CHAPTER 33

Longus

J.R. Morgan

If the cast-lists of the Greek novels are, on the whole, populated by figures who are individuated against a background of generic character-types, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* enriches the mix by hybridizing two distinct genres: ideal romance and Theocritean pastoral. Here we find versions of the romantic hero and heroine, of their parents, and of love-rivals, who are constructed as surprising and often humorous pastoral variants of romantic norms. Underlying the pastoral strand of the generic combination is a broad characterizing antithesis between the affluent and materialistic city and a simple countryside constructed as its prelapsarian ethical antitype. Although the novel as a whole complicates the simple equation of city with bad and country with good,[1] this categorization nevertheless provides a base setting from which individuals may be calibrated. Part of the process of complication involves the differentiation between the idealized 'soft' intertextually pastoral characters (principally the two protagonists), who seem to inhabit a golden-age landscape of leisure and plenty, and a more realistic set of rustic individuals engaged in grubbing out a subsistence-level existence of grinding poverty and labour.[2]

Before we move to details of Longus' techniques of characterization, we must say something about the narrator and narrative structure of the novel. A prologue features an internal narrator who relates how, while hunting on Lesbos, he came across a grove of the Nymphs where he saw a captivating image. The body of the novel purports to be an *ekphrasis* of that image, as expounded to the narrator by an otherwise unidentified local exegete. In the prologue the narrator is himself characterized as a pleasure-seeker from the city, and his perspectives on the countryside and its inhabitants are character-determined.[3] One element of the narrator's characterization of himself (which at his level is unintentional) is a sentimental and nostalgic idealization of the country's noble simplicity, while another is a sophisticated disdain for 'rusticity'. Neither is an adequate tool for fully understanding the story he tells.

1 See Morgan 2004: 15–16.

2 Particularly the protagonists' foster-fathers.

3 See Morgan 2004: 17–20.

This clear differentiation of narrator from author means that the reader of the novel must learn how to 'read through' the narrator to find the implied author's intended viewpoint. To put it crudely, what the narrator tells us about his characters may not be the 'truest' reading of them, and there will be places in this survey where we can see that the narrative hints at a subtler and deeper characterization than it actually expresses.

Names

Every name in the novel is carefully chosen. Some are straightforwardly 'speaking' names, such as that of the messenger Eudromus (literally 'good at running'). The transmitted text includes a comment on his name (4.5.2, 'because running was his job').[4] Daphnis' elder brother Astylus ('City Boy') is first named, without comment, at 4.10.1, though he has previously been referred to as the 'young master'. His name is more or less the sum total of his character, setting him up in contrast to Daphnis (to the connotations of whose name we shall return shortly).[5] Astylus' 'city-ness' governs his function in the plot: like the narrator and the young Methymnaeans within the story, he comes to the countryside for sport; he rides a horse (which none of the country folk does), and he blames it for the devastation of his father's ornamental garden, in a patrician gesture of sympathy for his underlings; he has a parasite and flatterer with whose homosexual (and thus anti-rural) designs on Daphnis he is prepared to connive.

The case of the parasite Gnathon ('Jaws') is a little more complex. His name, at a literal level, inscribes his gluttony and his natural habitat at his master's table. The narrator expatiates on the aptness of the name in an explicit characterization (4.11.2: 'whose accomplishments comprised eating, getting drunk, and drunken fornication, and who consisted of nothing more than jaws [*gnathos*], a stomach, and the parts below the stomach'). The name also carries an intertextual load, however, as that of the archetypal parasite of Athenian New Comedy.[6] As well as signalling the plot's transition from pastoral to urban comic mode, the name imports a ready-made characterization and set of motivations, which Gnathon duly enacts. His role in bringing the story to its proper conclusion by rescuing Chloe from her ruffian abductor, Lampis, is motivated

4 This clause is excised in Reeve's edition, following Piccolos, but it is not out of character for this narrator to draw attention to the artificiality of the naming process.

5 For possible intertextual implications of the name Astylus, see Morgan 2004: 229.

6 Morgan 2004: 229 for details.

by his desire not to be alienated from his new master's table. Similarly complex is the naming of Lycaenion ('Little She-wolf'), the seductive neighbour who initiates Daphnis into sex. The literal meaning of the name casts her as a metaphorical predator (though this is not the whole story, and the narrator does not tell the whole story), and as a link in the chain of wolf-imagery that denotes the animalistic aspect of sexual love. This name too has a literary heritage: prostitutes and courtesans are frequently named with cognates of *lukos* ('wolf'), and the diminutive form aligns Lycaenion with the stereotypical courtesan of New Comedy (Menander, →), the urban intertext underlining her urban background.[7]

Other names work more generally. The rustic characters often have vegetal or animal names: Myrtale ('myrtle'), Dryas (connected with *drus* 'oak-tree', but also alluding to the Nymphs who play such an important role in the story), Dorcon (from *dorkas* 'deer'),[8] Nape ('Woodland Glen'). Urban characters likewise bear socially marked names: Cleariste ('Best Fame'), Megacles ('Great Fame') are stereotypically aristocratic. The name of Daphnis' true father, Dionysophanes ('Dionysus Manifest') hints at an allegorical religious function, but also aligns him with a god whose worship in the novel is confined to the urban characters; its length and grandeur further denote elite status.[9]

The narrator draws particular attention to the naming of the two protagonists by their foster-parents. After discovering a baby boy abandoned with recognition tokens signifying a noble origin, Lamon and Myrtale decide to bring the child up as their own and to name him Daphnis 'so that even the name should appear pastoral (*poimenikon*)' (1.3.2). Chloe's foster-parents also give her a pastoral name (1.6.3, again *poimenikon*) to make their parenthood credible. In Daphnis' case, at least, the point is not just that the name (cognate with *daphnē* 'laurel') has vegetal and rustic connotations, but that it is that of the archetypal shepherd-hero of pastoral poetry (Theocritus, →). In one sense, the name encapsulates Daphnis' characterization and life-style, and obviates the need to recreate the conventions of the pastoral hero from scratch, though the joke is that within the story the characters are ignorant of the literary models in whose steps they tread. Features such as his amorousness and musicality are nominatively predetermined. At the same time, the Theocritean Daphnis is mysteriously unhappy in his love, and so provides an antithetical point of

7 For her urban background, see 3.15.1. On the name and her character see Morgan 2004: 208–210.

8 Dorcon's name is also cognate with the verb *derkomai* ('I see'), figuring his role as a male gazer; see Morgan 2004: 163.

9 There may be realistic connections with Mytilene; Morgan 2004: 231–232.

reference against which the reciprocal and successful love of Longus' protagonists can be more fully appreciated. Chloe's name (literally 'Green Growth') looks as if it is repeating the joke of illiterate foster-parents unwittingly giving a name with a significant literary pedigree, but, annoyingly, it does not occur in extant pastoral. Philetas' name marks him out as specially qualified to give advice in matters of love, and the narrator stresses this with a series of puns on the verb *phileō* ('love' or 'kiss') and its cognates. But he also functions as a further link to Alexandrian poetry, sharing a name with the influential poet Philitas of Cos. Details become controversial here, but it may be that Philetas' role as *erōtodidaskalos* and some details of his back-story (particularly his love for the beautiful Amaryllis) echo elements of Philitas' poetry now unfortunately lost to us.[10]

Character-Types

This is not the occasion to re-open the vexed question of how novels were conceptualized and categorized in antiquity. However, there are sufficient similarities between the five extant novels to allow us to talk of typical, if not generically determined, characters. Stories of love by definition require a pair of lovers, and those lovers tend to be young, attractive and upper-class, and their relationship one of mutual and faithful love. Stories of any length require some sort of adversity before a happy ending is achieved, and thus antagonists. These include love-rivals, as well as disruptive persons with other motives, such as pirates. The figure of 'hero's friend' or wise adviser is also a frequent one (Chariton, →), and sometimes the protagonists receive advice and guidance from an older or more experienced mentor. It is not too difficult to map these typical roles onto *Daphnis and Chloe*. The eponymous protagonists are obviously the lovers. The parts of love-rivals are taken by Dorcon and Lycaenion, who interestingly double up as friends and helpers. Pirates duly make an appearance, and are closely paired with a bunch of intrusive urban holidaymakers from Methymna. Philetas and Lycaenion share the role of *erōtodidaskalos*.

The romantic roles are crucially coloured with pastoral overtones. Daphnis and Chloe possess the nobility (*eugeneia*) of the typical romantic hero and heroine (Chariton, →), but are brought up by rural families, after being exposed at birth by their biological parents with recognition tokens that signify their *eugeneia*. Their nobility manifests itself metonymically in their physical beauty.

10 The argument is developed in Morgan 2011.

This is first presented through one another's focalization in a symmetrical pair of episodes where their love is awakened, first by the sight of Daphnis bathing naked (1.13.1–1.14.4) and second by a kiss from Chloe which Daphnis wins in a beauty contest with Dorcon (1.15.4–1.18.2). The mismatch between Daphnis' appearance and that of his ostensible parents is noted by Dryas, as he begins to suspect that Lamon's son may in fact be a good match for his foster-daughter (3.32.1). Their affective world is dominated, of course, by their exclusive mutual attraction, whose development forms the basis of the plot. However, although their foster-parents ensure that they receive a basic education,[11] Daphnis and Chloe's perspective is a rustic one, marked by an unrealistic naivety and ignorance about love and sex. For example, as Chloe watches Daphnis bathing, the narrator comments that she was 'but a little girl with a rustic upbringing, who had never so much as heard anyone speak love's name' (1.13.5). She manifests the traditional literary symptoms of love, like sleeplessness and loss of appetite, but relates her emotions to her rustic experience:

> 'I am in pain, and I have no wound. I am sad, and I have not lost any of my sheep. I am burning up, and I am sitting in the coolest shade. Brambles have often scratched me, and I never shed a tear. Bees have often stung me, and I never cried out. This thing that pricks my heart is more painful than any of those. Daphnis is beautiful, but so are the flowers; his pipes make beautiful sounds, but so do the nightingales; and I do not give them a second thought. I wish I could be his pipe so he could blow into me; I wish I could be a goat so I could have him for my shepherd.'
>
> 1.14.1–3

Her simplicity is expressed by the paratactic sentence-structure, by the rustic imagery, and even by the unwitting double entendre, which she is too innocent to notice, but which the narrator and his more sophisticated narratee certainly understand.

The innocence of the protagonists is, of course, the base point from which their erotic education must begin. Their first educator is Philetas, from whom they learn the name of the emotion they are experiencing, and who tells them the remedy of love: 'a kiss, an embrace and lying down together with naked bodies' (2.7.7). At first they hesitate to put this advice into effect, because the

11 The reasons are not specified by the narrator, but the author's implication is that they hope their foster-children will one day be lucratively reunited with their natural families.

third part of the suggested remedy seems 'too forward (*thrasuteron*), not just for maids but for young goatherds as well' (2.9.1). This unexplained sudden access of modesty reflects the concern for chastity that, with some variation of degree, is typical of novelistic protagonists, but the way that it is focalized contributes to the characterization of the protagonists as rustic and naive. It is obviously inconsistent for Daphnis and Chloe to feel moral inhibitions about something of which they are completely ignorant, and the narrator proceeds to have fun with their willingness but inability to have sex before marriage. They eventually pluck up the courage to try the third remedy, but in their innocence do not understand Philetas' euphemism and suppose that lying down together is all that is involved (2.11.3). Eventually Daphnis is initiated into sex by Lycaenion, who exploits Daphnis' naivety to lure him to a lonely place in the woods, and then warns him of the blood and pain that will occur when he tries out his new skills with Chloe (3.16.1–19.3). So Chloe's virginity is preserved, as it must be for a novel heroine, until her wedding night, but whereas other novel heroines are characterized by *sōphrosunē* (Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, Heliodorus, →), this concept has no meaning for one as innocent as Chloe. She has no idea what virginity is, and preserves it only by luck. Similarly, Daphnis is restrained not by any sense of sexual propriety but by clumsiness and a reluctance to cause Chloe physical pain. The narrator partly misses the point here: Daphnis' sexual initiation not only equips him for the act of love but also instils a new sense of responsibility and guardianship towards his beloved.

The rival figures are similarly adapted to the rustic setting. Whereas in Chariton the rivals for Callirhoe's love include the foremost of the Greeks of Ionia and the Persian king himself, Dorcon is a cowherd on a neighbouring farm, whose first function in the plot is to help Chloe pull Daphnis out of a pit using her breast-band (1.12.3–5). Although this is not made explicit by the narrator, it is apparently the sight of Chloe's breasts that inflames his desire for her. On that occasion he is not named, but when he re-enters he is introduced as 'a lad with his beard just on his chin' (1.15.1, *artigeneios meirakiskos*). He knows the 'name and deeds of love' (1.15.1), and hence has the two items of knowledge in which Philetas and Lycaenion will instruct the protagonists. His social superiority to Daphnis is only that of a cowherd above a goatherd in the generic pastoral hierarchy, and he is only slightly older. He sets about trying to win Chloe with pastoral courtship gifts which characterize him metonymically: a set of pipes, a fawn-skin (the pastoral equivalent of sexy lingerie perhaps, and revealing his designs on Chloe), cheese, flowers, apples, and a nest of birds, together with an 'ivy-cup' (*kissubion*, 1.15.3), a generic pastoral marker from Theocritus 1. However, the recipients of these gifts lack the knowledge of cultural codes of courtship to understand their true purpose (1.15.3). He then has

a contest with Daphnis (1.15.4–16.5), which adds to his characterization in several ways. Firstly, he compares himself to Daphnis and draws attention to his social superiority, lack of body odour, and general handsomeness. That these are important factors for him underlines his complete rusticity. Secondly, in the contest as a whole, he is easily outclassed by Daphnis, who inverts all of Dorcon's sneers and emerges as the better rhetorician; Dorcon, in vaunting his sophistication, demonstrates his lack of it.[12] Dorcon's next move is to attempt an assault on Chloe. For reasons unexplained he dresses in the skin of a wolf, using it to cover his body completely. Metonymically this denotes the animal and predatory aspects of his desire, and the narrator confirms this by describing Dorcon as 'having beastified (*ekthēriōsas*) himself to the best of his ability' (1.20.3). The metonymical characterization is extended when he conceals himself in a place where even a real wolf could have lurked unseen, overgrown with thorns, brambles and thistles. Again, however, reality does not bear out the fantasy that Dorcon is enacting. Instead of attacking Chloe, he is himself set upon by her dogs, and needs rustic poultices for his wounds. Eventually, Daphnis and Chloe, whose innocent interpretation of his actions as 'a pastoral prank' (1.21.5) both characterizes them and belittles Dorcon, walk him home. Dorcon has comically failed to enact the character type in which the romantic plot has cast him: in being transferred to a pastoral setting, the rival figure has been reduced in every way.

Dorcon's role in the plot is not yet over, though. The countryside of Lesbos is invaded by a crew of pirates, who beat Dorcon up and leave him for dead, abducting his cows and Daphnis. With his last breath, Dorcon gives Chloe his pipes and tells her that his cows are trained to respond to them. When she plays, the cows capsize the pirate vessel just a short distance from the land, and the pirates in their heavy gear sink straight to the sea-bed. Here again Longus is playing with a romantic character-type—the outlaws who threaten the protagonists (Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, →)—and, as with Dorcon, reducing them to comical ineffectiveness. At the same time, Dorcon briefly enacts the part of hero's friend, who, like Polycharmus in Chariton (→), saves the protagonist from death. It is an important part of Longus' pastoral vision that there are no real villains in his world, and to this extent Dorcon's characterization involves another complication and qualification of conventional stereotypes. It would be overstating the case to talk of character change or development; it is rather that at the last Dorcon is given the opportunity to display aspects of his character—magnanimity and compassion—that the story

12 Details in Morgan 2004: 165–166.

had hitherto occluded. At the very end of his life, he asks for, and gets, a kiss from Chloe (1.29.3), but this is no longer the erotic kiss he had tried to win before, but an ennobling and transfiguring gesture of profound gratitude and comradeship.

The corresponding female antagonist, Lycaenion, is equally ambiguous. As noted above, her name inscribes her nature as sexual predator, and her city origins (3.15.1, 'a little lady [*gunaion*] … from the city, young, pretty, and by country standards rather glamorous [*habroteron*]') mark her out as in some way antithetical to the pastoral characters. Initially she is interested only in enjoying Daphnis, but after witnessing the young lovers' unsuccessful attempt to imitate the mating of the animals, she takes pity on them and sees herself thenceforth as both satisfying her own desires and effecting their salvation (3.15.5). She inveigles Daphnis into accompanying her into the wood by means of a lie about an eagle stealing one of her geese;[13] and when she has got him to a conveniently deserted spot, tells a further untruth about having been told by the Nymphs in a dream to instruct him in physical love. This directly contradicts what the narrator has just said, but the narratee can see that Lycaenion is, unwittingly, furthering the Nymphs' purpose. The sexual act itself is described by the narrator as an 'erotic tuition' (3.19.1, *erōtikē paidagōgia*), in line with Lycaenion's own claim to be teaching Daphnis as her pupil. Although the narrator has explained her motivation for having sex with Daphnis, he is silent when she cautions Daphnis about the pain and blood that will result when he tries out his new skills on Chloe (3.19.2–3). The silence leaves an unresolved ambiguity: is she giving sincerely well-meant advice, or duplicitously using Daphnis' fear of hurting Chloe to keep him exclusively for herself? The indeterminacy of the narrator's vision of Lycaenion is yet further complicated by a hidden story implied by the 'facts' of the narrator's narration but not actually accessed by him.[14] Lycaenion is trapped in a spent sexual relationship with a rich farmer called Chromis, and a casual sexual adventure is all that life now holds. However, Lycaenion and Chromis appear together as guests at the wedding of Daphnis and Chloe (4.38.2). Her brief fling in the forest has turned out to be a life-changing experience for her as well as for Daphnis, and perhaps we are intended to see the agency of the Nymphs at work in this untold secondary story as well as in that of the protagonists.[15]

13 This evokes Penelope's dream at *Odyssey* 19.536–553, and so provides a metaphorically contrasting characterization; see Morgan 2004: 211.

14 Morgan 2004: 208–210.

15 This reading is argued more fully in Morgan 2004: 210.

Direct Characterization

On a few occasions the narrator introduces a character with a short character-sketch. We have already seen examples of this in connection with Dorcon, Lycaenion, Gnathon,[16] and Eudromus. Another example occurs at the first appearance of Philetas: he is described as 'an aged man (*presbutēs*), with a goat-skin cloak (*sisura*) round his shoulders and raw-hide shoes (*karabatinai*) on his feet, and a bag hanging at his side, and the bag was ancient too' (2.3.1). The characterization here is partly direct: the use of the dignified word *presbutēs* immediately distinguishes Philetas from the run-of-the-mill rustic old men (*gerontes*), and prepares for his roles as *erōtodidaskalos*-in-chief and sage rural judge. His clothing is unique and obviously characterizes him metonymically, though the precise semiotics of his exotic cloak and shoes are elusive: probably they denote a noble and ancient rusticity untouched by materialism.[17] Lycaenion's partner Chromis is afforded a characterizing introduction, as 'a neighbour who farmed his own land … now past his best physically' (3.15.1). This leads directly into the introduction of Lycaenion, quoted above. Chromis has no direct part to play in the story of Daphnis and Chloe, but the mere fact that he is named and given an introduction at all suggests that he has an importance (as part of Lycaenion's unwritten back-story and redemption that elude the narrator) beyond his minimal plot-function. Lampis, a ruffian and rival to Daphnis who tries to cause Daphnis trouble by vandalizing the master's ornamental garden and later abducts Chloe after Daphnis is recognized as the master's son, is introduced as 'a cowherd and a hothead' (4.7.1, *agerōkhos boukolos*), which is sufficient explanation for his actions. The master Dionysophanes is introduced on his first entrance as 'already middle-aged, but tall, good-looking and capable of holding his own with any young man. He had few equals for wealth and none for goodness' (4.13.2, *khrēstos hōs oudeis heteros*). His first action is to sacrifice to the gods of the countryside, Demeter, Dionysus, Pan and the Nymphs, a demonstration of piety that makes up part of his overall characterization as a good man. This is the only occasion when Demeter is named in the novel: despite her function as goddess of fertility and crops, she is an urban goddess, and Dionysus is associated with the festivities of the wine vintage that townsfolk come to the country to celebrate. Pan and the Nymphs, on the other hand, are genuinely rustic deities: Dionysophanes' sacrifices thus characterize him

16 Gnathon is also described by the narrator as 'a born pederast' (4.11.2, *phusei paiderastēs*).

17 Bowie 1985: 71–72 sees a resemblance to the clothing of Lycidas in Theoc. 7, who may be a cipher for the poet Philitas.

as urban but in tune with the natural countryside. Later this simple characterization is qualified by the realization that he exposed his youngest child in order to avoid dividing his estate. Dionysophanes' wife, Cleariste, is given no introduction at all: she is named as arriving at the country estate with Dionysophanes (4.13.1), and reappears to be impressed when her as yet unrecognized son puts on a show with his goats (4.15.1). Her characterization is limited to being a loyal appendage to her husband, and to experiencing maternal joy on cue. Chloe's father Megacles is not given a narratorial introductory characterization, other than the fact that he is one of the leading men invited to the banquet thrown by Dionysophanes on his return to Mytilene, and occupies a place of honour at the table by reason of his age (4.35.1). However, when he sees Chloe's recognition tokens and realizes that she is his daughter, he is allowed a brief narrative of her exposure, which shows him in a rather better light than Dionysophanes: at a time when he was not wealthy he hoped that an adoptive parent would be able to give her a better life than he was able to afford himself. His wife Rhode is not characterized at all: she is simply named twice.

In its way, this occlusion of the female characters is a form of characterization. Except in the case of Lycaenion (and of course Chloe) they are not capable of independent action and exist only in relation to their husbands, so embodying an ancient ideal of womanhood. Otherwise, the brief introductory characterizations that we have been discussing belong to secondary characters of some importance, and serve as markers of that importance. They are broad-brush and in most cases are subject to modification as the action proceeds; but they do provide a base-line calibration that allows the characters to be assigned to basic stock types.

On occasions, the narrator makes a directly characterizing comment which confirms his own limitations in understanding the story he is telling, and his tendency to patronize the rusticity of his characters. This can be illustrated in the Lycaenion scenes. Apart from failing to register that, despite her untruths, Lycaenion is serving the purpose of the novel's presiding deities, the narrator sees Daphnis only in terms of his ignorance and innocence. The narrator explains his enthusiasm to learn the sexual lesson Lycaenion is offering by stressing that Daphnis is a rustic goatherd, young and in love (3.18.1), and comments 'as if he was about to be taught something important, something truly heaven-sent' (3.18.2), the focalization implying, with a sophisticated smirk, that sex is the most ordinary thing in the world; but in this novel, and in the truest vision of reality, as the word 'heaven-sent' (*theopempton*) reminds us, Love really is humanity's greatest good.

Metonymical Characterization

As the editors explain in the Introduction, there are many techniques of metonymical characterization, and I shall return to some of them more explicitly. However, the broad categories of city and country underlie the novel's primary grouping of characters. It is not easy to separate metonymy and metaphor here, and the two often co-exist in a single passage. The seasonal changes of the countryside, for example, stand in a metaphorical relationship to the affective maturation of the characters, but the focalized presentation tells us something about the characters of the protagonists metonymically. And, if in the broadest sense the countryside is a metaphor for simplicity and purity and the city for sophistication and corruption, the opposition of the two entails a series of secondary cultural codes—such as dress, diet, worship—which express character metonymically.

We have already seen how Philetas' introduction includes an emphasis on apparently eccentric clothing, and how Dorcon dresses up as a wolf when he attempts to rape Chloe. However, we are told very little about 'normal' rustic clothing: Daphnis and Lamon both wear a *khitōniskos* ('shirt') as their normal daily wear (1.13.1, 4.7.5). Philetas' son Tityrus has a garment called an *enkombōma*, which he throws off when called upon to run an errand (2.33.3). Exactly what an *enkombōma* is is not clear: apart from entries in lexica, the word does not occur elsewhere in extant Greek texts, and may have come to Longus from erudite Alexandrian pastoral.[18] Predominantly, however, Daphnis and Chloe's interest in clothes centres on taking them off: their readiness to undress is an element of their characterization as sexually interested but naive and ignorant of polite convention. As they mature, they become more modest and reluctant to display their bodies to one another. Nevertheless, the importance of dress and appearance as a signifier distinguishing between rustic and urban is made clear after Daphnis is recognized by his natural parents. Almost his first action is to change into expensive clothes (4.23.2, *esthēta … polutelē*), and shortly afterwards he dedicates his pastoral clothes and bag to Dionysus, in a symbolic transition to the urban world. Even more strikingly, when it is revealed that Chloe is Daphnis' beloved and also emanates from a city family, she is scrubbed up and dressed by Cleariste in a way appropriate to her son's wife: her natural beauty is enhanced and transformed by ornament (*kosmos*), so that she is barely recognizable as the same person. The function of appropriate dress as a marker of *eugeneia* could hardly be clearer.

18 Morgan 2004: 135. If this is the case, it is appropriate for a character whose very name marks him out as an intertextual cipher.

Similarly, dietary codes serve as metonymic markers of country and city. The country folk live off their flocks, and their diet consists largely of bread, milk, cheese, fruit and wine, with occasional meat meals for special occasions or small birds in winter. The eating habits of the city people are quite different. As well as breakfast and an evening meal, they have a meal in the middle of the day, which consists of a pretentiously denominated 'urban cuisine' (4.15.4, *astikēs opsartusias*), and the celebratory dinner following Daphnis' recognition includes a range of comestibles not associated with the rustics: fine wheat flour, marsh fowl,[19] sucking pigs and honey-cakes (4.26.1). Gnathon's status as a parasite (i.e. table companion) is a product of urban social institutions, and cemented by urban gastronomy.

The social organization of town and country is another signifier of difference. Daphnis' foster-family is of servile status, and Lamon has to (or at least plausibly pretends to have to) ask his master's permission before he can marry. Chloe's family is of free status, and can tout her around suitable suitors. Although this is felt as an important differentiation in the country (3.26.4), there is in practice little distinction between free and slave labour in Longus' countryside. Lamon and Dryas are engaged in almost identical work as goatherd and shepherd, are both able to adopt a foundling and both have the resources to raise him or her without marked hardship. The country people themselves subscribe to a literary hierarchy that ranks cowherds above shepherds and shepherds above goatherds; Dorcon tries to make cruel use of this in his contest with Daphnis (1.16.1). However, there is no sign of social friction and every sign of communal cohesion. Above all, although there is time for singing and dancing, the life of the country people is one of hard labour, implicitly on the edge of starvation (3.30.3; although Daphnis and Chloe are, as idealized constructs, to some extent immune to such hardship). In the city, by contrast, the narrative focuses on a wealthy elite, clearly distanced from the slaves who constitute their household; there is no trace in the novel of free urban poor. The luxury of the urban rich is demonstrated through activities such as hunting for sport (Astylus' reason for coming to the country, 4.11.1), a sort of sanitized participation in the grape-harvest (4.5.2, a few select bunches are left on the vine for them to pick), and, iconically, the non-functional pleasure-garden (*paradeisos*) of Dionysophanes, which is engineered to present an artificial urban ideal of nature (4.2.1–3.2).[20] The centrepiece of the garden is a temple of Dionysus, decorated with images of violent scenes from his mythology, which characterize at

19 Compare the geese, ducks and bustards hunted by the young Methymnaeans (2.12.4).

20 On the *paradeisos* and its significance, see Morgan 2004: 223–225.

least one aspect of the city. As noted above, Dionysus and the other Olympian deities do not feature in the lives of the country people, whose religion centres on rural nature gods, particularly the Nymphs and Pan.

Emotions

It is almost superfluous to say that the emotion of love is central to the entire genre of the novel. As noted above, the central character-types are two beautiful and faithful lovers. Daphnis and Chloe obviously fill these roles. However, whereas in the other novels hero and heroine fall in love at first sight near the beginning of the story and their love, though tested, remains the one constant in their lives, *Daphnis and Chloe* thematizes the development of love as the nucleus of its plot. Love in this novel is not a monolithic entity, but one subject to subtle gradations. Daphnis and Chloe do not exactly undergo character-change, but they move from childhood to adulthood in a process of education and discovery. This process is articulated by the cycle of the seasons, which thus stand as metaphorical characterization of the stages of maturation. Love begins in the spring (1.9–22), becomes more heated in the summer (1.23–27), and reaches a first goal in the autumn (1.28–3.2), when Philetas reveals the name and nature of love to the young couple; winter (3.3–11) is a time of separation and frustration, but the second spring (3.12–23) heralds a rebirth of love and Daphnis' initiation at the hands of Lycaenion; the second summer (3.23–34) introduces the possibility of marriage; and finally a second autumn (4.1–40) brings the fruition of love and the first love-making of the protagonists. The following paragraphs survey the way that the protagonists' erotic emotions develop over the course of the novel's seven seasons. Here again, a strict separation of metonymical and metaphorical characterization is not feasible; indeed each stage is defined in essence by an intratextual metaphorical comparison with the preceding one. And each affective stage is expressed through a whole range of metonymies, including speech, actions and focalizations.[21]

When the narrative proper begins, Daphnis and Chloe are innocent and inseparable children. They imitate the sights and sounds of the natural world (singing like the birds, skipping like the lambs), and play childish and pastoral games together (1.10.2, *athurmata … poimenika kai paidika*). Chloe is the first to experience feelings she is unable to name, when she watches Daphnis taking

21 For a more detailed discussion, see Morgan 2004: 10–14.

a bath in the spring after falling into a wolf-trap. The description of his body is presented through her focalization, and, in her innocence, she thinks the bath itself must be the cause of this new beauty. The narrator comments in his patronizing way (1.13.5) that she is 'but a little girl with a rustic upbringing, who had never so much as heard anyone speak love's name'. She experiences symptoms of love-sickness, which coincide with those familiar from love poetry, particularly that of Sappho (one of the novel's principal intertexts): loss of appetite, sleeplessness, loss of interest in other things, sudden mood-swings and changes of complexion. Again, her rusticity is presented through a focalized comment: 'no cow tormented by a gadfly ever suffered so' (1.13.5, though the sexual overtones of the gadfly (*oistros*) are ironically clear to the narratee). The next chapter consists of an *ēthopoiia*, in which Chloe voices her perplexity in a suitably rustic and innocent manner (quoted above). There follows a symmetrical sequence, in which Daphnis' emotions are aroused by the metonymically 'untutored and artless' (1.17.1, *adidakton kai atekhnon*) kiss from Chloe which is the prize in his contest with Dorcon, and which she is only too pleased to award him. As with Chloe, the narrator gives us first a rustically focalized description of Daphnis' emotions:

> that was the first time he noticed with wonder that her hair was golden, that her eyes were as large as a cow's,[22] that her face truly was even whiter than goat's milk, as if now for the first time he had acquired eyes, and had been blind before.
>
> 1.17.3

He suffers a similar set of symptoms, including the clearest possible allusion to Sappho: 'his face was sicklier green (*khlōroteron*) than summer grass' (compare Sappho 31.14 LP, 'I am sicklier green [*khlōrotera*] than grass'); and he has a similar *ēthopoiia*, voicing his puzzlement about what is happening to him. Like Chloe, he conceives his emotions as the symptoms of a disease. The characterizing effect of all this is clear, but the technique is difficult to describe. The emotions described, the focalizations, and the speech acts are straightforwardly metonymical, but they are overlaid by a double metaphorical effect. First, the intertextual references to Sappho evoke a whole repertoire of love poetry, whose clichés Daphnis and Chloe are apparently reinventing; but second, the precise symmetry of the two inamorations enforces an intratextual

22 The joke here is that although Daphnis reaches for a comparison within his experience as a goatherd, he unwittingly hits on the Homeric formula *boōpis* ('ox-eyed').

comparison of the two lovers, emphasizing that at this stage their emotions are identical: their instinctive *homonoia* complies with the generic reciprocity of romantic love, and provides the starting point of a process of increasing gender differentiation.

The first summer is introduced by description focalized through a hypothetical observer:

> one might have thought (*eikasen an tis*) the rivers were softly singing as they flowed, the winds were piping as they blew through the pines, the apples were dropping to the ground from love, and the sun was making everyone take their clothes off because it loved beauty so.
>
> 1.23.2

The eroticization of the landscape is thus distanced from the protagonists, who are still ignorant of love: a metaphorical characterization of them. The behaviour of the young couple changes, in response to the physical heat of the season and the figurative heat of their passion. Daphnis bathes in rivers, and there is a series of erotically charged scenes, in which Chloe is melted by the sight of Daphnis bathing in the nude and he imagines that he is looking at one of the Nymphs; she tries on his clothes while he is bathing, and he reinvents one of the standard motifs of erotic poetry by using the pipes to pass her a kiss. This relatively short section culminates in a scene that inspired many later painters: Daphnis is fixated by the sight of Chloe sleeping, and in another *ēthopoiia* voices both his desire to kiss her again and his fear of doing so: he even adopts an anti-pastoral stance to emphasize that his still uncomprehended love overrides all his previous loyalties and concerns:

> 'those noisy cicadas, they will stop her sleeping with their din.[23] And the billy-goats are banging their horns together as they fight:[24] those wolves are worse cowards than foxes not to have carried them off.'
>
> 1.25.3

23 A metaphorical characterization by means of an intratextual comparison with the childish games of spring, when Chloe made a cricket-cage so that she could enjoy the entomological music (1.10.2).

24 His naivety prevents him, but not the narratee, from understanding that the he-goats are fighting over the she-goats; compare the more explicit description of their activity in the second spring (3.13.2–3).

As he speaks, a cicada being pursued by a swallow drops into Chloe's bosom. When she wakes up, Daphnis has the excuse to put his hand inside her dress; but no sooner has he retrieved the cicada than Chloe kisses it and replaces it between her breasts, indicating that she would be pleased for him to repeat the fondling. The actions express emotions of desire and pleasure that the characters are as yet unable to name, let alone articulate verbally.

At the grape vintage at the beginning of Book 2 each of the protagonists is the object of suggestive behaviour from other workers, and a new emotion, jealousy, enters their world. In their state of ignorance, however, they do not understand their feelings. Their incomprehension is expressed through focalization: the narrator conspicuously avoids naming jealousy, and instead uses vague terms for unpleasant feelings. Nevertheless, this new sense that the relationship is exclusive marks an increase in its intensity, and makes them ready for the first of the novel's didactic episodes, in which Philetas narrates an encounter in his garden with the child Eros, instructs them in the nature of his divinity, and finally offers them a remedy for love. Their naivety is carefully inscribed through the various stages of this scene. They receive Philetas' narrative as simply a story (2.7.1, *muthon ou logon*), and ask whether Eros is a child or a bird. The subsequent theology is received with equal blankness, and it is only when Philetas speaks of his own love for Amaryllis that they are able to make a connection to their own condition. With the knowledge of the name of love comes a new but apparently instinctive sense of modesty, which prevents Daphnis and Chloe putting the third part of Philetas' remedy—lying together with naked bodies—into effect: 'this was too forward not just for maids for young goatherds as well' (2.9.1). From this point, however, also arises an apparently natural male dominance on the part of Daphnis, as he accidentally ends up on top of her in a particularly passionate cuddle (2.11.1–2). He takes the part of Pan and she of Syrinx in a mime following Lamon's narration of the myth (2.37). The second book ends with the lovers exchanging vows of fidelity, but by different gods, Chloe by the Nymphs and Daphnis by the aggressively masculine Pan. These figures connect with the series of three myths to which we shall return shortly. Chloe is aware enough by now to realize that Pan would be all too likely to condone rather than punish infidelity, and compels Daphnis to swear again, this time by his flocks. In the first chapters of the next book he takes the initiative in trudging through the winter snow to visit her.

When the second spring arrives, it is described rather differently from the first, with an awareness of the animals' courting and mating. In terms of characterization there are several things going on; in fact, the passage illustrates the symbiotic inseparability of the forms and techniques of characterization. The countryside is, as throughout the novel, a metaphor for the emotional con-

dition of the protagonists. At the same time, the new sense of nature's erotic aspects indicates that the description is focalized metonymically through the perceptions of Daphnis and Chloe. Furthermore, the description of the second spring only has its full significance when compared to that of the first. The intratextual comparison metaphorically registers the development that Daphnis and Chloe have undergone in the intervening year. Daphnis' dominance accelerates. His sexual arousal is now made more explicit, and connected by a series of verbal echoes to the florescence of the natural world. He presses her to imitate the behaviour of the animals, and she rejects his suggestion that this might be the third remedy with arguments that combine naivety and sophistry: the animals do whatever it is they do standing up, and they do not take their wool off to do it. Daphnis' escapade with Lycaenion leaves him with a knowledge of the mechanics of sex that Chloe does not share. He can now control Chloe's transition from childhood to womanhood, but power brings responsibility as well. In the face of Lycaenion's warnings, he subordinates his physical desire to a loving concern for her welfare. This distances him both from the animals and from Lycaenion, who apparently, in following up her warning with advice to go to a quiet place where no one would hear Chloe's screams, never envisaged that he would not immediately graduate to sex with Chloe.

The second summer is largely taken up with questions of courtship and marriage, but it ends with an iconic scene in which Daphnis' masculinity and Chloe's femininity are demonstrated. Daphnis ignores Chloe's fears and, much to her annoyance, climbs a tree to pick a splendid apple from the highest bough.[25] Throughout the final book, Chloe is a fundamentally passive figure, who shyly avoids the visitors from the city, and is even subject to a violent abduction. On the wedding night that concludes the novel Daphnis finally teaches her 'some of the things' that he had learned from Lycaenion, and, although their shared pleasure is clear enough, it is also clear that they are settling into the conventional modalities of married sex, where an experienced man initiates his virginal partner.

A brief word about speech:[26] we do not know what Greek as spoken by farm labourers on Lesbos would have been like, but it is certain that Longus makes no attempt to imitate it, or to distinguish rustic characters from urban on the basis of their speech. We have already noted the *ēthopoiiai* given to Chloe and Daphnis in Book 1. The style is far from primitive, but there is arguably

25 This is an intertextual act of daring: Longus more or less quotes an epithalamium of Sappho in which the unpicked apple symbolized the bride's virginity.

26 More detailed discussion in Bowie 2006.

some characterization inherent in the simple sentence structures; though the faux-naive epigrammatic effect is quite sophisticated in its way. Perhaps the salient point for characterization is that, whereas Daphnis speaks in a variety of situations, Chloe is only ever allowed direct speech addressed to him.

Metaphorical Characterization

We have already seen several times in passing how Longus uses intertextuality as a means of characterization. This is in large part through assimilation to and differentiation from the character-types of other novels. But many of the characteristics of pastoral figures are drawn from Alexandrian poetry, certainly that of Theocritus and probably that of Philitas of Cos. Here too the differences within broad similarities are important, particularly in relation to the figure of Daphnis, a victim of tragic love in Theocritus but, eventually, the paradigm of love as a good in its own right in Longus. We have also seen that New Comedy furnishes some character patterns, such as the parasite and the courtesan (Menander, →). The love poetry of Sappho, appropriately enough for a story set on Lesbos, furnishes much of the characterizing psychology of love. In this final section, I want to draw attention to two intratextual features of the novel.

The first is the much discussed series of myths presented as secondary narratives:[27] the story of the wood-dove, told by Daphnis in Book 1; the myth of Pan and Syrinx, narrated by Lamon and subsequently acted out by Daphnis and Chloe in Book 2; and the myth of Echo, narrated by Daphnis in Book 3. The first of these includes a reference to the story of Pan and Pitys. Taken together they demonstrate an increase in male sexual aggression, embodied by Pan, and female victimhood, which keeps pace with the erotic development of the protagonists in the primary narrative. It is widely agreed that the figures of Pan and the Nymphs in these myths stand in some sort of analogical relation to Daphnis and Chloe. The exact nature of that relation is ambiguous: on the one hand, the myths may expose sexual dynamics of aggression and destruction which the main narrative sentimentally occludes; or the myths may be read as antithetical to the main narrative, examples of the sorts of sexual behaviour to be avoided and highlighting the positives of the main narrative by contrast; or, finally, they may be both of these things at one and the same time.

27 On these myths, see Morgan 2004: 171–172, 195–196, 213–216, and the bibliography cited there, particularly MacQueen 1990.

The second is the number of significant symmetries and parallelisms that Longus has built into his narrative. Perhaps the most obvious is that between Philetas and Lycaenion as the novel's two educators, in the name and deeds of love respectively, but also as representatives of the novel's cardinal concepts of nature and art, *phusis* and *tekhnē*, and in some sense of masculinity and femininity. Philetas' apparent benevolence is qualified by the comparison with Lycaenion: does he perhaps have selfish motives in telling the young couple to lie down together naked? Certainly, Lycaenion's selfish duplicity is redeemed when she is seen as counterpart to Philetas. But Lycaenion is also paired with Dorcon through a series of verbal echoes and most obviously by the wolf-imagery connected to them both, but also by the fact that Dorcon, strangely, is white-skinned like a woman from the town (1.16.5). Here too differences are as important as similarities: Dorcon turns from nominal deer to wolf, and is punished for his aggression by becoming the only named character in the novel to die. Lycaenion moves from nominal wolf to perhaps unwitting benefactress, and seems to win healing of her own life. Similarly, Philetas has another pairing: with Gnathon, who like him, delivers a speech on the nature of love, and may thus count as a third *praeceptor amoris*. Philetas' speech is perhaps Longus' finest moment, virtually a prose poem, whereas Gnathon's is vacuous rhetorical buffoonery. The comparison defines each of the characters more clearly. And to close the circle, Gnathon and Lycaenion are paired as representatives of the deviant or unnatural sexuality of the city, sexual predators who both end up as saviours.

The parallels do not end here. The novel contains two elaborate descriptions of gardens, symmetrically placed near the beginning of Books 2 and 4, each of which books is devoted entirely to an autumn: Philetas' *kēpos* and Dionysophanes' *paradeisos* which is tended by Lamon. Each of these gardens is, among other things, a metonymic characterization of its owner and/or cultivator. So Philetas' is productive, regularly cultivated, filled with birdsong, and fertilized by Eros bathing in its spring; Dionysophanes' is, for all its luxurious beauty, ornamental, regimented, silent and sterile, neglected in its master's absence, and fertilized with dung. Each of the gardens has an intruder: in Philetas' it is Eros, who does no harm, despite Philetas' fear that he might break some of the plants; in Dionysophanes' it is Lampis, who spitefully trashes the flowers in order to put Daphnis in his master's bad books. The parallel prompts us to see that Lampis is not just a nasty person, but represents the antitype of 'good' Eros. These examples do not exhaust the list of significant parallels that provided metaphorical characterization. There is much more to be said about the interpretation of each of them, but my purpose here has been primarily to draw attention to the presence of the technique.

Conclusion

In his proem, the narrator sets out the educational function of this novel, and hints that the story of Daphnis and Chloe is that of every human being; in other words that it is an allegory concerned with the universal not the individual. We cannot, therefore, expect profound psychological individuation of its characters: they are not 'real people'. On the other hand, its thematic of love and growing up requires a focus on emotions, which necessarily generates characterization. The range of techniques employed is remarkable, as is the finesse with which they are handled.