

SOME NOTES ON LONGUS, *DAPHNIS* *AND CHLOE*

I cite from M. S. Reeve's revised edition (Leipzig 1986).

1,7,1–1,8,2:

... ἤδη δὲ ἦν ὁ μὲν πεντεκαίδεκα ἐτῶν ἀπὸ γενεᾶς, ἡ δὲ τοσούτων δυοῖν ἀποδεόντων, καὶ ὁ Δρύας καὶ ὁ Λάμων ἐπὶ μιᾶς νυκτὸς ὀρώσιν ὄναρ τοιόνδε τι ... καὶ κοινώσαντες ἀλλήλοις τὸ ὄναρ κτλ.

Dryas, it will be recalled, was the adoptive father of the foundling Daphnis and Lamon of the other foundling Chloe. Dream visions are commonplace in antiquity, but that two individuals should independently have the same dream on the same night would have been an unusual phenomenon then as now, whether in life or in literature. Perhaps it needs to be emphasized a bit more here:

... καὶ ὁ Δρύας καὶ ὁ Λάμων, (ἄμφω) ἐπὶ μιᾶς νυκτός, ὁρῶσιν ὄναρ τοιόνδε τι κτλ.

‘... and Dryas and Lamon, both on a single night, see such a dream as follows ...’¹ The insertion of ἄμφω produces a rhetorical collocation of a sort common with the numeral ‘one’ (or an equivalent). Compare Eur. Hec. 285: τὸν πάντα δ’ ὄλβον ἡμᾶρ ἐν μ’ ἀφείλετο. Med. 1231–32: ἔοιχ’ ὁ δαίμων πολλὰ τῆδ’ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ / κακὰ ξυνάπτειν. Fr. 549 Nauck²: ἀλλ’ ἡμᾶρ (ἐν) τοι μεταβολὰς πολλὰς ἔχει. Men. Dysc. 187–88: πολλ’ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ / γένοιτ’ ἄν. Ennius, Ann. 258 Sk.: *multa dies in bello conficit unus* (see Skutsch ad loc., p. 441). νύξ is also found in such expressions, Theognis 663–664: ... ὅς μάλα πολλὰ πέπαται / ἐξαπίνης πάντ’ οὖν ἄλεσε νυκτὶ μιῇ.² Compare further van Groningen on Theognis, v. 160 and Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 1455. For the specific collocation of ‘both’ and ‘one’ in such locutions see Pi. Pyth. 10,2–3 πατρός δ’ ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἐνός/... γένος ... βασιλεύει. Nem. 6,1–2 ἐκ μιᾶς δὲ πνέομεν / ματρός ἀμφοτέροι. Verg. Aen. 2,709–10: *unum et commune periculum, / una salus ambobus erit*. In Longus himself a comparable phrase occurs immediately below, 1,7,2: ... τὸ δὲ [sc. παιδίων] ἐφραγμένον ἀμφοτέρων ἐνὶ βέλει κτλ. (Longus uses both ἀμφοτέροι and ἄμφω; for the latter see 1,12,2 and 1,12,5.) The accidental omission of ἄμφω after Λάμων would of course be a commonplace type of error.

M. D. Reeve, *Hiatus in the Greek Novelists*, CQ n. s. 21 (1971) 514–539, has shown that the novelists (Lollianus is an exception) tend to avoid hiatus rather strictly, a consideration which would seem to argue against ἄμφω ἐπὶ. But the objection is perhaps not insuperable. The avoidance of hiatus is by no means absolute and Reeve, in his admirable article, lists a number of categories in which hiatus is permitted, various degrees of pause being among them. Possibly there was a slight pause of emphasis after ἄμφω (‘both – on one night’). Alternatively an emphatic rhetorical colon such as ἄμφω ἐπὶ μιᾶς νυκτός may have been felt as so close a unit as to allow the hiatus. Compare, for example, οὐδὲ εἷς and μηδὲ εἷς (metrically admissible in comedy despite the hiatus). Such speculations aside – and I recognize their tenuousness – there are too many examples of hiatus in the novelists, including Longus, to remove them all by conjecture. Some must be sound, as Reeve himself seems to have recognized, p. 530: “... Some of these instances are so intractable that Longus himself may have been under constraint.” For some examples of hiatus after final -ω (-ῶ) in Longus see 2,3,2 ... τῷ Πανὶ ἐκείνῳ ἐσύρισα. 2,23,1 ... καὶ αὐτῷ αἱ τρεῖς ἐρίστανται Νύμφαι. 3,6,1 δρόμῳ οὖν ... 3,30,5 ὁ μὲν ταῦτα καὶ ἔτι πλείω ἔλεγεν. (Reeve accepts all these except the last where he inserts (τούτων) after πλείω, an unlikely conjecture in my view.) What is clear is 1) the novelists are fair-

1) Note that in καὶ ὁ Δρύας καὶ ὁ Λάμων the first καὶ is an ‘and’ connecting the two clauses, the second καὶ an ‘and’ connecting the two nouns; in other words, the force of καὶ ... καὶ ... here is not ‘both Dryas and Lamon.’

2) The exact text of v. 664 is uncertain, but the soundness of νυκτὶ μιῇ is not in doubt.

ly strict in avoiding hiatus; 2) many examples of hiatus in the MSS are rightly emended; 3) nevertheless, there remain numerous cases of apparently sound hiatus (more, in my view, than Reeve is inclined to accept); and 4) it is not always possible to settle the issue in a given case. Further investigation of hiatus in the novelists is a desideratum. In the present state of our knowledge (ἄμφω) here perhaps merits a mention in the apparatus; anything more would be rash.³

2,5,3:

... καὶ σε οἶδα νέμοντα πρωθήβην ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ὄρει τὸ πλατὺ
βουκόλιον καὶ παρήμην σοι συρίττοντι πρὸς ταῖς φηγοῖς ἐκείναις ἡνίκα
ἦρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος κτλ.

The speaker is Eros/Cupid addressing the old herdsman Philetas. In his apparatus criticus (p. 19, l. 29) Reeve has a comment on οἶδα: “fort. εἶδον.” One understands why. The tense of οἶδα should correspond to that of παρήμην and νέμοντα, if governed by οἶδα, should refer to present time relative to that verb. For the conjecture εἶδον compare 1,13,5: ... αὐτὸν ... λουόμενον εἶδε. For the (apparent) sense of the passage see C. Gill’s translation: “I’ve known you [emphasis added] when, as a lusty young man, you used to graze your large herd of cows on that mountain there, and I’ve been with you while you played the pipes beside those oaks when you were in love with Amaryllis.”⁴ There are two slips here, one of tense and one of sense. First, ‘I’ve known’ mistranslates the tense of οἶδα,⁵ and secondly οἶδα is confused with γινώσκω, the mot juste for ‘be acquainted with.’ Compare John Burnet’s apt comment on Pl. Ap. 20E Χαιρεφῶντα γὰρ ἴστε πού: “not γινώσκετε, for he was dead.”⁶ In this passage Eros presents himself as an ancient, indeed primeval, deity: οὔτοι παῖς ἐγὼ καὶ εἰ δοκῶ παῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Κρόνου πρεσβύτερος καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ παντός χρόνου (2,5,2). οἶδα seems consciously chosen to make this assertion an explicit and emphatic instance of Eros’ wide knowledge: ‘I know that you used to tend your wide-ranging⁷ herd when you were in your youthful

3) For an undoubted instance of ἄμφω followed by hiatus see the so-called ‘Glaucetes Fragment’ in the *Phoinikika* of Lollianus, p. 9 of A. Henrich’s edition (Die *Phoinikika* des Lollianos. Fragmente eines Neuen Griechischen Romans herausgegeben und erläutert von Albert Henrich [Bonn 1972]: ... κείμαι ... καὶ μετ’ ἐμοῦ κόρη καλή, ἄμφω ἀνηρημένοι [= P. Ox. 1368. col. ii, 30–33]. As Lollianus admits hiatus freely, this is, alas, not decisive. (The merit for discovering that this fragment comes from the *Phoinikika* goes to Reeve himself, [supra, p. 234] p. 536 n. 2.)

4) The translation can be found in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* edited by B. P. Reardon (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1989) 304.

5) More precisely, the English perfect tense ‘I’ve known’ reproduces neither οἶδα (‘I know’) nor ἤδη (‘I knew’).

6) I realize that this distinction is not absolute, but οἶδα so used is rare enough to question such a meaning here when its usual meaning makes excellent sense (below).

7) This seems to be the force of πλατὺ here; see G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad. A Commentary*. Vol. I (Cambridge 1985) on Il. 2,474. Longus’ phrase τὸ πλατὺ βουκόλιον is fashioned after the Homeric αἰπόλια πλατέ’ αἰγῶν (Il. 2,474, 11,679; Od. 14,101.103; also Hes. Theog. 445). Note that Longus applies the epithet to herds of cattle, not goats. See further R.L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge 1983) 60 (with n. 8 on p. 117).

prime ... and I was beside you when ...' νέμοντα is an instance of the so-called 'participle of the imperfect' of the grammars. The participle, when so used, frequently has an adverbial modifier (τότε, ποτε, πρότερον, πρόσθεν etc.), and here πρωθήβην elegantly performs that function. The use of this Homeric word gives an appropriate patina of archaic dignity to the pronouncement. If the paradosis wants further defending, just imagine that both οἶδα and εἶδον had come down in the MSS as genuine variants. Would not οἶδα be the *lectio difficilior*?

2,14,4:

... οἱ δὲ ἀντείχοντο σκληροὶ γέροντες καὶ χεῖρας ἐκ γεωργικῶν ἔργων
ἰσχυρὰς ἔχοντες καὶ ἠξίου δικαιολογήσασθαι περὶ τῶν γεγεννημένων.

οἱ δέ refers to Lamon and Dryas who have responded to Daphnis' cry for help. The Greek can stand as it is, but note that the subject of ἀντείχοντο is οἱ δέ, not οἱ δὲ γέροντες.⁸ The phrase σκληροὶ γέροντες is an appositional modifier of οἱ δέ and corresponds syntactically to χεῖρας ἐκ γεωργικῶν ἔργων ἰσχυρὰς ἔχοντες. The result is a certain rhetorical imbalance which can be easily removed by a slight addition and repunctuation, thus:

... οἱ δὲ ἀντείχοντο, σκληροὶ γέροντες (ὄντες) καὶ χεῖρας ἐκ γεωργικῶν
ἔργων ἰσχυρὰς ἔχοντες, καὶ ἠξίου κτλ.

For a comparable pair of balancing participles compare 3,31,2: ... καὶ γὰρ ἄν μαινοίμην, ἡμιγέρον τε ὦν ἦδη καὶ χειρὸς εἰς τὰ ἔργα δεόμενος περιττοτέρας, κτλ. In general Longus has a tendency to affect rhymes and balanced units. (See, for example, the opening sentence of 4,4,1–2 cited below.) The corruption (if such it be) assumes a haplography of the easiest sort.

3,16,1:

τῆς ἐπιούσης, ὡς παρὰ τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν τίκτουσαν ἀπιούσα, φανερῶς
ἐπὶ τὴν δρῶν ἔνθα ἐκαθέζοντο Δάφνις καὶ Χλόη παραγίνεται καὶ
ἀκριβῶς μιμησαμένη τὴν τεταραγμένην 'σώσόν με,' εἶπε 'Δάφνι, τὴν
ἀθλίαν κτλ.'

ἔνθα Courier : ἐν ἧ

The deceiver is Lykainion, the young city wife of old Chromis. The phrase μιμησαμένη τὴν τεταραγμένην is puzzling, since no specific disturbed woman to whom this can refer has been mentioned. C. Gill translates "... gave an accurate imitation of a woman in distress" and G. Dalmeyda in his Budé edition (Paris 21960) "prenant, à s'y méprendre, l'air d'une femme bouleversée" (emphases added in both versions). Clearly that is the meaning wanted, but can τὴν τεταραγμένην give it? The article with a participle may be either specific or generic (ὁ βουλόμενος = 'whoever wishes'), but ἡ τεταραγμένη, this tense of this verb in this sentence, is surely specific, and therefore wrong. Compare Soph. Ai. 726–27 (of Teucer) τὸν τοῦ μανέντος κάπιβουλευτοῦ στρατῶ / ξύναμον ἀποκαλοῦντες κτλ. where τοῦ μανέντος refers specifically to Ajax. What to do? Read μιμησαμένη τιν(ᾶ) τεταραγμένην, 'imitating someone (female) in distress' vel sim. τις so used is idiomatic

8) Distinguish clearly between (1) οἱ δὲ ἀντείχοντο σκληροὶ γέροντες and (2) οἱ δὲ σκληροὶ γέροντες ἀντείχοντο. They are syntactically quite distinct and it is the former, not the latter, that we have here.

and it is now legitimate to render the Greek (τινὰ τ., not τὴν τ.) by ‘a woman in distress.’ The participle τεταραγμένην could be loosely ‘glossed’ from Homer, Il. 6,389 *μαινομένη ἔϊκνυα* (cf. Il. 22,460 *μαινάδι ἴση*).⁹ Recall that *τιν* and *την* had come to be pronounced identically, observe that *την τεταραγμένην* is preceded by three occurrences of *τήν* in this sentence (and one of *της*) and followed by a fourth – not to mention two further instances of *τήν* in the immediately preceding sentence, and the cause of the error (a case of what is sometimes called *perseveration*) becomes apparent.

4,4,1–2:

τοιούτον ὄντα τὸν παράδεισον ὁ Λάμων ἐθεράπευε τὰ ξηρὰ ἀποτέμνων,
τὰ κλήματα ἀναλαμβάνων. τὸν Διόνυσον ἐστεφάνωσε, τοῖς ἀνθεσιν
ὔδωρ ἐπαχέτευσεν ἐκ πηγῆς τινὸς ἣν εὔρεν ἐς τὰ ἄνθη Δάφνης· ἐσχόλαζε
μὲν τοῖς ἀνθεσιν ἢ πηγῇ, Δάφνιδος δὲ ὅμως ἐκαλεῖτο πηγῇ. παρ-
εκελεύετο δὲ καὶ τῷ Δάφνιδι ὁ Λάμων παιαίνειν τὰς αἴγας ὡς δυνατὸν
μάλιστα κτλ.

ἐκ πηγῆς τινὸς ἣν Brunck : πηγῇ τις ἣν V (ἣν pro ἣν V²)

Reeve prints as above. In support of Brunck’s conjecture he compares 4,7,4 . . . *παρ-ελθὼν εἰς τὸν κῆπον ἔμελλεν ὔδωρ αὐτοῖς [sc. τοῖς ἀνθεσιν] ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς ἐπάξειν*. This is hardly a decisive parallel; note that even the verb (*ἐπάξειν*) is different. G. Dalmeyda prints in his edition . . . *πηγῇ τις ἣν, (ἣν) εὔρεν κτλ.* with the annotation “ἣν ἣν edd.” in his app. crit. I consider this to be correct, but postpone discussion while I attempt a clarification of a related problem. In his app. crit. Reeve goes on to add another observation: “ἐσχόλαζε – πηγῇ² non intelligo.” *ἐσχόλαζε* here means ‘was reserved for’, as some scholars have understood. LSJ s. v. IV state “of a place, *to be vacant, unoccupied*, Plu. CG 12, Jul. Caes. 316C: c. dat., *to be reserved for*, τὸ ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ κορρωφῆς μέχρι σελήνης θεοῖς καὶ ἄστροις . . . *σχολάζει* Herm. ap. Stob. 1,49,68.” (They do not cite our passage.) G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s. v. *σχολάζω* 5, gives another example of this meaning (*‘be reserved for’, c. dat.*) from Eusebius Theoph. fr. 3 (= Migne, PG 24,620A). This usage of the verb is a development of the meaning ‘be idle’, ‘be vacant’ (commonly used of places). To come to our sentence: *ἐσχόλαζε μὲν τοῖς ἀνθεσιν ἢ πηγῇ, Δάφνιδος δὲ ὅμως ἐκαλεῖτο πηγῇ*. One understands that, at first reading, this could appear an odd statement.¹⁰ But the sense is that, despite the fact (ὅμως) that the spring was reserved specifically for the flowers, it was called not the ‘Flower Spring’ but ‘Daphnis’ Spring’ – precisely because he had discovered it. The name is honorific. The sense would have been a bit

9) These are not necessarily references to Bacchic maenads, as Wilamowitz pointed out, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Darmstadt³ 1959), II p. 60 with n. 1.

10) Indeed R. L. Hunter (*supra*, n.7) 27, quoting 4,4,1 *τὸν Διόνυσον . . . ἐκαλεῖτο πηγῇ*, refers to “this curiously loose (and very curiously worded) detail in the description of Lamon’s garden.” He suggests that Longus has taken over a detail from the original myth of Daphnis (preserved by Servius on Verg. *Ecl.* 5,20), namely the account of how, after Daphnis’ blinding and translation, his father Mercury created the spring named Daphnis. He thinks that “Here Longus has apparently integrated into his story a detail from the original myth with less than his usual skill.” But once the Greek is printed with accurate text and punctuation, it is, I would maintain, coherent. See my comments following in the text.

clearer had Longus written, say, ... Δάφνιδος δὲ ὅμως ἀλλ' οὐ τῶν ἀνθῶν ἐκαλεῖτο πηγή. It is important to observe that this sentence (ἐσχόλαζε – πηγή²) is part not of the main narrative but of a parenthetic description, the function of which is to explain how Lamon was able to water his flowers in the first place.

The preceding sentence, to which I now return, is also part of this explanatory parenthesis. A different punctuation will make this clear:

τοιούτων ὄντα τὸν παράδεισον ὁ Λάμων ἐθεράπευε ... τὸν Διόνυσον ἐστεράνωσε, τοῖς ἀνθεσιν ὕδωρ ἐπωχέτευσεν. (πηγή τις ἦν, (ἦν) εὖρεν ἐς τὰ ἀνθη Δάφνης· ἐσχόλαζε μὲν τοῖς ἀνθεσιν ἡ πηγή, Δάφνιδος δὲ ὅμως ἐκαλεῖτο πηγή.) παρεκελεύετο δὲ καὶ τῷ Δάφνιδι ὁ Λάμων πιαίνειν τὰς αἴγας ὡς δυνατὸν μάλιστα κτλ.

With this reading and punctuation Lamon's activities and the little history of the spring are clearly distinguished. To my mind what settles the matter in favor of πηγή τις ἦν (ἦν) against Brunck's (palaeographically more difficult) ἐκ πηγῆς τινὸς ἦν is the expression itself. πηγή τις ἦν is modelled on an ancient, and familiar, type of introductory formula common in Greek (from Homer on) and Latin. See, for instance, Il. 2,811, 6,152, 11,711.722, 13,32; Od. 19,172; Aesch. Pers. 447 (νῆσός τις ἔστι). The present tense is commoner, but past tenses (necessitated here by the context) occur. For discussions see further N. Hopkinson, Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter (Cambridge 1984) 112–113 (on v. 37, with further references); R. M. Ogilvie, A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5 (Oxford 1965) on Livy 1,21,3 *lucus erat*; R. G. Austin, Vergil Aeneid IV (Oxford 1966) on Aen. 4,483. Once one perceives that πηγή τις ἦν introduces a 'mini-narrative' within the main narrative, that a parenthesis begins here, it becomes immediately apparent that the venerable introductory formula-type πηγή τις ἦν can scarcely be merely the product of manuscript corruption. These are rather the *ipsissima verba* of Longus himself.¹¹

11) I would like to thank Professor B. P. Reardon for kindly criticizing these notes.