



PROJECT MUSE®

---

The Pastoral Parents of *Daphnis and Chloe*

Arum Park

Arethusa, Volume 48, Number 2, Spring 2015, pp. 253-281 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/are.2015.0015>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/593123>

# THE PASTORAL PARENTS OF *DAPHNIS AND CHLOE*\*

ARUM PARK

## INTRODUCTION

Scholarship on Longus's<sup>1</sup> *Daphnis and Chloe* tends to center on eroticism or pastoralism or the interplay of the two in the infusion of Theocritean innocence into the Greek narrative prose tradition of heterosexual love.<sup>2</sup> Although these approaches examine Longus's careful construction of an eroticized pastoral world, they tend to overlook the reproduction and parenthood that also inform Longus's pastoralism. I will argue that Longus's pastoral landscapes, signaled chiefly by the *locus amoenus*, have a primarily reproductive rather than erotic function. These landscapes introduce

---

\* Thanks are owed to an audience at CAMWS, where an inchoate version of this paper was presented; to Phiroze Vasunia, in whose ancient novel seminar this paper was born; to my writing group at BYU; and to Carl Sederholm, Robert Colson, and David Carlisle for reading and commenting on full drafts of this paper.

1 I use the name "Longus" as shorthand for the author-narrator persona revealed in the novel's prologue. Similarly, I use "author," "narrator," and "author-narrator" interchangeably in the same way.

2 For example, Winkler 1990.102, who emphasizes nature as a contributing factor in the erotic development between Daphnis and Chloe; Zeitlin 1994.148, who hails the conceptual originality of the *pastoral* erotic tale as the most striking feature of Longus's novel; O'Connor 1991, who discusses the erotic significance of earth and nature imagery in Longus. See also Alpers 1996.323–48, on the relation of pastoral to narration in *Daphnis and Chloe*; Cresci 1999, who aims to identify how Longus deals with the problems of combining multiple genres: pastoral and the novel; Pandiri 1985, who argues that the novel is "quintessential pastoral" (116) because of its self-conscious narrative design, of which Longus's artfully crafted pastoral landscape is particularly emblematic. For an amusing and informative piece on the medicinal role of honey within the love story, see Trzaskoma 2007.

parenthood and childcare as themes that, in turn, serve as metaphors for the creative process behind the novel itself. By shifting the focus to the reproductive and parental aspects of *Daphnis and Chloe*, I will illuminate a hybrid quality to Longus's pastoralism that has not been fully explored but is a key aspect of his pastoral art.

While the pastoral *locus amoenus* often suggests sexual activity, in *Daphnis and Chloe* it is also closely linked to the procreative result of such activity. This association between eroticism, reproduction, and the natural world has precedents in earlier literature, such as at *Iliad* 14.346–49, when the ground spontaneously sprouts grass, lotus, crocus, and hyacinth during Hera's seduction of Zeus—a metaphor so thinly veiled that it hardly needs explaining.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, the prologue to Lucretius's *de Rerum Natura* invokes Venus as overseer of his poetic creation and thus connects her sexual allure to procreation (*DRN* 1.1–25). Her generative powers are manifest not only in human reproduction but in all natural creation: she is hailed as the mother of Aeneas (1.1), the goddess responsible for the conception of all living things (4–5), and for the growth of flowers (7–8); the whole world, plant and animal, is subject to her influence. Indeed, Paul Turner identifies similar parallels between Lucretius's Venus and Longus's Eros (2.7) that suggest, at the very least, a prevailing conception of sexual love as a procreative force (1960.118–19). Furthermore, organic connections between land and people were crystallized in local autochthony myths in, for example, Thebes and Athens.<sup>4</sup>

Despite this ancient association between natural landscapes, sexual activity, and procreation, the scholarship on Longus tends not to discuss the connection. As Helen Morales observes (2008, esp. 39–42), the last few decades of the twentieth century witnessed a growing interest in the history of sexuality, thanks in large part to the influence of Michel Foucault.<sup>5</sup> This

3 Cf. Swift 2010.268, note 62, who includes this passage in a list of examples of the eroticization of the *locus amoenus* in pre-tragic poetry but does not fully explore the reproductive aspects of this sexualized landscape.

4 Particularly intriguing works from the vast bibliography on Greek autochthony myths include Loraux 1993 and Detienne 2001.

5 See Goldhill 1995 for an illustrative example of Foucauldian scholarship on the ancient novel; pp. 1–45 examine sexuality in *Daphnis and Chloe*. For examples of Foucault's influence in other areas of classics, see Heirman 2012 and Thalmann 2011, esp. 34–35 and 67. Heirman examines the eroticized landscapes of Archaic Greek lyric and uses Foucault's concept of heterotopia—i.e., a space that reflects or references cultural norms—to argue for a connection between these poetic, imagined landscapes and the sympotic context in which they were performed. Thalmann applies the same Foucauldian concept

interest, coupled with the ancient novel's own focus on sex, has prompted scholarly attention to turn to the erotic rather than to those reproductive aspects of nature in *Daphnis and Chloe* that are also central to the novel.<sup>6</sup> The close associations between nature and procreation are key to understanding Longus's pastoralism, which nods to the erotic preoccupations of Theocritean and Vergilian bucolic while stressing, through its procreative metaphor, the strength of this literary debt.

I will demonstrate that any eroticism of the pastoral landscape must be understood in conjunction with those reproductive qualities that foster parental behavior. With its generative associations, Longus's *locus amoenus* is analogous to a biological parent, but it also inspires nurturing activity in those who enter it, notably the animals and humans who rescue Daphnis and Chloe from exposure. The relationship between Daphnis, Chloe, and the various components of their pastoral surroundings, from the setting to the characters within it, resembles a parent-child relationship wherein the pastoral setting "gives birth" to them and ultimately ensures their survival.

By extension, this relationship has implications for the literary identity of Longus's novel. The pastoral *locus amoenus* serves both a psychological function as a pseudo-parent for the two title characters and a metaliterary function as a metaphor for Longus's allusivity. By ascribing agency to the pastoral landscape and by describing Daphnis and Chloe's devotion—both fostered and innate—to this landscape and the life it represents, Longus alludes to his own literary debt and suggests that this debt is both imposed *on* but also chosen *by* him.<sup>7</sup> The various parental figures of *Daphnis and Chloe* assume different roles; this hybrid model of parenthood parallels the author's own literary creativity. The reproductive aspect of Longus's pastoral landscapes, combined with the nurturing roles assumed by those within them, reflects the hybridity of Longus's creative process, which similarly blends nature and nurture and is scripted in the very novel itself. In effect, Longus redefines pastoral as a continually regenerative

to the *Argo* of Apollonius's *Argonautica*, which he argues represents a floating space of Greekness.

6 Michael Mittelstadt notes nature's "generative capacity" in *Daphnis and Chloe* but uses this phrase to refer to the role nature plays in informing the sexual education of Daphnis and Chloe (1966.166).

7 The struggle between loyalty to tradition and developing a unique authorial voice is well articulated by T. S. Eliot in his seminal essay "Tradition and the Individual Talent" and by Harold Bloom's landmark *The Anxiety of Influence*; see Eliot 1982 and Bloom 1973.

literary tradition that is at once a spontaneous, even divine, offspring of previous pastoral and a product of mindful human efforts. He forges a new type of pastoral literature that is both reflected in this complex parental structure and also created and perpetuated by it. This conception of the pastoral appears in every aspect of the novel: settings, characters, and the interactions among them.

In the following pages, I discuss the opening ecphrasis, the reproductive and narrative questions it introduces, and how they are addressed. I then examine the key landscapes of *Daphnis and Chloe* to demonstrate how they represent the biological parents of the two title characters, particularly when compared to the various human and animal parental figures in Daphnis and Chloe's lives—my next area of discussion. My final section explores the metaliterary implications of this construction of parenthood and argues that this pervasive parental metaphor informs the plot and yields insight into the creative process behind it as one that deftly, almost imperceptibly, blends artful allusivity with natural spontaneity.

### ECPHRASIS

*Daphnis and Chloe* begins with the narrator's description of a painting (praef. 2):

γυναῖκες ἐπ' αὐτῆς τίκτουςαι καὶ ἄλλαι σπαργάνοις  
κοσμοῦσαι, παιδία ἐκκείμενα, ποιμνία τρέφοντα,  
ποιμένες ἀναιρούμενοι, νέοι συντιθέμενοι, ληστῶν  
καταδρομή, πολεμίων ἐμβολή, πολλὰ ἄλλα καὶ πάντα  
ἔρωτικά.<sup>8</sup>

On it were women giving birth and others dressing babies  
in swaddling-clothes, babies exposed, flock-animals suck-  
ling them, shepherds taking them up, young people mak-  
ing pledges, a pirates' raid, an enemy invasion—and many  
other things, all relating to lovers.

As the prologue continues, the narrator describes how “a yearning took hold of me to write a response to the painting” (πόθος ἔσχεν

---

8 All Greek citations are from the Teubner edition of Longus (ed. M. D. Reeve). All translations are my own.

ἀντιγράψαι τῆ γραφῆ, praef. 3), thus referring to his novel specifically as a textual explication of the picture. Although the size, shape, and structure of the painting are unclear, the narrator's claims about the correspondence between painting and writing prompt J. R. Morgan to surmise: "The contents of the novel are the same as those of the painting, which is clearly of the narrative style, with successive scenes from a story contained within a single, possibly subdivided frame" (2004.147). Perhaps this supposition goes too far in its specificity, but at the very least, Morgan is correct in pointing out that the prologue prompts the expectation that the novel will adhere closely to the ecphrasis.

Indeed, the details of this painting are key to understanding the novel, as ecphrasis was a well-known Second Sophistic trope for introducing and inviting interpretive activity on the part of the narrator-viewer.<sup>9</sup> This interpretive instinct is understandable given the various and sometimes conflicting purposes of visual and verbal representation. In Murray Krieger's words (1992.10): "The ekphrastic aspiration in the poet and the reader must come to terms with two opposed impulses, two opposed feelings, about language: one is exhilarated by the notion of ekphrasis and one is exasperated by it. Ekphrasis arises out of the first, which craves the spatial fix, while the second yearns for the freedom of the temporal flow." Krieger describes the dual nature of ecphrasis, "the imitation in literature of a work of plastic art" (1992.166), which both expresses a single moment in time and signals moments preceding and following, thus emphasizing but bridging the basic difference between visual and verbal representation.

Although Krieger is referring only to ecphrasis, this duality applies to Longus's combination of painting and narrative, which work in tandem to capture "the simultaneity, in the verbal figure, of fixity and flow, of an image at once grasped and yet slipping away through the crevices of language" (1992.11). Further, Krieger identifies the capacity of ecphrasis to expand the temporal scope of the object described, an expansion that occurs in *Daphnis and Chloe* itself, which quite faithfully follows but elaborates on the outline set forth by the painting: Daphnis and Chloe are exposed as infants by their wealthy parents, suckled by a goat and ewe, and adopted by the herdsmen Lamon and Dryas; they fall in love, experience a series of adventures that threaten this love, and are finally reunited with their

---

9 Bartsch 1989.14–31. See pp. 40–79 for the use of ecphrasis specifically in the novel of Achilles Tatius.

birth parents and allowed to marry.<sup>10</sup> The novel expands the temporal range of the painting, but the painting, in turn, limits the time of the novel and anticipates the themes of art, nature, and imitation that will thread through it (Hunter 1983.51). As Joseph Kestner notes, the prologue both bounds and initiates the narrative (1973–74.167).

The absence of childbirth and newborn care, the first items in the narrator's list, is conspicuous, given the close intertwining of ecphrasis and narrative that the prologue prompts us to expect. As Bruce MacQueen observes, the novel's presentation is not completely true to the order designated by the ecphrasis: "We shall not be told of the manner and place of either Daphnis's or Chloe's birth, or how they came to be exposed, until very near the end of the novel" (1990.21). I would point out that these items are not explicitly described anywhere in the following narrative. Instead, what opens the first book of *Daphnis and Chloe* is a description of Mytilene and Lesbos that emphasizes the contrast between city and country,<sup>11</sup> followed by Lamon's discovery of the infant Daphnis. In light of "the shift of the traditional ecphrasis from the auxiliary function it has in romance fiction to the underlying basis of the narrative, and from a short embedded piece to an entire novel" (Zeitlin 1994.149), this omission defies expectations: all the other items in the ecphrasis appear in the novel, but a verbal description of childbirth itself is absent. The biological mothers Cleariste and Rhode do not even appear until the novel's resolution, and even then the roles they play are minor.

As I will argue, the "women giving birth" of the ecphrasis are not merely presumed and omitted in the novel for the sake of brevity; rather, the pastoral landscape serves to represent the physiological and emotional processes of "normal" childbirth, and the various aspects of parenthood are diffused and interspersed among the settings and inhabitants of the pastoral world. The pastoral landscape is sexualized not only

10 In addition to pastoral models, Longus also alludes to Thucydides when he describes his intent to compose a "delightful possession for all mankind" (κτῆμα δὲ τεργνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, praef. 3). McCulloh 1970.31 sees this allusion as a way of lending the novel literary validity. For a rich and compelling examination of the parallels between Longus's prologue and Thucydides' methodological statement, see Luginbill 2002; see also Turner 1960.117–18, Hunter 1983.47–50, Pandiri 1985.117–18 and note 9, Teske 1991.2–7, and Wouters 1994.142 for the allusion to the Thucydidean phrase κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ (*Hist.* 1.22.4).

11 On the separation between city and country in pastoral, see Ettin 1984.11. Cf. also Effe 1999, who argues against Rohde 1937 that Longus's pastoral functions as an idealized literary—rather than realistic—evasion from urban reality.

in fostering the burgeoning erotic attraction between the main characters, but also in that it encompasses the reproductive aspect of sexuality, as demonstrated by Daphnis and Chloe's reliance on the pastoral landscape for their very existence.

### LANDSCAPE

The reproductive aspects of the pastoral landscape are immediately evident when the painting is discovered in a setting that anticipates the landscapes of the novel and the integral role they will play in the development of the two title characters. The painting is situated in a grove sacred to the Nymphs, a grove lush with trees and flowers and well-irrigated by a gurgling spring: καλὸν μὲν καὶ τὸ ἄλσος, πολὺδενδρον, ἀνθηρόν, κατάρρυτον· μία πηγὴ πάντα ἔτρεφε, καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ δένδρα (“The grove was also beautiful, thickly wooded, blooming with flowers, irrigated; one spring sustained everything, both the flowers and the trees,” praef. 1). The spring, flowers, and trees recall Theocritean landscapes (e.g., *Idylls* 1, 5, 6) and invite the expectation of rustic tranquility and pastoral song. It is an archetypal *locus amoenus* that conjures a literary pastoral world and, as Froma Zeitlin observes, “evokes desire from the stranger, a longing to find a way in, but with the attendant risk that he might violate its sensibilities—its landscape and inhabitants, its ethos and its nature” (1994.156). Zeitlin further argues that such a landscape produces tension between the security and stability it represents and the sexual magnetism at its core: “[Pastoral], for all its erotic allure, also needs to protect the idealized innocence of its *locus amoenus*” (1994.157). Her observations hint at what I see as the paradoxical complementarity of purity and allure within the *locus amoenus*, which employs sexual attraction to produce newborn innocence. Through a reproductive and not merely erotic lens, the fertility and abundance of the grove surrounding the painting become evident. In signaling conception and birth in this way, the grove anticipates the settings in which Daphnis and Chloe will be found.

Daphnis is discovered in a place that, like the grove of the painting, manifestly evokes the literary pastoral world: δρυμὸς ἦν καὶ λόχη βάτων καὶ κιττὸς ἐπιπλανώμενος καὶ πόα μαλθακή, καθ’ ἧς ἔκειτο τὸ παιδίον (“There was an oak grove, a thicket of brambles, wandering ivy, and soft grass, on which the child was lying,” 1.2.1). The specificity of the flora parallels archetypal Theocritean detail (e.g., κισσόν, “ivy,” *Id.* 3.14; ποία, “grass,” *Id.* 5.34), as does the midday setting (μεσημβρίας ἀκμαζούσης,

“at the height of midday,” 1.2.2; cf. μέσῳ ἄματι, “in the middle of the day,” *Id.* 6.4). The description of Chloe’s surroundings also evokes a pastoral landscape and is even more detailed (1.4.1–3):<sup>12</sup>

Νυμφῶν ἄντρον ἦν, πέτρα μεγάλη, τὰ ἔνδοθεν κοίλη,  
τὰ ἔξωθεν περιφερής. τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν Νυμφῶν αὐτῶν  
λίθοις ἐπεποιήτο· πόδες ἀνυπόδετοι, χεῖρες εἰς ὤμους  
γυμναί, κόμαι μέχρι τῶν ἀχένων λελυμένοι, ζῶμα  
περὶ τὴν ἰξύν, μειδίαμα περὶ τὴν ὀφρύν· τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα  
χορεία. ἵνα τοῦ ἄντρου, τῆς μεγάλης πέτρας, ἦν τὸ  
μεσαίτατον, ἐκ πηγῆς ὕδωρ ἀναβλύζον ρεῖθρον ἐποίει  
χεόμενον, ὥστε καὶ λειμῶν πάνυ γλαφυρὸς ἐκτέτατο  
πρὸ τοῦ ἄντρου πολλῆς καὶ μαλακῆς πόας ὑπὸ τῆς  
νοτίδος τρεφομένης. ἀνέκειντο δὲ καὶ γαυλοὶ καὶ  
αὐλοὶ πλάγιοι καὶ σύριγγες καὶ κάλαμοι, πρεσβυτέρων  
ποιμένων ἀναθήματα.

There was a cave of the Nymphs, a great rock that was hollow inside and curved outside. The statues of the Nymphs themselves had been made of stone: their feet were unshod; their arms naked to the shoulder; their hair was loose to their necks; there were belts around their waists, smiles on their faces; the whole manner was of a dance. In the very middle of the great rock of the cave, water gushing forth from a spring made a flowing stream; and so a very delicate meadow stretched out before the cave, and there was much soft grass nourished by the moisture. Milk pails, crooked flutes, Pan-pipes, and reed-pipes were laid up there—the offerings of previous shepherds.

Each scene exemplifies the *locus amoenus* as definitively described by E. R. Curtius: “The *locus amoenus* (pleasance) . . . is . . . a beautiful, shaded natural site. Its minimum ingredients comprise a tree (or several trees), a meadow, and a spring or brook. Birdsong and flowers may be added. The most elaborate examples also add a breeze” (1953.195). In Theocritean

---

12 Cf. Morgan 2004.151: Chloe’s “find-site is treated far more elaborately.”

bucolic, the *locus amoenus* is the archetypal pastoral setting, representing respite, safety, and escape from physical labor as well as from the dangers of the natural and cosmopolitan worlds—in short, the seclusion and security necessary for digression into pastoral song. The trees provide shady protection from the heat of the sun, and the water provides nourishment. As Thomas Rosenmeyer writes: “The pastoral pleasance [in Theocritus] exists to be enjoyed, to give protection, to furnish a solid background for the activities of the herdsmen” (1969.203).

The details of these *loca amoena* are not only Theocritean but stem from the older Daphnis myth as well, which by Theocritus’s time survived primarily in the use of “Daphnis” as shorthand for a typical shepherd. In the pre-Hellenistic myth of Daphnis, as pieced together from various ancient sources, Daphnis, son of Hermes and a Nymph, is exposed by his mother in a *locus amoenus* and discovered and raised by either shepherds or Nymphs.<sup>13</sup> Longus’s adaptation of this myth infuses his *locus amoenus* with the protection and seclusion of Theocritean landscapes but also the reproductive abundance surrounding Daphnis’ original discovery. By noting such details as the various flora and the lush, irrigated meadow, Longus foregrounds the fertility of the *locus amoenus*, and by coupling the Nymphs of the Daphnis myth with their offerings, Longus adds creative elements both spontaneous and mindful: the Nymphs represent the divine spontaneity of fertility,<sup>14</sup> while the offerings evoke the purposeful nurturing of growth by human hands. Indeed, the Nymphs and their offerings anticipate or mirror the parentage of Daphnis and Chloe—at once natural and artificial.

The fertility and security of the *locus amoenus* evoke the function of a womb: both are protected environments designed for fertility, growth, and nourishment.<sup>15</sup> Chloe’s *locus amoenus* is particularly reminiscent of a womb when considered through a Freudian lens, which is helpful for

---

13 Our sources for this myth are Diodorus Siculus, Aelian, Parthenius, and the ancient commentators on Theocritus and Vergil. See Hunter 1983.22–31 for a summary of the myth and a discussion of how it informs Longus’s novel.

14 On the Nymphs’ association with uncultivated spontaneity, cf. Ustinova 2009.57: “Pan and the Nymphs share the same savage environment, hence personify the idea of separation from human culture.”

15 The reverse side of this coin is to view an enclosed space as one of imprisonment and, by extension, death. As Seaford 1990.77 points out, secure enclosures are employed in tragedy against women of marriageable age whose weddings have been forestalled by their confinement in tomb-like caves or chambers (e.g., Antigone, Danae), but who symbolically experience marriage through “the irruption of a male into the chamber in a kind of wedding.” Their imprisonment thus puts into sharp relief the cultural associations between

articulating the erotic and reproductive significance of imagery surrounding the *locus amoenus*. As he wrote about dreams: “Birth is almost invariably represented by something which has a connection with *water*: one either falls into the water or climbs out of it, one rescues someone from the water or is rescued by someone—that is to say, the relation is one of mother to child” (1966.188; italics original). In Freud’s terms, the water of the *locus amoenus*, particularly in light of Daphnis and Chloe’s removal from this setting in early infancy, evokes emergence from the womb. Furthermore, “the male organ can be replaced by objects from which water flows—*water-taps, watering-cans, or fountains*” (1966.190; italics original). Although Freud focuses on symbols for the male organ, by analogy, the flowing water of the spring would represent seminal fluid.

Along the same lines, Chloe’s cave evokes the female reproductive organ: “The female genitals are symbolically represented by all such objects as share their characteristic of enclosing a hollow space which can take something into itself: by *pits, cavities and hollows*, for instance, by *vessels and bottles*, by *receptacles, boxes, trunks, cases, chests, pockets*, and so on” (1966.192; italics original). Freud’s observations parallel an ancient association between caves and birth in, for example, the myth of Zeus’s birth,<sup>16</sup> and between water and sexual reproduction as reflected in the “spring-rich” (πολυπίδακος, πολυπίδακα, *Hom. Hymn Ven.* 54, 68) setting of Aphrodite and Anchises’ tryst that ultimately produces Aeneas. Freud’s typology of symbols sheds light on the reproductive associations of a hallmark of pastoral literature—its stylized landscape—and thus the aptness of introducing Daphnis and Chloe’s existence within this landscape.<sup>17</sup>

What the *locus amoenus* represents is thus not a mere reflection of pastoral’s allure (see Zeitlin 1994.157), but also a reproductive space in which conception and *in utero* development occur. The subsequent removals of Daphnis and Chloe from these *loca amoena* symbolize birth, as

marriage and death and underscores the sexual associations—albeit here, negative ones—of enclosed spaces.

16 In Hesiod’s *Theogony*, Gaea hides Zeus within her body on Crete, presumably in a cave (479–80). Cf. *Od.* 19.188, where Odysseus refers to the “cave of Eileithyia” (σπέος Είλειθυίας). For further discussion of these and other ancient associations between caves and fertility, see Ustinova 2009.3–4.

17 The French philosopher Gaston Bachelard, influenced by psychoanalysis, similarly notes the presence of filial love as “the first active principle in the projection of images” (1983.116). For him, all liquids, particularly those depicted as part of the natural world, have a specifically maternal association as representations of a mother’s milk.

they correspond to emergence from the womb into the outside world. The epiphoric scene of women giving birth is therefore not absent or merely implicit in Longus's verbal account; rather, it is reinterpreted and represented symbolically. Longus reformulates infant exposure as childbirth partly by employing a setting that evokes human reproduction. Daphnis and Chloe are effectively reborn into a pastoral setting whose nourishing qualities resemble a womb's and save them from death in crucial ways. Furthermore, the settings and the circumstances in which they are found prefigure and even engender the close ties between the main characters and the pastoral world to which they cleave. The close—almost organic—connection between the children and their settings is perhaps what prompted J. R. Morgan to call Chloe a “child of nature” (1994.67).

### PASTORAL/PARENTAL EDUCATION: SURROGATE AND ADOPTIVE PARENTS

These *loca amoena* represent the biological parents of Daphnis and Chloe, whose care is eventually assumed by other parental figures who take their cues from the setting. Ultimately, the pseudo-biological, surrogate, and adoptive parents work in tandem to forge the main characters' enduring ties to the pastoral world. As Michael Mittelstadt writes: “Longus emphasizes nature as the nourishing force through which the love of Daphnis and Chloe constantly thrives . . . Nature becomes their nurse and guide, their teacher” (1966.166–67). What Mittelstadt does not explicitly point out is the importance of nature as “nurse and guide” and “teacher” in the very survival of Daphnis and Chloe themselves and not just the love that develops between them; without the *locus amoenus* as a model, their adoptive parents and even their animal nurses would have lacked instruction in caring for the two children. The result is a blended model of parenthood that juxtaposes cultivation and nature and reflects the interweaving of spontaneity and contrivance in Longus's pastoral novel.

The description of Daphnis' discovery demonstrates the indispensability of the setting in modeling nurturing behavior (1.2.1–3):

ἐνταῦθα ἡ αἴξ θεούσα συνεχὲς ἀφανῆς ἐγένετο  
πολλάκις καὶ τὸν ἔριφον ἀπολιποῦσα τῷ βρέφει  
παρέμενε. φυλάττει τὰς διαδρομὰς ὁ Λάμων οἰκτείρας  
ἀμελούμενον τὸν ἔριφον, καὶ μεσημβρίας ἀκμαζούσης  
κατ' ἴχνος ἐλθὼν ὀρᾷ τὴν μὲν αἴγα πεφυλαγμένως

περιβεβηκυῖαν μὴ ταῖς χηλαῖς βλάπτοι πατοῦσα, τὸ δὲ ὥσπερ ἐκ μητρῶας θηλῆς τὴν ἐπιρροὴν ἔλκον τοῦ γάλακτος.

The goat frequently ran there and often disappeared from view, and, leaving her kid, she would stay beside the baby. Lamon pitied the neglected kid and kept watch on the goat's back-and-forth. At the peak of midday, he followed her tracks and saw the goat going about with due caution lest she harm the child by trampling on it with her hooves, and the child drawing a stream of milk as if from its mother's breast.

Daphnis' fortuitous rescue by the goat ensures his survival, both for the short- and the long-term. By nursing Daphnis, the goat effectively becomes his surrogate mother, even neglecting her own offspring to do so. The bond between herself and Daphnis is evident as he responds to her the way a biological child would (ὥσπερ ἐκ μητρῶας θηλῆς, "as if from its mother's breast"). This is no accidental rescue on the part of the goat: her cautious (πεφυλαγμένως) actions show that she has affectionate regard for the child and has consciously chosen to care for it.

Her behavior reflects the parental education she has received from the *locus amoenus* she enters to save Daphnis. This setting itself, with its reproductive functions as discussed in the previous section, does more than provide sustenance to Daphnis in his infancy, it also alters the parental inclinations of the goat. She herself does not exemplify perfect parenthood: Lamon notices her because she tends to the human child while neglecting her own, whom Lamon pities. Her combination of neglect and nurture is what catches his attention, as her disregard of her offspring in favor of another's provides both a counterexample and a model to emulate. She and Lamon each attend to the young of another species at the expense of their own.

The goat's neglect of her own child demonstrates the power of the landscape to redirect her native parental instincts in favor of human nurture. This redirection parallels the fusion of nature and artfulness that defines Longus's pastoral. The *locus amoenus*, not her usual home (1.2.2), attracts the goat and seemingly inspires motherly behavior in her as she enters it, even as it curbs such behavior without. It is only after the goat gravitates toward and situates herself within idyllic abundance that she, too,

assumes the maternalism congruent with such a setting, which verges on what Thomas Rosenmeyer calls the *locus uberrimus* (“very fertile place”), where nature, unlike in the Theocritean *locus amoenus*, overwhelms man with its plenty and fruitfulness (1969.190–91).

Lamon adopts parental behavior after witnessing the goat’s. When he first discovers Daphnis, he is naturally struck by the oddity of the goat suckling a human baby, then by the magnificence of the baby himself (μέγα καὶ καλόν, “great and beautiful,” 1.2.3), and finally by the incongruous splendor of the artifacts surrounding the child that include a purple cloak with a golden clasp and an ivory-hilted sword (1.2.3). This tricolon of Lamon’s observations culminates in the tokens, which claim the greatest share of his attention and which he is at first inclined to take without the baby. But the goat’s human-like compassion shames him into rescuing the baby along with the tokens (ἔπειτα αἰδεσθεῖς εἰ μηδὲ αἰγὸς φιλανθρωπίαν μιμήσεται, “then ashamed if he should not even match the humanity of a goat,” 1.3.1). The contrasting behaviors of Lamon and the goat provide what Thalia Pandiri calls “glimpses of a more practical, realistic, cruder dimension to such idealized figures as Daphnis’ foster-father Lamon” (1985.120). Lamon’s entry into the *locus amoenus* represents the first human intrusion into the life of Daphnis, who nearly becomes a victim of the human monetary preoccupations prevalent outside of this secluded space.

As the *locus amoenus* admits these animal and human caretakers, it shifts from an idealized setting to a more expansive, less pristine world that includes animals, humans, and the set of rules they recognize as part of the herdsman’s life. The *locus amoenus* is the original site of nurture; this setting becomes increasingly specific to herding life—more literally “pastoral”—as a herd animal enters it followed by a herdsman. These various additions trigger a shift from the natural, spontaneous parenthood of the *locus amoenus* to an increasingly mannered and intentional adoption of parental behavior as the herd animals and human adoptive parents come into the picture. This transition in parenthood reflects Longus’s definition of “pastoral” as something that occurs spontaneously but is also consciously imitated. Lamon and Myrtale cultivate Daphnis’ continued ties to and reliance on the idealized life of a herdsman (1.3.2):

δόξαν δὴ κάκείνῃ, τὰ μὲν συνεκτεθέντα κρύπτουσι,  
τὸ δὲ παιδίον αὐτῶν ἐπονομάζουσι, τῇ δὲ αἰγί τὴν  
τροφήν ἐπιτρέπουσιν· ὡς δ’ ἂν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ παιδίου  
ποιμενικὸν δοκοίη, Δάφνιν αὐτὸν ἔγνωσαν καλεῖν.

Since it seemed best to her also, they hid the objects that had been placed with the child, called the child their own, and entrusted the nursing to the goat; and so that even the child's name might seem like a herdsman's, they decided to call him Daphnis.

By choosing his pastoral name and continuing to rely on the goat for his nourishment,<sup>18</sup> Lamon and Myrtale recognize and adhere to a set of pastoral conventions, thus effectively defining pastoral as they intentionally reinforce the bond between the infant and his rustic origins. Their choice of “Daphnis” acknowledges the literary pastoral associations of the *locus amoenus*, effects his primary allegiance to that type of pastoral, and demonstrates their adoptive rather than surrogate status as they assume secondary roles in Daphnis' upbringing, deferring to their pastoral surroundings as the governing reality of his life. Yet they, ironically, have helped define what this pastoral world is by choosing his name and goat-nurse. While Lamon and Myrtale ensure his economic subsistence, the goat remains the primary provider of the child's physiological and psychological needs. This arrangement points up the dual nature of literary pastoral: at once artless and contrived,<sup>19</sup> pastoral requires the seeming spontaneity of the natural world along with cultivation by human hands for its preservation.

Chloe's ewe-nurse plays a similar role in ensuring her survival (1.5.1–6.1):

εἰς τοῦτο τὸ νυμφαῖον οἷς ἀρτιτόκος συχνὰ φοιτῶσα  
 δόξαν πολλάκις ἀπωλείας παρεῖχε. κολάσαι δὲ  
 βουλόμενος αὐτήν καὶ εἰς τὴν πρότερον εὐνομίαν  
 καταστήσαι, δεσμὸν ῥάβδου χλωρᾶς λυγίσσας ὅμοιον  
 βρόχῳ τῇ πέτρᾳ προσῆλθεν ὡς ἐκεῖ συλληψόμενος  
 αὐτήν. ἐπιστάς δὲ οὐδὲν εἶδεν ὦν ἤλπισεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν  
 μὲν διδοῦσαν πάνυ ἀνθρωπίνως τὴν θηλὴν ἐς ἄφθονον  
 τοῦ γάλακτος ὀλκὴν, τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἀκλαυτὶ λάβρως  
 εἰς ἀμφοτέρας τὰς θηλὰς μεταφέρον τὸ στόμα καθαρὸν

18 They may have no other means for feeding Daphnis. See Calder 1983 and Guida 1985 on the customary reliance—in antiquity and even in modernity—on she-goat nurses for those without access to wet-nurses.

19 On the contrived nature of pastoral landscapes, see Effe 1999.

καὶ φαιδρόν, οἷα τῆς οἴος τῇ γλώττῃ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀπολιχωμένης μετὰ τὸν κόρον τῆς τροφῆς . . . θεῖον δὴ τι νομίσας τὸ εὖρημα καὶ διδασκόμενος παρὰ τῆς οἴος ἔλεεῖν τε τὸ παιδίον καὶ φιλεῖν, ἀναιρεῖται μὲν τὸ βρέφος ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος, ἀποτίθεται δὲ τὰ γνωρίσματα κατὰ τῆς πῆρας, εὐχεται δὲ ταῖς Νύμφαις ἐπὶ τύχῃ χρηστῇ θρέψαι τὴν ἰκέτιν αὐτῶν.

A ewe who had just given birth kept going back and forth to this shrine of the Nymphs and often caused Dryas to think that she was lost. Indeed, wishing to correct her and restore her to her previous good behavior, he bent the band of a green shoot like a noose and went to the rock to collect her there. But when he stood near her, what he saw was far from what he expected. He saw her, altogether humanlike, giving her teat for a generous drink of milk, and the child thirstily and tearlessly applying her mouth to each teat in turn. Her mouth was clean and shining because the ewe was licking her face with her tongue after she was satisfied from nursing . . . Indeed, Dryas considered this a divine discovery and learned from the ewe to pity and love the child. He lifted the child into the crook of his arm, put the tokens into his bag, and prayed to the Nymphs to support their suppliant with good fortune.

The ewe, like the she-goat who nursed Daphnis, is compared to a human (ἀνθρωπίνως) for assuming the nurturing role that would normally belong to the biological mother or a slave nurse. The child's lack of crying reflects her familiarity and ease with the ewe and the bond between them, akin to the one between Daphnis and his she-goat nurse. Likewise, the ewe responds to the child's needs, both biological and emotional, by ensuring Chloe's satiety and cleanliness as a biological mother would. This passage anticipates the end of the novel, where Chloe's biological father describes dreams in which "a sheep would make me a father" (με πατέρα ποιήσει ποίμνιον, 4.35.5).

As in Daphnis' case, the *locus amoenus* enables Chloe's survival by inducing care-giving inclinations in those who enter it. The ewe-nurse and her behavior within the *locus amoenus* represent the integration of natural and artificial modes of existence and survival. Her native maternalism is

altered by a setting that prompts her to care for the human child she finds within it and to leave her own without. Her attraction to this setting—as with the earlier she-goat—can be explained by the literary convention of including flock animals in *loca amoena*, but her decision to suckle the human child is unique and must be attributed to the various elements of the surroundings that foster abundance. Thus parenting begins with the *locus amoenus*, which provides the first sources of comfort for Daphnis and Chloe. Furthermore, as a cave of the Nymphs, this site is sacred to humans and influences the ewe’s nurture of a specifically human child rather than her own.<sup>20</sup>

Like the she-goat, the ewe models parental behavior for the humans who will adopt the infant. She teaches parenting to Dryas, who then persuades his wife Nape to adopt, but it is ultimately the ewe who wins Nape over (1.6.2–3):

παρακελεύεται θυγάτριον νομίζειν καὶ λανθάνουσαν  
ὡς ἴδιον τρέφειν. ἡ μὲν δὴ Νάπη (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο)  
μήτηρ εὐθὺς ἦν καὶ ἐφίλει τὸ παιδίον, ὡς περ ὑπὸ τῆς  
ἴους παρευδοκιμηθῆναι δεδοικυῖα.

Dryas urged her to look on the child as a daughter, keeping quiet about its origin and bringing it up as her own. And Nape (this was his wife’s name) became a mother instantly and began to love the child, as though frightened of being outdone by the ewe.

Nape’s immediate assumption of motherhood is somewhat mannered, as her nearly instant affection is motivated primarily by competitive emulation. Thus although the ewe herself has abandoned her biological offspring, she is responsible for both Dryas’s and Nape’s parental inclinations.

The contrast between their animal and human caretakers reflects two distinct but here intertwined avenues to parenthood: surrogacy and adoption. While the *loca amoena* and the animal nurses within them foster Daphnis and Chloe as substitute wombs would, they cannot sustain the children forever. The infants’ removal from these settings by humans—akin

---

20 See Connor 1988 and Larson 2001 for the significance and power of Nymphs in Greek antiquity.

to emergence from the womb—marks the next stage of their development under the care of human adoptive parents. The limits of both surrogacy and adoption are evident as Daphnis and Chloe enter the human realm at the hands of their human rescuers, who continue to rely on the pastoral setting and the surrogate parenting it signals for the children's development and survival.

The various stages of interruption or invasion of this setting parallel the various stages of parenthood. The settings first and foremost trigger the births of Daphnis and Chloe into the pastoral lives to which they will cleave. The entry of their flock-animal nurses represents the next step of their childhood: emergence from the womb and nourishment by their mothers. This step has been subdivided, however, as these mothers cannot fully assume the role of parent to human children; rather, Lamon and Dryas complete this process by assuming the remaining childcare duties that the goat and ewe cannot. Adoptive, surrogate, and biological parenting are interdependent and together constitute the pastoral upbringing of Daphnis and Chloe. Ultimately, the *locus amoenus* itself initiates the parenting process, as the she-goat and ewe adopt nurturing behaviors when situated within it, and Daphnis and Chloe's human adoptive parents step into their parental roles after learning from the animal nurses.

The *locus amoenus* and the pastoral world it introduces, then, are the original parent of Daphnis and Chloe, whose filial relationship toward this parent mirrors the relationship between biological children and parents as characterized by Aristotle: οἱ γονεῖς μὲν γὰρ στέργουσι τὰ τέκνα ὡς ἑαυτῶν τι ὄντα, τὰ δὲ τέκνα τοῦς γονεῖς ὡς ἅπ' ἐκείνων τι ὄντα ("For parents love children as being part of themselves, whereas children love parents as the source of their being," *NE* 8.1161b16).<sup>21</sup> When Aristotle attributes *philia* within families to a biological relationship, he could just as easily have been describing the relationship between Longus's pastoral world and the children it fosters, even begets. The affection for those "sources of their being" is most felt by Daphnis and Chloe for the pastoral world, which encompasses the landscapes and creatures that nourished them. Daphnis and Chloe attribute their survival to their animal nurses, members of this world, who prevented their immediate deaths by exposure.<sup>22</sup>

---

21 A passage cited by Golden 1990.97.

22 Indeed, Aristotle concludes that parents' love for their children is greater than their children's for them (*EE* 7.1241b1, *NE* 9.1166a8, 1168a23)—arguably the case here, too, given the pastoral world's continued sustenance of Daphnis and Chloe.

As Mark Golden in his study of childhood in Athens suggests, even if parental devotion stems from practical considerations of the benefits of having children, emotional attachment can and did still result from or coexist with such practicalities: a symbiosis develops between parents and children, caretaking and emotional devotion (1990.92–94). In the context of *Daphnis and Chloe*, this symbiosis exists primarily between the children and the idyllic and idealized herding world they inhabit; they have no interaction with their birth parents until the end of the novel, and even their human adoptive parents primarily serve transitional roles as they remove the children from a natural environment that could not have sustained them indefinitely, teach them how to survive in and care for this environment, and then return them to it.

Daphnis and Chloe's continued presence in this environment thus strengthens their ties to it, while their ties to their human caretakers are weakened. While Lamon, Myrtale, Dryas, and Nape see to the physical well-being of Daphnis and Chloe, they otherwise keep their distance and leave the children to find other ways of filling the emotional void left by their absent birth parents. The seclusion, security, and leisurely ease of this pastoral world are, of course, a literary artifice, but one that simultaneously preserves the rustic identity of the title characters and their wealthy origins and, as such, occupies an intermediary space between their various human parents—biological and adoptive—performing the functions of both in the process.

As the narrative jumps from their infancy to their adolescence, Lamon and Dryas dream of the children's future: they each envision the Nymphs giving Daphnis and Chloe to Eros, who bids them to keep goats and sheep, respectively (1.7.2). This dream underscores the innate filiation between the children and their idealized pastoral lives, as both Lamon and Dryas see this dream as a mandate from the gods: ἐδόκει δὲ πείθεσθαι θεοῖς περὶ τῶν σωθέντων προνοίᾳ θεῶν (“and it seemed best to obey the gods concerning those saved by the forethought of the gods,” 1.8.2). The *loca amoena* and the animal nurses within them not only substitute for Daphnis and Chloe's biological mothers but also continue to nurture their emotional development as they mature. Indeed, they demonstrate unusually strong filial affections toward their herd-animal parents: ἐφίλου τὰς αἴγας καὶ τὰ πρόβατα μᾶλλον ἢ ποιμέσιν ἔθος, ἣ μὲν ἐς ποιμνιον ἄγουσα τῆς σωτηρίας τὴν αἰτίαν, ὁ δὲ μεμνημένος ὡς ἐκκείμενον αὐτὸν αἰῖ ἀνέθρεψεν (“They loved the goats and sheep more than is customary for herdsmen, she attributing her survival to a sheep, and he remembering

that a goat had suckled him when he was exposed,” 1.8.3). Daphnis and Chloe relish their herding responsibilities as not merely a job but a way of caring for and preserving the world that essentially gave them life.

Out of loyalty to this environment, Daphnis and Chloe adopt the behaviors of its typical inhabitants: they sing like the birds, leap like lambs, and gather flowers like bees (1.9.2). These acts create a circularity between the children and their surroundings: they are at once products of this world, but they also consciously continue to cleave to it, even as they grow out of infancy. What results is an ever-deepening devotion to the pastoral world and seclusion from anything outside it. When Daphnis bathes after an accident, he does so in Chloe’s presence at the site of her discovery (1.13) in secret from his adoptive parents (1.12). He and Chloe thus come closer together and are ever more secluded as they consciously distance themselves from those parents. This moment is significant for its implications about their emotional ties and the source of these ties. Daphnis and Chloe are simultaneously natural and cultivated products of a pastoral world that consists of a combination of spontaneity and artifice, yet elicits an allegiance from the main characters that feels completely natural to them.

### PARENTHOOD AS LITERARY ANCESTRY

Most commentators who explore Longus’s pastoralism connect it to the love story of the two title characters—rightly so, given the main plot of *Daphnis and Chloe* and its Theocritean and Vergilian pastoral predecessors that similarly privilege erotic love (e.g., Alpers 1996.327). But I argue that the pastoral world, which is born from the *locus amoenus* and perpetuated by its animal and human inhabitants, represents parenthood, whether biological, surrogate, or adoptive, in that it produces and shapes the characters we come to know as Daphnis and Chloe. This model of parenthood, which combines generation with nurture and cultivation, parallels the duality of nature that Alain Billault identifies in Longus: nature appears both as a literary construct and as a reflection of reality.<sup>23</sup> As B. P. Reardon writes: “The natural setting—the time and place where the things done take place—is not just a setting, it *is* the action. The pastoral mechanism is not just decorative, it is functional” (1994.138). Other scholars similarly discuss

---

23 Billault 1996 bases his argument, in part, on the accuracy of references to the topography, flora, and fauna of Lesbos in *Daphnis and Chloe*.

the mannered artifice of Longus's pastoral (e.g., Pandiri 1985, Newlands 1987) and the various dual tendencies of *Daphnis and Chloe*, such as its balance of town and country or levity and seriousness (Chalk 1960), or its unique embedding of themes from pastoral poetry within a prose narrative (Newlands 1987, Alpers 1996).

What has gone unnoticed is how parenthood, too, as depicted in *Daphnis and Chloe*, embodies the dualism inherent to the novel's self-presentation. By understanding the complexity of Daphnis and Chloe's birth and upbringing, we can gain insight into the way Longus conceives of the role of previous pastoral in the construction of his own pastoral novel. Daphnis and Chloe's pastoralism parallels the dual agency of mannered emulation and innate inclination behind the authorship of the novel. Longus constructs an elaborate model of literary ancestry wherein pastoral predecessors are felt as both natural ancestors and models for the author to imitate consciously. This combination results in a novel that is simultaneously artful and spontaneous—a hybrid of creativity that acknowledges the art but privileges spontaneity as its source for authority.

In this elaborate model of hybrid parenthood, the author-narrator parallels various parental figures, while his text parallels the children. Just as multiple parental figures care for Daphnis and Chloe, the text of the novel is a product of both divine compulsion and willing, conscious emulation. As the narrator describes the painting and his reaction to it (ἰδόντα με καὶ θαυμάσαντα πόθος ἔσχεν ἀντιγράψαι τῆ γραφῆ, “As I looked and admired, a yearning took hold of me to write a response to the painting,” praef. 3), he invokes the painting as a form of literary authority<sup>24</sup> and expresses the kind of tension between innate and mannered that I have described. The language of writing and painting (ἀντιγράψαι, γραφῆ) reflects his conscious choice to engage in art, but the sheer intensity of his longing suggests external compulsion, thus undermining his agency or choice. This compulsion felt by the author-narrator perhaps best parallels the inclinations of the animal nurses, drawn inexplicably to their respective *loca amoena* and assuming maternal behaviors within them. The requisite interpreter, too, blends the spontaneity and intention behind the novel's production, as the need for an interpreter echoes the language of prophecy<sup>25</sup> and thus

---

24 The imputed literary authority of paintings is a contemporary tradition; cf. Hunter 1983.39–40 and Perry 1967.110.

25 Cf. Aeschylus *Ag.* 1062–63, where Cassandra's foreignness and her prophetic ability confuse the Chorus: ἐρμηνέως ἔοικεν ἢ ξένη τοροῦ / δεῖσθαι (“The stranger seems to need a clear interpreter”).

suggests a divine source for the novel, yet the narrator also labors over the four books of *Daphnis and Chloe* (ἀναζητησάμενος ἐξηγητὴν τῆς εἰκόνης τέτταρας βίβλους ἐξεπονησάμην, “After searching for an interpreter of the painting, I worked at the four books,” praef. 3).<sup>26</sup> As Thalia Pandiri notes, the word interpreter (ἐξηγητής) is itself playful, as it has profound religious connotations but can also simply denote “a temple guide, someone who shows sightseers around” (1985.117).

This paradoxically compelled willingness is, of course, a common conceit in ancient poetry, which characteristically ascribes art to a Muse-figure whom the poet channels. Hesiod’s Muses, for example, famously challenge the poet with their assertions of veiled truth and falsehood (*Theog.* 26–28), thus throwing into question the poem’s validity: has the poet indeed voiced the Muses word for word, even in light of their potential deception? What distinguishes Longus’s literary authority is that the compulsion he describes is not attributed to any particular god. Instead, he inverts the relationship, holding up the four books of *Daphnis and Chloe* as an offering to Love, the Nymphs, and Pan (praef. 3),<sup>27</sup> an assertion that anticipates the offerings to the Nymphs found in Chloe’s site of discovery (1.4); Longus thus intertwines the purported origins of the novel with the origins of one of the characters within it. His subsequent allusion to Thucydides (κτῆμα δὲ τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, “a possession delightful for all men,” praef. 3; cf. κτῆμά τε ἐξ αἰεὶ, “a possession for all time,” Thuc. 1.22.4; see above n. 10) evokes a prose tradition, while his purported inspiration nods to a poetic one; ultimately, he creates a new tradition into which his novel fits.

What, then, compels the author to write? He does not say, but as the novel unfolds, the pervasive power of the pastoral emerges—a power that, in essence, is a new type of god, both pre-existing Longus’s work but also dependent on it for its continuing survival. At the heart of this dual tendency is mimesis, which, as Zeitlin observes, operates on two levels activated by the combination of nature and art: “What best bridges the two worlds of ‘nature’ and ‘art’ is the double status of imitation—as a natural means of learning, and also as a high display of the sophistic aesthetic” (1994.149). She later (1994.153–54) identifies

two main strands [of mimesis] . . . applicable both to the education of children and to the production and enjoyment

26 See Bartsch 1989.26 on the vital importance in the Greek novels of an interpreter to supply the “correct” meaning of an ephrasis.

27 See Beck 2003.139–40 on the possible religious character of Longus’s novel.

of art: the first is a concept of imitation as a creative enhancement of nature, describing a relationship to “reality” outside itself. The second, current in Longus’s time, insists on looking back for imitation to earlier models whose authority and value have been established in the past. In the first case, the object of imitation is nature; in the second case it is art, the concept that prevailed in Longus’s time.

Zeitlin correctly observes the mimetic inclinations of Longus’s novel: Daphnis and Chloe themselves are called μιμηταί when they instinctively emulate what they hear and see (1.9.2). What she identifies as the prevailing power of mimesis, I would argue, can be re-articulated as the importance of pastoral parenthood as a metaphor for the production of Longus’s art. Just as mimesis is dually inclined toward nature and art, the elaborate parental structures of the novel have a dual origin in nature: emulation of the parental functions modeled by the natural world is both instinctive and conscious. Daphnis and Chloe’s erotic education—Zeitlin’s focus—is undoubtedly central to Longus’s novel, but concomitant to this education is the characters’ pastoral provenance. Their sexual relationship is the end product of their pastoral education, but parenthood and filial piety are the clarifying lenses through which we can understand Daphnis and Chloe’s relationship to the pastoral world and, by extension, the author’s relationship to his pastoral art.

The hybrid parenthood of Daphnis and Chloe is at once contrived and natural but ultimately *felt* as natural; this model informs the conception of literary ancestry that permeates the novel. The intensity of Daphnis and Chloe’s devotion to the pastoral world demonstrates the ability of their hybrid parentage to combine spontaneity and cultivation yet suppress the appearance of the latter. The effect of this combination is reflected in the beauty contest between Daphnis and Dorcon. While Dorcon raises arguments that diminish Daphnis’ pastoral upbringing, Daphnis employs these very same arguments in his successful defense. Dorcon claims superiority when he says, “My mother, not a beast, nursed me . . . and if, as they say, a she-goat gave him milk, he is no different from kid-goats” (με ἔθρεψε μήτηρ, οὐ θηρίον . . . εἰ δ’ ὡς λέγουσι καὶ αἰξ ἀντῷ γάλα δέδωκεν, οὐδὲν ἐρίφων διαφέρει, 1.16.1–2), but these claims are based on his assumption that biological parenthood is superior to surrogacy. Daphnis turns this argument to his advantage by adducing divine precedent: “A goat suckled

me just like Zeus . . . and remember, my girl, that a sheep suckled you, but you are beautiful” (ἐμὲ αἰῖξ ἀνέθρεψεν ὡσπερ τὸν Δία . . . μέμνησο δέ, ὃ παρθένε, ὅτι σὲ ποίμνιον ἔθρεψεν, ἀλλ’ εἰ καλή, 1.16.3–5).<sup>28</sup> By so doing, Daphnis invests his origins with divine authority, which trumps biology. Furthermore, he reminds Chloe of her own similar origins that, he implies, have aesthetic validity and make the two of them uniquely suited to each other.<sup>29</sup> Chloe’s decision is motivated by an affinity she feels toward Daphnis—further demonstration of the successful implementation of innate inclinations and the triumph of a pastoral that *feels* natural even when cultivated.

Daphnis argues that this model of reproduction and early childcare lends itself to beauty, a claim replete with implications beyond the scope of this particular *agōn*, as he essentially argues not only for his own superior beauty but for the superiority of a particular type of pastoralism that his beauty represents. As William McCulloh points out, this debate reflects the influence of “formal speech genres, such as . . . argumentations (*controversiae*)” of the Second Sophistic (1970.43). The debate’s emulation of a recognizable, competitive literary genre suggests a literary significance to Chloe’s choice of a suitor. Instead of picking the winner based on what attracts her, Chloe must listen to each case first, even though she already knows she favors Daphnis. The intermediary and unnecessary step of the debate demonstrates the qualitative superiority of Daphnis’ beauty, which represents a particular type of pastoral.

Physical attractiveness is not the only component of either Daphnis’ or Dorcon’s arguments. Dorcon also cites his socio-economic credentials (e.g., caring for cows rather than goats, resources to own a dog, 1.16.1–2), which include his being brought up by human parents. The culminating implication is that his *choice* of a pastoral life is superior to Daphnis’ submission to it. Daphnis, by contrast, elides the contribution of Lamon and Myrtale to his upbringing and argues that his animal nurse, lifestyle, and appearance have divine precedent in Zeus, Pan, and Dionysus. His argument as a whole premises his pastoral submission on divine authority. His victory

28 Daphnis refers to the myth of Zeus’s upbringing on Crete. He is suckled by a goat, either named Amaltheia or belonging to the Oceanid Amaltheia. See Gantz 1993.41–42 for the various versions of this myth.

29 Pace Calder 1983.50 and Guida 1985.142, who each claim that the use of she-goat nurses was a fairly common practice in antiquity; in the context of *Daphnis and Chloe*, however, the contrast between Daphnis and Chloe and the other figures in the novel is only reinforced by what should be taken as an unusual origin and upbringing.

is not for all of pastoral—after all, Dorcon, too, is a herdsman. Rather, he wins by persuading himself and Chloe that the kind of pastoralism they represent is a product of divine spontaneity. When viewed against his initial discovery and naming by his human adoptive parents, Daphnis' argument reveals how effectively Lamon and Myrtale have undetectably cultivated his instinctive devotion to the pastoral life, and his victory demonstrates the superior aesthetic quality of this hybrid of cultivation and spontaneity.

This conception of pastoralism must be understood through the lens of parenthood and reproduction in addition to eroticism, yet only the latter has been identified by scholars as the resounding theme of *Daphnis and Chloe*. The depiction of Eros supplied by Philetas (2.5–6) does demonstrate the utility of the usual interpretive focus, particularly as Philetas specifically describes Eros as the self-declared overseer of Daphnis and Chloe (νῦν δὲ Δάφνιν ποιμαίνω καὶ Χλόην, “I am now herding Daphnis and Chloe,” 2.5.4; Ἐρωτι, ὃ παῖδες, κατέσπεισθε καὶ Ἐρωτι ὑμῶν μέλει, “Children, you have been consecrated to Eros and he cares for you,” 2.6.2).<sup>30</sup> Here Longus makes a metaliterary reference to the topic of his novel, particularly in the irony of Daphnis and Chloe's reaction to hearing Philetas's description of Eros: “They were delighted as if they had been listening to fiction and not a true story” (πάνυ ἐτέρφθησαν ὡσπερ μῦθον οὐ λόγον ἀκούοντες, 2.7.1).

But Eros, too, must be understood in terms of reproduction and not merely eroticism, as he is a god associated with both sex and fertility. Eros tells Philetas that he is responsible for the abundance of his garden: “I come into your garden and take pleasure in the flowers and trees and bathe in these springs. That is why the flowers and trees are beautiful—they are watered by my bath” (εἰς τὸν σὸν ἔρχομαι κῆπον καὶ τέρπομαι τοῖσι ἄνθεσι καὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς κὰν ταῖς πηγαῖς ταύταις λούομαι. διὰ τοῦτο καλὰ καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ φυτὰ τοῖς ἐμοῖς λουτροῖς ἀρδόμενα, 2.5.4). This short description points to Eros's governance not only of the meeting of Daphnis and Chloe the characters, but also of the reproductive reality of the novel, as he is the governing force behind all creation. As Turner points out, Eros here recalls the Venus of Lucretius's *de Rerum Natura*, a goddess invoked as the creative authority and source of Lucretius's poem

---

30 Cf. Alpers 1996.328, who notes that the Philetas episode provides instruction in love for Daphnis and Chloe, thus fulfilling the promise of the prologue and demonstrating “how the Philetas episode is a model for the aesthetics of *Daphnis and Chloe*,” in that it allows for “aesthetic mastery of erotic energies.”

(1960.118–19). The depiction of Eros is thus infused with additional implications for the creative process behind the novel.

Furthermore, this Eros is specifically *pastoral*—he “herds” Daphnis and Chloe (ποιμαίνω, 2.5.4) and takes care of a pastoral *locus amoenus*, which, I have argued, is primarily a reproductive site in Longus. As an overseer, Eros also has parental control over Daphnis and Chloe. Again, Longus uses a complex parental/pastoral erotic metaphor to underscore the complexity of his literary art—at once real and imagined, spontaneous and artful.<sup>31</sup> Eros is the god who governs Daphnis and Chloe’s story, but he is at the same time a creation of the author. Through Eros, Longus gives us insight into his pastoral novel as an interplay between the natural and the artificial, a particularly intricate interplay given that Eros appears only in a narrative inserted by Philetas rather than by the narrator himself. The narrator describes and thereby creates Philetas, who then describes and creates Eros—to whom the narrator has dedicated the novel. Narrative and divine authority are so enmeshed that they become interdependent and nearly indistinguishable. *Daphnis and Chloe* the novel, like Daphnis and Chloe the characters, is a product of both compulsion and intentional creation.

## CONCLUSION

I have examined a previously neglected aspect of *Daphnis and Chloe*, namely, a reproductive element of the pastoral world that is seeded in the ecphrasis, reformulated in the opening chapters, and recurrent in the various episodes of the novel. The pastoral world serves as the original and primary parental figure for the two title characters and becomes the constant guide informing their upbringing. Daphnis and Chloe are cared for by a number of agents who work together to protect and even foster a continuing connection to the pastoral world that Daphnis and Chloe experience as an innate, instinctive inclination. I further argue that their upbringing reflects Longus’s conception of his own pastoral art. By noting how parenthood consists of an amalgam of landscape, animal, and human figures and how this amalgam results in an even stronger bond between pastoral parent and child than simple biological reproduction would, we can understand the implications for Longus’s literary creation, which is also presented as the

---

31 Pandiri 1985 sees in this and other scenes the artifice of Longus’s pastoral, but it is more accurate to view this episode as exemplifying the deft combination of artificial and natural that pervades the pastoral landscapes of *Daphnis and Chloe*.

product of spontaneous inspiration combined with intentional labor. The result of Daphnis and Chloe's uniquely mixed upbringing is their affinity for the pastoral world—an affinity that seems innate even though it stems from a combination of conscious efforts and natural inclination. In the same way, the novel—the story of Daphnis and Chloe's continued allegiance to the pastoral world—is itself a product of the pastoral world it creates. As an offering to Eros, Pan, and the Nymphs, the novel constructs a pastoral world appropriate to these gods as it fosters the characters and story of Daphnis and Chloe. In the process, the novel—presented as the product of conscious and unconscious factors—defines the very gods it reveres in the unfolding of its narrative and thus becomes something new: both an example of literary influence, but also a product of the gods. What results is a circularity between the story of the novel and its purpose as an offering to the gods, and, ultimately, an extremely complex work defining while exemplifying the interconnection between nature and art.

*Brigham Young University*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alpers, Paul. 1996. *What is Pastoral?* Chicago.
- Bachelard, Gaston. 1983. *Water and Dreams: An Essay on the Imagination of Water* (trans. Edith R. Farrell). Dallas.
- Bartsch, Shadi. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*. Princeton.
- Beck, Roger. 2003. "Mystery Religions, Aretalogy, and the Ancient Novel," in Gareth Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (rev. ed.). Leiden. 131–50.
- Billault, Alain. 1996. "La nature dans Daphnis et Chloé," *REG* 109.506–26.
- Bloom, Harold. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford.
- Calder III, William M. 1983. "Longus 1.2: The She-Goat Nurse," *CP* 78.1.50–51.
- Chalk, H. H. O. 1960. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longos," *JHS* 80.32–51.
- Connor, W. R. 1988. "Seized by the Nymphs: Nympholepsy and Symbolic Expression in Classical Greece," *CA* 7.155–89.
- Cresci, Lia Raffaella. 1999. "The Novel of Longus the Sophist and the Pastoral Tradition," in Swain 1999.210–42 (trans. of 1981. "Il romanzo di Longo Sofista e la tradizione bucolica," *A&R* 26.1–25).

- Curtius, Ernst Robert. 1953. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (trans Willard R. Trask). New York (trans. of 1948. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern).
- Detienne, Marcel. 2001. "The Art of Founding Autochthony: Thebes, Athens, and Old-Stock French," (trans. Elizabeth Jones) *Arion* 3<sup>rd</sup> ser. 9.1.46–55.
- Effe, Bernd. 1999. "Longus: Towards a History of Bucolic and its Function in the Roman Empire," in Swain 1999.189–209 (trans. of 1982. "Longos: Zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der roemischen Kaiserzeit," *Hermes* 110.65–84).
- Eliot, T. S. 1982. "Tradition and the Individual Talent," *Perspecta* 19.36–42 = 1920. *The Sacred Wood*. New York. 30–39.
- Ettin, Andrew V. 1984. *Literature and the Pastoral*. New Haven.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1966. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (trans. J. Strachey, J. Strachey and A. Richards, eds.). New York.
- Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources, vol. 1*. Baltimore.
- Gill, Christopher (trans.) 1989. "Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe*," in B. P. Reardon, ed., *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley. 285–348.
- Golden, Mark. 1990. *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens*. Baltimore.
- Goldhill, Simon. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge.
- Guida, Augusto. 1985. "More on She-Goat Nurses," *CP* 80.2.142.
- Heirman, Jo. 2012. "The Erotic Conception of Ancient Greek Landscapes and the Heterotopia of the Symposium," *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 14.3: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2047>
- Hunter, R. L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge.
- Kestner, Joseph. 1973–74. "Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*," *CW* 67.3.166–71.
- Krieger, Murray. 1992. *Ekphrasis: The Illusion of the Natural Sign*. Baltimore.
- Larson, Jennifer. 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford.
- Loroux, Nicole. 1993. *The Children of Athena* (trans. C. Levine). Princeton.
- Luginbill, Robert D. 2002. "A Delightful Possession: Longus's Prologue and Thucydides," *CJ* 97.3.233–47.
- MacQueen, Bruce. 1990. *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe*. Lincoln.
- McCulloh, William E. 1970. *Longus*. New York.

- Mittelstadt, Michael C. 1966. "Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Pastoral Tradition," *C&M* 27.162–67.
- Morales, Helen. 2008. "The History of Sexuality," in Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge. 39–55.
- Morgan, J. R. 1994. "Daphnis and Chloe: Love's Own Sweet Story," in J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman, eds., *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. London. 64–79.
- . 2004. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*. Oxford.
- Newlands, Carole E. 1987. "'Techne' and 'Tuche' in Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*," *Pacific Coast Philology* 22.1/2.52–58.
- O'Connor, Eugene M. 1991. "'A Bird in the Bush': The Erotic and Literary Implications of Bucolic and Avian Imagery in Two Related Episodes of Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*," *RM* 134.393–401.
- Pandiri, Thalia A. 1985. "*Daphnis and Chloe*: The Art of Pastoral Play," *Ramus* 14.2.116–41.
- Perry, B. E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances*. Berkeley.
- Reardon, B. P. 1994. "Μῦθος οὐ λόγος: Longus's Lesbian Pastorals," in Tatum 1994.135–47.
- Rohde, G. 1937. "Longus und die Bukolik," *RM* 86.23–49.
- Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. 1969. *The Green Cabinet: Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric*. Berkeley.
- Seaford, Richard. 1990. "The Imprisonment of Women in Greek Tragedy," *JHS* 110.76–90.
- Swain, Simon (ed.) 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*. Oxford.
- Swift, L. A. 2010. *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric*. Oxford.
- Tatum, James (ed.) 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore.
- Teske, D. 1991. *Der Roman des Longos als Werk des Kunst*. Muenster.
- Thalmann, William G. 2011. *Apollonius of Rhodes and the Spaces of Hellenism*. Oxford.
- Trzaskoma, Stephen M. 2007. "Honey and the Effects of Chloe's Kiss at Longus 1.25.2," *Hermes* 135.3.352–57.
- Turner, Paul. 1960. "*Daphnis and Chloe*: An Interpretation," *G&R* 2<sup>nd</sup> ser. 7.2.117–23.
- Ustinova, Yulia. 2009. *Caves and the Ancient Greek Mind: Descending Underground in the Search for Ultimate Truth*. Oxford.
- Winkler, J. J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York.

- Wouters, A. 1994. "Longus, *Daphnis et Chloé*: le *proæmium* et les histoires enchâssées à la lumière de la critique récente," *LEC* 62.131–67.
- Zeitlin, Froma I. 1994. "Gardens of Desire in Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*: Nature, Art, and Imitation," in Tatum 1994.148–70.