

THE EDUCATION OF DAPHNIS: GOATS, GODS, THE BIRDS AND THE BEES

STEPHEN EPSTEIN

DURING THE 1990s A TREND DEVELOPED in research on *Daphnis and Chloe*, with the novel's central focus on the nature of sexuality receiving renewed examination.¹ One aspect of the text that has yet to receive full attention in this regard, however, is the careful manner in which it marks human sexuality through a series of parallels as well as oppositions among human, animal, and divine. How, for example, are we to view the reflections and refractions of both the animal and the divine in Daphnis? In general, as Segal (1974: 291) has succinctly put it, civilization "rests on a double opposition: man versus beast and man versus god," and, to be sure, the Greek world-view frequently draws upon a series of such antitheses.² Nonetheless, *Daphnis and Chloe* works with these oppositions between human and animal on the one hand and human and divine on the other in a thoroughgoing, but rather unusual, way: the interplay of human, animal, and divine is rendered more complex because the text not only establishes oppositions between these spheres, but breaks down boundaries in such a way that mutual interpenetration occurs and all three come to resemble one another, especially in their similar reactions to Eros (see Philetas' account of the god's influence at 2.7). In this essay, I concern myself particularly with how the text situates Daphnis vis-à-vis both his goats and Pan, the goat-footed god, and the role these figures play in educating Daphnis about male sexuality as both positive and negative exempla: what precisely will Daphnis learn from an environment that contains the potential for both pastoral harmony and bestial aggression?

First of all, we should note that Daphnis, perhaps as much as any character in Greek literature, is portrayed as virtually belonging to the animal realm himself.

¹In particular, John Winkler's analysis of the "The Education of Chloe" in *Constraints of Desire* issued a provocative challenge to readers of Longus. In that essay, Winkler takes as a starting point the inadequacy of erotic instinct to realize itself in the novel and focuses on the "inherent violence of the cultural system discovered by Daphnis and Chloe . . . and the unequal impact of that violence" (1990: 103); his reading attempts to show that Chloe is gradually made to learn that she inhabits a world in which the threat of rape remains ever present. For all the innovative force in his reading of the work, many have nonetheless found some of his arguments difficult to accept, and a scholarly consensus appears to have been reached that recognizes value in much of Winkler's argumentation, but ultimately parts company with it: see Montague 1992; Konstan 1994: 79–90; Epstein 1995; and, most fully, Goldhill 1995: 30–45. For other recent discussions of sexuality in Longus that predate or do not otherwise engage in dialogue with Winkler's influential piece, see Zeitlin 1990; Daude 1991; O'Connor 1991.

²To cite only the most obvious example, sacrifice, the central act of Greek religion, clearly defines the human place in the universe through a structural relationship with the gods and with animals. For a cogent analysis, see Vernant's (1980) well-known piece "Between the Beasts and Gods."

Early on the question of his heritage is put before us: Daphnis has an obviously close connection to goats, being in essence one of them initially. The first sentence of narrative proper in the work after the proem and the description of Mytilene in 1.1 brings to light ambiguities in Daphnis' identity: Lamon, Daphnis' foster-father to be, finds a παιδίον ... ὑπὸ αἰγὸς τρεφόμενον (1.2.1), and Daphnis suckles as though the goat were in fact his mother, drawing milk ὥσπερ ἐκ μητρώας θηλῆς (1.2.3). Although Myrtale's naiveté invites a smile from the reader, her question whether goats give birth to human infants (εἰ παιδιά τίκτουσιν αἰγες, 1.3.2) further suggests the close identification between Daphnis and the caprine world; we may, at least temporarily, regard Daphnis as the scion of goats. Nor does Daphnis scorn his heritage: remembering that a goat had nurtured him, he, like Chloe, loves his flocks more than is usual for herdsmen (1.8.3).

An early episode further highlights Daphnis' ambivalent identity. At 1.12.1 two billies fall to battle (τράγοι παροξυνθέντες ἐξ μάχην συνέπεσον), and the victorious goat, despite smashing the horn of his opponent, continues on in relentless pursuit. Annoyed at the damage caused by the impetuous billy (ἀλγεῖ Δάφνις περὶ τῷ κέρατι καὶ τῇ θρασύτητι ἀχθεσθεῖς), Daphnis picks up his cudgel and starts off after him. The herdsman fits rather too easily into the chase: his staff serves as an offensive weapon akin to goat horns, and as his vexation matches the impulse that stimulated the two goats to fight with one another,³ he becomes an amusing counterpart of the pursuing he-goat (ἔδῶκε τὸν διώκοντα).⁴ Just as one goat makes the other turn tail, so the larger Daphnis puts the momentarily victorious goat to flight. Daphnis then establishes his credentials as top billy of the herd by comically surpassing the punishment visited by one of the billies upon the other: when the two tumble headlong into a wolf-trap, the goat now finds both its own horns broken when Daphnis topples down upon him. This jousting of the billy goats at 1.12 provides an implicit exemplar for the contest between Daphnis and Dorcon for Chloe's kiss that soon follows at 1.16: the two rivals are conceived, at least in part, as male animals in rut, as becomes even clearer from the way they identify themselves with their herds in their boasts.

The protagonist of Longus' pastoral novel is thus rendered far more like his charges than one normally expects not only in the novel but, more noticeably, in pastoral; in the latter genre one often indeed meets with an identification of herdsman and herd, but crucial oppositions appear that are far more marked than here.⁵ What purpose does the text achieve by bringing its male protagonist into such close connection with goats? The billy goat, we should note, embodied

³The text also tempts us to hear phallic double-entendres: both καλαῦρον (cf. O'Connor 1991: 399) and κέρας (LSJ s.v. κέρας 7b) are capable of carrying the connotation of *membrum virile*, which fits well the context of masculine combat for supremacy.

⁴In an amusing vignette in Book 3 the boundaries between human and animal break down with more obvious irony: a dog steals a choice piece of meat and Dryas runs off after it, pursuing κατ' ἔχνος ὡς κύων (3.7.2), as though he has become the hound, and the dog, the prey.

⁵Epstein 1992: 32–59.

male potency for the Greeks and Romans, an impression fostered by its beard.⁶ The insistent sexual urges of goats create ambiguity, for their remarkable vitality and virility provoked both annoyance and admiration: as Columella wrote at *De re rustica* 7.6.7, *haedorum lascivia compescenda*; the early sexual maturity of young males caused them to be separated off from the flocks in late spring. Goats, because of their potency, had a close relationship to religious cult as well and became primary sacrificial animals: in particular note that the best offering for Pan was considered to be either a τράγος ἔνορχις or a male kid. These connections with Pan, the phallus, and procreative power made the goat an especially “fertile” symbol for Greek writers. Moreover, as an animal of intermediate spaces, the goat dwells between plain and mountain, forest and field, and is neither wild nor truly domestic (Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981: 154). Indeed, this liminal status permits exploration of the border between nature and culture and accounts in part for the goat’s frequent appearance in Greek pastoral generally.

But while goats are obviously a pastoral feature, Longus’ novelistic interests cause their appearance to take on rather different meanings in his work, and the pasture animals come to function as sexual paradigms, for Daphnis is regularly wont to imitate his herds. The narrator’s choice of animals to set his concerns with Eros into relief is determined by characteristics that allow them to act as positive, if incomplete, models of erotic experience. To begin with, the raw power of their sexuality accords Longus’ animals tremendous vibrancy. The narrator, “preoccupied with . . . the seeming immortality of nature in her generative capacity . . . and nature’s eternal urge to perpetuate herself *in her collectivity*—that is, with collective rather than personal immortality” (Mittelstadt 1966: 166; italics mine), presents his animals en masse as a fecund entity whose vitality pervades the novel. Only very rarely does the text mark off flock animals in the singular, with the exception of the she-goat and ewe who suckle the protagonists.⁷ This lack of individuality in the herds does not detract from their importance in *Daphnis and Chloe*, however, but increases it; their significance lies in their ability to

⁶ For more on ancient perceptions of the goat, consult *RE* 10A (1972): 398–431, s.v. “Ziege.” An interesting metamorphosis in attitude towards goats took place in Greece from ancient to modern times, as the association of goats with Pan’s male, animal sexual energies yielded to a connection with the devil and feminine sensuality. The Sarakatsani, a transhumant society of northern Greece, place importance upon the antithesis of sheep and goat and relate this opposition to that of male and female. They share a widespread belief that goats were originally animals of the devil captured and tamed by Christ for man’s use. Campbell (1964: 26) writes that for the Sarakatsani sheep, on the other hand—“docile, enduring, pure and intelligent”—are creatures of God.

⁷ Even when animals engage in noteworthy action, they move in concert. Thus, for example, at 1.30.1, the herd of cattle springs as one into the sea, ὁρμῇ μιᾷ μυκησάμενοι πηδῶσιν; a plurality of goats gnaw at the withy mooring the Methymneans’ boat (2.13.4); Chloe’s sheep howl collectively as wolves (2.26.1). Even the most memorable event directly concerning the flocks, the fight that breaks out between two billy goats at 1.12, discussed above, *ipso facto* involves a pair, and the dueling goats are at first merely defined in terms of one another (τῷ οὖν ἑτέρῳ τὸ ἑτέρον . . . , 1.12.1). This method of depiction, in effect, paints a fuzzier picture of the animals in Longus. Theocritus, who often cites animals as separate entities, brings them into sharper focus.

reproduce and in their numbers, of which we hear not infrequently.⁸ Collective representation causes them to embody natural forces; the animals, remarkable for their fertility, function in part as a manifestation of Eros' potency.

Animals, as collective agents of Eros, become virtual *dramatis personae* in *Daphnis and Chloe* and can in a sense even take on the role of a dramatic chorus. The text in fact makes the analogy explicit when Chloe's return from her Methymnaean abductors is celebrated: καὶ ταῦτα <sc. τὰ πρόβατα> μὲν περιίσταται κύκλῳ τὴν Χλόην ὥσπερ χορός, σκιρτῶντα καὶ βληχόμενα καὶ ὅμοια χαίρουσιν (2.29.1).⁹ Like a chorus, the flocks in their own way dance and sing. Goats and sheep have an important relation to the development of Daphnis' and Chloe's sexual awareness as bystanders,¹⁰ their presence being associated with the protagonists' opportunities to see one another.¹¹ In this sense as well they function much as a chorus on the dramatic stage. I would not press the analogy too far, but it is possible to view the novel's tableaux of the seasons as equivalent to choral odes, for the animals' conduct at these points interjects comment, albeit implicitly, upon the actions of our protagonists by revealing paradigms to be emulated or rejected.

The behavior of the flock animals, as it undergoes a change during each phase of the year, helps fix an erotic context for the story by marking off new stages in the protagonists' relationship. The initial description of spring in the novel at 1.9 had evoked a sense of vibrance and playfulness. 3.13, the reprise of spring, is the single most important chapter for an examination of the relationship between animals and sexuality in Longus, and merits reprinting in full:

Ἐβληχῆσάτο που καὶ ποιμνία, ἐσκήρτησάν που καὶ ἄρνες, καὶ ταῖς μητράσιν ὑποκλάσαντες αὐτοὺς τὴν θηλὴν ἔσπασαν. τὰς δὲ μήπω τετοκυίας οἱ κριοὶ καταδιώκοντες

⁸Daphnis and Lamon, in fact, present us with head counts at 3.29.2 and 4.14.3. Vieillefond (1987: cxcv) calls attention, however, to the "accroissement incroyable du troupeau en si peu de temps."

⁹A choral role for the herds also helps explain a curious point about Longus' animals. Dramatists do not, in general, single out members of their choruses by name; neither does Longus. By way of contrast with his pastoral exemplar Theocritus, who bestowed names upon his flock animals with relative frequency (e.g., *Id.* 1.151; 4.45, 46; 5.103), the novelist shows reticence in giving his animals proper names. At both 4.26.4 and 4.38.4 Daphnis calls his goats ὄνομαστί, and thereby reveals that his animals have names, but it is surprising that we never hear what these are, especially given the frequency with which we encounter the names of even incidental human characters, such as Lycanion's husband (4.15.1). One could picture Daphnis and Chloe having favorites among the herds—and yet they do not. Rohde (1937: 29) offers an alternate explanation of the text's taciturnity on this point by noting the relative lack of direct speech in the novel.

¹⁰Cf. Theoc. *Id.* 5.41–42. We encounter the reverse of what occurs in *Daphnis and Chloe* in an amusing epigram (*AP* 9.317.3–4) where the goats seem to be impelled toward sexual activity as they witness it upon the human/divine plane: Αἰπόλε, τοῦτον ἐγὼ τρίς ἐπύγισα· τοὶ δὲ τραγίσκοι· εἰς ἐμὲ δερκόμενοι τὰς χιμάρας ἐβάτευν.

¹¹Cf., e.g., ἀγαγόντες τὰς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας τὰς ἀγέλας ἐς νομὴν, ἐφίλησαν μὲν ἀλλήλους ἰδόντες, ὁ μὴπω πρότερον ἐποίησαν (2.9.1); τὰς ἀγέλας κατήλυνον, ἐπειγόμενοι πρὸς τὰ φιλήματα (2.10.2).

καὶ κάτω στήσαντες ἔβαινον ἄλλος ἄλλην. ἐγίνοντο καὶ τράγων διώγματα καὶ ἐς τὰς αἴγας ἐρωτικώτερα πηδήματα, καὶ ἐμάχοντο περὶ τὴν αἰγῶν, καὶ ἕκαστος εἶχεν ἰδίας καὶ ἐφύλαττε μὴ τις αὐτὰς μοιχεύσῃ λαθῶν. καὶ γέροντας ὀρώντας ἐξώρμησεν εἰς Ἀφροδίτην τὰ τοιαῦτα θεάματα· οἱ δὲ καὶ νέοι καὶ σφριγῶντες καὶ πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ἔρωτα ζητούντες, ἐξεκάνοντο πρὸς τὰ ἀκούσματα καὶ ἐτήκοντο πρὸς τὰ θεάματα, καὶ ἐζήτουν καὶ αὐτοὶ περιττότερόν τι φιλήματος καὶ περιβολῆς, μάλιστα δὲ ὁ Δάφνις· οἷα γοῦν ἐνηβήσας τῇ κατὰ τὸν χειμῶνα οἰκουρίᾳ καὶ ἀσχαλίᾳ, πρὸς τε τὰ φιλήματα ὥργα καὶ πρὸς τὰς περιβολὰς ἐσκιτάλιζε, καὶ ἦν ἐς πᾶν ἔργον περιεργότερος καὶ θρασύτερος.

At 1.9 the narrator had described spring in relation to the resulting action of the animals and the desire of Daphnis and Chloe to imitate what they see, focusing on their singing, gamboling about, and gathering flowers like bees. At this point, however, his emphasis rests much more fully upon sexual matters: in keeping with the protagonists' growing awareness of Eros, "on n'y voit plus seulement, comme l'an passé, les agneaux sautant dans les pâturages, les oiseaux chantant dans les buissons et les abeilles bourdonnant dans les prairies, mais les boucs et les bœliers poursuivant et montant leurs femelles" (Vieillefond 1987: 140). The coming of spring rouses animal voices; the young again turn their attention toward play (ἐσκίρτησαν). The root σκίρτ- occurs just once in Theocritus (*Id.* 1.152), where she-goats are warned that their bounding about might arouse the billy; Theocritean friskiness carries with it the possibility of evoking sexual desire. Σκίρτ- appears more frequently in Longus, generally in contexts without manifest sexual overtones,¹² but by 3.13, its usage approaches that found in Theocritus. Play now appears not only in scenes of innocent frolicking but in conjunction with burgeoning erotic energy; for just as pasture animals pass through several months before sexual maturity, so Daphnis and Chloe, now into their second spring as adolescents, continue to awaken to the presence of Eros in the universe.

Spring arouses, above all, the male reproductive instinct, and the text focuses upon masculine aggression in animal sexuality. The seasonal struggle for supremacy among the billy goats had also been couched in the language of battle at 1.12.1,¹³ where one finds hints that a specifically sexual competition led the two to fight, particularly in the phrase παροξυνθέντες ἐς μάχην συνέπεσον. The verb παροξύνω brings with it connotations in Longus that are recognizably erotic to his audience, if not to his protagonist, as at 2.2.1, when one of the women at the festival of Dionysus kisses Daphnis: καὶ τις τῶν θρασυτέρων καὶ ἐφίλησε καὶ τὸν μὲν Δάφνιν παρώξυνε. As MacQueen (1990: 47) writes, "for us readers . . . it is not very hard to deduce why these billygoats were fighting, especially if we keep in mind that this is all happening in the springtime." What is implicit about the role played by sexual competition in inciting combat between the billy goats, however, is made more fully explicit in the narrative at 3.13, in

¹² 1.9.1, twice; 1.9.2; 1.18.2; 1.32.3; 2.2.6; 2.29.1.

¹³ See, e.g., the phrases βιαιοτέρως γενομένης ἐμβολῆς; ἐς φυγὴν ἐτράπετο; ὁ δὲ νικῶν.

keeping with Daphnis' growing but still incomplete understanding of Eros. In the latter passage the text distinguishes further between the sexes to call attention to the aggressive nature of masculine erotic behavior (e.g., οἱ κριοὶ καταδιώκοντες ... ἔβαινον ἄλλος ἄλλην. ἐγίνοντο καὶ τράγων διώγματα καὶ ἐς τὰς αἰγας ἐρωτικώτερα πηδήματα). By describing the male animals' territoriality and protectiveness towards the females in terms of human social institutions and the fear of being cuckolded, the narrative aligns male sexuality, human and animal.

After the long winter, Eros kindles a spark in the animals, which in turn becomes a fire that scorches Daphnis and Chloe (ἐξεκάοντο πρὸς τὰ ἀκούσματα καὶ ἐτήκοντο πρὸς τὰ θεάματα), although Daphnis is especially susceptible.¹⁴ The flocks' spirited activity at this point leads Daphnis and Chloe into their most daring premarital experimentations, and the male herd animals engage in forceful pursuit that Daphnis is tempted to emulate. The kindling of Daphnis' passion at 3.13 further suggests, then, an aggressive animal side in his nature. While the rare word ἐσκιτάλιζε, which Valley (1926: 77) defines as *ad complexus lascivius gestiebat*, offers ample indication of the young man's ardor,¹⁵ it is the chapter's end, ἦν ἐς πᾶν ἔργον περιεργότερος καὶ θρασύτερος, that links Daphnis most closely with his goats. "Boldness" appears frequently in Longus and has significant resonances:¹⁶ the primary reference of the root θρασ-, generally employed of animals, and the goats in particular, is to uncouth animal impulse toward action, although it carries erotic connotations as well, as in the passage cited above at 2.2.1.

The extension of Daphnis' daring ἐς πᾶν ἔργον has a meaning that is developed in the following chapter, when Daphnis, overcome by what he sees, asks Chloe to lie naked with him longer than they had done before in the hope of assuaging his erotic frustration. When Chloe queries Daphnis as to what he intends to do at that point, he responds, "τοῦτο . . . ὃ οἱ κριοὶ ποιοῦσι τὰς δῖς καὶ τράγοι τὰς αἰγας" (3.14.2). Daphnis thus now distinguishes between male and female roles during the sexual act itself; intercourse is represented as something which the male "does" to the female. Significantly, although the portrayal of intercourse as an asymmetrical act, in which one gender takes an active, pursuing role and the other passive, suggests conflict between the sexes, Daphnis notes that the ultimate result of copulation is harmony: this peculiar, unnamed deed, referred to merely

¹⁴ The motif of love as a seasonally burning fire had also occurred in the portrait of the previous year's summer at 1.23.1–2, but here the metaphor has a more immediate relevance as we approach a critical period of awakening for the young lovers. Cf. the following lines from one of the *Carmina Burana* for the seasons' role in producing changes in human moods: "Tempore brumali / vir patiens / animo vernali / lasciviens."

¹⁵ Cf. Σκίταλοι at Ar. *Eq.* 634 and as cited by Hesychius. The participle σφιγῶντες, used of both Daphnis and Chloe, also testifies to the excitement that spring stimulates. At 3.18.4, where Lycaenion determines Daphnis is fully prepared for his sexual initiation, μαθοῦσα ἐνεργεῖν δυνάμενον καὶ σφιγῶντα, the connection between the word and arousal is patent.

¹⁶ Cf. Epstein 1995: 68.

as τούτο τὸ ἔργον, τὸ ἔργον, or τούτο,¹⁷ brings an end to pursuit, flight, and hostility, and causes the males and females to graze together peacefully, ὥσπερ κοινῆς λοιπὸν ἀπολαύσαντες ἡδονῆς. Previously Philetas had suggested the only remedy for Eros was to lie together naked (2.7.5), but Daphnis sees that the act in which the goats and sheep engage also overcomes the bitterness of love (3.14.3): perhaps he and Chloe should combine Philetas' teachings with what he infers from his flocks. His observation of his goats is providing him with valuable information, but, as yet, his erotic understanding is incomplete,¹⁸ and Chloe already has a fuller understanding than her male companion that they differ from the flocks in essential ways. Her observation of pasture animals leads her to underscore these differences and to attempt to dissuade Daphnis from believing they can replicate the animals' happiness so easily (3.14.4).

Daphnis is temporarily persuaded, but finding himself at a loss how to fulfil his desire, he has Chloe get up and clings to her from behind, mimicking the goats (μιμούμενος τοὺς τράγους, 3.14.5); unlike Chloe, Daphnis persists in the illusion of likeness between human and animal,¹⁹ and masculine will carries the day, but this further attempt at overcoming erotic frustration proves no more successful. The text thus suggests that human males can choose the path of animalistic behavior, with ultimately negative results unless they receive proper education and socialization. It is at this point, of course, that Lycaenion makes her timely entrance and acts as the necessary human instructor (albeit a wolfish one) to complete Daphnis' training. After three books in which the main dramatic tension has resulted from the ignorance of our hero and heroine about the meaning and practice of Eros, the plot performs a *volte-face*: the secret of human intercourse has now been revealed to Daphnis, but Lycaenion warns Daphnis that Chloe will cry out, weep, and bleed profusely if she engages in a similar act (3.19.2) with Daphnis. The narrative now will look instead towards the protagonists' marriage. The goatherd finds his intentions to behave as a young billy thwarted in multiple ways, and a paradigm shift occurs: Daphnis, hitherto a "kid," is becoming a man.²⁰

¹⁷We might contrast this vagueness with the striking frequency of -μα nouns at 3.13 (e.g., διώγματα, πηδήματα, θεάματα, ἀκούσματα, φιλήματα), where a series of nominalized forms specify actions.

¹⁸Daphnis also employs inferences based on animal behavior to refute Gnathon when he asks Daphnis to offer him what the she-goats offer to the males (παρασχεῖν τοιοῦτον αἱ αἰγες τοῖς τράγοις, 4.12.2). Daphnis points to the goats in order to rebut Gnathon through an argument *ex silentio*: while it may be proper (καλόν) for a billy goat to mount a female, no one, he claims, has ever seen a he-goat mount a he-goat. Daphnis bases his understanding of a natural order upon the animals that Gnathon, to his mind, is unreasonably attempting to subvert. For more on this scene, consult Winkler 1990: 109–110 and Goldhill 1995: 51–52.

¹⁹Cf. Daude (1991: 218), who notes reasonably that Daphnis has already become cognizant of distance between himself and his flocks as early as his monologue in 1.18; nonetheless, Daphnis' awareness of difference remains inchoate and ill-formed, as here.

²⁰For a complementary reading of the relationship between Daphnis and his herds, and the decision not to make love in animal fashion that focuses on very different issues, see Daude 1991.

And what of Daphnis' relationship with the divine and the role it plays in his education? Nurturance from a she-goat not only draws Daphnis closer to the animal kingdom, but also confers upon him special status as a human: in having Daphnis suckle with a she-goat, as Zeus once did, Longus provides an immediate hint of Daphnis' dual nature as god and man, a distinction he blurs throughout.²¹ This connection is made explicit in Daphnis' first words of the novel when, in his contest with Dorcon, the young goatherd proclaims, "ἐμὲ αἷξ ἀνέθρεψεν ὥσπερ τὸν Δία" (1.16.3). The comparison is not mere self-aggrandizing bluster on Daphnis' part. Other characters in the novel recognize divine qualities within him: Dryas' puzzlement over Daphnis' identity stems in part from his knowledge of Daphnis' early upbringing ("ἐτράφη μὲν ὑπὸ αἰγὸς ὥς κηδομένων θεῶν," he thinks, at 3.32.1); the women at the grape harvest liken Daphnis' beauty to that of Dionysus (2.2.1), and the authorial voice itself compares Daphnis to Apollo (4.14.2). This consistent identification of Daphnis with specific divine figures is unique for a hero in the ancient Greek romance. Although the genre's heroines are likened to goddesses frequently enough, the male protagonists themselves tend to be more earthbound; if one figure serves as a paradigmatic reference for the novels' heroes, it is Achilles.²²

Daphnis, however, is never compared to a mortal hero; rather, Daphnis, in refuting Dorcon's slurs, goes on to cite a parallel between his own beardless skin and that of Dionysus (1.16.4), and, most notably for the argument I wish to develop, to draw an analogy between himself and Pan: Daphnis does not smell as a result of contact with his goats, and neither does Pan, despite being more goat than human (καίτοιγε ὦν τὸ πλεον τράγος, 1.16.3). Pan appears here for the first time since the proem, when the narrator had announced that his account is a dedication to Eros, the Nymphs, and Pan, and we should remark that it is particularly the god's goatishness that is stressed. Daphnis is an honorary goat; Pan himself is a virtual Supergoat; and Daphnis now implicitly likens himself to Pan: the seeds of an important triangular relationship are being sown. At this point a reader may recall that Lamon's discovery of Daphnis at midday (μεσημβρίας ἀκμαζούσης, 1.2.2) offers a suggestion of divinity and perhaps a special affinity with the goat-footed god, for in Greek thought noon,

²¹ Cf., e.g., Rohde 1937: 35; Geyer 1977: 190; Hunter 1983: 16. Calder (1983) argues that the detail of Daphnis' nurture by a she-goat likely reflects an observation rather than a learned allusion, but the motif possesses such thematic significance that I suspect the literary and mythological resonances determined Longus' choice.

²² We find, e.g., the assimilation of Callirhoe to Aphrodite and Anthia to Artemis in Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus, respectively; the latter has characters aver that Habrocomes is the very image of a god (1.2) but without specifying who. Both Chariton and Heliodorus regularly liken their heroes to Achilles. The sole time that Achilles Tatius likens Clitophon to the great warrior provides excellent insight into the author's subversive approach: when Melite disguises Clitophon as herself (6.1), she remarks on his lovely appearance and notes how she had once seen such an Achilles in a painting, in an allusion to Thetis' attempt to sequester Achilles as a girl at Skyros to avoid his conscription for the Trojan War.

regularly the time for divine encounters, was also known specifically as the hour of Pan.²³

Pan, who inhabits a sphere somewhere between the bestial and the divine, functions as a key liminal character in the novel. His importance is underscored by his epiphany at 2.25–30; no other divinity intervenes directly in the narrative, despite the frequent references to Eros' guiding presence and the *mythos* Philetas relates about him at 2.3–6.²⁴ The first relatively full description of Pan, or rather, his likeness in the form of a statue, lays stress on his animal characteristics: τραγοσκελές, κερασφόρον, τῇ μὲν σύριγγα, τῇ δὲ τράγον πηδῶντα κατέχον (2.24.2). Not only do the adjectives emphasize his physical resemblance to a goat, his pose with a goat in one hand enhances his close identification with these notoriously randy creatures. Moreover, Pan grasps not a female, but a male goat (note τράγον, not αἴγα) and the participle modifying it (πηδῶντα) confers a sense of bestial sexual energy.²⁵ And yet, this suggestion of rambunctious sexuality is counterpoised by a token of musical prowess. The god's contradictory aspects, as Turner (1960: 122) remarks, initially create a lack of sympathy for him on the part of Daphnis and Chloe. His presence up until Chloe's abduction by the Methymneans provokes little interest in the protagonists, a point to which the Nymphs explicitly allude (2.23.4) when they chide Daphnis for never having honored the god's image. In fact, all Pan's prior appearances in Book 2 occur in connection with Philetas (2.3.2; 2.7.6; 2.8.5; 2.17.1), and Daphnis' and Chloe's uncertainty how to deal with Eros reveals the extent to which they regard the nurturing Nymphs as their own proper guardians, and Pan as Philetas': "ἐπὶ τὰς Νύμφας δεῖ βοηθοὺς καταφεύγειν. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Φιλητᾶν ὁ Πᾶν ὠφέλησεν Ἀμαρυλλίδος ἐρῶντα" (2.8.5), they cry. But from the Nymphs' speech on, Pan, the embodiment of masculine erotic drive, comes to assume importance as Daphnis' tutelary deity.

In the feast of thanksgiving to Pan after his rescue of Chloe from the Methymneans, Lamon regales his fellow celebrants with the tale of Syrinx. The god who has just proven so benevolent towards Chloe is now revealed as also potentially dangerous for maidens:²⁶ Pan conceives a lust for Syrinx, but the nymph rejects this lover who is neither fully goat nor fully human (οὐδὲ ἐραστὴν ἔφη δέξασθαι μήτε τράγον μήτε ἄνθρωπον ὀλόκληρον, 2.34.2)²⁷ and Pan's pursuit leads to a tragic denouement. Daphnis and Chloe soon extend their

²³ For references, see Gow 1952: 2.4; Segal 1975: 37; Bulloch 1985: 179–180; Borgeaud 1988: 111. Cf. also Vaccarello 1935: 312, noting that many of *Daphnis and Chloe's* important events occur towards noon.

²⁴ See further Meillier 1975 on the religious, psychological, and symbolic aspects of Pan's epiphany.

²⁵ Cf. ἐρωτικώτερα πηδήματα: 3.13.2; 3.17.2; Σάτυροι μανικώτερον ἐπιδόν: 2.2.2.

²⁶ For Pan as an erotic aggressor more generally, see Borgeaud 1988: 74–87.

²⁷ Cf. Teske 1991: 54, noting that Syrinx's rejection of Pan here prepares us for Chloe's response to Daphnis when he suggests that they attempt to make love in half-human/half-goatish fashion.

mimetic activity to the world of myth and dance out the roles of Pan and Syrinx before those present (ὁ Δάφνις τὸν Πᾶνα ἐμιμεῖτο, τὴν Σύριγγα Χλόη, 2.37.1). The narrator, whose handling of the scene forces us to regard the protagonists in light of the characters they evoke, calls specific attention to the animal aspects of Pan that Daphnis mimics (e.g., τὰς χηλὰς μιμούμενος, 2.37.2). Daphnis' interpretation of the myth, however, effaces its violence: he importunes Chloe, who as Syrinx smiles indifferently; he gives chase and Chloe disappears into the woods, whereupon Daphnis merely plays a series of tunes on Philetas' own syrinx (2.37.3). Daphnis' subdued imitation here is emblematic of how he incorporates Pan into his life: Daphnis intuitively from the goat-footed god, as from his goats, that masculinity obliges an aggressive role in his relationship with Chloe, but also that the violence appropriate to divine Pan's mythical world is not acceptable in his human pastoral one.²⁸

Philetas, marked as Pan's devotee earlier in the book, jumps up in delight at Daphnis' musical skill. Recognizing the moment to yield to a new generation, Philetas bestows upon Daphnis his own big syrinx, earlier described as so remarkable that one would think it the one that Pan first fashioned (2.35.2), and enjoins him to pass it on eventually to a worthy successor (2.37.3); Daphnis then dedicates his own small pipes to Pan.²⁹ The god therefore becomes implicated not only in Daphnis' musical investiture, but more importantly, in an obvious metaphoric passage from boyhood to manhood, whether or not one chooses to read Freudian implications into Daphnis' graduation from possessing a small ὄργανον to a large one.

The important scene that concludes Book 2 and brings the first half of the novel to a climax has yet to receive the analysis it deserves. The day after the feast Daphnis and Chloe fall into a competition over who loves the other more (2.39.1), and Daphnis swears by Pan not to live alone without Chloe. But despite Pan's role in returning her safely to Daphnis, Chloe has heard enough to be wary of him, and Daphnis' newfound willingness to identify himself with this borderline creature disconcerts her. Consequently she rejects the oath: Pan, as a god who is ἐρωτικός, remains essentially ἄπιστος and will not punish Daphnis even if he goes to more women than there are reeds in the pan-pipe (2.39.2–3). Instead Chloe has Daphnis swear by the goat who raised him not to abandon her. But note carefully what ensues: Daphnis delights in Chloe's distrust (ἦδετο ὁ

²⁸ Winkler (1990: 120) offers a much more troubling interpretation of the erasure of the violence: for him, the effacement of Syrinx's consciousness in the myth and the subsequent bowdlerized reenactment by Daphnis and Chloe enshrines the acceptability of male violence as it is passed on in social conventions from one generation to the next. See *contra* also Morgan 1997: 2241: "this, however, neglects the beauty that issues from the violent metamorphosis, and which finds its analogue in the maturation and self-discovery of the protagonists."

²⁹ Cf. Deligiorgis 1974: 4 on additional ways that the text both likens Daphnis to, and distinguishes him from, Pan: "Daphnis, at the end of the pantomime . . . finds Chloe as Pan could not find Syrinx, yet, Pan-like, he acquires a *syrinx* in the end."

Δάφνις ἀπιστούμενος, 2.39.5), and the verbal echo (ἀπιστούμενος/ἄπιστος) casts him—at least subliminally—as wishing to emulate aspects of Pan. Furthermore, Daphnis' assent to Chloe's request ironically also draws him a step nearer to Pan, for the posture he adopts as he swears by his goats, στάς εἰς μέσον τὸ αἰπόλιον τῇ μὲν τῶν χειρῶν αἰγὸς, τῇ δὲ τράγου λαβόμενος, recalls Pan's statue, albeit with a second goat substituted for the syrinx. This ironic and partial assimilation to Pan is of equal programmatic value as his imitation at 2.34: Daphnis is suggestively depicted as a budding Pan, but crucial differences remain present. In one hand Pan holds the syrinx, the musical instrument that originated so violently from a nymph's demise, as we have now been explicitly reminded; Daphnis, conversely, grasps a she-goat to represent the one who suckled him as an infant, his oath suggesting that he maintains high regard for nurturing qualities.³⁰ Finally, the last sentence of the book tells us that Chloe, having rejected his oath to Pan, rejoices and trusts Daphnis inasmuch as she is a maiden; in fact, in the very next book Daphnis will become unfaithful (and therefore engage in precisely the Pan-like action Chloe had feared), albeit unintentionally so, as Lycanion maneuvers him into having intercourse with her, by portraying the act as being to Chloe's eventual benefit.

Daphnis' animal actions, such as his horn-shattering participation in the fight between the billies at 1.12, can now also be explained in terms of his growing equivalences with Pan, the horn-bearing, goat-footed god. This is most obvious at 3.13–14, a scene over which Pan's sexually assertive shadow looms large. At 2.37.2 Daphnis had mimicked Pan's hooves; at 3.14 he is prepared to go further, and his attempt to mount Chloe in imitation of the goats recalls the epithet for Pan, αἰγιβάτης;³¹ the posture is ironically recapitulated when Daphnis first follows after Lycanion at 3.17.1 (Epstein 1995: 62). Book 3, like Book 2, closes with a climactic scene that invites us to compare Daphnis with Pan: at 3.33–34 a beautiful apple, described in terms reminiscent of a well-known fragment of Sappho (fr. 105a), hangs at the very top of a tree. Nurtured like Chloe through the course of the seasons (3.34.2),³² the apple clearly symbolizes the shepherdess in some sense, much as the apple in the Sappho fragment symbolizes the beloved in an *epithalamion*;³³ Daphnis had in fact earlier likened Chloe's face to an apple (1.24.3). Daphnis starts upward, alert to the apple's beauty, although Chloe forbids him to retrieve it. Interestingly, the narrative does not inform us why she

³⁰ It is important to recognize here that nurturing figures in Longus, such as the she-wolf at 1.11, can easily play aggressive, predatory roles as well: see Epstein 1995.

³¹ E.g., Theoc. *Ep.* 5.6; *AP* 6.31; 12.128. As Borgeaud (1988: 67) points out, Pan is even depicted as coupling with goats in fifth-century iconography.

³² For the seasons as the single most important structuring device, see particularly the seminal article of Chalk (1960).

³³ On the analogies between Chloe and the apple and the relationship to the Sappho fragment, see further, among others, Philippides 1980–81: 197; Hunter 1983: 74; Gill 1989: 332; MacQueen 1990: 77.

does so: is she fearful for Daphnis' safety or does she hesitate to see this unplucked (read: *virginal*) piece of fruit soiled by human contact? What has transpired earlier in Book 3 provides hints how to read this episode. At 3.23 Daphnis had related to Chloe the tale of Echo: Pan grows angry with the maiden for excessive devotion to παρθενία and sends herdsmen mad who then tear her to shreds. Not long after Nape worries that Chloe might bestow her maidenhood upon a shepherd for such a modest gift as an apple (3.25.2). Indeed, the narrator's remark that the apple is perhaps being preserved for a shepherd in love (ἐρωτικῶ ποιμένι, 3.33.4) suggests that Daphnis is just that herdsman. Daphnis, now also ἐρωτικός like Pan (2.39.2), refuses to let this apple fall to the ground merely to be trampled or to rot (3.34.2) and plucks it as a love token for Chloe who, significantly, appears delighted with the gift despite her initial refusal to let Daphnis fetch it (3.34.5). The episode not only clearly looks forward to Chloe's loss of virginity with Daphnis but also aligns the goatherd, as he once more imposes his will upon Chloe, with Pan (cf. Turner 1960: 122). Again, the mythical world appears extremely violent; Daphnis' incorporation of Pan's aggressiveness far less so.³⁴

For three books the text has drawn Daphnis into increasing connection with Pan, such that by the beginning of Book 4, even his flocks would remind an onlooker of Pan's own sacred flock (4.4.5). How are we to understand these obviously deliberate parallels? Ultimately, these repeated teasing, partial analogies to Pan highlight precisely the ways in which Daphnis learns *not* to take Pan as a full role model. Daphnis comes to understand that masculinity entails an assertive and aggressive role, but his maturation as a male human being admits other influences: once he receives Lycaenion's warning, Daphnis becomes less insistent, not more,³⁵ until the final chapter when marriage, a social institution that disciplines sexuality, sanctions consummation for the pair. Brute satisfaction of desire is not his only motivation; unlike Pan, he demonstrates genuine concern for the well-being of his beloved: the contrast between his avoidance of continued erotic exploration with Chloe for fear of loss of self-control (3.24.3) and Pan's jealous destruction of Echo in the preceding chapter is stark (cf. Konstan 1994: 83). Pressing Chloe to accept a love token she forbids him to retrieve is the closest he comes to imposing an act of violence upon her. In the final scene of the novel multiple contrasts between Pan and Daphnis present themselves: Daphnis has indeed suffered frustration through the first books much like Pan, the embodiment of fruitless pursuit, but ultimately, and critically, Daphnis "gets the girl." Moreover, not only does Daphnis get the girl, he joins with her in lawful marriage before the relationship is consummated. Perhaps most importantly, when Daphnis passes on his knowledge to Chloe, she evidently responds with

³⁴ Cf. Pandiri 1985: 130–133, pointing to a crucial difference between Pan as he acts in the narrative and Pan as he appears in the stories.

³⁵ See also Hunter 1983: 54, offering a good discussion of the contrasts between the inset stories and the narrative and the ironies evoked.

alacrity (4.40.3), and the two live with one another in harmony (4.39), unlike Pan and the maidens with whom he appears in the novel's inset tales.

Why then attempt to establish a likeness between the protagonist and Pan at all? A passage from Borgeaud's *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece* that discusses the god's surprising relationship to marriage offers one cogent suggestion for Pan's prominence in *Daphnis and Chloe*:

Like the mythical Nymphs, Pan remains detached from marriage, but differently: while the nymphs, as companions of Artemis are chaste, Pan displays an exaggerated and distorted sexuality, which never achieves its object. *Duseros* (unlucky in love), he is paradoxically sterile. But the meaning of his detachment from the institution of marriage becomes clear only when we see that as patron of everything improper to marriage . . . he prepares, introduces and initiates into marriage. The outcast is from this point of view a founder Furthermore, just as Artemis, that fierce virgin, is nonetheless also goddess of childbirth, so Pan appears almost simultaneously distant from the proper relation between the sexes and, inasmuch as he symbolizes sexual desire, present at the very heart of that relation (Borgeaud 1988: 155–156).

Pan is therefore present at least in part to help initiate Daphnis into the fundamentally human institution of marriage by acting as both positive and negative exemplum. Although the text has flirted with the idea that Daphnis' true nature is that of Pan or a goat, he shows himself ultimately to be neither, but rather a human being dwelling within a social network; despite learning from Pan and the goats about the nature of masculinity, he distinguishes himself from the alternate paradigms of sexual behavior they offer, because he must learn to be an adult human male.

Perhaps more importantly for Longus, the multiple interconnections of Pan, Daphnis, and billy goats suggest commonalities of experience among all living beings, mortal and immortal. While human, animal, and divine experience of sexuality would hardly seem to be identical, Longus nonetheless chooses to problematize this apparently unobjectionable statement in his novel and to emphasize parallels as well as oppositions among the three groups. In doing so, he returns us to one of the primary themes of *Daphnis and Chloe*: experience of sexuality means participating in a universe dominated by Eros; the erotic impulse, the text insists, is felt by every entity in the cosmos. Animals, especially the novel's goats, and Pan, the most theriomorphic god of the Greek pantheon, highlight this concern in an important way, for it is precisely in the erotic realm that animality most corresponds to the divine, and human beings are most wont to resemble both.³⁶ Ultimately, it should prove no surprise that in Longus' world goats and

³⁶Cf. Dodds 1953: 218 on Plato, an author whom Longus clearly admired: "Eros has a special importance in Plato's thought as being the one mode of experience which brings together the two natures of man, the divine self and the tethered beast. For Eros is frankly rooted in what man shares with the animals, the physiological impulse of sex . . . yet Eros also supplies the dynamic impulse which drives the soul forward in its quest of a satisfaction transcending earthly experience."

a goat-footed god play a crucial role in helping to complete Daphnis' education about the birds and the bees.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
P.O. Box 600
WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND

Stephen.Epstein@vuw.ac.nz

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Borgeaud, P. 1988. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*. Tr. K. Atlass and J. Redfield. Chicago.
- Bulloch, A. W. 1985. *The Fifth Hymn/Callimachus*. Cambridge.
- Calder, W. M. 1983. "Longus 1.2: The She-Goat Nurse," *CP* 78: 50–51.
- Campbell, J. K. 1964. *Honor, Family, and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*. Oxford.
- Chalk, H. H. O. 1960. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus," *JHS* 80: 32–51.
- Daude, C. 1991. "Le roman de *Daphnis et Chloé* ou comment ne pas être un 'animal politique'," in N. Fick and J.-C. Carrière (eds.), *Mêlanges Étienne Bernard*. Paris. 203–225.
- Deligiorgis, S. 1974. "Longus' Art in Brief Lives," *PbQ* 53: 1–9.
- Dodds, E. R. 1953. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- Epstein, S. 1992. *Man and Animal in Ancient Greek Pastoral*. Diss., Berkeley.
- 1995. "Longus' Werewolves," *CP* 90: 58–73.
- Geyer, A. 1977. "Roman und Mysterienritual: Zum Problem eines Bezugs zum dionysischen Mysterienritual im Roman des Longos," *WJA* n.f. 3: 179–196.
- Gill, C. tr. 1989. "Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe*," in B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley. 285–348.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge.
- Gow, A. S. F. 1952. *Theocritus*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe*. Cambridge.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*. Princeton.
- MacQueen, B. D. 1990. *Myth, Rhetoric and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe*. Lincoln, NE.
- Meillier, C. 1975. "L'épiphanie du dieu Pan au livre II de *Daphnis et Chloé*," *REG* 88: 121–132.
- Mittelstadt, M. C. 1966. "Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Pastoral Tradition," *C&M* 27: 162–177.
- Montague, H. 1992. "Sweet and Pleasant Passion: Female and Male Fantasy in Ancient Romance Novels," in A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. New York. 231–249.
- Morgan, J. R. 1997. "Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*: A Bibliographical Survey," in *ANRW* II.34.2: 2209–76.

- O'Connor, E. M. 1991. "A Bird in the Bush: The Erotic and Literary Implications of Bucolic and Avian Imagery in Two Related Episodes of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," *RhM* 134: 393-401.
- Pandiri, T. A. 1985. "*Daphnis and Chloe*: The Art of Pastoral Play," *Ramus* 14: 116-141.
- Philippides, M. 1980-81. "The 'Digressive' αἰτία in Longus," *CW* 74: 193-199.
- Reeve, M. D. ed. 1994. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*. Leipzig.
- Rohde, G. 1937. "Longus und die Bukolik," *RhM* 86: 23-49.
- Schnapp-Gourbeillon, A. 1981. *Lions, héros, masques: Les représentations de l'animal chez Homère*. Paris.
- Segal, C. 1974. "The Raw and the Cooked in Greek Literature: Structure, Values, Metaphor," *CJ* 69: 289-308.
- Segal, C. 1975. "Landscape into Myth: Theocritus' Bucolic Poetry," *Ramus* 4: 115-139.
- Teske, D. 1991. *Der Roman des Longus als Werk der Kunst*. Münster.
- Turner, P. 1960. "*Daphnis and Chloe*: An Interpretation," *G&R* 7: 117-123.
- Vaccarello, E. 1935. "L'eredità della poesia bucolica nel romanzo di Longo," *MC* 5: 307-325.
- Valley, G. 1926. *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus*. Diss., Uppsala.
- Vernant, J.-P. 1980. "Between the Beasts and Gods," in J.-P. Vernant, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Tr. J. Lloyd. New York. 130-167.
- Vieillefond, J.-R. ed. 1987. *Longus: Pastorales* (Daphnis et Chloé). Paris.
- Winkler, J. J. 1990. "The Education of Chloe: Hidden Injuries of Sex," in J. J. Winkler, *Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York. 101-126.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1990. "The Poetics of Eros: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, and F. I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. New York. 417-464.