

**Bowie (E.) (ed.) *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*. Pp. x + 338. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. Paper, £24.99, US\$32.99 (Cased, £79.99, US\$105). ISBN: 978-0-521-77659-2 (978-0-521-77220-4 hbk).**

While no single ancient novel can claim to have received a surfeit of critical attention, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* has undeniably been best served by commentaries. Although the recent editions of books I-IV of Chariton's *Callirhoe* (Manuel Sanz Morales, 2021, Universitätsverlag Winter) and I-II of Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* (Tim Whitmarsh, 2020, Cambridge University Press) are hopefully indicative of a growing market, in general accessible commentaries on the Greek novels remain lacking. And yet, multiple recent commentaries are dedicated to Longus, most notably those of J. R. Morgan (2004, Aris and Philips) and M. P. Pattoni (2005, BUR). Both include a Greek text with facing translation and explanatory notes, but analysis of the Greek is not either work's primary focus, with Morgan focusing more on narratological issues and Pattoni on intertextual parallels. While both offer valuable contributions, the need for full-scale analysis of the novel's Greek text remains.

As such, B.'s commentary on *Daphnis and Chloe* is welcome, since, as B. puts it, the work 'aims to help its users to understand Longus' Greek and to enrich their appreciation of his writing by drawing attention to his handling of narrative and character and to his adaptation of motifs he very probably knew in earlier literature' (23). While the prior goal fills perhaps more of an obvious vacuum, B. also succeeds in covering familiar intertextual and narratological ground concisely while prioritising less well-known territory. After a brief overview of the story, the introduction opens with a discussion of Longus' poetic models, beginning naturally with Theocritus, but then looking at epigram, Sappho, and Homer (2-5). Turning to prose, B. covers Longus' well-discussed use of Thucydides and Plato before considering hitherto underexplored parallels with other novels (5-6). B.'s arguments here are sometimes tentative, but rarely tenuous. Most convincing is the proposal that Longus' use of the phrase *ταχέας δὲ φήμης* (4.25.3) evokes Chariton's *Callirhoe*, while points of contact with fragmentary novels, although by nature speculative, are suggestive. This balance of well-trodden but necessary introductory material and new approaches establishes one of the work's central strengths from the outset.

The rest of the introduction similarly covers a great deal of ground succinctly, exploring key themes such as religion, city and country, and art and nature (8-14), as well as Longus' style, syntax, and lexicon (14-20). While more engagement with secondary literature

might offer students a clearer understanding of the scholarly landscape, B.'s tight focus on the text offers an accessible overview, especially of linguistic matters. The section covering the novel's reception is a particular highlight. B. directly challenges the consensus that there is little to no reference to the novel until the ninth century and argues convincingly for the novel's influence upon the *Cynegetica*, Aristaenetus, and Nonnus (20-1), before turning to modern translations and receptions (21-3). Although brief, this section offers a fresh and convincing survey of Longus' hitherto neglected reception in late antiquity, which will hopefully stimulate future research in this area.

B.'s text derives in large part from Reeve's 1982 Teubner edition rather than personal study of the manuscripts, and includes few of his own conjectures (23). Despite a clear and useful *apparatus criticus*, B. does not get bogged down in textual issues and keeps the focus squarely on the stakes of such debates. For example, at 1.28.1 B. argues to retain V's reading of the pirates as Τύριοι, *contra* Reeve's Πυρραῖοι, following Young's conjecture for F's Πύρριοι, with reference to both the novel's internal logic and secondary scholarship, but does not lose sight of the fact that the pirates' origins are less important than the role they play in the novel. Not all textual choices will find favour with all readers, as Lucia Floridi's *BMCR* review discusses in more detail (*BMCR* 2020.05.30), but B.'s commentary prioritises offering practical examples of *why* these different readings matter in context.

The commentary, naturally, forms the majority of the work, and here again B. offers something for audiences both more and less familiar with Longus. Clear attention has been paid to the needs of novice readers of Greek, as more complex grammatical constructions are identified, such as accusative absolutes (1.3.2), genitives of exclamation (1.18.2, 4.8.3), and impersonal verbs (1.7.2, 2.1.2), as are phrases found more commonly in postclassical Greek (e.g. καίτοι for καίπερ, 1.16.3, οὐ παρέργως rather than μὴ παρέργως, 3.32.1, κρατῶν with accusative, 4.14.1). Translations are liberally proffered throughout, but often serve the greater purpose of situating the passage within a literary or cultural context. For example, B. offers a translation of the first description of Philetas at 2.3.1, but then unpacks the implications of almost every one of Longus' vocabulary choices, looking at intertextual parallels and cultural resonance (170). As such, B.'s translations serve to help readers comprehend the wider context of Longus' Greek rather than just its literal meaning, and the commentary as a whole is well pitched to help students progress from the mechanics of translation to interpreting the text.

Indeed, the commentary offers much beyond translation help, covering the topography of Lesbos, natural history, intertextual parallels, narratological issues, and more, often in a single note. For example, B.'s discussion of the recognition tokens left with Daphnis as a baby, a purple cloak and an ivory sword (1.2.3), explores the earlier attestation of the adjective ἐλεφαντόκωπον and its literary parallels, the gender dynamics of Daphnis' and Chloe's tokens, weapons in Hellenistic and Roman sculpture, and the exposure of children in history, literature, and mythology, all with further references (102-3). Well-known passages are often treated with a fresh approach and attention to underexplored perspectives, such as B.'s discussion of Lycaenion in contrast to the sexual rivals found in the fragmentary *Babyloniaka* and *Phoenikika* (3.15-19), or Chloe watching Daphnis bathe (1.13.2). B. outlines three primary models for the scene, treating the better-discussed model of Odysseus and Nausicaa more briefly before turning to *Callirhoe* and a hitherto underexplored network of epigrammatic allusions which B. treats in greater detail. A recurrent thread throughout is B.'s dedication to itemizing prior attestations of Longus' vocabulary, which makes clear the richness of the novel's literary texture.

Some of B.'s notes raise more questions than they answer. The famous statement that Daphnis and Chloe respond to Philetas' story about Eros as if it were a μῦθος rather than a λόγος (2.7.1) receives only a brief comment opposing 'myth' to 'report' and a list of parallels for the novel's use of μῦθος (179). By contrast, Morgan offers a much richer survey of the linguistic and philosophical history of this distinction (Morgan 2004, 182), to say nothing of the wide array of secondary literature on this phrase and Longus' engagement with terminology for truth and fiction. In addition, B. notes that the evocation of Plato's story of Gyges' ring (*Rep.* 2.359d5) in the phrase ἰδόντα με καὶ θαυμάσαντα (pr.3) 'can hardly be accidental: L. presents his narrator as an undetected voyeur of the couple's development' (96-7). This is undeniably true, but in a novel which gives such a prominent place to sexuality, especially the friction between innocent and knowing perspectives, Gyges cannot be a neutral or naïve paradigm of unobserved voyeurism.

Yet, no one book can do everything, and B.'s openly acknowledged debt to Morgan's commentary (vii) not only pays homage to the work's scholarly predecessors, but also recognises their complementary strengths. Even where B.'s analysis could have gone further, its wide-ranging and generous approach means that the breadth of its knowledge is inclusive rather than intimidating. As such, B.'s work is a welcome addition to novelistic scholarship

both as a vehicle for widening access to the Greek novel and as a thought-provoking foundation for future work.

*Ghent University*

CLAIRE RACHEL JACKSON