Metafictional Dreams in *Daphnis and Chloe*

Daphnis and Chloe is unusual among the surviving Greek novels, not only because of its ambiguous generic affinities but also in its emphasis on divine providence as the directing force of the plot. Longus crafts a world in which divine forces conspire not only toward the expected resolution of the plot but also toward explicitly metafictional goals, reflecting the authorial impulse toward unification of pastoral and romance.

I argue that this impulse is demonstrated in two key moments in the novel, a pair of ambiguous dream sequences. Each dream constitutes both a narrative event and a metafictional realignment of the text. Several authors have recognized the potential for dreams in the novels to signal "the presence of a 'deep meaning'... [which elicits] the hermeneutic activity of characters and readers alike" (Bartsch 1989), but the dreams in *Daphnis and Chloe* are unique in the extent to which they signal elements outside of the plot. Rather than predict the narrative future, as is nearly universal in Greek literature (Harris 2009), the dreams are on their surface merely admonitory. Instead, their predictive value lies in the way they encapsulate and expose the generic concerns of the novel, heightening our impression of authorial craft while furthering the text's peculiar synthesis of genres.

The first of these, the dream of the two parents at 1.7, is largely extraneous to the story; its only effect is to convince the two pastoralist-fathers to send their young foundlings into the fields. However, I suggest it contains a number of elements that have more explicitly metafictional purposes: (1) the simultaneous presence of the nymphs (pastoral) and of Eros (romance); (2) the shepherds' ignorance of the identity of Eros because they are *poimenes*, and thus are members of the pastoral universe only; and (3) the instruction by Eros that the foundlings should become shepherds, inaugurating a synthesis of the romantic and pastoral

worlds. The dream then functions as a *mise en abyme*, showing in microcosm the eventual course of the novel, which explicitly shows the authorial crafting of the text through what Harrison (2001) calls elsewhere an "extradiegetic... proleptic ekphrasis," though focalized ambiguously, as I argue, between Eros and the author himself. As a result, the text wavers between claims of representational fidelity and explicit artificiality, drawing attention to the author while officially denying his presence.

The second instance is the dream of Bryaxis at 2.26, where Pan instructs him to release the captive Chloe and return her to her flocks. Pan's stated reason is that Eros "wishes to make a *mythos* out of her," though it is notable that it is he who delivers the message, and not the god most directly interested. It is no coincidence that simultaneous to the dream are a series of pastoral *adynata* which suggest an alignment between the two genres, particularly the sound of a *syringos* (a shepherd's pipe) which nevertheless sounds more like a *salpinx*, a war-trumpet. This invasion of a typically novelistic element (the abduction of the maiden by pirates) into the broadly pastoral world of the novel necessitates an intervention by the god *par excellence* of pastoral, Pan, already transformed by the text's continued process of troubled integration between the two genres. Because the synthesis (like the novel) is here still incomplete, Eros's ability to direct the course of events is complicated by the competing claims to authority (pastoral and romance), which necessitates the intervention of a divine figure internal to the pastoral logic of this part of the text, rather than an external figure such as Eros or, as in *Callirhoe*, the author himself.

The programmatic intentions of the novel are made explicit at the end, where the two gods are given statues in the Nymphaeum that reflect their new roles in the confused generic synthesis; Pan as soldier, Eros as shepherd. The return of the now-adult children to the location

of the first dream marks the novel's programmatic end, as its complicated narrative focalization is resolved through self-conscious confusion of the author, the myth-making Eros, and the lovers themselves who recursively recreate the opening frame.

Bibliography

Bartsch, S. *Decoding the Ancient Novel.* Princeton: 1989.

Harris, W.V. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity.* (Harvard): 2009.

Harrison, S.J. "Picturing the Future: The proleptic ekphrasis from Homer to Vergil" in Harrison, S.J. *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, theory, and classical literature*. Oxford: 2001.

MacQueen, B. *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's* Daphnis and Chloe. (Nebraska): 1990.

Reardon, B.P. *The Form of the Ancient Greek Novel.* (Princeton): 1991.