THEOKRITOS 27: *OARISTYS*

This charming mime between a herdsman and a young woman has generally been considered spurious, and hence has suffered from the scholarly neglect accorded most anonymous works[1]. The evidence against Theocritean authorship is at best circumstantial and cumulative, but not probative. That only mss. D and C contain it means nothing, as these two mss., alone or together, also are the only ones to contain the genuine Idd. 26 and 30 and are among very few to contain 23, 28 and the Theocritean epigrams[2]. The *Oaristys* shares its fourth line with Id. 3.20, but the line is so organic to the *Oaristys*, that Hermann, Meineke, and others have argued that it was original there and then interpolated into Id. 3[3]. Nor are there any insup-

[1] The only separate general treatments I find are E.B. Clapp, The *Oaristys of* Theocritus, in: U. Cal. Publications in Cl. Philol. 2, 1911, 165–171; and Wilamowitz, Zur Ὀαριστύς, in: Hermes 13, 1878, 276–279. Some articles dealing with particular details will be cited below. Clapp's main concern is to prove Theocritean authorship. Although Clapp somehow believes that the poem exists in more mss. than it does, his literary and philological points are well taken.

[2] Cf. R.J. Smutney, The Text History of the Epigrams of Theocritus, in: U. Cal. Publications in Cl. Philol. 15.2, 1955, 29–94, who demonstrates, for the epigrams at least, the independence of C from D, disagreeing with Gallavotti, who argues for the dependence of C upon D. Gallavotti, therefore, and Gow (who depended on Gallavotti for his knowledge of the mss. readings) report for the most part only the readings of D in their apparatus: „Cum vero sit nullis papyris, at solis CD servatum XVII, ac praeterea C pendeat ex D, nullus efficitur conspectus". C. Gallavotti, Theocriti quique feruntur bucolici graeci, Rome 1946, xxxvii. For the readings of C, one must consult Ph.E. Legrand, Bucoliques grecs II. Pseudo-Théocrite, Moschos, Bion, Divers, Paris 1953. C is correct against D at 48 παρθένῳ (παρθένι D), 65 βέβηκα (C¹, βέβηκας D¹), and perhaps at perhaps at 59 τἀμπεχόνην (τἀμπέχονον D; edd. differ here). 71b κίεν C, ἤιεν D also suggests more than simple copying. P.G.B. Hicks, Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of Theocritus (Diss. Cambridge 1993) does not discuss these two manuscripts.

[3] Surely, though, a better argument for those believing *Oaristys* spurious is that a later author took it from Theokritos; so Legrand II (above, n. 2) 103, who lists other parallels between the *Oaristys* and other Theocritean poems, none as long as a line, which Legrand takes as a sign that "l'auteur était nourrit de Théocrite," but these very short phrases (some as short as two words) are usually not even exact parallels and in any case are too ordinary to prove the *Oaristys* spurious. Agreeing with Legrand on the point of the *Oaristys*' borrowing from Id. 3.20 is K.-H. Stanzel, Selbstzitate in den mimischen Gedichten Theokrits, in: M.A. Harder et al. (edd.), Theocritus = Hellenistica Groningana 2, 1996, 209. But Theokritos, as Stanzel himself so well illustrates, is happy to repeat his own words, as may well be the case here.

erable features of meter or language[4] that would prove it spurious.

On the former, one can not object to 51 κῶρα, because it is protected by Kalli-machos' κοῦρα at *Hymn* 3.72. This phenomenon, however, is always uncommon and largely post-Hellenistic[5]. It is thus methodologically suspect to introduce ano-ther example into this poem and then find this grounds for suspecting Theocritean authorship, as Fritzsche, Meineke, and Gow do. On 55, the mss. read as follows: φεῦ φεῦ, καὶ τὰν μικρὰν ἀπέστιχες. ἐς τὶ δ᾽ ἔλυσας; Editors now read μίτραν ἀπέσχισα, and indeed a torn brassiere makes perfect sense here, but since the line has clearly suffered corruption that goes beyond one word, it may be more prudent to restore a metrically correct μίτραν by reading φεῦ φεῦ καὶ μίτραν μευ ἀπέσχι-σας, which also improves the rhythm of the line (word-end after a spondaic second foot is mitigated by the forward looking τάν, but even so this is generally avoided)[6].

Perhaps the most telling argument against the authenticity of the *Oaristys* is the fact that it has not been found on papyri and "there is no admittedly genuine poem (apart from epigrams, of which there are no papyrus remains) which is not re-presented in papyri" (Gow 1.lxi), but this may well be an accident of preservation. Pap. Antinoae, e.g. (Gow's 31,3 P.), a codex now containing fragments of 18 idylls (and nothing not by Theokritos), "may have ... contained other poems now lost" (Gow 1.1). Note that this papyrus is the sole witness for Id. 31 and that it and ms. C alone contain Id. 30. It is true that there seems to be no room for the bucolic *Oaristys* in Servius' "canon" of ten Theocritean bucolics (which are taken to be Idd. 1, 3–11), but as Gutzwiller shows, even had Servius known a book containing (only) ten bucolic poems of Theokritos, this would say nothing about earlier Theo-critean books with varying contents[7].

That Stobaios 63.19 quotes the line and credits it to Theokritos therefore proves nothing one way or the other.

[4] Gow leaves hyperdoric forms such as φίλαμα and μᾶλα in the *Oaristys*, because he considers the poem spurious, but where the codd. present this same form in genuine poems he alters the text to φίλημα, μῆλα; cf. 1.lxxvi. Furthermore, as Gow 1.lxxiii–lxxiv and Leg-rand, Bucoliques grecs, I. Théocrite⁵, Paris 1960, xxix–xxx note, the precise extent of Theo-kritos' use of literary doric is not clear. See now J.G.J. Abbenes, The Doric of Theocritus, a Literary Language, in: Harder et al. (above, n. 3) 1–19, who concludes that Theokritos wrote his "doric" poems in an artificial dialect.

[5] Note, however, θοῖνα = θοίνη, which may be as early as Epicharmos 148.1 Kaibel and in any case is found in LXX *Wi.* 12.6. Also on the question of meter, Clapp (above, n. 1) 167 f. adequately disposes of Ahrens' objection to the slightly smaller percentage of bucolic diaereses in the *Oaristys* than in the Theocritean bucolic poems generally considered genuine.

[6] Hilberg's Law; cf. Maas, Gr. Metr. § 92.

[7] Servius in V.B. proem 3.20 f. Thilo: „sane sciendum vii eclogas esse meras rusticas, quas Theocritus x habet". K. Gutzwiller, "Theocritean Poetry Books", in: Harder et al. (abo-ve, n. 3) 120 f. Gutzwiller should also be consulted for the likely meaning of the term "buco-lic" as applied to Theokritos.

When the *Oaristys* does receive its infrequent notice, for the most part the few comments made in passing are at best unappreciative of the poem's subtlety and at the worst widely off the mark. Gow's introductory summary to his commentary may serve as an example of the former: "he is wooing her, and she with some demur accompanies him to a neighboring wood where she yields to a slight show of force and grants him her favours."[8] As an example of the latter, consider J.D. Reed's description of it as "a pastoral poem in which a youth rapes a maiden."[9]

The view to be argued here is that the woman of this poem is far more in control of the situation than appears at first glance. In this I am in agreement with P. Legrand, the only scholar who recognizes that the girl is every bit as willing to sleep with Daphnis as he is with her[10]. Legrand, however, thinks that it is only her sense of shame that delays their gratifying each other and that only Daphnis' promise to marry her allows her to give in. I, on the other hand, like the narrator (see below, ad fin.), think that shame has nothing to do with the matter; that from the very beginning she is plotting to extract a promise of marriage from him; and that, furthermore, as an analysis of the dramatic action will show, she manages to have her way while yet allowing Daphnis to think that *he* is the clever one directing the action.

The poem opens, unobjectionably, *in medias res*, as many mimes or narrative poems "spoken" by one of the character in the action do[11], but the fact that it closes with an anonymous narrative suggests that it also began with one, and hence that some lines of dialogue may have also have been lost[12]. None the less, as we have it,

---

[8] A.S.F. Gow, Theocritus, Cambridge 1952, 2.485. Cf. D. Heinsius, Θεοκρίτου τοῦ Συρακοσίου Εἰδύλλια τὰ Σωζόμενα, Heidelberg 1603, 170: „tandem cum puella *persuasa est* faciunt furtivas nuptias" (my emphasis).

[9] J.D. Reed, Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis, Cambridge 1997, 30, in the context of considering Gallavotti's assigning the *Oaristys* to Bion (p. 155). Gow ibid. would give it a date "well within the Christian era". Wilamowitz (above, n. 1) 276 thinks the poem unlikely to be older than the first century BC („älter als Artemidor"). Gallavotti ibid. says that Heinsius attributed the poem to Moschus, but I cannot verify this. All that Heinsius says in the introduction to the poem is „singularis suavitas est et facilitas huius Idyllii; ut non a Theocrito, sed ab alio quopiam authore scriptum esse videatur." The heading to ch. xxvii of his Lectiones Theocriteae ends „Locus alius ἐκ τοῦ 'Οαριστύος, item [sc. locus tertius] Moschi emendatus", p. 382. Is it possible that this was misunderstood to mean that Heinsius took the *Oaristys* to be by Moschus?

[10] Legrand II (above, n. 2) 102 f., who speaks of the «manœuvres de la jeune fille et de ses petites hypocrisies. Au fond, elle ne ressent guère moins de désirs que son partenaire.»

[11] In the corpus of Theokritos: 1. 2. 4. 5. 9. 20; cf. also Herondas 2. 3. 5. 6. Some Platonic dialogues do likewise, such as the early *Hippias Minor* and the late *Philebos*.

[12] So, e.g., Wilamowitz (above, n. 1) 277. There is no parallel for this lopsided form, although Idd. 18 and 21, far more acceptably, offer an introduction to a song, which is then allowed to end the poem, the prologue having been forgotten. Theocritean mimes framed with opening and closing narratives are 6. 8. 11. Id. 9 plays with this form in that it is framed by the words of a third person present, who then contributes his own song. R.J. Cholmeley, The Idylls of Theocritus, London 1901, 364 argues (without mentioning the narrative closu-

the first line of the poem is obliquely programmatic. It is spoken by the girl, whom, for simplicity's sake, following Edmonds, we shall call Akrotime[13]:

τὰν πινυτὰν Ἑλέναν Πάρις ἥρπασε βουκόλος ἄλλος.

How may Helen be said to be prudent or discreet (LSJ's entirely adequate translations for this adjective)? As Gow ad loc. says, this is a quality we associate (among Homeric women) less with Helen and more with Penelope[14]. That, as Gow adduces, Helen accepts responsibility for her part in the war, to Priam at 3.172 f. and to Hektor at 6.344 ff., reflects more common sense in the tenth year of fighting (she could hardly say otherwise to these Trojans) than any great moral or intellectual prudence on her part. Paris, of course, by all accounts, no matter how much they vary in the details of his and Helen's running off together, was drawn to Helen for her beauty alone. Nor does it take much to infer from the texts, especially Homer, that Paris was not the sort of male to appreciate a woman for her mind. If, however, we ask why (as Gow, e.g., does not) *Akrotime*, not an authorial voice, characterizes Helen as πινυτή, we may suspect that it is because she herself rather than Paris finds this quality in Helen, a suspicion that is confirmed as the poem proceeds.

The structure of the poem is simple: (i) 1–50: We enter in the middle of a conversation (see above) between a cowherd and a goatherdess, both to be imagined as just past puberty[15]. (ii) 51–62: Daphnis touches and tries to seduce her. (iii) 63–66:

re) that "there is no necessity to suppose anything lost". Wilamowitz ibid. also thinks that a kiss occurred before our text begins, but I agree with Gow in placing the kiss in question between vv. 4 and 5.

[13] Her name may appear on line 44, which has to be considered in its context. On line 42 Daphnis names himself, his father, and grandfather. On line 43 the girl says ",<You are> from noble stock, but I am no less than you." Then CD have οὐδ' ἄκρα τιμή ἐσσι, πατὴρ δέ τοι ἐστι Μενάλκας, where Briggs changed the first word to οἶδ' and Edmonds combined the next two into Ἀκροτίμη, the resulting text being precisely what is required: I know your stock: you are named ... and your father is ... (οὐδ' ἄκρα τιμήεσσα Iunt. Call., οὐ γ' ἄρα τιμία tent. Gallavotti). Identifying one's family during courtship is of obvious importance. Cf. the somewhat similar scene where Aphrodite, approaching another herdsman with seduction in mind, identifies her family: H. Aphrod. 111 f.; 138–140.

[14] Od. 11.445; 20.131; 21.103; 23.361, where the adj. is applied directly to Penelope; cf. also 20.71, where Penelope praises the daughters of Pandareos for, i.a., the εἶδος καὶ πινυτήν granted them by Hera. Another prudent woman, described by the epigrammatist Anyte, may offer a parallel in Antibia, who was like Helen in that many suitors came to her father's house κάλλευς καὶ πινυτᾶτος ἀνὰ κλέος (Anyte 6 Gow-Page = AP 7.490). In general, however, πινυτ- is rarely applied to women outside of sepulchral inscriptions, the one place where public praise of women was not only allowed but expected. For example, note a late (ii c. AD) inscription from Pergamon which praises a woman for, i.a., her εἶδος καὶ πινυτήν (Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca 243b.4), but since this is an obvious borrowing from Homer (Hera is also mentioned here as in Homer), this adds little to the use of this stem. For further inscriptional examples, see Geoghegan ad Anyte 6.6.

[15] Note χλοεροῖσιν ἰαινόμενοι μελέεσσιν in the closing narrative (67). A somewhat similar scene of mutual sexual awakening of a bucolic pair has the boy goatherd at age 15

She acquiesces. (iv) 67–73: Closing narrative. What this outline conceals, however, is the extent to which it is Akrotime who guides the action.

To Akrotime's remark that another cowherd, Paris, snatched away the prudent Helen, Daphnis replies, with greater relevance than he realizes, μᾶλλον, ἑκοῖσ᾽ Ἐλένα τὸν βουκόλον ἔσχε φιλεῦσα[16], "rather [i.e., ἥρπασε is too strong a term][17] did Helen, of her own free will, capture that neatherd with a kiss" (Gow). What Daphnis does not realize is that Akrotime has taken this view of Helen as her own mythological paradigm of how to better oneself by extracting the promise of marriage from a wealthy suitor. Note, for example, that Akrotime rejects Daphnis' advances with words only; she makes no attempt to leave – and words that, because she is either dense or prudent, serve only to lead him on. And note also how artlessly her sally that he should be kissing his calves, not an unmarried maiden (7, ἄζυγα κώραν), introduces the subject of marriage. Implicit is the idea that if he wants kisses (and what follows from kissing) from her he will have to marry her. Daphnis, however, misses the point of "unmarried", answering instead that she will not be a "maiden", i.e., young, for much longer (8, μὴ καυχῶ· τάχα γάρ σε παρέρχεται ὡς ὄναρ ἥβη)[18]. Akrotime will have to bring up the subject of marriage again later, as we shall see; but before she does, she fends off Daphnis' groping (19, but reasonably placed between 10 and 11)[19], μὴ 'πιβάλῃς τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ εἰσέτι; (i.e., you're trying to kiss me again?) χεῖλος ἀμύξω. Editors seem to take this last comment as a real threat on her part to bite his lips if he lays his lips on hers[20], but that is merely the surface sense, just below which lies the strong hint of the *Beisskuß* (English

---

and the girl shepherd·at age 13; Longos, Daphnis and Chloe 1. 7, 13. And cf. vv. 8 (discussed below) and 16, where Akrotime appeals to Artemis.

[16] ἑκοῖς᾽ Ahrens ἐδοῖς CD (a *vox nihili*), ἔσχε Hermann ἐστί CD.

[17] μᾶλλον = "rather" without the usual following δέ (LSJ s.v. μάλα II 2), so Daphnis' repetition of this idiom at v. 28 is worth noting.

[18] Cf. Sappho 169.3 V παρὰ δ᾽ ἔρχετ᾽ ὤρα, where ὤρα has, among other meanings, the same sense ἥβη does; for the other meanings, cf. Eranos 84, 1986, 57–59.

[19] By O. Ribbeck, „Zur Ὀαριστύς", in: RhM 45, 1890, 146 f., approb. Gallavotti, Legrand, Gow. This results in a perfect stichomythia, although earlier editors were satisfied with schemes that give one or the other speaker an occasionaly run of two or three lines. On the difficulties of text and interpretation provided by vv. 9 f., see below, n. 28.

[20] But G. Hermann, „Scholae Theocriteae", in his Opuscula, Leipzig 1834, 114, thinks that she is threatening to scratch his lips with her finger nails („minatur illa contra se labia eius unguibus, si manum iniiciat, atque osculum extorquere velit"), but with her nails she could scratch him in many parts of his body, and during kissing she would be in danger of hurting herself if she aimed at his lips. Gow simply refers the reader to another place in Theokritos where the root of ἀμύξω appears, which I think warrants the inference that he took her words literally. Legrand, to whom we owe the question mark after εἰσέτι, thinking only that Akrotime willingly accedes to Daphnis' requests for "ce qu'elle même brûle de donner" (102) might be willing to see her as leading him on with this phrase, but he does not specifically refer to it.

lacks such a word), which accompanies serious lovemaking, and which could only excite Daphnis more than he already is. Cf., e.g., Hor. O., 1.13.11–12 ("Horace" expressing jealousy at the thought of somebody else kissing Lydia) *impressit memorem dente labris notam*; and Lucretius feels that he has to inveigh against this practice of lovers twice: 4.1080 *dentis illidunt saepe labellis | osculaque adfligunt* 1109, *inspirant pressantes dentibus ora*[21]. Brown ad 1109 is right to say that Lucretius is being "deliberately unerotic"[22], but he (Lucretius, that is, not Brown) is a prissy fellow who, like Hermann, could never understand how the thought of a violent kiss might serve only further to excite an already excited Daphnis.

Daphnis continues to work the theme of inevitability, moving now from that of the onset of old age (which for teenagers begins at about age 20) to that of erotic passion: No parthenos can escape Eros; to which Akrotime responds φεύγω ναὶ τὸν Πᾶνα· σὺ δὲ ζυγὸν αἰὲν ἀείραις (21), substituting a yoke metaphor for Daphnis' hunting metaphor (cf. 17 μὴ βάλλει [sc. ἡ Παφία]²³ καὶ ἐς λίνον ἄλλυτον ἔνθῃς). This time, Daphnis makes the connection and realizes that what starts as passion can lead to marriage: δειμαίνω μὴ δή σε κακωτέρῳ ἀνέρι δώσει (22), "I fear lest Eros hand you over (LSJ s.v. δίδωμι II 1) to a worse man"; i.e., you may fall in love with someone worse. Akrotime, however, converting this verb to LSJ s.v. II 2, "give in marriage", says (with what truth we have no way of knowing) πολλοί μ' ἐμνώοντο, νόῳ δ' ἐμῷ οὔτις ἕαδε (23); i.e., if I want to sleep with somebody it will be with one of the suitors for my hand in marriage²⁴, not with somebody who offers nothing more than a musical overture under the elms (13). Daphnis takes the bait and is hooked: εἷς καὶ ἐγὼ πολλῶν μνηστὴρ τεὸς ἐνθάδ' ἱκάνω (24)²⁵.

If their love making took place now, one could argue that Akrotime has been restrained all along by a sense of shame, but that she longs to have sex every bit as much as Daphnis. In Kleinias' words in *Leukippe and Chariton,* ἐὰν δὲ αἰτήσῃς τὸ ἔργον προσελθών, ἐκπλήξεις αὐτῆς τὰ ὦτα τῇ φωνῇ, καὶ ἐρυθριᾷ καὶ μισεῖ τὸ

---

[21] See further Plautus, Pseud. 67, Catullus 8. 18, Lucian. Dial. Mer. 5,3: ἔδακνε μεταξὺ καταφιλοῦσα, Achill. Tatius 2.37.7: οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἐθέλει φιλεῖν τοῖς χείλεσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ὀδοῦσι συμβάλλεται καὶ περὶ τὸ τοῦ φιλήματος στόμα βόσκεται καὶ δάκνει τὰ φιλήματα, Paul. Sil. 76.1–2 Viansano (AP 5.244), Cic. Verr. 5.32, Plut. Pomp. 2.2; C. Sittl, Die Gebärde der Griechen und Römer, Leipzig 1890, 42 n. 5; W. Kroll, „Kuß", RE Suppl. 5, 1931, 513, Nisbet-Hubbard ad Hor. loc. cit.

[22] R.D. Brown, Lucretius on Love and Sex, Leiden 1987.

[23] Aphrodite's being called the Paphian here and in v. 55 has been used to deny authorship to Theokritos, but, as Clapp (above, n. 1) and even Gow note, this term, which has good Homeric precedent, was becoming common in the Hellenistic age.

[24] Although μνάομαι in nonerotic contexts can mean only "sue for, solicit a favour, office, etc." (LSJ s.v. II 2), its use in the *Odyssey* and other poetry guarantees that nothing less than marriage is meant here; as Daphnis' μνηστήρ shows. On the text of v. 23, see M. Haupt, in: Hermes 4, 1870, 339–341 = Opuscula, Leipzig 1876, 3.484–486, whose νόον δ' ἐμὸν οὔτις ἀρέσκει should at least be preserved in app. critt.

[25] Clapp (above, n. 1) 170 writes of "their mode of conducting courtship and marriage" as though this had been in Daphnis' mind from the beginning.

ῥῆμα καὶ λοιδορεῖσθαι δοκεῖ· κἂν ὑποσχέσθαι θέλῃ τὴν χάριν, αἰσχύνεται[26]. This, as has been said, is Legrand's view.

In what follows, however, Akrotime deviates from this scenario of innocence and shame. She not only, in what may be thought of as a prenuptial agreement, extracts from Daphnis the terms of the bride price (his herds and their pastorage, 34), but also an (admittedly unenforceable) agreement to consider her beautiful even after she bears children (32), never to leave her against her will (35 f.), and to build her a proper bridal room, house, and farm (37 f.). Now, and only now, does Akrotime allow Daphnis to make love to her. Only in Daphnis' mind – and in that of like-minded male scholars – can Akrotime be said to have been "persuaded". If anyone has been persuaded, it has been Daphnis, although "manipulated" would be a better word. And rape is totally out of the question. A women being raped was expected to scream, which could serve in some possible future trial as a sign of her being forced[27]. Indeed, someone may be approaching this young couple; at least Akrotime says μίμνε, τάλαν· τάχα τίς τοι ἐπέρχεται· ἦχον ἀκούω (57), which is the very antithesis of what a girl being raped should say. Well, maybe it is just the cypresses' whispering, as Daphnis says, for the love making proceeds; between vv. 62 and 63 the act is done and each has what he and (even more so) she wants. Akrotime's last words are the frequently quoted παρθένος ἔνθα βέβηκα, γυνὴ δ᾽ εἰς οἶκον ἀφέρπω (65). Daphnis is happy that he has possessed a parthenos; Akrotime is happy that she has become a woman, just as she planned[28]. As the anonymous narrator, whose story this is, notes at the end (69–70), the sense of shame that Legrand detects in her actions is feigned; in her heart she feels nothing but joy: χἢ μὲν ἀνεγρομένη πάλιν ἔστιχε μῆλα νομεύειν | ὄμμασιν αἰδομένοις, κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ἰάνθη[29].

New York University　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　David Sider

[26] Ach. Tat. 10.4.

[27] Cf. H. Dem. 20: ἰάχησε δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ὄρθια φωνῇ, with Richardson's very full note citing ancient parallels and modern literature.

[28] In additon to the passages analysed above in favor of this view, I believe that vv. 9 f. do so as well, but they could not be used because the text, order, and meaning of these lines are in great dispute; cf. Gow ad loc., who summarizes the views of Legrand, Ribbeck, and Wilamowitz. But if the view put foward here is correct, we can now go back and briefly state that a likely text is as follows:

　　AK.　　ἦν δέ τι γηράσκω; τόδε που μέλι καὶ γάλα πίνω.
　　ΔA.　　ἁ σταφυλὶς σταφὶς ἔστι. καὶ οὐ ῥόδον αὖον ὀλεῖται;
(ἦν δέ Cholmeley ἠδέ C ἦ δέ D¹ εἰ δέ D²). The first question mark is Wilamowitz', the second is mine. "And what if I grow old? [Not Gow's "I am growing older"; cf. Il. 17.325 κηρύσσων γήρασκε. "he grew old as a herald."] I still have this milk and honey to drink [i.e., I don't need you]." "The grape is a raisin [Ribbeck's ἔσται may be right, but conceivably the lost preface set the scene at a time of year when grapes were turning into raisins]. Will not the rose too perish all withered?" That is, at this stage, to lead him on, Akrotime tells Daphnis that as long as she is provided for she is entirely self-sufficient. But when she does let Daphnis into her life, it will be on terms that will supply far more than the simple subsistence she claims she is satisfied with.

[29] This piece has benefitted greatly from advice kindly given by Kathryn Gutzwiller and Alexander Sens, who are not to be held responsible for the aberrations that remain.