CHAPTER NINE

PAUSANIAS THE NOVELIST

WILLIAM HUTTON

In 2001 Ewen Bowie published an interesting suggestion: that in writing *Daphnis and Chloe*, Longus was influenced by Pausanias the periegete, whose ten-volume topographical account of the Greek mainland, the *Description of Greece*, was produced in the same general period in which Longus' novel emerged. The basis for Bowie’s suggestion is the similarity of wording and thought in a pair of passages from the two works: In Longus, the intervention of Pan to save Chloe from her would-be captors, in Pausanias the intervention of Apollo to save his shrine at Delphi from marauding Gauls. Though it hardly does justice to the subtlety of Bowie’s argument to present it this way, here are some examples of the comparisons he makes: In Longus, the *whole land* seemed to gleam with fire, and the *clash* of oars was heard (ἡ γῆ πᾶσα ἐδόξει λάμπεσθαι πυρί, κτύπος δὲ ἠκόυετο ... κωπῶν, 2.25.3); in Pausanias, the *whole land* shook and people thought they heard the *clash* of horses being driven. (ἡ τε γὰρ γῆ πᾶσα ... ἔσείτο ... ἐδόξαζον ... κτύπου ... ἐλαυνομέ-νον ἵππων ἰππόν (αισθάνεσθαι), 10.23.1–7). In Pausanias, the night brings on far more grievous events than those of the preceding day (τὰ δὲ ἐν ἐνυκτί πολλῷ σφαῖς ἐμελλεν ἀλγεῖ ἀλγεῖ ἐπιλῆψεσθαι, 10.23.4), in Longus a day arose that was much more frightful than the night it followed (... ἐπήλθεν ἡμέρα πολὺ τῆς νυκτὸς φοβερότερα, 2.26.1).
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According to Bowie, if one accepts these comparisons as evidence of contact (and Bowie himself admits there is room for skepticism), there are intriguing implications for both authors, and particularly for Longus. For instance, Bowie suggests that this connection with Pausanias gives us our firmest terminus post quem for Daphnis and Chloe, since Book X of the Description of Greece can be dated with some certainty to the environs of 180 CE. Implicit in this inference, however, is the assumption that it is Longus who is following Pausanias. In fact, the opposite may be true: given the uncertainty as to the date of Daphnis and Chloe, it is also possible that Pausanias wrote his description of events in Delphi with Longus’s vivid and memorable passage in mind.

While it is unlikely that many would object to the notion that a fiction-writer like Longus would read factual literature like The Description of Greece, perhaps with the aim of heightening the verisimilitude of his writings, it is a somewhat harder pill to swallow to think that Pausanias, an author we rely on for all sorts of serious real-world information, would have any significant dependence on the novelists of his day. Seen through the lens of traditional scholarship, there seems to be an unbridgeable chasm between the world of the ancient novel and Pausanias: The novel is fictional; Pausanias deals with facts. The purpose of the novel is entertainment; Pausanias’ purpose is information. The novel deals with the world of fantasy and romance; Pausanias deals with buildings and statues made of stone and metal, some of which we can still see and put our hands on today. Exacerbating this sense of division is the traditional view of the novel, on the one hand, as a frivolous genre, and of Pausanias, on the other, as a loner in the culture of his day, one who was interested in Classical rather than contemporary literature and whose own literary output seems to have “fail[ed] to find the audience he hoped for”, in that no other author refers to his work by name until the sixth century CE.

The most recent scholarship on Pausanias, however, has tended to call such traditional view of Pausanias’ isolation into question. Currently the list of contemporary and near-contemporary authors for whom a plausible argument has been advanced for a direct relation-
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