LUND UNIVERSITY

Researcher, Traveller, Narrator : Studies in Pausanias' Periegesis

Akujärvi, Johanna

2005

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Akujärvi, J. (2005). *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator : Studies in Pausanias' Periegesis*. [Doctoral Thesis (monograph), Greek (Ancient and Byzantine)]. Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Total number of authors:
1

Researcher, Traveller, Narrator

Studies in Pausanias' *Periegesis*

Johanna Akujärvi

To Daniel

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people to whom I wish to express my gratitude. My primary debt of gratitude goes to my first supervisor, Professor Jerker Blomqvist, not only for encouraging me to begin doctoral studies in Greek at Lund University but also for continually guiding and supporting me during my work with this book. My second supervisor, Professor Karin Blomqvist, has with her friendly aid, guide, and encouragement helped me bring the work to an end. Both I and my work have benefited greatly from the interest, useful comments, and constructive criticism we have received from you both. Thank you!

Further, I wish to express my gratitude to the members of the Greek seminar in Lund, for their different contributions to my work, and the seminar of the 'Athens Project' under the leadership of Professor Jerker Blomqvist. Special thanks to Dr. Karin Kulneff-Eriksson for reading a substantial part of my manuscript and giving me many helpful remarks.

I also wish to thank the staff of the University Library in Lund for skilfully supplying me with the necessary literature, which occasionally has been difficult to find, and Patricia Wetterberg for correcting my English. For financial support, I am grateful to the foundation of Hjalmar Gullberg and Greta Thott and to Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation) which sponsored the project 'Athens as the Cultural Metropolis of the Roman Empire' of which this dissertation is a part.

Finally, Daniel, without you by my side I would not have had the strength to bring this project to an end.

Kiitos myös perheelleni ja Maijalle. En osaa sanoa kuinka tärkeät kiinostuksenne ja kannustuksenne ovat olleet tämän pitkän työni aikana.

Malmö, October 2005
Johanna Akujärvi

Contents

List of tables

Bibliography

Editions and translations of the *Periegesis*

Casevitz 1992   Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce*. Tome I, Livre I, *L'Attique*. Texte établi par M. Casevitz. Traduit par J. Pouilloux. Commenté par F. Chamoux. Paris 1992 (Collection des universités de France).

Casevitz 1998   Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce*. Tome VIII, Livre VIII, *L'Arcadie*. Texte établi par M. Casevitz. Traduit et commenté par M. Jost, avec la collaboration de J. Marcadé. Paris 1998 (Collection des universités de France).

Casevitz 1999   Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce*. Tome V, Livre V, *L'Élide (I)*. Texte établi par M. Casevitz. Traduit par J. Pouilloux †. Commenté par A. Jacquemin. Paris 1999 (Collection des universités de France).

Casevitz 2000   Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce*. Tome VII, Livre VII, *L'Achaïe*. Texte établi par M. Casevitz. Traduit et commenté par Y. Lafond. Paris 2000 (Collection des universités de France).

Casevitz 2002   Pausanias, *Description de la Grèce*. Tome VI, Livre VI, *L'Élide (II)*. Texte établi par M. Casevitz. Traduit par J. Pouilloux †. Commenté par A. Jacquemin. Paris 2002 (Collection des universités de France).

Clavier 1814–1821   *Description de la Grèce de Pausanias*. Traduction nouvelle, avec le texte grec collationné sur les manuscrits de la bibliothèque du Roi, par M. Clavier. I–VI. Paris 1814–1821.

Frazer 1898   *Pausanias's Description of Greece*. Translated with a Commentary by J.G. Frazer. I–VI. London 1898 (1965).

Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910   *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*. Edidit, graeca emendavit, apparatum criticum adiecit H. Hitzig. Commentarium germanice scriptum… addiderunt H. Hitzig et H. Bluemner. I–III. Lipsiae 1896–1910.

Jones 1918–1935   Pausanias, *Description of Greece*. With an English translation by W.H.S. Jones (and H.A. Ormerod). I–IV. Cambridge, Mass. 1918–1935 (Loeb Classical Library).

Kuhn 1696   *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio accurata, qua lector ceu manu per eam regionem circumducitur*. Cum latina R. Amasaei interpretatione. Accesserunt G. Xylandri et F. Sylburgii annotationes ac novae notae I. Kuhnii. Lipsiae 1696.

Meyer 1967   Pausanias, *Beschreibung Griechenlands*. Neu übersetzt, mit einer Einleitung… von E. Meyer. 2. Aufl. Zürich 1967.

Moggi 2000	Pausania, *Guida della Grecia*. VII. *L'Acaia*. Testo e traduzione a cura di M. Moggi. Commento a cura di M. Moggi e M. Osanna. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 2000.
Moggi 2003	Pausania, *Guida della Grecia*. VIII. *L'Arcadia*. Testo e traduzione a cura di M. Moggi. Commento a cura di M. Moggi e M. Osanna. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 2003.
Musti 1982	Pausania, *Guida della Grecia*. I. *L'Attica*. Introduzioni, testo e traduzione a cura di D. Musti. Commento a cura di L. Beschi e D. Musti. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 1982.
Musti 1986	Pausania, *Guida della Grecia*. II. *La Corinzia e l'Argolide*. Testo e traduzione a cura di D. Musti. Commento a cura di D. Musti e M. Torelli. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 1986.
Papachatzis 1974–1981	Παυσανίου Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις. Edited, with a translation into modern Greek, and commentary by N.D. Papachatzis (Ν.Δ. Παπαχατζῆς). I–V. Athens 1974–1981.
Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990	*Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*. Edidit M.H. Rocha-Pereira. I–III. 2. Aufl. Leipzig 1989–1990.
Schubart & Walz 1838–1839	*Pausaniae descriptio Graeciae*. Recensuerunt, apparatu critico, interpretatione latina et indicibus instruxerunt I.H.Ch. Schubart et Ch. Walz. I–III. Lipsiae 1838–1839.
Siebelis 1822–1828	*Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*. Edidit, graeca emendavit, latinam Amasaei interpretationem castigatam adiunxit et adnotationes atque indices adiecit C.G. Siebelis. I–V. Lipsiae 1822–1828.
Spiro 1903	*Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*. Recognovit F. Spiro. I–III. Lipsiae 1903.

Other literature

Akujärvi 1999	J. Akujärvi, *Interpretational Problems in Pausanias' Attika (I 18.1, 6 and 9)*. Lund 1999 (Scripta minora Regiae societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis 1998–1999: 1).
Akujärvi 2001	——, 'De känslor en antik författare kan väcka. Om filologen Wilamowitz förhållande till Pausanias', *Medusa* 4: 2001 (årg. 22) 26–37.
Akujärvi 2005	——, 'The Unjust Mantineans. Pausanias VIII 8.10', *Eranos* 103 (2005).
Alcock 1993	S.E. Alcock, *Graecia Capta. The Landcsapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge 1993.
Alcock 1994	——, 'Nero at Play? The Emperor's Grecian Odyssey', in: J. Elsner & J. Masters, eds., *Reflections of Nero. Culture, History, & Representation*. Chapel Hill 1994: 98–111.

Alcock 1995   ——, 'Pausanias and the *Polis*: Use and Abuse', in: M.H. Hansen, ed., *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium August, 24–27 1994. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre vol. 2.* Copenhagen 1995: 326–344 (Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 72).

Alcock 1996   ——, 'Landscapes of Memory and the Authority of Pausanias', in: Bingen 1996: 241– 276.

Alcock 2001   ——, 'The Peculiar Book IV and the Problem of the Messenian Past', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 142–153.

Alcock *et al.* 2001 S.E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, & J. Elsner, eds., *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece.* Oxford 2001.

Ambaglio 1998   D. Ambaglio, 'Per il reperimento di materiali di storia locale greca: Diodoro, Strabone e Pausania', in: D. Ambaglio, ed., συγγραφή. *Materiali e appunti per lo studio della storia e della letteratura antica.* I. Como 1998: 93–109.

Ambaglio 2004   ——, 'Il peso del ricordo nella *Periegesi* di Pausania', in: U. Laffi *et al.* eds., *Artissimum memoriae vinculum. Scritti di geografia storica e di antichità in ricordo di Gioia Conta.* Firenze 2004: 9–24 (Biblioteca di geografia antiqua 2).

Ameling 1996   W. Ameling, 'Pausanias und die hellenistische Geschichte', in: Bingen 1996: 117–166.

Andersen 1992   Ø. Andersen, 'Pausanias' kunnskapskilder', in: Ø. Andersen & T. Eide, eds., *I Hellas med Pausanias. Artikler og oversettelser.* Bergen 1992: 51–66 (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske institutt i Athen 3).

Anderson 1989   G. Anderson, 'The *pepaideumenos* in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Empire', *ANRW* II.33.1 (1989) 79–208.

Anderson 1993   ——, *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire.* London 1993.

de Angelis 1998   F. de Angelis, 'Pausania e i periegeti. La guidistica antica sulla Grecia', *ASNP* IV.2 (1998) 1–14.

Arafat 1996   K.W. Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient artists and Roman rulers.* Cambridge 1996.

Arafat 1999   ——, 'Pausanias the Traveller: Digressions on the Wonders of Nature and of Foreign Lands', *Euphrosyne* 27 (1999) 237–248.

Auberger 1992a   J. Auberger, 'Pausanias et les Messéniens: Une histoire d'amour!', *REA* 94 (1992) 187–197.

Auberger 1992b   ——, 'Pausanias romancier? Le témoignage du livre IV', *DHA* 18 (1992) 257–280.

Auberger 1994   ——, 'Les mots du courage chez Pausanias', *RPh* 68 (1994) 7–18.

Auberger 2001   ——, 'D'un héros à l'autre: Pausanias au pied de l'Ithôme', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 261–273.

Auffart 1997	Ch. Auffart, '›Verräter — Übersetzer‹? Pausanias, das römische Patrai und die Identität der Griechen in der Achaea', in: H. Cancik & J. Rüpke, eds., *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion*. Tübingen 1997: 219–238.
Bacher 1919	G. Bacher, *De Pausaniae studiis Homericis*. Halis Saxonum 1919. Diss.
Bal 1977	M. Bal, *Narratologie (Essays sur la signification narrative dans quatre romans modernes)*. Paris 1977. Diss. Utrecht (First chapter also in English transl. by J.E. Lewin, 'The Narrating and the Focalizing: A Theory of the Agents in Narrative', *Style* 17 (1983) 234–269).
Bal 1997	——, *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 2nd ed. Toronto 1997.
Baladié 2001	R. Baladié, 'Structure et particularités du livre IV de Pausanias', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 275–282.
Beard 2001	M. Beard, '"Pausanias in Petticoats," or *The Blue Jane*', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 224–239.
Bearzot 1988	C. Bearzot, 'La Grecia di Pausania. Geografia e cultura nella definizione del concetta di Ἑλλάς', in: M. Sordi, ed., *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico*. Milano 1988: 90–112 (Contributi dell'Istituto di storia antica 14. Scienze storiche 41).
Bearzot 1992	——, *Storia e storiografia ellenistica in Pausania il Periegeta*. Venezia 1992.
Billault 2001	A. Billault, ed., ὈΠΩΡΑ. *La belle saison de l'hellénisme. Études de littérature antique offerts au Recteur J. Bompaire*. Paris 2001.
Bingen 1996	J. Bingen, ed., *Pausanias Historien. Huit exposés suivis de discussions, Vandœuvres-Genève 15–19 août 1994*. Genève 1996 (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 41).
Birge 1994	D. Birge, 'Trees in the Landscape of Pausanias' *Periegesis*', in: S.E Alcock & R. Osborne, eds., *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford 1994: 231–245.
BDR	F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 14. Aufl. Bearb. v. F. Rehkopf. Göttingen 1975 (1976).
Blomqvist 1997	K. Blomqvist, 'From Olympias to Aretaphila. Women in Politics in Plutarch', in: J. Mossman, ed., *Plutarch and his Intellectual World. Essays on Plutarch*. London 1997: 73–97.
Bowen 1992	Plutarch, *The Malice of Herodotus (De malignitate Herodoti)*. Translated, with an introduction and commentary by A. Bowen. Warminister 1992.
Bowie 1970	E.L. Bowie, 'Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic', *P&P* 46 (1970) 3–41 (also in M.I. Finley, ed., *Studies in Ancient Society*. London 1974: 166–209).

Bowie 1996	——, 'Past and Present in Pausanias', in: Bingen 1996: 207–239.
Bowie 2001	——, 'Inspiration and Aspiration: Date, Genre, and Readership', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 21–32.
Bowman 1992	D.A. Bowman, 'Pausanias 7.11.1–2 and the Identity of *ho Gallos*', *AHB* 6 (1992) 95–102.
Bremmer 1997	J. Bremmer, 'Myth as Propaganda: Athens and Sparta', *ZPE* 117 (1997) 9–17.
Briscoe 1986	J. Briscoe, rec. of Gruen 1984, *CR* 36 (1986) 91–96.
Brock 2003	R. Brock, 'Authorial Voice and Narrative Management in Herodotus', in: P. Derow & R. Parker, eds., *Herodotus and his World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of G. Forrest.* Oxford 2003: 3–16.
Brommelaer 2001	J.-F. Brommelaer, 'Traces de l'épigraphie delphique dans le texte de Pausanias', in: R.G. Khoury, ed., *Urkunden und Urkundenformulare im Klassischen Altertum und in den orientalischen Kulturen.* Heidelberg 1999: 83–93 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften. Neue Folge, II.104).
Brommelaer 2001	——, 'Les procédés de la localisation dans le dixième livre de Pausanias', in: Knopfler & Piérart 2001: 375–386.
Bruit 1986	L. Bruit, 'Pausanias à Phigalie. Sacrifices non-sanglants et discours idéologique', *Métis* 1 (1986) 71–96.
Bruit Zaidman 2003	L. Bruit Zaidman, 'La notion d'*archaion* dans la *Périégèse* de Pausanias', in: G. Lachenaud & D. Longrée, eds., *Grecs et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire. Réprésentations, récits et idéologie.* Colloque de Nantes et Angers 12–15 septembre 2001. I. Rennes 2003: 21–30.
Brunn 1884	H. Brunn, 'Pausanias und seine Ankläger', *NJPhP* 129 (1884) 23–30.
Busolt 1883	G. Busolt, 'Zu den Quellen der Messeniaka des Pausanias', *NJPhP* 127 (1883) 814–816.
Calabi Limentani 1960	I. Calabi Limentani, 'Aristide il giusto. Fortuna di un nome', *Istituto Lombardo (Rend. Lett.)* 94 (1960) 43–67.
Calame 1987	C. Calame, 'Spartan Genealogies: The Mythological Representation of a Spatial Organisation', in: J. Bremmer, ed., *Interpretations of Greek Mythology.* London 1987: 153–186 (transl. by A. Habib).
Cartledge 2001	P. Cartledge, 'Sparta's Pausanias. Another Laconian Past', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 167–172.
Cartledge & Spawforth 1989	P. Cartledge & A. Spawforth, *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta. A tale of two cities.* London 1989.
Casevitz 1992, 1998, 1999, 2002	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.
Chamoux 1992	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis, Casevitz 1992.
Chamoux 1996	F. Chamoux, 'La méthode historique de Pausanias d'après le livre I de la *Périégèse*', in: Bingen 1996: 45–77.

xiv

Chamoux 2001a ——, 'L'image de Périclès d'après Pausanias', in: Billault 2001: 97–101.

Chamoux 2001b ——, 'Les épigrammes dans Pausanias', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 79–91.

Champion-Smith 1998 V.A. Champion-Smith, *Pausanias in Athens: An Archaeological Commentary on the Agora of Athens*. Unpubl. diss. University of London 1998.

Cherry 2001 J.F. Cherry, 'Travel, Nostalgia, and Pausanias's Giant', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 247–255.

Clavier 1814–1821 See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.

Cohn 1999 D. Cohn, *The Distinction of Fiction*. Baltimore 1999.

Cole 2002 S.G. Cole, rec. of Alcock *et al.* 2001, *AJPh* 123 (2002) 633–637.

Cook 2001 B.L. Cook, 'Plutarch's Use of λέγεται: Narrative Design and Source in *Alexander*', *GRBS* 42 (2001) 329–360.

Dalfen 1996 J. Dalfen, 'Dinge, die Pausanias nicht sagt', in: R. Faber & B. Seidensticker, eds., *Worte, Bilder, Töne. Studien zur Antike und Antikerezeption*. B. Kytzler zu ehren. Würzburg 1996: 159–177.

Daux 1936 G. Daux, *Pausanias à Delphes*. Paris 1936. Diss.

Della Santa 1999 M. Della Santa, *La religiosità di Pausania*. Bellinzona 1999. Diss. Friburgo Svizzera.

Denniston 1954 J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Rev. by K.J. Dover. Oxford 1954.

Desideri 2002 P. Desideri, 'The Meaning of Greek Historiography of the Roman Imperial Age', in: E. Nis Ostenfeld *et al.* eds., *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*. Aarhus 2002: 216–224 (Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 3).

Dewald 1987 C. Dewald, 'Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Arethusa* 20 (1987) 147–170.

Dewald 2002 ——, '"I Didn't Give My Own Genealogy": Herodotus and the Authorial Persona', in: E.J. Bakker *et al.* eds., *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden 2002: 267–289.

Dickie 1997 M.W. Dickie, 'Philostratus and Pindar's Eighth Paean', *BASP* 34 (1997) 11–20.

Diller 1955 A. Diller, 'The Authors Named Pausanias', *TAPhA* 86 (1955) 268–279 (repr. in *Id.*, *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition*. Amsterdam 1983: 137–148).

Diller 1956 ——, 'Pausanias in the Middle Ages', *TAPhA* 87 (1956) 84–97 (repr. in *Id.*, *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition*. Amsterdam 1983: 147–162).

Dillery 1995 J. Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of his Times*. London 1995.

Dirven 1997   L. Dirven, 'The Author of *De Dea Syria* and his Cultural Heritage', *Numen* 44 (1997) 153–179.

Duhoux 1992   Y. Duhoux, *Le verbe grec ancien. Éléments de morphologie et de syntaxe historiques.* Louvain-la-Neuve 1992 (Bibliothèque des cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain 61).

Ebeling 1892   H.L. Ebeling, *A Study in the Sources of the Messeniaca of Pausanias.* Baltimore 1892. Diss.

Ebeling 1913   ——, 'Pausanias as an Historian', *CW* 7 (1913) 138–141, 146–150.

Eckstein 1987   A.M. Eckstein, 'Polybius, Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'On Traitors', *CQ* 37 (1987) 140–162.

Eide 1992   T. Eide, 'Pausanias and Thucydides', *SO* 67 (1992) 124–137.

Ekroth 1999   G. Ekroth, 'Pausanias and the Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults', in: R. Hägg, ed., *Ancient Greek Hero Cult.* Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg University, 21–23 April 1995. Stockholm 1999: 145–158 (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, series in 8⁰, 16).

Elsner 1994   J. Elsner, 'From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monuments, Travel and Writing', in: S. Goldhill & R. Osborne, eds., *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge 1994: 224–254.

Elsner 1995   ——, 'Viewing and Identity: the Travels of Pausanias; or, a Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World', in: *id.*, *Art and the Roman Viewer. The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity.* Cambridge 1995: 125–155 (a rev. of *id.*, 'Pausanias: a Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World', *P&P* 135 (1992) 3–29; repr., with a postcsript, in: R. Osborne, ed., *Studies in Ancient Greek and Roman Society.* Cambridge 2004: 260–285).

Elsner 1997a   ——, 'Hagiographic Geography: Travel and Allegory in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*', *JHS* 117 (1997) 22–37.

Elsner 1997b   ——, 'The Origins of the Icon: Pilgrimage, Religion and Visual Culture in the Roman East as "Resistance" to the Centre', in: S.E. Alcock, ed., *The Early Roman Empire in the East.* Oxford 1997: 178–199 (Oxbow Monograph 95).

Elsner 2001a   ——, 'Structuring "Greece": Pausanias's *Periegesis* as a Literary Construct', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 3–20.

Elsner 2001b   ——, 'Describing Self in the Language of Other: Pseudo (?) Lucian at the Temple of Hierapolis', in: S. Goldhill, ed., *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire.* Cambridge 2001: 123–153.

Engeli 1907   A. Engeli, *Die Oratio variata bei Pausanias.* Berlin 1907. Diss. Zürich.

Enmann 1884   A. Enmann, 'Geographische Homerstudien im Pausanias', *NJPhP* 129 (1884) 497–520.

Evans 1968   J.A.S. Evans, 'Father of History or Father of Lies; the Reputation of Herodotus', *CJ* 64 (1968) 11–17.

Ferrary 1988   J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate.* Rome 1988 (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 271).

Fischbach 1893   O. Fischbach, 'Die Benutzung des thukydideischen Geschichtswerkes durch den Periegeten Pausanias', *WS* 15 (1893) 161–191.

Flinterman 1995   J.-J. Flinterman, *Power,* Paideia *& Pythagoreanism. Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs and Political Ideas in Philostratus'* Life of Apollonius. Amsterdam 1995 (Dutch monographs on ancient history and archaeology 13).

Fludernik 1994a   M. Fludernik, 'Introduction: Second-Person Narrative and Related Issues', *Style* 28 (1994) 281–311.

Fludernik 1994b   ——, 'Second-Person Narrative as a Test Case for Narratology: The Limits of Realism', *Style* 28 (1994) 445–479.

Foccardi 1987   D. Foccardi, 'Religious Silence and Reticence in Pausanias', in: M.G. Ciani, ed., *The Regions of Silence. Studies on the Difficulty of Communicating.* Amsterdam 1987: 67–113 (London studies in classical philology 17).

Forte 1972   B. Forte, *Rome and the Romans as the Greeks Saw them.* Rome 1972 (Papers and monographs of the American academy in Rome 24).

Frazer 1898   See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.

Gabbert 1996   J.J. Gabbert, 'The Career of Olympiodorus of Athens (*ca.* 340–270 BC)', *AncW* 27 (1996) 59–66.

Gelzer 1937   K.I. Gelzer, *Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener.* Berlin 1937 (Hermes Einzelschriften 3).

Genette 1980   G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method.* Ithaca, N.Y. 1980 (transl. by J.E. Lewin, French orig. 1972).

Genette 1988   ——, *Narrative Discourse Revisited.* Ithaca, N.Y. 1988 (transl. by J.E. Lewin, French orig. 1983).

Genette 1993   ——, *Fiction and Diction.* Ithaca, N.Y.1993 (transl. by C. Porter, French orig. 1991).

Givón 2001   T. Givón, *Syntax.* I–II. Amsterdam 2001.

Graf 1993   F. Graf, *Greek Mythology. An Introduction.* Baltimore 1993 (1996) (transl. by T. Marier, German orig. 1987).

Gruen 1976   E.S. Gruen, 'The Origins of the Achaean War', *JHS* 96 (1976) 46–69.

Gruen 1984   ——, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome.* I–II. Berkeley 1984.

Gurlitt 1890	W. Gurlitt, *Über Pausanias. Untersuchungen*. Graz 1890.
Habicht 1984	Ch. Habicht, 'Pausanias and the Evidence of Inscriptions', *ClAnt* 3 (1984) 40–56.
Habicht 1985	——, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley 1985 (1998) (Sather Classical Lectures 50).
Habicht 1997	——, *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Cambridge, Mass. 1997 (1999) (transl. by D. Lucas Schneider, German orig. 1995).
Hall 2002	J.M. Hall, *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago 2002.
Heberdey 1894	R. Heberdey, *Die Reisen des Pausanias in Griechenland*. Wien 1894 (Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminares der Universität Wien 10).
Heer 1979	J. Heer, *La personnalité de Pausanias*. Paris 1979.
Hejnic 1961	J. Hejnic, *Pausanias the Perieget and the Archaic History of Arcadia*. Prague 1961.
Hershbell 1993	J.P. Hershbell, 'Plutarch and Herodotus – The Beetle in the Rose', *RhM* 136 (1993) 143–163.
van Herwerden 1887	H. van Herwerden, 'Notulae criticae ad Pausaniam', *Mnemosyne* 15 (1887) 48–73.
Heydemann 1869	H. Heydemann, 'Eine Felsinschrift auf der Akropolis von Athen (zu Paus. Att. 24, 3)', *Hermes* 4 (1869) 381–389.
Hirschfeld 1882	G. Hirschfeld, 'Pausanias und die Inschriften von Olympia', *Archäologische Zeitung* 40 (1882) 98–130.
Hirschfeld 1883	——, 'Pausanias und Olympia', *NJPhP* 127 (1883) 769–771.
Hirt 1878	P. Hirt, *De fontibus Pausaniae in Eliacis*. Greifswald 1878. Diss.
Hitzig 1887	H. Hitzig, 'Zur Pausaniasfrage', in: *Festschrift des Philologischen Kränzchens in Zürich zu der in Zürich im Herbst 1887 tagenden XXXIX. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner*. Zürich 1887: 59–96.
Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.
Holleaux 1888	M. Holleaux, 'Discours de Néron prononcé à Corinthe pour rendre aux Grecs la liberté', *BCH* 12 (1888) 510–528.
Hornblower 1994	S. Hornblower, 'Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides', in: *Id.*, ed., *Greek Historiography*. Oxford 1994: 131–166.
Hutton 1995	W.E. Hutton, *The Topographical Methods of Pausanias*. Unpubl. diss. The University of Texas at Austin 1995.
Immerwahr 1889	W. Immerwahr, *Die Lakonika des Pausanias auf ihre Quellen untersucht*. Berlin 1889.
Jacob 1980	Ch. Jacob, 'The Greek Traveler's Areas of Knowledge: Myths and Other Discourses in Pausanias' *Description of Greece*', *Yale French Studies* 59 (1980) 65–85.

Jacquemin 1991	A. Jacquemin, 'Delphes au IIe siècle après J.-C.: Un lieu de la mémoi-re grecque', in: S. Said, ed., ΄ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ. *Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 25–27 octobre 1989. Leiden 1991: 217–231 (Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg. Travaux du centre de recherche sur le Proche-Orient et de la Grèce antiques 11).
Jacquemin 1996	——, 'Pausanias et les empereures romaines', *Ktèma* 21 (1996) 29–42.
Jacquemin 1999	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis, Casevitz 1999.
Jacquemin 2001	——, 'Pausanias, le sanctuaire d'Olympie et les archéologues', in: Knopfler & Piérart 2001: 283–300.
Jacquemin 2002	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis, Casevitz 2002.
Jones 1971	C.P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford 1971.
Jones 1996	——, rec. of Arafat 1996, *EMC* 15 (1996) 458–462.
Jones 2001	——, 'Pausanias and His Guides', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 33–39.
Jones 2003	——, 'Editing and Understanding Pausanias', *JRA* 16 (2003) 673–676.
Jones 2004	——, 'Multiple Identities in the Age of the Second Sophistic', in: B.E. Borg, ed., *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin 2004: 13–21 (Millennium-Studien/Millenium Studies 2).
Jones 1918–1935	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.
de Jong 1987	I.J.F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad. Amsterdam 1987. Diss.
de Jong 2004	——, 'Introduction. Narratological Theory on Narrators, Narratees, and Narrative', in: de Jong *et al.* 2004: 1–10.
de Jong *et al.* 2004	I.J.F. de Jong, R. Nünlist, A. Bowie, eds., *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*. I. Leiden 2004 (Mnemosyne suppl. 257).
Jost 1998a	M. Jost, 'Versions locales et versions « panhelléniques » des mythes arcadiens chez Pausanias', in: Pirenne-Delforge 1998a: 227–240.
Jost 1998b	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis, Casevitz 1998.
Kalkmann 1886	A. Kalkmann, *Pausanias der Perieget. Untersuchungen über seine Schriftstellerei und seine Quellen*. Berlin 1886.
Kallet-Marx 1995	R.M. Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to Empire. The Development of the Roman* Imperium *in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.* Berkeley 1995 (Hellenistic culture and society 15).
Katičić 1959	R. Katičić, 'Ein Problem des messenischen Dialektes', *ZAnt* 9 (1959) 133–136.
Knoepfler 1996	D. Knoepfler, 'Sur une interprétation historique de Pausanias dans sa description du *Dêmosion sêma* athénien', in: Bingen 1996: 277–319.
Knoepfler 1999	——, 'Pausanias à Rome en l'an 148?', *REG* 112 (1999) 485–509.

Knoepfler 2002	——, 'Antiquité grecque et actualité romaine chez Pausanias', *JRA* 15 (2002) 651–656.
Knoepfler & Piérart 2001	D. Knoepfler & M. Piérart, eds., *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000*. Actes du Colloque de Neuchâtel et de Fribourg (18–22 septembre 1998) autour des deux éditions en cours de la Périégèse. Genève 2001 (Recueil de travaux publiés par la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines 49).
Koenig 1832	F.S.C. Koenig, *De Pausaniae fide et auctoritate in historia mythologia artibusque Graecorum tradendis praestita*. Berlin 1832. Diss.
Kreilinger 1997	U. Kreilinger, 'Τὰ ἀξιολογώτατα τοῦ Παυσανίου. Die Kunstauswahlkriterien des Pausanias', *Hermes* 125 (1997) 470–491.
Krueger 1860	G. Krueger, *Theologumena Pausaniae*. Lipsiae 1860. Diss. Bonn.
Kuhn 1696	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.
Kühner & Gerth 1898	R. Kühner & B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. II.1, Satzlehre. 3. Aufl. Hannover 1898.
Kühner & Gerth 1904	——, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. II.2, Satzlehre. 3. Aufl. Hannover 1904.
Lacroix 1992	L. Lacroix, 'À propos des offrandes à l'Apollon de Delphes et du témoignage de Pausanias: du réel à l'imaginaire', *BCH* 116 (1992) 157–176.
Lacroix 1994	——, 'Traditions locales et légendes étiologiques dans la *Périégèse* de Pausanias', *JS* 1994: 75–99.
Lafond 1991	Y. Lafond, 'Pausanias historien dans le livre VII de la Périégèse', *JS* 1991: 27–45.
Lafond 1996	——, 'Pausanias et l'histoire du Péloponnèse depuis la conquête romain', in: Bingen 1996: 167–205.
Lafond 1998	——, 'Pausanias et le panthéon de Patras: l'identité religieuse d'une cité grecque devenue colonie romaine', in: Pirenne-Delforge 1998a: 195–208.
Lafond 2000	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis, Casevitz 2000.
Lafond 2001	——, 'Lire Pausanias à l'époque des Antonins. Réflexions sur la place de la *Périégèse* dans l'histoire culturelle, religieuse et sociale de la Grèce romaine', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 387–406.
Lateiner 1989	D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto 1989 (Phoenix. Suppl. 23).
Le Roy 2001	Ch. Le Roy, 'Pausanias et la Laconie ou la recherche d'un équilibre', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 223–237.
Levy 1991	B. Levy, 'When did Nero Liberate Achaea – and Why?', in: A.D. Rizakis, ed., *Achaia und Elis in der Antike. Akten des 1. internationalen Symposiums Athen, 19.–21. Mai 1989*. Athens 1991: 189–194 (ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ 13).

Lightfoot 2003	Lucian, *On the Syrian Goddess*. Edited with introduction, translation and commentary by J.L. Lightfoot. Oxford 2003.
Lobeck 1829	C.A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus, sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis libri tres*. Regimonti 1829.
LSJ	*A Greek-English Lexicon*. Compiled by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, rev.… by H.S. Jones. 9th ed. Oxford 1940 (1990).
Luce 1989	T.J. Luce, 'Ancient views on the Causes of Bias in Historical Writing', *CPh* 84 (1989) 16–31.
Luraghi 1994	N. Luraghi, 'Pausania e la fondazione di Messene sullo stretto. Note di lettura', *RFIC* 122:2 (1994) 140–151.
Luraghi 2002	——, 'Becoming Messenian', *JHS* 122 (2002) 45–69.
Madvig 1871	J.N. Madvig, *Adversaria critica ad scriptores Graecos et Latinos*. I. *De arte coniecturali. Emendationes Graecae*. Hauniae 1871.
Madvig 1884	——, *Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. 2. Aufl. Braunschweig 1884.
Marcotte 1988	D. Marcotte, 'Le *Pausanias* de Christian Habicht. Notes de lecture', *LEC* 56 (1988) 73–83.
Marcotte 1992	——, 'La redécouverte de Pausanias à la Renaissance', *SIFC* 85 (1992) 872–878.
Margolin 1990	U. Margolin, 'Narrative "You" Revisited', *Language and Style* 23 (1990) 425–446.
Marincola 1987	J. Marincola, 'Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator's Presence', *Arethusa* 20 (1987) 121–137.
Marincola 1994	——, 'Plutarch's Refutation of Herodotus', *AncW* 25 (1994) 191–203.
Marincola 1997	——, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge 1997.
Marinescu-Himu 1975	M. Marinescu-Himu, 'Les sources d'inspiration de Pausanias dans le Livre IV de la Périégèse', in: *Actes de la XIIe conférence internationale d'études classiques. *Eirene*. Clúj-Napoca, 2–7 octobre 1972*. Bucaresti 1975: 251–257.
Meadows 1995	A.R. Meadows, 'Pausanias and the Historiography of Classical Sparta', *CQ* 45 (1995) 92–113.
Meyer 1967	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.
Modenesi 2001	N. Modenesi, 'Pausania "epigrafista" nell'itinerario della «Periegesis». Il caso singolare di Atene', *Acme* 54 (2001) 3–35.
Moggi 1993	M. Moggi, 'Scrittura e riscrittura della storia in Pausania', *RFIC* 121 (1993) 396–418.
Moggi 1996	——, 'L'*excursus* di Pausania sulla Ionia', in: Bingen 1996: 79–116.
Moggi 2002	——, 'Pausanias e Roma (Nota di lettura a VIII 27,1), *Gerión* 20 (2002) 435–449.
Moggi 2003	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.
Moggi & Osanna 2000	See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis, Moggi 2000.

Momigliano 1960   A. Momigliano, 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiog-raphy', in: *Id., Secondo contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici.* Roma 1960: 29–44 (Storia e letterature 77) (prev. publ. in *History* 43 (1958) 1–13).

Morgan 1988   M.G. Morgan, rec. of Gruen 1984, *CPh* 83 (1988) 245–248.

Muller 1980   A. Muller, 'Megarika', *BCH* 104 (1980) 83–92.

Muller 1981   ——, 'Megarika', *BCH* 105 (1981) 203–225.

Muller 1982   ——, 'Megarika', *BCH* 106 (1982) 379–407.

Muller 1983   ——, 'Megarika', *BCH* 107 (1983) 157–179.

Muller 1984   ——, 'Megarika', *BCH* 108 (1984) 249–266.

Musti 1982   See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.

Musti 1984   D. Musti, 'L'itinerario di Pausania: dal viaggio alla storia', *QUCC* 17 (1984) 7–18.

Musti 1986   See *Editions and translations of the* Periegesis.

Musti 1996   ——, 'La struttura del discorso storico in Pausania', in: Bingen 1996: 9–43.

Musti 2001   ——, 'L'«Ora» di Pausania. Sequenze cronologiche nella *Guida della Grecia* (sull'Anfizionia di Delfi e altri argomenti)', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 43–78.

Myres 1953   J.L. Myres, *Herodotus. Father of History.* Oxford 1953.

Nachtergael 1977   G. Nachtergael, *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes. Recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistique.* Bruxelles 1977 (Académie Royale de Belgique. Mémoires de la Classe des lettres 63:1)

Naiden 1999   F.S. Naiden, 'The Prospective Imperfect in Herodotus', *HSPh* 99 (1999) 135–149.

Nikolaidis 1985   A.G. Nikolaidis, 'Ἑλληνικός – βαρβαρικός. Plutarch on Greek and Barbarian Characteristics', *WS* 98 (1985) 229–244.

Nilsson 2001   I. Nilsson, *Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure. Narrative Technique and Mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites'* Hysmine & Hysminias. Uppsala 2001 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 7). Diss. Göteborg.

Nörenberg 1973   H.-W. Nörenberg, 'Untersuchungen zum Schluss der Περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος des Pausanias', *Hermes* 101 (1973) 235–252.

Obrecht 1919   J. Obrecht, *Der echte und soziative Dativ bei Pausanias.* Genève 1919. Diss. Zürich.

OCD   *The Oxford Classical Dictionary.* Edited by S. Hornblower & A. Spawforth. 3rd ed. Oxford 1996 (1999).

Oliver 1972   J.H. Oliver, 'The conversion of the Periegete Pausanias', in: *Homenaje a Antonio Tovar. Ofrecido por sus discípulos, colegas y amigos.* Madrid 1972: 319–321.

Osanna 1998	M. Osanna, 'Descrizione autoptica e rielaborazione «a tavolino» in Pausania: il caso di Aigeira', in: Pirenne-Delforge 1998a: 209–226.
Osanna 2001	——, 'Tra monumenti, *agalmata* e *mirabilia*: organizzazione del percorso urbano di Corinto nelle *Periegesi* di Pausania', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 185–202.
Palm 1959	J. Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Lund 1959 (Acta Regiae societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis 57).
Papachatzis 1974–1981	See *Editions and Translations of the* Periegesis.
Papadopoulos 1996	J.K. Papadopoulos, 'The Original Kerameikos of Athens and the Siting of the Classical Agora', *GRBS* 37 (1996) 107–128.
Papaïoannou 1999	C.P. Papaïoannou, 'Pausanias et la politique Antoninienne', in: R.F. Docter & E.M. Moormann, eds., *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Amsterdam, July 12–17, 1998. Classical Archaeology towards the Third Millennium: Reflections and Perspectives*. Amsterdam 1999: 303–305.
Pasquali 1913	G. Pasquali, 'Die schriftstellerische Form des Pausanias', *Hermes* 48 (1913) 161–223.
Pearson 1962	L. Pearson, 'The Pseudo-History of Messenia and its Authors', *Historia* 11 (1962) 397–426.
Pernot 1993	L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*. I–II. Paris 1993 (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 137–138).
Pernot 2001	——, 'Trois styles de portrait impérial au IIᵉ siècle après J.-C.: Antonin chez Aelius Aristides, Pausanias, Marc Aurèle', in: Billault 2001: 103–113.
Pfundtner 1866	O. Pfundtner, *Pausanias Periegeta imitator Herodoti*. Regimonti 1866. Diss.
Pfundtner 1869	——, 'Die historischen Quellen des Reisebeschreibers Pausanias', *NJPhP* 99 (1869) 441–454.
Phelan 1994	J. Phelan, '*Self-Help* for Narratee and Narrative Audience: How "I" —and "You"?—Read "How"', *Style* 28 (1994) 350–365.
Piérart 1998	M. Piérart, 'ΡΩΜΑΙΟΣ ΩΝ ΑΦΗΛΛΗΝΙΣΘΗ. La place de Rome dans la vision culturelle de Pausanias d'après le livre II', in: L.A. Foresti *et al.* eds., *L'ecumenismo politico nella coscienza dell'occidente*. Bergamo, *18–21 settembre 1995. Alle radici della casa comune europea*. II. Rome 1998: 149–163 (Centro ricerche e documentazione sull' antichità classica. Monografie 19).

Piérart 2000	——, 'Héros fondateurs. Héros civilisateurs. La rivalité entre Argos et Athènes vue par Pausanias', in: V. Pirenne-Delforges & E. Suárez de la Torre, eds., *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs*. Actes du Colloque organisé à l'Université de Valladolid du 26 au 29 mai 1999. Liège 2000: 409–434 (Kernos suppl. 10).
Piérart 2001	——, 'Observations sur la structure du livre II de la *Périégèse*. Argos, l'Argolide et la Thyréatide', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 203–221.
Piettre 2000	R. Piettre, 'Pausanias et les origines arcadiennes de l'humanité', *Uranie* 9 (2000) 67–96.
Pirenne-Delforge 1998a	V. Pirenne-Delforge, ed., *Les Panthéons des cités des origines à la Périégèse de Pausanias*. Actes du Colloque organisé à l'Université de Liège du 15 au 17 mai 1997 (2ᵉ partie). Liège 1998 (Kernos suppl. 8).
Pirenne-Delforge 1998b	——, 'La notion de « panthéon » dans la *Périégèse* de Pausanias', in: Pirenne-Delforge 1998a: 129–148.
Pirenne-Delforge 2001	——, 'Les rites sacrificiels dans la *Périégèse* de Pausanias', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 109–134.
Pirenne-Delfoge & Purnelle 1997	V. Pirenne-Delfoge & G. Purnelle, *Pausanias*, Periegesis. *Index verborum. Liste de fréquence. Index nominum*. I–II. Liège 1997 (Kernos suppl. 5).
Porter 2001	J.I. Porter, 'Ideals and Ruins. Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic', in: Alcock *et al.* 2001: 63–92.
Pretzler 1999	M. Pretzler, *Pausanias' Arkadia*. Unpubl. diss. Oxford 1999.
Pretzler 2004	——, 'Turning Travel into Text: Pausanias at Work', *G&R* 51 (2004) 199–216.
Pretzler 2005	——, 'Pausanias and Oral Tradition', *CQ* 55 (2005) 235–249.
Prince 1980	G. Prince, 'Introduction to the Study of the Narratee', in: J.P. Tompkins, ed., *Reader-Response Criticism. From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Baltimore 1980: 7–25 (transl. by F. Mariner, French orig. 1973).
Prince 1987	——, *A Dictionary of Narratology*. Scolar Press 1987 (1988).
Pritchett 1998	W.K. Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes*. Amsterdam 1998 (ΑΡΧΑΙΑ ΕΛΛΑΣ 6).
Pritchett 1999	——, *Pausanias Periegetes II*. Amsterdam 1999 (ΑΡΧΑΙΑ ΕΛΛΑΣ 7).
Raeymaekers 1996	J. Raeymaekers, 'The Origins of the Rivalry Between Philopoemen and Flamininus', *AncSoc* 27 (1996) 259–276.
Reardon 1971	B.P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIᵉ et IIIᵉ siècles après J.-C.* Paris 1971 (Annales littéraires de l'Université de Nantes 3).
Regenbogen 1956	O. Regenbogen, 'Pausanias', *RE* Suppl. 8 (1956) 1008–1097.
Richardson 1994	B. Richardson, 'I etcetera: On the Poetics and Ideology of Multipersoned Narratives', *Style* 28 (1994) 312–328.

Rijksbaron 1994   A. Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek. An Introduction*. 2ⁿᵈ ed., Amsterdam 1994.

Rimmon-Kenan 2002   Sh. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics*. 2ⁿᵈ ed. London 2002.

Robert 1909   C. Robert, *Pausanias als Schriftsteller. Studien und Beobachtungen*. Berlin 1909.

Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990   See *Editions and Translations of the* Periegesis.

Rood 1998   T. Rood, *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation*. Oxford 1998.

Roux 1958   G. Roux, *Pausanias en Corinthie (Livre II, 1 à 15)*. Texte, traduction, commentaire archéologique et topographique. Paris 1958 (Annales de l'Université de Lyon. Lettres III.31).

Roy 1968   J. Roy, 'The sons of Lycaon in Pausanias' Arcadian king-list', *ABSA* 63 (1968) 287–292.

Roy 1971   ——, 'Arcadia and Boeotia in Peloponnesian Affairs, 370–362 B.C.', *Historia* 20 (1971) 569–599.

Rubinstein 1995   L. Rubinstein, 'Pausanias as a Source for the Classical Greek *Polis*', in: M.H. Hansen & K. Raaflaub, eds., *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Stuttgart 1995: 211–219 (Historia Einzelschriften 95; Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2).

von Scheffler 1880   L. von Scheffler, *Über die Persönlichkeit des Periegeten Pausanias*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1880. Diss. Basel.

Schmitt 1992   O. Schmitt, *Der lamische Krieg*. Bonn 1992. Diss. (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke. Reihe Alte Geschichte 33).

Schmitz 1997   T. Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. München 1997 (Zetemata 97).

Schneider 1997   W.J. Schneider, 'Ein kryptisches Denkmal im Zentrum der Pausanias-Periegese', *Hermes* 125 (1997) 492–505.

Schneider 1999   ——, 'Buchgelehrsamkeit und Feldstudien. Neues über Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff und sein Verhältnis zu Pausanias Periegeta', in: W. Appel, ed., *„Origine Cujavus". Beiträge zur Tagung anläßlich des 150. Geburtstags Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs (1848–1931)*. Toruń 1999: 157–177 (Xenia Toruniensia 4).

Schöll 1878   R. Schöll, 'Zur Thukydides-Biographie', *Hermes* 13 (1878) 433–451.

Schubart 1866   J.H.Ch. Schubart, 'Die wörter ἄγαλμα, εἰκών, ξόανον, ἀνδριὰς und verwandte, in ihren verschiedenen beziehungen. Nach Pausanias', *Philologus* 24 (1866) 561–587.

Schubart 1883   ——, 'Pausanias und seine Ankläger', *NJPhP* 127 (1883) 469–482.

Schubart 1884   ——, 'Pausanias und seine Ankläger', *NJPhP* 129 (1884) 94–100.

Schubart & Walz 1838–1839   See *Editions and Translations of the* Periegesis.

Segre 1927   M. Segre, 'Pausania come fonte storica', *Historia* 1 (1927) 202–234.

Segre 1928 ——, 'La fonte di Pausania per la storia dei diadochi', *Historia* 2 (1928) 217–237.

Segre 1929 ——, 'Note storiche su Pausania Periegeta', *Athenaeum* 7 (1929) 475–488.

Settis 1968 S. Settis, 'Il ninfeo di Erode Attico a Olimpia e il problema della composizione della Periegesi di Pausania', *ASNP* II.37 (1968) 1–63.

Sidebottom 2002 H. Sidebottom, 'Pausanias: Past, Present, and Closure', *CQ* 52 (2002) 494–499.

Siebelis 1822–1828 See *Editions and Translations of the* Periegesis.

Smyth 1956 H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*. Rev. by G.M. Messing. Harvard 1956.

Snodgrass 2003 A.M. Snodgrass, 'Another Early Reader of Pausanias?', *JHS* 123 (2003) 187–189.

Sonnabend 1994 H. Sonnabend, 'Die Wahrnehmung von Grenzen bei Pausanias', in: E. Olshausen & H. Sonnabend, eds., *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur historischen Geographie des Altertums 4, 1990*. Amsterdam 1994: 291–302 (Geographica historica 7).

Spiro 1903 See *Editions and Translations of the* Periegesis.

Stamm 2003 C. Stamm, *Vergangenheitsbezug in der zweiten Sophistik? Die Varia Historia des Claudius Aelianus*. Frankfurt am Main 2003. Diss. Freiburg im Breisgau (Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 3. Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 977).

Steinhart 1997 M. Steinhart, 'Bemerkungen zu Rekonstruktion, Ikonographie und Inschrift des platäischen Weihgeschenkes', *BCH* 121 (1997) 33–69.

Steinhart 2002 ——, 'Das Unglück der römischen Herrschaft? Zum Verständnis von Pausanias 8, 27, 1', *WJA* 26 (2002) 145–150.

Steinhart 2003 ——, 'Pausanias und das Philopappos-Monument – ein Fall von *damnatio memoriae*', *Klio* 85 (2003) 171–183.

Strid 1976 O. Strid, *Über Sprache und Stil des Periegeten Pausanias*. Uppsala 1976. Diss. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 9).

Sutton 2001 S.B. Sutton, 'A Temple Worth Seeing. Pausanias, Travelers, and the Narrative Landscape at Nemea', in: Alcock *et al* 2001: 175–189.

Swain 1996 S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Oxford 1996.

Taylor 1998 J.G. Taylor, 'Oinoe and the Painted Stoa: Ancient and Modern Misunderstadings?', *AJPh* 119 (1998) 223–243.

Thompson & H.A. Thompson & R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*. 14. *The*
Wycherley 1972 *Agora of Athens. The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center*. Princeton 1972.

TLG	*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*™ (CD-ROM #E), ©1999 The Regents of the University of California, searched with the *Pandora Search Program for the TLG on the Macintosh* (2.5.3.1), ©The Presidents and Fellows of Harvard College.
Tobin 1997	J. Tobin, *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens. Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines*. Amsterdam 1997 (APXAIA EΛΛAΣ 4).
Torelli 2001	M. Torelli, 'Pausania a Corinto. Un intelletuale greco del secondo secolo e la propaganda imperiale romana', in: Knoepfler & Piérart 2001: 135–184.
Touloumakos 1971	J. Touloumakos, *Zum Geschichtsbewusstsein der Griechen in der Zeit der römischen Herrschaft*. Göttingen 1971.
Trendelenburg 1911	A. Trendelenburg, *Pausanias Hellenika (Allgemeiner Teil)*. Berlin 1911 (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Friedrichs-Gymnasiums 65).
Treu 1882	G. Treu, 'Vermischte Bemerkungen. IV. Zur olympischen Siegerliste des Pausanias (VI, 1–18)', *Archäologische Zeitung* 40 (1882) 72–76.
Treu 1883	——, 'Pausanias und sein Verteidiger', *NJPhP* 127 (1883) 631–634.
Tzifopoulos 1991	Y.Z. Tzifopoulos, *Pausanias as a Steloskopas. An Epigraphical Commentary of Pausanias' Eliakon A and B*. Unpubl. diss. The Ohio State University 1991.
Tzifopoulos 1993	——, 'Mummius' Dedications at Olympia and Pausanias' Attitude to the Romans', *GRBS* 34 (1993) 93–100.
Vanderpool 1949	E. Vanderpool, 'The Route of Pausanias in the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 18 (1949) 128–137.
Vanderpool 1974	——, 'The "Agora" of Pausanias I, 17, 1–2', *Hesperia* 43 (1974) 308–310.
Veyne 1988	P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*. Chicago 1988 (transl. by P. Wissing, French orig. 1983).
Veyne 1999	——, 'L'identité grecque devant Rome et l'empereur', *REG* 112 (1999) 510–567.
Vincent 2003	J.-Ch. Vincent, 'Le *xoanon* chez Pausanias: littératures et réalités cultuelles', *DHA* 29 (2003) 31–75.
Walbank 2002	F.W. Walbank, 'The Problem of Greek Nationality', in: Th. Harrison, ed., *Greeks and Barbarians*. Edinburgh 2002: 234–256 (orig. publ. in *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 41–60).
Wernicke 1884	C. Wernicke, *De Pausaniae Periegetae studiis Herodoteis*. Berlin 1884. Diss.
Westlake 1977	H.D. Westlake, 'ΛΕΓΕΤΑΙ in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne* 30 (1977) 345–362.

Whitehead 1988   D. Whitehead, ʹΚΛΟΠΗ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΥʹ: »Theft« in Ancient Greek War-fare', *C&M* 39 (1988) 43–53.

Whitmarsh 2001   T. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford 2001.

Whittaker 1991   H. Whittaker, 'Pausanias and his Use of Inscriptions', *SO* 66 (1991) 171–186.

Wilamowitz 1877   U. von Wilamowitz-Mœllendorff, 'Die Thukydideslegende', *Hermes* 12 (1877) 326–367.

Wilamowitz 1886   ——–, *Isyllos von Epidauros*. Berlin 1886 (Philologische Unter-suchungen 9).

Wycherley 1959   R.E. Wycherley, 'Pausanias in the Agora of Athens', *GRBS* 2 (1959) 21–44.

1 Introduction

1.1 A mining operation

This book is devoted to a study of the literary work entitled Περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος or Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις in the majority of the manuscripts preserving the text, in which the work is also ascribed to Pausanias.[1] Henceforth we will speak of the work in an abbreviated form, the *Periegesis*.[2]

In an interesting article on the use and abuse of the *Periegesis*, the readings to which scholars are wont to subject the work are described as often involving some sort of 'mining operation'.[3] That is, scholars dig out those pieces of information which they find useful for the moment without regard for the textual or temporal context in which they are embedded. Indeed, the very first reader of the *Periegesis* whom we know of for certain, Stephanus of Byzantium, perused the work in such a manner, culling information on Greek toponyms and the adjectival ethnics derived from them for his *Ethnica*.[4] Stephanus can be called

---

[1] One manuscript gives the title ἱστοριογράφου ἱστορίαι, and in another, the heading is ἱστορικοῦ παυσανίου περιηγήσεως ἑλλάδος; cf. Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, I: VI and VIIIf. In editions and translations of the *Periegesis*, the title is translated either as Graeciae descriptio, Description of Greece, Beschreibung Griechenlands, Description de la Grèce, or as Guida della Grecia, Guide to Greece.

[2] Regarding the periegetic genre, which is said to hark back to old Ionian historiography and Herodotus' *History*, though it did not develop into a genre of its own until Hellenistic times, there is not much to add to the discussions found in Pasquali 1913, Habicht 1985: 2–4, Hutton 1995: 46–50; see also de Angelis 1998.

[3] Alcock 1995: 327–9.

[4] In the epitome of Stephanus' *Ethnica*, the *Periegesis* is cited more than 80 times. All ten books are cited; mostly the number of the book is added to Pausanias' name, and occasionally the title of the work is added to the reference. On Stephanus' use of the *Periegesis*, cf. Diller 1955: 274 and 1956: 85f.; see also Casevitz 1998: 295–298 (Appendice I, 'Pausanias chez Étienne de Byzance') listing 72 instances in which Stephanus uses the *Arcadica*; in 25 of

1

the first reader of the *Periegesis* only in the sense that he is the first one to leave unmistakable evidence of his having read the work. There may very well have been other early readers of the *Periegesis*, who have left either no vestiges of their reading, or only disputable allusions.[5]

To use the *Periegesis* as a source of information that can be applied to almost any area of interest or any time in the history of Greece before the author's life-time, without considering the temporal and spatial situation of the text in which the different pieces of information occur, is a potential abuse of the text. The results obtained from such studies are of uncertain value. Studies of the *Periegesis* are often concerned with accommodating the text with the reality beyond it. For example, archaeologists try to harmonise the descriptions found in the *Periegesis* of this or that site with the finds from their excavations; historians evaluate the trustworthiness of the *Periegesis* for the historical record; students of religion use the *Periegesis* as a source for Greek religion; art historians search the *Periegesis* for information on their area of interest etc. Such studies of the relation between the stories told and the historical record or the sights described in the *Periegesis* and the archaeological finds are valuable, when successful.[6] Moreover, the *Periegesis* is a valuable source for anyone working with areas which are treated in it. However, studies using the *Periegesis* as a source of information generally share the same deficiency. They fail to see beyond their narrow field of interest and forget that the questions and subject matters that are in the centre of their own study, are often treated with such

---

these Pausanias is named. On the problematic apparent reference to a book XI of the *Periegesis*, cf. Regenbogen 1956: 1011 and Habicht 1985: 6.

[5] It has been suggested, and contested, that Aelian in *Varia Historia* 12.61 quotes VIII 27.12, and that Pollux 7.37 uses V 14.5; cf. Gurlitt 1890: 11 with n. 26, Diller 1956: 88, and Habicht 1985: 1 with n. 1. It has been suggested that Philostratus in *Vita Apollonii* 6.10f. uses select sections of the treatment of the sanctuary in Delphi X 5.5–32.1, cf. Dickie 1997: 15–20; that in Longus 2.25.3–29.3 there is an (admittedly very faint) echo of X 23.1–7, cf. Bowie 2001: 29–31; that Athenagoras in *Legatio* 17 uses I 26.4, cf. Snodgrass 2003. See also Diller 1956 on the evidence for readers of the *Periegesis* during the Middle Ages, and Marcotte 1992 on the discovery of the work in the renaissance.

[6] Studies of the *Periegesis* that we have particularly benefited from are e.g. the papers collected in Alcock *et al.* 2001, Arafat 1999, the papers collected in Bingen 1996, Bowie 1970, the several papers of Elsner, Gruen 1976, Habicht 1985, Heer 1979, the papers collected in Knoepfler & Piérart 2001, the papers collected in Pirenne-Delforge 1998a, Pritchett 1998 and 1999.

small interest in the *Periegesis* that the pieces of information which are coveted by modern scholars are often out of the focus of interest even in the immediate context in which they occur.

However, the *Periegesis* is no longer exclusively studied as a source of information of various kinds and the critique of it is (consequently) not centred on the sources used for this or that piece of information, the deficiencies in the material provided in the work, or the failure of it to deliver all the pieces of information scholars expect to find. There is a marked trend to study the *Periegesis* more on its own terms, more as an integral piece of literature than as a quarry of gems of varying value.

1.2 This study

In this study, we take the present trend in Pausanian studies to interpret the work as a piece of literature a step further. Here we study the so-called θεωρήματα without any concern for the archaeological finds, and investigate the so-called λόγοι without any consideration for their accuracy. This is a purely textual study, with the whole of the *Periegesis* as its object.

If we return to the mining metaphor for a moment, it must be conceded that every study, no matter how comprehensive it may be, may be regarded as a sort of mining operation. When conducting an investigation, any scientist takes, so to speak, a slice of real life and puts it under the microscope. That is, s/he extracts a segment, the object of study proper, from the totality to which it belongs, such as its historical, social, temporal, spatial, or textual context. As regards our mining operation on the *Periegesis*, it has been our ambition that the aspects of the work that we have chosen to extract for study, are of such a kind that the results of our study will be considered to have some repercussions beyond the individual passages that are brought up for discussion. With these reservations in mind, let us next proceed to present the method and aims of our study.

In this study, we approach the *Periegesis* with a narratological method of text interpretation. With the hermeneutic tools offered by narratology we study, describe, and analyse the form and function of some of the devices which are used for narrative representation in the *Periegesis*. That is, we study the manner in which the story – or rather the stories, their events and situations, manifest

themselves in the text. In short, how the narrative content is presented in the text.

Ever since de Jong's study of narrators and focalisers in the *Iliad*, classicists often use narratology as developed by Bal when they turn to this method of text interpretation. Nevertheless we have chosen to adopt and adapt the narratological method as expounded by Genette.[7] The reason why we prefer the Genettian narratology to the Balian one is on the one hand the fact that it is focussed on the study of the narrative text, and on the other that its character is overall less rigid and strict; its looseness does not become lax.[8] When we encounter phenomena that are not covered satisfactorily by Genette, we turn to other sources for theoretical discussions. This is the case specifically with the second person narrative and the narratee, whom we will call 'reader' in the following.[9]

Narratology has been developed by, and for the analysis of modern literary works, mainly works of fiction. To use such a modern method of text interpretation for the analysis of an ancient text, may raise some objections. As a preventive measure, let us briefly discuss two problems that have occurred to us. Firstly, there is the problem of transferring a method developed for fictional texts to a text that is factual, or at least not fictional in the sense of modern fictions. This problem has been addressed previously both from a theoretical

---

[7] Genette 1980 and 1988; Bal 1977 and 1997; de Jong 1987. Cf. also Hornblower 1994 and Rood 1998 for narratological studies of classical texts (in both cases Thucydides' *History*), and Nilsson's 2001 study of the Byzantine novel *Hysmine and Hysminias* using Genettian narratology.

[8] A statement like the following is not to be taken literally: '… I see no reason for requiring narratology to become a catechism with a yes-or-no answer to check off for each question, when often the proper answer would be that it depends on the day, the context, and the way the wind is blowing' (Genette 1988: 74). Here, Genette simply acknowledges the fact that the interpretation of literature is nothing more than proposals of meaning based on more or less thorough descriptions of the work of literature. Depending on the description underlying the interpretation, there will always be found other analyses which may appear equally plausible.

[9] Cf. the references in the footnotes below in section 6.3. When we write 'reader', with very few exceptions we mean the addressee to whom the narrator addresses his discourse. The reason why we choose to use the less technical term 'reader' rather than 'narratee' is the fact that the narrator appears to be representing his communication with the recipient of the text of the *Periegesis* as taking place through writing. On the narratee, cf. also below chapter 6.

standpoint and in practice.[10] Both kinds of studies have shown that, narratologically speaking, the difference between fact and fiction is one of degrees rather than essence. This means that in both kinds of texts all narrative devices, not to mention narrative content, may be used and have actually been used in practice. The main difference resides in the degree of the narrator's/author's access to consciousnesses other than his/her own, and dissonances between the voices of the author and the narrator.[11] Secondly, there is the problem of bridging the nearly two thousand years that lie between the composition of the *Periegesis* and the development of the analytical method of narratology. Considering the fact that narratology has previously been successfully applied to ancient texts, this temporal gap should not cause hesitance. Furthermore, both from our study and previous studies it appears that ancient narratives as well as modern ones can be successfully described and analysed with the tools offered by narratology.[12]

Our study falls into two parts. As we now proceed to set forth the reason why we have chosen this approach to the *Periegesis* and what our study is aimed at, the two parts of it must be kept separated. The narratological element is particularly conspicuous in part one. In the second part, narratology certainly underlies our analysis but only rarely comes into plain view.

In part one (chapters 2–6), we study the frame narrative with a particular focus on its most characteristic traits, viz. Ego and other agents acting within it. The reason for the study in part one is a need to revise the current notion of the governing principle in the *Periegesis*. We challenge the generally accepted view on the so-called θεωρήματα and λόγοι in the *Periegesis*. The aim is to reconsider the view that the topographical order of the monuments, the θεωρήματα, in the landscape provides the work with its organisatory backbone. Instead, we propose that Ego as narrator and the λόγος are the agents governing the *Periegesis*. Ego is the 'I' of the author/narrator in the *Periegesis*, occasionally also a character whom the narrator may designate with a first

---

[10] Cf. e.g. Genette 1993: 54–84, Cohn 1999: 109–131, and Hornblower 1994 *passim.*

[11] We will return to the latter below in chapter 2.

[12] Apart from the studies cited above in n. 7, cf. in particular the collection of analytic essays in de Jong *et al.* 2004, on which see the review of Scodel in *BMCRev* 2005.07.48 (http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/).

person pronoun; the λόγος is the periegetic narrative itself, to be distinguished from the λόγοι, the stories embedded in the frame narrative.[13] Both Ego and the λόγος work within the frame narrative. Further, we argue that both the θεωρήματα and the λόγοι are components embedded in the frame narrative. Apart from being an extensive record of Ego's composing the *Periegesis*, the frame narrative tells about the research, which occasionally takes the form of travels, carried out by Ego. This frame narrative is the organisatory backbone of the *Periegesis*.

Scholars frequently divide the content of the *Periegesis* into two distinct parts, which are normally labelled θεωρήματα, 'sights', and λόγοι, often rendered with 'digressions', though 'stories' or 'traditions' would be more appropriate. Herein the narrator's concluding remark to his description of Athens is echoed:

> τοσαῦτα κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀθηναίοις γνωριμώτατα ἦν ἔν τε λόγοις καὶ θεωρήμασιν, ἀπέκρινε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ λόγος μοι τὰ ἐς συγγραφὴν ἀνήκοντα.
> Such were in my opinion the most noteworthy of the Athenian traditions and sights. From the beginning, my narrative has selected from the mass those that fit in a narrative account.[14]

Here both Ego and the λόγος emerge. The narrator presents an opinion about the material as originating from Ego and the selection of the material as having ultimately been made by ὁ λόγος μοι, 'my narrative'. Both Ego and the λόγος appear to be working with the material included in the *Periegesis*. This material is spoken of with the terms θεωρήματα and λόγοι. In other words, the handling and inclusion of both θεωρήματα and λόγοι are presented as being at the mercy of Ego and ὁ λόγος μοι.

The θεωρήματα are descriptions of monuments, with a predilection for religious and ancient objects. It must however be noted that the narrator's treatments of monuments can seldom be called descriptions; they are rather mentions of an object which may cause comments or narratives (λόγοι).[15] The

---

[13] For Ego, cf. further below chapters 2–6; the λόγος is discussed further below in chapter 3.

[14] I 39.3. While λόγος, including the plural λόγοι, in various significations occurs frequently in the *Periegesis*, this is the only occurrence of θεώρημα in the whole of the work. This and similar passages are discussed further below in chapter 3.

[15] This has been noted by Brommelaer 2001: 386 'Celui-ci, contrairement à une affirmation

λόγοι are stories told either as myth-historical introductions to the regions or in connection with a monument, then usually called digressions, if extensive. Opinions differ as to whether, in Pausanias' mind, the θεωρήματα or the λόγοι are the most important component of the work, or if the λόγοι are at least equally important as the θεωρήματα.[16] The latter opinion appears to be the consensus nowadays, and the one that we share. Quantitatively speaking the θεωρήματα and the λόγοι appear to be equally important: it has been calculated that the proportion between the two is approximately equal in the whole work.[17]

However, in one respect the θεωρήματα, or more precisely one specific aspect of them, are regularly taken to have precedence over the λόγοι. Considering the fact that there is some order in the very multifarious content of the *Periegesis* and that this order is the topographical order of the monuments, it has been assumed that the θεωρήματα are the organisatory backbone of the *Periegesis*, all the more so as the λόγοι on the whole occur either as introductory notices preceding the descriptions or as explanatory notices attached to monuments of different sorts. This circumstance appears to enhance the notion that the θεωρήματα decide which λόγοι are to be narrated and where.

Certainly, as far as we can judge, the order in which the monuments are mentioned is normally a topographical one, but there is more than one exception to this procedure. In a number of passages, the topographical order is abandoned and monuments that have something in common are simply enumerated without any regard to their location. Such enumeration by categories is the exception

---

souvent rencontrée sous la plume de nos contemporains, ne décrit que rarement: le plus souvent, il commente, et il le fait en fonction de choix que, généralement, il n'explicite pas.'

[16] The θεωρήματα are most important: e.g. Gurlitt 1890: VI ('[θεωρήματα] sind so sehr die Hauptsache, dass wir die [λόγοι] als Zuthaten ausscheiden können, ohne dass dadurch das Buch in seinem wesentlichen Bestand alteriert würde.'), Frazer 1898, I: xxxiii, Regenbogen 1956: 1059, Meyer 1967: 28–31 (this, his opinion, is reflected in his truncated translation of the *Periegesis*); the λόγοι are most important: Robert 1909: 3–7 (suggesting that the work would be better named παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία), Pasquali 1913: 160f., 192; both are equally important: e.g. Nörenberg 1973: 238f., Habicht 1985: 21, Ameling 1996: 124, Chamoux 1996: 48–50, Kreilinger 1997: 489, Elsner 2001a: 6f., Le Roy 2001: 228f.

[17] Trendelenburg 1911: 15–17. The proportions between λόγοι and θεωρήματα vary from one book to another. Trendelenburg excludes books V and VI from his calculations, allegedly in order to reach a more correct picture of the proportions between the λόγοι and θεωρήματα in the *Periegesis* as a whole.

rather than the rule, but the instances are worth noticing.[18] The most fascinating example of this procedure is the *Altarperiegese* in the description of Olympia.[19] At the very beginning of it, the narrator takes care to clarify that the altars are mentioned in the order in which the Eleans are wont to perform their sacrifices on them; and approximately midway through it, he reminds the reader of this.[20] There are other examples of such enumeration by categories. For example, in the first book there is an enumeration of courts of justice in Athens, and a list of Hadrianic buildings in Athens.[21]

Thus, not only are there passages in which Ego and/or the λόγος explicitly appear to be selecting the material for the *Periegesis*, there are also other passages in which an enumeration according to categories replaces the enumeration of monuments according to a topographical order. Obviously, one has to look beyond the monuments to find the cause for such a temporary change. We argue that mostly the active cause is Ego, but occasionally the λόγος or both Ego and the λόγος, as they appear to be working in various ways to produce the *Periegesis*. This is the object of study in part one.

---

[18] An analogue to this procedure in the realm of λόγοι is the narrator's habit of citing examples of events and phenomena which are similar to the subject matter at hand. In chapter 7 below such syllepsis (taking together of entities or events according to a nonsequential principle) in the stories is discussed.

[19] V 14.4–15.12.

[20] V 14.4 ἐπακολουθήσει δὲ ὁ λόγος μοι τῇ ἐς αὐτοὺς τάξει, καθ᾽ ἥντινα Ἠλεῖοι θύειν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν νομίζουσι. θύουσι δὲ Ἑστίᾳ μὲν πρώτῃ κτλ. and V 14.10 μεμνήσθω δέ τις οὐ κατὰ στοῖχον τῆς ἱδρύσεως ἀριθμουμένους τοὺς βωμούς, τῇ δὲ τάξει τῇ Ἠλείων ἐς τὰς θυσίας συμπερινοστοῦντα ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον. The whole of the description of Olympia is first sorted into categories and subcategories which, with the exception of the *Altarperiegese*, are apparently treated in a topographical order. Cf. Elsner 2001a for an interesting interpretation of the description of Olympia as reflecting (aspects of) the whole *Periegesis*. Certain parts of the description of Olympia are discussed further below in chapter 3.

[21] I 28.8–11 and 18.9. The treatment of the countryside of Attica may be considered in this context. It is rather sketchy, with first an enumeration of some small demes (I 31.1–6), next mountains (I 32.1–2), some more demes about which more is told than about the previous ones (I 32.3–34.5) – here there is also some indications of location –, and, lastly, islands (I 35.1–36.2). After this, the narrator returns to the topographical order in describing the road from Athens to Eleusis and from there to Eleutherae first, and on to Megara (I 36.3–39.3). Cf. Robert 1909: 76–89 for further examples of this kind of sylleptic treatment of the sights of Greece.

Moreover, Ego does not exist in a vacuum. Rather, Ego is implicated in the frame narrative of the *Periegesis* in two separate capacities, viz. as its narrator and as a character. After a chapter devoted to definitions of the concepts needed for the analysis of Ego in the *Periegesis*, different aspects of the workings of Ego in the text are described in the four following chapters. As narrator, Ego is the one doing the actual telling of not only the frame narrative, but also the whole of the *Periegesis* (chapters 3 and 4). As character, Ego appears to be carrying out tasks which, though pertinent to the composition of the *Periegesis*, are separate from the actual telling of the work (chapters 5 and 6). In this frame narrative, the narrator presents Ego as character performing essentially one of two types of actions, either searching for and evaluating information or travelling. Although Ego is rather rarely found travelling, the frame narrative frequently takes the form of a narrative about a walking-tour of Greece. For this purpose, the narrator introduces a second character into the frame narrative: the anonymous, indefinite, shadow-like travelling-You. The analysis of the frame narrative in part one of our study is focussed on the various functions and different roles this very prominent Ego has in the *Periegesis*. Finally, in the summary and conclusions of part one, we try to delineate possible implications of our analysis of the frame narrative and the agents operating in it for the understanding of the *Periegesis* as a narrative and for interpreting the narratives embedded in it.

Part two (chapters 7–10) is devoted to the study of a small fraction of the many and multifarious narratives embedded in the frame narrative, i.e. a selection of historical narratives. The extensive non-narrative element of the *Periegesis*, the descriptions of or comments on monuments, is relevant to this part of our study merely as triggers for the λόγοι. Even after narrowing down the study to historical narratives, selectivity has to be applied. In our study, we review first the narrator's control in selecting subject matter for the *Periegesis* and disposing it throughout the work, by using two historical introductions as points of departure. Next, we study one theme in the history of Greece, viz. the Greeks at war. This theme falls into three sub-themes: Greeks at war against Greeks, Greeks at war against Others, and Greeks and Romans. The aim is to re-evaluate the prevalent interpretations of what Pausanias thought about such themes in the history of Greece.

In this part, the following restrictions have been put on the investigation. First, concerning the whole of part two, we are uninterested in two perspectives from which the history in the *Periegesis* has mainly been investigated in the past, i.e. the factual correctness of the historical notices and the sources for them. Such studies are, of course, important, if and when the history retold in the *Periegesis* is to be used as a source for the history of Greece. This is, however, not the case with this study. What is of interest in this study is, on the one hand, the question of how history is presented in the *Periegesis* and, on the other, the historical subject matter that is actually chosen for presentation.

The errors that can occasionally be observed in the historical narratives could well have been an interesting object of study. However, to us errors are significant only when they are conscious and deliberate. It cannot be determined whether the errors in the *Periegesis* are to be ascribed to a deliberate falsification of history on Pausanias' part (as opposed to simply recording events that in his times were regarded as historical truths but today are regarded as incorrect), faulty memory, or errors in the sources used. Therefore, historical errors in the *Periegesis* will be noticed only in passing, and any discussion on the correctness of the accounts will be relegated to the footnotes.

Secondly, as regards the content, the subject matter of the stories is altogether too diverse for a comprehensive discussion of more than a fraction of them. Even after narrowing down the study to those stories in which the history of Greece is retold, selectivity has to be exercised. This is the reason why, as already stated, we have decided to focus on three interrelated themes in the history of Greece. The common denominator for the three separate themes is Greeks at war, the most common subject matter for ancient Greek historiography. The themes are defined according to the other party with which the Greeks were brought into contact through these wars, viz. Greeks against Greeks, Greeks against Others, and Greeks and Romans – 'and' because in this case the wars were not fought as much between Greeks and Romans, as between Greeks and other Greeks; the Romans were for the most part implicated in the course of events in other ways than as the adversary (or as the original adversary). Indeed, it must be pointed out that when it comes to contact between Greeks – between Greeks and others too for that matter – conflict and war were certainly not its only manifestation, but war and conflict are the most common representations of it in the *Periegesis*.

Though narrowing down the study of history in the *Periegesis* to these three themes may appear to turn this study into yet another 'mining operation' of the work, it is our view that these themes occur so frequently throughout the whole of the *Periegesis* that the focus does not become too narrow. The choice to focus on these themes has been made with full awareness of all the other themes that are left out of the discussion in the process.

The reason why we focus on these three themes is the fact that they are considered important for the understanding of Pausanias' attitude to the history of Greece and the present situation under which he was living. As mentioned above, the aim is to challenge the current notions regarding these themes in the Greek past. First, we work from the assumption that to search the *Periegesis* for Pausanias' (the actual author's) attitudes, opinions, views or the like on any subject matter whatsoever is to search for answers the text simply cannot give. What we can hope to find in this and any other piece of literature is the idea, the image of this or any other subject matter which the narrator conveys to the reader through his presentation of matters; this image may or may not coincide with the actual author's views. Secondly, we argue that the presentation of the history of Greece in the *Periegesis* does not justify the current interpretation of the interest for the Greek past shown in the work. This argument is based on a reading of the whole of the *Periegesis*, taking all the evidence regarding one particular theme into account instead of only a selection of passages.[22] We aim to show that (1) the narrator presents warfare between Greeks as a normal state of affairs in the Greek past; though only once explicitly censured by the narrator, it is a surely regrettable state of affairs that prevailed among the Greeks when free to do what they wanted; (2) there is no basis for assuming that the narrator passes judgement on the Greek communities according to where they were found during the great Greek wars against outsiders; (3) the Romans are not presented negatively; (4) it is doubtful whether one is to interpret the *Periegesis* as giving voice to any yearning for a return to the state of things which prevailed

---

[22] A similar point is made in Steinhart 2003. This is an interesting study in which the importance of not myopically staring at one single passage when trying to determine how a certain phenomenon is evaluated in the *Periegesis* is argued. Instead, in order to evaluate properly whether or not any particular phenomenon is presented negatively one should compare the passage in which one is interested with the rest of the *Periegesis*. Steinhart's point of departure is the notorious 'grave monument for a Syrian' (I 25.8), on the hill of the Muses in Athens, the remains of which still is a notable landmark in Athens.

earlier, when the Greeks were free, without the stable Roman government preventing them from taking their disputes to war. Instead, the historical notices appear to function at least partly as reminders of the predominantly quarrelsome military past of Greece.

1.3 Previous studies: θεωρήματα and λόγοι

Previous studies concerning the historical λόγοι in the *Periegesis* have mostly been devoted to studying their historical correctness and the sources for the information conveyed in them. As our study is not concerned with the historicity of the λόγοι, these studies need not be discussed here.[23] As mentioned above, our study in part two has been occasioned by an ambition to revise the currently established interpretation of Pausanias' view on the three interrelated historical themes we have chosen for study – Greeks against Greeks, Greeks against Others, and Greeks and Romans. Therefore, we will now proceed to present the scholarly interpretations of Pausanias' outlook on the Greek past against which we argue.

It has been claimed that the view of the Greek past in the *Periegesis* is Panhellenisticly tinged, i.e. that it displays an unrealistically idealising notion about Greek unity in the past, and that this idealising notion of Greek unity was Pausanias' key to understanding the history of Greece.[24] Furthermore, it has been claimed that Pausanias' idealised understanding of Greek history affected his representation of two specific themes in the Greek past, viz. war of Greeks against Greeks and war of Greeks against Others. That is, while the moments of unity are supposed to be seized upon, emphasised and praised, the moments

---

[23] A number of these studies are mentioned in the footnotes of chapters 7–10.

[24] Most explicitly in Segre 1927: 223–230 and Ameling 1996: 142f. Both moreover claim that the Panhellenism in the *Periegesis* is accompanied by a philo-Atticistic view of the Greek past, i.e. a notion to the effect that what was good for Athens was good for Greeks in general, what was harmful to Athens was harmful to Greeks in general. Generally speaking, Panhellenism appears to have influenced the views of the past held by Pausanias' (near) contemporaries, cf. Touloumakos 1971: 51–79; see also Pernot 1993: 739–762, with a particular focus on Greek history in the works of rhetoricians/sophists.

when the Greeks turn their weapons against other Greeks are allegedly downplayed and censured.

This alleged censure of wars of Greeks against Greeks is the first aspect of the Panhellenism in the *Periegesis* which we will study. The history of Greece was full of conflicts between the Greek communities. They were not only such conflicts between communities that did not lead to physical violence, when for example disputing the possession of famous old artefacts such as the Palladium, the origin of a name as for example Megara, or the birthplace of a god such as Zeus.[25] Greek history was also full of armed conflicts and struggles for power, often involving more than two communities, amongst the Greeks themselves, taking place both in mythological and historical times.

Also as retold in the *Periegesis*, the history of Greece abounds in interstate quarrels, controversies, and struggles. This notwithstanding, it is not infrequently stated in the scholarly literature that Pausanias, because of his idealised view of the Greek past, believing in the notion that Greeks were 'really "Greek" only when united against the Other,' detests war between Greeks, or that he has even forgotten that disunity is a fundamental fact of Greek history.[26] Alternatively, it is stated that 'Pausanias consistently deplores the warfare of Greek against Greek'.[27] Such statements are mainly based on the one passage in the *Periegesis* in which war between Greeks is explicitly censured. Our study shows that mostly the quarrels and struggles are simply recorded without any comment neither positive nor negative.[28] Though the narrator is not likely to have found the quarrelsomeness praiseworthy, he does not hesitate to dwell on this very condition of the Greek past.

The alleged praise of Greeks uniting against others and censure of those who fail to join the cause is the second aspect of Panhellenism in the *Periegesis* which we will study. In the scholarly literature it is quite often stated that Pausanias, living in a time when Greece had long since lost its freedom,

---

[25] Palladium: I 28.8f., II 23.5. Megara: I 39.5. Birthplace: IV 33.1. Variant versions in the *Periegesis* are discussed further below in chapter 5.

[26] Elsner 1994: 246–248, quote p. 247. Cf. also Habicht 1984: 50, Elsner 1995: 140–144, Ameling 1996: 142f., Jacquemin 1996: 35, Lafond 2001: 388–391.

[27] Habicht 1985: 114.

[28] Generally speaking, the narrator rarely inserts evaluative comments explicitly in the first person, cf. further below chapter 5.

celebrates the few instances in Greek history when the still independent Greeks were actually united against others, specifically Trojans, Persians, Macedonians, and Gauls, as a model to be lived up to. It is further claimed that he has not only forgotten the reality of the past wars of Greeks against Greeks, but also uses the participation or non-participation of a state in this or that war of resistance against foreigners as something against which to judge the state in question.[29]

This understanding of the narrator's view on the theme of wars against others in the history of Greece will be challenged. Instead, we argue that the narrator betrays a more realistic outlook on the history of Greece. Specifically we argue that the few moments in the history of Greece when Greeks actually managed to put up a more or less united front, are not taken to be the moments defining the standing of a community. Rather, these moments appear to be the exceptions that prove the rule. Occasionally the Greeks managed to unite. But upon closer scrutiny it appears that those joining forces were various constellations of Greeks, and they did not manage to stay united for any length of time. Further, we argue that the narrator does not use the participation or non-participation of a community in these wars as a measure against which to judge them. These moments of unity or quasi-unity against an external foe were proud moments in the history of Greece and no doubt viewed as such by one and all, including the narrator. However, though great events, they were only isolated occurrences in a long chain of events in the history of Greece. One must further consider the possibility that the narrator's frequent mentions of, for example, the Persian wars may simply reflect the fact that it is a recurring theme in art and architecture and/or contemporary taste.[30]

Finally, the theme of Greeks and Romans, or rather, the subject matter of Pausanias' attitude to the Romans has been discussed by several scholars. There is no agreement on this matter. It is hard to find any evidence of Pausanias being opposed to Roman rule and presence in Greece, nor do scholars claim that he would have been fiercely opposed to it. Nevertheless, the opinions of scholars are certainly divided between those who find the balance slightly heavier on the anti-Roman side or the pro-Roman one.[31] A variant of imputing anti-Roman

---

[29] Cf. particularly Habicht 1985: 106–109, Lafond 1991: 42f., Elsner 1994: 246–251 and 1995: 140–144, Swain 1996: 334, and Alcock 1996: 251–260.

[30] Realised by Alcock 1996: 251.

[31] Pausanias anti-Roman in one sense or another, cf. e.g. Habicht 1985: 119–123 (n. 6 with

leanings to Pausanias is to view him – like many other authors of the same period, the Second Sophistic – as being politically resigned to the order of things, but seeking a refuge in Greek history, religion, and/or culture, and in this way finding strength for a cultural opposition to Rome, a means for construing a Greek identity separate from Rome.[32] Such interpretations of either Pausanias or other authors of the Second Sophistic do not reign supreme, nor have they gone by unquestioned or uncontradicted.[33]

As to the *Periegesis*, we argue that it is hard to find evidence in it of its author burning with a desire to use his explorations into the Greek political past and its religious and cultural past and present as fuel for opposition against Roman rule.[34] As to the contemporary Roman rule over Greece, the *Periegesis* does not suggest that it would be offensive. If anything, it should become clear in the end that the author of the *Periegesis* is confused at how the history of

---

references to earlier views), Lafond 1991: 40–42 (but see also Lafond 1996: 171–176), Swain 1996: 333–340 and 347–356, Bowie 1996: 216–221; pro-Roman or rather not an adversary to Rome, cf. e.g. Palm 1959: 63–74, Heer 1979: 66–68, Arafat 1996: 202–212, Jacquemin 1996 *passim*, Papaïoannou 1999 *passim*. In Forte 1972: 419–427 there is a convenient systematised collection of passages where Romans are mentioned in the *Periegesis*. See also the reflections of Jones 2004: 13f. on these diametrically opposed results reached by scholars.

[32] Pausanias: Bowie 1970: 22f., Elsner 1995: 140–144 and Elsner 1997b: 194, followed by e.g. Lafond 2001: 388–393, Sidebottom 2002: 497. Other authors of the period: Bowie 1970 *passim*, Touloumakos 1971: 51–79, Anderson 1989: 142f., Swain 1996: 135–422; see also the studies of Veyne 1999 and Whitmarsh 2001, with ample references to and criticism of previous scholarship on the subject matter. With a slightly different approach Elsner 1997a argues, apropos of Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii*, that Philostratus' Apollonius dares to say what other Greeks (among whom Pausanias may be placed) only dare think: 'Philostratus goes beyond the tacit resistance to Roman rule which Greek writers tend to display, and preaches a none-too-distant Greek-inspired sacred revival' (p. 36).

[33] Cf. the study of Palm 1959, Pernot 1993: 739–762, Schmitz 1997: 178, and in particular Whitmarsh 2001: 1–20 for a critique of interpreting authors of this period as expressing either acquiescence in or dissent from the Roman power by way of turning to their Greek past. See also, specifically on the *Periegesis*, Cherry 2001: 254 'If it is really so powerful an exploration of identity through memory and myth-history, and if its primary discourse concerns cultural anxiety about, and resistance to, Roman imperialism… then why did it not resonate more widely?'

[34] A similar thought is expressed in the critique of Jacquemin 1996: 42 'La tendence actuelle à voir dans Pausanias le héros d'une résistance culturelle, qui utilise l'identité religieuse comme forme de lutte face aux réalités de la domnation romaine, tend à forcer le texte…'.

Greece has been used both in the past and in his present. Moreover, he would probably be somewhat perplexed at the interpretations his history of Greece has been subjected to by posterity.

Previous studies of what we term the frame narrative have mainly focussed on two specific aspects. On one hand, it has been studied as a source for the biography of the author, and on the other as a guide to the remains of ancient Greece for travellers and archaeologists.

The explicit first person statements and other passages which have been implicitly taken to give hints as to the personality of the author have been investigated for constructing a biography of the otherwise unknown Pausanias.[35] Apart from an approximate date (from the 130's[36] to after 180) and a probable place of origin (perhaps Magnesia in the vicinity of Mount Sipylus in Lydia in Asia Minor[37]), what we can say about our author is that he must have been well educated, well read, and well-to-do in order to be able to have the ways and means to carry out the research for and the composition of the *Periegesis*.[38]

Undoubtedly, the *Periegesis* has for long been an indispensable guide to ancient Greece. However, for amateurs it has increasingly been replaced by modern travel guides; for specialists its value has diminished through the years as archaeology has brought more and more into the light of day, often raising questions of how to bring the reports of the *Periegesis* into line with the data of the excavations. As our study does not concern the reality that lies behind the text, these studies need not be discussed here.[39]

It would appear as if one specific aspect of the frame narrative tempts readers to use the *Periegesis* as a guide to Greece. In many instances, the

---

[35] Cf. in particular von Scheffler 1880, Frazer 1898, I: xv–xxii, Heer 1979, Habicht 1985: 1–27 and 141–164, Bowie 2001: 21–25, and Pretzler 2004 *passim* with a focus on Pausanias' travels and composition of the *Periegesis*.

[36] Cf. below chapter 4.

[37] Cf. the study of Jones 2004 in which the Lydian side of Pausanias' identity is stressed.

[38] On the problems with biographical readings of works of literature, cf. below chapter 2.

[39] Cf. e.g. Daux 1936 on Delphi, Roux 1958 on Corinth, Muller 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984 on Megara, Hutton 1995 on book II, Piérart 2001 on book II, Champion-Smith 1998 on the Agora of Athens. There are numerous studies of minor points of interpretational problems in the *Periegesis*. These are of interest only for those who specialise in the subject field in question, and need therefore not be mentioned here.

topographical order in which the θεωρήματα are mentioned appears to be not only a bare catalogue of monuments,[40] with or without information about the relative location of the monuments. Instead, it takes on the form of a narrative about a walking-tour of Greece. As walks in general, so too the one in the *Periegesis* follows a topographical order. If s/he wants to, the reader may take the same walk – the form of the frame narrative appears even to encourage such an undertaking. Whether or not it was intended to be a guidebook is, however, a question that must remain open. Although the reader can often follow in the steps of the frame narrative for long stretches without any difficulty, s/he also is left just as often without a clue as to the location of numerous monuments.[41]

However, when attempting to make the tour as described in the *Periegesis*, the reader must beware of getting lost and assuming that the tour narrated in the frame narrative is Pausanias' own. The narrator very rarely claims that Ego has undertaken the travels recorded in the frame. Indeed, though indubitably based on autopsy and the travels undertaken by Pausanias, the journey described in the frame narrative is a literary construction. In the first part of our study we examine this literary aspect of the frame narrative, as well as the fact that the narrator frequently introduces into the frame narrative other activities than travel.

When speaking of the literary – even fictional – character of the frame narrative we want to stress the dissociation between Pausanias' travels and the topographical order of the *Periegesis*, i.e. the narrative of the tour of Greece in the text. That is, though in many places a correct narrative, it is not a transcription of Pausanias' movements in Greece. It was such a misconception of the frame narrative that led the great German philologist Wilamowitz astray in his interpretation of the *Periegesis*. As many of his contemporaries did, Wilamowitz too used the *Periegesis* as a guide. Doing this, he got lost on the

---

[40] *Contra* Wycherley 1959: 28f. Cf. also Elsner 1995: 135 'This is no bald enumeration, but an actor-centred account which enacts the very process of travel.'

[41] Particularly in the descriptions of smaller communities, indications of the location of monuments etc. are often missing. For example, in the description of Aegira in Achaea (VII 26.1–9) there are no indications; on the 'carattere non «periegetico» della «*Periegesi*»' in the description of this city, cf. Osanna 1998 *passim*, quote p. 225. However, mostly there are at least some indications, but with gaps, cf. e.g. the chart in Muller 1981: 219 which clearly illustrates the intermittent character of the topographical indicators.

way between Olympia and Heraea in Arcadia.[42] The reason why Wilamowitz lost his way was that he did not realise that the route between Olympia and Heraea is traced not from Olympia to Heraea – despite the fact that the description of Olympia comes before that of Heraea – but from Heraea to Olympia. Assuming that the order in which monuments and sites are mentioned in the text corresponds to the order in which the author must have seen them, Wilamowitz inferred that the route between Olympia and Heraea is described in an order which is the opposite of the route that Pausanias himself must have followed. Why, then, this reversed order in the description, without warning the reader – did Pausanias not know better?[43] The difficulties Wilamowitz encountered in interpreting the passage in question had considerable consequences for the study of the *Periegesis*, as it initiated the search for Pausanias' periegetic sources.[44] This search was called off almost as soon as it had begun, but not until a number of articles and also one or two monographs had been written and published by champions of either side of the argument.[45]

Thanks to archaeological finds and the general increase in the knowledge of the topography of Greece, the *Periegesis* could soon be more directly compared with the material remains from antiquity. Such comparisons have proved the overall correctness of the descriptions, and have settled many of the scholarly disputes. Simultaneously, archaeology has made it obvious that the *Periegesis* does not even come close to providing such wealth of detail as to

---

[42] The route is described in VI 21.3–5.

[43] Wilamowitz 1886: 184 n. 43.

[44] Wilamowitz 1877: 344–347 is the first time he discusses Pausanias in print. Hitzig 1887: 59 identifies this article as the beginning of the *Pausaniasfrage*. On the part played by Wilamowitz in the questioning of Pausanias' accuracy in general and autopsy in particular, cf. in particular Habicht 1985: 165–175, Schneider 1999: 158–164, and (on a lighter note) Akujärvi 2001, all with references to further passages with comments by Wilamowitz on Pausanias. Cf. also Regenbogen 1956: 1093–1095 and Beard 2001 on the Pausanias-question in an anglophone context.

[45] E.g. on the prosecuting side: Hirt 1878, Hirschfeld 1882 and 1883 (actually retracting many of the allegations made in the article published the year before), Treu 1882 and 1883, Kalkmann 1886, Immerwahr 1889. For the defence may be quoted – just to mention a select few from this the winning side from the period when the argument was most heated – Schöll 1878: 436f. (calling for stronger arguments directly after Wilamowitz' initial attack), Schubart 1883 and 1884, Brunn 1884, Hitzig 1887, and Gurlitt 1890.

make possible reconstructions of the topography based on its text alone. It is, however, often detailed enough to encourage scholars to try to make them. This point can be illustrated most conveniently with the suggested reconstructions of the Athenian Agora before the excavations undertaken on the site: plans of no less than five quite disagreeing reconstructions are printed in the commentary of Hitzig and Blümner, and in 1909 Robert suggested a sixth one.[46] The excavations proved them all wrong.

However, even when proven topographically correct, one is not to assume that the frame narrative is a more or less accurate transcription of Pausanias' travels in Greece.[47] Whereas the *Periegesis* is invaluable for identifying the ruins that are brought to light by the archaeological excavations, these same excavations also reveal how much has been left out in the descriptions. To interpret the *Periegesis* in relation to the ruins and inscriptions was/is often a difficult task. In particular Pausanias' selectivity is often perceived as being greater than expected when the text can be compared with the remains. The amount of information given by Pausanias never seems to be enough. Indeed, those criticising Pausanias were not only philologists – archaeologists such as Hirschfeld were quite eloquent in their reproaches on the quality of the information conveyed in the *Periegesis*.[48]

A problem with the interpretation of the *Periegesis* is that it is often assumed that the order in which the monuments are mentioned in the text corresponds not only to the order in which Pausanias saw them, but also to the actual topographical order. This is assumed not only when the text is explicit on

---

[46] Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, Tafel II–VI (at the end of the first volume), Robert 1909: 309–344, with a plan on p. 330. Cf. also the comments of Wycherley 1959: 23–25 on the attempts at reconstruction, and Thompson & Wycherley 1972: 220–234 on the excavations that finally settled the matter.

[47] Cf. e.g. Heberdey 1894 reconstructing Pausanias' travel in the whole of Greece or Vanderpool 1949 analysing Pausanias' movements on the Athenian Agora – note especially the map on p. 130, with a man carrying a notebook drawn into it (Pausanias taking notes? Or an archaeologist with a copy of the *Periegesis*?). The frame narrative is spoken of in similar terms by many scholars, cf. e.g. Wycherley 1959, who, however, concedes that 'one is not bound to think of the dotted line given in the plan as an absolutely continuous itinerary trodden by Pausanias at every point' (p. 28).

[48] Cf. Jacquemin 2001 on the frustration of archaeologists with Pausanias in the excavations of Olympia.

the matter, but also when there are no indications of it. Consequently, when problems of interpreting the archaeological finds in comparison with the *Periegesis* arise, the solution is often sought in attempts to reconstruct Pausanias' assumed movements. Consider, for instance, the following passage from the description of the *Laconica*:

> Τευθρώνης δὲ ἀπέχει πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν σταδίους ἐς θάλασσαν ἀνέχουσα ἄκρα Ταίναρον, καὶ λιμένες ὅ τε Ἀχίλλειός ἐστι καὶ Ψαμαθοῦς…
>
> 150 stades from Teuthrone is Cape Taenarum projecting into the sea, and the harbours Achilleius and Psamathus…[49]

Only by assuming that the order in which these two harbours are mentioned corresponds to the order in which Pausanias saw them can one in this instance claim that he 'seems to reverse the location' of them.[50] A reinterpretation of the location of the harbours has been proposed in order to absolve Pausanias from an accusation of topographical inaccuracy in this passage.[51] However, both the assumption of a reversal of location and the need to defend Pausanias are superfluous. All one needs to do, is to point to the fact that in the absence of any topographical indicators in the text, one is not to expect topographical order, especially not when faced with an obvious catalogue as in the present passage.[52]

1.4 Matters of form

When quoting from the *Periegesis* we for the most part follow the text of the latest complete edition, which is that of Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990. However, in some instances we deviate from the readings of Rocha-Pereira, the reasons for

---

[49] III 25.4.

[50] Hutton 1995: 269, apparently having forgotten the excellent observations he made earlier, cf. Hutton 1995: 50–54.

[51] Le Roy 2001: 225–228.

[52] However, in some instances a bare catalogue does appear to follow a topographical order, cf. e.g. I 24.3 with Heydemann 1869: 384–388. Cf. also the observations of Robert 1909: 84–89 on the ease with which the narrator can deviate from the topographical order.

which are set forth in the footnotes.[53] For the texts of other authors, standard editions are used.

When quoting Greek in the text, we normally give translations or paraphrases in order to make our study accessible also to those who do not know Greek. The only exception to this practice is the instances in which we discuss linguistic matters, which in itself calls for a certain knowledge of the language. Unless otherwise specified, all translations from Greek are our own.

To render Greek names of persons or places we use the traditionally English Latin transcription system. Occasionally, specific Greek terms are italicised and transcribed according to the Modern English transcription system instead of being translated.

In the bibliography, the abbreviations of the titles of periodicals follow those in the *L'année philologique* or its predecessors.

---

[53] Note in particular that in table 2 we do not follow Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 in the following passages: III 5.3, VIII 52.5, X 32.2, X 38.10. For references to the discussions concerning the readings, see the select *Index locorum* at the end of this book.

PART I

FORM: EGO AND YOU IN THE FRAME

2 Definitions

There is a growing awareness of the fact that Pausanias probably visited some of the sites of Greece more than once, that he travelled along many roads more than once, and that (therefore) the itineraries described in the *Periegesis* are but a selection made among many possible ones. But, this notwithstanding, scholars in many instances continue to speak of the *Periegesis* as if they are retracing Pausanias' actual movements.[1]

In the following four chapters the 'I' – henceforth Ego – of the narrator/author/character in the *Periegesis* is studied. The author is the real flesh-and-blood agent in the empirical world who is responsible for the production of the text; the narrator is the counterpart within the text.[2] Narrator and author are not to be confused with one another; the former is inherent to its narrative, inscribed in it as its teller, and deducible from the text, the latter is not. Of course, in a factual narrative like the *Periegesis*, one may assume an identity between author and narrator. This identity symbolises the serious commitment of the author as regards the narrative assertions in the text.[3] We nevertheless introduce the narrator as an agent distinct from the author into our study of the *Periegesis*. This we do out of a desire to discourage the biographical reading of Ego in the *Periegesis*. It is particularly easy to fall for the temptation of biographical readings when studying an 'I' who is as prominent in a narrative as Ego is in the *Periegesis*. Moreover, we speak of Ego rather than of Pausanias as a reminder of the fact that, whereas Pausanias, the author of the *Periegesis*, is an extratextual person who very well may have lent some of his personality traits to the intratextual Ego, the sum total of the personality of Ego does not even come close to form a portrait of the extratextual person.

---

[1] E.g. Hutton 1995, despite his warnings of falling for the 'travelogue fallacy' (pp. 50–54). See also Akujärvi 1999, with a different approach to the problem.

[2] Cf. Genette 1980: 213, and Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 3f. Cf. also the definitions in Prince 1987 *s.vv.* 'author' and 'narrator'.

[3] Cf. Genette 1993: 68–79, esp. 78f. and Cohn 1999: 109–131.

Ego in the *Periegesis* has been studied previously, with a particular focus on such passages that are taken to reveal autobiographical information about the author. Since the *Periegesis* is the only available source to the biography of its author, it has been probed for biographical details, such as date, place of origin, date of composition, personal opinions and beliefs. The results of such a search are not, as is well known, plentiful.[4] In particular, scholars have been interested in retracing the author's travels. It is, however, not to be assumed that the portrait of the man behind the text which might be constructed from the few 'biographical' indications which are scattered throughout the work, must by necessity form a portrait of the real flesh-and-blood author of the *Periegesis*. However likely the assumption may be, there will always remain some degree of uncertainty because of the simple fact that there is not any extratextual biographical information on Pausanias.[5] All we will be able to extract about the author of the *Periegesis* is the idea (or image) of the author, which consists of nothing more or less than what the text lets the reader know about its author. That is, all we can reach is Pausanias, the implied author.[6] The extent of the similarities between the implied and the real author cannot be determined, if indeed there are any.[7]

The following statement may serve as an example of the confusion that may arise from not clearly distinguishing between the extratextual Pausanias and the intratextual Ego: '… he never describes an entire ritual sequence and rarely takes part himself.'[8] The assertions of both clauses are based on the *Periegesis*. The first one describes, quite correctly, a peculiar trait of the narrator. In the second one, information provided about Ego as character is transferred to the

---

[4] Cf. above chapter 1.

[5] That is, we do not have any extratextual evidence on our Pausanias, provided that our Pausanias is not identical with any of his contemporary namesakes known from other sources. There are 6 (or 5) roughly contemporary Pausaniases who have left some kind of trace in literature – our Pausanias is the only one whose work has been preserved. On this, cf. Gurlitt 1890: 64–66, Frazer 1898, I: xx, Robert 1909: 271–274, Diller 1955: 270–279, and Regenbogen 1956: 1012f.

[6] Cf. Genette 1988: 135–154; see also Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 87–90.

[7] As is well known, the same real author may write several texts, which may convey different images of the implied author, and which may have different narrators; cf. e.g. the examples quoted by Prince 1987 *s.v.* 'implied author'.

[8] Cole 2002: 635.

extratextual Pausanias. In other words, the fact that the narrator rarely tells about Ego's participation in religious rituals is taken to be equivalent to the fact that Pausanias himself rarely participated in such. While it (of course) cannot be excluded that this is so, it may very well be that Pausanias frequently took active part in the rituals. Either way, we simply cannot know for certain. What we do know, is that the narrator does not often have the intratextual Ego participating in them.

Ego deserves some attention. Ego is ubiquitous in the *Periegesis*. Ego very rarely calls upon anyone else to speak, without virtually appropriating the other's speech and making it part of his own narration, either by rendering it in the form of indirect discourse or summary, thereby treating it as one event among others.[9] Ego is an 'I' who is both reticent and talkative as regards himself. The sort of information about Ego that scholars have been most interested in studying, is such that Ego is most reluctant to give away. But, this notwithstanding, Ego is very much present throughout the whole of the *Periegesis* speaking in his own person. In the four following chapters the different roles played by Ego in the *Periegesis* will be studied.

In spite of the possibility that some interesting passages in which the narrator appears to be speaking in his own person might be excluded in the process, the present study of Ego in the *Periegesis* is limited to those passages in which the narrator explicitly introduces Ego into the course of the narrative using either a verb in the first person or a first person pronoun (or both) – singular and plural appear to be used without discrimination. Such a limitation is necessary when studying an Ego who is perceptible in the text to such a degree as Ego of the *Periegesis* is. Moreover, the content of the *Periegesis* – such as descriptions of settings, identifications of characters, commentary etc. – is largely of the sort that it would be taken as signs of the perceptibility of the narrator in an ordinary narrative text.[10] Therefore, the present study is limited to the explicit narratorial intrusions. Moreover, even the explicit narratorial intrusions are so numerous that a comprehensive study of them is almost impracticable. In these explicit intrusions the narrator either comments in his

---

[9] Cf. Genette 1980: 169–173 and Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 107–111 on the different ways of rendering speech.

[10] Cf. Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 97–101.

own voice on the narrative, or speaks about himself in another capacity than that of the narrator, viz. in the capacity of character.

It is very likely that Pausanias consciously imitates Herodotus by persistently introducing Ego into the *Periegesis*. That is, Pausanias not only imitates Herodotus stylistically.[11] He also copies the narratorial stance of the *Histories* and creates, in like manner with Herodotus, a narrative that has every appearance of being mediated by someone telling the story, viz. the narrator.[12] There are two very obvious differences in this narrative surface of Herodotus' *Histories* when it is compared to the works of later historians.[13] Firstly, Herodotus' narrative is such that it appears to be laboriously assembled from a multitude of stories (λόγοι). The *Histories* are not only a historical account, but also the story of its coming into being. The readers of it are given the impression and at every turn reminded of the fact that the *Histories* would not exist in its present form without the narrator's effort at assembling the material and putting it into writing. Secondly, the narrator/author constantly intrudes in the narrative with comments in his own person to a larger extent than later historians do. Moreover, the character of the inserted comments differs. They do not appear to have been inserted in order to inspire confidence in the authority of the ongoing narrative – or at least they do not create any such confidence. Rather, the intrusions reinforce the feeling of uncertainty that has already been created by the narrative itself, which has the appearance of having been scrambled together. The intrusions, moreover, remind the reader of the fact that the narrative is indeed a collection of stories made by the narrator – not a transcription of a fixed sequence of events.

The similarities with the *Periegesis* are striking. Much of the above description of the *Histories* would fit the *Periegesis*. The *Periegesis*, too,

---

[11] On Pausanias' stylistic imitation of Herodotus, cf. particularly Pfundtner 1866 and Strid 1976.

[12] Cf. Dewald 1987 for a study of the 1086 phrases that contain a first person pronoun or verb in the *Histories*; Dewald 2002 is a reconsideration of the 1987 study, and includes ample references to other studies of the narrator in the *Histories*; cf. also Marincola 1987 for a study of the instances in which Herodotus explicitly refers to his own experiences. See further Naiden's 1999 study of 'prospective' imperfect together with what we would call Ego's dater function in Herodotus' *Histories*.

[13] Dewald 1987: 148–152.

appears to have been assembled by the narrator, with some effort, of material from different sources. The narrator of the *Periegesis*, too, constantly intrudes in the narrative with comments in his own person, reminding the reader of his labours. Therefore, a reader of the *Periegesis* should not be under the impression that the text would exist in the form it has without the efforts of the narrator. Nor should any reader of the *Periegesis* imagine that the text is a transparent window to the reality behind the text. The narratorial intrusions should remind the reader of the fact that what s/he is reading is but the presentation of reality that Ego has chosen to make, just as the narratorial intrusions in the *Histories* remind the reader of the fact that what they are reading is the narrator's presentation of events.

As mentioned above, historians after Herodotus were less inclined to make intrusions in the first person. Indeed, it may be that first person intrusions in great quantities were considered to be a distinctly Herodotean trait by Pausanias and others. Pausanias obviously imitates Herodotus closely in many respects; an even closer imitation of Herodotus is Lucian's *de Syria Dea*, the *Syrian Goddess*.[14] Here even the Ionic dialect of Herodotus is imitated. This work, like the *Periegesis*, contains a large amount of narratorial intrusions in the first person. In the introduction to her edition, translation, and commentary of this treatise, Lightfoot explores, among other things, the similarities between the narrator of the *Syrian Goddess* and the narrator of the *Histories*.[15] In like manner with the narrators of both the *Histories* and the *Periegesis*, the narrator of the *Syrian Goddess* constantly intrudes into the narrative in the first person, making his presence felt and reminding the reader of the constructed and mediated

---

[14] On the much debated question of authorship of this treatise, see e.g. Dirven 1997, Elsner 2001b: 124f., and most recently Lightfoot 2003: 184–208, all with ample references to previous studies. As soon as a reader perceives that the voices of the author and the narrator are not univocal, but suspects that there may be dissonance between the two, s/he becomes uncertain of how to take the text. This is one of the main reasons why it is difficult to assess the authorship of the *Syrian Goddess*. Should Lucian be its author, it is hard to believe that the content of the treatise is to be taken seriously given the obvious disharmony between the serious and pious voice of the narrator/author of the *Syrian Goddess* and the author of other treatises in the Lucianic corpus. Students of the *Periegesis* do not encounter the same problems, mainly owing to the fact that we do not have other works by the same author with which we could compare it.

[15] Lightfoot 2003: 161–174.

nature of the text. Lightfoot also makes some observations on the similarities between the Egos of the *Syrian Goddess* and the *Periegesis*.[16]

An Ego of any narrative can appear in it in two capacities: as its narrator and as a character whom the narrator may designate 'I'.[17] This is also the case with Ego in the *Periegesis*. Therefore we distinguish between Ego as narrator and Ego as character in this study. As mentioned above, the narrator is both reticent and talkative when it comes to speaking about Ego. On the whole the narrator is reticent when it comes to giving personal details, and he prefers to introduce Ego in stereotyped roles and situations, whence characterisations of him as 'modest and discrete'.[18] This is in spite of the fact that its potentiality for homodiegetic narrative ('first-person narrative') is one of the most clear distinguishing differences between the frame narrative and the many stories – which, of course, are heterodiegetic, with very few exceptions – embedded within the frame narrative.[19] This is not to say that Ego does not appear as a character in the frame narrative.

When speaking of Ego as narrator, we mean the instances in which the narrator explicitly, in the first person, intrudes in the *Periegesis* in order to comment on the process of the composition, on the narration.[20] This is an extradiegetic narrator, i.e. as narrator Ego is situated outside the diegesis.[21] The narrator is in the text continually, fulfilling his defining function, i.e. the

---

[16] Lightfoot 2003: 87–91 and 161–174. The *Syrian Goddess* and the *Periegesis* have been compared previously by e.g. Elsner 1997b: 191–196 and Elsner 2001b: 129–133, who is reading both works as texts of resistance to Rome.

[17] Ego as narrator may or may not be identical with the author – this is a question that falls outside of the field of narratology; cf. e.g. Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 87–90.

[18] Habicht 1985: 18 and 141f.

[19] 'Every narrative is, explicitly or not, "in the first person"', since every narrator may use the first person pronoun to designate him/herself, whenever s/he wishes, cf. Genette 1988: 97f. Therefore the terms homodiegetic (character = narrator) and heterodiegetic (character ≠ narrator) are more apt when speaking about what is traditionally called first person and third person narrative respectively.

[20] Narration = narrating in the English translation of Genette, cf. Genette 1980: 27 n. 2 (translator's note). Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 2–4 uses the form narration.

[21] Cf. Prince 1987 *s.v.* 'diegesis': 'the (fictional) world in which the situations and events narrated occur'.

narrative one. However, though constantly in the text, the narrator actually appears in it only occasionally. When explicitly perceptible on the textual level of the narrative the narrator can refer to himself and his own doings with the text and within the text in a metanarrative discourse.[22] We distinguish two separate functions of this textually perceptible narrator: the writer, the one who is concerned with the production of the text as it is inscribed in the text itself; and the dater, the one who is concerned with linking (mainly) the many objects but also characters and other things to the 'now' in which he is writing the *Periegesis* down. These two function-categories break up into separate roles, or aspects, of the writer and the dater; some of these are more easily demarcated than others.

When speaking of Ego as character, we mean the instances in which the narrator intrudes in the *Periegesis* using the first person in order to speak about, not his production of the text, but about himself as character.[23] That is, the *Periegesis* is partially a homodiegetic narrative, i.e. a narrative in which its narrator figures as a character. Ego as character has performed and is presented as performing tasks separate both in space and time from the ones that the narrator is performing. That is, when speaking about himself as a character, the narrator is telling about what he himself has done at an earlier point in time. How much earlier is impossible to determine; occasionally the temporal gap separating Ego as narrator from Ego as character may be assumed to be practically non-existent, at other times it may be larger.

Further, in any narrative the question of how exhaustive a portrait of any given character is cannot be satisfactorily answered. Regarding the characterisation of Ego as character in the *Periegesis*, we cannot establish anything about all the things that are not explicitly brought into the text by the narrator. But one may discern that there lurks a more complex person behind the rather meagre portrait of Ego as character that can be scraped together from the scattered indications in the text.

When Ego as character is explicitly mentioned in the text, the narrator introduces him in two different functions, i.e. the researcher and the traveller. As

---

[22] Cf. Genette 1980: 255f.

[23] We use 'Ego as character' rather than 'Ego as *a* character', since as character Ego is not one among other characters. The narrator has a special relation to Ego as character, and, as character, Ego figures almost exclusively and nearly alone in the frame narrative.

is the case with the functions of Ego as narrator, so these two function-categories of Ego as character break up into separate roles, or aspects, of the researcher and the traveller, some of which are more easily demarcated than others. This gives us the following chart:

Table 1
View of the functions and roles of Ego in the Periegesis

	Function	*Role*
Ego as narrator (on extradiegetic narrative level)	Writer	Cross-referencing Organising Pretermitting
	Dater	Marking continuity Marking discontinuity
Ego as character (in homodiegetic relationship to the story of the frame narrative)	Researcher	Investigating Commenting Criticising
	Traveller	Travelling-Ego

In the two following chapters of this part of our study, Ego as narrator will be studied, i.e. Ego in the act of narrating the whole of the *Periegesis*. Ego freely and often talks about himself in the role of narrator, or refers to the 'now' in which the narration of the *Periegesis* is taking place. The voice of the narrator is very dominant in the narrative, drawing attention to himself at almost every turn in the process of composing the *Periegesis*.[24] Even when the narrator's voice is not explicitly audible, his implicit presence in sorting and selecting the material is felt throughout the narrative. Ego intrudes in the narrative in his capacity of narrator so often that there has been created what appears to be an 'alter ego' to Ego talking about the narration. So, instead of saying, for example, 'I have shown', the narrator often says 'my narrative (ὁ λόγος μοι *vel sim.*) has shown'.

---

[24] Hutton 1995: 235 ('[Pausanias] is not an author who calls attention to his own presence in the process of composition') fails to make the distinction between Pausanias the character and Pausanias the narrator. Cf. also Jones 2001: 33.

This usage goes beyond mere variation, which can be achieved by using impersonal passives instead of first person statements.

In the next two chapters of this part, Ego as character will be studied, i.e. instances in which the narrator describes Ego performing other tasks than narrating the *Periegesis*. The narrator's generosity regarding information about Ego as character is limited to the researcher function. With only a few exceptions, what is revealed about Ego as character does not go beyond information which in and of itself is of interest for the *Periegesis*. Whereas the one-tracked focus of Ego as narrator on the *Periegesis* is rather natural, the fact that what we get to know about Ego as character is equally restricted to matters of concern for the *Periegesis* is perhaps not equally self-evident. Be that as it may, when Ego surfaces as a homodiegetic character in the frame narrative, the narrator almost exclusively discusses how he is gathering, evaluating, and criticising the material that is to be included in the work. The narrator appears to introduce Ego both as narrator and as character not in order to draw the readers' attention away from the fact that what they are reading is mediated by Ego, but conversely to focus their attention on that very fact. What is more, one specific aspect of research for the *Periegesis*, viz. travelling, the narrator mostly chooses to present in a depersonalised way. Again, it is as if the narrator creates an 'alter ego' for his Ego, a travelling-You for the travelling-Ego. Therefore, a study of the travelling-You has been appended to the study of the travelling-Ego, which is the most infrequently occurring role of Ego. The travelling-You is an impersonal, unspecified, anonymous travelling persona introduced by the narrator in order to tell about movement. The many problems of interpretation created by the presence of this impersonal 'you' – perhaps even personal 'you' – introduced by the narrator side by side with Ego in various roles, will be discussed in chapter 5.

3 Writer

3.1 Introduction

Ego in his function of writer, speaking about his writing of the *Periegesis*, occurs rather frequently. We have counted some 280 passages where the narrator speaks of his writing, using the first person.[1] In the absence of any prologue or epilogue to the whole of the *Periegesis*, Ego's writer function has been of interest to scholars when trying to answer questions concerning the composition of the *Periegesis* and its completeness.

Our interest in Ego's writer function lies in exploring what writerly concerns prompt the narrator to break into the text in order to comment on what he is doing. Broadly speaking, the narrator appears to introduce Ego's writer function for one of two reasons: (1) a care for the material, (2) a care for the reader. The care for the material appears to be focussed on presenting every piece of information in a context which is the most appropriate one for any particular piece of information.[2] The care for the reader concerns his/her ability to absorb the narrative, i.e. knowing why a given piece of information is divulged at its location and trusting that the narrator has made his choices with a sound judgement. Obviously, there is a high degree of inter-relatedness between these two kinds of care, both of which may be said to work in the direction of producing confidence in the narrator.

Simultaneously, throughout the whole of the *Periegesis*, but not occurring quite as frequently, are passages that in another way enhance the trust for the narrator. These are those passages which (1) indicate that the narrator is not

---

[1] Note that the number 280 refers to passages, not instances of verbs in the first person or first person pronouns, in which case the number would have been higher.

[2] On the narrator's care to introduce historical material at its 'proper place', cf. below chapter 7.

completely independent in deciding what material to include in the *Periegesis* and where to put it, and (2) make clear that the narrator possesses some piece of information that he does not wish to divulge to the reader. The passages of the second sort will be discussed under the pretermitting role of the writer function. The passages of the first sort, in which the narrator appears to be in the grasp of the λόγος or some external agent dictating what he should do or must not do, will be discussed under the cross-referencing and the organising roles of the writer function.

3.2 Cross-referencing

In the whole of the *Periegesis* there are no fewer than 155 cross-references.[3] As has been observed by many scholars, almost all of the cross-references refer to passages that actually appear in the work.[4] There is but one exception, the famous promise of a fuller treatment of the forefathers of Larymna, daughter of Cynus, after whom the city Larymna was named. Larymna was a Boeotian city, but belonged originally to Opus, i.e. Opuntian Locris. Consequently, according to a practice that is frequent in the *Periegesis* – as will become apparent below – the narrator promises that 'the part of my narrative dealing with the Locrians' will clarify the matter of her forefathers.[5] It has been suggested that the promise is carried out in X 38.1, but in that paragraph, and in the whole of the last chapter of the *Periegesis*, the narrator treats only Ozolian Locris, and does not at all come to speak of Opuntian Locris.[6] In a couple of instances the assertion made in a cross-reference is not carried out quite satisfactorily in the corresponding passage. But in these the narrator speaks at least roughly about the promised theme. An example of such a slip is the promise in book IV to

---

[3] For the reader's convenience, the cross-references are gathered in table 2 at the end of this chapter. We have not included I 13.4; Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 *ad loc.* regards it as a cross-reference to III 6.3, but we consider it to be an organisatory statement.

[4] Cf. e.g. Habicht 1985: 6f.

[5] IX 23.7 τοὺς δὲ ἀνωτέρω προγόνους δηλώσει μοι τὰ ἔχοντα ἐς Λοκροὺς τοῦ λόγου.

[6] Suggested by Spiro 1903 *ad loc.* and Settis 1968: 62; rejected by e.g. Robert 1909: 261–265, Habicht 1985: 6f., Bearzot 1988: 97f., and Bowie 2001: 23.

reveal the form of the statue of Artemis Laphria in another context.[7] This passage is assumed to refer to a passage in book VII, where it is said that the statue has the form of a huntress.[8] One may wonder why the information was postponed, if Ego did not intend to say anything more than this when making the cross-reference in book IV, a cross-reference that almost required more words than the 'description'.[9]

The many cross-references in the *Periegesis* have been previously studied as a means to investigate the order of the different books and the question of completeness of the work.[10] Here the cross-referencing made by the narrator is studied as one of the several different ways in which he makes his presence felt in the narrative.

Of the 155 cross-references in the *Periegesis*, 103 refer the reader back to previous treatments, reminding him/her of information already given; 52 refer the reader forward to coming treatments. With only one possible exception, there is always some first person pronoun or verb form used in these cross-references. It is quite possible that in the one and only exception to this rule, an 'I' (in the form of μοι) has fallen out in the manuscript tradition.[11] The invariable presence of Ego in one form or another is almost the only constant feature of these references. Apart from the first person, the variation in the form of the cross-references is very high.[12] The only instances of identical expressions we have been able to detect are the following:

---

[7] IV 31.7 τὸ σχῆμα [*sc.* Ἀρτέμιδος Λαφρίας] ἑτέρωθι δηλώσω.

[8] VII 18.10 τὸ μὲν σχῆμα τοῦ ἀγάλματος θηρεύουσά ἐστιν.

[9] Other instances are V 4.5 'corresponding' with V 8.5 (where there actually is a cross-reference back to V 4.5!), VIII 4.6 'corresponding' with II 26.6, and VIII 6.6 'corresponding' with II 25.3. On this subject, cf. also Gurlitt 1890: 2 n. 13.

[10] Order of books, cf. e.g. Frazer 1898, I: xviif., Hutton 1995: 29f.; completeness, cf. in particular Robert 1909: 261–265, Regenbogen 1956: 1011f., and Bearzot 1988 *passim*. Cf. also Trendelenburg 1911: 6–9 for a brief discussion of the form, too, of the cross-references.

[11] III 5.3 αἰτία δὲ ἥτις ἐγένετο προσέσται τῷ ἐς Ἀγησίλαον λόγῳ should probably read … προσέσται μοι κτλ. Cf. VI 3.8 τῇ ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς προσέσται μοι συγγραφῇ and VI 8.5 προσέσται μοι καὶ ταῦτα τῷ ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς λόγῳ. It is true that in the fourth passage where a phrase containing προσέσται is used for cross-referencing, IX 24.3, there is not any μοι. But in IX 24.3 there is a first person in the sentence, in the form of a first person singular verb (ἤκουον) in the preceding clause; this might explain the absence of μοι.

[12] On *oratio variata* in the *Periegesis*, cf. in particular the study of Engeli 1907.

ἑτέρωθι δηλώσω,
ποιησόμεθα καὶ ὕστερον μνήμην,
καὶ πρότερον ἔγραψα,
ἐδήλωσα (Ø/καὶ) ἐν τοῖς προτέροις τοῦ λόγου,
δεδήλωκεν ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι,
καὶ πρότερον εἴρηταί μοι,
κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ἤδη μοι,
κατὰ τὰ ἤδη λελεγμένα μοι,
ἤδη λέλεκταί μοι.[13]

When confronted with occurrences like

δεδήλωται ἤδη μοι
ἤδη μοι δεδήλωται,[14]

καὶ πρότερον τούτων ἐπεμνήσθην
καὶ ὀλίγῳ πρότερον ἐπεμνήσθην,[15]

τὰ πρότερον ἔχει μοι τοῦ λόγου
τὰ πρότερα ἔχει μοι τοῦ λόγου,[16]

ἐδήλωσα ὀλίγῳ τι πρότερον
ἐδήλωσα ὀλίγον τι ἔμπροσθεν,[17]

---

[13] III 1.1 and IV 31.7; V 21.1 and VIII 47.3; II 32.3 and III 10.7; IX 39.14, X 20.5, and X 38.6; I 41.6, II 23.6, and VI 15.10; I 1.4 and 7.3; V 15.9 and VIII 27.17 (variation: κατὰ τὰ ἡμῖν εἰρημένα VI 17.1); VI 20.1 and VI 22.5 (variation: κατὰ τὰ ἤδη μοι λελεγμένα V 8.5); II 21.2, III 12.3, and IV 5.7.

[14] I 29.14 and 35.1.

[15] I 40.1 and V 26.3.

[16] I 36.6 and II 36.7.

[17] VI 15.6 and X 32.2. In the latter passage the manuscripts vacillate between ὀλίγον τι, ὀλίγῳ τινι, and ὀλίγῳ τι. Among other editors Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 and Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 print ὀλίγῳ τι; Schubart & Walz 1838–1839 and Spiro 1903 print ὀλίγον τι. In the *Periegesis*, both ὀλίγῳ and ὀλίγον, with or without τι, are used adverbially. It would appear as if ὀλίγῳ is preferred with πρότερον (cf. V 14.8, 26.3 and the above quoted VI 15.6; cf. the Herodotean phrase ὀλίγῳ τι πρότερον 4.79.2, 81.2, 6.69.2, 8.95.1), and ὀλίγον with ἔμπροσθεν, though there is only one occurrence of it apart from X 32.2 (cf. II 7.3). See also I 42.4, where the manuscripts vacillate between πρότερον ὀλίγον, which is

ἑτέρωθι τοῦ λόγου δηλώσω
ἑτέρωθι [δὴ] δηλώσω τοῦ λόγου,[18]

and

τοῦ λόγου μοι τὰ ἐφεξῆς δηλώσει
ὁ ἐφεξῆς μοι λόγος δηλώσει,[19]

one cannot but wonder whether the variation in these short phrases is deliberate. Of course, as soon as the reference is more definite as to the location where a specific piece of information will be or has been given, the form becomes more varied. In such cases the variation is, however, not for the sake of variation, but is (or: should be) a secondary consequence of a primary need or will to be more specific. Nor are we here interested in variation *per se*; what is of interest is variation in another formal feature of the cross-references, viz. the varying subject of them: first person or third person.

All perfects are left out of the discussion, since they are of a very stereotyped form, and only occasionally distinguished by any individualising features.[20] Of the 34 occurrences of the perfect tense in the cross-references there are merely 6 in the active voice. Only one of these is in the first person singular. The other 5 are all in the third person: δεδήλωκεν with ὁ λόγος, or a phrase with τοῦ λόγου implicitly as partitive genitive as subject.[21] The rest of the perfects are in the passive voice. The majority of these are passives of λέγω,[22] and δηλόω;[23] there are also one each of γράφω and προλέγω.[24] With the

---

printed in Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, Spiro 1903, and Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990, and πρότερον ὀλίγῳ; in the light of the observations, made above, perhaps one should prefer the latter reading.

[18] I 41.2 and VI 10.8.

[19] III 3.2 and V 24.6.

[20] The exceptions are I 11.6, V 18.8, VI 4.10, and IX 6.5.

[21] εἴρηκα I 24.1. δεδήλωκεν I 11.6, 28.5, 41.6, II 23.6, VI 15.10.

[22] λέλεκται I 24.3, II 21.2, III 12.3, IV 5.7; λελεγμένα V 8.5, VI 20.1, 22.5; and εἴρηται I 1.4, 7.3, 31.3, II 14.4, IX 6.5; εἰρημένον/α ἐστίν II 34.12, III 24.1, IV 5.1, V 14.8, 15.9, VI 17.1, VIII 27.17, IX 2.7, X 24.4.

[23] δεδήλωται I 29.14, 35.1, VI 4.10, IX 27.3; ἐστιν... δεδηλωμένα IV 31.9.

[24] γέγραπται I 31.5; προειρημένα V 18.8 in the phrase κατὰ τὰ προειρημένα. This phrase is found in another passage, too (V 17.1), but there it occurs in a transitional phrase concluding the previous subject-matter. Both occurrences of προειρημένα are omitted in the *Index*

exception of the single phrase containing a perfect in the first person singular, the presence of the narrator is marked in these backwards references by a dative of the first person pronoun.[25] When the verb is in the passive voice the dative is to be interpreted as a dative of the agent, when in the active voice as a dative of advantage.[26]

A majority of the referential propositions signify actions (such as *show*, *write*, *mention*, *enumerate*) deliberately initiated by their active agents, the subject.[27] In these cases the subject is either the first person or a third person of some sort. There are also a number of referential propositions construed with verbs that signify states (such as *have* and *be*). All of the verbs that signify state are in the third person, and their subjects have the semantic role of patient, i.e. the subject is either in a state or undergoes a change of state.[28]

Regarding the referential propositions with action verbs, there is one verb in particular that is recurrent: δηλόω in the forms δηλώσω, δηλώσει, and ἐδήλωσα, ἐδήλωσε; προεδήλωσε is also used.[29] More or less synonymous variants of δηλόω, but with more specific meanings than this general verb for 'show', are ἐμήνυσεν, ἔδειξεν, ἐσήμαινεν, ἐδίδαξε, and διδάξει; ἀπέδωκα, too, should be counted among these verbs.[30]

---

verborum of Pirenne-Delforge & Purnelle 1997 *s.v.* προλέγω.

[25] The singular μοι is used most frequently. The plural ἡμῖν is used in V 14.8, VI 4.10, 17.1, and X 24.4.

[26] For the dative of the agent, cf. e.g. Smyth 1956 §§1488–1490; the dative of advantage, *id.* §§1481–1485.

[27] On state, event, and action propositions, cf. e.g. Givón 2001: 106; on the semantic roles of the grammatical category 'subject', cf. e.g. Givón 2001: 125 and 173f.

[28] Givón 2001: 107. The passages with state-verbs are: ἔχει/ἔσχε I 36.6, II 36.7, III 14.2, VI 12.5, and X 19.5; ἐγένετο III 11.1 and IV 3.3; ἔσται/προσέσται I 8.1, II 31.2, III 5.3, V 23.5, VI 3.8, 8.5, IX 24.3.

[29] δηλώσω I 33.1, 41.2, II 7.4, III 1.1, IV 31.7, V 4.5, VI 10.8, VIII 37.1, 48.2. δηλώσει III 3.2, V 24.6, 27.9, VIII 27.16, 30.4, IX 23.7. ἐδήλωσα II 21.4, 30.10, III 17.3, IV 28.3, 35.2, 35.4, V 4.8, 16.4, VI 1.6, 14.9, 15.6, VIII 4.6, 23.2, 25.11, 31.1, 53.7, IX 19.2, 39.14, X 9.2, 20.5, 32.2, 36.6, 38.6. ἐδήλωσε III 6.9, 9.11, IV 2.4, VIII 25.2, 52.5, IX 14.5, 19.4, 41.2, X 31.10, 32.10, 37.4. In VIII 52.5 ἐδήλωσε δή μοι should probably be emended into ἐδήλωσεν ἤδη μοι, as suggested by Schubart & Walz 1838–1839 *ad loc.*; a similar emendation has already been made in VI 15.10. προεδήλωσε II 19.8, VI 11.4, VII 3.4, VIII 35.7, IX 5.5.

[30] II 32.10, VIII 14.7, 39.2, 41.9, V 15.3, and VIII 48.2 respectively.

Another, smaller, class of action verbs in the cross-references are verbs having the general meaning of 'telling' through some verbal means: γράφω,[31] ἐπέξειμι,[32] 'mention',[33] and 'enumerate'.[34] Further, there are some other expressions, all referring to future treatments and all in their own way signalling that there is a more suitable location for a specific piece of information.[35]

Apart from tying together the bits and pieces of information that are spread out throughout the whole of the *Periegesis*,[36] the many cross-references also help the readers to find their way through the work, by reminding them of what has been said or informing beforehand of what will come. Moreover, by alluding in the cross-references to information that has been or will be discussed more fully in some other context, the narrator has the opportunity to introduce

---

[31] ἔγραψα II 32.3, III 10.7, IV 29.1, VIII 5.1; γράψω I 24.5, 29.7, III 10.8; γράψομεν V 14.6. In the latter passage, the manuscripts read γράφομεν, which is emended into γράψομεν. The emendation was suggested by Porson (*non vidi*), is approved by van Herwerden 1887: 62f., and accepted in the editions of Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 and Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 but not in Spiro 1903 or Casevitz 1999. The emendation is plausible in the light of the fact that the future tense is always used in the *Periegesis* when reference is made to a coming treatment. The number should not be an objection, cf. the apparently indifferent alternation between the singular and plural in verbs signifying 'mention', below.

[32] ἐπέξειμι IV 6.5, VI 2.4, IX 2.4; ἐπέξεισι III 11.8, IV 2.3, 29.12, VII 8.6, VIII 32.5; ἐπεξῆλθε X 38.10. In the latter passage, we deviate from the text of Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990, who reads ἐπῆλθε with the manuscripts; ἐπεξῆλθε is an emendation proposed by Siebelis 1822–1828 and accepted e.g. by Spiro 1903. There is also an isolated διεξήει III 10.5.

[33] ἐπιμνησθησόμεθα VIII 9.2; ἐπεμνήσθην I 40.1, V 26.3, VIII 6.6; ἐμνημόνευσε VII 7.7. More common are periphrases: ποιήσομαι μνήμην I 15.3, III 2.5, 15.10; ποιησόμεθα μνήμην III 2.5, V 21.1, VI 12.9, VIII 5.9, VIII 47.2; μνήμην ἐποιησάμην I 8.6, V 10.4. There are also some more unusual periphrases in which the action 'mention' is transformed into a state: (οὐκ) ἀμνημόνως ἔσχεν VI 12.5; ἔχει... τινα μνήμην X 19.5; ἔσται μνήμη V 23.5. There are also 'arrive at a mention' ἀφιξόμεθα ἐς μνήμην VII 7.4; 'denied' οὐκ ἔφην I 42.4; and 'add' μέλλει... ὁ λόγος μοι προσθήσειν III 7.5.

[34] κατέλεξα I 28.2, VI 2.1; κατηρίθμησα II 1.4, III 26.11; ἐγενεαλόγησα VIII 27.11.

[35] οὔκ εἰμι πρόθυμος ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς σημῆναι I 22.7; οὐκ ἤπειγεν ὁ λόγος με ἐνταῦθα δηλῶσαι II 19.1; οἰκειότερα ὄντα ἑτέρῳ λόγῳ παρίημι ‹ἐν› τῷδε II 19.8; οὔ μοι κατὰ καιρὸν ἦν ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ τῇ παρούσῃ δηλῶσαι III 3.5; ἀποθησόμεθα αὐτῶν ἕκαστον ἐς τὸ οἰκεῖον τοῦ λόγου VIII 6.3; οὔ με ἀπὸ τῶν ἐς Ὀρχομενίους ἐχόντων εἰκὸς ἦν χωρίζειν IX 32.5.

[36] Cf. Ebeling 1913: 138f.; see also Elsner 1995: 137–40.

information – albeit in an abridged form – in a context in which it might not have presented itself otherwise for the reader. Further, they reveal that the narrator is in control of his material, that he has a clear comprehension of what he is going to treat where, and that the locations for divulging specific pieces of information are carefully chosen.

However, a number of the cross-references counteract this image of a narrator exerting control over his material. These are the action verb cross-references with the subject in the third person. They rather suggest the opposite: the material is controlling the narrator. This impression is created by way of the choice of subject in the cross-references. It has been mentioned above that the subject of the verbs in the references is not exclusively the first person of Ego the writer. A considerable number of the references have their verb in the third person. What is remarkable in this, is not the fact that the first person is not used exclusively, but the fact that when the third person is preferred, we find not only impersonal expressions like, for example, the following:

> … δεδήλωται μὲν ἤδη μοι…
> … has already been shown by me…[37]

But one also (and more frequently than impersonal expressions) finds phrases like

> … δεδήλωκεν ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι.
> … my narrative has already shown.[38]

The aorist is more common in this sort of references, compare, for example, the following:

> … καθὰ ὁ λόγος ἐδήλωσεν ἤδη μοι.
> … as my narrative has already shown.[39]

Apart from ὁ λόγος as subject, one finds also in the same function ἡ συγγραφή, which is more or less synonymous with λόγος. Compare, for example, the following passage from the beginning of the long narrative about the invasion of the Gauls, explaining in detail where the same event has been treated previously:

---

[37] I 29.14. On perfect in the references, cf. further above.

[38] I 41.6.

[39] VIII 25.2.

… ἔχει μέν τινα μνήμην καὶ ἡ ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἡμῖν τὸ Ἀττικὸν συγγραφή…

… also the part of my narrative dealing with the *bouleuterion* in Attica has some
mention…[40]

The subject of the cross-references may also be some more or less well defined
part of the λόγος, such as:

… διδάξει μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Ἀρκάδας…

… the part of my narrative dealing with the Arcadians will teach…[41]

Frequently occurring are also τὰ ἐς… (ἔχοντα)-phrases in which case one can
easily supply τοῦ λόγου, as in the following passage from the biography of
Pyrrhus of Epirus:

… δεδήλωκεν ἤδη μοι τὰ ἐς Λυσίμαχον ἔχοντα.

… the part dealing with Lysimachus has already shown.[42]

Considering how prone the author of the *Periegesis* is to vary the expression in
general, his attempts to vary the cross-referencing phrases are understandable. A
particularly noteworthy feature of the different ways in which the cross-
references are made in the *Periegesis*, is the fact that the narrator chooses to use
not only impersonal expressions, which would make the intrusion minimal,
slipping past a reader's eyes more or less unnoticed. In a number of references
he also makes the narrative itself, in the form of λόγος or synonymous
expressions, the subject; thereby an alter ego of sorts is created.[43] Thereby the
cross-references become more conspicuous. The effect is curious. Instead of the
narrator commenting on what he will discuss or has discussed in the course of
his narrative, one finds comments which explain what the λόγος, which appears
almost to be an autonomous agent, has discussed or will discuss. In some

---

[40] X 19.5.

[41] V 15.4.

[42] I 11.6.

[43] Herein Pausanias may be imitating Herodotus. In Herodotus, too, the λόγος occasionally
appears to be dominating over the narrator, cf. e.g. 2.3.2 τὰ δ' ἂν ἐπιμνησθέω αὐτῶν, ὑπὸ
τοῦ λόγου ἐξαναγκαζόμενος ἐπιμνησθήσομαι 'the mention I will make of them, I make
under the compulsion of the narrative' and 4.30.1 προσθήκας γὰρ δή μοι ὁ λόγος ἐξ ἀρχῆς
ἐδίζητο 'my narrative has been seeking out additions from the beginning'. On this trait in
Herodotus' *Histories*, cf. Dewald 1987: 165f., and Brock 2003: 8f. The narrator of the *Syrian
Goddess* does not appear to have imitated this peculiar feature of the Herodotean narrative.

references, in which the first person is the subject, one can detect the power of the λόγος exerting itself over the narrator. Compare:

> … μνήμην καὶ τῶνδε ποιησόμεθα ὁμοῦ τῷ λόγῳ μεταβάντι ἐς…
> … these, too, I will talk about, as soon as my narrative changes to…[44]

> καὶ τὰ ἐς αὐτόν, ἐπειδὰν ἐς τοῦτο ὁ λόγος ἀφίκηται, τηνικαῦτα ἐπέξειμι.
> As soon as my narrative comes to that, I will go through in detail the matter concerning him.[45]

> … καὶ ἐς πλέον ἐπέξειμι, ἐπειδὰν ἐς αὐτὰ ὁ λόγος καθήκῃ μοι.
> … I will treat in even greater detail, as soon as my narrative comes down to that.[46]

> … γράψω προελθόντος ἐς τὰ Βοιώτιά μοι τοῦ λόγου.
> … I will write when my narrative has arrived at the Boeotian matters.[47]

In these and some other instances it is the narrator who is explicitly telling about his own activities, but the λόγος is presented as prescribing the conditions for where and when the narrator may divulge the information he possesses. In the following instance the roles of the narrator and the λόγος are reversed:

> μέλλει καὶ αὖθις ὁ λόγος μοι προσθήσειν προελθόντι ἐς τὴν Μεσσηνίαν συγγραφήν.
> My narrative will make additions (to this) when I have come to the Messenian story.[48]

But more common than the above quoted mixed forms, are references with either a first or third person subject throughout. The remarkable instances are those in which the λόγος or something similar appear as the subject; particularly considering the fact that the narrator thereby allows the λόγος to usurp the role of the protagonist in narrating the *Periegesis*. Compare, further, the following passage:

---

[44] III 2.5.

[45] IV 6.5. Is this imitation with variation of Herodotus 6.19.2 τὸ μέν νυν ἐς τοὺς Ἀργείους ἔχον, ἐπεὰν κατὰ τοῦτο γένωμαι τοῦ λόγου, τότε μνησθήσομαι 'as soon as I come to that part of the narrative, I will speak of the matter concerning the Argives'?

[46] IX 2.4.

[47] I 24.5. See also γράψω τοῦ λόγου μοι κατελθόντος ἐς τοὺς Ἀργείους I 29.7.

[48] III 7.5.

τὰ μὲν οὖν Κρεσφόντου καὶ τῶν Ἀριστοδήμου παίδων οὐκ ἤπειγεν ὁ λόγος με ἐνταῦθα δηλῶσαι.

The narrative did not urge me to put forth here the story of Cresphontes and Aristodemus.[49]

What does this passage say about the extent to which the narrator controls his material? Of course, in the normal turn of phrase, 'my narrative' (ὁ λόγος μοι) is a thin disguise of 'I', but in this instance we have 'the narrative' telling 'me' what to do. It is an interesting choice of expression. Is it Ego, the narrator, or is it the narrative itself, the material of his *Periegesis*, that is laying down the rules for its course? It is, of course, the narrator who is doing the telling. The fact that the narrative itself is presented as the one making some of the decisions probably signifies that the narrator's presentation of the material is not wholly arbitrary, and that there is some higher authority whose commands the narrator willingly follows when need be and to whom he defers some of the decisions surrounding the narration.

3.3 Organising

Cross-referring to future and previous treatments is the most frequently occurring and distinct activity of Ego the writer; frequent also are his organising activities. Strictly speaking, the cross-referring activity is also an organising activity. But, as distinct from the cross-references, the organisatory statements that are considered in the present section are used in order to articulate the joints where one segment of the *Periegesis* ends and another begins. That is, organisatory statements clarify the structure on a smaller scale than the cross-references, which mostly tie together pieces of the narrative that are far apart.

For present purposes, we limit the investigation of the organisatory statements to the 87 passages that contain a first person either in the form of a pronoun or a verb. There are many other passages which mark a transition from one subject matter to another, but these are not taken into account. Some of the passages counted here have already been enumerated among the cross-references. The reason for the double-count is the fact that the passages in

---

[49] II 19.1.

question consist of at least two propositions, one cross-referring forwards or backwards, the other saying something about the subject matter at hand.

The phraseology of the organisatory statements which contain a first person is not as stereotyped as the phraseology of the cross-references. There are not two identical phrases among the organisatory statements with a first person. If one were to include the statements without any first person, one would detect recurring phrases, but with the same kind of variation as in the cross-references.[50] Among the organisatory statements, just as among the cross-references, one finds not only instances with the first person as subject or impersonal passives with an indefinite subject, but also instances in which the λόγος functions as the subject. Considering the fact that the organisatory statements do not appear to have been as hard to vary as the cross-references, the use of λόγος as subject in the organisatory statements, too, might indicate that a striving for variation is not the only reason why λόγος is occasionally used as subject in the cross-references.

Some of the organisatory statements with the λόγος as the subject deserve particular attention. To the cross-reference quoted above in which the narrator states that 'the narrative did not urge me to put forth here…' one may join a number of organisatory statements in which the narrative appears to be controlling the narrator. The most interesting instance is found in the description of Olympia. It is a complex description containing several organisatory statements marking the transitions between the descriptions/enumerations of the different sets of monuments in the Altis.[51] Having completed the description of the sacred monuments, and before proceeding to the description of the victor-statues, the following long and detailed organisatory statement is inserted. Despite its length, the whole passage will be quoted *in extenso*:

> Ἔπεται δέ μοι τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐς τὰ ἀναθήματα τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ἤδη ποιήσασθαι καὶ
> ἵππων ἀγωνιστῶν μνήμην καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἀθλητῶν τε καὶ ἰδιωτῶν ὁμοίως. τῶν δὲ

---

[50] For example, among the concluding phrases, one may note the use of the third person singular imperative passive, e.g. εἰρήσθω five times (I 24.6, 28.11, 33.7, VI 7.1, X 9.12) and ἐξητάσθω thrice (II 22.3, III 18.6, V 3.1); only two are identical (II 22.3 = III 18.6).

[51] V 14.4 (transition from the great altar of Zeus to other altars in the Altis; on this passage, cf. chapter 1), V 16.1 (the Heraeon), V 21.1 (statues of Zeus), V 25.1 (statues of/dedications to other gods). Cf. below chapter 6 for a discussion on V 10.1, a passage which produces a transition from the historical introduction to the description of the Altis.

νικησάντων Ὀλυμπίασιν οὐχ ἁπάντων εἰσὶν ἑστηκότες ἀνδριάντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποδειξάμενοι λαμπρὰ ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλοις ἔργοις, ὅμως οὐ τετυχήκασιν εἰκόνων· **τούτους ἐκέλευσεν ἀφεῖναί με ὁ λόγος, ὅτι οὐ κατάλογός ἐστιν ἀθλητῶν ὁπόσοις γεγόνασιν Ὀλυμπικαὶ νῖκαι, ἀναθημάτων δὲ ἄλλων τε καὶ εἰκόνων συγγραφή.** οὐδὲ ὁπόσων ἑστήκασιν ἀνδριάντες, οὐδὲ τούτοις πᾶσιν ἐπέξειμι, ἐπιστάμενος ὅσοι τῷ παραλόγῳ τοῦ κλήρου καὶ οὐχ ὑπὸ ἰσχύος ἀνείλοντο ἤδη τὸν κότινον, ὁπόσοις δὲ ἢ αὐτοῖς [εἶχεν] ἐς δόξαν ἢ τοῖς ἀνδριᾶσιν ὑπῆρχεν ἄμεινον ἑτέρων πεποιῆσθαι, τοσαῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς μνησθήσομαι.[52]

After announcing that the treatment of the statues of the contestants follows on the description of the dedications made to gods, the narrator comments on the constraints he finds himself under in describing the statues of the victors in the Olympic games. Pointing to the fact that not all victors, not even those who were particularly distinguished, have statues, the narrator explains:

> The narrative demanded that I leave out them [i.e. those who do not have any statue], since it is not a catalogue of all those who have won Olympic victories, but an account of dedications in general and of statues in particular.

In other words, the narrative (ὁ λόγος) dictates what Ego may and may not include in it, since it is of a certain character. It is an account (συγγραφή) of statues and dedications, and not a catalogue (κατάλογος) of victorious athletes.

However, these restrictions on the account do not suffice. In the following, the narrator goes on to explain that he will not treat every statue, since not every victor-statue has been erected in commemoration of a noble victory in the games. Hence, he says in conclusion of the organisatory statement, 'I for one will mention' all those who fulfil either one of the following conditions: (1) exceptional personal fame, (2) statue artistically well executed.[53] That is, the basis of the enumeration is the physical objects that can be seen in the Altis. If there is no statue or some other memorial of the person or event to be seen, there will not be any mention of the person or event in question in this context, no matter how famous a victor or person it is that is left out of the account. The

---

[52] VI 1.1f.

[53] There are not many exceptions to the rule that the account will be restricted to victor statues in VI 1.1–18.7. In the following passages statues are mentioned that are not explicitly said to have been erected in commemoration of a victory in the games: VI 11.1, 14.9, 15.10, 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.5, 17.3, 17.7–9, 18.2. However, these exceptions have been justified in one of the earlier organisatory statements, cf. V 25.1.

narrator presents these constraints as a command of the narrative on him. The constraints set forth in this organisatory statement, furthermore, hold true for the descriptions both of Olympia and of the rest of Greece – indeed, it confirms two earlier organisatory statements of the narrator.[54] Further, in the enumeration of the victor statues in the Altis the same general restriction applies as in the rest of the *Periegesis*, i.e. not every statue, not every monument (nor every story) is qualified for the narrative. Selectivity has to be exercised: statues of those who have some claim to renown, or statues that are artistically better executed than others are what 'I for one will mention'.[55] The last part of this organisatory statement is a more elaborate variant of the recurring formula 'noteworthy', which is a phrase that, of course, implies selectivity.

In another passage in which the λόγος is the subject, the narrative is presented as 'bringing me back' towards Stymphalus and the border between Pheneus and Stymphalus.[56] This turn of phrase is rather unusual in the sense that the λόγος appears almost to be operating in the physical geography, guiding Ego's steps. The only other instance we have been able to detect of the λόγος all but leaving the level of the text, is the following remark in the transition from the description of the great altar of Zeus to the description of the other altars in the Altis:

> ἐπακολουθήσει δὲ ὁ λόγος μοι τῇ ἐς αὐτοὺς τάξει, καθ᾽ ἥντινα Ἠλεῖοι θύειν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν νομίζουσι.
>
> My narrative will follow the order in which the Eleans are wont to sacrifice on the altars.[57]

There are three more instances in which the λόγος appears to be imposing its will on the narrator. They are all construed with the same verb:

---

[54] Cf. I 39.3 and III 11.1. These two organisatory, almost pretermitting, statements contain comments on the selectivity that has to be exercised in the composition of the *Periegesis*. Moreover, they both have the λόγος as subject, too.

[55] The relation between the λόγος and Ego appear in this instance to be rather like that between Ego and a certain man from Mysia, who informed Ego about the gigantic size of a skeleton found on the shore near the site of ancient Troy, and 'demanded that I' (με… ἐκέλευε) judge its size by comparing its kneecaps with the size of children's discus, I 35.4f.

[56] VIII 22.1 ἐπανάγει δὲ ὁ λόγος με ἐπὶ Στύμφαλον καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς Φενεατῶν καὶ Στυμφαλίων ὅρους, τὸ ὀνομαζόμενον Γερόντειον.

[57] V 14.4.

ἀπαιτεῖ δὲ ὁ λόγος δηλῶσαι καὶ τὰ ἐς Ἄτταλον ἔχοντα, ὅτι καὶ οὗτος τῶν ἐπωνύμων ἐστὶν Ἀθηναίοις.

The narrative demands that I also set forth the matters concerning Attalus, since he, too, is one of the Athenian eponyms.[58]

καί με ὁ λόγος ἀπαιτεῖ πρότερα εἰπεῖν τὰ ἐς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τῆς ὁδοῦ.

The narrative demands that I first speak about the name of the road.[59]

ἀπαιτεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ὁ λόγος τό τε Παλλάντιον…

Next, the narrative demands of me Pallantium…[60]

Apart from the narrative, i.e. the λόγος, itself, there appear to be other outside authorities influencing the narrator in his writing down of the *Periegesis*. In some passages the material appears to be imposing itself upon the narrator, demanding of him a certain coverage and direction.[61]

Occasionally, the narrator appears to be forced to confess that he has to stop, since he is on the verge of entering such material that cannot be divulged to all and sundry. On more than one occasion, the narrator signals that he himself has not been able to decide where the dividing-line between admissible and prohibited information goes. He is stopped by a dream:

πρόσω δὲ ἰέναι με ὡρμημένον τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου καὶ ὁπόσων ἐξήγησιν ἔχει τὸ Ἀθήνησιν ἱερόν, καλούμενον δὲ Ἐλευσίνιον, ἐπέσχεν ὄψις ὀνείρατος· ἃ δὲ ἐς πάντας ὅσιον γράφειν, ἐς ταῦτα ἀποτρέψομαι.

As I started to go further into this tradition and into all the stuff that the sanctuary in

---

[58] I 8.1. In this passage, there is no 'I', viz. με or ἡμᾶς, in the manuscripts. We count it nonetheless among the organisatory statements containing a first person. The με or ἡμᾶς that is necessary in order to complete the syntax, has probably fallen out in the manuscript tradition and should be restored. Cf. also I 6.1, where the narrator for the first time promises a treatment of Attalus I of Pergamum; here, the reason professed is that the history of those times has become obscure.

[59] III 12.1.

[60] VIII 43.1. It has been suspected that an infinitive has fallen out in this passage; Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 suggest the reading … ὁ λόγος ⟨δηλῶσαι⟩ κτλ.

[61] I 26.4, V 16.1, 20.4, VI 4.5, 6.4, VIII 44.1; cf. also the following instances without any first person: VIII 12.8, 19.4, 35.9, 36.1.

Athens (the so-called Eleusinium) had to be set forth, a dream vision stopped me. I will turn back to material that one may write on to everybody.[62]

That is, when the narrator was on the verge of entering into forbidden territory, a dream stopped him. Later on in the first book, in his (non-)description of the sanctuary in Eleusis the narrator explains that his dream – is it the same dream as the previous one? – forbade him to write about what was inside the wall.[63] In this instance the explicit pretermission, without any first person, is accompanied by a comment in which the narrator explains why he accepts the order of his dream: 'obviously the uninitiated should not hear about things that they are prevented from seeing.'

When it comes to matters of religion, there are several passages in which the narrator makes it clear that he is silent. The majority of these belong to the following section. Two further instances of religious silence belong to the organisatory statements. They both signal that the narrator is in possession of some information that will be withheld, but that there are some other pieces of information that may be divulged.[64]

The most common type of organisatory statements are those in which the narrator declares in some way or other that the information conveyed to the reader is but a piece of all the information he possesses. Statements of selectivity are very frequent indeed. The selectivity exercised in the *Periegesis* has been noticed by many scholars.[65] Most organisatory statements of selectivity do not contain any first person. They are simple remarks to the effect that what follows – or, more seldom, has been treated – is '(most) worthy of mention' or '(most)

---

[62] I 14.3. In this passage ὁπόσων ἐξήγησιν ἔχει is problematic. The manuscripts read ὁπόσα ἐξήγησιν which does not make sense. The above quoted text is a conjecture of Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990. The conjecture of Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, ἐς ἐξήγησιν ὁπόσων, is easier to make sense of, but the corruption would be difficult to explain; cf. also their *app. crit. ad loc.* for the other emendations proposed.

[63] I 38.7 τὰ δὲ ἐντὸς τοῦ τείχους τοῦ ἱεροῦ τό τε ὄνειρον ἀπεῖπε γράφειν, καὶ τοῖς οὐ τελεσθεῖσιν, ὁπόσων θέας εἴργονται, δῆλα δήπου μηδὲ πυθέσθαι μετεῖναί σφισιν.

[64] IV 33.5 and IX 25.5f.

[65] On the selectivity in the *Periegesis*, cf. e.g. Kreilinger 1997; cf. also Sutton 2001 for an interesting study of how the modern presentation of the landscape in the area of Nemea is influenced by the selectivity of the *Periegesis*.

worth seeing'.[66] In a sense, they are simultaneously organisatory statements declaring selectivity and evaluative comments estimating the quality of the traditions or objects treated.

Among the organisatory statements expressing selectivity with a first person, there are not only some 'worthy of mention', 'worth seeing', but also four instances in which the grounds of inclusion is presented as being the 'marvel' experienced by the narrator vis-à-vis the phenomenon in question.[67] Once the narrator states that he chooses to relate the tradition that the majority agrees upon.[68] In another passage he declares that all the diverging traditions will be included.[69]

All organisatory statements expressing selection convey basically the same message. The narrator possesses a big mass of information, but, for different reasons, he is willing – or, perhaps, compelled – to serve only small slices of it to the reader. When specified, the reason why some pieces of information is left out varies. One reason is that the information in question has been or will be given more fully, i.e. the organisatory statement is combined with a cross-reference.[70] Another is that the information is well known, i.e. the narrator explains that he will leave out certain matters since they are well known, instead he will speak about other things.[71] There are also instances in which the narrator declares that he will speak of one thing, but not about an other without any apparent reason – the curious thing is that, had the narrator not made these

---

[66] Cf. e.g. ἀξιόλογος II 13.3, 29.1, V 12.6, 21.1, VI 17.1, VIII 47.2, 54.7; ἄξιος λόγου I 27.1, II 2.6, 15.1, 17.6, 35.4, III 10.2, V 24.7; ἄξιος μνήμης VI 23.1; ἄξιος θέας I 1.3, 14.1, 17.2, 17.5, 44.4, II 1.7, 3.5, 20.7, 23.7, 24.3, III 18.7, 19.6, 22.4, 23.10, 25.10, 26.11, IV 31.10, VIII 13.2, IX 20.4, 23.5, X 28.4, 32.1.

[67] Worthy of mention: II 34.11, VIII 32.1, IX 39.12, X 9.1; worth seeing: I 35.5, III 21.2, VIII 10.1, X 32.3; marvel: II 5.8, 34.2, IV 35.11, VIII 16.4.

[68] II 12.3 διάφορα δὲ ἐς τοὺς Φλιασίους τὰ πολλὰ εἰδὼς εἰημένα, τοῖς μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὡμολογημένοις χρήσομαι.

[69] X 38.1 ἐς δὲ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τῶν Λοκρῶν τούτων διάφορα ἤκουσα, ὁμοίως δὲ ἅπαντα δηλώσω. The narrator's handling of the many divergent traditions in Greece will be discussed further below chapter 5.

[70] II 19.1, 32.10, III 3.2, IV 3.3, V 21.1, VI 2.1, VIII 6.3, X 9.1f., 19.5.

[71] I 23.10, II 15.4, 30.4, 30.9, III 17.7.

declarations the reader would probably not have given a second thought to the information withheld.[72]

The beginning of the description of the throne of Apollo in Amyclae is peculiar. The narrator begins by specifying that he will pass over the questions of the schooling of the artist and the date of the throne, and next states that 'I have seen the throne and will write about it as it was'.[73] That is, the narrator begins by alluding to information that will not be discussed further. He will, instead, dwell on the throne itself. However, after only a sentence, the narrator cuts the description short, with the comment that a detailed description would annoy the reader; a summary will suffice, since most is well known already.[74] That is, in a short span the narrator twice explicitly states that he will serve but a slice of information to the reader. The first time without any apparent reason – one may suspect that he did not have any information to divulge –, the second time ostensibly because he is anxious not to bore the reader by repeating information that is well known.

Another common type of organisatory statements are those that are to the effect that the narrator possesses two pieces of information, both of which he will divulge. Such organisatory statements function mainly as transitional phrases between two narrative segments; in a more or less elaborated manner they then express 'a has been said, b follows'. We will single out one of these:

φέρε δή, ἐποιησάμεθα γὰρ βωμοῦ τοῦ μεγίστου μνήμην, ἐπέλθωμεν καὶ τὰ ἐς ἅπαντας ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τοὺς βωμούς.

---

[72] I 14.1: he will speak about Triptolemus but not about Deiope – this is the only time her name occurs in the whole of the *Periegesis*; and 24.4: he will speak about the rituals surrounding the sacrifice to Zeus Polieus, but he will not give the reason why. This is especially remarkable given the fact that later (I 28.10) at least some part of the reason behind the peculiar ritual is given. Some further instances of explicit selectivity with a first person are I 29.10, 37.1, II 33.3f., V 5.1.

[73] III 18.9 ὅτου δὲ οὗτος ὁ Βαθυκλῆς μαθητὴς ἐγεγόνει, καὶ τὸν θρόνον ἐφ' ὅτου βασιλεύοντος Λακεδαιμονίων ἐποίησε, τάδε μὲν παρίημι, τὸν θρόνον δὲ εἶδόν τε καὶ τὰ ἐς αὐτὸν ὁποῖα ἦν γράψω.

[74] III 18.10 τὰ δὲ ἐπειργασμένα καθ' ἕκαστον ἐπ' ἀκριβὲς διελθεῖν ὄχλον τοῖς ἐπιλεξομένοις παρέξειν ἔμελλεν· ὡς δὲ δηλῶσαι συλλαβόντι, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ἄγνωστα τὰ πολλὰ ἦν κτλ.

Come, since we have mentioned the greatest altar, let us go through all the altars in Olympia.[75]

To our knowledge there is only one other passage in which the narrator uses the form of an exhortation in the frame narrative.[76] The present passage is probably intended to remind the reader of two passages in Herodotus.[77]

More commonly, this sort of organisatory statement functions as an introductory comment, stating, again in a more or less elaborate form, '*b* will be discussed, but first comes *a*'.[78] These organisatory statements appear to have been prompted by a desire to clarify to the reader the order of the exposition. There are a number of miscellaneous organisatory comments that appear to have been prompted by a similar desire to explain to the reader the order of things in the *Periegesis*.[79]

Finally, there is yet one more type of organisatory statements which appear to suggest, in one way or another, that what will follow, or has preceded, has been included into the *Periegesis* for apparently no other reason than that the narrator knows it, or has found it in some specific source.[80] Occasionally, one also finds the narrator declaring that something has been/will be mentioned because it is obscure, viz. a specific piece of information is included in order to make up for a supposed deficiency in the learning of the readers.[81] Once he adds that he expects that the reader has some interest in the information.[82]

---

[75] V 14.4. Cf. also I 4.6, 36.1, II 32.10, III 7.1, IV 29.13, VI 2.1, X 29.1, 19.5.

[76] IV 29.13 τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου τῆς χώρας καὶ πόλεων τραπώμεθα ἐς ἀφήγησιν 'Let us hereafter turn to a report of the land and cities.' This statement appears in the transition between the long historical introduction and the much shorter description of the landscape of Messenia.

[77] 2.14.1 φέρε δὲ νῦν καὶ αὐτοῖσι Αἰγυπτίοισι ὡς ἔχει φράσω and 2.105 φέρε νυν καὶ ἄλλο εἴπω περὶ τῶν Κόλχων, ὡς Αἰγυπτίοισι προσφερέες εἰσί. The Herodotean parallel has been noted by Pfundtner 1866: 55.

[78] I 13.4, 32.3, 33.7, III 1.9, IV 6.1, V 21.1, 25.1, VII 1.6, 19.1.

[79] I 43.7, IV 6.3, V 14.10, 25.1, VIII 8.1.

[80] I 23.10, 29.12, 41.7, 42.4, II 2.6f., 9.5, 21.8, 28.3, III 19.11, 24.7, 26.6, V 5.9, VI 3.8, VII 23.2, VIII 3.6, 5.11, 6.1, 23.5, X 19.3, 28.7. In some of these passages the investigatory aspect is particularly prominent; these will be discussed below in chapter 5, too.

[81] I 6.1, 23.2, 27.3, VIII 17.4, X 17.13.

[82] I 28.11; cf. also the above cited III 18.10 where a detailed treatment is cut short because of

3.4 Pretermitting

In this section passages will be discussed in which the narrator explicitly states that he possesses some piece of information, which he will not divulge to the reader. The narrator introduces into the *Periegesis* Ego's pretermitting role less frequently than the other two roles of the writer function. In the present section only instances of explicit silence are discussed. There is an endless amount of material that is left out in the *Periegesis*, but, given the structure of the work, the deliberate but implicit omissions cannot be listed, nor can they indeed be known. Ego is constantly exercising his selectivity in composing the *Periegesis*, but only occasionally does the narrator let the process of selection and exclusion behind the text become evident, as in the following passage which forms a transition from the treatment of Attica to the treatment of Megarica:

> τοσαῦτα κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀθηναίοις γνωριμώτατα ἦν ἔν τε λόγοις καὶ θεωρήμασιν, ἀπέκρινε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ λόγος μοι τὰ ἐς συγγραφὴν ἀνήκοντα.
>
> Such were in my opinion the most noteworthy of the Athenian traditions and sights.
> From the beginning, my narrative has selected from the mass those that fit in a narrative account.[83]

Certain types of explicit pretermission have been discussed already. The cross-referencing and some of the organising activities of the narratorial Ego are a kind of omission of information. Making a cross-reference to a previous or a coming treatment is an explicit omission – but only for the moment. Also, the statements of selection which were discussed above in connection with the organising role of Ego are explicit omission, even more so than the omissions of the cross-referencing role of Ego. When Ego cross-references he leaves out some material, but not permanently. But when Ego makes a selection, the material deemed unfit for the *Periegesis* is permanently lost for the reader. The reason why such statements of omission were discussed in the above section,

---

a fear to bore the readers.

[83] I 39.3; on this passage cf. also above chapter 1. Expressions of selectivity have been discussed above.

instead of being saved for the present one, is the fact that they, at the same time, are statements of inclusion – some material is preferred to other. Moreover, in the majority of the instances the narrator appears to have made his choices based on a care for the reader's interest, at least on the face of it.

The instances of explicit pretermission that have been saved for the present section differ from those discussed above in two respects: (1) these statements are statements of omission only, i.e. some material is not introduced at the same time as some other is excluded; (2) the reason for omission does not appear to have been any kind of concern for the reader. That is, in the statements of selectivity discussed under Ego's organising role, the choices of inclusion and exclusion appear to have been made in the interest of the reader – mainly, the purpose appears to have been not to bore him/her. But, in the instances of pretermission examined in the present section, the reason for omission appears to have been a wish to withdraw and create a sense of exclusivity vis-à-vis the reader. In particular, such a wish appears to be the reason for actually calling attention to the fact that some material is left out of the discussion.

One particular group among the instances of pretermission has attracted the interest of scholars, viz. the narrator's religious silences.[84] Those passages of religious silence which not only state what must be suppressed, but also include statements about what the narrator may go into, have already been discussed above. Including the passages discussed above, there are at least 13 passages in which knowledge about religious matters is implied but not conveyed to the reader.[85]

It is uncertain whether the pretermission regarding the origin of the statue of Athena Polias – did it fall from the sky or not? – is to be interpreted as religious, or as a general reluctance to go into the matter.[86] We have counted it among the religious silences. In two of the passages the fact of the

---

[84] Cf. in particular Foccardi 1987; also Dalfen 1996: 162f. and Della Santa 1999: 129f.

[85] In two or three passages the narrator obviously comments in his own person, but without using the first person, cf. I 38.7 (dream forbidding) and VIII 42.4 (common knowledge?). VIII 25.7 is problematic. It certainly contains information about religious matters that is not revealed to the readers. But, the text – … ἧς τὸ ὄνομα ἐς ἀτελέστους λέγειν οὐ νομίζουσι '… whose name they are not wont to divulge to uninitiated' – does not preclude the possibility that the narrator, too, belongs to those who are left in the dark.

[86] I 26.6 φήμη δὲ ἐς αὐτὸ ἔχει πεσεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. καὶ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ ἐπέξειμι εἴτε οὕτως εἴτε ἄλλως ἔχει.

pretermission, though explicit, is stated not quite as bluntly as in most of the instances. Speculating whether the hero called Cyamites actually was the first one to sow beans, or whether this is a made-up hero, since the invention of beans cannot be ascribed to Demeter, the narrator concludes:

> ὅστις δὲ ἤδη τελετὴν Ἐλευσῖνι εἶδεν ἢ τὰ καλούμενα Ὀρφικὰ ἐπελέξατο, οἶδεν ὃ λέγω.
>
> Whoever has seen the initiation in Eleusis or has read the so-called *Orphica*, knows what I am talking about.[87]

In other words, instead of stating 'I will not say' or the like, the narrator introduces in this instance the …-You, implying that there is a specific group of people who know exactly what he is talking about, viz. those who has been initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries.[88] Moreover, this statement appears to imply that those who do not yet belong to the …-You, very well might become one to whom the statement applies. In other words, it appears as if this pretermission encourages the addressee to find information for him/herself.

In a short exposé of differing views on the age of Eros in relation to the other gods, the narrator alludes to verses written by Pamphus and Orpheus for the Lycomidae to sing during the performance of their rites. He states that he has had the opportunity to read the poems in question, but that he will not speak of them any further.[89]

The remaining passages of religious silence fall into one of two categories: (1) out of reverent respect for the tradition, the narrator prefers to keep silent about religious matters that he professes to know;[90] (2) the narrator explicitly states that he has some specific piece of knowledge in religious matters, but, for no apparent reason, he prefers to conceal this.[91] One last instance will be singled out:

---

[87] I 37.4.

[88] On the …-You, cf. below chapter 6.

[89] IX 27.2 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπελεξάμην ἀνδρὶ ἐς λόγους ‹ἐλθὼν› δᾳδουχοῦντι. καὶ τῶν μὲν οὐ πρόσω ποιήσομαι μνήμην.

[90] II 17.4 ἀπορρητότερος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ λόγος; II 37.6 οὐχ ὅσιον ἐς ἄπαντας ἦν μοι γράψαι; VIII 37.9 ἔδεισα ἐς τοὺς ἀτελέστους γράφειν. I 14.3, IV 33.5, and IX 25.5f. which were treated above under the organising role of Ego, would belong to this sort of religious silence.

[91] I 29.2 λεγόμενον δὲ καὶ ἄλλον ἐς αὐτὰς λόγον εἰδὼς ὑπερβήσομαι; II 3.4 τὸν δὲ ἐν τελετῇ Μητρὸς ἐπὶ Ἑρμῇ λεγόμενον καὶ τῷ κριῷ λόγον ἐπιστάμενος οὐ λέγω; VIII 37.6

ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ βωμοῦ τῷ Λυκαίῳ Διὶ θύουσιν ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ· πολυπραγμονῆσαι δὲ οὔ
μοι τὰ ἐς τὴν θυσίαν ἡδὺ ἦν, ἐχέτω δὲ ὡς ἔχει καὶ ὡς ἔσχεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς.

On this altar they sacrifice to Zeus Lycaeus in secret. It did not appeal to me to inquire
into the sacrifice; may it be as it is and has been from the beginning.[92]

In like manner with the above-cited instances, this passage, too, is an instance of
explicit silence in religious matters. But, unlike the other instances, the narrator
does not vaunt information that he will not reveal to the reader. Instead, drawing
the readers' attention to the existence of a secret rite, he states that he chooses
not to pry into the secrets. Thereby the narrator makes it clear that Ego knows as
little as he is telling the reader, but that it might be possible to obtain further
information. However, had the narrator been let into the secret, he would
probably have had to keep silent.

Indeed, when it comes to religious matters, in the explicit pretermissions
Ego not only declares that he is privy to a secret that he may not divulge. In a
number of instances the explicit pretermission is of the last mentioned type, i.e.
the narrator is not included among those who know the secret, instead he may
note its existence.[93] That is, the narrator omits information because of ignorance.
Though this sort of explicit pretermission of religious matters mostly is not
expressed in the first person, they nonetheless must be mentioned here, in order
not to create a false impression of the degree to which the narrator is initiated
into the religious secrets of Greece.

The remaining instances of explicit pretermission can be divided into two
categories: those in which there is something resembling a reason for the
omission and those without one. The former category is more common than the
latter. A common reason for pretermission is reluctance to repeat well-known
facts, for example:

… ταῦτα εἰπόντος Ἡροδότου καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐπ' ἀκριβὲς οὔ μοι γράφειν κατὰ
γνώμην ἦν εὖ προειρημένα.

τὰ ἐς τούτους παρίημι ἐπιστάμενος. Also I 24.4 which was treated above under the
organising role of Ego, would belong to this sort of religious silence.

[92] VIII 38.7. Is this passage intended to be an imitation with variation of Herodotus 2.28.1
ταῦτα μέν νυν ἔστω ὡς ἔστι τε καὶ ὡς ἀρχὴν ἐγένετο 'may this be as it is and as it has
been from the beginning'?

[93] Cf. e.g. II 2.2, 7.5, 12.1, 13.4, 17.1, 29.8, 32.1, 34.10, 35.8, 38.3, III 14.5, 20.3, VII 17.9,
VIII 15.4, IX 35.3, X 32.14.

… since Herodotus has told all of this in accurate detail, I did not wish to write about matters that are well narrated.[94]

Another frequently recurring reason for pretermission is the inappropriateness of the material, for example:

… τὰς γὰρ εἰκόνας τὰς ἀφανεστέρας γράφειν οὐκ ἐθέλω…
… I do not want to write about the less distinguished statues…[95]

… παρῆκα, μὴ οὐ κατὰ καιρὸν δοκοίην γράφειν
… I have omitted, lest I should appear to write inopportunely.[96]

Some further instances of pretermission with miscellaneous or no motivation for why the material is excluded will be singled out.

In the beginning of two historical narratives in the description of Athens, both of which deal with post-Chaeronean matters, the narrator clarifies that the historical sketches are restricted to treat only material that have to do with Athens.[97] Considering the fact that many of the other historical narratives in the *Attica* are not restricted to strictly Athenian subject matter, the narrator's decision to focus his attention solely on Athens in these two historical narratives is noteworthy.

Apropos of a statue of Artemis in Hyamopolis the narrator explains that he has not revealed what it looked like. The reason for the omission of information is apparently, this time, that the narrator himself does not know: 'they usually open the sanctuary twice a year and not more often.'[98] In a curious instance the narrator states that he has decided to suppress his research into the age of Hesiod and Homer, not because it would be out of place, but because he is well aware of

---

[94] II 30.4. Other instances, which have been mentioned above, are I 23.10, II 15.4, 30.9, III 17.7. Herodotus, too, was concerned not to dwell on well-known facts, cf. e.g. 6.55.

[95] I 23.4.

[96] IV 24.3. Other instances are II 21.1, II 38.3, V 4.5, VIII 2.2.

[97] I 20.4 (the Mithridatic war leading to Sulla's capture of Athens) and 25.6 (sketching the historical backdrop to the great feats of Olympiodorus).

[98] X 35.7 σέβονται δὲ μάλιστα Ἄρτεμιν, καὶ ναὸς Ἀρτέμιδός ἐστιν αὐτοῖς· τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα ὁποῖόν τί ἐστιν οὐκ ἐδήλωσα· δὶς γὰρ καὶ οὐ πλέον ἑκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀνοιγνύναι νομίζουσιν. In this passage we follow the manuscripts and Spiro 1903 in reading οὐκ ἐδήλωσα. Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 prints οὐκ ἐδήλωσαν, which is an emendation proposed by Kuhn 1696.

the fault-finding propensities of people in general, and in particular of those who busy themselves with poetry.[99] Among the not infrequent instances of pretermission without motivation, one may single out yet another passage in which the narrator explains that he chooses to suppress what he has found out about the origins of Homer.[100]

3.5 Summary

In this chapter the roles in which the narrator introduces Ego the writer have been studied. The study has been restricted to the passages in which the voice of the narrator is explicitly heard, i.e. those in which there is either a first person pronoun or a verb in the first person, or both. The narrator introduces into the narrative Ego the writer in order to comment on its production, on the narration itself, in three different roles: the cross-referencing, organising, and pretermitting roles.

The narrator introduces Ego's cross-referencing role more than 150 times into the *Periegesis*. The narrator's cross-referencing comments are mainly concerned with helping the reader to find his/her way through the text. The cross-referencing comments consist on the one hand of reminders of what has been said ('x has been discussed'), on the other of signals beforehand of what will come ('y will be discussed').

The narrator does not introduce Ego's organising role into the *Periegesis* as often the cross-referencing one. The comments which introduce Ego in his organising as well as his cross-referencing role concern the production of the text and are largely focussed on helping the reader to find his/her way through the text. However, the Ego's organising comments work on a smaller scale; they are inserted into the text in order to signal transitions between different sections

---

[99] IX 30.3 περὶ δὲ Ἡσιόδου τε ἡλικίας καὶ Ὁμήρου πολυπραγμονήσαντι ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον οὔ μοι γράφειν ἡδὺ ἦν, ἐπισταμένῳ τὸ φιλαίτιον ἄλλων τε καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα ὅσοι κατ᾽ ἐμὲ ἐπὶ ποιήσει τῶν ἐπῶν *** καθεστήκεσαν. This statement of the narrator of the *Periegesis* is the opposite of the Herodotean declaration (7.139.1) not to withhold the truth, irrespective of the fact that it is odious in the eyes of most people.

[100] X 24.3. Other statements of pretermission without motivation are I 3.3, 29.3, IV 5.5, V 15.11, VI 25.1, VII 18.4, VIII 20.2.

in the text, to clarify the selection of material included in the *Periegesis* or the order of exposition.

Of the various roles of the writer function of Ego as narrator, Ego's pretermitting role is the least frequently occurring. The pretermitting comments differ from both the cross-referencing and the organising ones. The narrator's pretermitting comments do not appear to be concerned with helping the reader to understand the course of the narrative; they rather demonstrate the control Ego as narrator exerts over the material. They are simply statements of fact, clarifying that Ego knows this or that, but will not reveal it to the reader, for a reason which may be either accounted or unaccounted for.

Occasionally, it is not Ego in his cross-referencing, organising, or pretermitting role, but instead the λόγος, a dream or something else that is presented as dictating when, where, and what the narrator may write down in the *Periegesis*. Such passages appear to suggest that, while the narrator does have the overall control over the production of the *Periegesis*, nevertheless he has certain obligations that must be fulfilled. For instance, there is some material that must be covered, and some other that under no circumstances may be included, or some piece of information that is to be taken into the account, but in some other context. For the most part the narrator decides on such issues, but occasionally his own discernment does not appear to have been enough, whence the interventions of the λόγος etc.

Thus, the comments of Ego as narrator in his function of writer help the reader to find his/her way through the text and make him/her accept the narrator's authority over his material. Further, they create an impression that the narrator controls his material, that he has a clear comprehension of what he is going to treat where, that the locations for divulging specific pieces of information are carefully chosen, but that he knows equally well what to leave out of the *Periegesis*. And, finally, the narrator's compliance to higher authorities such as the λόγος or god-sent dreams forbidding him to divulge certain material, enhance a reader's confidence in the narrator, in the light of the fact that they make clear that the narrator does not only know when to go on, but also when to quit, and should Ego's own discernment fail, he knows to obey the higher authorities such as the λόγος.

Table 2

Cross-references in the Periegesis

I 1.4 καθὰ καὶ πρότερον εἴρηταί μοι

I 7.3 καὶ πρότερον εἴρηταί μοι

I 8.1 ἔσται μοι τῶν ἐς Λυσίμαχον παρενθήκη

I 8.6 καὶ πρότερον μνήμην ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις ἐποιησάμην

I 11.6 δεδήλωκεν ἤδη μοι τὰ ἐς Λυσίμαχον ἔχοντα

I 15.3 καὶ ὕστερον ποιήσομαι μνήμην

I 22.7 οὐκ εἰμι πρόθυμος ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς σημῆναι

I 24.1 ὧν εἴρηκα

I 24.3 λέλεκται δέ μοι καὶ πρότερον

I 24.5 γράψω προελθόντος ἐς τὰ Βοιώτιά μοι τοῦ λόγου

I 28.2 χωρὶς δὲ ἢ ὅσα κατέλεξα

I 28.5 καί μοι καὶ ταῦτα δεδήλωκεν ὁ λόγος

I 29.7 γράψω τοῦ λόγου μοι κατελθόντος ἐς τοὺς Ἀργείους

I 29.14 δεδήλωται μὲν ἤδη μοι

I 31.3 ἔτι πρότερον εἴρηταί μοι

I 31.5 γέγραπται δ᾽ ἤδη μοι

I 33.1 ἐν ἑτέρῳ λόγῳ δηλώσω

I 35.1 ἤδη μοι δεδήλωται

I 36.6 τὰ πρότερον ἔχει μοι τοῦ λόγου

I 40.1 καὶ πρότερον τούτων ἐπεμνήσθην

I 41.2 ἑτέρωθι τοῦ λόγου δηλώσω

I 41.6 δεδήλωκεν ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι

I 42.4 πρότερον ὀλίγον τούτων οὐκ ἔφην

II 1.4 πρότερον κατηρίθμησα

II 7.4 σαφέστερον ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς δηλώσω

II 14.4 ὡς εἴρηταί μοι

II 19.1 οὐκ ἤπειγεν ὁ λόγος με ἐνταῦθα δηλῶσαι

II 19.8 οἰκειότερα ὄντα ἑτέρῳ λόγῳ παρίημι ‹ἐν› τῷδε

II 19.8 ἡ Μεγαρική μοι συγγραφὴ προεδήλωσεν

II 21.2 ἤδη λέλεκταί μοι

II 21.4 ἐδήλωσα ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ

II 23.6 δεδήλωκεν ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι

II 30.10 ὡς ἐδήλωσα ἐν τοῖς πρότερον

II 31.2 ἑτέρωθι ἔσται μοι δῆλα

II 32.3 ὡς καὶ πρότερον ἔγραψα

II 32.10 ἐμήνυσεν ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι

II 34.12 ὥς ἐστιν εἰρημένον ἤδη μοι

II 36.7 ὡς καὶ τὰ πρότερα ἔχει μοι τοῦ λόγου

III 1.1 ἑτέρωθι δηλώσω

III 2.5 καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα τοῦ λόγου ποιήσομαι μνήμην

III 2.5 μνήμην καὶ τῶνδε ποιησόμεθα ὁμοῦ τῷ λόγῳ μεταβάντι ἐς τοὺς Εὐρυπωντίδας
καλουμένους

III 3.2 τοῦ λόγου μοι τὰ ἐφεξῆς δηλώσει

III 3.5 οὔ μοι κατὰ καιρὸν ἦν ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ τῇ παρούσῃ δηλῶσαι

III 5.3 προσέσται ⟨μοι⟩ τῷ ἐς Ἀγεσίλαον λόγῳ

III 6.9 πρότερον ἔτι ἐδήλωσέ μοι τὰ ἐς τὸν Σικυώνιον Ἄρατον

III 7.5 μέλλει καὶ αὖθις ὁ λόγος μοι προσθήσειν προελθόντι ἐς τὴν Μεσσηνίαν
συγγραφήν

III 9.11 ἐδήλωσέ μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Παυσανίαν

III 10.5 ἤδη μοι καὶ τάδε ἡ Σικυωνία ⟨συγ⟩γραφὴ διεξῆει

III 10.7 καθὰ καὶ πρότερον ἔγραψα

III 10.8 ἐπ᾽ ἐκείνῳ γράψω

III 11.1 ὃ δὲ ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ μοι τῇ Ἀτθίδι ἐπανόρθωμα ἐγένετο

III 11.8 καί μοι καὶ τάδε ὁ λόγος αὐτίκα ἐπέξεισι

III 12.3 ὡς ἤδη λέλεκταί μοι

III 14.2 ὁ Αἰγιναῖος ἔχει μοι λόγος

III 15.10 καὶ ὕστερον ποιήσομαι μνήμην ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ συγγραφῇ

III 17.3 ἐδήλωσα δὲ καὶ ταῦτα, ὁποῖα λέγεται, πρότερον ἔτι ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ

III 24.1 καί μοι τὰ ἐς τὸν Κλεώνυμον ἑτέρωθί ἐστιν εἰρημένα

III 26.11 κατηρίθμησα ἤδη καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Ἐλευθερολάκωσι

IV 2.3 καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτά που ⟨ὁ⟩ λόγος ἐπέξεισί μοι

IV 2.4 καί μοι δὶς ἤδη τὰ ἐς αὐτὴν ὁ λόγος ἔν τε τῇ Ἀργολίδι ἐδήλωσε καὶ ἐν τῇ
Λακωνικῇ συγγραφῇ

IV 3.3 καί μοι ταῦτα ἐγένετο ἤδη τῷ λόγῳ προσθήκη τῷ ἐς Τισαμενόν

IV 5.1 τὰ εἰρημένα ἤδη μοι

IV 5.7 ἤδη λέλεκταί μοι

IV 6.5 ἐπειδὰν ἐς τοῦτο ὁ λόγος ἀφίκηται, τηνικαῦτα ἐπέξειμι

IV 28.3 καθὰ καὶ πρότερον ἐδήλωσα ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ

IV 29.1 ἐν τοῖς Σικυωνίοις ἔγραψα ἤδη λόγοις

IV 29.12 ἡμῖν καὶ ὕστερον ὁ Ἀρκαδικὸς λόγος ἐπέξεισι

IV 31.7 ἑτέρωθι δηλώσω

IV 31.9 καί μοι καὶ ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς προτέροις ἐστὶν ἤδη δεδηλωμένα

IV 35.2 ἐδήλωσα δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν λόγοις

IV 35.4 πρότερον ἔτι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἐδήλωσα

V 4.5 ἐν τοῖς ἔχουσιν ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν τοῦ λόγου δηλώσω

V 4.8 ἐγὼ πρότερον ἔτι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐς Λακεδαιμονίους ἐδήλωσα

V 8.5 κατὰ τὰ ἤδη μοι λελεγμένα

V 10.4 μνήμην καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι ἐποιησάμην συγγραφῇ, τὰ Ἀθήνησιν ἐπεξιὼν
     μνήματα

V 14.6 γράψομεν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς Λετριναίοις

V 14.8 ὀλίγῳ μέν τι ἡμῖν πρότερόν ἐστιν εἰρημένα

V 15.4 διδάξει μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Ἀρκάδας

V 15.9 κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ἤδη μοι

V 16.4 ἐν τοῖς ἔχουσιν ἐς Ἀργείους ἐδήλωσα

V 18.8 κατὰ τὰ προειρημένα μοι καὶ ἐν τῇ Κορινθίᾳ συγγραφῇ

V 21.1 ποιησόμεθα καὶ ὕστερον μνήμην

V 23.5 ἡμῖν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα ἔσται μνήμη

V 24.6 ὁ ἐφεξῆς μοι λόγος δηλώσει

V 26.3 καὶ ὀλίγῳ πρότερον ἐπεμνήσθην

V 27.9 δηλώσει μοι τὰ ἐς Φωκέας τοῦ λόγου

VI 1.6 πρότερον ἔτι ἐδήλωσα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις οἳ ἐς τοὺς βασιλέας τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων
     ἔχουσι

VI 2.1 χωρὶς γὰρ ἢ ὅσους αὐτῶν κατέλεξα ἤδη

VI 2.4 καὶ ἐς πλέον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐς Ἀρκάδας ἐπέξειμι

VI 3.8 τῇ ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς προσέσται μοι συγγραφῇ

VI 4.10 καὶ ἐν τοῖς Σπαρτιατικοῖς λόγοις ἐς πλέον ἡμῖν δεδήλωται

VI 8.5 προσέσται μοι καὶ ταῦτα τῷ ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς λόγῳ

VI 10.8 ἑτέρωθι [δὴ] δηλώσω τοῦ λόγου

VI 11.4 προεδήλωσεν ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι

VI 12.5 καί μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ πρότερα οὔτε τῶν ἐς Ἄρατον οὔτε τῶν ἐς Ἀρέα
     ἀμνημόνως ἔσχεν

VI 12.9 ποιησόμεθα μνήμην καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑστέροις τοῦ λόγου

VI 14.9 ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἐδήλωσα

62

VI 15.6 ἐδήλωσα δὲ ὀλίγῳ τι πρότερον

VI 15.10 δεδήλωκεν [δὲ] ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι

VI 17.1 κατὰ τὰ ἡμῖν εἰρημένα

VI 20.1 κατὰ τὰ ἤδη λελεγμένα μοι

VI 22.5 κατὰ τὰ ἤδη λελεγμένα μοι

VII 3.4 προεδήλωσέ μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Λυσίμαχον

VII 7.4 καὶ αὖθις ἐν λόγοις τοῖς Ἀρκαδικοῖς ἀφιξόμεθα ἐς μνήμην

VII 7.7 ἐμνημόνευσε δέ μοι καὶ πρότερον ὁ λόγος ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ

VII 8.5 καὶ ἐς πλέον ἐπέξεισιν αὖθίς μοι τὰ ἐς Ἀρκάδας

VIII 4.6 πρότερον ἔτι ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ τῇ Ἀργολίδι ἐδήλωσα

VIII 5.1 τάδε γὰρ ἐφαίνετο εἰκότα εἶναί μοι μᾶλλον ἢ ὁ πρότερος λόγος, ἐν ᾧ
βασιλεύειν τε Ἀχαιῶν τηνικαῦτα Ὀρέστην ἔγραψα

VIII 5.9 ἐς πλέον μνήμην ποιησόμεθα ἐν τοῖς Τεγεατικοῖς

VIII 6.3 ἀποθησόμεθα αὐτῶν ἕκαστον ἐς τὸ οἰκεῖον τοῦ λόγου

VIII 6.6 ἐπεμνήσθην καὶ ἔτι πρότερον

VIII 9.1 ἐπιμνησθησόμεθα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα

VIII 14.7 ἔδειξεν ἤδη μοι τοῦ ἐς Σπαρτιάτας λόγου τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγάλματος τοῦ Ὑπάτου
Διός

VIII 23.2 ἐδήλωσα δὲ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐς Ὀρχομενίους

VIII 25.2 καθὰ ὁ λόγος ἐδήλωσεν ἤδη μοι

VIII 25.11 καὶ ἐδήλωσα ἐν τοῖς Ἐπιδαυρίων

VIII 27.11 ἐγενεαλόγησα δὲ ἤδη

VIII 27.16 δηλώσει τοῦ λόγου μοι τὰ ἐς Φιλοποίμενα

VIII 27.17 κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ἤδη μοι

VIII 30.4 δηλώσει μοι τὰ ἐς Φιγαλέας τοῦ λόγου

VIII 31.1 καθότι ἐδήλωσα ἤδη καὶ ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ συγγραφῇ

VIII 32.5 καὶ [ἐς] ὕστερον ἐπέξεισιν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος

VIII 35.7 προεδήλωσεν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος

VIII 37.1 δηλώσω καὶ τοῦτο, ἢν ἐς τοῦ Φωκικοῦ λόγου τὰ ἔχοντα ἐς Δελφοὺς ἀφικώμεθα

VIII 39.2 καὶ πρότερον ἔτι ἐσήμαινεν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος

VIII 41.9 ἐδίδαξε δὲ ὁ λόγος ἤδη μοι

VIII 47.3 ποιησόμεθα καὶ ὕστερον μνήμην

VIII 48.2 ἤδη τὴν αἰτίαν ἀπέδωκα ἐν τοῖς ἐς Ἠλείους

VIII 48.2 καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔπειτα δηλώσω

VIII 52.5 ἐδήλωσεν ἤδη μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Σικυωνίους

VIII 53.7 ὡς καὶ πρότερον ἐδήλωσα

IX 2.4 καὶ ἐς πλέον ἐπέξειμι, ἐπειδὰν ἐς αὐτὰ ὁ λόγος καθήκῃ μοι

IX 2.7 καί μοι τὰ ἐς αὐτὴν ἤδη, τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ ὁποῖα αὐτὸς εἴκαζον, ἔστιν εἰρημένα

IX 5.5 τὰ δὲ ἐφεξῆς μοι τοῦ λόγου προεδήλωσεν ἡ Σικυωνία συγγραφή

IX 6.5 εἴρηται [εἴρηται] δέ μοι καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ

IX 14.5 καί μοι τὰ ἐς τὸν οἰκισμὸν ἐδήλωσε τὰ ἐς αὐτοὺς ἔχοντα Μεσσηνίους

IX 19.2 πρότερον ἔτι ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ τῇ Μεγαρίδι ἐδήλωσα

IX 19.4 τὰ ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἔχοντα ἐδήλωσέ μοι τοῦ λόγου

IX 23.7 δηλώσει μοι τὰ ἔχοντα ἐς Λοκροὺς τοῦ λόγου

IX 24.3 προσέσται καὶ αὐτὰ τῇ Ὀρχομενίᾳ συγγραφῇ

IX 27.3 ἑτέρωθι ἤδη μοι δεδήλωται

IX 32.5 οὔ με ἀπὸ τῶν ἐς Ὀρχομενίους ἐχόντων εἰκὸς ἦν χωρίζειν

IX 39.14 ἐδήλωσα ἐν τοῖς προτέροις τοῦ λόγου

IX 41.2 ἐδήλωσεν ἤδη μοι τὰ ἐς Ἀρκάδας ἔχοντα

X 9.2 ἐν λόγῳ σφᾶς ἐδήλωσα τῷ ἐς Ἠλείους

X 19.5 ἔχει μέν τινα μνήμην καὶ ἡ ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἡμῖν τὸ Ἀττικὸν συγγραφή

X 20.5 καθὰ ἐδήλωσα καὶ ἐν τοῖς προτέροις τοῦ λόγου

X 24.4 ἐστιν ἡμῖν ἑτέρωθι εἰρημένα

X 31.10 ἐδήλωσε ⟨δέ⟩ μοι τὰ πρότερα τοῦ λόγου

X 32.2 ἐδήλωσα ὀλίγον τι ἔμπροσθεν

X 32.10 καί μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἔχοντα ἐς Θηβαίους ἐδήλωσε

X 36.6 ἐδήλωσα δὲ ἀρχομένης τῆς ἐς Φωκέας ⟨συγγραφῆς⟩

X 37.4 ἐδήλωσέ μοι τὰ ἐς Ἠλείους τοῦ λόγου

X 38.6 ἐδήλωσα δὲ ἐν τοῖς προτέροις τοῦ λόγου

X 38.10 ἐπεξῆλθέ μοι καὶ ἐς πλέον ἡ Μεσσηνία συγγραφή

4 Dater

4.1 Introduction

Under the dater function of Ego as narrator we consider the more than 400 instances in which the narrator refers to his own time. These passages fall into two large categories. When using Ego as a temporal point of reference, the narrator speaks of things and states and processes of the past that either continue or do not continue into the 'now' in which he is writing down the *Periegesis*. These will be discussed below under the two distinct roles of Ego the dater: marking continuity and marking discontinuity. But first some preliminary remarks.

Under the dater function, we have included not only prepositional phrases that contain a first person pronoun,[1] but also phrases without any first person.[2] The reason for this breach of the general limitations we have put on the investigation of Ego, is that the reference to Ego's temporal situation in the phrases without any first person is just as evident as in the ones with a first person pronoun. As has been mentioned above, also in the other functions of Ego there are instances in which the narrator appears to make comments in his own voice without using the first person. Some have been mentioned above, and some will be mentioned below, but they do not receive any systematic treatment. It is not easy to determine when we are dealing with 'covert narratorial intrusions' (as distinguished from the explicit, or overt, ones, viz. those which contain a first person) or the simple routine descriptions, identifications of settings, things, beings, persons, causes and the like that constitute a great part of the text of the *Periegesis*.[3] Hence the general limitation of this study to those

---

[1] ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς, κατ᾽ ἐμέ/καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν, ἄχρι/μέχρι ἐμοῦ/ἡμῶν.

[2] ἐς τόδε, ἔτι, (οὐκ) ἔτι, νῦν, (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν.

[3] Cf. Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 97–101 on different signs of overtness in narratives that have

passages which are obvious narratorial/authorial intrusions by way of the presence of the first person. Naturally, not all occurrences of ἐς τόδε or νῦν and the like refer to the temporal situation of the narrator; those that do not are, of course, excluded.[4]

It needs to be further clarified that by the dater function, we do not mean the instances in which the narrator actually gives an absolute date of an event. Despite Pausanias' notoriously bad reputation – which is true – for giving only vague dates in the historical narratives, there are nonetheless quite a few instances in which events of the past are dated by Olympiads and by Athenian *archontes*. Occasionally only one or the other of these two most commonly used dating systems in Greece is used in isolation, but mostly they are used side by side.[5] When dating the Phocian occupation of Delphi – an event which meant the beginning of the Third Sacred War – the Olympiad and *archon* of the year do not suffice; in addition to these two, the *prytaneuon* in Delphi is cited, too.[6]

To repeat: by 'dater', we do not mean the instances in which the narrator gives absolute dates to events, but the much more numerous instances in which he relates an event or object from the past to his own temporal position. This usually amounts to indicating whether or not there has occurred any change when the narrator compares his own time with the past.

---

more covert narrators than the *Periegesis*.

[4] For example, of the 29 ἐς τόδε only one instance (I 17.4) does not have the 'now' of the narrator as referent; of the 109 νῦν 95 refer to the 'now' of the narrator, the rest occur either in quotations (e.g. I 13.3) or are not used in a strictly temporal sense, 'now', but in order to mark reality in contrast to a hypothetical case, 'as it is/was' (e.g. III 6.8); for the latter usage of νῦν, cf. e.g. LSJ *s.v.* νῦν I.4, Smyth 1956 §2924.

[5] E.g. II 24.7 τὸν δὲ ἀγῶνα τοῦτον συμβάντα εὕρισκον Ἀθηναίοις ἄρχοντος Πεισιστράτου, τετάρτῳ δὲ ἔτει τῆς ‹ἑβδόμης καὶ εἰκοστῆς› Ὀλυμπιάδος ἦν Εὐρύβοτος Ἀθηναῖος ἐνίκα στάδιον 'I found that this battle took place when Pisistratus was *archon* in Athens, in the fourth year of the 27th Olympiad, in which Eurybotus of Athens won the stadium-race', which is 669/8 BC.

[6] X 2.3 τὴν δὲ τῶν Δελφῶν κατάληψιν ἐποιήσαντο οἱ Φωκεῖς Ἡρακλείδου μὲν πρυτανεύοντος ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ Ἀγαθοκλέους Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντος, τετάρτῳ δὲ ἔτει πέμπτης ὀλυμπιάδος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἑκατόν, ἣν Πρῶρος ἐνίκα Κυρηναῖος στάδιον 'The Phocians occupied Delphi when Heraclides was *prytaneuon* in Delphi, Agathocles *archon* in Athens, in the fourth year of the 105th Olympiad, in which Prorus of Cyrene won the stadium-race', which is 357/8 BC.

A selection of the passages in which the narrator is talking about things as they were, or were not, in his times has attracted special attention from previous scholars. These are those which contain the latest datable references in the *Periegesis*, thereby allowing us to arrive at an approximate date of the author and his work.[7] One passage in particular holds the place of honour:

τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἐπηλύδων ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων. Κορίνθιοι μὲν γὰρ οἱ νῦν νεώτατοι
Πελοποννησίων εἰσί, καί σφισιν, ἀφ' οὗ τὴν γῆν παρὰ βασιλέως ἔχουσιν, εἴκοσιν
ἔτη καὶ διακόσια τριῶν δέοντα ἦν ἐς ἐμέ.
The rest [of the land on the Peloponnesus] belongs to immigrants. The Corinthians of today are the youngest among the Peloponnesians and till my time 217 years have passed since they received their land from the emperor.[8]

This is the only passage that offers an exact year for the activities of the narrator – AD 174 – and the only one in which he calculates the number of years that have passed from an event to his present time. In four other instances the time of an event is calculated in a similar manner. But the events in question are not only insignificant in comparison with Caesar's re-founding of Corinth but also for the most part otherwise unknown; moreover, the narrator counts in generations instead of years.[9]

Yet another passage figures prominently in discussions of the production of the *Periegesis*:

κεκόσμηται δὲ καὶ ἐς ἄλλα τὸ Ὠιδεῖον ἀξιολογώτατα τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησι, πλήν γε δὴ
τοῦ Ἀθήνησι· τοῦτο γὰρ μεγέθει τε καὶ ἐς τὴν πᾶσαν ὑπ‹ερ›ῆρκε κατασκευήν,
ἀνὴρ δὲ Ἀθηναῖος ἐποίησεν Ἡρώδης ἐς μνήμην ἀποθανούσης γυναικός. ἐμοὶ δὲ ἐν
τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ τὸ ἐς τοῦτο παρείθη τὸ Ὠιδεῖον, ὅτι πρότερον ἔτι
ἐξείργαστό μοι τὰ ἐς Ἀθηναίους ἢ ὑπῆρκτο Ἡρώδης τοῦ οἰκοδομήματος.
In other respects, too, the Odeum is adorned most marvellously of the Greek Odea, except for the one in Athens. This excels in size and construction in general. An Athenian, Herodes, made it, in memory of his deceased wife. Any mention of this Odeum was omitted in my account of Athens, since the part dealing with the Athenians had been finished by me before Herodes had begun the building.[10]

---

[7] Cf. most recently Habicht 1985: 9–11, 176–180 and Bowie 2001: 21–24.

[8] V 1.2.

[9] VII 21.10, VIII 9.9, 32.3, X 32.10.

[10] VII 20.6. Was the building in Patrae a Roman one? Cf. Auffart 1997: 227.

The fact that the description of Patrae in Achaea in book VII has this supplement to the description of Athens, has been assumed to indicate that the first book, or parts thereof, was not only written but also published before the rest of the *Periegesis*, and that this happened before Herodes Atticus began building his Odeum in Athens.[11] That is a possible, but not a necessary conclusion; it may simply be that the narrator has wished to leave a record of the process of composition of the *Periegesis* in the text. What is particularly interesting, though, with this passage, is the fact that it appears to indicate that the narrator does not exist in an indeterminable, unchanging 'now' that ends some time in the 170's, in which decade the latest datable event that the narrator speaks of as taking place in his time occurs.[12] This passage contains one of the clearest explicit indications of how time-consuming a process the composition of the *Periegesis* must have been, and how complex the process of writing it was. It required not only travel to the sites described prior to the description of them, and other research, but also re-visits – in some instances probably more than one – to sites already described. In the present passage a trace of the process behind it surfaces in the text, in most cases there is not any visible evidence of it.

As indicated above, in the majority of the passages in which the narrator speaks of events or the state of things in his 'now', the exact temporal reference escapes the reader, if there indeed is any. With only a few exceptions the 'now' of the narrator is an indeterminable time zone in which things are said either to have changed or to continue to exist in a relatively unaltered condition when the past is compared with the state of the present.

There are more than 400 passages in which the narrator uses his own time as a point of reference. Approximately as often as the narrator indicates that things have changed, he indicates that things remain unchanged. In the great majority of instances when marking both continuity and change, the narrator

---

[11] E.g. Frazer 1898, I: xvi–xix, Robert 1909: 217–223; see also Habicht 1985: 7f., with references in n. 41 to scholars for and against the suggested interpretation of this passage. On the dates of the books, cf. e.g. Habicht 1985: 9–12, Hutton 1995: 29–39, and, most recently, Bowie 2001: 21.

[12] X 34.5 (the Costobocian invasion of Greece). It is assumed that the narrator's 'now' begins at the latest in the mid 120's. This assumption is based on I 5.5 (the creation of a *phyle* in Attica named after the emperor Hadrian) and VIII 10.2 (Hadrian's building of a new sanctuary for Poseidon Hippius); in both passages the narrator uses his 'now' as points of reference. The current interpretation of these passages is, however, uncertain, cf. below.

speaks about either concrete objects (of various sizes and kinds) which are said either to still be in existence or not, or usages and customs that still are or are not kept alive. Names of peoples and places, whether they have changed or not, are another category on which the narrator frequently comments; other areas of comment are more sporadic. When marking discontinuity the narrator appears indirectly to indicate that he found things to be in a certain way whereas he may have expected to find things differently because of, for example, outdated literature describing the sites; and, when marking continuity, the narrator appears to indicate that things were as he expected them to be.

4.2 Marking continuity

With the exception of simple νῦν and negated ἔτι, all the different expressions used by the narrator to speak about things 'now', can be used to mark continuity. Some are used regularly in order to mark continuity: ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς,[13] ἄχρι/μέχρι ἐμοῦ/ἡμῶν,[14] ἐς τόδε,[15] (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν,[16] and simple, unnegated ἔτι.[17] Others are used more sporadically in this function.[18]

In the majority of instances, when the narrator chooses to make explicit the continuity from the past till his own time, he is speaking about one of four different categories of subject matter. As indicated above, the markers of both continuity and discontinuity are most commonly used when the narrator speaks about such things that he might declare to have or not to have experienced. Three of the four categories of subject matter which are said to continue to exist 'still', are such concrete touchable objects or inspectable phenomena. Monuments of various sizes and sorts, for example:

---

[13] 67 occurrences.

[14] 7 occurrences.

[15] 28 occurrences.

[16] 37 occurrences.

[17] 40 occurrences.

[18] 11 occurrences of ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν, 9 occurrences of κατ᾽ ἐμέ/καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, and one occurrence of simple νῦν.

τὰ δὲ οἰκοδομήματα καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔτι ἦν.

The buildings were there still to my time.[19]

Usages, customs, and rituals of various kinds, for example:

ἐοικότα δὲ τῷ λόγῳ δρῶσιν ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔτι αἱ Μεγαρέων γυναῖκες.

The women in Megara still up to my time usually perform something similar to the story.[20]

Natural phenomena, for example:

κατορυχθέντων δὲ ὀλίγον ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς τῶν καθαρσίων φασὶν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀναφῦναι δάφνην, ἣ δὴ καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔστιν, ἡ πρὸ τῆς σκηνῆς ταύτης.

The implements of the cleansing [of Orestes] were dug down a little way from the hut, and they say that a laurel grew from them; it is there still up to my time, the one in front of the hut in question.[21]

The fourth category is less concrete, but nonetheless it comprises phenomena which are perceptible with one of the five senses, viz. the ears. Not infrequently

---

[19] I 29.16. Other objects – in size ranging from cities to the remnants of the plane-tree that is mentioned in *Il.* 2.307 – that the narrator specifically says continued to exist till 'now': ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς I 1.2, 4.5, 31.3, 39.3, II 3.7, 29.10, V 11.9, 20.9, VI 19.8, 21.6, VII 1.8, 2.9, 5.8, 16.8, 17.8, VIII 28.1, 32.3, 35.6, 35.7 (*bis*, the problems with this passage will be discussed below), 36.10, 40.5, 44.5, 46.3, IX 8.4, 10.3, 16.1, X 5.11, 13.9, 29.4, 35.3; μέχρι ἐμοῦ I 22.4; κατ᾽ ἐμέ/καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς I 19.3, X 16.5, 35.2; ἐς τόδε I 41.8, II 11.1, 16.2, 17.7, 36.2, V 13.7, VII 27.8, VIII 44.3, IX 17.2; ἔτι I 35.3, 38.9, 42.3, II 1.8, 2.6, 3.3, 15.2, 16.5, 36.8, 38.2, III 20.3, VIII 26.2, 32.2 (*bis*), 36.8, 42.13, 44.2, 46.5, IX 11.1, 19.7, 39.14, X 31.7; (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν I 10.5, 11.2, 42.3, II 34.10, 36.5, III 16.8, 24.6, VIII 4.9, IX 2.1, 11.5.

[20] I 43.2. Other usages, customs – including human habitation and political administration –, and rituals that the narrator specifically says continued to be performed still 'now': ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς II 20.3, 24.1, IV 16.6, 34.11, V 4.2, 4.4, 9.2, 9.6, VI 6.10, VII 16.10, 17.14, 18.9, IX 10.4, 12.3, X 4.7, 28.5; ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν III 14.6, V 17.10, VI 10.4, VII 24.4; ἄχρι ἐμοῦ II 27.4, VIII 5.5; κατ᾽ ἐμέ X 17.5; ἐς τόδε I 28.10, 35.3, II 9.3, 23.1, IV 30.3, V 1.2, 2.2, VIII 2.4, 14.10, 27.7, 48.1, IX 22.7; ἔτι II 10.7, 25.5, 34.2. III 22.12, IV 3.10, VIII 1.5, IX 5.2, 8.3; (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν I 8.1, II 2.5, 7.8, 10.1, 22.3, 31.8, III 1.8, 12.10, IV 14.3, 14.7, V 13.2, VI 12.9, VII 3.9, VIII 1.5, 15.4, 15.5, 23.7, IX 2.6, 4.4, X 12.4; simple νῦν IX 24.3.

[21] II 31.8. Other passages in which the narrator specifically says that natural phenomena of various kinds are still 'now' in existence: ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς II 34.1, VIII 29.4; ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν IV 35.11, VIII 14.1, VIII 16.2; ἄχρι ἐμοῦ II 1.3, VIII 24.11; κατ᾽ ἐμέ/καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς I 24.1, VII 4.4, VIII 22.6; ἐς τόδε I 36.3, V 14.3, X 33.10; (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν II 1.5; ἔτι II 31.10, 32.2, VIII 23.5, 29.4, X 4.4.

the narrator takes the occasion to indicate that the names under which places or people are known, are ancient; for example:

> μετὰ δὲ τοῦ Διὸς τὸ τέμενος ἐς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀνελθοῦσι καλουμένην ἀπὸ Καρὸς τοῦ Φορωνέως καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔτι Καρίαν…
>
> After the precinct of Zeus, as one has entered the Acropolis, which still up to my time is called Caria from Car, the son of Phoroneus…[22]

After this brief overview of the general areas of subject matter that the statements of continuity fall under, some of the passages will be singled out for discussion.

The survival of trees from a remote antiquity till Ego's present is remarkable; the narrator often expresses incredulity as to the veracity of such survivals. Of course, those trees that are explicitly presented as survivors till 'now', do not represent all the trees mentioned in the *Periegesis*. Nor are all trees that are associated with events of great antiquity explicitly said to be survivors till the narrator's 'now'. This is the case with, for example, the olive tree on the Athenian Acropolis which is said to be a token of the struggle for Attica between Athena and Poseidon, when it is mentioned for the first time.[23]

The narrator reports that in Aulis, a piece of the plane tree, which is mentioned in the *Iliad*, is still remaining and kept in the sanctuary of Artemis.[24] This, together with a curious pine tree on the Isthmus between Megara and Corinth are the only ancient trees that the narrator says were preserved till 'now' without in some way indicating that he is a more or less incredulous communicator of information derived from other sources.[25] It is, however, no

---

[22] I 40.6. Other passages in which the narrator specifically says that a name of sites of various sizes and people lasted till 'now': ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς I 44.3, II 12.4, III 1.2, 2.1, VI 10.3, VII 3.10, 5.1, VIII 2.3, 8.4, IX 5.2, 14.4, X 11.3, 17.7; ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν VIII 22.6 (ἐπὶ ἡμῶν in the manuscripts); κατ᾽ ἐμέ V 23.6, VII 26.4; ἐς τόδε I 28.8, 44.6, II 20.7, VIII 44.1; (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν I 38.2, 39.4, II 5.6, 7.7, IX 36.4; ἔτι I 44.4, II 9.4, IV 1.6, VII 1.4, VIII 7.4. In the following instances there are remarks on vocabulary and other matters that have to do with speech: I 21.1, III 24.4, IV 27.11, VIII 15.7. The following are miscellaneous: VI 15.9, VIII 22.8, X 12.11.

[23] I 27.2. On trees in the *Periegesis* in general, cf. Birge 1994.

[24] IX 19.7 πλατάνου δέ, ἧς καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐν Ἰλιάδι ἐποιήσατο μνήμην, τὸ ἔτι τοῦ ξύλου περιὸν φυλάσσουσιν ἐν τῷ ναῷ. Cf. *Il.* 2.307.

[25] II 1.3 προϊοῦσι δὲ ἡ πίτυς ἄχρι γε ἐμοῦ πεφύκει παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν καὶ Μελικέρτου

wonder that the tree/wood can be mentioned without any disbelief – the Homeric plane tree is, after all, but a piece of wood, piously preserved in a sanctuary. Obviously, it is easier to believe that there are only fragments left of the plane tree under which Agamemnon and the others sacrificed in Aulis, than that it is still thriving. The case of the pine tree on the Isthmus is more difficult to judge. One may note that the tree is spoken of as well-known and famous.[26] Perhaps it is to be associated with Melicertes, who is spoken of in the following. It should, however, be noted that nothing in the text suggests that the pine tree in question is a survival from the time of Melicertes.

The narrator indicates incredulity vis-à-vis a number of other ancient trees. In Troezen there were 'still' no less than three such ancient trees: a laurel that 'they say' (φασιν) sprouted from implements used to cleanse Orestes; a wild olive that – 'believe it who wants' (ὅτῳ πιστά) – grew from the club that 'they say' (φασιν) Heracles leaned against the statue of Hermes Polygius; a myrtle with leaves full of holes that 'they say' (λέγουσιν) Phaedra, struck with passion for Hippolytus, made in it with her hairpin.[27]

In Arcadia there was a plane tree which was called Menelais since, 'they say' (λέγοντες) Menelaus planted it when he came there collecting an army against Troy. Apropos of this plane tree, the narrator seizes the opportunity to enumerate the oldest trees that are still standing and thriving: the willow in the sanctuary of Hera on Samos, the oak of Dodona, the olive on the (Athenian) Acropolis and the one on Delos. The plane tree that triggered the list came in fifth. The introductory remark to this top-five-list of the oldest trees makes clear the source of information – Greek tradition – and suggests some degree of scepticism on the narrator's part:

> εἰ δὲ Ἑλλήνων τοῖς λόγοις ἑπόμενον καταριθμήσασθαι δεῖ με ὁπόσα δένδρα σῶα ἔτι καὶ τεθηλότα λείπεται, πρεσβύτατον μέν...
> If I have to enumerate, in accordance with the Greek traditions, such trees that are still preserved and flourishing: the oldest one...[28]

βωμὸς ἦν.

[26] Note the definite article, ἡ πίτυς. There is nothing in the text itself, such as previous mention or following description, that might explain the reference of the definite article.

[27] II 31.8, 31.10, and 32.3 with I 22.2. On the verbs of saying, cf. above chapter 5.

[28] VIII 23.4f., quote §5.

Moreover, with the remark that Syrians would give the third place to the laurel in their country, the narrator suggests that there are alternatives to his list, and thereby he reinforces the reader's impression of the scepticism harboured by the narrator vis-à-vis the tradition in question. To this Syrian laurel was perhaps attached the Syrian tradition about Daphne, which the narrator had refused to relate not many pages earlier.[29]

In the last book of the *Periegesis*, the narrator tells about an even more curious survival from antiquity till 'now'. We are told that, outside of Panopeus in Phocis, there was a small building containing an image, which, according to some, represented Asclepius, and, according to others, Prometheus. The narrator does not clarify which of the two opinions he endorses, but he does recount the evidence adduced by the advocates of Prometheus: two big stones in a ravine, which have the colour of dry clay, and smell like human skin. These, the narrator explains, 'they say' (λέγουσιν) remain from the time when Prometheus is said to have moulded the whole race of man.[30]

As is well known, politics and administration are subject matters that the narrator of the *Periegesis* does not dwell on. But once in a while such matters are touched upon nonetheless. In some instances the narrator chooses to make explicit the permanence of an institution. In the *Skias*, which is close to their market place, the Spartans, according to the narrator, still hold their assemblies – ἐκκλησιάζουσι, the one and only occurrence of this verb in the *Periegesis*.[31] Further, with the exception of the kingship, the rest of the Spartan constitution is said to be preserved till the narrator's times.[32] The Achaean Confederacy is said still to convene in Aegium, and, similarly, the Amphictyony continued to congress.[33] That is, many changes have occurred during the long history of Greece, some of which are mentioned in the *Periegesis*. The greatest change, which has remained permanent till the narrator's time, was the establishment of Roman rule in Greece. One of the most obvious manifestations of this new order

---

[29] VIII 20.2, on pretermissions cf. above chapter 3.

[30] X 4.4 ταῦτα ἔτι λείπεσθαι τοῦ πηλοῦ λέγουσιν ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἅπαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Προμηθέως τὸ γένος πλασθῆναι τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[31] III 12.10.

[32] II 9.3 … βασιλεύεσθαι μὲν οὐκέτι ἠξίωσαν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ καὶ ἐς τόδε διαμένει σφίσιν ἐκείνης τῆς πολιτείας.

[33] VII 24.4; cf., however, X 8.1–5 on the varying composition of the Amphictyony.

of things was the fact that a governor of Achaia continued to be sent from Rome till 'now'.[34] Despite such changes, which even appeared to be a threat to the name Ἑλλάς, it would appear that, in the eyes of the narrator, a sufficient number of features remained unchanged so as to make it possible for him to speak of continuance in, for example, the Spartan constitution and the gatherings of the Achaean Confederacy.

The narrator is well aware of the mutability of things. It would seem as if the instances in which he introduces Ego marking discontinuity would be the natural, perhaps even the only, occasion for him to indicate change in the *Periegesis*. However, not only in Ego's role of marking discontinuity, but also in his role of marking continuity, does the narrator note changes.

Three times the narrator stresses the permanence of a state of affairs, at the same time as he suggests the potential for change. All three times the narrator chooses to use the prepositional phrase ἄχρι ἐμοῦ/ἡμῶν. 'Up until my time', the narrator says, only Gorgus has won four Olympic victories in the *pentathlon* and one each in the *diaulon* and the armoured race – suggesting that someone might match the feat in later times.[35] 'Up until my time', he explains, the river Acheloüs has not yet silted up the waters off its mouth and made the Echinades islands into land – that this is a possibility is demonstrated by the fact that the Meander has turned the sea between Priene and Miletus into land.[36] Finally, closing a lengthy discussion on prophets, the narrator states explicitly the potential for change:

---

[34] VII 16.10 ἡγεμὼν δὲ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἀπεστέλλετο· καλοῦσι δὲ οὐχ Ἑλλάδος, ἀλλὰ Ἀχαΐας ἡγεμόνα οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, διότι ἐχειρώσαντο Ἕλληνας δι' Ἀχαιῶν τότε τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ προεστηκότων. On the Romans in the *Periegesis*, cf. further below chapter 10.

[35] VI 15.9.

[36] VIII 24.11. The narrator explains that the reason why this has not happened yet with the Echinades is the fact that the Acheloüs flows through an unpopulated and uncultivated area. Are these remarks in the *Periegesis* made in response to Herodotus 2.10.3, who says that the Acheloüs has already made half of the Echinades into mainland (τῶν Ἐχινάδων νήσων τὰς ἡμισέας ἤδη ἤπειρον πεποίηκε)? These islands are also commented on in Pseudo-Scylax *Periplus* 34 *ad fin.* καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα νῆσοι παράκεινται πολλαί, ἃς ὁ Ἀχελῷος προσχωννύων ἤπειρον ποιεῖ 'Many islands lie along the coast here, which the Acheloüs is forming into mainland by its deposits'.

τοσαῦται μὲν ἄχρι ἐμοῦ λέγονται γυναῖκες καὶ ἄνδρες ἐκ θεοῦ μαντεύσασθαι· ἐν
δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τῷ πολλῷ καὶ αὖθις γένοιτο ἂν ἕτερα τοιαῦτα.

Up until my time so many women and men are said to have prophesised by a god; but in
the long course of time new such things might happen again.[37]

That is, the list of prophets that have been inspired by a god is complete, as
things are up until the time of the narrator. Readers of a later age might find it
incomplete, but, for obvious reasons, that lies beyond the narrator's control.[38]

Maintaining the status quo, the uninterrupted continuity from the past till
the present, was not always easy; occasionally it even demanded what appears to
be divine intervention, as was the case with the cult of Artemis Stymphalia.[39]
The fact that the narrator marks some phenomenon as a continuance of a
previous state, does not necessarily imply that the state in question is identical
with the original one, viz. a certain amount of discontinuity is often mixed with
continuity. For example, this is the case with a number of sites and monuments
that are presented as still being in a ruined state. As a result of the synoecism of
Megalopolis in Arcadia many cities were completely abandoned, some named
exceptions had changed status from *polis* to *kome*; only Aliphera continued to be
considered a *polis* till 'now'.[40] Zoeteum and Paroria are two Arcadian cities that
are not enumerated among the exceptions, i.e. they were destroyed in the
synoecism. In the description of the Arcadian countryside, when the narrator
comes to their sites he writes, mindful of the previous account of the synoecism:

ἔρημοι δὲ **καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ** ἦσαν ἀμφότεραι· μένει δὲ ἐν Ζοιτείῳ Δήμητρος ναὸς καὶ
᾽Αρτέμιδος **οἳ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν**.

---

[37] X 12.11.

[38] The preposition ἄχρι is used instead of the more frequent ἐς in order to mark continuity in
three other instances, too: II 1.3 (on this passage, cf. above), 27.4, VIII 5.5. It is possible that
the narrator has chosen to use ἄχρι-phrases in these instances too in order to more strongly
suggest the possibility of change than could have been done with an ἐς-phrase. In its only
occurrence in the *Periegesis*, μέχρι ἐμοῦ I 22.4 appears to be used similarly to ἄχρι ἐμοῦ.

[39] VIII 22.8f. This is one of the few passages in which ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν is used about a single event
(as distinct of recurring rituals and the like) in the present.

[40] VIII 27.3–7. On *polis* and related terms in the *Periegesis*, cf. Alcock 1995 and Rubinstein
1995.

> They were both in ruins up till my time. In Zoeteum there remained a sanctuary of
> Demeter and one of Artemis, which were there up till my time.[41]

Changes have been suggested in the parts marked with bold in the above quote. Spiro prints [καὶ] ἐς ἐμέ in the first clause, and deletes the final relative clause; Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990, following Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, prints κατ᾽ [ἐς] ἐμέ in the first clause and preserves the final relative clause. However, we do not see any obstacles to keep the reading of the manuscripts, καὶ ἐς ἐμέ, in the first clause: both cities remained in ruins, i.e. they had not been rebuilt.[42] Nor do we find it necessary – despite the repetition – to delete the final relative clause, οἳ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν.[43] In the first occurrence of the phrase καὶ ἐς ἐμέ in this passage, it is used to mark the continuance of the ruined state of the two cities in question, in the second to mark the continued existence of the two sanctuaries amidst the ruins of one of the cities.

Indeed, the continuity is often of a precarious kind. Using the markers of continuity, the narrator often mentions the preservation of ruins or preservation in a ruinous or changed state. For example, in Olympia, the narrator notes a small temple, called Metroon 'still until my time'. But, despite the preservation of the ancient name, the function of the building has changed. The narrator notes that it does not contain any statue of the mother of gods, but statues of Roman emperors.[44] Most commonly the narrator uses ἔτι when talking about a partial preservation of things, for example:

> Ἐλευθερῶν δὲ ἦν μὲν ἔτι τοῦ τείχους, ἦν δὲ καὶ οἰκιῶν ἐρείπια.
> Of Eleutherae there were still ruins of the wall and ruins of houses.[45]

---

[41] VIII 35.7.

[42] *Contra* the objection of Schubart & Walz 1838–1839, I: LVII 'ἔρημοι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν nemo sanus facile dixerit'. Certainly, the wording of the statement is rather unexpected, but nevertheless it is intelligible.

[43] Regarding the repetition of one and the same prepositional phrase at such short interval, cf. I 22.3, where ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ is repeated at an even shorter interval.

[44] V 20.9 ναὸν δὲ μεγέθει ‹οὐ› μέγαν καὶ ἐργασίᾳ Δώριον Μητρῷον καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ καλοῦσιν ἔτι, τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῷ διασῴζοντες τὸ ἀρχαῖον· κεῖται δὲ οὐκ ἄγαλμα ἐν αὐτῷ θεῶν Μητρός, βασιλέων δὲ ἑστήκασιν ἀνδριάντες Ῥωμαίων. In the following passages, too, the continuity is commingled with change: II 3.7, VI 21.6, X 35.2f.

[45] I 38.9. Cf. also I 35.3, 42.3, II 2.6, 16.5, 36.8, 38.2, III 20.3, VIII 26.2, 32.2, 36.8, 44.2, IX 11.1.

That is, in the time of the narrator, Eleutherae was no more and cannot be spoken of as still existing. But instead of using the language of straight out discontinuity when speaking of the non-existence of Eleutherae, the narrator chooses to stress the continued existence of the place, though it is now in ruins.

4.3 Marking discontinuity

With the exception of ἐς τόδε, (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν and the simple, unnegated ἔτι, all the different expressions used by the narrator to speak about things 'now', can be used to mark discontinuity: ἐπ᾿ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾿ ἡμῶν,[46] κατ᾿ ἐμέ/καθ᾿ ἡμᾶς,[47] simple νῦν,[48] and negated ἔτι.[49]

As was indicated above, the markers of both continuity and discontinuity are most commonly used when the narrator is speaking about such things that he might declare to have or not have experienced. The indications of continuity may be compared with the indications of discontinuity. Then it appears that of the four categories of subject matter regarding which the narrator rather frequently says that they continued to exist till his time, only two are recurring when he is speaking about discontinuity. Mostly, when the narrator chooses to make explicit the discontinuity of the past till his own time, he is speaking about one of two categories of subject matter. Monuments of various sizes and sorts form one category, for example:

> ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πεδίῳ ναός ἐστι Διονύσου, καὶ τὸ ξόανον ἐντεῦθεν Ἀθηναίοις ἐκομίσθη τὸ ἀρχαῖον· τὸ δὲ ἐν Ἐλευθεραῖς ‹τὸ› ἐφ᾿ ἡμῶν ἐς μίμησιν ἐκείνου πεποίηται.
> In this plain there is a temple of Dionysus; the old wooden image has been moved from here by the Athenians. The statue in Eleutherae in my time is a copy of the former one.[50]

---

[46] 102 occurrences.

[47] 24 occurrences.

[48] 58 occurrences.

[49] 25 occurrences. There are also 2 occurrences of ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς.

[50] I 38.8. Other objects – in size ranging from cities to books of poetry, or Pelops' shoulder blade – that the narrator specifically says do not continue in their original form: ἐπ᾿ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾿

Names of peoples and places form the other category of subject matter that is frequently occurring when the narrator is talking about discontinuity when comparing the present with the original state of affairs, for example:

ὡς δὲ ἐν τῇ γῇ τῇ Ἐπιδαυρίων ἔτεκεν, ἐκτίθησι τὸν παῖδα ἐς τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο ὃ δὴ Τίτθιον ὀνομάζουσιν ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν, τηνικαῦτα δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο Μύρτιον.

When she had given birth in the land of the Epidaurians, she put out the child on the mountain that is called Titthium (Breast) in our times, but then was called Myrtium.[51]

Occasionally one finds remarks on the discontinuation of usages, customs, and rituals, for example:

τοῦτο μὲν δὴ καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔτι λείπεται… Κορίνθου δὲ ἀναστάτου γενομένης ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Κορινθίων τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀπολομένων, οὐκέτι ἐκεῖναι καθεστήκασιν αὐτοῖς αἱ θυσίαι παρὰ τῶν ἐποίκων οὐδὲ ἀποκείρονταί σφισιν οἱ παῖδες οὐδὲ μέλαιναν φοροῦσιν ἐσθῆτα.

This [sc. the statue] still remains to my time… But as Corinth was laid waste by the Romans and the old Corinthians ceased to exist, these sacrifices for them [sc. the children of Medea] are no longer established among the settlers nor do their children cut their hair or wear black clothes for them.[52]

ἡμῶν I 2.4, 2.5, 14.7, 22.3 (bis), 23.3, 29.2, 40.2, 43.4, 43.5, II 7.9, 19.3, 23.4, 25.9, 26.9, 27.3, 31.6, 34.11, 35.3, 36.1, 38.2, III 14.6, 16.8, 24.7, IV 1.3, 2.3, 30.1, V 23.3, VI 5.2, 10.8 (ἐπὶ ἡμῶν in the manuscripts), 19.11, 21.3, 22.8, VII 5.1, 22.9, 27.8, VIII 10.2, 13.2, 15.9, 17.6, 18.8, 22.1, 22.3, 24.6, 25.3, 26.8, 27.7, 29.5 (bis), 33.1, 38.3, 45.1, 45.5, 47.1, IX 7.6, 12.3, 26.5, 27.4, 29.2, X 5.13; κατ᾽ ἐμέ/καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς II 36.2, V 5.6, 13.6, VI 17.9, VII 2.11, VIII 24.7, 32.1, 42.12, 43.2, 54.4, IX 38.10, X 26.5, 32.1, 33.1; ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς VI 13.8, X 38.8; negated ἔτι II 7.9, 10.2, 11.2, 12.2, 15.2, 24.3, 25.4, VI 19.15, 22.1, VII 22.11, 24.13, VIII 33.3, 38.5, 41.10, X 16.1, 33.8, 38.9; νῦν I 1.5, 9.7, 18.8, 26.6, II 3.1, 5.6, 7.1, 7.5, 7.8, 8.1, 18.5, 24.1, 30.9, III 11.3, 23.3, 24.6, IV 27.5, VI 19.13, VIII 8.4.

[51] II 26.4. Other passages in which the narrator is explicitly talking about names as being new when compared with the original name: ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν III 2.1, 20.1, 26.8, IV 33.4, V 25.11, VI 24.2, VII 1.1, 17.6, VIII 12.7, 23.4, 48.4, X 1.1, 6.3, 37.5; κατ᾽ ἐμέ VII 26.4 (though the original name has not been completely forgotten); negated ἔτι X 32.9; νῦν I 2.6, 11.2, 29.5, 37.6, 41.8, II 4.3, 12.4, 15.4, 18.9, 29.2, 34.6, III 15.6, IV 1.1, V 1.1, 1.8, VI 10.8, VII 1.1, 2.2, 19.9, 26.2, 26.3, VIII 4.4, 24.9, IX 10.5, 14.5, 29.3, 33.2, 34.7, 40.5, X 8.1, 14.3, 30.4.

[52] II 3.7. Other usages, customs – including human habitation, political administration, and art style –, and rituals that the narrator specifically says has undergone change when an earlier state is compared with the present one: ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν I 34.1, 34.3, II 1.2, 37.3, 38.5,

78

It is understandable that phenomena that do not tend to leave any permanent remains once they have changed or disappeared, are virtually absent among the instances in which the narrator makes explicit the discontinuation of a previous state. The discontinuation of natural phenomena is not remarked upon very often. When, for example, a tree is dying, its remains are not always kept as reverently as the remains of the plane tree, which is mentioned in the *Iliad*. For discontinuation of natural phenomena, compare, for example:

> ἄμπελον δὲ φῦναι μὲν οἱ Θηβαῖοι παρὰ σφίσι πρώτοις φασὶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀποφῆναι δὲ οὐδὲν ἔτι ἐς αὐτὴν ὑπόμνημα εἶχον.
>
> The Thebans claim that they were the first men among whom vine grew, but they could no longer point out any memorial of it.[53]

A special category among the appearances of Ego the dater indicating discontinuity, are the instances in which the narrator speaks of events that took place in his time. κατ᾽ ἐμέ/καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς and ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν differ from the other phrases discussed in this chapter with respect to the fact that they are used not only in order to mark continuous processes and states of affair. They are also used about events, which, *qua* events, lead to a break with the past. For example:

> ἀνέθεσαν δὲ καὶ Χαρίτων ἀγάλματα ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ.
>
> In my time, they have dedicated statues of the Charites too.[54]

The number of events that the narrator chooses to explicitly characterise as actually occurring in his times is small. The number of events that we are able to date even approximately is even smaller: five.[55]

III 16.1, 22.6, IV 1.1, V 9.3, 9.4, 21.15 (*Zanes* erected by two athletes caught cheating in Ol. 226, i.e. AD 125), VI 26.10, VII 20.2, 26.5, VIII 9.10, 12.9, 28.1, IX 27.1, X 8.4; κατ᾽ ἐμέ/καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς I 5.5, VI 5.1, IX 30.3, 35.7; negated ἔτι II 1.2, 28.2, VIII 12.2, 22.1; νῦν I 29.6, II 2.2, 34.6, V 1.2, IX 14.5, 36.6.

[53] IX 25.1. In this passage the remark appears to have been triggered by an association by opposites from a thriving pomegranate-tree to this disappeared vine. Other passages in which the narrator specifically points to the discontinuation of natural phenomena: νῦν III 25.8; negated ἔτι VIII 14.3.

[54] IX 34.1. Other passages in which the narrator speaks of events that he specifically says occurred in his time: ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ/ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν II 1.7, 27.6, III 26.6, VIII 22.8, IX 33.7, 38.1; κατ᾽ ἐμέ V 15.2, 20.8, 27.11, VII 5.9, X 34.5. Event that specifically does not occur in the time of the narrator: ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ VIII 2.5. I 5.5 and VIII 10.2 do not belong to this category; cf. below.

[55] Datable are II 1.7f., 27.6, V 20.8, VII 5.9, and X 34.5; cf. below.

The above quoted examples, and the majority of instances where the narrator notes discontinuity indicate that, in the narrator's eyes, discontinuity does not necessarily imply that the change is one that has occurred close to his time. Indeed, when, for example, a name is designated as a modern one, in the majority of instances it appears to be the one that has been used for centuries. That is, the kind of discontinuity that the narrator most frequently talks about is not necessarily one that involves a difference between the past and present, but rather one that involves a difference between the original state of things and a later state of things. This later state of things belongs to the past, just as the original one, but has actually continued into the present. As to the time when the change occurred between the original and later (not present) state of things, it is either unspecified or understood on the basis of the (myth-)historical events or persons that are associated with the change.

Names appear to have been particularly prone to fluctuation; at any rate the narrator inserts rather frequently a 'now' when mentioning such well established names as Attica, Hellas, Achaea, Ionia, and Phocis.[56] The point with such indications is, presumably, to make evident the fact that the Greek past is not an unchanging entity, but an ongoing process during which more than one change has occurred. The changing names are but one sign of the many twists and turns that the history of Greece has taken. Indeed, one may even ask whether Greece is still to be called Greece. Just as the name Ἑλλάς was only gradually applied to the area that was Hellas in Pausanias' times and eyes (the exact borders of which are not easy, not to say impossible to pinpoint), it would seem that it was gradually being replaced by another name, viz. Ἀχαΐα, for the same (?) area, at least in the parlance of some.[57]

---

[56] Attica I 2.6; Hellas I 41.8 (ἡ νῦν καλουμένη Ἑλλάς, cf. Herodotus 1.1.2, 2.56.1, 8.44.2, and Thucydides 1.2.1); Achaea II 18.9, V 1.1, VII 1.1; Ionia I 29.5, IX 33.2; Phocis II 4.3, 29.2, VIII 4.4, X 1.1, 30.4.

[57] III 20.6 and VII 16.10. It could take time before a new name has replaced an old one (X 8.1, apropos of one possible explanation for the name 'Amphictyony'); and even after that, some can hold on to the old name (VII 26.4, apropos of Hestiaea/Oreus on Euboea); especially the archaic mannerisms of poetic language can be confusing in this respect (VII 17.7, apropos of Palea in an epigram = Dyme in normal speech, just as poets may call Amphiaraus and Adrestus Phoronidae and Theseus Erechthides). Cf. Bearzot 1988 and Hutton 1995: 57–70 on the difficulties involved in defining 'Pausanias' Greece'.

In a manner of speaking, many of the occasions in which the narrator indicates discontinuity, become, thus, indications of continuity. That is, the narrator – using his 'now' as a temporal point of reference – contrasts the original state of things with a later one. Thereby he establishes that a change has occurred in the past – for the most part we cannot establish in how remote a past the change occurred. In doing this, it is simultaneously established that there is discontinuity when the original state of things is compared with the later state of things, and continuity when this later state of affairs is compared with the 'now' of the narrator. It is, however, not always the case that the narrator introduces Ego in his role of marking discontinuity in order to indicate discontinuity-cum-continuity of the sort described above. In a number of instances the narrator compares and contrasts the past state of affairs with the present one, and establishes that a change has occurred 'now', i.e. there is discontinuity between past and present, without any implicit continuity.

Barring any extra-textual means, i.e. datable events or persons, of determining which of the two sorts of discontinuity the narrator is indicating in a given passage, are there any intra-textual means of separating the two kinds of discontinuity from one another? It has been suggested that the aspectual values of the tense stems of the verb is the determining factor.[58] The aspect of the verb is indeed part of the answer, but – as will become evident below – not all of it.

That is, passages with a verb of the present tense stem (imperfective aspect, denoting the state of affairs as incompleted) would denote continuation of an older state of affairs into the 'now' of the narrator; passages with a verb of the aorist tense stem (perfective aspect, denoting the state of affairs as completed) would denote discontinuation of an older state of affairs into the 'now' of the narrator.[59] Indeed, a review of the above discussed passages marking continuity, will reveal that the passages marking continuity into the present are routinely construed with the verb in the present stem, viz. the imperfective aspect. In one passage the narrator uses the aorist in order to mark continuity from the past into the present:

---

[58] Musti 2001 *passim*, esp. 63–70.

[59] On the aspects of the Greek verb, cf. e.g. Duhoux 1992: 136–144 and Rijksbaron 1994: 1–6.

λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν γενέσθαι θαῦμα τοιόνδε.

It is said that even in our times the following miracle occurred.[60]

In this instance, which is an introduction to a narrative about how the cult of Artemis Stymphalia has continued without interruption, the narrator dates with reference to his temporal situation not the continuance *per se*, but an event that prevented a threatening discontinuity to set in. In a number of instances verbs in the perfect tense are used with reference to the same state of affairs as the present tense.[61]

Is the aspectual value of the verb tense stem the determining factor in distinguishing between the two kinds of discontinuity discussed above, too? That is, does the narrator use (1) the aorist tense stem, denoting perfective aspect, when he uses his own position in time as a point of reference in order to mark discontinuity when the present state of things is compared with the original one; (2) the present tense stem, denoting imperfective aspect, when he uses his own position in time as a point of reference in order to mark discontinuity-cum-continuity, viz. continuity when the present state of things is compared with an earlier one, but discontinuity when this earlier state of things is compared with the original one? Taking but a selection of passages into consideration, it would seem so. Compare the two following examples:

τὰς μὲν δὴ πέτρας σέβουσί τε μάλιστα καὶ τῷ Ἐτεοκλεῖ αὐτὰς πεσεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ‹φασιν›· τὰ δὲ ἀγάλματα ‹τὰ› σὺν κόσμῳ πεποιημένα ἀνετέθη μὲν ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, λίθου δέ ἐστι καὶ ταῦτα.

They worship the boulders most of all and claim that they fell from the sky for Eteocles. The statues which were made with art were dedicated in my time; they, too, are made of stone.[62]

τὴν δὲ γῆν τὴν Ὠρωπίαν μεταξὺ τῆς Ἀττικῆς καὶ Ταναγρικῆς, Βοιωτίαν τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὖσαν, ἔχουσιν ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν Ἀθηναῖοι... κτησάμενοι δὲ οὐ πρότερον βεβαίως πρὶν ἢ Φίλιππος Θήβας ἑλὼν ἔδωκέ σφισιν.

The land of Oropus, between Attica and Tanagrica, originally belonged to Boeotia, but

---

[60] VIII 22.8.

[61] I 21.1, 28.8, 42.3, II 31.10, 32.3, III 14.6, 16.8, IV 30.3, 35.11, V 4.2, 9.6, VII 4.4, 27.8, VIII 27.7, 44.1, X 35.3 (pluperfect).

[62] IX 38.1.

in my time the Athenians have it… they did not come into firm possession of it until Philip gave it to them after conquering Thebes.[63]

In the first passage, with the verb in the aorist tense, the narrator is speaking about an event – the dedication of statues – that took place in his lifetime (when exactly is impossible to determine), and which constitutes a break with the earlier layout of the place. In the second passage, with the verb in the present tense, the narrator is speaking of a difference between the original state of affairs, when Oropus belonged to Boeotia, and the present state of affairs, when the Athenians have the land in question. In this instance, the present state of ownership of the land (being in the possession of the Athenians), is a continuation of an earlier state (when the land was in the possession of the Athenians), and, simultaneously, a break with the original ownership of the land (when the land was in the possession of Boeotians). Further, in this passage it is specified when the final break between the original and later state of things occurred: in the reign of Philip of Macedon.

The time when the break between the original and the later state of things occurred, is, however, not always specified. And unless it is specified there are no textual or linguistic means for determining how early or late the break occurred. The following is an introduction to an enumeration of abandoned cities:

τούτων τῶν πόλεων τοσαίδε ἦσαν ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν ἔρημοι…
Of these cities the following were abandoned in my times…[64]

The subsequent enumeration shows that the changes set in at very different points in time between the Persian wars and the 'now' of the narrator. Two of the cities were abandoned soon after the Persian wars, two were emptied when the emperor Augustus founded Nicopolis, the inhabitants of one city were forced to abandon their city twice, first by the Athenians, next by Philip II of Macedon.

The narrator may use the perfect tense stem to the same effect as the present one when introducing Ego the dater indicating discontinuation-cum-continuation as well as simple continuation. Compare, for example, the following passage:

---

[63] I 34.1. The data in this passage is not quite historically correct, cf. Chamoux 1992 *ad loc*.
[64] V 23.3.

ἔστι δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ Πουλυτίωνος οἰκία, καθ᾽ ἣν παρὰ τὴν ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι δρᾶσαι τελετὴν Ἀθηναίων φασὶν οὐ τοὺς ἀφανεστάτους· ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ δὲ ἀνεῖτο Διονύσῳ.

In it is the house of Pulytion, in which they say that the most notable Athenians performed rites in parody of the one in Eleusis. In my time it was dedicated to Dionysus.[65]

The three (or more) phases which are present when the narrator introduces Ego the dater indicating discontinuity-cum-continuity, is illustrated exceptionally well in the following passage which closes a lengthy discussion about opinions on and representations of the Charites throughout time:

καὶ ταῦτα μέν ἐστιν ὁμοίως ἅπαντα ἐν ἐσθῆτι, οἱ δὲ ὕστερον – οὐκ οἶδα ἐφ᾽ ὅτῳ – μεταβεβλήκασι τὸ σχῆμα αὐταῖς· Χάριτας γοῦν οἱ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ ἔπλασσόν τε καὶ ἔγραφον γυμνάς.

All these [*sc.* old statues of Charites] are clad alike, but later artists – I do not know why – have changed their form. At least artists today usually sculpt and paint Charites in the nude.[66]

That is, in this passage we have three stages clearly articulated: the original one in which Charites used to be represented with clothes; a later, unspecified, one in which artists have changed the mode of representation; and the stage, which is 'now', in which modern artists represent the Charites in the nude. This last stage of the development is actually a continuation of the middle stage, and serves as 'part proof' of the change that occurred in the middle stage – note the particle γοῦν introducing it and the imperfect tense, viz. imperfective aspect, of the verbs.[67]

However, in order to separate the instances in which the narrator introduces Ego the dater indicating plain discontinuation from those indicating discontinuation-cum-continuation from one another, it is not enough to distinguish between the imperfective and perfective aspects of the present and aorist tense stems of the verbs. The following instances should make this point evident. They are all construed with the verb in the aorist tense, all have the

---

[65] I 2.5. Other passages with the perfect stem: I 29.6, 40.2, 43.5, II 3.7, 24.3 (pluperfect), 26.9, 35.3, III 15.6, 24.6, V 13.6 (pluperfect), VIII 22.1, IX 12.3, IX 30.3 (pluperfect), X 33.1 (pluperfect).

[66] IX 35.7.

[67] γοῦν 'part proof': 'Much the commonest use of γοῦν is to introduce a statement which is, *pro tanto*, evidence for a preceding statement.' cf. Denniston 1954: 451–454, quote p. 451.

prepositional phrase ἐφ' ἡμῶν relating the statement to the temporal position of Ego, and they all speak of persons that are easy to date.

> τὸ μὲν δὴ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ῷκοδομήσατο Ἀδριανὸς βασιλεύς.
> The present sanctuary [*sc.* of Poseidon Hippius] was built by the emperor Hadrian.[68]

> Κόρινθον... ὕστερον λέγουσιν ἀνοικίσαι Καίσαρα, ὃς πολιτείαν ἐν Ῥώμῃ πρῶτος τὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν κατεστήσατο.
> They say that Corinth was later refounded by Caesar, who was the first to establish the present government in Rome.[69]

> Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ Φιλίππου τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν πόλεως ἐγένετο οἰκιστὴς κατ' ὄψιν ὀνείρατος.
> Alexander, the son of Philip, became the founder of the present city [*sc.* of Smyrna] in accordance with a dream.[70]

> ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ τὰ μὲν ἀρχαιότερα Πάλεια· ἐχόντων δὲ ἔτι Ἰώνων ὄνομά οἱ μετέθεντο ⟨τὸ⟩ ἐφ' ἡμῶν.
> Formerly it was called Palea; when the Ionians still occupied the city they changed its name into the present one [*sc.* Dyme].[71]

Let us presume that, without exception, when the verb is in the aorist tense, the statement with a reference to the 'now' of the narrator speaks of a plain discontinuity, viz. discontinuity when the past state of things is compared with the present one, and that the change causing the discontinuity took place in the life-time of the narrator. This hypothesis would seem to fit the first passage. There is a consensus that the reign of Hadrian fell within the life span of Pausanias.

However, it cannot be maintained that the events spoken of in the three following passages – the refounding of Corinth by Caesar, the founding of Smyrna by Alexander (the Great), the renaming of Palea by the Ionians while they were still living in what was later known as Achaea – took place in the life-time of the narrator. In order not to have to take recourse to special pleadings

---

[68] VIII 10.2.

[69] II 1.2.

[70] VII 5.1.

[71] VII 17.6.

when faced with these instances and many more of their sort, one may note that in all four passages the temporal prepositional phrases are not used adverbially (as in IX 38.1 and I 34.1, discussed above), i.e. they do not specify the time of the action of the predicate. Instead, they are preceded by the article of their head-word, that is, they are in the attributive position. This means that they – like any attribute – are simply added to their headword as descriptions of it. That is, when in the attributive position, the temporal prepositional phrase, 'in my time', does not specify that the event designated by the verb took place in the time of the narrator, but that the object, which has undergone the sort of change specified by the verb, continues to exist in its changed form 'in my time'.

There are, thus, two conditions that have to be satisfied before one may assume that the narrator is talking about an event as occurring specifically in his own life-time, viz. (1) aorist tense stem, viz. perfective aspect, of the verb, (2) temporal phrase, whether prepositional or adverb, used adverbially. If either one of these two conditions remains unfulfilled when the narrator introduces Ego the dater, the narrator is not talking about events taking place in his time, but about the continued existence of a state of affairs that has had its beginning at some earlier point in time. The instances in which the narrator talks about events as occurring in his own times are but a small minority among the great number of states and processes that he specifies to continue either in its original state or in a changed state into his own time.

The above observations on the manner in which the narrator designates events, which he wishes to represent as explicitly occurring in his own life-time, as opposed to occurring earlier and continuing into his life-time, raise some questions about the established interpretation of two passages in which Hadrianic doings in Greece are explicitly related to the 'now' of the narrator. One of them is the following passage:

> οἵδε μέν εἰσιν Ἀθηναίοις ἐπώνυμοι τῶν ἀρχαίων· ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶνδε φυλὰς ἔχουσιν, Ἀττάλου τοῦ Μυσοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου καὶ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ ἤδη βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ…
>
> These are the Athenian *eponymoi* of old. In later times they have *phylai* named after the following, too: Attalus the Mysian, Ptolemy the Egyptian, and further, in my time, the emperor Hadrian.[72]

---

[72] I 5.5.

Here, after an enumeration of the old eponymous heroes of Athens, the narrator mentions the eponyms that have been added more recently, the most recent addition being, obviously, Hadrian. The addition of new eponyms is, however, not described as an event ('they got'), but as a state ('they have'); this state is certainly a discontinuation of the previous state(s), but neither of the events that caused this discontinuation is presented as taking place in the 'now' of the narrator. The other passage in question, treating of Hadrian's building of a new sanctuary for Poseidon Hippius, has been quoted above. In that passage the verb is in the aorist tense, but the temporal prepositional phrase is in the attributive position. Thereby the Hadrianic sanctuary is described as a modern one; the event of building it is, however, not described as taking place in the time of the narrator.

Thus, in both instances events of the Hadrianic age which the narrator relates to his own 'now' are not designated as events occurring in the narrator's 'now', but as discontinuation-cum-continuation states of things. That is, the events, either initiated by Hadrian or affecting him, have caused a break with a previous state of things, and the new state of things resulting from this break is designated as continuing into the time of the narrator.[73] Are these turns of phrases chosen because the narrator cannot speak of events in the reign of Hadrian as occurring in his time? Can it be that Ego was not in his childhood and teen-years during the reign of Hadrian, having been born c. 115 as is commonly assumed, or even c. 110 as has been recently proposed?[74] Was he rather born late in Hadrian's reign, perhaps in the 130's? The datable events that are explicitly related to the time of the narrator would fit with such a later date. They all fall within the span between the 150's and the 170's.[75] One further passage appears to support the later date proposed here:

---

[73] Contra Habicht 1985: 12 n. 58 'I.5.5 indicates that Pausanias had been born when the tribe Hadrianis was created in Athens.'

[74] Pausanias born c. 115 e.g. Habicht 1985: 9–12, with references to previous scholars; Pausanias born c. 110, Bowie 2001: 21–24; Pausanias born c. 100–110, Musti 1982: XII.

[75] II 1.7f. (Herodes Atticus' dedication of chryselephantine statues in the sanctuary of Poseidon on the Isthmus before the 160's, cf. Tobin 1997: 63f. and 312–314), II 27.6 (buildings in the Asclepieum in Epidaurus erected by a Roman senator Antoninus (floruit c. 160), not identical with the Antoninus who was emperor, cf. Habicht 1985: 10 and 177), V 20.8 (digging for a foundation of a monument commemorating Olympic victories by an anonymous Roman senator, datable provided that he is identical with a certain Lucius

νᾱῶν δὲ ⟨τῶν⟩ ἐν Μαντινείᾳ νεώτατός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ Ἀντίνου ναός. οὗτος ἐσπουδάσθη περισσῶς δή τι ὑπὸ βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ· ἐγὼ δὲ μετ᾽ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἔτι αὐτὸν ὄντα οὐκ εἶδον, ἐν δὲ ἀγάλμασιν εἶδον καὶ ἐν γραφαῖς.

The sanctuary of Antinous is the most recent one in Mantinea. He was especially favoured by the emperor Hadrian. I did not see him while he still was among people, but I have seen him in statues and paintings.[76]

This passage has been interpreted as indicating that the narrator is implying that he could have had seen Antinous before his death in 130, should he have had the opportunity, and that he would have been old enough to have remembered the event, too.[77] However, another, equally possible interpretation of this emphatic denial of having seen Antinous in the flesh, is that it was physically impossible for him to have done so, either because he had not been born yet, or because he was still too young an infant for it to have happened.

4.4 Summary

In this section the numerous passages in which the narrator uses his own '(here and) now' as a temporal point of reference have been studied. It has frequently been pointed out in studies of the *Periegesis* that its narrator is preoccupied with things of the past. This is true. But the narrator is mostly interested in things of the past as they manifest themselves in his present, which he makes clear by repeatedly relating them to his 'now'.

More than 400 times the narrator introduces into the narrative Ego the dater in order to relate objects, usages and customs and the like to his own temporal position. Within this function of Ego as narrator two separate roles have been distinguished, one marking continuity and the other marking discontinuity. The

Minicius Natalis attested epigraphically from Olympia, after 153, cf. Habicht 1985: 178–180), VII 5.9 (a sanctuary for Asclepius in Smyrna, completed before 166, cf. Habicht 1985: 10 with n. 54; the same sanctuary is mentioned in II 26.9, too), and X 34.5 (invasion of the Costobocs, AD 170 or 171, cf. e.g. Habicht 1985: 9 with n. 50). The observation of Knoepfler 1999: 493–497 and *passim*, that Pausanias visited Rome at a time when he had not yet thought of the *Periegesis*, even suggesting the year 148, would fit well with the later date of birth suggested here.

[76] VIII 9.7.

[77] Cf. e.g. Habicht 1985: 12.

narrator introduces Ego the dater in the role of marking continuity roughly as often as in the one marking discontinuity.

Marking continuity means that the narrator indicates that a phenomenon of the past continues into the present; marking discontinuity means that the narrator indicates that a break has occurred in the chain of preservation from the past till the present. Furthermore, among the appearances of Ego the dater indicating discontinuity, one may note two separate types of break between past and present. One marks discontinuity plain and simple, the other marks discontinuity-cum-continuity. The latter category is the larger one of the two. With discontinuity-cum-continuity we mean the numerous instances which involve three points of time: the original state of things, a later state of things, and the narrator's 'now'. In these instances a change has occurred, but the change in question has not caused a break between the past and the present, but between the original state of things and a later state of things, and this changed state of things continues to exist till the narrator's present.

The category marking discontinuity plain and simple comprises the comparatively few instances in which the narrator speaks of an event as taking place in his own time. We are able to date only five of these. Further, if the criteria for determining when the narrator is speaking about an event as taking place in his time, suggested in the present chapter, are correct, then the reign of Hadrian is not part of the childhood, or even youth, of the narrator/author. At most, the narrator was an infant towards the end of Hadrian's reign. For the most part, the exact temporal reference of the 'now' of which the narrator speaks when introducing Ego the dater is impossible to pinpoint, nor is it probably meant to be determinable – at least not without some effort and extensive reading of the *Periegesis*.

5 Researcher

5.1 Introduction

Of the two distinct functions of Ego as character which surface in the *Periegesis*, the researcher function indubitably occurs the most frequently. We have counted more than 450 passages.[1] These passages will now be studied.

Our interest in the researcher function of Ego lies in exploring what scholarly concerns prompt the narrator to break into the text in order to leave a record for the reader about his handling the material of the *Periegesis*.[2] Broadly speaking, the reason why the narrator introduces Ego the researcher appears to be a care for indicating in diverse ways certainty or uncertainty regarding the subject matter of the work. Just as was the case with Ego the writer, the concerns of Ego the researcher appear to centre on a care for the reader and the material. The care for the reader is focussed on making him/her trust that Ego knows what he is saying; the care for the material manifests itself in actually conducting some degree of research. Both of these two kinds of care may be

---

[1] Note that we count passages, not occurrences of first person pronouns or verbs, in which case the number would have been higher.

[2] The actual researches done by Pausanias for the *Periegesis* have of course been the object of scholarly interest. Previous studies have focussed primarily on identifying the sources of information both for the description of monuments and for historical material. Studies devoted solely to the sources and trustworthiness of the *Periegesis* were produced in rather large quantities in the latter half of the nineteenth century, cf. e.g. Busolt 1883, Ebeling 1892, Enmann 1884, Hejnic 1969: 4–65, Hirt 1878, Immerwahr 1889, Kalkmann 1886, Koenig 1832: 11–29, Pfundtner 1869, Segre 1927 and 1928, Wernicke 1884; the study of Bearzot 1992 on the Hellenistic history in the *Periegesis* is also very much source-oriented. Two recent studies, pointing to deficiencies in earlier *Quellenforschung*, are Andersen 1992 and Meadows 1995. Gurlitt 1890 deserves to be mentioned here for his thorough refutation of the excesses of Kalkmann 1886. As we are not primarily interested in the actual veracity of the reports of the narrator in the *Periegesis*, we will not refer to these studies in the following.

said to work in the direction of producing confidence in the narrator. But, at the same time, by registering Ego's handling of the material, the narrator leaves an extensive record of the successes and failures, difficulties and uncertainties of the work-process, and of the many questions that remain unanswered.

Though the researcher's doings are almost undoubtedly much more extensive than what the narrator actually lets show in the text, we limit our study of the researcher to the instances in which the narrator unquestionably talks about Ego in the act of researching material for the work by using a first person pronoun or a verb in the first person, or both.[3] As the narrator tells about the activities of Ego the researcher, he presents a character, Ego as character, who is concerned with retrieving, considering, and judging the material for the *Periegesis*. Consequently, the researcher function falls into the roles of investigating, i.e. finding facts, commenting, and criticising data for the *Periegesis*. It has not always been easy to determine which passages are to be counted in which category – practice seldom accommodates itself to the clear-cut and well-defined limits drawn up in theory. Most passages are easily categorised; others almost defy categorisation, or, at the least, appear to belong equally well to more than one category, mainly because they contain more than one first person. Consequently, some passages are brought up more than once in the following.

5.2 Investigating

Under the investigating role of the researcher function of Ego as character, approximately 130 passages are included in which the narrator informs about Ego's fact finding activities. When speaking of Ego's investigating role, the narrator makes clear whether or not his researches have given results, in a more or less elaborate form. Mostly the intrusions are of the less elaborate sort.

When the research has been successful, the narrator normally indicates this by saying that he has learnt this or that, in one way or another. The ubiquitous anonymous 'they say' or 'it is said' are the single most frequently occurring phrases suggesting that the research has been successful, has paid off, or at the

---

[3] Cf. Pretzler 2004 for a study filling in the many lacunae left between the narrator's explicit mentions of Ego the researcher.

least that what is said does not come out of the narrator's own head, but is information belonging to the Greek traditions.[4] 'They say' and 'it is said' can be interpreted in several different ways. Primarily, 'they say' is a vague and imprecise source-citation, reminding the readers of the fact that what the narrator reports does not originate from but belongs to a tradition external to him. Secondarily, by way of their functioning as source-citations and being reminders of the external origin of the material, the phrases of saying may be interpreted as suggesting at least two different attitudes of the narrator vis-à-vis the material that is introduced with such phrases, viz. uncertainty or scepticism regarding its veracity. That is, these verbs of saying are primarily source-citations, and presumably introduced into the text in order to signal that the material is part of a larger tradition; secondarily, the reader may interpret these source-citations as suggesting uncertainty or scepticism on the narrator's part.[5] In other words, how the narrator's attitude is perceived in these cases is a matter that lies chiefly in the hands of the reader/interpreter of the text. Since the present study is confined to the passages in which Ego is overtly perceptible, we will merely note in passing these verbs of saying in the following.

When the narrator signals success in his fact-finding endeavour using the first person, the most frequent verbs are either εὑρίσκω 'find', πυνθάνομαι 'learn', or ἀκούω 'hear'.[6] Whether 'hear' refers to actual hearing from an oral source, or figurative hearing, i.e. reading, from a written source, is a question

---

[4] A *TLG* search for λέγουσι(ν) and φασι(ν) in the *Periegesis* gave 1090 hits; although among these there are quite possibly some dative plural masculine/neuter present participles, the number remaining is remarkably high; a search for λέγεται gave 168 hits.

[5] For a similar interpretation of λέγεται in Plutarch, cf. Cook 2001. Cf. also Westlake 1977 for a study of λέγεται in Thucydides, suggesting that 'it is said' is not solely used in order to convey uncertainty.

[6] εὑρίσκω II 26.8, 26.10, 28.1; εὕρισκον I 28.7, II 4.4, 24.7, III 21.9, IV 32.2, V 1.3, 4.5, 21.9, 21.18, 26.2, VI 4.9, 12.8, VII 4.10, 17.5, VIII 6.3, IX 6.1, 23.5, 27.8, X 5.12, 12.1, 26.7; πυνθάνομαι I 20.7, 38.1, VIII 50.3; ἐπυνθανόμην I 27.5, II 20.1, III 11.9, VIII 37.1, 45.5, IX 8.4, X 16.7, 32.18; ἤκουον IX 24.3; ἤκουσα I 17.4, 35.4, 42.3, 42.5, 43.1, 44.5, II 5.1, 5.3, 5.5, 37.3, 37.6, III 7.1, 17.7, IV 30.3, 32.5, V 5.5, 25.12, 27.9, VI 6.10 (*bis*), 20.17, 26.9, VII 23.3, VIII 2.7, 20.1, IX 8.4, 27.7, 28.2, 30.9, X 5.7, 8.10, 28.3, 32.18, 38.1. Not all occurrences of the verb-forms in question have been listed here, nor all forms in which these verbs are found referring to Ego in the *Periegesis*. Some of the ἤκουσα etc. better belong to other categories which are discussed below.

that cannot be answered satisfactorily. It is clear that 'hear' is often used also when the information is not obtained aurally, but it cannot be ruled out that 'hear' would never have been used in its proper sense in the *Periegesis*.[7] Some of these passages will be singled out for discussion in the following.

The narrator may use both 'hear' and 'find/learn' in order to introduce new material or to close an ongoing discussion. That is, phrases with these kinds of verbs are found in the joints between different sorts of material, in like manner with the above studied organisatory statements. 'Hear' is most frequently used in order to introduce new material, whereas 'find' is more commonly used in order to end a discussion. Compare, for example:

τὰ δὲ ἐς τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἑτέραν τοιάδε ἤκουσα εἶναι.
I heard that the things concerning the other [royal] house were as follows.[8]

Hereby the narrator introduces the second half, the history of the Eurypontids, of his long historical account at the beginning of the *Laconica*. For a concluding statement, compare, for example, the following one, which stands at the end of the extensive history of Achaea and Greece at the beginning of the *Achaica*:

τάδε μὲν οὕτω συμβάντα εὕρισκον.
I found that these thing happened in such a way.[9]

Statements such as the two quoted above hardly have any more extensive function than to bring about a transition from one subject matter to another. In this regard, they resemble the passages in which the narrator introduces the organising role of Ego the writer. The difference lies in what the narrator chooses to bring into focus, his present act of narrating the *Periegesis* (writer function) or his past act of researching material for it (researcher function). When the narrator introduces the investigating role of Ego the researcher, he brings forth all the preparatory work that is the foundation upon which the whole of the *Periegesis* is built. Consider further the following passage:

---

[7] Cf. in particular Kalkmann 1886: 13–24 condemning all source-citation which suggest oral communication in the *Periegesis* as a 'Coquettiren mit selbst erkundeten Nachrichten'; Gurlitt 1890: 91–102 gives a more balanced assessment of the question; cf. also Heberdey 1894: 5–10. On local traditions and oral sources in the *Periegesis*, see also Ambaglio 1998 and 2004 and Pretzler 2005.

[8] III 7.1.

[9] VII 17.5.

ἐοικότα δὲ ἀνδρὸς ἤκουσα Φοίνικος... τότε οὖν τὸν Ῥωμαῖον, ὃς ἐπετέτραπτο Αἴγυπτον, ἄνδρα ἔφη χρήμασιν ἀναπείσαντα ἐς τὸ ἄδυτον καταπέμψαι τῆς Ἴσιδος τὸ ἐν Κόπτῳ· καὶ ὁ ἐσπεμφθεὶς ἀνέστρεψε μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀδύτου, διηγησάμενον δὲ ὁπόσα ἐθεάσατο καὶ τοῦτον αὐτίκα ἐπυνθανόμην τελευτῆσαι.

I have heard something similar from a Phoenician man... He said that at that time [*sc.* when the Egyptians celebrate the feast of Isis], the Roman who governed Egypt bribed a man into going down into the *adyton* of Isis in Coptus. He who was sent in came back out of the *adyton*; and as he had told about all that he had seen, I learned, that he, too, died immediately.[10]

In this passage we again find an 'I have heard' introducing the new material, which is an anecdote with basically the same story as in the anecdote retold just before this one. The fact that the basic story is identical in these two anecdotes is most probably the reason why the second anecdote is retold in the first place.[11] As the narrator comes to the less credible part of the second anecdote, he inserts an 'I learned' in order to remind the reader of the fact that he is retelling something he has heard from somebody else. In this instance, we are given unusually much information about the source, who is presented as a Phoenician man.[12]

Before we proceed to other means at the narrator's disposal of indicating successful research, two or three further passages with 'I have heard' will be discussed. Describing the road between Corinth and Sicyon, the narrator notices a burnt down temple.[13] Exploring possible reasons for the condition of the temple, the narrator begins by making clear that there have been many wars in the history of Corinth which plausibly have set fire to houses and sanctuaries outside the city wall. However, 'they say' (λέγουσι), the narrator explains, that the sanctuary is a temple of Apollo and that it was burnt down by Pyrrhus, Achilles' son. But,

---

[10] X 32.18.

[11] It is a particular idiosyncrasy of the narrator's, apparently to confirm the credibility of a story or the like by adducing comparable material; cf. further below chapter 7.

[12] Cf. also IX 28.2 where the information is introduced with 'I know that I have heard from a Phoenician man' ἀνδρὸς ἀκούσας οἶδα Φοίνικος. In Habicht 1985: 144f. are listed other passages in which the narrator specifies the origin of his source.

[13] II 5.5.

χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον ἤκουσα καὶ ἄλλο τοιόνδε, ὡς οἱ Κορίνθιοι Διὶ ποιήσαιντο
Ὀλυμπίῳ τὸν ναὸν καὶ ὡς ἐξαίφνης πῦρ ποθὲν ἐμπεσὸν διαφθείρειεν αὐτόν.
Later I heard also something else, namely that the Corinthians built the temple for Zeus
Olympius and that a fire suddenly from somewhere fell on it and destroyed it.[14]

This is one of the few passages in which the narrator makes clear that the
research done for the *Periegesis* took place in instalments. Here we learn of a
first finding that is supplemented with something that 'I heard *later*'. The
narrator often introduces variant versions of stories or traditions, and he
frequently cites divergent opinions of different authorities.[15] The fact that the
narrator introduces the variant version in the same place as the first version he
learned is not remarkable. What is remarkable in the present passage is the fact
that the narrator explicitly states that he came across the variant version at a later
point in time.[16]

The second passage to be discussed here appears in the description of the
sanctuary of Demeter in Lerna in the Argolis, where, according to the narrator,
mysteries in honour of Demeter Lernaea are celebrated.[17] Apropos of these
mysteries, the narrator takes the opportunity to report what in his eyes appears to

---

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] The following is a selection of passages in which variant versions are discussed: I 14.2f.
(on this passage, cf. Piérart 2000), 39.5f., II 16.3f., 22.2f., 26.2–8, III 16.7–11, 19.9–13,
IV 2.2f., 5.1–5, V 2.2–5, VI 20.15–19, VII 19.9f., VIII 18.1–3, 20.1–4, IX 27.2f., 27.6–8,
30.4–12, 31.4–6, 31.7–9, 35.1–7, X 5.5–8, 12.2–7, 38.1–3. They are all rather extensive
discussions of divergences in Greek history and traditions, in all of them Ego appears, and in
some of them he judges the credibility of the stories. Some of these will be brought up again
in the following. Cf. also Alcock 1996: 263–265 for a list of passages in which variant
versions are reported.

[16] Cf. also VIII 5.1 where the narrator much later corrects information he has given
previously; this passages is discussed further below, where we will also discuss other
instances in which the narrator avails himself of an opportunity to correct earlier slips. In
VI 12.8, the remark … ἀληθεύοντα εὕρισκον '… I found that it was true' (on the suggested
changes in the text, cf. Casevitz 2002 *ad loc*.), suggests that Ego has checked the information
provided by his source (in this case an inscription). One may wonder how many tests of the
material which only confirmed the information already at hand have been done without them
leaving any traces behind in the text. Tests with negative results are more likely to have left
traces in the text, cf. e.g. the discussion on VIII 21.2, below.

[17] II 36.7.

have been a brilliant piece of scholarship.[18] The narrator begins by stating that 'they say' (φασι) that Philammon instituted the mysteries. However, he immediately clarifies that the words uttered during the ceremony are obviously not old (δῆλά ἐστιν οὐκ ὄντα ἀρχαῖα), i.e. not as old as Philammon. In the following he explains this statement. The text, which 'I heard was written on a heart made of mountain-copper', was not Philammon's. The narrator reports that this was discovered by a certain Arriphon, whom he presents as a notable contemporary from Lycia, clever at discovering 'what nobody has seen before'. In this passage, the investigation done by Ego appears to consist of discovering Arriphon's clever finding of the fact that the text of the ritual cannot possibly be old, at least not as old as Philammon, since it is written in Doric, a dialect unknown to the Argives before the return of the Heraclidae, and since Philammon lived before that event. At the end of this section, the narrator inserts an additional observation of his own, viz. that at that time the Dorians were not known to all Greeks, 'I think' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν). By adding the modifier 'I think' to the last statement, the narrator clearly shows that he is not as certain about the tenability of his own observation as he is confident in reporting Arriphon's findings.[19]

Finally, the following curious statement claiming that the information does not come out of the narrator's own head, but that it has been found in some other source, must be mentioned:

> ὅτι δὲ τῷ Ἀκίδαντι ὄνομα Ἰάρδανος ἦν τὸ ἀρχαῖον, αὐτὸς μὲν οὐδαμόθεν συνεβαλόμην, ἀκούσας δὲ ἀνδρὸς Ἐφεσίου λέγω τὸν λόγον.
> That Acidas was earlier named Iardanus, I have not myself inferred from some source, but I make the claim having heard it from a man from Ephesus.[20]

---

[18] II 37.2f.

[19] II 37.3 ἃ δὲ ἤκουσα ἐπὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ γεγράφθαι τῇ πεποιημένῃ τοῦ ὀρειχάλκου, οὐδὲ ταῦτα ὄντα Φιλάμμωνος Ἀρριφῶν εὗρε, τὸ μὲν ἀνέκαθεν Τριχωνιεὺς τῶν ἐν Αἰτωλίᾳ, τὰ δὲ ἐφ' ἡμῶν Λυκίων τοῖς μάλιστα ὁμοίως δόκιμος, δεινὸς δὲ ἐξευρεῖν ἃ μή τις πρότερον εἶδε, καὶ δὴ καὶ ταῦτα φωρᾶσαι ἐπὶ τῷδε. τὰ ἔπη, καὶ ὅσα οὐ μετὰ μέτρου μεμιγμένα ἦν τοῖς ἔπεσι, τὰ πάντα Δωριστὶ ἐπεποίητο· πρὶν δὲ Ἡρακλείδας κατελθεῖν ἐς Πελοπόννησον, τὴν αὐτὴν ἡφίεσαν Ἀθηναίοις οἱ Ἀργεῖοι φωνήν· ἐπὶ δὲ Φιλάμμωνος οὐδὲ τὸ ὄνομα τῶν Δωριέων ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ἐς ἅπαντας ἠκούετο Ἕλληνας.
[20] V 5.9.

Why such an elaborate explanation? The phrasing becomes even more curious, if this man from Ephesus indeed is the geographer Artemidorus of Ephesus, as has been suggested.[21] Nevertheless, significant for the present study is the fact that the narrator does feel the need to emphatically signal that the information belongs to an external tradition.

Among the remaining means at the narrator's disposal to speak about fact-finding that has given positive results, 'read' is the most frequently recurring.[22] Some of the instances will be singled out here. Previously, when discussing the pretermitting role of the writer function of Ego as narrator, we had the occasion to mention two passages in which the narrator speaks of research he has done into the age of (Hesiod and) Homer, the results of which he chooses not to reveal,

> ἡμεῖς ἀκούσαντές τε καὶ ἐπιλεξάμενοι τοὺς χρησμούς…
> although we have both heard and read the oracles…[23]

Occasionally the narrator speaks about his reading using such language as to suggest that the literature he has read is not quite what it purports to be:

> ἐνταῦθα Πιτθέα διδάξαι λόγων τέχνην φασί, καί τι βιβλίον Πιτθέως δὴ σύγγραμμα ὑπὸ ἀνδρὸς ἐκδοθὲν Ἐπιδαυρίου καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπελεξάμην.
> Here, they say that Pittheus taught the art of rhetoric. And I myself have read a book, a composition of Pittheus', forsooth, published by a man from Epidaurus.[24]

Before proceeding to the other means at the narrator's disposal to speak about his fact-finding, one further passage in which the narrator specifies that during his investigations he has come across information by reading must be mentioned. After quoting from the *Atthis* of Hegesinus, the narrator confesses

---

[21] Enmann 1884: 510–512, Kalkmann 1886: 159f., Habicht 1985: 145.

[22] ἐπιλέγομαι in various forms: I 12.2, 22.7, II 4.1, 31.3, IV 2.1, VIII 11.3, 18.1, 37.12, IX 27.2, 29.2, 31.5, X 12.10 (? lacuna in the text; though probable, it is uncertain whether the subject actually is 'I'), 12.11, 24.3, 31.2.

[23] X 24.3. The verb for 'research' is a different one in the second passage: περὶ δὲ Ἡσιόδου τε ἡλικίας καὶ Ὁμήρου πολυπραγμονήσαντι ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον κτλ. 'despite my most diligent research into the age of Hesiod and Homer…' IX 30.3.

[24] II 31.3. See VIII 37.12, too. On the ironic use of the particle δή, cf. Denniston 1954: 229–236.

ταύτην τοῦ Ἡγησίνου τὴν ποίησιν οὐκ ἐπελεξάμην, ἀλλὰ πρότερον ἄρα
ἐκλελοιπυῖα ἦν πρὶν ἢ ἐμὲ γενέσθαι.

I have not read this poem by Hegesinus; it had disappeared before I was born.[25]

After this startling confession, the narrator explains how it can be that he, nonetheless, has been able to quote from this work of literature that is no longer extant. The quote comes from a secondary source, the history of Orchomenus by Callippus of Corinth.[26]

In some passages, the narrator talks about Ego's fact-finding as a process of asking questions and getting answers. One of them comes in the description of the Agora in Elis. There, the narrator says, 'I have seen' (εἶδον) something which has the shape of a temple, is not high, lacks walls, and has a roof that is supported by columns of oak. Judging from the following comment, the narrator does not appear to know quite what to make of the building:

τοῦτο εἶναι μὲν ὁμολογοῦσιν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι μνῆμα, ὅτου δὲ οὐ μνημονεύουσιν· εἰ δὲ
ὁ γέρων ὅντινα ἠρόμην εἶπεν ἀληθῆ λόγον, Ὀξύλου τοῦτο ἂν μνῆμα εἴη.

The locals agree that it is a tomb, but do not remember whose. If the old man, whom I asked, told the truth, it would be the tomb of Oxylus.[27]

Whether the question-and-answer session is fictitious or not, cannot be decisively determined. What is significant with the present passage – and all other passages studied in this chapter – is the fact that the narrator creates a record of the search for information which is the foundation upon which the *Periegesis* is built. In the present passage, the data which can be gathered with the eyes ('I have seen') has to be supplemented. However, the narrator is not

---

[25] IX 29.1f., quote §2.

[26] *Ibid.* Κάλλιππος δὲ Κορίνθιος ἐν τῇ ἐς Ὀρχομενίους συγγραφῇ μαρτύρια ποιεῖται τῷ λόγῳ τὰ ‹Ἡγησίνου› ἔπη, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς πεποιήμεθα παρ' αὐτοῦ Καλλίππου διδαχθέντες. Neither Hegesinus nor Callippus are otherwise known to us, cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc.* IX 29.1 and 2. In IX 38.9f. the narrator, again, professes to quote a poem that no longer is extant, again from the same Callippus from Corinth. The same fate as these poets had encountered threatened, among others, the historians of the Hellenistic age. In his introductory comment, the narrator explains that this is the reason why he will treat of the Ptolemies and Attalus; cf. I 6.1 οἱ συγγενόμενοι τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἐπὶ συγγραφῇ τῶν ἔργων καὶ πρότερον ἔτι ἠμελήθησαν.

[27] VI 24.9.

quite satisfied with the answer he got ('if the old man told the truth, it would be…'), but apparently he does not see any means of reaching more certain results in this matter.[28]

Finally, before proceeding to the numerous passages in which the narrator talks about research that did not yield any results, there is yet a small category of passages which needs to be mentioned. In these passages, the narrator speaks about neither successful nor failed research, but about research that he did not think of doing when he had the chance. Consider, for example, the following statement made apropos of all-white blackbirds in Cyllene:

> ἐλάφους δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ λευκὰς εἶδόν τε καὶ ἰδὼν θαῦμα ἐποιησάμην, ὁπόθεν δὲ ἢ τῶν ἠπείρων οὖσαι ἢ νησιώτιδες ἐκομίσθησαν, οὐκ ἐπῆλθεν ἐρέσθαι μοι.
>
> I saw white hinds in Rome, and wondered at the sight; but it did not occur to me to ask whence they were brought, whether they came from some continent or island.[29]

In this remark on a question which Ego forgot to ask when he had the opportunity, the temporal and spatial gap that always separates the writer function of Ego as narrator from the researcher function of Ego as character becomes exceptionally evident. One may imagine that the remark in the present passage is occasioned by the fact that the narrator, when revising notes, memoranda, or memories on all-white animals, discovered a deficiency in them. He had noted that there were all-white blackbirds in Cyllene, white eagles by the lake of Tantalus on mount Sipylus, white wild boars and bears in Thrace, and white Libyan hares. However, as to the white hinds that he saw to his great amazement in Rome, it did not even occur to him to ask about their origin. Hence the remark.[30]

---

[28] Cf. also IV 32.3 and V 11.11; in both passages there is depicted a similar question-and-answer procedure. In the following passages the narrator speaks about Ego's researches in miscellaneous manners: I 23.5, 23.10, 29.12, 34.2, II 21.8, III 24.7, 25.7, IV 27.4, VIII 6.1, 17.2.

[29] VIII 17.4.

[30] Cf. also V 24.10 (οὐκ ἐμνημόνευσα ἐπερέσθαι 'I forgot to ask') and VIII 41.10 (οὐ… ἐπῆλθε πολυπραγμονῆσαί μοι 'it did not occur to me to inquire'); cf. also VIII 38.7 which is an instance of neglected research for religious reasons, see above chapter 3. Note the observations of Knoepfler 1999: 493–497 and *passim* that the visit to Rome probably took place before the *Periegesis* was thought of, perhaps in the year AD 148, cf. above chapter 4.

In order to indicate failed research, the narrator most commonly uses a phrase with 'cannot' or 'could not'. When the present tense is used the failure refers, properly speaking, to the narrating. Compare, for example, the following passage:

> τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Διὸς Μεγαρέων μέν ἐστιν ἀνάθημα, ἀδελφοὶ δὲ αὐτὸ Ψύλακός τε καὶ Ὄναιθος καὶ οἱ παῖδες οἱ τούτων εἰργάσαντο· ἡλικίαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἢ πατρίδα ἢ παρ' ᾧ τινι ἐδιδάχθησαν, οὐκ ἔχω δηλῶσαι.
>
> The statue of Zeus is a dedication of the Megarians, the brothers Psylacus and Onaethus and their children made it; about their age, their fatherland, or with whom they were schooled, I cannot say anything.[31]

However, both in the above quoted passage and in the other instances of 'I cannot say' this or that, it is evident that, when confessing to his inability to put something into writing, the narrator is speaking just as much about the failed research as about the fact that he does not have anything to narrate. His not having anything to relate is nothing but a consequence of failed research.

The past tense, 'I could not', is used much more frequently in order to indicate that the research has not given any results. The narrator, moreover, uses a wider range of phrases for stating 'I could not'.[32] When the narrator uses the past tense, the reference specifically to the investigating role of the researcher function of Ego as character is evident. A selection of the most notable passages will be singled out for discussion in the following.

The following passage stands at the close of a lengthy description of a painting on a tombstone, which is to be found 'before one enters [Tritea]':[33]

> πυθέσθαι μὲν δὴ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν οὐκ εἴχομεν· ταφῆναι δὲ ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα ἐν κοινῷ παρίστατο ἅπασιν εἰκάζειν.

---

[31] V 23.5. Further passages in which the narrator informs his readers that he cannot give information: οὐκ ἔχω I 22.4, 28.1, 37.4, 38.5, II 18.2, IV 33.6, V 17.3, VIII 20.1, IX 10.4, X 2.1. Also note οὐκ ἂν ἔχοιμι II 35.2.

[32] οὐκ εἶχον II 31.4, VII 22.5; οὐκ εἴχομεν VII 22.7; οὐκ ἐ/ἠδυνάμην I 28.3, 32.5, II 26.1, IX 5.3, 33.3; οὐκ ἐδυνήθην X 4.3; οὐχ οἷός τε ἦν/ἐγενόμην etc. I 38.2, V 15.7, VI 9.1, 21.10, VII 17.9, IX 3.3, 35.6, X 37.3; οὐδαμῶς ἡμῖν δυνατὰ ἦν V 19.10.

[33] VII 22.6 πρὶν δὲ ἢ ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἐσελθεῖν. This and similar means of indicating movement are discussed further below in chapter 6.

We could not learn their names. But it occurred to all to guess that a man and a woman had been buried together.[34]

What is one to make of the first person plural, 'we could not', in this passage? Is it a *pluralis majestatis* as so often is the case in the *Periegesis*, as well as in other Greek literature, or is it in this instance a genuine plural? An argument in favour for it to be a genuine plural, is the fact that in the following clause the narrator states 'it occurred to *all*'. Who are these 'all'? It is possible that 'all' is to be understood as 'all of us'; if not, then the reference of 'all' does not have any kind of qualification or limitation. That is, it might be that in the present passage there surfaces into the text an indication of the fact that during the researches for the *Periegesis* Ego was not always alone. In conjunction with the present passage, another one may be quoted:

> ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις, ἀκροθίνιον τῷ Διὶ ὑπὸ Μυάνων ‹ἀνα›τεθῆναι. οἵτινες δὲ οὗτοι ἦσαν, οὐ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ παρίστατο ἅπασιν εἰκάζειν· ἐμὲ δὲ ἐσῆλθεν ἀνάμνησις ὡς Θουκυδίδης ποιήσειεν…
>
> An inscription on the armour states that it was dedicated as first-fruits to Zeus by the Myanians. As to who these were, it occurred to all to guess differently. I chanced to remember that Thucydides wrote…[35]

Again, the narrator reports about a collective 'all', to whom it occurred to guess, but this time there was not any consensus among them. We, the readers, do not get to know the different opinions. We are only informed about the thoughts of Ego, who identifies the Myanians (Μυᾶνες) on the dedication with Myonians (Μυονεῖς) mentioned by Thucydides.

To return to the 'I could not'-passages: in the historical introduction to Thebes, there is a striking reminder of how readily Ego recognises the instability and variability of the Greek traditions:

> τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας τούτους – οὐ γάρ τι ἠδυνάμην ἐς αὐτοὺς παρευρεῖν – ἕπομαι τῷ μύθῳ Σπαρτοὺς διὰ τὸν τρόπον ὅντινα ἐγένοντο ὀνομασθῆναι.

---

[34] VII 22.7.

[35] VI 19.4f.; the reference is to Thucydides 3.101. This is the only explicit reference to Thucydides' history in the *Periegesis*. On the use of Thucydides in the *Periegesis*, cf. Fischbach 1893, with the excellent critique of Eide 1992. On the use of inscriptions in the *Periegesis*, cf. in particular Habicht 1984, Whittaker 1991, Tzifopoulos 1991, Brommelaer 1999, Chamoux 2001b, and Modenesi 2001.

> Since I could not find out anything additional about them, I follow the tradition that these men got the name *Spartoi* because of the way in which they came into being.[36]

Apparently disappointed not to be able to find any variant version of this particular myth, the narrator resigns to accepting the current tradition. In the following passage, apropos of a temple for Artemis Lycea in Troezen, the narrator openly admits that he is most likely to have missed some possible explanation:

> ἐς δὲ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν οὐδὲν εἶχον πυθέσθαι παρὰ τῶν ἐξηγητῶν, ἀλλὰ ἢ λύκους ἐφαίνετό μοι τὴν Τροιζηνίαν λυμαινομένους ἐξελεῖν ὁ Ἱππόλυτος ἢ Ἀμαζόσι, παρ' ὧν τὰ πρὸς μητρὸς ἦν, ἐπίκλησις τῆς Ἀρτέμιδός ἐστιν αὕτη· εἴη δ' ἄν τι καὶ ἄλλο οὐ γινωσκόμενον ὑπὸ ἐμοῦ.
>
> As to the surname, I could not learn anything from the *exegetai*, but it appeared to me that either Hippolytus had killed wolves which ravaged Troezenia, or that the Amazons, from whom he was descendant on his mothers side, have this surname for Artemis. There might also be something else that is not known to me.[37]

There are, of course, other means available to the narrator for indicating failed research. Consider, for example, the following passage from the extensive historical narrative in the beginning of the *Messeniaca*:

> πυθέσθαι δὲ σπουδῇ πάνυ ἐθελήσας, οἵτινες παῖδες Πολυκάονι ἐγένοντο ἐκ Μεσσήνης, ἐπελεξάμην τάς τε Ἠοίας καλουμένας καὶ τὰ ἔπη τὰ Ναυπάκτια, πρὸς δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁπόσα Κιναίθων καὶ Ἄσιος ἐγενεαλόγησαν. οὐ μὴν ἔς γε ταῦτα ἦν σφισιν οὐδὲν πεποιημένον…
>
> Since I most eagerly wanted to learn what children Polycaon had with Messene, I read the so-called *Ehoiai* and the epic *Naupaktia*, and besides these all the genealogical accounts, which Cinaethon and Asius have written. However, they have not written anything in these matters…[38]

---

[36] IX 5.3.

[37] II 31.4. Similarly, in I 31.5 the narrator explains that he was unable to find out anything from the *exegetai* (πυνθανόμενος δὲ σαφὲς οὐδὲν ἐς αὐτὰς ἐπισταμένους τοὺς ἐξηγητὰς εὗρον), whereas he himself conjectures an explanation (αὐτὸς δὲ συμβάλλομαι). In I 42.4, too, the narrator fills in on what the *exegetai* fail to report; on the *exegetai* in the *Periegesis*, cf. below chapter 6.

[38] IV 2.1.

That is, Ego was not able to find any corroboration for the tradition about the result of the union of Messene and Polycaon in any of the conceivable sources. What he did find in these were variant versions, which he reports in what follows the above-quoted text.[39]

The remaining passages in which the narrator informs the reader that Ego, when making his investigations, was not successful are of a rather miscellaneous sort. In these, the narrator mostly uses negations of verbs for successful research, such as 'I have not heard'. For example, apropos of the Arcadian river Aroanius, the narrator reports that 'they say' (λέγουσι) that the fish called *poikiliai* sing just like thrush. Regarding this fish, the narrator confesses to the following:

> ἐγὼ δὲ ἀγρευθέντας μὲν εἶδον, φθεγγομένων δὲ ἤκουσα οὐδὲν καταμείνας πρὸς τῷ ποταμῷ καὶ ἐς ἡλίου δυσμάς, ὅτε δὴ φθέγγεσθαι μάλιστα ἐλέγοντο οἱ ἰχθῦς.
>
> I have seen them caught, but I have not heard them sing anything, in spite of the fact that I stayed by the river all until sunset, which is the time when the fish are reported to sing in particular.[40]

This is an interesting passage. The narrator is not satisfied with merely repeating the story that the fish sing; he has tried to verify it, too. Now, thanks to his research, he can confirm that there indeed are *poikiliai* fish – he has seen such caught. However, as to their singing, that piece of the story his researches cannot corroborate.

---

[39] The narrator appears to have considered the traditions about the Messenian past as particularly fragile; cf. III 13.2 where he explains that many of the old Messenian traditions have fallen into oblivion because their misfortunes and long exile from the Peloponnesus.

[40] VIII 21.2; cf. e.g. Frazer 1898 *ad loc.* and Jost 1998b *ad loc.* for a list of other authors who mention the singing fish. According to Frazer, people in that area still in his time (*sic*) claimed that the fish (which he identifies as trout) sing. This Frazer cannot confirm 'I did not see (much less hear) any of the trout myself, but…'. Other miscellaneous passages are: I 31.5, 33.8, 42.4, II 7.2, 35.8, IV 2.1, 31.5, V 6.2, 21.8, VIII 10.2 (failed research or natural limitation?), 11.3, 41.6, X 28.7. Some of these passages will be brought up in the following. There are, of course, a number of different ways to indicate failed research without using the first person, e.g. οὐ μνημονεύουσιν II 15.4 or οὐ λέγουσι II 24.7.

5.3 Commenting

To the investigating role of the researcher belong the numerous instances in which the narrator informs his readers about practical circumstances surrounding his gathering of facts for the *Periegesis*. Basically, this means that we get to know whether Ego was able to come across information or not. Occasionally, the narrator is more exhaustive, providing the reader with some details in addition to the bare bones of 'I heard' or 'I could not' etc.

Before turning to Ego's commenting on the material, we will discuss some passages which are not easily defined as belonging strictly to either the investigating or the commenting roles of Ego the researcher. They share characteristics with both. In them the commenting is not made either concerning the trustworthiness of the material or in order to evaluate it. Instead, the comments concern the investigating activity of Ego. Consider the following passage from the description of the temple of Hephaestus on the hill by the Athenian Agora:[41]

> καὶ ὅτι μὲν ἄγαλμά οἱ παρέστηκεν Ἀθηνᾶς, οὐδὲν θαῦμα ἐποιούμην τὸν ἐπὶ Ἐριχθονίῳ ἐπιστάμενος λόγον· τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα ὁρῶν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς γλαυκοὺς ἔχον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς Λιβύων τὸν μῦθον ὄντα εὕρισκον.
>
> I did not marvel at the fact that a statue of Athena stood beside him, since I knew the story about Erichthonius. When I saw that the statue of Athena had blue eyes, I discovered that the myth was Libyan.[42]

According to the Libyans, the narrator goes on to explain, Athena, being the daughter of lake Tritonis and Poseidon, has blue eyes just as her father. In the present passage, is the narrator remembering his researches on the spot in Athens? It would appear as if the remark 'I did not marvel' is uttered retrospectively from the 'here and now' of Ego as narrator about Ego as character who was doing his investigations in a 'there and then' obviously both temporally and spatially separated from the narrator's present. That is, 'I did not

---

[41] The Athenian Agora is called *kerameikos* in the *Periegesis*; on the terms *agora* and *kerameikos* in the description of Athens, cf. Vanderpool 1974; on the Athenian Agora in general, cf. Papadopoulos 1996. Also in VIII 9.8 the narrator calls the Athenian Agora *kerameikos*.

[42] I 14.6.

marvel' is a comment about Ego in his investigating role: then, when faced with Athena at the side of Hephaestus, 'I did not marvel'. The same goes for the second part of the above quoted passage. Then, the narrator explains, when 'I saw' Athena's blue eyes, 'I discovered' that the myth was Libyan. That is, Ego imagines that the artist's choice of colour for Athena's eyes was influenced by a myth which he, when faced with the statue, managed to identify as Libyan.[43]

As we turn to the commenting role of the researcher, we are now faced with an Ego already in possession of the relevant information; instead of an Ego gathering information, we meet an Ego reacting to and expressing opinions about the information. Of the three roles of the researcher function of Ego as character, the commenting one, with its more than 260 passages, occurs most frequently. However, as well as being the most frequent of the roles of the researcher function, the commenting role is also the most stereotyped one. The narrator introduces Ego in his commenting role as reacting to the material in, broadly speaking, one of two ways: (1) by remarking on the certainty or uncertainty as to the trustworthiness of the material,[44] (2) by evaluating the material on moral, emotional, or aesthetic grounds. Of these two reactions, the former occurs most frequently.

When the narrator in his evaluation of the material uses the first person, his comment, unless expressing amazement, is usually one of either praise or blame.[45] Two of the evaluative comments will be singled out in the following.

Comments expressing praise are particularly frequent in the historical introduction to the *Laconica*. One of these comments concerns the Athenian and Spartan support for the Phocians in the third sacred war, despite their occupation

---

[43] Two further passages in which the commenting appears to concern the investigating rather than anything else are I 12.2 and VIII 38.7.

[44] In contrast to the uncertainty that can be inferred from the 'they say'-phrases (cf. above), the narrator now explicitly signals that Ego is uncertain (or certain) by using the first person. The uncertainty of the 'they say'-phrases is a secondary construction by the reader of a phrase that (at least on the face of it) is primarily a source-citation.

[45] Amazement: I 13.9, 23.4, 27.3, 35.5, II 5.8, VI 2.10, VIII 17.4, X 14.6; praise: I 8.3, 22.6, 29.3, II 27.5, III 4.7, 4.9, 5.5, 10.4, 17.3, 19.6, V 25.13, VII 17.3, VIII 52.5, IX 9.1, 9.5, 22.2, 22.3, X 22.9; blame: I 6.7, III 10.4, VI 8.4, IX 32.10, X 22.3; miscellaneous expressions of opinion: VII 24.9, VIII 28.2, X 32.2.

and pillage of Delphi.[46] The narrator's phrasing suggests to the reader that he does not quite believe in what he says regarding the reasons why Athens and Sparta came to the support of the Phocians. The Athenians came because of some old benefaction, 'forsooth' (δή), the narrator explains, with only a minimal interjection of personal opinion. As to the Spartans, with whom the narrator, naturally, is more concerned in this historical introduction, he conjectures that, though friendship was professed as the reason, they really supported the Phocians because of their hatred for the Thebans. By inserting an 'I think' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν), the narrator makes clear that he is uncertain as to the trustworthiness of the explanation given.[47] After further suggesting that the Spartan co-operation was promoted by their king Archidamus and his wife getting some of the money for themselves – Theopompus is cited as evidence for this allegation –, the narrator next evaluates the act:

> τὸ μὲν δὴ χρήματα ἱερὰ δέξασθαι καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἀμῦναι μαντείων πορθήσασι τὸ ἐπιφανέστατον οὐκ ἐς ἔπαινον τίθεμαι, τοσοῦτον δέ οἱ πρόσεστιν ἐς ἔπαινον.
> To accept holy money and to aid men who plunder the most illustrious of oracles I do not praise, but this much is to his credit.[48]

Despite Archidamus' sacrilegious acts, the narrator – who is regularly described as a pious man consistently censuring warfare between Greeks under the influence of the Panhellenic sentiments of the period[49] – finds something to commend in Archidamus: he stopped the Phocians from killing or enslaving the Delphians and razing the city to the ground. In general, the narrator is not prone to utter condemning evaluative comments explicitly in his own voice on any subject, not even on warfare between Greeks.

Art and objects are also evaluated.[50] Apropos of paintings in a room to the left of the *propylaea*, the entrance to the Athenian Acropolis, the narrator gets an

---

[46] III 10.3f.

[47] *Ibid.* Θηβαίοις μὲν δὴ πολεμεῖν τοῖς Φωκεῦσιν ἀφίκετο μὲν καὶ ἰδίᾳ συμμαχικὰ ἐπὶ χρήμασιν, ἀπὸ δὲ κοινοῦ λόγου Λακεδαιμόνιοί τε καὶ Ἀθηναῖοί σφισιν ἤμυνον, οἱ μὲν ἀρχαίαν δή τινα ἐκ τῶν Φωκέων μνημονεύοντες εὐεργεσίαν, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ προφάσει μὲν καὶ οὗτοι φιλίας, κατὰ ἔχθος δὲ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν τὸ Θηβαίων.

[48] III 10.4.

[49] This supposed attitude of the narrator vis-à-vis war of Greek against Greek will be discussed further below in chapter 8.

[50] On the frequently occurring θέας ἄξιος *vel sim.*, cf. above chapter 3, with n. 66.

106

opportunity to compare and contrast literary and pictorial representations of themes from the Trojan war cycle.[51] One of the paintings depicted Polyxena about to be slaughtered at Achilles' tomb, 'Homer did well in passing by this so cruel an act', the narrator comments.[52] There was also a painting of Achilles at Scyrus. 'I think that [Homer] did well in representing Scyrus as conquered by Achilles', the narrator comments, and not claiming, as others do, that he lived there with maidens; the latter theme is the motif of the painting which caused the comment.[53] In a third painting Odysseus was standing near Nausicaa and the other women who were washing clothes, 'in exactly the same way as Homer wrote.'[54] Note the transitions from one motif to another by way of comparing the pictorial representation with the Homeric epics.

As to the commenting on the trustworthiness of the material, we may distinguish between three different types. They all suggest varying degrees of confidence on Ego's part vis-à-vis the reported material. Ego's contentment with the material of the *Periegesis* appears to range from the dissatisfied to the satisfied, via the hesitant. In the following the commenting of Ego the researcher concerning the trustworthiness of the material will be discussed in an ascending order going towards the comments which suggest satisfaction with the material.

When commenting in such a manner as to suggest dissatisfaction with the trustworthiness of the material which is presented, the narrator most frequently qualifies the information with 'I do not know' (οὐκ οἶδα/ἴσμεν). That is, the dissatisfaction springs from the fact that Ego is reaching the limits of his knowledge, and has to – or feels the need to – confess his ignorance in certain matters. Consider, for example, the following passage from the description of the monument of the eponymous heroes on the Athenian Agora:

---

[51] I 22.6.

[52] *Ibid.* Ὁμήρῳ δὲ εὖ μὲν παρείθη τόδε τὸ ὠμὸν οὕτως ἔργον. This phrase, without any first person, is a reminder of the fact that there are evaluations other than the ones listed above, in n. 45. How to interpret evaluative words and phrases in contexts in which Ego is not explicitly present through a first person pronoun or verb, is an interesting problem which is unfortunately beyond the scope of the present study.

[53] *Ibid.* εὖ δέ μοι φαίνεται ποιῆσαι Σκῦρον ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως ἁλοῦσαν, οὐδὲν ὁμοίως καὶ ὅσοι λέγουσιν ὁμοῦ ταῖς παρθένοις Ἀχιλλέα ἔχειν ἐν Σκύρῳ δίαιταν, ἃ δὴ καὶ Πολύγνωτος ἔγραψεν.

[54] *Ibid.* κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καθὰ δὴ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐποίησε.

Κέκροπα δὲ καὶ Πανδίονα – εἶδον γὰρ καὶ τούτων ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις εἰκόνας – οὐκ οἶδα οὓς ἄγουσιν ἐν τιμῇ· πρότερός τε γὰρ ἦρξε Κέκροψ… καὶ ὕστερος…

As to Cecrops and Pandion (I saw statues of them, too, among the eponyms) I do not know whom they honour. For both a Cecrops the first ruled… and a Cecrops the second…[55]

With the comment 'I do not know', the narrator suggests that his investigation did not yield unambiguous results. In the following the narrator clarifies wherein the uncertainty lies. Cecrops and Pandion belong to the eponymous heroes of the Athenians, this much is clear. The problem is that in the history of Athens, there were two Cecropses and Pandions each. The investigations have led to unsatisfying results, viz. the realisation that there are several possible interpretations, and no means of determining which is the correct one. Hence the 'I do not know'.

The narrator's comment regarding the last motif mentioned in the long description of the paintings of Polygnotus in Delphi, deserves some attention in this context. The motif is Tantalus' sufferings in the underworld. He is depicted suffering all the torments that Homer has written about, i.e. hunger and thirst, but,

… ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς πρόσεστίν οἱ καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπηρτημένου λίθου δεῖμα. Πολύγνωτος μὲν δῆλός ἐστιν ἐπακολουθήσας τῷ Ἀρχιλόχου λόγῳ· Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ οὐκ οἶδα εἴτε ἐδιδάχθη παρὰ ἄλλων τὰ ἐς τὸν λίθον εἴτε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐς τὴν ποίησιν ἐσηνέγκατο.

… in addition to these, fear from the overhanging rock accrues to him. Polygnotus has obviously followed Archilochus' story. But I do not know whether Archilochus has learnt the matter concerning the rock from others, or whether he himself introduced it into the poem.[56]

In other words, when describing this motif, the narrator is mainly interested in identifying the literary model for the scene depicted in the painting.[57] Detecting

---

[55] I 5.3. Other occurrences of οὐκ οἶδα/ἴσμεν are: I 2.3, 9.1, 11.7, 27.6, 29.1, 33.6, 37.5, II 1.1, 6.2, 18.9, 29.2, 34.3, 36.1, 37.5, III 4.6, 14.9, 18.11, 19.2, 24.5, 26.4, IV 2.7, 31.10, 34.6, 35.5, V 8.8, 19.5, 21.3, 22.5, 24.4, VI 4.5, 10.5, 12.6, 14.11, 15.1, 19.2, 19.11, VII 12.8, 17.6, VIII 4.5, 17.6, 18.6, 22.6, 47.3, 53.8, IX 27.1, 35.7, 40.4, X 11.5, 17.1, 26.1, 31.12, 34.6, 37.2.

[56] X 31.12; the Homeric allusion is to *Od.* 11.582–592, Archilochus fragm. 91 West.

[57] This concern is reminiscent of the treatment of the statues of Athena and Hephaestus in I 14.6. There, too, the narrator's concern is focussed on identifying the tradition behind the

the influence of Homer and Archilochus on Polygnotus' painting appears to have been a simple matter. However, the narrator goes beyond simply identifying the literary model. He proceeds to speculating whether Archilochus himself invented the overhanging rock as an addition to the sufferings of Tantalus, or whether he was merely following the previous tradition. He does not have an answer to this question.[58] However, it is interesting that the narrator introduces the speculation at all into the *Periegesis*, considering the fact that he must have done it fully aware of the fact that in the end he must confess 'I do not know' in the matter.

Finally, mention must be made of the following comment about a bronze statue of Zeus dedicated by Mummius after his defeat of the Achaean Confederacy in 146 BC:

> Ῥωμαίων δὲ οὔτε ἄνδρα ἰδιώτην οὔτε ὁπόσοι τῆς βουλῆς οὐδένα Μομμίου πρότερον ἀνάθημα ἴσμεν ἐς ἱερὸν ἀναθέντα Ἑλληνικόν.
>
> We do not know of any Roman private person or member of the senate who has made a dedication in a Greek sanctuary before Mummius.[59]

From both inscriptions and literature, we know about dedications made by Romans in Greek sanctuaries before Mummius. Therefore, Pausanias has been accused of error in his statement about Mummius in this passage.[60] An attempt has been made to save Pausanias from error by forcing the meaning of ἀνάθημα, interpreting it to mean 'statue of a god' specifically, not 'votive offering' in general.[61] However, in the light of the fact that the texts reads 'we do not know of any…', there is no reason either to accuse Pausanias of error, or to save him from it. That is, there is no unqualified claim that Mummius indeed was the first

---

depictions.

[58] Cf. X 31.3f. where the narrator, apropos of Meleager in Hades, discusses variant versions as to how he died. He notes that Phrynichus was the first one to mention in a drama the firebrand with which Meleager's term of life was connected. Adding that Phrynichus does not elaborate the story about the firebrand, but merely alludes to the motif, the narrator concludes that Phrynichus would not seem to have been the inventor of the tradition. Hereby the narrator insinuates that he understands the license with which poets could handle the facts of a myth.

[59] V 24.4.

[60] Cf. e.g. Habicht 1985: 99f. and Jacquemin 1999 *ad loc.*, both with references to previous studies and relevant authors and inscriptions.

[61] Tzifopoulos 1993.

109

Roman to make dedications in a Greek sanctuary. All the narrator claims is not to know of any previous Roman dedicant, i.e. he confesses to the limits of his knowledge.[62]

Another means of indicating that Ego is reaching the limits of his knowledge is for the narrator to use expressions like the following. Apropos of a temple of Hades in Elis, the narrator notices:

ἀνθρώπων δὲ ὧν ἴσμεν μόνοι τιμῶσιν ᾿Αιδην ᾿Ηλεῖοι.
Of the people whom we know of, the Eleans are the only ones to worship Hades.[63]

That is, instead of unconditionally saying 'the Eleans are the only ones to…', the narrator qualifies the statement: the Eleans are the only ones 'of the people whom we know of'. Thereby he acknowledges the limitations of his knowledge, making clear that he is dissatisfied with the trustworthiness of the material which is reported in the statement. Having finished discussing why the Eleans have something as unusual as a cult for Hades, the narrator rounds off the discussion with a comment on the custom to open the temple only once a year:

ἑκάστου δὲ ἅπαξ ἀνοίγειν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ νομίζουσιν, ὅτι οἶμαι καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἡ κάθοδος ἡ ἐς τοῦ ᾿Αιδου γίνεται.
They are wont to open it once a year, since I think the descent to Hades' happens once for man.[64]

Since Ego does not appear to have made any inquiries on the subject, he merely conjectures that the reason behind the custom is that it is supposed to imitate the fact that people enter Hades only once. The narrator here uses 'I think' (οἶμαι) in order to make clear that the trustworthiness of the last piece of information is uncertain.

The comments suggesting that the narrator feels uncertain as to the trustworthiness of the material, and therefore is presenting it with some hesitancy, will be discussed next. The above discussed comments which suggest

---

[62] Cf. also the objections of Arafat 1996: 95f. to Tzifopoulos' interpretation of the passage.

[63] VI 25.2. Similar expressions as to the limitation of knowledge (πρῶτος ὧν οἶδα *vel sim.*) are found in I 16.2, 25.7, II 31.6, III 15.10, IV 17.2, 30.4, 30.6, VI 11.4, 25.2, VII 21.4, VIII 7.6, 41.3, IX 6.4, 21.3, 35.4, 36.4, X 23.1. The following are miscellaneous: X 27.3, 32.2.

[64] VI 25.3.

dissatisfaction with the trustworthiness appear to be occasioned by research which has not yielded satisfactory results, although the material is such that one should have been able to figure it out through research, at least in theory. When the narrator expresses uncertainty, he does this apropos of material concerning which it is impossible to reach absolute certainty, even in theory. The comments expressing uncertainty are, thus, mostly made when the narrator is attributing thoughts, feelings, motives etc. to others, or when the narrator wishes to make clear that what is said is Ego's opinion regarding the material. These are explicit signs of external focalisation, i.e. by introducing them into the text, the narrator indicates that he cannot get below the surface of things without entering the realm of conjecture and suppositions, and demonstrates his 'marked ignorance with respect to the hero's real thoughts'.[65] Of the numerous passages containing comments suggesting uncertainty, only a few can be discussed here. The phrases δοκῶ, δοκεῖ μοι, δοκοῦσί μοι, or δοκεῖν μοι ('I think', 'it seems to me') are the most frequently used when the narrator marks the statement as uncertain, i.e. the information of the *Periegesis* as being dependent on Ego's frail discernment.[66]

In the long biographical note on Pyrrhus of Epirus, occasioned by a statue of him somewhere in Athens, the narrator tells among other things about Pyrrhus' Italian venture.[67] Among Pyrrhus' failed successes, the most famous feature of his doings in Italy was his use of elephants when fighting against the Romans. The narrator, too, appears to consider the use of elephants as most

---

[65] On focalisation, cf. Genette 1980: 185–194, quote p. 194, and Genette 1988: 72–78, which is a response to the way in which Bal 1977: 19–58 critiqued and transformed his concept of focalisation; cf. also the excellent defence of the Genettian over the Balian concept of focalisation by Rood 1998: 11–14 and 294–296.

[66] I 1.5, 4.3, 8.3, 9.7, 12.4, 14.3, 17.5, 20.7, 21.2, 22.7, 23.4, 29.2, 34.5, 38.4, 41.8, 44.1, II 1.6, 6.4, 11.4, 11.5, 14.3, 18.7, 19.8, 21.10, 26.7, 27.5, 30.2, 31.1, 31.2, 31.5, 33.3, 34.5, 35.5, 37.3, 37.4, 38.2, III 2.4, 4.7, 8.2, 8.10, 10.3, 12.2, 16.7, 17.3, 18.5, 19.6, 19.8, 21.1, 22.3 (*bis*), 26.4, IV 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 16.10, 27.3, 29.6, 31.8, 33.2, 33.7, 35.2, 36.5, V 3.4, 8.10, 10.8, 11.8, 12.3, 13.6, 14.2, 14.7, 22.7, 26.1, 27.8, VI 4.9, 9.3, 11.5, 12.6, 20.18, 21.9, 22.11, VII 2.7, 6.4, 7.5, 7.9, 19.10, 22.1, 27.7, VIII 1.4, 2.2, 7.8, 8.12, 14.12, 26.7, 31.6, 34.1, 35.2, 35.4, 35.8, 35.10, IX 1.1, 1.2, 3.2 (*bis*), 5.1, 5.10, 7.2, 7.4, 10.4, 21.1, 21.4, 21.5, 22.2, 24.3, 25.9, 30.4, 31.9, 36.3, 40.6, 40.10, 41.3, X 3.4, 5.12, 7.8, 8.8, 10.4 (*bis*), 12.4, 16.6, 17.4, 19.11, 21.7, 25.3, 26.2, 28.2, 35.3. Some of these passages will be discussed below in other contexts too.

[67] Pyrrhus' biography I 11.1–13.9; the Italian venture I 12.1–13.1.

notable. At least he dwells on the subject of the elephants by, to begin with, explaining how Pyrrhus got hold of his elephants.[68] The Romans were terrified at the sight of them, since, the narrator explains, 'they thought that they were something else than animals'.[69] This provides the narrator with an opportunity to dwell further on the subject of elephants, now by explaining how recent the knowledge of elephants was among the Greeks at the time of Pyrrhus, as compared to the ancient knowledge of ivory. This is proven by Homer who mentions ivory-products, but not elephants. Indeed, the narrator continues:

θεασάμενος δὲ ἢ πεπυσμένος ἐμνημόνευσεν ἂν πολύ γε πρότερον, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, ἢ Πυγμαίων τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ γεράνων μάχης.
Had he seen or heard [*sc.* of elephants], he would have mentioned them much rather – I think – than a battle between Pygmies and cranes.[70]

That is, the narrator appears to opine that it would have been much more impressive to talk about the noise caused by elephants than by cranes, and, further, that this would have been the opinion of Homer, too. He, therefore, concludes that the reason why Homer mentions cranes instead of elephants is that he did not know about the animals. The line of reasoning is uncertain. The narrator appears to have realised this, and marks the uncertainty by inserting an 'I think' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν).

Describing the Isthmus, the narrator points out that it is sacred to Poseidon. The story explaining this circumstance is introduced with the following words:

τὸ δὲ οὐ Κορινθίοις μόνον περὶ τῆς χώρας ἐστὶν εἰρημένον, ἀλλὰ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν Ἀθηναῖοι πρῶτοι περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐσεμνολόγησαν.

---

[68] I 12.3.

[69] *Ibid.* ἄλλο τι καὶ οὐ ζῷα εἶναι νομίσαντας. Occasionally, as in the present passage, the narrator ascribes thoughts and the like to others without adding any 'I think' or other phrase to that effect. In other words, we have here an alteration to the dominant external focalisation, momentarily giving more information about the inner thoughts of somebody else with greater confidence than is typical of the *Periegesis*; such occurrences are termed 'paralepsis' by Genette 1980: 194–198, esp. 197. It should be noted that generally speaking ancient historiography does not quite obey the same rules as modern historiography. In the presentation of the subject matter, ancient historiography is on the whole much more open to fictionalising traits than modern historiography, *inter alia* by not strictly adhering to external focalisation; cf. e.g. de Jong 2004: 8f., which is a response to Cohn 1999: 109–131.

[70] I 12.4. The reference is to *Il.* 3.3–7.

> The Corinthians are not alone in relating a story about their land; the Athenians, I think, were first to say such solemn things about Attica.[71]

Thereupon the narrator goes on to explain how Briareus gave the Isthmus to Poseidon and the Acrocorinth to Helius, when the two gods rivalled for the honours. What is particularly noteworthy with the above quoted introductory statement, is the fact that the narrator introduces the Corinthian story by citing a parallel: the Athenians, too, have a similar story about gods vying for being patrons of their land.[72] Moreover, the narrator adds the uncertain piece of information – note 'I think' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν) – that the Athenians were the first to solemnify their past in such a manner.

Although different forms of δοκέω are, by far, the most frequently occurring markers of uncertainty, there are other verbs and phrases at the narrator's disposal for this purpose. For instance, in Athens there is a temple of Eucleia ('Good Repute'). This, the narrator informs us, has been dedicated from the spoils taken from the Persians who landed at Marathon. Apropos of this temple the following comment is made:

φρονῆσαι δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ ταύτῃ μάλιστα εἰκάζω...
I guess that the Athenians are particularly proud of this victory...[73]

'I guess'? We may be fairly certain that the narrator did not doubt that the Athenians indeed were particularly proud of their victory at Marathon, although we cannot state it for a fact. Therefore the narrator's 'I guess' appears to feign uncertainty, and should probably be understood ironically. The narrator goes on

---

[71] II 1.6.

[72] It is a recurring characteristic of the *Periegesis* that the narrator cites parallels to any story or phenomenon that he is in the process of talking about; on this, cf. below chapter 7.

[73] I 14.5. See also εἰκάζω etc. II 11.7, IV 1.3, 27.1, V 23.7, 25.5, VII 21.8, VIII 8.3, 17.2, 25.7, 37.1, IX 2.7, X 4.2, 25.4, 37.2; ἡγοῦμαι I 31.5, 42.4, II 12.5, 35.9, V 23.6, VI 19.13; κατὰ γνώμην/δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν etc. I 33.1, 39.3, III 14.5, IV 6.5, 35.1, VI 8.4, 14.2, 19.5, VIII 28.2, 43.6, X 29.4, 37.3; νομίζω etc. I 28.10, 42.4, V 23.7, IX 35.3; οἶμαι I 41.9, III 20.9, VI 25.3; πείθομαι I 16.3, 41.4, II 4.2, 19.3, 37.4, IV 11.8, V 5.9, 7.3, VII 26.8, VIII 8.5, IX 2.4, 21.4, 21.6 (*bis*), IX 37.5, 40.4, 40.12; τεκμαίρομαι etc. I 28.1, II 35.2, VII 5.9, VIII 22.7, X 31.11, 32.14, 33.3, 38.10; φαίνεταί μοι etc. II 13.5, 29.9, 31.4, III 18.5, V 14.2, 17.3, 20.5, VI 4.7, 7.7, 8.2, VII 23.9, VIII 22.6, 22.7, 48.6, IX 8.5, 22.3, 27.8, X 4.2, 11.6, 22.9, 33.6. The following are miscellaneous: II 28.2, III 11.11, V 15.7, 19.7, 19.10, VII 19.5, IX 11.4, X 15.5.

to cite Aeschylus as evidence of his assumption: Aeschylus wanted to be remembered for fighting the Persians at Marathon, not for his literary fame.[74]

Occasionally, the reason why the narrator marks a specific piece of information as uncertain, appears to be no other than his wish to make clear that what is said is not explicitly corroborated in some source other than himself. Consider, for instance, the following passage, apropos of a statue of Apollo Lycius:

> τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς Δαναοῦ καὶ ὁ ναὸς καὶ τὸ ξόανον ἀνάθημα ἦν· ξόανα γὰρ δὴ τότε εἶναι πείθομαι πάντα καὶ μάλιστα τὰ Αἰγύπτια.
>
> Originally, the temple and the *xoanon* were dedicated by Danaus. For I believe that in those days all [*sc.* statues], in particular the Egyptian ones, were *xoana*.[75]

In the first proposition, the narrator says 'the *xoanon*' (i.e. statue of wood), as if he knew for certain that the statue in fact was a wooden one. In the second proposition he clarifies the first statement: '(I say the *xoanon*) for', when Danaus lived, the practice was to use wood for sculpture. On this Ego is nearly certain, but he is hesitant enough to mark the trustworthiness of the statement as uncertain by using 'I believe' (πείθομαι).

Finally, an instance which procures a transition between the passages in which the narrator makes clear that he is uncertain regarding the trustworthiness of the material, and those passages in which he makes clear that he is rather confident as to its trustworthiness. Apropos of Oeantheia and Naupactus in Locris, the narrator discusses the origin of the names of the cities. Oeantheia got its name, 'I presume' (τεκμαίρομαι), from some woman or nymph – this is a matter in which the narrator cannot but guess. But Naupactus, 'I know' (οἶδα), is the site where the Dorians with the children of Aristomachus are reputed to have built the ships with which they sailed over to the Peloponnesus.[76] Hence the name.

---

[74] Is one to read the comment in I 21.2 in the light of this remark? In the theatre of Dionysus in Athens, there were statues of famous writers of tragedies and comedies. Among the tragedians, the narrator notes a statue of Aeschylus; this statue, 'I think' (δοκῶ), was sculpted much after Aeschylus' death.

[75] II 19.3. On *xoanon* and other vocabulary for 'statue' in the *Periegesis*, cf. Schubart 1866 *passim*, Pritchett 1998: 204–294, Pritchett 1999: 168–182, and Vincent 2003 *passim*.

[76] X 38.10 κληθῆναι δὲ ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἢ νύμφης τεκμαίρομαι τὴν πόλιν, ἐπεὶ ἐπὶ Ναυπάκτῳ γε οἶδα εἰρημένον ὡς Δωριεῖς οἱ ὁμοῦ τοῖς Ἀριστομάχου παισὶ τὰ πλοῖα

When the narrator makes it clear that he is satisfied with the trustworthiness of the information, the certainty which he signals mostly has reference to some specific detail in a larger context. However, the 'I know' (οἶδα/ἴσμεν) which is used to signal certainty regarding some detail, though formally speaking not reaching beyond it, gives an air of certainty to the larger context in which it is embedded, at least on a perfunctory reading.[77] Similarly, the much more frequently occurring markers of uncertainty give a hint of uncertainty to the context in which they occur. By occasionally signalling certainty with 'I know', the narrator gives the readers a much needed breathing-space where for a moment they can rest their minds assured in the knowledge that the narrator is prepared to guarantee the trustworthiness of at least some piece of information.

Closing a lengthy discussion on the deadly water of Styx in Arcadia, the narrator makes the following observation:

εἰ δὲ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Φιλίππου συνέβη τὴν τελευτὴν διὰ τοῦ φαρμάκου γενέσθαι τούτου, σαφῶς μὲν οὐκ οἶδα, λεγόμενον δὲ οἶδα.

Whether Alexander the son of Philip, too, happened to die from this poison, I do not know for certain, but I know that it is reported.[78]

αὐτόθι ἐποιήσαντο, οἷς ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἐπεραιώθησαν.

[77] Passages in which οἶδα/ἴσμεν signals certainty: I 23.4, 24.8, 27.1, 29.1, 29.2, II 1.8, 12.3, 18.4, 27.1, III 3.9, 19.11, 20.4, 20.6, 24.7, 24.11, 26.2, 26.6, 26.10, IV 14.7, 14.8, 32.4, 35.12, 36.6, V 1.3, 7.4, 14.7, 14.9, VI 22.6, VII 6.6, VIII 5.11, 13.1, 15.2, 18.6, 22.2, 33.1, 40.3, 46.3, IX 3.8, 11.7, X 29.2, 32.8, 38.10. We do not count II 2.2. Here Spiro 1903 and Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 print οὐκ ἂν οἶδ’ εἰ, which is an emendation proposed by Madvig 1871: 705 for a manuscript reading which does not make sense (οὐκ ἂν οὐδ’ εἰ). Though the emendation proposed by Madvig would produce good Greek, another emendation, proposed by Lobeck 1829: 284 n. *f*, would probably produce more Pausanian Greek: οὐκ ἂν οὐδέ. This emendation is preferred by Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 and Frazer 1898, I: 569f.; cf. also, regarding Lobeck's emendation, the comment of Musti 1986 *app. crit. ad loc.* 'quod mea sententia esse potest'. Indeed, Madvig's objection ('nemo tamen sic haec copulavit: οὐκ ἂν οὐδέ') against Lobeck's conjecture does not hold. It may be that the combination οὐκ ἂν οὐδέ is unusual in good (?) Greek, but in the *Periegesis* there are two occurrences of the combination, cf. II 11.6 and IX 39.10.

[78] VIII 17.6–18.6, quote §18.6.

That is, whereas the narrator is dissatisfied as to the truth-value of the report that Alexander of Macedon was poisoned by the water of Styx, he can at least be certain that there is a report to that effect.[79]

On the Athenian Acropolis, there was a statue of Apollo Parnopius, said to be the work of Phidias. As to the surname, Parnopius ('of the locusts'), the narrator notes that it was given to Apollo because the god promised to avert locusts that were devastating the land. However, Ego does not appear to have been able to find out all that he wanted about this event:

> καὶ ὅτι μὲν ἀπέτρεψεν ἴσασι, τρόπῳ δὲ οὐ λέγουσι ποίῳ. τρὶς δὲ αὐτὸς ἤδη πάρνοπας ἐκ Σιπύλου τοῦ ὄρους οὐ κατὰ ταὐτὰ οἶδα φθαρέντας…
> That he drove them away they know, but they do not say how. I myself know that locusts have been exterminated from mount Sipylus three times in different ways…[80]

The information failed regarding the specific destruction of locusts, which was the occasion for the dedication of the statue. Instead of speculating about the manner of their destruction, the narrator fills the gap by reporting about three different ways in which 'I know' (οἶδα) that locusts have been destroyed at a different place: heavy wind, rain followed by heat, and sudden cold.

Again, describing the temple of Athena Polias on the Athenian Acropolis, the narrator enumerates some old artefacts in it. Among these were spoils taken from the Persians: the breastplate of Masistius who commanded the Persian cavalry at Plataea and a sword which reportedly was Mardonius' (ἀκινάκης Μαρδονίου λεγόμενος εἶναι).[81] By inserting λεγόμενος, 'being said', to the last part of the statement, the narrator reminds the reader of the fact that he is merely reporting data originating from someone else. 'I know' (οἶδα), the narrator continues, that the Athenians killed Masistius in the battle, thereby implying that he has no difficulty believing that the breastplate indeed was Masistius'. As to Mardonius, he is not equally certain. Pointing to the fact that Mardonius fought against the Lacedaemonians in the battle and was killed by a Spartiate, the narrator suggests that it is not likely that the Athenians would have been allowed

---

[79] Among others, Plutarch *Alexander* 77.4f. reports the story. He, too, remarks that there are some who disbelieve it; cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc*. VIII 18.6 for references to other authors who mention the story.

[80] I 24.8.

[81] I 27.1.

to take Mardonius' sword.[82] Thus, though not altogether dismissing the idea, the narrator is not quite prepared to accept it either. In this regard, only one thing is certain: Masistius was killed by Athenians at Plataea.

Finally, before proceeding to the criticising role of Ego the researcher, there is yet one category of comments to be considered in the present context. These are a few passages in which the narrator expresses an opinion as to the veracity of the information. In these passages, the narrator explicitly and emphatically states whether he regards the information as reasonable or believable. For example, in the historical introduction to the *Arcadica*, the narrator reports about the failed return of the Heraclidae when their leader Hyllus was killed on the Isthmus by Echemus, king of Arcadia. Apropos of this, the narrator explains:

> τάδε γὰρ ἐφαίνετο εἰκότα εἶναί μοι μᾶλλον ἢ ὁ πρότερος λόγος, ἐν ᾧ βασιλεύειν
> τε Ἀχαιῶν τηνικαῦτα Ὀρέστην ἔγραψα καὶ Ὕλλον ἐπὶ Ὀρέστου βασιλεύοντος
> ἀποπειρᾶσαι καθόδου τῆς ἐς Πελοπόννησον.
> For this seemed to me more reasonable than the previous account, in which I wrote that
> Orestes was king of the Achaeans at that time and that Hyllus tried to return to the
> Peloponnesus during Orestes' reign.[83]

That is, the narrator has obviously found new facts that did not quite agree with information previously included in the *Periegesis*. He, therefore, takes the opportunity to draw the reader's attention to the fact that there is information in the work that he now finds erroneous, and to correct himself. Interestingly, at the beginning of the *Arcadica*, the narrator on two further occasions seizes the opportunity to explain to the reader that he has come to a new and improved understanding of things.[84]

---

[82] *Ibid*. Μαρδονίου δὲ μαχεσαμένου Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐναντία καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνδρὸς Σπαρτιάτου πεσόντος οὐδ' ἂν ὑπεδέξαντο ἀρχὴν οὐδὲ ἴσως Ἀθηναίοις παρῆκαν φέρεσθαι Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὸν ἀκινάκην.

[83] VIII 5.1, the reference is to I 41.2. Other passages in which the information is explicitly said to be reasonable: II 23.3, III 11.11, 14.7, 16.7, IV 1.9, 2.3, 6.3, VIII 14.12, 25.11. II 19.8 and VIII 35.4 are negated. Some of these passages have already been mentioned above, others will be mentioned again in the next section.

[84] VIII 2.1 οὐκέτι δὲ τὰ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις Παναθήναια τεθῆναι πρότερα ἀποφαίνομαι 'I no longer claim that the Panathenaea among the Athenians was held before [the Lycaea].' This is a view that has not been expressed previously in the *Periegesis*. VIII 8.2f. is discussed in

Among the occasionally emphatic professions to believe some thing or other, one passage will be singled out. In the *Boeotica*, apropos of the tomb of the sons of Oedipus, the narrator states the following:

> ‹ἔστιν› ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς δρώμενα ἃ οὐ θεασάμενος πιστὰ ὅμως ὑπείληφα εἶναι.
>
> There is a rite performed in their honour which I believe credible despite not having seen it.[85]

After describing the rite, or rather the fact that the flame divides itself in two, and that the sacrificial smoke goes in two directions, the narrator goes on to explain that the reason why he believes this story, is the fact that he has seen for himself something similar in Mysia. In Pionia, when they sacrifice to the founder Pionis, the smoke rises from the tomb by itself.[86] This passage is one of numerous instances in which Ego tests or tries to prove the veracity of the information by seeking parallels for it. The similarities between what happens on the two tombs may not be obvious to all, but for Ego they are evident enough to cite the one as evidence for believing the report about the other to be true.

5.4 Criticising

Finally, turning to the criticising role of Ego the researcher, we will discuss passages in which the narrator indicates deficiencies and faults with the material which he is reporting. To begin with, consider the following passage:

> Οἰβώτα δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀνδριάντα Ἀχαιοὶ κατὰ πρόσταγμα ἀνέθεσαν τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς
> Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπὶ ὀλυμπιάδος ὀγδοηκοστῆς· ἡ δὲ τοῦ σταδίου νίκη τῷ Οἰβώτᾳ
> γέγονεν ὀλυμπιάδι ἕκτῃ. πῶς ἂν οὖν τήν γε ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην μεμαχημένος ὁ
> Οἰβώτας εἴη μετὰ Ἑλλήνων; πέμπτῃ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ ἑβδομηκοστῇ ὀλυμπιάδι τὸ
> πταῖσμα ἐγένετο ‹τὸ› ἐν Πλαταιαῖς Μαρδονίῳ καὶ Μήδοις. ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν λέγειν
> μὲν τὰ ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων λεγόμενα ἀνάγκη, πείθεσθαι δὲ πᾶσιν οὐκέτι ἀνάγκη. τὰ δὲ
> ἄλλα ὁποῖα τὰ συμβάντα ἦν ἐς τὸν Οἰβώταν, τῇ ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς προσέσται μοι

---

detail below.

[85] IX 18.3. Other passages in which the narrator emphatically explains to believe a particular piece of information to be true: I 23.2, 29.2, IV 29.7, 35.12, V 6.2, 7.3, VI 22.6, VIII 2.3–7, IX 20.4–21.6, particularly §21.6.

[86] IX 18.3f.

συγγραφῇ.

The Achaeans dedicated the statue of Oebotas in accordance with a command of Apollo in Delphi in the 80th Olympiad. Oebotas won the *stadion* in the 6th Olympiad. Therefore, how could Oebotas have fought in the battle at Plataea with the Greeks? For Mardonius and the Persian suffered their defeat at Plataea in the 75th Olympiad. Now, I have to report what is said by the Greeks, but I do not have to believe them all. As to the other things that happened to Oebotas, they will be added to my account of the Achaeans.[87]

In this passage, Ego is prominent indeed. First, in the quoted text, the facts about Oebotas and his statue in Olympia are stated: ordered by Apollo, the Achaeans dedicated the statue in the 80th Olympiad (460 BC), Oebotas won his victory in the 6th Olympiad (756 BC). After stating these facts, the narrator asks, rhetorically, how this man could have fought at the battle of Plataea, pointing to the chronological impossibility of anything of that sort. The facts that actually are included in the text would probably not themselves have prompted such a criticising reaction on the narrator's part. Here the narrator is apparently arguing against something that has been left out of the text, presumably a claim (made by whom?) that Oebotas fought at Plataea. However, the most notable feature of this passage is what follows, viz. the claim that 'I have to report' the Greek traditions but not necessarily believe in them all. As has been noticed long ago, this statement is an obvious Herodotean echo:

ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαί γε μὲν οὐ παντάπασιν ὀφείλω, καί μοι τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος ἐχέτω ἐς πάντα τὸν λόγον.

I have to record what is said, but I do not have to believe in it altogether; may this statement apply to the whole of my narrative.[88]

The similarities do not merely lie in the locution; the narrators of the *Histories* and the *Periegesis* express the same sentiments, apparently with the same sincerity, too. However, the assertions of both Herodotus and Pausanias may very well be given a more vicious interpretation, if they are viewed not as resulting from a legitimate attempt to establish the tradition, but as a malignant historian's means for getting away with slanderous reports without having to

---

[87] VI 3.8, the reference is to VII 17.6f. and 17.13f.

[88] Herodotus 7.152.3; cf. e.g. Pfundtner 1866: 9f., Heer 1979: 97f., Habicht 1985: 147, and Dalfen 1996: 166. In the *Syrian Goddess* 11, too, there is a similar expression: τοὺς ἐγὼ πάντας μὲν ἐρέω, δέκομαι δὲ οὐδαμά 'I will tell them all, but by no means do I accept them'; cf. also Lightfoot 2003: 167f. and 334f.

119

guarantee the truth of one's assertions.[89] Be that as it may, on the face of it, the disclaimers signal uncertainty, whether sincere or insincere is for the narrators to know and for the readers to interpret.

The Herodotean expression of disbelief comes in a passage where the narrator has reported two different versions, and is about to give a third malicious explanation, as to why the Argives behaved as they did when the Persians invaded Greece. His statement is not a profession of his mindless recording of all the traditions he is told, but a reminder of the fact that neither the narrator nor the reader is obliged to believe all of the many traditions and variant versions that find their way into the *Histories*. That is, with the above quoted statement, the Herodotean narrator wants to remind the reader that, given the fluidity of the historical record, the fact that alternative versions are recorded do not imply that they have gained credence with the narrator. Moreover, considering the above, the reader, too, is warned that the narrative of the *Histories* should be handled with caution.[90]

In this regard the *Histories* and the *Periegesis* are alike, i.e. in both of them the narrators work with material that is difficult to manage, and they constantly point to alternative versions and questions that cannot be answered.[91] Just as the statement in the *Histories* is occasioned by the narrator's confrontation with information that he judges to be false, so is the statement in the *Periegesis* occasioned by a claim against which the narrator argues, explicitly making clear that he cannot accept it as true. In the *Periegesis*, the claim that prompted the narrator to declare that he has to record all, not believe it, remains, ironically, suppressed, though easily supplied from the context.

---

[89] Such is, basically, Plutarch's interpretation of Herodotus' history, cf. *De Herodoti Malignitate*, esp. 863C–D on Herodotus 7.152.3. Plutarch objects to this disclaimer of Herodotus', apparently considering it to be one of the devices at Herodotus' disposal for telling several different versions of the same event, without adhering to any one of them, and – more seriously – without giving any guarantees as to the truth of the stories he tells. On this Plutarchean essay, cf. in particular Marincola 1994 *passim*, esp. 202f. on Plutarch's reaction to Herodotus 7.152.3. Cf. also below chapter 9.

[90] For a similar interpretation of the Herodotean passage, cf. Lateiner 1989: 55–108, esp. 56 and 79f.

[91] Alternative versions in the *Periegesis* have been discussed above; for alternative versions in the *Histories*, cf. e.g. Lateiner 1989: 76–90.

In a number of passages, the critique is not as explicitly asserted as in the passage just discussed. This is the case when the narrator makes affirmations like the following, which is a statement introducing the tradition behind two *xoana* of Dionysus:

> τὰ δὲ λεγόμενα ἐς τὰ ξόανα καὶ ἐγὼ γράφω.
>
> I, too, will write what is said about the *xoana*.[92]

Whereupon follows the well known story of how Pentheus, spying on the women celebrating Dionysian rituals on mount Cithaeron, climbed a tree and how he, upon discovery, was torn down and torn into pieces by the women. Later, 'according to Corinthians' (ὡς Κορίνθιοι λέγουσιν), the narrator says, reminding his readers of the fact that he is merely repeating somebody else's words, the Corinthians were ordered by the Pythia to find the tree in question and venerate it as much as the god himself. 'And therefore these statues are made of that material', the narrator concludes.

Comparing the present passage to the one quoted earlier, there are both similarities and differences to be observed. The main difference is, of course, the fact that in the present passage the critique of the material is implied rather than explicitly stated. The narrator does not argue against the story told, nor does he declare that he does not believe it. All he does, is to make clear that he is merely repeating somebody else's story.[93]

However, in the majority of the more than 60 passages in which the criticising role of Ego is introduced in order to indicate explicitly the faults with the source material of the *Periegesis*, Ego appears to be more confident in his criticism. Consider the following passage from the description of a statue of Hera, with a pomegranate in one hand and a sceptre on which a cuckoo sits in the other. The story about the pomegranate the narrator cannot tell.[94] The cuckoo, 'they say' (φασι), sits on the sceptre because of a story (λέγοντες) according to which

---

[92] II 2.6f., quote §6.

[93] Similar, implicit criticism, is found in the following passages: II 21.8, III 24.7, VI 26.1f., VII 23.2, VIII 3.6. Cf. also above, on the λέγουσι(ν) and φασι(ν) passages which can be interpreted to signal scepticism or implicit criticism on the narrator's part vis-à-vis the material which is introduced with the verbs of saying.

[94] This is an instance of explicit religious silence, cf. above chapter 3.

Zeus, in love with young Hera, changed into that bird; she chased it as a toy. About this the narrator says:

τοῦτον τὸν λόγον καὶ ὅσα ἐοικότα εἴρηται περὶ θεῶν οὐκ ἀποδεχόμενος γράφω, γράφω δὲ οὐδὲν ἧσσον.

This story and similar traditions told about the gods I record although I do not accept them, but I record them nonetheless.[95]

That is, the narrator does not accept the traditions about the gods, but records them nonetheless. This statement is rather similar to the one made concerning Oebotas' statue in Olympia. In the present passage, however, the narrator's scepticism is limited to tales about the gods. Further, it may be noted that later in the *Periegesis*, the narrator seizes an opportunity to explain that his personal view on the Greek traditions about the gods has changed. Apropos of an Arcadian story that Rhea, when Poseidon was born, hid the child and gave Cronus a foal to eat, just as she later gave him a rock instead of Zeus, the narrator declares:

τούτοις Ἑλλήνων ἐγὼ τοῖς λόγοις ἀρχόμενος μὲν τῆς συγγραφῆς εὐηθίας ἔνεμον πλέον, ἐς δὲ τὰ Ἀρκάδων προεληλυθὼς πρόνοιαν περὶ αὐτῶν τοιάνδε ἐλάμβανον…

At the beginning of my work, I used to ascribe to these Greek traditions rather a lot of foolishness, but as I have come to the Arcadians I have reached the following considered opinion about them…[96]

This new view on the traditions about the gods is the idea that the traditions have sprung from the enigmatic sayings of the sages of old. Therefore, the narrator declares, he will follow the traditions when it comes to stories about the gods (τοῖς εἰρημένοις χρησόμεθα). As to the story about Cronus, the narrator explains that 'I guessed' (εἴκαζον) that it represents some Greek wisdom.[97]

---

[95] II 17.4; this passage is commonly seen as an expression of Pausanias' earlier views on myths concerning the gods, cf. e.g. Robert 1909: 37 n. 1, Foccardi 1987: 76–81, and Dalfen 1996: 162f.

[96] VIII 8.2f., quote §3.

[97] On the 'conversion' of Pausanias, cf. e.g. Krueger 1860: 10–13, Habicht 1985: 156f., Elsner 1995: 144, Piettre 2000: 84–86 (with references to earlier literature); see also Oliver 1972 *passim*. This statement is commonly interpreted as signifying that Pausanias, overcome by the ancient Arcadian traditions, could no longer dismiss them, cf. Veyne 1988: 98–100. It should be noted that this is a conversion only as regards *legends* about the *gods*. That is, his faith has not changed, nor his attitude towards the accounts about the heroes. Note also

In Megara there is a temple for Apollo and Artemis, which, 'they say' (φασι), was made by Alcathus after he had slain the lion of mount Cithaeron. Apropos of this temple, the narrator tells how this Alcathus, son of Pelops, became king of Megara. One of king Megareus' children had been killed by this lion, and his only other male child, campaigning with the Dioscuri against Aphidna, had earlier been killed by Theseus. Consequently, Megareus promised his daughter's hand in marriage and the throne to anyone who would kill the lion. Alcathus did this, became king and built the temple, which triggered the account.[98] Ego cannot fully accept the Megarean account; this the narrator confesses at the beginning of his criticising the tradition:

> ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω γενέσθαι λέγουσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ γράφειν μὲν ἐθέλω Μεγαρεῦσιν ὁμολογοῦντα, οὐκ ἔχω δὲ ὅπως εὕρωμαι πάντα σφίσιν…
> They say that it happened in such a way; but, although I want to write things in accordance with the Megareans, I cannot find everything in accordance with them…[99]

Ego grants that 'I do believe' (πείθομαι) that Alcathus killed the lion. However, next he asks for the source of the tradition – 'who has written?' – that Timalcus, Megareus' son, went to Aphidna with the Dioscuri. 'And', the narrator continues, 'if he came there, how is one to assume that he was killed by Theseus?'[100] Next appears the reason why the narrator can argue with such confidence against the Megareans: he has three pieces of evidence which support his argument. He explains that Alcman, in his song about the Dioscuri, says that Theseus himself was absent when the Dioscuri captured Athens and

---

VII 23.7f., where the narrator reports a conversation he claims Ego to have had with a Sidonian in a sanctuary of Asclepius on the nature of Asclepius and his father; cf. Habicht 1985: 157–159, with references to earlier discussions on this passage.

[98] I 41.3.

[99] I 41.4. We read εὕρωμαι together with Musti 1982, Spiro 1903, and the manuscripts (the dative σφίσιν is easily explained by understanding ὁμολογοῦντα from the previous clause, cf. Siebelis 1822–1828 *ad loc.*). Among the numerous conjectures suggested, Clavier's 1814–1821 συμφέρωμαι has been accepted by e.g. Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990, and Casevitz 1992.

[100] *Ibid*. Μεγαρέως δὲ Τίμαλκον παῖδα τίς μὲν ἐς Ἄφιδναν ἐλθεῖν μετὰ τῶν Διοσκούρων ἔγραψε; πῶς δ' ἂν ἀφικόμενος ἀναιρεθῆναι νομίζοιτο ὑπὸ Θησέως κτλ.; Cf. also III 18.5, where the narrator again expresses doubts regarding a battle at Aphidna.

took his mother captive; Pindar agrees with Alcman.[101] Moreover, the narrator points to the fact that 'anyone who has researched the genealogy' (ὅστις ἐγενεαλόγησε) must recognise the foolishness of the Megareans, if Theseus was indeed a descendant of Pelops. After this statement, the readers are, however, to connect the dots themselves: Theseus being Pelops' great-grandson and Alcathus his son, Timalcus cannot have been of the same generation as both Theseus and Alcathus. This means, again, that Theseus cannot have been his slayer. The narrator even speculates that a desire to appear to have a tidy order of succession is the reason why the Megareans entertain such false notions.

In other instances, too, Ego may be observed arguing in an equally confident manner against local traditions and other notions with which he finds fault.[102] Some of these passages will be singled out. Celeae lies outside Phlius. Every four years mysteries are celebrated there in honour of Demeter. The narrator notes that the rites are copied from the Eleusinian mysteries; this is a fact that the Phliasians themselves admit (ὁμολογοῦσι).[103] There is a tradition explaining these similarities. 'They say' (φασιν), the narrator explains, that Dysaules, brother of Celeus, was expelled from Eleusis by Ion at the time when Athens and Eleusis were at war; he came to Celeae and established the mysteries. To this the narrator objects:

τοῦτο μὲν δὴ Φλιασίοις οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ὁμολογήσω, κρατηθέντα μάχῃ τινὰ Ἐλευσινίων φυγάδα ἀπελαθέντα οἴχεσθαι.

---

[101] I 41.4f.; Alcman fragm. 21 Page, Pindar fragm. 243 Snell.

[102] Cf. I 9.8, 30.3, 33.3, 35.7f., 41.8, II 12.6, 16.3f., 19.8, 21.1, 21.10, 23.3, 23.5f., 26.7–10, 30.5, 31.2 (with a reference to III 25.4–6), 34.5, III 15.11, 18.5, 24.10f., IV 1.7–9, 6.1–5, 15.2f., V 16.4 (with a reference to II 21.10), 18.7, VI 18.6, VII 2.7, 19.10, VIII 14.5–7 (this passage is discussed further in chapter 6), 24.13f., IX 27.6–8, 31.7–9, X 5.10–12, 38.5f. The following are a selection of criticising passages without any first person: III 13.1f., 25.4–6, VIII 6.5, 11.5f., 24.1f., 24.5, 25.7, 25.12, IX 12.2. We list them as a reminder of the fact that the passages in which Ego is explicitly present through a first person pronoun or verb do not give us all the instances in which the material is criticised in the *Periegesis*. However, by focusing solely on the passages with a first person one does get all the instances in which the criticism is explicitly presented as Ego's and nobody else's.

[103] II 14.1.

124

In this, I cannot possibly agree with the Phliasians, that some Eleusinian would have been defeated in battle and driven off as an exile.[104]

The narrator immediately gives his reasons for the critique of the local tradition: the war between Athens and Eleusis was ended with a treaty before it was fought till an end. Moreover, the narrator points to the fact that Eumolpus, the leader of the Eleusinians, stayed in Eleusis.[105] Concluding this line of argument by admitting the possibility that Dysaules can have come to Celeae from Eleusis for some other reason than the one told by the Phliasians, the narrator next calls into question the report about Dysaules' descent. He was not, 'I think' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν), related to Celeus, nor even one of the Eleusinian notables. In criticising this point in the tradition about Dysaules, Ego uses the modifier 'I think', making clear that there is some degree of uncertainty in his mind. There is, however, corroboration for this belief. Quoting three verses of the Homeric hymn to Demeter as evidence, Ego claims that, had Dysaules been one of the Eleusinian notables, Homer would not have passed him by.[106] After this thorough critique of the tradition behind the mysteries at Celeae, the narrator concludes:

οὗτος δ᾽ οὖν, ὡς οἱ Φλιάσιοί φασιν, ὁ Δυσαύλης κατεστήσατο ἐνταῦθα τὴν τελετὴν καὶ οὗτος ἦν ὁ τῷ χωρίῳ τὸ ὄνομα παραθέμενος Κελεάς.

This Dysaules, as the Phliasians claim, established the mysteries here, and it was he who gave the land the name Celeae.[107]

However, after Ego's critique, Dysaules is not much more than a name.

As in the passage discussed above, the narrator, when criticising any given tradition, often appeals to the authority of Homer for corroboration. Citations and allusions to poets are common in the *Periegesis*, but no author, either poetic or prosaic, is referred to or even mentioned as often as Homer is.[108] Indeed, the

---

[104] II 14.2.

[105] Cf. I 38.2f. for a somewhat fuller account of this war.

[106] II 14.3, quoting *h.Hom.* 2.474–476.

[107] II 14.4.

[108] Cf. the *Index Auctorum* in the edition of Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990. On the use of Homer in the *Periegesis*, cf. e.g. Krueger 1860: 8f., Robert 1909: 25–28, Bacher 1919 *passim*, and Heer 1979: 95–97.

narrator confesses that he is particularly partial to Homer. In a temple of Leto in Argos there is a statue of a maiden who is called Chloris. 'They say' (λέγοντες) that she was the daughter of Niobe who, together with Amyclas, survived the attack of Artemis and Apollo. Chloris was originally named Meliboea, but as her horror made her pale green (χλωρά) for the rest of her life, her name was changed. Meliboea/Chloris and Amyclas, 'forsooth' (δή), 'they say' (φασιν), built the original temple for Leto. Ego's scepticism vis-à-vis the information, suggested by the insertion of the particle δή and the *verbum dicendi*, is confirmed by the following outright criticism of it:

> ἐγὼ δέ – πρόσκειμαι γὰρ πλέον τι ἢ οἱ λοιποὶ τῇ Ὁμήρου ποιήσει – δοκῶ τῇ Νιόβῃ
> τῶν παίδων μηδένα ὑπόλοιπον γενέσθαι. μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι τὸ ἔπος
>   τὼ δ' ἄρα καὶ δοιώ περ ἐόντ' ἀπὸ πάντας ὄλεσσαν.
>
> But I (for I am more devoted to Homer's poetry than others) think that none of Niobe's children survived. This verse bears witness for me: 'though they were but two, they killed them all.'[109]

In other words, weighing the Argive tradition against the Homeric evidence, Ego opts for Homer and chooses to believe that Niobe was left childless since he – according to his own admission – is predisposed to give precedence to Homer. Apropos of the tomb of Oedipus in Athens, the narrator explains that his inquiries revealed that Oedipus' bones were brought there from Thebes. He clarifies, too, that the reason why in the first place he conducted any research into the matter was that 'Homer did not allow me to believe' the Sophoclean version of Oedipus' death.[110] Did Oedipus have children with Iocasta, his mother and wife? 'I do not think' (οὐ δοκῶ) so, the narrator states, again quoting Homeric verses as evidence.[111] 'How did [the gods] make it immediately

---

[109] II 21.9f., quote §10; in this passage we follow the text of Spiro 1903 in retaining the phrase ἢ οἱ λοιποί. The Homeric quotation is from *Il.* 24.609. In V 16.4 the narrator reminds the reader of this discussion.

[110] I 28.7 ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου μνῆμα Οἰδίποδος, πολυπραγμονῶν δὲ εὕρισκον τὰ ὀστᾶ ἐκ Θηβῶν κομισθέντα· τὰ γὰρ ἐς τὸν θάνατον Σοφοκλεῖ πεποιημένα τὸν Οἰδίποδος Ὅμηρος οὐκ εἴα μοι δόξαι πιστά, ὃς ἔφη Μηκιστέα τελευτήσαντος Οἰδίποδος ἐπιτάφιον ἐλθόντα ἐς Θήβας ἀγωνίσασθαι. The allusions are to Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus* and *Il.* 23.679f.

[111] IX 5.10 παῖδας δὲ ἐξ αὐτῆς οὐ δοκῶ οἱ γενέσθαι, μάρτυρι Ὁμήρῳ χρώμενος, ὃς ἐποίησεν ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ κτλ., quoting *Od.* 11.271–274.

known' that mother and son had married each other, if they managed to have four children before that time,[112] the narrator asks, rhetorically, and concludes that Eurygania, not Iocasta nor Epicaste, as she is called in the *Odyssey*, was the mother of Oedipus' children. The *Oedipodia* epic and a painting by Onasias in Plataea are further cited as evidence of this contention. Particularly notable in the present passage is the fact that the narrator uses a rhetorical question in order to make his point.[113] When citing evidence for an argument, the narrator uses the phrase μαρτυρεῖ μοι or μαρτύριόν/ά μοι, with only a few exceptions.[114] The type of evidence used is either poetical (mostly Homeric) or artefacts and monuments of various kinds.[115]

Before leaving Ego's criticising role, two further types of comments need to be discussed in this context.

First, in some passages the narrator specifically criticises his (written) sources. In Arcadia, on mount Cotilium there is a source of water, about which the narrator states:

> ὅπου συνέγραψεν ἤδη τις ἀπὸ ταύτης τῷ ποταμῷ τὸ ῥεῦμα τῷ Λύμακι ἄρχεσθαι, συνέγραψεν οὔτε αὐτὸς θεασάμενος οὔτε ἀνδρὸς ἀκοὴν ἰδόντος· ἃ καὶ ἀμφότερα παρῆσαν ἐμοί.
>
> Where someone has written that the stream of the river Lymax has its beginning from

---

[112] IX 5.11 πῶς οὖν ἐποίησαν ἀνάπυστα ἄφαρ, εἰ δὴ τέσσαρες [γένε] ἐκ τῆς Ἐπικάστης ἐγένοντο παῖδες τῷ Οἰδίποδι;

[113] This is not the only occurrence of rhetorical questions in the *Periegesis*; other instances of rhetorical questions in the *Periegesis*: I 41.4 (cf. above), II 27.5, III 16.7, IV 35.12, V 2.1–5 (including variant versions, without any first person), 12.1f. (citing as additional evidence a real elephant's skull which 'I have seen' (θεασάμενος) in Campania), VI 3.8 (cf. above), 13.2 (without any first person), VIII 1.4, 15.6f., 29.4, X 38.11.

[114] μαρτυρεῖ μοι, μαρτύριόν/ά μοι *vel sim.* I 12.5, 23.3, 37.2, 39.4, 41.6, II 21.10, 26.8, 26.10, III 3.8, 16.9, IV 6.5, 36.5, VI 4.6, VII 18.1, VIII 24.11, 42.8, IX 5.7, 29.2, 36.3, 38.8, X 7.6; βεβαιοῖ μοι III 3.8, IV 36.4, VII 10.5; δηλοῖ μοι I 42.2. A number of passages without any first person in which evidence is cited are not taken into account here.

[115] Poetry: I 12.5, 37.2, II 21.10, 26.10, IV 6.5, 36.4, 36.5, VI 4.6, VII 18.1, IX 5.7, 5.10, 29.2, 36.3, 38.8; observable evidence I 23.3, 39.4, 41.6, 42.2, II 26.8, III 16.9, VII 10.5, VIII 24.11, 42.8, X 7.6. In III 3.8 the narrator adduces as evidence both verses of the *Iliad* and Achilles' spear dedicated in a sanctuary.

this, he has written without either having seen it himself or heard about it from someone who has seen it. These both were present for me.[116]

What/Whom is the narrator criticising? Is it a hypothetical writer and text, i.e. a writer whom he does not know and a text he does not know and consequently has not read, but which conceivably does exist somewhere, in some library? Alternatively, is the narrator criticising a specific writer and text, having just happened to misplace the exact reference for the moment – or, is he pretending to have misplaced the exact reference, whereas he actually knows very well to whom the critique is directed? Whatever the answer to these questions is, what matters here is the fact that the criticism is obviously directed against some written text. In this text, it is claimed that the Lymax has its rise in mount Cotilium. Such a claim can only be made, the narrator notes criticisingly, because of inadequate research. The (hypothetical?) author has not gone to the trouble of finding out, i.e. seeing, the facts for himself, or at least interviewing someone who has seen.[117] Ego has both seen it and heard of it from others. Therefore, he can give a correct account: the river Lymax is a stream,[118] whereas the water of the spring in Cotilium disappears altogether before it has reached far. However, the researches of Ego are not faultless either. The narrator has to confess that it did not occur to him to search for the source of Lymax.[119]

Second, in a few passages the narrator appears to have an urge to make a remark to the effect that he refrains from criticising the material just recounted.

---

[116] VIII 41.10. Cf. also V 11.9, VI 9.4f., IX 36.4f. (without any first person).

[117] Compare IV 31.5, where the narrator remarks that Ego has neither seen himself nor heard of anyone who has seen the walls of Babylon or Susa. This is not the case with the walls of Ambrossus in Phocis, Byzantium, and Rhodes. As he has seen the walls of these three well-fortified Greek cities, he can testify to the fact that the wall of Messene on mount Ithome is more imposing than these. Cf. also V 12.3, where the narrator points out that his long argument about the tusks of elephants being horns, not teeth, is not based on hearsay: he has seen an elephant's skull. In III 25.7, apropos of Arion on a dolphin among the offerings in Taenarum, the narrator observes that Herodotus told about Arion and the dolphin on hearsay (cf. Hdt.1.23f.), whereas Ego has seen a dolphin obeying and carrying a boy in Poroselene. Other passages in which hearing and seeing are contrasted as sources of knowledge are VI 6.10f., 26.2, VIII 10.2, 41.6, IX 39.14.

[118] Mentioned in VIII 41.2 and 41.4.

[119] On forgotten/neglected research, cf. above.

Apropos of a bronze structure in Argos, in which the bones of Tantalus are said to be, the narrator comments

> τοῦτον μὲν ‹τὸν› Τάνταλον οὐ διοίσομαι ταφῆναι ταύτῃ.
> I will not disagree that this Tantalus is buried here.[120]

In this instance, however, a specific condition has to be fulfilled in order for the narrator to refrain from criticism, viz. this Tantalus must not be the famous Tantalus, but a less famous grandson of his, who was married to Clytaemnestra before Agamemnon. 'I know that I have seen' (ἰδὼν οἶδα) the tomb of (the famous) Tantalus, son of Zeus, on mount Sipylus, the narrator adds in explanation of the condition set up.

5.5 Summary

In this chapter, the different roles of the researcher function of Ego as character have been studied. In the researcher function, Ego appears in the *Periegesis* in more than 450 passages. When Ego the researcher appears, one can distinguish between the investigating, the commenting, and the criticising roles or aspects of the researcher. This has been not a study of the actual sources of information that have been used for the *Periegesis*. Instead, this has been a study of how the researches upon which the text is built are represented in it, that is, what the narrator explicitly says about the material Ego has or has not found, how Ego reacts to it, and how Ego judges it.

To the investigating role of the researcher function of Ego as character have been assigned the approximately 130 passages in which the narrator speaks about Ego's troubles or successes in finding out facts for the *Periegesis*, explicitly using a first person pronoun or verb. To the commenting role have been assigned the approximately 260 passages in which the narrator makes explicit, first person, evaluative comments on the material, either by assessing it on moral, aesthetic etc. grounds, or by signalling certainty, hesitancy, or uncertainty as to the trustworthiness of the material or belief in its truthvalue. To the criticising role have been assigned the approximately 60 passages in which

---

[120] II 22.2f., quote §3. Cf. also II 18.1f., III 19.5 (without any first person), VII 18.4, X 38.11.

the narrator explicitly, in the first person, critically points to the deficiencies and faults with the material that is reported in the *Periegesis*.

The temporal and spatial gap that lies between Ego as narrator and Ego as character is particularly evident when the narrator is speaking about Ego's investigating role. The narrator exists in a 'here and now' from which he can look back upon the 'there and then' in which Ego once upon a time was conducting research for the *Periegesis*. How long the temporal and spatial gap is between the 'here and now' and the 'there and then' cannot be determined, nor is it constant. Whereas Ego's temporal situation is rather easily separated from the narrator's when he appears in his investigating role, it is not the case when he appears in his commenting or his criticising roles. Indeed, if there is any temporal gap between the narrator and Ego when making an appearance in either his commenting or criticising roles, it consists of the thought-process that reasonably must precede the commenting and criticising statements of the narrator. Moreover, both in the commenting and in the criticising roles Ego is presented as reacting in diverse ways to the material that has been gathered previously. That is, whether explicitly stated or not in the text, both the commenting and the criticising are temporally subsequent to the investigating role.

6 Traveller

6.1 Introduction

Finally, as we turn to in the traveller function of Ego as character, we reach the aspect of Ego which has been of the greatest interest for those studying the *Periegesis*. However, when studying travelling in the *Periegesis*, scholars are generally more interested in establishing how far Pausanias' travels have taken him, or establishing his itinerary in Greece, than in studying what the narrator actually says about travel in the *Periegesis*.[1]

In studying the traveller, our aim is not to establish whether Pausanias travelled to this or that site in Greece. Instead, this is a study of how and under what circumstances the narrator chooses to actually speak about the travels of Ego. In this study, the actual travels of Pausanias are taken for granted, and they are assumed to have been more extensive than and not identical with those which the narrator describes Ego as having made. The narrator frequently introduces into the text Ego in his other roles, but he is apparently very reluctant to introduce Ego in his travelling role. That is, the narrator generally proceeds as if Ego had not had any experiences on a site; when the narrator does introduce Ego's personal experiences, he does so in the briefest manner. Nor does he regularly speak about the moving between monuments and sites as undertaken by Ego. This, of course, has been observed previously by many scholars,[2] but not satisfactorily studied.

---

[1] Cf. most recently Pretzler 2004: 202–210, attempting to fill in some of the blanks of the text. For studies of Pausanias' travels, cf. in particular Heberdey 1894, and Hutton 1995 *passim*, esp. 105–234, for a study of the topographical sequence in the descriptions of territories and cities in the *Periegesis*, focussed on unravelling the topographical method in the *Periegesis*. For a convenient collection of passages suggesting travels/knowledge of the world outside Greece, see in particular Frazer 1898, I: xx–xxii; cf. also Arafat 1999 *passim*.

[2] Cf. e.g. Jones 2003: 676 'In fact, Pausanias is very coy about indicating even those

Nevertheless, movement is frequently introduced into the text. However, in these instances the narrator is not talking about the movements of Ego, but about movement undertaken by some impersonal, unspecified, travelling persona, named travelling-You in the following. This travelling-You is an indefinite person, appearing in the *Periegesis* in many of the different ways in which one may denote an indefinite subject in Greek, equivalent to the French 'on', German and Swedish 'man', English 'you' or 'one'. With regard to the fact that both languages have several co-existing, not quite interchangeable, means for expressing an indefinite subject, English and Greek are similar to one another. In the following, though naming the impersonal travelling persona in the *Periegesis* travelling-You, both 'one' and 'you' will appear in the translations of the Greek. 'You' should not be supposed to refer to a real or imaginary second person (whether singular or plural); instead it denotes an almost depersonalised, indefinite persona.

For the most part, the travelling-You appears to be a thin disguise for Ego the traveller, just as the λόγος is one for Ego the writer. This notwithstanding, it is uncertain whether the travelling-You may be claimed simply to replace the travelling-Ego. Therefore, in this study, the travelling-You will not be personalised, viz. studied as a part of Ego, as a means of reconstructing the movements of Ego.[3] Instead, we assume that the narrator has some motive for avoiding to relate the experiences of Ego as character in his travelling role, and that he, therefore, has some reason for introducing the travelling-You.[4] The narrator's preference for presenting most of the travelling, some of the experiencing, and occasionally even some parts of the investigating, in the *Periegesis* in a depersonalised manner, is not without consequence for the understanding of the frame narrative. Therefore, the passages in which the

experiences peculiar to himself, instead using general expressions such as 'for one sailing', 'for those entering'.'

[3] On the uncertainties involved in such (re)constructions of Pausanias' movements, cf. above chapter 1.

[4] *Contra* Champion-Smith 1998: 16; however, her remark that the depersonalised mode of presentation is not evidence to the effect that Pausanias lacks autopsy is certainly correct. Her comparison of the depersonalised mode of presentation in the *Periegesis* (dative plural participles are, however, mistaken for third person plural indicatives) with that of a modern guide-books is interesting. Are they both suggesting that the reader may walk along the routes described? Perhaps they are even inviting the reader to do that.

narrator introduces the travelling-Ego and the travelling-You, respectively, will be gathered and each studied separately. There is particular focus on the implications of the narrator's certainly intentional manoeuvre to represent an essential component of the frame for the whole of the *Periegesis*, viz. the movements in space, in such a depersonalised manner.

6.2 Travelling-Ego

When the narrator introduces the travelling role of Ego as character into the *Periegesis*, he is never again as explicit as in the following passage:

> ἐντεῦθεν ὁ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἡμῖν ἐξηγητὴς ἡγεῖτο ἐς χωρίον Ῥοῦν ὡς ἔφασκεν ὀνομαζόμενον.
>
> From here [*sc.* the tomb of Alcmene], the expounder of local matters led us to an area which was called Rhus, as he said.[5]

Here, in the description of Megara, the narrator does something that he does not do in any other passage of the *Periegesis*. He explains that he was guided from one point to another by a person whom he calls ὁ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἡμῖν ἐξηγητής, i.e. the man who explained local matters for us. The narrator appears to consciously avoid the term περιηγητής in favour of ἐξηγητής. That is, he opts for the more old-fashioned of the two terms which can both be used to denote men who show people around and explain matters of local cult, history, and related subject-matters.[6] We translate ἐξηγητής by 'expounder' rather than 'guide', since, in the *Periegesis*, the main function of the *exegetai* is to explain

---

[5] I 41.2. Cf. however also VII 23.7 ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τῷ ἱερῷ ἐς ἀντιλογίαν ἀφίκετο ἀνήρ μοι Σιδόνιος κτλ.

[6] On ἐξηγητής versus περιηγητής in the *Periegesis*, cf. in particular Jones 2001; Jacquemin 1991: 221–223 is also of interest. It is doubtful whether the choice of using *exegetes* is due to the fact that, for the narrator, there was a qualitative difference between a *periegetes* (superficial knowledge) and an *exegetes* (in-depth explanations), as suggested by Tzifopoulos 1991: 11–15, followed by Modenesi 2001: 8f. More likely, the choice was decided by the fact that *exegetes* was the older of the two terms, and the one found e.g. in Herodotus (1.78.2 and 3.31.3), just as the verb ἐπιλέγομαι for 'read' is preferred to the more common ἀναγιγνώσκω; cf. Jones 2001: 34f. Ironically, Pausanias is known as *periegetes* in modern times.

matters, or at least to try to do so, rather than to guide travellers.[7] Only in the above quoted passage is an *exegetes* depicted as showing the way between two locations.

A small number of the passages in which the narrator speaks about the experiences of Ego on a site go beyond simply declaring 'I saw'. For example, in one instance the narrator appears to be recollecting his experiences in the Altis of Olympia. Apropos of a statue of a man with jumping-weights in its hands, the narrator makes the following comment:

> τῶν δὲ ἐν Θράκῃ Μενδαίων τὸ ἀνάθημα ἐγγύτατα ἀφίκετο ἀπατῆσαί με ὡς ἀνδρὸς εἰκὼν εἴη πεντάθλου.
>
> The dedication of the Mendeans in Thrace very nearly fooled me to believe that it was a statue of a pentathlete.[8]

However, on the statue's thigh there was an inscription, which apparently set Ego's error right. From the narrator's quotation of the inscription, it appears that the Mendeans dedicated the statue from booty taken from Sipte in Thrace. In this passage, then, the narrator explains that he at first believed the statue to be something that it was not. Why does he make this confession? Given his overall reticence regarding personal experiences, there is no compelling reason why the narrator should let the readers know about his almost mistaken perception of the statue in question. It would appear as if the narrator by this admission of fallibility reminds the readers of the difficulties involved in Ego's investigation of Greece, and the caution with which the readers should take up the information. Mistakes can easily happen, in the present passage one was within an ace of happening.[9]

---

[7] Source of information plain and simple: I 13.8, V 6.6, 20.4, 21.9, VII 6.5, X 28.7. Imperfect source of information, or source of disagreement: I 31.5, 34.4, 35.8, 42.4, II 9.7, 23.6, 31.4, IV 33.6, V 10.7, 18.6, 21.8, IX 3.3.

[8] V 27.12. On this passage, cf. Schneider 1997.

[9] In addition, it may be noted that this comment is very artfully located. The dedication of the Mendeans is the very last of the public dedications made in honour of Zeus but not representing Zeus; next follows the introduction to and the lengthy enumeration of statues of victorious athletes (VI 1.1–18.7). In the description of the Altis, there is another artfully located mention of two statues. Last in the enumeration of the statues of *olympionikai* (VI 18.7), are the two first statues of *olympionikai* erected in the Altis (Ol. 59 and 61, respectively). The assertion regarding these two statues is particularly noteworthy, given the

The narrator is not inclined to speak about personal experiences. In particular he rather carefully avoids introducing the travelling-Ego when detailing movements in space. When the narrator does introduce movements undertaken by Ego into the *Periegesis*, these movements have for the most part negative results. For example, in describing the chryselephantine statue of Zeus in Olympia, the narrator informs the reader:

> ὑπελθεῖν δὲ οὐχ οἷόν τέ ἐστιν ὑπὸ τὸν θρόνον, ὥσπερ γε καὶ ἐν Ἀμύκλαις ἐς τὰ ἐντὸς τοῦ θρόνου παρερχόμεθα.
> It is not possible to go under the throne, in the way that we pass into the interior of the throne in Amyclae.[10]

Between the legs of the throne in Olympia fences form a wall, the narrator explains, which is why the visitors are hindered from prying under the throne. Note that the narrator when reporting that one cannot go in under the throne of Zeus in Olympia, compares and contrasts this state of things with the fact that this can be done in Amyclae; at the same time, in a much later context, he lets the readers know that Ego himself has gone in under the throne of Apollo in Amyclae. With the present passage one may compare the manner in which the narrator represents the same movement in the description of Apollo's throne:

> ὑπελθόντι δὲ ὑπὸ τὸν θρόνον…
> As one has gone under the throne…[11]

When mentioning the movement at its proper place and as a simple routine event that advances the description, the narrator tells about the movement in his usual, depersonalised, iterative, and atemporal manner.[12]

In Arcadia, near Phigalia, there is a sanctuary of Eurynome. This sanctuary is opened only on one specific day once a year; on that day public and private sacrifices are offered to Eurynome, the narrator reports.[13] Only then can one see the statue of the goddess. In this regard, Ego was not so lucky:

---

fact that the narrator has previously mentioned a statue of an even earlier victor, that of the Spartiate Eutelidas who was victorious in Ol. 38 (VI 15.8, with Jacquemin 2002 *ad loc.*).

[10] V 11.4.

[11] III 18.15.

[12] For a fuller discussion of this phenomenon, cf. the following section.

[13] VIII 41.4f.

ἀφικέσθαι μὲν δή μοι τῆς ἑορτῆς οὐκ ἐξεγένετο ἐς καιρὸν οὐδὲ τῆς Εὐρυνόμης τὸ ἄγαλμα εἶδον· τῶν Φιγαλέων ‹δ'› ἤκουσα…

Now, I did not manage to arrive in time for the festival, nor did I see the statue of Eurynome. However, I heard from the Phigaleans…[14]

Thereupon follows a description of the statue, based upon the information supplied by the Phigaleans. The statue was a woman down to the hips with the lower part of the body being that of a fish. It was moreover fettered with golden chains. In this instance, the narrator makes it abundantly clear that he describes the statue of Eurynome without having seen it. The reason why he relies on the report of others is that he himself did not happen to be present on the one day of the year when the statue was to be seen. Similarly, having described a rite in honour of Dionysus, during which jars locked into an apparently empty, sealed-off room were miraculously filled with wine, the narrator inserts the following comment:

ταῦτα Ἠλείων τε οἱ δοκιμώτατοι ἄνδρες, σὺν αὐτοῖς δὲ καὶ ξένοι κατώμνυντο ἔχειν κατὰ τὰ εἰρημένα, ἐπεὶ αὐτός γε οὐκ ἐς καιρὸν ἀφικόμην τῆς ἑορτῆς.

The most respectable of the Eleans, and with them visitors, too, swore that this is as retold, since I myself did not arrive in time for the festival.[15]

In these instances the comments explaining that Ego did not arrive in time to see the statue and the event, respectively, appear to have been inserted as disclaimers by the narrator. That is, the narrator does not guarantee the veracity of these two descriptions. Does it follow that when there are no disclaimers, which is the case for the majority of the descriptions in the *Periegesis*, one is to assume that Ego has seen what is described? Considering the fact that the negations appear to be negating the readers' expectations ('I have not seen x, as you might think, considering the fact that I describe x'), it would seem that this is the case.[16]

The sanctuary of Meter Dindymene, too, outside Thebes in Boeotia is opened only once year, the narrator explains, and inserts:

ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀφικέσθαι τε ἐξεγεγόνει τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα εἶδον ‹λίθου› τοῦ Πεντελῆσι καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸν θρόνον.

---

[14] VIII 41.6.

[15] VI 26.1f., quote §2.

[16] On presentation through negation, see below chapter 9.

I managed to arrive on this day, and I saw the statue itself and the throne, both of Pentelic marble.[17]

This comment, which does not lead on to any fuller description, sounds almost like a cry of triumph. This time, Ego did actually arrive in time, and managed to see one of the many cult statues to which the public had only restricted access.[18]

Before proceeding to other passages where the narrator suggests positive travelling experiences, one further instance in which failed experiences are spoken about must be brought up in this context. When describing Marathon, the narrator reminds the readers of the fact that 'the Athenians say' (Ἀθηναῖοι… λέγουσιν) that they buried the fallen Persians after the battle of Marathon. The narrator reports that he had tried to corroborate this claim:

> … τάφον δὲ οὐδένα εὑρεῖν ἐδυνάμην· οὔτε γὰρ χῶμα οὔτε ἄλλο σημεῖον ἦν ἰδεῖν.
> … but I could not find any tomb. There was neither any mound nor any other sign to be seen.[19]

However, despite his failure to find any substantiation for the Athenian claim, the narrator does not appear to necessarily disbelieve it. Instead he speculates that the Persians were thrown randomly into some pit. Perhaps the narrator is even suggesting scepticism vis-à-vis the tradition, by drawing attention to the fact that there was no confirmation of it.[20]

When the narrator speaks about travels undertaken by Ego having positive results, i.e., basically, Ego finding what he was looking for, he rarely says more than 'I saw' or 'I know that I saw'. Occasionally some details are added. The most noteworthy of these have been discussed above, but there are some further

---

[17] IX 25.3. The preliminaries leading up to this triumph are discussed below.

[18] Cf. also X 35.7 where the narrator explains that he has not described a statue standing in a temple which is opened twice a year – is one to understand that Ego was not present when the sanctuary was open? On this passage, cf. above chapter 3. In Pritchett 1998: 178 n. 72 there is a convenient list of other sanctuaries mentioned in the *Periegesis* to which access was restricted.

[19] I 32.5; in IX 32.9 too the Athenian burial of the fallen Persians at Marathon is mentioned.

[20] Among the passages enumerated above in chapter 5 nn. 32 and 40 there are other passages in which the narrator speaks about how he unsuccessfully has tried to corroborate a tradition.

passages that deserve to be mentioned. The narrator confesses that he had particularly looked forward to seeing a specific tomb in Arcadia:

> τὸν δὲ τοῦ Αἰπύτου τάφον σπουδῇ μάλιστα ἐθεασάμην, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἐς τοὺς
> Ἀρκάδας ἔπεσιν ἔσχεν Ὅμηρος λόγον τοῦ Αἰπύτου μνήματος.
> I saw the tomb of Aepytus with the greatest eagerness, since Homer mentioned
> Aepytus' tomb in his verses on the Arcadians.[21]

However, though Ego certainly was able to find and inspect the tomb in question, he appears to have been disappointed with his findings. The narrator describes the tomb as 'a small mound of earth, surrounded all around by a base of stone'.[22] Faced with such an insignificant tomb, a mere mound, it appears as if Ego started pondering over and trying to make sense of why Homer singles it out for mention. At least, in the following an explanation is offered. The narrator suggests that the tomb of Aepytus was the most noteworthy tomb Homer had ever seen, it amazed him, and therefore he mentions it.[23] That is, beauty lies in the eyes of the beholder and different times have different standards of taste. For Homer, the narrator continues, the works of Daedalus may have been the height of sophistication, whereas for Ego, who certainly did appreciate his works, they are something of an echo of times gone by. In another passage the works of Daedalus are characterised as 'rather strange to behold, but nonetheless something even divine is conspicuous in them'.[24] Whether a disappointment or not, the tomb of Aepytus serves as a point of departure for the narrator to tell about two of the most noteworthy tombs he knows of.[25]

Mostly, when the narrator declares that 'I saw' this or that, the declaration is used much in the same way as 'I know' or 'I have heard' etc. That is, they are

---

[21] VIII 16.3, the allusion is to *Il.* 2.604. In IV 2.1, too, the narrator uses σπουδῇ when talking about the activities of Ego as character, this time in the investigating role of the researcher, cf. above chapter 5.

[22] VIII 16.3 ἔστι μὲν οὖν γῆς χῶμα οὐ μέγα, λίθου κρηπῖδι ἐν κύκλῳ περιεχόμενον.

[23] *Ibid.* Ὁμήρῳ δέ – οὐ γὰρ εἶδεν ἀξιολογώτερον μνῆμα – εἰκότως παρέξειν ἔμελλε ‹θαῦμα›.

[24] II 4.5 Δαίδαλος δὲ ὁπόσα εἰργάσατο, ἀτοπώτερα μέν ἐστιν ἔτι τὴν ὄψιν, ἐπιπρέπει δὲ ὅμως τι καὶ ἔνθεον τούτοις. On the interest for old art-work in the *Periegesis*, cf. in particular Arafat 1996: 43–79, esp. 67–73 on Daedalus.

[25] VIII 16.4f. τάφους δὲ ἀξίους θαύματος ἐπιστάμενος πολλοὺς δυοῖν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπιμνησθήσομαι, τοῦ τε ἐν Ἁλικαρνασσῷ καὶ ‹τοῦ› ἐν τῇ Ἑβραίων.

used in order to indicate that there is at least one piece of information which Ego can substantiate. The difference is that, with 'I saw' the medium through which the information is obtained is represented as being visual, instead of aural or literary. Consider, for example, the following passage from the description of the chambers of the Sicyonian treasury in the Altis:

χαλκοῦ μὲν δὴ αὐτοὺς ἑώρων εἰργασμένους· εἰ δὲ καὶ Ταρτήσσιος χαλκὸς λόγῳ τῷ Ἡλείων ἐστίν, οὐκ οἶδα.

I saw that they [*sc.* the chambers] were made of bronze. Whether the bronze is Tartessian, as the Eleans claim, I do not know.[26]

In other words, having seen the chambers of the treasury, the narrator can be sure of one thing, viz. that the material is bronze. However, the certainty deriving from Ego's experience on site does not extend to substantiating the Elean claim that the metal originated from Tartessus.

In Arcadia, on the Acropolis of Pheneus there was a bronze of Poseidon Hippius, which 'they said' (ἔφασαν) was dedicated by Odysseus.[27] After having retold the story which explained why Odysseus dedicated such a statue in Pheneus (a thanks offering upon finding his horses), the narrator adds that 'they say' (λέγουσιν) that Odysseus decided to keep his horses in the land of the Pheneatians, just as he reared his cows on the mainland opposite Ithaca.[28] This claim the Pheneatians substantiated with the following piece of evidence:

καί μοι καὶ γράμματα οἱ Φενεᾶται παρείχοντο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγάλματος γεγραμμένα τῷ βάθρῳ, τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως δή τι πρόσταγμα τοῖς ποιμαίνουσι τὰς ἵππους.

---

[26] VI 19.2. Other passages in which the narrator clarifies that 'I saw' something or other: εἶδον I 5.3, 21.3, 25.1, 42.3, II 17.5, 30.4, 34.3, 37.5, III 18.9, 25.7, IV 16.7, 34.6, VI 24.9, VIII 4.7, 9.7, 17.4, 21.2, 28.6, IX 18.4, 21.1, 21.2, 25.3, 38.5, X 32.2; ἰδὼν οἶδα I 24.7, 43.8, II 22.3, 32.4, III 20.1, 21.2, IV 35.10, IX 32.8; simple ἰδών VIII 17.4, IX 39.14; ἐθεασάμην VII 18.13, VIII 9.2, 53.10, X 26.6; ἐθεώμην X 15.4; θεασάμενος οἶδα I 23.7, IV 35.9, 35.11, V 27.5, VII 26.8, VIII 17.3, X 25.10; simple θεασάμενος V 12.3, IX 18.3; θεώμενοι X 4.2; ἑώρων V 20.9, IX 10.4; ἑωρῶμεν VIII 41.10; ὁρῶν I 14.6; ὁρῶντες VII 5.9. Note II 35.8, IV 31.5, VIII 9.7, 10.2, 41.6, IX 21.6 where the narrator declares emphatically that Ego has not been able to see the things discussed.

[27] VIII 14.5.

[28] VIII 14.5f.

> And the Pheneatians even showed me a text written on the base of the statue, some command of Odysseus', forsooth, to those tending his horses.[29]

That is, having, first, pointed to the statue in question, and having retold the story explaining its existence, the narrator next signals in a roundabout way that he has visited the place and seen the statue, and states that the locals pointed to one particular feature of the statue as evidence for their claim, viz. the inscription.[30] Using the particle δή, the narrator immediately signals scepticism regarding the claim of the Pheneatians.[31] In the following he elaborates the criticism, introducing it with the following programmatic statement, which immediately clarifies his position:

> τὰ μὲν δὴ ἄλλα ἑπομένοις ἡμῖν τῷ Φενεατῶν λόγῳ εἰκὸς προσέσται, τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα Ὀδυσσέα ἀναθεῖναι τὸ χαλκοῦν οὐκ ἔχω πείθεσθαί σφισιν.
>
> As we follow the Pheneatian story, reason will be attributed to it in other respects, but I cannot believe in their claim that Odysseus dedicated the bronze.[32]

In the following explanation, the narrator clarifies the grounds for his strong scepticism. The evidence simply did not add up. The bronze statue, allegedly dedicated by Odysseus, was made in a technique which had not yet been invented at the time when Odysseus lived.[33]

Before proceeding to the instances in which the narrator speaks about the travelling-You, yet a couple of passages still need to be singled out. In these the narrator tells about the (travelling) experiences of both Ego and another agent, the indefinite 'you'. Above the theatre of Dionysus in Athens, there is a cave in

---

[29] VIII 14.6.

[30] Other passages in which the narrator signals 'I saw' by way of circumlocutions: VI 6.11 (γραφῇ δὲ τοιάδε ἐπιτυχὼν οἶδα), 18.2 (οἶδα εἰκόνα ἀνευρών), IX 31.4 (μοι μόλυβδον ἐδείκνυσαν). Many of the passages mentioned above in chapter 5 indicate indirectly that Ego has travelled to a specific place, cf. e.g. I 23.5, 31.5. II 13.5, 37.6, III 14.7, IV 30.3, V 6.2, 11.9, 13.7, 21.8, 23.7, 25.13, 26.2, VI 4.6f., VII 23.9, VIII 11.3, 20.1, 37.1, IX 3.8, 11.4, X 11.6, 32.14.

[31] On the ironic use of the particle δή, cf. above chapter 5.

[32] VIII 14.7.

[33] *Ibid.*, with a reference to III 17.6 for an explanation of how bronzes were made before the invention of bronze casting, apropos of the statue of Zeus Hypatus 'the oldest of all statues made of bronze' παλαιότατον πάντων ὁπόσα ἐστὶ χαλκοῦ.

which Apollo and Artemis are depicted killing the children of Niobe.[34] This motif initiates the following explanation:

> ταύτην τὴν Νιόβην καὶ αὐτὸς εἶδον ἀνελθὼν ἐς τὸν Σίπυλον τὸ ὄρος· ἡ δὲ πλησίον μὲν πέτρα καὶ κρημνός ἐστιν οὐδὲν παρόντι σχῆμα παρεχόμενος γυναικὸς οὔτε ἄλλως οὔτε πενθούσης· εἰ δέ γε πορρωτέρω γένοιο, δεδακρυμένην δόξεις ὁρᾶν καὶ κατηφῆ γυναῖκα.
>
> Even I myself have seen this Niobe when I climbed mount Sipylus. She is a rock and a crag not presenting any form of a woman mourning or otherwise when one is nearby it; but if you go farther away, you will be under the impression that you see a woman in tears and with downcast eyes.[35]

Here the narrator introduces a travelling experience of Ego with a positive result, viz. Ego climbed mount Sipylus and did see Niobe there. However, it should be noted that the detailing of the travels on mount Sipylus does not actually fall within the frame narrative. Properly speaking, the travels on mount Sipylus is one of the many narratives embedded in the frame, but with the difference that in this narrative the protagonist is Ego, not some third person. Moreover, judging from the specification given by the narrator as to the manoeuvring that has to be done in order to actually see Niobe in the rock on mount Sipylus, it would appear as if Ego nearly failed in finding her. Particularly interesting is how these manoeuvres, which, undoubtedly, Ego himself has made in order to be able to see Niobe, are presented in the text. The narrator does not say 'when I stood close by it, it did not seem to me…' or the like. Instead he prefers to use an impersonal style, converting the travelling-Ego into a travelling-You: if one is too close to the rock in question, one does not see anything but a rock, but moving away from it, one will perceive the figure of a woman in it.

The lengthy section devoted to the sanctuary of Demeter Melaina on mount Elaium outside Phigalia is noteworthy.[36] After establishing that the sanctuary is

---

[34] I 21.3 Ἀπόλλων δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ Ἄρτεμις τοὺς παῖδάς εἰσιν ἀναιροῦντες τοὺς Νιόβης. The text is, however, ambiguous: are the Apollo etc. (presumably in statue-form) in the cave or on (or between the legs of) the tripod just mentioned in the preceding sentence. Frazer 1898 *ad loc.*, Casevitz 1992, and Chamoux 1992 *ad loc.* opt for the former alternative; Jones 1918–1935 and Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 *ad loc.* for the latter one.

[35] I 21.3.

[36] VIII 42.1–13. Cf. Bruit 1986 for an interesting discussion of this passage, with a different

located on the mountain in question, the narrator relates the tradition explaining why the cult is located in a cave and why the goddess is called Melaina. Pointing to the fact that the first part of the Phigalean tradition is identical with the Thelpusian one, the narrator does not retell the details of Poseidon's rape of Demeter in the present section.[37] The narrator explains that the difference between the two traditions concerns the offspring from this intercourse: according to the Thelpusians Demeter gave birth to a horse, according to the Phigaleans, to Despoena. Continuing with the Phigalean tradition, the narrator tells us that Demeter, in anger at the loss of Core and the outrage of Poseidon, withdrew from the world into the cave on mount Elaium and dressed herself in black. During her absence crops failed and men suffered from famine. Eventually, the other gods managed to find and appease her. 'The Phigaleans say' (φασὶν οἱ Φιγαλεῖς), the narrator explains, that this is the reason why they consider the cave sacred and have dedicated a statue there.[38] Next, the statue is described: it is a woman sitting on a rock, with a horse's head, having snakes and other animals on the head, and holding a dolphin in one hand and a dove in the other.[39] The description is introduced by '(they say that) their statue was made in the following manner'.[40] Throughout the whole description of the statue, the narrator uses either the accusative with infinitive of indirect discourse or past tenses. Hereby he prepares the reader for the following announcement, which initiates the next section of the story of the cult of this Demeter:

> τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὸ ξόανον οὔτε ὅτου ποίημα ἦν οὔτε ἡ φλὸξ τρόπον ὅντινα ἐπέλαβεν αὐτό, μνημονεύουσιν.
> They remember neither whose work this wooden statue was, nor how the flame caught it.[41]

---

focus of interest, and Bruit Zaidman 2003 on §§11–13.

[37] VIII 42.1. In VIII 25.5f. we learn that during her wanderings after the disappearance of Core, Demeter came to Arcadia. Here, Poseidon spotted her and lusted for her. Shunning his advances, she transformed herself into a mare. He, too, transformed into a stallion and had intercourse with her.

[38] VIII 42.2f., quote §3.

[39] VIII 42.4.

[40] *Ibid.* πεποιῆσθαι δὲ οὕτω σφίσιν τὸ ἄγαλμα.

[41] VIII 42.5.

That is, the statue just described does not exist any more, which means that the description of it cannot be based on Ego's seeing it. In fact, the narrator does not in any way suggest that Ego has seen it. By using accusative with infinitive in the description of it, the narrator signals to the attentive reader that he depends upon the testimony of others for the description.

The narrator has not yet exhausted the subject matter of Demeter Melaina. Together with the disappearance of the statue, he continues, the cult of Demeter fell into oblivion. This continued to be the state of things until the Phigaleans, struck by famine, appealed to Apollo in Delphi, who advised them to revive the cult of Demeter.[42] The Phigaleans did this, by, among other things, dedicating a new statue of Demeter Melaina, which was a copy of the old one. Telling about the renewed cult, the narrator focuses almost exclusively on establishing the date of the sculptor of the statue, Onatas of Aegina.[43] Next follows the first of the two most noteworthy points in the narrator's treatment of Demeter Melaina:

> ταύτης μάλιστα ἐγὼ τῆς Δήμητρος ἕνεκα ἐς Φιγαλίαν ἀφικόμην. καὶ ἔθυσα τῇ θεῷ, καθὰ καὶ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι νομίζουσιν, οὐδέν.
>
> It was mainly because of this Demeter that I came to Phigalia. Just as the locals are wont to, I did not offer any (burnt) sacrifice to the goddess.[44]

Instead, the narrator continues, they are in the habit of putting fruits, honeycombs and unworked wool, and pouring olive oil on the offerings on the altar in front of the cave – did Ego do this, too? Such is the sacrifice performed by both private persons and the Phigalean community at their annual sacrifice to the goddess, the narrator clarifies. Note how the narrator passes over from talking about the experiences of Ego to those of others. In the present passage, the others about whose experiences the narrator is talking are not as completely anonymous as they usually are. Nonetheless, since the narrator previously equated what Ego did not do with what the Phigaleans do not do, viz. offer burnt sacrifices to the goddess, it may be assumed that Ego's experiences are

---

[42] VIII 42.6f.

[43] VIII 42.7–10.

[44] VIII 42.11. In II 30.4 the narrator declares that 'I sacrificed' (ἔθυσα); this sacrifice was to Auxesia and Damia on Aegina and performed just as the Eleusinian sacrifices. On the vocabulary of sacrifice in the *Periegesis*, cf. in particular Ekroth 1999 and Pirenne-Delforge 2001.

subsumed under those of the others. By transferring Ego's experiences to those of others, the narrator transforms what would have been a singular occurrence without any application beyond what 'I' did or did not do, into something that both has happened and will happen again an indeterminate number of times.[45]

Next, after some further specifications regarding the cult, comes one final surprise for those who suppose that the narrator has seen and described Onatas' copy of the original statue:

> τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀνάτα ποιηθὲν οὔτε ἦν κατ᾽ ἐμὲ οὔτε εἰ ἐγένετο ἀρχὴν
> Φιγαλεῦσιν ἠπίσταντο οἱ πολλοί.
>
> The statue made by Onatas did not exist in my time and the majority did not know whether the Phigaleans had had it in the first place.[46]

That is, not only the original statue of Demeter Melaina, but also the later one made by Onatas were no longer to be seen at the time of Ego. Ego appears to have made enquiries regarding it: 'the oldest man I met said to me' that three generations earlier, rocks had fallen from the roof onto the statue, which was thereby destroyed.[47] Ego can confirm one part of the statement: in the roof there was 'still visible for us, too' (δῆλα καὶ ἡμῖν ἔτι) the spot whence the rocks had broken off.

In the light of the fact that neither the original nor the later statue was there to be seen, is this a report of a successful or unsuccessful travelling experience of Ego? To be sure, it was unsuccessful as regards the viewing of the statue. However, it is doubtful whether the statement 'it was mainly on account of this Demeter that I came to Phigalia' refers to the actual statue of Demeter rather than the intangible divine presence on the site, and the holiness of the place which is made evident by the continued cult of Demeter, despite the disappearance of her statue.[48] If this is the case, the narrator is giving an

---

[45] Similarly, in the detailed narration of how the oracle of Trophonius is consulted (IX 39.5–14), the narrator presents the bulk of the consultation as if Ego had not consulted it; only in the very end it appears that Ego, too, had gone to the oracle.

[46] VIII 42.12.

[47] VIII 42.13 τῶν δὲ ἐντυχόντων ἡμῖν ἔλεγεν ὁ πρεσβύτατος γενεαῖς πρότερον τρισὶν ἢ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐμπεσεῖν ἐς τὸ ἄγαλμα ἐκ τοῦ ὀρόφου πέτρας, ὑπὸ τούτων δὲ καταγῆναι καὶ ἐς ἅπαν ἔφασκεν αὐτὸ ἀφανισθῆναι.

[48] Cf. also III 15.11. Here, regarding the tradition that the statue of Aphrodite Morpho in Sparta would have been put in chains by Tyndareus so as to punish her for the disgrace that

144

unusually detailed report of a successful travelling experience of Ego. It should be noted, however, that the larger part of the passage in question does not concern travelling experiences. Moreover, the narrator, when speaking about the sacrifice, quickly passes from telling about the experiences of Ego to those of others, which have a more universal applicability.

6.3 Travelling-You

As mentioned above, when introducing the travelling-You, the narrator uses several of the different means offered by the Greek language for expressing an indefinite subject. Most frequently occurring are participles of verbs denoting movement in space in the dative or the genitive case without any noun or pronoun.[49] One also finds the (omitted) second person singular or indefinite pronoun τις as subject, the verb being in the optative mood with ἄν.[50] Further, there are certain ὅστις-clauses and πρίν-clauses which obviously belong to this discussion. Moreover, when speaking about the travelling-You, the narrator occasionally uses the (omitted) second person singular subject with the verb in the future indicative.[51] Whether the subject is equally indefinite in this latter case as in the other ones, will be discussed in the following. The use of these different modes of expression is not interchangeable.

---

had befallen his daughters, the narrator comments: '… I do not accept at all. For it would be completely foolish to expect to be punishing the goddess by making a figurine of cedar-tree and naming it Aphrodite' … οὐδὲ ἀρχὴν προσίεμαι· ἦν γὰρ δὴ παντάπασιν εὔηθες κέδρου ποιησάμενον ζῴδιον καὶ ὄνομα Ἀφροδίτην θέμενον ἐλπίζειν ἀμύνεσθαι τὴν θεόν. That is, divinity does not reside in a statue, nor does holiness depend on the preservation of a statue.

[49] Dative participles of verbs denoting movement are regularly used in order to indicate geographical position, cf. Kühner & Gerth 1898 §423.18e and Smyth 1956 §1497a. For genitive participles without subject, cf. Kühner & Gerth 1904 §486 A2 and Smyth 1956 §2071b. For a short discussion of dative and genitive participles of this sort in the *Periegesis*, cf. Obrecht 1919: 38–41.

[50] Cf. Kühner & Gerth 1898 §352 A4; on the second person singular, cf. also Smyth 1956 §1017 and Gelzer 1937: 93–95 with numerous examples from other texts.

[51] The second person singular of the future tense is similarly used in Herodotus 2.29f. and Lucian's *Syrian Goddess* 30; cf. Kühner & Gerth 1898 §387 A1.

Most frequently occurring in the *Periegesis* is the dative participle. Of course, dative participles of verbs denoting movement in space (*go*, *come* etc.) are regularly used in Greek in order to indicate the geographical vantage point from which a statement holds true. Compare, for example, the following passage from the description of the Athenian Agora:

ἰοῦσι δὲ πρὸς τὴν στοάν, ἣν Ποικίλην ὀνομάζουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, ἔστιν Ἑρμῆς χαλκοῦς καλούμενος Ἀγοραῖος καὶ πύλη πλησίον.

As one walks towards the *stoa*, which is called *poikile* from its paintings, there is a bronze Hermes called Agoraeus and a gate nearby.[52]

In other words, from the sanctuary of Aphrodite Urania in Athens, one comes to Hermes Agoraeus and a gate if one moves towards the *Stoa Poikile*; were one to move in some other direction, one would reach some other destination, obviously. In this sense, the dative participle clearly functions to restrict the validity of the statement.[53]

However, within any particular statement, together with indicating a restriction in the validity of the statement, these participles function to denote the location of the object or phenomenon introduced by the speaker. The location of a specific object etc. is often further specified by adverbial adjuncts. In the above quoted passage the location is specified by a complement of the participle (πρὸς τὴν στοάν, ἣν κτλ.); in other cases the location is specified by an adjunct of the main verb of the sentence, as ἐν ἀριστερᾷ τῆς ὁδοῦ in the first instance in the passage quoted below. Finally, a common feature of practically all these participles is that they are derived from verbs of movement; it is this semantic function of the individual verb that motivates the space we devote to them in a section that deals with the travelling-You. Particularly when the participles appear in clusters, the movement suggested by the semantics of the verb becomes apparent; compare, for example, the following passage:

ἐκ δὲ Τιτάνης ἐς Σικυῶνα ἀφικομένοις καὶ καταβαίνουσιν ἐς θάλασσαν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ τῆς ὁδοῦ ναός ‹ἐστιν› Ἥρας οὐκ ἔχων ἔτι οὔτε ἄγαλμα οὔτε ὄροφον… καταβᾶσι δὲ ἐς τὸν Σικυωνίων καλούμενον λιμένα καὶ τραπεῖσιν ἐπ᾽ Ἀριστοναύτας τὸ ἐπίνειον τὸ Πελληνέων, ἔστιν ὀλίγον ὑπὲρ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ Ποσειδῶνος ἱερόν· προελθοῦσι δὲ κατὰ τὴν λεωφόρον…

---

[52] I 15.1.

[53] Cf. Kühner & Gerth 1898 §423.18e for examples from other authors.

> As one has arrived from Titane to Sicyon and descends to the sea there is on the left
> side of the road a temple of Hera without any statue or roof any longer… As one has
> come down to what is called the harbour of the Sicyonians and turned towards the port
> of the Pelleneans, Aristonautae, there is a little above the road to the left a sanctuary of
> Poseidon. Having continued along the highway…[54]

The dative participles seldom occur in so great concentrations as in the present passage. However, this passage illustrates well an essential point regarding these participles in the *Periegesis*, viz. that they are not used exclusively in order to indicate that the statement holds true from one specific spatial position. By using them, the narrator also introduces movement into the text, without restricting it to Ego or some other definite persona. The narrator can also – and indeed does frequently, but that is a field of enquiry that lies outside the present study – use prepositional phrases and adverbs in order to indicate position.[55] Considering the fact that the narrator has several different means at his disposal, it can be assumed that he has actively chosen one specific mode of expression rather than another. In other words, occasionally the narrator chooses not to use static modes of expression, such as 'in front of', preferring instead an expression which suggests active movement, such as 'having entered'. Compare, for example, the following two passages from the description of the Agora in Athens:

> τοῦ θεάτρου δὲ ὃ καλοῦσιν Ὠιδεῖον ἀνδριάντες πρὸ τῆς ἐσόδου βασιλέων εἰσὶν
> Αἰγυπτίων.
> In front of the entrance to the theatre which they call Odeum there are statues of
> Egyptian kings.[56]

> ἐς δὲ τὸ Ἀθήνησιν ἐσελθοῦσιν Ὠιδεῖον ἄλλα τε καὶ Διόνυσος κεῖται θέας ἄξιος.
> When one has entered the Odeum in Athens, there is among other things a Dionysus
> worth seeing.[57]

---

[54] II 12.2.

[55] Cf. also Brommelaer 2001 for an excellent study of the several means for indicating locality used in book X, particularly in the description of Delphi.

[56] I 8.6.

[57] I 14.1.

In other words, when speaking about the statues outside of the Odeum, the narrator uses a static prepositional phrase. When – finally, after several pages of biographies of various Hellenistic monarchs – it is time to mention objects inside the Odeum, the narrator introduces them by letting the travelling-You enter the Odeum. Of course, one has to take into account the overall propensity for variation of expression in the *Periegesis*, but the choices between prepositional phrases etc. and dative participles have probably not been made on purely formalistic grounds.[58] The content that is to be put into words should ideally, and probably does, play a significant part in deciding what mode of expression to use. In the light of how elaborate the specifications occasionally are, the dative participles appear to have been chosen precisely because they indicate simultaneously that someone or other has made/is making/will make the specific movements described in order to reach the destinations spoken of in the text.[59]

The impression that the function of the dative participles goes beyond restricting the validity of the statement and denoting locality, is reinforced by the two following considerations. (1) Verbs signifying movement in space are not the only type of verbs used by the narrator in his speaking about the experiences of the travelling-You using dative participles. However, the verbs of other semantic categories do not occur nearly as frequently as the verbs of movement do. (2) Dative participles are not the only means at the narrator's disposal for expressing movement in space; these other means for expressing movement are, however, not nearly as frequently used as the dative participles are.

Before passing on to the other ways of indicating movement by the travelling-You, let us first consider some of the instances in which the narrator introduces the travelling-You as performing some other business than moving in space. First, a passage which is open to several different interpretations:

> καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐς Μέδουσαν οὔκ εἰμι πρόθυμος ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς σημῆναι· ἔτι δὲ τῶν γραφῶν παρέντι τὸν παῖδα τὸν τὰς ὑδρίας φέροντα καὶ τὸν παλαιστὴν ὃν

---

[58] Cf. Engeli 1907: 138–140 for a short discussion on the different means for indicating location, and *passim* for *oratio variata* in the *Periegesis*.

[59] For the reader's convenience, there is at the end of the present chapter a list of the more than 350 occurrences of dative participles of verbs of movement used by the narrator when speaking about the travelling-You.

Τιμαίνετος ἔγραψεν, ἐστὶ Μουσαῖος. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔπη μὲν ἐπελεξάμην…

I am not willing to relate the matter concerning Medusa in the *Attica*. Furthermore, passing by the child carrying the water-jars and the wrestler painted by Timaenetus, Musaeus is among the paintings. I have read verses…[60]

Is one to understand the act expressed by the participle παρέντι as 'passing by' in its literal sense, i.e. physically moving by the painting in question, or 'passing by' figuratively, i.e. omitting? The answer to that question depends to some extent on who is understood to be the subject of the participle. In this passage the dative participle is preceded by a sentence in which the narrator introduces Ego's cross-referencing role and followed by another one in which, again, the first person is used; this time the narrator lets show Ego the researcher. In such surroundings, is one to understand the subject of the dative participle to be the indefinite travelling-You ('as one has passed by' physically), or the first person ('as I have passed by' either physically or figuratively)? One may never get a certain answer to that question. However, the travelling-You appears to be the more likely candidate, considering the fact that the narrator normally does not avoid introducing a first person pronoun into the text when need be – of course, provided that a μοι has not fallen out of the text.[61] Moreover, in a context such as the one of the present passage, the narrator normally prefers to keep Ego in the background, instead favouring the indefinite travelling-You, thereby giving his statement a wider applicability. Consider, further, the following passage from the *Boeotica*:

τοῦ δὲ Μενοικέως ἐπιπέφυκε ῥοιὰ τῷ μνήματι· τοῦ καρποῦ δὲ ὄντος πεπείρου διαρρήξαντί σοι τὸ ἐκτὸς λοιπόν ἐστιν εὑρεῖν τὸ ἔνδον αἵματι ἐμφερές.

---

[60] I 22.7.

[61] Cf. e.g. I 29.3 παρέντι δέ μοι τὰ πλείω τοσάδε… ἀρκέσει 'passing by the most, this much will suffice for me'. In this context one may note a cross-referencing phrase in which the narrator describes Ego's progression in the narrative in a manner reminiscent of the travelling-You's movement in space III 7.5 μοι… προελθόντι ἐς τὴν Μεσσηνίαν συγγραφήν 'when I have advanced to the Messenian account'; cf. also the organisatory statement in V 21.1 … ἡμῖν… τὰ ἀξιολογώτατα αὐτῶν ἐπερχομένοις '… as we are covering the most remarkable among them'. Cf. also II 12.3 and III 2.5 in both of which the subject of the dative participle is τῷ λόγῳ.

> On the tomb of Menoeceus a pomegranate tree grows; if you break through the exterior
> of the fruit when it is mature, you can find that the interior resembles blood.[62]

This is a curious case of stating the obvious. Why does the narrator describe the nature of the ripe pomegranate in a manner resembling that in which an elder would describe a pomegranate to a young child, who has never heard of such a fruit? Moreover, the presence of σοι makes one wonder whether the subject of the dative participle in the present passage is the indefinite 'you' (the travelling-You) or a definite 'you' (the narratee).[63] Cases of similar ambiguities in the interpretation of 'you' together with possible implications of such ambiguity are discussed below.

Whereas the dative participles vary apparently without consequence between the singular and the plural, the genitive participles are found mainly in the plural.[64] Apart from the obvious difference in form, there does not appear to

---

[62] IX 25.1. Other passages in which dative participles of verbs not signifying movement are used about the travelling-You: ἀκούσαντι II 21.7; ἀκούσασι I 19.6, II 21.6; εἰκάζοντι III 19.2, V 12.7; ἀντεξετάζοντι I 9.5; ἐπισχόντι IV 35.10; παρέντι II 20.1, III 18.11, V 21.4; ἐπιλεξαμένοις I 19.3; λουσαμένῳ II 34.1; ἰδόντι II 7.6, IV 35.11, V 7.1, VIII 9.8 (ἀπο-); ἰδοῦσι I 19.6; προθυμηθέντι IV 33.1; πυθομένοις I 17.3. It is uncertain whether (ἐ)θέλουσι I 20.4, V 6.2, VI 25.1; φθεγξαμένῳ (ἀνδρί) II 35.10; βοήσαντι (ἀνδρί) V 21.17 are to be included among these datives.

[63] Similarly, in the list of dative participles of verbs of movement, one may note four instances in which there actually is a subject of the participle, viz. ἀνδρί: IV 35.10 (ἀνδρὶ ἐσβάντι), VI 17.1 (ἀνδρὶ ποιουμένῳ τὴν ἔφοδον), 26.10 and VIII 39.1 (ἀνδρὶ ἰόντι).

[64] In at least two passages the manuscripts have the genitive singular. In II 24.7 the manuscripts read καταβάντος and in VIII 15.5 they vacillate between προσεληλυθότος and προσεληλυθότι. In the latter passage the manuscript reading has been emended into προεληλυθότι ever since the earliest editions. The change of the prefix into προ- is certainly justified. However, whether one should opt for the dative case rather than the genitive one is another question. As to the former passage, van Herwerden 1887: 57 has suggested that καταβάντος should be changed to καταβάντι or καταβάντων. Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 and Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 print καταβάντι; Spiro 1903 has kept the reading of the manuscripts. The low frequency of genitive absolute participles without subject in the singular as compared to the plural in the *Periegesis* corresponds to a general low frequency of them in Greek, cf. Madvig 1884 §181 A4c. It is therefore unnecessary to eliminate one or two genitive absolute participles without subject in the singular in the *Periegesis* on such grounds. We thus follow Spiro in keeping καταβάντος in II 24.7 and would prefer to read προεληλυθότος in VIII 15.5. On genitive absolutes without subject in the *Periegesis*, cf. also

be any significant distinction between the dative and the genitive participles. Occasionally, they are found in one and the same sentence, as in the following passage from the *Laconica*:

> ἐπανελθόντων δὲ ἐντεῦθεν προελθοῦσιν ὀλίγον καὶ τραπεῖσιν αὖθις ἐς ἀριστερὰν ἄγαλμά ἐστιν Ἡρακλέους καὶ τρόπαιον.
>
> When one has returned from there, advanced a little and again turned to the left, there is a statue of Heracles and a trophy.[65]

Beginning with a genitive and continuing with two dative participles, the narrator details the complex movements one has made/is making/will make – retrace one's steps, move on, and turn to the left – in order to cover the ground between the previous and the next object of description or comment. In both cases the subject of the participle is an equally indeterminate somebody, a 'you' or 'one' covering the distance between the two objects. Compare, further, the following passage from the description of the countryside outside Thebes in Boeotia:

> διαβάντων δὲ ποταμὸν καλούμενον ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τῆς Λύκου Δίρκην – ὑπὸ ταύτης δὲ ἔχει λόγος Ἀντιόπην κακοῦσθαι καὶ δι᾽ αὐτὸ ὑπὸ ⟨τῶν⟩ Ἀντιόπης παίδων συμβῆναι τῇ Δίρκῃ τὴν τελευτήν –, διαβᾶσιν οὖν τὴν Δίρκην οἰκίας τε ἐρείπια τῆς Πινδάρου καὶ μητρὸς Δινδυμήνης ἱερόν…
>
> When one has crossed a river called Dirce after the wife of Lycus – tradition records that Antiope was maltreated by her and that for this reason Dirce was killed by Antiope's children –, anyhow, when one has crossed the Dirce, there are ruins of Pindar's house and a sanctuary of Meter Dindymene…[66]

---

the list in Strid 1976: 37 n. 62.

[65] III 10.6.

[66] IX 25.3. In the following passages, too, the genitive participle is used by the narrator in order to speak about the movements of the travelling-You: compounds with -βάντων as the verbal element (prefixes: δια-, κατα-) II 24.5, 25.2, 25.9, III 25.1, IV 33.7, 35.10, VI 6.4, 20.6, 21.3 (*bis*), VII 25.10, VIII 29.1, 36.9, IX 24.5; ὑπερβαλόντων VIII 6.4, IX 23.7; ἰόντων and compounds with -ιόντων as the verbal element (prefixes: ἀνα-, ἐξ-, κατα-, παρα-, προ-, προσ-) I 2.2, 21.4, II 2.3, 3.2, 13.4, 13.5, 24.1, 32.6, 36.6, III 12.5, IV 33.6, V 15.9, VII 2.6, 27.1, VIII 37.1, IX 40.10; compounds with -ελθόντων as the verbal element (prefixes: ἐπανα-, ἐσ-, προ-) I 2.1, 2.4, II 25.9, III 10.6, IV 34.4, V 15.6, 15.7, VII 23.9, VIII 20.1, IX 26.2; ἀφικομένων IV 36.7.

That is, the very same action – the crossing of a river – is first set forth with a genitive participle, but later, after a short clarification as to who the eponymous woman was, the narrator prefers a dative participle. Clearly, the narrator did not perceive any difference in meaning between the two cases. If this is not always the case when he is speaking about the travelling-You, this is so at least in the present instance.

The present passage is, further, a good illustration of how thin the divide is between the travelling-You and the travelling-Ego. First, as already discussed, the movements are related as undertaken by the travelling-You. Then, after giving some details regarding the statue of Meter Dindymene and her sanctuary, particularly the fact that it is open on only one specific day every year, the narrator declares 'I managed to arrive on this day, and I saw' the statue.[67] In other words, the narrator obviously presents Ego as having travelled in the area, and to have been there on a specific day of the year, but, in accordance with his normal practice, he prefers not to introduce Ego into the text in the process of actually moving from point *a* to *b*, or even crossing a river. Instead, he introduces the travelling-You and lets this indefinite subject perform the act of crossing the river Dirce only to retire after s/he (it?) has done his/her (its?) duty. Hereby the narrator apparently deliberately depersonalises the account of the movement.

The narrator transforms a travelling experience which would, presumably, have been unique for Ego, potentially could have been embellished with a large number of details, and certainly could have been presented in the past tense, into one from which every personal detail is removed. The first person of Ego is replaced with the someone or other who is the subject of the participle, the detailing of the event is reduced to its bare minimum (crossing of the river Dirce), and the temporality of the event is not fixed. Has the crossing of Dirce happened, is it happening, or will it happen? Has it happened/is it happening/will it happen once, twice, thrice, or an infinite number of times? Speaking in terms of narrative frequency, we have here a difference between singulative narrative (narrating once what has happened once) and iterative narrative (narrating once what has happened *n* times).[68] That is, when speaking

---

[67] This passage is discussed above in the previous section, too, where the Greek text is quoted.

[68] On narrative frequency, cf. Genette 1980: 113–160, esp. 113–117 and Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 57f.

about Ego's travelling experiences, the narrator is – at least presumably – narrating a unique experience. When speaking about the travelling-You, the narrator reduces to one narrative utterance an event that may occur/may have occurred an infinite number of times. Iterative narrative as it presents itself in the *Periegesis* differs from iterative narrative as described by Genette. In the *Periegesis*, iterative narrative is not only a sylleptic comprehensive statement taking together prior occurrences of an event, it also suggests further future repetition of the event, as will presently be discussed. There is moreover the question of who the agent performing the crossing was/is/will be, i.e. who the indefinite travelling-You is.

These and similar questions, which arise from the narrator's deliberate choice to speak of much of the movement in a depersonalised way, do not have one single answer. It may be that this is the point with introducing this vague travelling-You. Hereby the narrator does not restrict himself to narrating the limited experiences of Ego. Instead, by peeling off such traits that would pin down the event to the singular experience of Ego – less is more! –, the narrator opens the narrative and widens its scope to potentially include not only every crossing of Dirce in his own time, but also all previous and subsequent crossings of the river. The several crossings of the river are, of course, not identical with each other. However, the narrator normally removes so many details from his narrative of any event in the frame, that the question of identity should not be a problem either in the present passage or in most of the *Periegesis*.

There is, however, one problem. Moving backwards or forwards from the 'now' of the narrator, for the most part one is bound to reach a point in time when the statement ceases to be true as a whole or in parts. The river may have some other name or be dried up, the sanctuary may be in ruins, the house of Pindar may be in an undamaged state etc. The narrator appears to realise that the narrative occasionally needs to be restricted into being a narrative about the one-time experiences of Ego. Thus, in the present passage, the narrator introduces Ego, lets him step in where the travelling-You leaves the scene, and declares that 'I', i.e. the travelling-Ego, arrived in time and saw the statue of Meter Dindymene.

The same interpretative openness is inherent in certain πρίν-clauses in the *Periegesis*, in which the narrator speaks about the travelling-You. These πρίν-clauses are introduced with the subordinating conjunction πρίν ('before'),

constructed with the infinitive as predicate, and with no subject specified. Consider, for example, the following passage from the *Laconica*:

> πρὶν δὲ ἢ διαβῆναι τὸν Εὐρώταν, ὀλίγον ὑπὲρ τῆς ὄχθης ἱερὸν δείκνυται Διὸς Πλουσίου. διαβᾶσι δὲ Κοτυλέως ἐστὶν Ἀσκληπιοῦ ναός...
>
> Before one crosses the Eurotas, a sanctuary of Zeus Plusius is pointed out a little above the bank. When one has crossed, there is a temple of Asclepius Cotyleus...[69]

In other words, on the way from Amyclae to Therapne in Laconia, whenever one postpones the act of crossing the Eurotas for a moment, one will see a sanctuary of Zeus Plusius a little above the riverbank – or, if one is in the right company, the sanctuary will be pointed out to one. Similarly, whenever one has crossed the river, there is a temple of Asclepius Cotyleus, provided, of course, that they have withstood the ravages of time. Naturally, the narrator cannot predict for how long a statement like the present one holds true in whole or in part, nor should he be expected to have that ability. What the narrator can do, is to draw attention to the frailty of things. He frequently points to the changeability of things, as indicated above in the study of Ego the dater; cf. also the passage which will be discussed next.

Potentially, present, aorist, and perfect participles and infinitives have reference to the three temporal situations of past, present, and future.[70] Therefore, when the narrator records the actions of the travelling-You using infinite forms of the verb in one of the three above mentioned tenses, these actions are floating in time. It is unclear whether they lie in the past, present or future of the time of narration. Turning next to the instances in which the narrator uses finite forms in order to speak about the travelling-You, it appears that in some instances the temporal position of the narration in relation to the actions of the travelling-You is that of anterior, or prior, narration. In other words, the narrator's narrating occasionally precedes the events narrated. The narrator is not recounting what has happened; instead, he predicts what will

---

[69] III 19.7. Of the more than 100 occurrences of πρίν in the *Periegesis*, we have been able to detect ten instances in which the temporal clause is used with reference to travels and other experiences on site of the travelling-You. The other nine are: I 18.6, 37.3, II 26.1, V 6.7, VII 5.9, 22.6, IX 4.4, 34.1, X 25.5.

[70] For unambiguous reference to the future, future participles and infinitives are to be chosen.

happen.[71] Compare, for example, the following passage from the treatment of the Argolid countryside between Argos and Epidaurus:

> ἐρχομένοις δὲ ἐξ Ἄργους ἐς τὴν Ἐπιδαυρίαν ἐστὶν οἰκοδόμημα ἐν δεξιᾷ πυραμίδι μάλιστα εἰκασμένον… προϊοῦσι δὲ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκτραπεῖσιν ἐς δεξιὰν Τίρυνθός ἐστιν ἐρείπια… καταβάντων δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, ἐνταῦθα οἱ θάλαμοι τῶν Προίτου θυγατέρων εἰσίν· ἐπανελθόντων δὲ ἐς τὴν λεωφόρον, ἐπὶ Μίδειαν ἐς ἀριστερὰν ἥξεις… ἐπ' ἐμοῦ δὲ Μιδείας πλὴν τὸ ἔδαφος ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐλείπετο… κατὰ δὲ τὴν Λῆσσαν ἔχεται τῆς Ἀργείας ἡ Ἐπιδαυρίων· πρὶν δὲ ἢ κατ' αὐτὴν γενέσθαι τὴν πόλιν, ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀφίξῃ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ.
>
> As one is walking from Argos to Epidauria, there is to the right a building rather like a pyramid… As one is proceeding from here and has turned to the right, there are ruins of Tiryns… As one has gone down towards the sea, there are the chambers of the daughters of Proetus. Having returned to the highway, to the left you will come to Midea… In my time there was nothing else left of Midea except for its foundation… In the area of Lessa, the land of the Epidaurians is adjacent to the Argive territory. Before you come to the city itself, you will arrive at the sanctuary of Asclepius.[72]

In this detailing of the route between Argos and Epidaurus, the narrator repeatedly introduces the travelling-You in order to narrate movement on the ground. Dative and genitive participles are mostly used, which signify, as discussed above, temporally indefinite actions undertaken by an equally indefinite subject. There is also a πρίν-clause, designating, in accordance with normal practice, a temporarily suspended action, in this case the arrival in the city of Epidaurus. Amidst the many travelling-Yous, the narrator also introduces into the text Ego the dater. The fact that the narrator introduces Ego in the present passage reminds us, again, of the fact that, though Ego's personal travelling experiences lie at the foundation of the frame narrative, the narrator does not wish to present the travels as personal. With the comment featuring Ego the dater, the narrator signals that whereas one indeed may come to the site of Midea, there was nothing left of the city 'in my time', i.e. when (the travelling-)Ego visited the place in question. This statement raises the question of what there will be to see when 'you' come(s) there.

---

[71] On the different temporal relations between the story and the narration, of which, for natural reasons subsequent narration is the most frequently occurring in any narrative, including the *Periegesis*, cf. Genette 1980: 215–223 and Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 90f.

[72] II 25.7–26.1.

The appearance of the two future indicatives in the second person singular is the most interesting feature with the present passage. Using the future, the narrator predicts that 'you will arrive at/come to' Midea and the Asclepieum, respectively. The use of the future tense and the second person singular raises some interesting interpretational problems, which centre on the question who 'you' is. The question of who 'you' is falls into two. First, there is the question of whether the second person singular is an indefinite 'you', i.e. someone or other (German and Swedish 'man'), or a definite 'you', i.e. the one to whom the narrator addresses himself (German and Swedish 'du'). If the second person singular is to be interpreted as a definite 'you', equivalent to the German and Swedish 'du', then we have here a momentary change of narrative situations. There are two standard narrative situations in the *Periegesis*: (1) the heterodiegetic narrative situation, in which the narrator ('I'), addressing a (mostly covert) narratee ('you'), is telling about the doings etc. of someone else ('s/he', 'it', 'one', 'you' or 'they'); (2) the homodiegetic narrative situation, in which the narrator ('I'), addressing a (mostly covert) narratee ('you'), is telling about the doings etc. of Ego ('I'). The homodiegetic narrative situation is the rarer of the two in the *Periegesis*, and with very few exceptions only occurs in the frame narrative. Instead of either one of these standard situations, we may here for a moment be faced with a rather unusual narrative situation in which the narrator ('I'), addressing a narratee ('you'), is telling about the doings etc. of a character who is also the addressee ('you').[73]

Secondly, one has to consider the reference of 'you', the character about whom the statement is made, as well as the addressee of the statement, and why the narrator has chosen this mode of expression. Is this 'you', about whom the narrator is speaking and whom he is addressing, chosen because of the ease with which not only the narratee but also the real (?) reader can identify with it? This question cannot confidently be answered with yes or no. It does, however, bring into focus the main challenge and allure with second person narrative, viz. its pull on the real reader to enter into the narratee-position. In other words, is the narrator, for a short moment, if not actually introducing the real reader into the text, then at least suggesting that a syncrisis of the character and narratee, both

---

[73] 'Second person narrative', cf. Margolin 1990, Fludernik 1994a: 284–290, and Fludernik 1994b.

textual, and the extratextual reader might be possible?[74] Of course, the extent to which 'I', the real reader, identify/-ies myself with 'you' in the narrative, whom the narrator is both addressing himself to and telling about, depends upon who 'I' am/is. What can be said for certain is that the narrator is telling about travels undertaken by a 'you' and taking place at some point in time that is subsequent to the narrating of it; depending on the reader, it is also subsequent to the time of reading. However, with second person narrative, there is the possibility that a reader fails to uphold the distinction between the different potential references of 'you', viz. the reader, the narratee, and protagonist. What happens then, if/when the actual reader accepts the syncrisis? Most likely, a reader's attempts to transfer the movements detailed in the text to the real world would result in frustration and misdirected criticism of the narrative, if it is done without a proper understanding of the narrator's procedures, witness for example Wilamowitz.[75] Consider, further, the following passage from the *Arcadica*:

> καὶ ταύτῃ πρῶτα μέν σε ὁ Ἀλφειὸς ἐκδέξεται… αὐτόθεν δὲ ἔχων τὸν Μαλοῦντα ἐν δεξιᾷ μετὰ σταδίους ὡς τριάκοντα διαβήσῃ τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἀναβήσῃ δι᾽ ὁδοῦ προσαντεστέρας ἐς χωρίον καλούμενον Φαιδρίαν.
> Here, first, Alpheus will receive you… From here, keeping Malus on your left, you will cross it after approximately 30 stades and ascend along a rather steep road to an area called Phaedria.[76]

That is, when the narrator is speaking about the travels that will be undertaken by 'you' sometime in the future, he may use the second person singular, or, more rarely, the third person singular; in this case 'you' is the object instead of the subject of the predicate. In the latter case, the subject is usually some geographical feature, such as the river Alpheus in the above quoted passage, receiving the traveller.[77]

---

[74] On such ambiguities inherent in second person narratives, particularly on the pressure it exerts on the reader, cf. Phelan 1994 *passim*, esp. 356–358. On the narratee, cf. also Prince 1980 *passim*, with Genette 1988: 130–134.

[75] Cf. further above chapter 1.

[76] VIII 35.1.

[77] Other passages in which the narrator is predicting travels and other experiences of the travelling-You: future, second person singular I 21.3, II 11.2, 23.2, 36.7 (*bis*), III 10.8, 14.3, 21.5, V 6.4, VI 7.1, 21.5 (*bis*), VII 25.5 (*bis*), 25.13, VIII 8.1, 11.1 (*bis*), 15.8 (*bis*), 16.5, 20.1, 21.1, 23.8 (*ter*), 25.1 (*bis*), 26.3 (*bis*), 26.5 (*ter*), 29.5 (*bis*), 35.3, 37.11, X 5.3, 28.1, 29.7

When the narrator uses the future tense to predict what 'you' will do without any modifications, he gives out an air of certainty that is not quite customary for him. Consequently, the futures are not very frequent. Occasionally they occur in combination with a conditional clause, as in the following passage from the *Eliaca*. In this passage, the narrator predicts the distance the travelling-You will have to cover between Olympia and Elis, but only provided that he should decide to walk along a specific route:

> εἰ δὲ ἐλθεῖν ἐς Ἦλιν διὰ τοῦ πεδίου θελήσειας, σταδίους μὲν εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐς Λετρίνους ἕξεις, ὀγδοήκοντα δὲ ἐκ Λετρίνων καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐπὶ Ἦλιν.
>
> If you should wish to go to Elis across the plain, you will have 120 stades to Letrini, and 180 stades from Letrini to Elis.[78]

Let us next proceed to discuss other means at the narrator's disposal for speaking about the travelling-You. These are ἄν with the optative mood, the subject being either the second person singular (the indefinite 'you') or the indefinite pronoun τις, and certain ὅστις-clauses. As we turn to these clauses, too, we are again faced with the problem of determining the reference of 'you'. As was the case already with the (suppressed) subject of the above discussed participles and infinitives, the 'you' is now indefinite, i.e. 'one', equivalent with the German and Swedish 'man'. A narrative about an indefinite subject is certainly a heterodiegetic narrative about a third person, in which the character and the narratee are two clearly distinct entities; it is, however, also the sort of narrative that comes closest to second person narrative.[79] It may be tempting to conceive of such a narration as stimulating a narratee's and/or a reader's perception of it 'being about' about him/her as much as about the indefinite 'you'. One must, however, not forget that, strictly speaking, it is a narrative about the indefinite 'you' or 'one'.

Let us begin with ὅστις-clauses, i.e. complex sentences in which the narrator, speaking about the travelling-You, uses a ὅστις-clause to limit the

---

(*bis*), 31.8; future, third person singular, with 'you' (σε) as object VIII 7.1, 11.1, 13.6, 28.1, IX 32.2, X 35.5; future, τις *vel sim.* subject I 21.5, 42.3, X 29.5.

[78] VI 22.8 Other passages in which the narrator uses conditional clauses when speaking about the travelling-You: I 21.3 (cf. above), II 11.6 VI 17.1, VIII 11.1, 36.7, 37.7, IX 21.5, X 4.1, 11.4, 17.10, 31.1.

[79] Cf. Richardson 1994 *passim*, esp. 323f.

reference of the subject of the main clause. Compare, for example, the following passage from the description of the Athenian Acropolis:

> ὅστις δὲ τὰ σὺν τέχνῃ πεποιημένα ἐπίπροσθε τίθεται τῶν ἐς ἀρχαιότητα ἡκόντων, καὶ τάδε ἔστιν οἱ θεάσασθαι.
>
> Anyone, who prefers things made with art to objects that have reached a great age, can see the following.[80]

In this passage, one may first note the ἔστι with infinitive used to narrate the doings of the travelling-You. Occasionally ἔστι with infinitive is used with reference to events in the frame, narrating what may or may not be done by the indefinite 'you'.[81] The most interesting feature is, however, the ὅστις-clause. Taking into account the fact that preferences differ, the narrator so to speak recasts the role of the travelling-You, from one who is interested in antiquated objects to one who prefers works of art. As to the ὅστις-clauses, generally speaking, the narrator appears to use them in order to endow the travelling-You, who is normally a *tabula rasa*, with whatever characteristics are needed for the moment. Indeed, when the narrator uses ὅστις-clauses, he does not always appear to depict this 'you' as travelling, or even having other kinds of experiences on site as a result of travels. Rather than a travelling-You, we have in these cases a …-You, a blank 'you', whom the narrator can endow with suitable characteristics. Compare also the following comment regarding the Trojan horse, made apropos of a statue representing it on the Athenian Acropolis:

> καὶ ὅτι μὲν τὸ ποίημα τὸ Ἐπειοῦ μηχάνημα ἦν ἐς διάλυσιν τοῦ τείχους, οἶδεν ὅστις μὴ πᾶσαν ἐπιφέρει τοῖς Φρυξὶν εὐήθειαν.
>
> That Epeus' product was a contrivance for breaking down the wall, is known to everyone who does not attribute complete stupidity to the Phrygians.[82]

In other words, the narrator apparently anticipates protest that might have arisen had he chosen to state simply 'everyone', or the like. Therefore he delimits the

---

[80] I 24.3.

[81] Other passages in which ἔστι with the infinitive is used about the indefinite 'you': I 19.3, 22.3, 37.1, 44.2, II 3.6, 11.6, 21.4, 33.1, V 16.8, 18.6, IX 19.1, X 14.6.

[82] I 23.8. Other ὅστις-clauses ascribing characteristics to the …-You: I 21.6, 22.1, 34.5, 37.4, 41.5, II 4.2, 23.3, VII 26.6, IX 10.2, 30.12, 37.5, X 20.1, 29.5. Cf. also II 15.2, V 5.7, VIII 42.4, X 5.5, 32.2, 32.7.

reference of the subject (translated above with 'everyone', which would be all-inclusive without a qualifier). Using a ὅστις-clause, the narrator creates a …-You, who for the moment is endowed with the characteristic of not being too narrow-minded when it comes to Phrygians, perhaps even to barbarians in general. Moreover, by limiting its scope, he creates a statement the validity of which is more difficult to refute.

After the dative participles, the narrator uses ἄν with the optative mood, i.e. the *modus potentialis*, expressing a possible event, most frequently when speaking of the travelling-You. With the ἄν with optative, the narrator creates something that might be called 'potential narration', i.e. instead of narrating what has happened, is happening or will happen, he narrates what may/might, can/could or should happen. As to narrative frequency, potential narration may be iterative. Consider, for instance, the following description of a painting in the Asclepieum in Epidaurus:

> γέγραπται δὲ ἐνταῦθα καὶ Μέθη… ἐξ ὑαλίνης φιάλης πίνουσα· ἴδοις δὲ κἂν ‹ἐν› τῇ γραφῇ φιάλην τε ὑάλου καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῆς γυναικὸς πρόσωπον.
> Here is Methe, too, painted drinking from a cup of glass… In the painting, you can see both the cup of glass and, through it, a woman's face.[83]

Apparently, in this instance the narrator prefers to state what possibly may be rather than predicting what will be, and suggests that 'you can see' instead of predicting that 'you will see', i.e. he prefers the potential mode to the future tense. By using the future tense one imparts a statement with a sense of certainty about the course of events that cannot be a matter of fact before their actual occurrence. Therefore, the future tense may occasionally be interpreted as having a potential connotation.[84] This does, however, not appear to be the case in the instances in which the narrator is speaking about the future doings of the travelling-You. Whereas the future tense may have a potential function, the optative with ἄν certainly has one. Regarding the doings of the travelling-You, the narrator's statements cannot in fact be anything but speculations, at least when the narration is not subsequent but prior to the events narrated. This is mirrored by the narrator's use of the optative with ἄν. By choosing the optative

---

[83] II 27.3.

[84] Cf. Rijksbaron 1994: 32f.; cf. also Kühner & Gerth 1898 §396.6 A1, citing a number of passages where future and optative with ἄν are found side by side, and BDR §385.1.

with ἄν rather than the future tense, the narrator explicitly signals that he will not and cannot predict what the travelling-You actually will or will not do, he can only suggest what the travelling-You possibly does or possibly will do.

Further, when he uses the optative with ἄν, it is noteworthy that the narrator for the most part is not speaking about the travelling-You's movements in space. Instead, the narrator introduces other kinds of experience that one might have on site, such as seeing or hearing. These are the same kind of experiences that the narrator does not mind presenting Ego as having. Of course, these experiences are in practice inseparable from actual travels. Consider, for instance, the following passage, which introduces the description of Olympia:

> πολλὰ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα ἴδοι τις ἂν ἐν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀκοῦσαι θαύματος ἄξια· μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς Ἐλευσῖνι δρωμένοις καὶ ἀγῶνι τῷ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ μέτεστιν ἐκ θεοῦ φροντίδος.
> There are many other marvellous things which one might see or even hear among the Greeks, but the Eleusinian mysteries and the games in Olympia are bestowed with the greatest care from god.[85]

In other words, the potential for experiences in Greece is great for both the travelling-You and for anyone travelling in Greece. Finally, let us consider the following passage from the *Attica*:

> διαβᾶσι δὲ τὸν Ἰλισὸν χωρίον Ἄγραι καλούμενον... τὸ δὲ ἀκούσασι μὲν οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐπαγωγόν, θαῦμα δ' ἰδοῦσι, στάδιόν ἐστι λευκοῦ λίθου. μέγεθος δὲ αὐτοῦ τῇδε ἄν τις μάλιστα τεκμαίροιτο· ἄνωθεν ὄρος ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἰλισὸν ἀρχόμενον ἐκ μηνοειδοῦς καθήκει τοῦ ποταμοῦ πρὸς τὴν ὄχθην εὐθύ τε καὶ διπλοῦν.
> When one has crossed the Ilisus, there is an area called Agrae... Though not quite alluring when one hears of it, but a wonder when it is seen, is a stadium of white marble. One might best estimate its size as follows: a mountain from above beyond the Ilisus, it begins in a crescent and reaches the bank of the river in a straight double line.[86]

The narrator appears to have been very impressed by this monument, the stadium of Herodes Atticus. Simply the fact that he attempts to describe a

---

[85] V 10.1. Other passages in which the narrator uses 'potential narration' when speaking about experiences the travelling-You might have on a site: II 11.6, 29.1, 32.6, VI 13.3, VII 5.5, VIII 16.5, IX 10.5, X 11.1, 24.2, 24.4, 25.5, 29.9, 33.5; τις subject: II 2.2, 11.6 (*bis*), 21.4, V 5.2, 18.7, VII 4.4, 17.6f., 20.5, 23.6, IX 39.3, 39.10, X 32.3.
[86] I 19.6.

utilitarian building such as the stadium is in and of itself remarkable. By generalising the experience of perceiving the building, the narrator attempts to convey some of the wonder in words. First, using two dative participles, he points to the fact that it might not seem much when one hears of it (=reads about it?), but that it is marvellous to behold. In the following, the narrator makes an effort to bridge this gap between words and the sight itself. He invites (the indefinite) 'you' to imagine the size of the stadium by comparing it to a mountain and continuing by actually describing the impression produced by the stadium clad in white marble.

As to the τις in this passage, the narrator is not so much talking about what an actual travelling-You might or might not do. Rather, he again appears to be expanding the applicability of his narrative even further, to include not only a travelling-You or an experiencing-You, but also a …-You, whom the narrator introduces once in a while so that s/he can perform certain tasks that cannot be fulfilled by others. The …-You is frequently introduced as guessing, believing, accepting and occasionally even investigating something or other.[87] In the present passage, s/he is introduced as the one estimating the size of the stadium.

6.4 Summary

In this chapter we have gathered and studied the passages in which the narrator introduces travelling experiences into the *Periegesis*. Following the narrator's practice of distributing the travel in the *Periegesis* between two travelling agents, viz. the first person (the travelling-Ego) and a mostly indefinite 'you' or 'one' (the travelling-You), the material in this chapter has been disposed in the separate groups of precisely the travelling-Ego and the travelling-You. In this study, the narrator's choice to introduce the travelling-You as an agent distinct

---

[87] Other passages in which the narrator talks about the potential doings of the …-You, using ἄν with optative, τις as subject: I 24.2, 37.3, 38.1, 44.3, II 7.1, 24.4, III 18.5, IV 8.9, 15.2, V 6.3, 25.3, 25.11, VI 12.9, 21.10, 24.7, 24.8, 26.2, VII 10.3, 21.8, VIII 2.5, 7.5 (*bis*), 11.9, 11.12, 14.2, 15.6, 28.2, 36.5, 44.6, 52.3, IX 8.1, 21.5, X 4.1, 20.2, 26.9. Mention must also be made of a number of third person imperatives, all exhortations to the …-You: ἴστω I 29.14, III 21.7, V 12.3, VI 13.11, 15.7, 16.8, X 19.11, 23.14, 30.2; μεμνήσθω V 14.10; πειθέσθω II 23.3, IV 4.3; προσιέσθω IX 35.5. One may also note ἴστωσαν in VIII 25.7 and 25.12; in these passages the narrator appears to be arguing with his source.

from the travelling-Ego has been respected. Therefore, despite the fact that the travelling-You is undoubtedly based on travelling experiences of Ego, the two have not been conflated into one category.

The travelling-Ego is not introduced nearly as frequently as the travelling-You. When the narrator does introduce the travelling-Ego, his concern is not for signalling movement from point *a* to point *b*, nor does he appear to be interested in making the actual movements of Ego part of his narrative. Therefore, with only a few exceptions, one does not come across mention of movements undertaken by Ego. The narrator is instead concerned with signalling successful or failed travelling experiences of Ego on any specific site, such as (not) seeing or (not) finding things, (not) managing to arrive in time for a particular event. The small extent to which the narrator introduces the travelling-Ego is in and of itself significant for determining what the narrator prefers to let Ego do in the text. In the case of the travelling-Ego the narrator does not exert himself to gloss over the difficulties and uncertainties encountered by Ego. Instead, the narrator inserts in certain passages what seem to be admissions of fallibility; apparently they are intended to be reminders of the fact that Ego in his function of traveller may be mistaken just as easily as in any other one his functions, particularly the researcher function.

Turning to the travelling-You, one may note, first, that this is a persona occurring very frequently in the *Periegesis*, secondly that for the most part it is used for narrating movements which the narrator does not introduce Ego as making. The travelling-You is also found having other kinds of travelling experiences than strictly moving on the ground. The travelling-You appears almost to be a stand-in for the travelling-Ego, introduced by the narrator when speaking about movement. Whether it is legitimate to assume that the narrator truly transforms actual travelling experiences of Ego to those of the travelling-You or not, cannot be known for certain. Nevertheless, considering the fact that the frame narrative is based on Ego's travels, one may wonder why the narrator has chosen to suppress the travelling-Ego. It would seem that an answer to the question why, is that whereas the narrator certainly wanted to make movement and travel in Greece a part of his narrative, he did not want to produce a narrative that would exclusively be about Ego's (travel) experiences. Hence the creation of the travelling-You.

Table 3

List of dative participles of verbs signifying movement by the travelling-You

ἀρξαμένῳ ἀνασκοπεῖσθαι V 17.6

βαδίζουσι I 43.4, II 7.6, VII 26.11

καταβαίνοντι III 21.4, VIII 14.9, 29.1

καταβαίνουσι II 11.2, 12.2, 32.9

compounds with -βάντι as the verbal element[88] III 23.1, 24.2, 25.4, IV 33.3, 33.4, 35.10, V 6.1, 13.7, 24.6, VII 3.5, VIII 13.4, 32.4, 35.8, 37.8, 54.4, IX 3.9, 23.2, 31.3, 39.10, X 8.8, 24.6, 32.1, 36.5, 37.4

compounds with -βᾶσι as the verbal element[89] I 19.6, 28.4, 37.4, 38.2, 42.3, 44.3, 44.10, II 11.4, 11.5, 12.1, 12.2, 18.3, III 19.7, 20.3, 21.7, VII 26.11, IX 25.3, 39.4

διαβεβηκότι IX 8.1

διαβεβηκόσι II 7.3

ὑπερβάλλοντι VI 20.10

ὑπερβαλόντι VIII 54.7, IX 24.5

ἰόντι and compounds with -ιόντι as the verbal element[90] II 20.5, 23.3, 38.5, 38.6, III 10.7, 12.1, 14.1, 14.6, 15.6, 15.6, 16.4, 17.4,[91] 18.2, 21.2, 22.13, IV 31.4, 33.3, V 5.3, 6.1, 10.10, 15.5, 15.6, 19.1, 20.6, 21.2, 23.1, VI 21.7, 24.3, 26.10, VII 3.4, 3.5, 20.7, 21.7, 24.5, 24.5, VIII 10.1, 13.4, 15.5, 16.1, 17.6, 25.1, 28.1, 34.1, 37.7, 39.1, 44.2, 46.4, 53.11, IX 24.1, 29.5, 30.7, 32.5, 34.5, X 5.1, 8.9, 29.3, 32.2, 32.8, 35.1

ἰοῦσι and compounds with -ιοῦσι as the verbal element[92] I 15.1, 18.4, 22.1, 24.5, 29.2, 33.2, 34.2, 36.3, 41.1, 41.6, 42.1, 42.6, 44.2, 44.4, 44.6, II 1.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.4, 4.6 (*bis*), 5.5, 10.2, 10.7, 15.4, 20.6, 24.2, 25.8, 28.2, 28.3, 30.3, 32.7, 34.6, 38.1 (*bis*), III 10.6, 18.6, 20.3 (*bis*), 20.8, 20.9, IV 31.4, V 12.5, IX 2.3, 2.7, 4.4, 8.3, 39.4, X 24.7, 33.3

ἐρχομένῳ II 15.1, 22.8, IV 33.1, V 6.7, 16.8, 24.1, VI 23.8, VII 20.3, IX 8.7, 29.5, X 38.6

---

[88] Prefixes: ἀνα-, δια-, ἐπανα-, ἐσ-, κατα-, ὑπερ-, ὑποκατα-.

[89] Prefixes: ἀνα-, δια-, κατα-.

[90] Prefixes: ἀνα-, ἐξ-, ἐπανα-, ἐπι-, ἐσ-, κατα-, παρεξ-, περι-, προ-.

[91] In this passage the manuscripts read ἐς δὲ τὴν πρὸς μεσημβρίαν στοάν; Frazer 1898, I: 576 has suggested that ἰόντι or ἰοῦσι has fallen out; this supplement has been accepted by Spiro 1903, who prints ἐς δὲ τὴν πρὸς μεσημβρίαν ‹ἰόντι› στοάν; Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, followed by Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990, instead change preposition and government, printing ἐν δὲ τῇ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν στοᾷ. We would prefer the former emendation of the present passage.

[92] Prefixes: ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐσ-, παρα-, προ-.

ἐρχομένοις I 39.1, II 3.6, 11.3, 18.1, 23.1, 25.7, VII 21.6

ἐλθόντι and compounds with -ελθόντι as the verbal element[93] II 1.7, II 22.5, 35.8, III 11.1, 14.6, 14.7, 18.3, 18.15, 20.2, 20.7, 21.1, 22.3 (*bis*), 22.4, 23.8, 24.2, 24.8, 25.1, IV 31.1, 31.4, 33.6, 34.7, V 22.5, 24.6, VI 21.4, 21.9, 22.1, VII 18.1, 22.11, 25.8, 25.11, VIII 6.5, 11.5, 12.2, 12.7, 13.4, 23.8, 28.7[94], 34.1, 36.5, 36.7 (*bis*), 39.5, 53.11, 54.4, IX 19.2, 19.6, 23.6, 24.3, 25.5, 26.6, 30.1, 30.8, X 8.6, 9.3, 24.6, 25.2, 37.1

ἐλθοῦσι and compounds with -ελθοῦσι as the verbal element[95] I 14.1, 26.5, 32.7, 37.2, 40.4, 40.6, 44.3, 44.10, II 5.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.7, 10.2, 10.3, 11.4, 12.2, 13.7, 15.4, 18.1, 18.3 (*bis*), 20.3, 21.1, 24.7, 25.2, 34.10, 35.1, 36.1, 38.4, III 10.6, 12.8, 14.2 (*bis*), 15.10, IX 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 4.4

προεληλυθότι IX 30.7

ἐλαύνοντι IX 5.14

ἀπέχοντι VIII 6.5

ἀποσχόντι III 23.2, 25.9

ἤξασι II 11.5

ἀφιέντι VIII 36.7

ἀφέντι V 5.3

ἀφικομένῳ V 7.1

ἀφικομένοις II 12.2

ἀφεστηκότι IX 8.1

ὁδεύοντι VIII 16.1; διοδεύοντι V 5.7

ὁδεύουσι VIII 36.5

ὁδεύσαντι V 6.4, VII 25.8

πλέοντι I 1.1, II 34.8, III 23.2, VII 22.10, IX 32.2; παραπλέοντι IX 32.4

πλέουσι VII 5.6; ⟨παρα⟩πλέουσι I 35.1; προσπλέουσι I 28.2

---

[93] Prefixes: ἀνα-, δια-, ἐξ-, ἐπανα-, ἐσ-, παρα-, προ-, ὑπο-.

[94] In this passage the text reads … ποταμὸς ἔξεισιν αὐτόθεν Βρενθεάτης καὶ ὅσον σταδίους προελθόντι πέντε κάτεισιν ἐς τὸν Ἀλφειόν '… the river Brentheates has its origin from here, and as one has advanced about five stades it falls into the Alpheus.' The text would make better sense if the participle was in the nominative case, having the river Brentheates as its subject: … προελθὼν… κάτεισιν κτλ. '… having flowed… it falls into…'. Moreover, with the change of the participle into προελθών, the manner in which the narrator speaks about the river Brentheates would correspond to the manner in which rivers are spoken of in e.g. IV 20.2, VIII 30.1, 54.2. Frazer 1898 *ad loc.*, Jones 1918–1935, Jost 1998b, and Moggi 2003 translate the passage as if the participle was a complement to Βρενθεάτης.

[95] Prefixes: ἀνα-, δια-, ἐπανα-, ἐσ-, κατα-, παρα-, προ-.

παραπλεύσαντι I 1.1, II 34.8; διαπλεύσαντι IX 24.1; περιπλεύσαντι III 23.2

περαιουμένοις X 37.3

περᾶν μέλλοντι V 15.3

ποιουμένῳ τὴν ἔφοδον VI 17.1

πορευομένοις II 32.10

ἀναστρέψαντι III 10.7, V 5.7, 15.1, IX 19.3, X 5.1; ἐπιστρέψαντι III 24.2, V 23.1

ἀναστρέψασι II 11.5; ἐπιστρέψασι II 7.3

ἀποτρεπομένῳ III 20.3

τραπομένῳ IX 26.6, X 8.8

τραπομένοις I 38.8; ἐκτραπομένοις I 44.4, III 10.6

τραπέντι X 24.6, 36.5; ἀποτραπέντι X 33.12; ἐκτραπέντι X 35.1

τραπεῖσι and compounds with -τραπεῖσι as the verbal element[96] II 5.4, 11.1, 11.3, 12.2, 21.1, 22.8, 25.8, 36.1, 36.2, 36.6, III 10.6, 21.5, VIII 44.5, 54.5, IX 2.1, 4.4

---

[96] Prefixes: ἀπο-, ἐκ-.

Summary and conclusion of part I

The first part of our study of the *Periegesis* has been devoted to a study of two particularly recurrent features of the frame narrative, viz. Ego and 'you'.

What is called frame narrative in this study corresponds roughly to what is commonly called periegetic narrative or simply descriptions of sights, θεωρήματα. The term 'frame narrative' is introduced in the light of the fact that it is actually neither merely a periegetic (i.e. guiding) narrative nor a description of sights to be seen. The frame narrative is a narrative in which either Ego or 'you' are protagonists. Within this frame are embedded descriptions of, or, more correctly, comments made regarding objects which exist in space. The objects of description or comment are connected one to the other to by way of the narrative in the frame, which to a large extent has the form of a journey through Greece. Indeed, actual descriptions of objects are rather infrequent in the *Periegesis*, the narrator preferring instead to insert comments regarding the objects. These comments in their turn frequently develop into embedded narratives of varying length. However, in the frame narrative the narrator tells not only about travel, but also about other kinds of research done for the *Periegesis* and to a large extent about the actual writing down of the *Periegesis*, too.

The most prominent feature of the frame narrative, Ego and 'you' have been the objects of study in the four preceding chapters. The purpose has been to explore what functions and roles Ego and (travelling-)You respectively have in the frame, and to ascertain, if possible, what consequences the distribution of Ego's and (travelling-)You's roles may have for the interpretation of the *Periegesis*.

As in any narrative, the 'I' of the narrator/character, i.e. Ego, appears in the *Periegesis* in two distinct capacities, as the narrator and as a character. As narrator Ego is on an extradiegetic narrative level, i.e. Ego is external to the story, which means that within the text there is no other narrating instance creating Ego as narrator. As character Ego is on a homodiegetic relationship to the story of the frame narrative, i.e. the narrator can use the first person to designate Ego as character, which means that the narrator to a certain extent tells his own story in the frame narrative.

The narrator is, of course, continually in the text fulfilling his defining function, viz. narrating the *Periegesis*, but only occasionally does he appear in the text. When explicitly perceptible on the textual level, the narrator intrudes into the text in order to refer to himself and his doings with the text and within the text. Two separate functions of Ego as narrator can be discerned, viz. writer and dater.

When speaking about Ego as character, the narrator intrudes into the text in order to give an account, not of his production of the text, but about himself performing tasks that are separate both in time and space from the narrating of the *Periegesis*. Two distinct functions of Ego as character can be discerned, viz. researcher and traveller.

The writer function of Ego as narrator was studied in chapter 3. By the writer function we mean the instances in which Ego is concerned with the production of the text itself. This function falls into three separate roles, or aspects of the writer, viz. cross-referencing, organising, and pretermitting. The narrator's comments, which introduce Ego the writer, appear to be mainly concerned with helping the reader to find his/her way through the text and making him/her accept the authority of the narrator over his material. Further, the comments featuring Ego the writer help to create an impression that the narrator is in control of his material, that he has a clear comprehension of what he is going to treat where, and that the locations for divulging specific pieces of information are carefully chosen, but that he knows equally well what to leave out of the *Periegesis*.

And, more generally speaking, the great number of instances in which the narrator intervenes in his narrative in order to articulate the joints between different sections of the text or the connections between parts that are far apart,

or in order to clarify questions of inclusion or exclusion of material, enhance the impression that the *Periegesis* is the narrator's own creation. In other words, the narrator does not avoid constantly reminding the readers of the fact that what s/he is reading is the narrator's text, his creation, and that, by extension, Greece as it is described in the *Periegesis*, is very much his creation. Even without leaving the level of the text, it may be assumed that the very same raw material that is used for the *Periegesis*, could have been used to create a radically different image of Greece by some other narrator. However, this statement is hypothetical. What is clear from the study of Ego the writer, is that the narrator does not try to hide the fact that someone, i.e. he himself, wields a controlling hand over the narrative. Furthermore, from this it is clear that what the readers of the *Periegesis* get is what the narrator wants them to have.

There are, however, some exceptions to this general image of a controlling and authoritative narrator. In a number of passages it is not the narrator who is telling about what he is or is not doing. Instead, it is the λόγος, a dream or something else that is presented as dictating when, where, and what the narrator may or may not write down in the *Periegesis*. What is one to make of such passages? Generally speaking, the text is the narrator's creation, but in the creative process, over which he has the overall control, there are certain obligations that he must fulfil. There is some material that must be covered, some other that under no circumstances may be included, or some pieces of information that are to be taken into the account, but in some other context. For the most part, the narrator decides such issues, but occasionally his own discernment does not appear to have been enough, whence the interventions of the λόγος.

One final point needs to be made regarding the narrator's introducing Ego the writer. The great majority of these appearances of Ego are concerned with clarifying matters for the readers – the organisation of the text or the choices of material. Such helpful pointers create a sense of closeness and help to inspire confidence in the narrator. But there are also a number of passages in which the narrator withdraws from the reader's side. Apparently deliberately, the narrator accentuates a sense of estrangement between himself and the readers on the many occasions in which he introduces Ego's pretermitting role, in order to explain that a certain piece of information cannot be revealed. The silences are especially prominent when it comes to matters of religion. However, one may

wonder whether the narrator aims to distance himself from all his readers. Modern readers are, of course, utterly disappointed when the narrator of the *Periegesis*, like every other ancient writer, holds his tongue when it comes to the Eleusinian mysteries for example. We are left completely in the dark, without any satisfactory means of enlightenment. This is, however, not the case for the contemporaries of Ego (Pausanias), to whom the *Periegesis* is primarily addressed. If not yet privy to the secrets at which the narrator hints, for the most part there was the possibility of getting to know them. For example, apropos of Demeter Chloe, the narrator advises the reader that, should one be interested in information on the surname of the goddess one can get information regarding that from her priests.[1] Both for those who were let into the secrets and for those who were not, the narrator's ostentatious silences suggest that he was a man to be relied upon. One may therefore wonder whether the narrator' pretermitting comments are yet another way to inspire confidence in the narrator.

The dater function of Ego as narrator was studied in chapter 4. With the dater function we mean the instances in which Ego is concerned with linking objects etc. to the temporal situation, the 'now', in which he is putting the *Periegesis* into writing. The dater function of Ego falls into two separate roles, or aspects of the dater, viz. marking continuity and marking discontinuity.

Regarding Ego the dater, one may wonder how the many appearances of Ego the dater are to be taken. The exact temporal reference is impossible to pinpoint, nor is it probably meant to be determinable – at least not without some effort and extensive reading of the *Periegesis*. Provided that the beginning of the work is intact – which it probably is –, the narrator does not actually say when this 'now', to which he so often refers, is until the beginning of book V, where he gives the year AD 174.[2] However, the year 174 is valid only for book V, and strictly speaking only for the immediate context in which it appears.

---

[1] Cf. I 22.3.

[2] V 1.2, cf. above. Regarding the question of the beginning and end of the work, it has repeatedly been pointed out that the *Periegesis* has 'neither head nor tail', i.e. neither prologue nor epilogue, cf. e.g. Frazer 1898, I: xxii (quote) and Musti 1982: xviii. Bowie 2001: 27f. suggests that a dedicatory letter at the very beginning of the work has fallen out in the manuscript tradition. Bowie 2001: 28 n. 32 maintains, quite correctly, that a prefatory/dedicatory letter cannot be dismissed with reference to 'the style of the man and the character of his work' (Habicht 1985: 18). We simply do not know enough about the actual

From the very beginning, then, the readers of the *Periegesis* are confronted with a narrator who exists in an unknown 'here and now'. Just as is the case with readers of most narratives,[3] the reader – at least this reader – of the *Periegesis* is not as interested in the spatial situation of its narrator in relation to the story he is recounting, as in his temporal situation in relation to it. Nor is the narrator of the *Periegesis* as forthcoming with information of the first sort as with information of the second sort. Whereas the narrator refers more than 400 times to his 'now', he appears to make one single reference to his 'here', which turns out to be in the vicinity of Mount Sipylus in Lydia in Asia Minor.[4]

Temporally the narrator is, obviously, subsequent to what he is recounting. What intrigues the readers is to know how long the temporal gap is between the events from different periods of the Greek past and the 'now' that figures prominently in the *Periegesis*. When a reader approaches the text without any prior knowledge of either the text itself or its narrator/author, s/he is faced with a slow and frustrating process of trying to pinpoint when the 'now' is, to which the narrator so often refers.

For the most part, as mentioned above, the exact temporal reference of the 'now' of which the narrator speaks when introducing Ego in his dater function escapes the reader. But the many appearances of Ego the dater play another, perhaps more important role in the *Periegesis*. From the first pages on, the many instances in which the narrator indicates that something is 'still' in a certain way, or is different 'now', alert the readers to the probability that the narrator is a latecomer to the objects described and the events retold. Otherwise he would not have had the need to constantly indicate that this remains the same

---

man behind the text (the author Pausanias as distinct from the narrator in the text) to rule that out. It may even be that our conception of the character of Pausanias the author would have been radically different, if there had been a preface. But that is only speculation. What we can say is that both the beginning and the end as they stand are perfectly in accord with the rest of the *Periegesis*. Regarding the beginning of the work, cf. the observations of Robert 1909: 265 'Das Thema des ganzen Werkes und das Thema des ersten Buches chiastisch einander gegenübergestellt… ist das etwa kein Prooemium? Ich meine doch, wenigstens im Sinne des Pausanias.' And, regarding the end of the *Periegesis*, cf. Nörenberg 1973 *passim*.

[3] Cf. Genette 1980: 215f. and Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 92.

[4] V 13.7 Πέλοπος δὲ καὶ Ταντάλου τῆς παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἐνοικήσεως σημεῖα ἔτι καὶ ἐς τόδε λείπεται κτλ. 'Still until now there remain some signs of Pelops' and Tantalus' residency with us…' On the implications of this Lydian origin, cf. the observations of Jones 2004: 15–21.

or that that has changed. That is, the narrator makes it abundantly clear that he is not interested in pretending that the past is his present. Instead, he is investigating the objects and events of the past through the present. During this process, the opportunity presents itself repeatedly for the narrator to indicate that he found things to be in a certain way, whereas he may have expected to find things differently because of, for example, outdated literature describing the sites (dater function indicating discontinuity); and to indicate that things were more or less as he expected them to be (dater function indicating continuity).

The researcher function of Ego as character was studied in chapter 5. By the researcher function we mean the instances in which the narrator introduces Ego in the process of finding out facts, commenting on or judging the material included in the *Periegesis*. When talking about the researcher function of Ego, the narrator introduces an earlier version of himself into the text, performing preparatory work for the *Periegesis*. Ego the researcher falls into three separate roles, or aspects of the researcher, viz. investigating, commenting, and criticising.

The investigating role of Ego the researcher is particularly interesting. When letting the investigating role into the *Periegesis*, the narrator leaves some sort of record for the reader, not only of the successes, but also surprisingly often of the setbacks which he encountered during the efforts to find facts for the *Periegesis*. This record of Ego's researches is not necessarily to be taken as literally corresponding to something that has actually happened – in the real world as opposed to the world of the text –, though of course it is possible. It may be conjectured that some part of the narrative about Ego's researches corresponds to the actual investigating done by Pausanias for the *Periegesis*. It should, however, not be assumed that the text says the whole truth or nothing but the truth in this matter. Given the general character of the *Periegesis*, it would, however, seem more likely that the narrator has left out a considerable number of details than that he has embellished the account.

When registering the researcher's search for material for the *Periegesis*, his evaluation of the trustworthiness of the material that is included, or his criticising of it, the narrator not only signals the uncertainties that one is faced with when exploring both the past and the present. He also reminds the readers

of the fact that what they read is a construction built on material that has been assembled with some difficulty. The appearances of Ego as character in his function of researcher highlight the opaqueness of the *Periegesis*, just as the many appearances of Ego as narrator in his function of writer do. Ego is firmly put into the text; the narrator's introducing Ego the writer put Ego into the *Periegesis* as the one doing the telling of it, whereas his introducing Ego the researcher put Ego into it as the one who, prior to the telling, has sought out the material that may be presented. Hereby, the narrator signals that the *Periegesis* is, on the one hand, a text that builds on material that does exist independently from it, and, on the other, simultaneously a construction of reality that would not exist in the form which it has outside of the text. Moreover, the type of comments the narrator makes regarding the researches done for the *Periegesis*, suggests that, whereas it certainly does build on traditional material (things said, whether orally or in literature, by others), this fact does by no means guarantee that the readers are to accept everything without reflecting. Instead, given that the narrator repeatedly introduces Ego the researcher in order to signal uncertainties with the material, questions that remain unanswered, and general dubiousness regarding the information, the readers, too, are invited to question the material and take part in the interpretative process. Can the reader reach certainty where Ego reveals himself as being overly cautious?

Finally, the traveller function of Ego as character was studied in chapter 6. By the traveller function we mean the instances in which the narrator introduces Ego as having experiences – Ego the traveller is rarely introduced as actually moving in space – on a site concerning objects etc. which are described or commented on in the *Periegesis*. When talking about Ego the traveller, the narrator introduces an earlier version of himself into the text, performing preparatory work for the *Periegesis*.

The traveller function of Ego differs from the other functions of Ego in that it does not appear to fall into two or more separate roles, or aspects. One can certainly distinguish between two separate travelling agents, viz. the travelling-Ego and the travelling-You, but whether or not the travelling-You is an aspect of the traveller function of Ego is uncertain. Nonetheless, the travelling-You, which is much more common than the travelling-Ego, has been included in our study of the traveller function in the *Periegesis*, for two reasons. Firstly, the

narrator apparently uses the travelling-You to relate travel in the text that he does not wish to introduce Ego as undertaking. Secondly, the travelling-You is frequently depicted as moving in areas where Ego is presented as having experiences which are certainly associated with travel, but strictly speaking are not actual travel or movement in space.

Thus, we have a slightly schizophrenic situation in the *Periegesis*. On the one hand, according to the narrator's own statements, Ego very often appears to have been in an area and undergone experiences of various kinds. But, on the other hand, the narrator usually does not depict Ego as actually moving in the area. When the narrator wishes to depict movement, he ordinarily introduces the travelling-You.

As to whether or not there are any actual advantages to be derived from suppressing the travelling-Ego, and introducing the travelling-You instead, one can only establish that, obviously, the narrator thought that there was one, for otherwise he need not have introduced the travelling-You. It is, however, doubtful whether we will ever quite understand why the narrator has chosen to present the travelling as he does. What we can do is to describe what happens in the narrative when the narrator introduces the travelling-You and depersonalises his account.

First, obviously, the identity between (author and) narrator and character is discontinued; instead of telling about what 'I' did, the narrator tells about the doings of a third party, the indefinite 'one' or 'you', perhaps even the definite 'you'. This 'you', whether definite or indefinite, is normally a *tabula rasa*, but occasionally the narrator endows him/her (it?) with such characterising traits as s/he (it?) needs to have for the moment. Second, the temporality of the action is obscured. Does the narrator narrate what has happened, is happening, or will happen? In some instances the narration is clearly anterior, i.e. the narrator tells of events that will happen. In these same instances the subject the narrator tells about almost seems to be the definite 'you', identical with the narratee, and, by syncrisis, if not actually, then at least potentially identical with the real (?) reader. Further, the frequency of the action is indistinct. Does the narrator narrate what has happened/is happening/will happen once, twice, thrice, or an infinite number of times? Finally, potential narration is one last obscurity inherent in some of the instances in which the travelling-You is introduced, i.e.

the event retold may/might, can/could happen – that is as far as the narrator's confidence goes in these instances.

It must be emphasised that Ego of the *Periegesis*, which has been the subject of investigation in the four preceding chapters, is nothing more or less than the 'I' of the narrator/character who figures prominently in the text. Tempting though it may be, the portrait of Ego that can be pieced together from studying the *Periegesis* closely, should not straight off be assumed to apply also to the extratextual author of the text. One has to consider that we do not have any other information on Pausanias, the author of the *Periegesis*, from any other source. This means that we do not have any prospect of knowing to what extent the information about Ego in the text is applicable to the extratextual 'I' who is the author of the text. Had we had another source for his biography, we could have compared the data of the *Periegesis* with the information of the other source. Would it have established or not that the portrait of Ego pieced together from the *Periegesis* is identical with the extratextual author of the text? We have no means of knowing either way.

Therefore this has been a study of the textual Ego based on the assumption that the extratextual Pausanias certainly has made some contributions to the textual Ego, but leaving aside attempts to turn the textual Ego into an extratextual Pausanias. At the very least Pausanias' general knowledge, researches, and travels are the basis for the material of the *Periegesis*. Moreover, Pausanias' actual knowledge etc. is reasonably more extensive than the knowledge etc. that the narrator portrays Ego as possessing or acquiring. Be that as it may, a comparison of Ego with Pausanias lies beyond the scope of the present study.

However, when studying the *Periegesis* as a work of literature, or as a source of information, the appearances of Ego are in and of themselves interesting. What concerns does Ego appear to have when it comes to the *Periegesis*? And what kind of impression does the narrator produce in the reader of the *Periegesis* by frequently introducing Ego in his varying functions and roles?

To a very large extent, Ego reveals himself to be concerned with how the reader may take in the material included in the *Periegesis*. Particularly, the writer function and the researcher function, in which Ego appears very

frequently in the text, are both largely oriented towards guiding the reader through the *Periegesis*. Ego the writer is concerned with literally making clear to the reader what pieces of information are to be found where in the text, and what material is completely excluded from it. Occasionally Ego adds an explanation of why a certain location is chosen for a specific piece of information, and why this or that piece of information is left out of the text. Ego the researcher is concerned with guiding the reader through the text in a more figurative sense of the word. The appearances of Ego the researcher leave to the reader a record of not only the failures and successes encountered during the researches for the *Periegesis*, they also – and perhaps more importantly – make clear Ego's attitude vis-à-vis the material included. In other words, comments like 'I know', 'I think', and 'I do not know', which signal Ego's certainty, hesitancy, and uncertainty towards the material, indicate to the reader what amount of trust s/he in his/her turn may put in it. And, when Ego appears in his criticising role, he not only points to a possible attitude vis-à-vis the material, but explicitly states how he himself evaluates it, and how the reader could or should assess it.

When introducing Ego the dater, the narrator is primarily concerned with indicating what the relation is between Ego and the material introduced: have things changed or have they remained comparatively unaltered? And, in doing this, the narrator introduces Ego so frequently into the narrative, that the reader, though s/he may note that the narrator is most interested in discussing things of the past, cannot but realise that Ego is firmly situated in his present. In this present Ego can only note whether or not the things of the past in which he is mainly interested continue to exist in an unchanged state of things. Indirectly, the appearances of Ego the dater are of a certain concern for the reader, too. On the one hand they bring into focus the changeability of things. If Ego, when comparing the past with his present, has to indicate that things have changed in approximately 50 percent of the instances, how often would the reader have to do the same when comparing the past as described in the *Periegesis* with his/her present? On the other hand they constantly remind the reader of Ego's presence in the text. Moreover, by repeatedly introducing Ego the dater, the narrator signals that not only has the research been done by Ego (researcher function) and is the narrating done by Ego (writer function), but also is the material of the narrative repeatedly related to the 'now' in which Ego exists (dater function).

The traveller function differs to some extent from the other functions of Ego. The most obvious difference is that the instances in which the narrator introduces the traveller function and actually explicitly refers to Ego are very rare. Most commonly, when introducing the traveller function into the *Periegesis*, the narrator is instead speaking about the movements of an anonymous, indefinite, atemporal, potential travelling-You. Occasionally, when he introduces this travelling-You, though he does not explicitly speak about the reader, the narrator appears to suggest that the addressee/real (?) reader may identify him/herself with the travelling-You. The potential of syncrisis of the addressee of the text and the object of narration does not truly begin to suggest itself until the narrator starts to use the second person singular of the future tense rather regularly when speaking about the travelling-You. This does not happen until well into book II, despite one stray second person singular of the future tense in book I.[5] Nor is the potential for this syncrisis equally manifest throughout the *Periegesis*. But once it has begun to manifest itself, it is reinforced with every occurrence of the travelling-You, whether the form is the second person singular of the future tense or dative participles.

In brief, as far as they manifest themselves in the text, the concerns of Ego centre on making it easier for the reader to perceive that the *Periegesis* is his product. In other words, throughout the text, Ego appears in it time and again, at every turn making it clear that what is presented in the text is Ego's own creation. The narrator does not make any effort to try to cover up the fact that the description of Greece in the *Periegesis* at every step of the way is dependent on and created by Ego. A reader of the *Periegesis* would not be presented with the same image of Greece had Ego not existed in the 'now' in which he exists, had he not conducted the researches which he has conducted, and had he not organised the material of the *Periegesis* the way in which it is organised.

To judge from the narrator's presentation of matters, it would appear that the image of Greece in the *Periegesis* is to a much lesser degree dependent on the travels done by Ego. But, one has to ask oneself what role the travelling-You plays in this respect. After all, in the frame narrative it is to a large part the travelling-You who makes the movements which link together the various sites and monuments.

---

[5] Cf. above chapter 6 n. 77.

Does the narrator hereby suggest that the image of Greece presented in the *Periegesis* is also dependent on the travel undertaken by the travelling-You? Should this be the case, one may wonder if such an assumption does not cause more problems than solutions. The main problem with the notion that the movements of the travelling-You would be decisive for the presentation of Greece in the *Periegesis*, is the temporal indefiniteness of the travelling-You. The narrator probably envisions the travelling-You to be approximately contemporary with Ego, i.e. the appearance of sites and monuments as described in the *Periegesis* is for the most part such as it would have been in the 'here and now' of Ego, but he does not confine him/her to this 'here and now', but potentially to a time that is both subsequent and prior to it. Hence the problem with the temporal indefiniteness of the travelling-You: the sites and monuments between which the travelling-You moves have not always had and will not for ever have the same appearance as they are described as having in the *Periegesis*. The question is whether or not the narrator deliberately introduced such an ambiguity into the text. Though certainly expecting a future audience for the text, it may very well be that he did not expect it to be read at a time when the sites and monuments as described in the *Periegesis* had changed beyond recognition. In other words, the narrator surely did not imagine a time such as ours, when we can barely piece together the layout of a place from the description in the *Periegesis*, should we not be so lucky as to have unearthed the ruins of what once was there.

PART II

CONTENT: THE GREEKS AT WAR

7 The history of Greece in the *Periegesis*

7.1 Introduction

Before turning to the three aspects of the Greeks at war – Greeks against Greeks, Greeks against others, and Greeks and Romans – which are the main theme of the second part of our study of the *Periegesis*, we will discuss briefly how the history of Greece is presented in the *Periegesis*. First, we will discuss the form of the historical notes in general terms, before we proceed to an inquiry into the presentation of the history of Greece in the *Periegesis* on a smaller scale, using the introductions to the *Laconica* and the *Arcadica* as points of departure. The first of these two introductions has been chosen as a representative of the longer introductions in the *Periegesis*, the second one as a representative of the shorter ones.[1] Furthermore, these introductions contain features which illustrate exceptionally well characteristics of the manner in which the historical material is presented in the *Periegesis*.

---

[1] III 1.1–10.5 and VIII 1.1–6.3. Counting the number of paragraphs, the difference in length between the two does not seem to be great. But when the length of the introductions is compared with the length of the whole books, the picture is quite different. The introduction to the *Laconica* constitutes about 36% of the whole book, the introduction to the *Arcadica* about 10%. Both proportionally speaking and counting the paragraphs and pages, the introduction to the *Laconica* is the shortest of the three long historical introductions in the *Periegesis*, the longest one is the introduction to the *Messeniaca* (about 80% of the whole book), while the one to the *Achaica* is the second longest (about 56%).

7.2 General remarks

Anyone reading the *Periegesis* notices immediately that in it the history of Greece is retold in the form of λόγοι, i.e. as stories, either in connection with monuments or serving as introductions to regions or cities.

As has been noted previously, in the several books of the *Periegesis*, the description of a region or a major city is in most cases preceded by a myth-historical introduction, with the notable exception of the description of Athens in the first book, in which all of the historical material is carefully linked to the monuments.[2] There is, however, a great variety between the separate books. At the very start of books III, IV, and VII there are long introductions, which do not exclude shorter introductory notes to some of the communities treated in these books. Books V–VI, VIII, and X have rather short introductions at the start of the books, combined with rather long ones preceding the individual communities. Books II and IX do not contain any general introduction at the start of the books, but there are introductions preceding the treatment of individual communities; in book I, too, there are short introductions attached to the treatment of Salamis and Megara.[3]

It has been calculated that the stories, which cover a great variety of subject matter, take up approximately half of the *Periegesis*.[4] However, not all stories can be considered to be history, not even myth-history. According to Trendelenburg's calculations, history covers roughly 330 pages of the 860 Spiro-pages that have been counted.[5]

As regards the historical narratives which the narrator chooses to introduce into the *Periegesis*, he is markedly selective. His interest is focussed exclusively on the history of Greece,[6] but, quantitatively speaking, the same amount of attention is not bestowed upon the different historical periods. According to calculations made by Bischoff, the Persian wars and the pentakontaetia are

---

[2] Cf. e.g. Gurlitt 1890: 12–14.

[3] I 35.2f., I 39.4–6.

[4] Trendelenburg 1911: 15–17. Trendelenburg unfortunately excludes books V and VI from his calculations, allegedly in order to reach a more correct picture of the proportions between the λόγοι and θεωρήματα in the *Periegesis* as a whole. The proportions naturally vary from one book to another.

[5] *Ibid.* 17.

[6] Noted by e.g. Habicht 1985: 102.

treated in about 11–12 (Spiro) pages each, the period from 403 to the death of Alexander the Great is treated in about 30 pages, and the period from the Diadochi to Sulla in about 108 pages.[7]

We are not given any numbers for the Peloponnesian war or for the archaic history down to the Persian wars. According to our calculations, approximately 12–13 pages are allotted to the Peloponnesian war. Since Regenbogen does not explain how Bischoff has made his calculations it is uncertain whether ours and his can be compared with one another. And, generally speaking, it is difficult to decide what to include in the calculation and what to leave out. In our calculation, events that certainly did occur during the Peloponnesian war, but which the narrator does not explicitly say belong to the period, have been left out – some consciously, others unwittingly.[8] Moreover, we have included the few mentions made of monuments commemorating events occurring during the Peloponnesian war.[9] We do not know whether Bischoff did the same.

The amount of text devoted to (myth-)history before the Persian wars may be estimated to at least 140 pages.[10] The narrator of the *Periegesis*, like other ancient writers with him, did not distinguish between what we call myth and history in the same way as we moderns do. Certainly, it was felt that there was some difference between the two, but there were equally striking similarities. To judge from the *Periegesis*, what separates myth from history is basically the fact that myth tells the history of much more distant times than history does, i.e. myth is history about very ancient times. For that reason, myth has been transmitted through many generations; during this transmission the myths have

---

[7] The three volumes of Spiro's Teubner-edition of the *Periegesis* covers about 1025 pages. The numbers are taken from Regenbogen 1956: 1066–1069, who used Bischoff's incomplete manuscript for his article.

[8] For example, II 20.2 is deliberately excluded, although events are retold there which occurred during the Peloponnesian war, but not marked as such in the text. It cannot be said with certainty that Pausanias knew that they occurred during the Peloponnesian war, although it is probable. Moreover, this episode is used here rather as a timeless example of the endless wars fought between the Argives and Spartans.

[9] For example the rather long description of the monument erected by the Spartans and their allies commemorating their final victory over the Athenians (X 9.7–9.11).

[10] This is but a rough estimate – probably too low – based on the figures given above.

often been fitted into extravagant, fantastic superstructures, which often render the accounts improbable.[11] For this reason (myth-)history was problematic.

As many others, the narrator of the *Periegesis* shows awareness of the difficulties that the superstructures caused when these accounts were to be used as historical sources. In this respect, also, myth and history are alike: the narrator does not always believe that the information is quite faultless in the field of history either, but he records it all the same.[12] As to the myths, they are narrated mostly without comment; sometimes the narrator expresses disbelief – mostly concerning details – and occasionally he makes rationalising interpretations.[13]

The myths have not only been distorted by tradition, but also multiplied in the sense that there are several divergent and conflicting versions of one and the same myth.[14] In this respect too history and myth are alike. In the *Periegesis*, one finds divergent accounts of such recent matters as the origin of the name of the Messenian town of Corone, which was founded after the battle of Leuctra, or who killed Epaminondas at the battle of Mantinea.[15] For the narrator, there

[11] Cf. particularly VIII 2.6f., which is discussed further below. For 'myth as history', cf. Graf 1993: 121–141. Cf. further Marincola 1997: 117–127 for a convenient inquiry into how ancient historiographers' treatment of myth differs from their treatment of history.

[12] Cf. e.g. I 9.8 τὰ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν ἐμοί ἐστιν οὐ πιστά, Ἱερώνυμος δὲ ἔγραψε Καρδιανός κτλ. 'the next part is incredible to me, but Hieronymus of Cardia relates that…'.

[13] Cf. Veyne 1988 *passim*, esp. 71–78 and 95–102 on Pausanias' and other Greeks' approach to myths; Gurlitt 1890: 34, n. 42 and Frazer 1898, I: lv–lx for further examples. See also Lacroix 1992 for modern rationalising interpretations of stories transmitted in the *Periegesis*. Some of Ego's criticism of myths and other traditions has been discussed above in chapter 5.

[14] Cf. Frazer 1898, I: lviiif. and Alcock 1996: 262–265 for examples of both types; cf. also above chapter 5. Cf. Lacroix 1994 for local traditions in the *Periegesis*; Piérart 2000 for an interesting study of Pausanias' favouring the Athenian version of the development of civilisation over the Argive one; Jost 1998a for a study of 'Panhellenic' versus local myths in the *Arcadica*; see also Schmitz 1997: 181–193 on the importance of local traditions for local identity during the Second Sophistic. See also e.g. Bremmer 1997 for a study of the ease with which divergent version of myths could develop.

[15] Corone: IV 34.5. The origin of the name is either to be found in a mispronunciation of Coronea or in the Greek word for crow (κορώνη). Epaminondas: VIII 11.5f. The Mantineans maintain that Machaerion, a Mantinean, killed him, the Lacedaemonians that Machaerion, a Lacedaemonian, killed him, the Athenians – with the Thebans agreeing with them – that Grylus of Athens wounded him.

does not seem to have been any clear line separating myth from history.[16] Therefore, myth has not been separated from history in our estimate, nor are the two treated as distinct entities in our study of the *Periegesis*.

The amount of space devoted to Hellenistic history is rather surprising in a work written during the second century AD, in the age of the so-called Second Sophistic. This is a period which, at least in some of its manifestations (viz. sophistic declamations), appears to be characterised by a nostalgic focus on classical times at the cost of later historical periods, in particular of the present and Hellenistic history.

This is a truth with some modifications. As to the sophistic declamations on historical themes, the subject matter was certainly sought in the history of Greece down to 322. However, in other genres – and most likely in the public consciousness – the death of Alexander of Macedon did not mark the end of history. The Hellenistic period was not avoided by such a *Fachschriftsteller* as Polyaenus. Historical monographs were written about the time after Alexander's death, for example Arrian's *Historia successorum Alexandri.* Some of Plutarch's Greek lives deal with persons of the Hellenistic age. Nevertheless works covering later periods are rare in comparison with the dominance of the more distant past. Also universal histories, except of course Roman histories, often ended with either the death of Alexander or the defeat of Athens in the Lamian war. It has, however, been pointed out that histories with a clear break in 322 are quite 'difficult to isolate… without having recourse to special pleading.'[17] However, Pausanias is not a completely atypical child of his times. Although the amount of space devoted to Hellenistic history is great in the *Periegesis*, the number of times it is brought up is not. Post-classical history is

---

[16] Cf. e.g. Sidebottom 2002: 495 and Arafat 1996: 43–79, esp. 74. Although Arafat inquires into 'Pausanias on the past' mainly from an art-historical point of view, the conclusions hold for ordinary history, too. For a more general discussion, cf. Veyne 1988.

[17] Anderson 1993: 101–132, quote p. 104, arguing against Bowie 1970 *passim*, esp. 10–22 on historians. Cf. Ameling 1996: 120–123 on the (dis)interest for Hellenistic history in the Second Sophistic. It has also been noted that Aelian chronologically goes both before and after the classical period for material for his *Varia Historia*, cf. Stamm 2003: 85f. Desideri 2002 stresses the amount of space that actually is devoted to (near) contemporary history by historians of this period.

thus brought up only a few times but is treated at length, presumably since it was not quite as well known as classical history was.[18]

In the *Periegesis*, the interest in the history of Greece ends almost completely with the Roman victory over the Achaean Confederacy in 146. Virtually nothing else than the events affecting Athens and Thebes in the Mithridatic war are told of the history of Greece after the subjugation of Greece by the Romans.[19] The history of the imperial period is essentially restricted to some scattered notices on the emperors.[20] To judge from the preserved fragments, the *Bithynica* of Arrian appears to have been an interesting parallel to the *Periegesis* in this respect. According to Photius, Arrian in this book treated the local history of Bithynia from mythical times down to the death of Nicomedes, who bequeathed Bithynia to Rome.[21] Thus Arrian in effect appears to have chosen a similar point in time as the narrator of the *Periegesis* to close his history: the end of independence and the absorption into the Roman Empire.[22] Following normal practice in antiquity, both Arrian and Pausanias appear to focus on inter-state conflicts and, when the over-all political situation no longer allows inter-state warfare, Greek history no longer arouses their interest.

In the *Periegesis* as a whole the history of Greece from the earliest mythological times down to the Roman conquest is told. It is true that some notices on events after the Roman conquest are to be found, but these are rather scarce. However, since the myth-historical notices are spread out in introductions and attached to monuments, the history of Greece is told in a fragmented form. But, as Ebeling has noticed, by means of cross-references, genealogies, dating by Athenians archons and Olympiads, and by using particularly well-known events as chronological markers, the disconnected bits and pieces are brought together, forming almost a systematic historical survey.[23] But, on the question whether there actually is a historical plan in the *Periegesis*,

---

[18] On this focus on little known subject matter, cf. further below.

[19] As noted by e.g. Habicht 1985: 102 and Ameling 1996: 123.

[20] Cf. Regenbogen 1956: 1096 and Habicht 1985: 102 with references.

[21] *Bibliotheca* codex 93, 73a–b Bekker.

[22] Bowie 1970: 20 notes that Telephus of Pergamum, too, appears to have ended his history *On the Pergamene Kings* at a similar point of time, namely the transition from kingdom to Roman province.

[23] Cf. Ebeling 1913.

as Ebeling supposes, one cannot but agree with Reardon: 'Il fut admettre cependant que le plan n'est pas très clair.'[24]

7.3 The *Laconica*

The introduction to the *Laconica* is the first long systematic historical narrative in the *Periegesis*.[25] It is both a history of the Spartan royal houses and a general Greek history exploiting the solid chronological structure provided by the genealogy of the Spartan kings. In the following we will discuss formal features in the narrative, with particular focus on the location of information and the point where the narrator ends the Laconian history in the *Laconica*.[26]

In a manner of speaking, both the Spartan and the Greek history are told twice over in the *Laconica*. After the return of the Heraclids, the history or genealogy of the Agiads is related first, next the history of the Eurypontids.[27] The reason why the narrator has chosen this procedure appears to have been mainly a practical one, but it is also motivated by the more or less constant differences of opinion held by the representatives of the two houses. At least this is the explanation given by the narrator for splitting the Spartan past into two.[28] This separate treatment of the two royal genealogies is open to criticism and an invitation to repetition. But on the whole, it does not result in repetitiousness, since, in the narrator's account, the separate royal houses were not engaged in the same events, at least not to such a degree that difficulty presented itself as to where the events should be retold. It has been noticed that the introduction to the *Laconica* presents 'an extreme instance of Pausanias's

---

[24] Reardon 1971: 221, n. 79.

[25] III 1.1–10.5. There are, however, some longish biographical notes in the two preceding books.

[26] Studies on the introduction to the *Laconica* are e.g. Calame 1987 and Meadows 1995 with references to earlier studies. Cf. further Cartledge 2001 and Le Roy 2001.

[27] Pre-Heraclidean Laconia: III 1.1–1.5; Agiads: III 2.1–6.9; Eurypontids: III 7.1–10.5.

[28] III 1.9 οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ὁμονοησάντων τοὺς ἀπογόνους αὐτῶν ἐς κοινὸν κατάλογον ὑπάξειν ‹ἂν› ἔμελλον· οὐ γάρ τι τὰ πάντα ἐς τὸ αὐτὸ συνεληλύθασιν ἡλικίας, ὡς ἀνεψιόν τε ἀνεψιῷ καὶ ἀνεψιῶν παῖδας, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τοὺς κατωτέρω κατὰ ἀριθμὸν τυχεῖν ἀλλήλοις γεγονότας τὸν ἴσον. ἑκατέραν οὖν τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπέξειμι αὐτῶν ἰδίως καὶ οὐκ ἀμφοτέρας ἅμα ἐς τὸ αὐτὸ ἀναμίξας.

method of dividing and distributing a connected historical account as the same matter was called for in different parts of his work.'[29] Or, to put it more simply: here, if anywhere, one can observe the care with which the narrator chooses the place to relate a piece of information.

The account of the Corinthian war may serve as an example. Both royal houses were involved in and affected by it, but in different ways. Since the history of the Agiads is told first, we first learn how the war affected Pausanias, son of Pleistoanax and grandson of Pausanias, the Spartan commander at Plataea.[30] The reason behind the war being, however, more related to the Eurypontid Agesilaus, the narrator refers the reader to the note on Agesilaus for an account of it.[31] Thus, in the narrator's mind, to present any particular piece of information at a suitable location appears to have had precedence over presenting the material in a chronological order.

In the history of the Agiads we are told about the part played by king Pausanias in the Corinthian war, or rather: the part he did not play and the consequences thereof. He arrived too late to assist Lysander in a battle against the Thebans and the Athenians at Haliartus. Informed about the defeat and death of Lysander he decided not to engage in battle when he noticed that he had enemy-forces both in his front and his back. Instead, he made a truce and collected the fallen for burial. The Lacedaemonians did not approve of Pausanias' decision, but the narrator commends it as prudent. The narrator presumes that king Pausanias had learned from history: the defeats at Thermopylae and Sphacteria show that the Lacedaemonians tend to be worsted when caught between enemy-lines and therefore, surrounded by the enemy, he decided not to be the cause of a third disaster.[32] Charged for his late arrival in Boeotia, Pausanias went into exile rather than going to court.

In the account of the Eurypontid Agesilaus, we learn how and why the Corinthian war began.[33] When Agesilaus and the Lacedaemonians were

---

[29] Ebeling 1913: 146f.

[30] III 5.3–6.

[31] III 5.3 αἰτία δὲ ἥτις ἐγένετο προσέσται τῷ ἐς Ἀγησίλαον λόγῳ, referring to III 9.1–11.

[32] III 5.5 τοῦτο Λακεδαιμονίοις μὲν ἐγένετο οὐ κατὰ γνώμην, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπαινῶ τῶνδε ἕνεκα τὸ βούλευμα· ἅτε γὰρ εὖ εἰδὼς ὁ Παυσανίας ὡς τὰ σφάλματα ἀεὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις γίνονται ἐν μέσῳ πολεμίων ἀποληφθεῖσι, τό τε ἐν Θερμοπύλαις καὶ ἐν τῇ Σφακτηρίᾳ νήσῳ δεῖμα ἐποιήσατο μή σφισι καὶ αὐτὸς τρίτου γένηται κακοῦ πρόφασις.

[33] III 9.1–13.

conducting successful campaigns in Asia against Artaxerxes, the king of Persia, he sent Tithraustes down to Sardis as a countermeasure. This Tithraustes contrived a plan which forced the Lacedaemonians to call Agesilaus home. He sent a certain Timocrates from Rhodes to Greece with money and orders to stir up a war in Greece against the Lacedaemonians; Argives, Thebans, Athenians, and Corinthians are reported to have had their share of the money. Thus, according to the account in the *Periegesis*, Persian machinations and money lay behind the Corinthian war. The Locrians of Amphissa were the ones who started the open hostilities. The Phocians disputed the possession of a piece of land with these Locrians; incited by those of the Thebans who had been bribed, the Locrians ravaged and plundered the disputed piece of land. The Phocians in their turn attacked and plundered Locris, as a result of which the Locrians with the Thebans as allies plundered Phocis, after which the Phocians turned to the Lacedaemonians in search of help, which the Lacedaemonians gave them, declaring war on Thebes. We are also told about an Athenian attempt to settle the matter in court, a suggestion that the Lacedaemonians rejected. The event following the beginning of the war, the battle at Haliartus, has already been told, and the reader is accordingly referred back to the note on king Pausanias discussed above.[34]

In the *Laconica*, the care with which the narrator chooses the most suitable place for recounting any specific piece of history is further illustrated by the considerable number of references forward to the *Messeniaca*, especially with respect to the Messenian wars. Both the Lacedaemonians and the Messenians were obviously involved in these wars in equal measure. But in the narrator's view the *Messeniaca* seems to have been the proper place to recount the events of these wars. There are four cross-references, promising fuller treatment of both the first, second, and third Messenian wars. Moreover the narrator, having summarised the main events of the second Messenian war, states that a full account of the events would be out of place in the present book.[35] Thus, for the

---

[34] III 9.11 τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔς τε τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων ἔξοδον καὶ τὰ ἐς τὴν Λυσάνδρου τελευτὴν ἐδήλωσέ μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Παυσανίαν. The beginning of the war is brought up a second time in IV 17.4f., which will be discussed further below in chapter 8.

[35] III 3.5 τὰ μὲν δὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ πολέμου συμβάντα, ὃν οἱ Μεσσήνιοι Λακεδαιμονίων ἀποστάντες ἐπολέμησαν, οὔ μοι κατὰ καιρὸν ἦν ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ τῇ παρούσῃ δηλῶσαι. Cross-references: III 3.2 (promising to relate the Spartan and Messenian accounts of the reason for the conflict, and its outcome), III 7.5 (first war), III 11.8 (third war), III 15.10

narrator, the *Laconica* was not the right place to tell about the Messenian wars. The reason for this is probably the fact that, although both Lacedaemonians and Messenians were involved in the wars, the Messenians suffered from them harder than the Lacedaemonians; an additional reason may be that most of the fighting appears to have taken place in Messenia. However, by mentioning the wars in the introduction to the *Laconica*, the narrator fixes them firmly in the chronological framework of the genealogy of the Spartan royal houses, however flawed that chronology may be in the eyes of modern historians.

The introduction to the *Laconica* illustrates yet another characteristic of the narrator's manner of telling history, which is connected with his avoidance of telling history in its improper place, viz. the point where the historical account ends. The history of both lines of the Spartan royal houses ends with references to book II, with statements to the effect that the feats of Cleomenes, son of Leonidas, Agis, son of Eudamidas, and Eurydamidas, son of Agis, have already been related.[36] Why? Certainly, the narrator usually avoids telling the same thing twice. Therefore, having told about Cleomenes and Agis in II, a reference in III to the earlier treatment could be said to be the customary procedure.

However, the account of Agis in book II is rather incomplete. Here the narrator makes only a short mention of his capture of Pellene and subsequent expulsion by Aratus.[37] Particularly in the light of the fact that the doings of both Agis and Cleomenes are brought up in later books, too, without cross-references to either II or III, one may wonder why the narrator is content with a cross-reference to II instead of completing the account of Agis in III.

In the *Achaica*, the narrator mentions again the capture and loss of Pellene.[38] And in the *Eliaca*, apropos of a statue of the Elean diviner

---

(Teleclus, whose death was one of the triggers to the first war). Further, the killing of Teleclus is mentioned in III 2.6 and the second war in III 7.6 and III 14.4, without, however, any cross-reference to the *Messeniaca*.

[36] III 6.9 (Κλεομένει δὲ τῷ Λεωνίδου τά τε ἄλλα ὁποῖα ἐς τόλμαν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀνδρείαν ὑπῆρξε καὶ ὡς ἐπαύσαντο ἐξ ἐκείνου Σπαρτιᾶται βασιλευόμενοι, πρότερον ἔτι ἐδήλωσέ μοι τὰ ἐς τὸν Σικυώνιον Ἄρατον· προσεπελάβετο δὲ ὁ λόγος μοι καὶ τρόπον ὅντινα ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Κλεομένης ἐτελεύτησεν) refers to II 9.1–3. III 10.5 (τὰ δὲ ἐς Ἀγιν τὸν Εὐδαμίδου καὶ ἐς Εὐρυδαμίδαν τὸν Ἄγιδος ὡς ἔσχεν, ἤδη μοι καὶ τάδε ἡ Σικυωνία ⟨συγ⟩γραφὴ διεξήει) refers to II 8.5.
[37] II 8.5.
[38] VII 7.3.

190

Thrasybulus, we learn that Agis was involved in a struggle at Mantinea, but, since this does not appear to have been the proper place to relate this event, we are promised a fuller account of this battle in the *Arcadica*.[39] Consequently, in the *Arcadica*, the battle is mentioned in the introduction to Mantinea; here we are told that the Mantineans, former allies to Lacedaemon, who had now joined the Achaean Confederacy, were victorious with help from Aratus and the Achaeans.[40] Moreover, apropos of a trophy near a sanctuary of Poseidon on the road from Mantinea to Tegea, there is a rather detailed account of the battle. The narrator describes in unusual detail the battle formation and the course of this battle in which Agis is said to have been not only defeated but also killed.[41] Further, in the introduction to Megalopolis, we are told that Agis conducted an unsuccessful siege of the city, the account of which is concluded with a sketch of Agis' life.[42] Thus, obviously, the subject matter of Agis was not quite exhausted in book II. This raises the question why the narrator did not sketch a complete biography of Agis in the *Laconica*, but instead found it more fitting to save this information for the *Arcadica*.

The account of Cleomenes in book II could be called a complete biographical sketch of the same kind as many of the Spartan kings get in the *Laconica*. There is a short description of his character and ambitions, and an exposé of the deeds to which these ambitions lead him, viz. his poisoning of Eurydamidas, son of Agis, other measures of his which affected the internal affairs of Sparta, and the wars he conducted against Dyme, Megalopolis, and Sellasia. The latter of these led to the capture of Sparta and the exile of Cleomenes. We are further told about Cleomenes' subsequent vicissitudes and death.[43] But why are these events related in book II? And, in particular, why are there only a short summary and a cross-reference in the *Laconica*, in the light of the considerable number of times Cleomenes' feats are brought up and retold in later books?[44]

---

[39] VI 2.4.

[40] VIII 8.11.

[41] VIII 10.5–8 (and §9). The *Periegesis* is our only source to this battle. On the problems of the account, cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc.*, Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 *ad loc.*, and especially Habicht 1985: 101f., and Cartledge & Spawforth 1989: 40 with references.

[42] VIII 27.13f. Agis' siege of Megalopolis is mentioned again in VIII 36.6.

[43] II 9.1–3.

[44] III 10.7 (apropos of the ruins of Sellasia, we are reminded of the fact that the city was laid

In the case of both Agis and Cleomenes the narrator is interested in their doings in so far as they affect Aratus and the Achaean Confederacy.[45] In fact, apart from Cleomenes' measures in the domestic affairs of Laconia – measures he took in order to strengthen his power at home, before turning his attention to the increase of Lacedaemonian power in Greece – and his end in Egypt, the same battles are brought up over and over again. These are Agis' battles at Pellene, Megalopolis, and Mantinea, and, more persistently, Cleomenes' at Dyme, Megalopolis, and Sellasia.

It has been suggested that the narrator mirrors the gradual merging of Laconian into Achaean history in his account by telling the end of the Spartan royal houses not in the *Laconica*, but in a biography of Aratus, a prominent leader of the Confederacy.[46] The narrator's decision to recount these pieces of Spartan history in II certainly indicates that he thought this to be the proper place for them – whatever the reason. At least the dominant position held by the Achaean Confederacy on the Peloponnesus and on the history of Greece down to the Roman conquest is mirrored in this. Moreover, the unceasing conflicts between the Lacedaemonians and the Achaean Confederacy, which the narrator dwells on in the *Achaica*, indicate clearly that this was a state of affairs that the Lacedaemonians (obviously) were not satisfied with.

---

waste by the Achaeans, with a cross-reference to II 9.2), IV 29.7 (Cleomenes' capture of Megalopolis shortly after the Messenians had joined the Achaean Confederacy), IV 29.9 (the tyrannies of Machanidas and Nabis in Sparta, after Cleomenes had been overthrown), VII 7.3f. (enumeration of Cleomenes' victory at Dyme, capture of Megalopolis, and defeat at Sellasia as an illustration of the enmity between the Achaean Confederacy and the Lacedaemonians, with a cross-reference to VIII 27.15f.), VIII 8.11 (the Mantinean participation in the 'destruction of the Lacedaemonian power'), VIII 27.15f. (an account of Cleomenes' successful siege of Megalopolis added to the account of Agis' abortive one, with a cross-reference to VIII 49.4f.), VIII 28.7 (the tomb of those who fell in the battle against Cleomenes); VIII 49.4f. (Philopoemen's reconquest of Megalopolis, when Cleomenes had taken the city, including the battle of Sellasia).

[45] As observed by Bearzot 1992: 158.

[46] Ebeling 1913: 147.

7.4 The *Arcadica*

The narrator begins the *Arcadica* with a remark on the unique geographical position of Arcadia as compared to the rest of regions on the Peloponnesus, being situated in the centre of the peninsula and thus landlocked.[47] The majority of the several books of the *Periegesis* are begun with a comment on geography; for the most part the narrator is not quite as exhaustive as in the *Arcadica*.[48]

The narrator proceeds to the early history of Arcadia. In this book, as in the rest of the *Periegesis*, the interest is focussed on local history. Beginning with Pelasgus the narrator goes through the history of Arcadia using the 25 kings of the royal house as a chronological/genealogical backbone.[49] Although an essential part of the history of Arcadia is left out in the process, not even a short résumé of the early history will be attempted here, in order not to get lost in details. Throughout the whole of the *Periegesis* a great amount of attention is paid to early (myth-)history, which is even more important for the local history than history proper. In these myth-historical accounts the narrator reproduces narratives which explain the origins of the inhabitants and the evolution of their specific way of life, particularly their religious life. These are tales that, at least partially, account for why a specific place belongs to specific Greeks, the origin of their customs and religious rites and the process through which both the place

---

[47] VIII 1.1–3. For a study of the perception of geographical borders in the *Periegesis*, cf. Sonnabend 1994.

[48] Not counting book VI, since it continues the description of the Altis of the previous book, there is only one exception to this procedure. Even the *Attica* begins with a sort of comment regarding the geographical position of the area in relation to the Greek mainland. The exception is book V. That book begins with a comment on geography, but not on the geographical position of Elis. It is instead introduced with an argument against 'those Greeks who say that there are five parts and not more of the Peloponnesus.' This claim has been interpreted as a veiled argument against Thucydides (1.10.2), which moreover springs from a misunderstanding of his text. On this, cf. e.g. Fischbach 1893: 165–167, Frazer 1898 *ad loc.*, Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 *ad loc.*, and Jacquemin 1999 *ad loc.* with references to more recent literature.

[49] VIII 1.4–5.13. As is the case of any historical information in the *Periegesis* Pausanias' sources for the account of the Arcadian royal house has been investigated, cf. Hejnic 1961 *passim*, Roy 1968: 287, Jost 1998b: xxf., and Pretzler 1999: 10–12 with references to earlier studies. As stated earlier, the question of the sources for or the accuracy of the historical accounts in the *Periegesis* is not of primary interest in our study.

and the people are made unique.[50] Here we will focus only on some of the more interesting features to illustrate the manner in which the history of Greece is retold in the *Periegesis*.

In the case of Arcadia the early history reads almost as an account of the origin of mankind. The narrator does not, however, accept all the Arcadian assertions. He begins by arguing against the Arcadian tradition that Pelasgus was the first man in the area. It is more reasonable to assume that there were others with him:

> ποίων γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἦρχεν ὁ Πελασγὸς ἀνθρώπων;
> For what people could he have ruled over?[51]

the narrator asks, rhetorically. Logic does not quite allow that the tradition is accepted without modifications. Having explained that Pelasgus must have been particularly powerful among his contemporaries, the narrator goes on to detail his contribution to the civilisation of mankind.[52]

During the reign of Lycaon, the son of Pelasgus, civilisation progressed in several respects: the city of Lycosura was founded, Zeus was given the epithet Lycaeus, the Lycaea games were founded.[53] But most interestingly, in the rather long chapter devoted to Lycaon, the narrator comments repeatedly on Greek tradition and compares the Arcadian tradition with the traditions of other Greeks. Apropos of the Lycaea, the narrator seizes the opportunity to revise the date of the Panathenaea, declaring that the Lycaea are the older games of the two. Commenting that the Olympian games, which are older than mankind, must be left out of the present discussion, the narrator appears to have exhausted the subject matter of athletic games.[54]

Continuing with Lycaon, the narrator comments that 'I for one believe' (δοκῶ... ἔγωγε) that Lycaon and the Athenian king Cecrops were contemporaries, although not equally wise in divine matters. With this remark, he has introduced the theme for the rest of the note on Lycaon, viz. his ungodly sacrifice of a human baby to Zeus, his transformation into a wolf as punishment,

---

[50] Cf. Jacob 1980: 73–76 on the definition of space, and Elsner 1995 *passim* on the importance of religion and rites in the *Periegesis* as a means to define one's identity.
[51] VIII 1.4.
[52] VIII 1.4–6.
[53] VIII 2.1.
[54] VIII 2.1f.

and, particularly, the amount of faith one can put in this and similar traditions.[55] The narrator begins by making the following declaration:

> καὶ ἐμέ γε ὁ λόγος οὗτος πείθει.
> This tradition convinces me.[56]

The rest of this chapter is devoted to an explanation of why faith is placed in this tradition, apart from the fact that it is an ancient tradition. The argument falls into two parts. (1) Men of those days were both rewarded and punished by the gods immediately. Just as Aristeus, Britomartis, Heracles, Amphiaraus, and Polydeuces and Castor were rewarded by deification, so were Lycaon punished by being turned into a wolf and Niobe, the daughter of Tantalus, by being turned into a stone. 'In my time' (ἐπ' ἐμοῦ), neither the wicked are punished nor the just rewarded – in particular, nobody is truly deified.[57] (2) Many events that have occurred in the past and others that still occur have been rendered incredible by a certain kind of men, specifically by

> οἱ τοῖς ἀληθέσιν ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἐψευσμένα.
> those who build lies on a foundation of truth.[58]

Thus the account of Lycaon is spoiled by the addition that men thereafter have always turned into wolves when sacrificing to Zeus Lycaeus, but only for nine years provided they do not taste human flesh. Similarly, the account of Niobe

---

[55] VIII 2.2–7.

[56] VIII 2.4.

[57] VIII 2.5 ἐπ' ἐμοῦ... οὔτε θεὸς ἐγίνετο οὐδεὶς ἔτι ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν ὅσον λόγῳ καὶ κολακείᾳ πρὸς τὸ ὑπερέχον, καὶ ἀδίκοις τὸ μήνιμα τὸ ἐκ τῶν θεῶν ὀψέ τε καὶ ἀπελθοῦσιν ἐνθένδε ἀπόκειται. This passage has been interpreted as indicating criticism of the deification of both Hellenistic and Roman rulers, though not directed against anyone specific. Cf. Palm 1959: 70f. and Ameling 1996: 158, both with references to previous studies. Swain 1996: 345f. is inclined to see in this statement at least some hint of Pausanias' attitude to the cult of the emperors. This passage is further perceived as an eloquent declaration of the cultural pessimism that pervades the *Periegesis*, cf. Piettre 2000: 93–96 and Porter 2001: 76. In historical times no deification occurred, but the boxer Cleomedes of Astypalea, was turned into a hero after Ol. 71 (496 BC). It is difficult to see why this man was given the honour, seeing that he had accidentally killed his opponent in the Olympic games, forfeited the victory, gone mad, and subsequently killed about 60 school-children, VI 9.6–8; cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc.* and Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 *ad loc.* with references to other mentions of this athlete.

[58] VIII 2.6.

turning into a rock is corrupted by the addition that she/it weeps on Mount Sipylus in the summer.[59] The section on Lycaon is closed with a return to the opening reflection on the rise of the incredible elements in otherwise truthful traditions.

Civilisation continued to spread in Arcadia: the many sons of Lycaon founded numerous cities.[60] Occasionally, the narrator interrupts the enumeration of these by alluding to more or less obscure points in poetry that are illuminated by knowledge of the Arcadian tradition. Thus, we are told that Stesichorus in his *Geryoneis* mentions Pallantium which was founded by Pallas.[61] We learn that Homer forged an epithet for Hermes after Acacus, the founder of Acacesium.[62] The narrator also informs us that Arcadia, formerly named Pelasgia after its first ruler, was renamed after Arcas, son of Zeus and Callisto, who was Lycaon's only daughter.[63]

Regarding the death of Ischys, one of the sons of Elatus, Arcas' son, the narrator cross-refers the reader to an earlier treatment. The reader's curiosity as regards Ischys' death is, however, not quite satisfied.[64] As to the first Lacedaemonian invasion of Tegean land, under the leadership of king Charillus, the reader is referred forward to the treatment of Tegea; here in the introduction the main elements of the event are summarised.[65] The third cross-reference in the introduction to the *Arcadica* corrects a previous statement regarding the date of the first attempted return of the Heraclids: it did not occur during the reign of Orestes over the Achaeans, as stated earlier, but before it.[66]

At this point in their history the Arcadians begin to get involved in affairs that affect other communities, too. Agapenor, the eleventh king after Pelasgus

---

[59] VIII 2.7. Two further parallels are: griffins are spotted like the leopard and tritons speak with a human voice.

[60] VIII 3.1–7.

[61] VIII 3.2, Stesichorus fragm. 5 Page.

[62] *Ibid*. The Homeric allusion is to *Il*. 16.185.

[63] VIII 4.1.

[64] VIII 4.6, probably referring to II 26.6, where nothing is said about the death of Ischys. Instead, we are told about the death of Coronis and the rescue of Asclepius (Ischys is one of his reputed fathers) by Hermes. On similarly imperfect cross-references in the *Periegesis*, cf. above chapter 3.

[65] VIII 5.9 referring to VIII 48.4f.

[66] VIII 5.1 referring to I 41.2 (with a reference to VIII 5.1); on this passage, cf. also below chapter 5.

and the successor of Echemus, during whose reign the Heraclids made the attempted return, led the Arcadians to Troy. During the reign of Cypselus, the fourteenth king, the Heraclids did return.[67] Cypselus neutralised the threat they posed to him by marrying his daughter to the Heraclid Cresphontes, who got Messene, and thereby he secured Arcadia for himself. Cypselus' son Holaeas, together with the Heraclids from Lacedaemon and Argos, restored his sister's son Aepytus to the Messenian throne.[68] The next event of more than local significance is the outbreak of the first Messenian war during the reign of Aechmis. The Arcadians fought on the Messenian side.[69] And, finally, the Arcadians stoned to death their last king, Aristocrates II, when they discovered that his treasonous acts were the cause of the Messenian defeat at the Great Ditch (Μεγάλη τάφρος).[70]

After his survey of the Arcadian royal house, the narrator concludes the historical introduction with a short résumé of the wars in which the Arcadians participated jointly.[71] The Arcadians fought in the Trojan war, they were allies of the Messenians in their war against the Lacedaemonians, and they fought the Persians in the battle of Plataea. They were on the Lacedaemonian side in the Peloponnesian war, they joined in with Agesilaus' expedition to Asia, and they fought with the Lacedaemonians at Leuctra but deserted them after the defeat of the Lacedaemonians in this battle. They did not fight with the Greeks either against Philip and the Macedonians at Chaeronea or against Antipater (in the Lamian war), but they did not fight on the Macedonian side either. They did not participate in the Greek resistance against the Gauls at Thermopylae, because of the Lacedaemonians. They were the most eager members of the Achaean Confederacy.

Arcadian history is in many ways dominated by Sparta, as appears from the résumé. In this respect Arcadia is typical for the Peloponnesus.

The closing remark of the introduction illustrates particularly well the narrator's concern for choosing the proper place to recount a particular piece of historical information:

---

[67] VIII 5.2 and 5.6.
[68] VIII 5.7.
[69] VIII 5.10.
[70] VIII 5.13. On the treachery of Aristocrates, cf. below chapter 8.
[71] VIII 6.1–3. On these wars, cf. above chapters 8 and 9.

ὁπόσα δὲ αὐτοῖς οὐχὶ ἐν κοινῷ, κατὰ πόλεις δὲ ἰδίᾳ συμβεβηκότα εὕρισκον,
ἀποθησόμεθα αὐτῶν ἕκαστον ἐς τὸ οἰκεῖον τοῦ λόγου.

All that I found happened not in common but individually in the cities, we will put off,
every one of them, for their proper place in the narrative.[72]

Consequently one expects to, and indeed does, find historical accounts throughout the *Arcadica*. The accounts are all located at such places where they are not merely disconnected pieces of information, but tell the specific history of a place which is made unique by way of the historical notice. Among the more substantial accounts, one may note the following. The rather substantial introduction to Mantinea is quite remarkable considering the fact that it goes down to battle of Actium.[73] In the vicinity of a sanctuary of Poseidon Hippius in Mantinean territory, there is a trophy erected in memory of a victory over Agis and the Lacedaemonians, apropos of which the narrator inserts an account of the battle.[74] Similarly we are told about the battle of Mantinea in which Epaminondas died on the road between Mantinea and Pallantium at a wood called Pelagus; this account mainly centres on the question of who killed Epaminondas.[75] There is a long introductory note to Megalopolis.[76] There is a short note on the history of Pallantium, which develops into a biography of Antoninus Pius.[77] The location of all of these notes is more or less self-explanatory.

The placement of the historical/biographical note on Philopoemen of Megalopolis is one of the most curious ones in the *Periegesis*. It is to be found in the description of Tegea. As is often the case in the *Periegesis*, this historical note, too, is inserted apropos of a monument:

οὐ πόρρω δὲ τῆς ἀγορᾶς θέατρόν τέ ἐστι καὶ πρὸς αὐτῷ βάθρα εἰκόνων χαλκῶν,
αὐταὶ δὲ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἔτι αἱ εἰκόνες.

Not far from the Agora is a theatre and by it are pedestals of bronze statues, but the
statues themselves are no longer extant.[78]

---

[72] VIII 6.3.
[73] VIII 8.5–12.
[74] VIII 10.5–9, on the historical problems with this battle, cf. above.
[75] VIII 11.5–12.
[76] VIII 27.1–16.
[77] VIII 43.1–6.
[78] VIII 49.1.

One of these pedestals without any statue had an elegy indicating that the lost statue once upon a time depicted Philopoemen. Apropos of this empty pedestal of the statue of Philopoemen the narrator chooses to tell the life of Philopoemen, and, having finished the life, he cites the elegy on it.[79] This biography is not placed here by chance, nor did the narrator seize upon the first opportunity which presented itself. Earlier in the *Periegesis* the narrator has on several occasions briefly alluded to certain matters in the life of Philopoemen. But, he obviously considered a separate biographical note to be the most suitable place to treat Philopoemen in full, and therefore he cuts himself short and refers his readers to the coming biographical note. One of the cross-references is in the historical introduction to Megalopolis.[80]

Why the narrator saw fit to tell the biography of the Megalopolitan general of the Achaean Confederacy apropos of an empty pedestal in Tegea one cannot but guess. Perhaps his choice was influenced by the encomiastic inscription that was still preserved, which contrasts sharply with the absence of the statue itself.[81] According to Plutarch, whose *Philopoemen* is one of the suggested sources for the biography of Philopoemen in the *Periegesis*, after the fall of Corinth there was a suggestion that the memory of Philopoemen should be abolished, *inter alia* by destroying the statues of him.[82] The proposal was voted down. By letting a pedestal which once supported a statue of Philopoemen trigger his biography, the narrator is perhaps emphasising how easily things from the past fall apart and are forgotten, even when deliberate destruction of the means of keeping the memory alive is averted.

---

[79] VIII 49.1–52.6.

[80] VIII 27.16 Μεγαλοπολῖται μὲν δὴ τρόπον ὁποῖον ἀνεσώσαντο τὴν αὐτῶν καὶ ὁποῖα κατελθοῦσιν αὖθις ἐπράχθη σφίσι, δηλώσει τοῦ λόγου μοι τὰ ἐς Φιλοποίμενα κτλ. There are two further references to this biography, IV 29.12 and VII 8.6.

[81] Pretzler 1999: 94 suggests that the 'noteworthy monument' with the epigram guided Pausanias in his choice of location of the biography.

[82] Plutarch *Philopoemen* 21.10–12; on the source(s) for the biography of Philopoemen in the *Periegesis*, cf. Raeymaekers 1996: 273–276.

7.5 Summary

The résumés of the introductions to the *Laconica* and the *Arcadica* throw light upon several distinctive features of the narrator's manner of telling history, his choice of subject matter, and the distribution of it throughout the *Periegesis*.

In the individual books the interest lies in local history. The history is often told from the first inhabitant(s) of the place to at least classical times or, as is the case in both the *Laconica* and the *Arcadica*, down to the last king. Often, as in the *Arcadica*, the narrator includes a selective enumeration of the inhabitants' participation or non-participation in 'great' Greeks wars, mainly the Trojan war, the Persian wars, the Peloponnesian war, the battle of Chaeronea, and the Lamian war.[83] Occasionally, the narrator brings the account even further back in time, as is the case with Mantinea. Simultaneously, through the local history, the history of the whole of Greece is told, through the involvement (or non-involvement) of the separate Greek communities, or even individuals, in events that affect the whole, or larger parts of Greece. Since the history of Greece is told through local history, the result is that there is not any coherent history of Greece from the beginning to the narrator's 'now', and that a connected chain of events is cut up and spread out throughout the work. The historical introduction to the *Laconica* is a good example of 'Pausanias's method of dividing and distributing a connected historical account.'[84]

Another effect of the narrator's manner of telling the history of Greece through local history – and in connection with monuments – is that some of the events are mentioned repeatedly. The more communities were involved in an event, the more often it is mentioned. The Peloponnesian war is a good example of this. In the introduction to both the *Laconica* and the *Arcadica* the war is brought up; in the *Laconica* it is brought up five times. The command against Athens in the Peloponnesian war is mentioned as the main episode, or one of the main episodes, in the reigns of Archidamus and Agis.[85] The realisation that Cyrus and not Artaxerxes had supported the Lacedaemonians in the Peloponnesian war is adduced as the reason why Agesilaus and the Lacedaemonians decided to launch an attack on Artaxerxes. Their weakness

---

[83] The treatment of these wars is discussed further below in chapters 8 and 9.
[84] Ebeling 1913: 147.
[85] III 7.10f. and 8.6.

after the Peloponnesian war is adduced as the reason why the Athenians declined the Lacedaemonian invitation to join in the attack.[86] Finally, the decision of Pausanias, Pleistoanax' son, not to engage in battle at Haliartus after realising that the enemy had surrounded him, is lauded by the narrator, since he assumes that king Pausanias had learnt the lesson that history taught, i.e. that the Lacedaemonians suffer defeat when surrounded by the enemy, as in the battles of Thermopylae and Sphacteria.[87]

This last example illustrates yet another of the narrator's idiosyncrasies, i.e. his habit of, so to speak, taking a step back from the subject matter at hand by adducing other examples of similar events, phenomena, or courses of action in history. When this is done, it is shown that no matter how unique an event or a phenomenon may seem in the history of a single community, the same, or a similar, thing has happened also in the history of other communities. In the introduction to the *Laconica*, there are a number of instances where an event is compared to similar events. For example, having told about the circumstances surrounding the recovery of Orestes' bones to Lacedaemon, the narrator next mentions that later the Athenians recovered the bones of Theseus from Scyrus under similar circumstances as the Lacedaemonians did: both communities were ordered to do so by an oracle in order to gain the upper hand in war.[88] King Cleombrotus fell early in the battle at Leuctra, with respect to which there is a list of other major defeats where the general fell early in the battle.[89]

The enumeration of analogue events may also serve the purpose of emphasising the exceptional character of an achievement. This is the case with, for example, the narrator's comment on the performance of king Leonidas at

---

[86] III 9.1f. The Athenian refusal to participate in this war is discussed further in chapter 8.

[87] III 5.5. Similarly, the future Megalopolitans had learnt their lesson from history and founded Megalopolis on the model of Argive synoecism which was initiated in order to increase their security against the threat from Lacedaemon, cf. VIII 27.1.

[88] III 3.5–7.

[89] III 6.1. Other examples are e.g.: IV 17.2–5 briberies instigated by or affecting the Lacedaemonians; IV 28.7f. list of uses that can be made of the Homeric epics; VII 10.1–5 list of traitors; VII 6.8–7.1 and 17.1f. lists of dominant Greek cities that each in its turn lost its power; VIII 33.1–4 reflecting on the ruinous state of Megalopolis, the narrator comments that he was not astonished at this, knowing well the fickleness of fate (an echo of Herodotus I 5, cf. Musti 1996: 11); VIII 46.1–4 list of statues of gods carried off as booty before Augustus carried the statue of Athena Alea to Rome; VIII 52.1–5 list of benefactors of the whole of Greece.

Thermopylae against Xerxes and the Persians. In the course of history, many wars have been waged, but only a few of them are remembered because of the feats of a single man, such as Achilles at Troy and Miltiades at Marathon. According to the narrator, Leonidas surpassed them both.[90]

Moreover, the veracity or at least trustworthiness of a statement may be corroborated by adducing similar phenomena. The name Βοώνητα ('bought with oxen') of a house in Sparta that once belonged to king Polydorus is explained by the fact that it was sold by his widow for the price of oxen, since the Lacedaemonians in those times, according to the ancient usage, bartered with oxen, slaves and uncoined silver and gold. The narrator informs us that this ancient custom had a still existing counterpart in India, where, according to Greek merchants, bartering with wares was customary, although there was gold and bronze in abundance.[91] In certain passages similar phenomena are catalogued with the explicit intention to add to the credibility of the first statement. In order to confirm the existence of all-white blackbirds in Cyllene, a number of other all-white animals are catalogued: white eagles on Mount Sipylus, white Thracian boars and bears, white Libyan hares, and white hinds, which 'I have seen in Rome'.[92] In the concluding remark, the narrator makes clear why these parallels have been recorded: 'May these remarks concerning the blackbirds in Cyllene have been made in order that no one may disbelieve what has been said about their colour.'[93]

As mentioned above, a consequence of the narrator's manner of telling the history of Greece through local history is that a connected chain of events is cut up and spread out throughout the *Periegesis*. However, the numerous cross-

---

[90] III 4.7; this passage is discussed further below in chapter 9. Similarly the long duration of the Messenian exile is emphasised by comparing it to a number of other Greeks who have suffered long exiles, cf. IV 27.9–11. Other examples are: III 14.9 the unusual choice of a dog for sacrificial victim in the ritual of the Lacedaemonian ephebes is emphasised by the fact that one single counterpart can be found in the Greek world; III 20.4 the custom of sacrificing horses to Helius appears to have been unique in the Greek world, since the only similar custom adduced is Persian. Cf. also VIII 38.6, VIII 50.3, X 32.2–7.

[91] III 12.3f. Similar are IV 14.7f., IV 35.8–11, V 12.1, V 27.2–5, VI 26.1f., VIII 1.5, VIII 38.6, X 32.17f.

[92] VIII 17.3f. ἐλάφους δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ λευκὰς εἶδον κτλ.

[93] VIII 17.4 τάδε μὲν ἡμῖν λελέχθω τῶν ἐν Κυλλήνῃ κοσσύφων ἕνεκα, ὡς μὴ τοῖς ῥηθεῖσιν ἐς τὴν χρόαν αὐτῶν ἀπιστοίη μηδείς. This passage is also discussed above in chapter 5. Cf. also VIII 10.8f., VIII 15.6f., IX 18.3f., 21.1–6, esp. §6, and X 5.11.

references create coherence.[94] The cross-references function to tie together the bits and pieces of information spread out in the work. They further indicate that the narrator carefully has chosen the locations where a specific piece of information is to be introduced. The introduction to the *Laconica* presents very distinct examples of this procedure. Although this introduction presents a number of opportunities to tell the history of the Messenian wars, the narrator constantly restrains himself, referring instead to the forthcoming treatment in the *Messeniaca*, once even stating that an account of the Messenian war would be out of place in the present book.[95] Further, in the account of the Corinthian war, the first main encounter is related before the causes behind the war are revealed. The reason for the reversed order is that the biography of king Pausanias was the more fitting place to relate the first main encounter, since it affected the subsequent events of his life, and it was more fitting to tell about the causes of this war in the biography of Agesilaus, since it appears to have been instigated through his actions in Asia Minor. Occasionally it is, however, difficult for us to understand fully the reason why the narrator has chosen a specific location for a narrative. This is particularly the case with the long biography of Philopoemen of Megalopolis.

Related to the matter of telling history at its proper place, is the interesting question of the point in time at which the narrator has chosen to end the history of Laconia. For him, the historical introduction was apparently not the proper place to tell about the last Spartan kings. As indicated above, this seems to reflect the merger of Laconian with Achaean history. The stops and starts in the introduction to the *Messeniaca* can be quoted as a parallel. The history of Messenia appears to stop when the independence is lost, only to start again whenever there is a reaction against the Lacedaemonian masters, i.e. when the Messenians, through rebellion, perform what might be called an independent act. In the end, Messenian history merges with Achaean history. Further, just as the history of Laconia and Messenia respectively end at those points of time when these states appear to cease to be the main agents in determining the course of their history, so the end of the history of Greece coincides with the

---

[94] On the cross-referencing in the *Periegesis*, cf. above chapter 3.

[95] Cf. above on III 3.5. Cf. further II 19.1, II 19.8, VIII 6.3, IX 32.5, and X 19.5, all of which comments clearly demonstrate that, though an opportunity presented itself to relate certain pieces of history, they would be 'more at home' (οἰκειότερα, II 19.8) in other places.

Roman defeat of the Achaean Confederacy, when the actions of the Greek *poleis* are determined from Rome even more than before and Greece merges into the Roman empire.

One last remark, stating an obvious fact for anybody who has studied the *Periegesis*. Whatever is the subject-matter at hand, the narrator can drop it, or rather set it aside for discussing any other subject-matter whatsoever. The change of subject matter cannot be predicted in advance. Take for instance the note on Lycaon in the *Arcadica*.[96] If we were to exclude the comments and side-remarks on the Panathenaea and the Olympic games, the comparison of Lycaon with the contemporary Cecrops, and, above all, the extended discussion on the credibility of traditions, we would get a much shorter narrative, which is more focussed on the subject matter at hand. The narrator's method for deciding what subject matters to discuss appears to be largely associative, within certain limits. Only occasionally does it become explicit, as in the following comment:

Πανοπέων δὲ τὸν ἀρχαῖον θεώμενοι περίβολον ἑπτὰ εἶναι σταδίων μάλιστα εἰκάζομεν· ὑπῄει τε ἐπῶν ἡμᾶς τῶν Ὁμήρου μνήμη…

As we saw the old wall of Panopeus, we conjectured that it was about seven stades. We recollected the verses of Homer…[97]

In other words, the sight of Panopeus, which was so insignificant a place that the narrator expresses doubt as to whether or not it deserves to be named *polis*,[98] brought to the narrator's mind Homeric verses. The narrator devotes the rest of the 'description' of Panopeus to explaining the two Homeric passages on Panopeus, and in particular the difficulties he encountered in trying to make out why the place was called καλλίχορος ('of beautiful dancing-floors').[99]

We mentioned the above quoted passage because it makes explicit what for the most part is implicit in the *Periegesis*, viz. though there certainly is a logic behind the narrator's inclusion and exclusion of material, one cannot predict what he will treat in any specific context. Certainly, both in the case of Panopeus and the rest of Greece, given the narrator's interest in the past, one can be fairly confident that the past will be brought up in one way or another.

---

[96] VIII 2.1–7.

[97] X 4.2.

[98] X 4.1 … Πανοπέας… πόλιν Φωκέων, εἴγε ὀνομάσαι τις πόλιν καὶ τούτους κτλ. On the interpretational difficulties inherent in this passage for the study of *poleis*, cf. Alcock 1995.

[99] X 4.2f., referring to *Od*. 11.581 and *Il*. 17.306–308.

There are, however, no means of predicting what the focus will be in a specific passage, such as the narrator's choice to focus on Ego's difficulty in elucidating the Homeric epithet *kallichoros* for Panopeus. The *Periegesis* would unquestionably have been much more easily handled in a study, had this associative dimension been lacking in it. But had this been the case, many of the qualities that make the *Periegesis* fascinating reading would be lost, and the reader's challenge of trying to elucidate the intentions of the author would be much reduced.

8 Greeks against Greeks

8.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we challenge the validity of notions such as that Pausanias, imbibed with a Panhellenic ideal of a united Greece, detests war between Greeks, and has forgotten that disunity is a fundamental fact of Greek history.[1] This is done by studying a number of instances in which the narrator narrates situations in which the Greeks were at war against one another. The introduction to the *Messeniaca* (IV 1.1–29.13), the stray remarks on the Peloponnesian war which are scattered throughout the whole of the *Periegesis*, and the two lists of successive Greek powers in the *Achaica* have been chosen as points of departure for our study of the usual presentation of wars between Greeks in the *Periegesis*. The introduction to the *Messeniaca* was chosen since it is essentially an extensive account of the wars fought by the Messenians against various other Greeks, mainly Lacedaemonians, the Peloponnesian war since it is nothing but a war between Greeks, and the lists of the Greek powers since in them the Greeks for the most part bring their own down.

In her interesting study of 'the peculiar book IV' Alcock argues that the periods which are chosen for extensive treatment and the periods which are passed over in relative silence in the *Messeniaca* may be paradigmatic for the work as a whole in its 'celebration of *eleutheria*, coupled with relative silence and aversion to its opposite state.'[2] However, we argue that the *Messeniaca* not only exemplifies '[Pausanias'] association of a people's identity with their

---

[1] For references, cf. chapter 1.3.

[2] Alcock 2001: 152f. Knoepfler 2002: 655 rightly objects that whereas Messenia was not deserted during the periods of Spartan domination, the buildings produced were of the sort that are normally left out of account in the *Periegesis*. Cf. further the reflections of Baladié 2001 on the particularities of the *Messeniaca* with a special focus on the periegetic part.

freedom,'[3] but also clearly demonstrates what independence entailed in the Greek world, viz. the freedom to fight one another in order to enhance one's own position, or, as in the case of the Messenians, simply in order not to be subjected to other Greeks.

Of course, it cannot be said that disunity between Greeks or that Greeks fighting wars against other Greeks is presented as something commendable in the *Periegesis*. This notwithstanding, the narrator appears to be a realist and to see the history of Greece for what it actually was, viz. a constant struggle for power, which was finally interrupted by the loss of independence. This is a view that can be paralleled in other authors, too, when they need to make a special point. For example, after Flamininus' famous declaration of Greek freedom at the Isthmian games, Plutarch has his Greeks reflect on the history of Greece. Excepting her battles against the Persians,

> πάσας τὰς μάχας ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ μεμάχηται πρὸς αὑτήν…
> Greece has fought all battles for servitude against herself…[4]

8.2 The *Messeniaca*

The *Messeniaca* appears to deviate from the other books of the *Periegesis* by having an introduction which occupies 69 of the 87 Teubner-pages, or about 80% of the text, dealing with Messenia.[5] This imbalance between θεωρήματα and λόγοι has been explained as being due either to the state of Pausanias' sources or to the lack of interesting monuments to describe in Messenia, the

---

[3] Alcock 2001: 152f.

[4] Plutarch *Flamininus* 11.3–7, quote section 6. A similar sentiment is expressed by Aelius Aristides in 26.40–70 Keil (εἰς Ῥώμην). Of course, those living at the time could not ignore the reality of things, witness for example the appeals for unity by Isocrates in the *Panegyricus*. However, depending on the message to be conveyed and the context of delivery, the facts could be presented in varying ways; on this cf. the convenient account in Touloumakos 1971: 1–22.

[5] The account of early Messenian history in the *Periegesis* is the fullest one preserved to our days, and as such it has, of course, been studied, cf. e.g. Ebeling 1892, Pearson 1962 for the creation of a Messenian past after the foundation of (new) Messene and abundant references to earlier studies, and Marinescu-Himu 1975. Cf. further Luraghi 2002 for an interesting study of the problem of Messenian identity.

historical account being long by way of compensation.[6] Against this, it has rightly been objected that, if this was the only reason why the introduction is long, a separate account of Messenia need not have been included in the *Periegesis*. Instead, the history and sights of Messenia could have been incorporated into the *Laconica*, just as the account of Megaris is incorporated into the *Attica*.[7] Moreover, as discussed above, the numerous cross-references forward to the *Messeniaca* in the introduction to the *Laconica* indicate that, in the narrator's mind, the *Laconica* was not the proper place for the history of Messenia. Within the historical narrative, the chronological imbalance is further significant, i.e. early Messenian history predominates over events post-dating the second Messenian war.[8] Apart from the space devoted to history, the *Messeniaca* is not remarkably different from the other books of the *Periegesis* – even the chronological imbalance should rather be called characteristic of the *Periegesis* than peculiar.

Thematically, too, the Messeniaca is rather typical of the *Periegesis*. Apart from the earliest myth-history and the return of the Heraclids, war and conflict dominate the history of Messenia.[9] Further, excepting a short mention of Messenian participation in the Trojan and Lamian wars, Messenian history, as retold in the *Periegesis*, is a history of their wars against other Greeks.[10] These wars were mainly fought against the Lacedaemonians, as well as against Acarnanians, Achaeans, and Arcadians. However, despite the abundance of wars between Greeks in the Messenian past, and despite the fact that the wars against the Lacedaemonians afflicted the Messenians heavily, even forcing them into the longest exile of any Greek community, there are not any comments in

---

[6] Kalkmann 1886: 154, n. 1, Heberdey 1894: 63, Meyer 1967: 591–593; cf. Alcock 2001: 142f. with further references.

[7] Ebeling 1913: 147. Cf. however Robert's 1909: 221–223 argument that Megaris was not originally part of book I (he calls the manuscript division between books I and II 'ganz absurd'), but that the dividing-line between books I and II should be I 39.3. Pasquali 1913: 221f. has argued against Robert's suggestion that the division of the work into books was not made by Pausanias: 'ein nachalexandrinisches, nicht in Bücher eingeteiltes größeres Werk für mich in den Bereich des schlechthin Unvorstellbaren gehört.'

[8] Noticed by e.g. Cf. Alcock 2001: 145 with references. See Regenbogen 1956: 1022–1026 for references to and summaries of studies of Pausanias' sources for the Messenian history; cf. also Pearson 1962: 397, n. 2, Auberger 1992b: 260, n. 10.

[9] Earliest myth-history IV 1.1–3.2; return of the Heraclids IV 3.3–6.

[10] Trojan war: IV 3.2; Lamian war: IV 28.3.

which the narrator explicitly in the first person censures the actual warfare. In the following, a short résumé will be made of Messenian history, followed by a discussion of the few passages where the narrator appears to pass judgement on the waging of war in the *Messeniaca*.

The accounts of both the first and the second Messenian wars are exceedingly elaborate – at least when compared to other narratives in the *Periegesis* – and naturally centred on Messenian enmity towards the Lacedaemonians.[11] Subsequent events in Messenian history are related more cursorily. History appears to come to a standstill during the periods when the Messenians were submitted to Lacedaemonian domination. Of the 39 year period between the first and the second Messenian wars, we are only told about the measures taken by the Lacedaemonians in order to settle the affairs in Messenia, until the Messenians found the situation unbearable and revolted.[12] During the 200 years until the revolt at Ithome after the second war, those Messenians who were forced to stay behind in Messenia are completely lost out of sight. In the meantime, we learn about the failed plans of revenge of those who managed to escape to Arcadia, and their subsequent migration to Zancle/Messene.[13] Finally, when the revolt at Ithome had been suppressed and some Messenians had escaped to Naupactus, which they had been given by Athens who were now friends with their enemies' enemies, the Messenians in Messenia drop out of sight.[14]

The history of the Messenians in Naupactus is presented as being continually dominated by war against other Greeks.[15] For example, they waged war against Oeniadae, which was held by Acarnanians who had good land and bad relations with Athens.[16] Just as the Athenians earlier had chosen to form

---

[11] First Messenian war IV 4.1–14.5; second Messenian war IV 14.6–21.12; events after the fall of Eira IV 22.1–24.4: abortive plans for revenge on the Lacedaemonians (IV 22.1–7), settlement in Zancle (IV 23.1–10), and the fate of Aristomenes' (IV 24.1–4).

[12] IV 14.1–6.

[13] IV 22.1–23.10. On this founding, cf. Luraghi 1994.

[14] IV 24.5–7. After the Spartan rejection of the help sent by Athens against the Messenians, the Athenians are said to have formed an alliance with Argos, too, expressly because of the Argives' eternal enmity with Sparta (συμμαχίαν ἐποιήσαντο Ἀργείοις Λακεδαιμονίων ἐχθροῖς τὸν ἄπαντα οὖσι χρόνον), cf. I 29.8f., quote §9.

[15] IV 25.1–26.2.

[16] IV 25.1–10. The *Periegesis* is our only witness to these events, cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc*.

bonds of friendship with their enemies' enemies, so the Messenians now chose as their new enemies those who were on inimical terms with Athens. Further, they were Athenian allies during the Peloponnesian war. They offered to the Athenians Naupactus as a base against the Peloponnesus and participated in the fighting on Sphacteria. That is, although they were away from the Peloponnesus, they nonetheless continued to fight the Lacedaemonians. After the Athenian defeat at Aegospotami, the Messenians were exiled from Naupactus because of their support for the losing party.[17]

The return of the Messenians and the founding of the city of Messene are the next events told, very circumstantially.[18] Their actions continue to be presented as being guided by their feelings towards the Lacedaemonians. After the Lacedaemonian defeat at Leuctra by the hands of Epaminondas and the Thebans, the Messenians are said to have returned to Messenia faster than anyone would have expected because of their never-ending hatred of the Spartans and their yearning for their fatherland.[19]

The founding of Messene marks the beginning of a new era of independence: it is the end of an earlier state of subordination to the Lacedaemonian masters, and thus a new beginning of Messenian history after the 287 year break during their exile.[20] By commenting on the fact that they managed to maintain their customs and dialect uncorrupted despite their long absence and by comparing the length of their exile with other long, but not nearly as long, exiles suffered by other Greeks, the narrator brings out how the Messenians clung on to their past and how exceptionally long their exile was.[21]

---

[17] IV 26.1f.

[18] IV 26.3–27.8. The founding of cities is a recurrent theme in the *Periegesis*. Indeed, one of the very first things said about a place is usually who is the founder and after whom the city in question got its name, as for example in the beginning of *Messeniaca*, where it is said that king Aphareus founded the city of Arene, naming it after the daughter of Oebalus (IV 2.4). Cf. e.g. II 5.6, 11.5, 12.4, III 1.2, 20.6, 22.11, 23.6f., V 1.11, 22.4, VI 21.8, 22.5, VII 1.4, 22.8, VIII 1.6, 2.1, 4.5, 26.8, 43.2, IX 5.2, 14.4, 29.1, 34.10. Occasionally some more details are added, but the account of the founding of Messene is the most circumstantial one in the *Periegesis*. In length, only the account of the founding of Megalopolis comes even close to rival it (VIII 27.1–8).

[19] IV 26.5 οἱ δὲ θᾶσσον ἢ ὡς ἄν τις ἤλπισε συνελέχθησαν γῆς τε τῆς πατρίδος πόθῳ καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐς Λακεδαιμονίους μῖσος παραμεῖναν ἀεί σφισιν.

[20] IV 27.9–11.

[21] On the Messenian dialect, cf. Katičić 1959. During the exile the Messenian life appears to

Even after the return of the Messenians, their history, as presented in the *Periegesis*, continued to be dominated by their bad relations to Sparta. Certainly, for as long as the Lacedaemonians were held back by their fear of the Thebans, the Messenians had nothing to fear from them. But when the third sacred war broke out and the Theban attention was diverted from the Peloponnesus, the Lacedaemonians are said to have picked up their courage and not been able to keep their hands off the Messenians any longer.[22] Alarmed at the perceived threat, the Messenians appealed to Athens for help; as the Athenians refused, they instead formed an alliance with Philip of Macedon. This alliance prevented them from fighting him at Chaeronea.[23] Similarly, they are said to have been prevented by the Lacedaemonians from fighting against the Gauls.[24] They lent help to their partisans in Elis against the partisans of Sparta.[25] Next, the Messenians repelled a raid made by Demetrius, son of Philip, son of Demetrius.[26] Interestingly, although the Spartans had nothing to do with this episode, the narrator nevertheless manages to bring the Messenians' relation with the Spartans into it, too. Discovering the intruders in the city and at first suspecting that they were Lacedaemonians, the Messenians defended themselves unsparingly, because of their ancient hatred for them.

---

have been on hold, focussed on maintaining what had been, but not achieving anything new, at least not when it came to the Olympian games, cf. VI 2.10f.

[22] IV 28.1. Similarly, the narrator states that the Megalopolitans had nothing to fear from the Lacedaemonians till the outbreak of the third sacred war, cf. VIII 27.9.

[23] IV 28.2; on this, cf. further below chapter 9.

[24] IV 28.3; on this, cf. further below chapter 9.

[25] IV 28.4–6, concluding in §§7f. with the comment that the trick used by the Messenians in order to get into the city obviously was inspired by Homer, and that other useful stratagems, too, can be found in the Homeric epics, which in fact is beneficial to men in all respects (τὰ Ὁμήρου μὲν οὖν ὠφέλιμα ἐγένετο ἐς ἅπαντα ἀνθρώποις). On the regard the narrator professes to have for Homer, cf. above chapter 5.

[26] IV 29.1–5. This is an error: Demetrius of Pharus, an associate of Philip V, is confused with Demetrius, the son of Philip V. The same mistake is repeated in IV 32.2 (Αἰθίδαν… ἡγήσασθαι τοῖς Μεσσηνίοις φασίν, ἡνίκα ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ Δημήτριός σφισιν ὁ Φιλίππου μηδαμῶς ἐλπίσασιν αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ στρατιὰ λανθάνουσιν ἐσελθόντες ἐς τὴν πόλιν). Cf. Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 *ad loc.*, where the error is blamed on Pausanias' source. Here, in IV 29.1, we are also referred back to a fuller account of the assassination of Demetrius, son of Philip, by Perseus, another son of Philip, in II 9.5. Polybius 3.19.11 tells us that Demetrius of Pharus died in his attempt on Messene. See also Habicht 1985: 98–102 with a catalogue of minor and some more serious historical mistakes in the *Periegesis*.

Because of the Lacedaemonians, the Messenians, according to the narrator, hesitated to join the Achaean Confederacy, which was openly hostile to the Lacedaemonians.[27] Eventually, the Messenians did join the Confederacy. Their history continued to be dominated by their relation to the Lacedaemonians, though now within the frame of the Achaean Confederacy. With a remark on the changes of fortune, we are told that the Messenians participated in capturing the city of Sparta with Aratus and the Achaeans after the battle of Sellasia.[28] Some time later, Nabis of Sparta raised an army and took Messene, but was soon forced to leave under truce.[29]

Only the very last events in Messenian history, as told by the narrator, have nothing to do with Sparta; they centre instead on their relations to the Achaean Confederacy, to the Arcadians, and in particular to Philopoemen. The Achaeans, because of some complaint (μεμφόμενοί τι) against the Messenians, attacked them and ravaged the greater part of their land. The Messenians managed to ward off a second expedition under the leadership of Lycortas, and they defeated and captured Philopoemen, who had arrived too late. The exposé of the history of Messene is concluded with the statement that those responsible for the death of Philopoemen were punished. From the very last words of the introduction, we learn that the Achaean complaint against the Messenians was that the Messenians had defected from the Confederacy.[30]

---

[27] IV 29.6. For the moment the relations between the Lacedaemonians and the Messenians are said to have been more amicable than normally because of the unsolicited help the Messenians had brought the Lacedaemonians when Pyrrhus of Epirus made war upon them. In I 13.4–6 there is a fuller account of Pyrrhus' expedition to Lacedaemon, forming a part of the biography of Pyrrhus; the expedition is mentioned in III 6.3, too. Cf. Cartledge & Spawforth 1989: 32–34 on this event in the history of Sparta.

[28] IV 29.9. At this point the narrator seems to have forgotten (?) that Aratus and the Achaean Confederacy had been forced to seek Macedonian alliance in order to hold their ground against the Lacedaemonians, cf. II 9.2.

[29] IV 29.10f.

[30] IV 29.11f., promising an account of the capture and execution of Philopoemen in the *Arcadica*, cf. VIII 51.5–8. In VIII 51.5–8, too, the reason for the Achaean hostility towards the Messenians is first stated in vague terms (ἦν γὰρ τηνικαῦτα ἐς Μεσσηνίους ᾿Αχαιοῖς ἔγκλημα), and only later is it said that the Messenians in fact had deserted the Confederacy (ὁ δῆμος αὐτίκα ὁ τῶν Μεσσηνίων προσεχώρησε τοῖς ᾿Αρκάσι).

In the long account of the history of Messenia, one has to look long and hard for episodes free of conflict between the Messenians and other Greeks. Likewise, one has to look hard in it for comments censuring the waging of the many wars. Some disapproving remarks are, however, to be found regarding specific episodes, especially when it comes to Lacedaemonian behaviour.

The first war was started by the Lacedaemonians. Its cause appears to have been a controversy grown out of proportion.[31] The narrator accounts for the explanations given by both sides, ostensibly refusing to endorse either one:

> ταῦτα μὲν ἑκάτεροι λέγουσι, πειθέσθω δὲ ὡς ἔχει τις ἐς τοὺς ἑτέρους σπουδῆς.
> This is what they both say; one may believe according to one's sympathies for either party.[32]

However, continuing from the first quarrel to additional wrongs suffered by the two, the narrator makes a comment which may suggest that, in his mind, the Lacedaemonians were more eager for the war than the Messenians. An actual war broke out once the Lacedaemonians, who had decided to go to war no matter what, had got a pretext which was sufficient for them, the narrator adds:

> … μετὰ δὲ εἰρηνικωτέρας γνώμης κἂν διελύθη δικαστηρίου γνώσει.
> … with a more peaceful disposition [sc. in the Lacedaemonians] the matter could have been solved by a decision in court.[33]

This suspicion is, moreover, confirmed in the following, at least when it comes to the first war.[34] The second Messenian war, on the contrary, was initiated by the Messenians; the cause for this war is represented as more just than that for the first war. The Messenians decided to revolt, according to the narrator, believing death in battle or even exile from Peloponnesus preferable to the slavery they were living under.[35]

---

[31] IV 4.1–5.5.

[32] IV 4.3.

[33] IV 4.4.

[34] Cf. e.g. the oath the Lacedaemonians are said to have sworn in secret before the first attack, IV 5.8. On the domination of warlike concerns in the constitution of the Lacedaemonians, cf. e.g. the comments of Aristotle *Politica* 1271b1–10.

[35] IV 14.6 … πρό τε δὴ τῶν παρόντων τεθνάναι μαχομένους ἢ καὶ τὸ παράπαν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου φεύγοντας οἴχεσθαι νομίζοντες αἱρετώτερα, ἀφίστασθαι πάντως ἐγίνωσκον.

The bribery of Aristocrates, king and commander of the Arcadian allies, to which the Lacedaemonians resorted in the third year of the second war is presented as a despicable act.[36] Not only did the Lacedaemonians bribe their enemy in order to gain the upper hand in battle, the narrator also comments that they were 'the first ones whom we know of' (πρῶτοι ὧν ἴσμεν) to have done so, and the first to have made success in battle a thing for sale. Before the Lacedaemonian transgression in the Messenian war and the treachery of Aristocrates, battles were decided by the bravery of the warriors and fortune.[37] In order to bring out the horribleness of the Lacedaemonian act, the narrator quotes a parallel. We are swept some centuries forwards in time to the battle of Aegospotami. The Lacedaemonians are again said to have bribed their enemy, this time some of the Athenian generals.[38] The narrator's concluding comment most clearly shows his depreciation of the Lacedaemonian device. He explains that the Lacedaemonians in due time got their Νεοπτολέμειος καλουμένη τίσις, i.e. they got tit for tat.[39] After explaining the origin of this expression, the narrator clarifies the nature of the Neoptolemean punishment suffered by the Spartans. Having themselves violated the laws of just warfare by using bribes in order to be victorious in wars against Messene and Athens, the Lacedaemonians got their punishment when the Persians in their turn circumvented them with bribes. In order to prevent the Lacedaemonians from gaining complete success in Asia Minor, bribes were used to instigate a war in Greece, the Corinthian one, which demanded the full attention of the Lacedaemonians in Greece. The bribes are now ironically called the invention of the Lacedaemonians (τὸ ἐκείνων εὕρημα).[40] The exposé on bribes in war is concluded with the comment that the Lacedaemonian trick against the Messenians was destined to lead to

---

[36] IV 17.2–5. The treachery of Aristocrates in mentioned also by Polybius 4.33.6 and Plutarch *De sera numinis vindicta* 548E–F.

[37] IV 17.2f. πρῶτοι γὰρ ὧν ἴσμεν Λακεδαιμόνιοι πολεμίῳ ἀνδρὶ δῶρα ἔδοσαν, καὶ ὤνιον πρῶτοι κατεστήσαντο εἶναι τὸ κράτος τὸ ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις· πρὶν δὲ ἢ παρανομῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίους ἐς τὸν Μεσσηνίων πόλεμον καὶ Ἀριστοκράτους τοῦ Ἀρκάδος τὴν προδοσίαν, ἀρετῇ τε οἱ μαχόμενοι καὶ τύχαις ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ διεκρίνοντο.

[38] IV 17.3. The Athenians would seem to agree on this; they claim that their defeat at Aegospotami was a result of the betrayal of certain corrupt generals, cf. X 9.11.

[39] IV 17.4. The *Periegesis* appears to be our only evidence for this expression.

[40] IV 17.4f. Cf. Arafat 1996: 45f. on the interest in the first inventors shown by both Pausanias and his contemporaries. On the Corinthian war, cf. also above chapter 7.

their own destruction in due time. The narrator returns to the present struggle and the immediately disastrous effects for the Messenians of Aristocrates' treachery, viz. an easy victory for the Lacedaemonians.[41]

Although the wars of Messenia were devastating to such a degree that when concluding the historical introduction, the narrator calls his Messenian history an account of 'the many sufferings of the Messenians,'[42] the waging of them is not condemned *per se*. Certain acts are censured, such as the Lacedaemonian breach of the code of just warfare when bribing king Aristocrates.

It has been argued that Pausanias underneath a seemingly objective account is, in fact, biased towards the Messenians throughout the accounts of the first and second Messenian wars.[43] However, in these studies the evidence is bent a bit too much in order to prove the argument that the narrator harbours a profound hatred for the Lacedaemonians, and that Lacedaemonian deceit and treachery are presented as the reasons behind their military success against the Messenians. In fact, the narrator's account shows that the Messenians themselves made some wrong decisions. Nor is their conduct in the second war depicted as favourably as it has been argued. For example, the Lacedaemonian victory in the first war is not only the result of their villainous acts. The Messenians too had failed to carry out an order from Delphi to sacrifice a virgin of the Aepytid family, or any other virgin given willingly by her father.[44] Nor are the Lacedaemonians the only ones to stoop to such acts as nocturnal attacks.[45] Aristomenes, deterred by the apparitions of Helen and the Dioscuri, certainly refrained from a nocturnal attack on Sparta. However, according to the narrator, he had previously made an attack on Pharis/Pharae at night, and was later to make another nocturnal attack on Corinthians who were on their way to assist the Lacedaemonians.[46] Moreover, the comment

---

[41] IV 17.9 Λακεδαιμονίοις δὲ ἥ τε κύκλωσις τῶν Μεσσηνίων μονωθέντων ἐγένετο οὐ χαλεπὴ καὶ νίκην ἑτοιμοτάτην πασῶν καὶ ἀπονώτατα ἀνείλοντο.

[42] IV 29.13 ὁ λόγος ἐπῆλθέ μοι Μεσσηνίων τὰ πολλὰ παθήματα.

[43] Cf. Auberger 1992a, repeated with some differences in Auberger 2001.

[44] IV 9.3–10.

[45] As argued by Auberger 1992b: 271 and 2001: 266, referring to IV 5.9 and IV 16.9.

[46] IV 16.9, 16.8, and 19.2. On the alternative forms of the name of the city, cf. IV 16.8.

> … αὐτίκα ἔργων μειζόνων ἥπτετο
>
> … he at once undertook greater deeds[47]

about the subsequent deeds of Aristomenes appears to have an ironic ring to it considering the episodes enumerated. Apart from the two above-mentioned nocturnal attacks, the two other deeds brought up both involve taking as prisoners women who were engaged in sacred rites.[48]

In sum, although there certainly may be some degree of sympathy for the Messenians in the narrator's account of the Messenian wars, they are not depicted as faultless. Instead, the narrator depicts them on the whole as to the best of their ability trying to give the Lacedaemonians as good as they got.

8.3 The Peloponnesian war

In accordance with his normal practice of not narrating well-known events, which have been extensively treated by respected authors such as Thucydides, the narrator does not give us any continuous narrative of the Peloponnesian war.[49] The Peloponnesian war is nevertheless the most frequently mentioned single conflict between Greeks. It is also the only war fought by Greeks against Greeks which is given an explicitly condemnatory comment in the *Periegesis*.

The repeated references to the same events, or rather to different bits and pieces of a series of events, are a result of the narrator's manner of telling the history of Greece through local history and inserting historical notices to monuments, as has been pointed out above. The more communities were involved in an event, or, as in this case, a war, the greater is the likelihood that it will be mentioned repeatedly. Yet, given the control the narrator has over what material to include and exclude, he could have easily passed over the Peloponnesian war in complete silence, or at least nearly complete silence – it is hard to conceive of the Peloponnesian war being left out of the introduction to the *Laconica*. However, the mentions of the Peloponnesian war do not appear to be restricted to merely such passages in which a mention of it can be considered

---

[47] IV 16.7.

[48] IV 16.9f. (the attack on the women is launched by Aristomenes as a substitute for the nocturnal attack on Sparta), and 17.1.

[49] On the narrator's reluctance to retell what is well known, cf. below chapter 9.

more or less necessary, as the historical notes summarising the history of a community. The narrator finds various other occasions to mention the war.

The Peloponnesian war is brought up on similar occasions as the Persian wars, though not quite as frequently. Not only is the participation of a state on the Athenian or Lacedaemonian side brought up in several of the historical introductions, but also commemorative monuments, trophies, honorific statues, spoils taken from the enemy, tombs erected for the fallen, and battle sites are mentioned.[50] The narrator even calls the conflict which issued from Theseus' refusal to give up the children of Heracles to Eurystheus a 'first war between Peloponnesians and Athenians', viz. a first Peloponnesian war.[51] Later, still in what we would call mythological times, during the reign of Codrus in Athens, the Peloponnesians invaded Attica a second time. This invasion was frustrated by Codrus' willingness to sacrifice himself in order to save Athens, the Delphian oracle having prophesised that the Peloponnesians would win the war only if Codrus would stay alive.[52] In the following, we will single out some of the mentions of the Peloponnesian war proper.

Having finished describing the paintings in the *Stoa Poikile* on the Athenian Agora, the narrator mentions some bronze shields in it. One group of shields is taken from Scioneans with allies. Another group is covered with pitch so that they may withstand time and rust. The narrator explains that 'it is said' (λέγεται) – apparently he could not confirm the information – that these were

---

[50] Participation/fighting: III 7.10f., 8.6, IV 26.1f., V 4.7, VI 7.4–7, VII 6.4, VIII 6.2, 8.6, X 38.10. Monuments etc.: I 2.5, 3.4, 11.7, 13.5, 15.1 (though not presented as such, cf. Taylor 1998), 15.4, 23.3, 29.6, 29.11–13 (on the problematic §11 cf. Knoepfler 1996), 40.4, II 22.9, 32.6, III 11.5, 17.4, 18.8, IV 36.6, V 26.1, VI 3.14–16, VII 16.4–6, VIII 11.12, 41.8f., IX 19.4, 32.6–10 (biography of Lysander, includes episodes from the post-Peloponnesian-war period, too), X 9.7–11, 11.5, 11.6, 15.5f., 28.6. Cf. Alcock 1996: 251–256 for an enumeration of mentions of the Persian wars.

[51] I 32.6 ἀφικόμενοι δὲ οἱ παῖδες ἱκέται πρῶτον τότε Πελοποννησίοις ποιοῦσι πόλεμον πρὸς Ἀθηναίους. In I 44.10 the death of Eurystheus by the hand of Iolaus is mentioned apropos of his grave.

[52] I 19.5 (the place where Codrus was killed), I 39.4 (on their way back home the Peloponnesians conquered Megara and let Corinthians and other allies settle there, as a result of which the Megareans changed customs and dialect, becoming Dorians), VII 25.2f. (after the main force had withdrawn, the Athenians released the Lacedaemonians who sought refuge in the Areopagus and the altars of the goddesses called *Semnai*), VIII 52.1 (Codrus accomplished glorious deeds before Miltiades, but only for the good of his own country).

taken from the Lacedaemonians defeated on Sphacteria.[53] By mentioning the measures taken in order to ensure the preservation of the shields, the narrator hints at how many years have passed since the event. Conversely, in another passage a reader ignorant of history might get the impression that the Peloponnesian war is a thing of the recent past:

> τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα οὐκ ἐξειργάσθη τοῦ Διός, ἐπιλαβόντος τοῦ Πελοποννησίων πολέμου πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ναυσὶν ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος καὶ στρατῷ φθείροντες Μεγαρεῦσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν χώραν τά τε κοινὰ ἐκάκωσαν καὶ ἰδίᾳ τοὺς οἴκους ἤγαγον ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον ἀσθενείας.
>
> The statue of Zeus is not finished, since the war between Peloponnesians and Athenians stopped it. During this war, by ravaging the land of the Megareans every year with fleet and army, the Athenians both caused damage to the state and privately drove the families to the utmost poverty.[54]

The face of the statue is of gold and ivory, but the rest of the body is of clay and gypsum. The narrator goes on to explain that behind the temple of Zeus there are half-completed pieces of wood, which the sculptor intended to use to complete the statue. It is hard to believe that more than 500 years have lapsed since the end of the war.[55] The narrator's intention is probably not to lead the reader astray. Instead, he addresses readers who have some education and are expected to understand the irony of the remark.[56] Surely, the narrator does not expect his readers to believe that the scraps of wood behind the temple are the remains of the work begun before the Peloponnesian war, and not rubbish gathered there over the years.

Among the monuments commemorating the Peloponnesian war the most interesting are two in Delphi: one is erected by the Athenians after an early success in the war, the other by the Lacedaemonians after their final victory at

---

[53] I 15.4. Why were the shields taken from the Scioneans not protected similarly? After all, the Athenian defeat of the Scioneans did not occur many years after their victory at Sphacteria. Were the Athenians more anxious to preserve for later generations a memorial of their victory over the Lacedaemonians than over the Scioneans?

[54] I 40.4.

[55] On this passage and its context, cf. also the interesting analysis by Bowie 1996: 213–215.

[56] Cf. Schmitz 1997: 160–196 for a good study of the recipients of the texts produced by the sophists during the Second Sophistic. Although the *Periegesis* is not quite like the bulk of the preserved texts produced at that time, the audience to which the author addresses himself is most likely the same.

Aegospotami.[57] Both monuments are described, the Lacedaemonian one more thoroughly than the Athenian one. On the Athenian monument the inscription specifies those whom the Athenians had defeated, and the Lacedaemonian one those who fought with Sparta against Athens – in both cases the narrator gives us the list. In other words, some 500 years after the war was fought, the narrator obviously thought it worth while to record the names inscribed in this monument, just as he records in Olympia the names of the Greeks who fought the Persians at Plataea, citing the inscription on the statue of Zeus erected by those who fought in the battle.[58]

Let us proceed to some instances in which episodes or the like from the Peloponnesian war are introduced as material for comparison. In the long biography of Pyrrhus in the *Attica*, the Athenians are mentioned only twice. First, the Athenians figure as one in a line of Greeks (not counting Greeks of Magna Graeca) who planned but from some reason did not go to war against the Romans:

> Ἀθηναίοις δὲ ἄλλα τε ‹πολλὰ› ἐλπίσασι καὶ Ἰταλίαν πᾶσαν καταστρέψασθαι τὸ ἐν Συρακούσαις πταῖσμα ἐμποδὼν ἐγένετο μὴ καὶ Ῥωμαίων λαβεῖν πεῖραν.
>
> Despite their great hopes of conquering even the whole of Italy, their defeat at Syracuse prevented the Athenians from making an attempt on the Romans, too.[59]

Second, the Athenian victory at Sphacteria is cited, together with Thermopylae, as one of the non-defeats suffered by the Lacedaemonians in the past. According to the Lacedaemonians, what happened at Sphacteria was a 'theft of war', not an Athenian victory.[60] It is also noteworthy how the narrator, in his note on the death of Epaminondas in Arcadia, near Mantinea on a site called *Pelagos*, brings in the Athenian disaster in Sicily.[61] Epaminondas was warned by an oracle to be aware of *pelagos* ('sea'). Interpreting the oracle literally he

---

[57] X 11.6 and 9.7–10. Cf. Habicht 1985: 71–75 on the problems of interpretation offered by the latter monument in relation to the preceding ones.

[58] V 23.1–3. The listing of those who fought the Persians is viewed as an element in the narrator's celebration of those Greeks who stood on the right side in the Greek battles against others by e.g. Habicht 1985: 105f.; cf. further below chapter 9.

[59] I 11.7.

[60] I 13.5; the first defeat the Lacedaemonians accept to have suffered on land is that at Leuctra. On the expression 'theft of war', cf. Whitehead 1988.

[61] VIII 11.5–9.

stayed away from the sea, but in the end it turned out that the oracle referred to a place in Arcadia.[62] Similarly, the Athenians were mislead by an ambiguous oracle, which urged them to colonise *Sikelia*. Without realising that the oracle referred to a small hill near the city, they launched their expedition against the large island of the same name – and the rest is history.[63]

Let us next turn to the condemnatory remark passed on the Peloponnesian war. Having concluded the biography of Philopoemen with his death, the narrator appends to it a list of 'good men' who were benefactors of the whole of Greece, introduced with the following comment:

> καὶ ἤδη τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐς ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν φορὰν ἔληξεν ἡ Ἑλλάς.
> After this, Greece ceased to bear good men.[64]

Miltiades, son of Cimon, is the first and Philopoemen himself is the last. Expressly excluded from this list are those men before Miltiades who indeed accomplished brilliant deeds, but who thereby benefited merely their own countries (πατρίδας τὰς αὐτῶν), not the whole of Greece (ἀθρόαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα).[65] Despite the fact that they both led the Greek forces at Plataea, both Aristides, son of Lysimachus, and Pausanias, son of Cleombrotus, are explicitly excluded by the narrator because of their later actions. Pausanias' misdeeds and Aristides' making the Greek islanders subject to tribute did not warrant them being called benefactors of Greece, the narrator clarifies.[66] Even more resolutely

---

[62] VIII 11.10. In §11 we are told about how the Carthaginian general Hannibal was mislead by an oracle into believing that he would die of old age at home after defeating the Romans.

[63] VIII 11.12. Ambiguous oracles by which men are mislead are a common theme in Greek literature, cf. e.g. Herodotus' *Histories*.

[64] VIII 52.1. The death of Philopoemen does not mark the end of Greek history in the *Periegesis*, as suggested by Auffart 1997: 222.

[65] VIII 52.1. One may wonder how some of the men who are included in the list actually benefited the whole of Greece and did not merely serve the interests of their own communities; cf. below.

[66] VIII 52.2. Interestingly, this is the Aristides who is said to be distinguished for his political skills and righteousness in e.g. Aristotle *Athenaion politeia* 23.3. Plutarch, too, emphasises his righteousness, for example in the anecdote about the illiterate man, who, when it was time for ostracism, asked Aristides to write 'Aristides' on his potsherd. Aristides did this without revealing his identity. Asked about the reason why, the man explained that he was tired of hearing about 'the Just' (*Aristides* 7.7f.). The same anecdote, with some slight differences, is

the narrator excludes from this list those who were active during the Peloponnesian war:

τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους πολέμου, καὶ μάλιστα αὐτῶν τοὺς εὐδοκιμήσαντας, φαίη τις ἂν αὐτόχειρας καὶ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα καταποντιστὰς εἶναι σφᾶς τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

As to the men living during the war between Peloponnesians and Athenians, and in particular those of them who were highly esteemed, one might say that they were murderers and well nigh pirates of Greece.[67]

Interestingly, the narrator chooses not to introduce Ego into the text in order to pass judgement on the men active during the Peloponnesian war in his own voice. Instead, he introduces the …-You, who is presented as the one who might entertain and voice such a harsh opinion regarding the men in question.[68] The fact that the deprecation is presented as the opinion of an indefinite 'you', is not to say that Ego does not share this opinion regarding the Peloponnesian war and its effects on Greece. It, however, does indicate that the narrator apparently is not comfortable with expressing the deprecation as his own. Instead, he prefers to hide behind this anonymous, indefinite 'you'. Simultaneously, he suggests that this is an opinion that many may share, including the addressees of the *Periegesis*.

Regarding this list, two details may be noted. Firstly, it was apparently not enough to have helped preserve Greek liberty in the face of foreign invasion to be included in it; therefore Aristides and Pausanias are excluded from the list. Secondly, fighting other Greeks does not appear to have been sufficient grounds for being excluded; therefore Conon, Epaminondas, Aratus, and Philopoemen are included in the list.[69] Conon and Epaminondas are explicitly included because of their military accomplishments against the Lacedaemonians, driving out their garrisons, *harmostai*, and *dekadarchiai*. Further, the rather long

---

found in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* 186A–B. Cf. Calabi Limentani 1960 for a study of the good repute of Aristides in history.

[67] VIII 52.3. Pericles was one of the highly esteemed men from the time of the Peloponnesian war; cf. Chamoux 2001a for an interesting discussion on the portrait of Pericles – or rather the lack of one – in the *Periegesis*. Chamoux concludes that Pausanias has not fallen for the temptation to praise Pericles, as other authors have done, without taking history into account.

[68] On the …-You, cf. above chapter 6.

[69] VIII 52.4f.

biographies of Epaminondas, Aratus, and Philopoemen in the *Periegesis* show that all three were mainly, Epaminondas even exclusively, involved in wars against other Greeks, predominantly against Lacedaemonians.[70] Conon is not given any biography, but from the stray notes on him in the *Periegesis*, it appears that the narrator associates him too with war between Greeks, during both the Peloponnesian war and the unsettled period following it, during which he even procured aid from Persia to further the Athenian cause.[71] The position of Athens in the Greek world was certainly strengthened with this aid from Persia, but it prevented Athens from joining in the campaign Agesilaus tried to gather against Persia, according to the narrator's report.[72] Nevertheless, Conon was one of the benefactors of Greece.

Why, then, the strong condemnation of the Peloponnesian war? What made this war worse than, for example, the Messenian wars or any other war between Greeks? The answer is probably to be found in the fact that it was, in a sense, a Panhellenic war, engaging all, or at least most of Greece in battle against each other. Further, there is the effect that the Peloponnesian war is presented as having had on the course of Greek history. In the note on the Spartan king Archidamus, after whom the first ten years of the Peloponnesian war are often named, the narrator explains that Greece was shaken in its foundations by the Peloponnesian war, and that Philip's conquest of Greece was facilitated because of it, since it left Greece unsound and not quite well.[73]

In sum, the Peloponnesian war affected Greece crucially since a great part of Greece was involved in it. It also made the coming of Philip of Macedon easier. Nevertheless, the narrator mentions the war frequently in the historical introductions and as material for comparison for the subject matter at hand, nor does he hesitate to treat monuments commemorating the war. Moreover, the narrator phrases cautiously the severe judgement directed against the war, avoiding to present the judgement as explicitly one entertained by Ego, instead introducing the …-You as the one who might voice such an opinion.

---

[70] Aratus II 8.1–9.5, Philopoemen VIII 49.1–52.6, Epaminondas IX 13.1–15.6.

[71] Cf. I 1.3, 2.2, VI 3.16, 7.6.

[72] Cf. I 3.2, III 9.2. This matter is discussed further in the next section; cf. also chapter 7.

[73] III 7.11 καὶ ὁ πόλεμος οὗτος εὖ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔτι βεβηκυῖαν διέσεισεν ἐκ βάθρων, καὶ ὕστερον Φίλιππος ὁ Ἀμύντου σαθρὰν ἤδη καὶ οὐ παντάπασιν ὑγιῆ προσκατήρειψεν αὐτήν.

8.4 The lesson from Greek history

The Peloponnesian war was certainly not the only war that the Greeks fought with each other as antagonists, nor the only one to weaken the state of Greece, but it is singled out as the event that shook Greece by the foundations. In the following we will discuss some of the other conflicts that led to the final weakening of Greece. In the *Achaica* there are two lists sketching the rise and fall of Greek powers, one introducing and the other concluding the narrative about the Achaean Confederacy. Here, the narrator enumerates the dominant Greek communities – Athens, Sparta, Thebes, and the Achaean Confederacy – which each one in its turn gained and lost its power. The lists are not identical in all details nor do they follow any chronological order, but they both end with the Achaean Confederacy – the first with its rise to power, the second with its (rise and) fall.[74] After a résumé of the sketches, we will discuss other passages in the *Periegesis*, which confirm or contradict the picture of Greek history presented in the lists.

The Peloponnesian war put an end to the Athenian power in Greece. Athens recovered somewhat from the Peloponnesian war and the pestilence, but was soon reduced by the Macedonians. Sparta's defeat at Leuctra put an end to Lacedaemonian hegemony in Greece, and the founding of Messene and Megalopolis, together with the wars fought by the Lacedaemonians with the Achaean Confederacy, prevented them from regaining their former prosperity. Thebes, the next Greek state to hold hegemony after Sparta, was laid so utterly waste by Alexander that the Thebans were not able to hold their own after Cassander had brought them back. Next Achaea rose to power; in the second list the language is unusually metaphorical:

> ὅτε δὴ καὶ μόγις, ἄτε ἐκ δένδρου λελωβημένου καὶ αὔου τὰ πλείονα, ἀνεβλάστησεν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸ Ἀχαϊκόν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἡ κακία τῶν στρατηγησάντων ἐκόλουσεν ἔτι αὐξανόμενον.

---

[74] VII 6.8f. and 17.1f.; as to subject matter the main difference between the two lists is the fact that in the second list Argos is included as the power to be reckoned with 'during the so-called heroes' (ἐπὶ τῶν καλουμένων ἡρώων) up until the Dorian invasion. Cf. also Bowie 1996: 209f. on these lists in the *Periegesis*.

When the Achaeans had barely shot up from Greece as from a maltreated and almost entirely dried up tree, it too was cut short when still in growth by the wickedness of its generals.[75]

Interestingly, only in the case of Thebes and partly in the case of Athens is foreign intervention referred to as the cause of ruin. Otherwise, the Greeks are presented as themselves managing to bring about their own downfall. This is a lesson to be learned from the history of Greece as retold in the *Periegesis*. Similar views on the history of Greece are found in other Greek literature from this period; for example, Herodianus writes quite pointedly:

ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο πάθος Ἑλλήνων, οἳ πρὸς ἀλλήλους στασιάζοντες ἀεὶ καὶ τοὺς ὑπερέχειν δοκοῦντας καθαιρεῖν θέλοντες ἐτρύχωσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

This is an old sickness of the Greeks. Since they are always at odds with one another and want to bring down those who seem to be more powerful, they have worn out Greece.[76]

First in line is Athens, which was brought down twice.[77] The first downfall was caused by the Peloponnesian war, which does not need to be discussed again here. When the Athenians had recovered somewhat from it, the narrator explains that they suffered their second downfall at the hands of the Macedonians. Hereby the narrator is probably referring to the battle at Chaeronea and the Lamian war. Both these events will be discussed further in the next chapter, for now, one point will suffice. For the most part when the narrator introduces Athens into his historical notes which deal with events after the Lamian war, he remembers to point out that the Athenians are weak because of the Macedonians.[78] Exactly who these Macedonians were is left unspecified.

Next, come the Lacedaemonians, victors in the Peloponnesian war. They could not keep their dominance of Greece for long. The beginning of their fall

---

[75] VII 17.2.

[76] Herodianus 3.2.8. For a discussion of this passage and others the same kind, cf. Touloumakos 1971: 52f.; cf. also Pernot 1993: 761 and Ameling 1996: 141–145. A similar view is expressed, in many more words, by Aelius Aristides in 26.40–57 Keil (εἰς Ῥώμην).

[77] VII 6.9 and 17.2.

[78] I 4.2 (before the invasion of the Gauls), VII 7.6 (at the beginning of the Roman involvement in Greece, with a cross-reference to I 36.5f.), VII 11.4 (before the Athenian invasion of Oropus).

was their decision to put down the king of Persia, Artaxerxes, son of Darius, since Cyrus had been the one who helped them in the Peloponnesian war.[79] In an attempt to turn the expedition into a Panhellenic enterprise, invitations were sent to the Greeks to join in. The narrator records some of the replies given to the invitation. The Corinthians are said to have decided to stay at home when suddenly a temple of Olympian Zeus burnt down, this being regarded as a bad omen. The Athenians declined adducing their weakness after the Peloponnesian war and the plague as excuses, but the narrator explains that most of all they decided to keep still, because of the news about Conon being with the king. The Thebans declined for the same reasons as the Athenians.[80] In the replies that the Athenians and the Thebans are said to have made to the Lacedaemonian invitation, the narrator does not hesitate to introduce lack of Greek unity. That is, instead of joining forces against the Persians, they looked for their own private advantage. In the case of the Athenians, Conon's being with the king and gaining influence and means for the Athenians against the Lacedaemonians is equivalent to their looking out for themselves.

Particularly noteworthy is the Persian countermeasure. The report of this episode reveals how easily the animosity between Greeks could be kindled. Artaxerxes sent Tithraustes down to the sea. This Tithraustes came up with a highly efficient method to force the Lacedaemonians into calling Agesilaus and his force home from Asia: he sent a certain Timocrates from Rhodes to Greece with money and the order to stir up a war in Greece against the Lacedaemonians. Timocrates appears to have easily carried the order out. Argives, Thebans, Athenians, and Corinthians had their share of the money.[81] This is not the place to go into details of the reasons behind the war, called the Corinthian war both in modern times and by the narrator. Suffice it to say, with the narrator, that Persian machinations and money lay behind the war and that Greek dissension made it flare up. The Locrians of Amphissa were the ones

---

[79] III 9.1. Interestingly, apart from the above-mentioned bribery of some of the Athenian generals at Aegospotami, Persian involvement and money given to the Spartans during the Peloponnesian war, in particular to Lysander, are mentioned repeatedly, e.g. V 6.5, IX 32.7.

[80] III 9.1–3. Cf. above on Conon. Compare further the statement that the Arcadians crossed over to Asia with Agesilaus ἀνάγκῃ πλέον καὶ οὐ μετ᾽ εὐνοίας 'rather coerced and not with sympathy' VIII 6.2.

[81] III 9.7f. Cf. also above chapter 7.

who started the war.[82] Once the Lacedaemonians had declared war on Thebes, Agesilaus was forced to abandon his campaign in Asia, and once in progress the war kept growing worse.[83] The narrator does not retell the course of the whole war. Only some of the battles are referred to, in particular the battle at Haliartus, which was the first major encounter in the war. Although the Lacedaemonians were victorious in the Corinthian war, it was the beginning of the end of their short-lived hegemony of Greece.

The event that brought the Lacedaemonians down was their defeat at Leuctra at the hands of Epaminondas and the Theban army.[84] As already mentioned, this defeat was moreover the first battle on land which the Lacedaemonians, according to the narrator, confessed to have lost.[85] The narrator bestows praise upon this victory won by the Thebans and upon the Theban general.[86] The Theban success at Leuctra is called both 'the Lacedaemonian disaster that had been long due' and 'most notable victory'.[87] There is praise of Epaminondas, but expressed in the narrator's usual cautious manner, introducing the …-You as the one who might entertain the positive opinion about Epaminondas:

---

[82] III 9.9–12. ὁ κληθεὶς Κορινθιακὸς πόλεμος III 9.12; ὁ ὀνομαζόμενος Κορινθιακὸς πόλεμος IV 17.5. Pausanias is not the only ancient author using this designation for the war, cf. e.g. Isaeus *De Aristarcho* 20, Isocrates *Plataicus* 27, and Diodorus Siculus *Bibliotheca* 14.86.6, who also explains that the reason for this appellation was that the war was mainly fought around Corinth. In Xenophon *Hellenica* 3.5.3 the beginning of the war is ascribed to the Opuntian Locrians. Cf. Meadows 1995: 106–110, with a discussion of possible sources for Pausanias' account of Agesilaus.

[83] III 9.12 ἐς πλέον ἀεὶ προῆλθεν.

[84] VII 6.8 and 17.2. Cf. also I 29.11 where, apropos of a tomb for Athenians fallen in the Corinthian war, the narrator remarks on the decline of Lacedaemonian power by pointing to the fact that they were defeated at Leuctra.

[85] I 13.5.

[86] Habicht 1985: 114f. adduces this passage as an obvious exception to the (allegedly) consistent lamentation over 'warfare of Greek against Greek' in the *Periegesis*.

[87] IV 26.4 τὸ ἀτύχημα ὀφειλόμενον ἐκ παλαιοῦ. This phrase does not necessarily indicate that the defeat suffered by the Lacedaemonians was a debt they owed to the Greeks, specifically to the Messenians. It was rather a debt that the Lacedaemonians owed to destiny, since in the following the reader is reminded of an oracle which foretold destruction 'for others after the first', i.e. for the Spartans after the Messenians; in IV 12.7 the whole oracle is cited. ἐπιφανεστάτη νίκη IX 6.4 (historical introduction to Thebes), ἡ νίκη κατείργαστο ἐπιφανέστατα IX 13.11 (biography of Epaminondas).

τὸν δὲ Ἐπαμινώνδαν τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι στρατηγίας ἕνεκα εὐδοκιμησάντων
μάλιστα ἐπαινέσαι τις ἂν ἢ ὕστερόν γε οὐδενὸς ποιήσαιτο.

One may particularly praise Epaminondas among those who are highly esteemed in the
opinion of Greeks for their generalship, or at least not consider him second to none.[88]

That is, he is praised among the most excellent Greeks for his military skill. In
the following the positive valuation of Epaminondas is justified by mention of
the fact that he was able to raise Theban self-esteem and make the Thebans
champions in a short time, without having the ancient reputation of the city in
his back, as Lacedaemonian and Athenian generals had.[89] Moreover, on a par
with Conon son of Timotheus, Epaminondas is even counted among the
benefactors of the whole of Greece. The reason for them being included in that
company is precisely their victories over the Lacedaemonians, by which they
expelled Spartan garrisons, *harmostai*, and *dekadarchiai*, Conon from the cities
near the sea and Epaminondas from the ones away from the sea. Epaminondas
is moreover praised for having made Greece more notable by founding Messene
and Megalopolis.[90] The founding of these cities is moreover presented as the
reason why the Lacedaemonians were unable to regain their former strength.
Epaminondas is further said to have been the cause behind the return of the
Mantineans to Mantinea.[91] The narrator comments that upon their return the
Mantineans were not just in all respects, inasmuch as they were treating for
peace with the Lacedaemonians secretly and privately, without the Arcadian
league, and finally changing alliances and fighting with the Lacedaemonians
against Epaminondas and the Thebans at Mantinea.[92] At the end of the

---

[88] VIII 11.9.

[89] *Ibid.* Λακεδαιμονίων μὲν γὰρ καὶ Ἀθηναίων τοῖς ἡγεμόσι πόλεών τε ἀξίωμα ὑπῆρχεν
ἐκ παλαιοῦ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται φρονήματός τι ἦσαν ἔχοντες, Θηβαίους δὲ Ἐπαμινώνδας
ἀθύμους τὰς γνώμας καὶ ἄλλων ἀκούειν εἰωθότας ἀπέφηνεν ⟨ἐν⟩ οὐ πολλῷ πρωτεύοντας.

[90] VIII 52.4 Κόνων ὁ Τιμοθέου καὶ Ἐπαμινώνδας... Ἐπαμινώνδας δὲ ἐκ τῶν πόλεων τῶν
ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἄνω Λακεδαιμονίων τὰς φρουρὰς καὶ ἁρμοστὰς ἐκβαλόντες καὶ
δεκαδαρχίας καταπαύσαντες· Ἐπαμινώνδας δὲ καὶ πόλεσιν οὐκ ἀφανέσι, Μεσσήνη καὶ
Μεγάλη πόλει τῇ Ἀρκάδων, λογιμωτέραν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐποίησεν. Cf. also IX 6.4.
Epaminondas' role in the foundation of Megalopolis is exaggerated, cf. Roy 1971: 577f.

[91] VIII 8.10. Epaminondas was not involved in this event quite to such an extent as the
account in the *Periegesis* may suggest, cf. Roy 1971: 577f.

[92] *Ibid.*, on these events cf. Jost 1998b *ad loc.* It is doubtful whether the change in the text
suggested by Kuhn 1696 *ad loc.* and accepted apparently unanimously by the more recent
editors is justified. The text should read, following the manuscripts ... οὔτε διὰ τὸ δέος τῶν

biography of Epaminondas, the narrator quotes the eulogistic inscription on the base of the statue, which triggered the biography. Here, it is claimed that Greece has become free and autonomous thanks to him.[93] This is high praise of the achievements of Epaminondas and the Thebans.

Thus, whereas the narrator mostly only mentions the warfare without any comment, he does occasionally introduce both praise and blame on the subject. In the light of this, it cannot be said that warfare between Greeks is consistently deplored in the *Periegesis*. Moreover, the Theban victory at Leuctra is not the only one called a 'most notable victory' (ἐπιφανεστάτη νίκη). The same designation is given the victory won by the Eleans over the Arcadians and the one by the Phocians over the Thessalians before the Persian war.[94] These three victories won by Greeks over Greeks have a common denominator: they were not expected. The Eleans certainly could not have expected to win their victory in the way they did. When they were in array awaiting the Arcadians, a woman, obeying a vision she had had in a dream, came and handed over to them her child as an ally in the war. The child was placed naked in front of the army, and when the Arcadians approached, the child turned into a snake. At this sight, the Arcadians were terrified and fled; the Eleans pursued them and won a remarkable victory. The Phocians had such misgivings over the prospect of victory, that they gathered their movable property, their images of the gods, and their women and children, and left thirty men behind with orders to on news of their defeat burn the whole lot as sacrifices after slaying the women and children.[95] Nonetheless, they won the most remarkable victory of their times, fighting bravely and with the favour of the gods. The feats of Epaminondas and the Thebans have been discussed above. At Leuctra they won the most

---

Θηβαίων ἐς τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων συμμαχίαν μετεβάλοντο ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ, καὶ τῆς Μαντινικῆς πρὸς Ἐπαμινώνδαν καὶ Θηβαίους μάχης Λακεδαιμονίων γινομένης ὁμοῦ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐτάξαντο οἱ Μαντινεῖς '... they did not openly enter into the Lacedaemonian alliance out of fear for the Thebans, but at the battle of Mantinea between the Thebans under Epaminondas and the Lacedaemonians, the Mantineans stood ranged together with the Lacedaemonians'. On the interpretation of this passage, cf. Akujärvi 2005.

[93] IX 15.6.

[94] VI 20.4f. (Eleans against Arcadians); X 1.1–9 (Phocians against Thessalians).

[95] The narrator explains that such insensible decisions as the Phocians made that day are called ἀπόνοια Φωκική X 1.7. Cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc*. and Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 *ad loc*. with references to other attestations of this expression.

remarkable victory that Greek had won over Greek, defeating the traditional Greek super-power on land, the Spartans.

Finally, judging from a comment on the expedition of the Seven against Thebes, the narrator can apparently even admire Greeks slaughtering Greeks in war, and express the opinion as his own:

> τὸν δὲ πόλεμον τοῦτον, ὃν ἐπολέμησαν Ἀργεῖοι, νομίζω πάντων, ὅσοι πρὸς Ἕλληνας ἐπὶ τῶν καλουμένων ἡρώων ἐπολεμήθησαν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων, γενέσθαι λόγου μάλιστα ἄξιον.
>
> I consider this war fought by the Argives to be the most remarkable of all the wars fought by Greeks against Greeks in the age of the so-called heroes.[96]

The narrator goes on to explain that this war was more remarkable than, for example, the one fought between Eleusinians and Athenians, since the contestants did not reach an agreement after the first encounter. When defeated in battle, the Thebans fled to the city, and were besieged by the Peloponnesians. Since the Peloponnesians were not experienced in this sort of warfare, they suffered heavy losses in their attempts to take the city. When the Thebans marched out of their city and commenced battle, they certainly defeated the enemy, but with severe losses for themselves – hence came the proverb Cadmean victory about victories that proved fatal for the victors.[97] It seems that the longer a war and the heavier the losses, the more remarkable it is – regardless of the fact that the losses were suffered by Greeks.

The fall of Thebes is in both lists attributed to an outside force, viz. Alexander of Macedon.[98] The narrator explains that Alexander wrought such destruction that the Thebans were not able to keep what was their own when Cassander had returned them. In the historical introduction to Thebes, this information is repeated in a more elaborate form.[99] Here we are moreover reminded of the fact that the narrator previously, in the *Attica*, had said that the

---

[96] IX 9.1.

[97] IX 9.1–5 (the two last paragraphs treat the expedition of the Epigoni and the *Thebais*). Auberger 1994: 9f. mistakenly finds here yet a piece of evidence for Pausanias' dislike of the Lacedaemonians – in fact, it was not the Lacedaemonians, but the Messenians who were involved in this expedition.

[98] VII 6.9 and 17.2.

[99] IX 6.5–7.4, with a short biographical note on Cassander.

Greek defeat at Chaeronea was the beginning of evil for the Greeks.[100] Now the narrator corrects the previous account, and explains that no Greek community was as severely affected as were the Thebans.

Finally, the cause of the downfall of the Achaean Confederacy, the last of the Greek powers, is presented as a complex mix of conflict between Greeks, incompetent generals, and appeals for Roman intervention which did not lead to the desired results.[101]

8.5 Summary

In this chapter, we have put to the test the validity of the notion that the wars between Greeks, wars that the history of Greece abounds in, are consistently deplored in the *Periegesis.* The historical introduction to the *Messeniaca*, the remarks on the Peloponnesian war, and the two lists of successive Greek powers in the *Achaica* were chosen as points of departure.

Certainly, it cannot be argued that Ego conceived of wars between Greeks as commendable, but at the same time it must be acknowledged that only in exceptional cases does the narrator let any negativity on Ego's part show in the text. When the reader goes beyond the few catch passages in which the leading men of the Peloponnesian war are called murderers and nearly pirates of Greece, or where it is said that the Peloponnesian war shook Greece to its foundations, making Philip's conquest of it easier, it will become evident that Ego appears to have a realistic outlook on the history of Greece. In the *Periegesis*, Greek history is presented as a constant struggle for power which finally was interrupted by the loss of independence. Moreover, side by side with the deprecating comment on the Peloponnesian war one may place as comparison the praise heaped on Epaminondas' feats in wars against other Greeks. One may also keep in mind the fact that, while men active during the Peloponnesian war are excluded from the list of benefactors of Greece, Epaminondas, Conon, Aratus, and Philopoemen are all included in the same list, despite their achievements being almost exclusively in wars against other Greeks.

---

[100] IX 6.5, referring to I 25.3; on this passage, cf. also chapter 9.
[101] Cf. below chapter 10.

The majority of the wars fought by Greeks against Greeks are recorded in the *Periegesis* without any commentary whatsoever. Witness for example the long account of the Messenian history, where the only depreciating comment on the constant warfare is that the Spartans took recourse to unjust means. The *Messeniaca* also demonstrates what independence entailed in the Greek world: the freedom to fight one another in order to enhance one's own position at others' expense, and avoid subjection to others. Moreover, the fact that the narrator mentions events during and monuments from the Peloponnesian war repeatedly in contexts where mention of the war may be considered not requisite, indicates that, despite many shortcomings in his historical notices, he was not seeking to rewrite the history of Greece in order to present an improved version of it. His aim was rather to present a correct chronicle of the history of Greece – of course within the bounds that he set for himself.

In sum, for the most part these Greek interstate conflicts of the past are simply recorded without comment. The narrator certainly deplores some, but simultaneously celebrates other wars fought by Greeks against Greeks. Peace and treaty between Greeks was not always to be commended, as is shown by the narrator's comment regarding the Mantinean peace-treaty with Sparta. Apparently, peace was not to be sought at all costs. The circumstances mattered. The Mantineans sought peace with the Lacedaemonians unjustly, since they did it privately without the Arcadian community[102] and did not remember their debt of gratitude to Thebes. In other words, the Mantineans sought peace and unity with the wrong Greeks in the wrong circumstances; this act moreover led to an enmity with their former allies, the Thebans.

Thus, in the *Periegesis* warfare between Greeks is presented as something natural, and warfare is a more or less normal practice among the Greeks when at liberty to do what they wanted. In trying to form an opinion of Ego's outlook on the Roman rule of Greece one should keep in mind how natural conflicts seemed to be in the Greek past.

---

[102] And, if the reading of the manuscripts is kept, they did it secretly; cf. Akujärvi 2005.

9 Greeks against Others

9.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter it was argued that the interstate quarrels, controversies, and struggles which the history of Greece, as recorded in the *Periegesis*, abounds in, for the most part are simply presented without any comment as more or less the normal state of things in the Greek past. In this chapter another aspect of the history of Greece will be discussed, viz. wars fought by the Greeks against outsiders. The wars in question are the Trojan war, the Persian wars, the battle of Chaeronea, the Lamian war, and the resistance against the Gauls.[1] Greek war against foreigners is potentially a more glorious theme in the history of Greece than internal quarrels and wars.

These Greek wars against outsiders are mentioned repeatedly by the narrator, as many scholars have previously observed. As is well known, the Greeks were successful only in the wars waged against the Persians and the Gauls, which means that the narrator lets both Greek victories and defeats be a recurrent theme in the *Periegesis*. However, not all of these wars receive a

---

[1] This is not the place to go into the thorny question of whether the Macedonians, against whom the battle of Chaeronea and the Lamian war were fought, were regarded as Greeks or not. For our present purposes, suffice it to say that, whatever the exact definition of 'Greece' in the *Periegesis*, the Macedonians do not form a part of the collective. Indeed, an antithesis between Greeks and Macedonians can be observed repeatedly in the *Periegesis*; cf. e.g. I 1.3, 8.3, 25.3, II 8.4, IV 28.2, V 4.9, VI 5.3, VII 6.5, 7.5, 8.1, VIII 6.2, 7.4, 27.10. In this antithesis, the Macedonians play the part of outsiders vis-à-vis the Greeks just as e.g. the Persians and Romans do. On the difficulty of defining the Greece of the *Periegesis*, see Bearzot 1988, Hutton 1995: 57–70, and above chapter 4. There does not appear to have been any consensus as to the exact definition of Greece in antiquity, cf. Marcotte 1988: 79f. and in particular Hall 2002: 125–171.

narrative.[2] Just as was the case with the Peloponnesian war, the Trojan war and the Persian wars are mentioned repeatedly – they are even the two most frequently mentioned conflicts in the whole of the *Periegesis* –, but they are not given any continuous narration. As discussed above, repeated references to the same event is a result of the narrator's manner of telling the history of Greece through local history and inserting historical notices in connection with discussions of monuments: the more communities were involved in a war, the more frequently the war in question will be mentioned.[3] Nor is there any narrative on the battle of Chaeronea. On the Lamian war there is a comparatively long narrative, and on the invasion of the Gauls there are two quite long narratives.[4] The reason why some of these events are narrated while others are not is most likely a combination of the narrator's professed reluctance to retell what other well-known authors have told before and to repeat known facts.[5] That is, as regards the wars in question, the narratives of the events become more extensive the closer they are to the narrator chronologically and the less canonical the historians are who have treated the event.

Not all passages pertaining to these wars are of interest in the present study. Indeed, the majority of the mentions are non-specific as regards the participation of a community. They concern instead, for example, monuments in some way associated with the wars or mention of a similar event. Of interest for this chapter are those passages in which the narrator explicitly states whether or not a community participated in any of these five conflicts; of particular interest are those passages which moreover contain some sort of comment. Table 4 aims to make clear the distribution of comments and explicit statements in either

---

[2] Noticed by e.g. Segre 1927: 205–207.

[3] Cf. above chapter 7.

[4] Lamian war I 25.3–5; invasion of the Gauls I 4 and X 19.5–23.14.

[5] Cf. e.g. III 17.7 τὰ δὲ ἐς αὐτὸν ὁποῖα ἐγένετο εἰδόσιν οὐ διηγήσομαι· τὰ γὰρ τοῖς πρότερον συγγραφέντα ἐπ᾽ ἀκριβὲς ἀποχρῶντα ἦν 'I will not tell the story of him [*sc.* king Pausanias] since it is known. What my predecessors have written accurately is sufficient' and II 30.4 ταῦτα εἰπόντος Ἡροδότου καθ᾽ ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐπ᾽ ἀκριβὲς οὔ μοι γράφειν κατὰ γνώμην ἦν εὖ προειρημένα 'since Herodotus has related all of this in detail accurately I do not wish to write down what has been told well before'; the reference is to Herodotus 5.82–87. Cf. also above chapter 3, and e.g. Musti 1984: 16–18, Lafond 1991: 38, and Moggi 1993: 408–415.

Table 4
Participation/non-participation of the poleis *in the great Greek conflicts*

Book:	I	III	IV	V/VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
Trojan war	Y	—*	—*	Y	Y+	Y	Y	Y
Persian wars	Y	Y+	—	Y	N+	Y	NG+	NG/Y
Chaeronea	Y+	—	N+	NG+	Y	N+	Y+	Y
Lamian war	Y	—	Y+	Y	N+	N+	—	Y
Gauls	Y+	—/N+	N+	—	N+	N+	—	Y+

Y = yes, i.e. participated in the war on the Greek side.

N = no, i.e. did not participate in the war.

NG = participated in the war, but not on the Greek side.

Y+ / N+ / NG+ same as above, but including some comment.

— no mention; —* uncertain.

direction, if there are any. Before proceeding to discuss these passages, we will comment briefly on the table.

First, the explicit statements of participation and non-participation are to a high degree concentrated to the historical introductions – with the obvious exception of the *Attica*. Second, books II and IX present special problems. Neither of the two books contain any general introduction. None of the historical introductions to the communities treated in book II goes much further down in time than the return of the Heraclids. Nor are any of the wars in question more than barely mentioned in other contexts in book II. The few mentions that are found in book II, and about communities treated in book II in other books, are too recalcitrant to be fitted into the table, but they will nonetheless be discussed below. In the table, IX is synonymous with Thebes, since this community is the only one in the book in question that is given a historical introduction.[6]

---

[6] The relevant passages in the introductions are: III 4.7–10, IV 28.2f., V 4.7–9, VII 6.3–8, VIII 6.1–3, IX 6.1–6, X 1.3, 2.1, and 3.4. There are also lists of participants in the Persian, Lamian, and Gallic wars. Persian wars: V 23.1–3 (Plataea) and X 20.1f. (Thermopylae). Lamian war: I 25.4. Gallic wars: X 20.3–5 is the principal passage.

9.2 The Trojan War

The Trojan war is the closest one can get to a Panhellenic enterprise, though not even in this instance does the phrase 'all Greeks' actually mean *all* Greeks.[7] In the expedition to Troy, as in every Greek expedition, there were absentees. The narrator reports that the inhabitants of two Arcadian communities, the Psophidians and Teuthians, maintain that their ancestors did not participate because of misgivings between the Argive leaders and their kings.[8]

When describing the Athenian Acropolis, the narrator has occasion to mention a monument commemorating the Trojan war, viz. a representation of the famous wooden horse of Troy made of bronze. The narrator takes the opportunity to criticise, by introducing the …-You, the tradition about the Trojan horse, stating that 'everyone who does not attribute complete stupidity to the Phrygians' knows that the Greeks manufactured some contrivance with which to breach the wall of Troy.[9] According to the tradition, the narrator continues, the ablest of the Greeks hid in the horse. Such is the Trojan horse on the Athenian Acropolis too; among others Menestheus and Theseus' children pop their heads out of it.

As to the Trojan war, the *Laconica* and the *Messeniaca* present special problems. Some of the most prominent leaders in the Greek camp came from the regions treated in these books. But the later inhabitants of Laconia and Messenia did not issue from the ranks they had commanded. In both Laconia and Messenia the return of the Heraclids represent a major break in the continuity of the history of the region, bringing in its wake an establishment of new royal lines and settlement of new inhabitants in the area.[10] The newcomers cannot reasonably be credited with the achievements of their predecessors. Accordingly, in the *Laconica* participation in the Trojan war is downplayed to such a degree that Menelaus is mentioned merely as ruler.[11] In the *Messeniaca*

---

[7] All Greeks united against the Trojans: I 15.2 … ὅμως ἐς Τροίαν ἦλθον Ἀθηναίοις τε αὐτοῖς μαχούμεναι καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἕλλησιν. Cf. also I 29.5.

[8] VIII 24.10 and VIII 28.4f.

[9] I 23.8, cf. above chapter 6, where the text is quoted.

[10] Return of the Heraclids: III 1.5, IV 3.3–6.

[11] III 1.5. To be true, the Trojan war is mentioned in III 4.7, but the mention concerns

participation in the Trojan war is mentioned, but only in a temporal absolute genitive phrase:

διαπολεμηθέντος δὲ τοῦ πρὸς Ἴλιον πολέμου καὶ Νέστορος ὡς ἐπανῆλθεν οἴκαδε τελευτήσαντος…

After the conclusion of the Trojan war and the death of Nestor after his return home…[12]

… the Dorians invaded the area and expelled the descendants of Neleus, the narrator explains. In other words, the Trojan war is introduced merely to make clear that a break in the genealogy of the royal lineage occurred after the war. A possible reason why the war is not passed over in complete silence in the *Messeniaca* might be the fact that the return of the Heraclids is not presented as a radical break with the preceding state of things. The aboriginal Messenians are said to have agreed to be ruled by the Heraclid Cresphontes and to share their land with the Dorians.[13]

The return of the Heraclids represents a major break in the history of Achaea, too. The Achaeans were autochthonous to the Peloponnesus, though not to those parts in which they lived at the time when the *Periegesis* was written. Driven from their abodes by the Heraclids, they themselves expelled the Ionians and occupied their land, i.e. Achaea which 'now has its name after these Achaeans'.[14] The case of the Achaeans is different from the Lacedaemonian and Messenian one. In Laconia and Messenia the continuity in the history of the landscape is broken off, without the newcomer's bringing in their own prehistory. In Achaea the previous inhabitants' (the Ionians') history is broken off, but the Achaeans bring with them their own pre-history, mainly the significant role they played in the Trojan war, which, therefore, is mentioned in the historical introduction to the *Achaica*.[15] Moreover, in book II,

---

Achilles.

[12] IV 3.3. In IV 3.2 the participation of the sons of Asclepius in the Trojan war is discussed.

[13] IV 3.6.

[14] V 1.1 γένη δὲ οἰκεῖ Πελοπόννησον Ἀρκάδες μὲν αὐτόχθονες καὶ Ἀχαιοί. καὶ οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ Δωριέων ἐκ τῆς σφετέρας ἀνέστησαν, οὐ μέντοι Πελοποννήσου γε ἐξεχώρησαν, ἀλλὰ ἐκβαλόντες Ἴωνας νέμονται τὸν Αἰγιαλὸν τὸ ἀρχαῖον, νῦν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν τούτων καλούμενον. Cf. also II 18.8 and VII 1.5–8.

[15] VII 6.3.

despite the rupture in history caused by the return of Heraclids, the Trojan war is mentioned, as are some monuments commemorating it, especially in Argos.[16] In fact, the Trojan war and in particular the return of the Heraclids appear to be the most significant events in the history of the communities treated in book II.[17]

9.3 The Persian wars

As mentioned above, in the *Periegesis* the Persian wars are probably the most often mentioned conflicts. Only occasionally does the mention of the wars include a statement as to whether a community participated in them or not. It appears that the Greek front was not quite as united against the Persians as against the Trojans.

Throughout Greece, there were a great number of monuments commemorating the Persian wars. The narrator notices some of these; particularly in the descriptions of Athens, Sparta, and Delphi, the mentions of memorials from the Persian wars are frequent.[18] According to the narrator, the Greeks who had faced the Persians decided to preserve in their damaged state sanctuaries and statues burnt or otherwise damaged by the Persians as a reminder for all times of the enmity.[19] He has the occasion to notice that some of these are in the Greek landscape.[20] The theatres of war, naturally, aroused

---

[16] Heraclids e.g.: II 4.3, 12.3, 13.1f., 18.9–19.1. Trojan war e.g.: II 5.4, 16.6, 20.6, 22.2, 23.1, 24.3.

[17] As noticed by Piérart 2001: 212f.

[18] Athens: I 1.5, 14.5, 15.3, 18.2, 19.5, 27.1f., 28.2, 28.4, 32.3–5, 32.7, 33.2. Sparta: III 11.3, 11.7, 12.6, 12.7, 12.9, 14.1, 16.6, 17.7. Delphi: X 8.7, 9.2, 10.1f., 11.5, 13.9, 14.5f., 15.1, 15.4, 16.6, 19.1f., 19.4. Cf. further Alcock 1996: 251–254 who also lists memorials in other parts of Greece.

[19] X 35.2f. This so-called Plataean oath is probably a later, fourth century, fabrication. The oath is preserved in Lycurgus *In Leocratem* 81 and Diodorus Siculus 11.29.3. Cf. *OCD s.v.* 'Plataea, oath of', Frazer 1898 *ad loc.*, and Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 *ad loc.* for further references.

[20] I 1.5, VII 5.4, and X 35.2f. In the last of these passages Pausanias is mistaken. The temple in question was not burned during the Persian wars, but during the Roman war against Perseus of Macedon, cf. Habicht 1985: 99, with references to earlier literature in n. 14. Describing the Athenian Acropolis the narrator mentions old statues of Athena, which were

memories of the battles fought at the sites.[21] Encounters with a numerically superior enemy provide yet other occasions to mention the Persian wars.[22] But most prominent are the reminiscences of the Persian wars, in particular the battle of Thermopylae, in the account of the invasion of the Gauls in book X. This is evident, for example, in the comparison of the Greek muster to face the Persians and the one facing the Gauls. The comparison is introduced with the following comment, in which the narrator introduces the …-You;[23] thereby it is suggested that Ego is not alone in being interested in making such comparisons:

> πάρεστι δέ, ὅστις ἐθέλοι καὶ ἀνταριθμῆσαι τούς τε ἐπὶ βασιλέα Ξέρξην ἐς Πύλας καὶ τοὺς τότε ἐναντία Γαλατῶν ἀθροισθέντας.
>
> Anyone who wishes can also compare those who mustered against king Xerxes at Thermopylae with those who then mustered against the Gauls.[24]

However, the great number of passages in which the Persian wars are mentioned is not equally interesting as those passages in which the narrator explicitly comments whether or not a community participated in the wars.

As already mentioned, the city of Athens abounds in memorials from the wars, for obvious reasons, since Athens' participation in the Persian wars was an important part of the Athenian past and self image. It appears almost as if the

---

in one piece, but blackened and fragile. The narrator explains that these too were caught in the flames when Athens was taken, I 27.6; cf. also 27.2 (an olive which was burnt down, but sprouted two cubits on the very same day, a slightly exaggerated version of Herodotus 8.55).

[21] Marathon I 32.3–5 and §7; Plataea IX 2.5f. Since the Greece of the *Periegesis* does not extend all the way to Thermopylae, that battle site is not described. After the battle, the site of a naval encounter is not easily marked out with a monument. There was a monument commemorating the victory at Salamis on Salamis (I 36.1), and memories of wreckage washed ashore at cape Colias (I 1.5, cf. Herodotus 8.96). The small island of Psyttalea close to Salamis is remembered for the massacre of the 400 Persians who landed there (I 36.2 and IV 36.6).

[22] E.g. the Messenians, when facing a superior host of Acarnanians, plucked up their courage when remembering the Athenian resistance at Marathon (IV 25.5). The Achaean leaders facing the Romans were so terrified that not even the associations of the battle at Thermopylae inspired brighter hopes in them (VII 15.3).

[23] On the …-You, cf. below chapter 6.

[24] X 20.1–5, listing first those who gathered to face the Persians, next those who opposed the Gauls. The narratives about the invasion of the Gauls will be discussed further below.

narrator considers that the Athenians celebrate their victories too excessively. Consider, for example, the following comment:

> … ναὸς Εὐκλείας, ἀνάθημα καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ Μήδων…
> … a temple of Eucleia, this too is a offering of the spoils taken from the Persians…[25]

Noteworthy is the adverbial καί, 'too', which the narrator inserts as if he previously has spoken about other offerings made by the Athenians from spoils taken from the Persians. Since the narrator has not mentioned any such dedications in the preceding narrative, one may assume that one of two things has happened. Either the καί is so to speak a window into the reality behind the text. In this case, it reveals that, as one – the travelling-Ego and/or the travelling-You?[26] – follows the road described in the text, this temple for Eucleia is not the first offering of spoils taken from Persians to be seen, though it is the first one mentioned. Or, this may simply be a case of careless editing, i.e. the present passage was perhaps originally planned to appear after other offerings of spoils taken from the Persians had been mentioned, in which case the καί would have made good sense. Be that as it may, the narrator goes on to speculate that the Athenians were particularly proud of their victory at Marathon. Later, the narrator has occasion to notice that on the Athenian Acropolis is a sword which is said to have belonged to Mardonius.[27] Pointing to the fact that Mardonius was slain by the Lacedaemonians in the battle, the narrator makes clear that he is not ready to accept this claim. Perhaps he is even indirectly suggesting that the Athenians try to take too much credit for the success in the wars against the Persians, and to belittle the contribution of others.

In the *Laconica* the Lacedaemonian share in the battle of Thermopylae is praised. Considering the prominence given to the individuals in the whole introduction to the *Laconica*, it is not surprising that particularly the role of Leonidas is given particular prominence.[28] In laudatory terms the narrator compares Leonidas' achievement at Thermopylae with the few wars which are especially memorable thanks to the achievement of one individual alone,

---

[25] I 14.5; on this passage, cf. also above chapter 5.

[26] On the travelling-Ego and the travelling-You, cf. below chapter 6.

[27] I 27.1; on this passage, cf. also above chapter 5.

[28] III 4.7f.

singling out for mention Achilles at Troy and Miltiades at Marathon. However, the narrator continues to make the following comment:

> ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὸ Λεωνίδου κατόρθωμα ὑπερεβάλετο ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν τά τε ἀνὰ χρόνον συμβάντα καὶ τὰ ἔτι πρότερον.
>
> But in fact, Leonidas' success surpassed, I think, those achieved both since and before.[29]

It should be noted that the narrator does not hesitate to present the laudatory opinion about Leonidas as one entertained by Ego. One should also note that, though the battle at Thermopylae actually was a defeat for the Greeks, the narrator praises the feat of Leonidas as a success (κατόρθωμα). What the narrator is praising here is not the outcome of the battle, but the courage and the military prowess of Leonidas and his men. He goes on to explain the reason for this praise: had the Lacedaemonians not been encircled at Thermopylae, Xerxes and the Persians would never have seen Greece, nor would they have burnt Athens down.[30]

In another passage, too, the battle at Thermopylae is talked about in hyperbolic terms. The narrator reports that, according to themselves, the Lacedaemonians had not suffered any defeats in battles on land before Leuctra. Indeed, 'they did not even admit' (οὐδὲ συνεχώρουν) to have been defeated before that time. The narrator goes on to explain the reason for the Lacedaemonian claim. 'They asserted' (ἔφασαν) that Leonidas was victorious, but that his troops were insufficient for a complete annihilation of the Persians, and that the Athenian feat on Sphacteria was a theft of war, not a victory.[31] It should be noted that the narrator takes care both to indicate that he is merely reporting the opinion of somebody else and to explain that the opinion originates with the Lacedaemonians. Does the narrator hereby also indicate that he avoids taking a stand on the issue, or is it that he is not quite in agreement?

---

[29] III 4.7.

[30] III 4.8 Ξέρξῃ γὰρ… Λεωνίδας σὺν ὀλίγοις… ἐγένετο ἂν ἐμποδὼν μηδὲ ἀρχὴν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν μηδὲ Ἀθηναίων ποτὲ ἐμπρῆσαι τὴν πόλιν κτλ.

[31] I 13.5 Λακεδαιμονίοις δὲ πρὸ μὲν τοῦ ἐν Λεύκτροις οὐδὲν ἐγεγόνει πταῖσμα, ὥστε οὐδὲ συνεχώρουν ἀγῶνί πω κεκρατῆσθαι πεζῷ· Λεωνίδα μὲν γὰρ νικῶντι οὐκ ἔφασαν τοὺς ἑπομένους ἐς τελέαν ἐξαρκέσαι φθορὰν τῶν Μήδων, τὸ δὲ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Δημοσθένους ἔργον πρὸς τῇ νήσῳ Σφακτηρίᾳ κλοπὴν εἶναι πολέμου καὶ οὐ νίκην. On 'theft of war', cf. also above chapter 8.

An unambiguous answer to that question is probably impossible to find. However, the mere presence of the verbs of saying is interesting, since they indicate that the narrator felt a need to mark that the information does not come from himself, but is derived from another source. That is, it would seem that the narrator does not quite wholeheartedly embrace the notion of Lacedaemonian success at Thermopylae.[32]

The Achaeans failed to participate in any of the battles against the Persians. The narrator carefully catalogues the Achaean failings. They do not appear in either the Laconian or Athenian lists of allies, i.e. they partook in neither the battle of Thermopylae nor the naval battles with the Athenians. Nor is their name to be found on the Greek votive offering in Olympia, which indicates that they did not show up at Plataea either.[33] This presentation through negation is interesting.[34] Why is the narrator so emphatically narrating what is not the case? What do the negations negate? Is the narrator entering into a dialogue with the reader, and negating his/her expectations ('the Achaeans did not fight the Persians, as you might think')? Or, is the narrator entering into an argument with some of his sources, and negating their claims ('the Achaeans did not fight the Persians, as they claim')? Since the narrator catalogues the evidence supporting his claims that the Achaeans did not take part in the battles, it would seem that he is arguing with his sources.

The reason for the Achaean absence in the Persian wars is another matter. It is envisioned by the narrator to be intimately connected with the prominent position they had in the Greek world during the Trojan war before the return of the Heraclids:

---

[32] On the difficulties of interpreting the verbs of saying, cf. above chapter 5.

[33] VII 6.3f. κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ξέρξου καὶ Μήδων ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ‹ἔφ›οδον οὔτε Λεωνίδᾳ τῆς ἐξόδου τῆς ἐς Θερμοπύλας εἰσὶν οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ δῆλοι μετεσχηκότες οὔτε Ἀθηναίοις ὁμοῦ καὶ Θεμιστοκλεῖ πρὸς Εὐβοίᾳ καὶ Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχήσαντες, οὐδὲ σφᾶς κατάλογος συμμάχων ἔχει Λακωνικὸς ἢ Ἀττικός. ὑστέρησαν δὲ καὶ ἔργου τοῦ Πλαταιᾶσι· δῆλα γὰρ δὴ ὅτι ἐπὶ τῷ ἀναθήματι τῷ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων μετῆν ἂν καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς γεγράφθαι.

[34] On presentation through negation, cf. de Jong 1987: 61–68 and Hornblower 1994: 152–156, with a discussion on the possible different interpretations of this device in historiography as compared to fiction.

> δοκεῖν δέ μοι τὰς πατρίδας τε ὑπολειφθέντες ἕκαστοι τὰς αὑτῶν ἔσῳζον καὶ ἅμα διὰ τὸ ἔργον τὸ πρὸς Τροίαν Λακεδαιμονίους Δωριεῖς ἀπηξίουν σφίσιν ἡγεῖσθαι.
>
> I think that, since they were left behind, they each preserved their country, and simultaneously, because of the feats at Troy, they deemed the Dorian Lacedaemonians unfit to command them.[35]

In other words, the reason for the Achaean absence is not presented by the narrator as one that the Achaeans themselves have delivered, the narrator himself merely acting as mouthpiece for them. Instead, the narrator introduces the explanation with 'I think' (δοκεῖν μοι), which marks it as an explanation worked out by Ego himself but which is only a conjecture – the real reason, or the reason the Achaeans would have stated may be something else.[36] Though not necessarily the actual reason, the narrator obviously regards the reason he gives as plausible – after all, he introduces it into the text. The motivation is moreover envisioned to be something quite typical for a Greek community, viz. an urge to safeguard what is one's own in the face of a potential threat from others and a pride in history. Later, the narrator moreover has the occasion to point to the fact that the former Achaean self-interest had preserved their strength, so that the Achaean Confederacy could rise up and take over the leading position in Greece after Argos, Athens, Sparta, and Thebes had been drained of their strength.[37]

As regards the Phocians, the narrator reports that they are said (λέγεται) to have been forced to side with the king, but deserted the Persians and ranged themselves with the Greeks during the battle of Plataea.[38] However, the Phocian performance on the Greek side does not appear to have been considerable enough to merit their inclusion on either the statue of Zeus in Olympia or the serpent-column in Delphi.[39] Neither their medizing nor their return to the Greek

---

[35] VII 6.4.

[36] *Contra* Habicht 1985: 107.

[37] VII 7.1.

[38] X 2.1 λέγεται τοὺς Φωκέας φρονῆσαι μὲν ὑπὸ ἀνάγκης τὰ βασιλέως, αὐτομολῆσαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν Μήδων καὶ ἐς τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν παρὰ τὸ ἔργον τὸ Πλαταιᾶσι παρατάξασθαι.

[39] Cf. V 23.1f.; in X 13.9 the serpent-column is mentioned, but the narrator does not list any of the names inscribed on it. For the discrepancies between the inscription on Zeus in Olympia as quoted in the *Periegesis*, the serpent-column, and the evidence of Herodotus, cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc*. X 13.9; on the serpent-column in general, cf. Steinhart 1997.

side receives any kind of comment in the *Periegesis*. It should be noted, too, that the information is marked as being derived from tradition (λέγεται).

The lists of participants in book V (apropos of the statue of Zeus dedicated by the Greeks who fought the Persians at Plataea) and book X (comparing the Greek muster against the Persians with the one against the Gauls) reveal that some of the communities treated in book II fought both at Thermopylae and Plataea. Mycenae, Phlius, and Corinth were at Thermopylae; Corinth, Sicyon, Aegina, Epidaurus, Phlius, Troezen, Hermion, Tiryns, and Mycenae at Plataea.[40]

To the list in book V the narrator appends a survey of communities that were subsequently deserted. Mycenae and Tiryns belong to these cities; they were both destroyed by the Argives.[41] In the introductory note to Mycenae the narrator explains that the Argives lay waste the city since they envied them the glory they had won by partaking in the Persian wars.[42] This explanation is probably false.[43] Nor is it the only explanation presented in the *Periegesis*. Another explanation for the measure taken by the Argives was that it was a synoecism made in order to gain strength against Sparta.[44] Nonetheless, it is interesting that the first, more incriminating, explanation can be given without one word of explicit condemnation being directed against the Argives for emptying this old venerable city of its inhabitants – and without any regret at the lot of the Myceneans being expressed. Thus, according to the account in the *Periegesis*, not only did the Argives avoid participating in the Persian wars, but they also destroyed Mycenae out of jealously of that city's achievement. This notwithstanding, the narrator does not explicitly reproach the Argives, nor does he imply criticism by using evaluative language. The event is simply recorded as one event among others in the history of Greece.

---

[40] Thermopylae: X 20.1; Plataea: V 23.1f.

[41] V 23.3.

[42] II 16.5 Μυκήνας δὲ Ἀργεῖοι καθεῖλον ὑπὸ ζηλοτυπίας. ἡσυχαζόντων γὰρ τῶν Ἀργείων κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστρατείαν τοῦ Μήδου, Μυκηναῖοι πέμπουσιν ἐς Θερμοπύλας ὀγδοήκοντα ἄνδρας, οἳ Λακεδαιμονίοις μετέσχον τοῦ ἔργου· τοῦτο ἤνεγκέ σφισιν ὄλεθρον τὸ φιλοτίμημα παροξῦναν Ἀργείους. In VII 25.5f., too, the capture of Mycenae by the Argives is spoken of, this time without any mention of the Persian wars.

[43] Cf. Frazer 1898 *ad loc*. II 16.5.

[44] VIII 27.1.

Finally, the Thebans: it was a well-known fact that the Thebans medized, and it is presented as such in the *Periegesis*, without any markers indicating that the narrator takes exception to the information presented.[45] The narrator certainly argues for exonerating the Thebans as a collective from any guilt for the choice to fight with the Persians against the Greeks, but this exoneration does not go as far as to question the reliability of the report:

> τῆς δὲ αἰτίας ταύτης δημοσίᾳ σφίσιν οὐ μέτεστιν, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς Θήβαις ὀλιγαρχία
> καὶ οὐχὶ ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία τηνικαῦτα ἴσχυεν· εἰ γοῦν Πεισιστράτου
> τυραννοῦντος ἔτι ἢ τῶν παίδων Ἀθήνησιν ἀφίκετο ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ὁ βάρβαρος,
> οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως οὐ καὶ Ἀθηναίους κατέλαβεν ἂν ἔγκλημα μηδισμοῦ.
>
> They do not as a community share in the responsibility for this, since an oligarchy
> prevailed in Thebes at that time and not their ancestral government. At all events, if the
> barbarians had come against Greece when Pisistratus or his children still held the
> tyranny in Athens, an accusation of medism would certainly have seized the Athenians
> too.[46]

In other words, a people is not responsible for the actions of an unjust ruler. In like manner with the Thebans, the Lacedaemonians too are exonerated from any guilt in connection with the sack of Megalopolis, since a tyrant ruled them at the time.[47] The exoneration of the Thebans is taken yet one step further. As partial proof (γοῦν) for the innocence of the Thebans it is said that the Athenians, too, would have found themselves fighting with the Persians, had the Persian wars taken place during the tyranny of Pisistratus or his sons.

It can safely be said that Pausanias' information on the Persian wars is mainly derived from Herodotus. To some extent, this written record surely was supplemented with information gathered from other sources, but Herodotus was his main source. He 'knew his source [*sc*. Herodotus] well', he felt no need to

---

[45] IX 6.1f.

[46] IX 6.2. A similar justification for choosing the wrong side is voiced by Thebans in Thucydides 3.62.3f.

[47] VIII 27.16 Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ τῷ δήμῳ τοῦ τῶν Μεγαλοπολιτῶν παθήματος μέτεστιν αἰτίας οὐδέν, ὅτι σφίσιν ἐκ βασιλείας μετέστησεν ἐς τυραννίδα ὁ Κλεομένης τὴν πολιτείαν.

discuss in detail such matters that had already been treated by Herodotus, and he often quotes him and even more often alludes to him.[48]

To compare how the Herodotean account of the Persian wars is accepted in the *Periegesis* and Plutarch's essay *On Herodotus' Malice* (*De Herodoti malignitate*) respectively, may be instructive when judging how the history of Greece, especially the theme of Greek unity and disunity in the past, is received and presented in the *Periegesis*. The reason why *On Herodotus' Malice* is of interest is that it demonstrates a radically alternative approach to Herodotus' *Histories* and the history of the period in question by a near contemporary of Pausanias', viz. Plutarch with his utter rejection of Herodotus in an attempt to salvage the glory of Greece. Though the scornful tone of Plutarch's essay makes the work less attractive for the modern reader, it was most probably meant as a serious attempt to prove Herodotus guilty of bias, malice, and constant attempts to diminish the glory of the Greek achievements against the Persians.[49] For Plutarch, the main problem with the Herodotean account of the Persian wars appears to be the fact that the historian is fair, i.e. he does not one-sidedly glorify the Greeks, which, in Plutarch's eyes, amounts to his being a *philobarbaros*.[50]

Regarding Herodotus' *Histories*, in particular the reports about the medizing of some of the Greek communities, the narrator of the *Periegesis* does

---

[48] Quote from Meadows 1995: 95. Pausanias' extensive use of Herodotus' *Histories* has been the subject of investigation by Pfundtner 1869: 441–447, Wernicke 1884; stylistical similarities have been studied by Pfundtner 1866, and Strid 1976; cf. also e.g. Habicht 1985: 103 n. 30, Arafat 1996: 23 n. 55, both with references to earlier studies, and Moggi 1996: 83–87; cf. also above chapter 2.

[49] Cf. e.g. Plutarch's complaint 'What then have the Greeks left that is glorious and great in those battles, if the Spartans fought an unarmed foe…' *De Herodoti malignitate* 874A. On *De Herodoti malignitate*, cf. Marincola 1994 *passim*, esp. 190f. and 194; on Plutarch and Herodotus, cf. Hershbell 1993; and on the long line of critics of Herodotus' *Histories*, e.g. Myres 1953: 17–31, Momigliano 1960, and Evans 1968.

[50] φιλοβάρβαρος *De Herodoti malignitate* 857A. Bias in historical works for nationalistic/patriotic reasons appears to have been acceptable in antiquity – and indeed it appears to be what Plutarch is demanding of Herodotus, cf. Luce 1989: 20f. Cf. also Nikolaidis 1985 for a survey of 'Greek' and 'Barbarian' in Plutarch; on Plutarch's dualistic view of the world, cf. e.g. Blomqvist 1997: 82 on the opposition Greeks-Barbarians, and *passim* on the opposition men-women.

not seem to have had any difficulty in accepting the Herodotean account, despite the occasionally less favourable light it throws on the Greeks. As discussed above, the narrator does not protest against Herodotus' account of medizing Thebans or Phocians. Instead, he suggests that the Athenians, too, would have been found siding with the Persians, had their political circumstances been different.

This is not the place to go into all the details of Plutarch's argument. Since his main objective is to prove Herodotus unreliable, he goes into topics that are beyond the scope of the present study. Here we will only discuss Plutarch's objections against Herodotus' presentation of the Thebans.

Regarding the medizing Thebans, Plutarch protests that Herodotus does not sufficiently take into consideration the duress under which the Thebans joined the Persian side. Further, regarding the report that the Thebans are said to have stayed fighting at Thermopylae under compulsion (as hostages), Plutarch complains that Herodotus gives noble deeds ignoble causes.[51] Plutarch's argument for restoring the Theban honour at Thermopylae builds on the irrationality in Leonidas' sending away willing allies but retaining the allegedly unwilling and unfriendly Thebans. Instead, Plutarch would have it, Leonidas invited the Thebans to Thermopylae since he considered them trustworthy allies.[52] Criticising Herodotus' account of the Theban performance at Thermopylae, Plutarch, again, stresses the point that the Thebans were willing participants in the battle: why fight when they could have deserted?[53] He particularly questions the Theban medizing in the light of the punishment they suffered after the battle: some were killed, the majority was branded.[54] This punishment, Plutarch claims, is unknown to Herodotus' predecessors, i.e. it is a Herodotean invention.[55] If genuine, it should be considered strong evidence

---

[51] Herodotus 7.222, Plutarch *De Herodoti malignitate* 864C–865F and 866D–867B. For a good analysis of these passages, see Marincola 1994: 198f.

[52] *De Herodoti malignitate* 865E. When making these arguments Plutarch ignores passages in Herodotus that constitute proof to the contrary, such as Herodotus 7.205, where it is said that Leonidas requested Theban participation in order to test whether they would send troops or openly abandon the Greek alliance; cf. Bowen 1992: 132.

[53] *De Herodoti malignitate* 866D–867B.

[54] Herodotus 7.233.

[55] On Herodotus' 'predecessors', cf. Marincola 1994: 200–203; Marincola suggests that

against the medizing of the Thebans, according to Plutarch: Leonidas' dead body was mutilated, the Theban commander's body was branded – these are both triumphant acts directed against implacable enemies.[56]

Finally, being unable to do much about the Theban achievement on the Persian side at the battle of Plataea, Plutarch tries to throw some doubt on it by reminding the reader of the earlier branding of them. When the Persians had been routed, the Theban cavalry rode in protection of the Persians, 'obviously in return for being branded at Thermopylae', Plutarch suggests.[57]

9.4 The battle of Chaeronea

From the Persian wars onwards the number of communities participating in the 'Panhellenic' wars is constantly decreasing. Not a word is said about either the participation or non-participation in the battle of Chaeronea of any of the communities discussed in book II. As to the Lacedaemonians, it may be noted that in the introduction to the *Laconica* neither the battle of Chaeronea, the Lamian war, nor the invasion of the Gauls are mentioned.

Neither the Messenians nor the Eleans participated in the battle of Chaeronea on the Greek side against the Macedonians. They had both the same reason for their absence from this battle, viz. they were allied to Philip II of Macedon. However, the narrator takes care to clarify that neither one of the two fought with the Macedonians.[58] Note that the narrator uses 'they say' (λέγουσιν)

Plutarch bases his arguments against Herodotus on their authority.

[56] Plutarch forgets that, from a Persian point of view, the Thebans were rebellious slaves of the king (they had given the king earth and water, cf. Herodotus 7.132), and that branding was a common punishment of slaves. Cf. also Bowen 1992: 134.

[57] *De Herodoti malignitate* 872D οἱ γὰρ Θηβαῖοι, τῆς τροπῆς γενομένης, προϊππεύοντες τῶν βαρβάρων προθύμως παρεβοήθουν φεύγουσιν αὐτοῖς, δηλονότι τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις στιγμάτων χάριν ἀποδιδόντες. Ironic remarks of this sort have been anticipated in 867B, where, however, rhetoric hyperbole has clearly taken over: 'though medizing at Thermopylae they were branded, and though branded they still were medizing enthusiastically at Plataea… like Hippocleides on the table… Herodotus appears to be dancing away the truth.'

[58] IV 28.2 τέλος δὲ οἱ Μεσσήνιοι Φιλίππῳ σύμμαχοι τῷ Ἀμύντου καὶ Μακεδόσιν ἐγένοντο, καὶ τοῦτο σφᾶς λέγουσιν ἀποκωλῦσαι τοῦ συμβάντος τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀγῶνος ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μὴ μετασχεῖν· οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐναντία θέσθαι τὰ ὅπλα

when giving the reason for the Messenian absence from the battle of Chaeronea. By indicating that the information is derived from some other source, the narrator perhaps wishes to make clear that he is merely repeating what others say, should his statement be doubted by someone.

The Arcadians, just as the Messenians and the Eleans, were absent from the battle of Chaeronea.[59] Unlike the failure of the Messenians and the Eleans to participate in the battle, the Arcadian non-participation is brought up more than once. In the introductory notice to the city of Megalopolis, the narrator *inter alia* mentions the fact that the Arcadians were absent from the battle of Chaeronea, adding that the Arcadian hatred for the Lacedaemonians was a significant factor in the growth of Philip's power.[60]

Narrating the history of the Achaean Confederacy, the narrator has occasion to tell about how an Arcadian contingent encountered Roman troops under the command of Metellus at Chaeronea. The Arcadian defeat gives rise to the following comment:

> ἔνθα δὴ ἐπελάμβανε τοὺς Ἀρκάδας ἐκ θεῶν δίκη τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν…
> At this site the Arcadians suffered a vengeance of the Greek gods…[61]

The narrator goes on to explain this comment by pointing out that the Arcadians were punished for not fighting Philip and the Macedonians at Chaeronea by being slaughtered by the Romans there. This is an interesting comment. Though not in the first person, passivity in the face of threats from the outside is apparently censured in this passage. This being the only occurrence of a sentiment like this in the *Periegesis*, the question is how applicable it is to the

---

ἠθέλησαν. V 4.9 Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ Ἀμύντου οὐκ ἐθέλοντος ἀποσχέσθαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος, προσεχώρησαν μὲν ἐς τὴν συμμαχίαν τῶν Μακεδόνων οἱ Ἠλεῖοι στάσει κακωθέντες ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων, μαχεσθῆναι δὲ οὐχ ὑπέμειναν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐναντία ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ. On the Elean alliance with Philip II, cf. also IV 28.4.

[59] VIII 6.2.

[60] VIII 27.10 Φίλιππον δὲ τὸν Ἀμύντου καὶ Μακεδόνων τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐχ ἥκιστα αὐξηθῆναι τὸ ἔχθος τὸ Ἀρκάδων ἐς Λακεδαιμονίους ἐποίησε. Because of old hatred for the Lacedaemonians, the Eleans too are said to have been willing to fight with Philip against the Lacedaemonians, cf. V 4.9. See also VIII 7.4–6, a biographical note on Philip II; there the narrator says that Philip came to Arcadia in order to bring over the Arcadians from the rest of the Greeks to his side.

[61] VII 15.6.

work as a whole. After all, the narrator finds extenuating circumstances to apologise for even worse offences against the Greek 'duty' to defend Greece.[62] Some have been quoted above; others will be discussed below. This passage is taken as the proof needed by those arguing that Pausanias judges the Greek communities according to their fulfilment of this 'duty' to defend Greece.[63]

Why this severe judgement on the Arcadians alone among the Greeks who were absent at Chaeronea? It is quite possible that the associations of the place of the battle prompted the comment. As is evident from the narrator's effort to tell bits and pieces of history in its proper textual and geographical context, he regards as significant not only an event, but also the place where the event occurred.[64] Moreover, occasionally it seems as if the narrator assumes that others too felt the historical associations of a location. Just a few paragraphs earlier in the *Achaica* the narrator seized the opportunity to note that the Achaeans failed to be inspired by the associations of Thermopylae,

> … ἔνθα ἦν μὲν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ ἐς Μήδους, ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναίοις τὰ ἐς Γαλάτας οὐδὲν ἀφανέστερα ἐκείνων τολμήματα.
> … where the Lacedaemonians had their exploit for Greece against the Persians, or the Athenians their no less glorious one against the Gauls.[65]

Were the Arcadians any worse than other Greeks who failed to participate in the battle at Chaeronea against Philip of Macedon? The Messenians and the Eleans, too, are explicitly said to have been absent from Chaeronea; just as the Arcadians, they too were Philip's allies, and the Eleans even harboured traitors and partook in Philip's attack on Lacedaemon.[66] The Arcadians were just as good, or just as bad as the others. But, unlike the others, they were unfortunate

---

[62] '… patriotic duty' to defend Greece as Habicht 1985: 107 puts it.

[63] Habicht 1985: 107; Moggi & Osanna 2000 *ad loc*. VII 15.6; Auffart 1997: 223f., too, touches on a similar line of thought. See also Touloumakos 1971: 62f., discussing other authors', roughly contemporary of Pausanias, sentiments regarding the battle of Chaeronea and Philip II of Macedon.

[64] Cf. above chapter 7.

[65] VII 15.3.

[66] It is not stated in the *Periegesis*, but the Argives and the Messenians too participated in Philip's attack on Sparta, cf. Jacquemin 1999 *ad loc*. V 4.9.

enough to fight against and be defeated by a non-Greek enemy at Chaeronea, a place full of associations.[67]

That Athens was one of the communities fighting against the Macedonians at the battle of Chaeronea goes without saying. Apropos of a statue of Olympiodorus, characterised as a man who gained fame for his actions particularly because of the time in which he came to the fore, the narrator inserts a résumé of the history of Athens from Chaeronea to this Olympiodorus.[68] The historical note, which after the historical background develops into a short biography of Olympiodorus, is introduced with the following statement:

τὸ γὰρ ἀτύχημα τὸ ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ ἅπασι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἦρξε κακοῦ…

The misfortune at Chaeronea was the beginning of evil for all Greeks…[69]

Thereupon he goes on to specify that Athens suffered particularly heavy losses by being deprived of its islands and naval force. In the previous chapter it was noted that, when the narrator introduces Athens as an actant in post-Chaeronean events, he usually reminds the readers of the fact that the city had been weakened by the Macedonian wars; the battle of Chaeronea represents the first defeat.[70] However, some Greeks were more heavily affected by Philip than was Athens. Athens even had some benefit from his incursion into the Greek world – they were given Oropus by Philip after his conquest of Thebes.[71]

---

[67] Note that the Arcadians are said to have been punished by the Greek gods (ἐκ θεῶν δίκη τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν), for not earlier fighting one outsider (the Macedonians) by being defeated by another (the Romans). On the Romans in the *Periegesis*, cf. further below chapter 10.

[68] I 25.3–26.3; on Olympiodorus, for whom the *Periegesis* is our main literary source, cf. Habicht 1985: 90–92 and particularly the study of Gabbert 1996.

[69] I 25.3. This is probably a deliberate echo of Herodotus 5.97.3 αὗται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι. In I 29.13 the narrator mentions the tomb of those who fell in the battle; cf. also the short eulogistic biographical note on Isocrates in I 18.8, where the narrator states that Isocrates 'voluntarily died' (ἐτελεύτησεν ἐθελοντής) at the news about the defeat at Chaeronea.

[70] Cf. e.g. I 4.1f., VII 6.9, 17.2.

[71] I 34.1, on this passage cf. above chapter 3. Was it out of gratitude for this gesture that the Athenians erected statues of Philip (and Alexander)? When the narrator mentions statues of them in Athens, he explains that they were erected owing to flattery (κολακείᾳ μᾶλλον ἐς αὐτοὺς τοῦ πλήθους) rather than because they had been true benefactors of the Athenians, cf.

250

When the narrator has come as far as the treatment of Thebes, he revises his statement regarding the effects of the battle of Chaeronea on Athens:

εἴρηται [εἴρηται] δέ μοι καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ τὸ ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ σφάλμα συμφορὰν γενέσθαι τοῖς πᾶσιν Ἕλλησι· Θηβαίους δὲ καὶ ἐς πλέον κατέλαβεν…

It was said by me in the *Attica* that the failure at Chaeronea was a misfortune for all Greeks; it affected the Thebans even more…[72]

The narrator explains that a garrison, which would later cause the ruin of the Thebans, was brought into the city. Upon the death of Philip, the Thebans decided to revolt and throw out the garrison. Alexander quickly quelled the revolt and laid the city in ruins.[73]

Before leaving the subject matter of the battle of Chaeronea, let us briefly discuss the narrator's interesting inventory of the Chaeronean battlefield. There were two trophies erected by Sulla, but none erected by Philip.[74] Apropos of the battlefield itself, or a monument on it, the narrator could have told about the battle. Instead, he was apparently side-tracked by the lack of a monument on it – or, perhaps, this is the impression that he wants to convey. Be that as it may, the lack of a monument erected by Philip provides him with an excuse to explain the reason why neither Philip nor Alexander, or any other Macedonian king, set up trophies commemorating their victories over Greeks or barbarians.[75]

I 9.4. According to the narrator, Lysimachus too was honoured with a statue by the Athenians since it was advantageous for the moment. Cf. also the comment I 9.3 regarding the benefactions – 'many and not worthy of exposition' (πολλά τε καὶ οὐκ ἄξια ἐξηγήσεως) – of Ptolemy Philometor (in *OCD s.v.* 'Ptolemy (Ptolemaeus)', Ptolemy IX Soter II, nicknamed Lathyrus) for which he was given a statue by the Athenians. Considering this kind of comments on the Athenians, together with, *inter alia*, the fact that there are long biographies of various Macedonian and Egyptian regents in the *Attica*, biographies in which Athens and the Athenians barely are mentioned – what makes the *Attica* the proper place to relate these biographies? –, one may wonder what a systematic study of Athens and the Athenians in the *Periegesis* would reveal. How philo-Athenian would Ego reveal himself to be? We hope to explore this and other questions regarding the presentation of Athens and the Athenians in the *Periegesis* in a future study.

[72] IX 6.5.

[73] IX 6.5f.

[74] IX 40.7. According to Diodorus Siculus (16.86.6) Philip did erect a trophy.

[75] IX 40.7–9.

The narrator continues, 'as one approaches' (προσιόντων) the city of Chaeronea there was a monument commemorating the battle, viz. the common grave of the Thebans who were slain in the battle. On this grave was a lion, but no inscription.[76] The narrator speculates – note 'I think' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν) – that the reason why there was no inscription is that the daring of the Thebans was not matched by their fortune. Is one to read anything into the narrator's juxtapositioning of these monuments, beyond what is explicitly stated in the text? It would appear as if the narrator is trying to present Philip, and the other Macedonian rulers, as being more willing to come to a peaceful understanding with their conquered enemies than the Romans. Further, it appears as if he is suggesting that any such attempt at a peaceful coexistence was thwarted by the Greek stubborn resistance, until the Macedonians were replaced by the Romans, who imposed their order on the Greeks. This was an order that proved to be lasting – perhaps because the Romans did not let their conquered enemies forget that they had been conquered.

9.5 The Lamian war

The Lamian war is treated with small interest in the *Periegesis*. It is rarely mentioned and, when it is, participation or non-participation is mostly noted only in a few words. However, unlike the battle of Chaeronea and the other conflicts discussed so far in the present chapter, there is a narrative about the Lamian war, albeit a rather short one.

In the *Attica*, when sketching the historical background to the feats of Olympiodorus, there is a short narrative of the Lamian war. It is characterised as a revolt instigated after the death of Alexander by the Athenians who could no longer bear the thought of the Greeks being subject to the Macedonians.[77] Most of this narrative about this war is taken up by a catalogue of those Greeks who joined the Athenians in the revolt: Argos, Epidaurus, Sicyon, Troezen, Elis, Phlius, Messene; outside the Peloponnesus the Locrians, the Phocians, the

---

[76] IX 40.10.

[77] I 25.3. On the events of the Lamian war, cf. e.g. Schmitt 1992, and, with an Athenian focus, Habicht 1997: 36–42.

Thessalians, Carystus and Acarnanians belonging to the Aetolian Confederacy; the Boeotian non-participation will be discussed in greater detail presently.[78] Next the narrator explains the structure of command, with special focus on why Leosthenes of Athens was given the supreme command, viz. the reputation of the city and the fact that he was considered to be experienced in war.[79] An equal amount of space is devoted to relating Leosthenes' benefaction to all Greeks, i.e. his saving of Greek mercenaries to Greece when Alexander planned to settle them on Persian land.[80] Though performing even more brilliantly than expected, he was reportedly the cause of the Greek failure, since his death made the others lose heart.[81] The only consequence of the Lamian war mentioned in the *Attica*, is the fact that a Macedonian garrison was brought into Athens.

The narrative of the Lamian war in *Attica* may be compared with the mentions of it in the other books. Not a word is said about the Lamian war in book II, in spite of the fact that a number of communities treated in that book participated in the war and are enumerated in the *Attica* as participants; nor is their participation mentioned in any other book of the *Periegesis*. As it was discussed above, the Messenians and Eleans did not fight at Chaeronea because of an alliance with Philip, but they were present on the Greek side in the Lamian war. They are enumerated in the list of participants in the *Attica*, and in the introductions of the *Messeniaca* and the *Eliaca* their respective participation is brought up again. In both introductions, the Lamian war is called the war fought 'after the death of Alexander', probably in order to emphasise the fact that the obligations that had been in force during the previous conflict, preventing them from participating in the battle of Chaeronea, had now expired.[82]

The Arcadians, who, like the Messenians and the Eleans, had not participated in the battle of Chaeronea, did not fight in the Lamian war, unlike the Messenians and the Eleans.[83] The Achaeans, too, belong to the absentees – 'they say that they did not' (οὔ φασιν) participate in the Lamian war, since they

---

[78] I 25.4.

[79] I 25.5 πόλεώς τε ἀξιώματι καὶ αὐτὸς εἶναι δοκῶν πολέμων ἔμπειρος.

[80] *Ibid*. It is because of this feat that Leosthenes is listed among the benefactors of the whole of Greece, cf. VIII 52.5.

[81] I 25.5; cf. also III 6.1.

[82] IV 28.3 Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ ἀποθανόντος and V 4.9 ἀποθανόντος δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου.

[83] VIII 6.2 and 27.10.

had not yet recovered from Chaeronea.[84] As mentioned above, the narrator does not have a word to say about the Lacedaemonian absence in the Lamian war.

Thebes did not exist in the time of the Lamian war, and therefore participation on their part is not to be expected, nor is the war mentioned in the introduction to Thebes. But the actions of the Boeotians are interesting. According to the narrator, they not only did not participate on the Greek side, they also supported the Macedonians with all their might.[85] Why? The *Periegesis* provides an answer. When Alexander of Macedon lay Thebes waste, the land was allotted to the Boeotians. Therefore, from the Boeotians' standpoint, Greek success against Macedon was undesirable, since it might entail a refoundation of Thebes and hence loss of land on the Boeotians' part. Therefore they joined in with the Macedonians. What is most interesting, is that Ego does not appear to have any problems in grasping this their interest in looking after their own mundane needs without a thought of the Greek collective.[86] That is, the Boeotian choice of sides is simply reported as a fact on which the narrator apparently does not feel any need to comment, at least there is no commentary.

Though many Greek communities united against the Macedonians during the Lamian war, not all participated on the Greek side, some even fought with the Macedonians. This notwithstanding, the Lamian war is occasionally spoken of as an affair in which all Greeks participated or which affected all Greece.[87] This is not the case in the main narrative of the war, where the inaccuracy of such a description would have been immediately obvious. One may wonder whether such hyperbolic language is a sign of the narrator's thoughtlessly following a tradition favourable to Athens (the whole of Greece rallied under

---

[84] VII 6.5 ἐς δὲ τὴν Θεσσαλίαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς Λαμίᾳ καλούμενον πόλεμον οὔ φασιν ἐκστρατεύσασθαι, οὐ γάρ πω μετὰ τὸ πταῖσμα ἀνενηνοχέναι τὸ ἐν Βοιωτοῖς. The wrestler Chilon was present as a sole representative of the Achaeans. Compare VI 4.6f., too, where the narrator speculates whether Chilon participated in the battle of Chaeronea or the Lamian war; in VII 6.5 he knows the answer.

[85] I 25.4 ἐς ὅσον ἧκον δυνάμεως τὰ Μακεδόνων ηὖξον.

[86] *Ibid.* Cf. also Diodorus Siculus 18.11.3f.; there the same explanation is given, but in more words.

[87] I 1.3, VI 5.3, VII 10.4.

the leadership of Athens), or whether it is an ironic twist underlining the demonstrable falseness of his sources.[88]

Be that as it may, in the end it was not the failure of one or two communities to participate in this war that caused its disastrous effects for Greece. According to the *Periegesis*, what proved fatal were traitors from the inside. In the list of Greek traitors inserted into the history of the Achaean Confederacy, the narrator explains that the Macedonian commander Antipater, being in a hurry to cross over to another war in Asia,

> … ἐβούλετο εἰρήνην ἐν τάχει συντίθεσθαι, καί οἱ διέφερεν οὐδὲν εἰ ᾿Αθήνας τε ἐλευθέραν καὶ τὴν πᾶσαν ῾Ελλάδα ἀφήσει.
> … wanted to conclude a peace quickly, and it did not matter to him whether he set both Athens and the whole of Greece free.[89]

Nevertheless the effects of the Lamian war were worse than those of the battle of Chaeronea: a Macedonian garrison was brought into Athens and many of the other cities, as a precautionary measure against future revolts. Demades and other treacherous elements in Athens are said to have persuaded Antipater to take such measures. As evidence for the allegation, the narrator cites (βεβαιοῖ μοι) the fact that the effects of the battle of Chaeronea on Greece were not nearly as severe as the effects of the Lamian war. For example, despite much heavier losses at Chaeronea than during the Lamian war, the Athenians were not made subject to Philip after Chaeronea.[90]

9.6 The Gauls

Unlike the other wars and conflicts discussed so far in this chapter, there are actually not only one, but two, narratives of the invasion of the Gauls, one in the first book, the other in the last book of the *Periegesis*.[91] The two narratives

---

[88] *Contra* Bearzot 1992: 47–68, who stresses the philo-Athenian, anti-Macedonian, and Panhellenian character of the narrative more than the *Periegesis* permits.

[89] VII 10.4.

[90] VII 10.5.

[91] I 4 (initiated in I 3.5 from a painting of Callippus who led the Athenians to Thermopylae) and X 19.5–23.14 (initiated in X 19.4 from Galatian shields, dedicated by Aetolians and

about the Greek resistance against the Gauls are not identical the one to the other, the most obvious difference being the fact that the second narrative is more extensive. The second narrative is introduced with the following words:

> Γαλατῶν δὲ τῆς ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐπιστρατείας ἔχει μέν τινα μνήμην καὶ ἡ ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἡμῖν τὸ Ἀττικὸν συγγραφή· προάγειν δὲ ἐς τὸ σαφέστερον τὰ ἐς αὐτοὺς ἠθέλησα ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐς Δελφούς, ὅτι ἔργων τῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους τὰ μέγιστα Ἕλλησιν ἐνταῦθα ἦν.
>
> My narrative dealing with the *bouleuterion* in Athens contains some mention of the expedition of the Gauls against Greece. But I wanted to develop the matter concerning them in more accurate detail in the narrative about Delphi, since the greatest of the Greek feats against the barbarians took place here.[92]

That is, by cross-referencing, the narrator reminds the readers of the first narrative about the invasion and explicitly connects the second narrative to the first one. The narrator goes on to explain that 'I wanted' to treat the matter in greater detail in the description of Delphi, since the greatest feats were performed there, i.e. this is the proper place to introduce a narrative about the invasion. In the narrative in the *Attica* there is no indication suggesting that Ego would consider any other context to be more proper than the one in the *Attica* for a narrative about the invasion of the Gauls. One may therefore wonder when Ego decided/realised that he wanted to narrate the invasion in connection with the description of Delphi, too. It seems to have been a decision reached by Ego after careful deliberation, as he became increasingly aware of the fact that the previous narrative was a distorted rendering of the events.[93] It may be that the

---

hanging on the temple of Apollo). Both in books I and X, the accounts of the invasion are distinguished by comparisons of this invasion with the Persian wars and imitation of Herodotus, cf. Nachtergael 1977: 19–22, 147–150 etc., Alcock 1996: 256f., and Ameling 1996: 145–158. These scholars moreover all argue that a tendency to promote the memory of Athens distinguishes both narratives; we argue that this is the case in the first narrative, but not in the second one. As always, our chief concern is not historical accuracy, but the presentation of history; therefore the historical problems with these two narratives will not be discussed in the following.

[92] X 19.5.

[93] In Delphi, before the shields from which the narrative of the resistance against the Gauls is initiated, the narrator has had occasion to mention three separate monuments commemorating the Aetolians for their feats against the Gauls (X 15.2, 16.4, 18.7); there is no mention of any monument erected by the Athenians or for the Athenians. Is it a reflection of the way things

narrator particularly wishes to rectify the impression his account in the *Attica* may have given of the Athenian contribution to the resistance.[94]

Regarding these two accounts one may also wonder why they are both in the *Periegesis*. Could the first narrative no longer be removed, i.e. had the first book been published before the rest of the *Periegesis*, so that the narrator could not make any changes in it?[95] Alternatively, after deciding that the description of Delphi was a suitable place for a narrative about the invasion, did the narrator deliberately let the first narrative stand without any changes, thereby inviting the reader to compare and contrast the two? A decisive solution to that problem is not forthcoming. However, it would appear as if Ego was dissatisfied with the presentation of the matter in the *Attica*. Apart from the extent of the second narrative, it is no different from other corrections that the narrator inserts when he discovers that his previous accounts are not satisfactory in the light of new evidence.

For present purposes a thorough comparison between the two narratives of the Galatian invasion would be too extensive. For now it will be enough to concentrate on the lists of participants on the Greek side in the two narratives. In the first narrative the resistance against the Gauls appears to have been, if not an exclusively Athenian affair, then at least mobilised on the Athenians' initiative. The narrator explains that, because their wars against the Macedonians had drained them of their strength, the majority of the Greeks did not care to come to defend Greece against the incursion of the Gauls.[96] This was, however, not the case with the Athenians:

> Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ μάλιστα μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπειρήκεσαν μήκει τοῦ Μακεδονικοῦ πολέμου καὶ προσπταίοντες τὰ πολλὰ ἐν ταῖς μάχαις, ἐξιέναι δὲ ὅμως ὥρμηντο ἐς τὰς Θερμοπύλας σὺν τοῖς ἐθέλουσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἑλόμενοι σφίσι τὸν Κάλλιππον τοῦτον ἡγεῖσθαι.
>
> Of the Greeks, the Athenians were most exhausted because of the length of the Macedonian war; though they for the most part had suffered defeats in their battles,

---

were or is the narrator deliberately blanking out the Athenians? The former alternative is probably the case, if indeed the second narrative is to be read as a corrective to the first one.

[94] *Contra* e.g. Ameling 1996: 145–158, cf. also n. 91 above.

[95] As suggested by e.g. Frazer 1898, I: xviif., who takes the two narratives about the invasion of the Gauls as strong evidence for the argument that the *Attica* was published separately.

[96] I 4.1.

they nevertheless were eager to march out to Thermopylae with those of the Greeks who were willing, having chosen this Callippus to command them.[97]

In other words, weakened though they may have been, the Athenians were nonetheless prepared to offer resistance against outsiders. In order to give prominence to the Athenian contribution in the fighting, the narrator keeps the other Greeks anonymous until the Athenians drop out of focus as the saviours of the Greeks, who lost the battle against the Gauls.[98] Exit the Athenians and the anonymous Greeks, enter the Delphians, Phocians and Aetolians who rally to defend Delphi against and, with the help of the gods, drive away the Gauls from Delphi.[99]

In the longer second narrative, this picture of the Greek defence dependent upon Athens is corrected. We now learn that Boeotians, Phocians, Locrians, Megareans, Aetolians, Athenians, as well as mercenary troops from Macedon and Asia fought to defend Greece at Thermopylae.[100] Here we learn that the contribution of the Aetolians was the greatest. We are moreover reminded of the fact that the Athenians were led by Callippus – 'as I set forth in the previous part of my narrative' – and we are told that they were given the command owing to the ancient repute of the city.[101] The narrator does seem to have problems with making this statement tally with the following narrative. The Athenians are certainly said to have surpassed the other Greeks in bravery in the first encounter with the Gauls at Thermopylae.[102] But after that they play a very minor part in the defence.[103]

Not all those who initially gathered at Thermopylae were, however, present throughout the whole conflict. When the Gauls had broken through the

---

[97] I 4.2. τοῖς ἐθέλουσι is an emendation proposed by Clavier 1814–1821 and accepted in the editions of Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910 and Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990; the manuscripts read τοῖς ἐλθοῦσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ('those of the Greeks who came'). Regardless of which reading one chooses to follow, the Athenians appear to be the ones taking the initiative.

[98] I 4.3f. οὗτοι μὲν δὴ τοὺς Ἕλληνας τρόπον τὸν εἰρημένον ἔσωζον κτλ.

[99] I 4.4. In 4.5f. the narrator briefly tells about the Gauls in Asia Minor.

[100] X 20.3–5.

[101] X 20.5 ἡγεμονίαν οὗτοι κατ' ἀξίωμα εἶχον τὸ ἀρχαῖον.

[102] X 21.1–6, esp. §§5f. with an opinion on the Athenians.

[103] Explicit mention in X 22.12.

defences at Thermopylae, most of the Greeks, including the Athenians, scattered to their hometowns.[104] For the defence of Delphi, the second crucial battle during this invasion according to the *Periegesis*, only Phocians and Aetolians were present.[105] When the battle had been won and the Phocians were pursuing the defeated enemy, the Athenians, together with Boeotians, joined the forces again upon discovering that the enemy was on the run. Eventually also Aetolians, Thessalians and Maleans joined in the pursuit of the Gauls, who were so hard pressed that not one of them got home alive.[106]

Before leaving these two narratives, mention must be made of two further passages in the second narrative. In these the narrator twice touches upon communities which collaborated with the Gauls. First he tells us that, ordered by the Galatian commander, those living around the Malian gulf bridged the river Spercheus quickly out of fear and a desire to get rid of the barbarians who were ravaging their land.[107] Later the narrator notes that, at Thermopylae, the Gauls were able to overcome the Greeks defences, thanks to the Heracleots and Aenianians who led barbarian troops along the same path that Persian troops had been led centuries ago – the narrator himself points to the parallel with the Persian wars.[108] The narrator explains that these Greeks did not lend help to the foe because of any ill-will towards the other Greeks. The reason was instead the prospect of a favourable outcome for themselves – they got rid of the barbarians who were ravaging their land. In other words, in this narrative about the defence of Greece against an invasion from the outside, the narrator presents Greeks as collaborating with the enemy in two passages. In neither of these passages is there any explicit censuring of the collaborators. In the latter of the two passages there is instead the following interesting concluding remark:

καί μοι φαίνεται Πίνδαρος ἀληθῆ καὶ ἐν τῷδε εἰπεῖν, ὅς πάντα τινὰ ὑπὸ κακῶν οἰκείων ἔφη πιέζεσθαι, ἐπὶ δὲ ἀλλοτρίοις κήδεσιν ἀπήμαντον εἶναι.

---

[104] *Ibid.*

[105] X 22.13.

[106] X 23.11–13.

[107] X 20.8 οἱ δὲ ἤνυον τὸ ἔργον σπουδῇ, τῷ τε ἐκείνου δέει καὶ ἀπελθεῖν ἐκ τῆς χώρας σφίσιν ἐπιθυμοῦντες τοὺς βαρβάρους μηδὲ ἐπὶ πλέον κακουργεῖν μένοντας.

[108] X 22.8f., cf. also I 4.2.

> Pindar, in my opinion, spoke the truth again, when he said that every man is pressed down by his own misfortune, but insensitive to the troubles of others.[109]

This is a comment made by a Greek about both Greeks and people in general, quoted of by another Greek living many centuries later, when commenting on the Greek selfish concern for what is one's own and lack of solidarity for the plight of others. Neither the Heracleots and the Aenianians nor the Greeks in general are the only ones to safeguard what is their own rather than concerning themselves with the safety of others. It is a universal phenomenon which, though not commendable, is understandable.

The mentions of the defence against the Gauls in other contexts than the two narratives confirm the impression given by the lists of participants in these narratives: the battles against the Gauls were a concern for the more northern regions of Greece. In the historical introduction to book X we learn that the Phocians were the most eager to defend Greece.[110] The narrator relates the feat of the Phocians with their previous deeds, by explaining that they were driven by a desire to help the god of Delphi and, 'I think' (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν), to make amends for earlier transgressions, i.e. their plundering of the sanctuary during the third sacred war, which has been narrated in some detail previously in the introduction.

None of the states of the Peloponnesus participated in the battles against the Gauls. The narrator reminds the readers of this point repeatedly in the books on the Peloponnesus, beginning with the *Messeniaca* in which the Gauls are mentioned for the first time after the *Attica*. There it is said that the Messenians did not fight against them, since Cleonymus and the Lacedaemonians refused them a truce.[111] Similarly, 'they say' (φασι) that the Arcadians did not participate for fear that the Lacedaemonians might ravage their land in the absence of men of military age.[112]

---

[109] X 22.9; the allusion is to Pindar *Nem.* 1.53.

[110] X 3.4 Γαλάτας δὲ καὶ τὴν Κελτικὴν στρατιὰν προθυμότατα ἠμύνοντο Ἑλλήνων. Cf. also X 8.3 where it is explained that as reward for this their zeal they were given back their seat in the Amphictyony.

[111] IV 28.3 Γαλάταις δὲ μεθ' Ἑλλήνων οὐκ ἐμαχέσαντο, Κλεωνύμου καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων σπείσασθαι σπονδάς σφισιν οὐ θελησάντων.

[112] VIII 6.3 πρὸς Γαλάτας δὲ τοῦ ἐν Θερμοπύλαις κινδύνου φασὶ Λακεδαιμονίων ἕνεκα οὐ μετασχεῖν, ἵνα μή σφισιν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι κακουργοῖεν τὴν γῆν ἀπόντων τῶν ἐν

In the historical introduction to the *Achaica* we are told that the Achaeans stayed at home together with the rest of the Peloponnesians, and that both the Achaeans and all the other Peloponnesians had jointly decided not to take part in the defence. Since the Gauls did not have any ships, the Peloponnesians judged that they would be safe from them, if they walled off the Isthmus.[113] Before he leaves the subject matter, the narrator appears to hint at the ill-advisedness of the Peloponnesian decision by pointing to the fact that the Gauls went to Asia in ships.[114] That is, the Gauls obviously could get their hands on ships, and the Peloponnesians were thus not safe behind their wall.

There was, however, one exception to the Panpeloponnesian absence from the defence against the Gauls. There was one Achaean community willing to help the Greeks on the continent. The men of Patrae, 'alone of the Achaeans', came to the aid of the Aetolians.[115] The Odeum in Patrae, the one that 'is the most splendidly decorated one in Greece, except for the one in Athens', was built with spoils from this event.[116]

Thus, in the books on the Peloponnesus there are two co-existing explanations for the non-participation of the Peloponnesians, which both amount to the same. There was an insufficient, or even lacking, desire to help fellow Greeks against an enemy incursion, when it did not pose an immediate threat to one's own safety. It may be that such conduct is not laudable, but the narrator appears to understand the motives behind it – or at least, he does not appear to consider it deserving of reproachful comments. Moreover, in the wake of the Argives, Athenians, Lacedaemonians, and Thebans, Achaea is presented as rising to a position of power owing to the fact that they had preserved their strength during the earlier wars.[117] They had not experienced the devastating effects of war to the same extent as other Greeks, thanks to their policy, if it might be called so, of looking after their own interests.

ἡλικίᾳ.

[113] VII 6.7f.

[114] VII 6.8 Γαλάται ναυσὶν ὅντινα δὴ τρόπον διαβεβήκεσαν ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν κτλ.

[115] VII 18.6 Ἀχαιῶν μόνοι; cf. also X 22.6.

[116] VII 20.6. On the importance of this mention of the Odeum of Herodes Atticus in Athens in the *Achaica* for dating the first book and elucidating something about the process of the composition of the *Periegesis*, cf. above chapter 4.

[117] VII 7.1.

9.7 Summary

This chapter has been devoted to wars fought by more than one Greek community against others, i.e. the Trojan war, the Persian wars, the battle of Chaeronea, the Lamian war, and the defence against the Gauls. All these wars are brought up repeatedly in the *Periegesis*. The present study has been concentrated on those passages in which mention is made of whether a community participated or did not participate in one of these wars, and passages in which there is some kind of comment regarding this participation or non-participation. This study of the wars in question has been occasioned by the not uncommon view that the different communities treated in the *Periegesis* are judged according to where they stood during these wars, and it has been argued that such a view is not justified.

Considering the fact that not only participation but also in many cases non-participation in the wars discussed in this chapter is brought up in the historical notes, one may conclude that these wars have a special place in the *Periegesis*. The presentation through negation in the detailing of communities which did not participate in this or that war is interesting. Does such presentation indicate that the narrator expects the readers to consider participation in the wars to be expected, or that he himself had such expectations, or does it indicate that the narrator is contradicting claims made by unnamed informants? Whatever the answer to that question is, one may note that the non-participation is mentioned mostly without comment, or is occasionally even given some justificatory comment.

The justificatory explanations are occasionally accompanied by a 'they say that…' (φασι or λέγουσι).[118] 'They say' is an extremely frequently recurring turn of phrase in the *Periegesis*.[119] Principally 'they say' seems to be used in order to indicate that the information introduced in the text does not originate with the narrator, i.e. that it comes from some other source, such as tradition, common knowledge or the like. For the most part there is no specification as to

---

[118] IV 28.2, VII 6.5, VIII 6.3.

[119] On φασι(ν) and λέγουσι(ν) in the *Periegesis*, cf. above chapter 5.

who the 'they' are. This is the case with the 'they say' explaining why the Messenians did not fight at Chaeronea, the Achaeans at Lamia, or the Arcadians against the Gauls. Therefore we do not concur with Habicht in holding that 'Pausanias… details their [i.e. the absentees'] selfish considerations or their justifications.'[120] At least not without further definition of who 'they' are.

To these passages one may add others where even collaboration with the enemy is either passed without comment or even given justificatory comments uttered by the narrator himself. The Thebans fought with the Persians against the Greeks. According to the narrator the blame is to be put on the government under which they lived at the time. Moreover, it is added that the Athenians, too, would have been found fighting with the Persians, had their tyrants still been in power.[121] Setting the different purposes of the works aside, Pausanias' *Periegesis* and Plutarch's essay *On Herodotus' Malice* may be compared at least when it comes to the views on the history of Greece betrayed in them regarding matters like these. The *Periegesis* betrays no difficulty in believing that the Greeks were not able to set their differences aside, that they did not fight the foe to a man or that some chose to join the other side. Though not the best moment in the history of some communities, absence from the battles of the Persian war or even siding with the other side was believable. Plutarch does not accept the Herodotean account as easily as Pausanias does, indeed he questions it at every turn. His agenda is clearly not Pausanias'.

The case of Thebes is particularly illuminating. Plutarch tries to defend the honour of the medizing community by insisting on the duress under which the Thebans joined the Persian side and their initial show of resistance: witness his long argument regarding the battle of Thermopylae. And, *en passant*, Plutarch tries to cast suspicion on the thought of the Thebans siding with the Persians at Plataea. In the *Periegesis*, though the narrator knew about it, he does not insist on Theban presence on the Greek side at Thermopylae.[122] And in his historical introduction to Thebes, the narrator discusses only the battle at Plataea and states in no uncertain terms that the Thebans fought with the Persians; their

---

[120] Habicht 1985: 107.

[121] IX 6.1f. Significantly, both Habicht 1985: 107 n. 41 and Alcock 1996: 254 dispatch quickly of this passage.

[122] X 20.1. However, §2 makes it clear that the in the eyes of the narrator, the Thebans did not participate in the actual fighting against the Persians.

presence on the Greek side at Thermopylae is not mentioned. In the *Periegesis* the Thebans as a body are exonerated from blame, but in a manner that is quite different from Plutarch. Instead of questioning the veracity of Herodotus' account, the narrator not only appears to find it plausible, but also thinks it possible that the Athenians would have played the same part as the Thebans did, had their political circumstances been different, i.e. had they still been under the rule of tyrants.

Observing that the Heracleots and Aenianians – in order to get rid of them from their own land – helped the Gauls to overcome the Greeks at Thermopylae, the narrator comments, by way of allusion to Pindar, that personal misfortune is manifest to everybody, the troubles of others are not.[123] The same comment might apply to the Boeotians for their ardent support given to the Macedonians during the Lamian war. Indeed, it might be extended to a large part of Greek (military and political) history.

Only once, when the Arcadian defeat at Chaeronea by the Romans is glossed as their punishment for failing to join in the Greek cause against Philip of Macedon at Chaeronea, is non-participation in any of these wars spoken of in negative terms. However, as suggested above, the associations of the place may have prompted this rather uncharacteristic comment from the narrator.

When (and if) the Greeks faced an enemy from the outside, one could expect them to be united among themselves.[124] But in their past the Greeks did not manage to set their differences aside even on such occasions, at least as the history of Greece is retold in the *Periegesis*. That is, in the eyes of the narrator there does not appear to have been much unity of Greeks against others or otherwise in the history of Greece and, what is more, he does not appear to have been surprised at not finding it. Indeed, it is quite possible that one, perhaps even the, reason why the narrator so frequently speaks of Greeks who did not join in the fight against foreigners, is that he reacts against the myth of all Greeks united in the fight against Trojans, Persians, Macedonians, and Gauls.

---

[123] X 22.8f. Both Habicht 1985 and Alcock 1996 ignore this passage.

[124] Cf. Walbank 2002 *passim* and Dillery 1995: 41–58 for an interesting discussions on the particularism of Greeks in the classical period and the invitations to unity among the Greeks in the form of appeals to war against the barbarians.

10 Greeks and Romans

10.1 Introduction

Let us next turn to the subject matter of Greeks and Romans, after studying those of Greeks against Greeks and Greeks against Others. In spite of the fact that the Romans were the ones who in the end established a lasting rule over Greece, a discussion of the presentation of the Romans in the *Periegesis* cannot be fitted in under the heading 'Greeks against…'. Hence the 'and', instead of 'against' in the heading of this chapter.

Searching the *Periegesis* for evidence regarding the attitude or the opinion of Pausanias vis-à-vis the Romans is to look in the text for an answer that it cannot give, just as the *Periegesis* cannot give us answers on Pausanias' actual opinions regarding warfare between Greeks or failure to participate in wars against outsiders.[1] Therefore, just as in the two previous chapters we studied how wars between Greeks and Greeks and between Greeks and Others are presented in the *Periegesis*, so in this chapter the object of study is the presentation of the relations and interaction between Greeks and Romans (and Greeks and Greeks). Essentially, this will be a reexamination of how Romans are portrayed in the *Periegesis*.

As is always the case with the *Periegesis*, the narrator is markedly more interested in the past than the present. Particularly much space is given to an analysis of a part of the historical introduction to the *Achaica*, which is a narrative of the events that led to the Roman conquest of the Achaean Confederacy.[2] The historical accuracy in the narrative is, again, not of primary interest. What is of interest is the narration of the interaction between the

---

[1] Similar objections against many studies of text from the Second Sophistic are voiced by Whitmarsh 2001: 29f.

[2] VII 7.1–16.10.

Achaeans and other Greeks (mainly Lacedaemonians) on the one hand, and on the other the interaction between these two parties and the Romans. The whole narrative is taken into consideration, instead of merely selecting a few isolated passages. Hereby it becomes apparent that labelling the attitude of the narrator 'pro-/anti-Roman' is not quite satisfactory.

Apart from the narrative about the Achaean Confederacy, two further passages will be discussed in this chapter, both notorious bones of contention in the discussions on how to interpret the portrayal of the Romans in the *Periegesis*. These are VII 17.1–3 (Nero's declaration of freedom for the Greeks together with Vespasian's revocation of the same) and VIII 27.1 (κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων). We will also discuss briefly the narrator's failure to mention Flamininus' declaration of freedom for the Greeks.

10.2 The Achaean Confederacy and Rome

In this section, the narrator's presentation of the history of the Achaean Confederacy from its formation in 281/0 until its defeat by Rome in 146 BC will be considered. Here, as always in our study, the focus will not lie on history itself, but on the presentation of the actors – Greeks and Romans – in history. As mentioned above, the historical sources or historical accuracy of the narrative in the *Periegesis* is not of concern.[3] The point of departure is the narrative in the historical introduction to the *Achaica*,[4] but other parts of the *Periegesis* will be also considered when relevant. Much space is devoted to a recapitulation of the narrative of the events. In order not to alter the impression of narrative continuity, or to create a false impression of precision, we follow the narrator's practice of not giving any dates.[5]

---

[3] Studies of the historical accuracy in this narrative are e.g. Segre 1929: 483–488, Gruen 1976 and Lafond 1991, all with references to earlier studies. For general studies of approximately the period in question, cf. Gruen 1984 and Ferrary 1988 *passim* esp. 45–218.

[4] VII 1.1–17.4; in particular 7.1–16.10, where the history of the Achaean Confederacy is told.

[5] The only solid – though erroneous – date in this narrative is the date for the end of the war, cf. below. On the vague chronological markers in this (and other) narratives in the *Periegesis*, cf. Lafond 1991: 29f.

Of particular interest here are, of course, the dealings between Greeks and Romans. The part played by the Romans in the history of Greece was a complex one. As we know it – and as it is presented in the *Periegesis* – the Romans were not at the outset perceived as an external threat as much as a foreign power which the Greeks called upon for their own purposes.[6] Indeed, the Greeks not only used, but also abused the Romans in their own continuous struggles for power. Finally, the Romans had had enough, as will become evident from the following résumé of the narrative in the *Achaica*, and became a threat to the Greeks, but it seems that the Greeks themselves did not realise it until too late.

The narrator's first mention of the Romans in the *Achaica* is combined with a cross-reference back to the *Attica*, 'my narrative has already set forth…'[7] In the *Attica* the narrator gives a very short account of the Roman wars against Philip V of Macedon and his son and successor Perseus. The résumé is triggered by the tomb of Cephisodorus, a leading Athenian politician at the time. Probably under the influence of a eulogistic inscription on the tomb, the narrator appears to be suggesting that the Roman intervention and ultimately their defeat of Macedon would not have taken place without the Athenian appeals for help when their other allies failed them.[8] In the *Achaica*, too, the context in which the Athenians and the Romans enter the scene is the trouble with the Macedonians under Philip V.[9] Athenian and Aetolian appeals for help are presented as a reason why Rome sent forces to Greece, but here they are said to have had interest in the Macedonians previously, and the Athenians soon exit the narrative, after having received the requested help. The Roman general, Otilius, overstepped his orders and razed to the ground Hestiaea and Anticyra, two cities

---

[6] I follow the analysis of the process which ended in the Roman conquest of Greece as presented by Gruen 1984 *passim*, esp. 437–528. Although some objections have been raised against it, its value is evident, cf. e.g. Briscoe 1986, Morgan 1988.

[7] VII 7.7 ἐμνημόνευσε δέ μοι καὶ πρότερον ὁ λόγος ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι συγγραφῇ. The reference is to I 36.5f.

[8] I 36.5f. On Cephisodorus, cf. Habicht 1985: 92–94; cf. also Gruen 1984: 385f. on the (probably fictitious) multiplication of embassies to Rome from Greece in general and Athens in particular in the historiographic tradition.

[9] VII 7.4–6.

that had been forced to side with the Macedonians. The narrator reports that, on hearing about the doings of Otilius, the senate relieved him of his post.[10]

His successor Flamininus continued the campaigns against the Macedonians. During his siege of the Macedonian garrison in Corinth Flamininus sent messages to the Achaeans inviting them to join in the siege. The prospect of becoming Roman allies and the possibility to do an act of goodwill towards fellow-Greeks appear to have been the inducements in the Roman invitation.[11] After a debate at which both facts about the past and scenarios for the future were brought up, the Achaeans are said to have decided to accept the invitation. Corinth was taken, and the Corinthians, who had been members earlier too, joined the Achaean Confederacy.[12]

Summarising the state of affairs after these events, the narrator states that the Achaeans were allies of the Romans, and ready for anything. They followed them in campaigns against the Macedonians, Syrians under Antiochus ('the Great'), and Aetolians, out of friendship for the Romans, although, the narrator adds, they also had an ancient quarrel with the Aetolians.[13]

Leaving the relationship between the Achaeans and the Romans for the moment, the narrator turns his attention to the Greek affairs of the Confederacy. The Confederacy was in a state of growth. The Lacedaemonians, former (or persisting?) adversaries of the Confederacy, were incorporated into it.[14] Among the measures taken, the narrator tells about the walls of Sparta being torn down and the Lacedaemonian youth being prohibited from training according to the ancient Lycurgan *paideia*. For further information, the reader is referred forward to the *Arcadica*.[15] In the *Arcadica*, the narrator informs us of, among other things, the fact that the Romans restored the Lacedaemonian *paideia*.

---

[10] VII 7.7–9. This Otilius is probably to be identified with P. Villius Tappulus, cf. Lafond 2000 *ad loc*. VII 7.8. The evidence in the *Periegesis* on the doings of Otilius is 'clearly overblown and probably worthless', Gruen 1984: 207 n. 21.

[11] VII 8.1 συμμάχους τε ἀξιωθησομένους καλεῖσθαι Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἅμα εὐνοίᾳ τῇ ἐς τὸ Ἑλληνικόν.

[12] VII 8.1–3.

[13] VII 8.3f.

[14] In VII 7.3f. some of the Lacedaemonian warfare on Achaea is retold.

[15] VII 8.4–6, referring to VIII 51.1–3.

The harsh treatment of the Lacedaemonians had considerable effects not only on the relations between Achaeans and Lacedaemonians, but also on their relations to the Romans. In particular, the Achaean annexation of Sparta into the Confederacy appears to have been an almost inexhaustible source of controversies within the Confederacy, as will become evident in the following. Dissension between Achaeans and Lacedaemonians, which earlier had been resolved by military means, were now referred to Rome instead.

The narrator reports that in search of relief the Lacedaemonians turned for help to Metellus and other Romans who in the wake of their victory over Philip at Cynoscephalae were in the region on other business.[16] Though not the first embassy directed by either the Lacedaemonians or the Achaeans to Romans in the hope for support in their continuing rivalries and struggles for power on the Peloponnesus, this is the first one in a long series that is reported in the *Achaica*.[17] The Romans decided that something should be done about the Lacedaemonian situation, and asked the Achaean authorities to summon an assembly for the following purpose:

> … ἵνα ἐν κοινῷ διδάξωσιν αὐτοὺς ἠπιώτερον μεταχειρίζεσθαι τὰ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι.
> … in order that they might publicly instruct them to manage the Lacedaemonian matters more gently.[18]

The Achaeans refused to comply since Metellus did not have any official mandate, the narrator explains. Thus, the Achaeans missed an opportunity to learn how to rule.

When back in Rome, Metellus is said to have made many complaints 'not all truthfully' regarding this matter.[19] Those arguing that there is an anti-Roman thrust in the narrative in the *Achaica*, adduce among other things this phrase 'not all truthfully' as evidence for their position. Since it is not found in Polybius' account, it would seem that its presence in the *Periegesis* indicates

---

[16] VII 8.6–9. On the narrator's failure to mention Flamininus' declaration of freedom for the Greeks, cf. the next section of this chapter.

[17] On the Greek (ab)use of the Roman senate as a (reluctant and indifferent) tribunal in which to decide their local controversies, cf. Gruen 1984: 96–131.

[18] VII 9.1. Cf. also Gruen 1984: 481–485 on the diplomatic play from the Achaean annexation of Lacedaemon till the events reported in the *Periegesis*.

[19] *Ibid*. πολλὰ… καὶ οὐ πάντα [τὰ] ἀληθῆ.

that Pausanias is giving Polybius an anti-Roman slant. However, they forget that at this point Polybius' account as we have it is only an epitome.[20] Metellus' complaints were indeed not truthful, since – as is evident from the narrator's account – the Achaeans had not done anything wrong in refusing his request. However, Metellus was not the worst one. Two prominent Lacedaemonians, Areus and Alcibiadas, vented even more accusations. The narrator characterises them as 'unjust vis-à-vis the Achaeans'.[21] In the following, the narrator justifies this judgement by pointing out that they failed to show proper gratitude to the Achaeans who had restored them to Lacedaemon.[22] The senate resolved to send an embassy to Greece to settle the differences. After hearing hard words from the Achaeans, the ambassadors decided *inter alia* that the Lacedaemonians should be given the right to send embassies to Rome.[23] Both parties are said to have contested the judgement. New embassies were sent to Rome, a commission was formed anew, and a new settlement was made, which was something of a compromise for both parties.[24] For example, Lacedaemon was not absolved from the Confederacy, but the Achaeans were to let Lacedaemonian exiles return.

By their intrigues against the Achaeans, the Lacedaemonian returnees proved themselves a source of intensified troubles within the Achaean Confederacy. In particular they appear to have learned how to exploit the Roman senate.[25] By sending Messenians who had been exiled by Achaea to the senate in Rome, they managed to procure their return to Messene thanks to certain Romans. Though not gladly, the Achaeans are reported to have acquiesced in the decision. The measures the Lacedaemonians took against the Achaeans are an obvious instance of the use Greeks made of the senatorial authority – or should one say senatorial indifference for the Greek intrigues? – for their own ends. Apparently without knowing it, or at least without caring too much, the Romans let themselves be used as instruments in the struggles for

---

[20] Polybius 22.12.8; cf. Segre 1929: 484 and Lafond 1991: 40f.

[21] VII 9.2 τὰ δὲ ἐς Ἀχαιοὺς οὐ δίκαιοι.

[22] *Ibid*. Similarly, the Mantineans are judged unjust for not showing proper gratitude for earlier benefactions, cf. VIII 8.10 with Akujärvi 2005 *passim*.

[23] VII 9.3f.

[24] VII 9.5.

[25] VII 9.6f.

power between Greeks, and in the process they were alienating their ally, the Achaeans.

After these events, there is a break in the developments. The narrative break is clearly marked with a pause in the progression of the narrative. This pause in the narrative consists of a narratorial commentary revealing the narrator's opinion on the turn the events are taking in the narrative. It is introduced with the following comment:

> τολμημάτων δὲ τὸ ἀνοσιώτατον, τὴν πατρίδα καὶ ἄνδρας προδιδόναι πολίτας ἐπὶ
> οἰκείοις κέρδεσιν, ἔμελλε καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς κακῶν ἄρξειν, οὔποτε ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου
> παντὸς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐκλιπόν.
>
> The most impious of impudent deeds, to betray one's country and fellow-citizens for private gain, never left Greece, and it was to be the beginning of evils for the Achaeans too.[26]

With this remark, the narrator introduces his famous list of Greek traitors, men who, from the Persian wars to the Lamian war, have betrayed their fellow-citizens for personal gain. It should be noted that the traitors in question are not traitors of Greece, but traitors of their own communities, whether they betray them to other Greeks or to outsiders.[27] Rounding off the list with an echo of the introductory comment, the narrator marks it as a self-contained unit:

> οὕτω μὲν οὔποτε τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐπέλειπον οἱ ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ νοσήσαντες.
>
> Thus, men suffering from the disease of treachery never left Greece.[28]

Hereby the readers are again reminded of the fact that whereas traitors betrayed their own communities, they certainly were to be found all over Greece. Next,

---

[26] VII 10.1.

[27] Whom one reckons to be a traitor and whom not, depends, obviously, on the point of view from which the man and his deeds are viewed, and with which community one's alliances are. On this, cf. the discussion by Polybius 18.13.1–15.16 with protests against Demosthenes' Athenocentric (most clearly in Demosthenes 18.295f.) branding of many prominent politicians of his times on the Peloponnesus as traitors for their doing in their *poleis* what Demosthenes did in Athens, viz. looking out for the best interest of their own community. On historical and interpretational problems of the Polybian discussion on traitors, cf. e.g. Eckstein 1987 *passim*.

[28] VII 10.1–5, quote §5.

the narrator introduces Callicrates, the following influential Achaean politician. Before even mentioning his name, the narrator has branded this Callicrates as a traitor, after which he anticipates that Callicrates would be the one who made the Achaeans subject to Rome. By introducing the above quoted comment and enumeration of parallels the narrator emphasises that, although the Achaeans appeared already to have been in a difficult enough situation – with the Lacedaemonians and others opposing them – there was a turn for the worse when Callicrates entered the scene.

The Roman victory over Perseus and the Macedonians, which is characterised (with a Herodotean echo) as 'the beginning of evil' for the Achaeans, is used as the chronological startingpoint for the new development in the history of the Achaean Confederacy.[29] A board of ten was sent from Rome to settle things in Macedon. Upon their arrival in Greece Callicrates is said to have fawned upon them and managed to win over one man, who was 'in no wise eager for righteousness', on the committee.[30] According to the narrator, Callicrates persuaded this Roman to attend a meeting of the Achaean Confederacy; this meeting is reported with unusual detail, even containing direct speech, a very rare feature in the *Periegesis*.[31]

At the meeting, the Roman (who remains anonymous throughout) is said to have accused the Achaeans of helping Perseus with money and by other means during the war. The accusation is not as absurd as it might look, in the light of the fact that there indeed was not any wholehearted Achaean support for Rome in the conflict.[32] Earlier in the narrative the narrator has had occasion to mention Achaean loyalty to Rome, but, significantly, he does not say a word about what the Achaeans might have done during this last conflict.[33] The Roman is said to have promised to reveal the identity of the men he considered guilty after the Achaeans had sentenced them to death. This, of course, met with protests. When the Achaeans wanted names, the Achaean generals were accused *en masse* of

---

[29] VII 10.5 ἀρχὴ δέ σφισιν ἐγίνετο κακῶν Περσεὺς καὶ ἡ Μακεδόνων ἀρχὴ καταλυθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων. In §6 the background is sketched briefly. Cf. again Herodotus 5.97.3.

[30] VII 10.7 ἄνδρα οὐδαμῶς ἐς δικαιοσύνην πρόθυμον.

[31] VII 10.8–10. Direct speech occurs in the following passages IV 9.3, 12.6, 21.10 (*bis*), 22.4, 26.6, VI 10.2, 18.4, IX 13.2.

[32] Cf. Gruen 1984: 505–514.

[33] Cf. VII 9.7 and VII 8.3f.

sympathising with Perseus. 'This he said on Callicrates' instruction', the narrator adds.[34] One of the generals declared himself willing to stand trial in both Achaea and Rome. The Roman seized upon this opportunity, and 'sent for trial at a Roman court all those whom Callicrates accused of having sympathised with Perseus.'[35] The uniqueness of the event is marked by the concluding comment: such a thing had never before happened to the Greeks. Not even the most powerful of Macedonians had ever dragged Greeks who had opposed them to court in Macedon, but they had stood trial at the Amphictyony.[36]

Although the actual historicity of this account has rightly been called into question, the anti-Roman tone of it has been exaggerated by some scholars.[37] Roman authority and power certainly lay behind the execution of the action taken against the Achaeans, but the Roman(s) are throughout the account presented as a pawn in the hands of Callicrates. Callicrates had fawningly lured the Roman to the meeting, Callicrates supplied him with the names, and hereby Callicrates got rid of whomever he wanted, guilty or not.[38] Those singled out by Callicrates were sent to Italy. They were not given any trial since the senate regarded them as already judged guilty by the Achaeans. The episode is concluded with a short anticipation of the release of those who were still alive 15 years later, when the Romans considered that they had punished them enough.[39] With this, the Romans leave the scene for the moment.

The relations between the Greek communities come into focus. The narrator reports that a conflict arose on the Peloponnesus, a border dispute

---

[34] VII 10.9 ὁ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἔλεγεν ὑπὸ διδασκαλίᾳ Καλλικράτους.

[35] VII 10.10 ὁ δὲ ἐπελάβετο αὐτίκα ὁ Ῥωμαῖος τῆς προφάσεως, καὶ ὁπόσοις Καλλικράτης ἐπῆγεν αἰτίαν Περσεῖ σφᾶς φρονῆσαι τὰ αὐτά, ἀνέπεμπεν ἐν δικαστηρίῳ κρίσιν τῷ Ῥωμαίων ὑφέξοντας.

[36] *Ibid.* ὃ μή πω κατειλήφει πρότερον Ἕλληνας· οὐδὲ γὰρ [παρὰ] Μακεδόνων οἱ ἰσχύσαντες μέγιστον, Φίλιππος Ἀμύντου καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος, τοὺς ἀνθεστηκότας σφίσιν Ἑλλήνων ἐς Μακεδονίαν ἐβιάσαντο ἀποσταλῆναι, διδόναι δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἀμφικτύοσιν εἴων λόγον.

[37] E.g. Gruen 1984: 515f., with n. 168 and Lafond 1991: 41.

[38] VII 10.11 ... ὄντινα καὶ ἀναίτιον Καλλικράτης ἐθελήσειεν αἰτιάσασθαι.

[39] VII 10.11f. ἀποχρώντως κολασθῆναι σφᾶς ἡγούμενοι.

between Sparta and Argos.[40] A certain Gallus was sent from Rome to arbitrate the matter.[41] According to the narrator, this Gallus was arrogant and made a mockery of the Lacedaemonians and Argives in that he did not want to judge the case himself, but entrusted it to Callicrates, 'a scourge of all of Greece.'[42] Gallus' worst offence appears to have been the fact that he did not show due respect to the noble rivalries of two famous old cities:

> πόλεσι γὰρ ἐς τοσοῦτο ἡκούσαις ἀξιώματος καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅρων τῆς χώρας τὰ μὲν παλαιότερα ἐς οὐκ ἀφανῆ πόλεμον καὶ ἔργα οὕτως ἀφειδῆ προαχθείσαις… αὐτὸς μέν σφισιν ὁ Γάλλος ἀπηξίωσε δικαστὴς καταστῆναι…
>
> For he deemed it beneath himself to personally become their judge, although they were cities that had reached such a great reputation and had earlier been driven to a famous war and so unsparing deeds over the boundaries of their territory…[43]

The narrator explains that, in his time, Philip, son of Amyntas had shown his respect towards these noble cities by acting as arbitrator in their conflict.[44] Regarding this Gallus, the narrator further reports that he gave permission to the inhabitants of Pleuron to abandon the Achaean Confederacy.[45] In this regard the narrator adds that Gallus was ordered to separate as many members as possible from the Confederacy – this is a claim that does not appear to have any foundation in fact,[46] nor is it substantiated in the following narrative.

The next episode, too, reveals how unwilling the Romans were to get involved in the Greek quarrels. This is not the place to go into the details of the Oropus-episode.[47] In brief, the course of events as retold in the *Periegesis* was

---

[40] VII 11.1f. Although Sparta and Argos had disputed regarding land, Pausanias is probably mistaken here regarding the identity of one of the protagonists. Sparta's adversary was in this instance Megalopolis according to Polybius 31.1.6f. Cf. Gruen 1976: 50, with n. 37.

[41] On the identity of Gallus, cf. Bowman 1992 *passim*.

[42] VII 11.2 Καλλικράτει δὲ ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνδρὶ ἀλάστορι ἐπιτρέπει τὴν κρίσιν.

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] Cf. II 20.1, too.

[45] VII 11.3. The *Periegesis* is our only witness to this event, cf. Gruen 1976: 51.

[46] Cf. Gruen 1976: 51.

[47] VII 11.4–8. On the many problems in this part of the narrative, which has been characterised as being 'riddled with difficulties and implausibilities', cf. e.g. Gruen 1976: 51–53 and Lafond 1991: 31–33, both with references to previous studies.

as follows. When attacked by Athens, Oropus appealed to Rome. The senate found that the Oropians had been wronged, but they forwarded the matter to the Sicyonians (who were members of the Achaean Confederacy). Athens was fined heavily. Upon appeal to Rome, the fine was reduced. But a different sort of agreement was reached between Athens and Oropus, one which Athens, however, did not honour. When wronged again, the Oropians this time turned to the Achaeans for help; they had presumably now learned that Rome was not interested in getting too involved in Greek strife. What is of interest for our present purposes is the degree to which Rome again is presented as avoiding getting too involved in yet another Greek territorial conflict. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that the narrator this time reports the matter without any comment.

The Oropus-episode appears to have aggravated the situation in the Achaean Confederacy, according to the narrator's presentation of the matter. The Oropians bribed Menalcidas, one of the leading men of the Confederacy, in the hope that they would get help from him. Menalcidas promised a part of the bribe to Callicrates for co-operation, but when he got the money, he did not want to part with any of it. In retaliation, Callicrates accused Menalcidas of wanting to detach Sparta from the Confederacy. Menalcidas gave some of the money to his successor, Diaeus of Megalopolis, and thereby got rid of the accusation. Diaeus was held responsible for Menalcidas' acquittal. He in his turn averted attention from himself by directing it towards a conflict with Lacedaemon.[48]

Although the line of causation as represented in the *Periegesis* is not quite accurate, the end result is: a territorial conflict between Achaea and Sparta threatening to escalate into open war.[49] Both are said to have turned to Rome for support. As on previous occasions, the decision eventually taken in Rome was to send a commission to Greece in order to decide the matter. Before the arrival of the commission, the Lacedaemonian leader had had the opportunity to deceive his compatriots and the Achaean leader his compatriots by saying that the senate had supported their respective claims.[50] The fact that the Lacedaemonians and the Achaeans were able to give quite different

[48] VII 11.7–12.3.

[49] Cf. Gruen 1976: 53–55.

[50] VII 12.4–9.

275

interpretations of the senate's reply, may betoken the vague and non-committal character of the senatorial reply rather than the deceitfulness of the Greek politicians.[51] It is, however, significant that the narrator again presents the Greeks rather than the Romans in an unfavourable light.

Out of this controversy war did break out between Achaea and Lacedaemon.[52] Roman envoys in the area on other business, in vain exhorted the Achaeans to await the arbitrators who had been sent from Rome. Damocritus and the Achaeans defeated but did not crush the Lacedaemonians. According to the narrator, the next Achaean general, Diaeus, agreed to await the Roman arbitrators, but strove to provoke the Lacedaemonians into war. He succeeded both in provoking the Lacedaemonians and in defeating them. Finally, when Achaea had fought and won the war, the embassy from Rome arrived, headed by (L. Aurelius) Orestes. At an assembly convened in Corinth, Orestes conveyed the following message:

> … ὡς δίκαια ἡγοῖτο ἡ Ῥωμαίων βουλὴ μήτε Λακεδαιμονίους τελεῖν ἐς τὸ Ἀχαϊκὸν μήτε αὐτὴν Κόρινθον, ἀφεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ Ἄργος καὶ Ἡράκλειαν τὴν πρὸς Οἴτῃ καὶ Ὀρχομενίους Ἀρκάδας συνεδρίου τοῦ Ἀχαιῶν.
>
> … that the senate found it just that neither the Lacedaemonians nor the Corinthians should be members of the Achaean Confederacy, and that Argos, Heraclea by Oeta, and Orchomenus in Arcadia should be released from the Confederacy.[53]

Upon hearing the message, uproar broke out. Despite Orestes' protestations and reminders that they were initiating hostilities towards Romans, the Achaeans did not even spare Lacedaemonians who had fled to Orestes' quarters. When the situation calmed down, an embassy was sent to Rome. It turned back upon meeting a Roman embassy on its way to Greece.[54]

Judging from the narrative in the *Periegesis*, it seems as if Orestes' message was not expected. Indeed, its tone differs from the previous vague communications from Rome. It should moreover be noted that at least two of

---

[51] Cf. Gruen 1984: 96–131.

[52] VII 13.1–8.

[53] VII 14.1.

[54] VII 14.2f. Polybius 38.9.3–5 (and 38.10.1–5) informs us that this embassy from Rome mildly rebuked the Achaeans for their behaviour towards the Romans. Cf. Gruen 1976: 57–62 for a discussion on this reversal in attitude.

the communities mentioned in the declaration, viz. Sparta and Heraclea by Oeta, were very reluctant members of the Confederacy according to the *Periegesis*. One may wonder how enthusiastic the other communities mentioned were.

Thus far, according to the *Periegesis*, the primary adversary of the Achaean Confederacy had been other Greeks. However, as Critolaus was elected their next general, their hostility appears to have turned more and more towards the Romans. According to the narrator, Critolaus – in the grip of a 'bitter and irrational desire to make war on the Romans' – was the one responsible for the outbreak of war between Rome and the Confederacy.[55] Indeed, in the following narrative he is portrayed as actively working towards a war.[56] He deceived the arbitrators who had come to settle the differences between Achaea and Sparta; they returned to Rome with unfinished business. At a meeting of the Confederacy Critolaus is said to have persuaded the Achaeans, who were encouraged by a promise of help from Thebes, to go to war against Sparta and openly declare war on Rome. Interestingly, the reason for the Theban support of a war against Rome is specified as dissatisfaction with the settlements that Metellus had judged in favour of different communities wronged by the Thebans. Actually, the Achaeans declared war not on Rome but on Sparta; the Theban support was reasonably prompted by a desire to fill the holes in the state treasury resulting from the fines.[57]

According to the narrator, the senate decided to declare war on Achaea after news of the arrogant way in which their legates (once again) had been treated in Greece. While Mummius was mustering an army, Metellus, who was in Macedon, tried to solve the conflict by diplomatic means, offering the Achaeans peace if they would comply with the earlier senatorial dictum. The Achaeans rejected the offer, and laid siege on Heraclea – a city that wanted to leave the Confederacy and one of the cities that the senate had instructed Achaea to let go.[58] The Achaeans are thus presented as directing their military might against unwilling members of their Confederacy. That is, although not

---

[55] VII 14.4 δριμὺς καὶ σὺν οὐδενὶ λογισμῷ τὸν Κριτόλαον πολεμεῖν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἔρως ἔσχε.

[56] VII 14.4–7.

[57] Cf. Gruen 1976: 64 with n. 160.

[58] VII 15.1f.

mentioning it explicitly, the narrator makes it quite clear that the Achaeans were still acting as if there were no threat of intervention from Rome.

During their siege of Heraclea, the Achaeans are said to have received news that Metellus was approaching with an army. This appears to have been unexpected. Panic spread in the Achaean ranks. The Romans caught up with the fleeing Achaeans and defeated them.[59] The Achaeans took measures to hinder Metellus' advance, to no avail. The Roman advance continued, and Thebes and Megara were taken easily. This notwithstanding, the Achaeans, according to the narrator, once again rejected an invitation from Metellus to peace-talks.[60] As Metellus was succeeded by Mummius, the conciliatory tone from the Romans ceased; Mummius mustered his forces. The Achaeans, incited by an early success, were lured to take the initiative for a battle, which ended in complete disaster, in part due to incompetent leadership.[61]

As the Achaeans were defeated, Corinth was taken and razed to the ground; its remaining citizens were slaughtered or sold into slavery, its riches taken off as booty.[62] The Romans took punitive actions against those Greeks who had participated in the war, *inter alia* by imposing a tribute ($\phi\acute{o}\rho o\varsigma$). According to the narrator, some of the imposed penalties were remitted later. For example, fines were written off, viz. damages that were to be paid to other Greeks – the Boeotians were to compensate for damage done to the Heracleots and Euboeans, the Achaeans to the Lacedaemonians.[63]

The narrator concludes the account with an (erroneous) emphasis on the continuity of the order established by the Romans by the remark that 'yet down to my day' ($\check{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}$) a governor is sent from Rome.[64] The narrator

---

[59] VII 15.3–6, with a particularly detailed account of the fate suffered by an Arcadian contingent at Chaeronea, on which cf. above chapter 9.

[60] VII 15.7–11.

[61] VII 16.1–4.

[62] VII 16.7f.

[63] VII 16.9f. On the nature of the post-war settlement, cf. e.g. Gruen 1984: 523–527 and Kallet-Marx 1995: 57–96, both with discussions on the many problems of the account at this point; on the status and organisation of Greece after the war, cf. Kallet-Marx 1995: 42–56.

[64] VII 16.10. The practice of sending a governor to Achaia did not begin until much later, the provincialisation of Achaia does not appear to have set in until with the Augustan organisations c. 27 BC; cf. *OCD s.v.* 'Achaia'.

explains that the governor is called the governor of Achaia, not Greece, since the Achaeans were then the leaders of the Greeks.[65] Finally, the end of the war is misdated to the 160th Olympiad, i.e. 140–136 BC, the year when Antitheus was *archon* in Athens.[66]

To sum up, if the whole of the narrative in the *Achaica* is taken into account, it is hard to discern any anti-Roman tendency in it. The account of the Achaean Confederacy is a narrative of escalating quarrels and struggles for power between Achaeans and Lacedaemonians, implicating Romans more and more through the frequent appeals for arbitration. Suddenly, and quite surprisingly (if one is ignorant of history), the narrative is no longer about the inter-Greek quarrels, but about an invasion of Greece by foreign troops. Almost before it had even started, the war was over – a war that was fought not because of Roman aggression, and almost against their will.[67]

10.3 Flamininus' declaration of freedom

Though not mentioned in the *Periegesis*, Flamininus' declaration of freedom for the Greeks will be discussed briefly, before turning to Nero's famous declaration of freedom for the Greeks and Vespasian's infamous revocation of the same. The fact that the narrator does not mention Flamininus' declaration of freedom has been taken to be one of the indices of the fact that he considers the Romans as playing the role 'of conqueror, not of liberator' in the history of Greece.[68] It cannot be stated for a fact that this is not the reason why the narrator

---

[65] *Ibid.* καλοῦσι δὲ οὐχ Ἑλλάδος, ἀλλὰ Ἀχαΐας ἡγεμόνα οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, διότι ἐχειρώσαντο Ἕλληνας δι' Ἀχαιῶν τότε τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ προεστηκότων.

[66] If Hagnotheus is confused with Antitheus, the archon points to the year 140/139. Cf. Habicht 1985: 98 and Lafond 2000 *ad loc*. VII 16.9–10 (pp. 154f.) with references.

[67] In many respects this is the course of events as construed by Gruen 1976 and Gruen 1984 *passim*, esp. 437–528; cf. also the comments of Lafond 1996: 175. In other words, there is poor foundation for the assumption of Swain 1996: 340 that Pausanias' comments present 'a consistent picture of Roman intent.'

[68] Swain 1996: 335–340, quote p. 339; in his analysis of the narrative about the Achaean Confederacy in the *Periegesis*, Swain finds anti-Roman innuendo in it where there is only neutral narration. Cf. also Moggi & Osanna 2000 *ad loc*. VII 8.2.

passes by the declaration of freedom in silence. However, this is not the only possibility, for one certainly can suggest that there may have been other reasons for the omission, e.g. that the narrator considered a mention of it in the Achaean narrative out of place.

In Polybius' *History* and Plutarch's *Flamininus* there are rather long and graphic narratives of the event.[69] In both accounts, the Flamininian proclamation is cited. In this declaration, one can find one possible explanation for why it is not mentioned in the *Periegesis*:

> ἡ σύγκλητος ἡ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Τίτος Κοΐντιος στρατηγὸς ὕπατος, καταπολεμή-
> σαντες βασιλέα Φίλιππον καὶ Μακεδόνας, ἀφιᾶσιν ἐλευθέρους, ἀφρουρήτους,
> ἀφορολογήτους, νόμοις χρωμένους τοῖς πατρίοις, Κορινθίους, Φωκέας, Λοκρούς,
> Εὐβοεῖς, Ἀχαιοὺς τοὺς Φθιώτας, Μάγνητας, Θετταλούς, Περραιβούς.
> The senate of the Romans and Titus Quintius the proconsul, having overcome king
> Philip and the Macedonians, set free, without garrison, without tribute, and to follow
> their own laws the Corinthians, Phocians, Locrians, Euboeans, Phthiotic Achaeans,
> Magnesians, Thessalians, and Perrhaebians.[70]

That is, Flamininus liberated some communities that had been under Philip's sway, not Greece. Further, reading past the proclamation itself, it appears that this liberation of the communities agreed with some of them being handed over to a stronger power: for example, the Phthiotic Achaeans were given to Thessaly and Corinth to Achaea.[71] Moreover, only three of the eight communities mentioned in the declaration fall within the borders of Greece of the *Periegesis*.

Furthermore, such liberation of Greece, or rather Greek communities, was not quite as unusual as the reaction described by Polybius and in particular by Plutarch might suggest. The liberation of Greece or the freedom of the Greeks was instead something of a frequently used slogan with a lengthy pre-history in the propaganda of the various belligerents in the period after the death of

---

[69] Polybius 18.42–48 which includes an account of the deliberations preceding the proclamation (which is found in chapter 46) and the steps taken in order to execute it. Plutarch *Flamininus* 10–12, also includes a short account of the steps taken in order to execute it; however, Plutarch strives in particular to describe the outbursts of astonished joy at the proclamation.

[70] Polybius 18.46.5. The wording in Plutarch *Flamininus* 10.5 is nearly identical.

[71] Polybius 18.47.6–10.

Alexander.[72] The long background notwithstanding, the slogan had not – at least not to our knowledge – been used by a Roman before: 'if there was stunned surprise… among those who heard the announcement, it was not because the formula was new and unfamiliar to Greeks; rather… [it was] unexpected to hear the Hellenic slogans from the mouth of a Roman.'[73]

In fact, Plutarch's *Flamininus* bears witness to how common the formula was in these times. According to Plutarch, Antiochus ('the Great'), urged on and advised by the Aetolians, for lack of a better reason for crossing over to Greece, seized on 'to free the Greeks without them wanting it (for they were free)' as a policy and pretext for war.[74]

In the *Periegesis*, too, there is indirect evidence of propaganda of this sort. The historical introduction to Elatea is unusually rich as regards information on history after the death of Alexander the Great. Among other things, the narrator reports that the Elateans were not willing to defect from Philip and join the Romans. This was in spite of the promises of changes for the better – *inter alia* a return to their former form of government – made by Flamininus, who had been sent from Rome in order to free the whole of Greece.[75] It would thus appear that all Greece was not particularly interested in being liberated by Flamininus. His mission, moreover, was not to liberate all Greece, but those parts of Greece that needed liberating, i.e. those under Macedonian control – the problem was that not even all of these wanted to be liberated. Therefore, why should the narrator mention Flamininus' declaration of freedom for Greece in the Achaean narrative?

---

[72] On this, see Gruen 1984: 132–157, which is a very interesting chapter entitled 'Slogans and Propaganda: the "Freedom of the Greeks"'.

[73] Gruen 1984: 146.

[74] Plutarch *Flamininus* 15.1 … Αἰτωλῶν… ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ πολέμου καὶ πρόφασιν διδόντων ἐλευθεροῦν τοὺς Ἕλληνας, οὐδὲν δεομένους (ἐλεύθεροι γὰρ ἦσαν).

[75] X 34.4 τὸ γὰρ δὴ Ἑλληνικὸν ἅπαν ἐλευθερώσων ἀπέσταλτο ἐκ Ῥώμης. When defeated the Elateans of course suffered vengeance at the hands of the Romans.

10.4 VII 17.3–4 and Greek disunity

The narrative about the Achaean Confederacy in the *Periegesis* is rounded off with a comment on the state of Greece after the Roman victory. The narrator introduces it with the following famous remark:

> ἐς ἅπαν δὲ ἀσθενείας τότε μάλιστα κατῆλθεν ἡ Ἑλλάς, λυμανθεῖσα κατὰ μέρη καὶ διαπορθηθεῖσα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος.
>
> Then Greece sank into utter weakness, though from the very beginning it had been spoiled and ravaged in its parts by the deity.[76]

Next, there is a concise summary of Greek history with focus on the rise and fall of the successive leading communities of Greece, echoing a similar summary preceding the narrative about the Achaean Confederacy.[77]

The essence of these summaries may be interpreted as suggesting that the reason for the continuing gradual devastation of Greece was the lack of continuity and stability in the ruling power in Greece. Once the Romans had defeated the Achaean Confederacy, such continuity and stability presented itself, at least in the eyes of the narrator. He appears to believe that the Romans in their post-war settlement of Achaea/Greece, instituted more or less the same order of things in which Ego was still living, witness his statement that the Romans continued 'yet down to my day' (ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ) to send a governor of Achaia from Rome.

After the short exposé of the changing Greek ruling powers, the narrator next reports Nero's bestowal of the gift of freedom for the Greeks.[78] There are no details regarding the declaration itself in the *Periegesis*, but Plutarch specifies that Nero himself made the proclamation on the Agora of Corinth during the Isthmian games.[79] Nero's gesture was certainly grand, and it is

---

[76] VII 17.1.

[77] VII 17.1f. and 6.8f.; on these summaries, cf. above chapter 8.

[78] VII 17.3.

[79] *Flamininus* 12.13. The date is disputed, either 66 (soon after Nero's arrival in Greece) or 67 (right before his departure), cf. e.g. Levy 1991; cf. also Alcock 1994 for an interesting reconsideration of Nero's activities in Greece. Plutarch himself may have been a witness of the event, cf. Jones 1971: 17–19. The text of Nero's rather boastful declaration has been discovered in the wall of a church in Boeotia; for details and text with a translation and

acknowledged as such by the narrator, who even introduces Ego in commenting that 'as I considered' this deed of Nero's, 'it seemed to me' that Plato was right in that the greatest wrongs are committed not by ordinary men but by noble souls ruined by foul education.[80] However, the question is what the narrator thought about the consequences of this gift to Greece, with which Nero, after all, took away the stability in Greece established by the Roman rule. As soon as the Greeks had been set free, it appears that they began to do what they always had done best when free to do what they wanted: fight one another.

Indeed, not even under Roman rule did the Greeks manage not to be at odds with one another; bloodshed was avoided largely thanks to the Romans, but differences were latently smouldering. In the *Periegesis*, the narrator has an opportunity to tell about two conflicts during which at least some Greeks had to choose sides, viz. when the Mithridatic war and Augustus' fighting with Mark Antony spilled over into Greece. Significantly, in their choices the Greeks are presented as being guided by their antipathies or sympathies for other Greeks, not for the protagonists in the conflicts. The Thebans, for example, are said to have chosen to support Mithridates purely because of their friendship with Athens.[81] And all Arcadians, except for the Mantineans, supported Mark Antony, since the Lacedaemonians had chosen to side with Augustus in the civil war.[82] Indeed, it would seem as if the narrator envisions that most of the Greek world sided with Mark Antony because of the Lacedaemonian support for Augustus.[83] In other words, the narrator readily acknowledges the fact that inter-

---

commentary, see Holleaux 1888 (the discoverer of the inscription); also printed in *Syll.*[3] 814.

[80] VII 17.3 ἀπιδόντι οὖν ἐς τοῦτό μοι τοῦ Νέρωνος τὸ ἔργον ὀρθότατα εἰρηκέναι Πλάτων ἐφαίνετο ὁ Ἀρίστωνος, ὁπόσα ἀδικήματα μεγέθει καὶ τολμήματί ἐστιν ὑπερηρκότα, οὐ τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων εἶναι ταῦτα ἀνθρώπων, ψυχῆς δὲ γενναίας ὑπὸ ἀτόπου παιδείας διεφθαρμένης. The allusion is to Plato *Resp.* 491E.

[81] IX 7.4 Μιθριδάτῃ γὰρ καταστάντι ἐς τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον προσεχώρησαν Θηβαῖοι κατ' ἄλλο ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν οὐδέν, τοῦ δὲ Ἀθηναίων δήμου φιλίᾳ. The Elateans managed to keep out of the conflict, or they did at least not support Mithridates, for which they were rewarded with liberty by the Romans, cf. X 34.2 and 4.

[82] VIII 8.12 … Μαντινεῖς ἐμαχέσαντο ὁμοῦ Ῥωμαίοις, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο Ἀρκαδικὸν συνετάχθησαν Ἀντωνίῳ, κατ' ἄλλο μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν οὐδέν, ὅτι δὲ ἐφρόνουν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰ Αὐγούστου.

[83] IV 31.1 καί οἱ [*sc.* Ἀντωνίῳ] τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἄλλοι τε καὶ οἱ Μεσσήνιοι [οἱ] προσέθεντο, ὅτι ἐφρόνουν Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰ Αὐγούστου.

Greek differences guide the Greeks' choice of sides in conflicts that strictly speaking have nothing to do with their relations with one another.[84]

Thus, once the Greeks had been freed by Nero, their conflicts appear to have escalated. Because of these renewed quarrels, Vespasian revoked Nero's gift of freedom for the Greeks. Concerning the revocation, the narrator states the following:

οὐ μὴν Ἕλλησί γε ἐξεγένετο ὄνασθαι τοῦ δώρου· Οὐεσπασιανοῦ γὰρ μετὰ Νέρωνα ἄρξαντος ἐς ἐμφύλιον στάσιν προήχθησαν, καὶ σφᾶς ὑποτελεῖς τε αὖθις ὁ Οὐεσπασιανὸς εἶναι φόρων καὶ ἀκούειν ἐκέλευσεν ἡγεμόνος, ἀπομεμαθηκέναι φήσας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν.

But it was not granted to the Greeks to enjoy the gift. For, when Vespasian was emperor after Nero, they fell into civil strife, and Vespasian ordered that they should be both subject to tribute again and obey a governor, claiming that the Greeks had unlearned their freedom.[85]

How is one to interpret this statement? Commonly, it is interpreted as indicating that Pausanias cannot but agree with the measure taken by Vespasian, and that he agrees with Vespasian's statement that the Greeks had forgotten how to be free.[86] It is of course impossible to know what Pausanias thinks in this or any other matter; what we can do is to study the narrator's presentation of it.

In the present passage, it would seem as if the narrator in fact does disagree with Vespasian, but only in part. Whether or not he disagrees with the measure

---

[84] Herein the narrator differs significantly from Plutarch who in *De Herodoti malignitate* 868B–F sharply objects against Herodotus' report that some Greeks chose to side with the Persians out of their antipathy for other Greeks who had chosen to resist the Persians and vice versa.

[85] VII 17.4.

[86] Cf. Palm 1959: 67 'an der von Vespasianus verfügten Aufhebung des berühmten neronischen Freiheitsedikts scheint Pausanias keinen Anstoss genommen zu haben; eher scheint er sie als wohlbegründet aufgefasst zu haben', Heer 1979: 67 'Pausanias n'y trouve rien à contredire', Habicht 1985: 123 'Pausanias does not quarrel with Vespasian's measure… and he does not disagree with Vespasian's remark… all the Greeks (and Pausanias) could do about [Roman rule] was to resign themselves to it', Arafat 1996: 155 'the implication is that Vespasian was left with no choice, and that the Greeks were responsible for provoking their own disadvantage in this respect', and Jacquemin 1996: 35 'les Grecs, selon lui, méritèrent leur sort pour ne pas avoir su jouir de la liberté, puisqu'ils se livrèrent à la guerre civile'.

taken by Vespasian in order to master the situation, we cannot say – it is simply reported in a matter of fact way. However, it would seem as if the narrator does disagree with Vespasian's assessment of the situation, which was the reason why he revoked the gift of freedom, summarised in the comment 'the Greeks had unlearned freedom.' By inserting φήσας 'claiming that…', the narrator signals that the content of the statement (the Greeks having unlearned freedom) introduced with this verb of saying, though reported by him, does not originate with him. That is, he is merely reproducing – but not verbatim – somebody else's sentiments that the Greeks no longer knew how to be free from outside domination.

How is one to interpret the fact that the narrator takes care to signal that he is merely rendering sentiment that does not originate with him? It would appear as if the narrator is throwing Vespasian's comment in an ironical light, perhaps even a sceptical one. It is as if he were asking if Vespasian did not understand what it meant for the Greeks to be free. The comment introducing Vespasian's revocation of the gift of freedom for the Greeks – 'it was not granted to the Greeks to enjoy the gift' – now appears in a new light. Whereas one would have expected the narrator to have in mind the fact that the Greeks were not allowed to enjoy a peaceful coexistence free from outside dominion, he may actually be speaking about the fact that the Greeks were not allowed to fight one another as they were beginning to do when freed from outside dominion.

Thus, in the *Periegesis*, the reason why the gift of freedom was revoked is essentially presented as being due to an insufficient understanding of the Greek past.[87] The narrator appears to have easily accepted the ultimate cause behind Vespasian's revocation of Greek freedom, viz. civil war. He does however not seem to agree with Vespasian's comment that they had forgotten how to be free.

---

[87] Herein the account in the *Periegesis* differs from Philostratus' in *Vita Apollonii*. The narrator of the *Periegesis* does not question that civil strife ensued; according to Philostratus, Vespasian used discord as a false pretext in order to take the freedom away, whereas in reality Greece never had enjoyed such concord, cf. Philostratus *Vita Apollonii* 5.41 πάντα τε ἀνήβησε ξὺν ὁμονοίᾳ τῶν πόλεων, ὃ μηδὲ πάλαι ἡ Ἑλλὰς εἶχεν, Οὐεσπασιανὸς δὲ ἀφικόμενος ἀφείλετο αὐτὴν τοῦτο στάσεις προβαλλόμενος. On this passage in the *Vita Apollonii*, cf. Flinterman 1995: 117f. and 124–126.

10.5 VIII 27.1

Finally, we must consider a passage which has been the object of much discussion by scholars when trying to determine Pausanias' attitude vis-à-vis the Romans. The passage in question is the very first sentence of the historical introduction to the Arcadian city of Megalopolis. In its traditional interpretation of the text as transmitted by the manuscripts, this sentence appears to convey such hard condemnation of the Roman rule, that, when taken into account, it seems to place Pausanias rather squarely in the anti-Roman camp. The text transmitted in the manuscripts reads as follows:

> ἡ δὲ Μεγάλη πόλις νεωτάτη πόλεών ἐστιν οὐ τῶν Ἀρκαδικῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησι, πλὴν ὅσων κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων μεταβεβήκασιν οἰκήτορες.
>
> Megalopolis is the youngest city, not of Arcadia only, but of Greece, with the exception of those whose inhabitants have been removed by the accident of the Roman domination.[88]

There are some problems with the text of the paradosis. The most severe problem is the lack of the definite article in the prepositional phrase κατὰ συμφοράν. In order to interpret the phrase as in the above quoted translation, an article is needed in the Greek to mark definiteness. Another problem is the harsh condemnation of the Romans inherent in the above interpretation of the passage.

For both linguistic and interpretational reasons an emendation has been suggested, viz. changing the phrase from κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων to κατὰ συμφορὰν ‹ἐπὶ› ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων.[89] By way of this insertion of the preposition ἐπί, συμφοράν and the genitive phrase are no longer interrelated with one another. Instead, we have two prepositional phrases, one stating the circumstances and the other the time of the event in question. That is, in this reading of the text the catastrophe because of which people moved was not that of Roman rule, but it was some unspecified catastrophe (presumably some natural disaster) occurring during the time of Roman rule. This would give a translation like '… par suite des circonstances, sous la domination romaine…'[90]

---

[88] VIII 27.1. The above translation is that of Jones 1918–1935.

[89] Palm 1959: 72–74. The emendation was first suggested by Clavier 1814–1821 *ad loc*.

[90] Jost 1998b *ad loc*.

The change in the text has been accepted in the latest Teubner and Budé editions of the *Periegesis* and by other scholars – mainly, of course, by those who, like Palm, tend to interpret the author of the *Periegesis* as having a rather positive attitude towards the Romans.[91] The emendation has not been accepted unanimously.[92] The emendation abolishes the only passage in the *Periegesis* which contains what might be interpreted as an outright condemnation of Roman rule in Greece. Although the tone of the passage seems awkward at first sight when compared to other non-hostile passages on the Romans, one must be careful not to change the text too hastily. Caution is called for particularly when the change has been advocated by scholars who are trying to interpret Pausanias' and other Greeks' attitudes to the Romans in a more positive light.

The interpretation of the present passage as expressing hostility towards the Romans or not does not necessarily depend on the insertion of the preposition ἐπί. Recently the paradosis, too, has been given a more neutral interpretation.[93] The gloss συμφορά, being derived of the verb συμφέρω, does not only have the more or less pejorative meaning of 'event, chance, (mis)hap' etc., but also the more concrete meaning of 'bringing together, collecting' or 'contribution'.[94] The latter meaning occurs less frequently than the former, but there are some examples of it in near contemporaries of Pausanias such as the sophist Polemon and the medical author Aretaeus. Therefore, opting for the rarer meaning of συμφορά, the passage may be given the following translation:

> … with the exception of those in which the inhabitants were transplanted with a contribution by the Roman government.[95]

---

[91] Rocha-Pereira 1989–1990 *ad loc.*, Casevitz 1998 *ad loc.*, cf. also e.g. Habicht 1985: 119f.; Arafat 1996: 202; Jones 1996: 460; Auffart 1997: 222; and, with some variations, Marcotte 1988: 74–78 and Piérart 1998: 152–154, followed by Moggi 2002: 435–441 and 2003 *ad loc.*

[92] Cf. Bearzot 1992: 19 n. 28; Swain 1996: 352–356; Bowie: 1996: 217 and (discussion with Bingen) 231–233; Sidebottom 2002: 497. Among the editors of the *Periegesis* that reject the proposed emendation may be noted Siebelis 1822–1828, Hitzig & Blümner 1896–1910, Spiro 1903, Jones 1918–1935, Papachatzis 1974–1981.

[93] Steinhart 2002 *passim*; cf. also Papachatzis 1974–1981 *ad loc.*

[94] Cf. LSJ *s.v.* συμφορά.

[95] Steinhart 2002: 149 '… außer denjenigen, bei denen die Bewohner mit einem Beitrag der römischen Regierung umgesiedelt wurden.' Steinhart's translation is rather similar to Papachatzis' 1974–1981 *ad loc.* translation into modern Greek: '… ἐκτὸς ἀπὸ τὶς πόλεις,

However, having recourse to a very rare signification of a key word in order to salvage an interpretation of a passage must be viewed with the same distrust as an emendation made in order to force an interpretation. Moreover, κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων may be given a more neutral interpretation without having recourse to either emendations or rare meanings of συμφορά.

To begin with, let us assume that the noun συμφορά bears its more commonly attested meaning, which is, generally speaking, 'something that happens', i.e. 'event' or, *in malam partem*, 'misfortune'. The interpretation of the present passage does not depend on whether συμφορά is interpreted *in bonam* or *malam partem*. What is important is the fact that συμφορά appears to be used of unexpected and/or unintentional events, whether good, bad or neither.[96] However, in the *Periegesis*, συμφορά is used predominantly *in malam partem*.[97] Crucial, too, is the interpretation of the function of the genitive ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων, which is obviously an attribute to κατὰ συμφοράν. Before deciding on how to interpret the genitive in the present passage, let us first examine how συμφορά is normally construed in the *Periegesis*.

There are 53 occurrences of συμφορά in the *Periegesis*. Not counting the present passage, in nine of these occurrences συμφορά is accompanied by a genitive complement. In all these instances, the genitive may be construed as an objective genitive, i.e. the genitive designates the one affected by the συμφορά.[98] If the paradosis of VIII 27.1 is to be given an anti-Roman interpretation, 'accident of the Roman domination', the genitive has to be given an interpretation that it does not have in any of the other occurrences in the *Periegesis*. That is, it is to be construed as a subjective genitive, as designating the source of the συμφορά instead of the party affected by it. Sometimes, in the

---

στὶς ὁποῖες ἐγκαταστάθηκαν κάτοικοι μὲ τὴ συμβολὴ τῆς ρωμαϊκῆς ἐξουσίας᾽.

[96] The prepositional phrase κατὰ συμφοράν is equated with κατὰ συντυχίαν by lexicographers, cf. e.g. *Suda* κ 688. In another passage (*Suda* ξ 110), it is explained that ξυμφορά is used by Thucydides about circumstantial, not intentional, misfortunes.

[97] Cf. Moggi 2002: 439.

[98] E.g. III 13.2 Μεσσηνίων δὲ αἱ συμφοραί; VII 15.5 ὡς δὲ τοῖς Φωκεῦσιν ἡ Κριτολάου συμφορὰ καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἀπηγγέλλετο; VIII 19.3 ἐπ' ἀνθρώπου συμφορᾷ ἀνευρημένον; X 7.3 ἔμελλε δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ κιθαρίζειν διδαχθέντι ἀχρεῖον τὸ μάθημα ὑπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς συμφορᾶς γενήσεσθαι. Cf. also V 5.5, VIII 33.4, X 1.6, 17.3, 17.12. Also observed by Moggi 2002: 439.

Periegesis συμφορά is accompanied by a modifier determining the source it. These modifiers are with only one exception prepositional phrases.[99] The exception is an adverb.[100]

Considering the above evidence it is highly unlikely that in VIII 27.1 the genitive is to be interpreted as anything other than as designating the party affected by the συμφορά. The passage should then be translated

> … with the exception of those whose inhabitants have been changed because of an event affecting the Roman government.[101]

Although Clavier proposed a change in the text, his translation is nonetheless very similar to the one above: '… à l'exception de celles qui ont changé d'habitants par suite des malheurs que l'empire romain a éprouvés.'[102]

If this interpretation is correct, what is the narrator referring to with this statement? He is obviously speaking of cities in Greece that were founded or synoecised in Roman times. There were a number of such cities in Roman Greece. In the *Periegesis* three of them are mentioned, viz. Corinth, Patrae, and Nicopolis.[103] In the present passage, the narrator is most probably alluding to all three of them. In other parts of the *Periegesis*, these three cities are explicitly

---

[99] I 10.3 εἰώθασι δὲ ἀνθρώποις φύεσθαι δι᾽ ἔρωτα πολλαὶ συμφοραί; I 14.7 ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς γενέσθαι τὴν συμφορὰν ἐκ μηνίματος τῆς Οὐρανίας; IV 24.3 οὐ γὰρ ἔδει συμφορὰν οὐδεμίαν Λακεδαιμονίοις ἔτι ἐξ Ἀριστομένους γενέσθαι; VII 7.1 αἵ τε ἐκ πολέμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς νόσου συμφοραὶ τῆς λοιμώδους οὐκ ἐς τοσοῦτο Ἀχαιοῖς ἐφ᾽ ὅσον τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησι. Cf. also VIII 33.4 and IX 40.4.

[100] VIII 49.2 ἐν Μεγάλῃ πόλει μετοικῶν κατὰ τὴν οἴκοθεν συμφοράν.

[101] 'The Roman government', for similar omission of the definite article, cf. e.g. III 11.4 ἀρχὴν τὴν καθεστηκυῖαν, cf. also IV 36.4, VII 7.4, and 24.2. A definite article is needed only if ἐπί should be inserted; Piérart 1998: 152–154, followed by Moggi 2002: 435–442 and 2003 *ad loc.*, printing ‹ἐπὶ τῆς› ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων.

[102] Clavier 1814–1821 *ad loc*. The interpretational difficulties inherent in this passage may be illustrated with the next editor after Clavier, Siebelis 1822–1828 *ad loc*. Siebelis rejects Clavier's insertion of ἐπί, and in his commentary he criticises the earlier interpretations of the passage, e.g. the translation of Sylburg: '… exceptis iis in quas post clades a Romano imperio acceptas coloni transmigrarunt'. Siebelis himself proposed to read πλὴν ἐς ἣν κατὰ συμφορὰν κτλ. and the translation 'excepta ea, in quam illo tempore quo imperii Romani mutatio facta est, incolae transierunt ex suis urbibus', which would refer to Nicopolis specifically.

[103] Cf. Alcock 1993: 132–145 on the founding of these cities.

spoken of as existing in the form they had at that time thanks to measures taken by Caesar and Augustus. Patrae and Nicopolis, especially, are explicitly said to have come into existence through synoecism.[104] The narrator is more vague when it comes to what kind of a settlement Corinth was. Once he calls the inhabitants of Roman Corinth ἔποικοι sent by Rome and twice 'those who got from the emperor' the city of Corinth.[105] Despite the undoubtedly pronounced Roman flavour in the three cities in question, the narrator does not in other contexts speak of them as being inhabited by Romans, or even by people sent from Rome. Particularly in the case of Patrae and Nicopolis, at least judging from the *Periegesis*, the Roman element appears to have been the organisatory initiative causing Greeks to leave their original homes and move together into a new city centre.

What, then, of the συμφορά affecting the Roman government because of which these cities were (re)founded? With this expression, the narrator probably refers to the transformation of the Roman government from republic to principate. According to the *Periegesis*, Caesar was the one who instituted the form of government under which he himself was living, i.e. Caesar was the first emperor, βασιλεύς.[106] Octavian/Augustus was his adoptive son and successor, and the one who secured the form of government instituted by his father.[107] Thus, in the light of the fact that the founding of Corinth, Nicopolis, and Patrae is presented as very much dependent on the initiative of Caesar and Augustus, the cities in question can indeed be said to have been founded because of an event affecting the Roman government. Had not the republic changed into principate, Caesar and Augustus would not have had the positions of power which enabled them to initiate the founding of the cities in question.

Consequently, giving VIII 27.1 a more neutral interpretation does not necessarily depend on a change in the text. Whether the interpretation suggested

---

[104] Nicopolis: συνοικισμός (V 23.3, X 38.4) and συνοικίζεσθαι (VII 18.8); Patrae: προσσυνῴκισε (VII 18.7). For two recent studies of the description of Patrae in the *Periegesis*, see Auffart 1997 and Lafond 1998.

[105] II 1.2; V 1.2, 25.1. For two recent studies of the description of Corinth in the *Periegesis*, see Osanna 2001 and Torelli 2001.

[106] II 1.2, III 11.4, V 1.2, 25.1. Cf. Arafat 1996: 114–116 and 131f. for an exploration of the designation of Caesar as emperor in the *Periegesis*.

[107] III 11.4.

above is accepted or not, it should at least be clear that the interpretation of the passage is uncertain.

10.6 Summary

In this chapter, the manner in which the Romans are presented in the *Periegesis* has been the object of study. The aim has not been to determine whether Pausanias himself had anti- or pro-Roman leanings. Asking the *Periegesis* for an answer in that matter is to ask for information it cannot convey to the reader. Therefore, we have been content with trying to determine how the Romans are portrayed in the *Periegesis*.

The long narrative about the Achaean Confederacy and its relations to other Greeks on the one hand and the Romans on the other, has been given much space in this chapter, and that is for three reasons. Firstly, to our knowledge, the narrative in question has not been considered in its entirety, other than by historians deploring its lack of historical reliability. Secondly, a selection of a few isolated passages does not give sufficient foundation for determining the attitude of the narrator as regards the Romans in this narrative; what counts is the totality. Thirdly, outside of this narrative Romans hardly appear in the *Periegesis*, excepting Sulla and the emperors Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius. Moreover, outside of the narrative about the Achaean Confederacy, when Romans appear in the text, they do so not primarily as Romans, but rather as individuals who happen to be Romans. Indeed, for the narrator, Romans appear to have been not much different from Greeks, i.e. like the Greeks, they were a collective composed of individual human beings, among whom one can find both noble specimens (such as Leonidas or Hadrian) and less noble ones (such as Cleomenes I of Sparta or Sulla).[108] For example, just as the narrator explains that the Thebans *en masse* cannot be given the blame for fighting with the Persians, since the decision was not taken by popular vote, so we should understand that he does not blame the Romans *en masse* for Sulla's severe punishment of the Athenians after the Mithridatic war.

---

[108] In this respect the Romans – and the Macedonians too, for that matter – differ from the two other outsiders that appear frequently in the *Periegesis*, viz. the Persians and the Gauls; among these the narrator only rarely speaks of individuals.

Indeed, the narrator explicitly signals that Sulla's behaviour was not quite typical for the Romans in general. Noticing that Sulla later died from a gruesome disease, the narrator explains:

> Σύλλᾳ δὲ ἔστι μὲν καὶ τὰ ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς Ἀθηναίων ἀγριώτερα ἢ ὡς ἄνδρα εἰκὸς ἦν ἐργάσασθαι Ῥωμαῖον.
> What Sulla did to the majority of the Athenians was more savage than a Roman would reasonably do.[109]

That is, such cruel treatment as the Athenians were subject to by Sulla, was not what one would expect from a Roman. However, the narrator supposes that the cause for Sulla's illness was not his treatment of the Athenians, but the wrath of Hicesius which he had brought down on himself when he had dragged out and killed Aristion who had sought refuge in the temple of Athena. In short, the Romans in the *Periegesis* are not much different from Greeks – being individuals, they are not all treated alike; anything else would have been surprising.[110] Therefore, disparaging or praising comments regarding either Roman or Greek individuals cannot be taken to apply to the whole collective.

The history of the dealings between the Achaean Confederacy, other Greeks, and Romans as retold in the historical introduction of the *Achaica*, is complex. The Romans enter the scene as allies to the Athenians against Macedon. Significantly, the narrator tells how the senate duly punished the general who, exceeding his orders, laid waste two Greek cities. That is, from the outset of the narrative the narrator signals that though an individual may be rotten, the Roman collective is not. Here, the implicit message is the same as in the above quoted comment apropos of Sulla. The role of Rome in the history of Greece and the Achaean Confederacy was for a long time that of an ally.

Disregarding wars fought in common, the Roman input into the affairs of the Confederacy was for the most part prompted by appeals from Lacedaemonians, Messenians, Oropians or other Greeks, in search for arbitration in their controversies with Greeks. Among other appeals, the narrator tells about one sent by Lacedaemonians who sought relief from the harsh

---

[109] I 20.7, cf. also IX 33.6 Σύλλα δὲ ἔστι… ἀνήμερα καὶ ἤθους ἀλλότρια τοῦ Ῥωμαίων κτλ. 'Sulla has… (committed acts) savage and alien for the Roman character…'.

[110] In Arafat 1996: 80–190 there is a convenient discussion on the Romans from Mummius to Marcus Aurelius as they appear (or do not appear) in the *Periegesis*.

treatment they suffered under the Achaeans. Romans who wanted to advice the Achaeans on how to treat the Lacedaemonians better, were turned away because of a technicality. A series of diplomatic complications ensued. Roman authority was used by the Lacedaemonians to the full. In the end, the Achaeans gave in.

The situation got worse when the Achaean Confederacy not only had to deal with opposition from Lacedaemon, but also got into the clutches of traitors from within. Exploiting the situation after the Achaean inactivity in the third Macedonian war, the Achaean politician Callicrates abused the authority of an anonymous Roman official and managed to get rid of every Achaean he wanted to eliminate. The Greek conflicts continued, as did their appeals to Rome. The Lacedaemonians proved to be an endless source of conflict within the Confederacy, causing frequent embassies to Rome. The Achaeans and the Lacedaemonians rarely appear to have followed to the letter the recommendations which they received from Rome.

We are told that, as the tensions within the Confederacy escalate even more, the Roman arbitrators decided that certain members of the Confederacy should be resolved from it. Among those listed were at least two members, Lacedaemon and Heraclea at Oeta, who were very reluctant members of the Confederacy – does the same go for the others listed in the proclamation? The Achaeans refused to accept the decision.

The troubles the Achaeans had with the other Greeks, and the fact that the Greeks turned repeatedly to Rome for arbitration – without giving heed to the replies given by Rome and without abiding by the advice given – eventually evolved and deepened into a conflict with Achaea and Rome as antagonists. War was declared by Achaea on Rome. But even after that, the Achaeans continued to direct their attention towards other Greeks, and the Romans continued to try to come to terms with the Achaeans. When that failed – well, the end is known.

According to the narrator, there appears to have been a significant difference between the Greeks and the Romans.[111] Unlike the Greeks, the Romans knew how to rule – a know-how they had tried to convey to the Achaeans, but to no avail. When the Romans had overcome the Achaean

---

[111] Were the Romans barbarians in the narrator's view? For a discussion on where Pausanias might have placed the Romans in the traditional bipolar view of the world as consisting of Greeks and barbarians, cf. Bowie 1996: 218–221, Swain 1996: 350f.

Confederacy by military force, they put into practice the advice that they had tried to make the Achaeans follow, which means, mainly, that they remitted to some extent the harsh terms of the peace once their wrath had settled. The order which the Romans established had, according to the narrator, lasted ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ, though it was not instituted immediately. The Greeks themselves never managed to establish a lasting government. Aelius Aristides in his *Encomium of Rome* explicitly acknowledges this difference between Greek and Roman domination.[112] A similar sentiment is expressed in the *Periegesis*. Though the narrator never says it explicitly, his narrative of the history of Greece gives ample evidence that he would agree.[113]

The interruption in the continuity, viz. Nero's grand but disastrous proclamation of freedom, is the exception that proves the rule. That is, the Greeks are proven to be notoriously incapable of living in peace with one another if not under constraints from the outside to do so – and not even then was there any true concord. Moreover, when trying to form an opinion of what the narrator may have thought about Vespasian's revocation of freedom for the Greeks, one should also take into consideration the history of Greece, as outlined in the *Periegesis* and as discussed above. According to the *Periegesis*, history shows that, for the Greeks, freedom signified a liberty to fight and quarrel amongst themselves without intervention from an outside power, and to try to enhance their own community at the expense of others, even if in the long run it weakened Greece to such a degree that their freedom got lost. Whether the narrator would agree or disagree with the measure taken by Vespasian, hinges on whether he would find the political unrest and war, which certainly would come with freedom, tolerable, when compared to the relative peace and quiet of the *pax Romana*.

κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων, finally, is no obstacle to the above interpretation of the presentation of Romans in the *Periegesis*. It is not necessary to take recourse to either any emendation of the text or any rare signification of the gloss συμφορά in order to salvage this passage from expressing a negative sentiment vis-à-vis Roman rule in Greece. Instead, interpreting the construction of the phrase in the light of other occurrences in

---

[112] Aelius Aristides 26.40–70 Keil (εἰς Ῥώμην).

[113] Cf. above chapters 8 and 9.

the *Periegesis* of συμφορά with genitive complements, we arrived at the following translation of the phrase: 'because of an event affecting the Roman government'. Further, we suggested that the narrator might be alluding to the transition from republic to principate. That is, rather than passing judgement on the Roman rule in Greece, the narrator appears here to be speaking of a specific past event or process in the Roman government, the tumultuous and difficult transformation from republic to principate, which ultimately caused the foundation of a number of new cities in the Greek world.

In sum, in trying to elucidate the view on Roman rule over Greece that the narrator of the *Periegesis* might entertain, one should not only take into consideration what he says about Rome and Romans, but also how he presents the history of Greece. When this is done, one may question whether, in the narrator's opinion, there was any realistic alternative to Roman rule of Greece – not only because the Greeks have been ruled by them for such a long time, but also because the Greeks have throughout history shown themselves notoriously unfit to rule, or even to live side by side without quarrelling with or fighting one another. He moreover appears to have appreciated the peace he was living under. The rather stereotyped portraits of the Roman rulers Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius in the *Periegesis* give some indication of this. All four waged war in the less central parts of the empire. Trajan, the first of the four, warred with the intention of expanding the empire.[114] But the narrator takes care to indicate that the other three emperors, Hadrian, Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius, waged only defensive wars against either rebellious subjects or aggressors from the outside.[115] Thus, the empire into which the Greeks were embedded served as a buffer against invaders. The Greeks themselves did not have to fight off aggressors, and Greek soil was no longer the theatre of war against invaders – with some few exceptions.[116]

---

[114] V 12.6 οὗτος προσεκτήσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς Γέτας τοὺς ὑπὲρ Θράκης Ὀσρόῃ τε τῷ ἀπογόνῳ τῷ Ἀρσάκου καὶ Πάρθοις ἐπολέμησεν.

[115] Trajan V 12.6; Hadrian I 5.5; Antoninus Pius VIII 43.3–6; Marcus Aurelius ('Antoninus the second' in the *Periegesis*) VIII 43.6. On the very similar construction of the imperial portraits, cf. Gurlitt 1890: 276 with n. 22 and Segre 1927: 226 with n. 120. On the portrait of Antoninus Pius, cf. also Pernot 2001 *passim*.

[116] X 34.5, the Costoboci managed to get all the way to Elatea.

Summary and conclusion of part II

The second part of this investigation of the *Periegesis* has been devoted to a study of historical λόγοι, 'stories', in the *Periegesis* in four separate chapters.

History is only element one in a wide range of subject matter treated in the narratives embedded in the frame narrative. When studying a work covering such diverse areas of subject matter as the *Periegesis* does, it is necessary to be selective. Therefore, we have chosen to focus on the historical notes in the work, and in particular to narrow down our investigation to three themes in the history of Greece. The common denominator for the three separate themes is Greeks at war, the most common subject matter for ancient historiography. The themes are defined according to the other party with which the Greeks were brought into contact through these wars: Greeks against Greeks, Greeks against others, and Greeks and Romans. Though narrowing down our study of history in the *Periegesis* to these three themes, the chosen themes recur so frequently throughout the whole of the *Periegesis* that the focus does not become too narrow. Indeed, when it comes to contact between Greeks – as well as between Greeks and others for that matter – conflict and war were certainly not its only manifestation, but war and conflict are the most common representation of it in the *Periegesis*.

In chapter 7 the way in which the historical material is introduced in the *Periegesis* was discussed in general terms. It is intended to form a transition between the two parts of this study, from studying the frame to studying a small portion of the many narratives embedded in it. Moreover, it is a case study of the narrator's overall control on the material, using the introductions to the *Laconica* and the *Arcadica* as points of departure. From the study of these two introductions it appeared very clearly that, at least when it comes to the

historical material, the narrator carefully seeks out the proper place to introduce any specific detail or narrative.

The exposition in the *Periegesis* follows a logic that (hopefully) is perfectly clear to the narrator. Mostly the reader, too, understands it without difficulty, but occasionally the reader has to divine the narrator's logic. For example, in the introduction to the *Laconica*, the narrator has chosen to let the genealogies of the two separate royal houses determine where to introduce specific events in the history of Sparta (and Greece). One of the consequences of this decision is that, when the account reaches the Corinthian war, which at different stages involved kings of both royal houses, the narrator has to present the event in an reversed chronological order. Since the narrator tells the history of the Agiads first, we first learn that the Agiad Pausanias was severely affected by the decision he made at one of the first encounters of the war. Later, in the Eurypontid genealogy, we learn about the cause of the Corinthian war. The reason why the narrator has postponed the account of the beginning of the war is that the actions of the Eurypontid Agesilaus is viewed as causing it. In this instance, the reader easily understands the logic behind the narrator's decision to present matters as he does – partly, or even largely, because he has previously explained how the subject matter will be presented in the historical introduction to the *Laconica*. At other instances the reader remains more or less baffled at the location in which the narrator chooses to insert a narrative. The narrator's decision to introduce the long biography of Philopoemen of Megalopolis apropos of an empty pedestal in Tegea which once upon a time supported a statue of Philopoemen, remains one of the great puzzles of the *Periegesis*, at least for this reader.

Apart from the narrator's control over the material, and the care with which he chooses the location to present the material, one particular feature is of importance when interpreting the presentation of history in the *Periegesis*, viz. the fact that the same events are mentioned repeatedly, if they concern several communities. Interconnected with this feature is the care with which the narrator chooses the location for introducing a specific piece of information – occasionally there simply is more than one proper place – and the fact that the narrator throughout the *Periegesis* is telling the history of Greece through local history.

In the other three chapters of this second part, 'Greeks against Greeks', 'Greeks against Others', and 'Greeks and Romans', the aim has basically been to challenge the prevalent understanding of Pausanias' attitudes as regards the themes treated in the chapters. Firstly, it is maintained that searching the *Periegesis* for Pausanias' (the actual author's) attitudes, opinions, views or the like on any subject matter whatsoever is to search in the work for answers it simply cannot give. What we can hope to find here, as in any other piece of literature, is the idea or the image of this or that subject matter which the narrator conveys to the reader through his presentation of matters. Secondly, regarding the narrator's presentation of the themes studied in chapters 8–10, it is argued that in the *Periegesis* there is not sufficient basis for the prevalent interpretation of them. When one takes into account a larger collection of passages, instead of myopically focusing on one or two passages which support the interpretation one wants to give the text, it appears that other interpretations are at least possible, perhaps even more probable.

In chapter 8 the assumption that war between Greeks is constantly regretted in the *Periegesis* was tested. As it is retold in the *Periegesis*, the history of Greece abounds in conflicts and wars between the several Greek communities. In order not to get lost in the many conflicts, this study of wars of Greeks against Greeks was limited to the historical introduction to the *Messeniaca*, which basically is nothing but a prolonged account of conflicts between the Messenians and other Greeks, the notices on the Peloponnesian war which occur throughout the *Periegesis*, and the rise to and fall from hegemony of the different Greek *poleis*, illustrating the instability inherent in the Greek past.

Though we do not claim that the narrator aimed to present the many wars of Greece in a positive light, one must still concede that the majority of these are narrated without any comment whatsoever from the narrator. The one negative comment – uttered apropos of the Peloponnesian war, not by introducing the first person of Ego but the …-You – more or less vanishes among the large amount of neutral narratives of wars between Greeks. In the *Periegesis* one moreover can find instances in which Epaminondas' praise is sounded for his feats in wars against other Greeks, again not in the first person, but introducing the …-You. The fact that the narrator introduces the …-You

may on both occasions suggest that the opinions voiced in these instances are such as the narrator expects others, too, to entertain.

In short, in the *Periegesis*, warfare between Greeks is presented as a more or less normal practice among the Greeks, when at liberty to do what they wanted. Should the narrator be aiming at presenting wars between Greeks in a negative light, one cannot but concede that he fails miserably in it. It would rather appear as if his aim is to present relations between Greeks in the past for what they were, viz. frequent failures at living at each other's side in harmony.

In chapter 9 the assumption that the narrator uses a community's participation or non-participation in the great Greek wars (of defence or resistance) against outsiders as a basis for judging a community was challenged. Like many of his contemporaries, the narrator of the *Periegesis* returns repeatedly to these wars, viz. the Trojan war, the Persian wars, the battle of Chaeronea, the Lamian war, and the defence against the Gauls. The wars against the Trojans, Persians, Macedonians and Gauls are recurrent themes in the *Periegesis*, the Persian wars being perhaps the most recurrent one of them all. Only those passages in which the narrator mentions, and occasionally also comments on, a community's participation or non-participation in the wars in question have been of interest in our study.

These wars against others form a potentially more glorious theme than the warfare between Greeks in the history of Greece, though the narratives about them are not constantly tales of success. Certainly, the victories over the Persians and Gauls were proud moments in the history of Greece, and there is no denying that the narrator brings up the Persian wars more often than any other individual conflict, but stressing exclusively this theme at the expense of others is misleading. Further, the frequent recurrence of the Persian wars in the *Periegesis* may simply reflect the frequency with which it is represented in art and architecture and/or contemporary taste.

Concerning the warfare of Greeks against others, one may note that the narrator occasionally comments on whether or not a community participated in these wars. His one and only disapproving comment on non-participation, specifically the Arcadians' failure to join the Greeks at Chaeronea, would probably not have found its way into the *Periegesis* had it not been for the fact that Arcadians were later defeated by the Romans on the same battleground.

Moreover, just as the narrator's negative assessment on the war of Greeks against Greeks vanishes among the large amount of neutral narratives of such wars, so his disapproving comment apropos of the Arcadians at Chaeronea is more or less drowned among the mentions without any comment, or mentions to which the narrator adds some comment explaining why this or that community was absent. These explanatory comments may either be presented as the narrator's own, or renderings of what 'they say' (λέγουσι or φασι), i.e. tradition or the claims of more or less anonymous informants.

To these may be added a couple of passages in which the narrator introduces clearly exonerating comments apropos of a community's joining the other side. The Thebans were found fighting with the Persians during the Persian wars. This is a fact that the narrator does not condemn or try to explain away. Instead he explains that the Thebans at large are not the cause, adding that the Athenians, too, would have been found fighting with the Persians, had the wars taken place when they were still under the rule of Pisistratus or the Pisistratidae. And, apropos of the Heracleots and the Aenianians who chose to collaborate with the Gauls in order to get rid of them from their lands, thereby pushing them forwards into the land of other Greeks, the narrator simply comments that Pindar spoke the truth with his remark that people tend to be grieved at their own misfortune, whereas the troubles of others do not move them. The support lent by the Boeotians with all their might for the Macedonians during the Lamian war, was motivated by a similar drive to preserve what was one's own.

Notices like those mentioned above reveal that on the one hand the narrator has a clear comprehension of the fact that the Greek past included both Greeks fighting side by side against outsiders, Greeks failing to take part in the battles against outsiders, and Greeks deciding for various reasons to join the outsiders against Greeks. On the other hand, such notices also make clear that the narrator does not hesitate to record such sides of the Greek past that might be considered sordid by the modern reader.

In other words, according to the *Periegesis*, concerning wars against others, participation is not required, and non-participation is to be expected, if there was no advantage in the deed for one's own community. Preferably one should not side with the enemy of the Greeks, but if this is done anyway, excuses, or rather reasonable explanations, are easy to find. Such conduct might

not be laudable, but it is not incomprehensible, and above all it does not merit reproaching comments from the narrator, who appears to be taking a Polybian stance on such matters – for example, what may appear to be treachery from an Athenian viewpoint, are prudent measures taken to ensure the best interest of one's own community from a Boeotian viewpoint. Moreover, this policy, if it might be called so, of looking after one's own interests is presented as one of the reasons why Achaea rose to a position of power in the wake of the Argives, Athenians, Lacedaemonians, and Thebans. Among other things, they had not experienced the devastating effects of war to the same extent as other Greeks.

In chapter 10 the way in which the Romans are presented in the *Periegesis* was the object of study. The aim has not been to determine whether Pausanias had an anti- or pro-Roman bias, since that is a question to which the *Periegesis* cannot give any answer. Rather, the purpose of our study of Greeks and Romans in the *Periegesis* has been to assess how the interaction between Greeks and Romans is presented. The procedure in this chapter has been similar to that in the two preceding chapters, i.e. instead of focusing on a few passages in which one finds either positive or negative comments regarding individual Romans – after all, a judgement on an individual applies only to that individual, not to the collective he is part of – much space has been given to a study of the introduction to the *Achaica*, which is the only narrative in the *Periegesis* in which the Romans as a collective, though often by proxy of individuals sent to Greece, are actually found acting.

If the whole of the narrative about the Achaean Confederacy in the *Achaica* is taken into account, it is hard to discern any anti-Roman tendency in it. It reads not as a tale of growing Roman interference in Greek matters and appropriation of power and land. Rather it reads as a tale of escalating quarrels and struggles for power between Greeks, mainly Achaeans and Lacedaemonians, spilling over in ever increasing measure to Rome through the frequent appeals for arbitration. The decisions for settlement that came from Rome were more often ignored than abided by. Finally the Romans had had enough. Without knowing where the line was drawn, the Achaeans had rejected one proposal too many for settlement. War was decided upon. Suddenly the narrative changes from a story of inter-Greek quarrels, to a story of invasion of Greece by foreign troops. The Roman forces appeared in Greece quite

surprisingly for the Achaean general and his troops, to judge from their flight in panic. Their appearance in the text, too, though foreboded, comes as a surprise. In like manner with the Achaeans, the reader – if ignorant of history, of course – would be expecting continued compliance from Rome. In one sentence the Achaeans are represented as having rejected an offer from Metellus and besieging an unwilling member of the Confederacy; in the next the Romans are marching against the Achaeans. Resistance was offered, but it was to no effect against the Roman forces. Almost before it had even started, the war was over – a war that was fought not because of Roman aggression, and almost against their will.

In addition to the introduction to the *Achaica*, three further particulars were considered. First, the fact that the narrator does not mention Flamininus' famous declaration of freedom for the Greeks with one word. It was argued that this circumstance does not necessarily cast an anti-Roman slant on the narrative in the *Achaica*. Rather, it shows that the narrator has resisted falling for the propagandistic claims – Flamininus and the Romans were not the only ones fighting for the freedom of the Greeks, the same claim was made by others involved in the warfare of the time.

Secondly, two separate passages were studied, viz. VII 17.3–4 and VIII 27.1. In the first of these the narrator may be offering us a glimpse of how he would prefer that his readers perceive certain events in the Graeco-Roman past and present; in the second one Pausanias is often taken to voice what he thought about the Roman rule of Greece. Whereas a study of the narrative in the *Achaica* can give us an idea of how the narrator construed the interaction between Greeks and Greeks and Greeks and Romans in the past, these two passages, though they do not explicitly concern the narrator's present, and though he does not explicitly voice an opinion regarding the presence of the Romans in Greece, are the closest we come to anything of that kind in the *Periegesis*.

The narrator's comment in VIII 27.1, in which it is stated that Megalopolis is the youngest city in Greece except for the ones in which the inhabitants have changed κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων, has for long been used as a touchstone for determining Pausanias' attitude vis-à-vis the Romans. The interpretation of this phrase has varied according to whether one perceives the author of the *Periegesis* as having anti-Roman or pro-Roman leanings. We have

argued that the previous interpretations of this passage appear to be mistaken for either of the two following reasons. (1) The relation between συμφορά and the genitive ἀρχῆς is given an interpretation it does not have in any other occurrence in the *Periegesis*. (2) Taking recourse either to emendations or to very rare significations of key words in order to give a passage the desired meaning, must be viewed with distrust. Therefore, we have proposed yet another interpretation.

Our translation of the passage '… because of an event affecting the Roman government', is based on the two following observations. (1) Both in the *Periegesis* and Greek in general, the most commonly attested meaning of the noun συμφορά is something that happens, i.e. 'event' or, *in malam partem*, 'misfortune'. (2) The genitive phrase ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων is an attribute to κατὰ συμφοράν, designating the one affected by the συμφορά. It was further suggested that the event affecting the Roman government would be the change from republic to principate.

Finally, in our discussion about VII 17.3–4, our focus of interest was on Vespasian's revocation of Nero's gift of freedom for the Greeks, particularly the two comments framing the account of it. In the first one, the narrator comments that the Greeks were not allowed to enjoy the gift, in the second it is claimed that the Greeks had forgotten freedom. It was argued that both these comments need to be interpreted in conjunction with both each other and the overall presentation of the history of Greece in the *Periegesis*, particularly the wars of Greeks against Greeks.

What was the freedom that was not granted the Greeks to enjoy? Considering the fact that the Greeks are said to have begun to fight one another again, it would appear that the narrator's comment refers to that fact. In other words, when free to do as they pleased, the Greeks did what they had done in the past, too, viz. fight. Upon regaining their freedom they appear immediately to have resumed such actions that the history of Greece abounded in – they were again making history. Had the Greeks been allowed to continue their fighting, it is very probable that the narrator would have found material from these times to report in historical notes, just as he finds occasion to bring into the *Periegesis* two Roman conflicts which spilled over into Greece and forced at least some of the Greek communities to choose sides, viz. the Mithridatic war and Augustus' fighting with Mark Antony.

However, that the Greeks should use their freedom in such a manner does not appear to have been what the power granting them their freedom expected. Indeed, this would not have been the first time the Romans – according to the *Periegesis* – counted on the Greeks to be able to live side by side in peace. Such expectations of the Greeks were in vain both then and at that occasion – does this apply to Ego's 'now' too? At all events, Vespasian, not being satisfied with the way in which the Greeks were using their freedom, made them again subject to Roman rule, claiming 'that the Greeks had unlearned their freedom'.

This brings us to the question of what is the narrator's disposition vis-à-vis the claim that the Greeks had forgotten freedom. We have argued that the narrator, by inserting the innocent looking φήσας, signals that he is merely reporting somebody else's claim that the Greeks did not remember freedom. Whether or not he himself endorses the view expressed in that claim, does not appear with certainty from this passage alone. Should one take into account the history of Greece as presented in the *Periegesis*, the narrator would seem to be of another opinion. By their actions the Greeks were showing that they still remembered what they used to do in the past; by his narrative, the narrator shows that he knew and wanted to remind his readers of what the Greek past looked like; and by his actions Vespasian in his turn showed his ignorance in this regard. However, whether or not the narrator finds fault with Vespasian's measure, does not follow from the above. Though he probably does not find fault with the measure, in order to get a definite answer to that question, one would need to know whether the narrator would prefer political and military unrest in Greece over the peace and quiet of the *Pax Romana*.

The account of Nero's granting and Vespasian's revocation of freedom for the Greeks in the *Periegesis* appears in a different light should one compare it with Philostratus' account in the *Vita Apollonii* 5.41. In the *Vita Apollonii*, the liberation and the renewed subjugation of the Greeks occur as a background story, which explains why Apollonius refused to present himself before Vespasian despite repeated invitations. According to the *Vita Apollonii*, the Greeks, when liberated by Nero, enjoyed such peace and harmony as never before. Moreover, the narrator explains that the civil strife which was the cause for Vespasian's revocation is nothing but a pretext. Not only those affected by the measure, but also Apollonius took offence, the narrator explains. Therefore

Apollonius refused to visit Vespasian, and sent no less than three letters to the emperor on the subject matter. The narrator quotes them – they are all short, and all censure the emperor for his measure.

It would be interesting to know which of these two accounts – if either – presents the correct picture of Vespasian's motivation. Did he allege civil discord among the Greeks as a pretext, as the narrator of the *Vita Apollonii* claims? Or, did the Greeks indeed begin to fight one another, as a result of which Vespasian revoked the gift of freedom claiming that they no longer knew how to be free, as the narrator of the *Periegesis* presents the matter? It would be most noteworthy if the account in the *Vita Apollonii* were the correct one, and the narrator of the *Periegesis* knew about it, but nevertheless records the one which we can still read in the *Periegesis*. Is the narrator of the *Periegesis* deliberately bringing to the fore the quarrelsomeness of the Greeks? Be that as it may, we can at least say for certain that in the *Periegesis* the blame is not put on the Roman(s) but on the Greeks themselves.

Bearing the above in mind, one may further wonder whether the narrator has some specific purpose for repeatedly bringing up the themes of Greeks against Greeks and Greeks against Others. This question is particularly pertinent considering the above discussed fact that he only rarely speaks of Greek wars against Greeks in order to deplore such activities, and of Greeks uniting against others in order to explicitly either laud those participating or censure those who fail to participate. Instead, one finds that the narrator repeatedly speaks of Greek communities deciding to look out for their own advantage, without taking into consideration the possible common good. One even finds accounts of Greeks collaborating with the enemy against other Greeks – all reported by the narrator without introducing any censuring comments.

Has the narrator introduced such narratives with the intention of reminding his readers of the fact that there are other sides to these well known events, and other events than those which occur most frequently in both sophistic declamations on historical themes and in the *Periegesis*? The readers, who undoubtedly have had their full of sophistic declamations and other literature in which the glorious aspects of the great Greek past are brought up again and again, may have responded to these reminders in the *Periegesis* in various ways – if at all. In other words, it may be that the narrator introduces his historical

notices as a counterbalance to some of the contemporary representations and notions of the Greek past, such as Plutarch's carping criticism of Herodotus' *Histories*.[1] His aim may have been to call the reader's attention to another side of the Greek past. This is a past in which some was good, but much was uncertain and unsettled; some events and circumstances were laudable, while much was such that one would not wish to experience it. There was constant quarrelling and warfare between Greeks, interrupted by a few moments of unity against an outside aggressor – a unity which upon examination proves to be only quasi-unity with one or more communities supporting the outsider in order to promote their own cause at the expense of other Greeks.

---

[1] Cf. the excellent observation of Bowen 1992: 137: 'neither P[lutarch]'s experience nor his ideals could make much sense of the quarrelsomeness of classical Greece.'

Index locorum

The *Periegesis*

308

312

Other Greek texts

STUDIA GRAECA ET LATINA LUNDENSIA
Ediderunt Jerker Blomqvist et Anders Piltz

1. Arne Jönsson, *Alfonso of Jaén. His Life and Works with Critical Editions of the* Epistula Solitarii, *the* Informaciones *and the* Epistula Serui Christi. 1989. 207 pp.

2. Bengt-Arne Roos, *Synesius of Cyrene. A study in His Personality.* 1991. xviii + 157 pp.

3. Britta Larsson, *Johannes Magnus' Latin Letters. A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary.* 1992. v +193 pp.

4. Lars Nyberg, *Unity and Coherence. Studies in Apollonius Rhodius'* Argonautica *and the Alexandrian Epic Tradition.* 1992. xviii + 182 pp.

5. Dimitrios Karadimas, *Sextus Empiricus against Aelius Aristides. The Conflict between Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Second Century A.D.* 1996. xx + 270 pp.

6. Arne Jönsson, *St. Bridget's Revelations to the Popes. An edition of the so-called* Tractatus de summis pontificibus. 1997. 69 pp.

7. Karin Kulneff-Eriksson, *On 'have' in Ancient Greek. An investigation on* ἔχω *and the construction of* εἶναι *with a dative as expressions for 'have'.* 1999. xxii + 192 pp.

8. Georg Walser, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue. An investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New testament.* 2001. xxvi + 197 pp.

9. Vassilios Sabatakakis, *Aspects of Morphological and Stylistic Variation of the Verb in* Erotokritos. 2004. 163 pp.

10. Rea Ann-Margaret Mellberg, *Minnet går gränsvakt. Fyra poeter ur 1970-talets grekiska diktargeneration.* 2004. xix + 282 pp.

11. Cajsa Sjöberg, *Ubi est unitas? The Latin Letters from Johannes Annorelius, a Swedish Catholic Convert, to his Brother. A Critical Edition with an Introduction.* 2005. 352 pp.

12. Johanna Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator. Studies in Pausanias'* Periegesis. 2005. xxviii + 314 pp.