



LUND UNIVERSITY

One and 'I' in the Frame (Narrative). Authorial Voice, Travelling Persona, and Addressee in Pausanias' Periegesis

Akujärvi, Johanna

Published in:
Classical Quarterly

DOI:
[10.1017/S0009838811000383](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000383)

2012

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Akujärvi, J. (2012). One and 'I' in the Frame (Narrative). Authorial Voice, Travelling Persona, and Addressee in Pausanias' Periegesis. *Classical Quarterly*, 62(1), 327-358. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000383>

Total number of authors:
1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

ONE AND ‘I’ IN THE FRAME NARRATIVE:
AUTHORIAL VOICE, TRAVELLING PERSONA
AND ADDRESSEE IN PAUSANIAS’ *PERIEGESIS**

I

The second-century A.D. *Περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος* collects a nearly endless number of temples, sanctuaries, precincts, altars, statues, paintings, tombs and an assortment of curiosities mainly in Greece but also in other parts of the Roman Empire. It contains an equally endless number of historical and mythological narratives, legends, traditions and various stories on curiosities. For example, in the *Attica*, the first of the ten books of the *Periegesis*, Pausanias discusses Sarmatian cuirasses, the bees of the Alazonian nomads, grasshoppers dying on Mount Sipylus in three different ways, Ethiopians, the wild inhabitants on the Satyrdes Islands in the Atlantic Ocean, how Phryne tricked Praxiteles into revealing which was his favourite sculpture, poets who have lived with kings and rulers (including a discussion on the possible reasons why Homer and Hesiod did not go to the courts of the rich and powerful), the haunting of Marathon, gigantic skeletons, winged statues of Nemesis, the invasion of Greece by the Gauls, the Mithridatic war, biographies of a number of Ptolemies, Pyrrhus of Epirus, Lysimachus, Seleucus ...¹

The list could be continued. It may be noted that none of the curiosities or historical subject matter mentioned appears to concern Athens exclusively. Nevertheless, they are all told in connection with sights, monuments and statues to be seen in Athens or Attica.

The two most striking characteristics of the *Periegesis* are its mixing of sights and stories from nearly every period of Greek prehistory and history down to Pausanias’ own times – though, as is well known, certain periods and certain types of subject matter are favoured over others. It has a highly miscellaneous subject matter. In this regard the *Periegesis* is fully comparable with miscellanies like Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae*, Aulus Gellius’ *Noctes Atticae*, Aelian’s *De natura animalium*.² Similarities between the *Periegesis* and miscellanies emerge gradually. Only extensive reading of the work makes its diversified subject matter evident.

* Earlier versions of this paper have been delivered at the Greek seminar at Lund University, the Kyknos seminar at University of Wales, Lampeter, at the 13th Congress of the FIEC in Berlin, and at the Scientists and Professionals in the Ancient World conference at the University of St Andrews. I wish to thank participants at the various venues for questions, comments and suggestions – none mentioned, none forgotten. Special thanks are due to Ewen Bowie for reading an early draft of parts of the paper. For funding a year at Corpus Christi College, Oxford during which I did the research for this paper, I am grateful to Sven och Dagmar Saléns Stiftelse.

¹ Paus. 1.21.5–7, 32.1, 24.8, 33.3–6, 23.5–6, 20.2–3, 2.3, 32.4, 35.5–8, 33.7, 4, 20.4–7, 6.2–7.3, 9.1–3, 11.1–13.9, 9.5–10.5, 16.

² The parallel has been noted by e.g. C. Robert, *Pausanias als Schriftsteller. Studien und Beobachtungen* (Berlin, 1909), 3–7 and B.P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* (Paris, 1971), 219–24.

II

This study intends to explore the consequences of three interrelated issues involved in any attempt to come to an understanding of the *Periegesis*. First, there is the question of its literary context. How are works that have become isolated from their literary system to be read if ‘the sense and structure of a work can be grasped only with reference to other models’, that is, works of the same tradition?³ Considering the apparently almost complete disappearance of its literary context, this is a highly relevant question in the exploration of the literary context of Pausanias’ *Periegesis*.

Secondly, there is the importance of elements at the beginning of a text for conditioning readers’ construal of the whole of the text.⁴ Early textual signals are particularly significant since readers are likely to hold on to their early understanding of a text for as long as possible, and not to reject it until it becomes untenable because of conflicting revelations that emerge later in the text. Every text has basically one chance of making a first impression on readers – who can amend and revise it in line with later inconsistencies in the text – and one opportunity to make, for example, an initial declaration of intent and thereby shape readers’ interpretative and readerly activities.⁵ There is a high degree of interpretative openness at the beginning of the *Periegesis*. As it stands at present, the work does not have at its outset any established authoritative frame in the form of authorial statements. Its guise has been the same ever since Musurus’ *editio princeps* in 1516 and, before then, the arrival in Italy of the archetype of all current manuscripts of the *Periegesis* in the first decades of the fifteenth century; it is, however, possible that something is missing at the beginning, perhaps a dedicatory letter.⁶ Whether the text was completed or not, and whether it has been completely preserved or not are questions that are never likely to be finally settled. However, as this is a reading of the *Periegesis* in the twenty-first century concerned with the present-day imperfect access to its literary context, the issue of completeness is not essential for this study. Modern readers are left in the dark for a very long time as to who

³ G.B. Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Ithaca, NY, 1986), 29.

⁴ M. Perry, ‘Literary dynamics: how the order of a text creates its meanings [with an analysis of Faulkner’s “A Rose for Emily”]’, *Poetics Today* 1 (1979), 35–64 and 311–61; A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford, 1982), 88–105.

⁵ Cf. Perry (n. 4), 49–58.

⁶ On the early history of the *Periegesis* in the West, cf. A. Diller, ‘Pausanias in the Middle Ages’, *TAPhA* 87 (1956), 84–97; D. Marcotte, ‘La redécouverte de Pausanias à la Renaissance’, *SIFC* 10 (1992), 872–8; dedicatory letter, E. Bowie, ‘Inspiration and aspiration: date, genre, and readership’, in S.E. Alcock et al. (edd.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford, 2001), 21–32, at 27–8; in the words of J.G. Frazer, *Pausanias’s Description of Greece* (London, 1898), 1.xxii the *Periegesis* has ‘neither head nor tail’. Many are concerned that the *Periegesis* is not complete, whether much or little is missing, and whether Pausanias did not manage to bring his project to an end or the text has been damaged in the transmission, e.g. W. Gurlitt, *Über Pausanias. Untersuchungen* (Graz, 1890), 2 with n. 13, Robert (n. 2), 261–5; C. Habicht, *Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1985), 6–7; C. Bearzot, ‘La Grecia di Pausania. Geografia e cultura nella definizione del concetto di Ἑλλάς’, in M. Sordi (ed.), *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico* (Milan, 1988), 90–112. Some argue that the beginning is intact, e.g. H. Hitzig and H. Blümner, *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio* (Leipzig, 1896–1910), ad loc.; Robert (n. 2), 264–5; D. Musti, *Guida della Grecia* (Milan, 1982), xviii; W. Hutton, *Describing Greece. Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias* (Cambridge, 2005), 175–6; others that the ending is not suspect, e.g. H.-W. Nörenberg, ‘Untersuchungen zum Schluss der Περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος des Pausanias’, *Hermes* 101 (1973), 235–52.

the author is, why he has written the work, what kind of material he has included and what he has excluded and for what reasons.⁷ Indeed, apart from searching for answers to such questions (some of which are not given any definite answer in the whole of the text), readers of the *Periegesis* also face the challenge of trying to decide the genre of the text, which is a matter of fundamental importance for understanding how to take it.

Thirdly, there is the linearity of texts. Like journeys, texts progress linearly from a beginning to an end by way of a number of intermediate stations, stages or steps. Whereas it is certainly true that texts progress continuously forward without a break until they reach their end, it does not follow that readers are bound to submit to and follow its order of exposition from beginning to end, unlike travellers who are more or less bound to the linearity of their journey, unless they take shortcuts. Linearity is not only a restriction on texts, but also an effective means for engaging the reader's interpretative activities by, for example, withholding crucial corroborative, divergent or conflicting pieces of information whereby a reader may be forced to re-evaluate his or her understanding of the text and to reconsider the view he or she has formed of it.⁸ A group of readers particularly prone to try to overcome the text's authority or tyranny – depending on one's point of view – are academics, at least when it comes to reading certain texts and reading under specific conditions. I suggest that the habit of viewing texts synoptically rather than staying alive to the effects of their linearity is so common among academics that we hardly even take notice of it.⁹ Needless to say, it is not suggested that the aids at our disposal or that synoptic reading habits should be abandoned, at least not more than temporarily. Nevertheless, the practice of taking a synoptic rather than a linear view on the *Periegesis* or any other ancient text is problematic, at least under certain circumstances. It counteracts the most fundamental characteristic of any text (except hypertexts), viz. its inherent, linguistically dictated linear progression, its presenting separate pieces of information linearly one after the other.

Not using material from later parts of the work may seem like a strange, futile and perhaps even perverse exercise hardly worth making.¹⁰ But subjecting oneself to the linearity – though the numerous cross references in the work (cf. below) may suggest that Pausanias was not necessarily averse to a non-linear reading – of the text may shed new light on the problematic question of the literary context of the *Periegesis*. A careful sequential reading of the beginning of the *Periegesis* appears to suggest that the literary context (or one of the literary contexts) of the *Periegesis* is the *periplus* genre rather than the elusive *periegesis* genre.¹¹ This is

⁷ A declaration such as the one in 1.39.3 ('in my opinion, such were 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') is not particularly enlightening. Upon closer examination, neither it nor its echo at the start of the description of Sparta in 3.11.1, nor the many declarations stating that something is 'worth mentioning' or 'worth seeing' (cf. J. Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator. Studies in Pausanias' Periegesis* (Lund, 2005), 49–50; see also 6.1.1–2 with Akujärvi, 45–7), reveal anything about the purpose of the work or the criteria of selection apart from subjective preferences.

⁸ Cf. Perry (n. 4).

⁹ In Pausanian studies, the last chapter in Hutton (n. 6) is an exception.

¹⁰ See, however, N.W. Slater, 'The horizons of reading', in A. Kahane and A. Laird (edd.), *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius' Metamorphoses* (Oxford, 2001), 213–21 for a similar exercise in sequential reading of the prologue of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

¹¹ I discuss the problems of the *periegesis* genre in 'Pausanias' *Periegesis*, Dionysius Periegetes, Eustathius' commentary, and the construction of the periegetic genre', in E. Balicka-

so today at least. Given the fragmentary state of works cited as *Periegesis* and *Periodoi*,¹² the *periplus* genre provides modern readers of the frame narrative of the *Periegesis* with its most tangible literary context, guiding them in their interpretation of its travelling persona. I shall have more to say on the frame narrative and the travelling persona shortly.

Before subjecting this study to the linearity of the *Periegesis*, a few words on the overall structure of the work, which becomes apparent gradually as the reading progresses. The *Periegesis* is often described as a collection of *θεωρήματα* and *λόγοι*, or sights and stories, strung together on a thin red thread that is the topographical order of the work.¹³ The so-called ‘radial plan’ which, simplistically put, organizes the description of monuments along multiple routes from central hubs has been described previously by Frazer, Robert, Piérart and Hutton; particularly the two latter scholars have refined our understanding of the complexities of how the very uneven spokes radiate from the hubs.¹⁴ But I argue that complexities in the organization of the *Periegesis* go beyond problems with its topographical sequence and the relation of the description in the *Periegesis* with the archaeological record. The *θεωρήματα* and *λόγοι* are not just enumerated in topographical order; the descriptions and narratives are embedded within a frame narrative. The descriptions of figurative art in the *Periegesis* frequently have a narrative character.¹⁵ That some descriptions turn into downright narratives is but a deepening of the tendency inherent in Pausanias’ manner of approaching the monuments as physical manifestations of the political and cultural history of the localities.

Witakowska, J. Heldt, D. Searby (edd.), *ΔΩΡΟΝ ΡΟΔΟΠΟΙΚΙΑΩΝ. Studies in Honour of Jan Olof Rosenqvist* (forthcoming in Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia, Uppsala 2011); see also G. Pasquali, ‘Die schriftstellerische Form des Pausanias’, *Hermes* 48 (1913), 161–223, H. Bischoff, ‘Perieget (περιηγητής)’, *RE* 1.17.2 (1937), 725–42, Jacoby’s commentary on *FGrH* 369, J. Schmayder, *De periegetarum graecorum reliquiis* (Łódź, 1950), F. de Angelis, ‘Pausania e i periegeti. La guidistica antica sulla Grecia’, *ASNP* 4.2 (1998), 1–14, J.L. Lightfoot, *On the Syrian Goddess* (Oxford, 2003), 87–91, Hutton (n. 6), 247–63, D. Marcotte, *Les géographes grecs*, vol. 1 (Paris, 2000), lv–lxxii places the *periegesis* within a typology of geographical genres, and P. Counillon, *Pseudo-Skylax, Le Périples du Pont-Euxin* (Bordeaux, 2004), 30 points to the uncertainty of a geographical genre typology and the general fluidity of the titles in the testimonia. Other influences, generic and otherwise, such as from historiography (apart from Herodotus), paradoxography, mythography, ecphrasis, must for reasons of space be left out of this study. For an exploration of a novelistic element in the *Periegesis*, see W. Hutton, ‘Pausanias the novelist’, in G.A. Karla (ed.), *Fiction on the Fringe. Novelistic Writing in the Post-Classical Age* (Leiden, 2009), 151–69.

¹² The *Periegesis* of the world by Dionysius Periegetes is the only other completely preserved *Periegesis*; despite its very compressed form, this *Periegesis* accords to the organization of the *Periploi*. The fragments, if there are any, may give a very incomplete but nevertheless rough idea of what subject matter was covered in the works of Hecataeus of Miletus, Ctesias of Cnidus, Heliodorus of Athens, Diodorus of Athens, Polemon of Troy and others cited as authors of *Periegesis* and/or *Periodoi*. But the fragments do not show how the material was organized, structured or presented.

¹³ On the terms, cf. Paus. 1.39.3.

¹⁴ Frazer (n. 6), I.xxiii–iv; Robert (n. 2), 69–200; M. Piérart, ‘Observations sur la structure du livre II de la *Périégèse*. Argos, l’Argolide et la Thyreatide’, in D. Knoepfler and M. Piérart (edd.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l’an 2000* (Geneva, 2001), 203–21; Hutton (n. 6), 83–174.

¹⁵ On the narrative aspect, expanding upon the depicted frozen moment, in ecphrasis, cf. J.A.W. Heffernan, ‘Ekphrasis and Representation’, *New Literary History* 22 (1991), 297–316.

The frame narrative of the *Periegesis* has gone unnoticed.¹⁶ It is difficult to pinpoint. It does not present any varied action nor many interacting characters. It is a narrative about travel in Greece, tracing a route from Piraeus to Naupactus via the Peloponnesus. There is an 'I', the author-narrator of the *Periegesis*, who performs several tasks within the frame, the most important being his writing down the text, the research he has done, and is still doing, for the *Periegesis* and his travels, which are inconspicuous in the text itself but essential for its origin. And there is an indefinite travelling persona, whose main function is to act as a dummy subject when movement is narrated.

The frame turns the collected facts of the *Periegesis* into a coherent report, it gives the work structure and, ideally, retains readers' interest and keeps them from skipping back and forth and dipping in and out of the text. It has a logic that is not immediately evident, granted, but that is decipherable to some extent after extensive reading. Even so the text does not become wholly predictable, for example in the area of what is included and what is excluded.¹⁷ That the first book is devoted to a selection of matters that have to do with Athens and Attica and that there is more to come can be worked out from its title, the tendency of the subject matter, and a couple of explicit statements.¹⁸ The suspicion is confirmed at the point where the account turns from Athens to Megara. Up to this point the text has been a collection of the most noteworthy Athenian sights and stories (1.39.3). In view of that, the discussions on Sarmatian cuirasses, Ethiopians, biographies of Hellenistic monarchs, and so on are unpredictable and unexpected elements.

This study steps back from the bewildering variety that is the mass of material included in the *Periegesis* in an attempt to describe two constants of its frame narrative: its travelling persona and its 'I'. Both appear early in the text, remain in it throughout, and develop along complementary yet different strands in the fabric of the *Periegesis*. As this is an exploration of the text through linear reading, the focus is continuously on the first occurrence(s) of some phenomenon or characteristic of the *Periegesis*, whereas later developments are merely sketched. When the development of the travelling persona is traced from its first appearance at the start of the first book, it emerges that as a textual construct it is strongly influenced by the *Periploi*. The tie to the *Periploi* is especially strong at the beginning of the first book, but it is maintained throughout the whole work; the iterative, atemporal and impersonal mode of narrating the movement of the persona is arguably modelled on the manner in which movement along the coasts is indicated in the *Periploi*. The first main part of this study reviews the surviving *Periploi* and discusses the structural similarities between the *Periploi* and Pausanias' *Periegesis*. A short analysis of how Arrian's *Periplus* deviates from and conforms to the tradition of the *Periploi* and a discussion of how Arrian's experiment with the genre compares to the *Periegesis* form a transition to the second main part

¹⁶ On framing narratives in general, cf. B.D. Irwin, 'What's in a frame? The Medieval textualization of traditional storytelling', *Oral Tradition* 10 (1995), 27–53.

¹⁷ The roughly topographical order in which the monuments are enumerated gives some measure of at least apparent logic to giving an account, after narrating the Mithridatic War, of how the image of Niobe can be spotted on the slope of Mount Sipylus, and thereafter going on to Sarmatian breastplates, to take one section of text almost at random (Paus. 1.20.4–21.7). The Athenian monuments prompt the narratives; but why they prompt these narratives and not others is another question.

¹⁸ Paus. 1.20.4, 22.7, 23.4, 23.10, 24.5, 25.6, 26.4, 26.6, 27.3, 28.11.

of this study, in which aspects of the first-person presence and authorial persona in the *Periegesis* are discussed. One of the more interesting features of the first person in the *Periegesis*, apart from its well-known Herodotean character,¹⁹ is that the travelling aspect of the 'I' is written out of the *Periegesis*; this is likely to be significant for the construction of its authorial voice. The travelling persona and the 'I' seem to be two entirely disparate entities existing and acting on different planes. I argue that the interplay between these two personae never quite amounts to interaction between the two, but that occasionally 'I' grounds the inherent indefiniteness of the travel narrative by (metaphorically) popping up at a site by the persona's side discussing, describing or drawing attention to specific aspects of monuments. In conclusion I suggest how the textual construct of the indefinite (travelling) persona may be taken outside the text and read as a model for the addressee/reader of the *Periegesis*.

III

Let us turn to the beginning of the *Periegesis*.²⁰

τῆς ἠπείρου τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς κατὰ νήσους τὰς Κυκλάδας καὶ πέλαγος τὸ Αἰγαῖον ἄκρα Σούνιον πρόκειται γῆς τῆς Ἀττικῆς· καὶ λιμὴν τε παραπλεύσαντι τὴν ἄκραν ἐστὶ καὶ ναὸς Ἀθηνᾶς Σουνιάδος ἐπὶ κορυφῇ τῆς ἄκρας. πλέοντι δὲ ἐς τὸ πρόσω Λαυρίον τέ ἐστιν, ἔνθα ποτὲ Ἀθηναίοις ἦν ἀργύρου μέταλλα, καὶ νῆσος ἔρημος οὐ μεγάλη Πατρόκλου καλουμένη· τεῖχος γάρ ...

Of the Hellenic mainland in the region of the Cyclades Islands and the Aegean Sea, Cape Sunium juts out from the Attic land. When you have sailed past the promontory there is a harbour and on the peak of the promontory a temple of Athena Sunias. Sailing on, there is Laurium, where the Athenians once had silver mines, and a small uninhabited island called the island of Patroclus. For a wall ... (1.1.1)

The first sentences plunge the readers *in medias res*. They set the scene and confirm the geographical frame given in the title (the Hellenic mainland), and the subtitle (Attica). The overall topic of (a) the whole of the *Periegesis* and (b) that of its first part frames a gradual zooming in on Cape Sunium, the starting point of the description. The first sentence reads like an expansion of the title of the whole work and that of the first book. The following clause introduces the theme of coastal voyage, which is narrated using dative participles of verbs denoting sailing without any specified subject (*παραπλεύσαντι ... πλέοντι*). These dative participles indicate not only movement from point A to point B, but also the geographical vantage point from which a statement holds true; the suppressed indefinite subject of the participle indicates the one 'for whom' or 'from whose' point of view the statement

¹⁹ On the influence of Herodotus on different aspects of the *Periegesis*, cf. e.g. C. Wernicke, *De Pausaniae Periegetae studiis Herodoteis* (Berlin, 1884), O. Pfundtner, *Pausanias Periegeta imitator Herodoti* (Königsberg, 1866), Akujärvi (n. 7), 28–30, Hutton (n. 6), *passim*, esp. 190–213.

²⁰ The text is quoted from the latest complete edition, M.H. Rocha-Pereira, *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*² (Leipzig, 1989); translations are adaptations of Frazer (n. 6) and W.H.S. Jones (and H.A. Ormerod), *Description of Greece* (Cambridge, 1918–35). Commentaries: Frazer (n. 6) and Hitzig and Blümner (n. 6) are both old but complete; neither the Budé series begun with M. Casevitz et al., *Description de la Grèce, I: L'Attique* (Paris, 1992) (Books 1, 4–8) nor that of the Fondazione Lorenzo Valla begun with Musti (n. 6) (Books 1–9) are finished.

of location is valid.²¹ Moreover, they associate the *Periegesis* with *Periploi*; texts that in their own way describe select sections of the world.²²

This type of dative participle is, however, not exclusive to *Periploi*. Dative participles of verbs of movement for indicating the location of sites or objects occur in, for example, Herodotus and Thucydides among many other authors. Among the offerings Croesus sent to Greek sanctuaries, for instance, Herodotus mentions two large bowls in Delphi, one of gold and one of silver. The golden bowl was 'on the right as one enters (ἐσιόντι) the temple, the silver one on the left' (1.51.1). Epidamnus lies, according to Thucydides, on the right 'as one sails (ἐσπλέοντι) into the Ionian gulf' (1.24.1); were one to sail in the opposite direction the city would be on the left hand. In historiography and other literature these adverbial participles, specifying the location of an object or place, are generally isolated islets in oceans of narrative of events. But in Herodotus' *Histories* there are some descriptions of larger territories where these participles are found in larger numbers, occasionally together with finite verb forms with subjects as indefinite as those of the participles.²³ For example, describing the vast expanses of the Scythian plains, Herodotus repeatedly uses dative participles to structure his account of the tribes east of the Borysthenes river – or as he puts it, 'when one has crossed (διαβάντι) the Borysthenes' (from west to east) and 'moves inland (ἄνω ἴοντι)' (4.18.1).²⁴ As the description continues, dative participles recur to mark the crossings of rivers, changes in direction and other major stages facing anyone exploring the Scythian steppes.²⁵

Closer to Pausanias' times, Appian structures the review of the geographical extent of the Roman empire with the familiar dative participles in the preface to his Roman history (proem 2–11). The Romans rule over most of Britain and all of the land along the coast as one sails into (εἰσπλέοντι) the Mediterranean through the Pillars of Heracles and circumnavigates (περιπλέοντι) it (proem 2). As the peoples along the coast are detailed, participles continue to structure the enumeration. These participles appear also in Lucian's *De Syria dea* once the account has come as far as to describe the temple itself. For instance, beginning the description Lucian states that even the *pronaos* is a great wonder for anyone who ascends (ἀνελθόντι) to it (30).²⁶

²¹ Cf. R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*³ (Hanover, 1898–1904), vol. 2 §423.18e and H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*² (Cambridge, MA, 1956), §1497. See also J. Obrecht, *Der echte und soziative Dativ bei Pausanias* (Geneva, 1919), 38–41 on this usage of dative and genitive participles in the *Periegesis*.

²² On the *periplus* in general, see F. Gisinger, 'Periplus (2)', *RE* 1.17.2 (1937), 841–50, R. Güngerich, *Die Küstenbeschreibung in der griechischen Literatur* (Münster, 1950), P. Janni, *La mappa e il periplo. Cartografia antica e spazio odologico* (Rome, 1984), O.A.W. Dilke, *Greek and Roman Maps* (London, 1985), 130–44, G. Hartinger, *Die Periplusliteratur. Untersuchungen zu Inhalt, Sprache und Funktion der überlieferten Texte* (Diss., Salzburg, 1992).

²³ This is paralleled in the *Periegesis*, cf. below.

²⁴ On space in Herodotus and other ancient Greek narrative, see the forthcoming third volume of *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Leiden).

²⁵ Hdt. 4.18–25: NB 19 διαβάντι τὸν Παντικάπην, 21 Τάναϊν ποταμὸν διαβάντι, 22 μετὰ τὴν ἔρημον ἀποκλίνοντι μᾶλλον πρὸς ἀπηλιώτην ἄνεμον, 23.2 διεξελλθόντι καὶ τῆς τρηχέως χώρον πολλόν, 25.1 ὑπερβάντι τούτους ἀνθρώπους. Cf. also e.g. 2.29.2–30.1 and 5.52, where second-person singular finite verb forms are also found.

²⁶ There are even some second-person verb forms, as in Herodotus and the *Periegesis*, e.g. *Syr. D.* 30; among the *Periploi* the *Stadiasmus* is remarkable for its second-person imperatives and futures, cf. below.

However, in *Periploi* these participial expressions have a different standing, as they, together with spatial adverbs, prepositional phrases ('from A to B') and measurements of distances give the works structure.²⁷ In historical narratives which recount events and action in an order which is predominantly but not absolutely chronological, matters of place and space are secondary. The reverse is the case in the *Periploi*. The order is spatial: what structures and organizes the account is an imagined movement from place to place, recounted in a manner that perhaps might be called a minimal narrative mode. Events, if events are mentioned in the *Periploi*, are secondary and mentioned only apropos of places or objects, as in Pausanias' *Periegesis*. Other genres of descriptive literature, *Periodoi* and *Periegesis*, may have been similar to the *Periploi* but, as mentioned above, their state of preservation affords us little material for study today. Despite its brevity, the *Mansiones Parthicae* of Isidorus of Charax suggests that the description of an inland area can be organized on the same principles as the description of a coastline.²⁸ This compact catalogue of places and distances between them begins with the statement that those who cross (διαβάντων) the Euphrates at the Zeugma come to the city of Apamea (1).²⁹

The *Periploi* that have come down to us more or less intact fall into two groups: the experimental ones and the catalogues. To the former group belong the fragments of the *Ἀναγραφὴ Ἑλλάδος* of Dionysius Calliphon's son,³⁰ the remains of the work attributed to pseudo-Scymnus,³¹ the nearly complete *Ἀνάπλους Βοσπόρου* of Dionysius of Byzantium³² and Arrian's *Periplus Ponti Euxini*.³³

²⁷ Cf. Hartinger (n. 22), 230–44 for a discussion of various typical linguistic features of the *Periploi*.

²⁸ *GGM* 1.244–54.

²⁹ Cf. also Heraclides Criticus, fr. 1.6.

³⁰ *GGM* 1.238–43, D. Marcotte, *Le Poème géographique de Dionysios, fils de Calliphon* (Louvain, 1990). The title *Anagraphe* is probably the invention of the same person who united the iambic trimeters with the three prose fragments of Heraclides Criticus; the combined fragments were earlier ascribed to pseudo-Dicaearchus. Dion. Calliphon.'s name and patronym emerge from the acrostic in the first 23 verses. On the process that united Dion. Calliphon.'s and Heraclides' fragments and the identification of two separate authors, see F. Pfister, *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides* (Vienna, 1951), 17–24, Marcotte (n. 30), 12–16, A. Arenz, *Herakleides Kritikos »Über die Städte in Hellas«. Eine Periegesie Griechenlands am Vorabend des Chremonideischen Krieges* (Munich, 2006), 31–3.

³¹ Various titles have been suggested for this treatise in iambic trimeters that is acephalous in the manuscript: *Periegesis* (*GGM* 1.196–237), *Periegesis ad Nicomedem regem* (A. Diller, *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers* [New York, 1952], 165–76), *περίοδος γῆς* (Marcotte [n. 11]), *περίοδος γῆς ἐν κομικῷ μέτρῳ εἰς Νικομήδην βασιλέα* (M. Korenjak, *Die Welt-Rundreise eines anonymen griechischen Autors („Pseudo-Skymnos“)* [Hildesheim, 2003]). A. Diller, 'The authors named Pausanias', *TAPhA* 86 (1955), 268–79, at 276–8 suggests that the author might have been Pausanias of Damascus (accepted in the *EANS*, s.v. 'Pausanias of Damaskos'); Marcotte (n. 11), 35–46 reviews earlier attempts at identifying the author and proposes that the author might have been Apollodorus of Athens. On the date, see also S. Bianchetti, *Πλωτὰ καὶ πορευτὰ. Sulle tracce di una periegesi anonima* (Florence, 1990).

³² R. Güngerich, *Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus Bospori* (Berlin, 1927); the title is cited in Steph. Byz. s.v. *Χρυσόπολις*; the *Suda* δ 1176 has a short note on Dion. Byz. Before the recovery of the manuscript containing the *Anaplus* (unfortunately with the middle folio missing), the text was only known in the Latin translation in Pierre Gilles' *De Bosporo Thracio libri tres*; this is printed as a supplement to its proem in the *GGM*. On the discovery of the text, the manuscript, Gilles' translation and previous editions, cf. Güngerich (this note), vi–xxvii; on Gilles and his text, see also *GGM* 2.i–xiv, and *GGM* 2.1–101. Lacuna in the Greek: Dion. Byz. 57–95 Güngerich.

³³ A.G. Roos and G. Wirth, *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia. 2. Scripta minora et fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1968), G. Marengi, *Periplo del Ponto Eusino* (Naples, 1958), A. Silberman, *Périple*

These four texts have the same basic structure as the other *Periploi*, but they are more than artless catalogues of places and distances. They show some degree of variation between themselves, for example in authorial voice, place of personal experience (whether of the author/narrator or of the addressee) within the account, and in the amount and type of extra-navigational subject matter – for they all have some such subject matter – that is included within the navigational framework. To mention some of the starkest features of these texts:³⁴ they are written with literary ambitions. Pseudo-Scymnus and Dionysius Calliphon's son's works are in iambic trimeters; Dionysius Byzantius' and Arrian's prose is carefully constructed and clearly Atticistic.³⁵ None of the authors burden their texts with more than the, at best, sporadic indication of distances between sites – Dionysius Byzantius and pseudo-Scymnus do not have one single measurement – but they indicate topographical progression and relative location carefully. The texts are not limited to strictly nautical information. For example, the tour of the Mediterranean in pseudo-Scymnus is professedly devoted not to distances between sites mentioned or the state of harbours, but to a miscellany of snippets of historical, mythological, ethnographical, geographical information about the stops which, more often than not, are Greek cities.³⁶ On the tour up and down the Bosphorus, Dionysius Byzantius shows a continuous interest in sites, sights and monuments on land, which are often religious and sometimes in ruins.³⁷ He is less attracted to their

du Pont-Euxin (Paris, 1995), A. Liddle, *Periplus Ponti Euxini* (Bristol, 2003). See also Ph.A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1980), 32–41, A.B. Bosworth, 'Arrian and Rome: the minor works', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 226–75, at 242–53.

³⁴ I hope to return to a closer study of these texts.

³⁵ On the literary character of Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.*, cf. Bosworth (n. 33), A. Silberman, 'Arrien, "Périple du Pont Euxin": Essai d'interprétation et d'évaluation des données historiques et géographiques', *ANRW* 2.34.1 (1993), 276–311, at 301–5 and Silberman (n. 33), xxiv–xxvii; on the Atticism and literary ambitions of Dion. Byz., see Güngerich (n. 32), xxviii–xl; on the poetical form of Dion. Calliphon., see Marcotte (n. 30), 26–8, on that of ps.-Scymn., cf. Marcotte (n. 11), 24–8 and 85–90.

³⁶ Ps.-Scymn. 65–97; on the question of subject matter and genre, cf. Marcotte (n. 11), 16–24.

³⁷ Temples, precincts, altars and rituals of various gods and heroes: Dion. Byz. 8, 9–10, 12, 13, 14 (*bis*), 16, 19, 24, 26, 28, 34, 36 (*bis*), 38, 41, 46, 49, 52, 56, 111. A quick glance s.vv. ἄγαλμα, ἱερόν, ναός, ξόανον, τέμενος, βωμός in the *Index verborum* put together by V. Pirenne-Delforge and G. Purnelle, *Pausanias, Periegesis. Index verborum. Liste de fréquence. Index nominum*, 2 vols. (Liège, 1997) gives an idea of how prominent sacred objects are in the *Periegesis*; see also the studies of L. Bruit, 'Pausanias à Phigalie. Sacrifices non-sanglants et discours idéologique', *Mètis* 1 (1986), 71–96, G. Ekroth, 'Pausanias and the sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults', in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult* (Stockholm, 1999), 145–58, J. Elsner, '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), 125–55 and 'Image and ritual: reflections on the religious appreciation of Classical art', *CQ* 46 (1996), 515–31, C. Jourdain-Annequin, 'Représenter les dieux: Pausanias et le panthéon des cités', in V. Pirenne-Delforge (ed.), *Les Panthéons des cités des origines à la Périégèse de Pausanias* (Liège, 1998), 241–61, L. Lacroix, 'Traditions locales et légendes étiologiques dans la Périégèse de Pausanias', *JS* (1994), 75–99, M. Piérart, 'Héros fondateurs. Héros civilisateurs. La rivalité entre Argos et Athènes vue par Pausanias', in V. Pirenne-Delforge and E. Suárez de la Torre (edd.), *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs* (Liège, 2000), 409–34, V. Pirenne-Delforge, 'Les rites sacrificiels dans la Périégèse de Pausanias', in Knoepfler and Piérart (n. 14), 109–34 and 'La portée du témoignage de Pausanias sur les cultes locaux', in G. Labarre (ed.), *Les cultes locaux dans les mondes grec et romain* (Lyon, 2004), 5–20, I. Rutherford, 'Tourism and the sacred. Pausanias and the traditions of Greek pilgrimage', in Alcock et al. (n. 6), 40–52, K. Stratiki, 'Le culte des héros grecs chez Pausanias', *BAGB* (2002), 70–93, C. Frateantonio, *Religion und Städtekonkurrenz.*

physical appearance than to the stories attached to them, thereby explaining the existence, appearance, name and the like of the sites or monuments.³⁸ Arrian's experiments with the *Periplus* genre go beyond matters of content to matters of form; this aspect of the text is discussed below.

The rest of the *Periploi* are best described as catalogues of distances between harbours and cities (in a roughly chronological order): the *Periplus* of pseudo-Scylax,³⁹ the anonymous *Periplus Maris Erythraei* (*PME*),⁴⁰ the *Stadiasmus sive periplus Maris Magni* which it has been suggested is part of the *Chronicon* by Hippolytus of Rome,⁴¹ the *Periplus maris exteri* of Marcian of Heraclea and his epitome of Menippus' *Periplus maris interni*,⁴² and the anonymous and compilatory *Periplus Ponti Euxini* (*PPE*).⁴³ Notwithstanding a number of significant differences, such as its theoretical framework (particularly the two introductory books),⁴⁴ overviews giving the geometrical shape of regions, descriptions reaching further inland, consistent interest in ethnography, history and Homeric geography, Strabo's *Geography* has basically the same structure as the *Periploi*. The description follows the coast of the Mediterranean and Black Sea from Iberia to Libya; the interior is often treated more sketchily. One site is enumerated after another in a linear fashion; topographical progression is indicated mostly with simple adverbs, prepositional phrases and the occasional participle.⁴⁵ Already in antiquity, Marcian of Heraclea noted that the *Geography* is a combination of geography and *periplus*.⁴⁶

Zum politischen und kulturellen Kontext von Pausanias' Periegesis (Berlin, 2009). Ruins: Dion. Byz. 14, 19, 36, 38, 49; on ruinous preservation and loss in the *Periegesis*, cf. J.I. Porter, 'Ideals and ruins. Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic', in Alcock et al. (n. 6), 63–92 and Akujärvi (n. 7), 75–7.

³⁸ e.g. Dion. Byz. 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, etc. This inclination to go for the background stories of the objects is shared with Pausanias.

³⁹ *GGM* 1.15–96, Counillon (n. 11); see also the commentary by D. Marcotte, 'Le Périples dit de Scylax. Esquisse d'un commentaire épigraphique et archéologique', *BollClass* ser. 3 fasc. 7 (1986), 166–82.

⁴⁰ *GGM* 1.257–305, L. Casson, *The Periplus Maris Erythraei* (Princeton, NJ, 1989); cf. F.J. González Ponce, 'El Periplo del Mar Eritreo y la evolución interna del género periplográfico. Nuevas aportaciones al problema de la fecha', *Habis* 23 (1992), 237–45 for a study of the place of this *Periplus* within the *periplus* genre.

⁴¹ *GGM* 1.427–514, Hippol. *Chronicon* 240–613 Helm. On the identification of the author as Hippolytus, see A. Bauer, *Die Chronik des Hippolytos im Matritensis Graecus 121. Nebst einer Abhandlung über den Stadiasmus maris Magni von O. Cuntz* (Leipzig, 1905), 17–20 and Cuntz, *ibid.* 243–79; arguing against, e.g. K. Mras *PhW* 50 (1930), 770–2; see also Marcotte (n. 11), xlix–liii.

⁴² *GGM* 1.515–62 and 563–73, Diller (n. 31), 147–64.

⁴³ *GGM* 1.402–23, Diller (n. 31), 102–46. On the different dates suggested for this work, see Diller (n. 31), 113. The *PPE* is compiled from sections of Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.*, ps.-Scymn., and Marcian. *Epit. Menippi*. Müller's translation of the *PPE* in the *GGM* registers the parallels between the *PPE* and Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.* and other geographical works; Silberman (n. 33) records parallels between the two *Peripli Ponti Euxini* in a separate *apparatus*.

⁴⁴ In the introduction (1.1.21) Strabo, in a spirit of criticism, calls attention to this lack in the *Periploi*.

⁴⁵ Among the most frequently occurring means of transition are *εἶτα* and *μετὰ δέ*, see e.g. the description of Attica, 9.1.12–24; participle, e.g. *πλέοντι* 9.1.9 approaching Attica; more artful transitions, e.g. in 14.3.6–7, 17.1.9–10. The most favoured transition in the *Mansiones Parthicae* is similarly *εἶτα*, e.g. 1. On Strabo and the *periplus* tradition, see K. Clarke, *Between Geography and History. Hellenic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford, 1999), 197–210 and D. Dueck, *Strabo of Amasia. A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* (London, 2000), 40–5.

⁴⁶ *Epit. Menippi* 3 Ἀρτεμίδωρος ὁ Ἐφέσιος γεωγράφος καὶ Στράβων, γεωγραφίαν ὁμοῦ καὶ περίπλου συνθετικότες.

On the Latin side, we have Pomponius Mela's *De chorographia*, the first Roman geography; its description of the countries surrounding the Mediterranean and along the Atlantic coast is organized according to the model of the *periplus*.⁴⁷

As mentioned above, all *Periploi*, both the experimental ones and the catalogues, are distinguished by the same basic structure exploiting the spatial organization of a route along the coast. The route is indicated alternately with adverbial phrases such as 'after' or 'next', with phrases such as 'from A to B is X stadia', etc.⁴⁸ or in the form we encountered in the *Periegesis*, that is to say with dative or genitive participles of verbs of movement with a suppressed indefinite subject.⁴⁹ The verbs are often verbs denoting sailing; this not only reflects the sea-based perspective from which the land has been experienced and is being presented in the description, but also is likely to indicate the anticipated perspective of future readers.

Hanno's periplus is the odd one out among the *Periploi*, not only in the light of the fact that, apparently, it is a Greek translation of a Punic original, but also – and more interestingly for present purposes – in that it is a first-person plural account of one specific exploratory expedition of 60 ships and 30,000 men and women under the leadership of Hanno down the Atlantic coast of Africa.⁵⁰ Arguably this *Periplus* is at least a partial influence on Arrian's experiment with the narrative mode of the *Periploi*. The summary of *Hanno's periplus* at the end of the *Indian History* (43.11–12) shows that Arrian knew this *Periplus*.⁵¹ I shall have more to say on the difference in narrative modes between the *Periploi* and the beginning of Arrian's *Periplus* below.

In order to bring out the similarities between the *Periploi* and the frame narrative of the *Periegesis*, let us compare its beginning, where these similarities are first manifested, with the beginning of the anonymous *PME*. The *PME* differs from other *Periploi* in its pronounced interest in trade and business. It catalogues harbours, anchorages, trading stations and the merchandise that one can buy and sell at and near the various stations; and it gives short but efficient sketches of the customs of the people which merchants can expect to have to deal with when doing their business along the Red Sea. Apparently, it has the practical purpose of helping merchants – perhaps even fellow merchants – to find their way to those trading posts in the area that best match their needs.⁵² But its basic structure is nevertheless the same as in other *Periploi*.

⁴⁷ A. Silberman, *Chorographie* (Paris, 1988), xvi–xviii.

⁴⁸ e.g. *μετὰ δέ*: ps.-Scyl. 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57, etc., *PME* 3, 4, 8, etc., *PPE* 22, 45, 50, etc.; *ἀπὸ δέ*: *PME* 9, 10, 11, 15, 16 etc.; *ἀπὸ* A *εἰς* B is X stadia': *PPE* 3, 4, 5, 6 etc., *Stadiasmus* 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. Distances between locations are generally calculated in stadia or days and nights, e.g. ps.-Scyl. 2, 3, 4, 5, etc., *PME* 8, 41, 51, *PPE* 43, 56, *Stadiasmus* 159, 185, 282, 315, 335. This is hardly a complete list of the various prepositional or nominal phrases used in these texts for connecting places.

⁴⁹ On genitive participles without subject, cf. Kühner–Gerth (n. 21), vol. 2 §486 A2 and Smyth (n. 21), §2072.

⁵⁰ Text and translation: J. Blomqvist, *The Date and Origin of the Greek Version of Hanno's Periplus. With an Edition of the Text and a Translation* (Lund, 1979); commentary: J. Ramin, *Le Périphe d'Hannon / The Periplus of Hanno* (Oxford, 1976).

⁵¹ It has been suggested that Scylax of Caryanda (*FGrH* 709) also wrote in the first person; see Güngerich (n. 22), 10. However, the fragments are too meagre to support an argument in either direction.

⁵² See Casson (n. 40), 7–47.

τῶν ἀποδεδειγμένων ὄρμων τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν ἐμπορίων πρῶτός ἐστι λιμὴν τῆς Αἰγύπτου Μυὸς ὄρμος, μετὰ δὲ αὐτὸν εἰσπλέοντων ἀπὸ χιλίων ὀκτακοσίων σταδίων ἐν δεξιᾷ ἢ Βερνίκῃ ἀμφοτέρων <δὲ> οἱ λιμένες ἐν τῷ ἑσχάτῳ τῆς Αἰγύπτου κόλποι [δὲ] τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης κείνται.

Of the designated harbours of the Red Sea and the ports of trade on it, Myos Hormos is the first harbour in Egypt and, after it, as one sails on for 1,800 stadia, Bernice is on the right. The harbours of both, bays of the Red Sea, lie on the edge of Egypt.

(PME 1)

The beginning of the *PME* is a typical example of the narrative mode of the *Periploï*, and, what is more, it bears a striking resemblance to the present-day beginning of the *Periegesis*.⁵³ Both launch *in medias res*, whereas most *Periploï* have some sort of introduction stating, at the very least, whence the catalogue begins and where it ends. Both texts introduce the subject matter similarly. First, they hint at the overall subject matter of the whole work (the Hellenic mainland and the anchorages and trading posts along the Red Sea, respectively), next they turn to what is the initial point of departure for the ensuing description (Cape Sunium and Myos Hormos, respectively).⁵⁴ This is a landmark from which readers can take their bearings. And both continue by indicating movement by ship using participles with suppressed indefinite subjects (note *παραπλεύσαντι ... πλέοντι* in the *Periegesis*, and *εἰσπλέοντων* in the *PME*).⁵⁵

Given Pausanias' wide reading, it is unlikely that he set out to write a description of Greece without giving some thought to how others before him had tackled problems of describing places, relating distances or covering the ground between sites. Arrian's experiment with the *periplus* genre shows that *Periploï* were accessible in

⁵³ Previously noticed by Hutton (n. 6), 266.

⁵⁴ A similar opening structure – the whole is taken before the part with which the account begins – occurs in ps.-Scyl. 2, Str. 3.1.1–2 (after the two introductory books), Dion. Calliphon. 24 (after the proem); see also Dion. Per. 1–3.

⁵⁵ Other dative and genitive participles in the *Periploï*: *-πλέω* compounds: *-πλέοντι* Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.* 12.3, 20.2, 21.1, 24.6, Marcian. *Peripl.* 1.11 (*bis*), 15 (*quater*), 45, 2.3, 9 (*bis*), *Epit. Menippi* 7, 8, 9, *PME* 33, *PPE* 1, 3, 11, 34 (*bis*), 47, 50, 57 (*bis*), 64, 87, ps.-Scyl. 63, 68, 69, 93, 109, 111, 112, ps.-Scymn. 310, 896, *Stadiasmus* 164, 232; *-πλέουσι* Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.* 23.1, Dion. Byz. 53 (conjecture), Marcian. *Peripl.* 1.2, *Epit. Menippi* 9, *PME* 29, 49, *PPE* 21; *-πλέοντος* *Stadiasmus* 132; *-πλέοντων* Arr. *Peripl. M. Eux.* 17.2 (*bis*), Dion. Byz. 3, Marcian. *Peripl.* 1.2, *Epit. Menippi* 7, *PME* 7, 10, 21, 30, 31, 63, *PPE* 1; *-πλεύσαντι* *PME* 11, 13, 19, 36, *Stadiasmus* 47, 219, *PPE* 1, 20, 34, 58, ps.-Scymn. 646, Marcian. *Peripl.* 1.12, 15, 16, 2.3, 21, *Epit. Menippi* 7, 9; *-πλεύσαντος* Marcian. *Peripl.* 1.2, 32. Other types of verbs occur less frequently, for example *παραμειψάμεν* Dion. Byz. 12, *κάμψαντι* Dion. Byz. 27, 54, Marcian. *Peripl.* 1.13, *Stadiasmus* 139, ps.-Scymn. 150, 556, 627; compounds with *-βάντι* Dion. Calliphon. 74, *PPE* 49 (*bis*), ps.-Scymn. 844, 859, *ἔχοντι* (sc. τὴν γῆν vel sim.) Marcian. *Peripl.* 1.11 (*bis*), 13, 15 (*ter*), 16, 45, 2.9 (*bis*), *Epit. Menippi* 7, *PPE* 1, ps.-Scyl. 112, *Stadiasmus* 185, 186, 189, 297, etc.

The *Stadiasmus* is particularly interesting in the light of its many second-person addresses, mostly imperatives (e.g. *εἰσάγου/κατάγου* 11, 16, 23, 44, 128; *ὀρμίζου* 13, 15, 34, 93, 124; *φυλάσσου* 18, 57; *διαφυλάττου* 304; *πλέε/πάρπλεε* 37, 46, 117, 146, 281; *ἀσφαλίζου* 55, 126, 302, etc.) and futures (e.g. *ᾄψει* 19, 30 (*bis*), 57 (*bis*), 67, 93 (*bis*), 115, 116; *ἔξεις* 67; *(κατα)πλεύσεις* 273 (*bis*), 280 (*bis*), 281, 282), which, together with an assortment of predicative participles and other verbal expressions (cf. e.g. 53, 67, 93, 117, 282, 298) give the text an air of being not only a verbal map of the coast, but also of giving sailing instructions perhaps to a specific addressee (cf. *ἀδελφὲ τιμώτατε* in the proem, the reference of which is difficult to determine), particularly in those stretches of text where the verbal expressions are dense (e.g. 11–19, 53–7, 273, 280–2, 297–304).

the second century A.D., so it is not unlikely that Pausanias' inquiry brought him to some *Periplus* or other though not necessarily to any of those preserved today.

At the start of Pausanias' *Periegesis*, then, the perspective and the language are similar to those of the most mundane *periplus* catalogue. Attica is approached by sea, apparently from the east. The perspective is that of an unspecified someone approaching Athens from the east, sailing along the coast of Attica, and landing at the Piraeus after having sailed past Cape Sunium and Patroclus' island. A temple on the promontory and Laurium with its famous silver mines are noticed *en route*. The progression is indicated with dative participles of verbs of sailing, one of the means by which progression is indicated in the *Periploi*.

The *Periegesis* is rather detailed, but it stays more or less in keeping with the *Periploi*, until Piraeus is reached. Most *Periploi* sail past the harbours and at most note the existence of cities inland. Pausanias, however, slows the pace, stops the ship and zooms in to gaze on particular objects on land, and he lets the travelling persona disembark and explore not just the harbour but also the cities and sites inland. The amount of detail swells. There is a sketch of the history of Piraeus as the port of Athens, a number of monuments are enumerated – apparently in a haphazard order and seemingly chosen at random, though they are singled out as 'noteworthy'⁵⁶ – and some sights in Munychia and Phalerum, the two other ports of Athens, are mentioned (1.1.2–5).

After the three ports of Athens, the description does not return to describing the coast on a coastal voyage. Instead there is a turn inland, towards Athens. In four stages, objects on land generally and the city of Athens specifically are established as the topic of the *Periegesis*:

ἔστι δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἐς Ἀθήνας ἐκ Φαληροῦ ναὸς Ἥρας οὕτε θύρας ἔχων οὕτε ὄροφον ...

Along the road to Athens from Phalerum there is a temple of Hera without either door or roof ... (1.1.5)

ἐσελθόντων δὲ ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἐστὶν Ἀντιόπης μνήμα Ἀμαζόνος ...

Having entered the city, there is a tomb of Antiope the Amazon ... (1.2.1)

ἀνιόντων δὲ ἐκ Πειραιῶς ἐρείπια τῶν τειχῶν ἐστίν, ἃ Κόνων ὕστερον τῆς πρὸς Κνίδω ναυμαχίας ἀνέστησε ...

Going inland from Piraeus there are ruins of the walls that Conon erected after the sea battle off Cnidus ... (1.2.2)

ἐσελθόντων δὲ ἐς τὴν πόλιν οἰκοδόμημα ἐς παρασκευὴν ἐστὶ τῶν πομπῶν ...

Having entered the city there is a building for preparing the processions ... (1.2.4)

Athens is approached not from one direction, but from two – first from Phalerum, next from Piraeus. *En route* selected monuments are noted, fewer on the road from Phalerum than on that from Piraeus. On the road from Phalerum only one ruined temple is noted (1.1.5); on the road from Piraeus the ruins of the long

⁵⁶ Paus. 1.1.3 θέας δὲ ἄξιον τῶν ἐν Πειραιεῖ.

walls are mentioned, Menander's tomb and the cenotaph of Euripides are singled out among the tombs along the road, and 'close to the gates' the memorial of an unknown subject with a sculpture by Praxiteles ends the catalogue (1.2.2–3). Euripides' cenotaph, or rather the fact that the tragedian is buried in Macedonia, occasions a lengthy catalogue of poets who have been attracted to the courts of the rich and powerful.

Athens is entered not once, but twice. The first time, the tomb of Antiope is noticed prompting a brief discussion of various traditions regarding her fate (1.2.1). The second time the city is entered, it is for good (1.2.4). After the first object the catalogue of sights to be seen in Athens goes on without end until the city is exited some sixty pages later (in Rocha-Pereira's Teubner edition) with the remark that the Athenians have sanctuaries and tombs outside the city (1.29.2).

The ship is left in Piraeus and the description turns inland, but the manner in which movement is narrated does not change. At the start of the description, the sequence *κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ... ἐσελθόντων δὲ εἰς τὴν πόλιν ... ἀνιόντων δὲ ἐκ Πειραιῶς ... ἐσελθόντων δὲ εἰς τὴν πόλιν* arguably serves the double purpose of establishing the idea of describing the inland using the organization that we today know best from the *Periploi* and Athens as the most immediate object of description.

When the topographical thread is firmly established and when it is clear that the movement is pedestrian and that the point of view on the objects is that of someone walking among them, verbal phrases become less frequent. Topographical relations are mostly signalled with adverbs or prepositional phrases, if at all. The route from the Pompeium to the agora immediately after Athens is entered may serve as an example. Its topographical skeleton – abridged and paraphrased: close to the Pompeium is Demeter's temple, with statues ... not far from the temple is Poseidon astride on a horse ... in front of the porticoes along the road are bronze statues of men and women. In one of the porticoes are sanctuaries, a gymnasium and a house that now is dedicated to Dionysus Melpomenus. Here (that is, in Dionysus' sanctuary) are a number of statues of gods. After Dionysus' sanctuary comes a building with clay statues of the Athenian king Amphictyon entertaining Dionysus and other gods. Here is (also) Pegasus of Eleutherae. Next, Pausanias narrates how Amphictyon became king of Athens (1.2.4–6).

The section is a fairly representative sample of Pausanias' procedure. The monuments are strung together one after another forming long, apparently unbroken – but not exhaustive⁵⁷ – topographical sequences. Most monuments are religious. Descriptions of larger monuments develop into accounts of their parts or of artefacts

⁵⁷ The principle of selection has been established already in the Piraeus, cf. above. Later there are breaks in the topographical sequence, either apparent (as the location of one monument is not specified in relation to the preceding one, e.g. 1.8.6; this is particularly frequent in descriptions of small places where only a few monuments are mentioned) or actual; e.g. in 1.17.1–2 the altar of Eleus is not connected to previous monuments but it is said to be in the agora – some commercial market, not the Classical agora, which Pausanias consistently calls *κεραμεικός*, cf. E. Vanderpool, 'The "agora" of Pausanias I, 17, 1–2', *Hesperia* 43 (1974), 308–10 – and Ptolemy's gymnasium is not linked to any specific monument but is said to be close to the agora. This is the beginning of a new topographical sequence; the Theseum is linked to Ptolemy's gymnasium. Distinguishing between the two is impossible without archaeological or other kinds of evidence, as is shown by e.g. A. Muller's series 'Megarika' on the topography of Megara published in five consecutive volumes of *BCH* (1980–4). On topographical sequences in the *Periegesis*, cf. Hutton (n. 6), 83–174.

housed in or near them. Details singled out in objects in close proximity are often varied. In this excerpt we are told that the statues in Demeter's sanctuary were made by Praxiteles, that the statue of Poseidon has been rededicated (Pausanias does not say to whom), that the statues in front of the porticoes represent ordinary men and women. About today's sanctuary of Dionysus Melpomenus we learn that it was once the house of Pulytion where the Eleusinian mysteries were parodied, about another building that it contains a clay statue group representing Amphictyon hosting a banquet for gods. Apropos of a statue of Pegasus of Eleutherae there is an account of who he was, and apropos of Amphictyon there is a narrative about how he became the king of Athens – illustrating the general tendency in the whole work to go for the background stories of objects and to bring out their contextual significance as much as, if not even more than, their physical appearance.⁵⁸

When verbal phrases recur – mostly with verbs of walking, rarely with verbs of sailing⁵⁹ – in the ensuing description they, together with the more inconspicuous but ever-present adverbs and prepositional phrases, confirm and reinforce the initial build-up establishing what we recognize today from the *Periploi* as the structuring frame of the *Periegesis*. Dative and genitive participles of verbs of movement, with more than 350 and 40 occurrences respectively, are most common – singular and plural appear to be used without any apparent difference in signification, though singular genitive participles are very rare. Additionally, the movement of the indefinite persona is occasionally expressed with futures, potential optatives with ἄν, πρίν-clauses with the infinitive and conditionals. In more than 200 further passages, the anonymous persona is also presented as doing something other than moving, such as, for instance, viewing, evaluating, having or forming opinions.⁶⁰ However, most commonly the verbs are used for narrating movement over larger areas, such as to Athens from Phalerum and Piraeus, as we saw earlier, or, leaving Athens, from Athens to the Academia (κατιούσι 1.29.2), from Athens to Eleusis (ἰούσι ... προελθούσι ... πρίν ἢ διαβῆναι ... διαβάσι ... διαβάσι 1.36.3–38.2), from Eleusis to Boeotia (τραπομένοις 1.38.8) and from Eleusis to Megara (ἐρχομένοις 1.39.1). Note that Athens is exited twice just as it is twice entered. Between the two exits from Athens, the topographical order breaks down in the description of the countryside of Attica after the Academia and its vicinity. Small demes (1.31.1–6), mountains (1.32.1–2), other demes about which more is told (1.32.3–34.5) and islands (1.35.1–36.2) are enumerated in a perfunctory manner.⁶¹

With the second exit from Athens the topographical order is resumed. With only a few exceptions, it remains the default mode for connecting one object to the

⁵⁸ The importance of the stories behind the monuments is well illustrated with the comment 'they do not tell any story' (οὐδεὶς λεγόμενός σφισίν ἐστι λόγος), concerning Cepus and the temple and statue of Aphrodite there (1.19.2). The *Periegesis*, however, does not tell every story. In the description of Athens, for example, two monuments finished close to Pausanias' own time, the Olympieum dedicated by Hadrian (1.18.6) and Herodes Atticus' stadium (1.19.6), are described without any mention of their prehistory. This move isolates the complexes from their history; for other references to these buildings in literature, cf. Frazer (n. 6) ad loc.

⁵⁹ Verbs of sailing: 1.35.1, 2.34.8 (see Hutton [n. 6], 122–3), 3.23.2, 7.22.10, 9.24.1 (across Lake Copais), 9.32.2, 9.32.4 (on the two latter, cf. A.M. Snodgrass, *An Archaeology of Greece. The Present State and the Future Scope of a Discipline* [Berkeley, 1987], 83–4). When the sea-borne perspective is resumed the risk of mistakes appears to increase; on Pausanias' propensity for making mistakes at sea, see Hutton (n. 6), 122–5.

⁶⁰ Cf. Akujärvi (n. 7), 145–66.

⁶¹ Cf. also the summary enumeration of Hadrianic buildings in Athens (1.18.9) and Athenian courts of justice (1.28.8–11).

previous one throughout the *Periegesis*. One type of exception is the occasional enumeration of objects according to category rather than topographical proximity, as in the Attic countryside.⁶² This procedure is developed further in the description of the Altis.⁶³

The great number of objects worth mentioning crammed into the small space of the Altis must have presented a particular challenge to Pausanias. He solved the problem of making a fairly clear and readable account of the layers of monuments accumulated in the Altis throughout the centuries by sorting them into categories and treating them one by one in a topographical order. The many and uncommonly long organizing comments throughout the description of the Altis reflect its complex structure.⁶⁴ The *Periegesis* presents not one but four tours of the Altis, starting with a long description of the temple of Zeus and its immediate vicinity (5.10.2–13.7), stopping at the temple of Hera and its immediate vicinity (5.16.1–20.10) and ending with the treasuries (6.19), before exiting the Altis in the direction of Mount Cronius and the hippodrome (6.20.1–21.3). The tours have different foci and all but one follow a topographical order. One tour focusses on the statues of Zeus (5.21.2–25.1), another on statues of gods other than Zeus (5.25.1–27.12) and the final and longest one on a selection of statues of men, mainly of Olympic victors (6.1.3–18.7). The first tour, that of the altars in the Altis, begins near the temple of Zeus with the great ashen altar for Zeus (5.13.8–15.12). A description of other altars in Olympia follows. As Pausanias makes clear in the organizing comment of transition, the altars are not recorded in the usual topographical order. Instead the account follows the order in which the Eleans are wont to sacrifice on them (5.14.4). Before long, after a number of altars that are mentioned in an apparent – perhaps actual – topographical order, Pausanias reminds the readers that the altars are not enumerated in the order in which they stand but in the order following the Elean ritual (5.14.10).⁶⁵ So much is the topographical order the norm for structuring the account in the *Periegesis* that, when another structuring device is used, readers need to be reminded in case they get the wrong idea about the structure.

Verbal phrases are less common for narrating movement in built-up areas where monuments are close together. Their appearance in city descriptions tends to give an impression of either long distance between monuments, the beginning of a new topographical sequence or particularly significant monuments,⁶⁶ as in the approach to the Acropolis in Athens.⁶⁷ A counterexample is the very perfunctory description of the sights in the Odeum at Athens:

⁶² Cf. Robert (n. 2), 76–89 for further examples of organization according to categories.

⁶³ For an analysis of the description of Olympia as a metonym for Greece within the *Periegesis*, see J. Elsner, 'Structuring "Greece": Pausanias's *Periegesis* as a literary construct', in Alcock et al. (n. 6), 3–20.

⁶⁴ Paus. 5.10.1, 14.4, 16.1, 21.1, 25.1, 6.1.1–2.

⁶⁵ In Paus. 5.14.5–9 the usual prepositional phrases and adverbs link one altar to the next.

⁶⁶ In the short description of Megara there are nine participles (1.40.4, 40.6, 41.1, 41.6, 42.1, 42.6, 43.4, 44.2 [*bis*]), which combine to create an impression of there being both some distance between the monuments and a number of new beginnings in the description. For a study of Pausanias' description and Megara's topography, cf. Muller (n. 57).

⁶⁷ Paus. 1.21.4, 22.1, 22.4. Most other participles in the description of Athens introduce significant monuments with a long history: 15.1 (Stoa Poikile), 24.5 (the Parthenon), 26.5 (the Erechtheum). The Sarapeum on the slopes of the Acropolis is also introduced with a participle *ἐντεῦθεν ἰοῦσιν ἐς τὰ κάτω* (18.4). The interpretation is uncertain. It may be that the distance between the Sarapeum and the Prytaneum was long and it is possible that the Sarapeum is the start of a new sequence, but as the exact location of both these monuments, as well as that of

ἐς δὲ τὸ Ἀθήνησιν ἐσελθοῦσιν Ὡδεῖον ἄλλα τε καὶ Διόνυσος κείται θέας ἄξιος.

As one enters the Odeum at Athens there is a noteworthy (statue of) Dionysus among other things. (1.14.1)

That is all. In this passage the participle is not explicable along any of the suggested lines. The ground covered is not great. A new topographical sequence is not introduced. Nor does the monument appear to be significant – rather, the description is something of an anticlimax. Instead, the almost over-explicit indication of location and movement – in Athens, as one enters the Odeum – may be explained as a means of regrouping the description in Athens after the series of long biographies of Ptolemy IX, Lysimachus and Pyrrhus (1.9.1–13.9). The series was launched by the statues of Ptolemies at the entrance to the Odeum nearly thirteen Teubner pages earlier (1.8.6). During the biographies the connection to Athens and the statues at the Odeum has increasingly faded away. When Pyrrhus is reached, it is no longer evident that the statue prompting the biography is at the entrance to the Odeum or close to it. The last biography is introduced with the statement that ‘the Athenians have a statue of Pyrrhus, too’ (1.11.1); where they have the statue is unclear.

IV

The distinctive atemporal, iterative and impersonal – or depersonalized – character of the travel narrative of the frame in the *Periegesis* and the *Periploi* stands out if we consider how the travel might have been narrated had it, for instance, been cast in the shape of a homodiegetic narrative, that is a first-person narrative.⁶⁸ This is precisely what Arrian does in the *Periplus Ponti Euxini*. He recasts the travel narrative as an account of a journey undertaken by the author and his companions.⁶⁹ Many aspects of this intriguing literary treatise-cum-letter-cum-*periplus* must be set aside in the present study, as we focus on that aspect of his experiments that interests us most, viz. the position of the author-narrator’s experiences within the travel narrative.

Beginning with a greeting typical of letters (*Ἀποκράτορι Καίσαρι Τραϊανῶ Ἀδριανῶ Σεβαστῶ Ἀρριανὸς χαίρειν*), the first half of the treatise evokes the form of a letter from a governor to the emperor – it is a product of Arrian’s

those before and after them, is unknown, the matter cannot be determined at present. Given Pausanias’ general preference for what is ancient and local, it seems unlikely that he would consider the Sarapeum a significant sanctuary in Athens, on a par with e.g. the Parthenon.

⁶⁸ For alternative modes of narrating travel, many of which appear less appropriate for the *Periegesis*, see M. Pretzler, *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (London, 2007), 44–56.

⁶⁹ On the possible influence on Arrian of *Hanno’s Periplus*, another semi-official report of a coastal voyage, see above. The *Act. Ap.* also narrates travel in the first person plural; this text is, however, not comparable in any other aspect with either Arrian’s or *Hanno’s Periplus*. On the first person plural narrative in the *Act. Ap.*, cf. e.g. S.E. Porter, *The Paul of Acts. Essays in Literary Criticism, Rhetoric, and Theology* (Tübingen, 1999) and ‘Hanno’s Periplus and the Book of Acts’, in A. Piltz et al. (edd.), *For Particular Reason. Studies in Honour of Jerker Blomqvist* (Lund, 2003), 259–72. See also Hutton (n. 6), 266–70 for a comparison with a different focus of the opening paragraphs of Arrian’s *Periplus* and the beginning of the *Periegesis*.

time as legate in Cappadocia in the 130s.⁷⁰ The repeated addresses to ‘you’, that is Hadrian, keep up the initial letter fiction, create a certain intimacy in its tone and remind readers that they are not the primary addressees.⁷¹

As the focus is on the experiences of a particular group of individuals, and as the account is a narrative of their experiences on one particular tour of inspection from Trapezus to Sebastopolis, not only the presentation but also the subject matter of this *Periplus* differs from that of other *Periploi*. The first sentence sets the tone:

εἰς Τραπεζοῦντα ἤκομεν, πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα, ὡς λέγει ὁ Ξενοφῶν ἐκείνος, ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ ἁκισμένην, Σινωπέων ἀποικον, καὶ τὴν μὲν θάλασσαν τὴν τοῦ Εὐξείνου ἄσμενοι κατείδομεν ὄθενπερ καὶ Ξενοφῶν καὶ σύ.

We arrived at Trapezus, a Hellenic city, as the famous Xenophon reports, built by the sea, a Sinopean colony, and we joyously looked down at the Euxine sea from the place whence both Xenophon and you did. (1.1)

As Arrian states that ‘we arrived at Trapezus’, he also echoes the wording of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* and alludes to one of the most famous episodes of that narrative, the Greeks’ joy at catching a first sight of the sea after their long march from inland Asia.⁷² He conflates three sightings of the Black Sea – his own with Xenophon’s and Hadrian’s – and fuses the past with the present, establishing a common interest, shared by Roman and Greek alike, in Greek history and literature as personified by Xenophon.⁷³ The literary character of the text casts the author as a *pepaideumenos* steeped in the Greek literary tradition; the same is implied about the addressee(s), both explicit and implicit. Presumably the readership was expected not only to recognize the literary allusions, but also to appreciate the author’s reworking of the traditionally straightforward *periplus* genre.

For present purposes Arrian’s most interesting innovation is the centrality of the experiences of ‘we’ or ‘I’ and his retinue on the shores of the Black Sea. After reporting on the progress in the building projects and on the sacrifices performed in Trapezus (1.1–2.4), the *Periplus* is a straightforward first-person (plural) narrative of ‘our’ voyage:

⁷⁰ The reference to the death of Cotys, king of the Cimmerian Bosphorus in A.D. 131/2 (17.3) gives a rather secure date *post quem* for the *Periplus*; cf. A.B. Bosworth, ‘Arrian’s literary development’, *CQ* 22 (1972), 163–85, esp. 163; see also H. Tonnet, *Recherches sur Arrien. Sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1988), 1.60–99.

⁷¹ Apart from the initial greeting, Hadrian is addressed in the second person in 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.4, 10.1, 11.1, 11.3, 12.2, 16.6, 17.3, 18.3; there are also two exhortations (1.4 and 2.1). Allusions to an official report in Latin (6.2 and 10.1) contribute to an increased sense of distance between Arrian’s primary and secondary addressees.

⁷² Cf. Xen. *An.* 4.8.22 and 4.7.21–6. On the Xenophontic influence on Arrian’s minor works in general and the *Periplus* in particular, cf. Bosworth (n. 33).

⁷³ Xenophon and Greek literature in general are continually present in the *Periplus*. All Xenophontic references are to the *Anabasis*: 2.3 (6.2.25), 11.1 (4.8.22), 12.5 (6.4.3–5), 13.6 (6.2.12, 3.4–5, 4.2, 4.23–4), 14.4 (6.1.15–17), 16.3 (5.5.3), 25.1–2 (7.5.12–13). Other references: the Homeric epics: 3.2 (*Od.* 5.469), 8.2 (*Il.* 2.754), 23.4 with a verbal echo of Plato, *Symposium* 180a (the whole *Iliad*); Herodotus: 15.1 (Hdt. 1.6.1 and 72.2–3, correcting the Herodotean account), 18.1–2 (Hdt. 4.109); Aeschylus: 19.2 (fr. 190–1 Radt); Greek literature in general: 19.4, 25.3. Quotation of an unknown tragedian 3.4 (*TrGF* 2.89).

ἐκ Τραπεζοῦντος δὲ ὀρμηθέντες τῇ μὲν πρώτη εἰς Ὑσσοῦ λιμένα καθήραμεν καὶ τοὺς πεζοὺς τοὺς ταύτῃ ἐγυμνάσαμεν ... ἐνθένδε ἐπλέομεν τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ταῖς αὔραις ταῖς ἐκ τῶν ποταμῶν πνεούσαις ἔωθεν καὶ ἅμα ταῖς κώπαις διαχρώμενοι.

We set off from Trapezus and put in at Hyssou Limen on the first day and exercised the infantry there ... Thence we sailed at first with the breeze blowing from the rivers in the morning and rowing at the same time. (3.1–2)

We read about the stages of their voyage, what winds were blowing, the storm they encountered, where they dropped anchor, the condition of the ports and anchorages and what they did during their stops while sailing from Trapezus to Sebastopolis (3.1–11.5). Occasionally what 'I' did is separated from what 'we' did, as in Apsarus where five cohorts were stationed (6.1):

καὶ τὴν μισθοφορὰν τῇ στρατιᾷ ἔδωκα καὶ τὰ ὄπλα εἶδον καὶ τὸ τεῖχος καὶ τὴν τάφρον καὶ τοὺς κάμνοντας καὶ τοῦ σίτου τὴν παρασκευὴν τὴν ἐνούσαν. ἦντινα δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τὴν γνώμην ἔσχον, ἐν τοῖς Ῥωμαϊκοῖς γράμμασιν γέγραπται.

I paid the troops and I inspected the armour, the wall, the trench, the sick and the present provision for supplies. What my opinion was on these matters is set out in the Latin letter. (6.2)

The nature of the duties of 'I' make it clear, as in the quotation above, that the voyage is undertaken on official governmental business, paying the troops and inspecting defences.⁷⁴ In chapter 12 the text changes character. It turns from a letter recounting Arrian's personal experiences on his tour of inspection into a catalogue of places and distances along the remainder of the Black Sea coast with only a few embellishments. The continuity between the first (epistolary) and the later (cataloguing) parts of the *Periplus* is secured by a succession of addresses to 'you' which are both more sporadic and less obtrusive, expressions of the author-narrator's personal opinions and so on. The personal experiences on board a ship fade away. Now we no longer read about 'our' sailing or 'my' inspection; now the text catalogues places, people and distances strung together with prepositional phrases and occasional impersonal participles. For instance, close to the start of the second section we find this:

ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πλέοντι ἐν δεξιᾷ Ῥήβας ποταμός· σταδίους διέχει τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διὸς ἐνενηκόντα. ἔπειτα Μέλαινα ἄκρα ὠδε καλουμένη, πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν.

Sailing from the sanctuary, the river Rhebas is on the right. It is 90 stadia from the sanctuary of Zeus. Thereafter the so-called Black Cape is 150 stadia away.⁷⁵ (12.3)

In short, after the experiment in the first section, in which the voyage element was turned from the nondescript movement of a featureless travelling persona – typical of the works of geographical description – into a homodiegetic narration about the

⁷⁴ Other instances where Arrian's experiences are separated from those of the others: 1.2, 2.3, 9.3–5, 10.3–4. Moreover, throughout the *Periplus* there are many first-person singular statements, mostly statements of opinion, e.g. *δοκεῖ μοι* vel sim.: 2.1, 2.2, 4.2, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 11.1, 11.4, 23.3.

⁷⁵ Other participles: 17.2, 18.1, 21.1, 24.6.

travels of a specific group of individuals, the text turns (both as regards form and content) into a traditional *periplus*.

Mutatis mutandis, the first part of Arrian's *Periplus* shows what form Pausanias' narrative might have taken had he chosen to produce an account of his personal travels in Greece. In the frame narrative of the *Periegesis* all specifics that would turn the narrative into an account of the unique experiences of Pausanias, or of Pausanias and his fellow travellers, are peeled off. Turning to the opening sentences of the *Periegesis* again, we notice that it narrates an approach towards Athens that could take place at any time, no matter when (whether in the past, present or future), no matter how many times, no matter who sails from Cape Sunium off Attica from the direction of Asia Minor, and not only when Pausanias did. Any time anybody sails on that route, the temple of Athena Sunias stands on the top of the promontory. Or rather, it is the temple of Poseidon – it is unfortunate that Pausanias happened to get things wrong at the very start of the *Periegesis*. And any time anybody sails on from there he will come to Patroclus' island and the remains of the silver mines at Laurium. This is so for as long as the temple – or its ruins – are left standing and the name of the district and the island are not changed, or at least for as long as the memory of the names remains. Changes and devastations of time limit the temporal applicability of the frame narrative. Nevertheless, with due allowance for the nearly two millennia that have passed since the *Periegesis* was written, Pausanias' words could describe an approach to Athens even to this day. The same timelessness applies to the rest of the frame narrative of the *Periegesis*, and to the *Periploi*.

It is possible that Pausanias deliberately avoided making the *Periegesis* into an account of one journey by one person or a particular group of individuals that took place once at a particular point in time. The reason is probably the gains to be had from the impersonal and atemporal mode rather than to avoid the effects of associating the narrative with first-person travel narrative, the prototype of which is the tale of Odysseus – the ultimate unreliable first-person narrator of his own travel experiences.⁷⁶ After all, as is shown below, Pausanias does not hesitate to create an equally dubious persona in the authorial-narratorial 'I' that has a strongly Herodotean flavour, with all its implications of fallibility.

A consequence of Pausanias' decision to model the frame narrative on the *periplus* genre, and to respect its particular atemporal, iterative and impersonal narrative manner, is that the travel narrative of the *Periegesis* cannot be read as an account of his travels. Or, perhaps the causality is the other way around. Wanting to keep personal travel experiences from the narrative, but nevertheless wanting to exploit the organizing structure of travel among the monuments of Greece, Pausanias decided on a framework familiar from the *Periploi* for the *Periegesis*.

V

Even so, the *Periegesis* does have a strong first-person presence. Many stray remarks make explicit the personal travel experiences that are implicitly the foundation of the work. However, only once are first-person experiences concerned with actual movement from point A to point B. This happens in Megara, where the

⁷⁶ As suggested in Pretzler (n. 68), 45–56.

man who explained local matters to 'us' led Pausanias from Alcmena's tomb to a spot called Rhous (1.41.2).⁷⁷ Neither before nor after this piece of information do we come across any similar snippet in the frame narrative.

The first-person travel experiences recounted are regularly confined to arriving in time or too late, to seeing or noticing some specific detail on a monument, to wonder and amazement or to reflections on correspondences or divergences between accounts. For example, in the Boeotian countryside there is, among other things, a sanctuary of Meter Dindymene with an image dedicated by Pindar. The ruins and the sanctuary are on the road from Thebes to Thespieae when one has crossed Dirce (διαβάντων and διαβάσι 9.25.3). This is one of many sanctuaries in Greece to which access is restricted.⁷⁸ It is the custom that this sanctuary is opened on one single day of the year, Pausanias says, and explains that 'I managed to arrive on this day, and I saw' the statue and the throne.⁷⁹ Whether Pausanias arrived at the temple *en route* from Thebes to Thespieae – as described in the text – or travelling in the opposite direction or perhaps on some different journey, he does not say. Apparently, such particulars are unimportant.

But I am anticipating myself. The first-person presence in the *Periegesis* is not limited to first-person travel experiences. A brief survey of the first-person statements in the *Periegesis* shows that these fall into two categories: 'I' as narrator and 'I' as character, which is an earlier incarnation of the 'I' on whose doings 'I' the narrator reports.⁸⁰ Based on a rough description of the types of action carried out, the categories are subdivided, each into two types. The narrator falls into the categories of writer and dater, the character into those of researcher and traveller. In what follows, I discuss the types more fully, illustrating them with examples taken from the first book, usually the first occurrences of a given phenomenon.

Needless to say, in every narrative text there is a narratorial 'I', the subject enunciating the discourse. Whether drawing attention to this act or not, he is always there enunciating. As narrator Pausanias resembles the primary Herodotean narrator in that he is very overt and firmly situated within the text as the narrating instance.⁸¹

Pausanias often draws attention to his writing of the *Periegesis* by explicitly bringing the composition of the text to the fore in cross references and organizing statements. There are more than 150 cross references in the work, some referring readers to previous accounts, others to future ones. Cross-referencing is a minor

⁷⁷ ἐντεῦθεν ὁ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἡμῖν ἐξηγητῆς ἡγήετο ἐς χωρίον Ῥοῦν ὡς ἔφασκεν ὀνομαζόμενον.

⁷⁸ See W.K. Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes* (Amsterdam, 1998), 178 n. 72 for a convenient list of other sanctuaries mentioned in the *Periegesis* to which the public had restricted access.

⁷⁹ ἔμοι δὲ ἀφικέσθαι τε ἐξεργασθῆναι τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα εἶδον <λίθου> τοῦ Πεντελῆσι καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸν θρόνον. 'I' was not always so lucky, cf. 6.26.1 and 8.41.6. In both these instances Pausanias appears to have inserted explanations that 'I' did not see or experience the things described as caveats indicating that he is working with second-hand information.

⁸⁰ Cf. Akujärvi (n. 7), 25–33.

⁸¹ On the Herodotean narrator, cf. e.g. C. Dewald, 'Narrative surface and authorial voice in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 147–70 and "'I didn't give my own genealogy": Herodotus and the authorial persona', in E.J. Bakker et al. (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden, 2002), 267–89, J. Marincola, 'Herodotean narrative and the narrator's presence', *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 121–37, D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto, 1989), esp. 55–108, I.J.F. de Jong, 'Herodotus', in ead. et al. (edd.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 2004), 101–14. In *Syr. D.* Lucian, influenced by the Herodotean author-narrator, creates a similar authorial-narratorial 'I', cf. Lightfoot (n. 11), 161–74, esp. 163–8.

subversion of linear reading, as it calls attention to sections of the text other than the immediate one and acknowledges – even suggests? – the possibility of taking shortcuts on the path through a text. A reference forward might tempt an impatient reader to skip to more interesting sections, and a reference back might entice a reader who has gone ahead of things to return to earlier sections of the text. The first cross reference appears on the second page of the Teubner edition, referring to the previous mention of Phalerum as the port of Athens barely one page earlier.⁸² In the absence of an introduction stating the scope of the work, early references to future accounts are particularly interesting as they give readers a sense of what is coming. That Athens is not the limit of the description appears from a few forward references, such as the statement that ‘I am unwilling’ to discuss Medusa ἐν τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς (1.22.7), that ‘I will write’ about the Sphinx upon reaching τὰ Βοιωτία (1.24.5), or the vaguer promises to discuss things in other parts of the work (1.33.1 and 41.2).⁸³ Together with the much discussed (organizing) declaration that ‘I will treat all things Greek’ (πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά, 1.26.4) – a Herodotean echo that apparently cuts short an incipient narrative on the cult of Artemis Leucophryne⁸⁴ among the Magnesians – statements like these alert readers to the fact that Athens is but one part of something larger.⁸⁵

The writer surfaces in numerous organizing first-person statements, articulating the joints where one segment ends and another begins. Like the cross references, the approximately 87 organizing statements in the first person clarify the structure of the work, though often on a smaller scale. For example, at the close of the first longer historical narrative, Pausanias declares, in the first overt organizing statement, that ‘I shall return to the beginning of the account, where I digressed’ (1.4.6),⁸⁶ turning next to the Tholus which, Pausanias says, is close to the Bouleuterion (1.5.1), which houses a painting of Callippus among other paintings and statues. This was the painting that triggered the narrative about the invasion of Greece by the Gauls (1.3.5) that begins as an explanation of who Callippus was and continues as an exposition of who the Gauls were before turning into an account of their invasion and its aftermath (1.4.1–6). ‘I shall return’ etc. closes the narrative and regrounds the account in the Bouleuterion at Athens.

⁸² Paus. 1.1.4 referring to §4. Perhaps this is in imitation of Herodotus, who occasionally has a reference to a narrative that was finished a few lines earlier (e.g. 1.61.1). For a full discussion on references in the *Periegesis*, cf. Akujärvi (n. 7), 35–44 and 60–4 with a list of cross references.

⁸³ With only one exception the cross references always have some form of first person (verb or pronoun), cf. Akujärvi (n. 7), 36.

⁸⁴ That is, Artemis Leucophryene, as she is known from other authors (e.g. Str. 14.1.40) and inscriptions (cf. LSJ s.v. *Λευκοφρυνη*). It is difficult to decide whether the fault lies with Pausanias or the manuscript tradition. The manuscripts unanimously read *Λευκοφρύνην* at this point; in 3.18.9 Artemis is called Leucophryene. Here, at 1.26.4, Hitzig and Blümner (n. 6) following Dindorf’s lead, emend the text, whereas F. Spiro, *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1903) and Rocha-Pereira (n. 20) keep the reading of the manuscripts.

⁸⁵ On the Herodotean echo, cf. D. Musti, ‘La struttura del discorso storico in Pausania’, in J. Bingen (ed.), *Pausanias historien* (Geneva, 1996), 9–34; see also the discussion on pp. 35–43. In the absence of declarations of the purpose of the *Periegesis* or of its geographical scope, the statement in 1.26.4 has been taken as giving at least some answers, though it is not particularly illuminating; see e.g. Habicht (n. 6), 6–7, Bearzot (n. 6), Elsner (n. 37), Porter (n. 37), 68–9, Hutton (n. 6), 55–8.

⁸⁶ ἐπάνειμι δὲ ἐς τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅθεν ἐξέβην τοῦ λόγου. Similar organizing statements occur both in geographical (e.g. ps.-Scyl. 7, 13, 29, etc., Str. 3.4.5, 7.3.10, 9.3.12, etc., *Stadiasmus* 284, 285, 291) and historical and other types of texts (e.g. Hdt. 7.137.3, Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.19, 5.1, 7.4.1, Polyb. 18.28.12, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 8.56.4, Joseph. *AJ* 6.350, Cass. Dio 46.19.1).

The organizing statements are of three types. First, they mark transitions, as in the example just discussed.⁸⁷ Secondly, they often express selectivity, stating that 'I' has access to information that 'I' for some reason or other – the reason is sometimes specified, sometimes not – will not or cannot divulge in full. For example, introducing a discussion on various traditions about Triptolemus, Pausanias states that 'I will omit anything relating to Deiope' (1.14.1) and, beginning the account of the sacrificial practices for Zeus Polieus, he declares that 'I omit the reason given for them' (1.24.4).⁸⁸ Why, he does not say. Or, at the start of the account of the Mithridatic war, Pausanias avoids delving into its background, stating that 'I will relate the events having to do with the capture of Athens' (1.20.4) and nothing else.⁸⁹ In this instance one may suspect that the theme of the *Attica* is one reason why the account is limited to that episode of the war. Sometimes the grounds of selection are explained, as when, after the lengthy discussion on the arrows covering the statue of Diitrephes, Pausanias enumerates a selection of statues close to it, explaining 'for I do not want to write about the insignificant statues' (1.23.4); or when he states that he will not write about Hermolycus or Phormion since others have written about them, but as regards Phormion 'I can add this much' (1.23.10).

Even before the first explicit first-person statement, the idea of selectivity as an implicit principle underlying the composition of the *Periegesis* is hinted at a number of times when Pausanias suggests that the sights mentioned or stories narrated are but a few among many or that they are (most) worth seeing or telling.⁹⁰ For readers – both ancient and modern – who are familiar with the sights of Greece the textual hints are not necessary to understand the implicit selectivity, but they are useful for bringing this principle out. Finally, as the account reaches the end of Athens and before it embarks upon Megara, there is an organizing statement marking the transition. Here Pausanias confirms that the sights and stories included in the *Periegesis* are those that 'I' deemed to be 'the most noteworthy' subjects concerning the Athenians and that the selection has been going on from the very start (1.39.3, cf. above). In light of the constant selectivity, both implicit and explicit, the statement that 'all things Greek' (1.26.4) will be treated can hardly be taken otherwise than as a transition-cum-hyperbolic assertion making it clear that Athens is not the limit of the work.

Finally, a third type of organizing comments are the statements of omission, that is statements to the effect that 'I' will not write a word about certain matters. For example, Pausanias closes the discussion on various traditions about Triptolemus with the remark that a dream stopped 'me' from going further into that tradition (1.14.3). With reference to the same dream he avoids describing what is on the other side of the wall of the sanctuary in Eleusis; this time the concluding remark shows that religious scruples are the cause (1.38.7). The reason for the omission is sometimes stated, sometimes not. When it comes to religious matters, the reason for omission, if stated, is scruples, as in the passage above, or ignorance – or apparently so. The statements are often ambiguous remarks (not explicitly in the first person) pointing to a religious secret that is not explained further, such as

⁸⁷ Cf. also e.g. 1.6.1, 8.1. A banal variant consists of statements clarifying the order of the account. They often function as introductory comments, stating basically that 'I' will discuss *b*, but first comes *a*, e.g. 1.13.4.

⁸⁸ Cf. Lateiner (n. 81), 59–75 on similar comments in Herodotus.

⁸⁹ Cf. also 1.25.6.

⁹⁰ ἄλλα τε ... καί vel sim., e.g. 1.6.2, 8.4, 21.5; θείας ἄξιον vel sim., e.g. 1.1.3, 5.4, 9.3, 14.1.

the allusion to secret rites performed in four pits in Titane (2.12.1).⁹¹ As to other subject matter, the stated reason for an omission is generally that it is unseemly, as when Pausanias refuses to mention insignificant statues (cf. above), or that other writers (sometimes named) have written about the event or episode, as when he refuses to write about Hermolycus and Phormion (cf. above). These statements are not always explicitly in the first person, as in the references to a fuller account of the battle at Mantinea and preceding events in Xenophon's *Hellenica* (1.3.4).⁹² Inversely, when there is an explicitly stated reason to *include* something in the *Periegesis*, then generally the reason is either that the subject is little known (1.6.1), though the sincerity of the claim may be doubted,⁹³ unknown (1.23.2), though the anecdote is actually found in other contemporary literature,⁹⁴ or likely to interest the readers (1.28.11).⁹⁵

Dater is the second role in which 'I' as narrator surfaces. With 'dater' I mean the more than 400 passages in which Pausanias refers to his own time, linking an object or an event with the 'now' when 'I' is writing the *Periegesis*, and not the relatively few instances of absolute dates.⁹⁶ Pausanias refers to 'now' using either prepositional phrases with a first-person pronoun – singular and plural appear to be used indiscriminately – or various adverbial phrases that refer to the temporal situation of 'I'.⁹⁷

Ever since the first dater comment stating that there were docks in the Piraeus 'even today' (1.1.2), the dater is constantly present in the *Periegesis* linking objects and events to 'now'.⁹⁸ Pausanias' linking of events and objects to his present generally amounts to indicating whether something has changed or remains the same when the present is compared with the past. The changes have often occurred a long time ago, though not always as long ago as when Actaea was renamed Attica (1.2.6). Unless Pausanias refers to an otherwise known event, the exact date generally escapes readers. Until 5.1.2 where it is revealed that it has 'now' been 217

⁹¹ On this kind of silence in the *Periegesis*, cf. further 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.

⁹² For a fuller discussion, cf. J. Dalfen, 'Dinge, die Pausanias nicht sagt', in R. Faber and B. Seidensticker (edd.), *Worte, Bilder, Töne. Studien zur Antike und Antikerezeption B. Kytzler zu ehren* (Würzburg, 1996), 159–77, Akujärvi (n. 7), 53–8. See also Lateiner (n. 81), 59–75 on omissions in Herodotus.

⁹³ Cf. e.g. E. Bowie, 'Past and present in Pausanias', in Bingen (n. 85), 207–39; see also the discussion in Hutton (n. 6), 290–2. Cf. also 1.27.3.

⁹⁴ Plut. *De garr.* 505D–E; see M. Pretzler, 'Pausanias and oral tradition', *CQ* 55 (2005), 235–49 for a study of Pausanias and the 'unknown', oral material.

⁹⁵ Compare 3.18.10 where 'I' cuts short an incipient detailed description of the throne of Apollo in Amyclae out of concern that it might bore readers; on the circuitous start of this description, cf. Akujärvi (n. 7), 51.

⁹⁶ Generally given by Athenian *archontes* coupled with Olympiads, e.g. 2.24.7 (the first) and 10.23.14 (the last).

⁹⁷ With first-person pronoun: ἐς ἐμέ/ἡμᾶς, κατ' ἐμέ/καθ' ἡμᾶς, ἐπ' ἐμοῖ/ἐφ' ἡμῶν, ἄχρι/μέχρι ἐμοῖ/ἡμῶν; without first-person pronoun: ἐς τόδε, (οὐκ) ἔτι, νῦν, (ἔτι) καὶ νῦν. Not every ἔτι and νῦν have temporal reference, but those that do refer to the 'now' of 'I'. See further Akujärvi (n. 7), 65–89.

⁹⁸ On the five first Teubner pages we are, further, told that the 'modern' statue of Hera in a ruined temple on the road to Athens from Phalerum was said to be the work of Alcamenes (1.1.5), that the 'contemporary' inscription on a statue of Poseidon throwing his javelin at Polybotes assigns the statue to someone else (2.4), that 'in my time' the house of Pulytion where the Eleusinian mysteries had once been parodied was devoted to Dionysus (2.5), that Actaeus is said to have been the first king of what is 'now' Attica (2.6).

years since Caesar refounded Corinth – that is, at this point in the account 'now' is A.D. 174 –, 'now' is mostly an indeterminate present, though it has become clear early in the *Attica* that it falls sometime after Hadrian, since Hadrian is mentioned among the eponymous heroes of Athens (1.5.5) and elsewhere.⁹⁹

The first reference to a contemporary event comes early in Book 2, where Pausanias notes a chryselephantine statue group in the temple of Poseidon on the Isthmus which, he says, Herodes of Athens dedicated 'in my time' (2.1.7). Pausanias mentions only five roughly datable contemporary events; they all fall between the 150s and the 170s.¹⁰⁰ Linguistically these statements are distinguished by aorist tense stems and the temporal phrase used adverbially.¹⁰¹

The repeated but vague references to 'now' are perhaps best interpreted as reminders of the temporal gap lying between 'now' when 'I' experiences the ancient artefacts that are the main focus of interest throughout the *Periegesis* and the time when they were new. In the 'now' some of the artefacts still remain more or less intact, but others have changed at some point in time. For instance, the sanctuary of Hera without doors or roof on the road to Athens may have been burnt down by Mardonius during the Persian invasion of Greece, but that is ancient history, since the cult statue that is said to have been made by Alcámenes (active a few decades after the Persian wars), is damaged as well (1.1.5). As Pausanias keenly remarks, the Persians cannot be responsible for the damage to the statue, so we are dealing with two phases of change here; the first one can be determined, the second one not. The atemporality of the travel narrative adds another dimension of complexity: when do these travels fall within the flow of gradual change? And the act of reading adds yet another temporal dimension. What can readers expect to find – and when?

Pausanias' many first-person comments on the composing of the text and his continued references to a vague 'now' combine to create an opaque narrative, situating the narrator firmly in the text. The authorial-narratorial voice becomes a semi-transparent film between the reader and the events narrated. This film constantly reminds readers that what they read is filtered through 'I' and that the world of the *Periegesis* is his creation.

The record Pausanias creates of his researches adds another layer of opacity.¹⁰² This is another aspect of the 'I' in the *Periegesis* that resembles the Herodotean author-narrator.¹⁰³ Throughout the *Periegesis* there are comments on the information gathered and conveyed to readers. Often they take the form of unobtrusive short comments, like the more than 250 'I think', 'I don't think', 'I

⁹⁹ On the Roman rulers in the *Periegesis*, cf. K.W. Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge, 1996).

¹⁰⁰ 2.1.7–8. (before the 160s, cf. J. Tobin, *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens. Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines* [Amsterdam, 1997], 63–4 and 312–4), 2.27.6 (buildings erected by a Roman senator Antoninus, *fl. c.* 160, cf. Habicht [n. 6], 10 and 177), 5.20.8 (digging for a foundation in Olympia by an anonymous Roman senator, datable provided that the senator is a certain Lucius Minicius Natalis attested epigraphically from Olympia after 153, cf. Habicht [n. 6], 178–180), 7.5.9 (sanctuary of Asclepius in Smyrna, completed before 166, cf. Habicht [n. 6], 10 with n. 54; the same sanctuary is mentioned in 2.26.9), and 10.34.5 (invasion of the Costoboci, A.D. 170 or 171, cf. e.g. Habicht [n. 6], 9 with n. 50). Contemporary but undatable events: 3.26.6, 5.15.2, 27.11, 8.22.8, 9.33.7, 34.1, 38.1.

¹⁰¹ See Akujärvi (n. 7), 77–88.

¹⁰² On the researcher in the *Periegesis*, cf. Akujärvi (n. 7), 90–130.

¹⁰³ On the Herodotean researcher, apart from the references above, cf. also C. Darbo-Peschanski, *Le discours du particulier. Essai sur l'enquête hérodotéenne* (Paris, 1987).

know', 'I don't know' and similar expressions of certainty or uncertainty, belief or disbelief in the trustworthiness of the data gathered and presented. For example, the Genetyllides goddesses in Colias are, 'I think', the same as the goddesses called Gennaiides in Ionia (1.1.5), or 'I do not know' who the soldier is on the last tomb mentioned before the city is entered, but Praxiteles has sculpted him and his horse (1.2.3).

Throughout the *Periegesis* there are more than a thousand instances of 'they say' and 'it is said' functioning as vague, anonymous source citations or rather as reminders of the external origin of the material. More interesting are the nearly 130 passages in which Pausanias foregrounds his research to give short accounts of his search for information. There are many instances of 'I've read', 'I've heard', and 'I've learned' in the *Periegesis*. In the biography of Pyrrhus, for example, there is a short narrative vignette from Pausanias' research, describing the admiration of Pyrrhus' courage that 'I' felt when 'I' read the *Memoirs* of insignificant historians (1.12.2). Or, on the Athenian acropolis Pausanias notices a small stone, only large enough for a small man to sit on. On that stone, 'they say', Silenus rested when Dionysus visited Attica. The legend attached to that stone on the acropolis prompts Pausanias to relate an account about the so-called Satyrides islands in the Atlantic Ocean that he has heard from a certain Euphemus. The whole thing is introduced with a first-person comment, stating the reason for the research – 'I' wanted to know more than most people do about who the Satyrs are – and the source of information (1.23.5–6). The research did not always render clear results. In Attica, for example, Pausanias encountered the cults of Artemis Colaenis and Artemis Amarysia. He explains that upon inquiry 'I found' that the expounders did not know anything about them; instead Pausanias presents his own conjecture about the origin of the epithets and cults (1.31.5). Among the memorials of the defeat of the Persians at Marathon, Pausanias looked in vain for the tomb of the fallen Persians: 'I could not find' it (1.32.5); the tomb of Crocon on the road to Eleusis was another that 'I did not manage to find' (1.38.2).

The tendency has been not to take the glimpses of Pausanias' researches at face value. In particular, the passages suggesting that 'I' would have been engaged in oral research on location have been doubted, but there is an ongoing re-evaluation of the place of local histories and oral traditions in the *Periegesis*.¹⁰⁴

Another aspect of the researcher surfaces when 'I' intervenes in order to criticize traditions whether local, oral or literary. For example, in the Athenian agora, there is a picture of Theseus, Demokratia and Demos which, Pausanias notes, represents Theseus as the one instituting democracy in Athens. He comments – perhaps in criticism – that the tradition according to which Theseus handed over the reins to the Athenian people and their democracy lasted until Pisistratus became tyrant is told in many media. People believe in this and many other popular but false legends because of historical ignorance and a general readiness to believe anything

¹⁰⁴ The source criticism of A. Kalkmann, *Pausanias der Perieget. Untersuchungen über seine Schriftstellerei und seine Quellen* (Berlin, 1886) is an extreme example that was answered already by Gurlitt (n. 6); studies of Pausanias' sources are generally focussed on single books or shorter sections of the text, cf. O. Regenbogen, 'Pausanias', *RE Suppl.* 8 (1956), 1008–97, at 1013–58 for a balanced account of many of the source-critical debates surrounding the separate books and their parts up to the 1950s; R. Heberdey, *Die Reisen des Pausanias in Griechenland* (Vienna, 1894) is an attempt to establish the extent of Pausanias' travels on linguistic grounds. See C.P. Jones, 'Pausanias and his guides', in Alcock et al. (n. 6), 33–9 and Pretzler (n. 94) for recent studies of the place of the oral and local material in the *Periegesis*.

heard in choruses and tragedies, Pausanias explains. In support of his objections he remarks in conclusion that not only did Theseus and three generations of his descendants rule, but that, 'if it had pleased me to trace pedigrees', 'I' could have appended a list of later kings of Athens from Melanthus down to Clidicus, Aesimides' son (1.3.3).

A similar instance of weighing different traditions against each other we find in the description of the area around the Areopagus. Within the precinct of the goddesses whom the Athenians call *Semnai* Pausanias notes Oedipus' tomb (1.28.6–7). He knows two accounts of his death: the Athenian one according to which Oedipus died in Colonus and was buried in Athens (best known from Sophocles' tragedy), and another one, mentioned in the *Iliad* (23.678–80), according to which he died in Thebes and was buried and honoured there with funeral games. Pausanias explains that 'Homer did not allow me to consider credible what Sophocles wrote' (1.28.7), showing that he evidently prefers the Homeric tradition. So what is he to make of Oedipus' tomb in Athens? Upon thorough investigation 'I discovered', he says, that the bones were brought to Athens from Thebes. Thus he manages to reconcile the monument in Athens with the Homeric account.

Throughout the *Periegesis* Pausanias wrestles with the variant versions of the Greek traditions. He constantly compares and contrasts local and Panhellenic, oral and literary variants of legends, traditions, myths and historical events. Sometimes he merely recounts the variants, sometimes he decides on a preferred account, sometimes he leaves the decision to the reader. For example, concerning Pyrrhus' death Pausanias mentions, without going into any particulars, that Hieronymus of Cardia has a different account (1.13.9, cf. also 1.9.8); concerning Theseus' death Pausanias merely dismisses the variants, and gives the version that 'I' found most believable (1.17.4). The Megarians have tombs of a number of famed heroines of Greek prehistory in the city and they recount legends explaining their burial there; Pausanias notes some of them: about Hippolyte, for example, 'I will write' what the Megarians say (1.41.7); about Iphigenia 'I have also heard' an Arcadian tradition, 'I know' that Hesiod says – and Herodotus' account agrees ... (1.43.1). Pausanias usually cites evidence in support of his critique or opinion. He turns often to poets, Homer most of all.¹⁰⁵ The evidence, however, may be of other kinds too, such as the unspecified but probably physical evidence that remains till 'now' that Tereus ruled in Daulis north of Chaeronea rather than in Pagae in Megaris, as the Megarians claim (1.41.8). When the *Periegesis* reaches Daulis we learn that swallows do not nest in the area, that 'they say' that the older *xoanon* of Athena was brought by Procne from Athens to an old temple in Daulis where there is an old statue of Athena (10.4.9). If one of the variant versions recorded is Homeric, the odds are that Pausanias will favour that one, as in the case of Oedipus' tomb in Athens.

The constant efforts with recording the variant versions of the Greek traditions are reminiscent, again, of Herodotus' *Histories*.¹⁰⁶ The parallel to Herodotus' struggles with conflicting accounts becomes even clearer later when, approximately halfway through the *Periegesis*, Pausanias states that 'I have to report what is said by the Greeks, but I do not have to believe every account' (6.3.8; cf. also 2.17.4). This not only concludes the discussion at hand, but is a general statement on the

¹⁰⁵ See 2.21.10 for a statement of particular faith in the evidence of Homer; on the use of Homer in the *Periegesis*, cf. G. Bacher, *De Pausaniae studiis Homericis* (Halle, 1919).

¹⁰⁶ On variant versions in Herodotus, cf. Lateiner (n. 81), 76–90.

handling of variant versions in the work and an echo of a similar statement by Herodotus (7.152.3).¹⁰⁷ The sentiments, in essence reservations guarding against charges of excessive gullibility, seem to be expressed by both authors with the same appearance of resignation in the face of refractory variants of the accounts, both historical and mythological. Pausanias, moreover, does it with a gesture and a wink in Herodotus' direction, with an allusion to the *Histories* which his readers were presumably meant to catch.

Both authors' statements are equally open to a more malicious interpretation. They could be taken as a way for mean historians to get away with including slanderous and/or false reports and at the same time denying any responsibility for them. Such is in essence Plutarch's interpretation of the disclaimers scattered throughout Herodotus' *Histories* expressed in *On Herodotus' Malice*, the essay that today is the best known representative of a whole tradition of denigrating Herodotus.¹⁰⁸ Such could also be the interpretation of the disclaimers and other records of research in Pausanias' *Periegesis*. Modelling the voice of the 'I' on the Herodotean author-narrator, was Pausanias consciously building an ambiguous persona for himself, or was he disregarding the sort of critique of Herodotus expressed by Plutarch and others?¹⁰⁹ Either way, the end result is the same. Pausanias creates an authorial-narratorial voice that becomes an increasingly dominant presence in the account and that, moreover, develops in a distinctly Herodotean direction. It is something of a paradox. The associations inherent in the tie to Herodotus' *Histories* undermine the (apparent?) authority of the Pausanian author-narrator constructed with building blocks adopted and adapted from the *Histories*.

The parade of examples could be continued almost *ad infinitum*. I will round off this review by returning to the point from which I started. Pausanias writes 'I' as traveller out of the *Periegesis*, using instead the iterative, atemporal and depersonalized travel narrative of the frame for effecting transitions from one object to the next. But 'I' is never far off.

On the slopes of the Acropolis in Athens, for example, above the theatre, there is a cave in which Apollo and Artemis are depicted killing Niobe's children. 'I myself' saw this Niobe, when 'I' climbed Mount Sipylus, Pausanias declares (1.21.3). It is difficult to make out the shape of a woman in the crag and it is likely that Pausanias experienced some difficulty in making out Niobe. But he does not write this into the *Periegesis*. Instead we meet the indefinite travelling persona. It is just a rock and a crag 'when *one* is nearby' (*παρόντι*) – not 'when *I* was' – with the familiar dative participle. And he continues, 'but if you go farther away, you will think that you see a crying and downcast woman' (*εἰ δέ γε πορρωτέρω γένοιο, δεδακρυμένην δόξεις ὄραν καὶ κατηφῆ γυναῖκα*). It is a general future condition, presenting the action as iterative and atemporal: if ever, then every time.

The second person is likely to be the generic 'you' – equivalent to the French

¹⁰⁷ The parallel is noted by e.g. Pfundter (n. 19), 9–10, J. Heer, *La personnalité de Pausanias* (Paris, 1979), 97–8, Habicht (n. 6), 147. Cf. Lightfoot (n. 11), 167–8 on similar statements in Lucian, *Syr. D.*

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Plut. *De Her. mal.*, esp. 863C–D on Hdt. 7.152.3. On this essay, see e.g. J. Marincola, 'Plutarch's refutation of Herodotus', *AncW* 25 (1994), 191–203, esp. 202–3 on Plutarch's reaction to Hdt. 7.152.3; see also F. Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus. The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History* (Berkeley, 1988), 295–309 on the credit accorded to the *Histories* in antiquity and later.

¹⁰⁹ On the potential ambiguity of Herodotean imitation in the second century, cf. Hutton (n. 6), 190–213.

'on' and the German and Swedish 'man' – but the finite forms of the verbs increase the possibility of taking the reference as specific. Should this be the case, then we might have a short stretch of second-person narrative, that is narrative about the doings of 'you'.¹¹⁰

Second-person narrative presents a particular challenge by virtue of its pull on the reader to enter into the position of narratee.¹¹¹ The second-person narrative – if it is such – does not reappear in the first book, but there are more than 50 similar passages in later books, particularly in Book 8. These are always brief and transient episodes, but they do raise interesting questions about the relation between the generally indefinite subject of the frame narrative and the reader of the *Periegesis*.¹¹² Perhaps the atemporal, iterative and impersonal character of the travel narrative in the frame of the *Periegesis* is designed as such to encourage readers to fill in the many blanks that the text deliberately leaves; and perhaps the episodes of second-person narrative are designed to pull the reader into the text, to create a vivid narrative and to convey to the reader a sense of being taken to the sites, as pseudo-Longinus remarks concerning Herodotus' use of second person singulars in describing the journey up the Nile from Elephantine (*Subl.* 26.2).¹¹³ If the frame does pull the reader into the text, its effect on individual readers varies, and the extent to which a reader identifies with the 'you' – either generic or specific – in the frame depends upon who the reader is.

Above the agora and the so-called Royal Stoa is Hephaestus' temple (1.14.6). True to his normal practice Pausanias does not describe the general layout of the area or the architecture of the building, but he focusses on a few details that caught his eye, in this case the statue of Athena next to that of Hephaestus. 'It did not surprise me', he explains, that her statue was there, since 'I know' the story about Erichthonius. Zooming in on that statue, Pausanias says that 'I saw' its blue eyes and 'I discovered' – this happened presumably at the same time when 'I' was not surprised – that the statue reflects a Libyan myth, according to which Athena is the daughter of Poseidon and Tritonis, and has therefore the same colour of eyes as her father.

This is how Pausanias' travel experiences on a site are manifested. There is not a word about the practicalities of travel, about how he got there or what he did there. Without warning 'I' pops up at a site, notices some detail, contests some tradition or explains some phenomenon. The events narrated about 'I' centre on research, whether in the study or on the ground among the monuments of Greece, trying to explain and reconcile the sights and stories of Greece. And 'I' recedes to

¹¹⁰ 'Second-person narrative', cf. U. Margolin, 'Narrative "you" revisited', *Language and Style* 23 (1990), 425–46, M. Fludernik, 'Introduction: second-person narrative and related issues', *Style* 28 (1994), 281–311, at 284–90 and 'Second-person narrative as a test case for narratology: the limits of realism', *Style* 28 (1994), 445–79. On the possible change of narrative situations in the *Periegesis*, see Akujärvi (n. 7), 151–7.

¹¹¹ On the ambiguities inherent in second-person narratives, particularly on the pressure it exerts on the reader, cf. J. Phelan, 'Self-help for narratee and narrative audience: how "I" – and "you"? – read "how"', *Style* 28 (1994), 350–65, esp. 356–8. On the narratee, cf. also 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, with G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (Ithaca, NY, 1988), 130–4.

¹¹² Cf. Akujärvi (n. 7), 155–61.

¹¹³ See Lateiner (n. 81), 30–3 on addresses to the reader-listener in Herodotus. Cf. the second person in Lucian, *Syr. D.* 30–2; cf. also F.E. Romer, *Pomponius Mela's Description of the World* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 13–15 on the second person in Pomponius.

the background as suddenly as 'I' appears. But 'I' never disappears. For even when Pausanias' experiences travelling and researching are not foregrounded, Pausanias the narrator is constantly present, whether in explicit first-person comments and references or implicitly as the one narrating and guiding the gaze of the travelling persona and as the one deciding what *λόγοι* and *θεωρήματα* (1.39.3) find their way into the text as he is piecing together the puzzle of *πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά* (1.26.4). Occasionally 'I' assumes a more definite shape, appears before the reader in the act of doing research or standing beside the indefinite travelling persona viewing and examining monuments, discovering their secrets and pointing them out to the travelling persona. Textually, however, it is of course 'I' the narrator who tells the narratee/reader what 'I' the character experienced at an earlier point in time.

VI

One final example that should lead to a conclusion. In one longer digression – despite possible connotations of incidentality, the term is used since the account deviates so far from Salamis – in the first book, Pausanias appears in a highly associative mood. On Salamis close to the harbour, a stone is pointed out on which 'they say' that Telamon watched after the ship that took his son Aias to Aulis and on to Troy (1.35.4). People on Salamis 'say', Pausanias goes on, that upon Aias' death a small white flower sprang up on the island. From the flower that sprouted at Aias' death the step to what 'I have heard' from the Aeolians living at Troy about the judgement concerning Achilles' armour is not gigantic: 'they say' that the armour was washed ashore at Aias' tomb after Odysseus' shipwreck. With the assertion that a Mysian was his informant concerning Aias' large size Pausanias introduces the topic of large or unusual skeletons. Floods and erosion have made access to Aias' tomb easy, so the Mysian had been able to inspect the remains.¹¹⁴ 'He told me to estimate' the size of the body by its kneecap, which was the same size as the discus used in the boys' pentathlon (1.35.5). 'I did not marvel' at the height of the Celts who live at the edges of the icy desert, Pausanias comments next, since they do not differ from the Egyptian dead. Associating by opposites, Pausanias introduces the next set of bodies with the declaration, 'I will tell what I found worth seeing' (1.35.5). These are the bones of the Olympic victor Protophanes of Magnesia on the Lethaeus whose ribs were grown together, and the corpse of Asterius, no less than ten cubits tall, buried on an islet off Miletus named for him (1.35.6). 'But what amazed me', Pausanias says in transition, are bones that look like human bones but are of superhuman size. When they were brought to light in the small town of Temenou Thyrae in upper Lydia, they were interpreted as the remains of Geryon, and the surrounding landscape was reinterpreted accordingly (1.35.7). The seat carved on a mountain spur was said to be Geryon's, the river was named Oceanus, and 'they said' that farmers chanced to find cow horns as they were ploughing their fields. In short the whole landscape was interpreted anew in the light of the first identification of the bones as those of Geryon.¹¹⁵ 'But when I objected and demonstrated' that Geryon is in Gadeira, the expounders admitted that the bones were those of Hyllus, and that the river was named for Hyllus (1.35.8).

¹¹⁴ According to Philostr. *Her.* 8.1 de Lannoy this happened during Hadrian's reign.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Gurlitt (n. 6), 101–2 and Pretzler (n. 94), 241.

'In Salamis – for I will return to the subject at hand ...' (1.36.1). With a statement of location Pausanias regrounds the account on Salamis as abruptly as the delving deeper and deeper into the subject of unusual remains was done gradually, and adds a short organizing statement explaining that the account indeed does return to the point of departure. Pausanias is a careful organizer of the material, and the readers are taken further and further away from the immediate subject matter almost imperceptibly. Only when the account is called to order does it become clear how far off he has strayed.

In this long excursion taking the readers from Salamis to remarkable skeletal remains in Troy, on the fringes of the habitable world, Magnesia, Miletus and Temenou Thyrae in Lydia, 'I' is prominently present in the text, but it is not necessary to assume that 'I', that is Pausanias, has been present at the sites.¹¹⁶ There is, however, nothing to disprove his presence at any of the places either. The emphasis is simply on other things than on autopsy. In this extract, as so often in the *Periegesis*, 'I' appears in the act of organizing the material, commenting on it and, most interestingly, as always searching for information and questioning it. Verbs of saying are conventional means of introducing quotations whether literary or oral, so the ubiquitous 'they say', 'I heard', etc. must be taken with some caution.¹¹⁷ But they do create a sense of dialogue and interaction between 'I' and the source, if nothing else. If the objections to the Lydian interpretation of the bones do not render *in nuce* how Pausanias questioned the information and convinced the locals of his interpretation of the evidence, then he does paint the portrait of a very engaged armchair scholar.

Perhaps this is a template for the addressee/reader. Following the example of the 'I' in this section – which is merely a concise picture of how the researches into and the questioning of Greek traditions by 'I' are narrated throughout the *Periegesis* – it is evident that information, regardless of how it is received, should never be accepted at face value but always tried against other accounts and, if necessary, called into question. While the inquiry does not necessarily have to lead to clear results, it does stimulate reflection and curiosity by its example.¹¹⁸ Indeed, throughout the *Periegesis* – both before and after this passage – there are invitations to 'one' to make one's own selection and evaluation of things. Again, as noted above, the practice has a precedent in Herodotus' *Histories*. For example, Pausanias omits to narrate the reason for the Mithridatic war with the comment that 'that may be a concern for those who are interested in knowing the history of Mithridates' (1.20.4); he suggests that anyone who talks to the priests will learn the story behind the epithets of Ge Curotrophus and Demeter Chloe (1.22.3); he implies that if one wanted one might find out many reasons why the Council of the Areopagus dedicated a bull on the Acropolis (1.24.2); regarding the statue of a boy cutting his hair for the river Cephisus, Pausanias explains that from the Homeric epics one might judge that it is an ancient Greek custom to do so (1.37.3).¹¹⁹

It is arguable that the addressee/reader is a latent but persistent potential concretization of the anonymous travelling persona. This is due not only to the highly

¹¹⁶ The past tense of the verbs may, however, be an indication of recollection of past experiences; cf. Heberdey (n. 104), a study of the travels of Pausanias on that premiss.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Kalkmann (n. 104), 14–24; the extremes of his scepticism are tempered in Gurlitt (n. 6), 91–102; Pretzler (n. 94) is still cautious.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Darbo-Peschanski (n. 103), 137 for a similar observation on the research in Herodotus.

¹¹⁹ Cf. further Akujärvi (n. 7), 150–62, esp. nn. 77, 78, 81, 82, 85, 87.

referential quality of a text that constantly points to a landscape and objects outside the world of the text, or to the possible episodes of second-person narrative which by itself entails a strong pull on the addressee to enter into the text, but also to how the travelling persona is gradually built into something more than an empty dummy for narrating movement.

Already in the first book there are passages which suggest that the travelling persona may develop beyond its initial function as dummy subject. Gradually Pausanias constructs an addressee by moulding an uninformed persona for whom he explains/describes/narrates the motif of an image (*μῆ πυθομένοις* 1.17.3); by conjuring up a persona present in Cynosarges reading the oracle so that the story about the dog will not be included in the *Periegesis* (*ἐπιλεξαμένοις* 1.19.3); by suggesting two approaches to the stadium refurbished in Pentelic marble by Herodes Atticus, one for those who see it – they will be amazed – and one for those who merely hear about it – they will not find the monument wondrous (*ἀκούσασσι ... ἰδοῦσι* 1.19.6).¹²⁰ It is possible that passages like these represent scenarios Pausanias has envisaged for the use of the text. It compensates for shortcomings in readers' knowledge when faced with an obscure mythological motif, but it does not explain elementary accounts that can be read in inscriptions on site; it suggests where particularly impressive sights can be seen and tries to capture the visual impression with words on papyrus to the best of its ability, while acknowledging the inadequacy of the medium.

By its constant focus on the unseen and unseeable (or rather almost unseeable: there are, after all, generally inscriptions which elucidate the history of the objects for those who read them; Pausanias was one of these)¹²¹ Pausanias' *Periegesis* complements what any casual visitor might see on a visit to a site. In the interplay between the travelling persona/addressee and the 'I' in the work, 'I' generally steps in to explicate aspects of the history of sites or objects that 'I' has decided are significant, thus imposing his take on things that the text arrived at in an atemporal and iterative mode. However, the ambiguous associations of the Herodotean model for the authorial-narratorial voice are likely to have made the trustworthiness of the author dubious in the eyes of contemporary readers. Perhaps that is an intentional move, to encourage the readers to an active examination of the Greek landscape, history, myth and traditions, both those that are included in the *Periegesis* and all that remains beyond the text.

Lund University

JOHANNA AKUJÄRVI
johanna.akujarvi@klass.lu.se

¹²⁰ Cf. further Akujärvi (n. 7), 150–62, esp. 150 n. 62.

¹²¹ On Pausanias and inscriptions, see C. Habicht, 'Pausanias and the evidence of inscriptions', *ClAnt* 3 (1984), 40–56, H. Whittaker, 'Pausanias and his use of inscriptions', *SO* 66 (1991), 171–86, Y.Z. Tzifopoulos, 'Pausanias as a *stelokopos*. An epigraphical commentary on Pausanias' *Eliakon* A and B' (Diss., Ohio State University, 1991), 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, F. Chamoux, 'Les épigrammes dans Pausanias', in Knoepfler and Piérart (n. 14), 79–91, N. Modenesi, 'Pausania "epigrafista" nell'itinerario della «Periegesis». Il caso singolare di Atene', *Acme* 54 (2001), 3–35.