

I

THE MAN AND HIS WORK

Pausanias, the man whose work and personality will be discussed on the following pages, has not fared well with posterity. In his own time he missed the audience for whom he wrote his ambitious book (almost nine hundred printed pages in the Teubner text). The first sign that it had been read comes only some 350 years after the author's death,¹ and the reader, Stephanus of Byzantium (in the time of the emperor Justinian), did not read it for pleasure or entertainment. No, Stephanus exploited it for a limited scholarly purpose: to extract from it the names of Greek cities and their ethnics. He hardly seems to be a member of the audience the author had hoped to attract. It has even been claimed, and with strong reason, that before Stephanus there was perhaps not a single copy of the work except that in the writer's own hand, deposited in one of antiquity's famous libraries.²

After Stephanus, there is once more no sign of any interest in our

¹It may seem that Pausanias' younger contemporary Aelianus (*VH* 12.61) is quoting Pausanias VIII.27.14, but already in the seventeenth century the passage had been deleted; it is in all probability an interpolation, as A. Diller has demonstrated (*TAPA* 87 [1956]: 88). K. Hanell has assumed ("Phaidryntes," in *RE* [1938], 1560) that Poll. 7.37 is a quotation from Pausanias V.14.5. The possibility cannot be excluded, since E. Bethe, an authority on the subject, states that Pollux added to the materials of his sources more from his own reading ("Iulius" [Pollux], in *RE* [1918], 778). But Hanell's suggestion is far from being certain.

²J. H. C. Schubart, *Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft* 20 (1853): 385–410, as quoted by A. Diller, *TAPA* 88 (1957): 169ff. (cf. *idem*, *TAPA* 87 [1956]: 84), who shares and develops the same opinion.

author or his work for several centuries. Only with the rise of modern scholarship did Pausanias finally receive attention. Unfortunately, those who now came to read him were scholars only, and most of them were more interested in pointing out his shortcomings than in acknowledging his merits.³ On top of all this misfortune is heaped poor preservation of the text: the manuscripts are late and defective (the earliest one, from which all others are derived, is fifteenth-century).⁴ Posterity has not smiled on our author. He has had to wait for the twentieth century and the age of tourism to attract attention and win the esteem he deserves.

Pausanias, often called “the Periegete” or “the Guide,” wrote a description of Greece as it appeared on his extended journeys during the second century A.D. The first epithet is derived from the word *περιηγέομαι* (*periegeomai*), “to show around.” In fact, the title of Pausanias’ book seems to have been *Περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος* (*Periegesis Hellados*), “Description of Greece,” that is, a book that conducts its reader around a certain area, large or small, in just the same way that local guides show tourists around a spot.⁵

The genre of periegetic literature, though of comparatively late origin (beginning only in the third century B.C.), was well established when Pausanias wrote. The matters usually discussed include topography, monuments, their history (or what is said to be their history),

³See app. 1.

⁴Fundamental are the two papers by A. Diller “Pausanias in the Middle Ages,” *TAPA* 87 (1956): 84–97, and “The Manuscripts of Pausanias,” *TAPA* 88 (1957): 169–88 (both reprinted in *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition* [Amsterdam 1983], 149–62, 163–82). Diller’s main conclusions seem to have won universal approval: P. Vidal-Naquet, *RHist* 238 (1967): 286; Rocha-Pereira 1:v ff.; H.-W. Nörenberg, *Gnomon* 49 (1977): 132–34; W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography*, pt. 4 (Berkeley 1982), 73 n. 17.

⁵With the verb *περιηγέομαι* Menippus requests the tour around the underworld from Aeacus in Lucian’s satire: *περιήγησαί μοι τὰ ἐν ἅδου πάντα* (*Dial. Mort.* 20.1). The substantive *περιήγησις* is used by Lucian in the same sense: *καί μοι δείξας αὐτὸ ἐντελή ἔση τὴν περιήγησιν πεποιημένους*, “You will have given me the complete tour” (*Charon* 22). Both the verb and the substantive occur in documents describing settlements of boundary disputes by judges of a neutral state; these judges are first given a tour at the spot, with explanations and pleading from both parties: “Arriving at the spot and shown around by both parties [*περιαγησαμένων ἑκατέρων*] we gave our verdict” (*SIG*³ 638.14–15; cf. *FD* III.1.362, col. I.16); “Arriving at the disputed area, we judged, according to the description given by both parties” (*ἐπὶ τοὺς διαμφοσβητούμενους τόπους ἐπελθόντες, κατὰ τὴν γενομένην περιήγησιν ὑφ’ ἑκατέρων ἐκρίναμεν*) (Moretti, *ISE* 43.10ff.).

works of art, votive offerings, anthropological features, and so on.⁶ Its boundaries in relation to other branches of literature, such as geography, local history, or mythology, are flexible. Models like the first four books of Herodotus' *Histories*, with their descriptions of regions and peoples unfamiliar to most Greeks, certainly contributed to the origin of this literary type,⁷ as did the descriptions of coastlines (the *Periploi*, or "Circumnavigations") written for the practical needs of sailors.⁸ Except for Pausanias, nothing from a once large periegetic literature has survived but fragments in the form of quotations, names of various authors, and a number of titles.

The most famous periegetic writer was Polemo of Troy (in the first half of the second century B.C.);⁹ others are Heliodorus the Athenian and, in Pausanias' own time, Telephus from Pergamum.¹⁰ Typical titles are "Description of the Athenian Acropolis," "Description of Troy," "Description of Syracuse," "Description of the Painted Colonnade in Sicyon," "Description of the Treasuries in Delphi," and "Description of the Augusteum in Pergamum."¹¹ Most of these works, as their titles show, were monographs on restricted topics—a single city, a prominent quarter of a town, or even a single monument.

Pausanias "towers above them"—the whole of Greece is his topic.¹² This fact is important because it is a major obstacle to the theory put forward more than a century ago by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff that Pausanias was largely dependent on earlier periegetic writers, especially Polemo.¹³ Comparison of Pausanias' narrative and the frag-

⁶A good summary can be found in H. Bischoff, "Perieget," in *RE* (1937), 725–42.

⁷"Die Kunstform der Periegetik ist die Kunstform der altionischen Geographie und Historiographie, die des Hekataios und des Herodot" (Pasquali, p. 187). See H.-W. Nörenberg, *Hermes* 101 (1973): 238; F. Chamoux, in *Mélanges Dion*, ed. R. Chevallier (Paris 1974), 83–84. Pausanias is in fact as close to, and as fond of, Herodotus as the separation of some six hundred years allows. His frequent imitation of Herodotus is notorious.

⁸Ath. 7.278D sees the writers of one and the other as the same kind of people: *οἱ τὰς περιηγήσεις καὶ τοὺς περίπλους ποιησάμενοι*.

⁹Polemo was honored by the city of Delphi in 177/176 B.C. (*SIG*³ 585.114) and is thereby exactly dated.

¹⁰For authors and titles, see Bischoff (above, n. 6). For Heliodorus see also *FGrHist* 373.

¹¹This is the provincial temple for the cult of Augustus and Roma.

¹²"Though Pausanias owes the idea of a guidebook to these various predecessors, he towers above them as a mountain above a plain. They had written monographs on single places, even single monuments; he had the grandiose notion of compiling a guidebook for all the memorable places and monuments throughout the whole of Greece" (L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* [London 1974], 294–95).

¹³See app. 1.

ments of earlier periegetic literature, added to the evidence of excavations in numerous places, has proven conclusively that Pausanias, as he claims, wrote from personal observation.¹⁴

In each of the ten books Pausanias describes sites, monuments (both sacred and profane), and works of art. There are numerous digressions into mythology, religion, and history. The ten books are: book I, Athens, Attica, Megara, and the Megarid;¹⁵ book II, the land of Corinth¹⁶ and the Argolid,¹⁷ including the island of Aegina; books III–VIII, the rest of the Peloponnese (III, Laconia;¹⁸ IV, Messenia;¹⁹ V and VI, Elis [two books because Olympia is treated at great length];²⁰ VII, Achaëa; VIII, Arcadia);²¹ book IX, Boeotia (in central Greece);²² book X, Phocis,²³ especially Delphi,²⁴ and parts of Locris.²⁵

The work obviously does not cover all the areas inhabited by Greeks. Pausanias undoubtedly used the term *Hellas* (Greece) in the restricted (and proper) sense of the Greek homeland in the Balkan Peninsula; he would therefore have excluded the Greek lands overseas: Sicily, Greater Greece, Asia Minor, the Black Sea, Cyrenaica, and the rest. Nor is it especially surprising that he did not include the Greek islands, either those along the coast of Asia Minor and Thrace (for instance,

¹⁴Gurlitt, *passim*; Frazer, p. lxxviii; K. Deichgräber, "Polemon," in *RE* (1952), 1294.

¹⁵The chapters on Megara and its territory (I.40–44) have recently been studied by A. Müller in a series of papers called "Megarika": *BCH* 104 (1980): 83–92; 105 (1981): 203–25; 106 (1982): 379–407; 107 (1983): 157–79; 108 (1984): 249–66.

¹⁶There is the thorough commentary of G. Roux, *Pausanias en Corinthie* (II 1–15) (Paris 1958).

¹⁷See M. Piérart, "Deux notes sur l'itinéraire argien de Pausanias," *BCH* 106 (1982): 139–52.

¹⁸See F. Bölte, "Sparta," in *RE* (1929), 1265–1373, esp. 1360–62: "Die Periege des Pausanias."

¹⁹See E. Meyer, "Messene," in *RE*, suppl. 15 (1978), 136–55, and "Messenien," in *RE*, suppl. 15 (1978), 155–289, and the discussion in chap. 2, pp. 36–63.

²⁰See A. Trendelenburg, *Pausanias in Olympia* (Berlin 1914); A. Mallwitz, *Olympia und seine Bauten* (Munich 1972); H.-V. Herrmann, *Olympia: Heiligtum und Wettkampfstätte* (Munich 1972). The description of Olympia (V.7.1–VI.21.3) takes up one-eighth (13 percent) of the entire work, whereas that of Delphi comes to only 7.75 percent; see below, pp. 6–7.

²¹See M. Jost, "Pausanias en Mégalopolitide," *REA* 75 (1973): 241–67; "Sur les traces de Pausanias en Arcadie," *RA*, 1974–75: 39–46.

²²See P. Roesch, *Etudes béotiennes* (Paris 1982).

²³See F. Schober, "Phokis," in *RE* (1941), 474–96.

²⁴See G. Daux, *Pausanias à Delphes* (Paris 1936). Still of interest is H. Pomtow, "Delphoi," in *RE*, suppl. 4 (1924), 1189–1432, and the continuation in *RE*, suppl. 5 (1931), 61–152, by Pomtow and F. Schober.

²⁵See W. Oldfather, "Lokris," in *RE* (1926), 1135–1288.

Rhodes, Cos, Samos, Chios, Lesbos, Samothrace, and Thasos) or those of the central Aegean (such as Crete and Delos). It might seem less natural that those close to mainland Greece, with the exception of Aegina, are also missing: Euboea, Andros, and others. On the other hand, Macedonia and Thrace are missing, but Pausanias certainly would not have considered them parts of Greece.

None of these omissions is troubling, but what does give rise to a serious problem is the fact that not even all of Greece proper is discussed. Parts of Locris are missing, and all of Aetolia, Acarnania, Epirus, and Thessaly (and its smaller borderlands).²⁶ To judge from Pausanias' work, the northern boundary of Greece would run from Thermopylae to Naupactus.²⁷

Was his work really inscribed "Description of Greece" (Περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος)? Pausanias himself never cites a title. The traditional title is the one Stephanus of Byzantium uses occasionally (not more than three times, however, among the eighty quotations from the book; twice he just says "Description," and seventy-five times he only gives the name of the author).²⁸ But we do have, once, the author's own testimony that he indeed had the *whole of Greece* in mind. At a very early stage, when he is discussing the Athenian acropolis, he mentions an altar of the goddess Artemis, dedicated by the sons of Themistocles, and adds that this particular Artemis (Artemis Leukophryene) was at home in Magnesia on the Maeander, the city given to Themistocles by the Persian king. The observation is important since it explains why this altar was dedicated by the kin of the famous Athenian. Even so, Pausanias admonishes himself for this digression: "But I must pro-

²⁶From VII.21.2 Meyer (p. 19f.) wants to deduce that Pausanias expressly excludes Aetolia and Acarnania from Greece. Pausanias narrates that the Calydonians in Aetolia applied to the oracle at Dodona in Epirus, "for the people who inhabited that part of the continent, to wit, the Aetolians and their neighbors the Acarnanians and Epirots, thought that. . . ." I fail to see how this could prove that these people were not Greeks in the eyes of the author.

²⁷It is roughly the province of Achaëa in Pausanias' time, which, however, also included Aetolia. Speaking of "Hellas" (Greece) in V.15.2, Pausanias actually means the province of Achaëa. See also his explanation in VII.16.10 of why the Romans call the province "Achaëa" instead of "Greece."

²⁸In A. Meineke's edition p. 50, line 5, Πανσανίας ὀνόματι περιηγήσεως Ἑλλάδος; p. 108, line 16, δευτέρῳ περιηγήσεως Ἑλλάδος; p. 594, line 23, ἐν τρίτῳ περιηγήσεως Ἑλλάδος. Cf. p. 6, line 5, ἕκτη περιηγήσεως; p. 705, line 5, ὀγδόῃ περιηγήσεως. Heer (p. 11) rightly states that the title is uncertain, Gurlitt (p. 34) thought of Ἐξήγησις Ἑλλάδος (which would be only a trifle different from the usually accepted title), whereas Regenbogen (p. 1010) thinks the traditional title, Περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος, the most probable.

ceed, for I have to describe the whole of Greece.” This is Frazer’s translation, and it is accurate, though free; “all the Greek matters” would be closer to the actual wording, *πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά*.²⁹ Pausanias clearly intended to describe Greece in its entirety.

Two questions arise: Did Pausanias write more and is the remainder of the work lost? Or, alternatively, did he intend to write more, but not persevere or live long enough to carry out his intention? Either of these hypotheses would account for the fact that there is no epilogue (the work ends rather abruptly),³⁰ but the absence of an epilogue does not prove that the work is unfinished or incomplete, because, after all, there is no prooemium either.

Indeed, a few scholars think that there was an eleventh book, dedicated to Euboea, and Carl Robert, in 1909, even postulated three more books beyond that—XII—XIV—and went so far as to divine what they contained.³¹ His speculations have not convinced others, for reasons that will soon appear, and they do not require further comment. However, the matter is different for the alleged book XI, since Stephanus does (or seems to) cite “Pausanias Book Eleven” in his article “Tamyna,” a city of Euboea. This is the only reference to a book number higher than ten, and the only indication that there might once have been an eleventh book. The reference, however, has been explained, convincingly, as a mistake for “Book One” (IA’ instead of A’) and in fact pertains not to Tamyna but to Tanagra, mentioned in Pausanias’ first book.³²

Pausanias, then, did not write more than ten books, but book X may be incomplete or its end lost, for a promise given in IX.23.7 (referring to a later treatment of Locris) seems not to have been fulfilled by what is said in X.38.1, the final chapter of the work as we have it.³³ The region in question, Opuntian Locris, was included in Pausanias’ plan,

²⁹I.26.4. Frazer, p. xxv: “the whole of Greece, or, more literally, all things Greek.” The text runs *Δεῖ δέ με ἀφικέσθαι τοῦ λόγου πρόσω, πάντα ὁμοίως ἐπεξιόντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά*.

³⁰Regenbogen, p. 1057, who considers the possibility that this may be intentional and another imitation of Herodotus. Nörenberg (above, n. 7) takes up this suggestion and elaborates on it.

³¹Robert, pp. 26, 61–64.

³²A. Meineke, on p. 600 of his edition of Stephanus, where the entry “Tanagra” is the second next after “Tamyna.” Meineke’s opinion is approved by Gurlitt, p. 68 n. 13, and (with additional arguments) Regenbogen, p. 1011. See, however, A. Diller, *TAPA* 86 (1955): 274–75. The reference would be to I.34.1.

³³Gurlitt, p. 2; Frazer, p. xxii; Heberdey, p. 107; Meyer, p. 20f. See also Regenbogen, p. 1046.

but the coverage is not thorough,³⁴ nor, moreover, is the description of Delphi, at least in comparison with the other descriptions in the work.³⁵ Pausanias either became tired or died before he could put the finishing touches to his work, but in any event only a very few pages can be missing.

A test of the completeness of the work is provided by the large number of cross-references—more than 100: 66 referring the reader back to earlier parts of the narrative, and some 35 anticipating matters and books still to come. All of them match existing passages³⁶ (with the one possible exception of the supposed “Book Eleven”). Most important seems the fact that there are many references in earlier books to books VIII–X, while not a single passage refers to any book beyond X.³⁷ And book X never refers to matters to be treated later, not even within the same book. In writing book X Pausanias saw the end of his job at hand.

Therefore the conclusion may be drawn that Pausanias did not write more than ten books and never intended to write more. The cross-references also prove that he planned in detail from the very beginning the outline of the whole work and the contents of the books: in the first book he is already referring the reader to matters that will eventually come only in books VIII and IX.³⁸ As scholars discerned long ago, Pausanias wrote the books, one after the other, in the order in which we have them,³⁹ and divided as we have them.⁴⁰

Many scholars have argued that book I was published separately, long before the rest of the work.⁴¹ Two reasons for this conclusion are given. First, in later books there are addenda to book I (which could

³⁴Pritchett (above, n. 4), p. 147.

³⁵Heberdey, pp. 96, 110; Daux (above, n. 24), p. 181; Heer, p. 46.

³⁶This has always been observed. The fullest list of these references (although with some errors) can be found in S. Settis, *AnnPisa*, ser. 2, 37 (1968): 61–63: “Tavola delle citazioni interne di Pausania.”

³⁷References to book X: V.27.9; VI.12.9; VIII.37.1, 48.2; IX.2.4, 23.7; to book IX: I.24.5; II.19.8; IX.24.3, 32.5; to book VIII: I.41.2; IV.29.12; V.15.4; VI.2.4; VII.7.4, 8.6; VIII.5.9, 9.2, 47.3.

³⁸I.24.5 cites IX.26.2; I.41.2 cites VIII.5.1.

³⁹Gurlitt, p. 1; all others agree.

⁴⁰A different opinion still in Meyer, p. 22, but see Pasquali, p. 221 (“Ich muss bekennen, dass ein nachalexandrinisches, nicht in Bücher eingeteiltes Werk für mich in den Bereich des schlechthin Unvorstellbaren gehört”), and Regenbogen, p. 1009.

⁴¹Gurlitt, pp. 2–3; Hitzig and Blümner, vol. 1, pt. 1 (1896), 115–16; Frazer, pp. xvii–xviii; Heberdey, p. 96; Robert, p. 217ff.; Meyer, p. 18. Against this assumption, Pasquali, p. 221f.; Regenbogen, p. 1010; A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 2d ed. (Bern and Munich 1963), 911.

have been inserted in their proper place had book I not already been made public). Second, some passages, occurring as early as in Book III, seem to be (in Frazer's view) Pausanias' response to criticism (so book I must have been known to critics).

One of the passages in question reads, "This seems to me a more probable account than the one I gave formerly," and is therefore not only an addition but also a correction.⁴² It is, however, a very casual correction, and there is no cogent reason why Pausanias should have inserted this and similar additions to book I between the lines or in the margins of that book rather than in the later books (especially if the work was not copied during his lifetime). It does not warrant the conclusion that the first book had already been published when the passage was written. Furthermore, criticism does not presuppose publication: Pausanias may have given recitals, as Herodotus seems to have done; such recitals were a common practice also in Pausanias' day.⁴³ Moreover, it is far from certain that these passages are really meant to answer critics. The references in book I to material in books VIII and IX certainly do not support the assumption that this, and only this, book was published separately.⁴⁴

So much can be deduced about the book, but what about the author? Who was Pausanias? And what do we know of his circumstances? The answer is that we know no more than he himself cares to tell us, and that is extremely little. From all of classical antiquity, during his lifetime and later, not a single note about him is preserved. And the same holds true for the Byzantine period, when so many learned men (the patriarch Photius, for instance) were interested in classical authors—not a whisper about Pausanias.

Since, however, Pausanias' date—in the second half of the second century A.D.—is known, numerous attempts have been made to identify him with one or another writer of the same period and the same name. For some time the suggestion that he was, in fact, none other than Pausanias of Damascus found favor,⁴⁵ but it is not worthwhile to

⁴²This is VIII.5.1, referring to I.41.2.

⁴³As Pausanias himself reports about Elis (VI.23.7): "In this gymnasium is also the Council House of the Eleans. Here are held exhibitions of extemporaneous eloquence and recitations of written works of every kind" (*ἐπιδείξεις ἐνταῦθα λόγων αὐτοσχεδίων καὶ συγγραμμάτων παντοίων*). See also Pliny *Ep.* 5.3.7–11, 8.21.2–4, 9.34.1.

⁴⁴So Regenbogen, p. 1010; Nörenberg (above, n. 7), p. 240. Against the view that Pausanias was reacting to criticism, already Robert, p. 219.

⁴⁵Kalkmann, p. 11; Robert, pp. 271–73; Pasquali, p. 222; O. Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen*, vol. 3 (Berlin 1938), 186; and, though reluctantly, Petersen, pp. 485–86.

speculate how much would be gained if this identification were true, since Aubrey Diller has convincingly shown that the Damascene Pausanias was, in fact, much earlier; he wrote in the last quarter of the second century B.C. and composed the versified description of the ancient coastal regions that is commonly known as the work of Pseudo-Scymnus.⁴⁶ Diller has also demonstrated that our Pausanias cannot be identified with any other known writer of that name.⁴⁷ The "Description of Greece" itself is our only source of information about its author.

There is, alas, neither proemium nor epilogue; the writer never mentions his name or his father's name or his city of birth. It is Stephanus alone who says the author's name is Pausanias, and we can only hope that Stephanus got this right. It has recently been said that Pausanias probably was a doctor, but the basis for such an assumption is extremely fragile.⁴⁸ Fortunately, however, Pausanias' time can be determined. In the fifth book, a passage (V.1.2) fixes a date: 217 years after Julius Caesar refounded the city of Corinth (which had been destroyed in 146 B.C.) as a Roman colony. Since the date of Corinth's revival is known to be 44 B.C., the passage was written in A.D. 174, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius. A slightly later date is provided by VIII.43.6, where Pausanias records this emperor's victory over the Germans (the Marcommani and Quadi in Bohemia) and Sarmatians. The victory can be dated to A.D. 175.⁴⁹ This passage is the latest within the work that can be verifiably dated; it may, of course, have been written a few years later, but hardly later than A.D. 180, since Marcus Aurelius, who died in that year, is the last emperor mentioned by Pausanias. (He mentions all of the emperors from A.D. 98 onward.) He also refers to the invasion of Greece by the barbaric tribe of the Costoboci, in either A.D. 170 or 171.⁵⁰ The conclusion is that Pausanias was still writing in

("Griechen, meinerwegen syrischer Griechen"). Against this view, Meyer, p. 14f.; Regenbogen, pp. 1012–13.

⁴⁶A. Diller, "The Authors Named Pausanias," *TAPA* 86 (1955): 268–79, esp. 276ff.

⁴⁷This was already Gurlitt's opinion (pp. 64–67).

⁴⁸Levi 1:2: "Pausanias seems to have been a doctor; he was interested in questions of anatomy and personally devoted to the healing-god Asklepios." It is, however, not easy to see where Pausanias shows any substantial interest in anatomical matters; and there were certainly many more patients than doctors among those deeply devoted to Asclepius.

⁴⁹P. Kneissl, *Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser* (Göttingen 1969), 107: late summer to fall of 175.

⁵⁰X.34.5. For the invasion of the Costoboci see A. von Premerstein, "Kostoboken," in *RE* (1922), 1504–7; for the chronology, W. Zwicker, *Studien zur Markussäule* (Amster-

the later 170s, and that he probably finished writing sometime between 175 and 180.

It is not so clear when he began to write. A reference (II.27.6) to Antoninus, Roman senator and benefactor of the shrine of Asclepius in Epidaurus, was long believed to refer to Antoninus Pius before his accession to the throne in A.D. 138. If so, this passage must have been written in the 130s.⁵¹ The most recent commentator, Peter Levi, and the most recent editor, Maria Helena Rocha-Pereira, are still uncertain about this⁵²—for no good reason, since it has long been clear from Epidaurian inscriptions that the senator was, in fact, Sextus Julius Maior Antoninus Pythodorus, whose floruit belongs to the 160s.⁵³

In the same book (II.26.9), Pausanias says that a shrine and a temple for Asclepius were built in Smyrna (Izmir) in his time, and he repeats this information in VII.5.9. We know from the speeches of Aelius Aristides that this Asclepieium was under construction in A.D. 151 and was completed in or before 166.⁵⁴ In another passage (on the monuments of Patras) Pausanias praises the Music Hall, built in the third century B.C., as the finest in Greece, except for the one in Athens, which he describes as superior in size and construction: "It was built by the Athenian Herodes in memory of his deceased wife" (VII.20.6).

dam 1941), 166–73; A. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (Boston 1966), 225, 229; A. Garzetti, *From Tiberius to the Antonines: A History of the Roman Empire A.D. 14–192* (London 1974), 491. See also below, pp. 176–80.

⁵¹Gurlitt, p. 61 n. 7, p. 442; Frazer, p. xvi.

⁵²Levi 1: 195 n. 161; Rocha-Pereira 3: 197. B. Forte, too, thinks that the senator might be the future emperor (*Rome and the Romans As the Greeks Saw Them* [Rome 1972], 331).

⁵³Ch. Habicht, *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions*, *Altortümer von Pergamon*, vol. 8, pt. 3 (Berlin 1969), 63–66, no. 23; H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.* (Göttingen 1979), 171–72, no. 89. He was the descendant of a man whom King Mithridates Eupator hunted because of his sympathies and support for Rome; this was Chairemon from Nysa, whose father was likewise named Pythodorus (C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* [New Haven 1934], nos. 73, 74). He was also related to King Cotys of Thrace (see the stemma in *JG* IV.1², p. xxxiv). This connection explains why he also restored the "Colonnade of Cotys" in Epidaurus, as reported by Pausanias, II.27.6. The correct identification in, for instance, Meyer, p. 578, and Roux (above, n. 16), p. 27.

⁵⁴Ael. Aristides *or.* 50.102 (2:450 Keil), 47.17 (2:380 K.). For the chronology of the events in question see A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la Sophistique dans la province d'Asie au deuxième siècle de notre ère* (Paris 1923), 137–43; G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969), 36–40; G. Alföldy, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen* (Bonn 1977), 214–17; R. Syme, *ZPE* 51 (1983): 278–79.

He is, of course, speaking of the magnificent building known as the Theater of Herodes Atticus, on the southern slope of the Acropolis, nowadays again the scene of musical and dramatic events. Pausanias continues: "In my book on Attica this Music Hall is not mentioned, because my description of Attica was finished before Herodes began to build the hall." Now, since Herodes' wife, Regilla, died in A.D. 160 or 161,⁵⁵ it is clear that Pausanias had already finished book I by that time. He must therefore have begun to write not later than, let us say, A.D. 155, and since he was still writing after A.D. 175, he must have spent at least twenty years on his work, writing, reading, traveling, and writing again.

Another indication, it may be noted, shows him at work after A.D. 165. After he has told the story of a heavyweight who won an Olympic crown but who, when he discovered, as he grew older, that his strength was diminishing, burned himself to death, Pausanias then adds, "In my opinion such deeds, whether they have been done in the past or shall be done hereafter, ought to be set down to the score of madness rather than courage." Since the incident in question belonged to the fifth century B.C., the sentence undoubtedly alludes to a more recent event, which can only be a famous incident during the Olympic games of A.D. 165, when the Cynic philosopher Peregrinus Proteus did what he had publicly announced: he lit a fire and flung himself onto the burning pyre in view of the festive crowd, which—in anticipation of the event—was even larger than usual.⁵⁶

Book I was written first—all the other books contain references to it, invariably in the past tense.⁵⁷ And by the time Pausanias wrote it, he had already seen a good deal of the world, not only most of western Asia Minor and a good part of Egypt but also most of Greece, includ-

⁵⁵ A. Stein, *PIR* A².720; Halfmann (above, n. 53), p. 158. See also A. Diller, *TAPA* 86 (1955): 268; S. Follet, *REG* 90 (1977): 49.

⁵⁶ VI.8.4. It has more than once been assumed that this alludes to the end of Peregrinus Proteus: Gurlitt, p. 83 n. 40; Settis (above, n. 36), pp. 43–48. Furthermore, Frazer (p. xli) wanted to connect Pausanias' story about Chinese silk and the silkworm (VI. 26.6–9) with imperial ambassadors who seem to have arrived in China in October 166; see also M. P. Charlesworth, *Trade Route and Commerce of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge 1972), 72, 107–9. A. Dihle, however, disputes the connection, since Pausanias has a very unclear notion of where China is located—he wants to have it in the neighborhood of Ethiopia (*Antike und Orient: Gesammelte Aufsätze* [Heidelberg 1984], 204; cf. also 212–13, 83).

⁵⁷ They are to be found in II.19.8, 21.4, 23.6, 32.3; III.11.1, 17.3; IV.28.3, 35.4; V.10.4; VI.14.9, 20.14, 26.2; VII.3.4, 7.7, 20.6; VIII.5.1, 9.8 (cf. I.3.4); IX.6.5, 19.2, 19.4, 27.3; X.19.5, 20.5.

ing regions not treated in his work, such as Epirus and Thessaly. He must have been a fully grown man when he began to write. This accords well with his testimony (VIII.9.7) that he never saw Hadrian's favorite, Antinous, in the flesh, but only in paintings and statues, lasting testimonies of the emperor's emotional attachment to the boy, whom he even had deified. Antinous drowned in the Nile on October 30, 130. Pausanias seems to imply that he himself was already old enough, by the time of Antinous' death, to have seen him alive and to have been able to remember him. It is on the basis of this evidence, combined with the other indications already discussed, that Pausanias is commonly assumed to have been born around A.D. 115.⁵⁸ He must have written his work, then, between the ages (approximately) of forty and sixty-five.

Pausanias was thus the contemporary of some well-known writers: slightly younger than the famous sophist and lord of Athens Herodes Atticus, born in A.D. 101, millionaire and benefactor of many Greek cities, member of the Roman senate and consul in 143;⁵⁹ about the same age as the astronomer and geographer Claudius Ptolemy of Alexandria in Egypt, who, unlike Pausanias, was read and studied both in antiquity and during the Middle Ages. Pausanias was, it seems, a few years older than the satirist Lucian of Samosata on the Euphrates, the most brilliant writer of his century, and certainly the one who, next to the considerably older Plutarch, was to have the greatest impact on the literature of later centuries. And Pausanias was some fifteen years older than Galen of Pergamum, whose work was the culmination of ancient medicine; Galen was appointed the physician of the imperial family. In addition to these men there were numerous Greek sophists, celebrities in their own day, who will be discussed later;⁶⁰ for the moment, may it be said that it seems an irony of history that so much is known about these ambitious, influential, and arrogant but nonetheless shallow characters, while next to nothing is known about a substantial and sober man like Pausanias. A man much more serious than these sophists

⁵⁸ Meyer, p. 18; Regenbogen, p. 1010. Not later than A.D. 115 according to Robert, p. 270. Heer, who thinks (p. 12) that he was born in A.D. 125, seems to have misunderstood Diller (*TAPA* 86 [1955]: 269), to whom she is referring: "He had been born by then." I.5.5 indicates that Pausanias had been born when the tribe Hadrianis was created in Athens. Unfortunately, it is still an open question whether this was in A.D. 121/22 or 124/25 (S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e siècle* [Paris 1976], 116ff.).

⁵⁹ P. Graindor, *Un Milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo 1930); *PIR*² C. 802; Halfmann (above, n. 53), pp. 155–60; W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim 1983).

⁶⁰ See below, pp. 124–40.

was another contemporary of Pausanias, Julius Pollux from Naucratis in Egypt, a scholar like Ptolemy, and author of a learned, if controversial, lexicon of Attic words, terms, and institutions, whom the emperor Commodus, sometime after A.D. 180, appointed to the chair of rhetoric in Athens.

There are, in the second century A.D., far fewer equivalent figures in Latin literature, the outstanding one being Apuleius, a slightly younger contemporary of Pausanias (born ca. 125 in African Numidia), and author of the delightful work *The Golden Ass*.

Most of the figures mentioned are neither from Greece (Herodes being the only exception) nor from Rome or even Italy, but from the outlying provinces of the empire: from Asia, Egypt, Numidia, or, as in the case of Lucian, even farther away. A good many others could be named to give additional force to the statement that literature in the second century was mostly an affair of the provinces and Greek literature mostly an affair of the Greeks overseas.

This, then, is the moment to ask, where did Pausanias—this man who chose the Greek motherland as his subject—come from? Once the unfortunate identification with Pausanias of Damascus has been abandoned, there is no longer any need to dispute the clear indications pointing to Lydia in Asia Minor, in particular the region of Mount Sipylus. It is this region where, in 190 B.C., the Roman army, led by the brothers Scipio, destroyed the army of King Antiochus the Great.

Mount Sipylus, rising to some four and a half thousand feet southeast of Magnesia, was, in antiquity, the realm of King Tantalus and his children, Pelops and Niobe, all rather unfortunate individuals. Tantalus, in the well-known story, invited the gods to dinner and served them the butchered flesh of his own son, Pelops, to test whether they could tell what they were eating. They could, and he was punished with everlasting suffering. Niobe, who had been boasting to Leto about the number of her children, had to watch them all being killed by Leto's two children, Apollo and Artemis. Pelops, however, was revived by the gods and went on to win the hand of Hippodameia of Elis and to become the eponym of the Peloponnese.

This region, rich in old Anatolian and Greek myths, has been movingly depicted by Carl Humann, the man who discovered the Pergamum Altar.⁶¹ Pausanias mentions Mount Sipylus time and again, and in such ways that there can be little doubt that he was brought up there. Since he must have been raised in a city with educational facili-

⁶¹ *AthMitt* 13 (1888): 22–41.

ties, everything points to Magnesia on the Sipylus as his place of origin. Some scholars had already come to this conclusion in the early nineteenth century,⁶² whereas others preferred Pergamum or some other place in Asia Minor. But Pergamum, a city of Mysia, is unlikely, since Pausanias knows Lydia best. IX.22.4 seems significant: Pausanias mentions blackbirds he has seen at Tanagra in Boeotia and adds, "These blackbirds are of the size of the Lydian birds." The place that comes to mind so easily and naturally for an incidental comparison must be home.

Within Lydia the indications point to the region of Mount Sipylus. In V.13.7, Pausanias says, "In my country there are still left signs that Pelops and Tantalus once dwelt in it. For there is a notable grave of Tantalus, and there is a lake called after him. Further, there is a throne of Pelops, on a peak of mount Sipylus, above the sanctuary of Mother Plastene. . . ." The lake has been identified as Lake Saloe, three miles east of Magnesia (VII.24.13; Pliny *HN* 5.31). Some four hundred yards above it is the throne of Pelops,⁶³ and the sanctuary of Mater Plastene was found nearby and identified in 1887 from dedications to the goddess.⁶⁴ Pausanias' description is as specific as it is accurate . . . and he calls the area *his own*. Some scholars have tried to deny the obvious sense of the passage and interpreted it as saying no more than that Pausanias lived there for some time.⁶⁵ No. He has told us that this is his home. And he simply knows too much about the region for it not to be home. Three times he has seen large swarms of locusts disappear from Mount Sipylus: "Once they were swept away by a storm that broke over them: once they were destroyed by intense heat following after rain; and once they were caught in a sudden cold and perished. All this I have seen happen to them" (I.24.8). Since such a disaster hardly befell the locusts every year, the implication is that Pausanias lived close to the mountain for a long time and visited it often.

⁶²This conclusion was reached by C. G. Siebelis in 1819 (*Quaestio de Pausaniae periegetae patria et aetate*, Programm Bautzen [*non vidit*]) and by A. Boeckh in 1824 (now *KISchr*, vol. 4 [Leipzig 1874], 209 n. 4, in which Boeckh is referring to Siebelis).

⁶³VII.24.13; Pliny *HN* 5.31. As for the "grave of Tantalus," various suggestions have been made, but no certain identification seems possible (J. Keil, "Lydia," in *RE* [1927], 2166–67).

⁶⁴*AthMitt* 12 (1887): 253, no. 17, and 271–74; *BCH* 11 (1887): 300, no. 8. All conjectures about the name of the goddess have been proven wrong by the epigraphic evidence (Πλακιανή, Πλακίζηνή, Μοστηνή); Pausanias is right. See also J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.*, 1979: 360.

⁶⁵So Kalkmann, pp. 11, 276; Robert, p. 271; A. Diller, *TAPA* 86 (1955): 270.

In ten passages,⁶⁶ Pausanias describes rivers, monuments, and birds he has seen in the region, and people performing an epichorial dance. As Frazer once remarked, "It is fair to surmise that Pausanias was born and bred not far from the mountains which he seems to have known and loved so well."⁶⁷ In an overlooked passage in his book on Athens, Pausanias speaks of the First Mithridatic War (88–84 B.C.), in which the Athenians defected to the Pontic king. The Roman commander Sulla encircled both the city and the Piraeus, which was defended by a large Pontic army under Archelaus, the most able of Mithridates' generals. Archelaus is a famous man; Pausanias, however, introduces him with the following sentence: "He was a general of Mithridates whom the people of Magnesia on the Sipylus wounded, when he attacked them, and they killed most of the barbarians" (I.20.5).

The main point is certainly true, since Appian, in his history of the war, describes how the king overran all of Roman Asia and many important cities joined him, including Magnesia on the Maeander; Appian adds that only a very few resisted and Mithridates sent his generals to reduce them. One of these cities is "Magnesia," which must be the city by Mount Sipylus.⁶⁸ Why does Pausanias introduce Archelaus with the story of the heroic resistance of Magnesia rather than one of Archelaus' major victories? Pausanias was a patriot: the men resisting the mighty king were his fellow citizens from the past, worth remembering after 250 years. We may safely conclude that Pausanias was a citizen of Magnesia on Mount Sipylus.⁶⁹

⁶⁶I.21.3; II.22.3; III.22.4; VI.22.1; VII.24.13, 27.12; VIII.2.7, 17.3, 38.10; X.4.6.

⁶⁷Frazer, p. xix.

⁶⁸App. *Mith.* 82 (cf. 250). Other testimonies are collected in Th. Ihnken, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Sipylus* (Bonn 1978), 161–62, T 19–22. An interesting document of Archelaus from a private collection has recently been published (*BCH* 105 [1981]: 566, no. 7, and fig. 48). It is an inscription on a silver bracelet (fig. 1): "In Piraeus. The general Archelaus gives this to Apollonius, son of Apollonius, a Syrian, as a reward for braveness" (*Ἐν Πειραιεῖ: Ἀρχέλαος στρατοπεδάρχης Ἀπολλωνίῳ Ἀπολλωνίου Σύρου ἀριστεῖον*). This dates from 86 B.C., when Sulla was besieging Archelaus in the Piraeus.

⁶⁹This had also once been Wilamowitz' view, if for the wrong reason. He thought that Pausanias had transferred a deed of Magnesia on the Maeander to the town on Mount Sipylus ("Dass Pausanias diese Ruhmestat auf Magnesia am Sipylus überträgt, spricht dafür, dass er wirklich diesem angehörte": *KlSchr.*, vol. 5, pt. 2 [Berlin 1937], 363). See, however, Th. Reinach, *Mithridates Eupator*, German edition translated by A. Götz (Leipzig 1895), 122 n. 2; W. Ruge, "Magnesia," in *RE* (1928), 473; F. Geyer, "Mithridates," in *RE* (1932), 2170; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950), 1102–3; R. Bernhardt, "Imperium und Eleutheria" (diss., Hamburg 1971), 132 n. 224: all agree that Pausanias is right. Wilamowitz, perhaps realizing that he had made a mis-



Fig. 1. Silver bracelet, 86 B.C.