Classical Quarterly 59.2 578–592 (2009) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S000983880999019X

TREASURE, TREASURIES AND VALUE IN PAUSANIAS*

Money and precious objects, how they have been used, and how they affect human behaviour for better or worse – values as well as value – are pervasive themes at all levels of society. Treasure and valuable materials are frequently manifest in the art and architecture of ancient Greece, notably the sanctuaries which housed treasuries as well as conspicuously rich buildings and dedications. Nowhere is this clearer than in the writings of Pausanias, who recorded what he saw in the sanctuaries and towns of second-century A.D. Greece, his travels presumably funded by his own personal wealth.[1] Not only does his account illuminate the wider attitudes of society in his time and earlier, but it also reveals something of his own views and therefore something of the man himself.

It has been argued that Pausanias is less prone to the characteristic attitudes and methods of the Second Sophistic than most of his contemporaries;[2] that there is in him less influence from the rhetoricians and sophists, less from the *progymnasmata*[3] in which schoolboys of that era would have been steeped and, above all, more concern with accurate reporting. Pausanias stands out among surviving ancient writers for being almost entirely concerned with sites and objects in their physical, religious and cultural context. Where he expands into history, it is usually local history, and thus germane to his subject. When writing history, he is necessarily in the hands of his sources, in marked contrast to his writings on sites and objects, which appear to have been done substantially from autopsy. He writes in a style far removed from rhetorical, clearly not intended to evoke emotions in the minds of his readers, the *enargeia* which Plutarch admiringly referred to in Thucydides (*Mor.* 347A).

In view of this, we should not be surprised that in Pausanias we normally find simple references to money, wealth or treasure rather than discussions of any notable length, and that these references usually lack the moral or philosophical elements that we find in many other writers. Characteristically, in Pausanias, objects of value are referred to where they are relevant to the particular moment of the narrative, and not as a means to make a wider point. This is illustrated by, for example, his reference to the money prizes awarded at the Theoxenia, the games for Apollo held at Pellene in

* This article is based on a paper given at a conference on 'Purse & Paideia: Money in Plutarch and the Second Sophistic' held at the University of Liverpool in June 2001. I would like to thank Alexei Zadorojnyi for inviting me to take part and for comments on a draft of this article. I am grateful also to J.K. Davies and an anonymous reader for comments. References to the text of Pausanias are from the Teubner edition of M.H. Rocha-Pereira, vols. 1–3 (2nd edn., Leipzig, 1989–90). Translations are taken from Frazer (1898) vol. 1, with some minor adjustments.

[1] Pretzler (2007), 25.

[2] e.g., Pretzler (2007), 26 characterizes Pausanias' prose style as 'idiosyncratic and quite different from other Second Sophistic texts', citing Hutton (2005), esp. 175–240. She also (112–13) stresses the differences between Pausanias' descriptions and full-blown *ekphrasis*, a distinction previously made by e.g. Snodgrass (2001), 127, cited approvingly by Elsner (2001), 8, who makes a distinction between Pausanias and 'more rhetorical texts'. Also, Arafat (1996), 20, 26–7, 31–2.

[3] Webb (2001).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Achaea (7.27.4), which is made in passing during his description of the sanctuary. None the less, on occasion a moral point is extracted, usually to illustrate the consequences of greed. The most obvious of these is the statement that 'warned by an oracle that avarice alone would prove the bane of Sparta, the Lacedaemonians were not accustomed to amass wealth' (9.32.10). None the less, he continues, 'Lysander imbued them with a keen desire for it'. Other, often indirect, references to the (usually corrupting) effects of the love of money and valuables will be addressed in what follows, but it is worth noting here an anecdote Pausanias gives in which filial piety overcomes love of money with miraculous and life-saving consequences: '… the so-called Pious Folk at Catana, who, when the stream of fire poured down from Aetna on Catana, recked nothing of gold and silver, but picked up, this one his mother, that one his father, and fled. As they toiled onwards, the flames came scudding along and overtook them. But even then they did not drop their parents; so the stream of lava, it is said, parted in two, and the fire passed on without scathing either the young men or their parents' (10.28.4).

CATEGORIES OF VALUE

I first consider some of the categories in which Pausanias refers to items of value, beginning with chryselephantine. This was the most opulent of all materials in which sculpture was made, particularly considering the scale of the best-known examples: both the Athena Parthenos and the Zeus at Olympia were some 40 feet high, and Polyclitus' Hera for the Argive sanctuary would have been of comparable size. Pausanias' references to chryselephantine[4] are, like innumerable references he makes to other materials, mostly simply to report the material, often with a note on technique (e.g. 1.18.6, 1.40.4), rather than as a means of indicating value – that, we may safely assume, was taken for granted. And in the case of the latter passage (1.40.4), Pausanias refers to a statue of Zeus at Megara with a chryselephantine face and the rest 'of clay and gypsum', which was unfinished because the Peloponnesian War caused funds to be diverted;[5] warfare will be a recurring theme in this article.

Pausanias' description of the Megara statue is in line with his constantly evident interest in technique, rather than being a means of indicating value. The same applies to the silver statuettes in the Tholos at Athens (1.5.1), and to the silver fingernails of the helmeted man made by Cleoetas which Pausanias saw on the Acropolis (1.24.3).[6] Both of these are of technical, not financial, interest, and, in the case of Cleoetas, Pausanias also tells us that he invented the starting mechanism in the hippodrome at Olympia (6.20.14).

A good indication of Pausanias' primary interest in technique rather than value in his references to valuable materials comes in his description of Hadrian's chryselephantine statue for the temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens, dedicated in 131–2 in imitation of the Phidian Zeus at Olympia. He says of it that 'considering the size the workmanship is good' (1.18.6). It should be recalled that it was the size of Phidias' Zeus that particularly struck him at Olympia (5.11.9). Nor was he apparently impressed even by the large collection of chryselephantine statues found in his day in

[4] Usefully collected in Lapatin (2001), 172–81.
[5] Akujärvi (2005), 218.
[6] One wonders whether the silver might have come from the Laurium silver mines, mentioned by Pausanias at the very beginning of his *periêgêsis* (1.1.1).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the temple of Hera at Olympia.[7] A contrast may be drawn with, for example, Plutarch, who was well aware of the value of so much gold, as he gives us the story of Phidias' being suspected of embezzlement and proving his innocence by having the gold of the Athena Parthenos removed and weighed (*Pericles* 31.3), an eventuality which had been foreseen by Pericles. We may reasonably assume that Pausanias knew this anecdote; but it is not relevant to what he wants to say about Phidias nor about chryselephantine.

However, Pausanias does give an interesting insight into his interpretation of dedications made from exotic materials, saying, as part of his discussion of the Zeus at Olympia, 'It is a proof to my mind of the public spirit of the Greeks, and of their liberality in the service of the gods, that they imported ivory from India and Ethiopia to make images of' (5.12.3). The 'liberality' referred to is in the amount of money spent. It would be unexpected in any other writer that the focus is on the ivory rather than the gold, and it suggests that he lived up to his own belief that 'it appears to be a characteristic of the Greeks to admire what they see abroad more than what they see at home' (9.36.5), a phrase I shall return to later. As to the Indians, Pausanias says elsewhere that 'those who sail to India say that the Indians give goods in exchange for Greek wares, but know nothing of money, though they have plenty of gold and bronze' (3.12.4). Characteristically, this story arises in the course of his narrative, at a point where he refers to the house of Polydorus, an early king of Sparta, which was bought from his widow with cattle, 'for as yet there was no silver or gold money, but after the ancient fashion people bartered oxen and slaves, and ingots of silver and gold' (3.12.3).[8]

Inevitably, Pausanias has much to say on the valuable offerings deposited in sanctuaries, and other sources of funding for sanctuaries, including cumulative deposits, for example at Oropus, where, when a man has been healed by an oracle, 'it is customary for him to drop silver and gold coins into the spring; for it was here, they say, that Amphiaraus rose as a god' (1.34.4). He mentions Sicily and Paphos for their wealthy sanctuaries (8.24.6), and says that the Ionian sanctuaries, those nearest to his own home area of Lydia, are unrivalled, specifying Ephesus as 'the first for size and wealth' (7.5.4). Such wealth could have a corrupting effect, shown, for example, in Pausanias' anecdote of the Cretan runner Sotades, who 'won the long race in the ninety-ninth Olympiad, and was proclaimed as a Cretan, as in fact he was; but in the next Olympiad he was bribed by the Ephesian community to accept the citizenship of Ephesus. For this he was punished with exile by the Cretans' (6.18.6). A similar case is that of another runner, named Dicon: 'In his boyhood he was proclaimed a Caulonian, as in fact he was; but afterwards for a sum of money he proclaimed himself a Syracusan' (6.3.11). Comparable also is the use of bribery by the same city to achieve the same end: 'Some Syracusans, who were bringing a sacrifice to Olympia from Dionysius, tried to bribe the father of Antipater to let his son be proclaimed as a Syracusan. But Antipater, despising the tyrant's bribe, proclaimed himself a Milesian, and inscribed on the statue that he was a Milesian by birth, and was the first Ionian who had dedicated a statue at Olympia' (6.2.6). I will discuss later the issue of bribes, most of which are associated with war rather than athletics or sanctuaries.[9]

[7] Arafat (1995); Jacquemin (2001a), 185–6; Jacquemin (2001b), 295; Lapatin (2001), 56–7; Moustaka (2002), 305–6.

[8] On the date of Polydorus, Huxley (1962), 39–41.

[9] Although 4.17.1 hints that even priestesses might be susceptible to bribes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

That sanctuaries as a whole are associated with wealth is repeatedly made apparent by Pausanias' descriptions of the dedications he saw at places like Delphi, where, he tells us, 'the present temple was built for the god by the Amphictyons out of the sacred treasures' (10.5.13). At Panhellenic sanctuaries, dedications by different, often rival, cities, would frequently be paid for by military spoils, a theme I shall return to when I discuss treasuries. But it is worth noting here that, on occasion, private individuals also dedicated from the same source: for example, the inscription referring to a bronze portrait of Sardus at Delphi 'states that it was dedicated by an Athenian, Callias, son of Lysimachides, from spoils (*chrêmata*) which he had himself taken in the Persian war' (10.18.1). Finally, an anecdote which illustrates that, however well intentioned they may have been, some offerings to the gods could become too costly: 'The people of Orneae in Argolis, being hard put to it by the Sicyonians in war, vowed to Apollo that if they should drive the Sicyonian army out of their native country, they would institute a procession in his honour every day at Delphi, and would sacrifice such and such animals in such and such numbers. Well, they beat the Sicyonians in battle; but, finding that the expense of fulfilling their vow daily was great, and the trouble still greater, they hit upon the device of dedicating to the god bronze figures representing a sacrifice and a procession' (10.18.5).[10]

There were always different levels of dedication, usually according to what one could afford. An example of a much humbler, but still significant, dedication comes in Pausanias' story that, according to an oracle, whoever dedicated one hundred tripods at the sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Ithome would take control of Messenia. In response to this, the Messenians set about making one hundred wooden tripods because they did not have enough money for bronze ones; but one of the Spartans just happened to be carrying one hundred terracotta tripods, which they dedicated first. The Messenians then ringed the altar with their wooden tripods and the dispute over the land continued (4.12.8–10).

TREASURIES

Such humble dedications are very much the exception in our written sources. It is the valuable ones which inevitably attract attention, including the treasuries, particularly those at Olympia and Delphi. I turn now, therefore, to the treasuries, noting that I shall make particular use of Plutarch at Delphi. Both authors had a strong interest in religion, and it is no surprise that Delphi is described at length by Pausanias. Plutarch, of course, was a priest at Delphi. As a Panhellenic sanctuary, Delphi attracted a wide variety of offerings over many centuries from all over the Greek world, not least the many treasuries.

First, a note on terminology: Pausanias always uses *thêsauros* for 'treasury', perhaps following Polemon of Ilium of the second century B.C., whose work on the treasuries at Delphi must have been a source.[11] Plutarch gives Polemon's title as *Peri tôn en Delphois thêsaurôn* (*Mor.* 675B). Similarly, as Frazer pointed out,[12] Athenaeus quotes Polemon's words on the *thêsauros* of Spina (13.606b); however, Athenaeus, who explicitly follows Polemon, uses *naos* (11.479f–480a). This implies rather that Polemon was inconsistent in his usage, as, indeed, was Plutarch, who refers to the treasury of

[10] On other aspects of this passage, Elsner (1996), 526–7.

[11] For Polemon, Hutton (2005), 251–7; Rutherford (2001), 45–6; Arafat (1996), 23 n. 57 with refs.

[12] Frazer (1898), 4.57; Arafat (2000), 199.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cypselus at Delphi as an *oikos* (*Mor.* 164A, 400D), a sacred term used in inscriptions from Delphi and Delos.[13] Herodotus (1.14) refers to it as a *thêsauros*. Dyer[14] argues that Polemon's use of *naos* indicates that he is 'identifying communal houses with temples'; and, as Dyer also observes, Strabo (14.1.14) refers to the treasuries on Samos as *naiskoi*. Williams[15] discusses the interchangeability of *oikos* and *naos*, noting that the latter was often applied to the innermost part of a temple, or the entire temple, as well as to a treasury. Dyer notes that the oldest treasury at Olympia is oriented like a temple, while the others are positioned in accordance with the topography. While he is right that 'each house is in plan a miniature temple', this should not imply a functional similarity. In addition, Polemon's apparent inconsistency (not discussed by Dyer), suggests that there was an acceptable term which did not emphasize the similarity of treasuries to temples. Pausanias, therefore, had a choice of terminology open to him, and I think his use of *thêsauros* is significant, since he treats the treasuries he discusses as buildings designed to contain treasure in a broad, usually non-monetary, sense, rather than as the religious buildings *oikos* and *naos* imply.

The earliest treasuries Pausanias refers to are the Mycenaean examples at Mycenae itself (2.16.6) and at Orchomenus in Boeotia (9.36.5, 9.38.2). Of the latter, the treasury of the local King Minyas, Pausanias says 'so great were the revenues of Minyas, that he outdid his predecessors in riches and he was the first man we know of who built a treasury to store his wealth in. It appears to be a characteristic of the Greeks to admire what they see abroad more than what they see at home. For while distinguished historians have given us the minutest descriptions of the Egyptian pyramids, they have not even mentioned the treasury of Minyas and the walls of Tiryns, which are not a whit less wonderful' (9.36.4–5). That Pausanias' admiration for the treasury derived from its architecture rather than its contents is clear from the fact that he says later that 'there is no greater marvel either in Greece or elsewhere' (9.38.2), but he does not refer to any treasure found there. He says that the people of Orchomenus 'were opulent as late as the Trojan War' (9.38.8), citing in support Achilles' reply to Agamemnon's ambassadors in *Iliad* 9.381: 'nor all the wealth that flows into Orchomenus'. But elsewhere Orchomenus is used to illustrate the transience of wealth: 'The places that of old surpassed the world in wealth, Egyptian Thebes and Minyan Orchomenus, are now less opulent than a private man of moderate means' (8.33.2).

Unsurprisingly, it is at the Panhellenic sites of Delphi and Olympia that Pausanias writes most about treasuries. However, it is surprising that he says during his description of Delphi: 'Near the offering of the Tarentines is a treasury of the Sicyonians; but neither in this nor any other of the treasuries are there treasures to be seen' (10.11.1). It is clear from the lack of reference to any object in the treasuries at Delphi that the word *chrêmata*, which Frazer here translates as 'treasures', indicates valuable deposits of any kind. It is perhaps curious that all of Pausanias' references to treasuries at Delphi are to the reason for their construction: military victory in the cases of those of Athens, Thebes, Syracuse and possibly Cnidus; a divine request for a tithe from the gold mines in the case of Siphnos; devotion to the god for Potidaea; no reason is given for the Corinthian.

[13] Dyer (1905), 301, 305.
[14] Dyer (1905), 306–7.
[15] Williams (1982), 60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

The only reference to contents, apart from noting their absence, is to the Lydian gold which used to lie in the Corinthian treasury (10.13.5; cf. 10.16.1, 'of the offerings sent by the kings of Lydia nothing now remains except the iron stand of Alyattes' bowl'). This gold is referred to by Herodotus (1.14), who specifies six golden bowls dedicated by Gyges, each weighing 30 talents and lying in the treasury which Herodotus says is not of the Corinthians but of Cypselus, the Corinthian tyrant of the mid-seventh century. As Peter Corbett notes in an unpublished commentary on Pausanias at Delphi,[16] it is Plutarch who tells us that the dedicatory inscription on the treasury was changed after the tyranny, at the request of the people, to name the Corinthians rather than the tyrant (*Mor.* 400D–E). It may also be noted that in the same passage, Plutarch tells us that the Corinthians also wished to inscribe the name of their city on a golden statue in Olympia ('Pisa'). While the authorities at Delphi agreed, he continues, those at Olympia refused, with the result that the Corinthians voted to exclude the Eleans from the Isthmian games, a significant sanction and one which Plutarch says still held in his day. Herodotus also mentions that in this treasury stood the seat from which Midas used to give judgement (1.14), and two dedications by Croesus: a gold lion which had originally weighed ten talents, but was in his day only six and a half talents, having been partly melted when the temple burnt down in 548 (1.50), and four silver *pithoi* (1.51); there was also a 'marvellous incense-burner' dedicated by Euelthon of Salamis in Cyprus (4.162), of the mid or second half of the sixth century.

There is, therefore, good evidence for a number of valuable dedications in the Corinthian treasury at Delphi in Herodotus' time. The discrepancy from Pausanias' account is explained largely by Plutarch, who says that 'the bronze palm tree in the treasure house (*oikos*) of the Corinthians, the only one of their votive offerings that is still left, the frogs and water snakes wrought in metal around its base, caused much wonder to Diogenianus, and naturally to ourselves as well' (*Mor.* 399F). It is most straightforward to conclude that this last remaining, and uncommonly exotic, sacred object had disappeared between Plutarch's time and that of Pausanias. Quite what it had been intended to signify is also a matter of debate in an earlier dialogue of Plutarch, with Periander, son of Cypselus: 'I have often desired, Periander, to ask you the reason for those frogs, and what is their significance, carved as they are in such numbers about the base of the palm tree, and what relation they have to the god or to the dedicator' (*Mor.* 164A).

We may envisage a similar fate for a golden tablet which Plutarch (*Mor.* 675B) tells us Polemon had mentioned was dedicated in the Sicyonian treasury. What is, at first sight, harder to account for is the omission of entire treasuries, such as the Massalian, in the Marmaria, the Athena sanctuary at Delphi (known from e.g. Diodorus 14.93, who mentions a gold bowl from the spoils of battle at Veii in 396/5 which was put in the treasury), and the 'treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians' dedicated by them with spoils from the Athenians, and featuring a marble statue of Brasidas which, according to Plutarch, really represents Lysander (*Lys.* 1.1). Plutarch also tells us that 'Lysander set up at Delphi bronze statues of himself and each of his admirals, as well as golden stars of the Dioscuri … and in the treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians, there was stored a trireme two cubits long, made of gold and ivory, which Cyrus sent Lysander as a prize for his victory. Moreover, Anaxandrides the Delphian writes that a deposit of Lysander's was also stored there, consisting of a talent of silver, and 52

[16] I thank Yana Spence for access to a copy of Corbett's commentary.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

minas and eleven staters besides, a statement that is inconsistent with the generally accepted accounts of his poverty' (*Lys.* 18.1–2). While Lysander's naval dedication and nearby Dioscuri are recorded by Pausanias, he does not mention the treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians. There are other such cases, for example the treasury of Spina mentioned by Polemon, according to Athenaeus (13.606a), and by Strabo (5.1.7). In fact, Pausanias mentions only eight treasuries, while we have foundations of twenty-three, so, even putting aside problems of identification, we should not be concerned if some treasuries have apparently gone astray.

Pausanias' descriptions of the treasuries at Olympia are very different. Far from being empty of treasures, like those at Delphi, virtually all contained offerings, several of them historic and valuable, such as Pelops' gold-handled dagger in the Sicyonian treasury (6.19.6). It is striking that Pausanias mentions the pedimental sculpture of the Megarian treasury at Olympia (6.19.13), although he says nothing of the far more elaborate sculpture of the Siphnian treasury at Delphi (10.11.2).[17] This inconsistency cannot be ascribed to his having decided to concentrate his descriptions of architectural sculpture on Olympia, since, for example, three books later (8.45.6–7), he describes the pedimental sculpture of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea, that of the east pediment in greater detail than that of either of the Olympia pediments. However, it remains possible that he had sated his evidently limited interest in the architectural sculpture of treasuries while at Olympia, and had none left by the time he got to Delphi, where he omits not only the sculpture of the Siphnian treasury, as noted, but also that of the Athenian treasury (10.11.5).[18] Nor is it easy to argue that the sculpture of the Siphnian treasury is less striking than that of the Megarian. In the end, this inconsistency may be due, rather, to Pausanias' characteristic and, at times, infuriating selectivity and unpredictability.

As at Delphi, there is evidence for objects once found in treasuries which Pausanias does not mention: specifically, in the Metapontine treasury[19] he mentions only an ivory Endymion (6.19.11), while Polemon, on the evidence of Athenaeus (11.479f), recorded 132 silver *phialai*, three gold-plated ones, two silver jugs and one silver *apothystanion* (a drinking vessel). The Byzantine treasury contained a Triton in cypress wood holding a silver *kratanion*, a silver Siren, two silver *karchêsia*, a silver kylix, a golden wine jug and two horns. This treasure is not mentioned by Pausanias, and it may be best to argue, as in the case of the bronze tree in the Corinthian treasury at Delphi, that these objects had disappeared before Pausanias' visit. However, it is also true that, while gold and silver plate held great interest for Athenaeus, it did not for Pausanias.[20] It may well be, therefore, that, characteristically, his personal interests took preference over the inherent value of the material in deciding what to record.

LOOTING

One final treasury introduces another prominent theme, namely looting. Trophonius and Agamedes, the architects of the temple of Apollo at Delphi in the first half of the sixth century (10.5.13) also built, according to Pausanias (9.37.5–6) the treasury of Hyrieus, king of Hyria in Boeotia: 'In the treasury they contrived that one of the

[17] e.g., Boardman (1978), figs. 210–212.4 (Siphnian treasury), 215.1–2 (Megarian treasury).
[18] e.g., Boardman (1978), figs. 213–213.9.
[19] As Hutton (2005), 256 n. 4, points out, Pausanias calls the treasury of Metapontum a *thêsauros,* while Polemon (fr.10) calls it a *naos.*
[20] Arafat (2000), 199; this passage is also discussed by Hutton (2005), 256 n. 4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

stones could be removed from the outside, and they always kept pilfering the hoard; but Hyrieus was speechless, seeing the keys and all the tokens undisturbed, but the treasures steadily decreasing. Wherefore over the coffers in which were his silver and gold he set traps, or at any rate something that would hold fast any one who should enter and meddle with the treasures. So when Agamedes entered he was held fast in the snare; but Trophonius cut off his head, lest at daybreak his brother should be put to the torture and he himself detected as an accomplice in the crime'. The story finds many close parallels – Frazer[21] lists no fewer than 28 from around the world! – the best known being that of the robbing of the treasury of the Egyptian king Rhampsinitus, told by Herodotus (2.121), so often Pausanias' model. But the closest parallel is not referred to by Pausanias, surprisingly in view of his often evident interest in local myths and tales. This is the story told by Charax of Pergamon,[22] a contemporary of Pausanias, that Trophonius and Agamedes made a gold treasury for Augeas, King of Elis (the cleaning of whose stables was, of course, one of the Labours of Heracles featured on the metopes of the early Classical temple of Zeus at Olympia, referred to by Pausanias, 5.10.9). The word used by Charax for treasury, *tamieion*, had been used by Plato (*Resp.* 416D) and Plutarch (*Cato the Younger* 18.3–4) for a building housing money and open to all, but without any suggestion of a sacred context. Thus, although it would have been another option open to Pausanias in addition to *thêsauros* and the other words discussed above, it appears to have lacked the necessary application to a sanctuary and, indeed, there is no indication in Charax' narrative that the treasury of Augeas stood in a sanctuary or other sacred context. Charax' story has the hallmarks of the traditional tale: Trophonius and Agamedes left a stone loose in order to allow secret access for later plundering of the treasury. Again, Agamedes became stuck and Trophonius cut off his head lest he be recognized. The story is alluded to also in the *Telegony*, a part of the Epic Cycle written by Eugammon of Cyrene and summarized by Proclus in the *Chrestomathy*. Odysseus, his adventures over, visits Elis and is entertained there by king Polyxenus, who gives him a bowl depicting the story of Trophonius, Agamedes and Augeas.[23]

Looting was naturally linked to sanctuaries in particular, and accounts of looting can indicate what was dedicated at sanctuaries. Such wealth proved attractive to Lachares, tyrant of Athens in the early third century,[24] of whom Pausanias says that 'as he had taken down golden shields from the Acropolis, and had stripped the very image of Athena of all the ornaments that could be removed, he was suspected of being very rich, and was therefore murdered by some men of Coronea' (1.25.7). It is striking that Lachares' death resulted from his perceived wealth, rather than from his impiety in acquiring the wealth. It has been suggested[25] that Lachares robbed the gold and silver treasuries of Athena rather than that he removed the gold from the statue itself, but Pausanias explicitly refers to *tês Athênas to agalma*. For present purposes, what matters is what Pausanias believes, rather than whether he is right to do so; and

[21] Frazer (1898), 5.177–9.

[22] *FGrH* IIA, 484 fr. 5. Charax was consul in A.D. 147: Habicht (1959/60).

[23] Davies (1988), 72–3; Huxley (1969), 169–72. A Laconian vase mentioned by Huxley (1969), 171, and discussed by Boehlau (1898), 127–8, pl. 10.4 and Lane (1936), 165–6, which was mostly lost during the Second World War, shows a building which, if intended to be a specific one at all, is more likely a Laconian temple, e.g. Artemis Orthia, than a tholos or treasury erected by Trophonius, as Boehlau, followed by Lane, suggested (Stibbe [1972], 134 fig. 60, showing what now remains of the vase).

[24] For the chronology of Lachares' tyranny, Harris (1995), 35–6.

[25] Harris (1995), 37–9, following Linders (1985), 117.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

in this instance, he clearly means the statue rather than the treasuries. The phrase 'stripped' (used also by Plutarch, *Mor.* 379D), implies removal of drapery. Lapatin[26] may well be right that later authors 'accepted literally a remark of the comic poet Demetrius, an ally of Lachares' enemy Cassander, that the tyrant "rendered Athena naked" '. Lapatin further believes that Pausanias' use of 'stripped' contradicts his own lavish description of the statue (1.24.5–7), but it need not do so if Pausanias, unlike Thucydides (2.13.5), did not believe the gold drapery was removable. Pausanias also records Lachares' other depredations of the Acropolis: 'Lycurgus brought into the public chest 6,500 talents more than Pericles had amassed: he made processional vessels for the goddess, and golden figures of Victory, and ornaments for a hundred maidens … Everything made of silver and gold was carried off by the tyrant Lachares' (1.29.16).[27]

Pausanias also tells us that Brennus, the Gaul who invaded Greece in 279 B.C., persuaded the Gauls to support him by 'pointing to the present weakness of Greece, to the wealth of her public treasuries, and to the still greater wealth stored up in her sanctuaries in the shape of offerings and of gold and silver coin' (10.19.8). Elsewhere, we are told that the Gauls 'were bent on plundering Delphi and the treasures of the god' (1.4.4).[28] This theme is found also in Justin (variously dated from the second to the fourth century A.D.), who says of Brennus' attack on Delphi that 'Brennus showed everyone the abundance of booty to sharpen the spirit of his men, [saying that] the statues with the quadrigae, of which a great quantity was visible from afar, were cast of solid gold, and that there was more booty in their weight than in their appearance' (24.7.10). In fact, these *quadrigae* would have been gilded bronze rather than solid gold,[29] but enough treasure was accumulated by Brennus for his commander to feel the need to organize a party to guard it during a confrontation with the Aetolians (10.22.13). In one instance, the removal of gold from a gilded statue of Athena at Delphi was not all it seemed: Pausanias says 'I observed that in some places the gilding on the image was damaged. I laid the blame on evildoers and thieves. But Clitodemus, the oldest of all the writers who have described Attica, says in his work on Attica, that when the Athenians were fitting out their armament to attack Sicily, an innumerable flock of crows flew to Delphi, pecked this image, and tore the gold off it with their beaks. He says, too, that they broke off the spear and the owls and the mimic fruit on the palm' (10.15.4–5). This may be unwitting vandalism by the crows, but it is portentous vandalism.

Removing valuable works of art from sanctuaries was, by Pausanias' day, standard practice. Indeed, he gives a potted history of the habit – going back to the share-out of spoils after the fall of Troy, when Sthenelus was given the wooden image of Zeus (8.46.2) – in order to justify the fact that one participant was Augustus, whom he clearly admires. As he puts it, 'Augustus merely practised an ancient custom, which is observed by Greeks and barbarians alike' (8.46.4).[30] In contrast, Pausanias says that Nero, whom he equally clearly loathes, took 500 bronze statues from Delphi (10.7.1;

[26] Lapatin (2001), 89.

[27] For Lycurgus' having golden *Nikai* made in the 330s, Harris (1995), 34, with other ancient sources.

[28] On Brennus' attack, Bearzot (1992), 103–25; Arafat (1999), 241–2.

[29] Cf. two statues at Delphi: that of Phryne by Praxiteles, which Phryne herself dedicated, and that of Gorgias: Arafat (2000), 196–7.

[30] For further discussion of this passage, Arafat (1996), 127–9; Jacquemin (1996), 31; Swain (1996), 345.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

cf. 10.19.2). In the same vein, Pausanias tells us that Nero stole for a second time a statue of Eros made by Lysippus for the Thespians, which Caligula had first stolen, and which had been restored by Claudius before Nero took it again (9.27.3–4).[31] It is interesting that Plutarch says nothing of Nero's depredations at Delphi, although it was very recent history. Similarly, while Pausanias does not mention Sulla's removal from Athens of a library consisting mainly of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus, mentioned by Plutarch (*Sulla* 26.1) and Strabo (13.1.54), both Pausanias (9.7.5) and Plutarch (*Sulla* 12.3–4, 29.6) mention Sulla's removal of artefacts from Olympia, Epidaurus and Delphi. Plutarch adds the detail that Sulla asked that the *kallista kai polytelestata* (12.3) of the dedications be sent to him.[32] Each author, then, uses examples which best serve his purpose, feeling no obligation to add incidents which seemed have no relevance to his topic.

The particular depredation from Delphi referred to is probably that of the Phocians as part of their attempt to raise a mercenary army in the third Sacred War in the mid fourth century (cf. Diodorus Siculus 16.23). The Phocians are certainly portrayed by Pausanias as wealthy, largely as a result of having captured Delphi. Indeed, he says that their 'attacks on the treasures of the god were the most prolonged and determined' (10.7.1; cf. e.g. 8.27.9). Worse, that is, than the Gauls. Nor does Pausanias share the Phocians' priorities: not only do they take the gold from the Plataean tripod at Delphi (10.13.9), but they happily let the Chaeroneans take the staff Hephaestus made for Zeus, which was subsequently passed down to Hermes, Pelops, Atreus and Thyestes, preferring to take the gold that was found with it (9.40.11–12). And finally, when they were under threat from the Thessalians, they 'gathered together their women and children, and all their movable property, together with their raiment, their gold and silver, and the images of their gods, and having made a vast pyre, they left thirty men in charge, with orders that if it went ill with the Phocians in battle, they were first to put the women and children to the sword, then place them and the valuables, like sacrifices, on the pyre, set fire to it, and then seek death themselves' (10.1–6–7). Pausanias also cites a story from Theopompus, who was contemporary with the Phocian occupation of Delphi, that Archidamus, who was ruler of Thebes at the time, and his wife, took 'sacred moneys' and defended 'men who have rifled the seat of the most famous oracle in the world' (3.10.4).

Pausanias mentions that the Amphictyony 'imposed a fine on the Phocians for cultivating the territory of the god', and that from this fine were put up two statues of Apollo, one being the more than 50-foot high statue of Apollo Sitalcas (10.15.1–2). It does not need spelling out that such an exceptionally large statue, placed right next to the temple of Apollo, as is clear from the order of Pausanias' description, was a prominent reminder to all visitors to the sanctuary of the Phocians' impiety. It should be recalled here that the Phocian occupation of Delphi was prompted by a fine imposed on them by the Amphictyony about which Pausanias says, 'I am unable to discover the truth of the matter, whether the fine was really incurred by misconduct, or whether the Thessalians wreaked their old grudge by causing the fine to be inflicted on the Phocians'. It was the depression of Philomelus, leader of Phocis, at the size of the fine which prompted the attack on Delphi (10.2.1–2). A further argument, that 'treasures' (*chrêmata*) would secure victory, is called 'specious' by Pausanias (10.2.2).

[31] Pretzler (2007), 89; Arafat (1996), 84, 86, 144.

[32] Plutarch mentions 250 wagons filled with captured statues, paintings and colossal figures in the triumphal procession of Aemilius Paulus (*Aem.* 32.2); he is not mentioned by Pausanias, as his writings do not cover Macedonia, although there is an allusion to these events at 7.10.5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

But not only is Pausanias clearly outraged by the actions of the Phocians; the gods also endorse the League's actions: 'in an engagement at the town of Neon the Phocians were routed, and in the flight Philomelus cast himself down a high precipice and expired. It chanced that this was the very punishment to which the Amphictyons had condemned the robbers of the temple' (10.2.4). This moral aspect, the notion of the looter of a sanctuary reaping his due reward, recurs on several occasions. For example, Phalaecus, a ruler of Phocis (mid fourth century) 'who being accused of embezzling some of the sacred treasures was deposed. He sailed to Crete with a detachment of the mercenaries and with such of the Phocians as cast in their lot with him. There he sat down before Cydonia, which had refused his demand for money. But he lost most of his army and perished himself' (10.2.7). Such consequences are sometimes given the nature of divine retribution for violation of the sanctuary: 'out of the remnant of the army of Xerxes which was left with Mardonius in Boeotia, all who entered the sanctuary of the Cabiri, moved perhaps by hope of great treasures, but rather, I fancy, by contempt for religion, immediately went out of their senses, and perished by flinging themselves into the sea or from the tops of crags' (9.25.9). Similarly, writing of Delphi, Pausanias tells us: 'There is an offering dedicated by the Delphians themselves near the great altar: it consists of a bronze wolf. They say that a man stole some of the god's treasures, and hid himself and the gold in the thickest part of the forest on Mount Parnassus; but that while he slept a wolf fell upon him and killed him, and then went daily to the city and howled. So thinking that the hand of God was in it they followed the beast; and thus they found the sacred gold, and dedicated a bronze wolf to the god'(10.14.7).

Here, as often, it is clear that Pausanias is not concerned with the theft of valuables per se, but with their theft from a sacred context, usually a sanctuary. Similarly, he says of Nabis, dictator of Laconia (*c.* 220s) that 'not content with robbing men, Nabis rifled sanctuaries, and soon amassed a large hoard, by means of which he mustered an army' (4.29.10). Pausanias records an instance of stealing from another sacred context, when robbers broke into the tomb of the Olympic victor Protophanes 'expecting to find some plunder' (1.35.6).

In one extreme case, at Delos, looting, both secular and sacred, and destruction are associated with slavery: Mithridates' general Menophanes 'looted much of the merchandise and all the votive offerings, sold the women and children into slavery, and razed the town of Delos to the ground' (3.23.4). Pausanias also refers to slaves in a monetary context elsewhere, for example, telling us that Alexander, dictator of Pherae in Thessaly from 369–358, captured Scotoussa during a truce and 'sold the women and children in order to pay his mercenaries' (6.5.2), a tradition which is also found in Plutarch's life of Pelopidas (*Pel*. 26–35, esp. 29.4). Compare Pausanias' story of the Messenians who 'plundered the Lacedaemonian country, and carried off whatever they could lay their hands on: the corn, cattle and wine which they took they consumed, but the movables and men they sold' (4.18.2). A further example of humans being traded for money concerns Aristomenes, king of Messenia, who looted the Laconian city of Pharis or Pharae. After repelling an attack by the Laconian king Anaxander, Aristomenes pursued him, stopping only after being wounded in the buttocks by a spear. Pausanias tells us that Aristomenes none the less held on to the loot he had taken (4.16.8). The story continues with Aristomenes capturing 'maidens who were dancing at Caryae in honour of Artemis', and 'seizing the wealthiest and noblest' (4.16.9). They 'were ransomed for large sums, and left his hands, as they entered them, maidens' (4.16.10). For the Thebans, the tradition was 'to hold their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

prisoners to ransom, but to put to death all Boeotian fugitives who fell into their hands' (9.15.4).

The examples of looting cited demonstrate a range of motivations, from the personal greed of individuals such as Trophonius and Agamedes or the robbers of the tomb of Protophanes, to the imperialistic looting of Menophanes at Delos or of the use of looting to fund an army by the Phocians at Delphi and Nabis of Laconia. While Pausanias' narrative reflects different types, and levels, of looting, he makes no systematic distinction between them. Where he expresses an opinion, it is generally, and characteristically, to convey his distaste at the violation of a sanctuary.

FINES

I mentioned in the previous section the fines imposed on the Phocians for violating the sanctuary at Delphi, and the prominent statues that were made from the fines. Such fines were a regular way of filling sanctuaries' coffers and funding dedications, often noticeable ones, no doubt deliberately so in order to remind any visitor of the reason for the imposition of the fine. The best-known example is the series of Zanes, or bronze statues of Zeus which lined the approach to the stadium at Olympia. According to Pausanias, these were first set up in 388, and were 'made from the fines imposed on athletes who wantonly violated the rules of the games' (5.21.2). He continues by explaining that the first fines resulted from an attempt at fixing a boxing match (5.21.3). As an indication of how long-lived the practice of setting up Zanes was, the fines imposed on two Egyptian boxers for the same offence in A.D. 125 were used to set up two statues of Zeus, flanking the stadium (5.21.15). Yet another boxing story is that of Theagenes who, rather curiously, was fined a talent in 480 for defeating Euthymus, the reigning champion, with malicious intent to deprive him of his crown; he was also made to pay a talent in damages to Euthymus (6.6.5–6; cf. 6.11.2–9). The message of the Zanes was rammed home by the inscriptions, which, intriguingly, particularly praised the Eleans for fining boxers (5.21.4). Indeed, Pausanias tells us that 'on the sixth and last [of the Zanes] it is stated that the images are a warning to all Greeks not to give money for the purpose of gaining an Olympic victory' (5.21.4). A comparable statue was 'made from the fines imposed on men who had wrestled for bribes' (5.21.8). While most of the offences for which athletes were fined seem to have been financial, i.e. bribery (discussed further below), there were fines, and expulsion, for lateness (5.21.12–14). In another case, a losing athlete disputed the decision of two of the three umpires – in this case, successfully – and had them fined by the Olympic council (6.3.7).

It should not be thought, though, that athletic misdemeanours were the only cause for fines: a detailed inscription now on display in Tegea museum specifies fines for wrongful disposal of dung within the sanctuary,[33] and Aeschines tells us that the demos of Athens was fined 'five hundred talents because they dedicated golden shields on the new temple before it had been dedicated' (*In Ctes.* 116).

Consistent with Pausanias' interests, references to fines other than in a sacred context are minimal. Discussing the details of the Hellenistic history of Achaea (admittedly, not his strong point) he tells us of Damocritus that 'on leading his army home again, he was sentenced by the Achaeans as a traitor to pay a fine of fifty talents, and being unable to find the money, he fled from the Peloponnese' (7.13.5).

[33] Inv. 1261. Stavridou (1996), 56–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Secondly, he refers to the Romans annulling fines imposed on Greece by Mummius (7.16.9–10).

BRIBES

Bribes have been touched upon several times already, in connection with Olympia (5.21.4–5, 8, 15; 6.2.6). Although Pausanias is horrified by bribery at as sacred a place as Olympia (and it was one of two sites in Greece which he specifies as being divinely blessed, 5.10.1), he is particularly appalled by the idea of an Elean being responsible for bribery, citing a case at the 192nd Olympiad (5.21.16–17). However, his reaction is perhaps surprising in view of his earlier statement that 'in addition to all the evil which Philip, son of Amyntas, did to Greece … he distributed bribes among the leading men of Elis' (4.28.4). In fact, most of the references that Pausanias makes to bribery are related to war rather than athletics.[34] Characteristically, he identifies those he believes to have started the practice of bribery in warfare: 'the Lacedaemonians were the first we know of who bribed an enemy, and the first who made victory in war a saleable commodity' (4.17.2). The impious nature of the practice, in Pausanias' view, is made clear by his comment that 'Before they misconducted themselves in the Messenian War … battles were decided by valour and the will of God' (4.17.3).[35] He then adds 'It is known that in later times also, when they lay at anchor opposite to the Athenian fleet at Aegospotami, the Lacedaemonians bought Adeimantus and other Athenian generals'. Pausanias returns to these events later, when he gives the Athenian version of events: 'The Athenians do not admit that they were fairly beaten at Aegospotami, alleging that they were betrayed by their generals, Tydeus and Adeimantus, who had taken bribes from Lysander' (10.9.11).[36] He then gives two prophecies, from the Sibyl and Musaeus, which were cited by the Athenians in support of their case. Although Pausanias here makes no comment himself, ending his account with the neutral phrase 'but enough of this', his belief in the veracity of the Athenians' claims is clear from his earlier comment. Nor have we finished with the Spartans: referring to the events of 357, Pausanias cites the fourth-century writer Theopompus of Chios as saying that Archidamus and his wife Deinicha had been bribed by the Phocians to fight the Thebans following the Phocian occupation of the sanctuary at Delphi (3.10.3). He adds that it was to Archidamus' discredit that he supported those who had robbed Delphi, but that he somewhat redeemed himself by preventing the Phocians from destroying Delphi and slaughtering its population.

A further example related to warfare concerns Gallus, a senator, who 'was sent to arbitrate between the Lacedaemonians and Argives in a dispute about land' (7.11.1).[37] According to Pausanias, 'Whilst [Gallus] was carrying out his orders, the Athenian democracy pillaged Oropus, a town that was subject to their sway. They did so from necessity, rather than choice, being reduced to the utmost poverty by the Macedonian War, which had told more heavily on them than on the rest of the Greeks' (7.11.4). There followed an appeal by the Oropians to the Roman senate, and the Athenians were fined, but, Pausanias tells us, instead of paying, persuaded the Oropians into an

[34] A further example is at 2.8.6.
[35] Akujärvi (2005), 214.
[36] Akujärvi (2005), 214 n. 38.
[37] This passage refers to Gaius Sulpicius, known from Polybius (31.1.6) to have been sent in 164/3 B.C., along with Manius Sergius, to mediate in a dispute between Sparta and Megalopolis, rather than Sparta and Argos as Pausanias says (Frazer [1898], 4.133; Papahatzis [1980], 55 n. 2).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

agreement 'by promises and gifts' (7.11.5). Subsequently, when the Achaeans refused to help the Oropians, they bribed Menalcidas, a Spartan general leading the Achaeans, to persuade them to help. Menalcidas promised half the bribe to the influential Callicrates but then, after the Achaeans arrived late, regretted the deal, leading to a trial at which Menalcidas was acquitted only through bribing the judge (7.11.7–12.3). The story illustrates that bribery does not always work, but does always corrupt.

CONCLUSIONS

Pausanias' narrative preserves for us many valuable objects otherwise irretrievably lost. His chosen task inevitably brought him into contact with many manifestations of wealth, above all in the sanctuaries which were his primary interest. His approach to these manifestations, be they elaborate treasuries or silver fingernails, is consistent with his working methods. He does not admire precious materials per se, but is struck by the techniques involved in making artefacts from them. Nor does he admire wealthy men for their own sake. Equally, he does not condemn wealth and the show of wealth per se: he has a clear distaste for all forms of violation of sanctuaries and disrespect for the gods, a recurrent theme throughout his writings. He much prefers to express this distaste by means of a cautionary tale rather than by evangelical zeal. Thus, for example, he tells us that the Siphnians, whose gold mines had enabled them to build their treasury at Delphi, had initially complied with the god's demand for a tithe of the profits, 'but when out of avarice they ceased to bring the tribute, the sea flooded and buried the mines' (10.11.2, following Herodotus 3.57), thus ending their prosperity.

Pausanias can show a strong sense of perspective, even invoking Homer, who, he tells us, 'esteemed the largesse of princes less than the applause of the people' (1.2.3), although the evident approval of such modesty is perhaps tempered by his statement that 'Homer was first struck blind, and then, as if this great calamity were not enough, came pinching poverty, and drove him forth to wander the wide world a beggar' (2.33.3). On occasion, Pausanias can put wealth in perspective with a touch of philosophy: 'I have also heard say that the water of the Selemnus is a cure for love in man and woman, for they wash in the river and forget their love. If there is any truth in this story, great riches are less precious to mankind than the water of the Selemnus' (7.23.3). But on the whole, Pausanias is non-judgemental. Perhaps this is surprising, but I would argue that it fits his approach as faithful recorder of what he sees. In the end, he offers us, his readers, the facts as he sees them, and allows us to draw our own conclusions.

King's College London K.W. ARAFAT
karim.arafat@kcl.ac.uk

WORKS CITED

Akujärvi, J., *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator: Studies in Pausanias'* Periegesis (Stockholm, 2005).
Alcock, S.E., Cherry J.F. and Elsner J. (edd.), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford, 2001).
Arafat, K.W., 'Pausanias and the temple of Hera at Olympia', *BSA* 90 (1995), 461–73.
——, *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge, 1996).
——, 'Pausanias the traveller: digressions on the wonders of nature and of foreign lands', *Euphrosyne* NS 27 (1999), 237–48.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press

——, 'The recalcitrant mass: Athenaeus and Pausanias', in D. Braund and J. Wilkins (edd.), *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter, 2000), 191–202.
Boardman, J., *Greek Sculpture: The Archaic Period* (London, 1978).
Bearzot, C., *Storia e storiografia ellenistica in Pausanias il Periegeta* (Venice, 1992).
Boehlau, J., *Aus ionischen und italischen Nekropolen. Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der nachmykenischen griechischen Kunst* (Leipzig, 1898).
Bowie, E.L., 'Past and present in Pausanias', in J. Bingen (ed.), *Pausanias historien* (Geneva, 1996), 207–30.
Davies, M., *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1988).
Elsner, J., 'Image and ritual: reflections of the religious appreciation of classical art', *CQ* 46 (1996), 515–31.
——, 'Structuring "Greece": Pausanias' *Periegesis* as a literary construct', in Alcock et al. (2001), 3–20.
Frazer, J.G., *Pausanias's Description of Greece* 1–6 (London, 1898).
Habicht, C., 'Zwei neue Inschriften aus Pergamon', *Ist. Mitt.* 9/10 (1959/60), 109–27.
——, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (California, 1985).
Harris, D., *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion* (Oxford, 1995).
Hutton, W., *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the* Periegesis *of Pausanias* (Cambridge, 2005).
Huxley, G.L., *Early Sparta* (London, 1962).
——, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London, 1969).
Jacquemin, A., 'Pausanias et les empereurs romains', *Ktema* 21 (1996), 29–42.
——, 'Pausanias témoin de la religion grecque dans le sanctuaire d'Olympie', in A. Pasquier (ed.), *Olympie: cycle de huit conférences organisé au musée du Louvre par le Service culturel du 18 janvier au 15 mars 1999* (Paris, 2001), 181–211 (Jacquemin 2001a).
——, 'Pausanias, le sanctuaire d'Olympie et les archéologues', in D. Knoepfler and M. Piérart (edd.), *Editer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000* (Geneva, 2001), 283–300 (Jacquemin 2001b).
Lane, E.A., 'Lakonian vase-painting', *BSA* 34 (1936), 99–189.
Lapatin, K.D.S., *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford, 2001).
Linders, T., 'Gods, gifts, society', in T. Linders and G. Nordquist (edd.), *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985*, *Boreas* 15 (1985),115–22.
Moustaka, A., 'Zeus und Hera im Heiligtum von Olympia und die Kulttopographie von Elis und Triphylien', in H. Kyrieleis (ed.), *Olympia 1875–2000: 125 Jahre Deutsche Ausgrabungen* (Mainz, 2002), 301–15.
Papahatzis, N., *Παυσανίου Ελλάδος Περιήγησις. Αχαϊκά – Αρκαδικά* (Athens, 1980).
Pretzler, M., *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (London, 2007).
Pritchett, W.K., *Ancient Greek Military Practices* 1 (California, 1971).
Rutherford, I., 'Tourism and the sacred: Pausanias and the traditions of Greek pilgrimage', in Alcock et al. (2001), 40–52.
Sinn, U., *Olympia: Cult, Sport, and Ancient Festival* (Princeton, 2000).
Snodgrass, A.M., 'Pausanias and the chest of Kypselos', in Alcock et al. (2001), 127–141.
Stavridou, A., *Τα Γλυπτά του Μουσείου Τεγέας* (Athens, 1996).
Stibbe, C.M., *Lakonische Vasenmaler des sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Amsterdam, 1972).
Swain, S. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250* (Oxford, 1996).
Webb, R., 'The *Progymnasmata* as practice', in Y.L. Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden, 2001), 289–316.
Williams, D., 'Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel IV. The inscription commemoratng the construction of the first limestone temple and other features of the sixth-century temenos', *AA* (1982), 55–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983880999019X Published online by Cambridge University Press