PAUSANIAS: PAST, PRESENT, AND CLOSURE

Pausanias' ordering and use of the past has been the subject of much recent debate.[1] In this brief article I argue that the only vaguely 'fixed' frame of periodization of political history that Pausanias has is a tripartite one of 'pre-heroic', 'heroic', and 'post-heroic'. This tripartite periodization, however, is often undermined by Pausanias' primary ordering of the past as a sequential line along which things are just earlier or later. Pausanias can stop at suitable but different points along this linear sequence to look backwards and/or forwards, thus in effect creating a flexible, *ad hoc* structuring of the past. When looking backwards or forwards Pausanias often juxtaposes things from widely different times, bringing the past into close relation with the present and giving the impression that they belong together.[2] This telescoping down of the past is validated by Pausanias' belief in the essentially unchanging nature of man. The stability of the human condition has implications for a reading of the text's construction of Greekness. The reader is encouraged to think of contemporary Greeks as not much different from those of the ancient past. This strategy reaches its culmination in Book 10, which can be seen not as a poor piece of work, incomplete, unfinished, or unrevised, but as an allusive and sophisticated *tour de force*.

Chronology sometimes mattered for Pausanias.[3] For example, it was nonsense to think that Daedalus, a contemporary of Oedipus, could have taken part in the foundation of a colony led by a man married to a daughter of Cadmus (10.17.4). Yet care for relative chronology, via genealogies,[4] generations (e.g. 8.8.12), or Olympiads (e.g. 6.3.8), does not have to mean that Pausanias 'rather than revelling in . . . a mix of periods, would attempt to distinguish periods, not only to separate Homer and Socrates (as it were), but to assess by how much to separate them'.[5]

[1] C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1985); K. W. Arafat, *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge, 1996); J. Bingen (ed.), *Pausanias Historien* (Vandoeuvres and Geneva, 1996); J. Elsner, 'Pausanias: a Greek pilgrim in the Roman world', *Past and Present* 135 (1992), 3–29 (expanded in id., *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity* [Cambridge, New York, and Melbourne, 1995], 125–55); id., 'From the pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: monuments, travel and writing', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (edd.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge, 1994), 224–54; id., 'The origins of the icon: pilgrimage, religion and visual culture in the Roman east as "resistance" to the centre', in S. E. Alcock (ed.), *The Early Roman Empire in the East* (Oxford, 1997), 178–99; S. C. R. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, A.D. 50–250* (Oxford, 1996), 330–56. S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner (edd.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford and New York, 2001) appeared too late for detailed consideration, but a preliminary reading indicates that none of the contributions pre-empt or vitiate the arguments of this article

[2] This article builds on the conclusions of E. L. Bowie, 'Past and present in Pausanias', in Bingen (n. 1), 207–30 (discussion at 231–9), and thus contests those of Arafat (n. 1); see below n. 5.

[3] Arafat ([n. 1], 58–79) has argued that relative chronology was important for Pausanias in art history; building on his, 'Pausanias' attitude to antiquities', *BSA* 87 (1992), 387–409; see below n. 5.

[4] Pausanias could express impatience with genealogies (10.6.5).

[5] Arafat (n. 1), 78. This paper specifically considers the periodization of political history in Pausanias. See W. Ameling, 'Pausanias und die hellenistische Geschichte', in Bingen (n. 1), 117–60 (discussion at 161–6), for an argument that the periodization of art history and literary history should be dissociated from that of political history. Not all are convinced: see Bowie in discussion at 162–3.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.494 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pausanias recognized the existence of 'what is called the heroic age' (9.9.1). In those days, because of their justice and piety (δικαιοσύνη and εὐσέβεια), men were close to the gods, unlike in our days (8.2.4–5). They were also bigger and stronger.[6] Pulydamas was the tallest of all men except the heroes and any other mortal race which may have existed before the heroes. He was the tallest of the men of our sort (6.5.1.).[7]

Describing Pulydamas as a man of our sort, before going on to place him at the court of Darius II (6.5.7), shows that Pausanias could consider everything since the heroic age as one era. In contrast to the heroic age, all since could be 'in our times' in the sense of 'in the time of us non-heroic mortals'. In other contexts, earlier times in the mortal era could be contrasted with our times (e.g. 5.9.3) or placed together with the heroic age as 'ancient' (e.g. 1.27.1, see below).

It is worth noting that Pausanias considers the possibility that there may have been mortals before the heroes: a 'pre-heroic' age (6.5.1).[8]

Pausanias does not seem to have thought of the heroic age as a different order of reality from that which succeeded it. Things from the two eras could be placed baldly in lists of the same phenomenon. The most renowned deeds of the Phocians were to fight in the Trojan war, then against the Thessalians just before the Persian wars (10.1.3). Pausanias had seen real objects from the heroic age. Among the ancient offerings worthy of mention in Athens were a folding chair made by Daedalus, the corselet of Masistius, and a sword said to be that of Mardonius (1.27.1).[9] The heroic age was not less real than the era that followed. It was just earlier, and somewhat different.[10]

We have seen the heroic/post-heroic division of the past being ignored in the linear sequence of the wars of the Phocians. That sequence starts with the Trojan war and ends with the defence of Greece against the Gauls in the third century B.C. (10.1.3–3.4). The Trojan war was a favoured starting point for such sequences. The Orchomenians had served at Troy, been expelled from their city by the Thebans and restored by Philip of Macedon, but since then the divine will had caused them to sink lower and lower (9.37.7–8). Another favoured starting point was the Persian wars. The Plataeans' claims to fame started with the battle of Marathon and the sequence ends with Philip of Macedon (9.1.3–8). Not all sequences started with such famous points of reference. The outline of the fortunes of the Thebans began with a defeat by the Athenians some time before the Persian wars and continued to their depressed state in the present day (9.6.1–7.6). Not only do such sequences start at different points, they also end at different points. Some, such as the story of the Orchomenians, seem to have no ending as such, but to be continuing. When Pausanias looked at the history of the Sibyls and

[6] Cf. an ancient statue which gives contemporaries great strength (10.32.6).

[7] ἀνθρώπων τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς is to be taken chronologically here as elsewhere (1.19.3, 24.2; 2.36.9; 8.43.2, 54.4),

[8] He is probably thinking of the giants. He argues elsewhere that they were mortals (8.29.2–4). Possibly mortals of that age were yet closer to the gods (ibid.) and yet bigger and stronger (2.25.8).

[9] Cf. the deer at 7.10.9 that lived from the Trojan war into historical times. On other artefacts that Pausanias thought to be heroic or earlier, see Arafat (n. 1), 58–75. On Daedalus in Pausanias, see W. K. Pritchett, *Pausanias Perigetes* (Amsterdam, 1998), 197–204.

[10] Pausanias' views on the heroic age appear to be the Greek norm, cf. H. Sidebottom, 'Studies in Dio Chrysostom *On Kingship*', dissertation (Oxford, 1990), 177 on Dio, and P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?* (English trans., Chicago and London, 1988), 101 in general. In establishing relative chronologies Pausanias could employ genealogies, generations, or Olympiads for the post-heroic era, but, obviously, only the first two for the heroic age.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.494 Published online by Cambridge University Press

men who had uttered oracles, he concluded that time was long and the like might happen in the future (10.12.5–11). Pausanias saw history as ongoing.[11]

At times Pausanias takes a vantage point in the middle of a sequence and looks backwards and forwards. Expounding the benefactors of Greece, Pausanias says Miltiades was the first and Philopoimen the last (8.52.1). Taking Miltiades as his mark, he first looks back to dismiss the claims of those between Codrus and Miltiades, then forwards, judging those between Miltiades and Aratus (8.52.1–5). Similarly, having identified the sack of Corinth as a low point, Pausanias discusses the disasters and blighted recoveries in Greek history, first looking back to Argos and the Dorian invasion and then forwards to Vespasian revoking the freedom of Greece (7.17.1–4). When constructing such linear sequences Pausanias can start and stop at different suitable points, thus creating a flexible, *ad hoc* structuring of the past.

As Bowie has pointed out, one of the striking things about Pausanias' ordering of history is the juxtaposition of things and events from very different eras.[12] To add a couple of examples. It was no wonder that the third temple at Delphi was made of bronze for Acrisius had made a bedchamber of bronze for his daughter, the Spartans still have a sanctuary to Athena of the Bronze House (cf. 3.17.2), and the Roman forum has a roof of bronze (10.5.11). From the beginning men have plotted against the sanctuary at Delphi: the first, a Euboean, was followed by the Phlegyans, the son of Achilles, some of Xerxes' army, the Phocians, the Gauls, and Nero (10.7.1).

Such juxtapositions, for example the omission of everything between the Phocians in the fourth century B.C. and the Gauls in the third, and then between the Gauls and Nero in the first century A.D., gives the impression that the things which are included were closely related, and that the often very-distant past shapes the present in a meaningful way. In the outline of the fortune of Thebes (9.6.1–7.6) we are told that the Athenians were keenest for the restoration of Thebes (9.7.1; in the fourth century B.C.). The ensuing Theban friendship with Athens led them to join Mithridates against Rome (9.7.4; in the first century B.C.). This led Sulla to take away half the territory of Thebes (9.7.5). From this point on, although they had got their lost territory back, the Thebans had sunk into such great misery that the lower city is now deserted (9.7.6; the mid-second century A.D.). The events that underlie current Theban poverty took place half a millennium ago. History is telescoped-down, and the difference between past and present is elided.

Many of the events of the past which Pausanias includes are the 'big events' of Greek history (the Trojan war or the Persian wars, and so on). These events must have formed the basis of ancient Greek social memory.[13] As Pausanias often tells his reader of conversations with local informants, we can assume that his view of the past was shaped in part by social memory. But we should not assume that it was totally determined by it. Pausanias could deny explicitly that he was trapped by social memory (1.6.1),[14] and his wide reading makes it *a priori* unlikely. At times we can be

[11] Cf. C. P. Jones, review of Arafat (n. 1), in *Classical Views* 15.3 (1996), 461, on Pausanias' use of the 'epistolary' imperfect indicating awareness of the future.

[12] Bowie (n. 2), esp. 213–16. Possibly the juxtapositions are more striking to us than to Pausanias' contemporaries, cf. Sidebottom (n. 10), 172–80.

[13] By social memory I mean the stories the Greeks told about their past: popular understanding only partly shaped by Greek historiography. Cf. 1.3.3, most learn history as children from choruses and tragedies.

[14] The oral tradition about Attalus and Ptolemy had died, but Pausanias can give their histories. Interest in Hellenistic history can be thought to make Pausanias unusual among his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.494 Published online by Cambridge University Press

certain that Pausanias knew more than he tells (1.4.6).[15] In other words the omissions and thus the juxtapositions are sometimes a result of Pausanias' choice.[16]

Pausanias' telescoping-down of the linear sequence of the past was underpinned by his belief in the largely unchanging nature of man. Man might have become less just and pious,[17] and thus further from the gods, but in essence man remained the same. Various things were unchanging; that audacity and weakness combined to be madness (7.14.4), or that treachery was a crime by which in the whole course of history Greece has never ceased to be afflicted (7.10.1–5). For Pausanias, an excuse made in the eighth century B.C. still holds true: 'of all the elements in human nature which drive us into dishonesty, avarice is the most irresistible' (4.4.7).[18] The essential unchanging behaviour of man could at times override Pausanias' customary division of mankind into Greeks and barbarians. When, after Actium, Augustus removed an image of Athena and the tusks of the Calydonian boar from Tegea, he was just behaving as Greeks and barbarians had since the fall of Troy (8.46.1–4).[19] Yet in a text which continually juxtaposes the ancient Greek past with the Greek present, the reader is lead to be impression that it is the Greeks who are unchanging.

As an introduction to his survey of the benefactors of all Greece (8.52.1–6, above) Pausanias does say that after the death of Philopoemen Greece ceased to produce good men. But it emerges from the text that this is the product of political circumstances. The imposition of Roman rule, probably the disaster of Roman rule (8.27.1),[20] limits the possible benefactions, and thus the goodness of later figures. The Olympic victor Mnesibulus could only benefit the city of Elatea not all Greece by fighting the barbarian Costoboci (10.34.5; cf. the figures between Codrus and Miltiades at 8.52.1). Herodes Atticus could act across the whole of Greece, but only give the material benefit of buildings not freedom, the essential criterion in Pausanias' list of figures from Miltiades to Philopoemen.[21]

In the logic of Pausanias' text (the relentless juxtaposition of Greek past and present, and thus elision of their differences) the reader is led to the impression that the Greeks of today are not much different from the Greeks of the past, those who defeated Persians and Trojans. That Greekness in large part is constituted in terms of opposition to outsiders must be of relevance to Pausanias' view of Rome. A reading of the text can now (and could then) place it in cultural opposition to Rome.[22]

The impression of an essentially unchanging Greekness that the text has encouraged in its readers for the first nine books reaches its culmination in the final book.

contemporaries: see H. Sidebottom, review of Arafat (n. 1), in *JRS* 90 (2000), 231–2, with references.

[15] Pausanias implies he knows more than just 'what everyone knows' about Pergamum: empire in Asia, withdrawal of Gauls, and Telephus against Agamemnon.

[16] *Pace* Habicht (n. 1), 95–6.

[17] Not only since the heroic age (8.2.4–5, above), but even since the time of the Persian and Peloponnesian wars (10.28.6; cf. 10.31.11).

[18] Cf. 8.2.6–7, 8.15.7, 10.22.9. Pausanias' views are comparable to those of Dio Chrysostom: Sidebottom (n. 10), 176–7.

[19] Cf. 9.16.4, incest among Greeks and barbarians.

[20] see Swain (n. 1), 195–201, for a convincing defence of the *paradosis* in Pausanias' text.

[21] See Arafat (n. 1), 195–201, and Bowie (n. 2), 226–7 on Herodes in Pausanias. Hadrian and other emperors, of course, did not count because they were not Greek.

[22] See S. E. Alcock, 'Landscapes of memory and the authority of Pausanias', in Bingen (n. 1), 241–67 (discussion at 268–76), for an exposition of this line of thinking. See also Bowie (n. 2); Elsner (n. 1, 1992, 1994, 1997); Swain (n. 1), 330–56. I intend to look at this elsewhere as part of a wider study of the interactions of cultures in Pausanias

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.494 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Book 10 is often seen as a weak bit of writing, unfinished or unrevised.[23] It can, however, be read as a sophisticated literary product that brings together the central themes of Pausanias' interests and closes with a multivalent allusion. The centrepiece of the tenth book is Delphi (10.5.5–32.1), said to be the centre of the world (10.16.3).[24] There are two key sections in the description of Delphi: the history of the Gallic invasions (10.19.5–23.14) and the ecphrasis of Polygnotus' pictures of the sack of Troy and of the underworld (10.25.1–31.12). Both are central to Pausanias' literary aims and construction of Greekness in this text.

Pausanias sets up the Gallic wars as greater than the Persian wars.[25] More Greeks fought the Gauls than the Persians (10.20.1–5). The Gauls were a greater danger than the Persians because their military system, which they had copied from the Persians, was more effective (10.19.9–11; cf. 10.19.3), and, as sacrilegious cannibals, unremitting gang rapists, and necrophiliacs with no pity for the dead, they were more barbarous (10.21.6–7, 10.22.3–4). Unlike the Persian war, this was not a struggle for liberty but for survival (10.19.12). Pausanias says he has been saving the story of the Gallic invasion for his coverage of Delphi since Book 1 (10.19.4; cf. 1.8.1–2). Pausanias' presentation of the Gallic wars allows him to stake an implicit claim to superiority over his model Herodotus[26] to expatiate on his favoured theme of divine vengeance (see below), and to demonstrate that the Greeks could achieve real pan-Hellenic greatness after the Persian wars.[27]

Pausanias' ecphrasis of Polygnotus' picture of the sack of Troy (10.25.1–27.4) acts as a counterpoint to the history of the Gallic wars, putting the latter in the context of the earliest pan-Hellenic heroism. It also lets Pausanias fill in the gap between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, thus 'completing' Homer's coverage of the Trojan war. The ecphrasis of the painting of Hades (10.28.1–31.12) expands the underworld of Book 11 of the *Odyssey*.[28] It lets Pausanias draw together a large number of mythical figures who have appeared throughout his text and show what happened to them,[29] working out the frequently recurring theme of divine judgement.[30] These ecphrases post a strong

[23] Habicht (n. 1), 6–7, surveys previous views before coming to the conclusion that 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'. Pausanias' coverage of Delphi has also been criticized on the practical guidebook grounds of error and omission by G. Daux, *Pausanias à Delphes* (Paris, 1936), 181; and J. Heer, *La Personalité de Pausanias* (Paris, 1979), 46. Habicht (n. 1), 71–7, defends him.

[24] Delphi gets the second longest description of any place in the work: 7.75 per cent of the whole, while Olympia gets 13 per cent (Habicht [n. 1], 4, n. 20).

[25] For the history of the invasion, see G. Nachtergael, *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes* (Brussels, 1977)

[26] D. Musti, 'La struttura del discorso storico in Pausania', in Bingen (n. 1), 9–34 (discussion at 35–43).

[27] Ameling (n. 5)

[28] Pausanias' underworld features twenty-four of the thirty-one characters in Homer and adds over thirty-six more. Pausanias foregrounds Theseus and Pirithous (10.29.9), whom Odysseus failed to see in Homer.

[29] Of over sixty, figures Pausanias previously had mentioned forty-threee. V. Pirenne-Delforge and G. Purnelle, *Pausanias Periegesis: Index verborum, liste de fréquence, index nominum* (2 vols, Liège, 1997) is invaluable for such a survey. Their lists confuse Olympus the mountain with the figure in the underworld.

[30] As well as the obvious figures of Sisyphus (10.31.10) and Tantalus (10.31.12), see also the man who was wicked to his father (10.28.2), Theseus and Pirithous (10.28.9), the daughters of Pandareos (10.30.1), Phocus and Iaseus (10.30.4), various musicians (10.30.4), and the uninitiated women (10.31.9). On divine vengeance/judgement in Pausanias in general, see Habicht (n. 1), 106–9, 152–4.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.494 Published online by Cambridge University Press

implicit claim to high paedeia. Previously Pausanias had boasted of his studies in Homeric scholarship, but claimed that he had been put off by the contrariness of those working in the field (9.30.3). These ecphrases invite comparisons both with studies of Homer and previous ecphrases of these paintings (10.30.2).

Rather than dismissing the ending of Pausanias' *Periegesis* (10.38.13) as either inept or the result of the loss of the end of the manuscript,[31] a reading can be made that sees it as an allusive summation of the entire work. The text also lacks a formal preface.[32] The text's sudden start can be compared with some of the ancient novels,[33] and the lack of a preface fixing the reader's expectations gave it a broad freedom of development.[34] The way in which Pausanias' work reaches closure with a seemingly irrelevant story can be compared with the ending of his model Herodotus.[35] At the end of Pausanias a Greek author[36] has a divine dream which instructs her to take a Greek text to a Greek who by reading it has his eyes opened. This is told by a Greek author, the recipient of divine instructions in dreams (1.14.3, 1.38.7, 4.33.5; cf. 10.32.13), who has given his Greek audience[37] the Greek text that they have just read, which should have opened their eyes to 'all things Greek' (1.26.4). When Pausanias had announced his intention to write about 'all things Greek' (*πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά*) clearly he did not intend to cover all geographical areas of Greece,[38] but instead to write about all the things that constituted Greek culture. Chief among these was religion. Pausanias' travels in researching his work led him, while in Arcadia, to believe in the truth of Greek religious myths (8.8.3).[39] His text leads its reader to reconstruct Pausanias' experience as it takes him or her along the same travels and the ending implies to the same conclusion.

Finally the work ends with the Arcadian poetess Anyte receiving two thousand gold pieces for the text she had presented. Possibly Pausanias hoped for a greater reward for his labours than it is commonly thought he received.[40]

Merton College, Oxford H. SIDEBOTTOM
harry@bigginstud.fsnet.co.uk

[31] See above n. 23. [32] Cf. Habicht (n. 1), 18.

[33] On novelistic elements in Pausanias, see J. Auberger, 'Pausanias romancier? Le témoignage du livre IV', *DHA* 18.1 (1992), 257–80.

[34] Cf. C. Bearzot, 'La Grecia di Pausania. Geografia e cultura nella definizione del concetto di *Ἑλλάς*', *CISA* 14 (1988), 90–112

[35] Cf. O. Regenbogen, 'Pausanias', *RE* Suppl. 8 (1956), 1057–97; H.-W. Nörenberg, 'Untersuchungen zum Schluss der *Περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος* des Pausanias', *Hermes* 101 (1973), 225–52.

[36] Actually an Arcadian poetess from the third century B.C.: Anyte of Tegea. She may have been chosen more for her origins and the connotations of her name than for her poetry (below).

[37] Pausanias clearly imagines his audience as Greek at 10.17.13; cf. Habicht (n. 1), 24–6; Sidebottom (n. 14), 232.

[38] Despite many cross-references only one (9.23.7) seems to point beyond the text as we have it.

[39] Veyne (n. 10), 96, speaks of Pausanias' 'road to Damascus in Arcadia'. The poetess who ends the work is Arcadian.

[40] Can we be sure that Pausanias' work 'paid no dividends' (Habicht [n. 1], 125)? It is worth noting the meanings of *ἀνύτω*, including 'to complete', 'to finish a journey', and 'to gain'.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.494 Published online by Cambridge University Press