

ANOTHER EARLY READER OF PAUSANIAS?*

Abstract: It is argued that Athenagoras, *Leg.* 17, draws on Pausanias 1.26.4, and may join Aelian, Pollux, Philostratus and Longus in the list of possible readers of the periegete.

CHAPTER 17 of Athenagoras' oration, the *Legatio pro Christianis*, where he discusses the earliest sculptural representations of pagan gods, has perhaps most often been used as a source for collections of ancient passages on art history; but it has other interests. At the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington DC in March 2002, Douglas Frame and I were participating in an open discussion after a paper on a quite different subject. Drawing on the opening paragraph of Christian Habicht's masterly study of Pausanias of 1985,¹ where it is argued that this author was apparently neither cited nor read for a period of centuries after he wrote, I casually named Pausanias as an example of a writer suffering this fate. Afterwards, Douglas Frame quietly took me aside and posed the question: 'What about Athenagoras?'

In 17.4, Athenagoras is arguing that the custom of making images of gods came relatively late; he provides a list of some of the first images, to show how it was possible to attribute even the earliest. There is a corrupt parenthesis near the start of the passage which can be omitted as having no direct bearing on the question in hand here; near the end, the text again becomes corrupt as it passes on to later works, and there I break off with the same pretext. But before this, Athenagoras makes seven or eight attributions of what we should call Archaic works: I number these for ease of reference:

τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος (1) καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἀθῆνας... () ... τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλαίας τὸ παλαιὸν (2) καὶ τὴν καθήμενὴν (3) Ἐνδοῖος εἰργάσατο μαθητῆς Δαιδάλου. ὁ δὲ Πύθιος (4) ἔργον Θεοδώρου καὶ Τελεκλέους καὶ ὁ Δήλιος (5) καὶ ἡ Ἄρτεμις (6) Τεκταίου καὶ Ἀγγελίωνος τέχνη, ἡ δὲ ἐν Σάμῳ Ἥρα (7) καὶ ἐν Ἄργει (8) Σμίλιδος χεῖρες...

The one of Artemis at Ephesos (1), and the one of Athena... the old one made of olive-wood (2) and the seated one (3), Endoios made, a pupil of Daidalos. But the Pythian [Apollo] (4) is the work of Theodoros and Telekles, the Delian [Apollo] (5) and Artemis (6) of Tektaios and Angelion, while the Hera at Samos (7) and at Argos (8) [is or are from] the hands of Smilis...

It was attribution number (3) that had caught Douglas Frame's eye, and that first occasioned this note. As Frame had seen, Athenagoras' account reads most easily as an excerpt of the essential words (here indicated in bold) from Pausanias' description of what appears to be the same work (1.26.4):

Ἐνδοῖος μὲν ἦν γένος μὲν Ἀθηναῖος, **Δαιδάλου δὲ μαθητῆς**, ὃς καὶ φεύγοντι Δαιδάλω διὰ τὸν Κάλω θάνατον ἐπηκολούθησεν ἐς Κρήτην. **τούτου καθήμενόν ἐστιν Ἀθῆνας ἄγαλμα**, ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον, ὡς Καλλίας μὲν ἀναθείη, ποιήσῃ δὲ Ἐνδοῖος.

So far, we have no more than a verbal resemblance between two passages by authors of closely sequential date (see below, p.189 and nn.7-9). But there is a wealth of circumstantial evidence to add to this. Not merely is Pausanias the *only* extant source for the view that Endoios was a pupil of Daidalos; but he evidently took a special interest in the *oeuvre* of this particular Archaic

* My debt to Douglas Frame, for starting the entire train of thought followed here, will be obvious: he will deal in his forthcoming book, entitled *Hippota Nestor*, with the aspect that concerns him, the pose of the 'old' statue of Athena Polias. But he cannot be implicated in the further ramifications which I have pursued. I am also

grateful to the anonymous referees for *JHS* for some valuable additional suggestions.

¹ *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Sather Classical Lectures 50, Berkeley 1985) 1, with acknowledgement in n.1 to A. Diller (below, n.11).

sculptor, as is shown by his detailed justification of an attribution to him of a work at Erythrai (7.5.9), and he provides a good part of our surviving evidence for the artist.² He thus has some claim to having put Endoios on the map as an important figure of ancient art history, a judgement that modern research and discovery have progressively reinforced.³ Athenagoras, as we have seen, made his first three attributions to Endoios.

Pausanias may also have been a prime authority for at least two of the attributions to other sculptors which Athenagoras makes in these lines. He is the only other writer to tell us (2.32.4) that the statue of Delian Apollo, no. (5), was by Tektaios and Angelion (although he does not mention the Artemis, no. (6)). Again, it is from him (7.4.4) that we derive our fullest attribution of the Hera at Samos, no. (7), to Smilis. Pausanias introduces this topic by citing a tradition that the Hera statue was brought there from Argos, by the Argonauts. The attribution itself did not originate with him: we can trace it back at least to Olympichos of Samos in, probably, the third century BC, and before that the statue had been discussed by an earlier Samian writer, Aethlios.⁴

But the story of the Argonauts and the moving of the statue is a different matter: for this is another case of a tradition found in Pausanias, but untraceable beyond him. As Jacoby wrote, 'Wir wissen von der Landung der Argo auf Samos sonst nichts.'⁵ Here I propose that a potentially vital indication lies buried in this and the next item, no. (8), of Athenagoras' list. Athenagoras does not, as might appear from a careless glance, list two different statues, one at Samos and one at Argos: this would surely require a repetition of the definite article, ἡ.⁶ As it stands, his text must be understood as referring to a single statue that was moved from the one location to the other – 'the Hera at Samos *and* at Argos' – the very feature that is peculiar to Pausanias' account. Even though Athenagoras inverts the order of the two places, his is a phrase immediately (and only?) intelligible to a reader of the Pausanias passage.

On the negative side, an important concession must be made: the attribution to Endoios of nos. (1) and (2), the Artemis at Ephesos and the 'old' Athena, is not found in Pausanias or any other author (see n.2, however, for an emendation of the text of the Elder Pliny). The same holds true for the Delian Artemis by Tektaios and Angelion, no. (6). There is thus proof that Athenagoras here used a source or sources now inaccessible to us; while at least one known but different source, Diodorus (1.98.5), was available to him for his no. (4), the Pythian Apollo of Theodoros and Telekles. It is impossible to exclude altogether the possibility that the whole list in Athenagoras came from a lost source. But the correlation with Pausanias, including the two very specific points just discussed, remains striking.

Had different authors been involved, for whom there was no such predisposition as the modern belief in an 'unread Pausanias', I think that the scholarly consensus would long since have come round to the view that the text of the earlier writer had been known to Athenagoras. It would have been natural for him to have consulted authorities in such a field as this, and an unbiased

² In J. Overbeck's collection of the passages on Endoios in *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig 1868) 60, nos. 348-53, Pausanias accounts for well over half the lines. The only other entries are a signature inscription, to be joined by a series of later finds, all admirably discussed by A.E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge, MA 1949) 491-5 (now *IG* 1³ 763, 764, 1214 and 1380); then this same passage from Athenagoras; then a further entry, created by a far from certain emendation of the text of the Elder Pliny (*HN* 16.214), proposed 'retroactively' by Sillig to harmonize with Athenagoras' attribution (no. (1) above) of the Artemis at Ephesos to Endoios.

³ See for example the array of important works directly or indirectly linked to him by J. Boardman, *Greek*

Sculpture: the Archaic Period (London 1978) 74, 82-3, 86, 158. We need not here enter into the probable identification of the damaged statue Akropolis 625 (Boardman, fig. 135), with Endoios' Athena. On this, see most recently Patricia A. Marx, 'Acropolis 625 (Endoios' Athena) and the rediscovery of its findspot', *Hesperia* 70 (2001) 221-54.

⁴ See *FGrHist* 537 F1; 536 F3.

⁵ *FGrHist* 545 F1(4); III b *Kommentar* (1955) 465 on §4; for the quotation, III b *Noten* (1955) 275, n.18.

⁶ Predictably, this very change was once proposed as an emendation, by P. Ubaldi: see M. Marcovich (ed.), *Athenagoras: Legatio pro Christianis* (Berlin 1990) 54 *ad loc.* But there can be no doubt as to which is the *difficilior lectio*.

reading of the evidence might suggest that Pausanias was one of, indeed prominent among, these authorities. If so, then Athenagoras, whose speech must be dated between AD 176 and 180,⁷ would have been a fairly early reader of Pausanias' first book, for whose completion Ewen Bowie has proposed a *terminus ante quem* of c. 165.⁸ Further consultation of the later books, such as Book 7 on Smilis (nos. (7)-(8) above), would imply that he was an even prompter, indeed almost immediate one: Pausanias probably completed his extant text within the principate of Marcus Aurelius (161-80), but perhaps only shortly before its end.⁹

I cite, in support of this argument, the quite separate grounds that already existed for a belief, however tentative, that Pausanias' work might have quickly secured a circle of readers. I refer primarily to the two cases which Habicht considered as possible objections to his own view.¹⁰ First, there is in our text of Aelian (*VH* 14.61, *ad fin.*) a terse sentence giving an absolutely explicit (and accurate) citation of Pausanias (8.27.14 and especially 8.36.6) on the cult of Boreas at Megalopolis. Habicht observed that, as early as 1667, Faber had excised this sentence as a palpable scholiast's interpolation (though not all later editors concurred). Some have felt this dry citation, appended to his excursus on the worship of Boreas at Thourioi and Athens, to be uncharacteristic of Aelian. But the case is not simple. The supposed interpolation appears in the heavily abridged later books of Aelian: it might seem to be both a step in the opposite direction, and at the same time itself a natural target for the process of abridgement. Does this mean that it belongs after that process, which in turn was dated by A. Diller to the tenth to twelfth centuries AD? Or is its own terseness, rather, a sign that it has already undergone abridgement? Diller appears to hesitate between these two views¹¹ and the case seems to be inconclusive.

The other case involves the *Onomastikon* of Pollux (7.37), where the rare word φαίδρυντής is glossed. It occurs in inscriptions of a restricted period, from Hadrian to Severus. But I take it that the primary business of Pollux was with literary sources, and it so happens that Pausanias (5.14.5) is the one other writer in whom the word occurs; it is explained by him as the title of a hereditary priesthood of Olympian Zeus at Athens. K. Hanell therefore understood Pollux's entry as a gloss on the text of Pausanias.¹² Here, once again, a very short lapse of time would be involved between the appearance of the two works: Pausanias' fifth book seems tied to AD 174, while the early books of Pollux may antedate the assumption of sole rule by Commodus in 180 (in the preface to the next book, 8, he mentions his appointment to the imperial chair of rhetoric at Athens, perhaps soon after 178). This too, Habicht concedes, is a case which can be neither proved nor disproved. Aelian was writing somewhat later than Pollux but, as the second and third authors offering possible literary acknowledgement of Pausanias' work in these years, they may be thought to give some corroboration to the argument here. The accumulation may indeed go further, with recent suggestions of a fourth and a fifth case from approximately the same time, in the persons of Philostratus¹³ and Longus¹⁴ respectively. One way and another, the case for the 'unread Pausanias' seems increasingly difficult to sustain.

A.M. SNODGRASS
Clare College, Cambridge

⁷ See W.R. Schoedel, *Athenagoras* (Oxford 1972) xi, who suggests the year 177.

⁸ 'Inspiration and aspiration: date, genre and readership', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry and J. Elsner (eds), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 21-32, at 21.

⁹ Here Habicht (n.1) 9-10 and Bowie (n.8) 22 ('with in the span 174-177' for Books 5-8) concur, though for different reasons.

¹⁰ Habicht (n.1) 1 n.1.

¹¹ See A. Diller, 'The authors named Pausanias', *TAPA* 86 (1955) 268-79, at 272 n.22; and 'Pausanias in the Middle Ages', *TAPA* 87 (1956) 84-97, at 84 and 88.

¹² In *RE* 19. 2.1560 (1938).

¹³ See M.W. Dickie, 'Philostratus and Pindar's eighth paean', *BASP* 34 (1997) 11-20 on the verbal similarities between Philostratus' and Pausanias' descriptions of the temples at Delphi, at 15ff.

¹⁴ Bowie (n.8) 29-31, on a similar resemblance between a passage in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Pausanias' account of the divine deliverance of Delphi from Brennus' Gauls.