Transactions of the American Philological Association 140 (2010) 423–459

Pausanias and the Mysteries of Hellas*

WILLIAM HUTTON
The College of William & Mary

SUMMARY: Instead of being an amorphous collection of useful facts for travelers, Pausanias's *Description of Greece* offers a carefully structured meditation on the state of Greece in the Roman period. By mustering certain narrative themes and techniques around the pivot-point of his description of Olympia, Pausanias compares and contrasts the Roman conquest of Greece with the Spartan conquest of Messenia and offers his own text as an affirmatory parallel to a sacred document that was restored to the Messenians at the time of their liberation. Appreciation of the author's ambitious program of structural and thematic patterns explains many aspects of the text that previous scholars have found perplexing, including its abrupt and enigmatic ending.

IN RECENT YEARS SCHOLARS HAVE BEGUN TO REALIZE THAT IN ADDITION TO being a rich source of information for ancient and modern antiquarians, Pausanias's *Description of Greece* is a work of surprising literary sophistication.[1] This essay will take that notion somewhat further than it has been by suggesting that there is an unrecognized thematic and organizational rhetoric that underlies Pausanias's work as a whole, one that involves the sequence in which

* Elements of the argument of this paper were presented to audiences at the Kyknos Center for Ancient Narrative at the University of Wales, Swansea, at the University of Athens, and at the International Congress on the Ancient Novel in Lisbon. Comments I received on all these occasions have improved the final product. I also obtained many helpful suggestions from Martha T. Jones, and from the editor and anonymous readers for *TAPA*. Financial support was provided, in part, by the Reves Center for International Studies at the College of William & Mary. All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.

[1] See, for instance, Musti 1984; Veyne 1988: 95–102; Elsner 1992 (republished with revisions as Elsner 1995: 125–55); Elsner 2001; Porter 2001; Sidebottom 2002; Hutton 2005b; Akujärvi 2005; Ellinger 2005; Pretzler 2007.

the author presents his material, the narrative and descriptive techniques he deploys, and the way he presents his own persona within his text. By means of this programmatic structuring Pausanias takes a potentially amorphous body of facts and observations and turns it into a subtle and complex reflection on the state of Hellas in the Roman period. The reading proposed here will provide interpreters of Pausanias's work with a number of advantages: it will explain some features of the text that are usually perceived as random or anomalous, it will suggest some new ways of looking at the relationship between Pausanias and other contemporary authors, and, finally, it will provide a solution to one of the thornier problems of Pausanian scholarship: the significance of the text's enigmatic ending.

The attempt to uncover grand schemes and deeper meanings in the text of Pausanias is bound to encounter resistance from at least two sources: first, from the perception that still persists in some quarters that Pausanias is a tedious, unintelligent author whose aims and opinions are far less interesting than the factual information he provides; second, from the skepticism that has developed in recent decades toward the identification of overarching patterns and designs in lengthy works of literature. Such attempts have been taken too far in the past, and the general trend in favor of a variety of approaches that can be vaguely classed as deconstructive has tended to diminish scholarly interest in the ways in which an author might attempt to exercise hegemonic control over the messages imparted by his or her work. But while we can readily acknowledge the importance of studying the things that a text like Pausanias's communicates independently of (or even in spite of) the author's intent, this does not preclude the possibility that Pausanias pursued his work with a deliberate and well thought-out plan, and that an understanding of that plan can illuminate the messages, both intentional and unintentional, that the work conveys.

SYNOPTIC STRUCTURE

The effort to identify elements of a grand design in Pausanias work is all the more justified by the fact that even if we confine ourselves to features of the text that are generally recognized, it is evident that the *Description of Greece* is a work that was planned and structured with extraordinary care. The ten volumes of Pausanias's work lead the reader on a systematic series of itineraries through the southern portion of the Greek mainland, providing copious information on sites and monuments as well as on local history and traditions. At various points, the author reveals through unobtrusive first-person references that most, if not all, of these itineraries are based on his own

travels in the region.[2] But regardless of how closely the sequence of routes plotted in the work replicates Pausanias's own movements, his presentation of those routes is carefully organized to provide a self-contained topographical framework for each sub-division of the territory covered (Hutton 2005b: 55–126; Pretzler 2007: 3–9). Although on the microscopic level Pausanias's deployment of topographic description and historico-mythical narrative may appear random, diffuse, and digressive, this diverse mass of material is subsumed and anchored into an overall structure that is balanced and symmetrical. The routes within and between the different sites Pausanias visits, as well as between the larger geographical divisions, are often chosen more to lend coherence and continuity to the account than to inform the reader of the most convenient way of proceeding or to replicate the movements of either Pausanias himself or any other specific traveler.

This textual edifice took its author many years, if not decades, to construct,[3] and the degree of planning that went into it—as well as the author's ability to conceive of his work synoptically—is indicated by a rich network of both forward-looking and backward-looking cross-references between different parts of the text.[4] Regardless of whether Pausanias started introducing these structures and cross-references from the beginning or whether they were imposed upon more formless material in some later redaction, the end result is a rare accomplishment. In the entire corpus of Greek literature there are few, if any, prose works of comparable length that exhibit such explicit arrangement and architecture. One supposes that in order to justify the expense of such effort, Pausanias envisioned at least some members of his audience reading the text from beginning to end, rather than diving into it and out of it in random intervals, as most modern readers are wont to do.

[2] Cf. Akujärvi 2005: 131–45, for a discussion of the role of Pausanias's narratorial "Ego" as traveler. In this article I will not maintain Akujärvi's scrupulous narratological distinction between "Pausanias" and the "Ego" of the text, but it should be understood throughout that I assume no identity between these entities. The antiquated notion that Pausanias's claims of autopsy are largely fictional can safely be characterized as defunct. Cf. Habicht 1998: 165–71.

[3] In brief, composition lasted at least from the early 160's to the mid 170's C.E., and conceivably much longer. See Habicht 1998: 9–11; and Bowie 2001: 21–24, with reference to earlier studies.

[4] See Settis 1968; Habicht 1998: 6–7; Akujärvi 2005: 35–44, who also provides a complete table of cross-references: 61–64. Already in Book I we find Pausanias referring ahead to Book VIII (1.41.2) and Book IX (1.24.5).

So much for what is generally acknowledged. It is a relatively small leap from there to suggesting an even more involved and complex patterning. Some scholars, including Bultrighini 1990, Ameling 1996: 146–47, Musti 1988,[5] and Elsner 2001: 7, 17, have observed elements of what could be understood as a thematic and compositional ring structure in the work as a whole. If one were to collate the observations of these scholars one could, in fact, produce a deceptively simple diagram like the one presented in Table 1.

There are certainly valid reasons for skepticism with regard to this diagram. When one perceives patterns and structures like these in an ancient text, it is essential to ask oneself whether the effects could be illusory, like the images one might read into clouds, tea leaves, or Rorschach blotches. In the case of poetry one can at least support the reality of such features with reference to a large body of comparanda from other poetic texts. This is less frequently true when it comes to prose,[6] and is particularly problematic in the case of the *Description of Greece*, a work whose idiosyncratic and unparalleled nature renders any comparative approach extremely difficult.[7] A related problem is the question of whether such structures are necessarily intentional and indicative of a more complex authorial agenda than what might appear on the surface. Apparent ring structures can arguably arise from a natural disposition toward cyclical patterns in human cognition and linguistic expression (Minchin 1995; Douglas 2007), or from techniques of effective storytelling that may be largely traditional and instinctual (Lang 1984; Nimis 1999, 2001).

In light of this uncertainty, and in the absence of any direct authorial statement, many of the parallels posited in Table I provide shaky foundations upon which to build any further analysis. For instance Book II on the Argolid and Book IX on Boeotia might seem to cohere thematically by the

[5] See also Bultrighini 1990: 291n1, who attributes to D. Musti (via personal communication) the most detailed hypothesis for the ring structure in Pausanias's books proposed so far. To my knowledge Prof. Musti has not published further on this topic. See also Hutton 2005b: 79; Schneider 1997.

[6] Not that such patterns have not been detected in prose writings. See for instance MacQueen 1990 on Chariton (*contra* Nimis 2001), Holzberg 1992 on the *Life of Aesop* (*contra* Karla 2009), and, less ambitiously, Pelling 1997: 240–44 on Plutarch; see also Rijksbaron 1986 and Herrington 1991b on Herodotus, Ellis 1991 on Thucydides, and Worthington 1991 and 1993 on rhetorical texts.

[7] The works with which Pausanias's text has the most in common, "periegetical" works of the Hellenistic period such as those of Polemon of Ilion and Heliodorus of Athens, exist only in fragments, so their overall structure is lost (cf. Bischoff 1938); but the little evidence that exists suggests that they may have been structured quite differently from Pausanias's work. See Hutton 2005b: 247–63.

TABLE 1. RING STRUCTURE OF THE *PERIEGESIS*

	Book	*Territory*	*Thematic and structural elements*
	I	Attica	Abrupt beginning, Major cultural center, Wall paintings, Gallic narrative, Appendage on a smaller territory (Megarid)
	II	Corinthia/Argolis	Multi-polis organization, Seven against Thebes
	III	Laconia	Narrative of kings
	IV	Messenia	Extended historical narrative of conquest, Quasi-novelistic elements
	V	Elis/Olympia	Description of Olympia
	VI	Elis/Olympia	Description of Olympia
	VII	Achaea	Extended historical narrative of conquest, Quasi-novelistic elements
	VIII	Arcadia	Narrative of kings
	IX	Boeotia	Multi-polis organization, Seven against Thebes
	X	Phocis/Delphi	Major cultural center, Wall paintings, Gallic narrative, Appendage on a smaller territory (Ozolian Locris), Abrupt ending

tradition of the Seven against Thebes (Bultrighini 1990), and organizationally by frameworks of itineraries in both books that are built around a number of important individual *poleis*, a feature that sets them in contrast to most other books where a single major city or site (Athens in Book I, Sparta in Book III, for instance) serves as the starting-point for routes through the countryside (Hutton 2005b: 69–70). Book III on Laconia and Book VIII on Arcadia similarly share parallels in form and content: both begin with regnal histories of the legendary and historic kings of their respective territories that are more lengthy and detailed than the historical introductions devoted to most other places (3.1.1–10.5 ~ 8.1.4–6.1). As suggestive as such parallels may be, a skeptic would have no trouble in casting doubt on their significance as building-blocks in a deliberate ring structure by pointing to imperfections in the parallels (the organization of Book II, for instance, is much more decentralized than Book IX), or to other parts of the work that share the features that are supposedly emblematic (for instance, Book VII, like Books II and IX, has itineraries anchored on several polis-centers).

Nevertheless, there does seem to be a more clear case of deliberate structuring involving the most obvious focal points of the work: the beginning, the ending, and the center. There are a number of distinctive correspondences between Book I and Book X: the former begins abruptly and the latter ends abruptly (the significance of this abrupt ending will be explored further below). Both books have long digressions on the invasion of the Gauls of 279 B.C.E. (1.4.1–6 ~ 10.19.5–23.14) and lengthy exegeses of narrative wall-paintings (1.22.6–7 ~ 10.25.1–31.12)[8]; both end with brief codas on regions outside of the main territory covered: Megaris in Book I (1.39.4–44.10) and Ozolian Locris in Book X (10.38.1–13). Most obviously, both books are largely taken up with a single site of major historical and cultural importance: Athens in Book I and Delphi in Book X. The correspondences between these books involve not just isolated features but a multifaceted complex of specific types of descriptions, specific types (and even subjects) of narratives, and specific singularities of structure. It is thus impossible to understand them as accidental or as resulting from an intuitive reflex of the narrator's art.

Anchoring and responding to these balanced extremities of the work are the two books that straddle the center of the text, Books V and VI, which

[8] See Sidebottom 2002 on the programmatic significance of Pausanias's transcription of the Polygnotan painting at Delphi. The evocative potential of the stories of the Gallic invasion, being the latest historical episode Pausanias relates in which a substantial number of Greek communities band together successfully to repel a foreign invader, is more obvious.

comprise Pausanias's description of the most splendid site of all, Olympia, a description which stands, as Elsner 2001: 17 puts it, as a "grand metonym for all of Pausanias' Greece," with its panhellenic monuments and their associated stories canvassing the greater part of the regions that Pausanias either has visited or will visit in other parts of his work. The structural synergy of Olympia, Athens, and Delphi within Pausanias's text, which Bultrighini has aptly compared to the vertices of a symmetrical triangle,[9] is sufficient in itself to suggest a certain degree of architectonic thinking on Pausanias's part, and even if we do not accept the detailed annular pattern suggested by Table I, perception of this looser structural context may help us appreciate the unusual characteristics shared by the one pair of books that we have yet to bring into our discussion: Books IV and VII, the volumes that flank Pausanias's Olympia on either side.

ROMANCE AND CONQUEST IN MESSENIA AND ACHAEA

Books IV (Messenia) and VII (Achaea) share two most evident features: long historical accounts of conquest and the use of certain narrative approaches and motifs that are rare elsewhere in the work. The bulk of Book IV (29 of a total of 36 sections) is occupied by the longest of all of Pausanias's historical narratives, his treatment of Messenian history. Pausanias begins this history in primordial times but soon focuses his attention on the wars between the Messenians and the Spartans in the Archaic period. The story of the Spartan conquest occupies much of the account, but the narrative culminates, after a brief overview of the intervening centuries, with the restoration of the Messenians to their homeland and the foundation of a new capital for them at Messene under the aegis of Epaminondas, whose Thebans had defeated the Spartans at Leuctra in 371 B.C.E.[10] Pausanias bases his narrative (or so he claims) on sources that are problematic from the point of view of modern scholars, including the sensationalist historian Myron of Priene and the epic

[9] Bultrighini 1990: 294: "la stessa struttura compositiva dell'opera che per così dire colloca strategicamente Atene e Delfi nei libri estremi, e Olimpia in quelli centrali, evoca una chiara simmetria per cui Atene e i due grandi santuari costituiscono i vertici di una sorte di grande triangolo ...."

[10] Luraghi 2002, 2008: 94–100 argues convincingly that much of this history, along with the separate ethnic identity of the Messenians, was in large part an invention of the period following the liberation of Messenia from Spartan control (cf. Deshours 1993; Siapkas 2003). The issue here, however, is the use Pausanias makes of this material, regardless of its origins.

poet Rhianus (4.6.1–5).[11] The result is a historiographical farrago wherein echoes of Herodotus and Thucydides collide with folklore and romance. Detailed descriptions of military engagements (e.g., 4.7.3–8.13), commanders' exhortations (e.g., 4.7.9–11), source criticism (4.6.1–5, 4.15.2–3), and Olympic-year datings (4.5.10, 4.13.7, etc.) share space with oracles (4.12.7, 4.20.2, etc.), portents (e.g., 4.13.1), pirates (4.4.6, 4.23.7), cross-dressing (4.4.3), divine intervention (e.g., 4.18.5–7), and a horribly mishandled virgin sacrifice (4.9.7–10).

Pausanias's approach and tone in his Messenian history is quite different from what we find in his other historical narratives, and in a series of articles on this account Jannick Auberger (1992a, 1992b, 2000, 2001) has suggested that some of the unusual features of this part of Pausanias's narrative demonstrate a close intertextual relationship with the burgeoning genre of the Greek Novel. The prime example that Auberger adduces is Pausanias's characterization of Aristomenes, the hero of the second Messenian war. Pausanias's Aristomenes is a gallant and adventuresome figure who performs many daring deeds. Though faultless in his sexual propriety (4.16.9–10), women find him irresistible and save him from peril on more than one occasion (4.17.2, 4.19.5–6). Like many heroes of contemporary fiction Aristomenes enjoys the tutelage of the gods (who go so far as to rescue him miraculously from certain death: 4.18.5–7), but also suffers their occasional anger and opposition (4.16.5, 4.26.7).

Auberger probably goes too far in seeing such characterizations as distinctively novelistic. Similar portrayals are also found in other forms of narrative, including the sorts that Pausanias avows as his sources: epic poetry and un-Thucydidean strains of historiography. Moreover, as Ogden 2004: 16–18 has pointed out, there are some important respects in which Pausanias's portrayal of Aristomenes diverges from the novelistic paradigm. For instance, although women fall in love with Aristomenes, Aristomenes is never described as reciprocating their affections and ends up marrying none of them.[12] Thus,

[11] On Pausanias's sources for this account see *FGrH* 3a2: 87–200 (though the extremes of Jacoby's *Quellenkritik* are not to be recommended); Pearson 1962; Castelli 1994, 1995; Ogden 2004: 155–99. On Pausanias's independence from these and other identifiable sources, see Auberger 1992a, 2001 and Luraghi 2008: 94–100, although the latter does allow for the possibility that Pausanias's treatment was influenced by a prior synthesis of Messenian history from the late Hellenistic or early Roman period (325).

[12] In fact, Aristomenes arranges for one of his female rescuers to marry his son (4.19.6), a character whose existence has not been revealed up to that point.

while Aristomenes is a dashing, heaven-favored hero, he is hardly the typical protagonist of a novel.[13]

On the whole it is true that Pausanias's work shares certain broad commonalities with contemporary fiction: the use of a travel motif as a narrative framework, which is rare in earlier Greek literature; a penchant for *ekphrasis* (or, more generally, for description) of monuments and works of art[14]; a marked emphasis on piety and religious observances (on which more below), and a tendency to reflect the world of the distant past in preference to the realities of contemporary life under the Roman empire (Bowie 1970). Moreover, the ring structure described above recalls the recapitulating plots of many of the novels, as they proceed from union to separation to reunion, from concord to estrangement to reconciliation, and from wedding to funeral to initiation.[15] Yet Ogden's objections are sufficient to show that if the type of literature defined for modern readers by the five "canonical" novels constituted a genre that was sufficiently fixed in the minds of second-century readers and writers, Pausanias was not trying to write according to the rules of that genre in his Messenian narrative. This does not, however, preclude the suggestion that Pausanias and the novels share a significant intertextual continuum. Among the surviving literature of Pausanias's day such elements as we find in Book IV—erotic, supernatural, and fantastic motifs embedded in a quasi-historical prose account—are represented most frequently in the novels, so calling them "novelistic" or, perhaps better, "quasi-novelistic" has some justification. But this terminology need not be taken to imply that Pausanias was directly dependent on actual novels as the models for his writing. Such elements can arguably be seen as a distinctive building block of literature of the Second Sophistic in general. One thinks, for instance, of the strange tale of Stratonice and Combabus within Lucian's *On the Syrian Goddess*, or the pastoral narrative embedded in the Euboean oration of Dio of Prusa.[16] In playing with narrative topics and techniques that we, from our

[13] As Ogden 2004: 17 also points out, a separate tradition, preserved in a reference by Plutarch (*On Love* 761d), seems to portray Aristomenes as more active in his amorous pursuits. Pausanias is either ignorant of this tradition or deliberately avoids it.

[14] On the importance of *ekphrasis* in the novels, see Bartsch 1989: 3–39; Stoneman 1995; cf. Sironen 2003. On its role in Pausanias, see Elsner 1995: 125–55.

[15] Cf. Reardon 1991: 97–126, 169–80; Fusillo 1997: 214–21.

[16] Lucian *Syr. D.* 19–27 (Lightfoot 2003: 384–419). Other examples might include the novelistic features of Philostratus's biographies of the oratorical luminaries of the Second Sophistic, e.g., the Potiphar's-wife story in the account of the life of the Trajanic-era sophist Scopelian (*V S* 21 [517]). Cf. Bowie 1994 on the novelistic in Philostratus and Currie 1990 on Curtius and Arrian.

perspective, identify with the novel, Pausanias may have been doing no more than following a broader fashion in prose literature of his time.[17]

Regardless of their origins, and regardless of the terminology we use to talk about them, what is important to note is that such "quasi-novelistic" features seem to be concentrated in certain parts of Pausanias's work. Book IV is one such locus, and we have hardly exhausted the examples to be found in that book. Perhaps the best instance of a quasi-novelistic feature in Pausanias's Messenian account is not the story of Aristomenes or of any individual character but the story of the Messenians themselves. Like the protagonists of most contemporary novels, the Messenians are driven from their homes by malicious enemies and angry gods; they suffer many adventures and tribulations in their exile; they wander to Arcadia (4.22.1–2), to Elis (4.23.1), to Sicily (4.23.7–10), to Libya (4.25.2), to Naupactus (4.24.7), and to Acarnania (4.25.1), before finally returning to their native land amid much pomp and portent and with the favor of heaven restored.[18] Recalling the wedding feasts at the end of *Daphnis and Chloe,* or the public assembly at the end of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the reestablishment of the Messenians is accompanied by a grand festival including Epaminondas and the Thebans along with representatives of neighboring peoples (minus the Spartans), with each group conducting sacrifices to their own gods (4.27.6). Other examples of "quasi-novelistic" elements in Book IV will enter our discussion below, but for present purposes, the most important thing to note is that outside of Book IV the thickest concentration of such elements is found in the book that balances it on the other side of the center-point of Olympia, Book VII.

Like Book IV, Book VII (Achaea), is taken up to a large extent with continuous historical narration. Here the narrative (filling 17 of 27 sections) comprises the legendary history of the colonization of Ionia by immigrants from Achaea (7.1.1–5.13) and, at greater length, the story of Rome's conflict with the Achaean League (7.6.1–17.4). Pausanias's narration of this latter-day conflict reaches its climax with the destruction of Corinth by the Romans. In a brief coda to his account he describes how the Achaeans' defeat ultimately led to the reduction of Greece to the status of a Roman province, which is what it remained up to his own time (7.16.10–17.4). As in Book IV the historical narrative in Book VII is accompanied by an unusual concentration of ele-

[17] For other reflections on the interplay between Pausanias and the novels, see Hutton 2009.

[18] Of course some portion of the Messenian population remains to provide serfs for the Spartan system of helotry (4.13.1), but Pausanias provides far fewer details about the post-conquest lives of these Messenians.

ments that could, in a broad sense, be called quasi-novelistic. Here the motifs occur not in the historical account itself, but in the topographical sections of the work that immediately follow it. Even more than in Book IV, the stories here focus on the erotic[19]:

1. Agdistis and Attis (7.17.10–11): At a sanctuary of the Dindymenian Mother and Attis in the western Achaean town of Dyme, Pausanias relates a "local" (ἐπιχώριος)[20] version of the story of Attis that contrasts with a more prosaic account he attributes to the poet Hermesianax: Agdistis is an autochthonous *daimon* with two sets of genitals, male and female. The gods cut off Agdistis's male genitals, an almond tree rises from the severed organs, and a local nymph impregnates herself with one of the fine nuts it produces. The resulting child, Attis, is exposed at birth but is fostered by a he-goat and grows into a beautiful young man. Agdistis falls in love with Attis, but the boy is marked out for marriage with the princess of Pessinus. At the royal wedding, Agdistis makes an appearance as the wedding hymn is being sung, and both Attis and his prospective father-in-law go mad and castrate themselves. Agdistis suffers remorse and persuades Zeus to protect Attis's body from decay.

2. Comaetho and Melanippus (7.19.2): In a situation parallel to that of many novels the story concerns two young lovers separated by disapproving parents. The couple commits sacrilege, however, by having clandestine intercourse in a temple of Artemis. The offended goddess sends a plague that necessitates the sacrifice of the lovers and many other young people as well. In concluding his account Pausanias reflects on the meaning of the story, expressing the opinion that the couple's death may not be the tragedy that it seems at first: Μελάνιππον δὲ καὶ Κομαιθὼ συμφορᾶς ἐκτὸς γενέσθαι τίθεμαι· μόνον γὰρ δὴ ἀνθρώπῳ ψυχῆς ἐστιν ἀντάξιον κατορθῶσαί τινα ἐρασθέντα ("I do not categorize what happened to Melanippus and Comaetho as a disaster, for the only thing worth a person's life is success at love").

3. Coresus and Callirhoe (7.21.4–5): Coresus falls in love with Callirhoe, but she does not return his affections. Unfortunately for her he is a priest of Dionysus, and he calls down a curse upon the people that can only be relieved by the sacrifice of Callirhoe. When the time comes for the sacrifice Coresus relents and kills himself in Callirhoe's place. Callirhoe suddenly repents of her rejection

[19] Cf. Winkler 1994: 32–35, who discusses some of these passages as embodying typical erotic story lines in the Greek tradition that stand in contrast to the happy-ending stories that form the main plot of the typical ancient novel. For additional comments on these stories, see Hutton 2009.

[20] Pausanias's words are ambiguous as to whether this version of the story is "local" to Dyme or to the Anatolian region where the action takes place. Probably the latter is to be preferred; cf. the more detailed (and somewhat different) version of the story ascribed to Timotheus by Arnobius 5.5–7.

of Coresus and kills herself as well. According to Pausanias, Coresus performed his self-sacrifice "with the most sincere disposition toward love of any man we know" (ἀνθρώπων ὧν ἴσμεν διατεθεὶς ἐς ἔρωτα ἁπλαστότατα).

4. Argyra and Selemnus (7.23.1–3): In a doublet of the Tithonus story, the nymph Argyra falls in love with Selemnus, a shepherd. As Selemnus grows older, though, she loses interest, and he dies of misery. His end is not totally in vain, however; Selemnus becomes a river and as a river he is alleged to have the miraculous ability to cure anyone who bathes in his waters of the illness of love.

All of these tales (with the possible exception of the tale of Attis and Agdistis) deal with heterosexual erotic relationships between mortals, and while none of them conforms to the principal plot of a canonical novel (particularly in the absence of a happy ending for the central couple), many of them find parallels in side-narratives within the surviving novels. For instance, the stories of Comaetho and Melanippus and of Argyra and Selemnus are both paralleled by the story told in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* (8.13) of Rhodope and Euthynicus, who engage in illicit sex in the sanctuary of Artemis, an act that leads ultimately to the transformation of Rhodope into a fountain in which those suspected of illicit love are made to bathe. No less interesting than the content of these stories, however, is the degree of personal investment that Pausanias expresses in them. In all but the first case he delivers a judgment in his own voice attesting to the power of love both to cause suffering and to ennoble sacrifice. In the story of Agdistis and Attis, that same message is delivered implicitly, as Agdistis's destructive passion leads to the quasi-immortalization of Attis.[21] In the case of Argyra and Selemnus Pausanias makes the following impassioned claim about the miraculous ability of the river Selemnus to cure heart-ache for those who bathe in it (7.23.3): εἰ δὲ μέτεστιν ἀληθείας τῷ λόγῳ, τιμιώτερον χρημάτων πολλῶν ἐστιν ἀνθρώποις τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ Σελέμνου ("If there is any truth to the report, the water of the Selemnus is more valuable to humankind than a large amount of money").[22]

Within the vicinity of these stories Pausanias makes other statements that also express what is, for him, an unusual degree of interest in amorous and erotic matters. In the course of the description of the city of Patrae, the first

[21] On this topic, see Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 321–24.

[22] On this passage Habicht 1998: 161 remarks, "Would [Pausanias] have made this remark if he had not experienced the sweetness, as well as the bitterness, of love?" Indeed, one might imagine from his continual revisiting of this theme that Pausanias wrote Book VII during a particularly nasty break-up, but such biographical speculation should not distract us from investigating the literary functions of the references.

major site in Achaea that Pausanias describes after the historical narratives that begin the book, he delivers the following comments on the sexuality of the city's women: they outnumber the men two to one, and have a "as great a share of Aphrodite as any women elsewhere" (7.21.14: αἱ δὲ γυναῖκές εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς Πάτραις ἀριθμὸν μὲν καὶ ἐς δὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν· Ἀφροδίτης δέ, εἴπερ ἄλλαις γυναιξί, μέτεστι καὶ ταύταις). Later on, in his description of the city of Aegeira, he comments on a statue depicting Tyche in the company of a winged Eros (7.26.8), suggesting by way of interpretation that the statue "is intended to signify that for human beings success comes through luck rather than by beauty, even in matters of love" (ἐθέλει δὲ σημαίνειν ὅτι ἀνθρώποις καὶ τὰ ἐς ἔρωτα τύχῃ μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπὸ κάλλους κατορθοῦται).[23]

Pausanias's predilection for erotic matters in Book VII has been explained as *variatio* (Regenbogen 1956: 1011–12), that is, as a conscious striving to add a certain degree of stylistic diversity to his supposedly monotonous catalogues of cities, temples, and statues. In similar fashion the lengthy historical narratives in both Books IV and VII have been seen by some as a device for fleshing out the text devoted to territories that are relatively poor in noteworthy monuments to describe (Alcock 2001; Swain 1996: 334; Hutton 2005b: 72). Such utilitarian explanations, which may be valid as far as they go, do not account for the specific choice of subject matter or for the correspondence of these elements in the two books that straddle the central volumes of the work. To restate that correspondence: in both Books IV and VII we have lengthy narratives of conquest and subjugation—of the Spartans over the Messenians in the former and of the Romans over the Achaean League (and hence, over Greece) in the latter—in combination with erotic and quasi-novelistic motifs. In Book IV those motifs are woven into the narrative itself. In Book VII the erotic tales and comments follow the main narrative, but rather than being scattered randomly across the topographical portion of the book, the bulk of them occur soon after the end of the narrative of Roman conquest. If there is any strictly cosmetic *variatio* at work here, it comes not so much in the choice of subject matter and narratorial attitude but in the manner in which Pausanias varies his deployment of these similar elements in the two books.

Recognition of the parallelism between Books IV and VII carries with it certain implications:

1. That the annular structuring of Pausanias's account described above is probably real and intentional, at least in its broad outlines. It is particularly

[23] Cf. Nimis 2003: 259–60 on the conjoined importance of Eros and Fortune in *Chaereas and Callirhoe.*

marked in the most critical spots, the first and the final book and in the four books that straddle the midpoint, and less so in the other books (II and IX, III and VIII), where the correspondences noted above are not to be pressed.

2. That there was some nexus in Pausanias's mind between narratives of conquest and the realm I have been calling here the "quasi-novelistic." It is tempting to adduce in this regard interpretations of the novels that see their fantasy elements and their eroticism as a kind of consolation for (or, less abjectly, as a creative response to) the powerlessness and alienation of a life under imperial powers.[24] Worth noting in this regard is the fact that many of Pausanias's erotic tales and statements in Book VII occur in the course of Pausanias's description of Patrae and its environs. Patrae was one of the places where the changes wrought by Roman domination were most conspicuous. Under Augustus the city had been transformed into a Roman colony and, as Pausanias himself attests (7.18.7), nearby cities and towns had been forcibly evacuated to provide additional population. In some cases, including the case of Calydon across the gulf of Corinth, religious cults, including cult statues and ritual practices, were transported wholesale from their ancient homes into the new city (7.18.8–9), a fact that was bound to be of greater than average significance for Pausanias, who elsewhere expresses strong disapproval of the tendency of Roman authorities to remove or disturb sacred objects and shrines (e.g., 9.7.5, 10.7.1).

3. That there was also some parallel in Pausanias's view between the Spartan conquest of Messenia and the Roman conquest of Greece.

THE MORAL RHETORIC OF CONQUEST

To accept that last of the inferences enumerated above—that Pausanias is comparing the Roman conquest to the Spartan conquest—it is not necessary to think of Pausanias as being subversive or "anti-Roman." Pausanias's attitude toward the Romans has been the subject of frequent inquiry,[25] and while some have identified instances in which Pausanias is more critical of Romans and imperial institutions than other Greek authors,[26] there are just

[24] Perry 1967; Hägg 1983: 81–90; Konstan 1994: 218–31. Cf. Goldhill 2001, esp. 167–80.

[25] E.g., Palm 1959: 72–74; Habicht 1998: 117–21; Arafat 1996; Swain 1996: 353–56; Lafond 2001; Akujärvi 2005: 265–95; Hutton 2008.

[26] Cf. Moggi 2002 (who compares Polybius with Pausanias in this respect); Hutton 2005b: 317–20 (on Pausanias's unusual perspective on the Imperial Cult).

as many occasions on which Pausanias expresses forthright appreciation for Roman actions and individuals, for instance in his praises for Hadrian (1.5.5) and for the other emperors with whom he was contemporary, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius (8.46.3). The imperial rhetoric of the Romans themselves coopted a certain amount of self-criticism, and there is no evidence that the Roman powers-that-be expected Greek authors under their sway to refrain from such criticism. Moreover, while conquest and subjugation may be tragic for a people, narration of such conquests does not in itself imply that the agents of it are morally culpable: as we shall see, in his account of the Roman conquest in Book VII Pausanias ascribes at least as much blame to the corruption and divisiveness of the Greeks as he does to the Romans. Yet even if it is not directed primarily, or exclusively, against the Romans, there is a significant moral rhetoric that emerges from considering the narratives of Books IV and VII side-by-side.

In comparison to the Messenian narrative and to his historical digressions elsewhere, Pausanias's account of the Achaean Wars is remarkably judgmental, and he reserves his most scathing comments for villains on the Greek side, especially the Achaean leaders Callicrates, Critolaus, and Diaeus, and the Spartan Menalcidas.[27] Callicrates, whom Pausanias calls "the scourge of all Greece" (ἁπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνδρὶ ἀλάστορι, 7.11.2), colludes with the Romans in order to get the better of his enemies within Achaea, and "though Achaean himself was working to the utmost to make the Achaeans subject to the Romans" (Ἀχαιοὺς δὲ ἀνὴρ Ἀχαιὸς Καλλικράτης τηνικαῦτα ἐς ἅπαν ἐποίει Ῥωμαίοις ὑποχειρίους, 7.10.5). Callicrates is thus the latest in a long line of Greeks "with a morbid penchant for treason" (οἱ ἐπὶ προδοσίᾳ νοσήσαντες, 7.10.5), a species whose previous representatives Pausanias takes pains to catalogue (7.10.1–5).[28] Yet even Callicrates' treachery pales in comparison with that of Menalcidas, who served as general both for the Achaeans and for his native Sparta against the Achaeans (7.12.2):

> βεβαιοῖ δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον ὡς ἄρ' ἦν καὶ πῦρ ἐς πλέον ἄλλου πυρὸς καῖον καὶ λύκος ἀγριώτερος λύκων ἄλλων καὶ ὠκύτερος ἱέραξ ἱέρακος πέτεσθαι, εἴγε

[27] Moggi's observation (2002: 441–49) that Pausanias presents the Romans in a worse light than does his main source, Polybius, is an important one, but it does not alter the fact that Pausanias is more explicitly critical of Greek failings than Roman ones. Pausanias's criticisms of Roman actions and individuals only serve to increase the jaundiced and judgmental character of the account as a whole.

[28] Including the Greeks who betrayed Ionia to Darius and Thebes to Xerxes. Pausanias frequently introduces such catalogues at points of emphasis; see Akujärvi 2005: 200–2, and below for further examples.

> καὶ Καλλικράτην ἀνοσιώτατον τῶν τότε Μεναλκίδας ὑπερῆρεν ἀπιστίᾳ, Καλλικράτην, ὃς ἐλάσσων παντοίου λήμματος.
>
> It really confirms the saying that one fire burns brighter than another fire and one wolf is fiercer than other wolves and hawk flies faster than hawk, if indeed Menalcidas outdid Callicrates in bad faith, Callicrates, the most unholy man of his time, a man who was helpless in the face of any sort of bribery.

The sorry life of Menalcidas, "who led the Lacedaimonians as the most foolish of generals, after earlier leading the Achaean people as the most criminal of men" (ἄρξαντι ... μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ὡς ἂν ὁ ἀμαθέστατος στρατηγός, πρότερον δὲ ἔτι τοῦ Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνους ὡς ἀνθρώπων ὁ ἀδικώτατος, 7.13.8), ends by suicide after his rebellion is put down by the Achaeans. His place in the ignoble parade of Achaean leaders is taken by Critolaus, on whom Pausanias lays the responsibility for the final series of disastrous hostilities with the Romans: "This man, this Critolaus, was seized by a passion [ἔρως] for waging war on the Romans that was bitter and totally lacking in rationality" (τοῦτον δριμὺς καὶ σὺν οὐδενὶ λογισμῷ τὸν Κριτόλαον πολεμεῖν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἔρως ἔσχε, 7.14.4).

In the end, the reckless Critolaus is succeeded by the incompetent and corrupt Diaeus, who meets a fitting end after the Romans smash his army and destroy Corinth (7.16.6):

> Δίαιος δὲ Ἀχαιοὺς ἀπολωλεκὼς ... ἀποκτείνας δὲ αὐτοχειρὶ τὴν γυναῖκα ... τελευτᾷ πιὼν φάρμακον, ἐοικυῖαν μὲν παρασχόμενος Μεναλκίδᾳ τὴν ἐς χρήματα πλεονεξίαν, ἐοικυῖαν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐς τὸν θάνατον δειλίαν.
>
> After bringing ruin upon the Achaeans, Diaeus ... killed his wife with his own hands ... and died by drinking poison, having displayed a greed for money similar to that of Menalcidas, and a similar cowardice in death.

In this extraordinary series of interconnected vituperations, Pausanias portrays the downfall of the Achaeans, and of Greece's independence, as largely the fault of Greek leadership. War with Rome is undertaken as a misguided ἔρως, and is steered along its inexorable course to disaster by a series of leaders who, in Pausanias's portrayal, seem to vie with one another for the distinction of being the most pusillanimous and venal.

In contrast, while the Messenian narrative possesses none of the explicit opprobrium for either side that we find in the Achaean account, Pausanias attributes more blame to the victors in that earlier conflict than to the vanquished (Auberger 1992a, 2000, 2001; Luraghi 2008: 94–100). Although Pausanias reports, with Herodotean objectivity, the reasons advanced by both

sides for the initiation of hostilities (4.4.2–3; 4.5.1), he focuses the reader's sympathies by elaborating on the Messenians' grievances and their suspicions of the Spartans' true intentions (4.5.2–5), and by portraying Messenian defeats consistently from the point of view of the Messenians themselves (e.g., 4.6.6). When war first commences, the Spartans refuse arbitration (4.5.7) and invade Messenia without a formal declaration (4.5.8). They later ambush a religious envoy (θεωρός) whom the Messenians had sent to Delphi (4.9.3). The corruptible Achaean leaders of Book VII are prefigured not so much by any Messenian as by the character of Aristocrates, the Arcadian king, who is bribed by the Spartans to desert his Messenian allies in the midst of the Battle of the Great Trench (4.17.2–9). Pausanias portrays this treachery as tipping the scales decisively toward Spartan victory, and in contrast to his attitude in Book VII, he lays more blame on the bribers in this instance than on the recipient of the bribes. In a portentiously Herodotean passage he states that the Spartans are the "first whom we know [πρῶτοι ... ὧν ἴσμεν] to give bribes to one of the enemy, and first to make power in arms a matter of commerce" (4.17.2). Pausanias emphasizes this point by alleging that the Spartans committed the same crime (παρανομῆσαι) centuries later when they suborned Athenian officers at Aegospotami, and that subsequently they were hoist by their own petard when the Persian king bribed Greek cities to rise up against Sparta in the Corinthian War (4.17.3–5).[29]

The Messenians themselves are far from faultless in Pausanias's account, and while their motivation is freedom and self-preservation rather than the greed, ambition, and bitter ἔρως that Pausanias ascribes to the Achaean leaders in Book VII, it is carelessness and a more mundane sort of ἔρως that ultimately seals their fate: a Laconian deserter living as a herdsman in Messenia manages to seduce a Messenian housewife, and while hiding in his paramour's house, he overhears her husband giving detailed information about Messenian defenses. The herdsman purchases redemption from his countrymen with this intelligence, and as a result the Spartans capture the last Messenian stronghold at Eira (4.20.5–21.12). Loose lips, an ill-considered abandonment of crucial posts in a blinding rainstorm, and the μοιχεία of one Messenian woman give the Spartans all the advantage they need. But while fate and the Messenians' own failings clearly play a role in their downfall, over the entire course of

[29] Although Pausanias dwells on the culpability of the Spartans here, he later relates how their stooge, Aristocrates, meets an appropriate end when his treachery is discovered by his fellow Arcadians: they stone him to death and toss his body beyond the boundaries of Arcadia to lie unburied (4.22.7).

the account of the wars there is little doubt that Pausanias is engineering the sympathies of his audience to lie more with the conquered than the conquerors. As if to encapsulate the ethical lesson of his account, Pausanias tells us that the defeated and vagabond Messenians, looking to found a new home in Sicily, spurn the advice of their western allies and refrain from treating the natives of Zancle the way that they themselves had been treated by the Spartans (4.23.8–9). The new polis of Messana is established not through conquest, expropriation, and enslavement, but through cooperation between the natives and the newcomers.[30]

The moral structure of the Messenian account suggests a potential approach to the Achaean Wars that Pausanias chooses not to pursue. If he had wanted to write his Achaean history in a manner that emphasized the culpability of the conquerors (in this case, the Romans), he could have easily done so. He could have made more of an issue, for instance, of the early depredations of the Roman leader "Otilius"[31] and refrained from stating that his actions met with disapproval in Rome (7.7.8–9); or he might have highlighted the Romans'

[30] Akujärvi 2005: 215–16, responding chiefly to Auberger 1992a and 2001, points to some other failings of the Messenians by way of arguing that Pausanias's account of the Spartan conquest is not markedly biased in favor of the Messenians. Against the many crimes of the Spartans Akujärvi adduces the fact that Pausanias's Messenians fail to carry out a virgin sacrifice properly (4.9.7–10), and that they engage in other activities that might be criticized, such as conducting night-time raids, raiding sanctuaries, disrupting rituals, and taking women captive. While it is quite possible that these actions are blameworthy in Pausanias's view, the fact remains that he does not criticize the Messenians explicitly on any of these points, and if there is any implicit criticism it is far more muted than what one finds, for instance, in Pausanias's comments on the Spartan bribery of Aristocrates. Shortly after describing the founding of Zancle, Pausanias relates another series of events that might seem to belie the forbearance he ascribes to them on that occasion: Messenians based in Naupactus seize Oeniadae in Acarnania and displace its population (4.25.1–2). But Pausanias mitigates this action somewhat by casting it as something the Messenians did, in part, to aid their Athenian allies in the Peloponnesian War. He offers no such justification for any of the Spartan actions in Book IV. No one reading the account from beginning to end could fail to notice the partiality that Pausanias displays toward the Messenians, in point of view if nothing else. This is not the same as saying that Pausanias portrays the Messenians as infallibly heroic or that he "harbours a profound hatred of the Spartans" (Akujärvi 2005: 215). Pausanias projects a complex view, rather than a black-and-white one, but a lack of oversimplification is not equivalent to impartiality.

[31] This name is probably a mistake on the part of Pausanias or a copyist for "[Publius] Villius [Tapulus]" (Οὐίλιος, rather than Ὀτίλιος). This part of Pausanias's account is factually challenged in a number of respects.

exploitation of the corruptibility of Callicrates, just as he pilloried the Spartans' suborning of Aristocrates. The fact that he does otherwise in Book VII suggests that his main goal in placing these two narratives in structural juxtaposition is not to compare the Romans to the Spartans, but to compare the victims of subjugation in each case. The contrast between the conquerors is a feeble one, with the Romans, if anything, looking slightly the better, but the difference between the vanquished parties is one of night and day: the Messenians embody the persistence of honor in defeat, the Achaeans the opposite.

This contrast implied between the Messenians and the Achaeans carries over into another important difference that emerges from the two narratives: the suffering of the Messenians is eventually recompensed by the defeat of the Spartans and the return of the Messenians to their homeland, yet the lot of the Greeks following the Roman conquest is one that still persists in Pausanias's own day, a fact that Pausanias goes to some lengths to emphasize. After narrating the sacking of Corinth and the disintegration of Achaean resistance, Pausanias states, "more than any other time it was then that Greece descended to the very depths of weakness, though from the beginning it had suffered destruction and ruination piecemeal at the hands of the divinity" (7.17.1).[32] There follows a catalogue of prior examples of Greek states, including Argos, Athens, and Sparta, that had risen to preeminence only to be brought low[33]; "and when," he concludes, "the Achaean League had scarcely sprouted up from Greece as from a tree that is mutilated and mostly withered, the corruption of its commanders brought it to a halt as it was still growing" (7.17.2). Pausanias is clearly taking pains to mark this defeat as the point when Greece passed under *de facto* Roman control. He has already stated that it is because of the Achaean War that the Romans call the governors they dispatch to Greece governors of "Achaea" (7.16.10), and he goes on to describe how after Nero, many generations later, granted freedom to the Greeks (an act that redeems the despised emperor somewhat in Pausanias's eyes), this liberty was soon rescinded by Vespasian, whose words on the occasion Pausanias quotes without objection or comment: "The Greek people have un-learned the art of freedom" (7.17.4).[34]

[32] Ἐς ἅπαν δὲ ἀσθενείας τότε μάλιστα κατῆλθεν ἡ Ἑλλάς, λυμανθεῖσα κατὰ μέρη καὶ διαπορθηθεῖσα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος.

[33] On Pausanias's usage of such catalogues, see p. 437 and n28 above.

[34] Ἀπομεμαθηκέναι ... τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν. Akujärvi 2005: 284–85 points out that since Pausanias attributes this statement to Vespasian without comment, one cannot be sure that he approves of it. This is true, but one suspects that if he disagreed with the sentiment completely he would have either said so or refrained from quoting the emperor in the first place.

Through the setting of these two narratives in analogous spots in the structure of his text, Pausanias seems to be inviting us to compare the (ultimately) happy fate of the Messenians with the persisting misfortune of Greece as a whole. Even if Pausanias is not being directly critical of the Romans themselves for their role in bringing about this state of affairs, the comparison does seem to leave us with a dark and pessimistic outlook on the current fate of Greeks as subjects of Rome. Once again, another course was open to Pausanias. On more than one occasion, as we have noted, he comments favorably on the activities of the Roman authorities in his own day, as when, after discussing the sack of Athens by Sulla, he states, "Athens, thus devastated by the war with the Romans, blossomed again when Hadrian was emperor" (1.20.7),[35] or when he recounts an inscription in Athens that attests to all the shrines Hadrian built and refurbished and the gifts he gave to the Greeks and to others (1.5.5).[36] Pausanias might easily have lessened the gloom at the end of his Achaean narrative by alluding to this brighter future, but no such optimistic references appear anywhere in Book VII, an omission that can scarcely be anything but deliberate.

SEQUENTIAL STRUCTURE AND RHETORIC

Despite, however, the pessimistic tone produced by the juxtaposition of the glorious fate of the Messenians with the ignominious fate of the Acheaeans, I would suggest that the tension of this contrast is not something that remains unresolved over the course of Pausanias's work. Just as the erotic stories Pausanias tells in Book VII hold out the hope that even a destructive ἔρως can ultimately confer blessings on those who suffer from it, the downfall brought about by the ἔρως of the Achaean leaders may yet be redeemed by the course of events. But to perceive the resolution that Pausanias is offering one must not look at the work as a static whole but follow it from start to finish. If we back up and read the text from the beginning we can perceive a sequential rhetoric to it, one that coexists with and complements the synoptic rhetoric we have been considering so far.

At the beginning of Book I Pausanias brings us to Athens from the perspective of someone traveling by sea from the east. Putting Athens first is perhaps a natural way to start, but the way Pausanias gets there also replicates the typical first experience in Greece for members of the Asiatic elite of the

[35] Ἀθῆναι μὲν οὕτως ὑπὸ τοῦ πολέμου κακωθεῖσαι τοῦ Ῥωμαίων αὖθις Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλεύοντος ἤνθησαν.

[36] See also 8.43.3 on the benefits provided by the Antonine emperors.

Imperial era (like Pausanias himself), who would travel to Athens as young men to see the famous sights or to study philosophy and rhetoric. From Athens Pausanias's text proceeds directly to the Peloponnese and covers the peninsula in a clockwise spiral that treats first the three Dorian territories—Argolis, Laconia, and Messenia—before passing through Elis and Achaea and finally ending up in Arcadia. In this progress the philhellenic reader finds much to support idealistic notions of Greek culture, but much to challenge them as well, most particularly in the fratricidal wars between the Dorian Spartans and the Dorian Messenians in Book IV. Having learned of these conflicts and their enduring physical effects, the reader reaches Olympia where, in pointed juxtaposition, the ideology of Panhellenic unity is more visibly and emphatically enacted than anywhere else. A separate ideology on display at Olympia, in the statues of emperors and the dedications of Roman nobles, is the peaceful and comfortable integration of Hellenism within the cosmopolitan culture of the empire, an ideology that either—depending on one's perspective—belies or is belied by the history of conflict with Rome that the reader proceeds to encounter in Pausanias's account of Achaea.

After experiencing this disorienting sequence of affirmations and problematizations of Hellenism, the reader/traveler comes to Book VIII, to Arcadia, and reaches, literally, the end of the road: a land-locked region isolated on all sides by territories that Pausanias's itineraries have already covered. Arcadia was, for Pausanias, the purest part of Greece; home of the oldest cities (8.38.1) and an aboriginal population relatively unchanged by the waves of violence and migration that transformed the rest of Greece at various junctures (5.1.1). The eighth book is by a considerable measure Pausanias's longest, despite the fact that the physical monuments he encounters in Arcadia are hardly more impressive, even by his own estimation,[37] than elsewhere in Greece. Pausanias presents his experience with the heart of Greece as something of a transformative one, one that gives him insight into the nature of Greek culture that he did not possess before. For example it is here in Arcadia that he delivers the following oft-discussed pronouncement, in reference to a certain tradition he relates regarding the birth of Poseidon (8.8.3)[38]:

> τούτοις Ἑλλήνων ἐγὼ τοῖς λόγοις ἀρχόμενος μὲν τῆς συγγραφῆς εὐηθίας ἔνεμον πλέον, ἐς δὲ τὰ Ἀρκάδων προεληλυθὼς πρόνοιαν περὶ αὐτῶν τοιάνδε ἐλάμβανον· Ἑλλήνων τοὺς νομιζομένους σοφοὺς δι' αἰνιγμάτων πάλαι καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ εὐθέος λέγειν τοὺς λόγους, καὶ τὰ εἰρημένα οὖν ἐς τὸν Κρόνον

[37] See, for instance, his comments on the state of Megalopolis (8.33.1–3).

[38] Cf. Frazer 1898: 1.lv–lx; Veyne 1988: 95–102; Swain 1996: 342–43; Habicht 1998: 156–59; Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 67–72, 337–41.

> σοφίαν εἶναί τινα εἴκαζον Ἑλλήνων. τῶν μὲν δὴ ἐς τὸ θεῖον ἡκόντων τοῖς εἰρημένοις χρησόμεθα.
>
> When I began writing I tended to attribute such stories of the Greeks to simple-mindedness, but once I had gotten as far as Arcadian matters I began to take a more cautious attitude toward them in the following way: I surmised that those of the Greeks who were considered wise in olden days used to tell stories through riddles, rather than directly, and that the things said about Kronos were thus a sort of wisdom of the Greeks. Of the things that pertain to the divine, we shall make use of what is said.

As I have argued elsewhere (Hutton 2005b: 308–11), there is some reason to doubt the sincerity of this sentiment, since it is difficult to trace the effects of Pausanias's change of perspective in the way he talks about the gods and about mythological tales elsewhere in the text. But the absence of any dramatic change in Pausanias's approach only makes it more significant that he chooses to profess this "more cautious attitude" at this particular point, and that he explicitly connects his new outlook with having gotten as far as Arcadia in his account. Also in Arcadia Pausanias manifests his new level of insight in a series of declarations on matters religious, cultural, and political that are largely unparalleled elsewhere in the text.[39] Slightly earlier in the book, after discussing the story of Lycaon's metamorphosis into a wolf, Pausanias offers what should perhaps be seen as an effort to embody the newfound appreciation for ancient truths that he will soon make a show of claiming for himself (8.2.4):

> οἱ γὰρ δὴ τότε ἄνθρωποι ξένοι καὶ ὁμοτράπεζοι θεοῖς ἦσαν ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης καὶ εὐσεβείας, καί σφισιν ἐναργῶς ἀπήντα παρὰ τῶν θεῶν τιμή τε οὖσιν ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἀδικήσασιν ὡσαύτως ἡ ὀργή. ἐπεί τοι καὶ θεοὶ τότε ἐγίνοντο ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, οἳ γέρα καὶ ἐς τόδε ἔτι ἔχουσιν ὡς Ἀρισταῖος καὶ Βριτόμαρτις ἡ Κρητικὴ καὶ Ἡρακλῆς ὁ Ἀλκμήνης καὶ Ἀμφιάραος ὁ Ὀικλέους, ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς Πολυδεύκης τε καὶ Κάστωρ. οὕτω πείθοιτο ἄν τις καὶ Λυκάονα θηρίον καὶ τὴν Ταντάλου Νιόβην γενέσθαι λίθον.
>
> For humans in those days were guest-friends and dinner companions of the gods on account of their justice and piety. And honor from the gods conspicuously came to those who were good as did their wrath to those who were wicked. For indeed, in those days gods even arose from the ranks of humans, and they receive honors even to this day, as do Aristaeus and Britomartis the Cretan and Heracles the son of Alcmene and Amphiaraus the son of Oecles, and in addi-

[39] Cf. Hutton 2005b: 305–11; Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 337–41.

> tion to these Polydeuces and Castor. Thus one might well believe that Lycaon became a beast and Niobe, the daughter of Tantalus, a stone.

This view of the past as an exceptional time when miraculous events like metamorphosis and apotheosis could occur reflects in turn on the present, and we soon find Pausanias delivering a scathing denunciation of the practice of worshiping humans as gods in his own time (8.2.5):

> ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ δὲ—κακία γὰρ δὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ηὔξετο καὶ γῆν τε ἐπενέμετο πᾶσαν καὶ πόλεις πάσας—οὔτε θεὸς ἐγίνετο οὐδεὶς ἔτι ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν ὅσον λόγῳ καὶ κολακείᾳ πρὸς τὸ ὑπερέχον, καὶ ἀδίκοις τὸ μήνιμα τὸ ἐκ τῶν θεῶν ὀψέ.
>
> But in my day—since evil has grown to a great extant and visits every land and all the cities—not a single god arises from the ranks of mankind, except in name only and in the flattery addressed to the powerful, and for the wicked the wrath of the gods comes slowly.

Such an expression of disdain for this practice, of which the imperial cult of the Roman emperors would certainly have been the primary contemporary example, is unusual not only in Greek literature of the Roman era, but even in the writings of Pausanias himself, who elsewhere refers to the Imperial Cult with no explicit distaste (Hutton 2005b: 317–22).[40]

The belief expressed in these passages in an inexorable decline from a previous state of grace is also illustrated in the physical realm throughout Pausanias's account. As has frequently been noted, Pausanias presents an image of Greece not as it was in its pristine golden age but as it actually is in his time (Frazer 1898: 1.lxiv–v; Pritchett 1999: 2.195–222). His descriptions of the Greek landscape are replete with deserted cities, dilapidated temples, and pillaged shrines. Later in the eighth book we find Pausanias's most extensive reflections on this process of decline in a distinctly Herodotean passage on the fate of the Arcadian city of Megalopolis (8.33.1), a fate which the reader sensitive to context would likely contrast with the triumphant foundation of Messene narrated earlier:

> εἰ δὲ ἡ Μεγάλη πόλις προθυμίᾳ τε τῇ πάσῃ συνοικισθεῖσα ἐπὶ Ἀρκάδων καὶ ἐπὶ μεγίσταις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλπίσιν ἐς αὐτὴν κόσμον τὸν ἅπαντα καὶ

[40] This does not exclude, of course, implicit expressions of distaste, which scholars have detected in certain other passages; cf. Elsner 2005: 148 (*contra* Steinhart 2002). Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 148–71 makes a persuasive argument for a consistently negative attitude toward the imperial cult throughout Pausanias's text, but it is still significant that he chooses this site for his most explicit and forceful expression of that attitude.

> εὐδαιμονίαν τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀφῄρηται καὶ τὰ πολλά ἐστιν αὐτῆς ἐρείπια ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν, θαῦμα οὐδὲν ἐποιησάμην, εἰδὼς τὸ δαιμόνιον νεώτερα ἀεί τινα ἐθέλον ἐργάζεσθαι, καὶ ὁμοίως τὰ πάντα τά τε ἐχυρὰ καὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ τὰ γινόμενά τε καὶ ὁπόσα ἀπόλλυνται μεταβάλλουσαν τὴν τύχην.
>
> Megalopolis was settled by the Arcadians with utmost enthusiasm and with the highest hopes of the Greeks in its favor. That it has been deprived of all its splendor and ancient prosperity and is mostly in ruins in our time was hardly surprising to me, since I realize that divine will always tends to bring about changes of circumstance, and that fortune always reverses everything in like fashion, both the strong and the weak and the things that wax and those that wane.

It is in Arcadia, also, that Pausanias presents his biography of Philopoemen, who in Pausanias's eyes was the last of the Greek leaders to embody an effective and honorable resistance to the encroachment of Roman domination (8.49.1–52.6). Significantly, Pausanias does not relate Philopoemen's tale in the general's native city of Megalopolis, but in the course of his description of the city of Tegea. While Tegea was the site of one of Philopoemen's important victories over the Spartans, it is hardly the place one would associate with him most closely, but in Tegea Pausanias finds an empty statue base bearing an inscription in Philopoemen's honor and it is to his mention of this statue base that he appends the leader's biography (8.49.1).[41] The missing statue of the Greek hero is an apt synecdoche for Pausanias's portrait of a dilapidated Greece, and Tegea is the final major city that Pausanias's itinerary visits in Arcadia. As we will see soon, Pausanias seems quite attuned to the rhetorical potential inherent in postponing things to the end. After relating the death of Philopoemen, Pausanias concludes that divinized humans are not the only thing that the debased contemporary world is incapable of engendering: "from this point on, Greece ceased producing good men" (τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐς ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν φορὰν ἔληξεν ἡ Ἑλλάς).

With this extraordinary series of comments and manifestos, Pausanias marks Arcadia out as a locus of revelation, a place where, after all his previous travels and researches, he has reached an elevated state of clarity about the validity of Greek traditions—even those that seem daft on the first several glances—and also about the contrasting debasement of the motherland of those traditions in his own time.[42] Taken as a whole the sequence of Pausanias's

[41] Cf. Pretzler 2007: 80.

[42] One might also adduce here a further passage from Pausanias's volume on Arcadia, 8.27.1, where he seems to refer to Roman rule as a "disaster" (συμφορά) for the Greeks, but both the text and the interpretation of this passage are controversial. See Palm 1959: 72–74; Habicht: 1998: 117–21; Swain 1996: 353–56; Akujärvi 2005: 265–295; Hutton 2008.

account up to Arcadia presents us with a sort of progress, a journey that brings greater insight and wisdom into things that are secret, enigmatic, or, at any rate, not obvious on the surface. From this perspective it is tempting to follow Elsner and others in thinking that Pausanias's text can be considered usefully as a species of pilgrimage literature.[43] It is also enlightening, once again, to compare the novels of Pausanias's day, many of which are structured as journeys that bring new experiences to the protagonists and rectify their relations with their fellow humans and with the gods.[44] The educational and wisdom-bringing aspect of travel is a potential theme in Greek literature from the time of the *Odyssey*, but it is not given expression very often prior to the Roman period when it emerges to become more prominent than ever before, in the novels, in such literature as Dio of Prusa's accounts of his experiences as traveler and exiled philosopher (Whitmarsh 2001: 156–67), and, if the interpretation offered here is correct, in Pausanias. Once again, though we may not be able to trace specific paths of contact between Pausanias and these other types of literature, all can be seen as partaking of narrative strategies and attitudes that, for some reason, attained a particular degree of productiveness in this period.

[43] Elsner 1992, 1995, 2007: 246–51; Rutherford 2001; Hutton 2005a; Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 98–102 (with reservations).

[44] In Bakhtin's view of the genre (1981: 87–110), the travels of the characters in the ancient novel occupy a static chronotope that produces no significant change in the characters' outlook and personality. While this view has some validity when we compare the rhetoric of the ancient novel with paradigms for character and plot development in later fiction, it is certainly overstating the case to deny that such changes and developments frequently occur in the ancient novels. See Zeitlin 1990; Konstan 1994: 45–49 (cf. Konstan 2002: 1); Alvares 2007. For a nuanced exegesis of Bakhtin's position, see Branham 2002. Also worth noting here is Morgan's recent essay (2007), in which he argues that particularly in the earlier novels (Chariton and Xenophon), travel seems to function merely as a convenient means of stringing episodes together rather than as something of crucial importance to character or plot development. While there is no room for a full discussion of the issue here, I think a distinction needs to be made between the experience of traveling per se (concerning which Morgan is absolutely correct), and the states produced by travel: absence, separation, confrontation with the alien, etc. In the latter sphere it seems to me that both novels avail themselves of the possibilities presented by travel in significant ways. A parallel situation prevails with Pausanias, who rarely discusses the realities of traveling from place to place (and when he does, his comments are brief), but who clearly presents himself as someone who gains wisdom simply by *being* in different places at different times. On the motif of wandering in ancient literature, see Montiglio 2005.

THE MYSTERY OF HELLAS

The religious element of the new enlightened outlook Pausanias expresses in Arcadia is also worth highlighting. In the course of his account Pausanias shows a marked interest in religious monuments in preference to secular ones, and portrays himself as an individual of deep piety. He records his own participation in a number of rituals at the shrines that he visits—including the oracular ritual at the shrine of Trophonius in Lebadeia (9.39.14), a ritual that Aristomenes, Pausanias's hero in Book IV, also engages in (4.16.7). Most notably he shows a particular respect for religious mysteries and prohibitions.[45] Frequently he lets the reader know that he is withholding information about cults and sacred objects on the grounds that the information is not to be profaned. On numerous occasions he even reports that his unwillingness to write about certain topics results from injunctions he received in dreams. The most striking example of this comes early on in the work when one of these dreams forbids Pausanias to describe the shrine of Demeter at Eleusis (1.38.7), a site which was home to an abundance of the sorts of monuments and rituals that are Pausanias's usual stock-in-trade. The popularity of mystery cults in the Roman period is well known, and is frequently reflected in the literature of the time, but once again some of the most vivid and direct reflections occur in the realm of the novel. While there is no need to resurrect the old theory that the novels arose as the narrative counterparts to actual mystery rituals,[46] it remains true that the plots of many novels are congruent with the typical structure of mystery narratives, involving separation and reintegration, revelation, real and figurative resurrection, and reconciliation with an alienated deity. One could argue that a similar course is charted in the *Description of Greece*, but in Pausanias's case the alienated deity to whom his wandering reconciles him is not Demeter, Aphrodite, or Isis, but the "goddess" of Hellenism itself, a revered entity whose true nature becomes clear to him only when he gets as far as Arcadia. This revelation gives Pausanias new insight not only into the meaning of the Greek past and its religious traditions, but also into the place of Hellas in the contemporary Roman world. Whether this new level of understanding represents a real spiritual and intel-

[45] For a thoroughgoing analysis of Pausanias's references to mystery cults and to religious taboos and proscriptions in other contexts, see now Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 291–346, with references to earlier literature.

[46] The classic statements of the idea of the novel as mystery text are Kerényi 1927; Merkelbach 1962. On its limitations see Hägg 1983: 101–4; Stark 1989; Reardon 1991: 171–75; Beck 1996. See also Merkelbach 1988 for a more nuanced expression of the notion.

lectual progress on the part of Pausanias, or whether it is simply the literary frame in which he presents the results of his researches, is probably a question beyond answering. But surely we do not need an answer to that question to see that the choice he made to cast his efforts in this mold is significant to the understanding of the text's nature and purpose. Far from being merely a utilitarian guidebook, Pausanias's work presents itself as a vision of how to value Hellas in its contemporary context.

THE END OF PAUSANIAS

How does the sequential rhetoric described above interact with the tension Pausanias creates through the structural apposition of the Messenian and Achaean accounts? To answer that we must consider the ends of things. Near the end of the Messenian account there occurs an extraordinary pair of passages. Pausanias tells us that when the final Messenian rebellion was in its last throes, Aristomenes, on the advice of the seer Lycus, buried a secret object by night in the ground of Mount Ithome. The fate of the Messenian people, the seer told him, hinged on that object remaining undiscovered when the Spartans wrested control of the mountain from the rebels (4.20.4):

> καὶ ἦν γάρ τι ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ τοῖς Μεσσηνίοις, ἔμελλε δὲ ἀφανισθὲν ὑποβρύχιον τὴν Μεσσήνην κρύψειν τὸν πάντα αἰῶνα, φυλαχθὲν δὲ οἱ Λύκου τοῦ Πανδίονος χρησμοὶ Μεσσηνίους ἔλεγον χρόνῳ ποτὲ ἀνασώσεσθαι τὴν χώραν.
>
> And the Messenians had a certain thing that they kept secret; if lost it was destined to plunge Messene into everlasting oblivion, but if preserved, the prophecies of Lycus son of Pandion said that the Messenians would regain their land at some later time.

In narrating these mysterious events Pausanias, like the Messenians themselves, says nothing about the nature of this buried object. It is only in his account of events many centuries later, after the oracles of Lycus have come true and the Messenians have been brought back home through the agency of Epaminondas, that the secret is revealed. Epiteles, the Argive colleague of Epaminondas charged with building the Messenians a new capital on Mount Ithome, receives a prophetic dream instructing him to dig at a certain spot on the mountain and "save the old woman, for she is trapped in a bronze chamber and dying" (4.26.7). Epiteles digs as instructed and discovers what it was that the dream was referring to in riddling fashion (4.26.7–8):

> ὁ δὲ Ἐπιτέλης ... ἐπέτυχεν ὀρύσσων ὑδρίᾳ χαλκῇ, καὶ αὐτίκα παρὰ τὸν Ἐπαμινώνδαν κομίσας ... αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸ πῶμα ἀφελόντα ἐκέλευεν ὅ τι

> ἐνείη σκοπεῖσθαι. ὁ δὲ θύσας καὶ εὐξάμενος ... ἤνοιγε τὴν ὑδρίαν, ἀνοίξας δὲ εὗρε κασσίτερον ἐληλασμένον ἐς τὸ λεπτότατον ... ἐνταῦθα τῶν Μεγάλων θεῶν ἐγέγραπτο ἡ τελετή, καὶ τοῦτο ἦν παρακαταθήκη τοῦ Ἀριστομένους.
>
> But Epiteles ... dug and came across a bronze hydria, and right away he brought it to Epaminondas ... and urged him to take off the lid and look at what was inside. He sacrificed and prayed and ... opened the hydria, and when he opened it he found tin hammered into a very thin sheet ... there the ritual of the Great Gods had been engraved, and this was the deposit of Aristomenes.

Appropriately, both for the Messenians and for Pausanias's mystery-filled text, the secret thing turns out to be a sacred text for the mysteries of the Great Gods at Andania. This cult was central to the Messenians' religious identity, as Pausanias indicates by narrating the cult's foundation at the beginning of Book IV and ascribing it to primordial times and to the territory's eponymous heroine, Messene (4.1.6–9).[47] Its secret text is therefore a fitting thing to be brought to light again as the Messenians' political and geographical identities are being restored to them. Pausanias emphasizes the significance of this recovery by employing an extraordinary narrative procedure: he conceals the nature of this sacred object at its first mention and waits for the culmination of the story to reveal it, when the revelation can have the maximum effect both for the Messenians and for Pausanias's readers. This hermeneutic approach to storytelling is hard to parallel either in the writings of Pausanias himself or in historiographical writing elsewhere,[48] but it does show up (once again)

[47] On Pausanias's portrayal of the Andanian mysteries in general, see Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 304–12. One curious phenomenon is that Pausanias seems to refer to what we know from inscriptions to be the Great Gods of Andania as the Great Goddesses. This has been variously explained as a change in the cult during the time between the inscriptions and Pausanias, or as the influence on Pausanias of sources that impute the Eleusinian goddesses into mystery cults elsewhere (see Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 308–10; Luraghi 2008: 296–97). In the passage quoted here the gender of the deities is ambiguous.

[48] One less marked example of hermeneutic storytelling in the Messenian narrative might be suggested. At certain junctures the Messenians are portrayed as being opposed by one or more of the gods (e.g., 4.16.5, 4.24.5–6). The reader attuned to traditional tales of divine vengeance might wonder what the Messenians have done to deserve this divine disfavor. But only at the end of the story does Pausanias tell us that they had angered the Dioscuri by launching an ambush on the Spartans during one of their festivals (4.26.9). On two previous occasions Aristomenes had been thwarted by visible ephiphanies of the twins (4.16.5, 9), but Pausanias offers no explanation at the time for their opposition, leaving the reader to assume that it is motivated only by their traditional connection with Sparta.

in contemporary novels: one thinks, for instance, of the cryptic beginning of Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*, where the reader is presented with a bewildering tableau of characters and situations that are only identified and explicated gradually, or of the postponed revelation of the royal descent of the title characters in *Daphnis and Chloe*.[49] The importance of Epiteles' urn is further emphasized, and further associated with the themes of hidden knowledge and revelation, in the topographical portion of Book IV. Andania itself was in ruins in Pausanias's day, and its rituals and sacred accoutrements had been moved to the nearby Carnasian grove. As is the case with many mystery cults, an admonitory dream prevents Pausanias from describing most of what goes on in the grove, but does not forbid him from revealing that Epiteles' urn was one of the objects on display there (4.33.5–6).

The true significance of this revelatory ending to the Messenians' saga is not uncovered, however, until we get to the end of Pauasanias's entire account. Following the climax of Book VIII, the rest of the *Description of Greece* is denouement and recapitulation. Pausanias transports himself from land-locked Arcadia back to the borders of Attica, the territory of Book I, and proceeds from there through Boeotia—the home of Oedipus and Epaminondas and the site of the battles of Plataea and Chaeronea—to Phocis where his tour of Greece culminates (or nearly culminates) in his description of Delphi, a place with panhellenic monuments and traditions rivalling those of Olympia. As in Olympia, where he explicitly abandons his normal spatial method of organizing his topography and deals with the altars of the Altis in the order in which the Eleans made their sacrifices (5.14.4), Pausanias's description of the sanctuary of Apollo follows the path of religious processions up the Sacred Way—a religious procession in the form of a *periegesis*.[50] Once again, the use of ritual and celebration as a closural device in the contemporary novel is worth comparing, but having finished with Apollo's shrine Pausanias is still not quite done with his *Description of Greece*.

After Delphi, Pausanias makes a quick tour of other sites in Phocis, then traces one final route that crosses the western bounds of Phocis and enters the territory of Ozolian Locris. He spends the very last section of his work (10.38) on a concise tour of this mountainous land, and ends up in the far west of the

[49] Cf. Winkler 1982: 95–101; Hägg 1983: 54–56; Fusillo 1988: 26–27; Morgan 1991, 1994, 2004a, 2004b. Also see Fusillo 1997: 213 on the "gradual disclosure of the narrator's voice" in Heliodorus and Hutton 2009 for a similar hermeneutic revelation of the narrator's persona in Pausanias.

[50] On the nexus between ritual and description in Pausanias (particularly in his account of Olympia), see Elsner 2007: 13–17, 35–36.

territory at the city of Naupactus, a city where, coincidentally (or perhaps not coincidentally), many of the Messenians had ended up after being expelled from their homeland. The last site Pausanias describes in Greece is a ruined shrine of Asclepius at Naupactus, founded by a private individual, Phalysius, in thanks for a cure the god had given him for his blindness. Pausanias relates the story of that cure: the poetess Anyte receives orders in a dream to bring a sealed tablet to an afflicted man in Naupactus. She does so, and when Phalysius opens the tablet she gives him he immediately regains his sight. With that, the *Description of Greece* comes to an end.

The abruptness of this ending has struck many readers as strange. To some it suggests that Pausanias died before he finished his work, or that his original ending was somehow lost (Gurlitt 1895: 68n13; Robert 1909: 261–64; Habicht 1998: 6–7). Yet as we have seen, the abruptness of the ending of Book X corresponds to the abruptness of the opening of Book I (which begins, idiosyncratically, with no prologue and no word of introduction),[51] and forms part of the suite of corresponding features that connect those two books, so it is incumbent on us to consider the implications of seeing both opening and ending as intentional artifacts. Some have proposed that the way Pausanias brings his work to a close forms part of his continual efforts to pay homage to Herodotus, whose *Histories* also ends abruptly with an enigmatic anecdote (9.122).[52] This is a very plausible suggestion, but there is a good chance that Pausanias's ending may be more than a literary flourish that beckons chiefly toward matters largely extraneous to the text itself. In an ingenious and creative analysis, Ellinger 2005: 199–223 has recently suggested that this passage forms the capstone of an intricate web of allusions in Pausanias's work involving the healing god Asclepius and the therapeutic associations embodied in the author's own name (Παυσανίας = "End of ills"). Sidebottom 2002: 498–99 has proposed that the ending is even more directly programmatic, and that Anyte's secret message is a metaphor for Pausanias's own work[53]:

> At the end of Pausanias, a Greek author, Anyte, 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 frequent recipient of instructions in dreams who has given his Greek audience the Greek text they have just read, which should have opened their eyes to all things Greek.

[51] On the possible programmatic nature of the opening of the text, see Robert 1909: 264–65 and Hutton 2005b: 175–76.

[52] Regenbogen 1956: 1057; Nörenberg 1973; cf. Dewald 1997 and Herington 1991a on Herodotus.

[53] Alcock 1996: 267 seems to have anticipated the kernel of this notion.

The suggestions of Sidebottom and Ellinger are hardly incompatible with one another, and neither is incompatible with the notion of Herodotean mimesis that other scholars ascribe to Pausanias in this passage. I would suggest, however, that there is an even more specific programmatic reference embedded in the tale: the secret message uncovered by Phalysius echoes the secret writings unearthed by Epiteles in Book IV, the import of which Pausanias had marked out for emphasis with his hermeneutic narrative technique. Just as the divine text uncovered by Epiteles signified the restoration of the long-suffering Messenians to their rightful place in the world, Anyte's divine message restores Phalysius's lost sight. To the extent that we, following Sidebottom, see Anyte's text as an allegory for Pausanias's own work, Pausanias seems to be claiming that his text of revelation and discovery can help restore something that the Greeks have lost: a clear vision of their rightful place in a world where they have become gradually more peripheral and unexceptional. The mysteries of the Great Gods of Messenia have their counterpart in the mysteries of Hellas that Pausanias has revealed to his readers. The sort of redemption that the Messenians enjoyed, which is denied to the Greeks at the end of Pausanias's account of the Achaean wars, is finally granted in some small degree to those Hellenes and phil-Hellenes who make it all the way to the end of the *Description of Greece*. At the end of his history of the Messenians Pausanias gives one of his few precise chronological calculations: the amount of time that the Messenians spent in exile and captivity was, by his reckoning, 287 years. Only a few sections later, in the beginning of Book V, Pausanias gives us the only precise chronological reference for his own activities as an author: from the time of the refoundation of Corinth as a Roman colony to the date in which Pausanias was writing the period was 217 years (5.1.2). Perhaps Pausanias felt that the Greeks could achieve their own redemption within the span of a lifetime from the time he was writing.

None of this is to suggest that Pausanias envisioned the arising of a new Aristomenes or a new Epaminondas to free the Greeks from Rome's oppressive yoke. There is nothing in Pausanias's text that implies that he viewed such a development as either possible or desirable. What is more likely is that Pausanias envisioned a liberating reaffirmation of the distinctiveness of Greece in its contemporary Roman context.[54] To judge by the numerous expressions

[54] A possible objection to this thesis might arise from a recent article by Madeline Jost, who claims in opposition to much recent scholarship that Pausanias's text embodies no discernable *réaction identitaire* (Jost 2006: 586). The chief evidence Jost offers for this claim is that Pausanias highlights differences between Greek communities as much if not more than their commonalities. This line of reasoning seems to me to embody an unnecessarily restrictive notion of "identity" (which is not the same thing as "unity" or "absence of diversity"), but that is a topic for a different venue.

of philhellenism among the Roman elite of the period, including the foundation of the Panhellenion under Hadrian, there is no reason to suppose that the Romans themselves would have disapproved of such an affirmation.

In conclusion, in the absence of explicit statements on Pausanias's part, our estimation of his intentions will always be somewhat speculative, and even if we could resurrect the author and interrogate him the answers would not yield everything worth noting about the effect produced by the text as a work of literature and as a monument of second-century culture. Yet if we read not just the network of his itineraries but his deployment of his narrative motifs and techniques as forming a deliberate structure, we can see the author engaging in an act of communication that is more sophisticated and ambitious than previously realized, one, moreover, that shows a more active engagement with the literary and cultural milieu of the time than most casual readers of the work nowadays would expect. Reading the text in this way offers an explanation for a number of features that have frequently been seen as accidental or as the misguided effort of a third-rate literary mind. The suggestion that Pausanias took pains to create a complex and subtle work of literature may seem to some to suggest that he took fewer pains than we would wish to report accurately on the *realia* of Greece in his day, but there is no reason why we should see the one effort as detracting from the other.

WORKS CITED

Akujärvi, J. 2005. *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator: Studies in Pausanias*' Periegesis. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Alcock, S. 1996. "Landscapes of Memory and the Authority of Pausanias." In Bingen, ed. 241–67.

—— 2001. "The Peculiar Book IV and the Problem of the Messenian Past." In Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner, eds. 142–53.

——, Cherry, J., and Elsner, J. eds. 2001. *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alvares, J. 2007. "The Coming of Age and Political Accommodation in the Greco-Roman Novels." In Paschalis, M. et al. eds. *The Greek and the Roman Novel: Parallel Readings.* Groningen: Barkhuis. 3–22.

Ameling, W. 1996. "Pausanias und die hellenistischen Geschichte." In Bingen, ed. 117–60.

Arafat, K. 1996. *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auberger, J. 1992a. "Pausanias et les Messéniens: une histoire d'amour!" *REA* 94: 187–97.

—— 1992b. "Pausanias romancier? Le témoinage du livre IV." *DHA* 18: 257–80.

—— 2000. "Pausanias et le livre 4: une leçon pour l'empire." *Phoenix* 54: 255–81.

—— 2001. "D'un héros à l'autre: Pausanias au pied de l'Ithōme." In Knoepfler and Piérart, eds. 261–73.

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Trans. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Beck, R. 1996. "Mystery Religions, Aretalogy and the Ancient Novel." In Schmeling, G. ed. *The Novel in the Ancient World.* Leiden: Brill.131–50.

Bingen, J. ed. 1996. *Pausanias Historien.* Entretiens Hardt 41. Vandœuvres-Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

Bischoff, E. 1938. "Perieget." *Pauly-Wissowa* 19: 725–42.

Bowie, E. 1970. "Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic." *P&P* 46: 3–41.

—— 1994. "Philostratus: Writer of Fiction." In Morgan and Stoneman, eds. 181–99.

—— 2001. "Inspiration and Aspiration: Date, Genre, and Readership." In Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner, eds. 21–32.

Branham, R. B. 2002. "A Truer Story of the Novel." In *id.*, ed. *Bakhtin and the Classics.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press. 161–86.

Bultrighini, U. 1990. "La Grecia descritta da Pausania: trattazione diretta e trattazione indiretta." *RFIC* 118: 282–305.

Castelli, C. 1994. "Riano di Creta: ipotesi cronologiche e biographiche." *RIL* 128: 73–87.

—— 1995. "Poeti ellenistici nella *Periegesi* di Pausania." In Belloni, L., Milanese, G., and Porro, A. eds. 1995. *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata.* 2 vols. Milan: Vita e Pensiero. 2.711–25.

Currie, J. 1990. "Quintus Curtius Rufus: The Historian as Novelist?" *GCN* 3: 63–77.

de Jong, I., Nünlist, R., and Bowie, A. eds. 2004. *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature.* Leiden: Brill.

Deshours, N. 1993 "La Legende et le culte de Messène ou comment forger l'identité d'une cité." *REG* 106: 39–60.

Dewald, C. 1997. "Wanton Kings, Pickled Heroes, and Gnomic Founding Fathers: Strategies of Meaning at the End of Herodotus's Histories." In Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler, eds. 62–82.

Douglas, M. 2007. *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ellinger, P. 2005. *La Fin des maux: d'un Pausanias à l'autre.* Paris: Belles Lettres.

Ellis, J. 1991. "The Structure and Argument of Thucydides' Archaeology." *ClAnt* 10: 344–76.

Elsner, J. 1992. "Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World." *P&P* 135: 3–29.

—— 1995. *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—— 2001. "Structuring 'Greece': Pausanias's *Periegesis* as a Literary Construct." In Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner, eds. 3–20.

—— 2007. *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Frazer, J. 1898. *Pausanias's Description of Greece.* 6 vols. London: Macmillan.

Fusillo, M. 1988. "Textual Patterns and Narrative Situations in the Greek Novel." *GCN* 1: 17–29.

—— 1997. "How Novels End: Some Patterns of Closure in Ancient Narrative." In Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler, eds. 209–27.

Goldhill, S. 2001. "The Erotic Eye: Visual Stimulation and Cultural Conflict." In *id.*, ed. *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 154–94.

Gurlitt, W. 1890. *Über Pausanias.* Graz: Leuschner und Lubensky.

Habicht, C. 1998 [1985]. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece.* 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hägg, T. 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Herington, J. 1991a. "The Closure of Herodotus' *Histories*." *ICS* 16: 149–60.

—— 1991b. "The Poem of Herodotus." *Arion* 1.3: 5–16.

Holzberg, N. 1992. "Der Äsop-Roman: Eine strukturanalytische Interpretation." In *id.*, ed. *Der Äsop-Roman: Motivgeschichte und Erzählstruktur.* Tübingen: Narr. 33–75.

Hutton, W. E. 2005a. "The Construction of Religious Space in Pausanias." In Elsner, J. and Rutherford, I. eds. *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 291–317.

—— 2005b. *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the* Periegesis *of Pausanias.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—— 2008. "The Disaster of Roman Rule: Pausanias 8.27.1." *CQ* 58: 622–37.

—— 2009. "Pausanias the Novelist." In Karla, ed. 151–69.

Jost, M. 2006. "Unité et diversité: la Grèce de Pausanias." *REG* 119: 568–87.

Karla, G. 2009. "Fictional Biography vis-à-vis Romance: Affinity and Differentiation." In Karla, ed. 13–39.

—— ed. 2009. *Fiction on the Fringe: Novelistic Writing in the Post-Classical Age.* Leiden: Brill.

Kerényi, K. 1927. *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung.* Tübingen: Mohr.

Knoepfler, D. and Piérart, M. 2001. *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000. Actes du colloque de Neuchâtel et de Fribourg (18–22 septembre 1998).* Geneva: Université de Neuchâtel/Librairie Droz.

Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

—— 2002. "Narrative Spaces." In Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S. eds. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1: Space in the Ancient Novel.* Groningen: Barkhuis.1–11.

Lafond, Y. 2001. "Lire Pausanias à l'époque de Antonins: réflexions sur la place de la Périégèse dans l'histoire culturelle, religieuse et sociale de la Grèce romaine." In Knoepfler and Piérart, eds. 387–406.

Lang, M. 1984. *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lightfoot, J. L. 2003. *Lucian: On the Syrian Goddess.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Luraghi, N. 2002. "Becoming Messenian." *JHS* 122: 45–69.

—— 2008. *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacQueen, B. 1990. *Myth, Rhetoric and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's* Daphnis and Chloe. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Merkelbach, R. 1962. *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike.* Munich: Beck.
—— 1988. *Die Hirten des Dionysos: Die Dionysos-Mysterien der römischen Kaiserzeit und der bukolische Roman des Longus.* Munich.
Minchin, E. 1995. "Ring-Patterns and Ring-Composition: Some Observations on the Framing of Stories in Homer." *Helios* 22: 23–35.
Moggi, M. 2002. "Pausanias e Roma (Nota di lettura a VIII 27.1)." *Gerión* 20: 435–49.
Montiglio, S. 2005. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Morgan, J. 1991. "Reader and Audiences in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros." *CGN* 4: 85–103.
—— 1994. "The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros: Narrative as Riddle." In Morgan and Stoneman, eds. 97–113.
—— 2004a. "Longus." In de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie, eds. 507–22.
—— 2004b. "Heliodorus." In de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie, eds. 523–43.
—— 2007. "Travel in the Greek Novel: Function and Interpretation." In Adams, C. E. P. and Roy, J. eds. *Travel, Geography and Culture in Ancient Greece, Egypt and the Near East.* Oxford: Oxbow. 139–60.
—— and Stoneman, R. eds. 1994. *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context.* London: Routledge.
Musti, D. 1984. "L'itinerario di Pausania: dal viaggio alla storia." *QUCC* 46: 7–18.
—— 1988. "La struttura del libro di Pausania sulla Beozia." Επετηρίς της εταιρείας Βοιωτικών μελετών 1.1 (Α' διεθνές συνέδριο Βοιωτικών μελετών): 333–44.
—— 1996. "La struttura del discorso storico in Pausania." In Bingen, ed. 9–34.
Nimis, S. 1999. "Ring-Composition and Linearity in Homer." In Mackay, E. A. ed. *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence on the Greek and Roman World.* Leiden: Brill. 65–78.
—— 2001. "Cycles and Sequence in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe.*" In Watson, J. ed. *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World.* Leiden: Brill.185–98.
—— 2003 "*In mediis rebus:* Beginning again in the Middle of the Ancient Novel." In Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen, eds. 255–69.
Nörenberg, H.-W. 1973. "Untersuchungen zum Schluß der Περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος des Pausanias." *Hermes* 101: 235–52.
Ogden, D. 2004. *Aristomenes of Messene: Legends of Sparta's Nemesis.* Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
Palm, J. 1959. *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit.* Lund: Gleerup.
Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. eds. 2003. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond.* Leiden: Brill.
Perry, B. F. 1967. *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Pearson, L. 1962. "The Pseudo-history of Messenia and its Authors." *Historia* 11: 397–426.

Pelling, C. 1997. "Is Death the End? Closure in Plutarch's *Lives*." In Roberts, Dunn, and Fowler, eds. 228–50.
Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2008. *Retour à la source: Pausanias et la religion grecque.* Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque.
Porter, J. 2001. "Ideals and Ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic." In Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner, eds. 63–92.
Pretzler, M. 2007. *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece.* London: Duckworth.
Pritchett, W. K. 1999. *Pausanias Periegetes.* 2 vols. Amsterdam: Gieben.
Reardon, B. P. 1991. *The Form of Greek Romance.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Regenbogen, O. 1956. "Pausanias." *Pauly-Wissowa* Supp. 8: 1008–97.
Rijksbaron, A. 1986. "Taalkunde en de structuur van Herodotus' Historien." *Lampas* 19: 220–30.
Robert, C. 1909. *Pausanias als Schriftsteller.* Berlin.
Roberts, D., Dunn, F., and Fowler, D. eds. 1997. *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature.* Princeton.
Rutherford, I. 2001. "Tourism and the Sacred: Pausanias and the Traditions of Greek Pilgrimage." In Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner, eds. 40–52.
Schneider, W. 1997. "Ein kryptisches Denkmal im Zentrum der Pausanias-Perihegese." *Hermes* 125: 492–505.
Settis, S. 1968. "Il ninfeo di Erode Attico a Olimpia e il problema della composizione della Periegesi di Pausania". *ASNP* 37: 1–63.
Siapkas, J. 2003. *Heterological Ethnicity: Conceptualizing Identities in Ancient Greece.* Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
Sidebottom, H. 2002. "Pausanias: Past, Present and Closure." *CQ* 52: 494–99.
Sironen, E. 2003. "The Role of Inscriptions in Greco-Roman Novels." In Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen, eds. 289–300.
Stark, I. 1989. "Religiöse Elemente im antiken Roman." In Kuch, H. ed. *Der antike Roman: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte.* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. 135–49.
Steinhart, M. 2002. "Tyrannenhaus und Kaiserkult: zu einer angeblich römerfeindlichen Bemerkung bei Pausanias." *Thetis* 9: 95–96.
Stoneman, R. 1995. "Riddles in Bronze and Stone: Monuments and their Interpretation in the *Alexander Romance.*" *GCN* 6: 159–70.
Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Veyne, P. 1988. *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?* Trans. by P. Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Winkler, J. 1982. "The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*." *YCS* 27: 93–158.
—— 1994. "The Invention of Romance." In Tatum, J. ed. *The Search for the Ancient Novel.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 23–38.
Worthington, I. 1991. "Greek Oratory, Revision of Speeches and Historical Reliability." *C&M* 42: 55–74.

—— 1993. "Two Letters of Isocrates and Ring Composition." *ElectronAnt.* 1 [online: *http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/ElAnt/V1N1/worthington.html*].

Zeitlin, F. 1990 "The Poetics of *Eros*: Nature, Art and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." In Halperin, D., Winkler, J., and Zeitlin, F. eds. 1990 *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 417–64.