

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 41 (1996)

Artikel: Landscapes of memory and the authority of Pausanias
Autor: Alcock, Susan E.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-661038>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 15.03.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

VII

SUSAN E. ALCOCK

LANDSCAPES OF MEMORY AND THE AUTHORITY OF PAUSANIAS

If every generation devises its own interpretation of Pausanias, as of other ancient authorities, then it should come as no surprise that the later twentieth century is witnessing a growing sense of unease about this once most pedestrian of ancient texts. Readings of Pausanias in previous scholarship founded themselves on his acceptance as a supposedly objective and neutral (if not unflawed) account, a solidity reflected in the famous nickname of 'Baedeker'. While lambasting him for a host of failings, including accusations of historical inaccuracy, tourists and scholars alike have consistently mined his *Periegesis* like a quarry, searching for acceptable nuggets of fact or legend about ancient Greece. However, what has now begun to creep into recent interpretations of Pausanias, subverting past approaches to the *Periegesis*, is Pausanias himself – questions about his authority and agenda, as well as about the genre in which he expresses himself: travel writing. It is no longer so easy to relax with the comfortable anonymity of Pausanias, to rely on the calm certainty of his commentary. Inevitably this unease must have an impact on any discussion of Pausanias as historian.

Reading Pausanias on his own terms, rather than as a source for specific anecdotes or as a sites and monuments register, generates an entirely different range of attitudes towards the text. Two important and increasingly influential treatments have emerged within the past decade. Paul Veyne, in answering his question 'Did the Greeks believe in their myths?', found Pausanias to be a central figure in unravelling the complex and paradoxical relation between myth and reason, in the process remarking ruefully that Pausanias was "not an easy author... This Greek, who has been taken for a compiler, a kind of Baedeker, takes pleasure in plunging us into doubt ..."¹ For John Elsner, the *Periegesis*: "...which has been regarded as a pedantic and antiquarian tourist guide can be interpreted to show how Greeks coped with the burden of a distinguished past weighing on their cultural identity, with the contemporary politics of Greece's status as a Roman province, and with the profound sense of the sacred with which so much of antique culture was imbued"². To offer yet another alternative perspective, in this paper I consider Pausanias as ethnographer: that is, as an individual who travelled among and wrote of a people from the outside looking in.

Over the past two decades or so, the genre of modern ethnographic writing has undergone a radical critique, an attack which for many has gravely undermined once entrenched notions of anthropological objectivity and omniscience. In the wake of this critique, more self-conscious and self-critical forces have moved to the fore, spearheaded by an insistence upon two significant points. The first involves the need for an increasing 'specification of discourse': 'who speaks? who writes? when and where? with

¹ P. VEYNE, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*. Translated by Paula Wissing (Chicago 1988), 92-102, at 101.

² J. ELSNER, 'Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World', *P&P* 135 (1992), 3, and 'From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monuments, Travel and Writing', in S. GOLDHILL and R. OSBORNE (edd.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge 1994), 224-254; S.E. ALCOCK, *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece* (Cambridge 1993), 174.

or to whom? under what institutional and historical constraints?'³. The discourse of the single, confident ethnographic voice (the voice of an 'imperial eye', as Mary Louise Pratt puts it), has been found to offer not complete and indisputable testimony, but instead a single version drawn from one of a myriad of uniquely different vantage points – a version which in turn can mask other voices and other possible testimonies. Ethnographic writings are by no means the only literary form where the power to tell one story 'blocks out' other narratives but, given its usual subject matter – the lives and habits of 'the other' – it is surely one of the most dangerously efficacious⁴. The second critical point also emerges from this challenge to the all-seeing, all-embracing ethnographic eye. Not only is it impossible for ethnographic accounts to be 'complete', it is also fallacious to consider them as impartial, their authors free from bias or constraint. As James Clifford puts it :

all constructed truths are made possible by powerful 'lies' of exclusion and rhetoric. Even the best ethnographic texts – serious, true fictions – are systems, or economies, of truth. Power and history work through them, in ways their authors cannot fully control. Ethnographic truths are thus inherently partial – committed and incomplete⁵.

Current traumas in post-modern ethnography may seem quite distant from the second century A.D. world of Pausanias. But, reading him as an ethnographer, it is appropriate to turn this critique upon the *Periegesis* and to frame a series of questions about its author : What is the underlying agenda for his narrative? What does he emphasize in his 'inherently partial – committed and incomplete' text? How does he establish his authority? Does the *Periegesis* mask alternative versions of the Greek past? And how

³ J. CLIFFORD, 'Introduction : Partial Truths', in J. CLIFFORD and G.E. MARCUS (edd.), *Writing Culture : The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley 1986), 13.

⁴ On the power of narrative : E. SAID, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York 1993), esp. 62-80. See also M.L. PRATT, *Imperial Eyes : Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London 1992); D. BOON, *Other Tribes, Other Scribes : Symbolic Anthropology in the Comparative Study of Cultures, Histories, Religions and Texts* (Cambridge 1982).

⁵ J. CLIFFORD [n. 3], 7.

can it be employed by later authors in constructing, in turn, their own accounts of the monuments and history of ancient Greece?

Itinerary

It is ironic that Pausanias has often been castigated as a 'simple' guidebook, for travel literature is increasingly perceived as a highly equivocal genre, and guide books are never simple. Such texts steer their user along a pre-defined course, imparting information in a prescribed fashion, either introducing the uninitiated to a new world, or re-educating and revising the experiences of a repeat visitor – all according to a certain authorial plan⁶. What Pausanias himself (I 26.4) tells us he is doing seems quite clear and deceptively simple: "But I must proceed, for I have to describe the whole of Greece (or 'all Greek things', πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά)". The itinerary of his travels has also long appeared to be self-evident. Beginning with the approach (via Sounion and the Piraeus) to Athens, he proceeds through the various regions comprising what corresponds, with some exceptions, to the territory of the Roman province of Achaia. Boundaries between regions and between individual poleis are well-defined, both by what Pausanias reports seeing at border crossings and by their treatment in his text, with regional boundaries, for example, often defining the ends of individual books. Within each region, Pausanias follows a systematic course, travelling from the border to the center, moving out and back again (in a 'sewing motion') along principal routes through the region, before finally passing out of the area and thus on to the next book of the *Periegesis*. As he goes, Pausanias describes sanctuaries, temples, altars, statues, hero shrines, paintings, civic buildings, groves, tombs, natural phenomena (θεωρήματα, sights or things seen). Mythic tales, historical accounts

⁶ "...Travel writing is always an act of cultural appropriation ..." J. ELSNER [II. 2. 1994], 226. On the ambiguous status of the genre: M. KOWALEWSKI, *Temperamental Journeys: Essays on the Modern Literature of Travel* (Athens, Georgia 1992); M.B. CAMPBELL, *The Witness and the Other World* (Ithaca 1988); E. CHEYFITZ, *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from 'The Tempest' to 'Tarzan'* (New York 1991); R. EISNER, *Travelers to an Antique Land: The History and Literature of Travel to Greece* (Ann Arbor 1991).

and local traditions (λόγοι) also form an integral part of his account; the relationship of these two elements has always provided one of the more tendentious areas in the study of the *Periegesis*. Finally, the narrative of the journey is presented experientially, very much from Pausanias' personal vantage point, with the reader told what they would 'see' if they were present to look for themselves⁷.

One further significant aspect of Pausanias' methodology has likewise long been acknowledged, if perhaps not fully appreciated, and that is his unquestionable selectivity in what he chooses to record in his text. Pausanias himself makes this eminently clear. On leaving Attica, for example, he makes the transition to neighboring Megara with the parting comment: "Such in my opinion are the most famous legends and sights among the Athenians, and from the beginning my narrative has picked out of much material the things that deserve to be recorded" (I 39.3). This sentiment recurs at other major transitional points in the text, as when he is about to pass from the Peloponnese on his way to central Greece (VIII 54.7), or to plunge into his description of Sparta:

To prevent misconception, I added in my account of Attica that I had not mentioned everything in order, but had made a selection of what was most noteworthy. This I will repeat before beginning my account of Sparta; for from the beginning the plan of my work has been to discard the many trivial stories current among the several communities, and to pick out the things most worthy of mention – an excellent rule which I will never violate (III 11.1)

⁷ At Olympia, for example: "My narrative will follow in dealing with them the order in which the Eleans are wont to sacrifice on the altars... The reader must remember that the altars have not been enumerated in the order in which they stand, but the order followed by my narrative is that followed by the Eleans in their sacrifices" (V 14.4; V 14.10); C. HABICHT, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1985), 19-27. On Pausanias' route: A.M. SNODGRASS, *An Archaeology of Greece: The Present State and Future Scope of a Discipline* (Berkeley 1987), 77-86; L. CASSON, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Baltimore 1974), 297. J. ELSNER [n. 2. 1992], 5, 11-17, notes that Pausanias' experiential approach is paralleled in later Christian accounts of pilgrimage.

Apart from such programmatic statements, references to the 'most noteworthy', 'oldest' or 'most remarkable' objects or structures in a city or sanctuary are ubiquitous⁸. In such passages, Pausanias points to the incompleteness ('from the beginning' as he reiterates) of his narrative, but the implications of this inherent partiality are difficult to explore. We rely on Pausanias to look and tell us 'what was there' – and lacking supplementary archaeological or other textual evidence to correct our vision, we can only see what he sees. Yet this subtle form of astigmatism has tended not to bother scholars, rarely provoking them to question exactly what Pausanias found deserving of attention and what he did not.

There are two major exceptions to that state of affairs, two areas where his bias is so glaring as to be impossible for subsequent readers to ignore. First is his 'conscious archaism': that is, his relative silence about Greek history and monument-building after approximately the mid-second century B.C. Secondly, there is his decided preference, among all potential Greek *theoremata*, for religious sites (sanctuaries, temples, altars, cult images)⁹. We will return to these selective biases – both subtle and overt – in considering their implications for the content, and the control, of social memory in Roman Greece.

⁸ Other examples: Pausanias I 23.4; I 27.1; I 29.2; I 33.1; II 2.6; II 10.4; II 13.3; II 15.1; II 17.6; II 34.11; II 38.3; III 19.7; V 4.5; VI 1.1; VI 17.7; VI 19.6; VII 26.1; X 9.1; X 32.1; X 32.10-11.

⁹ On his selectivity in general: C. HABICHT [n. 7], 22-23; A.M. SNODGRASS [n. 7], 76-77. On bias in chronological coverage and subject: E.D. HUNT, 'Travel, Tourism and Piety in the Roman Empire: A Context for the Beginnings of Christian Pilgrimage', *EMC/CV* 28 n.s. 3 (1984), 400; J. ELSNER [n. 2, 1992], 7-10, 17-18; C. HABICHT [n. 7], 104-105, 134-137; J. HEER, *La personnalité de Pausanias* (Paris 1979), 21-25, 127-128. Bias against post-classical history is not, of course, confined to Pausanias but is a more general characteristic of the Second Sophistic: E.L. BOWIE, 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic', in M. I. FINLEY (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society* (London 1974), 172, 188-189 and *passim*.

Agenda

If Pausanias' travel itinerary for his readers, on one level, seems relatively clear, the agenda he set for them (apart from his self-proclaimed description of πάντα τὰ ἑλληνικά) is less so. No single 'purpose' for such a work should be sought, of course, and a variety of explanations have been offered. Many of these revolve around the most salient aspect of Pausanias' narrative : his deep engagement with certain aspects of the Greek past, and his description of extant monuments as one sort of link to that past. This view of Pausanias conceives of him as a peripatetic offshoot of the general cultural phenomenon known as the Second Sophistic. While the strain of archaism in the *Periegesis* is undeniable, we can surely refine further our understanding of the role that past played in the present, and the mechanisms by which it was allowed to do so.

One major advance in the interpretation of Pausanias has been made by John Elsner who believes – and I agree with him – that the construction of a Hellenic sense of identity lies at the core of Pausanias' text. Elsner argues that this narrative worked to renew an identity under threat from conquest and subjugation. Pausanias, in this reading of his work, demonstrates “how a single Greek, living under the Roman empire, used myths of the ancient Greek past and the sacred associations of pilgrimage to shield himself from the full implications of being a subject”, offering a “guide to the formation of Greek religious identity as a form of resistance to the realities of Roman rule”. Elsner says many perceptive things about the *Periegesis* and the anxieties it reveals about just what it meant to be, and just how to be, a ‘Roman Greek’¹⁰. While accepting themes of identity and resistance as the primary discourse driving Pausanias' text, I want to develop my argument along lines other than Elsner's.

¹⁰ J. ELSNER [n. 2. 1992], 3, 5; Id. [n. 2. 1994], 246.

The deeply ambivalent results of contact and interaction between Greeks and Romans can be traced in writings from both sides, together with a Greek desire to preserve a sense of separation and of self. Scholarly views, however, which traditionally privilege Greeks as a people by nature set apart and Greek identity as an easily preserved commodity have lately been stigmatized as the fundamentally essentializing attitudes they are¹¹. That the Greeks were not impervious to the stresses of Roman rule (as concentration upon certain aspects of their cultural life under the empire has led some to accept) has become increasingly apparent through the examination of other sources of evidence, in particular archaeology, and through considering the lives of non-elite members of the Achaian population. Under circumstances of external conquest or coercion, as experienced in provincial Greece, *any* attempt to maintain a sense of 'authentic identity' requires careful negotiation and 'cultural work'¹². The need for such exertion provides an alternative framework within which to read the *Periegesis*.

Landscapes of memory

Pausanias' efforts in negotiating Greek identity were firmly situated within what I shall term a landscape of memory. Of course, stressing the topographic orientation of the *Periegesis* or emphasizing the ubiquity of the past within the text would hardly constitute a new approach to the subject. Invoking the terms

¹¹ R. BROWNING, 'Greeks and Others', in R. BROWNING, *History, Language and Literacy in the Byzantine World* (London 1989), 8-11; S.E. ALCOCK, 'Friends, Romans, Countrymen: Archaeology and Identity in the Early Imperial East', in S. HERBERT and D. POTTER (edd.), *Culture and Ethnicity in the Hellenistic East* (Ann Arbor forthcoming); cf. J. CLIFFORD, *The Predicament of Culture* (Cambridge, MA 1988).

¹² On the negotiation of identity and 'cultural work': J. BROW, 'Notes on Community, Hegemony and the Uses of the Past', *Anthropological Quarterly* 63 (1990), 1-6; A.M. ALONSO, 'The Effects of Truth: Representation of the Past and the Imagining of Community', *The Journal of Historical Sociology* 1 (1988), 33-57; B. ANDERSON, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London 1983); G. BOTTOMLEY, *From Another Place: Migration and the Politics of Culture* (Cambridge 1993); M.L. PRATT [n. 4]. On the impact of conquest on Roman Greece: S.E. ALCOCK [n. 2].

'landscape' and 'memory', however, generates a different set of reactions. *Landscape* is a difficult word to define, but – in the fashion I am using it here – it conveys the totalizing and constructed nature of Pausanias' narrated world, implying a geography conceived from the perspective of one individual observer. Moving through space, Pausanias shapes and adorns his particular landscape by noticing and recording certain elements : he creates the entire terrain the reader too travels.

Memory problematizes the relationship between the past and the present, providing the screen through which choices between remembering and forgetting are made; far from being an automatic process, memory demands constant and active decision-making. Choice of memory is an essential element in any social group's perception of itself, making it (as Foucault and others have observed) a central site for political contestations over the past, and the power and legitimacy that the past can offer. Control of social memory bears directly upon issues of hierarchy and authority, and, not surprisingly, it is thus articulated and enforced in countless ways : not least by the writing of histories and of guide books¹³. In agrarian societies, including the peoples of the ancient Mediterranean, one of the primary means by which memories were preserved and promulgated was through the marking of specific places in the landscape, either through the telling of stories, the enactment of rituals, or the building of commemorative monuments.

In the *Periegesis*' landscape of memory, what does Pausanias choose to remember (or to forget) and how significant are his choices? The *Periegesis* is throughout crowded with memories,

¹³ P. CONNERTON, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge 1989), 27. Social or collective memory is at issue here, not individual, personal recollections : M. HALBWACHS, *The Collective Memory* (New York 1980); J. FENTRESS and C. WICKHAM, *Social Memory* (Oxford 1992). On power and memory : M. FOUCAULT, *Power/Knowledge* (New York 1980); M. ROWLANDS, 'The Role of Memory in the Transmission of Culture', in R. BRADLEY (ed.), *Conceptions of Time and Ancient Society*, *World Archaeology* 25 (1993), 141-151.

inspired by the sight of monuments, the reading of inscriptions, or the tales of local guides. Some of these memories were clearly vital only at a small and intensely local scale (such as the cult of Strangled Artemis among the Arcadian Caphyans, VIII 23.6-7). The significance of other memories was shared more widely, such as recollections of Theseus in Athens and Troizen (Books I and II, *passim*), or the Seven Against Thebes, discussed at Thebes and Argos (Books IX and II, *passim*). Still other memories, as I shall demonstrate, appear and reappear throughout the course of Pausanias' travels and text, seeming thus to command the minds of all the Greeks. While many patterns of meaning could be traced in the commingling of these different levels of remembrance, in this context I am concerned with his treatment of dominant, 'panhellenic' memories. In other pre-industrial communities, certain key events or happenings appear to seize hold of a people's collective imaginings, taking on the burden of validating their existence and unique identity. These 'charters of identity' in turn lend a particular cast to the history of other periods, which are read and interpreted in their light. In some cases, outside observers have been bemused at the choice of what often seem ostensibly 'unimportant' events for such commemoration – as, for example, in one part of rural Italy, where World War I was quickly forgotten, while the earlier heroics of brigands provided a continually influential self-image¹⁴. 'Important' or not to the rest of the world, certain remembered events can take on an almost paradigmatic role for structuring social memory, and thus a people's sense of the past, and perceptions of the present.

Do any such paradigmatic, 'structuring' memories emerge in Pausanias' narrative? One unambiguous case is the remembrance and commemoration – through sanctuaries, statues, tombs, festivals and battlefields – of the Persian Wars. Memory of the battles

¹⁴ P. CONNERTON [n. 13], 20-21, citing C. LEVI, *Christ Stopped at Eboli* (London 1963); J. FENTRESS and C. WICKHAM [n. 13], 93-96.

involved (Thermopylae, Marathon, Salamis, Plataea) and of the protagonists on both sides (Leonidas, Mardonius, Miltiades, Pausanias, Themistocles, Xerxes) surfaces repeatedly, and not just in the context of one or a very small number of locales, as is the case with the great majority of Pausanias' chosen subjects. Pausanias was, as I shall demonstrate, deeply engaged with this episode (occurring some 600 or more years before his travels) in which Greeks preserved their Hellenic identity through courageous opposition to a barbarian invasion. It could immediately be objected, of course, that this apparent 'selection' of memory instead merely reflects the degree to which these wars were celebrated in classical art and architecture, one of Pausanias' favorite themes for attention. It could also be pointed out, quite rightly, that a focus on that particular epoch and its dramatic events is hardly unique to Pausanias, and in fact constitutes one of the general characteristics of the Second Sophistic. But if we choose to remember Pausanias' innate selectivity and his control over his narrative, then neither of these objections negates our need to investigate the unparalleled role of the Persian Wars in shaping Pausanias' landscape of memory.

Memories of opposition

Pausanias begins the *Periegesis* by approaching and entering Athens. On his way to the city (at a very early point in the text), he points out a promontory where the Persian fleet was destroyed, as well as a temple burned by Mardonius, which still stood though without doors or roof (I 1.5). Such signs of the barbarian invasion are, to Pausanias' eyes, ubiquitous. In downtown Athens stood a temple to Glory, "this too being a thank-offering for the victory over the Persians who had landed at Marathon. This is the victory of which I am of the opinion the Athenians were the proudest. ..." (I 14.5). That pride was also displayed (in the order of Pausanias' own experience and enumeration) in tangible, monumental markers along his route, including :

- the decoration of the Stoa Poikile with a painting of “those who fought at Marathon” (I 15.3, cf. I 17.6),
- statues of Miltiades and Themistocles in the Prytaneion (I 18.3),
- marble Persians as tripod supports in the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus (I 18.8)
- a structure built in emulation of Xerxes’ tent near the sanctuary of Dionysus and the theater (I 20.4),
- in the theater was an image of Aeschylus, already identified as being most proud of his service at Marathon (I 14.5; cf. I 21.2),
- on the acropolis, the dedications of Attalus depicting various confrontations of opposed forces, including the “engagement with the Persians at Marathon” (I 25.2); Persian spoils in the Erechtheion (I 27.1); figures of Athena dating back to the Persian sack (I 27.6); the bronze Athena of Pheidias, “tithes from the Persians who landed at Marathon” (I 28.2).

Sometimes memories are made manifest by the noted absence, rather than the presence, of a monument; detailing the graves of the honorable war dead in Athens, Pausanias makes clear that, uniquely, “for their valor”, those who fell at Marathon were buried on the field of battle (I 29.4)

At the battle sites too, a memorial landscape was mapped out by Pausanias. At Marathon, he witnessed the grave of the Athenian dead, as well as those of the Plataeans and the slaves who fought; he also saw the tomb of Miltiades and a trophy in white marble. On the other hand, the graves of the Persians, in Pausanias’ experience, were not to be found (I 32.3-5). Forgetting what had taken place at Marathon was also impossible, according to Pausanias, because — on one level — the battle was still being fought: “At Marathon every night you can hear horses neighing and men fighting. No one who has expressly set himself to behold this vision has ever got any good from it, but the spirits are not angered with such as in ignorance chance to be spectators” (I 32.4). The topography of the

battlefield was also rehearsed, for those who wished to see exactly where things happened: the marsh into which the Persians stumbled, the spring they used, the stables of the Persian leader, indeed the very marks of his tent (I 32.7; IX 4.3). The god Pan, who promised help to the Athenians (I 28.4) is also represented in a Hill of Pan and Cave of Pan (I 32.7). Salamis too was marked with monuments testifying to what had happened there. These included a victory trophy, a sanctuary of the hero Cychreus (who fought against the Persians, as foretold by an oracle); images of Pan were noted on a nearby island where hundreds of Persians were said to have been trapped and killed (I 36.1). At Plataea also, a trophy was erected by the Greeks on the battlefield (IX 2.6).

This enumeration of monuments related to the Persian invasion is, not surprisingly, especially marked in Athens and at the specific sites of conflict; but it is not confined to these places. Monuments to the dead of these wars, or related individuals, were reported by Pausanias in Megara (I 40.2-3; I 43.3), Sparta (III 12.7, III 14.8, III 16.6), and in Plataea itself (IX 2.2, IX 2.5). In Sparta, at the tombs of Pausanias and Leonidas, annual commemorative events were still held, including contests 'in which none may compete except Spartans' (III 14.1). Honorific statues, celebratory trophies, sanctuaries or other structures were raised at Sparta (III 11.3, III 12.8, III 17.7), Troizen (II 31.5), and Plataea (IX 2.6, IX 4.1-2). Other key sites for commemoration of the Persian Wars were, of course, the panhellenic sanctuaries, with dedications at Olympia and particularly at Delphi¹⁵. The very temple of Apollo at Delphi was adorned with the shields taken as spoils at Marathon (X 19.4). In cities, countryside or sanctuaries alike, each of these sights, geographically dispersed and variable in type as they are, acted as a reminder, reviving for the viewer (or, through the text of Pausanias, for the reader) the memory of successful Greek opposition to the barbarian.

¹⁵ Olympia: V 23.1; Delphi: X 10.1; X 11.5; X 13.9; X 14.5; X 15.1; X 16.6; X 18.1; X 19.1.

The Persian Wars play a further role in the *Periegesis*, offering a standard against which to measure and assess the actions of those implicated in the wars, which – in Pausanias' eyes – included all the Greeks. A community's or a people's participation on the Hellenic side in these fifth century struggles was something to record and to judge (Aeginetans, II 29.5; Arcadians, VIII 6.1-3; Tegeans, VIII 45.2; Plataeans, IX 1.3; Phocians, X 2.1), as was 'medizing' or refusing to fight at all (Achaeans, VII 6.3-4; Thebans, IX 6.1-2). Participation in the wars could be presented as a positive crux in a city's history; for example, the Argive destruction of Mycenae is explicitly related to the Mycenaean willingness to share in the struggle at Thermopylae (while the Argives 'made no move', II 16.3). Individuals too could still be honored, at a distance of centuries, for their heroism against the Medes (e.g. Leonidas, III 4.7; Miltiades, VIII 52.2; less obvious cases, Phayllus of Croton, X 9.2-3; Artemisia of Halicarnassus, III 11.3) or vilified for their betrayal of the Greek cause (e.g. Attaginus and Temegenidas of Thebes, VII 10.2). Pausanias also uses the behavior of Persians as models of barbaric irreverence and *hybris* towards the Hellenic gods. Instances include the incursion of men from Mardonius' troops into the Kabeirion 'to show their contempt of its gods' (they were subsequently struck mad, IX 25.9), the attack on Delphi by men of Xerxes (X 7.1), and the burning of temples at Abae in Phocis and elsewhere :

The Greeks who opposed the barbarians resolved not to rebuild the sanctuaries burnt down by them, but to leave them for all time as memorials of their hatred. This too is the reason why the temples in the territory of Haliartus, as well as the Athenian temples of Hera on the road to Phalerum and of Demeter at Phalerum, still remain half burnt even at the present day. Such I suppose was the appearance of the sanctuary at Abae also, after the Persian invasion, until in the Phocian war some Phocians, overcome in battle, took refuge in Abae. Whereupon the Thebans gave them to the flames, and with the refugees the sanctuary which was thus burnt down a second time. However it still stood

even in my time, the frailest of buildings ever damaged by fire, seeing that the ruin begun by the Persian incendiaries was completed by the incendiaries of Boeotia (X 35.2-3; cf. VII 5.4 for the burning of Ionian temples)

This behavior is explicitly contrasted at one point to the reverence of the Romans and the good will of the emperor Hadrian, who built another temple for Apollo at Abae. In these various ways, Pausanias' judgment of correct and incorrect behavior in past and present was displayed and defined in relation to memories of events from the fifth century B.C.

There is yet another fashion in which this particular nexus of memories was employed as a touchstone in Pausanias' *Periegesis*. On several occasions, the conflict of Greeks and Persians is related to other struggles, mythic and historical, with the 'barbarian'. For example, the Trojan War, another occasion when a coalition of Greeks fought against an eastern enemy, is frequently linked to the Persian Wars, especially in the litany of combatants involved. "The Eleans played their part in the Trojan War, and also in the battles of the Persian invasion of Greece" (V 4.7) or :

The wars of the Achaeans are as follow. In the expedition of Agamemnon to Troy they furnished, while still dwelling in Lacedaimon and Argos, the largest contingent in the Greek army. When the Persians under Xerxes attacked Greece, the Achaeans it is clear had no part in the advance of Leonidas to Thermopylae, nor in the naval actions fought by the Athenians with Themistocles off Euboea and at Salamis, and they are not included in the Laconian or in the Attic list of allies. They were absent from the action at Plataea, for otherwise the Achaeans would surely have had their name inscribed on the offering of the Greeks at Olympia. My view is that they stayed at home to guard their several fatherlands, while because of the Trojan War they scorned to be led by Dorians of Lacedaimon (VII 6.3-4)

Pausanias fabricates other links between the two events by allowing a particular monument or building to carry a dual memory. At a place called the Hellenium in Sparta :

...it has been stated that those who were preparing to repel Xerxes when he was crossing into Europe deliberated at this place how they should resist. The other story is that those who made the expedition against Troy to please Menelaus deliberated here how they could sail out to Troy and exact satisfaction from Alexander for carrying off Helen (III 12.6)

Historical encounters too are cast in the same paradigm, for example when Agesilaus defeated a Persian enemy “of which the muster on this occasion had been surpassed only in the expedition of Xerxes and in the earlier ones of Darius against the Scythians and against Athens” (III 9.6). Battles of Greek against Greek could also invoke the inspirational victory over the Persians, as when the exiled Messenians, about to be besieged in their Aetolian refuge by the Acarnanians, “recalled the achievement of the Athenians at Marathon, how thirty myriad Persians had been destroyed by men not numbering ten thousand. So they joined battle with the Acarnanians ...” (IV 25.5). Another connection between different historical conflicts is seen in Pausanias’ remarks about the aftermath of Aegospotami, where Lysander’s refusal to bury the slain was judged as disgraceful, not least because burial had been ‘a thing which even the Persians who landed at Marathon received from the Athenians, and the Lacedaimonians themselves who fell at Thermopylae received from King Xerxes’ (IX 32.9).

The most overt and carefully formulated link between different historical episodes, however, is the relationship Pausanias builds up between the fifth century Persian invasion and the incursion of the Gauls into Greece some two centuries later. As with the Persian Wars, Pausanias mentions the Gallic attack in a number of places: indeed, he appears almost to frame his entire narrative with two lengthy discussions of it, in Book 1 (I 3.5-4.6) and Book 10 (X 19.5-23.14). The resonances between the two barbarian threats, as the story is told by Pausanias anyway, are numerous :

- the leadership of the Athenians in a time of crisis,
- a critical encounter at Thermopylae, including use of the very same pass that once betrayed the Lacedaimonians (I 4.2; cf. III 4.7; X 20.1-5),
- the dedication of spoils from the two events in close association, as at the temple at Delphi, where Persian shields from Marathon hung near Gallic arms offered by the Aetolians : “their shape is very like that of Persian wicker shields” (X 19.4)¹⁶,
- the supernatural aid of Greek gods and heroes in defence against the barbarian, notably Pan, who inspired ‘panic’ on both occasions¹⁷,
- similarities in Persian and Gallic tactics and numbers; “I believe that the Gauls in adopting these methods copied the Persian regiment of the Ten Thousand, who were called the Immortals” (X 19.11; see also X 20.1-5).

On occasion Pausanias adds the Gallic invasion to a previously forged chain of memory connecting the Trojan and the Persian Wars, as in the litany of combatants (Achaea, VII 6.3-4, cf. VII 18.6; Arcadians VIII 6.1-3) or in the recounting of various threats to the sanctuary of Delphi, attacks which were said to extend from before the time of Pyrrhus son of Achilles, through to the sacrilege of Xerxes’ men, to the Gallic invasion, and beyond into more recent, Roman times (X 7.1)¹⁸.

What are the implications of Pausanias’ choice of the Persian Wars as a dominant memory within his narrative of πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά? Other scholars who have noted this pattern in passing

¹⁶ For other dedications in the wake of the Gallic invasion, see VII 20.6, X 15.2, X 16.4, X 18.7, X 21.5.

¹⁷ For divine aid : at Marathon (I 28.4, I 32.5); at Salamis (I 36.1); against the Gauls (X 23.2-3; X 8.7; X 23.7-8). See also I 40.2-3, X 32.4, X 34.6, X 30.9. Supernatural aid was also available at Troy (VIII 10.5).

¹⁸ A link just between the Gallic invasion and the Trojan war is created by Pausanias’ association of the Pergamene expulsion of the Gauls with Telephus’ exploits “against the followers of Agamemnon” (I 4.6).

have stressed its celebration of Athens, its creation of a standard against which to judge the behavior of Greek states and individuals, its representation of a time when all Greeks fought together in defense of their beloved ἐλευθερία¹⁹. All these observations are legitimate and significant, but do not, I believe, reach to the core of Pausanias' underlying agenda. The fundamental paradigm established is that of rejection of the barbarian, and thus the maintenance of a boundary between Greeks and those they oppose. Preservation of identity is located in the preservation of self-defined boundaries; the repulsion of Persians, and associated 'others', from Greek soil becomes a metaphor for this process²⁰. That notions of Greek identity were under stress during the Roman period cannot be denied. What we observe in Pausanias is a response dependent upon memories that crystallized and celebrated the separateness of Greeks. As in other documented cases of struggles to maintain 'authentic identity' among conquered and subjugated peoples, Pausanias' 'charter of identity' was rooted deep in tales of resistance to outsiders²¹.

What about the final instance of a barbarian invasion of the land of Greece? What about the Romans? The question of Pausanias' personal attitude towards Rome has been much debated, with various passages directly mentioning Roman rule used to indicate his approbation or disapproval²². By taking a more indirect approach,

¹⁹ C. HABICHT [n. 7], 106-111; J. ELSNER [n. 2, 1992 and 1994]. Not all Greek states, of course, did participate in this conflict on the Hellenic side, a fact of which Pausanias was more than aware.

²⁰ On the issue of self-defined and 'pure' boundaries, the current situation in the northern Balkans, especially the controversy over 'Macedonia' can be considered.

²¹ F. BARTH, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (Boston 1969) is the classic text. On 'charters of identity' being rooted in resistance, J. FENTRESS - C. WICKHAM [n. 13], 92-114. The repetition of Thermopylae as a crucial liminal zone in the contact between Greeks and barbarians is surely more than geographically significant. I have already mentioned Pausanias' sensitivity to borders and border crossings.

²² For a general review, C. HABICHT [n. 7], 117-140; J. HEER [n. 9], 66-69. A textual emendation of VIII 27.1, the most apparent denunciation of Roman rule, has been accepted by many; J. PALM, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund 1959), 72-74.

by examining the manner in which he organizes and structures memory, the emergence of a refrain of resistance and pride in opposition becomes difficult to deny. Active and violent resistance is not at issue here – Pausanias is no revolutionary – but that is not the only form of opposition in the past that later generations must be prepared to recognize. The sheer variety of methods by which subject peoples express resistance (at the individual, community or provincial level) is increasingly a subject of attention for historians, anthropologists and archaeologists alike²³. Opposition manifests itself here in a subtle, but very powerful fashion – namely, through the control of social memory. Pausanias dictates, through his landscape of memory, what was significant and unique about being Greek. And a central element of that identity was, and would always remain, the expulsion of barbarians.

In the *Periegesis*, opposition becomes, in a sense, timeless. The various events Pausanias chooses for commemoration (the Trojan War, Persian Wars, Gallic invasion), so far distant from each other in terms of their reality and temporality, are combined by him within a realm that could be termed ‘ritual’ time; there they interact with each other beyond the bounds of any linear, historical chronology. Events in ritual time are ever-present and ever-powerful, to be returned to again and again in ritual communication and commemorative acts²⁴. The elevation of these particular memories to such a dimension sheds some additional light on the relative neglect in Pausanias (and other contemporary authors) of their recent past and present circumstances. This neglect may not reflect so much that sense of cultural shame and humiliation that later scholars generally assume. Instead, silence is perhaps a better word than neglect, a silence born out of the irrelevance of those

²³ R.H. MCGUIRE and R. PAYNTER (edd.), *The Archaeology of Inequality* (Oxford 1991); D. MILLER, M. ROWLANDS and C. TILLEY (edd.), *Domination and Resistance* (London 1989); J.C. SCOTT, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven 1985).

²⁴ M. BLOCH, ‘The Past and the Present in the Present’, *Man* 12 (1977), 278-292; A. APPADURAI, ‘The Past as a Scarce Resource’, *Man* 16 (1981), 201-219.

years (a time when barbarians were not repulsed) to the essential themes of Pausanias' commemoration. This is not quite the same as 'cultural amnesia' or sheer escapism. Rather, it reflects a restructuring of memory, leading to a more profound, nuanced resistance to Rome by dwelling on other times when the boundaries of Greece, and Greek identity, had been preserved.

Authority and the competitive past

Although ethnic revivals are an increasingly controversial phenomenon of the present day, the post-colonial world tends to esteem opposition to external domination and the passionate affirmation of a people's unique identity. One consequence in the academic world has been the desire to seek out contestations of hegemonic authority in acts and texts traditionally "unwitnessed, suppressed, lost or simply overlain with repetition and unreality"²⁵. From such a perspective, Pausanias commands respect as that rare phenomenon: an articulate and powerful voice of resistance. But to what extent should Pausanias' narrative, his particular charter of Greek identity, be privileged, allowing one man to speak for the identity of many, his experience to represent the experience of all? Modern ethnographic concern about 'specification of discourse...who speaks? who writes?', if it applies to others, must also apply to Pausanias, however 'invisible' a narrator he may seem.

That invisibility – his so-called 'neutrality' – requires some further consideration. Pausanias, it is well known, rarely offers personal information. He voices his opinions in a quiet yet firm fashion; a word that appears again and again in modern characterizations of him is 'discreet'. Carrying the reader securely with him through space, he reports what he sees in an apparently straightforward and truthful fashion. All these characteristics have encouraged his use as a safe, sober and reliable source²⁶.

²⁵ See M.L. PRATT [n. 4], 2-4.

²⁶ On 'honesty' and discretion: J. HEER [n. 9], 13; L. CASSON [n. 7], 299; C. HABICHT [n. 7],

Looked at from another angle, however, such a presentation can be perceived as a rhetorical authoritative stance, designed to give Pausanias' personal and select narrative the status of an unchallengeable account. Crapanzano, studying a range of very different ethnographic situations, has detailed some of the strategies by which the ethnographer constitutes his authority and "tries to make his message convincing". These can include: emphasis on the 'on-the-spot' presence of the ethnographer; the almost tactile quality of observations, designed to yield an 'illusion of specificity'; a 'disinterested' perspective; an impression of sincerity; and finally, the reader's absolute reliance upon the narrator for movement and action. All of these are to be observed in some form in the *Periegesis*: its experiential, phenomenological approach, the close detailing of monuments and their precise relationships, the trouble taken to tie up possible uncertainties by textual cross-references, Pausanias' vaunted objectivity and neutrality, the 'relentless linearity' of his passage, the manner in which the reader is made to feel 'you were there'. None of these strategies need imply that individual ethnographers are 'lying', but they do undoubtedly work to ensure acceptance of their particular version of events – in our case, the presentation of Greece and Greek history as written by Pausanias²⁷.

Returning to the questions 'who speaks? who writes?', as discreet as Pausanias may be, we can still make our own observations. Though Greek, Pausanias was not from the 'Old Greece' of which he wrote, coming instead (most likely) from Lydia. He had travelled extensively elsewhere (including to Egypt and to Rome) and drew comparisons between those lands and the sights of

8, 18, 161. Compare Crapanzano on the problematic 'disinterest' of the ethnographer: V. CRAPANZANO, 'Hermes' Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Ethnographic Description', in J. CLIFFORD and G.E. MARCUS [n. 3], 51-76 at p. 53.

²⁷ On seeing giving veracity: V. CRAPANZANO [n. 26], 57; see, for example, Pausanias V 12.3; II 22.3; VIII 41.10. On cross-references: C. HABICHT [n. 7], 7; J. ELSNER [n. 2. 1992], 14-15 and n. 44. On authority and the right to narrate, H. WHITE, 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', *Critical Inquiry* (1980), 5-27.

Greece. He was a wealthy, male member of the expanding supra-local elite network of the eastern empire. He was probably a Roman citizen²⁸. All of these factors, and many more of which we may never be aware, shaped his particular landscape of memory, and made it different from any version others might have conceived.

Even within Pausanias' hegemonic reading of the Greek past and definition of Greek identity, such competing voices can be heard. The *Periegesis* refers to many arguments between communities (less often between individuals) over the correct understanding of a tradition or the interpretation of a monument. Occasionally, a clear practical advantage (such as boundary definition) is sought by one side or the other. Far more often, however, these claims revolve around ensuring a sense of local significance through a moment of local history, declaring that some important event (often the birth of a god or hero) had happened in *their* particular 'world' and not in someone else's. For the community successful in its claims, these events could provide a memorable past and a foundation charter for its continued existence. Just a few examples of such competition over memories recorded by Pausanias can be cited²⁹ :

— III 12.7 Near the Hellenium [in Sparta] they point out the tomb of Talthybius. The Achaeans of Aegion too say that a tomb which they show on their market place belongs to Talthybius. It was this Talthybius whose wrath at the murder of the heralds, who

²⁸ J. ELSNER argues that Pausanias is not exploring 'the other' (since he too is Greek) but rather is one who "chose to travel in and write about *his own native land*" (Elsner's emphasis), and is thus an explorer of the "ethnography of self", [n. 2. 1992], 7; [n. 2. 1994], 244. I suspect that while on some levels, all Greeks were 'Greek', diversity within Hellenic identity existed, with 'Old Greece' always somewhat set apart; S.E. ALCOCK [n. 11]. On Pausanias' travels outside of Greece: see I 42.3, V 7.4, V 12.6, IX 21.1, X 5.11; E.D. HUNT [n. 9], 399-400.

²⁹ Also I 2.1; I 13.2; I 39.5; I 43.1; II 2.4-5; II 5.2; II 11.7; II 13.2; II 22.2; II 26.2; II 35.4; III 12.11; III 13.1; III 18.4-5; III 19.9; III 24.3; III 25.1-2; III 26.6; IV 14.7-8; IV 31.9; IV 32.3; IV 34.9; V 3.7; V 4.6; V 5.4-5; V 10.7-8; VI 4.11; VII 17.8; VII 27.6; VIII 38.2; VIII 42.1; VIII 48.7; VIII 53.3-4; IX 26.6; IX 35.1-7; X 4.1; X 33.4; X 38.7.

were sent to Greece by King Darius to demand earth and water, left its mark upon the whole state of the Laconians... (cf. VII 24.1)

— IV 33.1 It is a hopeless task, however zealously undertaken, to enumerate all the peoples who claim that Zeus was born and brought up among them. The Messenians have their share in the story : for they too say that the god was brought up among them...

— VIII 36.10 ...the story of the Arcadians about it being here that the child Hermes was reared, and that Acacus the son of Lycaon became his foster father. The Theban legend is different, and the people of Tanagra again have a legend at variance with the Theban.

— X 24.2-3 The inhabitants of Ios point to Homer's tomb in the island, and in another part to that of Clymene who was, they say, the mother of Homer. But the Cyprians, who also claim Homer as their own, say that Themisto, one of their native women was the mother... These things I have heard and I have read the oracles, but express no private opinion about either the age or date of Homer.

In all these cases, both sides of the dispute are presented by Pausanias, and he does not cast a deciding verdict one way or another. That is not always the case : for Pausanias often enters actively into the debate, himself arbitrating between different versions of the past and the memories of different peoples. These contestations are most apparent when he takes exception to the testimony offered him by local guides or other informants. In some cases he objects to the identifications proffered, in others to the accounts he is given of rituals or beliefs. Pausanias contradicts and dismisses these alternative voices through a combination of 'academic' authority (based on 'classic texts'), aristocratic bias, or scepticism about 'impossibilities'³⁰. A few examples can be offered here³¹ :

³⁰ C. HABICHT [n. 7], 142-148; P. VEYNE [n. 1], 14 on Pausanias' separation of 'authentic kernels' from legend "by means of what we would call the doctrine of present things".

³¹ Other examples : I 1.4; I 30.4; I 35.7; I 41.4-5; II 1.1; II 12.3-4; II 14.2; II 21.10; II 23.3; II 23.5; II 30.5; II 32.4; III 14.7; V 2.3; V 6.2; V 26.1; VI 6.4; VI 13.2; VI 20.16-19; VII 19.9-

— I 3.3 A portico is built behind with pictures of the gods called the Twelve. On the wall opposite are painted Theseus, Democracy and Demos. The picture represents Theseus as the one who gave the Athenians political equality. By other means also has the report spread among men that Theseus bestowed sovereignty upon the people and that from his time they continued under a democratic government until Pisistratus rose up and became despot. But there are many false beliefs current among the mass of mankind, since they are ignorant of historical science and consider trustworthy whatever they have heard from childhood in choruses and tragedies...

— II 23.6 The Argive guides themselves are aware that not all the stories they tell are true; yet they stick to them, for it is not easy to persuade the vulgar to change their opinions. There are other things worth seeing at Argos...

— VI 3.8 The statue of Oebotas was set up by the Achaeans by the command of the Delphic Apollo in the 80th Olympiad (460 B.C.), but Oebotas won his victory in the footrace at the sixth Festival. How, therefore, could Oebotas have taken part in the Greek victory at Plataea? For it was in the seventy-fifth Olympiad that the Persians under Mardonius suffered their disaster at Plataea. Now I am obliged to report the statements made by the Greeks, though I am not obliged to believe them all (echoing Herodotus, VII 152.3: "I am bound to report all that is said, but I am not bound to believe it all alike").

— VIII 25.7 Those who think the image to be Themis and not Demeter Lusia are, I would have them know, mistaken in their opinion.

The very act of mentioning such alternative beliefs, only to dismiss them, adds weight to Pausanias' own version of events. Of course, he does often accept and even rely on local informants for

10; VII 21.8-9; VIII 2.6-7; VIII 11.5; VIII 12.5; VIII 12.7; VIII 14.7; VIII 14.12; VIII 15.6-7; VIII 24.1; VIII 26.3-4; VIII 35.4; VIII 38.11; VIII 39.2; IX 3.2; IX 5.10; IX 20.4; IX 27.6; IX 31.7; X 5.10; X 17.4; X 38.11.

his understanding of traditions or monuments, though when he employs such intelligence, in almost every case his informants are relegated to a background role, as unidentified sources, again leaving Pausanias the dominant authorial voice³².

All of these narrators, Pausanias and those with whom he disagreed, were of course working with the same building blocks – significant places, monuments, myths, historical anecdotes – in building their charters of identity. In effect what Pausanias does, however, is to mask out other possible landscapes of memory by choosing what was – in his eyes – ‘correct’ from the range of stories offered. Working both overtly and covertly, through what he reports and what he approves, he acts essentially as an outsider deciding local ‘truths’, dictating local history. While impossible to reconstruct any developed alternative versions of the past from his rejections and dismissals, what it is at least important to acknowledge is the potential multiplicity of rival geographies and other histories, the competitive narratives which lie below the surface of the *Periegesis*³³.

Pausanias as historian

So far this paper has explored Pausanias’ itinerary and agenda, his construction of a particular version of social memory, and the means by which he establishes an authoritative voice. One last

³² “Polyvocality was restrained and orchestrated in traditional ethnographies by giving one voice a pervasive authorial function and to others the role of source, ‘informants’, to be quoted or paraphrased”: J. CLIFFORD [n. 3], 15. On Pausanias’ use of local informants: P. VEYNE [n. 1], 102, 148, n. 159. On the ‘discourse of the native population’, C. JACOB, ‘The Greek Traveler’s Areas of Knowledge: Myths and Other Discourses in Pausanias’ Description of Greece’, *Yale French Studies* 59 (1980), 77-82.

³³ A. APPADURAI [n. 24], 215-218. The conflict between local memory and official history is still very much ongoing in Greece. In Herzfeld’s analysis of the Cretan town of Rethymnon, monuments, carefully preserved by external authority, nonetheless “embody different pasts for different actors. No attempt to monumentalize these histories in a single past can do justice to the complexities of its citizens’ struggle for recognition”: M. HERZFELD, *A Place in History: Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town* (Princeton 1991), 259; see also P. CONNERTON [n. 13], 21.

question is worth considering : how should the *Periegesis* be employed by later historians in constructing their own accounts of the history and monuments of Greece? An obvious response would be to stress the need for caution, given the issues of selectivity and bias already discussed in this paper. I would also argue for a more strictly contextual approach to the *Periegesis*, which is too often read as a kind of 'timeless' document, with its testimony applicable to many periods of Greek history. On the contrary, Pausanias' account is very much shaped by the imperial epoch in which he lived and wrote : although he seems absorbed in the past, the concerns which govern his narrative are a response to a social, political and cultural situation in the present. Readings of a more critical nature, therefore, are required for modern uses of the *Periegesis*.

Even more fundamental, perhaps, is the need to acknowledge the extent to which early modern and modern imaginings and investigations of Greece have already been molded by Pausanias' memories. Eighteenth, nineteenth century and even twentieth century travellers and scholars have used Pausanias (in his role as a Baedeker) as guide and authority in preference to the accounts of local informants or local traditions, obediently following Pausanias' lead in dismissing alternative indigenous voices lightly, even scornfully. Instead, such individuals relied implicitly upon the 'indispensable Pausanias' himself³⁴. Pausanias' narration of what is memorable in Greek history and topography has helped prescribe what subsequently has been considered 'worth knowing' and worth exploring further; the events and places he emphasizes are those with which we, as historians and archaeologists, are still primarily engaged today. Of course, Pausanias is not alone among ancient élite authors in stressing the centrality of such happenings as the Persian Wars or of places such as Athens, but – for all his

³⁴ For examples of early travellers, see H. ANGELOMATIS-T SOUGARAKIS, *The Eve of the Greek Revival : British Travellers' Perceptions of Early 19th Century Greece* (London 1990); D. CONSTANTINE, *Early Greek Travellers and the Hellenic Ideal* (Cambridge 1984).

low-key presentation and reputation – the *totality* of the landscape of memory Pausanias creates has proven particularly influential in shaping our understanding of, and our interest in, ancient Greece. Yet if we accept that “ethnographic truths are thus inherently partial – committed and incomplete”, the realization must confront us that there is no reason to privilege Pausanias’ account, his reading of monuments and traditions – apart from the fact that, out of so many potential narratives and memories, the *Periegesis* survives.

Lastly, a slightly frivolous coda. The concentration in this paper upon Pausanias as a viewer and reporter, as an authoritative ‘eye’, provides one explanation for something that had always puzzled me : the conclusion of Pausanias’ text. The last town he visits is Naupactus, the last sanctuary he sees is of Asclepius, the last story he tells is of a man called Phalysius : none of these, one would think, a particularly memorable note on which to conclude³⁵.

‘The sanctuary of Asclepius I found in ruins, but it was originally built by a private person called Phalysius. For he had a complaint of the eyes, and when he was almost blind the god at Epidaurus sent to him the poetess Anyte, who brought with her a sealed tablet. The woman thought that the god’s appearance was a dream, but it proved at once to be a waking vision. For she found in her own hands a sealed tablet; so sailing to Naupactus she bade Phalysius take away the seal and read what was written. He did not think it possible to read the writing with his eyes in such a condition, but hoping to get some benefit from Asclepius he took away the seal. When he had looked at the wax he recovered his sight, and gave to Anyte what was written on the tablet, two thousand staters of gold’ (X 38.13).

In my reading of Pausanias, such an ending is entirely appropriate – stressing as it does the importance of vision, and the price that must be paid for it.

³⁵ I realize that some scholars argue that Book X is incomplete; for references, see C. HABICHT [n. 7], 6-7, and nn. 33-34.

DISCUSSION

F. Chamoux : Considérer Pausanias comme un ethnographe ne me semble pas pertinent. L'ethnographie décrit le comportement d'un peuple auquel on se sent étranger et dont on peut difficilement reconstituer l'histoire. Pausanias se sent Grec et comprend la civilisation de la Grèce propre de l'intérieur : il en pratique la langue, il en connaît l'histoire, il en partage les croyances religieuses. Quand il signale tel ou tel rite étrange, c'est avec une curiosité sympathique et en lui accordant une adhésion de principe. L'aspect ethnographique de la *Périégèse*, comme celui des *Histoires* d'Hérodote, concerne exclusivement les peuples barbares, Sarmates, Éthiopiens, Celtes. En revanche, tous les témoignages relatifs au monde grec relèvent de l'histoire de l'hellénisme et ne peuvent être envisagés dans la perspective de l'ethnographie moderne sans risque d'en fausser l'interprétation.

S.E. Alcock : Assessing the position of Pausanias (a Greek from Asia Minor) in relation to the Greeks of 'Old Greece' is admittedly difficult, though I believe we can accept a measure of distance between the author and his subjects (as E.L. Bowie also notes). More importantly, however, I would disagree that ethnography must always be focused upon a people completely alien to the observer, arguing instead that 'ethnographies of self' are entirely possible. Treating Pausanias as an ethnographer, and as subject to the radical critique current in post-modern ethnography, at very least rasps some accepted attitudes about the *Periegesis*. This

perspective is valuable in serving to focus some much needed attention on the issue of Pausanias' authority and agenda – which in turn demands we re-examine the manner in which he has been employed by previous historians and archaeologists, as well as our own reception of the *Periegesis* and the manner in which it contrives to frame our research.

U. Bultrighini : Non credo che la difesa dell'identità culturale dei Greci, la conservazione della loro memoria sociale, sia il motivo unico e vero per cui le guerre persiane sono ampiamente evocate nella *Periegesi*. Sono due le considerazioni da fare :

1) Un *imitator Herodoti* non poteva che assegnare un grande spazio al conflitto dei Greci coi Persiani. Ci dovremmo stupire semmai del contrario.

2) All'interno del motivo non è legittimo mettere sullo stesso piano i riferimenti alla battaglia di Maratone e quelli alla battaglia di Salamina. Pausania è ideologicamente legato all'elaborazione teorica del IV secolo a.C. e mutua da questo livello culturale la valutazione e la presentazione di un evento epocale sentito *ovviamente* come patrimonio personale dei Greci. Il ruolo e il rilievo della battaglia di Maratone nella *Periegesi* è enormemente superiore a quello della battaglia di Salamina : è evidente che in questo caso il movente profondo è semmai l'aderenza a un'ideologia oplitica che in determinati filoni della tradizione sulle guerre persiane aveva operato distinzioni puntuali di merito. Quando parafrasa l'epigramma sepolcrale di Eschilo, nel passo che Lei ha citato (I 14, 5), Pausania approfitta immediatamente per inserire una valutazione riduttiva nei confronti della battaglia dell'Artemisio e di Salamina : una valutazione di merito e un richiamo esplicito che nell'epigramma non c'erano.

In generale direi che quella delle guerre persiane è una tematica *vissuta* naturalmente, spontaneamente, *da greco, dall'interno* – come patrimonio comune dei Greci ma anche con tutte le articolazioni e le differenziazioni nei giudizi e nelle posizioni ideologiche che emergono nel corso della tradizione – piuttosto

che uno schema, un blocco unitario, applicato intenzionalmente dall'esterno per ribadire una difesa dell'identità culturale dei Greci.

S.E. Alcock : There is no question but that Pausanias' treatment of the Persian Wars has been, can be, and should be interpreted in a variety of fashions, including with greater attention to the specific treatment of individual elements in that conflict. In my paper, I have adopted one admittedly alternative, and certainly not exclusive, approach to the matter, an approach that consciously avoided the issue of Pausanias' models or sources. My fear is that, by always beginning from the premise that Pausanias imitates Herodotus (or indeed anyone else) we lose sight of the basic fact that Pausanias *chose* to adopt a certain model, and thus to celebrate certain themes. My concern is that the importance and implications of the themes Pausanias selects for treatment, and his personal agenda for his work, are too often overwhelmed in the search for his progenitors .

Ø. Andersen : Irrespective of whether it seems to us to be legitimate to subsume the text of Pausanias under the paradigm of ethnographic writing and to submit it to what one might call ethnographic discourse analysis, it seems to me that ethnography is relevant to Pausanias and vice versa in a more pedestrian way.

Pausanias often refers to oral sources, of which it would be worth the while to make an inventory and classification. There are e.g. individuals; persons with particular functions - *exegetai*, the *nomophylax* of Elis (VI 23.6), perhaps the *μνημονεύοντες* in a technical sense (e.g. II 18.2; VIII 14.12); "the most respected Elean citizens, and with them strangers also» (VI 26.2); elderly people (VIII 42.13); women (I 18.5; X 4.2); other collectives like "the locals", "the people of Pellene" etc.

Hardly in any single instance can we avoid to confront questions like : general knowledge or specific source ? oral or written source ? real source or fictitious source reference ? After cautious

consideration, however, we would still be left with a Pausanias *among* people, trying to get his picture right by talking *with* people. Something might emerge on when and how Pausanias exploits oral sources, and what different categories of information they yield : on monuments, local legends, myth and cult, genealogy and history, sayings, etymologies, oracle stories (e.g. IV 32.5 f.). I suggest there is something to be gained from a fresh and close look at Pausanias in the field.

S.E. Alcock : I agree that closer scrutiny of the contents in which Pausanias consults oral sources would be worthwhile, to see if any patterning emerges in who precisely he consults in which situation or on what topic. Certainly a wider variety of types of people are mentioned than is sometimes acknowledged. I do wonder about the extent to which such a study would be hamstrung from the start by Pausanias' normal practice of saying very little about his informants – the implications of which practice I discuss in my paper.

W. Ameling : Wir stimmen sicher alle damit überein, daß Pausanias ein bewußt auswählender Autor ist und aus einer Menge möglicher 'landscapes' eine herausgesucht und beschrieben hat. In den meisten Fällen haben wir keine Möglichkeit seine Auswahl zu bewerten, so daß wir bei dieser allgemeinen Aussage stehen bleiben müssen. Es scheint mir nur zwei Wege zu geben, die zu einer kontrollierbaren Antwort auf die Frage nach seinen Selektionsprinzipien führen und damit vielleicht einen konkreten Hinweis auf die Art geben können, in der er seine 'landscapes of memory' aufbaut.

1) Der archäologische Weg. Es gibt, denke ich, einige Plätze, an denen die Ausgrabungen genügend weit fortgeschritten sind, um einen Vergleich mit der Darstellung des Pausanias zu ermöglichen (Agora, Akropolis etc.). Hier kann man sehen, welche 'alternative landscapes' möglich gewesen wären und aus den Auslassungen bzw. Akzenten seine Schlüsse ziehen.

2) Der philologisch-historische Weg. Wir haben ja alle betont, daß Pausanias seinem Publikum keine altbekannten Geschichten erzählen will – und es gibt genügend Selbstaussagen des Periegeten in dieser Richtung. Trotz dieses Anspruchs erzählt Pausanias eine Menge bekannter Geschichten. Ein präziser Vergleich mit den erhaltenen Quellen (allen voran Herodot) ist vielleicht ebenfalls interessant für die Art der Auswahl und die Konstruktion der ‘Erinnerungslandschaften’. Sollte es leichte Veränderungen der Vorlagen in eine bestimmte Richtung geben, so könnte dies auch erklären, weshalb Pausanias – trotz seines Anspruchs auf Neuheiten – die bekannten Geschichten noch einmal erzählt.

Die Ergebnisse dieser Arbeiten müßten schließlich die Berechtigung des gewählten Zugangs erweisen.

S.E. Alcock : I find these two valid suggestions of ways to ‘retroactively test’ Pausanias’ criteria of selection and to reconstruct alternative ‘landscapes of memory’. As an archaeologist I can perhaps comment more fruitfully on the first possibility. It is disturbing that, for the most part, far from using archaeological evidence to challenge the *Periegesis*, Pausanias has been used – in some instances almost slavishly – to validate the material record. Indeed, this annoying dependence first stimulated my personal suspicion that Pausanias might be a far more problematic authority than was generally supposed. While W. Ameling’s suggestion is a healthy antidote to this state of affairs, it must be remembered that even the most ‘total’ excavation can only recover a partial sample of ‘what Pausanias actually saw’, nor can it recover the range of meanings and associations represented by a particular monument. This inevitably hampers our ability to determine which particular memories he chose to record, and which he did not.

I do have an even more fundamental concern with Walter Ameling’s suggestions, and that is the danger of abuse if they are pushed too far, and strict ‘rules’ generated about Pausanias’ principles of selectivity. Despite all attempts at rehabilitation and reconstruction, there will always remain an ‘unknown universe’ of

potential 'landscapes of memory' untravelled by Pausanias. Comparative reading in anthropology and ethnography (for later and better documented periods) about the struggle between 'local' and 'official' histories would be another salutary reminder of just how much contestation over the control of social memory we have lost in our dependence on the *Periegesis*.

E.L. Bowie : I would like to take up the issues raised by U. Bultrighini's point based on Pausanias' choice of Herodotus as a model. Pausanias did not *have* to choose Herodotus as his model: once he has done so, he has indeed weighted the scales in the direction of giving especial prominence to τὰ Μηδικά – but we must allow that this consequence was one of which he may have taken account when he made his choice, and hence that to some degree he *chose* to compose a text in which the rôle of τὰ Μηδικά would be prominent.

There are many points I have been stimulated by in this splendid paper. I would like to pick out just three issues.

First, although I appreciate that, in the concept of this paper, only one of the themes to which Pausanias accords recurrent prominence could be examined, I think there is a danger in leaving *your* 'reader/audience' with just that theme and its implications in their minds. The effect Pausanias' text as a whole might be expected to have must be the result of all such highlighted themes, of the ways they are mutually related and of the relative prominence given to each. Now some of the other recurrent historical themes might in fact corroborate the sorts of conclusion you seek to draw from Pausanias' handling of τὰ Μηδικά, e.g. the resistance of Greek cities, especially Athens, to Philip or to Hellenistic super-monarchs; and of course the Achaean resistance to Rome. But others might dilute the brew, and only a full assessment could give fully persuasive results (noting, perhaps, rather less prominence to Τρωϊκά than in some other texts).

My second point concerns your 'alternative landscapes' of memory, the versions that Pausanias' choices exclude. In the area

of local μυθολογούμενα, which is where we often see him making choices, would presentation of one of the alternative ‘landscapes’ have made a substantive difference to the impression conveyed by the text as a whole?

My third point tries to probe your statement (on p. 245) that “the journey is presented experientially ... from Pausanias’ personal vantage point, with the reader told what they would ‘see’ if they were present”... There seem to me to be *two* vantage points, not *one*, and it is the second that is the regular one. I am struck by how rarely Pausanias claims autopsy or makes his own ‘seeing’ of an object the explicit basis of his account, by comparison, for example, with Herodotus. Rather his more typical articulation by prepositions of place or by participles in agreement with no explicitly stated person (e.g. ἐρχομένοις II 11.3; ἀνιοῦσιν II 10.7; ἐσελθοῦσι II 7.7) contributes to an impression of objectivity which, as you discuss, bolsters his authority and reduces any temptation to question his version of how things are. (By the 160s, after all, claims to autopsy could as readily suggest fraudulence as veracity, cf. Lucian, *Verae Historiae* I 1-3).

To return to the question of how far Pausanias is making conscious and deliberate choices in his embarking on his work and thereby committing himself to some degree to the recurrent foregrounding of Marathon, Thermopylae and Salamis : he is surely in a different position from the sophist whose declamation takes one of these heroic struggles as his theme or starting point, since that sophist chooses the theme from a limited range of favoured themes (that there is this limited range is a different issue) and indeed may have the theme proposed to him from the floor, by a member of his audience. Pausanias starts with a much less fettered choice – and given his interest in myth, he *could* have decided to write a literary text in which *only* myth figured, like Apollodorus or Antoninus Liberalis. Instead his fusion of myth and later ‘history’ was bound to lead him, as he must have seen, into τὰ Μηδικά.

Contrary to the view of François Chamoux, I do not think that it is inappropriate to classify part of Pausanias' activity as that of an ethnographer. In his model Herodotus Pausanias will have found similar (even the same ?) techniques of putting questions and reconciliation of or choice between different answers applied by the enquirer both to Ἕλληνες and to non-Greek peoples. He need not therefore see that there should be a fundamental difference between investigation of one's own culture (in his case, τὰ Ἑλληνικά) of that of others.

S.E. Alcock : On your preliminary remark, I have no response. Many thanks for these very apt questions! On your first point : any writing becomes a selective enterprise (this isn't a problem confined to Pausanias!), and you are right to point out that I have followed but one out of a multitude of 'paths' through the *Periegesis*. Numerous patterns of meaning could be traced in the wealth of memories Pausanias records, and by no means need they all lead in the same directions. I do find themes of resistance to external threat to be a very powerful motif (recurrent in *logoi* and *theoremata*) threading through the *Periegesis* but would never argue that this was the only 'conclusion' we could draw. Need we look for a unitary 'effect' of the text as a whole ?

On your second point : I suppose it depends on the scale by which you measure a 'substantive difference'. My contention is that Pausanias is throughout selecting and preserving one version of local tradition over another. To the overall schema of his work, as later readers have generally interpreted it, such issues as whether a god was born in x or y locale would make little difference. If, however, we turn to the *Periegesis* as a representation of local histories, as experienced and articulated by local individuals themselves, then his choice of one 'memory' over another is crucial. We can't recover memories 'lost' in this fashion, but we can acknowledge their potential existence and read Pausanias as a less 'closed' and authoritative source.

As for your third issue, I remain unconvinced that there are really two 'vantage points' in the *Periegesis*. My argument is that whatever the reader 'sees', he sees from Pausanias' own selective point of view – though Pausanias (as you point out) rarely puts himself forward in any sense as a 'lens' for his audience. This total reliance upon the author, masked though it is by his stance of relative 'invisibility', is (as you say) a striking, and I find a very powerful, narrative strategy.

Thank you for your observation, which again highlights the, I think very necessary, emphasis on Pausanias' relative freedom of choice in structuring and composing the *Periegesis*, and our need to examine what he did *not choose* to do, as well as what he did.