PAUSANIAS: A GREEK PILGRIM IN THE ROMAN WORLD*

The mere act of enumeration has a power of enchantment all its own.[1]

This is an article about cultural identity. I examine 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. Pausanias' *Description of Greece* reveals how one person saw himself, how he established his identity, personal, collective and cultural, in Greece in the second century A.D.[2] A text 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. In the case of Pausanias, we can see the relative significance of these aspects of the culture in their impact on the writer's view of himself and his project. By comparing Pausanias with travel-writers of the early Christian period, we can grasp not only some surprising continuities between pagan and Christian culture, but also some profound differences in how the holy was perceived and experienced.

For about thirty years, between A.D. 150 and 180, Pausanias travelled through mainland Greece describing the monuments

* An early version of this article was read at the "Loxbridge" conference of ancient historians in 1988 at the session chaired by Fergus Millar. I am grateful to him, to all who took part, and to Mary Beard, John Henderson, Roger Ling, Robin Osborne and Anthony Snodgrass who have commented on more recent drafts. My special thanks for his advice and encouragement are due to Keith Hopkins.

[1] M. Foucault, *The Order of Things* (London, 1970), p. xvi.

[2] Pausanias' *Description of Greece* is most readily available in English in the translation by Peter Levi (Harmondsworth, 1971). However, readers should be wary of this version, since it restructures the text so as to turn it into a modern guidebook to Greece, and thus loses the original structure which I shall argue is very important to understanding Pausanias. The most distinguished version is that by Sir James Frazer in the first volume of his commentary, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 6 vols. (London, 1898). On the text, its author and the manuscript tradition, see A. Diller, *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition* (Amsterdam, 1983), pp. 137-82.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

which he found of interest.[3] He recorded his impressions of those monuments together with a great many vignettes, myths and anecdotes in a *periegesis* (description) of ten books. With the notable exception of Paul Veyne,[4] critics have tended to see Pausanias as a bit of a pedant — an accurate, if plodding, observer of monuments, who cluttered his text with "irrelevant" digressions into myth and history.[5] The historical accuracy of his discussions has been frequently attacked, while their archaeological and topographical accuracy has been much lauded and used as a basis for further research.[6] Archaeologists have culled Pausanias for descriptions evoking what sites were like in the second century.[7] Historians of religion have also found much of anthropological interest in the stories Pausanias recorded.[8] Such approaches have tended to focus on particular stories or monuments which Pausanias discussed. They are interested not in his manner of approach or means of viewing, but in the objects he viewed. Those few attempts to present an overview of the whole text have examined the personality of Pausanias, the fact that he was a traveller, and the historical and archaeological trustworthiness of his observations.[9]

[3] For the date, see Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, i, pp. xvi-xviii; C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1985), pp. 8-11, summarizes earlier literature. For summaries of Pausanias' life and work with bibliography, see O. Regenbogen, "Pausanias", in G. Wissowa, W. Kroll and K. Mittelhaus (eds.), *Paulys Realencyclopaedie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband viii (Stuttgart, 1956), pp. 1008-97; E. Pernice and W. H. Gross, "Der Periegese des Pausanias", in U. Hausmann (ed.), *Allgemeine Grundlagen der Archaeologie* (Munich, 1969), pp. 402-8.

[4] P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?*, trans. P. Wissing (Chicago, 1988), p. 3.

[5] Some have thought the digressions to be the chief interest of Pausanias' work, and even doubted that he saw the monuments he describes. See, in particular, U. von Willamowitz-Moellendorf, "Die Thukidideslegende", *Hermes*, xii (1877), pp. 326-67, esp. pp. 344-7; C. Robert, *Pausanias als Schriftsteller* (Berlin, 1909); H. L. Ebeling, "Pausanias as an Historian", *Classical Weekly*, vii (1913), pp. 138-41, 146-50; the argument is reviewed by Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, pp. 164-75.

[6] See Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, appendix 1, pp. 164-75, for a summary of the attack on Pausanias. Habicht himself (esp. *ibid.*, ch. 2, pp. 28-63) leads the defence. On his reliability, see also R. E. Wycherley, "Pausanias and Praxiteles", *Hesperia*, suppl. no. 20 (1982), pp. 182-3, 188 f.

[7] See, for example, G. Daux, *Pausanias à Delphes* (Paris, 1936); G. Roux, *Pausanias en Corinthie* (Paris, 1958). For a bibliography of other examples, see M. Jost, "Pausanias en Megalopolitide", *Revue des études anciennes*, lxxv (1973), nn. 1, 2.

[8] See, in particular, M. G. Verral and J. E. Harrison, *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens* (London, 1890); Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*.

[9] See Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, introd.; J. Heer, *La personnalité de Pausanias* (Paris, 1979), on his personality and religion; L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London, 1974), pp. 292-300, for travel; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

My project in this article is somewhat different. Pausanias' acknowledged intention was to represent "all things Greek" (*panta ta hellenika*) (i.26.4).[10] No critic has sought to examine the text of Pausanias as an account of "all things Greek", as a unique attempt to systematize and encapsulate all that was interesting to the Greek-speaker about Greece at the height of the Roman empire. After setting Pausanias' writings in their historical and literary context, I shall focus on what his narrative, as a systematic enumeration of Greece, reveals about Greek identity in the second century A.D.

Pausanias offers us a guide to the formation of Greek religious identity as a form of resistance to the realities of Roman rule.[11] His text relates that sense of Greek identity both to specific privileged places in Greece and to the myth-histories which these places evoked. Pausanias presented his narrative of places in the order his readers would experience them if they too were making his journey. The reader travels through the text as Pausanias himself travelled through Greece. This means that the reader encounters the many different and previously independent localities of Greece within a single text encapsulating the whole. The way Pausanias structured his subject matter reveals an attempt to transcend the historical realities of conflict and division among the Greeks in search of a myth-history which might evoke the image of a free, unified Greece. This vision of the past (apart from being more of a mythical ideal than an historical fact) clearly conflicts with the realities of Pausanias' own day. In the second century A.D. Greece may have been united, but it was certainly not free. It was a province of the Roman empire.[12] The inevitable tension between this myth of Greek identity and the facts of Roman rule was resolved for Pausanias only by evoking a religious identity, deeper than socio-political realities, which lay in the sacred sites and monuments of Greece. The text provides a link between the external signs of the holy (statues, temples and sacred spots) and the inward experience of the holy. It offers a key to the formation of religious subjectivity in the ancient world. In

[10] Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, p. xxii; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, pp. 5-6.

[11] For a brief account of some aspects of Greek identity under the Roman empire, see R. Browning, "Greeks and Others", in his *History, Language and Literacy in the Byzantine World* (London, 1989), pp. 8-11.

[12] For some reflections on Greece in this period, see S. E. Alcock, "Roman Imperialism in the Greek Landscape", *Jl. Roman Archaeol.*, ii (1989), pp. 5-34; M. H. Crawford, "Rome and the Greek World", *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, xxx (1977), pp. 42-52.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

effect an analysis of this well-known text can shed valuable light on the cultural assumptions of the high empire, which in their turn gave rise to attitudes we would regard as typical of late antiquity.

I
HISTORICAL AND LITERARY CONTEXT

The usual view of Pausanias regards him as an antiquarian, writing a guidebook ("the Greek Baedeker") in an age of literary and linguistic antiquarianism — the so-called "Second Sophistic".[13] In this period travel for the sake of educated tourism became increasingly popular,[14] perhaps on the model of the extensive imperial journeys which had become a necessary part of the emperor's role.[15] This view of Pausanias, a reasonable estimate in many respects, is, however, deeply misleading. It rightly assimilates Pausanias' travels to the kind of learned tourism so well evoked by his earlier compatriot, the essayist and biographer Plutarch (*c.* A.D. 47-120), in the following sketch:

> Cleombrotus of Sparta . . . had made many excursions in Egypt and about the land of the cave-dwellers, and had sailed beyond the Persian Gulf; his journeyings were not for business, but he was fond of seeing things and of acquiring knowledge; he had wealth enough and . . . so he employed his leisure for such purposes; he was getting together a history to serve as a basis for a philosophy which had as its aim theology, as he himself

[13] On Pausanias as a Baedeker, Murray or Blue Guide, see Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, p. xxiv; G. Pasquali, "Die schriftstellerische Form des Pausanias", *Hermes*, xlviii (1913), p. 161; B. P. Réardon, *Courants littéraires grecs* (Paris, 1971), p. 222; Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, pp. 292 f.; K. Muller, *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung*, ii (Wiesbaden, 1980), p. 177; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, p. 20; R. Chevallier, *Voyages et déplacements dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 1988), p. 50; J. Ferguson, *Among the Gods* (London, 1990), p. 77. Only Veyne, *Did the Greeks*, pp. 3, 101, openly contests the "injustice" of this assessment. On the "Second Sophistic", see G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969); G. W. Bowersock (ed.), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (University Park, 1974); E. L. Bowie, "The Importance of Sophists", *Yale Classical Studies*, xxvii (1982), pp. 29-60.

[14] For the "antiquarian tourist" view of ancient travel, see the classic chapters in L. Friedlaender, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Röms*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1921-3), i, pp. 318-490; Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, pp. 229-330; E. D. Hunt, "Travel, Tourism and Piety in the Roman Empire", *Echos du monde classique*, xxviii (1984), pp. 391-417 (pp. 398-401 on Pausanias).

[15] See F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London, 1977), pp. 28-40; H. Halfmann, *Itinera Principum: Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im römischen Reich* (Stuttgart, 1986), esp. pp. 143-56; K. Holum, "Hadrian and St. Helena: Imperial Travel and the Origins of Christian Holy Land Pilgrimage", in R. Ousterhout (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* (Urbana, 1990), pp. 66-81.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

named it. He had recently been at the shrine of Ammon and it was plain that he was not particularly impressed by most of the things there.[16]

Pausanias may be compared with this type of traveller in the wealth and leisure he must have enjoyed to conduct his travels, and in his interest in writing. But there the comparison stops. He differed from the pattern implied by Cleombrotus in two fundamental aspects. First, most unusually, Pausanias chose to travel in and write about *his own native land*. He himself was aware that this was somewhat peculiar:

> The Greeks appear apt to regard with greater wonder foreign sights than sights at home. For whereas distinguished historians have described the Egyptian pyramids in the minutest detail, they have not made the briefest mention of the treasury of Minyas and the walls of Tiryns, though these are no less marvellous (ix.36.5).

Greek writers preferred to turn their gaze upon the foreign than upon the self. The strangeness of Pausanias' enterprise lies in recording the monuments and rituals of his own society rather than those of other peoples.[17] He was self-consciously exploring Greek identity through looking at "all things Greek" rather than implicitly defining it by contrast with things Egyptian or Scythian (as, for example, Herodotus did[18]).

Secondly, Pausanias' interests lay in religious sites and ceremonies. Although Plutarch's readers encounter Cleombrotus at the oracular shrine of Delphi and the account of him mentions a trip to a temple of Ammon, Cleombrotus' interests are not essentially religious. The discussion he conducted at the opening of the essay centred on obscure mathematical problems concerning the length of the year. When asked about the oracle of Ammon, he "made no reply and did not look up".[19] In fact the essay in which he appears is about the obsolescence of oracles in the Greece of Plutarch's time. By contrast, as critics have not failed

[16] Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum*, ii.410AB.

[17] For a brief account of Pausanias' view of Greece in the context of his view of world geography, see C. Jacob, "The Greek Traveler's Areas of Knowledge: Myths and Other Discourses in Pausanias's *Description of Greece*", *Yale French Studies*, lix (1980), pp. 65-85, esp. pp. 69-73.

[18] On Herodotus and the other, see F. Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus* (Berkeley, 1988). For a discussion of these different types of Greek ethnography, see J. Elsner, "From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monuments, Travel and Writing", in S. D. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Art and Text in Greek Culture* (Cambridge, forthcoming 1993).

[19] Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum*, iii.410C-411D, v.411E.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

to note, Pausanias is interested almost obsessively (though not exclusively) in things religious.[20]

The religious bias of Pausanias differentiates him significantly from travellers of more generally antiquarian interests. He was not simply an outsider seeking interesting information; he was (like his Latin-speaking contemporary Apuleius[21]) a potential insider, an initiate in at least some of the sanctuaries he visited.[22] A religious tourist visiting sacred sites is *not* simply a tourist: he or she is also a pilgrim. When visiting the cave of Demeter Melaine at Mt. Elaius, Pausanias tells us that "it was mainly to see this Demeter that I came to Phigalia" (viii.42.11).[23] The trip had meant a long journey west of Megalopolis in Arcadia. The cave Pausanias found was "sacred" (viii.42.1, 3: *hieron*), for here Demeter had hidden in grief for the rape of Persephone. And yet there was nothing to *see*. The horse-headed wooden cult-image, which Pausanias described from hearsay (viii.42.4-5), had been destroyed by fire, and its replacement, a bronze by the sculptor Onatas (viii.42.6-10), "no longer existed in my time, and most of the Phigalians were ignorant that it had ever existed at all" (viii.42.12). Yet the site was holy; it had a number of special rites, a priestess and three assistants. Pausanian travel was as much about making contact with the sanctity embodied in a place as it was about tourism. Pausanian viewing (as in the expression "to *see* this Demeter") was as much about perceiving the (in this case invisible) presence of the holy as it was about looking at art.

In effect, Pausanias' historical context is to be sought as much among the many pilgrims of antiquity who sought cures, explanations for dreams and visions of gods in the great cult centres (particularly of Asia Minor) as among the antiquarian intellectuals with whom he is so often associated.[24] His account, far from being merely a catalogue of monuments, gives us first-hand literary access to the world of pagan pilgrimage. In this sense, it can perhaps best be compared with the earliest Christian pilgrim

[20] See Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, pp. xxv-xxviii; Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias*, pp. 127-314; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, pp. 23, 151 f.

[21] Apuleius, *Apologia*, lv: "I have been initiated into various of the Greek mysteries".

[22] In particular, Pausanias appears to have been an initiate of Demeter and Kore: see Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias*, pp. 132-4; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, p. 156.

[23] On the Demeter of Phigalia, see Jost, "Pausanias en Megalopolitide", p. 249; Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias*, pp. 160-7.

[24] Many aspects of pagan cult and pilgrimage are brilliantly evoked by R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (London, 1986), pp. 27-261.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

accounts from the fourth century A.D.[25] But these pilgrims travelled *somewhere else* — to a Holy Land which was not their own.[26] It is Pausanias' insistence on *his own land*, on a journey into his own cultural roots, which makes his text both rewarding and unusual.

As anthropologists of Hindu and Buddhist pilgrimage have shown, there is a deep sense of place in the kind of religious travel which takes a pilgrim like Pausanias to the sacred centres of his *own* land (as opposed to the Muslim-Christian model of a journey to a holy land which is elsewhere).[27] In the East Asian model, pilgrimage becomes "an encounter between the individual and his geography, a cultural mode by which people express their personal identification with the continent . . . a means by which geography is made a part of their psyche and culture".[28] The orientation in space provided by pilgrimage is not simply geographic or cultural. It directly concerns the religious and moral assumptions which are a frequent aspect of Pausanias' commentary on what he described,[29] and which the philosopher Charles

[25] See esp. *Itinerarium Egeriae*, ed. P. Maraval (Paris, 1982); trans. by J. Wilkinson as *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 1981); the journey of the Bordeaux Pilgrim of A.D. 333, in *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, ed. P. Geyer and O. Cuntz (Corpus script. Christianorum [hereafter C.S.C.], ser. lat., clxxv, Turnhout, 1965); partially trans. by Wilkinson in *Egeria's Travels*, pp. 153-63. For a general discussion of the phenomenon, see E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, AD 312-460* (Oxford, 1982).

[26] For Christian pilgrimage as a journey to an "other world", see M. B. Campbell, *The Witness and the Other World* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1988), esp. pp. 15-44, on Egeria; for the emergence of a characteristically Christian conception of the Holy Land, see J. Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago, 1987), esp. pp. 88-95, on Egeria; R. A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 139-55, on "holy places and holy people".

[27] On location and sacred geography, see D. L. Eck, "India's *Tīrthas*: 'Crossings' in Sacred Geography", *Hist. Religion*, xx (1981), pp. 323-44, esp. p. 323; T. S. Naidu, "Pilgrims and Pilgrimage: A Case Study of the Tirumala-Tirupati Devasthanams", in M. Jha (ed.), *Dimensions of Pilgrimage* (Delhi, 1985), p. 17. On Christian pilgrimage as a journey *elsewhere*, see Campbell, *Witness and the Other World*, p. 18.

[28] J. J. Preston, "Sacred Centres and Symbolic Networks in South Asia", *Mankind Quart.*, xx (1980), p. 269 (quoting the unpublished work of B. Aziz).

[29] For example, see Pausanias' comments on fate (e.g., iv.9.6, "human affairs and human purpose above all are obscured by fate, just as the mud of a river hides a pebble"; c.f. viii.24.13); on modern morality (e.g., viii.2.5, "at the present time, when sin has grown to such a height and has been spreading over every land and every city, no longer do men turn into gods, except in the flattering words addressed to despots"); on piety (e.g., concerning Hadrian, i.5.5; the Athenians, i.17.1, 24.3; Antoninus Pius, viii.43.5); and impiety (e.g., concerning Sulla, i.20.7; the Achaeans, vii.10.1; Aristocrates son of Aechmis, viii.5.11; Philip, son of Amyntas, viii.7.5).

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

Taylor has tied to the notion of identity.[30] In short pilgrimage is a journey into one's identity in its topographic, cultural and spiritual resonances. Pausanias' journey to the sacred sites of Greece was no exception.

In antiquity Pausanias was unique. Although there are several examples of travel literature from the third century B.C., no one appears to have produced anything more comprehensive than a specific monograph on a single monument or limited area.[31] The interests of such descriptions may well have been significantly different from those of Pausanias, to judge by the extant portions of a second-century B.C. account of Attica and Boeotia preserved under the name of Pseudo-Dicaearchus.[32] This description, full of "slight highly-coloured sketches" with a "strong leaning to gossip and scandal" (as J. G. Frazer put it),[33] has great human interest, but displays almost none in religion. And yet Pausanias owed much to such ethnographic writing, of which perhaps the most important tradition flourished in Alexandria under the Ptolemies, and which is best represented today by the great geography of Strabo.[34] His work was ethnographically and descriptively much richer than either the bare guidebooks and lists produced to enumerate monuments and districts in the cities,[35] or the bald catalogues of coastal towns (with their precise

[30] C. Taylor, *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 3 f., 27-8, 43-4, esp. p. 28: "the essential link between identity and orientation. To know who you are is to be orientated in moral space".

[31] On Pausanias' predecessors, see Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, pp. lxxxii-xc; Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias*, pp. 9-12.

[32] The fragments of Pseudo-Dicaearchus are edited by C. Müller in *Geographi Graeci minores*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1882), i, pp. 97-110; for a partial translation, see Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, pp. xliii-xlviii.

[33] Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, pp. xlvii-xlviii.

[34] On Alexandrian geographies, see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1972), i, pp. 520-53; for descriptions of Alexandria itself (in particular Strabo's Book 17), see *ibid.*, pp. 7-37.

[35] For ancient guidebooks to cities, see G. Hermansen, "The Population of Imperial Rome: The Regionaries", *Historia*, xxvii (1978), pp. 129-68, esp. pp. 131-8, 140 f., on the enumerative lists of Roman monuments which go under the collective name of "regionaries" and the comparable *notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae*. The "regionaries" are collected and edited by H. Jordan in *Topographie der Stadt Rom in Alterthum*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1871), ii, appendix; R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti, in *Codice topografico della città di Roma* (Rome, 1940), pp. 63-258; A. Nordh, in *Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae* (Lund, 1949). Such accounts were drawn on by Zachariah Rhetor for his description of Rome in the *Syriac Chronicle*, x.16: see Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Röm*, ii, pp. 525-7; *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori*, ed. E. W. Brooks, 2 vols. (C.S.C., Script. Syrii, 3rd ser., lv-lvi, Louvain, 1919-21), ii, pp. 131-4; trans. F. J. Hamilton as *The Ecclesiastical History of Zacharius Rhetor* (London, 1892), pp. 317-19. For the *notitia* of Constantinople, see *Notitia dignitatum*, ed. O. Seeck

(cont. on p. 11)

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

entries about items for import and export) made by merchant travellers.[36] Pausanias combined the precision and aim for comprehensiveness implicit in such practical guidebooks with the more lively descriptive ambitions of Greek literary ethnography.

The unique achievement of Pausanias lay not just in his attempt to describe *the whole* of Greece, but also in his balance between comprehensive enumeration, the retelling of myth-histories and the urge to present the course of his travels experientially. His strategy was to select and compile the "most noteworthy" sights, to crystallize the "most famous legends" around the images that encapsulated them.[37] Pausanias' Greece was the past glorified *qua* past, but living and present still in the myth-historical and sacred presence of its sacred images. This is one reason, ideologically, why Pausanias was above all obsessed with religious monuments.[38] These works of art were not merely a decoration on the landscape — they transformed the landscape with the presence of a particular god, story or myth.[39]

II

STRUCTURING GREECE: PLACE AS MYTH AND AS EXPERIENCE

Like fourth-century Christian travellers to the Holy Land, such as Egeria or the Bordeaux Pilgrim of A.D. 333, Pausanias structured his Greece on the pattern of his own travels. We move in the text, as the traveller himself journeyed, from centre to centre. This was by no means to be expected in a work like Pausanias' *Description*. There was nothing unusual about a pilgrim like Egeria

(n. 35 cont.)

(Berlin, 1876), pp. 229-43; for the topographic descriptions of Constantinople that survive in the text of Codinus, see *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. T. Preger, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1901-7), ii.

[36] See, in particular, the *Periplus of the Erithraean Sea*, dating from about A.D. 95-130, ed. and trans. W. Schoff (London, 1912), G. W. B. Huntingford (London, 1980), L. Casson (Princeton, 1989).

[37] This goal was announced frequently: for example, "The most noteworthy sight in the Piraeus is a precinct of Athena and Zeus" (i.1.3); "The most noteworthy things which I found the city of Epidaurus itself had to show are these" (ii.29.1); among numerous other instances, see i.39.3, ii.10.4, 13.3, 15.1, 20.7, 23.7, 25.4, 30.10, iii.19.6, viii.54.7, x.32.1.

[38] On the concentration on sacred images, see Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, pp. xxv f.; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, p. 23, n. 91; Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, p. 296.

[39] On Pausanias, locative myths and "divine presence", see Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, pp. 111 f. On the importance of images in pagan cults, see *ibid.*, pp. 66-8. On Pausanias and local myths, see Veyne, *Did the Greeks*, p. 17.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

making an effort to write a personal account of the pattern and order in which she experienced the holy places. After all she had come far from her home (probably in Gaul), and it is likely that she was writing for a circle of pious women, one of whose devotional acts may have been to read her account.[40] But Pausanias was describing a *familiar* world, the classic sites of the Greek mainland, in a text aimed at Greek readers. Moreover the usual ethnographic pattern in antiquity, as evidenced by Strabo's book on Greece (the eighth book of his *Geography*), dealt with a country as a whole, breaking it up thematically or by area, according to a map.

No other pagan author, so far as I know, emphasized so insistently the personal and experiential nature of seeing what one sees in the order one travelled to see it. Pausanias himself employed a thematic structure in his excursus on Ionia (vii.2.2-5.13). The discussion of Ionia lacks the phenomenology of travel, the sense of "this is how one does it, this comes next on the road". His experiment in an alternative structure shows that Pausanias thought carefully about how to present his description. It mattered that Greece be more than an enumeration, that it be an *experience*, a journey into identity.

The first book begins by taking us not anywhere, but into Athens itself — at its port, Piraeus. After a leisurely exploration of Athens which moves from the Piraeus (i.1) into the city (i.2) and through the districts of the city such as the Cerameicus (i.3-14) and the Agora (i.17 f.) via a multitude of myths and stories up to the city's heart, the Acropolis (i.22-8), Pausanias takes us out of the centre into the outskirts. Via the Areopagus (i.28.4 f.), the Academy and the graveyard (i.29.2-30.3), we move into the numerous small parishes (*demoi*) (i.31.1 f.). Beyond these are the mountains, Pentelicus, Parnes and Hymettus (i.32.1 f.), Marathon (i.32.3 f.), Brauron (i.33.1 f.) and at i.34.1 "the land of Oropus, between Attica and the land of Tanagra, which originally belonged to Boeotia [but] in our time belongs to the Athenians". Like pilgrim accounts in medieval Europe,[41] the text enacts the journey it describes by taking readers along the roads which they would use if they were making the trip themselves. This is

[40] See H. Sivan, "Holy Land Pilgrimage and Western Audiences: Some Reflections on Egeria and her Circle", *Classical Quart.*, xxxviii (1988), pp. 528-35, esp. p. 533.

[41] See J. B. Holloway, *The Pilgrim and the Book* (New York, 1987), esp. p. xiv.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

no bald enumeration, but an actor-centred account which enacts the very process of travel.

When he discussed the altars at Olympia, Pausanias twice reminded the reader that the order he chose was not merely descriptive, but experientially determined by the order used in ritual: "My narrative will follow in dealing with them the order in which the Eleans normally sacrifice" (v.14.4); and again, "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.14.10). The point was reiterated. How did one fully visit, fully see a place? One did it as the locals did it, one fitted into an identity. Here, in Olympia, one did it liturgically. If we could identify the altars described here in the archaeological remains, we could map an Elean liturgy which is a more important, more meaningful arrangement of space than mere juncture ("the order in which they stand"). The text's structuring of monuments (here on the small scale of a specific site) maps space and what space contains according to a pattern of human experience. This phenomenologically oriented structure is in its turn governed by a sense of identity — the sacredness or cultural importance of particular places, the enactment of particular rituals.

Between the major centres, such as Athens and Megara (i.39.4 f.), the road passes through many minor stops and outlying areas: Oropus (i.34), a diversion to the islands (i.35-6), Eleusis (i.38-9). All these belonged to Athens (i.39.3), while the Megaris was marked as different — independent of the Athenians (i.39.4) and its "neighbour" (vi.19.12). The text itself marks the boundary firmly with a sentence that rounds Athens off: "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). These borders, as felt by the traveller on the actual land and as announced to the reader by the text, are crucial. What they mark are not merely lines on a map, but boundaries and thresholds in the *experience* of Greece. They delimit places not simply topographically, but as areas of culture, of race, of identity. This is why the borders of districts so frequently coincide with the ends of the books in Pausanias' account.

The effect of the phenomenology is to present Pausanias' text as a mirror of Greece. The major centres (political and sacred)

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

and the movement between centres imitate the condition of Greece as a land of many *poleis* (city states), a multiplicity of conflicting and often contradictory identities. The text imitates Greece as it moves from place to place. And yet the totality of Pausanias' narrative totalizes Greece, bringing all the separate *hellenika* ("worlds of Greece") into one Greece. The act of travelling and the parallel act of writing actually undermine the diversity which the text wishes to emphasize. Greece becomes a cohering of the many *hellenika* into one image, one man's image, defined by its otherness in relation to other ethnographies, and above all to Rome. The very conflicts of the *hellenika* become a cohesive factor, a shared myth which brings them together against the "other" of Rome.

The actor-centred pattern implies both a *personal* view and the assumption that one's land must be experienced through such a personal view in order to be understood. Implicit here is an emphasis on geography as a mode of identity, on the subjective and affective qualities of place. The investigation of identity can be seen as the core of Pausanias' text. He used a constant cross-referencing of myths and narratives to bring places together. Such stories tie the many *hellenika* into a single whole, *through* myth-history. They provide the reader with what he needs to know — an identity, a meaning — by drawing on the general knowledge of a broad mythology of Greece which Pausanias assumed as his readers' cultural background.[42] Pausanias took great pains to get his myth-historical interpretations right — his care for accuracy here was no different (despite the comments of critics)[43] from the painstaking care taken in providing precise topographies. He regularly took the trouble to tie up any loose ends by referring the reader elsewhere in his text.[44]

In effect the text presents not only a journey through topography, but also a myth-historical interpretation of the meaning of that topography. This interpretation darts in and out of the

[42] I follow Veyne, *Did the Greeks*, pp. xi-xii, *passim*, in taking the disparate totality of myths, beliefs and truths accepted or criticized by a society as constituting its culture.

[43] See Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, p. 97, and the views he quotes in n. 6 there.

[44] For instance, the promise of an account of the exile of Polycaon son of Lelex at iii.1.1, provided at iv.1.1-2.1; "As to the cause of the [Messenian] war, the Lacedaimonian version differs from the Messenian. The accounts given by the belligerents, and the manner in which the war ended" are promised "later in my narrative" (iii.3.1, 5). The promise is fulfilled at iv.5.1 f.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

travelogue-structure, reorganizing the narrative of monuments and places according to a pattern, not of geography, but of mythology — an ideological pattern whereby identity, having already been located by place, is further defined by story.[45] The importance of these myth-histories is not primarily as narratives, but as a means for valorizing places within the totality of "Greece" as a cultural construct.[46] The fact that Pausanias was so alive to his myths, that he remembered and cross-referenced them so assiduously, shows their paramount importance to his notion of "Greece". He made sense of his Greece through them.

It is revealing that most of Pausanias' contextualizing stories plunge us into a past that was distant even in his own time.[47] The identity which his text evokes was grounded in the past. A clear instance of the pastness even of present identity is the case of the Corinthians, whose city had been laid waste by Mummius in 146 B.C. and only refounded in 44 B.C. by Julius Caesar as a Roman colony (ii.1.2). Despite its new population and Roman credentials, what interested Pausanias about Corinth were its ancient (pre-Roman) associations and sights, which were explained to Pausanias by his contemporary Corinthians. By virtue of being in that place, according to the Pausanian definition these people had become "Greek"; the place itself had imparted its identity to them. Hence the stories recounted of Corinth are about Artemis (ii.3.2) and Medea (ii.3.6 f.), Bellerophontes (ii.4.1 f.) and the ancient history of the Corinthian kings (ii.4.3-4).

More powerful still as a myth of identity is the extended history of the Messenians (iv.1-29). This tale describes "the many sufferings of the Messenians, how fate scattered them to the ends of the earth . . . and afterwards brought them safely home to

[45] This is why it is mistaken to attack Pausanias for historical inaccuracy — his history is no different from myth, since both are ways of constructing identity. On Pausanias and history, see Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, ch. 4 (esp. p. 97, n. 6). But it is too simple to assert that "Pausanias wanted to enliven his descriptions of regions, cities and monuments with historical facts" (*ibid.*, p. 96). This assumes that Pausanias the historian was different from Pausanias the guide (*ibid.*, p. 95), but in fact Pausanias was neither. The distinction of "history" or "tourism" or "pilgrimage" from the rest of Pausanias' ideological thrust is an entirely false one: to the Greek of the second century A.D. creating a nostalgic ideology of sacred and ancient Greece, history, geography and myth were all part of identity.

[46] *Contra* the assumption that Pausanias' narratives are digressions or additions which expand or enliven what is basically a topographic guide book: see, for example, *ibid.*, p. 96; Frazer, *Pausanias's Description*, i, p. xl: "to relieve the tedium of the topographic part of his work Pausanias introduced digressions".

[47] Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias*, pp. 69 f.; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, pp. 102 f.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

their own country (*oikeian*)" (iv.29.13). Identity here depends on more than geography — it is a myth partly of race, partly of dialect, above all of displacement and return, but focused on locality in the sense of loyalty to the traditions of one's home: "The wanderings of the Messenians outside the Peloponnese lasted almost 300 years, during which it is clear that they did not depart in any way from their local customs, and did not lose their Doric dialect, but even to our day have preserved the purest Doric in the Peloponnese" (iv.27.11). But this fierce loyalty was not enough. Only when they returned to the full identity of being *in* their proper place could the Messenians return to being fully Greek:

> I was exceedingly surprised to learn that while the Messenians were in exile from the Peloponnese, their luck at the Olympic Games failed. For . . . we know of no Messenian, either from Sicily or from Naupactus, who won a victory at Olympia . . . However, when the Messenians came back to the Peloponnese, their luck at the Olympic Games came with them (vi.2.10).

Identity transcended place. It was competitive in the pan-Hellenic tradition of the Games. But success, a nation's place in the Games (and in the pan-Hellenic tradition), was itself dependent on the correctness of locality. The Messenians were not truly themselves until their return. This return was more than merely a re-placement in the right place; it proved to be a return to their form as fully Greek, as competitors and victors in the pan-Hellenic Games.

Deeply implicated in this sense of identity was the repeated theme of autochthony — of peoples being born from the soil they inhabit.[48] This recurs in most of the books of Pausanias' *Description of Greece* from Erichthonius (i.2.6) to the Locrians (x.38.3).[49] Despite the fact that identities could change, it was the earliest link between a people and an environment that Pausanias was most keen to record: "The Stymphalians are no longer included

[48] On the ancient Greek myth of autochthony in its Athenian context, see C. Bérard, *Anodoi: essai sur l'imagerie des passages chthoniens* (Neuchatel, 1974), pp. 29-38; N. Loraux, *Les enfants d'Athéna* (Paris, 1981), pp. 7-26, 35-73; N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), pp. 148-50, 193-4, 277-8. On Pausanias and autochthony, see Jacob, "Greek Traveler's Areas of Knowledge", pp. 73-82.

[49] Some further examples of autochthony include Aras, ii.12.4; the Aeginetans, ii.29.2; Lelex, iii.1.1; Phlyus, iv.1.5; the Arcadians and Achaeans, v.1.1; Anax of Miletus and Coresus of Ephesus, vii.2.5-7; Eumelus, vii.18.2; Pheneos, viii.14.4; the Plataeans, ix.1.1; Ogygus of Thebes, ix.5.1; the Thebans sown by Cadmus, ix.10.1; Alalcomeneus, ix.33.5; Castalius, x.6.4; the first Sardinians, x.17.2; Ledon, x.33.1.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

among the Arcadians, but are numbered with the Argive league, which they joined of their own accord. That they are by race Arcadians is testified by the verses of Homer" (viii.22.1). Pausanias was looking to an ur-past. His Stymphalians (despite their later choices) were located bang in the middle of Arcadia not simply by race or the authority of the poetic canon, but by the very structure of Pausanias' own account (where they occupy a place in the middle of the eighth book).

III

IDENTITY PAST, IDENTITY PRESENT: PAUSANIAS AND THE ROMANS

Clearly, in looking to the past for a Greek identity, Pausanias was avoiding the present. The present was the Roman empire under Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. The present was a Greece that served, at best, as a culturally influential, but otherwise not especially significant, province in a huge system whose centres of power were elsewhere. Like the Jews, the Greeks were an ancient and independent people whose relations with their Roman rulers were deeply ambivalent.[50] In a passage which seems to anticipate many of Pausanias' concerns, Plutarch described the problem from the Greek point of view:

> The statesman, while making his native state readily obedient to its sovereigns, must not further humble it; nor when the leg has been fettered, go on and subject the neck to the yoke, as some do who, by referring everything great or small to the sovereigns, bring the reproach of slavery to their country.[51]

The need to balance obedience with limited freedom made for long-term complications in the attitude of Greeks towards the Romans. As with Plutarch, Pausanias' relations with the Romans were, not surprisingly, complex.[52]

In his description, Pausanias ignored monuments he must have

[50] For the Jews, see N. R. M. de Lange, "Jewish Attitudes to the Roman Empire", in P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 255-81; for the Greeks, see Browning, *History, Language and Literacy*, pp. 9-10.

[51] Plutarch, *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae*, xix.814EF.

[52] For Plutarch and the Romans, see R. H. Barrow, *Plutarch and his Times* (London, 1967), pp. 119-49; C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971); G. J. D. Aalders, *Plutarch's Political Thought* (Amsterdam, 1982), pp. 12-25. On Pausanias and the Romans, see J. Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund, 1959), pp. 63-74; B. Forte, *Rome and the Romans as the Greeks Saw Them* (Rome, 1972), pp. 418-27; Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias*, pp. 66-9; Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, pp. 117-64.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

seen, such as the great charioteer group commemorating Marcus Agrippa by the entrance of the Acropolis at Athens, or the temple of Rome and Augustus which was placed on the Acropolis in front of the Parthenon's east entrance.[53] On the other hand, he was generous in acknowledging some major Roman building programmes, such as Hadrian's temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens (i.18.6 f.).[54] Romans might be paradigms of virtue like Hadrian (i.3.2, 5.5) or Antoninus Pius ("a most religious man", viii.43.1-5). But they might also be exemplars of evil — for instance the impious Sulla (i.20.7, whose "mad outrages against the Greek cities and gods of the Greeks" were punished by "the most foul of diseases", ix.33.6) or Nero and Caligula (ix.27.3 f.). The Romans might offer freedom to the Greeks by liberating particular cities, such as Mothone (iv.35.3),[55] and even the whole nation when Nero "gave to the Roman people the very prosperous island of Sardinia in exchange for Greece, and then bestowed upon the latter complete freedom" (vii.17.3). But this very act of bestowal was proof of who was master, and it could be reversed: "The Greeks however were not to profit by this gift. For in the reign of Vespasian, the next emperor after Nero, they became embroiled in a civil war. Vespasian ordered that they should again pay tribute and be subject to a governor, saying that the Greek people had forgotten how to be free" (vii.17.4). This is a deep condemnation — all the more bitter because freedom was inherently part of the Greek identity in the Pausanian myth; it was precisely this freedom which Roman domination had eroded.

In fact Pausanias' myth of Greece was supremely a myth of how "all Greece won independence and freedom", to quote the inscription which Pausanias quoted from the statue of Epaminondas (ix.15.6). It was a myth of how the lives of a few great men from Miltiades to Philopoemen transcended their local loyalties and how they had become "benefactors of all Greece": "Those who before Miltiades accomplished brilliant deeds, Codrus the son of Melanthus, Polydorus the Spartan, Aristomenes

[53] On these omissions, see M. L. D'Ooge, *The Acropolis of Athens* (London, 1908), pp. 276-7; the companion volume by R. E. Wycherley to Loeb edn. of *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 5 vols. (London, 1918-35), v, pp. 29-30, 34.

[54] Other examples of praise lavished on Hadrianic buildings concern his works in Athens (i.18.9); his marble temple at Megara (i.42.5); his road improvements (i.44.6); his temple of Antinous at Mantineia (viii.9.7); and his general improvement of conditions at Corinth (ii.3.5, viii.22.3).

[55] Compare also the cases of Pallantium (viii.43.1) and Elateia (x.34.2).

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

the Messenian, and all the rest, will be seen to have helped each his own country and not Greece as a whole" (viii.52.1). This is a fascinating passage. Not only is there an unashamedly moral slant to the pan-Hellenic picture, praise for motivations that transcend local interests, but this shades into an explicitly moral emphasis on the way lives ought to be lived. Pausanias specifically excluded "from being called benefactors of Greece" his namesake Pausanias and Aristeides, the victors of Plataea (on account of their subsequent transgressions), as well as the participants in the Peloponnesian war whom he billed as "murderers, almost wreckers, of Greece" (viii.52.2-3). There was, furthermore, a sense of inevitable decline and fall. As in Plutarch,[56] Philopoemen was the last in the roll-call of the great, and he was already involved in wars with the Romans (viii.50-1). Historically, the myth of Greece had to be defined, delimited and ended by its proximity to Rome.

And yet it was precisely the conquest of Greece by Rome which constituted the possibility for the myth of a free Greece in the past. Greece could only be one whole when it was a province in an empire whose various cities were united through having *lost* their freedom. For the Pausanian project to be possible, all the places, whose stories and sanctities he so carefully enumerated, had no longer to be free and at war (as they were in the myth Pausanias retails), but had to be united by and within a larger power. The very attempt to invent and justify a myth-history of "Greece" was simultaneously the evidence for its defeat: Greece could only exist in the invention, in the myth of Rome. The condition for the Pausanian description of Greece was that the Greece which his description described no longer existed.

Only when we appreciate the head-on clash of identities, the complexity and incongruity of conflicting paradigms from past and present which were reiterated through Pausanias' narrative, which together in their tension created his Greece, can we begin to grasp some of the ironies that lie hidden in the text. At Sikyon he noted drily: "The precinct . . . devoted to Roman emperors was once the house of the tyrant Cleon" (ii.8.1). The viewing of this temple is ironic in the extreme — and the effect is heightened when Pausanias launches immediately into the story of how Aratus liberated Sikyon and Corinth from tyranny

[56] See Aalders, *Plutarch's Political Thought*, p. 17.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

(ii.8.2-6). In the Argive Heraion, he noticed "statues . . . of various heroes, including Orestes. They say that Orestes is the one with the inscription that it represents the Emperor Augustus" (ii.17.3)! Only rarely did Pausanias reject inscriptional evidence for mere hearsay.[57] In both these cases the conflict, the ambiguity, of past and present as they clashed in the identity of the viewer emerged as irony. In all such instances it was the viewer's identity itself which was at stake in the act of interpreting a work of art.

One way out of the impasse of socio-historical identities was to look for a self which was outside history, beyond the decline of Greece into a Roman fief. At the heart of Pausanias' ideology of places was the theme of sacred centres. If the political path of the traveller was fraught with identity-conflicts, then perhaps religious pilgrimage was the solution to the identity crisis of second-century Greece. The traveller turned pilgrim was no longer searching for an historical past that was denied by the present; he sought rather a sanctified present-past whose sacredness had pervaded these places since the beginning, despite history.

IV

PAUSANIAS AS PILGRIM: IDENTITY AND THE SACRED

Pilgrimage was an important aspect of the religious culture of pagan antiquity. We know of many examples of individuals and groups going to sanctuaries to consult deities, seek healing, venerate relics.[58] But, with the exception of Pausanias, we possess no text from the pagan world which recounts the process of pilgrimage as a personal journey. Here the contrast between antiquity and the Christian tradition of travel-writing is stark. It gives Pausanias' text a unique cultural significance not only as testimony to a specifically *pagan* form and view of pilgrimage, but also as a counterpoint to later Christian writing.

One can see the whole of Pausanias' account as a pilgrimage

[57] On Pausanias and inscriptions, see Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, pp. 64-94.

[58] The finest account is Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, pp. 11-261. On the holiness of place in pagan antiquity, see S. MacCormack, "*Loca Sancta*: The Organization of Sacred Topography in Late Antiquity", in Ousterhout (ed.), *Blessings of Pilgrimage*, pp. 9-20; for the relics of the hero Pelops at Olympia, see Pausanias, v.13.4-6, vi.22.1; W. Burkert, *Homo necans* (Berkeley, 1983), p. 99.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

lasting many years.[59] Certainly it has elements of a *rite de passage* in which writer and perhaps reader are changed by their confrontation with the sacred identity of Greece.[60] Pausanias commented on his personal transformation over the course of his travels, after retelling the myth of how Rhea deceived Cronus:

> When I began to write my history I was inclined to count these legends as foolishness, but on getting as far as Arcadia I grew to hold a more thoughtful view of them, which is this. In the days of old, those Greeks who were considered wise spoke their sayings not straight out but in riddles, and so the legends about Cronus I conjectured to be one sort of Greek wisdom. In matters of divinity, therefore, I shall adopt the received tradition (viii.8.3).

Significantly this change of attitude related to "matters of divinity". It marked a shift from rationalistic literalism (the secularist's response to the sacred) to a greater openness towards hidden meanings which might point to religious truth.[61]

However, it is in the specific descriptions that we can elucidate more directly the elements of pilgrimage in Pausanian travel. Let us take the journey to Eleusis — which was not only a centre of mystery initiation, but was marked by Pausanias himself as one of the two supreme sites of Greece: "on nothing does heaven bestow more care than on the Eleusinian rites and the Olympic Games" (v.10.1). Pausanias was himself an initiate into the Eleusinian mysteries.[62] Although the text only reaches Eleusis at i.38, we have been prepared for its importance by the discussion of the Eleusinium at Athens (i.14.3) and the reference to initiation in the mysteries at i.37.4. Since "a vision in a dream" prevented

[59] A good analogy for this is the thousand-mile pilgrimage to the eighty-eight sacred places of Shitoku in Japan, so vividly evoked by O. Statler, *Japanese Pilgrimage* (London, 1983).

[60] For an excellent account of pilgrimage as *rite de passage*, see V. and E. Turner, *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture* (New York, 1978), pp. 1-39; V. Turner, "The Centre Out There: Pilgrim's Goal", *Hist. Religions*, xii (1973), pp. 191-230. On pilgrimage as a transformative journey, see A. G. Grapard, "Flying Mountains and Walkers of Emptiness: Toward a Definition of Sacred Space in Japanese Religions", *Hist. Religions*, xxi (1982), pp. 195-221, esp. pp. 205-7; Eck, "India's *Tirthas*", pp. 324-6, 334, 340-4. On "the act of accounting for one's travels" as itself a *rite de passage*, see M. Harbsmeier, "Elementary Structures of Otherness", in J. Céard and J. C. Margolin (eds.), *Voyager à la Renaissance* (Paris, 1987), p. 337.

[61] On this passage, see Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, pp. 156-7; Veyne, *Did the Greeks*, pp. 11, 98-100.

[62] See the implications of i.14.3, 37.4, 38. On Pausanias and Eleusis more generally, see Heer, *Personnalité de Pausanias*, pp. 127-89. For a discussion of the site, its archaeology and the mysteries, see G. E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton, 1962); K. Kerenyi, *Eleusis: Archetypal Image of Mother and Daughter* (London, 1967).

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

Pausanias from describing the contents of the Athenian Eleusinium, the reader is already prepared for Eleusis being religiously special.

This specialness is marked by the very topography the moment the text arrives at Eleusis (i.38.1): "The streams called Rheiti are rivers . . . sacred to the Maid and to Demeter, and only the priests of these goddesses are permitted to catch fish in them. Anciently, I learn, the streams were the boundaries between the land of the Eleusinians and that of the other Athenians". The geography here was itself sacred — marking an ancient boundary, a threshold between the political world of Attica and the other world, Eleusis, on its periphery. The ancient political settlement bore out this otherness: "The Eleusinians were to have independent control of the mysteries, but in all other things were to be subject to the Athenians" (i.38.3). The text now proceeds through a number of shrines and temples, and their myths, until it reaches the sacred enclosure itself.

Here Pausanias surprises us: "My dream forbade the description of the things within the walls of the sanctuary, and the uninitiated are of course not permitted to learn that which they are prevented from seeing" (i.38.7). Having set Eleusis up as a world apart, instead of describing this other, or bringing his reader through "the walls of the sanctuary" into its inner sanctum, Pausanias' text dramatizes the otherness of Eleusis in a notable way. Pausanias denies its describability within his own discourse. He never tells us what dream he had: it is a mechanism, implicitly a supernatural one, for justifying silence. No mark of otherness is so effective as this statement that the truth of Eleusis cannot be constrained in the act of writing. Here, in a radical about-face, Pausanias, who has constantly been the reader's guide, his ally in penetrating "all things Greek", suddenly changes to being the other's ally in concealing the mystery of Eleusis from his uninitiated readership. Here, before the sacred which cannot be described, the text's experiential emphasis breaks down. The reader who does Greece *with* Pausanias, in his order, at his pace, along his roads, is left *outside* the sacred wall. Pausanias' writing is generally an exercise in going out to us, making a way for us into the other of his Greece, its ritual and art. But his silence here — his articulation within discourse that there is an other to discourse before which discourse must cease — is the opposite of

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

the usual pattern of his writing, an obstacle to our entry into the heart of a Greece which his project was to facilitate.

If Eleusis were an isolated instance, we could be pardoned for overlooking it. But in fact it represents the paradigm for a repeated pattern.[63] It offered a journey to a sacred other, which was located on the periphery of a political centre, but was nevertheless deeply central to the pilgrim's sense of identity.[64] Such "peripheral centres" where the other (whether a statue or a set of rites) had to remain secret are numerous in Pausanias. In some cases, like Eleusis, Pausanias was an initiate who could not describe what he knew; in others he was an outsider (like his presumed readers) and never knew what lay at the sacred centre. Such cases included the sanctuary of Demeter on Mt. Pron outside Hermione, where Pausanias described a remarkable annual festival and sacrifice (ii.35.5-7), the minor statues and images (ii.35.8), and built to the climax "But the thing itself that they worship before all else I never saw, nor yet has any other man, whether stranger or Hermionian. The old women may keep their knowledge of its nature to themselves" (ii.35.8). Likewise at the very gate of Hermione on the road towards Mases is a sanctuary of Eileithyia: "Every day, both with sacrifices and with incense, they magnificently propitiate the goddess, and, moreover, there are a vast number of votive gifts offered to Eileithyia. But the image no one may see, except, perhaps, the priestess" (ii.35.11). Again the paraphernalia of the sacred (rituals, offerings) led to that which could not be viewed or described. These paraphernalia enticed description (their interest merited entry into the text) and yet the cause upon which all the ritual and the sanctuary itself rested — a deity and the deity's image — was denied to knowledge.

Pausanias' silence was itself a ritual act, the result of a religious *mentalité* of taboo and retribution. Often (as at Eleusis, the Athenian Eleusinium and the mysteries at the Carnasian grove outside Messene, iv.33.4-5), a dream informed Pausanias what he might or might not reveal. Several times he remarked emphatically on the consequences of transgression — whether the physical act of entering a sacred place or the verbal act of giving the mysteries

[63] See Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide*, p. 156.

[64] For pilgrimage as a confrontation with the other, see, for example, Grapard, "Flying Mountains", pp. 205-7; D. K. Samanta, "Ujjain: A Centre of Pilgrimage in Central India", in Jha (ed.), *Dimensions of Pilgrimage*, p. 52; V. Turner, *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1974), p. 197. On the peripheral nature of many pilgrimages, see *ibid.*, pp. 193-6.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

away. At the sanctuary of Poseidon Hippios near Mantineia (viii.10.2 f.) into which no one might enter, Pausanias twice repeated the story of how Aegyptus broke this rule, only to be punished by blindness and death (viii.5.5, 10.3). Death was the punishment for transgression at the precinct of Lycaean Zeus (viii.38.6) and at the sanctuary of the Cabeiri (ix.25.9-10). The merely inquisitive would also die (x.32.17), as would those who imitated the mysteries (ix.25.9) or who, like Orpheus, profaned them through speech (ix.30.5).

Such stories articulate a deep cultural sense of taboo surrounding the sacred. What was the sanctity which such taboos protected in pagan culture? Since his silence was scrupulously observed, Pausanias' readers were clearly not intended to know too much unless they were to become initiates themselves. However, there is one instance where he does tell us something about the mysterious nature of a sacred centre. The sanctuary of Lycaean Zeus in Arcadia boasted a truly remarkable marvel:

> If anyone takes no notice of the rule and enters, he must inevitably live no longer than a year. A legend, moreover, was current that everything alive within the precinct, whether beast or man, cast no shadow. For this reason, when a beast takes refuge in the precinct, the hunter will not rush in after it, but remain outside, and though he sees the beast he can behold no shadow (viii.38.6).

This sacred precinct was not merely other by man-made rules of liminality and entry. By contrast with other sites or rituals, this sanctuary was open to vision. But it was precisely the rules of seeing that were transcended. Here sacred space affected and altered material space — it broke natural laws within the threshold of its own sanctity by abolishing shadows and shortening the length of human life. Here, briefly but memorably, we see the other world penetrating this world — we see one aspect of the sacred in action.

These instances represent sacred centres outside or on the periphery of cities.[65] Close to this pattern is a parallel structure of the holy where a sacred centre is described in the heart of a city. In Athens, for instance, the most sacred image was Athena Polias, Athena "of the city" (i.26.6).[66] When Pausanias came to

[65] We may add the Lernaian mysteries (ii.37.1 f.), the secret sacrifices to Lycaean Zeus (viii.38.7) and the rites of the Cabeiri (ix.25.5 f.).

[66] On Athena Polias, see C. J. Herrington, *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias* (Manchester, 1955); J. H. Kroll, "The Ancient Image of Athena Polias", *Hesperia*, suppl. no. 20 (1982), pp. 65-76.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

discuss this statue, scholars have noted his silence about its appearance.[67] Moreover, in the description of the Arrephoria, or festival of bearing sacred offerings to this image, there are several secrets surrounding the ritual:[68]

> Having placed on their heads what the priestess of Athena gives them to carry — neither she who gives nor they who carry have any knowledge what it is — the maidens descend by the natural underground passage that goes across the adjacent precincts, within the city, of Aphrodite in the Gardens. They leave down below what they carry and receive something else which they bring back covered up (i.27.3).

At the ritual heart of the city, its sacred identity, were secrets necessarily absent from knowledge which were none the less crucial to the preservation of sanctity.

Secrecy marked an otherness which upheld the sacred. And the sacred was above all a guarantor of identity. When disaster loomed for the Messenians in their war with Sparta, Aristomenes their leader decided to hide their "secret thing" (iv.20.4). Pausanias comments that "if it were destroyed, the Messenians would be overwhelmed and lost for ever, but if it were kept . . . after a lapse of time the Messenians would recover their country". This "secret thing" was the spiritual heart of the Messenians — it was the absent centre that defined their identity: "Aristomenes, knowing the oracles, took it towards nightfall and coming to the most deserted part of Mt. Ithome, buried it on the mountain, calling upon Zeus who keeps Ithome and the gods who had hitherto protected the Messenians to remain guardians of the pledge" (iv.20.4). It mattered that the object and its location be secret, that the hiding be done at night, that Pausanias' narrative told his readers all and yet missed the crucial precisions of what was buried and where it was concealed. For it was the identity of Messenia itself which was at stake.

V
VIEWING AND IDENTITY

Pausanian viewing was the enumeration and classification of "all that is Greek". What might have seemed in principle a simple act of cataloguing turned out to be the highly complex act of

[67] Herrington, *Athena Partenos and Athena Polias*, pp. 16-17; Kroll, "Ancient Image", p. 65.

[68] On the Arrephoria, see H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (London, 1977), pp. 141-3; E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica* (Madison, 1983), pp. 39-46.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

meeting the statues, buildings and natural wonders of one's native land on all the conflicting levels of one's identity. The facts of the present and the myths of the past, which together create a socio-political identity, normally intertwine, reinforcing each other like a double-helix. But, in this case, they did not match. And so the identity to which they gave birth was not coherent, was full of contradiction. Moreover in this socio-political identity Pausanias was incapable of grasping or describing the sacred — which defined his identity in the crucial aspect of pilgrim and initiate.

Pausanias was quite explicit about the limits of his discourse and of his knowledge. The description designed to do justice to the most noteworthy sites of Greece broke down precisely at some of the sights that Pausanias deemed most worth seeing. At the sacred centres to which the pilgrimage of his text moves there is an absence; over the sights which are most worth viewing is drawn a veil. Pausanian enumeration was not only a construction of ideology; it was a catalogue of instances where the ideology constructed by the rest of his text failed to apply. What all the instances in which Pausanias signalled his inability to describe an object have in common is ritual and the difference of an initiated viewer from the ordinary person. In every case, either Pausanias fell into the category of the uninitiated, like his presumed reader, or (as at Eleusis) he could not reveal the contents of the sacred secret to readers who might be uninitiated themselves. For "the uninitiated are not of course permitted to learn what they are prevented from seeing" (i.38.7).

In Pausanias' discourse we are offered two contestant, logically exclusive, yet mutually constitutive, sets of signs. The one is Pausanias' structure of descriptions and myths, the other his pronouncements of what he cannot describe. These are not equal. To signify the impossibility of enunciating the other world, the holy, was to reveal that the kind of discourse inherent in ordinary Pausanian viewing could not control the other world and was insufficient to it. The implication for the cultural historian is that Pausanias had at least two quite different and logically exclusive ways of viewing the world, depending on the sanctity of the site he was visiting. These two ways of viewing coexisted *in the same individual*. Identity depends in part on context, and the same person's identity in different contexts will be different.

The function of Pausanias' use of so-called digressions into

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

history and myth was to construct a narrative which could help his readers understand Greece. His text allows them to contextualize the objects and buildings they see — to derive meaning from and supply meaning to those objects. But such viewers are excluded from the sacred images which are open to the initiate viewer.[69] Initiate viewing is participant within ritual in a way that ordinary viewing cannot be. In initiate viewing, the observer consciously gives up the privacy of his or her own personal view, as well as the culturally shared assumptions which have helped to formulate such a view, for a "shared subjectivity" of participants in the ritual process or journey. Ritual is culturally important because it provides a different, an exclusive or sectarian, cultural framework for the construction of subjectivity and self-identity. Quite different kinds of interpretation of the world "out there" will result.[70]

VI
CONCLUSIONS

This article has been about subjectivity — not in the entirely personal sense, but about that part of subjectivity which the individual takes on from outside and constructs himself into. Pausanias' text is evidence for a certain ideology which was designed to provide his readers with a cultural identity, a shared subjectivity, out of which to view art. This was a very generalized and "secular" identity, available to anyone within his particular world (like being British, or American). But he also evoked a second and much narrower cultural identity, shared exclusively and esoterically by the initiates in certain rites and cults. For the initiate this was a deeper and more fulfilling reality than the more general sense of the subjective which the main thrust of the text offered. It was a reality that necessarily excluded the uninitiated.

In many ways Pausanias' approach anticipated that of later Christian pilgrims like Egeria. They too emphasized the phenomenology of travel, describing their journeys personally step by step. Here is an extract from the narrative of the Bordeaux Pilgrim of A.D. 333:

[69] "Ordinary" viewing is not merely inadequate; it is impious — see the recurring use of the word *hosion*: for example, i.14.3, ix.25.5-6.

[70] See C. Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System", in M. Banton (ed.), *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion* (London, 1966), p. 38.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

City of Neapolis (15 miles). Mount Gerizim is there, where according to the Samaritans, Abraham offered his sacrifice. There are 1,300 steps leading to the top of the mountain. Nearby, at the foot of the mountain, is the place called Shechem, which is the site of the tomb in which Jacob is buried . . . A mile from there is the place called Sychar, where the Samaritan woman went down to draw water, at the very place where Jacob dug the well, and our Lord Jesus Christ spoke with her. Some plane trees are there, planted by Jacob, and there is a bath which takes its water from this well. Twenty-eight miles from there on the left of the road is the village called Bethar and a mile from there is the place where Jacob slept on his way from Mesopotamia, and the almond tree is there, and he saw a vision, and an angel wrestled with him.[71]

The Christian pilgrim's awareness of the road itself, his constant relation of places to the stories evoked by them,[72] his tying of current landmarks (the 1,300 steps at Mt. Gerizim, the plane trees and bath at Sychar, the almond tree at Bethar) to the ancient myths — all this was very similar to Pausanias. Like Pausanias in Greece, the Christian traveller to the Holy Land attempted to evoke a sense of identity through place and through the myths which gave places their meaning in his culture. Moreover, again like Pausanias, the early Christian pilgrims displayed a remarkably acute sense of, and deep interest in, ritual. Egeria devoted about half of the surviving portion of her account to the liturgy in Jerusalem.[73]

However, the differences are fundamental. Where Pausanias' monuments evoked a mass of conflicting myth-histories referring to oral as well as written traditions, the Christian pilgrims tied their sense of place almost exclusively to Scripture.[74] While Pausanias travelled through his own land (where his native language was spoken, his native myths were alive and his identity was embodied), Christian pilgrimage was to another world altogether — a foreign holy land where, as the Latin-speaking Egeria tells us, sermons were preached in another language (Greek), were translated into Syriac and might also be interpreted in Latin.[75] The Christian identity was constructed in a fundamentally different way — through reading a sacred book originally created

[71] *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, ed. Geyer and Cuntz, 587.2-589.10.

[72] On the sense of place in fourth-century pilgrimage accounts, see Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage*, pp. 83-8.

[73] On Egeria and the liturgy, see *ibid.*, pp. 107-28; J. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship* (Rome, 1987), pp. 55-64, 83-96 (using Egeria to reconstruct patterns of fourth-century worship in Jerusalem at Easter).

[74] See Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage*, pp. 83-106; MacCormack, "*Loca Sancta*", pp. 20-4.

[75] *Itinerarium Egeriae*, ed. Maraval, 47.3-5.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013

in another culture (the Jewish East) and around the topography of a sacred place far from home (Palestine).

Moreover Egeria had no need for selective mystical silence. Her text, her Christian world, her presumed readership, all belonged to a circle of initiates. This shift above all was fundamental to the transformation in identity between the pagan second and the Christian fourth centuries. For Pausanias, there was an absolute difference between the secular world of his socio-historical identity and the sacred world of initiation. The latter gave access to an exclusive and esoteric identity shared with a small and self-selecting group of fellow initiates. It was not available to outsiders. By the time of Egeria, in the late fourth century, we already see the extraordinary "drainage of the secular" which has been seen as the most essential characteristic of the onset of the Middle Ages.[76] Despite the fact that Christianity had only escaped persecution less than a century before her, Egeria *assumed* that her readers, indeed the whole world of her personal experience, would share her Christian initiation. A religion which had begun as an exclusive sect, little different from the initiate cults we meet in Pausanias, had become a universal church. One of Christianity's greatest achievements in transforming the identity of the ancient world was the way it used the intense exclusiveness of the initiate cult, which we see so clearly in Pausanias, to define the world of secular and social experience as well. What in Pausanias had been two worlds — secular and sacred — had become one sacred world.

Jesus College, Cambridge *John Elsner*

[76] See the excellent account in Markus, *End of Ancient Christianity*, pp. 1-18, 224-8.

Downloaded from http://past.oxfordjournals.org/ at Russian Archive on December 22, 2013