said since that line has been concerned with the matter of removing the pollution (so γεγολυτὸν...μισθοῖν in 1047) arising from that matricide. 1155: It is not clear from her translation («glowing like fire») how K. takes the dative in λάμπωντι γυν. 1174: Thoas’ claim that not even among barbarians would someone go so far as to kill his mother ought to have prompted comparison with Herodotus’ assertion (1.137.2) that the Persians deny that anyone has ever killed a parent. 1264: It is not accurate to refer to πολέσιν as «L.’s reading» (or to πολέσιν as the reading of Triclinius). In fact, L. (now) reads πολέσιν, with one accent original and one added by Triclinius. The reading of the apograph P (πολέσιν) shows that what appeared originally in L. was a form of the word πολές and that Triclinius sought to introduce a ‘Homeric’ form of the word πολές (for which there is no precedent in the text of Euripides or Sophocles; see Maia 31 [1979] 242–43). 1272: In connection with χθονίαν ὀφελέαν μην θείς a reference to P. Pyth. 4.158–59 ὀφελέαν μήν χθονίων would have been appropriate. 1312–13: The participle in τὸ δὲν ποιν ἐν παρθένῳ seems superfluous, and I wonder if it hasn’t replaced the rare τύφρος (for which, see Headlam and Thomson on A. Ag. 737), making a pointed contrast with οὐθές.

Naturally, any commentary, particularly one on a work whose text and interpretation are so energetically contested, will provoke disagreement and discussion. Indeed, the only commentaries that fail to do so are those that are ignored. K.’s important contribution to the study of IT should not, and will not, be ignored.

Champaign, Illinois

David Sansone


For almost a century now Pausanias’ Periegesis has been the object of archaeological and historical rather than literary studies. H[utton]’s ‘Describing Greece’, which promises an analysis of Pausanias’ «sophisticated literary craftsman[ship]», is therefore a priori a most welcome contribution. The book basically consists of four parts: the first two chapters give a short introduction and place the work in the historical and literary contexts of the Second Sophistic and ancient travel literature; chapters three to five analyse the organizing principles of the work; chapters six and seven are devoted to its style and genre; and in the eighth and final chapter H. tries to reconstruct Pausanias’ ‘aauthorial and attitudinal development over the course of the composition of the Periegesis’ (275). Throughout the book H. tries to replace the conventional view of Pausanias as a «dependable dullard» (4) by the far more positive picture of a highly creative and innovative author. Unfortunately, however, H. often gets carried away in his attempt to prove Pausanias’ originality and either misinterprets the evidence or moves to the realm of wild speculation.

The two introductory chapters offer helpful orientation, but readers unacquainted with Pausanias should always check H.’s claims against the older, but on the whole more reliable works by C. Robert (Pausanias als Schriftsteller, Berlin 1959) and C. Habicht (Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece, Berkeley 1985).

One particularly striking example of H.’s fondness of speculation is his suggestion (27) that the use of the first person plural could indicate that Pausanias was travelling in a group (but cf. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik 2,243: «Kontakt mit dem Publikum»).
When endorsing Elsner’s interpretation of Pausanias as a ‘pilgrim’ (8), H. cites J. Rutherford’s contribution to S. E. Alcock/J. F. Cherry/J. Elsner, Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece, Oxford 2001, but he alerts his readers neither to the terminological problems discussed there nor to the objections that have been raised against this concept by Swain, Arafat and others (similarly unsatisfactory is the discussion in the three lines of n. 62 on p. 327). Also, H. frequently employs the category of ‘travel narrative’, but this term is not very useful if it covers anything from the ‘Odyssey’ to Herodotus and Pausanias (5–6), and H.’s own remarks (13) about the impersonal participles in Paus. 1.1.1 show that the *Periegesis* is anything but a narrative. Regrettably, among ancient travel narratives the ancient novel is not mentioned, and one also looks in vain for a reference to miscellany or *Buntschriftstellerei* which many of Pausanias’ digressions closely resemble.

The most substantial and reliable bits of the book are H.’s chapters on the structure of the work (54–174). H. analyses in great detail how Pausanias’ text relates to the topography of ancient Greece and convincingly demonstrates that Pausanias employs a variety of organizing principles and carefully adapts these to suit the respective subject matter.

Somewhat surprisingly for a study of Pausanias’ literary craft, however, H.’s structural analysis of the *Periegesis* is entirely focussed on topography and pays hardly any attention to the many geographical, cultic, zoological, philosophical, and even novelistic digressions, which Pausanias has inserted to make his description more interesting and entertaining. In this respect H.’s analysis clearly falls behind the work of his predecessor Robert, who had accentuated the sophisticated economy of these excursuses (see Robert 8ff).

In his chapter on Pausanias’ language (175–240) H. tries to establish that Pausanias is a non-conformist who deliberately employs non-Attic forms and imitates the style of Hesegias of Magnesia. The Hesegias hypothesis goes back to Boeckh, and most of the linguistic evidence, too, had been published in one form or another before. What is original about the chapter is H.’s highly arbitrary and unconvincing interpretation of the evidence.

H.’s claim of deliberate non-conformism is based on five statistics listing the frequency of variant orthographies for ἄττικα, ἄττικα ἔλεγχον, ἀπεξέρχομαι, ὑποταγή, χάρινομα and νοεῖ (181–90). There are quite a few other words and phenomena (e.g. φιλιστέρια, τίς ἔρχεται, ἐμπεδώροφες) that would have been relevant in this context, and H. ignores that Atticism was not so much concerned with orthography as with *lexeis*. Furthermore, H. arbitrarily excludes Lucian’s On the Syrian Goddess’ and ‘Astrology’ and Arrian’s *Indica* from the statistics, thus blurring the fact that for certain genres and topics Atticizing authors deliberately chose a less Attic and more Ionic Greek. Finally, H. should have seen that Pausanias’ use of *ο-ο-*, orthographies and ἔρχεται has a parallel in Herodotus and is therefore best interpreted not as a reaction to Atticism but as part of Pausanias’ imitation of Herodotus.

More complex is H.’s argument for Pausanias’ imitation of Hesegias of Megara. H. begins by calling into question the analysis of O. Strid (Über Sprache und Stil des Periegeten Pausanias, Uppsala 1976), who had interpreted Pausanias’ artificial word order as a Thucydidean feature. H. objects that the extent of Thucydidean influence on Pausanias is doubtful (225), that Strid had failed to adduce ‘comparable figures’ for the authors whom he suggests as Pausanias’ stylistic models, and that the ‘sheer number of stylistic peculiarities’ in Pausanias ‘far surpasses that employed by any of the authors that Strid takes into consideration’ (221). H. himself, however, does not give any evidence whatsoever for the last claim, and he himself later (283–4) speaks of Thucydidean reminiscences in Paus. 1.11.7. Moreover, the ancient responses to Thucydidean style collected by H. himself (219) show that Thucydides was regarded as the difficult prose author par excellence in antiquity, and given the close relation between Pausanias’ *Periegesis* and historiography, given Pausanias’ imitation of the other major Greek historian Herodotus, and given the
imitation of Thucydides by other authors of the same period (e.g. Arrian), Thucydides is by far the most plausible model for Pausanias’ word order. But even if Pausanias’ model was not Thucydides, it certainly was neither Hegesias nor the ‘Sipylene school’ of writing in Hegesianic style which H. postulates (222–3). H.’s argument for Hegesian influence rests entirely on a few fragments chosen by Hegesias’ ancient critics to illustrate his poor taste (223); on the artificial word order in the parody of Hegesianic style in Dionysius’ De Comp. Verb. 4 (224–8); on the use of clausulae in the Hegesianic fragments (224, 229); on Philostratus’ brief reference to the ‘Ionian style’ of the sophist Onomarchus (Vit. Sophh. pp. 598–9), and on a «circumstantial logic» around Hegesias’ «notorious reputation» (231).

Even leaving aside the highly speculative nature of H.’s argument, three objections remain: First of all, Pausanias’ handling of clausulae is similar to that of various other imperial Greek authors (e.g. Philon, Lucian, Chariton) and cannot prove Hegesianic influence (cf. H. Szelest, De Pausaniae clausulis, Warsaw 1943, 39; Strid 65). Secondly, the surviving fragments of Hegesias show a far less artificial word order than Dionysius’ parody (cf. Strid 63–4), and Pausanias’ Periegesis and Dionysius’ parody are not the two Greek prose texts with the most artificial word order (thus H., 230 without evidence), but Dionysius himself clearly surpasses Pausanias in the use of hyperbata (see Strid 61); and thirdly, a glance at the choppy sentences of Hegesias and at the word plays and synonym clusters in the Onomarchus quotation preserved by Philostratus at once shows that Pausanias imitates neither Hegesias nor the ‘Ionian style’ of Onomarchus.

Worse than the rather obvious errors in his argument is the fact that H.’s focus on Pausanias’ alleged non-conformism and imitation of Hegesias has eclipsed several features which could tell us much more about the author and the purpose of the Periegesis, e.g. Pausanias’ affected simplicity (cf. G. Pasquali, Hermes 48 (1913), 218), his tendency to periphrase names and events in a way that leads to «einer Art Versteckspiel mit dem Leser» (Robert 203), his constant attempts at variatio (briefly mentioned by H. on pp. 216–17, but cf. Robert 210–16), or his complex narrative strategies (cf. J. Akujärvi, Interpretational problems in Pausanias’ Attika, Stockholm 1999 [not mentioned by H.] and ead., Researcher, Traveller, Narrator, Stockholm 2005).

Similarly misleading is H.’s account of the genre of the Periegesis (241–72). According to H., Pausanias has written neither a travel guide (242–7), nor a peri− egesis (247–63), nor a periplus (264–6), nor an imitation of Herodotean historiography (262–3) or «Arrianic epistolography» (272) but has «combine[d] recognizable aspects of a number of traditions to create his own genre» (272). This argument ignores that the generic conventions of ancient historiography and geography are not nearly as strict as those of epic or tragedy and that the label periegesis does not refer to a distinct genre, but is used of works situated somewhere in the vast grey area between strictly historical and strictly geographical works. Hence, the categories employed by H. are misleading, and any of the works compared by H. to the Periegesis can be argued to be «sui generis» in one way or another. Moreover, Strabo’s presentation of mythical, philological and historical material within the topographical framework of his ‘Geography’ certainly does constitute a precedent for Pausanias’ Periegesis, and so do other works which H. does not mention, e.g. the periploi of Isidorus of Charax (cf. GGM 1,254f) and Nymphodorus (cf. FGrHist 572 F 4) or Mnaseas’ Periplus or Periegesis (thus the title at St. Byz. s.v. Ἑγγελάνες = FHG 3,152 fr. 13). Finally, H.’s claim that, unlike Pausanias’ work, earlier antiquarian periegeses did not combine antiquarian erudition with a topographical design (256–63) is once again based on a selective and arbitrary interpretation of our evidence.
To prove that earlier periegeseis lacked a topographical design, H. discusses four texts. Of these four texts, one (Diodorus FGrHist 372 F 35) is not a verbatim quotation but a periphrasis by Plutarch and therefore allows no inference (also, FF 34–5 indicate the position of the respective sites with great precision, and an itinerary can be constructed between F 35 and F 39). The other three texts (Polemio fr. 20, Hawara Periegesis FGrHist 369, Heracleides Creticus fr. 1,1) do indeed display an arrangement by subject matter, but this does not prove that they were structured only topically, for Heracleides fr. 1,26 clearly follows an itinerary, and Pausanias’ account, too, is often structured topically (cf. e.g. Paus. 1,28,8–11). Furthermore, compared to the abundant material of local histories, often periegetical in nature, contained in FGrHist II.B, and compared to the many surviving geographical fragments, the four texts discussed by H. are a rather small sample. Of the many authors H. does not consider Claudius Iullus (cf. FHG 4,363 fr. 2) and Callimachus/Menecrates (cf. FGrHist 370 FF 1–2 with Jacoby ad loc.) evidently wrote topographically arranged periegeseis, and Xenion’s Cretica must at least in part have been organized topographically (cf. FGrHist 460 F 15). For a number of other works such as Alexander Polyhistor’s Carica (cf. FGrHist 271 F 25 with E. Bischoff, RE 19.1 (1937), 716,10–14) and for authors such as Alcetas of Delphi (FGrHist 456) or Semos of Delos (FGrHist 396) topographical arrangement is at least possible, if not likely.

There are further oddities in this section of the book: e.g. H. refers to Aristarchus of Elis as a contemporary oral source for Pausanias (246 n. 15, but cf. Paus. 5,20,41), and his claim (262–3) that earlier periegeseis did not imitate Herodotus seems rather improbable in view of the stylistic variety we find in the surviving fragments: cf. e.g. the lofty tone of FGrHist 369 F 1: Θεός ἔργον ἡ πόλις and see G. Pasquali, Hermes 48 (1913) 212–13 on the epicizing style of Heracleides.

H.’s last chapter rightly draws attention to the possibility that while writing his Periegesis Pausanias may have undergone an «authorial and attitudinal development» (275). H. discerns a «growing emphasis on the points in history when the Greek cities were able to act as one» (295–302) and discusses possible changes in Pausanias’ attitude to religion (303–11) and in particular to the cult of Tyche (311–17) and to the Roman emperor cult (317–22). These issues are very complex and would have needed a much more detailed discussion. Although H. is more cautious in his judgement here, he pays too little attention to Pausanias’ sources and the overall economy of the work.

A good example of this is H.’s claim of a growing interest in the cult of Tyche. According to H., Pausanias gets interested in Tyche when seeing her Argolid shrines (cf. Paus. 2,2,8; 2,7,5; 2,11,8; 2,20,3; 2,35,3), «does more research» (316) and finally presents his observations in a long excursus in Ἰλιοῦ 303–6. However, like many other pieces of information on cultic matters, Pausanias’ treatment of Tyche’s absence from the Homeric epics in 4,303–4 has close parallels elsewhere (Macr. S. 3,16,8, Lyd. Mens. 4,7, Schol. II. A 684 – Eust. 3,102,23 v. d. Valk) and clearly comes directly from a philological-antiquarian source (cf. G. Wentzel, ΕΠΙΚΗΛΕΣΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ, Göttingen 1889 and J. F. Gaertner, Hermes 134 (2006), 472ff). Moreover, like the unusually long historical introduction occupying 29 of the 35 chapters of book four, the excursus on Tyche in Ἰλιοῦ 303–6 primarily functions to compensate for the evident lack of Messenian theoremata.

On the whole, H. gives a solid account of the relation between Pausanias’ Periegesis and the topography of ancient Greece, but in literary and philological matters H. is a less reliable guide than Robert, Pasquali or Habicht.

Leipzig

Jan Felix Gaertner