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Abstract

The *Periegesis Hellados* presents a description of the sites and sights of Roman Greece in ten carefully constructed books. These books present the fruits of author’s extensive travels and careful textual research over the course of several decades (between the 130’s and *ca. AD 175-80*) and compiled into a unified composite itinerary. There is no doubt that Pausanias travels through an “already written landscape,” and his travel experience is necessarily informed by and sometimes clearly motivated by his literary encounters. This project investigates Pausanias’ engagement with literary antecedents, with a particular focus on the antiquarian impulse to excerpt and compile anecdotes in thematic catalogues, which broadly resemble wonder-texts (paradoxographies). The organizing principle of these thematic catalogues contrasts with the topographical (spatial) structure of the frame narrative of the *Periegesis*. In part, this study aims to resolve the perceived tension between the travel account and the antiquarian mode in Pausanias’ project in order to show that they serve complementary rather than competing ends. Resolution of these competing paradigms allows in turn for a more coherent understanding of the *Periegesis* as unified subject. This study argues that wonder (*thauma*) is a unifying theme
of *Periegesis Hellados*. Through epiphanies and descriptions of marvels, whether in
catalogues or tied to particular features on his route, Pausanias negotiates the
unbridgeable ontological distance between human and divine agents through a discourse
of the marvelous that is firmly rooted geographic specificity. This study suggests the
*Periegesis Hellados* can be broadly understood as an attempted re-enchantment of Hellas
in the imperial age.
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Introduction

In thinking about the Pausanias’s purposes in compiling his encyclopedic guide to Greece, it may be best to put aside the topographical maps and photographs that accompany modern editions, and ignore the erudite reconstructions of ancient sites provided by archaeologists, valuable as these are for understanding the Classical world. Instead just read a stretch of the *Periegesis* out loud, slowly, as the ancients would have done. At a certain point the long sequences of anecdotes and artifacts begin to numb reflection and leave only the irreducible pleasure—it is, I think, a genuine pleasure—of scanning an intelligently itemized inventory of precious things and places. For us armchair sightseers, that is the joy of reading Pausanias.

Konstan, “Joys of Reading Pausanias,” 60

I begin with this quotation from Konstan not because I advocate similarly for the inherent joys of reading Pausanias, but rather because with his use of “encyclopedic,” “anecdotes,” “inventory,” and “armchair” travel, he evokes once debated aspects of the genre and composition of the *Periegesis* that have fallen out of favor with the resurgence of sustained study of the text in the last several decades.¹ Pausanias’ text is now understood as the product of his own travels, a rich eyewitness account of mainland Greece in the 2nd century.² It is not my aim to contest this interpretation, but rather to revive the *Periegesis* within its original literary and historical circumstances in order to better understand the criteria of selection for the text as a whole and to suggest coherent thematic unity in the multiplicity of seemingly disparate elements.

In his advocacy for the pleasures inherent in reading the *Periegesis* as literature, Konstan casually associates the Periegete’s text with Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae*, Pliny’s *Natural


² The scholarly consensus is that the date of composition for the *Periegesis* spans the period from the early 160s to the mid-to-late 170s. For *Periegesis* as travel literature, see e.g. Pretzler 2007a: 11: “Pausanias’ *Periegesis* is the most extensive text surviving from antiquity that deals with a traveller’s experiences.” Cf. Hutton 2005a: 5-7; Chamoux 1996: 49 states: “Il a vraiment voulu composer une périégèse, fondée sur son expérience personnelle de voyageur consciencieux qui aime à voir et qui sait voir.”
History and Aulus Gellius’ Attic Nights as other imperial antiquarian texts. His reading places the Periegesis squarely in the antiquarian “genre of collections of information that his contemporaries prized and perused for noteworthy bits of knowledge.” With the current trend to emphasize travel, autopsy, and historical method in the Periegesis Hellados, the antiquarian label has largely fallen out of Pausanias’ research in order to downplay any association with the Quellenkritik that plagued previous scholarship. There is no doubt that Pausanias travels through an “already written landscape,” and his travel experience is necessarily informed by and sometimes clearly motivated by his literary encounters. This project is particularly concerned with the interaction between travel and text for constructing meaning in Pausanias’ description of Roman Greece. As Gunderson notes, the antiquarian mode “accumulates accumulations and piles up the already piled up,” and this observation informs a prominent aspect of the method and structure of the Periegesis Hellados.

This project does not seek to undermine the reliability of the authorial travelling persona or contest the fruitful readings of the Periegesis as a travel text; instead it investigates Pausanias’ engagement with literary antecedents, with a particular focus on the antiquarian impulse to excerpt and catalogue anecdotes, in order to shed light on the unifying the themes of the text. In part, this study aims to resolve the perceived tension between the travel account and the antiquarian mode in Pausanias’ project in order to show that they serve complementary rather than competing ends. Resolution of these

---


4 As Konstan 2001: 60 puts it: “Greek-speaking Romans participated in the pedantic dinner conversation recorded by Athenaeus, and I see no reason they might not have responded with equal enthusiasm to Pausanias’ review of the chief physical sites of Achaia. They too would acquire in this way a fund of useful or decorous knowledge, just as they might do in the Latin pages of Pliny’s encyclopedic Natural History or Aulus Gellius’ Attic Nights.”

5 See Akujärvi 2005: 90 n.2 for references.

6 Cherry 2001: 250-251 applies Heather Henderson’s analysis of Emerson’s phrase “My giant goes with me wherever I go” (“Self-Reliance” 1841) to the interpretation of travel and textual mediation in the Periegesis. Cherry notes: “Pausanias’ trip to Greece began in reading and in images derived from reading.” See also Laing and Frost 2012 for recent discussion of the interaction between reading, travel and writing.

7 Gunderson 2009: 15.
competing paradigms will in turn allow for a more coherent understanding of the 
*Periegesis* as unified subject.

The wealth of archaeological data from excavation and topographical research in Greece 
during last century has fundamentally changed perceptions of the *Periegesis*.\(^8\) Through 
the scientific investigation of major sites like the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi by the 
École Française d’Athènes and the Athenian Agora by the American School of Classical 
Studies, the reliability of the topographical descriptions in the *Periegesis Hellados* has 
been resolutely demonstrated.\(^9\) Christian Habicht’s study of the *Periegesis* more than 
three years ago has been a watershed for the study of the text; it is now generally 
assumed that Pausanias did in fact see what he claimed to have seen, read what he 
claimed to have read, and traveled where he claimed to have gone.\(^10\)

**Alterity**

One benefit of this shift in scholarly attitudes towards the reliability of Pausanias’ 
account is that scholarship on travel, topography and historiography in the *Periegesis* has 
fLOURISHED in recent decades with the publication of several monographs and edited 
volumes on these themes.\(^11\) But an unfortunate consequence of the early assault on the 
authenticity of travel account in the *Periegesis* has been the near total neglect of wonders 
in recent analyses.\(^12\) While some scholars have noted the prevalence of wonders in the 
*Periegesis*, they have generally interpreted them as mere ornamentation to capture the 
reader’s interest and alleviate tedium, rather than as a major concern of the text.\(^13\) Since 
the publication of Greenblatt’s influential study of the rhetoric of wonder in the European 
narratives of travel to the New World, marvels have been understood as staple fare for

---

\(^8\) See also Habicht 1985: 28-65 for confirmation of Pausanias’ reliability after excavations at Mycenae, 
Troizen, Kallipolis, Onchestos and Messene.

errors in the *Perigesis* that argues that most are the result of lacunae and faulty transmission.


\(^11\) E.g. Bingen *et al.* 1996; Alcock *et al.* 2001; Hutton 2005a; Pretzler 2007a; Pirenne-Delforge 2008; 
Frateantonio 2009.

\(^12\) E.g. “wonder,” “marvel,” and “thauma” do not appear in the index of Hutton 2005a or Pretzler 2007a.

\(^13\) Jacob 1980*passim*; on natural wonders in the *Periegesis* see also Jacquemin 1991: 123-130; Pirenne-
travel writing. One would expect that further analysis of this theme in the Periegesis would follow naturally.

Association of the Periegesis Hellados with exotic travel narratives like Ctesias’ Indika or Pytheas of Massalia’s Wonders Beyond Thule seems counter-intuitive for two reasons: the cultural identity of the author in relation to his topic of inquiry and the geographical centrality of Roman Greece in the oikoumene. An encounter with the radical other and the experience of wonder are often presented as the genesis of travel writing.

Pausanias’ familiarity with the landscape, culture and history of his subject area is assumed to mitigate his capacity to either experience wonder in his travels, or elicit it in his readers, who must necessarily be familiar enough with Greece and Greeks to be literate in the language. He is sometimes identified as a pepaideumenos, thoroughly steeped in the literature, traditions, values and practices of Hellenism that are shared with the object of his description. What room is there for a Greek to experience wonder when traveling the iconic routes of Roman Greece?

In opening lines of his novel The Go-Between, L.P. Hartley writes, “The past is a foreign country: they do things differently there.” This notion of the exoticism of the past offers important insight for the interpretation of the Periegesis, as Pausanias often depends on temporal rather than geographical distance for the production of alterity in his text. The various logoi of the Periegesis are more often concerned with aetologies and eponymous heroes than historical themes. The most apparent chronological distinction in the text replicates the Hesiodic Myth of Ages—the contrast between a time of heroes, when gods and men commingled, and his own day. This qualitative distinction is apparent, for example, in his response to the story of Lycaon’s metamorphosis into a wolf that appears in his description of Arcadia (8.2.4-6). Wonder blooms in encounters with the trees,

15 E.g. Pordzik 2005; Sell 2006; Micallef and Sharma 2013.
16 E.g. Thompson 2011: 9-12.
19 Hartley 1953.
20 Pausanias frequently contrasts his own time and the far distant past. Habicht 1985: 176-80 defines the present in the Periegesis through the expression “in my time.” For the past in Pausanias, see also Bowie 1996: 207-239; Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 41-95, 243-289.
21 Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 41-54.
rocks, streams and mountains that bear witness to the activities of gods and heroes from this earlier age.

Through epiphanies and descriptions of marvels, whether in catalogues or tied to particular features on his route, Pausanias negotiates the unbridgeable ontological distance between human and divine agents. In this respect, the *Periegesis* resonates with Aelius Aristides’ account of miraculous healing in his *Sacred Tale* and Plutarch’s account of *enigmata* in his Delphic dialogue *On the Letter E*. 22 The remark about the Eleusinian mysteries and the Olympic games at the mid-point of Pausanias’ narrative progress around Roman Greece is revealing. He says:

*πολλά μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα ἰδοὺ τις ἃν ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἄκουσαι θαυμάτως ἄξια· μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς Ἔλευσιν δρωμένοις καὶ ἀγώνι τῷ Ἐλυμπίᾳ μέτεστιν ἐκ θεοῦ φροντίδος.*

Many are the sights to be seen in Greece, and many are the wonders to be heard; but on nothing does Heaven bestow more care than on the Eleusinian rites and the Olympic games. 23

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 5.10.1

By insisting that Greece is replete with *thaumata*, this statement not only undermines the common assumption that exoticism is an essential criterion for the construction of the marvelous, it also suggests that the source of these marvels is the divine through the correlation of *θαυμάτως ἄξια* and 'have a share of the divine care' (μέτεστιν ἐκ θεοῦ φροντίδος). 24 Pausanias singles out of the rites at Eleusis and the Olympic games among these wonders, and this serves as a potent reminder that his notion of the marvelous need not coincide with contemporary expectations; although wonder may be a universal

---


23 This is the translation in Jones and Ormerod 1918 in the *Loeb* series. As a rule, the translations of Pausanias’ *Periegesis* printed in this dissertation are from this publication, though I note occasions when I have amended or adapted them.

24 I interpret the syntax of the clause μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς Ἔλευσιν δρωμένοις καὶ ἀγώνι τῷ Ἐλυμπίᾳ μέτεστιν ἐκ θεοῦ φροντίδος according to the usage in the *LSJ* s.v. *méteō* II: “impers., μέτετι μοι τίνος I have a share in or claim to a thing.” The Budé translation prints the same interpretation: “Mais ce sont tout particulièrement les cérémonies d’Éleusis et le concours d’Olympie qui on part à la sollicitude divine.”
passion, wonders are culturally specific. It is the ambitious goal of this study to
demonstrate that in the Periegēsis Hellados much of what is ἄξιον θέας, “worth seeing”,
or ἄξιον μνήμης, “worth recording” is actually θαύματος ἄξιον “worthy of wonder”
because it “[has] a share of divine care” (μέτεστιν ἐξ θεοῦ φροντίδος).

A note on Authorial Intent

Before proceeding I must make note of the particular use of “Pausanias” in this study.
From a theoretical standpoint, this study will not follow in the footsteps of Heer and
attempt an analysis of the personality of Pausanias as an author.25 I recognize the futility
of trying to securely reconstruct the author or his intent on the basis of evidence from the
text. Nevertheless, the strong first person narrator in the Periegēsis Hellados coincides
with the authorial persona, which Akujärvi refers to as the “narrator/author” or “Ego.”26
She notes “The author is a real flesh-and-blood agent in the empirical world who is
responsible for the production of the text; the narrator is the counterpart within the text.”27
Rather than adopt Akujärvi’s practice and refer to narrator/author as “Ego,” I prefer to
refer to this constructed authorial persona as “Pausanias” for the sake of expediency.
Nevertheless, it is the intention of this study to elucidate the structures of the text and
how it constructs meaning, not to exactly explore the extratextual author’s intentions.
Many of the programmatic statements in the Periegēsis Hellados are made by the
narrator/author “Ego” in one of four roles—Writer, Dater, Researcher, and Traveller—so
it is rhetorically convenient for the sake of concision to refer to this intratextual character
by name (though he is not named in the text).28

Antiquarian Compilation(s)

The Periegēsis Hellados presents a description of the sites and sights of Roman Greece in
ten carefully constructed books.29 These books present the fruits of the author’s numerous
travel itineraries and careful textual research over the course of several decades in a

---

26 Akujärvi 2005: passim, but first introduced on page 5.
29 Habicht 1985: 4 provides a list of the books and the territories to which they are devoted. Cf. Hutton
2010: 424-429 provides an overview of the structure of the work.
unified composite itinerary.\textsuperscript{30} Generically, the *Periegesis Hellados* is nominally a *periegesis*, though this designation does little to illuminate its form or concerns, because Pausanias’ text is among the only substantially complete extant examples of this fragmentary ancient genre.\textsuperscript{31} It is impossible to extrapolate generic features from so small a sample with any degree of confidence, and, as Hutton has argued, the *Periegesis Hellados* is essentially *sui generis*.\textsuperscript{32} Attempts to categorize the text have drawn parallels between the *Periegesis Hellados* and antiquarian compilation, historiography, mythography, art-history, guide-books, travel literature, and ethnography, all of which all are relevant to this multifarious and unique text.\textsuperscript{33} From the received title of the work, *Periegesis Hellados*, one might reasonably expect a “leading-around” of the monuments and other topographical features in “Greece.” But the precise criteria for inclusion or exclusion in the text have so far proven difficult to identify satisfactorily in scholarship on the *Periegesis*, beyond a vague notion of the author’s idiosyncratic taste.\textsuperscript{34}

Like Pliny’s encyclopedia and Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistai*, the contents of the *Periegesis* are notoriously variegated — the Parthenon, Chinese silkworms, the travails of the Messenians, and monuments of Asia Minor are all equally at home in the text.\textsuperscript{35} The geographic criterion implied in the transmitted title, *Periegesis Hellados*, in fact suits neither the territories covered by the narrator’s virtual itinerary through the ten books, nor the full geographical scope of the work.\textsuperscript{36} Although Pausanias’ description is the fullest transmitted account of the monuments and topography of Roman Greece, it does not do

\textsuperscript{30}See \textit{e.g.} Elsner 2001: 3-20; Hutton 2010: 423-425; Akujärvi 2005: 131-45. Akujärvi gathers the evidence for Pausanias’ first person statements as narrating “Ego” in his traveller role that support the notion that the itineraries are based on his own travels. See also Habicht 1985: 9-10 and Bowie 2001: 21-24 for date of composition.
\textsuperscript{31}See Chapter 3 for comparison with Dionysius’ *Description of Known World*.
\textsuperscript{32}Hutton 2005a: 241-272 explores the problematic genre the *Periegesis Hellados* and labels the text *sui generis* to underscore the work’s uniqueness. In particular, see p. 247-263 for overview of periegetic works by Polemon of Ilium and Heliodorus of Athens.
\textsuperscript{33}E.g. Cherry 2001: 249 and Cohen 2001: 93.
\textsuperscript{34}E.g. Habicht 1985: 23-24; Pretzler 2007a: 9-10: “It seems impossible to establish consistent criteria, and it is never made explicit what makes a story or monument ‘worth recording’... In the end, what is ‘worth seeing’ or ‘worth recording’ is a matter of the author’s personal judgment.”
\textsuperscript{35}Parthenon: 1.24.5, Chinese silkworms: 6.26.6-9, the *Messeniaka*: book 4, significant monuments and wonders of Asia Minor: 7.5.4-13. On miscellany in Athenaeus, see Jacob 2013 \textit{passim}, esp. 33-40 with particular emphasis on the preface of the epitome of the text (1.1.a-c).
\textsuperscript{36}See Habicht 1985: 5 for discussion of the reliability of the received title, which comes from the testimony of Stephanus of Byzantium, and n.28 on the same page for additional bibliography on this issue.
so in a manner that is exhaustive or even geographically exclusive; for instance, some conspicuous monuments on Pausanias’ itineraries, like the Nymphaion of Herodes Atticus at Olympia, are notoriously omitted from his description. Other monuments from well beyond mainland Greece, like the Colossus of Memnon at Thebes (1.42.3), find their way into the text.

While it is well known that geography—or more precisely topography—is the organizing principle that structures the text as a whole, it does not serve as the only selection criterion. It is accepted that the Periegesis reflects a preference for the “old over the new and the sacred over the profane,” but isolation of more precise criteria has been elusive. Cohen notes, “[m]odern scholarship no longer views [the text of] Pausanias as a unified subject.” The tendency to explore myth, history, ritual and art history separately in the Periegesis is similar to the treatment of Pliny’s Natural History, which scholars have tended to carve up along disciplinary lines rather than treat it as a unified and coherent whole. Contrary to the implication of the slice-and-dice approach to the Natural History, Pliny suggests that his work explores a unified and universal subject, rerum natura “the nature of things,” which he glosses with the phrase hoc est vita “life as it actually exists” (HN pref. 13). It is the ambition of this study to demonstrate that, like Pliny’s umbrella theme natura, Pausanias’ project is similarly devoted to thauma as a particular unifying theme.

---

38 See Frazer 1898: I. xx-xxii for discussion of Pausanias’ foreign travels.
39 E.g. Habicht 1985: 19: “The guiding principle is geographic: first one district of Greece is treated and then another.”
40 Habicht 1985: 23; see n.91 on the same page for additional bibliography.
42 Carey 2003: 10 describes scholarly investigation of Pliny’s Natural History as Quellenforschung in attempts to isolate and revive the some of 2000 volumes that he claims to have used in his compilation. This narrow focus on sources essentially disregards the critical role of Pliny in the process of selection and compilation. Carey further observes that the tendency to divide the voluminous totality of the Natural History along contemporary categories of knowledge, such as geography, art history, zoology, further erases Pliny’s subjective role in the creations of the text by avoiding the strategies and concerns that shape the whole of the 37 books.
43 Translation by Bostock and Riley (1855), though “this is life” more literally reflects the text. Contrast the translation by Beaujeu (1950) in the Budé series: “il s’agit de la nature, c’est-à-dire de la vie,” and Rackam (1937) in the Loeb edition: “the world of nature, or in other words life”.

That *thauma* is the unifying theme of the *Periegesis Hellados* is not unequivocally stated in the text. Rather, Pausanias declares his intent in the first book to describe *panta ta Hellenica* over the course of his project (1.26.4). But what, exactly does *panta ta Hellenica* connote? Virtually every scholar of the *Periegesis* has commented on this well-known passage, for it is a rare declaration of the literary program of the work. This statement is sometimes taken as a reference to geographical scope, as Frazer’s translation of the phrase *panta ta Hellenica* as “all of Greece” exemplifies.44 Elsner’s translation of the expression as “all things Greek,” which he glosses as “all that was interesting to a Greek speaker about Greece at the height of the Roman empire,” emphasizes a cultural connotation in addition to the geographical one; he interprets the *Periegesis* as a meditation on Hellenic identity in the 2nd century CE.45

The inclusivity of Elsner’s gloss is appealing in view of the miscellaneous content transmitted in the *Periegesis*. It has the misfortune, however, of perpetuating the notion that the geographical scope of the *Periegesis* is coterminous with “Greece,” and this presents two main difficulties. The first difficulty is that the territories described in the ten books of the *Periegesis* do not map onto any known formulation of Hellas from antiquity, and the second is that many monuments and phenomena described in the text are physically located well beyond these regions.46 There is a fundamental disjunction between the geographical scope of the topographically structured frame narrative of the *Periegesis* and that of the *parerga* (or digressions), which extends to the furthest reaches of the *oikoumene*.47 Even without the geographical criterion, Elsner’s gloss “all that was interesting to a Greek speaker” is yet useful, because although Elsner eschews specifying

44 Frazer 1898: I. xxv. See also Casson 1974: 294-5, Habicht 1985: 5-6, Arafat 1996: 8-9. Compare Philostratus VA 1.35: σοφόν ἄνδρι Ἑλλάς πάντα ("to a wise man, everything is Greece").

45 Elsner 1992: 5. This corresponds to his interpretation of the *Periegesis* as a pilgrimage text in the broad sense of the category, as travel that is motivated by a particular interest. See also Elsner 1995 for cultural resistance to Roman rule. See the notion of cultural tourism in Jost 2007: 114-119 and the *Periegesis* as a centripetal ethnography in Musti 1984: 7-8. See further Jost 2006.

46 See Hutton 2005a: 55-82 for detailed discussion of the scope of the *Periegesis* and the itineraries in relation to various incarnations of the boundaries of Hellas with previous scholarship.

47 See Akujärvi 2005 and 2012 for frame narrative as structuring principle, and Arafat 1999 for foreign marvels in the *Periegesis*. See also Pretzler 2007a: 11: “The information on offer in the *logoi* is more than just documentation of a particular region: comparative material takes into account much of the Greek world and sometimes areas beyond, and Pausanias’ interpretation contributes to a picture that is much wider than just a collection of all those details he observed at particular sites in Greece.” See also Bultrighini 1990: 282-305.
the selection criteria more clearly than generic ‘interest,’ his formulation invites future attempts to identify and elaborate just what is ‘interesting’ and why in order to clarify the concerns of the text.

Paratext generally informs the reader’s understanding of the text by acting as a threshold, or “seuil” in Genette’s French, between the world of the reader and the text itself—a zone of contractual mediation in which the strategy of the work is presented and reader’s approach is formed. Perhaps one reason that this suggested unifying theme has remained somewhat obscure is the pitiful state of the paratext for the Periegesis Hellados.48 The transmitted title is not secure; it is given in the testimony of the Stephanus of Byzantium in the sixth century, and no reference to the author’s name or to the word periegesis appears anywhere in the work itself.49 Even if the received title does indeed reflect the original inscribed one, no introductory comments on the subject or scope of the work are made in the transmitted opening of the text; the Periegesis begins in medias res with the first person narrator’s maritime approach to Cape Sounion in Attica. The text breaks off again equally abruptly at the end of the tenth book after a description of the Asklepieion in Locris that is embellished with an account of the miraculous recovery of temple founder’s sight through the intervention of the eponymous healing god (10.38.13). As Frazer succinctly states, “[Pausanias’] book has neither head nor tail, neither preface nor epilogue.”50 Although scholarly discussion about the abruptness of the Periegesis’ beginning and end has generally focused on the question of the relative completeness of the received text, it is not my purpose here to engage with this issue, but rather to draw attention to the inherent difficulty of interpreting matters of scope, subject and genre in so vast a text without an explicit preface to suggest a key to the literary program.51

In the absence of an explanatory preface or summarizing coda, scholars of the Periegesis have often relied on programmatic statements distributed sporadically throughout the text.

48 Gennette 1997: 1-2 defines “paratext” as all the peripherals that surround and frame the text proper, e.g. author’s name, title, preface, index, illustrations, font, etc.
49 Habicht 1985: 5.
50 Frazer 1898: I. XXII.
51 Habicht 1985: 6-8. See also Bowie 2001 for discussion of the possibility that an elaborate dedicatory letter may have dropped out of the manuscript tradition, while Sidebottom 2002: 499 argues that the lack of preface gives Pausanias compositional freedom.
to reconstruct the program and scope of the work. This study will by necessity also examine these well-known passages, but I hope to shed new light on their interpretation by employing a comparative approach. Although Hutton’s characterization of the *Periegesis Hellados* as *sui generis*—unique in our surviving corpus—is undoubtedly correct, scholars have noted significant similarities between the *Periegesis* and other antiquarian miscellanies. With an eye to the importance of an explanatory preface for constructing meaning and interpretation of a text, I propose to take advantage of affinities between the *Periegesis* and particular antiquarian miscellanies in order to reconsider Pausanias’ well-known programmatic passages with insights derived from their intact and elaborate openings. This approach does not challenge the uniqueness of the *Periegesis* or elide the significant differences that distinguish each of these antiquarian compilations, for as Gunderson has noted, despite similarities between antiquarian texts, they are not all the same even if cut from the same “parti-colored patchwork cloth.”

The narrator’s stated intention to describe *panta ta Hellenica* (1.26.4) occurs directly after a historical digression on the Macedonian occupation of Greece after the Battle of Chaeronea (1.25.2-26.4). In the subsequent passage, Pausanias chides himself for delaying the progress of his description of the Acropolis with phraseology that strongly echoes Herodotus.

> δεί δὲ με ἄφικεσθαι τοῦ λόγου πρόσω, πάντα ὁμοίως ἔπεξίόντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά.

But my narrative must not loiter, as my task is a general description of all Greece.

---

52 E.g. Akujärvi 2012b: 327, with 327 n. 2 for references to previous discussion of the parallels.
53 Gunderson 2009: 6. See also Smith 2014: 47 n.1 for list of literary miscellanies and additional bibliography.
54 Hdt. 1.5.3: τοῦτον σημίνας προβήσομαι ἐς τὸ πρόσω τοῦ λόγου, ὁμοίως σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξίοντα. Cf. Hutton 2005a: 55. On Herodotus as a major literary model for Pausanias, see Habicht 1985: 3 n.7: “Pausanias is as close to, and as fond of, Herodotus as the separation of some six hundred years allows. His frequent imitation of Herodotus is notorious.” See also Pritchett 1999: 8 with references.
55 This translation belongs to Jones and Ormerod (1918), and though it elides the meaning of the Greek in significant ways, I have not adapted his translation here because it adequately expresses a significant way that the passage has been construed, for instance by Frazer 1898. Rather than “a general description”, the adverb and participle ὁμοίως ἔπεξίόντα translate more literally to “going through in a similarly detailed manner”.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 1.26.4

Despite the encyclopedic claim implied in the promise to describe *panta homoios ta hellenica*, as noted above, the author treats neither all the territories where Greeks were to be found nor all of what might be traditionally described as mainland Greece, nor even all the prominent monuments within his itineraries.\(^{56}\) In light of these omissions, some scholars interpret *panta ta Hellenica* as rhetorical hyperbole.\(^{57}\) But in order to put Pausanias’ encyclopedic claim into perspective, it is helpful to consider it in the light of Pliny’s express attempt at a totalizing collection.\(^{58}\)

Pliny lays out the scope of his own vast project in an elaborate preface that includes an imperial dedication and leads into both a table of contents and list of sources.\(^{59}\) On the novelty and scope of his project he writes:

> praeterea iter est non trita auctoribus via nec qua peregrinari animus expetat. nemo apud nos qui idem temptaverit, nemo apud Graecos, qui unus omnia ea tractaverit. magna pars studiorum amoenitates quaerimus; quae vero tractata ab aliis dicuntur immensae subtilitatis, obscuris rerum tenebris premuntur. ante omnia attingenda quae Graeci τῆς ἑγκυκλίου παιδείας vocant, et tamen ignota aut incerta ingenii facta; alia vero ita multis prodita, ut in fastidium sint adducta.

And, besides this, my road is not a beaten track, nor one which the mind is much disposed to travel over. There is no one among us who has ever attempted it, nor is there any one individual among the Greeks who has treated of all the topics. Most of us seek for nothing but amusement in our studies, while others are fond of subjects that are of excessive subtlety, and completely involved in obscurity. My object is to treat of all those things which the Greeks include in the general education [Encyclopædia], which, however, are either not generally known or are rendered dubious from our ingenious conceits. And there are other matters which many writers have given so much in detail that we quite loathe them.\(^{60}\)

---

\(^{56}\) See Habicht 1985: 4-5. Cf. Hutton 2005a: 58 in reference to Elsner 1992: 58: “This reading would be more satisfying, though, if it weren’t for the fact that there were certainly things of interest to Greek-speakers at this time outside of the territory that Pausanias covers. Pausanias covers some of these himself: Delos, for instance, and the shrine of Zeus in Dodona in Epeiros.”

\(^{57}\) Akujärvi 2012: 349: “the statement that ‘all things Greek’ (1.26.4) will be treated can hardly be taken otherwise than as a transition-cum-hyperbolic assertion, making it clear that Athens is not the limit of the work.” Cf. Hutton 2005a: 57.


\(^{60}\) Translation by Bostock and Riley (1855).
Pliny presents his encyclopedic project as an innovation on the basis that nobody else has yet tried to gather so much diverse information in one compendium, *nemo apud nos qui idem temptaverit, nemo apud Graecos, qui unus omnia ea tractaverit.* He presents the novelty of his literary project through the metaphors of an untraveled road and the unexpected journey, *praeterea iter est non trita auctoribus via nec qua peregrinar i animus expetat.* Hutton argues, primarily on the basis of its scale and scope, that the *Periegesis Hellados* is a text that presents a novel innovation on periegetic literature: while Pausanias describes an area roughly coterminous with Roman Greece in ten books with a mere four chapters devoted to the Athenian acropolis, Polemon and Diodorus, as examples of earlier periegetic writers, respectively dedicated four books and at least three to the description of the same acropolis. In contrast, just as Pliny distinguishes his project from earlier topical collections on the basis of universality, the scope of the *Periegesis Hellados* sets it apart not only from periegetic works devoted to a particular *polis* or sanctuary but also geographical works devoted to the entire world.

The prevailing organizational principle of the *Periegesis* is topographical, and the frame narrative presents a journey along the routes of Roman Greece. Thus Pliny’s

---

61 Carey 2003: 18 contrasts Pliny’s project with previous thematic collections of Varro, Cato, and Celsus on the basis of its universality. Carey observes that in addition to the statement in the preface (14), the structure of the work as a whole reflects its compass, beginning with the description of the cosmos (*mundum*) in book 2 and then the creatures that inhabit, and finally the mineral and materials within the earth itself, in a totalizing progression from vast to minute, celestial to subterranean.

62 Pliny’s route metaphor for his text is a trope that is by no way limited to *NH*, but it is particularly relevant to the structure of Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados*. E.g. Demodocus presents paths (*oimai*) of song in the *Odyssey* (8.481), and Parmenides’ *Proem* and Herodotus’ *Histories* both present song and *logos* with route metaphors. See Purves 2010: 67-69, 77, 120-132.


64 See Pretzler 2006: 144-160.

65 See Pretzler 2007a: 35 for discussion of actual travelling behind the production of the *Periegesis* and references to the conditions of the roads. Pretzler assumes, perhaps correctly, that Pausanias was a man of means who would have traveled by vehicle with an entourage between sites, but explored sites on foot. This is consistent with the practice of wealthy travellers according to Casson 1974: 176-182. But Pritchett 1999:163 allows for the possibility of pedestrian travel: “His practice of describing the various roads radiating out from the principle cities consumed many days, especially if on foot.” Akujärvi 2012b: 338-343 explores the language of movement in the topographical thread of the *Periegesis*. Akujärvi (340) states: “When the topographical thread is firmly established and when it is clear that the movement is pedestrian and that the point of view on the objects is that of someone walking among them, verbal phrases become less frequent.” Cf. Jost 2007: 106-108 where distances in stadia are approximations based on “walker’s speed.” Regardless of the realities of the extratextual narrator’s mode of transporation, the frame narrative
metaphorical presentation of his text-as-travel becomes travel-as-text in Pausanias. Unlike the *Natural History*, which invites cherry picking with its vast table of contents and thematic structure, the *Periegesis Hellados* invites the very mental journeying in the narrator’s footsteps (*peregrinari animus*) that Pliny’s metaphor evokes, the kind of “armchair travel” that Konstan noted in the epigraph to this introduction.

Pliny further specifies that his project, which collects all of the *rerum natura* in one compendium, reflects the entirety of the *enkyklios paideîa* or what Greeks call the “general education.” While the word *encyclopedia* conjures notions of universalism and totalization, the ancient context for the expression offers interesting insights for the interpretation of the *Periegesis Hellados*. König and Woolfe argue against a strict generic approach to *encyclopaedias* from antiquity to the modern period, noting that the use of the term to designate “large-scale, comprehensive compilation” does not occur until the seventeenth century, whereas previously it was applied to “compilations linked with educational curricula” and compilations organized along disciplinary lines. They therefore advocate for an encyclopedic spectrum, which they define as a “range of shared rhetorical and compilatory techniques to create knowledge-ordering works of different kinds, works that often claimed some kind of comprehensive and definitive status.”

Pliny’s reference to the *enkyklios paideîa* is suggestive for the topographically structured frame narrative of the *Periegesis Hellados*. The route begins in Attica and proceeds

---

66 See Pretzler 2004: *passim.*
67 See Elsner 2001 for reading the *Periegesis* as a literary construct composed of multiple itineraries and Pretzler 2004 for analysis of Pausanias’ method of composition. See also Akujärvi 2012b for discussion of the linearity of the text.
68 The preface of Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae* presents the breadth of disciplines that encompass *paideîa* both through enumeration of the topics treated in the text and the specializations of each of the illustrious dinner guests (1.1), so that it is clear that both Pliny’s compilation and Athenaeus’ fall within the spectrum of encyclopaedism. In his treatise on education, Plutarch admonishes parents to make sure that no branches of the traditional cycle of education remain unfamiliar, emphasizing knowledge through personal experience Plut. *de liberis educandis* 7c: Δεὶ τοῖςν τὸν παίδα τὸν ἐκεῖθενον μηδὲ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν καλομένων ἐγγενείων παιδευμάτων μητ’ ἀνήρικον μητ’ ἄθεατον ἐὰν εἶναι. On the traditional subjects of the general education see Marrou 1982: 176-178 and 280-281, and Morgan: 1998: 33-39 and 50-89.
southward down and around Peloponnese, and so the arrangements of Books 1 through 8 reflect a roughly circular itinerary around mainland Greece.\textsuperscript{71} While the expression \textit{enkyklios paideia} properly refers to the well-roundedness of a general education that covers all the traditional disciplines, it offers a provocative metaphor for the organization and presentation of the material and pedestrian circuit of the \textit{Periegesis}, which itself presents a composite itinerary spliced together from numerous journeys around Greece and further afield. The juxtaposition of Pliny’s goal of archiving the \textit{enkyklios paideia} with Pausanias’ \textit{panta ta Hellenica} also conjures the correlation between education and Hellenism expressed by Isocrates by which the \textit{pepaideumenoi} defined themselves.\textsuperscript{72} Despite Pliny’s lofty ambition and best efforts to get it all into a single text, he admits this is not really possible even as he exalts the goal of attempting it (\textit{HN} pref. 18).\textsuperscript{73} Pausanias’ text is no more successful at a complete capture, if this is in fact what is implied by \textit{panta ta Hellenica}. But like the extraordinary breadth of learning encompassed by the \textit{enkyklios paideia}, the diversity of subjects treated in the \textit{Periegesis Hellados} is a defining characteristic of the text.\textsuperscript{74}

Another useful comparandum for the diversity of the \textit{Periegesis’} contents is provided by Aulus Gellius’ \textit{Attic Nights}. Gellius’ preface emphasizes the role of chance (\textit{ordine rerum fortuito}) and the lack of internal logic (\textit{indistincte atque promisce annotabam}) for the order in which the excerpts and comments are presented in his text because they follow the order in which he consumed his sources (pref. 2-3) rather than some other organizing principle.\textsuperscript{75} This in turn produces the heterogeneity (\textit{facta...disparilitas}) between the entries that reflect the range and variety of his sources (\textit{ex auditionibus lectionibusque variis}). In contrast to Pliny’s thematic clustering or Athenaeus’ device of the banquet, the order and logic of presentation in Gellius is essentially disorder.\textsuperscript{76} The preface to Gellius’

\textsuperscript{71} See map of regional book divisions printed in Pretzler 2007a: 5.
\textsuperscript{72} On Isocrates \textit{Paneg.}, 4.50, see Swain 1996 and Malkin 2001. For more on \textit{paideia} and ethnicity in the Roman Empire, see Goldhill 2001 and Borg 2004.
\textsuperscript{73} See Carey 2003: 21: “The paradox of this quest for totality, is that, as Pliny himself admits, in order to catalogue the whole world, he has to leave things out.”
\textsuperscript{74} Akujärvi 2012b: 327.
\textsuperscript{75} Cf. Smith 2014: 49 for Aelian’s use of the aesthetic of \textit{poikilia} ‘variety’. See also Whitmarsh 2007: 45-46 for other several authors who eschew order in their miscellanies.
\textsuperscript{76} See Gunderson 2009: 5-47 for analysis of reading Gellius that has much to offer for approaching any antiquarian text, 18-26 in particular for this passage.
antiquarian text provides a useful paradigm for the amalgamation of heterogeneous materials in a single compendium in a way that fundamentally reflects the diversity of the sources consulted.  

This variety of inputs is also evident in a coda to Pausanias’ description of Attica, in which he summarizes the material he has just presented in a programmatic statement.

τοσαύτα κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀθηναίοις γνωριμώτατα ἦν ἐν τε λόγοις καὶ θεωρήμασιν, ἀπέχονε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὗ λόγος μοι τὰ ἐς συγγραφὴν ἀνήκοντα.

Such then are, according to my own judgment, the most well-known among the Athenian sights and stories, for from the beginning my narrative has selected from much material the most suitable elements for the composition.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 1.39.3

Gellius’ model of varied materials based on varied sources resonates subtly with this statement through the vagueness of λόγοις καὶ θεωρήμασιν, terms that are so capacious they can comfortably accommodate almost anything said, read or seen. Also in specifying that the narrative represents only a sample from a considerable abundance (ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν) there is an implication of a multitude of sources behind the work, which includes his personal experiences (autopsy) and information gathered from both oral and written sources.

Pausanias further clarifies his methods and subject matter, first presented in this coda to his Attic logos, in a programmatic statement in the third book on Laconia.

ὁ δὲ ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ μοι τῇ Ἀθηναίοις ἔγένετο, μὴ τὰ πάντα μὲ ἐφεξῆς, τὸ δὲ μάλιστα ἀξία μνήμης ἐπιλέξαμεν ἀπὸ συγκεκριμένων, δηλῶσο δὴ πρὸ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἑς Σπαρτιάτας: ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἠθέλησον ὁ λόγος ἀπὸ πολλῶν καὶ οὐκ ἀξίων.

---

77 The same can be said of Pliny. On Pliny’s treatment of sources (*HN* pref.17), see Beagon 1992; Conte 1994: 67-75; Carey 2003 24-25.

78 See Akujärvi 2005: 7 n.17 for quantitative relationship between the theoremata and the logoi.

ἀφηγήσεως, ὧν ἃ ἐκαστὸς παρὰ φύσι λέγουσιν, ἀποκρίναι τὰ ἀξιολογώτατα. ὡς οὖν εὖ βεβουλευμένος οὖ, ἐστιν ὅπου παραβήσομαι.

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.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 3.11.1

His use of *ta panta* in this passage glosses both the *theoremata* and *logoi* mentioned in the programmatic statement from the close of the Attic *logos* (1.39.3). This statement, however, is more explicit about the plurality of sources collected and assessed in the composition of the *syngraphe* (ἀπὸ πολλῶν... ἃ ἐκαστοὶ παρὰ φύσι λέγουσιν). These comments on the plurality of sources resonate strongly with Gellius’ statement that the miscellany of topics in his compilation reflects the plurality of sources.

Just as Pliny ultimately backs down from his objective in accordance with the pragmatic goal of completion, these related programmatic passages show that Pausanias does not really attempt to present *panta ta Hellenica*, or even all of the sights and stories of the communities visited in his text (1.39.3; 3.11.1). His *syngraphe* is selective rather than totalizing and indiscriminant. In this, Gellius is again useful for considering Pausanias’ methods. Gellius underscores his absolute subjectivity in the process of selection and compilation with his frequent use of the first person verbs and pronouns. But if his order of presentation is essentially random, his process of selection is not. Rather Gellius specifies that when he came across something worth remembering (*quid memoratu dignum audieram*), whether while reading or in conversation, he noted it. Gellius is not here more specific about what makes something “worth remembering,” other than to present himself the ultimate arbiter of what is worth recording.

---

80 Pref. 2-3: *Vsi sumus, feceramus, ceperam, audieram, annotabam eaque mihi ad subsidium memoriae quasi quoddam literarum penus recondebam, me, sumperam, facile inde nobis, feceramus.*

81 Compare Photius’ comments on the ordering in Pamphila’s miscellany (*Biblio. codex 175*): Ταύτα δὲ πάντα, ὅσα λόγου καὶ μνήμης αὐτὴ ἄξια ἔδοξε, εἰς ὑπομνήματα συμμενὴ καὶ οὐ πρὸς τὰς ἱδίας
Like Gellius, Pausanias tells his readers at the end of his Attic logos that his selections were made on the basis of personal assessment (κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἐμὴν). But his personal judgment is not the only one reflected in this passage; popular opinion is understood in the superlative γνωριμώτατα, most well-known, which presents a collective that extends beyond Pausanias’ own assessment. In the introduction to his Laconian logos, Pausanias insists that he does not present everything exactly in the order that he encounters them (μὴ τὰ πάντα μὲ ἐφεξῆς... εἰσιν), but rather that he selects from among a multitude only the most worth-remembering (τὰ δὲ μάλιστα ἄξια μνήμης ἐπιλεξάμενον). Rather than strict topography, the selection criterion appears to be what Pausanias considers to be the most worth-remembering. And this points to perhaps the most significant parallel between Gellius and Pausanias compilations; Pausanias’ repeated use of worth-remembering (ἄξια μνήμης) corresponds directly to Gellius’ phrase memoratu dignum.

But despite the similarity of expression, the implicit selection criteria for both texts are quite different. Where Gellius suggests a fundamentally subjective and personal prerogative—whatever suits his fancy or may be usefully recalled at some later date—Pausanias’ repeated use of the superlative in both programmatic passages (γνωριμώτατα, τὰ μάλιστα ἄξια μνήμης, ἄξιολογώτατα) suggests the addition of external constraints in his selection criteria. Further, the syntax of the second clause of the Attic coda grants agency to his logos itself (ὁ λόγος μοι) to decide (ἀπέκρινε) what material is suitable for inclusion in the text (τὰ ἐς συγγραφῆν ἀνήκοντα). This statement opens the door for speculation about some as yet unknown generic constraints as it suggests that the logos itself has criteria for what is appropriate to it, though Pausanias does not here elaborate on what these criteria are or even what kind of logos he has undertaken beyond the generic syngraphe.  

---

82 LSJ s.v. “γνώριμος” A.I.1 well-known; II. notable, distinguished.
84 E.g. 1.39.3; 2.19.8; 9.5.5. See discussion of syngraphe in relation to periegetic writing and historiography in Chamoux 1996: 48-9 and Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 21-40.
Gellius suggests that his compilation will provide him with a useful aide-mémoire to consult at some future date, but further into his preface, he explains that he also intends the collection be useful by saving the reader, who has the desire to learn but little leisure, from awkward ignorance, *rerum atque verborum imperitia* (pref.11-12). He underscores his didactic intent with commentary on the carefulness of his excerpting through the gnomic quip “πολυμαθήνυ νόον οὐ διδάσκει,” which illustrates the practice of a bevy of “Greeks” who compile indiscriminately, *sine cura discriminis.*

Outside his preface, Gellius provides the reader with a vignette of his methods through his account the discovery of a hoard of old Greek books full of miracles at a shop in Brundisium, books which he proceeds to read and jot down the marvelous anecdotes (*mirabilia*), now divorced from their context, in order that the reader not be ignorant of these facts (ἀνήκοως) (9.4.2-4). This vignette presents a reiteration of his method of reading and selective recording what he considers note-worthy (*in legendo carpsi, notavi*), only in this case he is more specific that it is marvels he is collecting and transmitting.

Gellius’ purpose in this passage resonates strongly with Pausanias’ presentation of an extended digression on Sardinia in this midst of his description of Phocis. The digression on Sardinia presents an account of the myth-history of the island, description of its prominent monuments, geographical features, flora and fauna, and the whole is appended to Pausanias’ mention of a statue of the Sardinians’ eponymous hero Sardu in Delphi (10.17.1-13). He closes his digression with a justification for its inclusion, “I have introduced into my history of Phocis (ἐς τὴν Φωκίδα συγγραφήν) this account of Sardinia (περὶ τῆς Σαρδῶς λόγον), because it is an island about which the Greeks are very ignorant (ἀνηκοῶς εἶχον).”

---

85 This is a portion of a fragment of Heraclitus transmitted in Diogenes Laërtius 9.1 (*DK* B40): πολυμαθήνυ νόον οὐ διδάσκει. Ἡσίωδον γὰρ ἂν ἐδόθη καὶ Πυθαγόρην, αὐτὸς τε Ξενοφάνεα τε καὶ Ἑκατείαν. Gellius expands on his goals in making selections (pref.12-13), but I will refrain from further analysis of his preface in order not to stray too far from exegesis of Pausanias’ text.

86 This is an important passage for the definition of paradoxography, which will be further examined in subsequent chapters, but for the moment it is sufficient to emphasize the didactic intent of his process of excerption and compilation.

87 See also Gabba 1981: 57-58 for discussion of association between island narratives and the marvelous in Hellenistic historiography.
reflects the same subject miscellany as the *Periegesis Hellados* itself and functions as a representation of the text on a miniature scale, a sort of periegetic *mise-en-abîme*. If the object of Sardinia *logos* is mitigation of the ignorance of the Greeks, then it follows that the object of the *Periegesis Hellados* is not merely to describe the features, monuments and myth-history of Roman Greece, but also the instruction of the Greeks.88

**TRAVEL NARRATIVE AS PARADIGM**

The gnomic saying *pathei mathos* indicates that we learn through suffering.89 This concept stands behind the correlation between wandering and knowledge in ancient Greek culture that begins with Odysseus, the Homeric much-suffering man of many-ways.90 If, indeed, the overall goal of the *Periegesis* is didactic, then the format of an authentic travelogue is particularly appropriate to further this end, because it presents a unique combination of discovery and personal experience. Both Pliny’s *Natural History* and Aulus Gellius’ *Attic Nights* are generically related to the *Periegesis Hellados* as miscellanies on the encyclopaedic spectrum, and comparative analysis offers suggestive insights for interpreting the genre, subject and scope of Pausanias’ project.91 But the strategy adopted for the organization and presentation of material is different from one antiquarian miscellany to another.92 For instance, Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae* encompasses a prodigious miscellany that is structured as an elaborate dinner party for several sophisticated literati. It is therefore sensible to consider Plato’s *Symposium*, as the most illustrious in a literary tradition of the banquet typology, as model for this text.93 By the same logic, it makes sense to seek a travelogue as a model for Pausanias’ *Periegesis*

---

88 Chamoux 1996: 53 makes a similar observation in relation to Pausanias’ use of digressions throughout the work: “sa désinvolture dans l’introduction des parerga à l’intérieur de son logos principal montre bien que sa préoccupation est moins de plaire que d’instruire.”

89 Aesch. *Ag.* 1.177.

90 Hom. *Od.* 1.1-5. See also Montiglio 2005: 2-5 on voluntarily undertaking the suffering of travel to acquire knowledge. Montiglio suggests significant overlap between wandering and travel, and explores the suffering inherent in a mortal’s wandering in contrast to the gods. See Pretzler 2007b for the role of travel to and around Greece in the elite education of the *pepaideumenoi* in the Second Sophistic.

91 The selection of Pliny and Gellius’ works is not based solely on the parallel miscellaneous content, but also because of the inclusion of paradoxographical material. On wonders in Pliny, see essays by Beagon and Naas in Gibson and Morello 2011: 57-88. On marvels and paradoxography in Gellius, see Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 375-376, 410-425. Other suitable candidates for comparison for this study include Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae* and Aelian’s *De Natura Animalium*.

92 See König and Whitmarsh 2007: 31-39 for discussion of ordering diverse material.

93 Cf. Ath. *Epit.* 1.1. Jacob 2013: 5-40 explores Athenaeus’ *mimesis* and innovation within this tradition. See additional bibliography on the genre listed on p. 6 n. 1. See also Trapp 2000.
\textit{Hellados}, because the text is structured as a narrative of pedestrian travel. The tradition of travel texts from antiquity is unfortunately not well represented in our corpus of surviving material; nevertheless reading the preface to Lucian’s parody of these texts, \textit{True Stories}, offers insights about their characteristic features.\footnote{Pretzler 2007a: 44 begins the discussion of ancient travel narrative with Lucian’s \textit{True Stories}. A more thorough treatment of wonder in ancient travel literature will follow in the next chapter.}

In his preface, Lucian insists on the inherent ambiguity of authorial reliability in travel narrative.\footnote{See Kim 2010: 144-174.} He inverts the methodology through which travel writers (and historians) establish credibility, namely personal experience or autopsy, when he mockingly states that he will write about things he has not seen, experienced or learned from inquiry (περὶ ὧν μήτε εἶδον μήτε ἔπαθον μήτε παρ’ ἄλλων ἐπιθύμην).\footnote{On autopsy and authority in historiography, see Marincola 1997: 63-86.} Lucian’s parody draws attention the vulnerability of the these methods to ironic \textit{mimesis}; since he has nothing true to report (ἐπεὶ μηδὲν ἄληθὲς ἱστορεῖν εἶχον) because of a lack of life experience (οὐδὲν ἐπεπόνθειν ἄξιολογον), he must turn to outright lying (ἐπὶ τὸ ψεῦδος ἐτραπόμην), so that the only true thing he will report is that he is lying (\textit{VH} 1.4). He frames this as a kind of poetic license (ἐν τῷ μυθολογεῖν ἐλευθερία).

But just what kind of experience does Lucian consider truly worth telling (axiologon) in a travel-tale? In his disparagement of earlier authors, he specifies:

\begin{quote}
πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τὰ αὐτὰ τούτοις προελόμενοι συνέγραψαν ὡς δὴ τινὰς ἑαυτῶν πλάνας τε καὶ ἁπάνθωσις, θηρίων τε μεγέθη ἱστοροῦντες καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὄμοτητας καὶ βίων καινότητας.
\end{quote}

Many others, with the same intent, have written about imaginary travels and journeys of theirs, telling of huge beasts, cruel men and strange ways of living.

Lucian, \textit{Verae Historiae} 1.3

Accounts of great beasts and the savage ways of wild men are standard fare for reports of exotic travel and these are quintessentially marvels, \textit{terastia} and \textit{paradoxa}.\footnote{See Jacob 1980b.} Of course, Lucian insists these accounts are not reliable; rather they are clever lies that are told in a
believable manner, ψεύσματα ποικίλα πιθανῶς. But despite Lucian’s cynicism, it is clear from his framing of the True Stories that wonders that are authenticated through autopsy or ‘credible’ second-hand report are at the heart of the traditional accounts of exotic travel that he mockingly mimics, and his appropriation of this marvelous material for his own (spurious) travel narrative shows that it is in fact the kind of stuff that is ‘worth telling’ (ἀξιόλογον).98

If Lucian indicates that marvels are ‘worth telling’ in a travelogue, what exactly makes a monument or phenomenon worth seeing or worth recording according to the criteria of the Periegesis Hellados? The traces of the heroic past, the rivers, springs and contours of the landscape of Roman Greece are regularly signaled as “worth seeing” (ἄξιον θέας), “worth recording” (ἄξιον μνήμης), and “worth telling” (ἀξιόλογον).99 So, too, are the rituals, monuments and sanctuaries as cultural products of its inhabitants, and these repeatedly draw narrator’s interest. Pausanias does not elaborate on the exact properties that make an artifact, monument, ritual or feature of the landscape “worth seeing” or associated logos “worth recording”, but from the coda to Pausanias’ description of Attica, we know that he has applied selection criteria to sort through the mass of material related to the region in order to present what is most suited to his text, τὰ ἐς συγγραφὴν ἀνήκοντα (1.39.3). This periphrastic construction is echoed and amplified in the programmatic statement at the opening of the description of Laconia, where Pausanias insists that his method requires selecting only the most worthy sights and stories for inclusion in the text, ἀξιολογώτατα (3.11.1). It has been observed that Pausanias uses wonder (thauma) and worth seeing (theas axion) interchangeably in the text.100 This seems consistent with Lucian’s usage in the preface to the True Stories, so that we should expect that what is axiologon in travel writing—and by extension theas axion the Periegesis Hellados—is in fact a marvel.

98 Kim 2010: 148 states: “Strabo’s targets, like Lucian’s, are not traveler’s tales and ethnographies per se, but the sort of ‘myths’ that are characteristic of those genres and remain problematic even when they occur in more properly historical works, like those of Herodotus and Theopompus.” Cf. Hutton 2005a: 6; Morgan 1985.
99 Pretzler 2007a and Pirenne-Delforge 2010 do not distinguish between the forms theas axion, mnemes axion, and axiologon.
100 Neer 2010: 68. See also Kreilinger 1997 for an art-historical approach to Pausanias’ selection criteria.
OUTLINE OF THE WORK

I have so far refrained from defining exactly what is meant by wonders, marvels and the marvelous in the context of this study, which is given a more thorough treatment in the following chapter. But before proceeding further, it is necessary to give some sense of what is intended by the terminology of wonder I employ. Nightingale’s formulation of Archaic wonder as “both cognitive and affective, intellectual and emotional, ranging from the feelings of reverence and awe to admiration and amazement” eloquently describes wonder as a subjective experience.¹⁰¹ But this study is also concerned with objective wonders. In the briefest iteration, this category refers to any phenomenon or object that is labeled as a *thauma* or *paradoxon* (or their cognate forms) in Greek, or a *mirabilum* in Latin. We might fruitfully adopt Westermann’s definition from the opening of his edition of the Greek paradoxographers, where he identifies *thaumata* — and the equivalent term *paradoxa*— as *quae praeter expectationum accidunt et admirationem movent*.¹⁰² This combination of expectations and admiration suggests that *thaumata* are part of the aesthetics of rare experiences and the phenomenology of rare events that have at surprise at their core.¹⁰³ The foreign customs of the Egyptians and the Scythians are ethical wonders familiar to readers of Herodotus’ *Histories*, as are natural wonders like the flow of the river Nile.¹⁰⁴ The Shield of Achilles in the *Iliad* as an *imago mundi* with its animated figures rendered in precious metals with divine skill is the archetypal example of an artifact as *thauma*; the plowing mimesis on the shield is specifically labeled as a wonder (*II. 18. 549*), and Hephaestus promises Thetis that any mortal who sees the shield will marvel, *θαυμάσσεται, ὅς κεν ἴδηται* (*II. 18. 466-467*).¹⁰⁵

In addition to the myriad artifacts and natural phenomena that are individually described as wonders in ancient texts, collections of marvels open the door for a category of conventional marvels: Daston and Park refer to a “canon of natural wonders” that “had a stable core” from the Hellenistic period through to the Middle Ages “with a penumbra

¹⁰¹ Nightingale 2004: 256.
¹⁰² Westermann 1839: ix.
¹⁰⁵ Cf. Hephaestus’ tripods that move on their own are a *θαυμάμιδεσθαι* *II. 18. 372-377*. For readings of the significance of the shield as artifact, see Hubbard 1997; Francis 2009; Scully 2003; Purves 2010: 46-55.
that expanded and contracted as ideas, experiences, and sensibilities changed.”\footnote{Daston and Park 1998: 17.} Proper contextualization of such conventional marvels requires in-depth analysis of surviving wonder-books and testimony of lost works that will be the focus of the next chapter, but for the moment it will suffice to note that the vocabulary of wonders appears frequently in the \textit{Periegesis Hellados}, as do ethical and natural wonders as well as prodigies that can easily be understood as \textit{thaumata} by convention.\footnote{Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 55-56 categorizes wonders as either characteristic of encounters with either nature or human achievements.} The first chapter is devoted to matters of definition and redefinition in relation to \textit{thaumata} and \textit{paradoxa}.

The scholarly reception of the \textit{Periegesis} in the late 19th and early 20th century replicates Lucian’s innate suspicion that writers who include tales of marvelous beasts and strange customs in their accounts are necessarily embellishing through poetic license.\footnote{See Habicht 1985: 165-175, Appendix 1: “Pausanias and his critics,” for his survey of debate. Wilamowizt and his followers notably judged Pausanias as an compiler of previous periegetic literature who did not read or see what he claimed, which is countered especially by Gurlitt and Frazer, though both understand the Periegesis to be a guide-book. See also Elsner 1992: 4 n.3-9 for a summary of earlier scholarship and related bibliography, and Hutton 2005a: 20-23.} For example, Kalkmann devotes an entire chapter of his monograph on the \textit{Periegesis} to a demonstration of the prevalence of marvels in the text, not so much to elucidate its concerns, but rather to attack the credibility of the account on the basis of the frequent autopsy claims in the descriptions of \textit{thaumata}.\footnote{Kalkmann 1886: xxx. See also Heberdey 1894 for assertions of autopsy in the Periegesis.} Kalkmann’s argument is based on assumptions about the essential characteristics of travel and paradoxographic writing that create a binary opposition between primary and secondary witness in these texts. This binary constructs paradoxography as a specialized genre of derivative wonder literature—compilations of wonder anecdotes culled second-hand from more authoritative literary sources—and travel writing as a brand of eyewitness account based on actual travel. The assimilation of the \textit{Periegesis} to a derivative antiquarian mode therefore undermined the reliability of Pausanias as a primary witness to any monuments, rituals and oral reports described in the text, because according to this definition wonder compilation is fundamentally incompatible with authentic autopsy. The object of the second chapter of this study is to show that the generic and methodological distinctions between travel texts and paradoxographies are far more flexible than generally assumed. Interrogating the
relationship between travel writing and paradoxographic literature shows that wonder-texts reflect a continuum rather than a binary. By challenging the assumptions that underpin the scholarship on wonder-texts, this chapter destabilizes the rigidity of these siloed generic categories and allows for the development a more nuanced picture of the roles of textual research and various authentication strategies in wonder-texts.

The third chapter further explores paradoxography and periegetic compositions as virtual collections. In the main it is devoted to exploring thematically structured catalogues of wonders in the *Periegesis Hellados* in order to shed light on analogy as a strategy for authenticating marvels. This chapter exploits stylistic commonalities between paradoxographies and periegetic writing in order to emphasize the important role of thematic catalogues in the text, which stand in contrast to the topographically ordered frame narrative. This chapter also challenges the exclusion of myth-historical wonders from discussion of paradoxography in order to challenge the generic distinction between paradoxography and *periegetic* writing on the basis of classes of *mirabilia*.

The fourth chapter explores the strategic use of exotic wonders and antiquarian catalogues in the text in order to expand to the geographical scope of the *Periegesis Hellados* to include the whole of the *oikoumene*. The inclusion of foreign wonders in the description of Greece allows Pausanias to challenge conventions that limit wonders to marginal, far-off places. In the *Periegesis Hellados*, exotic marvels are paired and compared with analogous phenomena at the centre of the inhabited world through the application of techniques associated with antiquarian compilation in order to demonstrate the geographic specificity and numinosity of Roman Greece.
Chapter 1: Defining Wonder

In the introductory chapter, I presented a tentative definition of wonder drawn from Westermann’s usage with the promise to further elaborate the definition in the first chapter. Westermann’s definition, *quae praeter expectationum accidunt et admirationem movent*, is functional enough to give a general sense of the subject of inquiry.¹ It does a fundamental disservice to the study of wonder in Pausanias’ text, however, because it allows for the replication of the modern reader’s biases about what constitutes a wonder. Daston and Park encountered a similar challenge in their influential study of wonder in scientific medieval texts. They lay out their theoretical and methodological approach to producing a historically contextualized definition of wonder as follows:

[W]e have adopted one fundamental principle: to attend as precisely as possible to what our sources meant by the passion of wonder and by wonders as objects. We here diverge from most recent student of the pre-modern marvelous, who have tended to define their subject in terms of “what we now call marvels,” in the words of Jacques Le Goff. (...) Accounts of the subject based on this anachronistic definition are evocative for modern readers, but they lack historical coherence and precision.²

If this study is to avoid the pitfalls of employing an anachronistic definition of wonder in terms of “what we now call marvels” as the basis for analysis of the *Periegesis*, the primary goal must be to establish a working definition for the cultural context in which the text was composed, and then to imitate Daston and Park and stay as close as possible to what is meant by both the subjective experience of wonder and wonders as either objects or phenomena in the *Periegesis* itself.

² Daston and Park 1998: 15.
A NOTE ON USAGE

But before proceeding further, it is necessary to make a note on usage and terminology in this project. Following the practice of Westermann in his 19th century critical edition of collected books on wonders, I use the terms paradoxa, thaumata and mirabilia interchangeably throughout to designate wonders or marvels. The English semantic field to which wonder and marvel belong is extraordinarily polyvalent. Just as the English wonder can designate both any marvelous ‘thing’ in the objective sense, it can also indicate a passion akin to the subjective sensation of astonishment and curiosity provoked by an encounter with such a marvelous object. Daston and Park analyze the origins of the vocabulary employed by medieval and early modern Europeans to denote “wonder” and “marvel,” and observe that, in Latin, the emotion itself is called admiratio and while the objects are designated as mirabilia, miracula and admiranda, which they trace through miror to the Indo-European root for “smile.” These cognates are represented in the romance language “merveille” and English “marvel.” The English word wonder is derived from the Germanic form wunder, which though it has obscure origins, appears to connote complexity. Daston and Park follow the late medieval and early modern practice of using the Germanic wonder and the romance marvel interchangeably, and this study will follow their example.

“What We Now Call Marvels”

What is implied in the phrase “what we now call marvels”? In the introduction to his Marvelous Possessions, a seminal work on marvel in European accounts of the New World in the “Age of the Discovery,” Greenblatt is careful to present a well-defined and restricted definition of wonder. He states, “[t]he expression of wonder stands for all that cannot be understood, that can scarcely be believed. It calls attention to the problem of credibility and at the same time insists upon the undeniability, the exigency of the

---

3 Westermann 1839: IX.
4 Cooke 2013: 6 with reference to the definitions in the OED.
5 OED s.v. wonder, n. I: “Something that causes astonishment.” and II 7 a: “The emotion excited by the perception of something novel and unexpected, or inexplicable; astonishment mingled with perplexity or bewildered curiosity.”
experience.” His observations are based on the conceptualization of the marvelous according to Descartes’ formulation in his book on the passions, *Les passions de l’âme.* Descartes describes wonder (*l’admiration*) as “when the first encounter with some object surprises us, and we judge it to be new, or very different from what we knew in the past or what we supposed it was going to be, this makes us wonder and be astonished (*étonnés*) at it.”

Descartes’ formulation of wonder as the first of the passions is a deeply subjective one, as the cognitive experience is entirely dependent on the familiarity and expectations of the subject viewer. He locates the physiological process in the brain, which contrasts with earlier conceptualizations of the phenomenon as a passion rooted in the heart and blood. Greenblatt, following Spinoza, calls this the ‘somatic authority’ of the experience of wonder. According to his definition, wonder is a mental state brought on by an encounter with the unexpected that is so powerful it produces a physiological effect akin to paralysis.

Fisher, following Kant, classifies both the sublime and wonder as part of the aesthetics of rare experiences, and both categories are associated with surprise. But he distinguishes between these two aesthetics on the basis of the emotional response associated with each passion. Wonder, he says, “involves the aestheticization of delight, or the pleasure principle,” which he contrasts with “the death principle, whose agent within aesthetic experience is the sublime.” He defines wonder briefly as a “sudden experience of an extraordinary object that causes delight.” Fisher deliberately excludes signs and miracles from his analysis of the aesthetics of wonder on the grounds that they functionally stymie the very intellectual curiosity that he most closely associates with wonder. He combines two well-known proverbs to make his point clear: “Fear made the

---

7 See Greenblatt 1991:16-22 for summary of the conceptualization of the marvelous, p. 20 for quotation. See also Nightingale 2004:253-268 for historical overview of wonder in scientific discourse.
9 On Spinoza’s critique of wonder in the philosophical tradition, see Rosenthal 2010: 236-239.
10 Fisher 1998: 2. Vasalou 2015 takes Fisher’s ‘crisp’ definition of wonder as a “sudden experience of an extraordinary object that causes delight” as the starting point for the investigation of the ‘grammar’ of wonder. Vasalou suggests that Fisher’s aphoristic definition is a good place to begin to answer the question “What is wonder?” but does not account for the full range of wonder’s ‘grammar’ through “its characteristic objects, feeling tones, means of provocation, and reasons for being desired” (2-4). Despite opening new possibilities through deconstruction of Fisher’s definition, Vasalou does not attempt a similarly synthetic or comprehensive definition of wonder, instead she provides the “highlights of its character, sketching the passion of wonder from different angles—linguistic, historical, evaluative” (5).
gods, but philosophy begins in wonder.” Daston and Park further note that “what we now call marvels” more or less map onto contemporary notions of the fictional or fantastic.\textsuperscript{13} Notions of the fictional and fantastic oppose the rational and the credible in modern fantastic literature, and embrace the sensational. Sandner draws attention to the importance of belief in the reception of the fantastic, noting that “[f]antastic literature is a necessarily skeptical literature, appearing after primary belief in the supernatural has waned.”\textsuperscript{14}

But how appropriate is an articulation of wonder based on the work of Descartes, Spinoza or Kant to the study of \textit{thaumata} in Pausanias’ \textit{Periegesis Hellados}? Although these formulations of wonder, akin to shock and awe, are familiar to contemporary readers, they are less appropriate to the study of \textit{thauma} in Pausanias because these are clearly historically contingent theoretical formulations of the passion and its aesthetics. In order to avoid the pitfalls of “what we now call wonders” in this study, it is necessary to begin by dismantling certain assumptions about wonder in the modern era in order to frame \textit{thauma} and its referents in ancient authors. There are three main sticking points between the modern notion of the marvelous outlined above and articulations of wonder in ancient authors that will be addressed in this chapter: the first is the distinction in contemporary discourse between wonder and the sublime on the basis of pleasure and fear, the second is the distinction between miracles and wonders as respectively proper to religious and scientific discourse, and the third is the notion that novelty or surprise is an essential prerequisite in the construction of wonder in ancient authors.

\textbf{Summary of Treatments of Wonder in Ancient Authors}

A few scholarly treatments of wonder in antiquity provide the basis for further inquiry. These, however, have generally been restricted to a particular chronological period or author; examples include Prier’s treatment of wonder in Archaic sources, Hunzinger’s study of \textit{thauma} and cognates in the Homeric epics, Munson’s exploration of ethical

\textsuperscript{12} Fisher 1998: 9; here philosophy stands for the tradition of scientific enquiry associated with the natural sciences.
\textsuperscript{13} See Todorov 1970.
\textsuperscript{14} ‘Introduction’ in Sandner 2004.
wonders in Herodotus’ political discourse, Neer’s analysis of wonder as one of several responses to sculpture in the Classical period, and most recently Chrysakopoulou’s analysis of Platonic wonder and philosophy.\(^{15}\) Each of these contextualized studies provides useful insights for a broader definition of wonder in antiquity and necessary background for this study, but they unfortunately provide only glimpses of the semantic range of *thauma* rather than a synthetic definition. Since wonder and its referents change over time, the question arises, how do we better contextualize Westermann’s definition while remaining within a manageable scope?

In his study of methodology in paradoxographic compilation, Jacob discusses various approaches for the definition of *thauma* that can shed light on how to proceed further.\(^{16}\) He suggests three possible methods of inquiry: the first is to conduct a diachronic analysis of the use of key terminology across the semantic field of wonder in order to determine precise usage and significance;\(^{17}\) the second is to explore context specific usage akin to the studies of Prier, Munson and Hunzinger noted above;\(^{18}\) the third is essentially a process of reverse engineering whereby wonder is defined on the basis of what is included in compilations of marvelous anecdotes.\(^{19}\) Both because the overwhelming scope and scale of a comprehensive diachronic survey are obvious deterrents to the undertaking, and because the subject of his investigation was paradoxography rather than wonder *per se*, Jacob opted for the third methodological approach. He defines *paradoxa* on the basis of what is included in his model text: Antigonus Carystius’ collection of wonders.

At first glance, paradoxographic compilations, which will be further explored in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, seem to provide the obvious point of departure for the identification and definition of *thaumata*, because the genre is exclusively devoted to the systematic presentation of wonders. For instance, the 173 entries in Antigonus’ wonder compilation

---

\(^{15}\) See Prier 1989; Hunzinger 2005; Munson 2001; Neer 2010; Chrysakopoulou 2013. To this may also be added Malinowski’s (2001) treatment of marvels in Strabo.

\(^{16}\) Jacob 1983:122-3 frames the study as a continuation of Giannini’s 1961 systematic study of *mirabilia*.

\(^{17}\) The relevant terms are identified as *paradoxon*, *idion*, *thaumaston*, *xenon*, *apiston*, *atopon*.

\(^{18}\) Truly he considered this approach to be a subset of the first. The contextualized studies he proposes are *thauma* in the *logos* of Herodotus, in the rhetoric of Isocrates, the works of the *Peripatetics*, in Stoic philosophy, etc.

\(^{19}\) Jacob 1983: 122-127.
are as follows: Chapters 1-108 deal with zoology, 109-118 with human physiology, 119-128 with places with dangerous exhalations, and 129-73 are topically varied wonders drawn from Callimachus’ wonder compilation with an emphasis on waters.\textsuperscript{20} Apollonius’ collection reflects similar material: sections 1-6 recount traditions about the extraordinary experiences of named individuals, like Epimenides of Crete, who slept for 57 years and lived for over 150 (1), while the remaining entries (7-51) deal with botany, zoology, human biology, springs, rocks and ethnography.\textsuperscript{21} These compilations, however, in no way attempt to define what a \textit{thauma} is even though they are replete with examples. In the process of compilation, what constitutes a wonder appears to be self-evident and can therefore be can be taken for granted, or at least remain unexpressed in the text. Ultimately, Jacob’s third option for defining wonder is tautological: a wonder is what you find in a collection of wonders.

For ancient theories about wonder (cognitive, subjective) and wonders (objective), it is necessary to look beyond paradoxographic compilations to the source texts from which \textit{thaumata} and \textit{paradoxa} are excerpted and compiled; epic poetry, historiography, scientific, and philosophical writings all contribute raw material for compilation and testify to a variety of conceptual engagements with wonder. But as Platt admonishes in his analysis of the discourse of wonder in the Renaissance, “no unified vision of the marvelous existed: it was a concept full of inconsistency and variety,” and the same polyvalence should be expected from ancient sources.\textsuperscript{22} The brief survey of relevant passages that follows in this chapter aims to give a representative sample, if not a comprehensive capture, of \textit{thauma} in ancient authors in order to produce a working definition of wonder for analysis of the \textit{Periegesis Hellados} that stays as close as possible to a coherent construction of the marvelous in ancient sources.

\textit{The Phenomenology of Wonder in Ancient Authors: Toward Conventional Wonders}

In his detailed analysis of wonder in Archaic thought, Prier defines to \textit{thauma} as “a most widely used substantive for ‘amazed stupor,’ ‘state of shock,’” as well as “quasi-

\textsuperscript{20} Summarized in Hansen 1996: 4-5.
\textsuperscript{21} Hansen 1996: 6. Apollonius is the 2nd century author of the collection \textit{Historíai thaumásiai}.
\textsuperscript{22} Platt 1999: 16.
archaeological ‘objects’. ” He further explains the related formula *thauma idesthai*, a wonder to behold, as the “intermediation between the polarities of men and gods, visually linguistic symbols of power.” He provides a list of examples that includes the shield forged for Achilles by Hephaestus (*Il.* 18 478-608), the golden chariot and armor of the Thracian king Rhesus (10.436-9), intricately woven textiles (*e.g.* *Od.* 6.306; 8.366), the cave of the Naiads (*Od.* 13.105-109), the House of Hephaestus (*Il.* 18.370-377), and the city of the Phaeacians (*Od.* 7. 41-45). Each of Prier’s examples drawn from the Homeric epics embodies both an objective quality of the artifact and the subjective experience of the viewer. Many bear the emblems of extraordinary skill in their manufacture and the use of gleaming materials, of which the golden armor of the Thracian king Rhesus is a representative example. The armor (*τεύχεα*), which is huge (*πελώρια*) and golden (*χρύσεια*), is described as a wonder to see (*θαύμα ἱδέσθαι*). Both the size and the material of the armor are noted as significant, but the poet further emphasizes that the armor is unlike that worn by mortals (*τὰ μὲν οὐ τι θαυμαθητοῖσιν / ἀνδρεσσιν φορέειν*) and rather resembles that worn by the gods (*[ἴουσεν] ὃλλ’ ἀθανάτοιοι θεοῖσιν [φορέειν]*). From this passage one can surmise that the armor is a ‘wonder to see’ because of its gleaming material and its size, but also some unmentioned quality that marks it as fit for the gods.

Hunzinger is careful to emphasize that the verbal form *θαυμάζει* connotes a way of seeing associated with contemplation; the temporal length of the regard and the viewer’s inability to look away are characteristic features of the inherent fascination understood in *θαυμάζει*. This state of fascination then produces immobility akin to temporary paralysis as the subject’s focus is entirely devoted to contemplation of the marvel. The next section will argue that contrary to Fisher’s contemporary distinction between the

---

23 Prier 1989: 91. However, Hunzinger 2005: 29 observes that in the *Iliad* the substantive *thauma* is never used to designate the sensation of amazement or admiration, but rather the external objects that provoke these subjective states. Hunzinger observes (n.1) that the use of *thauma* to designate the sensation is very rare in Archaic epic. See *Od.* 10.326; Th. 588; Hesiod *fr.* 278, 1.


25 *Cf.* *Il.* 18.82-85.


27 Hunzinger 2005: 32.
sublime and wonder, analysis of passages from Homer, Aristotle and Pseudo-Longinus demonstrates that *thaumata* can elicit both fear and delight.

**THAUMA: FEAR AND DELIGHT AND THE ‘VIEWING’ SUBJECT**

Although the definition of sublimity in Pseudo-Longinus’ *On the Sublime* is primarily stylistic—the “distinction and excellence of expression” which “flashing forth at the right moment scatters everything before it like a thunderbolt” (1.3-4)—Neer characterized the “critical jargon of the sublime” in this text as the after-life of the older (Archaic) concept *thauma.*28 Pseudo-Longinus’ discussion of *thauma* provides a useful point of departure for an examination of wonder because it so clearly articulates the relationship of the viewer-subject to both mundane and marvelous phenomena.29

Pseudo-Longinus suggests that it is in the nature of human beings by virtue of their intellect to conceive a deep spiritual longing, ἄμαχον ἑωτα ἐνέφυσεν ἡμῶν ταῖς ψυχαῖς, for the great and beautiful things in the cosmos, παντὸς ἂεὶ τοῦ μεγάλου, and most especially those things which are more divine than ourselves, πρὸς ἡμᾶς δαμονιωτέρου (35.2).30 He goes on to exemplify this observation in a well-known passage on natural wonders.

\[
\text{ἐνθὲν φυσικῶς πῶς ἁγόμενοι μὰ Δί' οὐ τὰ μικρὰ ἑξίθρᾳ θαυμάζομεν, εἰ καὶ διανηγὴ καὶ χρήσιμα, ἄλλα τὸν Νείλον καὶ Ἅιστρον ἢ Ρήνον, πολὺ δ' ἐπὶ μᾶλλον τὸν Ωσκεανόν· οὐδὲ γε τὸ υφ' ἡμῶν τουτὶ φλογῖον ἀνακαώμενον, ἐπεὶ καθαρὸν σφώζει τὸ φέγγος, ἐκπληττόμεθα τῶν υψίστων μᾶλλον, παῖτι πολλάς ἐπικοσμουμένων, οὔτε τῶν τῆς Αἰτνῆς κρατήρων ἀξιοθαυμαστότερον νομίζομεν, ὡς αἱ ἀναχωμένοις πέτρους τε ἐκ βυθοῦ καὶ ὄλους ὀξὺς̇ς ἀναφέρουσι καὶ ποταμοῦς ἐνίστη τοῦ γηγενοῦς ἐκείνου καὶ αὐτομάτου προχέουσι πυρῶς, ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν τοιοῦτων ὀπάντων ἐκεῖν' ἃν εἴπομεν, ὡς εὐπόρουσον μὲν ἀνθρώπους τὸ χρείωδες ἢ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον, θαυμαστὸν δ' ὀμοίως ἂεὶ τὸ παράδοξον.
\]

This is why, by a sort of natural impulse, we admire not the small streams, useful and translucent though they be, but the Nile, the Danube or the Rhine, and still more the Ocean. Nor do we view the tiny flame of our

---

28 Neer 2010: 68.
29 See also Porter 2001: 63-92 for analysis of nostalgia in *On the Sublime* and the *Periegesis Hellados*.
own kindling (guarded in lasting purity as its light ever is) with greater
awe than the celestial fires though they are often shrouded in darkness; nor
do we deem it a greater marvel than the craters of Etna, whose eruptions
throw up stones from its depths and great masses of rock, and at times
pour forth rivers of that pure and unmixed subterranean fire. In all such
matters we may say that what is useful or necessary men regard as
commonplace, while they reserve their admiration for that which is
astounding.\footnote{Translation by Rhys Roberts (1899) with minor changes by me.}

Longinus, \textit{On the Sublime} 35.4-5

The notion of comparative scale is essential to Pseudo-Longinus’ articulation of wonder
in this passage; it is not the small rivers that provoke wonder (οὐ τὰ μικρὰ ἑξεῖθ’ ἡμῶν
θαυμάζομεν), but rather the grandest ones, the Nile, the Ister and especially the river
Ocean. The same difference in scale and effect is reiterated in the contrast between the
radiance of the stars or Mount Etna’s volcanic emissions on the one hand, and domestic
flames on the other. The usefulness of both water from the smaller streams (χρήσιμα)
and lamp-light or cooking-fires draws attention to human beings’ control over these
phenomena through technology, which stands in opposition to vastness of Ocean or
violence of Etna (τὸ ύπ’ ἡμῶν τουτ’ ἄλογιον ἀναξιομένον) which exist beyond
humans’ ability to master. So, Pseudo-Longinus says, the necessary and the useful
(χρειῶδες ἢ καὶ ἀναξιομένον), which connote humans’ technical mastery, are considered
commonplace. In contrast we marvel (ἄν εἰπομεν...θαυμαστὸν) at those things that
beyond our control, here glossed as beyond our understanding (τὸ παράδοξον).

Although the river Ocean is imagined as the limit of the Earth, it is an endlessly deferred
limit eternally beyond reach, and so its vastness stands in for infinity; the figure of the
river Ocean evokes a sort of vertigo brought on by contemplation of the cosmos as an
unknowable chasm.\footnote{Cf. Plato’s \textit{Theaetetus} 155c: καὶ νὴ τούς θεοὺς γε, ὥς Ἔξωρατες, ὑπερφυός ὡς θαυμάζω τὶ ποτ’ ἐστὶ
tαύτα, καὶ ἐνίοτε ὡς ἀληθὸς βλέπων εἰς αὐτὰ σχοτοδηνός. Wonder is, in this case, the famous
Socratic moment of knowing one’s own ignorance. See also Chrysakopoulou 2013: 94.} This, Pseudo-Longinus says, is the way in which a \textit{paradoxon} is
forever \textit{thaumaston}. His articulation of \textit{thauma} here translates best to the modern notion
of the sublime as the aesthetic agent of the death principle, because of the emphasis on
the limitations of human capacities as mortal beings. But Aristotle tells us the marvelous
is sweet, τὸ δὲ θαυμαστὸν ἡδύ (Pol. 1460a). Contrary to Fisher’s contemporary distinction between wonder and the sublime, I argue below that *thauma* is associated with both fear and pleasure.

Homer’s presentation of the shield of Achilles illustrates the blurring of the lines between pleasure and fear associated with beholding a marvel on the basis of the subjective viewer’s status. As noted in the introductory chapter, Hephaestus promises Thetis that the shield he crafts for Achilles will provoke wonder in any who beholds it (*Il. 18.466-467*).

But the gift’s reception in fact provokes two distinct reactions in its mortal onlookers: both paralyzing fear and pleasure.  

‘Accept rather from me the glorious arms of Hephaistos, so splendid, and such as no man has ever worn on his shoulders.’ The goddess spoke so, and set down the armour on the ground before Achilles, and all its elaboration clashed loudly. Trembling took hold of all the Myrmidons. None had the courage to look straight at it. They were afraid of it. Only Achilles looked, and as he looked the anger came harder upon him and his eyes glittered terribly under his lids, like sunflare. He was glad, holding in his hands the shinning gifts of Hephaistos. (...) “My mother, the god has given me these weapons; they are such as are the work of immortals. No mortal man could have made them.”

Homer, *Iliad* 19.10-22

---

33 See Purves 2010: 53-54. She contrasts the fear of the Myrmidons and the gleam in Achilles’ eye as indicative of their differentiated statuses relative to the divine. Cf. Scully 2003: 40-45.

34 Translation by Lattimore (1951).
Thetis’ presentation of the armor to her son in this scene articulates the qualitative difference and distance between mortal and immortal; she specifies that the arms are made by Hephaestus and are therefore of divine origin (Ἡφαίστου πάρα χλυτὰ τεύχεα), and that they are of such quality that has never been worn by a mortal man (οἳ ὀὐ πῶ τις ἄνήρ ὤμοι φόρησεν). Achilles, too, notes the divine skill in the manufacture of the arms (οἳ ἐπιεικὲς ἔφη ἐμὲν ἄθανάτων) that far exceeds any human technical capabilities (μη δὲ βροτόν ἄνδρα τελέσσαι). The erga athanatōn and the modifiers κλυτὰ and δαίδαλα πάντα recall the extended ekphrasis of the shield (18.478-608), in which Homer has already signaled that the moving figures rendered with divine skill in precious metals are wondrous to behold (18.549).35

But in beholding the gifts of Hephaestus, the mortal Myrmidons are seized with terror and are unable to look upon them (Μυρμιδόνας δ’ ἀρα πάντας ἔλε τρόμος, οὐδὲ τις ἐτλη ἄντην εἰοιδέειν, ἀλλ’ ἔτρεσαν).36 The finely wrought figures in rippling metal present all of the cosmos in miniature—the scene of ‘life-affirming’ peace-time pursuits, ‘death-dealing’ gory battle, the sun, the moon and the stars are all enclosed by the river Ocean on the rim of the shield—and this effectively mimics an synoptic Olympian perspective of the world that overwhelms the mortal Myrmidons.37

Their collective reaction stands in contrast to Achilles’ delight in the divinely wrought arms (τέρπετο δ’ ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχων θεοῦ ἀγλαὰ δώρα). Where the mortal Myrmidons had averted their eyes, Achilles’ own flash with a baleful gleam (δεινὸν σέλας) that replicates the shining arms (θεοῦ ἀγλαὰ δώρα).38 Achilles is able to not only to grasp the shield and hold it on his arm, but also to take pleasure in its intricacies. This pleasure is magnified when Achilles dons the armor, which “raises up the shepherd of the people as though on wings” (τῷ δ’ ἐυτε πτερὰ γίγνετ’, ἐμὲ δὲ ποιμένα λαών, 19.386).

35 Il.18.496; cf. [Sc.] 140, 224, 318, 218.
36 Cf. τρόμος as the fear of Trojan host when Penelos dangles Ilioneus’ head (14.506); as the fear felt by Priam when he sees Iris (24.170), and when the Trojans realize that Achilles has been brought back into the war (18.247).
37 Scully 2013: 40.
38 Scully 2013: 35-36 notes: “The affinity of inner fire and outer gleam suggests likeness rather than difference between Achilles and the shield.”
The contrast between the terror-stricken Myrmidons and the pleasure of Achilles shows that shield as a wondrous artifact, a *thauma*, provokes both fear and delight depending on the subject. ⁴⁹ In this case, the subjectivity of the viewer is articulated through their respective statuses; the essential distinction between Achilles and his men is that they are mortal men, but he, through his divine mother, is a demi-god. ⁴⁰ With this distinction of relative statuses in mind, it is tempting to understand the reaction of the Myrmidons along the lines of Fisher’s construction the aesthetic experience of the sublime as the agent of the death principle. But Achilles, with his special status somewhere between god and man, is able to behold the divine artifacts without being overwhelmed by fear of death though he is mortal. ⁴¹ He is therefore able to accept them with relish. When Hephaestus promises that whoever beholds the armor will marvel (θαυμάσσεται), both the delight of wonder and terror of the sublime are possible. ⁴²

Hesiod’s poetic presentation of the creation of the first woman, Pandora, as a punishment for Prometheus’ theft of fire further, also illustrates that *thauma* can reflect both alluring beauty (associated with aesthetic pleasure) and sheer terror. ⁴³

---

³⁹ See Neer 2010: 66-68 for analysis of *thaumata* as “analytically middle” in the continuum between the radiant “radical alterity” of the gods (“that”) and human visual perception (“this”).

⁴⁰ Scully 2003: 38-39 discusses other passages in which the arms mark Achilles as separate from other men, e.g. Athena feeds him nectar and ambrosia when he does not join in the army’s meal before battle (19.353-4). This is contrasted (43-45) with Hector’s mortal reaction to the shield, which prompts his flight from Achilles.

⁴¹ See also Nightingale 2004: 256-7 for reading of *thauma* in the meeting of Achilles and Priam in Il.24, which she construes as dependent on their mutual recognition of being ‘godlike.’

⁴² Cf. the reaction of Odysseus to the *θέσκελα έργα* on Heracles’s war-belt in Od.11.609-614.

⁴³ See also Neer 2010: 58-59 for compatible analysis of this passage with further emphasis on Pandora’s iconicity and doubleness.
For the very famous Limping God formed of earth the likeness of a shy maiden as the son of Cronos willed. And the goddess bright-eyed Athena girded and clothed her with silvery raiment, and down from her head she spread with her hands an embroidered veil, a wonder to see; and she, Pallas Athena, put about her head lovely garlands, flowers of new-grown herbs. Also she put upon her head a crown of gold which the very famous Limping God made himself and worked with his own hands as a favor to Zeus his father. On it was much curious work, wonderful to see; for of the many creatures which the land and sea rear up, he put most upon it, wonderful things, like living beings with voices: and great beauty shone out from it. But when he had made the beautiful evil to be the price for the blessing, he brought her out, delighting in the finery which the bright-eyed daughter of a mighty father had given her, to the place where the other gods and men were. And wonder took hold of the deathless gods and mortal men when they saw that which was sheer guile, not to be withstood by men.

Hesiod, Theogony 570-89

Like the shield of Achilles, the golden crown Athena places on Pandora’s head is highly wrought with figures (δαίδαλα πολλά) and a wonder to behold (θαυμάσια). Also like the animated ploughing mimesis on the shield of Achilles that was singled out as a thauma, the figures on the crown are termed thaumasia that are like living beings with voices (ζώοισιν ἐοικότα φωνήεσσιν). Further, the gleaming that characterizes both the shield and the helmet Hephaestus crafted for Achilles is reiterated in the golden crown Pandora wears, from which divine grace shines (χάρις δ᾽ ἀπελάμπτετο πολλή).

In addition to the complicated and life-like figures that adorn the crown, the poet emphasizes the divine craftsmanship employed in its manufacture through the use of the intensifying pronoun αὐτὸς and the reference to god’s manipulations (ἀσκήσιος παλάμης). This aspect is also apparent in the silver garments with which Athena adorns

---

44 Translation by Evelyn-White (1914).
Pandora: the veil is singled out as a wonder to behold (θαυμαί ἰδέοθωμι) presumably because it is elaborately embroidered (καλύπτρῃν δαιδαλέην). Although the dative plural ‘hands’ in this passage (χείρεσσι) is construed as the means by which Athena drapes the veil (κατέσχεθε), it may be presumed that the goddess dresses Pandora with her own handiwork. This would emphasize that it is Athena’s divine skill in ornamenting the veil that makes it a wonder to behold.

Pandora herself is the product of divine artifice, molded from clay by Hephaestus’ hands (γαίς γὰρ σύμπλασσε περινυλυτός Ἀμφιγνήμεις). Like the figures on her crown, she is a wondrous facsimile of a living creature—she is like a maiden in aspect (παρθένῳ Ἀμφιγυῆς) who is brought to life and adorned by divine craft (ζώσε δὲ καὶ κόσμησε θεᾶ). Pandora is herself a wonder to behold, as thauma seizes both the gods and mortals to whom she is first presented (θαυμα δ’ ἔχ’ ἀθανάτους τα θεούς θνητούς τ’ ἀνθρώπους). Although at first glance it would seem that Pandora’s effect on both gods and men is the same since they are both seized with wonder, Hesiod’s explicit contrast between mortal men (θνητούς ἀνθρώπους) and immortal gods (ἀθανάτους θεούς) suggests different affect on the two populations. Though both may see that she is “sheer guile” (εἶδον δόλον αἰτύν), Hesiod specifies that she is impossible to overcome (ἀμήχανον ἀνθρώποιοι) for mortal men.

In the Works and Days, however, Hesiod presents Zeus’ intent that men should be delighted (ἀπαντες τέρπονται κατὰ θυμόν) by his retaliatory “gift” in exchange for the theft of fire (ἀντὶ πυρὸς κακόν, WD 57-58). As an artificial being, Pandora is a wonder to look upon, a beautiful evil (καλὸν κακὸν), and because of this the aesthetic experience of contemplating her form aligns more with pleasure rather than fear. The use of τέρπω, to enjoy or delight oneself, both for Achilles’ response to his new shield and the pleasure of embracing Zeus’s beautiful evil point to the plaisir esthétique that the

45 Cf. Athena as patron of textile crafts Hom. Od. 7.110-111.
46 Cf. LSJ θεσάλος, ον: “set in motion by God (τέλλω), and so marvellous, wondrous, always of things θ. ἔργα deeds or works of wonder.” The lexicon cites the description of Heracles’ war belt in the nekyia (11.610) and the cease-fire of the Achaean and Trojan hosts in anticipation of Menelaos and Paris’ duel (II.3.130) as exemplary.
47 Cf. the myth of Er and Er’s vision of unfathomable beauty, Pl. R. 615a: θεας ἀμηχάνους τὸ κάλλος.
thaumata can provoke.⁴⁹ These passages from Pseudo-Longinus, Homer and Hesiod suggest that Fisher’s distinction between the sublime and wonder would be anachronistic if applied to *thauma*, and liable to mislead an earnest attempt to understand expressions of wonder in ancient authors. After all, even as the Myrmidons cowered before Achilles’ divinely wrought weapons, Aristotle tells us the marvelous is sweet, τὸ δὲ θαυμαστὸν ἕδύ (Pol. 1460a).

UNDERMINING THE VISUALITY OF WONDER

Research on the phenomenology of wonder in Archaic Greek thought has focused on the visual sense, and each of the examples presented above act on their subjects through visual perception.⁵⁰ Prier’s analysis of the use of visual terms demonstrates an important correlation between ways of seeing and perception in the *thumos*, that mysterious sensory organ in the chest. His analysis of the terms *agasthai*, *theaesthai/theesthai*, *thaumazein*, *thambein* in the Homeric epics shows their similar semantic ranges in relation to the experience of wonder, and establishes that this experience “must have its outside instigation.”⁵¹ Hunzinger argues that in the Homeric epics *thaumazo* is essentially a seeing verb with significant semantic overlap with *theesthai*.⁵² She cites the entries for the *theomai* and cognates in Hesychius’ *Lexicon* to support her inference along with relevant exempla from the epics because of the prevalence of cognates of *thaumazo* in the equivalences.⁵³ Hunzinger provides a list of such wonders which includes Hephaestus’ *automata* (II. 18.377), Arete’s distaff (*Od*. 6.306), the weaving of the Naiads (13.107-8), but also the palace of Alcinoos (4.44-5) and the ports, boats, public spaces and walls of the city of the Phaeacians (7.43-5).⁵⁴

According to Hunzinger, these are rare and precious objects that are wonders in themselves and provoke contemplation in the viewer; they are manufactured products,

---

⁵² Hunzinger 2005: 35-35. See also the emphasis on the visual sense in philosophical *theoria* in Nightingale 2004.
⁵³ E.g. Hesychius *Lexicon s.v.* (470) θηήσασθαι: θεάσασθαι, θαυμάσαι; (471.) θηήσεται: θαυμάσεται; (472.) θηήτηρ: θαυμαστής ἡ θεατήρ; (473.) θηήτηρ [ἀπατεών.] θεωρός; (474.) θηήτον: θαυμαστόν. καλὸν, καταθύμιον, περικαλλές, σύμφορον; (475.) θηήτος: θαυμαστός.
executed with technical skill and often elaborately worked (δαίδαλα). She also notes, however, that contemplation of the beauty of woman or hero is expressed with the same terms as contemplation of the elaborate artifacts, and cites the example of Athena’s beautification of Odysseus in the Odyssey, which, through a simile, exploits the parallels between the pouring of grace on Odysseus and the expert crafting skill of Hephaestus and Athena. She says that the results of both processes are the same, because “la grâce versée sur l’oeuvre d’art et le charme donné au héro suscite le même émerveillement.” This observation suggests that the source of thauma is in fact divine influence through charis. Hunzinger’s observations mesh well with Prier’s analysis of the various semata and eidola identified as thau mata, which emphasize wonder’s bridging of human experience and divine agency as “symbol-signs.”

Hephaestus’ super-human technical skill is evident in the intricacies of the shield of Achilles and Pandora herself, in addition to the crown that she wears. But in the Theogony, Hesiod provides an example of another thauma that explicitly mediates between immortals and mortals, though this one is not elaborately worked. Intergenerational conflict and succession are important themes in Hesiod’s epic poem about the birth of the gods; the poem narrates the creation and (ultimate) stabilization of the cosmos in the current world order under the rule of Zeus as the supreme entity as the father of gods and men. The truth of Hesiod’s account of the Olympians’ overthrow of the Titans and giants, and the consolidation of their rule (arche) is guaranteed by his poetic investiture at the opening of the poem through the invocation of the Muses. In addition to the divine origins of his speech, he builds into the poem a quasi-archaeological artifact to bear witness to the truth of the succession narrative.

55 See also the description of Aphrodite (h.Ven. 81-90) with analysis in Neer 2010: 60.
59 On poetic inspiration as a gift from the gods and ambiguity of the Muses’ logos as paradox, see Pucci 1977:1-44, and more recently recapitulated in Pucci 2009: 41-44.
He vomited up first the stone which he had swallowed last. And Zeus set it fast in the wide-pathed earth at goodly Pytho under the glens of Parnassus, to be a sign thenceforth and a marvel to mortal men.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 497-500

Hesiod tells us that Zeus took the stone vomited by his father Cronos and set it in the folds of Mount Parnassos to be a sign in perpetuity, a wonder for mortals (σῆμεν ἔξοπισον, θαῦμα θνητοῖοι βροτοῖοι).

If the stone is a *sema*, what exactly does it symbolize and how is it to be read? Hesiod makes no mention of distinguishing features or identifying marks, but this particular stone is associated with Gaia’s deception of Cronos and Zeus’ triumph over his father. The stone itself is material evidence that corroborates the succession narrative recounted in the poem; as a *sema*, it is tangible proof of the ontological status of the gods. This is what Hesiod glosses as θαύμα θνητοῖοι βροτοῖοι, a wonder for mortal men. The stone is a *thauma* because of its symbolic and literal association with divine narrative. The durability of the material and the temporal adverb ἔξοπισον ensure that this *sema* keeps its significance in perpetuity, and thereby transcends the temporal distance between the time when the current world order was taking shape and Hesiod’s own time, as concrete evidence for the aetiology of the cosmos.

Pausanias presents a description of this very stone and the rituals associated with it in his Phocian *logos* (10.24.6); he states that the stone itself is of no great size and makes no mention of distinguishing features that could prompt an involuntary lingering gaze that Hunzinger and Prier have argued is characteristic of *thaumazein*. Rather it is the *logos*, or more specifically the *mythos*, associated with the stone that gives it its power to fascinate. Functionally, though visual perception plays a role in the experience of wonder

---

60 See also Neer 2010: 57-58 for analysis of the stone as the “archetypical work of sculpture in Greek epic” because is it the product of craft (*dolos* and *metis*), and as a double of Zeus. Neer calls it the first “symbole plastique.”

61 Pausanias also describes another sacred stone in the same precinct in Delphi, the *omphalos* (10.16.3), which is said to be the centre of the *oikoumene*. Amandry 1992: 187-8 is clear that these two sacred stones are distinct, though they apparently received similar rites. He says: “Le faux bébé, vomi par Cronos, et l’omphalos de marbre se trouvait dans le même secteur; mais aucun lien n’est à établir, semble-t-il, entre ces deux pierres.”
associated with the *sema*, it is recollection of the mythical narrative, itself acquired through auditory perception, that provides the external stimulus for wonder to bloom in the mind of the viewing subject. Although Prier and Hunzinger focused their attentions on marvels and the visual sense, *thaumata* are not limited to spectacles; the phrase \( \theta\alpha\upmu\mu\alpha\tau\, \acute{o}k\omicron\upsilon\omicron\alpha \) is used to describe the cacophony of Typhoeus’ voice (*Theog.* 834), the sound of the Delian Maidens’ polyphonic hymns to Apollo (*Hom. h. Ap.* 156), and the sound of the lyre (*h. Merc.* 440, 443, 455). Since it is clear that *thaumata* can be either visual or auditory phenomena, it seems likely the emphasis on the visual in previous analyses has been overstated. Whether through the visual or auditory perception, the key to a *thauma*’s effect appears to be mental processes that underlie contemplation of the extraordinary artifact, spectacle or phenomenon as the subject attempts to make sense of it. Rather than construing *thaumazo* as a verb of visual perception, the verb connotes the kind of arresting contemplation, whether in pleasure or fear, that is associated with *thaumata*.

**WONDERs AND MIRACLES**

The example of the Delphic *sema* illustrates another caveat about contemporary constructions of the marvelous: the perceived contrast between wonders and miracles. Just as Fisher’s distinction between fear and delight as respectively proper to the sublime and wonder does not map onto ancient constructions of *thauma*, the explicit correlation of *sema* and *thauma* in Hesiod’s presentation of the Delphic *sema* shows that Fisher’s categorical exclusion of signs and miracles from the aesthetics of wonder is also anachronistic. Manifestations of the gods through material artifacts or symbols are but indirect experiences of epiphany.62 The focus on wondrous artifacts as mediators between human and divine spheres in Archaic thought also translates to examples of revelatory embodiment in which the divine makes its presence manifest. Platt explains:

> In the vocabulary of the Archaic Greek experience, an epiphany functions as the ultimate form of *thauma*, a ‘wonder,’ in which divine presence, or *eidos*, is asserted in profoundly physical terms and experienced

---

phenomenologically as a sensory extravaganza, generated as ‘appearing’
(phainesthai) rather than ‘seeming’ (dokein), that comes from outside or
elsewhere (the ‘other/that’ rather than the ‘this’) and has a powerful, often
transformative effect upon its witnesses and their surroundings.63

Platt recognizes that divine epiphany is at one end of a continuum of thaumata that runs
the gamut from direct manifestations of divine presence through to semata of divine
agency associated with mythical narratives.64 While direct manifestations of the divine
have temporal finitude, they can also have an impact on the surrounding landscape, and
so an epiphany is often invoked in the aetiology for a particular phenomenon or feature of
the landscape.65

It seems pretty obvious that ‘miracles’ belong to this same continuum, but miracles and
wonders are often treated as distinct and irreconcilable phenomena in scholarly literature,
or at the least, they are investigated separately. Wendy Cotter’s statements in the
introduction to her sourcebook Miracles in Antiquity provide a salient example.66 She
makes a clear distinction between “miracle stories” and publications of “nature’s genetic
anomalies, often called terrata [sic], or nature’s strange inexplicable phenomena,
sometimes called paradoxographia [sic],” which she notes might well be called
mirabilia. Rather than explore the connection between “miracle stories” and mirabilia,
she limits her study to “narratives in which a wonderful rescue or salvation of someone
takes place by overturning the ‘canons of the ordinary’ through the intervention of a deity
or hero.”67 Cotter’s distinction roughly reflects Basinger’s definition of a miracle as an
“unusual, remarkable event that would not have occurred in the context in question if not
for the intentional activity of a supernatural being.”68 Garland, however, notes that that
Christological terms for miracle are semeion and ergon, particularly when used to
describe the miracles performed by Jesus Christ.69 He also states that the closest Greek

63 Platt 2011: 56.
64 Cf. Nightingale 2001: 33. On religious theoria, Nightingale states: “the theoros encounters the ultimate
and most distant ‘other,’ a divine being. Though he does not literally ‘see’ this being, he does look at sacred
images and symbols of the divinity and, by way of ritual, enters into a relationship with a god.”
68 Basinger 2011:19. Basinger further stipulates that miracles imply the intervention of a benevolent
supernatural being.
69 The terms teras and dunamis are also marked.
and Latin equivalents for ‘miracle’ are *thauma* and *miraculum*, but does not in fact consider Greco-Roman *thaumata* and *mirabilia* to be miracles, since “what is amazing is not invariably or necessarily the same as what is miraculous.” Although he admits that “there is no Greek or Latin word that differentiates an act, sight or occurrence that is ‘truly’ miraculous from one that is, quite simply, worthy of wonder,” he interprets this lack of distinction between wonder and miracle as evidence that polytheistic religion were not proselytizing in the same way as Christianity, and therefore did not have the same recourse to the miraculous as a discursive strategy for proving deity.\(^{70}\)

Although no distinction between wonder and miracle exists in the Greek and Latin terminology, Remus has argued for a fundamental categorical distinction between the two types of extraordinary phenomena on the basis of whether or not they are explained through overt reference to the divine.\(^{71}\) He includes in his miracle category only such phenomena that are explicitly explained by recourse to the divine, and considers *wonders* both those for which an alternate (scientific) explanation is presented and those for which no explanation is presented. But these categorical distinctions do not account for the possibility for divine causation within rational scientific discourse, or a world-view in which everything is imbued with divine influence, and so the default cause for phenomena where no explanation is expressed is in fact the divine.

Herodotus, with his mantle as the father of history, is famously presented as the “prototype of the historian who always marvels.”\(^{72}\) The preface to his *Histories* highlights the author’s concern with the marvelous; he promises an account that will preserve the great and wondrous deeds of men for posterity.

> Ἰδέα αὐτῶν ἱστορίης ἔχει, ὡς ἑκάστη τὰ γεγονότα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ έξετάζει, μήτε ἐνκαθεστώτα, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλην, τὰ δὲ βασιλεία ἀποδεικτέα, ἀκαλέ ἐνενεοτα, τὰ τέ ἄλλα καὶ δυ’ ἵνα ἐπιλέμησαν ἀλλήλοις.


\(^{71}\) Remus 1983:7-47.

\(^{72}\) Momigliano 1975: 25.
This is the display of the inquiry of Herodotus of Halicarnassus, so that things done by man not be forgotten in time, and that great and marvelous deeds, some displayed by the Hellenes, some by the barbarians, not lose their glory, including among others what was the cause of their waging war on each other.

Herodotus, *Histories* pref.\(^{73}\)

Because of the program of laid out in the *prooemion*, it is not surprising to find that wonders abound in the *Histories*.\(^{74}\) The presence of *thaumata* is so pervasive in the *Histories* that Neer observes that for Herodotus “anything prodigious is a wonder.”\(^{75}\)

Herodotus’ metanarrative comments on the wonders of Scythia are revealing in the context of Remus’ distinction between marvels and miracles.\(^{76}\) Herodotus expressly identifies two phenomena of the region as worthy of wonder: the first is the immensity of the rivers and the Scythian Plain, and the second is a giant footprint of Herakles preserved in stone.
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extraordinary nature of the phenomenon; heroes were physically larger than men.\textsuperscript{77} But the association of the footprint with the hero Herakles makes it not only emblematic of his presence in this particular region, but also as a literal an imprint of the demi-god on the landscape, it is a \textit{sema} comparable to the Delphic \textit{sema} discussed above. Just as the Delphic \textit{sema} is a concrete symbol that vouches for the authenticity of the succession narrative in the \textit{Theogony} and is therefore a wonder for mortal men (\textit{thauma thnetoi}si \textit{brotoisi}); the footprint of Heracles is a concrete manifestation that validates the narratives of the hero’s journeys. This \textit{sema} of Herakles’ passage and his heroic stature corroborate the mythological narratives of his long-ago wandering, labors and divine lineage, which in turn confirm the ontological status of the gods. Nonetheless, Herodotus does not explicitly elaborate the connection between the footprint as a \textit{thauma} and a relationship with the divine. The divine connotation is not overtly expressed.

Herodotus explains that the rivers of Scythia are marvelous on account of the number and size (\textit{ποταμούς τε πολλῷ μεγίστον καὶ ἄριθμον πλείστους}), though whether this phrase indicates their immense breadth, volume or length is not clear. The wonder inherent in the oversized rivers is conceptually parallel to Pseudo-Longinus’ comments on the River Nile, the Danube or the Rhine explored above (\textit{Subl.} 35.4). The same idea is replicated in the vastness of the Scythian plain, so that like the river Nile in Egypt, these features of the natural landscape are considered wonders in Herodotus’ discourse because they are extraordinary. These are among the class of wonders that Remus would suggest are explained by geography rather than divine agency.\textsuperscript{78} The assumption is that geography and the “canons of the ordinary” in the natural world have a rational basis beyond the divine. Remus likely has in mind the schematic division of the world into a centre-margin binary in which the \textit{eschatiai} have extreme and atypical climate and the centre presents a balanced mixture; these extreme conditions the produce extraordinary cultural and natural phenomena.\textsuperscript{79} These ideas will be more fully discussed in Chapter 4, but for the moment it will suffice to suggest that Herodotus incorporates the notion of a divine plan into this geographical schematic.

\textsuperscript{77} \textit{E.g.} the 12-cubit skeleton of Orestes (Hdt.1.68) or the 11-cubit skeleton of Orontes (Paus. 8.29.4). \textit{Cf.} Remus 1983: 9-10 for entry on heroes in his canons of the ordinary and extraordinary.


\textsuperscript{79} See \textit{e.g.} Redfield 1985:110-112; Romm 1992: 38-81.
On the topic of biology, Thomas draws attention to Herodotus’ discussion of oligogonia and polygonia in the context of contemporary Ionian discourse on relative fecundity across species and cultures.\(^{80}\)

Καὶ κως τοῦ θείου ἡ προνοίη, ὡσπερ καὶ οίκος ἐστὶ, ἐόσα σοφή, ὅσα μὲν ἤγαγεν τε δείλα καὶ ἐδώδιμα, ταῦτα μὲν πάντα πολύγονα πεποίηκε, ἵνα μὴ ἐπιλίπη κατεσθιόμενα, ὅσα δὲ σχέπλαιαν ἀνηρά, ὀλιγόγονα.

Somehow the forethought of God (just as is reasonable) being wise has made all creatures prolific that are timid and edible, so that they do not become extinct through being eaten, whereas few young are born to hardy and vexatious creatures.

Herodotus, *Histories* 3.108

Herodotus goes on to explore the extraordinary phenomenon of superfetation in the hare as a prey animal noting it alone can conceive again when already pregnant (ἔπικυϊσκεται μοῦνον πάντων θηρίων 3.108). In Munson’s analysis of wonders in the *Histories*, Herodotus’ statements about the fecundity of animals of prey are emblematic of a theological framework in which natural (rational) processes occur.\(^{81}\) She says, “The divine, which ultimately rules nature (3.108), operates in predictable ways so that phenomena can be seen to derive from material causes.”\(^{82}\) Contrary to Remus’ limitation on miracle, Munson suggests that any “effect that breaks the pattern [of nature] and has no visible cause (...) leads one, by default, to the immediate and extraordinary agency of a transcendent force.”\(^{83}\) Munson’s observation suggests that the default explanation for extraordinary phenomena in the *Histories* is divine agency. This paradigm implies that rational explanations need not stand in opposition to wonders as miracles.

**Wonder and Scientific Knowledge**

At the opening of his study, Remus presents a paradigm to illustrate the difference between construing an extraordinary event as wonder or a miracle in order to illustrate

---

\(^{80}\) Thomas 2000: 139-153.

\(^{81}\) Cf. Hdt 9.100.2: δῆλα δὴ πολλαπλασία δεχμερίσται ἕστι τὰ θεία τῶν πριγμάτων (“Now there are many clear indications of the divine ordering of things.”)

\(^{82}\) Munson 2001: 243.

\(^{83}\) Ibid. See also Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007: 501 for commentary on “τοῦ θείου ἡ προνοίη” as a “Herodotean compromise between transcendental and immanent teleology.”
the importance of scientific explanation and belief in both of these concepts.\textsuperscript{84} The anecdote hinges on the significance and interpretation of a lunar eclipse on the eve of the Battle of Pydna in 168 BCE as reported by the Roman historian Livy (44.37); Remus focuses on the Roman officers’ ability to predict the lunar eclipse due to their scientific knowledge and thereby reassure their soldiers that no prodigy has occurred. This is contrasted with the Macedonians, who interpret the same phenomenon as a dire portent because they do not have an alternate explanation. Remus’ paradigm is one in which knowledge or understanding of the cause of a phenomenon mitigates wonder, and so even a rare occurrence ceases to be marvelous in the sense we have been exploring. But the relationship between rational explanation and wonder is in fact more complicated that the example from Livy would suggest: we have seen that Herodotus frames the rational processes observable in nature as evidence of intelligent design, but there are other instances when wonder can be said to mark both the beginning and limit of scientific knowledge.

Hunzinger’s focus on the involuntary fascination and contemplation that \textit{thaumata} provoke in the viewing subject resonates in Fisher’s analysis of the aesthetics of wonder. Fisher characterizes the rainbow as the ideal phenomenon to “elicit a lingering and free-play of the mind, a delight and interest, a curiosity—in short, a combination of passion and energy, intellectual alertness and pleasure in the unknown that would itself lead on to science.”\textsuperscript{85} Though Fisher is concerned primarily with a Cartesian formulation of wonder, it is worth noting that the rainbow is a particular favorite for the theorizing about wonder in antiquity as well. The \textit{locus classicus} appears in Plato’s \textit{Theaetetus} when Socrates addresses the youth.

\begin{quote}
μάλα γὰρ φιλοσόφου τούτο τὸ πάθος, τὸ θαυμάζειν: οὖ γὰρ ἄλλῃ ἄρχῃ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἢ αὐτή, καὶ ἔοικεν ὁ τὴν Ἰριν Θαύματος ἐκγόνων φήσας ὄν κακῶς γενεαλογεῖν.
\end{quote}

For this feeling of wonder shows that you are a philosopher, since wonder is the only beginning of philosophy, and he who said that Iris was the child of Thaumas made a good genealogy.

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{84} Remus 1983: 3-6.
\textsuperscript{85} Fisher 1998: 38.
\end{footnote}
Plato, *Theaetetus* 155d

Plato here refers to the rainbow’s genealogy according to Hesiod’s *Theogony*. In Hesiod’s poem, offspring often express aspects of their parents, and so Plato’s Socrates deems the rainbow’s descent from Thaumas, “Mr. Wonderful,” to be particularly appropriate.

Aristotle’s statements about the origins of philosophy, *qua* natural science, in the *Metaphysics* resonate strongly with Plato’s presentation of wonder at the onset of philosophical inquiry in the *Theaetetus*.

For it is owing to their wonder (*to thaumazein*) that men both now begin and at first began to philosophize; they wondered originally at the obvious difficulties, then advanced little by little and stated difficulties about the greater matters, e.g., about the phenomena of the moon and those of the sun and of the stars, and about the genesis of the universe. And a man who is puzzled (*aporon*) and wonders (*thaumazon*) thinks himself ignorant (whence even the lover of myth is in a sense a lover of Wisdom, for the myth is composed of wonders) ...

Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 982b

There is a significant correspondence between the τὰ πρὸχειρα τῶν ἀτόπων that cause wonder in the Aristotelian passage and *Theaetetus’ aporia* in the Platonic dialogue, but I wish to draw particular attention to the focus on wonder in contemplation of natural phenomena in Aristotle’s passage. Aristotle identifies wonder in contemplation of

---


87 See Chrysakopoulou 2013: 88-120 for discussion of *thauma* in Plato’s *Theaetetus*, which highlights the relationship between *thauma* (as divine beauty) the *arche* and *telos* of philosophy.

88 Translation by Mckeon (1941).

89 See Nightingale 2004: 187-252 for contrast between Platonic and Aristotelian conceptions of reverential *thauma*. In relation to Aristotelian wonder, Nightingale (254) states: “To ‘theorize’ or ‘see’ the cause of something perplexing is to move from a state of wonder to a state of certainty. Philosophy, then, begins in
movements of the sun, the moon and the stars, which will in turn give rise to the science of astronomy, as the quintessential example of the trajectory from ignorance to knowledge. There is an implicit contrast in his example between an earlier time in which the movements of astral bodies were not theoretically understood and his own time when the movements of the fixed stars, the planets, the sun and the moon along the ecliptic were described and modeled so that they could be predicted. Thus, as in the Remus’ Livy paradigm, scientific knowledge provides an explanation for phenomena that mitigates wonder. Aristotle’s theorizing about the coincidence of wonder and the origins of philosophical (ἐξ ἀρχῆς) suggests that wonder belongs in the liminal space between what is known and unknown in scientific discourse. As Daston and Park remark “wonder and wonders hovered at the edge of scientific inquiry. Wonders as objects marked the outermost limits of the natural. Wonder as a passion registered the lines between the known and unknown.” Wonder, thauma, occurs when one confronts the limits of scientific knowledge and it is in this sense beyond what is understood through rational processes, or very literally paradoxon. Far from standing in opposition, wonder and scientific knowledge have a complementary relationship.

Aristotle’s focus on thauma in the origins of philosophical inquiry is symptomatic of his larger concern with origins and causes, as he states that the proper objective of scientific inquiry is speculation about first principles (Met. 982b). In his comparative study of philosophical wonder and cosmological poetry, Kenaan notes that in Greek and Latin the concept of beginning (arche, principium) is closely tied to the concept of regulation that is echoed in Aristotle’s presentation of relationship between origins and causes, arche and aitia. Aristotle makes explicit that the purpose of scientific inquiry, sparked by

---

92 *LSJ* sv. παράσ. C. III: “past, beyond.”
93 Kenaan 2011: 16.
wonder, is the identification of first causes (aitía) that allow for rational explanation for the phenomenon that has been observed, and so supplant wonder with understanding.\footnote{Jouanna 1991: 223-254 argues for a similar interpretation of the rhetoric of wonder in the medical writings of the Hippocratic corpus.}

The acquisition of this knowledge, however, must in a sense result in something which is the reverse of the outlook with which we first approached the inquiry. All begin, as we have said, by wondering that things should be as they are, e.g. with regard to marionettes, or the solstices, or the incommensurability of the diagonal of a square; because it seems wonderful to everyone who has not yet perceived the cause that a thing should not be measurable by the smallest unit. But we must end with the contrary and (according to the proverb) the better view, as men do even in these cases when they understand them; for a geometrician would wonder at nothing so much as if the diagonal were to become measurable.

Aristotle, *Metaphysics* (983a)

The tacit supposition of scientific progress in Aristotle’s passage above suggests that rational explanation of a phenomenon mitigates the potential for wonder in beholding it. As with the examples of wonder at the movements of astral bodies at the dawn of scientific inquiry, the specific example of marionettes (αὐτόματα) and solstices (τὰς τοῦ ἕλιου τροπάς) suggests that scientific knowledge is cumulative, and when the cause of a phenomenon is understood, wonder abates as only those who have not yet ascertained the cause of a phenomenon wonder at it (θαυμαστὸν γὰρ ἐϊναι δοξεὶ πάσι τοῖς μῆπῳ τεθεωρηκόσι τὴν αἰτίαν).\footnote{Aristotle *Met.* 983a.} Although this passage is often cited in support of the opposition between wonder and knowledge in scientific discourse, it must be read in the context of Aristotle’s other statements that nuance this dichotomy. While he
provides examples in which knowledge of causes precludes wonders in the passage above, he also invokes a second dichotomy between human and divine knowledge in relation to causes in the passage that immediately precedes it.

Since wonder marks the boundary between known and unknown, we should note that Aristotle put limits on human knowledge: he problematizes the possibility that humans are capable of forming a perfect rational understanding of the world in which they live. In the following passage, Aristotle presents the divine as among the causes of things, he then states that there are things known to the divine that cannot be known by human beings.  

διό καὶ δικαιῶς ἐὰν οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνη νομίζοιτο αὐτῆς ἡ κτήσις: πολλαχή γὰρ ἡ φύσις δουλὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν, ὡστε κατὰ Σιμωνίδην "θεός ἐν μόνῳ τούτῳ ἔχω γέρας," ἀνδρα δ' οὖν ἔχων μή οὐ ζητεῖν τὴν καθ' αὐτὸν ἐπιστήμην. ἐι δὴ λέγουσι τι οἱ ποιηταὶ καὶ πέρυσε φθονεῖν τὸ θείον, ἐπὶ τούτῳ συμβήνει μάλιστα εἰκὸς καὶ δυστυχεῖ εἰναι πάντας τοὺς περιττοὺς. ἀλλ' οὔτε τὸ θεῖον φθονορόν ἐνδέχεται εἰναι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν παρομοίαν πολλὰ σφέντονται ἄοιδοί, οὔτε τῆς τοιαύτης ἄλλην χρή νομίζειν τιμωτέραν. ἡ γὰρ θειοτάτη καὶ τιμωτάτη τοιαύτη δὲ δύχος ἐν εἰς μόνη· ἤν τε γὰρ μάλιστ' ἂν ὁ θεός ἔχω, θεία τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ἐστι, κὰν εἰ τις τῶν θείων εἰς, μόνη δ' αὐτὴ τούτων ἁμφοτέρων τετύχηκεν· ὃ τε γὰρ θεός δοκεῖ τῶν αἰτίων πάσιν εἰναι καὶ ἄρχῃ τις, καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην ἢ μόνης ἢ μάλιστ' ἂν ἔχω ὁ θεός. ἀναγκαῖοτεραὶ μὲν οὖν πάσαι ταύτης, ἀμείνων δ' οὐδεμία.

For this reason its [wisdom] acquisition might justly be supposed to be beyond human power, since in many respects human nature is servile; in which case, as Simonides says, “God alone can have this privilege,” and man should only seek the knowledge which is within his reach. Indeed if the poets are right and the Deity is by nature jealous, it is probable that in

96 Cf. Aristot. Met. 1072b on the “first principle”: τὸ γὰρ δεκατικὸν τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας νοῦς, ἐνεργεῖ δὲ ἔχων, ὡστε ἐκεῖνον μᾶλλον τούτῳ ὁ δοκεῖ ὁ νοῦς θείων ἔχειν. καὶ ἡ θεωρία τὸ ἱδιότων καὶ ἀριστον. ἐι οὖν οὖσας τὸ ἔχει, ὡς ἡμεῖς ποτὲ, ὁ θεός ἀεὶ, θεωρεῖν: εἰ δὲ μᾶλλον, ἐτὶ θεωρεῖν· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδέχετο. καὶ ζῷον δὲ γε ὑπάρχει· ἡ γὰρ νος ἐνέργεια ζῳον, εκεῖνος δ' ἂν ἐνέργεια: ἐνέργεια δ' ἡ καθ' αὐτὴν ἐκεῖνον ζῷον ἁρίστη καὶ ἀριστον. φαμέν δὴ τὸν θεὸν εἰναὶ ζωον ἀριστον ἐκαθορισε, ὡστε ζῷο καὶ αὐτὸν συνέχεις καὶ ἀριστον ὑπάρχει τῷ θεῷ· τὸτε γὰρ ὁ θεός. (“Hence it is actuality rather than potentiality that is held to be the divine possession of rational thought, and its active contemplation is that which is most pleasant and best. If, then, the happiness which God always enjoys is as great as that which we enjoy sometimes, it is marvellous; and if it is greater, this is still more marvellous. Nevertheless it is so. Moreover, life belongs to God. For the actuality of thought is life, and God is that actuality; and the essential actuality of God is life most good and eternal. We hold, then, that God is a living being, eternal, most good; and therefore life and a continuous eternal existence belong to God; for that is what God is.”)
this case He would be particularly jealous, and all those who excel in knowledge unfortunate. But it is impossible for the Deity to be jealous (indeed, as the proverb says, “poets tell many a lie”), nor must we suppose that any other form of knowledge is more precious than this; for what is most divine is most precious. Now there are two ways only in which it can be divine. A science is divine if it is peculiarly the possession of God, or if it is concerned with divine matters. And this science alone fulfills both these conditions; for (a) all believe that God is one of the causes and a kind of principle, and (b) God is the sole or chief possessor of this sort of knowledge. Accordingly, although all other sciences are more necessary than this, none is more excellent.

Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 982b-983a

While he goes on to enumerate his four physical causes, we must understand from his previous statements that human understanding of these causes has a finitude beyond which is the purview of divine knowledge. In this way, although knowledge abates wonder by explaining the cause of a phenomenon and resolving the *aporia* engendered by contemplating it, knowledge does not obliterate wonder, it merely pushes its horizon back. This articulates the sense of *paradoxon* such that knowledge corresponds to *doxa*, and what is beyond *doxa* is *paradoxon.* But Aristotle tells us that some causes are known only to the gods, ἥν τε γὰρ μάλιστ’ ἄν ὁ θεὸς ἔχοι, θεία τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ἐστί, κάνει τίς τῶν θεόν ἐιή. This suggests that beyond the finitude of human understanding of rational causes is not the unknown exactly, but rather the purview of a divine *episteme* that is beyond human reach.

A phenomenon that appears to break the laws of nature or behave in a way that is beyond expectation can be understood as either 1) a phenomenon that will eventually be explained through scientific investigation, or as 2) a manifestation of divine *episteme* that will ever remain beyond human ability to rationally explain. This dichotomy suggests that the default explanation for rare and unusual phenomena is better construed as divine causation than a secular supposition of some future rational explanation through scientific knowledge. On the phenomenon of the rainbow, Fisher states that a “religious system of explanation is a technique in which beauty is wounded by meaning so that the work of

97 See Pajón Leyra 2011: 46 for similar discussion of δόξα and παράδοξα.
wonder can never begin.” But Aristotle’s formulation suggests on the contrary that a religious system of explanation does not preclude scientific investigation or ultimately, explanation of the rare and surprising phenomena that constitute *paradoxa*.

**GEOGRAPHY AND THE DISCOURSE OF WONDER**

As mentioned above, Remus suggested that geography can provide an alternate explanation for rare phenomena that distinguishes between wonders and miracles. Like the emphasis on wonders in the opening of the *Histories*, Herodotus’ apology for his extended treatment of Egypt in his text demonstrates that marvels are a central concern of his inquiries and programmatic for the text as whole. In a statement about his methodology, Herodotus correlates the amount of space devoted a particular territory in his text with the quantity of marvels associated with the region:

> Ἐφεξομεν δὲ περὶ Αἰγύπτου μηχανέων τὸν λόγον, ὅτι πλείονα προσπάθεια ἔχει [ἡ ἡ ἄλλη πᾶσα χώρῃ] καὶ ἔργα λόγου μέζω παρέχεται πρὸς πᾶσαν <ἄλλην> χώρῃν τούτων εἶνεκα πλέω περὶ αὐτῆς εἰρήνεται.

Concerning Egypt itself I shall extend my remarks to a great length, because there is no country that possesses so many wonders, nor any that has such a number of works which defy description. For the sake of these, I shall say the more concerning Egypt.

Herodotus, *Histories* 2.35

This programmatic statement about the wonders of Egypt is important because it foregrounds the association between marvels, *thōmasia*, and the territory to which they belong, *chōrē*. This passage invokes the notion of geographic specificity, which is a crucial for identifying and describing differences between regions, and the peoples and places within those regions. As I have already mentioned, further analysis of the relationship between geography and wonders will follow in Chapter 4, but I present this
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99 Translation adapted from A. D. Godley (1920) and G. Rawlinson (1859).
100 Lee 1997: 127-8 states: “if space represents the historically constituted embodiment of particular social meanings, values and attitudes, then the precise specificity of location matters (emphasis in the original)...” Lee suggests that modernity and globalization may be behind the destruction of “locality and the specificity of place, as the embodiment of uniqueness.” See also Cresswell 2004 on the specificity of “place” in relation to “space” in human geography. Goldhill 2010: 46-68 explores the rhetoric of the “local” in the *Periegesis Hellados*. 
passage from Herodotus’ Lydian logos in order to move away from the discourse of natural wonders and engage with the category of man-made wonders. In contrast to the wealth of wonders in Egypt, Herodotus tell us that has Lydia has comparatively few.

There are not many marvelous things in Lydia to record, in comparison with other countries, except the gold dust that comes down from Tmolus. But there is one building to be seen there which is much the greatest of all, except those of Egypt and Babylon. In Lydia is the tomb of Alyattes, the father of Croesus, the base of which is made of great stones and the rest of it of mounded earth.

Herodotus, *Histories* 1.93.1-2

Herodotus goes on to give the dimensions of the tomb, details of its financing and construction, and its location next to the Gygean lake (1.93.5). Herodotus notes the quantitative paucity of Lydian wonders that are appropriate for his project (Θώματα δὲ γὴ ἡ Λυδίη ἐς συγγραφῆν οὐ μάλα ἔχει, οἷα τε καὶ ἄλλῃ χώρῃ, πάρεξ τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Τμώλου καταφερομένου ψήγματος. Ἔν δὲ ἔργον πολλὸν μέγιστον παρέχεται χωρίς τῶν τε Αἰγυπτίων ἔργων καὶ τῶν Βαβυλωνίων· ἔστι αὐτόθι Ἀλυάττεω τοῦ Κροίσου πατρὸς σῆμα, τοῦ ἡ κρηπὶς μὲν ἐστὶ λίθων μεγάλων, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο σῆμα χώμα γῆς."

Although Herodotus does not specify what exactly is marvelous about the dust from Tmolus, it is sensible to infer that the tomb is a marvel because of its size. Its monumentality is emphasized by comparison with Egyptian and Babylonian architecture (ergon pollon megiston), the size of the stones in the foundation course (hē krēpis lithōn megalōn) and the total dimensions of the tomb, which Herodotus tells us run six stades and two plethra in length by thirteen plethra in width (περίοδος τοῦ σήματος εἰσὶ στάδιοι ἑξάκοιδος καὶ δύο πλέθρα, τὸ δὲ εὑρός ἐστὶ πλέθρα τρία καὶ δέκα). In the course

---


of the Histories, several other large building projects are, like the tomb of Alyattes, signaled as marvels.\textsuperscript{103}

Jacoby interpreted the \textit{ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά} from Herodotus programmatic statements in the preface of the Histories as “große staunenswerte Bauwerke,” and this narrow interpretation of \textit{erga} in a concrete sense has important ramifications for an approach to Pausanias’ \textit{Periegesis Hellados} because the text is often conceived as travel-guide akin to an ancient Baedeker with a focus on the noteworthy sights (\textit{theoremata}) of Roman Greece.\textsuperscript{104} The final section of this chapter will tie together the various conceptual threads related to defining \textit{thaumata} in relation to Pausanias’ comments on what is worth seeing (\textit{axion theas}) and worth recording (\textit{axion mneme}) in the \textit{Periegesis} in order to show that \textit{thaumata} conceived as extraordinary phenomena that are \textit{semata} of divine agency provide a useful lens through which to examine the contents and themes of the \textit{Periegesis Hellados}.

\textbf{Approaching \textit{Thaumata} in the \textit{Periegesis Hellados}}

It is a commonplace that Pausanias’ \textit{Periegesis Hellados} owes much to Herodotus Histories as a model, and Herodotus’ influence on the presentation and rhetoric of wonders in the text is no exception.\textsuperscript{105} In his account of Elis, Pausanias writes:

\begin{quote}
πολλὰ μὲν δὴ καὶ ὄλλα ἵδοι τις ἐν Ἑλληστὶ, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀκοῦσαι θαύματος ἔξω· μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς Ἐλευθερίην ὄρυχαν θηρικοῖς καὶ ἀγώνι τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ ἱερῷ καὶ ὀλυμπίᾳ μέτεστιν ἐκ θεοῦ φροντίδος.
\end{quote}

Many are the sights to be seen in Greece, and many are the wonders to be heard; but on nothing does Heaven bestow more care than on the Eleusinian rites and the Olympic games.

Pausanias, \textit{Periegesis} 5.10.1

\textsuperscript{103} \textit{E.g.} the aqueduct and the breakwater and the sanctuary of Hera on Samos (3.60), Xerxes canal through the Athos peninsula (7.24).
\textsuperscript{104} \textit{E.g.} Habicht 1985: 4 states: “In each of the ten books Pausanias describes sites, monuments (both sacred and profane), and works of art.”
The phrase μέτεστιν ἐκ θεοῦ φροντίδος recalls Herodotus’ statement about the hares and divine plan (3.108.3), but it also demonstrates the conceptual link between *thaumata* and divine agency that we have explored in this chapter. This passage also presents the rites at Eleusis and the Olympic games as wonders (θαύματος ἄξια). As rituals, the mention of these festivals invokes the discourse of ethnographic wonders explored by Herodotus.  

In much the same way as the ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά of Herodotus proemium can equally be construed with the more concrete sense of ‘great and wondrous works of art/monuments’ as well as ‘great and wondrous deeds,’ Pausanias presents numerous examples of architectural marvels. One passage in particular points to Herodotus Egyptian *logos* and his description of the pyramids as architectural marvels.

*Ἑλληνες δὲ ἀρα εἰσὶ δεινοὶ τὰ ὑπερόρια ἐν τῇ θαύματι τίθεσθαι μείζονι ἡ τὰ οἰκεία, ὡστε γε ἀνδράζουν ἐπιφανείαν ἐς συγγραφήν πυραμίδας μὲν τὰς παρὰ Αἰγυπτίους ἐπῆλθεν ἐξηγήσασθαι πρὸς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, θησαυρόν δὲ τὸν Μινύου καὶ τὰ τείχη τὰ ἐν Τίρυνθι οὐδὲ ἐπὶ βραχὺ ἤγαγον μνήμης, οὐδὲν ὀντα ἐλάττονος θαύματος.

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

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 9.36.5

Pausanias’ description of the Minyan treasury and the walls of Tiryns relies on their connection to the heroic past, the impressive size of walls themselves, and the building material used in the cyclopean masonry to identify them as marvelous (οὐδὲν ὀντα ἐλάττονος θαύματος). In terms of their appearance, it is not difficult to see why such

---

106 Cf. Munson 2001: 234-247. In her study of ethnographic discourse in the Histories, Munson notes that Herodotus makes mention of exceptional agents, actions or customs as wonders through either metanarrative wonder terminology or through the presentation of ‘conventional code of ethnographic wonders.’  
107 Cf. 9.38.2 on the construction of the Minyan Treasury; θησαυρός δὲ ὁ Μινύου, θαύμα ἀν τὸν ἔν Ἑλλάδι αὐτῇ καὶ τὸν ἐπέρῳ ὀνείρους ὑπερέραν, πεποίηται τρόπον τοιόντι: λίθου μὲν ἔργασται, σχήμα δὲ πειρατείς ἐστιν αὐτῷ, κορυφή δὲ ὡς ἄγαν ὀξὺ ἀνηγμένη τὸν δὲ ἐνιστάτω τῶν λίθων φασιν ἀριστερὰν παντὶ εἶναι τῷ οἰκοδομήματι. (“The treasury of Minyas, a wonder second to none
imposing structures are labeled as wonders, but their connection to heroic narrative through the work of the Cyclopes is also significant, because these monumental structures are material evidence that corroborate the legends about the heroic past (Κυκλώπων δὲ καὶ ταύτα ἔργα εἶναι λέγουσιν, οἷς Προίτω τὸ τείχος ἐποίησαν ἐν Τίρυνθι 2.16.5).

As discussed above, Hesiod presents the Delphic sema as material evidence that corroborates the succession myth that forms the backbone of the Theogony. It, too, provides an important paradigm for approaching wonder in the Periegesis. In a programmatic statement from his Attica logos, Pausanias makes clear that he has been very selective and included only the note-worthy sights and stories from the area (1.39.3; cf. 3.11.1). With this in mind, it is significant that he includes in his description of Attica a small stone that appears to have no distinguishing features, beyond the fact that it is the right size for a small man to sit upon it (1.23.5). Despite its ordinary appearance, this artifact is included among those things most worth seeing in the region. Pausanias goes on to explain that this is not just any rock, but is in fact the very rock on which Silenus sat when Dionysus visited the Athenian Acropolis. Like the Delphic sema, this stone is noteworthy because it is a concrete symbol that acts as evidence to confirm a mythological narrative. It is this correlation between myth-historical narrative and concrete semata that Jacob signals in his injunction to explore la “Grèce imaginaire” through Pausanias’ “haunted landscape.”

In the Introduction, I mentioned Pausanias’ metanarrative comments about his skepticism toward metamorphoses and deification appended to his description of Mount Lycaon (8.2.4-6), in order to demonstrate that the Periegesis displays a temporal sense consistent with Hesiod’s presentation of the myth of ages. It is because the Heroic age was

---

108 Jacob 1983: 37: “Et si nous suivons Pausanias dans ces paysages hantés, nous pouvons entrer dans des jardins merveilleux, lieux bien singuliers traversés de fleuves voyageurs et fleuris de plantes rares, peuplés de grenouilles, de cigales et de fourmis, d’un bestiaire étonnant qui frappe l’imaginaire et défie l’entendement. Retrouvez, dans la Périégèse la Grèce imaginaire.”

109 Cf. 1.30.3 for Pausanias’ skepticism about the metamorphosis of the king of Ligyes into a swan. For discussion of the reception of Hesiod’s Myth of Ages in later authors, see Van Noorden 2015 passim, but esp. 204-260 for Ovid’s Metamorphoses. This passage is analyzed more fully in Chapter 3.
characterized by the closer proximity and commensality between gods and men that so many of the features of the landscape described in the *Periegesis* relate to this time.\(^{110}\) Despite the expectation that the gods operate at a further remove in his own time, it is not as though Pausanias presents a description of Roman Greece devoid of divine agency; in his own time, the gods operate through dreams,\(^{111}\) oracles,\(^{112}\) portents\(^ {113}\) and the occasional epiphany.\(^{114}\)

In the Introduction I also drew attention to Neer’s statement about the semantic equivalence of *thauma* and *axion theas* in *Periegesis*, which he interpreted as the diminishment of *thauma* over time, and so it amounted to no more than the tourist’s gaze in the 2nd century. But if we are to take Neer’s observation to heart and seriously consider that what Pausanias tags as “worth seeing” has the valence of a wonder, it becomes clear that the *Periegesis Hellados* charts its course through Roman Greece by noting all the *semata* of the heroic past, and those rare contemporary instances that demonstrate the continued influence of the divine. A correlation between the wonders of mythical narrative and the prodigies in nature is often evident in the text, as the commentary on a representation of Theseus and the Minotaur testifies.

\[\text{τούτων πέραν, ὅν εἴρηκα, ἐστὶν ἡ λεγομένη Ἐηρέως μάχη πρὸς τὸν ταύρον τὸν Μίνω καλοῦμενον, εἰτε ἄνηρ εἰτε θηρίον ἣν ὀποίων κεκράτηρεν ὁ λόγος· τέρατα γὰρ πολλὰ καὶ τούτως θαυμασιώτερα καὶ καθ’ ἴμας ἐτικτὸν γυναῖκες.}\]

Opposite these I have mentioned is represented the legendary battle of Theseus with the so-called Bull of Minos, whether this was a man or a beast of some sort like in the accepted story. For even in our time women have given birth to far more extraordinary monsters than this.\(^ {115}\)

---

111 *E.g.* 1.38.7: the injunction in his dream not to describe the buildings within the temenos at Eleusis.
112 There are numerous references to oracles throughout the *Periegesis*. Of particular note is Pausanias’ catalogue of “true oracles” in the Phocis *loge* (10.12.1-11) and his metanarrative comments after the last entry; τοιαύτα μὲν ἄχρι ἐμὸν λέγοντα γυναῖκες καὶ ἄνδρες ἐκ θεοῦ μαντεύσασθαι· ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τῷ πολλῷ καὶ αὕτης γένοιτο ἄν ἔτερα τοιαύτα “These are the women and men who, down to the present day, are said to have been the mouthpiece by which a god prophesied. But time is long, and perhaps similar things may occur again.” On oracular tales in Pausanias more generally, see Overmark Juul 2010.
113 *E.g.* 4.13.1: dogs howling before the defeat of the Messenians.
114 *E.g.* 10.23.1-7: the appearance of the Delphic heroes during the invasion of Brennus and the Gauls in 279 BCE. On epiphany in Pausanias and more generally, see Platt 2011 *passim*.
115 Translation by Jones and Ormerod (1918), but adapted by me.
Pausanias, *Periegesis* 1.24.1

In this passage, prodigious births (τέρατα) in the present (καθ’ ἡμᾶς) give credence to the mythological account of the Minotaur as a man-bull hybrid. These prodigious births engage with scientific discourse as observable phenomena, but they also make at least one marvelous aspect of Theseus’ heroic narrative more credible. In this example, the marvelous elements in heroic narrative that are replete with divine agency work together with scientific discourse. Together, they construct a coherent world-view in which extraordinary phenomena and individuals are emblematic of the agency of the gods.  

The perceptible signs of divine agency are not limited to the wonders of nature and the relics of the heroic past; rather Pausanias presents a theological outlook on history in which the fortunes of cities and peoples rise and fall according to divine favor.

I know that heaven is always willing to do something new, and likewise that all things, strong or weak, increasing or decreasing, are being changed by Fortune, who drives them with imperious necessity according to her whim. (...) At Babylon the sanctuary of Belus still is left, but of the Babylon that was the greatest city of its time under the sun nothing remains but the wall. The case of Tiryns in the Argolid is the same. These places have been reduced by heaven to nothing. But the city of Alexander in Egypt, and that of Seleucus on the Orontes, that were founded but yesterday, have reached their present size and prosperity because Fortune favours them.

---

116 See Cuny-Le Calet 2005: 43-60 for study of monstrosity in Roman authors. Cuny-Le Calet states (45): “Le monstre est donc bien un être dont on considère qu’il n’appartient pas au cours habituel et normal de la nature, c’est précisément pour cela qu’il est reconnu et répertorié comme un monstre, dans lequel on reconnaît l’intervention des dieux.” Cf. Cic. Nat.D. 2.13-15: *praeter naturam hominum pecudumque portentis* (“unnatural monstrosities human and animal”) are included in a list of many other portents, e.g., earthquakes, comets, that are emblematic of the divine nature of the universe. See Gevaert and Laes 2013: 211-230 for study of monstrosity in Pliny’s *NH*, with p.213 no.4 for additional bibliography on defining *monstrum* and p.214 for comparison of portent words (including *miraculum* and *monstrum*).
Pausanias goes on to say that he will present an incident that “proves the might of fortune to be greater (ισχύν μείζονα) and more marvelous (θαύματος πλείονος) than is shown by the disasters and prosperity of cities” and thereby sets the stage for a miraculous tale (8.33.4). Unfortunately, the text is corrupt and there is a lacuna, so the particulars of his startling tale are lost. The geographical range of the cities mentioned, Babylon, Tiryns, Alexandria in Egypt and Seleucia on the Orontes, makes clear that the sphere of influence of Pausanias’ Tyche extends to the furthest reaches of the oikoumene.

Pausanias’ metanarrative comments on Tyche suggest that all the architectural and cultural products that reflect a city’s prosperity are ultimately emblematic of the divine order. In this way, much that would seem at first glance to be secular in the Periegesis in fact engages with this theological framework. Pausanias’ text is noted for the wealth of art historical information it contains, and though it may seem that there is little connection between sculptures of Olympic victors and divine agency, Pausanias’ selectivity in presenting objects and works of art suggests that this connection is in fact the overriding criterion.¹¹⁷

In the Corinthian logos, Pausanias specifies that the things that are worthy of mention in Corinth (λόγου δὲ ἄξια) are the remains of antiquity and the more recent products of Roman foundation (ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκμης ἐποιήθη τῆς ύστερον). Among the things that are worthy of mention in Corinth is a wooden sculpture of Heracles.

Now the sanctuary of Athena Chalinitis is by their theater, and near is a naked wooden image of Heracles, said to be a work of Daedalus. All the works of this artist, although rather uncouth to look at, are nevertheless distinguished by a kind of inspiration.

Pausanias, Periegesis 8.33.2-4

The description suggests a contrast between the artistic skill in the rendering of the Heracles *xoanon* and the impression on the viewer. This ancient image, like other works attributed to Daedalus, are not noteworthy for their artistic skill (τέχνη), which Pausanias characterizes as strange to look upon (ἀτοπώτερα μὲν ἐστὶν ἐς τὴν ὄψιν). Nevertheless, the viewer is left with the impression of divine inspiration (ἐπιπρέπει δὲ ὁμοί τι καὶ ἐνθεὸν τούτοις), and it is this aspect that makes the Heracles in Corinth, along with this other works of Daedalus, worth seeing. On the basis of what is included in the *Periegesis*, Pritchett suggests that sculptures noted for their antiquity, particularly wooden cult statues (*xoana*) are emphasized.

The descriptions of the shield of Achilles or Pandora explored above insist on the subjective cognitive experience of wonder as a response to a symbol or artifact that mediates between human and divine spheres. But many passages in Archaic epic employ marked terms for wonders without comment on their effect, and so their usage appears almost categorical. These categorical wonders in Archaic epic include the exceptional size and beauty of gods and heroes, objects or deeds of extraordinary human skill, and acts of divine intervention. Marked terms are also used to designate marvelous skill in combat, weaving, or dance. The lives of mortals and whims of immortals are neatly enmeshed in the world of Homeric epic, the Age of Heroes when gods and men were still intimate and the relative distance between them less. The artifacts and phenomena that make this intimacy manifest are wonders that extend beyond the world of epic into later traditions almost as wonders by convention. A reader of the *Iliad* cannot look upon the shield of Achilles him or herself as Achilles, the Myrmidons, and Hector do; rather they experience the marvelous artifact through *ekphrasis*. In the next chapter, we will explore the textual strategies employed in travel writing and paradoxography to communicate wonders, which inform the structure and contents of the *Periegesis* as a description of

---

120 See e.g. *Od.* 7.145; 8.459; 11.287; 24.370.
121 See e.g. *Il.* 5.722-725; 10.11-12; 10.439; 18.83, 377, 466-467, 549; *Od.* 4.44; 7.43-5; 13.108; 19.229.
122 See e.g. *Il.* 2.320; 20.344; 21.54; *Od.* 3.373; 4.655; 10.326; 13.157; 19.36. For additional examples of wonders drawn from the epics, see Pajón Leyra 2010: 41 n.35.
123 See e.g. *Il.* 13.11; 13.99; 15.286; 18.496; 24.394; *Od.* 5.306; 8.265.
Roman Greece that is replete with *thaumata*, each of which explores the mediation between men and the divine.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{124} E.g. from the natural category are: the minotaur (1.24.1), giant bones (1.35.11; 5.13.5), the sources and courses of rivers (4.35.11; 8.7.3), stones that emit music (1.42.3), animals that are all white (8.17.3-4), beasts of Elis (5.5.2), water that attacks metal (8.18.4), the absence of swallows from Phocis (10.4.9), the Tanagra Triton (9.20.4-21). In the second category, are works of art: the marble stadium in Athens (1.19.6), sacred statues (8.42.7; 10.18.6), the ‘treasury’ of Minyas (9.38.2), the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus (8.16.4). Also, there are deeds of exceptional men like Pyrrhus (1.12.2) or athletes (5.21.16, 6.5.6, 6.4, 13.3).
Chapter 2: Wonder-books as Paradoxography and Travel Literature

At the opening of his literary analysis of the *Periegesis*, Hutton remarks on the persistence of Pausanias’s characterization in modern scholarship as a “dependable dullard” who is the “historian’s favorite kind of source: a congenial, plodding workhorse who is too dull to lie and too unimaginative to distort the facts in pursuit of literary artifice.” With the prevalence of such an opinion, it may at first seem odd to suggest that wonder and wonder-books, with their association with readerly pleasure, have a central place in the composition of the *Periegesis*. But the suggestion that the *Periegesis* is replete with wonders is not in fact novel; Jacob observed the influence of paradoxography on the composition of the *Periegesis* in an article published more than thirty years ago. In his article he collects and discusses a variety of wonders in the text, which include such unfamiliar fauna as Celtic elk (9.21.1), the Ethiopian rhinoceros (9.21.2) and Indian elephant (1.12.34). He interprets the concern with *mirabilia* evident in the *Periegesis* as consistent with the intellectual trends of the Second Sophistic.

Earlier scholars had also noted profound similarities between Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados* and collections of *thaumata*, referred to in the scholarly publications as *paradoxographies*. Further research into Greek and Roman paradoxography has advanced understanding of the genre: studies by Schepens and Delacroix and more

---

1 Hutton 2005a: 4 and 22-23.
2 E.g. Pritchett 1999: 8 n.4 states: “The persons who extract entertainment from reading that ‘Place a is so many stades from place b, and place c so many more from place b’ must be few in number and of unusual disposition.”
3 Jacob 1980a: 35-67. Jacob’s publication and his insights, however, do not appear to have had a significant impact on English language scholarship on Pausanias’ *Periegesis*. It should noted that although Jacob 1980a is included in the bibliography of important works like Alcock, et al. 2001 and Pretzler 2007a, it does not appear in that of Habicht 1985, Hutton 2005a, Akujärvi 2005, inter alia.
4 Following Jacob’s study of wonders in the *Periegesis*, Jacquemin 1991 published an article on natural wonders in the text. See also Arafat 1999 for other discussion of natural wonders and Pausanias’ treatment of non-Greeks and Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 55-6 and 104 for list of natural wonders, works of art and epiphanies in the *Periegesis*. See also Jost 2007: 111-112.
recently Pajón Leyra have elaborated the origins, characteristics, concerns, and intended audience of this genre of text. These more recent publications provide the impetus to explore the *Periegesis* in relation to the generic features of paradoxographies in order to reevaluate the role of θαύματα and παράδοξα in structuring the text, and to further explicate the discourse of wonder in it.

The following two chapters will explore the intersections between paradoxography and *periegesis*, both fragmentary genres that are intimately entwined with the tradition of ancient travel writing (both non-fictional and fictional). This chapter focuses on personal experience (autopsy and inquiry) and culling from authoritative texts (derivative compilation) in wonder-books in order to problematize the perceived generic distinctions between paradoxography and travel writing. The analysis in this chapter suggests that categories of wonder-books are better construed as a continuum rather than a strict binary with respect to their methods of composition and authentication strategies.

**Gelliuss’ *Libri Graeci miraculorum fabularumque pleni***

A passage from Aulus Gellius’ *Attic Nights* provides a suitable point of departure for tracing the prominent threads in the study of wonder-books. He writes that on his trip back from Greece to Rome, he saw a bunch of books for sale in Brundisium.

> Erant autem isti omnes libri Graeci miraculorum fabularumque pleni, res inauditiae, incredulae, scriptores veteres non parvae auctoritatis: Aristeas Proconnesius et Isigonus Niccaensis et Ctesias et Onesicritus et Philostephanus et Hegesias; Accessi tamen percontatusque pretium sum et, adductus mira atque insperata vilitate, libros plurimos aere pauco emo eosque omnis duabus proximis noctibus cursim transeo; atque in legendo carpsi exinde quaedam et notavi mirabilia et scriptoribus fere nostris intemptata eaque his commentariis aspersi, ut qui eos lectitarit ne rudis omnino et ἀνήκοος inter istiusmodi rerum auditiones reperiatur.

---

7 Schepens and Delacroix 1996; Pajón Leyra 2010.
8 The need for such an analysis is evident in the curious fact that despite Jacob’s publications, Pausanias’ *Periegesis* receives mention neither among the works of geographers or travel stories with paradoxographical elements in Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 439-442.
9 Schepens and Delacroix 1996 uses “Wonder-Books” to refer to paradoxographies, e.g. (376) “poets and historians who indulged in the telling *mirabilia* and *fabulae* were at least as successful as the specialized authors of *Wonder-Books,*” and “the *Wonder-Books* of the third and second centuries BC.” I adopt the expression to designate a broader range of texts about wonders. “Wonder-books” correlates well with Gelliuss’ expression *libri...miraculorum fabularumque pleni,* and is less cumbersome than “books full of wonders.”
Now, all those books were in Greek, filled with marvelous tales, things unheard of, incredible; but the writers were ancient and of no mean authority: Aristeas of Proconnesus, Isigonus of Nicaea, Ctesias, Onesicritus, Philostephanus and Hægesias. I bought a large number of them for a small sum, and ran through all of them hastily in the course of the next two nights. As I read, I culled from them, and noted down, some things that were remarkable and for the most part unmentioned by our native writers; these I have inserted here and there in these notes, so that whoever shall read them may not be found to be wholly ignorant and ἀνήκοος, or “uninstructed,” when hearing tales of that kind.

Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights* 9.4.2-4

Gellius’ *libri Graeci miraculorum fabularumque pleni* are evidently texts concerned with marvels and as such have a bearing on the subject of inquiry of this study. Gellius names several authors of these “books full of wonders” and specifies that they have the merit of both authority and antiquity (*scriptores veteres non parvae auctoritatis*): Aristeas of Proconnesus, Isigonus of Nicaea, Ctesias, Onesicritus, Philostephanus and Hægesias. This passage well illustrates that these *libri miraculorum fabularumque pleni* are here grouped together on the basis of their kindred subject matter (*res inauditae, incredulae*), but the wonder-books by these *scriptores veteres non parvae auctoritatis* are in fact considered generically distinct in contemporary scholarship.¹⁰

Many of these ancient authors are known as travellers whose texts are dependent on their exotic journeys: Aristeas of Proconnesus appears in Herodotus, as well as Gellius, as the author of the *Arismaspeia*, a poetic account of his travels to Scythia and the land of the Issedones further to the north;¹¹ Ctesias is the author of an historical account of Persia, where he resided as the physician for the royal court, and a second related monograph on the marvels of India;¹² Onesicritus, a student of the cynic Diogenes of Sinope, composed

---

¹⁰ E.g. Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 376: “The authors of the books on sale were not all paradoxographers like Isigonus and Philostephanus, but writers of epic poetry and history as well.”

¹¹ Herodotus (4.13-15) cites him as the source for the one-eyed Arimaspians, griffins and Hyperboreans. See Bolton 1962.

¹² Historian and physician at the court of Artaxerxes II (405-398/7 BCE). Author of a *Periodos* (a geographical treatise), an *Indika* and a 23-volume *Persika*. See Lenfant 2004; Stronk 2010:1-59; Nichols 2011:11-45. As for Ctesias’ travels, Nichols 2011:17 observes that although “we have no direct information on Ctesias’ activities or travels within the empire, we can discern many of the places he likely visited. He certainly would never be far from the royal family in case his services were needed. Thus we know he visited the capitals at Susa, Ecbatana, and possibly Persepolis...” Ctesias also visited Babylon (F28). Nichols infers that Ctesias never travelled to India on the grounds that Artaxerxes never campaigned that
an account of his travels with Alexander from India to Babylon that included the practices of gymnosphistae among other marvels.\(^\text{13}\) But Isigonus and Philostephanus, in contrast to Aristeas, Ctesias, and Onesicritus, are known as library compilers rather than travellers (or travel writers).\(^\text{14}\) Gellius does not appear to distinguish between authentic travel writing and derivative compilation (or any gradation between the two) in his grouping of the texts as *libri miraculorum fabularumque pleni*.\(^\text{15}\)

Scholars agree that the essential characteristic of paradoxography is its subject matter—a singular focus on θαύματα or παράδοξα.\(^\text{16}\) Schepens observes that while Greek literature has been concerned with wonders from its beginnings, the term paradoxography is reserved for works conspicuously concerned with θαύματα or παράδοξα.\(^\text{17}\) The distinction highlights the exclusive focus on wonders that is characteristic of these texts, as opposed to texts in which wonder is a prominent theme or element. Although paradoxography is sometimes broadly defined as writing which “describes παράδοξα, phenomena or creatures, which occur against all δόξα, human expectation,”\(^\text{18}\) Gellius’ *libri Graeci miraculorum fabularumque pleni* are not in fact considered paradoxographies in contemporary scholarship; Ziegler, for instance, says that they are “something else,” though he does not say what.\(^\text{19}\) The narrow, and more usual, definition

---

\(^\text{13}\) See Brown 1949. The prominence of wonders in in Onesicritus’ text is suggested by Strabo’s characterization (15.1.28): Ὄνησίκριτος, ὃν οὐκ Ἀλεξάνδρου μάλλον ἢ τῶν παραδόξων ἀρχιμερυνητῆτιν προσεῖτοι τις ἄν.

\(^\text{14}\) Isigonus of Nicaea wrote at least two books of Απίστα (‘Unbelievable things’); fragments are transmitted in the anonymous (likely Byzantine) collection know as Paradoxographus Florentinus. Philostephanus of Cyrene was a pupil of Callimachus; he is the author of geographical works focused on etiological and paradoxographical themes that survive only as fragments and titles, such as On the Cities of Asia (frr. 1-8 Müller); On the Cities of Europe (frr. 9-9a Müller); On Islands (frr. 10-19 Müller); On Peculiar Rivers (frr. 20-26 Müller) On Springs (frr. 27 Müller). See F. Gisinger, s.v. ‘Philostephanus.’

\(^\text{15}\) See also Mason 1978: 1-12 on the meaning of *fabula Graecanica* in Apuleius’ *Golden Ass* and Apuleius’ reworking of Greek material into a Roman context, esp. p.8 for relationship to paradoxa.

\(^\text{16}\) E.g. Westermann 1839; Ziegler 1949; Jacob 1983; Schepens and Delacroix 1996; Pajón Leyra 2010.

\(^\text{17}\) Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 380-382. See Giannini 1963: 247-266 and 1965 for the origins and antecedents of paradoxography. He begins his treatment of the development of paradoxographical writing with Homer’s *Odyssey* and Herodotus’ *Histories*.

\(^\text{18}\) Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 410.

\(^\text{19}\) Ziegler 1949 s.v. ‘Paradoxographoi’: “Da sind allerdings die eigentlich Paradoxographen mit Fabulisten anderer Art zusammengefaßt.” It is worth noting that although Ziegler’s publication is more than 60 years old, Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 377 characterizes it as “essential reading for anyone interested in the subject.”
of paradoxography suggests that in addition to the focus on wonder, scholars have identified the process of culling anecdotes from earlier writers (ekloge) and collecting them in compilation form (synagoge) with paradoxography proper. Antigonus Carystius’ wonder compilation and Phlegon of Tralles’ Books of Marvels, which both present wonder anecdotes in a largely thematic arrangement, are representative examples of paradoxography in the narrow sense.

In the Introduction, paradoxography and travel writing were singled out privileged texts for the presentation of marvels. Jacob remarks as follows on the tradition of describing natural, zoological and ethical wonders in the reports of ancient travel:

> The descriptions of distant lands and of their characteristics disseminated by travel narratives contributed to creating in Greece an immense curiosity about “strange facts,” “θαυματα,” that run counter to common sense, and those that are out of the ordinary, “παραδοξα.”

Of course, Jacob does not explicitly refer to travel writing as a genre here; he opts rather for the periphrastic construction “descriptions of distant lands and of their characteristics disseminated by travel narratives.” Pretzler also notes that there is no ancient genre of travel writing per se, but rather “travelling and travel experiences play a crucial role in many ancient texts” that belong to a variety of genres. But some of Gellius’ Greek-

---

20 E.g. Westermann, Ziegler, Jacob and Schepens.
21 On Phlegon, see Hansen 1996. On Antigonus, see Jacob 1983. Dorandi 1999: xi-xxxii argues that, contrary to the assessment of Wilamowitz, there are several authors designated as Antigonus Carystius rather than one author to whom the biographies of philosophers is attributed. Titles attributed to Antigonus Carystius are a Περὶ λέξεως, a Περὶ ζῴων, a poem Λατίπατρος in epigrams, a prose work titled Ἀλλούσεις and a Μακεδονική περιήγησις. Dorandi cites the dissertation of Köpke 1862 and the more recent work of Musso 1977 to suggest that the wonder compilation attributed to Antigonus is in fact a late-Byzantine compilation falsely attributed to an ancient author. This view has not been generally accepted, e.g. Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 401 n.89: “[W]e still believe that Wilamowitz’s (1881: 16-26) arguments, which rest on two unambiguous testimonies, carry sufficient weight for assigning the Ἰστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή to the sculptor, art critic and biographer Antigonus of Karystos.” Cf. Sassi 1993: 459-465.
22 Jacob 1980b: 66.
23 In the paragraph immediately preceding, Jacob 1980b: 66 states: “The tradition [of writing about travels] becomes established and the travel narrative develops as an autonomous genre.” His notion of the tradition begins with Homer’s presentation of Odysseus’ wandering, then Hecataeus of Miletus and Herodotus. He includes, however, Dionysius’ Periodos Ges in his list of relevant texts for his “autonomous genre” even though it is a geographical description that is not based on any travel on the part of the author, nor does it feature traveling. My impression is that Jacob does not rigorously distinguish between geography and travel writing, and as such his use of “genre” here would not stand up to further scrutiny.
24 Pretzler 2009: 356. Among these are periploi, periodoi, epic poetry, histories, novels, etc.
books-full-of-wonders are exotic travel narratives of the kind mocked by Lucian in the preface to his *True Stories* that will be further discussed below. It is significant that both Gellius and Lucian cite the 5th century doctor-historian Ctesias in the quoted passages, because his works do not easily conform to modern categories of travel writing.

The distinction between the texts by Aristeas, Ctesias and Onesicritus on the one hand and Isigonus and Philostephanus on the other is not so much the contents of their texts—they are all *libri Graeci miraculorum fabularumque pleni*—but rather their divergent methods of composition. The distinction between wonder-text-as-travel-writing and wonder-text-as-paradoxography in the narrow sense is not so much the subject-matter, as *thaumata*/*paradoxa* are obviously germane to both, but rather the issue of primary versus secondary witness, whether the text is a *synagoge* or *syngraphe.* The following section will engage with the scholarly literature that explores generic features of both travel writing and paradoxography in order to clarify and then problematize the boundaries drawn between these texts.

**Defining Paradoxography**

We begin with a sketch of the *communis opinio* of the defining features of paradoxography according to the scholarly tradition established by Westermann and elaborated by Jacob, Schepens, Delacroix and Pajón Leyra. This sketch is intended both to make an unfamiliar genre and some non-canonical texts more familiar, and to enumerate the salient features of the genre as they are presented in the scholarly literature. The main focus of this section, however, will be on the ambiguous status of autopsy in paradoxographic texts.

---

25 The issue of structural organization is also important, though not conclusive: travel writing is often construed as 1st (or perhaps 3rd) person narrative with plot elaborated over space and time, while paradoxography presents discontinuous narrative that is organized thematically or spatially. *Periploi* and fragments of *periegetic* writing complicate these distinctions; both are related to travel but do not really elaborate plot. On periplus literature in general, see Gisinger 1937: 841-50; Dilke 1985: 130-44; Hartinger 1992 (*non vidii*). On the connection between experience and text, see Dueck 2012: 111-118.

26 Westermann 1839; Jacob 1983; Schepens and Delacroix 1996; Pajón Leyra 2010. Giannini 1963, 1964 and 1965 are also relevant. Regenbogen 1956 has also been influential, though the salient points of his analysis are presented in Jacob 1983.
As stated above, the scholarship on paradoxography presents both a broad and a narrow definition of the genre: the broad definition encompasses any type of writing concerned with marvels, the narrower (and more usual) definition described a specialized genre focused on the systematic presentation of mirabilia culled from literary antecedents. Photius’ summary of Alexander of Myndos’ lost collection of marvels provides a succinct overview of the salient traits of paradoxographies in the narrow sense.

Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἀλεξάνδρου θαυμασίων συναγωγή. Λέγει μὲν ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ πολλὰ τερατώδη καὶ ἀπιστά, πλὴν ἄλλους τῶν οὐκ ἀφανῶν εἰσάγει ταῦτα προϊστορήσαντας. Λέγει δὲ περὶ τε ζῴων καὶ φυτῶν καὶ χωρῶν τινῶν καὶ ποταμῶν καὶ ρηχών καὶ βοτανῶν καὶ τῶν τοιούτων.

Read Alexander, A Collection of Marvels. He relates in this book a number of prodigious and unbelievable things, but he lists first other authors who have reported these facts before him and who are not without renown. He speaks of animals and plants of cer
derivative method of composition for the compilation is emphasized; it depends on the
culling anecdotes from earlier writers (πλὴν ἄλλους τῶν οὐκ ἀφανῶν εἰσάγει ταῦτα προϊστορήσαντας). Among these earlier writers of considerable authority and reputation
we might imagine Herodotus and Aristotle, though Photius does not in fact elaborate on the identity of the sources. Photius’ testimony specifies that the *thaumata* collected in Alexander’s *synagoge* are natural wonders—the plants, animals, waterways and other such things that are indigenous to particular territories (*περί τε ζώων καὶ φυτῶν καὶ χωρῶν τινῶν καὶ ποταμῶν καὶ θηριῶν καὶ βοσκῶν καὶ τῶν τοιούτων*)—which he has already suggested are marvelous (*τερατώδη καὶ ἀπίστω*).

It is worth noting that Alexander’s collection is no longer extant and our knowledge of his work is entirely based on the testimony of other authors. Among the most notable surviving examples of paradoxographies are the *Collection of Marvelous Stories* by Antigonus Carystius (3rd century BCE), the Pseudo-Aristotelian *On Marvelous Things Heard*, Phlegon of Tralles’ *Book of Marvels* (2nd century CE), and Apollonius’ *Historiae Mirabiles*. These are collections of all manner of natural wonders and curiosities such as ghost stories, hermaphroditism, giant bones, long-lived persons and Olympiads, zoological wonders, particularities of human physiology and physiognomy, features and sources of waterways, among others. They generally conform to the model sketched by Photius’ summary of Alexander’ compilation above, but the question arises: does the accident of preservation truly give a full sense of the methods and range of subjects that characterize the genre?

---

31 There are also anonymous medieval compilations by the so-called Paradoxographus Florentinus, Paradoxographus Vaticanus, Paradoxographus Palatinus, though because of their late date of composition, I have not treated them in this study. See also Westermann 1839: xii. Westermann names the following as paradoxographers: Antigonus, Pseudo-Aristoteles, Achelaus, Philostephanus, Agatharchides, Polemo, Nymphodorus, Bolus, Diphanes, Alexander, Isigonus, Sotion, Trophilus and Protagoras. Hansen 1996 limits his list to seven more or less complete exempla: Antigonus Carystius’ *Ἱστοριῶν Παραδόξων Συναγωγή*, Apollonius’ *Ἱστορίαι Θαυμάσιαι*, Phlegon of Tralles’ *Περὶ Θαυμάσιων*, and four anonymous compilations: [Aristotle]’s *Περὶ Θαυμάσιων ἀκονημάτων* and the three anonymous medieval compilations listed above.

32 Jacob 1983: 124 ff. provides an analysis of the structure of Antigonus Carystius’ compilation. Hansen 1996: 8 states: “The original topics of the genre remain the favorites: the marvellous characteristics and properties of animals, plants, stones, waters, localities, fire—in other words, wondrous natural phenomena, but the genre grew to embrace other topics as well. Of these, the most notable is amazing human beings, whether individuals, whole communities, or characters belonging to Greek mythological history, although mythology, despite its fabulous content, never came to play a major role in paradoxography, for the compilers were attracted more to the wonders of the contemporary and near contemporary world than to prehistory.” Cf. Pliny *HN* 7, in which peripheral man-eaters, mythical Cyclopes, and *monstra* are all included.
Paradoxography is a contemporary term and the study of “wonder-texts” \textit{qua} genre begins in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century with the contribution of Westermann. He published the earliest collection of critically edited “wonder-texts” under the title \textit{Παραδοξογράφοι: Scriptores rerum mirabilium Graeci}.\textsuperscript{33} The generic designation “paradoxography” first appears in Westermann’s publication though it has no ancient precedent; he adapts the expression \textit{paradoxographos}, first used by Tzetzes to designate the author of a wonder-compilation (\textit{Chil. 2.35.151}), to designate the whole class of texts concerned with wonders. The isolation of \textit{mirabilia} as the primary thematic criterion of these texts, the insistence on derivative compilation as the characteristic mode of composition, and the association of wonder anecdotes with pleasurable reader-response are all introduced in Westermann’s seminal publication.

He presents Callimachus of Cyrene as the author of the earliest attested true paradoxography, and this has been widely accepted.\textsuperscript{34} This conclusion is based partly on the testimony of a \textit{Suda} entry, in which works titled \textit{Collection of Wonders of the Whole World According to Place} (\textit{θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἄπασαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὄντων συναγωγή}) and \textit{On the wonders in the Peleponnese and Italy} (\textit{Περὶ τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ καὶ Ἰταλίᾳ θαυμασίων καὶ παραδόξων}) among others, are attributed to Callimachus.\textsuperscript{35} For Westermann, Callimachus’ erudition and his privileged position at the Library of Alexandria are crucial in the development of genre and evidenced in the substantial list of authors cited in his compilation (\textit{συναγωγή}).\textsuperscript{36} Westermann identified the following as the requisite methodology for the composition of paradoxographies: they must be strict compilations of earlier works, exclusive of any first-hand knowledge of the phenomena they describe, “…\textit{ut non quae experti ipsi essent, sed quae in scriptis aliorum reperissent mirabilia exacerperent et in unum quasi corpus colligerentatque...}

\textsuperscript{33} Westermann 1839. The complete title is \textit{Παραδοξογράφοι: Scriptores rerum mirabilium Graeci. Insunt (Aristotelis) Mirabiles auscultationes; Antigoni, Apollonii, Phlegontis Historiae mirabiles, Michaelis Pselli Leciones mirabiles, reliqaurum eiusdem generis scriptorum deperditorum fragmenta.}


\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Suda} s.v. \textit{Καλλίμαχος}. The importance of this testimony will be explored below in relation to the various organizing principles employed within the compilations.

\textsuperscript{36} Westermann 1839: x-XI. The authors cited in Antigonus, and plausibly attributable to Callimachus, include Amometus, Aristotle, Ctesias, Eudoxus, Heraclides, Lycus, Megasthenes, Nicagoras, Phanias, Philonis, Pindar, Polycritos, Theophrastus, Theopompus, Timaeus and Zenophilus. See Krevans 2004: 173-182 for discussion of Callimachus’ prose works and appendix of titles.
Westermann tacitly uses Callimachus’s wonder-compile as the paradigmatic example from which to derive the characteristic features of the genre on the grounds that it is the foundational text; he favored natural wonders over other types of *thaumata* and suggests that the inclusion of more sensational material in later compilations reflects a degeneration of the Callimachean form.  

But Callimachus’ wonder-compile is a problematic model text, because it does not survive through direct witness in the manuscript tradition; rather it was itself excerpted and transmitted by Antigonus of Carystius, another Hellenistic paradoxographer, in his Ἱστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγῆ. It is therefore not possible to isolate which features of the Ἱστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγῆ reflect Callimachus’ compilation and which reflect more properly to Antigonus’ own criteria. One cannot confirm Westermann’s hypothesis that the inclusion of more sensational and portentous material in later *exempla* of the genre reflects a degeneration of the Callimachean model, as the absence of these from Antigonus’ compilation may reflect his preferences rather than those of Callimachus. In fact, Westermann’s criteria appear to be too restrictive to account for the full range of wonder-books attested in testimonia, and so the categorical distinctions are likely more fluid than he suggests.

More than a hundred years after the publication of Westermann’s editions of the Greek paradoxographers, Giannini embarked on the publication of a collection of new editions of the texts; Giannini’s editions are based on his own collations of the relevant manuscripts and Jacoby’s monumental work on the fragments of the Greek historians. His text remains the standard edition for many of the authors included in his *Paradoxographorum Reliquae* (1965). His publication of the texts followed upon his publication of the texts followed upon his

37 Westermann 1839: XII-XIII.
39 Giannini 1965: 15-20 for fragments of Callimachus’ wonder-compilations, most of which are transmitted by Antigonus. See 31-109 for text and Latin translation of Antigonus’ text. Musso 1985 is the most recent edition of Antigonus’ text and is based of the latest autopsy of the manuscript.
40 There is an assumption that Antigonus’ substantial excerpt faithfully renders the range entries in Callimachus’ own compilations, though this view is not founded on any particular evidence.
41 Giannini 1965: 7-10.
42 Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 376 n.5 states that Schepens uses Giannini’s editions as the basis of his analysis with the exception of Antigonus Carystius’ text, for which the more recent Musso 1985 edition has surpassed Giannini’s.
companion studies of the antecedents of paradoxography in Homer, Herodotus, Ctesias and others; although the studies demonstrate a longstanding interest in the marvelous in Greek literature, they contribute little to our understanding of the development and features of paradoxography.\textsuperscript{43}

In his brief account of the development of the genre, Jacob posits a transition from the particular interest in marvels evident in Greek literature to a specialized genre, “paradoxography”. He writes,

À la découverte initiale de l’ethnographe et du naturaliste se substitue l’écriture artificielle du compilateur: il peut s’agir d’un véritable enquêteur, qui parcourt le monde à la recherché des phénomènes extraordinaires et qui interroge sur le terrain les témoins d’un prodige, mais le plus souvent, le paradoxographe voyage dans les livres de sa bibliothèque.\textsuperscript{44}

Jacob here suggests two types of paradoxographical texts, one based on actual travel in the search of wonders, and the other entirely derivative and based on metaphorical travel through books. In many ways, the latter model maps directly onto the practice Gellius presented above: he read, culled and compiled mirabilia from the *libri Graeci miraculorum fabularumque pleni* (9.4.2-4). But Jacob’s suggestion that paradoxographical research could be conducted in the field, so-to-speak, appears to be entirely rhetorical, because he goes on to describe the two fundamental processes in the composition of a paradoxography as excerpting and compiling.\textsuperscript{45} Although Jacob’s statements address paradoxography in general, it is significant that, like Westermann, his analysis is in fact based on a single exemplum: Antigonus Carystius’ *Ἰστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή*.\textsuperscript{46} Because both Westermann and Jacob ultimately based their observations on the same surviving exemplum, they define paradoxography as a specialized Hellenistic genre devoted to the derivative compilation of wondrous

\textsuperscript{43} Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 380 states: “Attempts made at delineating paradoxography from other forms of literature in terms of the particular subject matter treated in it (Ziegler 1949) or by exploring its roots in Greek epic, historiographical, scientific and philosophical literature (Giannini 1963) do not really explain what paradoxography is all about.”

\textsuperscript{44} Jacob 1980b: 55.


\textsuperscript{46} Jacob 1983: 122-137.
anecdotes.\textsuperscript{47} Though this accurately describes Antignous’ collection, is his text truly representative of the genre more generally?

The analyses of Westermann and Jacob have been extremely influential, and so scholars have generally accepted the major points of their definitions. Schepens elaborates on their observations on the basis of a larger data-set, and presents a more systematic analysis of the features and structure of the Greek paradoxography.\textsuperscript{48} Among the generic elements Schepens identifies are 1) an emphasis on credibility through documentation and 2) the acknowledgement of sources, 3) the process of extraction (ἐκλογή) and compilation, and 4) the systematic arrangements of the excerpts. He also notes that despite these common characteristics, there is no consistent style associated with paradoxographic texts so that these can be written freely in either prose or verse.\textsuperscript{49}

One of the most significant insights of Schepens’ analysis points to the importance of credibility in paradoxography. He notes that “for paradoxographers, to uphold certain standards of credibility is vital to their aim,”\textsuperscript{50} which suggests that, in order to achieve their desired affect as \textit{thaumata}, it is essential that the reader consider the anecdotes collected to be a part of the real world and not the figments of the paradoxographer’s imagination.\textsuperscript{51} He presents two techniques open to the paradoxographer in order to demonstrate the credibility of his report: the first is the attribution of the anecdote to a trustworthy and authoritative source, and the second is the demonstration of personal inquiry. This is consistent with Gellius’ remarks that the Greek wonder-books were attributed to ancient writers of no mean authority. Further, the section of Antignous’ collection derived from Callimachus’ own compilation is characterized by the wealth of

\textsuperscript{47} Jacob’s commitment to the characterization of paradoxography as derivative was also based in part on his belief in the narrative of intellectual decline (traced through historiography) from the Classical through the Roman periods on the one hand, and the essential differences between oral societies and literary cultures, on the other. See Jacob 1983:122.

\textsuperscript{48} Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 380-398.

\textsuperscript{49} Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 399.

\textsuperscript{50} Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 383. The force of Gellius’ characterization of the contents of the \textit{libri Graeci miraculorum fabularumque pleni} as “incredible things” (\textit{res incredulae}) must surely be rhetorical, as his encomium for Pliny’s learning and authority suggest.

\textsuperscript{51} See Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 382-389 for discussion of the importance of documentation and credibility in paradoxography.
‘bibliographic’ references to attest to the credibility of the sources. Schepens contends that this technique is in fact characteristic of paradoxographical compilations.

In addition to the citation of authoritative sources, some paradoxographers cite documentary evidence in support of their anecdotes. Philon of Heracleia reports that asses in Scythia have horns that hold the water of the River Styx, and cites an example of such a horn dedicated at Delphi with a metrical inscription in order to vouch for the phenomenon. Nymphodorus of Syracuse also makes use of epigraphic evidence to support his anecdote about the simultaneous death of all five of Daphnis of Syracuse’s dogs upon their master’s demise and quotes directly from the inscribed funerary monument. Like the wealth of bibliographic references that is characteristic of paradoxography, the use of documentary evidence to corroborate anecdotes points to the paradoxographers’ concern with establishing the credibility of their excerpts.

Although Jacob had criticized paradoxographers for their perceived lack of critical acumen, Schepens argues that critical assessment of the reliability of sources is evident in paradoxographic compilations. He points to Antigonus’ criticism of Ctesias’ reliability as exemplary of this critical assessment of sources.

---

52 Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 383 lists the authors Antigonus presents in oratio obliqua as the sources Callimachus cited for his excerpts. These include Eudoxus, Theophrastus, Megasthenes, Timaeus, Theopompos, Aristotle, Ctesias, Heracleides Ponticus, among others.

53 Though sources are infrequently cited by name in [Aristotle] Collection of Marvelous Things Heard.

54 Stob. Auth. 1.49.52: 'Επειδὴ περὶ τοῦ Στυγοῦ ἔδωκεν ὁ λόγος ἐστὶ, δηλότου σοι βουλόμαι καὶ ἐτέραν ἱστοριὰν περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ: Φίλον γὰρ ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ Πρὸς Νύμφην περὶ θαυμασίου ἐν Σκύθας φημὸν ὅνους γέγενθα χέρατα ἔχοντας, ταύτα δὲ τὰ χέρατα δύνασθαι τότε τὸ ὅπωρ διαφέρειν· καὶ Αλέξανδρος τῷ Μακεδόνι ἐνεχθῆναι ὑπὸ Σωπάτρου κέρας τοιοῦτο, ὅ καὶ ἀνατεθήναι ἐν Δελφοῖς, ἐφ’ οὗ καὶ ἐπεγεγράφθαν·

Σοι τόδ’ Ἀλέξανδρος Μακεδόνι κέρας ἀνθέτο, Παιάν, κάθαρος Σκύθων, χρήμα τι δαιμόνιον·

ὁ Στυγός ἀχράντω Λούσητος σοὶ ἐδαμάσθη

ἕψατε, βαστάξαν δ’ ἔδωκεν ἤνωθεν.

Cf. Arrian Anab. 7.27.1; Pliny HN 30.149; Plutarch Alex. 77; Aelian NA 10.40.

55 Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 388 Nymphodorus F2 (Giannini)= Schol. Theocritus 1.65: 'Υμφόδωρος δὲ φημὸν ἐν τῷ περὶ Σκύθας θαυμαζομένων ὁ πότε τῷ Δάφνιδος (65/66c.) μεταλλάξατος ἐκποιμιζομένῳ τοὺς χόνας συναξολουθεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόφου μεταλλάξατος καὶ ἐναὶ αὐτῶν ἐν μνήμῃ, ὅ γεγραμμέν· 'Σάμος Πόδαργος Λάμπους Αλκίμος Θάσος.'

Καὶ ἐν Ἐκβατάνοις δὲ καὶ ἐν Πέρσαις Κτησίας ἱστορεῖ παραπλήμιον τι τούτοις. διὰ δὲ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλὰ ψευδεσθαὶ παρελθομεν τὴν ἐκλογήν· καὶ γὰρ ἐφαίνετο τερατώδης.

Ctesias claims that something similar to this occurs in Ecbatana and Persia, but since he is prone to telling lies, I will skip over this extract because it seems too fanciful.

Antigonus Carystius, Mir 15

In contrast to his criticism of Ctesias’ reliability, we might compare Antigonus’ assessment of Aristotle’s scientific authority on the lives and habits of animals and how it impacts his treatment of the source material. Antigonus comments upon the exactitude with which one might learn from Aristotle’s biological works (ἀκριβέστατ᾽ ἃν τις ἐκ τῆς Αριστοτέλους συναγωγῆς καταμάθωι) and for this reason he ranks him foremost among the sources for his own compilation (ἐξ ἤς ἡμεῖς πρῶτον ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἐκλογήν). Antigonus further specifies that from the wealth of information in Aristotle’s texts, he has selected only wondrous material (πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐκλογήν ἐκποιεῖ τῶν προηγημένων αὐτῷ τὸ ἔξον καὶ παράδοξον ἐκ τῶν τούτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιδραμείν).

Aelian also makes some revealing comments about his own ability, as compiler, to critically assess the reliability of an anecdote in his De Natura Animalium. He attributes to Alexander of Myndos the fact that cranes migrate to islands in the river Ocean in their old age and, once arrived there, change into human form (3.23). But Aelian also insists that this is a credible rather than an invented report, because he can discern no motive for Alexander to present a false report.

καὶ οὐ μοι δοκεῖ μύθος εἶναι. ἢ τί καὶ βουλόμενος ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος τοῦτο ἂν ἐτερατεύσατο κεφαλαίων μηδὲ ἐν; ἄλλως τε οὐδ’ ἂν

57 Antigonus Mir. 26: Καὶ μὴν τὰς τε λοιπὰς ἐν τρεχείας τῶν ζῴων, οἷον ἐν μάχαις, ἐν θεραπείαις τραυμάτων, ἐν παρασκευαῖς τῶν πρὸς τῶν βίων ἀναγκαίων, ἐν φιλοσοφίαις, ἐν μνήμαις, ἐξ ἦς ἡμεῖς πρῶτον ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἐκλογήν.

58 Antigonus Mir. 60: Πλὴν ὁ γε Ἀριστοτέλης χωρίς τῆς περὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν ζῴων ἐντρεχείας καὶ τοιαύτα τινα διεξέρχεται, πάνυ πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν πεποιημένοι παῖς πλείστοις αὐτῶν καὶ οἷον ἔργο, ὃ παρέχον χρωμένος τῇ περὶ τούτων ἐξήγησεν. τὰ γούν πάντα σχεδὸν ἐβδομήκοντα περὶ αὐτῶν καταβεβλητη βιβλία, καὶ πεπείγοντα ἐξήγησικώτερον ἢ ἱστορικῶτερον ἐν ἐκάστοις ἀναπρόφερεθα. πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐκλογήν ἐκποιεῖ τῶν προηγημένων αὐτῷ τὸ ἔξον καὶ παράδοξον ἐκ τούτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιδραμεῖν.

59 On Aelian’s De Natura Animalium in its literary and culture context, see Smith 2014.
This is in my opinion no fairy-tale, otherwise what was Alexander’s design in relating such marvels when he had nothing to gain from it? Anyhow, it would have ill become an intelligent man to sacrifice truth for falsehood, be the gain never so great, still less if he was going to fall into an opponent’s grasp, from which act nothing whatsoever was to be gained.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{Aelian, De Natura Animalium 3.23}

Alexander’s report of the metamorphosis of the cranes as an example of divine dispensation for filial piety appears to be the type of marvel that can be credibly reported by an intelligent and earnest (συνετός) compiler. It is clear from Aelian’s comments, however, that he does recognize a category of false or invented report (\textit{mythos}), to which Alexander’s anecdote does not conform.

Where Jacoby and Gabba had identified paradoxography as an offshoot of historiography, other scholars have noted that it borrows from the tradition of scientific writing, so that “[t]he key to the genre is the objective and rational presentation of an item that appears to break the laws of nature.”\textsuperscript{61} Unlike Westermann and Jacob, who were functionally generalizing from Antigonus’ compilations for their observations on the genre, Pajón Leyra focused her attention on the pseudo-epigraphic Aristotelian \textit{On Marvelous Things Heard} and the peripatetic tradition of noting the odd and unusual; she highlights the relationship between paradoxographic compilation and scientific writing.\textsuperscript{62} In contrast to scientific writing, however, paradoxographies do not seek to identify the underlying rational causes for the phenomena described; instead, as one scholar quipped, the purpose of paradoxographic writing was “to produce not an ‘Aha’ of understanding, but an ‘Oh’ of wonder.”\textsuperscript{63} For Pajón Leyra, the origins of paradoxography in scientific writing accounts for the objective tone of the texts, though the process of excerption is

\textsuperscript{60} Translation by Schoefield (1958).

\textsuperscript{61} Krevans 2004: 175.

\textsuperscript{62} Pajón Leyra 2010 \textit{passim}, esp.113-117 and 242-263.

focused only on transmitting the *paradoxon* rather than theorizing about the rational causes that may account for it.

The Introduction touched upon Gellius’ method of extraction and compilation in his *Attic Nights*, in which the content is structured by the order in which came across interesting bits in his reading (Gell. pref. 2-3), but paradoxographers present their wonder-anecdotes according to more systematic rubrics. Callimachus’ foundational text is organized according to geography, while other examples testify to thematic organization. Although inconclusive, there is some evidence to suggest that alphabetical organization was also employed, and finally some texts are organized according to the authors excerpted. Consistently, these various organizational strategies produce catalogues of *thaumata* divorced from their original contexts.

The picture of paradoxography that emerges in the scholarship suggests that the nexus of the Hellenistic passion for scholarly collection and compilation, a traditional Greek interest in the marvelous, and the inheritance of Peripatetic scientific curiosity form the cultural context for the development of paradoxography with Callimachus of Cyrene as its originator. Further, the credibility of the *thaumata* reported is emphasized throughout by critical references to authoritative sources and documentary evidence. Once identified, these wondrous anecdotes are then presented as systematized catalogues.

In the programmatic statement that introduces the section of his compilation devoted to the texts of Aristotle, Antigonus is explicit that his collection of *mirabilia* is based on

---

64 Pajón Leyra 2010: 30-32.
66 The geographical arrangement in Callimachus’ compilation is posited on the basis of the title of the work: θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἄπασαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὀντων αὐξαγωγήην. See Giannini 1964: 105-106 for issues related to the received title. Titles that reflect regional wonders are also relevant, e.g. Nymphodorus of Syracuse’s Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ θαυμαζομένων. Cf. Polemon’s Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ θαυμαζομένων ποταμών and Lisimachus’ τῶν Ὄμβριων παραδόξων. The relationship between paradoxography and periegetic writing which will be explored more fully in Chapter 3.
67 In addition to thematic criteria, Antigonus’ collection is organized according to the authors excerpted, and so anecdotes from Callimachus and Aristotle are grouped together. See Pajón Leyra 2010: 39-40 and Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 395-396 for alphabetic ordering in the case of Philo. *Suda s.v.* Παλαίφατος Ἀβυδηνός: “Φίλων ἐν τῷ ε στοιχείῳ τού περί παραδόξου λογίας βιβλίον α’.”
extraction and compilation (ἐκλογή) of the marvelous material (τὸ ξένον καὶ παράδοξον) in these scientific treatises (Mir.60). Although Gellius’ wonder-books are similarly full of wondrous material, it is clear that Aristeas’ Arimaspeia and Ctesias’ Persika and Indika are composed according to a different methodology than Antigonus’ Ἰστοριών παραδόξων συναγωγή; claims to authentic travel and other personal experiences are fundamental to the accounts of Aristeas, Ctesias, and Onesicritus in a way that is not characteristic of the compilations. The following section explores the role of personal experience, whether in the form of autopsy or inquiry, in wonder-texts in which travel is an important theme. The purpose of this line of inquiry is to clarify strategies for establishing the credibility of the account that are distinct from reliance on earlier textual authority.

**Travel Writing and the Discourse of Wonder**

This section is predominantly concerned with wonder-texts as travel writing. This investigation is complicated in the first instance by a lack of consensus in the scholarship over what exactly constitutes travel writing, and whether it is an appropriate generic category to apply to ancient texts. In *The Norton Book of Travel*, Fussell suggests that the travel-book was distinct from other forms that narrate mobility (guide-book, travel diary, etc.), in part because his definition of travel itself is circumscribed and distinct from merely moving from place to place; he says “to constitute real travel, movement from one place to another should manifest some impulse of non-utilitarian pleasure.” He further distinguishes between travel and tourism, suggesting that the former connotes both the will to learn and to teach through experiences, while the latter does not. For Fussell, travel writing connotes a particular species of self-conscious literary output based on the kind of travel that promotes intellectual growth and a sense of humility; it is

---

69 See also Lenfant 2004: XLVI-XLVIII: “Loin de se référer à des sources littéraires, l’historien prétendait s’inspirer de son expérience propre: ce qu’il avait vu, voire goûté ou senti, mais aussi ce qu’il tenait de témoins oculaires.” Cf. Photius Biblio. 72.47, 48, 51.

70 E.g. Youngs 2013: 1 notes: “Travel narratives, both oral and written, have been around for millennia. Yet their longevity has made it no easier for critics to agree on how to define or classify them. No discussion of travel writing seems complete without critics remarking on the difficulty of determining their object of study.” See 1-7 for discussion of definition of travel writing.


essentially a subspecies of autobiography.\textsuperscript{73} This type of non-utilitarian travel is virtually unknown in the ancient world, and so in accordance with his definition, Fussell suggests that there is no travel writing from antiquity.\textsuperscript{74}

But Fussell’s definitions of travel and the travel-book (travel writing) are deeply situated in the 19th century, and have limited application for ancient accounts. Youngs’ more recent overview of genre in travel writing shows how far Fussell’s naïve vision of enlightenment as the defining aspect of ‘travel’ has moved with the rise of postcolonial theory, which emphasizes the implicit connections between travel, empire, capitalism and racial ideologies.\textsuperscript{75} Distinctions between utilitarian and non-utilitarian travel no longer seem to be meaningful in discussions of travel writing. For instance, Youngs’ recent publication defines travel writing as “predominantly factual, first-person prose accounts of travels that have been undertaken by the author-narrator,” which includes other genres such as “ethnographies, maritime narratives, memoirs, road and aviation literature, travel journalism and war reporting.”\textsuperscript{76}

Whether one accepts the notion of an ancient genre of “travel writing,” or merely accepts that travel is an important theme in many ancient genres,\textsuperscript{77} the definitive study of ancient travel writing is impeded by the poor survival of texts; for instance, only fragments of Scylax of Caryanda’s exploration from Caspapyros down the Indus River have survived.\textsuperscript{78} The sorry state of the evidence means that the preface to Lucian’ \textit{True Stories}

\textsuperscript{73} Fussell 1980: 203. Fussell here uses the term ‘travel books’ which he contrasts with guide-books, on the grounds that the former are autobiographical and “sustained by narrative exploiting the devices of fiction” while the latter do not.
\textsuperscript{74} See Casson 1974: 76-85 and 130-137 for motives for ancient travellers in the Classical Greece and Roman times. Note that Casson uses travel and traveller freely for utilitarian travel as well as tourism. See also Pretzler 2009: 352-356.
\textsuperscript{75} Youngs 2013: 9-11. See Caplan 1996: x-xi, 1-26 and 50-56; Campbell 2002: 261-278; Clifford 1989: 177-184. Thomspsen 2016 suggests that travel theorist have now moved even beyond post-colonial readings of travel writing by investigating non-Western travel accounts and traditions.
\textsuperscript{76} Youngs 2013: 3.
\textsuperscript{77} Pretzler 2007a: 44-56; 2009: 356: “While travelling and travel experiences play a crucial role in many ancient texts, there is no clearly defined genre of Greek travel literature.” Burgess 2010 states that Fussell goes too far in suggesting that there is no ancient travel writing at all, and draws attention to such works as Xenophon’s \textit{Anabasis} and Hanno’s \textit{Periplus} as exempla. On ancient travel and travel writing more generally, see Casson 1974, Camassa and Fasce 1991, André and Baslez 1993, and Adams and Roy 2007, and Hutton 2016.
\textsuperscript{78} Collected in \textit{FGrH} 709.
provides one of the most instructive surviving glimpses of the tradition of ancient writing about marvels and travel.

In his preface, Lucian advises his reader that they will find many ancient authors pilloried in the text that follows for the lies they have told about monsters or other wonders (πολλὰ τεφράστια καὶ μιθώδη) as though they were true facts (VH 1.2). Although his criticism is directed at unspecific historians and philosophers, he singles out Ctesias and Iamboulos as exemplary authors for the kind of text he has in mind (1.3). He continues:

πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τὰ αὐτὰ τούτοις προελέμονει συνέγραψαν ὡς δὴ τίνας ἑαυτῶν πλάνας τε καὶ ἄποδημίας, θηρίων τε μεγέθη ἱστορούντες καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὠμότητας καὶ βίων καινότητας.

Many others, with the same intent, have written about travels and journeys of theirs, telling of huge beasts, cruel men and strange ways of living.\(^79\)

Lucian, *Verae Historiae* 1.3

Here, Lucian clearly refers to a wealth of authors (πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι) who wrote about the same things (τὰ αὐτὰ) as Ctesias and Iamboulos, which he glosses as foreign travels (ἕαυτῶν πλάνας τε καὶ ἄποδημίας). Both because Lucian treats these texts as a type coherent and cohesive enough to be parodied in his *True Stories*, and because Lucian makes clear that there are many such authors (πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι), we must posit a robust tradition of travel writing replete with exotic marvels that has not survived.\(^80\)

Lucian specifies that those who wrote about their foreign travels (τίνας ἑαυτῶν πλάνας τε καὶ ἄποδημίας), the unusual fauna and customs of the inhabitants (θηρίων τε μεγέθη ἱστορούντες καὶ ἀνθρώπων ὠμότητας καὶ βίων καινότητας) are a disingenuous bunch who present so much balderdash (τοιαύτη βιωμολογία) (VH 1.3). Lucian’s rejection of the authenticity and credibility of these wonder-laden travel narratives is emphatic; he suggests he should be commended for saying one true thing over the course of his narrative, namely that whole thing is a lie (κἂν ἐν γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο

\(^79\) Translation adapted from Harmon (1913).

\(^80\) See Müller 1855 [1965] *Geographi Graeci Minores*; see also Diller 1952; Gisinger 1937; González Ponce 2008:17-44 on *periploi* generally.
ἀληθεύσω λέγων ὅτι ψεύδομαι, VH 1.4). Although the True Stories presents a cheeky parody of a travelogue rather than an account of an actual journey, his text engages directly with the inherent ambiguity of autopsy as a technique for establishing credibility in both historiography and travel writing, and therefore provides an illuminating critical frame for approaching these texts.

It might seem odd to begin an analysis of wonders in ancient travel writing with Lucian’s True Stories, because Youngs’ definition of travel writing as “predominantly factual, first-person prose accounts of travels that have been undertaken by the author-narrator.” Lucian’s True Stories has been described as a science fiction novel and evidently does not meet Youngs’ criteria for travel writing. These narratives, however, are naturally prone to crossing generic boundaries, as Jonathan Raban states: “As a literary form, travel writing is a notorious raffish open house where very different genres are likely to wind up in the same bed.” Some have even suggested that generic hybridity is the salient characteristic of travel writing as a genre. Borm has said that travel writing “is not a genre, but a collective term for a variety of texts both predominantly fictional and non-fictional whose main theme is travel.” Despite Youngs’ insistence that travel writing is “predominantly factual,” Borm admits “texts both predominantly fictional and non-fictional” to the genre.

The contrasting positions of Youngs and Borm point to the tension between fiction and non-fiction in texts whose main theme is travel and the inherent difficulty of distinguishing between the two. Moroz, adapting Fleishman’s insight of the “paradox of autobiographical writing” to travel writing, suggests that “the author of an autobiography (or travel book) must believe that there is a fundamental difference between autobiography (travel-book) and fiction, even if he/she is using all the usual tools of

---

83 Raban 1987: 253-260. For a more recent discussion of genre and travel writing with bibliography, see Youngs 2013: 1-7. See also Thompson 2016: XVI-XX.
fiction.” Moroz’ observation highlights the fact that distinction between fiction and non-fiction in travel writing is not one of form or generic features, but rather a species of “referential pact” between the narrator (construed as one in the same with the author) and the reader, which relates directly to the credibility of the report. Hourmant encapsulates this pact as “Je vais vous raconter ce que j’ai vu.” But Korte has noted that the same techniques and motifs are deployed in accounts of both fictional and non-fictional travel, and so “there appears to be no essential distinction between the travel account proper and purely fictional forms of travel literature” in the formal aspects of the texts. In effect, determining the authenticity of a travel account depends on external assumptions that “can only be tested beyond the text itself.”

Lucian expresses no doubt that the texts he pillories are fictional, but only surprise that the authors would expect to be believed (ἐκεῖνο δὲ αὐτῶν ἑθαύμασα, εἰ ἐνόμιζον λήσειν οὐκ ἅληθῇ συγγράφοντες, 1.4). This implies that these narratives do employ literary techniques to enhance the credibility of their reports, and seek to establish a “referential pact” with the reader, though these may not necessarily succeed. For example, Photius transmits Ctesias’ concern with the credibility of his narrative in a closing coda from the Indika that succinctly captures the inherent difficulty of distinguishing fact from fiction when the reported phenomena are out of the ordinary.

Ctesias relates these fables as perfect truth, adding that he himself had seen with his own eyes some of the things he describes, and had been informed of the rest by eye-witnesses. He says that he has omitted many

---

87 Hourmant 2000: 64. Hourmant (14) applies Genette’s (1972: 261-5) notion of “fonction testimoniale” (a term borrowed from narratology), which refers to the suite of techniques through which the writer (traveller) cites his sources in order to establish and authenticate his discourse. He says: “En présentant leur récit comme narratio authentica, les voyageurs doivent légitimer l’ensembles des représentation, largement idéalisées, voire enchantées (ou uniformément critiques ou dépréciatrices), qu’ils élaborent.”
89 See Pajón Leyra 2010: 209-239 for discussion of Ctesias as source or antecedent to paradoxographical compilation.
far more marvelous things, for fear that those who had not seen them might think that his account was utterly untrustworthy.\textsuperscript{90}

Photius, \textit{Bibliotheca} 72.51

This passage presents Ctesias’ assurance that he has reported absolutely true facts (\textit{λέγει τ’ ἀληθεύστατα γράφειν}) that are vouched for on the basis of his own autopsy (\textit{τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἱδὼν γράφει}), or that he learned from others who had witnessed the phenomenon first-hand (\textit{τὰ δὲ παρ’ αὐτῶν μαθὼν τῶν ἱδόντων}).\textsuperscript{91} But despite Ctesias’ deployment of the “\textit{fonction testimoniale},” his comments on his methodology raise an important issue about credibility and wonder that is directly tied to autopsy: he admits that he has censored his text and not included even more marvelous phenomena (\textit{ἄλλα θαυμασιώτερα παραλιπέιν}) for fear that they would not be believed by those who had not seen them themselves (\textit{μὴ δόξαι τοῖς μὴ τεθεαμένοις ἁπαστα}). The idiom “seeing is believing” points to the strength of autopsy for the traveller, historian or natural philosopher who witnesses and records \textit{thaumata}, but persuading the reader, who is necessarily at one remove from the experience, is another matter altogether.

Despite Ctesias’ concern for the credibility of his account, which is on display in Photius’ summary of the \textit{Indika}, Lucian states that Ctesias wrote things about India that he neither saw himself nor learned from any reliable source (\textit{ἂ μὴτε αὐτὸς εἶδεν μὴτε ἄλλου ἀληθεύοντος ἥκουσεν}, \textit{VH} 1.3).\textsuperscript{92} His emphatic dismissal of the authenticity of Ctesias’ claims to autopsy and personal inquiry in the \textit{Indika} sets the stage for Lucian’s own fake narrative, in which he promises to relate “things he has not seen or experienced first hand, learned from others” and are not even physically possible (\textit{γράφω τοῖς περὶ ὑμῖν μὴτε ἐπαθον μὴτε παρ’ ἄλλων ἐπιθύμην, ἐτὶ δὲ μὴτε ὅλως ὄντων μὴτε τὴν ἁρχὴν γενέσθαι δυναμένων, 1.4}). Lucian here presents an inversion of referential pact of travel writing by promising to lie and therefore to spuriously deploy the tropes of “authentic” travel narratives. Lucian’s paradoxical premise is a corruption of the

\textsuperscript{90} Translation by Freese (1920).

\textsuperscript{91} Cf. Herodotus on the distinction between hearsay and interviewing an eye-witness (4.16); \textit{οὐδενὸς γὰρ δὴ αὐτόπτεω εἰδέναι φαμένοι δύναμαι πιθέσθαι (…) ἀλλὰ τὰ κατύρπηθε ἐλεγε αὐχὴ, φασὶ’ Ἰουσίδωνες εἶναι τοὺς ταύτα λέγοντας. ἄλλ’ ὅσον μὲν ἡμεῖς ἀτρεφεῖσι ἐπὶ μακρότατον οἴοι τε ἐγενόμεθα αὐχή ἐξίστησθαι, πὰν εἰρήστεα.}

\textsuperscript{92} Cf. Strabo’s dismissal the credibility of descriptions of India in general (15.1.2-6).
referential pact through *mimesis* and marks his text as fiction rather than non-fiction. Nevertheless it draws attention to the inherent difficulty of distinguishing between authentic and fictional report.\(^{93}\) Lucian’s paradoxical premise demonstrates that the truth-value of autopsy and (by extension personal inquiry) is inherently ambiguous.\(^{94}\)

Lucian’s doubt about the credibility of marvelous elements in travel narrative can be traced to the earliest incarnation of such tales in the Greek tradition. He names Odysseus as the originator and teacher of this type of unreliable travel narrative (*ἀρχηγὸς δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ διδάσκαλος τῆς τουαύτης βιωμολογίας, VH 1.3*), because of the fabulous tales he recounts to King Alcinoüs and the rest of the Phaeacian court in the *Odyssey*.\(^{95}\)

The fantastic elements of Odysseus’ travel narrative, namely power over the winds, one-eyed cannibalistic wild-men, many-headed beasts, and shape-shifting potions (*ἀνέμων τε δουλείαν καὶ μοноφθάλμους καὶ ὠμοφάγους καὶ ἀγρίους τινάξανθρωποὺς, ἐτὶ δὲ πολυκέφαλα ζώα καὶ τὰς ἀπὸ φαυμάκων τῶν ἑταίρων μεταβολὰς, 1.3*), which Lucian dubs “telling marvels” (*ἐτερατεύσατο*), are at the root of his skepticism.\(^{96}\) Lucian mocks the gullibility of the Phaeacians (*идιώτας ἀνθρώπους τοὺς Φαίακας*) for believing so much nonsense, and makes it clear that he reads Odysseus’ account of his travels (the *Apologos*—Books 9 through 12 of the *Odyssey*) as false; to him the fantastic elements are patently incredible because of their implausibility.

But already within the *Odyssey* itself, Homer plays with the unresolvable tension between credibility and wonder in travel accounts.\(^{97}\) A contrast is often painted between Odysseus’ biographical self-presentation to the Scherian court and what he says to Athena, Eumaios and Penelope on his arrival in Ithaca. In the poem, the plausibility of Odysseus’ three Cretan lies is emphasized; the poet states that “he knew how to say many lies that

---

\(^{93}\) On travel writing and fiction in antiquity, see Romm 1992: 172–214; Romm 1994; Pretzler 2007: 44-56. See also Youngs 2013: 5-6 for a contemporary perspective.

\(^{94}\) Particularly in relation to far-off places, *e.g.* Strabo 1.2.19; see Romm 1992: 96-98 for discussion.

\(^{95}\) See Burgess 2011: 271.

\(^{96}\) *LSJ* sv. *τερατεύομαι*: talk marvels.

\(^{97}\) See Pratt 1993: 55-114 for lying in Homeric poetry. See Parry 1994 for analysis of the wanderings that argues that they are true to the worldview of the poem. Olson 1995: 44 no.3 gives a selection of examples of authorial authentication for parts of Odysseus’ wanderings, which include fantastic elements: the wrath of Poseidon for the blinding of his son Polyphemus (1.68-9); the stay with Calypso and visit to Circe (1.51-57; 5.14-15, 30-277; 18.447-53). See also Burgess 2015: 54-56.
resembled the truth” (ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοιον ὁμοῖα, 19.203). Within the context of the poem, these spurious alternate biographies are told for reasons of expediency and the key to their plausibility is embellishment upon elements of truth. The reader knows the Cretan tales are lies not because they are inconsistent with the poet’s construction of the world of the *Odyssey*, but because the poem says that these tales are untrue. In the world of the *Odyssey*, plausibility is not a good measure of truth when it comes to the assessment of a travel narrative. Since Odysseus is often presented in the scholarly literature as the archetypal traveller, the man of many-ways who knows the cities of men, the ambiguity about the truth-value of the facts recounted in travel-narrative must be regarded as intrinsic to the genre.

Lucian’s parody of travel literature presents autopsy as a trope to be exploited to make a false narrative both more believable and more pleasurable. As previously mentioned, he inverts the methodology through which travel writers (and historians) establish credibility—namely personal experience or autopsy—when he mockingly states that he will write about things he has not seen, experienced or learned from inquiry (περὶ ὥν μήτε εἶδον μήτε ἔπαθον μήτε παρ᾽ ἄλλων ἐπιθόμην). Lucian’s subversive deployment of the autopsy trope highlights how easily it can be used to endorse fake facts, and so autopsy almost becomes the marker of fictional narrative rather than a strategy for establishing credibility.

---

101 *E.g.* Elsner and Rubies 1999: 8: “Since the literary creation of the *Odyssey*—whose portrait of a great journey home after the Trojan War was not only the very first major text in the European tradition (along with the *Iliad*) but also remains Antiquity’s most famous book of travels—the theme of the voyageur has been central to the Greco-Roman tradition.” See also Hulme and Youngs 2002: 2; Youngs 2013: 20. On Odysseus as traveller, see also Hartog 2001: 3-36.
102 See *e.g.* Dougherty 2001: 61-78.
103 On autopsy and authority in historiography, see Marincola 1997: 63-86.
104 *Cf.* Eratosthenes, who argued that Homer knew next to nothing of the locales of Odysseus’ travels (Eratosth. fr. 1B3 Berger = Strabo 1.2.14), and invented them wholesale, placing them far away so that they were easier to lie about (Eratosth. fr. 1A14 Berger = Strabo 1.2.19). See Kim 2010: 56-60 for reconstruction of Eratosthenes’ position. See also Roller 2010: 112-124.
In addition to his spurious use of the autopsy trope, his ironic presentation of two pseudo-documentary artifacts is exemplary of his manipulations of credibility strategies. His narrator, also named Lucian, encounters an inscribed stele commemorating the extent of the travels of Heracles and Dionysus and two footprints nearby on a far-flung mysterious island in the *True Stories*. Where Herodotus had presented the over-sized footprint of Heracles in Scythia as a concrete *sema* in the landscape to vouch for the hero’s travels (Hdt. 4.82), Lucian embellishes on the phenomenon by doubling the number of footprints, increasing the size of Heracles’ impression to a *plethron* (100 feet) and adding a bronze inscription that reads: “To this point came Hercules and Dionysus” (Ἀχριτούτων Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Διόνυσος ἀφίξοντο, *VH* 1.7). Lucian’s specific use of distances (προελθόντες δὲ δῶδ' σταδίους τρεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης) and measures (τὸ μὲν πλεθριαίον) show an attention to detail that enhances the credibility of the account, but he goes one step further to emphasize the authenticity of the inscription (ἡμῖν πολὺ μᾶλλον πιστεῦειν τῷ ἐπὶ τῆς στήλης ἐπιγράμματι) by making the river near by flow with Chian wine, presumably as a physical manifestation of Dionysus’ passage (τα σημεία τῆς Διονύσου ἐπιδημίας, ἐπήμε οὖν, ὃρῶν). Whereas Philon of Heracleia had transcribed the inscription of the votive horn at Delphi to corroborate his statement that the horns of Scythian asses hold water form the river Styx, Lucian’s deployment of documentary evidence offers spurious “proof” to corroborate his openly false narrative. As with autopsy more generally, his tongue-in-cheek *mimesis* of the use of documentary evidence highlights its intrinsic vulnerability to fraud, which in turns destabilizes the truth-value of the strategy in ‘authentic’ travel narratives.

Because Lucian frames his narrative as false with his opening paradox—the only true thing he will say is that he is lying—there is no real ambiguity about the authenticity of either Dionysus and Herakles’ footprints or the accompanying inscription. These

---

105 See Ní Mheallaigh 2008 on pseudo-documentarism in imperial literature, esp. 219-222.
107 See Moroz 2013: 33-34 for importance of paratexts (including preface) for establishing “genre contract,” and by extension the credibility of the narrator/author. Ní-Mheallaigh 2014: 208 observes: “Lucian’s repeated dramatization in his narrative of the competitive dynamic between fiction and reality, and his celebration through the fiction of the *True Stories* of how the illusion of authenticity can be achieved. *True Stories* represents the ultimate victory of the world of the book over the world of reality, where fiction creates an alternative reality that is both avowedly fake and better that the ‘real thing’—‘hyperreal.”
artifacts are straight artifice. But Lucian’s ironic use of pseudo-documentary evidence in his parody only works because this strategy is used in earnest in authentic travel writing. \(^{108}\) The susceptibility of autopsy and documentary tropes to manipulation highlights the reader’s inherent difficulty in distinguishing between authentic narratives and those that mimic them. \(^{109}\) This difficulty lies behind the fluctuations of a particular author’s credibility over time: for instance, Strabo treats Pytheas’ account of his travels to the far north, \(Περὶ \Ωκεανοῦ\), as patent fiction precisely because of the details which he claims to have seen first hand. \(^{110}\) But Pytheas’ reputation has received a boost in modern era due to the consistency of his reports with the climate and geography of the far north. \(^{111}\) The reception of this author demonstrates that ultimately it is external corroboration rather than any techniques intrinsic to the text that allows the reader to distinguish between authentic and fictional report. \(^{112}\)

There is a significant contrast between Lucian’s travel writers, who are associated with first-hand accounts designated by the term \(συνγραφὴ\) (\(συννέγραψαν...\ \ιστοροούντες\), \(VH\) 1.3), and Antigonus’ literary activity (\(ἐκλογή\) and the compilation (\(συνάγωγη\)) that it

---

\(^{108}\) \textit{E.g.} Polemo of Ilium, who is attested as a \textit{petiegete} and historian (\textit{Suda} \textit{sv. Πολέμου}) and whose fragments show frequent autopsy claims. The fragments are collected and published in \textit{Prelle} 1838. \textit{Athenaeus} (6.234D) reports that Herodicus gave Polemo the nickname \textit{στελοκόπας} (‘stele glutton’). See \textit{Tzifopoulos} 1991:1-24 for discussion of the term and its appropriateness for Pausanias on account of his interest in inscriptions. See also \textit{West} 1985: 278-305 for discussion of epigraphical sources in \textit{Herodotus’ Histories}. \(^{109}\) \textit{Cf.} \textit{Antonius Diogenes}, \textit{The Incredible Wonders Beyond Thule}, as summarized by \textit{Photius} (\textit{Biblio.} 166), which tells the story of Dinias and his son Demochares on a fantastical journey of exploration. He begins with the following characterization of the text: \( Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἀντωνίου Διογένους τῶν ὑπὸ Θούλην ἀπίστων λόγων λαίδ᾽. Δραματικὸν οἱ λόγοι, σαφῆς ἡ φράσις καὶ οὐτοῦ καθαρὰ ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἑλλῆνισμὸν εὐκρινείας δεισίδαι, καὶ τότε κατὰ τὰς ἐκτροπὰς τῶν διηγημάτων. Ταῦτα δὲ διανοίας πλείστων ἔχει τοῦ ἱδέως, ἀτε μέθυον ἔγγυς καὶ ἀπίστων ἐν πιθανωτάτῃ πλάσει καὶ διασκεδαιμονίᾳ ἔλημεν ἀκουστὴ διηγημάτων ποιομένη ("Read \textit{The incredible wonders beyond Thule} by \textit{Antonius Diogenes} in twenty-four books. The work is a novel; the style is clear and of such a purity that the clarity never leaves anything to be desired, even in the digressions. In the thought, it is most agreeable as, so close to the myths and incredible wonders, it gives to the material of the story a fashion and arrangement which is absolutely believable.") On the relationship between \textit{The Incredible Wonders Beyond Thule} and Lucian’s \textit{True Stories}, see \textit{Morgan} 1985: 475-490. \(^{110}\) \textit{Strabo} 1.4.3: \( ἰστοροφὸν τὴν Θούλην Πυθέας ἀνήρ \嘌ευδίστατος \]='	extit{e}ξήτησαν ("the man who tells about Thule, Pytheas, has been found, upon scrutiny, to be an arch-falsifier"). \textit{Cf.} 1.4.3-5; 2.3.5; 3.4.4. \textit{Strabo’s} deprecation of Pytheas’ credibility was not universally held; see \textit{Hawkes} 1977: 7-9 on his reception in ancient authors. \(^{111}\) \textit{E.g.} \textit{Cunliffe} 2001; \textit{Biancetti} 1998. \(^{112}\) \textit{Cf.} \textit{Herodotus} (4.42) on the impossibility of the report of the sun being on the right (N) when circumnavigating Africa.
produces.\textsuperscript{113} It is this distinction between \textit{synagoge} and \textit{syngraphe} that Jacob isolates as the key index between wonder-texts as paradoxography and wonder-texts as travel writing; \textit{synagoge} is a text produced through \textit{ekloge} while a \textit{syngraphe} is based on personal experience. Although narrative versus non-narrative structure could provide a useful heuristic, the use of autopsy as a technique for establishing credibility is at the heart of the accepted scholarly distinction between \textit{synagoge} and \textit{syngraphe}.\textsuperscript{114} But Lucian’s example in the \textit{True Stories} demonstrates that autopsy can be deployed dishonestly to endorse false or incredible claims. Where autopsy claims have been made to endorse the marvelous, scholars have assumed either literary artifice or outright mendacity.

Pretzler’s work on the \textit{Periegesis Hellados} has demonstrated that the tradition of periegetic literature is associated with travel writing.\textsuperscript{115} In spite of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century attacks on the credibility of Pausanias’ claims to have visited some, if any, of the places he describes in the \textit{Periegesis}, the current scholarly consensus suggests that features of the work that relate to its genesis in authentic travel are reliable, in particular the autopsy claims and the topographical descriptions.\textsuperscript{116} In spite of the speculations about Ctesias’ method of composition in the \textit{Indika}, the analysis of genres sketched in this chapter suggest that the methodologies of paradoxography (as a derivative genre of wonder compilation or \textit{synagoge}) and travel writing (as report of wonders based on personal experience and inquiry or \textit{syngraphe}) are fundamentally irreconcilable and mutually exclusive. In this strict dichotomy, an autopsy claim embedded in derivative compilation must be interpreted as spurious, the sort of fiction employed by Lucian in his \textit{True Stories}.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Chamoux 1996: 48 n.11 notes that meaning of \textit{syngraphe} in Pausanias is obviously ‘history book’ on the basis of several passages (1.6.1; 12.2; 34.1). He also notes that \textit{συγγράφες} denotes a historian in the language of Diodorus. \textit{Cf. LSJ sv. \textit{συγγράφες} II: “that which is written, writing, book, esp. in prose: history, narrative.” See also Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 23-25 for further discussion of \textit{syngraphe} and \textit{historia}.} \textsuperscript{114} See Westermann 1839: xi-xii; Jacob 1983: 123-4. See also Jacob 2013: 31-32 on the use of \textit{synagoge} as “collection” in Athenaeus, and 97-101 on the activity of the compiler. See also Gunderson 2009: 15-16 on the desire of the antiquarian archivist to collect the witty, unusual and surprising for the sake of cataloguing.
\item Pretzler 2007a; 2004.
\item See e.g. Habicht 1985: 167-9, esp. n.24 for bibliography of proponents of Pausanias’ authenticity. More recently, see Pretzler 2007a: 55-6; Hutton 2005a: 21-22. \textit{Cf.} Dueck 2012: 65: “The result is (...) the longest and most detailed narrative from classical antiquity of one individual’s experiences as a traveller.”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
AUTOPSY AND COMPILATION: RE-EXAMINING PARADOXOGRAPHY

It is this perception of the incompatibility of autopsy and compilation of wonder-anecdotes that forms the basis of the attacks on Pausanias’ credibility by critics like Kalkmann and that will be explored further in the next chapter.\(^{117}\) Despite the consistent description of paradoxography as necessarily derivative in much of the scholarly literature, Schepens invokes Gellius’ presentation of the *libri Graeci miraculorum fabulorum pleni* as an “indication that the expression of paradoxographical elements in literature generally (in historiography, geography, travel stories, epics, epigrams, etc.) and under the form of specialized marvel-treatises should not be divided too neatly.”\(^{118}\) Indeed, preserved testimony about lost paradoxographies and *periegeses* presents significant overlap between the genres. Evidence from testimony suggests that rather than a strict dichotomy between *synagoge* and *syngraphe*, wonder-texts span a continuum between both compositional methods.

From the outset of this chapter, the discussion of Antigonus of Carystos has focused on his paradoxography titled Ἱστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή. The testimonies of Festus, Plutarch and Stephanus of Byzantium, however, also attribute a periegetic *Italika* and a *Makedonike Periegesis* to a certain Antigonus, whom Giannini identified as one in the same author.\(^{119}\) Jacob also notes affinity between periegetic literature and collections of wonders based on the writings of Polemo of Ilium, Dionysius of Alexandria and even Pausanias.\(^{120}\)

Nevertheless, as we have seen above, Jacob maintains his distinction between paradoxography and periegesis on the basis of primary versus secondary witness, but Photius’ reading of the texts of Alexander of Myndos and Protagoras undermines this

\(^{117}\) Kalkmann 1886: 27 states: “In erster Reihe handelt es sich um Paradoxa und auffällige Dinge, wenn Pausanias versichert aus Autopsie zu reden: nach den in der Einleitung gemachten Andeutungen kann das nicht mehr Wunder nehmen.” In the same work, Kalkmann (34) notes: “Exkurse über paradoxe Erscheinungen bei Quellen und Flüssen kennzeichnet als solche gewöhnlich der kompilatorische Charakter.”

\(^{118}\) Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 415.

\(^{119}\) *Italika*: Festus; Plutarch. *Romul. 17. 11*; *Makedonike Periegesis*: Stephan. Byz. s.v. Ἀβάντις. See Giannini 1964: 112-116. The *TLG* presents the fragments of the *Italika* and *Makedonike Periegesis* under the heading “Antignon” separate from “Antignon Carystius,” though both entries are listed as contemporary (3rd c BC). *Contra*, see Dorandi 1999: XIV-XVI.

\(^{120}\) Jacob 1983: 139 n.15.
distinction. In the passage quoted above (*Biblio*. 188), Photius says that Alexander’s collection (θαυμασίων συναγωγή) contains many beastly and unbelievable things (τερατώδη καὶ ἄπιστα) particularly concerned with natural wonders (Ἀλέγει δὲ περὶ τε ζώων καὶ φυτῶν καὶ χωρῶν τινῶν καὶ ποταμῶν καὶ χρηνῶν καὶ βοσκυόν καὶ τῶν τοιούτων) that were compiled from earlier authors who are not without renown (πλὴν ἄλλους τῶν οὗν ἀφανῶν εἰσάγει ταῦτα προϊστορημένα). Alexander’s collection clearly maps onto the criteria that scholars have identified as characteristic of paradoxography in the narrow sense. But his is not the only text reported in this codex; Photius goes on to discuss a second text, Protagoras’ *Γεωμετρία τῆς οἰκουμένης*.

Ἐν ταύτῳ δὲ καὶ Πρωταγόρου γεωμετρίας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἔπηγαρθήν ἔχον, λόγοι γὰρ, ὅταν τὰ μὲν ε’, εἰ καὶ μὴ σπουδαῖοι καὶ ὡς οἱ ὤστερον ἄρωμιός, ἄλλ’ οὖν τὴν τῆς Ασίας καὶ Λιβύης, ἄλλα καὶ Εὐρώπης περιήγησιν ποιεῖται. Τὸ δὲ ἐκτὸν σύστοιχον πῶς ἐστὶ τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ συναγωγῇ τῶν γαρ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην παραδεξελογομένων ἀναγράφει τὴν ἱστορίαν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν εἰς ἀρχαιότερους ἀναφέρει, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ εἰς αὐτοψίαν ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ἔλαττον τῶν ἄλλων προβαλλόμενα τὸ παράδοξον. Σαφῆς δὲ καὶ οὔτος καὶ κεφαλαιώδης κατὰ τὸ ἐκτὸν τὴν φράσιν μάλιστα.

In the same volume, a work of Protagoras entitled *Universal Geography* in six books. The first five, without being as serious or exact as the geographers followed, form a description of Asia, Libya and Europe. The sixth book is in the same vein as the collection of Alexander, because it reports exotic stories which circulate everywhere; he attributes part of this to earlier authors and pretends to have seen himself much no less strange than the rest. This author equally has a clear and concise style, above all in his sixth book.

Photius testifies that Protagoras’ text comprised six books: the first five present a *periegesis* of Asia, Libya and Europe (ἄλλ’ οὖν τὴν τῆς Ασίας καὶ Λιβύης, ἄλλα καὶ Εὐρώπης περιήγησιν ποιεῖται), and appended in a sixth book is a collection very like Alexander’s *Collection of Marvels* (Τὸ δὲ ἐκτὸν σύστοιχον πῶς ἐστὶ τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ συναγωγῇ).

---

121 This refers to Alexander of Myndos, who lived in the first part of the 1st century A.D., and not as has been long believed, Alexander Polyhistor. He is cited by Ptolemy Chennos (Cod. 190) and Aelian, as in the in passage quoted above.
Although Photius expressly compares Protagoras’ sixth book with Alexander’s paradoxography, he also highlights a significant difference: where Alexander’s text is presented as derivative (εἰσάγει ταῦτα προϊστορήσαντας), Protagoras drew both from earlier accounts and from what he himself saw (ὡν τα μὲν εἰς ἀρχαιοτέρους ἀναφέρει, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ εἰς αὐτοψίαν ἔλαβε). Moreover, Photius records that Protagoras’ autopsy was particularly concerned with wonders (οὐκ ἔλαβεν τῶν ἄλλων προβαλλόμενα τὸ παράδοξον). Photius’ testimony of this codex, which transmits the texts of Alexander and Protagoras together, suggests that periegetic literature, paradoxographic compilation and travel accounts are far more enmeshed than the communis opinio generally allows.¹²² The coincidence of both autopsy and the paradoxographic compilation attested in Protagoras’ lost work provides a useful parallel for my approach to autopsy and compilation of wonders the Periegesis Hellados, which I will explore in the next chapter.¹²³

¹²² In his summary of codex 189, Photius describes works by Sotion, Nicholaus and Acestorides. He explicitly likens Sotion’s work on marvels to the sixth book of Protagoras and the collection of Alexander, and though he notes that the range of marvels in Sotion’s work is limited to springs and rivers in contrast to the more diverse contents of Alexander and Nicholaus. He treats them a part of the same genre with no comment about methodology.

¹²³ Alexander, Protagoras and Sotion are among the ‘paradoxographic’ authors listed by Tzetzes Chil. 7.144.634-41: Ὅτι δ’ εἰσὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἄλλοι φαινοί μυρίοι τοιαῦτα καὶ ἱκανότερα θεάσασθαι ἐν βίῳ, Κτησίας καὶ Ἡσίου, Ἡσίου, Ρηγίνου, Αλέξανδρου, Σωτήρων τε καὶ ὁ Ἁγαθοσθένης, Ἀντίγινου καὶ Ἐΰδοξος, Ἐποπτῆρας, μυρίοι, ὁ Πρωταγόρας τε αὐτός, ἂμα καὶ Πολεμαίος, Ἀκεσορίδης τε αὐτός καὶ ἄλλοι πεζογράφοι, αὕς τε αὐτός ἀνέγνωκα καὶ οὕς οὐκ ἀνεγνώκειν. Although Tzetzes comments that some of the authors are more obscure than others, he treats them all as a single set, rather than distinguish between authentic and derivative exempla.
Chapter 3: Paradoxography and Periegesis

While moving between poleis and sanctuaries on the mainland, Pausanias made meticulous lists of what he saw, including the details of local artifacts, traditions and cults. Before or after these visits, he studied earlier works in search of information on the sites, particularly their history and mythic traditions. He then incorporated that information into his lists. The result is not a simple, naïve traveller’s record, but a work with significant literary aspirations, influenced by and responding to, specific intellectual Hellenic traditions.

Daniella Dueck, *Geography in Classical Antiquity*, 63

Dueck’s description of Pausanias’ method quoted here is speculation, if plausible, as the *Periegesis* transmits very little overtly to inform us about the author’s research methodology or his literary program. Dueck’s reasonable inferences about the nexus of research and travel behind the production of the *Periegesis Hellados* are exemplary of the profound change in Pausanias’ reputation that has resulted from the corroboration of his topographical descriptions through archaeological discoveries in the last century. But Dueck’s insistence on list-making in Pausanias’ process is unusual in contemporary scholarship, presumably because of the association of lists with derivative compilation at the expense of authentic travel and autopsy. The previous chapter argued that the generic distinctions between paradoxography and travel writing on the basis method of composition are unstable; testimony of ancient texts suggests a continuum of wonder-books that employ complementary authorizing strategies rather than a strict categorical binary between derivative compilation and authentic travel writing.

This chapter builds on the previous chapter’s conclusions to probe perceived generic distinctions between periegetic writing and paradoxography. The first distinction is made on the basis of spatial organization (geographical or topographical) in contrast to thematic continuity between elements (more specifically anecdotes) in list form. In this chapter, I argue that both organizational principles are appropriate to periegetic writing and purposefully deployed in the *Periegesis Hellados*. The second distinction is made on the basis of different classes of mirabilia; Westermann, for instance, associates myth-historical wonders with *periegeses* and natural wonders with paradoxography. The
analysis in this chapter suggests that this distinction is anachronistic because it is rooted in the cultural context of mediaeval Christian readers and copyists who transmitted the texts. The main objective of this chapter is to demonstrate that the simulated travel experience in spatially structured texts and virtual experience of wonders in textual collections (catalogues) both reinforce the association of wonders with particular places and create a sense of geographic specificity. Comparison of some inset wonder catalogues in the *Periegesis Hellados* with other virtual collections of wonders will elucidate Pausanias’ method of composition, organizing principles and authorizing strategies.

“**LEADING AROUND**: PULLING THE TOPOGRAPHICAL THREAD

The emphasis on Pausanias’ eyewitness account of the topography of Roman Greece and religious rituals, among other tantalizing bits of information gleaned from interviews with locals, for which he is virtually our sole surviving witness, lie behind the characterization of Pausanias’ *Periegesis* as travel writing.¹ Akujärvi has argued that the topographical thread that structures the *Periegesis Hellados* presents a first-person narrative of pedestrian travel through Roman Greece.² Akujärvi’ narratological study of the *Periegesis* accords well with Youngs’ basic definition of travel writing as “predominantly factual, first-person prose accounts of travels that have been undertaken by the author-narrator.”³ But Pausanias’ *Periegesis* is not a travelogue in the strictest sense—an account of a journey through Roman Greece; instead it is the composite sum of many journeys.⁴ Elsner has argued that *Periegesis* reflects a synthesis of several itineraries explored over the course of years and compiled into a seamlessly constructed literary route.⁵

---

² Akujärvi 2005.
³ Youngs 2013: 3.
⁴ Pretzler 2007a: 32 states: “The *Periegesis* is not a travelogue, but the text is in many ways influenced by the realities of travel at the time.”
⁵ See Elsner 2001 for an analysis of the routes of the *Periegesis* as a literary construct. See also Pretzler 2004 for a study of Pausanias’ method and the relationship between travel and the preserved text of the *Periegesis*. 
Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados* and Dionysius Periegetes’ *Periodos Ges* are the only two substantially preserved examples of the literary genre known as *periegesis*. They differ widely in terms of form, style, content, and scope, and so it is difficult to determine the generic features of periegetic literature on the basis of either of these texts. Pasquali traced the development of periegetic writing back to Herodotus’ *Histories* and the *Periodos Ges* of Hecataeus of Miletus, both of which prominently feature personal inquiry and autopsy. But Dionysius’ *Description of the Known World* stands in stark contrast to Herodotus’ *Histories*, the *Periodos Ges* of Hecataeus of Miletus, and Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados* in regard to autopsy.

The *Description of the Known World* presents a description of notable topographical features of the *oikoumene*. In her analysis of Dionysius’ methodology, Lightfoot observes the privileging of book learning over autopsy. This is particularly evident in his invocation of the Muses for his description of the Caspian Sea and environs:

τοῖς ἐπὶ Κασπίη κυμαίνεται ἀμφίτριτη.  
ἡ δὲ τοῖς τήνδε καταγράφασιμι θάλασσαν,  
οὐ μὲν ἵδιον ἀπάννευθε πόροις, οὐ νη ἰπόρησις: (...)  
ἀλλὰ μὲ Μουσάων φορέει νόος, αἱτε δύνανται  
νόσφιν ἀλημοσύνης πολλήν ἀλα μετρήσασθαι  
oὐφεά τ’ ἦπειρόν τε καὶ αἰθηρών ὡδὸν ἀστρον.

Alongside them, the Caspian breaks its waves,  
A sea whose outlines I’ll describe with ease,  
Though never have I seen or sailed its routes (...)  
The Muses’ mind bears me aloft, who can  
Without ranging afar traverse vast seas,

---

6 Bischoff 1937: 728-742 lists more than sixty authors who are either referred to as “periegetes” in ancient sources, have *periegesis* in the title of their works, or whose works have similar themes. Only Diodorus Periegetes, Heliodorus of Athens, and Polemo of Ilium are authors with substantial enough fragments to contribute to a discussion on genre. Lightfoot 2003: 89 suggests in an analysis of Lucian’s *De Dea Syria*, that this text, which presents the foundation myths and an eyewitness account of the temple at Hierapolis and its institutions, can be considered an example of a *periegesis*.

7 Hutton 2005a: 249-250 on Dionysius Periegetes in particular, and 248-263 on problems related to defining a periegetic genre. Preller 1938: 155-156 posited two streams in periegetic texts, geographical and antiquarian. He attributed Dionysius Periegetes unequivocally to the geographical stream, and Polemo, Diodorus, Heliodorus and Pausanias to the antiquarian one. The contrast between the two appears to be the extent to which mythical and historical material is incorporated into the description of monuments, etc.


9 Lightfoot 2014: 419-420.
Mountains and plains, and paths of heavenly stars.

Dionysius, *Periegesis* 706-717

Dionysius’ *Description of the Known World* relies on exclusively textual sources, which he renders poetically as Μουσάων νόος. Dionysius presents a *recusatio* of travel related to commerce (οὐ γὰρ μοι βίος ἐστὶ μελανάων ἐπὶ νησῶν, οὐδὲ μοι ἐμπορία πατρώϊος—My livelihood is not drawn from black ships./ Nor commerce in my blood, 709-10) and adventuring in the pursuit of wealth (ὥστε ἄνθρωπον ὄλβον, 712). Dionysius provides an explicit rejection of autopsy and travel to produce his description of the significant topographical features of oikoumene, which, in the case of the Caspian Sea, he identifies as marvels (ἡ δὲ πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα ... θαύματ᾽ άέξει— Among the many marvels it engenders, 723).

Both Pausanias’ *Periegesis* Hellados and Dionysius Periegetes’ *Description of the Known World* are organized on a geographic principle, which has long been thought to be the hallmark of periegetic composition. Both are therefore consistent with the generic conception of *periegesis* as a sort of descriptive “leading around.” But Lightfoot has also explored catalogues and lists in Dionysius’ poem in order to emphasize the influence of Archaic poetry on his composition and the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* in particular (*Il. 2.484-785*). Lightfoot contends that the invocation of the Muses quoted in the passage above signals Dionysius’ engagement with Archaic epic through the intermediary of Hellenistic poetry. She flags the *Catalogue of Ships* as an important influence on “periegetical writing in general, and Dionysius in particular, by illustrating a way of writing about geography that was inclusive.” The *Catalogue of Ships* presents the marshaled forces of the Greeks in geographical order, or as Lightfoot puts it, “an

---

10 Translation by Lightfoot (2014).
11 Pasquali 1913. Lightfoot 2014: 6-7 suggests origins of periegetic genre in didactic geography beginning with the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, with ps.-Scymnus’ iambics also named as influences on Dionysius.
12 Bischoff 1938: 728 highlights the “leading around” as an indispensable feature of ‘antiquarian periegesis’.
13 Lightfoot 2008: 11-31. See also Lightfoot 2014: 89-100.
14 Cf. Hunter 2003: 343-356. Hunter notes particularly the invocation of the Muses, the statement of the impossibility of enumerating everything, *epanaphora* and *epanalepsis*. As Hunter (353) notes, these features of catalogue style occur in other geographical or genealogical informational passages, e.g. *Il. 12. 95-97* and *Od.1.22-24*. He (354) categorizes the Catalogue of Ships as “the authorizing Homeric model for later periegeses.”
approximately followable route round (most of) Greece.”16 But she also notes that the catalogue accommodates expansion to include related facts and details.17

In addition to its geographic organization, the Catalogue of Ships is also defined by the thematic unity of its constituent elements; it is a list of troop contingents.18 The Homeric Catalogue of Ships demonstrates that catalog style and geographical writing can be deployed simultaneously. Based on the influence of the Homeric example, Lightfoot suggests “[o]ne way of describing the genre of the Periegesis [of the Known World], then, is as an outwardly expanded catalogue, packed both with ‘facts’ and with diversions, informative and entertaining in equal measure.”19

The fragmentary remains of the voluminous output of the Hellenistic periegete Polemo of Ilium also feature prominently in discussions of periegesis as genre.20 Much has been made of the correspondence between Polemo’s writing and Pausanias’s text, particularly in the source criticism of the latter in 19th century.21 Polemo’s lost texts are often interpreted as a generic antecedent for Pausanias’ Periegesis on the basis of chronological precedence and the strength of topical correspondences between the fragments and the Periegesis. But Hutton has argued that similarities between the texts have been exaggerated. He cites a methodical flaw in Preller’s publication of Polemo’s fragments—the order of the fragments in Preller’s edition is modeled on Pausanias’ Periegesis. This undermines the notion that Polemo’s text, like the periegeses of Dionysius and Pausanias, was spatially organized, and Hutton suggests that it is unclear whether geographical

17 Lightfoot 2008: 13, e.g. ethnography (Il.2.542-544), mineralogy (2.857), marvelous rivers (2.752-755) and foundation-myth (2.730).
18 See Dickinson 2011 for overview of the Catalogue of Ships. Dickinson summarizes the elements of the catalogue as follows: “Twenty-nine separate contingents are listed, and the accounts of them have many similarities. They always contain the name of the leader or joint leaders and of the regions, islands, or settlements, in eleven cases also the peoples, from which the contingent is drawn, and give the number of ships that it filled; natural features like mountains and Rivers may also be named in defining settled territories. Over 190 names of peoples, places, and features are cited in this way, as well as others referred to in passing; the majority (nearly 150) are clearly names of settlements.”
19 Lightfoot 2014: 100.
20 See Preller 1838: 155-199 for an account of the development of the genre. See also Bischoff 1937: 725-742.
21 See Frazer 1898: I. LXXXIII-XC for rebuttal of these conclusions.
structure attributed to Polemo’s text is apparent at all when the fragments are examined independent of Pausanias’ text.\textsuperscript{22}

One implication of Hutton’s analysis is that Polemo’s texts may have presented catalogs related to a particular site, city or sanctuary rather than spatially structured descriptions.\textsuperscript{23} This brings to mind the genre of text that Lightfoot characterizes as “Hellenistic ethnography” through affiliation with “specialist monographs ‘about’ a certain place or thing, περί-literature as developed by the Peripatetics” and the tradition of writing local histories that arises in the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{24} The Athidographies, as works devoted to Athens and Attica, are the earliest and most well known examples of such local histories.\textsuperscript{25} Like local histories, the fragments Polemo’s writing are topically varied. They include dedications at shrines,\textsuperscript{26} accounts of great men,\textsuperscript{27} myth and myth-history,\textsuperscript{28} accounts of great artists\textsuperscript{29} and various religious customs.\textsuperscript{30}

Attention to epigraphic evidence and frequent references to autopsy are striking features of Polemo’s fragments; in Athenaeus (6.234d), Herodicus calls Polemo ὀστηλοκόπας, “tablet-glutton,” which Arvantinepolous emended to ὀστηλοσκόπας, “examiner of stelai.”\textsuperscript{31} Polemo’s attention to epigraphic evidence is paralleled in the Periegesis Hellados; the 223 passages in Periegesis in which Pausanias claims to be reading an inscription underscore his interest in epigraphic sources.\textsuperscript{32} These passages feature both some form of γραφ- or cognate on their own or in combination with terms that specify


\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Pasquali 1913: 180-1 on catalogues in Polemo’s fragments.

\textsuperscript{24} Lightfoot 2003: 88. See Gabba 1981: 60-1 for discussion of local histories. The fragments are collected in Tresp 1914.

\textsuperscript{25} On athidography, see Jacoby 1949; Harding 2008; and Bearzot and Landucci 2010. Jacoby 1949: 1 presents groups of local historians as οἱ Ναξίων συγγραφεῖς, οἱ συντεταχότες τὰ Τρωικά, οἱ τὰ Εὐβοϊκά συγγράφαντες, οἱ Μιλησιακά, οἱ τὰ Θηβαϊκά, etc.

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. fr.1, 27 numbered as in Preller 1838.

\textsuperscript{27} Cf. fr. 3a, 4, 8, 9, 25.

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. fr. 10-3, 24, 31, 32.

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. fr. 2, 17, 41, 66.

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. fr. 3a, 6, 8, 12, 39, 40, 49, 61, 72, 74, 83, 90.


\textsuperscript{32} See Tzifopoulos 1991: 3, 415-416 (“Appendix A”) for list of passages.
either the metrical form of the inscription (τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, τὸ ἐλεγεῖον, τὸ ἰαμβεῖον) or the form of the object inscribed (ἡ στήλη or τὸ πολυάνδριον).\textsuperscript{33}

Tzifopoulos contends that Pausanias’ interest in epigraphic evidence is consistent with the periegetic tradition.\textsuperscript{34} He draws a parallel with the example of the periegetes, ‘guides’, in Plutarch’s \textit{De Pythia Oraculis} in which there is a close association between the act of reading inscriptions and the speeches the guides deliver onsite.\textsuperscript{35} He further contends that inscriptions constitute a privileged source in the composition of the \textit{Periegesis}, and hold more authority for Pausanias than hearsay because they are written documents.\textsuperscript{36} He says, “For him inscriptions appear to have constituted for the most part objective and therefore trustworthy information which preserve and enliven the history and customs of the past.”\textsuperscript{37} Pausanias’ treatment of the Mysteries of Andania (4.1.5-9) and the statue of Philopoimen in the agora of Tegea (8.49.1-52.6) are exemplary of his methodology for dealing with epigraphic evidence; he presents verbatim quotations from the inscriptions as evidence for his analysis in paraphrase.\textsuperscript{38} Pausanias’ use of inscriptions corresponds to the use of documentary evidence as emblematic of \textit{autopsia} that Lucian parodies in the \textit{True Stories}.

If the correspondence between geographical organization and \textit{periegesis} has been overstated, it has conversely been understated for paradoxography. The \textit{Suda}’s testimony of Callimachus’ wonder-compilation transmits the title, a \textit{Collection of Wonders of the Whole World According to Place} (θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἁπάσαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὄντων συναγωγή). The attested title clearly shows that paradoxographies can be

\textsuperscript{33} Tzifopoulos 1991: 5. Pausanias also distinguishes letter forms on the basis of regional characteristics and diachronic changes. See e.g. 1.2.4: γράμμασιν Ἀττικοῖς; 2.27.4: γέγραπται δὲ φωνῇ τῇ Δωρίδι; 5.22.3: ἐλεγεῖον γράμμασιν ἐστιν ἀρχαῖος.
\textsuperscript{34} Tzifopoulos 1991: 11.
\textsuperscript{35} Plut. \textit{De Pyth. or.} 395a: Ἐπεράγαν οἱ περιηγηταὶ τὰ συντεταγμένα μηδὲν ἤμων φροντίσαντες δειθέντων ἐπιτεμεῖν τὰς ἱήσεις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων. Pausanias does not in fact use “periegetes” in his text, rather he prefers older term “exegetes”.
\textsuperscript{36} See also Habicht 1984: 40-56, and Zizza 2006.
\textsuperscript{37} Tzifopoulos 1991: 15.
\textsuperscript{38} Tzifopoulos 1991: 17 and 18 for discussion of skepticism of re-inscribed dedications, e.g. 2.17.3: statue of Orestes labeled as Emperor Augustus.
organized acccording to geographical or topographical principle (κατὰ τόπους).[39] This problematizes the notion that geographical structure is a distinguishing characteristic between periegesis and paradoxography. Further, Gabba notes “[t]he materials of which paradoxographies were composed derive for the most part from local histories. The principal aim of these was to note and record the peculiarities and characteristic features of particular places and individuals.”[40] This leaves little to distinguish between Polemo’s texts as periegeses and paradoxographies other than the distinction between primary and secondary witness explored in the previous chapter.[41]

The previous chapter examined Protagoras’ γεωμετρία τῆς οἰκουμένης as an example of a hybrid wonder-text based on textual research, travel and personal inquiry (Photius Biblioi.188). Photius describes the first five books of Protagoras’ work as a periegesis of Asia, Libya and Europe and the appended sixth book as a synagoge of wonders. Perhaps Photius’ distinction between the two unequal parts of this work reflects a difference in organizing principle. It suggests the association of periegesis with spatial organization and the synagoge of marvels with thematic cataloguing. But the pairing of these two distinct parts of the text into a synthetic whole, the γεωμετρία τῆς οἰκουμένης, suggests that both modes can coexist in the same text and even complement each other.

The correspondences and differences between Pausanias’ Periegesis Hellados, Dionysius’ Description of the Known World, and the fragments of Polemo’s periegetic writing suggest that catalogue style, whether through geographical organization, thematic structure, or a combination of both, are all admissible features of the genre known as periegesis. Further, authorizing strategies through either primary or secondary witness are

---

[39] The geographical criterion is important for Callimachus’ Περὶ τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ καὶ Ἰταλίᾳ θαυμασίων καὶ παράδοξων (“On the Wonders in the Peleponnese and Italy”), but it is not possible to infer that the work was spatially structured on the basis of the titles alone.

[40] Gabba 1981: 60. Cf. Polemo’s description of the statue of Kottina and a bronze bull dedicated in Lacedaemon associates the dedications with divine epiphany (F18): ἕν δὲ Λακεδαιμόνι, ὡς φησὶ Πολέμων ὁ περιηγητὴς ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαιμονί παράδοξων, εἰκὼν ἐστὶ τῆς διαβοήτου ἐται φας Κοττίνας, ἔν φησι καὶ βοῦν ἀναθεῖναι χαλκῆν, γράφον ὅτε ταῖς ἐταῖρας εἰκόνιον, ἢ διὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ὑπεράνω τὸ λέγεται καὶ νῦν, ἐγγυτάτω τῆς Κολώνης, ἱνα τὸ Διονύσιον ἐστιν, ἐπιφάνεις καὶ πολλοῖς ἐγγυισμένον τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει. Ἀνθίημα δ’ αὐτῆς ἐστιν ύπέρ τοῦ χαλκοῦ, βοίδων τοῦ χαλκοῦ, καὶ τὸ προερημένον εἰκόνιον.”

[41] Some of the attested titles of Polemo’s works are Περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνης ἄροστολες (1), Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς Πρωτοπλασίων πάντων (6), Περὶ τῆς ἐν Σικυώνι σικυλής στοάς (14-15), Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαιμονί ἀναθημάτων (18), Περὶ τῶν Θηβάν Ἡσαλείων (26).
equally permitted. The deployment of these features and methodologies in each text is therefore a function of choice rather than a reflection of generic constraints. The remainder of this chapter is concerned with exploring the logic of these choices in the Periegesis Hellados in order to better understand how the deployment of topographical or thematic structure, autopsy or literary citation, elucidates the concerns of the text as a whole.

UNDERMINING THE AUTOPSY/COMPILATION BINARY

The dominant organizing principle of the Periegesis Hellados is topographical—a narrative of pedestrian travel—but this is not the only structuring principle employed in the text.\textsuperscript{42} Famously, the altars at Olympia are presented according to the order in which the Eleans sacrificed rather than the spatial relationship between them (5.14.4).\textsuperscript{43} The same thematic organization that structures the description of altars at Olympia is repeated for the statues in the Altis; the statues of Olympic victors are presented as a group separate from both the votive dedications and the statues of Zeus.\textsuperscript{44} Because of the association of thematic ordering and derivative compilation, Kalkmann suggested that Pausanias’ treatment of Olympia is based on textual sources rather than personal experience, though we have already seen that catalog style need not imply derivative compilation.\textsuperscript{45} Although the thematic arrangement of the descriptions of the altars, dedications and statues of Olympic victors stands in contrast to the topographical order of the frame narrative of the Periegesis, it is wrong to associate the latter with autopsy and the former with compilation. These inset catalogs comprise material that Pausanias claims to have seen first hand as well as information collected from guides.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{42} See Elsner 2001: 10-16 for discussion of the presentation of the altars, statues of Zeus, votive offerings and statues of victors each in turn.
\textsuperscript{43} 5.14.1: φέρε δή, ἐποιημένῳ γὰρ βωμῷ τοῦ μεγίστου μνήμην, ἐπέλθωμεν καὶ τὰ ἐς ἄπαντας ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἑπακολουθήσατε δὲ ὅ λόγος μοι τῇ ἐς αὐτοὺς τάξει, καθ’ ἱεράν Ἡλείαν ἔγινεν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν νομίζουσι. Cf. 5.14.10.
\textsuperscript{45} Kalkmann 1886: 72-109.
Although the thematic catalogs from the Altis at Olympia are replete with references to Pausanias’ personal experience, this is not the case for all the thematic catalogs in the *Periegesis*; some catalogs appear to reflect the paired activities of ekloge and synagoge of anecdotes that have been traditionally associated with encyclopedic compilation (including paradoxography).\(^47\) The non-narrative portions of the *Periegesis Hellados* that are clearly derived from earlier literary sources have received little scholarly attention since the rise of interest in the text as travel writing.\(^48\) The relative silence about these catalogs is perhaps a reaction to the excessive *Quellenkritik* of the 19\(^{th}\) century scholarship on the *Periegesis*, which characterized Pausanias as a plagiarist and actively sought to attribute every bit of the text to earlier sources.\(^49\)

Habicht singles out Kalkmann as one of the most vehement critics of Pausanias’ reliability.\(^50\) Kalkmann’s criticism of the authenticity of personal experience in the *Periegesis* is rooted in the assumption that material derived from earlier authorities (compilation mode) is incompatible with authentic autopsy claims (historiographical mode). This is particularly true of paradoxographical compilation. Kalkmann draws attention to particular marvels in the *Periegesis* that are authenticated by strong autopsy claims, but also appear in other written sources; for Kalkmann these passages conclusively demonstrate that these particular autopsy claims are spurious because Pausanias is merely manipulating the autopsy trope.\(^51\) Kalkmann extrapolates from these examples to suggest that *all* the autopsy claims in the *Periegesis* are equally unreliable and should be viewed as mere literary artifice. He concluded that the whole narrative of pedestrian travel was no more than a literary construct, a fiction invented to structure the descriptions and digressions.

\(^47\) *E.g.* 5.7.6-10: on the origins of the Olympic games and Hyperborean; 5.14.3: on the associations between rivers and particular plants and trees; 9.40.3-4 on the works of Daedalus; 9.28.1-4 on poisonous plants and animals.

\(^48\) Certain scholars who have been interested in Pausanias’ historical method and sources are exceptions to this trend, *e.g.* Chamoux 1974; 1996; Ameling 1996. See also Gaertner 2006: 471-487.


\(^50\) Habicht 1985: 167.

\(^51\) Kalkmann 1886: 24-45, esp. 27-29 and 37-39 for particular passages discussed below.
The previous chapter argued that although scholarly categories construe derivative compilation and authentic travel narrative as mutually exclusive, the evidence suggests a categorical continuum rather than a strict binary. Pausanias’ *Periegesis* employs both autopsy and literary sources strategically to validate his account. While it is now accepted that the *Periegesis* is not wholly derivative as critics like Wilamowitz and Kalkmann suggested, it is also clear that portions of the work are in fact compiled from earlier sources. Pausanias’ catalog of true oracles in his Phocian *logos* is a representative example; it lists the individuals from the first Cumaean sibyl Hierophile down to his own day who have had oracular abilities (10.12.1-11). The catalogs in the *Periegesis* deserve further scrutiny because they offer insights into the themes and concerns of the text.

**A NOTE ON THE READER, RESEARCHER, AND WRITER PERSONAE**

Before proceeding to the analysis of catalogs in the *Periegesis*, it must be noted that Pausanias’ engagement with literary antecedents is complex, and the process of excerption and citation associated with compilation is only one aspect. Cherry observes that Pausanias travels through an “already written landscape,” and that his travel experience is necessarily informed by and sometimes clearly motivated by what he has read. This is what Cherry referred to as “Pausanias’ giant”. In a kindred assessment, Pretzler notes that the volume of literature related to Greece in antiquity was immense and readily available in the great libraries of the empire.

Readers of a work about Greece would therefore come to the region with detailed previous knowledge and perhaps also strong preconceptions. They would expect certain places and facts to be mentioned precisely because they had heard of them already. Famous place-names would evoke special associations with myths and historical events, and whole lists of rather obscure place-names would be known to the many educated people who had memorised the Homeric epics. Many events from Greek history needed to be taken into account, too, and last but not least, Greece also contained some of the best known buildings and artworks, such as the Parthenon or Phidias’ Zeus of Olympia. Any author dealing with Greece

---

52 See Park and McGing 1988: 23-50 for ancient scholarly sources on the Sibyls, esp. 36-45 on Pausanias’ sources for this catalogue.
53 Cherry 2001: 250-251, the passage is quoted above in the Introduction.
54 Pretzler 2006: 144-146 (quotation p.144): “Mainland Greece posed a challenge to any author because of its long and widely known literary tradition and the large amounts of secondary literature that needed to be taken into account.”
had to bear in mind the previous knowledge and high expectations of his readers.\textsuperscript{55} Pretzler’s “previous knowledge and high expectations” jibe well with Cherry’s analysis of belatedness and nostalgia in the \textit{Periegesis Hellados}. This is most apparent in the frequent allusions and references to both poets and historians (Homer and Herodotus above all) in text, and his interest in the sites that feature prominently in their texts.

Arafat counts at least 80 named authors in the \textit{Periegesis Hellados}; it is a figure that testifies to the wealth and breadth of Pausanias’ reading.\textsuperscript{56} He also notes that there are many additional references to unnamed authors and works in the text. Pretzler lists among the texts about Greece: local histories, extensive commentaries on the classical texts, scientific works (such as biological and geographical studies), various \textit{periploi}, and detailed guidebooks to the famous sites.\textsuperscript{57} It is not my intention here to embark upon large-scale source-criticism for the \textit{Periegesis Hellados}, but I do want to look at traces of Pausanias’ use of sub-literary compilations, and wonder-texts in particular. Chamoux has argued the \textit{Periegesis Hellados} was a sort of \textit{varia historia} with a geographical component that was strongly influenced by paradoxography.\textsuperscript{58} This chapter explores the traces of Pausanias’ use of paradoxographies (and other compilations) as textual sources and examines their influence on the project both in directing fieldwork and shaping the structure of the text.

\textbf{CATALOGUING WONDERS IN THE \textit{PERIEGESIS HELLODAS}}

Lightfoot’s observations on ability of the \textit{Catalogue of Ships} to present an inclusive approach to writing geography offer a valuable insight for approaching Pausanias’ \textit{Periegesis Hellados}. She notes, “No catalogue was ever a mere matter of listing. Many little asides and flourishes diversify the \textit{Catalogue of Ships}.”\textsuperscript{59} In the case of Dionysius,

\textsuperscript{55} Pretzler 2006: 147.  
\textsuperscript{56} Arafat 2000: 191.  
\textsuperscript{57} Pretzler 2006: 146. See also Gartner 2006: 471-485.  
\textsuperscript{58} Chamoux 1974: 90. Two decades later, however, Chamoux 1996: 48-9 backs away from the notion of \textit{varia historia} in relation to the \textit{Periegesis}: “Pausanias ne s’est nullement proposé d’écrire un recueil d’Histoires variées, une Παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία comme le fera plus tard Élien, compilation où, en l’occurrence, les itinéraires ne serviraient que d’un artifice de présentation. Il a vraiment voulu composer une périégèse, fondée sur son expérience personnelle de voyageur consciencieux.”  
\textsuperscript{59} Lightfoot 2014: 99.
this provides the template to pepper his itinerary generically diverse material
(chorography, ethnography, gemmography, mythography, etc.), and the same organizing
scheme is evident in Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados*. Thematically structured catalogs
disrupt the flow of the topographical frame narrative and virtual progress through the
landscape. These thematically structured catalogs are best construed as a species of
digression from the frame narrative. As Akujärvi succinctly puts it, “Any site, object,
ritual or narrative can trigger comments or narratives about similar events, phenomena
and practices in a wholly different setting.”60 Although Pausanias’ tendency to digress is
well known, the narrative digressions on mythical and historical themes have received the
lion’s share of scholarly attention, while the non-narrative, thematically structured
catalogs of wondrous artifacts, events, phenomena, and practices are comparatively
understudied.

*Investigating Marvels*

Catalogs present multiple elements, but analysis of wonder-catalogs in the *Periegesis*
must begin by first exploring how Pausanias deals with individual wonders. His report
about the phenomenon of the singing fish in the river Aroanius in the region of Arcadian
Cleitor provides a suggestive example. He writes:

> εἰσὶ δὲ ἵχθυς ἐν τῷ Ἀροανίῳ καὶ ἄλλοι καὶ οἱ ποικίλαις καλούμενοι·
> τούτους λέγοντες ποικίλας φθέγγεσθαι θύλη τῇ ὀρνιθί οὖσσεϊ.
> ἔγω δὲ ἀγρυφέντας μὲν εἶδον, φθεγγομένοι δὲ ἣκουσα οὐδὲν
> καταμείνας πρὸς τῷ ποταμῷ καὶ ἔς ἡλίου δυσμάς, ὅτε δὴ
> φθέγγεσθαι μάλιστα ἐλέγοντο οἱ ἵχθυς.

Among the fish in the Aroanius is one called the dappled fish. These
dappled fish, it is said, utter a cry like that of the thrush. I have seen fish
that have been caught, but I never heard their cry, though I waited by the
river even until sunset, at which time the fish were said to cry most.

> Pausanias, *Periegesis* 8.21.2

This passage richly emphasizes the importance of personal experience in Pausanias’
methodology with the recurrence of the 1st person singular and verbs of perception (ἐγὼ

---

60 Akujärvi 2012: 239. Chamoux 1996: 51 calls the digressions πάρεργα λόγου, and refers to the example
of the thematic ordering of law courts in Athens that interrupts the topographical sequence (1.28.11) to
illustrate his point.
...εἰδον... ἡξουσια.\(^{61}\) But it also hints at prior knowledge about the phenomenon of the singing fish with its insistence on reported facts (ξαλούμενοι... λέγουσι... ἐλέγοντο οἰ ἵθης). Pausanias does not cite any sources for the reported information about the fish; instead he uses the unspecific λέγουσι, “they say.” While λέγουσι (and the implied agents of the passive καλούμενοι and ἐλέγοντο) could easily refer to either an oral or written source(s), extra-textual evidence suggests that Pausanias had read about the singing fish before he ever visited Kleitor. The singing fish are also mentioned in Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae (8.3-6). In this passage Athenaeus cites several sources for the wondrous phenomenon: Mnaseas’ Periplous,\(^{62}\) an unknown work by Aristotle, Philostephanus’ On Wondrous Rivers, and the peripatetic Clearchus.\(^{63}\) The singing fish comprise but one of several anecdotes about curious fish Athenaeus records and his methodology here clearly reflects the tradition of collecting and compiling catalogs of wonders, in this case curious fish.

Although the parallel account of the singing fish in Athenaeus may shed light on Pausanias’ sources for reported facts, Pausanias’ account differs in respect to the purpose of mentioning the singing fish. Jacob reasons that Athenaeus compiled curious material from his sources in order to reveal “to the reader the taxonomies of the natural world, that are woven together by the threads of symbolic values,” and to create sumptuous heterogeneity and variety (poikilia) in the text.\(^{64}\) Jacob characterizes Athenaeus’ work as a “periodos tes bibliothekes,” which underscores the text’s absolute dependence on a

\(^{61}\) E.g. Pretzler 2005: 53 states: “For Pausanias autopsy is everything: he says ἵδον ὀδὸ (‘I know because I have seen it’), 2.22.3) and for him that settles an argument.” Cf. 8.41.10 on the source of river Lymax and the spring on Mount Cotilius.

\(^{62}\) Damschen 2006 describes Mnaseas as a 3rd century BC periegetic writer, who “wrote a work entitled Περίπλους (Periplous) or Περιηγήσεις (Perihégéseis), consisting of several books, in which, arranged according to geographical areas (Europe, Asia, Libya), myths and θαυμάσια/thaumásia (‘miracle stories’) are interpreted in a rational, euhemeristic way.” Cf. Cappelletto 2003 for testimony and fragments, which illustrate the intersection between mythography, periegetic and paradoxographic writing.

\(^{63}\) Ath. 8.3-6: Μνασάς δὲ ὁ Πατρεύς εν τῷ Περιπλόῳ (Capelleto fr. 14) τοὺς ἐν τῷ Κλείτορι ποταμῷ φησιν ἱθηςβεγέγεθαι, κατὸς μόνος ἡμφότος Ἀριστοτέλους (fr. 272 R) φθέγγεσθαι σχάρον καὶ τὸν ποτάμον χοίρον. Φιλοστέφανος δ’ ὁ Κυρηναῖος μὲν γένος, Καλλιμάχου δὲ γνώμος, ἐν τῷ πείρᾳ τῶν παραδόξων ποταμῶν (FHG III 32) ἐν Λόρνῃ φησὶ τὸ ποτάμῳ διὰ Φενεοῦ φεῦντι ιθής εἶναι φθεγγόμενος ὁμοίως κύλλαις· καλεῖσθαι δ’ αὐτοῖς ποικίλας. (...) ἔτι ὁ αὐτὸς Κλέάρχος καὶ ταύτα φησι, συφεστόν τοῦ Κυρηναίου Φιλοστέφανου, οὐ πρότερον ἔμμηνθην (p. 331 d) ἐπεὶ τινὲς τῶν ἱθύων οὐκ ἔχοντες βρόχον φθέγγοντα, τοιοῦτα δ’ εἴσον οἱ περὶ Κλείτορα τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ἐν τῷ Λάδωνι καλομένῳ ποτάμῳ φθέγγονται γὰρ καὶ πολλὰ ἦχον ὀπταλοῦντον.’ Cf. Pliny 9.34 (19), which conflates the properties of the fish known as “exocoetus” and the “poikilias.”

\(^{64}\) On Athenaeus’ use of ekloge, see Jacob 2013: 1-4, 47-54, 95-102.
library of ancient Greek books. In contrast, Pausanias’ presentation of his visit to the river Aroanis shows him testing the marvelous phenomena of the singing fish, which he has heard about second-hand. Significantly, Pausanias reports that he did not in fact experience the wondrous phenomenon although he was present at the very time of day that the fish are supposed to be the most vocal (ὅτε δὴ φθέγγεσθαι μάλωτα ἐλέγοντο). The temporal detail, that he waited by the river until the sun set (καὶ ἐς ἥλιον δυσμάς) to hear the fish sing, suggests that he may have made the visit with the express purpose of experiencing the wondrous phenomenon for himself. This example implies that Pausanias’ engagement with paradoxographical compilations can in fact motivate his travels by acting as a goad to investigate a wondrous phenomenon first-hand.

A similar dynamic can be inferred from Pausanias’ account of the tame dolphin at Poroselene in the Hecatonnesi (between Lesbos and mainland Asia Minor). In addition to the desire to experience (verify or investigate) marvels reported second-hand, this passage exemplifies Pausanias’ technique of juxtaposing a thematically related anecdote or logos to a particular phenomenon or monument on his itinerary.

Among other offerings on Taenarum is a bronze statue of Arion the harper on a dolphin. Herodotus has told the story of Arion and the dolphin, as he heard it, in his history of Lydia. I have seen the dolphin at Poroselene that rewards the boy for saving his life. It had been damaged by fishermen and he cured it. I saw this dolphin obeying his call and carrying him whenever he wanted to ride on it.

Pausanias, Periegesis 3.25.7

---

65 Jacob 2013: 113.
66 Cf. Phlegon Mir. 35 on the hippocentaur sent to Rome who died en route: τὸν δὲ πεμφθέντα εἰς Ῥώμην εἰ τις ἀποστεί, δύναται ἰστορήσαν· ἀπόκειται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀρίοις τοῦ αὐτοχράτορος τεταρχευμένος, ὡς προσείην.
67 Kalcyk 2016 identifies the Hecatonnesi as an “archipelago in the north of the eastern strait which divides Lesbos from the mainland of Asia Minor.” The largest island of the archipelago was Poroselene.
In the reader’s virtual progress along the topographically structured frame narrative, this passage describes a bronze statue of Arion on a dolphin located at Taenarum (the southernmost point of the Peloponnese). The description of the sculpture itself is sparing, however, as it is limited to identification of the figures and the material. But the mention of the statue prompts exegetical comments about the narrative represented: Pausanias mentions Herodotus’ account of the episode in the Histories (1.23-4). It is significant that Herodotus refers to the story of Arion and the dolphin as a great wonder (θώμα μέγιστον), and himself includes a reference to this same statue of Arion at Taenarum (Ἀρίονος ἔστι ἀνάθημα χάλκεον οὗ μέγα ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ, ἐπὶ δελφίνος ἐπεὶ ἀνθρώπος). The first part of Pausanias’ account therefore seems to do no more than reiterate Herodotus’ marvel, while emphasizing the credibility of Herodotus’ account (Ἡρόδοτος εἶπεν ἄκοίν). But Pausanias goes on to describe a comparable phenomenon. He claims to have seen for himself a tame dolphin at Poroselene that accommodated a human rider (τοῦτον τὸν δελφίνα εἶδον καὶ καλοῦντι τῷ παιδί ὑπαξούντα καὶ φέροντα, ὅποτε ἐποχείσθαι οἱ βοῦλοιτο). The mention of the statue at Taenarum therefore occasions a thematic mini-catalog of dolphins with human riders, phenomena that are ultimately vouched for on the basis of Pausanias’ own autopsy (τοῦτον τὸν δελφίνα εἶδον). Although brief, this list of dolphins with human riders is kindred to paradoxography in so far as it is a thematic collection of marvels. Further, despite the strong claim to autopsy in this passage, the account of the tame dolphin at Poroselene is in fact not unique; Aelian gives a far longer and more elaborate account of the same animal, for which he credits “a certain Byzantine, Leonidas by name” as his source (HA 2.6). For this reason, Kalkmann singled out Pausanias’ claim to have seen this dolphin obeying the boy’s commands as exemplary of his unacknowledged borrowing from other sources and spurious use of the autopsy trope.69

Closer examination of Aelian’s account suggests that, like the singing fish of Kleitor, Pausanias has sought out a marvel he heard about elsewhere. The supplemental

68 See Munson 2001: 251-255 on Arion as a great marvel in Herodotus, with 252 n.70 for additional bibliography.
information in Aelian’s account includes the context for the taming and display of the dolphin in addition to his roster of his tricks. He explains that, as recompense for the care it received when wounded, the dolphin now provides for the people of Poroselene by generating revenue as a tourist attraction.

ταύτα τούτων ἐκεκήρυκτο, καὶ τοῖς πλέουσιν ὀφαμα ἐδόξει σύν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δοσ ἢ πόλις ἀγαθά εἰχε, καὶ τοῖς πρεσβύταις καὶ τῷ μειρακίῳ πρόσοδος ἤν.

These things were talked about, and seemed to those who sailed in to be a spectacle and to others to be among the good things the city had to offer, so that it became a source of revenue for both the old people and the boy.

Aelian, *De Natura Animalium* 2.6

Aelian’s testimony suggests that the trained dolphin in Poroselene performed regularly enough to present a viable and profitable enterprise, and the performances were celebrated far and wide (ταύτα τούτων ἐκεκήρυκτο). The dolphin show was considered one of the sights worth seeing in the city (ὁραμα ἀγαθά). Since the example of the singing fish of Kleitor clearly demonstrates that Pausanias sometimes sought out such wondrous phenomena to test them, it would be consistent for him seek out the famed Poroselene dolphin to experience the spectacle first-hand. This seems rather more likely than Kalkmann’s suggestion that he lifted the marvel from another source and presented a false report of autopsy.

In the Arcadia *logos*, Pausanias states that he visited Phigalia in order to see the cult statue of Demeter by Onatas (8.42.11). He learned from a local elder on his arrival that *agalma* had been destroyed by falling rocks several generations before (8.42.12-13). This sequence suggests that Pausanias’ knowledge of the Phigalian Demeter must derive from a textual source, as he would hardly have made the journey in order to see a statue if he had known *a priori* that it no longer existed. 70 Although Pausanias does not identify the

---

70 8.42.2-10 presents the mythological aetiology for the dedication of an ancient wooden statue to Demeter in the sacred cave in Phigalia and a description of the statue itself. Pausanias includes an account of how this statue was lost and ultimately replaced by a statue by Onatas that itself had not survived to his own day. Moreover, Pausanias states that it had been so long since Onatas’ statue was destroyed that “most of the Phigalians were ignorant that it had ever existed at all” (τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀνάτα ποιηθὲν οὔτε ἦν κατ’ ἐμὲ οὔτε εἰ ἐγένετο ἄρχην Φιγαλεύσιν ἡπάσαμτο οἱ πολλοὶ).
Phigalian Demeter as a wonder *per se*, he does note that another sculpture by the same artist (a bronze Apollo in Pergamum) was a marvel on account of its size and skillful execution (θαυμάζω ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα μεγέθους τε ἔνεκα καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ τέχνῃ), and that Onatas was guided by a vision in his dreams in his rendering of the Phigalian Demeter (8.42.7). Taken together, Pausanias’ comments on Onatas suggest that he made use of a reference work such as Hegesander’s lost Περὶ ἀνδριάντων καὶ ἀγαλμάτων, *On Statues of Men and Gods.* 71 Although Pausanias does not cite Hegesander directly, he does cite ‘those who have made a special study of the history of the sculptors’ (οἱ δὲ πολυπραγμονήσαντες σπουδὴ τὰ ἐς τοὺς πλάστας) for details about Colotes, a pupil of Phidias, who made the table of ivory and gold in the temple of Hera at Olympia (5.20.2). 72

Pausanias’ practice of investigating marvels he has read or heard about indirectly has a parallel in another paradoxographical compilation. Palaephatus’ *Apista* presents a series of rationalized explanations for the marvelous aspects of myth-historical narratives. In his preface, Palaephatus suggests that earlier authors have manufactured wonders in order to entertain the reader. These myth-historical narratives are said to strain credibility, but be nevertheless pleasing to the reader. This motive for incorporating marvels into a text resonates with Lucian’s criticism of travel writers explored in the previous chapter. Palaephatus, however, maintains that these myth-historical narratives are founded on a kernel of truth, and he promises that he will tease out the true elements from the fictional components through careful application of historical methods. He offers his own autopsy and inquiry as correctives to various the corruptions in the traditional narratives. 73

71 Arafat 2000: 194 suggests that Pausanias made use of texts as reference works, among which he posits *On Sculptors* by Adaeus of Mytilene and Hegesander’s *On Statues of Men and Gods*; both are attested in Athenaeus (12.606a; 5.210b) though not named in the *Periegesis*.

72 Cf. 5.23.3 and comments on the passage in Pritchett 1999: 12.

73 Hawes 2014: 45-46 suggests that Palaephatus uses the trope to build his own authority through the “topoi of historiographical fieldwork—travel, personal inquiry and the accumulation of new information through a campaign of interviews.” But Hawes also notes “references to, or indeed evidence of, this wide-ranging research are suspiciously absent from the rest of the text.”
I visited many places and asked the elder what they had heard about each of these stories and I am now recording what I learned from them. I saw these places for myself, what each was like, and I have written down these stories not as they are traditionally told, but what I learned about them after going there myself and making my inquiries.

Palaephatus, *Apista* pref.74

The product is a collection of rationalized heroic narratives, whose marvelous accretions have been identified as exaggerations or misunderstandings of true historical events.

Palaephatus presents a dynamic mechanism through which travel and personal experience are used to corroborate or discredit a wonder reported elsewhere. Palaephatus’ methodology reflects the cyclical nature of his investigations: it is prior knowledge of the marvelous myth-historical narratives (from textual or oral sources) that prompts his alleged inquiries and travel to the sites. He then publishes the results of his efforts in a textual form that intended for circulation. Significantly, Palaephatus does not undertake his investigations in order to prove that the traditional marvelous narratives are false, but rather to identify the elements in them that are true. The results of his vetting process are presented in his collection *Apista*, which itself is organized as a thematic catalog.

The interplay between text and autopsy (fieldwork) in Palaephatus’ text is useful for approaching Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados*. In his programmatic statement at the close of his description of Attica, Pausanias summarizes what has come before as “the most famous legends and sights among the Athenians” (Ἀθηναίων γνωριμώτατα ἶν ἐν τε λόγοις καὶ θεωρήμασιν, 1.39.3). Pausanias’ Attic *logos* is rich in autopsy claims, which supports the consensus that he travelled through Attica and saw for himself the sights he describes.75 The use of γνωριμώτατα, however, suggests Pausanias had prior knowledge of traditions about these sites and sights. These reports may have circulated orally or in textual form. Pausanias cites “those who know about the antiquities of the Athenians” (Ἀθηναίων ὁσοὶ τὰ ἄρχαία ἱσαίοιν, 1.27.4) as a source in his Attic *logos*.

74 Translation by Hawes (2014).
Jacoby interpreted this as a reference to the ‘Atthidographers’ “in the affected language of Pausanias.”

Pausanias also references the exegete Kleitōdemos, whom he describes as the earliest of those who wrote on local Athenian matters (Κλειτόδημος δὲ, ὅπωσι τὰ Ἀθηναῖων ἐπιχώρια ἐγγαψαν ὁ ἀρχαιότατος, οὗτος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ φησὶ τῷ Ἀττικῷ, 10.15.5).

The Limits of Ekphrasis

In the Periegesis, seeing a marvel first-hand is different from hearing (or reading) about it. For example, Pausanias states that the marble stadium built by Herodes Atticus in Athens is a greater marvel to behold than to hear about (ὃ δὲ ἀκούσας μὲν οὕς ὁμοίως ἔπαχωγόν, θαῦμα δ’ ἴδουσι, 1.19.6). This idea is more clearly articulated in the comments about the Phidian cult statue of Zeus:

μέτρα δὲ τοῦ Ἑλεομενὴν Ολυμπίας Διῶς ἐς ύψος τε καὶ ύψους ἐπιστάμενος γεγραμμένα οὕς ἐν ἑπαίνῳ Íορομαι τοὺς μετρήσαντας, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ εἰρημένα αὐτοίς μέτρα πολύ τι ἀποδεόντα ἔστιν ἢ τοῖς ἱδούοι παρέστησεν ἐς τὸ ἄγαλμα δόξα, ὅποιον γε καὶ αὐτόν τὸν θεόν μάρτυρα ἐς τοῦ Φειδίου τὴν τεχνὴν γενέσθαι λέγουσιν.

I know that the height and breadth of the Olympic Zeus have been measured and recorded; but I shall not praise those who made the measurements, for even their records fall far short of the impression made by a sight of the image.

Pausanias, Periegesis 5.11.9

Phidias’ statue of Zeus at Olympia is practically the archetype a marvelous work of art. Although excessive size (whether large or small) is an attribute of a statue or building considered to be a thauma, in the case of the Phidian Zeus, the marvelous effect is not simply a matter of the statue’s size. Rather Pausanias insists that it is the extraordinary skill of Phidias that makes the statue a wonder (τοῦ Φειδίου τὴν τέχνην). From his criticism of “those who measured and recorded the dimensions of the statue,” whose

76 Jacoby 1949: 1.
77 FGrH 323. Cf. Athen. 9.78; Tertullian De An. 52.
78 Cf. Epictetus Dissertations 1.6.23: Ἀλλ᾽ εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν μὲν ἀποδημεῖτε, ἵν’ εἴδητε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Φειδίου, καὶ ἀτύχημα ἐκαστος ὑμῶν οίτε τὸ ἀνιστόρητος τούτων ἀποθάνειν.
records Pausanias says “fall far short of the impression made by a sight of the image,” we may infer that he had read descriptions of the statue before his visit to Olympia. But in what kind of text? It is difficult to reconstruct a precise picture of the sources to which Pausanias is alluding here, because as with the ‘Atthidographers’, he uses a roundabout phrase to describe the texts. July. Certain particulars can be inferred on the basis of inter- and extra-textual evidence, which shed light on his research and writing methodologies.

Platt characterizes the Pausanias’ description of the statue of Olympian Zeus as the centrepiece of the *Periegesis*. The description includes a brief ekphrasis of the statue, the comments quoted above, and an account of Zeus’ epiphanic validation of Phidias’ skill (5.11.1-9). Platt interprets Pausanias’ description of the statue as a “self-conscious ekphrastic failure,” which she suggests signals “the inability of language and number to convey the numinosity of Zeus.” Platt, among others, notes a resonance between Pausanias’ comments and Callimachus’ Sixth *Iambus*, “which parodies of the numerical accounts of the statue and impresses upon the reader the need for a direct encounter.” In his analysis of Callimachus’ poem, Kerkhecker states:

Why does Pausanias censure the μετρήσαντες? Because a list of measurements cannot capture the experience of the beholder. Is that possible in the medium of language? What does Pausanias want? Literary ἔκφρασις.

Kerkhecker further specifies list of measurements fails to capture the “overwhelming impression, the statue’s awesomeness, [and] its beatific qualities” in a way characteristic of ekphrastic descriptions of the statue. But Pausanias’ own ekphrastic failure suggests that even precise or detailed the descriptions of the cult statue cannot convey the impression of seeing the statue firsthand.

---

79 Cf. 3.12.4: οἱ δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἰνδικὴν ἐσπλέοντες φορτῶν φασίν Ἑλληνικῶν τοὺς Ἰνδοὺς ἀγώνιμα ἄλλα ἀνταλλάσσοσθαι for references to *periploi*. See also Strabo 8.3.30: ἀνέγραψαν δὲ τινες τὰ μέτρα τοῦ ἔξοάνου, καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν ἴαμβῳ τινὶ ἐξεῖπε. 
83 Kerkhecker 1999: 164. 
On the strengths and limitation of *ekphrasis* to communicate wonder, Philo of Byzantium’s *De septem orbis spectaculis* is revealing. He states that these wonders are known to all through report, but they have been seen by only few (τῶν ἐπτὰ θεαμάτων ἔκαστον φήμη μὲν γινώσκεται πάσιν, οὕτε δὲ σπανίος ὄραται, pref.). His contrast points to an epistemological divide between knowing by report and direct witness, which he characterizes as problematic. His answer to this problem is to produce an elaborate *ekphrasis* of these famous wonders as a means to bridge the epistemological gap. He claims his *ekphrasis* is so vivid and detailed that it supplants the need for (and expense of) travel to experience the monuments first-hand.\(^87\)

The logic underlying Philo’s project suggests that the effect of viewing these wonders first-hand is so overwhelming for the subject that details of the workmanship are lost or soon forgotten.\(^88\) While the ekphrastic description of a marvel aims to conjure an image of it in the mind’s eye, it does not produce the characteristic state of shock associated with seeing the object through direct witness. *Ekphrasis* provides a proxy viewing experience that mitigates the effect of a marvel on the viewer, and thereby allows for a more detailed and intimate knowledge of the marvelous object through language. He further suggests that a virtual experience of the sights in literary description is in fact superior to autopsy because it is more memorable than a direct experience.\(^89\)

---

\(^{86}\) On the Seven Wonders, see Antipater of Sidon in *Anth. Pal.*. 9.58; Str. 14.652, 656; 16.738; 17.808; Diod. Sic. 1.63; 2.11; Plin. *HN* 36.30; Mart. *de spectaculis* 1.1; Hyg. *Fab.* 223; Vitr. *De Arch.* 7, pref.


\(^{88}\) *Philo de Septem Miraculis* 21: καὶ τὸ παράδοξον· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους ἐλθὼν ἀπαξ ἵδεν καὶ παρελθὼν ἐπιλήσθησαν· τὸ γὰρ ἀκριβές τῶν ἔργων λανθάνει καὶ περὶ τὰ κατὰ μέρος φεύγουσιν αἱ μνήμαι· ὁ δὲ λόγος τὸ θαυμαζόμενον ἑπορημένος καὶ τὰς ἐξεργασίας τῆς ἐνεργείας, ὅλον ἐγκαταστημανόμενος τὸ τῆς τέχνης ἔργον ἀνεξελέπτος φυλάσσει τοὺς ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστῳ τῶν εἰδώλων τύπους· τῇ ψυχῇ γὰρ ἑώρακεν τὰ παράδοξα.

\(^{89}\) *Philo de Septem Miraculis* 21-2: ὁ δὲ λόγῳ φανηται πιστῶ, ἐὰν τῶν ἐπτὰ θεαμάτων ἔκαστον ἐναργος ὁ λόγος ἐφοδεύσας πείθη τὸν ἀκριβοτάτην ἐπινεύσας τὴν τῆς θεωρίας κοιμώμενον δόξαν. καὶ γὰρ δὴ μὸνον ταύτα τῇ κοινῇ τῶν ἐπαίνων προσηγορίᾳ καλεῖται βλεπόμενα μὲν ὀμοίους, θεωριαμένα δὲ ἀνομοίως. τὸ γὰρ καλὸν ἠλλὰ παραπληροῖς σώζῃ ἐφ᾽ ὑπὸ τοῦ λοιποῦ θεωρεῖν, ὅταν αὐτὸς διαλάμψη.
Philo’s preface suggests that the purpose of his catalog is to invest his reader with the same sense of wonder and munificent paideia (διὰ τούτο θαυμαστόν παιδεία καὶ μεγαλόδωρον) through his virtual experience that actual travel to the destinations does (21). But the emphasis on detailed knowledge about these renowned architectural marvels veers dangerously close to the obsession with facts that Callimachus parodied. Despite Philo’s avowed commitment to the details of the works he describes, his comments on extraordinary nature of the Phidian Zeus are focused on the impression made by the statue rather than the details.90

Discussion of Philo’s *De septem orbis spectaculis* is not intended to launch a discussion of ekphrasis in Pausanius’ text (though there is much to be said on the topic), but instead to frame the discussion of wonder-catalogs in the *Periegesis Hellados*. Philo’s text is itself a thematically structured catalog of architectural marvels, and is generally acknowledged as a paradoxography.91 Philo’s statements provide a useful model with which to approach catalogs of wonders in the *Periegesis* as virtual collections that punctuate his narrative of virtual pedestrian travel. While Philo’s individual ekphrases of the gardens in Babylon, the Pharos, or the Phidian Zeus may fail to adequately communicate wonder, I suggest that their presentation as a collection allows each to reinforce the marvelousness of the rest.

Pausanias employs a similar strategy in his treatment of the Phidian Zeus. Rather than attempt to communicate the power of his own subjective viewing experience through his description of the statue, Pausanias conveys its extraordinary effect by associating it with a miracle.92 Pausanias claims that Zeus manifested aesthetic approval of the object d’art with a divine epiphany, striking the floor of the temple with a lightning bolt.

90 Philo *De septem spectaculis* 28-30: τοιγαροῦν τὰ μὲν ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐπτὰ θεσμάτων θαυμάζομεν μόνον, τούτῳ δὲ καὶ προσκυνούμεν· ὡς μὲν γὰρ ἔχον τέχνης παράδοξον, ὡς δὲ μήμημα Δίος ὅσιον.
91 See Broderson 1992.
92 Cf. 8.16.3-5 for Pausanias’ description of the grave of Aegyptus. He is anxious to see it because Homer mentions it (*Iliad* 2.604). Pausanias specifies that Homer thought it a wonder, 8.16.3: Ὁμήρῳ δὲ—οὐ γὰρ εἶδεν ἀξιολογότερον μνήμα—εἰκότος παρέξειν ἐμέλλε θαύμα. Pausanias pairs his description of the mound with a brief catalogue of wonderful graves, 8.16.4-5: τάφους δὲ ἀξίους θαύματος.
Nay, the god himself according to legend bore witness to the artistic skill of Phidias. For when the image was quite finished Phidias prayed the god to show by a sign whether the work was to his liking. Immediately, runs the legend, a thunderbolt fell on that part of the floor where down to the present day the bronze jar stood to cover the place.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 5.11.9

The experience of viewing the statue is so overwhelming that even Zeus (was) struck! Although the epiphany itself is necessarily ephemeral, it left a scar on the floor that acts as a *sema* of Zeus’ approval. Platt calls this *sema* “a powerful demonstration of the statue’s cognitive reliability.” But this *sema* is in fact hidden from view by a bronze urn in the temple itself, and so knowledge of the epiphany and its physical proof are ultimately conveyed by report rather than autopsy (*λέγουσιν... χεραυνόν φασιν*).

Pausanias therefore mitigates the inadequacy of description by conveying the effect of the statue with a mini-catalog, in which one wonder presents external validation for another.

*Insights from the Lindian Chronicle: (im)material wonders*

The so-called ‘Lindian Chronicle’—a monumental Hellenistic inscription preserving the noteworthy dedications to Athena Lindia in Rhodes—provides conceptual parallels for Pausanias’ list of noteworthy dedications to Athena Alea at Tegea that will be discussed below. The inscription is divided into three parts: a decree (ψαφίσμα, A11), a catalog of lost noteworthy dedications (τοίδε ἀνέθηκαν τᾶι Ἀθάνατι, B1), and a short catalog of epiphanies of the goddess (ἐπιφάνειαι, D1).

The decree states the resolution of the *mastroi* (magistrates) and *Lindians* to have a list of the offerings to the goddess and her epiphanies compiled from suitable sources, to have this list inscribed upon a *stele*, and subsequently have the *stele* erected in the sanctuary.

The decree of the *mastroi* makes it clear that the intent of the inscribed catalog is the

---

93 Translated by Jones and Ormerod (1918).
95 See Higbie 2003 for edition of the text, commentary and analysis.
preservation of the memory of the dedications that have been lost over time (συμβαίνει δὲ τῶν ἁνα[θεμάτων τὰ ἀρχαιότατα μετὰ τὰν ἑ]πιγραφάν διὰ τὸν χρόνον ἐφθάρθῃ, A4). The decree both emphasizes the antiquity and prestige of the sanctuary, and draws a direct correlation between the impetus to offer dedications to the goddess and her epiphanies (ἐπεὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τὰς Αθάνας τὰς Λινδίας ἀρχαιότατον τε καὶ ἐντιμό[τα] τον ἵππον πολλοῖς κ[αί καλοῖς ἀναθέμας ἐκ παλαιο[τά]των χρόνων νεκρόμενα διὰ τὸ τάς θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν, A2-3).

The dedications themselves would function as material emblems of divine agency for the visitor to the sanctuary (as semata of Athena Lindia intervention in the world), if they were extant. But these dedications were in fact no longer extant at the time the inscription was commissioned; many dedications were presumably lost when the temple and its contents were burned in 392/1 BC (ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερέως/ τοῦ Ἁλίου Εὐκλεύς τοῦ Ἀστυανακτίδα/ ἐμπυρισθέντος τοῦ ναοῦ κατεκαύσθη, C39-41). The commissioned compilation and inscription of these dedications therefore compensates for the material loss of these semata by creating of a virtual collection that the visitor can experience by reading inscribed stele, which is itself a monument in stone.

Pausanias begins his description of the temple of Athena Alea in Tegea by stating that the ancient image of the goddess and tusks of the Caledonian boar are no longer housed in the sanctuary (8.46.1). He reports that Augustus removed the statue from the sanctuary following the Battle of Actium in 31 BC. He then interrupts his treatment of the ancient statue with a catalogue of sacred works of art (ἀναθήματα καὶ ἔδη θεῶν) that were also carried-off as plunder in order to show that Augustus was following a well established custom when he removed Athena Alea to Rome (8.46.2-4). The list of plundered sacred artworks could derive from Pausanias’ interviews with local guides or his own extensive reading and travels, but the thematic unity of the elements, the chronological range represented, and the inclusion of certain details about the works themselves—such as

---

96 Higbie 2003: 8-10.
97 See Wellington Gahtan and Pegazzano 2014: 15 on virtual or represented collections (including the Lindian Chronicle and Pliny NH) and their relationship to the tradition of ekphrasis.
materials and sculptors—all suggest that he has consulted a catalogue of such works.98 Pausanias concludes his catalogue with the following statements about the ancient image of Athena Alea and the tusks of the Caledonian boar.

The ancient image of Athena Alea, and with it the tusks of the Calydonian boar, were carried away by the Roman emperor Augustus (...) The image of Athena Alea at Rome is as you enter the Forum made by Augustus. Here then it has been set up, made throughout of ivory, the work of Endoeus. Those in charge of the curiosities say that one of the boar’s tusks has broken off; the remaining one is kept in the gardens of the emperor, in a sanctuary of Dionysus, and is about half a fathom long.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 8.46.5

As Pausanias refers to his visits to Rome elsewhere in the *Periegesis*,99 it is possible that his topographical comments about the new location of the Athena Alea statue are in part based on autopsy. But Pausanias cites oi ἐπὶ τοῖς θαύμασιν “those in charge of the curiosities” for the information about the fate of the tusks of the Caledonian boar.

Schepens interprets the expression oi ἐπὶ τοῖς θαύμασιν as a reference to paradoxographers.100 From this source, Pausanias transmits the state of preservation, size and location of the tusks in a sanctuary of Dionysus in the gardens of the emperor.101

98 This catalogue of plundered works parallels a catalogue of the genuine works of Daedalus presented in his Boeotian *logos* (9.40.3-4). The catalogue of Daedalus’ works overlaps significantly with the catalogue of plundered cult statues, with additional details. He reveals, for instance, that xoana brought from Omphale to Gela are no longer extant in his day. On Daedalus in the *Periegesis*, see Pritchett 1998: 197-204.
101 Cf. Scholion on II.4.109 that cites Alexander of Myndos (*FGH* 25 F6) for exegesis of the description of Pandarus’ bow: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ φήμην ἐν Δῆλῳ κεῖσθαι κέρατα ἀόρτο τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης, κρυοῦ
It is worth noting that in this passage, the boar’s tusks, which are relics of heroic past, paradoxographers (οἱ ἐπὶ τοῖς θαύμασιν), and dedications in sanctuaries are all explicitly connected. Pausanias proceeds directly to describe what are the ‘most worth recording’ (ἀξιολογῶτα) of the dedications that remain in the temple of Athena Alea (ἀναθήματα δὲ ἐν τῷ ναῷ, 8.47.2-3). The dedications are presented in a catalogue or inventory format. The first item mentioned is the hide of the Caledonian boar (τὸ δέρμα ὑὸς τοῦ Καλυδωνίου). Pausanias emphasizes the antiquity of hide by noting its state of preservation; it has rotted over time and lost all its bristles (διεσήπετο δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου καὶ ἔς ἀπαν ἦν τριχῶν ἡδη ψιλῶν). Next, he mentions that the fetters (αἱ πέδαι) that the Lacedaemonians prisoners wore when they dug the Tegean plain (ἀξιόμακατο τὸ πεδίον Τεγέαται ἐκατηπτον) are hung up on display in the temple (κρεμάμεναι). He again emphasizes the antiquity of these artifacts by noting that some have rusted away (πλὴν ὄσας ἠφάνισεν αὐτῶν ἴός).

Although Pausanias makes no mention Herodotus here, the fetters are likely to be the ones that he reports having seen in the same location. The fetters are relics of the historical rather than the heroic past, but they are also emblematic of the ambiguity inherent in human interpretations of oracles in the Histories. The Spartans were defeated by Tegeans because they had misconstrued the Delphic Oracle’s promise: “I will give you Tegea to beat with your feet in dancing, and its fair plain to measure with a rope” (δώσω τοι Τεγέην ποσσίκροτον ὀρχήμασθαι καὶ καλὸν πεδίον σχοίνῳ διαμετρήσασθαι, 1.66). After the celebrated fetters, Pausanias rounds out his list of the most noteworthy dedications in the temple with a couch sacred to Athena, a portrait painting of Auge (the mother of Telephus), and the shield of Marpessa in quick succession and without further elaboration.\(^{102}\)

Pausanias’ catalog of the most noteworthy dedications in the temple of Athena Alea is a temple inventory of a sort, though it obviously serves a very different purpose from the

\(^{102}\) Marpessa will reappear later in the description of Tegea (8.48.4-5) as preeminent among the female defenders of Tegea. They performed great deeds (πολλὰ τε καὶ ἄξια μνήμης) during the invasion of Charillus, king of Lacedaemon. The story is told in relation to the statue of Ares “Γυναικοθοίναν” in the Tegean agora.
well-known examples from the Athenian Acropolis. These are preserved on inscribed stelai and were primarily intended as a means of ensuring the accountability of the cult administrators. Rather than as any sort of accounting control for cult property, Pausanias’ catalogue of the noteworthy dedications in the temple of Athena Alea functions as a virtual collection. The selection and compilation of the dedications in catalogue form communicate the special relationship between Athena Alea and the Tegeans as effectively as the material collection would. While it would presumably be possible for Pausanias’ reader to follow in the narrator’s footsteps and see the hide of the Calydonian boar and other artifacts first-hand, the ancient cult statue and tusks of the legendary boar no longer form part of the material collection in Tegea. Like the Lindian Chronicle, Pausanias’ virtual catalog can incorporate artifacts that are no longer extant or that have been moved elsewhere. Pausanias’ virtual collection evokes the special relationship between Tegea and the divine as effectively as material artifacts could, even if the experience of reading about them is not the same as a direct encounter.

It is clear from the decree in the first section of the Lindian Chronicle that all of the dedications listed in the following section are lost; Higbie presents doubts that many ever existed at all. She suggests that if they did, they may have been forgeries. Her doubts about the authenticity of the dedications are in part founded on the fact that the first sixteen entries involve mythical figures: salient examples include a phiale from Lindos, the eponymous founder of town (B2), a vessel (χρυσός for χρυσάριος) from the Telchines (B9), a silver drinking cup from Minos (B18), a pair of bracelets from Helen (B70), Alexander’s leather cap dedicated by Menelaos (B62-3), and the steering-oars (οἴαξ) from Menelaos’ helmsman, Kanopos (κυβερνάτας for κυβερνήτης, B73). The Chronicle also reports that these dedications featured inscriptions naming the dedicators.

103 See Harris 1995 for analysis and contextualization the temple inventories, esp. 20-29 for discussion of the function and method of taking the inventories.

104 Cf. Polemon fr. 20: Πολέμων γονόν, ἢ ὧτς ἐστὶν ὁ ποιήσας τὸν ἐπιγραφόμενον Ἑλλαδικόν, περὶ τοῦ ἐν ὸλυμπία λέγον Μεταποντίνου ναὸν, γράφει καὶ ταῦτα: “Ναὸς Μεταποντίνων, ἐν ὧ φιάλας ἀργυραὶ ἐκατόν τριάκοντα δύο, οἰνοχόη ἀργυραὶ δύο, ἀποθυστάνον ἀργυροῖς, φιάλας τρεῖς ἐπίχρυσοι. Ναὸς Βυζαντίων, ἐν ὧ Τρίτων κυπαρίσσινος, ἔχον κρατάνιον ἀργυροῖν, Σειρίν ἀργυρα, καρχηδόν δύο ἀργυρά, κυλλεῖ ἄργυρα, οἰνοχόη χρυσῆ, κέρατα δύο. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ναῷ τῆς Ἁρισ τῷ παλαιῷ φιάλας τριάκοντα, κρατάνια ἀργυραὶ δύο, χύτρας ἀργυροῖς, ἀποθυστάνον χρυσοῦν, κραταὶ χρυσοῦς, Κυρηναίων ἀνάθημα, βατιάκιον ἀργυροῖν.”

105 Higbie 2003: 164.
The bronze lebes dedicated by Kadmus was supposedly inscribed with the “Phoenician” script (φοινικικοῖς γράμμασι ἐπιγεγραμμένον, B15-16), and it is clear that Bronze Age objects with legible Greek inscriptions should be viewed as inherently suspicious. ¹⁰⁶ The authenticity of the relics, however, is moot for the current analysis. It is the connection between the sanctuary, the compilers’ present, and the heroic past that is significant.

Higbie notes the absence of “curiosa” from among the dedications listed in the chronicle.¹⁰⁷ Her interpretation of “curiosa” runs along the lines of “supposed bones of mythological beasts, or mysterious stones, etc.” collected in the Pseudo Aristotelian On Marvelous Things Heard and exemplified in Suetonius’ account of Augustus’ collection of oddities at Capreae.

Higbie’s choice of parallel is revealing, as it suggests that she has prehistoric fossils in mind when she suggests that ‘curiosities’ are excluded in the Lindian Chronicle. These were often identified as giants’ bones (immanium beluarum ferarumque membra praegrandia, quae dicuntur gigantum ossa). She is right to draw attention to the absence of such dedications from the catalog, because passages from Pliny and Pausanias both

---

¹⁰⁶ Higbie 2003: 65 states: “The compilers anachronistically believed that such early objects would have been inscribed, but they are not unique in this. Greek writers as early as Acusilaus (FGH 2 T1) and Herodotus (5.58-61) thought they had seen objects with early forms of the Greek alphabet inscribed on them.” We need not suppose that the dedications and their inscriptions are contemporary. It is possible that the inscriptions were added at a later date to early dedications.

¹⁰⁷ Higbie 2003: 171 n. 29.
suggest that giant bones were often dedicated in sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{108} The Suetonius passage, however, makes clear that Augustus’ villa housed relics of notable antiquity and rarity \textit{(rebusque uetustate ac raritate notabilibus)}, which included both the weapons of heroes \textit{(arma heroum)} and fossilized remains. The accoutrements of heroes are as much ‘curiosities’ as the giant fossils because both are relics of the heroic past. There are many dedications identified as personal effects of legendary heroes in the Lindian Chronicle. The dedications attributed to Heracles provide a representative example.

\begin{verbatim}
Ἡρακλῆς γέρρα δύο, τὸ μὲν ἐν περισσυνυμένον, τὸ δὲ κατακεχαλκωμένον, ὃν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐσκυτωμένου ἐπεγέγρατο· “Ἡρακλῆς ἀπὸ Μερόπων τῶν Εὐρυπύλου”, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ κατακεχαλκωμένου· “τὰν Λαομέδοντος Ἡρακλῆς ἀπὸ Τεῦκρων Αθάναι Πολιάδι καὶ Δίῳ Πολιεί”. ὃς ἀποφαίνεται Ξεναγόρας ἐν ταῖς αἱ τάς χρονικὰς συντάξιοις, Γόργων ἐν ταῖς αἱ τάς περὶ Ρώδου, Νικασύλος ἐν ταῖς γ’ τάς χρονικάς συντάξιοις, Ἡγησίας ἐν τοῖς Ἐξαγιάδις, Αἰέλουρος ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ ποτὶ τοὺς Ἐξαγιάδας(?), Τάφνος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Λίνδου, Γοργοσθένης ἐν τοῖς ἐπιστολαί, Ἡρόβουλος ἐν τοῖς ἐπιστολαί.
\end{verbatim}

Herakles, two wicker shields, one sheathed in leather, the other in bronze. Of these, on the leather one had been inscribed, ‘Heracles, from the Meropes, the [shield] of Eurypylus’. On the one of bronze, ‘The [shield] of Laomedon, Herakles from the Teucrians, to Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus’, as Xenagoras declares in the first book of his work \textit{About Rhodes}, Nikasylos in the third book of his \textit{Annalistic Account}, Hegesias in his \textit{Encomium of Rhodes}, Aielouros in his work \textit{About the War against the Exagiades}, Phaeninos in his work \textit{About Lindos}, Gorgosthenes in his letter, Hieroboulos in his letter.\textsuperscript{109}

\textit{Lindian Chronicle, B23-36}

\textsuperscript{108} Pliny \textit{NH} 8.31; Pausanias 2.10.2; 3.22.9; 5.12.3; 8.32.5. See also Aelian 17.28; Palaephatus \textit{Apista} 3; [Plut.] \textit{Fluv.} 9. See Mayor 2011: 58-60, 110, 138-144 for examples of giant bones (fossils) dedicated in sanctuaries.

\textsuperscript{109} Translation by Higbie (2003).
The two shields dedicated by Herakles to Athena Lindia conform to the model of arms of heroes as relics of notable antiquity and rarity. Menelaus’ steering-oar, Helen’s jewelry and Pandaros’ quiver are all relics from the heroic past, which I argued in the first chapter are best construed as wonders, but Higbie does not explore the ideology behind the inclusion of heroic relics in the Lindian Chronicle.110

Because Heracles’ dedications are no longer extant at the time the Lindian Chronicle was compiled, there is no possibility that the compilers were able to examine the dedications for themselves. Rather, the decree suggests that the compilers work “from the letters and public records and from the other evidence” (ἐκ τε τῶν ἔπιστολῶν καὶ τῶν χρηματικῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων μαρτυριῶν, A6-7). Although heavily reconstructed, this line is consistent with the extensive use of bibliographic references the compilers cite as authorities for other the lost dedications. Several entries cite Gorgosthenes and Hieroboulos, both letter-writers and priests of Athena, who may represent examples of ‘temple knowledge’.111 Many of the sources referenced are lost works, and are therefore somewhat difficult to discuss in detail.112 Higbie, however, observes that twenty-one of the twenty-three sources named are authors of histories or antiquarian works.113

Her analysis, however, does not really explore affinities between local histories, antiquarian works, and periegetic or paradoxographic compilations in relation to their use of textual sources. On the contrary, she states:

Following the description of the epiphany or the quotation of any votive inscription on the gifts, the compilers turn to the final part of the entry, the citation of their sources. This is, I suggest, perhaps the most striking element of the stele, as it reveals a ‘document-mindedness’ which has few, if any, parallels this early in the Greek World.114

110 Cf. Mayor 2011: 138-144.
112 E.g. Xenagoras’ About Rhodes, Nikasylos’ Annalistic Account, Hegesias’ Encomium of Rhodes, Aielouros About the War against the Exagiades, Phaennos’ About Lindos.
113 Higbie 2003: 189. Higbie further notes that of these authors, nine are known only from the Chronicle. Eight or nine others are known also from brief testimony or quotations by Plutarch, Diodorus, Pausanias, or Athenaeus. Herodotus is the only one of the sources cited whose work has survived.
114 Higbie 2003: 188.
Though the quantity of different sources cited for Heracles’ shield dedications is certainly extraordinary, the ‘document-mindedness’ that Higbie observes in the Lindian Chronicle is also characteristic of the compilation methodology evident in Antigonus of Carystius’ *Historion Paradoxon Synagoge* and later Aelian’s *De Natura Animalium*, among others. Moreover, both Aulus Gellius and Photius note the references to earlier textual authorities in wonder- compilations.

Although the compilers of the Lindian Chronicle are far more specific and explicit in naming the textual sources that attest to the lost dedications to the goddess and her epiphanies than Pausanias is as a general rule, the sources listed in their compilation provide insight for the variety and number of sources available to Pausanias as inspiration or in preparation for his travels. In addition to the more oblique references to textual sources that are likely compilations like those in charge of the wonders (8.46.5), those who measure the dimensions of the Phidian Zeus at Olympia (5.11.9), or the description of the statue of Demeter Melaina at Phigalia (8.42.11), Pausanias does also name particular authors and texts that illustrate the relationship between travel and textual research in the *Periegesis*.

**MYTH AND WONDERS**

Higbie’s dismissal of ‘curiosities’ from the Lindian Chronicle, despite the evident inclusion heroic relics in the document, exemplifies a larger trend to treat mythological and paradoxographic material as categorically distinct. The final element to address in this reevaluation of the intersections between paradoxography and periegetic literature relates to the status of mythological material. Although Westermann admits that ‘deeds of great men’ are *thaumata*, he suggests that natural wonders reflect more properly the interests of Callimachus as the founder of the genre. He excluded ἱστορικὰ παράδοξα

---

115 Jacob 1983 provides a list of Antigonus’ sources. See Smith 2014: 149-153, with 165 n.49 for additional references.
116 *E.g.* Gell. 9.4.7 on the *auctoritas* of Pliny the Elder; Photius *Biblio*. 188.
118 Rocha-Pereira 1989: Vol. III. 252-259 provides an index of authors named in the *Periegesis*.
119 Westermann 1839: XI: “Haec est enim nostrarum rerum conditio ut, sive naturam species sive facta hominum sive artes atque litteras, ubique accident que prout quique ingenium est magis minusve mirabilia esse videantur.” See also (XII): “Ac primum Callimachus ipse, quantum ex Antigoni excerptis colligi potest,
from his construction of paradoxography as a genre because he considered the subject matter (the deeds of great men and heroes) to be more akin to the periegetic genre.¹²⁰ He considers the compilations that deal with the myth-histories of a particular polis, such as Lysimachus’ παράδοξα Θηβαϊκα, to have little in common with Photius’ definition of paradoxographic themes (189).¹²¹ For Westermann, these texts have more in common with mythological compilations, for which he suggests the appropriateness of μυθικῶν συναγωγή, τὰ κατὰ πόλιν μυθικά, καινὴ ιστορία, διηγήσις, ἀπιστα and other such similar titles.¹²²

The desire to separate wonders related to mythology from natural wonders reflects upon the ambiguous status of the truth-value of myth. Xenophanes’ early critique of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry well illustrates the long history of the ambiguous status of mythological narrative.¹²³ But Schepens notes, “An astonishing item can only be termed θαυμαστόν if it belongs to the real world... the unusual will not produce its proper effect on the reader unless this reader is brought to believe that the phenomenon ... does not merely exist in the imagination of the paradoxographer.”¹²⁴ So if mythoi are construed as pseusmata, the wonders in mythological narratives cannot suit collections of natural wonders. In many authors, however, the distinction between myth and history is not easily discerned, and the credibility of mythological material is ultimately couched in religious ideology.¹²⁵

The preface to Palaephatus’ Apista well illustrates this point and presents a convenient counterpoint to the view expressed in the Periegesis.

---

¹²⁰ Westermann 1839: xiv cites the arguments of Preller 1838: 155 ff. about history and periegetic genres. Preller’s distinction between antiquarian and geographical periegesis has already been presented above.


¹²² Westermann 1839: xiv.

¹²³ Xenophanes fr.11: πάντα θεοί άνέθημαν Ὄμηρος θ’ Ἡσιόδος τε, δόσα παρ’ ἀνθρώποις όνείδες καὶ ψυχὸς ἑστίν, κλέπτειν μοιχεύειν τε καὶ ἄλλοις ἀπατεύειν. Cf. Papers collected in Buxton 1999 for problematization of the supposed development from mythos to logos (myth to reason) from the Archaic to the Classical period.


Τάδε περὶ τῶν ἀπίστων συγγράφα. (...) ἔμοι δὲ δοξεῖ γενέσθαι
pάντα τὰ λεγόμενα (οὓς γὰρ ὄνόματα μόνον ἐγένοντο, λόγος δὲ περὶ
αὐτῶν οὐδεὶς ὑπήρξεν· ἀλλὰ πρῶτον ἐγένετο τὸ ἔργον, εἰθ’ οὕτως
ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ αὐτῶν· διὰ δὲ εἰδῆ καὶ μορφῆς εἰς λεγόμενα καὶ
γενόμενα τότε, αὐν οὕς εἰς, τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐκ ἐγένοντο. εἰ γάρ τί
ποτε καὶ ἄλλοτε ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐν τε γίνεται καὶ αὐθῆς ἐσται. (...)}

I have written this work about unbelievable things...I think that all the
stories happened since names do not appear in isolation without any story
behind them. No, first there was reality, then accordingly the story about
it. Whatever physical shapes and forms are said to have existed in the past
but that do not exist now—such things never existed, for anything that has
ever come into existence at any time both exists now and will exist in the
future. (...) The poets and chroniclers distorted certain events into
something more incredible and so that people would be thrilled. I
recognize that such things cannot happen as they are described, but I have
also grasped this separate fact: if they had not happened at all, they would
not have been turned into stories.126

Palaephatus, Apista pref.

The key element of Palaephatus’ preface is his assertion that the (heroic) distant past was
not qualitatively different from his own present—the natural world is immutable.127 This
is an emphatic negation of the Hesiodic temporal paradigm reflected in the Myth of Ages,
which stipulates that in the past, gods and men interacted more freely and frequently.
This belief is also known as the ‘doctrine of present things’.128 By rationalizing heroic
myth—stripping it of its fantastic elements—Palaephatus becomes “a corrector not a
rejecter of the myths he inherits” with the aim of reinforcing belief in the historicity of
ancient heroes by essentially eliminating the wondrous elements.129

---

126 Translation by Trzaskoma (2004).
128 Hawes 2014: 42-43 states: “The dictum that ‘if anything existed at some past time or other, then it exists
now and will exist in the future’ is strictly a biological axiom which limits the range of living creatures
possible in the past and the future to those which inhabit the present world. Yet it also has a wider
application: it underlines the necessity of critiquing the stories of the past by reference to standards of the
plausibility derived from the empirical experience of present reality. This is the most forceful statement of
Paul Veyne’s ‘doctrine of present things’.”
Stern suggests that the model of Palaephatean rationalism is found only among ancient historians and geographers among whose number he specifically mentions Pausanias. In the main, Veyne’s analysis of myth in the Periegesis suggests that Pausanias only believed the broadest strokes of the majority of the heroic tales and genealogies he collected and transmitted, as the rationalized presentation of Medusa suggests. Just as Palaephatus suggests that the ancient truths of the heroic narrative are corrupted with fantastic adulterations, Pausanias states:

ἐν δὲ τῷ παντὶ αἰῶνι πολλὰ μὲν πάλαι συμβάντα, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἑτι γινόμενα ἁπίστα ἐίναι πεποίηκασιν ἐξ τούς πολλοὺς οἱ τοῖς ἄληθεοι ἑποικοδομούντες ἐφευρομένα.

All through the ages, many events that have occurred in the past, and even some that occur today, have been generally discredited because of the lies built up on a foundation of fact.

Pausanias, Periegesis 8.2.6

Pausanias presents the following example to illustrate his point: it is said that every year at the sacrifice to Lycaon Zeus a worshipper turns into a wolf, but this metamorphosis can be reversed if he abstains from eating human flesh for nine years (8.2.6-7). He further elaborates that petrified Niobe on Mount Sipylus is said to cry tears in the summer, that griffins have leopard spots, Tritons have human voices or fashion horns from bored-out shells. He caps this list of dubious reports with a statement about the corrupting the truth in narrative:


131 Veyne 1983: 72 refers to Pausanias as a “new Palaephatus.” About Medusa, Pausanias writes (2.21.5): ἀπόντος δὲ τοῦ μύθου τάδε ἄλλα ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐστιν εἰρημένα. Jones and Ormerod (1918) translate ἀπόντος δὲ τοῦ μύθου as “I omit the miraculous.” But here the force of mythos appears to suggest ‘traditional’ narrative rather than ‘miraculous narrative,’ because in the subsequent section (2.21.6), Pausanias transmits the Carthaginian Procles’ account of Medusa, which includes “unbelievable beasts” and “wild-men,” and “wild-women” (ἡμία ἀκούσασιν οἱ πιστὰ καὶ ἄνδρες ἐνταῦθα ἁγίοι καὶ ἡγισαί γίνονται γυναίκες). Mythos and cognates are actually rare in the Periegesis (μύθος 1.2.4, 14.6; 2.21.5; 9.5.3; 10.5.6; μυθόδης 10.25.1; μυθολόγημα 8.2.7), despite the prevalence of ‘mythological’ material. For analysis of the narrative taxonomy of mythos in the Periegesis relative to credibility, see Pirenne-Delforge 2004: 48-62.
Those who like to listen to the miraculous are themselves apt to add to the marvel, and so they ruin truth by mixing it with falsehood.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 8.2.7

It may seem obvious on the basis of his examples and subsequent comments that Pausanias is dismissing the metamorphosis of a man into wolf or a woman into stone, or the existence of hybrid creatures like the griffin and the triton. But he has already stated that he found the story of Lycaon’s metamorphosis credible (ἐμέ γε ὁ λόγος οὗτος πείθει) because it has both the virtues of antiquity (ἐκ παλαιοῦ) and plausibility (τὸ εἰκός) in the preceding passage (8.2.4). This suggests that it is the additional details that reflect the corruption of the truth with the admixture of falsehood (τοῖς ἁληθέοις ἑλμήναντο, συγκεραννύντες αὐτὰ ἐψευσμένοις). The metamorphosis of Lycaon is credible, but the importance of diet restrictions is not. The metamorphosis of Niobe is credible, but the seasonality of her tears is not. The existence of griffins is credible, but the specifics of their markings are not. The existence of tritons is credible, but the particularity of their speech is not.

Although Pausanias treats the metamorphoses of Lycaon and Niobe as credible, there are several accounts of metamorphosis in the *Periegesis* that he either does not endorse or outright dismisses. The explanation for the plausibility of the Lycaon metamorphosis and implausibility of other narratives of bestial transformation is couched in terms of the fundamental difference in the relationship between gods and mortals that characterizes

---

132 Cf. 8.2.5 the metamorphosis of Niobe into stone is also credible: οὐτὸς πείθοιτο ἄν τις καὶ Λυκάονα θηρίον καὶ τὴν Ταντάλου Νιόβην γενέσθαι λίθον.

133 Niobe also appears at 1.21.3; 2.21.9-10, 34.4-5; 3.4.1; 5.11.2, 16.4.

134 Cf. 9.20.5: θαύμα δὲ παρέχεται μείζων ἒπεὶ οἱ Τρίτῳν; 9.21.1: εἴδον δὲ καὶ ἄλλον Τρίτωνα ἐν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις θαύμασε, μεγέθει τοῦ παρὰ Ταναγραίοις ἀποδέοντα. See also tritons rendered in iconography 2.1.7-8; 3.18.10. See also Aelian NA. 13.21 for tritons. Aelian cites Demostatus’ λόγοι ἀλευτικοί for the description of the Tanagra triton, which Pausanias claims to have seen first-hand.

135 E.g.1.30.3: ἐγὼ δὲ βασίλευσα μὲν πείθομαι Ἀγαμῆν άνδρα μουσικόν, γενέσθαι δὲ μοι άποστον ὄρνθα ἀπ’ ἀνδρός (“I am ready to believe that a musician became king of the Ligyes, but I cannot believe that a bird grew out of a man”). Cf. 1.41.9; 2.17.4; 6.8.2. See Hawes 2014: 201 on metamorphosis: “In the *Periegesis*, rationalizations cluster noticeably around stories of metamorphosis, a class held up as paradigmatic of mythic impossibility more generally in Greek culture.”
the heroic age and Pausanias’ present: he says that then (τότε) humans were guest-friends (ξένοι) and tablemates (ὁμοτράπεζοι) with the gods on account of their greater piety and justice (ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης καὶ εὐσεβείας). The examples of Aristaios, Britomartis of Crete, Heracles, Amphiarius, Castor and Polydeuces show men could become gods, but only in the heroic past, (θεοὶ τότε ἐγίνοντο ἐξ ἀνθρώπων—8.2.4). Now (ἐπ’ ἐμοῦ δὲ), apotheosis no longer occurs except in the false words of flatterers (οὔτε θεός ἐγίνετο οὐδεὶς ἐτι ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν ὅσον λόγῳ καὶ κολακείᾳ πρὸς τὸ ύπερέχον, 8.2.5).136

This suggests that Pausanias’ rationalization of myth—the removal of fantastic elements—functions primarily on a chronological criterion that reflects the Hesiodic myth of ages (Op.109-201). Wonders related in heroic myth are plausible because they reflect divine agency in the world, and in those days the gods were more active in the world than in his day, openly rewarding the pious and punishing the impious. In his day, they reserve their punishments and rewards for beyond the grave (Paus. 8.2.4).137 The wonders recounted in heroic myth highlight the power of the gods to disrupt the normal course of human lives and the natural world in ways that leave a material imprint in the landscape, rituals or institutions in their wake.138

Westermann’s distinction between wonders related to mythology and natural wonders can be traced back to the Byzantine readers of wonder-compilations. It is clear from Photius’ comments on the New History (περὶ τῆς εἰς πολυμαθίαν καινῆς ἱστορίας) of Ptolemy Hephaestion that he considers heroic narratives fabulous fictions (Biblio. 190). He says Ptolemy’s collection, though useful, “abounds in extraordinary and badly imagined information (πολλὰ καὶ τερατώδη καὶ κακόπλαστα) and more absurdly (τὸ ἀλογώτερον), for certain trivial fables (ἐνίων μυθαρίων), he attempts to explain the reasons (αἰτίας) for their appearance.” Photius’ distain for mythical material is evident in the comparative form τὸ ἀλογώτερον and diminutive form of μυθαρίων. It contrasts

136 8.2.6: λέγουσι γὰρ δὴ ὡς Λυκάνονος ὑστερον ἀεὶ τις ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λύκος γίνοιτο ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ τοῦ Λυκαίου Διός. The temporal distinction in the comparative phrase Λυκάνονος ὑστερον ἀεὶ also emphasizes this point.

137 Compare, however, the fate of Sulla after the sack of Athens, 1.20.7.

Photius’ distinction between natural wonders (which though amazing are still deemed credible) and wonders recounted in heroic myth is even more explicitly stated in his summary of the compilations of Nicholaus of Damascus and Acestorides (Biblio.189). He states that these are transmitted in the same codex as the wonder compilation of Sotion, which he likens in terms of subject matter and style to the compilations of Protagoras and Alexander quoted above. He says that Nicholaus of Damascus’ compilation “contains a collection of strange customs” which agrees in many points with anecdotes collected by Alexander and Conon, who is best known as a mythographer. Photius reports that some of the facts recorded by Nicholaus are believable and corroborated by other authors, but there are also some in “which the unreality is evident.” It is reasonable to speculate that it is the matters that relate to ethical wonders, qua ethnographic material, that Photius deems believable and the mythical material similar to the contents of Conon’s collection of myths that he reads as patent fiction.

Photius’ treatment of Acestorides’ collection of Urban Fables (κατὰ πόλιν μυθικῶν) provides support for this inference. He writes:

Ἐν ταύτῳ δὲ τεύχει συναναγνώσθη ἐν λόγοις δ’ Ἀκεστορίδου τῶν κατὰ πόλιν μυθικῶν. Ἒοιχε μὲν οὖν οὖτος ὁ ἄνὴρ ὑπὸν εὐστοχότερον τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ κεχρήθηκα, ἃ γὰρ ἐτέρου ἢ οἳ γε μετριώτερους μηδὲν ἔπισημηνάμενοι, ἢ ἔνοι καὶ ὡς ἀληθή σπουδαιολογήσαντες ἀνεγράφαντο, ταύτῃ οὖτος οὖν τῷ φιλαλήθει μύθους καλέσας, τήν περὶ αὐτῶν ἰστορίαν ἢ μυθολογίαν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς χαίρει λέγων, συνετάξατο. Πολλά μὲν οὖν ἔστιν ἐν τούτοις εὐφειν, ἄ τε συνειλεκτα Κόνωνι καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τῇ αὐτῷ εἰπε Βιβλιοθήκη καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ἱθροισε καὶ Νικόλαος προσφέωνης καὶ Πρωταγόρας προδιέλαβεν. Ἐστι δ’ Ἀκεστορίδη τούτῳ καὶ πολλά μὲν τῶν ἐκείνων ἀφειμένων ἀναγεγραμμένα, πλὴν καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς, περὶ ὧν οὖτος τε κακεῖνοι διεξέχονται, ἀσύμβατον ἔστιν αὐτῶν θεάσασθαι τὴν ἀφήγησιν Πολλά μὲν οὖν ὁ ἄνηρ καὶ ἰστορίας ἐπιδόξεις μαρτυρούμενα ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ λόγοις ἀναγράφει, ἔστι δ’ ἀ καὶ ταῖς ἐναργείαις τὸ πιστὸν ἐνδεικνύσθαι δεδυνημένα. Καὶ ἔοιχε μάλλον τὸ μυθικόν οὖν ἐπὶ διαβολῇ τῶν συντεταχμένων αὐτῶ ἐπιφήσηθαι ἄλλα τὸ χαῖρεν καὶ ψυχαγωγὸν αὐτῶν ἐνδειξνυμένῳ, πλὴν ἀλλ’ ἐμοιχε χριτῇ εὐγνώμονος ἄν ἀπενέγκοι.


In the same volume, I have also read in four books a work by Acestorides on *Urban Fables*. This author appears to me to have had much more ability than many others in the choice of his title. In fact the histories which others have transmitted, the more moderate among them without comment, the others asserting that these are true, by him in his desire to be accurate are called fables and are assembled as a collection or even a book of legends, as he is happy to call it. Among these stories, one may find many which are in the collection of Conon and which Apollodore has recounted in his Library, which have been collected by Alexander, dedicated to Augustus by Nicolas, and treated earlier by Protagoras. But this Acestorides has included many which the others have omitted; indeed in many of the stories handled by himself and others, one can see that the versions diverge. This author relates in his own writings many facts which are attested in famous accounts. He is one of those who could demonstrate their truth clearly and it seems that he has entitled them as fables not to criticize the character of their composition, but to emphasize their agreeableness and charm. But in my opinion one may recognize his wisdom because, in proposing to join together carefully fables and real facts, he avoids blame by the ambiguity of his title. In styles he resembles likewise the preceding authors.

Photius, *Bibliotheca* 189

Photius’ comments on his reading of Acestorides’ compilation of *mythika* by *polis* demonstrates a distinction between true— but marvelous— facts and *mythoi*, and suggests that it is legendary material in particular that he does not find credible. His comparison of *mythologia* with the contents of Conon’s collection and Apollodorus’ *Bibliotheca* shows that he is using *mythos* in the modern sense of traditional heroic narrative.

This is hardly surprising in light of the fact that Photius reflects a Christian, rather than ‘pagan,’ point of view. But it is equally clear that Photius’ theological bias is reflected in his distinction between natural or ethical wonders on the one hand, and the wonders of heroic myth on the other. But Photius’ categorical denial of the truth of heroic narratives was not shared by the Hellenistic and Roman compilers of paradoxographic material; his testimony of the compilations of Protagoras, Alexander, Nicholas and Acestorides shows that these compilers did not draw a firm distinction between mythical and other *thaumata*. Photius’ scathing remarks about the paradoxographies of the 6th century Neo-
Platonist philosopher Damascius are particularly revealing. Damascius is credited with the titles *On Incredible Events*, *On Incredible Stories of Demons*, *On Incredible Stories of Souls that have appeared after Death*, and *On Incredible Natures* about which Photius claims:

Ἐν οἷς ἀπασιν ἀδύνατα τε καὶ ἀπίθανα καὶ παχόπλαστα τερατολογήματα καὶ μωρὰ καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀξία τῆς ἀθεότητος καὶ δυσσεβείας Δαμασκίου, ὃς καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸν κόσμον πληρώσαντος, αὐτὸς ὑπὸ βαθεῖ σκότῳ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας ἐκάθευδε.

They all contain impossible, incredible, and clumsily invented tales of wonderful things, foolish and worthy of the impious and godless Damascius, who, while the light of the true religion spread over the world, remained steeped in the thick darkness of idolatry.

Photius, *Bibliotheca* 130

It is clear from this entry that Photius considers marvelous anecdotes that are inconsistent with a Christian worldview “impossible” (ἀδύνατά), “incredible” (ἀπίθανα) and “invented tales of wonderful things” (παχόπλαστα τερατολογήματα). It is also clear that in Photius’ estimation, Damascius’ persistence in a ‘pagan’ tradition, which is “steeped in the thick darkness of idolatry” (ὑπὸ βαθεῖ σκότῳ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας), in contrast with Christian faith, “the light of the true religion” (τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς εὐσεβείας), characterizes Damascius as both “impious and godless” (τῆς ἀθεότητος καὶ δυσσεβείας). This is a fundamental rejection of the truth-value of the entire ‘pagan’ mythological and heroic tradition. It has significant implications for the evaluation of the credibility of paradoxographic anecdotes, and subsequently, generic distinctions between accounts of natural wonders (paradoxography) and wonders associated with legendary narratives (mythography).

---


140 Photius *Biblio*. 130 begins with a summary of the contents that plainly identifies *paradoxa* as the subject of Damascius’ compilation: Ἀνεγνώσθη Δαμασκίου λόγοι δ’, ὃν ὁ μὲν πρώτος ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχει περὶ παραδόξων ποιημάτων κεφάλαια τυβ’, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος παραδόξων περὶ δαιμονίων δημιουμάτων κεφάλαια ψ’, ὁ δὲ τρίτος περὶ τῶν μετὰ θάνατον ἐπιφαινομένων ψυχῶν παραδόξων δημιουμάτων κεφάλαια ξ’; ὁ δὲ τέταρτος καὶ παραδόξων φύσεων κεφάλαια ψε’.
In the previous section, I have argued that the categorical denial of the historicity of mythical material is echoed in the modern scholarship on wonder-texts, and so mythography has been treated as separate from paradoxographic material, even though they were often presented together as coherent compilations of divine semata from the Hellenistic period though the Roman era. Westermann is explicit that mythical material is proper to both periegesis and mythography, but excluded from paradoxography proper. Schepens presents a more measured view when he notes that the literary authorities employed by paradoxographers include works by historians, “but also works by natural scientists, engaged in zoological and botanical research, works of geography ethnography, and poetry,” but he further adds “even mythography, being a legitimate part of the ancient’s conception of ‘history’ provided the paradoxographer with some material.” Despite this admission that mythical material is also included in paradoxographic compilations, Schepens downgrades this reliability of this material, noting that: “the information drawn from these works seems to have needed support from other sources, such as archaeological evidence or local tradition.”

The citation of multiple sources for a particular phenomenon is actually fairly common in these compilations, however, so it appears that Schepens is unfairly singling out material from mythography as subject to greater need for corroboration than other wonders.

The example of Pausanias’ catalog of “true oracles”(10.12.1-11) printed above demonstrates his tendency to incorporate thematically linked elements into the progress of the topographically structured narrative pedestrian travel through Roman Greece. Park and McGing suggest “Pausanias simply introduced his [list of Sibyls] as a literary digression, so as to diversify the somewhat monotonous catalogue of the chief monuments of Delphi.” But this catalog also emphasizes the author’s faith in the continued agency of the divine in the world despite his earlier assertion of the difference between the heroic age and his own time (8.2.4-5). The catalog concludes, “These are the women and men who, down to the present day, are said to have been the mouthpiece by which a god prophesied. But time is long, and perhaps similar things may occur again.”

The catalog of “true oracles” demonstrates that wonders can transcend time, revealing the

---

141 Schepens and Delacroix 1996: 388. Schepens cites Antig. Mir. 5 as exemplary.
142 Park and McGing 1988: 36.
agency of the divine from the heroic past to the present day. The following chapter explores the ability of catalogues of wonders to collapse space as well.
Chapter 4: So far...so close

Et si nous suivons Pausanias dans ces paysages hantés, nous pouvons entrer dans des jardins merveilleux, lieux bien singuliers traversés de fleuves voyageurs et fleuris de plantes rares, peuplés de grenouilles, de cigales et de fourmis, d’un bestiaire étonnant qui frappe l’imaginaire et défie l’entendement. Retrouvez, dans la Périégèse la Grèce imaginaire.

Jacob, Paysages hantés et jardins merveilleux, 56

The previous chapters argued that boundaries between travel writing, periegesis and paradoxographic compilation are more porous than previously supposed. Accounts of marvelous objects and phenomena (thaumata) are reported in texts best construed as a continuum between the poles of authentic travelogue on one end of the spectrum and entirely derivative literary compilation at the other. I also argued that the inclusion of thematic catalogues in the topographical thread of the Periegesis Hellados does not suggest derivative methodology, as some critics have suggested; instead it elucidates the relationship between textual research and autopsy. Examples from the Periegesis suggest that reading about marvels can act as a goad to travel and experience the sights or phenomena first hand. Further, textual catalogues of wonders are virtual collections and provide proxy viewing experiences, which, in the case of the Periegesis Hellados, complement the experience of virtual travel provided by the frame narrative.

In this chapter, I will focus on Pausanias’ inclusion of a particular type of catalogue in the Periegesis that permits the expansion of the geographical scope of the text well beyond the boundaries of Roman Greece to the furthest reaches of the oikoumene. This expansion engages with travellers’ discourse about exotic wonders within the context of Pausanias’ description of a radicallycircumscribed area at the centre of the inhabited world. Closer examination of catalogs of exotic wonders in the Periegesis sheds further light on the strategies employed to enhance the credibility of wonders reported in the text, and ultimately to highlight the numinosity of Roman Greece.
**DISRUPTING THE TOPOGRAPHICAL FRAME**

In his essay on walking in the city, De Certeau contrasted the complete compass of the bird’s eye-view obtained from any great vantage with the myopic detail of the street level gaze.\(^1\) He terms these contrasting points of view *synoptic* and *pedestrian* perspectives. The *Periegesis Hellados* presents an unrelentingly pedestrian perspective.\(^2\) The organizing principle of the work is topographical, so that multiple routes that form the composite itinerary around Roman Greece are arranged in a ‘radial plan’ with a central polis in each territory acting as a hub.\(^3\) Akujärvi notes that the ‘radial plan’ creates a *mimesis* of “linear movement, which is indicated with frequent prepositional phrases and adverbs, and intermittent verbal phrases,” that “forms a minimal narrative of travel from place to place and object to object.”\(^4\) She observes elsewhere that the perspective of the *Periegesis* imitates the sequential itinerary characteristic of *periploi*, but adapted to an overland journey.\(^5\)

The *synoptic* perspective is so conspicuously absent from the *Periegesis* that even when he ascends to top of mountains, Pausanias barely, if ever, comments on the view.\(^6\) His brief statements from the summit of Mount Lycaon are the exception that proves the rule (8.38.7).\(^7\) In her work on space and time in Greek narrative, Purves elaborates on the contrast between *cartographic* and *hodological* models for representing space. The visual compass of the *cartographic* model adopts De Certeau’s *synoptic* perspective, while the *hodological* model employs the limited view of the pedestrian perspective. The

---

2. *E.g.* Jost 2007:105 on detail in the *Periegesis*: “The *Periegesis* is therefore an account of the discovery and absorption of the landscape made possible by a journey... most of the time, he combs the region, and archaeologists have often underlined the precision of his description.” *Cf.* Arafat 1996:18-22.
hodological model drives the plot forward in sequential prose through the metaphor of the logos as a road.\textsuperscript{8}

Despite the weakness of plot in the Periegesis Hellados, it conforms to Purves’ hodological spatial model with its presentation of a topographical sequence in which either the narrator (through first person statements) or the reader (largely through participial forms of verbs of motion in the dative case) progress along routes through the landscape.\textsuperscript{9} Pausanias’ itinerary follows the major roads between cities, often marking distances in stadia.\textsuperscript{10} On account of the hodological treatment of space in the Periegesis, it is not surprising that Pausanias gives no overview of the geographical scope of his project.\textsuperscript{11} The closest he comes is in a passage from his description of Attica, in which he chides himself for a particular digression, “But my narrative must not loiter, as my task is a general description of panta ta Hellenika.” Virtually every scholar of the Periegesis has commented on this passage, and Frazer’s translation of the phrase panta ta Hellenica as “all of Greece” exemplifies the geographical connotation in this passage understood by many scholars.\textsuperscript{12}

Elsner’s translation of the expression panta ta Hellenika as “all things Greek” more literally reflects the Greek. He paraphrases his translation as “all that was interesting to a Greek speaker about Greece at the height of the Roman empire.”\textsuperscript{13} But Elsner’s gloss maintains the geographical connotation of Hellas as the scope of Pausanias’ project even

\textsuperscript{8} Purves 2010: 145 on Janni 1984 (non-vidi) “spazio odologico”: “That is, his understanding of space follows a trajectory from A to B, following the traveler’s experience and perspective rather than that of an abstract, overseeing eye. Narratives based on a model of hodological space tend to proceed in one direction (forward) and usually present the space they traverse as a series of places and landmarks en route.”

\textsuperscript{9} Although the Periegesis Hellados presents a sequential topographical narrative, it is often approached as a non-narrative text to be mined for factoids rather than read from beginning to end. This is not surprising since, despite Pausanias’ description as ‘plodding,’ there is no significant plot development to speak of. It is a text without beginning or end as Frazer (1898: I. xxii) states, with “neither head nor tail” in which nothing really happens, unless you count Pausanias’ realization that there is deep wisdom is ancient myths as an anagnorisis. See Akujärvi 2005 and 2012b: 331-2. See also comparison between the Periegesis and ancient novels in Hutton 2009.

\textsuperscript{10} See Pritchett 1999: 23-31 for table of stadia references in the Periegesis.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. Habicht 1985: 4-6; Hutton 2005a: 54-82.

\textsuperscript{12} E.g. Habicht 1985: 5-6. See above in Introduction.

\textsuperscript{13} Elsner 1992: 5.
though his translation highlights culture rather than space. Some scholars read the promise to describe *panta ta Hellenica* as rhetorical hyperbole. Porter suggests reading the expression along the same lines as its Herodotean usage. He says “τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν (Herodotus 8.144.2) designates ‘Greekness’, pure and simple; Pausanias will be describing Greek identity in an exhaustive way.” This poses a problem, as Hutton also notes, because this interpretation of πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά is so expansive that it should include many things that are outside the geographical scope of the *Periegesis Hellados*.

In order to understand the scope of the *Perigesis* it is important to note the structural hierarchy of the text. As noted in previous chapters, the basic structure of the *Periegesis Hellados* is expressed in the summarizing coda to Pausanias’ treatment of Attica. He states “Such in my opinion are the most famous legends (logoi) and sights (theorematata) among the Athenians, and from the beginning my narrative (logos) has picked out of much material the things that deserve to be recorded” (1.39.3). Although it is often stated that the *Perigesis* is composed of descriptions of monuments (theorematata) and digressions (logoi), Akujärvi has argued that this dichotomy elides the importance of the frame narrative for the structure of the work. In fact the theorematata and the logoi are embedded components of the frame narrative, the logos, or elsewhere syngraphe, which itself presents the narrative of Ego’s research and travel around and between sites. The spatial scope of the frame narrative maps closely, if imperfectly, on the political boundaries of Roman Greece (Achaea).

---

15 E.g. Akujärvi 2012b: 349 asserts: “the statement that ‘all things Greek’ (1.26.4) will be treated can hardly be taken otherwise than as a transition-cum-hyperbolic assertion making it clear that Athens is not the limit of the work.”
16 Porter 2001: 69. That Herodotus was an important model for Pausanias in the composition of the *Periegesis* has been clearly shown. See e.g. Bowie 2001: 25-7; Musti 1996: 11-2, 21, 35-39, 42-43.
17 The issue of the geographic scope of the *Periegesis* will be discussed below.
19 Meyer 1967: 19-20. See also Pretzler 2007a: 7 for Homeric geography and a comprehensive map of overlaid models. Arafat 1996: 2 states: “It is the territory of the Roman province of Achaia, or rather a part of that province, that he guides us through.” Pausanias twice explicitly glosses *Hellas* as the province of Achaia (5.15.2; 7.16.10), though strictly speaking Opuntian Locris, Aitolia and Euboea are absent. There is external evidence for a lost eleventh book with the entry for Tamyna in Euboea in Stephanus of Byzantium’s *Ethnica*. See Diller 1955: 274-275 for discussion and Habicht 1985: 6 n.32 for additional bibliography.
If Pausanias’s route is in fact confined to a rough circuit of the province of Achaea, how exactly do exotic wonders find their way into the text? Despite his commitment to the spatial organization of sights in the text, rather than progress faithfully along his routes Pausanias as author/narrator has a well-known tendency to digress. As Akujärvi succinctly puts it, “Any site, object, ritual or narrative can trigger comments or narratives about similar events, phenomena and practices in a wholly different setting.”

For instance, Pausanias describes a stone near the hearth of the promdomeis in Megara, on which the locals say Apollo laid his lyre while helping Alcathous build a wall. He reports that this stone gives off the sound of plucked lyre string when struck with a pebble. This curious effect is then compared to a similar auditory marvel from well outside of bounds of the frame-narrative as Pausanias continues,

This made me marvel, but the colossus in Egypt made me marvel far more than anything else. In Egyptian Thebes, on crossing the Nile to the so-called Pipes, I saw a statue, still sitting, which gave out a sound. The many call it Memnon, (...) and every day at the rising of the sun it makes a noise, and the sound one could best liken to that of a harp or lyre when a string has been broken.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 1.41.3

In this passage, the reader (in the phenomenological position of a traveller) steps far beyond the bounds of the Megarid to all the way to Egyptian Thebes and back. Since the dominant perspective of the *Periegesis* is pedestrian and the treatment of space is *hodological*, the thematic connection between twanging rocks can best be described as a giant leap, a kind of *hyperbaton*.

In *On the Sublime*, the author known as Pseudo-Longinus says that our thoughts tend to travel (ekbainousi) beyond the bounds (horous) of our immediate surroundings through

---

20 Akujärvi 2012a: 239.
the contemplation of marvels (35.3), and this provides a conceptual parallel for Pausanias’ narrative technique. It is worth noting the relationship between the stone in the Megarid and the colossus in Egypt is not only the sounds they produce, but that both are specified as marvels, *thaumata*. He says the stone made him marvel (*θαυμάσαι*), but the colossus even more (*πολλῷ μᾶλιστα*).\(^{21}\)

The previous chapter focused on thematic catalogues as one species of digression in the *Periegesis*, which Akujärvi describes as “the occasional enumeration of objects according to category rather than topographical proximity.”\(^{22}\) Although she notes elsewhere that “shifting scenic standpoint is mainly used in descriptions,” this chapter will argue these narrative *hyperbata*, which shift the scenic standpoint, are also characteristic of wonder-catalogues in the *Periegesis*.\(^{23}\) Catalogs of exotic marvels expand the geographical scope of the *Periegesis* from the confines of Roman Greece to the limits of the inhabited world.

**EXOTIC WONDERS IN THE PERIEGESIS HELLADOS**

It has been argued that travellers’ discourse in Pausanias’s *Periegesis Hellados* conforms to a geographical model that locates wonders on the margins of the *oikoumene* and Greece at the centre.\(^{24}\) In his description of Delphi Pausanias reports, “What is called the Omphalus by the Delphians is made of white marble, and is said by the Delphians to be the center of all the earth.”\(^{25}\) Although he does not explicitly endorse their view, there is nothing in the *Periegesis* to suggest that he disagrees. Greece is literally at the centre of the inhabited world. Environmental theories of health, best exemplified in the Hippocratic treatise *On Airs, Waters, Places*, dictate that Greece should produce moderate people, flora and fauna on the basis of its central position in the *oikoumene*, while monsters, beasts, and other wonders populate the territories on the margins, such as
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\(^{21}\) *Cf.* Str. 17.1.46. See also Bowerstock 1984 for collected ancient testimonia of the auditory marvel. See Bernard and Bernard 1960 for a collection of the inscriptions carved on the statue by tourists.

\(^{22}\) Akujärvi 2012b: 342. See Robert 1909: 76-89 for references to categorical organization in the *Periegesis*.

\(^{23}\) Akujärvi 2012a: 241. For an example of a shifting scenic standpoint in a descriptive passage, see 1.24.5-6: the ekphrasis of the helmet of the Athena Parthenos segues into Aristeas’ account of the Arimaspi and Issedones in connection with the griffins.

\(^{24}\) E.g. Jacob 1980.

\(^{25}\) 10.16.3. *Cf.* Pind. Pyth. 4.74. See also Amandry 1992: 179-205 for discussion of where the *omphalos* was housed in the sanctuary.
Ethiopia, Arabia, India and the land of the Celts. As Herodotus states: “The most outlying nations of the world have somehow drawn the finest things as their lot, exactly as Greece has drawn the possession of far the best seasons.” The discourse of wonder as a phenomenon of the margins is familiar from Herodotus’s Histories and Ctesias’ Indika, in which encounters with the Other, such as foreign customs or exotic plants and animals, are recorded as thaumata. These wonders vividly recall the travellers’ discourse pilloried by Lucian in the preface to the True Stories.

In his study of Pausanias’ attitude toward non-Greeks, Arafat notes “exceptional peoples were products of exceptional lands—so, too, were exceptional beasts.” There are several passages in the Periegesis that support this centre-margin dichotomy. Pausanias says that the land of the Celts is in “the most remote portion of Europe, near a great sea that is not navigable to its extremities, and possesses ebb and flow and creatures quite unlike those of other seas.” We can compare this with his statements on giants and monstrous beasts in India. In an anecdote about the discovery of an overlarge 11-cubit coffin in the bed of the Orontes River with a proportionally oversized humanoid occupant, Pausanias says,

This corpse, the god in Clarus, when the Syrians came to his oracle there, declared to be Orontes, and that he was of Indian race. If it was by warming the earth of old when it was still wet and saturated with moisture that the sun made the first men, what other land is likely to have raised men either before India or of greater size, seeing that even to-day it still breeds beasts monstrous in their weird appearance and monstrous in size?

---

28 See Chapter 2.
30 1.4.1: οί δὲ Γαλάται οὕτως νέμονται τῆς Εὐρώπης τὰ ἐσχατά ἐπὶ θαλάσση πολλῇ καὶ ἐς τὰ πέρατα οὗ πλοιόμφο, παρέχεται δὲ ἄμπωτιν καὶ ἵαχιν καὶ θηρία οὐδὲν ἐοικότα τοῖς ἐκ θαλάσση τῇ λοιπῇ...
Pausanias, *Periegesis* 8.29.4

To these examples, we may add the land of the Iberians and Celts beside the Ocean (1.33.4), and the peculiar size of corpses of Cabarenses and Egyptians (1.35.5). But Pausanias’ report of the Island of the Satyrs beyond the Pillars of Heracles is particularly informative. He writes:

> ἔφη δὲ Εὐφημὸς Κάρι ἀνήρ πλέων ἐς Ἠταλίαν ἁμαρτείν ὑπὸ ἄνέμων τοῦ πλοῦ καὶ ἐς τὴν ἕξω θάλασσαν, ἐς Ἦν οὐνετί πλέουσιν, ἐξενεχθῆναι. νῆσοὺς δὲ εἶναι μὲν ἐλεγεν ἐρήμους πολλάς, ἐν δὲ ἄλλαις οἰκεῖν ἄνδρας ἄγριους ταύτας δὲ οὐκ ἐθέλειν νῆσος προσίχθηναι τοὺς ναῦτας ὅπα πρῶτον τε προσηχόντας καὶ τῶν ἐνοικοῦντων οὐκ ἀπείρως ἔχοντας, βιασθῆναι δ’ ὄν καὶ τότε. ταύτα καλείσθαι μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ναυτῶν Σατυρίδας, εἶναι δὲ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας καὶ καπνοῦς καὶ ἵππων οὐ πολὺ μείους ἔχειν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱσχίοις οὐράς, τούτους, ὡς ἤσθοντο, ναταδραμόντας ἐπὶ τὴν ναῦν φωνὴν μὲν οὐδεμίαν ἓναν, ταῖς δὲ γυναιξιν ἐπιχειρεῖν ταῖς ἐν τῇ νησίτελος δὲ δείσαντας τοὺς ναύτας βάρβαρον γυναῖκα ἐβάλειν ἐς τὴν νήσον· ἐς ταύτην οὖν ὑβρίζειν τοὺς Σατυρίδας οὕτως ἀνόητον ἐνασπισθηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁμοίως σῶμα.

Euphemus the Carian said that on a voyage to Italy he was driven out of his course by winds and was carried into the outer sea, beyond the course of seamen. He affirmed that there were many uninhabited islands, while in others lived wild men. The sailors did not wish to put in at the latter, because, having put in before, they had some experience of the inhabitants, but on this occasion they had no choice in the matter. The islands were called Satyrides by the sailors, and the inhabitants were red haired, and had upon their flanks tails not much smaller than those of horses. As soon as they caught sight of their visitors, they ran down to the ship with out uttering a cry and assaulted the women in the ship. At last the sailors in fear cast a foreign woman on to the island. Her, the Satyrs outraged not only in the usual way, but also in a most shocking manner.  

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 1.23.6

In this passage, Pausanias relates what is essentially an exotic travel tale attributed to Euphemus the Carian. The islands on which the sailors come ashore are explicitly far off “in the outer sea, beyond the course of seamen” (ἐς τὴν ἕξω θάλασσαν, ἐς Ἦν

31 This is the translation by Jones (1918). A more literal rendering of ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁμοίως σῶμα would be “but even her whole body in the same fashion.”

32 Euphemus is otherwise unknown.
oùxeti plēoun).33 Pausanias notes that some of the islands are uninhabited (νῆσους δὲ εἴναι μὲν ἐλεγεν ἐφήμους πολλάς), which accords with Herodotus’ characterization of the eschatiai of the Earth as empty.34 But the other islands are inhabited by “wild men” (οἰκεῖοι ἄνδρας ἄγριος), an expression that echoes Homer’s presentation of the Cyclops Polyphemus in the Odyssey (9.214-15).35 These “wild men” have aberrant anatomy with red hair and tails, and equally aberrant customs (nomoi) exemplified by their unbridled sexual assault, first attempted on the shipboard women (ταῖς δὲ γυναιξίν ἐπιχειρεῖν ταῖς ἐν τῇ νηί), but then realised on the unfortunate barbarian woman (βάρβαρον γυναίκα), who was cast off the ship (ἐς ταύτην οὖν ὑβρίζειν τοῦς Σατύρους οὐ μόνον ἡ καθέστησεν, ἄλλα καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁμοίως σῶμα). In the each of the passages mentioned above, the geographic locale on the margins of the oikoumene is emphasized along with the peculiarity of the fauna and people who live there. Each is also an example of a hyperbatic logos appended to landmark anchored in the frame narrative so that it disrupts the topographic flow of the text and takes the reader to a far off-place. For instance, the description of the Island of Satyrs is triggered by the mention of a small rock on the Athenian Acropolis, on which Silenus is supposed to have sat when Dionysus visited (ἔστι δὲ λίθος οὗ μέγας, ἄλλ᾿ ὀς ναιθείσχθημα μικρὸν ἄνδρα, 1.23.5). The link between the theorema of the stone in Attica and Euphemus’ travel narrative is analogic; they share a common theme, specifically satyrs. Pausanias remarks on his fascination with the subject of satyrs and desire to learn as much about them as possible (περὶ δὲ Σατύρων, οἵτινες εἰσιν, ἐτέρου πλέν ἐθέλων ἐπισταθηκέναι πολλοῖς αὐτῶν τούτων ἐνεχα ἐς λόγοις ἡλθον, 1.23.5). This associates the digression on Satyrs with the cataloguing impetus explored in Chapter 3.

Pausanias’ uses hyperbatic logos as an analogical technique to incorporate exotic marvels into the narrower geographical scope of his topographical frame narrative. While the

---

34 Hdt. 3.98; 4.17, 185; 5.9. See Romm 1992: 35-36.
geographical scope of the frame narrative is restricted to Roman Greece, the embedded logos expand the range of the *Periegesis* to the furthest reaches of the *oikoumene*.

Although the examples of foreign marvels in the *Periegesis* I have just presented are all from the margins of the inhabited world, I will argue that Pausanias resists a strict center/margin dichotomy in the discourse of wonder.

**Wonder and Particular Places**

In a passage that underlines the correlation between place and inhabitants, Pausanias suggests that *thaumata* may have more to do with the uniqueness of a place than its distance from Delphi. He says:

δοκῶ δὲ, εἰ καὶ Λιβύης τις ἢ τῆς Ἰνδόν ἢ Αράβων γῆς ἐπέρχοιτο τὰ ἐσχατὰ ἑθέλων θηρία ὑπόσα παρ᾽ Ἕλληνι ἐξευρεῖν, τὰ μὲν οὐδὲ ἀρχήν αὐτὸν εὑρήσειν, τὰ δὲ οὐ κατὰ ταύτα ἔχειν φανεῖσθαι οἰ-οί-οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἄνθρωπος μόνον ὡμός ποὺ ἄρει καὶ τῇ γῇ διαφόροις οὐσι διάφορον κτάται καὶ τὸ εἴδος, ἄλλα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἄν πάσχοι τοῦτο ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἄν πάσχοι τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ θηρία αἰ ἀσπίδες τοῦτο μὲν ἔχουσιν αἱ Λίβυσσος παρὰ τὰς Αἰγυπτίας τὴν χρόαν, τοῦτο δὲ ἐν Αἰθιοπίᾳ μελαίνας τὰς ἀσπίδας οὐ μείον ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρωπους ἢ γῆ τρέφει.

And I think that if one were to traverse the most remote parts of Libya, India or Arabia, in search of such beasts as are found in Greece, some he would not discover at all, and others would have a different appearance. For man is not the only creature that has a different appearance in different climates and in different countries; the others too obey the same rule. For instance, the Libyan asps have a different colors compared with the Egyptian, while in Ethiopia are bred asps quite as black as the men.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 9.21.5-6

Pausanias demonstrates that geographic specificity is not merely a function of marginality; there is regional variation between asps of Libya and Egypt. He states that only Lybia alone (Διβύη μὲν γε μόνη) breeds huge “land-crocodiles” (κροκοδείλους τρέφει χερσαίους διπήχεων οὐκ ἐλάσσονας), while parrots (οἱ ψιττακοί) come only from India (2.28). But Pausanias indicates that this regional variation exists also at the center of the *oikoumene*. His comments on the parrots and “land-crocodiles” are prefaced

---

36 See Arafat 1999: 246-247. Cf. 4.34.1-3 for discussion of differences between Greek rivers and the Nile and Indus on the basis of the man-eating beasts.
with the assertion that the blond snakes that are sacred to Asclepius and tame with men live in Epidaurus, and Epidaurus alone.\textsuperscript{37} The connection between geographical specificity and wonder at the centre of the \textit{oikoumene} appears frequently in the \textit{Periegesis}. Pausanias says: “One would marvel at the fine flax in the land of Elis, because it only grows here, and nowhere else in Greece, and because only over the border, and not within it, can the mares be impregnated by asses.”\textsuperscript{38} To these examples from Elis, we may add the absence of swallows from Phocis (10.4.9), or that birds of prey stay away from the altar at Olympia (5.14.1), or the sweetness of cultivars on Helicon (9.28.1-4), which are all explicitly labeled as wonders.

Despite the numerous local wonders described in the \textit{Periegesis}, Pausanias notes a bias toward exotic wonders in earlier sources. He says:

\textquote[\textit{Periegesis} 9.36.5]{\textquote[The Greeks appear apt to regard with greater wonder foreign sights than sights at home. For whereas distinguished historians have described the Egyptian pyramids with the minutest detail, they have not made even the briefest mention of the treasury of Minyas and the walls of Tiryns, though these are no less marvelous. Pausanias, \textit{Periegesis} 9.36.5]}

Since Pausanias’ usage and comments both insist that wonders can be local phenomena, why are exotic marvels introduced into \textit{Periegesis Hellados} at all? What purpose do they serve?

\textsuperscript{37} 2.28.1: δράκοντες δὲ—οἱ λυπητοὶ καὶ ἑτερον γένος—ές τὸ ξανθότερον ἱεροὶ μὲν τοῦ Ασκληπιοῦ νομίζονται καὶ εἰσὶν ἀνθρώποις ἠμεροὶ, τρέφει δὲ μόνη σφαίρα ἤ τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων γῆ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ εὐφράσῳ καὶ ἄλλας χώρας συμβεβήκασι.\textsuperscript{38} 5.5.2: θαυμάσαι δ’ ἂν τις ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τῇ βίβασον, ὅτι ἐν τῇ ὑπερορίᾳ καὶ σὺν ἑντός τῆς χώρας αἰ ὑπὸ οὐράνιον ἐκύκλωσον εἰς τῶν ὄνων. Cf. Hdt. 4.30, where Herodotus marvels (θωμάζω) at the infertility of mules in Elis, which attributes to an ancient curse (ἐκ κατάρας). Plutarch also refers to a curse related to the covering of mares in Elis (\textit{Quaes. Gr.} 52), though the transmitted text is thought to be corrupt.
In his article on natural wonders in the *Periegesis*, Jacob interpreted the ‘digressions,’ what I have been calling *hyperbatic logoi*, as exegetical ‘analogies.’ He contends that they serve two purposes: 1) to better explicate the local *theorema* to which they are attached, and 2) to enhance the pleasure of the reader by adding the spice of exotic marvels. The latter purpose echoes Frazer’s inference that “Pausanias has introduced digressions on the wonders of nature and of foreign lands” in order “to relieve the tedium of the topographical part of his work.” In the following section, I argue that quite beyond the aesthetic function of adorning the text, the exotic *logoi* have an important role to play in establishing credibility for analogous phenomena.

**COMPOUNDING WONDERS: CATALOGUES AND CREDIBILITY**

As we have seen, Lucian draws a firm corollary between accounts of foreign travels and telling lies in the preface to the *True Stories.* The inclusion of wonders is at the heart of his characterization of these narratives as *pseusmata*. He defines the falsification inherent in these marvelous narratives as a sort of poetic license (μυθολογεῖν ἔλευθερία, *VH* 1.4). Homer’s Odysseus is placed at the head of this lying tradition as (διδάσκαλος τῆς τοιαύτης βωμολοχίας) because of the account of his wanderings at the court of the Phaeacians (1.3). Odysseus’ narrative of his wanderings, in Books 9-12 of the *Odyssey*, fulfills his characterization in poem’s proem as a man who saw (*iden*) many cities of men and suffered (*pathen*) many pains on the sea. Moreover, Odysseus’ travel account is given in response to the request of King Alcinoüs to tell the assembly about where he has been, whom his has met and what are the ways of these peoples. In contrast to Odysseus’ long suffering and experience, the inexperience of Lucian’s narrator persona is apparent in his declaration that he has not had any experiences worth reporting (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐπεπόνθειν ἄξιόλογον, *VH* 1.4).

---

39 Jacob 1981: 39 states: “lorsqu’il est confronté à quelque phénomène particulier, à une singularité archéologique, culturelle ou naturelle, Pausanias a recours à une ‘description analogique’: pour mieux rendre compte de ce qu’il voit, il décrit ce qu’on peut voir ailleurs.”

40 Frazer 1898: I. XLI, also quoted in Arafat 1999: 239.

41 See Chapter 2.

42 *Od*. 1. 3-4: πολλῶν δ’ ἀνθρώπων ἤδεν ἄστεᾳ καὶ νόον ἔγνω, /πολλὰ δ’ ὁ γ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὁν κατὰ θυμόν.

Where Lucian derides the Phaeacians’ gullibility in accepting Odysseus’ tall tales at face value, Pausanias comments more favorably on the correlation between personal experience and open-mindedness. He reports the wise words of Cleon of Magnesia on the Hermus, who said “those men are incredulous of wonders who in the course of their own lives had not met yet greater marvels” ( ἐφασεν ές τα παράδοξα ἁγίους εἶναι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς ἄν μὴ παρά τον αὐτόν γένηται βίον θεάμασαν ἐπιποίησιν λόγου μείζονον, 10.4.6). It is no surprise then, that Lucian’s narrator, who has not seen or done anything worth mentioning, would in turn not find anything out of the ordinary credible. But beneath Cleon’s comment is the suggestion that bearing witness to one wonder makes yet other wonders more believable. This idea has an important intersection with a passage from Aristotle’s Poetics that also treats wonder and credibility, and provides further insight into the use of wonder catalogues in the Periegesis.

Aristotle, like Lucian, puts Homer at the head of a tradition of ‘poetic license’, or more literally ‘telling falsehoods as one should’ (ψευδή λέγειν ώς δει, 1460a). Unlike Lucian, however, he praises this innovation rather than finding fault with it. Aristotle defines the marvelous, τὸ θαυμαστὸν, as the irrational and nonsensical (τὸ ἄλογον and τὸ ἄτοπον). But he also insists it is sweet (ἡδον) and appropriate to both tragic and epic verse. But by way of proof of the headiness of the marvelous (σημεῖον), he does not give an example from either poetic genre. Instead he cites the sort of natural embellishment that accompanies good story telling and pleases its audience (πάντες γὰρ προστιθέντες ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ώς χαριζόμενοι). The key to lying as one ought (ψευδή λέγειν ώς δει), so Aristotle says, is the use of logical fallacy (παραλογισμός). Through logical fallacy the truth-value of one story-element is falsely established by its association with another true element. Although Aristotle draws his paradigmatic example of a logical fallacy from the Odyssey, it is not in fact taken from the fabulous narrative delivered at

44 Aristotle Poetics 1460a: δει μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ποιεῖν τὸ θαυμαστὸν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐνδέχεται ἐν τῇ ἐποποίᾳ τὸ ἄλογον, δι’ ὅν συμβαίνει μάλιστα τὸ θαυμαστὸν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὄραν εἰς τὸν παράτονα(...) τὸ δὲ θαυμαστὸν ἥδι: σημεῖον δὲ, πάντες γὰρ προστιθέντες ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ώς χαριζόμενοι, δεδιδαχὲν δὲ μάλιστα ὶμηρος καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ψευδή λέγειν ώς δει. ἐστὶ δὲ τούτῳ παραλογισμός. ἐστὶ δὲ τούτῳ παραλογισμός. οὕστιν γὰρ οἱ ἀνθρώποι, ἐπὶ λογικό τὸν ὄντος τοδὲ ἢ ἢ γινομένου γινέται, εἰ τὸ ύστερον ἐστιν, καὶ τὸ πρότερον εἰναι ἢ γίνεσθαι: τούτῳ δὲ ἐστὶ ψευδὸς. διὸ δὲ, ἢ τὸ πρῶτον ψευδὸς, ἂλλο δὲ τούτου ὄντος ἁπάντως εἶναι ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ, προσθείναι· διὰ γὰρ τὸ τούτῳ εἰδέναι ἀληθές ἢ παραλογίζεται ἡμῶν ἢ ψευδῆ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ὡς ὄν. παραδείγμα τοῦ τούτου τὸ ἐκ τῶν Νίπτρων. προσφείνουσα τε δεί ἄνδυνα εἰκότα μᾶλλον ἢ δυνατά ἀπόθανα·
the court of Alcinoüs that Lucian derides. He specifies rather the ‘Washing’ (τὸ ἐκ τῶν Νίπτρων), which refers to the whole of the recognition episode in Book 19 of the *Odyssey*.

Aristotle’s choice of the ‘Washing’ as the paradigmatic example of *paralogismos* surely centres on yet another of Odysseus’ travel tales. In his third Cretan tale, Odysseus, disguised as a beggar, tells Penelope that he is Aithon, son of the Cretan Idomeneus, who entertained Odysseus and his men on their way to Troy (*Od.* 19.164-247). He gives credence to his false autobiography by including accurate and correct details about his cloak, elaborately wrought golden brooch, and the identity his companion Eurybates. Penelope accepts this lying tale on the basis of these proofs in a kind of truth metonymy; the veracity of particular details vouches for the truth-value of the whole narrative.

The poet of the *Odyssey* is clear, however, that Aithon’s biography is false despite its credibility; it is one of Odysseus’ plausible Cretan lies—lies that resemble the truth (ψεύδεα ... ὑμῖν ἐτύμωσιν, 19.203). It is the ability to add a little spice without sacrificing credibility that Aristotle appreciates and recommends to the dramatic poet when he advises crafting plausible falsehoods rather than unbelievable truths (ἀδύνατα εἰκότα rather than δύνατὰ ἀπίθανα, 1460a). Aristotle’s analysis in the *Poetics* is intended for the composition of tragic drama, but nevertheless his exegesis of truth and fiction in narrative through fallacy as a literary technique is valuable for approaching travel narrative. After all, Aristotle’s point is that *to thaumaston* is pleasurable and Lucian insists that the *True Stories* will be a pleasurable read even though it is fiction precisely because it will present all kinds of lies in a believable way (ψεύσματα ποικίλα πιθανῶς τε καὶ ἐναλήθως ἐξενινόχαμεν, VH. 1.2).

---

46 *Od.* 19. 215-219. Penelope solicits details about Odysseus’ clothes (ἐἵματα), demeanor (οἶος ἔστι) and companions (ἕταμορος οἴοι ἔποντο) as a means of testing the stranger’s word (ὁδὸν πειρήσεσθαι). Her response to his account (19.249-250) reveals the persuasive success of the details as tokens of truth: τῇ δ’ ἐπὶ μάλλον ἐνὶ ἔρειν ὥσπερ γόνοι/σήμετ’ ἀνεγνωσθὲν, τὰ οἴ ἐμπεδα πέφραδ’ Ὄδυσσεύς.  
Pausanias’ complaint about those who “ruin the truth by mixing it with falsehood” (τοῖς ἁληθεύσιν ἐλυμήναντο, συγκεραννύντες αὐτὰ ἐψευσμένοις, 8.2.7), explored in the Chaper 3, demonstrates his awareness of paralogismos as a technique for embellishing narrative. But it is equally clear that he does not condone the spurious exploitation of the cognitive bias that allows Aristotle’s logical fallacy to work. In his description of Boeotia, Pausanias provides an example of paralogismos deployed in earnest rather than to deceive. He makes the following remarks about the grave of the children of Oedipus and the rituals performed there.

Adjoining are the tombs of the children of Oedipus. The ritual observed at them I have never seen, but I regard it as credible. For the Thebans say that among those called heroes to whom they offer sacrifice are the children of Oedipus. As the sacrifice is being offered, the flame, so they say, and the smoke from it divide themselves into two. I was led to believe their story by the fact that I have seen a similar wonder. It was this. In Mysia beyond the Caicus is a town called Pioniae, the founder of which according to the inhabitants was Pionis, one of the descendants of Heracles. When they are going to sacrifice to him as to a hero, smoke of itself rises up out of the grave. This occurrence, then, I have seen happening.

Pausanias, Periegesis 9.18.3-4

In this case, Pausanias explains that he finds the phenomenon of the smoke from the ritual flame dividing itself in two credible even though he has never seen it happen himself. He does not vouch for this phenomenon on the basis of another’s authority or
what is likely or common (eikos), or even through a rational explanation of the process, but rather on the basis of a similar phenomenon he has witnessed elsewhere.  

Pausanias’ report of the rituals and phenomena at the tomb of Oedipus’ sons exemplifies the logic that underlies Cleon of Magnesia’s statement quoted above: seeing marvels makes yet other marvels appear more credible (10.4.6). In pairing one marvel with another, particularly ones authenticated on the basis of autopsy or inquiry, the former becomes more credible. Pausanias makes this explicit in further remarks about assessing the reliability of accounts of rare or unusual phenomena. He warns:

{oùtω χοῆ πάντα τινά μήντε ἐπίδρομον τήν γνώμην μήτε ἀπότως ἔχειν ἐς τά σπανώστερα, ἐπεὶ τοῖς καὶ ἐγώ σπερωτοὺς ὄφεις οὐ θεωσάμενος πείθομαι, διότι ἀνή Φοβε ἠγαγέν ἐς Ιωνίαν σκορπίον τάς ἁχρίόν ομοιότατα σπερά ἔχοντα.}  

So everyone should be neither over-hasty in one’s judgments, nor incredulous when considering rarities. For instance, though I have never seen winged snakes I believe that they exist, because a Phrygian brought to Ionia a scorpion with wings exactly like those of locusts.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 9.21.6

---

48 See Jost 2007: 112 on “sights to see” in nature: “If the ‘sights’ collected by the Periegetes vary in their degree of interest, his method on the other hand seems very modern: he preceeds by citing ‘parallels’ which should support the truth of the reported *mirabilia* (8.17.4).”  
49 Spiro (1903) and Rocha-Pereira (1981) print οὖ θεωσάμενος πείθομαι: <πείθομαι> δὲ ὅτι in the Teubner editions. The second πείθωμαι is credited in the apparatus as Schubart’s (1838) supplement. Schubart notes in the preface to his edition that “πείθωμαι bis ponendum, et cum omnibus codicibus δέ ὅτι scribendum est” (XVIII). In his text, however, he prints πείθωμαι: διότι, and so he emends the manuscript reading δέ ὅτι to διότι. Hitzig (1907) also prints οὖ θεωσάμενος πείθομαι: <πείθομαι> δέ ὅτι, and in his apparatus notes “πείθωμαι δὲ ὅτι codd., πείθωμαι, διότι edd., πείθωμαι: <πείθομαι> δέ ὅτι coni. Sch(ubart), rec. Sp(iro).” The supplement of the second πείθωμαι seems unnecessary, and Jones and Ormerod’s translation (“as I believe that a Phrygian brought to Ionia a scorpion”) reflects an additional layer of hearsay to the account that destroys the sense. The conceptual parallel of the credibility of smoke at the grave of son of Oedipus (9.18.3), which relies on Pausanias’ eyewitness of a similar phenomenon (οὐ θεωσάμενος πιστά ὄμως... ἐμὲ δὲ ἐπηγάγοντο ὃν λέγουσιν ἐς πιστὴν ἱδόντα ὄλλο τοιοῦτο), coincides with Schubart’s emended reading “πείθωμαι, διότι”. Papachatzes 1981:140 translates the passage into modern Greek; he maintains the second πείθωμαι, but renders it as emphatic (πιστεύω..., καὶ τὸ πιστεύω, γιατί...). The emendation of δὲ ὅτι to διότι does not seem significant in relation to the sense of the passage, since both ὅτι and διότι can introduce causal clauses (Smyth 1369), and δὲ can denote a causal rather than adversative connection (*LSJ* sv. δὲ II.3), but the manuscript reading is not grammatically sound. Further, the conjunction διότι is frequently attested in the *Periegesis* (e.g. 1.35.7; 2.16.4, 21.3, 23.8; 3.18.2). I print Schubart’s emended text without the conjectural supplement against the authority of the manuscripts.
In this case, he warns against snap judgments (μήτε ἐπίθυμον τὴν γνώμην) or flat out denials (μήτε ὀπίστως ἔχειν) in relation to rare phenomena (τὰ οπανιώτερα). As with the grave-side ritual in Boeotia, which he found credible though he had not witnessed it himself (δρόμεναι οὐ θεασάμενος πιστὰ ὁμοιούμενος πείθομαι). He believes in the existence of winged snakes though he has never seen one (ἐγὼ πετρωτοὺς ὀφεῖς οὐ θεασάμενος πείθομαι). The basis of this belief is his experience of an analogous creature, a winged scorpion, which itself is analogous to the locust (σκορπίων ταῖς ἀκρίσιν ὁμοιότατα πτερὰ ἔχοντα). Pausanias’ experience with locusts is the foundation on which to comprehend the more rare (but analogous) winged scorpion, and between the two, suggest the possibility that winged snakes are real.\(^{50}\)

In the hyperbatic logoi I have presented so far, I have strategically focused on examples where the local theorema was associated with a single exotic phenomenon in order to demonstrate the logic of the analogy. Pausanias is not always so reticent. In fact at several loci throughout the Periegesis the description of a sight or phenomenon will trigger a whole catalog of comparable phenomena. Among these are the catalogs of wonderful tombs (8.16.3-5), marvelous waters (4.35.8-11), exotic beasts collected in Rome (9.21.1-5), and so on.\(^{51}\) Pausanias also comments on the usual fowl of Mount Cyllene in northern Arkadia in the context of a catalogue with multiple elements. He says:

\[\text{παρέχεται δὲ καὶ θαύμα τοιὸνδε ἢ Κυλλήνη· κόσμοι φοι̊ γὰρ οἱ ὄρνιθες <ολόδευκοι> εἰσὶν ἐν αὐτῇ· οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ Βοιωτῶν καλούμενοι γένος ἄλλο ποὺ τι εἰσὶν ὄρνιθων, οὐκ φθινόν. άτεούς μὲν οὐν ὄνομαζομένους κυκνίας μάλιστα ἔως χίλιον λευκότητα ὁίδα ἐν Σπύλῳ θεασάμενος περὶ λίμνην καλούμενην Ταντάλου· ής δὲ ἄγριους λευκοὺς καὶ ἄρχτους τῶν Θρακίων λευκάς ἥδη ποὺ καὶ ἄνδρες ἐκτήσαντο ἅθωσεν· λαγὸς δὲ καὶ ἐλαφοί, τὸ μὲν Λιβυκὸν θέμαμα οἱ λαγὸς εἰσίν <οί> λευκοί, ἐλάφους δὲ ἐν Ρώμη λευκάς ἐδὸν τε καὶ ἱδὼν θαύμα ἐπουρράχησαν, οπόθευν δὲ ἢ τῶν ἵππευρων οὖσαι ἢ νησιώτιδες ἐκομίσθησαν, οὐκ ἐπίλθθαν ἔφεσθαι μοι. τάδε μὲν\]

\(^{50}\) Locusts (πάρνοπες) are also discussed in relation to an infestation of Attica cured by Apollo, and Pausanias’ personal experience of three plagues at Mount Sipylus in another hyperbatic logos (1.24.8).

\(^{51}\) Cf. 4.35.11 where Pausanias makes a programmatic statement in his catalogue of marvelous waters that makes clear that these are thumata: καὶ δόσας μὲν πηγὰς θαύμα τι ἢ καὶ ἱδόντα, τοσαύτας θεασάμενος οίδα, τὰς γὰρ δὴ ἐλάσσονος θαύματος ἐπιστάμενος παρήμα.
Cyllene can show also the following marvel. On it the blackbirds are entirely white. The birds so called by the Boeotians are a somewhat different breed, which does not sing. Eagles called swan-eagles, very like to swans for whiteness, I am acquainted with, as I have seen them on Mount Sipylus round the lake called the Lake of Tantalus. White wild boars and Thracian white bears have been known to be acquired by private individuals. White hares are bred in Libya, and white deer I have seen in Rome to my great astonishment, though it never occurred to me to ask from what continent or island they had been brought. I have made these few remarks concerning the blackbirds in Cyllene that nobody may disbelieve what has been said about their color.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 8.2.3-4

In this catalog, it is clear that the strategy of presenting several comparable phenomena, in this case white animals, is intended to make the original *theorema* that triggered the hyperbatic catalog more credible, the white blackbirds (κόσσυφοι) of Cyllene.

**COMPARING WONDERS**

In his description of Phocis, Pausanias includes a catalog of marvelous caves that is representative of the function of *hyperbatic logoi* to expand the geographical scope of the *Periegesis* Hellados and incorporate exotic wonders in the text. The catalog is prefaced by one of the rare statements of embodiment in the *Periegesis*.\(^{52}\) Pausanias remarks: “the ascent to the Corycian cave is easier for an active walker than it is for mules or horses” (ὦραν εὐζώνῳ ἄνδρῃ ἣ ἡμιόνοις τε καὶ ἵπποις ἐπὶ τὸ ἄντρον ἔστιν ἄνοδος τὸ Κωρύκιον). This ascent is firmly located in space, on the way from Delphi to the summit of Parnassus (ἰὸντι δὲ ἐκ Δελφῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄχρα τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ), with further specifications about the distance and landmarks en route (σταδίοις μὲν ὰδον ἐξήκοντα ἀπωτέρω Δελφῶν ἔστιν ἄγαλμα χαλκοῦν). The embodied reference and topographical

---

\(^{52}\) See Weiss and Faber 1999: xiii: “In the process of critiquing philosophy’s own negligence regarding the body, the very expression ‘the body’ has become problematized, and is increasingly supplanted by the term ‘embodiment.’ The move away from one expression to another corresponds directly to a shift from viewing the body as a nongendered, prediscursive phenomenon that plays a central role in perception, cognition, action, and nature to a way of living or inhabiting the world through one’s acculturated body.” See also Bosnak 2007: 106: “Embodiment is the sense that a presence, self or alien, is substantive.” The emphasis on the physical body on the route to the Corycian cave contrasts with the usual practice in the *Periegesis*. See Pretzler 2007: 60-61, 72.
locators both reinforce the setting of this portion of the frame narrative in Phocis. But the geographical scope of the catalog of marvelous caves is much broader and takes the reader to far off locales. Unlike the catalog of white animals explored above, this catalog does not employ *paralogismos* in order to enhance the credibility of the various elements; instead it engages directly with the centre/margin dichotomy in the rhetoric of wonder.

He writes:

> ὅσα μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τε αἰγιαλοῖς καὶ ἀγχραβεῖ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, τούτων μὲν
> οὐδὲ ἄριστον ὁν τις ἐνθέλων ἔξευγοι, ὁνομαστῶτα δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάσι
> καὶ ἐν γῇ τῇ βαρβάροις ἐστὶν: Φυγὲς οἱ ἐπὶ ποταμῷ Πενκέλα, τὰ δὲ
> ἄνωθεν ἐξ Αρχαγίας καὶ Αξάνου ἐς ταύτην ἀφωγόμενοι τὴν χώραν,
> δεικνύουσιν ἄντρον καλοῦμενον Στεύνος περιφέρεσι τε καὶ ἤπαυσι
> ἐχον εὐπρεπῶς· Μήτρος δὲ ἐσπεῖν ἱερόν, καὶ ἀγάλμα Μήτρος
> πεποίηται. Θεμισσονίοι δὲ τὸ ὑπέρ Λαοδίκειας Φυγὲς μὲν καὶ τοῦτο
> οἰκοσύνε· ὅτε δὲ ὁ Γαλατῶν στρατὸς ἐξεφέρε καὶ ἤγεν Ἰωνίαν καὶ
> Ἰωνίας τὰ ὀμορα, οἱ Θεμισσονεῖς φασίν αὐτοῖς Ἰρακλέα βοήθην τὸν
> ἄντρον καὶ Απόλλωνα γενέσθαι καὶ Ἐμην· τούτους γὰρ τοῖς τάς ἄρχυς
> ἔχουσιν ἄντρον τὸ ἐντὸ ἀνεφίλου ἁγίατα καὶ ἀποκρυφήναι
> Θεμισσονεύς καὶ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καὶ θάνατον ἔξωτο προστάξαι τὸ
> ἄντρον. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ πρὸ τοῦ σπηλαίου οὑσίν αὐτῶι ἀγάλματα τὰ
> κατά παντὶ ἀριθμάν Μήτρας τὸ ἠμαίντο Αἰγάλωνος καὶ Ἐμηνοῦ τε καὶ
> Ἀπόλλωνος, Σπηλαίαι τα καλοῦμενα: τὸ δὲ ἄπεχε  ὁ δον τριάκοντα του ἁγίωι σταδίους,
> ὕδατος δὲ εἰσὶν ἐν αὐτῷ πηγά· ὥστε δὲ ἔσπερος ἐς αὐτῷ φέρει ὅποι
> ἐπὶ πολὺ ἢ αὐγὴ δέεσθαι τοῦ ἢμιοῦ, τοῦ τε ὀρόφου τὰ πλείονα
> ἐγκυμάτω τοῦ ἐκδόφους γίνεται. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ ποταμῷ Ληβαῖως
> Μάγνηνοι Αἰδιαί καλοῦμεν Χωρίῳς· ἐντάθω Ἀπόλλωνος ἀνέταιτα
> σπηλαίον, μεγάθης μὲν εἶναι ὁ πολύ λαβύματος, τὸ δὲ ἀγάλμα
> τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὰ μάλιστα ἀρχαῖον καὶ ισχυν ἐπὶ ἐγγυο παρέχεται
> παντι· καὶ αὐτῷ ἄνδρες ιεροῖ κατὰ χρημάν τε ἀποτόμαι καὶ
> πετρών προδώσσιν γηλιῶν καὶ ὑπερμύχην δένδρα οὕσιτετε ἐκ ριζῶν
> κατὰ τὰ στενότατα τῶν ἀτραπῶν ὅμοι τοῖς ἀχθεῖσι ὀδέφουσι.

It would be impossible to discover even the mere number of caves whose entrances face the beach or the deep sea, but the most famous ones in Greek or in foreign lands are the following. The Phrygians on the river Pencalas, and those who came to this land originally from the Azanians in Arcadia, show visitors a cave called Steunos, which is round, and handsome in its loftiness. It is sacred to the Mother, and there is an image of her. Themisionium above Laodicelia is also inhabited by Phrygians. When the army of the Gauls was laying waste Ionia and the borders of Ionia, the Themisionians say that they were helped by Heracles, Apollo and Hermes, who revealed to their magistrates in dreams a cave, and commanded that in it should be hidden the Themisionians with their wives and children. This is the reason why in front of the cave they have set up
small images, called Gods of the Cave, of Heracles, Hermes and Apollo. The cave is some thirty stades distant from the city, and in it are springs of water. There is no entrance to it, the sunlight does not reach very far, and the greater part of the roof lies quite close to the floor. There is also near Magnesia on the river Lethaeus a place called Aulai, where there is a cave sacred to Apollo, not very remarkable for its size, but the image of Apollo is very old indeed, and bestows strength equal to any task. The men sacred to the god leap down from sheer precipices and high rocks, and uprooting trees of exceeding height walk with their burdens down the narrowest of paths.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 10.32.3-6

Pausanias does not introduce this catalogue of caves with the marked terminology of wonder, but rather with a reference to their fame. The superlative form ὄνομαστότατα recalls the programmatic statement from the close of the Attic logos (1.39.3), and the assessment of the Aulai (the caves near Magnesia on the Lethaeus) indicates that these caves are *thaumata*. Pausanias says the Aulai are not marvelous on account of the their size (μεγέθους μὲν εἶνεξα οὐ πολλοῦ θαύματος), but rather because they are sacred to Apollo.53 The numinosity of the Aulai is apparent in the ancient image housed there (τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὰ μάλιστα ἄρχαιον), which imparts superhuman strength (ἰσχὺν ἐπὶ ἔργῳ παρέχεται παντὶ) and allows the priests to leap unharmed from lofty cliffs and uproot trees with Herculean might. The numinosity and physical characteristics of each of the marvelous caves in the list are emphasized: Steunos is notable for its height and because it is sacred to the Great Mother, the Themisonium is associated with an epiphany of Heracles, Apollo and Hermes. It has interior springs, a low roof and no entrance.

The list of marvelous caves is significant because of the exotic geography it encompasses. The elements in the catalog shift the setting from Phocis to the river Pencalas in northwestern Phrygia (Aezani), to Laodiceia in southwestern Phrygia, to the river Lethaeus near Magnesia in Caria. Pausanias notes from the outset that the list comprises the most famous caves from a universal set of those both in Greece and in foreign lands (ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνὶ καὶ ἐν γῇ τῇ ἑλληνίδῳ). In the context of the list of

53 The name of the place is uncertain; Wilamowitz amended the manuscript *hylai* to *Aulai*. Livy (38.13) says that there is an oracle of Apollo there.
wonderful caves, it is significant that Pausanias singles out the Corycian cave. He states: “of all the caves I have ever seen this seemed to me the best worth seeing” (σπηλαίων δὲ ὄν εἶδον θέας ἄξιον μάλιστα ἐφαίνετο εἰναί μοι, 10.32.2).

tὸ δὲ ἄντρον τὸ Κωρυκίου μεγέθει τε ὑπερβάλλει τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πλείστον ὑδέωσα δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄνευ λαμπτήρων· ὁ τε ὀρόφος ἐς αὐταρχεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐδάφους ἀνέστηκε, καὶ ὑδώρ τὸ μὲν ἀνεφχόμενον ἐκ πηγῶν, πλέον δὲ ἔτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀρόφου στάζει, ὡστε καὶ δῆλα ἐν τῷ ἐδάφει σταλαγμών τὰ ἴχνη διὰ παντὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ ἄντρου. ἱερὸν δὲ ἀυτὸ οἱ περὶ τὸν Παρνασσὸν Κωρυκίου τε εἶναι Νυμφών καὶ Πανὸς μάλιστα ἠγηνται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Κωρυκίου χαλεπῶν ἡδη καὶ ἀνδρὶ εὐζώνῳ πρὸς τὰ ἄκρα ἀφικέσθαι τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ.

But the Corycian cave exceeds in size those I have mentioned, and it is possible to make one’s way through the greater part of it even without lights. The roof stands at a sufficient height from the floor, and water, rising in part from springs but still more dripping from the roof, has made clearly visible the marks of drops on the floor throughout the cave. The dwellers around Parnassus believe it to be sacred to the Corycian nymphs, and especially to Pan. From the Corycian cave it is difficult even for an active walker to reach the heights of Parnassus.

Pausanias, Periegesis 10.32.2-7

The particular characteristics of the Corycian cave that make it “the best worth seeing” (θέας ἄξιον μάλιστα) are its size (μεγέθει τε ὑπερβάλλει τὰ εἰρημένα) and numinosity. The latter is evident in the water features (ὑδώρ τὸ μὲν ἀνεφχόμενον ἐκ πηγῶν) and cult associations (ἱερὸν... Κωρυκίων τε εἶναι Νυμφών καὶ Πανὸς μάλιστα). Although the Corycian cave is but one in a set of marvelous caves in Greek or foreign lands (ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνὶ καὶ ἐν γῇ τῇ βαρβάρῳ), it is significant that the list of exotic caves is bookended by descriptions of it. Just as the catalogue is prefaced with the embodied reference to the rigors of the route from Delphi up toward the cave, the catalogue closes with a further comment on the difficulty of the ascent to the summit: “From the Corycian cave it is difficult even for an active walker to reach the heights of Parnassus” (ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Κωρυκίου χαλεπῶν ἡδη καὶ ἀνδρὶ εὐζώνῳ πρὸς τὰ ἄκρα ἀφικέσθαι τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ). These embodied statements invoke de Certeau’s pedestrian perspective and the hodological treatment of space in the frame narrative by strongly emphasizing the location of both the narrator and the Corycian cave on the
heights of Parnassus. But the description of the Corycian cave itself is interrupted by the hyperbatic catalog that zooms the reader over the sea to different destinations Asia and back to mainland Greece.

Jacob suggested that the digressions in the Periegesis are analogies that serve an exegetical function. This seems plausible enough in those instances with a one to one ratio between the theorema and the analogy/digression. But this interpretive model is less successful in the case of the Corycian cave, both because of the multiple elements in the list and because the most informative section on the Corycian cave actually follows the hyperbatic logos. Instead of an explanatory relationship, the elements in the catalogue have a pronounced thematic link; they are all marvelous caves. But in contrast to the catalogue of white animals, which built a case in support of the white kossyphoi of Cyllene, the emphasis in the catalogue of marvelous caves is comparative. Among the most famous caves (ὄνομαστότατα) the Corycian cave is the biggest (μεγέθει τε ὑπερβάλλει τὰ εἰρημένα) and the best worth seeing (θέας ἀξιον μάλιστα). The example of the catalogue of caves illustrates that in addition to increasing credibility, the prominent analogic function of the hyperbatic catalogs goes so far as to suggest parity between local theorema and exotic marvels in their capacity to elicit wonder in both the traveller and the reader. Through the manipulation of thaumata from the margins of the oikoumene, Pausanias presents a rhetoric of marvels at the centre, firmly embedded in his description of Roman Greece. The comparative function of the catalogue of numinous caves contests the bias of the Greeks, which Pausanias flagged in his Boeotia logos: “The Greeks,” he says, “appear apt to regard with greater wonder foreign sights than sights at home” (9.36.5).

In the midst of his description of Achaea in the Northern Peloponnese, Pausanias presents an extended excursus of the wonders of Ionia (7.5.4-13). He begins: “The land of the Ionians has the finest possible climate and sanctuaries such as are to be found nowhere else” (Ἰωαὶ δὲ ἔχει μὲν ἐπτηθεῖσσα μνήματα ὑφὸν κράσεως ἐὰν κάρωσα, ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἱερὰ οίκα οὗτος ἐτέρωθοι, 7.5.4). He lists the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, which is noteworthy

54 See also Greaves 2010: 171-201 for summary of cults and temples of Ionia.
for its size and wealth; the Samian Heraion and the sanctuary of Athena at Phocaea, which were both sacked by the Persians; the temple of Athena at Priene because of its cult statue; and finally the sanctuary of Heracles at Erythrae because of its age. Pausanias specifies that the Samian Heraion and sanctuary of Athena at Phocaea are both wonders to behold, despite their destruction by fire. Ionia has other things to record besides its sanctuaries and its climate. Among these he lists extraordinary rivers, springs, mountains and groves with sacred connotations. The extraordinary nature of many of these features is emphasized by frequent use of superlative forms or by vocabulary, as many are explicitly stated to be wonders. He specifies, for example, that the river Ales has the coldest water in Ionia. He characterizes the bathing pools in the vicinity of Lebedus as wondrous because of their healthful properties, but the bathing pools at Chalcis as most useful. Pausanias states that the Erythraeans worship Heracles of the Idean Dactyls, who is said to be older than Heracles the son of Amphitryon.
The opening of Pausanias’ excursus on Ionia emphasizes the geographical specificity of
the region, and the emphasis on both anthropogenic and natural marvels throughout
confirm that this digression is functionally a catalogue of wonders. This interpretation is
further supported by the coda to the hyperbatic logos in which he states: “Ionia, in fact, is
a land of many wonders” (τὰ μὲν δὴ ἐν Ἴωνίᾳ θαύματα πολλά, 7.5.13). The
pleasurable aspect of reading about the wonders of Ionia is apparent in the catalogue, for
he projects the reader’s delight in beholding the sanctuary of Heracles at Erythrae and of
Athena at Priene (ἡσθείης δὲ ἀν καὶ τῷ ἐν Ἐρυθραίῳ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς τῷ ἐν
Πρίηνῃ ναῷ, 7.5.5). But in addition to readerly pleasure, the digression on the wonders
of Ionia serves a comparative function parallel to the catalogue of marvelous caves, for
he specifies in his closing remarks that the wonders of Ionia “are but little inferior to
those of Greece” (οὐ πολλῷ τινὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀποδέοντά ἐστιν, 7.5.13). The
comparative function of the catalog is explicit; the wonders of Ionia make Greece even
more marvelous.

Richard Neer noted that the expressions thauta and axion theas are used interchangeably
in the Periegesis. He interpreted this as evidence of a process of disenchantment over
time, a mitigation of wonder so that it meant no more than the curiosity of the tourist. I
suggest rather that what Pausanias deems ‘worth seeing’ is a marvel in the centripetal
plane. For Pausanias introduces his description of Elis, which is emphatically placed at
the centre of Periegesis, with an explicit statement about the wonders and numinosity of
Greece.⁶⁰

πολλά μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα ἱδοί τις ἃν ἐν Ἱλλησει, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀκούσαι
θαύματος ἄξια· μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς Ἐλευσίνι δρωμένις καὶ ἄγῳν τῷ
ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ μέτεστιν ἐκ θεοῦ φροντίδος.

Many are the sights to be seen in Greece, and many are the wonders to be
heard, but on nothing does Heaven bestow more care than on the
Eleusinian rites and the Olympic games.

Pausanias, Periegesis 5.10.1

⁶⁰ See Elsner 2001 for emphasis on Athens, Olympia and Delphi as the beginning, middle and end of text.
Pausanias’ use of digressions on exotic wonders (*hyperbatic logoi*) allows him to expand the geographical scope of *Periegesis Hellados* to the extremities of the *oikoumene* and engage with travellers’ discourse on the marvelous, of the kind parodied by Lucian. These digressions also capitalize on analogy’s tendency to correlate the truth-value of comparable phenomena through the same cognitive bias that Aristotle describes in the use of *paralogismos*, logical fallacy. The catalogue structure allows a well-known or personally witnessed phenomenon to vouch for a similar but more obscure one. But the prominent analogic relationship between elements in a catalogue also invites comparison. Using the antiquarian technique of compilation to produce *hyperbatic logoi* in catalogue form, Pausanias compounds the effect in order to show that Roman Greece is as marvelous as any exotic locale. Analysis of *hyperbatic logoi* in the *Periegesis* suggests that autopsy and compilation (*syngraphe* and *synagoge*) in catalogues of marvels from both the centre and liminal spaces of the *oikoumene* work symbiotically to reinforce the numinosity of Greece.
Conclusion

In the first chapter, I argued toward a culturally specific definition of wonder (*thauma*, *paradoxon*) to employ in the analysis of wonder in the *Periegesis Hellados*. Westermann’s definition of wonders as “*qua praeter expectationum accidunt et admirationem movent*” is vulnerable to the modern reader’s biases about what constitutes a wonder, and runs the risk of employing an anachronistic definition of wonder as the basis for analysis. Certain post-Cartesian assumptions about wonder were challenged. These assumptions are first, the distinction in contemporary discourse between wonder and the sublime on the basis of pleasure and fear, second, the further distinction between miracles and wonders as respectively proper to religious and scientific discourse, and finally, the notion that novelty or surprise is an essential prerequisite in the construction of wonder in ancient authors.

In addition to the wealth of wonders compiled in paradoxographies, a survey of contextualized studies suggests that *thaumata* are best construed as rare or extraordinary phenomena, and precious objects that provoke contemplation in the subject. Wonder is associated with the characteristic fascination these artifacts provoke and transcends the element of surprise; objective wonders constitute a class of artifacts or phenomena almost on a categorical basis. These artifacts are often manufactured products, executed with extraordinary technical (possibly divine) skill and elaborately worked (δαίδαλα).¹ Various *thaumata* in Archaic epic are identified as *semata*, “symbol-signs,” because they emphasize wonder’s bridging of human experience and divine agency.²

Hesiod provides the *locus classicus* for *thaumata* as explicit mediators between immortals and mortals in the *Theogony*. The stone vomited by his Cronos is set up by Zeus in the folds of Mount Parnassos to be sign (*sema*) in perpetuity, a wonder (*thauma*) for mortals (σῆμ’ ἐμεν ἐξοπίω, θαυμά θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι, 500). Unlike the daedalic artifacts rendered in precious materials with divine craftsmanship, the Delphic *sema* is not elaborately worked. Rather it is a marvel because it provides material corroboration

---

¹ Hunzinger 1994: 8
for the cosmic succession myth narrated in the poem; as a *sema*, it is tangible proof of the ontological status of the gods and evidence of the divine aetiology of the cosmos. It is the *logos*, or more specifically the *mythos*, associated with the stone that gives it its power to fascinate, and the explicit correlation of *sema* and *thauma* in Hesiod’s presentation of the Delphic *sema* shows that exclusion of signs and miracles from the category of wonder is inappropriate for defining *thauma* in ancient sources.

Manifestations of the gods through material artifacts or symbols are but indirect experiences of epiphany. While epiphanies have temporal finitude, they can have a profound impact on their surroundings, and so are often invoked in the aetiologies for particular phenomenon, rituals, practices and feature of the landscape. Thus *thaumata*, conceived of as extraordinary phenomena and artifacts that are *semata* of divine agency, provide a useful lens through which to examine what is worth seeing (axion theas) and worth recording (axion mnemen) in *Periegesis Hellados*.

The second chapter explored the intersections between paradoxography and *periegesis*, as fragmentary genres intimately entwined with the tradition of ancient travel writing (both non-fictional and fictional). Personal experience (autopsy and inquiry) and culling from authoritative texts (derivative compilation) in wonder-books are problematically employed to support the perceived generic distinctions between paradoxography and travel writing. The analysis in the second chapter argued that categories of wonder-books are better construed along a continuum than as a strict binary with respect to methods of composition and authentication strategies. An anecdote from Aulus Gellius’ *Attic Nights* provides a cypher for this continuum of wonder-texts, as he does not appear to distinguish between authentic travel writing and derivative compilation, or any gradation between the two in his grouping of *libri miraculorum fabularumque pleni* (9.4.2-4).

I began with the scholarly consensus that the essential characteristic of paradoxography is its subject matter—a singular focus on θαύματα or παράδοξα. Although paradoxography is sometimes broadly defined as writing which describes *paradoxa*, the narrow, and more usual, definition of paradoxography has dictated that in addition to the

3 Platt 2011: 56.
focus on wonder, the process of culling anecdotes from earlier writers (ekloge) and compilation (synagoge) are characteristic of paradoxography proper. The picture of paradoxography that emerged in the review of the scholarship suggests that the nexus of the Hellenistic passion for scholarly collection and compilation, a traditional Greek interest in the marvelous, and the inheritance of Peripatetic scientific curiosity form the cultural context for the development of paradoxography with Callimachus of Cyrene as its originator. Further, the credibility of the thaumata reported is emphasized throughout by critical references to authoritative sources and documentary evidence. Once identified, these wondrous anecdotes are then presented as systematized catalogues.

One of the most important insights of Schepens’ analysis of the origin, characteristics and readership of the genre points to the importance of credibility in paradoxography. He suggests that in order to achieve their desired affect as thaumata, it is essential that the reader consider the anecdotes collected to be a part of the real world and not the figments of the paradoxographer’s imagination. Although scholarship on paradoxography has dismissed the importance of autopsy in these compilations, Photius’ testimony of Alexander of Myndos’ Collection of Marvels and Protagoras’ Geometria tes oikoumenes suggests that textual research and traditional historiographical methods (autopsy and inquiry) can coexist in wonder compilations (Biblio. 188).

The distinction between synagoge and syngraphe has been isolated as the key index between wonder-texts as paradoxography and wonder-texts as travel writing; a synagoge is a text produced through ekloge while a syngraphe is based on personal experience. But Lucian’s example in the True Stories demonstrates that autopsy can be deployed dishonestly to endorse false or incredible claims. Where autopsy claims have been made to endorse the marvelous, scholars have assumed either literary artifice or outright mendacity. Previous scholarship suggested that the methodologies of paradoxography (as a derivative genre of wonder compilation or synagoge) and travel writing (as report of wonders based on personal experience and inquiry or syngraphe) are fundamentally irreconcilable and mutually exclusive. In this strict dichotomy, an autopsy claim

---

embedded in derivative compilation must be interpreted as spurious, the sort of fiction employed by Lucian in his *True Stories*.

The contrasting positions of Youngs and Borm point to the tension between fiction and non-fiction in travel writing and the inherent difficulty of distinguishing between the two. While Youngs has defined travel writing as “predominantly factual, first-person prose accounts of travels that have been undertaken by the author-narrator,” Borm has said that travel writing “is not a genre, but a collective term for a variety of texts both predominantly fictional and non-fictional whose main theme is travel.” Other than a species of “referential pact” between the narrator (construed as one in the same with the author) and the reader and which relates directly to the credibility of the report, there is no formal distinction between a travel account proper and purely fictional forms of travel literature. Ultimately, corroboration for a factual travel narrative must come from outside the text itself.

Although the *True Stories* presents a cheeky parody of a travelogue rather than an account of an actual journey, Lucian’ text demonstrates the inherent ambiguity of autopsy as a technique for establishing credibility in both historiography and travel writing. Lucian presents an inversion of the referential pact of travel writing by promising to lie and therefore to spuriously deploy the tropes of “authentic” travel narratives. Lucian’s paradoxical premise is a corruption of the referential pact through *mimesis* and marks his text as fiction rather than non-fiction, but it also demonstrates that the truth-value of autopsy and (by extension personal inquiry) is inherently ambiguous.

It is this perception of the incompatibility of autopsy and compilation of wonder-anecdotes that forms the basis of the attacks on Pausanias’ credibility by critics like Kalkmann. But preserved testimony about lost paradoxographies and *periegeses* presents significant overlap between the genres. Photius’ testimony suggests that rather than a strict dichotomy between *synagoge* and *syngraphe*, wonder-texts span a continuum.

---

5 Youngs 2013: 3.
9 Kalkmann 1886.
between both compositional methods. Ultimately, periegetic literature, paradoxographic compilation, and travel accounts are far more enmeshed than the *communs opinio* generally allows.

The third chapter probes the perceived generic distinctions between paradoxography and periegetic writing. The first distinction is made on the basis of spatial organization (geographical or topographical) in contrast to thematic connection between elements (more specifically anecdotes) in list or catalogue form. Both organizational principles are appropriate to periegetic writing, however, and purposefully deployed in the *Periegesis Hellados*. This chapter argued that the simulated travel experience in spatially structured texts and the virtual experience of wonders in textual collections (catalogues) both reinforce the association of wonders with particular places, and thereby create a sense of geographic specificity.

Both Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados* and Dionysius Periegetes’ *Description of the Known World* are organized on a geographic (topographic) principle, which has long been thought to be the hallmark of periegetic composition. Both are therefore consistent with the generic conception of *periegesis* as a sort of descriptive “leading around.” But the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* has been shown to be a significant model for Dionysius Periegetes’ poem, and in addition to its geographic organization, the *Catalogue of Ships* is also defined by the thematic unity of its constituent elements; it is a list of troop contingents. The Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* demonstrates that catalogue style and spatial organization can be deployed simultaneously in periegetic writing. The correspondence between spatial (topographical, geographical) organization and *periegesis* has been overstated, and it has conversely been understated for paradoxography. The Suda’s testimony of Callimachus’ wonder-compilation transmits the title, a *Collection of Wonders of the Whole World According to Place* (*θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἄπασων τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὄντων συναγωγή*). The attested title clearly shows that paradoxographies can be organized according to geographical or topographical principle (*κατὰ τόπους*).
The correspondences and differences between Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados*, Dionysius’ *Description of the Known World*, and the fragments of Polemo’s periegetic writing suggest that catalogue style, whether through geographical organization, thematic structure, or a combination of both, are all admissible features of the genre known as *periegesis*. Further, authorizing strategies through either primary or secondary witness are equally permitted. The deployment of these features and methodologies in each text is therefore a function of choice rather than a reflection of generic constraints.

Although the dominant organizing principle of the *Periegesis Hellados* is topographical—a narrative of pedestrian travel—this is not the only structuring principle employed in the text. The thematic arrangement of the descriptions of the altars, dedications, and statues of Zeus and Olympic victors in Pausanias’ description of the Altis stands in contrast to the topographical order of the frame narrative of the *Periegesis*, but it is wrong to associate the latter with autopsy and the former with derivative compilation. These inset catalogues comprise material that Pausanias claims to have seen first hand as well as information collected from guides. But some other catalogues appear to reflect the paired activities of *ekloge* and *synagoge* of anecdotes that have been traditionally associated with encyclopedic compilation (including paradoxography). The traces of Pausanias’ use of paradoxographies (and other compilations) as textual sources demonstrate their influence on his project both in directing his fieldwork and shaping the structure of his text.

Thematically structured catalogs disrupt the flow of the topographical frame narrative and virtual progress of the reader through the landscape. These thematically structured catalogs are best construed as a species of digression from the frame narrative. Although Pausanias’ tendency to digress is well-known, the narrative digressions on mythical and historical themes have received the lion’s share of scholarly attention, while the non-narrative, thematically structured catalogs of wondrous artifacts, events, phenomena, and practices have been hitherto comparatively understudied.

Palaephatus’ *Apista* presents a paradigm for a dynamic mechanism through which travel and personal experience can either corroborate or discredit a wonder reported elsewhere.
He offers his own autopsy and inquiry as correctives to various the perceived corruptions in traditional narratives (myths) that challenge credibility. Palaephatus’ methodology reflects the cyclical nature of his investigations: it is prior knowledge of the marvelous myth-historical narratives (from textual or oral sources) that prompts his alleged inquiries and travel to the sites. He then publishes the results of his efforts in a textual form that intended for circulation. The product is a collection of rationalized heroic narratives, whose marvelous accretions have been identified as exaggerations or misunderstandings of true historical events.

The interplay between text and autopsy (fieldwork) in Palaephatus’ text provides a useful paradigm for reading Pausanias’ *Periegesis Hellados*. The example of the singing fish of Kleitor suggests that Pausanias’ engagement with paradoxographical compilations can in fact motivate his travels by acting as a goad to investigate a wondrous phenomenon first-hand. In addition to the desire to experience (verify or investigate) marvels reported second-hand, the comments about the tame dolphin at Poroselene exemplify Pausanias’ technique of juxtaposing a thematically related anecdote (*logos*) and a particular phenomenon or monument (*theorema*) on his itinerary. Pausanias’ own ekphrastic failure in his description of the Pheidian Zeus at Olympia suggests that even precise or detailed descriptions of marvel cannot convey the impression of experiencing it first-hand, and this throws into question the purpose of describing marvels in the *Periegisis* at all.

Philo of Byzantium’s *De septem orbis spectaculis* provides a second paradigm to address the strengths and limitation of *ekphrasis* to communicate wonder. The logic underlying Philo’s project suggests that the effect of viewing wonders first-hand is so overwhelming for the subject that details of the wondrous objects’ workmanship are lost or soon forgotten. While the *ekphrastic* description of a marvel aims to conjure an image of it in the mind’s eye, it does not produce the characteristic state of shock associated with seeing the object through direct witness. *Ekphrasis* provides a proxy viewing experience that mitigates the effect of a marvel on the viewer, and thereby allows for a more detailed and intimate knowledge of the marvelous object through language. Philo further suggests that a virtual experience of the sights in literary description is in fact superior to autopsy because it is more memorable than a direct experience. While Philo’s individual
ekphrases may fail to adequately communicate wonder, their presentation as a collection allows for each to reinforce the marvelousness of the rest.

The same strategy is evident in Pausanias’ treatment of the Phidian Zeus. Rather than attempt to communicate the power of his own subjective viewing experience through his description of the statue, Pausanias conveys its extraordinary effect by associating it with a miracle in the form of an epiphany of Zeus. Pausanias mitigates the inadequacy of description by conveying the effect of the statue through a mini-catalogue of wonders, in which each thauma presents external validation for the other.

Pausanias’ catalogue of the most noteworthy dedications in the temple of Athena Alea resembles a temple inventory of a sort. The catalogue of the noteworthy dedications in the temple of Athena Alea, like the heroic votives and epiphanies inscribed in the Lindian Chronicle, functions as a virtual collection. The selection and compilation of the dedications in catalog form communicates the special relationship between Athena Alea and the Tegeans as effectively as the material collection would, even if reading about the artifacts does not produce the same experience as a direct encounter.

The third chapter also challenged generic distinctions based on different classes of mirabilia; Westermann, for instance, associates myth-historical wonders with periegeses and natural wonders with paradoxography.10 This distinction is anachronistic because it is rooted in the cultural context of mediaeval Christian readers and copyists who transmitted the texts rather than cultural context of their composition. The desire to separate wonders related to mythology from natural wonders reflects upon the ambiguous status of myth. In many authors, however, the distinction between myth and history is not easily discerned, and so the credibility of mythological material is ultimately couched in religious ideology. Photius’ distinction between natural or ethical wonders on the one hand, and the wonders of heroic myth on the other, reflects his theological bias. Photius (Biblio. 130) considers marvelous anecdotes that are inconsistent with a Christian world-view “impossible” (ἀδύνατόν), “incredible” (ἀπίθανον) and “invented tales of wonderful things” (κακόπλαστα τερατολογήματα). This is a fundamental rejection of the truth-

10 Westermann: 1839.
value of the entire heroic tradition. It has significant implications for the evaluation of the
credibility of paradoxographic anecdotes, and subsequent generic distinctions between
accounts of natural wonders and wonders associated with legendary narratives. But
Photius’ categorical denial of the truth-value of heroic narratives was not shared by the
Hellenistic and Roman compilers of paradoxographic material; his testimony of the
compilations of Protagoras, Alexander, Nicholaus and Acestorides shows that these
compilers did not draw a firm distinction between mythical and other \textit{thaumata}
\textit{(Biblio.188-189)}.

Unlike Palaephatus, who employs the ‘doctrine of present things’ as the basis for his
rationalization of heroic narrative, Pausanias comments on credibility and myth in his
catalogue of metamorphoses, which is appended to his description of Mount Lycaon
(8.2.4-6), suggest a qualitative distinction between the heroic past and the author’s
present. The explanation for the plausibility of the Arkadian King Lycaon’s
metamorphosis and the implausibility of other narratives of bestial transformation is
couched in terms of a qualitative difference in the relationship between gods and mortals
during the heroic age and Pausanias’ present: he says that then (τότε) humans were
guest-friends (ξένοι) and tablemates (ὁμοτράπεζοι) with the gods on account of their
greater piety and justice (ὑπὸ δίκαιοτρόπους καὶ ἐὔσεβείας). This suggests that
Pausanias’ rationalization of myth—the removal of fantastic elements—functions
primarily on a chronological criterion that reflects the Hesiodic myth of ages \textit{(Op.109-}
201). Wonders related in heroic myth are plausible because they reflect divine agency in
the world, and in those days the gods were more active in the world than in his day. The
wonders recounted in heroic myth highlight the power of the gods to disrupt the normal
course of human lives and the natural world in ways that leave a material imprint in the
landscape, rituals or institutions in their wake.

The fourth chapter focused on Pausanias’ inclusion of a particular type of catalogue in the
\textit{Periegesis} that permits the expansion of the geographical scope of the text well beyond
the boundaries of Roman Greece to the furthest reaches of the \textit{oikoumene}. This expansion
engages with travellers’ discourse about exotic wonders in the context of a description of
a radically circumscribed area at the centre of the inhabited world. This examination of
catalogues of exotic wonders in the Periegesis sheds further light on the strategies employed to enhance the credibility of wonders in the text and ultimately highlights the numinosity of Roman Greece.

Although it is often stated that the Perigesis is composed of descriptions of monuments (theoremata) and digressions (logoi), Akujärvi has shown that this dichotomy elides the importance of the frame narrative for the structure of the work. In fact the theoremata and the logoi are embedded components of the frame narrative, the logos, or elsewhere syngraphe, which itself presents the narrative of travel. The spatial scope the frame narrative maps closely, if imperfectly, onto the political boundaries of Roman Greece (Achaea). But despite his commitment to the spatial organization of sights in the text, rather than plod faithfully along his routes, Pausanias as author/narrator has a well-known tendency to digress.

In On the Sublime, the author known as Pseudo-Longinus says that our thoughts tend to travel (ekbainousi) beyond the bounds (horous) of our immediate surroundings through the contemplation of marvels (35.3), and this provides a conceptual parallel for Pausanias’ narrative technique. In his pairing of two auditory marvels, one a stone near the hearth of the promdomeis in Megara that makes the sound of a plucked lyre when struck by a pebble and the other the colossal Memnon that “cries out” (βοά) at dawn, the reader steps far beyond the bounds of the Megarid to all the way to Egyptian Thebes and back. Since the dominant perspective of the Periegesis is pedestrian (in contrast to synoptic) and the treatment of space is hodological (in contrast to cartographic), the thematic connection between twanging rocks can best be described as a giant leap, a kind of hyperbaton.

Previous scholarship argued that travellers’ discourse in the Periegesis conforms to a geographical model that locates wonders on the margins of the oikoumene and Greece at the centre. But Pausanias resists a strict center/margin dichotomy in the discourse of wonder. The correlation between place and inhabitants suggests that thaumata may have

---

11 Akujärvi 2005; 2012b.
12 E.g. Jacob 1980.
more to do with the uniqueness of a place than its distance from Delphi. In fact, Pausanias insists that domestic wonders are undervalued (9.36.5).

Quite beyond the aesthetic function of adorning the text, the exotic _logoi_ have an important role to play in establishing credibility for analogous phenomena. Beneath Cleon of Magnesia’s comment “those men are incredulous of wonders who in the course of their own lives had not met yet greater marvels” is the suggestion that bearing witness to one wonder makes yet other wonders more believable (10.4.6). This idea has an important intersection with a passage from Aristotle’s _Poetics_ (1460a) that also treats wonder and the credibility, and provides further insight into the use of catalogues in the _Periegesis._

Aristotle defines the marvelous, τὸ θαυμαστόν, as the irrational and nonsensical (τὸ ἄλογον and τὸ ἄτοπον), but he also insists it is sweet (ἡ δύ). He cites the sort of natural embellishment that accompanies good story telling and pleases its audience (πάντες γὰρ προσπιθέντες ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ὡς χαριζόμενοι) as proof (σημεῖον). The key, so Aristotle says, to lying as one aught (ψευδῆ λέγειν ὡς δεῖ), is the use of logical fallacy (παραλογισμός). Through logical fallacy the truth-value of one story-element is falsely established by its association with another true element. His exegesis of truth and fiction in narrative and fallacy as a literary technique are valuable for approaching travel narrative.

It is clear that Pausanias does not condone spurious exploitation of the cognitive bias that allows Aristotle’s logical fallacy to work (8.2.7). _Paralogismos_ is employed in the composition of wonder catalogs in earnest rather than to deceive. By pairing one marvel with an analogous one (particularly once authenticated on the basis of autopsy or inquiry), the former becomes more credible. The strategy of presenting several comparable phenomena is intended to make the original _theorema_ that triggered the hyperbatic catalogue more credible, as in the case of the white _kossophoi_ of Cyllene (8.2.3-4).

The example of the catalogue of marvelous caves (10.32.2-7) illustrates that in addition to increasing credibility, the prominent analogic function of the hyperbatic catalogs
suggests parity between local *theoremata* and exotic marvels in their capacity to elicit wonder in both the traveller and the reader. Among the most famous caves (ὀνομαστότατα) in Greece and in foreign lands (ἐν τε Ἐλληνι καὶ ἐν γῇ τῇ βαρβάρῳ), the Corycian cave is the biggest (μεγέθει τε ύπερβάλλει τὰ εἰρημένα) and the best worth seeing (θέας ἄξιον μάλιστα). Through the manipulation of *thaumata* from the margins of the *oikoumene*, Pausanias presents a rhetoric of marvels at the centre, firmly embedded in his description of Roman Greece. Using the antiquarian technique of compilation to produce hyperbatic *logoi* in catalog form, Pausanias compounds the effect in order to show that Roman Greece is as marvelous as any exotic locale. Analysis of hyperbatic *logoi* in the *Periegesis* suggests that autopsy and compilation (*syngraphe* and *synagoge*) in catalogues of marvels from both the centre and liminal spaces of the *oikoumene* work symbiotically to reinforce the numinosity of Greece.

**AFTERWORD**

τούτοις Ἑλλήνων ἐγὼ τοῖς λόγοις ἀρχόμενος μὲν τῆς συγγραφῆς εὐθίας ἔνειμον πλέον, ὡς δὲ τὰ Ἀρκάδων προεληλυθόως πρόνοιαν περὶ αὐτῶν τοιάνδε ἠλάμβανον: Ἑλλήνων τοὺς νομιζομένους σοφοὺς δὲ αἰνιγματῶν πάλαι καὶ οὕς ἐξ τοῦ εὐθέος λέγειν τοὺς λόγους, καὶ τὰ εἰρημένα οὖν ἐς τὸν Κρόνον σοφίαν εἶναι τίνα εἰκαζούν Ἑλλήνων. τῶν μὲν δὴ ἐς τὸ θείον ἱκόντων τοῖς εἰρημένοις χρησόμεθα.

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.

Pausanias, *Periegesis* 8.8.3

On the matter of Pausanias’ belief of the myths, Veyne points to this passage from the Arkadia *logos*. Veyne interprets this passage as a religious conversion akin to Paul’s on the road to Damascus, through which Pausanias lets go of his rationalizing tendency and
embraces some aspect of truth in the myths of the heroic past.\textsuperscript{13} Veyne’s interpretation of this passage a statement of conversion is interesting, but if Pausanias has in fact experienced a \textit{changement d’esprit}, this change is not reflected in a shift in the subject matter, thematic concerns or structure of the text that sets the pre-Arkadian books apart from those that follow.\textsuperscript{14} It is therefore hard to endorse a biographical reading of the evolution of Pausanias’ faith through the travels recounted in the \textit{Periegesis Hellados}, and the effort seems misguided in any event. The rhetoric of the passage nevertheless suggests that travel has a transformative effect, particularly in relation to attitudes toward the divine (ἐξ τὸ θείον). I draw attention to this passage because it highlights the connections between wonder, belief, received tradition, and travel treated in the previous chapters.

Pausanias employs the metaphor of pedestrian travel to describe the plot of his \textit{syngraphe} or \textit{logos}, and in this passage, he collapses the distinction between the writing and travelling processes altogether by contrasting his attitude at the beginning of his literary project with his attitude toward myth upon arrival in Arkadia, ὁρχόμενος μὲν τῆς συγγραφῆς... ἐς δὲ τὰ Αρκάδων προεληλυθὼς. In this passage, writing the description of Greece is conflated with the journey itself, but the sense of the passage is clear enough: seeing the sights in Roman Greece in the course of his travels has changed his perception of the truth-value of traditional narratives. He once thought them full of nonsense (τούτοις Ἑλλήνων ἔγω τοῖς λόγοις ... εὐηθίας ἐνεμον πλέον), but now considers them to have a certain kind of wisdom (καὶ τὰ εἰρημένα ... σοφίαν εἶναι τινα εἶκαξον Ἑλλήνων). That the wisdom or latent truth in these narratives is not immediately evident is a result of the enigmatic speech of the ancients (δι᾽ αἰνιγμάτων πάλας καὶ ὅν τοῦ εὐθέος λέγειν τοῦς λόγους), and it is worth noting that Plutarch insists in his dialogue \textit{On the Delphic E}, that \textit{enigmata} are “challenges posed by god to mortals.”\textsuperscript{16} In this way, the wisdom in the \textit{enigmata} and the \textit{thaumata}, which preserve the

\textsuperscript{15} See Hutton 2009: 166-167.
\textsuperscript{16} McInerney 2004: 45-46. Elsewhere in the \textit{Periegesis}, Pausanias only uses \textit{αἰνιγμα} of the Sphinx’s riddle (9.26.2), and in an oracle supposedly given to Homer and inscribed in bronze on his monument (10.24.2). It warns him to beware of the riddle of young children (νέων παιδων αἰνιγμα φύλαξαι).
traces of the agency of the gods are, are intimately connected as evidence of their ontological status. Pausanias highlights this relationship in another passage from the Elis logos, where he states:

πολλὰ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα ἴδοι τις ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀκούσα τιθαίμαι τὰ μὲν ἁμέλετα δὲ τοῖς Ἐλευθέρους δραμένοις καὶ ἀγώνι τῷ Ἐλευσίσι Μέτωτιν ἐκ θεοῦ φοροντίδος

Many are the sights to be seen in Greece, and many are the wonders to be heard but on nothing does Heaven bestow more care than on the Eleusinian rites and the Olympic games.

Pausanias Periegesis 5.10.1

This statement suggests that through the direct experience of wonders, some element of divine concern (ἐκ θεοῦ φοροντίδος) is perceptible. In significant ways, the Akardian conversion passage and introduction to the Elis logos present affinities between the Periegesis Hellados and pilgrimage literature.

Elsner first suggested pilgrimage as a useful paradigm for analysis of Periegesis Hellados in an influential article three decades ago. In his argument, Elsner employed the term pilgrimage in its broadest possible sense as travel directed according to a unifying goal or interest, which he identified as Greek culture. While it is clear that much of the content of the Periegesis is focused on sanctuaries, rituals and dedications, Elsner was careful in his early publication not to suggest that Pausanias was a pilgrim in the religious sense the of the word. Nevertheless, some scholars objected to the characterization of the Periegesis as a religious text; Arafat, for instance, noted that much in the Periegesis is secular.

Arafat’s point is well taken. Certainly the many descriptions of civic architecture, historical events and individuals complement the descriptions of sanctuaries, rituals and

20 Cf. Jost 2007: 119: “the periegetic literature of Pausanias is not centred only on religion: his geographical and cultural horizon is broader than that of a pilgrim. That is why the expression ‘cultural tourism’ seems to me more suitable to define the Periegesis: in it Pausanias satisfies curiosities of all sorts. Among these curiosities matters of religion occupy pride of place, but still leave space for other interests.”
sacred spaces in the *Periegesis*. But is the dichotomy between sacred and secular in the *Periegesis* as distinct as Arafat supposes? Pausanias’ comments on *tyche/Tyche* suggest that all the architectural and cultural products that reflect a city’s prosperity are ultimately emblematic of the divine order (8.33.2-4). In this way, much that would seem at first glance to be secular in the *Periegesis* in fact engages with this theological framework. In addition to historical digressions, Pausanias’ text is also noted for the wealth of art historical information it contains, which may also imply a secular focus. Though it may seem that there is little connection between sculptures of Olympic victors and divine agency, Krelinger has argued that Pausanias’ selectivity in presenting objects and works of art suggests that this connection is in fact the overriding criterion.

Some of the criticism directed toward reading the *Periegesis Hellados* as pilgrimage literature is focused on two dichotomies. The first is the identification of pilgrimage as a cultural phenomenon proper to Christianity, which questions whether it can be correctly applied to ‘pagan’ religious practice. The second is the imagined polarization of pilgrimage and tourism as mutually exclusive categories of travel. Here Williamson’s comments in the introduction to his study of the Mucianus fragments are exemplary:

[W]e might argue that whilst a sense of wonder is at the heart of both pilgrimage and tourism, in either case its origins are very different. In the case of religion, that wonder is grounded in the operation of divine power or presence in either objects (for instance, saint’s bones, pieces of the True Cross) or a sacred site, leads to accounts of pilgrimage not merely evoking this wonder but linking it explicitly to statements of divine power or involvement. On the other hand, tourism, and the wonders evoked by a visit to, say, the Uffizi Museum or the Taj Mahal, connects to the availability of an aesthetic response, an operation grounded in the admiration of the power of Man or Nature.

---

22 Cf. 4.30.3-6.
25 See Pretzler 2007a: 166 n.64 for references.
26 Williamson 2005: 220-221.
However this distinction between wonder and admiration as correlates of pilgrimage and tourism as different modes of travel has been shown to be untenable more generally. It nevertheless has important implications for the study of the *Periegesis*, which has been construed as a guidebook, an ancient Baedeker, with a focus on the noteworthy sights (*theoremata*) of Roman Greece.

In the Introduction, I drew attention to Neer’s statement about the interchangeable use of *thauma* and *axion theas* in *Periegesis*, which he interpreted as the diminishment of Archaic wonder to no more than the tourist’s gaze in the 2nd century. Neer’s statement exemplifies the sequestering of travel and tourism from the kind of transcendent experience associated with pilgrimage. If we are to take Neer’s observation to heart and seriously consider that what Pausanias tags as “worth seeing” has the valence of a wonder, it becomes clear that the *Periegesis Hellados* charts its course through the Roman Greece noting all the *semata* of heroic past and those rare instances from his own day that demonstrate the continued influence of the divine. In contrast to Palaephatus’ rationalizing of traditional narratives, Pausanias’ project provides a virtual experience of the wonders of Roman Greece, which in turn seeks to reanimate the connection between particular places and the emblems of divine agency in the landscape. But it also protreptic in so far as it invites readers to travel Pausanias’ route, and to experience these wonders for themselves.

An analogue from the modern world provides a possible critical lens for future research on wonder, space and place in the *Periegesis*: Land and Saler point to Max Weber’s characterization of the modern world through “rationalization and intellectualization, and, above all, by the ‘disenchantment of the world’” as a starting point for examining secular strategies of modern enchantment. Land and Saler itemize the necessary criteria for re-enchantment strategies as follows:

---

27 Badone and Roseman 2004.
29 Neer 2010: 68.
30 See Hutton 2010: 449-453 on the close of the *Periegesis* programmatically reaffirming Greek identity within the Roman empire through the presentation of mystery cults in the text.
If the world is to be re-enchanted, it must accordingly be reimbued not only with mystery and wonder but also with order, perhaps even with purpose; there must be a hierarchy of significance attaching to objects and events encountered; individual lives and moments within those lives, must be susceptible again to redemption; there must be a new, intelligible locus for the infinite; there must be a way of carving out of, within the fully secular world, a set of spaces which somehow possess the allure of the sacred; there must be everyday miracles, exceptional events which go against (and perhaps even alter) the accepted order of things; and there must be secular epiphanies, moments of being in which, for a brief instant, the center appears to hold, and the promise is held out of a quasi-mystical union with something larger than oneself.\textsuperscript{31}

The extent to which strategies of re-enchantment as defined by Land and Saler can provide further insight for our understanding of the Periegesis Hellados requires further research, but I hope that this analysis of wonder in Pausanias’ text has demonstrated that the nexus between travel and textual compilation may be fruitfully construed as complementary strategies for the enchantment of Roman Greece.

\textsuperscript{31} Landy and Saler 2009: 2 (emphasis in the original).
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