

---

*Following Pausanias: The Quest for Greek Antiquity* edited by Maria Georgopoulou, Céline Guilmet, Yanis Pikoulas, Konstantinos Staikos, and George Toliás; and translated by Deborah Kazazi

New Castle, DE/Athens: Oak Knoll Press/Kotinos Publications, 2007. Pp. 255. ISBN 978-1-58456-209-2. Cloth \$75.00

---

*Reviewed by*  
William E. Hutton  
The College of William and Mary  
[wehutt@wm.edu](mailto:wehutt@wm.edu)

In May of 2007, an international conference was held in Athens under the title *Στὰ Βήματα του Πανσανίου* (literally translated, *In the Footsteps of Pausanias*). The conference was a well-funded affair, with substantial support from the European Union and the Greek Ministry of Culture. Large glossy advertisements for the event were posted on the walls of the Athens Metro and in other high-visibility locations throughout the city. The speeches and paper sessions were accompanied by a poster display in the lobby of the National Hellenic Research Foundation and by a special exhibit of Pausanias-related material from the collection of the Gennadius Library of the American School of Classical Studies. The standing-room-only crowds attending the event were offered mementos to purchase, including a beautiful large-scale map showing the routes of Pausanias, and an attractive companion-volume in Greek bearing the title of the conference. Altogether, a remarkable amount of attention was lavished on an author who is little known outside of academia and who remains, in the eyes of many scholars of antiquity, a dull and uninteresting recorder of interesting information. A short time after the conference, an English translation of the companion-volume emerged with the title transformed to *Following Pausanias*; and it is this edition that is currently under review.

Participants in the conference included philologists and archaeologists from several countries, yet the organizers and a majority of the contributors to both the conference and the current volume were Greek scholars, which is worth noting because little significant scholarship on Pausanias (as distinct from the sites and monuments that

© 2008 Institute for Research in Classical Philosophy and Science

All rights reserved

ISSN 1549-4497 (online)

ISSN 1549-4470 (print)

ISSN 1549-4489 (CD-ROM)

*Aestimatio* 5 (2008) 8-15

Pausanias tells us about) has been published in Greek since the richly illustrated edition and commentary by Nikolaos Papahatzis of the 1970s. As we are told in a foreword by Paschalis Kitromilides, Director of the Institute for Neohellenic Research in Athens, the Greeks have always had a special relationship with Pausanias; and the images of ancient Greece that Pausanias uniquely preserves possess great iconic value for modern Hellenes as they negotiate the tortuous dialogue between their own culture and the legacy of their ancestors. If the conference and this volume mark the beginning of a new and fertile period of productivity on the Periegete from the perspectives of contemporary Greek scholars, it will be a welcome development.

As one might expect from the circumstances of its origins, *Following Pausanias* has something of the character of a popularizing coffee-table book (though one with numerous citations of scholarship and a copious bibliography at the end), and serious students of antiquity will want to keep an eye out for the expected publication of papers from the conference. But there are some parts of this volume that break new ground and will be of immediate interest to the scholarly community. It is on these sections of the book that I will concentrate my comments.

The longest and most important part of the text is chapter 3, ‘Pausanias in Modern Times (1418–1820)’, in which five scholars, Céline Guilmet, Konstantinos Staikos, George Tolia, Alex Malliaris, and Aliko Asvesta, combine to trace the reception of Pausanias’ work from the first hint of its existence in Renaissance Italy through to the 19th century. This work takes a solid step toward filling a longstanding lacuna in the *Rezeptionsgeschichte* between, on the one hand, Aubrey Diller’s fundamental series of articles on the transmission of the text through the middle ages [Diller 1955, 1956, and 1957], and, on the other, recent studies of the use and abuse of Pausanias by scholars of the late 19th and early 20th century such as Wilamowitz and Farnell.<sup>1</sup> The authors do a good job illustrating the importance of

---

<sup>1</sup> On Wilamowitz, see Habicht 1998, 165–175; on Farnell, Henderson 2001. On other readers of the 19th and 20th centuries, see Sutton 2001, Wagstaff 2001, Beard 2001. It should be noted that earlier reception is also covered, in complementary rather than redundant fashion, in Maria Pretzler’s new book on Pausanias [2007, 118–135], which appeared almost simultaneously with this one.

Pausanias to Renaissance scholars, whom the Ottoman conquest deprived of physical access to Greece soon after the text first appeared in the West. There are times when one wishes that the analysis offered here was more extensive and more precisely documented, but for the type of book this is one cannot complain too much on that score. The authors call attention to a number of interesting original texts; for instance, the extraordinary Latin paraphrase of the *Periegesis* in the form of a dialogue published by Stefano Negri in 1517, only a year after the publication of the *editio princeps*. In his introduction, Negri extols the didactic value the text: the literary journey upon which Pausanias takes the reader can, in Negri's view, go some way toward replicating the illumination from actual travel to antique lands, an experience that was no longer available to the young Philhellenes of Renaissance Europe.

The list of personages who knew and were affected by Pausanias is long and impressive: Lascaris, Chalcondyles, Rabelais, Rubens, Racine, Diderot, among others. Although the authors do not make this connection, scholars pondering the text's ancient reception (or rather, the reception that Pausanias might have expected) would do well to consider the range of responses that one meets in this later pre-modern period. To many readers of the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, Pausanias was considered a delight to read rather than the plodding drudge that he seems to many members of his current audience; his intellect was highly regarded and he was thought of as a historian as much as he was as a geographer or topographer. Also of interest is the influence of Pausanias in the early days of the discipline of Art History; here Guilmet's well-illustrated essay on early artistic representations of monuments described by Pausanias is particularly eye-opening.

An important development that one can trace in these pages is the emergence of the common present-day view of Pausanias as a congenial and trusty dimwit, and of his text as a treasure-trove of useful information rather than a work of intellectual merit and literary sophistication. As access to Greece was regained in the 18th and 19th centuries, the utilitarian value of Pausanias *qua* travel guide tended to become the primary focus of readers' interest. For instance, one composer of an abridged edition of Pausanias promises his readers that he will omit 'all the useless digressions [i.e., the historical and mythical excursuses that enlivened and gave meaning to the land-

scape for earlier readers] so that the author's route may be better followed'.<sup>2</sup> Another fascinating theme in this chapter is the political dimension to Pausanias' reception. The early interest in Pausanias in the Renaissance was fueled to some extent by anxiety over the Ottoman conquest, and many, including expatriate Greeks like Musurus, who produced the *editio princeps* of Pausanias for the Aldine press in 1516, openly expressed the hope that Pausanias' vivid images from a land now lost would inspire the western powers to action against the Ottomans. The sequel to this part of the story comes in the excellent but tantalizingly brief essay by Toliaş on the importance of Pausanias to Greek scholars, and Greeks in general, during the era of the War of Independence. For Hellenes of this time, Pausanias provided not just a record of their past but a blueprint for their future; and the shape of the territory covered by Pausanias even influenced early concepts of what the modern Greek state should comprise geographically.

At times the collaborative nature of this chapter leads to some redundancies and inconsistencies. For instance, when Guilmet states that artistic renditions of stories in Pausanias envisioned by Pontus de Tyard (1585) would have been the first depictions based on excerpts from Pausanias' *Periegesis* [129], one wonders how that statement fits with scholarship cited earlier by Toliaş that argues for Pausanias' influence in artworks by Poliziano and Antonio Lombardo nearly a century earlier [97]. But, by and large, the various contributions complement one another effectively. A somewhat more substantial criticism is that the authors of this section, who tend, quite appropriately, to be scholars of things other than ancient literature and civilization, could have benefited at times from more engagement with the classical scholarship on Pausanias. For instance, in discussing 19th-century Greek interest in Pausanias, Toliaş mentions the work that the greatest Greek philologist of the time, Adamantios Korais, did on the posthumous edition of Étienne Clavier's text of the *Periegesis* [1814]. One interesting thing about this work that Toliaş does not mention is that Korais recommended the rejection of what has turned out to be Clavier's single most influential textual intervention: the insertion of a preposition at 8.27.1, turning Pausanias' apparent reference to the 'misfortune of Roman rule' into a

---

<sup>2</sup> Le Roy 1758, 2.32, as quoted on p.127 of the present volume (parenthesis added).

reference to a ‘misfortune <during> Roman rule’. The case for and against this emendation has long been a bone of contention among scholars trying to gauge Pausanias’ attitudes toward the Roman empire.<sup>3</sup> Whatever philological reasons Korais had for rejecting it (and he specifies none in his notes to Clavier’s edition), one suspects that the role he played in detaching the modern Hellenic state from a latter-day imperial power had something to do with it.

Scholars will also be attracted to chapter 4, ‘Pausanias Today: an Evaluation’, which consists mostly of essays by various scholars on some of the major sites described by Pausanias. The concept of this section holds great promise, since the authors are all prominent archaeologists who are intimately involved in the excavation and/or surface exploration of the sites in question (Leda Costaki for Athens, Eleni Kourinou for Sparta, Xenia Arapogianni for Olympia, Rozina Kolonia for Delphi, Petros Themelis for Messene, and Yanis Pikoulas on ‘settlement patterns’). The contributors are thus in an excellent position to provide authoritative and up-to-date analyses of how Pausanias’ text matches up with the remains on-site. Unfortunately, this potential remains mostly unfulfilled. Apart from Costaki’s detailed and remarkably clear explication of Pausanias’ itineraries in Athens, the other offerings are cursory and do little to elucidate the author’s aims and methods in describing ancient sites. Arapogianni’s treatment of Olympia, for instance, is not really about Pausanias’ description at all but about Olympia in the Roman period. Symptomatic is the fact that she discusses the monumental nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus without bothering to tell the reader that Pausanias refrains from making the slightest mention of it. So diverse and inconsistent are the contributions in this section that one suspects that the editors were not clear enough in their instructions to the contributors or did not hold them to their instructions. One point on which the authors are (unfortunately) consistent is that they all seem to assume that Pausanias’ text is an immediate record of things the author saw, in the order that he saw them, on a single jaunt through each site; hence, we frequently read things like ‘Pausanias entered the city...’, ‘next he saw ...’, ‘he has turned back ...’. A considerable amount of re-

---

<sup>3</sup> For a review of the controversy, see [Pretzler 2007](#), 28–29.

cent scholarship has demonstrated the danger of such assumptions,<sup>4</sup> and it is difficult to say whether this tendency in the chapter results from ignorance of that scholarship or from an editorial decision to avoid such academic nuances. One benefit that readers will get from this chapter is the generous number of maps and plans provided as illustration. In some cases, these graphics help to compensate for the limitations of the sketchy written reports.

The remaining chapters are largely unobjectionable but also unremarkable from a scholarly point of view: chapter 1 on ‘The *Periegetes* Pausanias and his Era’ presents little that will be new to readers familiar with, e.g., Habicht’s treatment of these issues [1998],<sup>5</sup> and there is little sign that the authors have consulted scholarship more recent than Habicht. Where they innovate, the results are often infelicitous (for instance, the fact that Pausanias mentions no emperor after Marcus Aurelius hardly means that AD 180 ‘constitutes an indisputable *terminus ante quem* for his life’ [38]). Readers (even non-academic readers) seeking an introduction to Pausanias’ life and times in English would do better to go straight to Habicht or to Maria Pretzler’s new book [2007], which appeared too late for the authors of *Following Pausanias* to take into account. The same could be said for those seeking an introduction to Pausanias’ aims and methods as a topographer, something that chapter 4 does not really succeed in delivering. Finally, chapter 2 by Guilmet, surveying the few things we know about the transmission of Pausanias’ text ‘From Antiquity to the Renaissance’, is only a page and a half long and could have easily been worked into chapter 3.

In sum, the chapter on Pausanias’ reception is truly important and original, and is highly recommended for those who are seriously interested in Pausanias or in the early-modern reception of antiquity; but there is little else in the text of the volume that any reader will be much poorer for having missed. In addition to the essays, however,

---

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Akujärvi 2005, 19–20; Hutton 2005, 25–29; Pretzler 2007, 8. For concrete examples of cases where such assumptions have led readers astray, see Habicht 1998, 165–175. See also Williams [Williams and Fisher 1975, 25–29] on the identification of temples in the forum at Corinth that were previously misidentified [Scranton 1951, 3–73] on the basis of just such a fallacious reading of Pausanias.

<sup>5</sup> A paperback edition, largely unrevised, of his publication of 1985.

the book is also richly illustrated, with glorious photos of manuscript pages and the like (many in color, and many from the outstanding collection of the Gennadius), and with numerous maps, plans, and diagrams, including a miniaturized version of the poster-sized map of Pausanias' routes mentioned above (produced under the direction of Pikoulas, who is currently unrivaled as an authority on ancient roadways in Greece). For the visual material alone, the book would be a worthwhile addition to anyone's library.

In closing, it should also be mentioned (especially since her name is quite hard to find in the front matter) that Deborah Kazazi's translation from the original Greek is remarkably clear, accurate, and idiomatic. I noticed only the occasional problem: e.g., it should be 'sacred way' at Delphi, rather than 'secret way' [213], and 'beyond the Tholos' rather than 'above the Tholos' at Athens [198].

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akujärvi, J. 2005. *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator: Studies in Pausanias' Periegesis*. Lund.
- Alcock, S.; Cherry, J.; and Elsner, J. edd. 2001. *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford.
- Beard, M. 2001. "'Pausanias in Petticoats", or The Blue Jane'. Pp. 224–239 in [Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner 2001](#).
- Clavier, E. 1814–1823. *Description de la Grèce de Pausanias*. Paris.
- Diller, A. 1955. 'The Authors Named Pausanias', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 86:268–279.
- 1956. 'Pausanias in the Middle Ages', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 87:84–97.
- 1957. 'The Manuscripts of Pausanias', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 88:169–188.
- Habicht, C. 1998 [1985]. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. 2nd edn. Berkeley.
- Henderson, J. 2001. 'Farnell's Cults: The Making and Breaking of Pausanias in Victorian Archaeology and Anthropology'. Pp. 207–223 in [Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner 2001](#).

- Hutton, W. 2005. *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*. Cambridge.
- Le Roy, J. 1758. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce, considérées du côté de l'histoire et du côté de l'architecture*. Paris.
- Negri, Stefano [Stephanus Niger]. 1517. *Dialogus, quo quicquid in Graecarum litterarum penetralibus... in lucem propagatur...* Milan.
- Papahatzis, N. 1974–1981. *Πανσανίου Ελλάδος περιήγησις*. 5 vols. Athens.
- Pretzler, M. 2007. *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece*. London.
- Scranton, R. 1951. *Corinth I.iii: Monuments in the Lower Agora and North of the Archaic Temple*. Princeton.
- Sutton, S. 2001. 'A Temple Worth Seeing: Pausanias, Travelers, and the Narrative Landscape at Nemea'. Pp. 175–189 in [Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner 2001](#).
- Wagstaff, J. 2001. 'Pausanias and the Topographers: The Case of Colonel Leake'. Pp. 190–206 in [Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner 2001](#).
- Williams, C. K. II and Fisher, J. E. 1975. 'Corinth, 1974: Forum Southwest'. *Hesperia* 44:1–50.