

PAUSANIAS IN THE AGORA OF ATHENS

R. E. WYCHERLEY

PAUSANIAS' ROUTE IN THE AGORA was worked out fully and satisfactorily by E. Vanderpool in *Hesperia*, Vol. 18, pp. 128ff. The probable identification of Pausanias' Enneakrounos as the south-eastern rather than the south-western fountain house subsequently produced a modification which made for greater simplicity and clarity. I accept in all essentials the emended route-line as given in the plan published in the agora *Guide* and in *Athenian Agora*, Vol. III¹; I merely offer a few comments on Pausanias' methods and on certain particular problems.

As each new site described by Pausanias is excavated and its topography largely determined, users of his periegesis can gain an increasingly clear idea of his value and his limitations, his modes of procedure and the way in which his evidence should be used. Few sites have been more revealing than the Athenian agora. The form of the agora of Roman Corinth too has emerged clearly in recent years, and offers an interesting comparison. These are the only two great city centres of ancient Greece described fully by Pausanias which can also be fully reconstructed on paper from the archaeological material.

It is now startlingly evident that no reconstruction even approaching completeness and correctness could have been made on the basis of Pausanias' description alone, or even with the help of other literary authorities. Not only were there very large gaps but the whole character of the agora as it was in Pausanias' time, at Athens as at Corinth, was effectively concealed. To glance at Corinth first, the complicated and impressive architectural scheme of the Roman agora was revealed by excavation only.² The surrounding colonnades and basilicas, the "upper agora" to the south and the "lower agora" to

¹*The Athenian Agora, A Guide to the Excavations* (Athens, 1954), 86 fig. 14; *The Athenian Agora*, Vol. 3, *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia* (Princeton, 1957), Plate IV (called *Agora III* below). I should like to thank Professor Homer Thompson, Professor Eugene Vanderpool, and other colleagues at Athens and at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, for useful information and discussion.

² See the architectural-topographical volumes of *Corinth*, especially I, iii, *The Lower Agora*, by R.L. Scranton, (1951); and I, iv, *The South Stoa*, by O. Broneer, (1955).

the north, divided by a long row of shops and public buildings, the magnificent and ingeniously constructed South Stoa completing and dominating the Roman agora as it had dominated the Greek, might not have existed as far as Pausanias is concerned. He passes by or through all this in silence as not worth mention, being neither of religious significance nor amongst the remains of antiquity. He singles out the shrines of Artemis and Dionysos, which because they are atoms in the void are impossible to locate, before passing on to the row of temples on the west side of the agora, where the sequence of his description makes identification reasonably sure.³ His procedure is similar at Athens, but it leads to less wholesome omissions and enables him to give a much fuller picture of the agora.

One need not blame Pausanias or criticize his description as inadequate. He is doing just what he set out to do. His interests are mainly religious and antiquarian, and he does in fact pick out, unerringly as a rule, the things which on these principles are most worth mentioning. Long colonnades enclosing the agora were for him merely its setting, to be taken for granted and walked through in silence unless they contained notable works of art. But one cannot help regretting that he did not feel moved at Athens or Corinth to give some coherent general idea of the architectural character of the site. It might have prevented many misconceptions and false reconstructions. He does attempt something of the kind occasionally, as at Elis, where he gives an enlightening note on the distinction between the old-fashioned and Ionian types of agora.⁴

At Athens he enters the agora at the northwest corner, and looking across the square he would see the great two-storeyed stoa of Attalos enclosing the east side and the vast "middle stoa" running across the south side, with the Odeion set against it and forming the dominant centre piece of the whole agora, like a temple in a Roman forum. He gives no general impression of all this but turns at once to a minute examination of the older and more modest monuments on the

³ 2. 2. 6-8.

⁴ 6. 24. 2.

west side. At 1.14.1 he must have seen and possibly passed through the complex of stoas which from the second century B.C. made a separate square of the southern part of the agora, but he says nothing of it. All this, including the very existence of the "middle stoa", one of the largest buildings in Athens, would have been unknown but for the excavations. Pausanias does mention the Odeion, briefly and incidentally in connection with the statues; not unnaturally it was given a comparatively modest and unobtrusive place in earlier attempts to reconstruct the agora. These reconstructions were apt to go very badly wrong, partly because of the vagueness of Pausanias' indication of the relation of one monument to another, but even more so because too much was expected of the literary authorities and of Pausanias in particular. The agora had in fact undergone two revolutionary changes in its architectural form, one in the second century B.C. and one in the time of Augustus. Even the most carefully reconstructed plan, that of Judeich (Abb. 43, p. 344), besides inevitably showing many monuments in the wrong place, gives the whole agora the kind of form, open and loosely knit, which it had at a much earlier stage.

In spite of his ignoring these later developments, Pausanias is still undoubtedly describing the agora as he himself saw it in Roman imperial times. He has been entirely vindicated against the charge that he relies mainly on an earlier writer, e.g. Polemon. An additional piece of evidence in his favor provided by the excavations is that in his account the temple of Ares falls into the place to which it was transferred from an unknown site in the time of Augustus.⁵

These limitations of Pausanias one has to accept with a good grace, as the result of his legitimate interests. One can only criticize his omissions if they involve things which on his own criteria are interesting and important, or if his account is mismanaged or confused or misleading.

On the whole it may be said that he covers the ground thoroughly and attains a remarkable degree of completeness,

⁵ *Hesperia*, 9 (1940), 47.

considering the complexity of the site, the large number of monuments, and the fact that at the very beginning of his work he is attempting one of his most difficult tasks. Omissions which call for comment are few. He does not mention the Leokorion, the shrine of the daughter of Leos; but though it was known to Cicero and remained famous through antiquity, it is just possible that it no longer existed in his time. He introduces the story of the daughters of Leos in another context, after mentioning their father among the Eponymoi.⁶ He says nothing of the hero-shrine of Aiakos, mentioned by Herodotus (though he was interested in the parent shrine at Aigina⁷); this has been tentatively identified with an *eschara* or ground-altar of suitable date found just south of the Twelve Gods; and this monument certainly went out of use and was invisible long before Pausanias' time.⁸ Other absentees from his list are Zeus Agoraios, whose altar may be the large structure east of the Eponymoi⁹; the Herms, which formed an important feature of the northern part of the agora¹⁰; and the tiny shrine of Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria inserted between the buildings of the west side—perhaps it had nothing about it “worth seeing” and noting.¹¹ At the Tholos he merely says that the presidents sacrifice, and does not mention the notable cults, Artemis Boulaia and Phosphoros and the Phosphoroi.¹² On the Kolonos he misses the shrine of Eurysakes.¹³

⁶ 1. 5. 2; perhaps he is content to leave it at that. For the plentiful evidence for the Leokorion see *Agora* III, 108ff. The shrine has not been located by the excavations; possibly it was on the unexplored north side (*ibid.*, 113). A small round building shown in plans of remains found by the German Archaeological Institute in the bed of the railway, west of the XII Gods Altar, may just possibly belong to it (I owe this suggestion to Mr. J. Travlos and Professor Homer Thompson).

⁷ 2. 29. 6-8.

⁸ *Hesperia*, 22 (1953), 45 n. 28.

⁹ *Hesperia*, 21 (1952), 92.

¹⁰ See p. 39 below.

¹¹ *Agora* III, 52.

¹² *Ibid.*, 55ff.

¹³ See n. 16.

His most surprising omission is the famous altar of the Twelve Gods, but that may be partly accounted for.¹⁴

It has been noted that in Book I Pausanias was tentatively working out methods of covering the ground and of describing sequences of sites and monuments. "The explanation of the defects of the *Attica* is that the author was finding himself in his new work, and had not altogether arrived at a definite plan."¹⁵ There is some truth in this as regards his treatment of Attica and of the city of Athens as a whole. After he has left the agora, he attempts to deal with the rest of Athens, except the Acropolis, by means of two excursions based on the Prytan-eion; the result is not altogether satisfactory, and some interesting quarters are not included at all.¹⁶ But his agora tour is based on a sound principle, which with one or two slight complications works out well in practice.

Very few monuments in the agora can be identified outright, beyond the possibility of dispute by the most determined sceptic. Identifications to a certain extent lean up one another, or depend upon the position of a monument on Pausanias' presumed route. With all due caution one has to argue in circles. But the general coherence of the picture must be allowed to carry conviction. Fortunately, from Pausanias' point of view, some of the most important elements are the most secure. The Tholos is absolutely fixed. The temple of Ares,

¹⁴ See p. 40 below.

¹⁵ M. Carroll, *The Attica of Pausanias* (1907), 6.

¹⁶ E.g. Melite with the shrine of Herakles and other interesting shrines, including the Eurysakeion. It has now been convincingly shown that Kolonos Agoraios was included in Melite (see D. Lewis in *ABSA*, 50 [1955], 16; cf. Schol. *Birds* 997); and to this Pausanias gives a somewhat hasty and belated glance (see p. 35 below).

I have dealt briefly with his treatment of eastern and southeastern Athens in an article in the Neleion (not mentioned by Pausanias) which is to appear in the *ABSA*. First he makes an extensive eastward sweep, in the middle of which he breaks off at Kynosarges (18.3) and jumps across to the other gymnasium, the Lyceum, from which he takes a yet more easterly line southward. Then he follows a closer circuit round the east end and south side of the Acropolis.

another turning point, is safe; there is no other candidate for the occupancy of this shrine. The great building in the middle of the agora must without any doubt be the Odeion. The evidence for the Eleusinion, in the shape of inscriptions and minor finds, away to the southeast of the agora, is overwhelming. The Poikile, though it has not been found, cannot now be placed anywhere but on the north side of the agora. These locations in themselves fix beyond doubt the main lines of Pausanias' advance. Before the Tholos he is unquestionably coming down the west side, whatever trouble we may encounter at the north end.

One is not bound to think of the dotted line given in the plan as an absolutely continuous itinerary trodden by Pausanias at every point.¹⁷ All one can say, and all one needs to be sure of, is that he followed certain lines at different stages and gave certain sequences of monuments. When he entered the agora at the northwest corner from the Dipylon, Pausanias would find three streets diverging from that point, one to the south, one to the southeast diagonally across the agora, and one to the east. To follow these streets must have appeared to him the best way of covering the area. His periegesis is thus based in the main on three lines radiating from the point of entry. On this site he finds convenient a radial method of covering the ground which he came to use regularly in dealing with cities and whole districts.¹⁸ At Corinth the agora hardly lent itself to such treatment, but itself formed the centre from which he followed various diverging roads.

Pausanias' chapters on the agora, studied in relation to the finds, take us a stage further in determining the true character and aim of his work, and confirm that however artificial and literary a form he ultimately gave it, his work is primarily a guide, a *Reiseführer*. He is taking his readers round the site as he himself found it, and pointing out in sequence the things most worth attention. The topographical element, based on a list of monuments, is the hard core, the backbone. Some

¹⁷ Cf. n. 34 below.

¹⁸ C. Robert discusses his radial method well in *Pausanias als Schriftsteller*.

modern writers on Pausanias have minimized this element and made much of his literary pretensions¹⁹; but the most recent authors have attained a more balanced estimate. Undoubtedly Pausanias thought of his book as a literary work also, to be read and appreciated whether one used it as a guide or not. On the whole it is not very profitable to try to separate the two motives; one cannot help doubting whether Pausanias was altogether clear and consistent in his own mind as he wrote.

The connecting thread which runs through each section of Pausanias' work is the simple list of monuments, noted in more or less topographical order—with occasional twists or kinks—however much this is subsequently complicated.²⁰ In fact more than two thirds of the chapters on the agora consist of very long historical notes, which tend to dislocate the work and which well illustrate Pausanias' lack of a sense of proportion. But these are essentially insertions. They do not worry the topographer. At almost every point Pausanias refers back and resumes with admirable smoothness and clarity (1.5.1;

¹⁹ Robert's admirable book has been misleading in this respect. His reconstruction of the agora, in which he allows himself to be guided by his ideas of Pausanias' methods of composition, is one of the most erroneous of all. Not only are the buildings badly misplaced, but the whole agora is dislocated from its proper site.

Even a recent writer (G. Zuntz on the Altar of Eleos in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 14, [1953], 74) while admitting that many of Robert's statements have been refuted, commends his general view and says, "It remains nonetheless true that the book of Pausanias is essentially a literary production. He who picks out those features which can justify its description as a 'Baedeker' is bound to mistake him *in toto et in partibus*." However this may be, Robert, putting his ideas into tangible form in a plan of the agora, produced something which *in toto et in partibus* is quite unlike anything the agora ever was.

For more recent treatment see E. Meyer's introduction to his recent translation (1954) and O. Regenbogen in Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. VIII, col. 163. Though the former tends to emphasize the character of the book as a *Reiseführer*, while the latter lays more stress on its literary character, in fact the two come pretty close together. I have indicated my views briefly in *Agora III, Introduction*, 11.

²⁰ And the topographical element, one should note, is continuous and fairly systematic; the elaboration in the form of mythological and historical digressions and so forth is more occasional and fortuitous, more lacking in system and sense of proportion.

8.2; 14.1). He makes no connecting reference at 17.1, but the digression on Seleukos is very much shorter than the others.

What causes real difficulty in following Pausanias on the spot, and picking out the things he mentions, is the fact that he uses vague and general terms—if he says anything at all—to indicate the relation of each monument to the one preceding. One would hardly look for precise distances and directions as in a modern guidebook; but one might expect a little more than he gives. Assuming that his work began with a list of monuments, one suspects that this lack of precision was at some points apt to be aggravated in the process of working up his basic material into literary form. He wished his book to be readable; he was conscious that the nature of his subject was liable to produce monotony. In striving after literary style he seeks variety in his transitions. The formulae which he uses are of a conventional character; topographical relations are apt to become blurred in the process of literary composition. G. Daux emphasizes and illustrates this characteristic in the case of the monuments of Delphi.²¹ After a careful analysis of Pausanias' varied modes of transition he speaks of "ces véritables acrobaties" (200). One would hardly use such a term of his procedure in the Athenian agora; but there he had not such long sequences of more or less homogeneous monuments to cope with. "Parcourant le sanctuaire," writes Daux, "il prend des notes devant chaque monument, et c'est la succession même de ces notes qui constitue le plan de son exposé." One can say the same of the Athenian agora; there, too, one has reason to doubt whether he always took careful note of the successive stages of his itinerary, of the relative position of monuments; whether he incorporated such notes directly and precisely in his final work, or relied to a certain extent on memory assisted by literary invention.

²¹ *Pausanias à Delphes, passim*, and especially 189ff.

PERIEGESIS OF THE AGORA

On entering the agora (3.1), which he calls the Kera-meikos, probably restricting too narrowly even for his contemporaries the significance of the latter name,²² Pausanias clearly indicates the direction which he takes—to the right, i.e. southwards. A group of closely related monuments follows, and in presenting these he consistently gives indications of the relation of one to another. Yet in spite of this he has left room for doubt whether the Basileios and the stoa of Zeus are the same or separate buildings. How this may have happened is discussed more fully below.²³ That it can happen at all is symptomatic of a certain lack of clarity and precision into which his language is apt to fall. He seems in fact to have been guilty of a verbal inconsistency in writing up his material.

When he passes from the stoa of Zeus to the temple of Apollo, at 3.4, the fact that Euphranor not only painted the pictures in the stoa of Zeus but also made “the Apollo called Patroos in the temple near by” provides him with the kind of opportunity which he welcomes—to make a more interesting and stylish transition than a mere topographical sequence allows.

His omission and inclusion of topographical directions are quite arbitrary. He gives none at the next stage (3.5), but simply says, “There is built also a shrine of the Mother of the Gods.” His common phrase *ὀλίγον ἀπωτέρω*²⁴ would not have been inappropriate here, since he is going on to a fresh group of monuments, comparatively detached from those just mentioned. A broad passage was left between the temple of Apollo and the Metroon, leading up the hillside to the temple of Hephaistos, which he might well have visited at this point. He gives no hint of the elaborate and complex form of the contemporary Metroon, with its shrine and record rooms. Shrine of the Mother, record-office and Bouleuterion hang closely

²² See *Agora* III, 221.

²³ See p. 37 below.

²⁴ See *Agora* III, 89–90, for his use of this phrase.

together in his account (3.5, *πλησίον*; 5.1, *πλησίον*)—as they do in fact—in spite of the long digression on the Gauls. Pausanias constantly writes on the assumption that the reader can see things for himself; for example at 3.5, “The Thesmothetai” (what Thesmothetai? The ones you see in front of you) were painted by Protogenes.

Now the periegesis takes a different direction (5.1). Monuments were thick along both sides of the western street, and to deal with them adequately Pausanias doubles back along its eastern side; we now know this from the archaeological finds. There is no hint of the change of direction in the text of Pausanias. In fact something seems to have gone wrong with his account at this point. There is no reasonable doubt about the site of the Eponymoi. They stood on the long base on the other side of the street, further north and a little *lower down*. One might have expected from Pausanias something like *καταντικρύ*, which would give a vague but not misleading idea of their position; or possibly *ὀλίγον ἀπωτέρω*.²⁵ In fact he says *ἀνωτέρω δὲ . . .* A reasonable explanation is that Pausanias’ basic notes did not contain a clear indication of the relation of the Eponymoi to the Tholos, or of the point at which he turned back down the street, and that he suffered from a momentary confusion of mind or lapse of memory.

The statues leading up to and around the temple of Ares follow in succession, until one reaches the tyrannicides, again with a variety of mainly colorless topographical transitions.²⁶ One can make pretty well what one wishes of this in looking for the sites of these monuments in the central part of the agora around the temple. Other authors give somewhat more precise information in several cases. Demosthenes was near the altar of the Twelve Gods²⁷; this places him beyond the

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ 8. 2-5; cf. *Hesperia*, 22 (1953), 43.

²⁷ *Ps. Plutarch, X Orat.*, 847a. The old difficulty of coordinating Pausanias and *Ps. Plutarch* and *Ps. Aeschines* (see n. 28) is neatly resolved now that we can assume that Pausanias has doubled back and is near the *Basileios* again, and the XII Gods Altar is in this same region..

temple to the north. Yet Pausanias coming from the south mentions Demosthenes first, and then says that the temple is near his statue. Presumably he thinks it natural and effective to list Lycurgus, Kallias and Demosthenes together, even though this takes him beyond the temple. This means a departure from strict sequence, but hardly a real aberration from his itinerary. Pindar stood in front of the Basileios,²⁸ i.e. in the same part of the agora as Demosthenes, but he is mentioned *after* the temple along with the obscure Kalades. With the tyrannicides Pausanias must have reached the line of the Panathenaic street; Arrian almost pin-points the site—"about opposite the Metroon, where we go up to the Acropolis."²⁹ This last phrase can now hardly be taken to mean anything but the Panathenaic Street; and the statues must have been *immediately adjacent* to the street, if the words are to have any point.

The "theatre called Odeion" (8.6) receives no introduction. Dominating the agora, as we now know it did, it would be quite unmistakable. The succession of monuments which follows, as far as Eukleia, 14.5, hangs together, even though loosely. Enneakrounos is "near" the Odeion, the temples of Demeter and Kore and of Triptolemos are above the fountain, the temple of Eukleia is "still further off." The lack of a topographical link between the Odeion and the tyrannicides has had unfortunate results in the modern study of Pausanias. In the days when his Enneakrounos and the Eleusinion were sought in comparatively distant parts, and this passage was thought to be a special excursion or even to have suffered a serious dislocation in Pausanias' scheme, the whole group of monuments beginning with the Odeion was pushed around Athens with some ruthlessness.³⁰ Now the Odeion is particularly firmly fixed in the middle of the agora and the Eleusinion is safely placed to the southeast. There is no eccentricity or dislocation in the periegesis at this point; it merely becomes a

²⁸ Ps. Aeschines, *Epist.* IV, 2-3.

²⁹ *Anabasis*, 3. 16. 8.

³⁰ Cf. Fraser's Pausanias, Vol. 2, 112.

little more diffuse and widely extended. That this is so excuses to some extent his loose use of the word *πλησίον* at 14.1, of Enneakrounos in relation to the Odeion. The "South-east Fountain-House", which is probably Pausanias' Enneakrounos, is about 90m., even in a direct line, from the south side of the Odeion, and is cut off from it by the stoas of the southern part of the agora. This is a very different matter from *πλησίον* as used hitherto; Pausanias is stretching the sense of the word to its limit, but perhaps not beyond. Perhaps one should think of him as proceeding along the Panathenaic Street; opposite the east end of the Middle Stoa the Odeion would still be towering up close behind him, while the fountain house would be coming into view not far in front. (*πλησίον* and *ὑπέρ* at 14.1, would be much more difficult to account for if one were trying to identify his Enneakrounos with the south-west fountain house.) Whatever one thinks of *πλησίον*—it may be no more than a conventional connection rather carelessly used—since the Odeion and the Eleusinion are fixed one is led forcibly to the conclusion that among the hydraulic installations to the southeast of the agora, midway between and just off the road, Pausanias saw what he took to be Enneakrounos.³¹

³¹ Although to this extent one may hopefully consider the old Enneakrounos problem as simplified and concentrated, in some ways the excavations have introduced new complexities. For the newly discovered fountain houses see *Hesperia*, 18 (1949), 133, 214; 22 (1953), 29-35; 24 (1955), 57; *Agora Guide*, 73, 74, 80; *Agora III*, 140. I have also benefited from hearing a lecture by Professor Homer Thompson on the water-supply of the agora and Athens in general, a complex subject on which new evidence continues to appear.

The south-east fountain house is of suitable archaic date for the Peisistratid Enneakrounos; but it consisted essentially of rectangular water-basins at either end, east and west, of a long rectangular area; and it is difficult to imagine for it a suitable nine-spouted form. Also the water was supplied mainly by an important aqueduct leading from the east—little rose on the spot—which makes even more puzzling Pausanias' statement that Enneakrounos was Athens' one and only *πηγή* or natural source. He may be simply mistaken on this point; it would be difficult in city fountains to tell to what extent water came from a natural spring.

Towards the middle of the second century A.D., in Pausanias' own time, was built the handsome semi-circular Nymphaeum which has been found adjacent to the archaic fountain-house, on the north. The question rises whether this is what Pausanias means, or whether indeed this was the second century version of Enneakrounos. Pausanias would have it prominently in view as he

Whether it was Thucydides' Kallirrhoe-Enneakrounos, and why Pausanias says it was the only *πηγή* at Athens, are questions to which the answer is still not clear. The old Enneakrounos problem has not been solved by the excavations but has taken on a different form. But at least one can be fairly sure that Pausanias is following a simple and continuous route at this point.

In spite of the considerable distance again involved, his description of the Eleusinian shrines as "above the fountain" is quite natural. His reticence about the Eleusinion, and his confused and ambiguous way of relating the temples to it, are unfortunate. First he mentions the temple of Demeter and Kore and the temple of Triptolemos, then he alludes to the Eleusinion, then he comes back to the temple of Triptolemos. It would be premature to attempt to interpret his words till excavation has cleared the rest of the site.³²

His introduction of the Hephaisteion at this point I have discussed elsewhere³³; it is in the nature of a special excursion in the itinerary,³⁴ perhaps intended to remedy an earlier omission. For this purpose he adopts for a moment quite a different method, relating the temple not to anything immediately preceding it but to the agora (Kerameikos) as a whole, and to the most important building below it on the west side. He could hardly have spoken in just these terms, I believe, of any but the temple which still crowns the hill and dominates the scene from the west.

came along the Panathenaic Way. But the Nymphaeum was an elaborate building of blatantly contemporary design à la Herodes Atticus; and Pausanias speaks of Peisistratos and his work. Perhaps he ignored the new building and noticed the old; perhaps the Nymphaeum had not yet been built.

The south-west fountain house, designed on a different principle and L-shaped, was built in the fifth century B.C. and still existed in Pausanias' time.

³² See *Agora* III, 74 for the evidence.

³³ In an article to appear in *JHS*.

³⁴ Here in particular one need not insist on the dotted line of the continuous itinerary. If one does, then instead of going back through the middle of the agora and up between the Metroon and the temple of Apollo, Pausanias may have passed across the south side of the agora and then up to the Kolonos through two small propyla discovered south and west of the Tholos.

At 14.7 the sense of *πλησίον* is again somewhat strained, though not beyond credibility, if the identification of the shrine of Aphrodite Ourania, as the small building whose remains lie at the southern foot of Kolonos, is correct.³⁵

At 15.1 Pausanias gives the impression that he is making a new approach, but he gives no indication from what direction. To his contemporaries no doubt all would be clear, since he uses one of the most famous buildings of the agora as his point of reference. His mode of procedure is somewhat similar to what we have at 3.1-3, if one assumes that the Basilios and Zeus stoas are identical—first a brief mention of the Poikile, then certain monuments which one sees as one approaches it, then on to the stoa itself and its paintings. But there is no ambiguity at this point, since he says quite clearly “*This stoa . . .*”

At 17.1 he uses the term “agora” for the first time instead of Kerameikos. One need not look for any particular significance in this. His mode of introducing the altar of Eleos has an artificial literary and moral tone; this is another method by which on occasion he diversifies the periegesis. As far as anything he says about the site goes, the altar might be anywhere in the agora; but unless there is evidence to the contrary we can assume that the altar like everything else so far takes a natural place in the itinerary. There are, however, certain curious features in his treatment of the altar which are dealt with separately below.³⁶ He attaches to it a list of altars to other “abstract” deities, without saying where they were; one at least, the altar of Aidos, stood on the Acropolis.³⁷ Similarly at the Academy, 30.1, in connection with the altar of Eros he mentions the altar of Anteros, though in this case he makes it clear that the latter was “in the city.”

³⁵ Mrs. Dorothy Thompson has pointed out to me that this identification is not beyond doubt, and that the building may not be a temple at all but another propylon.

³⁶ See p. 40 below.

³⁷ See Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*,² 283.

BASILEIOS-ZEUS STOA

In the first stage of Pausanias' description of the agora (3. 1-3) a problem at once arises which shows in an acute form the kind of trouble which his method of description is liable to create. He mentions the stoa Basileios; he mentions various statues; he continues, "behind is built a stoa," which is undoubtedly what other writers call the stoa of Zeus Eleutherios. The problem is, have we two stoas here, or only one. This question has been much discussed in recent years; probably the last word cannot be said until the excavations are carried further north. The excavators themselves, besides other commentators, are not in agreement whether the stoa actually discovered in the northwestern part of the agora is the stoa of Zeus only or whether it is also the Basileios. Thompson's arguments for the identity of the two, expressed fully in his publication of the building,³⁸ remain convincing, I believe; there are difficulties, but there are greater difficulties in separating the stoas. R. Martin gives a good summary of the discussion in *L'Agora Grecque*,³⁹ and is of the same opinion.

Pausanias can, I think, be best explained on this view; but for the moment we are only concerned with that element in the character of his evidence which has made it possible to derive from it diametrically opposite opinions. Before the excavations showed the difficulty of fitting in a second stoa the problem did not arise. At first reading Pausanias certainly seems to be speaking of two buildings, and Frazer in his edition and Judeich in his *Topographie*⁴⁰ took this for granted. Once the archaeological finds brought the difficulty to the fore Thompson noted that the words of Pausanias allowed and even suggested the possibility that there was only one stoa. One might go still further and say that if one carefully re-examines his language this is the only view which they allow, or even that they prove the case outright. "Near the Basileios stand

³⁸ *Hesperia*, 6 (1937), 64ff. and 225; cf. *Agora* III, 30.

³⁹ *Recherches sur l'Agora Grecque* (1951), 320ff.

⁴⁰ 339.

Konon and Timotheos and Euagoras." "Here (*ἐνταῦθα*) stand Zeus and Hadrian." "Behind is built a stoa." He simply has not moved on; one cannot get him away from the Basileios. In the agora he repeatedly deals with groups of statues in relation to a particular building. *ἐνταῦθα* means that he has not changed his major architectural point of reference. In some contexts, where he is taking a broader view, it might imply a greater distance and a certain degree of detachment; here, where he is moving slowly and describing monuments in great detail, it hardly can. (And it so happens that a suitable group of bases have been found in front of the excavated stoa,⁴¹ to corroborate the view that he is anchored down to one spot, that he has not passed on to another building).

Yet acute pre-excavation commentators overlooked all this and took his words in quite a different sense. The trouble lies of course in the way he continues—"a stoa is built behind;" he should have written, to be consistent, "*the stoa* is built behind," or even "the stoa Basileios," and then all would have been clear. Of course he *may* have gone wrong at *ἐνταῦθα*, using the word improperly and blurring a topographical transition at that point. But the most likely explanation is I think something like this—he enters the agora and notes, "Stoa Basileios—statues—pictures in stoa;" then in working up his material into literary form he does not keep very clearly in mind whether there are two stoas or one. Thompson perhaps flatters Pausanias when he speaks of the passages on the Basileios as "our most straightforward and trustworthy evidence." Pausanias did not deceive, but he was sometimes not very clear-headed or direct in expression.

But for the unfortunate ambiguity of language, his suggested procedure in dealing with the Basileios—to mention the building and its purpose, then the statues conspicuous on the roof followed by the statues in front, then to go in and see the paintings—is not unreasonable, though it is difficult to find a precise parallel. Thompson suggests his description of the

⁴¹ *Hesperia*, 6 (1937), 56ff. and 68.

Propylaea and the sanctuary of Poseidon at the Isthmus.⁴² In the former case his procedure is perhaps simpler and more natural; he does not mention the same structure twice in such a way as to cause ambiguity. First he admires the beauty of the great gateway itself, then he mentions various associated shrines, monuments and subsidiary structures; finally he passes through the gateway still noting statues as he goes. A fairly close parallel on a vast scale is his approach to the Acrocorinthus (2.4.6-5.1). "The Acrocorinthus is a peak above the city . . . handed over by Helios to Aphrodite;" shrines on the way to the hill follow, then the peak itself with the temple of Aphrodite. This again is entirely natural and clear. At 1.3.1-3, he has been unhappy in his choice of language; he has not kept the scene clearly in view or brought it unmistakably before his readers' eyes.

HERMS

On one troublesome point concerning the monuments of the northwestern corner of the agora Pausanias unfortunately remains silent. This is the question of "the Herms," and "the stoa of the Herms," a very elusive structure on which a word from Pausanias might have settled doubts. However with great caution one may sometimes use Pausanias' silences and omissions as significant evidence. There were Herms everywhere about the streets of Athens, but somewhere in the northwest corner of the agora stood what were known as "the Herms" *par excellence*.⁴³ Elsewhere (1.24.3) he mentions the Athenian practice of setting up Herms, and it may be that he is content with this "blanket" reference and does not feel called upon to mention "the Herms" in the agora specifically. Yet he goes out of his way to bring in certain particular Herms in the Ptolemaion (1.17.2).

Menekles-Kallikrates, as quoted by Harpokration on *Hermai*, said that the Herms were "from the Poikile and the Stoa of the King," which must mean that they began at and

⁴² *Ibid.*, 225.

⁴³ See *Agora* III, 103ff. for the evidence.

extended from these stoas. This is best explained on the assumption that the Basileios was at the north end of the west side of the agora—as indeed we know it was—and the Poikile at the west end of the north side. There would then be a group or line of Herms at the north end of the Basileios and the west end of the Poikile.

It is a probable assumption, though it cannot be proved, that the Herms dedicated by Kimon belonged to this group, which, according to Menekles-Kallikrates, consisted of large numbers set up by both private individuals and magistrates; and that the "Stoa of the Herms," in which Kimon's dedication stood, was in this region. The existence of this stoa has been denied and the text of Aeschines (iii, 103) forcibly emended to get rid of it.⁴⁴ On the other hand in some of the restored agora plans it is placed solidly at the west end of the north side of the agora, considerably displacing the Poikile towards the east. This gives an arrangement which does not suit Menekles-Kallikrates' description so well. I have already suggested that one can keep the stoa of the Herms, but not make it inconveniently obtrusive on the scheme of this part of the agora, by assuming that it was not a great stoa, coordinate with the Poikile and the Basileios, but a mere frame for the three Herms.⁴⁵ In that case it is less surprising that Pausanias says nothing. But even so one might have expected something from him on this notable and famous group of figures.

ALTAR OF ELEOS

The last thing of all which Pausanias mentions (17.1) before leaving the agora and visiting the buildings to the east and southeast is the altar of Eleos. This has been very reasonably identified with what was called the altar of the Twelve Gods; the identification is very acceptable though it cannot be

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 104.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

proved outright.⁴⁶ It is very probable that the name "altar of Eleos" does not represent a genuine old cult, but was rather a somewhat artificial title given to another cult, and that of the Twelve is for various reasons the most likely. The altar of the Twelve has been discovered and identified on very sound evidence, including a dedication *in situ*, in the middle of the northern part of the agora. Pausanias does not mention the altar of the Twelve (under that name) which is particularly unfortunate since it is one of the few points in the agora which archaeologically are securely fixed. Whether one accepts the identification of Eleos and the Twelve or not, what he has to say at this point calls for comment and for some reflection on his method.

If the altar of the Twelve is distinct from Eleos, then Pausanias is guilty of an omission, perhaps the most surprising and culpable in his account of the agora. The altar was ancient and venerable and played an important part in Athenian life; it was in a key position in the agora and served as a central milestone from which distances were measured,⁴⁷ and it may be what Pindar⁴⁸ calls in his dithyramb for the Athenians "the much-frequented navel of the city, fragrant with incense." One might even use the unlikelihood of Pausanias having ignored this monument completely as an argument for bringing the Twelve and Eleos together.

If the identification is correct, as it probably is, then Pausanias merely failed to observe the true nature of the cult and the history of the altar. This would not be surprising; he does not usually show great powers of penetration in such matters. In the agora he appears to be quite ignorant of the remarkable history of the temple of Ares, torn up from some other site and replanted in the middle of the square, though this must have been well known and remembered at Athens.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ *Hesperia*, Suppl. VIII, 94; Vol. 21 (1952), 49; Agora III, 67ff and 122; cf. G. Zuntz in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 14 (1953), 71ff., who expresses strong doubts about the identification, and the present writer in *C.Q.*, N.S. 4, 143ff.

⁴⁷ Herodotus, 6, 108, 4; *IG* II², 2640.

⁴⁸ Frag. 75 (Snell), 63 (Bowra); cf. *Agora* III, 122.

⁴⁹ Dinsmoor in *Hesperia*, 9 (1940), 47.

The place of the altar of Eleos in his description suits the altar of the Twelve well enough to support the identification. The altar is not far to the south of, i.e. in front of the Poikile, which he has just described, and which must now be placed on the north side of the agora probably towards the west end.⁵⁰ But there are two peculiar points in his mode of introducing the altar of Eleos, which perhaps when taken together explain one another, and at the same time throw a little light on his procedure. The altar is not quite where one would have expected from his description; he could more easily and naturally have brought it in at an earlier stage. And he says it is amongst the things in the agora which are “not *episema* to all,” an obscure remark which has usually been mistranslated and which on any interpretation is a strange thing to say about this altar. At this stage Pausanias is passing along the north side of the agora and is about to leave it at the north east corner. He has dealt with the Poikile, noted the statue of Solon in front of it and the statue of Seleukos “a little further off;” and his next stopping point is the Ptolemaion to the east of the agora. The altar of the Twelve is on the other side of the Panathenaic street, and in some ways more closely linked with the monuments in the northwestern section, and also those in the centre near the temple of Ares. It was near the *perischoinisma*,⁵¹ where that was we cannot be sure, but the most probable location is in front of the Basileios, especially if one can identify the Basileios with the stoa of Zeus. The great painting of the Twelve in the stoa of Zeus linked up with the altar, and Pausanias might have mentioned the altar in connection with this stoa rather than the Poikile. Again the altar of the Twelve

⁵⁰ I.e. further west than is tentatively indicated in most of the agora plans; see p. 40 above and Agora III, 40; it is probably best to assume that it was not masked by the small “north-east stoa”; I also think that the “stoa beside the Basileios” of *Ecclesiastus* 685 is probably the Poikile (see Agora III, 22); if this is so the Poikile must be near the west end, so that on entering the agora the visitor would have the Basileios to the right balanced by the Poikile to the left.

⁵¹ Ps. Plutarch, *X Orat.* 847a; cf R. Martin in *B.C.H.*, 66-67 (1942/43), 282, and the present writer in *J.H.S.*, 75 (1955), 117-18.

was near the statue of Demosthenes,⁵² which Pausanias saw with other statues near the temple of Ares. The best point of all at which to introduce the altar into his sequence of monuments would have been after these statues, at 1.8.5. It would have been an entirely natural turning point for the next "leg" of his tour. Instead he misses it and turns immediately south to the Tyrannicides and so on towards the Eleusinion.

At 1.17.1 he is again in the neighborhood of the altar and at last his attention is drawn to it. One almost gets the impression that he is glancing over his shoulder and repairing an omission before he finally leaves the agora; and the consciousness of this may have led him to use the otherwise inexplicable words *οὐκ ἐπίσημα*. The altar was a low and modest structure, and surrounded and perhaps masked by trees;⁵³ he may have failed to recognize it for what it was, and to note it down at the earlier stage.

Just what does he mean by "not *episema* to all"? Frazer translates, "not universally known," W. H. S. Jones, "not generally known." E. Meyer's recent translation reads, "die nicht bei allen Menschen bekannt sind." These versions are at best only approximate; they miss the essential meaning of *ἐπίσημος*, which is "bearing a distinguishing mark." Even when the word assumes a vaguer and more general character (see L-S-J 3, "notable", "remarkable") one cannot get away altogether from this basic meaning. I therefore take the words to mean, "not bearing a distinguishing mark for all to see," "not easily distinguishable for everyone." The words can hardly refer to the fact that Eleos was not recognized as a god and worshipped elsewhere. *ἐπίσημος* does not mean "honored" or "worshipped"; and Pausanias is speaking of actual concrete objects, monuments such as an altar, in the Athenian agora, and saying that *these* are not *ἐπίσημα*.

It would in fact have been quite untrue to say that the altar of Eleos was "not generally known." It was very famous indeed from at least the time of Lucian and Pausanias, and it

⁵² *X Orat.* 847a.

⁵³ Statius, *Theb.* 491; cf. *Hesperia*, 21 (1952), 50; 22, p. 46.

became proverbial, a commonplace of the rhetorical schools, with which Pausanias was not unacquainted. Apsines says,⁵⁴ speaking of the altar of Eleos, "For this you have a great reputation amongst all other men." Perhaps the expression is one of those which indicate Pausanias' awareness of the enormous task he has before him. In such a place as the agora of Athens it is only too easy to miss things of interest if they do not stand out clearly recognizable; there are so very many things to see and record.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This article was put together mainly during a period at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, and I should particularly like to record my debt to helpful suggestions by Professor H. A. Thompson. For the plan I am indebted to the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES

⁵⁴ *Ars. Rhet.*, ed. Hammer, 307; cf. *Agora* III, 67ff.