

PAUSANIAS AND THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CLASSICAL SPARTA

The *Periegesis* of Pausanias has finally entered the world of serious literature. Long after the way was first shown, the Magnesians have arrived and duly taken his place in the intellectual world of the second century: a pilgrim to the past.¹ Yet he was no bookish, library-bound bore. Recent studies have transformed our opinion of him as a recorder of the sites and treasures of what was, even to him, antiquity, 'His faithfulness in reporting what he saw has, time and time again, been proven at a large number of sites and could easily be demonstrated at a good many others.'² The very fact that the second-century A.D. traveller Pausanias wrote at such length about the sites and monuments of Greece is itself indicative of his most important attitude towards antiquities. That is, he thought them of sufficient value to be worth recording and thought it worth travelling extensively in mainland Greece over a period of many years to see them for himself.³ And so inevitably, as respect for the author has grown, the desire to lay bare his soul has followed. Critics are unanimous in their view of a man sensitive to the resonance of the ancient and power of the past. On occasion a Herodotean fascination with the mutability of man's lot bubbles to the surface, indeed we may surmise Herodotus to have been an important influence on the *Periegesis* in several fundamental respects.⁴ Above all he was a man of deep learning and keen interest in the past and a faithful recorder of its remains. Archaeologists and art-historians concur.

¹ See E. L. Bowie, 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic' in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society* (London and Boston, 1974), pp. 166–209, 188–9; B. P. Reardon, *Courants Littéraires Grecs des II^e et III^e Siècles après J.-C.* (Paris, 1971), pp. 221–4. The following works are also cited by authors' names only: K. Arafat, 'Pausanias' Attitude to Antiquities' *ABSA* 87 (1992), 387–409; J.-F. Bommelaer, *Lysandre de Sparte. Histoire et Tradition*. *BEFAR* 240 (Paris, 1981); P. A. Cartledge, *Agisilaos and the Crisis of Sparta* (London, 1987); G. De Sanctis, 'Nuovi Studi sulle "Elleniche" di Oxyrhynchos' *AAT* 66 (1931), 157–94; O. Fischbach, 'Die Benutzung des thukydideischen Geschichtswerkes durch den Periegeten Pausanias' *WS* 15 (1893), 161–91; W. G. Forrest, 'The Date of the Lykourgan Reforms at Sparta' *Phoenix* 17 (1963), 157–79; W. Gurlitt, *Über Pausanias Untersuchungen* (Graz, 1890); Ch. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1985); D. Musti and M. Torelli, *Pausania Guida della Grecia Libro III La Laconia*² (Milan, 1992); C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives' *JHS* 99 (1979), 74–96; M. Segre, 'Pausania come fonte storica' *Historia* 1 (1927), 202–34; G. S. Shrimpton, *Theopompus the Historian* (Montreal and Kingston, 1991); C. J. Tuplin, 'Pausanias and Plutarch's *Epaminondas*' *CQ* 34 (1984), 346–58; C. Wernicke, *De Pausaniae Periegetae Studiis Herodoteis* (Berlin, 1884). All unattributed references are to Pausanias in the Teubner edition of M. H. Rocha-Pereira, second edition (Leipzig, 1989). Unattributed references to the commentaries of H. Hitzig and H. Blümner (Leipzig, 1896–1910), and J. G. Frazer (London, 1897) are to vols. 1.2 and 3 respectively; translations of Pausanias are taken from the first volume of the latter work. All dates are B.C., unless otherwise specified.

² Habicht, p. 63 and *passim* for a revisionist view of Pausanias, esp. pp. 165–75 for an investigation into the origins of modern hostility to Pausanias. Even where Pausanias now appears from excavation to have been wrong, the reaction is to explain rather than vilify. See e.g. J. De la Grenière, 'Pausanias et le Sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux d'Akriai' *CRAI* Janv.–Mars. 1991, 257–65.

³ Arafat, p. 387, cf. Habicht, pp. 148–51.

⁴ For the most recent study of the psychology of Pausanias and previous bibliography see J. Elsner, 'Pausanias: A Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World.' *P & P* 135 (1992), 3–29. Mutability: cf. Habicht, p. 164 with n. 87. Herodotus: Habicht, p. 133, Arafat, p. 388; Bowie, p. 188, Segre, pp. 207–8. See further below, Part I.

But what of its History? Like all good guide-books, the *Periegesis* contains much historical background. On occasion this takes the form of short vignettes, attached to an object or place, and sometimes these can grow into longer historical treatments. Equally, Pausanias feels free to set out his historical background in the form of an extended narrative preface to the region he is about to describe. Often detailed, and almost as often preserving accounts of events otherwise unknown, some of these historical passages have become notorious chestnuts of Greek History.⁵ It is thus desirable for historians, no less than archaeologists, to try to arrive at an understanding of Pausanias' working method and reliability. However, while archaeologists may continue to dig and uncover the objects Pausanias saw and the places he visited, it is unlikely that historians will recover any more of the historical sources used by Pausanias. Conclusions may be drawn only from detailed analysis of what exists.

What follows is offered as a beginning to such an analysis, an attempt to lay down some parameters, while at the same time investigating afresh an inherently interesting historical account. The focus will be on the preface to book three of the *Periegesis*, the Laconian History (3.1.1.–3.10.5), and more specifically the account contained therein of the late fifth and fourth century. At the beginning of this book, as elsewhere, Pausanias treats us to a summary of the history of the region he is about to describe. In the case of Laconia this would be interesting enough, covering as it does the period from the first king, Lelex (3.1.1), to the death of Cleomenes III (3.7.1). However the whole treatment is given an extra dimension by Pausanias' decision to base his narrative on the structure of the king-lists of the two Spartan royal houses. The question of the sources for this book of the *Periegesis* was given its first and only comprehensive treatment by W. Immerwahr at the end of the last century.⁶ Subsequently various investigations have been made into the nature of parts of the 'history', but they have concentrated exclusively on the account of the fifth century or earlier. In one of these W. G. Forrest made an attempt to provide a brief overview of the nature of the problem. The density of account that Pausanias sets out varies from period to period. Thus from c. 590–479 the Kings of both families are credited with a good number of colourful stories, while the era prior to that as far back as the birth of the twins Eurysthenes and Procles yields little, and likewise the years 479–404 are surprisingly barren. Once Pausanias arrives at the fourth century however, the quantity and quality of material improves dramatically again. *A priori*, there is an obvious conclusion to be drawn: 'This is no condensation of a general history of Sparta: no writer of such a history could have passed so lightly over the fifth century. It is rather a rhapsody of sources for different periods and I suspect that Pausanias himself may have been the rhapsode.'⁷

⁵ One need hardly mention the Messenian War account of book four's preface or the Achaean War of book seven's, or descriptions appended, for example, to statues of Aratus, Epaminondas, Lysimachus, Pyrrhus, Attalus and Ptolemy (2.8.1, 9.12.4, 1.9.5, 1.11.1, 1.6.1). 'Ohne diese literarischen Quellen bliebe auch das epigraphische und archäologische Material zum größten Teile für die historische Rekonstruktion unverwertbar.', H. Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur Hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Historia Einzelschrift* 20 (Wiesbaden, 1972), p. 167.

⁶ W. Immerwahr, *Die Lakonika des Pausanias auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin, 1889), henceforth 'Immerwahr'. For bibliography of the studies of Pausanias' sources in general see Segre, p. 214 n. 60, and D. Musti and L. Beschi, *Pausania Guida della Grecia Libro I l'Attica* (Milan, 1982), pp. xxiv–xxxv. Also of use is O. Regenbogen's article 'Pausanias' *RE Supplbd.* 8, cols. 1008–97.

⁷ Forrest, pp. 176–7.

I

The first problem, then, is the sort of rhapsody involved. Did Pausanias take several standard authors from his shelves and, picking details from here and there, weave them together to form a composite narrative? Or did he rather pick one historian for each 'period' with which he was concerned and rather sew them end to end? Synthesis or parathesis? The comparative poverty of the fifth century account might seem to militate against the former of these notions, as much as against general history, but, surprisingly, this concept of a Pausanias picking and mixing from a selection of authors has continued to survive. So the most recent commentary on book three announces, 'la novità di Pausania consiste dunque nel dare una sintesi di testimonianze proveniente dalla grande storiografia, presentate nella forma della successione genealogica e dinastica.'⁸

To proceed any further, closer examination of Pausanias' text is required. The *Laconia* is an apt text with which to start, not only because of the content of the later historical account, but also because the earlier part provides a useful control for theories of Pausanias' method. As has often been observed, the majority of the account of the sixth century Kings is clearly derived from Herodotus. The relevant texts have been set out in parallel and briefly discussed by C. Wernicke, and the details of this debt need no further demonstration.⁹

In general, Pausanias' tendency is not to reproduce his source verbatim, though occasional verbal echoes remain. Rather, he recasts the story in his own words, usually in abbreviated form. Although the Periegete also inserts some details that are not to be found in Herodotus, none of these need point to the use of a second narrative source. On the Agiad side the biggest insertion is the digression on the bones of Theseus (3.3.7). There is no need to insist on finding a source for this: 'man mit Improvisationen des P[ausanias] rechnen muss.'¹⁰ The method of introduction of the Theseus story suggests that this was a recollection of Pausanias himself rather than a reference sought out. Likewise, the suggestion that for the metallic discourse (3.3.8) Pausanias was using the same source as the scholiast to Apollonius of Rhodes 1.430 is far-fetched.¹¹ Such a belief about the use of metals would have been commonplace for any interested party who knew Homer and Hesiod. Pausanias may reasonably be credited with some knowledge of his own. In the account of Cleomenes, three details were seized upon by Wernicke and Immerwahr as pointing to an additional source for this king. First, Pausanias' *αὐτίκα* ('immediately') at 3.4.1 does not appear to be derived from Herodotus' account (6.76ff), but this may as well be carelessness as

⁸ Musti and Torelli, pp. xxvii and 167–88 *passim* for specific observation of this synthesis.

⁹ Wernicke, pp. 16–17, 51–68, 87–8. See also the treatment 25 years earlier by O. Pfundtner, 'Die Historischen Quellen des Reisebeschreibers Pausanias,' *NJPhP* 99 (1869), 441–54, esp. pp. 444–6. The stories taken from Herodotus are as follows (references to Pausanias book three in brackets): Bones of Orestes (3.5–3.6) – Hdt. 1.67–8; Cleomenes' Succession (3.9–3.10) – Hdt. 5.40–2; Cleomenes at Argos (4.1) – Hdt. 6.76–80; Cleomenes at Athens (4.2) – Hdt. 5.64; 5.70–4; Cleomenes in Aegina (4.2) – Hdt. 6.49–50; Cleomenes and Demaratos (4.3–4.5) – Hdt. 6.61–7; Cleomenes' Death (4.5) – Hdt. 6.75; Protesilaos and Artayktes (4.6) – Hdt. 9.116–20; Laudatio Leonidae (4.7–4.8) – Hdt. 7.204ff; Pausanias' Regency (4.9) – Hdt. 9.10; Pausanias and the Coan (4.9–4.10) – Hdt. 9.76; Mardonius' Body (4.10) – Hdt. 9.78–9; Ariston's Wife (7.7–7.8) – Hdt. 6.61–9; Demaratos (7.8) – Hdt. 6.70; Leotychidas' Succession (7.9) – Hdt. 6.71; Leotychidas at Mykale (7.9) – Hdt. 8.131; 9.96–106; Leotychidas in Thessaly (7.9) – Hdt. 6.72; Leotychidas in Tegea (7.9) – Hdt. 6.71.

¹⁰ Regenbogen, *RE Supplbd* 8 col 1072. For attempts to attribute the Theseus story to a particular source: Immerwahr, pp. 21–2 and Wernicke, p. 55.

¹¹ Made by Wernicke, p. 55 n. 68.

introduction of new information.¹² Second, Pausanias names Niobe as the mother of Argos. This is clearly another snippet that Pausanias has inserted on his own initiative: Niobe was close to his heart and he had visited the grave of the hero, son of Niobe when he was in Argos.¹³ The same must also be true for the third addition, the ravaging of Orgas in Eleusis. Its inclusion in 3.4.2 is probably linked to, perhaps suggested by, the tradition Pausanias knows about Cleomenes' insanity preserved by the Athenians (3.4.5, where Orgas is also absent from Herodotus 6.75.3).¹⁴ The further difference, noted by Hitzig-Blümner (747), in the number of Argive refugees at the sacred grove (3.4.1) where Pausanias records a figure of πεντακισχίλιοι need be nothing more than a misreading or misremembrance of Herodotus' figure for the number of Argives duped into leaving the grove, κατὰ πεντήκοντα (6.79.1).

On the Eurypontid side matters are more straightforward (3.7.7–3.7.10). All is easily traceable to Herodotus apart from a reference to the Iliad (19.117) supplied by Pausanias himself, and a reference to the descendants of Demaratos.¹⁵ This latter, explained by the verb φασί ('they say'), cannot come from Herodotus, but need be nothing more than a recollection by Pausanias: it is short, vague and not specifically attributed. The specific reference to the temple of Athene Alea (3.7.10), as opposed to Herodotus' plain Tegea (6.72.2), must also be an addition by the Periegete, probably a supposition by analogy with the case of Pausanias the King (3.5.6).

There would appear to be little or nothing in Pausanias' account of the years covered by Herodotus that came neither from Herodotus, nor, we may assume, from Pausanias' own knowledge. Pausanias knew his source well: he was able to pluck stories from the various books of the Histories when necessary.¹⁶ He referred to no other account for stories of Spartan kings of this period. The stories have been reworted, but their provenance is still clearly recognisable. There is no explicit reference to the source, however, except earlier at 3.2.3 on a point of specific disagreement. This cannot be quite the whole story however, for, although Herodotus was Pausanias' narrative source for the sixth and early fifth centuries, the two authors do not agree on the names and order of succession of the Eurypontid house.¹⁷ As has long been observed, Pausanias must have had a separate chronographical source for the chronological skeleton that underlay the narrative flesh.¹⁸

¹² Forrest, p. 176 n. 103. It is difficult to say when exactly in Cleomenes' reign this event did occur however, and we should not necessarily condemn this as inaccuracy.

¹³ Argos: 2.22.5. Niobe: 1.21.3, 8.2.5–7; cf. Habicht, pp. 13–14 and G. E. Bean, *Aegean Turkey*² (London, 1979), pp. 31–3.

¹⁴ As an initiate of the Eleusinian mysteries (1.38.7; cf. 1.37.4) Pausanias was particularly interested in Eleusis' wider influence. See Frazer, I. liii, cf. Habicht, p. 156.

¹⁵ 3.7.8: καὶ τοῦ μὲν παρὰ Δαρείου ἐλθόντος ἐς Πέρσας ἐπὶ πολὺν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ χρόνον διαμείναι τοὺς ἀπογόνους φασί: ('They say that, Demaratus having gone to the court of King Darius in Persia, his descendants long survived in Asia Minor').

¹⁶ For the view that Pausanias remembered history rather than copied it, Habicht, 98. Pausanias' knowledge of Herodotus may not be unlike that of Plutarch, who seems to have 'remembered his Herodotus as disconnected anecdotes, and not as connected historical narrative', F. J. Frost, *Plutarch's Thermistocles – A Historical Commentary* (Princeton, 1980), p. 180; cf. Pelling, p. 96.

¹⁷ The bibliography on the kinglists of Pausanias and the Agiad and Eurypontid genealogies of Herodotus VII.204 and VIII.131 is extensive. See, for example, D. P. Henige, *The Chronology of Oral Tradition: quest for a chimera* (Oxford, 1974), pp. 207–13, P. Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia, A Regional History 1300–362 B.C.* (London, 1979), pp. 341–6, and most recently M. L. West, 'Alcman and the Spartan Royalty' *ZPE* 91 (1992), 1–7.

¹⁸ So, for example, Wernicke, p. 51: 'Quo factum est, ut in rebus Laconicis scribendis, paene duobus uti fontis videretur, quorum alter, qui Spartaе historiam genealogice conscripsit, proprie fons dici posset, alter, Herodotus videlicet quasi illius supplementum merito haberetur.' The identity of this chronographer is probably irretrievable. Three candidates have been suggested:

For the early narrative then the pattern seems straightforward: Pausanias picked an historian of the period on which he was writing and used him alone for that period, in the manner that is usually ascribed to a Diodorus or a Livy. The view implicit in Immerwahr and others that Pausanias synthesised his historical treatment of specific periods from various authors in the manner of, say, Plutarch is unlikely from the start.¹⁹ From the detailed argument below the broader pattern will hopefully become clear: this was Pausanias' method throughout the history of book three.

II

Given this model of lengthy narrative sources stitched end to end over a chronological framework, the next task, before investigating the patch that forms the object of this study, must be to determine where the seams lie and so justify the decision to concentrate on the period from c. 479 to c. 338. Furthermore, the suggestion that Pausanias may have been using certain sources (notably Ephorus) for earlier periods and thus for later periods as well must be tackled head on.

1. The Monarchy

For the section from Lelex to Teisamenos (3.1.1–3.1.5) sources are not easy to pin down.²⁰ On the whole, the account is bare of any detail that is not relevant to the succession, with the exception of aetiological and ktistic information.²¹ The Pythian approval of the dual kingship in 3.1.5 may be the first appearance of Herodotus as a source in the king-list.²² This is too short a passage for certainty though. The story of the enmity of the twin sons of Aristodemos (3.1.7–8) seems to echo that in Herodotus (6.52.8), while the subsequent account of Theras' expedition to Calliste follows, broadly speaking, that of Herodotus 4.147–8. There are material differences however, and it is probably best to assume that Pausanias had two sources for this event.²³

2. The two lines down to the mid-sixth century

(i) *The Agiads from Eurysthenes to Eurycrates II* (3.2.1–3.3.5)

For Eurysthenes' son Agis only ktistic stories are recorded, a fact that perhaps points to the same source as in (1.) above.²⁴ Under Labotas (3.2.2), Pausanias inserts his dig

Timaeus of Tauromenion, Charon of Lampsacus and Sosibius the Spartan. Forrest, pp. 177–8 weighs the pros and cons. If any one fact can sway the decision it may be that throughout the *Periegesis* Pausanias only claims to have read the work of one of the three men: the Lampsacene (10.38.6 = *FGrHist.* 262 F4).

¹⁹ So, for example, Gurlitt, with a passage from book three of the *Periegesis* in mind, 'Die Arbeitsweise des Pausanias entspricht hier der des Plutarch in seinen Biographien.' (p. 83 n. 39).

²⁰ For other versions of the various stories, see Frazer, pp. 311–12.

²¹ Leleges, Eurotas (1.1), Lacedaimonians, Sparta (1.2), Amyclae, tomb of Hyacinthus (1.3). On the possible significance of this, Forrest, pp. 177–8.

²² So Immerwahr, p. 9 (his reference should be to Hdt. 6.52.5).

²³ For the differences, see Immerwahr, p. 11 who suggests that the other source is Ephorus. His evidence, the notice in Schol. Pind. Pyth. 5.101b (= *FGrHist.* 70 F16) that Ephorus also recorded the migration of Theras' family from Thebes is extremely flimsy. Two other possibilities at least should be considered: first that the non-Herodotean source that Pausanias has been using before this episode recorded the additional detail; second, that Pausanias draws on the same source as Ephorus, or a source that used Ephorus. Certainty is impossible.

²⁴ The otherwise unknown episode with the Kynoureans suggests that Pausanias' source here had access to *recherché* local history (that disagreed with Herodotus' tradition of the autochthony of the Kynoureans [Hdt. 8.73.8]).

at Herodotus' naming of Leobotes. For Doryssos and Agesilaos Pausanias records short reigns compared with Diodorus' durations of 29 and 44 years respectively (Diod. Sic. 7.8.2). Pausanias may here be 'massaging' the regnal years to fit both Herodotus' statement about the relationship between Leobotes and Lycurgus, and the more common tradition that the latter legislated in the time of Charillos.²⁵ The Pythian/Cretan origins of Lycurgus' legislation are the same as those of Herodotus (1.65.4). The specific attribution to Minos, and the Cretans' belief in his divine inspiration are not. According to Strabo (10.4.8 = *FGrHist.* 70 F147), Ephorus credited Minos with the help of Zeus. For Immerwahr (p. 11) this is an 'unzweifelhafte Spuren von der Benutzung des Ephoros'. The less adventurous *Quellenkritiker* may find himself correspondingly less able to make this leap: the notion about Minos is based on a passage of the *Odyssey* (19.178–9), and was available to any historian who knew his Homer. The similarity of ideas here is not enough to pin down Pausanias' second source for Lycurgus as being Ephorus.²⁶ The capture of Aigys (3.2.5), along with the conquests of Teleclos are presumably to be attributed to the same ktistic oriented chronography.²⁷ The capture of Helos (3.2.7) was placed by Ephorus in the reign of Agis I (*FGrHist.* 70 F117). This should lead us to doubt not only that Ephorus was the chronographic source for Pausanias, but also that Pausanias was familiar with this section of Ephorus' work at all. With the Messenian War and its dating to the reign of Polydoros we stumble upon a problem of a wholly different order, and a debate that cannot be entered upon here.²⁸ About Eurycrates I and Eurycrates II (who does not exist for Herodotus) Pausanias knows nothing.

(ii) *The Eurypontidai from Procles to Agesicles (3.7.1–3.7.6)*

Pausanias only has a small, aetiological detail about the first three kings of this line, Procles, Soos and Eurypon (3.7.1). The notice of the Argive/Spartan hostility under Prytanis, and previous conflict with the Kynoureans (undated) seems to be a spreading of the thin detail we find in the Agiad line (3.2.2–3.2.3). The attribution of the Spartan/Argive hostility to Prytanis (the fourth Eurypontid) must be simple transferral from the fourth Agiad, Labotas, or vice versa.²⁹ Charillos' unsuccessful campaign against Tegea is a summary of the account given by Herodotus (1.66). Its chronological position may also be governed by Herodotus (1.66.1), who seems to

²⁵ On massaging the figures, Hitzig-Blümner, p. 742. On the tradition concerning Charillos, W. G. Forrest, *A History of Sparta c. 950–192 B.C.* (London, 1968) p. 55. Pausanias may have shifted Lycurgus into the Agiad list to facilitate polemic against Herodotus or, with Forrest (op. cit. [n. 1]), p. 177 n. 110, as a tribute to him.

²⁶ The possibility, at least, must remain that this detail occurred in Pausanias' chronographic source, with its interest in aetiology.

²⁷ To suggest with Immerwahr (p. 18) that Ephorus *could* be the source for those cities not already taken by Procles and Eurysthenes (Strabo 8.5.4. = *FGrHist.* 70 F117) is special pleading with no firm evidence to support the supposition. Similarly, the notice of Polydoros' colonies (3.3.1) also probably belongs to the ktistic chronography: it certainly contradicts Herodotus on Croton (8.47) and Ephorus on Locri (*FGrHist.* 70 F138).

²⁸ See Forrest, pp. 167f: 'The entry in book 3 owes its origins not to the more or less sober author behind that account but to the absurd romance [of Rhianus] of book 4'. Whomever we take to be the source for the Messenian history of book four, he is clearly intruding.

²⁹ It looks very much as if Pausanias' source here was attributing one king to one generation, so that the reigns of the 'equivalent' kings in the two lines coincided. Thus there is nothing of substance to report concerning the kings Eunomos and Polydectes, the fifth and sixth kings (3.7.2), as there was not for the fifth and sixth Agiads, Doryssos and Agesilaos (3.2.4), while for Nicander (3.7.4) an event from the other king-list, the death of Teleclos (3.2.6), is inserted again, apparently, by numerical equivalence in the succession line. Pausanias is almost certainly not responsible for this; he is alert to the problems inherent in such 'equations' (3.1.9).

date it soon after the death of Lycurgus. For Pausanias, Lycurgus legislated in the reign of Agesilaos. A short time after this would be in the subsequent reign of Archelaos. Since Pausanias seems to have known from his chronographic source that the reigns of Archelaos and Charillos coincided, Charillos would be the appropriate Eurypontid king.³⁰ the invasion of the Argolid under Nicander (3.7.4) is problematic. Pausanias includes the detail that the people of Asine helped the Spartans but, for their trouble, were driven out of their land by the Argives. This is not to be found in Herodotus, and, because of the frequent appearance of the fate of Asine in the *Periegesis*, Immerwahr (35) suggests that, since we have a fragment of Theopompus (*FGrHist.* 115 F383) that describes the foundation of the settlement of refugees from Asine, Theopompus was the source for Pausanias. Methodologically this is highly dubious,³¹ and since there are good ktistic aspects to this story there is no reason to doubt that it could derive from the bare chronography.

For these prehistoric sections then, there is nothing that cannot be attributed to the chronographic source or Herodotus. There is certainly no obvious use of the universal historian Ephorus.

3. From mid-sixth century to 479/469 B.C.

(i) *The Agiads from Leon to Pausanias the Regent* (3.3.5–3.4.10)

(ii) *The Eurypontidai from Ariston to Leotychidas* (3.7.7–3.7.10)

At this point in the account of Spartan history the *ἡμερήσιον φάος* of Herodotus' histories lights up and from the darkness of the bare sources for the previous centuries, we emerge into the colourful world of the Herodotean anecdote. Of the observations made in Part I about Pausanias' use of Herodotus we may simply restate that the *Periegete* was either extremely familiar with the text of Herodotus, or ransacked him quite thoroughly and with purpose. If there is a story to be found concerning a Spartan king in Herodotus, Pausanias locates and summarises it.

4. From 479/469 to 409 B.C.

(i) *The Agiads Pleistarchus and Pleistoanax* (3.5.1)

No mention is made of the fall from grace of Pausanias the Regent, nor is any information given for Spartan activities under the command of either king. For Pleistarchus this is perhaps less surprising; for Pleistoanax it is striking. Had Pausanias been using Thucydides in the same way that he did Herodotus one would at least expect the notice of Pleistoanax's invasion of Attica (Thuc. 1.114).³²

³⁰ So Immerwahr (p. 34). Cf. Hitzig-Blümner, p. 755.

³¹ For two reasons: how common this story is in the *Periegesis* is irrelevant to the question of whether the chronographer included the story in his account; the fact that part of the same story is found in Theopompus does not automatically identify him as the source. The episode that follows (3.7.5) concerning Thyreatis may well be the original capture of this portion of land mentioned by Herodotus (1.88). If this is the case, the aetiological/ktistic chronography may again be responsible. The fragment of Sosibius' *Περὶ Θουσιῶν* preserved by Athenaeus (xv. 678b = *FGrHist.* 595 F5) is clearly not enough in itself to pin down the source as Sosibius.

³² That Pausanias knew Thucydides' work, but not so well, seems to be hinted at in 6.19.4–5: οἷτινες δὲ οὗτοι ἦσαν, οὐ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ παρίστατο ἅπασιν εἰκάζειν· ἐμὲ δὲ ἐσήλθεν ἀνάμνησις ὡς Θουκυδίδης ποιήσειεν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις Λοκρῶν τῶν πρὸς τῇ Φωκίδι καὶ ἄλλας πόλεις, ἐν δὲ αὐταῖς εἶναι καὶ Μυονέας. οἱ Μυᾶνες οὖν οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσπίδι κατὰ γε ἡμετέραν γνώμην ἀνθρωποὶ μὲν εἰσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ <καὶ> Μυονεῖς οἱ ἐν τῇ Λοκρίδι ἡπείρῳ. The only other mention of Thucydides is at 1.23.9, referring to a statue, rather than the *Histories*. Pausanias seems simply to have felt distaste for Thucydides' subject matter: 8.52.3.

(ii) *The Eurypontid Archidamos (3.7.10–3.7.11)*

It has generally been assumed that the source for the debate between Archidamos and Sthenelaidas was Thucydides (1.79–86).³³ The only reason for this assumption is the fact that the Thucydides passage is our only other extant reference to the event – a poor reason when, as we have seen (4.i), there are strong grounds for thinking that Pausanias was not using Thucydides for this period of history. Potentially, Pausanias' immediate source could have been any historian of this period alive between the times of Thucydides and Pausanias. The contents of 3.7.11 may suggest a possible candidate. Appended to the cause of the Peloponnesian War is the *sententia*

καὶ ὁ πόλεμος οὗτος εὖ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔτι βεβηκυῖαν διέσεισεν ἐκ βάρβρων, καὶ ὕστερον Φίλιππος ὁ Ἀμύντου σαθρὰν ἤδη καὶ οὐ παντάπασιν ὑγιή προσκατήρειψεν αὐτήν. (3.7.11)

Greece had been stable and strong before but this work shook it to its foundations, and afterwards Philip, son of Amyntas, brought the rickety and decaying structure with a crash to the ground.

What was it that led Pausanias to make this oblique connection? There is nothing obvious to suggest the specific connection such as in the case of the leap from Orestes' bones to those of Theseus (3.3.7). The possibility should be considered that Pausanias found in his source the inkling, if nothing more, of such an idea. One obvious candidate for such a notion is Theopompus, whose views on Philip have been shown in a recent study to be essentially the same as those of Pausanias.³⁴ There is no need to assume a Pausanias wholly subservient to his sources though. For Habicht this passage fits into a broader system of beliefs he sees at work in the *Periegete*,³⁵ and Pausanias may simply have seen a moral illustration of which he approved and slotted it into his history lesson. Whomever else we believe to have been the immediate source for this passage, however, the case for Thucydides is weakened still more by the absence of any further detail about the activities of Archidamos or Agis in the Peloponnesian War immediately following this (3.7.11). Instead the account jumps to 402 B.C.

5. From 409 to 338 B.C.

We now enter the period with which Part III of this paper is concerned. For the moment, it will suffice simply to justify the breaking up of the history into this particular chunk. From the Eurypontid line the reason for the above dates should be reasonably clear. Pausanias devotes more space to Agis II (427–400) and Agesilaos II (400–360) than to any other kings (3.8.1–3.10.2),³⁶ the account of Agis beginning with his campaigns against Elis (c. 402–400). Archidamos III (360–338) also merits a small

³³ Immerwahr, p. 37, followed by Fischbach, p. 168, Frazer, p. 316 and Hitzig-Blümner, p. 757.

³⁴ 'The Greece he [Philip] conquered, Pausanias believed, had been enfeebled by the Peloponnesian War. In other words, Philip was lucky to have marched against Greece at a time when she was too weak to resist. This characterization sounds as if it originated with Theopompus.' See Shrimpton, pp. 169–70 with n. 23. Fischbach (p. 168) somewhat disingenuously cuts his citation of Pausanias short and thus can find the sentiment concerning the weakness of Greece to be Thucydidean.

³⁵ Habicht, pp. 112–13.

³⁶ 63 Teubner lines to the former, 143 to the latter.

narrative account (3.10.3–3.10.5). The subsequent kings Agis III (338–330) and Eudamidas I (330–c. 300) are peremptorily passed over and the Eurypontid line goes badly awry at this juncture. On the Agiad side a similar pattern is evident. Pausanias the King (408–395) receives extended treatment (57 lines). Agesipolis (395–380) is also reasonably well represented (25 lines). The account of Cleombrotos II (380–371), however, is curiously barren, there is no detailed account, for example, of Leuctra or the attendant events. Agesipolis II only reigned for two years and accomplished nothing. About Cleomenes II (370–309), Pausanias can say next to nothing other than to describe the succession problem following his death, a passage that closely resembles the introduction of Cleonymos in book one.³⁷

6. From 338 to 222 B.C.

The Eurypontid list becomes a shambles with the death of Eudamidas. Archidamos IV and Eudamidas II are absent (c. 300–244).³⁸ For the history of Agis IV and Eurydamidas (= Eudamidas III) Pausanias directs the reader to his *Sicyonia* (2.5.6–2.7.1). The absence of these two kings may have some significance: the fact that he directs his reader to a section of narrative in another book for the completion of the king-list may suggest that Pausanias was only using one source for the kings of this period,³⁹ and that a narrative, rather than bare chronology. Certainly, if he had a chronography, or simply a bare king-list for the third century, he really ought to have noticed the existence of Archidamos V (228–227), who is also absent from his list. The only reasonable explanation here would seem to be that Pausanias passed over Archidamos in a narrative account without registering the fact that he was a king.⁴⁰ Whether or not we can infer from this that the absence of Archidamos IV and Eudamidas II is also due to a hiccup in the reading of a narrative, the likelihood must remain that when he reached the third century, the chronological king-list source that Pausanias had earlier been using had dried up, and that he was now wholly reliant upon narrative sources.

The Agiad list is in better shape, being complete, but the narrative seems to owe its origins to histories not immediately concerned with Sparta. The similarity of the succession problems of Cleonymos with the passage in book one (1.13.3) have been noted above (5.). The occurrence in book one comes as part of an excursus centred on the activities of Pyrrhus, within which Hieronymus of Cardia is explicitly mentioned as a source by Pausanias.⁴¹ For Areus, the source seems to be focused

³⁷ Compare the accounts of Cleonymos' ancestry at 3.6.1–3 and 1.13.4–5. Given the paucity of detail provided by Pausanias for Cleonymos' closest ancestors, including the events at Leuctra, these details may well derive from a digression in the main source for Cleonymos, Hieronymus of Cardia; on whom see n. 41 below.

³⁸ The reason for this omission, I suspect, is simple enough. By *saut de même au même*, Pausanias has jumped from Eudamidas I to the son of Eudamidas II. Whether this occurred whilst reading a list or when scrolling through a narrative is impossible to say in isolation.

³⁹ That the same narrative source is behind 2.9.1f and 3.10.5 seems guaranteed by the idiosyncratic naming of Eurydamidas in both passages.

⁴⁰ Easily done: cf. Plut. *Cleomenes* 1.1; Polyb. 4.35.13.

⁴¹ 1.9.8 = *FGrHist.* 154 T11: ὁ δὲ Ἱερώνυμος οὗτος ἔχει μὲν καὶ ἄλλως δόξαν πρὸς ἀπέχθειαν γράφει τῶν βασιλέων πλὴν Ἀντιγόνου, τοῦτ' αὖτε οὐ δικάτως χαρίζεσθαι. (cf. 1.13.9 = *FGrHist.* 154 F15 and 1.9.7 = F9). J. Hornblower suggests that Pausanias 'almost certainly had no direct knowledge of his [Hieronymus'] work.' (*Hieronymus of Cardia* [Oxford, 1981], p. 72), largely, it would seem, because it is unlikely that 'Pausanias conducted serious

more on the role of Athens in the Chremonidean War than on Sparta.⁴² The description of Areus' reign (309–265) begins with Antigonus' assault on Athens (3.6.4) and ends with his withdrawal of the Macedonian garrison (3.6.6). Pausanias has nothing to say concerning Acrotatos (265–c. 260) or his son Areus II (260–256). Given the Athenocentric nature of the Chremonidean War source, and the fact that it seems to have petered out at the time of this war, a strong candidate for the ultimate account must be the Atthidographer Philochorus, whether directly, or via some other intermediary such as the first-century epitome by Pollio.⁴³ Elsewhere Pausanias cites both Androton and Cleidemus and, given Pausanias' general philatticism, it is not inherently implausible that he should have read the last of the Atthidographers. While there is no other hint in the *Periegesis* that Pausanias used Philochorus, there are better grounds for accepting Philochorus than Phylarchus as his source for this period.⁴⁴ The problems of Leonidas II and his exile are recorded and, since we are now chronologically in the same era as Agis IV, who is dealt with in the *Sicyonia*, and immediately before Cleomenes III, likewise treated in the same account in book two, it would seem possible that Pausanias is here using a source which covered approximately the years 244–222.⁴⁵ The glaringly obvious ultimate source is, of course, the *Memoirs* of Aratus, an increasingly attractive candidate when we consider that the bulk of the information that Pausanias deploys on these years comes in the context of a shrine to Aratus (2.8.1).⁴⁶ For Pausanias the king-list stops at this point: he has nothing to say of Epicleidas (Eucleidas) and does not even mention the existence of Agesipolis III. The inevitable conclusion seems to be that his source stopped around 222, and that he did not know Polybius' second and fourth books.⁴⁷

research into writers who were by then... both ancient and obscure, and his immediate sources for the historical episodes introduced into the *Periegesis* were probably compilations or abstracts of the imperial period.' Yet Hieronymus was used by Plutarch (ibid. pp. 67–71) and Arrian (pp. 64–5), both near contemporaries of Pausanias. He seems also to have been a major source for Diodorus (pp. 18–62) and Dionysius (pp. 71–2). For the view that he was a principal source for Pompeius Trogus and Quintus Curtius too, see R. M. Errington, 'From Babylon to Tripuradeisos: 323–320 B.C.' *JHS* 90 (1970), 49–77; especially pp. 72–5. In short, for the first 150 years or so of our era (and a little before that), Hieronymus seems to have been the main author to turn to for late fourth/early third century history. Moreover, if Pausanias goes to the length of naming his historical source, not a frequent occurrence in the *Periegesis*, we must seriously consider the possibility that he knew him at first hand. Cf. Frazer, I. p. lxxviii, Habicht, p. 142.

⁴² So too in the other two references to the war in the *Periegesis* (1.1.1, 1.7.3).

⁴³ On Philochorus' personal interest in this war and the probable terminal date of his history, see Jacoby *FGrHist.* IIIb Suppl. I., pp. 222, 254. For Pollio's epitome, Suda sv. *Πωλίων ὁ Ἀσίνιος* (= *FGrHist.* 193 T1); Jacoby *FGrHist.* IId Komm., p. 621. The picture of the survival of Philochorus to Roman times may not be quite as bleak as that portrayed by Jacoby (*FGrHist.* IIIb Suppl. I. pp. 248–9). His *Atthis* may not have achieved popularity at Rome (and dropped out of popularity in Greece), but in this respect 'Pausanias does, at least in the field of history, represent something more than was to be expected of a man of his time' (Habicht, p. 134).

⁴⁴ Androton: 6.7.6, 10.8.1 (= *FGrHist.* 324 FF46 and 58; cf. T15); Cleidemus: 10.15.5 (= *FGrHist.* 323 F10; cf. T1). Philatticism: Segre, pp. 228–30; Bowie, p. 189; Reardon, p. 224; Habicht, p. 108. Phylarchus suggested by Immerwahr (p. 31), cf. Musti and Torelli, p. 180.

⁴⁵ Leonidas II was in exile c. 242–241: K. J. Beloch *Griechische Geschichte* 2 IV.2. p. 162; Agis IV ruled 244–241.

⁴⁶ For Aratus' *Memoirs* as the ultimate source of Pausanias 2.8–9, see Jacoby, *FGrHist.* IId Komm., p. 655, who prefers, however, to assume a *Zwischenquelle*.

⁴⁷ In fact, *pace* Frazer, I.lxxiii–lxxiv, the probability is that he did not know Polybius' *Histories* at all. The suggestion that Pausanias drew on Polybius for Achaean affairs elsewhere in the *Periegesis* (see e.g. R. M. Errington, *Philopoemen* [Oxford, 1969], pp. 239–40) would be attractive but for the fact that a good deal of the Achaean history at the beginning of book seven plainly cannot derive from Polybius. See C. Wachsmuth, 'Über eine Hauptquelle für die Geschichte des Achäischen Bundes' *Leipziger Studien* 10 (1887), 269–98. All references to Polybius in the *Periegesis* are to honorary statues or inscriptions (8.9.1–2; 8.30.8–9; 8.37.2; 8.44.5; 8.48.8).

granted.⁴⁸ There is thus no option but to take a detailed look at the passages in question, first for the Agiads and then for the Eurypontids, and examine the assertions of Immerwahr and others about the sources for them. Once such an examination of these stories has been made and the few possible conclusions extracted, the broader analysis of the pattern of source use may be re-applied more effectively.

3.8.1–3.8.2: Before passing from Archidamos II to Agis II, Pausanias first mentions Archidamos' daughter Kyniska. She is known also from Xenophon *Ages.* 9.6, but this latter passage is clearly not the source. Xenophon is more interested in Agesilaos' role and the resulting focus and detail is wholly different. For Immerwahr (40), the source must be periegetic, since Kyniska's tomb is mentioned later in the periegetic section (3.15.1), and since for Immerwahr the periegetic section is a literary construct. This will not do. The question must be asked, even if Immerwahr were correct about the nature of the *Periegesis*, why did Pausanias include such an irrelevant detail in his king-list if he had a monument to pin the story on coming up five chapters later?⁴⁹ The peculiarity of this detail in the king-list is better taken as a sign that it was a 'Spartan detail' plucked from the historical source that Pausanias was using for this period, and that the mention of the monument was occasioned by the previously established historical context. This being the case, we are still left guessing at the identity of the historical source, though Xenophon is to be ruled out.

3.8.3–3.8.5: The war of Agis with Elis (c.402–400) clearly does not derive from Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.2.21–31) either. There are far more discrepancies than we ever observe between Pausanias and Herodotus: the Spartan request for the autonomy of the Lepreates is absent from Xenophon and the Elean reply is different; the extent of Agis' march in the first year (Olympia and the Alpheus) is absent from Xenophon. The *xenia* and *proxenia* of Xenias are likewise missing from the latter. In Pausanias the *harmost* of Epitalion is Lysistratus, in Xenophon Lysippus. Pausanias has the walls of Elis demolished, Xenophon thought the city unwallled in the first place. Diodorus' brief account of these events describes an expedition led by Pausanias, not Agis.⁵⁰ Again we are left with no clear source on which to pin this account.⁵¹

3.8.6: Agis' conquest of Athens cannot have Xenophon as its source either. Immerwahr⁵² points to the similarity between the plans attributed to Lysander and Agis by Pausanias' account, and a statement found in Plutarch's life of Lysander:

⁴⁸ Tuplin, op. cit. (n. 1).

⁴⁹ The same question also applies to Forrest's suggestion that Pausanias had the information from Olympia (Forrest, p. 176 n. 104).

⁵⁰ Diod. Sic. 14.17.6–14.17.12. See Cartledge, p. 251 n. 4 and C. J. Tuplin, *The Failings of Empire. A Reading of Xenophon's Hellenica* 2.3.11–7.5.27. *Historia Einzelschrift* 76 (Stuttgart, 1993), p. 201 with n. 1.

⁵¹ Gurlitt (p. 83 n. 39) suggests that Thucydides 5.49 may in some way be involved (he does not explain how). The similarity is superficial and it is difficult to see how this could be relevant or explain the account as a whole. Fischbach (pp. 177–8) also attempts to link the notice of the Spartans' exclusion from Olympia with the mention of this in Thucydides. We would have to presume that Pausanias, contrary to his practice elsewhere, took this one detail from Thucydides and then added the account of the Elean War from elsewhere, rather than assume that he was using a self-contained account that gave the background incident to the war.

⁵² Immerwahr, p. 40 followed by Hitzig-Blümner, p. 759.

καταλυθέντος δὲ ἐν Αἰγὸς ποταμοῖς τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ναυτικοῦ Λύσανδρος ὁ Ἀριστοκρίτου καὶ Ἄγης ὄρκους μὲν θεῶν ὑπερέβησαν, οὓς ὤμοσαν Ἀθηναίους ἐν κοινῇ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, κατὰ σφάς δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ οὐ μετὰ Σπαρτιατῶν τοῦ κοινοῦ τὸ βούλευμα ἐς τοὺς συμμάχους ἐξήνεγκαν ἐκκόψαι προρρίζους τὰς Ἀθήνας. (Paus. 3.8.6)

But when the naval power of Athens was shattered at Aegospotami, Agis and Lysander, the son of Aristocritus, in defiance of the faith which Sparta had publicly plighted to Athens, proposed to the allies, of their motion, and without the sanction of the Spartan state, that Athens should be destroyed root and branch.

ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ προτεθῆναι φασιν ὡς ἀληθῶς ὑπὲρ ἀνδραποδισμοῦ γνώμην ἐν τοῖς συμμάχοις, ὅτε καὶ τὸν Θηβαῖον Ἐρίανθον εἰσηγήσασθαι τὸ μὲν ἄστυ κατασκάψαι, τὴν δὲ χώραν ἀνείναι μηλόβοτον. (Plut. Lys. 15.2)

Some people say that in fact a proposal to enslave the Athenians was put before the allies, at which point the Theban Erianthos also suggested that the city be razed and the land given over to sheepgrazing.

Immerwahr's argument runs as follows: since the two passages are similar they come from the same source. Since Plutarch is quoting the report of ἔνιοι ('some people'), he is not using his main source for Lysander (Theopompus) at this point. Therefore, since Xenophon is not a possibility, Ephorus must be the source for both passages. There are (at least) three fundamental flaws in this argument. First it is by no means clear that Theopompus was the main source for the *Lysander*. Whenever Plutarch explicitly assigns a view to Theopompus in this biography he also cites Ephorus, notably at places where their accounts differ, as if this were the reason for mentioning their names at these places.⁵³ Second, the introduction of the report with ἔνιοι δὲ... φασιν ('some people say') does not necessarily mean that Plutarch is recounting a story not in the main source. A plausible alternative might be that the source phrased it that way, or even that he found it in several sources, but did not believe it himself. Finally, the two passages above are plainly not as similar as Immerwahr would have us believe. There is a clear apologetic tone to Pausanias' story that is absent from Plutarch. The former goes out of its way to defend the Spartan people, the latter talks vaguely of the motion put before the allies, attributing it to neither Lysander nor Agis. Again we must admit uncertainty as to the provenance of Pausanias' story, although we certainly cannot discount either Ephorus or Theopompus.

3.5.1–3.5.2: Much the same methodology underlies Immerwahr's examination of the activities of Pausanias the King in Attica. Once again it is clear enough that Xenophon cannot be behind Pausanias' account: the former (*Hell.* 2.4.29) describes the king's motive as envy of Lysander, the latter (3.5.1) as the desire to strengthen the tyranny established by Lysander at Athens. Moreover, Pausanias has a well informed account of the trial of the king in 403 that is not to be found in Xenophon at all.⁵⁴ Turning to the *Lysander* again though, Immerwahr examines Plutarch's account of

⁵³ Lys. 17.1–2, 30.2–3. In any case, the notion of a 'sonst benutzen Quelle' for the life of Lysander is certainly an oversimplification. Plutarch also cites Duris, Theophrastus and Daimachus in the *Lysander*. See Cartledge, p. 70 on Plutarch's sources for the *Agésilaios* and general *modus operandi*; cf. Pelling, p. 96 and id., *Plutarch. Life of Antony* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 31–3. More recently Shrimpton, pp. 43f has argued that Ephorus was Plutarch's main source for at least one story concerning Lysander.

⁵⁴ On the extraordinary nature of this account, see Cartledge, p. 134.

events in which he sees polemic against a particular source.⁵⁵ The polemic is difficult to see. At most Plutarch is taking two contradictory accounts of the motivation of the Spartan king and rationalising them λόγῳ μὲν...ἔργῳ δὲ ('ostensibly...in fact') However, as already noted, the assumption cannot be made that Theopompus was the principal source for the *Lysander*. Thus any attempt to associate Ephorus with Pausanias' account by juggling perceived polemic in the *Lysander* passage can be nothing but guesswork.

3.8.7–3.8.10: The problems with succession following Agis' death in 400 bears some resemblance to the accounts in Plutarch (*Lys.* 22 and *Ages.* 3) particularly in their quotation of the oracle issued by Delphi. There are slight verbal differences however which are enough for Immerwahr to assume not only that Pausanias and Plutarch had different sources, but also that Plutarch had two separate texts of the oracle and thus two different sources. The differences are, as Immerwahr (p. 41) sets them out, the following:⁵⁶

Pausanias 3.8.9

μόχθοι
φθισιβρότον
κυκλωμένον

Plutarch *Lys.* 22.5

μόχθοι
φθισιβρότου
κυλινδόμενον

Plutarch *Ages.* 3.4

νοῦσοι
φθισιβρότου
κυλινδόμενον

Again Immerwahr's reasoning is open to doubt. The differences between Pausanias and Plutarch are minor: the first is orthographic and, in fact, the manuscript tradition of both Lives offers differing spellings of φθισιβρότου at this point in the text: the second although obviously a different word (κυκλωμένον) in Pausanias, may well have been a variant reading in the manuscript of a fourth century historian by the time of Plutarch and Pausanias over five centuries later and cannot be pressed in itself to suggest different sources. As far as the difference between Plutarch's two texts is concerned, it is also limited to one word, which if not a misremembrance by Plutarch might very well have entered the early manuscript tradition of the *Agésilaoi*. Thus Immerwahr's conclusion that the sources for Pausanias, *Lysander* and *Agésilaoi* were Ephorus, Theopompus and Duris respectively cannot stand only on the evidence he provides.⁵⁷ A brief examination of the stories recounted in the three works is more helpful. Both of Plutarch's accounts, not surprisingly, are similar. In the *Lysander* it

⁵⁵ ἐξῆλθε δὲ ὁ Πανσανίας, λόγῳ μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν τυράννων ἐπὶ τὸν δῆμον, ἔργῳ δὲ καταλύσων τὸν πόλεμον, ὡς μὴ πάλιν ὁ Λύσανδρος διὰ τῶν φίλων κύριος γένοιτο τῶν Ἀθηνῶν. τοῦτο μὲν οὖν διεπράξατο ραδίως· καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους διαλλάξας καὶ καταπαύσας τὴν στάσιν ἀφείλετο τοῦ Λυσάνδρου τὴν φιλοτιμίαν. ὀλίγῳ δὲ ὕστερον ἀποστάντων πάλιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸς μὲν αἰτίαν ἔλαβεν...τῷ δὲ Λυσάνδρῳ προσεθήκατο δόξαν ἀνδρὸς οὐ πρὸς ἑτέρων χάριν οὐδὲ θεατρικῶς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ τῇ Σπάρτῃ συμφέρον αὐθεκάστως στρατηγούντος. (*Lys.* 21.3–4). Pausanias set out, ostensibly on behalf of the tyrants against the people, but in fact to put a stop to the war, so that Lysander could not again, through the help of his friends, become master of the Athenians. This Pausanias achieved easily; and having reconciled the Athenians and put a stop to their internal dissent, he thwarted Lysander's ambition. Shortly afterwards, however, when the Athenians revolted again, Pausanias himself took the blame, while Lysander gained the reputation of a man who commanded straightforwardly, neither ingratiatingly nor theatrically, but for the good of Sparta.

⁵⁶ Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 399B where the Teubner text of Pohlenz/Siebeking reads μόχθοι, φθισιβρότον, κυλινδομένον.

⁵⁷ The 'evidence' for Theopompus is nothing more than the sweeping statement regarding the sources of the *Lysander* discussed above. For the *Agésilaoi*, the single reference at 3.1 is enough to pin the whole account on Duris. Ephorus is thus the only one left for Pausanias.

is Lysander who is responsible for encouraging Agesilaos in his aspiration. The opportunity is afforded by Timaias's association with Alcibiades and Agis' rejection of Leotychidas. When Agis repents and requests those at Heraeum to plead Leotychidas' cause, Diopieithes produces the oracle to strengthen the case against Agesilaos, who has the support of Lysander. It is Lysander who replies to the oracle and prevails on Agesilaos' behalf. In the *Agesilaos* the problem is introduced via the infidelity of Timaias, to which Plutarch adds a detail from Duris. This infidelity gives Lysander the chance to thrust Agesilaos forward and many Spartiates support him. Diopieithes now produces the oracle, and again it is Lysander who replies to it. Now Plutarch adds the detail of Agesilaos' speech about Poseidon (perhaps from Xenophon *Hell.* 3.3.2). Pausanias' account, while much condensed, seems to show a different bias. After the death of Agis, Agesilaos acts without any prompting from Lysander. It is the Heraeans specifically who arrive to plead the cause of Leotychidas, but the name of Diopieithes as introducer of the oracle is absent. There is no mention of a speech of Lysander in reply to the oracle, instead speeches of Leotychidas and Agesilaos are summarised (though from a different account from that of Xenophon).⁵⁸ When the debate has reached deadlock, it is only then that Lysander appears being responsible, as Pausanias thinks, for the eventual success of Agesilaos without recourse to Delphi. The overall impression is that the rôle of Lysander is suppressed in favour of increased ambition on the part of Agesilaos. Indeed, as Pausanias casts it, Lysander only appears in the account at all because of Pausanias' own opinion, not that of the source. Yet one must be wary of attributing this story to a source on the basis of a perceived bias towards or against Lysander or Agesilaos. Whereas the account of Lysander and Agis at Athens (3.8.6) seemed slightly hostile to both in comparison with Plutarch, here, in the case of Lysander, the opposite seems to be true. Thus if we are to assume consistent use of a single source for a period by Pausanias, as was the case with his use of Herodotus, it would appear for this period to be a source that held no consistent bias towards or against Lysander. On this assumption, we probably cannot suggest or rule out any potential source for this period.⁵⁹

3.9.1–3.9.9: The Asiatic expedition of Agesilaos again is not derived from that narrated by Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.4.1–3.5.2).⁶⁰ The replies of the Corinthians, Athenians and Thebans are all missing from Xenophon. Far more significantly however, Pausanias is extraordinarily well informed about the embassy of Timocrates of Rhodes (3.9.8). Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.5.1) can be ruled out as the source for all the detail, since Pausanias records names that Xenophon does not (Sodamas and Amphithemis).

⁵⁸ Bommelaer, p. 175 n. 15 cannot be correct to suggest that Pausanias and Xenophon's accounts are similar. In Pausanias Leotychidas links the oracle with Agesilaos' lameness; in Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.3.2–3.3.3) the only speech given to Leotychidas occurs before the arrival of the oracle and argues on the basis of the nature of father–son succession.

⁵⁹ On the nature of the accounts of Ephorus and Theopompus see Shrimpton, pp. 43–51. For example, Theopompus' fragments seem to show that on occasion he approved of Lysander (cf. *FGH Hist.* 115 FF333 and 20), yet 'Plutarch's inability to report a positive tradition is significant. He seems to want to set Lysander's achievements in the best possible light; therefore, if he found fulsome praise of Lysander's "near ideal" exercise of Spartan power in Theopompus, why did he not reflect that tradition in his *Lysander*?' On this ambivalence of Theopompus see further W. R. Connor, 'History without Heroes: Theopompus' Treatment of Philip of Macedon' *GRBS* 8 (1967), 133–54. Such equivocation seems to resemble that we find in Pausanias.

⁶⁰ Bommelaer, p. 227 n. 133 is stretching matters too far to see the origin of this episode in Xenophon *Ages.* 1.8.

Table 2.

	Pausanias	Xenophon	<i>Hell. Oxy.</i>	Polyaenus
Persian	Tithraustes	Tithraustes	Pharnabazus	Pharnabazus
Argives	Cylon Sodamas	Cylon & those with him		
Thebans	Androcleides Ismenias Amphithemis	Androcleidas Ismenias Galaxidorus	Androcleidas Ismenias Antitheus	
Athenians	Cephalus Epicrates	No-one	Cephalus Epicrates	
Corinthians	Polyanthes Timolaus	Polyanthes Timolaus	Timolaus & others	
Efficacy of Bribe	Accepted everywhere	Not accepted at Athens	Accepted but irrelevant at Athens	Accepted everywhere

But in this case we can go a step further, for it is at precisely this point that the London fragment of the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* begins. First published in 1908⁶¹ (and thus not available to Immerwahr), *P.Oxy* 842 is of particular significance for the investigation of the sources of this period of Pausanias' history of Sparta, for it too contains a reasonably detailed account of the embassy of Timocrates. Again, differences make it clear that the Oxyrhynchus Historian was not Pausanias' source. The Persian sender of the gold is different (*Hell. Oxy.* VIIIB [I].5), and Pausanias can name two Argive recipients who appear nowhere in the London fragments. The Thebans named by Pausanias are not explicitly stated to have received gold by the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*. Indeed, where the same faction is given three leaders later (*Hell. Oxy.* XVIIIB [XII].1) the third is Antitheus not Amphithemis. Moreover there is the motivation of Timolaus – for Pausanias his pro-Argive sympathies were a factor in his support for the war and acceptance of the gold, for the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* author his hostility to Sparta was ἰδ[ί]ων ἐγκλημάτων ἕνεκα ('the result of a personal grudge') and the gold plays no part (VIIIB [II].3). Finally, while the effect of Timocrates' gold is played down in the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* version (VIIIB [II].2), for Pausanias the acceptance of the bribe seems important. The differences between the three accounts (and a fourth from Polyaeus 1.48.3) are tabulated above (Table 2).

On simple matters of fact alone, Pausanias' account is clearly independent of the other three. Polyaeus' source or sources can only be the subject of guesswork.⁶² The *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* however, is now generally taken to be the main source for Ephorus' account of the history of this period.⁶³ If Ephorus' account followed the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* on the embassy of Timocrates, and there is no reason to think that it did not, then Pausanias' source cannot have been Ephorus either. In view of the detailed nature of the account, Theopompus' *Hellenika* must become a very strong candidate. Indeed, if De Sanctis is correct in his suggestion that Polyaeus'

⁶¹ B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri V*. (London, 1908), cited here by the Teubner edition of V. Bartoletti (Leipzig, 1959).

⁶² For some attempts see Jacoby, *FGrHist.* IIc Komm. pp. 8f; De Sanctis, pp. 169–70.

⁶³ For example, Jacoby *FGrHist.* IIc Komm., p. 4: 'dieser autor war eine hauptquelle des Ephorus für die zeit nach Thukydides'; G. L. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 52–4; A. Andrewes, 'Notion and Cyzicus: the sources compared' *JHS* 102 (1982), 15–25, p. 15.

sources were the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* and Theopompus we perhaps have further support for this hypothesis: of the two remarkable details in Polyaeus' account (Pharnabazus and the universal success of the bribe) one is found elsewhere only in the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*, the other only in Pausanias.⁶⁴

3.5.3–3.5.6; 3.9.9–3.9.11: Immerwahr, not unreasonably, regards these two passages dealing with the events of 395 as being derived from the same source. Pausanias himself seems to see the two accounts as complementary.⁶⁵ For the first passage, Immerwahr uses his customary tools of Xenophon and Plutarch's *Lysander* (= Theopompus) to gauge the various traditions. Since there are clear differences between Pausanias and these other two,⁶⁶ he argues that a third source must be posited for the *Periegete*: Ephorus springs readily to hand. Enough has been said above about the flaws of this method. Immerwahr finds 'confirmation' for Ephorus in the second passage (3.9.9) where Pausanias ascribes the cause of the war to the Locrians of Amphissa (Ozolian Locri). Since Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.5.3) has Opuntian Locri, Pausanias' source has confused the two peoples. Since this is exactly the mistake that Ephorus makes in his description of the colonists of Epizephyrian Locri (*FGrHist.* 70 F138a), Pausanias' source for this blunder must be Ephorus. This sort of argument cannot stand: confusion of Locrians in two wholly separate contexts does not constitute proof that the same author is behind both passages. In any case, it is far from clear that Xenophon is correct and Pausanias (or his source) mistaken.⁶⁷

Halfway through 3.5.5 Pausanias the *Periegete* intervenes in his source to say why he approves of Pausanias the King's actions. Immerwahr sees a change of source here: the Spartan defeats, he notes, are also mentioned in 1.13.5 (the source for which he does not know); the flight of Leotychidas is described by Herodotus 6.72;⁶⁸ and Chrysis by Pausanias himself (2.17.7).⁶⁹ For Immerwahr, apparently, these two

⁶⁴ De Sanctis, pp. 169–70 with n. 2. Although, as always, the shadowy figures of Daimachus and Cratippus lurk in the wings, since there is no other evidence for Pausanias having read either, they must remain there.

⁶⁵ Note the careful cross-references: αἰτία δὲ ἧτις ἐγένετο προσέσται τῷ ἐς Ἀγησίλαον λόγῳ (3.5.3); τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐς τε τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων ἐξοδὸν καὶ τὰ ἐς τὴν Λυσάνδρου τελευτὴν ἐδήλωσέ μοι τοῦ λόγου τὰ ἐς Πausanίαν (3.9.11); Immerwahr, pp. 27 and 45f.

⁶⁶ For example, Pausanias knows which Theban was particularly involved with the incitement of the Locrians (3.9.9) while Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.5.3) is more vague. Pausanias (3.5.3) knows of Thebans and Athenians who had secretly entered Haliartus, Xenophon (3.5.18–19) does not. The relationship between Pausanias' source and the source of Plutarch (*Lys.* 28–9) is less easy to establish. Both authors were presumably selective in what they took from their source or sources. *Lys.* 28 contains more detail than Pausanias about Lysander's defeat and death at Haliartus, but there need be no discrepancies between the two. Plutarch does not actually describe the Athenians' secret entry into the city with the Thebans, but we do find Athenians joining the Thebans before the battle (28.3). Some of them may have gone to Haliartus. In *Lys.* 29 the only difference from Pausanias' account occurs in the motive stated for Pausanias the king's desire for a truce. In Pausanias (3.5.4) it is the arrival of Thrasyboulus, in Plutarch (*Lys.* 29.2) it is the Thebans who concern the king. Yet even this difference does not require that Plutarch's entire account came from a different source than that of Pausanias. As Cartledge (p. 70) observes, in Plutarch we are dealing with a Macaulay, not a Nepos.

⁶⁷ The *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* (XVIIIB [XIII].2) also specifies Western Locrians. I. A. F. Bruce, *An Historical Commentary on the Hellenika Oxyrhynchia* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 118–19.

⁶⁸ And thence by Pausanias himself at 3.7.10.

⁶⁹ Immerwahr (p. 28) tries to suggest two different sources for the two different mentions of her in Pausanias again on the basis of an orthographic difference (*Χρυσίδα* in book two, *Χρυσίδα* in book three). The current text of Rocha-Pereira exposes the fragility of this notion. One observation that can be made about this notice however is that it does not ultimately derive from Thucydides (4.133.3) where Chrysis flees to Phlius.

paragraphs are a bizarre patchwork of snippets taken from various sources. On the other hand, common sense and comparison with Pausanias' technique elsewhere would suggest that Pausanias was here writing from memory, associating ideas as he went. Overall, the impression created is that Pausanias took a single account of the events leading up to the Corinthian War and split it between the two royal houses. Since the transition at 3.9.9 is far smoother than that at 3.5.3,⁷⁰ the probability is that the whole account was originally appended to that of the embassy of Timocrates, and that the King Pausanias section was excerpted and moved to its place in the Agiad line.

3.5.7 and 3.9.12–13: The notice of the battle of Nemea won by Aristodemos (3.5.7) is so cursory that it could come from any source that covered this year (394). The brevity may in part be due to the limited relevance of the battle to any king – Aristodemos was regent. The recall of Agesilaos later in the same year is told in 3.9.12–13. There are no hints as to the possible source. The account agrees with Xenophon's narrative (*Hell.* 4.3.3ff), the only difference being the addition of the cult-name of Athene.⁷¹ Xenophon may or may not be the ultimate source; Pausanias' account at this point is too condensed and general for certainty.

3.10.1–2: Pausanias now jumps over the rest of the Corinthian War to 390 and goes on to give a summary and highly selective survey of the remainder of Agesilaos' career. First there is the episode at the Isthmia, an abbreviated version of the story told by Xenophon (*Hell.* 4.5.1–18). Pausanias' account however confuses the escort battalion of hoplites who are wiped out by Iphicrates in Xenophon's account, with the Amyclaeans they had escorted (*Hell.* 4.5.11–18). In much the same way, the Aetolian expedition of the following year is similar to but shorter than Xenophon's version (*Hell.* 4.6.1–14). The striking difference in this case is that Pausanias three times refers to Aetolia or Aetolians: for Xenophon these are Achaeans. If Xenophon is the ultimate source for these stories, then there are two alternatives: either Pausanias made the mistakes (or alterations) himself, or the possibility must be considered that there was an intermediary between Xenophon and Pausanias. There is now a second, larger jump of almost thirty years in Pausanias' account. Agesilaos' activities in the '80s and '70s are passed by in silence. If Xenophon was the ultimate source for the events of 390–389, then the remainder of the *Hellenika* can have held no fascination for the author of Pausanias' source. If Pausanias was himself reading Xenophon, then the jump he makes is extraordinary.

The final event of Agesilaos' life was his expedition to Egypt. The source for this is not Xenophon, whose only treatment of this episode bears no relation to that of Pausanias (*Ages.* 2.28–30). Immerwahr (p. 46) opts for Theopompus, and there are strong reasons for doing so. It is known that Theopompus dealt with Agesilaos' Egyptian campaign.⁷² While this by itself proves nothing, the reference to Theopompus in the next chapter (3.10.3) is as clear an indication as we could require that Pausanias was using the *Philippika* at this stage in his work. The possibility must also be considered that the brief notices of the campaigns of Agesilaos in 390–389 also

⁷⁰ 3.9.9: οἱ δὲ ἐς τὸ φανερόν τοῦ πολέμου παρασχόντες τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγένοντο οἱ ἐξ' Ἀμφίσσης Λοκροί. ('But it was the Locrians of Amphissa who brought about an open rupture.') 3.5.3: μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολὺν χρόνον... (Not long afterwards...).

⁷¹ 3.9.13. cf. Xenophon *Hell.* 4.3.20; though this may be Pausanias' own addition—he had visited the sanctuary himself (9.34.1).

⁷² *FGrHist.* 115 F106, cf. F22.

came from the *Philippika*, perhaps in some sort of digression.⁷³ Since these accounts are not pure Xenophon, nor at the same time far from Xenophon, Theopompus is an attractive intermediary.⁷⁴

3.5.8–3.5.9: The source for Agesipolis' campaign against Argos cannot be Xenophon, who has Agesipolis leading his army from Phlius via Nemea to Argos (*Hell.* 4.7.3). In Pausanias Agesipolis approaches from Tegea, almost the opposite direction.⁷⁵ Pausanias does not mention Agesipolis' activities at Mantinea (Xenophon *Hell.* 5.2.3ff), but passes straight to his death at Olynthus. The wording of the transition from the one story to the other⁷⁶ rather suggests that he was not aware that these two episodes were seven years apart, and that he did not know of any of Agesipolis' activities in the meantime. Xenophon again is to be ruled out as an immediate source. Rather Pausanias does not seem to be using a continuous narrative here such as he had for the events of 396–394: instead he has only excerpts concerning Agesipolis on which to draw.

3.6.1–3.6.2: Pausanias dismisses the battle of Leuctra in nineteen words,⁷⁷ supplementing this meagre offering with what appears to be a *sententia* of his own. Pausanias' version is further startling in that the only detail it contains is not to be found in any other extant account: the early death of Cleombrotos.⁷⁸ While it is possible that Pausanias was 'saving up' the account of Leuctra for the appropriate geographical location, it is nevertheless difficult to understand why he should be quite so curt in book three or why there should be a complete absence of historical context.⁷⁹ Moreover, the fact the Pausanias provides a detail in book three that is absent from the account in book nine might suggest that he was using a different source for the two accounts.⁸⁰ If we assume that Pausanias was using the same source here as elsewhere for the first half of the fourth century, another possibility presents

⁷³ Or possibly Theopompus' *Hellenika*, since he seems to have dealt with the Egyptian expedition in this too (*FGrHist.* 115 FF106 and 22).

⁷⁴ On digression in Theopompus see Cicero *Or.* 207 (= *FGrHist.* 115 T37); Dion. Hal. *ad. Pomp.* 6 (= T20); Photius *Bibl.* 176 p. 120 b19 (= T2). Cf. F103: Theopompus' inclusion of the Peace of Antalcidas in *Philippika* 12 (Shrimpton, p. 41); on Theopompus' use of Xenophon (though for the *Hellenika*), F21.

⁷⁵ Hitzig-Blümner, p. 751 *contra* Immerwahr p. 28.

⁷⁶ οὗτω μὲν δὴ ἐκ τῆς Ἀργολίδος ἀνέζευξεν ἄκων, ἐπὶ δὲ Ὀλυνθίους ἐποιεῖτο αὐθις στρατεῖαν. (3.5.9).

⁷⁷ 3.6.1: ὑπὸ ἡγεμόνι τούτῳ Βοιωτοῖς ἐναντία ἡγωνίσαντο ἐν Λευκτροῖς: Κλεόμβροτος δὲ αὐτὸς γενόμενος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἀρχομένης ἐπὶ ἔπεσε τῆς μάχης. ('Under his command the Lacedaemonians fought the battle of Leuctra against the Boeotians. Cleombrotus behaved himself bravely on that occasion, but fell at the beginning of the battle').

⁷⁸ Not even his own (9.13.9–10); cf. Xenophon *Hell.* 6.4.13ff, Plutarch *Pel.* 23. Diodorus (15.55.5) seems to imply that Cleombrotos did not die immediately. See Hitzig-Blümner, p. 752.

⁷⁹ For such a grand scheme at work in the *Periegesis* see H. L. Ebeling, 'Pausanias as an Historian' *CW* 7 (1913), 138–41 and 146–50, esp. pp. 146–7. Pausanias is happy to give details about other events twice, though. Cf. the fate of Asineans (above, p. 7).

⁸⁰ For (necessarily) inconclusive discussion of Pausanias' sources for Epaminondas' life (9.13–15) see Tuplin, p. 358: 'to describe Plutarch's life as "the most obvious source" betrays a perspective too much influenced by the isolated survival of a large *corpus* of Plutarchan biographies – and by the frustrating fact that it does not include *Epaminondas*.' There is in fact little evidence to support the notion that Pausanias knew Plutarch's work at all, with the possible exception of the life of Philopoemen, on which see H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin, 1863), pp. 287–90. Achaean history in Pausanias is problematic, see above n. 47.

itself: Pausanias' source did not describe the battle. If this were the case then Xenophon (whose account we possess) and Ephorus (whose account was notorious)⁸¹ are immediately ruled out. Theopompus though, once again, becomes a strong candidate:

Καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ περὶ τὰς ὀλοσχερεῖς διαλήψεις οὐδεὶς ἂν εὐδοκῆσαι τῷ προειρημένῳ συγγραφῇ (Theopompus): ὅς γ' ἐπιβαλόμενος γράφειν τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς πράξεις ἀφ' ὧν Θουκυδίδης ἀπέλιπε, καὶ συνεγγίσας τοῖς Λευκτρικοῖς καιροῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἔργων, τὴν μὲν Ἑλλάδα μεταξὺ καὶ τὰς ταύτης ἐπιβολὰς ἀπέρριψε, μεταλαβὼν δὲ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τὰς Φιλίππου πράξεις προύθετο γράφειν. (Polybius 8.11.3)

Indeed, no-one could approve of the overall divisions in the aforementioned author (Theopompus). Having set out to narrate Greek affairs from the point where Thucydides left off, just as he was approaching the period of Leuctra, and the most glorious of Greek deeds, he cast aside Greece and her endeavours, and altering his plans, decided to narrate the activities of Philip.

Polybius, we note, complained of Theopompus' neglect of 'the period of Leuctra' (τοῖς Λευκτρικοῖς καιροῖς): the *Hellenika* left off in 394, the *Philippika* picked up in c. 360.⁸² The brevity of Pausanias' Leuctra is surely not coincidental.

3.10.3–3.10.5: On the Eurypontid side, Pausanias moves from the death of Agesilaos in 360 to the episode of Archidamos with the Phocians in 357. Here Pausanias specifically cites Theopompus as the source. This fragment (= *FGrHist.* 115 F312) is probably from the fifty-second book of the *Philippika*, where the death of Archidamos in Tarentum (3.10.5) was certainly described by Theopompus.⁸³

It was shown in part I above that Pausanias' tendency in dealing with the history of the mid-sixth to early fifth century was to use a single narrative source (despite the peculiar difficulty of doing so) for his entire account. Any extra detail supplied was either Pausanias' own, or that of his chronographic source. A similar case can be made for his treatment of history from where Herodotus ceased to be available to the mid-fourth century. The detailed examination of this period has, to a certain extent produced negative results – the confident ascriptions of the nineteenth century German source critics cannot be maintained in most cases. The sources for many passages cannot be ascertained by detailed consideration in isolation. In one case only (the reign of Archidamos III) can the source confidently be declared as Theopompus. In one other case (the embassy of Timocrates, together with the narrative of the outbreak of the Corinthian War) a process of elimination seems to yield the same name. Further progress may be made by consideration of the period as a whole and its broad patterns of narrative coverage.

A crude examination of the relative lengths of the Eurypontid list show this structure nicely. In the Teubner text, this account is 317 lines long. From Procles to

⁸¹ Polybius 12.25¹.4 = *FGrHist.* 70 T20.

⁸² Cf. Shrimpton, p. 41: 'The implication is that the omission of the *Leuktrikoi Kairoi* is not a fault of the *Hellenika* alone, but also of the *Philippika*.' The shortness of the notices in Pausanias' account of the Agiad kings of this period, Agesipolis II and Cleomenes II, probably cannot be pressed however: the former ruled for two years only, about the latter no extant source has anything of substance to relate. Perhaps most telling is the fact that Diodorus only mentioned his accession and death, and then cannot decide how long he ruled (Diod. Sic. 15.60.4, 20.29.1). For the chronological extent of the *Philippika*, Jacoby, *FGrHist.* IId Komm. pp. 355, 358–9, Shrimpton, pp. 58–66.

⁸³ Athenaeus 12.51 = *FGrHist.* 115 F232; Jacoby, *FGrHist.* IId Komm. pp. 388 and 395. Unfortunately the text of Athenaeus does not seem to be transmitting Theopompus verbatim, so no conclusion can be drawn concerning Pausanias' rewording of his source here.

Agis II takes 82 of these, the reign of Agis itself 63 lines and that of Agesilaos until the battle of Coroneia 123 lines. The remainder of Agesilaos' reign down to the end of the kingship occupies a further 49 lines. Thus some five years of Spartan history (c. 399–394) occupy almost 60% of Pausanias' account of the Eurypontidai. The break is clearly to be made at Coroneia in Agesilaos' reign, since here the focus of Pausanias' account switches from Agesilaos to introduce the next section (3.10.1) via the activities of the Corinthians. The figures speak for themselves: the first three years of Agesilaos' reign occupy 123 lines, the next 34 years after Coroneia only 20 lines. A similar pattern is observable in the Agiad line. The kings from Eurysthenes to the regency of Pausanias occupy 248 of the 399 lines (just over 60%, a figure largely explained by the quantity of Herodotean anecdote related concerning these kings). Again the fifth century (the Thucydidean period) is barren: only 3 lines for Pleistarchus and Pleistoanax. Immediately following the Peloponnesian War though things pick up with 53 lines for Pausanias the King. There are four lines dealing with the events of the regency in 394 and then the account becomes fragmented again. Agesipolis manages 19 lines, the remainder of the Agiadai are dealt with in 71 lines, of which 31 deal with Areus and the Chremonidean War, 17 with Leonidas.

The bulk of the fifth century (the Thucydidean period) is not covered, a fact that militates against a universal historian such as Ephorus. The immediate increase in detailed coverage following this period strongly suggests a continuator of Thucydides as a potential source. In many cases, as has been shown, Xenophon is specifically ruled out, or appears to be reaching us through a filter. Where Pausanias' account lacks detail, his version can look like Xenophon's, where detail occurs it invariably contradicts the Xenophontic account. For the early to mid-fourth century, Pausanias' narrative seems to fall into two parts: first, the detailed and continuous narrative of the activities of Agis, Pausanias and Agesilaos; second, the more fragmentary accounts of the later reign of Agesilaos, Agesipolis, Cleombrotos and Archidamos. The break seems to fall in the Eurypontid line in 394, and in a similar place in the Agiads, perhaps with the regency of Aristodemus in the same year (3.5.7). The accounts change in nature at this point from detailed continuous narrative to haphazard summary of careers. This pattern, together with the absence of what Polybius called the *Leutrikoi Kairoi*, strongly suggests that Pausanias' main source for the period c. 409–338 was Theopompus, in both his *Hellenika* and *Philippika*.

From study of this section of the *Periegesis* confirmation thus emerges that Pausanias' tendency was, wherever possible, to use a single narrative source for his historical excursus. This is not, of course, to deny that Pausanias was an extraordinarily well read man: 'Time and again, we find Greek and Roman historians claiming a wide range of reading, and deserving to be believed; yet time and again, we find them demonstrably basing their narrative of individual episodes on a single source.'⁸⁴ Thus, when Pausanias cites an ancient source, casual though the mention might be, it is advisable to believe that he had read it. The earliest of these sources should cause no surprise – the debt of the *Periegete* to Herodotus has long been noted. After initial pause, the second should cause little surprise either. Theopompus seems to have been a popular and widely read author. For Cicero and Quintilian his work was distinguished by its rhetorical flavour. For the Augustan literary critic Dionysius he was not only the rhetorical historian *par excellence*, but also one of the most perceptive (*ad Pomp.* 6 = *FGrHist.* 115 T20). For the Gaul Pompeius Trogus his *Philippika* seem to have been a seminal influence. For the Greek Plutarch he was

⁸⁴ Pelling, p. 91. For the breadth of Pausanias' reading, Habicht, pp. 132–4, 142–3.

clearly one of the principal sources to whom one turned for the period he covered.⁸⁵ In the Greek intellectual climate of the second century A.D., the rhetorical nature of his work, which Dionysius and others so relished, cannot but have made him a favourite read, ideal model and obvious source for anyone interested in the fourth century B.C. As far as Pausanias' later sources are concerned, we are on less firm ground, but the balance is certainly in favour of Hieronymus of Cardia, and possibly Philochorus and Aratus.

We are, finally, in a position to revise our view of Pausanias as an historical reporter. His choice of sources is significant: with the inevitable exception of Herodotus, Pausanias chose the work of men who were close contemporaries of the events about which they wrote and, perhaps, *engagé*: Theopompus the moral critic of the fourth century, Hieronymus the court historian of the Successors, Philochorus the patriotic Athenian and Aratus the Achaean *Strategos*. Their texts were as much ancient artifacts as the buildings and monuments that complement Pausanias' historical accounts. In choosing these ancient sources (some four, five and six centuries old by his own day) Pausanias reveals the same preference as in his choice of monuments to describe, 'his work shows a linking of intrinsic sanctity with that bestowed by virtue of age'.⁸⁶ For Pausanias the ancient text, no less than the artifact, gained power with age.⁸⁷

Trinity College, Oxford

A. R. MEADOWS

⁸⁵ Cic. *de Orat.* 2.13.57. Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.74. Dionysius: S. Usher, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus—Critical Essays Volume 2* (Loeb Classical Library, London, 1985), p. 351: 'In none of Dionysius' critical works does any author receive more fulsome praise than Theopompus in this letter [*ad. Pomp.* 6].' For Dionysius, partly what made him such a strong historiographer was the interest he showed in 'ἐθνῶν...οἰκισμοὺς καὶ πόλεων κτίσεις' (*ibid.*), an aspect that would make him a particularly attractive source to a periegete. It is perhaps no coincidence that Dionysius, like Pausanias, had little time for Thucydides. Trogus: R. Develin, 'Pompeius Trogus and Philippic History' *SSor* 8 (1985), 110–15. Plutarch: Cartledge, pp. 69–70.

⁸⁶ Arafat, pp. 407–8; cf. Reardon, p. 224, Habicht, pp. 134–7. So, for example, Pausanias will privilege inscriptions over the statements of the locals who guided him: Habicht, p. 65.

⁸⁷ It is a pleasure here to record two debts incurred during the writing of this paper: first to the Department of Classical Studies at the University of Michigan for generous support, both financial and practical; and second to John Dillery for his help, encouragement and generosity.