

XIX. The Authors Named Pausanias

AUBREY DILLER

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The problem of identifying the several men of letters named Pausanias who lived or may have lived in the second century has been attacked by classical scholars for 450 years without being solved satisfactorily. The course of this long effort was marked by slow progress and false steps until the deeper knowledge of antiquity became available towards the end of the last century. Since then there have been some valuable contributions, although the problem is still unsolved. Without aspiring to succeed where so many have failed, I wish to take up the subject because I have something new to propose on it and because I am working on the text-history of the *Hellados periêgêsis* and this is the first part of it.

We begin of course with the most important and best-known literary Pausanias, the author of the *Periegesis*. We must establish some of the personal circumstances of this man, because old errors have vitiated a good deal of the discussion of identification. Pausanias wrote the ten books of the *Periegesis* in order,¹ probably from about A.D. 160 (at least after 143) to about 180 (at least after 175). The lower limit is given in 1.19.6 by the reference to Herodes' stadium in Athens, which was finished in 143, as is generally agreed now.² An upper limit for Book I would be given by the statement in 7.20.6 that Herodes' odeum was not built yet when Book I was written, but we only know that Herodes' wife, in whose memory the odeum was built, died in 160;³ the building would be somewhat later. For Book V we have a precise date, A.D. 173,^{3a} in the statement (5.1.2) that it was 217 years since the refounding of Corinth (44 B.C.). The lower limit for VIII-X is given in 8.43.6 by the refer-

¹ G. Krüger, *Theologumena Pausaniae* (Diss. Leipzig 1860) 10, note 3, cited by J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (London 1898) 1. xvii, note 5.

² C. Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen* 1 (Leipzig 1874) 695, also in *AM* 9 (1884) 95; Münscher in *RE* Halbb. 15 (1912) 928; P. Graindor, *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo 1930) 65, 182; W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (Munich 1931) 103, note 1.

³ Münscher 936 f., Graindor 92 f.

^{3a} 173 rather than 174, in the ancient way of counting; see von Premerstein (cited in note 4) 151.

ence to the campaign of Marcus Aurelius against the Sarmatians, which was signalized by the novel title *Sarmaticus* assumed by the emperor early in 175 and the triumph *de Sarmatis* celebrated late in 176.⁴ There are many other indications of time in the *Periegesis*, but these are the extreme and decisive ones.

Although it is clear now that the *Periegesis* was written entirely or nearly so in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180), this is a certainty that has been achieved only lately. The dates 143 and 175 were not recognized until about 1890.⁵ Formerly it was thought that Pausanias was writing already under Hadrian (117–138). This view was based in the first instance on the reckoning from Antigonos to Hadrian in 8.8.12,⁶ which really has no bearing on the date of the *Periegesis*. Later it was based with more reason on the passages where Pausanias refers to the year 125 as *κατ' ἐμέ* or *ἐφ' ἡμῶν*.⁷ But these expressions in Pausanias, as in Strabo,⁸ cover the whole life of the author from the year of his birth. They show, not that Pausanias was writing then, but that he had been born by then. Still later this view was supported by identifying the senator Antoninus in 2.27.6 with Antoninus Pius and thus dating the passage under Hadrian.⁹ This identification was arbitrary at best and is known now to be false.¹⁰ With all this evidence, the view that Pausanias wrote under Hadrian prevailed from the 16th to the 19th century. When Xylander pointed out the dates 161 (8.43.6, 10.34.5) and 173 (5.1.2),¹¹ this confusing evidence was admitted by extending the composition of the *Periegesis* over a period of fifty years.

⁴ Von Rohden in *RE* 2 (1894) 2300–302; Stein in *RE* 3A (1921) 15. The invasion of Greece by the Costoboci (Paus. 10.34.5) was probably before the Sarmatian campaign; see note 5 and von Premerstein in *Klio* 12 (1912) 145–64 and *RE* 22 (1922) 1504–7.

⁵ W. Gurlitt, *Über Pausanias* (Graz 1890) 58–62; R. Heberdey, "Der Einfall der Kostoboker in Griechenland und die Abfassungszeit der Periegesis des Pausanias," *AEM* 13 (1890) 186–91.

⁶ Scholia in codex Va; see Hitzig and Blümner, edition of Pausanias 1.1 (Berlin 1896) p. XV, and F. Spiro, ed. Paus. 1 (Leipzig 1903) p. VI.

⁷ 1.5.5 and 5.21.15. The tribe *Adrianis* (1.5.5) was created when Hadrian visited Athens in 124–25; see P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo 1934). The reference to the death of Antinous, A.D. 130, in Paus. 8.9.7 indicates about the same time.

⁸ Honigsmann in *RE* 7A (1931) 76 f.

⁹ Siebelis (see note 12) p. VII and vol. 1.2.232 f.

¹⁰ H. Comfort, "The Date of Pausanias, Book II," *AJA* 35 (1931) 310–18.

¹¹ G. Xylander and F. Sylburg, edition of Pausanias (Frankfurt 1583) 1.498–501, followed by G. J. Vossius, *De historicis graecis* (Leiden 1624) 184 f. A. Nibby, in the preface to his Italian translation of Pausanias (Rome 1817), also arrived at a nearly correct estimate of Pausanias' age.

The nationality of the periegete has been the subject of another error, though not as early-born or long-lived as the first. C. G. Siebelis, the author of a major edition of the *Periegesis* (1822), while upholding the old mistaken view on the time of Pausanias, introduced a new mistaken view of his own on the birthplace. From the phrase Πέλοπος καὶ Ταντάλου ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐνοίκησις in 5.13.7 he inferred that Pausanias was a Lydian and supported this inference with the several statements of autopsy of Mount Sipylus and other Lydian localities found in the *Periegesis*.¹² Siebelis' successor, J. H. C. Schubart, pointed out in his own major edition of the *Periegesis* (1838) that this view was not warranted, that the phrase in question means at most that Pausanias was living in Lydia when he wrote it.¹³ The migratory life of men of letters in the second century is notorious, and the author of the *Periegesis* was no exception.¹⁴ Nevertheless the belief that he was a Lydian has been widely held and has entered largely into the discussion of identification.

We can proceed now to the first candidate for identification with the author of the *Periegesis*. This is the sophist Pausanias noticed by Philostratus:

Caesarea in Cappadocia, near neighbour to Mount Argaeus, was the birthplace of Pausanias the sophist. He was educated by Herodes, and was one of the members of the Clepsydrium, who were vulgarly called "the thirsty ones." But though he inherited many of the peculiar excellences of Herodes, and especially his skill in extempore oratory, yet he used to deliver his declamations with a coarse and heavy accent, as is the way with the Cappadocians. He would make his consonants collide, would shorten the long syllables and lengthen the short. Hence he was commonly spoken of as a cook who spoiled expensive delicacies in the preparation. His style in declamation was somewhat sluggish, nevertheless it has force, and succeeds in giving a flavour of antiquity, as we may gather from the declamations that are extant. For there are many of these by Pausanias, delivered at Rome where he spent the latter part of his life; and there he died when he was already growing old and was still holding the chair of rhetoric. He also held the chair at Athens. . . .¹⁵

¹² C. G. Siebelis, *Quaestio de Pausaniae periegetae patria et aetate* (Progr. Budissae [Bautzen] 1819, 14 pp.); edition of Pausanias 1.1 (Leipzig 1822) pp. IV-VIII; Gurlitt (see note 5) 56 f.

¹³ J. H. C. Schubart and C. Walz, edition of Pausanias 2 (Leipzig 1838) pp. IV-VIII; "Pausanias und dessen Periegesis," *Ztschr. f. d. Alterthumsw.* 9 (1851) 289-318. Heberdey (see note 14) and Foerster and Robert (see notes 37, 38) also rejected the Lydian origin of Pausanias.

¹⁴ R. Heberdey, *Die Reisen des Pausanias in Griechenland*, *Abh. d. archäol.-epigr. Semin. d. Univ. Wien* 10 (1894).

¹⁵ Philostratus, *Vitae soph.* 2.13, trans. by W. C. Wright (*LCL*, 1922). See also 2.31 (Aelian) and 33 (Aspasius). See Stegemann in *RE* 36.3 (1949) 2405 f. (No. 21).

Philostratus also tells us that Aelian of Rome and Aspasius of Ravenna — the only Italian sophists in the *Lives* — were disciples of Pausanias. The identification of the periegete with this sophist was made as early as 1506¹⁶ and passed almost unchallenged for over three centuries. The first to express serious doubt was Goldhagen in 1766.¹⁷ He was followed by Siebelis, who, fortified by his mistaken views on the person of the periegete, so discredited the identification that it went out of fashion, although Schubart still defended it. Now that we no longer think the periegete was a Lydian, we are free to suppose him a Cappadocian; and since he may have been born as late as 125 and certainly lived beyond 175, he can have been a disciple of Herodes Atticus (*ca.* 101–177) and teacher of Claudius Aelianus (*fl.* 222). The professorship in Rome, which came at the end of the sophist's life, when he was old,¹⁸ would be later than the *Periegesis* (*ca.* 160–180), but it need not be the first time the sophist visited Italy, as Goldhagen and Siebelis think; the autopsies in the *Periegesis* could have occurred on an earlier visit.

So far, then, the identification of the periegete with the sophist is possible. The main objections have been *ex silentio*. If the periegete was a native of Cappadocia, why is that country ignored in the long list of autopsies attested in the *Periegesis*?¹⁹ Pausanias may never have returned there after receiving his education and regarded it as uninteresting culturally, or even been ashamed of it, if he was Philostratus' man. If the periegete was a disciple of Herodes Atticus, why does he mention him several times without saying so? He may not have thought this personal matter relevant; he doesn't mention any other personal relations either. If the sophist wrote the *Periegesis*, why don't Philostratus and the *Suda* say so? Philostratus and the *Suda* both mention works of the sophist, but each omits what the other mentions, so that their silence doesn't mean much. Philostratus does not pretend to give complete bibliographies of his sophists; he may not have been interested in the *Periegesis* — few were, as we shall see — or even known of it, as he seems to be most familiar with the Roman end of the sophist's

¹⁶ Raffaele Maffei Volterrano, *Commentarii urbani* (Rome 1506) *lib.* XVIII fol. CCLI r. Cf. Conr. Gesner, *Bibliotheca universalis* (Zurich 1545) fol. 541 v., and Xylander-Sylburg (see note 11).

¹⁷ J. E. Goldhagen, preface to his German translation of Pausanias (Berlin 1766), cited by Siebelis (see note 12).

¹⁸ M. Nächster, *De Pollucis et Phrynichi controversiis* (Diss. Leipzig 1908) 41–45.

¹⁹ On autopsies in the *Periegesis* see Heberdey, cited in note 14.

career. The author of the bibliographical articles in the *Suda*^{19a} does pretend to be complete, and since he omits the *Periegesis* entirely, he did not know of it. But his ignorance of the work would have no bearing on its authorship unless his source knew the sophist personally.

The real questions here are how much weight to give to the coincidences in name and time, and whether the sophist would have written such a work as the *Periegesis*. In the lack of more decisive evidence, opinion on these questions will always be subjective and uncertain.

The literary relation between the *Periegesis* and the works of Philostratus²⁰ and Aelian²¹ may throw some light on this problem. There are quite a few striking coincidences in subject-matter, but on examination the parallel passages seldom indicate that the *Periegesis* was the source. We would conclude that Philostratus and Aelian probably did not use or know the *Periegesis*, were it not for a single meagre citation of Pausanias by name in Aelian's *Varia historia* 12.61 that can scarcely not refer to *Periegesis* 8.27.14 and 36.6.²² Faced with this explicit instance we must admit the possibility of other less evident drawings on the *Periegesis* by Aelian and perhaps by Philostratus too. Since the *Periegesis* attracted scarcely any attention for several centuries, the fact that Aelian, who lived in Rome, did know it would support the identification of the periegete, who lived in Asia, with the sophist, who came to Rome and taught Aelian.

Our third homonym is Πανσανίας ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας σοφιστῆς εἰς Ῥώμην

^{19a} The author of most of these articles was Hesychius of Miletus (6th cent.), but his work was based largely on Herennius Philo of Byblus (2nd cent.). — The well-known tenth-century Byzantine compilation was not by an author named Suidas, but was entitled *ἡ σοῦδα*. The title was converted into an author's name by Eustathius (12th cent.) on the basis of the Hellenistic Thessalian author Suidas cited by Strabo and Steph. Byz., two of Eustathius' favorite sources. This was the brilliant discovery of Paul Maas announced, on the heels of Adler's edition, in *BZ* 32 (1932) 1. It is certainly right; aside from the evidence of the MSS, the name Suidas in the tenth century is a monstrosity; but the meaning of the newly-discovered title is problematical.

²⁰ Gurlitt (see note 5) 73, Frazer (see note 1) xv, note 6, Robert (see note 38) 264, note. The closest parallel with Philostratus is in Paus. 2.5.3 and *Vita Apoll.* 1.20.

²¹ F. Rudolph, "De fontibus quibus Aelianus in *Varia Historia* componenda usus sit," *Leipz. Stud.* 7 (1884) 1–137, also in *Philologus* 52 (1894) 657 f.

²² The meagerness of the citation, without *politicon* or title, may be due to the abridgment of the text of the *Varia historia*; see R. Hercher's preface to the Didot edition of Aelian (Paris 1858) and compare note 39. However, it is impossible to suppress the suspicion that the citation of Pausanias in *V.H.* 12.61 is an alien interpolation. It was athetized by T. Faber (1667), but restored by Jac. Perizonius (1701), who discussed it in relation to the Pausanias problem in his preface.

ἀφικόμενός ποτε, whom Galen says he treated for paralysis of the right hand.²³ The statement occurs in a work of Galen's old age, when he was practicing in Rome (169–199). We have, then, another sophist Pausanias in Rome toward the end of the second century. These coincidences seem very compelling, and it is tempting to identify Galen's sophist with Philostratus' sophist.²⁴ But there are difficulties. The mention of Syria has been overplayed in the discussions of identification, chiefly because of Pausanias of Antioch and Pausanias of Damascus, whom we shall deal with presently. Neither of these Syrians is known to have been a sophist in Rome in Galen's time, and Galen does not exactly say his patient was a Syrian anyway. More serious are the difficulties that Philostratus' sophist apparently came to Rome from Athens, not Syria, and that Galen's words ἀφικόμενός ποτε suggest a visit to Rome rather than a professorship there. Since Pausanias the periegete was of about the same age as Galen and like Galen had resided in the province of Asia, it is likely Galen knew him, but in that case his reference seems insufficient.

A fourth Pausanias of the second century is the author of the Attic lexicon known from Photius, *Bibl.* 153, and numerous citations in Eustathius' commentaries. Nothing else is known of this man. The lexicon is so similar to the lexicon of Aelius Dionysius known from the same sources that it is thought they must be contemporary.²⁵ Aelius Dionysius is scarcely better known, but he is usually identified with the Dionysius of Halicarnassus, author of a *Musica historia*, who flourished under Hadrian.²⁶ If all the links in this chain hold, the Pausanias of the lexicon must not be the same as any of the first three homonyms, because they all flourished under Marcus Aurelius and later. But the links are not very strong. As for Aelius Dionysius, we may observe that there are half a dozen Greek writers of the second century that bore the gentile name *Aelius*,²⁷ and in the clear cases of Aristides and Herodian the bearer was born rather than flourished under Hadrian. So it is again possible that we do not have another Pausanias here but the same as one or more of the preceding. In his standard history of Greek

²³ Galen, *De locis affectis* 3.14 (VIII p. 213 Kühn). This passage was introduced into the discussion of our problem by Joannes Jonsius, *De scriptoribus historiae philo-sophicae* (Frankfurt 1659) 16.

²⁴ Von Rohden in *PIR* 3 (1898) 18 (No. 133).

²⁵ Wendel in *RE* 36.3 (1949) 2406 f. (No. 22).

²⁶ Cohn in *RE* 9 (1903) 986–91 (No. 142).

²⁷ Harpocration, Theon, Dios, Serenos, etc.

literature W. Christ, apparently unwilling to unite *Periegesis* and Attic lexicon in a single author, identifies our fourth Pausanias with Galen's sophist from Syria,²⁸ the least-known of all and so a 'dark horse' in this contest.

Of the four or fewer authors we have dealt with only one work is extant, the *Hellados periêgêsis*, and that one barely survived. For three centuries after the solitary citation by Aelian it disappears altogether. Plainly it did not suit the literary interests of the times. We may compare the *Geography* of Strabo, which is cited before the sixth century only by Athenaeus and Harpocration. In the sixth century both works come to light in Constantinople, where they are attested by the *Ethnica* of Stephanus Byzantius (ca. 535). In the extant epitome of the *Ethnica* there are eighty-four citations of the *Periegesis* and many other quotations without citation.²⁹ Most of the citations add the number of the book to Pausanias' name, and eight times the title περιηγήσεως or περιηγήσεως Ἑλλάδος is added to the number. Only once is a book cited by its own title: Πανσανίας Ἰλιακῶν ᾧ (*sic* MSS PQR^{29a}) in the article *Τυπαῖον*. All ten books are cited, but very unevenly: V and VI only twice each, VIII thirty times. There are of course some errors in the numbers. All this throws a clear and welcome light on the history of the *Periegesis*.

Nevertheless the citations of Pausanias in Stephanus Byzantius present two thorny problems. One of them is the citation of an eleventh book of the *Periegesis* in the article on Tamyna, a town in Euboea. MSS PQ of Stephanus read ἱᾶ, while R reads ἱ, but Tamyna is not mentioned at all in the *Periegesis* as we have it. This citation has been a stumbling-block ever since it was first observed. Scholars have veered from expecting the eleventh book to appear in the next edition³⁰ to denying that it ever existed.³¹ The latter view seems to

²⁸ W. Christ, *Gesch. der griech. Litt.*² (Munich 1890) 765.

²⁹ A. Lentz, *Herodiani technici reliquiae* 1 (Leipzig 1867) p. CLXXIX and 3 (1870) 1228, claimed that Steph. Byz. took his citations of the *Periegesis* from Herodian, but this view has not been accepted (Hiller in *Jahrb. f. class. Philol.* 103 [1871] 526). With the later dating of the *Periegesis* it is scarcely tenable, as Herodian himself was writing under Marcus Aurelius. F. Atenstädt, "De Hecataei Milesii fragmentis," *Leipz. Stud.* 14 (1893) 8–22, put the *Periegesis* among the immediate sources of Stephanus Byzantius.

^{29a} On the MSS of Steph. Byz. see A. Diller in *TAPA* 69 (1938) 333–48.

³⁰ Lilius Gyraldus (d. 1552) quoted by Salmasius in Abr. Berkel's edition of Steph. Byz. (Leiden 1688, 1694) *ad loc.* I have not found the original context of Gyraldus' statement. See Siebelis (note 12) 1.1.pp. XLVI f. and Schubart (note 13) 3.pp. IV f.

³¹ See Meineke *ad loc.*, who makes the latest and best attempt to dispose of this eleventh book.

prevail at present,³² in defiance of the texts of Stephanus and Pausanias. The alternative seems so hypothetical that most modern critics have avoided it. Yet what can be said against it? There is no internal evidence of the work's being complete as we have it. That is an assumption on the basis of the tradition only, and the tradition is very weak. Only in the hands of Maximus Planudes (ca. 1300) does it appear limited to ten books.³³ It is not improbable that an eleventh book existed and was lost before Planudes. That is what almost happened in the case of the *Roman Archaeology* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

The other problem in Stephanus Byzantius is the citation of another work by a Pausanias, whom we shall have to call the fifth of the name. In the article *Seleukobēlos* Stephanus cites Pausanias *ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀντιοχείας*; in the article *Dōros* he cites Pausanias *ἐν τῇ τῆς πατρίδος αὐτοῦ κτίσει*;³⁴ in *Mariammmia* he cites Pausanias with a title that is corrupt; in *Botrys*, *Gabba*, *Gaza* he cites Pausanias without title. All six citations have to do with towns in Syria, Phoenicia and Palaestine and are alien to the *Periegesis*. Assuming that the same work is cited in all of them, we learn from the two titles that it was a single book on the history of Antioch,³⁵ which was the author's native place. There is no doubt that this Pausanias of Antioch is the same as the Pausanias *chronographus* cited several times without title for Antiochene history by Joannes Malalas of Antioch, who was contemporary with Stephanus Byzantius. A few more citations occur in the Slavic versions of Malalas, the *Chronicon Paschale*, and Tzetzes, the last with the title *ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀντιοχείας κτίσεως*.³⁶ From intensive study of Malalas and the history of Antioch it has emerged that Pausanias' history of Antioch dates from the second century (after 115), that Libanius used it in

³² Except Robert (see note 38) 262 f.

³³ A. Diller, "Codices Planudei," *BZ* 37 (1937) 295–301.

³⁴ See note 39. Compare Steph. Byz. *Anchialē* Ἀθηρόδωρος περὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ πατρίδος and *Aphormion* Ἀφροδίσιος ἦτοι Εὐφύμιος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς πατρίδος.

³⁵ All the names of towns cited from this author by Stephanus could have occurred incidentally in a history of Antioch. Since the collation of codex R of Stephanus in 1824 it is no longer correct to assume another work or a sixth book on the basis of the corrupt title in *Mariammmia*. The citation of a fifth book in *Laeia* (the name of a town in Caria) is referred now to the *Periegesis* (see Meineke *ad loc.*).

³⁶ Müller, *FHG* 4.467–71; L. Dindorf, *Hist. gr. min.* 1 (Leipzig 1870) 154–64. The identification was first made by Lucas Holstenius (d. 1660, see W. Dindorf, edition of Steph. Byz. [Leipzig 1825] 1.677) and then again by Siebelis (see note 12) 2.2.200 f. Robert (see note 38) is alone in rejecting it.

his *Antiochicus*, and that it was one of Malalas' immediate sources.³⁷ This Pausanias has often been identified with the periegete,³⁸ because he too had been in Syria and Stephanus does not distinguish between them.³⁹

We are ready now to deal with the last homonym, Pausanias the sixth, on whom I wish to propose the something new I mentioned at the beginning. As in the case of the third Pausanias, there is only one *Belegstelle*. The Byzantine scholar-emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (d. 959), in his work *De thematibus*, begins the chapter (1.2) on the Armeniac theme by stating that the name of it is not ancient.

οὔτε γὰρ Στράβων ὁ γεωγράφος τῆς τοιαύτης ὀνομασίας ἐμνήσθη, καίτοι Καππαδόκης ὦν τὸ γένος ἐξ Ἀμασείας τῆς πόλεως, οὔτε Μένιππος ὁ τοῦς σταδισμοῦς τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης ἀπογραφάμενος, οὔτε μὴν Σκύλαξ ὁ Καρναυδὴνός, οὔτε Πανσανίας ὁ Δαμασκηνός, οὔτε ἄλλος τις τῶν ἱστορίας συγγεγραφότων.⁴⁰

For over a century now this Pausanias of Damascus has been identified with the historian of Antioch cited by Stephanus Byzantius and Joannes Malalas, and the latter goes constantly under the name of the former.⁴¹ Sometimes there has been further identification extending to the periegete himself.⁴² The obvious difficulty of identi-

³⁷ R. Foerster, "De Libanio, Pausania, templo Apollinis Delphico," *Album gratul. in hon. H. van Herwerden* (Utrecht 1902) 45-54; *Libanii opera* 1 (Leipzig 1903) 450-70; 3 (1906) xxxiv; E. Patzig in *BZ* 10 (1901) 255-62, 385-93.

³⁸ Sylburg (see note 11); G. J. Vossius, *De historicis graecis*² (Leiden 1651) 228; Fabricius, *Bibl. graeca* 3 (Hamburg 1717) 470; Schubart (see note 13); W. M. Leake, *The Topography of Athens*² (London 1841) 1.475-77; Foerster (see note 37); C. Robert, *Pausanias als Schriftsteller* (Berlin 1909) 271-74; G. Pasquali in *Hermes* 48 (1913) 222 f.

³⁹ The promiscuous citation of both homonyms without title in Steph. Byz. is probably due to the abridgment of the text. The important title in *Dōros* is given in the unabridged text of the Séguier-Coislin MS but omitted in the epitome. Compare note 22.

⁴⁰ A. Pertusi, *Costantino Porfirogenito de thematibus*, "Studi e Testi" 160 (Vatican City 1952) 63. I have preferred the text of MS C; Pertusi follows MS R, which reverses the last two clauses. Two violent alterations in this text, intended to abolish Pausanias of Damascus, have been proposed by Jac. Palmerius (d. 1670), quoted by Schubart (see note 13), and by W. Christ (see note 28) 695, note 3.

⁴¹ Holstenius (see note 36); A. Westermann in *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Paed.* 25 (1839) 25-27 and Pauly's *RE* 5 (1848) 1265; Müller and Dindorf (see note 36); Christ-Schmid, *Gesch. der griech. Litt.* 2.2 (Munich 1924) 758 f., 1039; O. Seel in *RE* 36.3 (1949) 2402-4 (No. 15).

⁴² Foerster and Robert (see notes 37, 38).

fyng a man of Damascus with a man of Antioch has been regarded as not insurmountable. But a greater difficulty has not been observed at all. No one has stopped to consider the context of the unique citation of Pausanias of Damascus. Why should a history of Antioch be cited for not mentioning the Armeniac theme? In the work cited here that region must have been an integral part of the subject-matter. Therefore it was not a history of Antioch. Moreover we have here a negative citation, which shows that Constantine knew the work himself; but it is unlikely Pausanias' history of Antioch was extant in his time. If I am not mistaken, then, Pausanias of Antioch must be separated once and for all from Pausanias of Damascus and made to go by his own name.

Our last argument implies that the work of Pausanias of Damascus cited by Constantine was extant in his time, the tenth century, and so might be extant today. Let us look again at the passage in *De thematibus*. Four authors are cited for not mentioning the Armeniac theme, Strabo of Amaseia, Menippus, Scylax of Caryanda, and Pausanias of Damascus. Strabo's *Geography* needs no comment except to note that Constantine cites or quotes it several times elsewhere. We may remark in passing that Ptolemy's *Geography* would have been equally relevant, but it is not cited here or elsewhere by Constantine, probably because he did not know it. The three other authors are obscure and this is the only medieval citation of them. However, it has not been recognized that the texts cited as Menippus⁴³ and Scylax⁴⁴ are extant among the Minor Greek Geographers. Each is a periplus of the Mediterranean Sea, with the Euxine, so

⁴³ Müller, *Geogr. gr. min.* 1.563-73; Gisinger in *RE* 29 (1931) 862-88; A. Diller, *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers* (Lancaster, Penn., 1952) 147-64. It is odd that Constantine omits the *politicon* of Menippus of Pergamum, unless the title compensates for it. This title is noteworthy as differing from the one given by Marcian of Heracleia. *Stadiasmoi*, though apt for Menippus' periplus, actually occurs only in the *Stadiasmus Matritensis*, which is closely related to Menippus. *Oikoumenē*, though inapt for a periplus of the Mediterranean Sea, occurs in the title of Scylax' periplus in codex D.

⁴⁴ Müller 1.15-96, Gisinger in *RE* 5A (1927) 619-46. As is well known, the periplus of the Mediterranean Sea that goes under the name of Scylax of Caryanda is of the fourth century B.C. and so cannot be by the Scylax of Caryanda who explored the Indian Ocean under Darius I (Hdt. 4.44). There are quite a few citations of Scylax of Caryanda in ancient literature, some of which refer to the Mediterranean Sea. It is usually assumed that these refer to a lost work, but the citations seem to me to agree well enough with the extant periplus in view of the instability of the texts involved: Strabo 566A from Pseudo-Scylax 8716, 583A from 8802, Schol. Ap. Rh. 1.1177 from 8721, 4.1215 from 6820, Avienus 372 from 8323.

that they could be adduced with some reason as negative witnesses on the region in question. Very germane to our problem are the facts that these two minor texts are preserved together in the unique thirteenth-century codex D of the Minor Geographers⁴⁵ and that this codex preserves a third periplus equally relevant to the argument in *De thematibus* 1.2. This is the periplus in comic trimeters commonly known now as Pseudo-Scymnus.⁴⁶ It is anonymous merely because the titles are normally given at the ends in codex D and the end of this periplus has been lost from the codex. It is certain that these three opuscula were preserved together in the tenth century as well as in the thirteenth and that if Constantine had two of them he had the third also, in fact, that he had the codex that D was copied from without the mutilations of the texts due to damages suffered by D itself. This being so, we could well expect Constantine to cite Pseudo-Scymnus by its lost genuine name after Menippus and Scylax — that is their order in codex D — and I think he does so in the unique name of Pausanias of Damascus.⁴⁷

The innovation I propose, then, is that Pausanias of Damascus, who has had all the works of a Pausanias fathered on him, be only the author of Pseudo-Scymnus, which has been fathered falsely, as is known, on Marcian of Heracleia and Scymnus of Chios. The metrical periplus of Pseudo-Scymnus is addressed to a Nicomedes king of Bithynia, although it is not certain which one is meant. If Pausanias of Damascus is the author, we must place him in Bithynia about 100 B.C. — quite a different setting from what he has been in before. We have not gained much by attributing the periplus to him, as he is still an unknown person. A Syrian author of a Greek literary work at that time and place is rather unexpected, but is paralleled somewhat by Antipater of Sidon and Meleager and Menippus of Gadara and others.⁴⁸ So I do not think the case is improbable.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Paris. suppl. graec. 443; see Müller 1.ix-xi, Diller 19–22.

⁴⁶ Müller 1.196–237, Gisinger in *RE* 5A (1927) 661–87, Diller 165–76.

⁴⁷ This idea occurred to me too late to be incorporated in *The Tradition* (see note 43), where it is stated hastily in the addenda (p. 177). *De thematibus* 1.2 should have been discussed on p. 19 as a testimonium on codex D instead of on p. 42.

⁴⁸ On Hellenism in Syria in general see M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 1941) 2.1054–98 and 3.1588–1600.

⁴⁹ Compare Artemidorus of Ascalon ὁ τὰ περὶ Βιθυνίας γεγραφώς (Steph. Byz. *Askalón*).

After removing Pausanias of Damascus from the company of second-century writers of that name, we may conclude with a summary remark on the identification of the rest of them. It is not likely that these five contemporary homonyms were all different or all identical. Of the twenty-five numerically possible identifications, nearly half have actually been proposed at one time or another; but there is nothing definite to say either for or against them, and in the future it would probably be best to discard all of them.