

PAUSANIAS 3.14.1: A SIDELIGHT ON SPARTAN HISTORY, C. 440 B.C.?

W. R. CONNOR

Princeton University

I

τοῦ θεάτρου δὲ ἀπαντικρὺ Πανσανίου τοῦ Πλαταιᾶσιν
ἡγησαμένου μνημὰ ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον Λεωνίδου· καὶ
λόγους κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς λέγουσι καὶ
5 τιθέασιν ἀγῶνα, ἐν ᾧ πλὴν Σπαρτιατῶν ἄλλωι γε οὐκ ἔστιν
ἀγωνίζεσθαι † τὰ δὲ ὅστ' αὐτοῦ Λεωνίδου τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεσιν
ὑστερον ἀνελομένου ἐκ Θερμοπυλῶν τοῦ Πανσανίου
κεῖται δὲ † καὶ στήλη πατρόθεν τὰ ὀνόματα ἔχουσα
οἱ πρὸς Μήδους τὸν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις ἀγῶνα ὑπέμειναν.

2 καὶ—5 ἀγωνίζεσθαι pro parenthesi accepit Siebelis

4 ἄλλο γε Vindobonensis

5 δὲ del. Siebelis

τεσσαράκοντα: τέσσαρσι K. O. Müller, *Dor.* II² 488.40;
τέσσαρσι κεῖται ἔτεσι Kayser, *Z. f. Alter-
tumswissenschaft* 6 (1848) 1000; "achtzig," E.
Meyer.

6 post Θερμοπυλῶν lacunam ind. Schubart, Πανσανίου
τοῦ Πλειστοάνακτος excidisse putans

post Πανσανίου lacunam stat. Dindorf; bis κεῖται
scripsit Kuhn

7 post κεῖται add. ἔστι Clavier

δὲ del. Schubart

The passage has received the most divergent treatments and interpretations. Amid such disagreement there may be little hope for progress, but the passage is an extraordinarily interesting one and, if the information it contains is even partially correct, its implications are significant, perhaps not least for historians interested in the growing hostility between Athens and Sparta in the period after the Thirty Years'

Peace. First, a discussion of the text; then a few words about the historical context.¹

That some emendation is required is widely agreed. Two courses have most commonly been followed. The first is to punctuate with dashes after *Λεωνίδου* and *ἀγωνίζεσθαι* and to take the enclosed words as a parenthesis. *Pace* Rocha-Pereira in the 1973 Teubner, this entails the deletion of *δέ* in line 5. Since the result is still a very loosely constructed sentence, many scholars have preferred a second course: punctuating with a full stop after *ἀγωνίζεσθαι*, keeping the *δέ*, and supplying a main verb. No verb proposed to date has produced a consensus among the critics, but the required sense is clear. Pausanias clearly wanted to say that the bones were brought back to Sparta.²

This problem cannot fully be resolved, but it is less serious than another difficulty. As the text stands it seems to say that Pausanias, presumably the victor at Plataea just mentioned, removed the bones of Leonidas forty years later—later, it appears, than the battle of Thermopylae. But this Pausanias had long been dead by the 440s.³ Some corruption is likely and many remedies have been proposed. The figure “forty” has been suspected; “four” is an obvious suggestion, but does not accord well with what we know of Pausanias’ career.⁴ Ernst Meyer’s suggestion (“achtzig”) makes the reference apply to the younger Pausanias, the son of Pleistoanax, and grandson of the victor at Plataea.⁵ But the *Description of Greece* is usually careful to distinguish between homonymous individuals, and indeed

¹Versions of this paper were presented at colloquia at Princeton University and at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. I am especially grateful to Colin Edmonson, Adalberto Giovannini, Christian Habicht and the anonymous readers of the Association for useful suggestions and criticisms, and to The American School of Classical Studies for its hospitality during a sabbatical year.

²Kühn’s suggestion of *κεῖται* is palaeographically attractive and the repetition of the final word in one sentence as the first word in the next sentence can be paralleled elsewhere in Pausanias, e.g., 3.3.6. But the sense of the passage demands something other than a simple statement that the bones were buried. The commonest verbs for the required sense are *κομίζω* and its compounds (Pausanias 3.11.10 and 7.1.8; Aelian, *V.H.* 12.64; Polyaeus, *Strat.* 6.53) and *ἐπάγω* (Pausanias 8.9.3; cf. Herodotus 1.67.2 and 5.67).

³The basic discussion of the chronology of Pausanias and his children remains M. White, *JHS* 84 (1964) 140–52. See also A. Lippold, *RhM* 108 (1965) 328, note 33.

⁴At this time Pausanias was probably at Kolonai in the Troad; see White (above, note 3) 144 and A. Andrewes in P. Garnsey and C. Whittaker, *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (Cambridge 1978) 93.

⁵Ernst Meyer, *Pausanias Beschreibung Griechenlands* (Zurich 1954) 584. Meyer’s suggestion is presumably based on the assumption that an original *π*i (80) would easily have been corrupted into a *μ*u (40). On such confusions see W. K. Pritchett, *CP* 60 (1965) 260. See also R. Ball, “Herodotus’ List of the Spartans Who Died at Thermopylae,” *Museum Africum* 5 (1976) 1–8.

differentiates the two Spartan Pausaniases quite clearly in 3.5.1.⁶ For this reason, Schubart's suggestion in the 1889 Teubner might be preferred to Meyer's. He suggested that Pausanias the younger might have been referred to as "Pausanias the son of Pleistoanax the son of Pausanias" and that a haplography might then have resulted in our text. Such an accumulation of patronymics, though ponderous, is not unparalleled in the *Description of Greece*⁷ and editors who print the manuscript text without obelus or indication of a lacuna are presumably accepting the substance of Schubart's conjecture—the idea that the allusion is to the younger Pausanias. This, however, is difficult, for the younger Pausanias would have been very young, perhaps not even born, c. 441.⁸ It is possible, of course, to accept *both* Meyer's change in the figure *and* some emendation that would make it clear that the allusion is to the younger Pausanias. But one would naturally prefer a simpler solution.

A helpful clue is provided by the article *τοῦ* before *Παυσανίου*. At first glance this appears simply to be an example of the familiar pattern of using an article before a repeated personal name—exactly as *τοῦ* precedes *Λεωνίδου* in line 5. But in fact Pausanias does not always follow the common practice of using the article with the second and subsequent occurrences of personal names.⁹ In particular he avoids the use of the article with a personal name that is the subject of a genitive absolute.¹⁰ Hence, *τοῦ Παυσανίου* is more likely to be a patronymic than the subject of *ἀνελομένου* and one can suspect that the name of a son of Pausanias the

⁶See also Pausanias 3.3.5; 6.10.4; 6.12.2; 8.5.13.

⁷See, for example, 3.15.6; 3.16.9; 6.17.6; 6.21.11; 7.18.5; 8.5.1; 8.5.4; 8.45.7.

⁸All we know for certain is that he was too young to command in 427 B.C.: Thucydides 3.26.2; White (above, note 3) gives 444–440 for his birth; H. Schaefer s.v. "Pausanias (26)," *RE* 18 (1949) 2578, concludes he was born shortly before 447.

⁹For the rule see Schwyzler, *Gr. Grammatik* II 19 ff., esp. 25; for the degree of variation B. Gildersleeve, "On the Article with Proper Names," *AJP* 11 (1890) 483–87, and A. Deissmann, "Der Artikel vor Personennamen in der spätgriechischen Umgangssprache," *BPhW* 22 (1902) 1467–68. Pausanias seems to vary his practice greatly. Chapter three of the third book, for example, begins by avoiding the article with the repeated personal name of Alcamenēs (repeated from 3.2.7). The second, third and fourth instances of Polydorus occur without article, and the fifth with article. One can also observe the avoidance of the article with the names Polemarchos, Eurykrates and Anaxandros. In section 5, however, a digression begins, marked off by *γίνονται δὲ οὕτως*. Within the digression iterated names regularly have the article. When the digression stops (*ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἴσμεν ἔχοντα οὕτως*, sec. 9), Pausanias again avoids the article in the repetitions of the names of Anaxandrides, Cleomenēs (three times) and Dorieus. He is perhaps not one of the authors in whom "the variation bade defiance to rule" (Gildersleeve 486), but this feature of his style would repay further study.

¹⁰Of the 26 examples of such genitives absolute that I found in Book 3, only that in 3.3.6 (cf. note 9) shows the article before the personal name.

victor has dropped out of the text. Since Pausanias the periegete is well informed about the history of Sparta and is likely to have had access to sources now lost to us,¹¹ he may have known of Cleomenes, whom Thucydides (3.26) mentions as regent for the younger Pausanias. If this name originally stood in this passage, the chronology is right.¹² The disappearance of the name can be explained as a lipography of a type common in the *Description of Greece*.¹³ τεσσαράκοντα can stand.

II

But is it possible that Pausanias was correct in this matter? The objections are formidable: he flourished six hundred years after the events to which the passage refers. In the meantime Sparta had changed drastically, the monarchy had disappeared, and elaborate festivals commemorating Leonidas and Pausanias had grown up.¹⁴ Our story could

¹¹Sosibius of Sparta and Polemon of Ilium (*FGrHist* 595) have often been suggested as Pausanias' sources for this section of the work (A. Kalkmann, *Pausanias der Perieget* [Berlin 1886] 119–25), though Jacoby is very cautious about the former (see especially his commentary on *FGrHist* 595, pp. 637 and 642) and Frazer (*Introduction to Pausanias* lxxxiii–lxxxix) about the latter. W. Immerwahr, *Die Lakonika des Pausanias* (Berlin 1889) 69, suggests an "ausführliche Periegesis" or "eine Schrift *peri mnematon*." Pausanias' use of local historians is clear (e.g., 9.29.1 and 9.38.9 f., and see Hiller v. Gaertringen on *IG* V 2 pp. xxix and 132 and J. Hejnic, *Pausanias the Periegete and the Archaic History of Arcadia* [Prague 1961] 63 f.). It is difficult to assess the quality of Pausanias' sources, but they could from time to time provide him with plausible details not found in Herodotus, Thucydides, *et al.* A comparison of Pausanias 3.7.9 and Herodotus 6.71, for example, led Frazer to conclude that Pausanias had a source to supplement his Herodotus. It is also possible that an inscription supplied some of the information he reports: cf. 3.15.1 and 6.1.6 and see Frazer's introduction lxxv.

¹²Other names are possible, e.g., Nicomedes, who commanded in the early 450s (Thucydides 1.107.2 and Diodorus Siculus 11.79.5). But he is a brother of the elder Pausanias and not heard of after the Tanagra campaign. See V. Ehrenberg s.v. "Nikomedes (2)," *RE* 33 (1936) 492 f. Aristocles would disappear from the stemma of the family if Cobet's attractive emendation of Thucydides 5.16.2 were accepted. He is in any event likely to be younger than Cleomenes and hence a less likely candidate.

¹³In Pausanias the first proper name in a series is often omitted as the scribe's eye jumps ahead to the next name. Examples: 2.30.9; 3.13.5; 4.33.4; 5.17.4 (cf. 5.24.1); 6.16.7; 8.3.3; 10.1.8. In the light of this pattern Schubart's suggestion in 10.33.12 is strengthened.

¹⁴A festival Leonidea is attested in several inscriptions of Roman times: *IG* V (1) 18–20 (*SEG* XI 460, cf. 565) and *IG* V (1) 559 and 660. Also of Roman date is the "fine sepulchral chamber of square form, regularly constructed with large blocks, . . . nearly opposite the theatre and a short distance from it" which E. Dodwell (*Classical and Topographical Tour II* [London 1819] 404) identified with the tomb of Pausanias. Cf. W. Leake, *Travels in the Morea* I (London 1830) 156, and Frazer on Pausanias 3.14.1. The interior of this construction "is composed of brickwork" and hence Roman. That the Roman period witnessed a great revival of interest in the ancient glories of Sparta is well known; the difficult question is the extent to

be a fabrication designed to enhance the glory of these festivities. Herodotus does not mention the transfer of Leonidas' bones.¹⁵

These arguments have force, but the possibility that Pausanias knew whereof he spoke also deserves serious consideration. Hans Schaefer has shown that there were strong religious incentives for the Spartans to seek to bring home the bones of their kings.¹⁶ The rite described in Herodotus 6.58.3—if a king dies in battle (i.e., if his body cannot be recovered) they prepare an *eidôlon* and give it elaborate funeral honors—must have been used in Leonidas' case and perhaps only in his case. But, as Schaefer indicates, it is not likely to have satisfied the feeling that it would be better to have the actual body of the king buried in Sparta.¹⁷ After his death at Thermopylae Leonidas' body was mutilated and his head impaled.¹⁸ Later a monument in his honor was set up at Thermopylae.¹⁹ His bones may have been scattered and perhaps permanently lost, but this would not be an impediment to their later "discovery" and restoration, as the example of Cimon's "discovery" of Theseus' bones shows.²⁰

One further factor deserves consideration as we assess this tradition. If, as we have argued, the figure "forty" is secure, the return of Leonidas'

which that revival was based on old practices and the survivals of early traditions.

¹⁵In weighing Herodotus' evidence it is important to determine whether he implies that Leonidas' bones were never recovered or whether he simply fails to mention their transfer to Sparta. It has sometimes been assumed that he implies that the monument at Thermopylae (7.225.2) marked Leonidas' actual resting place. But, as note 19 below attempts to show, Herodotus' comments are much more limited and merely mention a memorial in Leonidas' honor. He is silent about the transfer of Leonidas' bones, just as he is about Cimon's spectacular transfer of Theseus' bones. Since the event lies outside of Herodotus' main chronological period, caution is required. His silence does not show that Herodotus visited Sparta only before 440 B.C., as Jacoby (following A. Kirchhoff, *Ueber die Entstehungszeit des herodotischen Geschichtswerkes* [Berlin 1878] 49 ff.) once thought (*RE* Supp. II [1913] 274). Nor does it disprove the historicity of Pausanias' story, as Jacoby later concluded ("Patrios Nomos," *JHS* 64 [1944] 43, note 23).

¹⁶H. Schaefer, "Das Eidolon des Leonidas," *Charites. Studien . . . E. Langlotz* (Bonn 1957) 223–33 = *Probleme der Alten Geschichte* (Göttingen 1963) 323–36.

¹⁷Schaefer (above, note 16) 325 f.

¹⁸Herodotus 7.238 and Macan *ad loc.*; cf. 9.78.

¹⁹Some have construed Herodotus 7.225.2, *δοκὺν νῦν ὁ λιθίνος λέων ἐστηκε ἐπὶ Λεωνίδῃ*, to mean that the lion was placed upon the grave of Leonidas. Stein and most commentators, however, seem to me to be correct in understanding the phrase as "in honor of Leonidas" (Rawlinson). In addition to the examples cited by the commentators see Dittenberger on *IG* VII 589, Schwyzler, *DGEP* 348 no. 2, 452 no. 1 and 456 no. 100 and R. E. and M. Piérart, *BCH* 99 (1975) 55.

²⁰Plutarch, *Theseus* 35 and 36, shows how little evidence Cimon had when he "discovered" Theseus' bones—and how little it bothered him. Cf. also Herodotus 1.67–68 on the discovery of Orestes' bones and the discussion by D. M. Leahy, *Historia* 4 (1955) 26–38.

bones should fall in 441 or 440 B.C. This historical setting is both plausible and suggestive. It is plausible because it is easy to see why Cleomenes, or any leader of the Agiad house, would be eager at this point to call attention to Leonidas. The house's reputation had suffered from a series of awkward episodes—Pausanias' strange behavior, the suspicions of treason that surrounded his last days, and his death in disgrace; Pleistarchos' apparently lackluster rule;²¹ and Pleistoanax' condemnation and flight after the abortive invasion of Attica in 446. And in the background lingered the charges and suspicions against that other notorious Agiad, Cleomenes. The restoration of the bones of Leonidas and some public memorial for him—we need not assume that all the arrangements in Pausanias or the hero cult attested in later sources were established at this time—would be the best remedy for the deterioration in the reputation of the house. Whatever controversies were provoked by Leonidas' bold strategy in 480, the heroic resistance at Thermopylae seems securely to have established him and his followers in Spartan public esteem. A reminder of his devotion to Sparta would unquestionably be helpful to the Agiads, especially in the late 440s.

A date *c.* 441/40 is also a very suggestive one. This is the period to which the Corinthians allude in Thucydides 1.40.5, when they remind the Athenians of their support at a time when the Peloponnesians were voting on the question of whether to come to the aid of the rebellious Samians. A. H. M. Jones has argued that such proposals could come before the Peloponnesian League only if the Spartans had already approved them.²² He therefore inferred that Sparta was willing to repudiate the more conciliatory policy that had led to the Thirty Years' Peace and now risk war with Athens. Jones' views have been resisted by some excellent scholars²³ and this corrupt and problematic passage in Pausanias surely cannot be

²¹Note the prominence of the Eurypontid monarch, Archidamus, in the ancient traditions concerning the great Spartan earthquake: Plutarch, *Cimon* 16, and Diodorus 11.63.5 ff. Later the Agiad Pleistoanax leads the invasion of Attica (Thucydides 1.114.2; 2.21.1 and 5.16.3), but the expedition results in Pleistoanax' exile.

²²A. H. M. Jones, "The Two Synods of the Delian and Peloponnesian Leagues," *PCPhS* N.S. 2 (1952/3) 43–46.

²³See the doubts expressed by A. Andrewes, "Thucydides on the Causes of the War," *CQ* N.S. 9 (1959) 235 and note 4; R. Sealey, "The Causes of the Peloponnesian War," *CP* 70 (1975) 89–109; and A. E. Raubitschek, "Corinth and Athens before the Peloponnesian War," *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean: Studies . . . F. Schachermeyr*, ed. K. H. Kinzl (Berlin and New York 1977) 266–69. More favorable opinions have been expressed by G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London and Ithaca 1972) 200–205, and A. J. Holladay, *JHS* 97 (1977) 62 and note 42. The matter might decisively be resolved if a little more of *IG* i² 50 (Meiggs and Lewis 56) were preserved. Especially tantalizing are the letters $\Pi\Omega\Omega\text{N}\text{N}\text{E}\Sigma$ in line 12 of fragment b of this stone, the regulations governing Samos' situation

said to corroborate his conclusions. But the convergence in date is remarkable. Were the Agiads, under new leadership, calling to mind not only their past services, but also their commitment to an aggressive foreign policy and to the cause of Greek freedom? For Leonidas was more than a brave warrior; he was the Spartan leader who was willing to defend Greek freedom by marching north, beyond the usual borders of Spartan activity, when others thought it sensible to stay closer to home. He was willing to engage at Thermopylae, says Herodotus, when "it was the wish of the Peloponnesians generally to fall back on the Isthmus" (7.207). Like the regent Pausanias, and Cleomenes before him, he was an Agiad who wanted his city to pursue an activist foreign policy, with commitments that reached far beyond the Peloponnese. By calling attention to the history of their house, were the Agiads also then hinting that they repudiated the more conciliatory approach which Pleistoanax seems to have favored and had now shifted to supporting stronger measures to resist a new enslavement of Greece?²⁴ If so, Pausanias 3.14.1, for all its problems and difficulties, may help us understand Sparta's move from a policy of toleration of the Athenian empire *c.* 446/5 to a willingness to risk war in order to stop Athenian aggrandizement, and may thereby help explain a change in Spartan foreign policy that was to have the greatest of consequences for Sparta, for Athens, and for the whole Greek world.

after the revolt. Some reference to the Peloponnesians is almost certain and hence "to the Samian attempt to involve Sparta and her allies" (R. Meiggs, *Athenian Empire* [Oxford 1972] 190).

²⁴On Pleistoanax' policies and attitude towards Athens see de Ste Croix (above, note 23) 138 and the sections there referred to. The ceremonies described in Thucydides 5.16.3 suggest to me that Pleistoanax may have regarded Cleomenes as a person who exercised illegitimate power.