University of Reading

Pausanias as historian in Winckelmann's History

Article

Accepted Version

Harloe, K. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0207-5212 (2010) Pausanias as historian in Winckelmann's History. Classical Receptions Journal, 2 (2). pp. 174-196. ISSN 1759-5142 (special issue Receptions of Pausanias: from Winckelmann to Frazer) Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/6931/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.
Published version at: http://crj.oxfordjournals.org/content/2/2/174.full

Publisher: Oxford Journals Oxford University Press

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

University of Reading

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in Classical Receptions Journal following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version, 'Pausanias as historian in Winckelmann's *History*', *Classical Receptions Journal* (2010) 2 (2): 174-196 *is available online at:* http://crj.oxfordjournals.org/content/2/2/174.full.

Pausanias as historian in Winckelmann's *History*

Katherine Harloe

The relation between Winckelmann and Pausanias – the one the author of the most extensive account of the topography of ancient Greece, the other among its most influential modern imaginators – might seem an obvious area for exploration. Yet Pausanias has so far received little attention from writers on Winckelmann.

One reason for this, perhaps, is Winckelmann's own emphasis upon autopsy: his insistence on first-hand observation of works of art and contempt for learning that relies on books (Winckelmann 2006: 71-76). Yet the image of Winckelmann as (solely) an enraptured viewer has long since been exploded; Schadewaldt (1954) and Décultot (2000) have both emphasized the extent to which his putatively fresh and visual approach to antiquity relies on reading practices that hark back to ancient and Renaissance writers. Neglect of Pausanias contrasts with the interest commentators have shown in other possible influences. Kraus (1935) and Schadewaldt (1941) have explored Winckelmann's engagement with Homer, Potts (1994) and Décultot (2000) have discussed his reading of French Enlightenment *philosophes*. In none of these works does Pausanias receive more than a passing mention.

Perhaps more relevant (as well as slightly sinister) is the fact that some earlier scholars did not so much overlook Pausanias' importance to Winckelmann as seek to minimize it. Such appears to be Senff's agenda in the introduction to his 1964 edition of the *History*. Senff's professed aim was to uncover the sources of Winckelmann's *Hauptwerk*; his introduction nevertheless invites suspicion that his real aim was to shield the art historian from any charge of depending upon 'inferior' writers, such as Pausanias, for his approach. Proclaiming that 'It is incorrect to portray him as an epigone of the writers, rhetors and sophists ['Skribenten, Rhetoren und Sophisten'] of the first two centuries of our era', Senff goes on to divide Winckelmann's sources into several groups. The principal outcome of his categorization is a strong distinction between 'the great historians... poets... and philosophers of Greece' (together with those of the Enlightenment) and the mere 'Skribenten' (Senff 1964: 2-3). Senff does not doubt the importance of the first group (which includes Herodotus, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Homer and Virgil), stating that Winckelmann 'bowed down in awe' before such 'giants' as these, as he had 'studied the

beautiful' at their feet. As for the 'Skribenten' (defined in rather less loving detail as 'Pausanias, Pliny, Quintilian, Lucian, etc.'), we are told that Winckelmann valued them for what 'facts' they had to about specific objects and cultural-historical contexts, but also that he often disputed their claims, criticizing and correcting them constantly (Senff 1964: 2). There is an interesting story here about the posthumous construction of Winckelmann as a classic – a narrative stretching from Goethe's Weimar to the cultural policies of the German Democratic Republic – but that is a tale for another day.[1] Suffice to say that if Senff's words were an attempt to keep Pausanias off the agenda for Winckelmann scholarship, they were extremely successful.

Fortunately, researchers on Pausanias have refused to adopt a similarly blinkered vision. Some years ago Snodgrass (2001: 135) posed the question of Pausanias' importance for Winckelmann: a matter that, as he pointed out, was 'still largely unacknowledged'. More recently it took Pretzler (2007: 122-5) just a few pages to prove Senff wrong, showing that Pausanias was significant for Winckelmann not just as a source of information about the material, attribution and display of hundreds of works of art, but also in shaping his judgements about the characteristics of period styles and his assumption that Greek art reached its height in connection with fifth-century Greek freedom.[2] This paper aims to explore rather a different aspect of Pausanias' relation to Winckelmann. First, though, it is worth saying something more general about the views of Pausanias that were current over the century and a half or so before Winckelmann wrote.

This early-modern background is important because it provides the context for Winckelmann's particular engagement with Pausanias. Here we should bear in mind Elsner's (2001: 19) warning that reading Pausanias is always a process of selection, of anthologizing. I would prefer to cast this observation in the language of reader-response theory, saying that individual readers only ever actualize or 'concretize' a sub-set of the many different potential readings the *Periegesis* offers.[3] For much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the principal focus of interest was Pausanias' reports of what he had seen while journeying around Greece; the potential readings actualized treated him as a guide either to the topography of ancient Greece or to its artistic and architectural treasures. Yet this kind of reading may have been stimulated by the particular promise nineteenth- and twentieth-century archaeology held out of vindicating Pausanias as a recorder of sights; it

[1] Fuhrmann 1972; Sünderhauf 2004.

[2] Pretzler extends her discussion in her contribution to this volume. Much work remains to be done, bearing in mind the Kochs' judgement about Pausanias in her recent, source-critical study of Winckelmann's use of Greek literature: 'He [Pausanias] is – this is true throughout Winckelmann's writings – the author who is cited by far the most often' (2005: 118).

[3] Eco 1989, Iser 1978.

may not have been the only – or even the most obvious – approach to the *Periegesis* for earlier generations. This is why one should ask: who was Pausanias for Winckelmann and his predecessors?

Pausanias in the early modern period: an expansive set of possibilities?

In a basic sense, this question is simple to answer. For Winckelmann, as for most of his predecessors, the author of the *Periegesis* was Pausanias the sophist from Cappadocia, the student of Herodes Atticus and teacher of Aelian, brief details of whose activities are transmitted in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*. In his overview of suggested identifications of Pausanias, Diller (1955: 271) reports that Raffaele Maffei Volterrano made the association in his *Commentariorum rerum urbanarum libri XXXVIII* (1506). From here it was taken over – although with some misgivings – by Conrad Gesner in his *Bibliotheca Universalis* (1545 2: 541 r.-v.), repeated (again with doubts) by Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Graeca* (1711: 518) and then endorsed by Joachim Kuhn, whose 1696 edition of the *Periegesis* Winckelmann used.[4] The identification was popular partly because it provided – for those who required it– an explanation of the difficulty of Pausanias' Greek: Philostratus reports that Pausanias was, like his fellow Cappadocians, 'coarse-tongued' (παχεία τῇ γλώττῃ), and that his style in declamation was 'lazy' (ὑπτιωτέρα, *V.S.* 2.13.594.7, 12).[5] Winckelmann's sole proposed emendation to Pausanias in the *History* shows that he accepted this identification. The problematic passage comes during Pausanias' description of Hadrian's dedications in the Olympeion at Athens (1.18.6); Winckelmann's solution would have Pausanias praising Zeus's statue '*not* for its size, because those at Rhodes and Rome are also big... *but* for its workmanship'. This is interesting because it shows him ascribing to Pausanias a certain aesthetic – not of the grand but of the fine – but he dismisses the truncated sentence that results with the comment 'this will not surprise those familiar with the literary style of this Cappadocian' (Winckelmann 2006: 369 n.347).[6] It is, then, very clear who Pausanias 'was'

---

[4] Kochs (2005: 118) notes that all of Winckelmann's citations of Pausanias are referenced to this edition, making it probable that he owned a copy.

[5] Thomas Taylor, author of the first complete translation into English, claimed that 'he may perhaps be considered as the most difficult author to translate of any in the Greek tongue' (1794: viii). Kuhn suggested more plausibly that Philostratus' comments refer not to Pausanias' command of the Greek language but to his oratorical style of delivery (*pronuntatio*).

[6] The passage in Kuhn's edition (1696: 42) reads 'Ἀδρίανος ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς τόν τε ναὸν ἀνέθηκε, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα θέας ἄξιον, οὐ μεγέθει μὲν, ὅτι μὴ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Ῥοδίοις εἰσὶν οἱ κολοσσοὶ, τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγαλμάτα ὁμοίως ἀποδείκνυται. πεποίηται δὲ ἔκ τε ἐλεφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ, καὶ ἔχει τέχνης εὖ πρὸς τὸ μέγεθος ὁρῶσιν.' Winckelmann's suggestion is to read ὅτι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις for ὅτι μή. The editor of the Teubner accepts Corais' emendations: οὗ for οὐ and ἀπολείπεται for ἀποδείκνυται.

for Winckelmann in this simple manner. But another way of understanding the question is to take it to ask about the possibilities Pausanias' text presented to early modern readers. Here a little more detective work is necessary.

There is evidence of a continuous thread of interest in Pausanias from his first arrival in Italy in the early fifteenth century. The *editio princeps* is the Aldine of 1516 edited by Musurus, but it is predated by Calderini's partial Latin translation, which appeared in Venice around 1500. Two further Latin translations (this time of the entire text) appeared in the mid-century: by Loescher (Basil 1550) and by Amasaeus (Florence 1551); followed by a new edition of the Greek text from Xylander (completed by Sylburg, Frankfurt 1583).[7] Finally, the sixteenth century also saw the first vernacular translation, with Bonacciuoli's Italian rendering of 1593 (Parks 1971, Beschi and Musti 1982: lxxxi-lxxxii, Georgopoulou et al. 2007: 74-88). This initial flurry of humanist activity occurred during the first century and a half of Ottoman rule, when very few western Europeans travelled to mainland Greece. Afterwards, there seems to have been little new interest in Pausanias – at least so far as this can be gauged in terms of scholarly publications devoted to the author – until the second half of the eighteenth century.[8] Admittedly a French translation appeared in 1731, a work which according to its translator Nicholas Gedoyn was solicited by the *Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. But interest in Pausanias only really took off from the 1760s onwards, with a German translation by Goldhagen in 1766, English translations in 1780 and 1794 and a new edition by Facius in 1794-6.[9]

The later eighteenth century was also a time of increasing interest in and travel to Greece, prompted in part by publications such as Le Roy's *Ruines* (1758), Stuart and Revett's *Antiquities of Athens* (1762-1816), and Chandler's *Travels* (1775). Yet some travellers had made it there as early as the mid-seventeenth century, Spon and Wheler providing the most famous example. Despite the popularity of such accounts and their open reliance upon Pausanias (Pretzler 2007: 130-135, Georgopoulou et al. 2007: 109-112), these earlier reports didn't immediately cause readers at home to reach for the *Periegesis*. It was still possible for Gedoyn to claim that Pausanias' text "is known only to savants, who on account of the infinity of curious and singular researches it contains have made it their favourite read..."(Gedoyn 1731: v-vi). It seems, then, that we should see the period 1600 to 1760 as a time of continuous, rather than increasing, interest in Pausanias, during which the *Periegesis* remained a relatively well-known text within a rather limited circle of scholars and

[7] This edition was something of a tour-de-force, comprising a new Greek text edited by Xylander, a commentary, a reprint of Amasaeus' latin translation together with Sylburg's lengthy critical notes upon it, relevant extracts from Strabo, Ptolemy and Pliny, and indexes.

[8] For an overview of the humanist uses of Pausanias, see Georgopoulou et al. 2007: 59-65, 96-104.

[9] For the English translations see Elsner in this volume.

antiquarians. What were the interests that led this select group to Pausanias, and what picture(s) of his work emerged from their readings?

There was certainly always a strain of interest in Pausanias for his reporting of *Realien*. Yet there are also suggestions of a more generous view of what he could offer. The title of Calderini's partial translation was after all not 'Pausanias periegeticus', nor even 'Pausanias peregrinus', but rather 'Pausanias historicus': a designation that aligns him with Herodotus or Polybius rather than Pliny or Strabo.[10] Aldus Manutius concurred in his Latin preface to the *editio princeps* (Musurus 1516):

> A work of ancient and rare erudition containing treasures. Dear reader, here you will find many rarities, many things fine to know; not a few that you have read nowhere else before. You will marvel at the author's precise and careful diligence, whether he is gathering accounts of outstanding deeds at the beginnings of each book or relating genealogies; whether he is commencing *ab ovo* or recovering step by step the origins of a people; whether he is recording the makers of statues or commemorating those in whose honour they were erected. You will weep at the destruction of so many glorious cities, which the author hands down to memory still flourishing in wealth and fortune, but our age sees levelled with the earth. You will feel outrage that Christian princes contend among themselves over even the smallest Italian town and bring shame upon all in calamitous wars, yet allow the lands of the Peloponnese, so rich and so suited to all kinds of trade, to be ravaged by the wicked nation of the Turks. There are also frequent excursuses, in the course of which, while he digresses, the author elucidates innumerable passages of the poets. Their variety will hold your attention wondrously, whether with pleasure or against your will.[11]

This is clearly an invitation to anthologizing, designating the text as 'thesauros continens'. The treasures Pausanias is said to offer nevertheless extend well beyond reports of sights: he is praised as a narrator of *res gestae*, a preserver of genealogies, and a memorializer of the great deeds of historically significant figures as well as of artists.

We find a similar picture in the dedication to the Aldine edition: a lengthy epistle from Marcus Musurus to Janus Lascaris. Lascaris (1445-1535) was a highly influential Byzantine émigré who combined the roles of érudit and man of affairs. He had served Cardinal Bessarion and then Lorenzo de' Medici, undertaking two voyages to Greece and

---

[10] Thus too the title in the primary MS of Pausanias in the hand of Constantine Lascaris (Madrid, Bib. Nac. Codex 4569): Παυσανίου ἱστοριογράφου ἱστορίαι. See Diller 1957: 178-9, Chamoux 1994: 45-6.

[11] Aldus died early in 1515, a fact that perhaps led the cautious Gesner (1545: 541 r.) to attribute the unsigned preface to 'innominati cuiusdam'. Yet Aldus had intended a Pausanias edition for some years, and in his signed preface to the Aldine Alexander of Aphrodisias (Musurus 1513) he refers to it as already under way (see too Wilson 1992: 115-6, 152). It is entirely possible that Aldus was the author of the short Latin preface, which is little more than an advertisement; but my argument does not rest upon this assertion.

Constantinople for the latter in order to secure texts for the Laurentian Library. He held the Chair of Greek in Florence from 1492-5, but entered the service of the French King Charles VIII after the deposition of Lorenzo's elder son Piero, serving as envoy first to Venice (1503-09) and then to the Vatican, where he became involved in the establishment of Pope Leo X's Greek College on the Quirinal. Musurus, a former student of Lascaris, had obtained the chair of Greek at Venice in 1512 (he had previously taught at Padua). He had collaborated with Aldus on-and-off since the 1490s, producing first editions of, among others, Aristophanes, Plato and Athenaeus as well as Pausanias.[12] The periegetic aspects of the text were perhaps especially evident to these first-generation Byzantine émigrés, and Musurus uses them to good effect in his closing plea for Leo to mount a new crusade against the Turks, a course of action Lascaris had been advising:

> for with one of you urging on and the other accomplishing Hellas will be freed, and the lovers of learning and lovers of sights will flock without fear to the Peloponnese, once the barbarians have completely vanished, and holding Pausanias in hand they will find diversion in touring all around, comparing his writings directly with the sights, and they shall have their fill of great pleasure.

He nonetheless also praises the work more generally as:

> Pausanias' most learned account, which offers a guide to Greece and a tour of all parts of Attica and the Peloponnese, giving details of thousands of flourishing villages and cities (of which not even ruins now remain), and filled with many researches – of a kind that are not found everywhere but are particularly uncommon – and which also records many other things of note, avoiding satiety by the variety of its episodes, and truly portraying the strength, power and prosperity of the Greeks of that age.[13]

Gedoyn's view of the *Periegesis* is even more telling. He takes care to explain that rather than using the traditional titles for individual books (*Attica*, *Corinthiaca*, etc.) he has called his translation 'Voyage historique de la Grèce', as he believes that this title presents a more 'clear and distinct' sense of the work's contents to his readers. Its first two words are intended to carry equal weight:

> For [in Pausanias] one finds at once an inquisitive traveller and a profound writer, perfectly informed about every aspect of the different peoples of whom he speaks... For he not only describes the present state of the lands through which he has travelled; he investigates the origins of the peoples who inhabit them, gives us the succession of kings who have ruled them, the genealogies of the great men who have lived in them, an accurate account of all the

[12] For brief details on Lascaris and Musurus see Legrand 1883: 108-124, 131-162; Wilson 1992: 98-100, 148-156. For further details on Lascaris and the political context see Knös 1945: 30-55, 140-157; for more on Musurus see Geanakoplos 1962: 111-166.

[13] For further discussion of this letter see Georgopoulou et al. 2007: 81-87.

> monuments that have survived there until his age, and very often he traces back generation upon generation to that famous era of the Greeks, Deucalion's flood – for they knew nothing of the times before this, because that flood changed the entire surface of their lands and made the earth as new – and so he conceives of the greatest design any pagan author could countenance, to [the execution of] which, one may say, he applies as much art as erudition. For as he had to describe the land most adorned and rich in marvels of any there has ever been, if he had spoken continually of public buildings, porticoes, acqueducts, tombs, statues, trophies, stadia and theatres, he would have soon bored his reader. Such a catalogue necessarily provokes satiety and distaste; Pausanias realized its disadvantages and remedied them by relating everything he saw to History, a connection so natural that the one seems to follow from the other. (Gedoyn 1731: v)

Gedoyn is interesting because he shows concern for the structure of Pausanias' text as literature and sensitivity to the stylistic requirements of variety necessitated by its subject-matter. It is also clear that the Pausanias he offers up is a much more than a reporter of *Realien*. We could call this view of Pausanias archaeological, but only in the expansive, ancient sense of the term according to which it denotes an interest in *panta ta archaia* (Plato *Hippias Maior* 285d; see Momigliano 1950: 287).

We have seen that although many nineteenth- and twentieth-century readers were interested primarily in Pausanias as a reporter on ancient sites and monuments, this was not such a dominant focus in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. To couch the distinction in Pausanias' own terms (and to reprise an old chestnut of Pausanias studies), for earlier readers the *logoi* contained in his account were at least as important as the *theōrēmata*.[14] We have also seen that throughout the early modern period there was an interest in Pausanias' personality and literary style, and a commonly accepted view as to how stylistic considerations governed the form of his narrative. I have pursued these matters at some length because this background conditions Winckelmann's engagement with the *Periegesis*. Below, I shall claim that Pausanias the historian is at least as important for Winckelmann as Pausanias the observer and describer of monuments. I shall argue further that as historian, Pausanias plays a privileged role in Winckelmann's *History*. My suggestion is that Winckelmann read Pausanias, as he read Lucian and Philostratus, not only as a source of information about lost artworks, but also as a source of what he called 'Denkweise': of the appropriate attitudes by which to contemplate and interpret the history of Greece. Just as Winckelmann strove to view the *theōrēmata* of the Belvedere through the eyes of Philostratus and Lucian, so it was through Pausanias' eyes that he attempted to contemplate the *mega theōrēma* of Greek history. If this is correct, it means that Pausanias' value for Winckelmann is not merely, as Senff suggests, as one among a number of ancient sources giving facts and dates. The sustained effort of viewing the history of Greece through Pausanias' eyes

[14] See for example Habicht 1998: 20-25, Hutton 2005: 30-53.

involved a much deeper identification on Winckelmann's part, and it ought to be detectable throughout his *History*.

Winckelmann and Pausanias: two historians in search of a fatherland?

My argument will focus upon Winckelmann's engagement with Pausanias as documented in his correspondence and manuscript remains, but first let us turn to the end of the *History* itself:

> Ich bin in der Geschichte der Kunst schon über ihre Gränzen gegangen, und ungeachtet mir bey Betrachtung des Unterganges derselben fast zu Muthe gewesen ist wie demjenigen, der in Beschreibung der Geschichte seines Vaterlandes die Zerstörung desselben, die er selbst erlebet hat, berühren müßte, so konnte ich mich dennoch nicht enthalten, dem Schicksale der Werke der Kunst, so weit mein Auge ging, nachzusehen. So wie eine Liebste an dem Ufer des Meeres ihren abfahrenden Liebhaber, ohne Hofnung ihn wieder zu sehen, mit bethränten Augen verfolget, und selbst in dem entfernten Segel das Bild des Geliebten zu sehen glaubt. Wir haben, wie die Geliebte, gleichsam nur einen Schattenriß von dem Vorwurfe unsrer Wünsche übrig; aber desto größere Sehnsucht nach dem Verlohrnen erwecket derselbe... (Winckelmann 1764: 430)

> I have in this history of art already gone beyond its set bounds, and although contemplating the collapse of art has driven me nearly to despair, still, like someone who, in writing the history of his native land, must touch upon the destruction he himself has witnessed, I could not keep myself from gazing after the fate of works of art as far as my eye could see. Just as a beloved stands on the seashore and follows with tearful eyes her departing sweetheart, with no hope of seeing him again, and believes she can glimpse even in the distant sail the image of her lover – so we, like the beloved, have as it were only a shadowy outline of the subject of our desires remaining. But this arouses so much the greater longing for what is lost... (Winckelmann 2006: 351, Mallgrave translation corrected)

In this much-quoted passage Winckelmann bids goodbye to his subject in markedly periegetic terms. Previous commentary upon it (including my own) has tended to concentrate on the connotations of the central simile of Ariadne/ Dido: Winckelmann's extended comparison of himself to the distraught woman whose mythological and poetic destiny it is to stand by the sea shore watching her perfidious lover sail away (Davis 1994, 1996; Harloe 2009: 103-4; Güthenke 2009). But what of the image that intrudes just before this conceit? Who is the man compelled to include a narrative of his native land's destruction within a description (*Beschreibung*) of its history?

One possibility, continuing the Virgilian theme, is that this is Aeneas, narrator of Troy's fall, departing burning Ilium:

> And I launch out in tears and desert our native land,
> the old safe haven, the plains where Troy once stood.
> So I take to the open sea, an exile outward bound
> with son and comrades, gods of hearth and home
> and the great gods themselves. (Virg. *Aen*. 3.10-12, tr. Fagles)[15]

The situation and tone suit the passage well and have the merit of bringing out the journeying metaphor implicit in Winckelmann's words. But - while reserving the probability of multiple associations – I suggest that this unnamed historian is (also) Pausanias.

The identification is rendered initially plausible by further details from the Philostratean life. These tell us that Pausanias the sophist spent his final years teaching rhetoric at Rome. Yet it was neither Rome nor Caesarea (his birthplace) that this Pausanias considered his true fatherland:

> He also held the chair at Athens, and on the occasion of his leaving it he concluded his address to the Athenians by quoting very appropriately the verse of Euripides
>
> "Theseus, turn me round so that I may behold the city."
>
> (Philostr. *V.S* 2.13.594.14-20, tr. Wright)

Philostratus' comment that these words are 'very appropriate' (καιριώτατα) suggests that neither he nor the Athenian audience was perturbed by the source of this Euripidean quotation: Herakles' tragic request to view the corpses of his murdered children (*H.F.* 1406). However incongruous it may seem to modern readers, the transformation of a tragic image of destruction into a pretty compliment is consistent with Greek practices of quotation, which often display a high tolerance for quite radical transformations of source contexts.[16] On the other hand, the association between Theseus, Herakles and an Athens which provides a common fatherland (κοινὴ πατρίδα) to all is underlined by Aristides' Panathenaic discourse. The notion of Athens as foster-parent to all Greeks is a central topos of this speech, within which Theseus' reception of Herakles and his family is repeatedly cited as a paradigm of Athenian hospitality (Aristid. *Or.* XIII. 34, 48-53, see Oliver 1968; see too E. *H.F.* 1322 – 1335). If it deploys an established topos of Athenian panegyric, Pausanias' play on Euripides may have been less incongruous than it seems to twenty-first century readers. Regardless of Winckelmann's own response to the passage, Pausanias' life-story may have encouraged him to feel an affinity with the ancient author: both scholars and

[15] I thank Stephen Harrison for this suggestion.

[16] For a Plutarchan example, with discussion, see Pelling 2007.

teachers who had spent their mature years in Rome, far from the lands of their birth; but both holding an inner orientation towards a different, Greek fatherland.[17]

Might this image of the unnamed historian, appearing fleetingly yet programmatically at the *History*'s conclusion, hint at Pausanias' importance within that work? The observations above are suggestive but inconclusive. It is time to consider more explicit evidence for Winckelmann's engagement with the author.

Pausanias in Winckelmann's correspondence and manuscripts

It is clear that Winckelmann read extensively in Pausanias in the period immediately following his arrival in Rome in November 1755.[18] In correspondence written just weeks after his arrival he announces that he and Mengs are reading the *Periegesis*, along with Strabo and Lucian, in preparation for a work 'On the taste of ancient artists'. During the early years in Rome Winckelmann's letters report an astonishing number of new projects: by March 1757 he is talking of the work on taste together with one on the restorations of ancient sculpture, an account of the Belvedere statues (to include 'poetic descriptions' of the Torso and the Apollo), a description of the villas and galleries of Rome, a grand history of art up to the beginning of modern times, a critical edition and translation of Libanius, and a collation of various Vatican manuscripts with the printed editions of ancient writers, focussing particularly on passages concerning art.[19] It is an extremely ambitious and diverse set of projects, and it is notable that the *History* is the only one of them that came to fruition, although traces of many of the others can be detected in that work. Amid all this variety, reading Pausanias is a constant theme. It is Pausanias whom Winckelmann consults first for his work on the taste of ancient artists, Pausanias to whom he appeals when contesting

---

[17] If this is plausible, Winckelmann's voyaging imagery might even be thought to hint at the opening of the *Periegesis*: 'On the Greek mainland, across from the Cyclades and the Aegean Sea, Cape Sounion juts out from the Attic land...' (Pausan. 1.1.1-3). Here Pausanias brings his readers across the Aegean Sea to put in the Peiraeus, incidentally (or perhaps not?) retracing Theseus' path home from Crete and Naxos. Beschi and Musti (1982: 249) suggest that this opening is a deliberate narrative strategy aimed at underlining 'the centrality of Attica and, even more precisely, of the Sounion promontory, within the historico-geographic theatre comprised by the Greek mainland, the Cycladic islands [and], the Aegean Sea'. Interestingly, they also cite *Panathenaikos* (9) as the closest parallel to the kind of imaginative geography they posit. Winckelmann's imagery of embarkation effectively reverses this conceit while preserving its Thesean overtones, an appropriately learned way of acknowledging a debt of influence. I thank Jaś Elsner for this suggestion.

[18] On the evidence for Winckelmann's reading of Pausanias before and during his time in Rome see Kochs (2005: 29, 44, 60, 76-80, 84, 118); for further discussion, see Pretzler in this volume.

[19] See Winckelmann to Francke, March [9] 1757 (Rehm I: 274-275).

others' attributions of objects, and when he announces his intention to work on the texts of ancient writers, he proposes to begin with Pausanias.[20]

Winckelmann's reading of Pausanias is also amply documented in his manuscript remains, most of which (some 4000 pages) are now held in the German collections of the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*. The manuscripts were transported there in 1798 as part of the confiscations of the Albani family collections made by Napoleonic forces in Italy. At some point before their transfer they were catalogued and bound in volumes according to a loosely thematic order. Tibal (1911) attempted to establish the chronology of the various papers; research on the watermarks has now enabled Bockelkamp (1996) to issue some valuable corrections to his work.[21] Unlike some better-known manuscript collections (for example, Nietzsche's), Winckelmann's *Nachlaß* includes relatively few drafts of published works. The majority of the twenty-one volumes held in Paris is taken up by excerpts from authors he read over a period of some twenty-five years, from the early 1750s until about a year before his death in 1768. They include three significant clusters of passages from Pausanias.

For the purposes of this paper the first of these is the most interesting. It is a booklet of some 72 pages (BNF Fonds allemand 57, foll. 198r – 233v), labelled by Winckelmann 'Collectanea ad historiam artis' and consisting mainly of extracts from Pausanias, Strabo and Lucian. The manuscript conforms to Winckelmann's typical working method: he would divide each page into two columns and then read through a text, noting down key passages as he went on the left-hand side of the page. The right-hand column was reserved either for extracts made during a second reading of the same text or for passages from other authors that relate to those on the left. At the beginning of the booklet (fol. 201r.) passages from Pausanias occupy the left-hand column (and very often the right-hand one too), around fol. 213 Strabo begins to take priority, and for the last ten pages Lucian is dominant.[22] The booklet therefore accords with what we hear from Winckelmann's letters of 1756-7: that he read Pausanias first, followed by Strabo and Lucian.

To some extent, these manuscripts give us an insider's view of Winckelmann's anthologizing. We can see exactly what he selected from the Pausanias, although interpretation is still necessary in order to uncover the reasons behind his choice. Dating the collection is not the only problem here. Winckelmann provides little first-person editorial comment upon his library of excerpts: the manuscripts themselves provide few clues,

---

[20] On Pausanias as the first source Winckelmann read with Mengs, see Rehm I: 208; as a guide to period style I: 387, I: 395 ; for the list of other projects I: 274-5.

[21] For a recent discussion, see Décultot 2000: 303-5.

[22] The first three pages of the booklet are taken up with miscellaneous excerpts from ancient and post-Renaissance authors, together with the opening paragraph of an uncompleted essay 'On Beauty'.

beyond the passages themselves, to how he approached this material. It is unclear whether the passages represent a self-sufficient florilegium or an index: a set of prompts to send Winckelmann back to the relevant pages of Kuhn's edition.[23] In what follows I argue for an interpretation based upon two modulations that occur during Winckelmann's excerpting.

It seems that Winckelmann began to read Pausanias in a straightforward manner: beginning at the start of Book 1, going through the text chapter by chapter, and noting down interesting passages as he proceeded. So the first excerpt concerns the temple of Demeter, which is one of the first buildings Pausanias says one can see upon entering Athens (Pausan. 1.2.4); we then move on through the Odeon (1.14.1), the Painted Stoa (1.15.1), and so on. What Winckelmann found particularly noteworthy in these early chapters were the sculptures and paintings Pausanias reports – so, as you'd expect, he notes the statues attributed to Praxiteles and the paintings of Polygnotus. Even in these early pages, though, we find Winckelmann going beyond Pausanias' observations on *theōrēmata*. One such example is furnished by his interest in Pausanias' description of the Eleusinion. Winckelmann copies out Pausanias' claims (1.14.3, 1.38.7) that he was prevented from describing what lay within the sanctuary by a 'dream-vision', adding in the right-hand column his admission (4.13) that a similar dream forbids him from speaking about the rites of Demeter and Kore at Oichalia. Given Winckelmann's own emphasis (as manifest in some of his ekphrases) in the limits of description when confronted with the sacred, his interest in Pausanias' sense of these limits is intriguing.[24]

Fairly soon we find a more marked shift in Winckelmann's excerpting. Rather than following Pausanias' narrative order he begins to arrange and group the passages under thematic headings. These are extremely diverse – over the first few pages we find 'On Greek aqueducts', 'On ancient Greek tombs', 'Musical contests', 'Architecture', 'Linen', 'The Greeks' love of their fatherland', 'Olympic Games', and others. It seems that Winckelmann is mining Pausanias for a wide range of observations on the culture and social customs of ancient Greece in a manner reminiscent of the motley of commonplaces he wove into the idealized image of Greece presented in the *Thoughts on the Imitation of the Painting and Sculpture of the Greeks* (1755).

---

[23] Several of the passages are fairly long, suggesting a florilegium. But some are puzzling when viewed in this light. For example, on 210r we find an excerpt from Pausanias' well-known meditation (8.33) on the decline of once-great cities. Winckelmann quotes only the section that pertains to Delos. Was he really only interested in this small part of the passage, or was it a cue to a longer extract already committed to memory?

[24] This aspect of his ekphrases, which is particularly apparent in early versions of the Apollo and Torso descriptions, has not yet received much attention in the secondary literature. For some relevant discussion see Schadewaldt 1968: 1-20, Harloe 2007: 239-247.

Yet another modulation in Winckelmann's practice of excerpting soon begins to disturb this process of accumulation. This is the recurrence of passages that describe the situation of various Greek cities once they have come under Roman rule. These intrude in places where, according to Winckelmann's headings, they have no right to be. For example, half-way down fol. 202v, under the heading 'Certamina musica', we find what is putatively a collection of extracts concerning ancient Greek festivals. But there, amid reports of the festival of Dionysus of the black goat-skin (Pausan. 2.35.1) and the Ithomaia (4.33.2), are notes on the temples of the Roman emperors erected in the Spartan agora and in Asopus (3.22.9), on Augustus' redrawings of territorial boundaries within Greece and the resettlements of different peoples in different lands (4.30.2, 31.2; 3.21.6, 26.7).[25]

Passages of this sort become more and more frequent as one progresses through the booklet, until eventually they begin to infect the thematic headings Winckelmann gives his material. Among the more idealizing passages on the Greeks' habit of holding beauty-contests, or on places renowned for their abundance of water, there appear sober sections titled 'The situation of Greece under Augustus', 'Greece under the Antonines', 'On the statues transported to Rome' and even 'Devastation of things in Greece, cities destroyed, etc.'. More and more it appears as if Winckelmann is concerned to pick out from Pausanias those passages that highlight the (mis-) deeds of Augustus and the other emperors in Greece.

The increasing frequency of such passages suggests that Winckelmann's selection from Pausanias is – or rather becomes – a form of anthologizing that foregrounds his testimony about the Greek states' loss of power and independence under Roman rule. The perspective he gleans from his reading is one that emphasizes the disintegration and destruction of Greece under Rome in terms of the destruction of cities and monuments and the dispersal of works of art. It is a highly selective but remarkably coherent picture of Pausanias that emerges from Winckelmann's manuscripts. Has this view of Pausanias, or rather this view of Greek history mediated by a particular reading of Pausanias, left any traces in Winckelmann's *History*?

[25] Significantly, this section also gives us a rare first-personal interjection from Winckelmann. Coming immediately after an extract from Pausan. 3.3.8 on the bronze weapons of Homeric heroes, the German comment reads: 'It seems to me that the following passage is also testimony as to the state of the Greeks under Augustus'. The extract that follows is from Pausan. 3.11.4: 'There are temples in the [Spartan] agora: first to Caesar, who was the first among the Romans to desire monarchy and to rule in the present manner; then to Augustus his son, who stabilized the kingdom and outstripped his father in reputation and power.'

I suggest that it has. Winckelmann's greatest overt dependence upon Pausanias within the *History* occurs in the chapter describing the greatest eras of Greek art in the fifth and the fourth centuries (Part 1, Chapter 4). His references are most frequent in the sections that explore the causes of Greek art's superiority, relating it to the Greeks' fair climate, habits of promoting and esteeming beauty and free constitution. As Pretzler (2007: 124-5) observes, these aspects of Winckelmann's depiction of Greece are in broad agreement with Pausanias, although elements of them could also be found in Herodotus, Pliny, Tacitus or Longinus. But Pausanias' influence seems equally important in the *History*'s closing sections, where Winckelmann traces the decline of art in Greece under the changed circumstances of Macedonian and Roman rule.

Although they have come to be associated particularly with his name, neither the doctrine that the excellence of Greek art was attributable to Greek 'freedom' nor that it declined with the loss of that freedom was unique or original to Winckelmann. Quite apart from the ancient sources mentioned above, the connection of liberty and letters had been asserted in different ways by a number of English and French writers at the beginning of the eighteenth century.[26] In 1740 George Turnbull (in a book on ancient painting represented in Winckelmann's manuscript library) claimed that the decline of Greek art under Rome provided ample proof of the thesis that 'Liberty or a free Constitution is absolutely necessary to produce and uphold that Freedom, Greatness and Boldness of Mind, without which it cannot rise to noble and sublime Conceptions' (1740: 99-100). Yet there was still plenty of room for disagreement over when precisely the decline had begun. Turnbull held that the Greeks' innately freedom-loving character had allowed them to maintain artistic greatness for several centuries after losing their independence:

> Yet it is remarkable, that even after Greece was absorbed in the Roman Empire, and became a Province to it under the Name of Achaia, it did not lose with its Power and Sovereignty, that lively Sense and Love of Liberty which was the peculiar Character of that People, amongst whom the Arts were produced and brought to Perfection. The Romans when they had subdu'd Greece, left that generous, brave and polite People in possession of many of their Rights and Privileges. And they maintain'd such an ardent Zeal for Liberty, that, to name no other Instances of it at present, when the civil Wars happen'd in Italy, the Athenians very warmly espoused the party of Pompey who fought for the Republick: And, after Caesar was killed, they erected Statues in honour of Brutus and Cassius near to those of Harmodius and Aristogiton their ancient Deliverers. It was hence Greece, Athens in particular, after it was

[26] For a general discussion see Starobinski 1977. One important English predecessor, not mentioned by Starobinski but represented in Winckelmann's manuscripts, is Shaftesbury. Potts (1978: Part 1), gives an overview of eighteenth-century views about the decline of ancient art, arguing that no consensus – and indeed, no systematically argued viewpoints – existed before Winckelmann.

> very much fallen and degenerated, continued still to be the Metropolis of Sciences, the School of all the fine Arts, the Standard and Center of good Taste in all Works of Genius, to Cicero's time, and long afterwards. (Turnbull 1740: 100)

Another tradition, stretching back as far as Horace (*Ep*. 2.1.156-7) and influentially espoused by Vasari (1986: 95-96), argued for a transfer of the arts from Greece to Rome, where they continued to flourish well into the time of the Flavians and Antonines. Winckelmann locates the decline far earlier, during the first and second generations of Alexander's successors. It is throughout these sections of the *History* that his Pausanian affinities are clearest:

> Yet Greek art would not take root in Egypt, in a climate foreign to it, and it lost amid the splendor of the courts of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies much of its grandeur and its true conception. Its complete fall took place in Magna Graecia: together with the philosophies of Pythagoras and Zeno of Elea, art had flourished there in so many free and powerful cities, but the weapons and barbarity of the Romans destroyed it.
>
> But in Greece itself, the remaining roots of freedom – which had been weakened by the many tyrants who had been installed with the aid and under the protection of Antigonos [II] Gonatas, king of Macedonia – sent out a new shoot. From the ashes of their forefathers awoke a few great men, who sacrificed themselves for the love of their native land and made the Macedonians and Romans pay great attention. In the 124th Olympiad [284/81 BC], three or four cities, scarcely known to history, undertook to withdraw from the rule of Macedonia. They successfully banished or killed the tyrants who had been installed in each city, and because the alliance of these cities was deemed to be of little consequence, they remained undisturbed: this was the foundation and beginning of the celebrated Achaian League. Many large cities, even Athens itself, that had not dared to take this course of action were now ashamed and sought the restoration of their freedom with similar courage. In the end, the whole of Achaia entered into a confederation and drafted new laws and a distinctive form of government. And when the Lacedaemonians and Aetolians rose up against the league out of jealousy, Aratus [of Sikyon] (then only twenty years old) and Philopoemen, the last heroes of Greece, emerged as leaders and were courageous defenders of freedom. (Winckelmann 2006: 319-320)

Winckelmann's main source for these events is of course not Pausanias, but Polybius, who gives a comprehensive account of the (re-)formation of the Achaean League and the Kleomenic War in Book II of the *Histories* (II.37-70). It is Polybius to whom Winckelmann's footnotes refer throughout this section. But there are also clear traces of Pausanias. While his emphasis upon the roles of Aratos and Philopoimen is consistent with Polybius' report of events, Winckelmann's designation of them as 'the last heroes of Greece' recalls Pausanias 8.52, in which the two Achaian leaders form the final pair in a list of 'benefactors of Hellas'

(εὐεργέται τῆς Ἑλλάδος) stretching back to Miltiades.[27] Winckelmann's reference to the 'roots of freedom' sending out a 'new shoot' with the League's formation is surely intended to evoke Pausanias' final comment in his account of the League:

> And when with difficulty, as if from a damaged and mostly withered trunk, the Achaean Confederacy shot up anew from Hellas, the cowardice of its generals cut it short while it was still growing. (Pausan. 7.17.2)

Like 8.52, this Pausanian comment comes at the climax of a catalogue of significant deeds in Greek history. This time, however, the focus is not upon benefactors but the disasters visited upon various Greek states since time immemorial. Its climax is Mummius' destruction of Corinth in 146 B.C., following the catastrophic war against Rome initiated by the Achaeans under Kritolaos and Diaios. For Pausanias, their defeat marks the point when 'Hellas descended into utter ruin' (ἐς ἅπαν δὲ ἀσθενείας τότε μάλιστα κατῆλθεν ἡ Ἑλλάς, 7.17.1). Winckelmann's allusion thus hints at the outcome of the Achaean War even as the League and its activities are first introduced, and events narrated far apart in Polybius (II-V and XXXVII – XXXIX respectively) are telescoped into one action.[28] This corresponds to Pausanias' narrative strategy, which compresses events from the League's origins to its destruction into a mere eleven chapters (7.7 – 7.17). Compared with the proud narrative of Polybius this also amounts to a shift in emphasis, indicating a different attitude towards events in third-century Greece. For Polybius, the refoundation of the League and the Kleomenic War are to be viewed as moments in the growth of a Greek political entity to the height of its power. By following Pausanias in discussing the League within a perspective informed by the sack of Corinth, Winckelmann casts it instead as a brief moment of hope (destined all-too-soon to be disappointed) within an overall story of Greek decline.[29]

The elegiac tone continues through Winckelmann's narrative of the 'Social War' of 220-217 BC:

> After war erupted between the Achaians and the Aetolians during this same Olympiad [the 140th], the bitterness between the two parties went so far that they even began to vent their rage on works of art. When the Aetolians marched unopposed into the Macedonian town of

---

[27] Polybius by contrast (II.40.2) gives us a triad: Aratos, Philopoimen, and his own father Lycortas, who respectively presided over the League's conception, perfection and stability.

[28] Here I follow Walbank's (1972: 99-110, 129) reconstruction of the probable structure of Polybius' *Histories*.

[29] Pausan. 7.17.2 reads very much like a correction of Polybius' account of the League. Polybius uses similar organic imagery when he announces his intention to start his narrative from the 'new beginning' the League received in the 124th Olympiad: 'From this point, *continuing ever to grow*, the federation *attained that perfection* it had in my own time, about which I spoke just now.' Polyb. II.40.6 (emphasis mine), referring back to II.40.2, quoted in n. 19 above. For a general discussion of Pausanias' use of Polybius in Book 7 of the *Periegesis*, see Lafond, 1991.

> Dion (from which the inhabitants had fled), they pulled down the city's walls and destroyed the houses; they set fire to the porches and porticoes of the temples and smashed all the statues therein. The Aetolians laid waste to the Temple of Jupiter at Dodona in Epirus with the same ferocity; they incinerated the galleries, shattered the statues, and razed the temple itself to the ground. And Polybius instances in the speech of an Akarnanian envoy many other temples pillaged by the Aetolians. The territory of Elis, which because of the public games had thus far been exempted from the hostilities and enjoyed the rights of a free city, was from the 140th Olympiad on just as afflicted by the Aetolians as other territories. The Macedonians under Philip [V] and the Achaians exercised the right of retaliation in almost the same way at Thermos, the capital of Aetolia, sparing only the statues and likenesses of the deities, but when this king came for a second time to Thermos, he pulled down the statues that he had previously left standing. In the siege of the city of Pergamon, this same king vented his rage against the temples, which, together with their statues, he destroyed to such an extent that even the stone itself was crushed so that it could not be used to rebuild the temples... At the beginning of the war, Athens was entirely quiescent, because this city was totally dependent on the Macedonians and on the king of Egypt. Due to this inactivity, however, the city's reputation and standing among the Greeks declined sharply. When the city deserted the Macedonians, Philip [V] marched into its territory, burned the Academy on the outskirts of the city, plundered the temples around it, and did not spare even the tombs... The Romans, who had previously spared the temples of their enemies, now began to practice, according to their view, the right of retaliation, and they plundered the temples on the island of Bacchium, which lies across from Phokaia, and carried away the statues. Such were the circumstances in Greece in the 140th Olympiad. (Winckelmann 2006: 320-321)

The footnotes indicate that Winckelmann's immediate source for these events is again Polybius. But once more, the overall tenor is very different. For Polybius, who devotes the greater part of two books to discussion of this conflict, the war was a just and fitting action (IV.26) which led to a satisfactory conclusion and again represented a stage in the increase of Achaian power. For Winckelmann, the Social War forms the first of four phases of the destruction and dispersal of Greek cultural heritage after Alexander's death.[30] The wanton acts of vandalism visited on monuments by the Macedonians and Aetolians constitute ominous first attacks on art, and it is equally fateful that this Olympiad witnesses the first Roman intervention in Greek affairs, when the Aetolians call upon them for help in fighting the Achaians and Macedonians. Once more, the narrative is highly compressed: there is none of the detailed discussion of battles and equally complex diplomatic manoeuverings in which Polybius delights. It is also highly emotionally coloured, with its lingering emphasis on repeated depredations within Greece and in particular on the cruelty ('*Grausamkeit*') exhibited by Philip.[31] Polybius is certainly unequivocal in his condemnation

[30] The subsequent culprits are Mummius, Sulla, and the Julio-Claudian emperors.

[31] For Polybius, by contrast (IV.24, 77.1-4; V.10.9-12.8), Philip during the Social War is not yet the monster he is to become.

of the damage wreaked on sanctuaries and offerings by Macedonians and Aetolians alike (IV.62, 67.1-4; V.8-11), but it is Winckelmann who weaves these events into a tragic and emotional narrative of suffering – perhaps more in the style of the despised Phylarchus than that of the pragmatic historian (Polyb. II.56). The narrative treatment is once again undoubtedly one of decline – a perspective on the events of the 140th Olympiad that, as we have seen, is more Pausanian than Polybian.

For Winckelmann, the waning of art sets in immediately after Alexander's death, and the seventy-five year period from the Social War of 220/17 to the Sack of Corinth in 146 forms the decisive stage in the history of its decline. Admittedly, 'decline' suggests a drawn-out process, and indeed Winckelmann goes on to trace the fate of art 'beyond its set bounds', 'as far as my eye could see' (that is, down to the fall of the Western Empire). But he rejects the temporal models proposed by predecessors such as Turnbull and Vasari. His comments on the Flavian Vespasian and the 'Good Emperor' and Graecophile Hadrian are representative of his alternative approach:

> For all his [Vespasian's] thriftiness, his reign appears to have been more favorable to the arts than the monstrous extravagance of his predecessors... Of interest is Plutarch's extraordinary comment that when the columns of Pentelic marble that Domitian had made in Athens for the Roman Temple of [Capitoline] Jupiter were brought to Rome and reworked or polished, they lost their beautiful form. (Winckelmann 2006: 335-6)

> Had it been possible to return art to its former glory, Hadrian was the man to have done so, as someone lacking neither knowledge nor initiative; but the spirit of freedom had retreated from the world, and the wellspring of elevated thinking and true fame had vanished... The assistance that Hadrian gave to art was like the food doctors prescribe to those that are ill: it prevents them from dying but also gives them no nourishment. (Winckelmann 2006: 340)

Winckelmann countenances neither an authentic revival of Greek art under the Roman Empire (following Turnbull) nor a transfer of the arts from Greece to Rome (following Vasari).[32] For him, in contrast to these earlier writers, the loss of Greek independence in the second century B.C. amounts to the death of art.[33]

---

[32] Winckelmann clearly experienced some difficulty in reconciling his denial of a revival of the arts during the Graeco-Roman period with both the pronouncements of ancient authorities and his own aesthetic preferences. He rejects Pliny's famous claim (*N.H.* 34.29.52) that art revived in the 155th (as Winckelmann's edition had it) Olympiad on the grounds that by then 'the Romans were in Greece as enemies'. His recourse, throughout his narrative of decline, to the metaphors of a flame that burns brightest just before its extinction and a corpse that barely still breathes (Winckelmann 2006: 321, 340, 342), are perhaps an attempt to reconcile these conflicting imperatives. His reinterpretation of the Belvedere Antinous as a Meleager and his suggestion that the Belvedere Apollo may have been brought to Rome from Delphi may also be seen as prompted by the need to reconcile his theoretical position with his responses to particular statues.

This brings out the final aspect of Winckelmann's debt to Pausanias: the latter's role in shaping not only his account of the temporality of decline, but his very historical ontology. Here again an initial contrast with Polybius is instructive. Polybius famously claims that the history of Rome merits particular attention because it is under her hegemony that 'history' has become 'organic' (σωματοειδῆ... γίνεσθαι τὴν ἱστορίαν, 1.3.4). For Winckelmann, by contrast, the Hellenistic and Roman periods represent not the generation of something unified and organic, but rather its disintegration and destruction. This 'something' is, of course 'Art': the subject announced in the title of Winckelmann's book, the progress and decline of which are tracked in its narrative. But this 'Art' is not simply the sum of the individual statues, pictures and buildings once present in Greece, although some of these are indeed destroyed and dispersed in the course of the events Winckelmann narrates. 'Art' for Winckelmann seems rather to be an entity that, albeit abstract, is every bit as unified and 'organic' as Polybius' 'historia'. It bears an even stronger resemblance to Pausanias' 'Hellas'. In particular, Winckelmann's 'art' is almost uniquely associated with Greece (the Romans have no artistic style of their own), his narrative is centered upon the Greek mainland (art cannot 'take root' when transplanted elsewhere), but the province of art – like Pausanias' Hellas – is not identical with any particular political or territorial unit within the ancient world. The individual works of art whose fate Winckelmann discusses in the *History* are, moreover, charged with standing for this abstract 'Art', just as the places where Pausanias travels and the objects he chooses to describe are not just several places or objects, but parts of a more abstract and symbolically charged entity of Hellas which emerges in the course of his work. It is in the contours of this Art/Hellas, this abstract unity that is represented synecdochically by the monuments that have survived its destruction, that the full depth of Winckelmann's affinity with Pausanias may be seen.

Conclusion: 'not even ruins now remain'

In this paper I have made three main claims:

> i. In the early modern period, Pausanias was admired and valued as much *qua* historian as *qua* reporter on *Realien*.

---

[33] Stuart and Revett posit a similar temporality of decline in the Preface to vol. 1 of their *Antiquities of Athens* (1762: iv), basing their view on the anecdote about Domition from Plutarch's *Life of Publicola* (also cited by Winckelmann, above) and a comment about Mummius in Velleius Paterculus. Winckelmann certainly knew of Stuart and Revett's project, although a letter to Füssli from September 1764 suggests that he did not see a copy of their publication until after he had completed the *History* in 1763 (Rehm III: 57; see Décultot 148, 185).

ii. Winckelmann values and uses him as both.

iii. In its geographical and temporal extent and its symbolic significance, Winckelmann's 'Art' is shaped by Pausanias' *Hellas*.

In conclusion I would like to return to Winckelmann's words at the end of the *History*.

I hope that my analysis of Winckelmann's manuscripts, together with the narrative of decline in Part 2 of the *History*, has strengthened my case that the anonymous historian teasingly and programmatically mentioned there is Pausanias. If the 'fatherland' whose destruction has been witnessed is, in Pausanias' case, Hellas, Winckelmann has transformed this into a narrative of the destruction of Art. But we should also observe that, according to the *History*'s conclusion, 'Art' is always out of reach. My reading of Winckelmann reading Pausanias therefore entails that (at least in Winckelmann's view) Hellas in the *Periegesis* is an entity that is irrevocably past and gone, just as the heights of Greek art are impossible to recover.[34] If this is correct I would like to note two final points.

First, Winckelmann's view of Pausanias starts to look strikingly like some more recent 'nostalgic' readings of the *Periegesis* as concerned to preserve a memory of the classical Greek past (and in particular of Greek 'freedom') as a counterweight to present experience. There has been much controversy over how far this 'archaism' (to use Bowie's term) should be attributed to Pausanias' dissatisfaction with contemporary political conditions and in particular with the Greeks' loss of freedom under Roman rule.[35] I do not wish to take up a position within that debate, but it is perhaps not insignificant that Pausanias was read in this way by a figure who was foundational within modern philhellenism as well as *Altertumswissenschaft*.

Second, and equally strikingly, my reconstruction makes Winckelmann's view of Pausanias appear rather different from those of his predecessors: Gedoyn and the Renaissance scholars involved in the Aldine edition. Their writings certainly express an awareness of temporal distance from the glory that was Greece, but this is a distance of 'us

---

[34] Here I assume with Décultot (2000: 91-112) and others that by the time he completed the *History*, Winckelmann had abandoned his earlier optimism about artistic imitation of the Greeks as a means of cultural revival.

[35] E. L. Bowie may be said to have initiated this strand of interpretation, although he was careful to conclude that 'most Greeks were in no real sense *anti*-Roman, and their absorption in the Greek past *complemented* their acquiescence in the politically defective Roman present'(1970: 41). Other 'nostalgic' readings have been put forward by Elsner 2001, Musti 1994, Porter 2001. Critics include Ameling 1994, Konstan 2001; but Pausanias' 'archaism' has been noted even by commentators such as Habicht (1998: 102, 123), who have not interpreted it politically or nostalgically. For a recent discussion see Hutton 2008.

moderns' from 'those ancients', according to which Pausanias belongs firmly on the 'ancient' side of the divide.[36] Gedoyn, for example, asserts the superiority of the *Periegesis* to contemporary travellers' reports in virtue of its portrayal of a Greece whose power and resources are intact:

> It is, finally, a voyage around Greece: not Greece as she exists today or described by Spon and Wheler – impoverished, wretched, depopulated, groaning under the condition of slavery, no longer offering the sightseer anything but haughty ruins, among which one may search for her without success – in short, an image of the most dreadful devastation and a pitiable example of the vicissitudes to which all things of this world are subject. Rather, Pausanias gives us a description of Greece at the height of her flourishing, when she was the haunt of the Muses, the home of the sciences, the centre of good taste, the theatre of an infinity of marvels; in short, the most celebrated country in the entire world. (Gedoyn 1731: ix)

The ideological objectives of the Aldine dedication (the call for a crusade to recover the Greek mainland) also require a view of the *Periegesis* as 'truly portraying the strength, power and prosperity of the Greeks of that age'. Compared to this brand of incipient ethnocentric philhellenism, as well as the fully-fledged nineteenth-century versions that followed it, I find the position that makes one's fatherland a matter of imaginative orientation rather than birth rather appealing.[37]

[36] Winckelmann therefore appears to have been one of the first to emphasize Pausanias as being 'late' within the time-frame of antiquity itself. This realization is surely not irrelevant to his influential development of the first systematic periodization of ancient art and literature according to temporally successive styles. His view of Pausanias chimes interestingly with Elsner's recent discussion of Pausanias' understanding of style as a tool of historical analysis. This paper's findings support his suggestion that 'key characteristics of nineteenth- and twentieth-century style art history... may trace their origins to ancient viewing and ancient uses of stylistic and iconographic analysis' (2007: 64).

[37] I am grateful to the participants in the February 2009 symposium on Receptions of Pausanias organized by Jaś Elsner, to Elsner himself and to Emma Aston and Thomas Marshall for helpful criticisms of earlier versions of this paper.

Works cited

Amasaeus, R. 1551. *Pausaniae Veteris Graeciae descriptio* (Florence: L. Torrentius)

Ameling, W. 1994. 'Pausanias und die hellenistische Geschichte', in Bingen, J. (Ed.) *Pausanias historien (*Geneva: Fondation Hardt)

Arafat, K. W. 1996. *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient artists and Roman rulers (*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Beschi, L. & Musti, D. (eds.) 1982. *Pausania. Guida della Grecia. Libro I: L'Attica (*Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla)

Bockelkamp, M. 1996. 'Was lehren uns die Wasserzeichen der Pariser Winckelmann-Handschriften?', *Philobiblon,* 40**,** 40-56

Bonacciuoli, A. 1593. *Descrittione della Grecia di Pausania: nella quale si contiene l'origine di essa, il sito, le Città, la Religione antica, i costumi, & le guerre fatte da que' Popoli. Insieme co' monti, laghi, fiumi, fontane, minere, statue, colossi, templi, & tutte le cose maravigliose, che l'hanno illustrata.Tradotta dal Greco in volgare dal S. AlfonsoBonacciuoli Gentilhuomo Ferrarese. Con la Tavola copiosissima delle cose notabili, che in essa si contengono le postille nel margine* (Mantua: F. Osanna)

Bowie, E. L. 1970. 'Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic', *Past and Present,* 46**,** 3-41

Calderinus, D. [1500]. *Pausanias historicus. Domitius Calderinus e Graeco traduxit. Atticae descriptio* [Venice: Otinus de Luna, Papiensis]

Chamoux, F. 1994. 'La méthode historique de Pausanias d'après le livre I de la Periégèse', in Bingen, J. (ed.) *Pausanias historien : huit exposés suivis de discussions (*Geneva, Fondation Hardt) 45-77

Chandler, R. 1775. *Travels in Asia Minor: or, an account of a tour made at the expense of the Society of Dilettanti* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Davis, W. 1994. 'Winckelmann divided: mourning the death of art history', in Davis, W. (ed.) *Gay and lesbian studies in art history* (Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press)

----------. 1996. 'Winckelmann divided', in id. (ed.) *Replications. Archaeology, art history, psychoanalysis* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press), 257-265

Décultot, E. 2000. *Johann Joachim Winckelmann. Enquête sur la genèse de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris: Presse Universitaires de France)

Diller, A. 1955. 'The authors named Pausanias', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 86**,** 268 - 279

----------. 1957. 'The manuscripts of Pausanias', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assocation,* 88**,** 169-188

Eco, U. 1989. *The open work (*London: Hutchinson Radius)

Elsner, J. 2001. 'Structuring "Greece". Pausanias's *Periegesis* as literary construct', in Alcock, S. E., Cherry, J. F. & Elsner, J. (eds.) *Pausanias. Travel and memory in ancient Greece (*Oxford: Oxford University Press) 3-20

----------. 2007. *Roman eyes. Visuality and subjectivity in art and text* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Fabricius, J. A. 1711. *Bibliotheca Graeca Libri IV Pars Altera. Qua praeter scriptores de Numerorum doctrina & alios nonnullos Philosophicos, recensentur Rhetores ac Sophistae, Lexicorumque veterum Graecorum notita traditur* (Hamburg: Liebezeit)

Facius, J. F. (ed.) 1794-6. *Pausaniou Hellados periegesis. Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*, 4 vols (Leipzig: Schaefer)

Fuhrmann, M. 1972. ‚Winckelmann, ein deutsches Symbol', *Die neue Rundschau*, 83**,** 265-83

Geanakoplos, D. J. 1962. *Greek scholars in Venice. Studies in the dissemination of Greek learning from Byzantium to Western Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Gedoyn De Beaugency, N. (tr. and ed.) 1731. *Pausanias, ou Voyage Historique de la Grece, traduit en François, avec des Remarques (*Paris: Quillau)

Georgopoulou, M., Guilmet, C., Pikoulas, Y., Staikos, K. & Tolias, G. 2007. *Following Pausanias. The quest for Greek antiquity (*Newcastle, DE and Athens: Oak Knoll Press and Kotinos)

Gesner, C. 1545. *Bibliotheca Universalis, sive Catalogus omnium Scriptorum locupletissimus, in tribus linguis, Latina, Graeca, & Hebraica; extantium & non extantium, veterum et recentiorum in hunc usque diem, doctorum & non doctorum, publicatorum et in Bibliothecis latentium. Opus nouum, & non Bibliothecis tantum publicis privatísue instituendis necessarium, sed studiosis omnibus cuiuscunque artis aut scientiae ad studia melius formenda utilissimum*, 2 vols (Zürich: Froschoverus)

Goldhagen, J. E. (tr. and ed.) 1766. *Pausanias ausführliche Reisebeschreibung von Griechenland* (Berlin: F. W. Birnstiel)

Güthenke, C. 2009. 'The potter's daughter's sons: German classical scholarship and the language of love circa 1800', *Representations*, 109, 122-147

Habicht, C. 1998. *Pausanias' guide to ancient Greece (*Berkeley, Los Angeles And London: University of California Press)

Harloe, K. 2007. 'Allusion and ekphrasis in Winckelmann's Paris description of the Apollo Belvedere', *Cambridge Classical Journal (Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society),* 53**,** 229-252

----------. 2009. 'Ingenium et doctrina.Historicism and the imagination in Winckelmann and Wolf', in P. Hummel, ed., *Metaphilology.Histories and Languages of Philology* (Paris: Philologicum) 91-116

Hutton, W. 2005. *Describing Greece. Landscape and literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

----------. 2008. 'The disaster of Roman rule: Pausanias 8.27.1', *Classical Quarterly,* 58**,** 622-637

Iser, W. 1978. *The act of reading : a theory of aesthetic response (*London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

Knös, B. 1945. *Un ambassadeur de l'hellénisme - Janus Lascaris - et la tradition Greco-Byzantine dans l'humanisme français* (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells)

Kochs, S. 2005. *Untersuchungen zu Winckelmanns Studien der antiken griechischen Literatur. Stendaler Winckelmann-Forschungen 4* (Ruhpolding: F. P. Rutzen)

Konstan, D. 2001. 'The joys of Pausanias', in Alcock, S. E., Cherry, J. F. & Elsner, J. (eds.) *Pausanias. Travel and memory in Roman Greece (*Oxford: Oxford University Press),57-60

Kraus, K. 1935. *Winckelmann und Homer mit Benutzung der Hamburger Homer-Ausschreibungen Winckelmanns* (Berlin, Junker und Dünnhaupt)

Kuhn, J. (ed.) 1696. *ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΗΓΗΣΙΣ. hoc est, Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio accurata, qua Lector ceu manu per eam regionem circumducitur: cum latina Romuli Amasaei interpretatione* (Leipzig, Fritsch)

Lafond, Y. 1991. 'Pausanias historien dans le livre VII de la Periégèse', *Journal des savants*, 27-45.

Legrand, É. 1883. *Bibliographie Hellénique* (Paris: Leroux)

Le Roy, J. D. 1758. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce. Ouvrage divisé en deux parties, où l'on considere, dans la premiere, ces monuments du côté de l'histoire; et dans la second, du côté de l'architecture*, 2 vols (Paris: L. F. Delatour)

Loescher, A. [1550]. *Pausaniæ de tota Græcia Libri decem, quibus non solum urbium situs, locorumque intervalla accuratè est complexus, sed Regum etiam familias, bellorumque sausas & eventus, sacrorum ritus, Rerumpub. status copiose descripsit: hactenus à nemine in linguam latinam conversi nuncque primùm in lucem editi* (Basil: J. Oporinus)

Momigliano, A. 1950. 'Ancient history and the antiquarian', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* 13, 285-315

Musti, D. 1994. 'La struttura del discorso storico in Pausania', in Bingen, J. (ed.) *Pausanias historien (*Geneva: Fondation Hardt), 9-43

Musurus, M. (ed.) 1513. *Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἀφροδισιέως εἰς τὰ τοπικὰ Αριστοτέλους, ὑπομνήματα. Alexandri Aphrodisei in topica Aristotelis, Commentarii* (Venice: Aldus Manutius)

----------. 1516. *Pausaniae commentarii Graeciam describentes* (Venice: Aldus Manutius)

Oliver, J. H. 1968. *The civilizing power. A study of the Panathenaic discourse of Aelius Aristides against the background of literature and cultural conflict, with text, translation and commentary* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society)

Parks, G. B. 1971. 'Pausanias', in Kristeller, P. O. (ed.) *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: medeiaeval and renaissance Latin translations and commentaries. Annotated lists and guides* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America)

Pelling, C. R. B. 2007. 'Sophocles' learning curve', in P. Finglass, C. Collard, N. J. Richardson (Eds.) *Hesperos: Studies in ancient Greek poetry presented to M. L. West on his seventieth birthday* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press), 204-27

Porter, J. I. 2001. 'Ideals and ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the Second Sophistic', in Alcock, S. E., Cherry, J. F. & Elsner, J. (eds.) *Pausanias. Travel and memory in ancient Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 63-92

Potts, A. 1978. 'Winckelmann's interpretation of the history of art in its eighteenth century context' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, Warburg Institute)

----------. 1980. 'Greek sculpture and Roman copies. I: Anton Raphael Mengs and the eighteenth century', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* 43, 150-173

----------. 1994. *Flesh and the ideal: Winckelmann and the origins of art history* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

Pretzler, M. 2007. *Pausanias. Travel writing in ancient Greece* (London: Duckworth)

Price, U. 1780. *An account of the statues, pictures, and temples in Greece; translated from the Greek of Pausanias* (London: T. Evans)

Rehm, W., and Diepolder, H. (eds) 1952-57. *Winckelmann Briefe*, 4 vols (Berlin: De Gruyter)

Schadewaldt, W. 1941. Winckelmann und Homer (Leipzig: J. A. Barth)

---------- . 1954. 'Winckelmann als Exzerptor und Selbstdarsteller. Mit Beiträgen von Walther Rehm', *Neue Beiträge zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Bernhard Schweitzer* (Stuttgart: Kohlkammer), 391-409

---------- . 1968. *Winckelmann und Rilke. Zwei Beschreibungen des Apollon* (Stuttgart: Neske)

Senff, W. (ed.) 1964. *J. J. Winckelmann. Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (Weimar: H. Böhlaus)

Snodgrass, A. M. 2001. 'Pausanias and the Chest of Kypselos', in Alcock, S. E., Cherry, J. F. & Elsner, J. (eds.) *Pausanias. Travel and memory in ancient Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 3-20

Starobinski, J. 1977. 'Eloquence and liberty', *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 38**,** 195 – 210

Stuart, J. and Revett, N. 1762. *The Antiquities of Athens measured and delineated by James Stuart F.R.S. and Nicholas Revett Painters and Architects*, vol. 1 (London: Haberkorn)

Sünderhauf, E. S. 2004. *Griechensehnsucht und Kulturkritik. Die deutsche Rezeption von Winckelmanns Antikenideal 1840-1945* (Berlin: Akademie)

Taylor, T. 1794. *Pausanias. The description of Greece... translated from the Greek, with notes, in which much of the mythology of the Greeks is unfolded from a theory which has been for many ages unknown. And illustrated with maps and views elegantly engraved* (London: Fauldner)

Tibal, A. 1911. *Inventaire des manuscrits de Winckelmann déposés à la Bibliothèque Nationale (*Paris: Hachette)

Turnbull, G. 1740. *A treatise on ancient painting, containing observations on the rise, progress, and decline of that art* (London: A. Millar)

Vasari, G. 1986. *Le vite de' più eccellenti architetti, pittori, et scultori italiani, da Cimabue insino a' tempi nostri*, ed. L. Belloso and A. Rossi (Turin: Giulio Einaudi)

Virgil 2006. *The Aeneid*, tr. R. Fagles (London: Penguin)

Walbank, F. W. 1972. *Polybius* (Berkeley, LA and London: University of California Press)

Wilson, N. G. 1992. *From Byzantium to Italy. Greek studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London: Duckworth)

Winckelmann, J. J. 1755. *Gedancken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Wercke in der Mahlerey und Bildhauer-Kunst* (Friedrichstadt: Hagenmüller)

----------. 1764. *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (Dresden: Walther)

----------. 2006. *History of the Art of Antiquity,* tr. H. F. Mallgrave (Los Angeles: Getty Publications)

Xylander, G., and Sylburg, F. 1583. *Παυσανιου της Ἑλλαδος περιηγησις; hoc est, Pausaniae accurata Graeciae Descriptio, qua lector ceu manu per eam regionem circumducitur: a Guilielmo Xylandro diligenter recognita, & ab innumeris mendis repurgata. Accesserunt Annotationes, quae a G. Xylandro paulo ante obitum inchoatae, nunc vero a Frid. Sylb. continuatae, magnaque accessione locupletatae, non exiguum ad genuinam Pausaniae lectionem momentum*, 2 vols (Frankfurt: Wechel)