

## LUCIAN'S GUIDE TO HIERAPOLIS IN SYRIA\*

By

JERZY SCHNAYDER

Lucian's little text, known as *Περὶ τῆς Συρίας θεοῦ* (*De dea Syria*) in the history of Greek literature, has up to now been examined almost exclusively within the general scope of the writings of this multi-faceted Syrian from Samosata. For example, scholars have investigated the authenticity of this guide, which had been questioned by M. CROISET (*Essai sur la vie et les oeuvres de Lucien*, Paris 1882), and later by R. HELM in his monograph on Lucian (*RE* XIII 2, 1927, col. 1761), because it lacks even the slightest trace of the spirit and feeling that is normally associated with Lucian<sup>1</sup>. Just before the war, scholars began to focus on the contents of the text. Thus archaeologists and experts on religion examined the credibility of the data from the standpoint of ancient heortology, topography or archaeology. Beyond the immediate scope of Lucian's writings there were also studies of the relationship of Lucian's guide to Herodotus. First and foremost, it was established that this text was written in the natural and unforced dialect of Herodotus and with the great simplicity of description which is so characteristic of the great traveller from Halicarnassus<sup>2</sup>. In the past several years I have become familiar with the traditional apparatus used by Greek travel guides. I therefore decided to examine this text about the Syrian goddess as an example of the literary genre of periegesis. I was spurred by my conviction that an analysis of such a late text based on the literary tradition or γένος which had already passed through various phases of development would permit Lucian's guide to assume a more important position in the history of literature than it had up to the present.

---

\* Originally published in Polish in "Eos" XLI 1940–1946, fasc. 1, pp. 130–156.

<sup>1</sup> From among Polish philologists, T. MANDYBUR cast his vote against the authorship of Lucian, *Ps. Lukiana περὶ τῆς Συρίας θεοῦ*, Kraków 1901 (Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności, Wydział Filologiczny s. 2 XVIII [XXXIII]).

<sup>2</sup> This imitation was earlier addressed by A. PENICK, *Studies in Honour of B.L. Gildersleeve*, Baltimore 1902. I was unable to access this work, which had been received with a certain scepticism by W. KROLL, *Philologische Wochenschrift* XXIII 1903, col. 461.

## I

Athargatis, the first Semitic deity to appear in Italy and to have a famous temple in the Syrian Hierapolis (Bambyce) near the Euphrates, was worshipped throughout Syria. The Greeks called her Συρία θεά, the Romans as *dea Syria*<sup>3</sup>. The author, who presents himself as a Syrian (Ἀσσύριος), is about to describe the temple and the artifacts associated with this Syrian Hera.

Even a cursory reading of Lucian's text shows that we are dealing with a typical guide-periegesis. At every step we encounter some motif traditionally found in this literary genre. However, not all the motifs in the guide are equally important in its composition. Some which are relatively unimportant in the overall text are nevertheless very characteristic of the overall γένος. Because of this difference and in order to obtain a picture as clear as possible, I decided not to discuss these motifs in the order in which they appear in the text, but to group them as I thought useful<sup>4</sup>.

1. Other extant Greek periegeses do not always include an introduction by the author. As we know, the most extensive and completely preserved guide of Pausanias begins rather unexpectedly and without any introduction because the author clearly did not consider an introduction necessary. It is difficult to judge other periegeses which are incomplete, but even Heraclides Criticus (of whose work only fragments remain), before he proceeded to the actual περιηγεῖσθαι, discussed in fr. 3<sup>5</sup> certain more general matters, e.g., the boundaries of northern Greece and the origins of the name of the country as a whole. For this reason, I have judged fr. 3 to be the introduction to his periegesis<sup>6</sup>. Lucian's guide also begins with an introduction. The author begins by a topographical description of Hierapolis and by a discussion of the original name of the city. Then he proceeds to discuss his own text and presents its contents. These will include: (1) religious customs, νόμοι, (2) sacred festivals, πανηγύρεις, (3) sacrifices, θυσίαι, (4) the founders of the temple and (5) the founding of the temple. The author does not keep to the order that he gives, and so, e.g., we read about the founders of the temple and about its mythology in the middle chapters of the guide (11–27), while we find the various religious customs and festivals (which were

<sup>3</sup> Cf. F. CUMONT, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, Paris 1929, p. 161.

<sup>4</sup> Here I provide materials for comparison in a relatively abbreviated form. I am reserving more ample discussion for my synthetic work-in-progress which will include all extant Greek periegeses. After that, I would like to plan a study of the Roman reflexes of this Greek literary product.

<sup>5</sup> We read it today in W.H. DUKE's edition, *Essays and Studies Presented to W. Ridgeway*, Cambridge 1914, pp. 234 ff., until the critical and commented edition of F. PFISTER, announced just before the onset of the last war, becomes available to us [*Die Reisebilder des Herakleides*, Wien 1951].

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. SCHNAYDER, *De Heraclidis descriptione urbium Graeciae*, Cracoviae 1939 (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Archiwum Filologiczne XV), pp. 55 ff.

mentioned first in the introduction) towards the end of the text (47 ff). However, a detailed analysis of the text indicates that, in spite of the contents so summarily given in the introduction, it is possible to distinguish in Lucian's text certain self-enclosed sections and to determine that the bridges between them were quite clearly marked by the author.

Section 1 (2–9). When discussing the cult of the gods introduced into Syria from Egypt, the author lists the oldest temples of Syria and Phoenicia. The temple of Astarte in Sidon is linked with the μῦθος of Europa (4), the temple of Aphrodite in Byblos is linked with the ὄργια of Adonis and the miracle associated with him (6 and 8). This section is clearly demarcated from the next by a concluding statement (9): τὰδε μὲν ἐστὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Συρίῃ ἀρχαῖα καὶ μεγάλα ἱρά.

Section 2 (10 f.) begins with the statement that no other temple in the world is more highly esteemed and no other country as holy. This is followed by a terse enumeration of what the guide will later say about the rare objects in the temple: ἔργα (works of art), ἀναθήματα, θωύματα, ξόανα, θεοὶ ἐμφανέες (because the statues sweat) and the treasures which come from all parts of the earth. Chapter 11 asserts the existence of various λόγοι about the founders of the temple and the author classifies them (ἱροί, ἐμφανέες [i.e., intelligible]; κάρτα μυθώδεις, βάρβαροι and others which are in agreement with Greek accounts). This second section ends with the declaration: τοὺς (*scil. λόγους*) ἐγὼ πάντας μὲν ἐρέω.

Indeed, in Section 3 (12–27), Lucian discussed various theories about the founding of the temple in Hierapolis. He mentions: (1) Deucalion and his myth, the miraculous chasm and the customs associated with it, (2) Semiramis, linked with a mention of the cult of her mother Derceto, (3) Attis, who supposedly built a temple for his mother Rhea, (4) Dionysus (there are traces of his cult near the temple) and finally, (5) Stratonice, wife of Seleucus I. Here are found longer λόγοι, particularly that of Combabus, whose cult is continued by Gallic eunuchs.

Section 4 (28–60) pertains to the temple itself: its location (28), the φάλλοι found before the building, their origins and the customs associated with them (29), the dimensions of the temple, *pronaos*, doors (30). Finally, the author passes to the descriptions of the interior (31–35). After noting who has the right to enter, the author provides a catalogue and description of the statues (31–38): Hera, an unnamed statue (Dionysus, Deucalion or Semiramis), the throne of Helios (why the statue is missing), bearded Apollo (λόγος about prophecies, the movement of the statue when the god prophesies), other statues (38). This subsection about the interior concludes with the words: τὰ μὲν ὧν ἐντὸς τοῦ νηοῦ ὧδε κεκοσμέεσθαι (39). Now the author passes to the exterior and begins (*ibid.*): ἔξω δὲ he mentions the altar, the μυρία ξόανα of kings and priests (e.g. that of Semiramis with a more detailed description), other statues outside the temple (40). Then we pass to the αὐλή, where sacred animals are pastured (41). The author mentions the priests, their costumes and their functions (42), the lower echelons of temple servants (43), the sacrifices (44), and the sacred pool (45–48),

and, in particular, the great spring celebrations in which the Galli participate (50–53). Again, we read about sacrifices (54) and the rites of pilgrims (55), who are given a special welcome in the city (56). This section ends with a description of cult customs and oaths taken in the temple (60).

A certain schematic organization of description has already been demonstrated in Herodotus (this was formulated by F. JACOBY in *Klio* IX 1909, p. 89), and similarly in the post-Herodotean ethnographers and geographers by K. TRÜDINGER<sup>7</sup>. In the fragmentary periegetical works, it is difficult to discuss any type of deliberate arrangement. It stands to reason that a researcher as serious as Polemon of Ilium must have presented his material in some kind of order. But it is striking that even a non-scholarly, rather popular periegesis preserved in fragments, such as the guide to the cities of central Greece ascribed to Heraclides Criticus shows a pedantically elaborate arrangement of material<sup>8</sup> which is even at odds with the temperament of the author. Even in the guide of Lucian's contemporary, Pausanias, whose work begins without an introduction, J.G. FRAZER<sup>9</sup> observed a clear and constant arrangement (with the exception of the introductory periegesis of Attica) which Lucian presents in such an obscure way in his introductory section. In any case, some type of distinct tradition did exist.

It is only at this point that the author introduces himself. The phrase γράφω δὲ Ἀσσύριος ἔων (1) is difficult to correlate with the opening words of Herodotus: Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέως ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις...<sup>10</sup>. This opening phrase of Herodotus, which predicts the basic thesis and purpose of his work and which, to this day, we read with emotion as we are struck by his lofty goal and his desire to immortalize all that is important and great, has in Lucian lost its venerable and archaic colouring and has become a bland echo, a mere schematic diagram of the contents by a nameless author.

2. More importantly, in this introductory section the author informs us how he gathered the materials for his guide. Lucian, it seems, believing that the eyes are more accurate witnesses than the ears (a principle already noted by Heraclitus in fr. 101a D.–K. and followed by the geographer Hecataeus in his scholarly travels), gathered his research materials with his own eyes first and only after that by interviewing the priests: τὰ μὲν αὐτοψίῃ ἔμαθον τὰ δὲ παρὰ ἱρέων ἔδαην, ὁκόσα ἔοντα ἐμεῦ πρεσβύτερα (1). Thus the focus of his interviews are the 'earlier times'. Herodotus before him had also contrasted the witness of his own eyes with personal interviews: (II 29) ἐπυθόμην [...] αὐτόπτης ἔλθῶν [...] τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τούτου ἀκοῆ ἤδη ἱστορέων. Cf. also II 99. Pausanias employed

<sup>7</sup> *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*, Basel 1918.

<sup>8</sup> This was demonstrated by R. DAEBRITZ, *RE* VIII 1 (1912), col. 486.

<sup>9</sup> *Pausanias and Other Greek Sketches*, London 1900, pp. 18 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Before him, Hecataeus introduced himself in the same way in the *Genealogies*: Ἐκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται (*FGrHist* 1 F 1a).

both these methods, e.g. IV 31, 5: οὔτε εἶδον οὔτε ἄλλων περὶ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα αὐτοπτούντων.

Lucian uses such formulae pertaining to personal experience very frequently and, bearing in mind the brevity of his guide, we can truthfully say that he does so more frequently than even Pausanias, in whose extensive periegesis I have counted 25 positive statements regarding his eyewitness accounts. Thus Lucian saw the majority of the temples in Syria with his own eyes (πλεῖστα ὄπωπα, 3). He uses εἶδον several times when he is referring to looking at a statue, a building or observing sacred customs (6, 9, 40, 48). Again, when some kind of miracle would take place in his presence, he writes ἐπ' ἐμεῦ or ἐμεῦ παρεόντος (7, 37, 42, 45) and twice, ἐθεησάμην (7, 45). Quite obviously, Herodotus also refers to the witness of his own eyes, e.g. ἐπυθόμην αὐτόπτης ἐλθῶν (cf. III 12), but more often he does not stress his personal involvement, using such expressions as ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν (I 52, 66, 92, 181; II 181; III 124; V 77; VI 119). These expressions are quite neutral, as are the δείκνυται and δεικνύουσι which are common even in the fragments of the periegetes. I have found them in Phlegon fr. 44 MÜLLER and once in Lucian's guide, 35; again in Paeon fr. 2, Hyperochus fr. 2, and in Polemon fr. 44. The same formula occurs 21 times in Pausanias, who also uses ἔστιν ἰδεῖν (VI 3, 16, cf. Phlegon fr. 41) as well as οἶδα θεασάμενος (VII 26, 8) or ἰδῶν οἶδα (e.g. I 43, 8; II 22, 3 and passim). In Lucian, however, these neutral formulae are lacking and we find only the decisive verbs ὄπωπα, εἶδον, ἐθεησάμην. This clear emphasis on the witness of his own eyes gives us to think, and, when combined with the emphasis on this element in the parody of a traveller's romance in the *Vera Historia*, we get the impression that this is some type of compositional element. We will return to this later. When he has not witnessed something with his own eyes, the author clearly indicates it: ἐγὼ μὲν [...] οὐκ ὄπωπα (5), βάθος λίμνης [...] ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐπειρήθην (46). Lucian can tell us nothing precise about certain festivities, because he did not take part in them, but what he did see, he will relate (48). Similarly, regarding the chasm near the temple into which, according to myth, the waters of the Flood drained, he writes: (13) ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸ χάσμα εἶδον, καὶ ἔστιν ὑπὸ τῷ νηῶ κάρτα μικρόν. Εἰ μὲν ὧν πάλαι καὶ μέγα ἐόν νῦν τοιόνδε ἐγένετο, οὐκ οἶδα· τὸ δὲ ἐγὼ εἶδον, μικρόν ἐστι. This lack of personal witness is stressed several times already in Herodotus. If the statue of Apollo in Hierapolis rose into the air as it prophesied (and did so in Lucian's presence, 37), let us remember that Herodotus, describing a floating island in Egypt (II 156) states: αὐτὸς μὲν ἔγωγε οὔτε πλέουσιν οὔτε κινηθεῖσιν εἶδον, τέθηπα δὲ ἀκούων<sup>11</sup>. The negative statement is found in Pausanias as well: οὐκ ἦν ἰδεῖν (III 26, 1), οὐκ εἶδον (II 35, 8) or οὔτε εἶδον οὔτε ἄλλων περὶ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα αὐτοπτούντων (IV 31, 5).

<sup>11</sup> Ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ εἶδον in Hdt. also I 183 and II 73.

This last statement leads us to the method of the interview which, following Herodotus, the periegetes contrast with eyewitness accounts. The author of our guide mentions the interview several times. It is driven by the desire for knowledge, ἱστορίη, so esteemed in the eyes of the Ionians. For example, he asked about the age of the temple: ἱστορέοντι δέ μοι ἐτέων περί, ὀκόσα τῶ ἱρῶ ἔστι (11). He is also able to emphasize his own investigative initiative (9): ἀνέβην δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸν Λίβανον ἐκ Βύβλου [...] πυθόμενος αὐτόθι ἀρχαῖον ἱρὸν Ἀφροδίτης ἔμμεναι. In the same way, Herodotus travelled to Phoenician Tyre in order to learn something about the cult of Heracles (II 44). The results of such interviews are noted by Lucian by ἐδάην (6), ἤκουσα (12, 15) or else he notes that someone was telling him (4, 8, 11), just as Herodotus does in several well-known passages (e.g. II 3, 13, 32 and *passim*). Even as renowned a scholar as the periegete Polemon was not content with sporadic interviews during his journeys, but used to stay for an extended period of time in pertinent locations in order to get to know them just as well as their inhabitants. The fragments of the periegetes do not inform us directly of their investigative methods. Instead, Pausanias, who revived the literary form of Herodotus, on several occasions mentions his contacts with priests or the inhabitants of a particular location, the ἐπιχώριοι (I 22, 23; II 26, 1).

Lucian, when giving the results of his investigations, permits himself to give several possible explanations for a particular issue. For example, when addressing the issue of whose temple is located in Sidon (4), Lucian compares the version of the Sidonians with the tale of some learned priest. When he was trying to determine the age of the temple in Hierapolis and who its founder was, he collected many conflicting answers and, as we saw, evaluated and classified them (11). In doing so, Lucian was quite eclectic: he rejects the versions of Deucalion, Semiramis and Attis as founders, he likes the one about Dionysus, but he accepts as correct the fifth version, the one in which Stratonice (the wife of Seleucus I) is the foundress of the shrine (12–17). In the same way, Herodotus cited and differentiated between conflicting versions of historical events, compared the accounts of the Persians and of the Greeks (I 2) and later of the Persians and the Phoenicians (I 5) on the subject of whose fault first provoked the conflict between East and West<sup>12</sup>. Lucian is at times undecided, e.g., whether Stratonice, like the Greek Phaedra, accused her would-be and innocent lover: (23) ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐχέτω ὄκως καὶ ἐγένετο. He also reveals a certain indecisiveness with regard to the tradition that the man who dwells on the top of the mighty phallus does not fall asleep because he is woken by a scorpion: (29) εἰ δὲ ἀτρεκέα ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔχω ἐρέειν. In this case, however, Lucian brings himself to provide his own

<sup>12</sup> Similarly, in the matter of the betrayal of the Greeks at Thermopylae, he cites a differing tradition (VII 214) although he does not believe it. And yet, e.g., in the matter of the Scythians (IV 11) he rejects their own tradition and allies himself with the historical, generally accepted one.

explanation of this curious phenomenon. In this he differs from Herodotus, who did not wish to come to a decision in certain cases (cf. I 57: οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν), as is also the case with Pausanias, e.g., whether or not the statue of Athena Polias fell from the heavens (I 26, 6) or his refusal to give his personal opinion of the guilt of Aegisthus and Agamemnon (II 18, 2).

Lucian often displays a negative and critical stance (οὐδαμὰ πείθομαι, 14) with respect to the cult of Derceto in Hierapolis. He also does not believe that the Galli castrated themselves in Rhea's honour: τὰ δέ μοι εὐτρεπέα μὲν δοκέει ἔμμεναι, ἀληθέα δὲ οὐ (15). He also criticizes the various explanations for why the man remains on the phallus: (28) ἐμοὶ μὲν νυν καὶ τάδε ἀπίθανα. Similarly, we find this several times in Lucian's contemporary, Pausanias, e.g. I 3, 3: λέγεται [...] καὶ ἄλλα οὐκ ἀληθῆ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς, or II 23, 3: ἐγὼ μὲν σφισιν οὐ πείθομαι. We should remember that criticism can also be found in the authors who laid foundations for periegetical writing. Admittedly, the pertinent fragment of Hecataeus (*FGrHist* 1 F 1a) comes from a genealogical, not geographical, work. Even so Herodotus, who often draws upon Hecataeus, is nonetheless often at odds with him and with other, anonymous traditions for which Hecataeus may have been responsible (I 182; IV 5).

The author of our guide expresses a positive judgement by ἐγὼ δοκέω (4): this is the way Hecataeus expresses himself in the pertinent geographical fragment δοκέω δὲ μάλιστα (F 234). We also find in Lucian the infinitive absolute δοκέειν δέ μοι (1) or δοκέει δέ μοι (28, 46), which recalls Herodotean ἔμοιγε δοκέει (I 58) or δοκέειν ἐμοὶ εἶναι (I 172; II 4, etc.). As far as I could tell, Pausanias is more sparing in this respect. Although this is difficult to detect in other periegetes, nevertheless in the fragments of Polemon it can be seen that he expresses his own views rarely and in an unassuming manner<sup>13</sup>. Thus, in this as well, Lucian reflects Herodotus' manner of expression rather than those of the other writers. In these positive judgements of Lucian, I observed the comparison of foreign beliefs or myths with those of the Greeks. In any case, some of the barbarian tales which identify the age of the temple and its deities agree with the Greek ones (11), and that which the Greeks relate about Sthenoboea and Phaedra is also related by the Syrians about Stratonice (23). Herodotus also practiced such forays into comparison, not always successfully, e.g. καθαρισμοί among the Lydians and the Greeks (I 35), the cult of Aphrodite in Babylon and on Cyprus (I 199), the work of the Nile and Greek rivers (II 10), etc. Periegetes in foreign territories seemed to direct their attention to this, since in fr. 18 of Nymphodorus of Syracuse (*FHG* II 375), which is dated to the end of the Alexandrian period, we find the comparison of certain Egyptian customs with those of the Greeks. I also noticed in the guide to Hierapolis that rationalizing interpretations of certain wonders coexist with their complete acceptance. For example, the river in

<sup>13</sup> Cf. K. MÜLLER, *FHG* III 115. Fragments of the periegetes are cited after the same edition.

the region of Byblis which flows from the mountains of Libanus bleeds so much each year that it even colours the sea. To the inhabitants of Byblis, this is a sign that Adonis has been wounded in the mountains. So Lucian cites the interpretation of this wonder by an inhabitant of Byblos, who correctly explains the matter (ἀληθέα δοκέων λέγειν), saying that the red clay which had been blown into the mountains of Libanus by the winds causes the waters of the river to be coloured red (8). In another example, where it is said that the scorpion prevents the man on the phallus to fall asleep, Lucian, relying on his common sense, attributes the priest's inability to sleep simply to his fear of falling from the height: τῆς πτώσιος ἢ ὀρρωδία (29). And again, when it seems to many that the altar floats in the sacred pool and is upheld by its waters, Lucian provides a rational explanation for this as well, saying that the altar is held up by some kind of supporting column (46). While the rationalism of Hecataeus is evident primarily in his genealogical work, or since the fragments of his periegesis at least do not demonstrate this<sup>14</sup>, Herodotus, in spite of all his old-fashioned piety, permitted himself to take fashionable rationalistic detours, e.g., against the existence of a sacred snake on the Acropolis (VIII 41), against the miracles accomplished by statues (V 86), etc. Of the later periegetes, Apollas (or Apellas), who dates from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, mentions (fr. 1 = *FHG* IV 307) that both extant palladia were the works of human hands. Rationalistic interpretations of several myths, such as those of Cerberus, Actaeon and Medusa<sup>15</sup>, are also found in Pausanias.

3. The guide to a city as holy as Hierapolis must obviously exhibit a religious and cultic focus. For Lucian, the topic of the founding of the great temple in Hierapolis, which I have already mentioned, was the equivalent of what the prehistory of Attica and Athens was for Herodotus, and the prehistory of the great cities (e.g., Epidaurus II 26, 1 ff., Troezen II 30, 5 ff.), which he later described from a periegetic perspective, for Pausanias. As we are interested here primarily in compositional elements, we note in passing and only in order to obtain a more complete picture of the guide, that its author mentions the cult of Heracles (i.e. Melcart-Baal) in Tyre (3), of Astarte-Derceto-Athargatis in Sidon (4, 14, 47; Lucian identifies Astarte with Selene, and calls Athargatis Hera), further on, the cult of Aphrodite in Byblos (6), Adonis (7, 8) and Attis (15). However, he devotes the most attention (as can also be seen from the analysis of the contents discussed above) to the local cultic customs and religious beliefs. For example, Lucian links the two great φάλλοι found before the temple with the cult of Dionysus (16; cf. Herodotus II 48)<sup>16</sup> and also the man who twice a year spends seven days on the top of one phallus (28). Among the other cultic practices to

<sup>14</sup> Rationalization of popular accounts is posited by e.g., JACOBY in the commentary on *FGrHist* 1 F 127.

<sup>15</sup> Concerning this, see FRAZER, *op. cit.* (n. 9), pp. 84 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Concerning this, cf. R. GANSZYNIEC, *ARW* XXI 1922, pp. 499 f.



which Herodotus had already turned his attention (e.g., I 35 or 47), Lucian mentions the practice of tattooing oneself (59), of youths cutting their hair and hanging the locks in the temple (60; for a similar practice on Delos, cf. Herodotus IV 34, in Troezen, cf. Pausanias II 32, 1), the custom of pouring water into the chasm which had devoured the waters of the Flood (13). When he mentions the oracle of Apollo, he also recalls other oracles throughout the world (36).

Cultic affairs which comprise a large part of our guide to the sacred city<sup>17</sup> are the primary focus of attention in other periegetes as well. The *index rerum* in H. HITZIG and H. BLÜMNER's edition of Pausanias' *Description of Greece* (vol. III 2, Leipzig 1900) demonstrates this clearly. Even in the fragmentarily preserved works of the other periegetes, we keep coming across the descriptions of sacrifices and cults. Beginning with the most serious of them, Polemon, who, as we can infer from the fragments, devoted much attention to these matters<sup>18</sup>, similar interest can be observed in Semus (fr. 3), Staphylus (fr. 6), Xenagoras (fr. 3), Xeno (fr. 14), Menodotus (fr. 1), Paeon (fr. 2), Praxiteles (in Plutarch *Quaet. conv.* V 3, 1), Heliodorus (fr. 2 and 3) and Alexandrides (fr. 2). It seems, however, that periegeses with almost no mention of matters of religion and cult also existed, one example of such being Heraclides Criticus whose purely secular focus I emphasized in another place (*op. cit.* [n. 6], pp. 14 f.).

4. Mythological matter is often linked with cult. In Herodotus, who treated legend and tale on par with history, local myths play an important role in the composition of his work<sup>19</sup>. This passed from the Ionian periegesis to the later guides, which readily enhance the content with fables. Even the unassuming papyrus guide to Athens, known as *The Periegesis from Hawara*, according to suppositions of its editor U. WILCKEN<sup>20</sup> introduced the myth of the συνοικισμός of Theseus into the description of Athens. In the fragments of the other authors we constantly encounter mythological content<sup>21</sup>. Myth also keeps rising to the surface in Pausanias, although he is often very critical towards it. In Pausanias, mythological examples vary in length from quite long, e.g. Medea, II 3, 8 ff., to quite short

---

<sup>17</sup> This has recently been explained on the basis of extensive comparative material by C. CLEMEN (*Der alte Orient* XXXVII 1938, fasc. 3, pp. 48 ff.) in the commentary to the translation.

<sup>18</sup> He, too, mentions the popular beliefs in wandering statues (fr. 60, cf. Luc. 36) or the custom that those who have been acknowledged as dead are not permitted to enter certain temples (fr. 50, cf. Luc. 53).

<sup>19</sup> The author includes them at every opportunity. When Xerxes reached Ἄλος in Thessaly, the guides οἱ κατηγεμόνες immediately recount an ἐπιχώριος λόγος about the temple of Zeus Δαφύστιος (the story of Athamas and Phrixus, VII 197).

<sup>20</sup> *Die attische Periegesis von Hawara*, in: *Genethliakon Carl Robert*, Berlin 1910, p. 213 (col. II 30 ff.).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Staphylus fr. 2 (Thessalian mythology), 8 (Arcadian mythology), Philostephanus fr. 13 and 14, Socrates (A. GUDEMAN, *RE* III A, 1, 1927, col. 806), Mnascas (R. LAQUEUR, *RE* XV 2, 1932, col. 2250), Neanthes fr. 28, Polemon (e.g.) fr. 10.

(as with almost every description of a statue, e.g. I 2, 1 and *passim*). In Lucian, we find several such insertions. The most extensive, which constitutes the entire rather long chapter 12, is the μῦθος of Deucalion, while the myth of Europa (4) and the ἱερὸς λόγος of the travels of Attis (15) are greatly abbreviated.

The varied digressions in Herodotus which he himself calls παρενθῆκαι and προσθῆκαι have been acknowledged by F. JACOBY (*RE* Suppl. II, 1913, col. 380), the greatest expert on the artistry of this writer, as the primary characteristic of his entire art. An echo of these Herodotean λόγοι in Lucian is the already mentioned and disproportionately long narration about Stratonice, the foundress of the temple, who was loved by her son-in-law (digression 1, 17 f.) and who vainly attempted to attract the notice of the handsome Combabus, who manifested his loyalty to the king in a most radical fashion (digression 2, 19–26). Both these λόγοι, which comprise nine of the most extensive chapters or almost one-sixth of the entire work, could probably rival in length the story of the physician Democedes in Herodotus (III 129–138). Here we have in Lucian the typical features of a wandering fable, i.e., the motif of a dream and of illicit love, of extreme loyalty to the ruler which is richly rewarded, and, most importantly, the compositional motif of the dialogue. It is this last feature which primarily points us to Herodotus. W. ALY, examining myth motifs in Herodotus<sup>22</sup>, noted that, even before Herodotus, it is in these mythical narrations that we pass from indirect to direct speech (*oratio recta*). And so it is. This type of composition had already appeared in Hecataeus (cf. F 30) and it had earned for him the praise of the author of the treatise on loftiness (*De sublim.* 27, 1). After him, Herodotus interrupts in his digressions the monotony of narration and dramatically enlivens it by dialogues between the characters who up to then had been described objectively<sup>23</sup>. From the λόγοι of Lucian, who, as a man of letters, was after all used to expressing himself primarily through dialogue, the conversations between the physician and the stepson's father (18), and then between the king and Combabus (25) reveal the similarity of Lucian's digressions to the technique of Herodotus rather than of Pausanias. The latter, whose text contains so many digressions on mythological and historical themes, never introduces dialogue, not even when the context lends itself to it. I have examined all the digressions of Pausanias on this point, and have determined that only in one case (VI 18, 2–6), where we have the reception of Anaximenes of Lampsacus by Alexander, the famous rhetor addresses the king, but dialogue does not ensue and we do not hear the answer of Alexander. The same, however, is true of our guide, where the

<sup>22</sup> *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen*, Göttingen 1921.

<sup>23</sup> Within the excursus about the physician Democedes the dialogue of Atossa and Darius is developed (III 134). Attention to this role of dialogue in Herodotus has already been drawn by R. HIRZEL, *Der Dialog*, vol. I, Leipzig 1895, pp. 38 f.

speech of the king to Combabus (19) and of Combabus to the king (20) before the journey with the beautiful queen goes unanswered.

Generally speaking, the genre of periegesis permitted the possibility of digressions, and thus they can be found e.g. in Asclepiades of Myrlea (fr. 1) and in Semus in connection with his descriptions of cities (JACOBY, *RE* II A, 2, 1923, col. 1357). Traces of a historical λόγος have been found by WILCKEN even in the very simple *Periegesis of Hawara* in connection with the temple of Artemis in Munichia (*op. cit.* [n. 20], col. II 11 ff.).

5. In the literature of periegesis, one area has always been in focus from the very beginning of this genre. Hecataeus was already sensitive to miracles, θωύματα. According to Porphyry, Herodotus would at times borrow them word for word, although at other times he would criticize them severely. For example, in a verbatim fragment of Hecataeus (found in the geographer Stephanus of Byzantium, F 305) we read about a floating island that ἔστι [...] μεταρσίη καὶ κινεῖται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος. Herodotus even introduced a type of label which announced such miracles and which was long maintained in periegetical texts<sup>24</sup>. Even without this kind of announcement, Herodotus notes various θωύματα, such as a river flowing with asphalt (I 179) or a spring of asphalt (VI 119), trees with intoxicating scent (I 202) or a spring with the scent of violets (III 23). He also notes distinctly that Lydia (I 93) or Scythia (IV 82) θωύματα [...] ἔς συγγραφῆν οὐ μάλᾳ ἔχει.

Before we examine our guide from this perspective, let us note that the other periegetes, in relation to the seriousness of their work, also focus on θαυμάσια καὶ παράδοξα. Even the most serious of them did not completely omit this area, which flourished of its own accord as the so-called paradoxographical literature, and which left obvious traces in the fragments of the periegetes. Thus Polemon also discussed the peculiarities of certain rivers (fr. 81–83) and of the physical θαυμάσια of various people (fr. 84), Heliodorus discussed marvellous waters which taste like wine (fr. 6), Philostephanus (3<sup>rd</sup> century BC) mentioned wondrous fish (fr. 20) and a river that flows under the ground (fr. 23). In particular, the periegesis of Mnaseas abounded in such curiosities and wonders of nature<sup>25</sup>.

Pausanias, Lucian's contemporary, also found plenty of space for diverse παράδοξα. He mentions strange animals in various countries (II 28, 1), unusual (IV 41, 1 f.) and even singing (VIII 21, 2) fish, also places where animals cast no shadows (VIII 38, 6) or swallows that do not lay eggs (X 4, 9) and the like.

---

<sup>24</sup> Here belong the following expressions: ἀξιοθέητος (I 14 and 184; II 111 and 176; IV 85 and 162), θώμα μέγιστον (I 93 and 194; II 149 and 155; III 12), θέης θωμάσαι ἄξιος (I 25; III 43 and 111; IV 53 and 199), ἄξιος θώματος (I 185), θαυμάσια ἔχει (II 35), θαυμαστότατος (II 156; III 112), ἀξιαπηγητότατος (II 99 and 137), ἀξιόλογος (II 148).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. also Nymphodorus of Syracuse about domesticated turtles (fr. 4) and about water that colours hair (fr. 5a).

It is not surprising, then, that the labels of *θωῦμα*, *ἄξιος θωμάσαι*, *θωυμαστόν*, *λόγου ἄξιον* or finally *ἄξιον μνήσασθαι*, so familiar from Herodotus, are also to be found in Lucian. In this way, Lucian describes the yearly phenomena of the head of Osiris floating from Egypt to Byblos (7), of the river Adonis filling with blood (8) (which was, in fact, verified by M. RENAN during his stay in Phoenicia), and the phenomenon of the statues of the gods sweating (10). He also narrates other oddities: how the man climbs up the *φάλλος* (29), that a statue rises up and moves during divination (39), that near the temple animals are pastured that are simultaneously both wild and tame (41), that in the pool there are tame fish (45) and that the altar seems to float upon the water (46). Moreover, by the pool there lives a sacred rooster which breaks the wax seals on the jars brought by pilgrims (48). All these are proclaimed as *θαυμάσαι ἄξιον*, *θαῦμα διάφορον* or simply as *θαῦμα*.

6. If we realize that, with some of the *θαῦματα*, the *periegetes* are trying to explain the cause (*αἰτία*) of the phenomenon, then we touch upon a motif that is important in *periegetical* literature, had roots in Ionian *ἱστορία* and was the point of origin for the entire and extensive genre of aetiological literature which, particularly in the Alexandrian period, was also bolstered by the poets.

From this aetiological perspective Hecataeus observed not only natural phenomena (the flooding of the Nile: F 302a) but also the names of rivers (F 102a) and places (F 115a and 266). In a similar fashion, Herodotus later gives the *αἴτιον* of the names of peoples<sup>26</sup>, personal names (V 65; VI 63) and the names of festivals (*λυχνοκαΐη*, II 62). He attempts to discover the *αἴτιον* of the flooding of the Nile (II 20 ff.) or the phenomenon of lions attacking only the camels of Xerxes' army (VII 125: *θωμάζω δὲ τὸ αἴτιον...*). Later *periegetes* also include the etymology of place names<sup>27</sup>. These aetiological investigations sometimes refer not only to the name of a city but also to its history and its founder, the *κτιστής*. This motif is also very popular among the *periegetes*. I observed it in six fragments of Philostephanus and in four passages of Pausanias. Even Heraclides Criticus, who generally lacks a historical sense, concerns himself with the etymology of the city of Hellas and the person of its founder (fr. III 2). In other *periegetes*, including the very typical Polemon, we also find *αἴτια* of the epithets of the gods, the names of festivals and rare words<sup>28</sup>.

After this introduction, let us return to Lucian's guide. At the very beginning (1), we come across the *αἴτιον* of the name Hierapolis itself. In the author's

<sup>26</sup> *Τυρσηνοί* (I 94), *Λύκιοι* (I 173), *Ἀμμώνιοι* (II 42), *Ἀριμασποί* (IV 27), *Μεγάγχλαινοι* (IV 107), *Ἄτλαντες* (IV 184).

<sup>27</sup> Philostephanus (as can be seen in over a dozen fragments, e.g., fr. 1 and 2), Callistratus explains the names of cities (fr. 5–9), Alexander Polyhistor (fr. 31a, 32, 33, 39, etc.), Mnaseas (fr. 22, 28), Polemon (fr. 56), Alexandrides (fr. 1).

<sup>28</sup> I am omitting references for lack of space.

opinion, this name was originally different, (ὄνομα) τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον ἄλλο ἦν. The name currently in use did not arise with the founding of the city, but derives from the many festivals that are held there. Thus, in addition to the αἴτιον, we also find a motif which is not found in Herodotus: the change in the place name. I came across this motif in Neanthes (fr. 36 M, referring to the change in the name of one of the capes of Euboea) and in Staphylus (fr. 1, referring to the former name of Thessaly). Pausanias mentions a change of name several times, referring to the name of a city (IV 35, 1; VII 17, 6), of an island (II 5, 2) or of a land (II 12, 3)<sup>29</sup>. Pausanias also mentions several dozen times the αἴτιον for the names of diverse places, beginning with the name of Attica (I 2, 6) or Κεραμεικός (I 3, 1). We constantly read the following phrases: ἀφ' οὗ καλοῦσι τὸ χωρίον (I 20, 1); τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ τοῦ [...] ἐτέθη τῇ πόλει (II 15, 1); ἀπὸ μὲν δὴ τούτου τὸ ὄνομα ἐγένετο τῇ πόλει (II 25, 6)<sup>30</sup>.

Lucian is also interested in the αἴτια of certain religious beliefs. In chapter 7, he gives the reason for which some inhabitants of Byblos believe that ceremonies in honour of Adonis are in fact directed at Osiris. When describing how the river Ἰαδωνίς is each year filled with blood, Lucian writes ἐτέτην [...] τοῦ πάθεος αἰτίην (8). He also notes the αἰτίη πιστοτέρη for the castration of the Galli. Later (26), he gives the aetiology for their existence and their use of women's robes (27). He takes more time to relate the αἴτιον for the origin of the temple (12–17), just as Pausanias does when he describes the temple of Thetis in Sparta (III 14, 4). In the description of the man who climbs the phallus, we read (28): αἰτίη δὲ οἱ τῆς ἀνόδου ἦδε λέγεται: either because in this way he is closer to the gods or because he is commemorating the Flood. I mentioned earlier that Lucian also gave the reason for which the man does not fall asleep while he is on the phallus (29). The statue of Hera in Hierapolis has on its head a precious stone called the λυχνίς [...] οὖνομα δὲ οἱ τοῦ ἔργου ἢ συντυχή. ἀπὸ τούτου ἐν νυκτὶ σέλας πολλὸν ἀπολάμπεται, ὑπὸ δὲ οἱ καὶ ὁ νηὸς ἅπας οἶον ὑπὸ λύχνοισι φαίνεται (32). Lucian tries in vain to divine the cause of why the Syrians erect statues: κοίη ὦν αἰτίη ξοανουργίης (34) to those gods who manifest themselves in the air when Helios and Selene, who are visible to all, are deprived of statues. With respect to statues, we also have the αἰτίη for the representation of Apollo as bearded γενειήτεω (35) and of Semiramis pointing at the temple with her right hand (39). If to these we add an explanation of the name διδάσκαλοι, those who guide foreigners (56), we can assert that Lucian was considerably interested in aetiological matters, an interest he shares with other periegetes. Obviously Pausanias, in his rambling style, provides us with the most material in this area. His explanations

<sup>29</sup> The Alexandrians and the poets led by Callimachus also reveal an interest in the μετονομασία of cities. Nicanor devoted a separate text to this.

<sup>30</sup> For lack of space, I am omitting the copious material that has been collected on this issue concerning Pausanias.

for the epithets of the gods (e.g., Apollo Λύκιος, II 19, 3 f.), the names of springs (II 7, 4) or (as we have seen) of places are standard fare.

It can be added that the motif of εὐρήματα is also associated with aetiology. The question of the development of culture through discoveries and inventions was most probably posed for the first time by the sophists. Just as the periegete Semus discussed various εὐρήματα (JACOBY, *RE* II A, 2, 1923, col. 1357) and Polemon (fr. 64) mentioned the discovery of μύρον, so our Lucian begins his periegesis by the assertion (2) that the Egyptians were the first to introduce statues of gods and sacrifices and the first to give names to the gods; they also invented the sacred myths and, originally, their temples were ἀξόανοι (3). Herodotus also ascribed similar inventions to the Egyptians (II 4): from them, the Pelasgians learned the names of the gods (II 51) and statues and altars were originally lacking among the Persians (I 131).

7. From Herodotus onwards, the periegetes include various ἀναθήματα among the so called θεωρήματα: the silver ἀναθήματα of Gyges in Delphi (Hdt. I 14), altars (I 183) and statues (II 41), monumental buildings (II 138) as well as inscriptions (e.g. II 187 and passim). As can be seen even from the fragments, the periegetes not only record these artifacts but also promote them. *The Periegesis from Hawara* ([n. 20], col. II 9 ff.) describes the sundial in the port of Zea (which is not mentioned anywhere else) as a curiosity and explains how it functions, it describes the temple of Artemis in Munichia (II 11 f.) as a περιβόητον and the walls surrounding Piraeus as ἀλόγως ἐλλογιμώτατα ὄντα διὰ τῆς Εὐρώπης (II 24). Similarly, Heraclides Criticus, who at every turn readily emphasizes any oddities in urban planning, mentions the θέατρον ἀξιόλογον μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν, Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν [...] ἄξιον θεᾶς<sup>31</sup> μεγάλην κατὰ πλεξιν ἔχον τοῖς θεωροῦσιν (I 1) at the very beginning of his entry for Athens. He is disappointed with the appearance of Athens itself, but he describes even the as yet unfinished Ὀλύμπιον as κατὰ πλεξιν ἔχον τὴν τῆς οἰκοδομίας ὑπογραφὴν (*ibid.*), and Thespieae as a place which possesses ἀνδριάντας εὖ πεποιημένους (I 25).

In each guide descriptions of ancient monumental artifacts and works of art constitute the most interesting section. In Lucian's guide, the attention of the reader is drawn by the author's well known aesthetic predilections in this area. We know how much he was enraptured by Phidias' statue of Zeus (*De sacrif.* 11). He also mentioned the aesthetic interpretation of works of art, ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὸ κάλλος (*Hist. conscr.* 27)<sup>32</sup>. Although in his other works Lucian expresses the pleasure he

<sup>31</sup> This is my reading after the MS Paris. 443 Suppl. Both MÜLLER and DUKE introduce an unnecessary change to θεᾶς, which is inappropriate to the clearly secular character of the guide of Heraclides. The identical expression ἄξιον θεᾶς is frequently found in Pausanias, e.g., I 14, 1; IX 38, 2; X 37, 8.

<sup>32</sup> These and other interesting sections of Lucian were exploited by W. MADYDA in a work published just before the war, *De pulchritudine imaginum deorum quid auctores Graeci saec. II p. Chr. n. iudicaverint*, Cracoviae 1939 (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Archiwum Filologiczne XVI), pp. 31 ff.

experiences when looking at works of art, he does not do so in his guide. Rather, he restricts himself to the cataloguing of statues (10, 14, 26, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 40), recording some as ἔργον or ποίημα, just as Herodotus (I 52 and 25) and Pausanias (e.g., V 17, 3 and 24, 1) did. In only one case does Lucian record the artist: Ἐρμοκλέους τοῦ Ῥοδίου ποίημα (26) and only once does he emphasize the beauty of the statue of Stratonice, even then quite perfunctorily, κάρτα καλόν (40). At the most, he describes the μορφή of some statues (of Hera, πολυειδέα μορφήν, 32, of a nameless statue, which μορφήν μὲν ἰδίην οὐκ ἔχει, 33, cf. 40). Only when a statue evokes θαυμάσιον in the one examining it or when it is made from some costly material does Lucian pay more attention to it. For example, the statue of Hera is decorated with many jewels and on her head is a stone which glows even during the night: καὶ ἄλλο θωυμαστόν ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ξοάνῳ ἣν ἐστὲως ἀντίος ἐσορέης, ἐς σὲ ὀρή καὶ μεταβαίνοντι τὸ βλέμμα ἀκολουθεῖ, καὶ ἦν ἄλλος ἐτέρωθεν ἐσορέη, ἴσα καὶ ἐς ἐκεῖνον ἐκτελέει (32 fin.).

Except for the one time that Lucian underscores the artistry of an unknown artist (40), throughout the entire text he generally exhibits an indifference towards the works of art that he is describing. In this, he is not necessarily following in the footsteps of Pausanias, who of old was judged as not able to perceive the aesthetic beauty of these works of art<sup>33</sup>. More recently Pausanias has been defended by his estimable commentator, J.G. FRAZER (*op. cit.* [n. 9], pp. 94 ff.), who asserts that Pausanias not only recognized the greatness of Phidias but also that he was capable of independent judgement even when measured against the pronouncements of his contemporary, Lucian (in works other than our guide, of course). For this reason, in the description of statues in the *De dea Syria*, I perceive a conscious archaisation and striving for an aesthetic standard even lower than that of Pausanias. Herodotus, when he mentions statues, was at times unable to do more than record their height and the material of which they were made (e.g., the statue of Sesostris, II 106). From time to time, he would describe the figure as executed by the artist, without, however, expressing his personal aesthetic experience. With this second group of descriptions it is possible to compare several references to the statues in the guide to Hierapolis. For example

(ch. 31): ...ἄμφω δὲ χρύσειοι τέ εἰσι καὶ ἄμφω ἔζονται· ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν Ἥρην λέοντες φέρουσι ὁ δὲ (Ζεὺς) ταύροισι ἐφέζεται,  
(cf. Hdt. I 24: Ἀρίωνος ἐστὶ ἀνάθημα χάλκεον οὐ μέγα [...] ἐπὶ δελφίνος ἐπεῶν ἀνθρώπος)

(ch. 32, the statue of Hera): χειρὶ δὲ τῇ μὲν ἐτέρῃ σκῆπτρον ἔχει, τῇ ἐτέρῃ δὲ ἄτρακτον...,  
(cf. Hdt. II 141, referring to the statue of Sethon: καὶ νῦν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔστηκε ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ [...] λίθινος, ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς μῦν).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. R. BERTRAND, *Études sur la peinture et la critique d'art dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1893, p. 336; then G. PASQUALI, *Hermes* XLVIII 1913, pp. 162, 189.

Now let us proceed to the description of monumental artifacts. In his description of the temple (28 and 30), Lucian mentions the double ring of surrounding walls, the *propylaea*, their height and the height of the temple pedestal. He describes the central building in more detail (*pronaos*, the golden doors, the entire temple is blazing with gold, its ceiling is golden, the *ναός* and the interior decoration of the temple). Even Pausanias, in his description of the temple of Apollo Ἐπικούριος at Bassae in the Peloponnesus praises it as λίθου τε ἐς κάλλος καὶ τῆς ἀρμονίης ἔνεκα (VIII 41, 8). He also praises the harmonious proportions and the beauty of the materials of the temple of Zeus at Olympia. The Athenian stadium made from white marble does not impress in the telling; this wonder must be seen (τὸ δὲ ἀκούσασι μὲν οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐπαγωγόν, θαῦμα δ' ἰδοῦσι, I 19, 6). On the basis of such revelations about architectural works which FRAZER (*op. cit.* [n. 9], pp. 97 f.) compared with Lucian's aesthetic judgements, it became clear that, in this area also, Pausanias did display a certain artistic sense even if it was somewhat limited. In our guide, however, Lucian's description of the temple is far from being an aesthetic evaluation of a monumental artifact. For this reason, I would rather relate it to similar descriptions in Herodotus, e.g.:

(ch. 28): τὰ δὲ προπύλαια τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐς ἄνεμον βορέην ἀποκέκλιται μέγαθος ὅσον τε ἑκατὸν ὄργυιέων;

(cf. Hdt. II 136: τὸν [*scil.* Ἄσυχιν] τὰ πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα ποιῆσαι [...] προπύλαια ἐόντα πολλῶν τε κάλλιστα καὶ πολλῶν μέγιστα)

(Lucian, *ibid.*): ὁ μὲν χῶρος αὐτός ἐν τῷ τὸ ἱρὸν ἴδρυται, λόφος ἐστί, κέεται δὲ κατὰ μέσον μάλιστα τῆς πόλιος...

(and ch. 30): ἄνοδος ἐς αὐτὸν (*scil.* νηὸν) λίθου πεποιείται οὐ κάρτα μακρῆ...

(cf. Hdt. II 138: ἐὸν δ' ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει τὸ ἱρὸν κατορᾶται πάντοθεν περιούνη [...] κατὰ μὲν δὴ τὴν ἔσοδον ἐστρωμένη ἐστὶ ὁδὸς λίθου...)

Here it is easy to observe the almost identical literary structure and the excessively objective description.

To be even more precise, let us add that in Lucian's guide we also have the already mentioned throne of Helios (34), the altar in the pool (46) and the coin displaying Europa (4). While inscriptions are numerous in Herodotus as well as in Polemon (who was known as *στηλοκόπας*), Pausanias and others, Lucian includes only one, the inscription on the phalli before the temple (16). Because the inscription was in an unfamiliar dialect, Lucian provides a summary of the inscription based on his own imagination and the information he received from the priests<sup>34</sup>.

8. In Lucian, as in other periegetical writings, descriptions of monumental artifacts or works of art are often accompanied by topographical indications. Overall, the entire guide begins with the topographical localization of Hierapolis (1): οὐ πολλὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐφρήτεω ποταμοῦ. There is a similar entry for the

<sup>34</sup> Cf. CLEMEN, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 44 (in his commentary) and GANSZYNIEC, *op. cit.* (n. 16), p. 501.



sacred pool: οὐ πολλὸν ἐκάς τοῦ ἱεροῦ (45). Such topographical indications are naturally very characteristic of guides. In the case of doubtful fragments, they often constitute the criterion by which such writings may be classified as periegetic. H. BISCHOFF (in his article *Perieget*, *RE* XIX 1, 1937, coll. 726 ff.) utilized this criterion to compile a list of alleged periegetes, e.g. referring to Alcetas (no. 25), to Claudius Iullus, a Roman who wrote in Greek (no. 33) and also to Praxiteles (no. 8). Clearly, a guide must provide topographical orientation.

In the generally oriented geographical work of Hecataeus, whom I mention as the father of periegesis, we find only very cursory indicators of location (μετὰ δὲ... μετὰ δὲ: F 48, 106 and 166 or ἐν δὲ... ἐν δὲ: F 67a and 146), most frequently according to the cardinal directions of the world (e.g. F 203, 204, 207). This last system of notating location passed to Herodotus as well, II 112; 121: προπύλαια τὰ πρὸς ἐσπέρην τετραμμένα; 136: τὰ πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα (cf. 153; IV 35; V 77) and in Lucian cf. προπύλαια [...] πρὸς ἄνεμον βορέην ἀποκέκλιται (28) or else ὁ νηὸς ὁρέει μὲν ἐς Ἥέλιον ἀνιόντα (30). Pausanias also describes location in this way (VI 21, 2): οἰκήσεις ἐπὶ τε ἄνεμον Λίβα καὶ ἡλίου δυσμᾶς as well as Heraclides Criticus, fr. II 9: πρὸς τε ζέφυρον καὶ ἡλίου δύσιν ἐστραμμένα. In our guide this is linked with the indicating of direction according to the right or left hand: ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ νηοῦ (16), ἐν ἀριστερῇ τοῦ νεώ..., ἐν δεξιῇ (39), which also appears sporadically in Herodotus (e.g., II 169; V 77).

Other topographical formulae also exist, of which the simplest are probably prepositions and adverbs. These are used by Herodotus to indicate the location of artifacts quite accurately. Beside the usual ἐν we also meet καθυπέρθεν, πρό, ἀντίον, ὀπισθε, ἀγχοτάτω, ἔσω, ἔξω, ἔμπροσθεν. I have also found similar expressions even in the fragments of authors who today are considered periegetes<sup>35</sup>. In Lucian, we also find ἐπὶ τῷ χάσματι, ὑπὸ τῷ νηῷ (13), ἐν τῷ ἱεῷ (16), μετὰ [...] τὸν θρόνον (35, 38), ἐντὸς τοῦ νηοῦ (39), κατὰ μέσον (28, 46). As renowned a periegete as the 3<sup>rd</sup> century Diodorus gives the topography of the tomb of Themistocles with the greatest precision in fr. 1 (= Plut. *Them.* 32):

περὶ τὸν λιμένα τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἄλκιμον ἀκρωτηρίου πρόκειται τις οἶον ἀγκῶν καὶ κάμψαντι τοῦτον ἐντὸς, ἢ τὸ ὑπεύδιον τῆς θαλάττης, κρηπὶς ἐστὶν εὐμεγέθης καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτὴν βωμοειδὲς τάφος τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους.

WILCKEN, the editor of *The Periegesis from Hawara* ([n. 20], pp. 208 f.), asserts that, for the first time in literature, a topographical feature (a certain hill called Σικελία) was used to denote the orientation of the walls of the port of Phaleron (col. II 25 f.).

<sup>35</sup> In Xenon (fr. 14), Philostephanus (fr. 24, 25), Phlegon (fr. 41, 44, 46), Pausanias of Damascus (fr. 4), Praxiteles (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* V 3, 1), Polemon (fr. 18 and 44), Heraclides Criticus (fr. I 1, 6, 12, 23, 26, 30; fr. II 8).

As early as Herodotus, we come across the so called *dativus relationis* or *indicantis*, a construction that denotes location from the standpoint of the traveller or guide. This occurs more than a dozen times in Herodotus and in one verbatim fragment in Hecataeus, F 169: ὑπερβάντι τὸν Θράκιον Αἴμον; Hdt. I 51: ἐκέετο ἐπὶ δεξιὰ ἐσιόντι τὸν νηόν<sup>36</sup>. This construction is also found in fr. 3 of Callicrates: βαδίζουσι δὲ ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν εἰσὶ στῆλαι. In Lucian's guide, we find two examples (30), but these datives are not used for topographical orientation<sup>37</sup>. Instead, a defective genitive absolute is used, lacking a noun which would denote the traveller. This rather rare construction, but already familiar to Homer, is not found in Herodotus or any of the fragments of the periegetes and only once in Lucian: ἐσιόντων ἐν ἀριστερῇ κέεται [...] θρόνος (34).

With respect to topographical formulae, a record number of 41 various formulae are found in Pausanias, who definitively surpasses all other periegetes whose writings survive. In his work, 34 examples of the rare defective genitive absolute alone can be found<sup>38</sup>.

Since we are discussing topography, it is worth noting that Lucian's guide lacks tourist information. Herodotus, while not a periegete, frequently has the traveller in mind and provides the distance to be travelled: μῆκος ὁδοῦ εὐζώνω ἀνδρὶ (I 72)<sup>39</sup>. In Heraclides Criticus as well I have noticed many similar simply practical directions, which are nonetheless an expression of literary stylisation (*op. cit.* [n. 5], pp. 46 f.). Pausanias, although he was likely writing for readers, not for travellers, follows tradition and gives multiple directions, indicates the direction of roads (II 12, 3) or else classifies them: ὁδοὶ δύο, ἡ μὲν ἀνδρασι εὐζώνοις [...] ἡ δὲ στενὴ [...] ὀχήμασι δέ ἐστιν. Lucian simply mentions pilgrimages (ὁδοιπορίαί, ὁδοιπορεῖν, 48, 55), only once indicates the distance between the temple on Libanus and Byblos as being ὁδὸς ἡμέρης (9), and that the head of Osiris undergoes a πλόον ἑπτὰ ἡμερέων from Egypt to Byblos (7). We also have a mention (56) of special hosts, ξενοδόκοι, who take care of pilgrims in Hierapolis. This almost unique piece of information was acclaimed by T. MANDYBUR (*op. cit.* [n. 1], p. 388) as an indicator of the basic orientation of a text that was, in his view, intended for pilgrims.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Hdt. II 7, 8, 29, 155; IV 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 34.

<sup>37</sup> Ἀνελθόντι δὲ θεῶμα and καὶ σοὶ ἀνιόντι προσβάλλει πνοιήν.

<sup>38</sup> It can be added that the technique of periegesis is also used in literary works which, while not really belonging to the literature of travel guides, nevertheless give a detailed description of some particular spot, e.g., the description of an immense forty-tiered ship built during the time of Ptolemy Philopator (in Callixenus of Rhodes fr. 1 = *FHG* III 55 f.) exhibits the primarily topographical bent of periegesis, which is completely natural. Much can be said about the topographical arrangement in the works of the Atthidographers as well. Later, Lucian himself used topographical formulae in his parody of travel literature, most likely in order to create the impression that he is speaking the truth.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. 104; III 5; IV 18, 21; V 50, 52 f., particularly the description of the royal road Ephesus–Susa.

## II

In my opinion, the material so far presented in this article is sufficient for us to draw certain conclusions pertaining to the relation between our guide and Lucian's literary output on the one hand, and to the place of this periegesis in the history of Greek literature on the other.

1. In the general assessment of the text, the first question to be raised is that of its authenticity. Today, the view that Lucian was its author is supported by many weighty opinions. Earlier proponents of this view were W. CHRIST (*Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, vol. II 2, München <sup>s</sup>1913, p. 560), W.W. BAUDISSIN, an expert in the history of religion, CUMONT (*op. cit.* [n. 3], p. 248, n. 19), Th. NÖLDEKE (in a letter to CUMONT), then GANSZYNIEC (*op. cit.* [n. 16]), the Dutch scholar G. GOOSSENS<sup>40</sup>, CLEMEN (*op. cit.* [n. 17]) just before the war, and last year (1945), Professor Tadeusz SINKO (in his work on the chronology of Lucian's writings which was presented at a meeting of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences). Among those who disagree with their opinion is Rudolf HELM, the eminent expert on Lucian. While BAUDISSIN perceived everywhere between the lines a roguish sense of humour and a mockery of holiness concealed by an apparent gravity, and CHRIST wrote clearly of a successful satire on Syrian worship, HELM was unable to detect in this text even a trace of Lucian's spirit. The guide to the sacred city of Hierapolis is indeed written in a serious vein, at which the author must have laboured purposefully. So how can we explain this literary *curiosum*, as our text was called by T. MANDYBUR (*op. cit.* [n. 1], p. 368)?

The author of the guide is completely at the service of the traditions of the literary genre of periegesis, so much, that his own personality is submerged by this whole traditional apparatus of the genre. Lucian wished to write a guide in a rather Herodotean manner and this is why, as he described works of art, he consciously introduced archaisms. He employed lexical archaism as well. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD, however, the use of the Herodotean dialect was fashionable<sup>41</sup>. Similarly, honouring the literary tradition, Lucian did not permit himself to voice his own aesthetic judgements of these works of art as he did in so many other works. Again, in this guide which was nothing else than a literary *lusus ingenii* (something that ancient writers frequently attempted), Lucian, author of the parody on prayer<sup>42</sup> and sharp critic of professional guides<sup>43</sup> imposed silence upon his

<sup>40</sup> *De Syrische godin van Lucianus*, Philologische Studien VII 1935–1936, pp. 122 ff. (see a review in: *Bursians Jahresb.* CCLXXII 1941, p. 213).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. *Att. Ind.* – Once again, the Asianic manner, which had earlier (A. BOECKH) been observed in Pausanias as well, had been introduced by Heraclides Criticus in his description of the cities of central Greece (fr. 1; cf. SCHNAYDER, *op. cit.* [n. 6], pp. 48 ff.).

<sup>42</sup> Described by H. KLEINKNECHT, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike*, Stuttgart 1937

<sup>43</sup> *Philops.* 4: εἰ γοῦν τις ἀφέλοι τὰ μυθώδη ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, οὐδὲ ἂν κωλύσαι λιμῶ τοὺς περιηγητὰς αὐτῶν διαφθαρῆναι μηδὲ ἀμισθὶ τῶν ξένων τ' ἀληθῆς ἀκούειν ἐθειλησάντων.

own opinions concerning the *res sacrae* in Hierapolis. As we read his periegesis, we are tempted to repeat the words of Sienkiewicz's character Zagłoba which refer to the speech of a Swedish envoy in Zamość: "the devil has donned a chasuble and is ringing for Mass with his tail...". This voluntary and conscious constraint gives rise in Lucian to a certain exaggeration in his amassing of wonders as well as to a sometimes glaring imposition of eyewitness accounts, particularly with reference to the miracles, which obviously constitute a compositional element. This double standard is credible in a Syrian, i.e., a representative of a rather mediocre and ethnically quite uninteresting race, particularly in one who, in the προλαλία entitled Ἡρόδοτος ἢ Ἀετίων had stated that he would like to imitate Herodotus, but perhaps not in everything, since this was too much to hope for: Ἡρόδοτον εἶθε μὲν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μιμήσεσθαι δυνατὸν ἦν· οὐ πάντα φημί ὅσα προσῆν αὐτῷ, μείζον γὰρ εὐχῆς τοῦτό γε (1). Elsewhere, however, Lucian rates this same Herodotus among common liars who achieved their fame through lies preserved in writing: ...ἀοιδίμους ἄνδρας ἐγγράφω τῷ ψεύσματι κεχρημένους (*Philops.* 2, cf. *Ver. hist.* II 31). Arguably, only literary stylistics can justify such a radical about-face.

Lucian was a man of letters versed in rhetorical ἐκφράσεις, not a professional periegete. He consciously made use of the traditional repertoire of periegesis, a genre which, although already in existence for several centuries, had stagnated by the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD as had other genres of Greek prose. Our author was eagerly drawing upon this rich inheritance and gravitating primarily towards Herodotus. Here belong the eyewitness accounts, the interviews with priests, the focus on cultic affairs and religious beliefs, the excursions into myth, the interest in θωύματα and the aetiology of names and cults, the description of monumental artifacts and the cataloguing of statues as well as topographical directions. Similarly, a familiarity with sympotic motifs permitted Lucian to write a cynical symposium in Menippean style. In the same way, Horace gave a biting satirical description of a dinner party of the *nouveau-riche* Nasidienus (*Sat.* II 8), and his portrayal of various traditional characters, such as the host, has been highly acclaimed by classical scholars. Also, in his *Iter Brundisinum*, Horace consciously introduced various motifs from periegesis<sup>44</sup>. This suffices for the question of authorship. The contents of our guide for the most part correspond to reality. More recent experts in the history of religion (BAUDISSIN, CUMONT, GANSZYNIEC) have attested to the undeniable value of the information provided by Lucian. The

---

<sup>44</sup> The technique of periegesis was afterwards used by Lucian in his parody of travel literature in the so-called *Vera historia*; here we find eyewitness accounts (I 4, 13, 28; II 1, 25) and of course various θαυμάσια, columns with inscriptions (I 7, 20, 32; II 3, 28), estimates of distance, dimensions (I 7, 9, 13, 15, 30, 31 passim; II 1, 3, 5, 33), and even aetiological speculations (I 7, 12, 13, 22; II 31).

author fails only where he permits himself to improvise. Recent archaeological investigations have also provided positive results<sup>45</sup>.

2. In his local periegesis, motivated no doubt by his local Syrian patriotism, Lucian introduced into his descriptions of the sacred artifacts of Hierapolis various motifs from the literary style of Herodotus. We should not, however, focus too exclusively on this imitation, especially because due to the fact that this guide is restricted to one location only, a certain shift in or limitation of the content matter occurred. For this reason, not all the τόποι of Herodotus that pass to the other periegetes can be found here. For example, we do not find an interest in urban planning, the author does not concern himself with the inhabitants of the city and their δίαίτια or the produce of the earth. At the same time, however, because the *De dea Syria* does exhibit characteristics common to the whole literary genre, it was necessary to compare it with other examples of periegesis up to and including Pausanias.

With regard to the attitude of Lucian the periegete to his contemporary, the author of the extant and the most extensive *Περιήγησις τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, it must be concluded that some motifs typical of Pausanias are lacking in the guide to Hierapolis. These include quotations from poetry, historical λόγοι (in Lucian, these are rather mythological and with a composition more similar to that of Herodotus and the λόγος about Stratonice is not historical: CLEMEN, *op. cit.* [n. 17], p. 38) as well as the absence of tourist instructions. In Lucian's periegesis, the attitude towards works of art is rather indicative of archaism, not to mention that the guide begins with a prominent introduction, something which is lacking in Pausanias. The only possible correspondence is with book I of Pausanias and it is based on Lucian's religio-archaeological inclinations. We know that the scope of Pausanias' interests expanded in the later books (the first was published separately) and included the inhabitants, their costumes and customs and even at times the landscapes. All this leads to the conclusion that the motifs that are found in our guide are those quite generally found in periegesis, and it is the author himself who is responsible for their selection and formulation.

What value does Lucian's guide hold for us? In order to answer this question, we have to realize that, from the entire and rather extensive genre of periegetic literature which, it would seem, enjoyed the greatest popularity during the Hellenistic period, up to the present only the guide of Pausanias has been preserved in its entirety. Except for this, we possess only fragments, which have recently been catalogued and inventoried by BISCHOFF, and which to some degree permit us to orient ourselves in this type of literary production and even to establish a typology of the genre. Seen in this light, Lucian's guide assumes a very real worth which in the past had been underestimated. In it, we have one more

---

<sup>45</sup> GOOSSENS, *op. cit.* (n. 40); H. STOCKS, *Studien zu Lukians De Syria dea*, Berytus IV 1938, pp. 1 ff., cf. Bursians Jahresb. CCLXXII 1941, p. 212.

entirely preserved example of periegesis which, although written by a man of letters rather than a periegete, still gives us a good understanding of the techniques of the genre. No one will compare this text with the scholarly works of Polemon or Heliiodorus, for Lucian's guide is devoid of any type of scholarly pretensions or antiquarian learning. Following the unpretentious, naive manner of Herodotus, he instead emphasizes θαυμάσια and the sacred artifacts associated with the city of the goddess Athargatis. Such guides to sacred places must have been numerous, as were periegeses to non-religious locations (e.g. that of Heraclides Criticus) which did not focus on cult. By its restriction of content to the artifacts of only one temple or sacred city, Lucian's text suggests a resemblance to works whose character, however, cannot be assessed in any detail: the periegesis of Democritus of Ephesus (from the Hellenistic period), represented by a few fragments (*Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ναοῦ* in BISCHOFF no. 37) or that of Alcetas' *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀναθημάτων* (only one fragment, in BISCHOFF no. 25).

Following the example of Herodotus, Lucian was subconsciously striving to reach the original source of this literary form used by the Greek periegetes. Although they deviated from the original in both language (Pausanias, for example, modernized the language of Herodotus) and expression, nevertheless the *De dea Syria* should not be omitted from the history of Greek periegesis. In any case, it is an interesting example of a type of work reconstructed by a man of letters, a work whose preservation the envious centuries clearly neglected, as well as a significant witness to the enduring power of literary tradition in antiquity.