

THE EXTENT OF STRABO'S TRAVEL IN GREECE

BY CHARLES HEALD WELLER

The two writers to whom we are most indebted for our knowledge of the geography and topography of ancient Greece are Strabo and Pausanias; the importance of our learning as much as possible of the extent of their travels and autopsy is, therefore, obvious. Pausanias' personal acquaintance with the country has been proved by the excavations and researches of the last half-century. The question as to that of Strabo is still debatable.

A few of the divergent opinions on the subject may properly be quoted, though, since one finds no thorough discussion of the evidence, a complete list need not be given. The earlier scholars (for example, Heeren, who is mentioned below) took more or less for granted the geographer's visitation of the places that he described; increasing doubt has been shown by later investigators. Leake says (*Athens and the Demi of Attica* I, p. 32): "As his account of the sea-coast is generally more accurate and detailed than that of the inland districts, we are tempted to believe that few parts of the interior were visited by him, but that his travels were principally performed by sea." Curtius remarks (*Peloponnesos* I, p. 120): "Denn ausser Korinth . . . wird man schwerlich einen peloponnesischen Ort ausfindig machen, welchen er nachweislich aus eigener Anschauung beschrieben hat." But elsewhere he declares (*ibid.* II, p. 114, n. 75; cf. *Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthumswiss.* X [1852], cols. 5 f., where his view is given with more detail): "Die folgende Beschreibung der Gemälde (Str., p. 343 Cas.) macht mir wahrscheinlich, dass Strabon selbst diese Küste (i. e., of Elis) bereiste und Olympia besuchte." Bursian (*Geographie von Griechenland*) does not express explicitly his estimate of our author's testimony; he sometimes mentions a lack of autopsy (as II, p. 258), but in general he seems to admit Strabo's personal knowledge (cf. *ibid.*, p. 322: "Strabon fand zwischen den Trümmern der Stadt noch ein Heiligthum des Asklepios," etc.). Schröter (*De Strabonis itineribus*, as quoted by [CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY I, October, 1906] 339

Vogel, *Philologus* XLI (1882), p. 516) maintains: "vix credibile est Strabonem non plura visitasse Graeciae loca quam Corinthum et Athenas." Niese affirms (*Rhein. Mus.* N. F. XXXII [1877], p. 281; cf. *Hermes* XIII [1878], p. 43): "Aus eigener Anschauung kennt Strabo in Hellas nur Korinth," his view being approved by Vogel (*loc. cit.*). Bunbury's view (*History of Ancient Geography* II, p. 266, n. 9) is: "Athens, Megara and Corinth are the only points in continental Greece, which he can be proved to have actually visited. Groskurd adds Argos, but I can see no evidence of this." Falconer (Hamilton and Falconer *Geography of Strabo* III, pp. xiv f.) states: "Athens, Corinth, Argos, and their neighbourhood, were the only parts of Greece our author saw. Heeren, indeed, maintains that he had seen the whole of it, . . . but satisfactory proof of this is altogether wanting." Elsewhere (*ibid.*, p. viii) he adds Megara to his list. Tozer (*History of Ancient Geography*, p. 241) says: "In Greece there is no clear proof that he stopped at any place except Corinth." Frazer remarks (*Pausanias* I, p. xci): "In fact it is generally recognized that Strabo visited very few parts of Greece, perhaps none but Corinth;" and he expresses *passim* the same view.

In consideration of such varying opinions, it seems worth while to examine the subject anew, in order to discover, if possible, evidence sufficient for the decision of the question. The material available — which is entirely "internal" — must be gleaned principally from books viii, ix, and x of Strabo's *Geographica*. These books form a somewhat independent section, for which our author's appellation would be the *Helladica*, or the *Helladic Geography* (p. 332). In this he treats of all the mainland of Greece except Epirus and of the adjacent islands (including Crete) of the Ionian and Aegean seas.

In his introduction to this section Strabo gives a résumé of the sources which he has found useful in its compilation (*loc. cit.*):

ἀποδώσωμεν νυνὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς Ἑλλαδικῆς γεωγραφίας, ἅπερ Ὅμηρος μὲν πρῶτος, ἔπειτα καὶ ἄλλοι πλείους ἐπραγματεύσαντο, οἱ μὲν ἰδίᾳ λιμένας ἢ περίπλους ἢ περιόδους γῆς ἢ τι τοιοῦτον ἄλλο ἐπιγράψαντες, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὰ Ἑλλαδικὰ περιέχεται, οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ κοινῇ τῆς ἱστορίας γραφῇ χωρὶς ἀποδείξαντες τὴν τῶν ἡπείρων τοπογραφίαν, καθάπερ Ἐφορός τε ἐποίησε καὶ Πολύβιος· ἄλλοι

δ' εἰς τὸν φυσικὸν τόπον καὶ τὸν μαθηματικὸν προσέλαβόν τινα τῶν τοιούτων, καθάπερ Ποσειδώνιός τε καὶ Ἱππαρχος.

This is a wide range of authorities, but Strabo's execution is more than equal to his promises. In 215 Teubner pages he quotes by name upward of sixty authors some 260 times. Many of these references are purely literary and have no bearing on our question. In other instances, notably from Ephorus (who is quoted by name some twenty-five times), extracts of several pages are made. Homer, Strabo's geographer *par excellence*, is quoted by name some fifty times; as "the poet," "the catalogue," etc., much oftener. Still more frequent are *τινὲς φασιν, οἱ δὲ φασιν, ἄλλοι φασίν, ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ δέειν*, and the like, such references occurring, on the average, several times to the page.

Niese has examined (*Rhein. Mus.* N. F. XXXII [1877], pp. 267 ff., "Apollodors Commentar zum Schiffskataloge als Quelle Strabo's") Strabo's dependence on Apollodorus' commentary on the Catalogue of the ships, and summarizes his discussion with the remark (*ibid.*, p. 281), "Das Facit der Rechnung ist, dass Apollodor in den Büchern viii-x Strabo's nicht nur bedeutend benutzt ist, sondern die Hauptquelle genannt werden muss; und die Aufgabe, die uns noch übrig bleibt, ist nicht so sehr das Apollodorische darin zu ermitteln, als das Nichtapollodorische auszuschneiden." This statement seems exaggerated; a detailed study of all our author's sources for the *Helladica* would probably indicate, as already suggested, that Strabo may still have the credit of using most of his authorities at first hand (cf. pp. 339, 422). But that Apollodorus is much employed, is indisputable. Whole sections—notably the chapter on Thessaly—are little more than a commentary on the Catalogue, Strabo's chief concern being to verify and illustrate Homer: his interest, to determine whether this or that town was under the sway of Nestor or Menelaus or Achilles, rather than to portray the condition of the country in his own day. This may be said fairly, notwithstanding such remarks of our author as (p. 337):

λέγω δὲ τὰτα συμβάλλων τά τε νῦν καὶ τὰ ὑφ' Ὀμήρου λεγόμενα
δεῖ δὴ τά τε ὄντα λέγειν καὶ τὰ τοῦ ποιητοῦ παρατιθέντας ἐφ' ὅσον προσήκει
προσσκοπεῖν (cf. Curtius *Peloponnesos* I, pp. 119 f.).

The general plan of Strabo's work is suggested by Ephorus (cf. Bursian *Geog.* I, p. 3). Following this author he starts from Acarnania, since (p. 334) "Εφορος μὲν οὖν ἀρχὴν εἶναι τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν Ἀκαρνανίαν φησὶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσπερίων μερῶν. Thence he proceeds along the southern coast around Peloponnesus, and then through central and northern Greece; for οὕτω καὶ ἡμῖν προσήκει, he explains (*loc. cit.*), ἀκολουθοῦσι τῇ φύσει τῶν τόπων σύμβουλον ποιεῖσθαι τὴν θάλατταν (cf. Leake, quoted above). Occasionally he deviates from this mode of procedure, only to recall himself as soon as possible; so, for example, p. 391: ταύτας οὖν διέξιμεν ἀναλα[βόντες πάλιν ἀπὸ τῆς π]αραλίας ἀφ' ἧσπερ ἀπελίπομεν.

In each successive state which he reaches in his narrative he branches off to follow the order indicated by Homer. An extended list of passages which show this method might be given; a few will suffice:

p. 377: ἐξῆς δὲ λέγωμεν περὶ τῶν . . . τόπων ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ.—p. 408: τῷ π[οιητῇ] ἀκολουθοῦντες.—p. 411: ὁ δὲ ποιητῆς ἐφεξῆς ταῖς Κώπαις Εὐτρησιν τίθῃσι.—*ibid.*: ἐξῆς δὲ Κορώνειαν καταλέγει.—p. 416: οἱ τὰ περὶ τῶν νεῶν συγγράψαντες, οἷς ἀκολουθοῦμεν.

For his time Strabo was undoubtedly an extensive traveler. Indeed, he boasts of the wide area covered by his visits, and of his consequent fitness to write a geographical treatise (pp. 117 f.). The most satisfactory outline of his itinerary is that of Niese in his "Beiträge zur Biographie Strabo's" (*Hermes* XIII [1878], pp. 33 ff.). A sketch of this survey may be convenient. Born in Amasia in Pontus (pp. 547 ff., 561), he naturally traveled first in Asia Minor. We find him in Cappadocian Comana (p. 535), then follow him through the "Cilician Gates" into Cilicia (p. 536). Farther west he visited Hierapolis (p. 630), Nysa (p. 650), Ephesus (p. 641), and perhaps Magnesia (p. 648). In the Aegean he saw Chios (p. 645), perhaps Cos (p. 657), surely Gyarus (p. 485), as we shall see below. Corinth (pp. 377, 379) and Brundisium (p. 282) were visited on the way to Rome (pp. 234 ff.; 282 ff.; cf. p. 381). Niese thinks that he wrote at Rome, but this is not certain (cf. Schröter *Bemerkungen zu Strabo*, Leipzig, 1887). He lived a long time at Alexandria (p. 101), visited Heliopolis (p. 806), the Sphinxes at Memphis (p. 807),

the Labyrinth (pp. 810 f.), the statues of Memnon (p. 816), Philae (p. 818), and went up the Nile to Syene (p. 118). Cyrene he saw only from the sea (p. 837). In Italy he visited also Puteoli (p. 793) and Baiae and Naples (pp. 242 ff.). Populonia in Etruria (p. 223; cf. p. 117) was the most northern and western spot that he saw.

Niese confines his list too closely to places that Strabo actually tells us he has seen (cf. Vogel *loc. cit.*), but the catalogue probably can not be greatly lengthened. So far as we are informed, Strabo traveled, at least in Asia and Greece, during the earlier part of his life, perhaps before he conceived the plan of writing even his *History*, almost surely before he contemplated his *Geography*, which was to be a sort of appendix to the former work. Indeed, the *Geography* seems to have been composed some forty years later than the general period of his travels, which, therefore, can scarcely have been made, as were those of Pausanias, in anticipation of such a production (cf. Niese, *loc. cit.*).

In 29 B. C., as will appear from the following passage, Strabo anchored off the small island of Gyarus on his way to Corinth:

τῇ Γυάρῳ, he says (p. 485), προσορμισθεὶς ἔγγων κωμίον ὑπὸ ἀλιέων συνοοούμενον· ἀπαίροντες δ' ἐδεξάμεθα πρεσβυτὴν ἐνθὲνδε ὡς Καίσαρα προκεχειρισμένον τῶν ἀλιέων τινά (ἦν δ' ἐν Κορίνθῳ Καῖσαρ βαδίζων ἐπὶ τὸν θρίαμβον τὸν Ἀκτιακόν)· συμπλέων δὲ ἔλεγε πρὸς τοὺς πυθομένους ὅτι πρεσβεύει περὶ κουφισμοῦ τοῦ φόρου· τελοῖεν γὰρ δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα καὶ τὰς ἑκατὸν χαλεπῶς ἂν τελοῦντες.

Immediately thereafter Strabo visited Corinth, which he describes (p. 379) as νεωστὶ ἀναληφθείσης ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων. He does not tell us the duration of his stay, which, however, would seem to have been brief. He saw the city and climbed the Acrocorinthus—the usual procedure of the casual visitor of today. He describes the splendid view from the summit of the mountain and (p. 377) particularly mentions seeing Cleonae, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκροκορίνθου κατωπτεύσαμεν τὸ κτίσμα—doubtless his only view of that city, which was on the route that he describes from Argos. Since he says that Parnassus and Helicon were snow-capped (p. 379; cf. p. 410), we may gather that his visit was in the early spring.

From here he probably proceeded on his way to Rome, his next stopping-place being Brundisium (p. 282).

His description of Corinth is accurate and vivid, if not detailed, and has added much to our knowledge of the city. No other portion of the *Helladica*, however, shows a positive trace of his personal examination of places that he mentions. He does not tell us directly of other visits, and his work contains no other description that could not have been made from the study of previous authors.

General dependence on the writings of others is not, to be sure, a necessary indication of incompetence or of the lack of personal observation. Strabo himself in his description of Corinth mentions as his sources Hieronymus, Eudoxus, *καὶ ἄλλοι*, before he adds, *καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ εἶδομεν* (p. 379). In a thoroughly scientific manner he verifies and supplements the statements of his authorities. But when to an author's general literary dependence are added quotations from others concerning matters which an eye-witness must know personally, or when an author makes palpable blunders regarding things that a visitor must have seen, belief in his autopsy becomes doubtful. If such quotations and strange statements are frequent, doubt approaches certainty.

In Pausanias' description of Greece, four times as long as Strabo's, no instances of this sort, as Frazer remarks (*Paus.* I, p. lxxxii) are "so clear as to amount to a proof of borrowing." In the *Helladica* of Strabo we find some fifty such cases. These must now be discussed, following in general in each class Strabo's order of treatment, which has been outlined above.

In the course of his description of Elis, Strabo argues stoutly for the Triphylia Pylus as the Pylus of Nestor. Certainly, if he had seen the place, he would know as to the appropriateness of Homer's epithet *ἡμαθόεις*. But he is driven to declare (p. 344), *καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἡμαθόδη τὸν ποταμὸν ἢ τὴν χώραν εἶναι ψεῦδος φασί*, elsewhere (p. 336; cf. p. 344) deriving the epithet from the name of the contiguous river *ἡμαθος* (cf. Bursian *Geog.* II, p. 279, n. 1). In relation to the same region Strabo is about to discuss the question as to the portion of the country occupied by

the Caucones, and he remarks (p. 345): *φασὶ δ' ἐν τῇ Λαεπρεάτιδι καὶ Καύκωνος εἶναι μνήμα.*

In his narrative he has pursued the seacoast around to Laconia. On reaching Gytheum, where the traveler would disembark for Sparta, he says of the port (p. 363), *ἔχει δ' ὥς φασι, τὸ ναύσταθμον ὀρυκτόν*, a condition which we might expect even a casual visitor to have learned for himself. A few lines farther on Strabo remarks (p. 364), *τῶν δ' ὑφ' Ὁμήρου καταλεγόμενων τὴν μὲν Μέσσην οὐδαμῶν δείκνυσθαι φασι*, and then he adds, on the same authority, *Μεσσοῖαν δ' οὐ τῆς χώρας εἶναι μέρος [ἄλλα] τῆς Σπάρτης, καθάπερ καὶ τὸ Λιμναῖον*, implying that at least two of the four quarters or wards of Sparta (cf. Frazer *Paus.* III, p. 341) are beyond his personal knowledge.

Nor is the familiar passage relating to the sources of the river Eridanus in Athens the product of Strabo's own experience. Of these he declares (p. 397), *εἰσὶ μὲν νῦν αἱ πηγαὶ καθαροῦ καὶ ποτίμου ὕδατος, ὥς φασιν, ἐκτὸς τῶν Διοχάρους καλουμένων πυλῶν πλησίον τοῦ Λυκείου*, and the inference is clear that Strabo was not personally acquainted with this portion of the city—though he mentions the Lyceum (p. 396) as a point of interest in Athens.

"They say" is apparently all that Strabo knows of the Euripus also:

περὶ δὲ τῆς παλιρροίας τοῦ Εὐρίπου τοσοῦτον μόνον εἰπεῖν ἱκανόν, ὅτι ἐπτάκις μεταβάλλειν φασὶ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐκάστην καὶ νύκτα· τὴν δ' αἰτίαν ἐν ἄλλοις σκεπτέον (p. 403; cf. pp. 10, 36, 55).

That this was the current opinion is shown by Livy's words:

et fretum ipsum Euripi non septies die, sicut fama fert, temporibus statis reciprocatur sed temere in modum venti (xxviii. 6).

But Strabo probably took the statement directly from Ephorus (p. 400), together with the account of the bridge and of the execution of Salganeus, *ὃν φασι ἀναιρεθῆναι . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ ναυάρχου Μεγαβάτου* (p. 403). Likewise of Aegae in Euboea he says (p. 405): *κατὰ δὲ τὴν παραλίαν ταύτην [i. e., of Boeotia] κείσθαι φασιν Αἰγὰς τὰς ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ . . . ἣν δέ ποτε καὶ πόλις.*

But more striking than the cases thus far mentioned is the fact that he has information of Delphi only at second hand. In beginning his description of the oracle he says (p. 419):

φασὶ δ' εἶναι τὸ μαντεῖον ἄντρον κοῖλον κατὰ βάθους οὐ μάλα εὐρύστομον, ἀναφέρεσθαι δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐνθουσιαστικόν, ὑπερκεῖσθαι δὲ τοῦ στομίου τρίποδα ὑψηλόν, ἐφ' ὃν τὴν Πυθίαν ἀναβαίνουσιν δεχομένην τὸ πνεῦμα ἀποθεσπί-
ζειν ἑμμετρὰ τε καὶ ἄμετρα.

Passing over the question as to the archaeological accuracy of such a description, Strabo's complete borrowing is manifest. After this beginning we scarcely need to add his anachronistic account (p. 420) of the two eagles (Strabo, "crows") upon the omphalos. Strabo says: *δείκνυται δὲ καὶ ὀμφαλὸς τις ἐν τῷ ναῷ τεταινωμένος καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ αἱ δύο εἰκόνες τοῦ μύθου*, though "we are expressly told that the golden eagles had been carried off in the Sacred War, that is, about three hundred years before Strabo's time" (Frazer *Paus.* V, p. 315; and the ancient authorities there).

In the instances thus far noted Strabo has quoted his sources only in general terms; we find also numerous places in which he mentions his authorities by name. Such is his method in speaking of the size of the chryselephantine statue in the temple of Zeus at Olympia (p. 354): *ἀνέγραψαν δέ τινες τὰ μέτρα τοῦ ξοάνου, καὶ Καλλιμαχος ἐν ἰάμβῳ τινὶ ἐξείπε*. But an appeal to another's authority in such a matter is, perhaps, not strange, and this point, while of interest cumulatively, is not especially significant of itself.

Only a degree more important is our author's quotation (p. 366):

περὶ δὲ τῆς φύσεως τῶν τόπων καὶ τούτων [i. e., Λακωνικῶν] καὶ τῶν Μεσσηνιακῶν ταῦτα μὲν ἀποδεκτόν λέγοντος Εὐριπίδου· τὴν γὰρ Λακωνικὴν φησιν ἔχειν "πολὸν μὲν ἄροτον, ἐκπονεῖν δ' οὐ ῥάδιον· κοίλῃ γὰρ, ὅρεσι περιδρομος, τραχεῖά τε δυσσεῖσβολός τε πολεμῖος," τὴν δὲ Μεσσηνιακὴν "καλλίκαρπον κατάρντον τε μυρίοισι νάμασι, καὶ βουσί καὶ ποίμναισιν εὐβοτωτάτην οὐτ' ἐν πνοαῖσι χερίματος δυσχείμερον, οὗτ' αὖ τεθρίπποις ἡλίου θερμὴν ἄγαν."

Strabo may be permitted to borrow a poetic description, but one more than suspects that he does so here because of his own lack of knowledge. The remainder of the page should also be taken into consideration, together with the mention of Tyrtaeus.

For the location of Thyrea (cf. Frazer's *Paus.* III, p. 308; V, p. 605) Strabo makes use (p. 376) of Thucydides:

Θυρέας δὲ Ὅμηρος μὲν οὐκ ὠνόμασεν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι θρυλοῦσι· . . . εἶναι δέ φησι τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο Θουκυδίδης (ii. 27; iv. 56) ἐν τῇ Κυνουρίᾳ κατὰ τὴν μεθορίαν τῆς Ἀργείας καὶ τῆς Λακωνικῆς.

If Bursian is correct (*Geog.* II, p. 71), the city was never rebuilt after its destruction by the Athenians in 424 B. C., and Thucydides mentions its site for this reason. Pausanias does not describe it.

Of Helice, the submerged city of Achaea, Strabo says (p. 384):

Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδεῖν φησι τὸν τόπον, καὶ τοὺς πορθμέας λέγειν ὡς ἐν τῷ πόρῳ ὀρθὸς ἐστήκει Ποσειδῶν χάλκεος, ἔχων ἱππόκαμπον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ κίνδυνον φέροντα τοῖς δικτυεῦσιν.

The inference is clear that Strabo himself had not visited the site. In Arcadia he appeals again to the same author (p. 389):

Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ φησι περὶ Φενεὸν μὲν τὸν Ἀνίαν καλούμενον ποταμὸν λιμνάζειν τὰ πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, καταδύεσθαι δ' εἰς τινὰς ἡθμούς οὓς καλεῖσθαι ζέρεθρα.

Parapotamii in Phocis is described at some length by Strabo on the authority of Theopompus (p. 424):

Παραποτάμιοι δ' εἰσὶ κατοικία τις ἐπὶ τῷ Κηφισσῷ ἰδρυμένη . . . φησὶ δὲ Θεόπομπος τὸν τόπον τοῦτον διέχειν τῆς μὲν Χαιρωνείας ὅσον τετταράκοντα σταδίου, . . . κείσθαι δ' ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμβολῆς τῆς ἐκ Βοιωτίας εἰς Φωκέας ἐν λόφῳ μετρίως ὑψηλῷ, κ. τ. λ.

But the site in reality was deserted before Strabo's time (*Plut. Sulla* 16), and Pausanias was able to say (x. 33. 8) οὔτε ἔνθα τῆς χώρας ᾠκίσθη ἡ πόλις μνημονεύουσιν.

Of Halus in Thessaly Strabo declares (p. 433), Ἀρτεμίδωρος δὲ τὴν Ἄλουν ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ τίθησι—but probably no one would venture to claim that Strabo saw any part of Thessaly.

In yet another group of places Strabo's want of autopsy is evidenced by his apparent or confessed perplexity as to the interpretation of his authorities. This is sometimes shown by his confusion of tenses. Touching Lepreum he says (p. 344):

τοῦ δὲ Πύλου πρὸς νότον ἐστὶ τὸ Λέπρειον. ἦν δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἡ πόλις ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάττης ἐν τετταράκοντα σταδίοις.

The case is identical in his description of Olympia (pp. 353 f.).

ἐστι δ' ἐν τῇ Πισάτιδι τὸ ἱερὸν . . . πρόκειται δ' ἄλσος . . . τὴν αὔξῃσιν ὅσῃν ἴσμεν ἔλαβε διὰ τε τὴν πανήγυριν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα . . . ἐκοσμήθη δ' ἐκ τοῦ πληθους τῶν ἀναθημάτων, ἅπερ ἐκ πάσης ἀνείθετο Ἑλλάδος, ὧν ἦν καὶ ὁ χρυσοῦς σφυρήλατος Ζεύς, . . . ὑπῆρξε τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ξάνον . . . δαίκνυνται δὲ καὶ γραφαὶ πολλαὶ κ. τ. λ.

A significant instance is (p. 350): *αὐτοῦ δέ που καὶ ἡ Οἶχα-
λία ἐστὶν ἢ τοῦ Εὐρύτου ἢ νῦν Ἀνδανία.*

Of Pisa Strabo asserts (p. 356):

*τὴν δὲ πόλιν ἰδρυμένην ἐξ' ὕψους δεκνύουσι μεταξὺ δυεῖν ὁροῖν, Ὕσσης καὶ
Ὀλύμπου, ὁμωνύμων τοῖς ἐν Θετταλίᾳ.*

But after so definite a location, implying someone's recent autopsy, if not his own, he adds in the next words:

*τινὲς δὲ πόλιν μὲν οὐδεμίαν γεγενέαι Πισάν φασιν . . . κρήνην δὲ μόνον
ἦν νῦν καλεῖσθαι Βῖσαν, . . . Στησίχορον δὲ καλεῖν πόλιν τὴν χώραν Πισαν
λεγομένην.*

A less important example of such doubt is found in Strabo's mention of Sicyon (p. 382):

*ἀνέκτισε δ' αὐτὴν ἀπὸ θαλάττης ὅσον ἑκοσι σταδίοις (οἱ δὲ δώδεκά φασιν)
ἐπὶ λόφον ἐρυμνὸν Δημήτριος.*

But the next three examples of this sort make it impossible to suppose that Strabo visited the sites in question, and accordingly, may be quoted without comment:

(p. 368) *τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα τοῦ Ἀργολικοῦ (i. e., κόλπου) Λάκωνες ἔχουσι, τὰ
δὲ λοιπὰ Ἀργεῖοι· ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ τῶν μὲν Λακώνων τὸ Δῆλιον ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος
. . . καὶ Μινῶα . . . καὶ ἡ λιμνηρὰ Ἐπίδαυρος, ὡς Ἀρτεμίδωρος φησιν.
'Απολλόδωρος δὲ Κυθήρων πλησίον ἱστορεῖ ταύτην.—(p. 456) μεταξὺ δὲ τῆς
'Ιθάκης καὶ τῆς Κεφαλληνίας ἡ Ἀστερία νησίον . . . ἦν ὁ μὲν Σκήψιος μὴ
μένειν τοιαύτην οἶαν φησὶν ὁ ποιητής . . . ὁ δὲ Ἀπολλόδωρος μένειν καὶ νῦν,
καὶ πολίχνην λέγει ἐν αὐτῇ Ἀλαλκομενάς.—(p. 460) Ἀρτεμίδωρος μὲν [οὐχ]
οὕτω περὶ τῆς εἴτε Χαλκίδος εἴτε Χαλκίας τοῦ ὄρους, μεταξὺ τοῦ Ἀχελώου καὶ
τῆς Πλευρώως ἰδρύων αὐτήν, Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ, ὡς πρότερον εἶπον, ὑπὲρ τῆς
Μολυκρείας καὶ τὴν Χαλκίδα καὶ τὸν Ταφιασσόν· κ. τ. λ.*

But still more important for our present purpose are Strabo's misstatements. Whether his comment on the stadium at Olympia is to be put under this category perhaps can not be determined with certainty. He says (p. 353): *πρόκειται δ' ἄλσος ἀγριε-
λαίων, ἐν ᾗ τὸ στάδιον.* One may venture to express a doubt whether this is an accurate description of the conditions existing in Strabo's time, and not rather an inference drawn from the derivation of the word ἄλτις from ἄλσος (an original grove) and the knowledge that the wreath of wild olive was awarded as a

prize. Pindar (*Ol.* 3. 18; 8. 9; cf. Curtius, in Curtius and Adler *Olympia*, Text I, p. 21) indeed speaks of the ἄλσος at Olympia, but as Strabo himself elsewhere remarks (p. 412), οἱ δὲ ποιηταὶ κοσμοῦσιν, ἄλση καλοῦντες τὰ ἱερὰ πάντα κὰν ἦ ψιλά. A similar comment is made by the scholiast on the first passage quoted from Pindar. By Strabo's time the Altis had received practically its final form, and one finds difficulty in seeing a place for the grove in front of the temple—for "temple" is what Strabo usually means by ἱερόν. Pausanias uses the word ἄλσος (v. 101) in a very general sense. The wreath was taken from a single sacred tree (Paus. v. 7. 7; 15. 3).

However this may be, another passage seems to show conclusively that Strabo had not seen the precinct of Olympia. After speaking of the aid rendered Phidias by his nephew Panaenus in decorating the great statue, Strabo adds (p. 354), δέικνυνται δὲ καὶ γραφαὶ πολλαί τε καὶ θαυμασταὶ περὶ τὸ ἱερόν ἐκείνου ἔργα. Unless the word περὶ is used with astounding inaccuracy, Strabo's ignorance of the true location is certain; the paintings of Panaenus were surely *in* the temple, whether beneath or around the throne (Paus. v. 11. 5). We have already commented on Strabo's authority for the measurements of the great ξόανον and his confusion of tenses in his description of Olympia. His silence regarding the other temples and buildings is also significant.

Another error is the statement (p. 359): κοινὴ δ' ἐστὶν ἀμφοῖν (i. e., Triphylia and Messenia) ἄκρα. Elsewhere he says, presumably correctly (p. 348): νυνὶ μὲν οὖν τῇ Τριφυλίᾳ πρὸς τὴν Μεσσηνίαν ὄριόν ἐστι τὸ τῆς Νέδας ρεῦμα. The Neda empties into the sea through a plain; no promontory is near (Curtius *Pelop.* II, p. 130)—nor is any other considerable promontory along this coast. Platamodes (p. 348) is undoubtedly in Messenia.

Strabo states of the Pamisus River in Messenia (p. 361) μέγιστος δ' ἐστὶ ποταμῶν τῶν ἐντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ. It is, of course, markedly inferior in size to both the Alpheus and the Eurotas.

He is also in error regarding the range of Ταῖγetus (p. 363):

συνάπτον κατὰ τὰ προσάρκτια μέρη ταῖς Ἀρκαδικαῖς ὑπωρεΐαις, ὥστε καταλείπεσθαι μεταξὺ αὐλῶνα, καθ' ὃν ἡ Μεσσηνία συνεχῆς ἐστὶ τῇ Λακωνικῇ.

The nearest approach to such a defile is the celebrated Langada Pass, but this is not situated so far north as the spot Strabo apparently has in mind, nor can it properly be described as an *αὐλὼν καθ' ὃν ἡ Μεσσηνία κ. τ. λ.* (cf. Frazer *Paus.* III, p. 437).

A difficult question to decide from the evidence submitted either by Strabo or Pausanias is with respect to the location of Scyllaeum promontory (p. 368). The present space will not permit a discussion of the point; enough to say is that Strabo is probably wrong (cf. Frazer *Paus.* III, p. 290: "It seems more likely that all three writers, Strabo, Pliny, and Pausanias, were misinformed"). The same may be said of the limits set by Strabo for the Hermionic Gulf (p. 369; cf. Frazer. *Paus.* III, pp. 290 ff.).

Strabo is again wrong in his view of the watering of Argolis (p. 370). His maps showed him several rivers in this district, and he is, accordingly, impelled to emend Homer's *πολυδίψιον Ἄργος* (Δ 171) to *πολὺν δ' ἔψιον Ἄργος*. He did not know that the rivers are, and doubtless were, usually dry, and Homer's epithet is apt (cf. Bursian *Geog.* II, p. 40; Frazer *Paus.* III, p. 96).

One may query, in passing, if, in his statement (p. 372), *ἄργος δὲ καὶ τὸ πεδίον λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις, παρ' Ὀμήρῳ δ' οὐδ' ἄπαξ*, Strabo does not confuse the Argive plain with the *ἀργόν* plain in Arcadia (Paus. viii. 7. 1).

In the case of Mycenae Strabo's inaccuracy is well known. His (p. 372) *ὥστε νῦν μὴδ' ἔχνος εὐρίσκεσθαι τῆς Μυκηναίων πόλεως* and his (p. 377) *αἱ μὲν οὖν Μυκῆναι νῦν οὐκέτ' εἰσὶν* correspond ill with the brief but accurate description of Pausanias, or with the remains as they still were before Schliemann's work began.

In his description of Arcadia Strabo is least satisfactory. Knowing that inhabitants from many towns had been brought by the advice of Epaminondas into Megalopolis, he assumes that (p. 388) *τῇ τε χώρῳ οἱ γεωργήσαντες ἐκλελοίπασιν*. This can never have been completely true. So the hyperbolic remark of a comic poet (*ibid.*; cf. p. 738), *ἐρημία μεγάλη ὅστιν ἡ Μεγάλη πόλις*, Strabo takes as a statement of fact. But coins, remains, and at least one inscription testify to the existence of a more or less flourishing community in Megalopolis at the time of which Strabo writes. The theater was just undergoing extensive repairs (Frazer

Paus. IV, pp. 347, 352). Of the other Arcadian cities which our author says (p. 388), *ἡ οὐκέτ' εἰσὶν ἢ μόλις αὐτῶν ἵχνη φαίνεται καὶ σημεῖα*, at least six (Caphyae, Clitor, Heraea, Mantinea, Orchomenus, and Pheneus) are proven by coins to have been "still inhabited and doing business long after the agreeable, but not too scrupulously accurate, geographer had been gathered to his fathers" (Frazer *Paus.* I, p. xcii). In the case of Mantinea, as Frazer notes (*loc. cit.*), Strabo's ignorance of true conditions is especially evident. Pausanias found these cities still flourishing.

Our author's quotation from Eratosthenes regarding Pheneus has been mentioned. One may question, too, whether the statement (p. 389), *περὶ Φενεὸν δ' ἔστι καὶ τὸ καλούμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ*, is not somewhat inaccurate.

When he comes, in his discussion, to Piraeus, where the traveler must disembark for Athens, Strabo says (p. 395 f.; cf. p. 654):

οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ πόλεμοι . . . τὸν τε Πειραιᾶ συνέστειλαν εἰς ὀλίγην κατοικίαν τὴν περὶ τοὺς λυμένας καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ σωτήρος,

and then he mentions the paintings and colonnades of this sanctuary. But Pausanias was able, generations later, to name not only the temple of Zeus, but also (i. 1) the Long Colonnade, two markets, the ship-sheds, sanctuaries of Artemis, Demeter, Athena, and Zeus, together with various altars and images; and the evidence of coins, inscriptions, and ruins testifies to his correctness. Indeed, a well-known inscription ('*Εφ. Ἀρχ.*, 1884, cols. 165 ff.; cf. Frazer *Paus.* II, pp. 14f; Judeich *Topographie von Athen*, p. 97, n. 15) indicates that not even Pausanias named all the buildings left in Piraeus from ancient times. It is hard, therefore, to believe that Strabo saw the city at all—and if not Piraeus, not Athens.

That the last inference is correct we have been led to think also from our author's remark on the Lyceum and the Diochares gate. To this we may now add his apparent blunder in the quotation or interpretation of a passage from the Asian Hegesias—a strange authority withal for Athenian topography! Hegesias is quoted as saying (p. 396):

ὁρῶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν καὶ τὸ περιττῆς τριαίνης ἐκεῖθι σημεῖον, ὁρῶ τὴν Ἑλευσῖνα, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γέγονα μύστης· ἐκεῖνο Λεωκόριον, τοῦτο Θησεῖον· κ. τ. λ.

That is, in the midst of an enumeration of Athenian places of note, Hegesias is made to speak of a deme seventeen miles away and not visible from any part of Athens. That this is Strabo's understanding of the passage is shown by his words a little farther on, 'Ελευσινά τε εἰπὼν ἓνα τῶν . . . δῆμων κ. τ. λ. (cf. Richards *Class. Rev.* X (1896), pp. 383 f.). With little doubt, however, Hegesias meant—or should have meant; we have no evidence respecting his personal knowledge of Athens—the *Eleusinium*. The exact location of this precinct is not certain, but it was close to the Acropolis, and with the interpretation suggested, the passage becomes more consistent. Of course, Strabo could not have meant to bring Eleusis into so close proximity with Athens, and the probability is that he was unacquainted with the *Eleusinium*.

Again, the remark (p. 399), μαρμάρου δ' ἐστὶ τῆς τε 'Τμηττίας καὶ τῆς Πεντελικῆς κάλλιστα μέταλλα πλησίον τῆς πόλεως, may be due to the same misunderstanding of the true conditions. *πλησίον* is a relative term, and its interpretation is partly a matter of personal opinion; but while entirely applicable to Hymettus, which sometimes seems very near to Athens, the use of the term with reference to Pentelicus, appears a little strange. Furthermore, we have an expression of Strabo's in regard to the distance of Onchestus from Helicon—which is much less than the distance of Athens from Pentelicus—that favors the view just expressed. The passage is as follows (p. 412):

οὕτω καὶ τοῦ 'Ορχηστοῦ κατέψευσαι [i. e., 'Αλκαῖος] πρὸς ταῖς ἐσχατιαῖς τοῦ 'Ελικῶνος αὐτὸν τιθείς· ὁ δ' ἐστὶν ἄπωθεν ἱκανῶς τοῦτον τοῦ ὄρους.

As a matter of fact, the opinion of Alcaeus is not far from the truth. The site of Onchestus is on the summit of "a low ridge which connects the Sphinx Mountain (*Phaga*) with the roots of Helicon" (Frazer *Paus.* V, p. 139).

Strabo's description of other parts of Attica is also unsatisfactory. In his enumeration of the demes he makes at least two serious errors. *περὶ δὲ 'Ανάφλυστόν ἐστι*, he says (p. 398), *καὶ τὸ Πανεῖον καὶ τὸ τῆς Κωλιάδος 'Αφροδίτης ἱερόν*. This means a distortion of twenty-five or thirty kilometers in the location either of Cape Colias or of Anaphlystus, as well as a mistake in the order

of mention (cf. *Amer. Jour. Arch.* VII [1903], p. 286). On the other side of Attica he names (p. 399) Myrrhinus between Halae Araphenides and Probalinthus. Instead of Myrrhinus he should have said Myrrhinutte (Frazer *Paus.* II, p. 413). Respecting the demes in central Attica he says (p. 399), τοὺς δ' ἐν τῇ μεσογαίᾳ δήμους τῆς Ἀττικῆς μακρὸν εἰπεῖν διὰ τὸ πλῆθος. But some of the largest and most important are thus omitted and one may fairly suspect that here οἱ τοὺς περίπλους . . . ἐπιγράψαντες failed him, and he did not deem it worth while to investigate further—as he seems to have done in the case of the Elean Samos (p. 347). Of the Cephissus he says (p. 400), χειμαρρώδης τὸ πλέον, θέρου δὲ μειοῦται τελέως. But the Cephissus is never wholly dry “even in the most scorching heat of summer” (Frazer *Paus.* II, p. 492; Plut. *Sulla* 16), and, as we have seen, Strabo was in Corinth in the spring.

In his description of Boeotia Strabo speaks of the Melas River as (p. 407) ῥέοντα διὰ τῆς Ἀλιαρτίας; which is manifestly impossible, since it courses the opposite side of the Copaic plain. He uses better authorities when he declares (p. 415) that the Melas is between Orchomenus and Aspledon. Of the same stream Strabo declares (p. 407) that now ἡφάνισται τελέως; in reality the Melas “is the only one which, after the lake has been drained, continues to flow across the whole width of the plain in a deep bed of its own” (Frazer *Paus.* V, p. 111).

Strabo further declares (p. 410):

νυνὶ δὲ μόνῃ (Thespia) συνέστηκε τῶν Βοιωτικῶν πόλεων καὶ Τάναγρα· τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἐρείπια καὶ ὀνόματα λέλειπται.

In his own description of the individual towns he seems to forget this extravagant assertion, as will be seen, for example, in the following expressions: of Thebes (p. 403), οὐδὲ κώμης ἀξιολόγου τύπον σῶζουσι; Graea (p. 404) ἐστὶ τόπος Ὁρωποῦ πλησίον; (*ibid.*) Mycalessus κεῖται δὲ παρ' ὁδόν; (*ibid.*) ὅπου νῦν ἐστὶ τὸ ἱερὸν αὐτοῦ (Amphiaraus); (*ibid.*) Hyria τῆς Ταναγραίας νῦν ἐστὶ; (*ibid.*) Heleum ἐστὶ κώμη Ταναγρικῇ; (*ibid.*) Anthedon πόλις λιμένα ἔχουσα; (p. 408) Scolus ἐστὶ κώμη τῆς Παρασωπίας; (p. 411) Thisbe Θίσβαι νῦν λέγονται, οἱ κεῖται δὲ μικρὸν ὑπὲρ

τῆς θαλάττης; (*ibid.*) Coronea ἐγγὺς τοῦ Ἑλικῶνός ἐστιν; (p. 413) Acraephium κεῖται ἐν ὕψει; (p. 414) Chaeronea ἐστὶν Ὀρχομενοῦ πλησίον, δέικνυται δὲ κἀνταῦθα ταφή; (*ibid.*) Lebadea ἐστίν, ὅπου μαντεῖον ἵδρυνται, καταβαίνει δ' αὐτὸς ὁ χρηστηριαζόμενος· κεῖται δὲ κ. τ. λ.; (*ibid.*) Leuctra ἐστίν, δέικνυται δὲ ὁ τόπος οὗτος κ. τ. λ. In part of these instances the author may be referring to the site in general without regard to present habitation. Yet in a few cases he specifies sites which he supposes to be deserted, as, Harma (p. 404), κῶμη ἔρημος; Isus (p. 405), ἔχνη πόλεως; Haliartus (p. 411), νῦν οὐκέτι ἐστί; Onchestus (p. 412), ψιλός and ἱερὸν καὶ αὐτὸ ψιλόν.

On the whole, there is probably much error in Strabo's views on the desolation of Boeotian towns. Pausanias found most of the towns which Strabo names more or less inhabited. In the hundred and fifty years between the times of the two men some towns may have sprung up again, but this is not to be expected to any considerable extent. Furthermore, we have ample evidence as to the existence of cities which Strabo thinks deserted. On the authority of the Pseudo-Dicaearchus, in a work written not long before Strabo's day, we learn of flourishing settlements at Oropus, Tanagra, Plataea, Thebes, and Anthedon—probably also at Coronea, Onchestus, and Haliartus (*Müller Frag. Hist. Graec.* II, pp. 254 ff.; Fuhr *Dicaearchi Frag.*, pp. 140 ff.; cf. Frazer *Paus.* I, pp. xliii ff.). Again in the case of Haliartus, where, in addition to his general statement (see above), Strabo specifically declares (p. 411) νῦν οὐκέτι ἐστί, we have inscriptional evidence to the contrary (Frazer *Paus.* V, p. 166). Of the grove of Onchestus, which Strabo says was bare in his time, Pausanias declares (ix. 26. 5): ἐπ' ἐμοῦ δὲ ναός τε καὶ ἄγαλμα Ποσειδῶνος ἐλείπετο Ὀγχηστίου καὶ τὸ ἄλσος ὃ δὴ καὶ Ὀμηρος ἐπήνεσε. Frazer suggests (*Paus.* I, p. xciii) that the trees might have sprung up again between the times of Strabo and Pausanias. But in view of Strabo's many mistakes, we may reasonably suppose him in error here also (cf. also Plut. *Sulla*, *passim*).

In regard to Phocis the situation is similar—the treatment of Delphi has been discussed. Strabo's description, in the first place, omits several important cities, which were flourishing in

in Pausanias' time and probably earlier. Of these are Tithorea, a small but growing town in Sulla's day (Plut. *Sulla* 15) and able to set up a statue to Nerva in 98 A. D. (Frazer *Paus.* V, p. 405); Amphiclea (*ibid.*, pp. 420 ff.); and Stiris, shown by an inscription to have been prosperous as late as the first half of the second century B. C. (*ibid.*, pp. 446 ff.).

Strabo gives Medeum (p. 410) a location inconsistent with that of Pausanias and with the known union between this town and Stiris (Frazer *Paus.* V, p. 453). Crisa is located on the coast (pp. 416, 418) between Cirrha and Anticyra, instead of near *Chryso* on the mountain-side (Frazer *Paus.* V, pp. 459 ff.). Abae (p. 423) is placed not far from Medeum, Ambrysus, Pharygium, and sites on the Bay of *Aspra Spitia*, while, in fact, it is far across the state near the boundary of Locris—and all these places are set near Ascrea, which is farther away than Abae. Elatea is supposed (p. 418) ἐπικεῖσθαι τοῖς στενοῖς καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα ταύτην ἔχειν τὰς εἰσβολὰς τὰς εἰς τὴν Φωκίδα καὶ τὴν Βοιωτίαν, while it really lies at the head of a narrow glen on the edge of a large plain and not in the pass at all (Frazer *Paus.* V, p. 428). The discrepancy between Strabo's statement (p. 418; cf. pp. 407, 424) that this city is πασῶν μεγίστη τῶν ἐνταῦθα πόλεων, and that of Pausanias (x. 34. 1), μεγίστη πόλεων ἐστὶ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ γε τοὺς Δελφοὺς, must be noted. As Frazer remarks (*loc. cit.*): "The relative sizes of the two cities may have altered between the time of Strabo and the time of Pausanias." The fact that Strabo agrees with such writers as Harpocration, Suidas, and Stephanus Byzantius is of little moment.

Quite as important as the quotations and errors that have been discussed is the fact that Strabo's entire description of Greece lacks the touch of the first-hand observer. Paucity of detail and dryness of expression betray everywhere the lack of personal knowledge, in marked contrast with the account of Pausanias and with Strabo's own narrative of places that he had visited, as, for example, Rome and Egypt. This might be illustrated by numerous comparisons, but one will suffice—the parallel accounts of Pausanias and Strabo touching the oracle of Trophonius at

Lebadea. The picture of the former (portrayed in three Teubner pages, ix, chap. 39) is most vivid. The story of the preliminary sacrifices, the baths, the anointings, the draughts of holy water, the difficult descent on one's back through the opening, and one's memorable feelings when within the cavern, makes almost needless the remarks with which he closes, *γράφω δὲ οὐκ ἀκουήν, ἀλλὰ ἐτέρους τε ἰδὼν καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ Τροφωνίῳ χρησάμενος*. With this compare the meager account of Strabo (p. 414):

Λεβάδεια δ' ἐστίν, ὅπου Διὸς Τροφωνίων μαντεῖον ἴδρνται, χάσματος ὑπόμουν κατάβασιν ἔχον, καταβαίνει δ' αὐτὸς ὁ χρηστήριαζόμενος.

And to heighten the contrast one may read Strabo's excellent description of the Plutonium at Hierapolis in Phrygia (pp. 629 f.), a natural phenomenon somewhat comparable with the Lebadean oracle.

Tozer remarks (*History of Ancient Geography*, p. 241) in this connection that "the fulness of detail with which he has delineated that town [Corinth] contrasts strangely with his notices of the rest of the country." Even a casual reading of the *Helladica* will show this to be true. Strabo's complete narrative of Corinth mentions a number of interesting sites and fills six Teubner pages. Argos is treated in as many lines. The topography of Athens requires less than a page—most of this borrowed from Hegesias and Polemo. Megara is hardly more than mentioned. A single line suffices for Sparta. The inference is evident.

The conclusion to which we are led by the facts here outlined has already been stated, and corresponds with the theory of Niese. Strabo's *Helladica* is essentially literary in plan and in execution. No claim for the author's personal observation is made by him, except in the case of Corinth, and the evidence indicates that Corinth is the only site that he visited. The bearing of this conclusion on our use of Strabo's unsupported testimony in archaeological and topothetical investigation is sufficiently obvious.

IOWA CITY, IOWA