Why Naupaktos: Endings and Beginnings in Pausanias, Book X
Aaron W. Wenzel (Ohio State University)

Pausanias abruptly begins his *Periegesis* by saying that "Cape Sounion juts out from the land of Attica" (I.1.1). Scholars have long noted that the text has no proper introduction but seems to imagine the reader approaching Greece across the Aegean on a ship from Asia Minor, as the author himself had. Bowie (2001) argued that Pausanias must have written a now-lost preface. Less attention has been paid, however, to the equally abrupt ending of the *Periegesis* at Naupaktos. Book X ends with the foundation story of a temple of Asklepios at Naupaktos. Porter (2001) has offered a "meta-literary" interpretation of this story as programmatic for Pausanias' larger project, and Ellinger (2005) has similarly touched on the religious significance of ending the work in a temple to the god of healing. Neither of these scholars, however, addresses the question of why Pausanias chose to end in Naupaktos in the first place. This paper argues that the answer lies in the city's geographical and historical importance. Furthermore, I believe that understanding the end of the *Periegesis* can add to the emerging consensus that Pausanias did not write an exhaustive guide to the Greek mainland, but rather, created a literary monument which memorializes a particular moment in Greek history: the pre-Roman past.

While some scholars have argued that Book X is incomplete, I agree with Porter that these arguments do not hold water. Rather, Pausanias *intended* to end his tour of Greece in Naupaktos. Just as Cape Sounion is the first indication of mainland Greece when one approaches Athens by sea from the east, Naupaktos (as a port of western Greece) is an indication that one has finally left Greece when sailing on to Italy and the West. But why finish in Naupaktos, rather than a larger and busier port like Nikopolis or Patras? This paper argues that there are two reasons. First, Nikopolis and Patras were connected with Roman rule in a way that Naupaktos was not, thus making it difficult for Pausanias to fit such ports into his largely de-Romanized imaginary Greece. These two cities were tainted for Pausanias by their Roman history, but Naupaktos had not been significantly impacted by the Roman conquest. Therefore, it could provide a suitable conclusion to Pausanias' vision of a pre-Roman Greece.

The second reason is that Naupaktos had been an Athenian naval base in the Peloponnesian War. Pausanias recounts this fact in Book IV on Messenia, since the Athenians had given Naupaktos to Messenian refugees following their defeat by Sparta in the Third Messenian War. Out of gratitude to the Athenians, the Messenians then allowed the Athenians to use Naupaktos as a naval station for their attacks on the Peloponnese. Pausanias does not re-tell this history in Book X, but the reader would remember that Naupaktos was, in effect, Athenian. In this way, Pausanias can end his description of Greece with an outpost of Athens in the West (just as he began with Cape Sounion, the south-easternmost tip of Attica), thus tying together Books I and X by relating them to Athens. By doing so, Pausanias emphasizes the key role Athens played in his conceptual geography – it was the beginning and end of Greece.

Within the last decade, scholars have begun to see the *Periegesis* less as a text to be mined for details about Greek monuments and religious practices and more as a consciously constructed literary work based on a selective description of Greece. Hutton (2005) and Elsner (1992, 2001) have been at the forefront of this movement, discussing how Pausanias carefully structures the imaginary Greece which he describes. Alcock (1996) and Porter (2001) have written about Pausanias' attempts to create a memory of the classical Greek past through his descriptions of classical monuments and events. My paper builds upon these scholars' work to show how the twin themes of selective geography and memory of the past are combined to provide a fitting end-point to the *Periegesis*.