

PAUSANIAS, II, 2, 3: A COLLATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE

(PLATE 80)

ἐν δὲ Κεγχρέαις Ἀφροδίτης τέ ἐστι ναὸς καὶ ἄγαλμα λίθου, μετὰ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ
ἐρύματι τῷ διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης Ποσειδῶνος χαλκοῦν, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἕτερον πέρασ τοῦ
λιμένος Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ Ἰσίδος ἱερά.

Pausanias, II, 2, 3.

“In Cenchreae are a temple and a stone statue of Aphrodite, after it on the mole running into the sea a bronze image of Poseidon, and at the other end of the harbour sanctuaries of Asclepius and of Isis.”¹

IN their monumental work, *A Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*, F. Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner published an uncommon Corinthian issue of the Antonine period, the reverse of which provides an exegesis for this passage (Pl. 80, a).² An approximately semicircular harbor scene is the main element of the die design. Temples stand at both extremities of this harbor. They are connected by what appears to be either a colonnade or a series of ship or landing slips. In the harbor itself and between the temples, there stands a statue of Poseidon holding a trident and dolphin. In the foreground, three ships under sail appear. The legend above the design, C(OLONIA) L(AVS) J(VLIA) COR(INTHVS), suggests that the port depicted was either Lechaion or Kenchreai, the two emporia that served the metropolis of Corinth. While there is no specific identification of the port, in light of the above passage there can be no doubt that the harbor represented is in fact Kenchreai.

This Corinthian coin is from one of several similar local issues struck throughout

¹ The text and translation are from the Loeb edition of Pausanias edited by W. H. S. Jones.

I wish to thank Professor Robert L. Scranton of the University of Chicago for reading this note and for his valuable suggestions. Professor Scranton, along with Professor Edwin Ramage of Indiana University, directed the excavations at Kenchreai conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, through the joint sponsorship of Indiana University and the University of Chicago.

² F. Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner, *A Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*, London, 1887, p. 17, pl. D, LX. Schubring's recension of Pausanias (Teubner, 1881), which is used by Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner, is the same as the Loeb text cited for Pausanias, II, 2, 3.

Two other Kenchreai harbor coins appear in K. Lehmann-Hartleben's *Die antiken Hafenanlagen des Mittelmeeres*, *Klio*, Beiheft XIV, 1923, Münztafel, nos. 10 and 11 (Pl. 80, b, c). His coin no. 10 is from the same series as the one illustrated by Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner. No. 11, however, portrays another deity in the entrance to the harbor and not Poseidon.

the empire during the reign of Antoninus Pius to commemorate official interest in maritime affairs. These various harbor coins, discussed in great detail by Aline Abaecherli Boyce, provide numismatic confirmation of this emperor's construction efforts enunciated in the *Historia Augusta* (*S.H.A. Pius*, 8, 2-3).³ If Boyce is correct in her claim that the various local series with harbor scenes proclaim Antoninus's attempts to provide closer ties between Rome and the provinces through extensive imperial port construction and refurbishment, this issue suggests that Corinthia was not neglected in his grand plan. It may well speak of some officially sponsored repair or extension of existing facilities at Kenchreai during his reign. There is even the possibility that in addition to the general message of the coin, a more specific event was being honored. The erection of the statue of Poseidon, depicted on the reverse and mentioned by Pausanias, may have been the occasion for the issue.

Supporting evidence for this claim is circumstantial but compelling. First of all, it is very unlikely that this Poseidon image dates from Kenchreai's Hellenic or Hellenistic past. A similar statue *may* have adorned Kenchreai's Greek harbor, now believed to be west of the visible remains of Roman facilities recently excavated by the University of Chicago and Indiana University.⁴ But if so, Mummius surely would not have missed such a prize during his pillage of Corinth, the city served by Kenchreai, and its *raison d'être*.⁵ The monumental bronze statue depicted on this coin is most likely Roman, placed near the harbor entrance sometime after 44 B.C., the year in which Corinth was resettled.

Shortly after this recolonization, Strabo (VIII, 6, 22) visited the area but failed to mention a statue or temples in his account of Kenchreai. His silence seems to suggest that the major construction efforts in the port area were in the future. Sometime after his visit but before the travels and writings of Pausanias, during or just after the reign of Antoninus, the port facilities were constructed and the Poseidon erected.⁶

During the imperial period, municipal mints, such as the one at Corinth, normally noticed events of regional importance on bronze issues which were intended primarily

³ Aline Abaecherli Boyce, "The Harbor of Pompeiopolis: A Study in Roman Imperial Ports and Dated Coins," *A.J.A.*, LXII, 1958, pp. 67-78.

⁴ See Robert L. Scranton and Edwin S. Ramage, "Investigations at Corinthian Kenchreai," *Hesperia*, XXXVI, 1967, pp. 124-186 and other preliminary reports there cited in p. 124, note 1.

The location of Kenchreai's Greek port was suggested by Professor Scranton in a paper presented at the Archaeological Institute of America's Seventieth General Meeting, in Toronto, December, 1968; resume of paper, "Kenchreai—1968," *A.J.A.*, LXXIII, 1969, p. 245.

⁵ I here follow F. Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁶ H. N. Fowler and R. Stillwell, *Corinth*, I, *Introduction-Topography-Architecture*, Cambridge, 1932, p. 74, also suggest that the Poseidon image was erected between the visit of Strabo, shortly after the resettlement, and the writing of Book II by Pausanias, after A.D. 165 (p. 24). On the date of composition of Book II, see also H. Comfort, "The Date of Pausanias, Book II," *A.J.A.*, XXXV, 1931, p. 314, who offers a number of termini for the writing of this book based on archaeological and numismatic evidence. All dates are during or just after the reign of Antoninus Pius.

for local use. The erection of a presumably larger-than-life statue in Kenchreai's harbor is the type of event that the mint at Corinth could be expected to honor with a commemorative issue. In this regard, the failure of the Corinthian mint to portray the statue on a coin series before the Antonine period is significant, particularly since other steps in the progressive development of the harbor seem to be suggested by other Corinthian series. One can perhaps associate the construction or dedication of the temple of Aphrodite mentioned by Pausanias with an issue struck at Corinth during the reign of Nero.⁷ These bronze coins bear an Aphrodite as a reverse type with the legend, CENCRHEAE (*sic*), inscribed on a galley below. Another coin struck at Corinth during the reign of Hadrian, bearing two nymphs as a reverse type with the legend, LECH CENCH, may announce a further elaboration of the port complex at that time.⁸ But it is not until the Antonine period that the port, approximately as described by Pausanias, appears as a type on a Corinthian issue.

From evidence provided by K. Lehmann-Hartleben, it appears that the general type of harbor scene with temples actually appeared on *two* series struck during the Antonine period.⁹ The first, and probably the earliest, is similar to the reverse with Poseidon except that another deity stands between the two moles (Pl. 80, c).¹⁰ Lehmann-Hartleben's comment on the two series—that they indicate the presence of many statues in the Kenchreai port—is not convincing.¹¹ If indeed the harbor was distinguished by several monumental statues, why did Pausanias, who visited Kenchreai shortly after the issuance of this coin, neglect to mention them? It is more likely that the deity which appears first on the harbor series was in fact replaced at some time during the Antonine period with the bronze Poseidon seen by Pausanias. The second series (Pl. 80, b), which provides a commentary for Pausanias, II, 2, 3, may honor an extension of harbor facilities at Kenchreai and seemingly commemorates the dedication and erection of the Poseidon image.

But regardless of the specific or general commemorative intent of this series, the numismatic representation of the harbor does not coincide with the description of Pausanias. Although both sources acknowledge the existence of a temple at one end of the harbor and a sanctuary (with a temple?) at the other, they do not agree on the position of the Poseidon image. On the coin, it is clearly between the moles and in the middle of the harbor. In Pausanias, it is "on the mole running into the sea."

⁷ B. V. Head, *British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins: Corinth, Colonies of Corinth, etc.*, London, 1889, p. 68, no. 556, pl. XVII, 13.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75, no. 595, pl. XIX, 15. Boyce, *op. cit.*, p. 77 notes that Hadrian had initiated the scheme of harbor construction completed by Antoninus Pius.

⁹ Lehmann-Hartleben, *op. cit.*, Münztafel, nos. 10 and 11 (Pl. 80, b, c).

¹⁰ Lehmann-Hartleben, *op. cit.*, p. 238, note 2, suggests that this may be a representation of a female deity (eine weibliche Gottheit). However, the attributes of the statue are not clear.

¹¹ *Loc. cit.*, "Es ist sehr wohl möglich, dass unter Antoninus Pius der Hafen mit mehreren Standbildern dekoriert wurde."

The two accounts, however, were not always at variance. The codices of Pausanias in fact contain the reading, ἐπὶ τῷ ρεύματι τῷ διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης, which can be easily reconciled with the pictorial version.¹² A "floating" platform for the statue might have been placed in a location approximating that suggested by the engraver of this coin die. The difference between the two sources arose when Jo. Facius, in his critical edition of Pausanias published in 1794, emended the text, substituting ἐρύματι for ρεύματι.¹³

Although generally accepted as correct, Facius's emendation, which clearly does not agree with the numismatic evidence, has caused some controversy.¹⁴ Leake, who visited Kenchreai during his travels in the Morea, rejected both the Facius reading and the manuscript tradition and offered his own reading for ρεύματι.¹⁵ His suggestion, ἔρματι, was in keeping with the representation on the Antonine coin and implied that the statue had stood on a submerged reef or rock, and not on one of the two promontories which formed the harbor. Frazer in his commentary on Pausanias attempted to reconcile Facius's emendation and the harbor scene as depicted on the Antonine coin by suggesting that "... at some intermediate point (between the two quais at either extremity of the port) a mole running out into the harbour supported an image of Poseidon."¹⁶

The land and underwater excavations conducted by the University of Chicago and Indiana University have provided much new general information regarding the nature of the port of Kenchreai and some specific data relating to Pausanias, II, 2, 3.¹⁷ Some archaeological evidence was uncovered to support the existence of the sanctuaries mentioned by Pausanias and depicted on the coin issue. Excavations at the northeastern terminus of the harbor (Area C) produced considerable, although as yet unpublished, data which suggest the presence of a sanctuary in this location.¹⁸

¹² The readings in the codices of Pausanias are discussed by Jo. Facius, *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio*, Leipzig, 1794, I, p. 184, note 4 and J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, London, 1898, I, p. 570.

¹³ Facius, *loc. cit.*

¹⁴ Cf. the Loeb text cited above and the Teubner editions of Pausanias published in 1889 and 1903. A recent text and translation of Book II also accepts the Facius emendation; Georges Roux, *Pausanias en Corinthie*, Paris, 1958, p. 39.

¹⁵ W. M. Leake, *Travels in the Morea*, London, 1830, III, p. 235. F. W. Hasluck, "An Inscribed Basis from Cyzicus," *J.H.S.*, XXII, 1902, p. 130 also translates ἔρμα as a "reef of rocks."

¹⁶ Frazer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 17.

¹⁷ Scranton and Ramage, *op. cit.* For accounts of the underwater exploration of Kenchreai, see Joseph W. Shaw, "Shallow-Water Excavations at Kenchreai," *A.J.A.*, LXXI, 1967, pp. 223-231 and Robert L. Hohlfelder, "Clio Beneath the Sea: Underwater Archaeology, a New Source of Old and New World History," *Proceedings of the Northern Great Plains History Conference*, Winnipeg, 1967, pp. 96-104.

¹⁸ Scranton and Ramage, *op. cit.*, pp. 159 f., for a preliminary account of the excavations in this area. Professor Scranton, who is preparing a final report on the Kenchreai excavations, has indicated *per litteras* that there is a "considerable though characteristically tenuous argument" for the presence of a sanctuary in Area C.

At the southwestern promontory (Area A and the South Mole) extensive explorations were undertaken on land and under the sea.¹⁹ Here traces of various buildings, some of which are now submerged, were discovered. These structural remains, which may well have been of a religious nature, date from several periods of the imperial epoch. Included in this complex was an apsidal room in which numerous *opus sectile* panels were found still in shipping crates. A Nilotic theme which distinguishes many of the panels suggests a possible connection between this room and the temple of Isis.²⁰

The general shape of the harbor, as depicted on the coin, does not seem to be accurate. Although the Kenchreai bay area today coincides approximately with the semicircular numismatic portrayal of the ancient port, excavations conducted at various points on land and underwater indicate a more linear design for the ancient harbor, perhaps similar to the Late Roman-Byzantine port facilities at near-by Anthedon.²¹ The pictorial representation of the harbor, like the three ships under sail entering or just outside the moles and possibly the temple forms as well, can be seen as conventional rather than realistic. This may also be true of the curving or semicircular colonnade or ship slips which appear to connect the quais. No remains of any construction that might be so construed were uncovered either on land or under the sea.²²

A thorough underwater search was made of the areas adjacent to both of the now submerged moles and in the mouth of the harbor in hopes of finding the Poseidon or more probably some trace of the platform or base that supported it. These extensive explorations, conducted within and without the harbor to depths exceeding one hundred feet, did not reveal the bronze statue or any remains of a third mole, a submerged rock or reef, or any permanent construction that could have supported a monumental statue. Furthermore, considering the great depth of the water in the mouth of the harbor (in excess of one hundred feet in places), the severe storms that occasionally still lash the bay of Kenchreai and the width of the harbor entrance (*ca.* 200 m.), it seems unlikely that a statue ever "floated" in the harbor. Mooring a floating platform to withstand all possible weather conditions would have been a difficult task. Given the nature, value and importance of the object supported by the mooring, the risks involved would have been too great.

It seems that the die engraver of the Kenchreai harbor coin, to achieve a better artistic balance for his reverse design and perhaps to emphasize the statue itself,

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 125-158. Shaw, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-227.

²⁰ Robert L. Scranton, "Glass Pictures from the Sea," *Archaeology*, XX, 1967, pp. 163-173, for a discussion and illustrations of the *opus sectile* panels.

²¹ H. Schläger, D. J. Blackman, and J. Schäfer, "Der Hafen von Anthedon mit Beiträgen zur Topographie und Geschichte der Stadt," *Arch. Anz.*, LXXXIII, 1968, plans 2 and 4.

²² Professor Scranton has suggested, however, again *per litteras*, that foundations discovered at the north end of Area E might well have belonged to a *straight* stoa which extended for an undetermined distance along the north side of the harbor front. See Scranton and Ramage, *op. cit.*, pp. 170 f. for a discussion of the excavations in Area E.

especially if the intent of the issue was to commemorate its dedication, placed the image in mid harbor. Perhaps because of this issue, this location for the Poseidon image was perpetuated in the text of Pausanias until Facius's emendation.

While the underwater explorations did not conclusively prove the validity of his correction, they did present a *prima facie* case to support his recension *contra* the pictorial representation provided by the coin series and other suggested textual readings. Moreover, at the end of the 1968 campaign, a large platform near the outer terminus of the North Mole was discovered and investigated. This may well have been the location for the statue. Facius was probably quite accurate when he assumed Pausanias had seen Poseidon standing *on* a mole, ἐρύματι, announcing a haven for the many vessels that made Kenchreai a port of call during the imperial period.

ROBERT L. HOHLFELDER

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO



a.



b.



c.

ROBERT L. HOHLFELDER: PAUSANIAS, II, 2, 3: A COLLATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL
AND NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE



I. G., V, 1, 21 in 1970

JAMES H. OLIVER: HADRIAN'S REFORM OF THE APPEAL PROCEDURE IN GREECE