

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 41 (1996)

Artikel: Past and present in Pausanias
Autor: Bowie, Ewen L.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-661025>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 15.03.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

VI

EWEN L. BOWIE

PAST AND PRESENT IN PAUSANIAS

In this paper I want to explore aspects of the relation between Pausanias' responses to events and artefacts of the Greek past and his response to the Graeco-Roman present. His adult life, chiefly stretching from the reign of the emperor Antoninus Pius to the end of that of Marcus, was lived in a Greek world of great cultural and, in many cases, economic vitality, but a Greek world administered by a governing class drawn largely, and by emperors hitherto wholly, from the Latin West. Like other thinking Greeks of his day Pausanias could not avoid pondering the losses and gains for the Greek world that had accrued from the rise of Rome to total and apparently unshakeable control of the Mediterranean world. His responses must have been affected by the generation in which he formed his attitudes, by his geographical and social origins, and by his personality – his intellectual and spiritual commitments. Those of his responses that we can detect are necessarily screened by the filter of his literary work. Pausanias comes across – to me at least – as a writer with a very clear conception of the sort of work he is trying to compose, and of the tradition in which he expects his readers to place it: this conception will have inhibited some types of response that might seem out of place¹. In consequence it is often

¹ I discuss this and related issues in a forthcoming article 'Problems in Pausanias: date, genre, readers and purpose'.

hard to determine what his judgement actually is of something he reports. But where Pausanias' responses can be identified, they emerge, not surprisingly, as falling within the range we can construct for other Greeks of the second and early third centuries. This is not to say that he is 'typical'. His text has a form and purpose shared by no others of the period, and its mode of constructing a Greek national identity out of the Greek past is quite different from that of our other texts². Thus just as what we know of his contemporary world is indispensable to understanding Pausanias, so he too adds very substantially to our comprehension of that world.

The Greek world of the later second century A.D. was, as is generally agreed, a world much preoccupied with its past, particularly its pre-hellenistic past. In this as in many respects Pausanias resembles many of his contemporaries. He sees the Greeks, οἱ Ἕλληνες, as united by a continuous culture stretching from the era of Deucalion and Minos down to his own time³. He expects his readers to be familiar with major landmarks like the Trojan war (*passim*) the return of the Heraclidae (I 41.1-2; II 13 etc.); the colonisation of Ionia (VII 1ff.); the Persian wars (*passim*); and the growth of Macedon's power in the fourth century. The battle of Chaeroneia was a disaster for the Greeks. As Pausanias says, echoing Homer (*Iliad* XI 603) and Herodotus (V 97.3), τὸ γὰρ ἀτύχημα τὸ ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ ἅπασιν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἦρξε κακοῦ, καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα δούλους ἐποίησε τοὺς ὑπεριδόντας καὶ ὅσοι μετὰ Μακεδόνων ἐτάχθησαν (I 25.3)⁴. The destruction of Corinth

² I accept much of J. ELSNER's interpretation of Pausanias as showing "how Greeks coped with the burden of a distinguished past weighing on their cultural identity, with the contemporary politics of Greece's status as a Roman province, and with the profound sense of the sacred with which so much of antique culture was imbued" in 'Pausanias: a Greek Pilgrim in the Roman World', *P&P* 135 (1992), 3-29. My discussion throughout owes much to C. HABICHT's perceptive account, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1985).

³ One symptom is his interest in survival of a practice or building, often marked by ἔτι, e.g. II 10.7.

⁴ The echo is heard again at VII 10.5.

by Mummius in 146 B.C., registered with clinical and to my ear Thucydidean brevity at II 1.2 (cf. II 2.2; V 10.5, though these are little more than allusions), and in more pathetic detail at VII 16.7 - 17.4, was the nadir of Greek fortune : ἐς ἅπαν δὲ ἀσθενείας τότε μάλιστα κατῆλθεν ἡ Ἑλλάς, λυμανθεῖσα κατὰ μέρη καὶ διαπορθηθεῖσα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος (VII 17.1). Pausanias chooses this moment to note the successive collapses of cities that had held a leading position in Greece – Argos, Athens, Thebes and Sparta⁵ and compares the destruction of the Achaean league to that of a shoot growing on a tree most of which was dried up and mutilated (VII 17.2) : ὅτε δὲ καὶ μόγις, ἅτε ἐκ δένδρου λελωβημένου καὶ αὐοῦ τὰ πλείονα, ἀνεβλάστησεν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸ Ἀχαϊκὸν καὶ αὐτὸ ἡ κακία τῶν στρατηγησάντων ἐκόλουσεν ἔτι αὐξανόμενον. Although elsewhere he notes the foundation of Roman Corinth by Caesar and some acts of Augustus, in this chapter his next landmark is the reign of Nero. Pausanias credits Nero with a noble soul for his restoration of freedom to Greece, and closes his excursus with Vespasian's reversal of the measure and his remark that the Greek world had forgotten the art of freedom : ἀπομεμαθηκέναι φήσας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν (VII 17.3-4).

There is little or nothing in this profile of Greek history that would surprise contemporaries. Sophistic declamation chose many topics from Athenian resistance to Macedon and its collapse at Chaeronea; Greek and Latin writers alike saw the destruction of Corinth by Mummius as a key moment in the history of Rome's relations with Greece; like Pausanias, Plutarch saw Nero's gift of freedom to Greece as a redeeming feature (*de sera numinis vindicta*, 567F-568A), and Philostratus registered comparable pain at its withdrawal by Vespasian (VA V 41). Pausanias' contemporaries would also have shared many assumptions underlying what he chooses to explain – for example, the assumption

⁵ For a related set of reflections of the rise and fall of cities (cf. Hdt. I 5.4) note VIII 33.1-4.

that any Greek reader can be expected to be familiar with the narratives of the central canonical texts – the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, Herodotus and Thucydides, parts of Demosthenes and perhaps Ephorus for the fourth century.

But there are also features in respect of which Pausanias begins to look different, at least from most writers who survive. One such feature is his plethora of detail on the early history of each city and on the establishment of its religious cults. Here we may simply be prisoners of the selective survival of written texts. Some surviving texts do show comparable interest in the early history of a city or cult, e.g. Aristides' *Panathenaicus*, a speech probably delivered in A.D. 155⁶. Local historiography clearly flourished in the second century A.D.⁷ and both the history of cults and of the foundation and early years of the city were surely prominent. We know too that appeal to transmitted or invented legends about the founders of cities was regularly deployed by Greek cities in the second century to strengthen their claim to Hellenic ancestry and in some cases to establish a title to membership of the Panhellenion founded by Hadrian in A.D. 131/2⁸. It remains clear, however, that Pausanias himself *is* attracted more by the very early than the less early, just as he is attracted more by the religious than by the secular. This

⁶ The date argued for by C.A. BEHR, *Aelius Aristides and The Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam 1968), 87-88, and 'Studies on the biography of Aelius Aristides', *ANRW* II 34.2 (Berlin - N.Y. 1994), 1140-1233, §8. Early history (but sketchily, and using much-worn themes) is found at *Panathen.* (*Or.* I) 50, 55 etc.

⁷ For a very brief account cf. E.L. BOWIE, 'Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic', *P&P* 46 (1970), 3-41 at 19-22, reprinted in M.I. FINLEY (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Society* (London, 1974), 166-209 at 184-188. Add perhaps Marsyas of Tabae (cf. *F Gr H* 768) and the boy-historian Xenophon of Samos, *SEG* I 400, cf. J.H.M. STRUBBE, 'Gründer kleianasiatischer Städte. Fiktion und Realität', *AncSoc* 15-17 (1984-6), 253-304 at 285-286. Unfortunately our remains of such local histories are so sparse that it is hardly possible to gauge how close to Pausanias they stand.

⁸ See A.J. SPAWFORTH and S. WALKER, 'The world of the Panhellenion. I. Athens and Eleusis', *JRS* 75 (1985), 78-104, and 'The world of the Panhellenion. II. Three Dorian cities', *JRS* 76 (1986), 88-105; J.H.M. STRUBBE [n. 7]. For a good exploration of a single city's consciousness of its identity see B.G.M. ROGERS, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus* (London 1991).

holds for events narrated as well as for monuments described; and although one part of the explanation for the bias might be that this is precisely the sort of material with which readers could not be expected to be familiar but in which they would have a keen interest, the chief reason must be a combination of Pausanias' own inclination and its corollary in the text he is writing, i.e. a decision that it is to be a text in which both the very ancient and the religious are to play a very prominent role⁹.

It is a related phenomenon that Pausanias' citations show him to be much more widely read in mythographic poetry than any of his contemporaries (even, for example, than the lexicographer Pollux) : this applies especially to early hexameter poetry, but his search for mythical variants takes him to Hellenistic poetry too¹⁰.

Another feature in respect of which Pausanias differs from his contemporaries, though perhaps less than he claims, is in his presentation of sequences of history of the period 323 B.C. to 146 B.C. The first comes very near the beginning of his account of Attica. Pausanias notes a painting of the Athenian Callippus, who led his city's force to Thermopylae to resist the Gauls, and uses it to introduce an excursus on the Gallic invasion of Greece and eventual settlement in Anatolia (I 4). The second follows closely (I 6.1-8.1) : an account of how Attalus and Ptolemy established their kingdoms, an account which Pausanias claims to be needed because oral tradition about them had ceased and their contemporaries' written accounts had been neglected even sooner (I 6.1). This seems to me an odd explanation. The claim is somewhat undermined by Pausanias' rather differently stated ground for not offering a comparable excursus on Philip and Alexander : he does not concede that this material would be well-known – as it surely was – but explains that he does not attempt to

⁹ Another text with similarities to Pausanias is the *Library* of Apollodorus, but that lacks Pausanias' religious commitment and focus on monuments, and its use to illuminate Pausanias is further impeded by our lack evidence for its date.

¹⁰ But his use of Apollonius as a quarry for information on myth (II 12.6, VIII 4.3) does not show that he likes him, *pace* C. HABICHT [n. 2], 133.

include it because it would be too voluminous for his work (I 9.4). There clearly still were traditions attaching to later Hellenistic dynasts too (e.g. I 18.4; IV 29.1-5) and the books that Pausanias alleges to have been neglected were available for others to consult just as he did. Some did consult them¹¹, and although the Hellenistic period was not favoured by imperial Greeks as a subject for historiography there were some exceptions in the century before Pausanias was writing : some of Plutarch's *Lives* (e.g. *Agis and Cleomenes*, *Aratus*, *Philopoemen*); some books of Appian's *Roman History*; and Arrian's *History of the Successors* (Τὰ μετ' Ἀλέξανδρον). It is indeed possible that Arrian's *History after Alexander* had not been written when Pausanias was drafting book I, but there can be little doubt about Appian's pre-Civil War books¹². Hence I doubt the motivation professed by Pausanias at I 6.1. Rather it seems to me that he has two different, though closely related, reasons for including this material, reasons he prefers not to state openly. One is to do with his conception of his work : it is to blend narrative with monuments, and he badly needs some relevant but preferably not too familiar narrative to set alongside the monuments he is here discussing. The related reason is that his models, Herodotus and Thucydides, offered a preponderance of narrative over monuments, and he does not want to go further into book I without some display of his Herodoto-Thucydidean mode¹³.

Pausanias' decision here in book I and in later books to offer substantial if economical narratives of Hellenistic history is in striking contrast to his neglect of any monuments between ca. 250

¹¹ Hieronymus of Cardia, for example, was known to Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Strabo in the Augustan period (*FGrH* 154 F 13, 16, 17, 18); to Josephus (F 6); to Plutarch (T 8, F 11, 12, 14); and to Appian (F 3).

¹² For a brief statement of evidence and modern positions see E.L. BOWIE in P.E. EASTERLING and B.M.W. KNOX (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* I (Cambridge 1985), 888-889 = vol. I.4 of paperback edition (Cambridge 1989), 254-255.

¹³ Note for example his satisfied Herodoto-Thucydidean claim εὐρισκόν, I 14.6, 28.7, II 24.7, 26.10 etc., cf. Hdt. I 60.3, 105.3, IV 15.1 etc., Thuc. I 21.1, 135.2 etc.

B.C. and his own time¹⁴. He does not want his reader to forget about the period after Alexander; but he does, surely, want his reader to carry away an impression of a Greek world disrupted by its leaders' ambition and unprincipled behaviour (κακία) and by the aggression of external powers, a world which not coincidentally failed to produce monuments and works of art comparable to those of earlier and better periods.

Another peculiarity of Pausanias' presentation of the past is his frequent juxtaposition of events or monuments of quite different periods, giving the impression that they nevertheless belong closely together. This is not because he has no concept of a chronological sequence or interest in establishing one. That he often does, whether over the longer span of time as exemplified by his analysis of Greek decline discussed above, or over shorter periods where he exploits the time-honoured and necessary device of ordering material by its attachment to different generations¹⁵. It is encouraged, of course, by the fact that the basic structure of his text is topographical: monuments of different eras stand cheek-by-jowl, and that is how it is natural to describe them. But Pausanias seems deliberately to force such juxtapositions on his reader, and chooses them where monuments are not the limiting factor.

As an example I take I 40.1-5. Discussing the fountain of Theagenes at Megara, Pausanias (cross-referring to I 28.1) notes Theagenes' marriage connection with Cylon of Athens; then that its waters bear the name of the Sithnides, nymphs of whom one

¹⁴ Cf. H. STUART-JONES, *Select passages from ancient writers illustrative of the history of Greek sculpture* (London 1895), revised A. Oikonomides (Chicago 1966), xvi; C. HABICHT [n. 2], 134-135, noting that (e.g.) in Delphi "he discusses no monument, no statue, no base, no object that is later than 260 B.C., except the 'third temple' in the sanctuary of Athena and 'several statues of emperors' ". The few Hellenistic monuments mentioned include that to Auge at Pergamum, VIII 4.9; statues include an Apollo at Patrae, VII 20.6.

¹⁵ For Pausanias' interest in establishing gradations of antiquity in works of art cf. K. ARAFAT, 'Pausanias' attitude to antiquities', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 87 (1992), 387-409

slept with Zeus and was mother to Megarus who swam to safety on Gerania in Deucalion's flood. Near the fountain he notes an ancient shrine in which are statues of Roman emperors and of Artemis Soteira : we are told that the cult was established when soldiers of Mardonius trying to get back north to Thebes were overtaken by nightfall and deluded by Artemis into firing all their arrows, making them easy prey for the Megarians at daybreak. In the same shrine were statues of the twelve gods by Praxiteles. Next Pausanias mentions a precinct and temple of Olympian Zeus, noting that its cult-statue was not completed because work, by Pheidias and a local artist Theocosmus, was interrupted by the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War and destructive Athenian raids. In the temple Pausanias picks out for attention the bronze prow of a trireme, captured when the Megarians fought the Athenians for Salamis – whose recovery by Athens, he notes, was credited in Athenian tradition to the stimulus of an elegy by Solon.

In a little over two pages Pausanias has swept his reader through more than a millennium and a half of Greek history, from pre-historic Deucalion¹⁶ to statues of unnamed Roman emperors. The staging posts are the late seventh century B.C. (Cylon), the early sixth century (Solon), the early fifth century (Mardonius), the later fifth century (the Peloponnesian War) and the middle of the fourth century (Praxiteles) – but the order is scrambled. The impression that the Peloponnesian War is an event of the *recent* past is given by the note that its outbreak stopped the construction of the statue, reinforced by Pausanias' mention of the half-worked timber still to be seen on site, timber that was to have been used for the cult-statue of Zeus. A reader might wonder why nothing more had been done towards its completion in the centuries that had elapsed since – almost six centuries! It may partly be to inhibit reflection on this span of time that Pausanias does not name the emperors whose

¹⁶ Compare the use of Deucalion to give depth to the backdrop of the past against which Pausanias sets Hadrian's completion of the temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens, I 18.7-8.

statues stood in the same shrine as that of Artemis Soteira. It is also worth noting that the events and persons mentioned are almost all well-known : readers would have no difficulty in locating Cylon (cf. e.g. Hdt. V 71), Mardonius, or Praxiteles. Solon's 100-line poem on Salamis was still available and admired in Plutarch's day (*Sol.* 8.1-3) and alluded to by Pausanias' close contemporaries Aristides (*Or.* III 549 Lenz-Behr) and Polyaeus (I 20.1)¹⁷. The outbreak of the Peloponnesian War was known not just from Thucydides but from Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (as Diod. Sic. XII 38-40 and Plutarch *Per.* 30.4 show).

The same impression of a classical past that is very close to the present is given by another of Pausanias' historical notes on Megara, the murder of Anthemocritus. That is in his account of Attica itself. He mentions, without description, the tomb of Anthemocritus, and attaches to it a brief note of the Megarians' murder of this herald, calling it ἀνοσιώτατον ἔργον and saying καί σφισι ταῦτα δράσασι παραμένει καὶ ἐς τόδε μήνιμα ἐκ τοῖν θεοῖν, οἷς οὐδὲ Ἀδριανὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς ὥστε καὶ ἐπαυξηθῆναι μόνοις ἐπήρκεσεν Ἑλλήνων (I 36.3). This too is part of Plutarch's narrative of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (*Per.* 30.3) : a *cause célèbre*, then. But Pausanias gives a quite different flavour by linking divine punishment for the act with Megara's continued stagnation and by his observation that even Hadrian's beneficent activity has failed to achieve Megara's revival. As with the temple of Zeus at Megara, the consequences of the classical past are present and tangible. The perception is not unique to Pausanias. Memmius Marcus of Byzantium, a sophist whose career fell chiefly under Hadrian and Pius, is alleged by Philostratus to have persuaded the Megarians to desist from their hostility to Athenians, still so extreme that they refused the Athenians access to the Lesser Pythian Games "as if the decree had just been drafted against

¹⁷ The poem and Solon's role in the recovery of Salamis also figure prominently in Diogenes Laertius' account of Solon, I 46-47.

them”¹⁸. Contemporary readers would understand Pausanias’ link of Megara’s present with its classical past. But the religious twist fits his outlook elsewhere and is very likely his own. Likewise the decision to bring in Hadrian, whose benefactions to Athens he has recently chronicled, reminds us that in some parts of Greece there is a flourishing present.

There are many other cases of the collapse or elision of past and present which I have illustrated by part of Pausanias’ account of Megara, but I hope that this one case is enough to make the point. The account has, however, touched on two further aspects of Pausanias’ respective evaluation of past and present : his presentation of Romans, and in particular his presentation of Hadrian.

The issue of Pausanias’ presentation of Rome has often been discussed¹⁹. I have only one or two new suggestions to make, and I see no gain in reviewing the material in detail yet again. I am broadly in agreement with Habicht’s assessment. Pausanias as a Greek regrets that Greece (and, we may infer, the world of the Greek cities, τὸ Ἑλληνικόν in its widest sense) has fallen under Roman rule, although he does not hint that Macedonian rule would have been any better. He disapproves of Rome’s treatment of Greece in the second century B.C.²⁰, of Mummius’ destruction of Corinth and Sulla’s of Athens, and of Augustus’ movement of

¹⁸ Philostratus, *VSI* 24, 529-530. That the notice is immediately followed by one concerning Hadrian’s admiration for Marcus does not show that Hadrian was involved in this reconciliation, as suggested by W. WEBER, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leipzig 1907), 181-182.

¹⁹ See especially O. REGENBOGEN, *RE Suppl.*-Bd. VIII 1069-1070; J. PALM, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund 1959), 63-74; B. FORTE, *Rome and the Roman as the Greeks saw them*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 24 (Rome 1972), 419-27; C. HABICHT [n. 2], 119-124.

²⁰ Cf. VII 7.7-16.10, cited by C. HABICHT [n. 2], 121 n. 14.

populations in Aetolia (V 23.3; X 38.4). His bare registration of the theft of statues from Greek holy places by a sequence of Romans from Mummius to Nero should not be taken (as it was by Forte) to indicate his lack of resentment, even if he recognises that such thefts had always been perpetrated upon the conquered by conquerors (VIII 46.4). Indeed in several cases he notes that the sacrilege involved in such thefts has been visited by divine punishment.

Habicht's presentation was to some extent a reaction against that of Palm, who himself had reacted against previous views of Pausanias as hostile to Rome. It may be that Habicht has not reacted strongly enough. One of Palm's conclusions which Habicht accepts is that the text of VIII 27.1 should be emended to give a reading that does not condemn Rome. The manuscripts read ἡ δὲ Μεγάλη πόλις νεωτάτη πόλεων ἐστίν οὐ τῶν Ἀρκαδικῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλησι, πλὴν ὅσων κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων μεταβεβήκασιν οἰκήτορες. Habicht endorses Palm's support for Clavier's insertion of ἐπί after συμφορὰν, so that we have Pausanias stating that Megalopolis is the newest Greek city with the exception of those whose inhabitants had moved 'because of a catastrophe occurring *in the time of* Roman domination' rather than 'because of the catastrophe *of* Roman domination'. The paradox has recently been defended by Simon Swain, and I am persuaded by him that it is sound²¹. He notes that Pausanias regularly uses συμφορὰ not of natural disasters but fortunes (e.g. a little later, at VIII 33.4 συμφορὰς καὶ εὐπραγίας); and that natural disasters resulting in movements of population are hard to document for the period since the foundation of Megalopolis. Pausanias is not, then, excluding the consequences of natural catastrophes *during* the time *of* Roman rule but the consequences *of* the catastrophe of Roman rule.

²¹ I am grateful to Dr Swain for allowing me to refer to his forthcoming book *Plutarch to Philostratus. Culture and Power in the Second Sophistic*.

How does Pausanias reconcile this black view with his own membership of a Greek élite many of whom had intermarried with Italians and some of whom had become *equites Romani* or even entered the Roman senate? First, of course, it is not only Romans whom he condemns; many Greeks are condemned too²². Second – and in this I agree with Palm – Pausanias criticises individual Romans, but never to my knowledge explicitly or even implicitly criticises either Romans as a whole or aspects of the Roman character. Indeed one of his criticisms of Sulla clearly implies commendation of Roman character. Among Pausanias' many condemnations of Sulla, he notes that "in his treatment of the majority of Athenians he acted with a savagery greater than one would expect from a Roman": τὰ ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς Ἀθηναίων ἀγριώτερα ἢ ὡς ἄνδρα εἰκὸς ἦν ἐργάσασθαι Ῥωμαίων (I 20.7). I think the term 'cruelty', used by Frazer and Habicht, translates the Greek less well than 'savagery'; and I do not accept Habicht's view (121) that "Pausanias does not mean to say that Romans are so noble that Sulla's cruelty is unexpected, but that you would not expect *even* (my italics!) a Roman to act so viciously". The 'even' is not there in the Greek, and I would hold that Pausanias does indeed attribute a level of conduct to Romans in general – there is no need to raise the stakes by using the word 'noble' – of which Sulla's savagery is surprising and untypical. That also emerges from another of Pausanias' references to Sulla's treatment of Athens, when he says that "Sulla's treatment of the Athenians was also uncivilised and alien to the Roman character, and similar to that was also his treatment of Thebes and Orchomenus" (IX 33.6): the key terms ἀνήμερα καὶ ἥθους ἀλλότρια τοῦ Ῥωμαίων clinch the interpretation of I 20.7.

That Pausanias felt neither need nor inclination to criticise Romans as a whole might also be argued from his approach to the problem of their location in the long-standing polarity between Hellenes and βάρβαροι. True, he makes no attempt to follow

²² Cf. esp. VII 10.1-12 on those who betrayed Greece.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus along the road that made Romans Hellenes by descent. Although his discussion of the colonisation of the Palatine from Arcadian Pallanteum (VIII 43.1-2) must imply the infusion of some Greek blood, he conceives of the Romans as chiefly descended from Aeneas and his Trojans (cf. I 11.7; II 23.5). There are also several places where in the dichotomy of Greeks and barbarians some reflection on the text in context would lead the reader to classify both Rome and in general the Latin West as a whole among the βάρβαροι²³. But equally Pausanias steps back from explicit assimilation of Romans to barbarians, although he does classify Trojans, including Aeneas, as barbarians (V 22.2), as he does the south Italian neighbours of Tarentum (III 10.5, X 10.7). Instead such passages as VIII 46.4, ascribing the practice of looting statues to Hellenes and barbarians alike and then beginning the next sentence 'Ρωμαίοις δέ ... leave the reader to construct his own solution to the problem. The quarter in which that solution is to be found is indicated by Pausanias contrast of Persian and Roman treatment of Abae in Phocis: "To the god at Abae the Romans did not render honour in the same way as the Persian: the Romans, out of piety towards Apollo, granted to the people of Abae that they should be autonomous, but the army with Xerxes burned down even the temple at Abae" (X 35.1-2, cf. Hdt. VIII 43).

That Romans are closer to Hellenes than to barbarians seems also to be indicated by some details of Pausanias' discussion of Roman Corinth. Despite registering the enormity of Mummius' destruction of Greek Corinth, and despite his clear presentation of the city founded by Caesar as a Roman *colonia* (II 1.2), Pausanias does not shrink from referring to the period of Roman Corinth as the city's "later efflorescence" (ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκμῆς τῆς ὕστερον, II 2.6). Likewise at the opening of Book V he notes that Arcadians

²³ IV 32.1 as well as Greeks, many βάρβαροι honour Hermes, Heracles and Theseus in *gymnasia* and *palaestrae*; both Hadrian (I 5.5, cited below n. 26) and Pius (VIII 43.4) assisted Greeks and those βάρβαροι who asked.

and Achaeans are autochthonous in the Peloponnese, but the other peoples are immigrants. These others include Dryopes, Dorians, and the present inhabitants of Corinth who are νεώτατοι Πελοποννησίων (V 1.2). Perhaps he is influenced by the fact that by the reign of Hadrian the Roman *colonia* had been substantially Hellenised and was using Greek for most public documents, and could even be complimented on its Hellenism by Favorinus²⁴. But he does not himself explicitly mention that Hellenisation. Taken together the evidence suggests that although Romans are not Hellenes they are as near as one could get.

It is consonant with this presentation of Romans that Pausanias never brands them either as a whole or individually as uneducated, ἀπαίδευτοι. This was a powerful charge in the second century Greek world, readily levelled at opponents by sophists or by the satirist Lucian. One of Plutarch's major themes in his *Lives* had been the effect of education (or its lack) not only on his Greek but also on some of his Roman 'heroes'²⁵. The nearest Pausanias gets to this issue is his use of the term ἀνήμερα of Sulla's actions (IX 33.6, translated above) implying that the Roman character was indeed ἡμερον. One could argue lack of opportunity, or Pausanias' characteristic economy of comment. But Pausanias surely knew the story told by Velleius Paterculus (I 13.4) to illustrate Mummius' lack of culture – Mummius allegedly warned those transporting the looted masterpieces of sculpture and painting from Corinth that if they destroyed any they would have to replace them by new ones – and he abstains from telling it.

²⁴ [Dio Chr.] *Or.* XXXVII, throughout treating his Corinthian audience as inheritors of the traditions of old Corinth, and explicitly saying that they have been Hellenised at XXXVII 26. For discussion of the extent of and reasons for Roman Corinth's Hellenisation see D. ENGELS, *Roman Corinth* (Chicago 1990), 71-74.

²⁵ See S.C.R. SWAIN, 'Hellenic culture and the Roman heroes of Plutarch', *JHS* 110 (1990), 126-145.

It is perhaps part of the explanation both for the implication that the Roman ἦθος was ἡμερον and for the absence of any suggestion of lack of culture that contemporary Rome, its governing class and above all its emperors were both ἡμεροὶ and πεπαιδευμένοι. My concluding section examines briefly Pausanias' presentation of these emperors and of some members of the governing class without which they could not have ruled.

The emperor for whom Pausanias manifests most admiration is Hadrian. Like other Greeks, Pausanias admires Hadrian on account of his philhellenism – his support for Greek individuals and institutions, and his contribution to the revival of Greek culture. Indeed at Hadrian's first mention, attached to his statue next to that of Zeus Eleutherios and significantly early in book I, he is glossed as “the purveyor of benefits to his other subjects and in particular to the city of Athens” (I 3.2). That theme is repeated at Hadrian's second appearance, attached to the mention of another statue among those of the eponymous heroes (I 5.5), and to it is added piety²⁶. But Pausanias then gives a brief sketch – that Hadrian had never willingly entered a war; that he had suppressed the Jewish revolt; and that the Pantheon in Athens displayed a record of new temples he had built, of his enhancement of existing temples by dedications in them and additions to them, and of his gifts to Greek cities and to those βάρβαροι who sought them²⁷. It is against this general picture of Hadrian as universal benefactor that Pausanias notes the paradox of Megara's stagnation (I 36.3, cf. above p. 215).

But Pausanias' mentions of Hadrian go well beyond this brief selection of key achievements, comparable to that which he seems to have felt obliged to append to his mentions of Trajan²⁸ and a

²⁶ ... τῆς τε ἐς τὸ θεῖον τιμῆς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐλθόντος καὶ τῶν ἀρχομένων ἐς εὐδαιμονίαν τὰ μέγιστα ἐκάστοις παρασχομένου.

²⁷ ὅποσα δὲ θεῶν ἱερὰ τὰ μὲν ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐπεκόσμησεν ἀναθήμασι καὶ κατασκευαῖς, ἢ δωρεὰς πόλεσιν ἔδωκεν Ἑλληνίσι, τὰς δὲ καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων τοῖς δεηθείσιν, ἔστιν οἱ πάντα γεγραμμένα Ἀθήνησι ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῶν θεῶν ἱερῷ (I 5.5).

²⁸ V 12.6-7 (in the context of a statue dedicated at Olympia, cf. n. 33): annexation of Dacia, Parthian War, Forum at Rome. Note that Pausanias makes no mention of Apollodorus of Damascus as architect of this last. His only other mention of Trajan is of his gift of freedom to Messenian Mothone, IV 35.3.

model for the much longer laudation of Pius (VIII 43.3-6, see above p. 219). He mentions statues of Hadrian more readily than of any other emperor²⁹. But it is above all in relation to buildings that Pausanias' admiration comes across: the completion of buildings started long ago, like the temple of Olympian Zeus whose first building Pausanias attributes to Deucalion (I 18.6-8); the erection of new buildings – in Athens the temple of Hera and Zeus Panhellenios, the Pantheon and the library and gymnasium (I 18.9). We must suppose that it is chiefly on account of his building at Athens that Pausanias judges that in Hadrian's time Athens, which had suffered at Sulla's hands, flourished (I 20.7).

Time and again Pausanias notes that a Hadrianic monument was closely integrated with an antique one. At the tomb of Epaminondas Hadrian erected a new stele with an epitaph from the imperial pen beside the old (ἀρχαία) which bore a Boeotian epigram (VIII 11.8). His new temple at Abae, built alongside the old and larger temple, had cult statues that were ἀρχαιότερα. His stoa at nearby Hyampolis is mentioned next to the remains of the ancient agora (X 35.4 and 6). But the palmary case is that of the temple of Poseidon Hippios at Mantinea. Pausanias notes that Hadrian built his new temple round the remains of the old, and records in obvious admiration that he appointed clerks of works to oversee the operations so that nobody could peer into the ancient shrine (τὸ ἱερόν τὸ ἀρχαῖον) or shift any of its remains (VIII 10.2). Restoration of another sort is involved in Hadrian's reinstatement at the winter Nemeans of the horse-race that had dropped out of both Nemean and Isthmian games (VI 16.4), and restitution to Mantinea of its ancient name instead of that acquired to flatter a Macedonian ruler, Antigoneia (VIII 8.12)³⁰. A rather different case is that of

²⁹ I 3.2, 5.5 noted above; I 18.6 in the Olympieion; I 24.7 in the cella of the Parthenon, the only statue other than Athena's, though that of Iphicrates is immediately mentioned at the entrance; V 12.6, at Olympia, from the Achaean cities; VIII 19.1 from the Arcadian Cynaethaëis.

³⁰ It is not clear whether at Megara the marble temple of Apollo built by Hadrian replaced the ancient brick one which Pausanias mentions first (I 42.5) or (more probably) was erected beside it.

Hadrian's widening of the road at the Isthmus, presented as following through the original provision of a road by Sciron "when he was polemarch" (I 44.6).

Only occasionally is a Hadrianic construction mentioned that has no antique context: the harbour at Lupiae in South Italy, whose mention is dragged in in the context of the Treasury of Sybaris at Olympia³¹, or Hadrian's aqueduct for bringing water from Stymphalus to Corinth (VIII 22.3) distributed through a fountain-house that was necessarily new, as were his baths at Corinth (both II 3.5).

In an architectural sense the temple to Antinous at Mantinea (VIII 9.7-8) belongs with this group: but it is described in a sequence which carefully sets the modern Roman history of Mantinea in the context of its Hellenic past. After details of mythology and classical history (VIII 8.6-12), he turns to monuments (VIII 9.1), and we learn that the temple of Aphrodite Symmache in its present form had been constructed as a memorial to Mantinea's support for Rome (he means Octavian, as he made clear at VIII 8.12!) at the battle of Actium (VIII 9.6). The transition to the Roman world has been made with Mantinea's honour intact. It is then that Pausanias mentions Mantinean cults of Antinous as a god, his allure to Hadrian, his honours elsewhere, the annual ritual and penteteric *agon* instituted by Hadrian, and a shrine in the gymnasium that is *θέας ἄξιος* for its statues, marble and paintings. These are in some sense legitimised for the Greek reader by the explanation of their location in Mantinea: Antinous was from Bithynia, and the Bithynians claimed descent from Arcadian Mantinea (VIII 9.7). The panel is immediately framed by mention of a copy of the painting in the Athenian *agora* of the Athenians' battle at Mantinea (363/2 B.C.). The link between Mantinea's past and present is further strengthened by discussion of the ἠρωὸν of Podares who had died fighting Epaminondas' Theban force and

³¹ Writers on Italian geography, avers Pausanias, say that Lupiae had once been called Sybaris, and then changed its name: VI 19.9.

was reckoned third in bravery after Xenophon's son Gryllus and Cephisodorus of Marathon. Pausanias notes that three generations before his time the name on the tomb had been changed to that of a homonymous descendant of Podares who held Roman citizenship, but that the original Podares was honoured by the Mantineans of Pausanias' time (VIII 9.10).

Although overt comment is suppressed, I sense disapproval of the change of name, as of changes of names on honorific statues (cf. n. 34), though here it is mitigated by the new honorand's descent from the old. Pausanias' contemporaries did better, in offering honour to Ποδάρην ... τὸν ἀρχαῖον. Introduction of the new cult of Antinous was legitimate, since it was of a Hellene who had attracted the interest of a philhellenic emperor. It is immediately after this that Pausanias offers the account of Hadrian's scrupulous construction of a new temple of Poseidon Hippios that I have discussed above.

On the other hand even on Hadrian there are silences. Despite the presence of dedications in the list of Hadrian's benefactions at I 5.5, only once does Pausanias mention a dedication other than a cult statue, viz. the golden peacock set with gemstones at the Argive Heraeion (where he also mentions Nero's gold crown and purple πέπλος II 17.6)³². His few remarks at I 5.5 about other aspects of Hadrian's policy are far from representative, and he says nothing of another of Hadrian's enthusiasms that impressed some literary Greeks, his rewards to sophists and poets. Nor has he anything to say about the establishment either of the Panhellenion, which recent scholarship has urged to be a key element in Hadrian's policy for integrating the Greek world with Athens as a sort of capital, or even of the penteteric Panhellenian *agon* which is and perhaps was its most palpable manifestation³³.

³² One might expect, for example, mention of Hadrian's dedication of Eros at Thespieae and its accompanying hendecasyllabic epigram, *IG VII 1828* = G. KAIBEL, *Epigrammata Graeca* 811 = D.L. PAGE, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981), pp. 565-566.

³³ For a hypothesis concerning the role of the Panhellenion see A.J. SPAWFORTH - S. WALKER [n. 8]. Perhaps οἱ πάντες Ἕλληνες who dedicated a statue of Trajan at Olympia (V 12.6)

Are such silences odd? Pausanias has no brief to expand on the benefactions noted at I 5.5 other than those involving dedications and buildings; and even with these, as he insists, he is selective. But the imbalance between mention of buildings and of dedications remains striking, and it is hard to suppose it would have been reflected in a total inventory of Hadrianic hardware in Greece. Several factors may have played their part. Buildings are more striking (θέας ἄξια, to use Pausanias' language); they involve greater expense and are likely to endure longer, and they have a function, whether religious or secular. These reasons may suffice. But there may be two more. The theft of dedications by Mummius, Sulla, Augustus, Gaius and Nero is reported with discernible disapproval by Pausanias: that makes the issue of dedications by Roman leaders delicate, and Pausanias may be keen to distance Hadrian the benefactor from his malefactor predecessors. Second, the point made by Pausanias in describing Hadrian's temple of Poseidon Hippios at Mantinea (above p. 222) is less easily made of dedications. A new dedication can stand next to an old, but it cannot rework, complete or encompass the old – except, of course, by the objectionable practice of rededicating a statue with a new name³⁴.

It is, I think, these architectural practices of restoring the old, or of juxtaposing or even superimposing the new, that especially elicit Pausanias' approval. The old must be left, the new must seem in some way to complement it. That might be seen as symbolic of the role he seems to assign to contemporary Roman in relation to ancient Greek culture. Pausanias wants no more thefts, no more renaming of statues, above all no more acts of destruction. But he is well aware that emperors, governors and holders of lesser power

are the Panhellenes – there is no oddity in a statue of Hadrian's father being erected after A.D. 131/2, especially as the context might suggest that the statues of Trajan and Hadrian are a pair. But this solitary mention would not support the view that the Panhellenion seemed important to Pausanias.

³⁴ Noted by Pausanias of statues of Themistocles and Miltiades on the Athenian acropolis (I 18.3) and of a statue of Orestes renamed as one of Augustus at the Argive Heraeum (II 17.3).

in the Roman system have the opportunity and often the inclination to leave their mark on the sacred landscape that he describes, and his selection and focus in handling Hadrian's buildings may be argued to promote the model of imperial activity of which he approves. We may wonder whether despite his extended encomium of Antoninus Pius (VIII 43.3-8) Pausanias felt as much admiration for him as he did for Hadrian. Although he praises his restoration of Cos, Rhodes and cities of Caria and Lycia destroyed by an earthquake (VIII 43.4, cf. II 7.1), and registers monetary gifts and public works in mainland Greece, Ionia, Africa Proconsularis and Syria, he dispenses himself from offering details by noting that others had written them up ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον. While we should probably believe that such accounts did exist, it hardly suffices to explain why not a single building, statue or dedication of Antoninus Pius in mainland Greece is mentioned. We may conclude that either Antoninus or his artefacts did not seem to Pausanias to merit the exception to his general neglect of recent objects that he made for Hadrian.

Only occasionally does Pausanias mention other buildings. Three are buildings of Herodes Atticus, and are mentioned as outstanding – the stadium and *odeion* at Athens (I 19.6; VII 20.6), and one which involved up-grading an existing structure, viz. the stadium at Delphi, previously built of local stone and redone in marble by Herodes (X 32.1). Pausanias also mentions two sets of statues erected by Herodes: a chryselephantine group in the temple of Poseidon at the Isthmus (II 1.7) and statues of Demeter and Kore in Pentelic marble at Olympia (VI 21.2). That the latter were erected 'in place of the old ones' (ἀντὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων) makes it almost as puzzling that they are mentioned as that Herodes' *nymphaeum* is not: perhaps the latter seemed out of place to Pausanias in a religious complex, but that explanation does not wholly persuade me.

We should also note that if Herodes is highlighted because of his influence and euergetism in Achaëa (and indeed beyond) Pausanias omits to tell us. Herodes' vast wealth is illustrated by his

use of Pentelic marble for the stadium at Athens, but his other roles are passed over, and he is glossed simply as ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος (I 19.6, VII 20.6; just Ἀθηναῖος II 1.7, VI 21.2, X 32.1). The same applies to other builders of the Roman period fleetingly mentioned. We read of the baths of Eurycles, ἀνὴρ Σπαρτιάτης, at Corinth (II 3.5) and of the gymnasium of Eurycles at Sparta (III 14.6); but we do not learn who he was or when he lived. At least with the buildings of Sex. Iulius Maior Antoninus Pythodorus at Epidaurus Pausanias tells us they are of his own time, but he omits to say that the man whom he simply calls Antoninus numbers Greeks of *provincia Asia* among his ancestors, and there is nothing to suggest the important place that, like Herodes and Eurycles, Antoninus held in a nexus of aristocratic families stretching beyond the boundaries of Achaëa³⁵. But perhaps such silence is welcome if the alternative is the sort of gloss Pausanias offers on the builder of the monument which is still battling with pollution on the hill of the Muses in Athens: ὕστερον δὲ καὶ μνημα αὐτόθι ἀνδρὶ ᾠκοδομήθη Σύρω (I 25.8). Only his Attic readers are likely to realise that this is king C. Iulius Antiochus Philopappus, descendant of the kings of Commagene, a man who had Athenian citizenship and attained the consulate at Rome (A.D. 109), who was a friend of Plutarch, no φιλοβάρβαρος, and who in the year in which he was archon at Athens and ἀγωνοθέτης Διονυσίων (A.D. 87/88) financed all the choruses in the dithyrambic competition³⁶. It is tempting to suppose that Pausanias' mentions of Herodes, Eurycles and Antoninus are intended to pick out recent Greek figures distinguished for euergetism, but if that was his intention his approach is unusually oblique even for him.

³⁵ For the evidence on Antoninus' career see H. HALFMANN, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh.n.Chr.* (Göttingen 1979), 171-172, no.89. Note especially SEG IV 407.

³⁶ Plutarch, *Quaest.Conv.* I 10, M 628A-629A.

Finally, two men of the recent past different both from the builders and each other³⁷. At Messene Pausanias mentions hero cult of a rich man shortly before his time, a man whom his manuscripts call Aethidas (IV 32.2) and whom most moderns identify with the Ti. Claudius Saethidas Caelianus attested epigraphically. He was ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν and Ἑλλαδάρχης; by the 160s A.D. his son had reached the Roman consulate and his two grandsons were early in a Roman senatorial career, one honoured as εὐεργέτης at Argos, the other as *patronus* of Abella in Italy³⁸. Pausanias has nothing to say either of these men's achievements, or of the benefactions that we know for one of them and can presume for their grandfather too. His interest is rather in the possibility that the Saethidas on the monument is not the fat cat who prospered under Hadrian or Pius but a distant ancestor who commanded the Messenians on the night they offered heroic resistance to a surprise attack by Demetrius son of Philip – an exploit Pausanias has just written up (IV 29.1-5). Pausanias had glossed over the fact that, however heroic, the resistance was in vain. But it is this exploit, and not great wealth or Roman careers, that has earned the Saethidae their place in Pausanias' roll of honour.

So too Mnesibulus of Elateia. If Mnesibulus had not existed, Pausanias would have felt driven to invent him. When Pausanias reaches Elateia he first records its claims to Arcadian ancestry and its fate at the hands of the Medes, Macedonians and Flamininus (X 34.1-4). Against this background he introduces the incursion of the Costoboci into Greece in A.D. 170 or 171. When the Costoboci got to Elateia, Mnesibulus gathered a band of men to fight them, and fell in battle after slaying many of the barbarians. He was, Pausanias

³⁷ He also mentions two other recent Olympic victors: Granianus of Sicyon, several times victor, in connection with his statue at II 11.8 – identified by L. MORETTI, *Olympionikai* (Roma 1957), 163 no.848 with a victor at Sparta attested by SEG XI 838; – and a Roman senator (V 20.8) whom he does not name, usually taken to be L. Minicius Natalis, cf. C. HABICHT [n. 2], 178-180. Pausanias' interest in the latter case is not in the victory but in the antique objects that were excavated when the victor's monument was being erected.

³⁸ For the evidence see H. HALFMANN [n. 35], 174, nos. 93, 93a; 196, nos. 126 and 127.

notes, the Olympic victor in the *stadion* and the hoplite race in A.D. 161, and was commemorated by a bronze statue at Elateia. The exploit recalls both the defence of Thermopylae by Leonidas and more overtly its defence two centuries later against the Gauls, "the barbarians from the Ocean" which Pausanias has just narrated (X 20.1 ff.), explicitly comparing it to the action of 480 B.C. It is a defence in which Pausanias heroises the Athenians (I 4.2; X 20.5), especially young Cydias, for whom it was the first and last taste of battle (X 20.5). The Costoboci were small beer by comparison with the Medes and the Gauls, but they sufficed to let Mnesibulus of Elateia demonstrate that the Hellenic capacity for heroism was not dead.

Conclusions

The Pausanias whom I have attempted to uncover is certainly a child of his time. His focus on the Greek past with minimal attention to Hellenistic monuments and only slightly more to monuments of over two centuries of the Roman empire matches the imaginary world of the sophists and novelists. His accounts of Hellenistic history, necessary to create a continuum between the classical and Roman periods, are probably less unusual than he chooses to maintain. His unremitting and extensive exploration of genealogy and of the early history of cities, fundamental to his construction of a Greek national identity and to its spatial articulation, is certainly unparalleled in what survives, but will have had some parallels in local histories and mythographic handbooks, and undoubtedly responds to a contemporary preoccupation reflected in cities' construction of claims to Hellenic descent and to relationships with better authenticated Greek cities.

Pausanias is keen to impress his perspectives on his readers. The repeated patterns of citation of ancient monuments and of deeds ranging from the mythical to the historical invite contrast with the Roman version of the Greek world which he knows these readers inhabit. Pausanias' decision only rarely to mention

buildings, statues and dedications of the imperial period is entirely consonant with his general focus on the classical past. That he makes a major exception for the buildings of Hadrian is chiefly attributable to his admiration for Hadrian as a benefactor of Hellenes and Hellenism. It may be – but this is debatable – that the buildings of Hadrian that Pausanias chooses to record and the way that he reports them indicate a particular admiration for Hadrian's own sympathy with the Hellenic heritage and for his attempts to preserve its monuments as well as to revitalise its institutions. As to buildings and dedications of other individuals in the imperial period, it is perhaps more important to offer an explanation of why he mentions the few that he does than why he omits the many more he does not. I am tempted by the view that he regards Herodes as an outstanding Greek whose contributions bring him into a class not very far from Hadrian: hence several mentions of his buildings or statues. But silence on the *nymphaeum* at Olympia remains a puzzle to me as it has been to many. The few other individuals whose buildings are mentioned – Eurycles, Philopappus, Antoninus – resist any pattern that I can discern, and their mention is no more significant than that of Mnesibulus. Even in a Greece that has enjoyed a Hadrianic revival there are only a few deeds and monuments that merit inclusion in a memorial to its illustrious past.

DISCUSSION

J. Bingen : Je voudrais revenir sur trois points de détail, mais des points de détail qui ont une résonance exceptionnelle dans l'exposé si riche et si bien argumenté que nous venons d'entendre.

Le premier porte sur l'interprétation d'un passage souvent cité où certains ont cru percevoir une condamnation générale du régime impérial ou, en tout cas, de la domination romaine en Grèce. Bowie dit, après tant d'autres : "the catastrophe of Roman rule" pour rendre κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων (VIII 27, 1). La condamnation a paru si brutale qu'on a tenté de l'écarter par des corrections ((ἐπι) ἀρχῆς Clavier, σύμφορον Marcotte). Mais le texte de la tradition manuscrite comporte-t-il vraiment une condamnation générale? Je sais que l'omission de l'article est souvent une recherche d'écriture chez Pausanias, mais, jusqu'à preuve du contraire, le texte me semble signifier "par un effet désastreux de la domination romaine". Le mot συμφορά a un caractère circonstanciel plutôt qu'il ne marque une durée; cf. l'autre emploi de l'expression chez Pausanias, il est vrai sans complément, VII 25, 5, σύνοικοι Μυκηναῖοι κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀφίκοντο ἐκ τῆς Ἀργολίδος ("en raison de leur détresse"), cf. Ael. Arist. *Panath.* 133, μόνοι δὲ οὐχ ὑπὸ πολεμίων τοῦτο παθόντες, ὑπὸ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐξοκίσθησαν ὑπὲρ νίκης, οὐ κατὰ συμφορὰν ὑφ' ἑτέρων, ou, *cum grano salis*, Xen. *Hier.* 3, 4, ὅταν γε ἀφροδιασθῆ κατὰ συμφορὰν τινα γυνή. Le passage VIII 27, 1 fait allusion, selon moi, aux effets négatifs que les différentes réorganisations du territoire après la conquête romaine et jusqu'à Auguste ont eus sur les peuplements grecs, particulièrement les

synœcismes (cf. S.E. Alcock, *Graecia capta*, 132 sqq.). Pour moi, ce passage, loin d'être une condamnation générale de l'hégémonie romaine, s'ajoute simplement aux jugements défavorables qu'en tant qu'historien, Pausanias porte sur les aspects contestables de la conquête romaine, comme il n'a pas manqué de critiquer bien plus souvent le comportement de beaucoup de Grecs.

Ma deuxième remarque porte sur la question que se pose Bowie: où situer les Romains dans le couple 'Ἕλληνες/βάρβαροι? A mon avis, au II^e s., même pour un notable grec sorti du gymnase, le monde ne se réduit plus à une telle dichotomie. Pour définir les composantes de l'οἰκουμένη, il y aurait plutôt 'ménage à trois', et l'empereur est l'empereur de tous indistinctement. Le passage IV 32, 1 sur les cultes d'Hermès, Héraklès et Thésée, n'est pas très probant (il fait probablement allusion aux gymnases abritant des hellénisés plus ou moins douteux de l'Orient grec). La générosité remarquable d'Hadrien pour les cités grecques et les barbares qui le sollicitaient (I 5, 5), et la générosité tout aussi remarquable d'Antonin le Pieux pour les Grecs et pour les βάρβαροι qui en ont besoin (VIII 43, 4) sont au contraire sans équivoque, particulièrement dans leur parallélisme. La générosité de ces deux empereurs romains envers les Romains va de soi, elle n'appartient pas à la catégorie qui doit être citée dans ces passages de la *Périégèse*. La vieille dichotomie 'Grecs/Barbares' reste un mode d'écriture; mais elle n'a pas posé, suivant moi, à Pausanias le problème, très profond en apparence mais probablement inexistant pour lui, de savoir si les Romains – le système qui ordonne le monde où il vit – relèvent de la barbarie, même si on traduit celle-ci par la "non-grecité"; cf., par exemple, la répartition des peuples d'Aelius Aristide, *Or. XVI (D) 395* : "les Romains et les autres peuples, Grecs et Barbares", citée par J. Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund 1959), 61.

Je voudrais terminer sur une question méthodologique mineure, intéressante en soi, que nous pose Ewen Bowie, celle des 'silences sur Hadrien', particulièrement pour ses nombreuses

consécration de statues et d'offrandes dont l'épigraphie confirme la multiplicité. Il est exact que les mentions sont rares et que leur répartition est arbitraire. Mais ces 'silences' ne seraient significatifs que si le programme de Pausanias envisageait une description poussée systématiquement jusqu'à son époque. Nous savons que ce n'est pas le cas et que, d'ailleurs, à l'annonce systématique πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά, répondent chez lui beaucoup d'autres silences dans le domaine grec post-classique ainsi que le droit que Pausanias s'est réservé explicitement de sélectionner. Les allusions à son époque sont quantitativement peu nombreuses et généralement adventices ou circonstanciées. Bowie a raison de noter ces absences, mais je ne crois pas qu'elles soient significatives pour situer idéologiquement Pausanias par rapport à son époque, à l'Empire, ou même à son empereur favori.

E.L. Bowie : 1) The translation Jean Bingen proposes for the transmitted text at VIII 27.1 is very attractive, though it would still, as he concedes, leave some degree of criticism of the Roman ἀρχή. I am not sure, however, that συμφορά + genitive is paralleled in the sense of "disastrous consequence of...". When συμφορά is qualified by a noun in the genitive that genitive seems regularly to be partitive (συμφορὰ κακῶν) or possessive (βίου) and the idea of *consequence* is not present in συμφορά.

2) On whether Romans are βάρβαροι, I would not wish to rely too heavily in IV 32.1, although I would have thought that the 'hellénisés' who frequent *gymnasia* should for Pausanias be – precisely in virtue of that hellenism – Ἕλληνες. In the two passages I 5.5 and VIII 43.4, I am not convinced that it is self-evident that the emperor would confer benefits upon 'the Romans'. It certainly had not been omitted as self-evident by Augustus in his *res gestae*. The degree to which such benefits might be taken for granted must depend, too, on what we think Pausanias would have meant had he used the term Ῥωμαῖοι in this context. The inhabitants of the city of Rome (cf. πολιτείαν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ... τὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν, II 1.2)? The *cives Romani* of Rome and Italy who can still be

regarded as constituting the most important single element in the governing class of the empire (cf. I 9.5 on Thrace and the Celtic world)? Hardly, in our passages at least, the totality of *cives Romani*, who include many Greeks already comprised in Pausanias' Ἑλληνίσιν/Ἑλλησι. And indeed it seems to me that the prime suspects for classification as βάρβαροι in those passages are Latin speakers from the cities of western provinces, who were, of course, beneficiaries both of Hadrian and of Pius, and whose enumeration alongside Ἕλληνας goes far towards offering a complete inventory of the empire. To such *municipia* and *coloniae* imperial *beneficia* can surely be no more taken for granted than to Greek cities. But of course these westerners include many *cives Romani*, more than in the East, and all alike are surely seen by Pausanias as ὑπήκοοι of the emperor at the top of the pyramid of power. Because all were ὑπήκοοι even in Rome and Italy, I would have no problems with Pausanias' decision to note imperial *beneficia* to them; and because *not all* were *cives Romani* it becomes intelligible that, seeking a single term for non-Hellenic beneficiaries within the empire, Pausanias should select βάρβαροι. No doubt he could have evolved a description of the Latin West in different terms, but it would necessarily have been complicated. If, however, we take βάρβαροι in I 5.5 and VIII 43.4 to be non-hellenised parts of the East, or peoples outside the empire, we have the paradox that these (surely much less extensive) *beneficia* are balanced against those to Hellenes, while nothing at all is said of imperial responses to the rest of the empire. If that is the right interpretation, it too involves a striking silence.

3) Finally, concerning silences on dedications and statues of Hadrian, I agree that Pausanias' need and stated intention to select requires any hypothesis based on omissions to be formulated with extreme caution. However all I wanted to note was that *even* in the case of an emperor who does indeed seem to be Pausanias' favourite the proportion of material noticed *seems* to be much lower than that of material from the archaic and classical Greek past.

W. Ameling : 1) Aus IX 23, 7 darf man kaum auf die Unfertigkeit des Werkes schließen, so daß dieser Ansatz für eine Altersbestimmung entfällt. Sind Ausdrücke wie ἐπ' ἐμοῦ κτλ. wirklich ausschließlich auf das Erwachsenenalter zu beziehen? Mit anderen Worten : Sollte man nicht vielleicht doch bei den alten Daten für das Leben des Pausanias bleiben und auf weitere Implikationen verzichten?

2) Pausanias' Angabe in I 6, 1 über hellenistische Geschichte schreiben zu wollen, weil sein Publikum darüber zu wenig weiß, scheint mir noch gültig. Der Hinweis auf die große Menge an Traditionen über Philipp und Alexander (I 9, 4) widerspricht dem nicht, da gerade diese beiden ja im Geschichtsbild der zweiten Sophistik eingeschlossen waren. Vgl. noch meinen Hinweis auf die unterschiedliche Behandlung Philipps und Alexanders in VIII 7, 7. Sie sagen schließlich selbst, daß Pausanias eine "preferably not too familiar narrative" gesucht habe.

3) Was halten Sie von D. Marcotte's Konjektur in VIII 27, 1 κατὰ σύμφορον ἀρχῆς?

E.L. Bowie : 1) I agree that IX 23.7 does not prove that Pausanias did not complete the work. However that was not my ground for putting it late in his life : rather the combination of dates of completion of books with the evidence of his reference to the creation of the Athenian tribe *Hadrianis* (121/2 or 124/5) as in his own time. But I agree that ἐπ' ἐμοῦ etc., are not expressions *exclusively* used of adult life, though I would retain the view that the implication of the Antinous-reference tends in that direction. So a Pausanias born rather earlier, and writing rather older, is only a speculation with very slender foundations, I agree. But I have not yet heard arguments *against* it, and I am attracted by the sort of personal explanation it adds to other reasons for Pausanias' attachment to Hadrian.

2) You may of course be right to accept at face-value Pausanias' explanation at I 6.1. But while I agree that Attalus and Ptolemy I were not so familiar as Philip, far less Alexander, and did not get

into the sophistic repertoire at all, I still doubt that they were quite so unfamiliar to many readers as Pausanias implies. I do not suppose that I 9.4 *contradicts* I 6.1 : rather I am struck by the point (which I did not make clearly enough) that instead of saying at I 9.4 “we all know about Philip and Alexander” he chooses to explain his silence at this point by the volume of the material – it suggests to me that the criterion of ‘known/not known’ does not seem to him quite straightforward.

3) I confess that Marcotte’s conjecture was unknown to me. If its sense is to be ‘in accordance with what was advantageous to the Roman ἀρχή’, I would expect τὸ σύμφορον, not just σύμφορον, and the dative not the genitive, i.e. κατὰ τὸ ἀρχῆ τῆ Ῥωμαίων σύμφορον *vel sim.*

S.E. Alcock : I am glad that you have raised the question of elisions – of shifts in meaning, or shifts in naming statues or monuments. Like you, I think these odd and rather jarring juxtapositions (the collapsing of past and present identifications) can be very revealing. I wonder if they can be taken as an indirect measure of Pausanias’ opinions, or of what he is trying to convey in his text. For example, on the heated issue of his attitude to Rome, what are we to make of a statue of Orestes that represents the emperor Augustus (II 17.3) or a precinct near the sanctuary of Persuasion, once the house of the tyrant Cleon, now dedicated to Roman emperors (II 8.1)?

Are such elisions worth pursuing further, and on other issues?

E.L. Bowie : I am not sure that I have identified ‘elisions’ in the sense of ‘shifts of meaning’, and I may be using the term idiosyncratically. But certainly juxtapositions seem to me always to be worth exploration as indications of how to read the text. I agree entirely that Augustus’ sudden and expected appearance in a Trojan mythological context (II 17.3–4) might be expected to jar, especially since we know Pausanias disliked renaming of old statues. I had not noticed the Cleon case, but you are surely right

that mentioning the dedication as a τέμενος to Roman emperors of what had been the house of a τύραννος, followed by a passage in which ἐπιθυμία τυραννίδος is counter-pointed by Aratus-narrative (II 8), alerts the reader to the issue of the nature of Roman monarchy.

Ø. Andersen : Ewen Bowie's demonstration of how Pausanias collapses past and present, as in the presentation of the monuments of Megara, I found most illuminating. It is a literary device with an ideological purpose : to connect. I venture to suggest that this could be seen against a more general background.

Pausanias is a member of a highly literary culture, and he knows his chronology. Yet collecting, reporting and somehow authorizing the traditions people live by, he is moving – not in a world of linear history, but of significant events and 'privileged times'. Insignificant time is blank space. This may be viewed as a residue of an oral and traditional, non-linear mode of conceiving past time – or as the way human psyche makes sense out of history. Would you see a place for this more anthropological approach as well?

E.L. Bowie : This is a most interesting observation. My first reaction is to wonder whether features characteristic of oral traditions would most likely come to Pausanias *via* ἐξηγηταί or other local non-written traditions. But although, as you say, Pausanias belongs to a highly literary culture, it is a culture in which there was still plenty oral communication too : most of this is necessarily lost to us, but we can catch glimpses in Plutarch's *Quaestiones convivales*, Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* or anecdotes in Galen, Diogenes Laertius, Aristides and Philostratus. If this phenomenon is particularly characteristic of oral traditions, then its presence in Pausanias might point to a persistent oral reworking of key events in the history of Ἕλληνες or of one πόλις at an oral level. I remain inclined, however, to suggest that some part of the explanation is to be found in deliberate choices made and effects sought by Pausanias.

M. Moggi : Desidero richiamare l'attenzione di Ewen Bowie sul problema del rapporto fra Pausania ed Erodoto-Tucidide. Nel caso dello storico di Alicarnasso il rapporto è forte e indiscutibile: conosciamo tutti la ripresa pausaniana dell'affermazione erodotea relativa al dovere di λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, così come è noto il richiamo, da parte del Periegeta, ai fondamentali strumenti erodotei nel campo della attività storiografica (ὄψις, γνώμη, ἱστορίη); in questi giorni, inoltre, Domenico Musti ha molto opportunamente evidenziato la grande rilevanza di Paus. I 26, 4 in riferimento a Hdt. I 5.

Per quanto riguarda Tucidide, invece, mi sembra che la situazione sia completamente diversa : nessun richiamo, da parte di Pausania, alle dichiarazioni programmatiche e metodologiche tucididee; un atteggiamento polemico e competitivo – implicito, ma percepibile – in riferimento a temi come quello della strutturazione urbanistica di Sparta e della suddivisione regionale del Peloponneso.

Certo, Tucidide può essere stato modello di Pausania sul piano dello stile e della lingua, ma per quanto riguarda la 'brevità' di certe notazioni pausaniane ritengo che si tratti, *in generale*, di una caratteristica da ricondurre non tanto alla imitazione dello storico ateniese, quanto ad uno dei criteri fondamentali che hanno ispirato la selezione del materiale e la composizione della *Periegesi* : trattare rapidamente le questioni già note perché presenti nella grande storiografia, destinare particolare attenzione e ampio spazio alle cose meno conosciute e rare, in modo da soddisfare l'esigenza di originalità, una esigenza fortemente sentita da Pausania, ma difficile da concretizzare nell'ambito di una riscrittura della storia del passato.

In ogni caso, mi sembra che l'eventuale ruolo di modello svolto da Tucidide sia da porre su un piano ben diverso da quello sul quale possiamo collocare il ruolo svolto, con certezza, da Erodoto.

E.L. Bowie : I am sure that you are right to insist that the rôle of Herodotus as a model for Pausanias is more important than that of

Thucydides. But I still hold that some Thucydidean features are discernible, and that after Herodotus it is Thucydides (rather, e.g., than Xenophon or Ephorus) whose influence a second-century reader would perceive. I am not sure that there is *no* allusion to programmatic statements of Thucydides – Pausanias' recurrent claim to select what is ἀξιόλογον, for example, uses a catchword and a principle more prominent in Thucydides than Herodotus (above all ἀξιολογώτατον Thuc. I 1.1). Certainly brevity is often attributable in Pausanias to his disinclination to repeat what his reader knows, though even material known from Herodotus can be given some space, as early in Book III. In the case of Pausanias' brevity at II 1.2, part of the reason must be that he is reserving his full account for VII 16, and it is not a case where he avoids retelling what is already well-known. Whether the consequent brevity of II 1.2 has any Thucydidean colour I am very happy to agree to be a question to which my tentative answer was subjective.

