Proceedings of the
Danish Institute at Athens VI

Edited by *Erik Hallager* and *Sine Riisager*

Cover illustration: Reconstruction of the city of Kalydon
Graphics by: Mikkel Mayerhofer

Destruction or depopulation of cities in Pausanias. Nikopolis, Aetolia, and Epirus

Jacob Isager

The Augustan author Strabon describes the effect of the foundation of a City of Victory close to the site of the battle of Actium in 31 BC in the following manner:

> In later times, however, the Macedonians and the Romans, by their continuous wars, so completely reduced both this [the city of Ambracia] and the other Epeirote cities because of their disobedience that finally Augustus seeing that the cities had utterly failed (ἐκλελειμένας), settled what inhabitants were left, in one city together – the city on this gulf which was named by him Nicopolis, and he so named it after the victory he won in the naval battle before the mouth of the gulf over Antonius and Cleopatra the queen of the Egyptians, who was also present at the fight. Nicopolis is populous (εὐανδρεῖ), and its numbers are increasing daily...[1] (Transl. H.L. Jones, Loeb ed.)

Here Strabon presents to the reader a process, where he contrasts the concept of ἔκλειψις (being extinct) and the concept of εὐανδρία (being populous). Augustus, seeing that the cities had failed to live up to their status as poleis with prosperous hinterlands,[2] restored the landscape of Epirus to its former glory by creating a new and more developed model of urbanization. And Strabon goes on telling us about the positive effects of the synoecism on the smaller settlements in the area.

Shortly after the middle of the 2nd century AD Pausanias gives his version of the synoecism, which he presents in four different passages.[3]

1.

5.23.3: Of these cities the following are at the present day uninhabited (ἦσαν ἐφ’ἡμῶν ἔρημοι): Mycenae and Tiryns were destroyed by the Argives (ἐγένοντο ὑπὸ Ἀργείων ἀνάστατοι) after the Persian Wars. The Ambraciots and Anactorians, colonists of Corinth, were taken away by the Roman emperor to help found Nicopolis near Actium. The Potidaeans twice suffered removal from their city (ἀναστάτους ἐκ τῆς σφετέρας... γενέσθαι), once at the hands of Philip, the son of Amyntas, and once before this at the hands of the Athenians. Afterwards, however, Cassander restored the Potidaeans to their homes...

Τούτων τῶν πόλεων τοσαίδε ἦσαν ἐφ’ἡμῶν ἔρημοι. Μυκηναῖοι μὲν καὶ Τιρύνθιοι τῶν Μηδικῶν ὕστερον ἐγένοντο ὑπὸ Ἀργείων ἀνάστατοι. Ἀμβρακιώτας δὲ καὶ Ἀνακτορίους ἀποίκους Κορινθίων ὄντας ἐπηγάγετο ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς ἐς Νικοπόλεως συνοικισμὸν πρὸς τῷ Ἀκτίῳ. Ποτιδαιάτας δὲ δὶς μὲν ἐπέλαβεν ἀναστάτους ἐκ τῆς σφετέρας ὑπὸ Φιλίππου τε γενέσθαι τοῦ Ἀμύντου καὶ πρότερον ἔτι ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων, χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον Κάσσανδρος κατήγαγε μὲν Ποτιδαιάτας ἐπὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα...

2.

7.18.8: On the acropolis of Patrae is a sanctuary of Artemis Laphria. The surname of the goddess is a foreign one, and her image too was brought in from elsewhere. For after Calydon with the rest of Aetolia had been laid waste (ἐρημωθείσης) by the Emperor Augustus in order that the Aetolian people might be incorporated into Nicopolis above Actium, the people of Patrae thus secured the image of Laphria. Most of the images out of Aetolia and from Acarnania were brought by Augustus' order to Nicopolis, but to Patrae he gave with other spoils from Calydon, the image of Laphria, which even in my time was still worshipped at the acropolis of Patrae.

Πατρεῦσι δὲ ἐν ἄκρᾳ τῇ πόλει Λαφρίας ἱερόν ἐστιν Ἀρτέμιδος, ξενικὸν μὲν τῇ θεῷ τὸ ὄνομα, ἐσηγμένον δὲ ἑτέρωθεν καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα. Καλυδῶνος γὰρ καὶ Αἰτολίας τῆς ἄλλης ὑπὸ Αὐγούστου βασιλέως ἐρημωθείσης διὰ τὸ ἐς τὴν Νικόπολιν τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀκτίου συνοικίζεσθαι καὶ τὸ Αἰτωλικόν, οὕτω τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς Λαφρίας οἱ Πατρεῖς ἔσχον. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἀγάλματα ἔκ τε Αἰτωλίας καὶ παρὰ Ἀκαρνάνων, τὰ μὲν πολλὰ ἐς τὴν Νικόπολιν κομισθῆναι, Πατρεῦσι δὲ ὁ Αὔγουστος ἄλλα τε τῶν ἐκ Καλυδῶνος λαφύρων καὶ δὴ καὶ τῆς Λαφρίας ἔδωκε τὸ ἄγαλμα, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῇ Πατρέων εἶχε τιμάς.

3.

8.24.11: That the Echinades islands have not been made inland as yet by the Achelous is due to the Aetolian people, who have been driven from their homes (...γεγόνασι δὲ αὐτοί τε ἀνάστατοι) and all their land has been laid waste (καὶ ἡ γῆ σφισι πᾶσα ἠρήμωται). Accordingly, as Aetolia remains untilled, the Achelous does not bring as much mud upon the Echinades as it otherwise would do.

Τὰς δὲ Ἐχινάδας νήσους ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀχελῷου μὴ σφᾶς ἤπειρον ἄχρι ἡμῶν ἀπειργάσθαι γέγονε δὴ αἰτία τὸ Αἰτωλῶν ἔθνος, γεγόνασι δὲ αὐτοί τε ἀνάστατοι καὶ ἡ γῆ σφισι πᾶσα ἠρήμωται. ταῖς Ἐχινάσιν οὖν ἅτε ἀσπόρου μενούσης τῆς Αἰτωλίας οὐχ ὁμοίως ὁ Ἀχελῷος ἐπάγει τὴν ἰλύν.

4.

10.38.4: One hundred and twenty stades away from Delphi is Amphissa, the largest and most renowned city of Locris. The people hold that they are Aetolians, being shamed of the name Ozolians. Support is given to this view by the fact that, when the Roman emperor drove the Aetolians from their homes (βασιλεὺς ὁ Ῥωμαίων ἀναστάτους ἐς τὸν Νικοπόλεως συνοικισμὸν ἐποίησεν Αἰτωλούς) in order to found the new city of Nicopolis, the greater part of the people went away to Amphissa.

Δελφῶν δὲ ἀπωτέρω σταδίοις ἔικοσι τε καὶ ἑκατόν ἐστιν Ἄμφισσα μεγίστη καὶ ὀνομαστοτάτη πόλις τῶν Λοκρῶν. ἐσποιοῦσι δὲ αὐτους ἐς τὸ Αἰτωλικὸν αἰσχύνῃ τῶν Ὀζολῶν τοῦ ὀνόματος. καὶ δὴ καὶ ἔχει λόγον ὅτε βασιλεὺς ὁ Ῥωμαίων ἀναστάτους ἐς τὸν Νικοπόλεως συνοικισμὸν ἐποίησεν Αἰτωλούς, ἀποχωρῆσαι τοῦ δήμου τὸ πολὺ ἐς τὴν Ἄμφισσαν.

Since Epiros and Aetolia are not included in Pausanias' description of Greece, his remarks on the effect of the synoecism in Nikopolis are connected with descriptions of sites in Elis (Book 5), in Achaia (Book 7), in Arkadia (Book 8), and in Lokris (Book 10).

It is remarkable that Pausanias describes a process almost opposite of that described by Strabon. According to Strabon the cities of Epirus, themselves, caused their own decay and Augustus came as a rescuer. Pausanias reverses the roles: Aetolia was "laid waste" by the Emperor Augustus and the Aetolians were driven from their home, so that they could be incorporated into the new synoecism of Nikopolis. Augustus caused a decay for Aetolia by deporting the Aetolians. Strabon speaks mainly about Epirus, whereas Pausanias focuses more on Aetolia, each of the authors choosing their own opinion of the process of synoecism in connection with the foundation of Nikopolis. Strabon's treatment of the foundation of Nikopolis and its relation to his models of civilization on one side and the archaeological results on the other side have already been treated in an earlier article.[4]

---

[4] Isager 2001.

The present article focuses on Pausanias' short descriptions of the effects of the foundation of Nikopolis as a starting-point for a discussion of Pausanias' use of the concepts denoting depopulation and forced migration as well as the results of this.[5] A more careful and precise reading and translation of Pausanias is needed, which, hopefully, will result in a better understanding of his aims. In this connection we should add that Pausanias' remarks on Augustus' role in the synoecism and his remarks on the fate of Corinth have been taken by several modern scholars as some of several documentations for anti-Roman feelings expressed more or less openly in Pausanias' text. The discussion is on-going.[6] One question is if Pausanias' comments more reflect his possible anti-Roman feeling than the reality that he is expected to describe. In recent years the results of the archaeological investigations, especially landscape surveys in the area described by Pausanias, have given us new possibilities for testing the information given by Pausanias and better foundations for reflections when (or if) we are met with a conflict between the archaeological results and the ancient text.[7] But this is of no avail if Pausanias' text is misunderstood. This seems evident, but as we shall see, in some places the text of Pausanias is affected by mistranslations, which may have contributed to ascribing Pausanias attitudes, which are not expressed by the Greek text.

After an interpretation of Pausanias' remarks on Nikopolis, Corinth will be taken into consideration in the connection with the discussion of modern translations of the Greek word "anastatos", and in the article on *Kalydon and Pausanias* following immediately after in this volume, Søren Dietz confronts my conclusions, based on the text of Pausanias, with recent results of the archaeological investigations of the site of ancient Kalydon made by Danish and Greek archaeologists.[8]

The effects of the foundation of Nikopolis according to Pausanias

In the four texts of Pausanias quoted above the effects of the foundation of Nikopolis are described with concepts denoting abandonment and desolation.

Text 1 relates how the Roman emperor (Augustus) let bring the inhabitants of Ambrakia and Anaktorion to the new city of Nikopolis. This information is given in a context enumerating cities left abandoned/uninhabited (ἔρημοι) and consequences of this. The verb (ἐπηγάγετο), used to indicate the transfer of the inhabitants of Ambracia and Anaktorion, only states that they were brought to Nikopolis. Pausanias tells us in a general statement that the inhabitants were transferred to the new city. No details are given.[9]

As to the other cities, mentioned in text 1, we are informed that the inhabitants of Mycenae and Tiryns and the inhabitants of Potidaea are made ἀνάστατοι. In the case of Mycenae and Tiryns the adjective ἀνάστατος is rendered in the following way in the Loeb translation: "Mycenae and Tiryns were destroyed by the Argives." But when it comes to the Potidaeans, the same adjective is translated into "suffered removal". Later in the text we are informed that Cassander restored (κατήγαγε) the Potidaeans to their homes. The use of the adjective ἀνάστατος, derived from the verb ἀνίστημι, indicates that the inhabitants were "made to stand up and emigrate". It means that in the case of the Myceneans and Tirynthians the translation does not follow the Greek text. Instead we are told that Mycenae and Tiryns were destroyed.[10] Why this difference? We will come back to this.

---

[5] For a general discussion of these topics and depopulation and wasteland as a topos of decline see *e.g.* Gallo 1980; Alcock 1993, *passim* in the chapters on The Rural Landscape and The Provincial Landscape; Strauch 1996, *passim*; Pritchett II 1998–9, 195–222; Isager 2001.

[6] See *e.g.* Habicht 1985, 118–41; Arafat 1996, 202–15; Akujärvi 2005, 265–306; Bowie 1996; Swain 1996, 330–56; Hutton 2005, 41–53; Pretzler 2007, 28–31. See also this article pp. 210–3.

[7] See *e.g.* Alcock 1993; Strauch 1996.

[8] See S. Dietz, "Kalydon and Pausanias" in this volume.

[9] Another literary source and archaeological investigations can supply us with the information that people kept on living in both places. Ambrakia was reduced to a dependency of Nikopolis and Anaktorion was given the status as a port of trade (emporion) for Nikopolis (Strab. 10.2.2 [C 450]). For their status as satellite-villages see Strauch 1996, 156–8, 196, 205–8, 244–6, 251.

[10] In 8.33.2 Mycenae is mentioned as left abandoned and utterly destroyed (Μυκῆναι ἠρημώνται πανώλεθροι). In 8.33.3 we hear that of Tiryns remains nothing but the wall.

In text 2 we are told that Kalydon and the rest of Aetolia "has been laid waste" by the Emperor Augustus in connection with the synoecism in Nikopolis. Here the concept of eremia (ἐρημία) is added, denoting the result of abandonment: desolation. The noun ἐρημία is never used in Pausanias, but the verb ἐρημόω is found in a total of 20 occurrences. The adjective ἔρημος is found 35 times in the text. The translation "laid waste" will be discussed later.

Text 3 gives us a sequence of the concepts already presented: The Aetolian people were "driven from their homes" (γεγόνασι δὲ αὐτοί τε ἀνάστατοι) "and all their land has been laid waste" (καὶ ἡ γῆ σφισι πᾶσα ἠρήμωται). The result is that "Aetolia remains untilled" (ἀσπόρου μενούσης τῆς Αἰτολίας). The process presented here is that: 1) people are forced to leave their homes, 2) the result of this abandonment is desolation and wasteland.

Text 4 states that Amphissa is the largest and most renowned city of Lokris, and later in the same chapter it is characterized as beautifully adorned. We are told that the inhabitants reckon themselves as Aetolians and Pausanias repeats the information that the Aetolians were driven from their homes, that the Roman Emperor made them ἀναστάτους in order to transfer them to Nikopolis.[11] As in text 1 no name is given to the Emperor. We are further informed that most of the Aetolians preferred to move to Amphissa. The text seems not to indicate the possibility of their remaining in their former homes.

We are told about a greater and a lesser part, and since we have no further indication of numbers, we are left without any idea of the exact distribution of Aetolians to the two cities.

In book 10 (10.38.9) Pausanias informs us that the cities in the area (Myonia, Oiantheia and Naupaktos) with the exception of Amphissa are under the government of Achaeans of Patrae, who received the privilege from the Emperor Augustus.[12]

What we can deduce from the four texts quoted above is that Pausanias describes the events connected with the synoecism of Nikopolis in following way. The inhabitants of the Greek cities involved were forced to leave their homes, they were made ἀνάστατοι. In the case of Kalydon part of them were able to or allowed to migrate to Amphissa.[13]

A result of the migration away from Aetolia was that the land was left without its former inhabitants ("laid waste") and the soil remained untilled. That is, in text 2 we must assume that the information given here is this that Augustus only indirectly laid waste Kalydon and the rest of Aetolia. It happened as a result of a forced migration instigated by the Emperor.

It is interesting to compare these deductions with the description of the foundation of Nikopolis found in Dio Cassius (51.1.3): "... he (Caesar Augustus) founded a city on the site of his camp by gathering together some of the neighbouring peoples and disposing others, and he named it Nicopolis." (Transl. Foster, Loeb) – ...τοὺς μὲν συναγείρας τοὺς δ' ἀναστήσας τῶν πλησιοχώρων, συνῴκισε, Νικόπολιν ὄνομα αὐτῇ δούς.

Dio simply states that Augustus gathered together some and removed others from their home. The verb ἀνίστημι is used here in connection with the last mentioned group denoting that they were driven from their home. One is tempted to conclude with a view to the description of the same event in Pausanias that the "gathering together" refers to inhabitants of cities like Epirotan Ambrakia and Acharnanian Anaktorion that were situated rather close to Nikopolis, while the group that had to accept "forced migration" were the Aetolians. The transfer to Nikopolis from cities close by would cause little change in maintaining agriculture in these areas. But forced migration was necessary, when people were going to be removed far away from their farmland with the result that the cultivation would stop and the land laid waste, and this is exactly the

---

[11] We do not hear about Aetolians who moved or were being moved to Patrae. See Strauch 1996, 199–201. As to the territory of Kalydon, Strauch states that without any doubt it was taken over by Patrae and as the cult of Artemis Laphria is known to have existed in Nikopolis as well, it is assumed that the inhabitants of Kalydon were moved to Nikopolis: "Bewohner, Geschichte, Kulte und Traditionen von Aetolien "erbte" zwar Nikopolis, das Land jedoch ging an die Kolonisten in Patras." As to Amphissa see note 13.

[12] Se Arafat 1996, 135.

[13] Se Strauch 1996, 198, 245–6. "...tatsächlich migrierten die Ost-Aitolier und Lokrer, die sich nicht an der Gründung von Nikopolis beteiligen mussten, freiwillig in den (nach Patras) dritten Zentralort der Region" (245).

JACOB ISAGER

situation of the Aetolians as described by Pausanias. As stated above, Strabon focuses on the more positive effects for Ambrakia and Anaktorion.

The translation of the word "anastatos" in Pausanias

Pausanias makes use of the adjective ἀνάστατος 37 times (26 of them in the plural form, found only in nominative or accusative) and it is often used in a context very similar to that described above. The substantive ἀνάστασις is only found once in Pausanias in connection with the use shortly before of the adjective (9.15.3). The *index verborum* to Pausanias made by Pirenne-Delforge & Purnelle[14] gives an easy access to the various grammatical forms of the word, and in most of its occurrences ἀνάστατος is used as a predicate that takes cities or the inhabitants of cities, the citizens, as its subject. In a single case an area (χώρα) between Epidauros and Asine is declared ἀνάστατος, which is mentioned because it creates problems when defining the borders (2.28.2). All the other occurrences of the word seem to describe the same phenomenon: when the town is the subject (or object), the meaning would be that it has been emptied for its inhabitants; when the inhabitants are the subject (or object) implied, the adjective denotes that they have been driven from their homes. In one case the city mentioned was only deprived of the men of military age (3.2.2 ...Κυνουρέας τοὺς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ Λακεδαιμονίοι ποιοῦσιν ἀναστάτους.) and in another case a city (Amyklai) ended up as a village (3.19.6: Ἀμύκλαι δὲ ἀνάστατος ὑπὸ Δωριέων γενομένη καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου κώμη διαμένουσα...).[15]

But when it comes to the modern translations of the word, for example those found in the Loeb-edition, the translators treat the meaning of ἀνάστατος in mainly two rather different ways. When the text speaks about inhabitants of a city the word is normally translated with a wording like this: "they were driven away from their homes" or someone "drove them away" as seen in the translations quoted above.[16] Varieties like "expelled, dispossessed" are found.[17] A single case of the translation "depopulated" is seen in 2.29.5. "(Philip) made

their country desolate" is found in 7.10.6 where a more literal translation would be: "Philip drove the Sapaeans from their homes." That is, when speaking about the inhabitants of a city the translators seem to render into English the general meaning of the Greek ἀνάστατος.

But when the same adjective is used in connection with cities, the Loeb translators generally[18] choose another wording in their translation. In 7.3.5 we hear that Lebedos was "razed to the ground". In several cases the translation "laid waste" is found.[19] In other cases the translator chooses "destroy" or "destroyed".[20]

In two cases even the translation "utterly destroyed" is used where there is no indication in the text to support this extra stress: In 5.6.4 we are told that "the Eleans utterly destroyed it (the locality of Scillus)", where the Greek text simply states that the Eleans made the Scilluntians ἀναστάτους, that is, drove them from their home. In the other text (7.7.9) the Greek text tells us that the cities of Hestiaea and Antikyra were made ἀναστάτους by Otilius; in the translation we find that "he utterly destroyed" the cities.

As already said, in 5.23.3 we find that "Mycenae and Tiryns were destroyed by the Argives", but later in the same period the Potidaians "twice suffered removal from their city". In both cases the Greek text gives us the inhabitants as the grammatical sub-

---

[14] Pirenne-Delforge & Purnelle 1997.

[15] The Loeb-translations: 3.2.2: "...the Lacedaemonians removed all the Cynurians of military age"; 3.19.6: "Amyclai was laid waste by the Dorians, and since that time has remained a village".

[16] 1.35.2 (the Salaminians); 4.34.9 (the city of the Dryopians in Messenia); 5.10.5 (the Dorian Corinthians); 8.24.11 (the Aetolians); 9.1.3 (the Plataeans); 9.7.1 (the Thebans); 9.15.3 (the Thebans); 10.36.6 (the Anticyraeans); 10.38.4 (the Aetolians).

[17] "expelled": 3.22.6; 9.37.8; "dispossessed": 1.4.1; 4.3.6. Or "bodily removed": 8.27.10; "drove out": 1.35.2; "dispersed" (the Messenians): 4.20.1.

[18] In 3.24.1 the town of Zarax is mentioned as "depopulated by Cleonymus".

[19] 2.1.2; 2.3.7 (Corinth), 3.19.6 (Amyklai), 7.26.13 (Donoussa), 9.19.4 (Mykalessos), 2.9.2 (Megalopolis).

[20] 1.12.5 (the Hellenic cities on Sicily); 2.29.5 (Mycenae and Tiryns); 6.3.12 (cities in Southern Italy): 6.22.4 (the Piseans (in the Loeb translation: "It was the fate of Pisa... to be destroyed by the Eleans.")); 6.22.5 (Pylos); 9.23.5 (Thebes).

jects in the sentence (the Myceneans and Tirynthians, and the Potidaians). The translation has kept the wording "Potidaians", but in the case of the two other cities, instead of following the wording of the Greek text by naming the inhabitants, the translator chooses the city-name when translating, stating here that these two cities "were destroyed". Further examples of this kind of translation of ἀνάστατος are found in 6.3.12, where we are informed about king Pyrrhus' wars in Italy and are told that several cities "were destroyed".[21] In connection with the same wars we are told 1.12.5 that the Carthagenians had crossed the sea and "were destroying" all the Greek cities in Sicily except Syracuse. In connection with Kimon (1.17.6) we are told that he "ravaged" Skyros.

The same pattern is found in Frazer's translation of Pausanias, in the Budé editions and the Italian Mondadori-edition.[22] The same tendency for using "zerstört" is found in the German translation by E. Meyer.[23] Despite the fact that the Greek text indicates the same process by using the same adjective, the translators evidently prefer to discern between cities (which "are destroyed") and inhabitants of cities (which "are driven out"). In case the translators, in their translation, prefer to replace the Greek word for the inhabitants, used by Pausanias, with the name of the city, almost automatically the wording "destroyed" will be used.

As there is no indication in the text of Pausanias that calls for any change in the meaning of the Greek word, the change of words and thereby the meaning in the translation is made by decision of the translator.

As to Pausanias' use of the ἀνάστατος it seems, in most of the cases, to denote an expectation of a resettling sooner or later and this expectation is often fulfilled by the author with a remark about the return to the city of their former inhabitants or their descendants (*e.g.* the Aeginetans (2.29.1), Pylos (6.22.5), the Potidaeans (5.23.3), the Thebans who are mentioned several times, and the Antikyraeans (10.36.6)). Sometimes a resettlement by others is mentioned,[24] or a resettlement elsewhere, like that of the Aetolians in Amphissa or in Nikopolis. Lysimachos' transfer of the people of Lebedos to Ephesus is another example (7.3.5).

Pausanias and Corinth

In Book 2 Pausanias mentions the fate of Corinth in 146 BC in the so called Achaean War, provoked by the league of Achaean cities, and its refoundation in 44 BC as a Roman colony. The description of the fall of Corinth seems to follow the pattern related above. In 2.1.2 we are informed that Corinth is no longer inhabited by any of the ancient Corinthians, but by colonists sent by the Romans. We are told that this change was due to the Achaean League, which was to blame for the war: When the victory was declared the Romans disarmed the population of the other Greek cities and dismantled the walls of the fortified towns. But Corinth was made ἀνάστατος by Mummius and later refounded by Caesar (Κόρινθον δὲ ἀνάστατον Μομμίου ποιήσαντος τοῦ τότε ἡγουμένου τῶν...Ῥωμαίων). It is translated in the Loeb edition in this way: "Corinth was laid waste by Mummius...").

The following paragraph (2.2.2) concerns the Isthmian games. They were not interrupted, even when the Corinthians were driven away by Mummius (ἀναστάντων ὑπὸ Μομμίου Κορινθίων, translated in the following way in the Loeb edition: "when Corinth had been laid waste by Mummius"). During the period in which the city was left in desolation (ἠρήμωτο) the games were performed by the Sicyonians. When Corinth was resettled, the honour of celebrating the games was given back to this city.[25] The wording and the pattern is depopulation> desolation> resettlement.

In 2.3.7 Pausanias tells us again that when Corinth was made ἀνάστατος by Mummius (rendered by "laid waste" in the Loeb edition) and the original inhabitants were extinct (ἀπολομένοι), the new settlers broke the custom of sacrificing to the sons of Medea. In 5.10.5 Pausanias describes

---

[21] And – with a more correct translation – that Kaulonia was "utterly laid waste" (ἐς ἅπαν ἐρημωθῆναι).

[22] *E.g.* in 2.1.2; 2.3.7; 5.6.4; 5.23.3; 7.3.5; 7.7.9. For the examples from Book 2, see also note 26.

[23] Meyer 1967 (and later editions).

[24] *E.g.* 3.22.6 (Geronthrai); 5.6.4 (Scillus).

[25] 2.2.2: ὁ δὲ Ἰσθμικὸς ἀγὼν οὐδὲ ἀναστάντων ὑπὸ Μομμίου Κορινθίων ἐξέλιπεν, ἀλλ' ὅσον μὲν χρόνον ἠρήμωτο ἡ πόλις... οἰκισθείσης δὲ αὖθις ἐς τοὺς νῦν οἰκήτορας περιῆλθεν ἡ τιμή.

the Temple of Zeus in Olympia and mentions the 21 gilded shields that were dedicated there after Mummius "had conquered the Achaeans, captured Corinth and driven out the Dorian Corinthians" as given by the Loeb translation (...Μομμίου... Κόρινθον τὲ ἑλόντος καὶ Κορινθίους...ποιήσαντος ἀναστάτους).

In the descriptions of the events in Corinth, as quoted above, the wording of the Greek text and the pattern are close to that seen in the descriptions of the above mentioned cities: Depopulation causing desolation, followed, eventually, by a resettlement. Only the translation introduces the element of destruction when rendering ἀνάστατος with "laid waste" whether the subject is the city (2.1.2 and 2.3.7) or the citizens (2.2.2). The same deviations from the Greek text are found in French and Italian translations.[26] There is not any explicit notion of destruction in Pausanias' wording. In 5.10.5 the Loeb translator seems to respect this when translating ἀνάστατος with "driven out".

But Pausanias gives us another more dramatic account of the sack of Corinth. This is found, not in connection with the chapters on Corinth in Book 2, but in Book 7, where Pausanias dedicates a chapter to the history and the – often self inflicted – wars of the Achaeans and the Achaean League. Here Pausanias (7.16.5–9) relates how, after the battle in 146 BC, the fugitives from the battlefield who had escaped to Corinth, fled from the town together with most of its population. The gates were left open, but Mummius, fearing an ambush, only on the third day decided to enter the city. He captured the city and set it on fire. Most of the people still found there were massacred by the Romans and the women and the children were sold by Mummius as slaves. He then carried off the most admired monuments and art pieces. Then we are told that he dismantled the city-walls of all the cities that had fought against the Romans and disarmed the inhabitants as already stated in 2.1.2. In the next chapter Pausanias laments the weakness of Greece at that time and its changing fate through times. When the Achaean League rose like a fresh shoot, the roguery and cowardice of its generals blighted the growing plant (7.17.2).

Returning to the problem of the translator's choice of a denotation of destruction when translating ἀνάστατος, one has to conclude, that there is not any internal evidence in Pausanias' text that allows for the different translations of the same word, as quoted above. Nevertheless, there seems to be full agreement on this point between the translators. Is it so that the choice of word in the translation could build on the translators' common historical knowledge or opinion of the fate of certain of the cities described rather that on any connotation of destruction found in the Greek text? It may well be part of an answer to the problem, but as we shall see, there is a further explanation.

When one turns to translations of occurrences of ἀνάστατος in other authors the same pattern emerges, as has been noticed by Hansen and Nielsen in connection with texts related to the cities from the period covered by their inventory of archaic and classical poleis.[27] Following J. E. Powell, A Lexicon to Herodotus, Cambridge 1938[28] they conclude that ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι never has "to be ruined" or "to be destroyed" as principal meaning, which, instead, should be "to be expelled", when the subject is a people and "to be depopulated" when the subject is a city or a region. When a πόλις is mentioned as ἀνάστατος, the word πόλις is used in the personal rather than the urban sense of the word. With reference to the basic meaning of the verb ἀνιστάναι "make to stand up", "raise up" they conclude that the adjective ἀνάστατος scarcely would have carried the meaning "ruined", "destroyed", especially since the meaning "forced to migrate" or "depopulated" seems to fit all occurrences. The translation "ruined" is misleading and

---

[26] Pièrart 1998, 154–5 uses systematically *détruire/destruction.* when translating ἀνίστημι and ἀνάστατος in Pausanias 2.2.2; 2.1.2 and 2.3.7 concerning Corinth. In the Italian Mondadori edition of Pausanias (Musti and Torelli 1986) Libro II, ἀνάστατος is translated with "*rasa al suolo* da Mummio" in 2.1.2 and "*distrutta* Corintho dai Romani" in 2.3.7 and ἀνίστημι is rendered with "Corintho *fu distrutta* da Mummio" in 2.2.2. *Cf.* note 22.

[27] Hansen & Nielsen 2004, 121: Appendix. The Meaning of ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι.

[28] Powell 1938, 24 *s.v.* ἀνάστατος gives the following translations: 1. of a city, *depopulate.* 2. of a people, *make homeless.*

"laid waste" is better replaced by "depopulated". That means if we do not get other information in the text we cannot deduce for sure that the town mentioned as ἀνάστατος was physically destroyed. The conclusions drawn by Hansen and Nielsen thus confirm and support the results of this analysis of Pausanias.

As to the question why the translators have allowed themselves to consider and to choose the concept of destroying or laying waste, the answer seems straightforward. When one consults the entrance for the word and suggestions for the different meanings given in the *LSJ Greek-English Lexicon*, it states quite simply: 1) "made to rise up and depart, driven from one's house and home" giving several references to Herodotus and one to Isocrates and to Sophocles; 2) "*of cities*, "ruined, laid waste"" giving again several references to Herodotus and one to Andocides.

So, it may seem reasonable to blame the *LSJ* for the translators' distinction between inhabitants and cities when translating the word ἀνάστατος. It is interesting to notice that the same lexicon does not give the distinction in connection with the entrance for ἀνίστημι. Only the notion of forced emigration is found here (A.III.2 "make (people) emigrate, transplant"; B.II.2 "to be compelled to migrate"). No references to Pausanias are found in the *LSJ* in connection with the concepts under investigation here.

Thus, it would be a rather risky affair to use translations of Pausanias on this point or, when reading the Greek text, to trust the suggestions for meanings and translations given by the *LSJ s.v.* ἀνάστατος. Pape's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch gives the same interpretation: "entvölkert, zerstört, verwüstet" with focus on "zerstört", and the *Dictionaire grec-francais* by Magnien/Lacroix follows the same lines with "détruit", "ruiné".[29] These basic lexica seem to agree on this interpretation and a common source may well be the *TGL* (Stephanus), which gives as translations: *eversus,* ("expelled", "overthrown", "sacked"), *vastatus* ("destroyed", "laid waste") and *sedibus pulsus* ("driven from home"). They have clearly left their imprints on the translations into various languages. When choosing between the different mean-

ings the translators have followed the rule given by the dictionary: In the case of cities: "ruined, laid waste". And one is tempted to believe that the choice of word in the translation at the same time would be influenced by the translators' historical knowledge or opinion of the fate of certain of the cities as seen for example in the cases of Mycenae, Tiryns and Corinth.

It is, therefore, quite evident that one can easily be led to a wrong interpretation of the text, for example when an element of destruction or total destruction is inferred without any foundation in the wording of the text, and (the translation of) the text, then, is evoked as evidence for the author's resentments or biases for example when creating enemy images. In a wider context in connection with historical or archaeological investigations, misleading suggestions for translations would have far-reaching consequences, when Pausanias is used as evidence of destruction of cities, or for dating (total) destructions.

As already said, a correct translation would be the one suggested for the verb ἀνίστημι, which does not, explicitly, indicate any element of violent destruction. With his choice of the word ἀνάστατος in connection with cities Pausanias wants us to understand a process of whole or partial depopulation and its consequences, in most cases with a longer prospect of possible resettling.

In connection with her discussion of alienation and destruction as a result of imperial activity Susan Alcock mentions the descriptions of the destruction and the refoundation of Corinth in the following way:[30]

Rhetorical exaggeration may well color descriptions of this destruction, perhaps in order to match the violence of the annihilation of Carthage in the same year. Archaeological evidence actually suggests some degree of settlement at the site during the subsequent hundred or more years. This "interregnum" was brought to a close by the foundation of *Colo-*

---

[29] Pape 1824; Magnien & Lacroix 1969.
[30] Alcock 1993, 133.

nia Laus Julia Corinthiensis, established by Caesar shortly before his assassination in 44 BC.[31] Here Alcock attributes rhetorical exaggeration to Pausanias among other ancient authors. I should rather prefer as a result of my investigation to blame modern editors of translations and dictionaries. They may well assume their responsibility for contributing to the exaggerations stated by Alcock, when it comes to cases where the exaggerations seem to have no foundation in the Greek text of Pausanias.

In his investigation of Augustus' urban planning for Western Greece, Strauch lists[32] all the attractions of the new and modern city of Nikopolis and the new possibilities for the political elite transferred from their former cities to Nikopolis, and he discusses the fate and status of the people left back in the former cities now reduced to villages.

Strauch also criticizes Pausanias for not fully understanding the good intentions behind Augustus' "Umsiedlungsprogram" for Aetolia and the fate of the Aetolians and the Aetolian landscape:

> Wenn Pausanias Aitoloakarnania als öde und verlassen beschreibt, kennzeichnet er lediglich den Endpunkt einer lange Entwicklung: den Untergang des urbanen Lebens. Ein Verlassen der Landschaft hat es natürlich nie gegeben...[33]

This brings us to a short investigation of Pausanias' use of another Greek concept of abandon and desolation.

Ἔρημος and ἐρημόω in Pausanias

When discussing the meaning of ἀνάστατος above, we connected it with the concept of the empty and the wasted (ἔρημος and ἐρημόω) in a context of depopulation leading to desolation. An example was Pausanias 5.23.3 where he lists the Greek cities who took part in the battle of Plataea. We are informed that some of them are now ἔρημοι, that is, left in desolation. As said above, five cities were listed here: Mycenae and Tiryns were depopulated

and remained in desolation, the Ambracians and the Anactorians were brought to Nikopolis, and the Potidaeans were resettled later.

In the connection with the synoecism of Megalopolis mentioned in 8.27 we are informed that many citizens were persuaded to leave their town and congregate in the new city, others, being forced because they were unwilling to move, left for elsewhere. Of the abandoned cities is said (8.27.7) that now some are altogether deserted (ἐς ἅπαν... ἔρημοι) while other are now villages (κῶμαι). The cities are listed with their names, and archaeological evidence has now shown that the pattern is much more complicated and some of the cities mentioned as abandoned continued as city-centres striking their own coins, *etc.*[34]

As stated above, the adjective ἔρημος is found 35 times[35] in Pausanias of which 24 concern cities or land.[36] Some cities are mentioned as having been founded for the first time in an uninhabited area,[37] others as now lying wholly abandoned (ἐς

---

[31] For the "Interlude 146–44 BC" see also Wiseman 1979, 491–6: "The destruction of Corinth was far less extensive than scholars have preferred to believe" (494).

[32] Strauch 1996, 249–52.

[33] Strauch 1996, 245–6. On page 179 he states how recent archaeological investigations in the "chora" of Nikopolis contradicts "die Menschenleere, von den Strabo und Pausanias berichten". In his discussion of the synoecism of Megalopolis Pritchett II, 1998–9 in his chapter on "Ruins in Pausanias" page 206, note 11 expresses the process in this way: "The tendency towards the concentration of the population into fewer cities is most prominently marked by Augustus' activities in the founding of Nikopolis and the refounding of Patrai, and the transfer to these cities of parts of the population of Akarnania, Aitolia, and Achaia. Many Aitolians were removed to Amphissa. It was not so much a matter of destroying cities as reviving the country. Akarnania illustrates the same trend. Urban life was concentrated in fewer cities. *Cf.* Isager 2001.

[34] For the topos of "abandonment and desolation" and the reality of the habitation pattern in Arcadia, see. *e.g.* Di Napoli 2005, 518: "It is beyond doubt, then, that this situation did not necessarily imply total depopulation, disastrous decline and abandon."

[35] *Cf.* the *index verborum* by Pirenne-Delforge & Purnelle 1997, 413.

[36] The 11 not taken into consideration here concern real deserts or desert islands: 1.1.1; 1.7.2; 1.23.5; 1.35.5; 2.21.6; 4.20.4; 4.34.12; 8.14.12; 8.22.4; 8.22.6; 10.15.7.

[37] 4.1.1 (Messene); 4.23.7 (Zankle); 7.4.8 (Chios).

ἅπαν…)[38] others only partially.[39] Other cities are abandoned only by the men (of military age οἱ ἐν ἐλίκια).[40] Most of the examples mentioned (10) are about cities now left in abandon.[41] What becomes clear from the examples found is that a city can be abandoned in various degrees, partially or wholly or just abandoned. And nothing seems to indicate what the designation abandoned (ἔρημος) without further indication in the text really implicates, for example when compared to the designation "wholly abandoned". When the text declares a city abandoned, it does not allow us to conclude to which degree it is abandoned.

The verb ἐρημόω is used 20 times in the text, not unexpectedly in the same context as the adjective. We hear of former cities now laid waste. Examples are: Kalydon (7.18.8) and Kolophon (7.3.4) where the inhabitants became part of a plan for synoecism. The Kolophonians were moved to Ephesos. The verb is also used in connection with the land of the Anatolians, already mentioned (8.24.11). Lyrkea lay deserted already before the Greek expedition to Troy (2.25.5) and Delos after the sack of Mithridates VI, king of Pontos (3.23.5). Illyrians desolated the town of the Mothonians, carrying off a number of men and still more of the women (4.35.7). This must be considered a partial desolation. Total desolation is mentioned (6.3.12) in connection with Kaulonia in Italy, "whose fate it was to be utterly laid waste" (Loeb transl.) … ἐς ἅπαν ἐρημωθῆναι… and a worse fate befell Mycenae and Niniveh, which were "utterly ruined and desolate …ἠρήμωνται πανώλεθροι" (8.33.2).[42]

In the reversed context, where cities left in abandon were resettled, we find the verb used in the following examples and again with inconsistent translation practice: Leontini (6.17.8, "laid waste" (Loeb transl.)), Thebes (4.27.10, ἐρημώσαντος Ἀλεξάνδρου τὴν πόλιν… "When Alexander destroyed the city" (Loeb transl.)), again Thebes in 7, 6, 9, ἐς τοσοῦτο ἠρήμωσεν Ἀλέξανδρος τὴν πόλιν… here translated "Thebes had been brought so low by Alexander that…" (Loeb transl.), Thebaid territory (1.25.4), occupied by the Boeotians "now that there were no Thebans left to dwell here" (Loeb transl.), and Corinth laying deserted (2.2.2 quoted above).[43]

As above it is difficult to state to which degree the cities mentioned were desolated before they were resettled. In the case of the two references to the same event (Thebes) the Loeb translation renders two different translations of the verb. The translators seem to make their choice according to their own impressions of the course of the events.

By mischance of Roman rule?

A much discussed passage in Book 8 on Arcadia has been related to our two cases: the synoecism of Nikopolis and to the refoundation of Corinth. When describing the synoecism of Megalopolis around 360 BC, mentioned above, Pausanias gives the following statement (8.27.1):

Megalopolis is the youngest city, not of Arcadia only, but of Greece, with the exception of those whose inhabitants have been removed by accident of the Roman domination. The Arcadians united into it to gain strength… (Transl. W.H.S. Jones, Loeb ed.)

Ἡ δὲ Μεγάλη πόλις νεωτάτη πόλεών ἐστιν οὐ τῶν Ἀρκαδικῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐν

---

[38] 5.23.6 (Greater Hyblaea; Hyblaea Gereatis was reduced to a village (κώμη); 8.27.7 (unspecified cities in Arcadia); 8.29.5 (Thoknia). In 10.11.3 we are informed that the Cnidians settled on the Aeolian islands, finding some of them desert and driving away the inhabitants from others (ἀναστήσαντες…τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας…).

[39] 8.25.3 (Thelpousa), 8.27.7 (cities reduced to villages around Megalopolis); 9.7.6 (Theben, the lower part is abandoned).

[40] 1.27.6 (Athens); 2.7.1 (Sikyon); 2.20.8 (Argos).

[41] 2.36.1 (Halike); 2.38.2 (Nauplia); 4.2.3 (Eurytion); 4.3.2 (Trikka); 5.23.3 (Mycenae and Tiryns); 7.27.8 (Poseidonion); 8.15.9 (Aigae); 8.26.8 (Melaineae); 8.33.2 (Delos); 8.35.7 (Zoitia and Paroria).

[42] The translated quotations are taken from the Loeb edition. 1.20.7 gives an example of Athenians, during the siege of Sulla, asking Pythia if time had come for Athens to be made desolate.

[43] The last 6 examples of the use of the verb mention: Lysimachos having lost his friends (1.10.3), the house of Aphareus being bereft of all male descendants (4.3.1), battle positions left being without troops (4.17.7), the women of Elis being deprived of men under arms (5.3.1), the house of Amphion being left desolate by plague (9.5.9), and the sanctuary of Alalcomenai being deprived of their goddess (9.33.4).

JACOB ISAGER

Ἕλλησι, πλὴν ὅσων κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων μεταβεβήκασιν οἰκήτορες. Συνῆλθον δὲ ὑπὲρ ἰσχύος ἐς αὐτὴν οἱ Ἀρκάδες...

Simon Swain deals with the passage in connection with what he characterizes as Pausanias' attacks on Rome and concludes that he "find(s) it hard to believe that Pausanias is not antipathetic to Roman rule in Greece, though we certainly cannot speak of general hostility."[44] Swain takes this passage as evidence for Pausanias' anti-Roman attitude and gives the following translation:

Megalopolis is the youngest not only of the cities in Arcadia but of [all] those in Greece, with the exception of those whose inhabitants have been immigrants by mischance of Roman rule.

To Swain these new foundations are Corinth and Nikopolis. He refers to Pausanias 5.1.2 for the remark that "modern Corinthians are the youngest of the Peloponnesians", and he adds that Nikopolis clearly is younger still. And he proceeds:

That the new foundations under Rome were "by mischance of Roman rule" is explained by the hostility Pausanias bears towards Rome for the destruction of old Corinth and the importation of a non-Dorian population, and for the brutal synoecism by which (in his account) Augustus formed Nikopolis.[45]

Swain does not accept the other reading of the text, proposed by Clavier and taken up by Palm, where an ἐπί is inserted before ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων.[46] This reading is followed by Rocha-Pereira[47] in the Teubner-edition and by the Budé editions and it can be seen as a solution of the problematic use of the genitive ἀρχῆς as an agent (*Subjective Genitive*) for συμφορὰν.[48] The emendation changes the meaning to "by mischance during (the) Roman rule". The responsibility for the "mischance" is taken away from the Romans and the passage cannot be used as evidence for "destruction" and "brutal synoecism". The question is, then, if Pausanias wants us to think of Corinth and Nikopolis when he refers to cities that the inhabitants were

forced to leave because of an accident or a mischance, about which he gives no further indication.

Pausanias' passage on Megalopolis keeps on playing a key-role in the discussion of the author's attitude to Roman rule in Greece and, as said above, no consensus has been reached. The tendency is to accept a more "neutral" reading as seen in Bowie 1996 and Hutton 2005 and 2008.

Bowie[49] follows the opinion of Habicht when stating that Pausanias as a Greek regrets that Greece has fallen under Roman rule – not that Macedonian rule would have been any better – and that Pausanias disapproves of Rome's treatment of Greece in the 2nd century BC, of Mummius' destruction of Corinth and Sulla's of Athens, and of Augustus' movement of the population in Aetolia.

As to 8.27.1, Bowie[50] follows Swain in not accepting the textual emendation suggested by Clavier and to him Pausanias' text speaks about "the consequences of the catastrophe *of* Roman rule". In the discussion following Bowie's *exposé* in the Fondation Hardt publication *Pausanias Historien* Bingen[51] prefers to translate the text with "par un effet désastreux de la domination romaine". To him "le mot συμφορά a un caractère circonstantiel plutôt qu'il ne marque une durée". The movement of populations was an unfortunate effect of Roman rule, but it could also have happened in a context of Greek domination. The text should not be taken as a general critique of the Romans from the part of Pausanias, but only as a critical judgement from Pausanias as a historian, who does not refrain from making severe judgements of Greeks

---

[44] Swain 1996, 352–6.
[45] Swain 1996, 354.
[46] Clavier 1814–21, IV, 406–7; Palm, 1959, 74. Habicht 1985 (German edition), 121 follows the reading accepted by Palm and Clavier and that leads him to the natural conclusion that with this reading of Pausanias' text the possibility to read any negative reference to Roman rule is ruled out. The debate is closed.
[47] Rocha-Pereira 1977.
[48] *Cf.* Piérart 1998, 153.
[49] Bowie 1996, 216.
[50] Bowie 1996, 217.
[51] Pausanias Historien 1996, 231–2.

as well.[52] The fact that very few monuments of the Roman period are mentioned by Pausanias is not taken by Bingen[53] as indication of any anti-Roman feelings.

Hutton[54] in a chapter entitled "Pausanias the Conformist" takes the same standpoint when warning against the temptation to read any disdain or approval into Pausanias' silence about Roman and contemporary affairs. Hutton confines himself to mention only very briefly 8.27.1 and to suggest a possible interpretation of the "misfortune" of Roman rule.[55] He concludes that Pausanias does not occupy a single position on Rome. He displays, in fact, a multiplicity of attitudes toward Rome and they are not completely the same from the beginning of the work to the end.[56]

As to 8.27.1 Piérart sees no problem in insertion of an ἐπί thereby giving the meaning "at the time of Roman rule": "à l'exception des villes que les habitants ont eu le malheur de devoir quitter sous la domination romaine". Piérart adds that Pausanias, surely, has the fate of the Corinthians in mind as well and maybe also the people who had to leave their homes because of the foundation of Nikopolis.[57]

Another solution is found in Steinhart.[58] He states that Pausanias (2.1.2) blames the Achaean league for the fall of Corinth and as a consequence of this Pausanias would hardly use συμφορά in 8.27.1 in the meaning of misfortune. Steinhart, therefore, suggests that the meaning "contribution", given in the LSJ, would fit nicely in:

Megalopolis ist die jüngste Stadt nicht nur von denen der Arkader, sondern auch von denen bei den Griechen, ausser denjenigen, bei denen die bewohner mit einer Beitrag der römischen Regierung umgesiedelt wurden.

Steinhart[59] refers to Pausanias 5.23.3 on the "Umsiedlung" of the inhabitants from Ambrakia and Anaktorion to the new-founded Nikopolis. He adds Patrae as another example and concludes on page 150:

An der vieldiskutierte Stelle 8, 27, 1 verweist Pausanias also auf die Unterstützung des rö-

mischen Herrscher für neu- oder wiedergegründete Städte in Griechenland, die dann in der Tat die jüngsten Städte bei den Griechen waren."

A recent contribution to the discussion of 8.27.1 has been given by Akujärvi[60] who warns against emending the text with the intention of giving a more "positive" meaning to the only passage in the Periegesis, that could be interpreted as a clear condemnation of Roman rule in Greece. Likewise, she cannot accept the very rare meaning of "contribution" given to συμφορά by Steinhart, who finds his parallels only outside the Periegesis in authors like Polemon and Aretaeus. Pointing to the fact that

---

[52] Cf. Bowie, 1996, 218: "First, of course, it is not only Romans whom he condemns: many Greeks are condemned too. 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."

[53] Pausanias Historien 1996, 233.

[54] Hutton 2005, 48.

[55] Hutton 2005, 47: "...the question of his [Pausanias'] attitude toward Roman rule has long been a subject of debate. Too often, however, the proponents on one side or the other have taken these statements out of context and argued without due regard for the complexity of the very issue of what it meant to be "pro-Roman" or "anti-Roman" at this time. Pausanias has unabashedly positive things to say about the emperors of his own time, particularly Hadrian, and little overt criticism of any emperor, contemporary or prior. At the same time, he does have harsh words for these Romans who were responsible for the destruction and despoliation of various cities in Greece, and at one point, in a passage where the manuscript reading is in dispute, seems to refer to Roman rule as a "misfortune" (συμφορά) for the Greeks (8.27.1). Rome and Roman rule is an everyday reality for Pausanias, one that intersects the axes of his topographical and historical efforts at every level, and Pausanias has a multiplicity of responses to it that defy simple characterizations. We will see Pausanias occupying not a single position on Rome, but numerous positions."

[56] Hutton 2005, 322. See now Hutton 2008.

[57] Piérart 1998, 153: "La traduction "à l'exception des villes que les habitants ont eu le malheur de devoir quitter sous la domination romaine" ne fait pas de difficultè. De quels malheurs s'agit-il? Pausanias en fournit un qui concerne Kéryneia (7, 24, 5)."

[58] Steinhart 2002.

[59] Steinhart 2002, 150.

[60] Akujärvi 2005, 286–91. She gives a full bibliography on the topic.

JACOB ISAGER

examples of συμφορά construed with a subjective genitive are not found in Pausanias' text, she interprets the genitive as subjective and proposes as "a more neutral interpretation" the following translation: "with the exception of those whose inhabitants have been changed because of an event affecting the Roman government."[61] According to her, the narrator[62] refers to Corinth, Patrae, and Nikopolis and the event referred to would be the transformation of the Roman government from republic to principate. "Had not the republic changed into principate, Caesar and Augustus would not have had the positions of power which enabled them to initiate the founding of the cities in question."[63] To my opinion it may have been difficult for the Greek or Roman reader to grasp this meaning, and I think that this is the reason why Akujärvi cautiously adds that whether one can accept her interpretation or not, it should be clear that the passage is uncertain and not a reliable evidence for any anti-Roman attitudes. Generally, Akujärvi does not find an anti-Roman tendency in the *Periegesis*.

My reading of Pausanias' remarks on Corinth and Nikopolis, presented above, would hardly support the conclusions reached by Swain. I have difficulty in reading any real antipathy or hostility, open or hidden, into Pausanias' descriptions of the fate of Corinth and the cities connected with the synoecism of Nikopolis. Pausanias relates a well known sequence of events which were caused by different factors, and which, in a further perspective, lead to new possibilities, as was the case for Megalopolis– and, eventually, for Corinth and Nikopolis. As to the procedure of removing the inhabitants of a city after it has been captured, it seems to Pausanias to be a possible and logic consequence of any warfare at any time, and to him it seems quite acceptable that the Romans have used this procedure. I see no need to change the text of Pausanias by inserting

an ἐπί and would agree to the view expressed by Bingen quoted above.[64]

As to Pausanias' more general attitude to the Romans[65] I would subscribe to the general conclusion reached by Anne Jaquemin who in her article on "Pausanias et les empereurs romains" expresses what now seems to represent a widely accepted view of the figure of Pausanias:

I do not think that Pausanias stands in opposition to Rome, and it seems to me difficult to find him expressing approval of any form of hostility against the imperial regime and its way of administrating its provinces.[66]

---

[61] Akujärvi 2005, 288. A translation close to that given by Clavier 1814–1821, despite his proposal for an emendation of the text.

[62] Akujärvi prefers the designation "narrator", working from the assumption that to search for the actual author's views, that is, Pausanias' views on any matter, is to search for answers the text cannot give (page 11).

[63] Akujärvi 2002, 290.

[64] See pp. 211–2.

[65] It has recently been said that the supposed Hellenic patriotism is a chimaira: Jones 2004, 14, who explains the real "identity" of *pepaideumenoi* like Pausanias as something complex and multilayered, pointing out for example Pausanias' supposed Lydian origin and that Pausanias never talks of the Greeks as "us", but always as a third-person entity.

[66] Jaquemin 1996, 41: "Il ne me semble donc pas que Pausanias incarne une résistance à Rome; il paraît meme difficile de voir en lui témoin sympathisans de formes d'hostilité au regime imperial et à la provincialisation." A recent discussion of Pausanias' "complex attitude" to the Romans is found in Pretzler 2007, 28–31.

Bibliography

Akujärvi, J. 2005
Researcher, traveller, narrator: studies in Pausanias' Periegesis (Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 12), Stockholm.

Alcock, S.E. 1993
Graecia capta. The landscapes of Roman Greece, Cambridge.

Arafat, K.W. 1996
Pausanias' Greece. Ancient artists and Roman rulers, Cambridge.

Bowie, E.L. 1996
'Past and present in Pausanias', in *Pausanias Historien*, 207–39.

Clavier 1814–21
Descriptions de la Grèce de Pausanias. Traduction nouvelle, avec le texte grec collationné sur le manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Roi, par M. Clavier, I–IV, Paris

Di Napoli, V. 2005
'The theatres of Roman Arcadia, Pausanias and the history of the region', in Østby 2005, 509–20.

Frazer, J.G. 1898
Pausanias's description of Greece, I–VI, Translated with a commentary by J.G.F., London.

Gallo, L.1980
'Popolosità e scarsità, contributo allo studio di un topos', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa,* S.III 10, 1233–70.

Habicht, Chr. 1985
Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece, Berkeley. German edition: *Pausanias und seine "Beschreibung Griechenlands",* München 1985.

Hansen, M.H. & T.H. Nielsen 2004
An inventory of Archaic and Classical poleis, Oxford.

Hutton, W. 2005
Describing Greece. Landscape and literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias, Cambridge.

Hutton, W. 2008
'The distaster of Roman Rule: Pausanias 8.27.1', *Classical Quarterly* 58, 622–37.

Isager, J. 2001
'Eremia in Epirus and the foundation of Nikopolis. Models of civilization in Strabo', in *Foundation and Destruction, Nikopolis and Northwestern Greece,* J. Isager (ed.), (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens, Vol. 4), Aarhus, 17–26.

Jacquemin, A. 1996
'Pausanias et les empereurs romains', *Ktema* 21, 29–42.

Jones, C.P. 2004
'Multiple identities in the age of the second sophistic', in *Paideia: The world of the second sophistic,* B.E. Borg (ed.), Berlin/New York, 14–21.

Magnien, V. & M. Lacroix 1969
Dictionaire Grec-Francais, Paris.

Meyer, E. 1967
Pausanias, Beschreibung Griechenlands, München-Zürich (2. Ausg.).

Musti, D. & M. Torelli (eds.) 1986
Pausania. Guida della Grecia. Libro II. La Corinzia e l'Argolide, testo e traduzione di D. Musti, Commento a cura di D. Musti e M. Torelli,

Fondazione L. Valla (Mondadori ed.), Verona.

Østby, E. (ed.) 2005
Ancient Arcadia. Papers from a seminar on Ancient Arcadia…Athens 7–10 May 2002, (Papers from the Norwegian Institute 8), Athens.

Palm, J. 1959
Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit, Lund, 63–74 (Pausanias).

Pape, W. 1824
Handwörterbuch der Griechieshen Sprache. Braunschweig (1824 and later editions).

Pausanias Historien 1996
Pausanias Historien. Préparés et presides par Jean Bingen. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, Tome XLI, Geneve.

Piérart, M. 1998
'ΡΩΜΑΙΟΣ ΑΦΗΛΛΗΝΙΣΘΗ. La Place de Rome dans la version culturelle de Pausanias d'apres le livre II', in *L'ecumenismo politico nella coscienza dell'Occidente,* Congr. Bergamo 1995, Aigner, L., A. Barzano *et al.* (eds.), Roma, 149–63.

Pirenne-Delforge, V. & G. Purnelle 1997
Pausanias, Periegesis. Index verborum. Liste de fréquence. Index nominum, I-II. Liège.

Powell, J.E. 1938
A lexicon to Herodotus, Cambridge.

Pretzler, M. 2007
Pausanias. *Travel writing in ancient Greece,* London.

Pritchett, W.K. 1998–1999
Pausanias Periegetes, I-II Amsterdam.

Rocha-Pereira, M.H. 1973–1981
Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio. Edidit M.H. Rocha-Pereira, I–III. 2. Aufl., Leipzig.

Steinhart, M. 2002
'Das Unglück der römischen Herrshafft? Zum Verständnis von Pausanias 8,27,1', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 26, 145–50.

Strauch, D. 1996
Römische Politik und Griechische Tradition. Die Umgestaltung Nordwest-Griechenlands unter römischer Herrschaft, München.

Swain, S. 1996
Hellenism and empire. Language, Classicism, and power in the Greek World, AD 50–250, Oxford.

Wiseman, J. 1979
'Corinth and Rome I, 228 B.C.- A.D. 267', *ANWR* II, 7,1, 438–548 (491–6: The interlude 146–44 B.C.).