

THE DISASTER OF ROMAN RULE: PAUSANIAS 8.27.1

As many readers have come to realize in recent years, the periegete Pausanias is capable of furnishing valuable perspectives on the complex nature of Greek culture in the Roman period. Over the course of his unique topographical account of the monuments and landscapes of Greece, Pausanias reflects on the interaction between Greek and Roman in contexts that other authors of the period deal with only rarely. The attitudes that Pausanias exhibits toward Rome have received frequent scrutiny over the years,¹ but the results so far have hardly been unanimous: to some Pausanias (or the narratorial persona he projects)² is resistant if not recalcitrant toward Roman rule, to others he seems neutral or even favourably disposed. Recent scholarship has emphasized the problematic nature of pitting ‘Greek’ against ‘Roman’ in this period, however,³ and even a cursory glance at the evidence suggests that any generalization

* Martha T. Jones read many drafts of this article and saved me from embarrassing errors. I would also like to thank the anonymous reader for *CQ* for his/her constructive comments. No doubt there are many infelicities remaining that neither of them would choose to be associated with.

¹ A partial list of works that have dealt with this issue: O. Regenbogen, *RE Suppl.* 8 (1956), 1069–70; J. Palm, *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der Griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (Lund, 1959), 63–74; C. Habicht, *Pausanias’ Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, 1985, 1998²), 117–40; Y. Tzifopoulos, ‘Mummius’ dedications at Olympia and Pausanias’ attitude to the Romans’, *GRBS* 34 (1993), 93–100; K. Arafat, *Pausanias’ Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers* (Cambridge, 1996), esp. 106–215; S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250* (Oxford, 1996), 330–56; A. Jacquemin, ‘Pausanias et les empereurs romains’, *Ktéma* 21 (1996), 29–42; C. Auffarth, ‘“Verräter-Übersetzer”? Pausanias, das römische Patrai und die Identität der Griechen in der Achaëa’, in H. Cancik and J. Rüpke (edd.), *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion* (Tübingen, 1997), 219–38; M. Piérart ‘*Ρωμαίος ὡν ἀφελληνίσθη*: La place de Rome dans la vision culturelle de Pausanias d’après le livre II’, in L. Foresti (ed.), *L’Ecumenismo politico nella coscienza dell’occidente* (Rome, 1998), 149–62; M. Torelli, ‘Pausania a Corinto. Un intellettuale Greco del secondo secolo e la propaganda imperiale romana’, in D. Knoepfler and M. Piérart (edd.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l’an 2000* (Geneva, 2001), 135–84; Y. Lafond, ‘Lire Pausanias à l’époque des Antonins’, in Knoepfler and Piérart (edd.) [see previous item], 387–406; M. Moggi, ‘Pausania e Roma (Nota di lettura a VIII 27,1)’, *Gerión* 20 (2002), 435–49; M. Steinhart, ‘Das Unglück der römischen Herrschaft? Zum Verständnis von Pausanias 8.27.1’, *WJA* 26 (2002), 145–50; W. Hutton, *Describing Greece. Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias* (Cambridge, 2005), 41–51, 317–22; J. Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator. Studies in Pausanias’ Periegesis* (Lund, 2005), 265–95; M. Pretzler, *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (London, 2007), 27–31.

² Akujärvi (n. 1), 25, wisely warns against assuming that Pausanias the author is identical with the persona he projects in his writings. For ease of reference this distinction is not maintained punctiliously in what follows, but should be understood throughout.

³ A brief selection of recent works: G. Woolf, ‘Becoming Roman, staying Greek: culture, identity and the civilization process in the Roman East’, *PCPS* 40 (1994), 116–43; Swain (n. 1); T. Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 1997); T. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford, 2001), esp. 20–6 and *passim*; and the several contributions in S. Goldhill (ed), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire* (Oxford, 2001). Compare the parallel re-evaluation of ‘Romanization’ in Greece and elsewhere among students of material culture. See, for instance, R. Hingley, *Global-*

about Pausanias on this issue is bound to be wide of the mark. For instance, he has unabashedly laudatory things to say about some of the emperors, especially Hadrian (e.g. 1.3.2), but at the same time he has harsh words for Romans such as Sulla who were responsible for depredations in Greece (e.g. 1.20.7, 9.7.5–6). He praises the innate nobility of Nero for his short-lived grant of ‘freedom’ to the Greeks (7.17.3), yet excoriates him for the ransacking of sacred artworks from Delphi (10.7.1).⁴ He passes over major Roman-era monuments in silence, yet is not above highlighting baths and aqueducts built by imperial benefactors as sources of local pride for Greek cities.⁵ The aim of this article is not to tease out all the intricacies of Pausanias’ stance(s) toward the Romans, but instead to re-examine the one passage that has attracted the most attention in discussions of the topic. Misreading of this passage has diverted the discussion of Pausanias’ outlook into unprofitable byways, and has motivated questionable emendations of the text.

At about the mid-point of his description of Arcadia, in his treatment of the Arcadian city of Megalopolis, Pausanias refers (according to the manuscripts) to movements of population that occur in Greece ‘as a result of the disaster of Roman rule’ (8.27.1: *κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων*). Those who see Pausanias as critical of the Romans have frequently adduced this statement as evidence for their view, while those who prefer a neutral or pro-Roman Pausanias have felt compelled to obviate the implications of it in a number of ways, most frequently by emendation.⁶ In what follows we shall see that problems in interpreting the received text render

izing Roman Culture (London, 2005), esp. 14–48; and the various contributions to E. Fentress (ed.), *Romanization and the City* (*JRA* Supplement 38, Portsmouth, RI, 2000).

⁴ Cf. Arafat (n. 1), 140–55. Temple-robbing frequently inspires expressions of disapprobation from Pausanias, whether the sacrilege is committed by Romans (see also 9.27.3–4, and the case of Sulla at 9.7.5) or other ethnicities (e.g. 1.16.3; 8.46.2–3). Many scholars follow Arafat (n. 1), 127–9, in seeing 8.46.1–4. as an exception: Augustus is ostensibly excused for his peculation of sacred objects at Tegea on the basis of the fact that a long line of mythical and historical figures did the same, including Xerxes and the Greeks at the sack of Troy (see M. Moggi and M. Osanna [edd.], *Pausania, Guida della Grecia libro VIII, l’Arcadia* [Milan, 2003], 502; Pretzler [n. 1], 28, n. 82, 87; cf. Swain [n. 1], 345). In light of Pausanias’ consistency on this issue elsewhere, however (and in light of the fact that Xerxes and the Greeks at Troy are hardly the most flattering figures to be compared with in the realm of religious propriety), this passage should probably be read as sarcastic, rather than ‘frankly fawning’ (Arafat, loc. cit.). On sarcasm in Pausanias see Hutton (n. 1), 318–21, and for a parallel case compare 1.13.9 (where Pausanias ‘excuses’ the historian Hieronymus of Cardia for gross bias on the basis that other historians are also biased) with 1.9.8 (where he straightforwardly condemns Hieronymos for the same bias). See also Habicht (n. 1), 122 on 8.46.1–4: ‘Just because others had committed robbery does not mean that Pausanias found robbery excusable’.

⁵ Cf. W. Hutton, ‘The construction of religious space in Pausanias’, in J. Elsner and I. Rutherford (edd.), *Pilgrimage in Greco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 2005), 291–317; and Hutton (n. 1), 166–74.

⁶ Important discussions of this passage appear in most of the works listed in n. 1 (esp. Palm, Habicht, Arafat, Swain, Piérart, Moggi, Steinhart, Akujärvi). To those should be added D. Marcotte, ‘Le Pausanias de Christian Habicht’ (review of Habicht [n. 1]), *LEC* 56 (1988), 73–83; E. Bowie, ‘Past and Present in Pausanias’, in J. Bingen (ed.), *Pausanias Historien* (Fondation Hardt Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique XLI, Geneva, 1996), 207–33, at 217, 233; J. Bingen, (Comments to Bowie) in Bingen (ed.) (see previous item), 231–2; G. Maddoli, ‘*Κατὰ συμφορὰν*, i sinecismi forzati e il giudizio di Pausania sul dominio romano in Grecia (a proposito di Paus. VIII 27,1)’, in A. Isola, E. Menestò and A. Di Pilla (edd.), *Curiositas. Studi di cultura classica e medievale in onore di Ubaldo Pizzani* (Naples, 2002), 163–6; and the commentary ad loc. in the editions of Pausanias by H. Hitzig and H. Blümner (Berlin, 1896–1910); N. Papachatzis (Athens, 1974–1981); M. Casevitz, M. Jost and J. Marcadé (Paris, 1998); and Moggi and Osanna (n. 4).

emendation tempting, but that the most widely accepted emendation is not the best available option. We will also see that neither emendations nor attempts to explicate the passage without emendation succeed in transforming the statement into one that dissociates Roman rule from the concept of ‘disaster’. In the end, however, we will not be left with an ‘anti-Roman’ Pausanias. While Pausanias quite probably did mean to refer to Roman rule or its effects as a disaster, what needs to be challenged most is an assumption common to all sides of the debate: that referring to the impact of Rome in such terms amounts to an anti-Roman statement on Pausanias’ part. While Pausanias’ reflections on the role of the Romans in Greece are complex and worth further study, consideration of that topic should not be sidetracked, as it has in the past, by a misunderstanding of this one passage.

To understand Pausanias’ statement it is important to look at it in its broader context: Megalopolis was founded soon after the battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C.E.,⁷ long before Rome became a significant actor in the region. Population for the new city was obtained by the resettlement of the inhabitants of numerous nearby towns. This resettlement is something that Pausanias describes in detail (8.27.1–8) and refers to several times in his description of Arcadia as he encounters the cadavers of the abandoned villages in the course of his travels (e.g. 8.26.5, 36.1, 38.3). It is at the very beginning of his account of the city’s foundation that Pausanias makes the statement at issue (8.27.1):

ἡ δὲ Μεγάλη πόλις νεωτάτη πόλεων ἔστω οὐ τῶν Ἀρκαδικῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑλλάσιν, πλὴν ὅσων κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων μεταβεβήκασιν οἰκήτορες· συνῆλθον δὲ ὑπὲρ ἰσχύος ἐς αὐτὴν οἱ Ἀρκάδες...

Megalopolis is the newest of cities, not only in Arcadia, but also in all of Greece, except for those the inhabitants of which have migrated as a result of the disaster of Roman rule. But the Arcadians gathered themselves into the city for reasons of strength...

Whatever one thinks of Pausanias’ attitude toward the Romans, the urge to emend is understandable, since no attempt to make sense of the received text has been entirely satisfying. First of all, what has seemed to many to be the common-sense interpretation would take the genitive phrase ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων as either a subjective genitive (Roman rule is the agent of the disaster) or a genitive of substance or apposition (Roman rule is the disaster).⁸ But in Greek in general, and Pausanias in particular, a dependent genitive with συμφορὰ is almost always an objective genitive expressing the victim of the disaster rather than its source. For example, when Pausanias refers to Μεσσηνίων ... αἱ συμφοραὶ (3.13.2) he is referring to disasters suffered by the Messenians rather than disasters caused by the Messenians.⁹ This ineluctable fact has been noted in recent years by Mauro Moggi and Johanna Akujärvi,¹⁰ but interestingly enough, it also seems to have been recognized by many of Pausanias’ earliest readers in the modern age. Friedrich Sylburg, who completed the deluxe sixteenth-century edition of Pausanias begun by Xylander, translates the passage as follows: *in quas, post clades a romano imperio acceptas, coloni trans-*

⁷ There is some disagreement in the sources over the exact date. See S. Hornblower, ‘When was Megalopolis founded?’ *ABSA* 85 (1990), 71–7.

⁸ Cf. Kühner–Gerth 402c–d; Schwyzler 2.121–2; 2.129.

⁹ Although Pausanias most often uses a dative of reference in a verbal construction to express the victim of a συμφορὰ, e.g. 1.10.3, 1.13.6, 2.20.9, 3.23.10, 4.33.7, 6.5.3, 7.19.7, 9.6.5.

¹⁰ Moggi (n. 1), 439; Akujärvi (n. 1), 288–9; cf. Marcotte (n. 6), 75; Bowie (n. 6), 233.

migrarunt, ('into which colonists immigrated after the disasters suffered by the Roman empire').¹¹

The easiest way to read the unemended passage in isolation would thus cast Roman rule as the victim of a disaster rather than its perpetrator. Instead of condemning the empire, Pausanias' statement would, if anything, express a certain amount of sympathy toward it. But things are not so simple once one begins to ask what 'disaster suffered by Roman rule' Pausanias might be referring to, keeping in mind that the disaster in question was one that led to migrations of populations in Greece. Failure to find a plausible answer to that question led Moggi to favour emending the text.¹² Akujärvi, however, revives with some modification an interpretation offered in the early nineteenth century by Siebelis,¹³ according to which the *συμφορά* at issue was the breakdown of the Roman republic and the establishment of the principate, a transformation that actually did provide the context for a number of new foundations and movements of population within Greece. Pausanias is aware of at least three examples from this period: the re-establishment of Corinth and Patrae as Roman colonies and the new foundation at Nicopolis.¹⁴ In the latter two cases Pausanias testifies that population for the new communities was drawn from surrounding cities and towns, a situation that parallels in some respects the earlier case of Megalopolis.

Before critiquing Akujärvi's solution, we must address a basic issue of semantics. It seems to be a common belief that in addition to meaning 'disaster', 'calamity', etc., the term *συμφορά* can refer more neutrally to any sort of 'event', 'incident' or 'experience', even a good 'experience'. As applied to 8.27.1 this notion finds expression in a number of outlets, for instance in the translation of Frazer ('...cities whose inhabitants, under the Roman Empire, have chanced to be transferred...'),¹⁵ and also in the translation in the new edition of Book 8 in the Budé series: 'par suite des circonstances, sous la domination romaine'¹⁶ (a translation that we will discuss further below). Over the whole course of Greek literature it is true that *συμφορά* can

¹¹ Xylander–Sylburg (Frankfurt, 1583–1603), 258, in the course of Sylburg's comments on the 1547 translation by Amasaes that is included in the Xylander–Sylburg edition. Amasaes himself had also translated the genitive as objective (Xylander–Sylburg: 219): *...in quas post imperii calamitatem ab urbe Roma coloni immigrarunt* ('into which colonists immigrated from the city of Rome after the disaster of the empire').

¹² Moggi (n. 1), 438–44, and Moggi and Osanna (n. 4), 142.

¹³ C.G. Siebelis (ed.), *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio* (Leipzig 1822–8), 3.370. Although he does not adopt it in his text, Siebelis also suggests in his notes a possible emendation (nn. to vol. 3, pp. 282–3), from *πλήν ὄσων* (which Siebelis, following what are now thought to be inferior MSS, prints in place of *πλήν ὄσων*) to *πλήν ἐς ον*, changing the reading from 'except for however many the inhabitants of which migrated...' to 'except for the one into which the inhabitants migrated...', thus enabling the reference to be limited to the founding of Nicopolis. Akujärvi follows all modern editors in reading *πλήν ὄσων* and accordingly prefers to allow the passage to refer generally to all the new foundations of the period.

¹⁴ For references to the founding and populating of Nicopolis: 5.23.3, 7.18.8–9, 10.38.4; for Patrae: 7.17.5, 18.7, 27.1; for Corinth: 2.1.2, 3.1; 5.1.2. Pausanias makes no mention of the colonial foundation at Dyme reported by Strabo 8.7.5, although he does say Augustus gave control of Dyme to Patrae (7.19.5). He shows no awareness of any movements of population that occurred as a result of this change.

¹⁵ Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (London, 1898), 1.497.

¹⁶ Casevitz, Jost and Marcadé (n. 6), 78. This translation is based also on the acceptance of Clavier's addition of <ἐπί> to the clause, an emendation that will be discussed below. Frazer's translation may also reflect this emendation, although Frazer does not discuss the textual issues of this passage.

vary in meaning between ‘incident’ and ‘disaster’,¹⁷ but in the interpretation of any term one must consider how it is employed by a particular author for a particular audience. Pausanias uses the word *συμφορά* on 52 other occasions in the course of his work,¹⁸ and in all of these instances the event in question is not just an experience, but an unequivocally *bad* experience from the point of view of those who undergo it. Hence translations that use words like ‘disaster’ and ‘misfortune’ are entirely appropriate. Moreover, in the Greek of Pausanias’ era, cases where *συμφορά* must mean ‘incident’ rather than ‘disaster’ occur only in rare and specialized circumstances. On two occasions in the *Anabasis* (7.14.1, 7.24.4), Arrian makes reference to customary sacrifices performed ‘for good events’ (*ἐπὶ ξυμφοραῖς ἀγαθαῖς*), but the similarity in the contexts of these references suggests that we may be dealing with a conscious archaism or with fossilized religious language relating to sacrifice (cf. Ar. *Eq.* 655), and in any case the adjective ‘good’ provides an unambiguous semantic directive, the sort of thing that is absent from 8.27.1. Much weight is often put on comments found in lexicographers of Pausanias’ time and beyond who sometimes gloss *συμφορά* in a neutral sense,¹⁹ but such glosses generally stem from commentary on earlier literature and reflect the fact that this connotation is unusual in the lexicographers’ own times.²⁰

Even if a neutral connotation for the word is conceivable in this period, the fact remains that Pausanias resolutely refrains from exploiting this semantic opportunity elsewhere. In light of his consistency in this regard, interpreting the word in a neutral sense in 8.27.1, in the absence of clear contextual markers of the sort we have in the Arrian passages, is ill-advised. While the evidence of Arrian and the lexicographers suggests that educated readers of the time could understand the use of *συμφορά* as ‘incident’ or ‘outcome’ in highly circumscribed contexts (much as many modern English speakers can understand ‘passing’ to mean ‘surpassing(ly)’ in fossilized phrases like ‘passing strange’), that tells us little about how the word would be read in an unmarked context within a contemporary text. Even if Pausanias had meant to convey the meaning ‘incident’ in 8.27.1, there is absolutely nothing to prevent readers

¹⁷ Though the meaning ‘disaster’ is always more common, and ‘incident’ is attested primarily in tragic poetry (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 24, *Eum.* 897, 1040; Soph. *OT* 33; Eur. *Alc.* 1155). The most unequivocal examples in classical prose are perhaps Hdt. 1.32 and 7.49. Stephanus and LSJ cite a Thucydidean passage (1.140), but here the case is ambiguous: ‘circumstance’ and ‘occurrence’ are possible translations, but so are ‘disaster’ or ‘mishap’ (cf. *Suda* Ξ 110, where it is interpreted as ‘mishap’ [*ἀτυχία*]). The same could be said for Thuc. 7.57. On other possible meanings of the term, including ‘collection’, ‘contribution’ or ‘comparison’, see below.

¹⁸ A complete list of citations for *συμφορά* in Pausanias can be found in V. Pirenne-Delforge and G. Purnelle, *Pausanias, Periegesis* (Liège, 1997), 2.937.

¹⁹ For instance *Synagoge* K 146 (= *Suda* K 688, Photius *Lex.* 140.4), *κατὰ ξυμφοράν κατὰ συντυχίαν* (‘by *συμφορά*: by happenstance’), perhaps a comment on Thuc. 7.57.8 (and not necessarily a correct comment: cf. schol. ad loc.). See also Hesychius Ξ 114, Σ 2356; *Suda* Σ 1408 (contrast Σ 1407 [= *Synagoge* Σ 303]).

²⁰ More telling are the frequent instances where the lexicographers use *συμφορά* as a convenient gloss for less common words connoting calamity and suffering, e.g. Pollux 3.99; Hesychius E 4073, K 2538, Π 38, Π 1399, T 1233 (= *Synagoge* T 233, *Suda* T 892); *Synagoge* Π 395 (= *Suda* Π 1266); *Suda* A 1333, 2081, Π 20–1, K 1190, 2639, N 575, Y 347. Annotated translations of the *Suda* passages by various hands can be found at the *Suda On Line* (<http://www.stoa.org/sol>). One possible example of the neutral use of the term in the voice of the lexicographer (or his post-classical source) is in Hesychius K 3860, where the verb *κουριάν* is glossed as *τὸ κατὰ συμφορὰν ἄλλως καθιέναι κόμην* (‘letting one’s hair hang down randomly *κατὰ συμφορὰν*’). In the context *κατὰ συμφορὰν* could be understood as ‘by chance’ or ‘willy-nilly’, but the sense may also be ‘as is appropriate for disaster’, since long and unkempt hair is often associated with people who are physically or psychologically afflicted. If *κατὰ συμφορὰν* were to mean ‘by chance’ here, then the adverb *ἄλλως* would be redundant.

from understanding the term as ‘disaster’, just as they would have done every other time they encountered the word in Pausanias’ text.

To return to Akujärvi’s suggestion that *κατὰ συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων* is a reference to the fall of the Roman republic, such semantic considerations are pertinent because like Siebelis before her, Akujärvi depends on reading *συμφορὰ* as ‘incident’ in this passage.²¹ If the word bears the connotation of ‘disaster’ here then her thesis encounters difficulties. For one thing it implies a far greater concern for Rome’s internal institutions than Pausanias exhibits elsewhere. Consider the following from the third book (3.11.4).

ναοὶ δὲ εἶσιν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς Καίσαρος, ὃς μοναρχίας πρῶτος ἐν Ῥωμαίοις ἐπεθύμησεν καὶ ἀρχὴν τὴν καθεστηκυῖαν πρῶτος ἐκτίησεν, ὃ δὲ Αὐγούστῳ πεποιήται παιδὶ ἐκείνου τὴν τε βασιλείαν βεβαιωσαμένῳ μᾶλλον καὶ ἀξιώματος καὶ δυνάμεως ἐς πλεόν ἢ <δ> πατὴρ οἱ προελθόντι· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἦν τοῦτῳ Αὐγούστος, ὃ κατὰ γλῶσσαν δύναιται τὴν Ἑλλήνων σεβαστός.

There are temples on the agora [in Sparta]: to Caesar, who first strove for monarchy among the Romans and first established the existing regime, and one has been made for Augustus his son, who put the kingship on a sounder footing and advanced farther than his father in esteem and power. His name was Augustus, which has the force of ‘revered’ in the language of the Greeks.

This passage and similar passages show that Pausanias was aware of the change in Roman government in the time of Caesar and Augustus, yet at no point does he state, or even imply, that he viewed this as a change for the worse, much less a ‘disaster’.²² In addition, Pausanias often seems to assume an audience that has little familiarity with Roman history and government. In the passage cited above, for instance, he feels a need to explain not only who Caesar and Augustus were and how they were related, but even what the name ‘Augustus’ meant. If he is writing for the same audience at 8.27.1, it would be bewilderingly cryptic of him to refer to this ‘disaster [affecting] Roman rule’ without having explained, here or previously, what the ‘disaster’ was. He might well refer more vaguely to ‘an incident [affecting] Roman rule’ as a means of avoiding such an explanation. Unfortunately, for the reasons outlined above, it is highly unlikely that that is what Pausanias was trying to say.

The reinterpretation of the word *συμφορὰ* is one strategy frequently employed by those who have sought to mitigate the apparent anti-Roman sentiment of the received text. Another attempt of this sort is Matthias Steinhart’s recent suggestion that the passage exhibits an even rarer meaning for the word. Rather than ‘disaster’ or, more neutrally ‘incident’, Steinhart would understand *συμφορὰ* as ‘collection’ or ‘contribution’, rendering the crucial phrase as, ‘with a contribution from the Roman government’.²³ Steinhart suggests that Pausanias is referring to donations of land and population that the Roman rulers provided for the new foundations. This is an ingenious suggestion, yet while the meaning ‘collection’ or ‘contribution’ accords well with the etymological relationship between *συμφορὰ* and the verb *συμφέρω* (‘bring together’), the fact is that the attestations of this connotation are exceedingly rare

²¹ Akujärvi (n. 1), 288.

²² In fact Arafat (n. 1), 94–5 sees this reference, in conjunction with a briefer reference to the establishment of the principate at 2.1.2, as reflecting positively on the end of the republican era, which, after all, was the period in which the likes of Mummius and Sulla committed their depredations.

²³ Steinhart (n. 1), 149: ‘...mit einem Beitrag der römischen Regierung...’, reviving an overlooked suggestion of Papachatzis (n. 6), 4.290 and n. 3, who translates ...*με τη συμβολή της ρωμαϊκής εξουσίας*.

(perhaps even non-existent, as we shall see). Steinhart recognizes that there are no other attestations in the text of Pausanias himself, but offers some possible examples from the Roman era: a reference in Polemon's *Kynaigeiros* to a βελῶν συμφορά (which Steinhart interprets as 'a collection of arrows'),²⁴ and a description in Lucian's *Lexiphanes* of a meal provided ἐκ συμφορῶν (ostensibly 'from contributions').²⁵ Both of these examples are problematic, however. The Polemon passage could be understood as referring to the 'disaster of the arrows', since the arrows in question constitute the hail of Persian missiles that pinned the corpse of the Athenian Polemarch Callimachus to the battlefield at Marathon;²⁶ and in Lucian's dialogue, the phrase ἐκ συμφορῶν is spoken by the title character Lexiphanes ('Mr. Word-Flaunter'), an ancient forerunner to Sheridan's Mrs. Malaprop. Lexiphanes' catachresis, in which Lucian capitalizes on the homophony between συμφορῶν and a word that genuinely means 'contributions', συμβολῶν, provides little or no evidence for the range of legitimate meanings of συμφορά. When Mrs. Malaprop congratulates herself on her 'nice derangement of epitaphs', one cannot conclude that 'derangement' could mean 'arrangement' in Sheridan's time, or that 'epitaphs' could mean 'epithets'. In fact, the opposite conclusion is more likely, and the same is true of Lexiphanes' misuse of συμφορά.²⁷

In light of the difficulties with the interpretations of Akujärvi and Steinhart, the best available option for the unemended text is to resort to the common-sense interpretation of ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων, not as a subjective genitive (which is truly unparalleled with συμφορά), but as a genitive of substance or apposition (Roman rule is the disaster).²⁸ There are some parallels for such a construction, two in Aeschylus (*Persians* 436: συμφορὰ πάθους, 'disaster of suffering' and 1030: συμφορὰ κακοῦ, 'disaster of evil'), and from later Greek there are two Aeschylean echoes in the

²⁴ Polemon *Kynaigeiros* 1.24.

²⁵ Lucian *Lexiphanes* 6. To these passages, which are also cited for the meaning 'contribution' in LSJ and Stephanus, Steinhart adds a line from an honorary inscription from Bubon in Lycia which the original editor of the inscription tentatively restores as reading εἰς πῶλε[ως] συμφορᾶν ἐκ τῆς [ἑαυτοῦ] οὐσίας (F. Schindler, *Die Inschriften von Bubon (Nordlykien)* [Vienna, 1972], 33–6). Steinhart suggests that we understand συμφορᾶν here as meaning 'contribution' without specifying how that meaning would function in the context, or why the meaning 'disaster' would not also be appropriate (one could easily imagine the laudandus being praised for his aid to the city in a time of 'disaster'). In any case, so much of the context is restored that specifying either meaning with any certainty is surely inadvisable. For other passages where 'collection' is a possible meaning, including Aretaeus *SD* 11.1 and *Suda* Σ 1409, see below (and cf. Akujärvi [n. 1], 287).

²⁶ W. Reader (ed.), *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse. The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo* (Atlanta, 1996), at 118, does not translate συμφορά with anything like 'collection', although his own translation, 'circumstance', is also unlikely for the reasons enumerated above.

²⁷ As A.M. Harmon, the translator of the Loeb edition of Lucian's dialogue, succinctly notes, 'the phrase ... to Lexiphanes meant "off contributions" ... but to anyone else in his day it meant "off catastrophes"' (*Lucian*, vol. V [Cambridge, MA, 1936], p. 303, n. 3). Steinhart also argues that trotting out a *recherché* meaning of συμφορά would be characteristic of Pausanias' well-known penchant for *variatio*. Yet Pausanias' *variatio* occurs more in the realm of word order than in vocabulary (cf. A. Engeli, *Die Oratio variata bei Pausanias* [Berlin, 1907]), and where he does conspicuously vary his vocabulary it is generally in cases where the variation has some point: for instance, in alternating between *ναός* and *ἱερόν* in a list of adjacent religious structures (e.g. 2.2.8). Had Pausanias been referring to a number of 'contributions' in the vicinity of 8.27.1, he might have had reason to choose a rare (and ambiguous) word for the concept in this one instance, but no such motivation existed.

²⁸ Cf. Bowie (n. 6), 217, 233.

pseudo-Lucianic *Okyprous* (77 and 125: τοῦ πάθους τὴν συμφορὰν in both cases), and an impassioned passage in Philo Judaeus, who speaks of ‘irremediable disasters of god-sent evils’ (*Embassy to Gaius* 293: τὰς τῶν θεηλάτων κακῶν ... ἀνηκέστους συμφοράς).²⁹ It will be noted, however, that these passages are all poetic or histrionic, and that unlike ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων, the dependent genitives in these examples (‘evil’ and ‘suffering’) lie within the semantic neighbourhood of συμφορὰ to begin with. Closer parallels might emerge if we reinterpret the passages that are commonly adduced as instances of the meaning ‘contribution’ for συμφορὰ. All such passages can be re-read plausibly as examples of συμφορὰ qua ‘disaster’ with a genitive of substance. As we have seen, this works well with the Polemon passage cited by Steinhart (βελῶν συμφορὰ: ‘collection of arrows’ or ‘disaster of arrows’?). Similarly a passage in the second-century medical writer Aretaeus (*SD* 11.1) describes the womb as ἀγαθὴ μὲν ἐς κάθαρσιν...ξυμφορὴ δὲ νούσων μυρίων τε καὶ κακῶν (‘Good for purification, but a ξυμφορὴ of countless diseases and ills’).³⁰ One can certainly understand this to mean a ‘collection of diseases and ills’, but it is also possible to read it as ‘a disaster of diseases and ills’. If nothing else, this makes for a more effective μὲν...δέ antithesis (ἀγαθὴ μὲν ... ξυμφορὴ δέ...), and as with Pausanias, every other time Aretaeus uses the word ξυμφορὴ (= συμφορὰ in Aretaeus’ affected Ionic dialect), it has the customary connotation of ‘disaster’ or ‘calamity’.³¹

In all these examples the words in the genitive (‘evils’, ‘suffering’, ‘arrows’ and ‘diseases’) are impersonal entities hardly capable of suffering disaster themselves, so there can be no question of the genitives being objective. The same may be true in the case of Pausanias’ συμφορὰ ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων. In Pausanias an ἀρχή is not generally a ‘realm’ in the concrete sense of a territory and its population; instead it means ‘rule’ or ‘rulership’ as an intangible power that one wields or exercises over a kingdom, city or empire.³² For Pausanias συμφοραὶ occur to individuals, to cities, to peoples and to armies. They do not occur to governments or to abstract concepts such as a ‘rule’ or ‘reign’ (an additional objection, one might note, to the thesis of Akujärvi discussed above). Pausanias may have felt that this distinction was all that was necessary to disambiguate what he intended to say from the more common objective connotation of the genitive with συμφορὰ. Reading συμφορὰν ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων as ‘disaster [consisting] of Roman rule’ is thus more palatable than other readings of

²⁹ This construction with συμφορὰ becomes more common in late antique and Byzantine Greek; e.g. Georgius Pisides *apud Suda* Σ 77; Basil of Caesarea, *PG* 32 1273.45; Johannes Chrysostomus *De sacerdotio* 6.12.148; Nicolaus Mysticus *Ep.* 16.60; ps.-Sphrantzes *Chronicon* 420.20. Cyril of Alexandria is particularly fond of the construction: *PG* 1 249.14, 649.1, 688.11; 2 181.19, etc.

³⁰ This passage is also cited by Stephanus and LSJ for the meaning ‘collection’.

³¹ Yet another example cited by Stephanus for the meaning ‘collection’ is also susceptible to this alternative interpretation: Georgius Pisides *apud Suda* Σ 1409, ἐκ τῆς ἀμετρον συμφορὰς τῶν συρμάδων (‘from the immeasurable collection of drifts’, or ‘...disaster of drifts’?). The vagaries of the Pisidian’s poetic diction and the uncertainty of the precise meaning of the word συρμάδων in this context prevent us from choosing between these alternatives with confidence. The lexicographer (or his source) interprets συμφορὰ here as ἡ ὀμοῦ ἐπιφορὰ, but that may be no more than a guess.

³² Out of more than 150 occurrences of the word in the sense of ‘reign’ vel sim. (excluding instances of the meaning ‘beginning’, etc.), there is only one case where the reference is unequivocally to an expanse of space (albeit supernatural space in this instance), as distinct from the authority wielded by a ruling entity over a population or region: 2.36.7, where Pausanias is speaking of a physical entrance to the ‘underworld realm’ (τὴν ὑπόγειον ἀρχήν). Of more ambiguous cases perhaps the least ambiguous are 1.9.6 and 7.24.2. A number of other passages, still decidedly in the minority, could refer equally well to a physical realm or the authority over a physical realm: cf. 1.5.3, 1.16.2, 2.1.1, 2.18.5, 4.17.5, 9.5.5.

the unemended text. This interpretation, unlike those of Steinhart and Akujärvi, would preserve the apparent reference to Roman rule as a ‘disaster’, but the scarcity of precise parallels, both within Pausanias and elsewhere, renders it vulnerable to criticism in its own right. Hence, the prospect of finding a solution through emendation is alluring.

What, then, are the possibilities for emendation? By far the most popular intervention is the insertion of the preposition ἐπί into the crucial phrase: κατὰ συμφορὰν <ἐπί> ἀρχῆς τῆς Ρωμαίων. This addition would change the meaning of the text significantly (‘as a result of disaster *in the time of* Roman rule’)³³ and would, allegedly, remove any criticism of the Romans. The addition of ἐπί was first suggested in the early nineteenth century by Étienne Clavier in his edition of the *Periegesis*,³⁴ but was largely overlooked until 1959, when Jonas Palm published a vigorous defence of it in the course of his general study of the attitudes toward Rome among Greek authors.³⁵ It must be noted that Palm’s view of the text was not disinterested: his thesis in general was that Pausanias displayed no categorical anti-Roman animus, so the text as it stood was a source of potential embarrassment. Nevertheless, Palm’s championing of Clavier’s emendation has proved quite persuasive, so much so that all but one of the post-Palm editions of Pausanias have adopted it,³⁶ and it has also been supported in print by a number of eminent scholars.³⁷

Palm makes two main arguments in support of Clavier’s emendation, but neither of them is compelling. Here his arguments are paraphrased and responded to:

- (1) *A definite article is absent where it would be expected: if Pausanias were trying to say ‘the disaster of Roman rule’ one would expect a word for ‘the’.* The lack of an article is somewhat jarring, but one of the hallmarks of Pausanias’ unusual style is his idiosyncratic use of the article,³⁸ and Palm himself cites an example of a passage closely parallel to the unemended 8.27.1: εἰκασμένον κύκλωι τῆς σελήνης (9.12.1: ‘similar to [the?] orb of the moon’).³⁹

³³ Pausanias frequently uses ἐπί + genitive to mean ‘in the time of...’ e.g. 1.41.5: ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς Νίνου (in the reign of Ninus); 3.2.4: ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀγεσιλάου βασιλείας (during the kingship of Agesilaus).

³⁴ E. Clavier, *Description de la Grèce de Pausanias* (Paris, 1814–21), 4.406–7. In his notes to this passage (6.238) Clavier does not discuss his reasons for the emendation. Interestingly, Adamantios Korais, in notes included in Clavier’s edition, expressed his opinion that the emendation should be expunged (p. v of supplementary notes to Clavier, vol. 4). Clavier himself takes no account of his own emendation in the translation that appears with his edition ‘...à l’exception de celles qui ont changé d’habitants par suite des malheurs que l’empire Romaine à éprouvés’ (‘with the exception of those that have changed their inhabitants as a consequence of the misfortunes that the Roman empire experienced’), and his emendation was not adopted in any of the subsequent critical editions produced prior to 1959: Siebelis (n. 13), Schubart (Leipzig, 1838–9), Dindorf (Paris, 1845), Hitzig-Blümner (n. 6), or Spiro (Leipzig, 1903).

³⁵ Palm (n. 2), 72–4.

³⁶ Rocha-Pereira (Leipzig, 1989–90), Casevitz, Jost and Mercadé (n. 6), Moggi and Osanna (n. 4) print <ἐπὶ τῆς> rather than simply <ἐπὶ>, on the basis of a suggestion by Piérart (n. 1), 153, who notes that Pausanias employs the definite article on other occasions when he uses ἐπὶ ... ἀρχῆς to mean ‘during the reign of’. Cf. also Moggi (n. 1), 439–40.

³⁷ Other scholars who have been persuaded by Palm’s arguments include J. Oliver, (review of Palm [n. 1]), *Gnomon* 32 (1960), 503; Habicht (n. 1), 119–20; Arafat (n. 1), 202; C. Jones (review of Arafat [n. 1]), *EMC* 15 (1996), 460–1. Scholars favouring the text as it stands, in addition to Akujärvi and Steinhart, include Bowie (n. 6), 217; Bingen (n. 6), 231; Swain (n. 1), 353; Maddoli (n. 6); H. Sidebottom, ‘Pausanias: past, present and closure’, *CQ* 52 (2002), 497.

³⁸ O. Strid, *Über Sprache und Stil des Periegeten Pausanias* (Uppsala, 1976), 78–80; Hutton (n. 1), 176.

³⁹ Palm (n. 1), 73.

- (2) *The phrase κατὰ συμφορὰν can stand alone as an independent adverbial expression. Inserting ἐπί in 8.27.1 allows the phrase to function similarly in this instance. It is true that κατὰ συμφορὰν can act as an autonomous adverbial unit meaning 'disastrously' or 'in disastrous circumstances' (much as κατὰ τάχος can mean 'with speed' and κατὰ κράτος can mean 'by force').⁴⁰ For instance, in his Panathenaic Oration, Pausanias' contemporary Aelius Aristides, who employs the phrase more frequently than any other author, praises the Athenians for their history of being generous to other people even when their needs were somewhat less than dire: ὡς ... ἄμεινον ἢ κατὰ συμφορὰν ἐπεπράγεσαν ('when they had fared better than [they did] in disastrous circumstances').⁴¹ If we ascribe a similar usage to Pausanias in 8.27.1, then the sort of specificity that the phrase ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων provides in the unemended text would seem out of place. However, just because κατὰ συμφορὰν can stand as an independent expression, there is no need for it to be doing so in the present passage. Where the phrase occurs, the 'disaster' is frequently specified with adjectives or modifying phrases.⁴² To return to Pausanias' own usage, he employs the phrase once without any modifiers (7.25.5), and once, as in 8.27.1, the disaster is specified by an adjectival element (8.49.2): μετοικῶν κατὰ τὴν οἴκοθεν συμφορὰν (migrating as a result of the disaster at home).⁴³*

The case Palm makes for Clavier's emendation, therefore, leaves much to be desired. But even if one accepts the emendation, the implications for Pausanias' attitude toward Rome are not as obvious as they may seem at first. Again, one needs to ask what sort of 'disaster' in the period of Roman rule Pausanias could be referring to. Palm suggested that he meant a natural disaster such as a flood or earthquake,⁴⁴ but, as Simon Swain has pointed out, this proposal is unpersuasive, partly because there is no known instance in which a city was abandoned as a result of such a catastrophe in the Roman period prior to Pausanias, and more importantly because it would make little sense for Pausanias to limit a statement about natural disasters to those of the Roman period, since some two hundred years separate the foundation of Megalopolis and the commencement of even *de facto* Roman rule.⁴⁵ As Swain notes, Pausanias

⁴⁰ Although it should be noted that κατὰ συμφορὰν appears far less frequently than these other two phrases; only three examples are attested prior to Pausanias' own era: Thuc. 4.21.3 (plural), 7.57.8; Xenophon *Hiero* 3.4.2.

⁴¹ *Panathenaicus* 70.

⁴² For other examples of modifiers appearing with κατὰ συμφορὰν: Athenagoras *De resurrectione* 8.3; Synesius *Ep.* 93.12; Libanius *Or.* 44.3; Georgius Pisides *apud Suda* K 177.

⁴³ Cf. also 8.33.4, where Pausanias uses the plural form of the noun: κατὰ συμφορὰς καὶ εὐπραγίας πόλεων. Palm also makes the curious argument that no movements of populations within Greece are known to have occurred at the time of the introduction of Roman rule; therefore the 'disaster' cannot be Roman rule itself. Pausanias nowhere mentions the *introduction* of Roman rule in this passage. Palm seems to have been influenced by the interpretation offered by Hitzig and Blümner (n. 6) in their commentary on this passage: '[Pausanias] erklärt das Hereinbrechen römischer Herrschaft für ein Unglück'. There is nothing in Pausanias' language that corresponds to Hitzig and Blümner's *Hereinbrechen*, and hence no need to assume that Pausanias is referring to events associated with the informal establishment of Roman hegemony in the second century B.C.E. As we have seen, there are appropriate foundations and movements in the first century B.C.E. (at the time when Roman rule was formalized with the creation of the province of Achaëa), and it is probably those to which Pausanias is referring.

⁴⁴ Palm (n. 1), 74.

⁴⁵ Five of the 52 other συμφοραὶ which Pausanias mentions are natural disasters: 4.26.4 (earthquake), 4.35.8 (destructive winds), 5.5.5 and 7.7.1 (plagues), 5.25.2 (? perhaps a storm at sea or a sea monster). Reference to the effect of snake venom (10.17.2) and poisonous water (8.19.3) might also be included in this list. The rest are manifestly man-made disasters.

obviously had in mind a sort of disaster that started taking place only after, and most likely because, the Romans asserted control in Greece.⁴⁶ In the context of Pausanias' discussion of the foundation of Megalopolis it is hard to imagine he would have in mind any other 'disaster in the period of Roman rule' than the movements of populations accompanying the foundations at Patrae and Nicopolis.

In Pausanias' account of the events in question, the biggest difference between Megalopolis and the Roman-era foundations is that the migrations involved in the latter were involuntary, whereas the Arcadians of the region willingly concentrated their settlements into a new metropolis *ὑπὲρ ἰσχύος* ('for reasons of strength').⁴⁷ The phrase 'for reasons of strength', is usually overlooked in considerations of this passage, but it stands in a quasi-antithetical relationship to *κατὰ συμφορὰν* and suggests that those who suffered the *συμφορὰ* did so from a position of weakness or subjugation. Many of the attestations of the phrase *κατὰ συμφορὰν* outside Pausanias come in similar contexts where the victims are subject to force and compulsion,⁴⁸ and a surprising number have to do, as here, with instances in which people are forced to leave their homes by a stronger power.⁴⁹ This is also true in two of the other three instances where Pausanias himself uses the phrase: In 7.25.5 he relates that settlers from Mycenae migrated *κατὰ συμφορὰν* to the Achaean city of Cerynea and then goes on to explain the nature of the disaster: the Mycenaeans had been forced out of their own city by the Argives. In 8.49.2 a single individual, the guardian of the young Philopoemen, was exiled from his home city, Mantinea, and came to Megalopolis *κατὰ τὴν οἴκοθεν συμφορὰν* ('due to his disaster at home').⁵⁰ These considerations show that even if one accepts Clavier's emendation, Pausanias would still be referring to things that occurred as a direct effect of Roman intervention, and he would be doing so in language that carries with it implications of compulsion and victimization. The difference, for the purpose of gauging Pausanias' general attitudes, would not be insignificant: while the unemended text characterizes Roman rule in general as a 'disaster', with the emendation it is only certain Roman acts that produce 'disaster'. But the emendation hardly renders the statement neutral on the effects of Roman rule, as Palm and others have suggested.

An even more basic objection to Clavier's emendation, however, is its arbitrary nature. If the passage presents a problem that needs to be solved by emendation, there are other possibilities that are at least as likely.⁵¹ For instance, one could supply the

⁴⁶ Swain (n. 1), 353–4.

⁴⁷ Pace Maddoli (n. 6), 165. As Pausanias describes it, the vast majority of cities that succumbed to synoecism in the creation of Megalopolis did so willingly. A few resisted (cf. Diod. 15.72.4, 94.1–3; Livy 32.5.4), but in general Pausanias emphasizes the communal nature of the effort. Hence *ὑπὲρ ἰσχύος* cannot mean 'forcibly' ('forzato') here.

⁴⁸ Aelius Aristides, *Panathenaicus* 133, and Synesius, *Ep.* 67.328, draw an explicit contrast between things that are done voluntarily and those that are done *κατὰ συμφορὰν*, by which they clearly, in context, mean 'under disastrous compulsion'. For other examples of *κατὰ συμφορὰν* being employed in this sense cf. Xenophon *Hieron* 3.4.2; Clement of Alexandria 3.1.1. Cf. Maddoli (n. 6), and the references in the next two notes.

⁴⁹ Aelius Aristides, *Panathenaicus* 50, 133, 231. Menander Rhetor (356.13) advises orators that in praising a city that has been re-founded elsewhere, one must emphasize that the change was made *πρὸς κάλλος* (for the purposes of beauty) instead of *κατὰ συμφορὰς*.

⁵⁰ In a number of other cases Pausanias uses *συμφορὰ* to refer to exile: 6.19.10, 6.22.2, 9.15.5, 8.33.4.

⁵¹ In addition to the emendations discussed here, Marcotte (n. 6), 78 has proposed a further alternative: replacing *συμφορὰν* with *σύμφορον* (convenience, advantage), yielding the meaning 'to the advantage of the Roman empire'. This suggestion, however, founders on the fact that no

desired article: viz. *κατὰ συμφορὰν* <τὴν> ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων.⁵² For what it is worth, articles are more likely to be omitted than prepositions in the process of transmission: among the supplements accepted in the most recent Teubner edition by Rocha-Pereira, definite articles are restored far more frequently. In Book 8 the ratio stands at 36 articles to 14 prepositions,⁵³ and many of the latter are two-letter prepositions (chiefly ἐν, ἐς and ἐκ) in dittographic circumstances.⁵⁴

The addition of the article, however, does nothing to alleviate the difficulties inherent in interpreting the dependent genitive phrase. To avoid that problem one might prefer to restore a preposition, but even among prepositions ἐπί is not the best choice. A stronger case can be made for ἐξ: *κατὰ συμφορὰν* <ἐξ> ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων, an emendation which would, if anything, make the empire's implication in the disaster even less ambiguous: '...as a result of disaster arising from Roman rule.' There are numerous passages in Pausanias in which the source or agent of a συμφορά is expressed with ἐκ/ἐξ. In 1.14.7 the sisters of Aegeus suffer a συμφορά 'from the wrath of [Aphrodite] Ourania' (ἐκ μηνίματος τῆς Οὐρανίας). In 4.24.3, no further συμφορά is destined to occur to the Lacedaemonians 'from Aristomenes' (ἐξ Ἀριστομένους) after his death. The divinity afflicted the people of Elatea in Phocis with 'disasters ... from the Macedonians' (ἐκ Μακεδόνων), a passage (10.34.3) interesting both for its expression of dual causation (the disasters are ordained by the god, but carried out by the Macedonians) and for the fact that the ἐκ phrase describes the intrusive activities of an imperial power, which would also be the case if we restore ἐξ in 8.27.1.⁵⁵ συμφορὰν <ἐξ> ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων has a closer parallel in these passages than συμφορὰν <ἐπί> ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων has anywhere in Pausanias.

In sum the case for Clavier's emendation is weak, and neither it nor any of the alternative emendations proposed above cleanses the statement of apparent criticism of Roman rule. Pausanias' 'disaster' is either Roman rule itself (following the best reading of the unemended text) or something that Rome is identified in pointed language as being responsible for causing (following any of the possible emendations). It is perhaps because they recognize this problem that the authors of the recent edition of Book 8 for the Budé series have adopted not only Clavier's emendation, but the unsatisfactory translation of the word συμφορά mentioned

parallel for the phrase *κατὰ σύμφορον* exists either in Pausanias or elsewhere. See Swain (n. 1), 354, n. 109; Piérart (n. 1), 153; Moggi (n. 1), 438.

⁵² Where the preposition *κατὰ* is followed by a noun with a definite article and a modifying word or phrase in attributive position, Pausanias decidedly prefers this construction (preposition + noun + article + modifier) to other possibilities such as preposition + article + modifier + noun, or preposition + article + noun + article + modifier. e.g. 7.10.9: ἐν συνεδρίῳ τῷ Ἀχαιῶν ὑπὸ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ Καλλικράτους, cf. Strid (n. 37), 78–80.

⁵³ Prepositions supplied: 8.1.1, 8.7.2, 8.7.6, 8.11.1, 8.11.9, 8.15.2, 8.20.1, 8.25.6, 8.26.2, 8.27.6, 8.33.4, 8.38.11, 8.42.4, 8.50.8.

⁵⁴ For instance 8.11.9: ἀπέφηνεν <ἐν> οὐ πολλῶ πρωτεύοντας; 8.15.2: ἀναγνόντες <ἐς> ἐπήκοον. Rocha-Pereira (n. 35) accepts the supplementation of ἐπί in one other place in Book 8 (8.11.1).

⁵⁵ Another close parallel occurs in the section immediately preceding this (10.33.3): Pausanias states that after the city of Lilaea had been destroyed and depopulated by Philip II in the Sacred War and later refounded (cf. 10.3.1–3), it suffered a second 'misfortune from Macedonia' when Philip V reduced it by siege and imposed a garrison (10.33.3): τοὺς δὲ ἐνταῦθα ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἀνωικίσθη αὐτοῖς ἡ πόλις, ἀτύχημα ἐκ Μακεδονίας δεύτερον σφᾶς ἔμελλεν ἐπιλήψεσθαι ('Even after their city was refounded, a second misfortune from Macedonia was to overtake the people here'). In this passage, ἀτύχημα (misfortune) serves as a virtual synonym for συμφορά. Cf. also 7.7.1, where the Achaeans are said to have suffered fewer 'disasters from wars' (ἐκ πολέμων... συμφοραῖ) than other peoples of Greece.

above: ‘circumstances’.⁵⁶ In the notes to this passage, the editors explicitly reject a less neutral translation on the grounds that it conflicts with their estimation of Pausanias’ attitudes toward the Romans,⁵⁷ but that is clearly begging the question. As we have seen, a neutral connotation of *συμφορὰ* along the lines of ‘incident’ or ‘circumstances’ is next to impossible for this period in general and for Pausanias in particular.

Where, then, does this leave us in our estimation of Pausanias’ attitudes? On first glance the analysis offered here would seem to bolster the case of those who see Pausanias as a strong critic of Roman rule. But one thing that has never been sufficiently examined is the assumption, common to both supporters and opponents of the received reading, that referring to Roman rule or its effects as a ‘disaster’ would be an ‘anti-Roman’ statement on Pausanias’ part. Not long after the passage we are considering, in 8.33.1, Pausanias reflects on the fate of Megalopolis itself. This city, for which several older cities had been abandoned, was, according to Pausanias, nearly derelict in his own day.⁵⁸ The decline of Megalopolis, congruent as it is with a classicizing view of the rise and fall of human fortunes, inspires in Pausanias a lengthy Herodotean reflection on great cities of the past that have declined to insignificance and on small cities that have become great (8.33.1–4):

εἰ δὲ ἡ Μεγάλη πόλις προθυμίᾳ τε τῇ πάσῃ συνοικισθεῖσα ἐπὶ Ἀρκάδων καὶ ἐπὶ μεγίσταις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλπίσιν ἐς αὐτὴν κόσμον τὸν ἅπαντα καὶ εὐδαιμονίαν τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀφῆρηται καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἐστὶν αὐτῆς ἐρείπια ἐφ’ ἡμῶν, θαῦμα οὐδὲν ἐποιησάμην, εἰδὼς τὸ δαιμόνιον νεώτερα αἰεὶ τινα ἐθέλον ἐργάζεσθαι, καὶ ὁμοίως τὰ πάντα τὰ τε ἐχυρὰ καὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ τὰ γινόμενά τε καὶ ὅποσα ἀπόλλυνται μεταβάλλουσαν τὴν τύχην....

If Megalopolis, settled by the Arcadians with utmost enthusiasm and with the highest hopes of the Greeks in its favour, has been deprived of all its splendour and ancient prosperity and is mostly in ruins in our time, I was hardly surprised, since I realized that the divinity always tends to create upheavals, and that fortune always reverses everything in like fashion, both the strong and the weak and what waxes and whatever wanes....

Pausanias goes on to illustrate this assertion with a long list of once-great cities that have ostensibly fallen to ruin: Mycenae, Nineveh, Boeotian Thebes, Egyptian Thebes, Orchomenus, Delos, Babylon and Tiryns. In contrast, he says, cities like Alexandria and Antioch, though founded only ‘yesterday and this morning’, are now among the world’s most prosperous. From this Pausanias draws the (rather prosaic) lesson, ‘human affairs are subject to circumstance, and by no means secure’ (τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πρόσκαιρά τε καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐστὶν ἐχυρὰ). The fate of Megalopolis, the fate of the cities that died in the creation of Megalopolis, and, by implication, the fates of Corinth, Patrae and Nicopolis, are part of a pattern of human destiny, a

⁵⁶ Casevitz, Jost and Marcadé (n. 6), 78. The entire phrase: ‘...à l’exception de celles dont, par suite des circonstances, sous la domination romaine, les habitants ont changé de lieu’.

⁵⁷ Casevitz, Jost and Marcadé (n. 6), 217; cf. xxvii.

⁵⁸ The extent to which this is an accurate assessment or one coloured by rhetorical exaggeration is difficult to say. Excavation and survey shows that the city was still inhabited and functioning in Pausanias’ time, though by far the majority of the most impressive structures and finds date to previous periods (see J. Roy, J. Lloyd and E. Owens, ‘Megalopolis under the Roman Empire’, in S. Walker and A. Cameron [edd.], *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* [London, 1989], 146–50). On ‘Greece in decline’ as a common (and exaggerated) rhetorical trope of the period, see S. Alcock, *Graecia Capta. The Landscapes of Roman Greece* (Cambridge, 1993), 24–32, and on the iconic status of the decline of Megalopolis in particular, see J. Henderson, ‘From Megalopolis to Cosmopolis: Polybius, or there and back again’, in Goldhill (ed.) (n. 3), 29–49, esp. 33–5.

pattern of ‘disasters and successes’ (*συμφορὰς καὶ εὐπραγίας*, 8.33.4) in which the Greeks and the Romans both play their role in turn.

In Pausanias’ moral universe, therefore, *συμφοραί* occur as part of the natural order of things. What is even more important to note for the purposes of understanding 8.27.1, however, is that ‘disasters’ do not necessarily, or even usually, happen to people undeservedly. In the majority of his references to *συμφοραί*, Pausanias does not comment on the issue of blame or responsibility.⁵⁹ Where he does, the examples in which disaster occurs as retribution for crimes or impious acts far outnumber those where the victim is portrayed as blameless. In 8.5.5, for example, one of the legendary Arcadian kings, Aepytus, is struck blind after entering a shrine to which access was prohibited to all mortals, and he dies soon after suffering this *συμφορά*. In 2.9.5, after relating how Philip V arranges the murder of two Athenians by poison, Pausanias says that Philip himself later suffered a *συμφορά* when his own son died by poison. As a moral to this tale Pausanias declares that Hesiod was speaking with divine inspiration (*σὺν θεῶ*) when he said that he who plots injustice against another brings it also upon himself. In 1.20.7, we have perhaps the most interesting example in terms of the relationship between Rome and the Greeks. Here Pausanias uses the term *συμφορά* to describe the horrible disease that brought an end to Sulla, a fate which Pausanias explicitly casts as divine vengeance for Sulla’s violation of the rights of a suppliant in the course of his depredation of Athens:

Σύλλα δὲ ἔστι μὲν καὶ τὰ ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς Ἀθηναίων ἀγριώτερα ἢ ὡς ἄνδρα εἰκὸς ἦν ἐργάσασθαι Ῥωμαίων· ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐ ταῦτα δὴ αἰτίαν γενέσθαι οἱ δοκῶ τῆς συμφορᾶς, Ἰκεσίου δὲ μῆνυμα ὅτι καταφυγόντα ἐς τὸ τῆς Ἀθηναῖς ἱερόν ἀπέκτεινεν ἀποσπάσας Ἀριστίωνα.

Many things were done by Sulla to the people of Athens more savage than was seemly for a Roman man; but I think that the cause of his disaster was not this, but instead the wrath of the God of Suppliants, because after Aristion had sought asylum in the shrine of Athena, Sulla had him dragged out and killed.

In a total of ten cases a *συμφορά* is described as divine will, or as retribution for some transgression or offence on the part of the sufferer.⁶⁰ In contrast, while one might suspect that Pausanias views the victims of many *συμφοραί* as undeserving of their fate, there are only three instances where he even comes close making that explicit. The clearest example is at 9.15.3, where Epaminondas is said to have considered it a *συμφορά* that the Thebans expelled the Orchomenians without his authorization. In this passage the *συμφορά* is equated with a *τόλμημα* (‘reckless action’) on the part of the Thebans.⁶¹

⁵⁹ By far the largest class of examples comprises references to military defeats, without any overt apportionings of blame: 1.13.6, 2.20.9, 3.13.2, 4.5.8, 4.17.6, 4.17.10, 4.21.10, 6.19.10, 9.6.5, 10.1.6.

⁶⁰ In addition to the three already mentioned: 1.14.7, 4.17.6, 4.21.10, 4.24.6, 4.33.7, 6.22.2, 7.4.5. One might also add cases where Pausanias uses the word to describe the fate of a legendary figure who was traditionally thought to meet his end as a result of a transgression against a god: 2.7.9 (Marsyas), 7.4.5 (Daedalus), 9.2.5 (Pentheus), 10.17.3 (Actaeon – although at 9.2.5 Pausanias states that he does not believe every element of the traditional story). *Suda* Ξ 110, based on scholia to Thucydides, tells us that Thucydides uses *ξυμφορά* for ‘ill fortune that arises from circumstance’, not ‘malfeasance or baseness arising from personal irresponsibility’ (*οὐκ ἐξ οἰκείας ἀβουλίας κακοπραγίαν ἤτοι κακίαν*), suggesting perhaps that the latter connotation was understood to be common outside of Thucydides.

⁶¹ The other examples, which are more ambiguous, are 4.5.5 and 6.5.3.

Such passages are clearly the exception. When Pausanias uses the term *συμφορά*, we have no grounds for assuming that he wanted his readers to view the victims as blameless or the perpetrators as morally culpable. In the case of 8.27.1, Roman rule may well have been a disaster for the Greeks, but it is by no means clear that from Pausanias' point of view the Romans are any more to blame for this disaster than the Greeks themselves. This passage can only be properly understood in the context of a number of statements that Pausanias makes elsewhere about the imposition of Roman rule in Greece. In Pausanias' extended account of the conflict between Rome and the Achaean League at the beginning of his seventh book, the Romans are scarcely presented as blameless,⁶² but Pausanias directs his most explicit criticism toward Greek agents.⁶³ This criticism is summed up the end of Pausanias' narrative as follows (7.17.2):

ὅτε δὲ καὶ μόγεις, ἄτε ἐκ δένδρου λελωβημένου καὶ αὐοῦ τὰ πλείονα, ἀνεβλάστησεν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸ Ἀχαικόν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἢ κακία τῶν στρατηγησάντων ἐκόλουσεν ἔτι αὐξάνομενον.

And when scarcely the Achaean League had sprouted up from Hellas as from a tree mutilated and mostly withered, the baseness of its commanders brought it also to a halt as it was still on the increase.

Clearly, in Pausanias' view, the decline of Greece from the heights it once knew is not imposed entirely from without but develops also from Greece's internal weaknesses. Even if Roman rule is a *συμφορά* for the Greeks, or brings *συμφορά* upon them, that does not in itself mean that the Romans are culpable – any more than the gods are culpable for Sulla's suffering – or that Greece is not, on the whole, better off with the Romans than without them. 8.27.1, emended or not, is therefore neither 'pro-Roman' nor 'anti-Roman'. It is, however, the statement of an authorial persona with a deep interest in the moral texture of the history of Rome's involvement with the Greek mainland.

More than ten years ago C.P. Jones opined that the question of the attitude of Second-Sophistic era writers toward their contemporary political situation was an issue 'overdue for retirement',⁶⁴ and given the history of such problems as the one examined here it is hard not to be sympathetic to that view. But surely what needs to be retired is not the question itself but the search for black-and-white answers to it. In considering the culturally convoluted world of the Second Sophistic, the very issue of what being anti-Roman or pro-Roman means might justly be described as a modern problematic that has little or no direct correspondence with ancient conceptual categories. In the case of Pausanias, recent work has hinted at complexities of thought on the issue that remain to be fully explored. Elsewhere, for instance, I have argued that over the course of the composition of his work, Pausanias develops a more

⁶² See, for instance 7.9.1, and 7.10.5 where Pausanias describes the Roman defeat of Perseus as a 'beginning of evils' (*ἀρχὴ...κακῶν*) for the Greeks. Even here, however, criticism of the Romans, if any there be, is presented obliquely: it is not the Romans who are called the 'beginning of evils' but 'Perseus and the empire of the Macedonians, when it was destroyed by the Romans' (*Περσεὺς καὶ ἡ Μακεδόνων ἀρχὴ καταλυθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων*). Pausanias goes on to make it clear that it was the situation resulting from that defeat that gave scope to the corrupt Achaean leader Callicrates to do his mischief, and it is that, rather than any action of the Romans, that is the proximate cause of Greece's downfall. See also n. 66 below for reference to Moggi's nuanced analysis of the question of Roman vs Greek culpability in Pausanias' account.

⁶³ See esp. the lengthy moralizing statement at 7.10.1–5.

⁶⁴ Jones (n. 36), 462.

jaundiced and critical view of the imperial cult than one finds in other writings of the era,⁶⁵ and Moggi has suggested that despite his emphasis on the faults of Greeks in his narrative of the Achaean Wars, Pausanias adapts the testimony of his source (chiefly Polybius) in a manner that heightens Roman culpability as well.⁶⁶ These features do not justify our calling Pausanias ‘anti-Roman’ plain and simple, but they are indicative of an authorial stance that is unique among writers of the period, and they are also indicative of an author for whom the transactions between Roman and Greek are a topic of fertile interest. The interpretation of the multiplicity of attitudes that Pausanias projects, in comparison with the stances of his contemporaries (which are themselves bound to be equally complex if not more so), is a topic that requires further study. Work on such issues should proceed without the perception of 8.27.1, with or without emendation, as a roadblock. To sum up the main points of this article:

- (1) No interpretation of 8.27.1 should depend on reading the word *συμφορά* in a neutral sense (that is, as ‘incident’, ‘contribution’, etc.)
- (2) The best way to understand the unemended *συμφορά ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων* is ‘disaster [consisting] of Roman rule’.
- (3) Of the possible emendations, *συμφορά <ἐξ> ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων* is preferable to the popular *συμφορά <ἐπὶ> ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων*.
- (4) Referring to Roman rule or its effects as a ‘disaster’ does not make Pausanias ‘anti-Roman’.

College of William and Mary, Williamsburg

WILLIAM HUTTON
wehutt@wm.edu

⁶⁵ Hutton (n. 1), 317–22. V. Pirenne-Delforge (rev. of Hutton [n.1]), *BMCR* 2007 (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2007/2007-04-04.html>) seems to promise an even more forceful argument for Pausanias’ negative attitude toward the imperial cult in her forthcoming book.

⁶⁶ Moggi (n. 1), 441–9.