

Declan Keefe

Prof Sadarananda

CG 311

5/7/25

### A Sophisticated Approach to Time

Pausanias “represents and reproduces a series of negotiations with Roman power precisely through the ways [he] weaves together space and time” (Barker et al. 2023, 126). The Roman Imperial system was susceptible to challenges and unrest from within the “governing class,” a class that Pausanias was adjacent to (Ando 2000, 4). Even though in Book Seven Pausanias describes the Roman takeover of Greece as an end to democracy, aligning with other provincial Romans’ thoughts, their loyalties laid with Rome (Ando 2000, 59). Pausanias also uses the terms “Hellas,” and “Achaia” when referring to Greece, aligning himself with the Roman naming convention for the province (Hutton 2005, 61). This use of nomenclature further reinforces his loyalty. Coming from Asia Minor, Pausanias was at the heart of literary activity during his time (Bowie 2001, 24). This area was the epicenter of sophistic education and thought. Pausanias was able to subtly subvert Roman power in his writing, especially having a provincial background. In this paper, however, I aim to dismantle this idea. Through Pausanias’s unusual methods of timekeeping in the *Description of Greece*, he demonstrates his learnedness and position in society as a Roman elite during the Second Sophistic.

The Roman Empire achieved its power through many methods. One major strategy that the Empire employed was religious legitimacy (Ando 2000, 7). Provincials would explain their own conquest through the divine will of their local gods. Rome reinforced this idea by legitimizing themselves through Roman religion and imperial cults. By involving the gods in

their takeover, they were able to force provincial citizens into submission through acceptance. Another way that Rome was able to conquer effectively was through extensive propaganda (Ando 2000, 8). They would advertise their benefactions to the whole empire, expecting gratitude from the benefacted. Pausanias discussed this concept in Book One, specifically pointing out how “Hadrian constructed other buildings also for the Athenians: a temple of Hera and Zeus Panellenios (Common to all Greeks), a sanctuary common to all the gods, and, most famous of all, a hundred pillars of Phrygian marble.” (Jones 1918, 91). This passage describes the type of infrastructure that would be plastered throughout the provinces. Pausanias further pushes this narrative through his writing, uplifting the actions of the Empire. The Roman Empire also used imperial coinage as a method of propagandistic control (Ando 2000, 8). Depictions of emperors on coins would keep them in the front of provincials’ minds, while they also thought of the emperor as the one who oversaw the validity of Roman currency. Through the emperor’s supervision, they thought, the provincial citizens were granted prosperity. Pausanias existed in this empire full of propaganda and overbearing control, resulting in his mixed opinions on the subject. In some cases he damns the imperial system, such as in the case in Book Seven where he condemns Rome’s conquest of Greece. In cases such as his praise of Hadrian’s benefactions, he seems to approve of the empire. Overall, I consider his stance to be more akin to indifference.

Although it is well-known that Pausanias hails from Asia Minor (specifically Magnesia ad Sipylum), it is also important to examine the influences of the province on his upbringing and adult ideologies. Asia minor was a place where many foundational Greek myths took place, such as the myth of Antiochus and Scipio (Bowie 2001, 24). Myths such as these could very well have influenced Pausanias’s love of Greece. These foundational myths give locals a sense of patriotism and pride for their city, while also keeping Greece at the forefront of their minds.

Bowie also points out that Pausanias's home city, Magnesia, also took an anti-Mithridatic stance, which he emphasized in Book One (Bowie 2001, 24). In this passage he states,

“There was an Athenian, Aristion, whom Mithridates employed as his envoy to the Greek cities. He induced the Athenians to join Mithridates rather than the Romans, although he did not induce all, but only the lower orders, and only the turbulent among them. The respectable Athenians fled to the Romans of their own accord. In the engagement that ensued the Romans won a decisive victory; Aristion and the Athenians they drove in flight into the city, Archelaus and the foreigners into the Peiraeus.” (Jones 1918, 99-101)

This passage recalls his identity as a Magnesian, while promoting Roman imperialism. He argues that the “respectable Athenians” surrendered to the Romans, while anyone who did not was foolish. Since Pausanias seldom inserts his political opinions into his writing, I find it particularly powerful that he decides to here, about an issue relating to his home province. Including this opinion highlights Pausanias's patriotism for Asia Minor and tolerance of the Roman empire. Bowie further claims, which I agree with, that his upbringing in Magnesia contributed to his balance “between condemnation and acceptance of Roman aggression” (Bowie 2001, 24). Moreover, since Magnesia is a *civitas libera*, or free city, the absence of strong military action in his city may have contributed to this balance as well. Coming from Asia Minor, he also had an extensive academic upbringing. This province was where elites from around the empire sent their young to be educated, and Pausanias was right in the heart of it (Bowie 2001, 24). Being in such proximity to the academic center of the empire, he was a well-learned epitome of a Second Sophistic man.

As this epitomic man, he had the wherewithal to produce the works that we have today, but his motivations exist as another topic altogether. In the Second Sophistic, literary

achievement was one of the highest one could attain (Bowie 2001, 25). Pausanias does not include a prologue in his *Description of Greece*, which is usually a space for the author to explain their motives, expectations from the reader, and purpose. It is safe to assume that Pausanias wanted to achieve fame through his writing, as was common among elites of his time. One method of disseminating works was through public oration, which often garnered the attention of Roman officials, giving the authors honors if their work was deemed excellent. Although his works did not receive the fame he was looking for, it was likely a driving factor behind his academic journey. Furthermore, Pausanias surely wanted to distinguish himself from his predecessors and contemporaries. He models himself after Herodotus and Thucydides in many of his stylistic choices, while separating himself through his use of Attic Greek and unique invention of his genre (Bowie 2001, 25). He also likely used Attic Greek to express his philhellenism, and to flaunt his ability to write a complex work in a dialect not of his homeland. Simultaneously distinguishing himself from others and proving his intelligence, Pausanias displays his learnedness. The way he goes beyond historiography, anthropology, mythography, and ekphrastic writing paved the way for Pausanias to achieve fame.

To understand my argument, that Pausanias was not trying to subvert Roman power structures through his timekeeping methods, I first must define said methods. He doesn't follow normal narrative chronology, as most modern readers are acclimated to. He instead invented his own method, proving his intelligence and again, paving his own unique path to distinguish himself from his peers. A prime example of his anachronistic writing is from the beginning of Book One, in his description of the Piraeus. Pausanias writes,

While the deme Piraeus on the one hand was of old, on the other hand before Themistocles was Archon for the Athenians it was not a state harbor. Whereas

Phaleron— the sea is least distant from the city here— this place was their port, and it is said that Menestheus set out to Troy with ships from there and it is said that Theseus before this will bring justice to Minos to avenge the death of Androgeos. When Themistocles ruled, Piraeus seemed to him to be more suitable for sailing and had three harbors instead of the one at Phaleron, and he built it as the harbor to them. Up to my time there were temples and buildings and near the biggest harbor is the grave of Themistocles. It is said that the Athenians repented for Themistocles, and that his relatives took up the bones and carried them out of Magnesia. And it appeared that the children of Themistocles returned and dedicated a painting on the Parthenon, on which Themistocles is depicted.

In this passage, Pausanias jumps around in time, going from the time of Themistocles's archonship to the Trojan War, back to the myth of Theseus and the Minotaur, then going back to Themistocles. Not only does he jump around in time, but he also mixes real history with mytho-history. Perhaps to him, all these events really happened, but regardless the anachronistic nature of the narrative is uniquely Pausanias. Barker and others describe his methods as a "disjunction between narrative and chronological time" (Barker et al. 2023, 126). In this passage, as well, Pausanias uses the phrase "my time," or "ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν" in the original Greek. According to Brady Kiesling's article on the Digital Periegesis website, Pausanias uses this phrase or similar ones around 100 times in his work (Kiesling 2021). Unless the reader knows who Pausanias is and when he lived, this term leaves ambiguity as to when he is talking about. He goes against Roman conventions of mentioning emperors' reigns and instead mentions himself. This difference, however, does not reflect Pausanias's feelings about the Roman Empire. Rather, Pausanias is again trying to be unique in his

writing style to show off to his contemporaries that he is a learned man, perhaps more intelligent through his innovative work.

According to the Barker article, Pausanias “represents and reproduces a series of negotiations with Roman power precisely through the ways [he] weaves together space and time” (Barker et al. 2023, 126). This claim is, however, false. Pausanias may not fully support the Roman Empire, but I do not believe he fully condemns them, either. Pausanias seems to be fully concerned with history and place, such as in Book One when he writes, nearby to the stoa Conon is set up and Timotheos the son of Conon and the King of Cyprus Evagoras, who brought it about that the Phoenician triremes were given to Conon from King Artaxerxes; he gave them as an Athenian from the first from Salamis, after tracing his genealogy to Teucer and the daughter of Cinyras. Here stands Zeus having been named Eleutherios (Freedom) and King Hadrian, who, to the others was ruling well and especially exhibited this to the city of Athens. In this passage, he rattles off genealogy, as he often does, while describing this area of the Athenian Agora. Most sections of this text follow the same pattern, simply regurgitating information. In the majority of his mentions of Rome or its emperors, he does so to highlight the history of the place, or monuments erected during the Roman Period. Furthermore, many of Pausanias’s negative mentions of Rome may have been misinterpreted. A common instance is in Book Eight, when Pausanias refers to the migration of Greeks (Hutton 2008, 624). Many claim that he refers to the Roman Empire as a “disaster”; a disaster which caused the unfortunate migration of Greeks out of Megalopolis. Hutton argues, however that Pausanias’s language is misinterpreted, with the disaster afflicting the Romans, not being caused by them (Hutton 2005, 624). This stance aligns with the thought that Pausanias was indifferent to Rome’s actions. He is simply stating what

occurred at Megalopolis, without placing blame. Overall, Pausanias's methods of timekeeping reflect his ambitions to be successful and recognized by his peers through his innovation and uniqueness.

In sum, through Pausanias's use of unusual timekeeping, he proves his place in society as an elite Sophistic writer. Pausanias was obsessed with providing historical context to space above any other information, giving us his "chronotope". He mentions Rome when it relates to the place he is describing, often praising an emperor's benefactions. Pausanias is more concerned with producing a unique, intelligent, and thorough piece of literature than the activities of the Roman Empire. He accepts Roman imperialism and indulges the potential for receiving its benefits through his writing.

#### Works Cited

- Ando, Clifford. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Barker et al. 2023. "Journeying through Space and Time with Pausanias's Description of Greece."
- Bowie, E. 2001. "Inspiration and Aspiration: Date, Genre, and Readership" In *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Ancient Greece*, eds. Alcock, S., Cherry, J., and J. Elsner. 21-32. Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Ancient Greece. Oxford University Press.
- Hutton, W. 2005. *Describing Greece: Landscapes and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hutton, W. 2008. "The Disaster of Roman Rule: Pausanias 8.27.1." *The Classical Quarterly* 58, no. 2: 622–37. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000670>.

Kiesling, Brady. 2021. "Pausanias the Chronotopiarist." Digital Periegesis.,  
<https://www.periegesis.org/en/articles.php?aid=6>.

Pausanias. Description of Greece, Volume I: Books 1-2. Translated by W. H. S. Jones. Loeb  
Classical Library 93. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.