

**A Cloud from the West:
Greek Perceptions of Rome during the Macedonian Wars
(c. 215-167 BC)**

Joe Duncker

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

BACHELOR OF ARTS WITH HONORS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

April 3, 2013

Advised by Professor Celia E. Schultz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Speeches	10
Chapter Two: Rome as Liberator	32
Chapter Three: The Roman Threat to Greek Freedom	54
Conclusion	74
Bibliography	77

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Professor Celia Schultz, for all of her advice and support during the past few years, both with this thesis and with other subjects. I also wish to thank my family for their love and support, and for putting up with me when I was stressed and irritable. Finally, I want to thank my professors and colleagues in both the History and Classics Departments for their insights and comments throughout this process.

INTRODUCTION

The Greek antiquarian Plutarch (c. 49- 120 AD) wrote that when the Roman proconsul Titus Quinctius Flaminius announced the “Freedom of the Greeks” at the Isthmian Games in 196, the shouts of joy were so loud that ravens flying overhead were knocked out the sky.¹ Polybius (c. 200- 118 BC) said that in the same year, the Aetolians claimed that the Romans were conquering the Greeks, taking over “the fetters of Greece, and that what was happening was a readjustment of masters.”² While the historical accuracy of these two references may be questioned, they illustrate two seemingly opposed views of Roman intervention in the East during the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries BC.³ The purpose of this study is to reexamine Greek attitudes towards Roman intervention in the East from 217 to 167 and to argue that Greek views varied through time and according to the Republics actions in Greece. In some cases, Roman involvement was resented: the Western power was seen as a threat to the safety and freedom of Hellas. However, Rome also frequently left matters in Greece to the Greeks or even aided Greeks against other states. Greek views of Roman imperialism during the period of the Macedonian Wars (c. 217-167) were complex, varying according to the actions of the Republic and the needs of the Greeks.

Historical Overview

Before 215, Rome paid little attention to the various Greek city-states and leagues on mainland Greece and the Peloponnese, the Aegean islands, the Greeks in Asia-Minor or the

¹ Plut. *Flam.* 10.6.

² For Greek texts I have used published translations, except for a few inscriptions where translations were not readily available. I have included the original Greek for citations for which I was unable to locate a published translation. Latin translations are my own. Translations of Polybius are from Paton. Polyb. 18.45.6.

³ All dates are BC unless otherwise noted.

major Hellenistic kingdoms.⁴ Rome had fought two wars in Illyria, across the Adriatic from Italy and northwest of mainland Greece. Both wars ended in Roman victories. The two Illyrian Wars – the first in 229 instigated by Italian traders concerned with Illyrian piracy, and another in 219 sparked by the growing influence of the Illyrian monarch Demetrius – did not seriously engage Rome in Greece. Instead, Rome’s focus was on the western Mediterranean, Italy, and North Africa.

Between 215 and 167, Eastern powers fought four major wars against the Republic. In the First (215 BC to 205) and Second Macedonian Wars (200-197), Rome and a number of Greek allies fought against Philip V of Macedonia. The First Macedonian War began when Philip made a treaty with the Carthaginians, with whom Rome was currently engaged in the Second Punic War (218-201). Sparta, Messene, and the Aetolian League, a federal coalition of Greek city-states in southern mainland Greece, allied themselves with Rome against Philip and a number of his Greek allies. The war ended with the Peace of Phoenice in 205.

After embassies from a number of Greek states came to Rome seeking aid against Philip and Antiochus III of Syria, Rome entered into a second war against Philip. The two most powerful Greek federal leagues, the Aetolian and Achaean Leagues, sided with Rome, along with a number of other less powerful Greek states. The Second Macedonian War ended with the Roman proconsul Titus Quinctius Flaminius’ victory over Philip at the Battle of Cynoscephalae in 197. At the Isthmian Games at Corinth in 196, Flaminius proclaimed the “Freedom of the Greeks,” and after two years Rome removed all of its forces from the East. In the same year as the Isthmian Declaration, according to Polybius, Rome issued an order to Antiochus III of Syria that he not cross into Europe.

⁴ The main ancient sources for the narrative of this period are Polybius and Livy.

The Aetolian League, Rome's ally in the previous two wars, had been dissatisfied with the settlement after Cynoscephalae and over the next few years openly criticized Rome. In 192, the Syrian king directly opposed the order Rome had given to him by bringing his army into Greece. The Aetolian League sided with the Antiochus, and both fought against Rome and the Republic's Greek allies. Antiochus suffered major defeats at Thermopylae in 191 and Magnesia in 190. The war finally ended with the Peace of Apamea in 188. With Antiochus defeated, Roman forces again returned back across the Adriatic.

After Magnesia, Rome had overcome the two most powerful Hellenistic kings and demonstrated that it was the most powerful state in the Mediterranean. For the following fifteen years, Roman interaction with Greeks was mostly limited to embassies and commissioners who arbitrated Greek disputes. In 179, Philip was succeeded by his son Perseus. Early on Perseus gathered support around Greece by allowing fugitives to return to Macedonia. In 172, King Eumenes II of Pergamum came to Rome to level charges against Perseus. Eumenes emphasized the wealth and resources that Macedonia had accrued, and said that Perseus was moving his army around Thessaly, causing unrest there and in Perrhaebia. In the Third Macedonian War (171-168), Roman forces again crossed the Adriatic, this time to combat Philip's son. The war ended with Lucius Aemilius Paullus' victory over Perseus at the Battle of Pydna in 168.

Between 215 and 168 Rome did not annex territory, install governors, or depose rulers in Greece. For much of this period, Rome did not even have garrisons stationed across the Adriatic. However, after Perseus' defeat in 168, the kingdom of Macedonia was divided into four separate states. Aemilius Paullus decimated Epirus and sold much of the population into slavery. Greek politicians who opposed Rome were put to death or exiled, and even

Greeks who tried to maintain an appearance of neutrality, such as the Rhodians, were punished by the Romans.

Sources

The most important sources for this period are the ancient historians Polybius and Livy. Polybius (ca. 200 to 118) lived through most of the period under investigation and was an active participant in Achaean League politics. After the defeat of Perseus in 168, Polybius was accused by Callicrates, one of his political rivals, of anti-Romanism, and was held hostage at Rome from 167 to 150. During this time Polybius began to write his *Histories*, with the goal of documenting “the how, when, and wherefore all the known parts of the world came under the domination of Rome.”⁵ Polybius lived at a time when it was “universally accepted as a necessary fact that henceforth all must submit to the Romans and obey their orders.”⁶ He originally intended to write 30 books on this subject, but after 146, he decided to add ten books tracing events up to 146 and describing the effects of Roman rule.⁷

Polybius lived through and witnessed some of the events in his *Histories*, but for much of his work he had to rely on other sources. These sources may have included interviews with other eye-witnesses, the *Memoirs* of Aratus of Sicyon, Achaean League archives from Aegium, Roman public records, some published speeches, the library of the

⁵ Polyb. 3.1.4.

⁶ Polyb. 3.4.2.

⁷ Polyb. 3.4.6.

Antigonid kings that was brought to Rome by Polybius' friend Lucius Aemilius Paullus, and the works of other historians, both Greek and Roman.⁸

Not all of Polybius 40 books have survived. Gaps in his account can be filled in by the Augustan historian Livy (c. 59 BC- 17 AD). Livy wrote a history of Rome, *Ab Urbe Condita*, in 142 books. His work was the culmination of the Roman annalistic tradition that had begun with the first Roman historian Fabius Pictor, who wrote at the beginning of the 2nd century. Neither Polybius' nor Livy's entire work is extant, and it is rare that the surviving portions of Polybius and Livy cover the same year. Besides not being contemporary to these events, Livy rarely, if ever, directly uses primary source material.⁹ While he may have used some extant speeches of Cato the Elder, and he certainly used Polybius, most of his information came from other Roman historians who were not primary sources themselves.¹⁰

There is some debate over which annalists Livy read and which he knew through an intermediary source.¹¹ Whichever annalists he read, there were only a limited number of sources available in Rome which they could have used. These included the *Annales Maximi*, the *libri lintei*, *senatus consulta*, private collections, and other historians.¹² The *Annales Maximi* were records of events compiled by the *pontifex maximus* that contained information on elections, prodigies, and public events.¹³ The *libri lintei* were lists of magistrates housed

⁸Cecil Wooten, "The Speeches in Polybius: An Insight into the Nature of Hellenistic Oratory," *The American Journal of Philology* 95 (1974): 235; F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957), 12.

⁹P.G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1961), 110.

¹⁰Livy 39. 43.

¹¹Walsh, *Livy*, 115; James T. Luce, *Livy: The Composition of His History* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977), 161.

¹²Walsh, *Livy*, 110-112.

¹³McDonald, *OCD*, 54, s.v. "Annals, Annalists." Attempts to recreate the information contained in the *Annales* are highly speculative. Bruce Frier contends that the ancient authors who discussed the *Annales* knew very little about the actual chronicle and their recreation of its history stemmed from an attempt to rationalize the annalistic tradition. Bruce Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: the Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (Rome: American Academy of Rome, 1979), 177-8.

in the Temple of Juno Montea.¹⁴ *Senatus consulta*, or senatorial decrees, laws, and important treaties were also preserved in the treasury.¹⁵ Livy does not seem to have consulted these sources himself, but these documents were available to the other historians whom Livy read.

While Polybius and Livy are the sources that discuss this period most comprehensively, other ancient sources also provide evidence for Greek views of Rome. Special attention will be paid to other sources from the early second century B.C. The Greek poet Alcaeus of Messene lived through the Second Macedonian War, and wrote poems praising Rome and criticizing the Macedonian king. Inscriptions documenting Greek relations with Rome, such as letters or treaties, also provide valuable primary source material. The later authors Pausanias (c. 150 AD), Plutarch, Phlegon of Tralles (early 2nd century AD) and Appian (late 1st - early 2nd centuries AD) all wrote on the events from this period, and drew on earlier sources that are no longer extant.

Various opinions have been expressed on how Greeks reacted to the increased presence of the Republic. Some scholars think Greeks primarily resented Rome's interference in their spheres of influence and feared subjugation to the western power. For Dmitriev, Roman violence in the First Macedonian War led Greeks to view Rome as a threat to peace and to their freedom.¹⁶ When the Romans used the slogan of freedom to provide a *casus belli* in Greece, Antiochus responded by claiming to be liberating Greece from Rome. Rome was on the defensive in the propaganda war in the 190s.¹⁷ By Polybius' time Greeks in general viewed Romans as barbarians, but Greek politicians attempted to work with Romans or use Roman support to further their own political ends.

¹⁴ Walsh, *Livy*, 111.

¹⁵ Walsh, *Livy*, 112.

¹⁶ Sviatoslav Dmitriev, *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece* (New York: Oxford Up, 2011), 147.

¹⁷ Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 217.

Fear is the recurring element in Greek attitudes toward Rome according to C. Champion. Champion thinks that Greeks saw the Western invaders as ruthless and barbaric.¹⁸ Derow argues that Roman brutality in the First Macedonian War coupled with resurgence in Panhellenic solidarity in the 3rd century resulted in a negative view of Rome. Rome recognized the need for better public relations in Greece, and attempted to redefine itself with the “Freedom of the Greeks” slogan. Whatever effect this had in Greece had worn off by 192. Derow claims that Polybius’ assertion that it was necessary “to give heed to the Romans and obey them in their orders” after 167 also applies to the period after 188.¹⁹

Another group of scholars see Greek views as having been shaped by Greek states’ relationships with other Hellenistic powers. For these scholars, Roman intervention was a necessary evil. E. Gruen thinks that Greeks had not formulated a clear image of Rome prior to the 2nd century because the Greeks had little interaction with Rome.²⁰ Beginning with the Second Macedonian War, bewilderment was the main emotion felt by Greeks concerning Rome. Some Greeks sought Roman intervention, others feared the Republic, but most Greeks were puzzled when the Senate made little effort to enforce its will and often gave vague replies to Greek ambassadors.²¹

A. Eckstein agrees with Gruen that the Greeks were not primarily hostile to Roman involvement. In Eckstein’s opinion there was significant distrust among Greeks toward Rome prior to 202. After a child inherited the throne of Egypt in 204, Antiochus and Philip made an

¹⁸ Craige Champion, *Cultural Politics in Polybius’ Histories* (Berkeley: University of California, 2004), 52-55.

¹⁹ Polyb. 3.4; Peter Derow, “The Arrival of Rome: From the Illyrian Wars to the Fall of Macedon,” in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ed. Andrew Erskine (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 67-8.

²⁰ Erich S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984), 324-3.

²¹ Gruen, *The Hellenistic World*, 330-1, 438.

alliance in order to take control of Egypt.²² The Pact between the Kings made a Greek alliance with Rome necessary if the delicate balance of power in the Mediterranean was to be restored.²³ After the Second Macedonian War ended, Greek contemporaries did not view Isthmian Declaration as a sham, but thought that the Roman's bestowal of freedom was genuine.²⁴ Rome's Greek allies in the Syrian War acted through fear of both Antiochus and Rome.²⁵ After 188, Greeks recognized that Rome had achieved a position of unipolarity. Eckstein says that recognition of Greek *libertas* did not rule out Roman *auctoritas*.

The purpose of this study is to re-evaluate the sources, and to provide a new approach to the study of Greek views of Roman imperialism. While the narratives of ancient writers are essential to this project, special attention will be paid to other types of sources, such as inscriptions, or ancient prophecy. Through these sources, it may be possible to filter out additions by later authors, and gain a better understanding of Greek attitudes toward Roman intervention in the East.

In Chapter I, I examine the evidence from speeches written by Polybius and Livy. Both historians based the speeches in their histories on historical sources but also had their own biases and viewpoints which affected the content of those speeches. These speeches cannot be completely disregarded as historical evidence but must be approached with

²² Arthur Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East: From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230-170 BC* (Malden: Blackwell, 2008), 129-180. Eckstein accepts the existence of the Pact as Polybius describes it. Richard Berthold, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984), 110-1 accepts the existence of a modified version of the Pact in which Antiochus and Philip agreed not to enter each other's spheres of influence. Errington and Magie reject the existence of any major agreement between the kings. R.M. Errington, "The Alleged Syro-Macedonian Pact and the Origins of the Second Macedonian War," *Athenaeum* 49 (1971): 353-4 and David Magie, "The 'Agreement' between Philip V and Antiochus III for the Partition of the Egyptian Empire," *Journal of Roman Studies* 29 (1939): 42.

²³ A. Eckstein, *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006), 278.

²⁴ Eckstein. *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 297.

²⁵ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 329.

caution. In Chapters II and III evidence other than speeches is analyzed in order to demonstrate two different views of Rome. In Chapter II, I show that Rome's hesitation to exert its control over Greece and the assistance the Republic offered to various Greeks resulted in many Greeks being grateful for Roman intervention. In Chapter III, I argue that Roman actions in the East were not always welcome and that some Greeks resented Roman power, especially after the end of the Syrian War in 188. Multiple views of Rome existed at the same time and conflicted with one another, but any discussion of Greek views of Roman imperialism in the 2nd century that excludes one of these views does not accurately represent the period.

CHAPTER ONE: SPEECHES

Throughout the works of Polybius and Livy, the authors placed speeches in the mouths of their characters. Ancient speeches are one of the most common pieces of evidence that historians use in discussions of Greek views of Rome in the 2nd century.¹ It is critical to recognize that these are not direct transcriptions of the words as they were originally spoken: they were compositions of the historian. Even when a published speech was available, ancient historians might re-write the speech that their character delivers.² This was not unique to Polybius and Livy, but was standard practice for ancient historians. This does not mean that the sources available on the content of those speeches were completely ignored. The value of each speech for determining Greek views of Rome during the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries varies according to each author's practices in recording speeches, the sources he had available to him, and how each speech fits into each author's view of history.

Polybius' speeches, while based on source material, were not verbatim transcriptions of those sources, but reflect the author's biases and hindsight. Polybius himself witnessed some of the events he describes, but his history begins long before his own lifetime. He stressed that historians should not invent speeches, and he probably followed his sources for his own version of each speech. However, the Greek historian began writing his *Histories* as an exile in Rome, and his view of history ended with Roman control over the Mediterranean. Any discussion of the speeches in his work must take into account both the period in which Polybius wrote and the period in which the speeches he reports were originally delivered.

¹ E.g. Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 107-111; Derow, "Arrival of Rome," 56-7.

² Walsh, *Livy*, 219 e.g. Sallust wrote the speeches of Caesar and Cato at *Cat.* 51., although he had access to the originals.

Like Polybius, Livy had his characters deliver speeches. Livy's sources for his speeches were often not as reliable as those of Polybius. While Polybius may have personally observed some of the speeches he relates, or interviewed others who were in attendance, Livy was writing over a century after the events he describes. Although Livy's sources were rarely eye-witnesses, he often closely follows the content of the speeches in his sources, with his own stylistic embellishment.³ The speeches he found in the works of other historians were also likely compositions of those historians. Livy relied heavily on Polybius for his account of Rome's Eastern wars, and the speeches in Livy often closely correspond to Polybius' version. Because Livy depended on Polybius, the Roman historian's speeches' were indirectly based on historical sources. However, these speeches also reflected the combined biases and goals of Polybius and Livy.

217 to 207

According to Polybius, at the council of Naupactus in 217 BC Agelaus cautioned the Greeks to stop waging war against each other.⁴ The Second Punic War between Rome and Carthage had recently erupted, and Agelaus told his audience that whoever won that war would inevitably seek power and control in the East. Rome and Carthage were "clouds that loom in the west," and Agelaus begged Philip V to stop waging war with the Greeks, and instead turn his attention to the war in Italy.⁵ The Greek speaker told the Macedonian king that in Italy he could fight for global sovereignty. The style of the speeches is the same as Polybius' style in the rest of his work, which shows that even those speeches that are

³ Walsh, *Livy*, 231; Luce, *Livy: The Composition of His History*, 151.

⁴Polyb. 5.104. This chapter is organized in chronological order because there is a shift in Greek attitudes over time.

⁵ Polyb. 5.104.8.

reported in direct discourse are not quotations.⁶ The problem is how much Polybius' version of Agelaus' speech preserves the original message conveyed at Naupactus, and to what extent the fears expressed by Agelaus reveal Greek attitudes towards Rome in 217.

There are a number of approaches to the speech of Agelaus. O. Morkholm thinks it is a theoretical fabrication of Polybius. Morkholm argues that the reference to Carthage as a threat to Greece is a clear indication that Polybius' voice is coming through. There is no evidence that Carthage was interested in Greece, but Polybius' frequently interprets the Second Punic War as the decisive battle for control of the Mediterranean.⁷ Furthermore, there was no way Agelaus could have known about Philip's territorial ambitions in Italy, and this appeal made by the Greek indicates that the speech is anachronistic.⁸ Dmitriev disagrees that the Greeks could not have anticipated Philip's plans after the news of the recent Roman defeat at Lake Trasimene, and adds that the theme of Hellenic unity was common in this period, as is displayed by Magnesia's efforts to create a Panhellenic festival of Artemis Leukophryene.⁹

E. Gruen admits that many of the speeches in Polybius' *Histories* emphasize the theme of Greek unity, but sees this as grounds for suspicion. Further, even if Agelaus did refer to the west, it need not represent serious Greek concerns but may have been merely a rhetorical ploy of Agelaus.¹⁰ B. McGing concedes that the speech was given before Rome had expressed much interest in the East, but he does not see this as grounds to discount Polybius' version entirely. Agelaus still may have made this point, and perhaps his warning

⁶ Wooten, "The Speeches in Polybius," 237.

⁷ Otto Morkholm, "The Speech of Agelaus at Naupactus 217 B.C.," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 28 (1967): 248.

⁸ Morkholm, "The Speech of Agelaus," 251.

⁹ Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 148, 151.

¹⁰ Gruen, *The Hellenistic World*, 324.

about the West was what made his speech stand out.¹¹ A. Eckstein accepts the metaphor of the clouds as referring to both Rome and Carthage and as belonging to Agelaus' original speech, as well as many other elements of Polybius' narrative that have been questioned by more skeptical scholars.¹² Finally, C. Champion sees it as plausible that Greeks felt that the war in the west may eventually affect them, and proposes that the famous metaphor may have been what made Agelaus' speech worth remembering.¹³

One of the main arguments used in favor of the authenticity of the speech is Polybius' emphasis on reporting speeches that were actually spoken. In Book Twelve of his history, Polybius harshly accused Timaeus, a Greek historian from Sicily who lived from around 350 to 260, of inventing speeches: Timaeus included in his work what "ought to have been said," and not "the words spoken nor the sense of what was really said."¹⁴ For Polybius, the two most important aspects of writing speeches were to record "the words actually spoken, whatever they were, and next to ascertain the reason why what was done or spoken led to failure or success."¹⁵ This will allow the reader to learn from the past.

Polybius also says that he does not object to recording "possible speeches," but it was not "his principle to do this on any and every pretext." He says that he recorded possible speeches when he "quoted both the speeches and the writings of politicians."¹⁶ Polybius could mean that his speeches represent whatever one could say in such a historical situation. However, because of Polybius' interest in "the words actually spoken", it is more likely that he did not invent speeches that he felt fit in with the situation, but rather that, of all the

¹¹ Brian McGing, *Polybius' Histories* (New York: Oxford UP), 89.

¹² Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 83, 117.

¹³ Craig Champion, "The Nature of Authoritative Evidence in Polybius and Agelaus' Speech at Naupactus," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127 (1997): 119.

¹⁴ Polyb. 12.25a5.

¹⁵ Polyb. 12.25b.1.

¹⁶ Polyb. 36.1.1.

available versions of a speech that came to him in his sources, he chose what he felt was most historically accurate.¹⁷ It may also be argued that Polybius criticized Timaeus for creating speeches when none was delivered; he himself created speeches, but only for instances when he knows someone spoke. Polybius' emphasis on "the words actually spoken" would not fit with this interpretation. Polybius also could not be interested in how what was said resulted in success or failure if he completely invents the speeches in his work.

Polybius tried to find sources for the speeches he included in his work, and usually follows those sources. His emphasis on personal experience in writing history also caused him to impose his own view of history on his narrative. Polybius does not place much emphasis on written documents, saying that "industry in the study of documents is only a third part of history and only stands in the third place,"¹⁸ besides studying physical features of historical sites, and having experience in politics.¹⁹ Instead he selected the best of all possible speeches through "reasoning from our personal experience in the past."²⁰ He also says in his criticism of Timaeus that "the most important part of history" is "to inquire from as many people as possible, to believe those worthy of belief and to be an adequate critic of the reports that reach him."²¹ Polybius seems to have recorded historical speeches by evaluating the sources he had, including oral accounts, based on his own experience. In light of Polybius' personal experience as a hostage in Rome, it is no surprise that Agelaus' speech mentions a threat from the West. The speech of Agelaus as related by Polybius is an anachronistic reconstruction of whatever sources the historian had, based on Polybius' personal experiences and hindsight from after 167.

¹⁷ Champion, "The Nature of Authoritative Evidence," 114.

¹⁸ Polyb. 12.25i.2.

¹⁹ Walbank, *Commentary* II: 391 ; Polyb. 12.25^e .1-7.

²⁰ Polyb. 12.25i.8.

²¹ Polyb. 12.4c.2-5, cf. Walbank *Commentary* I: 27.

It is difficult to gauge the truth of the tradition as it was received by Polybius as we do not have his sources, but the important points that Agelaus makes are similar to points Polybius makes throughout his work. This lends support to the idea that Agelaus' words were largely Polybius' creation. The speech at Naupactus also touched on Philip V's territorial ambitions in Italy: Agelaus encouraged Philip to look to Italy, so he could "compete for the sovereignty of the world."²² In this speech, Greek fear of Rome and Carthage and Philip's plan in Italy were both aspects of the coming together of the Eastern and Western halves of the Mediterranean that plays a major role in Polybius' view of history.²³ This coming together may have been mentioned in the sources for the speech that Polybius had, and he used it as an opportunity to bring attention to this aspect of his *Histories*.²⁴ As McGing points out, Polybius chose to record only Agelaus' speech from this conference, although there were many speakers. This may have been because this speech stood out through its attention to western powers.²⁵

Polybius claims that Agelaus' speech was important in convincing the combatants to agree to peace, but this is misleading. Agelaus was mentioned a few other times by Polybius, and later in 217 was elected strategus by the Aetolians, a federal league of city-states on the Greek mainland, because of his role in ending the war with Philip.²⁶ However, the Aetolians were eager for peace before Agelaus delivered his speech, and Philip was considering seeking an end to the war as well.²⁷ Agelaus "made all the allies disposed for peace and especially Philip, as the words in which he addressed him accorded well with his present

²² Polyb. 5.104.7.

²³ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 83; Morkholm, "the Speech of Agelaus," 251.

²⁴ Champion, "the Nature of Authoritative Evidence," 117; Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 323.

²⁵ McGing, *Polybius' Histories*, 89.

²⁶ Polyb. 5.107.5.

²⁷ Polyb. 5.102.2,103.

inclination.”²⁸ Both sides already wanted peace. Furthermore, according to Polybius Philip was not moved by Agelaus’ discussion of the threat from Rome but by the Aetolian’s appeal to Philip’s territorial ambitions in Italy.²⁹ The speech does not reflect serious Greek concern for the coming of Rome. Rather, one speaker at the conference drew attention to Rome, and Polybius used these words to emphasize his view of history.

The question of the authenticity of the speech is not the only reason to doubt that Agelaus’ words in Polybius’ *Histories* accurately reflect Greek fear. Rome had shown little interest in Greece prior to 217. Rome’s only significant interaction with the Greeks had been to announce the Roman victory in the First Illyrian War in 228. This resulted in the Romans being admitted to the Isthmian Games by Corinth, which does not suggest hostile relations between Greeks and Romans.³⁰ By 217, Rome was engaged in a war with Carthage in which victory was by no means certain. Rome had recently suffered a disastrous defeat at Lake Trasimene that may have spurred Philip to plan an expedition to Italy.³¹ It would be odd if at that moment, the Greeks were also concerned about the threat posed by Roman strength.

Six years later, the threat from Rome was mentioned in a speech of Lyciscus reported by Polybius, and Rome was once again referred to as “a cloud from the west.”³² Rome was still fighting Carthage, but Philip V of Macedonia had made an alliance with Hannibal against Rome. Rome responded by making an alliance with the Aetolian League. Polybius recreated two speeches delivered to the Spartans as representatives from the Aetolian League and from Philip’s ally, the Acarnanian League, each sought to persuade the Spartans to join their side. The Acarnanian ambassador, Lyciscus, told the Spartans that the Aetolians have

²⁸ Polyb. 5.105.1.

²⁹ Polyb. 5.105.1, cf. 5.101.7-10.

³⁰ Polyb. 2.12.8.

³¹ Polyb. 5.101.3.

³² Polyb. 9.37.10.

made an alliance with “barbarians” and that Greece faced “men of a foreign race who intend to enslave her.”³³ Lyciscus encouraged the Spartans to fight for all the Greeks against a foreign invader, just as their ancestor Leonidas fought against Xerxes and the Persians, and described the violence that the Roman army has already committed in Greece.³⁴ The authenticity of this speech, just like the speech of Agelaus, is debated. Eckstein and Walbank both accept the speech as historically valid.³⁵

It has also been argued that the reference to Roman enslavement of Greeks is clear evidence that the speech is a later composition.³⁶ Rome certainly was not interested in annexing territory in Greece in 211. The treaty between the Romans and the Aetolians described by Livy and partially preserved in an inscription makes this clear.³⁷ It included the provision that “from the Aetolian territory as far as Corcyra, the land, dwellings, and walls with the fields should be the Aetolians, and all other plunder should be of the Roman people.”³⁸ An inscription from Thyrrheum in Acarnania that is contemporary with the First Macedonian War supports Livy’s much later, literary version: “If the Romans capture by force any cities of these / peoples let it be permitted to the Aetolian people to have these cities and (their) territories as far as the Roman people is concerned; and [whatever] is captured apart from the city and its territory, / let the Romans have it.” The same arrangement applies to cities captured by both the Romans and Aetolians.³⁹ While the

³³ Polyb. 9.37.8.

³⁴ Polyb. 9.38-39.

³⁵ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 117; Walbank, *Commentary II*: 162.

³⁶ Habicht and Walbank, Polyb. 9.36.7.n77; this is a different view from that which Walbank expressed in 1967 and it is not clear from the text if the opinion is solely that of Habicht.

³⁷ Livy 26.22.11.

³⁸ *urbium Corcyrae tenus ab Aetolia incipienti solum tecta quae et muri cum agris Aetolorum, alia omnis praeda populi Romani esset*

³⁹ M.M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981), 62.

Romans receive booty from their victories, only the Aetolians gain territory. Livy confirms that this arrangement was carried out: three cities captured in 211, Oeniadae, Nasus, and Anticyra, were all given to the Aetolians.⁴⁰ If Lyciscus was saying that the Romans were trying to conquer Greece, his point would not have been supported by the actions of the Republic. Even if Polybius' reconstruction accurately recreates the language Lyciscus used, Lyciscus was an Acarnanian and an ally of Philip V. Whatever Lyciscus actually said about Rome could have been propaganda meant to discourage Sparta from siding with the Republic.

In 209, Philip and the Aetolians met at the Conference of Aegium to discuss peace. The meeting was described by Livy, and a Polybian fragment of a speech by an unknown attendee is attributed to a speaker at this conference.⁴¹ Eckstein correctly points out that the speaker must be a Macedonian, as he prays against an Aetolian victory.⁴² The anonymous Macedonian says that "should the Aetolians be victorious, which Heaven forbid, the Romans will subjugate them as well as all the other Greeks."⁴³ The Macedonian's speech does not reflect how neutral Greeks or Rome's allies perceived the Western power. Beyond whatever embellishments Polybius has made, the anti-Roman elements of the speech were also exaggerated as a piece of Macedonian propaganda.

The issue of Roman conquest is raised again in another fragmentary Polybian speech from 207 delivered to the Aetolians, urging them to end hostilities. The name of the speaker is not given in the text, but he is usually thought to be a Rhodian named Thrasycrates, based

⁴⁰ Livy 26.24.15, 26.26.3.

⁴¹ Livy 27.30-31; Polyb.10.25, cf. Walbank, *Commentary II*: 15, following Schweighauser.

⁴² Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 96.

⁴³ Polyb. 10.25. 5-6.

on a note in the margins of one of the manuscripts.⁴⁴ The main argument of the speech is that the treaty the Aetolians have made with the Romans is dishonorable, as the Aetolians are “fighting for the enslavement and ruin of Greece.”⁴⁵ Thrasycrates tells the Aetolians:⁴⁶

For it is only too evident, I think, that the Romans if they get the war in Italy off their hands—and this will be very shortly, as Hannibal is now confined in quite a small district of Bruttium—will next throw themselves with their whole strength on Grecian lands on the pretext that they are helping the Aetolians against Philip, but really with the intention of conquering the whole country. Should the Romans, when they have subjugated us, determine to treat us kindly, the credit and thanks will be theirs; but if they treat us ill it is they who will acquire the spoils of those they destroy and sovereignty over the survivors, and you will then call the gods to witness when neither any god will be still willing, nor any man still able to help you.

Polybius generally disapproves of complete invention of speeches, and he did usually strive for historical accuracy.⁴⁷ If he reported these speeches accurately, then Lyciscus, Agelaus, Thrasycrates, and the Macedonian ambassador alleged that Rome was trying to conquer Greece long before the Republic had shown any interest in doing so. It seems plausible that Greeks expressed concern about a foreign army attacking Greek cities. While Roman troops were not making territorial gains at this point, they were taking booty and selling captives into slavery, which is mentioned both by Lyciscus and Thrasycrates.⁴⁸ Derow is incorrect to say that “Nothing like this, with populations being enslaved, had been seen in Greece for a long time.”⁴⁹ When Mantinea was besieged in 223, the booty and slaves were worth 300 talents.⁵⁰ Philip took 5,000 prisoners when Elis was sacked in 219 and sold

⁴⁴ Walbank, *Commentary* II: 16, 274-5. The speech comes from Polybius' narrative of Greek affairs for 207. The identification with Thrasycrates is given in the margins of the Polybius manuscript F.

⁴⁵ Polyb. 11.5.1.

⁴⁶ Polyb. 11.6.1-4.

⁴⁷ Polyb. 12.25b.1.

⁴⁸ Lyciscus- Polyb. 9. 38-39. Thrasycrates- Polyb. 11.5.5.

⁴⁹ Derow, “Arrival of Rome,” 56.

⁵⁰ Polyb. 2.62.12.

off “the existing inhabitants” of Thebes in 217.⁵¹ The numbers may not be trustworthy, but the exact amount is not important. The Romans were not doing anything unprecedented by taking large numbers of slaves. This does not mean, however, that it would not have been a cause for concern among Greeks. The hostility to Roman conquest in the early speeches in Polybius is likely to be exaggerated by the historian, but the Greeks of the late 3rd century had reason to resent Roman involvement.

Eckstein uses Thrasycrates’ speech as evidence for wider anti-Roman sentiment at Rhodes. However Eckstein’s view rests too heavily on his understanding of this speech. This speech from Polybius is a later reconstruction and contains an exaggerated view of anti-Romanism in 207. Other interpretations are possible: for example, Berthold claims that the Rhodian was trying to convince the Aetolians to make peace apart from Rome, and could have overstated the hostility towards Rome. Berthold adds that one speech does not constitute a Rhodian anti-Roman policy.⁵²

Polybius’ bias against the Aetolians may have also caused him to exaggerate Greek fear in these speeches. Polybius regarded the Aetolians as greedy pirates.⁵³ While the speeches of Lyciscus, the Acarnanian, and Thrasycrates all depict the Romans unfavorably, by extension they also depict the Aetolians negatively, since the Aetolians were Rome’s main ally in this war. Besides Polybius’ hindsight from after 167, his hatred for the Aetolians could also have contributed to the negative portrayal of Rome in these three speeches.

⁵¹ Elis: Polyb. 4.75.2-6. Thebes: Polyb. 5. 100. 8, cf. Angelos Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History* (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), 142.

⁵² Richard Berthold, "The Rhodian Appeal to Rome in 201 B.C.," *The Classical Journal* (1975): 105-6.

⁵³ Polyb. 2.43.9, 4.3.1; D. Mendels, 1984/1986. “Did Polybius Have ‘Another’ View of the Aetolian League?” *Ancient Society* 15/17: 68-71.

In using these speeches to gauge the level of resentment among the Greeks at the end of the 3rd century, it is worth noting that the strategy of pointing out the threat from Rome was not successful for any of these speakers. Despite Lyciscus' speech in 211 urging against it, the Spartans allied themselves with the Aetolians and Rome.⁵⁴ In 209 the Macedonian speaker did not convince the Aetolians to agree to peace.⁵⁵ Despite the urging of Thrasycrates in 207, the Aetolians did not make peace with Philip for nearly a year, and this was due mainly to lack of Roman support.⁵⁶ Those whose interests were opposed to Rome's may have emphasized the threat the Republic posed, and this would not have been worthwhile unless Roman involvement generated some alarm, but the response of the Greeks also shows that these fears were subordinated to their present concerns.

In sum, Polybius's views on speech writing make it unlikely that the speeches he reports were complete fabrications. He used various sources for the speeches he relates, and one of his criteria for evaluating these sources was his own experience. During the period before Polybius' life, the speeches are less reliable than later speeches in his *Histories* when he himself may have been in attendance. The historian was writing in a period when Roman power and authority over Hellas was indisputable. This led him to exaggerate aspects of his sources that discussed Roman imperialism. The four speeches examined here all discuss Roman subjugation of the Greeks. Although Rome showed through its actions that conquest was not its goal at this point, Roman behavior in war would still have generated some anxiety. It is likely that there is some element of historicity in all of these four speeches, but

⁵⁴ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 324.

⁵⁵ The main point of his speech also indicates Rome's limited involvement in Greece. The Macedonian tries to make the Aetolians dissatisfied with Rome by pointing out that most of the fighting was carried out by Aetolian and Peloponnesian troops. Polyb. 10.25.3.

⁵⁶ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 324.

the threat from Rome was not serious enough for the Spartans in 211, nor for the Aetolians in 209 and 207, to take steps to prevent Roman intervention.

The Second Macedonian War

The First Macedonian War ended in 205 with the Peace of Phoenice. After a few years of calm, another war in the East broke out between Philip and Rome. At a conference of the Aetolian League in 199 delegates from Macedonia, Rome, and Athens (then a Roman ally) each presented arguments to the Aetolians regarding what side to take.⁵⁷ In Livy's reconstruction, the Macedonian envoy appeals to the peace treaty the Aetolians made with Philip in 206, and points out that the Romans ignored Aetolian requests for help a few years earlier. He then describes how the Romans claimed to be aiding Messana and Syracuse, two Greek cities, when they went to Sicily, and now they control the island. He presents the Aetolians' circumstances as the same as the Sicilians.⁵⁸ As in the earlier speeches in Polybius, the Romans are referred to as barbarians. The Macedonian says that "with foreign people, with barbarians, all Greeks have and will have an eternal war. For they are enemies not by causes that change day by day, but by nature, which is everlasting."⁵⁹

The Athenian envoy is the second to speak. He lists the injuries that Philip has inflicted on Athens. Destruction and slavery imposed during war is acceptable, but Philip has exceeded this and committed numerous crimes against the gods.⁶⁰ Philip attacked their sanctuaries, and Rome came to fight against Philip, implying that Rome saves even the gods

⁵⁷ Livy 31.29-31. Livy includes the conference in his narrative for the year 200, but Briscoe argues that it actually belongs in 199. John Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI-XXXIII* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), 17.

⁵⁸ Livy 31.29.

⁵⁹ *cum alienigenis, cum barbaris aeternum omnibus Graecis bellum est eritique; natura enim, quae perpetua est, non mutabilibus in diem causis hostes sunt.* Livy 31.29.15-16.

⁶⁰ Livy 31.30.1-11.

themselves and the Aetolians should take the side of the Romans. The Roman ambassador, Lucius Furius Purpurio, defends Roman action against the criticism of the Macedonian. He does not deny that Sicily is under Roman control. Instead he claims that “the fortune of each people is according to its service towards us.”⁶¹ The Roman then attacks Philip’s character and says that the Romans entered the first war with Philip for the sake of the Aetolians. He closes by offering to restore the friendship between the Romans and Aetolians. According to Livy, the Aetolians were leaning in favor of the Romans, but the chief magistrate Damocritus, who was bribed by Philip, convinces them to put off making a decision until later. Eventually, the Aetolians side with Rome after a Roman victory at Ottobulum and an increase in Roman naval strength.⁶²

Polybius’ account of this conference is lost, but it is likely that Livy used Polybius as his source for these speeches.⁶³ Where direct comparison is possible, there are no incidents where Livy included a speech where Polybius does not.⁶⁴ Livy’s speeches were not translations of those in Polybius, however. Livy often rearranged the order of speeches, paid more attention to emotions and psychology, and adjusted the lengths of various speeches.⁶⁵ For example, both Polybius and Livy discussed a meeting between Antiochus III of Syria and Roman commissioners in 196.⁶⁶ Livy expanded the speech of the Romans, shortened the speech of Antiochus, and rearranged the points Antiochus made in his speech, while covering the same material as Polybius.⁶⁷

⁶¹ *pro merito cuique erga nos fortunam esse*. Livy 31.31.9-10.

⁶² Livy 31.40; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 279; Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 444.

⁶³ Briscoe, *Commentary Books XXXI-XXXIII*, 19; Walbank, *Commentary II*: 531.

⁶⁴ Briscoe, *Commentary Books XXXI-XXXIII*, 18. Briscoe also thinks that the speeches which Livy includes before battles come from sources other than Polybius.

⁶⁵ Walsh, *Livy*, 235; Briscoe, *Commentary Books XXXI-XXXIII*, 6.

⁶⁶ Polyb. 18.50-51; Livy 33. 39-40.

⁶⁷ Walsh, *Livy*, 232.

Whatever the Athenian envoy to the Aetolians said about Rome in 199, or at least what the Athenian said in Polybius' reconstruction, it is likely that Livy's patriotism led him to exaggerate Rome's role as defender of Greece. The Macedonian appeal to Panhellenism is similar to other appeals made by speakers throughout Polybius, and it is likely that the Greek historian included the concept of Greek unity against a foreign power.⁶⁸ This does not mean that this idea was added by Polybius, only that it was not added by Livy.

There is no reason to believe Livy's comment that Damocritus was bribed by Philip, but the Aetolian response to these speeches is important. The Aetolians did not decide on with whom to ally themselves until Rome appeared stronger.⁶⁹ This could have been through fear of the Roman ambassadors justification for Roman treatment of Sicily—that Rome treated other peoples based on their services to Rome—or it could have been due to the Aetolian desire for certain areas in Greece.⁷⁰ The two motivations are not entirely separate. The Aetolians sided with whom they thought would win.⁷¹ Although the Aetolians may have been motivated by a desire for conquest themselves, the Roman justification for the treatment of Sicily could not have reduced fears of Rome among Greeks. When the Macedonian suggested that the Aetolians' situation was like that of the Sicilians, the Roman ambassador implied that, if the Aetolians should disfavor Rome like the Sicilians, they would suffer the same fate.

In 198, the other major federal League in Greece, the Achaean League, defected from Philip and joined the Romans. Before the Achaeans made this decision, ambassadors where

⁶⁸ E.g. Polyb. 5.104, 9.37.

⁶⁹ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 444.

⁷⁰ For the Aetolian desire for land lost to Philip, see Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 444.

⁷¹ Any previous treaties or the Aetolian appeal for Roman help that may or may not have been sent a few years earlier were irrelevant. On the possible Aetolian appeal to the Roman senate for help against Philip, see Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 211-217.

sent by the Romans, Rhodians, King Attalus of Pergamum, the Athenians, and the Macedonians. At Sicyon, a council was held to determine what the Achaeans should do. According to Livy, there was a great confusion among the Achaeans both before and after the ambassadors spoke.⁷² In Livy's version, the Achaean chief magistrate Aristaenus delivers a speech urging the Achaeans to side with Rome. Aristaenus stresses the strength of the Roman forces in Greece. He refers to the Achaean conflict with Nabis of Sparta, in which Philip had not assisted them. There is also a long list of Philip's crimes that Aristaenus says he will leave aside. After Aristaenus' speech, the Achaeans approve a treaty with the Rhodians and with Attalus and decide that they would also make an alliance with Rome. Three members of the league, the Dymaei, the Megalopolitans, and the Argives—all loyal to Macedonia⁷³ –, storm out of the conference when this was put to a vote.⁷⁴

The meeting at Sicyon was held after Rome had offered to restore Corinth to the Achaeans, although Aristaenus does not mention this in his speech.⁷⁵ As with the Aetolian alliance with Rome, the issues involved in the Achaean decision were Greek acquisition of land and the strength of Roman forces, although fear of Nabis of Sparta was also relevant.⁷⁶ It is likely that Livy's version of this speech was based on a version related by Polybius.⁷⁷ Gruen stresses the Achaean desire for Peloponnesian hegemony with the acquisition of Corinth and Roman support against Nabis of Sparta, while Eckstein emphasizes fear of Rome, but also thinks that Polybius (and therefore Livy) downplayed Rome's promise of

⁷² Livy 32.20.1-7, 32.22.1-4.

⁷³ Eckstein, "Polybius, Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'," *The Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987): 143 against Walbank, *Commentary* I: 2, who thinks only a small number of Achaeans objected to Aristaenus.

⁷⁴ Livy 32.22.

⁷⁵ Livy 32.19.4.

⁷⁶ Eckstein, "Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'," 143.

⁷⁷ Briscoe, *Commentary Books XXXI-XXXIII*, 19; Eckstein, "Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'," 143.

Corinth because of his patriotism.⁷⁸ The destruction of Greek towns by Flamininus would have encouraged Achaean fears, although he concedes that Philip engaged in similar tactics.⁷⁹

Eckstein is correct that the offer of Corinth was suppressed by Polybius in order to defend his native Achaean League. If Polybius' Aristaenus mentioned this, Livy would not have missed an opportunity to demonstrate Roman generosity.⁸⁰ Polybius' version of this speech could have served as a defense of his native Achaean League against accusations that they violated their oaths to Philip for the sake of territorial gain.⁸¹ Polybius may have been trying to show that it was necessary for the Achaeans to join Rome in the interest of self-preservation, a claim he states explicitly elsewhere.⁸² Livy's speech of Aristaenus is also consistent with the philosophy that Polybius attributes to Aristaenus with regard to Rome. Polybius says that Aristaenus' view of Greek relations with Rome was that a state should strive to do what is honorable when it is possible, but when people are powerless, they must do what is in their best interest.⁸³ Polybius includes this at a later point in his *History*, and this may reflect slightly different historical circumstances, but the same principle is evident in the speech in Livy.

It is impossible to know for certain how prominently the promise of Corinth featured in the Achaean decision to abandon Philip or in the speech Aristaenus actually delivered. While Polybius claimed to report what was actually said, he was also prone to showing

⁷⁸ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 444; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 281; Eckstein, "Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'," 148-9.

⁷⁹ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 281-2.

⁸⁰ Eckstein, "Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'," 148.

⁸¹ Eckstein, "Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'," 148-9. For the Aetolian accusation against the Achaeans in 195, see Livy 34. 23. 6.

⁸² Polyb.13.8.

⁸³ Polyb. 24.12.

favoritism for his native Achaean League.⁸⁴ It is likely that the acquisition of Corinth was one of the factors involved in the Achaeans' decision: the Achaeans did not side with Rome until after Flaminius made the offer. However, the position that Aristaenus takes in Livy is consistent with his views on international politics elsewhere, and the speech is probably not a complete fabrication by Polybius.⁸⁵ The concern with the threat posed by Rome that appears in Livy was probably in Aristaenus' historical speech.

During the Second Macedonian War, both main Leagues in Greece sided with Rome. Although not always explicit, the same theme was present in both decisions. Rome rewarded its friends and punished its enemies. When the strength of Rome's forces convinced the Greeks that the Republic would be able to enforce its will, both the Aetolians and Achaeans preferred to be rewarded rather than punished. The Aetolians did not side with Rome until the Western power appeared to be winning the war, and the Achaeans did not side with Rome until they were promised territorial gain. Both motivations were important to Greek views of Rome, but in the speeches from this period, the Roman threat is the dominant theme.

After the Isthmian Declaration

After the end of the Second Macedonian War and the famous declaration of Greek freedom, Flaminius remained in Greece to ensure the post war settlement was carried out and possibly to defend Roman interests should conflict break out between Rome and Antiochus III of Syria. When Roman legates reported to the senate that there was a threat from Nabis of Sparta, the Senate did not declare war but decided to let Flaminius decide

⁸⁴ Walbank, *Commentary* I: 12.

⁸⁵ Polyb. 24.12.

what to do.⁸⁶ After Nabis took control of Argos, Flamininus held a meeting with Greek representatives at Corinth, where he asked the Greeks what they wanted Rome to do.

In Livy's version of the meeting, Flamininus tells the Greeks that Nabis' hold on Sparta would be no concern to Rome except that the enslavement of Argos violates the Roman declaration of Greek freedom.⁸⁷ The representative from Athens praises Roman service to Greece, but the Aetolian representative presents the Isthmian Declaration as a sham, as Roman forces held Chalcis and Demetrias, two of the "Fetters of Greece" previously held by Philip.⁸⁸ The Aetolians will deal with Nabis; Rome can remove its legions from Greece. Aristaenus responds on behalf of the Achaeans, saying that the Aetolians "have only the language of Greeks, as they have only the shape of humans."⁸⁹ He then asks the Romans to save Argos from Sparta and to keep the rest of the Greeks safe from the Aetolians. The Greeks decide on war with Sparta.

Livy says that besides the Aetolians the representatives were generally in favor of Roman involvement.⁹⁰ Flamininus' speech was part of a larger propaganda campaign meant to ensure support among Greeks. Whatever Rome's actual motivation for the war, most of the Greeks supported the Roman war on Sparta.⁹¹ Livy's version was probably based on Polybius, although the admiration of Flamininus is likely an addition of Livy.⁹²

⁸⁶ Livy 33.45.2-3.

⁸⁷ Livy 34.22-24.

⁸⁸ Livy 34.23.9.

⁸⁹ *Linguam tantum Graecorum habent, sicut speciem hominum.* Livy 34.24.3.

⁹⁰ Livy 34.24.4 cf. Polyb. 18.45.

⁹¹ Gruen says in *The Hellenistic World*, 453-5 that for the Romans the war was mainly used as propaganda and to increase Flamininus' glory. Derow, in "Arrival of Rome," 63 views the war with Nabis as a reason to keep Roman troops in Greece. Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 201-209 sees Flamininus' use of the "Slogan of Freedom" as a way to justify Roman involvement in a war that Rome had no business getting involved in. Framing the war as a fight for Greek freedom, instigated by Greeks, allowed Flamininus to keep command in Greece.

⁹² Briscoe, *Commentary Books XXXIV-XXXVII*, 85.

After the Second Macedonian War, Roman propaganda in Greece stressed Rome's role as liberator. This perception of Rome would change over the next decade. In 184, Appius Claudius, a member of a Roman delegation sent to Greece, appeared before a council of the Achaean League in response to complaints that the Achaeans had mistreated the Spartans. Lycortas, Polybius' father, delivered a speech addressing the accusations against the Achaeans. In Livy's version of the speech, Lycortas opens by saying that it is unfair that the Achaeans must defend themselves to a Roman against a charge raised against them by a Roman.⁹³ Lycortas addresses the crimes that Achaeans allegedly committed against the Spartans, but he ends his speech with a discussion of Roman power. Lycortas says his speech is one "of slaves disputing with their masters."⁹⁴ The treaty that the Romans had with the Achaeans is presented as one of equals, but "in reality, for the Achaeans there is a freedom obtained by begging, and for the Romans there is dominance."⁹⁵ Appius Claudius responds that the Achaeans should solve the problem on their own before they are forced to do so against their will.⁹⁶

Four years later, controversy again arose between Sparta and the Achaeans, and the Achaeans sent representatives to Rome. In Polybius' version of the embassy, Callicrates tells the Romans that all Greek states were divided between those who thought that the Greeks should always give in to Roman demands and those who thought that previous treaties and laws should still be followed.⁹⁷ Callicrates then tells the Senate if they want the Achaeans to stop ignoring their demands, they should make this issue a priority. Polybius says that after

⁹³ Livy 39.36.8.

⁹⁴ *Scio ego, Ap. Claudii, hanc orationem qua sum adhuc usus neque sociorum apud socios neque liberae gentis esse, sed vere servorum disceptantium apud dominos.* Livy 39.37.9.

⁹⁵ *re apud Achaeos precaria libertas, apud Romanos etiam imperium est.* Livy 39.37.13.

⁹⁶ Livy 39.37.19-20.

⁹⁷ Polyb. 24.9.

this speech by Callicrates, the Romans began to intentionally put their supporters in power in Greece and to remove their detractors from power.⁹⁸ Callicrates was eventually responsible for Polybius' exile, and it is likely that Polybius is placing too much of the blame for Greece's downfall on his political rival. However, Callicrates' speech must have had an effect on the Romans, since the Senate wrote to the Achaeans, Aetolians, Epirots, Athenians, Boeotians, and Acarnanians that "there ought to be more men like Callicrates in the several states."⁹⁹

The speeches by Lycortas and Callicrates represent a more submissive attitude of the Achaeans toward Rome than the one displayed in 195. Although the Aetolians objected to Rome's presence in the war with Nabis, the Achaean Aristaenus was in favor of Roman intervention, and Flamininus offered the Greeks the decision on the war. This may have been a mere formality, but even this formality would fade away in the next decade. In 195, Flamininus asked the Greeks what they wished him to do. After the defeat of Philip V and the Isthmian Declaration, Rome tried to cultivate an image as the savior of Greece. In 184, Appius Claudius told the Greeks that if they did not resolve their conflicts, they would not have a choice in the matter. Besides the Aetolians, who were dissatisfied because Rome had not granted them territory that thought they deserved, many Greeks had a favorable view towards Rome in 196, but this image had largely disappeared by 184 when Appius Claudius spoke to Lycortas.

Speeches are a major component of ancient historiography. They give the characters more depth, and provide the author an opportunity to explain the motives and causes behind historical events. For Polybius, a speech in a historical work should recreate what the speaker

⁹⁸ Polyb. 24.10.

⁹⁹ Polyb. 24.10.6-7.

actually said. Polybius determined what was actually said through examining documents, interviewing witnesses, but most importantly through personal experience. Livy was also dependent on his sources for speeches. When Livy follows Polybius, he does not invent speeches that Polybius does not report. Livy was more interested in literary style and emotion than Polybius, and Livy's speeches are not always verbatim replications of his source. Both authors have biases for their homeland: Polybius defends the Achaean League and criticizes the Aetolians, and Livy suppresses information damaging to Rome's reputation.

Despite these shortcomings the speeches in both their works provide insight into Greek perception of Rome during the period of the Macedonian Wars. During the first Macedonian War, three speakers discussed a threat from Rome: Lyciscus (211), an unnamed Macedonian (209), and Thrasycrates (207). Fear of a Roman threat to Greece was present in these speeches, but two of these speakers were enemies of Rome trying to tarnish the Republic's reputation. A Roman threat was not serious enough for the Aetolians to disassociate with Rome, and it did not deter the Spartans from joining with the Aetolians and the Romans. Roman involvement in the East during the Second Macedonian War was significantly greater than during the First. The threat posed by Roman forces in Greece and the rewards that could be gained by siding with the winner were used to encourage both the Aetolians and the Achaeans to side with Rome. After winning the war and proclaiming Greek freedom, the Romans sought to be viewed as the saviors of Greece. Eventually many Greeks began to view their relationship with Rome as it was expressed by Lycortas, as slaves arguing with their masters.

CHAPTER TWO: ROME AS LIBERATOR

Roman intervention in the East from around 217 to 167 was sometimes viewed by Greeks as a liberating force. This view of the western power was due to Rome's limited involvement in Greece, Roman propaganda, and the competition Rome created for other imperialist powers like Philip and Antiochus. Rome's commitment to the First Macedonian War was small, and even after Antiochus' defeat Rome often avoided exerting control in Greece. Rome's hesitancy to take control was recognized by Greeks who ignored Rome's requests.

Romans also tried to gather support among the Greeks by portraying themselves as liberators. The Isthmian Declaration, a letter from Flamininus to the people of Chyretiae, and Flamininus' offering to the temple of Apollo at Delphi are all examples of Roman propaganda. Rome could make the claim to be restoring the freedom of the Greeks because Roman aid was often the best hope the Greeks had for a defense against other imperialist powers. The alliance between Philip and Antiochus at the end of the 3rd century posed a threat to the entire balance of power in the Mediterranean. Philip's violent behavior caused some Greeks, like the poet Alcaeus of Messene, to rejoice in his downfall. Greek cities in Asia Minor, like Smyrna, saw Rome as a counter-point to threats from Antiochus and made dedications to Rome as a way to seek Roman support or express their gratitude. Rome also relieved Greeks from imperialism of other Greeks, such as when Rome liberated Delphi from the Aetolians. Since Rome often did not exercise control in Greek affairs and presented itself as a liberator, many Greeks saw Rome's victories as a chance at increased freedom.

The Limits of Roman Involvement

Rome's presence in the East was often restrained or non-committal. Rome's investment in the First Macedonian War was small. After defeating Philip, Rome did not impose typical forms of control, like permanent garrisons, on the Greeks. When Rome had defeated Antiochus, the Republic rarely enforced its decisions, which Greeks often ignored.

Mediation attempts by neutral Greek states in the First Macedonian War have been viewed as attempts to keep Rome out of Greece. This misrepresents the goals of the neutral states, however, which aimed their peace talks at Philip and the Aetolians because Rome was not considered one of the main combatants. Such mediation attempts occurred in 209 at Phalara and Aegium, in 208 at Elateia, and possibly in 207 at two Panaetolian assemblies.¹ The nature of these mediations has generated significant interest among modern scholars. The focus of debate is whether the talks were aimed at a peace treaty between the Aetolian League and Philip V, or a "comprehensive peace," which would have included Rome.² Eckstein stresses that the goals of the neutral Greeks often conflicted with Roman interests, since Rome wanted the war in the East to continue as it would keep Philip from invading Italy. He adds that the conflict between the mediators' and Rome's interests was a conscious policy on behalf of the Greek mediators.³ Eckstein bases this inference in part on the hostility toward Rome voiced in the speeches from this period in Polybius. Dmitriev goes

¹ Phalara and Aegium: Livy 27.30. The speech at Polybius 10.25 also likely comes from an attempt at mediation in 209, Walbank, *Commentary II*: 229. Elateia: Livy 28.7.14. Panaetolian assemblies: Appian, *Mac.* 3 The speech of the Thrasycrates at Polybius 11.4 has also been seen in the context of the assemblies related by Appian (Eckstein, "Greek Mediation in the First Macedonian War, 209-205 B.C." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 51 (2002): 287 and *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 107-111)

² Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 92-116, and Walbank, *Commentary II*: 229 are among those who think that the mediators were interested only in the Aetolians and Philip. The main argument for a comprehensive peace comes from J.W. Rich, "Roman Aims in the First Macedonian War," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* (1984): 145-7.

³ Eckstein, "Greek Mediation," 270.

further and says that “the peace between Philip and the Aetolians was supposed to establish the ‘safety of the Greeks’ by expressly denying the Romans an opportunity to interfere in Greek affairs.”⁴

There is no doubt that the actions of Rome in the East during the First Macedonian War distressed the Greeks. Still, Roman involvement in the First Macedonian War was actually minimal. Rome did not annex any territory, as the inscription of the Roman-Aetolian treaty shows.⁵ The Aetolians were nearly forced to make peace in 209 because of a lack of support from Rome.⁶ The Aetolians did eventually make peace with Philip but only after Roman troops had been inactive in Greece in 207 and 206.⁷ The war was referred to by contemporaries as “the Aetolian War,” which underscores the prominence of the Greek league in the conflict.⁸

A closer look at the efforts of the neutral Greeks show that they focused their mediation attempts on the Aetolians and Philip because they were the two main competitors in the war. Eckstein places too much emphasis on the speeches from this period, and misreads an important passage in Livy, which causes him to exaggerate Greek hostility toward Rome. Dmitriev is incorrect to say that one of the purposes of these mediations was to keep Greeks safe from Rome. Although the First Macedonian War is now viewed as the first in a long string of Roman wars in the East which resulted in Roman domination of

⁴ Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 147.

⁵ See above, pgs. 17-8.

⁶ Livy 27.10.

⁷ Livy 29.12.1, although Rich, “Roman Aims,” 136-9 proposes a different chronology than Livy in which the Roman expedition in 205 should be moved to 206. Rich also thinks that the view that Roman commitment to the war was half-hearted is mistaken, but even he admits that Rome’s contribution to the war effort was “modest.” Rich, “Roman Aims”, 130.

⁸ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 93; Livy 27.30.10, 27.30.4, 28.7.14. Eckstein acknowledges that Livy is the only source for this title, but the Roman author is probably following Polybius in these passages, and in passages from Annalistic sources the conflict is referred to as *bellum Macedonicum* or *bellum adversus Philippum*.

Hellas, to the Greeks at the time it was a conflict between Philip V and the Aetolian League. The Romans were seen as a violent and barbaric force, but also as an assistant of the Aetolian League.⁹

The first of these mediation attempts occurred at Phalara in 209. Livy's version is the only account that remains. After Philip defeated an allied force of Aetolian, Roman, and Pergamene troops at Lamia, he proceeded to Phalara.¹⁰

There envoys from Ptolemy king of Egypt, the Rhodians, the Athenians, and Chians came for the purpose of ending the war between Philip and the Aetolians. Amyntander, king of the Athamanians, was invited by the Aetolians from the neighboring lands as an arbitrator. Moreover, all of them were not so much concerned for the Aetolians, a more violent people than is in the nature of Greeks, as that Philip and his power, which would be burdensome to their liberty, not mix with Greek affairs. The deliberation concerning peace was delayed until the council of the Achaeans, and for that council a location and a certain date was set. Meanwhile, a cessation of hostilities of thirty days was obtained.

Dmitriev includes this conference in a list of mediation attempts where Greek representatives emphasized that the Greeks were being enslaved by the Romans.¹¹ However, the Romans are mentioned nowhere in Livy's account of this conference. Dmitriev has extended his conclusions about other peace talks to include this one, although the text does not support it. Instead Livy says that fear of Philip motivated the Greeks. It is true that Livy could have suppressed information that would seem damaging to Rome's image, but this

⁹ Cf. Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 379.

¹⁰ *Eo legati ab rege Aegypti Ptolomaeo Rhodiisque et Atheniensibus et Chiis venerunt ad dirimendum inter Philippum atque Aetolos bellum. Adhibitus ab Aetolis et ex finitimis pacificator Amyntander rex Athamanum. Omnium autem non tanta pro Aetolis cura erat, ferociori quam pro ingentiis Graecorum gente, quam ne Philippus regnumque eius rebus Graeciae, grave libertati futurum, immisceretur. De pace dilata consultatio est in concilium Achaeorum, concilioque ei et locus et dies certa indicta; interim triginta dierum indutiae impetratae.* Livy 27.30.4-7.

¹¹ Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 146.

section is thought to derive from Polybius and there is no reason why fear of Philip is an unreasonable motivation.¹²

A few months later, Philip met with the Achaean League at Aegium.¹³ The Aetolians and the neutral Greeks from Phalara also came and discussed ending the war. Negotiations were unsuccessful after the Aetolians made excessive demands to Philip, who was in a more powerful position at the time. Livy says that Philip:¹⁴

proceeded to Aegium to a meeting of his allies which was called long ago. There the issue of ending the Aetolian war was treated, so there would be no cause either for the Romans or for Attalus to enter Greece. But when the length of the armistice was nearly spent, the Aetolians overthrew all this after they heard that Attalus had come to Aegina and a Roman fleet lie at Naupactus. For when they were called to the Achaean council, where the ambassadors also were who had dealt with the issue of peace at Phalara, the Aetolians at first complained about certain small deeds done contrary to the promise of their arrangement during the period of the truce. Then they said that the war could be not stopped unless the Achaeans returned Pylus to the Messenians, Atintania was restored to the Romans, and the Ardiaei were restored to Scerdilaedus and Pleuratus. Philip on the other hand, having thought it disgraceful for the conquered voluntarily to give conditions to him, the victor, said that not even formerly had he heard the discussion of peace or had he fixed the truce having any hope that the Aetolians would remain at peace, but so that he would have all his allies as witnesses that he sought an occasion for peace, while the Aetolians sought one for war. And so, with peace unaccomplished he dismissed the council.

¹² F.W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1940), 89-90; Eckstein, "Greek Mediation," 274.

¹³ Livy 27.30.9-15.

¹⁴ *Aegium profectus est ad indictum multo ante sociorum concilium. Ibi de Aetolico finiendo bello actum, ne causa aut Romanis aut Attalo intrandi Graeciam esset. Sed ea omnia vixdum indutiarum tempore circumactio Aetoli turbavere, postquam et Attalum Aeginam venisse et Romanam classem stare ad Naupactum audivere. Vocati enim in concilium Achaeorum in quo et eae legationes erant quae ad Phalara egerant de pace, primum questi sunt quaedam parva contra fidem conventionis tempore indutiarum facta; postremo negarunt dirimi bellum posse, nisi Messeniis Achaei Pylum redderent, Romanis resistuerentur Atintania, Scerdilaedo et Pleurato Ardiaei. Enimvero indignum ratus Philippus victos victori sibi ultro condiciones ferre, ne antea quidem se aut de pace audisse aut indutias pepigisse dixit spem ullam habentem quieturos Aetolos, sed ut omnes socios testes haberet se pacis, illos belli causam quaesisse. Ita infecta pace concilium dimisit.* Livy 27.30. 9-15.

Livy said that peace was discussed “so there would be no cause either for the Romans or for Attalus to enter Greece.”¹⁵ Eckstein thinks that this phrase refers to a public proclamation of the intent of the mediators.¹⁶ He claims that the phrase must refer to the general purpose of the conference, which would have been determined by the mediators. However, it is not clear from Livy’s account that this phrase was a public statement, or that it was a “proclamation of the general purpose of the peace conference.”¹⁷ When Livy makes this statement, he has not yet mentioned any mediators. He has just spoken of Philip’s meeting with his allies.

Livy, Polybius, or Polybius’ sources could be responsible for attributing this motivation to Philip and his allies. In the context of Philip’s recent victories, this motivation would have been a reasonable interpretation for either of the ancient historians. Philip says at the conference that the Aetolians were not in a position to make demands due to their recent defeats. Philip and his allies would have wanted to bring an end to the war before additional reinforcements arrived from Rome or Attalus. This interpretation is reinforced by the events that followed. When Roman and Pergamene forces did arrive, the Aetolians gained confidence in their position and made demands that Philip deemed excessive.¹⁸ This is exactly what Philip and his allies were trying to avoid by seeking peace before Rome and Attalus arrived.

Appian (95 A.D.- 160’s), an Alexandrian historian of the 2nd century A.D., records two other mediation attempts from the year 207. According to Appian, during the first attempt neutral Greeks attempted to convince the Aetolians, Philip, and the Romans to agree

¹⁵ *Aegium profectus est ad indictum multo ante sociorum concilium. Ibi de Aetolico finiendo bello actum, ne causa aut Romanis aut Attalo intrandi Graeciam esset.* Livy 27.30.10.

¹⁶ Eckstein, “Greek Mediation,” 277.

¹⁷ Eckstein, “Greek Mediation,” 277.

¹⁸ Livy 27.30.

to peace. Sulpicius Galba, proconsul in 207, was instructed by the Senate to refuse to agree to terms.¹⁹ Rome then sent reinforcements to Greece and helped the Aetolians capture Ambracia. There was then a second mediation attempt. During these peace talks, the neutral Greeks said that the Aetolians were forcing servitude on the Greeks by allying themselves with Rome. When Galba tried to reply, the audience shouted at him.

Appian's later account should be rejected. The Alexandrian historian's record of the Roman expedition to take Ambracia was not mentioned by either Polybius or Livy, and it conflicts with the earlier historians' account of Roman inactivity in 207.²⁰ There are other incidents where Appian described events which did not happen. He says that Philip captured Chios in 201, although this did not occur.²¹ The Alexandrian historian also describes an incident in 167 where Prusias, king of Bithynia, asked the Romans to forgive him for being neutral in the Third Macedonian War. However, Prusias did not remain neutral in this war, and gave Rome five ships.²² Appian's information on the period of the Macedonian Wars often was erroneous.

Despite the difficulties Appian's narrative presents, Eckstein does not see this as grounds to dismiss it completely. He suggests that either Appian was confused, or he was working with a Roman tradition that invented Galba's expedition to defend Rome against the charge of abandoning the Aetolians. Eckstein argues that the peace conferences which Appian reports before and after Galba's expedition should be accepted because the second

¹⁹ App. *Mac.* 3.

²⁰ *Mac.* 4; Livy 29.12.1, 32.21.17; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 105.

²¹ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 105n.106.

²² App. *Mithr.* 2; Livy, 44.10.12, 44.24.3; Eckstein, "Rome, the War with Perseus, and Third Party Mediation," *Historia: Zeitschrift Fur Alte Geschichte* 37 (1988): 437. Prusias did hesitate to enter the war on Rome's side since he was married to Perseus' sister. Livy 42.29.3.

attempt to affect a peace treaty provides a context for Thrasycrates' speech from Polybius 11.4-6.²³

Even if Appian's account does describe the same incident as Polybius 11.4-6, this still does not provide adequate evidence of anti-Roman policy from neutral Greeks. If Thrasycrates delivered his speech at Appian's second mediation attempt, it is possible that Polybius was the ultimate source. Appian could have combined Polybius with a Roman source, or the Roman source could have drawn on Polybius. The Alexandrian cites Polybius in another circumstance, but he may not have directly read Polybius. Instead he may have read an intermediary source.²⁴ If this episode does come from Polybius, the hostility in the ambassador's speeches would be subject to the same criticism as Thrasycrates' speech: it reflects Polybius hindsight after 167 and his bias against the Aetolian League. Regardless of the source, the Rhodians could have exaggerated the Roman threat to convince the Aetolians to agree to a separate peace, and one speech, tentatively attributed to a Rhodian, is not adequate evidence of a Rhodian anti-Roman policy.²⁵ Eckstein also underplays the fact that the ambassadors included the Romans in the first mediation attempt, apparently with no hostility.

Eckstein's view of these mediation attempts is correct to the extent that he claims that the main goal of the mediators was to achieve peace between Philip and the Aetolians, but he places too great an emphasis on the language of Polybius' speeches. Dmitriev's claim that neutral Greeks were deliberately trying to keep Rome out of Greece misrepresents the

²³ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 105.

²⁴ App. *Pun.* 132.630; Alain M. Gowing, *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 222 n.39.

²⁵ See above, pg. 20.

intention of the Greek mediators, since Roman presence in the East during these years was actually minimal.

Even after the First Macedonian War, as Romans became more involved in Greek affairs, they rarely exercised direct control over Greeks. Except for installing garrisons in Demetrias, Chalcis and Acrocorinth for three years after Cynoscephalae, Rome did not annex territory, install governors, or establish colonies in the East.²⁶ Even after Rome had defeated the two most powerful Hellenistic kings, Roman rulings on Greek affairs were still sometimes indecisive. For example, in 189, after Sparta had attacked a city inhabited by Spartan exiles, the Achaeans demanded that Sparta surrender those who were responsible for the attack. In response, the city of Sparta tried to break away from the Achaean League by surrendering to the Roman consul M. Fulvius Nobilior.²⁷ The Lacedaemonians and the Achaeans both sent ambassadors to Rome. Rome's decision was that there should be no change concerning the Spartans.²⁸ The response was so vaguely worded that both sides interpreted it in their favor.

When Rome did issue direct commands, Greeks sometimes felt free to ignore them. In 181, the Senate sent a letter to the Achaeans telling them to allow Spartan exiles to return to their city, but the Achaeans ignored this ruling.²⁹ In 178, the Lycians sent an embassy to Rome to ask for aid against Rhodian oppression.³⁰ The Romans sent envoys to the Rhodians saying that they were not to regard the Lycians as their slaves but as their allies.³¹ The Rhodians sent envoys to Rome to contest this decision, which the Romans avoided

²⁶ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 346.

²⁷ Livy 38.30-34.

²⁸ Livy 38.32.9: *novari tamen nihil de Lacedaemoniis placebat*.

²⁹ Polyb. 24.2; John Briscoe, "Rome and the Class Struggle in the Greek States," *PP* 36 (1967):14.

³⁰ On the date of this episode, see Walbank, *Commentary III*: 278.

³¹ Polyb. 25.4.1-25.6.1.

answering. Soon after this the Rhodians and Lycians waged war against each other, and Livy recorded no response from Rome.³² At least in some instances, the Greeks thought they could ignore Roman demands and not suffer negative consequences.

Roman Propaganda and the Slogan of Freedom

Rome's tendency to avoid taking direct control in Greece reinforced its claim to be fighting for Greek independence. From the beginning of the Second Macedonian War, Rome demanded that Philip not attack the Greeks. After Cynoscephalae, Flaminius proclaimed Rome's gift of freedom to the Greeks at Corinth in 196, in his dedication at Delphi, and in a letter he wrote to the people of Chyretiae.

In the beginning of the Second Macedonian War, Roman demands against Philip depicted Rome as fighting on behalf of the Greeks. In 200, Roman messengers told Philip "to make war on no Grecian state...If he acted so, they added, he might consider himself at peace with Rome, but if he refused to accede the consequences would be the reverse."³³ Two years later, Flaminius ordered "that Philip should withdraw from the whole of Greece after giving up to each power the prisoners and deserters in his hands."³⁴ Although there is no mention of Greek freedom, Romans still are speaking of protecting Greece from Philip's aggression.

³² Livy 41.25.8. Livy does not give much information on this incident, since he has enough work to do to complete his history of Rome. Cf. Berthold, *Rhodes*, 178.

³³ Polyb. 16.27.2. cf. Polyb. 16.34.3.

³⁴ Polyb. 18.1.12-13, 18.2.6, 18.5.5, 18.9.1, Livy 32.10.3, 32.33.3, Appian *Mac.* 5, Plut. *Flam.* 5.6.

The demands made to Philip in 200 and 198 led to Roman propaganda of Greek freedom. The first appearance of this slogan of freedom was the senatorial decree that ended the Second Macedonian War. The contents of the decree included that:³⁵

All the rest of the Greeks in Asia and Europe were to be free and subject to their own laws; Philip was to surrender to the Romans before the Isthmian Games those Greeks subject to his rule and the cities in which he had garrisons; he was to leave free, withdrawing his garrisons from them, the towns of Euromus, Pedasa, Bargylia, and Iasus, as well as Abydus, Thasos, Myrina, and Perinthus; Flamininus was to write to Prusias in the terms of the *senatus consultum* about restoring the freedom of Cius; Philip was to restore to the Romans all prisoners of war and deserters before the same date, and to surrender to them all his warships with the exception of five light vessels and his great “sixteen”; he was to pay them one thousand talents, half at once, and the other half by installments extending over ten years.

Polybius does not claim to recreate the senatorial decree, but he may have had access to a Roman copy of the document.³⁶ Prior to Cynoscephalae, the Romans had not used the notion of freedom in their dealings in the East, but various Greek states did present their war efforts as a fight for their own freedom.³⁷ For example, the Greek envoys to the Senate in 198 and King Amyntas of the Athamanians asked Rome to limit Philip’s power in the post-war settlement, because of the threat he posed to their freedom.³⁸

Rome’s Greek allies may have suggested the use of this slogan, and the Romans adapted their practices to a Greek context by using propaganda based on earlier precedents throughout Greek history.³⁹ The practice of declaring Greeks free to garner support had Hellenistic precedents going back at least to 318, when the Macedonian regent Polyperchon tried to gather Greek support against Cassander and Antigonos Monophthalmus. Similar

³⁵ Polyb. 18.44.

³⁶ Walbank, *Commentary I*: 32; Briscoe, *Commentary Books XXXI-XXXIII*, 304. cf. Livy 33.30.6-11, who includes annalistic variations. Walbank, *Commentary II*: 609.

³⁷ Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 169.

³⁸ Polyb. 18.11.4, 7, 11, 18.36.3; Livy 33.12.4.

³⁹ Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 173, 176; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 291.

language was used by the Ptolemies and Seleucids throughout the third century.⁴⁰ In contrast, it appears that prior to the Second Macedonian War the Romans rarely used the notion of *libertas* in their interstate relations.⁴¹ The Roman use of the slogan of Greek freedom may have been a Roman attempt to adopt Hellenic forms of international relations.

With the war against Philip brought to a close, Rome looked to the next major threat: Antiochus III of Syria. Flaminius became a spokesperson for the Roman policy of gathering Greek support to create a buffer zone between Italy and Syria.⁴² Polybius reports that at the Isthmian Games in 196, Flaminius proclaimed to the Greeks in attendance that:⁴³

the senate of Rome and Titus Quinctius the proconsul having overcome King Philip and the Macedonians, leave the following peoples free, without garrisons, and subject to no tribute and governed by their own countries' laws—the Corinthians, Phocians, Locrians, Euboeans, Phthiotic Achaeans, Magnesians, Thessalians, and Perrhaebians.

Polybius, Livy, and Plutarch all report loud shouts of joy from the Greek audience, and honors heaped on Flaminius for making the declaration.⁴⁴ Flaminius also made a dedication at Delphi in which he said that “Titus, a descendant of Aeneas, has brought you a most excellent gift, he who for the sons of the Greeks wrought freedom.”⁴⁵ Although Roman garrisons were in Demetrias, Chalcis, and Acrocorinth for two years, in 194 all Rome’s troops left Greece.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 134-142; Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 112-141.

⁴¹ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 143-4.

⁴² John Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXIV-XXXVII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 116; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 317.

⁴³ Polyb. 18.46.5 cf. Livy 33.32.

⁴⁴ Plut. *Flam.* 10.6, whose late account includes the fantastic detail that the shouts were so loud that they knocked birds flying overhead out of the sky.

⁴⁵ Plut. *Flam.* 12.6. Translation by Bernadotte Perrin.

⁴⁶ Livy 34.49, 34.51.1, 34.52.1.

Flamininus' policy is further documented by an inscription from Chyretiae dating to around 194, preserved on a white marble stone in the wall of a church in Thessaly.⁴⁷ The inscription records a letter of Flamininus to the people of Chyretiae, in which Flamininus returned land previously under Roman control to the Greek people. The land had probably been under Roman control since the Aetolians sacked the city in 199.⁴⁸ In the letter, Flamininus says that he was demonstrating the favorable policy of the Romans to the Chyretiaeans, and that the Romans "favor above all else good will and a good name."⁴⁹ Flamininus also included a subtle criticism of the Aetolians, by saying that his purpose was to show that Rome would not accept censure from those who do not act properly themselves.⁵⁰ Both the act of returning land and the inscription itself would have demonstrated Rome's beneficence.⁵¹

Eckstein sees this as an example of Flamininus interfering in Greek affairs contrary to the Isthmian Declaration.⁵² However, as Walsh and Armstrong argue, property restorations did not depend on political affiliations, only on legal property rights.⁵³ Flamininus' actions did not support any specific political party, and he did not take away land from anti-Roman Greeks. Instead he demonstrated that Greek freedom was genuine by returning land to people who had fought against Rome. As with the Isthmian Declaration and

⁴⁷ R. K. Sherck, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1969), p. 211 n.33. S.I.G. II (1917) no.593.

⁴⁸ David Armstrong and Joseph Walsh, "SIG3 93: The Letter of Flamininus to Chyretiae," *Classical Philology* 81 (1986): 35, 43 against Sherck, *Roman Documents*, 213. Sherck thinks the Romans had confiscated the land at some point.

⁴⁹ Sherck, *Roman Documents*, p. 211 n.33. Trans. Walsh and Armstrong, "Letter of Flamininus," 33.

⁵⁰ Ln.4-6. Armstrong and Walsh, "Letter of Flamininus," 42. See below, pgs. 59-66 for Aetolian criticism of Rome after the Isthmian Declaration.

⁵¹ Armstrong and Walsh, "Letter of Flamininus," 36.

⁵² Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 293.

⁵³ Armstrong and Walsh, "Letter of Flamininus," 43.

the removal of Roman troops, this letter represents one more attempt by Flamininus to stress Rome's benevolence towards the Greeks before he returned westward.

Roman Assistance and Greek Gratitude

Roman propaganda of Greek freedom resulted from Greek attempts to solicit Roman aid. Numerous Greek envoys were sent to the Senate. The Republics actions frequently benefitted Greeks, and Greeks responded with praise and thanks. These expressions of gratitude took the form of poems, religious dedications, and honorific inscriptions, and they confirm that many Greeks viewed Rome's declaration of freedom as genuine.

Rome entered the Second Macedonian War after numerous Greek states sent envoys to Rome seeking aid. According to Polybius, after Ptolemy Philopator died and was succeeded by his very young son, Philip and Antiochus made an alliance to take control of Ptolemaic possessions. This created a threat to the Greek world that the various Greek city-states and Leagues could not fight on their own. In 201, Attalus of Pergamum and Rhodes sent to Rome for help in their war against Philip.⁵⁴ Egypt sent ambassadors to Rome looking for protection from Philip and Antiochus.⁵⁵ Athens sent three embassies to Romans. When Athens was besieged by Macedonian forces in 201, the Athenians sent a request for Roman aid, and a second in early 200.⁵⁶ Finally, in autumn of 200, Athenian envoys asking for Roman help met Publius Sulpicius Galba when he arrived across the Adriatic.⁵⁷ The Aetolian League may also have asked Rome for help against Philip, although the historicity

⁵⁴ Livy 31.2.1; Polyb. 16.24.3.

⁵⁵ Just. *Epit.* 30.2.6-3.7. See Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 205-6 for a defense of the authenticity of Justin/Trogus' account, which is doubted by Gruen, *The Hellenistic World*, 679.

⁵⁶ Livy 31.1.10, 31.5.6.

⁵⁷ Livy 31.14.3; cf. Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 209.

of this is less firmly established.⁵⁸ When the second war with Philip was winding to a close, already Greeks in Asia Minor began soliciting Roman aid against Antiochus. Smyrna, Lampascus, and Alexandria Troas appealed to Rome in 197.⁵⁹ These embassies at least suggest that these Greek states considered increased Roman presence in the East to be in their best interest.

The appeals for Roman aid from the Rhodians, Egyptians, and Athenians also reinforce the conclusion that mediating states in the First Macedonian War were not concerned with a threat from Rome. These three states were among the neutral Greeks seeking to end the First Macedonian War. Eckstein sees the appeals for help in 201 and 200 as a dramatic turn from earlier attempts by these Greeks to arrange a peace treaty in the First Macedonian War, which was contrary to Rome's purpose. It is true that such mediation attempts were contrary to Rome's goals, but the embassies in 201 and 200 do not represent as dramatic a turn in Greek attitudes as Eckstein suggests.⁶⁰ As Eckstein himself admits, besides the issue of the peace talks, Roman relations with Egypt and Athens had been friendly, although distant.⁶¹ In the First Macedonian War, Rome's refusal to take land could have demonstrated to the Greeks that the Republic was not a major threat to them. Instead, the Greeks could hope that the Romans would see the threat posed by Philip and Antiochus and provide assistance without subjugating Greece themselves.

Once Rome had become the dominant power in the East, attempts to solicit Roman aid were phrased by Greeks as surrender. Rome was viewed as the best alternative to the imperialist aggression of other eastern powers, like Antiochus, or the Achaean League. In

⁵⁸ Livy 31.29.4; Appian *Mac.* 4. cf. Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 212.

⁵⁹ Polyb. 21.13.3; App. *Syr.*2; Diod. 29.7; SIG 591, ln 69; Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 170.

⁶⁰ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 217-220.

⁶¹ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 203, 210.

192, when Achaean expansion threatened Messene, the Messenians offered to surrender themselves to Flamininus, in hopes of protection.⁶² When the Achaeans sided with Spartan exiles against Sparta, the Spartans surrendered to Fulvius Nobilior for the same reason.⁶³

An inscription of a letter of Lucius Cornelius Scipio dating to 190 records a similar incident with Heraclea-ad-Latmos.⁶⁴ When the Roman army arrived in Asia Minor under Scipio, the Heracleans surrendered to the Romans.⁶⁵ Scipio then sent a letter to the Heracleans, accepting the surrender and telling them “to you, just as to all the other cities which have placed themselves in our care, we grant freedom, with the right to administer all your own affairs yourselves, under your own laws.”⁶⁶ Greek states in Western Asia Minor which were taken by Antiochus were often subject to imperial garrisons, governors, and taxation.⁶⁷ When Greeks like the Heracleans were forced to choose between Rome and other threats, such as Antiochus, the possibility of freedom made Rome the more tolerable choice.

Besides asking for Roman assistance, Greeks also expressed gratitude towards Rome when the Republic’s actions worked to their advantage. The Greek poet Alcaeus of Messene, who published during the Second Macedonian War, is one example of a Greek who saw the Roman victory as resulting in Greek freedom. Alcaeus’ poems are preserved in the *Greek Anthology*: a collection of Greek poetry compiled by the Byzantine Greek Cephalas (912-59 AD) from the earlier collections of Meleager (c. 90 BC), Philippus (c. 40 AD), and Agathias

⁶² Livy 36. 31. 4-5, Flamininus eventually orders the Messenians to join the Achaean League anyways.

⁶³ Livy 36.32; Errington, *Philopoemen*, 137-8.

⁶⁴ Sherk, *Roman Documents*, p.217 n.35; S.I.G. II no. 618.

⁶⁵ Sherk, *Roman Documents*, 218.

⁶⁶ Translation from Naphtali Lewis and Reinhold Meyer, *Roman Civilization*, vol. 1, *The Republic* (New York: 1951) 313, no. 122c.

⁶⁷ John Ma, *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (New York: Oxford UP, 2000), 155. Heraclea was granted exemption from garrisons and many forms of taxation, although the imperial government at least had control of Heraclea’s harbor dues. Ma, *Antiochus III*, 119, 132-3 and Document 31.B.II.

(570 AD).⁶⁸ One of Alcaeus' twenty-two remaining epigrams praises Titus Quinctius Flamininus for liberating Greece:

Both Xerxes led a Persian host to the land of Hellas,
and Titus, too, led there a host from broad Italy,
But the one meant to set the yoke of slavery on the neck of Europe,
and the other to put an end to the servitude of Hellas.⁶⁹

Xerxes was the Persian king against whom 31 Greek states had fought in the Persian Wars in 480 and 479. By comparing Xerxes with Flamininus, Alcaeus depicted the Roman proconsul as a barbarian. However, he also contrasted Flamininus with that most important enemy in the Greek historical memory by saying that Xerxes tried to enslave Greece, while Flamininus tried to free it.

Hostility toward Philip in Alcaeus' other epigrams and Philip's aggression against Alcaeus' home Messene suggest that the poet's praise of Flamininus was probably genuine. Few Messenians would have supported Philip after his actions in 215, when the king encouraged a revolt which resulted in the deaths of over 200 Messenian officials.⁷⁰ The following year, Philip was unable to take the city, so he ravaged the Messenian countryside.⁷¹ When Roman forces came to Greece in 211, Messene was one of the Greek states that sided with them against Philip.

In another of Alcaeus' epigrams, the author calls Philip a murderer and wishes he could smash the king's skull:

I drink, Bacchus, I drink; yes, deeper than the Cyclops drunk when he had
filled his belly with the flesh of men; would that I could dash out the brains of

⁶⁸ Hightet, *OCD*, 56, s.v. "Anthology."

⁶⁹ *Anth. Pal.* 16.5. Trans. Paton.

⁷⁰ Plut. *Arat.* 50, cf. Polyb. 7.12; Walbank, *Philip V*, 72-79; Walbank "Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome (Continued)," *The Classical Quarterly* 37 (1943): 13; Edson, "Philip V and Alcaeus of Messene," *Classical Philology* 43.2 (1948): 116.

⁷¹ Polyb. 8.8.1, 8.12.1.

my foe and drain Philip's skull to the dregs, Philip who tastes of the blood of his friends as he carouses, pouring poison into the wine.⁷²

Alcaeus presents Philip as a monster who violates the rules of hospitality.⁷³ The mention in the final line of Philip poisoning his guests refers to a common accusation leveled against Philip. There are many incidences of this accusation which are known to be untrue.⁷⁴ The date of the poem is not certain. Walbank connects it chronologically with *Anth. Pal.* 11.12, because the two poems have similar themes. This other poem refers to the deaths of two Greeks, Callias and Epicrates, which Walbank says must have occurred after 198. The Achaean politician Aristaenus would have referred to their deaths in the speech he delivered in that year, yet there is no mention of them in Livy's account.⁷⁵ This is not a satisfactory justification for dating *Anth. Pal.* 9.519 to after 198. This poem need not come from the same year as *Anth. Pal.* 11.12, and Livy's version of Aristaenus' speech could have excluded references that seemed irrelevant to the Roman author, even if they were included in Polybius' version of the speech.

An exact date is not necessary to show that Alcaeus was no friend of Philip. In addition to the poem quoted above, a story related by Plutarch also shows the aggression of the Greek poet toward the Macedonian king. Alcaeus composed a poem mocking Philip for his defeat at Cynoscephalae, to which Philip responded with his own poem threatening to crucify the Messenian poet.⁷⁶ Whether *Anth. Pal.* 11.12 and 9.519 date before or after 198 does not diminish their value for demonstrating Alcaeus' antagonistic relationship with the Philip.

⁷² *Anth. Pal.* 9.519. Trans. W.R. Paton.

⁷³ Walbank, "Alcaeus," 5. Alcaeus again compares Philip to the Cyclops in *Anth. Pal.* 11.12

⁷⁴ Walbank, "Alcaeus," 4n.3. Examples of the accusation are at Polyb. 8.12.2-8, 18.7.6, 22.14.2-6; Livy 32.21.23; Paus. 2.9.4.

⁷⁵ Walbank, "Alcaeus," 6-7.

⁷⁶ Plut. *Flam.* 9.1-3.

It is uncertain if Alcaeus once supported Philip V, or if the Greek poet was alienated from the king in 215, or perhaps after 201, but by the time Philip was defeated at Cynoscephalae, Alcaeus was certainly Philip's enemy.⁷⁷ Whether Alcaeus was ever sympathetic toward Philip depends on whether the praise of the Macedonian king in another of his epigrams, *Anth. Pal.* 518, is genuine or sarcastic. In using Alcaeus' poetry to determine Greek attitudes toward Rome, it is worth noting that anti-Macedonian does not necessarily mean to be pro-Roman. However, the resentment toward Philip felt by Messenians and expressed in Alcaeus' poems supports the contention that Alcaeus viewed Flaminius' settlement of Greece, whereby Greece was freed, as a positive development.

Feelings of gratitude toward Rome were not limited to the immediate aftermath of the Isthmian Declaration in 196. A series of inscriptions contemporary with the Syrian War (192-188) demonstrate such feelings of gratitude among the Delphians. Delphi had been under the control of the Aetolian League since before 290, and the Aetolians had even begun to dominate the Amphictyonic Council, the federal league centered at Delphi which included representatives from throughout Greece.⁷⁸ The Delphians were liberated from Aetolian control in 190 by Manius Acilius Glabrio. They constructed an equestrian statue in Glabrio's honor, and on the base of the statue inscribed a dedication to the Roman and a letter of Glabrio's to the city of Delphi, among other documents.⁷⁹

In the letter dating to sometime in 190 Acilius responded to a complaint the Delphians sent to him that the Aetolians still controlled land near Delphi. The letter contained a list of properties which Acilius gave to the city and to Apollo.⁸⁰ Although the

⁷⁷ For 201, see Walbank, "Alcaeus." For 215, see Edson, "Philip V and Alcaeus."

⁷⁸ H.W. Parke, *A History of the Delphic Oracle* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1939), 260.

⁷⁹ Sherk, *Roman Documents*, p. 221 n.37 = S.I.G. II 609-610

⁸⁰ Ln B1, τα δεδομένα χωρία τῷ θεῷ. Sherk, *Roman Documents*, p. 224 n.37.

text is incomplete, Acilius seems to have acknowledged the autonomy of the city and the sanctuary.⁸¹ Taken together with the statue itself, the letter shows that the Delphians were honoring Glabrio for his liberation of the city and his restoration of property formerly held by the Aetolians.

The free status of Delphi was confirmed by the Senate shortly after Glabrio wrote this letter, as indicated by a letter of 189 from the Roman praetor Spurius Postumius to the Delphians which was inscribed on a large marble stele.⁸² Postumius told the Delphians “that it has been decreed by the Senate that both the sanctuary of Apollo, and the city be inviolate, that both the city and the territory of Delphi be exempt from taxation, and that its citizens be forever autonomous...enjoying freedom and governing themselves according to their own wishes.”⁸³

In another letter also preserved on the base of the statue of Acilius Glabrio, Gaius Livius Salinator, the Roman consul for 189, promised to grant further assistance to the Delphians.⁸⁴ Livius explains that the earlier envoys sent by the Delphians to Rome had been murdered and that the Romans would find and punish the killers. Rome would make the Aetolians return plunder they had taken from Delphi and ensure that the Aetolians would not loot the Delphians again. Livius also mentions that the Delphians had established games and offered sacrifices in honor of the Romans.⁸⁵ He ends the letter by promising that the Romans “shall endeavor always to be the author of some good to the Delphians, on account of both

⁸¹ Ln A9, [σωζομένης τῆς] τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτονομίας, with Sherk, *Roman Documents*, 224.

⁸² Sherk, *Roman Documents*, p. 21 n.1 with a translation from Lewis and Meyer, *Roman Civilization*, p.311 n. 122.

⁸³ Lewis and Meyer, *Roman Civilization*, p. 311 n. 122.

⁸⁴ Sherk, *Roman Documents*, p. 226 n. 38, with a translation from Lewis and Meyer, *Roman Civilization*, p.31 n. 122.

⁸⁵ Lewis and Meyer, *Roman Civilization*, p. 312 n.122; Sherk, *Roman Documents*, p. 226 n. 38 ln.6-7.

the god and yourselves, and because it is [their] ancestral practice to reverence the gods and to honor them as being the authors of all blessings.”⁸⁶

Throughout Greece, cities offered dedications and gave honors to the Romans. The Chalcidians dedicated offerings to Titus Quinctius Flamininus, and even established a priest of Titus, both of which lasted at least until the time of Plutarch.⁸⁷ The city was granted freedom by the Romans, even though it had shown allegiance to Philip.⁸⁸ At Gytheum, Flamininus was referred to as “savior.”⁸⁹

During the second century, *Rhomaia* festivals and cults of *Roma* were established in numerous Greek cities. The earliest known temple of the city of Rome was at Smyrna in 195, although this is attested by the later author Tacitus.⁹⁰ The Smyrnaeans were being attacked by Antiochus in 195⁹¹ and sought Roman support. Livy recorded an embassy from Alabanda in 170 in which the Alabandes “recalled that they had built a temple of the City of Rome and had instituted annual games for that goddess.”⁹² In 189, after a request from envoys from Alabanda, the consul Manius Vulso captured a fortress that had rebelled against the city and restored it to them. The temple of the city of Rome may date to that year.⁹³ Rome granted Magnesia freedom from the Attalids after Apamea and the city established games in honor of

⁸⁶ Lewis and Meyer, *Roman Civilization*, 312 no. 122; Sherck, *Roman Documents*, p. 221 n.38 ln. 22-25.

⁸⁷ Plut. *Flam.* 16. Plutarch records seeing inscriptions dedicated “by the people to Titus and Heracles” and “to Titus and Apollo.”

⁸⁸ Ronald Mellor, *Thea Rōmī the Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 21n.47.

⁸⁹ S.I.G. II no.592. Τίτον Τίτου Κοίγκτιον, στραταγὸν ὕπατον Ῥωμαίων, ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Γυθεατᾶν τὸν αὐτοῦ σωτήρα. cf. Livy 34.29.

⁹⁰ Mellor, *the Goddess Roma*, 14; Tac. *Ann.* 4.56.

⁹¹ Livy 33.38.3.

⁹² *Alabandeses templum Urbis Romae se fecisse commemoravere ludosque anniversarios ei divae instituisse*. Livy 43.6.5.

⁹³ Mellor, *the Goddess Roma*, 43.

Rome.⁹⁴ While the evidence for many of these honors comes from later sources, the priesthood of Flamininus at Chalcis and the games dedicated to Rome at Delphi support Mellor's contention that many Greek dedications to Rome date to the time of Antiochus' defeat.⁹⁵ Such dedications could have been used to encourage Roman support, discourage Roman hostility, or express gratitude for Rome's benevolence.

Greeks often sought out Roman intervention across the Adriatic. Numerous embassies came to Rome seeking aid. When Rome did choose to intervene, it presented itself as a liberator, as the policy of Titus Quinctius Flamininus demonstrates. During the First Macedonian War, Roman involvement was minimal. After Roman forces returned to Italy, Rome often took a relaxed approach to control in Greece. For a number of years after the Isthmian Declaration, Greeks praised Flamininus and the Romans for liberating them from subjugation by the Hellenistic kings. Feelings of gratitude can be seen in the writing of Alcaeus, the dedications to Rome and certain Romans, the series of inscriptions from Delphi dating to the final years of the war with Syria, and in Polybius' and Livy's account of the settlement after the Second Macedonian War. Although Rome would eventually be the unquestionable ruler of Greece, it is important to recognize that Roman assistance in the later 3rd and early 2nd centuries was gratefully accepted by many Greeks who faced aggression from other imperialist powers.

⁹⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 3. 62; Sherck, *Roman Documents*, p. 44 n.7; Mellor, *the Goddess Roma*, 52; *S.I.G. III* 1079 In.3 mentions the contest of the Romans (τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ῥωμαίων). The inscription dates to the late 2nd century B.C., but Mellor traces the founding of the *Rhomaia* to after 188.

⁹⁵ Mellor, *the Goddess Roma*, 43-45, 53.

CHAPTER THREE: THE ROMAN THREAT TO GREEK FREEDOM

While the power of Rome aided many Greeks in their military conflicts against other Hellenistic powers, to other Greeks it represented a limit on their autonomy and a threat to their freedom. Roman actions in Greece showed the Republic's strength and desire to enforce its will. Greeks often demonstrated their fear and resentment about Rome's growing influence in the East.

Although embassies from multiple Greek states sought Roman intervention against Philip in 201 and 200, Rome's demonstration of power in the Second Macedonian War was a cause for concern. For many Greeks, this fear was eliminated by the Isthmian Declaration. The Aetolian League, however, was not impressed by the Declaration of Freedom in 196, and became Rome's most outspoken opponent in Greece years before most other Greeks expressed similar resentment. While many other Greeks initially viewed the Isthmian Declaration as genuine, more Greeks gradually began to be skeptical of the freedom Rome claimed to have granted them. The policies of important Achaean League politicians reveal that it did not take long for the Greeks of the Peloponnese to see Rome as an oppressor instead of a liberator. When Perseus appeared to be a potential rival to Rome, many Greeks were hopeful that a balance of power could be achieved that would replace the previous preeminence of Rome.

Roman Imperialism

After the beginning of the First Macedonian War in 214, Roman actions across the Adriatic Sea often infringed on the freedom of the Greeks. Violence from Roman generals, Roman settlements after the various wars, and the Senate's expectation to be consulted by

Greeks about important, internal Greek affairs demonstrate the increasing degree of Roman power and control in Hellas.

Although Roman involvement in the First Macedonian War was limited, Roman violence was suffered by Greeks. For example, in 211, Laevinus captured the island Zakynthus, Oeniadae and Nassus. Oeniadae and Nassus were then given to the Aetolian League.¹ The Romans also plundered Oreum, captured Anticyra and sold off its inhabitants as slaves, and pillaged Dymae.²

The Greeks in the East would also have been aware of the brutality of the Roman destruction of Syracuse, a Greek city in Sicily that was a casualty of the Second Punic War, and the violence Roman forces had committed against other cities in Italy that had sided with Hannibal.³ Livy refers to the “many wicked examples of anger and many of avarice” that Romans committed during the siege of Syracuse.⁴ In Polybius’ description of the sack of New Carthage in Spain in 209, he says that it was the Roman custom when sacking a city “to kill all they encountered, sparing none.”⁵ Livy provides a similar description of large scale violence and plunder for the sack of Tarentum, another Greek city in Italy that sided with Hannibal, in the same year.⁶

The violence continued when Rome again crossed the Adriatic during the Second Macedonian War. In 200, Roman forces devastated Chalcis. The same year, Galba’s lieutenant tried to convince the people of Antipatreia to surrender. When they refused,

¹ Livy 27.25; Polyb. 9.39.2.

² Oreum: Livy 28.7.4; Anticyra: Polyb. 9.39.2; Dymae: Livy 32.22.10; Paus. 7.17.5.

³ Champion, *Cultural Politics*, 50-51.

⁴ *multa irae, multa avaritiae foeda exempla ederentur*. Livy 35.31.9 cf. 25.40.1.

⁵ Polyb. 10.15.4.

⁶ Livy 27.16.

Roman troops killed all the men of military age, and burned the city.⁷ Soon after, the town of Codrio surrendered, out of fear it would be treated in the same way. Violence against Greeks did not stop when Flaminius took command in 198. T. Flaminius' forces plundered Elatia, then sacked and burned Phaloria. Naval forces under his brother, Lucius, sacked Eretria.⁸ In 197, T. Flaminius took five thousand slaves.⁹

Sulpicius Galba (proconsul from 210 to 206 and consul in 200), Flaminius, and the Roman forces acquired a reputation for violence at this time.¹⁰ When Aegina was captured, Galba at first refused to allow the captives to send envoys to get ransom payments.¹¹ Appian says that in the Achaean League debate in 198, much of the opposition to Rome was due to "certain outrages against Greece committed by Sulpicius."¹² Pausanias says that the Achaeans criticized Flaminius for Roman treatment of Greek cities that were unwilling subjects of Philip.¹³ Sometimes slavery and violence were used to punish traitorous cities,¹⁴ and when such violence was used against cities who had not betrayed Rome, it would have been viewed as especially heinous. This may explain the Achaean censure of Flaminius, who acquired a reputation similar to Galba's.¹⁵

⁷ Chalcis: Livy, 31.23.1–24.3; Antipatreia: Livy 31.27.1–6; Champion, *Cultural Politics*, 52; Eckstein "T. Quinctius Flaminius and the Campaign against Philip in 198 B. C." *Phoenix* 30.2 (1976): 126; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 278.

⁸ Phaloria: Livy: 32.15.22-3, Elatia: Livy 32.24.6-7, Eretria: Livy, 32.16.15. Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 281; Champion, *Cultural Politics*, 52.

⁹ Livy 33.10.7, 33.11.2; Polyb. 18.27.6.

¹⁰ Dmitriev, *Greek Slogan of Freedom*, 146; Champion, *Cultural Politics*, 52; Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 379; Polyb. 11.5.6; App. *Mac.* 3.1.7.

¹¹ Polyb. 9.42.5-8, although Galba did eventually change his mind, telling his prisoners that "for the sake of the rest of the Greeks he would allow them to envoys to get ransom, as such was their custom."

¹² App. *Mac.* 3.7.1 trans. Horace White.

¹³ Paus. 7.8.1-2.

¹⁴ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 297.

¹⁵ Paus. 7.8.1; App. *Mac.* 7; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 281.

Romans were not unique in the use of excessive violence and profiting from warfare through slavery and plunder. In 220, the Cnossians captured the women and children of Lyttus and destroyed the town.¹⁶ In 202, Philip told the Thasians that if they surrendered he would not tax them or put a garrison in their town. Once they surrendered he enslaved them.¹⁷ A few years later, Philip had his soldiers sack and burn towns in Thessaly, his ally at the time, so that the Romans could not profit from them.¹⁸ Livy, citing Polybius as his source, says that by 194 there were twelve hundred Roman citizens in Achaëa alone who were enslaved during the Hannibalic War and sold to the Greeks.¹⁹ Regardless of how common these practices were, however, Roman actions still would have generated fear and hatred among the Greeks.

Besides committing acts of violence, Rome decided what the state of affairs would be in Greece. During the First Macedonian War, Rome gave land that it had taken to the Aetolian League. After the Second Macedonian War, it was Rome that decided what the settlement would be. Flamininus ignored the requests of Alexander the Aetolian and King Amnyander to remove Philip from power.²⁰ When Flamininus proclaimed Greek freedom, it was freedom given with Rome's permission. The first Greeks mentioned in the Isthmian Declaration were the Corinthians, Phocians, and Locrians, whom Rome had made subject to the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues as part of the settlement.²¹ Rome had promised Corinth

¹⁶ Polyb. 4.54.1-4; Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World*, 142.

¹⁷ Polyb. 15.24.1-4, cf. Livy 33.30.3.

¹⁸ Livy 32.13; Polyb. 18.3.9; Walbank, *Philip V*, 153-4; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 281-2.

¹⁹ Livy 34.50.2-7, Plut. *Flam.* 13.3-6 For examples of Greeks enslaving other Greeks, see Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World*, 133, 142, and the sources cited there.

²⁰ Polyb. 18.36-37 cf. Livy 33.11.5; Kenneth Sacks, "Polybius' Other View of Aetolia." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 95 (1975): 100.

²¹ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 449n62; Polyb. 18.46.5; Livy 33.32.5.

to the Achaean League in order to convince the Peloponnesian Greeks to join their side.²² Rome's willingness to subjugate weaker Greek states to stronger ones as a way to gain support was noted by the Greeks. In the opening stages of the war between Rome and the Aetolians, Demetrias joined the Aetolian League partially out of fear that Rome would return them to Philip's control.²³

Even Flaminius' attempts to demonstrate Rome's goodwill could cause Rome to appear as violent and controlling. In 196, the Boeotians asked Flaminius to allow those who had sided with Philip to return home. Flaminius allowed their return, hoping for Boeotian support.²⁴ The Boeotians then elected one of the pro-Macedonians, Brachylles, to public office and sent a message to Philip to thank him for the soldiers return. Zeuxippus and other Boeotians who favored Rome asked Flaminius for his assistance in murdering Brachylles. Flaminius said that he would not involve himself but also would not stop them from carrying out the assassination. When the attempt failed, it spurred anti-Roman sentiment in Boeotia, and Romans troops in the area where killed.²⁵

During the period after Antiochus' defeat, Rome expected Greeks to consult the Senate on controversies in the East. In 183, Messene attempted to secede from the Achaean League. Rome had initially said that it did not care about the problems of the Achaeans. After the Achaeans had successfully put down the rebellion, the Senate told the same Achaean ambassadors that Rome had ensured that supplies and grain would not be sent to Messene. Polybius says that "this made it patent to every one that so far from shirking and neglecting less important items of foreign affairs, they were on the contrary displeased if all matters

²² Livy 32.19.4.

²³ Livy 35.31, 35.34.5-12; Derow, "Arrival of Rome," 64.

²⁴ Polyb. 18.43; Livy 33.27-29.

²⁵ Livy 33.39.1-6, cf. Polyb. 20.7; Livy 36.6.

were not submitted to them and if all was not done in accordance with their decision.”²⁶

Unlike other forms of Hellenistic arbitration, Rome expected to have a say in Greek affairs, even if the Senate’s resolution was indecisive.²⁷ For example, Roman ambassadors told the Achaean League to consult Rome when Sparta attacked Las in 189²⁸ and when Messene began to revolt in 183.²⁹

In the aftermath of Perseus’ defeat in 168, Rome exercised greater control over the East than it ever had before. Strabo, citing Polybius, says that Lucius Aemilius Paullus destroyed seventy cities in Macedonia and sold off one hundred and fifty thousand prisoners as slaves.³⁰ Pro-Roman governments were encouraged throughout the East. Paullus approved the murder of five hundred and fifty Aetolians and the exile of others because they had favored Perseus.³¹ Over 1,000 Achaeans, including Polybius, were taken to Italy as hostages, and more were taken from Aetolia, Boeotia, Acarnania, and throughout Greece.³²

The Aetolian League

The Aetolian League, the confederacy of city-states in southern mainland Greece, was Rome’s most vocal opponent among the Greeks after the end of the Second Macedonian War and consistently challenged the image of Rome as the liberator of Greece. The Aetolians and Romans were allies in the First Macedonian War after signing a treaty in 212, but the Aetolian peace treaty with Philip in 206 marked the beginning of a rift that widened

²⁶ Polyb. 23.17.4, cf. 23.9.13.

²⁷ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 351.

²⁸ Livy 38.32.4.

²⁹ Polyb. 23.9.8, 24.9.13, although Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 494 is correct that the Achaeans felt free to ignore this request.

³⁰ Strabo 7.7.3; Polyb. 30.15 cf. Livy 45.34.6.

³¹ Livy 45.28, 45.31.

³² Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 516; Paus. 7.10.11; Polyb. 30.7.5, 32.5.6; Livy 45.31.9, 45.35.1.

in the aftermath of the Second Macedonian War. After the Battle of Cynoscephalae, Flamininus became irritated with the Aetolians for taking booty that he felt was owed to the Romans and for taking credit for Philip's defeat.³³ Polybius reports that the Aetolians also thought that the Roman proconsul was bribed by Philip when the king was granted an armistice.³⁴

In 195 the Aetolians sent ambassadors to the Senate to ask that they be given Pharsalus, Leucas, and other areas that they thought the first treaty with Rome guaranteed them.³⁵ Polybius, followed by Livy, traces the later war between the Romans and Antiochus and the Aetolians to this disagreement over Rome's settlement after Philip's defeat.³⁶ Sacks thinks that Polybius has overdramatized the conflict following the end of the Second Macedonian War.³⁷ According to Sacks, Polybius' depiction of the Aetolians changes after the second war against Philip, and during the negotiations with Philip and Flamininus the Greek league is portrayed as the victim of Rome's growing authority in the East. However, even if Polybius has exaggerated the role these confrontations played, it is unlikely that he has invented them completely. In Rome's first two wars in the east, the Aetolians and Rome were allies, but after Cynoscephalae all of the ancient sources indicate a hostile relationship.

The Roman slogan of Greek freedom was questioned most forcibly by the Aetolian League. Polybius says that the Aetolians were alone among the Greeks in viewing the

³³ Polyb. 18.27.3, 18.34.11; Plut. *Flam.* 9. Plutarch reports another version of Alcaeus' poem *Anth. Pal.* 7.247, which contains an additional two lines. Plutarch's version says that Philip's troops were "subdued by the sword of the Aetolians and of the Latins whom Titus led from spacious Italy." Plutarch says that this line upset Flamininus and that the Aetolians accused Flamininus of accepting bribes from Philip.

³⁴ Polyb. 18.34.5.

³⁵ Livy 33.39.8.

³⁶ Polyb. 3.7. cf. Livy 33.13.13-14; Polyb.18.39.

³⁷ Sacks, "Polybius' Other View," 105.

Isthmian Declaration with skepticism.³⁸ They accused the Romans of being the new masters of Greece, and criticized the Romans for keeping garrisons in Corinth, Demetrias and Chalcis.³⁹ When Polybius discusses the differences between historical causes and pretexts, he says that the Aetolians used as a pretext for war with Rome “the liberation of Greece, which they announced in defiance of reason and truth going round with Antiochus from city to city.”⁴⁰ In 192 the Aetolians approved a decree inviting Antiochus to arbitrate between themselves and the Romans, and to liberate Greece.⁴¹ This is not simply a request to make Antiochus a “patron and judge.”⁴² At least since the Isthmian Declaration, Rome had cultivated an image as the liberator of the Greeks. There was no way the Aetolians could invite Antiochus to liberate Greece without directly challenging Rome’s place in the East.⁴³

Grainger argues that the Aetolians may have designed the invitation to Antiochus to arbitrate so that they would gather support from anti-Roman Greeks.⁴⁴ The point of the arbitration was to alter the terms of peace struck after Cynoscephalae. The Aetolians could have expected that Rome would not agree to this, as doing so would alienate the rest of Greece. On the other hand, refusing to allow Antiochus to arbitrate would provoke the king. Either way, the Aetolians would make someone more hostile toward Rome.

In 193, the Aetolians sent ambassadors to Nabis of Sparta, Antiochus of Syria, and Philip in order to urge them to start a war with Rome.⁴⁵ There was no immediate action taken against Rome. Gruen thinks that the commonly accepted narrative, where the Aetolians

³⁸ Polyb. 18.45.1, cf. Livy 33.31.

³⁹ Polyb. 18.45; Livy 34.49; Plut. *Flam.* 10.1-2.

⁴⁰ Polyb. 3.7.3.

⁴¹ Livy 35.33.8, cf. Plb. 3.7.3; Plut. *Flam.* 15.1, *Cat. Mai.* 12.2.

⁴² Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 459.

⁴³ Briscoe, *Commentary Books XXXIV-XXXVII*, 33.

⁴⁴ J.D. Grainger, *the Roman War of Antiochus the Great* (Leiden: 2002), 177-8.

⁴⁵ Livy 35.12.

sought a war with Rome in order to free Greece, exaggerates the importance of Rome in the Aetolians' motivation.⁴⁶ Regarding the ambassadors sent to the kings in 193, Gruen argues that it would have been an odd occasion to speak of liberating Greece from Rome after Rome had removed all its garrisons the previous year.⁴⁷ Instead, Gruen thinks that the Aetolians were pursuing their own imperialist schemes, and were simply taking advantage of the opportunity that the lack of Roman forces provided.

This approach cannot be accepted. As Gruen himself points out, the Senate's main concern in the East at this time was possibility of a war with Antiochus.⁴⁸ Although Rome removed its troops from the East, the Aetolians could easily have suspected that urging Antiochus to war would provoke hostility from Rome. Gruen explains the envoys to Philip and Antiochus by saying that they would provide potential allies in case of Roman interference. This explanation still suggests that the Aetolians feared a reaction from Rome.

Furthermore, Gruen's suggestion that the Aetolian leader, Thoas, sought to expand Aetolian territory and to keep the Achaean League occupied by a conflict with Nabis is not supported by the text. Livy says that Thoas "complained about the injuries of the Romans and the state of Aetolia, because they were the most unrewarded of all the peoples and states of Greece after that victory, of which they themselves were the cause."⁴⁹ Gruen cites this as evidence that the Aetolians wanted to recover land they thought they had earned after Cynoscephalae and to expand Aetolian territory. Gruen refers to a comment from a speech of Aristaenus in 195 that the Achaeans were not protected from the Aetolians by the sea that separated them and that the Peloponnesians did not want the Aetolians to have a base at

⁴⁶ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 456.

⁴⁷ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 457.

⁴⁸ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 458.

⁴⁹ *Conquestus iniurias Romanorum statumque Aetoliae, quod omnium Graeciae gentium civitatemque inhonoratissimi post eam victoriam essent, cuius causa ipsi fuissent.* Livy 35.12.4.

Argos, in the Peloponnese.⁵⁰ Gruen infers that Aetolian expansion would provoke a response from the Achaeans unless they were occupied with Nabis.

It is true that the Aetolians were dissatisfied with the settlement after Philip's defeat, but it is not clear how these ambassadors sent to Antiochus, Philip, and Nabis would have helped the Aetolians recover those cities. Even assuming Aristaenus said what Livy reports, that the Achaeans did not want the Aetolians to have a base at Argos, unlike Argos the cities the Aetolians were seeking to recover were in Thessaly, quite a distance removed from Achaea.⁵¹ Livy also does not report any military activity taken by the Aetolians to expand their territory after these ambassadors were sent. Gruen's reconstruction of the embassies does not provide a valid explanation for why they were sent.

When Antiochus brought troops into Greece, the Aetolians elected him their commander. Even after this, Gruen maintains that the Aetolians were hoping to avoid a war with Rome. He says that Thoas, the Aetolian magistrate responsible for encouraging the assembly to elect Antiochus, also prevented Antiochus from sending Hannibal to start conflict in Africa, which would have certainly caused Roman resistance.⁵² However, Livy says that Thoas' reason for opposing this move was that it would weaken Antiochus' forces in Greece, which hardly indicates that the Aetolians were avoiding a war with Rome.⁵³ Hannibal remaining with Antiochus would have also appeared antagonistic toward Rome.

Gruen also argues that when the Aetolians elected Antiochus as their commander, it was merely a symbolic move, similar to when Aetolia had given this name to Attalus in 209. In the First Macedonian War, the Aetolians and Pergamum acted separately, and the Aetolian

⁵⁰ Livy 34.24.1-5.

⁵¹ Polyb. 18.38.3-4; Livy 33.13.6.

⁵² Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 461.

⁵³ Livy 35.43.7.

relationship with Antiochus should be seen in the same light. However, even if the Aetolians acted separately from Attalus in 209, both were at war with Philip. If this shows anything about the Aetolian position towards Rome, it shows that they were expecting war, not avoiding it.

Besides directly opposing Rome's liberation propaganda by substituting Antiochus as Greece's new savior, the Aetolians probably created a story about a Roman consultation of the Delphic Oracle which portrayed the Romans as conquerors. A story is preserved by the 2nd century AD paradoxographer, Phlegon of Tralles, who cites Antisthenes the Peripatetic, a contemporary of the Syrian war (192-188). According to the story, after the battle of Thermopylae in 19 one of Antiochus' deceased commanders rose from the dead to tell the Romans that Zeus would send an army to Italy if they did not stop plundering the dead Syrians. Alarmed by the occurrence, the Romans consulted the Delphic Oracle on how to proceed. The Oracle responded:⁵⁴

Restrain yourself now, Roman, and let justice abide with you,
Lest Pallas stir up a much greater Ares against you,
And make desolate your market-places, and you, fool, for all your effort,
Lose much wealth before reaching your land.

After consulting the Oracle, the Romans traveled to Naupactus to make sacrifices at a Panhellenic sanctuary. There an unspecified Publius made a number of prophetic utterances of his own, and then was eaten by a wolf. After he was eaten, Publius' head made one final prophecy, and the remaining soldiers built a temple to Apollo, and then traveled home.⁵⁵

The prophecy that is attributed to Delphi may not have come from the Delphic Oracle, but still shows contemporary Aetolian propaganda. Parke and Fontenrose both think that the oracle comes from the time of the Syrian War but deny that it came from the Delphic

⁵⁴ Phlegon *Mir.*3.6. Translation by William Hansen.

⁵⁵ Phlegon, *Mir.* 3.7-15.

Oracle. They claim that to accept the oracle as authentic would require one to accept the reason for the consultation: the decapitated Syrian threatening Rome.⁵⁶ However, it is possible that the prophecy did come from the Pythia and was inserted into this context by a later author. Whether the prophecy came from the Delphic Oracle or not, it is not necessary to doubt that the prophecy is contemporary with events it describes, or to reject Phlegon's citation of Antisthenes. As Parke points out, there is no reference to later eastern threats to Rome, such as Mithridates, and there would be no reason to fabricate the prophecy after Antiochus had already been defeated in 189.⁵⁷

Parke thinks that the prophecies reported by Antisthenes through Phlegon were invented by a pro-Aetolian Delphian between 190 and 189. However, whether the prophecy came from the Pythia or not, a story about the Oracle threatening Rome at this time would have seemed out of place in light of Rome's liberation of Delphi from the Aetolians in 190 and the subsequent pro-Roman sentiment at Delphi.⁵⁸ A more plausible time frame is between the defeat of Antiochus at Thermopylae, and the liberation of Delphi in 190. During this time, Delphi was still under Aetolian control, and the prophecies warning Rome to stop its injustices in Greece would have been given more credence.

As the Syrian War came to close, Aetolian hatred of Rome would only have been encouraged. After their defeat at the Battle of Heraclea in 190, the Aetolians decided to surrender themselves to the good faith of the Roman people, the Roman equivalent of

⁵⁶ Parke, *History of the Delphic Oracle*, 281; Joseph Fontenrose, *the Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, and a Catalogue of Responses* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978), 33, 261.

⁵⁷ Parke, *History of the Delphic Oracle*, 282.

⁵⁸ Parke, *History of the Delphic Oracle*, 282.

unconditional surrender.⁵⁹ After the Aetolian ambassadors were treated harshly by the consul Glabrio, however, many Aetolians refused to participate in a peace discussion, and the war continued.⁶⁰ When they were finally forced to accept Roman terms, the Aetolians lost their political autonomy. The treaty between the Romans and Aetolians was more restrictive than Roman treaties with any other Greek people up to that point. The treaty said that the Aetolians “shall preserve without fraud the empire and majesty of the Roman people...they shall have the same enemies as the Roman people, and on whomever the Romans make war the people of Aetolia shall make war likewise.”⁶¹ Although there are no extant references to Roman and Aetolian interaction in the following fifteen years,⁶² for the first time the Romans had taken away from a Greek state the right to control its own interstate relations.⁶³ Whether Rome issued orders to the League or not does not change the fact that the Aetolians after 188 had no choice but to obey Rome’s instructions.

Achaean League

The Achaean League was not as openly hostile towards Rome as the Aetolian League, but the Greek federation in the Peloponnese often opposed Rome’s presence in the East. Many times when the Achaeans did cooperate with Rome, it was through fear. The

⁵⁹ Polyb. 20.9. In 197, Flaminius told Phaeneas that he would not hand over to the Aetolians the cities that had willingly surrendered themselves to them Romans. Polyb. 18.38.4-9; Eckstein, “Glabrio and the Aetolians: A Note on *Deditio*,” *TAPA* 125 (1995): 281 n.29. When the Aetolians surrendered, they expected to be treated with mercy and compassion, probably because of the envoy Phaeneas’ experience with Flaminius. In 190, however, Glabrio ordered that the Aetolians not cross into Asia and that they surrender to the Romans a number of their allies. When the Aetolian Phaeneas responded that those demands were “neither just nor Greek,” the Roman consul Marcus Acilius Glabrio threatened to put the Aetolian envoys in chains.

⁶⁰ Polyb. 20.10.15.

⁶¹ Polyb. 21.32.2; Livy 38.11.

⁶² Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 348.

⁶³ Walbank, *Commentary* III: 131. Walbank also thinks that Polybius had access to an official Roman version of this treaty.

Achaean were not direct subjects of Rome, but had to find ways to live under Roman control.⁶⁴

Achaean politicians in the early 3rd century were generally divided into two camps regarding their views towards Rome. These two parties were headed by Aristaenus and Philopoemen, whose policies are compared by Polybius in Book 24. Aristaenus felt that Rome was too powerful for the Achaeans to do what was honorable, and all that remained was for the Achaeans to do what was in their own best interest. This meant ignoring previous laws and treaties when Rome so willed.⁶⁵ Philopoemen acknowledged Rome's superiority. However, he also thought that the Achaeans should try to abide by the rules of the treaties and alliances they had made, even when that meant opposing Rome.⁶⁶ Even so, Philopoemen acknowledged that even when the Achaeans protested and were legally in the right, they still would have to follow Rome's orders in some cases.⁶⁷ Polybius presents these two positions not in speeches by each politician, but rather as a theoretical discussion in the authorial voice of each politician.⁶⁸ According to Polybius, both of these politicians admitted that Roman power limited their decisions: the only question was how best to negotiate under Roman supremacy.⁶⁹

Aristaenus' view that Achaean stability could be maintained through subservience to Rome is demonstrated by his support of Rome in the Second Macedonian War. In his discussion of treachery, Polybius says that "if Aristaenus had not then in good time made the

⁶⁴ Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 331-334.

⁶⁵ Polyb. 24.11-12.

⁶⁶ Polyb. 24.13.

⁶⁷ Polyb. 24.11.8.

⁶⁸ Walbank, *Commentary III*: 265. cf. Paus. 8.51.4.

⁶⁹ Although Polybius 24.13.8 says that Philopoemen thought that Greece would eventually be completely subject to Rome's will, Gruen may be right when he says in *The Hellenistic World*, 332 that this reflects Polybius' hindsight and not Philopoemen's actual opinion before 167.

Achaean throw off their alliance with Philip and change it for that with Rome, the whole nation would evidently have suffered utter destruction.”⁷⁰ Aristaenus’ willingness to abandon the treaty with Philip is the only example available of him ignoring previous treaties in order to side with Rome. For this reason, Errington claims that Polybius has created a contrast between Aristaenus and Philopoemen which did not actually exist.⁷¹

While it is true that Aristaenus’ decision to abandon the Achaean treaty with Philip is the only example of this policy that remains, it is unfair to dismiss Polybius’ testimony entirely. Polybius defends Aristaenus against the charge of being a traitor and seems to have a favorable view towards him.⁷² Yet Aristaenus’ policy is very similar to that of Callicrates, for whom Polybius had no sympathy. Polybius depicts Callicrates as a Roman sycophant and attributes to him much of the blame for the fall of the Achaean League.⁷³ If Aristaenus did not adhere in some way to the policy Polybius attributes to him, the Greek historian would not ascribe to him the same policy as Callicrates.

There are other examples of Achaeans acceding to Rome’s wishes. In 184, when four different Spartan embassies came to Rome with complaints against the Achaeans, the Achaeans allowed the return of one of the groups of Spartan exiles on Roman orders, despite the fact that it violated one of their inscribed laws.⁷⁴ After Appius Claudius threatened the Achaeans in 184, they gave in to the Romans demands and repealed the death sentence of two Spartan leaders, Areus and Alexander.⁷⁵ Polybius also says that it was the policy of

⁷⁰ Polyb. 18.13.8 cf. Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 333.

⁷¹ R.M. Errington, *Philopoemen* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 224.

⁷² Polyb. 18.13.

⁷³ Polyb. 24.10.8-11.

⁷⁴ Polyb. 23.4; Livy 39.48.

⁷⁵ Livy 39.37.20.

Callicrates and Hyperbatus to accede to Roman wishes.⁷⁶ Whether Polybius has misrepresented Aristaenus' position or not, there were those in Achaëa who felt that following Rome's request was best.

It bears repeating that before 167 not all Achaeans thought that Roman orders needed to be obeyed, as Philopoemen and his followers show.⁷⁷ In the Second Macedonian War, the Roman war against Philip was advantageous to Philopoemen in distancing the Achaean League from dependence on the Macedonian king.⁷⁸ However, tension began to develop between Rome and the Achaeans, and especially between Philopoemen and Flamininus, between the Isthmian Declaration and the war with Syria. Flamininus became jealous of Philopoemen for receiving more of the credit for defeating Nabis of Sparta, and Philopoemen became disillusioned with the Roman declaration of freedom after Flamininus told the Achaeans to wait for Roman forces before they responded to aggression from the Spartan king.⁷⁹ Philopoemen continued with his plan to attack Sparta in spite of Flamininus.⁸⁰

Supporters of Perseus

When Philip's son Perseus took the throne in 179, he began to gather support in Greece by allowing debtors and fugitives to return to Macedonia and by relieving debts in his

⁷⁶ Polyb. 24.8.6.

⁷⁷ Derow, "Arrival of Rome," 65 moves Polybius' statement at 3.4, that after 167 there was no choice "but to give heed to the Romans and obey them in their orders," to 188. This is false, as Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 350 says.

⁷⁸ Errington, *Philopoemen*, 72, 82.

⁷⁹ Flamininus' jealousy: Livy 35.42.4; Plut. *Phil.* 15.1. See also Errington 99, 236 on Plutarch's use of Polybius' *Histories* and the no longer extant *Life of Philopoemen*. For Flamininus telling the Achaeans to wait, see Errington, *Philopoemen*, 95-99; Livy 35.25.

⁸⁰ Livy 35.25.11-12. Livy says that Philopoemen wanted to listen to Flamininus but the Achaeans did not have time to wait for the Roman fleet. As Gruen, *the Hellenistic World*, 464 says, this was just a pretext. Philopoemen rushed to prepare his attack and used a quadrireme that was over eighty years old as his flagship. For Philopoemen's eagerness to move against Nabis, see Plut. *Phil.* 14.4; Paus. 8.50.7; Errington, *Philopoemen*, 103 suggests that Philopoemen moved so quickly because he wanted to commence fighting before the Romans could interfere.

kingdom.⁸¹ In 172, after nearly two decades of Roman unipolarity in the East, the Third Macedonian War generated hopes among Greeks for a new balance of power. Polybius describes an upwelling of Greek support for Perseus after his initial victory at Callinicus in 171.⁸² Polybius attributes this not to any anti-Roman or pro-Macedonian leaning, but to people's innate tendency to favor underdogs. However, Polybius was writing for a Roman audience as well as Greek,⁸³ and his interpretation could have served as a defense of himself and other Greeks charged with anti-Romanism.

In Book 30, Polybius directly addresses the mentality of anti-Roman Greeks, which he divides into three groups. The first group consists of those who did not want to see either Rome or Perseus achieve absolute power. The second includes people who wanted to see Perseus win, but could not convince their community. The third comprises those who favored Perseus, and were successful in convincing their states to support the Macedonian king.⁸⁴ In a passage thought to derive from Polybius, Livy provides another analysis of Greek views of the war.⁸⁵ Livy says that the *plebs* in Greece favored Perseus. Among the *principes*, some sought political support from Rome, others were Macedonian sycophants, and still others hoped to get out of their own debts if there was a massive political change. Another group followed the masses in favoring Macedon, and still others preferred Rome to Perseus, but really wanted neither side to be more powerful.⁸⁶ These reconstructions of Greek views are theoretical and possibly over-schematic, but Polybius is speaking from personal experience on this matter, as he was well into his political career by this point.

⁸¹ Polyb. 25.3.

⁸² Polyb. 27.9.

⁸³ Champion, *Cultural Politics*, 173; Derow, "Arrival of Rome," 68.

⁸⁴ Polyb. 30.6.

⁸⁵ Erich Gruen, "Rome and Rhodes in the Second Century B.C.: A Historical Inquiry," *The Classical Quarterly* n.s., 25.1 (1975): 62-3.

⁸⁶ Livy 42.30.

Polybius' division of Greek political leaders into pro- and anti-Macedonian groups is exemplified by Rhodian politics in the 170s. After Antiochus' defeat, Rome had given Lycia to the Rhodians "as a gift."⁸⁷ However, in 178 after Lycians complained to Rome about Rhodian oppression, the Senate sent a letter to the Rhodians telling them "the Lycians had not been handed over to the Rhodians as a gift, but rather to be treated like friends and allies."⁸⁸ The Romans made no effort to enforce this change, but the reversal of Rome's decision could have encouraged resentment from the Rhodians.⁸⁹

Popular resentment of Rome at Rhodes was exacerbated when Gaius Lucretius, praetor in 171, sent a Greek slave as a messenger to Rhodes to ask for Rhodian naval support.⁹⁰ The Rhodians debated whether to send the ships or not. The two sides came to a compromise, and sent only six of the available forty vessels.⁹¹ Polybius claims that two Rhodians, Deinon and Polyaratus, were the leaders of the party that favored Perseus.⁹² They clashed with two other Rhodians, Philophon and Theaedetus, on whether to ransom Macedonian prisoners back to Perseus or not. Deinon and Polyaratus' opinion won the day, and the Macedonians were returned to Perseus.⁹³ Perseus recognized the division and sent a mission to Rhodes attempting to convince the Rhodians to join him.⁹⁴ The Macedonian king was not able to convince them to join him and the Rhodians encouraged him to seek peace.⁹⁵

⁸⁷ Polyb. 22.5.4.

⁸⁸ Polyb. 25.4.5.

⁸⁹ Berthold, *Rhodes*, 178. Berthold sees Rome's reversal of policy as related to Rhodes decision in the same year to provide ships to escort Perseus' new bride Laodice, Antiochus III granddaughter, to Macedonia.

⁹⁰ Polyb. 27.7.1; Berthold, *Rhodes*, 182. Berthold thinks that dividing the Rhodians into pro- and anti-Roman is misleading. He claims that all the Rhodians actually sympathized with Perseus, but some thought that Roman power was so great that it was imprudent to support the king.

⁹¹ Polyb. 27.7.14.

⁹² Berthold, *Rhodes*, 184; Polyb. 27.7.11, 14.2, 28.2.3, 17.14; Livy 44.23.10.

⁹³ Polyb. 27.14.1-2.

⁹⁴ Polyb. 29.3.9.

⁹⁵ Polyb. 29.11.1-6.

The point is not to show that Rhodes supported Perseus during the war. However, Polybius shows that there was a division among Rhodian politicians on what was in their best interest.

Gruen dismisses the idea that Rhodian politics before and during the Third Macedonian War were the result of conflicts between pro- and anti- Roman groups. Instead, he argues that the tradition in Livy and Polybius has been distorted by three sources: Roman annalists who sought to defend Rome's harsh punishment of Rhodes after 167 by depicting Rhodes as a staunch supporter of Perseus, Polybius' Rhodian sources who sought to place blame for Rhodian actions on the party of Deinon and Polyaratus and draw blame away from themselves, and Polybius himself, who wanted to create a distinction between anti-Roman politicians like Deinon and politicians like himself who were unfairly accused of anti-Romanism.⁹⁶

These problems do provide adequate reasons to completely reject the ancient sources' testimony on the internal political disputes at Rhodes. That the Roman tradition amplified Rhodes' hostility toward Rome seems indubitable: Livy reports an episode from 169 that is not attested elsewhere. Rhodian ambassadors threaten to take action against either Perseus or Rome if either side prevents peace.⁹⁷ However, Rhodian support of Perseus is not entirely an annalistic fabrication, since it appears throughout Polybius' narrative as well. Polybius' Rhodian sources may have placed too much of the blame for Rhodes actions' on their political opponents, but they could not have done this unless that party had expressed some support for Perseus. Finally, unless Polybius perceived an actual difference between his own policies and those of Deinon and Polyaratus, he would not have included comments so

⁹⁶ Gruen, "Rome and Rhodes," 58-62.

⁹⁷ Livy 44.14.8-12; Gruen, "Rome and Rhodes," 59. Polybius also reports a Rhodian embassy in 169, but in his account the Rhodians sought to ensure good relations with Rome, get permission to export grain, and to defend themselves against charges of anti-Romanism. Polyb. 28.2.1-5. For the Rhodians hospitable reception at Rome, see Polyb. 28.16.5-9.

disparaging and critical of those two politicians.⁹⁸ Polybius may have taken advantage of the biases in his Rhodian sources, but this is not grounds to dismiss his evidence on Rhodian attitudes.

The Republic had demonstrated its strength in a series of violent wars that resulted in a Roman rearrangement of Greece. After Apamea, the Senate expected to be consulted by Greeks about internal Greek affairs, although it rarely dedicated resources to enforcing its decisions. The Aetolian and Achaean League, the two most powerful Greek states, reacted to Roman power in different ways. When Rome denied the Aetolians the reward they thought they deserved, the Aetolians resented Rome's intrusions in the East and supported Antiochus as a new liberator of the Hellenes. For many Achaeans, Rome could be treated as an ally rather than a ruler. For others, Roman orders took precedence over Greek laws and treaties.

⁹⁸ E.g. Polybius says Deinon was "avaricious and unscrupulous." 27.7.11-12. Cf. 30.8-10; Gruen, "Rome and Rhodes", 60.

CONCLUSION

Forty seven years after Rome began its first war against Macedon, the political landscape of the Greek east had changed drastically. The Seleucid monarch had been forced to keep out of Europe and the kingdom of Macedonia was torn apart. The Aetolian League lost control of its foreign affairs. The Achaean League was drained of politicians. Rome was the agent of all these changes. But there were other effects of Roman involvement in this period. Thessaly was freed from Philip V. The Delphians were freed from Aetolian control. The imperialist agendas of Philip and Antiochus in Greece had been stopped. From 215 to 167, Greek views of Rome varied because of the varied effects Roman involvement had in the East.

During the First Macedonian War, Rome's goal was limited to keeping Philip occupied in the east and to prevent him from assisting Hannibal in Italy. Some Greeks resented the foreign power's violent intrusion in their spheres of influence. However, the view of some modern scholars that neutral Greeks intentionally tried to halt Rome's advance into Greece or sought peace in a conscious resistance to Rome is mistaken. Such a view relies too heavily on the language of speeches in Polybius and Livy, which are anachronistic reconstructions written from a period when Roman authority was indisputable. Polybius disapproves of inventing speeches when writing history, but he also thinks personal experience is important for a historian. As an exile in Rome who resented the Aetolian League, Polybius amplified Greek fear of Rome. Livy follows Polybius for many of his speeches and makes some changes to glorify Rome. Two of these speeches, those of Lyciscus in 211 and the Macedonian orator in 209, were not even delivered by neutral Greeks, and do not show how neutral Greeks reacted.

A few years after the Peace of Phoenice, many of the same Greeks who attempted to mediate the first Macedonian war came to Rome seeking military assistance against the combined might of Philip and Antiochus. Rome's commitment in the Second Macedonian War was significantly greater than in the previous war against Philip, and both the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues sided with Rome. Livy's recreations of the Achaean and Aetolian League debates before joining Rome reflect a genuine fear among Greeks of Rome's strength. When Greeks gathered at Corinth in 196 and heard Flamininus' famous declaration, Rome's promise of Greek freedom relieved much of those fears. But some viewed the Isthmian Declaration as a charade. In the eyes of Aetolians, the Romans had abandoned them against Philip in the First Macedonian War and denied them their rightful property after the Second. Rome claimed to be freeing the Greeks while in reality Roman troops held the "Fetters of Greece." Violence against Roman troops in Boeotia and Demetrias' defection to the Aetolian league demonstrate that such views were not limited to the Aetolians.

After Antiochus' defeat, Rome had proven its power to all in the Mediterranean. Unlike other Hellenistic powers, Rome still showed no interest in annexing territory in Greece and kept no garrisons in the east. The Senate often avoided making decisions on Greek affairs and was more interested in issues in the Western Mediterranean. Such hesitancy at Rome led many, like Philopoemen, to maintain that Greek politics could be carried on without submission to the Republic.

Not all shared Philopoemen's view. Other Achaeans thought it was necessary to give in to Rome even to the point of violating Achaean laws. The defeat of Antiochus and Philip meant that no state existed that was powerful enough to challenge Rome. Later, many Greeks hoped that Perseus would combat Rome's hegemony, as Rome had done with the Hellenistic

kings a few decades earlier. Internal politics at Rhodes illustrate the division of Greeks at this time.

The accounts of ancient historians are essential to any study of the Macedonian Wars, but these authors have imposed their own view of history on their narratives. When viewed separately from each author's interpretations and embellishments, the actions of various Hellenistic states illustrate the changing relations between Greeks and Romans.

Contemporary evidence reinforces some of what the ancient authors say. The poems of Alcaeus and inscriptions from Delphi show that some Greeks accepted Rome's claim to be liberating Greece. The prophecy preserved by Phlegon should be seen in the context of Aetolian opposition to Rome and control of Delphi. When placed in the background provided by the ancient historians, these other sources demonstrate the range and changes in Greek opinions on Roman intervention during the Macedonian Wars.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

<i>Anth. Pal.</i>	<i>Greek Anthology (Anthologia Palatina)</i>
<i>App. Mac.</i>	Appian, <i>Macedonian Affairs</i>
<i>App. Mithr.</i>	Appian, <i>Mithridatic Wars</i>
<i>App. Pun.</i>	Appian, <i>Punic Wars</i>
<i>App. Syr.</i>	Appian, <i>Syrian Wars</i>
Diod.	Diodorus of Sicily
Just. <i>Epit.</i>	Justinus, <i>Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus</i>
Livy	T. Livius
<i>OCD</i>	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>
Paus.	Pausanias
Phlegon, <i>Mir.</i>	Phlegon of Tralles, <i>Book of Marvels</i>
Plut. <i>Arat.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Life of Aratus</i>
Plut. <i>Cat. Mai.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Life of Cato Maior</i>
Plut. <i>Flam.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Life of Flaminius</i>
Plut. <i>Phil.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Life of Philopoemen</i>
Polyb.	Polybius
Sallust, <i>Cat.</i>	Sallust, <i>Bellum Catilinae</i>
<i>S.I.G.</i>	<i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , Fourth Edition
Tac. <i>Ann.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Annales</i>

Ancient Sources

- Austin, M. M, ed. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- Appian. *Roman History*. Vols.1-4. Translated by Horace White. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1912.
- Diodorus. *The Library of History*. Vol. 11. Francis R. Walton. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1957.
- Dittenberger, W., ed. *Sylloge Inscriptorum Graecarum*. Vols. 1-4. Leipzig, 1915-1924.
- Justin. *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Translated by J.C. Yardley. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Lewis, Naphtali and Reinhold Meyer. *Roman Civilization*. Vol. I, *The Republic*, New York, 1951.
- Livy. *From the Founding of the City*. Vols.7-13. Translated by Frank Gardner Moore, Evan T. Sage, and Alfred C. Schlesinger. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1922-1959.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Vols.1-5. Translated by W.H.S. Jones. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1918.
- Paton, W.R., trans. *The Greek Anthology*. Vols.1-5. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1916-1918.

- Phlegon. *Book of Marvels*. Translated by William Hansen. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1996.
- Plutarch. *Parallel Lives*. Vols.1-11. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1968.
- Polybius. *The Histories*. Translated by W.R. Paton. Vols.1-6. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2010.
- Sallust. *Catiline's War, the Jugurthine War, Histories*. Translated by A.J. Woodman. New York: Penguin Books, 2007.
- Sherk, R.K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969.
- Strabo. *Geography*. Vol.3. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1924.
- Tacitus. *The Annals*. Vol.3. Translated by John Jackson. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1931.

Modern Sources

- Armstrong, David, and Joseph Walsh. "SIG3 593: The Letter of Flamininus to Chyretiae." *Classical Philology* 81 (1986): 32-46.
- Berthold, Richard M. "The Rhodian Appeal to Rome in 201 B.C." *The Classical Journal* (1975): 97-107.
- . *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.
- Briscoe, John. "Rome and the Class Struggle in the Greek States 200-146 B.C." *PP* 36 (1967):3-20.
- . *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI-XXXIII*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.
- . *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXIV-XXXVII*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
- Champion, Craige. "The Nature of Authoritative Evidence in Polybius and Agelaus' Speech at Naupactus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127 (1997): 111-28.
- . *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories*. Berkeley: University of California, 2004
- Chanotis, Angelos. *War in the Hellenistic World: A Social and Cultural History*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.
- Derow, P.S. "The Arrival of Rome: From the Illyrian Wars to the Fall of Macedon." In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ed. A Erskine, 51-70. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell, 2003.
- Dmitriev, Sviatoslav. *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*. New York: Oxford UP, 2011.
- Eckstein, Arthur M. "T. Quinctius Flamininus and the Campaign against Philip in 198 B. C." *Phoenix* 30.2 (1976): 119-42.
- . "Polybius, Aristaenus, and the Fragment 'on Traitors'" *The Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987): 140-62.
- . "Rome, the War with Perseus, and Third Party Mediation." *Historia:Zeitschrift Fur Alte Geschichte* 37 (1988): 414-444.
- . "Glabrio and the Aetolians: A Note on *Deditio*." *TAPA* 125 (1995): 271-289.

- . "Greek Mediation in the First Macedonian War, 209-205 B.C." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 51 (2002): 268-97.
- . *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006.
- . *Rome Enters the Greek East: From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230-170 BC*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2008.
- Edson, Charles. "Philip V and Alcaeus of Messene." *Classical Philology* 43.2 (1948): 116-121.
- Errington, R. M. *Philopoemen*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1969.
- . "The Alleged Syro-Macedonian Pact and the Origins of the Second Macedonian War." *Athenaeum* 49 (1971): 336-54.
- Fontenrose, Joseph. *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1978.
- Frier, Bruce W. *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1979.
- Gowing, Alain M., *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Grainger, J.D. *The Roman War of Antiochus the Great*. Leiden. 2002.
- Gruen, Erich S. "Rome and Rhodes in the Second Century B.C.: A Historical Inquiry." *The Classical Quarterly* n.s., 25.1 (1975): 58-81.
- . *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley: University of California, 1984.
- Luce, T. James. *Livy: The Composition of His History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1977.
- Ma, John. *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Magie, David. "The 'Agreement' between Philip V and Antiochus III for the Partition of the Egyptian Empire." *Journal of Roman Studies* 29 (1939): 32-44.
- McGing, B. C. *Polybius' Histories*. New York: Oxford UP, 2010.
- Mellor, Ronald. *Thea Rōmī the Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Mendels, D. 1984/1986. "Did Polybius Have 'Another' View of the Aetolian League?" *Ancient Society* 15/17: 63-73.
- Morkholm, Otto. "The Speech of Agelaus at Naupactus 217 B.C." *Classica Et Mediaevalia* 28 (1967): 240-53.
- Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford, 1949.
- Parke, H. W. *A History of the Delphic Oracle*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1939.
- Rich, J.W. "Roman Aims in the First Macedonian War." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* (1984): 126-80.
- Sacks, Kenneth S. "Polybius' Other View of Aetolia." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 95 (1975): 92-106.
- Walbank, F.W. *Philip V of Macedon*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1940.
- . "Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome (Continued)," *The Classical Quarterly* 37 (1943): 1-13.
- . *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Vols. 1-3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957-1979.
- Walsh, P. G. *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Wooten, Cecil. "The Speeches in Polybius: An Insight into the Nature of Hellenistic Oratory." *The American Journal of Philology* 95.3 (1974): 235-51.