

believe that they would not have adapted the Marcellia to honor him as well as his father.<sup>10</sup> Given this probable precedent for the inclusion of C. Marcellus in the traditional games, there is little reason not to accept the accounts of Cicero and Plutarch. Thus, while accepting Gruen's emphasis on the initiative of the Syracusans in this matter, I would argue that the custom of *clientela* influenced them enough to emphasize the hereditary aspects of the honors. In this way, the Marcellia constitute a significant step towards ruler cult as it existed in the imperial period, when Hellenistic civic honors were regularly combined with emphasis on the imperial family.<sup>11</sup>

JAMES B. RIVES  
Columbia University

10. Praetor: Livy 32.27.3; cf. Münzer, "Claudii Marcelli," coll. 2755–57. A fourth Marcellus in Sicily is indicated by a bronze coin of the late Republic; he probably served as quaestor, but little more can be said: T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. 2 (New York, 1952), p. 478.

11. See, e.g., Price, *Rituals and Power*, pp. 159–62. I would like to thank M. Petrini and CP's anonymous referee for their helpful suggestions.

#### BONES OF CONTENTION: PHARSALUS, PHTHIOTIC THEBES, LARISA CREMASTE, ECHINUS

After defeating Philip V of Macedon in the Second Macedonian War, the Roman consul Flamininus and the Aetolian League quarreled fatefully. The Aetolians' disgruntlement led them to invite Antiochus the Great to "liberate" Greece. The ensuing defeat of this Syrian and Aetolian coalition at Roman hands assured complete Roman hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean. The immediate cause of the conflict was Flamininus' refusal to hand over Larisa Cremaste, Echinus, and Pharsalus to the Aetolians, cities that the Aetolians had demanded along with Phthiotic Thebes. It is odd that in a matter of such importance and with such tragic consequences for Greece's liberty, no one has explained why the Aetolians were asking for these four cities and no other Thessalian cities and, more significantly I think, why Flamininus returned only Phthiotic Thebes to the Aetolians, but not the other three cities. My analysis will suggest that the sad plight of refugees and exiles complicated and even in part determined the policies of Rome and the Aetolian League. Let us start by reviewing the sequence of events leading up to this dissension.

#### I

In November 198, eight months before his great defeat at Cynoscephalae, Philip V met with T. Quinctius Flamininus and his Greek allies near Nicaea to discuss terms of peace. On the first day of the conference Flamininus and the Greeks presented

I am indebted to the Editor, CP's anonymous reader, M. Gwynn Morgan, David Armstrong, and Gayla McGlamery for their helpful comments and suggestions. This paper was largely researched when I was Oscar Broneer Fellow at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and I would like to express my gratitude to the School for its support and hospitality.

their demands to Philip. We are here concerned with one demand in particular. Phaeneas, *strategos* of the Aetolian League, ordered Philip to withdraw from Greece and to return unharmed the cities that had "formerly been members of the Aetolian League."<sup>1</sup> After Phaeneas' speech Alexander the Isian, an Aetolian statesman, aimed some blunt invective at Philip, and inquired, "with what excuse was he still holding Echinus and Phthiotic Thebes and Pharsalus and Larisa?"<sup>2</sup> After more negotiations and bandying of words, Philip requested and was granted a recess to study the allies' demands.<sup>3</sup> The next day Philip declared himself willing to concede, among other things, Pharsalus and Larisa Cremaste to the Aetolians, but not Phthiotic Thebes.<sup>4</sup> Echinus was not mentioned. The conference did not lead to peace, and subsequently the Romans and Aetolians decisively defeated Philip at Cynoscephalae in the early summer of 197. After the battle the Roman-Aetolian partnership began to sour when the Romans discovered that the Aetolians had cleaned out Philip's camp before they themselves had gotten a chance to acquire any booty.<sup>5</sup> The Aetolians further provoked Flamininus by usurping (in Flamininus' view) the credit for the victory over Philip.<sup>6</sup> At the same time the Aetolians regarded with suspicion Flamininus' perceived leniency toward Philip and his tendency to handle things by himself after the battle.<sup>7</sup>

In this somewhat tense atmosphere the allies met with Philip at Tempe to dictate to him the terms of his surrender. Philip was prepared to concede virtually anything.<sup>8</sup> When the Aetolian representative Phaeneas asked, "Why don't you then, Philip, give us back Larisa Cremaste, Pharsalus, Phthiotic Thebes, and Echinus?" Philip told him to take them.<sup>9</sup>

But Titus [Flamininus] said that [the Aetolians] should receive none of the other towns, but only Phthiotic Thebes. For when he [Flamininus] approached Thebes with his army and exhorted them to surrender *in fidem*,<sup>10</sup> they refused. Consequently he claimed that he had the right to decide about them as he wished, since they were subject to him in warfare. But Phaeneas grew angry and said that, in the first place, they ought now to recover [all] the towns that formerly belonged to their League since they too had fought, and that secondly [they should recover these towns] in accordance with their original alliance, by which the possessions of those captured in warfare belong to the Romans, but the cities themselves to the Aetolians. Flamininus replied that they were wrong on

1. Polyb. 18.2.6, Livy 32.33.8.

2. Speech: Polyb. 18.3; quotation: 18.3.12 (see note 51, below); cf. Livy 32.33.9–16.

3. Polyb. 18.7.3–7, Livy 32.35.1.

4. Polyb. 18.8.9, Livy 32.35.11.

5. Polyb. 18.27.3–4, 18.34.1, Livy 33.10.6, Plut. *Flam.* 8.5. For an account of the subsequent decline in Roman-Aetolian relations and its effects, P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris, 1964), pp. 166–69; cf. A. M. Eckstein, *Senate and General: Individual Decision Making and Roman Foreign Relations, 264–194 B.C.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987), pp. 285–93.

6. Plut. *Flam.* 9, Polyb. 18.34.2, Livy 33.11.8.

7. Polyb. 18.34.3–8, Livy 33.11.3–9, Plut. *Flam.* 9.4. See, too, Polybius' account of the meeting of the allies before the conference at Tempe with Philip (18.36–37; cf. Livy 33.12). The author intends to discuss these events and their causes in another paper.

8. Polyb. 18.38.1–3, Livy 33.13.

9. Polyb. 18.38.3–4, cf. Livy 33.13.6–7.

10. I agree with scholars who read εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων πίστιν, as Flamininus' or Polybius' attempt to render the Roman concept into Greek; cf. 20.9–10; F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 79–81, for discussion and bibliography. On the complex πίστις/fides nexus, see especially W. Dahlheim, *Struktur und Entwicklung des römischen Völkerrechts im dritten und zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Munich, 1968), pp. 5–67, esp. pp. 66–67; E. Gruen, "Greek Πίστις and Roman Fides," *Athenaeum* 60 (1982): 50–68; J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme* (Rome, 1988), pp. 72–81.

both points; that the alliance had been dissolved when the Aetolians abandoned the Romans and made peace with Philip; that even if the alliance were still in effect they should not recover and possess cities that had voluntarily surrendered *in fidem* of the Romans, which is what all the Thessalian cities had now done, except only those taken by force. [Polyb. 18.38.4–9]<sup>11</sup>

Flamininus got his way, and the Aetolians eventually received only Phthiotic Thebes. Submitting with bad grace, they brought the matter up again in 195 when Flamininus called a conference of Greek allies at Corinth to discuss waging war with Nabis of Sparta. An Aetolian representative, Alexander, took the opportunity to complain that “although it had been agreed in the treaty that the cities and fields should belong to them when Philip was defeated, they were defrauded of Echinus and Pharsalus.”<sup>12</sup> Neither Phthiotic Thebes nor Larisa Cremaste appears here in Livy’s account.

## II

At Tempe Flamininus claimed that the Aetolians could receive Phthiotic Thebes since Thebes had resisted the Romans but he denied the Aetolians Larisa Cremaste, Pharsalus, and Echinus since those cities had not resisted. However, this explanation was merely his justification, not his reason.<sup>13</sup> In fact, once he had maintained the invalidity of the treaty with the Aetolians, he was entitled to do whatever he wished with all four cities in question.<sup>14</sup> Distinguishing captured from surrendered cities was specious, since he was not obliged to observe a stipulation from a lapsed treaty anyway. Philip was to surrender all the cities peacefully. The four cities in question were evidently still in Philip’s hands,<sup>15</sup> for there would have been nothing to discuss with him had he already surrendered these cities or had they been captured. All four, then, belonged in the “surrendered,” not the “captured,” category. More telling yet is the fact that if Thebes was to be set apart for having *in the past* offered resistance to the Romans (Livy 33.5.1–3), the same was equally true of Larisa Cremaste (Livy 31.46.12–13).<sup>16</sup> Clearly the defunct treaty and its clauses were produced to justify a

11. Cf. Livy 33.13.7–13, who, however, has misunderstood Polybius (P. G. Walsh, “The Negligent Historian: ‘Howlers’ in Livy,” *G&R* 5 [1958]: 86).

12. “pactos in foedere suas urbas agrosque fore devicto Philipo, fraudari Echino et Pharsalo,” 34.23.7–8. Presumably Alexander the Isian is speaking again.

13. Whether the treaty was or was not still in effect and, if so, whether Flamininus’ or the Aetolians’ depictions of its contents are correct (the bibliography on this issue is immense: see H. H. Schmitt, *Die Staatsverträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.*, vol. 3 [Munich, 1969], pp. 265–66 (treaty no. 536); J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI–XXXIII* [Oxford, 1973], p. 273), may be of intrinsic interest but has little to do with why Flamininus decided to refuse the Aetolians Pharsalus, Larisa Cremaste, and Echinus.

14. Cf. A. Aymard, *Les premiers rapports de Rome de la Confédération Achaienne* (Paris, 1938), p. 171, n. 21.

15. Misunderstood by, among others, F. W. Walbank, review of G. A. Lehmann, *Untersuchungen zur historischen Glaubwürdigkeit des Polybius* (Münster, 1967), in *JRS* 58 (1968): 254; E. Badian, *Titus Quinctius Flamininus: Philhellenism and Realpolitik* (Cincinnati, 1970), p. 49; Briscoe, *XXXI–XXXIII*, pp. 272–73; Dahlheim, *Struktur*, p. 90.

16. The inconsistency also undercuts the value of seeing Flamininus’ behavior as based on Roman *editio in fidem* policy, as A. Heuss does (*Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik in republikanischer Zeit*, *Klio*, Beiheft 31 [1933], p. 83). Another example of this inconsistency: Opus surrendered to Flamininus (Livy 32.32.1–5) but was apparently handed over to the Aetolians anyway (*GDI*, no. 1986; see Walbank, “review of Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*,” p. 254; *contra*: Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 107–10).

distinction motivated by other considerations.<sup>17</sup> An examination of the earlier history of these cities will, I think, elucidate these considerations.

In 302 Demetrius Poliorcetes took Larisa Cremaste<sup>18</sup> from Cassander and granted the city αὐτονομία (Diod. Sic. 20.110.2), though we may assume alignment with Macedonia. The city appears to have had some sort of membership in a Phthiotic Achaean association or league, for its coinage shows the monogram  $\Sigma$ .<sup>19</sup> Larisa Cremaste seems to have maintained its affiliation with this league until at least 232.<sup>20</sup> Much of the history of Phthiotic Thebes<sup>21</sup> in the third century is similar to that of Larisa Cremaste. Like Larisa, in 302 it probably received autonomy within the Macedonian sphere of influence, and in the third century it issued coins with the  $\Sigma$  of the Phthiotic Achaean League.<sup>22</sup> Echinus<sup>23</sup> was an Achaean city subject to Boeotian Thebes when Philip II of Macedon took it (Dem. 9.120) and (probably) gave it to Malis.<sup>24</sup> We have little information on the subsequent history of the town itself until its capture by Philip V in 210 (Polyb. 9.41.1–42.4), and in all likelihood it shared the history of the Malians up to that point. Possibly in the middle of the third century the Malians became part of the Aetolian League.<sup>25</sup> Pharsalus, like the rest of Thessaly proper, had been subject to the Macedonian kings throughout the third century.<sup>26</sup>

Some time before 198, when the Aetolians demanded the return of the four cities, the Aetolians must have incorporated them into their League and then lost them to Macedonia. The death of Demetrius II in 229 is the most likely opportunity for this daring Aetolian thrust into Macedonia's principal dependency.<sup>27</sup> Plutarch

17. See J. Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland, 217–86 v. Chr.* (Berlin, 1971), p. 62; cf. Eckstein's sensible discussion, *Senate and General*, pp. 291–93.

18. On the site and sources, F. Stählin, *Das hellenische Thessalien* (Stuttgart, 1924), pp. 182–84; idem, "Larisa," no. 2, *RE* 12.1 (1924): 840–45.

19. I.e., Ἀχαιῶν. On the reverse, "ΛΑΠΙ Thetis l., seated on hippocamp; holds in l. hand, shield inscribed  $\Sigma$ ," P. Gardner, *A Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum VI: Thessaly to Aetolia* (London, 1883), p. 33, general discussion xxvii–xxx; cf. R. Weil, "Bemerkungen zu den griechischen Bundesmünzen," *Ztschr. für Num.* 1 (1874): 175.

20. A proxy inscription of Histiaea for ca. 232 (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 492 I.36) mentions: –61.–, Ἀγμέμαχος Ἀχαιῶν ἐν Λαρίσσι.

21. On the site and sources for Phthiotic Thebes, see Stählin, *Thessalien*, pp. 171–73; idem, "Thebai," no. 3, *RE* 5 (1934): 1582–83.

22. I.e., Ἀχαιῶν. On the reverse Protesilaus is depicted leaping ashore with the monogram  $\Sigma$  between his legs, Gardner, *CBM*, p. 50.

23. On the site and sources, A. Philippson, "Echinus," no. 2, *RE* 5.2 (1905): 1921; Stählin, *Thessalien*, pp. 185–87; Y. Béquignon, *La Vallée du Spercheios*, (Paris, 1937), pp. 299–303; L. W. Daly, "Echinus and Justinian's Fortifications in Greece," *AJA* 46 (1942): 500–508.

24. Ps.-Scylax 63, Ps.-Scymn. II. 602–4.

25. R. Flacelière, *Les Aitolians à Delphes: contribution à l'histoire de la Grèce centrale au III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.* (Paris, 1937), p. 247, hesitatingly suggests ca. 249–48 as a *post quem* (by dating the archonship of Euclides, under whom a Πρωτολόχος Μαλιεύς ἐξ Ἐχίνου is mentioned in a proxy list [no. 49, appendix II] to 249–48, pp. 462–63) and ca. 235 as an *ante quem* (by accounting for one of the two new Aetolian amphictyonic votes [reflected in the increase from 9 in *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 461 to 11 in *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 506] as arising from their acquisition of Malis).

26. Comprehensive treatment of the site and history of Pharsalus with bibliography: Y. Béquignon, "Pharsalos," *RE* suppl. 12 (1970): 1038–84.

27. So K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*<sup>2</sup>, vol. 4.2 (Berlin–Leipzig, 1927), pp. 412–14; cf. F. Stählin, "Die Phthiotis und der Friede zwischen Philippos V. und den Aetolern," *Philologus* 77 (1921): 199; J. V. A. Fine, "The Problem of Macedonian Holdings in Epirus and Thessaly in 221 B.C.," *TAPA* 63 (1932): 133–34; Flacelière, *Aitoliens*, pp. 253–54; P. Treves, "Studi su Antigono Dosone," *Athenaeum* 12 (1934): 407; F. W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* (Cambridge, 1940), p. 11; Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 75–76; Ed. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*<sup>2</sup>, vol. 2 (Nancy, 1979), pp. 361–63.

indicates that at this time the power of the Achaean League grew “since the Macedonians were occupied with wars with neighbors and peoples sharing their borders” (*Arat.* 34.5). Justin’s narration of Antigonos Doson’s attempt to quell a Macedonian uprising provides the identities of Macedonia’s opponents: “he punished the revolt of their allies . . . he checked the Dardanians and Thessalians who were running rampant due to King Demetrius’ death” (18.3.13). Moreover Pompeius Trogus asserts that Doson subjugated Thessaly (Book 28, prologue). The unsuccessful outcome of the Thessalian revolt was probably the fruit of the Aetolian defeat at Doson’s hands recorded in Frontinus (*Str.* 2.6.5). J. V. A. Fine has argued persuasively that Doson very quickly reconquered and restored to Macedonian rule the tetradic parts of Thessaly, that is, Thessaly proper, including Gomphi and Limnaea ca. 228.<sup>28</sup>

Still, despite Antigonos Doson’s efforts in Thessaly, the Aetolians had been able to retain many of their acquisitions in Achaea Phthiotis (and perhaps Pharsalus) into Philip’s reign. Cyphaera,<sup>29</sup> Xyniae,<sup>30</sup> Meliteia,<sup>31</sup> Pereia<sup>32</sup> (probably with Phyladon and Carandae),<sup>33</sup> Thaumaci,<sup>34</sup> Larisa Cremaste, and Phthiotic Thebes (probably with Phylake and Pyrasos),<sup>35</sup> all remained Aetolian. In fact, the League

28. For the impossibility of a recovery of lost parts of Thessaly in the Social War, Fine, “Macedonian Holdings,” adduces as evidence: 1) Philip’s marching through Hestiaeotis unopposed in 219 (p. 137); 2) Polybius’ evaluation (7.11.4) of Philip’s position on becoming king (pp. 137–38); 3) Polyb. 4.9.4, on events in 220 (pp. 138–39); 4) Polyb. 4.76.2, on events in the winter of 219–18 (p. 139). Against the First Macedonian War: 1) in 211 Lyciscus, Acarnanian envoy to Sparta, names the Thessalians as allies of Macedonia, Polyb. 9.38.5 (p. 135); 2) *argumenta ex silentio* (pp. 135–37). In agreement with Fine, among others, Treves, “Antigono Dosone,” p. 407; S. Dow and C. Edson, “Chryseis,” *HSCP* 48 (1937): 166–68; Walbank, *Commentary*, 3:555; Will, *Histoire*, pp. 361–63.

29. Cyphaera was possibly held until 210 (F. Stählin, “Κύπαρα,” *RE* 12.1 [1924]: 46–47; Briscoe, *XXXI–XXXIII*, p. 191; Fine, “Macedonian Holdings,” p. 145, n. 102; but see Flacelière, *Aitoliens*, p. 316, n. 3). On the site and sources for Cyphaera see Stählin, “Κύπαρα,” coll. 46–47; idem, *Thessalien*, pp. 159–60; Béquignon, *Spercheios*, pp. 336–37.

30. Xyniae must have still been Aetolian in 214/3 when Aetolian mediators decided a border dispute between it and Meliteia (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 546A; see Klaffenbach, *JG* 9<sup>2</sup> 1.1, no. 177, note to 1.1). Thus 210 offers the most likely date for Xyniae’s capture by Philip (P. Niese, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeroneia*, vol. 2: *Vom Jahre 281 v. Chr. bis zur Begründung der römischen Hegemonie im griechischen Osten 188 v. Chr.* [Gotha, 1899], p. 484, n. 1; Stählin, “Phthiotis,” p. 205; Fine, “Macedonian Holdings,” p. 143, n. 93). On the site and sources for Xyniae see Stählin, *Thessalien*, pp. 160–61; G. Daux and P. de la Coste-Messelière, “De Malide en Thessalie,” *BCH* 48 (1924): 348–53; E. Meyer, “Xyniae,” *RE* 9 [1967]: 2174–77.

31. F. Stählin, “Μελίταια,” *RE* 15.1 (1931): 537–38; Flacelière, *Aitoliens*, pp. 199–200, 293. *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 546A provides the evidence for Aetolian influence. On the site and sources for Meliteia see Stählin, *Thessalien*, pp. 162–65; idem, “Μελίταια,” coll. 534–40; Daux and Coste-Messelière, “Malide,” pp. 351–52, 359–60.

32. Pereia may have become Aetolian at an early date with Meliteia, which represented it in a dispute against Peuma ca. 270 (*JG* 9 2 add. ult. ad 205, no. II, p. 11; cf. H. Pomtow, “Die delphischen Schiedsrichter-Texte und die Epidamirgen,” *Klio* 18 [1923]: 260–61). It was certainly Aetolian ca. 213 when it was contemplating dissolving its *συνπολιτεία* with Aetolian Meliteia (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 546B ll. 14–31; for the date, H. Pomtow, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 546A, n. 1; idem, “Delphische Neufunde V,” *Klio* 17 [1921]: 197) and there is no evidence that it fell under Macedonian sway again. On Pereia in general see Stählin, *Thessalien*, pp. 166–68; with a different identification, E. Kirsten, “Pereia,” *RE* supp. 7 (1940): 885–92.

33. On these two towns as subject to Pereia see E. Kirsten, “Phyladon,” *RE* 20.1 (1941): 1016–17.

34. In 199 Philip unsuccessfully besieged Thaumaci (Livy 32.4). It was still Aetolian in 198 when its Aetolian garrison slaughtered refugees from Macedonian towns (Livy 32.13). See Flacelière, *Aitoliens* (passim; see index under “Thaumacoï”); in general, see Stählin, *Thessalien*, pp. 155–57; idem, “Θαυμακοί,” *RE* 2.5 (1934): 1331–37; A. Philippson and E. Kirsten, *Die griechischen Landschaften*, vol. 1.1: *Thessalien und die Spercheios-Senke* (Frankfurt, 1950), pp. 197–98.

35. For Pyrasos, see Stählin, *Thessalien*, p. 173; K. Ziegler, “Pyrasos,” no. 3, *RE* 24.1 (1963): 11–12. For Phylake, Stählin, *Thessalien*, pp. 173–74; E. Kirsten, “Phylake,” no. 4, *RE* 20.1 (1941): 983–87.

controlled the better part of western Achaea Phthiotis, stretching to Pharsalus in the north, Phthiotic Thebes in the northeast and Larisa Cremaste in the southeast.

But Philip took some of these cities back: Phthiotic Thebes in 217,<sup>36</sup> Echinus (which was in fact Malian and Phthiotic Achaeon) in 210 (Polyb. 9.41.1–42.4), Larisa Cremaste,<sup>37</sup> Cyphaera and Xyniae probably in 210 (before 198), and Pharsalus, perhaps, in the early years of the Social War.<sup>38</sup> Of these cities, the Aetolians recaptured Xyniae and Cyphaera after the battle at the Aous pass but before Cynoscephalae (Livy 32.13). They never lost Meliteia (with Pereia *et al.*?) or Thaumaci. Thus the Achaeon-Thessalian cities known to have been subject to Aetolia into or nearly into Philip's reign divide neatly into two groups: those the Aetolians had in their possession immediately after Cynoscephalae (Cyphaera, Xyniae, Meliteia, etc.) and those they demanded back from Philip, that is, our four cities. Unlike the cities won in 229 and lost immediately after, the four cities had been lost less than twenty years ago and, more significantly, these cities had all been Aetolian for years, not merely for a few months.<sup>39</sup> That is, these were the only Phthiotic Achaeon and Thessalian cities still held by Philip to which the Aetolians had a plausible and active claim.<sup>40</sup>

### III

To solidify their claim to the newly and, for the most part, briefly incorporated areas of western Thessaly and Achaea Phthiotis, the Aetolians began to send ἱερόμνημονες to Delphi from several of these towns. Amphictyonic inscriptions reveal

36. Polybius (5.99.1–100, 8.99.4) tells us explicitly that the Aetolians were in control of the town. Cf. Livy 28.7.11–12.

37. See, among others, Flacelière, *Aitoliens*, pp. 299–300; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 88; Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, p. 67, based on the “geographische Lage”; Stählin, “Larisa,” col. 841, simply, “Das muss zwischen der Einnahme von Theben 217 und der von Echinus 210 erfolgt sein.” It was certainly Macedonian again before 200 when Apustius took everything but the citadel (Livy 31.46.12). The later dispute shows that the Romans then either withdrew or were driven out of the city by the Macedonians.

38. In 217 we find Pharsalus once again in the Macedonian camp (Polyb. 5.99.4). Some scholars believe that Pharsalus was recaptured early in Antigonos Doson's reign (Stählin, “Phthiotis,” p. 200; Fine, “Macedonian Holdings,” pp. 148–50; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 100, n. 1; Béquignon, “Pharsalos,” coll. 1067–68). Unfortunately the Macedonian recovery of the town is nowhere mentioned in our extant sources. Strictly speaking, Walbank's assertion, “Polybius (5.99.3) states that Pharsalus was Macedonian during the Social War,” *Philip V*, p. 100, n. 1 (similarly Fine, “Macedonian Holdings,” p. 133), is imprecise: Polybius only tells us that Pharsalus was Macedonian when Philip decided to attack Phthiotic Thebes in 217 and that the city had suffered at the hands of the Aetolians in Thebes. Briscoe, *XXXI–XXXIII*, p. 53, is more cautious; Treves, “Antigono Dosone,” p. 408, n. 1, is certain that Pharsalus was Macedonian “al termine della guerra sociale” (my emphasis). I would suggest that the town was retaken in the early years of Philip's reign or, perhaps, at the end of Antigonos Doson's. The Aetolians (and others) saw Antigonos' death as an opportunity to make gains against Macedonia (N. G. L. Hammond, in Hammond and F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 3 [Oxford, 1988], pp. 368–84; relations between Antigonos Doson and Aetolia remained strained and even hostile until his death (F. W. Walbank, in Hammond and Walbank, *Macedonia*, 3:345–64, *passim*). If so, then Pharsalus would have been Aetolian for years, just like Larisa Cremaste, Echinus, and Phthiotic Thebes. This would explain why it was so closely associated with these cities in the Aetolians' consciousness and why the Aetolians were so determined to get it back. The absence of any recapture of Pharsalus in Polybius' account of the Social War may, however, argue against that war being the most likely context.

39. These results have a bearing on Flamininus' disposition of Achaea Phthiotis as well. Obviously the Aetolians did not relinquish the Achaeon properties in their own possession after Cynoscephalae. This means that the Achaea Phthiotis attached to the renewed Thessalian League by Flamininus was chiefly the eastern portion, including Echinus but without Phthiotic Thebes.

40. Their strategic importance made them worth claiming (see, among others, J. Muylle, “Le traité d'amitié entre Rome et la Ligue Étolienne,” *AC* 38 [1969]: 425).

among the Aetolian ἱερομνήμονες two Pharsalians, a Gomphian, two Limnaeans, two Cyphaerans, two Phthiotic Thebans, two Thaumaciens, and two Melitaeans.<sup>41</sup> After losing most of their Thessalian acquisitions ca. 228, the Aetolians continued to send ἱερομνήμονες to the Delphic Amphictyony from Gomphi, Limnaea, and other towns.<sup>42</sup>

Most historians assume either that the Aetolians recaptured and then once again lost Larisa, Thebes, Echinus, and Pharsalus after 210, or that Philip had promised these cities to the Aetolians in 206 but reneged on his obligation.<sup>43</sup> Scholars arguing that the Aetolians recaptured the four cities cite as evidence Aetolian ἱερομνήμονες at Delphi from Phthiotic Thebes under the archons Megartas and Philaetolus, generally dated some time after 206.<sup>44</sup> Yet this does not prove that the Aetolians still possessed these cities, since Aetolian ἱερομνήμονες do not necessarily indicate Aetolian possession of the cities thus represented. We know that Philip retook Phthiotic Thebes in 217 (Polyb. 5.99.1–100.8) and still held it in 200. There is not a hint of the postulated series of captures and recaptures in our sources, a remarkable omission considering the number and significance of the cities which, according to this view, are presumed to have fallen twice. F. Stählin has argued a more credible explanation for our amphictyonic dilemma: the Aetolian ἱερομνήμονες from Phthiotic Thebes and Pharsalus do not reflect possession of the cities, but only an assertion of rightful ownership.<sup>45</sup>

Thus the Aetolians continued to send representatives to Delphi from those cities that they had lost ca. 228, including Gomphi and Limnaea. The political reasons for maintaining this assertion after Antigonos' successful campaign ca. 228 have been overlooked. To extend further Aetolian dominance of the Amphictyony, to preserve a feeling of having been wronged by the Macedonians and thus to provide a justification for retaking these cities should the opportunity arise, certainly. But

41. The Pharsalians, Πολλέα Φαρσαλίου (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 539A 1.8), and . . . ]βολου Φαρσάλιου (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 545 1.3); the Gomphian, . . . Γομφεύς (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 553 1.5); the Limnaeans, Λειωνος Αἰμυ[ν]αίου (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 553 1.4), and Πολυξένου Λιμναίου (*GDI* 2532 1.2); the Cyphaerans, Νικιάδα Κυφα[υ]ρέως (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 538 11.8–9), and Κλεῖ[μ]εν[ε]ως Κυφαίρεως (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 523 1.5); the Phthiotic Thebans, Πυρρία Θηβαίου (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 564 1.6), and Νικοβούλου Θηβαίου (*GDI* 2529 1.4); the Thaumaciens, Ευρυμαχου Θαυμακου (*GDI* 2529 1.5), and Φαικου Θαυμακου (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 539A 1.5); the Melitaeans, Φιλεταιρου Μελιταεως (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 538 1.6), and Αἰυκωνος Μελιταεως (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 523 1.4). For the most comprehensive and sensible discussions see Stählin, "Phthiotis," pp. 199–206; Fine, "Macedonian Holdings," 130–55.

42. For both Gomphi and Limnaea, see *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 553, dated to 207–6 by B. W. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), p. 144; to 208 by H. Pomtow (*Syll*<sup>3</sup>). Also for Limnaea see *GDI* 2532, dated to 206–5 by Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 144; to 217–12 by É. Bourguet, *Fouilles de Delphes*, vol. 3.1 (Paris, 1929), p. 196.

43. For the former: among others, Niese, *Geschichte*, p. 503, n. 1; Klaffenbach, *IG* 9<sup>2</sup> 1, p. xxxii, ll. 49–80; Flacelière, *Aitolien*, pp. 306–8, esp. pp. 307–8, n. 2, pp. 340–41; M. Piraino, "La pace di Fénice," *Rivista di Filologia* 33 (1955): 71–72, n. 1 (by implication); B. Ferro, *Le origini della II guerra macedonica* (Palermo, 1960), pp. 12–19. For a broken promise: among others, Stählin, "Phthiotis," pp. 205–6; M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C. (273–205)* (Paris, 1935), p. 255, n. 1; Walbank, *Commentary* 2:555–56; Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 67–77. Fine, "Macedonian Holdings," pp. 142–50, sees no Aetolian recapture, but no promise either. Briscoe, *XXXI–XXXIII*, pp. 53–54 (discussion), p. 54: "It is impossible to find a solution."

44. See Dinsmoor, *Archons*, pp. 144–45, who dates *GDI* 2529 to 203–2, and *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 564 to 202–1. Pomtow dates *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 564 to 202 and Stählin, "Phthiotis," p. 204, dates *GDI* 2529 to 202. G. Daux, *Chronologie Delphique* (Paris, 1943), p. 45, dates Megartas to between 205/4 and 203/2. For our purposes, the differences are insignificant. For a useful chart on Aetolian amphictyonic representatives from Phthiotic Thebes and these other Thessalian cities, see Fine, "Macedonian Holdings," p. 144.

45. "Phthiotis," pp. 199–205. Fine, "Macedonian Holdings," pp. 130–50, offers telling refinements of Stählin.

the Thessalian exiles provided the chief motive. Apparently when the Thessalians revolted they turned to Aetolia for support,<sup>46</sup> some (perhaps many) cities even joined the Aetolian League. The revolt ended in failure and Aetolian promises of succor proved meaningless. Doubtless many Aetolian sympathizers fled into exile in Aetolia.<sup>47</sup> By sustaining their claim to parts of Thessaly, the Aetolians were throwing a bone to these hapless people whom they had tragically disappointed and who were now perforce living among them. But as the exiles became residents and the likelihood of recovering these cities more remote, it became pointless to maintain all these old and brief claims. Some were abandoned.

Historians suggesting that Philip had promised the Aetolians the four cities in the peace of 206 but never handed them over cite Livy. According to the Roman historian, at the conference near Nicaea in 198 Alexander the Isian ended his harangue against Philip as follows:

[Philip] had also taken more from the Aetolians themselves when he was their ally than when he was their enemy; he had expelled the Aetolian commander and garrison from Lysimachia and then taken the city; Cius, likewise a city of theirs, he had utterly overthrown and destroyed; by this same deception [*eadem fraude*] he held Phthiotic Thebes, Echinus, Larisa, and Pharsalus. [Livy 32.33.15–16]<sup>48</sup>

The *fraus* in question, it is argued, must have been a broken agreement since there is no record of Philip either losing the cities to the Aetolians or recovering them through treachery; nor does it seem likely that Philip would have made any real concessions from his position of strength. But Alexander did not say *eadem fraude*, Livy did.<sup>49</sup> The passage is clearly based on Polybius.<sup>50</sup>

He asked Philip why he [sc. Philip], when Lysimachia was aligned with the Aetolians and had a commander sent by them, had expelled the commander and held the city with a garrison? Why had he enslaved the Cians despite the fact that they were full fellow citizens of the Aetolians and he was a friend of the Aetolians? Under what pretext was he still holding Echinus and Phthiotic Thebes and Pharsalus and Larisa? [Polyb. 18.3.11–12]<sup>51</sup>

Alexander complains that Lysimachia was Aetolian when attacked by Philip; that Cius was a member of the League and that Aetolia and Philip were at peace when Philip took Cius. But of our four cities he simply asks, “Under what pretext was he

46. Will, *Histoire*, 2:361: “Il n'est pas douteux que cette sécession fût encouragée, voire fomentée d'Étolie.”

47. Fine, “Macedonian Holdings,” pp. 146–47.

48. “ipsis quoque Aetolis eum plura socium quam hostem ademisit: Lysimachiam pulso praetore et praesidio Aetolorum occupasse eum; Cium, item suae dicionis urbem, funditus evertisse ac delesse; eadem fraude habere eum Thebas Phthias, Echinum, Larisam, Pharsalum.”

49. Fine, “Macedonian Holdings,” p. 150, suggests, “. . . it is evident that the Aetolians are using rather rhetorical language when they speak of the ‘fraus’ of Philip regarding these cities . . .”! On the mark is Muylle, “Le traité,” p. 424: “L’interprétation par Tite-Live a été à l’origine de la confusion: eadem fraude.”

50. G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei romani*<sup>2</sup>, vol. 3 (Turin, 1916), p. 435, n. 2: “e solo una traduzione di Polyb. xviii 3,12”; Klaffenbach, *IG* 9<sup>2</sup> 1, p. xxxii, ll. 54–61, recognizes this phrase as Livy’s interpretation, but agrees with it.

51. ἤρετο γάρ τὸν Φίλιππον διὰ τὴν Λυσιμάχειαν μετ’ Αἰτωλῶν ταττομένην καὶ στρατηγὸν ἔχουσαν παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐκβαλὼν τοῦτον κατάσχοι φρουρὰ τὴν πόλιν· διὰ τί δὲ Κιανούς, παραπλησίως μετ’ Αἰτωλῶν συμπολιτευμένους ἐξανδραποδίσαιτο, φίλος ὑπάρχων Αἰτωλοῖς· τί δὲ λέγων κατέγει νῦν Ἐχίνον καὶ Θήβας τὰς Φθίας καὶ Φάρσαλον καὶ Λάρισαν;



[sc. Philip] still holding Echinus and Phthiotic Thebes and Pharsalus and Larisa?" Livy has therefore added *eadem fraude* to Polybius' account, to connect all the cities mentioned by Alexander. But Polybius has Alexander speak of the four cities in a separate sentence, viewing them as a distinct group as he does elsewhere,<sup>52</sup> complaining of Philip's possession of these cities, not of how he acquired them. Livy's embellishments are not evidence. There was no Aetolian reconquest and no broken promise between 206 and 201.

Elsewhere in Livy, the phrase, "because of the treacherous peace with the Aetolians and the other allies of that same region,"<sup>53</sup> is most likely an allusion to Philip's capture of Lysimachia, Chalcedon, and Cius in 202. It is unnecessary to include Larisa, Thebes, Echinus, and Pharsalus.<sup>54</sup> The statements made by L. Furius Purpurio, Roman delegate to the meeting of the Aetolian League in 199, provide no support for a broken promise either:<sup>55</sup>

By describing his unspeakable and uncivilized crimes against chthonic and heavenly gods, what further charges against Philip have the Athenians left me or anyone else? Consider that the people of Cius, Abydos, Aenus, Maronea, Thasos, Paros, Samos, Larisa, and Messenia from Achaia have made the same complaints, complaints yet more serious and bitter from those he was more capable of harming. [Livy 31.31.3–4]<sup>56</sup>

The attacks on Messene took place in 215 and 214. The attack on Larisa here referred to is that between 217 and 210. Nor is there any talk of fraud. Purpurio refers to Philip's sacrileges.

#### IV

One question remains unanswered: why did Flamininus distinguish Phthiotic Thebes from the other cities and return it alone to the Aetolians? Thebes' distinct history provides the answer.

When Philip sacked Phthiotic Thebes (from which the Aetolians had been raiding Pharsalus) in 217, he "enslaved the existing population<sup>57</sup> and, having settled Macedonians [there], renamed the city Philippi instead of Thebes."<sup>58</sup> The Aetolians settled the surviving Thebans in Thronion,<sup>59</sup> a city that itself had been devastated by Philip. The Aetolians must have sent the Theban ἱερομνήμονες to Delphi

52. As emphasized by Muylle, "Le traité," p. 424, who sees Philip's μανία as the theme that lends coherence to Alexander's tirade. Contra, Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, p. 69, who sees an "enge Beziehung" between Alexander's charges.

53. "ob infidam adversus Aetolos aliosque regionis eiusdem socios pacem" (Livy 31.1.9). Livy is about to embark on his narrative of the Second Macedonian War and here alludes to Philip's peace with the Aetolians, that is, the Peace of Phoenice of 205. It is not out of the question that Livy, expressing himself imprecisely, has in mind the Aetolians' supposed betrayal of the Romans in concluding peace with their common enemy, Philip.

54. Briscoe, *XXXI–XXXIII*, p. 53. This is only Livy's (or his source's) interpretation anyway.

55. Cf. Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, p. 70; contra: Ferro, *Origini*, p. 15.

56. "Atheniensis in deos inferos superosque nefanda atque inhumana scelera eius referendo quid mihi aut cuiquam reliquerunt, quod obicere ultra possim? Eadem haec Cianos, Abydenos, Aenios, Maronitas, Thasios, Parios, Samios, Larisenses, Messenios hinc ex Achaia existimate queri, graviora acerbioraque eos quibus nocendi maiorem facultatem habuit."

57. Walbank's (*Commentary* 3:628) translation for τοὺς . . . ὑπάρχοντας οἰκήτορας, with parallels refuting W. W. Tarn, review of F. W. Walbank, *Philip V*, in *JRS* 31 (1941): 173.

58. γενόμενος δὲ κύριος τῶν Θηβῶν τοὺς μὲν ὑπάρχοντας οἰκήτορας ἐξηνδραποδίσατο, Μακεδόνας δ' εἰσοικίσας Φιλίππου τὴν πόλιν ἀντὶ Θηβῶν κατόνομασεν (Polyb. 5.100.8).

59. Polyb. 5.99–100, Livy 28.7.11–12.

from the Theban exile community in Thronion, and after Philip's capture of Thronion in 208,<sup>60</sup> from wherever they had been resettled. When Philip withdrew his garrisons from Phocis and Locris,<sup>61</sup> the Thebans may have moved back to Thronion. The Aetolian obligation to maintain their claim to Phthiotic Thebes for the sake of the Thebans was therefore exceptionally compelling: the loss of Thebes had been relatively recent; the Thebans were not only exiled from their native city but had lost it utterly to Macedonian colonists; by settling the Thebans together at Thronion (where they suffered once again), the Aetolians had preserved their identity as a polis.<sup>62</sup> Thus even after the peace with Philip in 206, the Aetolians could not let the pretense of rightful ownership lapse.

The Aetolians were in a position to lend some measure of official credence to their claim. They controlled Delphi at that time and thus could determine the representatives in the Amphictyony. Besides, the seats more properly belonged to the Phthiotic Theban people, at that time in exile, than to Macedonian settlers occupying the Thebans' land. Revealingly, the inscriptions commemorating the foundation of the festival of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia on the Maeander do *not* acknowledge this claim.<sup>63</sup> In an Aetolian *psephisma* recognizing the festival, Thessalian and Phthiotic Achaean cities are conspicuously absent among the *subscriptores*.<sup>64</sup> The Magnesians had no obligation to the Phthiotic Thebans and had more to gain and to fear from Philip than from the Aetolians. The Magnesians sought and obtained Philip V's recognition of the festival as well<sup>65</sup> and they saw to it that the inscription of the Aetolian *psephisma* erected in Magnesia respected the wishes of the dangerous king and the realities of the day, not Aetolian propaganda. Philip thus won a small propaganda victory at Magnesia, the Aetolians a perhaps larger one at Delphi.<sup>66</sup> The price of obtaining the Phthiotic Thebans' amphictyonic representation may well have been war with the Aetolians, a price that Philip may

60. "Haud maiore certamine quam Opuntem Attalus ceperat, Philippus Thronium cepit. Incolebant urbem eam profugi ab Thebis Phthioticis; urbe sua capta a Philippo cum in fidem Aetolorum perflugissent, sedem iis Aetoli eam dederant urbis vastae ac desertae priore eiusdem Philippi bello," Livy 28.7.11–12. De Sanctis, *Storia*, p. 435, n. 92.

61. Polyb. 18.10.4, Livy 32.36.9.

62. The case of the Elateians' corporate exile to Stymphalus and the ultimate restoration of their homeland offers a contemporaneous parallel (recorded in *ISE* 155; R. K. Sherk, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* [Cambridge, 1984], no. 17, provides a translation of this key inscription and some bibliography). The Elateians were absent from their city for about seven years, if we assume that the Elateians were expelled by Flamininus in 198 (see M. Mitsos, "Inscription de Stymphale," *REG* 59–60 [1946–47]: 156–57; followed by, among others, S. Accame, "Elatea e la nuova epigrafe di Stinfalo," *Rivista di Filologia* 27 [1949]: 217–48; L. Moretti, *ISE*, no. 55, p. 140; Briscoe, *XXXI–XXXIII*, p. 214). The Elateians lived in exile three to five years if the Aetolians expelled them (A. Passerini, "La condizione della città di Elatea dopo la seconda guerra macedonica in una nuova iscrizione," *Athenaeum* 26 [1948]: 84–92; following Passerini, with modifications, Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 120–25; Will, *Histoire*, 2:156). The Plataeans provide an example of preserving identity as a polis in even greater adversity and over a much longer period. See F. W. Walbank, *Selected Papers* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 8–9.

63. O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin, 1900), nos. 16–87, pp. 11–69, esp. no. 11 (= *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 557), pp. 11–13; cf. O. Kern, "Magnetische Studien," *Hermes* 36 (1901): 491–515; H. Swoboda, "Studien zu den griechischen Bünden," *Klio* 11 (1911): 450–56; L. Robert, *BE* 38 (1936): 12–15.

64. Kern, *Inschriften*, no. 28, pp. 20–21; cf. *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 557, p. 49 (appendix).

65. Kern, *Inschriften*, no. 47, pp. 37–38 (= *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 561, 1.1).

66. Philip may have conceded the Aetolians this gesture (which would have been abandoned eventually)—he had the city, they had public relations. Or the Aetolians, after having ceded the rights to the city to Philip, may have turned around and consoled the Theban exiles by maintaining their vote. *Contra*: Piraino, "Pace," p. 72, note; Ferro, *Origini*, p. 15.

have considered too steep at that time, especially since the Amphictyony had lost much of its political importance. The Macedonians seem to have lost interest in contesting vigorously Aetolian preeminence at Delphi.<sup>67</sup>

The city itself, moreover, had become a Macedonian colony, a *Fremdkörper* in the center of liberated central Greece.<sup>68</sup> Obviously the Macedonians had to be expelled—Philip's complete withdrawal from Greece was the only undisputed *sine qua non* in the fulfillment of Rome's liberation of Greece. It was natural that Flamininus return the liberated city to the unfortunate remnants of pre-217 Thebes, people whose city it had in fact been, people who twice had suffered at Philip's hands. But there was a catch. These same Thebans had found refuge and home with the Aetolians. Aetolian kindness and Philip's cruelty had conspired to bind the Thebans to the Aetolians by gratitude and mutual loyalty. Flamininus wanted peace in Greece. Disgruntled refugees are always liable to stir up trouble. Returning Thebes to the Aetolians was the equivalent of resettling the Thebans. The Thebans would be happy to get their homes back, and something was conceded to the Aetolians. The Aetolians found this inadequate, but everyone else was pleased (Polyb. 18.39.1).

## V

Historians have oversimplified and misunderstood the history of Larisa Cremaste, Phthiotic Thebes, Pharsalus, and Echinus, and thus misinterpreted the significance of these cities for postwar Greece and, in particular, Roman-Aetolian relations. The Aetolians viewed their association with these four cities as relatively recent and lasting, and hence importuned for their restoration. Yet the cities had Thessalian, not Aetolian, traditions, and Flamininus may have viewed their association with the Aetolian League as distant and short-lived. Pharsalus, Larisa Cremaste, and Echinus presumably preferred to face their futures as part of the new Thessalian League, independent of both Macedonia and Aetolia. Only the Aetolians would be frustrated. But Phthiotic Thebes was different. The Thebes that existed at the end of the war was a Macedonian outpost and had to be expelled. The remnants of the old Achaean Thebes were indebted to the Aetolians for their homes, for their very existence, and had in fact been part of the Aetolian League for years. By returning Thebes to the Aetolians, Flamininus was satisfying the Thebans and settling a potentially dangerous problem of refugees and exiles, while making an apparently disinterested gesture of generosity. He was also mitigating somewhat the insult of denying the Aetolians the other three cities. His citation of the Aetolian-Roman treaty in the negotiations after Philip's defeat was little more than a smoke screen. The Aetolians recognized this. Yet to acknowledge the consul's true reason for distinguishing the cities would have entailed acknowledgement that there was in fact a distinction to

67. There is no record of delegates from peoples under Macedonian control either attending or voting at Delphi from 279 to 197 (W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* [Oxford, 1913], pp. 208–14, especially pp. 213–14). Fine, "Macedonian Holdings," p. 147, suggests: "Macedon, rather than be outvoted by Aetolia and her friends and thus suffer a dangerous loss of prestige, stayed completely aloof from Delphi."

68. It is because Thebes had become a Macedonian city that Philip was willing to cede Pharsalus and Larisa Cremaste to the Aetolians at Nicaea in 198, but insisted on holding on to Thebes despite the difficulty of his position (Lehmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 71–72, emphasizes Philip's tenacity in trying to retain Thebes).

be made. The Aetolians considered all four cities equally theirs, almost as a bloc, and were not about to lend any credibility to Flamininus' dividing them up and disposing of them differently. So they continued to demand the three cities the Romans denied them. And they grew yet more embittered.<sup>69</sup>

JOSEPH J. WALSH

*Loyola College in Maryland*

69. I intend to discuss in greater detail the conflict between Flamininus and the Aetolians in another paper.

### PLINY THE ELDER AND STANDARDIZED ROLL HEIGHTS IN THE MANUFACTURE OF PAPYRUS

In his famous account of papyrus and its manufacture, Pliny the Elder discusses in detail, if not always with lucidity, the grades of papyrus: for each grade he gives the names, the relative quality, and the width of the individual sheets that are joined to make up a roll (*HN* 13.74–78). Surprising, at least to modern commentators, is Pliny's failure to mention the height of the roll.

The problem has attracted a variety of solutions, none entirely satisfactory. N. Lewis supposes an omission in Pliny's source; to that E. G. Turner apparently assents, adding that Pliny demonstrates his lack of first-hand acquaintance with the process; H. Leclercq hypothesizes an absolute ratio between width and height, making explicit mention of the height unnecessary; I. H. M. Hendriks similarly proposes that in giving the widths Pliny implicitly says something about the heights since the sheets were square; most recently, A. Bülow-Jacobsen writes that *latitudo* in 13.78 refers not to the width but to the height of the roll.<sup>1</sup> The latter three theories can be rejected on the basis of surviving papyri. Evaluating the lists of examples in Kenyon's handbook, we find that the width of a sheet taken as a percentage of height ranges from 32% to 97%,<sup>2</sup> and therewith we may put Leclercq and Hendriks to one side. Bülow-Jacobsen's theory also fails the test of the evidence to hand. The higher range of *latitudo* specified by Pliny translates to 24.05 cm. for the *optimi* (the Augustan, Livian, and probably also Claudian grades) and 20.35 cm for the hieratic grade. These higher grades are presumably the ones usually selected for literary rolls. Were *latitudo* the height, we should be hard pressed to explain why literary rolls commonly extend to a height of 30 cm. or more. Taking Kenyon's list of examples once again, we find that only three are so short as the

1. N. Lewis, *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford, 1974), p. 56, where Turner's views (from a letter to Lewis) will also be found; H. Leclercq, "Papyrus" in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 13.1 (Paris, 1937), col. 1374 (whose views are rejected by Lewis, *Papyrus*, p. 56, n. 31); I. H. M. Hendriks, "Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* XIII, 74–82 and the Manufacture of Papyrus," *ZPE* 37 (1980): 130; A. Bülow-Jacobsen, "'Magna in latitudine earum differentia' (Pliny, *NH* XIII, 78)," *ZPE* 60 (1985): 273–74, who is cited with approval by N. Lewis, *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity: A Supplement*, *Papyrologia Bruxellensia*, vol. 23 (Brussels, 1989), pp. 26–27.

2. F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1951), pp. 50–51.