

ABSTRACT

Rome: Reverence and Resentment in the Greek East

William J. Stover

Director: Kenneth R. Jones, Ph.D

The years between 229 BC and 146 BC saw a massive transformation of the relationship between Rome and her Greek neighbors. From antiquarian curiosity concerning Roman origins to hopeful approval and bitter opposition, the catalog of Greek attitudes toward Romans is lengthy. This thesis shall investigate the ways in which Greeks dealt with Romans in political interactions and portrayed them in literature from the time of their first appearance up to the loss of Greek political autonomy. Beginning with the earliest Greek discussions of Rome's Trojan or Greek ancestry and moving through the subsequent military and political history of Rome's involvement in Greece, I will elucidate the Greek views which underlie their policies toward the Romans, and trace the development of those views through the course of their exchanges.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

Dr. Kenneth R. Jones, Department of Classics

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: _____

ROME: REVERENCE AND RESENTMENT IN THE GREEK EAST

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Baylor University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Honors Program

By
William John Stover

Waco, Texas

May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Shadowy First Impressions	7
Chapter Three: Renewed Interest.....	20
Chapter Four: Rome’s Attention Shifts East	33
Chapter Five: Antiochus and Rome.....	45
Chapter Six: Epilogue and Conclusion.....	57
Bibliography	65

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Kenneth Jones	For peerless instruction and mentorship
Dr. Alden Smith	For steady guidance in school and life
Dr. Jeff Fish	For always having a lexicon ready
Dr. Simon Burriss	For making me learn the principle parts
Dr. Timothy Heckenlively	For convincing me to take Greek
Niloy Shah	For being co-ruler of the fourth floor
Nevin Shah	For being my “archenemy”
Matt Blair	For our getaway in Mobile Command Center
William Kabel, Brendan Loewen, and Aaron Rider	For a terrible journey from Pennsylvania
Aaron Carter	For many fine discussions
Walker Bailey	For many memorable experiences
Clayton Mills	For constant support and encouragement
Rainey Spencer	For being a light to me in dark places, when all other lights go out

DEDICATION

To my parents: I could not have asked for better guardians and exemplars.

To my brother, Dr. Justin Stover, without whose stories and lessons I would never have learned to love the Classics.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The question “How did neighboring nations view the Romans” resounds from such disparate sources as Monty Python’s *Life of Brian* and Eric Gruen’s *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. The question of the attitudes of subjected peoples can be shaded by the implicit assumption of anti-Roman sentiment. When introduced, the question evokes images of dissatisfaction with Roman rule, rebels stealthily plotting civil unrest, and hard-bitten Roman officers ruthlessly crushing resistance. Certain modern cultural attitudes also reinforce an assumption of discontent on the part of subject peoples. Such a view has been reinforced by modern scholarship, portraying Rome as unyieldingly assertive and forceful in her dealings with other nations. Consideration of the nature of Rome’s approach to the nations and kingdoms on the fringes of its empire, and the reactions to such action, can easily lack objectivity. There is a temptation to impute malcontent to those entities affected without proper textual support. The Greek sources themselves offer a profoundly nuanced view. The scope of this investigation commences with the earliest recorded references to Rome in Greek literature, in the fifth century BC, and moves through Rome’s involvement in Greece up to the loss of Greek political autonomy in 146 BC. Since it spanned the entire eastern Mediterranean, it is difficult to say that anything is universally applicable to the Greek world, which contained an assortment of varying cultural and political entities. Nevertheless, the commonality of language, heritage, and accepted mythology does engender a certain

unity. While using sources from different parts of this Greek world, this investigation will center around events on the Greek mainland, to which the direct involvement of Rome was primarily restricted in that era. The sources evince a variety of assessments from Greek authors, displaying a spectrum of views beyond a simple dichotomy of positive and negative. Although the varied nature of sources and disparate outlooks preclude a universal characterization of their content, some general observations can be garnered from a close reading of the texts at hand. In this thesis it will be shown that the early interactions of the Romans and the Greek world present a picture too complex and multifaceted to be briefly summed up and formulized, but nevertheless from which certain, surprising observations spring.

The topic is rendered difficult by the paucity of early sources and the relatively short time between the beginning of Greek interest in Rome, and the loss of Greek autonomy to the Romans, rendering the later discourse a more Romanized perspective. Furthermore, relatively little scholarly work has sought to elaborate the attitudes of the Greeks toward their western neighbors. Generally it is only mentioned tangentially in works of scholarship on Roman expansion. This gap in scholarly work on the topic of reactions to Roman expansion into the governing spheres of established cultures underscores the mystery which surrounds this topic. Nevertheless, Eric Gruen's contributions stand out as the most cogent attempt at a complete description of the cultural exchange and military conflicts between the established Hellenistic worlds and the nascent power of Rome. A particularly valuable aspect of Gruen's work is his examination of the world which he depicts through a Hellenistic lens, putting events in their Hellenistic, rather than Roman context. A reviewer identifies the compelling feature

of Gruen's scholarship when she writes that "Gruen puts [Roman expansionism] in a Hellenistic context because he believes that Roman infiltration of the Eastern Mediterranean was initially informed by Greek rather than Roman experience."¹ Gruen furthermore rejects the notion that Rome's mechanisms for her dealings with the Hellenistic East were of a thoroughly Roman nature, an imposition of foreign institutions and mores upon an established society, as posited by E. Badian in his work *Foreign Clientelae*.² Nevertheless the vast majority of scholarship has focused on Roman attitudes and motivations in their dealings with their eastern neighbors, with little attention given to the way in which Roman actions would have been viewed in the Greek world.

The scholarly discussion is also burdened by the idea of unremitting and aggressive Roman imperialism, which must of course have engendered a negative response from its victims. Ultimately however, the primary source material: historical, prophetic, mystical, must be allowed to speak for itself. While significant, scholarship concerning the prevailing views of Roman imperial integration of established Hellenistic societies remains relatively scant and highly focused on individual events. Consequently the majority of treatments deal with a focus too narrow to elucidate any common

¹ Carney, Elizabeth D. 1984. Review of *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. *The Classical World* 79 (3). Johns Hopkins University Press, Classical Association of the Atlantic States: 196.

² Badian, Ernst. *Foreign clientelae (264-70 BC)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

narrative. The narratives presented by Greek sources give evidence of a highly nuanced view of Rome. A nuanced approach to the issues presented is thus requisite.

The earliest treatments of Rome take the form of antiquarian inquiries into the history and origin of the Roman people, a question answered with reference to various traditional myths. Early works focus on Rome's place in the Greek world, assured by its Greek or Trojan origins. This familial view of the Romans proved durable, and continued throughout the cultural discourse of Greece even up to the second century BC, which saw the loss of the Greece's political autonomy. Many Greek works similarly incorporated Rome into the Greek world by including it in oracular pronouncements, building upon Rome's mythical Greek origin and acknowledging the inevitability of Rome's involvement in the future. Other works give more dubious views of Roman involvement. "Restrain yourself, Roman, and let justice abide with you" a second century BC oracle proclaims, perhaps echoing the author's own dubious view of Roman affairs.³ Yet even in many of the more anti-Roman sources, the nature of their anti-Roman sentiment is nuanced, opposing particular political or military actions, but nevertheless accepting the idea of Roman involvement.

Among Greek historical sources that provide a witness to the Roman domination of the Hellenistic world, many accounts show a clear regard for Rome, evinced through the interactions, both friendly and otherwise, which highlight the generally amicable nature of Rome's interactions with the Greeks. The Greeks seem to have understood Rome to be a part of the same world, a separated and foreign part, but far closer to Greeks than to uncivilized barbarians. The Greeks seem to have considered that

³ Phlegon, *Book of Marvels*, 3:6.

even when in a clearly dominant position, Rome is not without respect or understanding. Certainly, accounts of individual contemptuous, or even barbaric actions, by particular Romans are present, but they do not generally seem to be indicative of a larger Greek perspective toward the Romans. The historical accounts overall continue the theme of Rome not as conquering tyrant, but as reasonable and respectable ruler, willing and able to use great strength and force, but by no means blood-thirsty.

Other events indicate an almost messianic longing for a savior, who will arise from the Greek world to free the Greek peoples from the cruel Latin yoke of Roman military dominance. Yet overall, such an opinion seems to have been sporadic at best, tied to particular promising political developments, rather than a perennial Greek enmity toward Rome. To the politically volatile Greek world, Rome has a surprising, if nevertheless variable image. On the whole however, the Greeks tended to view the Romans as something above the lot of barbarians, but yet not quite part of the civilized Hellenic world; a part of the extended family, but an estranged and difficult to understand one that had to be approached with caution. Ultimately, few Greeks seem to have correctly identified Rome as the irresistible, impregnable force that would eventually swallow up the political autonomy of the Greeks. There is no unilateral way to characterize the Greeks' view of Rome at any given time. Each era likewise displays a variety of opinions. Where Polybius saw noble dominion, Antisthenes saw an upstart tyranny and Lycophron saw the fulfillment of prophetic inevitability. Relative geography seems to be the only concrete link between these disparate authors. Ultimately, Greeks seem to view Rome not as truly foreign, whether good or ill, but as a very part of that Hellenistic world which some authors would later aver them to be destroying. The vision

of Rome is fluid, ever-changing in the course of history. It is the goal of this work to draw out and narrate the historical course of Rome's involvement in Greece from the time of first contact up to the Roman political reorganization of Greece in 146 BC, and from there to outline commonalities and themes that unite and divide authors who touched upon Rome in order to sketch a thread of continuity through the fascinating and volatile history of Rome and the Greeks.

CHAPTER TWO

Shadowy First Impressions

The earliest chapter of Roman-Hellenic relations is veiled in obscurity and plagued by a paucity of historiographical sources. Prior to the onset of the third century BC, what little textual evidence exists lacks unity and cogency. Eric Gruen describes the surviving evidence as “murky and scattered fragments.”¹ The primary topic of disputation concerned the relation of Rome to the civilized Greek Mediterranean. The discussion seems to have revolved around the origin of Rome, accounts of which were rarely presented historiographically, and often consisted of esoteric origin reckoned in relation to accepted classical myths.

Nevertheless, the question of Rome was cogent in the period before direct Roman involvement in Greek and Hellenistic affairs began. This cogency sprang from Rome’s unclear position in Greek conceptions. Rome bridged the gap between Greek and barbarian, or rather, its exact identity in that dichotomy was indeterminate at best, as it did not seem to be wholly one or the other. Additionally, the secondhand nature of many of the sources, consisting primarily in references in the work of later authors, creates difficulty in forming a conclusive narrative of the earliest impressions of Rome held by Greeks. Gruen is correct in noting that none of the sources “count as evidence of serious

¹ Gruen, Erich S. *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*. Vol. 1. Univ of California Press, 1984:314.

and sustained study of Rome” on the part of Greeks.² Nevertheless, in the absence of true literary treatment, the corpus of anecdotes, passing references, and fables must be relied upon to outline the sentiments of Greeks toward Romans in earliest days of their cultural interchange.

Inquiries into Roman Origins

According to Festus, Alkimos, a Sicilian Greek of the fourth century ascribed to the view that the Romans were descendants of Aeneas and those who fled from Troy.³ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in the first century BC, catalogues many other similar accounts from ancient Greek scholars concerning Rome. In his work, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία*, (*Roman Antiquities*) he presents the various ancient Greek viewpoints with which he was familiar. He cites Demagoras, Agathyllus, and many others (καὶ ἄλλοις συγχοῖς) as Greek sources for the foundation of Rome.⁴ They also ascribe to the account of Rome’s founding by Trojans in the second generation after Aeneas.⁵ The association

² Gruen 1984: 321.

³ Sextus Pompeius Festus, *On the Meaning of Words*, 326.35-328.2: Alkimus ait, Tyrrhenia Aeneae natum filium Romulum fuisse, atque eo ortam Albam Aeneae neptem, cuius filius nomine Rhodius condiderit urbem Romam (Alkimos has said that Romulus was the son born for Aeneas and Tyrrhenia and also that Alba, born from him, was the granddaughter of Aeneas, the son of whom, Rhodius in name, founded the city of Rome.) (Trans. Stover)

⁴ Dion. Hal. 1.72.1.

⁵ Dion. Hal. 1.72.1.

of the Romans with a Trojan origin invites the question: Are the Trojans Greek or barbarian?⁶ Dionysius elsewhere remarks that:

Ἵτι δὲ καὶ τὸ τῶν Τρώων ἔθνος Ἑλληνικὸν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα ἦν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου ποτὲ ὠρμημένον, εἴρηται μὲν καὶ ἄλλοις τισὶ πάλαι, λεχθήσεται δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἐμοῦ δι' ὀλίγων.⁷

“That the Trojans, too, were a nation as truly Greek as any and formerly came from the Peloponnesus has long since been asserted by some authors and shall be briefly related by me also.”

While Dionysius’ unnamed sources do not survive, his reference to them indicates that at least a portion of the Greeks viewed the Trojans as part of the Greek world.

Menekrates of Xanthos, a Greek historian operating in Lycia in the fourth century, gives an account of Aeneas in which he betrays the Trojans, participates in the overthrow of the city, and ultimately “becomes an Achaean”.⁸ The blurry divide between Greek and Trojan culture goes all the way back to Homer, who not only equates the Greek and Trojan pantheons, splitting the favor the gods between the two sides, but also relates instances of amicable interactions between the warring Greeks and Trojans.⁹ The most

⁶ For a full treatment of the questions of Troy’s place in the Greek world, and its reflection in Roman identity, see: Erskine, Andrew. *Troy between Greece and Rome: local tradition and imperial power*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2001.

⁷ Dion. Hal. 1.61.1; N.b. All Greek and Latin text and translations taken from *Loeb Classical Library*, unless otherwise noted.

⁸ Dion. Hal. 1.49.4: Dionysius quotes Menekrates: Αἰνεΐης γὰρ ἄτιτος ἐὼν ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ἀπὸ γερῶν ἐξειργόμενος ἀνέτρεψε Πρίαμον· ἐργασάμενος δὲ ταῦτα εἰς Ἀχαιῶν ἐγεγόνει. (For Aeneas, being scorned by Alexander and excluded from his prerogatives, overthrew Priam; and having accomplished this, he became one of the Achaeans.) For biography of Menekrates, see: Bryce, Trevor, and Jan Zahle. *The Lycians: The Lycians in literary and epigraphic sources*. Vol. 1. Museum Tusulanum Press, 1984:208.

⁹ Exchange of armor, *Ill.* 6.120-232, exchange of gifts 7.290-312, the pleading of Priam and the pity of Achilles, 24.468-576.

vehement anti-Trojan sentiment comes from the mouth of Agamemnon, a less than admirable character in Homer's depiction.¹⁰ The extreme similarity of the Greeks and Trojans as well as the sympathetic portrayals of Troy in Greek art makes a negative stigma attached to Rome's Trojan origin unlikely.¹¹ The presence of the *Ilioupersis*, a depiction of the sack of Troy by the Achaeans, on the Athenian Parthenon reconstructed in the wake of the great destruction of the Persian war has been suggested as evidence of sympathy toward Troy, ravaged by the Achaeans as Athens had been ravaged by the Persians.¹²

In addition to the purely Trojan account, other authors favored the position that the origin of Rome was actually both Trojan and Greek, appending Odysseus to the

¹⁰ *Ill.* 6.58-61: τῶν μὴ τις ὑπεκφύγοι αἰπὸν ὄλεθρον
 χεῖράς θ' ἡμετέρας, μηδ' ὄν τινα γαστέρι μήτηρ
 κοῦρον ἔοντα φέροι, μηδ' ὄς φύγοι, ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντες
 Ἴλιου ἐξαπολοῖατ' ἀκήδεστοι καὶ ἄφαντοι. (Let none escape death at our hands, not even the child in the womb; let not a one survive, let all Ilium die: leave none behind as witnesses to mourn.) For a full treatment of Homer's intentionally negative portrayal of Agamemnon, see Greenberg, Nathan A. "The Attitude of Agamemnon." *The Classical World* 86, no. 3 (1993): 193-205; Postlethwaite, N. "Agamemnon Best of Spearman." *Phoenix* 49, no. 2 (1995): 95-103; Bassett, Samuel Eliot. "The Ἄμαρτία of Achilles." In *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, pp. 47-69. American Philological Association, 1934; Lefèvre, Eckard. "Die Schuld des Agamemnon: Das Schicksal des Troja-Siegers in stoischer Sicht." *Hermes* 101, no. H. 1 (1973): 64-91.

¹¹ Michael J. *Anderson*, (*The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) makes the case that 5th and 4th century Greek view are Troy are generally sympathetic, portraying the Trojans as the victim of atrocity and sacrilege from the Achaeans. For discussion of the similarity of Greeks and Trojans, see: Taplin, Oliver. *Homeric soundings: the shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford University Press on Demand, 1992.

¹² Ferrari, Gloria. "The Ilioupersis in Athens." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100 (2000):139.

previously discussed Aenean origin. Hellanikos of Argos serves as the voice of this theory. Dionysius explains Hellanikos' position:

Αινείαν φησὶν ἐκ Μολοττῶν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἐλθόντα μετ' Ὀδυσσέως οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως, ὀνομάσαι δ' αὐτὴν ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῶν Ἰλιάδων Ῥώμης.¹³

“Hellanikos says that Aeneas came into Italy from the land of the Molossians with Odysseus and became the founder of the city, which he named after Romê, one of the Trojan women.”

To this he adds the support of Damastes of Sigeum.¹⁴ Agathokles of Kyzikos amends Hellanikos' account in the third century, changing Romê's identity from simply one of the Trojan women to the granddaughter of Aeneas, providing a nobler lineage for the Roman name.¹⁵ Aristotle apparently contributed to this account as well, relating in a lost work that the origins of Rome were with seafaring Achaeans lost on their return from Troy with Trojan captives.¹⁶ While the fragments preserved from Aristotle are of dubious

¹³ Dion. Hal. I. 72.2.

¹⁴ Cary, E., *Loeb vol.* 319, pg. 237 fn 3 “Damastes (*ca.* 400) wrote the genealogies of the Greek leaders before Troy; also a description of the earth and its peoples, to accompany his map of the world. “

¹⁵ Solinus, *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* 1.3: *Agathocles scribit Romen non captivam fuisse, sed Ascanio natam Aeneae neptem appellationis istius causam fuisse.* (Agathokles writes that Rome was not a captive girl ... but that Askanios' daughter and Aeneas' granddaughter was the reason to give this name to the city.)

¹⁶ Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* ii. 178, 242; Müller, Carl. "*Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, IV. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1851; Rose, 609; Rose, Valentin. *Valentini Rose De Aristotelis librorum ordine et auctoritate commentatio.* Berlin: Reimer, 1854; Dion. Hal. 1.72.3: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος Ἀχαιῶν ἱστορεῖ τῶν ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀνακομισαμένων περιπλέοντας Μαλέαν, ἔπειτα χειμῶνι βιαίῳ καταληφθέντας τέως μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων φερομένους πολλαχῆ τοῦ πελάγους πλανᾶσθαι, τελευτῶντας δ' ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς Ὀπικῆς, ὃς καλεῖται Λατίνιον ἐπὶ τῷ Τυρρηρικῷ πελάγει κείμενος. (But Aristotle, the philosopher, relates that some of the Achaeans, while they were doubling Cape Malea on their return from Troy, were overtaken by a violent storm, and being for some time driven out of their course by the winds, wandered over many parts of the sea, till at last they came to this place in the land of the Opicans which is called Latinium) And concerning their settlement: συμβῆναι δὲ αὐτοῖς τοῦτο διὰ γυναῖκας

legitimacy as actual writings of the philosopher, the fact that they were known and taken as genuine certainly leaves open the possibility that Aristotle did at least touch upon such stories in a lost work.¹⁷ Dionysius includes several other accounts that bear out the same principle: the origin of the Romans is Greek, not barbarian. Of these, of particular note is the account he claims to have taken from Xenagoras.¹⁸ This account excises the Trojan Aeneas from the account and names Odysseus and Circe as the progenitors of the Roman race. This account follows the reference in Hesiod's *Theogony*, which places Odysseus and Circe as ruling in the vicinity of the Tyrrhenians.¹⁹ The many fragmentary references

αἰχμαλώτους, ἃς ἔτυχον ἄγοντες ἐξ Ἰλίου. ταύτας δὲ κατακαῦσαι τὰ πλοῖα φοβουμένας τὴν οἴκαδε τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἄπαρσιν, ὡς εἰς δουλείαν ἀφιζομένας. (This fate, he says, was brought upon them by the captive women they were carrying with them from Troy, who burned the ships, fearing that the Achaeans in returning home would carry them into slavery.)

¹⁷ The primary collection, examination, and publication of such Aristotelian fragments was titled by its editor: *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (1863). Plutarch references the existence of an Aristotelian work concerning Rome in *Cam.* 22: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος τὸ μὲν ἀλῶναι τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ Κελτῶν ἀκριβῶς δῆλός ἐστιν ἀκηκόως, τὸν δὲ σώσαντα Λεύκιον εἶναι φησιν· ἦν δὲ Μάρκος, οὐ Λεύκιος, ὁ Κάμιλλος. (But Aristotle the philosopher clearly had accurate tidings of the capture of the city by the Gauls, and yet he says that its savior was Lucius, although the forename of Camillus was not Lucius, but Marcus.)

¹⁸ *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: In Seven Volumes.* Trans. E. Cary, Vol. 319. Loeb Classical Library, 1945, pg. 239, footnote 3, “Xenagoras (date uncertain) wrote a historical work called *Χρόνοι* and a book about islands. Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* IV.527.6.”

¹⁹ Hesiod, *Theogony* 1011-1016: Κίρκη δ', Ἡλίου θυγάτηρ Ὑπεριονίδαο, γείνατ' Ὀδυσσεῖος ταλασίφρονος ἐν φιλότητι Ἄγριον ἠδὲ Λατῖνον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε: Τηλέγονον δ' ἄρ' ἔτικτε διὰ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην. οἳ δὴ τοι μάλα τῆλε μυχῶ νήσων ἱεράων πᾶσιν Τυρσηνοῖσιν ἀγκλειτοῖσιν ἄνασσον. (And Circe the daughter of Helius, Hyperion's son, loved steadfast Odysseus and bare Agrius and Latinus who was faultless and strong: also she brought forth Telegonus by the will of golden Aphrodite. And they ruled over the famous Tyrenians, very far off in a recess of the holy islands.)

to Roman origins are taken by some as evidence of an ongoing Greek academic interest in Rome, of which we have but scant evidence.²⁰

Rome: a City of the Greek World

The view of Rome as essentially Greek in origin seems to have survived through much of the early discourse of the Greek Mediterranean. Plutarch relates a fascinating anecdote from Heraclides Ponticus, a writer of the fourth century BC, whose account he considers trustworthy, due to the author's relatively close chronological connection to events portrayed.²¹ He informs us that news of Rome's fall to the barbarians reached all the way to Greece. The excerpt of Heraclides which he uses as proof provides a fascinating piece of evidence, and is worth quoting in whole:

ἀπολειπόμενος ἐν τῷ Περὶ ψυχῆς συγγράμματι φησιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας λόγον κατασχεῖν, ὡς στρατὸς ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων ἐλθὼν ἔξωθεν ἤρήκοι πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα Ῥώμην, ἐκεῖ που κατακλιμένην περὶ τὴν μεγάλην θάλασσαν²²

“In his treatise *“On the Soul,”* Heraclides says that out of the West a story prevailed, how an army of Hyperboreans had come from afar and captured a Greek city called Rome, situated somewhere on the shores of the Great Sea.”

While Plutarch identifies the references to “Hyperboreans” and “the Great Sea” as fabulous exaggerations, he takes no issue at all with the identification of Rome as a “Greek” city.

This account, taken from a source predating extensive interactions between Romans and Greeks, indicates a strand of Greek thought, stretching from early times even into the

²⁰ Engels, Johannes. "Agathokles (472)." *Brill's New Jacoby*. Editor in Chief: Ian Worthington (University of Missouri). Brill Online, 2016.

²¹ Plut. *Cam.* 22.2: Ἡρακλείδης γὰρ ὁ Ποντικὸς οὐ πολὺ τῶν χρόνων ἐκείνων (For indeed Heraclides Ponticus was not far from those times.)

²² Plut. *Cam.* 22.2.

Empire, which viewed Rome as Greek in origin, at least on a vague and undefined level.²³

The backdrop of his story is the war between barbarians and Romans in the fourth century BC.²⁴ Concerning this war, Polybius relates that:

Τὰς μὲν οὖν ἀρχὰς οὐ μόνον τῆς χώρας ἐπεκράτουν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν σύγγενους πολλοὺς ὑπηκόους ἐπεποίητο, τῇ τόλμῃ καταπεπληγμένους.²⁵

“On their first invasion they not only conquered this country but reduced to subjection many of the neighboring peoples, striking terror into them by their audacity.”

Directly before this account however, Polybius discusses the social affairs, interactions and proclivities of these barbarians, providing a contrast and distinction between them and the early Romans with whom they were at war. While by itself not necessarily indicative of a specific Greek attitude toward Romans, when taken with the evidence of Heraclides’ account, it illustrates that they were viewed differently than barbarians.

The geographer Strabo, writing in the late first century BC, likewise provides intriguing anecdotal evidence for this Greek-Roman relation. In his treatment of the Roman coastal city of Antium, he makes passing reference to the naval history of the inhabitants of Antium who, in former times, engaged in piracy against the Greeks of the eastern Mediterranean. In light of this piracy, Demetrius Poliorcetes (337–283 BC), the Antigonid ruler of Macedon after Alexander, sent messengers to the Romans, declaring that their conduct was unsuitable:

²³ Early 4th century: see footnote 6.

²⁴ Diodorus Siculus (14.113.1) identifies these invaders as Celts, to which Polybius (13.6-12) agrees, while Dionysius of Halicarnassus (13.6-12) considers them Gauls. In either case, they are clearly barbarians.

²⁵ Polyb. 2.18. 1-2, describing events taking place in 390 B.C.

οὐκ ἀξιοῦν δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἄνδρας στρατηγεῖν τε ἅμα τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ ληστήρια ἐκπέμπειν, καὶ ἐν μὲν τῇ ἀγορᾷ Διοσκούρων ἱερὸν ἰδρυσαμένους τιμᾶν, οὓς πάντες Σωτῆρας ὀνομάζουσιν, εἰς δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πέμπειν τὴν ἐκείνων πατρίδα τοὺς λεηλατήσοντας.²⁶

“He did not deem it right for men to be sending out bands of pirates at the same time that they were in command of Italy, or to build in their Forum a temple in honor of the Dioscuri, and to worship them, whom all call Saviors, and yet at the same time send to Greece people who would plunder the native land of the Dioscuri.”

Drawing on this shared cultural background, Demetrius magnanimously releases the captured Roman pirates, for the sake of the shared connection of Greeks and Romans:

χαρίζεσθαι μὲν αὐτοῖς ἔφη τὰ σώματα διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας συγγένειαν.²⁷

“He was doing the Romans the favor of sending back the captives because of the kinship between the Romans and the Greeks.”

Once again, we must rely on a later source to illuminate an earlier sentiment. The chronological leap notwithstanding, the presence of such literary references indicates a certain level of hypothetical collegiality between Greeks and Romans, which would not have existed between Greeks and unrefined barbarians. Much additional anecdotal evidence is present in the corpus of Greek literature. A shadowy figure named Memnon of Heraklea relates that:²⁸

²⁶ Strabo, 5.3.5.

²⁷ Strabo, 5. 3 .5.

²⁸ Biographical Essay from *Brill's New Jacoby*: “In effect nothing is known about Memnon of Heraklea. It is even impossible to fix his date with any accuracy. Suggestions range from the time of Julius Caesar to ‘before Hadrian’ and well into the 2nd century AD. All that survives of his *History* is a synopsis of Books nine to sixteen. This was made in the mid 800s AD by the Byzantine patriarch Photius and is contained in his *Bibliotheca*.”

ὅπως τε ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ διαβαίνοντι, καὶ γράψαντι ἢ κρατεῖν, ἐὰν ἄρχειν δύνωνται, ἢ τοῖς κρείττοσιν ὑπέικειν, στέφανον χρυσοῦν ἀπὸ ἰκανῶν ταλάντων Ῥωμαῖοι ἐξέπεμψαν.²⁹

“He told how the Romans, when Alexander was crossing to Asia and had written to them saying that they would either prevail, if they were capable of ruling, or would submit to stronger forces, dispatched to him a golden crown weighing a considerable number of talents.”

While the actual historicity of this event can very justly be called into question, it does betray a cultural memory of a sentiment of friendliness between Greeks and Romans.

Turning to a Roman source, Pliny the Elder confirms the existence of an embassy from the Romans to Alexander, citing the ancient author Clitarchus:

*Theopompus, ante quem nemo mentionem habuit, urbem dum taxat a Gallis captam dixit, Clitarchus ab eo proximus legationem tantum ad Alexandrum missam.*³⁰

Theopompus, before whom nobody mentioned them, merely states that Rome was taken by the Gauls, and Clitarchus, the next after him, only that an embassy was sent to Alexander.”

Assuming that Pliny correctly cites Clitarchus, he is a valuable early source.³¹ Diodorus Siculus identifies Clitarchus as a contemporary of Alexander. This lends a certain credibility to Clitarchus’ account, as the event was well within the time of his writing.

Arrian also references the alleged embassy, citing Aristos and Asklepiades as the source of the story, concerning the veracity of which he declares himself undecided.³²

²⁹ Memnon, *Frag. Grae. Hist.* 434 F 18.2.

³⁰ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* III, 57-58.

³¹ Diodorus Siculus identifies Clitarchus a contemporary of Alexander: ὡς δὲ Κλείταρχος καὶ τῶν ὕστερον μετ’ Ἀλεξάνδρου διαβάντων εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν τινὲς ἀνέγραψαν. (But according to the account of Cleitarchus and certain of those who at a later time crossed into Asia with Alexander.) (Dio. 2.7.3)

³² Arrian, *Anabasis* 7.15.5-6: καὶ τοῦτο οὔτε ὡς ἀπρεκὲς οὔτε ὡς ἄπιστον πάντη ἀνέγραψα (I have recorded this embassy as neither true nor wholly lacking in credibility.)

Respect and Interest

The friendliness and respect shown between the Romans and Greeks in the time before substantive political interactions had taken place, while discoverable primarily through references in later works, are nevertheless attested. This provides evidence of an amicable, if ignorant view of Rome on the part of the Greek speakers of the eastern Mediterranean. The Trojan motif proved quite enduring. The first military confrontation between Romans and Greeks, the invasion of Italy by Pyrrhus in 280 BC, seems to have involved rhetoric equating the Romans with the Trojans.³³ Nevertheless the conduct of the war seems to indicate a certain mutual respect among the adversaries, betokened by gestures of generosity. Pyrrhus sent captured prisoners back to the Romans, unharmed and unransomed; the Romans turned over a deserter to Pyrrhus after he dishonorably offered to murder the king for the Romans.³⁴

At the onset of the engagement, Pyrrhus sent an envoy to Rome, offering a mediation between the Romans and the Italian Greeks on whose alleged behalf Pyrrhus had launched his war.³⁵ While this embassy was rejected, Pyrrhus' attempt at this very

³³ Pausanias 1.12.1-2: ταῦτα λεγόντων τῶν πρέσβεων μνήμη τὸν Πύρρον τῆς ἀλώσεως ἐσηλθε τῆς Ἰλίου, καὶ οἱ κατὰ ταῦτα ἤλιπζε χωρήσειν πολεμοῦντι· στρατεύειν γὰρ ἐπὶ Τρώων ἀποίκους Ἀχιλλέως ὦν ἀπόγονος. (When the envoys urged these considerations, Pyrrhus remembered the capture of Troy, which he took to be an omen of his success in the war, as he was a descendant of Achilles making war upon a colony of Trojans.)

³⁴ Livy, *Periochae* 13.4, 13.11.

³⁵ Plut. *Pyrr.* 16.4: προπέμψας κήρυκα πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, εἰ φίλον ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς πρὸ πολέμου δίκας λαβεῖν παρὰ τῶν Ἰταλιωτῶν, αὐτῷ δικαστῆι καὶ διαλλακτῆι χρησαμένους. (Having first sent a herald to the Romans with the enquiry whether it was

Greek solution indicates that he did not view the Romans as utterly foreign and unhellenic.³⁶ Plutarch also indicates that these interactions with Romans stirred the interest of Cineas, a statesman and philosopher in the service of Pyrrhus, who conducted inquiries into the life, customs, and government of the Romans.³⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus confirms that the Pyrrhic war provided an impetus for increased Greek interest in Rome. He identifies Hieronymus of Cardia as the first Greek historian to write a history of the Romans, which concluded with a treatment of the Pyrrhic War.³⁸ That this event engendered further Greek interest in Rome is also indicated by Dionysius' comment that Timaeus of Sicily not only included the Romans in his general history, but also penned a separate work about the Pyrrhic War.³⁹ Despite his Sicilian origin, Timaeus

their pleasure, before waging war, to receive satisfaction from the Italian Greeks, employing him as arbiter and mediator.)

³⁶ For an examination of the nature of mediation and arbitration in Ancient Greece, see: Beck, Hans, ed. *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

³⁷ Plut. *Pyrr.* 19.4-5: λέγεται δὲ Κινέαν, ἐν ᾧ ταῦτα ἔπραττεν, ἅμα ποιησάμενον ἔργον καὶ σπουδάσαντα τῶν τε βίων γενέσθαι θεατὴν καὶ τῆς πολιτείας τὴν ἀρετὴν κατανοῆσαι, καὶ διὰ λόγων ἐλθόντα πρωκτός τοῖς ἀρίστοις τὰ τε ἄλλα τῷ Πύρρῳ φράσαι. (It is said, too, that Cineas, while he was on this mission, made it his earnest business at the same time to observe the life and manners of the Romans, and to understand the excellences of their form of government; he also conversed with their best men, and had many things to tell Pyrrhus.)

³⁸ 1.6.1: πρώτου μὲν, ὅσα κάμει εἰδέναι, τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν ἐπιδραμόντος Ἱερωνύμου τοῦ Καρδιανοῦ συγγραφέως ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν Ἐπιγόνων πραγματείᾳ. (The first historian, so far as I am aware, to touch upon the early period of the Romans was Hieronymus of Cardia, in his work on the Epigoni) Cary, E., *Loeb*, vol. 319, pg. 19, fn. 3, "Hieronymus wrote a history of the Diadochi (the immediate successors of Alexander) and of their sons, sometimes called the Epigoni (cf. Diodorus i. 3), covering the period down to the war of Pyrrhus in Italy."

³⁹ 1.6.1 ἔπειτα Τιμαίου τοῦ Σικελιώτου τὰ μὲν ἀρχαῖα τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς ἱστορίαις ἀφηγησαμένου, τοὺς δὲ πρὸς Πύρρον τὸν Ἡπειρώτην πολέμους εἰς ἰδίαν καταχωρίσαντος πραγματείαν· (After him Timaeus of Sicily related the beginnings

spent the majority of his life in Athens, residing there continuously for over fifty years.⁴⁰ It was in Athens that he composed his historical works. His keen interest in the Pyrrhic war, while likely influenced by his Sicilian origin, should not be dismissed as a mere local interest.

Thus, the views of Rome expressed through the literary evidence present a generally positive view, while some authors presented the Romans as springing from a barbarian source, many authors assigned to Rome a familial origin. Assessing a Greek or Trojan ancestry for the Romans served to incorporate them into the Greek world, and distinguish them from the barbarians. The early fragmentary references to Rome treat it as a city of the Greek world, recording incidents that indicate an intellectual atmosphere in which a cultural commonality was shared with the Romans, and least on a theoretical level. Furthermore, even in the absence of actual experience and contact with Romans, Greek authors tended to display positive attitudes toward them. This attitude was demonstrated by the respectful and diplomatic nature of Pyrrhus' interactions with the Romans, even in the context of military conflict. Nevertheless, as Roman power grew, the Greeks were forced to reckon with Rome as a reality, and not necessarily a friendly, familial reality.

of their history in his general history and treated in a separate work the wars with Pyrrhus of Epirus.)

⁴⁰ Polyb. 12.25h.1.

CHAPTER THREE

Renewed Interest

As the relationship between Greeks and Romans continued to evolve, especially in light of Roman success in the Pyrrhic War, changes in attitude were inevitable. In this chapter, I shall examine the attitudes of Greeks toward Rome evinced following Rome's first military engagement with Greeks and through the period of Rome's nascent hegemony. Despite the cultural differences and sometimes hostile climate which developed as the Roman eagle spread its wings over the Hellenic world, the Greek idea that the Romans were to be identified in a class separate from the barbarians continued.¹ There is much evidence to suggest that Romans were seen to be worthy of a higher measure of respect, even approaching a practical identification of the Romans as honorary Greeks. The Romans were viewed as a people with whom one could reasonably associate, in contrast to the barbarians, whose uncivilized nature made them naturally distinct from Greeks.²

¹ Browing puts forth the suggestion that a tripartite division of the world into Romans, Greeks, and barbarians might best accommodate the literary evidence, Browing, R., "Greeks and Others: From Antiquity to the Renaissance." T. Harrison (Ed.), *Greeks And Barbarians*, New York: Routledge, 2002: 262.

² Nippel, W., *The Construction of the "Other."* Trans. A. Nevill. In Harrison, Thomas, 2002: 291; Isocrates, 4.184, 12.163; Plato, *Republic*, 469b–471b, *Menexenus*, 242d.

Writing shortly after the Pyrrhic War, Timaeus of Tauromenium provides the first systematic historical inquiries into Roman history.³ Timaeus' attested interest in the Pyrrhic War, sets that particular event apart as a point of development in Greek interest in Rome.⁴ Polybius describes for us a fragment of Timaeus' own scholarship concerning Roman origins:

καὶ μὴν ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Πύρρου πάλιν φησὶ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους ἔτι νῦν ὑπόμνημα ποιουμένους τῆς κατὰ τὸ Ἴλιον ἀπωλείας, ἐν ἡμέραι τινὶ κατακοντίζειν ἵππον πολεμιστὴν πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐν τῷ Κάμπῳ καλουμένῳ, διὰ τὸ τῆς Τροίας τὴν ἄλωσιν διὰ τὸν ἵππον γενέσθαι τὸν δούριον προσαγορευόμενον.⁵

“And indeed in his writings on Pyrrhus again he says that the Romans even now have a memorial ceremony commemorating the taking of Troy, on which day they shoot down a war-horse before the city in the so-called Campus, on account of the fact that the sack of Troy happened because of the wooden horse.”

The large amount of ancient scholarship dedicated to attacking Timaeus indicates that his work was well-known and influential enough to merit such efforts.⁶ If Timaeus' views did

³ Biographical notes from: Champion, Craige B. “Timaios”, *Brill's New Jacoby*. Editor in Chief: Ian Worthington, Brill Online, 2016: “Timaios (ca. 356-260 BC), son of Andromachos, of Sicilian Tauromenion, was the most important Greek historian of the western Mediterranean before Polybios. Timaios's historical work comprised thirty-eight books (F 35a, cf. T 6a with Commentary, T 8). He was renowned as a great prose stylist (T 20, with Commentary, T 21). The last five books were considerably detailed, treating in depth the time of Agathokles (T 8). Timaios's main work, apart from the monograph on Pyrrhos (T 9a, T 9b, T 19, F 36), concluded either with the death of Pyrrhus in 272 BC or before the Romans crossed over into Sicily in 264 BC. The latter is almost a certainty (Commentary to T 6a)”

⁴ Polyb. 1.5.1 states that: “ὑποθησόμεθα δὲ ταύτης ἀρχὴν τῆς βύβλου τὴν πρώτην διάβασιν ἐξ Ἰταλίας Ῥωμαίων· αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν συνεχῆς μὲν τοῖς ἀφ' ὧν Τίμαιος ἀπέλιπεν, πίπτει δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐνάτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατὸν ὀλυμπιάδα. (I will take as the starting-point of this book the first crossing of the Romans overseas from Italy. This follows immediately upon the place where Timaios left off and took place in the 129th Olympiad)

⁵ Polyb. 12.4b.1-4c.1.

⁶ Not only Polybius, but also Istros (*Brill's New Jacoby*: 334), Polemon (*Frag. Graec. Hist.* 857A), Artemidoros (*Brill's New Jacoby*: 438), Philodemos, Diodorus,

not express some cultural currency, it is unlikely that so much ink would have been spilt against them. Concerning Timaeus' aforementioned argument for the Trojan origin of the Romans, Polybius provides the criticism:

πρᾶγμα πάντων παιδαριωδέστατον· οὕτω μὲν γὰρ δεήσει πάντας τοὺς βαρβάρους λέγειν Τρώων ἀπογόνους ὑπάρχειν· σχεδὸν γὰρ πάντες, εἰ δὲ μή γ' οἱ πλείους, ὅταν ἢ πολεμεῖν μέλλωσιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἢ διακινδυνεύειν πρὸς τινὰς ὀλοσχερῶς, ἵππῳ προθύονται καὶ σφαγιάζονται, σημειούμενοι τὸ μέλλον ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ζώου πτώσεως, ὃ δὲ Τίμαιος περὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς ἀλογίας οὐ μόνον ἀπειρίαν, ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον ὀψιμαθίαν δοκεῖ μοι πολλὴν ἐπιφαίνειν, ὅς γε διότι θύουσιν ἵππον, εὐθέως ὑπέλαβε τοῦτο ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς διὰ τὸ τὴν Τροίαν ἀπὸ ἵππου δοκεῖν ἐαλωκέναι.⁷

“This is a most childlike statement. For in that case it would be necessary to say that all of the barbarians were descendants of the Trojans, since nearly all of them, or at least the majority, when they are about to go to war or are on the brink of a decisive battle, offer and sacrifice a horse, divining the issue from the way in which it falls. Timaios concerning this part of the irrational practice seems to me to display not only ignorance but also poor education in simply assuming that they sacrifice a horse because Troy was supposed to have been taken by means of a horse”

Contrary to Craige Champion's interpretation, Polybius does not here seem to be taking issue with the idea of a Trojan origin story for the Romans, but rather specifically attacking the methodology of Timaeus' argument.⁸ Furthermore, by saying that such an argument's logical conclusion is a Trojan ancestry for barbarians, and presenting such a conclusion as ridiculous, Polybius distinguishes a patent division in Greek conceptions between Romans and barbarians. He does not question why Timaeus' would associate the Romans with the Trojans. Since Polybius does not hesitate to criticize Timaeus, the

Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Caecilius (*Brill's New Jacoby*: 183), Josephus, Plutarch, and Clement of Alexandria wrote against Timaeus.

⁷ Polyb. 12.4b.1-4c.1.

⁸ See: Champion, Craige. "Romans as BAPBAPOI: Three Polybian Speeches and the Politics of Cultural Indeterminacy." *Classical Philology* 95, 2000: 425-444.

tacit acceptance of the Timaeus' underlying assertion of the Trojan origins of Rome indicates that Polybius viewed it as an accepted idea in Timaeus' time. The *reductio ad absurdam* which he engages in by asserting that Timaeus' methodology could even be used to justify assigning a Trojan origin to barbarians further reinforces the idea that the Romans are not to be classed with the barbarians.

Nevertheless the question of Roman identity seems to have continued to elicit different answers in the Greek world of the third century BC. Eratosthenes the mathematician is reported by Strabo as having expressed that Romans, while barbarian, were civilized in nature:⁹

Ἐπὶ τέλει δὲ τοῦ ὑπομνήματος οὐκ ἐπαινέσας τοὺς δίχα διαιροῦντας ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πλῆθος εἰς τε Ἑλληνας καὶ βαρβάρους, καὶ τοὺς Ἀλεξάνδρῳ παραινοῦντας τοῖς μὲν Ἑλλησιν ὡς φίλοις χρῆσθαι, τοῖς δὲ βαρβάροις ὡς πολεμίοις, βέλτιον εἶναι φησὶν ἀρετῆ καὶ κακίᾳ διαιρεῖν ταῦτα. πολλοὺς γὰρ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἶναι κακοὺς καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἀστείους, καθάπερ Ἰνδοὺς καὶ Ἀριανούς, ἔτι δὲ Ῥωμαίους καὶ Καρχηδονίους, οὕτω θαυμαστῶς πολιτευομένου.¹⁰

“Now, towards the end of his treatise—after withholding praise from those who divide the whole multitude of mankind into two groups, namely, Greeks and barbarians, and also from those who advised Alexander to treat the Greeks as friends but the barbarians as enemies—Eratosthenes goes on to say that it would be better to make such divisions according to good qualities and bad qualities; for not only are many of the Greeks bad, but many of the barbarians are refined—Indians and Arians, for example, and, further, Romans and Carthaginians, who carry on their governments so admirably.”

While contrasting with Timaeus and earlier sources by referring to the Romans as barbarians, Eratosthenes negates the barbarian idea adding the qualifying ἀστείους. Furthermore the context of this identification is itself undermining the strict distinction

⁹ Strabo (1.2.2) describes him as a student of Zeno (who died 262 BC), which indicates a birth year of perhaps 285 or earlier.

¹⁰ Strabo, 1.4.9.

between Greek and non-Greek, a distinction which had always been a hallmark of Greek thought.¹¹ Even as far back as the fourth century B.C., the strictly racial delineation of Greek vis-à-vis barbarian had begun to erode. Isocrates the orator claimed, in reference to Athenian oratory and governance, that:

τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα πεποίηκε μηκέτι τοῦ γένους ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν εἶναι,¹²

“The name “Hellenes” suggests no longer a race but an intelligence.”

By acknowledging the well-governed nature of the Romans, Eratosthenes is lifting them from the category of the true barbarians and aligning them more closely with the Greeks. This distinguishing of Romans from barbarians is the same distinction which was drawn by Polybius.

Honorary Greeks

Further evidence that a significant strain within Greek thought viewed the Romans in the light of familial identity may be found in 228 BC, in the aftermath of Rome's first expeditionary war across the Adriatic.¹³ Having sent legates to various Greek states to explain their military venture in a region so close to the motherland of mainland Greece, Polybius informs us that:

τυχόντες δὲ παρ' ἑκατέρου τῶν ἐθνῶν τῆς καθηκούσης φιλανθρωπίας αὐθις ἀπέπλευσανεῖς τὴν Κέρκυραν, ἱκανοῦ τινος ἀπολελυκότες φόβου τοῦς Ἕλληνας

¹¹ For a full treatment, see: Browning, 2002.

¹² Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 50.

¹³ Rome defeated the regent queen of Ardea for her refusal to stop the piracy of Illyrian tribesmen against Roman commercial interests. (Polyb. 2.8:8-9)

διὰ τὰς προειρημένας συνθήκας, οὐ γὰρ τισὶν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι, τότε κοινούς ἐχθρούς εἶναι συνέβαινε τοὺς Ἰλλυριοὺς.¹⁴

“After meeting with all due courtesy from both the leagues (Achean and Aetolian), they returned by sea to Corcyra, having by the conclusion of this treaty, delivered the Greeks from no inconsiderable dread; for the Illyrians were then not the enemies of this people or that, but the common enemies of all.”

This account, painting the Romans as saviors, certainly does not lend itself to the idea that there was yet a commonly held negative view toward the Romans. Polybius furthermore goes on to add the detail that:

ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης τῆς καταρχῆς Ῥωμαῖοι μὲν εὐθέως ἄλλους πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλαν πρὸς Κορινθίους καὶ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, ὅτε δὴ καὶ Κορίνθιοι πρῶτον ἀπεδέξαντο μετέχειν Ῥωμαίους τοῦ τῶν Ἰσθμίων ἀγῶνος.¹⁵

“But having thus begun, the Romans immediately afterward sent other envoy to Athens and Corinth, on which occasion the Corinthians first admitted them to participation in the Isthmian games.”

This event underlines the nature of Romans as being delineated from barbarians, and considered to be at least honorary Greeks, since festivals such as the Isthmian games were Panhellenic events, open to all Greeks, but closed to barbarians.¹⁶

¹⁴ Polyb. 2.12.4-6.

¹⁵ Polyb. 2.12.8.

¹⁶ Herodotus, 5.22 states that: “Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ ἀεθλεύειν ἐλομένου καὶ καταβάντος ἐπ’ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, οἱ ἀντιθευσόμενοι Ἑλλήνων ἐξεῖργόν μιν, φάμενοι οὐ βαρβάρων ἀγωνιστέων εἶναι τὸν ἀγῶνα ἀλλὰ Ἑλλήνων· Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἀπέδεξε ὡς εἴη Ἀργεῖος, ἐκρίθη τε εἶναι Ἕλληνα καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον συνεξέπιπτε τῷ πρώτῳ. (For when Alexander chose to contend and entered the lists for that purpose, the Greeks who were to run against him were for barring him from the race, saying that the contest should be for Greeks and not for foreigners; but Alexander proving himself to be an Argive, he was judged to be a Greek; so he contended in the furlong race and ran a dead heat for the first place.) And Plut. *Thes.* 25:4-5: καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα πρῶτος ἔθηκε κατὰ ζῆλον Ἡρακλέους, ὡς δι’ ἐκεῖνον Ὀλύμπια τῷ Διί, καὶ δι’ αὐτὸν Ἰσθμια τῷ Ποσειδῶνι φιλοτιμηθεὶς ἄγειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας. (He also instituted the games here, in emulation of Heracles, being ambitious that as the Hellenes, by that hero’s appointment, celebrated

Hostile Witnesses

Nevertheless, the affiliation with the Romans felt by the Greek world does not preclude a chilling of Greek attitudes in response to increasing Roman military activity.¹⁷ Testaments to hostile Greek attitudes toward the Romans are provided by Polybius in his narration of several speeches given by Greek leaders. While separated by a sizable span of time from the action that his narrative describes, Polybius' own historical methodology precludes the invention of historical events for the sake of illustrating a point, so it is reasonable to consider his recording of these speeches as a trustworthy retelling of the historical facts.¹⁸ The earliest speech he records, from Agelaus of Naupactus, takes place in 217 B.C., during a peace conference among the Greeks. In this speech, Agelaus utters an impassioned plea to the assembled Greeks, beseeching unity in the face of impending doom from the west, represented by Rome and Carthage:

ὅς ἔφη δεῖν μάλιστα μὲν μηδέποτε πολεμεῖν τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀλλήλοις, ἀλλὰ μεγάλην χάριν ἔχειν τοῖς θεοῖς, εἰ λέγοντες ἐν καὶ ταῦτὸ πάντες καὶ συμπλέκοντες τὰς χεῖρας, καθάπερ οἱ τοὺς ποταμοὺς διαβαίνοντες, δύναιτο τὰς τῶν βαρβάρων ἐφόδους ἀποτριβόμενοι συσσώζειν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰς πόλεις.¹⁹

Olympian games in honour of Zeus, so by his own appointment they should celebrate Isthmian games in honour of Poseidon.)

¹⁷ As any inquiry into Greek history will show, Greeks certainly did not shy away from violence against others identified as Greeks.

¹⁸ Agelaus of Naupactus: c. 221 BC; Lyciscus, c. 210 BC; For a defense of the historicity of Polybius' accounts, see: Walbank, Frank William. *A historical commentary on Polybius*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957: 13-14.

¹⁹ Polyb. 5.104.1.

“It would be best of all if the Greeks never made war on each other, but regarded it as the highest favor in the gift of the gods could they speak ever with one heart and voice, and marching arm in arm like men fording a river, repel barbarian invaders and unite in preserving themselves and their cities.”

Agelaus then goes on to say that whether the Romans or the Carthaginians prevail in their struggle against each other, the victor is likely to have designs on mainland Greece.

While certainly betraying a view antithetical to Roman expansion, Agelaus nevertheless does not directly level the title of barbarian at the Romans or Carthaginians, but rather contrasts the ideal situation of unified Greeks carrying the banner of Hellas against the barbarians, with the actual reality of impending subjection by the Romans. This reference to the Romans and the Carthaginians, while certainly negative, falls short of actually condemning Romans as barbarians, but rather serves to warn of the great danger they pose, perhaps even more so than the barbarians.²⁰

The second speech recorded was delivered at Sparta in 210 B.C., as the Aetolians and Macedonians both sought Greek allies in their war with each other. In this speech, Lyciscus, an Acarnian envoy of the Macedonians berates the Aetolian ambassadors for their city's alliance with Rome, saying:

ὦ Κλεόνικε καὶ Χλαινεά, τίνας ἔχοντες συμμάχους τότε παρεκαλεῖτε τούτους εἰς τὴν κοινοπραγίαν; ἄρ' οὐ πάντας Ἕλληνας; τίσι δὲ νῦνκοινωνεῖτε τῶν ἐλπίδων, ἢ πρὸς ποίαν παρακαλεῖτε τούτους συμμαχίαν; ἄρ' οὐ πρὸς τὴν τῶν βαρβάρων;²¹

²⁰ Wiedemann, Thomas. "Rhetoric in Polybius." *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries BC*, ed. H. Verdin, G. Schepens, and E. de Keyser 1990: 298. Concerning Polybius' account of the first Carthaginian war, Wiedemann says that “Polybius seems to be indicating that he is uncertain whether Hannibal is civilized or barbarous.” If Polybius is unwilling to dismiss the Carthaginians as barbarians, it is unlikely that this passage serves to indicate such a view of the Romans.

²¹ Polyb. 5.37.4-6.

“I ask you, therefore, Cleonicus and Chlaeneas, what allies had you when you first invited the Spartans to act with you? Were they not all Greeks? But who make common cause with you at present or what kind of alliance do you invite them to enter? Is it not an alliance with barbarians?”

The envoy makes several more direct references to Romans as barbarians, and attributes to them wanton violence.²² The context of this declaration indicates that it served as a polemic, rather than a cultural observation, and does not prove a general change in sentiment concerning the semi-Greek status of the Romans, but rather reinforces it.

Preceding the speech of Lyciscus, the Aetolian ambassador had made a cutting attack against the Macedonians, in which he presented them as the other, the enemy invader.

Chlaeneas the Aetolian begins thus:

“Ὅτι μὲν οὖν, ὧ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, τὴν Μακεδόνων δυναστείαν ἀρχὴν συνέβη γεγονέναι τοῖς Ἑλλησι δουλείας, οὐδ’ ἄλλως εἰπεῖν οὐδένα πέπεισμαιτολμῆσαι.”²³

“Men of Lacedaemon, I am convinced indeed that no one would venture to deny that the slavery of Greece owes its origin to the kings of Macedon.”

He is here setting up the Macedonians as inimical to the freedom of the Greeks, and foreign to the society of the Greek states. And again he draws the division:

Καὶ μὴν περὶ τῶν διαδεξαμένων τούτου τὰ πράγματα πῶς κέχρηται τοῖς Ἑλλησι, τί με δεῖ κατὰ μέρος λέγειν.²⁴

“And as for the successors of Alexander, need I tell you in detail how they treated the Greeks?”

²² Polyb. 5.38.5, 5.38.7.

²³ Polyb. 9.28.1.

²⁴ Polyb. 9.29.1-2.

His oration continues in such a vein, distinguishing the Macedonians from the Greeks, and attributing to them wanton violence, impiety, and offenses against the Greeks.

Toward the end of his oration, he adds the hope that:

Φίλιππον δὲ πάντως πέπεισμαι λήξειν τῆς ὀρμῆς κατὰ μὲν γῆν ὑπ’ Αἰτωλῶν πολεμούμενον, κατὰ δὲ θάλατταν ὑπὸ τε Ῥωμαίων καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀττάλου.²⁵

“As for Philip, I feel sure that his aggressiveness will soon cease with the Aetolians fighting him on land and the Romans and King Attalus at sea.”

Chlaeneas thus demonstrates the point of his oration: that Macedonians are aggressively violent and antithetical to Greece, and that the Romans are fighting for the cause of Greece’s deliverance, just as in the case of Rome’s war against Illyria, as mentioned above. Polybius remarks upon the reasonableness of this oration, saying:

Ὁ μὲν οὖν Χλαινεάς τοιαῦτα διαλεχθεὶς καὶ δόξας δυσαντιρρήτως εἰρηκέναι κατέπαυσε τὸν λόγον.²⁶

“Chlaeneas after speaking in these terms which seemed difficult to refute, here ended his harangue.”

It was in light of this formulation of the situation, which paints the Macedonians as non-Greeks and implicit barbarians, that Lyciscus resorts to such a tactic in his attack upon the Romans.

²⁵ Polyb. 9.30.7.

²⁶ Polyb. 9.31.7.

The Macedonian Connection

The Macedonians, like the Romans, had an ambiguous status in the Hellenic worldview.²⁷ Thus, rather than speaking to a general sentiment that the Romans were to be classed as simple barbarians, Lyciscus above is actually responding in kind to the accusation of Chlaeneas, taking the form and material of the accusation against the Macedonians and applying it instead to the Romans, indicating at least a superficial similarity in their status in the Greek world.

This enmity, between Romans and Macedonians, or rather particular hostility toward the Romans on the part of the Macedonians, is attested throughout the remainder of the century. Furthermore, the usage of the title barbarian in reference to the Romans seems to happen almost entirely in the context of affairs involving the Macedonians.²⁸ The attested references to the Romans as barbarians were not singular accusations leveled by Greeks, but are rather recycled rhetorical attacks used by Greeks against the

²⁷ For a full treatment of the Macedonian question, see: Badian, Ernst. "Greeks and Macedonians." *Studies in the History of Art* 10 (1982): 33-51.

²⁸ Livy records a speech of a Macedonian ambassador decrying the Romans foreignness: *Furor est si alienigenae homines, plus lingua et moribus et legibus quam maris terrarumque spatio discreti, haec tenuerint, sperare quicquam eodem statu mansurum* (31:29 12) (It is madness to hope that anything will remain in the same condition if foreigners, separated from us more by language, manners and laws than by the space of land and sea, shall gain control.) The Athenians respond to this accusation by identifying Philip the Macedonian as the true barbarian: *Verum enim vero id se queri, quod is qui Romanos alienigenas et barbaros vocet adeo omnia simul divina humanaque iura polluerit, ut priore populatione cum infernis deis, secunda cum superis bellum nefarium gesserit* (31:30:4) (But they did, however, complain that he who calls the Romans aliens and barbarians had so polluted human and divine law alike that on his first raid he had waged impious war on the gods of the world below, on his second, with the gods above.) And they conclude by saying: *Urbis quoque suae similem deformitatem futuram fuisse, nisi Romani subvenissent.* (31:30:9) (Their city too would have suffered the same despoliation if the Romans had not come to its aid.)

Macedonians, presented by Greeks favorable to the Macedonians or by Macedonians themselves. Plutarch even records the contrast between the conception of the Romans which the Macedonians attempted to propagate and the impressions garnered by Greeks:

ἀκούοντες γὰρ τῶν Μακεδόνων ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἄρχων βαρβάρου στρατιᾶς ἔπεισι δι' ὅπλων πάντα καταστρεφόμενος καὶ δουλούμενος, εἶτα ἀπαντῶντες ἀνδρὶ τὴν τε ἡλικίαν νέῳ καὶ τὴν ὄψιν φιλανθρώπῳ, φωνὴν τε καὶ διάλεκτον Ἑλληνι καὶ τιμῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐραστῇ, θαυμασίως ἐκηλοῦντο, καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀπιόντες ἐνεπίπλασαν εὐνοίας τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς ἐχούσας ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἐλευθερίας.²⁹

“For they had heard the Macedonians say that a commander of a barbarian host was coming against them, who subdued and enslaved everywhere by force of arms; and then, when they met a man who was young in years, humane in aspect, a Greek in voice and language, and a lover of genuine honor, they were wonderfully charmed, and when they returned to their cities they filled them with kindly feelings towards him and the belief that in him they had a champion of their liberties.”

Thus, it seems that a significant portion of the anti-Roman views being expressed in Greek literature toward the end of the 3rd century has less to do with the sentiments of Greeks as it does with the politics of the Macedonian kings, to whose hegemony over mainland Greece Rome was a great obstacle. While elements of anti-Roman sentiment were certainly heard in this era, they do not seem to have amounted to a rejection of the familial origin account which had previously been prominent in Greek literature. While Greek literature concerning Rome's origins does not seem to have continued to be composed at this time, the attitudes which they represent endured and are demonstrated in the interactions between Romans and Greeks. The shifting political atmosphere was forcing Greeks to reckon with Rome as a concrete reality, instead of a cultural curiosity; diplomatic interchange replaced scholarly inquiry, but both were flavored by the same underlying view of Rome. The “indeterminate cultural position” of the Romans in the

²⁹ Plut. *Flam.* 5.4-6.

Greek conception, in combination with the hegemonic struggle against the Macedonians, contributed to the very different attitudes toward Rome attested in the literature at this time.³⁰

³⁰ Champion 2000: 442.

CHAPTER FOUR

Rome's Attention Shifts East: Responses to Active Involvement

With Roman involvement in Greece having become a concrete reality, events transpired rapidly, changing the nature of Rome's relationship with the Greek states. Rome's sudden transformation into the dominant presence in the Greek world at the opening of the second century BC, cannot be disputed. Eric Gruen refers to this time as the dawn of a new era, a time in which Rome “established military predominance over the eastern powers.”¹ The attitudes demonstrated at the time, as presented in literature, are likewise altered from their previous disposition. The era displays a rising anti-Roman sentiment which the literature of the preceding century lacks. Nevertheless, the transformation of attitudes also encompasses a development in the pro-Romans attitudes present among the Greeks.

The origins of Rome's shift toward the east ought to be touched upon briefly, to frame Greek responses to heavily increased Roman involvement. The relatively uneventful conclusion of the First Macedonian War indicates a lack of serious Roman interest in eastward expansion.² In the arrangement of the peace several terms that should have been demanded by the Romans are conspicuous by their absence.³ Gruen

¹ Gruen, Erich S. *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*. Vol. 1. Univ of California Press, 1984: 325.

² Peace of Phoenice, 205 BC. (Livy, 29.12)

³ E.g. Philip's surrender of Atintania.

cites this as proof of Roman disinterest.⁴ Other scholars contend that the treaty was designed to fail, “creating conditions which led almost inevitably to an appeal for military help”.⁵ This position is also held by later ancient historians, most notably Appian, who concluded his mention of the treaty by saying:

καὶ τὰς συνθήκας οὐδέτεροι βεβαίους, οὐδ’ ἀπ’ εὐνοίας, ἐδόκουν πεποιῆσθαι⁶

“And neither of them believed that the treaty was a secure one, or based on goodwill.”

Livy likewise casts doubt of the sincerity of the treaty, assigning an external cause to the Romans desire to end hostilities:

*quia verso in Africam bello omnibus aliis in praesentia levare bellis volebant.*⁷

“Since, now that the war had shifted to Africa, they wished for the present to be relieved of all other wars.”

Whether concluded for reasons of disinterest or simply more pressing needs elsewhere, the result of the First Macedonian War certainly did not bolster Greek esteem for Rome. As previously noted, certain Greeks and Macedonians had used the occasion of the war to decry Roman barbarism to the Greeks.⁸ Polybius also passes down record of a

⁴ Gruen 1984: 381.

⁵ Harris, William Vernon. *War and imperialism in Republican Rome, 327-70 BC*. Oxford University Press, 1985:208.

⁶ Appian, 9. 3.2.

⁷ Livy, 29.12.16.

⁸ In addition to previously mentioned instances, in 207, Thrasycrates, a Rhodian, attempting to procure peace between Philip and the Aetolian's during the war, harangues the Aetolians in Polyb. 11.6.1-2: Λάβετε τοίνυν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν τὴν αὐτῶν ἄγνοιαν. φατὲ μὲν γὰρ πολεμεῖν ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρὸς Φίλιππον, ἵνα σφζόμενοι μὴ ποιῶσι τοῦτῳ τὸ προστατμενον, πολεμεῖτε δ’ ἐπ’ ἐξανδραποδισμῶ καὶ καταφθορᾷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος. ταῦτα γὰρ αἱ συνθήκαι λέγουσιν ὑμῶν αἱ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους. (Consider, then, the errors you have committed. You say that you are fighting with Philip for the sake of the Greeks,

Macedonian speech highlighting the very frugal nature of Rome's actual military commitment to the war. In this anonymous speech, believed to have taken place in 209 BC, a Macedonian envoy compares Rome to a phalanx that holds itself in reserve, sending lesser troops to be slaughtered, before taking the credit for the final victory.⁹ Livy provides further instances of such an attitude.¹⁰ It seems likely that such resentment had taken root among at least some of the Greeks in light of Rome's abortive involvement, and the less than rigorous terms which were settled upon in 205 BC. Gruen identifies such resentment as a primary motive in Rome's massive campaign of advertising its newly-established hardline against Macedonian expansion after envoys from Athens, Rhodes, and Attalus, had requested Roman assistance against Philip in

that they may be delivered and may refuse to obey his commands; but as a fact you are fighting for the enslavement and ruin of Greece. This is the story your treaty with the Romans tells.) And in 11.6.6-7: καὶ κυριεύσαντες μὲν αὐτοὶ πόλεως οὐτ' ἂν ὑβρίζειν ὑπομείναιτε τοὺς ἐλευθέρους οὐτ' ἐμπιπράναι τὰς πόλεις, νομίζοντες ὡμὸν εἶναι τὸ τοιοῦτο καὶ βαβαρικόν· συνθήκας δὲ πεποιήσθε τοιαύτας, δι' ὧν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας ἐκδότους δεδώκατε τοῖς βαρβάροις εἰς τὰς αἰσχίστας ὕβρεις καὶ παρανομίας (Did you capture a city yourselves you would not allow yourselves to outrage freemen or to burn their towns, which you regard as a cruel proceeding and barbarous; but you have made a treaty by which you have given up to the barbarians all the rest of the Greeks to be exposed to atrocious outrage and violence.)

⁹ Polyb. 10:25.2: Εἶναι γὰρ τὸ νῦν γινόμενον ὁμοιότατον τῇ περὶ τὰς παρατάξεις οἰκονομία καὶ χειρισμῶ καὶ γὰρ ἐπ' ἐκείνων προκινδυνεύει μὲν ὡς ἐπίπαν καὶ προαπόλλυται τὰ κοῦφα καὶ τὰ πρακτικώτατα τῆς δυνάμεως, τὴν δ' ἐπιγραφὴν τῶν ἐκβαιόντων ἢ φάλαγξ καὶ τὰ βαρῆα λαμβάνει τῶν ὅπλων. νῦν δὲ παραπλησίως προκινδυνεύουσι μὲν Αἰτωλοὶ καὶ Πελοποννησίων οἱ τούτοις συμμαχοῦντες, ἐφεδρεύουσι δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι, φάλαγγος ἔχοντες διάθεσιν (What is happening now is exceedingly like the disposition and management of an army for battle. For in that case also the first to be exposed to danger and to suffer loss are the light and most active part of the force, whereas the phalanx and the heavy-armed troops get the credit for the result. Similarly at present those who bear the brunt of the danger are the Aetolians and those Peloponnesians who are in alliance with them, while the Romans, like a phalanx, hold themselves in reserve)

¹⁰ Livy, 29.12.1, 31.29.3.

201.¹¹ This embassy, bearing demands directed toward Philip, seemed far less concerned with delivering them to Philip than with ensuring that Rome's new position was well known to all the Greek states.¹² This follows Gruen's hypothesis that Rome's reputation among the Greeks had declined after the first Macedonian War, and was in need of restoration.

Greeks Turn to Rome: The Pact of Kings

Another vital facet of Rome's renewed interest in eastern affairs is found in the so-called "Pact of Kings" made between Philip and the Seleucid Antiochus III in 202 BC. This treaty, the terms of which Arthur Eckstein ably summarizes as: "the dismemberment of the Ptolemaic kingdom by taking brutal advantage of the weak regime of child-king Ptolemy V, and swelling Macedonian and Seleucid power by the addition of Ptolemaic lands to their possession."¹³ This event, symptomatic of the greater state of "international Anarchy" in the Greek world at the close of the third century, ultimately led to Roman involvement in renewed hostilities with the Macedonian and Seleucid forces.¹⁴ Eckstein convincingly argues against the traditional understanding of Polybius, *Histories*, 15.20.6-

¹¹ Livy, 31.1.9 – 31.2.1.

¹² Livy gives all the Roman destinations in: 31.28.3, 31.31, 31.40.7-10, 32.14.4-8, 32.19-23, and 33.16-17.

¹³ Eckstein, Arthur M. "The Pact Between the Kings, Polybius 15.20. 6, and Polybius' View of the Outbreak of the Second Macedonian War." *Classical Philology* 100, 2005: 229.

¹⁴ For a full treatment of the concept of Hellenistic international anarchy, see: Eckstein, Arthur M. *Rome enters the Greek East: from anarchy to hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230-170 BC*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

7, as an attribution of the cause of Roman involvement to mere fortune, and makes a case that the Pact of Kings and the resultant Greek pleas for Roman assistance are an integral part of Rome's return to the east.¹⁵ The Greeks' invocation of Rome to stabilize the political situation affirms a positive view of Rome, on the part of at least a significant portion of the Greek states, and establishes Rome as a recognized political player in the Hellenic eastern Mediterranean. Eckstein traces Rome's interest, not as a uniquely aggressive and bellicose power, but rather a participant in a greater power transition crisis within a broader political field.¹⁶ Eckstein's placement of Rome within the political field of the Greek world, is evinced by the Roman concern with the Pact of Kings, itself initiated by Greek embassies towards Rome. These circumstances suggest that Greeks viewed Roman participation in the Greek world as to be expected, and not necessarily a portent of subjugation. Rome had become, in a sense, part of the greater Hellenistic political scene.

¹⁵ ἐπιστήσασα Ῥωμαίους, ἀκεῖνοι κατὰ τῶν πέλας ἐβουλεύσαντο παρανόμως, ταῦτα κατ' ἐκείνων δικάίως ἐκύρωσε καὶ καθηκόντως παραντίκα γὰρ ἐκάτεροι διὰ τῶν ὄπλων ἠττηθέντες οὐ μόνον ἐκωλύθησαν τῆς τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐπιθυμίας (For even while they were still breaking their faith to each other and tearing to shreds the boy's kingdom she drew the attention of the Romans against them, and very justly and properly visited them with the very evils which they had been contrary to all law designing to bring upon others.)

¹⁶ 2008:128: Denying any particular Roman bellicosity, he writes “Without at all denying to downplaying the diplomatic and military aggressiveness of Rome, we no longer need view Rome in isolation, or view its decision as unique. We can compare Roman decisions and actions to those of the other states involved in the crisis, both the powerful and the less powerful. We can compare Roman, Antigonid, Seleucid, Ptolemaic, Attalid, Rhodian, and Athenian actions as the crisis unfolded – while recognizing that it unfolded under the synergistic impact of all these multiple actions together.” And contesting Roman imperialistic designs at this time, he reminds the reader that direct Roman rule, the ultimate result of Roman imperialism, did not come upon Greece for another 50 years.

Throughout this second conflict, Macedonian rhetoric continued to warn of Roman oppression, painting the Romans as potential despots and barbarians.¹⁷ Voices in favor of Rome also made themselves heard. In the deliberations of the Acheans in 198 BC, after speaking of the presence of factions of pro and anti-Roman sentiment in the city, Livy supplies the speech of the president of the assembly, Aristaenus. Reversing the rhetoric of the Macedonians, Aristaenus discourses on the many outrages and atrocities of the Macedonians, and urges his fellow citizens:

*Liberare vos a Philippo iam diu magis vultis quam audetis. Sine vestro labore et periculo qui vos in libertatem vindicarent, cum magnis classibus exercitibusque mare traiecerunt.*¹⁸

“For a long time you have wished, but not dared, to free yourselves from Philip. Now men have crossed the sea with mighty fleets and armies, to affirm your claims to liberty without trouble or danger on your part.”

Livy tells us that the reactions to this pronouncement were starkly divided, with many applauding and many rejecting the speech. Appian adds the detail that the majority preferred to side with Philip, in light of Roman atrocities.¹⁹ This seems to mirror directly

¹⁷ Livy 31.29.14-15, quotes a Macedonian envoy to the Aetolians: *sero ac nequiquam, cum dominum Romanum habebitis, socium Philippum quaeritis.* (Too late and all in vain will you call upon Philip to aid you when you have the Roman as master.)

¹⁸ Livy, 32.21.36.

¹⁹ Appian, 9.7: καὶ οἱ πλείονες ἠροῦντο τὰ Φιλίππου καὶ ἀπεστρέφοντο Ῥωμαίους διὰ τινὰ ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα Σουλπικίου τοῦ στρατηγοῦ παρανομήματα. ἐγκειμένων δὲ βιαίως τῶν Ῥωμαϊζόντων, οἱ πολλοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπεχώρουν δυσχεραίνοντες, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ διὰ τὴν ὀλιγότητα ἐκβιασθέντες συνέθεντο τῷ Λευκίῳ, (The greater part of them preferred the alliance of Philip and sided against the Romans on account of certain outrages against Greece committed by Sulpicius, the former commander. When the Roman faction urged their views with vehemence, most of their opponents left the assembly in disgust, and the remainder, being forced to yield by the smallness of their number, entered into an alliance with Lucius.)

Aristaenus' argument above, which perhaps indicates it was more of a rhetorical flourish than a cogent charge.

While there was certainly a trend of Greek support for Macedon over Rome at this time, the paucity of anti-Roman rhetoric not involved with Macedonian affairs seems to indicate that the opposition was circumstantial, a reaction to the political and military scenario, rather than an actual cultural judgement against the Romans. Nevertheless elements of discontent were patent. Polybius relates that:

ἐκ δὲ τούτων εὐθεώρητον ὑπάρχειν πᾶσιν ὅτι μεταλαμβάνουσι τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς πέδας παρὰ Φιλίππου Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ γίνεται μεθάρμοσις δεσποτῶν, οὐκ ἐλευθέρωσις τῶν Ἑλλήνων.²⁰

“From this anyone could easily see that the Romans were taking over from Philip the fetters of Greece, and that what was happening was a readjustment of masters and not the delivery of Greece out of servitude.”

Having explained that this is the charge which the Aetolians advanced against the Romans, he then relates that, in time, these false accusations gained currency among some Greeks.²¹ This again speaks to the dichotomy of Greek opinion at this time. While some Greeks held the Macedonian view of Rome as barbarian and oppressor, it seems that the older positive view of the Romans as part of the greater civilized world still persisted. In 196, at the Isthmian games in Corinth, Titus Flamininus, seeking to combat the growing negative attitudes toward Rome, proclaimed freedom for the Greeks,

²⁰ Polyb. 18.45.6.

²¹ Polyb. 18.45.7: Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑπ' Αἰτωλῶν ἐλέγετο κατακόρως; (Such things were being said by the Aetolians ad nauseam) 18.45.8: πλεοναζούσης δὲ τῆς τῶν Αἰτωλῶν διαβολῆς καὶ πιστευομένης παρ' ἐνίοις. (As the slanderous reflections of the Aetolians were becoming more current and were credited by some.)

relieving them of garrison and obligations of tribute.²² Both Appian and Polybius record a massive outpouring of rejoicing and thanks toward Flamininus.²³

Lycophron and the Oracles: Reverence and Apprehension

Turning from the historians, another work which provides a witness to attitudes toward Rome is Lycophron's *Alexandra*. While debate concerning the dating of the work has flourished since antiquity, the traditional dating of the work places it in the hands of Lycophron of Chalcis, in the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus²⁴; other scholarship places the authorship in the time of Ptolemy Euergetes, or even later.²⁵ Other suggested dates would place it completely out the present consideration of early Greek attitudes toward Rome.²⁶ Excellent cases have been made for an early second century dating of the text, in

²² Participation in the games had been granted to the Romans in 228, Titus presence at the games in 196 could indicate that Romans continued to be technically eligible for participation. For a full treatment of this event, see: Eckstein, A. M. "Polybius, the Achaeans, and the 'Freedom of the Greeks'." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 31, 1990: 45.

²³ Polyb, 18.46; Appian, 9.9.4.

²⁴ See: Bates, William N. "The Date of Lycophron." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 6, 1895: 75; Jones, Kenneth R. "Lycophron's *Alexandra*, *The Romans and Antiochus III*, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 134 2014: 41-55. Jones supplies a reference to *Schol. in Lyc. Alex.* 1226: ἐντεῦθεν περὶ Ῥωμαίων λέγει καὶ Λυκόφρονος ἑτέρου νομιστέον εἶναι τὸ ποίημα, οὐ τοῦ γράψαντος τὴν τραγωιδίαν. συνήθης γὰρ ὦν τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ οὐκ ἂν περὶ Ῥωμαίων διελέγετο.

²⁵ 247-221 BC.

²⁶ Horsfall, Nicholas. "Lycophron and the "Aeneid", Again." *Illinois Classical Studies* 30 (2005): 35-40 Horsfall goes so far as to place the work in the Augustan, post-Vergilian age, on account of certain thematic references to references to the Aeneid that he claims to have found in the *Alexandra*.

the wake of either the second Macedonian war, or the Antiochene war.²⁷ As a thorough investigation into the dating of this work is outside the scope of this project, or the purpose of this examination we shall consider it a product of the early second century. The so-called “Roman passage” of the poem has a messenger narrate from the Trojan Cassandra:

Γένους δὲ πάππων τῶν ἐμῶν αὖθις κλέοςμέγιστον ἀξήσουσιν ἄμναμοί ποτε,
αἰχμαῖς τὸ πρωτόλειον ἄραντες στέφος, γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης σκήπτρα καὶ
μοναρχίαν λαβόντες.²⁸

“And the fame of the race of my ancestors shall hereafter be exalted to the highest by their descendants, who shall with their spears win the foremost crown of glory, obtaining the sceptre and monarchy of earth and sea.”

As seen in the early historians, references to the descendants of the Trojans immediately call to mind Romans. This strange language, hidden in the folds of formulaic Hellenistic poetry, casts light onto a new and developing aspect of attitudes toward Rome, namely reverence. While firmly seated in the Hellenistic world, this poet nevertheless reveres Roman power and places in the mouth of his poetic character a prophecy of coming power of Rome of which his day had witnessed the start. Lycophron also adds a brief lament, perhaps indicating a certain fellowship with the contemporary anti-Roman attitudes:

οὐδ’ ἄμνηστον, ἀθλία πατρίς, κῦδος μαρανθὲν ἐγκατακρύψεις ζόφῳ.²⁹

“Nor in the darkness of oblivion, my unhappy fatherland, shalt thou hide thy glory faded.”

²⁷ For Macedonian war date, see Gruen 1984: 326-7; for Antiochene War date, see Jones 2014, above.

²⁸ Lyc. *Alexandra*, 1225-1230.

²⁹ Lyc. *Alexandra*, 1230-1231.

This witness betrays a sense of awe and reprehension toward growing Roman power, coupled with a resignation toward the reality of Roman domination, couched in mystical terms. The poet laments the inevitability of Roman power, but attributes it to the workings of fate. Pausanias supplies a further oracular pronouncement concerning Rome and the victory over the Macedonians. The oracle warns:

αὐχοῦντες βασιλεῦσι Μακεδόνες Ἀργεάδησιν,
ὕμιν κοιρανέων ἀγαθὸν καὶ πῆμα Φίλιππος.
ἦτοι ὁ μὲν πρότερος πόλεσιν λαοῖσιν τ' ἀνακτας
θήσει: ὁ δ' ὀπλότερος τιμὴν ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ὀλέσσει,
δηθηεὶς ἐσπερίοισιν ὑπ' ἀνδράσιν ἠώοις τε.³⁰

“Ye Macedonians, boasting of your Argive kings,
to you the reign of a Philip will be both good and evil.
The first will make you kings over cities and peoples;
the younger will lose all the honor,
defeated by men from west and east.”

Appian's history includes a very similar oracle, which he identifies as Sybilline, and seems to be an alternate retelling of the same pronouncement.³¹ Plutarch adds yet another prophecy of Roman victory in his discourse on the Pythian oracles. While tangential to his discussion, the narration of the oracle, and his explanation thereof, further cements the growing inevitability of Roman domination in the eyes of many Greeks. This oracle, in which Romans are once again identified by their supposed Trojan lineage, he relates thus:

³⁰ Pausanias, 7.8.9: Pausanias adds, by way of explanation: Ῥωμαῖοι τε δὴ τὰ πρὸς ἐσπέραν νεμόμενοι τῆς Εὐρώπης καθεῖλον τὴν Μακεδόνων ἀρχὴν καὶ τῶν ἐς τὸ συμμαχικὸν ταχθέντων Ἄτταλος τῆς ἐκ Περγάμου συλλεχθείσης ἡγεμὼν καὶ ἔτι ἐκ Μυσίας στρατιᾶς: πρὸς δὲ ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον μᾶλλον τι ἢ Μυσία τέτραπται. (Now those who destroyed the Macedonian empire were the Romans, dwelling in the west of Europe, and among the allies fighting on their side was Attalus who also commanded the army from Mysia, a land lying under the rising sun.)

³¹ Appian, 9.2-3.

ἀλλ' ὅποτε Τρώων γενεὰ καθύπερθε γένηται
Φοινίκων ἐν ἀγῶνι, τότε ἔσσειται ἔργα ἄπιστα:
πόντος μὲν λάμψει πῦρ ἄσπετον, ἐκ δὲ κεραυνῶν
πρηστῆρες μὲν ἄνω διὰ κύματος αἰξουσιν
ἄμμιγα σὺν πέτρᾳ, ἢ δὲ στηρίζεται αὐτοῦ
οὐ φατὸς ἀνθρώποις νῆσος καὶ χεῖρονες ἄνδρες
χερσὶ βησιάμενοι τὸν κρείσσονα νικήσουσι.³²

“When Trojan race the victory shall win
From Punic foe, lo! Wonders shall begin;
Unearthly fires from out the sea shall flash,
Whirlwinds toss stones aloft, and thunder crash,
an isle unnamed, unknown, shall stand upright,
the weak shall beat the stronger in the fight.”

Plutarch adds an interpretation of the oracles, as well as an assurance that an island did indeed rise from the sea:

τὸ γὰρ ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ Ῥωμαίους τε Καρχηδονίων περιγενέσθαι καταπολεμήσαντας Ἀννίβαν, καὶ Φίλιππον Αἰτωλοῖς συμβαλόντα καὶ Ῥωμαίοις μάχῃ κρατηθῆνα³³

“What happened within a short time — that the Romans mastered the Carthaginians, and brought the war with Philip to a finish, that Philip met the Aetolians and Romans in battle and was defeated.”

Gruen argues that the reference to the Aetolians as coupled with the Romans dates the interpretation to between the Second Macedonian and Antiochene War. Narrations of Philip’s defeat dated to after that war, in which the Aetolians opposed Rome, generally do not include a coupling of Rome and the Aetolians.³⁴ Marcus Junianus Justinus, a later Roman historian (second century AD), relates the same mysterious rising of an island, and attributes to the seers and soothsayers of that time the prognostication that:

³² Plut. *De Pyth.*, 399C.

³³ Plut. *De Pyth.* 399d.

³⁴ Gruen 1984: 327.

*Quo prodigio territis omnibus uates cecinere, oriens Romanorum imperium uetus Graecorum ac Macedonum voraturum*³⁵

“As all men were alarmed at this prodigy, the soothsayers predicted that “the rising power of the Romans would swallow up the ancient empire of the Greeks and Macedonians.”

The stark terms in which he places the contemporary feelings lend themselves to an apprehensive, but resigned view of the inevitability of Roman domination at this time. Forced to reckon with Rome as a Hellenic power, not a barbarian interloper, the complaints of those who stood in opposition to Rome were voiced in increasingly esoteric terms. The use of Greek oracles and prophecies to highlight the growth of Roman power and inevitability of Roman domination demonstrates that Rome had now firmly held her place in the Hellenic world, and political discontent could not be expressed in purely cultural terms. In the decade after the Second Macedonian War, Rome continued to be an important part of the Hellenistic political field. The year 184-183 BC, witnessed unprecedented numbers of Greek embassies to Rome to complain of abuses by the recently bested Philip, whom the Romans had left in possession of his kingdom.³⁶ At this time, Rome was stepping into the role of the dominant power of the Hellenic world, serving as the guardian of the freedom of the Greeks. Rome compete with Antigonid and Seleucid as the hegemon of the Hellas, occupying the role of the dominant civilized state of the Greek world.

³⁵ Justin, *Historiae Philippicae*, 30.4.4.

³⁶ Polyb. 23.1.

CHAPTER FIVE

Antiochus and Rome: Political players in the Hellenistic World

Following the successful conclusion of the Second Macedonian War, Rome soon found itself in another similar political embroilment. Polybius sets the stage for this war as a logical continuation of the Second Macedonian War. He relates that the spark of this new conflict was enkindled directly after Flaminius' declaration of freedom for the Greeks at the Isthmian Games of 186 BC.¹ At this time Rome made demands to Antiochus concerning his treatment of the Greeks in Asia and well as those of the mainland. The similarity of the terms of Rome's demands to this Hellenistic monarch to those presented to Philip underscores the similarity of the political situation in both scenarios.² Like the Second Macedonian War, the escalation of the Antiochene War was

¹ Polyb. 18.47.1-2 records the instructions of the Romans to the ambassadors of Antiochus: διακελευόμενοι τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας πόλεων τῶν μὲν αὐτονόμων ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ μηδεμιᾶ πολεμεῖν, ὅσας δὲ νῦν παρείληφε τῶν ὑπὸ Πτολεμαῖον καὶ Φίλιππον ταπτομένων, ἐκχωρεῖν. σὺν δὲ τούτοις προηγόρευον μὴ διαβαίνειν εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην μετὰ δυνάμεως· οὐδένα γὰρ ἔτι τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε πολεμεῖσθαι νῦν ὑπ' οὐδενὸς οὔτε δουλεύειν οὐδενί. καθόλου δὲ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν τινὰς ἔφασαν ἤξειν πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίοχον. (They ordered him, as regards the Asiatic cities, to keep his hands off those which were autonomous and make war on none of them and to withdraw from those previously subject to Ptolemy and Philip which he had recently taken. At the same time they enjoined him not to cross to Europe with an army, for none of the Greeks were any longer being attacked by anyone or the subjects of anyone, and they announced in general terms that some of their own body would come to see Antiochus.)

² Polyb. 16.34. 3 relates the Romans' demands to Philip: ἐπιστήσαντες τὴν πρὸς τοὺς βασιλέας ὁρμὴν ἐξέπεμψαν τὸν προειρημένον, ὃς καὶ συμμίξας περὶ τὴν Ἄβυδον διεσάφει τῷ βασιλεῖ διότι δέδοκται τῇ συγκλήτῳ παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν μῆτε τῶν Ἑλλήνων μηδενὶ πολεμεῖν μῆτε τοῖς Πτολεμαίου πράγμασιν ἐπιβάλλειν τὰς χεῖρας.

gruelingly slow. The initial meeting between Antiochus and Roman ambassadors was in 196 BC, when the topic of war was first broached.³ Antiochus' response to the Romans and their demands was pointed:⁴

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς πρῶτον μὲν διαπορεῖν ἔφη κατὰ τίνα λόγον ἀμφισβητοῦσι πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας πόλεων· πᾶσι γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐπιβάλλειν τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἢ Ῥωμαίοις. δεύτερον δ' ἡξίου μηδὲν αὐτοὺς πολυπραγμονεῖν καθάλου τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς περιεργάζεσθαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἀπλῶς οὐδέν.⁵

“The king replied that in the first place he was at a loss to know by what right they disputed his possession of the Asiatic towns; they were the last people who had any title to do so. Next he requested them not to trouble themselves at all about Asiatic affairs; for he himself did not in the least go out of his way to concern himself with the affairs of Italy.”

With Antiochus having provided solutions or explanations to all Roman complaints, the meeting concluded with Antiochus freely offering to accept arbitrated judgment from a third-party, namely the Rhodians, instead of waiting for a Roman pronouncement.⁶ This

(Meeting the king near Abydus he informed him that the Senate had passed a decree, begging him neither to make war on any of the Greeks, nor to lay hands on any of Ptolemy's possessions.)

³ Polyb. 18.50.8-9: δὲ καὶ τῶν αὐτονόμων ἀπέχεσθαι πόλεων. καθόλου δ' ἔφη θαυμάζειν τίνα λόγῳ τοσαύταις μὲν πεζικαῖς, τοσαύταις δὲ ναυτικαῖς δυνάμεσι πεποιήται τὴν εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην διάβασιν· πλὴν γὰρ τοῦ προτίθεσθαι Ῥωμαίοις ἐγγχειεῖν αὐτόν, οὐδ' ἔννοιαν ἑτέραν καταλείπεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς ὀρθῶς λογιζομένοις. οἱ μὲν οὖν Ῥωμαῖοι ταῦτ' εἰπόντες ἀπεσιώπησαν. (He also advised him to keep his hands off the autonomous cities. And generally speaking he said he wondered on what pretext the king had crossed to Europe with such large military and naval forces. For anyone who judged correctly could not suppose that the reason was any other than that he was proposing to attack the Romans. The Roman envoy having concluded his speech thus.)

⁴ Gruen, Erich S. *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*. Vol. 1. Univ of California Press, 1984:623.

⁵ Polyb. 18.51.1-2.

⁶ Polyb. 18.54.1-4.

method of resolving political disputes was a standard practice in the Hellenistic world.⁷ That Antiochus would have recourse to such a means in resolving a dispute in which Rome was involved speaks to the integration of Rome as an accepted political player in the Hellenistic world. Following this resolution, relations between Rome and Antiochus were placid. The king even went so far as to propose a formal alliance with Rome.⁸ This proposition refutes a notion of cemented anti-Roman sentiment.⁹ By 194/193 BC, Rome was filled with Greek embassies and envoys.¹⁰ While the extant sources provide no clear explanation as to the purposes of these embassies, with the exception of an embassy from Philip concerning his war indemnity and hostage son, Diodorus suggests the imminence of war with Antiochus as a possible cause for the flurry of Greek diplomatic activity. Such a reason would mirror the situation on the eve of Rome's slow descent into war with Philip.

In response to Antiochus' request that Rome enter into an alliance, Flamininus demanded that Antiochus withdraw from Europe, or else Rome would continue what it had started in the Macedonian wars and liberate the Greek cities of Asia Minor. The parlay thus ended without result, save perhaps the restoration of positive views toward Rome on the part of the Greeks present.¹¹ A subsequent Roman embassy to Antiochus

⁷ Gruen 1984: 623.

⁸ Livy. 34.25.2.

⁹ Appian, 11.50. Appian contends that Antiochus was at this time secretly planning a war against Rome, but this seems an unwarranted extrapolation by the later author.

¹⁰ Livy, 34.57.2-4; Appian, 11.6; Diodorus Siculus, 28.15.1.

¹¹ Gruen 1984: 628

accomplished nothing, but provides insight into the attitude toward Rome. Antiochus' representative decries Roman double standards concerning the Roman treatment of Greek possessions and the demands which the Romans made upon Antiochus in that regard, equating the statuses of Roman and Antiochene hegemony.¹² This conflicts with the historical Macedonian attempts to discredit Rome and engender a view of Rome as barbarian. Nevertheless, Antiochene court personages exhibited vitriol towards Rome:

*Ibi alius alio ferocius quia, quo quisque asperius adversus Romanos locutus esset, eo spes gratiae maior erat.*¹³

“There each tried to outdo the other in violence, since each thought that he would win greater favor in proportion to the severity of his attitude towards the Romans.”

Severity however, is not out of place in interactions between opposed civilized states in the Hellenistic world. What is absent however, is the denunciations of Romans as barbarians which flavored earlier rhetoric. Even the rebuff which Roman envoys suffered from Aetolian assembly in 193 BC, which nominated Antiochus as liberator of Greece and arbitrator between Romans and Aetolians, lacks acerbic anti-Roman sentiment.¹⁴ Indeed, Antiochus' steadfast efforts to substitute himself for Rome as the patron of Greek freedom indicates that Rome still held that position at least nominally in the minds of many Greeks.

A different view of Rome's struggle with Antiochus is demonstrated in a tale compiled by Antisthenes the Philosopher, recorded by Phlegon of Tralles. Set in the

¹² Livy, 35.16.

¹³ Livy, 35.17.

¹⁴ Livy, 35.33.

Antiochene War, and likely originating from that time, the tale depicts an officer of Antiochus who was slain in battle rising again to deliver the admonition:¹⁵

Κρονίδης νεμεσᾷ Ζεὺς μέρμερα λεύσσων, μηνίει δὲ φόνωι στρατιᾶς καὶ σοῖσιν ἐπ' ἔργοις καὶ πέμπει φύλον θρασυκάρδιον εἰς χθόνα τὴν σήν, οἷ σ' ἀρχῆς παύσουσιν, ἀμείψηι δ' οἷά γ' ἔρεξας.¹⁶

“Zeus Kronides is wrathful observing your actions, angry at the slaughter of an army and at your behavior, and he will send a valorous tribe into your land that will put an end to your power, and you will pay for what you have done.”

The account goes on to include an alleged Pythian oracle advising the Romans to cease all foreign ventures and make supplicatory offerings to assuage divine wrath. Afterward, however, a Roman general is described as entering into a fit and speaking prophetic verse concerning Rome's initial success but ultimate catastrophic failure in its Asian campaign, as a great host comes out of the East and lays waste to the Roman homeland. Following this the general is eaten by a wolf, except for his head, which continues to spout dire warnings in verse. The account ends with the assurance that all the foretold events came to pass.¹⁷ While certainly never intended as a history, the presence of such a work speaks to the growing anti-Roman sentiment among segments of the Greeks. Nevertheless, even sources firmly ensconced in the Antiochene party still adhered to the old Trojan origin story of the Romans. Antiochus' chief negotiator with the Romans, Hegesianax, is credited with the authorship of a lost work which details Aeneas' founding of Rome.¹⁸

¹⁵ Gruen (1984: 318) attests that the accuracy of historical details indicates an origin close in time to the events described.

¹⁶ *Brill's New Jacoby*. ed. I. Worthington, Brill, 2007: BNJ 508 F2.

¹⁷ *Brill's New Jacoby*: 257 F36 III.

¹⁸ S. Pompeius Festus, *De verborum significatu*, 326.28-33 (BNJ 45 F10) relates that: *Romam appellatam esse Cephalon Gergithiusnqui de adventu Aeneae in Italiam videtur conscribisse ait ab homine quodam comite Aeneae. eum enim occupato monte,*

Even a man actively engaged against the Romans still viewed them with interest and curiosity, even assigning a familiar lineage. This displays not the hostility one might expect from a confrontation with barbarians, but a respectful interest.

Perseus' War: The Price of Roman Intervention

Following Roman victory over Antiochus, the customary pattern was followed, possessions were shuffled among the victors and the defeated, tributes were imposed, and Rome withdrew from direct rule or involvement. After the death of Philip, his son Perseus ascended the Macedonian throne in 179 BC. Interactions between Rome and the Greek world took a hiatus in the decade after Perseus' ascent. Although guilty of many actions which would later be considered possible causes of war, Perseus failed to evoke a hostile Roman response.¹⁹ Just as in the Second Macedonian War, Rome's interest was drawn first by the complaints of disgruntled Greeks. Before initiating hostilities, Rome

qui nunc Palatinus dicitur, urbem condidisse atque eam Rhomen nominasse. (Kephelon of Gergis, who seems to have written about Aeneas' coming in Italy, says that Rome received his name by one of his fellows; this man, after taking over the hill now called Palatine, founded the city and named it Rhome.) *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: In Seven Volumes* (Vol. 319). Loeb Classical Library, 1945:157, fn. 3 identifies Kephelon of Gergis as: "A fictitious author under whose name Hegesianax of Alexandria in the Troad published some of his own works"; Dionysius upholds this account in *Roman Antiquities*, 1.72.1-2: Κεφάλων μὲν γὰρ ὁ Γεργίθιος συγγραφεὺς παλαιὸς πάνυ δευτέραι γενεᾷ μετὰ τὸν Ἰλιακὸν πόλεμον ἐκτίσθαι λέγει τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξ Ἰλίου διασωθέντων σὺν Αἰνεΐᾳ. οἰκιστὴν δὲ αὐτῆς ἀποφαίνει τὸν ἡγησάμενον τῆς ἀποικίας Ῥῶμον· τοῦτον δ' εἶναι τῶν Αἰνεΐου παίδων ἓνα. (For Kephelon of Gergis, a very ancient historian, says that the city was founded two generations after the war of Ilion by the men escaped from Troy together with Aeneas. As its founder he names the leader of the colony, Romos; this Romos was one of the Aeneas' sons)

¹⁹ See Gruen 1984: 408-419 for a full account and reckoning of the sources.

first engaged in a massive campaign of diplomatic advertising, seeking pledges of loyalty in case of a potential conflict with the Macedonians.²⁰ After receiving further complaints from Greek states against Perseus, Rome finally committed a small initial force to Greece in 172 BC.²¹ Even at this point, Perseus maintained an extreme deference to Rome, going so far as to express willingness to submit to a senatorial judgment concerning the complaints lodged against him by other Greeks. Despite great efforts on Perseus' part, war proved unavoidable.²² As in the First Macedonian war, Roman concern seemed to center around preserving the positive attitudes of Greeks toward Rome.²³

League and Legate: Deference, Indifference, and Catastrophe

With Rome having secured victory in 167 BC, the political landscape of the Greek world was drastically altered. The previously exhibited Roman practice of maintaining the status quo while exacting certain concessions was no more. Rome had altered the nature of her relationship with Greece. Perseus was led in chains to Rome; the Macedonian monarchy was abolished and the Macedonian homeland partitioned; economic sanctions were employed and tribute directly to Rome was imposed.²⁴ Having

²⁰ See Gruen 1984: 411 for a painstaking presentation of the various diplomatic missions, their destinations, and attestation in primary sources.

²¹ Livy, 42.27.5-6.

²² Livy, 42.50.2 records that he went so far as to call a council to consider yielding territory, paying tribute, and acquiescing to other demands in order to avoid a war with Rome.

²³ Livy, 42.12.2 records Eumenes' warning that as Perseus' favor with the Greeks grows, Rome's will lessen.

²⁴ Plut. *Aem.* 28.3; Diodorus Siculus, 31.8.1; Livy, 45.18.7.

again withdrawn troops after this imposition, Rome was forced to return in order to quell an upstart Macedonian state led by Andriscus, a pretended son of Perseus.²⁵ Following the deposition of this would-be Antigonid, Rome created a Macedonian province, and began construction of roads, bringing the north of Greece firmly under Roman control.²⁶

The Greek mainland however, maintained its Hellenistic politics. Very little substantive change was enacted by the Romans after their victory over Andriscus.²⁷ The ultimate destruction of the old order in Greece did not come until 146 BC, as a result of the Achaean War. In the decades leading up to this war with the Achaean league, disputes over the nature of the relationship of Greek states to Rome were in full force. While all were striving to prosecute their own Greek wars and rivalries, the various leaders of the Achaean league couched their political rhetoric in ways that betray different conceptions of Rome. Polybius describes Aristaenus thus:

Ἀρίσταινος ἦγε τὴν ἀγωγὴν τῆς πολιτείας οὕτως ὥστε πᾶν τὸ πρόσφορον Ῥωμαίοις ἐξ ἐτοίμου ποιεῖν, ἔνια δὲ καὶ πρὶν ἢ προστάξει ἰκείνους. ἐπειρᾶτο μέντοι γε τῶν νόμων ἔχεσθαι δοκεῖν καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην ἐφείλκετο φαντασίαν, εἰκὼν, ὁπότε τούτων ἀντιπίπτει τις προδήλως τοῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων γραφομένοις.²⁸

“Aristaenus in conducting affairs of state was ever ready to do what was agreeable to the Romans, sometimes even anticipating their orders, but yet he aimed at a seeming adherence to the law, and strove to acquire a reputation for doing so, though giving way whenever any law was in evident opposition to the Roman instructions.”

²⁵ Polyb. 36.10.4-5.

²⁶ Accepted by most scholars but disputed by Gruen, who nevertheless acknowledges that was represented a clear turning point. (Gruen 1984)

²⁷ See Gruen 1984: 505-527.

²⁸ Polyb. 24.11.4.

To this Polybius contrasts Philopoemen, who believed that the laws of the Achaean League ought to be held in preeminence against Roman demands, if possible.²⁹ Polybius then provides speeches demonstrating their positions. Aristaenus held that association with Rome must be broken off and active resistance undertaken, or else they must comply with Rome's wishes. Philopoemen responded by averring that facile and undisputed obsequiousness would simply lead to harsher and harsher demands being made upon them.³⁰ Neither even suggests the possibility of a political climate free from Roman influence, or the possibility ignoring Rome in political dealings. Nevertheless, in the period from the Antiochene war to the outbreak of the Achaean war, the league demonstrated a penchant for autonomy and independent policy, never directly in defiance of Rome, but hardly deferential to the western power. Aristaenus is recorded as having simply remained silent concerning the league's oppression of the Spartans, and not made any effort to follow Roman wishes that they desist.³¹ In response to the demand of a Roman legate that an assembly be called, Philopoemen refused to convene one, calling into question the authority of a legate not possessing a written decree of the senate.³² While thus exhibiting an independent autonomy, the discourse of the Achaeans is itself colored by the rising Roman domination. The very rebuff of Roman authority is itself couched in terms of Roman authority. Other political players attempted to sell-out political rivals to the Romans. Some raised the banner of total subservience to Rome.

²⁹ Polyb. 24.11.5-8.

³⁰ Polyb. 24.13.1-4.

³¹ Polyb. 22.10.3.

³² Livy, 39.33.5.

The Achaean envoy Callicrates is said to have lambasted the Roman senate with dire warnings that Roman inaction and aloofness was engendering disregard and irreverence toward Rome and persecution of partisans of Rome among the Greeks.³³ While Polybius' details concerning Callicrates' embassy seem suspect, it is unlikely that the substance of his recorded speech would have been completely foreign to the political atmosphere.³⁴ Nevertheless even such a vehement defender of Rome as Callicrates seems to have belonged more to the fractured internal politics of the Achaean league, than to a truly pro-Roman renaissance.³⁵ This state of affairs holds for several decades, displaying a pattern of tacit reverence on the part of the Greeks, coupled with disregard, but always flavored by the knowledge that:

μη δύνασθαι μετρεῖν μήτε τὴν διαφορὰν τοῦ πολιτεύματος τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν μήτε τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δυνάμεως³⁶

“One is incapable of measuring the difference between the two states, Rome and Achaea, and the superiority of the Roman power.”

Through the course of these several wars, Greek attitudes toward Rome had been profoundly mixed. Discussion of both Rome's familial Greco-Trojan origin stories, as well as the later denunciations of uncivilized barbarism receded. They were replaced by an acceptance of Rome into the political field of the eastern Mediterranean. This

³³ Polyb. 24.9.

³⁴ Callicrates' own appointment seems to contradict his claim that pro-Roman politicians are marginalized. See: Gruen 1984:497

³⁵ Gruen argues that Callicrates' prime motivation in seeking direct Roman intervention in the restoration of the Spartan exile was the potential embarrassment and political damage it could cause his rivals. “Here was Achaean politics as usual.” (1984: 498)

³⁶ Polyb. 20.13.1, words attributed to Philopoemen.

acceptance of Rome into the Greek world is demonstrated both with approval and contempt. Occasional polemic remarks notwithstanding, Rome's place in the Greek world was as unquestioned as that of the Macedonians.

Emboldened by Rome's aloofness, the Achaeans grew increasingly antagonistic. In response to the harassment and mocking of a Roman delegation sent to investigate the league's unauthorized military mobilization against Heraclea, the legions stationed in Macedonia, having just demolished the regime of Andriscus, were ordered into mainland Greece.³⁷ Several withering engagements left the Achaean League completely overwhelmed. The site of the Achaeans' impudence toward the delegation, Corinth, was razed to the ground.³⁸ What had begun as typical Hellenic military coercion had become the death-knell of Greek independence. While not yet converting Greece into a province, the Romans instituted new laws and governments, and abolished the ethnic leagues.³⁹ They did leave this new order in the hands of Greeks, not yet in direct Roman control. Nevertheless, Greece would no longer have a free and self-directed political scene. Gruen describes this event, not as the imposition of overlordship in Greece, but the emasculation of Greece.⁴⁰

In this final chapter of the story of independent Greece, the cultural position of the Romans as an accepted part of the Greek world continued to be attested. Antiochus and Perseus both went to great lengths to demonstrate their acceptance of Roman

³⁷ Pausanias, 7.15.1.

³⁸ Livy, *Periochae*. 52; Polyb. 38.16.4-12.

³⁹ Polyb. 39.5; Pausanias, 7.16.9.

⁴⁰ 1984: 527.

integration in the Hellenic world. The nature of the diplomatic strategies which they employed, treating Rome as they would treat a Hellenic power, highlight the conceptual integration of Rome into the Greek world. Even those who opposed particular actions and policies of the Romans nevertheless implicitly accepted the idea that Rome would be involved as a participant in the affairs of the Greek world. Unfortunately for those Greeks, this attitude led to disaster. Viewing Rome as another Hellenic power prevented the Greeks from foreseeing the dire consequences of disrespecting the authority of the Rome. When finally moved into action, Rome did not simply reassert hegemony, as a Greek power might have, but rather drastically displaced the social order of Greece, putting an end to independent Greece entirely.

CHAPTER SIX

Epilogue and Conclusion

In the century after the destruction of Corinth in the Achaean War, Rome's dominion continued to grow and expand, leveling the threats of Numidia, Gaul, and Pontus, and seeing the last real assertion of Greek military force against Rome in 87 BC.¹ Yet in this case the Greek opposition to Rome was limited, being restricted primarily to Athens and Mytilene.² This activity was also short lived, lasting only into 86 BC, in Athens and 79 BC in Mytilene.³ Despite Mithridates VI's attempted to stir up Panhellenic sentiment against Rome, his efforts had little effect in instilling anti-Roman attitudes in mainland Greece.⁴ When Rome responded in force, they found that most of Greece offered no opposition and continued to accept Roman authority.⁵ The wanton violence which characterized Rome's treatment of defeated Athens, does not seem to have

¹ Athens joined forces with Mithradates VI of Pontus in his war against Rome. (Appian, 12)

² Those other states which joined the cause seem to have responded to overwhelming military intimidation, not ideology, as evinced by their rapid reorientation with Rome. (Appian, 12.30)

³ Pausanias, 1.20.5: The Athenian support for Mithridates was limited to only a portion of citizens disposed to turbulence; Plut. *Luc.* 2-4.

⁴ For a full treatment of Mithridates' political use of philhellenism as a tool against the Romans, see: McGing, B., *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus (Mnemosyne, Supplements: 89)*, Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 1984

⁵ Memnon, 22.11 (*Brill's New Jacoby: 434 F 1*) *Brill's New Jacoby.* ed. I. Worthington, Brill, 2007.

reflected upon Rome's image, instead only upon the Roman commander Sulla who was punished with illness.⁶

With any meaningful idea of Greek independence extinguished in 146 BC, it is a fitting time to bring the examination to a close, as attitudes from the first century and later reflect a state of settled Roman control, in which there was not real hope of a resurgence of Greek autonomy.⁷ Despite the enormous changes which took place in the Greek world and culminated in the events of 146 BC, previously attested attitudes continued to be displayed. Writing after the fall and sack of Corinth, the poet Polystratus laments:

Τὸν μέγαν Ἀκροκόρινθον Ἀχαιϊκόν, Ἑλλάδος ἄστρον,
καὶ διπλῆν Ἴσθμοῦ σύνδρομον ἠϊόνα
Λεύκιος ἐστυφέλιξε· δοριπτοίητα δὲ νεκρῶν
ὄστέα σωρευθεὶς εἰς ἐπέχει σκόπελος
τοὺς δὲ δόμον Πριάμοιο πυρὶ πρήσαντας Ἀχαιοὺς
ἀκλαύστους κτερέων νόσφισαν Αἰνεάδαι.⁸

“Lucius has smitten sore the great Achaean Acrocorinth, the star of Hellas, and the twin parallel shores of the Isthmus. One heap of stones covers the bones of those slain in the rout; and the sons of Aeneas left unwept and unhallowed by funeral rites the Achaeans who burnt the house of Priam.”

Here the poet brings the Trojan origins of Rome back to the forefront, highlighting the enduring nature of that myth, which had defined much of the early Greek discourse concerning Rome in earlier centuries. As discussed in chapter I, the Trojan association drew Rome into the wider circle of the Greek world. Evidence of Rome's participation in this Greek world from the era of the Achaean War is manifest. In 155 BC, a diplomatic

⁶ Pausanias, 1.20.7.

⁷ The later uprising was supported and facilitated by Mithridates. (Appian, 12.27)

⁸ *Anthologia Graeca* 7.297.

mission to Rome from Athens included three prominent philosophers, Carneades, Critolaus, and Diogenes.⁹ These philosophers went about Rome just as if it were Athens, gathering about themselves a school of young disciples, teaching rhetoric, and enriching listeners with culture and philosophy.¹⁰ While the envoys were sent back to mainland Greece in short order by Marcus Cato, who disapproved of their philosophy, the ease and alacrity with which they continued their Greek educational endeavors in Rome speaks to the intimate association of Rome and Greece at this point.¹¹

Polybius gives a rare insight into Greek attitudes toward Rome at this time in his discussion of the aftermath of the demolitions of Carthage and Corinth, which serves as an excellent recapitulation of these attitudes. He begins by underscoring the mixed nature of Rome's image among the Greeks, a perennial fixture of this discussion.¹² Some in Greece, he relates, praised the actions of the Romans, giving them the attributes “φρονίμως καὶ πραγματικῶς,”¹³ (wise and practical) which have a strong association with the idea of a well ordered state.¹⁴ Others took the view that the present actions were not befitting the

⁹ Cicero, *De Oratore*, 155; *Tusculan Disputations*. 4.5.

¹⁰ Plut. *M. Cato*, 22.

¹¹ Plut. *M. Cato*, 22.

¹² Polyb. 36.9.1: Ὅτι περὶ Καρχηδονίων, ὅτε κατεπολέμησαν αὐτοὺς οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ψευδοφίλιππον κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πολλοὶ καὶ παντοῖοι διεφέροντο λόγοι, τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ Καρχηδονίους, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πάλιν ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ψευδοφίλιππον. (Both about the Carthaginians when they were crushed by the Romans and about the affair of the pseudo- Philip many divergent accounts were current in Greece, at first on the subject of Carthage and next concerning the pseudo-Philip.)

¹³ Polyb. 36.9.4.

¹⁴ See: Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English lexicon: with a revised supplement 1996*. ed. Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996

Roman state, an assertion predicated upon a positive, civilized view of Rome.¹⁵ To these critics, Rome's current behavior was at odds with its identity as a civilized state:

χικῆς πραγματοποιίας οἰκεῖον εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ πολιτικῆς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς αἰρέσεως καὶ προσεικὸς ἀσεβήματι.¹⁶

“This, they said, savored more of a despot's intrigue than of the principles of a civilized state such as Rome, and could only be justly described as something very like impiety and treachery.”

Others undertook a defense of Rome, declaring that Rome's actions did not constitute injustice, as they transgressed against neither gods, nor parents, nor treaty, nor custom.¹⁷

This defense serves to exonerate Rome on the basis of Greek standards. The application of such standards implicitly includes Rome in the Greek world. The most pointed reaction which Polybius records contains a startling comparison. Rome has lost her principle, this party argues.¹⁸ These principles are credited with Rome's successful attainment of ἡγεμονίαν. This formulation is in line with the positive views expressed above. The surprising conclusion of the critics' warning is:

¹⁵ Polyb. 36.9.9.

¹⁶ Polyb. 36.9.11

¹⁷ Polyb. 36.9.15-18. οὐ γὰρ εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς οὐδ' εἰς τοὺς γονεῖς οὐδ' εἰς τοὺς τεθνεῶτας ἐξαμαρτάνειν, οὐδὲ μὴν ὄρκους οὐδὲ συνθήκας παραβαίνειν, τὸ δ' ἐναντίον αὐτοὺς ἐγκαλεῖν τοῖς Καρχηδονίοις ὅτι παραβεβήκασι. Καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ νόμους οὐδ' ἐθισμοὺς οὐδὲ τὴν κατ' ἰδίαν πίστιν ἀθετεῖν· λαβόντας γὰρ τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν παρ' ἐκόντων ὃ βούλοιντο πράττειν, οὐ πειθαρχούντων τοῖς παραγγελλομένοις, οὕτως αὐτοῖς προσάγειν τὴν ἀνάγκην. (Neither did they sin against the gods, against their parents, or against the dead, nor did they violate any sworn agreement or treaty; on the contrary they accused the Carthaginians of doing this. Nor, again, did they break any laws or customs or their personal faith. For having received from a people who consented willingly full authority to act as they wished, when this people refused to obey their orders they finally resorted to force.)

¹⁸ Polyb. 36.9.5

κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς τὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων ἐκτρέπεσθαι φιλαρχίαν.¹⁹
“They were little by little deserting these for a lust of domination like that of Athens and Sparta.”

The comparison of Rome to potent Greek states of the past, rather than to a despotic kingdom such as that of the Persians underscores the reality of Rome’s acknowledged place in the Greek, not barbarian world.

Conclusion

Through the course of the history examined, from the earliest literary and mythological references to Rome, to Roman hegemony and subjugation, the response of the Greeks was mixed and confused. The initial antiquarian curiosity declared the Romans to be a part of the Greek world, at least tangentially. This cordiality was expressed in the diplomatic approach Pyrrhus took toward Rome, and gestures of civility showed in that conflict. Having attracted attention with their successful action in this war, Rome became an object of increased interest to the Greek world.

The following century brought little clarity to the situation. While some authors continued to uphold the traditional Trojan origin story, others began to question whether Romans were in fact barbarians. Nevertheless, the suggestion does not seem to have motivated any substantial change in attitude, as the Romans were admitted to the Panhellenic games in 226 BC, an display of inclusion in a broader Greek world, even if only tangentially, like the Macedonians. Not all held a favorable view however. While shying away from directly equating the Romans with barbarians, anti-Roman Greek rhetoric did develop around the idea of Roman savagery and the hope of Hellenic

¹⁹ Polyb. 36.9.5

resistance. Such rhetoric however, being directed at fellow Greeks, was necessarily born out of an atmosphere in which many Greeks threw their lot in with Rome. Furthermore the anti-Roman sentiment seems to center not around Greece, but Macedonia, itself inhabiting an indeterminate position in the Greek world. Such hostility was closely tied to the political ends of the kings of Macedon, who wished to hold hegemony in Greece through carrying the banner of “freedom for the Greeks,” a position which Rome threatened to usurp.

Rome’s limited involvement in the First Macedonian war bred great discontent among her Greek allies, who resented the expenditure of their forces and resources while Rome sat idle. Nevertheless, Rome still held the position of the great stabilizing force in the political minds of many Greek states who flocked there for assistance and support against the rising tide of Macedonian aggression. Responding with her military might, Rome had inextricably entered the political world of the eastern Mediterranean. As Roman involvement increased, opposition from the partisans of the Macedonians intensified, painting the Romans as invaders and barbarians, the very charges so often applied to the Macedonians themselves. Nevertheless a significant portion of Greece continued to view Rome as a civilized, nearly Greek power assuring stability in the region. Once again present at the Panhellenic Games, the Romans accepted such a mantle by proclaiming “freedom of the Greeks”.

Roman involvement engendered not only political, but literary and religious reactions as well. Poems and oracles of the early second century which speak of the inevitable triumph of Roman power decreed by fate underscore the concrete reality of Roman influence. Tropes of Trojan origin are also present in this era, showing the

continuity of that strain of Greek thought, which gave Rome an indirect Greek origin. Rome's next great conflict, with Antiochus, continued to demonstrate that Rome was treated as a more or less Hellenistic power by Greeks. While denying Rome's authority to make pronouncements over Asia, Antiochus never questioned Rome's interest in Greece. Early attempts to end the conflict through time-honored Greek diplomatic means show Antiochus' regard for Rome's Greek culture. Even when relations soured and war was on the horizon, the relation between Rome and Antiochus continued to resemble a parlay between Hellenistic powers. Antiochus attempts to set himself up as the provider of "freedom for the Greeks" in opposition to Rome shows that Rome still held the position in the Greek consciousness. Even as reactionary anti-Roman literature began to appear and anti-Roman attitudes to intensify the traditional view of Rome as the successor of Troy, and thus not barbarian, endured. Even when coupled with political enmity to Rome, the acceptance of the idea of Roman involvement as a part of the Greek world was unchallenged.

In the days of the last Antigonid monarch in Macedon, Perseus, Rome continued its accepted role as the guardian of peace and stability, committing to war once again in response to Greek embassies, fearing that the reverence in which Rome was held might be usurped by Perseus. In mainland Greece, it was an unchallenged principle that Rome would be involved in Greek affairs. Nevertheless, Rome's slowness to act and hesitation to engage its full military might led many Greeks to adopt the idea that Rome required only lip service, and that they could retain the autonomy of their states and leagues. This attitude eventually gave way to the direct disrespect of Roman authority which ultimately led to Rome's decisive military takeover, and the end of Greek autonomy in 146 BC.

The story of Greek views toward Rome is a convoluted and twisted labyrinth of myths and poems, prophecies and histories. Throughout the course of interactions however, the general attitude evinced is one of cautious familiarity, assigning to the Romans a place above the barbarians. In time Rome's honorary status within the Hellenic world led to widespread Greek acceptance of the idea of Roman intervention in Hellenic affairs. Even when bitterly opposed to actual Roman activities, the discourse of Greeks of this era tended on the whole to accept the idea that the Romans were a part of the Greek world, and thus bound to be involved in the affairs of the Hellenistic world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Michael John. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Appian. *Roman History, Volume II*. Trans. Brian McGing. Loeb Classical Library 3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912.
- Arrian. *Anabasis of Alexander, Volume I: Books 1-4*. Trans. P. A. Brunt. Loeb Classical Library 236. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Badian, Ernst. "Greeks and Macedonians." *Studies in the History of Art* 10 (1982): 33-51.
- Badian, Ernst. *Foreign clientelae (264-70 BC)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Ball, Warwick. *Rome in the East: the transformation of an empire*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Bassett, Samuel Eliot. "The Ἀμαρτία of Achilles." In *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, pp. 47-69. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; American Philological Association, 1934.
- Bates, William N. "The Date of Lycophron." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 6 (1895): 75-82.
- Beck, Hans, ed. *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Browning, Robert. "Greeks and others: from antiquity to the Renaissance." Harrison, Thomas. *Greeks and Barbarians*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Bryce, Trevor, and Jan Zahle. *The Lycians: The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*. Vol. 1. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 1986.
- Carney, Elizabeth D., Review of *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. *The Classical World* 79 (3). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, Classical Association of the Atlantic States, 1986
- Champion, Craige B.. "Timaios (566)." Brill's New Jacoby. Editor in Chief: Ian Worthington, Brill Online, 2016.

- Champion, Craige. "Romans as BAPBAPOI: Three Polybian speeches and the politics of cultural indeterminacy." *Classical Philology* 95, (2000): 425-444.
- Cicero. *On the Orator: Books 1-2*. Translated by E. W. Sutton, H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 348. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Cicero. *Tusculan Disputations*. Translated by J. E. King. Loeb Classical Library 141. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Volume XI: Fragments of Books 21-32*. Translated by Francis R. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 409. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library 319. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Eckstein, A. M. "Polybius, the Achaeans, and the 'Freedom of the Greeks.'" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 31, 1990: 45.
- Eckstein, Arthur M. "The Pact Between the Kings, Polybius 15.20. 6, and Polybius' View of the Outbreak of the Second Macedonian War." *Classical Philology* 100, 2005: 228-242.
- Eckstein, Arthur M. "*Rome enters the Greek East: from anarchy to hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230-170 BC.*" Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- Engels, Johannes. "Agathokles (472)." *Brill's New Jacoby*. Editor in Chief: Ian Worthington (University of Missouri). Brill Online, 2016.
- Erskine, Andrew. *Troy between Greece and Rome: local tradition and imperial power*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2001.
- Ferrari, Gloria. "The Ilioupersis in Athens." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100, 2000:139
- Festus, Sextus Pompeius, Paul (the Deacon), and Wallace Martin Lindsay. *De verborum significatu quae supersunt*. BG Teubner, 1913.
- Finlay, George. *Greece under the Romans*. London: JM Dent & Company, 1907.
- Greenberg, Nathan A. "The Attitude of Agamemnon." *The Classical World* 86, (1993): 193-205.
- Gruen, Erich S. *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*. Vol. 1. Univ of California Press, 1986.

- Harris, W. V. (1985). *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327-70 BC*. Oxford University Press.
- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars, Volume III: Books 5-7*. Translated by A. D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library 119. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. "Lycophron and the Aeneid, Again." *Illinois Classical Studies* 30 (2005): 35-40.
- Isocrates. *To Demonicus. To Nicocles. Nicocles or the Cyprians. Panegyricus. To Philip. Archidamus*. Trans. George Norlin. Loeb Classical Library 209. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Jones, Kenneth R. "Lycophron's Alexandra, The Romans and Antiochus III." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 134 (2014): 41-55.
- Justin, *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Kallet-Marx, Robert M. *Hegemony to Empire*. University of California Press, 1996.
- Keaveney, Arthur; Madden, John A. "Memnon (434)." *Brill's New Jacoby*. Ed. Ian Worthington, Brill Online, 2016.
- Lefèvre, Eckard. "Die Schuld des Agamemnon: Das Schicksal des Troja-Siegers in stoischer Sicht." *Hermes* 101, (1973): 64-91.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English lexicon*. Ed. Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Livy, Julius Obsequens. *History of Rome, Volume XIV: Summaries. Fragments. Julius Obsequens. General Index*. Trans. Alfred C. Schlesinger. Loeb Classical Library 404. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Livy. *History of Rome, Volume IX: Books 31-34*. Trans. Evan T. Sage. Loeb Classical Library 295. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Livy. *History of Rome, Volume VIII: Books 28-30*. Trans. Frank Gardner Moore. Loeb Classical Library 381. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Livy. *History of Rome, Volume X: Books 35-37*. Trans. Evan T. Sage. Loeb Classical Library 301. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Livy. *History of Rome, Volume XII: Books 40-42*. Trans. Evan T. Sage, Alfred C. Schlesinger. Loeb Classical Library 332. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938.

- Livy. *History of Rome, Volume XIII: Books 43-45*. Trans. Alfred C. Schlesinger. Loeb Classical Library 396. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- McGing, Brian C. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Millar, Fergus. *The Roman Empire and its Neighbors*. Bristol Classical Press, 2013.
- Millar, Fergus. *The Roman Near East, 31 BC-AD 337*. Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Müller, Carl. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Paris: Firmin Didot: 1851.
- Nippel, Wilfried, and Вилфрид Ниппель. "The Construction of the 'Other.'" Trans. A. Nevill. Harrison, Thomas. *Greeks and Barbarians*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Volume I: Books 1-2 (Attica and Corinth)*. Trans. W. H. S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 93. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- Plato. *Republic, Volume I: Books 1-5*. Trans. Christopher Emlyn-Jones, William Preddy. Loeb Classical Library 237. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Plato. *Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles*. Trans. R. G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library 234. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Pliny. *Natural History, Volume III: Books 8-11*. Trans. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 353. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola*. Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 46. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume II: Themistocles and Camillus. Aristides and Cato Major. Cimon and Lucullus*. Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 47. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume II: Themistocles and Camillus. Aristides and Cato Major. Cimon and Lucullus*. Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 47. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume IX: Demetrius and Antony. Pyrrhus and Gaius Marius*. Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 101. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume VI: Dion and Brutus. Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus*. Trans. Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 98. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume X: Agis and Cleomenes. Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. Philopoemen and Flaminius*. Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library 102. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Plutarch. *Moralia, Volume XV: Fragments*. Trans. F. H. Sandbach. Loeb Classical Library 429. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Polybius. *The Histories, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Trans. W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank, Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 128. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Polybius. *The Histories, Volume III: Books 5-8*. Trans. W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank, Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 138. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Polybius. *The Histories, Volume IV: Books 9-15*. Trans. W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank, Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 159. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Polybius. *The Histories, Volume V: Books 16-27*. Trans. W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank, Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 160. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Polybius. *The Histories, Volume VI: Books 28-39. Fragments*. Trans. S. Douglas Olson. Rev. F. W. Walbank, Christian Habicht. Loeb Classical Library 161. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Postlethwaite, N. "Agamemnon Best of Spearmen." *Phoenix* 49, 1995: 95-103.
- Prag, Jonathan, and Josephine Crawley Quinn. *The Hellenistic West*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Rose, Valentin. *Valentini Rose De Aristotelis librorum ordine et auctoritate commentatio*. Berlin: Reimer, 1854.
- Sherk, Robert K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Sherwin-White, Adrian Nicholas. *Roman foreign policy in the East, 168 BC to AD 1*. London: Duckworth, 1984.
- Strabo. *Geography, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Trans. Horace Leonard Jones. Loeb Classical Library 49. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.
- Taplin, Oliver. *Homeric soundings: the shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford University Press 1992.

The Greek Anthology, Volume II: Book 7. Trans. W. R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library 68.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917.

Walbank, Frank W. *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic world: Essays and reflections.*
Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Walbank, Frank William. *A historical commentary on Polybius.* Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1957.

Walbank, Frank William. *The Hellenistic World.* Harvard University Press, 1993.

Wiedemann, Thomas. "Rhetoric in Polybius." *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek
Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries BC.* Ed. H. Verdin, G.
Schepens, and E. de Keyser, Leuven: *Studia Hellenistica* 30, 1988: 288-300