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ABSTRACT

In Part One the composition of Book 45 of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* is studied and an attempt is made to trace portions of the book to a small number of principal sources. It is demonstrated that Livy used the work of the Greek historian Polybius for his account of Roman activities in the Hellenistic east and for Roman relations with the Hellenistic states. Livy's Latin sources in this book were the Sullan annalists Valerius Antias and Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, of whom Claudius may have been the more prominent. Livy used these late annalists for his account of events in Rome and the west, and for administrative details such as lists of magistrates. This analysis of Livy's work helps us to evaluate the relative worth of his account, since Polybius was generally more reliable than the annalists in his description of affairs in the Hellenistic east, while the annalists seem to have provided an important service by preserving "archival" material in their writings.

The detailed commentary on Book 45 appears in Part Two. Although problems of many kinds are treated, the emphasis is on international relations, prosopography, political groups in Rome, chronology and the other traditions which treat the events described by Livy.

In Appendix One and Appendix Three an attempt is made to clarify the diplomatic relations of Rome with the Rhodians and with the Ptolemaic kingdom, respectively, during the years 172 - 167. This attempt involves an evaluation and synthesis of a variety of sources belonging to different traditions. The attitude towards the Rhodians reflected in the work of the Roman annalists forms the subject of Appendix Two. In Appendix Four the relations between Rome and the Hellenistic states are considered. The most usual bond between Rome and these states in the second century B. C. seems to have been that of *amicitia*, a relationship which denoted friendship without clearly defining the terms by which friendly relations were to be maintained. The Romans, however, became more and more insistent that their foreign *amicis* should follow Roman foreign policy much as the Italian *socii* did. A few Hellenistic
states, however, were granted, or were forced to accept, _foedera_ with Rome which imposed upon them obligations similar to those of the Italian _socii_, but these non-Italian _socii_ of Rome were never fully absorbed into the system of the "Roman alliance".
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INTRODUCTION

After their victory in the struggle against Hannibal and the Carthaginians, the Romans turned their attention to the Hellenistic east to settle an old score with Philip V, king of Macedonia. The Second Macedonian War brought Rome for the first time into close and continuous contact with the Hellenistic east and provided an entirely new theatre of action in which the Roman politicians and generals could win renown and public support at home. The Greeks, distracted by their own quarrels, tried on many occasions to use the might and prestige of Rome as a means to their own ends, but they failed to understand how the political experiences of the Roman people had accustomed them to be leaders instead of followers, and to demand enduring respect instead of momentary gratitude from the communities upon which they conferred benefits. The states which had invited Roman intervention and which had co-operated with the Romans became the inferior partners in their relations with Rome. Several Hellenistic states, such as Rhodes and the Attalids, discovered suddenly and in unpleasant circumstances that they were no longer free to act in their own interests without considering the wishes of Rome. It was defiance of Roman wishes that brought on the Achaean War of 147 - 146 whose result was the supervision of Greece by the governor of Macedonia. The arrogance and armed force which had previously been reserved for the Antigonids and the Seleucids along with their Greek allies had now been turned against the hostile states of mainland Greece.

But naked violence had been used against the Greeks over twenty years earlier. After the destruction of the Macedonian monarchy in 168 - 167, the Romans displayed a shocking ruthlessness and cruelty in punishing the Greeks and the other peoples of the Balkans who had fought on the Macedonian side. Cities and towns were plundered; individuals were put to death or forced into exile by the Romans and by the friends of the Romans in the Greek states. Leading figures were detained in Italy, where they were denied the opportunity to defend themselves against suspicions and nebulous
charges of anti-Roman sympathies or actions. For years after their crushing victory the Romans were pleased to allow Epirus and several of the Greek states to be dominated by opportunists such as Kharops and Kallikrates. These men were permitted or even encouraged to persecute any of their political opponents whom they could brand as anti-Roman.

It is with these reflections on Roman relations with the Hellenistic world that we begin our study of the last extant book of Livy.

Unless otherwise stated, all dates are B.C., and all dates are given by the day and month of the pre-Julian calendar.

In the transliteration of Greek and Latin names, I have tried to follow the original as closely as possible except where the Latinized or Anglicized forms have become common (for example, A. Antonius, Kharops, but Pompey, Polybius. For non-Anglicized Latin names I have followed the spelling given by Broughton Magistrates wherever possible. The forms of the Greek and Latin names given in the headings to the notes in the commentary are the forms of these names as they appear in the text of Giarratano.

The numbers in parentheses which follow the names of Roman magistrates and officers are the numbers used in the articles of RE to distinguish the various persons with the same nomen gentilicium, and such numbers following other personal names are those used in the articles of RE to distinguish persons who bore the same name. An asterisk signifies that the article appears in the first edition of RE. Where an equivalent without an asterisk is given to a number with an asterisk, for example, Quinctilius (*6/13), the equivalent number (in this example, 13) refers to the corresponding article in the new edition of RE (edited by G. Wissowa et alii. Stuttgart, 1894 - ). It is intended that these references will aid the reader in identifying the persons discussed in this thesis and in obtaining further biographical and prosopographical information about them from the articles in RE and from Broughton Magistrates, where reference is
made to articles in RE whenever they exist.

I have not used articles in the supplements to RE which have appeared since 1962 (Supplementbände IX (1962) - ) for any of the Roman magistrates and officers mentioned in this thesis.
PART ONE
THE SOURCES

Introduction

Most of our information about the period between the end of the Second Punic War and the fall of the Macedonian monarchy can be traced to the work of the Greek historian Polybius. As a prominent figure in the Achaean League, Polybius was among the thousand Achaeanhs detained in Italy after the war against Perseus because of alleged anti-Roman sympathies. While in Rome Polybius became a friend of Scipio Aemilianus and was allowed the freedom to collect information for a history of the Hellenistic world as it fell under Roman domination in the period 220/19 to 146/5 B.C. As a member of a prominent family in one of the more important Greek states, as a leading figure in the Achaean League, with friends and connections in other Hellenistic states, as the friend and protégé of an illustrious and powerful Roman family, as a resident of a great capital where he could speak to so many persons of high rank, and as a traveler and observer who witnessed many of the events he described, Polybius was in a favourable position to undertake the writing of an account of the developments which brought Rome to world domination. Although his prejudices can be readily identified, the historical methods and the standards of accuracy of Polybius give his work a high value.

See Pedech Meth. Hist. esp. 598 - 604; Walbank Polybius 71 - 96.

Of Books 16 - 39, treating the years 202/1 - 146/5, only fragments survive. The Codex Vaticanus Urbinas, which contains excerpts from Books 1 - 18 (except Book 17), is our best single manuscript of the fragments of Polybius. Most of the excerpts from the remaining books (19 - 39) are found in the collections made in the tenth century on the order of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetos (see p. 24 n. 3). Other fragments of the lost books occur in the works of later writers, including Plutarch, Strabo, Athenaios and the author of the Suda Lexicon.

See Ziegler RE XXI. 2 (1952) cols. 1575 - 1577.
One of the later Greek writers to make extensive use of Polybius' work in his own treatment of the period 218 - 146 was Diodoros of Sicily, who wrote in the middle and latter part of the first century B.C. Books 25 - 32 of Diodoros survive only in fragments preserved in the Constantinian excerpts, in the works of Photios and in the work of an unidentified Byzantine writer. A comparison of the fragments of Diodoros with the corresponding fragments of Polybius, where they exist, suggests that Diodoros was following his source very closely. See Schwartz RE V. 1 (1903) cols. 664, 688 - 690.

An important contribution made by Livy to our knowledge of Roman history in the early second century was his regular use of Polybius for events in the Hellenistic world from the outbreak of the Second Macedonian War to the end of the Achaean War in Books 31 - 52 of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, of which only Books 31 - 45 are extant. Using Polybius, Livy was able to present a detailed and reliable account of eastern events which was superior to the work of the Sullan annalists Q. Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias, Livy's two major Latin sources for the same period. For information on administrative matters and events in Rome and the west, Livy turned to the work of Claudius and Antias, whose special value consisted in their preservation of Roman documentary evidence, especially from the *Tabulae Pontificum*. This annalistic material included election lists, distribution of provinces and commands among the consuls, praetors and promagistrates, legionary dispositions in the various theatres of war, priestly appointments, prodigies, grain prices and public games. The annalists also dealt with treaties, embassies and military action, but their work on these subjects was often unreliable, especially when they described events involving the Hellenistic states. Even the material which appears to be archival must be treated with caution because the later annalists seem to have indulged in a certain amount of elaboration and invention. A study of Livy's sources is therefore of immediate value in providing a means of estimating the relative worth of Livy's account.

In the annalistic sections of the fourth and fifth decades, it is generally agreed that Livy used Claudius and Antias as his
principal sources, Antias being the more prominent source in Books 31 - 38, Claudius thereafter. Since Livy usually identified his sources only to note a conflict in his sources or to supply additional information from another source, it is often impossible to identify with confidence the annalistic source which Livy followed at any given point in his narrative.

In Book 45 there are at least four passages that seem to permit us to attempt an identification of the annalistic sources:

1) 1.1-5, which bears some resemblance to a fragment of Valerius Antias;
2) 20.4 - 25.4, describing an embassy which Claudius possibly antedated to 169;
3) 40.1-5, where Valerius Antias seems to have been used as an alternative source;
4) 43.1-8, where Antias seems to have been used for additional information,

Since Claudius and Antias were Livy's two main annalistic sources, it is probable that, if we are able to exclude either one of these as the source for a given annalistic passage, we may identify the other as the source for that passage.


Of the fifth decade of Livy, only Books 41 - 45 are extant. These books survive in but a single MS. of the fifth or sixth century, the Codex Vindobonensis (see Giarratano 7 - 12). The remaining books of Livy (46 - 52) in which Polybius was used are
lost. Apart from the works of later writers who used Livy, these lost books are represented by the Epitomae of Livy for Books 46 - 52, and by the Oxyrhynchus summaries for Books 48 - 52 (see Klotz RE XIII. 1 (1926) cols. 822 - 824).

Dio Cassius, who wrote a history of Rome in Greek in the time of Septimius Severus, seems to have followed the Polybian account of events in the Hellenistic east in Books 18 - 21, covering the years 201 - 146, but the occurrence in his work of annalistic material very similar to that found in Livy suggests that Dio did not use Polybius directly, but instead obtained the Polybian account along with annalistic material from the Latin historian. Dio seems to have used other sources, possibly including annalistic writers. His work is usually of no help to us in tracing portions of Livy's account either to Polybius or to the annalists.

In the manuscripts of Dio are preserved only Books 36 - 54, substantial fragments of Books 55 - 60, fragments of Books 78 - 79 and mutilated remains, probably of Book 17. Of the lost books of Dio we have excerpts in the works of the Byzantine writers Xiphilinos (second half of the 11th c.), who used Dio, Books 36 - 80, and Zonaras (early 12th c.), who used Dio, Books 1 - 21 and 44 - 80 in Books 7 - 12 of his 'Επίστολας χρονικοις. Other fragments of Dio are found in the Constantinian collections and in a number of other sources. See Schwartz RE III. 2 (1899) col. 1721.

The other sources for this period, such as Velleius Paterculus and Appian, cannot be considered in the context of the Polybian-Livian tradition. These authors are generally unhelpful to us in the study of Livy's sources, since we cannot identify their own sources with confidence and since we do not know how they used their sources.
Analysis of Livy, Book 45

1.1 - 3.2

Presentiment of victory at Rome (1.1-5); announcement of victory, demobilization of Roman forces, thanksgiving (1.6 - 3.2).

This section is annalistic.

Nissen (Krit. Untersuch. 272) argued that 1.1-5 is Polybian on the grounds that the names of the three envoys appear in a passage of Book 44 which is clearly Polybian (L. 44.45.3) and that the return of Fabius to Macedonia is mentioned in a passage of Book 45 which is clearly Polybian (L. 45.27.1). Klotz (Livius 20, 73) agrees with Nissen in attributing 1.1-5 to Polybius, but suggests that Livy obtained the names of the envoys from the annalistic source of 1.6 - 3.2.

Nissen's reasons for attributing 1.1-5 to Polybius are unconvincing because it is not unusual for both Polybius and Livy's annalistic sources to know the names of Roman envoys.

Furthermore, a miraculous story of this kind is not to be expected from Polybius (see for instance his criticism of Timaios in 12.24.5: ὁδός γὰρ ἐν μὲν ταῖς τῶν πέλας κατημορκαῖς πολλὴν ἐπιφαίνει δεινότητα καὶ τόλμαν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἱδίαις ἀποφασεῖν ἐνυπνεῶν καὶ τερατῶν καὶ μύθων ἀπιθάνων καὶ συλλήβδην δεισίδαιμονίας ἀγεννοῦσ καὶ τερατεύσ ἴεναικόδους ἐστι πλήρης).

The more usual account of the announcement of the victory at Pydna given by most Roman authors included the divine brothers Castor and Pollux, who either act as intermediaries announcing the victory to P. Vatinius (Cicero De Nat. Deor. 2.6, 3.11; Val. Max. 1.8.1; Lactantius Inst. 2.7.10) or bring word to Rome themselves (Florus 1.28.14-15; Pliny NH 7.86; Minucius Felix 7.3).

We may compare Livy's account of the announcement of the victory over Perseus with his description of the battle of Lake Regillus (2.19.3 - 20.13). The annalistic tradition seems to have described the participation of Castor and Pollux in this battle (Cicero De Nat. Deor. 2.6, 3.11; Dionysios of Halikarnassos Ant. 6.13.1-3; Florus 1.11.4-5; Val. Max. 1.8.1; Frontinus Strat. 1.11.8; Lactantius Inst. 2.7.10). The only vestige of the Castor and Pollux story in Livy's account is the vowing of a temple to the
divine brothers by the dictator A. Postumius. Ogilvie (Commentary 289) writes: "Livy blandly omitted the theophany which was the motive for the vow and the climax of the engagement".

The presentiment story therefore seems to be an adjustment which Livy made in the generally accepted version of the announcement of the Roman victory over Perseus. We may compare this passage to the one in which Livy described the portents which accompanied the report of renewed fighting in Africa in 202 (L. 30.38.6-12). A closer parallel to the presentiment story is the passage in Livy (37.38) describing the rumor celebris in Rome, according to which the consul L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus and his brother Scipio Africanus had been captured by Antiochus III and that all the Roman forces in Asia had been destroyed. Valerius Antias, who was cited by Livy (37.38.1, 7) as the sole authority for this rumor, may also have been Livy's source for the presentiment story, which occurs only here in Livy in connection with the report of the victory over Perseus, and in sources dependent upon Livy.

The presentiment story as given by Livy is found in substantially the same form in Plut. Aem. 24.2-3 and Zon. 9.24.2. The account of Zon. can probably be traced to Livy and it is quite possible that Plutarch used Livy for this story. 1

The account of the miraculous presentiment did not belong to the annalistic account of the report of victory presented in L. 45.1.6 - 3.2. One indication of this is the language of Livy in 1.6: et altera traditur turbae non minus similis veri laetitia. The account which follows is circumstantial and follows the usual pattern for the transaction of public business in Rome. First news of the victory is brought on 16 Sept. by the tabellarius sent by the envoys, who arrive in Rome themselves on 25 Sept. (1.6, 2.2-3). The source of the presentiment story seems to have been unaware of the tabellarius and placed the official report some time after the presentiment, quod postquam verius nuntiis Fabi Lentulique et Metelli adventu firmatum est (1.5).

There also seems to be a chronological problem created by the source of the presentiment story. While the annalistic story which included Castor and Pollux placed the report of victory in Rome on
the very evening after the battle, the annalistic tradition also placed the report of victory by the tabellarius on 16 Sept., the second day of the Ludi Romani. It is possible that the source of the presentiment story placed the report of the victory in Rome on the third day after the battle (i.e., on 7 Sept.) in an effort to bring this event into the context of the Ludi Romani. This would suggest that the source of the story was an annalist of the Sullan period (or later), since the Ludi Romani were originally held on one day (15 Sept.) and the festal period was gradually extended so that in Augustan times it lasted from 4 to 19 Sept. It is possible that the games began almost as early as the fourth in the time of the Sullan annalists. Since the circus games, however, did not begin until 15 Sept., while the presentations which preceded them were dramatic, the source of the presentiment story would have produced a poor chronological link with the account of the formal announcement of victory. See on 1.6.

Livy's account of the formal report of victory (1.6 - 3.2) came from his principal annalistic source, while the presentiment story probably came from a secondary annalistic source, and was added in order to help establish an emotional setting for the official report of victory.

We may perhaps accept the suggestion of Klotz (Livius 20, 73) that the names of the envoys did not appear in the presentiment story, but were taken by Livy from his annalistic source for the section 1.6 - 3.2.

There is a difference between the accounts of Polybius (in L. 44.32.5) and of the annalistic source (in L. 45.3.1) concerning the names of the legati from Illyricum. According to the Polybian account, the envoy was Perperna (M. Perperna (3), while Livy's annalistic source named C. Licinius Nerva (133) and P. Decius (20). See on 3.1.

Rhodian embassy (3.3-8); return of Marcellus from Spain (4.1); capture of Perseus (4.2 - 6.12); interview of Paullus with Perseus (7.1 - 9.1); review of the history of the Macedonian kingdom (9.2-7); Popillius at Rhodes (10. 1-15); summary of events in Egypt (11.1-11); Popillius in Egypt (12.1-8).

Except for a brief annalistic portion (4.1), this section is Polybian.

A change of source from the annalistic sources of 1.1 - 3.2 is indicated at 3.3 by the words tradidere quidam. Fragments of the Polybian narrative which Livy used in this section are found in Pol. 29, covering the Olympiad year 152.4 (169/8). We begin with an extract from Polybius' section on the Bellum Persicum treating the Rhodian embassy (L. 45.3.3-8 = Pol. 29.19). Before turning to events in Macedonia and the Hellenistic east in 4.2, Livy added a brief note on the return of Marcellus from Spain from his annalistic source. This completed Livy's account of business handled by the senate in the middle of the consular year 168.

No Polybian fragments dealing with the capture of Perseus are preserved, but a derivative account is probably to be found in Dio fr. 66.3 and in Zon. 9.23.9-12. The opening words of L. 45.4.2 (Paulus Aemilius consul, cum castra, ut supra dictum est, ad Siras terrae Odomanticae haberet....) point back to the Polybian narrative on the subjugation of Macedonia by Paullus which we left at the end of Book 44 (L. 44.46.11). The arrival of Paullus at Sirae must have been mentioned in the page of the MS. which is missing at the end of Book 44 (see Weissenborn-Müller 183).

The speech of Paullus to the young Roman officers was derived from Polybius (L. 45.8.6-7 = Pol. 29.20). The review of Macedonian history in L. 45.9.2-7 is probably from Polybius. Although we do not have a fragment of Polybius which corresponds to this passage, we may note that the remarks of Polybius concerning the prediction made by Demetrios of Phaleron (29.21) are appropriate to a summation from which Livy could have drawn material for his own account. Another argument in favour of a Polybian summation at this point is that Polybius had originally intended to carry his history only down to
the fall of the Macedonian monarchy in 168 - 167 (cf. Pol. 3.1.9). Dio, who seems to have followed Livy, agrees with him that Perseus was the twentieth king of Macedonia after Karanos (L. 45.9.3; Zon. 9.24.5), while a variant tradition is possibly recorded by Justinus 33.2.6, where it is stated that Perseus reigned thirtieth after Karanos. Eusebios, counting such figures as Pyrrhos, Lysimakhos and Ptolemy Keraunos, made Perseus thirty-ninth after Karanos (cf. Eusebii Chronicorum Liber Prior, ed. Schoene. cols. 241 - 242). According to Eusebios, Perseus reigned for ten years and eight months.

The last portion of Livy’s narrative derived from Polybius’ section on the Belium Persicum deals with the actions of Popillius at Rhodes (L. 45.10). No fragment of Polybius survives, but Dio fr. 68.1 may probably be traced to him. At 45.10.1 Livy resumed the Polybian narrative of naval action in the Aegean which we left at 44.29.5 (see L. 44.28.1 - 29.5).

Next we come to a part of Livy’s account derived from Polybius’ section on the Belium Antiochi cum Ptolemais Fratribus. Livy (45.11) provided a summary of events in Egypt from late in 169 until the intervention of Popillius in the summer of 168. Polybius was probably the source of this summary: see his review of events in Egypt in the years 213 - 204 (Pol. 14.12). The summary in Zon. 9.25.1 probably depends ultimately on Polybius (but note the erroneous detail that Antiochus supported the claims of the younger brother). The criticism of Antiochus for his pretense of supporting the rights of the elder Ptolemy, and for his abrupt abandonment of that pretense once he had lost his pretext, is found in Diod. 31.1 as well as in Livy (45.11.8). The occurrence of this detail in Diod. strongly suggests a Polybian origin. Livy’s passage on the intervention of Popillius in Egypt (45.12.1-8) was derived from Pol. 29.27.

We may also note two places in the section L. 45.3.3 - 12.8 where Livy apparently explained the Greek of Polybius for his readers: Theondan, qui summus magistratus apud eos erat - regem epsi appellant - ad Persea mittunt (5.6), and pueri regii apud
Macedonas vocabantur principum liberi ad ministerium electi regis (6.7).

The passages noted by Weissenborn-Müller 6 as parallels to Livy's account of the Rhodian embassy (Zon. 9.24.6; Dio fr. 68.2-3) refer, not to the embassy of 168, but to the embassy of 167.

On the sources of L. 45.3.3 - 12.8 see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 273 - 274; Klotz Livius 21, 75.

12.9 - 18.8

Campaign of the consul Licinius in Gaul (12.9-13); congratulatory embassies of Antiochus IV and of the Ptolemies (13.1-9); dispute between Luna and Pisa (13.10-11); embassy from Eumenes, Attalos and Athenaios (13.12); embassy from Masinissa (13.12 - 14.9); census (15.1-9); religious matters (15.10); the new consuls put the question of the provinces before the senate (16.1-4); prodigies (16.5-6); thanksgiving (16.7-8); settlement of Macedonia and Illyricum (17.1 - 18.8).

This section of Livy is annalistic. Livy completed his account of the events of the consular year 168 (12.9 - 15.10) and opened his account of 167 (16.1 - 18.8) with his annalistic source.

The account of the congratulatory embassies from Antiochus IV and from the Ptolemies (13.1-9) is annalistic rather than Polybian. The Polybian account of the Egyptian embassy is found in Pol. 30.16. There are a number of differences in detail between Livy's account and that of Polybius. Noumenios, the Ptolemaic ambassador, and Menalkidas, a Spartan released by the Ptolemies at the request of C. Popillius Laenas, appear in Pol. but not in Livy. Pol. spoke of οὐθέν τῶν πολεμίων, while Livy's annalistic source spoke of the "regibus Aegypti, Ptolemaeo Cleopatraeque". Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, the younger brother of Ptolemy VI, now shared the throne of Egypt with Ptolemy VI under Roman protection (cf. Pol. 29.27.9), but the annalistic source does not seem to have recognized this here. In Livy's account we also note the annalistic detail that C. Papirius distributed the presents to the envoys. Furthermore, it is unlikely that Livy would pass over the account of the Olympiad year 153.1 (168/7) on the Res Italiae and the Res Graeciae, now represented by
Pol. 30.1-15, in order to use the Polybian account of the Ptolemaic embassy, since Livy normally followed the order of events as given in the text of Polybius.

The Polybian accounts of the settlement of Macedonia and Illyricum occur in L. 45.29.1-14 and 26.11-15, respectively. The annalistic source of L. 45.17.1 - 18.8 named the legati sent to determine the detailed arrangements of the settlement of Macedonia and Illyricum, and reported the general terms of the settlement proclaimed by the senate, adding an explanation of Roman motives.

On the sources of L. 45.12.9 - 18.8 see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 274; Klotz Livius 21, 75.

19.1 - 34.14
Embassy of Attalos (19.1 - 20.3); embassy of the Rhodians (20.4 - 25.4); the Rhodian Peraea, the request by Rhodes for an alliance with Rome (25.4-13); Anicius in Illyricum and Epirus, arrangements for Illyricum (26); sack of Aiginion, Agassai and Aineia by Paullus (27.1-4); travels of Paullus in Greece (27.5 - 28.5); violence in Aetolia (28.6-8); Paullus meets the ten commissioners and Perseus at Amphipolis (28.8-11); arrangements for Macedonia (29); description of Macedonian resources (30); investigation and arrest of anti-Roman politicians (31); provisions for the government of the Macedonian μητρικά, deportation of leading Macedonians to Rome, victory games of Paullus at Amphipolis (32); dedication of spoils, punishment of Illyrians who had supported Perseus (33); sack of Epirus, Anicius orders deportation of anti-Roman politicians in Epirus and Akarnania to Rome, departure of Paullus for Rome (34.1-9); embassy to the Galatians (34.10-14).

For his description of events in the Hellenistic east, Livy returned to the narrative of Polybius in Book 30, covering the Olympiad year 153.1 (168/7). We begin with portions from Polybius' section on the Res Italicae (embassy of Attalos, L. 45.19.1 - 20.3 = Pol. 30.1-3; the Rhodian Peraea and the Rhodian request for a Roman alliance, L. 45.25.4-13 = Pol. 30.5).

Next we turn to the portion of Livy's narrative derived from
the Polybian section on the *Res Graeciae*. In L. 45.26.1 we are referred to the Polybian account in Livy, Book 44 on the capture of Gentius (L. 44.30.1 - 32.5). In L. 45.26.1 - 34.9 we may note the following correspondences with the fragments of Polybius: travels of Paullus in Greece, L. 45.27.5 - 28.5: cf. Pol. 30.10; investigation and arrest of anti-Roman politicians, L. 45.31.5-11 = Pol. 30.13; remark of Paullus at the victory celebrations, L. 45.32.11 = Pol. 30.14; sack of Epirus, L. 45.34.5-6 = Pol. 30.15.

The two correspondences with the fragments of Diodoros are probably evidence for a Polybian origin: the division of Macedonia into four parts, L. 45.29.4-9 = Diod. 31.8.6-9; victory celebrations, shipment of treasure to Rome, departure of Paullus from Macedonia, L. 45.32.8 - 33.7, 34.7-8: cf. Diod. 31.8.9. The account of violence in Aetolia as described by Livy (28.6-8) was probably derived from the narrative of Polybius to which Pol. 30.11 belongs.

Livy's account of the embassy to the Galatians came from Polybius' section on the *Res Asiae*. Although no fragment from this section survives for this Olympiad year, we note that Polybius mentioned the embassy which was sent to the Galatians in 167 under P. Licinius Crassus (Pol. 30.3.7-8), and that he indicated that he treated the Galatian problem further on in his narrative. The section on the *Res Asiae* for this Olympiad year would have occurred between the sections on the *Res Graeciae* (represented by frs. 6 - 15) and on the *Res Aegypti* (represented by fr. 16). Since Polybius (30.28) reported the senatus consultum liberating the Galatians from Pergamon in his account of the Olympiad year 153.3 (166/5), it is probable that he described the Galatian problem in some detail in its appropriate place under the two preceding Olympiad years.

Note that in 45.32.2 Livy translated the Greek of Polybius: *senatores quos synedros vocant*.

Livy's description of the Rhodian embassy (45.20.4 - 25.4) was derived, not from Polybius, but from an annalistic source. Livy did not name the Rhodian ambassadors until he returned to the Polybian narrative at 25.4, but he did not name the third envoy, Philophron. Polybius did not name the praetor (M'. Iuventius Thalna) who proposed the declaration of war on Rhodes, nor did he mention the other tribune, M. Pomponius, who acted with Antonius in
dragging the praetor down from the rostra. There are, furthermore, a number of substantial differences between the two accounts. Livy's account is the more circumstantial, as he described the meeting of the senate convened by the consul M. Iunius Pennus to discuss the reception of the Rhodians, the public rebuff offered by the consul and the senate to the ambassadors, the proposal of war by the praetor Iuventius which was blocked by the tribuni plebis Antonius and Pomponius, and the violation of constitutional practice by both Iuventius and the tribunes. According to Livy the Rhodians donned mourning after their public rebuff by the senate, while Polybius placed this after the proposal of war by the praetor. The tenor of the speech made by Astymedes before the senate, as we gather from the criticism of it by Polybius, was that the services of the Rhodians had been far greater than those of the other Greeks, whose offenses against Rome Astymedes emphasized and exaggerated. In the speech which Livy composed to represent the address of the Rhodian spokesman, the argument of the Rhodians is that their previous behavior had always been correct in view of the amicitia with Rome, and that their lukewarm support of Rome in the war against Perseus had been the fault, not of all the Rhodians, but only of a few misguided politicians, who either had or would be punished to the satisfaction of the senate.

Although Livy used his annalistic source to describe the Rhodian embassy, he returned to Polybius for the account of subsequent Rhodian problems in the Peraea and of negotiations with Rome in 167. At this point Livy accepted the Polybian version of events which placed the senatus consultum liberating Lycia and Caria in 167, and rejected the version of Claudius Quadrigarius, who placed it in 169 (see L. 44.15.3-7 with Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 261; Klotz Livius 71 - 72). In the speech composed by Livy for the embassy of 167 (L. 45.22-24), the Rhodians fail to complain about the loss of Lycia and Caria (cf. 22.2: Rhodii, quos provinciis nuper Lycia atque Caria, quos praemiis atque honoribus amplissimis donastis; 23.1: Praemia et Philippo et Antiocho devicto amplissima acceperimus a vobis; 23.17 (referring to the Rhodian peace-making embassy of 168): Satis quidem et tunc in praesentia castigata illa
legatio erat, cum tam tristi responso vestro dimissa. Si tum parum ignominiae pensum est, haec certe tam miserabilis ac supplex legatio etiam insolentioris, quam illa fuit, legationis satis magnum piaculum esset).

Livy has therefore removed all references to a senatus consultum in 169 in order to have the speech agree with the Polybian dating of the senatus consultum liberating Lycia and Caria to 167. Although it is possible that Livy was using Valerius Antias, who may have agreed with Polybius in placing the senatus consultum in 167, it is also possible that for his account of the Rhodian embassy Livy used Claudius Quadrigarius, who may have described the embassy of 167 without repeating the earlier loss of Lycia and Caria through the senatus consultum which he had placed in 169. But even if Claudius had mentioned the loss of Lycia and Caria, Livy could still have used his account, omitting references to it. Thus, Livy's agreement with Polybius on the dating of the senatus consultum does not indicate the identity of his annalistic source for the section 20.4 - 25.4. Since Claudius, however, placed the senatus consultum in 169, it is possible that for artistic reasons he telescoped the three Rhodian embassies of 169, 168 and 167 into one embassy which he described in his account of the consular year 169. If this is the case, then Claudius would not have described a separate Rhodian embassy in his account of 167, and Livy would presumably have used Valerius Antias for his account of this embassy. See Klotz Livius 71 - 72.

The insertion of an annalistic section (20.4 - 25.4) into a Polybian section of the narrative (19.1 - 20.3, 25.4 - 34.14) is not unusual. In his account of the final campaign in Macedonia leading to the battle of Pydna and the fall of the Macedonian kingdom (44.32.5 - 46.11), Livy inserted a brief annalistic passage (37.5-9) describing the lunar eclipse which preceded the battle of Pydna, although the rest of the narrative is Polybian (see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 265 - 266; Klotz Livius 20, 73). Livy probably judged that his annalistic source was more reliable and more complete in its treatment of the Rhodian embassy than Polybius was. Polybius himself may have used an early annalistic source for his account.
of the Rhodian embassy (see Klotz Livius 76), or he may have questioned witnesses, obtaining a version of events not too dissimilar from that of Livy's annalistic source. Klotz (Livius 76) suggests that Livy may have used the Origines of Cato as well as an annalistic source for his account of the Rhodian embassy, but this is generally considered improbable (see Walsh Livy 134 - 135; Walbank in Livy, ed. Dorey 50 - 51).


35.1 - 44.21

Debate over the triumph of Paullus (35.1 - 39.20); triumph of Paullus (40.1-5); speech of Paullus (40.6 - 42.1); triumph of Octavius (42.2-3); custody of Perseus, Alexander and Bithys, embassy from Kotys, Macedonian ships (42.4-12); triumph of Anicius (43.1-8); Gentius in custody, Illyrian ships (43.9-10); military activity of the consuls of 167 (44.1); elections for 166 (44.2); calendar, religious appointments (44.3); embassy of Prusias (44.4-21).

Livy completed his account of the consular year 167 by describing events in Rome according to his annalistic source (see also Per. 46, where Livy seems to have begun his account of 166 by following the annalistic source on the campaigns of the consuls against the Gauls and Ligurians). Livy often completed his account of the consular year by describing events in Rome according to an annalistic source (cf. 42.6.4 - 10.8 (173); 42.18.6 - 28.13 (172); 43.1.1 - 3.7 (171); 44.13.12 - 18.8 (169); 45.12.9 - 15.10 (168).

Livy's account of the debate concerning the triumph of Paullus is annalistic. Polybius did not ordinarily concern himself with the detailed treatment of events in Rome unless these events were closely connected with developments in the Greek world, but since he had discussed important events in Rome which involved Scipio Africanus, the grandfather by adoption of Scipio Aemilianus (cf. Pol. 23.14), it is also likely that he mentioned the attempt to deny a triumph to Aemilius Paullus, the father of Scipio Aemilianus.
If Polybius mentioned the triumph of Aemilius Paullus, his passage on the triumph of Anicius (30.22) could have been a comparison of the extravagance of Anicius at his triumph with the traditional forms observed by Paullus. Although it is possible that Polybius treated the triumph of Paullus in his section on the Res Italiae for the Olympiad year 153.2 (167/6), perhaps in a passage which occurred before the account of the embassy of Kotys at 30.17, it seems more likely that Livy's account is annalistic. Certain details in Livy's narrative suggest this: the senatus consultum on the triumphs of the victorious generals and the special rogatio on the imperium of the generals (35.4); the note on Sulpicius Galba, qui tribunus militum secundae legionis in Macedonia fuerat (35.8); the rogatio of the tribune Ti. Sempronius on the imperium of Paullus (36.1); the repetition of the voting and the note on Servilius Pulex, qui consul et magister equitum fuerat.... Tribuni...de integro agere coeperunt revocatosque se easdem tribus pronuntiaverunt (36.9-10). The mention of the presentiment in Plut. Aem. 31.4 points back to the annalistic account in Aem. 24.2-3 and in L. 45.1.1-5. Plutarch's account (Aem. 30 - 31) was probably derived in part either from Livy or from the same source used by Livy in 45.35.1 - 39.20.

The description of the triumph of Paullus (40.1-5) is annalistic. Notice especially the details of the military procession (deinde equites turmatim et cohortes peditum suis quaeque ordinibus), details of the distribution of money to the troops, and the speculation about the intention of Paullus to grant a more generous distribution.

Nissen (Krit. Untersuch. 278) thought that Plutarch used the same source for both the debate over the triumph (Aem. 30 - 31) and for the description of the triumph (Aem. 32 - 34), while Livy used this source only for the debate over the triumph (35.1 - 39.20) and turned to another source for his description of the triumph (40.1-5).

It is not necessary, however, to posit the use of two sources in L. 45.35.1 - 40.5. Plutarch's account of the triumph of Paullus (Aem. 32 - 34) can be reconciled with that of Livy (40.1-5). The triumphal celebrations lasted three days (cf. Degrassi Fasti Triumphales p. 81 ad a. 167: see on 40.1). According to the epitomator Florus, whose work on this period is generally agreed to
have been based mainly on Livy,\textsuperscript{4} in the procession on the first
day there appeared the statues and pictures; on the second day,
arms and money; on the third day, the captives and the king himself
(1.28.12-13). This bare summary is essentially in agreement with
the account of Plutarch.

The events described in L. 45.40.1-5 occurred on the third
day of the triumph. Livy's account of the first two days of the
triumphal celebrations, and of the earlier part of the third day,
must have occurred in the page of the MS. which is missing before
the beginning of Chapter 40 (see Weissenborn-Müller 219;
Giarratano 359). In the procession which took place on the third
day of the triumph, there were, according to Plutarch, trumpeters,
sacrificial victims, precious metals, the chariot of Perseus with
the royal arms preceded by the children of the king and their
attendants, the advisors of Perseus following the king, wreaths of
gold and the \textit{triumphator} Aemilius Paullus in his chariot followed
by the army. The interrupted narrative of Livy resumes with
comments on the sum of precious metals captured, with a note on
the accumulated wealth of Perseus. These notes, which probably
formed part of the description of the Macedonian booty, occur
appropriately just before Livy's description of Paullus.

Thus, Livy's annalistic account of the triumph (40.1-5), which
is probably represented by Florus 1.28.12-13, can be compared to
the account of Plutarch (Aem. 32-34) and can be shown not to have
been radically different from that account. Both Livy and Plutarch
can have used the same annalistic source for their accounts of the
triumph, or perhaps Plutarch used Livy. The differences between
the two accounts can be explained partly by Plutarch's use of a
variety of sources.

The account of Diodoros (31.8.10-12), which differs in several
details from the annalistic account represented by Plutarch, Florus
and Livy, was possibly derived from Polybius.

Livy's comments on the total value of the precious metals
captured from Macedonia do not fit the usual pattern found in his
accounts of triumphs. Livy usually provided a list of the
precious metals displayed in their several forms (see Frank
The total given here is probably part of the description of the Macedonian booty. In the missing page of the MS, Livy probably followed the usual method of describing captured money and precious metals, for in criticizing the total given by Valerius Antias, he remarked: *qua haud dubie maior aliquanto summa ex numero plaustrorum ponderibusque auri, argenti generatim ab ipso scriptis absumptum efficitur.* Unless Livy was merely correcting the arithmetic of Valerius Antias, this remark of Livy's suggests that he was using Antias here as an alternative source with whom he disagreed. Perhaps this allows us to identify Livy's main source as Claudius Quadrigarius.

If L. 45.35.1 - 40.5 may be traced to one annalistic source, we are not prevented from identifying this source as Claudius by the detail in the speech of Servilius (38.7) that Scipio Africanus lived at Liternum during his exile. Although this fact was stated by Valerius Antias, Livy's main source for the "trials of the Scipios" (L. 38.50.4 - 55.13; Scipio at Liternum: 38.53.8, 56.3; see Nissen *Krit. Untersuch.* 213; Klotz *Livius* 16), the details of the exile of Scipio Africanus at Liternum were a commonplace in literature (cf. Val. Max. 2.10.2; Pliny *NH* 14.49, 16.234; Seneca *Ep.* 86; Dio fr. 63; Dio 38.26.3), and as such, a reference to the exile of Scipio Africanus could have appeared just as well in the work of Claudius Quadrigarius.

Livy's account of the misfortune of Paullus in the loss of his sons (40.6 - 42.1) is probably annalistic, but the Polybian tradition, which is probably represented by Diod. 31.11, treated this episode and the speech of Paullus in a very similar manner. The speech of Paullus could have occurred in the Polybian section on the *Res Italiae* for the Olympiad year 153.2 (167/6) in a passage which preceded his account of the embassy from Kotys (Pol. 30.17). Polybius may have used a Roman annalist or a family document preserving the speech of Paullus; he may have heard the speech himself or learned of it through witnesses. As an exhibition of the fortitude of Paullus in the midst of personal tragedy, this speech became part of the annalistic tradition. From the version of Val. Max. 5.10.2, where a portion of the original speech may
be preserved, it appears probable that the annalistic tradition included a sketch of Paullus' movements and achievements similar to that reported in the Polybian tradition (cf. Val. Max. 5.10.2: oratione, quam de rebus a se gestis apud populum habuit). The annalistic tradition is probably represented by Plut. Aem. 34.4 - 37.1 and perhaps also by Appian Mak. 19. In both of these sources there occurs a sketch of the movements and achievements of Paullus similar to the one in Diod. 31.11, which probably represents the account of Polybius.

The detail in Livy's account that Paullus addressed a contio assembled by the tribunus plebis M. Antonius (45.40.9) suggests an annalistic origin.

The section on the return of Bithys to his father Kotys (L. 45.42.6-11) is annalistic. In Livy's account there occurs a statement of Roman motives and a report of the arguments of the senate which placed Kotys in the wrong. The names of the envoys sent to escort Bithys to Thrace are listed, and the gift of 2000 asses for each of the Thracian envoys is mentioned. Bithys was summoned from Carseoli, where he was being detained according to L. 45.42.5. The Polybian version of the embassy from Kotys occurs at Pol. 30.17.

In describing the triumph of Anicius (43.1-8), Livy seems to have used Valerius Antias only for the additional piece of information on the value of that part of the booty from Illyricum which Anicius did not surrender to the treasury. Livy, however, realized that the statement of Antias was suspect because information of this kind was not ordinarily available (see on 43.8). Livy's main source for this passage may probably be identified as Claudius.

The embassy of Prusias (45.44.1-19, 20-21) is described according to Livy's annalistic source (cf. 44.19: haec de Prusia nostri scriptores). In 44.19-20 Livy mentioned the alternative account of Polybius, whose treatment of this embassy seems to have been concerned mainly with criticism of the servile behaviour of Prusias (cf. Pol. 30.18). The annalistic account favourable to Prusias is also preserved in Val. Max. 5.1.1e and in Eutropius 4.8.4.

On the sources of L. 45.35.1 - 44.21 see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 277 - 279; Klotz Livius 76 - 77.
The following chart represents an attempt to show the relationship of Livy's account to the other surviving accounts of the same events.

In the first column appear portions of Livy's narrative for which parallels in the other major sources can be found.

In the second column occur references to parts of the Polybian account used by Livy, and in the third column occur references to portions of the account of Diodoros which correspond to fragments of Polybius and to portions of Livy's account. Since Diodoros based his account of the years 218 - 146 on Polybius, his work is also evidence for the Polybian origin of corresponding portions of the Livian account.

In the fourth column are listed references to the fragments of Dio and to the excerpts of Zonaras from Dio, who seems to have based his account of the years 201 - 146 on Livy.

Since it is not clear what sources Appian consulted and how he used his sources, the references to portions of his work which appear in the fourth column do not suggest anything about the origin of the corresponding portions of Livy's account.

As with the works of Dio, Zonaras and Appian, the references to Plutarch's _Aemilius_ cannot be used as independent evidence for the origin of the corresponding parts of Livy's narrative, since Plutarch used a variety of sources, probably including both Polybius and Livy, so that in his account are preserved elements of both the annalistic and the Polybian traditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentiment of victory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.1.1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhodian embassy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.3.3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capture of Perseus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.4.2 - 9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remark of Paullus to his military staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.8.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Macedonian history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.9.2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(probably part of a summary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Popillius at Rhodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of events in Egypt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement of the conduct of Antiochus IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Popillius in Egypt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 45.12.1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Additional Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Attalos</td>
<td>L. 45.19.1 - 20.3</td>
<td>Pol. 30.1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodian embassy</td>
<td>L. 45.20.4 - 25.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Zon. 9.24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble in the Rhodian Peraea</td>
<td>L. 45.25.4-13</td>
<td>Pol. 30.5</td>
<td>see Dio fr. 68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodian feeling of relief</td>
<td>L. 45.25.6</td>
<td>Pol. 30.5.2-3</td>
<td>Diod. 31.5.2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paullus on tour</td>
<td>L. 45.27.5 - 28.5</td>
<td>see Pol. 30.10</td>
<td>see Plut. Aem. 28.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Macedonia</td>
<td>L. 45.29.4-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diod. 31.8.6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest of anti-Roman politicians</td>
<td>L. 45.31.5-11</td>
<td>Pol. 30.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remark of Paullus at the victory celebrations</td>
<td>L. 45.32.11</td>
<td>Pol. 30.14</td>
<td>Diod. 31.8.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translated from Greek to English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Additional References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sack of Epirus</td>
<td>L. 45.34.5-6</td>
<td>see Appian Ill. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pol. 30.15</td>
<td>see Plut. Aem. 29,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= L. 45.34.5-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate over the triumph of Paullus</td>
<td>L. 45.35.1-39.20</td>
<td>see Plut. Aem. 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The triumph of Paullus</td>
<td>L. 45.40.1-40.5</td>
<td>see Zon. 9.24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see Plut. Aem. 32-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The misfortune of Paullus in the loss of</td>
<td>L. 45.40.6-42.1</td>
<td>see Diod. 31.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his sons</td>
<td>see Appian Mak. 19</td>
<td>see Plut. Aem. 34.4-37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of Bithys</td>
<td>L. 45.42.6-12</td>
<td>see Zon. 9.24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Prusias</td>
<td>L. 45.44.4-19, 20-21</td>
<td>see Zon. 9.24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see Diod. 31.15</td>
<td>see Dio fr. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see Val. Max. 5.1.1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Polybian account of the embassy of</td>
<td>L. 45.44.19-20</td>
<td>see Appian Mith. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prusias</td>
<td>see Pol. 30.18</td>
<td>Diod. 31.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Pol. 30.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes to Part One

1) Both Dio, from whose work Zonaras made excerpts, and Plutarch, in his biographies of Romans, used Livy and the Roman annalists as well as Greek authors. On Plutarch see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 280 - 305; Peter Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographien der Rümer; Smith CQ 34 (1940) 1 - 10; Delvaux Les sources de Plutarque dans les vies parallèles des Romains; Ziegler RE XXI. 1 (1951) cols. 912 - 914; Griffith "The Greek Historians", Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship 220 - 221, notes 103 - 107; De Sanctis Storia III. 2. 197 - 200, 366 - 373.

For his account of the Second Punic War, Dio seems to have used Livy as well as annalistic sources. Polybius seems to be the basis of Dio's account of the years 201 - 146, covered in Books 18 to 21, but the appearance in Dio of annalistic material similar to that found in Livy suggests that Dio followed Livy instead of making direct use of Polybius. On Dio's readings, cf. Dio fr. 1.2: ἀνέγνων μὲν πάντα ὡς εἶπείν τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν τις ἡγηραμένα, συνεγραφά δὲ οὖ πάντα ἄλλα ὅσα ἔξεκρινα. On Dio see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 308 - 312; Schwartz RE III. 2 (1899) cols. 1696 - 1697; De Sanctis Storia III. 2. 186 - 192, 637 - 641.

2) For his account of the years 218 - 146, covered in Books 25 to 32, Diodoros followed Polybius closely. A number of fragments from Books 30 and 31 of Diodoros can be shown to be almost verbatim copies of Polybius. On Diodoros see Nissen Krit. Untersuch.110 - 113; Schwartz RE V. 1 (1903) cols. 688 - 690; De Sanctis Storia III. 2. 647 - 650.

3) Within each Olympiad year, Polybius treated events in each theatre of action, following a fixed order which is rarely broken (i.e., Italy, Sicily, Spain, Africa, Greece and Macedonia, Asia, Egypt; cf. Pol. 32.11.2: τὴν δὲ ἡγησίαν ἐστὶ τὴν εἰδομένην τὰς, ὡς ἡχομεθα παρὰ ὅλην τὴν πραγματείαν). The Constantinian excerpts from Polybius were placed under fifty-three titles, of which only six have survived: De Virtutibus et Vitiis; De Sententias; De Insidias; De Strategematis;
De Legationibus Gentium ad Romanos; De Legationibus Romanorum ad Gentes. The Constantinian excerpts cover the whole of Polybius' work except Books 17, 19, 26, 37 and 40, and are arranged in the order in which they appeared in the original, but identifying book-numbers are rarely given. The fragments of Polybius preserved under the six titles mentioned may be arranged within the account of the Olympiad years according to Polybius' usual order for the various theatres of action. See Ziegler RE XXI. 2 (1952) cols. 1575 - 1577; Moore The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius 123 - 167.


5) In Mak. 19 the account of Appian is close to that of Polybius, but it appears that Appian also used annalistic material and that he may have obtained the Polybian tradition through an intermediary. On Appian see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 113 - 118; Schwartz RE II. 1 (1895) cols. 219 - 222; Meloni Il Valore Storico e le Fonti del Libro Macedonico di Appiano 207 - 213; Will Histoire II. 469 - 471.
PART TWO
COMMENTARY

1.1 Victoriae nuntii:

Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus (109)
L. Cornelius Lentulus (190)
Q. Caecilius Metellus (Macedonicus) (94)

Fabius was a son of L. Aemilius Paullus (see on 1.8) by his first wife, Papiria. In 181 he was adopted into the family of the Fabii Maximi, probably by Q. Fabius Maximus (105), a grandson of Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator (116). The younger brother of Fabius was P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus (335), adopted in 179 into the family of the Cornelii Scipiones by P. Cornelius Scipio (331), the eldest son of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (336). As praetor in Sicily in 149 during the Third Punic War, Fabius (109) received the Carthaginian hostages and transferred them to Rome; he attained the consulship in 145.

Lentulus may be the same L. Cornelius Lentulus (191) who was praetor in 140, or the Cornelius Lentulus (172) who was praetor in 137, and perhaps the L. Cornelius Lentulus (192) who was consul in 130. The Cornelii Lentuli were traditional supporters of the Scipios (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 166 - 167). Later in 168 a P. Cornelius Lentulus (202) was sent by Aemilius Paullus as a legatus to negotiate with Perseus (L. 45.4.7). As praetor in Macedonia and Greece in 148 Caecilius crushed the revolt of Andriskos; his imperium was prorogued in 147 and in 146. After he defeated the Achaeans and their allies at Skarpheia and Khaironeia, he was superseded by Mummius and returned to Rome, where he celebrated a triumph over the Macedonians and Andriskos. He was consul in 143, censor in 131, augur from before 140 to 115. His father, Q. Caecilius Metellus (81), had been a supporter of Scipio Africanus (see Cassola Gruppi 407 - 410; Scullard Rom. Pol. 76 - 78). Caecilius (94), although at first a friend of Scipio Aemilianus, later became
hostile to him (see Astin Scipio Aemilianus 312 - 315).

1.2 quarto post die:
7 Sept. by the Roman (i.e., the pre-Julian) calendar. See on 1.11.

1.2 cum in circo ludi fierent:

1.2 murmure:
For other examples of unconfirmed reports in Livy, see
L. 5.18.7-12 (rumor in the Roman camp and in Rome after a
defeat by the Falernians and Capenates), 24.11.6 (on the state
of war in Sicily), both of which proved to be true, and
33.41.1 (the death of Ptolemy V), 28.25.1 (the death of Scipio
Africanus), both of which proved to be false. For further
examples of miraculous pre-knowledge see Pease De Natura
Deorum I. 557 - 558. An account similar to this one is that
of the report of victory over Hasdrubal by Livius Salinator
and Claudius Nero in 207 (L. 27.50.3 - 51.10). A rumor (fama)
spread to the effect that two cavalrymen from the camp guarding
the pass of Furlo into Umbria had come to Rome with tidings of
the victory which could scarcely be believed, especially
because the battle had been fought only two days before.

1.6 ante diem quintum decimum kalendas Octobres, Ludorum Romanorum
secundo die:
Roman 16 Sept. The Ludi Romani were originally held on a single
day (15 Sept.), but the festal period was gradually extended,
so that by Augustan times it lasted from 4 to 19 Sept. The
days before the epulum Iovis (13 Sept.) were devoted to
dramatic presentations, and the days after, commencing with
15 Sept., to the circus games. See Michels The Calendar of
the Roman Republic 185; Wissowa Rel. und Kult. 127 - 128, 454.

1.6 C. Licinio consuli:
C. Licinius Crassus (51).
As consul in 168, his province was Italy, with charge of levies
and supplies for the Macedonian war. After the battle of Pydna
he dismissed his levies (see on 2.1) and later in the year he
went to Gaul, where his imperium was prorogued until he was
appointed as one of the ten commissioners for the settlement
of Macedonia. The Licinii Crassi were at this time political
associates of the Popillii (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 194 - 198, 207 - 208). As praetor in 172, Licinius enabled M. Popillius Laenas (*6/24), proconsul in Liguria, to escape condemnation for excessive severity against the Statellates (L. 42.22.2-8).

1.6 tabellarius:
There is no previous mention of this messenger in the text of Livy, who, in a Polybian section of his narrative, reported only the despatch of the three legati (L. 44.45.3).

1.6 laureatas litteras:
The despatch bearing news of victory was decorated with laurel: see L. 5.28.13; von Premerstein RE XII. 1 (1924) col. 1014; Ogilvie Commentary 691.

1.8 L. Aemilium:
L. Aemilius Paullus (114), the conqueror of Perseus. He was curule aedile in 193. In 191 he was praetor in Farther Spain, where his imperium was prorogued in 190 and 189. He was consul in 182 and proconsul in Liguria in 181, consul for a second time in 168 in Macedonia, where his imperium was prorogued in 167, censor in 164, and augur from about 192 until his death in 160. cf. CIL XI (1888) no. 1829; Degrassi Elogia no. 81, pp. 62 - 63:

L. Aemilius
L. f. Paullus,
Co(n)s(ul) II, cens(or), interrex, pr(aetor), aed(ilis) cur(ulis), q(uaestor), tr(ibunus) mil(itum) tertio, aug(ur).
Liguribus domitis priore consulatu triumphant.
Iterum co(n)s(ul) ut cum rege [Per]se bellum gereret, ap
[.... f]actus est. copias regis [decem dieb]us quibus Mac[e]
[doniam atti]git delev[it].
[regem cum liberi]s cep[it - - ]

1.9 civitates omnes Macedoniarum in dicionem populi Romani venisse:
By 6 Sept. (see on 1.11). Deditio (deditio in fidem, in dicionem, in potestatem, and so on) signified the unconditional surrender
of an individual or a community into Roman hands before a complete military defeat (expugnatio). A state at war with Rome could surrender voluntarily or under compulsion, while a state at war with or threatened by another state could make an act of deditio to Rome as a request for Roman protection. Dediticii were considered to have no political rights until the Romans arranged their political status. Although an act of deditio was deemed to place the state surrendering at discretion completely at the mercy of Rome, the dediticii had a claim on Roman fides and could usually expect moderate treatment. Deditio had been an instrument for building up the alliance of states in peninsular Italy under Roman hegemony. In the Hellenistic east, deditio established Roman spheres of influence (as in Illyricum after the war against the Ardiaei under Teuta: see Dahlheim Deditio und societas 22 - 27) or served as a means of restricting the sovereignty of unfriendly states (as in the case of Aetolia in 189: Ibid. 20 - 21, 45 - 51).

The formula of deditio made to Rome by a hostile state is given by L. 1.38.2 (also see Pol. 36.4.1-3; Ogilvie Commentary 153 - 154). For the terminology of deditio by a non-hostile state seeking Roman protection see Dahlheim Deditio und societas 22 - 27; on deditio in general see Heuss Wölk. Grundl. 60 - 113; Badian Foreign Clientelae 4 - 7; Dahlheim Deditio und societas.

1.11 tertius decimus dies:

16 Sept. Therefore the battle was fought on 4 Sept. according to the annalistic tradition.

Our major sources for the battle of Pydna are L. 44.37.5 ff., Zon. 9.23.4-7 and Plut. Aem. 17.3 ff. The Roman annalistic tradition seems to agree that the battle occurred on the day following a lunar eclipse, but it is not clear whether Polybius (cf. Pol. 29.16) gave precisely the same sequence.

According to Cicero De Re Pub. 1.23, Sulpicius Galus, on the day after the eclipse, addressed the troops in order to calm their fears. There is no mention of the battle of Pydna having taken place that day. Val. Max. 8.11.1 links the speech of Sulpicius Galus after the eclipse with the renewed eagerness
of the Roman troops for battle. Justinus 33.1.7 relates that a lunar eclipse occurred on the night before the battle. Pliny NH 2.53 relates that Sulpicius Galus freed the army from fear when, on the day before the defeat of Perseus, he was brought before the soldiers by Paullus to foretell the eclipse. Frontinus Strat. 1.12.8 states that Sulpicius Galus predicted the eclipse. The annalistic tradition seems to agree that the eclipse occurred on the night before the battle, but is in disagreement as to whether the speech of Sulpicius Galus preceded or followed the eclipse.

The accounts of Livy (L. 44.37.5 ff.; also cf. Ep. 44), Zonaras (9.23.4-7) and Plutarch (Aem. 14 - 22) are more difficult to analyze. In his account of the battle of Pydna and of the fighting which preceded, Livy (44.32.5 - 43.9) used Polybius except for a brief annalistic passage (44.37.5-9) which records the address of Sulpicius Galus to the troops about the lunar eclipse which was to occur later that evening (see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 264 - 267; Klotz Livius 20, 73). In placing the battle of Pydna on the following day (cf. 44.37.10: Postero die), Livy agreed with the annalistic tradition, but it is not clear whether Polybius (29.16), who also placed the eclipse before the battle of Pydna, assigned it to the day preceding the battle.

According to Zon. 9.23.4, which seems to represent the account of Livy, there was an interval of several days between the arrival of Paullus in the vicinity of Pydna and the battle. This delay mentioned by Zon. was probably described in the four missing folia which occur in the text of Livy, Book 44, before chapter 36 (see Weissenborn-Müller 181; Giarratano 286), and the march described by Livy (44.36.1-3) was probably the last change of position which preceded the battle. The words postero die, therefore, indicate that the battle occurred on the day after this change of position, but since Livy's passage on the eclipse is annalistic, his account does not indicate the precise chronological sequence of eclipse and battle in the Polybian
tradition. Polybius could have placed the eclipse at any
time during the presence of Paullus in the vicinity of Pydna,
but there is no compelling reason for us to deny that he may
have placed the eclipse on the day preceding the battle.
Plutarch used a variety of sources for his account of the
battle of Pydna and the fighting which preceded it (Aem. 14-22),
among them Polybius, with whom he often disagreed (cf. Aem.
15.3, 16.2, 19.2). Plut. reported two variant accounts of
how the battle started (Aem. 18.1-2), the second of which
seems to agree with the Polybian account preserved in Livy
(44.40.4-10). Since Plut. did not report any disagreement
among his sources on the chronology of eclipse and battle
(cf. Aem. 17.6 ff.), it is at least possible that Polybius, too,
had reported the occurrence of the battle on the day after
the eclipse.
The date of the battle is fixed by reference to the lunar
eclipse of Julian 21 June 168 B.C. See von Oppolzer Canon
of Eclipses Lunar Eclipse no. 1596.
Mr. O. Gingerich, Professor of Astronomy and the History of
Science at Harvard University, and Mr. L. V. Morrison of
Her Majesty's Nautical Almanac Office, Royal Greenwich Observatory,
kindly responded by letter to my inquiry about the validity of
the Canon for this period, and have indicated that a total
lunar eclipse would have been observed from Greece on Julian
21 June 168 B.C. about an hour after sunset. This information
agrees with Livy's statement from the annalistic source that
Sulpicius Galus predicted the eclipse ab hora secunda usque
ad quartam horam (44.37.6).
The date of the eclipse as given by the annalistic tradition
was A.D. III Non. Sept. (cf. L. 44.37.8: nocte quam pridie
nonas Septembres insecuta est dies), or Roman 3 Sept. Since
this eclipse was visible from Rome (see Ginzel Spezieller Kanon
der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse für das Landgebiet der
klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 192), it was almost certainly
recorded in the Annales Maximi. If we rely upon the date handed
down by the tradition, we may establish the equation, Roman
3 Sept. = Julian 21 June. Thus, in the year 168 the Roman
calendar was some 74 days ahead of the Julian. On the problems
with the Roman calendar at this time see De Sanctis
Storia IV. 1\textsuperscript{2}, 358 - 365; Derow Phoenix 27 (1973) 345 - 356.
Upon this date for the eclipse depend the dates for the battle
and for the report of victory in Rome. We have noted that we
are not sure of the precise sequence of eclipse and battle in
Polybius, but that Livy, in agreement with the annalistic
tradition, wished to place the battle on 4 Sept. The tabellarius
sent ahead by the official envoys arrived in Rome ante diem
quintum decimum kalendas Octobres, ludorum Romanorum secundo
die...tertius decimus dies erat ab eo, quo in Macedonia
pugnatum est (L. 45.1.6, 11), that is, on 16 Sept. The Ludi
Romani, in earlier times, began on 15 Sept., so that the arrival
of the tabellarius is correctly dated to the second day of the
festival. If this was twelve days (exclusive reckoning) after
the battle, then in the annalistic tradition the date of the
battle was 4 Sept. Eutropius (4.7.1), who gave the date of
the battle as A. D. III Non. Sept., must have either confused
the date of the battle with the date of the eclipse, or made
a mistake in his arithmetic arising from the confusion of
inclusive and exclusive reckoning.
The annalistic account, which dated the battle to 4 Sept.
(Julian 22 June), seems to disagree with Polybius' indication
of time by reference to the seasons. We may trace to Pol. the
statement in L. 44.36.1: ...anni post circumactum solstition
erat and perhaps the statement in Plut. Aem. 16.7: Ἐφος ἡν
ω' ρα φινοντος. It would appear, then, that Polybius placed
the battle of Pydna at the height of summer, perhaps somewhat
later than the Roman annalists placed it. However, there is
probably no chronological problem here, since seasonal dates
in Pol. are always approximate and it is not likely that Polybius
used astronomical tables for precise dating by phenomena.
See Pe.dech Meth. Hist. 461 - 464; Sumner Proceedings of the
We have, moreover, an Attic inscription honouring one Kalliphanes, who brought to Athens the news of the defeat of Perseus (see Meritt Hesperia 3 (1934) no. 18, pp. 18 - 21 and Hesperia 5 (1936) no. 17, pp. 429 - 430). The inscription is dated to the last day of the archon year of Eunikos (169/8). Meritt now equates this date with Julian 7 August, but his earlier view had been 8 July (see Meritt The Athenian Year 219 - 220). Meritt's earlier view seems more appropriate, since the Athenians had no cause to postpone for over six weeks the voting of their memorial of the Roman victory. No precise date is given for the capture of Perseus. A brief notice on the capture occurs in L. 45.13.9 in an annalistic section on events which occurred late in the consular year 168. On the night after the battle, Perseus reached Pella (Plut. Aem. 23.3). By the second day after the battle (6 Sept.) he reached Amphipolis (L. 44.45.1), where he tried without success to obtain aid from the Bisaltae, who lived inland on the west bank of the Strymon. Perceiving that the people of Amphipolis would not support him against the Romans, Perseus fled to Galepsos, arriving there on the same day as his departure from Amphipolis. On the following day he reached Samothrace (L. 44.45.15).

Since Paullus had received the submission of most of Macedonia within two days (by 6 Sept.), Perseus probably fled Macedonia within a week or ten days of his defeat at Pydna, arriving in Samothrace about 14 Sept. (Julian 2 July).

Meanwhile at Pydna Paullus received the ambassadors sent by Perseus from Amphipolis. These ambassadors would have arrived in Pydna by at least 8 Sept. (Julian 26 June). As yet unaware of the king's flight to Samothrace, Paullus placed garrisons in the Macedonian cities under his control and sent out expeditions to destroy resistance. If we allow about two weeks for this activity, Paullus would have set out from Pydna about 20 Sept. (Julian 8 July), reaching Pella on the following day (L. 44.46.4). After having spent a few days here, examining
the site and receiving congratulatory embassies, he left for Amphipolis, arriving there after a three-day march on about 26 Sept. (Julian 14 July). From Amphipolis Paullus marched up the Strymon to Sirae (L. 45.4.2), probably to complete the subjugation of Macedonia.

If we allow about a week for this activity, Paullus would have returned to Amphipolis about 3 Oct. (Julian 19 July). During the negotiations between Paullus and Perseus, Octavius brought the fleet to Samothrace. Some time was consumed in the efforts of Octavius to persuade the Samothracians to allow the removal of Perseus from the sanctuary. Perseus meanwhile laid plans for an escape, but he was abandoned by his guide Oroandes. His two younger children were taken by the tribunus militum C. Postumius along with the royal pages, and Perseus now surrendered himself to Octavius along with his elder son. If we allow about a week for these events, the capture of Perseus would have occurred about 10 Oct. (Julian 28 July). That the capture of Perseus occurred in the archonship of Xenokles (168/7) is not proved by the fragment of Apollodoros of Athens (Jacoby FGrHist II. B. 244 F 47, verses 28 - 31): Ἀγνωστῶρ δὲ μετὰ τὴν Πέρσεως ἀλωσιν, Ἀρκάσ, μίας ἤν πολεμίζον, ἐπὶ Ξενοκλάου τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τοῦ βλου ἐποιήσατ'.

This scheme for the capture of Perseus allows an interval of about five weeks between the battle of Pydna and the capture of the king. See De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 314 - 323, where only seven days are allowed between the battle and the arrival of Paullus in Amphipolis.

2.1 supplicationes:
These were occasions of request or of thanksgiving, initiated by the consuls or the senate, and celebrated by the entire citizen body. Originally lasting only one day, the supplicationes as occasions of request to the gods were sometimes extended to last two or even three days. There was a tendency to extend supplicationes as occasions of thanksgiving after military victories, so that in the late republic we hear of such festivals lasting ten days (Cicero De Prov. Cons. 27) and even as long as fifty days (Cicero Phil. 14.29.37). See Wissowa Rel. und Kult. 425.
2.1 Demobilization:

On 17 Sept. the senate decreed that the consul Licinius should disband all the forces under his command quos praeter milites sociosque navales coniuratos haberet (2.1). The coniurati were those Roman, Latin and allied troops (cf. Pol. 6.21; L. 22.38.1-5) who had taken the formal oath of loyalty administered by the decuriones and centurions to their units (see Fiebiger RE IV. 1 (1900) col. 885). The levies now to be disbanded by Licinius were possibly the evocati, who took the oath (sacramentum) en masse in a shortened form. See Servius ad Aeneidem 8.1; Fiebiger RE V. 1 (1907) cols. 1145 - 1152; Klingmüller RE I. A. 2 (1920) cols. 1667 - 1668.

On 25 Sept. the senate ordered the dismissal of the socii navales and of all troops who had taken the coniuratio before Licinius. Rowers in the fleet were usually supplied by the allies, but Roman citizens of the lowest census rating might also serve (see Liebenam RE V. 1 (1903) cols. 606 - 607; Toynbee Hannibal's Legacy II. 518 - 521).

No previous mention occurs of the disposition of reserve troops in the places specified in 2.11, but in 169 the socii nominis Latini were to be held in reserve in case of future need (cf. L. 43.12.8: si quo res posceret), while levies of cavalry and infantry over and above the two legions needed for Macedonia were to be distributed as garrisons (L. 44.21.8: ceteros pedites equitesque in praesidiis disponi).

3.1 duo legati:

C. Licinius Nerva (133)
P. Decius (Subulo) (20)

Licinius may have been the legatus of Anicius in 167 and the ambassador sent to Kotys of Thrace late in that year (see L. 45.26.2, 42.11; Broughton Magistrates I. 432 n.1). The Licinius Nervae were traditional supporters of the Scipios (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 186 - 187). Note that in 169 an A. Licinius Nerva (131) had been chosen by the senate as one of the three special envoys to report on conditions in Greece and Macedonia.
These envoys were to be men acceptable to Paullus, the consul-elect (L. 44.18.5).

The Decii were a plebeian family who rose to political prominence at the time of the Samnite wars, after the consulship had been opened up to plebeians by the Licinian-Sextian Laws of 367. The most prominent representatives of the Decii were P. Decius Mus (15), consul in 340; P. Decius Mus (16), consul in 312, 308, 297, 295, censor in 304, Magister Equitum in 306; P. Decius Mus (17), consul in 279, consul suffectus in 265. The next member of the gens Decia known to have held high office after Decius (17) was P. Decius (9), praetor in 115. Decius (20) had been triumvir coloniae deducendae for Aquileia in 169 (L. 43.17.1).

In a Polybian section of the narrative (44.23.1 - 37.4) Livy states that Anicius, after the fall of Scodra, sent Perperna (M. Perperna (3) to announce the victory over Gentius (L. 44.32.4). We are thus confronted by a difference between the Polybian and the annalistic accounts.

Münzer (RE IV. 2 (1901) col. 2286; RE XIII. 1 (1926) col. 453) states that we must simply prefer the account of Polybius to that of the annalists, but it is at least possible that the two accounts are not mutually exclusive. Since we have already noted that an A. Licinius Nerva (131) had been sent as a special envoy to Greece and Macedonia in 169, and since Licinius (133) may perhaps be identified with the legatus of Anicius in 167, the appearance of a Licinius in the present context is not surprising.

The Roman commanders left for their provinces in early spring (L. 44.30.1). Gentius was captured within a month (32.4), while the battle of Pydna was not fought until summer (cf. L. 44.36.1 and see on 1.11). Licinius and Decius could have been sent after the defeat of Perseus, while Perperna may have been sent immediately after the capture of Gentius. A possible parallel is the report of the victory over Hasdrubal at the Metaurus in 207 by Claudius Nero and Livius Salinator (L. 27.50.3 - 51.10), where news was first brought by two cavalrymen whose report was
later confirmed by a letter from their commanding officer and finally by the report of the three official legati.

3.1 Gentium regem:

Gentius was king of the Ardiaeini, an Illyrian tribe, from 180 to 168. His predecessors Skerdilaidas and Pleuratus had become amici of Rome about 216 before the opening of the First Macedonian War. Pleuratus, the son of Skerdilaidas, was included as an adscriptus to the Peace of Phoinike (cf. Pol. 5.110.8-9; L. 26.24.9, 29.12.14). It was probably the Illyrians who brought the complaints against Philip V mentioned by Livy (30.26.2 ff., 30.42.2 ff., 32.33.3 = Pol. 18.1.4). Pleuratus assisted the Romans during the Second Macedonian War (cf. L. 31.28.1) and in the war against Antiochus III (cf. L. 38.7.1-3). Although Gentius had been accused of hostile acts against the Romans (cf. L. 40.18.3-5, 40.42.1-5, 42.26.2-7; 43.9.4), he sent a squadron of 54 lembi for the Roman fleet in 170 (L. 42.48.8), but in the following year he abandoned his amicitia with Rome and made an alliance with Perseus (cf. Pol. 29.2; L. 44.23). See Stähelin RE VII. 1 (1910) col. 1199; Holleaux Rome, la Grèce 165 - 166, 177 - 178, 211 n. 1; Badian Foreign Clientelae 55 - 57.

3.2 supplicationes decrevit. Indictae a consule sunt:

The reading of the MS. is DECRE / UIURLATINAEDICTAE. Mommsen emended this to supplicationes decrevit. iterum Latinae edictae. He drew parallels from the Fasti to show that the Feriae Latinae could be repeated as a feast of thanksgiving, for example in 449 and 23 B.C., and pointed to the evidence of Dio 55.2.5, where a repetition of the Feriae Latinae was being planned for the celebration of the triumph of Drusus, the brother of Tiberius, in 9 B.C. See Mommsen Römische Forschungen 97 - 112.

The Feriae Latinae were not fixed to any one date by the calendar, but were set by the consuls before their departure for their provinces at the beginning of the magistrate year. The Fasti (Tabula Feriarum Latinarum, CIL I² (1893) pp. 55 - 59; CIL VI. 1 (1876) nos. 2011 - 2019; CIL XIV (1887) nos. 2227 - 2250), which date from imperial times, consistently name only one day,
the day for the essential sacrifice, but the festal period lasted up to four days. The Feriae Latinae could be repeated because of an error in form, or repeated as a special occasion of thanksgiving. See Samter RE VI. 2 (1909) cols. 2213 - 2217; Wissowa Rel. und Kult. 125; Latte Röm. Rel. 144 - 146.

While Mommsen was correct about the possibility of the repetition of the Feriae Latinae, it is not likely that this honour would be accorded to Anicius, whose achievements were described by the annalistic source of Livy (45.43.1-4) as inferior to those of Paullus. We may also point out the linguistic parallel to the *supplicatio* voted in thanksgiving for the victory of Paullus: *supplicatio...indicta est ex ante diem quintum idus Octobres cum eo die in quinque dies* (2.12). The *supplicatio* in thanksgiving for the victory of Anicius was to last only three days.

3.3 *Legatos Rhodios nondum dimissos:*


This embassy was sent to Rome in the summer of 168 before the defeat of Perseus (Pol. 29.10) for the purpose of mediating a peace between Rome and Macedonia. On the diplomatic relations between Rome and Rhodes from 172 to 167 see Appendix I.

There is a tradition that there existed a relationship of *amicitia* between Rome and Rhodes since 306. An informal relationship of *amicitia* certainly did exist from about 201, when the Rhodians sent an embassy to Rome to warn the senate about the Syro-Macedonian pact. A formal treaty (*foedus*) was established in 165/4 (Pol. 30.31; L. Ep. 46). On *amicitia* and *societas* see Appendix IV. On the problem of the *amicitia* between Rome and Rhodes see Holleaux Rome, la Grèce 29 - 46; Casson TAPA 85 (1954) 168 - 187; Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 1 - 150, esp. 47 - 49; Cassola Gruppi 41 - 45.

3.4 *Agepolim, principem eorum:*

cf. Pol. 29.10.4: οὐ δὲ πρωτάνεις παραχρῆμα πρεσβεύτας κατέστησαν τοὺς διαλύσοντας τὸν πόλεμον, εἶς μὲν τὴν ἑρμῆν Ἀγέπολιν, Διοκλῆς, Κλινομηθρόν .... Agepolis had been a member
of an earlier embassy to the consul Q. Marcius Philippus and to C. Marcius Figulus, commander of the fleet, in 169 (Pol. 28.16). Since on both occasions his name heads the list of ambassadors, he was probably one of the leading members of the group which favoured mediation.

3.7 cum Perseus in Thessaliam...obsideret:
In 171 Perseus had taken control of the pass of Tempe, which gave him easy access to Thessaly. He was forced to withdraw his garrisons in the spring of 169 when the consul Philippus reached the coast of Macedonia (L. 42.51.11, 44.3-6).

3.8 Postquam...audissent:
In summer of 168 Paullus forced the pass into Perrhaibia at Petra and turned to meet Perseus, who offered battle near the coast at Pydna (L. 44.34.10 - 35.23; Plut. Aem. 13.3 - 16.5).

4.1 M. Marcellus:
M. Claudius Marcellus (225)
As praetor in 169 his province was the two Spains (L. 43.15.3). He was consul in 166, 155 and 152.
The Claudii led one of the major groups of Roman politicians. Their closest associates were the Fulvii. See Scullard Rom. Pol. 61 ff., 93 ff., 165 ff.
Marcolica is unidentified.
For the war-time treatment of Spain see on 16.2.

4.2 Paulus Aemilius...haberet:
Previous mention of Sirae in Livy's account would have occurred in the page of the MS. lost after L. 44.46.11 (see Weissenborn-Müller 183; Giarratano 284). After his entry into Amphipolis Paullus probably marched up the Strymon to complete the subjugation of Macedonia. Sirae (modern Serres; cf. Hdt. 8.115: ἐν ξυπρίᾳ Παραυνίας) is on the left or eastern bank of the Strymon above Lake Kerkinitis.

4.3 qui paulo ante...auxilia:
Perseus had defeated the Dardani and Illyrians, inveterate enemies of the Macedonians, in 170 (L. 43.18-21). These campaigns had resulted in considerable conquests for Perseus. See Meloni Perseo 273 - 277.
The Bastarnae, whom Philip V had asked for military aid (to destroy the Dardani and to plunder Italy: cf. L. 39.35.4 and 40.57.5-6), refused to co-operate with Perseus after the death of Philip (L. 40.57.8), and Perseus continued to stir up trouble between the Dardani and the Bastarnae (cf. L. 41.19.3). Polybius (25.6) described an embassy from the Dardani to the senate in 177 complaining about an agreement among Perseus, the Bastarnae and the Galatians. Livy (44.26.1 - 27.7) described the failure of Perseus in 169 to secure the aid of the "Galli", whose chieftain he called Clondicus. Since, however, this was the name of one of the chieftains of the Bastarnae (L. 40.58.8), Livy may have confused the Bastarnae, a Germanic tribe (see Strabo 7.306; Pliny NH 4.81; Tacitus Germania 46) with the Galatians. See Meloni Perseo 329 - 335.

4.3 *fani religione...tutus esset:
Perseus took sanctuary in the temple of the Kabeiroi (cf. L. 45.41.6: *in templo Samothracum*). According to Pol. 29.8.7, Samothrace was part of the Macedonian kingdom. It had probably been taken by Philip V some time after 196, but in the Roman settlement of 167 Samothrace was declared a *civitas libera* (cf. Strabo 7 fr. 48 and see on 18.7, 20.2).

4.7 *tres legati:*

P. Cornelius Lentulus (202)
A. Postumius Albinus (Luscus) (*26/46)
or A. Postumius Albinus (*33/31)
A. Antonius (18)
The Cornelii Lentuli were political associates of the Aemilian-Scipionic group (see on 1.1). Note also that Cornelius (202) and P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica (Corculum) (353) were both curule aedile in 169 and praetor in 165. Cornelius (202) was *consul suffectus* in 162 with Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (19), one of the three *legati* acceptable to Paullus who were chosen to investigate conditions in Greece and Macedonia late in 169 (L. 44.18.5).

Of the two Postumii, it seems more likely that the ambassador to Perseus was Postumius (*33/31), for as *tribunus militum* in
167 he received custody of Perseus and his son (L. 45.28.11). Postumius (*33/31) was praetor in 155 and consul in 151. The Postumii were political associates of the Fabii (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 134 ff., 164 ff.) No fewer than five members of the gens Postumia served as legati during the Third Macedonian War (see Broughton Magistrates I. 410 - 432). On the political prominence of the Postumii during the period 174 - 169 see Scullard Rom. Pol. 191 - 193.

Of Antonius (18) nothing further is known. M. Antonius (27), tribunus plebis in 167, prevented the declaration of war against Rhodes (L. 45.21.1-3) and summoned the contio before which Paullus as triumphator addressed the people (L. 45.40.9).

4.7 ut se suaque omnia in fidem et clementiam populi Romani permitteret: Aemilius Paullus was urging Perseus to make an act of deditio to Rome (see on 1.9).

5.1 Cn. Octavi:

Cn. Octavius (17)

As praetor in 168 he held command of the fleet in the war against Perseus. The Octavii had been politically associated with the Scipios. Cn. Octavius (16), father of Octavius (17), served as a promagistrate under Scipio Africanus in 202.

Scullard (Rom. Pol. 208) thinks that Octavius (17) belonged to the Scipionic group (also see Astin Scipio Aemilianus 87), but Briscoe (Historia 18 (1969) 63 - 65) argues that he was associated with the Fulvii and that he had ties with the group of senators who accepted the unscrupulous treatment of Roman enemies and of uncooperative amici.

5.4 homicida:

Polybius accused Perseus of attempting to have Eumenes II of Pergamon murdered at Delphi in 172 (cf. Pol. 22.18.5, 27.6.2; L. 42.15-16; Diod. 29.34; Appian Mak. 11.7). Because Eumenes had come to Delphi from Rome, where he had urged the senate to declare war on Perseus, the attempt to implicate Perseus had good value as propaganda against the king. The attempted murder of Eumenes appears among the charges against Perseus listed
in an inscription set up in Delphi about 171 - 170
(cf. SIG\textsuperscript{3} 643, lines 29 - 32). Nothing further came of this
accusation after the war; Eumenes was even said to have had
secret dealings with his putative would-be assassin towards
the end of the war (cf. Pol. 29.5-9). On the implication of
Perseus see Meloni \underline{Perseo} 162 - 164; De Sanctis \underline{Storia} IV. 1\textsuperscript{2}.
266; Hansen \underline{Attalids} 104.

5.5 \textit{per Evandrum:}
Evander the Cretan was a commander of auxiliaries under Perseus.
He was accused by Polybius of leading the attempt on the life
of Eumenes (L. 42.15-16). He was present to advise Perseus
at the battle of Kallinikos in 171 (L. 42.59.8-11). After
the defeat at Pydna he was one of the few supporters of Perseus
to remain loyal (L. 44.43.6), and tried to persuade the people
of Amphipolis to continue resistance in support of the king
(L. 44.45.10-11).
At the muster of his forces at Kition in 171, Perseus had
some 3000 Cretans under their commanders Sousos of Phalasarnai
and Sylos of Knossos (cf. L. 42.51.7 and Meloni \underline{Perseo} 218 n. 3).
On the political connections between Perseus and the Cretans,
note that according to Polybius (29.8.6), the Knossians were
to receive the hostages from Eumenes in connection with the
secret transactions between the two kings.
The escape of Perseus from Samothrace was to be arranged by
the Cretan Oroandes (L. 45.6.2).

5.6 \textit{Theondam...regem ipsi appellant:}
A Samothracian named Theondas died in Alexandria in the third
century (see Merriam \textit{AJA} 1 (1885) 21). The \textit{rex} (βασιλεύς) of
Samothrace was the eponymous magistrate (see Schoeffer \textit{RE} III. 1
(1897) cols. 66 - 71). He was possibly a member of the college
of προεδραι, the annual presidents of the Samothracian \textit{boule}.
See Fraser \textit{Samothrace} 24, 28 - 29.

6.2 \textit{ad Cotym:}
Kotys, king of the Odrysian Thracians. He participated in the
Macedonian war as an ally of Perseus, leading Thracian forces
in the campaign of 171 (L. 42.51.10, 57.6); he was present with
the Odrysian cavalry at the battle of Pydna (L. 44.42.2). His son Bithys, whom he had sent to Macedonia as a hostage (Pol. 30.17; L. 45.42.6-12), was captured by the Romans along with the other Thracian hostages, who were released without ransom by the Romans late in 167 (L. 45.42.6-11).

"The kingdom of the Odrysae, the leading tribe of Thrace, extended over present-day Bulgaria, Turkish Thrace (east of the Hebrus) and Greece between the Hebrus and the Strymon, except for the coastal strip with its Greek cities...." (Cormack, The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2nd ed. 1065).

By the Roman settlement of Macedonia in 167, the first of the four μερίδες was to extend from the Strymon to the Nessos, encroaching in part upon the territory of the Odrysae. The acceptance of this arrangement by Kotys may have been a condition for the release of Bithys and the other hostages without ransom.

On earlier Macedonian relations with Thrace see Meloni Perseo 86 - 92.

6.9 ad C. Postumium tribunum militum:
C. Postumius (*31/10)
The Postumii were political associates of the Fabii (see on 4.7). For the year 168 Paullus had been permitted to choose twelve tribuni militum for his two Macedonian legions from among all the tribuni for the eight legions, half of the tribuni having been elected by the people and half chosen by the two consuls (L. 44.21.2). It is therefore possible that Postumius (*31/10), who served as tribunus militum under Octavius in this year, was not a particularly important associate of Paullus, even though another Postumius, L. (Postumius) Albinus (*29/41) served as tribunus militum under Paullus in 168.

6.9 Ion Thessalonicensis:
In 171 he commanded the slingers and javelin-throwers of Perseus (L. 42.58.10).

6.9 Philippum, maximum natu ex filiis:
Perseus' two sons were Philip and Alexander (L. 45.39.7). Perseus also had a daughter whose name is unknown (cf. Plut. Aem. 33.4).
Perseus and his elder son were taken to Amphipolis soon after they were captured, but his younger son Alexander and his daughter were left in Samothrace until autumn of 167 (cf. L. 45.28.11), when they were summoned to Amphipolis. Perseus and his three children were sent to Rome to be paraded in the triumph (Plut. Aem. 33.4). Perseus, Philip and the daughter died in prison at Alba Fucentia, but Alexander survived as an artisan and as a secretary to the local magistrates (Plut. Aem. 37.3).

7.1 Q. Aelium Tuberonem:
Q. Aelius Tubero (154)
He was married to a daughter of Aemilius Paullus (Plut. Aem. 5.4). In 168 he served as legatus in Macedonia under his father-in-law.
In the middle of the first century B.C., Q. Aelius Tubero (156) wrote a history of Rome from the fall of Troy to at least the time of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey. Aelius (156) was the son of L. Aelius Tubero (150), not of Q. Aelius (154). Q. Aelius Tubero (155), the son of Q. Aelius (154), was tribunus plebis before 129, and would not likely be alive over eighty years later to be writing about the civil war. See Schanz-Hosius Gesch. Röm. Lit. I. 321 - 323.
The Aelii were political associates of the Scipios (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 96, 211). Note that a P. Aelius Tubero (152) had been one of the ten commissioners for the settlement of Asia in 189 (L. 37.55.7).

7.2 Patrum aetate Syphax rex:
For the interview of Scipio Africanus with Syphax in the Roman camp, see L. 30.13.

7.3 nec ipsius tantum patris...fecerant:
Perseus was the son of Philip V (221 - 179) and the grandson of Demetrios II (239 - 229). The royal dynasty of the Antigonids to which Perseus belonged had been firmly established in Macedonia by Antigonos Gonatas (276 - 239), the father of Demetrios II and the son of Demetrios I Poliorcetes, who ruled Macedonia from 294 to 285. The dynasty of Philip II
and Alexander the Great had come to an end in 310 with the execution by Kassandros of Alexander IV, the son of Alexander the Great and Roxane.

8.4 *pacis:
For the terms of peace with Philip V in 196 see Pol. 18.44; L. 33.30. For the Isthmian Declaration see Pol. 18.46; L. 33.32.

9.3 **Perseus Q. Fulvio L. Manlio consulibus regnum accepit:**
In 179. See L. 40.54.1 - 57.1.

9.3 **a senatu rex est appellatus M. Iunio A. Manlio consulibus:**
In 178. Recognition by the senate implied that the Romans expected the new king to follow the policy of his predecessors in acting in accordance with Roman wishes. See Sands *The Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic* 59 - 88; Badian *Foreign Clientelae* 105 - 106.

10.1 **Antenor:**
Admiral of the Macedonian fleet (see L. 44.28.1 - 29.5). See Wilcken *RE* I.2 (1894) col. 2353; Schoch *RE Suppl. IV* (1925) cols. 31 - 32.

10.2 **C. Popilius:**
C. Popilius Laenas (*7/18*).
He was praetor in 175, consul in 172, legatus in Greece and Macedonia in 170 and 169, consul again in 158. Early in 168 Popillius was instructed by the senate to protect the Ptolemies from Antiochus IV (L. 44.19.3; see Appendix III), but until the defeat of Perseus at Pydna, he commanded a squadron of ships based at Delos in praesidio navibus Macedonian petentibus (L. 45.10.2). The Macedonian fleet under Antenor was attacking merchant ships (L. 44.29.3-4). These would have included grain carriers heading for Chalcis in Euboia, the Roman naval base in Greece. Egyptian grain was brought to Chalcis for distribution to the Roman forces (OGIS 760), and it was probably to inspect conditions that the three legati visited Chalcis (L. 44.29.1) before going to the Aegean against Antenor.

The Popillii had recently emerged from a century of obscurity
to prominence in political life along with a number of other plebeian gentes, such as the Aelii Ligures and the Cassii Longini (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 194-198). M. Popillius Laenas (*6/24), the brother of Popillius (*7/18), had been praetor in 180 and consul in 173.

10.2 adventiciis navibus:

The reading of the MS. is ADTICISNAUBUS. The following emendations have been proposed: adventiciis navibus, Madvig; Attalicis navibus, Attali navibus, Luterbacher; Asiaticis navibus, Harant. The reading adopted by Giarratano 298 is adventiciis navibus.

Attalos, the brother of Eumenes II of Pergamon, participated in the military campaigns of the Third Macedonian War, but we have no evidence for his presence with the fleet, while we do know that Eumenes himself commanded a fleet of twenty sail in 169 (see McShane Foreign Policy 180-181). The Pergamene sailors met by Popillius at Delos before the defeat of Perseus were described as Eumenis socii navales (L. 44.29.3). Thus, it seems unlikely that we may connect Attalos with the fleet by reading Attalicis navibus or Attali navibus with Luterbacher. The words adventicius and Asiaticus are not used in the surviving books of Livy in the manner proposed in the emendations of Madvig and Harant.

Ferguson (Hellenistic Athens 314 n. 1) suggested that we read Atticis navibus, since the Athenians are known to have participated in the defense of Delos in the Second Macedonian War (cf. SIG³ 582). In 171 the praetor C. Lucretius Gallus refused the Athenian offer of naval assistance (L. 43.6.1-3), but Athenian ships may have been necessary in 168 to oppose the fleet which Perseus sent into the Aegean (L. 44.28.1-29.5). It was perhaps in recognition for their services that the senate assigned to the Athenians Haliartos in Boiotia and the islands of Delos, Skyros, Lemnos and Imbros (cf. Pol. 30.20 and see De Sanctis Storia IV. 1². 336-337). Thus, on historical grounds Ferguson's suggestion is not unreasonable; it is possible that the first syllable of Atticis was erroneously transcribed
as the preposition *ad*.

10.2 *ad susceptam legationem:*

This embassy was sent early in the consular year 168 in response to a request for aid against Antiochus IV from the co-rulers of Egypt, Ptolemy VI, Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra II. On the chronology of the Sixth Syrian War and diplomatic relations between Rome and the Ptolemies from 170 to 168, see Appendix III.

The tradition according to which an informal relationship of *amicitia* was established between Rome and Ptolemy II in 273 is now generally accepted. In 201/200 Rome seems to have been made the *επίτροπος* of Ptolemy V (see on 44.13). See Holleaux *Rome, la Grèce* 60 - 83; Heuss Völk. Grundl. 31 - 32; Neatby *TAPA* 81 (1950) 89 - 98; Cassola *Gruppi* 45 - 47; Dahlheim *Deditio und societas* 134 - 140; Heinen, Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt I. 1 (1972) 633 - 659; Peremans and van't Dack, Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt I. 1 (1972) 660 - 667.

For general discussions of the embassy of Popillius see Badian *Foreign Clientelae* 107; De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 325 - 327; Will *Histoire* II. 262 - 275; Scullard *Rom. Pol.* 210 n. 2.

10.4 *Cum praeterveherentur Asiam legati et Loryma venissent:*

Loryma (modern Bozuk or Oplasikabuk) was a town in the Rhodian Peraea just across from the city of Rhodes. See Fraser-Bean *Rhodian Peraea* 59.

The members of this embassy were

- C. Popillius Laenas (*7/18*)
- C. Decimius (1)
- C. Hostilius (Tubulus ?) (3)

On the Popillii see on 10.2.

The family of the Decimii had only recently attained Roman citizenship. During the second Punic War, Num. Decimius (6), a prominent nobleman from the Samnite town of Bovianum, was placed in command of 8000 infantry and some 500 cavalry by the dictator Q. Fabius Maximus in 217 (L. 22.24.11-14). In 209 C. Decimius Flavus (8) served as *tribunus militum* under the proconsul M. Claudius Marcellus. During the Third Macedonian
War two other members of this family, L. Decimius (3) and M. Decimius (4) served as _legati_.

In 171 Decimius (1) had been one of the three _legati_ sent to Crete to raise additional auxiliary troops. He was praetor in 169.

The Hostilii were politically associated with the "middle group" led by the Fabii, Claudii and Fulvii (see Scullard _Rom. Pol._ 184 - 189). Because of the importance of the embassy to Antiochus IV, and since Popillius was of consular and Decimius of praetorian rank, Münzer (RE VIII. 2 (1913) col. 2501) argued that Hostilius (3) must have been one of the praetors whose names appeared in the list of magistrates for 170 which occurred in the lacuna in the text of Livy after 43.3.7. Broughton (Magistrates I. 420) does not include Hostilius (3) in his list of praetors in 170, but at least two of the names on his list are very uncertain.

11.1 The Sixth Syrian War:

On the chronology of the Sixth Syrian War and the diplomatic relations between Rome and the Ptolemies from 170 to 168, see Appendix III.

11.1 _maiore Ptolemaeo:_

Ptolemy VI Philometor (180 - 145)

11.2 _ad sororem:_

Cleopatra II (170 - ca. 116)

11.3 _ad fratrem:_

Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (170 - 116)

12.6 _dextram regi tamquam socio et amico porrexit:_

The tradition which spoke of a _foedus amicitiae_ between Rome and a Seleucus (Seleucus I or II?), granted by Rome on condition that Ilion be left free of taxation, is generally discredited. There was also an annalistic tradition that before the war with Rome, Antiochus III had been an _amicus_ (cf. L. 32.8.13, 33.20.8). Although this is generally disbelieved by modern scholars, it is not impossible that the tradition is sound. From about 200 to 198, Antiochus III had enjoyed cordial relations with Rome which could be considered an informal _amicitia_ (see Appendix IV).

12.9-12 Licinius in Gaul:

Livy's annalistic source made an unfavourable comparison of the achievements of Licinius with those of Paullus, but the comparison is probably a fair one. Licinius' province was Italy, with charge of the levies and supplies for the Macedonian war. The Gallic campaign conducted by Licinius began late in 168; his imperium was prorogued for 167 (L. 45.17.2), but Licinius was later succeeded in Gaul by the new consul Q. Aelius Paetus when he was named to the commission for the settlement of Macedonia. The Roman magistrate took the auspicia on behalf of the state in a place designated by the augurs and called the templum. For the technical fault in his omission to do so, Licinius was deprived by the augurs of his legions. See Mommsen Röm. Staatsr. I. 99 - 104; Wissowa Rel. und Kult. 526 - 528.

12.10 augures:

In 168 the college of augurs probably included

Patricians: L. Aemilius Paullus (114) ca. 192 - 160
C. Claudius Pulcher (300) 195 - 167
P. Cornelius Scipio (331) 180 - ?
? (name lost in the lacuna which occurs in the text of Livy 43.11.13. His predecessor was L. Quinctius Flamininus (*4/43) 170 - ?

Plebeians: M. Servilius Pulex Geminus (78) 211 - after 168
Q. Aelius Paetus (104) 174 - ?
Ti. Sempronius Gracchus Veturianus (T. Veturius Gracchus Sempronianus (*17/23): see below) 174 - ?
Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (53) 204 - ?
? (identity unknown)
The text of L. 41.21.9 reads T. Veturius Gracchus Sempronianus. This suggests that a Sempronius Gracchus was adopted by a T. Veturius who had no cognomen. According to Broughton (Magistrates I. 407 n. 5), the retention of the cognomen Gracchus after adoption would not have been impossible, but it is unexampled in this period. A greater difficulty is that the names of the four patrician augurs in 174 are known, so that as a patrician, a member of the gens Veturia would have been excluded from the college of augurs at this time.

Geer (AJP 60 (1939) 466 - 467) argued that the new augur must have been a plebeian and suggested that we read Ti. Sempronius Gracchus Veturianus. In this case, a member of the patrician gens Veturia would have been adopted into the plebeian gens Sempronia.

Of the nine augurs, four belonged to the Aemilian-Scipionic group: Aemilius Paullus himself; Cornelius (331), the son of Scipio Africanus; Servilius (78), who supported the bill granting Paullus his triumph in 167 (cf. L. 45.36.9 - 39.19); Aelius (104) (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 211).

Sempronius (53), although he married a daughter of Scipio Africanus, was a supporter of the Claudii (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 295 - 296).

The Veturii were supporters of the Aemilian-Scipionic group (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 134 - 135, 165 - 166), but if a Veturius was adopted by a Sempronius, he could probably be expected to follow the political alignment of his new family, especially since the Sempronii were much more prominent than the Veturii.

The representative of the Claudii was Claudius (300), consul in 177, censor in 169.

If the unknown patrician augur was a Quinctius, he would probably have been an associate of the Claudii (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 97 - 98).

12.13 praetores praeter C. Papirium Carbonem:
C. Papirius Carbo (32) had obtained Sardinia as his province during his praetorship in 168, while L. Anicius had obtained
the jurisdiction between citizens and foreigners in Rome (L. 44.17.10). When Anicius was sent to succeed Appius Claudius in Illyricum (L. 44.21.4), Papirius took over as praetor peregrinus for Anicius and P. Fonteius Capito (24), praetor in Sardinia in 169, was probably continued in his command.

13.1 Popilius et ea legatio:
See on 10.2.

13.10 disceptatum inter Pisanos Lunensesque legatos est:
Pisa was an Etruscan town which became a socius of Rome probably at the time of the Ligurian war in 238 - 236 (on foedera between Rome and the Etruscan states see Harris Rome in Etruria and Umbria 85 - 98). In the early second century the Ligurians penetrated northern Italy, reaching Placentia (in 194) and Mutina (in 177). In 180 Pisa, threatened by the Ligurians, who had captured the Tyrrhenian coast just to the north, offered territory to Rome with the request that a Latin colony be founded on it (L. 40.43.1). Three years later the Romans founded Luna on the Bay of Spezia, which the Ligurians had captured from the Etruscans in the vicinity of the river Macra. Luna, however, was founded not as a Latin colony but as a Roman colony (L. 41.13.4-5).

Before the Second Punic War the citizen-colonies (Roman colonies) had been exclusively coloniae maritimae occupying strategic points while the coloniae Latinae were sent to sites of the first rank where there was an excellent chance for the development of an important community. After 183, however, with the settlement of Aquileia, Latin colonization ceased. Salmon (JRS 26 (1936) 47 - 67) argued that the senate stopped Latin colonization in order to maintain citizen numbers, while the unwillingness of Romans to relinquish their citizenship or to share the spoils of conquest with non-citizens were also factors. See McDonald Cambridge Historical Journal 6 (1939) 127 - 128; Sherwin-White The Roman Citizenship 72 - 75; Salmon Phoenix 9 (1955) 63 - 75; Toynbee Hannibal's Legacy II. 142 - 154, 533 - 540; Harris Rome in Etruria and Umbria 147 - 160.
Saturnia, Parma and Mutina (in 183: L. 39.55.6-9) were the first inland colonies (coloniae agrariae) to have Roman rather than Latin status. Citizen colonies before 183 normally received 300 families, while the Latin colonies tended to be much larger, Vibo Valentia receiving 3700 pedites and 300 equites in 192 (L. 35.40.5-6), Placentia and Cremona 6000 familiae in 190 (L. 37.46.9 - 47.2), and Bononia 3000 homines in 189 (L. 37.57.7-8). With inland Roman colonies now replacing Latin colonies, Luna received 2000 cives (L. 41.13.4-5), as had Mutina and Parma and probably Saturnia in 183 (L. 39.55.6-9). The size of the allotments had been, on the whole, much larger in the Latin colonies than in the citizen colonies. From 194 to 177 the allotments in citizen colonies tended to be under 10 iugera per man, while in the Latin colonies the allotments during the same period varied from 15 iugera (Vibo Valentia) to as much as 50 iugera (Aquileia), discounting the pro-rata allotments of the centurions and equites. See Frank ESAR I. 122 - 123.

Salmon (Roman Colonization under the Republic 188 n. 193 and JRS 26 (1936) 65) rejected the figure of 51 1/2 iugera per man at Luna given by the MS. at L. 41.13.5 (LIS = 51 1/2), which he emended to VIS (6 1/2) to bring the allotment at Luna into line with allotments at the other Roman colonies established in this period. The reading of the manuscript may well be correct, however, in view of the cessation of Latin colonization, and the unusual size of the allotments may explain the complaints of the people of Pisa.

We have no information about the settlement made by the five commissioners (see on 13.11). Pisa was declared one of the consular provinces in 167 (see on 17.6).

13.11 quinque viros:

Q. Fabius Buteo (58)
P. Cornelius Blasio (76)
T. Sempronius Musca (72)
L. Naevius Balbus (11)
C. Appuleius Saturninus (not in RE)
Fabius had been praetor in Cisalpine Gaul in 181 where his imperium was prorogued in 180; he was named triumvir coloniae deducendae when Pisa offered land for a colony (see on 13.10). Cornelius became praetor about 165 (see Broughton Magistrates I. 438 n.1).

Nothing further is known about the other members of the commission, who were probably fairly young men.

On the political associations of the Sempronii (Gracchi) see on 15.8.

13.12-13 Services of Masinissa to Rome:

cf. L. 42.29.8-10, 62.5 (1000 cavalry, 1000 infantry, 22 elephants); 43.6.11-13 (1,000,000 modii of wheat, 1200 cavalry, 12 elephants).

In addition to a change in Carthaginian hostages (L. 45.14.5), Masgaba may also have been seeking to win Roman approval for his father's seizure of Carthaginian territory.

Carthage had remained faithful to the treaty of 201 (cf. Pol. 15.18; L. 30.37; Appian Lib. 54 with Walbank Commentary II. 466 - 469), furnishing six ships for the war against Antiochus III in 191 (L. 36.42.2) and two quinquiremes for the war against Perseus in 171 (L. 42.56.6). They supplied 1,000,000 modii of wheat and 500,000 modii of barley in 170 (L. 43.6.11). The Romans had nevertheless consistently allowed Masinissa to seize and retain Carthaginian territory (cf. L. 40.17.1-6 (182); L. 40.34.14 (181); L. 42.23-24 (172); Pol. 31.21; Appian Lib. 67). The aim of Masinissa, according to Polybius (cf. L. 42.29.8-10 with Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 248 - 249; Klotz Livius 19, 68) had been to gain control of all Carthaginian territory in the event of a Roman set-back in the war against Perseus. It was perhaps because of this intention of Masinissa's that the senate, which did not desire the complete destruction of Carthage, considered a visit by the Numidian chieftain unwelcome, and saw fit to remind him that he owed his position to Rome.

In 153, during another boundary dispute, Karthalo, the Carthaginian commander of auxiliary forces, attacked a group of Numidians occupying disputed territory. This attack led to
a war between Masinissa and the Carthaginians, who had now technically broken the treaty of 201. After a series of embassies to Africa, the senate declared war against Carthage in the winter of 151 - 150 on the grounds that the military preparations of Carthage constituted an infringement of the treaty of 201 (L. Ep. 48). On the preliminaries to the Third Punic War see De Sanctis Storia IV. 3. 1 - 33; Astin Scipio Aemilianus 270 - 280.

14.2 trium regum bellis:
In the wars against Philip V (cf. L. 31.11.8-12), Antiochus III (cf. L. 36.4.8) and Perseus (see on 13.12).

14.5 Petenti Masgabae...exigeret:
Giarratano 308 reads: obses in locum * [exigeretur, responsum est haud aequum videri senatum a Carthaginiensibus obsides arbitrio Masinissae] exigere. Giarratano explains: Post LOCUM genetivus nominis proprii deest. Lacunam explevit Zingerle, Sigonium, Madvigium, H. I. Muellerum secutus. The reading of the MS., interpreted by Giarratano as exigere, is exigeret. According to the peace treaty of 201 the Carthaginians were required to sent 1000 hostages to Rome. It appears from this passage that hostages were still being held in 168 and that their personnel was changed from time to time (cf. Pol. 15.18 with Walbank Commentary II. 466 - 471).

Hanno was possibly the son of that Hamilkar (called "the Samnite") who later became the leader of the so-called democratic party in Carthage which favoured going to war against Masinissa (cf. Appian Lib. 68).

14.8-9 Misagenes:
In 171 he was sent with 1000 infantry, 1000 cavalry and 22 elephants to serve under the consul P. Licinius Crassus (L. 42.29.8-10, 62.2, 65.12). Livy's account of this episode, partly lost in the lacuna which follows 45.14.9, may be reconstructed from Val. Max. 5.1.1d, where Misagenes is called Musochares.

15.1 Census:
Part of the census description is missing from the beginning
of Chapter 15, where a page of the MS. is lost (see Weissenborn-Müller 213; Giarratano 309). To this lacuna probably belonged the information preserved in L. Ep. 45:

Lustrum a censoribus conditum est; censa sunt civium capita trecenta duodecim milia octoginta quinque.

15.1-6 The voting of the libertini:

In the early republic the libertini voted in the four urban tribes. As censor in 312, Appius Claudius Caecus enrolled the libertini in all the tribes, but Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus and P. Decius Mus, censors in 304, cancelled the registrations of Appius Claudius and once more restricted the libertini to the four urban tribes (L. 9.46; Diod. 20.36.4; Plut. Poplicola 7). In the next half-century other censors evidently followed the example of Appius Claudius by enrolling libertini in the rural tribes, since at some time between 234 and 220 they were once again restricted to the four urban tribes (L. Ep. 20 with Taylor Voting Districts 138 n. 22).

By the Lex Terentia of 189 (see Rotondi Leges Publicae 274) the sons of libertini were granted full citizen rights, and at some time between 189 and 174, probably in 179 during the censorship of M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior, favourable changes were made in the registration of the libertini themselves. Those who had sons over five years of age and those who had property valued at a minumum of 30,000 HS. (a census rating of the first and second classes) were placed in the rural tribes (L. 45.15.1-2). In 168 the censor Ti. Sempronius Gracchus wished to exclude the libertini altogether from the tribes, except, perhaps, those already enrolled in the four urban tribes, but his colleague C. Claudius Pulcher objected and a compromise was reached, by which one of the four urban tribes was to be chosen by lot and all the libertini, except, perhaps, those already enrolled in the four urban tribes, were to be placed in it. The precedent for the selection by lot of a tribe in which a group of people would vote was the selection by lot of a tribe for the Latini (see
Taylor Voting Assemblies 79 n. 46. On the use of the lot in elections, see Ibid. 70 – 74).

It was perhaps M. Aemilius Scaurus, the consul of 115, who restored the libertini to the four urban tribes and perhaps to the rural tribes as well. Several further attempts were made to enroll the libertini in all the tribes, notably by P. Sulpicius Rufus in 88, by C. Manilius in 66 and by P. Clodius Pulcher in 53, but except for brief periods, the votes of the libertini in the late republic were limited to the four urban tribes. See Mommsen Rom. Staatsr. III. 434 – 439; Taylor Voting Districts 132 – 149; Cassola Gruppi 119 – 120.

C. Claudius Pulcher (300) and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (53), the censors of 169, belonged to families which were politically associated (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 134 – 135, 165 ff., 295 – 296). Claudius and Sempronius had been praetors together in 180 and consuls in 177. During their trial for perduellio in 169, it was said that Claudius was saved from conviction by the threat of Sempronius to go into exile if his colleague should be condemned (cf. L. 43.16.15-16). Claudius may have been returning a favour by letting Sempronius have his way in the matter of the voting of the libertini.

On the censorial activity of Sempronius, also see Cicero De Orat. 1.38; [Aurelius Victor] De Vir. Ill. 57.3.

15.8 Plures...ignominia:

Seven men were removed from the senate (L. 43.15.7).

Persons accused of immorality or misbehaviour by the censors suffered the public disgrace (ignominia) of having a mark (nota censoria) placed against their names in the register of citizens. The punishment which accompanied the nota censoria could take four different forms: a senator could be expelled from membership in the senate (senatu motus); an Eques Equo Publico could be deprived of the Equus Publicus (equum vendere iussus), and any full Roman citizen subject to the tributum (see on 34.5) could be taxed at a higher rate (aerarius factus) or, if he was registered in one of the rural tribes, he could be both taxed at a higher rate and transferred to one of
the four urban tribes (tribu motus et aerarius factus).

Mommsen (Röm. Staatsr. II. 405 - 406) thought that the two parts of the phrase tribu movere et aerarium facere refer to the same act, on the basis of his belief that, before the censorship of Appius Claudius in 312, Roman citizens subject to tributum were divided into two classes: the tribules, who possessed the minimum value of landed property required for inclusion in the Servian classes, and who were members of the tribes, and the aerarii, who did not possess the minimum property census and who were not members of the tribes. To this second group Mommsen added the cives sine suffragio and former tribules who had been removed from their tribes by the censors. According to Mommsen, a person removed from his tribe automatically became an aerarius; after Appius Claudius admitted to the tribes citizens without the minimum census requirement for inclusion in the Servian classes, the only aerarii left were the cives sine suffragio and former tribules who had been removed from their tribes.

Fraccaro, however, has argued convincingly (Athenaeum 11 N. S. (1933) 150 - 172) that the historical distinction which Mommsen posited between tribules and aerarii never existed. Membership in the tribes was normally an essential part of citizenship; no Roman citizen could be deprived of membership in the tribes without losing his status as a full citizen. Even before 312 citizens without the minimum census requirement for inclusion in the Servian classes were members of the tribes, and the aerarii, before and after 312, were members of the tribes. See also Last JRS 35 (1945) 30 - 48.

Registration in the four urban tribes became a disability after 304 when the censor Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus transferred the mass of the poorer urban dwellers from the rural to the urban tribes. Disenfranchisement reduced a citizen to the status of a cives sine suffragio, whereas transfer from a rural to an urban tribe caused a diminution in a citizen's political importance and influence.
The term aerarium facere as a penalty may occur alone, while the term tribu movere is always closely linked to aerarium facere. This implies that the punishment signified by the expression tribu movere et aerarium facere was the more severe punishment, imposing not only the payment of tributum at a higher rate, but also the political disadvantage of being transferred from a rural to an urban tribe. See Pieri L'Historie du Cens jusqu'à la Fin de la République Romaine 113 - 122.

The Equites Equo Publico were Roman citizens of the highest census group enrolled in the eighteen equestrian centuries, and are to be distinguished from the larger number of citizens who possessed the resources to serve as cavalrymen at their own expense (cf. L. 5.7.5 with Ogilvie Commentary 641 - 642). The Equites Equo Publico were given the aes equestre and the aes hordearium by the state for the purchase and maintenance of a horse on military campaigns. Until some time between the year 123 and the time of Sulla, senators had been enrolled in the eighteen equestrian centuries, but were then transferred to the first class by a plebiscitum reddendorum equorum (see Rotondi Leges Publicae 303).

The loss of the Equus Publicus, along with the privilege of voting in one of the eighteen equestrian centuries, could accompany the nota censoria. This punishment was designated by the expressions equos adimere, equi adempti, equum vendere iussit, direptis equis publicis, equum publicum perdere. A senator who was an Eques Equo Publico could be deprived of the Equus Publicus as well as expelled from the senate. See Nicolet L'Ordre Equestre à l'Epoque Républicaine (312 - 43 av. J.-C.) 15 - 123; Hill Roman Middle Class 32 - 44.

15.9 Cn. Tremellius tribunus:

Cn. Tremellius (2)

As praetor in 159 he was fined for contending with M. Aemilius Lepidus, the Pontifex Maximus and Princeps Senatus (L. Ep. 47).

On the prorogation of urban magistracies see Mommsen Röm. Staatsr. I. 637 n. 1, II. 351. For other examples of the use of
tribunician powers for personal reasons see L. 22.61.5-8, 25.3.15-17 with Bleiken Volkstribunat 98 - 99.

Since Tremellius was now tribunus plebis, he had probably already held the quaestorship, but election to this office did not automatically confer membership in the senate before the time of Sulla (see Rotondi Leges Publicae 362, 353 - 354), while the tribunate did not automatically confer membership until the passing of the Lex Atinia some time before 102 (see Rotondi Leges Publicae 330; perhaps the law was passed about 131: see Astin Scipio Aemilianus 354 - 355).

The censors, who performed the lectio senatus, were not obliged to choose only ex-magistrates, but there was a tendency to choose persons who had held curule office (cf. L. 23.23.5).

Another ex-magistrate in this period who was not a senator was P. Licinius Crassus Dives Mucianus (72), quaestor in 152, who was mistaken for a senator at the beginning of the Third Punic War by Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus (Val. Max. 2.2.1).

Certain privati, magistrates and ex-magistrates (quibus in senatu sententiam dicere licet: L. 23.32.4; Gellius 3.18.7), who were not technically senators, were permitted to participate in the deliberations of the senate before they were formally enrolled as members of that body by the censors at the next lustrum. See Mommsen Röm. Staatsr. III. 354 - 866.

15.10 C. Cicereius:

C. Cicereius (1)

He was praetor in Sardinia in 173 where his imperium was prorogued in 172. Later in 172 he was sent as an ambassador to Gentius (L. 42.26.6-7). As praetor in 173 he vowed a temple to Iuno Moneta (L. 42.7.1) which he now built on the Alban mount where, as propraetor, he had celebrated an ovatio in 172 because the senate refused to grant him a triumph for his exploits in Corsica (L. 42.21.6-7). Cicereius had been secretary to Scipio Africanus (Val. Max. 3.5.1, 4.5.3).

In 167 he was one of the five commissioners for the settlement of Illyricum (see on 17.4).
15.10 Flamen Martialis inauguratus:
The fifteen Flamines, three maiores and twelve minores, formed part of the Collegium Pontificum. Each Flamen was assigned the cult of one god. The Flamen Martialis, who attended to the cult of Mars, was one of the three Flamines maiores. See Latte Rhm. Rel. 36.

L. Postumius Albinus (*32/42) was praetor by 157 and consul in 154, when he died on his way to his province. His great-grandfather A. Postumius Albinus (30) had also held the position of Flamen Martialis. On the Postumii in politics, see on 4.7.

16.1 Q. Aelio M. Iunio consulibus:
Q. Aelius Paetus (104)
M. Iunius Pennus (122)

They took office on Roman 15 March, which would have been about 1 Jan. by the Julian calendar (see on 1.11). Livy now begins his account of the consular year 167. The Aelii and the Iunii were political associates of the Aemilian-Scipionic group (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 134 - 135, 165 ff., 211 for the Aelii; 184, 211 for the Iunii).

Aelius (104) had been augur since 174; he was probably praetor in 170 (see Broughton Magistrates I. 422 n. 1). As consul in 167 his province was Gaul.

Iunius (122) was praetor in Nearer Spain in 172 where his imperium was prorogued in 171. As consul in 167 his province was Liguria.

16.2 duas provincias Hispaniam rursus fieri:
During the war years 171 to 168 the two Spanish provinces had been united under one governor of praetorian rank so that a praetor would be free to take command of the fleet.

According to L. 32.28.11, the two Spanish provinces were demarcated in 197, but Sumner (Arethusa 3 (1970) 85 - 102) argues that from 218 until at least 196 there were two simultaneous commands held over all of Spain. Because the consul M. Porcius Cato held the command in Spain along with two praetors in 195, it appears that the permanent division of the province occurred
some time after 195. The college of praetors was increased from four to six in 197 in order to supply two governors each year for Spain. Before the permanent division of Spain into two provinces the command had been held jointly by two governors with proconsular imperium. This arrangement probably continued at least until 196.

16.3 Consulibus Pisae et Callia decretae:

Violence had perhaps broken out in the dispute between Luna and Pisa in 168 over the assignment of land for the Roman colony at Luna (see on 13.10). C. Licinius Crassus, the consul of 168, had led a campaign in Cisalpine Gaul, where his imperium was prorogued in 167 until he was named as one of the ten commissioners for the settlement of Macedonia (L. 45.12.9-12, 17.2). Later in 167 both consuls campaigned against the Ligurians (L. 45.44.1).

16.3-4 Praetorum sortes fuere:

Q. Cassius (Longinus) (69)
Ti. Claudius Nero (252)
Cn. Fulvius (13)
M'. Iuventius Thalna (30)
C. Licinius Nerva (133)
A. Manlius Torquatus (73)

Cassius (69) belonged to a family which had recently risen from three centuries of political obscurity. C. Cassius (Longinus) (55), consul in 171, was the first member of his gens to reach the consulship since Sp. Cassius Vicellinus (91) in the early fifth century. The Cassii were one of a group of plebeian families which rose to prominence in the late 170's. As praetor in 167, Cassius (69) conducted Perseus to Alba Fucentia (L. 45.42.4) and presented the ships captured from Gentius to the people of Corcyra, Apollonia and Dyrrhachium (L. 45.43.10). He was consul in 164. See Scullard Rom. Pol. 195 ff.

As tribunus plebis in 170 Iuventius joined in the prosecution of C. Lucretius Gallus for his treatment of Chalcis as praetor in command of the fleet in 171 (L. 43.8.2-10). In attempting to obtain the declaration of war against Rhodes during his praetorship (L. 45.21.1-8), Iuventius was probably acting in
the interests of Q. Marcius Philippus (see Appendix I). It is possible that Philippus, as censor in 164, used his influence to help Juventius to the consulship of 163, since the Iuventii were not prominent in Roman politics, and Juventius (30) was the first and only member of his gens to attain the consulship. He died during his consulship in 163. See Scullard Rom. Pol. 287.

For Licinius see on 3.1.

The Manlii were political associates of the Fabii (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 135, 184). Manlius (73) became consul in 164, one year after his brother T. Manlius Torquatus (83). Nothing further is known of Claudius (252) and Fulvius (13).

16.4 A. Manlio Torquato...retentus:

The praetorian governors of Sardinia sometimes received special additional tasks. In 177 L. Mummius was required to prosecute the Latini who had not returned home before 1 Nov. of that year (L. 41.9.9-10).

16.5-6 Prodigies:

cf. Julius Obsequens 11.

The expiation of prodigies regularly took place at the beginning of the new year before the consuls left for their provinces. The senate could decree sacrifices, lectisternia, supplicationes, novemdiales sacri, lustrationes urbis, ludi scaenici, or obsecrationes. When a particularly serious prodigy was reported, the senate might consult the Pontifices or seek the advice of haruspices or issue a decree ordering the decemviri sacris faciundis to consult the Sibylline books.


16.7-8 Lectisternium in thanksgiving for the victories over Perseus and Gentius:

On lectisternia see Latte Röm. Rel. 242 - 244. The lectisternium for the victory over Antiochus III was vowed in 191 (L. 36.2.2-5), but the fulfilment of this vow in 185 was not recorded in Livy's annalistic account for that year, and is mentioned here for the
first time.

17.1 - 18.8 The settlement of Macedonia and Illyricum:

On the settlement of Macedonia see Frank CP 9 (1914) 49 - 59; Larsen CP 40 (1945) 65 - 97; CP 44 (1949) 73 - 90; ESAR IV. 294 - 300; Rep. Gov't 86, 103 - 104; Greek Federal States 295 - 300; Aymard CP 45 (1950) 96 - 107; Meloni Perseo 409 - 431; Badian Foreign Clientelae 96 - 97; Will Histoire II. 236 - 238; De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 328 - 331.


For Livy's Polybian account of the settlement of Macedonia and Illyricum see 45.29 and 45.26.11-15, respectively.

17.1-3 Legatos:

A. Postumius (Albinus) Luscus (*26/46)
C. Claudius Pulcher (300)
Q. Fabius (Labeo ?) (91)
(?) Q. Marcius Philippus (79)
C. Licinius Crassus (51)
Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (19)
Ser. Cornelius Sulla (2, 388)
L. Iunius (Brutus ?) (19)
T. Numisius Tarquiniensis (10)
A. Terentius Varro (80)

Of the commissioners of censorial rank, Postumius had been praetor in 185, consul in 180 and censor in 174; Claudius had been praetor in 180, consul in 177 and censor in 169.

Of the three consulars, only the name of Licinius is preserved in the MS., which seems to have omitted two names. The name of Fabius is restored on the basis of L. 45.31.14, where the Labeo sent to Lesbos is almost certainly a member of the commission. The name of Marcius Philippus was restored by Weissenborn solely on the basis of Marcius' experience in Greek affairs (see Weissenborn-Müller 39 ad L. 45.17.2).

Domitius may have been praetor in 170, seeing that his name occurs first after those of the consulars (also see on 10.4).
Cornelius, whose name comes next, was probably the Cornelius whose imperium was prorogued in Sardinia in 174, and who would thus probably have been praetor in that province in 175. Drumann (Geschichte Roms. vol. IV. 10) conjectured that Iunius (19) was a Brutus and the brother of M. Iunius Brutus (48), the consul of 178. Numisius had been sent to Egypt in 169 to attempt to negotiate a peace between Antiochus IV and Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra (see Appendix III). Terentius had been praetor in 184. On the political connections of the Postumii see on 4.7. On the Claudii see on 4.1. On the Fabii see Scullard Rom. Pol. 165 ff.

On the political connections of the Postumii see on 4.7. On the Claudii see on 4.1. On the Fabii see Scullard Rom. Pol. 165 ff.

On Marcius Philippus see Briscoe JRS 54 (1964) 66 - 67. C. Licinius Crassus (51) was an associate of the Popillii (see on 1.6). Domitius, Cornelius, Iunius and Terentius were associated with the Aemilian-Scipionic group (Domitius had been one of the three special envoys to Greece and Macedonia acceptable to Paullus late in 169: see on 3.1; for the Iunii see on 16.1; for the Terentii see Scullard Rom. Pol. 141, 211, 284).

Numisius may have been associated with Marcius Philippus (see Briscoe JRS 54 (1964) 76 - 77).

17.4 In Illyricum autem hi nominati:

- P. Aelius Ligus (84)
- C. Cicereius (1)
- Cn. Baebius Tamphilus (42; cf. 43)
- P. Terentius Tuscivicanus (75)
- P. Manilius (13)

Aelius had been consul in 172; Cicereius praetor in 173; Baebius praetor in 168. Aelius (see on 16.1), Cicereius (see on 15.10), Baebius (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 170, 211) and Terentius (see on 17.1) were political associates of the Aemilian-Scipionic group.

Manilius (13) belonged to a new family whose first member to reach the consulship was M' Manilius (12), perhaps a younger
brother of Manilius (13), in 149. According to Cicero (De Re Pub. 1.18), Manilius (13) was a member of the Scipionic circle.

17.7 ceterum...possent:
In 189 after the defeat of Antiochus III the senate sent ten commissioners to Asia for the settlement of details, but determined beforehand the general policy to be followed (cf. Pol. 21.24.4-9; L. 37.55.4-6).

18.1 liberos esse:
In the Hellenistic world the terms κυνομοίκος, ἔλευθερος, had come to denote little more than "local autonomy" and were not incompatible with various forms of domination (see McShane Foreign Policy 68 - 73; Jones The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian 95 - 112). When the Romans received the deditio (see on 1.9) of a defeated enemy, they considered themselves entitled to make political arrangements for that state and to determine its status (see Dahlheim Deditio und societas 1 - 52).

Cato the Censor had argued against the incorporation of Macedonia as a province on the grounds that it could not be defended (Malcovati ORF² no. 8 frs. 161 - 162). Macedonia now became a free amicus of Rome.

The earlier Roman notion of libertas excluded restrictions such as the imposition of tribute, but here for the first time the Romans imposed tribute on a free state (see on 18.7).

18.2 sub tutela [populi Romani]:
The words populi Romani, which do not occur in the MS., and which were added by Sigonius, are accepted by Giarratano 313. Livy refers to the informal protectorate established over the Greek states by the Romans during the course of their intervention in eastern affairs from the time of the First Illyrian War in 229 - 228 (see on 43.10).

18.3 Metalli quoque Macedonici...tolli placebat:
In Macedonia the gold and silver mines had formed part of the royal domains. The estates (praedia rustica) closed to capitalist development were probably the private estates of the king. See Cicero II De Lege Agraria 50; Rostovtzeff SEH
Although the senate had originally decided to close all the mines, Paullus and the ten commissioners closed only the gold and silver mines, while permitting the working of the iron and copper mines, presumably by Macedonian contractors (cf. L. 45.29.11). The former royal estates probably continued to be worked by small tenants. See Rostovtzeff SEH 758. Badian (Publicans and Sinners 39 - 43) argues that the publicani were being deprived of the opportunity to exploit the mines and estates in Macedonia because of their conflict with the censors C. Claudius Pulcher and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus in 169 which led to a charge of perduellio being brought against them by the tribunus plebis P. Rutilius (L. 43.16). The conflict continued into the following year, when the censors deprived Rutilius and many other Equites Equo Publico of their horses (cf. L. 44.16.8 and see on 15.8), and in 167 the publicani were further chastised by being deprived of the chance to exploit the mines and estates in Macedonia. However, if it was merely a question of punishing the equites, the senate might simply have barred them from exploiting the mines and estates without preventing the Macedonians from exploiting them. The mines and estates had to be closed because the alternative to allowing their exploitation by the equites was to permit the Macedonian financiers to exploit them, but this was considered a politically dangerous expedient which might lead to the resurgence of Macedonian strength. According to Livy's annalistic source, the publicani could not be permitted to exploit the mines and estates because Macedonia had been declared free. In Spain the mines were exploited by equestrian companies, and the taxes on revenues from the mines were farmed out by the censors to contractors who bid for the right to collect them. The ager publicus in the Roman provinces was let to tenants by the censors for fixed periods and for fixed rents. After the Pergamene kingdom had been declared a province, the personal property of the kings was treated in this way. But since Macedonia had been
declared free, the extension of the censors' authority to Macedonia would be a violation of the rights of free amici. Thus it was the decision not to annex Macedonia as a province which prohibited the activity of the publicani there, but this decision was taken, not as a means of punishing the publicani, but because of the general reluctance of the senate during this period to annex territory outside of Italy (see Badian *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic* 1 - 43). Cato's argument against direct rule over Macedonia was that the country could not be defended (cf. Malcovati *ORF* no. 8 fr. 162). Without direct rule, the publicani could not be supervised properly, another reason for keeping them out of Macedonia.

See Orth *RE Suppl.* IV (1924) cols. 152 - 154; Frank *ESAR* I. 154 - 157; Stevenson *Roman Provincial Administration till the Age of the Antonines* 134 - 144; Hill *Roman Middle Class* 57 - 59; Ürögdi *RE Suppl.* XI (1968) cols. 1184 - 1192.

The gold and silver mines were re-opened in 158 (cf. Cassiodorus *Chronica*, ed. Mommsen. p. 130 n. 403), probably for exploitation by the Macedonians.

When Macedonia became a province in 148, the mines and other sources of revenue were presumably opened up for exploitation by the publicani. It is thought that coinage was resumed with the re-opening of the mines in 158 and that the four Macedonian μερίδες (see below) had coined no money during the preceding years. See Rostovtzeff *SEH* 758.

18.6 commune consilium:

The reading of the MS. is *communeconsiliumgentisessetinprobum vulgiadsenatorialiquidoliberatatemsalubrimoderationidatamad licentiampestilentemtraheretinquattuormacedonesdescribi madonianamvisumquaecueconsiliumhabereplacuit*....

Giarratano 314 reads *[denique ne, si] commune concilium gentis esset, inprobus vulgi adsentator aliquando libertatem salubri moderatione datam ad licentiam pestilentem traheret, in quattuor regiones describi Macedonian, ut suum quaeque concilium haberet, placuit*....

This text, in its main outlines and in most particulars, is accepted by modern editors, except for the interpretation of
the MS. reading *consilium* which occurs twice in this passage.

Larsen (CP 44 (1949) 73 - 90) argued for the retention of the MS. reading instead of emending to *concilium*. The emendation of *consilium* to *concilium* can be traced back to Sigonius and has generally been treated as the orthodox reading. The MS. in both cases reads *consilium*, which Sigonius adopted as the reading in 18.6 with a note to the effect that it should be understood as *concilium*, and which in 18.7 he emended to *concilium*. Because *consilium* in Livy corresponds best to the Greek *συνέδριον* and Livy often used the word *concilium* to refer to the primary assembly (*ἐκκλησία*) of a Greek federal state, the reading of the MS. should be retained, especially since the terms of the settlement of Macedonia (cf. L. 45.29-30) indicate that the Romans wished to deprive the Macedonians of their capacity for common action by preventing the continuation of a single administration (see Walbank *Museum Helveticum* 27 (1970) 129 - 143).

For the division of Macedonia into four parts see L. 45.29.5-9.
The four *regiones* (*μέρη*, Diod. 31.8.8; *μερίδες* : see Larsen CP 44 (1949) 85 n. 37) with their separate administrations seem to have continued at least into the Flavian period (see Larsen Rep. Gov't. 108 - 114), although it appears from the numismatic evidence that a *κοινόν* or provincial assembly for the whole of Macedonia existed as early as the reign of Claudius. For the numismatic evidence for the *μερίδες* see Head *Historia Nummorum* 216, 238 - 246; Head, ed. Poole *A Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum*, vol. V. liii - lxiii, 7 ff.
The council (*βουλή, consilium*) of each *μέρη* was called a *συνέδριον* (cf. L. 45.32.2: *senatores, quos synedros vocant, legendos esse, quorum consilio res publica administraretur*).

This implies a representative government (see Larsen CP 40 (1945) 65 - 97; Rep. Gov't. 86 - 105).

Aymard (CP 45 (1950) 102 - 107) argued against Larsen (CP 44 (1949) 87 - 88) that there probably were primary assemblies in each of the four *μερίδες*. Larsen himself (ESAR IV. 298) had
earlier granted the possibility of electoral assemblies consisting, presumably, of the deni principes civitatium (cf. L. 45.29.1).

A parallel to the division of Macedonia and of Illyricum (see on 18.7) is the division of the new province of Galatia into three administrative areas in 25 B.C. (see Jones The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces 119 - 120).

18.6

inprobus vulgi adsentator:

Livy implies that the lower classes of Macedonia could be stirred to rebellion by their leaders if the Romans were to allow a unified government for the whole country.

The important social and political cleavage in Hellenistic society was not ideological (e.g., democracy versus oligarchy) but economic (lower class versus upper class). Two main features in this "class struggle" were the demands for the cancellation of debts and the redistribution of land (see Rostovtzeff SEH 755 - 757, 1115 - 1134, 1460 n. 14; Holleaux CAH VIII (1930) 146 - 148).

The question of political opposition to Rome in the Hellenistic world from the First Macedonian War to the time of Sulla has recently been studied by Deininger (Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland 217 - 86 v. Chr.) Deininger seeks to divide this opposition to Rome into two periods marked by the deportation of the anti-Roman leaders to Italy in 167. Confining his study to Rhodes and mainland Greece (excluding Macedonia), Deininger concludes that before 167 the upper classes, divided among themselves on the question of relations with Rome, controlled foreign policy, while after 167 the lower classes, who had been opposed to Rome even during the earlier period, led the opposition to Rome.

Although the Romans generally preferred to see the upper classes in control of the Greek states (cf. the arrangements made by Flamininus in Thessaly in 194: L. 34.51.4-6), it is not true that there was invariably a state of hostility between the Romans and the lower classes in Greece. The Romans sometimes recognized or tolerated revolutionary regimes (e.g., Sparta under Makhanidas and Nabis) and were not in general concerned
about the internal politics of the Greek states unless there was danger that any state or group of states might upset the social and political stability and order which the Romans wished to preserve in Greece. Flamininus went to war against Nabis in 195 to free Argos from Spartan control, but this was only to restrict Spartan power in the Peloponnese (cf. L. 34.22.4 - 41.10). In the wars of the the Romans against Philip V, Antiochus III and Perseus the lower classes in the states which supported Rome generally followed without incident the example of their political leaders. See Briscoe Past & Present 36 (1967) 3 - 20.

In their recent reviews of Deininger's book, Derow (Phoenix 26 (1972) 303 - 311) and Errington (JRS 63 (1973) 249 - 250) question the rigid conclusions stated by the author, who may not have paid enough attention to the tendency of Livy to interpret differences in public opinion along class lines even when his source did not do so (cf. Pol. 27.1.7-9 and L. 42.44.3-5). Also see Musti, Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt vol. I, Part 2 (1972) 1165 - 1168.

After the deportation of the anti-Roman leaders in 167, the political leaders of the Greek states continued to come from the upper classes. In the Achaean War of 147 - 146, which broke out after the Roman attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the Achaean League, the wealthy classes as well as the lower classes opposed Rome (see De Sanctis Storia IV. 3. 127 - 162; Fuks JHS 90 (1970) 78 - 89). The lower classes were not instantly prepared to fight Rome at the first opportunity, but had to be persuaded to vote for the declaration of war by the proclamation of social measures favourable to them. The liberation and arming of slaves was an act of necessity approved by the leaders of the Achaean League (cf. Pol. 38.15.1-5).

After more than a half-century of relative political stability in the Greek world, Mithridates tried to gain the support of the lower classes in Greece and Asia Minor by promises of social revolution (see Rostovtzeff SEH 930 - 944), but although he appealed to widespread social discontent, many cities opposed him, notably Rhodes (see Hiller von Gaertringen RE Suppl. V
After the defeat of Perseus, Macedonians of all social classes remained hostile to Rome and rebelled in 149 - 148 under Andriskos. The Roman settlement of Macedonia displeased the traders, whose business was damaged by restrictions placed on commerce between the four regions (cf. L. 45.30.1-2), while the political arrangements which established federal governments for the Macedonian regions led to the outbreak of disorder and violence among the political leaders (cf. Pol. 31.2.12, 17.1-2), who probably disliked the new ways. All Macedonians, whether rich or poor, must have resented the defeat and fragmentation of their country, which had been an important imperialist power with strong traditions of unity under a national monarchy. Thus the establishment of the four μεριδία by Rome represents an attempt to restrict not only the lower classes, but also the upper classes, who would continue to supply the political leadership in Macedonia.

18.7 dimidium tributi:
Plutarch gives this sum as 100 talents per year (Aem. 28.3). Larsen (Greek Federal States 299) suggests that the full tax formerly collected by the king was still collected, with half of it now going to Rome and half to the governments of the four μεριδία. The tributum soli or land tax was one of the forms of revenue derived by the Romans from the provinces, but in the case of Macedonia, a free amicus of Rome, the tributum should probably be considered more a war-indemnity than a tax. See Cicero In Verrem II. 3.6.12; Schwann RE VII. A. 1 (1939) cols. 1 - 13, 42.

Until this time the Romans had always associated immunitas (freedom from taxation) with libertas (political independence). During the course of their involvement in the affairs of the Greek east, the Romans learned that the Hellenistic concept
of αὐτονομία or ἔλευθερία did not exclude various forms of subjection, including the payment of tax, so that Flamininus, in his declaration of liberty at the Isthmian Games of 196, specified that the Greeks were to be liberos, immunes, suis legibus (L. 33.32.5; cf. Pol. 18.46.5: ἔλευθεροις, ἀφορολομήτους, νόμους χρωμένους τοῖς πατρίοις).

During the settlement of Asia after the defeat of Antiochus III, the Romans freed from tribute cities ὅσα μὲν τῶν αὐτονόμων πόλεων πρότερον ὑπετέλουν Ἀντιοχῷ φόρον (Pol. 21.45.2; note Livy's translation of this: quae stipendiariae regi Antiocho fuerant: L. 38.39.7). In 189 the Romans still considered it a contradiction in terms that a free city should be paying tribute, though apparently they permitted free cities which formerly paid tribute to Attalos I to continue paying tribute to Eumenes II. The Romans themselves are first known to have applied conditions to a grant of libertas in the case of the Ambraciots in 187 (cf. L. 38.44.4: portoria quae vellent... caperent, dum eorum immunes Romani ac socii nominis Latini essent). On libertas et immunitas see Jones, Anatolian Studies 103 - 117. As in the case of Sicily, the Romans found that the Macedonians had been accustomed to paying tax, and the senate decided to continue collecting it, even though it might have been considered more a war-indemnity than a tax, since the Macedonians were left as free amici. See Badian Foreign Clientelae 79 - 81.

18.7 Similia his et in Illyricum mandata:

For the Polybian account of the settlement of Illyricum see L. 45.26.11-15. Cato the Censor appears to have been concerned about the treatment of Illyricum and may have argued against annexation. cf. Peter HRR2 I. p. 88 fr. 96: M. Catonem in Originum quarto - scripsisse et item in quinto: urbes insulasque omnis pro agro Illyrio esse; fr. 97: Cato Originum libro V: Fluvium Naronem magnum, pulchrum, pisculentum.... (the river Naro, the modern Narenta or Neretwa, is in Jugoslavia.)

19.1 The embassy of Attalos:

The purpose of this embassy was to congratulate the Romans for their victory over Perseus and to request assistance against
the Galatians. For general discussions of this embassy see McShane *Foreign Policy* 181 - 186; Will *Histoire* II. 245 - 246; De Sanctis *Storia* IV. 12. 347 - 351; Hansen *Attalids* 121 - 122. Eumenes himself had been forced to return home in 168 to deal with an uprising of the Galatians (see on 19.3) and was now seriously ill in Pergamon (cf. L. 45.34.10-14).

Attalos I became an amicus of Rome about 211 along with the Aetolians, with whom he was on good terms. He seems to have made arrangements with the Romans for the division of the spoils in the First and Second Macedonian Wars similar to those made by the Aetolians in 211 (for the Romano-Aetolian treaty see IG. IX2. 1. 2 (1957) no. 241 and SEG XVII. 280 with Will *Histoire* II. 76 - 77). On Attalos cf. L. 28.7.4-5, 31.45.7, 31.46.16.


Attalos was born in 220, the second son of Attalos I. In 192 he came to Rome with the report that Antiochus III had crossed the Hellespont into Europe (L. 35.23.10-11). Attalos was left in charge of Pergamon in 190 when Eumenes took command of the fleet (L. 37.18.1-8); he commanded forces on the Roman right wing at the battle of Magnesia (L. 37.43.5). In 189, while Eumenes was in Rome, Attalos was again left in charge of Pergamon and participated in the campaign of Cn. Manlius Vulso against the Galatians (L. 38.12.6-8). Attalos commanded the Pergamene forces in the war against Pharnakes (183 - 179) during the illness of Eumenes and went to Rome with his younger brothers to seek Roman intervention (Pol. 24.5). He commanded forces at the battle of Pydna (L. 44.36.8). He returned to Rome in 160 to refute the charges of Prusias II and the Galatians (Pol. 31.1.2-7, 32.1.5-7).

The senate, displeased with the conduct of Eumenes (see on 19.5), showed Attalos special favour (cf. Pol. 32.1.7) and during the
embassy of 167 a group within the senate tried to create an
open break between the brothers (see on 19.2). Upon the death
of Eumenes, Attalos became king as Attalos II (159 - 138).

19.2 Exceptus enim ab iis...venissent:
There was an important group in the senate which desired to
support Attalos against Eumenes. In an annalistic section
of Book 44 (see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 260 - 263; Klotz
Livius 20, 72 - 73) Livy, following Valerius Antias, contrasted
the uncooperativeness of Eumenes with the eager support given
the Romans by Attalos in the campaigns of 169 and 168
(L. 44.13.12-14, 44.20.7). This may have been due to the
Galatian revolt in Asia Minor (see on 19.3), but a more
serious charge made by Polybius was that Eumenes had
communicated with Perseus concerning the negotiation of peace
between Rome and Macedonia (see on 19.5). In 167 Attalos
was well received by those senators present who had known him
during their military service in the Macedonian war (cf. Pol. 30.1.4:
πάντων δὲ φιλοφρόνως αὐτῶν ἀποδεχομένων διὰ τε τὴν ἐν τῷ
στρατεύεις ὑπηευμένην συνήθειαν καὶ διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν εὐνοῦν αὐτοῖς
διπάρχειν). Scullard (Rom. Pol. 215) believes that the
senators in question were members of the "less scrupulous
plebeian group, including Q. Marcius Philippus, the consul
of 169, whose diplomacy had previously shocked the more old-
fashioned and upright". Briscoe (JRS 54 (1964) 66 - 67) suggests
that we can identify a number of politicians whose high-handed
and unscrupulous methods showed a lack of the "old Roman
qualities of virtus and fides" - among them Q. Fulvius Flaccus (61),
censor in 174; M. Popillius Laenas (*6/24), consul in 173;
C. Popillius Laenas (*7/18), consul in 172; P. Licinius Crassus (60),
consul in 171; C. Lucretius Gallus (23), praetor in 171; and
L. Hortensius (4), praetor in 170.
Although these men did not belong to one political group,
Briscoe believes they could have agreed on certain issues, such
as the deception of Perseus in 172 (for the embassy of Marcius
Philippus to Perseus, cf. L. 42.38.8 - 43.3; 42.47) and the
interference in the Attalid dynasty in 167.
It was perhaps largely the same group within the senate that wished to interfere in Pergamon and to declare war on Rhodes (see on 25.2). Polybius (30.1.7) called the senators concerned ἐνώσεως τῶν σκολότων, which Livy rendered as quidam Romanorum non boni auctores (45.19.4). Badian (Foreign Clientelae 102 - 104), taking a different view from that of Scullard and Briscoe, argues that if Marcius Philippus had been a principal in these dealings, Polybius would not have hesitated to name him (cf. Pol. 23.9.8 ff., 27.1.3 ff., 28.17.4 ff.) He concludes that Polybius was "shielding his friends in a disreputable affair", suggesting that Aemilius Paullus stood behind this senatorial group. However, Marcius Philippus was not the only senator of high rank involved, and Polybius may have hesitated to identify the whole group. The complicity of Paullus seems to be excluded by the fact that he was still in Macedonia at this time.

For similar interference by the senate and Flamininus in the Macedonian royal house see Edson HSCP 46 (1935) 191 - 202.

19.3 The Galatians:
The kings of Pergamon were long-standing opponents of the Galatians, who first invaded Asia Minor in 278/7. Philetairos protected his own hinterland and assisted Kyzikos and other Greek cities against the Galatians (cf. OGIS 748). In 241, after his victory over the Galatians in the Caicus valley which drove them from the coast, Attalos I assumed the name Εὐπήρ and the title Βασιλεὺς. On at least four occasions between 240 and 228 Attalos defeated Antiochus II and his Galatian allies in Asia Minor, driving the Seleucid king from north-western Asia Minor and confining the Galatians to the area between the river Sangarios to just east of the Halys. When the Galatians renewed their raids on the territory of Pergamon in 190, Eumenes II and some of the Greek cities urged the Romans to send an army against them. Attalos, the brother of Eumenes, participated in the campaign of Cn. Manlius Vulso in 189 and in 188. The Galatians assisted Prusias I of Bithynia in his war against Eumenes (ca. 186 - 183). After this war was brought to an end by Roman intervention, Eumenes seems to have incorporated the
territory of the Galatians into his kingdom; it was in the eighties of the second century that the Great Altar was built. Two Galatian chieftains assisted Pharnakes of Pontus in his war against Eumenes (183 – 179). In 168 the Galatians once again took arms against Eumenes, who was forced to leave the theatre of war in Macedonia to meet the new threat to his kingdom. Eumenes sent his brother Attalos to Rome in 167 to request aid against the Galatians.

For subsequent developments see on 45.21.

See McShane Foreign Policy 29 – 186; Hansen Attalids 14 – 129.

19.5 altero nec Romanis nec Persei fido socio:

According to Pol. 29.5-9 (also see L. 44.24.7 – 25.12), Eumenes had offered either to withdraw his services from the Roman side or to use his influence in making peace between Rome and Macedonia. During the Macedonian war, Eumenes had contributed considerable military and naval forces to the Roman war effort (see McShane Foreign Policy 177 – 181) and could scarcely be called an ally of Perseus. The annalistic tradition, however, described the unwillingness of Eumenes to participate personally in the campaigns of 169 and 168, but this may have been due to the Galatian revolt in Asia Minor (see on 19.3). Because the alleged negotiations between Perseus and Eumenes came to nothing, Eumenes cannot have been guilty of any overt act of disloyalty. Polybius identified the source of his information concerning these negotiations as the friends of Perseus, presumably the Macedonians who were removed to Rome in 167 (see on 32.3). He was inclined to believe their story in the light of the senate's later attitude towards Eumenes (see Pol. 30.1.6; Pol. 29.6 with De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 352 n. 325; Fedech Meth. Hist. 400 – 404). Scullard (Rom. Pol. 286 – 287) and Badian (Foreign Clientelae 102 – 104) accept the account of Polybius, suggesting that Eumenes' motive for the negotiations was the Galatian revolt, in which Perseus himself may have had a hand (cf. Pol. 25.6.3). De Sanctis (Storia IV. 12. 349), on the other hand, believed that Polybius was misled by his informants into thinking that the subject of the negotiations was the mediation of peace between Rome and Macedonia when the real topic of discussion may have been
nothing more than the exchange of prisoners or the like (cf. L. 44.24.7). It is also possible that some of the Macedonian hostages invented this story as a way of harming their enemy Eumenes. Subsequent events, however, seem to support the allegation that the negotiation of peace was discussed (see Jones The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces 114 - 116; Badian Foreign Clientelae 102 - 105; McShane Foreign Policy 181 - 186; De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 347 - 351; Hansen Attalids 120 - 129; Scullard Rom. Pol. 286 - 287). Similar attempts to negotiate a peace had been made or contemplated by the Rhodians (see Appendix I), by Ptolemy VI (Pol. 28.1.7) and possibly by Prusias II (see on 44.4).

19.10 regnum eorum novum:
Philetairos, the founder of the Attalid dynasty, had been placed in charge of Pergamon by Lysimakhos, from whom he revolted in 282. Attalos I, his grand-nephew, was the first of the line to adopt the title of king (in 241).

19.11 eam infirmatatem...aetatemque Eumenis:
Eumenes had fallen seriously ill towards the end of 168 or the beginning of 167 (cf. L. 45.34.11). Born before 221, Eumenes was now in his middle or late fifties, and his wife, Stratonike, was still childless after eight years of marriage (see Hansen Attalids 95 n. 66).

19.16 ex fraterna caede:

20.2 Aenum sibi et Maroneam petuit:
These towns in Macedonia had been promised to Attalos by the senators who wished to instigate him against Eumenes, but the offer was withdrawn when Attalos refused to comply with their wishes (Pol. 30.3.5-7). Ainos and Maroneia were declared civitates liberae (probably also immunes: see on 18.7; cf. Pol. 30.3.7: τὴν μὲν Αἴνον καὶ τὴν Μαρώνεαν ἐλευθέρωσεν[sc. ἦ τοῦ σύνταγματος]. Along with Abdera, these
two towns remained outside the first Macedonian μερικά (see on 29.5). Livy concealed the original promise of Ainos and Maroneia to Attalos (see Walsh Livy 151 - 153).

20.4 Rhodian Embassy:

For general discussions of this embassy see Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 151 - 167; Badian Foreign Clientelae 100 - 102; Will Histoire II. 250 - 253; De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 342 - 347.

20.8 Rhodios non ita meritos...habendi sint:

For the relationship of amicitia between Rome and Rhodes see on 3.3. For amicitia see Appendix IV.

21.1-8 Violations of constitutional practice:

Iuventius brought before the Comitia Centuriata the bill (rogatio) calling for the declaration of war with Rhodes. This was done without prior consultation of the senate and without prior notification of the consuls who, as magistrates with maius imperium, had the right to introduce legislation in the comitia before the praetors.

The senate enjoyed the privilege of prior consultation, especially in the fields of military commands, foreign policy, finance and public religion, stemming from the sanction of patrum auctoritas, (the sanction of the patrician senators), required for all legislation in the early republic. Although the Lex Publilia de patrum auctoritate of 339 required the senate to grant pro forma approval to any bill laid before the comitia (see Rotondi Leges Publicae 227), the senate continued to control legislation in important fields through senatus consulta (technically advice to magistrates), which the magistrates tended to accept as law, and through the corporate domination of the senate as a group over the magistrates, who either were senators or hoped to become senators.

For other examples of bills introduced against the wishes of the senate, see L. 21.63.3; 38.36.8. The alliance with Messana in 264 was voted without the express approval of the senate (see Pol. 1.10-11 with Walbank Commentary I. 60).

See Mommsen Röm. Staatsr. III. 1022 - 1239; Botsford The Roman Assemblies 139 - 151, 230 - 232; O'Brien-Moore RE Suppl. VI
Voting on a bill was always preceded by the publication of an edict before a gathering of the people in a contio (rogationem promulgare). The interval between the publication of a bill and voting was set at 24 days (see Taylor Voting Assemblies 144 n. 35), the so-called trinum nundinum, by the Lex Caecilia Didia of 98 B. C. (see Rotondi Leges Publicae 335), but no strict interval was regularly observed before this time. The actual voting on a bill (in the comitia) was traditionally preceded by a number of informal gatherings of the people (contiones) for the purpose of discussion (there were three contiones before judicial assemblies). By vetoing the bill before allowing sufficient time for discussion, Antonius and Pomponius were violating an accepted principle of Roman constitutional practice. See Mommsen Röm. Staatsr. III. 369 - 396; Botsford The Roman Assemblies 139 - 151; Taylor Voting Assemblies 15 - 19; Staveley Greek and Roman Voting and Elections 143 - 149.

The declaration of war was no longer governed by the traditional form of the ius fetiale, according to which the stages in the declaration of war were: 1) res repetuntur; 2) testatio deorum (denuntiatio); 3) senatus censet; 4) populus iubet; 5) bellum indicitur.

By the 270's the Fetiales no longer journeyed to the enemy country for the belli indictio, and by the Second Punic War the Fetiales were replaced by senatorial legati. The three journeys into enemy territory were combined into one and the legati "went out armed with a conditional declaration of war, authorized beforehand by the senate and people, so that, if the reply to their rerum repetitio was unfavourable, they could immediately convey the Roman declaration of war" (Walbank CP 44 (1949) 15). The stages in the declaration of war were now: 1) senatus censet; 2) populus iubet; 3) res repetuntur; 4) testatio deorum (denuntiatio); 5) bellum indicitur.

See Wissowa Rel. und Kult. 550 - 554; McDonald and Walbank
M. Antonius et M. Pomponius tribuni plebis:

M. Antonius (27) and M. Pomponius (*13/9).
Antonius later summoned the *contio* at which Aemilius Paullus addressed the people after his triumph (L. 45.40.9).
The Pomponii were associates of the Aemilian-Scipionic group. Pomponius (*13/9) was probably the great-grandson of the brother of the M'. Pomponius Matho (16) whose daughter was married to P. Cornelius Scipio (330), the consul of 218 and the father of Scipio Africanus. As urban praetor in 161, Pomponius (*13/9) sponsored a *senatus consultum* banning philosophers and rhetors from Rome.

Speech of the Rhodians:

In this speech, which seems favourable to the Rhodians, the ambassadors seek to demonstrate that Rhodes had not attacked any of Rome's *amici*, that the Rhodians had participated in the eastern wars of the Romans, that they had not made an alliance with Perseus or assisted him in any way, and that it was only a small but powerful group of politicians, not the state as a whole, which desired a Macedonian alliance. The Rhodians thus claimed that they had acted as faithful *amici* of Rome, but the senate regarded the actions of the pro-Macedonian party in Rhodes as sufficient grounds to terminate the *amicitia* with that state. On *amicitia* see Appendix IV.

Antea, Carthaginiensibus victis...venissemus:
For the Rhodian embassies to Rome in 201 and 189 see L. 31.2.1-2 and Pol. 21.22.5 - 24.15.

quos provinciis nuper Lycia atque Caria...donastis:
These were awarded to the Rhodians by the senate in 189 as part of the eastern arrangements which followed the defeat of Antiochus III (Pol. 21.24.7-8); a formal *senatus consultum* was passed in 188 (L. 38.39.13). In 196, after the defeat of Philip V, the Rhodians had been granted Stratonikeia and other cities in Caria which Philip had held (L. 33.30.11). After the
war against Antiochus, Rhodian territories on the mainland were extended to include Lycia and Caria as far as the Maeander river, but excluding Telmessos (L. 38.39.13). See Fraser-Bean Rhodian Peraea 70 - 78, 107 - 117; Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 81 - 128.

22.4 Rhodios...hostes ex sociis facturi estis:

For the question of the Rhodian alliance see on 3.3.

22.6-8 The causes of Rome's wars:
The Rhodians refer to the causes of the wars against Carthage, Macedonia and Antiochus III. Their attitude reflects the Roman view that Rome went to war in defense of allies who were being attacked or injured.

In 264 the Mamertini, discharged Italian mercenaries of Agathokles who had turned to robbery and had made Messana their stronghold, were besieged by King Hiero of Syracuse. The act of deditio of the Mamertini to Rome was accepted and they were later granted a foedus with Rome of the Italian type (see Cicero II In Verrem 19.50 with Dahlheim Deditio und societas 27 - 29). The Carthaginians, who had already been requested by the Mamertini to install a garrison in Messana, now joined with Hiero in the siege of persons who were socii of Rome, not merely amici.

On the causes of the First Punic War see Pol. 1.7-11 with Walbank Commentary I. 57 - 63.
The annalistic tradition regarded the appeal of the Greek states to Rome against the aggression of Philip V as one of the three reasons for the Roman declaration of war against Macedonia in 200. In an annalistic section of his narrative (see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 119 - 120) Livy mentioned the arrival of an Athenian embassy in Rome to complain about Philip (L. 31.1.10). Polybius, too, regarded the aggression of Philip against Athens as a factor in the Roman decision to declare war (see Balsdon JRS 44 (1954) 33). The complaints of the Illyrians may have been of special significance (see on 3.1). Although it seems unlikely that Rome had any socii of the Italian type among the Greek states, the Romans did have a circle of amici in Greece, perhaps best identified in the list of Roman adscripti to the Peace of Phoinike in 205 (L. 29.12.14). According to the extreme
view taken by Holleaux (Rome, la Grèce 258 - 271), the only amici of Rome in Greece in 205 were Attalos I and Pleuratus, but more recent scholarship tends to accept the list with the exception of Ilion and Athens (see, for example, Balsdon JRS 44 (1954) 32 - 33; Badian Foreign Clientelae 55 - 59; Dahlheim Deditio und societas 220 - 235). For bibliography on the validity of Livy's list of adscripti, see Walbank Philip V 103 n. 6; Dahlheim Deditio und societas 223 n. 1.

The relationship of amicitia did not bind the Romans to provide military assistance to an amicus who was being attacked, but they might do so if they wished.

On the causes of the Second Macedonian War see Walbank Philip V 310 - 317; Badian Foreign Clientelae 62 - 69; Dorey AJP 80 (1959) 288 - 295; Will Histoire I. 113 - 128.

The charge that Philip had sent money and mercenaries to Hannibal in Africa was made by the "legati sociarum urbium" according to L. 30.26.2 in 203. Livy also reported the presence of the "Macedonum legionem" at Zama (L. 30.33.6), although they did not appear in his account of the battle. After the battle these mercenaries and their commander Sopater, who were now Roman prisoners, were not released to the Macedonian envoys who came to demand their restoration (L. 30.42.4-6). The presence of these troops appears as one of the reasons for the declaration of war against Philip V in 200 (L. 31.1.10). The presence of Macedonian forces has generally been disbelieved (see, for example, De Sanctis Storia III 2. 2. 425 n. 100), but Balsdon (JRS 44 (1954) 34 - 35) suggested that a mercenary force may have been sent to Africa, although Livy's annalistic source mistakenly supposed this force to have been engaged in the battle. Perhaps Philip recalled the earlier disasters suffered by Agathokles and by M. Atilius Regulus, and wished to cover himself in case of a Roman defeat without committing himself too deeply by sending regular forces.

After the defeat of Philip V, the Greek states, declared free by Rome, were now amici of the Romans, their protectors, who felt entitled to prevent Antiochus III from campaigning in Thrace.

The Aetolians, hostile to Rome because of the settlement of the
Second Macedonian War which did not satisfy their expectations, invited Antiochus to liberate Greece in 192 (L. 35.32.2 - 33.11). In 192 Demetrias went over to the Aetolians, who turned it over to Antiochus as a landing-point and naval base; later that year Antiochus captured Chalcis, and in 191 he seized the pass of Thermopylae. Demetrias and Chalcis, two of the three "fetters of Greece", had been set free after the defeat of Philip V. See Badian *Foreign Clientelae* 75 - 83; Will *Histoire* II. 152 - 173.

The charges against Perseus mentioned here by the Rhodians were brought before the senate by Eumenes in 172 (L. 42.13.5-10, 42.40.1-11; also see the reply of Perseus: 42.41.1-8). Charges against Perseus were inscribed for display on a stele within the precinct of the temple of Apollo at Delphi (cf. *SIG* 3 643 and see on 27.7). See Meloni *Perseo* 131 - 210; Will *Histoire* II. 222 - 228.

To these examples we may add the Roman claim that the Carthaginians had created a casus belli by attacking a civitas sociata of Rome (the Saguntines were probably amici, not socii in the Italian sense). The Carthaginians argued against the Romans that in attacking Saguntum they had not violated the treaty of 241, which granted immunity from attack to the allies of either side, because at that time Saguntum had not been a Roman ally and did not appear as such in the list of Roman allies which formed part of the treaty. Some time between 241 and the conclusion of the Ebro Treaty in 226, the Romans entered into friendly relations with Saguntum, but the town was probably not granted special protection under the terms of the Ebro Treaty. When Hannibal attacked Saguntum, the group within the senate which desired war with Carthage could still advance the argument that the Romans should come to the aid of their amici. See Walbank *Commentary* I. 168 - 172, 335; Cassola *Gruppi* 245 - 258; Dahlheim *Deditio und societas* 153 n. 4.

22.9 *a Polyarato et Dinone, civibus nostris:*

These politicians were supporters of an alliance with Perseus. In 170 they succeeded in making arrangements with Perseus for the return of prisoners (Pol. 27.14); they spoke in favour of
Perseus and Gentius when these kings sent a joint embassy to Rhodes in 169 (Pol. 29.11), but failed to obtain an alliance between Rhodes and Macedonia (Pol. 30.7.9-10), despite the assurance that Metrodoros, the leader of this embassy, had received from Polyaratos (Pol. 29.3-4; L. 44.23). When the death penalty was decreed by the Rhodian boule against the leaders of the pro-Macedonian party after the arrival of the legati Popillius and Decius, Polyaratos fled to Alexandria, where Popillius later demanded that the Ptolemies send him to Rome. Instead, they put him on board a ship bound for Rhodes, but Polyaratos was eventually seized after several attempts to escape (cf. Pol. 30.9). See Lenschau RE XXI. 2 (1952) cols. 1438 - 1439.

22.11 Rhodian naval assistance:
For the naval assistance given by Rhodes in the Second and Third Macedonian Wars and in the war against Antiochus III, see Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 59 - 92, 137 - 142. The Rhodian fleet was defeated off the island of Samos by the fleet of Antiochus under Polyxenidas in 190 (L. 37.10-11). Later that year, a Rhodian fleet of 32 quadriremes and 4 triremes defeated the fleet of Antiochus off Side in Pamphylia. At the battle of Myonessos the Rhodian contingent, which accounted for 22 of the 80 ships on the Roman side, played an important part in the defeat of Polyxenidas, who lost 42 of his 89 ships (L. 37.22.2 - 24.13, 37.27-30). C. Livius Salinator (29) was praetor in command of the fleet in 191, L. Aemilius Regillus (127) in 190.

23.5 nos principio belli misisse ad vos legatos:
Because Eumenes, in his speech urging the senate to declare war on Perseus, accused the Rhodians of siding with Macedonia, the Rhodians sent a delegation in 172 to clear themselves of suspicion and to attack Perseus (L. 42.14.5-10; cf. 42.45.6). Livy's annalistic source (cf. L. 42.26.8-9) reported the presence of a Rhodian embassy later in this year to counter the report of the senatorial legati Ti. Claudius Nero and M. Decimius that the Rhodians were sympathetic to Perseus (see Broughton Magistrates I. 412, 415 n. 4). According to Appian Mak. 11.2, the Rhodian
fleet had carried to Macedonia the bridal possessions of Laodike, the wife of Perseus and the daughter of Seleukos IV. The Rhodian ἡγασιλικʰ ῥατας Hagesilikhos subsequently persuaded the boule to give full naval support to Rome (Pol. 27.3; L. 42.45), but in 171 the token squadron of 5 quadriremes sent to Chalcis was dismissed by C. Lucretius Gallus, praetor in command of the fleet (Pol. 27.7; L. 42.56.6-7; cf. L. 45.23.6). These examples suggest that the accusations made against Rhodes had some basis in fact.

23.11 legatos eodem tempore...de pace misimus:
In 168. Decision to send embassies: Pol. 29.10. Embassy to Rome: Pol. 29.19; L. 45.3.3-8. Embassy to Paullus and Perseus: L. 44.35.4-6.

23.12 C. Popilius legatus Romanus:
On Popillius see L. 45.12.1-6; for the theme of Rhodian arrogance, see Appendix II.

23.15 Atheniensium populum fama est...ingredientem:

23.16 et nostrorum tumidiorem sermonem esse:
On the Asianic style in Greek oratory and literature see Norden Die Antike Kunstprosa 126 ff.; Kennedy The Art of Persuasion in Greece 301 - 303; von Willamowitz-Moellendorff Hermes 35 (1900) 1 - 52. cf. Quintilian Inst. Orat. 12.10.16: Et antiqua quidem illa divisio inter Atticos atque Asianos fuit, cum hi pressi et integri, contra inflati illi et inanes haberentur.... The Rhodians were acquitted of Asianism by Cicero (Orator 8.25) and were described as the exponents of a middle style by certain unnamed critics mentioned by Quintilian (Inst. Orat. 12.10.18).

23.17 Earlier Rhodian embassy:
See L. 45.3.3-8.

24.2 voluntatis nostrae tacitae:
The Rhodians argued that because they had committed no overt act of opposition to Rome, the senate had no grounds for seeking the declaration of war. The group within the senate which desired war (see on 25.2) regarded the very intention of the
pro-Macedonian party to make an alliance with Perseus sufficient justification for war, while Cato the Censor insisted that the mere intention to commit a hostile act did not constitute a punishable offense according to Fetial Law (cf. Malcovati ORF\(^2\) no. 8 frs. 164 - 168). Cato also pointed to the example of legal codes, which did not consider punishable the intention to commit a crime. Most of the pro-Macedonian politicians probably desired a balance of power rather than an outright victory for Perseus (cf. Pol. 30.6.5-8), a point recognized by Cato (fr. 164), but the majority of senators do not seem to have been strongly influenced by such considerations. The senate as a whole felt that the Rhodian attempt to mediate was a hostile act.

24.6 Punishment of the pro-Macedonian politicians:

For the death sentence decreed by Rhodes against these politicians in 168, see L. 45.10.13-14. For the escape and capture of Polyaratos, see on 22.9.

24.12 corpora nostra...vestrae potestati permittemus:

The Rhodians would perform an act of deditio (see on 1.9) if the Romans were to declare war upon them.

25.2 Plurimum...M. Porcius Cato:

For the probable involvement of Q. Marcius Philippus in these affairs see Appendix I and on 16.3.

It was perhaps largely the same group within the senate who wished to interfere with the Attalid dynasty and to declare war on Rhodes (see on 19.2). Since Paullus was still in Macedonia, the leading promoters of a war against Rhodes were probably P. Licinius Crassus, A. Hostilius Mancinus and Q. Marcius Philippus, the predecessors of Aemilius Paullus, who had held command in Macedonia (see Briscoe JRS 54 (1964) 66 - 77 and Historia 18 (1969) 60 - 63). Since the two consuls of 167 were political associates of the Aemilian-Scipionic group (see on 16.1), Iuventius introduced the bill without the permission or even the knowledge of the consuls (L. 45.21.4-5).

For general works on Cato the Censor (M. Porcius Cato Censorinus (*10/9) see Helm RE XXII. 1 (1953) cols. 108 - 165; Kienast Cato der Zensor.

For Cato's policy regarding the Rhodians see Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 153 - 155; De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 344 - 346.

25.4 Philocrates et Astymedes:
The third member of this embassy was Philophron. All three envoys were pro-Roman politicians. Philophron had gone as an envoy to the Roman commission for the settlement of Asia in 189 to ask for Lycia and Caria (Pol. 22.5); he supported the sending of embassies to Rome and to Marcius Philippus in 169 (Pol. 28.16.3). Astymedes supported the sending of ships to Chalcis at the request of C. Lucretius Gallus, praetor in command of the fleet in 171 (Pol. 17.7.1-3). The speech of Astymedes before the senate in 167 was criticized by Polybius (30.4.10-17) for its attack on the other Greek states. As ναύαρχος of Rhodes in 154/3, Astymedes came to Rome to seek aid in the war against the Cretan pirates (Pol. 33.15-17). He was possibly the son of Theaidetos (see on 25.7).

25.6 In praesentia...praefectos:
According to Pol. 30.5.11-12, the senatus consultum liberating Lycia and Caria was not issued until the return of Theaidetos (see on 25.7) to Rhodes and the outbreak of revolt in the Rhodian Peraea. Livy, however, inserted an order for the evacuation of these territories in the answer given by the senate to the Rhodian envoys. This insertion came possibly from the account of Valerius Antias (see pp. 13 - 14 above). Nissen's view (Krit. Untersuch. 275 - 276) that Livy merely anticipated the mention of this senatus consultum in the text of Polybius, which he otherwise followed closely, is unacceptable. Whereas in Polybius the senatus consultum came upon the Rhodians almost completely by surprise and caused them to despair of achieving...
an alliance, in Livy the Rhodians knew of the senatus consultum and deliberately opposed Roman policy. Perhaps the annalistic tradition sought to conceal the opportunistic methods of the senate in ordering the liberation of Lycia and Caria only after rebellion had broken out in these territories, or perhaps Livy himself made the adjustment (also see on 20.2).

If the senate had been considering the liberation of Lycia and Caria at the time of the Rhodian embassy, the knowledge of the poor relations between Rome and Rhodes may have prompted the revolts in the Peraea.

On Livy's phrase deducere praesidia, note that in other places Livy translated ἑλέω δερῳ in Polybius as deducere praesidia (cf. Pol. 21.14.8 and L. 37.35.9-10).

Later in 167 the senate passed a decree ordering the evacuation of Kaunos and Stratonikeia (Pol. 30.21.3), two cities in the Rhodian Peraea which had not been assigned to Rhodes by the Romans (cf. Pol. 30.31.5-6).

25.7 coronam viginti milium aureorum:

The reading of the MS. is CORONAM.XX.MILIB.AUREORUM; this was corrected by Gruter to coronam viginti milium aureorum.

The reading of Pol. 30.5.4 is ἄπο μυρίων χρυσῶν (see Buettn-Wobst IV. 278).

For the figure 20,000 see L. 44.14.3, where the Pamphylian envoys present a golden crown of 20,000 philips (ἡλίαστρησίων). For the figure 10,000 see Pol. 32.1.1, where the envoys of Ariarathes of Cappadocia bring a στέφανον...

The Rhodian gold piece was the gold stater on the Attic standard with a weight of two drachmas. Since the ratio of gold to silver in 189 had been approximately 10:1 (see Pol. 21.32.8), the stater would have been worth 20 drachmas, and a golden crown of 20,000 staters would have been worth 400,000 drachmas (66 talents 4000 drachmas).

The weight of such a crown would have been 40,000 drachmas. If we allow the conversion rates 1 denarius = 1 drachma and 1000 denarii = 1 Roman pound, the crown would have weighed
25.7 Theodotum, praefectum classis:

The reading of the MS. is THEODOTUM.

For another occurrence of this name in Livy see 45.26.5.

The name Theaedetus (or Theaetetus) does not occur in the extant work of Livy.

The name of this man in the Constantinian excerpts of Polybius is \( \Theta\varepsilon\alpha\zeta\gamma\tau\omicron\sigma \), corrected by Ullrich to \( \Theta\varepsilon\alpha\zeta\theta\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\sigma \) (see Buettner-Wobst IV. 278; also cf. Pol. 22.5.2).

For an example of the name \( \Theta\varepsilon\alpha\zeta\theta\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\sigma \) in Polybius see 18.10.10.

The name \( \Theta\varepsilon\alpha\zeta\theta\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\sigma \) was common in classical and Hellenistic times (see RE V. A. 2 (1934) 1351 - 1373). The more common form of this name on the island of Rhodes, especially at Lindos, was \( \Theta\varepsilon\alpha\zeta\theta\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\sigma \) (see IG XII. 1 (1895) nos. 163, 1135 and Index I).

In 189 Theaidetos was one of the envoys to the Roman commission for the settlement of Asia who asked for Lycia and Caria (Pol. 22.5). As a pro-Roman politician (cf. Pol. 27.14, 28.2.3, 28.16.3, 29.11.2), he was one of those who advised the Rhodians to send an embassy to Rome in 169; he opposed Deinon and Polyaratos when the envoys of Perseus and Gentius came to Rhodes (Pol. 29.11). He died in 167/6 while seeking an alliance between Rome and Rhodes (Pol. 30.21). He was perhaps the father of Astymedes, one of the leaders of the Rhodian embassy of 167 (see IG XII. 1 (1895) nos. 852, 856 with Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 152 n. 4).

25.9 Nam ita per tot annos:

cf. Pol. 30.5.6: \( \omega \varsigma \sigma\chi\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu \ \varepsilon\tau\gamma \ \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\alpha\nu\alpha \ \pi\omicron\sigma\ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \varepsilon\kappa\alpha\xi\tau\omicron\nu \).

Livy's omission of the numeral 140 may reflect his decision to reject the text of Polybius in view of the development of significant co-operation between Rome and Rhodes only at about the time of the Second Macedonian War. On the problem with the text of Polybius here see Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 11 - 15.

Another city which had assisted Rome as an amicus and was later granted a foedus was Elaia (or Pergamon) in 129 (cf. SIG\(^3\) 649, lines 1 - 32). On the treaty made between Rome and Rhodes
in 165/4 see Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 167 - 172.

25.11 The Rhodian Peraea:
On the Rhodian Peraea, see Fraser-Bean Rhodian Peraea 70 - 78, 102 - 117; Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 93 - 128.

25.11 Caunii:
Kaunos, in southern Caria, was given to the Rhodians, probably by the Seleucid king Antiochus I and the crown prince Seleukos. At some later time it was lost, probably to Philip V, who conducted a Carian campaign in 201 - 198, but it was recaptured in 197. See Fraser-Bean Rhodian Peraea 102 - 105.

25.11 Mylassenses:
Mylasa, in northern Caria, had been excluded from the grant of 188. See Pol. 21.46.4 with Fraser-Bean Rhodian Peraea 107 - 108.

25.11 Euromensium oppida:
The territory of Euromos was named after its chief centre. The territories of Euromos and Mylasa were adjacent. See Fraser-Bean Rhodian Peraea 109 - 110.

25.13 Cibyratarum asciverant auxilia:
Kibyra, in south-eastern Caria, had a foedus with Rome which dates from some time after 189 (cf. OGIS 762).

25.13 Alabandensisque...acie vicerunt:
Alabanda in northern Caria had possibly been excluded from the grant of 188. See Magie Roman Rule II. 994 - 995.

25.13 circa Orthosiam:
Orthosia, "somewhere in the Euromus". See Fraser-Bean Rhodian Peraea 110.

26.1 L. Anicius rege Gentio...redacto:
For the capture of Gentius, see L. 44.30.1 - 32.5.
L. Anicius Gallus (15), originally praetor peregrinus in 168, was transferred to the command of Roman forces in Illyricum against Gentius; his imperium was prorogued in 167. He became consul in 160 with M. Cornelius Cethegus (93). Anicius may have been an associate of the Aemilian-Scipionic group, since a Cn. Anicius (3) appears as a legatus of Paullus in Macedonia in 168 (cf. L. 44.46.3).

26.2 Scodrae...C. Licinium:
Gabinius (2) belonged to a family which had only recently attained
Roman citizenship. For Licinius see on 3.1.

Scodra (modern Scutari), the capital of Gentius and the centre of resistance, is at the south-eastern end of Lake Labeates. Rhizon (modern Risano) is the chief port on the Bocche di Cattaro (see Oberhummer RE I. A. 1 (1914) cols. 937 - 939). Olcinium (modern Ulcinj or Dulcigno) is a port on the southern coast of Montenegro in Jugoslavia near the Albanian border (see Saria RE IX. A. 1 (1961) cols. 507 - 508).

Rhizon and Olcinium were two of the Illyrian towns which had gone over to the Romans before the defeat of Gentius (L. 45.26.13).

26.3 in Epirum:

For bibliography and general discussions see Scullard JRS 35 (1945) 58 - 64; Oost Roman Policy 40 - 91; Hammond Epirus 621 - 635; Deininger Pol. Widerstand 173 - 175, 202 - 204, 209 - 211.

From about 232 the Epirote tribes formed a federation whose capital was Phoinike in Chaonia. The Molossian tribe broke away from the Epirote Federation in 170 in order to support Perseus (see on 26.5), but the rest of the Epirotes remained faithful to the amicitia which had been established between Rome and the Epirote Federation some time after the battle of Kynoskephalai. Before the formation of the federation in about 232, the Molossi had been the leading tribe of the Epirote Alliance, their kings acting as the military leaders of the alliance. The federation was established soon after the downfall of the Molossian monarchy.

26.5 Antinous et Theodotus:

These politicians belonged to a group of Molossians who led their tribe to side with Perseus against Rome. Other members of this group included Kephalos and Philostratos. According to Pol. 27.15, they had hoped that Rome and Macedonia would not go to war, so that neither power would become predominant in Greece. When war broke out, however, this group had preferred to honour the amicitia with Rome (see Oost Roman Policy 55 - 56), but Kharops, whose grandfather of the same name had aided the Romans in the Second Macedonian War, repeatedly denounced them to the Romans for their earlier relations with the royal house of Macedonia, until they were driven to support Perseus
openly (Pol. 27.15).

Scullard (JRS 35 (1945) 58 - 62) suggests that Kharops belonged to the Chaonian tribal group, whose territory was close to, or lay partly within, the Roman protectorate, and who tended to favour the Romans in opposition to their traditional rivals, the Molossians.

As a boy Kharops had been sent to Rome by his grandfather to learn Latin. While in Rome he made many acquaintances, among them, perhaps, the more violent and unscrupulous members of the obscure families which were now coming into political prominence.

In 167 Kharops denounced his political opponents to the Romans as supporters of Perseus (see on 31.9). Until his death in 161/0 Kharops continued to persecute his opponents (cf. Pol. 32.5-6).

See Buettner-Wobst RE Suppl. I (1903) col. 285.

In spring 170 Theodotos and Philostratos invited Perseus to enter Epirus and seize the consul Mancinus as he passed on his way to Boiotia, but the king was prevented from crossing the Aous by the Molossian guard, and Mancinus took ship for Thessaly (Pol. 27.16). Soon after this the Molossians broke away from the Epirote Federation in support of Perseus. Polybius (30.7.2-3) named Antinous, Theodotos and Kephalos responsible for the alliance between Perseus and the Molossians. See Münzer RE V. A. 2 (1934) cols. 1955 - 1956.

Antinous is to be identified with the Antinous Klathiatos who had been general of the Epirote Federation (SGDI 1339), Kephalos with the Kephalos Peialos who had been προστάτης of the Molossian κοινόν (SGDI 1352). See Schoch RE Suppl. IV (1924) cols. 878 - 879.

Philostratos appears in L. 43.23 as the commander of 500 Epirote (i.e., Molossian) troops under the Macedonian officer Kleuas in 169.

26.10 pertinacia Cephalis principis:
For Kephalos see on 26.5.

26.11 Arrangements for Illyricum:
For bibliography see on 17.1. Livy 45.26.11-15 is our only source for these arrangements.

26.12 Illyrios esse liberos...deducturum:
On libertas associated with freedom from garrisons see Badian Foreign Clientelae 87 - 89 and see on 18.1.
26.13 Non solum liberos...defecisset:
The Romans no longer automatically associated *immunitas* with *libertas*; see on 18.7. See De Sanctis *Storia IV*. 12. 332 - 333 for the emendation of the MS. reading *ESSENES* to Lissenses. De Sanctis rejected the emendation *Issenses*, made in the *editio princeps*, on the grounds that *Issa* was not part of the Illyrian kingdom at this time and had in fact been under Roman protection since 229 (cf. Pol. 2.11.12 with Fluss RE Suppl. V (1931) cols. 348 - 349).

26.14 *relictio Caravantio*:
Caravantius, the half-brother of Gentius. He commanded forces against the Illyrian towns of Durnium and Caravandis; he was captured at Meteon, a city of the Labeatae, along with the rest of Gentius' immediate family, and was sent to Rome to be paraded in the triumph of Anicius (L. 44.30.9, 44.32.3, 45.43.6).

26.14 *vectigal...[impositum]*:
The word *impositum*, omitted by the MS., was added by Heraeus (see Giarratano 332). For the *tributum* imposed upon Macedonia see on 18.7.

26.15 *in tres partes*:
The second Illyrian region was the area around Scodra and Lake Labeates; the third region was the coastal area from the Bocche di Cattaro perhaps as far as the river Naro to the north. The first region was possibly southern Illyria below Lissos and the territory of the Taulantii, the Dassareti and the Pirustae (see Papazoglou *Historia* 14 (1965) 176; De Sanctis *Storia IV*. 12. 332 - 333; see on 26.2).
The MS., in the definition of the first region, reads *UNAMEAMFECITQ / SUPRADICTAMEST*. Madvig emended *DICTAM* to *Issam*, Zippelius to *Dyrrhachium*, Mülller (Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia, vol. I, Part 1. p. 308) to *Pistam* or *Pistum*, a town placed between Lissos and Dyrrhachium by the Peutinger Table.

27.1 *ante adventum decem legatorum*:
They were sent at the beginning of the new consular year (L. 45.17.1).

27.1 *Q. Maximum filium*:
See on 1.1. In 167 Fabius seems to have acted as a *legatus* under Aemilius Paullus in Macedonia.
27.1 ad Aeginium et Agassas diripiendas:
Aeginion in Tymphaia, a part of Epirus, identified by Hammond (Epirus 680 - 682) as Nea Koutsoufliani. The people of Aeginion had killed 200 of Anicius' soldiers in a sally from the town before they were aware that the war had ended (cf. L. 44.46.3). Agassai (near the modern Katerini) was on the river Mitys in Pieria (in Macedonia). In 169 the consul Marcius Philippus accepted the deditio of Agassai (L. 44.7.4-5).

27.4 ad Aeniorum quoque urbe:
Aineia, in Krousa of the Chalcidic peninsula. In 169 the consul Marcius Philippus had ravaged its territory (L. 44.10.7-8).

27.4 L. Postumium:
L. Postumius Albinus (*29/41).
Postumius (*29/41) had been consul in 173; in 168 he served as tribunus militum or legatus under Aemilius Paullus in Macedonia (L. 44.41.2). For the Postumii, see on 4.7.

27.5 ad circumeundam Graeciam...noscentur:
The itinerary of Aemilius Paullus, along with the notes on the sites and monuments, suggests that tourism was common in Greece in the second century. The most famous travel guide from antiquity is that of Pausanias, written in the latter half of the second century A. D. An earlier writer (ca. 164 - 86 B. C.) was Pseudo-Dikaiarkhos (cf. Müller FHG II. 253 - 264), whose work consisted of general sketches rather than a detailed enumeration of places and monuments. Antiquarian works which Pausanias may have known or used were those of Diodoros, who wrote before 308 B. C. (cf. Müller FHG II. 353 - 359), Heliodoros, who wrote about 200 B. C. (cf. Müller FHG IV. 425 - 426), and Polemon of Ilion, who wrote about the same time as Heliodoros (cf. Müller FHG III. 108 - 148). The geographical works of Strabo (mid-first c. A. D.) and Ptolemy (mid-second c. A. D.) also contain information on legends, history and monuments which reflects an interest in travel. See Frazer Pausanias' Description of Greece I. lxvi - xcvi; Lécrivain, Darenberg-Saglio V. 817 - 820; Regenbogen RE Suppl. VIII (1956) cols. 1058 - 1066.
On travel in the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman periods see
Sneider Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus II. 206 - 207;
Friedländer Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire
I. 323 - 394.

After the announcement of Greek liberty at the Isthmian festival
in 196, Flamininus visited Euboia and Magnesia to remove the
Macedonian garrisons and to see to the arrangement of the
constitutions of the cities in those districts. He then toured
among the various Greek cities in order to assure the restoration
of peaceful conditions and political stability (Plut. Flamininus
12.2-3). He conducted the Nemean Festival at Argos as αἶτωντες;
he dedicated a golden wreath, his own shield and some silver
bucklers, probably Macedonian spoils, at Delphi. In the spring
of 194 Flamininus returned to Corinth to proclaim the imminent
evacuation of Greece by the Romans and the withdrawal of
Roman garrisons from Corinth, Chalcis and Demetrias as well as
from the other Greek cities (L. 34.48.2 - 51.6).

27.6 Praeposito castris C. Sulpicio Gallo:
C. Sulpicius Galus (66) had served under Aemilius Paullus in
the campaign against the Ligurians in 182 - 181, probably as
tribunus militum; he was praetor in 169. As tribunus militum
under Paullus in 168 he predicted the lunar eclipse which
occurred on the evening before the battle of Pydna; in 167 he
continued to serve under Paullus, and held the consulship
in 166. Although the Sulpicii were, generally speaking,
political associates of the Claudian-Fulvian group (see Scullard
Rom. Pol. 135), Sulpicius (66), as tribunus militum under
Paullus in 168, seems to have been associated with the Aemilian-
Scipionic group (cf. L. 44.21.1-3); we are told by Cicero
(De Re Pub. 1.23; De Senectute 49) that Sulpicius (66) was
a close friend of Paullus.

27.6 tegentibus latera...fratre:
P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aemilianus (335) had been adopted
into the family of the Cornelii Scipiones (see on 1.1). Scipio
Aemilianus was consul in 147 during the Third Punic War, during
which he destroyed Carthage as proconsul in 146. He was again
consul in 134 during the Spanish War and destroyed Numantia as
proconsul in 133.

Athenaios was the youngest son of Attalos I of Pergamon. He participated in the campaign of Cn. Manlius Vulso against the Galatians in 189 (L. 38.12.8-10) and came to Rome in 183 to bring complaints against Philip V (Pol. 23.1, L. 39.46.9).

In 171 he was present with Eumenes and Attalos in command of the Pergamene fleet (L. 42.55.7) and was present at the battle of Pydna (see Meritt Hesperia 3 (1934) no. 18, pp. 18 - 21 and Hesperia 5 (1936) no. 17, pp. 429 - 430).

For the expression tegentibus latera see L. 40.13.3: duo soli tua tegentes latera (said of Perseus and Demetrios accompanying their father, Philip V of Macedonia).

27.7 columnas:

The tetragonal pillar (κύονα μέγαν τετράγωνον ἐκ λευκῶν λευκᾶν συντηρομένων) mentioned by Plutarch (Aem. 28.2) is probably to be identified with the monument of Aemilius Paullus found in the precinct of the temple of Apollo at Delphi near the south-east corner of the pronaos. The pillar and pedestal of this monument, which seems to have been surmounted by an equestrian statue of Paullus, are covered by 38 Greek inscriptions of later date. The reference to Paullus as imperator in the dedication (cf. CIL I 2 (1893) 622, CIL III Suppl. (1902) 1420322: L. Aemilius L. F. Inperator de rege Perse / Macedonibusque cepet) indicates that the monument was set up between the battle of Pydna (Julian 22 June 168) and the triumph of Paullus in Rome (about Julian 12 October 167). For these dates see on 1.11 and 40.1. The frieze around the top of the pillar depicted scenes from the battle of Pydna.

While Plutarch described only one monument, Polybius and Livy mention the existence of several columns. There appear to have been at least two dedications by Paullus in the precinct of the temple, since a second monument ("le monument à rosettes"), similar to the first and covered by two inscriptions, was found near the first one.

Pillars were also dedicated before the temple of Apollo in honour of Eumenes II (cf. SIG3 628, 630) and Prusias II (cf. SIG3 632).
On the monument of Aemilius Paullus see Reinach Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique 34 (1910) 433 - 468; Courby "La Terasse du Temple" ("Le Sanctuaire d'Apollon"), Fouilles de Delphes II. Fasc. 2; Colin "Monuments des Messéniens, de Paul-Emile et de Prusias", Fouilles de Delphes III. Fasc. 4, Part 1; Rostovtzeff SEH 740; Kühler Der Fries vom Reiterdenkmal des Aemilius Paullus in Delphi.

28.2 urbs...ante excidium;

Corinth was destroyed by L. Mummius in 146. Some scholars have thought that the first thirty books of Polybius were completed before the destruction of Carthage in the same year, but there is no certain proof that Polybius had written beyond Book 15 by that time (see Ziegler RE XXI. 2 (1952) cols. 1485 - 1489; Walbank Polybius 16 - 19; De Sanctis Storia III2. 1. 198 - 201). It also appears likely that Polybius revised his work after 146 (see Pedech Myth. Hist. 563 - 573). Thus, Livy's comment on the greatness of Corinth before its destruction may have been derived from Polybius.

On the desolation of the area around Corinth in the middle of the first century B. C. see the letter of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus to Cicero (Ad. Fam. 4.5 with How Select Letters II. 430).

28.3 Aesculapi nobili templo...dives erat:

cf. the comment of Strabo (8.6.15) on the temple of Asklepios at Epidauros: καὶ αὐὴ δ' οὐκ ἄσημος ἡ πόλις, καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ Ἀσκληπείου θεραπευέων νόσους παντοδαπὰς πεπλασμένου, καὶ τὸ ἔρομ πληρὲς ἔχοντος ἀεὶ τῶν τε καμνότων καὶ τῶν ἀνακειμένων πινάκων...

No mention was made by Strabo of donative offerings being removed. Perhaps Livy referred to the plunder of the temple treasures by Sulla in 87 (cf. Paus. 9.7.4), in which the case his comment on the spendour of the gifts which were stolen may have been derived from one of his late annalistic sources, or perhaps it represents an addition by Livy himself. We do not have any explicit reference to an earlier plunder of the temple, but such a theft could have occurred at the time of the destruction and sack of Corinth by Mummius, who did visit Epidauros at that time.
(cf. IG IV² 1 (1929) no. 306 D). In this case, Livy's comment can have been derived from Polybius.

28.6 Ita peragrata Graecia...inquireret:
According to Polybius, Paullus did not approve the policy of arresting the anti-Roman politicians in the Greek states, but carried out the policy of the senate. He did not approve of the accusations brought forward by Kallikrates of Achaea and Lykiskos of Aetolia (Pol. 30.13.8-11).

28.6 Demetriadem:
Demetrias in Thessaly in the Magnesian peninsula. The walls of this city were destroyed as part of the punishment of Macedonia after the war (Diod. 31.8.6).

28.6 Violence in Aetolia:
See Will Histoire II. 325 - 326; Deininger Pol. Widerstand 168 - 172.

28.7 ab Lycisco et Tisippo:
These men were pro-Roman politicians of Aetolia. Lykiskos attacked his opponents by accusing them of opposing Rome (Pol. 27.15.14, 28.4.5-10). He was στρατηγός of the Aetolian League in 172/1 (L. 42.38.2). He and Tisippos became very powerful after the defeat of Perseus; they headed an embassy to Paullus in 167 to congratulate him for the victory over Perseus and to denounce their opponents (Pol. 30.13). Polybius accused Lykiskos of being responsible for most of the trouble in Aetolia (Pol. 32.4). See Obst RE XIII. 2 (1927) col. 2295.

Polybius was generally hostile to the Aetolians (see Brandstaeter Die Geschichten des Ηtolischen Landes, Volkes und Bundes 199 ff.; Fine AJP 61 (1940) 129 - 165; Walbank Commentary I. 237), but he was no more critical of Lykiskos and Tisippos than he was of other opportunists in the guise of pro-Roman politicians (e.g., Kharops of Epirus: see on 26.5).

For earlier trouble in Aetolia see L. 41.25.1-6. On the anti-Roman group in Aetolia see Deininger Pol. Widerstand 146 - 152, 168 - 172.

28.7 [ab] A. Baebio [praefecto] praesidii:
The reading of the MS. is ABAEBIOPRAESIDI. This was corrected
by Kreyssig to [ab] A. Baebio [praefecto] praesidii (see Giarratano 335).

A. Baebius (8) commanded the garrison left by Aemilius Paullus in Demetrias. He was later condemned for having provided Roman troops to carry out the slaughter of Aetolians accused of anti-Roman activity (cf. L. 45.31.1-2).

On the Baebii see on 17.4.

For similar Roman intervention in the affairs of a foreign state, see the case of Saguntum about 223 - 222 (Pol. 3.14.7, 3.30.1-2).

28.8 Apolloniam:

Apollonia Mygdonia in the Chalcidic peninsula, near the shore of Lake Bolbe. See Strabo 7.21.

28.9 Perseus:

He was being held under guard, first by Q. Aelius Tubero in 168 (L. 45.8.8), then by C. Sulpicius Galus, who had been placed in charge of the winter camp of Amphipolis in 167 (L. 45.27.6). The rebuke to Sulpicius Galus may have prompted the opposition to the triumph of Paullus led by Ser. Sulpicius Galba. See on 35.8.

28.11 The family of Perseus:

See on 6.9.

28.11 A. Postumio:

A. Postumius Albinus (*33/31) was probably the ambassador to Perseus in Samothrace in 168 (see on 4.7).

29.1 Arrangements for Macedonia:

For general bibliography see on 17.1.

29.1 denos principes:

The Romans on several occasions summoned ten representatives from conquered, subject or allied states to hear their decisions: cf. the twelve Roman colonies that refused to send military contingents in 209 (L. 29.15.5) and the Epirotes in 167 (L. 45.34.2).

29.1 pecuniam regiam:

Over 6000 talents according to Pol. 18.35.4.

29.3 Silentio...referebat:

Aemilius Paullus spoke Greek (cf. L. 45.8.6) but chose to read in
Latin the arrangements for Macedonia, which were then translated into Greek by Cn. Octavius. Paullus seems to have staged an impressive spectacle of Roman ceremony in order to awe the conquered Macedonians. The proclamation of Flamininus at the Isthmian festival of 196, when the Romans posed as the champions of Greek freedom, was read in Greek by the Corinthian herald (Pol. 18.46.4).

29.4 Omnium primum...magistratus:
For the meaning of libertas see on 18.1.
For the guarantees of Macedonian possession of the cities and territories which had belonged to the Macedonian kingdom, also see the treaty between Rome and Carthage in 201 (Pol. 15.18.1-2; L. 30.37.1-2 with Walbank Commentary II. 466 - 468). A guarantee of this kind was included in the renewal of the League of Corinth under Philip III Arrhidaios and Polyperkhon in 319 (cf. Diod. 18.56.4: πάντα τὰ αὐτῶν ἔχοντας).
For the guarantee of local autonomy see the treaty between Rome and Philip V (Pol. 18.44.2; L. 33.30.2) and the declaration of Flamininus at the Isthmus (Pol. 18.46.5; L. 33.32.5).
In Greek usage the expression νόμος ἐρωμένοι τοῖς πατρίοις may be traced back to the constitution of the League of Corinth, which seems to have guaranteed the continuation of local laws (cf. Dem. 17.12: τοὺς δ' ἀποκόσμησαν νόμας νόμους ἀνακάθισσι λύειν).
See Jones, Anatolian Studies 114 - 115.
Contrast the treatment of Macedonia with that of the Aetolians in 189 (Pol. 21.32.2-4; L. 38.11.2-3), who lost Kephallenia and were bound to Rome by a foedus which deprived them of the right to pursue an independent foreign policy (see Badian Foreign Clientelae 84 - 87 and Appendix IV).

29.5 Deinde in quattuor regiones dividit Macedonianum:
For the four μερίδες see on 18.6.
On the geography of Macedonia see Strabo Book 7, frs. 9 - 47; Pliny NH 8.10; Ptolemy Geogr. 3.12.

29.5-6 unam fore et primam partem...appellant:
Ainos and Maroneia had resisted the attack of C. Lucretius Gallus in 171, and remained untaken until the end of the war, while Abdera seems to have fallen to L. Hortensius in 170 (cf. L. 43.4.8-13,
43.7.10; also see Meloni Perseo 260 - 261). The senate had declared free (ἡ Ἀἰνῶν καὶ Μαρόνεια) the towns of Ainos and Maroneia (see on 20.2); the senate refused to grant Abdera, which had probably also been declared a civitas libera, to Kotys of Thrace, who requested it in 166 (cf. SIG² 656). See Jones The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces 6 - 7.
The Bisaltae lived to the west of the lower Strymon, between Lakes Prasias and Kerkinitis. Herakleia Sintike was on the west bank of the Strymon above Lake Kerkinitis. See Hammond Macedonia 192 - 193.

29.7 Secundam fore regionem...colerent:
The Paeones lived between the upper Strymon and Axius rivers. By the fifth century they held the eastern side of the upper and middle Axius valley and a narrow strip of land on the west down to the sea (Thuc. 2.99.4). See Hammond Macedonia 428.

29.8 tertia pars...cingunt:
The Peneus is the famous river in Thessaly. The third region was defined on the south by the lowest reach of the Peneus. See Hammond Macedonia 73.

29.8 ad septentrionem Bora mons obicitur...concesserunt:
The reading of the MS. is ABSENTENONEMBORA. This was corrected in the editio princeps to ad septentrionem Bora. The reading of the MS. at 29.9 is TRANSDORSUMMONTEM, corrected in the editio princeps to trans Boram montem. The reading of Diod. 31.8.8, which is not disputed, is Βερμόντιος ὁρός in both cases. Hammond identifies Mt. Bora and Mt. Bernon with Mt. Bermion (see Ptolemy Geogr. 3.12.16). The emendation of L. 45.29.9 is perhaps unnecessary in view of Livy's use of the word dorsum to mean "the ridge of a range" (e.g., L. 36.15.6: Apennini dorso Italia dividitur; also see 41.18.8, 44.4.4).
Because Polybius' direction is east to west instead of north to south, he treats Mt. Bermion as a northern instead of as a western boundary marker. Thus there is no real problem with Edessa being actually north of Mt. Bermion. See Hammond Macedonia 73 - 74.

29.9 Quarta regio...Epiro:
From L. 45.30.6 we learn that this area was inhabited by the
Eordaei, Lyncestae and Pelagones, and that adjacent to these peoples were Atintania, Strymepalis and Elimiotis. Hammond (Macedonia 46) prefers to retain the MS. reading Strymepalis instead of adopting the common emendation Tymphaeis, which would denote part of Epirus (see Hammond Epirus 680 - 682). He places Strymepalis between Lyncestis and Eordia and to the west, in the basin south of Lake Prespa (Epirus 633 - 634). Atintania controlled the approach to Macedonia through the Aous valley (see Hammond Macedonia 76 - 78; Oost Roman Policy 82).

29.9 Capita regionum...fecit:

Amphipolis, Thessalonike and Pella were to be administrative centres for the first three μεριδεσ; Pelagonia was not a city but a tribal district. Hammond (Macedonia 74 - 75) suggests that the tribal government of the Pelagones and the existing governments of the three capital cities formed the basis of the new administrations. This seems likely in the case of the fourth μερις, where there were no fully developed cities, but in the other μεριδεσ it appears that a federal form of government was instituted, in which representatives from the various districts of the μεριδεσ participated. See on 18.6. The governments of the individual Macedonian cities apparently continued to function. See Larsen Greek Federal States 295 - 300. Pelagonia was west of the upper and middle Axius, across from the Paeonians (see Hammond Macedonia 59 - 60). A city called Pelagonia is first clearly attested in the Synekdemos of Hierokles (ed. Parthey, no. 641.5), composed about 527 A. D. De Sanctis (Storia IV. 12. 329 n. 260) suggested that Pelagonia be identified with Herakleia Lynkestis.

29.10 Pronuntiavit...esse:

Connubium and commercium, respectively, denoted the recognition in Roman law of marriages and commercial contracts between Roman citizens and foreigners. The prohibition of connubium and commercium was a punishment applied to the Latins and Italians (cf. L. 8.14.10, in 338 after the Latin War; 9.43.24, in 306 after the Second Samnite War), not only in their relationship with Rome but also in their relationships with other

De Sanctis (Storia IV. 12. 329 n. 262) suggested that the expression *commercium agrorum aedificiorumque* refers, not to the validity of contracts among the four *merods*, but to the right of a person to own property in land and houses in a state of which he is not a citizen (*ης καὶ οἰκίας ἔχετας*). See Rostovtzeff SEH 204 - 205. On *ἐκτησία* in Attica see Pečírka *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions.*

A similar prohibition was imposed upon citizens of the Greek states which had opposed Rome in the Achaean War of 147 - 146 (cf. Paus. 7.16.9: καὶ οἱ τὰ χρηματα ἔχοντες ἐκλώσαντο ἐν τῇ ἁπεροπίᾳ κτασθαί).

Restrictions on the right to own land had been imposed upon the Campanians after the fall of Capua in 210 (L. 26.34.6-10).

29.11 *Metalla:*

The gold and silver mines had previously formed part of the royal domains (see Rostovtzeff SEH 252 - 253). The general policy of the senate had been to close down all the mines in Macedonia (see on 18.3).

29.11 *Et sale invecto uti vetuit:*

In modern times salt is obtained from salt-pans near the mouth of the Haliakmon, in what would have been the third Macedonian *meris* (see Hammond *Macedonia* 144, 160). The prohibition against the import of salt into Macedonia may have been designed to encourage the production of this crucial commodity in Macedonia. With the closing of the gold and silver mines, which had formed part of the royal domains, the governments of the four *merods* were deprived of two important sources of revenue which might to some extent have been replaced by revenues derived from an increase in the production of salt. The Romans arranged the sale of salt to the Dardanians at Stobi in the third *meris* (L. 45.29.13). On the importance of the salt-trade and on taxes on salt in the Hellenistic kingdoms see Rostovtzeff SEH 470, 1254.

29.12 *Dardanis repetentibus Paeoniam:*
The Dardani, an Illyrian tribe, lived in the area between the upper Drilo and Axius rivers (see Hammond BSA 61 (1966) 247 - 249 and Macedonia 80 - 82). They had been defeated by Perseus in 170 (L. 43.18.2, 19.14, Ep. 43) with the loss of 10,000 men (according to Plut. Aem. 9.3).

29.14 Navalem materiam...vetuit:
The forests of Macedonia were one of the chief sources of timber and pitch in the Hellenistic world (see Rostovtzeff SEH 1168 - 1170, 1612 n. 110; Hammond Macedonia 207 - 209) and had formed part of the royal domains (Rostovtzeff SEH 252 - 253).

29.14 Regionibus...haberent:
The military establishment of Macedonia was to be restricted to border troops. The Romans were unwilling to assume direct responsibility for the defense of Macedonia (see on 18.3).

30.2 regionatim...ignorabant:
The national feelings of the Macedonians were not destroyed by the creation of the four μετάδεστες, which were always regarded as portions of Macedonia (see on 18.6).

30.4 Secunda pars...versi:
Kassandraia (Potidaia) was in Pallene, the western prong of the Chalcidic peninsula; Torone in Sithonia, the central prong; Mt. Athos on Akte, the eastern prong. Aineia (see on 27.4) was on the west coast, and Akanthos on the east coast of the Chalcidic peninsula, north of Akte.

30.5 Vettiorum bellicosam gentem:
The people of Bottiaia, between the lower Axius and Haliakmon rivers. See Hammond Macedonia 152 - 154; Saria RE VIII. A. 2 (1958) col. 1842.

30.6 Tymphaeis:
Hammond (Macedonia 46) reads Strymepalis, following the MS. (see on 29.9). On the location of the peoples mentioned here, see Map 15 in Hammond Epirus 614.

31.1 leges:
According to Justinus 33.2.7, this law-code was still in force in the time of Pompeius Trogus (late first c. B. C.) or perhaps in the time of Justinus himself (second c. A. D.?) Macedonia seems to have received a code similar to that contained in a
lex provinciae, which provided for the local government of the province, for the administration of justice, and for the collection of taxes. The Macedonians, however, had been declared free, so that this law-code must have been largely confined to administrative matters (cf. L. 45.32.1-2 and see Abbott and Johnson Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire 48 - 49). There was probably little interference in other areas of law, and the Macedonians themselves were to be responsible for the administration of justice. See Meloni Perseo 418 - 419; Stevenson Roman Provincial Administration till the Age of the Antonines 68 - 69.

31.1 Aetoli deinde citati:
See on 28.6 and 28.7.

31.4 Tria genera principum:
Livy described three general classes of politicians within the Greek states: 1) those subservient to Rome; 2) those subservient to kings (i.e., to Perseus and Gentius), both groups seeking personal wealth and power, and 3) a middle group (media pars) which sought to preserve independence for their states.

A similar classification appears in L. 42.30.2-7, where it is said that the third group (optima eadem et prudentissima) preferred Rome to Macedonia if compelled to choose, but really desired a balance of power.

Polybius (30.6.5-8) placed this last group among the politicians suspected of opposing Rome. See Badian Foreign Clientelae 100 - 104.

31.9 Ab his...sequerentur:
The accusers are named in Pol. 30.13.4: Lykiskos and Tisippos from Aetolia (see on 28.7), Khremas from Akarnania, Kharops (see on 26.5) and Nikias from Epirus, and Mnasippos from Boiotia.

31.9 in Achaeam:
The envoys from Achaea were Kallikrates, Aristodamos, Agesias and Philippos (Pol. 30.13.3).
On C. Claudius Pulcher and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, see on 17.1.
On the partiality of Polybius towards the Achaean League, see Pol. 16.14.6 with Ziegler RE XXI. 2 (1952) cols. 1557 - 1560; Walbank Commentary II. 518 - 519. Polybius (30.13.8) described
the Roman envoys to Achaea as τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους ἄνδρας τῶν ἄκα, which was not quite true, at least in the case of Domitius. The thousand Achaeans deported to Rome were detained in the cities of Etruria without being given the opportunity of defending themselves against the nebulous charges of their accusers (Pol. 30.32). The three hundred or fewer who were still alive in 150 were released through the intervention of Scipio Aemilianus with the support of Cato (cf. Pol. 35.6; see Astin Scipio Aemilianus 280 - 281; De Sanctis Storia IV. 3. 127 - 128). Among the hostages was Polybius, who became a close friend of Scipio Aemilianus.

On the anti-Roman group in Achaea, see Deininger Pol. Widerstand 177 - 184, 197 - 202, 211 - 214.

31.12 Aetolis dimissis:
Livy failed to mention the detachment of Amphilokhia from the Aetolian League by the Romans (cf. Diod. 31.8.6). Amphilokhia was a region located on the eastern side of the Ambracian Gulf. See Hirschfeld RE I. 2 (1894) cols. 1936 - 1937; Hammond Epirus 247 - 248.

31.12 Acarnanum citata gens:
In 170/69 the opponents of the pro-Macedonian group in Akarnania tried without success to obtain a Roman garrison (Pol. 28.5; L. 43.17.6-9). Shortly before the battle of Kynoskephalai the Akarnanians had abandoned Philip V in order to become amici of Rome (L. 33.16-17). During the war against Perseus they took no public action contrary to the amicitia with Rome.

The island of Leukas was the political centre of the Akarnanian League (cf. L. 33.16.3, 36.11.9). Leukas, captured by the Romans in the Second Macedonian War, had been returned to the Akarnanians (cf. Pol. 18.47.8).

On the Akarnanian League see Larsen Greek Federal States 89 - 95, 264 - 273; Deininger Pol. Widerstand 175 - 176.

31.13-14 Quaerendo deinde latius...iuissent:
For Q. Fabius Labeo see on 17.1.

In 168 Perseus sent his admiral Antenor with the fleet into the
northern Aegean (L. 44.28-29). For the punishment of Antissa also see Pliny NH 5.139.

31.15 Duo securi percussi...iunxerant:

Of this Andronikos nothing further is known. He and his father may have served among the 500 Greeks who fought for Perseus (L. 42.41.8). For suggested emendations of the name Andronikos see De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 340 n. 298; Deininger Pol. Widerstand 195 n. 18.

On the anti-Roman group in Aetolia see Deininger Pol. Widerstand 146 - 152, 168 - 172.

Neon had been responsible for the alliance between Macedonia and the Boiotian League (L. 42.12.5-6; on the date see Meloni Perseo 146 n. 1; Deininger Pol. Widerstand 153 n. 2).

When Q. Marcius Philippus led an embassy to Boiotia in 172, Neon offered to surrender all of Boiotia into the hands of the Romans (cf. Pol. 27.1.2), while envoys from Thespiae offered to surrender their city alone. Preferring to keep the cities of the Boiotian League divided, Philippus spurned Ismenias, the envoy of Neon. The Thebans then decided to abandon their alliance with Perseus and to exile Neon and Hippias, the authors of that alliance. Neon, protected by Marcius Philippus from the violence of the Thebans, made his way to Macedonia to become one of the loyal supporters of Perseus who accompanied the king on his flight from Pydna (L. 44.43.6).

On the anti-Roman group in Boiotia see Deininger Pol. Widerstand 153 - 159, 164 - 167.

Other Greek political leaders were put to death by the orders of Anicius and Paullus (cf. Pol. 32.5.6).

32.1 Macedonum rursus advocatum concilium:

The reading of the MS. is CONCILIUM. Thid body was not one of the four Macedonian συνέδρια, but the assembly composed of the deni principes which had received the arrangements for Macedonia on the first day of the gathering at Amphipolis (cf. L. 45.29.1, 30.1). The Latin equivalent for συνέδριον would have been consilium (see on 18.6).

32.2 senatores, quos synedros vocant:

The word συνέδριον denotes a council composed of representatives
from the constituent parts of a federal state: see Larsen Rep. Gov't. 66 - 105.

32.3 **Nomina...principum Macedonum:**
According to Diod. 31.8.12, some 250 of the Macedonian ηυμόνεσ were led in the triumph of Paullus. These detainees included administrators (στρατηγοτετάτει) and members of the royal council (φιλοτο). See Walbank Philip V 2 - 3. Among their number were Hippias, Meidon and Pantaughos, the ambassadors sent from Amphipolis by Perseus to Paullus at Pydna (L. 44.45.2). The ultimate fate of these men is unknown. Some of them may have carried the funeral bier of Aemilius Paullus in 160 (cf. Plut. Aem. 39.4).

32.7 **leges:**
See on 31.1.

32.8 **ludicrum:**
The games organized by Paullus after the announcement of the arrangements for Macedonia were victory celebrations attended by delegates from the Hellenistic states which had supported the Roman cause.

33.2 **Luaque matrem:**
Lua Mater was the consort of Saturn. Captured arms were dedicated to her. See L. 8.1.6 with Wissowa Rel. und Kult. 208 and Astin Scipio Aemilianus 341 - 342.

33.3-4 **ea copia rerum...aveherent:**
Some of this surplus may have come from the accumulated stores of Perseus (cf. L. 42.12.8 with Larsen ESAR IV. 292 - 294).

33.5-6 **praeda Macedonica omnis...fierent:**
For other examples of art looted by the Romans see L. 26.21.7-8 (Syracuse); 32.16.17 (Chalcis) and 38.9.13 (Ambracia).

33.8 **ad Pellaeum:**
The reading of the MS. is ADPAELE / UM, corrected by Heraeus to ad Pellaeum. The Pellaeum (Pellaion) could have been the shrine of the Macedonian hero Pellas, the legendary founder of Pella.

33.8 **P. Nasicam et Q. Maximum filium:**
P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum (353) was curule aedile in 169 and served as tribunus militum under Aemilius Paullus in 168.
and 167. He was praetor in 165, consul in 162 and 155, censor in 159. He was Pontifex Maximus from 150 to his death shortly after 142. He was married to Cornelia Prima, a daughter of Scipio Africanus. Plutarch (Aem. 15.3, 21.3) quoted from a letter written by Nasica πρὸς τινὰ τῶν βασιλείων about the battle of Pydna and the fighting which preceded it. For Fabius Maximus Aemilianus see on 1.1.

34.1 Haud procul...aberant:
See L. 45.26.15.

34.1 ad quem litteris missis...exercitui dedisse suo:
On the Epirotes who opposed Rome, see on 26.3.
On the involvement of Paullus in the plunder of Molossis see Scullard JRS 35 (1945) 58 - 64, where it is argued that Paullus carried out senatorial policy with which he disagreed; contra, see Oost Roman Policy 133 n. 106, 134 n. 112, where the view is expressed that Paullus himself may have desired this punishment of the Molossians.

34.2 denos principes:
See on 29.1.

34.5 tantaque praeda fuit:
The accounts of Livy (45.34.1-6) and Plutarch (Aem. 29) disagree on the value of the booty taken from the Epirote cities. Livy gave the figure of 200 denarii per soldier and 400 per cavalryman, while Plutarch reported 11 drachmas per soldier.
Various attempts have been made to explain the difference. De Sanctis (Storia IV. 12. 341 n. 300), taking Livy's figures as representing the proceeds from the sale of 150,000 slaves, estimated that the average price of 50 denarii per slave would have been more than enough to cover the distributions mentioned by Livy to an army of 31,000 foot and 2400 horse. He therefore discarded the figure of Plutarch.
The number 33,400, however, seems too high for the army of Aemilius Paullus (cf. L. 44.21.5-8 with Brunt Ital. Manpower 424). Thus the average price per slave would have had to have been less than 50 denarii, but we cannot know what the price of an Epirote slave would have been when the market was suddenly flooded. Frank (ESAR I. 194 - 195) gave the figure of 500 denarii
as the average price for an able-bodied labourer in Italy (also see Westermann RE Suppl. VI (1935) cols. 935 - 937). Leidmeier (Plutarchus' biographie van Aemilius Paullus 140 - 142) supposed that Livy evaluated the total booty, Plutarch only the part that came from the sale of slaves. Hammond (Epirus 635 n. 1) suggests that Livy's figures represent the value of the gold and silver collected by the centurions and the tribuni militum, while Plutarch's figures represent the estimated value of moveables seized by the pillaging troops. A fair reading of Livy's account, in the writer's opinion, will suggest that the higher figures in Livy were derived from the cash value of the slaves and plunder plus the value of the gold and silver collected, that is, of the entire booty. Unless Plutarch's figure is entirely worthless, it could have been derived from the value of only part of the booty, perhaps the division of the coined money or, more probably, the cash value of the soldiers' plunder (cf. Plut. Aem. 29.3: ἐχθρούς ὅλου κατακρυμάτισθέντος). Plutarch or his source apparently used this lower figure to help explain the dissatisfaction of the troops which is otherwise clearly attributed to the refusal of Paullus to distribute the spoils taken from the treasury of Perseus (cf. L. 45.34.7, 35.6, 37.10; Plut. Aem. 30.2). The money had been handed over to the quaestors (Plut. Aem. 38.6), while the works of art and other precious articles, after being displayed in Amphipolis, were handed over to Octavius for transport to Rome (L. 45.33.5-7). A distribution of 11 drachmas (equivalent to about 11 denarii) would have been the lowest recorded distribution per soldier since 191 when P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica in his triumph over the Boii gave each soldier 125 asses (under 8 denarii). The sum of 11 denarii would have been extremely low in view of the generally high profitability of the Third Macedonian War. A distribution of 200 denarii per soldier, however, would have been four times as great as the highest recorded distribution during the period 200 - 168 (the highest being 50 denarii per
soldier by Q. Fulvius Flaccus in 180). During this period distributions rarely exceeded 25 denarii per soldier.
The sum of 200 denarii per soldier is not unreasonable in view of the distribution of 100 denarii per soldier by Paullus at his triumph and the suspension of the tributum soli on ager Romanus (producing about 1,800,000 denarii per year in this period according to Frank ESAR I. 139) after the war. It is also possible that Aemilius Paullus was aware of the movement to deny him a triumph and wished to secure the favour of the troops by a generous distribution in Epirus. While such a distribution of 200 denarii would not have been a source of dissatisfaction to the troops, the failure of Paullus to reward the troops by a generous distribution in Macedonia, followed by his refusal to be more generous at his triumph, may have aroused their anger despite the relatively high value of the distributions.
Although the soldiers could traditionally expect to be rewarded with a portion of the booty, the triumphing general was not required by law to grant any part of the booty to the troops at all (cf. the example of L. Papirius Cursor in 293: L. 10.46). See Shatzman Historia 21 (1972) 177 - 205.

34.7 Oricum:
Flamininus departed from Oricum (in Akrokeraunia, part of Epirus). cf. L. 34.52.1.

34.10 legati...in Asiam pervenerant:
The leader of the Roman embassy was P. Licinius Crassus (60). The embassy left near the beginning of the consular year 167 (probably about late January: see on 1.11). For earlier trouble between the Galatians and the Attalids, see on 19.3.

34.12-14 Ibi Romani cum Solovettium...fuisse:
Solovettius was probably the tetrarch of one of the three Galatian tribes. See Jones The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces 114 - 115. The report of Licinius on his interview with Solovettius shows that the Romans did not intend to arrange a peace between Pergamon and the Galatians. For the estrangement between Rome and Eumenes II
see on 19.2 and 19.5; for the subsequent treatment of the Galatian problem by Rome see on 44.21.

35.1 reges captivi:
Perseus and his family had been placed in the custody of A. Postumius Albinus at Amphipolis in the summer of 167 (see on 28.11). In the summer of 168 Gentius had been placed in the custody of C. Cassius at Scodra and was soon sent with his family and other leading Illyrians to Rome (L. 44.31.15, 32.4).

35.2 si qui apud reges esse dicebantur:
For the example of Polyaratos, see Pol. 30.9.

35.3 regia nave...agebant:
This ship was probably the ἐκκαλόκηρης of Demetrios Poliorcetes (cf. Plut. Dem. 43), later in the possession of Philip V, who was permitted to keep it in 197 after the Second Macedonian War (Pol. 18.44.6). On such large ships in the Hellenistic world see Tarn Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments 132 - 141, where it is argued that this ship would have been a bireme with sixteen rowers to each pair of oars, eight rowers to an oar.

35.4 mandatumque Q. Cassiō praetori...imperium esset:
For Q. Cassius Longinus (69) see on 16.3.
In order to celebrate a triumph, the victorious general was required to be a magistrate with imperium leading troops under his own auspicia. The senate claimed the right to grant the victorious general the permission to triumph on the Capitol, but the right to triumph was vested in the general himself, and he could not be prevented from celebrating a less prestigious triumph outside the city (triumphus in monte Albano: see on 38.4). For the constitutional aspect of the senate's control over the triumphs see on 21.1. On the co-operation between the senate and the tribuni plebis in the second century see Bleiken Volkstribunat 46 - 63.
The earliest example of a comitial lex passed to enable a triumphator to retain his imperium on the day of the triumph in Rome is that of M. Claudius Marcellus in 211 (L. 26.21.5: Tribuni plebis ex auctoritate senatus ad populum tulerunt ut M. Marcello quo die urbem ovans iniret imperium esset). At least
from this time, the *imperium militiae* lapsed when the magistrate crossed the *pomerium*, unless he could obtain this dispensation. This arrangement may have been the result of the conflict between the senate and C. Flaminius in 223. The senate had refused Flaminius a triumph, but he was granted one through a *plebiscitum* (see Rotondi *Leges Publicae* 249). Perhaps the senate allowed the *populus* (or the *plebs*) the right to refuse a triumph in exchange for the understanding that the senate would continue to hold the initiative in granting triumphs.


35.6 *Antiqua disclîpina milites habuerat*:

On the declining efficiency of Roman officers and troops after the Second Punic War, see Toynbee *Hannibal's Legacy* II. 80 - 87. Because it was becoming more difficult in this period to raise Roman troops, the generals had to pay more attention to the wishes of citizens liable for military service (see Brunt *Ital. Manpower* 61 - 75).

35.8 *Sed eos Ser. Sulpicius Galba...privatim imperatori inimicus*:

Ser. Sulpicius Galba (58) was *tribunus militum* of the second legion under Aemilius Paullus in 168 and 167; he was praetor in 151 and consul in 144. As *tribunus militum* under Paullus, Sulpicius (58) was likely to have been associated with the Aemilian-Scipionic group (cf. L. 44.21.1-3 and see on 28.9). He may have led the opposition to the triumph of Paullus because of the insult to C. Sulpicius Galus (66), whose young son Quintus (69) later became the ward of Sulpicius (58). See Val. Max. 8.1.2.

It is not known how closely related Sulpicius Galba (58) and Sulpicius Galus (66) were.

36.1 *Ti. Sempronius*:

Nothing further is known of Ti. Sempronius (12). For the political allignment of the Sempronii (Gracchi), see on 15.1. The political meeting described here is a *contio* (see on 21.1).

36.7 *Intro vocatae primae tribus*:

A legislative meeting of the *Concilium Plebis* is being described.
The order in which the tribes voted was determined by lot. The first tribe was called the *principium*. See Taylor *Voting Assemblies* 70 - 77.

36.9 **M. Servilius:**

M. Servilius Pulex Geminus (78) was *Magister Equitum* in 203, consul in 202, augur from 211. The Servilii had been closely associated with the Aemilian-Scipionic group for the greater part of the Second Punic War (see Cassola *Gruppi* 411 - 413; Scullard *Rom. Pol.* 35, 39). Servilius (78) was probably the oldest living consular at this time. Another supporter of Paullus on this occasion was probably Cato the Censor, who seems to have delivered a speech against Galba (cf. Malcovati *ORF* no. 8, fr. 172; see Scullard *Rom. Pol.* 269 - 270).

36.9 **ut de integro...facerent:**

A legislative assembly could be interrupted at any time up to the final announcement of results, most frequently by tribunician *intercessio* or by the report of omens. A presiding officer could interrupt proceedings in order to withdraw a bill which he was sponsoring, as in the cases of Ti. Gracchus (cf. Appian *B. C.* 1.12.52-54) and of A. Gabinius (cf. Dio 36.30), who, as a threat, had introduced bills before the *concilium plebis* calling for the removal from office of *tribuni plebis* hostile to them. Electoral meetings of the *Comitia Centuriata* could be interrupted before the announcement of final results by a presiding officer (e.g., by Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator at the consular elections for 214 after the *praerogativa* had voted for two candidates of whom he disapproved: L. 24.7.10 - 9.3), by a candidate (e.g., by T. Manlius Torquatus at the consular elections for 210 after the *praerogativa* had voted for him despite his disabilities: L. 26.22) or by a *tribunus plebis* (e.g., by C. and L. Arrenius at the consular elections for 209 after the *praerogativa* had voted for Fabius Maximus and Q. Fulvius Flaccus: L. 27.6). In these three cases the person who stopped proceedings also addressed the voters, and the voting was repeated. In the voting for the triumph of Paullus, the leaders of the
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senate (principes civitatis) seem to have invaded a concilium plebis (see L. 45.35.4 and 36.1) and persuaded the presiding officers, the tribuni plebis, to stop the voting. Since the praetor Q. Cassius Longinus had arranged with some of the tribuni plebis for this rogatio to be brought before the plebs, it is likely that they were co-operating with the senate and would have allowed such an interruption of the voting at the insistence of the leaders of the senate. See Taylor Voting Assemblies 74 - 77, 93 - 94. On co-operation between the senate and the tribuni plebis see Bleiken Volkstribunat 46 - 63.

37.3 tirocinium ponere et documentum eloquentiae dare:
Sulpicius Galba did not reach the praetorship until 151. He had not yet held any magistracy (cf. L. 45.37.4) and must have been a fairly young man at this time. Sulpicius later became known as an eloquent public speaker (cf. Cicero Brutus 82 with Münzer RE IV. A. 1 (1931) cols. 766 - 767).

37.4-5 nomen deferret...ad populum accusaret:
In order to institute legal proceedings, Sulpicius Galba could only bring a complaint against Paullus to a magistrate with the ius agendi cum populo as long as Sulpicius himself was a privatus; as a magistrate with this right, he himself would be able to institute proceedings. The charge that Sulpicius might have wished to bring against Paullus in either of these ways was that of peculatus. See Jolowicz Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law 321 - 331; Shatzman Historia 21 (1972) 188 - 202.

37.9-10 eodem die...duxit:
According to L. 44.36, the troops, military staff and commanders of the foreign contingents called for an immediate engagement, which Paullus refused (also see Plut. Aem. 17.1-3).

37.12 quae ambitione imperatorum clades acceptae sint...meminit:
In 217 M. Minucius Rufus was appointed Magister Equitum under the Dictator Q. Fabius Maximus, and was later granted imperium equal to that of the Dictator by a bill sponsored by C. Terentius Varro. The example of Fabius and Minucius is not appropriate as a parallel to the hostility between Paullus and Sulpicius Galba.
because Minucius, who belonged to the group of politicians who favoured direct encounters with the enemy, was not trying to win favour with the troops by relaxing discipline or offering higher distributions. The point of the comparison must have been that Minucius and Sulpicius Galba were inferior men contending with their betters. See Scullard Rom. Pol. 44-55.

38.4 in monte Albano triumpharunt:
There were three kinds of victory procession: the triumph proper (see on 35.4), the ovatio and the triumphus in monte Albano. The last of these was held outside Rome on the mons Albanus and ended at the temple of Iuppiter Latiaris. It was celebrated as the prerogative of a victorious general by a commander who had been refused a formal triumph or an ovatio in the city, and was recorded in the Fasti Triumphales. The first such triumph was held in 231 by C. Papirius Maso (6, 57), the father-in-law of Aemilius Paullus.
See Mommsen Röm. Staatsr. I. 134; Cagnat, Daremberg-Saglio V. 491; Versnel Triumphus 165-166.

38.4 C. Lutatio:
C. Lutatius Catulus (4) concluded the treaty with Carthage and celebrated a naval triumph de Poenis ex Sicilia in 241.

38.4 P. Cornelio:
P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (336) arranged a peace with Carthage with the advice of the ten legati and celebrated a triumph over Hannibal, the Carthaginians and King Syphax in 201.

38.7 peccatum in Camillo:
M. Furius Camillus (44) as Dictator in 390 saved Rome from the Gauls. After his appointment as Interrex in 391, before the Gallic invasion, Camillus had been condemned on some charge and had retired into voluntary exile, from which he was recalled in the hour of peril (cf. L. 5.32.8-9; Dionysios of Halikarnassos Ant. 13.5.1 with Ogilvie Commentary 698-699).

38.7 in P. Africano:
After the conclusion of the war against Antiochus III, Lucius (337), the brother of Scipio Africanus (336), was accused in the senate and later by the tribunus plebis C. Minucius Augurinus, of having
accepted bribes from Antiochus. This attack was also aimed against Scipio Africanus, who was accused personally by the tribunus plebis M. Naevius. He withdrew into exile at Liternum, where he died in 183. On the chronology of the so-called "trials of the Scipios", see Scullard Rom. Pol. 290 - 303.

38.11 de Pyrrho:
M'. Curius Dentatus, consul in 275, defeated Pyrrhos, king of Epirus, at Malventum, forcing him to leave Italy, which he had invaded in 280.

38.12 triumphum nomine cientes...incidunt:
cf. Varro De Ling. Lat. 6.68: Sic triumphare appellatum, quod cum imperatore milites redeuntes clamitant per urbem in Capitolium eunti: "Io triumpe".
It was also the custom at a triumph for the soldiers to chant short Fescenine verses in praise or in blame of their general.
cf. Appian Lib. 66: καὶ τὰν ἀρχόντων οὐς καὶ ἑπανοιασίν, οὐς ἀπὸ σκύπτουσιν, οὐς ἀπὸ τρέψσιν.

39.1 Triumphatum nuper de Philippo...et de Antiocho est:
T. Quinctius Flamininus triumphed over Philip V in 194,
L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus over Antiochus III in 189.

39.7 Syphax rex:
According to Polybius (see L. 30.45.4-5) Syphax was led in the triumph of Scipio Africanus, but Valerius Antias reported that Syphax had died a short while before the triumph.

39.10 Dis quoque enim...debetur triumphus:
M. Servilius seems to have argued that the triumph represented the fulfillment of a vow made by the magistrate on the Capitol before his departure for his province, but this claim must have been essentially an emotional appeal, since the state often saw fit to refuse a general a formal triumph in the city, but could not prevent him from celebrating a private triumph on the mons Albanus (see on 35.4 and 38.4). See Versnel Triumphus 181 - 195.

39.13 epulae senatus:
This meal took place in the temple of Iuppiter Capitolinus.
According to Val. Max. 2.8.6, the consuls were requested to be absent so that no one with greater imperium should partake. There was also a feast set for the soldiers of the triumphing general, called the cena triumphalis (see Josephus B.I. 7.156; Appian Lib. 66). See Versnel Triumphus 382 - 383.

39.14 [in] circo Flaminio:
Part of the triumphal display and celebration was often held in the Circus Flaminius (cf. L. 39.5.17; Plut. Lucullus 3-4). See Makin JRS 11 (1921) 33 - 34.

39.20 Revocate....
The remainder of this speech is lost (one page of the MS. is missing: see Weissenborn-Müller 219; Giarratano 359), but the general sense of the missing part may be restored from Plut. Aem. 31.6.

40.1 Triumph of Paullus:
cf. Degrassi Fasti Triumphales p. 81 ad a. 167:
L. Almilius L. f. M. n. Paullus II pro co(n)s(ule) a. DXXC[VI]
ex Macedo(nia) et rege Perse per triduum
IIIII II[I] Pridie K. Decem.
The date of the first day of the triumph, by the Julian calendar, would have been about 12 Oct. 167.
Diod. 31.8.10 placed the triumphs of Aemilius Paullus, Octavius and Anicius in reverse order.

40.1-5 Quantity of booty from Macedonia:
Valerius Antias gave the total of 120,000,000 HS., but Livy considered this figure too low in view of the inventory of precious metals presented by Valerius himself. Velleius Paterculus 1.9.6 reported the total of 210,000,000 HS.; Pliny NH 33.56 reported 300,000,000 HS. According to Pol. 18.35.4, the value of the precious metals removed from the palace of Perseus was over 6000 talents. If we allow the conversion rate 1 drachma = 1 denarius, 6000 talents would be worth 36,000,000 denarii or 144,000,000 HS. This total, as Livy seems to have observed, was somewhat higher than the total given by Valerius Antias. The inventories given by Plut. Aem. 32 - 34 and Diod. 31.8.10-12, which differ in details, are similar and both
approximate the 6000 talents given by Polybius. See De Sanctis *Storia IV. 1*². 342 n. 302; Meloni *Perseo* 433 - 435.

40.1 **Summam...Valerius Antias tradit:**
The values of the precious metals in their various forms were usually listed separately and the total value was sometimes added. That Antias listed the various forms is clear from Livy's observation in 40.1. See L. 45.43.4-5; Frank *ESAR I*. 126 - 137.

40.2-3 **eoque id mirabilius erat...coepit:**
Perseus had accumulated money, weapons and provisions. His resources were listed by Eumenes in the summer of 172 in his attempt to persuade the senate that Perseus was a threat to the Greek world (L. 42.12.8-10). See Larsen *ESAR IV*. 292 - 294.

40.4 **Ipse postremo Paullus in curru:**
This was on the third day of the triumph. For an account of another three-day triumph, see that of T. Quinctius Flamininus over Philip V (L. 34.52.4-11).

40.4 **filii duo:**
See on 1.1.

40.5 **pediti...equiti:**
The value of the distribution to individual foot soldiers, centurions and cavalrymen was usually in the ratio of 1:2:3. See for instance L. 34.52.4-11, 39.5.14-17; see Frank *ESAR I*. 126 - 137. This was also the ratio for the payment of the stipendium to men serving in these capacities (cf. Pol. 6.39.12 with Walbank *Commentary I*. 722). For the generosity of this distribution, see on 34.5.

40.7-8 **Nam duobus e filiis...opportuerat:**
These were the two sons of Paullus borne by his second wife (see on 1.1). According to Val. Max. 5.10.2, the boy who died after the triumph had accompanied his father in the triumphal chariot.

40.9 **Paucis post diebus...fuit:**
M. Antonius (27) had earlier prevented Iuventius Thalna from proposing the declaration of war against Rhodes (L. 45.21.3). According to L. 45.40.9, Appian Mak. 19, Plut. Aem. 36.2, Diod. 31.11.1 and Val. Max. 5.10.2, the speech of Paullus
de suis rebus gestis was delivered after the triumph, when both of his youngest sons were dead, while Velleius Paterculus 1.10.4 placed the speech some time before the triumph and the death of Paullus' two sons, which Paullus had foreshadowed in his prayer to the gods. Perhaps the more usual occasion for a speech of this kind was the day after the triumph (cf. the speech of Sp. Cassius Vicellinus, consul in 486, in Dionysios of Halikarnassos Ant. 8.70.1-4: ταύτα διανοηθέντας τῇ μετὰ τὸν θρίαμβον ἡμέρᾳ συνεκάλεσε τὸ πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν καὶ παρελθὼν ἕπε τῷ βῆμα, ὡς ἐδοθεὶς ἐστὶ ποιεῖν τοῖς τεθριαμβευκόσι, πρῶτον μὲν ἀπέδωκε τὸν ύπὲρ τῶν πραξιθέντων αὐτῶν λόγον, οὗ κεφάλαια ἢν ταύτα ....)

41.3 Profectus ex Italia....

According to the tradition preserved in this speech, Paullus finished in fifteen days a war that had dragged on for four years. This fifteen-day period must refer, not to the time between the departure of Paullus from Brundisium and the battle of Pydna, but to the time required for the final military operations of the war from the attempt on the passage through Petra to the defeat of Perseus at Pydna.

The magistrates left Rome for their provinces immediately after the celebration of the Feriae Latine on Prid. Kal. Apriles (Roman 31 March = about Julian 16 January: cf. L. 44.22.16 and see on 1.11), while the battle of Pydna was fought on Roman 4 Sept. (Julian 22 June). The seasonal dates given by Polybius for these two events, as they appear in the text of Livy, are iam veris principium erat (L. 44.30.1) and [tempus] anni post circumactum solstitium erat (L. 44.36.1).

After reaching the camp in Thessaly within nine days of his departure from Brundisium, Paullus restored discipline, marched through the pass at Tempe into Macedonia, and established a camp at Phila, north of the Peneus river. Paullus then moved north to a position across from the fortifications which Perseus had built along the north bank of the Elpeus river, and attempted to dislodge the enemy. Considerable portions of Livy's narrative of the action at Phila and at the Elpeus river have been lost (two folia after L. 44.32.11; one folium before 44.35.1 and
four folia after 35.24: see Giarratano 260, 264, 268), but the surviving narrative suggests that the fighting was protracted. Because Macedonian resistance on the Elpeus was firm, Paullus finally decided to attempt the pass at Petra in order to enter Macedonia. Scipio Nasica and Fabius Maximus Aemilianus were sent to Herakleion on the coast with Octavius and the fleet carrying ten days' cooked rations for a thousand men, while Aemilius Paullus continued to attack the fortifications along the Elpeus. When the pass at Petra had been seized, Paullus rejoined Scipio Nasica and forced his way through to Pydna, where Perseus had gone to await him. There was an interval of several days before the battle (cf. Zon. 9.23.4: διέτριψαν δὲ οὐκ ὀλίγας ἡμέρας; modern historians tend to disregard this statement: see, for example, Meloni Perseo 363–376; De Sanctis Storia IV. 2. 309–314). This interval was probably taken up with changes of position made by Paullus and Perseus (see on 1.11). An interval of fifteen days from the first attempt on the pass of Petra and the final defeat of Perseus is not impossible. There was possibly an interval of ten days between the forcing of the pass and the battle of Pydna (cf. CIL XI (1888) no. 1829, line 10 and see on 1.8). The notion in some of the ancient sources (e.g., Plut. Aem. 36.3; Appian Mak. 19) that the fifteen days in which Paullus ended the war followed directly upon his arrival in Thessaly was probably due to a misinterpretation of their sources.

The journey of Paullus from Brundisium to the camp in Thessaly in nine days was quick but not unreasonably so, and winter sailing was not unknown. Pompey crossed from Brundisium to Dyrrhachium in late January, 49 B.C., and in the following year Caesar made a January crossing to Akrokeraunia in one day (Caesar B.C. 1.25–29, 3.6). In the spring of 169 Q. Marcius Philippus and C. Marcius Figulus reached Corcyra on the day after their departure from Brundisium (L. 44.1.1–2). If Ti. Sempronius Gracchus could complete the journey from Amphissa to Pella in two days (L. 37.7.11), Paullus' four days from Delphi to the camp in Thessaly is not an unreasonable interval.
41.5 tres ante me consules:
P. Licinius Crassus (60) in 171; A. Hostilius Mancinus (16)
in 170; and Q. Marcius Philippus (79) in 169.

41.7-8 Mihi quoque ipsi...sentiret:
cf. Val. Max. 5.10.2: cum in maximo proventu felicitatis nostrae,
Quirites, timerem ne quid mali fortuna moliretur, Jovem optimum
maximum Iunonemque reginam et Minervam precatus sum ut, si quid
adversus populum Romanum inmineret, totum in meum domum
converteretur.

42.2 Cn. Octavius...navalem triumphum egit:
cf. Degrassi Fasti Triumphales p. 81 ad a. 167:
[Cn. Ocjtavius Cn. f. Cn. n. pro pr(aetore) an. DXXCV[I]
ex Macedon(i)a et rege Perse naval(em) egit K. Dec.

42.4 Albam:
Alba Fucentia on the Via Valeria, a Latin colony founded in 303
in the territory of the Aequi (L. 10.1). Alba was one of the
twelve colonies which refused to send military contingents
in 209 for the war against Hannibal (L. 27.9.7). The strength
of its walls and its natural position made Alba an ideal place
of detainment. Syphax of Numidia (L. 30.17.2) and Bituitus,
king of the Arverni (L. Ep. 61) were also imprisoned here.
See MacKendrick The Mute Stones Speak 95 - 98. For a possible
identification of the dungeons, see De Visscher and De Ruyt
Ant. Class. 20 (1951) 72 - 74.

According to Diod. 31.9, Perseus had been thrown into prison
by one of the praetors (τῶν καὶ τὰ πολέμων στρατηγῶν εἰς: probably
by Cassius Longinus himself) before the senate had made a
final decision on the fate of the king. After seven days of the
most miserable confinement Perseus was removed to more comfortable
quarters at the instance of M. Aemilius Lepidus (68), the
princeps senatus.

There are two versions of the circumstances of the king's death.
According to Diod. 31.9, which probably represents the Polybian
tradition, the king was killed by the prison guards, who would
not let him sleep. This version also occurs in Sallust Hist.
fr. IV. 69.7. The other version is recorded by Zon. 9.24.5
and probably represents the annalistic tradition. Zonaras states that Perseus committed suicide when he lost hope of being restored to his kingdom. Plutarch (Aem. 37) recorded both versions, noting that most of his sources reported that Perseus committed suicide, while some said he was killed by the guards.

According to Plutarch it was Aemilius Paullus himself who interceded on behalf of Perseus; this tradition is preserved in the Incerti Panegyricus Constantino Augusto VI (VII) 10.7.

42.5 [Bithys, filius Cotyis], regis Thracum:

The words detrahens habere sineret; Bithys, filius Cotyis, which are missing from the MS. at L. 45.42.4-5, were added by Madvig (see Giarratano 363 - 364).

Bithys had been captured along with the children of Perseus in Macedonia, where he had been sent as a hostage by his father (see on 6.1). In the following year Bithys was sent by Kotys at the head of an embassy to request that the Romans assign Abdera in Thrace to Kotys (cf. SIG³ 656).

42.5 Carseolos:

Carseoli was a Latin colony founded in 198 (L. 10.13.1). It was another one of the twelve colonies which refused to send contingents in 209 (L. 27.9.7). The town was located on the Via Valeria in the territory of the Aequi.

42.8 meminisse amicitiae quae...fuisset:

Amicitia was established with three Thracian tribes in 172 (L. 42.19.6), but we do not know of any relationship of amicitia between Rome and the Odrysae, who in fact had supported Perseus against Rome (see on 6.2).

42.11 beneficia gratuita esse populi Romani:

In fact the Romans had annexed to Macedonia the part of Thrace west of the Nestos and declared free the cities of Ainos, Maroneia and Abdera (see on 29.5), the last of which had been claimed by Kotys (see on 42.5).

42.11 Legati tres:

T. Quinctius Flamininus (*6/46)
C. Licinius Nerva (133)
M. Caninius Rebilus (12)
Quinctius (*6/46) was the son of either T. Quinctius Flamininus (*3/45) or of the latter's brother Lucius (*4/43). The Quinctii had been associated with the Claudii during the Second Punic War, but were not hostile to the Scipios (see Cassola Gruppi 421 - 422; Scullard Rom. Pol. 97 - 100).

In 167 Quinctius (*6/46) succeeded C. Claudius Pulcher (300) as augur. He was consul in 150.

For Licinius see on 3.1.

Caninius (12) had been sent to Greece in 170 as a legatus to investigate the conduct of the war by the consul Hostilius Mancinus (L. 43.11.2). His brother Caius (8) had been praetor in Sicily in 171.

43.1 Triumph of Anicius:

cf. Degrassi Fasti Triumphales p. 81 ad a. 167:


The Quirinalia were held on 17 Feb. (see Wissowa Rel. und Kult. 153 - 156). The date by the Julian calendar would have been about 2 Dec. 167 (see on 1.11). On dating by the Quirinalia indicating an intercalary year see Michels The Calendar of the Roman Republic 171 - 172.

43.4 intra paucos dies:

cf. L. 44.32.4: intra triginta dies. The subjugation of Illyricum took twenty days according to Appian Ill. 9.

43.8 multis dux ipse carminibus celebratus:

For triumphal odes, see on 38.12.

43.8 Sestertium ducentiens...auctorem pro re posui:

The part of the booty which was displayed in the triumph was turned over to the treasury, where official lists describing this booty were deposited (cf. Cicero In Verrem II. 1.57). Because Roman generals were not required to surrender all of the booty to the treasury, no complete lists of booty were kept, so that there were no public records from which the value of the undisplayed booty could be discovered by Valerius Antias (see Shatzman Historia 21 (1972) 177 - 205).
43.9 **Spoletium:**
On the Via Flaminia, a Latin colony in Umbria founded in 241
(L. Ep. 20; Vell. Pat. 1.14.8).

43.9 **Romae in carcerem:**
The Tullianum. See Welin RE VII. A. 1 (1939) cols. 794 - 798;

43.9 **Iguvium:**
A *civitas foederata* on the Via Flaminia in Umbria. Iguvium
received the Roman citizenship during the Social War (see
Cicero *Pro Balbo* 47).

43.10 **Corcyraeis et Apolloniatibus et Dyrrhachinis:**
The Greek towns of Corcyra, Apollonia and Dyrrhachium (ancient
Epidamnos) had placed themselves under Roman protection
(for *deditio* see on 1.9) during the First Illyrian War and
entered into a relationship of *amicitia* with Rome. At the
conclusion of the war the Romans established a sphere of
influence over the coastal regions of Illyricum and Epirus,
perhaps from the river Mati just south of Lissos, to just
south of Apollonia. This sphere of influence came into being
as a result of the *amicitia* established with Issa, Corcyra,
Pharos, the Atintani and the Parthini, along with these three
Greek towns. Corcyra, Apollonia and Dyrrhachium were later
incorporated into the Roman province of Macedonia established
in 148.

See Oost Roman Policy 9 - 15; Badian *Foreign Clientelae* 44 - 45
and *Studies in Greek and Roman History* 1 - 33; Dahlheim *Deditio*
und *societas* 22 - 27; De Sanctis *Storia III* 2. 1. 290 - 294.

44.1 **agro tantum Ligurum populo:**
The Ligures lived along the coast between the Rhone and the
Arno, and inland as far as the Durance and the mountains south
of the Po. The Ligurian tribes were defeated in campaigns
between 238 and 117, and their territory incorporated into
Gallia Cisalpina, the province of Gallia Narbonnensis and
the Alpine provinces. The Ligurians supported Mago in 205 - 203;
after the campaign of 180 the Roman colony of Luna was established
on territory captured from the Ligurians (in 177: see on 13.10).
On the Ligurians see De Sanctis *Storia IV.* 12. 405 - 412.

44.1 *consules crearunt:*

M. Claudius Marcellus (225)
C. Sulpicius Galus (66)

For Claudius (225) see on 4.1.
For Sulpicius (66) see on 28.9.
The two men had also been praetors together in 169.

44.2 *praetores:*

L. Iulius (Caesar?) (28, 127?)
L. Appuleius Saturninus (28)
A. Licinius Nerva (131)
P. Rutilius Calvus (12)
P. Quinctilius Varus (*6/13)
M. Fonteius (11)

The precise allotment of provinces among the praetors is unknown, except that Iulius may have been the *praetor urbanus* (Iulius 127) who died in office.

Sex. Iulius Caesar (148, 149), consul in 157, had served as *tribunus militum* under Aemilius Paullus in the campaign against the Ligurians in 181; in 165 he was curule aedile with Cn. Cornelius Dolabella (132). The Iulii Caesares may therefore have been associated with the Aemilian-Scipionic group at this time.

For the Licinii Nervae see on 3.1.

Rutilius (12) is perhaps to be identified with the *tribunus plebis* of 169, Rutilius (8), who supported the cause of the publicani in their dispute with the censors C. Claudius Pulcher and Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (cf. L. 43.16). Rutilius (8) was deprived of the *Equus Publicus*, moved from his tribe and made an *aerarius* by the censors (see on 15.8). Münzer (*RE* I. A. 1 (1914) col. 1248) rejected the identification of Rutilius (12) with Rutilius (8) on the grounds that the *nota censoria* could not be lifted until the next census, which took place in 164, but Cicero (*De Re Pub.* 4.6; *Pro Cluentio* 119 - 122) implied that the *nota censoria* did not bar a man from holding public office. Note further that C. Antonius Hibrida (19), praetor
in 66, had been expelled from the senate by the censors in 70, even though the next census took place only in 65. See Kübler RE XVII. 1 (1936) cols. 1055 - 1057.
The Quinctilii were associated with the "middle group" led by the Claudii, the Fulvii and the Fabii (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 134 - 135, 165 ff.)
The Fontei were probably supporters of the Scipios (see Scullard Rom. Pol. 208 n. 1). A P. Fonteius Capito had been praetor in Sicily in 169, and his imperium was probably prorogued in 168 (see on 12.13).

44.2 **duae Hispaniae:**
For the war-time treatment of Spain, see on 16.2.

44.3 **Intercalatum eo anno:**
In 168 the Roman calendar was some 74 days ahead of the Julian (see on 1.11). In the pre-Julian Roman calendar, the intercalary month was inserted after the **Terminalia** (A. D. VII Kal. Mart. = 23 Feb.) When 22 intercalary days were to be added, the regular month of February was interrupted on the 23rd and the 22 days were inserted, followed by the last five days of February; when 23 days were to be added, the regular month of February was interrupted on the 24th and 22 days were inserted. The intercalary month was called **Mercedonius** or **Intercalaris**. See Michels The Calendar of the Roman Republic 145 ff.

44.3 **C. Claudius:**
C. Claudius Pulcher (300) had been consul in 177, censor in 169, augur from 195 until his death in 167.
For T. Quinctius Flamininus (*6/46) see on 42.11.

44.3 **Q. Fabius Pictor:**
Q. Fabius Pictor (127), Flamen Quirinalis from 190 to 167, was the son of Q. Fabius Pictor (126), the first Roman historian. As praetor in 189 he was prevented by the Pontifex Maximus P. Licinius Crassus Dives from acting as praetor in Sardinia and was transferred to the position of praetor peregrinus (L. 37.51.1-6). For the possible representation of Fabius (127) by his grandson or great-grandson N. Fabius Pictor (125), who was **triumvir monetalis** about 114 - 104, see Babelon Description
Historique et Chronologique des Monnaies de la République Romaine I. 484.

44.4 rex Prusia:

Prusias II, king of Bithynia (ca. 182 - 149). His father, Prusias I (ca. 230 - 182), had at first been a supporter of Philip V of Macedonia. During the First Macedonian War, Prusias I fought against Attalos I of Pergamon in Asia Minor and was included as an adscriptus to the Peace of Phoinike in 205 as an ally of Philip (L. 29.12.14). In 202 he and Philip co-operated in the capture of Kios, which was assigned to Prusias (Pol. 15.23.10). Although Antiochus III sought Prusias as an ally, the Bithynian king was persuaded by the Scipios and by the legatus C. Livius Salinator to remain neutral (Pol. 21.11.1-2; L. 37.25.4-14). Prusias II had wished to remain neutral at the opening of the Third Macedonian War (L. 42.29.3), but in 169 he decided to contribute five ships for the Pergamene fleet (L. 44.10.12) and probably now entered into a relationship of amicitia with Rome. This amicitia was terminated by the senate in 154 (Pol. 33.11.4). See Habicht. RE XXIII. 1 (1957) cols. 1086 - 1127.

The annalistic source of Livy 44.14.5-7 reported the arrival in Rome of an embassy from Prusias II in 169 with the object of negotiating a peace between Rome and Macedonia. This account may have been coloured by the annalistic tradition which placed the peace-making embassy of the Rhodians in this year (see Appendix I). On the other hand, the Ptolemaic embassy of late 170 came to Rome with the intention of seeking an end to the war between Rome and Macedonia (Pol. 28.1.7) without provoking reprisals (although it must be added that the envoys refrained from introducing the subject of peace on the advice of M. Aemilius Lepidus, the princeps senatus). Prusias, too, may have withdrawn his offer of mediation before actually declaring his position before the senate, or the senate may have found it more convenient to overlook his mistake (see on 44.9). On this embassy see Will Histoire II. 245 - 246.
For the later treatment of Prusias, see on 44.9.

44.4 cum filio Nicomedes:

He later reigned as Nikomedes II (ca. 149 - 128).

44.7 [L.] Cornelius Scipio quaestor:

L. Cornelius Scipio (324), son of L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus (337). He died soon after his quaestorship at the age of 33 (cf. CIL I² (1893) no. 12 = ILS 5).

44.8 Praeneste unam Fortunae:

At the temple of Fortuna Primigenia (see Berig RE Suppl. VIII (1956) cols. 1243 - 1254; Fasolo and Gullini Il Santuario della Fortuna Primigenia a Palestrina). At once a primordial mother-goddess and the daughter of Jupiter, she also delivered oracles (see Otto RE VII. 1 (1910) cols. 23 - 29; Latte Röm. Rel. 176, 264).

Another well-known visitor to Praeneste was Karneades, the head of the Academy (in 155: cf. Cicero De Div. 2.87).

The feast in honour of Fortuna Primigenia was held on 11 and 12 April, a sacrifice being offered on these dates.

cf. CIL I² (1893) p. 235 with Commentarii p. 339 (Fasti Praenestini, ad A. D. III, Prid. Id. Apr.):

[hoc biduo sacrificium maximum]

Fortunae Primigeniae. Utro eorum die oraculum patet. II viri vitulum immolant.

In 194 a temple to this goddess was built in Rome by Q. Marcius Ralla, the duumvir created for the purpose (L. 34.53.5).

44.9 ut societas secum renovaretur:

For the relation of amicitia between Rome and Prusias, see on 44.4.

As an informal relationship of friendship not based on a foedus of the Italian type, amicitia with Rome was frequently renewed by foreign states and rulers. The renewal of amicitia with Rome by a new Hellenistic ruler implied that the Romans expected the new ruler to continue the policy of deference to Roman wishes which his predecessor had initiated or maintained; the renewal of amicitia by a non-monarchic state implied that the Romans expected the present government to continue such a policy of deference. Examples of such renewals mentioned by Livy are:
Nabis of Sparta, ca. 198 (L. 34.31.6); Perseus, 178 (42.40.4); Ptolemy VI, 173 (42.6.5); Antiochus IV, 173 (42.6.8); Rhodes and cities in Crete, 172 (42.19.8); Thebes, 172 (42.44.5); Pamphylia, 169 (44.14.4). See Sands The Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic 58 - 59.

On amicitia see Appendix IV.

44.9 agerque sibi de rege Antiocho captus...daretur:

It is not known what territory is meant here. By the treaty of Apamea (cf. Pol. 21.42; L. 38.38) Antiochus III was required to evacuate all of Asia Minor north of the Taurus and west of the Halys river. According to the settlement of Asia, Eumenes II received Hellespontine Phrygia, Greater Phrygia and Phrygia Epiktetos (also called Mysia; Prusias I had taken it from Antiochus III). At the conclusion of the war between Eumenes and Prusias in 183, the country of the Galatians seems to have fallen under Pergamene control, but in 168 the Galatians revolted and were not reduced until 166 (see on 19.3). The territory in question here might have been occupied by the Galatians before the peace of Apamea and the settlement of Asia Minor, and left in Galatian hands (cf. L. 45.44.10-11). See Hansen Attalids 92 - 101, 120 - 124.

44.9 filium...senatui commendavit:

In the Roman sense, commendatio denoted an act of submission in which one party placed itself under the protection of another (cf. Caesar B. G. 4.27.7: principesque undique convenire et se civitatesque suas Caesari commendare coeperunt). In Roman social life commendatio implied that a person was placed under the tutela or clientela of another (cf. Terence Eunuchus 1039 - 1040: patri se Thais commendavit, in clientelam et fidelem nobis dedit). A somewhat similar concept in the Hellenistic world was that of ἐπιτροπεῖα. According to Memnon of Herakleia (Jacoby FGrHist III. B. 434 F 14.1), Nikomedes I of Bithynia declared as ἐπιτροπος for his heirs Ptolemy II Philadelphus, Antigonos Gonatas, and the people of Byzantion, Herakleia Pontike and Kios. This act of ἐπιτροπεῖα, however, did not necessarily imply the subordination of one party to another, but constituted a guarantee that a ruler's heirs would by recognized by other states.
omnium...favore est adiutus:
The same group of senators who wished to interfere in the
Attalid dynasty (see on 19.2) and to declare war on Rhodes
(see on 25.2) probably desired to promote the influence of Prusias
as the guardian of the balance of power in the east. See Badian
Foreign Clientelae 104 - 105; McShane Foreign Policy 182 - 186;
Will Histoire II. 245 - 246; De Sanctis Storia IV. 12. 352 - 354;

44.10 legatos:
Their identity is unknown. It was perhaps their recommendations
which led to the senatus consultum granting the Galatians
independence in 166 (cf. Pol. 30.28).

44.13 quanta cura...documento Ptolemaeum, Aegypti regem, esse:
For the tradition of amicitia between Rome and the Ptolemies
since 273 see on 10.2.
There is also a tradition that M. Aemilius Lepidus assumed
a tutela over Ptolemy V in 201/200 at the request of the
Alexandrians (cf. Justinus 30.2.8; Val. Max. 6.6.1). This
may have been an act of ἐν τροπε, which the Romans could
have interpreted as an act of commendatio (see on 44.9),
that is, as an act implying that the Ptolemaic kingdom was
being placed under Roman protection. In keeping with this act
and with the Ptolemaic request for protection, the three
legati C. Claudius Nero, M. Aemilius Lepidus and P. Sempronius
Tuditanus set out for Egypt in 200 in order to attempt a
settlement of the dispute between Antiochus III and Ptolemy V
(cf. Pol. 16.27.5) and later warned Philip V not to touch any
of Ptolemy's possessions (cf. Pol. 16.34.3). For Roman
ulterior motives, see Walbank Commentary II. 533 - 534.
An embassy from Ptolemy VI in late 170 renewed friendly
relations with Rome (Pol. 28.1.7), and after the defeat of
Perseus the Romans decided to limit the ambitions of Antiochus IV,
ostensibly on behalf of their amici, the Ptolemies (see Badian
Foreign Clientelae 107).
The present rulers of Egypt (see on 11.1, 11.2, 11.3) were the
children of Ptolemy V.
One hundred pounds of silver (cf. L. 45.14.6).

These were warships used in the Macedonian war; they did not belong to the flotillas of the duumvir navales which protected the coasts of Italy from 181 to 176. The duumviral squadrons made their last appearance in 176 (cf. L. 41.17.7). See Thiel Studies on the History of Roman Sea-Power in Republican Times 420 - 429.

The account of Polybius (30.18) and of the Greek writers who followed his account (e.g., Diod. 31.15) does not treat the details of this embassy, but concentrates on portraying the servile baseness of Prusias. The annalistic tradition and the account of Polybius, which are not strictly contradictory, may reflect the different attitudes towards Prusias taken by the senate, who viewed him as a useful ally, and by Polybius, who viewed him as a gross degenerate whose vices led to his inevitable downfall (cf. Pol. 32.15, 36.15 with Pédech Méth. Hist. 216 - 229). The unfavourable opinion of the Bithynian kings seems to have persisted down to the time of Nikomedes IV, with whom Caesar was suspected by some people of having had homosexual relations (cf. Suet. Julius 2, 49).

Prusias I was aided by the Galatians in his war against Eumenes II (ca. 186 - 183). In 167 Prusias II requested some territory in Asia Minor being held by the Galatians (see on 44.9). In response to this request the senate despatched ambassadors, who may have recommended that the Galatians be declared free (see on 44.10). This declaration probably followed the defeat of the Galatians by Eumenes in 168 - 166.
Eumenes was later accused by Prusias of interfering with the Galatians (cf. Pol. 30.30.2-3). In 165 Prusias also encouraged the Galatians themselves to complain about Eumenes (Pol. 31.1.2-5). Their suspicions increased by these accusations, the Romans sent envoys to investigate the conduct of Eumenes as well as that of the other Greeks (Pol. 31.1.6-8, 31.6). These accusations continued as late as 161 (cf. Pol. 31.32), until Prusias and Attalos II, who had succeeded his brother Eumenes in 159, went to war (ca. 156 - 154). See Willrich RE VI. 1 (1907) cols. 1096 - 1103; Vitucci Il Regno di Bitinia 73 - 82; Habicht RE XXIII. 1 (1957) cols. 1113 - 1120; Hansen Attalids 124 - 133.

On the colophon which occurs at the end of the MS. containing Book 45, cf. Giarratano 370: Post sex fere versuum intervallum haec exstant et minio et atramento exarata:

TITI LIUI
AB URBE CONDITA
LIB . XLU . EXP .
INC . LIB . XLUI . FELICITER
APPENDIX ONE: ROME AND RHODES, 172 - 167

Livy (44.14.8 - 15.8), following his annalistic source, wrongly placed in 169 the peace-making embassy which, according to Pol. 29.19 (followed by L. 45.3.3-8), arrived in the summer of 168 shortly before the battle of Pydna (also see L. 44.35.4). The Rhodians did send an embassy to Rome late in the summer of 169 (cf. Pol. 28.2, 16), but at that time relations between Rome and Rhodes were still cordial and the purpose of the embassy was to renew amicitia with Rome and to request trading privileges in Sicily. The ambassadors were also to defend their city against accusations (Pol. 28.2.2). These must have been accusations of disloyalty occasioned by the emergence of a powerful pro-Macedonian faction which consistently opposed Rhodian support of Rome (for example, of the forty ships placed at the disposal of the Romans by Hagesilokhos in 172, only six were sent when the praetor C. Lucretius Gallus requested Rhodian ships in 171: Pol. 27.3, 7).

The embassy despatched to Rome under Hagesilokhos in 169 seems to have been controlled by the pro-Roman group, while the other embassy of 169, sent to the consul Q. Marcius Philippus and to the praetor C. Marcius Figulus, seems to have been controlled by the pro-Macedonian group. Agepolis, the leader of this second embassy, was the leader of the peace-making embassy of 168 (cf. Pol. 28.2, 16; 29.10).

When Agepolis and his colleagues arrived on their embassy to him in 169, Marcius Philippus suggested that the Rhodians should try to negotiate a peace between Rome and Macedonia (cf. Pol. 28.17.4 with Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 145 n.2). Thus, Philippus was probably aware of the strife between the pro-Roman politicians of Rhodes and their opponents, who either desired an outright victory for Perseus or preferred a balance of power (see on 24.2, 31.4). Later in 169 Perseus sent an embassy to Rhodes (Pol. 29.4.7). Metrodoros, the leader of this embassy, received an assurance from
Polyaratos that the Rhodians would join Perseus (L. 44.23).
In 168 the Rhodian boule, now controlled by the pro-Macedonian group, decided to send peace-making embassies to Rome and to Aemilius Paullus and Perseus (Pol. 29.10). Envoys were also sent to the Cretan cities with which the Rhodians wished to form alliances. Upon the arrival of the embassy from Perseus, the Rhodian boule granted the ambassadors of Perseus and Gentius a courteous reply, informing them of the Rhodian policy of mediation and urging them to be disposed to accept terms with Rome (Pol. 29.11; L. 44.29.6-8).

The Rhodian envoys sent to Aemilius Paullus, arriving in Macedonia shortly before the time of the battle of Pydna, were summarily dismissed (L. 44.35.4-6; Zon. 9.23.3). The envoys sent to Rome arrived before the victory over Perseus, but when they were introduced before the senate after the defeat of Perseus at Pydna was known, they made no attempt to disguise the purpose for which they had been sent. In fact, they seem to have already discussed peace negotiations at an earlier audience with the senate (cf. L. 44.35.4; Zon. 9.23.3).

It is possible that the senatorial commission sent to the Hellenistic east in 172 did find out about the pro-Macedonian group in Rhodes and accurately reported that the Rhodians could not be relied upon (L. 42.19.7-8; 42.26.7-9. Annalistic: see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 246 - 248; Klotz Livius 67 - 68). The majority of Rhodian leaders, however, were still loyal to Rome in 172 (cf. Pol. 27.3) and it was only towards the latter half of 169 that the pro-Macedonian group became predominant. The annalists probably placed the Rhodian attempt at mediation a year earlier in order to exaggerate the disloyalty of Rhodes and to justify the harsh treatment of the Rhodians which followed the war (see on 20.4).

For general bibliography see on 3.3 and 20.4. Also see Schmitt Rom und Rhodos 211 - 217; Derow Phoenix 27 (1973) 351 n. 20.
APPENDIX TWO: THE THEME OF RHODIAN ARROGANCE IN THE ANNALISTIC TRADITION

The Roman annalistic tradition seems to have characterized the Rhodians as proud and arrogant. We read, for instance, in Livy's account of the embassy of 169, Rhodii superbe commemoratis meritis suis (44.14.8). The Rhodians issued a stern warning: per quos stetisset quominus belli finis fieret, adversus eos quid sibi faciendum esset Rhodios consideraturas esse (44.14.12). After the senate, according to Claudius Quadrigarius, had issued the senatus consultum liberating Lycia and Caria, the Rhodian bubble burst: qua re audita principem legationis, cuius magniloquentiam vix curia paulo ante ceperat, corruisse (L. 44.15.1-2). Valerius Antias reported an answer of the senate contemptuous of the Rhodians' presumption, and pointed out that the envoys refused the customary gift of money offered by the senate (L. 44.15.3-8).

Livy introduced the notion of Rhodian arrogance even when his source did not. In describing the embassy of 168, Polybius wrote that Fortune made a mocking display of Rhodian stupidity (Τὴν τῶν Ρόδιων δύναμιν: 29.19.2). Livy rendered this as ludibrium stolidae superbiae (45.3.3). Livy also inserted a reference to inborn Rhodian arrogance into his version of the speech of the Rhodian spokesman in 167 (45.23.13-19).

The reason for the tardiness of the Rhodians in seeking an alliance with Rome was, according to Pol. 30.5.6-8 (followed by L. 45.25.9), the desire to remain independent in their foreign policy. However, we may perhaps find another trace of the Roman annalistic attitude to the Rhodians in the reasons given by Dio fr. 68.3: the Rhodians wished to inspire the Romans with fear and wished to be courted by states which went to war against Rome.

Finally, we may note a statement in the speech of Cato the Censor on behalf of the Rhodians delivered in 167 (Malcovati ORF\textsuperscript{2} no. 8 fr. 169):

Rodensi superbos esse auiunt id obiectantes quod
mihi et liberis meis minime dici velim. sint
sane superbi. quid ad nos pertinent? idne irascimini,
si quis superbior est quam nos?
Livy had read this speech (cf. L. 45.25.2-4) as well as the accounts of Claudius Quadrigarius and of Valerius Antias, and seems to have repeated their bias against the Rhodians which probably stemmed from the surprising tone of independence which the Rhodians alone dared to take with Rome at this time.
APPENDIX THREE: ROME, THE PTOLEMIES AND ANTIOCHUS IV, 170 - 168

Our knowledge of the chronology of the Sixth Syrian War is derived from a variety of sources, mainly partial or fragmentary accounts. The following scheme represents an attempt to clarify the stages of this war and the diplomatic relations between Rome and the Ptolemaic kingdom during the war.

1) Some time between 5 Oct. and 12 Nov. 170 the joint reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor, Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II and Cleopatra II was proclaimed. This move was probably connected with the Egyptian plans for the conquest of Koile Syria. See Turner Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 31 (1948) 148 - 161; Bikerman Chronique d'Egypte 54 (1952) 396 - 403; Skeat Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 47 (1961) 107 - 112.

2) Embassy of Ptolemy VI and of Antiochus IV to Rome, late 170 (Pol. 28.1). The envoys of Antiochus complained of Ptolemaic aggression, while the envoys of Ptolemy came to renew friendly relations with Rome (see on 10.2), to seek an end to the war between the Romans and the Macedonians, and to observe the outcome of the audiences of Antiochus' envoys with the senate. M. Aemilius Lepidus (68), who had been sent as an ambassador to Ptolemy V in 201, warned the Egyptian envoys not to introduce the subject of peace with Macedonia. The Ptolemaic envoys received favourable replies to their requests, while the ambassadors of Antiochus were told that the senate would charge Q. Marcius Philippus (79), the consul of 169, to write to Ptolemy ὁς αὐτῷ δοκεῖ συμφέρειν ἐκ τῆς ἱδίας πρὸ τῶν ἐστίων.

3) After the Ptolemaic army was defeated late in 170 (before 9 Dec.; for bibliography see no. 1), Ptolemy VI failed to escape to Samothrace and was compelled to negotiate with Antiochus, who now controlled Egypt (Pol. 28.18-19; Porphyrius of Tyre, Jacoby FGrHist II. B. 260 F 49).

4) Anakleteria: late 170 or early 169 (cf. Pol. 28.12.8). News of the Anakleteria of Ptolemy VI reached the Achaecans early in 169 when Perseus was preparing to enter Thessaly. The coming of age of Ptolemy VI was most likely proclaimed by Antiochus, who recognized the right of the elder brother alone to the throne of Egypt.
5) Antiochus desired the return of Ptolemy VI to Alexandria as a client king (Pol. 28.20-23), but the reaction of the Alexandrians to the negotiations between Ptolemy VI and Antiochus had been to declare the younger brother of Ptolemy VI sole king (cf. Pol. 29.23.4; ῧδη η αρ συνέβαινε τότε τόν νεώτερον Πτολεμαίον ύπο τῶν ἄξων ἀνεδείξας βασιλέα δι' τῆν περιστάσιν).

6) Antiochus now laid siege to Alexandria, claiming to support the rights of the elder Ptolemy, whom he had left at Memphis (cf. Pol. 29.23.4; Pol. 28.22; L. 45.11.1).

7) Before the departure of Antiochus from Alexandria, Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra sent an embassy to Rome. This embassy is erroneously placed by Livy's annalistic source (cf. L. 44.19.6-14) at the beginning of the consular year 168 (about mid-January: see on 1.11). Since by that time the two Ptolemies had been reconciled (see no. 10), it appears that the annalistic source post-dated this earlier embassy. It was probably in reply to this embassy from Ptolemy VIII and Cleopatra that the senate sent T. Numius Tarquiniensis (10) to negotiate an agreement between Antiochus and the Ptolemies (cf. Pol. 29.25.3-4). See Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 263; Scullard Rom. Pol. 210 n. 2. There also seems to have been a later embassy which arrived in Rome early in the consular year 168 (see no. 10).

8) Unable to capture Alexandria, Antiochus installed a garrison in Pelousion, which he held as a point of entry into Egypt in case he decided to lead another invasion of the country. Leaving Ptolemy VI at Memphis in control of the rest of Egypt, Antiochus retired into Syria, expecting that a civil war between the two brothers would remove any threat to his continued possession of Koile Syria (L. 45.11.4-5).

9) When Antiochus abandoned the siege of Alexandria in 169, he sent as envoys to Rome the same men whom he had sent earlier to complain about Ptolemaic aggression (Pol. 28.22; cf. Pol. 28.1.1). The money which Antiochus offered as a gift to the Romans may have been derived from the booty he had taken in Egypt (cf. Porphyrios of Tyre, Jacoby FGrHist II. B. 260 F 49).

10) After the departure of Antiochus from Alexandria and before the spring of 168, the Ptolemies were reconciled (L. 45.11.1-7). They asked military aid from the Achaean League (Pol. 29.23-25) and
from Rome (L. 44.19.6-14 with no. 7; Justinus 34.2.8 - 3.1). The request for Roman aid was perhaps accompanied by a shipment of grain to the Roman naval base at Chalcis in Euboia (cf. OGIS 760 and see on 10.2).

11) In response to this embassy the senate sent C. Popillius Laenas (*7/18), C. Decimi.us (1) and C. Hostilius (3). For their instructions, cf. L. 44.19.14: Prius Antiochum, dein Ptolemaeum adire iussi et nuntiare, ni absistatur bello, per utrum stetisset, eum non pro amico nec pro socio habituros esse.

For the amicitia of Rome with the Ptolemies and with the Seleucids see on 10.2 and 12.6. For general bibliography on this embassy, see on 10.2.
According to Roman Fetial Law, all foreign states were either hostes or socii. The socii in peninsular Italy were technically sovereign states bound to Rome by a foedus (permanent alliance). The socii nominis Latini, who were not all bound by a foedus, and whose status approached more closely that of Roman citizenship, were not foederati in the same sense as the socii proper. The individual states allied to Rome (civitates foederatae) agreed by the terms of their foedus that neither party would commit an act of hostility against the other, and that either party would come to the aid of the other if that state was attacked by a third party. Although it is possible that in theory either state was required to aid the other with all its forces (see the summary of the Foedus Cassianum in Dionysios of Halikarnassos Ant. 6.95 with Ogilvie Commentary 317 - 318), in practice the Romans, always the dominant partner in these alliances, determined the extent of allied participation in their wars by reference to the formula togatorum, by which fewer than the full levy were called up (cf. L. 27.10.3, 29.15.6). The formula togatorum was a schedule which stated either the maximum number of troops which the socii and the Latini were required to provide by treaty (see Beloch Italische Bund 203 - 210; Toynbee Hannibal's Legacy I. 424 - 437) or, more probably, the number of troops requested each year by Rome on the basis of revised estimates of allied military capacity (see Beloch Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt III. 353 - 355; Brunt Ital. Manpower 545 - 548. Also see Beloch Italische Bund 194 - 206; Sherwin-White The Roman Citizenship 112 - 125; Badian Foreign Clientelae 25 - 28; Toynbee Hannibal's Legacy I. 258 - 266.

The relationship which Rome usually formed with non-Italian states in the third and second centuries B. C. was that of amicitia. This relationship was not necessarily based on a foedus and did not necessarily mean anything more than the existence of friendly relations between Rome and a foreign state. The amici might voluntarily co-operate with Rome in wars or in other circumstances (on Polybius' use of the term κοινωνιακά see Dahlheim Deditio und
societas 242 n. 2), but they were not strictly obliged to do more than maintain cordial relations with Rome. By the middle of the second century, however, the Romans had come to expect the amici to show a willingness to defer to Roman wishes, especially in the area of foreign policy (cf. Pol. 3.4.3; OGIS 315). In this way, the amici, although sovereign states, tended to become clientes of Rome, and the conduct expected of them approached that expected of the Italian socii.

The senate declared foreign states and individuals amici through a senatus consultum, and public lists (the so-called formula sociorum or formula amicorum) were kept of the amici (cf. L. 43.6.10, 44.16.7; CIL I² (1893) no. 588).

Treaties formed with the amici might specify conditions under which friendly relations could be deemed to exist (cf. the treaties between Rome and Carthage: Pol. 2.7, 3.22-25 with Walbank Commentary I. 168-172, 337-353; the treaty between Rome and Antiochus III in 189: Pol. 21.42; L. 38.38 with Thüibler Imperium Romanum 49: amicitia was established between the two powers on condition that Antiochus observe the terms of the peace treaty). A similar case was probably the amicitia granted Philip V in 197 (cf. Pol. 18.48.4-5; L. 33.35.5-6).

Such treaties might also determine the nature of the cooperation between Rome and the amici for some specific purpose of limited duration (cf. the last treaty between Rome and Carthage: Pol. 3.25.1-5; the treaty between Rome and the Aetolian League in about 211: IG IX². 1. 2 (1957) no. 241; L. 26.24 with Walbank Commentary II. 162; Will Histoire II. 76 - 77).

The conclusion of a peace treaty with a foreign power did not in itself establish a defeated state as an amicus of Rome. After the conclusion of the peace-treaty with Philip V in 197, the king was instructed to send ambassadors to Rome to seek a relationship of amicitia (Pol. 18.48.4-5; L. 33.35.5-6). In the revised peace treaty (see Thüibler Imperium Romanum 34 - 35) ratified by Antiochus III and the ten commissioners in 188, the first clause granted Antiochus a relationship of amicitia with Rome on condition that he observe the terms of the peace treaty (Pol. 21.42.1; L. 38.38.1).
Although the establishment of *amicitia* might be accompanied by a *foedus* which defined the obligations of the *amici*, it is most probable that the Romans intended the friendly relations established by *amicitia* to continue even after the specific circumstances envisaged in the *foedus* no longer existed, or when both the Romans and the *amici* had fulfilled the terms of the *foedus*. One case which may seem to suggest that the Romans placed temporal limits on the relationship of *amicitia* is the peace treaty between Rome and Hieron II of Syracuse in 263. According to Diod. 23.4.1, peace was made for fifteen years, while Zon. 8.16.2 recorded the establishment of perpetual *amicitia* in 248. From this Dahlheim (*Deditio und societas* 122 - 127) concludes that the Romans occasionally made alliances (cf. Ibid. p. 121: "Es ist absolut sicher, dass der Praeliminarvertrag hier erweitert und Hieron unter die σύμμαχον zu zählen ist") of fixed duration, but it seems more likely that the terms mentioned by Diodoros formed part of a peace treaty (*Waffenstillstandsvertrag*, or, more probably, *Deditionsvertrag*; see Thübler *Imperium Romanum* 14 - 44), rather than part of an alliance. If these terms formed part of a peace treaty, it is possible that Hieron had been required to pay tribute in yearly installments, the last of which was paid in 248 (cf. Zon. 8.16.2), and that the relationship of *amicitia* first established in 263 was now renewed on a different basis in 248.

A somewhat similar case was the *amicitia* between Rome and Macedonia, which was probably based on the peace treaty of 197 (cf. Pol. 18.48.4-5; L. 33.35.3-7). In 172, when Perseus refused to abide by the terms of the peace treaty which had been made with his father, or to accept the Roman interpretation of this treaty, he demanded that new terms more favourable to Macedonia should be negotiated (see L. 42.25, in an annalistic section reflecting the Roman attitude towards *amicitia*: Nissen *Krit. Untersuch.* 246 - 247; Klotz *Livius* 67 - 68). See the review of Dahlheim's book by Oost, *CP* 62 (1967) 149 - 151.

Even if Diodoros was accurately reporting the terms of an alliance similar to the one which accompanied the *amicitia* between Rome and the Aetolian League, we should not conclude that a
temporal limit was imposed on the amicitia established at that time as well as on the validity of the specific terms listed in the treaty (the terms of the Romano-Aetolian treaty, for instance, were to be observed until the war against Philip V was ended on conditions acceptable to the Romans).

Treaties made by Rome with the amici did not, however, assimilate the amici to the status of the Italian socii, who were distinguished from them (cf. L. 29.11.2; Appian Kelt. 13). Societas of the Italian type always rested upon a foedus, whereas amicitia was not necessarily based upon a foedus. Foedera of the Italian type were perpetual alliances, while the foedera which might accompany the establishment of amicitia contained terms which were valid in specific circumstances of limited duration.

The relationship of amicitia could be revoked unilaterally by Rome or by the amicus (cf. Pol. 33.12.5; L. 36.3.8, 42.25.1), whereas societas could not be revoked in this way. Amicitia did not bind either party to come to the military assistance of the other, while societas did so bind them. The amici of Rome were not regularly called upon to provide military aid as were the Italian socii; they were not included in the formula togatorum. Unless there existed a foedus defining the responsibilities of the amici, they had no formal commitment to Rome beyond the adoption of at least a position of declared or of undeclared neutrality when Rome was at war. If an amicus did decide to give military support, "he sent it of his own free will alone, determined the amount himself and the time during which it should be available, and it was not subject to Roman command, except by special and temporary arrangement" (Matthaei 191). It was of course expected that the amici would refrain from committing hostile acts against Rome, but the interpretation of any act as hostile was dependent upon the attitudes of the Romans at any given time, and by the middle of the second century, the failure of the amici to accept Roman foreign policy could clearly be considered a hostile act (cf. the alleged negotiations between Perseus and Eumenes II concerning the mediation of peace between Rome and Macedonia; Pol. 30.1.6 and see on 19.1 and 19.5; the attempt of the Rhodians
to mediate: Pol. 29.19 and see on 3.3 and 24.2). Since they were expected more and more to accept Roman foreign policy, the amici came to resemble the Italian socii in their responsibilities to Rome. See Sands The Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic; Heuss Völk. Grundl.; Dahlheim Deditio und societas 244 - 246; Accame Roma alla Conquista del Mediterraneo Orientale 59 - 69.

Although the foreign amici may be distinguished from the Italian socii, the terminology used of the amici in the literary sources is confused and imprecise. Although the amici were not identical in status to the Italian socii, the terms socii and societas were often used in connection with the amici (see Matthaei 186 - 187).

We may perhaps identify a number of factors which led to this confusion. By the middle of the second century, the responsibilities of the amici were in certain ways similar to those of the Italian socii. Some of the amici did have foedera with Rome, while even those who did not have foedera could be expected to act as if they did. Since the socii were all foederati (but not all foederati were socii), the Roman annalists may have tended to treat as socii those of the amici who did have foedera with Rome, and even those who did not have such foedera, seeing that in practice the difference between the two groups had grown slight. Any state which supported Rome in war could in a practical sense be considered a socius, and Polybius seems to have often equated κοινοπραγία with συμμαχία, even this would not have been accurate from the point of view of Roman Fetial Law (see Dahlheim Deditio und societas 242). On the imprecise terminology of the literary sources, see Matthaei 186 - 187; Dahlheim Deditio und societas 163 - 175.

Another problem is the similarly imprecise use of the expression socii et amici. Although it is used exclusively of non-Italian states, never of the Italian socii, this expression does not distinguish the different classes of non-Italian states. A notorious example is the case of Rhodes after the Third Macedonian War. Livy, probably reflecting the attitude of his
annalistic source, included as part of the answer of the consul. M. Iunius Pennus to the Rhodian ambassadors in 167 the following statement: Rhodios non ita meritos eo bello, ut amicorum sociorumque numero habendi sint (45.20.8), implying that the relationship between Rome and Rhodes had been one of societas et amicitia, a relationship which the Rhodians had destroyed by their attempt to follow an independent foreign policy. However, we are told by Polybius (30.5.5-10), who was followed by Livy (45.25.7-10), that although the Rhodians had often co-operated with the Romans in war, there existed no treaty binding the two states.

Polybius used the expression ἐ φιλία καὶ ἑ συμμαχία to describe the relationship between Rome and Prusias II which the Romans terminated unilaterally in 154 because Prusias would not stop his war against Attalos II (cf. Pol. 33.12.5: διὸ ὁ προσκυνεῖ τὴν γενναίαν συμμαχίαν καὶ τὴν συμμαχίαν...) The relationship thus terminated can only have been one of amicitia.

Since the expression socii et amici is also used of other states which cannot be shown to have had any sort of treaty with Rome, Matthaei and Dahlheim conclude that this expression was used simply to designate the amici in their character as states whose conduct resembled that of the Italian socii (cf. Matthei 185: "Socius et amicus was, I think, simply the official title applied to the amici by the Roman government"; Dahlheim Deditio und societas 245 - 246: "Der Terminus amicus et socius benennt vielmehr nur zwei von der historischen Realisierung abhängige Seiten ein- und desselben Rechtsverhältnisses, nämlich der amicitia").

The expression socii et amici (φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι) also occurs in epigraphic documents. Among the earliest documents which describe relations between Rome and Hellenistic cities called φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι of Rome are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OGIS 762</td>
<td>Kibyra</td>
<td>ca. 189 - 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XIV (1890) p. 696</td>
<td>Tabai</td>
<td>ca. 167 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG 679</td>
<td>Priene and Magnesia</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG 674</td>
<td>Melitaia and Narthakaia</td>
<td>ca. 140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of these, only Kibyra, Elaia, Epidauros and Astypalaia can be shown to have had treaties with Rome, a point which favours the views of Matthaei and Dahlheim.

There was clearly a group of non-Italian states, however, which had foedera with Rome which did not merely specify the conditions under which amicitia could exist, or define the nature of the co-operation between Rome and these states, but which placed these states on a standing which closely resembled that of the Italian socii. These states were required not only to refrain from committing any hostile act against Rome, but also to provide military aid if Rome was the victim of attack by a third party. The Romans on their part undertook the same responsibilities towards these non-Italian states. Details of several treaties of this kind with non-Italian states are preserved on stone:

OGIS 762 Kibyra, ca. 189 - 167
IG XII. 2 (1899) no. 510 Methymne, before 105
IG XII. 3 (1904) no. 173 Astypalaia, 105
IG XII. 2 (1899) no. 35 col. D Mitylene, 25

In 129 the people of Elaia (or Pergamon), who had possessed a relationship of φιλία with Rome until the end of the war against Andronikos, now became φίλα τε καὶ σύμμαχοι of Rome (SIG$^3$ 694). Epidauros, which in 115/4 obtained a relationship of φιλία καὶ σύμμαχος with Rome probably also belongs to this group of states (IG IV$^2$. 1 (1929) no. 63).
To these documents we may add a number of treaties described in the literary sources:

Memnon, Jacoby FGrHist 434 F 18.10

Herakleia Pontike, ca. 189

In 190 the people of Herakleia became amici of Rome (cf. Memnon, Jacoby FGrHist 434 F 18.6: A letter was sent to them, ἐν ἣν φιλίαν τε πρὸς αὐτοὺς τῆς συνκλητοῦ βουλῆς ὑπερεχείτο, and probably in the following year they became socii et amici, receiving a foedus similar to those of the Italian socii (cf. Ibid., F 18.10: καὶ τέλος συν ἡκατέρων ἡμετερίας τε καὶ ἡ βασιλείας, μὴ φίλους εἶναι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ συμμάχους ἀλλήλοις, καθιστῶν τε καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν δὲν ὑπείπεν ἐκάτερον . . . )

Pol. 21.32; L. 38.11 Aetolian League, 189

The treaty with the Aetolian League was, strictly speaking, a peace treaty, not an alliance, but the obligations of a socius were imposed upon the Aetolians in this treaty. The Romans were unwilling to treat the Aetolians as they treated the other non-Italian socii by agreeing to reciprocal obligations, but the position of the Aetolians was similar to that of the Italian socii in their obligation to have the same friends and enemies as the Romans (cf. Thüblner Imperium Romanum 63: "Das Wesen dieses Vertrags liegt im Gegensatz zu den gleichen Verträgen in der formalen und sachlichen Einseitigkeit seiner Verpflichtungen. Rom erscheint nur als verpflichtender, Aitolien nur als verpflichteter Teil").

The forerunner of this treaty seems to have been the peace treaty concluded with Carthage in 201 (cf. Pol. 15.18; L. 30.37; Appian Lib. 54 with Walbank Commentary II. 466 - 469), which restricted Carthaginian foreign policy by the prohibitions against waging war outside Carthaginian territory, against waging war within Carthaginian territory without Roman consent, and against waging war with Masinissa or any other amicus of Rome. According to L. 36.4.10 (in an annalistic section: see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 177 - 178; Klotz Livius 13, 39), the Carthaginians were required
ex foedere to provide ships against Antiochus III in 191, and later in this year we find two Carthaginian ships serving in the Roman fleet (L. 36.44.5, in a Polybian section: see Nissen Krit. Untersuch. 186 - 187; Klotz Livius 13).

Pol. 30.31; L. Ep. 46 Rhodes, 165/4

This treaty was renewed in 51 (cf. P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther in Cicero ad Fam. 12.15.2: ...Rhodum reverti confisus...

foedere quoque, quod cum his, M. Marcello, Ser. Sulpicio consulibus, renovatum erat; quo iuraverant Rhodii, eosdem hostes se habituros, quos S.P.Q.R.) In 43, when Cassius was intimidating the Rhodians with a show of force, the Rhodians, who were supporting Dolabella, reminded Cassius of the treaty (συνθηκών), αἱ 'Ρωμαῖοις εἰσὶ καὶ 'Ρωμαῖοις, ὁπλα μὴ φέρειν ἐπὶ ἄλληλους, adding, εἰ δὲ τι περί συμμαχίας ἐπιμέμφοτο, ἐθέλειν παρὰ 'Ρωμαίων βουλής πυθέσθαι, καὶ κελευόσθης συμμαχίης (Appian B. C. 4.66). Cassius insisted that since the treaty forbade the Romans and the Rhodians to attack one another, and since it called for mutual assistance if either party was the victim of attack by a third power (τὰς δὲ συνθηκὰς κελεύειν ὁπλα μὴ φέρειν ἐπὶ ἄλληλους... κελεύειν δὲ ἄλληλοις συμμαχίαν ...), the Rhodians had violated the treaty by assisting Dolabella, an enemy of the legitimate government of Rome, against Cassius, an authorized representative of that government (Appian B. C. 4.66). According to Cassius, the treaty contained a stipulation, ἡ 'Ρωμαίοις 'Ῥοδίους ὑπηγείν, καὶ καὶ ἔνα χρῆσιν (Appian B. C. 4.70). As a pro-magistrate with maius imperium over the provinces east of the Adriatic (cf. Cicero Phil. 11.30-31, 13.30 and ad Fam. 12.7.1), Cassius claimed the right to determine when the need for such military aid existed. The treaty with Rhodes had apparently been revised by Julius Caesar (Appian B. C. 4.68, 70).

Josephus Ant. 12.414 - 419; I Macc. 8.22-30

Judas Maccabaeus, 160

Josephus Ant. 13.163 - 165

Jonathan Maccabaeus, 135
Although the terms of the Jewish alliance seem to indicate that the Jews became foreign socii of Rome, the relationship established by the foedus of 160 and by the later renewals of it was probably that of amicitia (cf. Josephus Ant. 14.320, where Antony in a decree spoke of the Jews as an ἑσύνος ὄντων).

The treaty with Judas Maccabaeus was made in 160 soon after the Jews, in revolt from Demetrios I, had defeated and killed in battle the Seleucid general Nikanor. Judas had probably been in communication with the senate in 161 (cf. Josephus Ant. 14.233), and the amicitia was probably concluded early in 160 before the recognition of Demetrios as king by Rome in this year (cf. Pol. 31.33.3). The Romans had probably only considered the possibility of interfering on behalf of the Jews before the accord with Demetrios in 160, and the later renewals of the amicitia probably reflect similar intentions; but it is not clear why the Romans allowed a foedus of amicitia to take the form of a permanent alliance with a non-Italian socius in this case.

The first military intervention of Rome in Judean affairs was in 64 - 63, when Pompey restored Hyrcanus as High Priest. The Romans did nothing to help the Jews when that people was once more brought under Seleucid control by Bakhides, the general of Demetrios I, after the death of Judas Maccabaeus in 160 (cf. Josephus Ant. 13.1-57). When the Jewish alliance was renewed in about 127/6, the ambassadors of Hyrcanus presented letters to the senate requesting the redress of grievances against the Seleucid king, but they received the answer that the senate would consider these matters ὅταν ἀπο τῶν ἱδων ἣ σύμηκτος εὐσχολής (Josephus Ant. 13.265).

Since the treaty was made when the Jews had the upper hand in their constant struggle for independence from the Seleucids, and since the treaty was twice renewed in similar circumstances, it seems more likely that the treaty was intended to be a form of moral support for the Jews and a vague warning to the Seleucids that the senate might seriously consider military intervention,
ostensibly on behalf of their Jewish allies, if relations between Rome and the Seleucid empire became bad enough.

On the Jewish alliance, see Will Histoire II. 308 - 312; cf. Thübler Imperium Romanum 253:

Ihr Verhalten gegenüber den Juden liegt zwar nicht im Sinne des Bundesgenossenschaftsvertrags, aber ebensowenig im Sinne eines freundschaftlichen Abkommens....

Ganz abgesehen davon, dass die Bundeshilfe nicht unbedingt, sondern nach den Zeitumständen zugesagt war, ist dies eben der Unterschied zwischen einem beschworenen und einem nur durch den Senat abgeschlossenen Vertrage, dass dieser jederzeit einseitig aufgelöst werden kann.

On the date of the renewal of the amicitia by Hyrcanus, see Broughton Magistrates I. 509 n. 2.

Kibyra, Methymne, Kallatis and Mitylene are not expressly said to have had a relationship of societas et amicitia (فيلיא και συμμαχία) with Rome in the surviving portions of the epigraphic documents to which we have referred, but the form of their treaties with Rome suggests that they were given that title and that it would have appeared in the portions of these documents which are now lost (cf. the alliance with Astypalaia as described in IG XII. 3 (1904) no. 173, lines 26 - 28:

\[
[\text{συμμαχίαν καὶ} ] \text{τώρα (ς) δήμων (ς) τώρα (ς)} \quad \text{Ἀ στυπαλαίεων}
\]

\[
[\text{καὶ συμμαχίαν ἕστω καὶ κατὰ θῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν...}
\]

On these foedera see Thübler Imperium Romanum 44 - 66, 190 - 202, 204 - 214, 239 - 254, 276 - 317; Walbank JRS 37 (1947) 206; Magie Roman Rule 967 n. 89; Sherk Roman Documents from the Greek East 94 - 99, 146 - 157.

Although they had foedera with Rome which closely resembled the foedera of the Italian socii, these non-Italian states differed from the Italian socii in that they were not called upon to perform regular military service according to the formula togatorum. This point alone shows that the Romans continued to distinguish the
Italian socii from the non-Italian socii who, at least in this respect, continued to be treated as amici. It is possible that the expression socii et amici refers properly to the non-Italian socii of Rome who had foedera similar to those of the Italian socii but who were for practical reasons never fully absorbed into the system of the "Roman Alliance".

The earliest epigraphic evidence for the application of the term συμμαχία καὶ συμμαχία to the relationship between Rome and a non-Italian state which received a foedus similar to those of the Italian socii seems to be OGIS 762 (Kibyra, ca. 189 - 167). Writers of a later period carelessly applied this name to the amici who had foedera with Rome, even though these foedera were not of the Italian type, and even more carelessly applied it to those of the amici who did not have foedera with Rome. A similar lack of precision seems to occur as well in the epigraphic texts. This confusion can be explained by the fact that by the middle of the second century, the amici of Rome were expected to accept Roman foreign policy without demur and to provide satisfactory military co-operation when this was required. Matthaei and Dahlheim are undoubtedly correct in considering the status of all non-Italian states, whatever their precise position in international law, to have been closer in reality to the status of amicitia than to the status of societas of the Italian type, but there was certainly a class of foreign states whose status closely resembled that of the Italian socii. In SIG 694, moreover, συμμαχία is clearly distinguished from συμμαχία καὶ συμμαχία since Elaia (or Pergamon) is announced in this inscription to have exchanged the former status for the latter in 129 (also see Memnon, Jacoby FGrHist 434 F 18.6, 10).

Most of the non-Italian socii of Rome described as socii et amici (συμμαχία καὶ συμμαχία) were single city-states of minor rank and of little or no military importance. In this respect the expression societas et amicitia (or amicitia et societas) was used by the Romans in much the same way as the expression συμμαχία καὶ συμμαχία was often used in the Greek east. The expression συμμαχία καὶ συμμαχία often denoted the relations of the kings with
the cities in their areas. While these cities were often styled ἀυτῶνομοι and enjoyed a degree of local independence, they were usually subject to various forms of royal interference and control, and in general they followed the policy of the kings. The expression φιλία καὶ συμμαχία was also commonly used to describe the alliance between two powers when one of them could be considered the principal in the alliance (e.g., Philip V and Skerdilaidas the Illyrian in 220/19: Pol. 4.29.2; Hannibal and Philip V in 215: Pol. 7.9.6).

It is possible that this expression, translated into Latin as amicitia et societas, was adopted to denote the technically sovereign states allied with Rome which were in fact subordinate to Rome. At the same time, this designation could serve to distinguish these non-Italian socii from the Italian socii. See Jones The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian 95 - 112; Schmitt Die Staatsverträge des Altertums III. Register, s.v. φιλία καὶ συμμαχία, pp. 440 - 441; McShane Foreign Policy 68 - 89.

Among the non-Italian socii of Rome in the second century, the Aetolian League and Rhodes had been important powers whose freedom of action the senate wished to restrict. Although the Aetolians had been amici of Rome since about 212, in 192 they went to war against Rome in support of Antiochus III, whom they had invited into Greece (see on 22.6-8). Since the informal bonds of amicitia had not been sufficient to ensure the loyalty of the Aetolians, the Romans demanded the legal right to enforce this loyalty by compelling the Aetolians to accept a peace treaty which bound them to follow Roman foreign policy (cf. Pol. 21.32.2-4; L. 38.11.1-3).

The Rhodians, instead of offering whole-hearted support during the war against Perseus, had attempted to negotiate a peace between Rome and Macedonia (see on 3.3 and 24.2). Because of this, the Romans finally decided in 165/4 to restrict the freedom of the Rhodians to pursue an independent foreign policy by granting them a foedus similar to those of the Italian socii. The humiliation felt by the Rhodians because of this treaty can be understood if we remember that the people of a once proud and independent city were being forced to beg the Romans to consider them as belonging to the class of minor city-states allied to Rome. Never again would the Rhodians be allowed to refuse aid when Rome demanded it.
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