

QUINTUS FABIVS MAXIVS AND THE DYME AFFAIR (SYLL.³ 684)*

The most striking example of Roman intervention in the affairs of mainland Greece between the Achaean and Mithridatic Wars is provided by an inscription now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.¹ This stone bears the text of a letter to the city of Dyme in Achaëa from a Roman proconsul named Q. Fabius Maximus, which describes his trial and sentencing of certain men of Dyme whom he had judged responsible for a recent disturbance in that city. One crux to be resolved is chronological: A date of c. 115 B.C. has long been generally accepted, but recently evidence from another, still unpublished inscription has been thought to point to the year 144.² Further, the letter of Fabius Maximus has long been held to exemplify the close supervision that most scholars, regardless of their position on the vexed question of Greece's formal status after 146, assume was exercised over Greece by Roman commanders in Macedonia from the time of the Achaean War.³ The document has also often been cited to bolster the claim that Rome pursued in second-century Greece a conscious policy of suppressing democracy or the political aspirations of the lower class.⁴ This is not, of course, the place for reassessment of

* I thank the staff of the Fitzwilliam Museum for permission to study the inscription and in particular Dr David Gill, then Assistant in Research (Dept. of Antiquities), for his assistance during my visit. I am most grateful to F. W. Walbank and L. Kallet-Marx for examining the stone with me and discussing its problems, although they should not be thought to have corroborated specific readings; also, to Ch. Kritzas for generously offering information about the unpublished Argive inscription which bears on the date of this text. I thank P. S. Derow, A. M. Eckstein, C. Habicht, B. Jordan and R. Renehan for their comments on drafts of this paper and many helpful suggestions; they must not be thought to subscribe to any of the views presented here, and all faults that remain are, of course, entirely my own. Smith College, then my home institution, provided a grant which enabled me to visit Cambridge. An early version of this paper was read at the meeting of the American Philological Association in December, 1987.

¹ Syll.³ 684 = Sherkr, *RDGE* 43 = Abbott-Johnson 9.

² J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme* (BEFRA 271; Rome, 1988), pp. 189–90 with n. 228, using information supplied by Ch. Kritzas.

³ See esp. S. Accame, *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto* (Rome, 1946), pp. 1–15, who adduces the Dyme inscription at pp. 9–10, 33–4, 149–53. The inscription has played a significant role in the debate over Accame's thesis that the defeated states in the Achaean War were appended to a formally constituted province of Macedonia: see, against Accame, T. Schwertfeger, *Der Achaïsche Bund von 146 bis 27 v. Chr.* (Munich, 1974), pp. 70–2, and E. S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley, 1984), p. 524; and, in favour of Accame's hypothesis, W. Dahlheim, *Gewalt und Herrschaft* (Berlin, 1977), pp. 124–30; R. Bernhardt, 'Der Status des 146 v. Chr. unterworfenen Teils Griechenlands bis zur Einrichtung der Provinz Achaia', *Historia* 26 (1977), 62–73; D. W. Baronowski, 'Greece after 146 B.C.: Provincial Status and Roman Tribute', in J. Fossey (ed.), *Συνεισφορά McGill 1: Papers in Greek Archaeology and History in Memory of Colin D. Gordon* (McGill Monogr. Class. Arch. Hist. 6; Amsterdam, 1987), pp. 125–38, and 'The Provincial Status of Mainland Greece after 146 B.C.: A Criticism of Erich Gruen's Views', *Klio* 70 (1988), 448–60; Ferrary, op. cit., 199–209. A new hypothesis is presented in my *Hegemony to Empire. The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East, 148–62 B.C.* (University of California Press, forthcoming 1995), chapters 1–2.

⁴ See esp. A. Fuks, 'Social Revolution in Dyme in 116–114 B.C.E.', *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 23 (1972), 21–7 = *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece* (Leiden, 1984), pp. 282–8 (citations below will be to the latter); also M. I. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic*

these old, complex controversies. My purpose here is rather to show that interpretation of the letter of Fabius Maximus has not always been sufficiently mindful of the many obscurities of the text and, consequently, of the events that lie behind it; too often the great lacunae in our knowledge have been filled with assumptions that beg the questions that are under debate. Perhaps that is because it has been the fate of this inscription to be briefly noted and discussed in passing in larger historical treatments,⁵ while on the other hand the sole extended analysis of the document as a whole, that of A. Fuks, devotes little attention to the problems of the text and uncertainties of interpretation, which are considerable.⁶ I begin, therefore, with a full text, based on autopsy and a squeeze taken during a visit to the Fitzwilliam Museum on June 20, 1988, followed by commentary on uncertain letters, restorations, difficult words and other textual matters.

I. TEXT, EPIGRAPHICAL COMMENTARY, AND NOTES ON RESTORATIONS AND PROBLEMATIC WORDS

The inscription was discovered in 1797 in the ruins of ancient Dyme and presented to Trinity College, Cambridge, by 'J. Hawkins, Esq. of Bignor Park, Sussex.'⁷ In 1924 it was lent to the Fitzwilliam Museum,⁸ where it is now on display.

P. P. Dobree, *Classical Journal* (London) 30 (1824), 127–9, 139–41 (no. 5) (reprinted in H. J. Rose, *Inscriptiones Graecae Vetustissimae* [Cambridge, 1825] pp. 393–4, 405–7, no. 5); A. Boeckh, *CIG* 1543; E. L. Hicks, *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1882), no. 202; W. Dittenberger, *Syll.* 242, *Syll.*² 316; P. Viereck, *Sermo Graecus* (Göttingen, 1888), pp. 3–5 (no. 4); T. W. Beasley, *CR* 14 (1900), 162–4; Hiller, *Syll.*³ no. 684; F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* (Princeton, 1926), p. 261 (no. 9); R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore, 1969) no. 43; J. and L. Robert, *Bull. Epig.* (1974), 262.⁹

World (Oxford, 1941), pp. 757, 1508–9; J. Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland, 217–86 v. Chr.* (Berlin, 1971) pp. 243–4; Schwertfeger, op. cit., 66–7; M. H. Crawford, 'Rome and the Greek World: Economic Relationships', *EconHistRev* 30² (1977), 45–6; G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 306–7; Baronowski, *Klio* 70 (1988), 454.

⁵ Further noteworthy historical treatments are G. Colin, *Rome et la Grèce de 200 à 146 av. J.-C.* (Paris, 1905), pp. 654–5; Larsen, op. cit., p. 503; D. Asheri, *Leggi greche sul problema dei debiti* (Studi Classici e orientali 18, Pisa, 1969), p. 97; Schwertfeger, op. cit., pp. 66–7, 70–1; E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*² 2 (Nancy, 1982) p. 398; R. Bernhardt, *Polis und Herrschaft in der späten Republik (149–31 v. Chr.)* (Untersuch. ant. Lit. Gesch. 21; Berlin, 1985), pp. 222–3; Ferrary, op. cit., pp. 186–99.

⁶ Fuks, op. cit. Ferrary's good discussion focuses on the evidence of the document for Rome's pose as Liberator of the Greeks.

⁷ P. P. Dobree, 'Greek Inscriptions from the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge,' *Classical Journal* (London) 30 (1824), 139.

⁸ See *AR* 1970–71, p. 77.

⁹ This list includes only those publications relevant to establishing the text. Historical treatments are cited above, nn. 3–5. Photograph in *Oxford History of the Classical World* (Oxford, 1986), 431. English translations are available in N. Lewis and M. Reinhold, *Roman Civilization I. Selected Readings: The Republic and the Augustan Age* (New York, 1990), no. 127; R. S. Bagnall and P. S. Derow, *Greek Historical Documents: The Hellenistic Period* (Chico, Cal. 1981), no. 46; R. K. Sherk, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* (Translated Documents of Greece & Rome 4; Cambridge, 1984), no. 50.

Of the works listed in the lemma, it should be noted that only Dobree, Hicks, Beasley and Sherk appear to have examined the stone. Boeckh used a copy by Müller as well as Dobree's text; Dittenberger, Viereck and Hiller seem to have been entirely dependent on published texts.

(E) Ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Λέωνος, γραμματέ-
 ος τοῦ συνεδρίου Στρατοκλέος·
 Κόιντος Φάβιος Κοίντου Μάξιμος ἀνθύπατος Ῥωμαίων Δυναί-
 ων τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ συνέδροις καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν· τῶν περὶ
 Κυλλάνιον συνέδρων ἐμφανισάντων μοι περὶ τῶν συντελε-
 σθέντων παρ' ὑμῖν ἀδικημάτων, λέγω δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμπρήσε-
 ως καὶ φθορᾶς τῶν ἀρχ(εί)ων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων γραμμάτων, ὧν ἐγε-
 γόνηι ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ὄλης συγχύσεως Σώσος Ταυρομένεος ὁ
 καὶ τοὺς νόμους γράψας ὑπεναντίους τῇ ἀποδοθείσῃ τοῖς
 [A]χαιοῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων πολιτ[εί]αι, περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος διτ[η]λο-
 μῆν ἐν Πά[τρ]αις μετὰ τοῦ παρόν[το]ς συμβουλίου· ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ διαπρα-
 ξάμενοι ταῦτα ἐφαίνοντό μοι τῆς χειρίστης κ[α]ταστ[ά]σεως
 [κ]αὶ ταραχῆς ΚΑ[. . . 6-7. . .] ποιούμενοι [. . . . 13-14. . .] [IN οὐ μὲ-
 νον. . .] τῆς πρ[ὸ]σάλληλου[s] ἀσυναλαξ[ί]ας καὶ ΧΡΕ[. . . 8-9. . .]
 [2-3]Α ἀλλὰ καὶ [τ]ῆς ἀποδομένης κατὰ [κ]λιῶν τοῖς Ἑλλη[σιν ἐ-]
 λευθερίας ἀλλότρια καὶ τῆ[σ] ἡμετέ[ρα]ς προαιρέσεως, ἐγὼ πα-
 ρασχομένων τῶν κατηγορῶν ἀληθινὰς ἀποδείξεις Σώ-
 σον μὲν τὸν γεγονότα ἀρχηγὸν [τ]ῶν πραχθέντων καὶ νο-
 μογραφῆσαντα ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς ἀποδοθείσης πολιτεί-
 [α]ς, κρίνας ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτῳ, πα[ρ]εχώρισα, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ
 [2-3]μίσικον Ἐχθεθένοσ τῶν δαμοργῶν τὸν συμπράξαντα
 τοῖς ἐμπρήσασι τὰ ἀρχεῖα καὶ τὰ δημόσια γράμματα, ἐπεὶ καὶ
 [αὐτὸ]ς ὠμολόγησεν· Τιμόθεον δὲ Νικέα τὸμ μετὰ τοῦ Σώσου
 [γεγονό]τα νομογράφον, ἐπεὶ ἔλασσον ἐφαίνετο ἡδικηκῶσ, ἐ-
 [. . . 6. . .] προάγειν εἰς Ῥώμην ὀρκίσας, ἐφ' ὧν τῇ νομηνίαι τοῦ ἐν-
 [άτου μνη]δὸς ἔστα[ι] ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐμφανίσας τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων στρατη-
 γῶν . . . ΓΑΜ[. . .] πρῶτότερον ἐπάγεισιν εἰς οἶκον ἐὰν μ]ῆ ΑΥ[. . .]

1. The first two lines, with the exception of the E in the first letter-space of line 1, are carved in larger letters (0.14–0.16 m) than those of the rest of the inscription (0.08–0.10 m). The E at the beginning of line 1, however, is carved on the smaller scale used in the body of the text; it is almost certainly a false start by the mason. The *Theokolos* was the eponymous official of Dyme: See now R. K. Sherk, *ZPE* 83 (1990), 258.

3. *Κόιντος Φάβιος Κοίντου Μάξιμος ἀνθύπατος Ῥωμαίων*: On the identity of this Q. Fabius Q.f. Maximus and his official position, see below, section II, p. 13ff.

7. *ΑΡΧΩΝ* is clearly a slip for *ἀρχείων*, as line 22 shows. *Ἀρχεῖα* denotes both the place where the records are kept and the collection of records itself (cf. Dziatzko, *RE* 2 [1895], 553–4), while *τὰ δημόσια γράμματα* are the individual public records themselves, including laws (G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* i.457). Fuks's distinction (op. cit., p. 286) between 'private agreements and contracts' (*ἀρχεῖα*) and public ones (*δημόσια γράμματα*) is unfounded.

8. *τῆς ὄλης συγχύσεως*: Note that Fabius calls the affair *σύγχυσις*, not *στάσις* or *κίνημα/κίνησις*, the usual words for revolutionary violence in our main source of second-century historical prose, Polybius.¹⁰ *Σύγχυσις*, on the other hand, is in

¹⁰ For *κίνημα/κίνησις*, see Plb. 2.39.2; 4.23.1, 5; 4.35.1; 5.25.7; 5.29.3; 5.50.2; 5.54.13; esp. 15.25.37. Curiously, *νεωτερισμός* (cf. Sherk, *RDGE* 40, line 24) is avoided by Polybius except in its verbal form: 5.29.9; 7.3.6. On Polybius's typology of revolution, D. Mendels, 'Polybius and the Socio-Economic Revolution in Greece (227–146 B.C.)', *AntClass* 51 (1982), 86–110, is informative.

Polybius nothing more specific than confused disorder or disturbance (14.5.8; 15.25.8; 30.22.7).¹¹

10. The *politeia* 'restored to the Achaeans by the Romans' (also lines 19–20) is evidently identical to τὴν δεδομένην πολιτείαν mentioned by Polybius (39.5.3; also τῆ πολιτεία καὶ τοῖς νόμοις, §2) as a product of Mummius's settlement in 146/145. Laws handed down by Mummius and the senatorial commission seem to be mentioned in a Nemean inscription (*SEG* 23.180, lines 9–13; cf. D. Bradeen, *Hesperia* 35 [1966], 327); these may have regulated interstate justice, as did the laws Polybius himself drew up in cooperation with the commission (39.5.5). Pausanias adds a (short-lived) abolition of rights of ownership of foreign land and a property requirement for magistrates (7.16.9). Some have thought that a *politeia* for 'the Achaeans' must be a federal organization,¹² but this is very dubious.¹³

In the same sentence in which Pausanias mentions the property requirement for magistrates he asserts that Mummius 'was suppressing democracies': ὡς δὲ ἀφίκοντο οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ [sc. Μομμίῳ] βουλευσόμενοι, ἐνταῦθα δημοκρατίας μὲν κατέπαυε, καθίστα δὲ ἀπὸ τμημάτων τὰς ἀρχάς (7.16.9). This has led to the notion that the Romans imposed 'timocratic' constitutions on conquered Greece, which has in turn induced editors and commentators to divine that the alleged subversion of the 'politeia restored to the Achaeans' in Dyme was in essence a 'democratic' reaction against the putative timocracy.¹⁴ But Pausanias's assertion appears in a passage that is riddled with errors and goes far beyond our other evidence.¹⁵ Bernhardt (op. cit., p. 221) plausibly supposes that the Roman *politeia* in Achaea remained democratic in the contemporary sense. Ferrary (op. cit., pp. 190–99) draws attention to Fabius's suggestion, by use of the phrase ἡ ἀποδοθείση πολιτεία (lines 9–10, 19–20), that the Romans had brought a return to traditional, that is 'democratic,' government.

Of the dotted *O*, only the top of the circle is preserved.

10–11. διτ[λ]θ[ο]μεν ἐν Πάτραις, Dobree. Hicks, Beasley and Sherk read διτ[λ]θ[ο]μεν ἐν [Π]άτραις. At present the stone is broken just to the left of the letters ΤΡΑΙΣ,

¹¹ The *LSJ* cites the Dyme inscription for the meaning 'confusion' (s.v. σύγχυσις, III.2), as well as *Acta* 19:29 (disturbance at Ephesus).

¹² So Accame, op. cit., pp. 150–51, and Schwertfeger, op. cit., pp. 24–5.

¹³ F. W. Walbank, *Historical Commentary on Polybius* iii.734–5, and *CR* 26 (1976), 238; Ferrary, op. cit., p. 191, n. 235.

¹⁴ The conjecture was especially common among the early editors (Boeckh, Viereck, Hicks, and Beasley; cf. Colin, op. cit., p. 655); among modern treatments, the link is made most directly by Accame, op. cit., p. 150; Schwertfeger, op. cit., pp. 65–7; Fuks, op. cit., p. 285; De Ste. Croix, op. cit., pp. 307, 525; Baronowski, *Klio* 70 (1988), 453–4. See further below, p. 21.

¹⁵ For an introduction to the problems of the entire passage, see Schwertfeger, op. cit., pp. 65–72; Gruen, op. cit., pp. 523–6; Ferrary, op. cit., pp. 199–209; Baronowski, *Klio* 70 (1988), 454–8 offers a defence. Pausanias's authority is diminished by at least two major errors (the statements that after Mummius the Romans regularly assigned a magistrate to Achaea and that the Achaean War concluded in the 160th Olympiad: 140–137) and very probably—if my arguments in *Hegemony to Empire*, chapter 3, are sound—another (the claim that Greece paid tribute to Rome from 146). Other serious errors appear in his survey of the history of the Achaean League: see Ferrary, op. cit., p. 201, n. 264. J. Touloumakos's exhaustive examination of the constitutional structure of Greek states has shown that there is little if any epigraphic evidence for noteworthy change around the middle of the second century B.C. ('Der Einfluß Roms auf die Staatsform der griechischen Stadtstaaten des Festlandes und der Inseln im ersten und zweiten Jhd. v. Chr.' [Diss. Göttingen, 1967], pp. 1–12), a finding that has weight even if it is not decisive (Schwertfeger, op. cit., pp. 65–6, and J. and L. Robert, *BE* [1969], 82). Ferrary is probably right to conjecture that the claim that Mummius suppressed democracies is merely Pausanias's (over) interpretation of the import of the new census-requirement (op. cit., p. 194), on which see below, n. 71. Even De Ste. Croix (op. cit., p. 525) concedes that Pausanias's assertion should only be understood 'in a very qualified sense.'

the fracture running along the bottom of the letter-spaces to the left. As this agrees precisely with the texts and facsimiles of Dobree and Boeckh, the earliest witnesses to the text, I can only conclude that Hicks misplaced his brackets and was followed in his ‘reading’ by Beasley and Sherk. The termination *ΤΡΑΙΣ*, however, appears to assure Dobree’s restoration. Patrae is 24 km northeast along the coastal highway from the site of ancient Dyme. For Patrae after 146, see Accame, *op. cit.*, pp. 153–6, and Schwertfeger, *op. cit.*, pp. 60–61.

συμβουλίου: *Consilium*: probably the personal advisory council on which Roman commanders in the field regularly relied. See e.g. *Syll.*³ 741 = Sherk, *RDGE* 48, lines 3–8; *Syll.*³ 747 = Sherk, *RDGE* 23, lines 29, 39, 42–3, 55–6;¹⁶ and (*συνέδριον*) Plb. 11.26.2–3; 14.9.1–2; 21.14; 27.8.6–10, with Walbank, *HCP* ii.428. Only considerably later do we hear of a special *consilium* formed *ad hoc* by a provincial governor in the East for a particular trial: Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.72–6.

The bottom part of a vertical stroke is preserved of the dotted P.

12. Of the dotted E, only a small nick corresponding to its upper left-hand corner remains; too little is preserved even to determine whether the stroke was diagonal or vertical.

In the first letter-space after the K, no original surface remains. Earlier editors were of two minds as to whether an A could be read therein. Boeckh and Sherk print a certain A; Dobree an uncertain A; Hicks encloses A in brackets.

13–15. A break across the stone at this point, where Fabius’s judicial rationale is given, has left three large gaps in lines 13–15 which have long exercised editors’ ingenuity and historians’ imagination. The version with which scholars are now acquainted through its appearance in the *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* and Sherk’s *Roman Documents From the Greek East*, and on which all modern historical discussion is based, is that of Beasley, published in 1900. I give the entire causal clause (lines 11–16) as it is restored in those two corpora, but maintaining the placement of brackets and dotted letters as I have specified above:

ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ διαπρα-	12
[ξά]μενοι ταῦτα ἐφαίνοντό μοι τῆς χειρίστης κατασ[τ]άσεως	
[καὶ παραχῆς κατασκευῆν] ποιούμενοι [τοῖς Ἑλλησι πάσιν] οὐ μόνον γὰρ τῆς [πρό]ς ἀλλήλου[ς] ἀσυναλλαξ[ία]ς καὶ χρε[ω]κοπίας οἰ-	
[κεῖ]α, ¹⁷ ἀλλὰ καὶ [τῆ]ς ἀποδοδομένης κατὰ [κ]οινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλη[σιν ἐ]-	15
λευθερίας ἀλλότρια καὶ τῆ[ς] ἡμετέ[ρα]ς προαιρέσεως· ἐγ[ώ] κτλ.]	

But the pleasure of seeing continuous prose gives way to doubts when one attempts to read it. In this restoration, a long and intrusive parenthesis (starting with οὐ μόνον [lines 13/14] and ending with προαιρέσεως [line 16]), which however lacks a main verb and indeed a clear indication of its subject,¹⁸ awkwardly interrupts the link between subordinate, causal clause (starting with ἐπεὶ οὖν, line 12) and the main clause (beginning with ἐγώ, line 16). J. Robert rightly comments, ‘dans le document... on a été arrêté par d’assez nombreuses difficultés... spécialement aux lignes 13–15, dont la construction ne se comprend pas, bien que les éditeurs n’aient pas pourvu les restitutions même d’un point d’interrogation.’¹⁹ Indeed, the restorations supplied for the long gaps in lines 13 and 14/15 have only been asserted

¹⁶ Further epigraphic references in Sherk’s index, *RDGE*, s.v. *συμβούλιον*.

¹⁷ Beasley printed οἰκεία and ἀλλοτρία, thus making both fem. sing., presumably agreeing with παρασκευῆν. Hiller and Sherk, however, accent as above, presumably in agreement with ταῦτα.

¹⁸ See above, n. 17.

¹⁹ *BE* (1974), 262.

and never explicitly defended. In what follows, I shall take a consistently sceptical view of all attempts to restore these lines. The object of restoration is not to show what may have appeared, but what did appear on the stone; and in my view, the gaps are simply too long, in the absence of formulaic language or clear parallels, for the restoration of these lines to be more than arbitrary.

13. The bottom of the right diagonal stroke of an *A* or *Λ* appears to be preserved at the left edge of the preserved portion of the stone.

KA[.6-7.]: Of the various possibilities suggested for filling this gap (*κατασκευήν*, Colin: *καταβολήν*, Viereck: *κατάπειραν*, Dobree), only Viereck's proposal seems to fit the space. *καταρχήν* would, however, be equally possible. For *καταβολήν ποιείσθαι* = to lay the foundation (for something), compare Plb. 13.6.2 *καταβολήν δ' ἐποιεῖτο καὶ θεμέλιον ὑπεβάλλετο... τυραννίδος*.

A full vertical stroke, not previously noted, is preserved just to the right of *OIOYMENO*, but its right side is broken away. I distinguish no traces in the space before these letters, but Hicks and Sherk read there a certain *Π*, which was not noted by Dobree and Boeckh.

[*τοῖς Ἑλλησι πάσιν* Wilamowitz (apud Viereck): [*ἦ κολαστέα ἐστίν* Dobree. Dobree's conjecture is probably too short for the space; Wilamowitz's, although it would fit the space, is too bold.²⁰ The appearance of *τοῖς Ἑλλησι*] two lines below, referring to a different event (the Roman 'restoration of freedom to the Greeks'), does not require its appearance here as well – indeed, it would seem otiose. A verb is badly wanted to govern the clause or clauses that follow. The letters *IN* which follow the gap might form part of [---*ἐστίν*] (*Ferrary* suggests [*ἦ ἐστίν*] [op. cit., p. 188 n. 221]) or of an active infinitive; again [---*ἐν ὑμῖν*] is attractive if *πρὸς ἀλλήλους* in line 14 is to be taken to refer to Dymaeans in general, not merely *οἱ διαπραξάμενοι ταῦτα*. But speculation seems fruitless.

13-14. *οὐ μό[νον ὡς]* Dobree: *οὐ μό|[νον ἄτε]* Boeckh: *οὐ μό|[νον γάρ]* Wilamowitz. The gap near the beginning of line 14 is unlikely to have accommodated more than four letters; *γάρ*, in addition to its length, has the further disadvantage of interrupting the link between causal clause (*ἐπεὶ οὖν*, line 11) and main clause (*ἐγὼ κτλ.*, line 16). After *οὐ μόνον*, some two-letter word such as *δὲ*, *ἐκ*, *τὰ*, or *τε* seems most probable.

Only part of the dotted *O* is extant.

14. *τῆς πρ[ὸς ἀ]λλή[λου]ς οὐ[σ]α συναλλ[αγῆς]* Dobree, Boeckh: *τῆς πρ[ὸς ἀ]λλή[λ]ου[ς] {α} συναλλ[αγῆς]* Dittenberger: *τῆς πρ[ὸς ἀ]λλήλου[ς] <οὐ>α συναλλ[αγῆ]ς* Hicks: *τῆς πρ[ὸς ἀ]λλήλου[ς] ἀσυναλλ[αξί]ας* Beasley: *τῆς πρ[ὸς ἀ]λλήλου[ς] ἀσυναλλ[αξί]ας* Sherk. There are numerous cracks resembling strokes in the space corresponding to the *A* of *ἀλλήλους*, but none seems to be part of a letter, *pace* Hicks and Sherk. Dobree's reading of the letter after *ΛΛΗ* as *Σ* forced editors who had not seen the stone (Boeckh, Dittenberger) to assume a mason's error, until Hicks saw that the letter was in fact a *Λ*. This left the difficulty of the *A* following *ἀλλήλους*, which Dittenberger had also dismissed as an error (*Syll.² ad loc.*, n. 7) and Hicks had supposed to be a mistake for *οὐσα*. But Beasley discerned a *Ξ* in the second letter-space after *ΣΥΝΑΛΛ* and saw that the space that followed was too long for *ΗΣ*: *συναλλ[αγῆς]* was now in any case impossible, and he saw that only the exceedingly rare word *ἀσυναλλαξίας* would fit the extant traces, thus elegantly accounting for the recalcitrant *A* as well. I confirm Beasley's reading of a *Ξ*: a top horizontal stroke is fully preserved, with no connecting vertical. The *Σ* of the genitive ending Hicks already noted as present and was dotted by Sherk; I see traces consistent with the bottom right seriph of a *Σ*. Between the *Ξ* and this letter

²⁰ Yet it is a 'supplemento indubbio' according to Accame, op. cit., p. 151.

there is, as Beasley noted, more room than would be filled by a single *H*.²¹ Clear traces of the broken crossbar of the third *A* can also be discerned.

Ἀσυναλλαξία, although an easy coinage, is an exceedingly rare word, appearing, it seems, only once elsewhere in ancient literature, and it has therefore been interpreted very freely. Beasley, who first recognized it on the stone, never clarified what he thought it meant. Translators of the document and historians discussing the text have taken it to denote either hostile relations among citizens, or the abolition or *de facto* lapse of contracts.²² But we can do a little better than this, with the help of the other appearance of the word and the use of its cognates. John of Stobi, in his discussion of the Peripatetic virtues, uses ἀσυναλλαξία to indicate a bad state of character (ἔξις) that is defined by its contrast with the virtue predictably called εὐσυναλλαξία: a particular kind of δικαιοσύνη, according to Stoics and Peripatetics, which operates in the realm of formal, contractual obligations between people and is characterized by a cautious but not overly rigid attitude toward asserting one's rights in such exchanges.²³ Usage of its cognate adjective εὐσυνάλλακτος, however, suggests that εὐσυναλλαξία need not be restricted to formal relations between people but might govern the whole area of social intercourse.²⁴ In John of Stobi's scheme, the vicious extremes on either side of the virtuous mean represented by εὐσυναλλαξία are ἀσυναλλαξία and a state of character which according to John has no name, but is something like an excessive zeal to obtain one's rights to the letter (κατὰ τὸ ἀκριβοδίκαιον εἶναι πως). For John, then, ἀσυναλλαξία must be an attitude characterized by shunning such exchanges altogether; again, the use of the cognate adjective implies a rather wider scope for the word than the area of formal obligations.²⁵ LSJ's definition, 'lack of intercourse', is therefore suitably broad. Returning to the inscription, we find that this meaning suits the context well. Fabius does not appear to be speaking of any specific act in line 14 (such as cancellation of contracts), but to a potential or actual condition among the citizens of the city (πρὸς ἀλλήλους). An illuminating parallel for the sort of complaint he is likely to be making

²¹ From the left edge of the upper horizontal stroke of the *E* to the left edge of the *K* that follows is a space of 0.04 m. The combination *H* and *S* with one other letter nowhere occupies more than 0.037 m on the preserved portion of this text (the average is about 0.034 m); nor is the space allotted to the letters of this line especially great.

²² Sherck: 'lack of good relations with each other'; Bagnall and Derow: 'a state of mutual disaffection'; Colin: 'irréconciliables haines intestines' (so too Accame). Rostovtzeff: 'cancellation of contracts' (p. 757), 'abolition of συναλλάγματα' (p. 1509); so too Fuks, *op. cit.*, pp. 287–8, who saw this as far more radical than cancellation merely of debts. Asheri, *op. cit.*, p. 96: 'inadempimento di contratti'; Ferrary, *op. cit.*, 187–8: 'le non-respect des contrats', comparing (at the suggestion of P. Gauthier) *JCr* I.19.3, lines 16–19, esp τῶν ποτ' ἀλλάδος συναλλαγμάτων πάντων ἐν ταραχαῖ τε καὶ διχοστασίαι τῆι μεγίσται κειμένων (188 n. 222). See Asheri, *op. cit.*, pp. 95–7 on cessation of judicial enforcement of debt. De Ste. Croix, *op. cit.*, p. 307, has it both ways: 'cancellation of debts and other contracts'; 'disregard of contractual obligations'.

²³ Stob. *Ecl.* 2.147 W εὐσυναλλαξίαν δὲ ἔξιν εὐλαβητικὴν τῆς ἐν τοῖς συμβολαίοις ἀδικίας, μεταξὺ ἀσυναλλαξίας οὖσαν καὶ ἀνανύμου (τὴν δὲ ἀνανύμου κατὰ τὸ ἀκριβοδίκαιον εἶναι πως). See *id.* 2.62 W = *SVF* iii. 264 εὐσυναλλαξίαν δὲ ἐπιστήμημν τοῦ συναλλάττειν ἀμέμπτως τοῖς πλῆσιον. [Andron.] *Peri Path.* 254.28–255.40 = *SVF* iii. 273 εὐσυναλλαξία δὲ ἔξις ἐν συναλλαγῆι φυλάττουσα τὸ δίκαιον. *LSJ*: 'Fair dealing'.

²⁴ Plut. *Mor.* 42F (listeners who make a lecturer digress or interrupt him with questions) οὐχ ἡδεῖς οὐδ' εὐσυνάλλακτοι πρὸς ἀκρόασιν. Compare John Chrys. *Fragmenta in Job* 64.513. *LSJ*: 'Easy to deal with'.

²⁵ Dion. Hal. 1.41.1: Heracles associated Greeks and barbarians, mainlanders with coastal dwellers, οἱ τῶς ἀπίστους καὶ ἀσυναλλάκτους εἶχον ὁμίλιας; 5.66.3 (quoted below, p. 8). Plut. *Mor.* 416E ἀνεπίμικτα τὰ τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ποιοῦσι καὶ ἀσυνάλλακτα. *LSJ*: 'Without intercourse; unsociable'.

is provided by a passage of Dionysius of Halicarnassus's *Roman Antiquities*, in which a proposal for debt-relief is attacked by Ap. Claudius Sabinus as an ill-considered gift to the poor δι' ἣν ἀσυνάλλακτος ὁ κοινὸς ἔσται βίος καὶ μισάλληλος καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων χρεῶν, ὧν χωρὶς οὐκ ἔνεστιν οἰκείσθαι τὰς πόλεις, ἐνδεής (5.66.3). Whether debts were involved in the disturbance at Dyme or not we do not strictly know (see below), but in any case the burning of archives alone would provide a sufficient basis for a charge that the orderly exchange of services and obligations between citizens was being, or had been, undermined. According to Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*, a standard argument for those who wished to uphold the strict terms of a contract was that if contracts were not enforced all mutual intercourse would be abolished.²⁶ Nor dissimilar is Cicero's view of the consequences for civil societies, which are founded above all on the secure possession of private property, if *fides* is overthrown by political proposals for the remission of debts.²⁷

Dobree's restoration of the rest of line 14 as χρ[είας τῆς κατ' ἰδίαν] survived until Beasley saw the traces of an *A* at the left edge of line 15. Beasley was induced by a suggestion of Foucart to restore lines 14–15 as χρ[εωκοπίας] οἰκεία ('or some such word'), and the supplement passed without discussion into the standard editions without so much as a query. The further inference that a cancellation of debts actually took place at Dyme has been almost universally drawn.²⁸ But our concern is now only with the text, not yet with the historical reality behind it; we shall see below (p. 21f.) that at the distance of more than two thousand years the intentions of archive-burners cannot be easily divined from the fact of the event alone. Caution is salutary. Records of debt are not the only kind of document that resided in archives,²⁹ and nowhere in the preserved portions of our text are debts even mentioned; laws, on the other hand, are. Further, it is awkward to construe χρεωκοπία (an event) in a strict parallel construction with ἀσυναλλαξία (a condition), both dependent on the same adjective (οἰκεία); in any case, it does not help the case that χρεωκοπία is not attested in extant literature before the late first century B.C.³⁰ Finally, the extant letters on the stone—*XPE*—are consistent with other words. In this context, χρεῖα(-ι) is particularly apt, especially in its sense of 'a relation of business or intercourse.'³¹ We have already seen how Dionysius's speaker identified the life that was ἀσυνάλλακτος with that which was τῶν ἀναγκαίων χρεῶν ἐνδεής, and how Aristotle's champion of the strict observation of contracts would naturally claim that neglect of their terms would abolish ἡ πρὸς ἀλλήλους χρεῖα τῶν ἀνθρώπων.³² But the lack of clear parallels makes attempts to champion particular

²⁶ Arist. *Rhet.* 1376b, 1.15.22 ἔτι δὲ πράττεται τὰ πολλὰ τῶν συναλλαγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἐκούσια κατὰ συνθήκας, ὥστε ἀκύρων γιγνομένων ἀναιρεῖται ἢ πρὸς ἀλλήλους χρεῖα τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

²⁷ See esp. *Off.* 2.72–85 and N. Wood, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought* (Berkeley, 1988), pp. 123–32, 202–4.

²⁸ The noteworthy exception is Asheri, op. cit., p. 97, with n. 62. On the inference, see further below, p. 21.

²⁹ See generally E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, 1972), pp. 91–117, and Dziatzko, 'Archive', *RE* 2 (1895), 553–64.

³⁰ *Χρεωκοπία/χρεοκοπία* (for the Classical phrase χρεῶν ἀποκοπή [-αί]) seems to appear first in extant literature in writers of the Augustan period (Dion. Hal. 5.67.5, 6.38.2; Diod. 29.33 [following Polybius, but there is no assurance that the phrasing is his]; the verbal cognate χρεοκοποῦντες in Strabo 8.3.29).

³¹ *LSJ*, s.v., IV.
³² Above, n. 26. A noteworthy association of συναλλάγματα and χρεῖα in Arist. *EN* 1178a, 10.8.1 δίκαια γὰρ καὶ ἀνδρεία καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους πράττομεν ἐν συναλλάγμασι καὶ χρεῖαις καὶ πράξεσι παντοίαις ἐν τε τοῖς πάθεσι διατηροῦντες τὸ πρέπον ἐκάστω, ταῦτα δ' εἶναι φαίνεται πάντα ἀνθρωπικά.

ways of filling the lacuna equally idle. The central point is that it is injudicious to 'restore' into a text a specific historical reference such as *χρεωκοπία* (rather than regular and predictable formulae) that is not necessitated by what remains on the stone.

15. As Beasley noted, the bottom part of a right diagonal stroke is preserved at the left edge of the stone; only *Λ* or *Α* is epigraphically possible.

Of the two dotted lambdas at the end of the line, only the bottom tips of two vertical or diagonal strokes, each toward the left of its letter-space, are now discernible. The original editors, Dobree and Boeckh, give in their copies what corresponds to **Ελλ[ησιw--]*. Hicks, followed by Sherk, apparently saw an *H* as well and printed **Ελλη[σιw--]*; it is now invisible.

15–16. *τῆς ἀποδεδομένης κατὰ κοινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλησιw ἐλευθερίας ἀλλότρια*: The phrase is valuable evidence, as has long been known, of the continuing claim of the Romans to be the liberators of Greece, even after the Achaean War.³³

16. I accent *ἀλλότρια* in the neuter plural for convenience, but of course the fem. nom. sing. (*ἀλλοτρία*: so Beasley) cannot be rejected out of hand. *Ἀλλοτριότης* in contemporary political discourse often implies hostility: below, p. 24.

18–19. *νομογραφῆσαντα*; cf. 23–24 *τὸμ μετὰ τοῦ Σώσου| [γεγονό]τα νομογράφον*: Sosus and Timotheus had been *nomographoi*, doubtless of Dyme rather than a (dubious) reconstituted League (below, p. 11). For *nomographoi*, both federal and local, cf. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* i.462–3, and Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* ii.1561, 1572, n. 6; Larsen, op. cit., pp. xxiv (nn. 1–2), 209, 235.

20. Editors, commentators and translators have disagreed over which verb *παρεχώρισα* represents, whether *θανάτω* is to be taken with it or with *ἔνοχον εἶναι*, and even over the sense: Although those who have discussed the inscription recently have understood the meaning to be that Fabius ordered the man executed, some have thought that the verb refers to an order of exile;³⁴ yet neither usage is paralleled. A deeper investigation is clearly warranted.³⁵

The phrase *ἔνοχον εἶναι* + penalty in the dative or genitive is a regular usage,³⁶ in view of which the word order here would seem to favour construing *θανάτω* with it unless one is obliged to do otherwise. As for what follows, it is surely possible that *παρεχώρισα* is an itacized aorist form of *παραχωρῶ* (*παρεχώρ(η)σα*).³⁷ Itacism of

³³ See Gruen, op. cit., pp. 132–57, esp. 155, and Ferrary, op. cit., pp. 5–218, esp. 186–209. The effort of Bernhardt (*Historia* 26 [1977], 62–73) to define this freedom formally and within narrow limits rather obscures the rhetorical function of the claim: see Ferrary, op. cit., p. 197.

³⁴ The minority view originates with Colin ('je l'ai fait déporter') and is adopted in Accame's influential treatment (op. cit., pp. 9, 151: 'condanna a morte e fa deportare'). For the prevailing view, see *LSJ* s.v. *παραχωρίζω*, and e.g. Viereck ('Q. Fabius de Soso et Phormisco supplicium sumpsit'), Beasley ('Sosus was condemned to death'), H. von Herwerden, *Lexicon graecum suppletorium et dialecticum*² (Leiden, 1902), 1116 ('morti concessi, pro *παρέδωκα*, tradidi'), a translation evidently favoured by Hiller in the *Syll.*³ (n. 13), and the translations cited above, n. 9: 'I adjudged Sosus to be guilty and condemned him to death' (Lewis-Reinhold); 'I have judged to be guilty and condemned to death Sosus' (Bagnall-Derow); 'I judged him to be guilty and sentenced him to death' (Sherk). Ferrary translates 'j'ai jugé que Sósos... était passible de la peine de mort, et je l'ai fait exécuter' (op. cit., p. 188).

³⁵ R. Renehan drew my attention to the problem posed by *παρεχώρισα*. Most of what follows derives directly or indirectly from discussion of this word with him, but he is naturally innocent of the result.

³⁶ *LSJ* s.v. *ἔνοχος*, II.2. The phrase appears with the penalty in the dative or in the genitive: for both usages in the same author, cf. Diod. 14.6.1 and 27.4.7.

³⁷ So Dobree, Boeckh, Hicks and Beasley. Viereck: 'sed ne hoc quidem graecum esset.' Herwerden, op. cit., offering 'concessi' as a Latin translation of *παρεχώρισα*, would appear to have thought this to be a form of *παραχωρῶ*.

παρεχώρησα in speech is certainly possible in this period,³⁸ but it must be noted that *H* is maintained elsewhere in the inscription, including three other weak aorists in *-ησ-* (lines 19, 22, 23); if derived from *παραχωρῶ*, the form on the stone would have to be a mason's error, perhaps influenced by the contemporary shift in pronunciation.³⁹ *Παραχωρῶ* implies concession; *Σῶσον μὲν... παρεχώρ(η)σα* would mean 'I gave up' or 'surrendered Sosus.'⁴⁰ It would, I think, be impossible to take *θανάτῳ* as the 'recipient' of the concession: 'I yielded him up to death'⁴¹ would be an oddly poetical form of expression for a Roman official to whom coolly efficient phrases like *ad supplicium tradere, dedere, duci iubere* were native.⁴² Nor is the aspect of concession at all apposite toward the lictor, who would have been the actual executioner. If we are to read *παρεχώρ(η)σα*, I see no alternative to supposing that Fabius 'gave up' Sosus to his Dymaeon accusers, who had proven that he merited a sentence of death, to execute the punishment. A parallel might be extracted from the punishment of two Boeotian politicians in 172, following their condemnation at Chalcis by Roman legates touring Greece during the prelude to war with King Perseus.⁴³ Although our knowledge of this affair is lacunose, *prima facie* it appears that they were punished by Greeks, not Romans.⁴⁴

Παρεχώρισα may, of course, simply be the aorist of *παραχωρίζω*;⁴⁵ then the difficulty arises that this compound of *χωρίζω* does not seem to be otherwise attested before a *logos* in the collection ascribed to Pseudo-Macarius that dates to the fourth or fifth century after Christ.⁴⁶ The meaning remains difficult in the absence of good parallels, but in the passage of Pseudo-Macarius it evidently means 'put' or 'set

³⁸ On the phenomenon in this period, see V. Bubenik, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area* (Amsterdam, 1989), pp. 186, 217–18, 237–8. In Ptolemaic papyri: E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* 1.1² (Berlin, 1970), pp. 51–2.

³⁹ Note other errors in line 1 and 7.

⁴⁰ Cf. *LSJ* s.v. *παραχωρέω*, 4. Usage with an accusative object is exemplified by Plut. *Cic.* 8.6 *οικίαν... τῷ ἀδελφῷ παρεχώρησεν*; *Mor.* 843F *λαχὼν ἐκ τοῦ γένους τὴν ἱερωσύνην καὶ παραχωρήσας τῷ ἀδελφῷ Λυκόφρονι*. A human object in *II Macc.* 8.11 *προκαλούμενος ἐπ' ἀγορασμὸν Ἰουδαίων σωμάτων ὑπισχοούμενος ἐνεθήκοντα σώματα ταλάντου παραχωρήσεν*.

⁴¹ So Herwerden, op. cit.: 'morti concessi,' construing *θανάτῳ* both with *ἐνοχον* and *παρεχώρισα*.

⁴² For these standard phrases, see Cic. *Verr.* II.5.11–12, 66, 166; *Clu.* 181; *Vat.* 21.

⁴³ The affair and its immediate background is related by Plb. 27.1–2 and Livy 42.43.4–44.6. Livy supplies the verdict of the Romans (42.44.6 *auctores regiae societatis decreto suo damnarunt*), which does not appear in our text of Polybius. But this fragment of Polybius, transmitted by the Constantinian excerptors (*De legationibus gentium*), does mention what must be the consequences of condemnation (the flight of one of the men to Macedonia and the imprisonment of two others: 27.2.8–9); the excerptors appear to have skipped over part of Polybius's original text, as they can be seen to have done not infrequently where we can check them in the extant books. Curiously, Livy's record of the legate's verdict is not noted in modern discussions of the embassy; cf. e.g., P. Meloni, *Perseo e la fine della monarchia Macedone* (Cagliari, 1953), p. 199; Deininger, op. cit., pp. 158–9; E. S. Gruen, 'Class Conflict and the Third Macedonian War,' *AJAH* 1 (1976), 44–5; Walbank, *HCP* iii.290–93; P. Roesch, *Études béotiennes* (Paris, 1982), pp. 372–7.

⁴⁴ Plb. 27.2.8 *οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἰσμενίαν καὶ Δικέταν τότε μὲν ἀπήχθησαν εἰς φυλακὴν, μετὰ δὲ τινα χρόνον ἀπῆλλαξαν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν*. Since Polybius has just mentioned the departure from Chalcis of the Roman embassy, it does not appear to be the agent of this action.

⁴⁵ So Dittenberger, *ad Syll.*² 316, n. 10 (comparing the compound *καταχωρίζω*) whose comment is reproduced by Hiller, *Syll.*³ 684, n. 13; *LSJ* s.v. *παραχωρίζω*, 'hand over,' citing only this single example ('condemn to death'), followed by Sherk, for whom *παρεχώρισα* 'is equivalent to *παρέδωκα*' (*RDGE*, app. crit.).

⁴⁶ [Mac. Aeg.] *Sermones* 64 (B) 37.4.8 (Berthold) *ἐν αὐτῷ οὖν ὁρώσι τὴν θεότητα... τὴν μὲν ἀρχαίαν φύσιν φανερώσας, τὰ δὲ παρὰ φύσιν παραχωρίσας, φέρει* [sc. Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς] *τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*.

aside;’ ‘hand over,’ then, the definition of *LSJ* (above, n. 45) based solely on its problematic use in our own inscription, is not quite on the mark. A passage of Seneca may indicate that *παρεχώρισα* is a rendering of the Latin word *seponere*, in the sense of taking a man condemned to death into custody until execution of his sentence.⁴⁷ If so, then by its immediate proximity the entire phrase *ἐνοχον εἶναι θανάτῳ* can be understood to be completing the sense of *παρεχώρισα*: ‘judging him to be punishable by death, I set him aside (sc. for execution).’

What precisely is meant by *κρίνας ἐνοχον εἶναι θανάτῳ παρεχώρισα* will remain somewhat conjectural unless a compelling parallel emerges. However, the view of Colin and Accame that Fabius sent Sosus into exile after sentencing him to death is clearly an inadmissible interpretation of *παρεχώρισα* that suits neither *παραχωρῶ* or *παραχωρίζω*, and would be paradoxical without the insertion of the concessive particle *καίπερ*. It would be of historical interest to know whether Sosus was given up to his accusers or taken into Roman custody, but the intended punishment—death—seems clear enough.

21. [Φορ]μίσκος Boeckh, remarking ‘qui melius sciat, nolit id nobis invidere’ (p. 715). His tentative suggestion is incorporated into the text of Sherk’s edition. However, the name Phormiscus does not seem otherwise to be attested; and among other candidates of the -miscus termination, *Δαμίσκος* or *Λαμίσκος* would suit the spacing better (most probably two rather than three letters before the *M*).⁴⁸

[—]miscus was almost certainly a *damiorgos* of Dyme, rather than of the Achaean League (rightly, Hiller, *Syll.*³ 684, n. 15, against Hicks and Beasley). There is no convincing evidence that the Achaean League was reconstituted by Mummius in 146–145, *pace* Schwertfeger, op. cit., pp. 22–40.⁴⁹ A *damiorgos* mentioned without further qualification in a letter to the ‘magistrates, councillors and city’ of Dyme should be a local official. For *damiorgoi* of individual cities, especially in Achaia and Arcadia, cf. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* i.506–7 (add the Cerynaean *damiorgoi* mentioned in the unpublished inscription mentioned below, p. 13);⁵⁰ *damiorgoi* are known to have been eponymous officials in Argos and at Tritaea, Lousoi, and Orchomenos in Arcadia (Sherk, *ZPE* 83 [1990], 258–9, 262, 264, 265–6).

22. Beasley, Hicks and Sherk print a certain Σ as the first preserved letter of the line, which however was not seen by the earlier editors, and no longer exists. Only the right half of the upper bar of the dotted *E* is preserved.

Sherk did not print the neuter plural definite article before *δημόσια*, although it remains on the stone.

23. The end of the upper right seriph of the dotted Σ survives.

Timotheus’s patronymic can be read fully as *Νικέα*, not *Νικία* as shown in all texts. The inscribed space is too wide for an *I*, and in addition to the full vertical stroke toward the left of the space there are clearly two horizontal strokes extending from

⁴⁷ Sen. Ep. 18.11 *Liberaliora alimenta sunt carceris, sepositos ad capitale supplicium non tam anguste qui occisurus est pascit.*

⁴⁸ See F. Dornseiff (rev. B. Hansen), *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1957) 254. For ‘Damiscus’, see W. Pape (rev. G. E. Benseler), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*³ (Braunschweig 1884) i.268, and F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle, 1917), p. 130; cf. also *SEG* 11.972, line 31; 979, line 53; and the Messenian Damiscus at Paus. 6.2.10–11. For ‘Lamiscus,’ Pape, op. cit., ii.768; Bechtel, op. cit., p. 274; *IG IX.1*² 1, p. Iv, Fl 44; 2.246, line 12; 247, line 11; 582, line 2; *SEG* 26.184, line 28; 26.704, lines 16–17; 34.941, line 7; 35.665, A, lines 10, 14; 38.475, line 9; 38.476, line 5; 38.490, I, line 19.

⁴⁹ See Walbank, *HCP* iii. 735 and my *Hegemony to Empire*, chapter 3.

⁵⁰ Unfortunately I have not been able to obtain Ch. Veligianni-Terzi’s Heidelberg dissertation (1977) ‘Demiurgen. Zur Entwicklung einer Magistratur.’

it to the right. The name Niceas is not uncommon in the Peloponnese and, across the Corinthian Gulf, in Aetolia and West Locris: cf. (e.g.) *IG* IV.1² 97, line 30; V.2 368, lines 87, 94; V.2 395, line 6; IX.1.1² 24, line 31; IX.1.1² 34, line 18; IX.1.1² 71, lines 9, 16; IX.1.1² 102, lines 8, 11; IX.1.3² 640, line 14; IX.1.3² 708, line 1; IX.1.3² 715, lines 7, 8; *SEG* 11.1051; 14.390, line 10; 39.418.⁵¹

24–27. Timotheus was evidently to be detained in Rome, but not, to judge from line 27, indefinitely. Known precedents are Demetrius of Pharos's 'friends' held by the Romans in 215 (Plb. 7.9.14), the Macedonian 'Friends' of Philip demanded in 184 (Plb. 22.14.1–5; Livy 39.34.6), the Aetolian leaders sent to Rome after the defeat at Callicinus/Callinicus in 171 (Livy 42.60.8–10; App. *Mac.* 12; Plb. 20.11.10, 27.15.14, 28.4.6),⁵² and the famous mass of detainees in 167 (Paus. 7.10.7–12; Livy 45.31.3–11, 45.34.9, 45.35.1–2; Plb. 30.7.5–8; 30.13; 30.32.2–7; 32.5.6; Zon. 9.31.1),⁵³ including Polyaratus of Rhodes (Plb. 29.27.9; 30.9.2–19). As in the case of the detainees of 167, the official in Rome who has administrative charge of Timotheus is a praetor (see below on lines 26–7). It is clear that Timotheus was not to be tried in Rome, since he had already been tried by Fabius.⁵⁴ How else could Fabius have ascertained that Timotheus *ἐλασσον ἐφαίνετο ἡδίκηκώς* (line 24)? (Note the chain of parallel clauses, all dependent on *ἐγὼ παρασχομένων τῶν κατηγορῶν ἀθλιῶς ἀποδείξεις* [Σῶσον μὲν... ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ [...] μίσκον... Τιμόθεον δὲ κτλ.]) Polybius's discussion of the Roman demand for Philip's 'Friends' in 184 suggests that a senatorial inquiry of some sort was envisioned on that occasion; but whether or not the deportees of 167 were being sent to Rome to stand trial was evidently a source of confusion even at the time (compare Paus. 7.10.10 with Plb. 30.32.2–7), and in any case no trial or investigation ever occurred, while in the other cases noted above there is no suggestion of an intended trial.

25. The gap at the beginning of the line appears too short for the traditional restoration *ἐ[κέλευσα]*. *ἐ[πέταξα]* with subject accusative is rare but not unknown (LSJ s.v. *ἐπιτάσσω*, I.1), and may have come easily to a Roman (cf. *iubere*).

I read the Ω as certain: the right edge of a circular letter appears along the break in the stone, and the end of the right 'foot' of an Ω emerges below it.

25–26. *ἐν[άτου μηνός]*; Dittenberger. Dittenberger and Beasley suppose that Fabius thus specified the ninth month of the official calendar of the old Achaean League, by which months were designated strictly by ordinal numerals. But perhaps he only designates thereby the beginning of the ninth month hence.

26. τῶ[ι] ἐ[πὶ]: to the right of the *T* part of a circular letter is visible along the break of the stone.

26–27. Specification of the *praetor inter peregrinos* here makes it probable that the praetor mentioned by Polybius as having charge over the Achaean detainees in Rome (31.23.5) was in fact this one, not the *praetor urbanus*, as Walbank, *HCP* iii.496 supposes.

στρατη[γῶι ταῦ]τα [μὴ] πρότερον Dobree: *στρατη*[γῶι ὄρω]ς ἂν [μὴ] πρότερον Boeckh: *στρατη*[γῶι τὸ δόξ]αν, [μὴ] πρότερον Viereck (following a suggestion of Wilamowitz). Of the first letter of the preserved portion of line 27, only a horizontal bar at the top of the space remains. Beasley concluded that 'The line is too mutilated to decide whether we have the remains of a Σ or of a Ε,' but the horizontal bar is not articulated on either end, nor does it slant as do those of sigmas on this inscription;

⁵¹ Cf. Pape, op. cit. ii.1001; Bechtel, op. cit., p. 335.

⁵² See Deininger, op. cit., pp. 168–72.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 191–208.

⁵⁴ Rightly noted by Ferrary, op. cit., p. 313 n. 156, contra Sherck, *RDGE*, p. 248, Deininger, op. cit., p. 244, and Fuks, op. cit., pp. 283, 288.

it should therefore be either a *E* or a *T*. Of the next letter, only the apex of *A* or *Λ* remains. The left vertical stroke of the third letter of the group slants more than those of *N* normally do on this text, and makes *M* somewhat more likely. Dobree's facsimile (reproduced by Boeckh) shows that no more was legible when the text was first published. Dobree's restoration alone is fully consistent with the traces on the stone: *στρατη* | [*γαυ ταυ*] *τα μ[η] π[ρ]ότερον.*

Of the dotted *N* of *ἐπάνεισιν*, only the edge of the upper left corner is preserved. Only the top horizontal bar of the dotted *E* is extant.

AY: Only the upper left part of a diagonal stroke is preserved in the last extant letter-space.

The text may have continued for many more lines: the stele is rather thick (ca. 0.14 m), while our fragments occupy only the top ca. 0.475 m of its front face.

II. THE DATE

For the last half-century it has been generally accepted that the Dyme inscription dates to c. 115. The argument, which we shall consider presently, depends on the identification, from the four available candidates, of the Q. Fabius Q. f. Maximus of our text as Eburnus, consul in 116 and thus available for a proconsulship in Macedonia and Greece in 115. But the recent discovery at Argos of a dossier of letters from Roman magistrates relating to the privileges of Dionysian artists (as yet unpublished) apparently shows that a proconsul of the same name as our Q. Fabius Q. f. Maximus wrote a letter which was forwarded to Sicyon by the *damiourgoi* of Cerynea 'of the second year'—presumably of the 'Achaean Era,' i.e. 144/143 B.C. If that indeed is the meaning of the phrase in the Argive inscription, the only Fabius Maximus available for service in Greece at that time would be Servilianus, the consul of 142, serving as proconsul after his praetorship ca. 145; and if, further, this is the same Fabius as the author of the text from Dyme, our document also should date to ca. 144/143.⁵⁵ Attractive as the argument is, it remains so far only the most plausible of a number of hypotheses, as J.-L. Ferrary, who has now presented it in print in a preliminary fashion, readily acknowledges.⁵⁶ My purpose is to show that even leaving aside the new evidence from Argos, the author of the letter to Dyme can be identified on independent grounds with a high degree of probability as Servilianus, and its date fixed in 144 or 143. The two lines of argument confirm each other and produce in combination a highly probable conclusion.

The four Q. Fabii Q. f. Maximi of the appropriate time period are distinguished by their agnomina Aemilianus (cos. 145), Servilianus (Aemilianus's adoptive brother, cos. 142), and their respective sons Allobrogicus (cos. 121) and Eburnus (cos. 116). Until the middle of this century, Aemilianus and Servilianus were the preferred candidates, since it was presumed that the inscription belonged shortly after the Achaean War,⁵⁷ but for our purposes, of course, this premise would beg the question. It was S. Accame who revived and won general acceptance for the earlier view of

⁵⁵ Information kindly supplied by Dr Ch. Kritzas. See *ArchDelt* (Chron.) 28 (1973), 126 for preliminary notice of this important find.

⁵⁶ Ferrary, *op. cit.*, pp. 189–90, with n. 228.

⁵⁷ Aemilianus: Boeckh and Münzer (*RE* 6 [1909], 1794). (Münzer's argument, however, dissolved upon revision of Sherk 14 = *ICret* III.4.10: see Guarducci's commentary to that stone.) Servilianus: Beasley (p. 163). Hiller's date in *Syll.*³ ('139?'), reproduced without comment by Lewis-Reinhold, depends on Münzer. Colin, however, thought the 140s too early 'pour qu'on puisse déjà regarder comme bien vraisemblables de nouvelles révolutions en Grèce' (*op. cit.*, p. 654, n. 2).

A. W. Zumpt that the author of the letter to Dyme must be, by simple elimination, Eburnus: Aemilianus and Servilianus both served in Spain in the year following their consulships, while Allobrogicus commanded in Gaul, from which it appeared to follow that Eburnus held an otherwise unattested command in Macedonia and Greece immediately after his consulship in 116 and was the proconsul of the inscription, which would therefore date to *c.* 115.⁵⁸ This argument however is flawed by a failure to recognize that an ἀνθύπατος or *pro consule* is the regular title of a commander of praetorian rank who held proconsular *imperium*, as is repeatedly attested in Macedonia and Spain.⁵⁹ The author of the letter to Dyme is, then, not necessarily an ex-consul, and the question of the identity of our Fabius Maximus, and consequently of the date of the inscription, is again thrown open.

It happens that we can exclude all but Servilianus from a command in Macedonia or Greece following the praetorship: Aemilianus served as praetor in Sicily in 149,⁶⁰ Allobrogicus was in Spain following his praetorship,⁶¹ while the praetorian province of Eburnus, though unknown, can hardly have been Macedonia.⁶² Servilianus's praetorship (about which no other evidence survives) will have fallen no later than 145, since he was elected in 143 to the consulship of 142, and one would not want to place much earlier than 145 the praetorship of this *vir nobilissimus*, for whom swift progress to the consulship may be assumed. Servilianus will have been available for the command in Greece during or immediately after a praetorship in 146 or 145.

Between the two possible scenarios separated by almost thirty years, there cannot be much doubt which is preferable. Outside the height of the Scordiscan wars from 114 to 111, when four consuls marched east successively,⁶³ we have no evidence of any consul or consular sent to command in Macedonia or Greece between Mummius and Sulla. The pattern is clear that consuls were only sent to the Balkans in this period when serious military danger threatened. If there had been in 116 a military threat in the southern Balkans sufficiently grave to require—for the first time since Mummius—a consular command, we would have heard about it. On the other hand, a praetorian command for Servilianus after the departure of L. Mummius in the summer of 145 fits the norm perfectly. In order to avoid circularity of argument, I have thus far avoided bringing into the chronological argument any consideration of

⁵⁸ Accame, *op. cit.*, pp. 149–50, followed by Sherk (with a query), and T. R. S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York and Atlanta, 1951–86) ii.644, iii.87–8. Zumpt, *Commentationum epigraphicarum ad antiquitates Romanas pertinentium* 2 (Berlin, 1854), p. 167ff. (*non vidi*) first formulated the argument; see also M. Holleaux, *Hermes* 49 (1914), 583, n. 4, and Στρατηγὸς Ὑπατος (BEFAR 113; Paris, 1918), 15, with n. 1, who saw that Fabius might be of praetorian rank but did not pursue the consequences.

⁵⁹ See, for example, Cn. Cornelius Sisenna (*FD* III.2.70a = *Syll.*³ 705 = *RDGE* 15, lines 59–60), or Cn. Egnatius (*BCH* 98 [1974] 813–16 = *CIL* I² 2977), both praetorian proconsuls of Macedonia. For further examples, see the lists given by W. F. Jashemski, *The Origins and History of the Proconsular and the Propraetorian Imperium to 27 B.C.* (Chicago, 1950). Jashemski (following T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* 2⁹ [Leipzig, 1888], pp. 647–50) believes indeed that all praetors sent to Macedonia were given proconsular imperium. That is doubtful, but does not affect the present argument. ⁶⁰ *MRR* i.458, iii.87. ⁶¹ *MRR* i.514.

⁶² He presided as praetor over the court in which L. Crassus prosecuted C. Carbo, no later than and almost certainly in 119 (*MRR* 1.526); but Cn. Cornelius Sisenna, his praetorian colleague in 119, held Macedonia as praetor and in 118 as proconsul (*ibid.* 1.528 with n. 2). Even if Eburnus's praetorship were to be placed earlier than usual, in 120, he could not have held Macedonia because its commander at that time, almost certainly the immediate predecessor of Sisenna, is known: Sex. Pompeius, killed in action against the Scordisci in 119: *Syll.*⁶ 700 and *MRR* 1.527 n. 3.

⁶³ Namely C. Porcius Cato, C. Caecilius Metellus Caprarius, M. Livius Drusus, and M. Minucius Rufus, the last of whom remained in Macedonia until *c.* 107.

the nature of the events at Dyme, but it may have some confirmatory value to note that the potential for civil disturbance in an Achaean city and for Roman intervention in its resolution was certainly at its highest in the years immediately following the Achaean War of 146, while the Peloponnesians were forced to adapt to the *politeia* imposed by the Roman commissioners.⁶⁴

This line of inquiry reaches a conclusion identical with that based on the evidence of the unpublished Argive inscription. We may regard it as virtually certain that the author of the letter to Dyme was Q. Fabius Q. f. Maximus Servilianus, praetorian proconsul,⁶⁵ and that its date is 144 or 143.⁶⁶

III. INTERPRETING THE DYME *SUNCHUSIS*

It is not difficult to discern the potential for disturbance in Dyme in 144/143. According to Polybius, the cities of the Peloponnese had been in some distress already before the war.⁶⁷ In preparation for war the *strategos* Critolaus had then suspended the legal enforcement of repayment of debts; later, since military action had drained the public funds, Diaeus buttressed the war effort by ordering special financial contributions from the wealthy.⁶⁸ In the fighting in Phocis before the arrival of Mummius, a contingent of troops supplied by the *synteleia* of Patrae, which included Dyme, suffered a particularly noteworthy disaster.⁶⁹ To political and military catastrophe we may add economic dislocation due to the loss of persons and property, the transfer of property of those killed, condemned, or deprived of the right of land-ownership abroad, the payment of indemnities imposed by the Romans, and probably urgent demands by creditors for the repayment of debts, which had been suspended during the war.⁷⁰

The new laws imposed by Mummius on Achaea as part of the settlement included features—such as a census requirement for magistrates—that may well have aroused political discontent,⁷¹ and we know that the Roman commission of ten in 146/145

⁶⁴ Plb. 39.5. On this *politeia*, see above, p. 4; on conditions in Achaea, see below.

⁶⁵ I would assume that Servilianus had been assigned *Macedonia provincia*, which sufficed for any necessary proconsular intervention in Greece. That is not to say that a 'province' of Macedonia had been formally constituted and that Greece was part of it. On all this see my *Hegemony to Empire*, chapter 2.

⁶⁶ There is no evidence that a praetor in a provincial command during his year of office would have been styled officially *pro consule* or *ἀνθύπατος* (see above, n. 59). Fabius's titlature in the Dyme inscription in my view therefore should exclude 145, the most likely date of his (Servilianus's) praetorship.

⁶⁷ *πάσαι μὲν γὰρ ἐκορύζων αἱ πόλεις* (38.12.5). Cf. A. Fuks, 'The Bellum Achaicum and its Social Aspect', *JHS* 90 (1970), 85, with n. 50. I hesitate to put too much stress, however, on Polybius' comments that immediately precede about the lowly composition of the crowd at the Achaean assembly in spring, 146; this is brought up precisely to provide partial exculpation for the noisy disrespect shown the Roman envoys.

⁶⁸ Plb. 38.11.10, 15.3–6, 15.11. Cf. Fuks, *JHS* 90 (1970), 79–84, and esp. 84, 86, 88–9, stressing the nationalistic over the social-revolutionary aspect of these measures.

⁶⁹ Singled out by Plb. 38.16.4: *Πατρείς δὲ καὶ τὸ μετὰ τούτων συντελικὸν βραχεῖ χρόνῳ πρότερον ἐπταίκει κατὰ τὴν Φωκίδα, καὶ τὸ συμβαῖνον ἦν πολλῶ τῶν κατὰ Πελοπόννησον ἐλεεινότερον*; cf. Walbank, *HCP* 3.712–13, and for the Patraean *synteleia*, J. A. O. Larsen, 'The Rights of Cities within the Achaean Confederation', *CP* 66 (1971), 84–6.

⁷⁰ For condemnation and confiscation of property of those allegedly responsible for inciting the war with Rome, see Plb. 39.4.3 (cp. Zon. 9.31.8, Diod. 32.26.2), and perhaps Plb. 39.6.4–5. Abolition of *ἐγκτησις* and indemnities: Paus. 7.16.9–10. For the moratorium on debts, cf. above, n. 68.

⁷¹ The census-requirement: Paus. 7.16.9. The passage in which this reference appears is tendentious and not altogether reliable, but the imposition of a census-requirement at least is supported by the precedent of Flaminius's arrangements in Thessaly in 194 (Livy 34.51.6). Of

had been sufficiently concerned about Achaea's transition to the new *politeia* to ask Polybius to lend a hand after their own departure (39.5.2). On Polybius's own accounting, it was some time (μετά τινα χρόνον, 39.5.3) before the Achaeans were reconciled to the new *politeia* and laws, and *ταραχή* remained at first a distinct threat (39.5.5). Perhaps especially in Dyme, which had a history of animosity toward Rome. The city had profited from the Social War under Philip's leadership and had therefore been devoted to the Macedonian king.⁷² In the First Macedonian War the city fell to Rome's fleet under P. Sulpicius Galba and its citizens were sold into slavery; Philip however secured their release.⁷³ This benefaction confirmed the strong loyalty of the Dymaeans, and at the meeting of the Achaean League in 198 in which alliance with Rome and her allies against Philip was debated, they were among those who refused to betray the king and join the hated Romans. Along with the Argives and Megalopolitans, the Dymaeans conspicuously walked out of the meeting when it became clear that the change of course was going to be approved.⁷⁴ We know little of Dyme's history in the subsequent period of Achaean expansion under Roman tutelage,⁷⁵ but it is probable that few Dymaeans entirely forgot the sufferings of their parents. On the other hand, it would be most surprising if the Roman victory over the Achaean League in 146 did not encourage some local politicians to forge or exploit a connection with Rome in order to advance their own prospects at home, as did so many after the defeat of King Perseus. We might have known more of such manoeuvres if Polybius's text survived in full, but one fragment shows that in the former states of the Achaean League those who had supported Diaeus were condemned to death or exile,⁷⁶ their property confiscated and sold off by the Roman quaestor (Plb. 39.4.2–3). Another fragment gives a glimpse of how the Roman victory was used to settle accounts in the cities of central Greece, and it would be surprising if the same thing did not happen in the Peloponnese.⁷⁷

course, given the practical realities of self-promotion and office-holding in the Hellenistic city, it is unlikely that a census-requirement of magistrates, as reported by Pausanias, will have had much effect on the participation of the poor in politics: see A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City* (Oxford, 1940), pp. 170–71, and Plb. 28.7.7, with J. L. O'Neil, 'The Political Elites of the Achaian and Aitolian Leagues', *AncSoc* 15–17 (1984–86), 41–3.

⁷² Plb. 4.83.5; cf. 7.11.7 with Walbank, *HCP* ii.58. See also Paus. 7.17.5, who, strangely, claims that Dyme, alone among Achaean cities, was directly subject to Philip.

⁷³ Paus. 7.17.5; Livy 32.22.10 (cf. 21.28).

⁷⁴ Livy 32.22.8–12 chooses to stress obligations to Macedon rather than hostility to Rome (for which see Paus. 7.8.2, App. *Mac.* 7), but Dyme had reason to hate Rome as well as to love Philip.

⁷⁵ The dedications of the 160s by and for Hagemonidas of Dyme (*ISE* 56–7), a general in the Seleucid service under Antiochus IV, Antiochus V, and Demetrius, are suggestive, but of course do not imply hostility toward Rome. Cf. however L. Moretti, 'Epigraphica', *RivFil* 93 (1965), 284–7, who explains the Laodicean honours for Hagemonidas (set up in his home town at Dyme) by the hypothesis that he had saved Laodicea from punishment by Demetrius after the murder there of the Roman legate Cn. Octavius in 162. On Hagemonidas's service under the Seleucids, see C. Habicht, 'Der Stratege Hagemonides', *Historia* 7 (1958), 376–8. Whether *SEG* 15.254, which lists Dymaeans among those Achaeans who served under Cn. Domitius ἐν Γαλάτας, belongs in 122, as has been most recently argued by Schwertfeger (op. cit., pp. 30–8) or in 162 or even 96, is in my view unknown (*Hegemony to Empire* [forthcoming], Appendix F). *Syll.*³ 530, the judgment of Dyme against counterfeiters, which G. Thür and G. Stumpf would now date shortly after 190 (*Tyche* 4 [1989], 171–83), casts little light on the history of the city in this period.

⁷⁶ Perhaps the former is more likely, in view of Mummius's execution of some *hippeis* of Chalkis: Plb. 39.6.5.

⁷⁷ Cf. Plb. 38.16.6 οἱ μὲν ἦγον ἐκδώσοντες ἀλλήλους τοῖς πολεμίοις ὡς ἀλλοτρίους γεγονότας Ῥωμαίων, οἱ δ' ἐμήνουν καὶ κατηγοροῦν τῶν πέλας. A transition between the

From our inscription (now that it is dated to 144/143), it emerges that Polybius was not left alone after Mummius's departure with the task given him by the Roman commissioners of seeing that the new *politeia* and laws took root in his unsettled homeland (Plb. 39.5.2–5), but that a Roman proconsul, Q. Fabius Servilianus, was present at least part of the time in the Peloponnese as well, presumably to oversee the return to political quiescence, just as Flamininus had remained in Greece two years after the peace treaty with Philip in 196. Servilianus, incidentally, was surely an acquaintance of Polybius. Servilianus was the adoptive brother of Fabius Aemilianus, who was the son of L. Aemilius Paulus and natural brother of Scipio Aemilianus. Both Aemiliani were of course close friends of Polybius; indeed Fabius, as the elder, was at first the more conspicuous confidant of the two, and we know that Polybius frequented his house.⁷⁸ Servilianus will doubtless have associated with him there. Another *familiaris* may perhaps be inserted into the picture as well, if the date of 144/143 plausibly suggested by H. B. Mattingly for Scipio Aemilianus's famous tour of the east be accepted.⁷⁹ On the Greek leg of his trip Scipio may have observed and assessed the efforts of his friend Polybius and his brother's brother Servilianus to consolidate the settlement of Greece.

While moving the Dyme inscription some thirty years earlier casts new light on Roman efforts to ensure the consolidation of the peace of 146, it also has the important effect of removing the prime illustration of the formal supervisory role over Greece usually attributed to the proconsul of Macedonia, whether or not Greece was part of, or attached to, the province of Macedonia.⁸⁰ When dated to c. 115, the Dyme inscription appeared to show that long after any immediate military rationale had receded it was the norm for the proconsul of Macedonia to monitor local Greek affairs closely. Now placed in the proper context of Roman measures taken to consolidate the settlement of the Achaean War, Fabius's intervention in the affairs of Dyme fits neatly into a pattern of behaviour already well established among Roman commanders operating in Greece. Fabius did not intervene unilaterally, but was approached by a group of Dymaeon councillors with a complaint against other prominent local politicians.⁸¹ Similarly, in 172 Theban exiles and then, after a change of heart in their home city, envoys from Thebes as well denounced the men

immediately preceding mention of the fate of the men of Patrae in Phocis (above, n. 69) and this sketch of the terror of the inhabitants of the cities of Central Greece must have been passed over by the Constantinian excerptors.

⁷⁸ See Polybius's famous account of the beginning of his friendship with Scipio Aemilianus, 31.23–4. Fabius Aemilianus's house: 31.23.7. A. M. Eckstein alerted me to the possibility of a connection between Servilianus and Polybius, but must not be supposed to accept the view I take of the matter.

⁷⁹ 'Scipio Aemilianus' Eastern Embassy', *CQ* 36 (1986), 491–5, and, on the embassy in general, A. E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford, 1967), 127, 137–9, 177.

⁸⁰ See the works cited above, n. 3, esp. Dahlheim, *op. cit.*, p. 127: 'Das Eingreifen des römischen Beamten war also keine subsidiäre nur für den vorübergehenden Zweck vorgenommene Maßnahme, sondern die selbstverständliche Ausübung einer rechtens anerkannten Funktion'; Baronowski, *Klio* 70 (1988), 453: '[Fabius's] authoritative handling of the revolution at Dyme, which he merely reported to the civic administration, indicates his formal *locus standi* in Greece.' Schwertfeger, *op. cit.*, p. 71, rightly saw that Fabius's intervention hardly demanded the formal underpinning of 'provincialization'.

⁸¹ Rightly stressed by Schwertfeger, *op. cit.*, pp. 67, 71, and Bernhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 223. Schwertfeger (p. 67), Bernhardt (p. 222) and Bagnall-Derow (above, n. 9) extract from the specification of the *sunedroi* at lines 4–5 as those 'with Cyllanius' that some *sunedroi* at least stood on the other side, backing Sosus. The conjecture is not historically implausible, but the phrase itself cannot be stretched so far, as its regular use in Polybius and in inscriptions (cf. Hiller [Dittenberger], *Syll.*³ 684, n. 4) shows.

responsible for the Boeotian alliance with Macedon before the Roman legates at Chalcis.⁸² The appeal to the Roman general was obviously not required by any formal structure but transparently an attempt by one faction in a political struggle to enlist Roman power against its opponents. No further explanation is needed for the decision of Cyllanius and his colleagues to resort to Fabius. The lesson had long been learned in Greece that the cultivation of Roman favour could be a powerful weapon in the competition for political pre-eminence at home,⁸³ and the mass deportations which followed Pydna had shown just how efficiently political opponents could be removed after a war by means of allegations of unfriendliness toward Rome.⁸⁴ Fabius's acceptance of the role of adjudicator no more implies or exemplifies a permanent and legally defined subjection of Greece to Roman supervision after 146 than do Flaminius's jurisdiction in Phocis during the winter of 195/194, M. Fulvius Nobilior's search for and punishment of the murderers of some Delphian envoys in 189/188, the Roman legates' verdict in 172, and, in 167, Paulus's investigation of the conduct of Aetolian leaders and his review of sentences passed by the Aetolian federal assembly, not to mention his execution of certain anti-Roman Greeks.⁸⁵ With the redating of the Dyme inscription, the absence of a noteworthy instance of intervention by a Roman proconsul in the affairs of Greece between 144/143 and 88 puts the nature of Rome's involvement in the area during this period in an entirely new light.⁸⁶

Let us turn at last to the events described in the document. The facts which we can readily extract from the preserved portion are the following: The archives and public records at Dyme had been burnt (lines 6–7, 22). Also, a certain Sosus and one Timotheus had served as *nomographoi*—whether before or after the firing of the archives is not stated⁸⁷—and had proposed laws that were regarded, at least subsequently by Fabius, as contrary to, or even aiming at the subversion, of the *politeia* 'restored' to the Achaeans by the Romans (lines 8–10, 18–20, 23–4).⁸⁸ A group of *sunedroi* led by one Cyllanius laid information about the 'disruption' (*sunchusis*, line 8) before the proconsul, Q. Fabius Maximus (lines 4–6), accusing Sosus of being the primary instigator of the burning of the public records (lines 7–8, 16–18), as well as a *damiorgos*⁸⁹ named [-]miscus of conspiring with the alleged arsonists (lines 21–2). Fabius discussed the details with his *consilium* while at Patrae

⁸² Above, n. 43.

⁸³ See Polybius on the Achaean leader Callicrates of Leontium: 24.9–10, esp. Callicrates's assertion that *ἐὰν μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου γίνηται τις ἐπισημασία, ταχέως καὶ τοὺς πολιτενομένους μεταθέσθαι πρὸς τὴν Ῥωμαίων αἵρεσιν, καὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς τούτους ἐπακολουθήσειν διὰ τὸν φόβον* (24.9.6) and Polybius's own assessment of the result: *οὕτως καὶ τότε πρῶτον ἐπεβάλετο τοὺς μὲν κατὰ τὸ βέλτιστον ἱσταμένους ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις πολιτεύμασιν ἐλαττοῦν, τοὺς δὲ καὶ δικαίως <καὶ ἀδίκως> προστρέχοντας αὐτῇ σωματοποιεῖν. ἐξ ὧν αὐτῇ συνέβη κατὰ βραχὺ, τοῦ χρόνου προβαίνοντος, κολάκων μὲν εὐπορεῖν, φίλων δὲ σπανίζειν ἀληθινῶν* (24.10.4–5). Cf. also Pol. 30.13.4–10 (Livy 45.31.8) on the effect on local Greek politics of Rome's victory over Perseus.

⁸⁴ Most notorious were Charops of Epirus and the Aetolian Lyciscus. See P. S. Derow, 'Polybius and the Embassy of Kallikrates', in *Essays Presented to C. M. Bowra* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 12–24; also Gruen, *op. cit.*, pp. 514–19, who may well be right to regard the phenomenon as an ephemeral result of the war with Macedon. Even so, the reprise of Roman military intervention in the Achaean War will have encouraged its reappearance.

⁸⁵ Livy 34.48.2; Sherck, *RDGE* 38 = *Syll*⁸ 611, lines 10–14; legates; above, n. 43; Paulus: Livy 45.31.1–2 (cf. 45.28.6–8), 45.31.15.

⁸⁶ The implications are pursued in *Hegemony to Empire*, chapters 1–3.

⁸⁷ Fuks, *op. cit.*, pp. 282–8 assumes that the legislation followed the fire, without argument. So too Bernhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 223; Sherck, equally tacitly, seems to imply the reverse (*RDGE*, p. 248).

⁸⁸ See above, p. 132.

⁸⁹ Almost certainly a local official of Dyme, not of the Achaean League: above, p. 139.

(lines 10–11), and, satisfied with evidence presented in support of the accusations (line 17), determined that Sosus and [–]miscus merited death (lines 20–3). Timotheus, whom Fabius regarded as having committed a lesser crime (line 24), was ordered to proceed to Rome and do something there involving the *praetor inter peregrinos* before returning home (lines 23–7). Fabius then wrote a letter to the magistrates and city of Dyme to inform them of the action he had taken, which was inscribed and published by the Dymaeon authorities (lines 1–4).

Two preliminary points need to be made before we consider the character of the *sunchusis* at Dyme. It is sometimes supposed that rebels led by Sosus had seized power in the city, that Fabius may have had to intervene forcibly to suppress the ‘revolution’; Fuks even claimed that a ‘revolutionary government’ was established which ‘abolished’ the ‘existing régime’ and proceeded to introduce ‘a new constitution.’⁹⁰ These are unwarranted assumptions. The allegation that Sosus’s legislation was aimed at the overthrow of the new constitution (esp. lines 19–20) in no way implies that that supposed object was achieved, even temporarily. We certainly do not hear from Fabius that Cyllanius and the councillors had been expelled from Dyme, nor does the Roman claim that Sosus and Timotheus had illegally usurped the office of *nomographos* in the course of *stasis*.⁹¹ Nor is it anywhere suggested that Fabius had approached closer than Patrae, where he reviewed the case (lines 10–11). Armed intervention will hardly have been necessary, as it was not for L. Aemilius Paulus in 167, when, remaining at Amphipolis, he heard grave charges against certain Aetolian leaders or shortly thereafter, when he executed on other grounds the Aetolian Andronikos and the Theban Neon.⁹² Indeed, we are entitled to wonder whether Fabius himself was fully aware of all relevant details, since it would not be overly sceptical to conjecture that much of his information came directly from Cyllanius and his fellow *synedroi*.⁹³ The Roman proconsul may well have been much more concerned with Rome’s interest in supporting its friends than in the probably messy details of the affair. A thought-provoking parallel is Aemilius Paulus’s trial of Aetolians mentioned above, in which even Livy acknowledged that *magis ultra pars Romanis, ultra regi favisset quaesitum est, quam ultra fecisset iniuriam aut accepisset* (45.31.1). Fabius’s letter may provide only a partisan reflection of a tendentious report of Sosus’s doings.

Fabius declares that the ‘disruption’ at Dyme was not merely of local significance⁹⁴ but, inasmuch as Sosus’s legislative proposals were held to have aimed at the subversion of the Roman *politeia* for the Achaeans, had an aspect of opposition to the Roman settlement (lines 9–10, 15–16; cf. 19), which was still in its infancy. Still, it must be stressed that we simply have no idea of the content of the proposed laws;

⁹⁰ Fuks, *op. cit.*, pp. 283–4, 288. That the legislation brought about a ‘new “system of government”’ (p. 285) Fuks extracted from Fabius’s use of the word *κατάστασις* in line 12. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 757, Sherck, *RDGE*, p. 248, Dahlheim, *op. cit.*, p. 127, n. 159, Schwertfeger, *op. cit.*, p. 67, similarly speculate that the ‘revolution’ may have been temporarily successful.

⁹¹ Sherck concludes from the men’s legislative activity that ‘they must have established some sort of an organization’ (*RDGE*, p. 248). But the appointment of *nomographoi* in times of distress is no revolutionary novelty: compare Plb. 13.1.1–2.1 on Aetolian *nomographoi* c. 206/205, and the references given above, p. 137.

⁹² Above, n. 85.

⁹³ Note that only [–]miscus is noted to have confessed (line 23). The *kategoroi* who provided ‘true proofs’ (lines 16–17) of Sosus’s guilt were almost certainly the very ones who laid the information before Fabius, namely Cyllanius and the *synedroi* with him.

⁹⁴ Such appears to be the nature of the contrast expressed in Fabius’s explanation of his judicial rationale (οὐ μόν[ον]... ἀλλὰ καὶ, lines 13–15).

and it is very difficult to believe that Sosus intended a direct and explicit challenge to the Roman settlement so soon after the Achaean War, with a Roman proconsul still within reach.⁹⁵ We have no statement for the defence, and it is not improbable that Sosus would have characterized his proposals in a different way. Indeed, close scrutiny of the text invites the suspicion that the legislation of Sosus and its alleged subversion of the Roman settlement were a decidedly secondary matter. The *ἀδικήματα* which Cyllanius reported to Fabius, and which the proconsul examined in detail with his council, were, strictly speaking, quite specifically (λέγω δὲ) the firing of the public archives and the associated destruction of public documents (lines 6–7). Sosus's legislation only emerges in a conjoined participial phrase (ὁ καὶ τοὺς νόμους γράφας κτλ., lines 8–9), although it clearly remains part of Fabius's justification of the death sentence (lines 18–20). The differing sentences given the two other men accused further implies the priority of the charge of arson: [—]miscus had conspired with the alleged arsonists and was executed (lines 20–3), but Timotheus, who shared responsibility for the noxious legislation as *nomographos* with Sosus, was explicitly judged to have committed a lesser offence (line 24) and therefore escaped the extreme penalty (lines 25–27), evidently to be detained in Rome like many before him who had angered the Romans, but not warranted worse punishment.⁹⁶ The burning of the archives, then, appears to have been the immediate stimulus for Cyllanius's appeal to the proconsul and clearly was the 'crime' Fabius punished most severely. But of course it was very much in Cyllanius's interest to present Sosus's actions as motivated by opposition to the Roman settlement; his legislation, which could be presented as an attempt to subvert the new Roman regulations for Achaea, gave Cyllanius a ready pretext for the appeal to Fabius. At the same time, it was in Fabius's interest, wherever the truth lay, to give a clear warning back in Dyme that tampering with the new regulations for Achaea would invite Roman intervention.

Much remains obscure, in particular the precise nature of the 'disruption'. Modern interpretation of the document has been dominated by the idea of a social-revolutionary or democratic struggle against Roman-sponsored oligarchs,⁹⁷ often written up quite colourfully. For Rostovtzeff, 'The populace rose against the propertied classes with elemental force.... The cry was certainly for cancellation of debts... and of contracts.... New laws were drafted and no doubt adopted by the new "democratic" government....'⁹⁸ Fuks writes of a revolt of the 'masses,' the abolition of the 'existing régime' and the 'rule of the *possidentes*' by a 'revolutionary government' which instituted 'revolutionary rule'; Accame sees 'un movimento socialista' led by 'i rivoluzionari' against 'il partito timocratico'; Larsen, more moderately but equally anachronistically, labels it a 'leftist revolution'.⁹⁹ Such terms seem to say more about twentieth-century preoccupations and presuppositions than about whatever occurred at Dyme. The masses are nowhere in evidence; on the contrary, all those who appear in our inscription, from Cyllanius and his fellow-

⁹⁵ So esp. Fuks, op. cit., pp. 282, 285, and Schwertfeger, op. cit., pp. 65–7, following the lead of Boeckh, Hicks and Beasley (p. 163); contra, Deininger, op. cit., p. 244, and Bernhardt, op. cit., p. 223. See above, p. 132.

⁹⁶ Fuks, op. cit., p. 288, wrongly makes Timotheus one of the ringleaders in the destruction of the archives. It was hardly the case, then, that 'to change the new constitutions... was punishable with death' (*JHS* 90 [1970], 86). See above, p. 140.

⁹⁷ See the works listed above, n. 4, with varying degrees of emphasis on socio-economic and political factors. The more sensitive recent treatments by Bernhardt and Ferrary are notably cool toward this aspect.

⁹⁸ Op. cit., p. 757.

⁹⁹ Fuks, op. cit., pp. 283, 285, 288; Accame, op. cit., p. 150; Larsen, op. cit., p. 503. Will, op. cit., p. 398: 'révolution démocratique'.

synedroi to the *nomographoi* Sosus and Timotheus and the *damiorgos* [—]miscus, evidently belong to the local political élite of office-holders.¹⁰⁰ A ‘revolution’ is neither explicitly mentioned nor unambiguously suggested: there is no charge of violence against persons; as we have seen, Fabius makes no suggestion that Sosus and his friends had seized power, and when required to sum up the affair in one word, chooses the relatively tame *sunchusis*. Of course, it remains possible that Fabius had in mind a more politically charged Latin word such as *seditio* or *tumultus*. But we can only judge from the evidence before us, and the word used in the letter need not imply mass or popular revolt.

To make Sosus’s object the restoration of ‘unfettered democracy’¹⁰¹ requires us not only to accept at face value Pausanias’s reference to Mummius’s suppression of democracies¹⁰² but to make it central to the interpretation of a text that never mentions democracy or any known concomitant of democracy. Indeed, recent analysts have raised the possibility that Sosus aimed at a tyranny, or at least that this is what Fabius wished to suggest.¹⁰³ But either hypothesis goes well beyond our evidence. Equally dubious is the notion that the incident was a kind of debtors’ revolt.¹⁰⁴ We have seen that Beasley’s restoration of *χρε[ωκοπίας οἰκεί]α* is questionable at least; while on the other hand, even if the restoration be accepted *in toto*, it would by no means follow that cancellation of debts actually came about or even that such was the intention of Sosus and his followers. Rather the reverse: Fabius would then only be *likening* their actions to debt-cancellation, which may be a misrepresentation of no less magnitude than that Sosus’s actions were ‘alien to the freedom restored in common to the Greeks’ (lines 15–16). Asheri rightly saw that so pervasive is the tradition of hostile misrepresentation of debt-legislation that Fabius’s word on the matter cannot be accepted without qualification.¹⁰⁵ In the final analysis, the problematic lines 14–15 do not help us very much to discern the true nature of the incident.

On the face of it, the burning of the archives seems quite suggestive. Unlike our other information, this seems a hard datum, and is certainly *prima facie* testimony to a real disturbance in Dyme, the occurrence of which, in the painful circumstances of the aftermath of the Achaean War reviewed above, is indeed little surprise. But again the perpetrators’ objective and the true nature of the incident are hardly self-evident. We know of incidents—from a considerably later period and the great urban environment of Rome and Antioch under the Empire—in which desperate debtors were thought to have been driven to burn archives and public buildings in the hope of escaping their obligations.¹⁰⁶ But our case seems different: the alleged perpetrators are members of the political élite,¹⁰⁷ and nothing is said in the preserved portions about an intention to escape their own debts; instead, Fabius appears to impute to them considerably wider political aims. In that respect, the firing of the archives at

¹⁰⁰ See also above, n. 81.

¹⁰¹ See above, p. 132. ‘Die absolute Demokratie’ is Schwertfeger’s phrase (op. cit., p. 67). ‘Unfettered democracy’ would have been rather out of place in second-century Achaean: on the moderation of the traditional democracy in Achaean, see esp. Walbank, *HCP* i.221–2, and O’Neil, *AncSoc* 15–17 (1984–6), 41–3.

¹⁰² 7.16.9. See above, p. 132.

¹⁰³ Bernhardt, op. cit., p. 223; Ferrary, op. cit., pp. 198–9, with n. 257.

¹⁰⁴ This scenario is never rigidly distinguished from the one that stresses an ‘anti-timocratic’ aspect, but emerges particularly strongly in Rostovtzeff, Fuks and Baronowski: see above, n. 4.

¹⁰⁵ Asheri, op. cit., p. 97 n. 62.

¹⁰⁶ See the fire in Rome, 7 B.C. (Dio 55.8.5–6), or that in Antioch, A.D. 70 (Jos. *BJ* 7.54–62).

¹⁰⁷ Naturally, it must not be assumed that only the lower orders would be indebted:

Bernhardt, op. cit., pp. 222–3. Cf. Asheri, op. cit., pp. 92–4.

Jerusalem by the Jewish rebels at the beginning of their revolt in A.D. 66 (Jos. *BJ* 2.427) may provide a useful parallel,¹⁰⁸ despite its distance in space and time. Had we known no more about this event than we do about the Dyme incident, we might have concluded swiftly and with utter confidence that the uprising was in essence a debtors' uprising against the rich—truly a social revolution. Yet in this case, we have the relatively full account of Josephus, and we find that here the object of the arsonists was to rally the poor and indebted to their cause in the factional struggle which was not driven by social-revolutionary aims up to this point, and, despite this act, did not become so in the subsequent four years of the revolt.¹⁰⁹

But the issue of debt need not lie behind the fire at all. Before Beasley introduced a reference to debt by means of his restoration of line 14, editors and commentators regularly explained the firing of the archives in other ways: Boeckh suggested that the attack on the archives was part of an attempt to overthrow the new constitution imposed by the Romans (on which more presently), and Hicks elaborated, supposing that property valuations needed for the application of a new census requirement may have been the objective. Beasley himself voiced the possibility that the arsonists aimed to destroy census records and assessments of tribute, which he thought was imposed in 146, while Fuks included among the purposes of the alleged arson destruction of the 'public documents' which enshrined the 'political set-up'.¹¹⁰ When Sex. Cloelius (allegedly) burned *tabulae publicae* in the Temple of the Nymphs in Rome in 57 or 56 B.C., records not of debt but of the recipients of the grain-dole were apparently targeted.¹¹¹ We cannot simply assume without further evidence that debt lies behind every case of archive-burning, of which, curiously, there apparently are no clear historical parallels from Greece. On the other hand, while Fabius's letter makes no certain reference to debt, it does speak of laws and the drafting of laws, copies of which will also have resided in the city archives. The references in the inscription to the legislative activity of Sosus and Timotheus as *nomographoi* might suggest something more than a random connection between the two complaints: that the fire was a drastic manoeuvre connected with a controversy surrounding a revision of the laws which came to be represented by its opponents as an attack on the Roman order. But we do not know the nature of Sosus's and Timotheus's laws, and cannot penetrate further.

In sum, it would be unwise, given the fragmentary nature of our evidence, to attempt to characterize the *sunchusis* at Dyme too definitely. Political, economic, social factors may well all have played a role in bringing forth and exacerbating a sharp struggle among an élite divided by defeat and the opportunities afforded by the proximity of Roman power.

The inscription is rather more informative about Fabius's response. We have noted that there is no indication that he came to Dyme itself; he heard the case at Patrae,

¹⁰⁸ Fuks, *op. cit.*, pp. 286–7.

¹⁰⁹ See M. Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea. The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66–70* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 18, 54–8, and 152–227 (esp. 153–5, 167–9, 199–208, 215–18), and 'The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt', *JJS* 33 (1982), 417–27, for the economic background to this event, which he regards as essentially symbolic, since other records will have existed in private possession.

¹¹⁰ See Boeckh and Hicks *ad loc.*; Beasley (p. 163), apparently followed by Accame, *op. cit.*, p. 150; Fuks, *op. cit.*, pp. 286–7.

¹¹¹ Cic. *Cael.* 78, *Mil.* 73; cf. *Red. Pop.* 14, *Sest.* 84–5, *Har. Resp.* 57, *Parad.* 4.31. See C. Nicolet, 'La temple des Nymphes et les distributions frumentaires à Rome à l'époque républicaine d'après des découvertes récentes', *CRAI* 1976, 29–51.

passed sentence, and communicated his actions to the city by his letter (probably to be carried back to Dyme by Cyllanius) rather than in person. His actions betray no extraordinary concern about what may well have been a fairly minor event. We must beware of assigning undue significance to an event whose prominence in our evidence is due to the accidental preservation of an inscribed stone.¹¹² Still, in the circumstances—the tense aftermath of the Achaean War—Fabius was more or less obliged to consider Cyllanius’s appeal, especially as the incident was presented to him as tinged by an anti-Roman animus. Sharp action following a war against political leaders who did not appear friendly to Rome’s interests, whatever the validity of the charges preferred, falls into an established pattern of Roman official behaviour.¹¹³ In addition, Fabius seems to have had a particularly brutal disposition, demonstrated to excess during his command in Spain after his consulship.¹¹⁴

I have suggested that Fabius’s representation of the ‘disorder’ at Dyme should not be accepted docilely, without recognition of its probable tendentiousness. On the other hand, it does give an indication of how he wished his intervention to be viewed by his ‘audience’: the recipients of his letter, the officials and citizens of Dyme. To explain his handling of the matter to the ‘magistrates, councillors and city of Dyme,’ Fabius stresses that the condemned men had been ‘laying the foundation (?) for the worst conditions and disturbance (ταραχῆς)’ (lines 12–13). *Ταραχῆ* and the associated term ἀκρισία are in Polybius pregnant words which are used to describe the character of the policy of the Achaean *stratego*i Critolaus, Diaeus and the others who had brought on the disastrous war with Rome, and the continuing threat of disruption in the Peloponnese even after Mummius and the commission of ten had restored order.¹¹⁵ Fabius’s characterization of Sosus’s objective (?) as τῆς χειρίστης καταστάσεως might seem merely banal, but for the warning the Achaeans had received from the envoy Sex. Julius Caesar in the year before the clash with Rome that Critolaus was urging the Achaeans ἐπὶ τὰ χεῖριστα (Plb. 38.9.4). Fabius further claims that the events were not only destructive of the communal fabric of mutual exchange (*asunallaxia*: above, p. 7f.) in their own city, but also had larger ramifications for the settlement of Greece, for they were ‘alien to the freedom restored to the Greeks in common and our policy’ (lines 15–16). If we are to ask from whom the Greeks this time had been liberated, the answer can only be ‘men such as Critolaus and Diaeus’, so it is certainly plausible, as J.-L. Ferrary has recently argued, that here too Fabius’s language is meant to associate Sosus and his followers with the

¹¹² *Contra* Sherk, *RDGE*, p. 248, who accepts Fabius’s hostile characterization of the laws of Sosus and Timotheus and concludes that ‘this implies rather grandiose plans’. Similarly, Fuks, *op. cit.*, p. 288: ‘the last echo of a long period of social-economic struggles in late classical and Hellenistic Greece’.

¹¹³ Above, pp. 12, 17–18. Mummius had executed some *hippeis* of Chalcis (Plb. 39.6.5).

¹¹⁴ Servilianus captured 10,000 prisoners in a sweep of towns held by Viriathus; of these, he beheaded 500 and sold into slavery the remaining thousands; then he cut off the hands of the followers of a ‘brigand’ named Connoba. See App. *Ib.* 68; Front. *Strat.* 4.1.42; Val. Max. 2.7.11; Oros. 5.4.12, with Astin, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

¹¹⁵ Plb. 38.12.1, 15.8, 17.9, 18.7; 39.5.5: μὴ γὰρ ἐξεργασμένου τούτου [sc. τοῦ Πολυβίου] καὶ γράψαντος τοὺς περὶ τῆς κοινῆς δικαιοδοσίας νόμους ἀκριτα πάντα ἦν καὶ πολλῆς γέμοντα ταραχῆς. Note too Polybius’s description of the seven or eight years down to 146 as one of ταραχῆ καὶ κίνησις (3.4.12)—in my view, a rebellious disruptiveness caused by a failure to recognize the fact, which Polybius regards as patent after 168, that Rome’s orders had to be obeyed (3.4.3). On the period of ταραχῆ καὶ κίνησις, see esp. F. W. Walbank, *Selected Papers* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 325–43 (= *Historiographia antiqua: commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* [Leuven, 1977], pp. 139–62), and Ferrary, *op. cit.*, pp. 265–348.

'tyrannical' instigators of the recent disaster.¹¹⁶ *Ἀλλότρια... τῆς ἡμετέρας προαιρέσεως* (line 16) recalls another resonant phrase of the mid-second century: *ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἀλλοτριότης*. In the pages of Polybius, and particularly from the mouth of a Roman official, this is a state of disaffection from Rome that calls for swift correction in order to avoid dire consequences.¹¹⁷ Fabius's use of terms that the contemporary Achaean, Polybius, shows were heavily loaded in contemporary usage is probably not coincidental. With such language Fabius not only justifies his own involvement but also, through the implicit association of the trouble-makers at Dyme with the men who had brought on catastrophe for Achaea only two or three years before, he justifies the appeal to his authority by Cyllanius and suggests dire consequences for paying heed to men like Sosus in the future. According to Polybius, the Achaean politician Callicrates had forty years before pointed out to the Roman Senate that a clear signal of Roman displeasure would stampede opposition to their friends in the cities by the political élite and the general population alike.¹¹⁸ It is easy to see what a comfort the inscribed letter from Fabius, posted in a prominent place, will have been to Cyllanius and his supporters.

IV. CONCLUSION

Past discussion of the Dyme inscription has been based in large part on dubious restorations with weighty historical implications, and has sometimes been prone to arbitrary interpretation of a highly problematic text. This fragmentary and isolated text simply cannot sustain confident pronouncements on the nature of the trouble at Dyme. The inscription itself and its new historical context, in the immediate aftermath of the Achaean War, make it probable that a host of mutually aggravating causes underlay the *sunchusis*, but it goes too far beyond our exiguous evidence to characterize the objectives of Sosus and his associates as primarily social-revolutionary, democratic, or even anti-Roman. There is some danger, too, of exaggerating the importance of the affair because of the largely random fact of the inscription's survival although, to be sure, it may be taken to exemplify the potential for *παραχῆ* immediately after the Achaean War on which Polybius remarks.

For all its obscurities, the inscription remains the best evidence of the intervention of a Roman commander in the internal affairs of a Greek city between the Achaean and Mithridatic Wars. But the light it casts falls very differently now that it is to be dated *c.* 144 rather than *c.* 115. The letter of Fabius now usefully supplements the picture we derive from Polybius of Roman measures in the aftermath of the Achaean War to secure the peace. Fabius's acceptance of an appeal initiated by local Dymaeon authorities against their political rivals fits well into an established pattern, manifested most strikingly during and after the war with Perseus, of Roman assistance of those they perceived as their friends against those of doubtful loyalty. But another result of the new data is that Fabius's actions can no longer be thought representative of the normal activities of the 'governor' of Macedonia but must instead be set in the special context of the immediate aftermath of the Achaean War, when Roman attention will have been unusually focused on mainland Greece. The question must now be posed whether in the subsequent decades down to the Pontic invasion Roman commanders

¹¹⁶ Ferrary, *op. cit.*, pp. 196–9. Polybius explicitly attributes monarchic power to Critolaus at 38.13.7; certainly his description of Diaeus's method of dealing with opponents (38.17.1–18.6) recalls the standard depiction of the tyrant.

¹¹⁷ Pib. 20.7.3; 22.14.6; 23.8.2; 30.31.13; 30.31.20; 38.9.4; 38.12.3; 38.16.6 (quoted above, n. 77.

¹¹⁸ Pib. 24.9.6, quoted above, n. 83.

in Macedonia exercised the same degree of vigilance toward the affairs of Greece, or were instead a distant presence, preoccupied with the problems of the permeable Macedonian frontier.¹¹⁹

University of California, Santa Barbara

ROBERT M. KALLET-MARX

¹¹⁹ An answer is attempted in my *Hegemony to Empire* (forthcoming).