NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

MARCELLUS AND THE SYRACUSANS

In the introductory section of his study on imperial cult in the western provinces, D. Fishwick makes a slight error: "The earliest Roman recipient of divine honours would appear to have been C. Marcellus, whose festival was established at Syracuse following the capture of the city from the Carthaginians." While it is true that we know of no prior festival in honor of a Roman, the *praenomen* of the conqueror of Syracuse was not Gaius, but Marcus. Fishwick is not the first, however, to have made this small mistake: it is also found in Cerfaux and Tondriau's compendious study of ruler cult in the Greco-Roman world. M. Gelzer also attributes these games to C. Marcellus, but makes no mistakes with *praenomina:* he refers to the governor of Sicily in 79 B.C. Gelzer's attribution, however, is dismissed by E. Badian as "an odd slip." The matter is obviously in need of some clarification; furthermore, the confusion has obscured an interesting aspect of these honors.[1]

First of all, it is clear that the Syracusans did establish games for M. Marcellus sometime after his sack of their city in 211 B.C., as Cicero implies in his speeches against Verres (*Verr.* 2.4.151): "etiam hercule illud in Syracusanis merito reprehenderetur, si, cum diem festum ludorum de fastis suis sustulissent celeberrimum et sanctissumum, quod eo ipso die Syracusae a Marcello captae esse dicuntur, iidem diem festum Verris nomine agerent, cum iste a Syracusanis, quae ille calamitosus dies reliquerat, ademisset." Marcellus was one of the great heroes of Rome, and Cicero's attack on Verres' arrogance in replacing the Marcellia with a festival in honor of himself would have been an effective tactic. But M. Marcellus was not the only one whose honor had been affronted by Verres. In another passage, Cicero writes of the games in a slightly different way (2.2.51): "per eosdem istius furtorum, iniuriarum uxorumque socios istius imperio Syracusis Marcellia tolluntur maximo gemitu luctuque civitatis: quem illi diem festum cum recentibus beneficiis C. Marcelli debitum reddebant, tum generi, nomini, familiae Marcellorum maxima voluntate tribuebant." The C. Marcellus to whom he refers must be the proconsul of 79 B.C., who according to Münzer in his Pauly article was the great-great-grandson of the famous conqueror.[2] In light of this passage, Gelzer's attribution becomes much less odd, and one sees that the mistakes of Cerfaux-Tondriau and Fishwick result from a conflation of the various passages in Cicero. The games

1. D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West,* vol. 1 (Leiden, 1987), p. 46; L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Un concurrent du christianisme: le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine,* Bibliothèque de théologie, series 3, vol. 5 (Tournai, 1957), p. 281; M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik* (Berlin, 1912), pp. 81–82; E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae (264–79 B.C.)* (Oxford, 1958), p. 296, n. P.

2. F. Münzer, "Claudii Marcelli," *RE* 3.2 (1899): 2731–64.

were indeed founded for M. Marcellus, but were later used to honor his descendant C. Marcellus as well.

The festival that Cicero says was given to M. Marcellus was an honor often given by other Greek cities to Hellenistic kings.[3] In some cases preexisting festivals of gods were modified to include these kings: thus the Athenians renamed the Dionysia in honor of Demetrius Poliorcetes after he had "liberated" the city from Cassander. In other cases entirely new festivals were established, such as the Seleuceia in Erythrae and the Antiocheia in Lycian Laodicea.[4] These games are part of the complex of honors collectively described as Hellenistic ruler cult, in which honors previously reserved for the cult of civic deities were extended to the new rulers who arose in that period. As S. Price has argued, such ruler cults were "an attempt to come to terms with a new type of power" by representing it in the language of traditional divine cults.[5] As Roman power began to penetrate into the Greek world, the same system was also applied to its representatives. The games for Marcellus were, as far as we know, the first use of such cult trappings in honor of a Roman. But it is possible that the language of Hellenistic ruler cult was not the only one on which the Syracusans drew in order to define their relationship with Marcellus.

The origin of the honors for Marcellus is described in more detail by Plutarch. In his account, a body of delegates from Syracuse came to Rome in 210 B.C., the year after its capture, and accused Marcellus before the Senate of violating the terms of surrender. After both sides had presented their case, the Senate acquitted Marcellus. The Syracusans thereupon begged him to forgive them and to look kindly upon their city in the future. Marcellus consented, and in return the Syracusans voted him several honors; in particular, that if Marcellus or any of his descendants should come into Sicily, the Syracusans would wear garlands and sacrifice to the gods (Plut. *Marc.* 23). No mention is made here of games, but their foundation should probably be associated with this incident. The same story is found in Livy and, more briefly, in Valerius Maximum, although neither of them refers to the honors for Marcellus. They do, however, provide an explicit interpretation of the relationship established between Marcellus and the Syracusans; according to Livy, the Syracusans entreated Marcellus to accept them *in fidem clientelamque*.[6] If we accept Livy's account, it would appear that in their honors for Marcellus the Syracusans combined the Hellenistic tradition of ruler cult with the Roman tradition of clientship.

3. Cicero elsewhere mentions another honor typical of those for Hellenistic rulers, the adornment of the bouleuterion with a bronze statue of M. Marcellus, "qui eum Syrcusanis locum, quem eripere belli ac victoriae lege posset, conservavit ac reddidit" (*Verr.* 2.2.50).

4. Demetria: Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 166, Plut. *Demetr.* 12.2; on Hellenistic festivals, see in general F. Taeger, *Charisma: Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1957), and Chr. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*[2], Zetemata, vol. 14 (Munich, 1970).

5. S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 29–30.

6. Livy 26.26.5–11, 27.16, 29.1–32.8, Val. Max. 4.1.7; cf. Dio Cass. 15.46A (Loeb) and Zonar. 9.6; see especially Livy 26.32.8: "[Syracusani] obsecrantes . . . in fidem clientelamque se urbemque Syracusas acciperet," and cf. Val. Max. 4.1.7: "supplices et orantes ut ab eo in clientelam reciperentur clementer excepit." Livy even shows Syracusan delegates suggesting to Marcellus during the last days of the siege that "incolumes . . . Syracusas familiae vestrae sub clientela nominis Marcellorum tutelaque habendas tradas" (25.29.6).

The interpretation of Livy is of course that of a Roman writing some two centuries after the fact, not that of a contemporary Syracusan. The extent to which these two points of view might have resembled one another is rather controversial. E. Badian has argued that in the Republic the Romans understood their relationships with foreign peoples and cities in terms of the traditional Roman institution of *clientela*. Such relationships could exist either between peoples and the Roman state as a whole, or between foreign peoples and individual Roman patrons. He cites the example of Marcellus and the Syracusans as the first known to us in which a people pass into clientship via *deditio* to a general, and suggests that it may even have set a precedent for such clientship.[7] E. Gruen, on the other hand, has argued that the interpretation of Roman foreign relations in terms of *clientela* is peculiar to the late Republic. Instead, the extension of Roman patronage and the establishment of honors for Roman leaders in the late third and second centuries B.C. should be understood as the continuation of Hellenistic practices. Gruen does concede that individual Romans acted as the formal patrons of foreign communities, and considers the case of Marcellus and the Syracusans to be the first clear example of such patronage. But even here he stresses that the initiative came from the Syracusans, and concludes that "the practice can hardly be reckoned a Roman institution in origin."[8]

The intentions of the Syracusans themselves, as opposed to Livy's interpretation of them, may be clarified by focusing on a particular aspect of their honors for Marcellus. The honors that Greek cities established for Hellenistic rulers, in contrast with the cults created by the rulers themselves, were often *ad hominem* and took little account of descendants. When there was a dynastic aspect to such cults, it concerned the ancestors rather than the descendants of the ruler. The relationship that the Syracusans established with Marcellus and which they expressed through the language of cult seems to have differed in the emphasis placed on his family and heirs. Plutarch says that the honors were vowed for Marcellus' descendants as well as himself, while Cicero stresses the *genus, nomen, familia Marcellorum*. The latter asserts that not just Syracuse, but the entire province of Sicily was devoted to the name of the Marcelli.[9] This hereditary aspect of the honors is characteristic not so much of the civic ruler cult practiced in the Hellenistic period as of Roman *clientela*. Since the Syracusans had been dealing with the Romans for some fifty years by the time of Marcellus, it is quite possible that they had acquired some sense of Roman customs, particularly that of hereditary patronage and clientship. In establishing their relationship with Marcellus, they may well have decreed honors applicable to his family as well as to himself, knowing that they would thus conform to his expectations of such a relationship. If the Syracusans did not think of his family at the time, they had another opportunity a few years later, when in 198 B.C. his son became praetor of Sicily. The sources give no indication of the relationship that the younger Marcellus had with the Syracusans, but it is difficult to

7. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, pp. 7 and 157.

8. E. S. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1984), p. 166; on Marcellus, see p. 163; in general, pp. 158–200.

9. *Div. Caec.* 13: "Scit is, qui est in consilio, C. Marcellus: scit is, quem adesse video, Cn. Lentulus Marcellinus: quorum fide atque praesidio Siculi maxime nituntur, quod omnino Marcellorum nomini tota illa provincia adiuncta est;" cf. *Verr.* 2.3.45 and 2.4.89–90.

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

JAMES B. RIVES
Columbia University

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

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

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

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

I

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

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