

# THE ACHAIAANS IN NAUPAKTOS AND KALYDON IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

THE PROBLEM OF ACHAIAN CONTROL of Kalydon and Naupaktos as outposts on the north shore of the Gulf of Corinth in the 4th century is a very difficult one, and although the sources for the history of these two cities are substantially different, there is some overlap which compels us to consider them together. The sources are relatively few and scattered, and much scholarship on the problem consists of attempts to fill the blanks.<sup>1</sup>

Originally Kalydon was an Aitolian city, and it is described as such in Homer.<sup>2</sup> Xenophon says it was formerly Aitolian<sup>3</sup> and was in the possession of the Achaiaans who had given its inhabitants Achaian citizenship; in 389 B.C. it was garrisoned by the Achaiaans because of the threat of an attack by the Akarnanians with help from the Athenians and Boiotians.<sup>4</sup> How or when it became Achaian is left unstated, but they must already have held it for a few years, and the fact that its inhabitants had been given citizenship suggests that it was the result of a somewhat friendly arrangement.<sup>5</sup> This granting of Achaian citizenship foreshadows the ease with which the Achaian League granted Achaian citizenship

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenika* IV.6.1 and IV.6.14 and Diodoros, IV.75.2 are the evidence for this first period of Achaian control of these sites. On the history of Achaia and the early Achaian League see J. K. Anderson, "A Topographical and Historical Study of Achaea," *BSA* 49, 1954, pp. 72–92; J. A. O. Larsen, "The Early Achaean League," *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson*, II, St. Louis 1953, pp. 797–815; and *idem*, *Greek Federal States*, Oxford 1968, pp. 80–89.

Works frequently cited are abbreviated as follows:

Beloch, *GG* = K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, 2nd ed., Berlin 1922

Glitz, *HG* = G. Glitz, *Histoire grecque*, Paris 1936

Hohmann = W. Hohmann, *Aitolien und die Aitoler bis zum lamischen Kriege*, diss. Universität Halle, 1908

Unger = G. F. Unger, "Die Abfassungszeit des sogenannten Skylax," *Philologus* 33, 1874, pp. 29–45

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad*, II.638–640, IX.529–531, and XIII.216–218. Daimachos, *FGrHist* 65, F 1, which gives the Aitolian genealogy of Kalydon, was probably written in the context of the events of 366 B.C.

<sup>3</sup> K. J. Beloch ("Αἰτωλικά," *Hermes* 32, 1897, p. 671) suggests that this is a Homeric reminiscence and proves nothing about Kalydon's political membership in the Aitolian League.

<sup>4</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenika* IV.6.1. This expedition of Agesilaos to Akarnania is usually dated in 389 on the basis of its context in Xenophon: Beloch, *GG* III<sup>2</sup>, 1, pp. 86–87; M. Cary, *CAH* VI, Cambridge 1927, p. 52; Glitz, *HG* III, p. 93; C. D. Hamilton, *Sparta's Bitter Victories: Politics and Diplomacy in the Corinthian War*, Ithaca 1979, pp. 287–288. K. J. Beloch (*Die attische Politik seit Perikles*, Leipzig 1884, p. 348) suggested that 388 was just as likely as 389. G. E. Underhill (*A Commentary on the Hellenica of Xenophon*, Oxford 1900, p. xlix) also suggested that the order of Xenophon's narrative is the only reason to prefer 389 to 388. It is a very good reason indeed. U. Kahrstedt (*Forschungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden fünften und des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1910, pp. 194–195) placed this expedition between July and October 390, seeing its purpose as the rebuilding of Spartan prestige after the defeat of a Spartan *mora* near Lecheion, but while he showed that this date is possible, he presented no concrete evidence to support it. D. H. Kelly, *Sources and Interpretations of Spartan History in the Reigns of Agesilaos II, Archidamos III and Agis III* (diss. Cambridge University, 1975, pp. 138–139) similarly placed this expedition in the second half of the summer of 390; he redated the term of office of Antalkidas as nauarch to 390/89 from the usually accepted 388/7. Agesilaos' tactics in this campaign against the Akarnanians are described in P. Cartledge, *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*, Baltimore 1987, pp. 224–226.

<sup>5</sup> Hohmann, p. 25. Larsen ([footnote 1 above], p. 804) believes the Achaiaans were acting as the agents of the Spartans and the Peloponnesian League to control the mouth of the Gulf of Corinth by establishing posts on both sides of it.



to non-Achaians in the 3rd century and thus was able to transform itself from a tribal coalition into a major federal state. It is, however, a remarkable departure for the beginning of the 4th century.

The Messenians had been driven from Naupaktos after the Peloponnesian War, and it had been handed over to the local Lokrians.<sup>6</sup> We do not know how long it remained Lokrian, but at some point it became Achaian. The only direct evidence for Achaian control is a passage in Diodoros which attests to the expulsion of an Achaian garrison.<sup>7</sup> In 389 Naupaktos could not have been Aitolian since, according to Xenophon, the Aitolians were hoping to acquire it through Agesilaos' good will.<sup>8</sup> There is some question about Xenophon's use of the word ἀπολαβεῖν. Does it mean "recover", which would suggest that the Aitolians had held the city before, or "receive", which would not? Those who accept the former translation have proposed various previous Aitolian occupations of Naupaktos,<sup>9</sup> but the lack of any evidence for previous Aitolian control of Naupaktos makes the latter translation much more likely. Who held Naupaktos at this time? Obviously it was not the Aitolians, because they

<sup>6</sup> Diodoros, xiv.34.2; Pausanias, iv.26.2 and x.38.10. Pausanias dates this event after Aigospotamoi, and Diodoros, under the events of 401/0, states that the termination of the Elean War freed the Spartans to deal with the Messenians at Naupaktos. Diodoros (xiv.17.4–12) narrates the events of the war in 402/1 and at 34.1 tells of the terms of peace in 401/0. From these passages it would seem that the Messenians were expelled from Naupaktos in 401/0, but Xenophon (*Hellenika* iii.2.21–3.1) gives very different information about the Elean war. He tells us that it occurred when Derkyildas was active in Asia, 399–397. He reports an abortive invasion of Elis from Achaia under King Agis which was cut short because of an earthquake; he also reports a flurry of Elean diplomatic activity, a second invasion, likewise under Agis' command, which did much more damage, and peace at the beginning of the following year. These events can be spread over two or three years depending on whether Xenophon's words περὶ ὅντι τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ should be interpreted to mean that the two expeditions occurred in one year or two. Pausanias, iii.8.3–5, which is ultimately derived from Xenophon's account, indicates two years. Diodoros tells of only one expedition led by King Pausanias. Thus both the length of the war and its events are in dispute. Two main schools of thought on the chronology of this war have flourished since the 19th century. The war can be placed in any two or three years between 403 and 397. It is usually, but not universally, agreed that if hostilities had occurred while the 95th Olympic Games were being held in summer 400, this fact would have appeared in our sources. The earlier chronology, relying on Diodoros, places the war in 403 or 402–400: Beloch, *GG* III<sup>2</sup>, 1, pp. 17–19; P. Funke, *Homónoi und Arché: Athen und die griechische Staatenwelt vom Ende des peloponnesischen Krieges bis zum Königsfrieden (404/3–387/6 v. Chr.)* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 37), Wiesbaden 1980, p. 32, note 16; J.-F. Bommelaer, *Lysandre de Sparte, histoire et traditions* (*BEFAR* 240), Paris 1981, pp. 175–176; M. Sordi, "Il santuario di Olympia e le guerre d'Elide," *Contributi dell'Istituto di storia antica* 10, 1984, pp. 20–30; and *idem*, "Le implicazioni olimpiche della guerra d'Elide," in *Problemi di storia e cultura spartana* (Pubbl. della Fac. di lettere dell'Univ. di Macerata 20), Rome 1984, pp. 143–159. The late chronology, relying more on Xenophon, places the war *ca.* 400–398 and the expulsion of the Messenians from Naupaktos in 398. Cf. J. Hatzfeld, "Notes sur la chronologie des «Helleniques» II. Chronologie de la guerre d'Elis," *REA* 35, 1933, pp. 395–409; Hamilton (footnote 4 above), pp. 119–121; and Underhill (footnote 4 above), pp. xliii–xlv, where the events of the war are dated one year later. Kelly ([footnote 4 above] pp. 21–41), trying to integrate Xenophon's and Diodoros' accounts, spreads these events over four years. He proposes that the war started in 402 with a campaign led by King Pausanias. There followed an abortive campaign under King Agis in 401 and his major campaign in 400, with a break for the Olympic Games before the surrender of the Eleans in 399. R. K. Unz ("The Chronology of the Elean War," *GRBS* 27, 1986, pp. 29–42) places the start of the war in 401 and the end in early 398.

<sup>7</sup> Diodoros, xv.75.2.

<sup>8</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenika* iv.6.14.

<sup>9</sup> W. A. Oldfather (*RE* XVI, 1935, col. 1989, *s.v.* Naupaktos) presents some of these conjectures. Unger, pp. 43–45.

wanted it. It has been suggested that in 395, at the beginning of the Corinthian War, Naupaktos was in the hands of the Achaiaans, because Naupaktos would have been the object of attack and ought to have been taken by the Achaiaans before Kalydon.<sup>10</sup> This opinion, however, ignores the flexibility and mobility offered by sea routes. It is unlikely that the Achaiaans held it at this time because the Spartan expedition was supporting them, and the Aitolians could hardly have hoped that Agesilaos would deprive his own allies of a possession they already held for the benefit of the Aitolians. Consequently Naupaktos must have been Lokrian at this time.<sup>11</sup>

There is no direct evidence for when the Achaiaans gained control of Naupaktos, but a likely context for it is this very expedition of Agesilaos, for at this point both Lokrian peoples were hostile to the Spartan coalition and had already fought on the anti-Spartan side in the Corinthian War.<sup>12</sup> It would be perfectly in character for Agesilaos to gain passage through Aitolian territory by dangling the prospect of obtaining Naupaktos before the Aitolians and, once he had passed through, giving it to the Achaiaans, the allies on whose behalf the expedition had been mounted and who so far were unsatisfied with its outcome.<sup>13</sup>

Achaian possession of these two outposts lasted until 366,<sup>14</sup> when Epaminondas expelled Achaian garrisons from Kalydon, Naupaktos, and Dyme and freed these cities.<sup>15</sup> It is likely that Kalydon was turned over to the Aitolians, while Naupaktos was returned to the Lokrians, i.e. the Lokrian inhabitants of the city. In this way he would satisfy the hopes of his allies<sup>16</sup> and at the same time gain sites which could ultimately serve as bases for the

<sup>10</sup> E. Oberhummer, *Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas im Altertum*, Munich 1887, p. 119, note 6. L. Lerat rejects this idea: *Les Locriens de l'ouest* (BEFAR 176), Paris 1952, I, pp. 39–41, II, pp. 44–45.

<sup>11</sup> C. Salvetti, "Ricerche storiche intorno alla lega etolica," *Studi di storia antica* 2, 1893 (pp. 93–137), p. 103.

<sup>12</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenika* iv.2.17 (Nemea) and iv.3.15 (Coronea).

<sup>13</sup> In Xenophon, *Agesilaos*, 2.20 we learn that he made the Akarnanians and Aitolians friends to the Achaiaans and allies to himself. This probably took place in Spring 388. Cf. Xenophon, *Hellenika* iv.7.6. How he did this and what it entailed is left unsaid.

<sup>14</sup> The chronology of Epaminondas' third expedition to the Peloponnese is disputed, although usually placed in 367 or 366. Diodoros places it in 367/6. I here accept 366, the date argued by J. Roy, "Arcadia and Boeotia in Peloponnesian Affairs, 370–362 B.C.," *Historia* 20, 1971 (pp. 569–599), p. 592.

<sup>15</sup> In all probability Dyme, which was garrisoned for one reason or another by federal troops, was only freed of its garrison. This idea is rejected by E. A. Freeman (*History of Federal Government in Greece and Italy*, 2nd ed., London 1893, p. 186, note 6). Ephoros, *FGrHist* 70, F 84 probably refers to the capture of Dyme. H. Swoboda (in K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten* I<sup>6</sup>, 3, Tübingen 1913, p. 375, note 5) follows Freeman and believes that Naupaktos remained Achaian to 338. If Diodoros, xv.75.2 is rejected we have no evidence at all for Achaian control of Naupaktos before 342. Cf. H. D. Westlake, "Xenophon and Epaminondas," *GRBS* 16, 1975 (pp. 23–40), pp. 26–28, and J. Buckler, *Theban Hegemony, 371–362 B.C.*, Cambridge, Mass. 1980, pp. 185–193.

<sup>16</sup> The Phokians, Aitolians, and Lokrians were made friends of the Thebans after Leuktra: Diodoros, xv.57.1. The Lokrians were clearly allies of Thebes, for both Lokrian peoples are said to have participated in the first Boiotian expedition to the Peloponnese: Diodoros, xv.62.4; Xenophon, *Hellenika* vi.5.23 and *Agesilaos*, 2.24. The Lokrians also joined the Boiotians at Mantinea in 362: Diodoros, xv.85.2. Diodoros (xv.57.1) lists the Aitolians among the peoples whom the Thebans made their friends. Beloch (*GG* II, 1st ed., Strassburg 1897, pp. 257–258, note 2, omitted in the second edition) suggested that this was a slip. Hohmann (pp. 27–32) explains how the Aitolians could have been members of the Theban alliance without participating in their expeditions.

planned Boiotian navy.<sup>17</sup> For although the Boiotians could not garrison these places, they did want them in friendly hands.

Unlike Kalydon, which appears henceforth as an Aitolian city, Naupaktos offers evidence of further Achaian occupation in 342.<sup>18</sup> Again we are in the position of learning of the existence of Achaian control from its removal, and all the details of the re-establishment of Achaian control at Naupaktos are lost. No evidence exists to show when Naupaktos returned to Achaian control, but it should have happened shortly after Epaminondas expelled the Achaians in 366. If Achaian control had been acceptable to the Lokrian inhabitants, the reversion could have occurred when the Achaian cities rose against the Theban harmosts in 366.<sup>19</sup> Closely related is the suggestion that the reversion happened after the battle of Mantinea in 362 effectively ended the Theban hegemony.<sup>20</sup>

Other dates for the re-establishment of Achaian domination over Naupaktos are sometimes proposed on the basis of chapter 35 of the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Skylax, which places Naupaktos in Aitolia.<sup>21</sup> If this passage was written before 342, it would prove an Aitolian period of occupation before the Achaian reoccupation and thus would entail an Achaian occupation down to 366, an Aitolian occupation sometime between 366 and 342, an Achaian occupation, and a final Aitolian occupation. If this passage was written after Philip handed Naupaktos over to the Aitolians in 338, then there is no complication, and the city was held by the Achaians from their recovery of the city shortly after 366 until 338. Thus we must briefly consider the nature and the date of the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Skylax.

As a result of the scholarship of the 19th century it became accepted that the *Periplus* of Skylax was not written by the well-known navigator of the Indian Ocean (Herodotos, iv.44). It was taken to be a work of the 4th century which passed under the name of the famous Skylax. It was clear that it could not be the personal observations of one man and that it was a compilation of diverse materials from different sources. The lack of mention of any of the geographic changes brought about by Alexander's conquest clearly puts it before his reign. The usual place for it was in the reign of his father Philip. The date of composition is usually determined by a series of *termini post* and *ante quem* from the places mentioned and from their status.<sup>22</sup> The passage mentioning the colony founded by Kallistratos

<sup>17</sup> The suggestion that Epaminondas was interested in gaining naval control of the Corinthian Gulf has been rejected by Buckler ([footnote 15 above] pp. 189–190).

<sup>18</sup> Demosthenes, ix.34. This is the only certain piece of evidence for the second period of Achaian control of Naupaktos.

<sup>19</sup> Xenophon, *Hellenika* vii.1.42–43.

<sup>20</sup> O. Roltsch, *Die Westlokrier*, diss. Universität Jena, 1914, pp. 48–49.

<sup>21</sup> Unger (p. 45) places the reversion in 347 in the context of the Achaian support of the Phocians. This campaign was fought in East Lokris which would have made the seizure of Naupaktos rather difficult. Diodoros (xvi.30.4) places the campaign among the events of the year 354/3, but modern scholarship places it in 355 or 354. Cf. Beloch, *GG* III<sup>2</sup>, 1, pp. 249–250; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, in *CAH* VI, Cambridge 1927, pp. 215–216; Glotz, *HG* III, p. 266.

<sup>22</sup> Various scholars have developed different dates for the work. B. G. Niebuhr ("Ueber das Alter des Küstenbeschreibers Scylax von Karyanda" in *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften* I, Bonn 1828, pp. 105–130) decided that it was written between 352 (when the Phokians were able to seize Epiknemidian Lokris) and 348 (the destruction of Olynthos); A. J. Letronne (*Fragments des poèmes géographiques*, Paris 1840, pp. 165–262), between 348 (Olynthos and the other Chalcidian cities which had been considered to be

of Aphidna at Daton<sup>23</sup> near Neapolis must be after *ca.* 360. Another passage, in chapter 66, mentioning Olynthos in a list of Greek poleis must date before 348. Although habitation at the site may have continued after 348, it is unlikely to have been constituted as a polis at that time. The fact that the entire Chalcidice is considered to be part of Macedonia, on the other hand, suggests a period after Olynthos was destroyed. Echinus is in the hands of the Malians, but Demosthenes tells us that Philip took it from the Thebans in 341.<sup>24</sup> This suggests that the passage was written after 341.<sup>25</sup> A recent study puts the final redaction of the *Periplus* between 361 and 357.<sup>26</sup> Yet it would appear that there are allusions to later events in the text: the Aitolian control of Naupaktos after 338 would be one of the latest things mentioned, although not the latest.<sup>27</sup> Recent scholarship emphasizes the diverse, chronologically distinct strata that make up the work, which was given a thorough revision in the middle of the 4th century, and would convert the *Periplus* from a unitary work of the 4th century which was falsely attributed to Skylax into a re-elaboration of a *Periplus* which might very well go back to Skylax.<sup>28</sup> The latest scraps of information in it are to be dated in the 330's. In any case there is no evidence that Aitolian occupation of Naupaktos should be placed before 338, when Philip handed the city to the Aitolians.

In Demosthenes' third Philippic of 341 we learn that Philip has promised to transfer Naupaktos from the Achaiaans to the Aitolians.<sup>29</sup> The context of the promise seems to be Philip's western campaign of winter 343/2.<sup>30</sup> This promise seems to have attached the

---

in Thrace were now in Macedonia) and 346 (the Phokian cities were not yet destroyed by Philip); C. Müller (*Geographi graeci minores* I, Paris 1882, pp. xliii–xlix), between 338 (when Naupaktos became Aitolian) and 335 (the Strymon divides Macedonia from Thrace; cf. Strabo, vii, frg. 33, which says the Nessos or Nestos was fixed as the boundary by Philip and Alexander in their times, and further there is no mention of an Alexandria); Unger (pp. 29–45), in the first half of 347. Summaries of these arguments are to be found in E. H. Bunbury, *A History of Ancient Geography*, 2nd ed., I, London, 1883, pp. 404–406 and M. L. Allain, *The Periplus of Skylax of Karyanda*, diss. Ohio State University, Columbus 1977, pp. 65–67. The annotated bibliography in A. Diller, *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers* (APA Philological Monograph 14), Lancaster, Pa. 1952, pp. 48–101 is very useful.

<sup>23</sup> Although chapter 66 of the *Periplus* calls the city Daton, the almost contemporary *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup>, 94, line 32, uses Datos in an official document. Most scholars following Strabo, vii.34 and 36 use Daton, e.g. A. Philippson, *RE* IV, 1900, col. 2229, *s.v.* Daton. Cf. Harpokration, *s.v.* Δᾶτος.

<sup>24</sup> Demosthenes, ix.34.

<sup>25</sup> C. T. Fischer, "Quaestionum Scylacearum specimen," in *Griechische Studien Hermann Lipsius . . . dargestellt*, Leipzig 1894 (pp. 141–152), pp. 145–146.

<sup>26</sup> P. Fabre, "La date de la rédaction du périple de Scylax," *EtCl* 33, 1965, pp. 353–366. He argues (p. 360) that Naupaktos became Aitolian when Epaminondas expelled the Achaian garrison and that it fell back into Achaian hands after 362, perhaps in 356 or 355 in connection with the Achaian support of the Phokians. I should again point out that these campaigns were in East Lokris, nowhere near Naupaktos. The date of this passage is much more likely to be after 338.

<sup>27</sup> V. Panebianco, "L'indicazione di Posidonia e di Elea nel periplo di Ps.-Scilace," *PP* 25, 1970, pp. 241–243. The only time that Posidonia could have been a Greek city and Elea an apoikia of Thurii was *ca.* 333–330, in connection with the expedition of Alexander of Epiros.

<sup>28</sup> Allain (footnote 22 above), pp. 65–76. A. Peretti, *Il Periplo di Scilace, Studio sul primo portolano del Mediterraneo*, Pisa 1979.

<sup>29</sup> Demosthenes, ix.34.

<sup>30</sup> J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*, London 1976, p. 158. On the date, cf. G. Cawkwell, *Philip of Macedon*, London 1978, p. 187 and A. Schäfer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* II, 2nd ed., Leipzig 1886, pp. 423–427.

Aitolians to Philip's side and driven the Achaiaans to the side of his enemies. At the beginning of 342 Athens, responding to the perception of the growing threat of Philip, sent ambassadors around Greece and gained the alliance of some Peloponnesian states.<sup>31</sup> The Achaiaans clearly allied themselves with Athens to gain support for their possession of Naupaktos.<sup>32</sup> In 341/40 the Achaiaans joined the Hellenic League formed by Demosthenes to fight Philip.<sup>33</sup> As a result of the war which led to the battle of Chaironeia, Philip was able to carry out his promise, and the city was transferred to the Aitolians, becoming a member of the Aitolian League.<sup>34</sup> There is some question concerning the timing of Philip's capture of the city. Some scholars place it in 338, immediately after the capture of Amphissa.<sup>35</sup> Others place it in the period after Chaironeia.<sup>36</sup> Whether it occurred early in 338 or after the battle of Chaironeia, Naupaktos became Aitolian and remained so until the time of Augustus.

Recently the historicity of the transfer of Naupaktos by Philip to the Aitolians has been challenged by Bosworth.<sup>37</sup> The challenge relies mainly on the fact that, according to Arrian, the Aitolians were uniformly hostile to Macedon almost from the beginning of Alexander's reign.<sup>38</sup> We learn from Arrian that, in the context of the destruction of Thebes in 335, the

<sup>31</sup> Scholion to Aischines, III.83. Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 225.

<sup>32</sup> H. Wankel, *Demosthenes: Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* II, Heidelberg 1976, pp. 1051–1052.

<sup>33</sup> Demosthenes, XVIII.237; Aischines, III.95; [Plutarch], *X Orat.*, 851B; Plutarch, *Demosthenes*, 17; Pausanias, VI.4.7; VII.6.5. S. Accame (*La lega ateniese del secolo IV a.C.*, Rome 1941, pp. 213–214) suggests that in 342 Athens had a series of individual alliances but that in 341/0 they were fused into a Hellenic League.

<sup>34</sup> Strabo, IX.4.7 (C 427); Theopompos, *FGrHist* 115, F 235.

<sup>35</sup> Schäfer (footnote 30 above), p. 559. This date is based on the proximity of the two cities and the citation of Theopompos, *FGrHist* 115, F 235, ἐν β', "in the second book", which is emended to ἐν νβ', "in the fifty-second book". The fifty-third book contained the events relating to the battle of Chaironeia. Among those who accept this date are Beloch (*GG* III<sup>2</sup>, 1, p. 567); Pickard-Cambridge ([footnote 21 above], p. 261); J. Kaerst, (*Geschichte des Hellenismus* I, 3rd ed., Leipzig 1927, p. 261); G. Klaffenbach (*IG* IX<sup>2</sup> 2, 1, p. xii, lines 75–81); Glotz (*HG* III, p. 359); F. R. Wüst (*Philipp II. von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren von 346 bis 338*, Munich 1938, p. 164); N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith (*A History of Macedonia* II, Oxford 1979, p. 594).

<sup>36</sup> Hohmann (pp. 33–34) bases this date on the fact that there is no mention in the sources of the advance from Amphissa to Naupaktos before Chaironeia. The main threat was the allied army in Boiotia, and Naupaktos was a sideshow because the city would fall after the defeat of the allied army. Philip offered peace after Amphissa, and the capture of Naupaktos would vitiate the effect of the offer. Strabo's use of προσκρίναυτος suggests a legal judgment, and we know of a number of disputes that were settled by the Synedrion of the Hellenes (see footnote 44 below). Among those who accept this later date are Salvetti ([footnote 11 above], p. 103); B. Niese (*Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten* I, Gotha 1893, p. 36, note 3); W. A. Oldfather (*RE* XIII, 1926, cols. 1213–1214, s.v. Lokris and *op. cit.* footnote 9 above). It appears to me that the mountainous terrain which did not have easily passable roads between Amphissa and Naupaktos would have deterred Philip from dividing his forces and allowing them to be defeated in detail by the united allied armies. If this consideration outweighs the emended book number in Theopompos, then Hohmann is correct.

<sup>37</sup> A. B. Bosworth, "Early Relations between Aetolia and Macedon," *American Journal of Ancient History* 1, 1976, pp. 164–181. Further discussion by B. Gullath, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Boiotiens in der Zeit Alexanders und der Diadochen* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 169), Frankfurt 1982, pp. 131–132.

<sup>38</sup> Arrian, *Anabasis* I.7.4 and 10.2.

Aitolians sent embassies by tribe to Alexander. From this fact it is argued that the Aitolian League had been dissolved into its component tribes sometime between the battle of Chaironeia and the death of Philip and that the most likely time for this dissolution was the winter of 338/7. The event which precipitated this revolution in Aitolio-Macedonian relations was Philip's refusal to hand over Naupaktos to the Aitolians, although he had promised the city to them. In turn the disgruntled Aitolians seized control of Naupaktos, an act which led Philip to capture the city from them, have the Aitolian garrison executed on the vote of or actually by the Achaiaans, and turn the city over to the Achaiaans.<sup>39</sup>

I think that more evidence must be adduced to demonstrate the dissolution of the Aitolian League. The plural in the text of Arrian, *πρεσβείας σφῶν κατὰ ἔθνη*, may be explained either as an attempt by the individual tribes to repudiate the action of the federal government or as indicating successive embassies from the Aitolian League with representatives from each of the different tribes in each of the embassies. Yet the simplest explanation is to assume that the tribes still played a role in the Aitolian state. The Aitolians had been organized as a tribal state which over the years was converted into a sympolity or federal state composed of individual units, usually city-states. That the Aitolians were able to act effectively during the Peloponnesian War<sup>40</sup> and that in 367 the Athenians complained to the federal government about the actions of one of its component units<sup>41</sup> are indications of a developed federal organization or sympolity. But since the Aitolians seem to have created their sympolity out of the old tribal organization, and not from scratch, they may well have retained older elements, embassies *κατὰ ἔθνη* for example.<sup>42</sup>

The argument against Philip's transfer also takes Strabo's testimony too lightly. Strabo says that Naupaktos was originally Lokrian, but in his day it was Aitolian, *Φιλίππου προσκρίνοντος*. From Strabo's context one should assume that the genitive absolute is closely connected to Aitolian Naupaktos.<sup>43</sup> It would be perverse to assume that it refers to Philip's promise of 342 on which he reneged after Chaironeia. Rather, when Philip took the city from the Achaiaans there were two claimants for it, the Aitolians and the West Lokrians. The verb suggests some form of arbitration or award between the claimants, perhaps in the context of Philip's Corinthian League, which went in favor of the Aitolians.<sup>44</sup> Further, we

<sup>39</sup> The text of Theopompos, *FGrHist* 115, F 235 is here taken at face value. Literally the citation from Suidas says, "When Philip took Naupaktos he killed its entire garrison on the judgment of the Achaiaans," and that from Zenobios says, "When Philip took Naupaktos, the Achaiaans slew the garrison and killed Pausanias the chief of the garrison." A. Schäfer ("Zu den Fragmenten von Theopompos," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 79, 1859, p. 483) emends the latter text to "When Philip took Naupaktos he slew the garrison of the Achaiaans and killed Pausanias the chief of the garrison."

<sup>40</sup> Thucydides, III.94.3–98.5.

<sup>41</sup> M. N. Tod, *Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* II, Oxford 1948, no. 137.

<sup>42</sup> J. A. O. Larsen, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History* (Sather Classical Lectures 28), Berkeley 1955, p. 71 and *idem*, *States* (footnote 1 above), p. 196. In fact Thucydides (III.100.1) tells us that an embassy in 426 contained one representative from each of the different divisions of the Aitolians.

<sup>43</sup> W. J. Woodhouse (*Aetolia, Its Geography, Topography and Antiquities*, Oxford 1897, p. 64) translates it as "it is now an Aetolian possession on the strength of Philip's award" (my italics).

<sup>44</sup> C. A. Roebuck (*A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C.*, diss. University of Chicago 1941, pp. 53–56) believes the transfer of Spartan territory to Messenia, Argos, Megalopolis, and Tegea was carried out through

know that the Achaians participated on the allied side in the anti-Macedonian movement of 331.<sup>45</sup> If Philip had returned Naupaktos to them, it would have been an act of sheer stupidity. Clearly the reason for their adherence to the allied side was hostility to Macedonia, and the main cause of this hostility was the loss of Naupaktos brought about by Philip. The claim that there is no epigraphical evidence for the Aitolian League in the reign of Alexander is weakened by the grant of Delphic proxenia to an Aitolian from Makyneia in 329/8<sup>46</sup> because Makyneia was originally a West Lokrian town and it is unlikely that Aitolia would have retained control of Makyneia after the dissolution of the league. It is more likely that the cause of the Aitolian disenchantment with Macedon was Philip's refusal to give the Aitolians all that they wanted after Chaironeia, rather than his refusal to give them what he had promised. Philip showed by his occupation and garrisoning of Ambrakia that he did not intend to abandon western Greece to his allies the Aitolians, or to anyone else. The Aitolians were probably interested in expansion into Akarnania, Ozolian Lokris, and Amphilochia, and Philip's garrison in Ambrakia would serve as a deterrent to their plans. They took advantage of the turmoil after Philip's death to restore the exiles from Akarnania and were probably involved in the revolt of Ambrakia against the Macedonian garrison and in the establishment of a democracy.<sup>47</sup> Around 330, taking advantage of Alexander's absence in Asia, they seized Oiniadai in Akarnania and expelled the inhabitants.<sup>48</sup>

---

the machinery of the Hellenic League. *IG* XII 3, 1259 (Tod, *GHI* [footnote 41 above], no. 179) shows that Philip's Hellenic League did settle territorial disputes. F. W. Walbank (*A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, II, Oxford 1967, pp. 172–173) says that the "territorial disputes were settled *de facto* before the constitutive meeting of the Hellenic League." See also L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci* I, Pisa 1973, nos. 60, 61, pp. 222–229. Philip seems to have tried to give legal coloring to his transfers of territory to his friends. Tacitus, *Annales* iv.43 shows that the Lacedaimonians claimed that they had been deprived of the temple of Artemis Limnaia and the Denthaliatis by the force of Macedonian arms, while the Messenians stated that Philip had not decided on the basis of power but on truth. Pausanias (ii.38.5) says the Argives claimed they won the Thyreatis in a δίκη and in vii.11.1 states that this dispute was decided before Philip as an impartial judge. Livy (xxxviii.34.8) says the Belbinatis was restored to Megalopolis in accord with an old decree of the Achaians in the reign of Philip II; this should be a reference to the Hellenic League.

<sup>45</sup> Aischines, iii.165; Deinarchos, i.34; Curtius Rufus, vi.1.20. See now E. I. McQueen, "Some Notes on the Anti-Macedonian Movement in the Peloponnese in 331 B.C.," *Historia* 27, 1978 (pp. 40–64), pp. 45–47 and N. G. L. Hammond and F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* III, Oxford 1988, pp. 77–78. On the date, see R. A. Lock, "The Date of Agis III's War in Greece," *Antichthon* 6, 1972, pp. 10–27 and P. A. Brunt, *Arrian* I (*Loeb Classical Library*), Cambridge, Mass. 1979, pp. 480–485.

<sup>46</sup> É. Bourguet, "Inscriptions de Delphes: Sur trois archontes du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *BCH* 23, 1899, pp. 356–357. On the dating, see P. de la Coste Messelière, "Listes amphictioniques du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *BCH* 73, 1949, pp. 234–236. In addition there is also a certain amount of epigraphical material of this period from Delphi which mentions the Aitolians. There are two grants of Delphic proxeny to Aitolians which are dated by the archon Damochares, who is usually placed in the year 334/3: *FdD* III.1, nos. 147 and 148. There is also a collective grant of promanteia to the Aitolians in the archonship of Sarpadon. A case has been made to place Sarpadon in 338/7, the year of Chaironeia, by J. Bousquet ("Les Aitoliens à Delphes au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *BCH* 81, 1957, pp. 485–495), but it may very well be placed later. The significance of collective promanteia is treated by J. Pouilloux, "Promanties collectives et protocole delphique," *BCH* 76, 1952, pp. 484–513.

<sup>47</sup> Diodoros, xvii.3.3.

<sup>48</sup> Diodoros, xviii.8.6 and Plutarch, *Alexander*, 49.15.



To summarize, the Achaians gained control of Kalydon before 389 and granted Achaian citizenship to its inhabitants. In 389 Naupaktos was taken from the Lokrians and added to the Achaian League. In 366 Achaian garrisons in these cities were expelled, and the cities were liberated from Achaian control. Kalydon became and remained Aitolian, while Naupaktos soon returned to Achaian control, where it remained until 338 when it was adjudged to the Aitolians.

IRWIN L. MERKER

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY  
Department of History  
Newark, NJ 07102