

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to decode the intended symbolism that lies behind the proclamation of Greece's freedom at the Isthmian festival of 196. This proclamation displays meaningful similarities with Greek manumission customs, in both its delivery (a herald's announcement at a gathering place) and vocabulary (technical use of a formulaic expression with ἀφίημι and ἐλεύθερος). This intended symbolism squares well with the traditional τόπος of slavery *vs* freedom, which was very commonly exploited throughout the Macedonian wars and which is explicitly applied to Flamininus' role in Greece, most notably in Alcaeus' epigram AP 16.5. But although Greek freedom is a familiar theme, especially during the Hellenistic age, there is no truly satisfactory parallel for the Isthmian episode. Arguably, the Romans chose a particularly theatrical and emotional way to announce Greece's freedom in order to effectively win control over Greek public opinion.

Keywords

Flamininus, Isthmian games, Greek freedom, Manumission, Polybius

The proclamation of Greece's freedom at the Isthmian festival of 196 is a most famous episode in ancient history. Among the many significant issues involved, this proclamation appealed to the traditional political slogan of Greek freedom<sup>2</sup>, and the actual assessment of its function and meaning in this particular event lies at the heart of our overall understanding of the Romans' politics and policies in Greece<sup>3</sup>. Any treatment of such issues would clearly require discussing a large array of controversial aspects. But my concern in the present paper is much narrower in its primary scope. What I aim to show is that the very way in which Greece's freedom was announced was meant to turn this event, in the eyes of the Greek audience, into a symbolic large-scale replica of so-called Greek 'civic' manumissions. Thus, the episode would best be put on a par with the recurrence of the concepts and imagery of freedom and slavery within the diplomatic vocabulary of the time.

*The Manumission of Greece*

The momentous event of the Isthmian festival of 196 is described in virtually the same way by a number of sources, all of which ultimately rely on Polybius' account of the episode<sup>4</sup>.

Greeks from every region crowded Corinth's stadium<sup>5</sup>, for everyone could foresee that some important announcement concerning Greece's fate was imminent. Indeed, after Philippos' defeat at

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Albio Cesare Cassio, Donatella Erdas, Anna Magonetto, and Peter J. Wilson, who read and commented on this article at different stages of its development. Special thanks are due to John Thornton for his insightful remarks. I also wish to thank Sergio Knipe, who has improved the English of this article. I am solely responsible for any remaining factual errors and/or misjudgements.

<sup>2</sup> On this topic see especially DMITRIEV 2011.

<sup>3</sup> A thorough discussion is provided by DMITRIEV 2011, 151-165 (a select bibliography on the episode is also provided by BURTON 2011, 224 and n. 107).

<sup>4</sup> Plb. 18.46, Liv. 33.32, Plut. *Flam.* 10.4-10, App. *Mac.* 9.4, Iust. 30.4.17, Val. Max. 4.8.5.

<sup>5</sup> According to Polybius (18.46.1), for instance, σχεδὸν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἀνδρῶν συνεληλυθότων.

Cynoscephalae all Greeks were anxious to find out what the Roman plans for their country were. The Aetolian anti-Roman propaganda had rapidly gained popularity<sup>6</sup>, and not a few people came to believe that the Romans, not aiming at Greek freedom at all, simply wanted to substitute Philippus' domination with their own by leaving garrisons in strategic places<sup>7</sup>. The announcement at the Isthmian games was to provide an answer to all this. Having silenced the audience in the stadium, a herald declared that the Roman senate and Flamininus, who had just defeated Philippus and the Macedonians, were setting a number of Greek populations free, without any garrisons, and without subjecting them to any tribute, allowing them to restore their traditional laws. The names of the populations concerned follow. After the herald had finished, the crowd reacted tumultuously and a second identical announcement by the herald was required in order to make everybody sure of what had just been made publicly known.

Flamininus' choice of having Greece's freedom proclaimed in this fashion has often been described as a spectacular way of making the announcement<sup>8</sup>. And Polybius' vivid description of the event reinforced this opinion<sup>9</sup>. Some scholars also framed the Isthmian episode together with others which show the Romans' sensitivity to Greek agonistic culture<sup>10</sup>. All this is certainly very reasonable. But it seems to me that the intended symbolic overtones of the episode have been largely overlooked.

As a number of literary and epigraphical sources attest, all over ancient Greece one typical way of freeing slaves was by having a herald announce their manumission in assembly places (especially at the theatre) during major public festivals<sup>11</sup>. An explicit (though indirect) Polybian instance of this custom is to be found in Plb. 5.76.5, where the liberation of Logbasis' slaves is described with the words κηρύξαντες τοῖς δούλοις ἐλευθερίαν. I deem it certain that for the proclamation Flamininus consciously chose to draw upon this custom<sup>12</sup>. For in the herald's speech we have in Polybius (and in Plutarch and Appian after him) one reads that the Roman senate and Flamininus ἀφίᾳσι ἐλευθέρους the Greeks<sup>13</sup>, and the expression with ἀφίᾳμι and ἐλεύθερος is technical one in so-called 'civic' manumissions, as both literary and epigraphical sources largely

---

<sup>6</sup> Plb. 18.45.6-8 ἐκ δὲ τούτων εὐθεώρητον ὑπάρχειν (sc. the Aetolians said) πᾶσιν ὅτι μεταλαμβάνουσι τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς πέδας παρὰ Φιλίππου Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ γίνεται μεθάρμοσις δεσποτῶν, οὐκ ἐλευθέρωσις τῶν Ἑλλήνων. [7] ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑπ' Αἰτωλῶν ἐλέγετο κατακόρως [...] [8] πλεοναζούσης δὲ τῆς τῶν Αἰτωλῶν διαβολῆς καὶ πιστευομένης παρ' ἐνίοις.

<sup>7</sup> Plb. 18.46.1-2 πολλοὶ καὶ ποικίλοι καθ' ὅλην τὴν πανήγυριν (sc. the Isthmian festival of 196) ἐνέπιπτον λόγοι, [2] τῶν μὲν ἀδύνατον εἶναι φασκόντων Ῥωμαίους ἐνίων ἀποστήναι τόπων καὶ πόλεων, τῶν δὲ διοριζομένων ὅτι τῶν μὲν ἐπιφανῶν εἶναι δοκούντων τόπων ἀποστήσονται, τοὺς δὲ φαντασίαν μὲν ἔχοντας ἐλάττω, χρεῖαν δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν παρέχεσθαι δυναμένους, καθέξουσι.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. BADIAN 1958, 73: «Flamininus staged his greatest *coup de théâtre*».

<sup>9</sup> PFEILSCHIFTER 2005, 297: «selbs wenn man einiges von Polybios' emphatischen Bericht abzieht, bleibt eine immense Wirkung auf die Zeitgenossen».

<sup>10</sup> See KYLE 2015, 262-263.

<sup>11</sup> See now the thorough discussion provided by ROCCA 2015.

<sup>12</sup> Not by chance, after the Isthmian festival Antiochus' ambassadors went to Corinth to praise Flamininus and the Roman commission, but they were urged to tell the Seleucid king to keep away from all free Greek cities of Asia Minor and to withdraw from all former Ptolemaic and Macedonian possessions in Greece, because οὐδένα γὰρ ἔτι τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε πολεμῆσθαι νῦν ὑπ' οὐδενὸς οὔτε δουλεύειν οὐδενί (Plb. 18.47.2).

<sup>13</sup> This content of the announcement is identical in Polybius' and Plutarch's accounts of the event. Appian alters it a little. The Latin sources present the *status* of the Greek populations by using Roman juridical terms (i.e. *liberos immunes*). For the possibility that Flamininus adapted the original *senatus consultum* to a form more suitable for the Greek audience, see BADIAN 1958, 87 and DMITRIEV 2011, 3 and 280.

attest<sup>14</sup>. Once we take all this into account, the opposition drawn between Flamininus and Xerxes in Alcaeus' epigram *AP* 16.5<sup>15</sup> appears to be more than just a rhetorical commonplace because, while the latter went to Greece to enslave the country, the former brought its slavery to an end<sup>16</sup>. Finally, it should also be considered that Flamininus' subsequent celebration in the whole of Greece as σωτήρ and ἔλευθέριος<sup>17</sup> – both epithets of Zeus Eleutherios<sup>18</sup> – would clearly fit within the same context. For Zeus Eleutherios was not only addressed as the divinity protecting Greek civic freedom, but as the god of slaves and freedmen too<sup>19</sup>.

The fact that the Isthmian declaration of 196 took place in the stadium, and not at the theatre as was often the case with manumissions, does not affect the present argument. To begin with, the Isthmian festival was probably intentionally chosen by Flamininus<sup>20</sup>. And since this was an especially gymnastic festival, the gathering of the audience in the stadium, rather than at the local theatre, is no surprise<sup>21</sup>. One could even speculate a bit further. In Corinth, as we learn from Pausanias (2.1.7), the theatre was a short distance away from the stadium<sup>22</sup>. As a consequence, one might argue that the decision to have the Greeks gathered in the stadium and their freedom proclaimed there was due to the huge number of people who had arrived in Corinth, an element all our sources are very keen to highlight<sup>23</sup>. Be that as it may, on a more general level the precise location of the announcement, whether the stadium or the theatre, should probably not bear any particular weight. For originally the key reason for choosing an assembly place during a festival in order to announce a slave's manumission was simply to make the largest available audience witness the liberation which was

---

<sup>14</sup> See e.g. Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.15 and Arist. *Rhet.* 1373b 18. For a discussion of various epigraphic examples see also ROCCA 2011, 258 and n. 3 (with previous bibliography on the distinction between 'civic' and 'sacral' manumission), ROCCA 2015, 23-24 and 27, and ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ 2005, *passim*. The translators of Polybius, Plutarch, and Appian fail to notice this detail.

<sup>15</sup> Alc. *AP* 16.5 ἄγαγε καὶ Ξέρξης Πέρσαν στρατὸν Ἑλλάδος ἐς γᾶν, | καὶ Τίτος εὐρείας ἄγαγε' ἀπ' Ἰταλίας· | ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Εὐρώπα δοῦλον ζυγὸν αὐχένι θήσων | ἦλθεν, ὁ δ' ἀμπαύσων Ἑλλάδα δουλοσύνας.

<sup>16</sup> See line 4: ὁ [sc. Flamininus] δ' ἀμπαύων Ἑλλάδα δουλοσύνας. One should also note the recurrence of the freedom slogan and the extensive use of the verb *liberare* and cognate forms in Flamininus' speech against Nabis of Sparta in 195 (see Liv. 34.32.3-4-6-8-13).

<sup>17</sup> One is reminded here of Flamininus' acclamation in Corinth in 194 as *servator* and *liberator* (Liv. 34.50.9).

<sup>18</sup> See WALBANK 1967, 613-614.

<sup>19</sup> See BÖMER 1991, 113-115.

<sup>20</sup> As DMITRIEV 2011, 280 rightly points out, the Roman choice of a Corinthian festival was also due to the fact that «this city's history had been closely intervoven with the use of the slogan of freedom».

<sup>21</sup> It ought to be borne in mind that we also know of assemblies taking place (just occasionally or on a regular basis) in the stadium (see, for instance, the case of Athens and the evidence collected by GILMAN ROMANO 1985, 454 and n. 58). For the interactions between drama and athletics in the Greek world see LARMOUR 1999.

<sup>22</sup> In Hellenistic cities there are also cases in which the theatre and the stadium formed a single complex (see GILMAN ROMANO 2016, 318).

<sup>23</sup> According to GEBHARD 1973, 30, in the lower cavea of the theatre «approximately 1,550 persons could have been accomodated, with room for many more on the slope above». Even doubling the figure of those potentially attending the event (i.e. counting those sitting on the slope), there would probably not have been enough space for the huge crowd of people gathered at Corinth from all over Greece that Polybius describes. On the contrary, it is easy to imagine that the stadium was larger than the theatre. For the position of Corinth makes likely that the Isthmian festival usually attracted a large audience, probably one even larger than those of other major Panhellenic festivals (see DILLON 1997, 112). This may well have been a further reason for Flamininus' choice of having Greece's freedom proclaimed during this particularly convenient occasion.

being made public. A theatre provided a useful location for this, but the evidence we have clearly proves that it was by no means the only convenient place<sup>24</sup>.

### *Freedom, slavery, and liberation at the time of the Macedonian Wars*

The symbolic interplay with manumission customs at the Isthmian proclamation of 196 is no surprise, for it participates in the rhetoric of freedom, slavery, and liberation that was recurrent at the time of the Macedonian wars.

On the one hand, this was a useful anti-Macedonian theme. Greece's δουλεία under the Macedonians is explicitly stated by the Aetolian Chlaeneas in Polybius<sup>25</sup>, and δουλεία is also said to be Sparta's condition in those years, when the city was subject to the tyranny of Nabis<sup>26</sup>. It is worth adding that with regard to the event that occurred in the spring of 194, when Roman slaves previously sold by Hannibal in Greece were made free and given to Flaminius as he was about to sail back to Italy with the army, Livy<sup>27</sup> notes that it would have been very odd for those who had made Greece free to become its slaves.

But, on the other hand, the rhetoric of slavery and manumission was useful for Rome's opponents too. Before the Roman intervention in Greece, in Plb. 9.37.7<sup>28</sup> the Achaean ambassador Lyciscus (responding to Chlaeneas' words – see above) foresees that the Greeks will fight for their own freedom against people (the Romans) who will try to force them into slavery<sup>29</sup>.

The slavery-freedom τόπος comes to the surface again during the Syrian war too. In a decree from Iasos (*I. Iasos* 4, dated by Blümel<sup>30</sup> to between 195-193 and now by Fabiani<sup>31</sup> to between 196/5 and 195/4), issued to honour Antiochus III and Laodice III, the Seleucid king is praised for having freed

---

<sup>24</sup> See also RÄDLE 1969, 14-16 and Rocca 2015: 20-21. Plutarch's account of the Isthmian episode displays some theatrical vocabulary in the broadest sense, but this is common for assemblies too (let us think of Cleon's speech in Thuc. 3.38.3-7; for Polybius see CHANIOTIS 1997, 229-231).

<sup>25</sup> Plb. 9.28.1 ὅτι μὲν οὖν, ὧ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, τὴν Μακεδόνων δυναστείαν ἀρχὴν συνέβη γεγενῆσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλήσι δουλείας, οὐδ' ἄλλως εἰπεῖν οὐδένα πέπεισμαι τολμῆσαι. But this applies to the Macedonian population too (see Plb. 36.17.13 Μακεδόνες μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἐτετεύχισαν φιλανθρωπιῶν, κοινῇ μὲν πάντες ἀπολυθέντες μοναρχικῶν ἐπιταγμάτων καὶ φόρων καὶ μεταλαβόντες ἀπὸ δουλείας ὁμολογουμένως ἐλευθερίαν). Shortly after Plb. 9.28.1 the origin of Greece's slavery is traced back to the Diadochi (Plb. 9.29.6 οἱ δὲ τυράννουσ ἐμφυτεύοντες οὐδεμίαν πόλιν ἄμοιρον ἐποίησαν τοῦ τῆσ δουλείασ ὀνόματος).

<sup>26</sup> See e.g. Plb. 4.81.13 πικροτάτης δὲ δουλείασ πείραν ἔλαβον (*sc.* the Spartans) ἕως τῆσ Νάβιδος τυραννίδος, οἱ τὸ πρὶν οὐδὲ τούνομα δυνηθέντες ἀνασχέσθαι ῥαδίως αὐτῆσ, Liv. 34.41.4 *serua Lacedaemon relicta*, Plut. *Flam.* 12.1 καὶ προέμενος (*sc.* Flaminius) τὴν Σπάρτην ἀναξίως δουλεύουσαν (*sc.* under Nabis).

<sup>27</sup> Liv. 34.50.5 *ne ipsis quidem honestum esse in liberata terra liberatores eius seruire*. Livy and the other sources for this episode are collected by ECKSTEIN 1990, 71 n. 80.

<sup>28</sup> Plb. 9.37.7-8 τότε μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἡγεμονίας καὶ δόξης ἐφιλοτιμεῖσθε πρὸς Ἀχαιοὺσ καὶ Μακεδόνας ὁμοφύλους καὶ τὸν τούτων ἡγεμόνα Φίλιππον· νῦν δὲ περὶ δουλείασ ἐνίσταται πόλεμος τοῖς Ἑλλήσι πρὸς ἄλλοφύλους ἀνθρώπους (*sc.* the Romans), [8] οὐσ ὑμεῖσ δοκεῖτε μὲν ἐπισπᾶσθαι κατὰ Φιλίππου, λελήθατε δὲ κατὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐπεσπασμένοι καὶ κατὰ πάσης Ἑλλάδος.

<sup>29</sup> On this passage see further THORNTON 2010, 58-59 and n. 73, who underlines that, beside the metaphorical allusion to political submission, Lyciscus also mentions, or alludes to, actual episodes of enslavement of Greeks by the Roman army.

<sup>30</sup> BLÜMEL 1985, 23.

<sup>31</sup> FABIANI 2015, 209, 267-268.

some Greeks<sup>32</sup>, and in particular the city of Iasos itself<sup>33</sup>. Blümel rightly underlined the topical nature of this praise<sup>34</sup>, and following a remark by Hicks and J. & L. Roberts he reminds that in Liv. 37.17.6 people from Iasos call their being subject to Antiochus a *servitus regia*. This is of particular interest for the present discussion too. For in a passage of Livy (34.58.10-11)<sup>35</sup> Flaminius contrasts Antiochus' aim to enslave the Greek cities with the *patrocinium* of Greece's freedom that Rome had provided in the past (i.e. during the Macedonian wars). Given the opposition with the *servitus* that Antiochus wished to impose on the Greeks, the Roman *patrocinium* might be seen to aptly define the relationship of a former master with a *libertus*.

The manumission symbolism of the Isthmian episode of 196 squares well with the evidence just collected. To my mind, this spectacular proclamation was meant to give concreteness and vividness to an otherwise merely verbal declaration of Greek freedom, and to fully satisfy the Greeks' need for an answer with regard to the Romans' plans for Greece after Philippos' defeat. This theatrical proclamation was designed to allow the Romans to gain control over the emotions of the Greek public<sup>36</sup>.

#### *Parallels for the Isthmian episode of 196 (?)*

Announcements appealing to the already traditional slogan of Greek freedom are common throughout Hellenistic history. There is plenty of evidence of diadochoi, epigonoι, and later Hellenistic kings issuing written decrees in which they declare Greek communities free<sup>37</sup>. The vocabulary which defines the status of the freed communities is quite fixed and closely paralleled in the Isthmian declaration of 196 too<sup>38</sup>. However, in no single case does one find anything even vaguely comparable in form of delivery and displayed symbolism to what occurred at the Isthmian games of 196<sup>39</sup>.

A parallel for this episode, albeit only a partial one, would be provided by Aratus of Sicyon's freeing of Corinth from Antigonos in 243<sup>40</sup>. There are a number of similarities. Both events took place in Corinth<sup>41</sup>. Aratus declared the city's freedom when entering in the local theatre, and was welcomed by the cheering Corinthian population. However, beside the fact that Aratus had just seized Corinth at night while Flaminius organised a (long-awaited) public announcement at a major Panhellenic

<sup>32</sup> See line 45: [τι]νᾶς (sc. Greeks) δὲ ἀντὶ δούλων ἐλευθέρους πεποιηκότος.

<sup>33</sup> See lines 47-48: τὴν δὲ ἡμετέραν πόλιν πρότερόν τε ἐγ δουλείας ὀυσάμενος ἐποίησεν ἐλευθέραν.

<sup>34</sup> BLÜMEL 1985, 25: «Antiochos hat einige Hellenen aus Sklaven zu Freien gemacht: dies gilt gerade für Iasos, das er aus der 'Sklaverei' Philipps V. in die 'Freiheit' der Seleukiden überführt hat. [...] Es handelt sich um eine politische 'Parole', ein Schlagwort, das jede Partei gegen den Gegner benutzte».

<sup>35</sup> Liv. 34.58.10-11 *si sibi Antiochus pulchrum esse censet, quas urbes proavus belli iure habuerit, avus paterque nunquam usurpauerint pro suis, [11] eas repetere in servitutem, et populus Romanus susceptum patrocinium libertatis Graecorum non deserere fidei constantiaequae suae ducit esse*. On these episode see further the discussion of MA 2002, 99.

<sup>36</sup> On this and other aspects of the theatricality of Hellenistic politics, see especially CHANIOTIS 1997.

<sup>37</sup> An exhaustive discussion is provided by DMITRIEV 2011, 112-141, who collects all relevant episodes. The formulas regularly features words and concepts such as ἐλεύθερος (ἐλευθερία, ἐλευθερώω, ἐλεύθερος + ἀφίημι), ἀφρορητος, and αὐτόνομος (αὐτονομία).

<sup>38</sup> See Dmitriev 2011, 180: «Flaminius likely refined the senatus consultum (which proclaimed the Greeks to be "free and under their own laws") into a declaration that sounded more familiar to the Greeks: the latter were to be "free, ungarrisoned, untaxed, and under their own ancestral laws"».

<sup>39</sup> See FERRARY 1988, 83-88 for the discussion of likely Hellenistic antecedents.

<sup>40</sup> An account of this episode may be found in Plut. *Arat.* 18-23.

<sup>41</sup> See above n. 20.

festival, a number of further important elements mark a striking difference between the two episodes. First of all, nothing in the way in which Aratus declared Corinth free is in line with Greek manumission customs. He did not have freedom proclaimed by a herald (just after the fight against the Macedonian garrison, Aratus entered the theatre still wearing his armour and announced freedom himself), nor did he make any use of the technical vocabulary of manumission<sup>42</sup>. Second, while after Philippos' defeat the Romans declared their (apparent) will to abstain from imposing their control over Greece (as some people feared – let us think here of the aforementioned rapidly spreading διαβολαί of the Aetolians about the Romans' plans for Greece), Aratus defeated the Macedonian garrison in Corinth so that the freed city could join the Achaean League, as he hoped it would. In other words, while the Romans apparently renounced their newly gained possibility to exercise control over Greece, and to do so actually performed its manumission<sup>43</sup>, Aratus freed Corinth from a third party, as he did not come into possession of the city to be manumitted.

### *Conclusions*

Bearing in mind what has been argued thus far, Flaminius' decision of having Greece's freedom spectacularly announced by a herald by using manumission formulas looks much more meaningful than had hitherto been noted. And it must certainly have struck the Greeks as such too. As Dmitriev has recently emphasised, "the Greek audience reacted so positively to the declaration of Flaminius [...] because his declaration used the concepts of 'freedom' and 'autonomy', which were familiar to them, and they thus immediately understood his message"<sup>44</sup>. The same considerations apply all the more so to the manumission symbolism that was put on display in Corinth.

Federico Favi, Oriel College, University of Oxford  
federico.favi@classics.ox.ac.uk  
Oriel College, Oxford OX1 4EW, United Kingdom  
Via Vincenzo Comparini 145, 00188 Roma

### Bibliography

BADIAN 1958

E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.)*, Oxford 1958.

BLÜMEL 1985

W. Blümel, 1985. *Die Inschriften von Iasos*. Teil I: Nr. 1-218, Bonn 1985.

BÖMER 1991

---

<sup>42</sup> Aratus' symbolic act was to give back to the Corinthians the keys of the city that had previously been taken away by Antigonos (Plut. *Arat.* 23.4).

<sup>43</sup> See also FERRARY 1988, 81-82. Indeed, and despite all promises and the declaration of 196 itself, the Romans handed control over parts of Greece over to the Achaean League and local rulers, modified constitutions, and retained Chalcis and Demetrias (though not for long), the two other remaining fetters of Greece apart from Corinth.

<sup>44</sup> DMITRIEV 2011, 3-4.

F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom. Erster Teil: die wichtigsten Kulte und Religionen in Rom und im lateinischen Westen*. Zweite, durchgesehene und von Peter Herz in Verbindung mit dem Verfasser erweiterte Auflage, Wiesbaden 1991<sup>2</sup>.

BURTON 2011

P. J. Burton, *Friendship and Empire. Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353–146 BC)*, Cambridge 2011.

CHANIOTIS 1997

A. Chaniotis, *Theatricality Beyond the Theater. Staging Public Life in the Hellenistic World*, in B. Le Guen (Éd.), *De la scène aux gradins. Theatre et representations dramatiques apres Alexandre le Grand*, Toulouse-Le Mirail 2011, 219-259.

DILLON 1997

M. Dillon, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*, London-New York 1997.

DMITRIEV 2011

S. Dmitriev, *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*, Oxford 2011.

ECKSTEIN 1990

A. M. Eckstein, *Polybius, the Achaeans, and the 'Freedom of the Greeks'*, «GRBS» 36 (1990), 45-71.

FABIANI 2015

R. Fabiani, *I decreti onorari di Iasos. Cronologia e storia*, München 2015.

FERRARY 1988

J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Rome 1988.

GEBHARD 1973

E. R. Gebhard, *The Theater at Isthmia*, Chicago-London 1973.

GILMAN ROMANO 1985

D. Gilman Romano, *The Panathenaic Stadium and Theater of Lykourgos: A Re-Examination of the Facilities on the Pnyx Hill*, «AJA» 89 (1985), 441-454.

GILMAN ROMANO 2016

D. Gilman Romano, *Athletics. Stadia, Gymnasia, Palaistrai, and Hippodromes*, in M. M. Miles (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Architecture*, Chichester 2016, 418-538.

KYLE 2015

D. G. Kyle, *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*, Malden, MA 2015<sup>2</sup>.

LARMOUR 1999

D. Larmour, *Stage and Stadium. Drama and Athletics in Ancient Greece*, Hildesheim 1999.

MA 2002

J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford 2002<sup>2</sup>.

PFEILSCHIFTER 2005

R. Pfeilschifter, *Titus Quinctius Flamininus. Untersuchungen zur römischen Griechenlandpolitik*, Göttingen 2005.

RÄDLE 1969

H. Rädle, *Untersuchungen zum griechischen Freilassungswesen*, Diss. München 1969.

ROCCA 2011

F. Rocca, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1560 e la pratica della manomissione ad Atene: alcune osservazioni, «HISTORIKÁ» 1 (2011), 247-268.

ROCCA 2015

F. Rocca, *La liberazione degli schiavi e il teatro*, «Epigraphica» 77 (2015), 9-37.

THORNTON 2010

J. Thornton, *Barbari, Romani e Greci. Versatilità di un motivo polemico nelle Storie di Polibio*, in E. Migliario - L. Troiani - G. Zecchini (a cura di), *Società indigene e cultura greco-romana. Atti del convegno internazionale*, Trento 7-8 giugno 2010, Roma 2010, 45-76.

WALBANK 1967

F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius. Volume II. Commentary on Books VII-XVIII*, Oxford 1967.

ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ 2005

R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free. The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*, Leiden-Boston 2005.