

EMMA NICHOLSON

## Philip V of Macedon, ‘*Erōmenos* of the Greeks’: A Note and Reassessment

**ABSTRACT:** Polybios’ famous description of Philip V of Macedon as “the darling of the Greeks” (ἐρώμενος ... τῶν Ἑλλήνων) comes about at a critical moment in the historian’s narrative of the king’s life: it appears at the end of a summary extolling all of the good characteristics and deeds Philip exhibited and achieved in his early years, when he had inspired great hopes of future magnanimity amongst his Greek allies (4.27.9, 77; 7.11); and just before the king takes a sudden turn for the worse in 215 BC, when he incites revolution in the allied city of Messene and attempts to impose a Macedonian garrison on its citadel. This article sets out to break new ground not only in the study of the Macedonian king, but also in the study of the literary aspects of Polybios’ work, by exploring this statement in more depth and arguing that it retained its significance beyond the structural demarcation of Philip’s change. The imagery that such a title inherently possessed and conveyed helped to define and deepen understanding of the relationship between Philip and his Greek allies in his early years by evoking implicit connotations within the audience.

Within Polybios’ “Histories”, Philip V of Macedon (ruled 221–179 BC) is presented as a striking figure. His life is one of opposites: brilliance, success and power, coupled with cruelty, defeat and tragedy. The historian’s portrait is on the whole negative and hostile, depicting a king who falls into increasingly cruel, treacherous and excessive behaviour until he is defeated by Rome in 197 BC, and thereby supposedly punished for his bad behaviour by an avenging *tyche* (Plb. 18.22; 23.10). Yet, this depiction of decline comes about after a glowing start. For the first six years of his reign while still in his youth (c.17–23 years old), Philip is said to have conferred so many benefits upon his Greek allies and displayed such a beneficent policy that Polybios declares he could be called, “the darling of the Greeks” (ἐρώμενος ... τῶν Ἑλλήνων)<sup>1</sup>. This description marks an important moment in the historian’s narrative of the king’s life: it comes at the end of a summary extolling all of the good characteristics and deeds Philip exhibited and achieved in his early years, when he had exceeded expectations and brought about great hopes of his magnanimity for the future among his Greek allies (4.27.9, 77; 7.11). It also comes just before the king’s conduct takes a sudden turn for the worse in 215 BC when he incites revolution in the allied city of Messene and attempts to impose a Macedonian garrison in its citadel (7.10–14). This statement therefore underlines what Polybios considered the highpoint of Philip’s career, and deliberately enhances the contrast between Philip while still in his

1 Plb. 7.11.7–8.

youth and full of potential, and Philip in his adult years having allegedly turned to cruel, excessive and impious behaviour. This description is important therefore in Polybios' structuring of his account of Philip, contrived though it may be, and offers his audience an easy approach with which to understand the king and his life.

Acknowledging that this structuring is vital for understanding Polybios' overall depiction of the king is important, yet it is hardly a novelty in itself.<sup>2</sup> However, the striking nature of the title, ἐρώμενος ... τῶν Ἑλλήνων, and its implications have generally been taken up without question by modern scholarship<sup>3</sup>. This article will therefore set out to break new ground not only in the study of the Macedonian king, but also in the study of the literary aspects of Polybios' work, by exploring this statement in more depth and argue that it retained its significance beyond the structural demarcation of his change<sup>4</sup>. That is, it will discuss how this description helped to define and deepen understanding of the relationship between Philip and his Greek allies in his early years by drawing out the implicit connotations it would have evoked within the audience.

### Defining and Contextualising the Erōmenos

The noun ὁ ἐρώμενος appears rather frequently in the extant literature from the archaic period onwards and within a vast array of genres, yet rather infrequently in Polybios' "Histories". It is found only five times throughout the course of his surviving text (Polyb. 5.28.6–8, 7.11.8, 31.25.4–5)<sup>5</sup>. The

- 2 Note particularly, F. W. WALBANK, *Supernatural Paraphernalia in Polybios*, in: Walbank, Polybios, Rome and the Hellenistic World, Cambridge 2002, 253–5; D. GOLAN, *The Metabole of Philip V. The Res Graeciae in Polybios: Four Studies*, Rome 1995; see also, A. M. ECKSTEIN, *Rome Enters the Greek East: From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230–170 BC*, Berkeley 2008, 132–38.
- 3 See for instance: F. W. WALBANK, *Philip V of Macedon*, Cambridge 1940/60, 67, 74, 275; F. W. WALBANK, *Philippos tragoidoumenos: A Polybian Experiment*, in: *JHS* 58: 55 = WALBANK, *Selected Papers*, Cambridge 1985, 210; R. M. ERRINGTON, *A History of Macedonia*, Berkeley 1990, 184; P. GREEN, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Berkeley 1993, 287; A. ECKSTEIN, *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybios*, Berkeley 1995, 226; D. GOLAN, *The Res Graeciae in Polybios*, 68; B. MCGING, *Polybios' Histories*, Oxford 2010, 161.
- 4 A literary turn in Polybian studies started with J. DAVIDSON, *The Gaze of Polybios' Histories*, in: *JRS* 81, 1991, and has been taken up with increasing interest since. See GOLAN, *The Res Graeciae in Polybios*, N. MILTSIOS, *The Perils of Expectations: Perceptions, Suspense and Surprise in Polybios' in Histories*, in: *Narratology and Interpretation: the content of narrative form in ancient literature*, edited by J. GRETHLEIN & A. RENGAKOS, 2009 Berlin/Boston, 481–506; MCGING, *Polybios' Histories*, 2010, 6–7, 10; F. MAIER, *Learning from History para doxan: A New Approach to Polybios' Manifold View of the Past*, in: *Histos* 6, 2012, 144–168; F. MAIER, *Überall mit dem Unerwarteten rechnen. Die Kontingenz historischer Prozesse bei Polybios*, Munich/Frankfurt 2012; J. GRETHLEIN, *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography. Futures Past from Herodotus to Augustine*, Cambridge 2013, 224–267; F. MAIER, *How to avoid being a backward-looking prophet – counterfactuals in Polybios*, in: *Hindsight in Greek and Roman History*, edited by E. BARAGWANATH & A. POWELL, Swansea 2013; B. MCGING, *Youthfulness in Polybios: The Case of Philip V of Macedon*, in: *Polybios and his World: Essays in memory of F.W. Walbank*, edited by B. GIBSON & T. HARRISON, Oxford 2013; N. MILTSIOS, *The Shaping of Narrative in Polybios*, Berlin/Boston 2013, esp. 1–3.
- 5 Also note that ὁ ἐρώς appears only three times (1.14.2, 5.34.10, 8.10.4), the first in describing the Roman writers Philinus and Fabius Pictor as if those in love (τοῖς ἐρώσι) in their favourable descriptions of the Romans and Carthaginians, the second denotes the love-affairs of Ptolemy IV (τοὺς ... ἐρωτάς), the third quotes an epigram on the tomb of Sardapanalus 'Mine are they yet/the meats I ate,/my wanton sport above,/ the joy of

first two appear in close succession (5.28.6 and 28.8) and both refer in passing to the ἐρώμενος of Philip's adviser Apelles, when the latter is called to Corinth and commits suicide<sup>6</sup>; the third is Philip's title, the ἐρώμενος of the Greeks (7.11.8: ἐρώμενος ... τῶν Ἑλλήνων); and the fourth and fifth are used when Polybios describes a change in the sexual mores of Roman youths following the defeat of Macedonia, pointing out that they had a greater tendency to fall into love affairs with boys and to pay increasingly high prices for an ἐρώμενον (31.25.4–5)<sup>7</sup>. In the first and second occasions, Polybios seems to use the term in a relatively neutral sense and it appears only in passing to convey further detail. In the fourth and fifth, a more negative tone is implied as Polybios is commenting on a change in conservative Roman sexual mores which was received with hostility by some of its members.<sup>8</sup> The third occasion (Philip), however, does imply a more positive reception of the term as the historian has just discussed Philip's glowing reputation among the Greeks.

Interestingly, modern translations of the term have all been consistent in choosing to use three different words or phrases for ἐρώμενος in each of the three contexts, despite there being no change in vocabulary on Polybios' part. In some instances, they also convey very different meanings, both to each other and to the original text. This is partly due to a lack of suitably equivalent terminology in our modern European languages – although, as will be seen below, the Germans have coined a suitably equivalent term. But also partly due to modern perceptions about what Polybios must be trying to say. For instance, while PATON's 1922 Loeb edition, revised by HABICHT and WALBANK in 2012, translates it as 'favourite', 'darling', and 'male favourite' respectively in the last four instances (5.28.8, 7.11.8 and 31.25.4–5), in the first (5.28.6), the word 'minion' is used. While the latter three carry neutral or positive connotations as Polybios intended, the first English term is decidedly derogatory. Within Polybios' text ἐρώμενος could, of course, have possessed a spectrum of meanings depending on context, and its use in describing Apelles' beloved, surrounded by the negative context of his conspiracy against Philip, may have suggested a more hostile and derogatory tone. Yet, the English term 'minion' imposes an even harsher note of negativity than that implied by the historian, or by the language he uses. It is possible that this was influenced by more contemporaneous attitudes towards homosexuality and pederasty. A more neutral English translation, which does not

love' (μετ' ἐρωτος); and ἐράω once (20.8.2) in describing how Antiochos III was in love with (ἐρασθεῖς) and married a Chalcidian woman at about the age of 50. Note also that Polybios only uses ἐραστής once in the entirety of his surviving work – at 2.43.3 – and it is not in the context of this type of relationship, but rather describing Aratos of Sikyon as a 'lover' of the principles of the Achaian League.

- 6 Plb. 5.28.6–8: ἀναγνοὺς δὲ ταύτας, καὶ νομίσας πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἀρχηγὸν εἶναι τὸν Ἀπελλῆν, τοῦτον μὲν εὐθέως φυλακὴν περιστήσας ἐξαπέστειλε μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰς τὸν Κόρινθον, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν ἐρώμενον ... περὶ δὲ τὰς αὐτὰς ἡμέρας συνέβη καὶ τὸν Ἀπελλῆν μεταλλάξαι τὸν βίον, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν ἐρώμενον.
- 7 Plb. 31.25.4–6: οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἰς ἐρωμένους τῶν νέων, οἷδ' εἰς ἑταίρας ἐξεκύντο, πολλοὶ δ' εἰς ἀκρόαματα καὶ πότους καὶ τὴν ἐν τούτοις πολυτέλειαν, ταχέως ἠρπακότες ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος εὐχέρειαν. καὶ τηλικαύτη τις ἐνεπεπτώκει περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἔργων ἀκρασία τοῖς νέοις ὥστε πολλοὺς μὲν ἐρώμενον ἡγορακέναι τάλαντου, πολλοὺς δὲ ταρίχου Ποντικῶν κεράμιον τριακοσίων δραχμῶν.
- 8 For Roman sexual conservatism, see Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 17,20; Sen. *Dial.* 4.32.2; P. VEYNE, *Desire and Passion*, in: *A History of Private Life: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*, vol.1, edited by P. VEYNE, Cambridge 1987, 202–5. See also P. VEYNE, *Homosexuality in Ancient Rome*, in: *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present*, translated by A. FORSTER and edited by P. ARIÈS and B. BÉJIN, Oxford 1985. For Roman reactions to Greek love, see R. MACMULLEN, *Roman Attitudes to Greek Love*, in: *Historia*, 31, 1982, 484–502; and C. B. CHAMPION, *Cultural Politics in Polybios's Histories*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 2004, 58–60.

detect an implicitly hostile tone in the Apelles instances, was given by EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH in his 1889 edition. Here he uses ‘favourite boy’, ‘darling’, and ‘favourite youths’ for each of the three instances respectively<sup>9</sup>. ROBIN WATERFIELD’S 2010 translation, which only covers the Apelles instances in book 5, uses the even more neutral, but loose term, ‘boyfriend’<sup>10</sup>. PAUL PÉDECH, in his 1977 French edition, translated it as “son mignon” ‘his lovely’ for the Apelles case, and “la bien-aimé”, ‘the beloved’ for Philip<sup>11</sup>. MANUELA MARI in her 2005 Italian translation takes a more restrained stance: the positive and neutral terms ‘favorito’ and ‘un amante’ are used for Philip and the male lovers paid for by Roman youths, and ‘il suo favorito’, an ambiguous, suggestive term with sexual connotations, is applied to Apelles’ ἐρώμενος<sup>12</sup>. Similar connotations are implied by HANS DREXLER’S 1990 German translation: for Apelles’ ἐρώμενος, he uses “Lieblingsknabe”, which may be translated as ‘favourite boy’ or ‘lover’, specifically in a passive position and in relation to an erotic relationship between a man and a boy; for Philip, “Liebling”, equivalent to ‘darling’ or ‘favourite’; and for the Roman ἐρώμενοι “schöne Knaben”, ‘beautiful boys’<sup>13</sup>.

These disparities in translation stand as a warning. They suggest that we are not be entirely certain as to the original meaning or shades of meaning of ἐρώμενος in every instance. It is especially puzzling that in only one episode – the one in which Philip is described – ἐρώμενος receives translations with fewer sexual and pederastic connotations than the others. It seems only right to question and be suspicious of this anomalous treatment. Furthermore, our own modern conceptions and biases may distort our understanding of the term. What makes approaching it with the original context and meaning in mind difficult is that as this term was familiar to both his Greek and Roman readers the historian never felt the need to expand on it. Yet, the positivity of the term in relation to Philip is at least unmistakable. Moreover, if Polybios had intended a more derogatory meaning he would have compromised his own construction of the king’s life as one which started off brilliantly and then sharply declined into notoriety; a construction which was vital to the structure of his whole explanation for Macedonia’s fall and Rome’s rise. It is, of course, possible that darker undercurrents of meaning could also have been implied without compromising the primary purpose of its application and it is important to acknowledge this complexity when exploring the consequences of Polybios’ use of the term.

### Social and Cultural Aspects

Before we move on to the implications of this title, it would be prudent to briefly outline the social and cultural features that accompanied the figure of the ἐρώμενος. This will allow us not only to reinforce the discrepancies in meaning between the Greek terms and its various modern translations just discussed, but also provide a more comprehensive and nuanced definition of the figure and surrounding customs which may be used as a reference in discussing Philip’s title. Defining the

9 Polybios, “The Histories of Polybios”, transl. E. S. SHUCKBURGH, London 1889.

10 Polybios, “The Histories”, transl. R. WATERFIELD, Oxford 2010.

11 Polybe, “Histoires”, transl. P. PÉDECH, Paris 1977.

12 Polybios, “Storie”, transl. M. MARI, Milan 2005.

13 Polybios, “Geschichte”, transl. H. DREXLER, Munich 1990.

ἑρώμενος is, however, not without its difficulties as we are dependent on ambiguous and varying terminology in the sources – for instance, the more ambiguous term *pais* (plural *paides*) meaning variously ‘boy’, ‘child’, ‘girl’, ‘son’, ‘daughter’ or ‘slave’, or *paidika* ‘having to do with *paides*’ were often used in the same sense (it should be noted, however, that Polybios never uses *pais* or *paidika* in this way). It should also be remembered that cultural practices will also not have been uniform over time or place<sup>14</sup>. Despite these issues, however, we can establish some basic principles. The ἑρώμενος can be described as a young man of aristocratic birth, usually before he had grown his first beard and in the years in which he would undergo his military training (generally between 15–17 years old).<sup>15</sup> Sometimes the term could be used merely as an endearment, such as that expressed by a parent; however, more frequently, from the archaic period onwards, it was connected with pederasty. In this context, the ἑρώμενος, generally the younger partner, was courted by an older ἑραστής, ‘lover’ or ‘admirer’, who would hope to win the affections of the younger by his value as an exemplar and by the patience, devotion and skill with which he comported himself in courting and educating the ἑρώμενος. If the ἑρώμενος accepted these attentions, a relationship of reciprocation and mutual benefit could develop<sup>16</sup>. While this relationship often had a sexual element to it, its primary importance lay within its maintenance of solidarity within elite circles as a kind of male bonding and its part in the education of the younger party, introducing him into the military, political and social customs of his class<sup>17</sup>. The ideal ἑραστής-ἑρώμενος relationship was therefore pedagogical and frequently seen, particularly by the elite, as advantageous to Greek society as it aimed to produce citizens of good moral character who would reinforce and bring stability to aristocratic circles and the wider community<sup>18</sup>.

While pederasty was established and developed in the archaic and classical periods, attested most clearly in Athens, Sparta, Crete, and Thebes, it was still in practice in the Hellenistic world<sup>19</sup>.

- 14 See K. J. DOVER, *Greek Homosexuality*, Harvard 1978, 16. The ambiguity of *pais* is also discussed at length in Ch.3 of J. DAVIDSON, *Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece*, London 2007, 68–98.
- 15 For *eromenoi* and pederasty see DOVER, *Greek Homosexuality*; F. BUFFIÈRE, *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique*, Paris 1980; W.A. Percy, *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, Champaign 1996; D. H. GARRISON, *Sexual Culture in Ancient Greece*, Norman 2000, 108–110, 157–74, 239; T. K. HUBBARD, *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome. A Sourcebook of Basic Documents*, Berkeley 2003, 4–7; DAVIDSON, *Greeks and Greek Love*; T. K. HUBBARD, *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*, London 2013, Ch. 7 ‘Ancient Pederasty: An Introduction’.
- 16 DOVER, *Greek Homosexuality*, 202; GARRISON, *Sexual Culture*, 157–8.
- 17 Cf. the relationship between Socrates and Alcibiades in Plato, “Symposium” 216c–219e. Also note, GARRISON, *Sexual Culture*, 157.
- 18 In the “Symposium”, Aristophanes advances the notion that pederasty produces a good politician (191e–192a). Cf. K. J. DOVER, *Aristophanes’ speech in Plato’s Symposium*, in: *JHS* 86, 1966, 45. For the connection between pederasty and social and military organisation, particularly in Doric cities, see also DOVER, *Greek Homosexualities*, 192–94, and Ch. 1 of MURRAY, *Homosexualities for a general discussion of homosexuality and the production of warriors*, and pp. 34–43 specifically for ancient Greece.
- 19 For Crete see fn.8. For Athens see, for instance, D. COHEN, *Law, Society and Homosexuality in Classical Athens*, in: *Past & Present* 117, 1987, 3–21; T. K. HUBBARD, *Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens*, in: *Arion* 6 (1), 1998, 48–78. For Sparta, see MURRAY, *Homosexualities*, 37–41; A. POWELL, *Dining Groups, Marriage, Homosexuality*, in: *Sparta*, edited by M. WHITBY, New York/London 2002, 90–103; P. CARTLEDGE, *The Politics of Spartan Pederasty*, in: *PCPS* 27, 2013, 17–36. For the Theban Sacred Band, see D. LEITAO, *The Legend of the Sacred Band*, in: *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*, edited by M. C. NUSSBAUM & J. SIHVOLA, Chicago 2002

For instance, Polybios' predecessor, Ephoros of Cyme, confirms the continued understanding and existence of pederasty, as well as the continued use of the terms ἐραστής and ἐρώμενος as general descriptions of the relevant figures, when he describes the Cretan rituals of pederastic abduction. Here he explicitly points out that the ἐρώμενος in this case was called κλεινός 'famous', and the ἐραστής, φίλῆτωρ 'befriender'<sup>20</sup>. Carystios of Pergamon, a historian writing at the end of the second century BC, also mentions how Demetrius of Phaleron's young beloved, Diognis, was the envy of many of the youths in Athens at the time for receiving the attentions of such a high-ranking and influential lover<sup>21</sup>. It is, of course, in Hellenistic poetry that pederastic themes appear most prominently, particularly in the poetry of Callimachus of Cyrene (310–305–240 BC), his contemporary Theocritus of Syracuse and Meleager of Gadara (c. first century BC)<sup>22</sup>. A short poem by Alkaios of Messene (c. 200 BC), a contemporary of Philip and who wrote five epigrams on the Macedonian king himself, also centres on a pederastic relationship<sup>23</sup>. Despite a continued emphasis on the need for virtuous behaviour in the ἐρώμενος, it is here in Hellenistic poetry that we find greater realism in the depiction of the ἐραστής-ἐρώμενος dynamic as tastes moved away from the idealism of the classical period<sup>24</sup>. In light of the enduring practice of pederasty in the Hellenistic period, therefore, Polybios' use of the term ἐρώμενος and his lack of definition and description come as no surprise. His Greek audience would clearly have known what he was talking about.

The Romans were also familiar with and practised same-sex relationships as is indicated not only by Polybios' comments on changing sexual mores at 31.15.4–5, but also, for example, by the poems of the first century BC poets Catullus and Lucretius<sup>25</sup>. However, their attitude towards pederasty tended to be rather different. Male-male relationships were generally expected and socially

143–169; MURRAY, *Homosexualities* 41–43.

20 See Ephoros of Cyme, 2A 70 F = FHG 149: ... τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἐρώμενον καλοῦσι κλεινόν, τὸν δ' ἐραστήν φίλῆτορα ... See also DOVER, *Greek Homosexuality*, 189–90; PERCY, *Pederasty and Pedagogy*, 23; S. O. MURRAY, *Homosexualities*, 34–37.

21 Carystios of Pergamon, FHG 10.14–18:

Ἐξηλοτύπουν δὲ πάντες οἱ παῖδες τὸν ἐρώμενον  
αὐτοῦ Θεόγριν· καὶ τοσοῦτον ἦν τῷ Δημητρίῳ προσελ-  
θεῖν, ὥστε, μετ' ἄριστον αὐτοῦ περιπατήσαντος παρὰ  
τοὺς Τρίποδας, συνήλθον εἰς τὸν τόπον παῖδες κάλλι-  
στοὶ ταῖς ἐξῆς ἡμέραις, ἴν' ὄφθειεν αὐτῶ.

22 See, for instance, Callimachos AP 12.43 (2 GP), and 12.73 (4 GP); Theocritus *Idyll* 5, 12, and 13; and Meleager AP 12.33 (90 GP), 12.41 (94 GP), 12.63 (91 GP), 12.72 (92 GP) and 12.81 (86 GP).

23 Alkaios of Messene, AP 12.29 (7 GP); for those on Philip see Alkaios of Messene G-A. 7.247, 9.518, 9.519, 11.12, 16.5 and 16.6. Cf. G. DE SANCTIS, *Storia dei Romani*, Vol. 4, Torino 1923, 1, 9; F. W. WALBANK, *Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V and Rome*. Part I, in: CQ 36, 1942, 134–145, and *Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V and Rome*. Part II, in: CQ 37, 1943, 1–13; A. MOMIGLIANO, *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, Rome 1984, 431–46; C. F. EDSON, *Philip V and Alcaeus of Messene*, in: CP 43, 1948, 116–121; K. GUTZWILLER, *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*, London 2007, 117.

24 For an overview of pederasty in Hellenistic poetry see BUFFIÈRE, *Eros adolescent*, 279–324; HUBBARD, *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome*, 268–71.

25 See Catullus "Carmina" 24, 48, 81, 99; Lucretius "De Rerum natura" 4.1052–1056. For later references to same-sex activity, see for instance, Tibullus 1.4, 8 and 9; Propertius 4.2; Vergil "Eclogue" 2; Suet. "Julius Caesar" 49; "Galba" 22; Plut. "Galba" 9; Tacitus "Annales" 11.2. For Roman sexuality, see P. VEYNE, *Homosexuality in Ancient Rome*; J. P. HALLETT & M. B. SKINNER, *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton 1997; M. W. GLEASON, *The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning in the Second Century C. E.*, in: C. A. WILLIAMS, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, New York, Oxford 1990; M. B. SKINNER, *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*, London 2013.

tolerated within Roman society, particularly before marriage, however, the acceptability of such a partnership was closely tied up with the specific role that the individual took and his social standing. As long as the receptive position was taken up by an individual of lower status, such as a male prostitute (*concupinus*), slave or boy (*puer*), there was little cause for concern. However, this was not the case if the receptive partner was a freeborn Roman male, nor if both individuals were of relatively equal status and age, as was often the case with pederastic relations in Greece. By occupying such a role instead of the more acceptable dominant, penetrative one, a Roman's very moral standing as an upright Roman citizen would be compromised. Moreover, while the Greek *eromenos* was usually idealised and a pederastic relationship considered beneficial to society, the Roman equivalent was far more vulnerable to ridicule, as indicated by the derogatory nature of the equivalent Latin term *cinaedus* (see also *catamitus*, *pathicus*, *pedico*) and the relationship was thought rather to compromise the strength and virtue of Roman society<sup>26</sup>. The reception of Greek pederasty was therefore generally negative and Polybios' Roman audience, while likely to have understood the Greek term and its social context, would not have viewed it in such glowing terms, particularly when applied to a king. However, it is unlikely that the Romans were Polybios' target audience for this particular episode given its Greek context, and this negative response would therefore have been secondary to its primary positive one.

### Speaking 'A bit more hyperbolically ...' (Polybios 7.11.8)

While understanding the background and customs associated with the term *έρώμενος* is essential when discussing Polybios' description of Philip as the 'darling of the Greeks', we should not place too much importance on the pederastic relationship it might imply. This is clear when we consider Polybios' whole statement:

καθόλου γε μήν, εἰ δεῖ μικρὸν ὑπερβολικώτερον εἰπεῖν, οἰκειότατ' ἂν οἶμαι περὶ Φιλίππου τοῦτο ῥηθῆναι, διότι κοινός τις οἶον ἐρώμενος ἐγένετο τῶν Ἑλλήνων διὰ τὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως εὐεργετικόν.

Indeed on the whole, if one must speak a bit more hyperbolically, I think it most fitting for this to be said about Philip: that he was someone who became a universal *έρώμενος*, as it were, of the Greeks because of his beneficent conduct. (7.11.8)

Crucially, in describing Philip in this manner we find that Polybios admits not only to speaking 'a bit more hyperbolically' (μικρὸν ὑπερβολικώτερον), but also additionally implies by his use of *τις* 'someone' and *οἶον*, 'as it were', that this was not a real title or situation. Moreover, the presence of the first person singular, *οἶμαι*, could even suggest that this is a description of the king not in common usage, but a title ascribed to him by Polybios himself. This is a critical point: the historian does not usually

26 For the sexual roles and terms, see WILLIAMS, Roman Homosexuality, 177–208; A. RICHLIN, Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the Cinaedus and the Roman Law against Love between Men, in: Journal of the History of Sexuality 3, 1993, 523–73. See also M. DUBUISSON, Graecus, graeculus, graecari: L'emploi péjoratif du nom des grecs en latin, in: ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque, edited by S. SAÏD, Leiden 1991, 315–35.

allow the use of sensational or excessive language which might stretch and distort the truth of events, as this compromises what he saw as the most important feature of history – its didactic quality<sup>27</sup>. This statement, and Polybios' admission of even slight exaggeration, is therefore unusual.

As we have seen, while the historian acknowledges his own exaggeration, he still uses ἐρώμενος ... τῶν Ἑλλήνων, with all the connotations and heightening effects that it could bring, to draw out the importance of this moment and Philip's early reputation for brilliance amongst the Greeks. It must therefore have been incorporated deliberately for rhetorical effect: by declaring that Philip was 'the ἐρώμενος of the Greeks' Polybios intensifies the king's relationship with them and brings about an emotional quality to its interpretation. Philip's turn away from the Peloponnese and Greek affairs following the conclusion of the Social War (220–217 BC), most evident in his attempt to take Messene in 215 BC (7.12–14), therefore becomes far more personal and negative. In Greek eyes, the relationship was meant to produce an individual who would protect, reinforce and benefit the current status of their community – in this case, protect, reinforce and benefit the independence and strength of the Achaian League and its allies in the Peloponnese. Yet, Philip decided to take a different approach and compromises their freedom and strength. While Polybios excuses himself from criticism of stretching the truth and thus hypocrisy at this point by softening his statement with μικρὸν ὑπερβολικώτερον, τις and οἶον, he still imprints a slightly more dramatic interpretation onto his audience's mind. The historian's softening is diminished or even forgotten as these are not the words that carry impact. This is evident from the title's use in modern scholarship: we tend to ignore the fact that Polybios says that this was not technically the case and instead freely consider Philip to have been the 'darling of the Greeks' in a more literal sense. If we have been so taken in by this rhetoric, would not Polybios' original audience have been too?

As far as we know from the surviving material, Polybios does not use this title for Philip again, not even in his later summaries of the king's life (cf. 25.3.9–10). In conjunction with the historian's admission of slight exaggeration, therefore, it seems that this was not a description meant to be taken literally – Philip was not literally the ἐρώμενος of the Greeks. That would of course be possible. It was used rather as a device to reinforce the poignancy of the moment – to bring his account of Philip to the height of its splendour and then bring it crashing down with the account of his sudden reversal<sup>28</sup>. Similar metaphorical language is used in other sections of his account of the king's life: just a few lines after this episode Polybios describes the king's change to a tyrant as that of a wolf

27 The crucial importance of preserving the beneficial nature of history by recording events as truthfully as possible without ornamentation and excessive sensationalism is brought out by Polybios on numerous occasions within his work (for instance, Philinus and Fabius at 1.14.1–2, and those writing about Hannibal at 3.48.8–9), but is most prominent in his polemic against Phylarchos in Book 2 (2.58–63), Theopompos (8.8–11) and Timaios in Book 12 (12.15), and in general at 9.1–2. There are exceptions in Polybios' own practice, however, including his concession to patriotism and description of the Achaian League (16.14.6–10; 2.) and occasional scenes of high drama and emotion in his own work: the chaos of battle at Molon's second attack on Seleucid forces (5.48.9); the tragic mode at the end of Philip's life (23.10–11); and the dignity of Hannibal's wife at the time of her suicide following the fall of Carthage (38.20). For the didactic benefit of history see 1.1.1–4, 14.6–11; 2.6.7–7.12, 35.5–10, 56.11–12; 12.12.1–3, 25b.

28 Note 7.11.1, 10: ἐγὼ δὲ κατὰ τὸ παρὸν ἐπιστήσας τὴν διήγησιν βραχέα βούλομαι διαλεχθῆναι περὶ Φιλίππου, διὰ τὸ ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι τῆς εἰς τοῦτοπαλιν μεταβολῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ χεῖρον ὁρμῆς καὶ μεταθέσεως ... ἀπὸ τοίνυν τῶν κατὰ Μεσσηνίου ἐπιτελεσθέντων ἅπαντα τὴν ἐναντίαν ἐλάμβανε διάθεσιν αὐτῷ. Cf. 7.13.6: ἐν ᾧ παρὰ μίαν ἡμέραν Δημοκρίτου μὲν παρόντος, ὡς ἀρτίως ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ Μεσσηνίου ὑπεδείξαμεν, Ἀράτου δὲ καθυστερήσαντος, ἤρξατο Φίλιππος ἄπτεσθαι τῶν μεγίστων ἀσεβημάτων.

who has had his first taste of blood (7.13.7); and finally at the end of Philip's years Polybios claims Fortune set furies and avenging spirits (ἐρινῦς καὶ ποινὰς) against the king in punishment for his previous cruelty, impiety and excess (23.10.2)<sup>29</sup>. These latter two images, as well as the description of Philip as the ἐρώμενος of the Greeks, are clearly meant to be taken metaphorically. Recognising this feature, it therefore becomes necessary to explore how this metaphor developed the picture of the king for his audience, and what Polybios wished to imply about the relationship between Philip and the Greeks in using it.

Importantly, Polybios does not explicitly call any party a corresponding ἐραστής, although he does make Philip the beloved 'of the Greeks', *implying* that they as a whole could be perceived as occupying such a position. This vagueness means, of course, that we cannot be entirely sure how far to take this as a metaphor based on the concept of a pederastic relationship. It could have been meant merely as a term of endearment. Yet, the fact that benefits conferred by an ἐρώμενος are explicitly stated as a feature of this relationship, as well as the fact that Polybios himself acknowledges the existence of such relationships in Greek and Macedonian culture by his earlier references to Apelles' ἐρώμενος (5.28.6–8; see above), would suggest that pederastic connotations should be taken into consideration. It is also likely that Polybios' original audience would have understood the phrase, at least in part, along these lines as another layer of interpretation for the king. This is particularly the case when we consider the pedagogical nature of Philip's relationship with the Greeks at the time. However, before we start probing into this educational aspect more closely, it is first necessary to make some preliminary remarks about Philip's counterpart in this relationship – οἱ Ἕλληνες 'the Greeks' – and who they were.

### 'Of the Greeks'

In translating τῶν Ἑλλήνων, modern scholars have frequently taken it to mean, rather sweepingly, that Philip was the darling of Greece as a whole. In their conception τῶν Ἑλλήνων, 'of the Greeks', has become τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 'of Greece'<sup>30</sup>. Acknowledging and keeping the distinction between the Greeks as people and Greece as the land is important, however, because confusing the two would suppose a political and social unity within Greece, as well as within Greek public opinion, which did not exist at the time. Moreover, this modern blurring is a reflection of another issue of detail: Poly-

29 See L. HAU, Tyche in Polybios: Narrative Answers to a Philosophical Question, in: *Histos* 5, 2011, 183–207. For other further discussions of the various interpretations of the role and use of *Tyche* in Polybios' text, see for example, F. W. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary on Polybios*, Vol. 1, Oxford 1957, 16–26; P. PÉDECH, *La Methode Historique de Polybe*, Paris 1964, 331–354; ECKSTEIN, *Moral Vision*, 238–71; F. W. WALBANK, *Fortune (Tyche) in Polybios*, in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, edited by J. MARINCOLA, London 2007; and J. DEININGER, *Die Tyche in der pragmatischen Geschichtsschreibung des Polybios*, in: *Polybios und seine Historien*, edited by V. GRIEB & C. KOEHN, Berlin/Boston 2013, 71–111.

30 In particular, see the translations of Polybios' text by PATON/HABICHT & WALBANK, MARI, DREXLER and PÉDECH discussed on pp. 2–3, fn. 5–8. But also secondary literature, for instance: WALBANK, *Philippos tragodoumenos: A Polybian Experiment*, 55–68; WALBANK, *Philip V of Macedon*, 67, 258; P. GREEN, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Berkeley 1993, 287; ECKSTEIN, *Moral Vision*, 226; MCGING, *Polybios' Histories*, 161.

bios' own original blurring of terminology, specifically his lack of differentiation between the king's Greek allies and the Greeks as a whole. Polybios' lack of clarity was noted by FRANK WALBANK in his *Commentary*, where he observed that 'τῶν Ἑλλήνων' must in this case have meant Philip's Greek allies, rather than the Greeks as a broader category<sup>31</sup>. While WALBANK makes no qualifying remark to support this statement, and the presence of κοινός may seem to suggest otherwise, this is still very likely the case given the literary context. Just before this statement Polybios listed the benefits which Philip had conferred upon his Greek allies from the beginning of his reign down to 215 BC. Within this summary he does not mention any acts of goodwill towards neutrals or enemies. It should be noted, however, when discussing this passage that it is corrupted right in the middle of the list of beneficiaries (ἄμα δὲ τούτοις Ἡπειρωτῶν, Ἀκαρνάνων ... ὅσων ἐκάστοις ἀγαθῶν ἐν βραχεῖ χρόνῳ παραίτιος ἐγένετο); we therefore only have the Epirotes and Akarnanians, two allies in the Symmarchy, as certain recipients and we are left uncertain as to the length of this list and whether or not benefits may have been bestowed upon Greeks beyond the king's allies. Yet, despite this difficulty, there is still little problem in rejecting the assumption that 'τῶν Ἑλλήνων' meant the Greeks in general. The presence of τὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως εὐεργετικόν at the end of the statement supports this line of reasoning, especially if we also take into account the historical context. Philip's protracted war against the Aitolians and their Spartan allies would certainly not have encouraged them to view Philip as their ἐρώμενος or to have viewed his conduct towards them as εὐεργετικός; rather he would have been an energetic and ruthless enemy who had defeated them in the Social War only a few years before. For the same reason, while the presence of κοινός could compromise this narrower definition, it is far more likely that it emphasises the fact that the king was loved universally by his allies because of his beneficent conduct, rather than indicate a wider spread of goodwill.

A similar instance of exaggeration is also evident in the very next sentence, when Polybios claims that in 219 BC all of the Kretans united and entered into one confederacy with Philip as hegemon of the whole island, and this was because of the honourable principles and good faith that he displayed (7.11.9)<sup>32</sup>. Previously at 4.54 and 55, Polybios stated that of the Kretans it was only the Polyrrenians, Lappaian, Keraian, Orii, and Kretan Arcadians who allied themselves to Philip in the Symmarchy to strengthen their position against their stronger island enemies, Knossos and Gortyn, who had recently received Aitolian reinforcements. The war on Krete generally went in favour of Philip and his allies, and within a short amount of time Eleutherna, Kydonia and Aptera had joined the coalition. After the defeat of Aitolia on the mainland in 217, the Knossians and Gortynians were also compelled to join the league, but this did not mean that Philip was hegemon of the whole island – the city of Itanos, amongst others, was still attached to Egypt for instance. Polybios therefore exaggerates the completeness of Macedonian control and again shows himself not opposed to blurring the details at this point.

31 F. WALBANK, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 2, Oxford 1967, 58; cf. M. HOLLEAUX, *Rome, Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.*, Paris 1921 164 n.7.

32 See F. WALBANK, *Philip V*, 33–4, 67 n.5; A. CHANIOTIS, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*, Stuttgart 1996, 441, n. 76.

‘Τῶν Ἑλλήνων’, therefore, very likely only refers to those Greeks allied to Philip in the Symmachy: the Achaian League, Epirotes, Phokians, Boiotian League, Akarnanians, Euboians Thesalians, and the Kretan cities attached to him<sup>33</sup>.

Yet, what about the Achaian leader, Aratos of Sikyon, and his role as Philip’s adviser? Aratos had acquired a very close advisory position with the young Philip even before the beginning of his reign, when his uncle and predecessor Antigonos Doson had encouraged Philip to attach himself to the Achaian leader. Philip would have been about 16 or 17 years old<sup>34</sup>. Could the Achaian also represent an ἐραστής figure? He was after all the Greek (at least in Polybios’ narrative) most closely attached to the king and most influential during his early years. Yet, while this is an attractive notion, it must be emphasised that this was not the way Polybios defined this relationship; it was not defined as one existing between two individuals, and he therefore must have been pointing towards something else. It seems that Polybios did not want to draw attention to or discuss the relationship between Philip and Aratos at this point – indeed in the early books of the “Histories” the historian was trying to defend Aratos’ involvement with the Macedonians, and drawing attention to this connection would only bring Aratos into further suspicion. Instead, he wanted to highlight the king’s wider relationship with his Greek allies. It was the emphasis on this greater relationship, and how it was built and later destroyed by the king’s cruelty, which allowed Polybios to illustrate how the Achaians were later justified in defecting from their alliance with the Macedonian king to Rome in 198 BC. This does not mean that Aratos could not be seen to inhabit this role; while the phrase ἐρώμενος ... τῶν Ἑλλήνων signifies the counterpart to be in the plural, Aratos was one of the leaders of this group and could have been included, if implicitly, within this phrase.

This vagueness in distinguishing between Philip’s Greek allies and the Greeks as a whole is still difficult, however, as Polybios frequently insists upon the necessity of clarity and precision<sup>35</sup>. Could this blurring of terminology therefore be deliberate and used intentionally to make this statement more profound? The fact that Philip is described as a κοινός ... ἐρώμενος (a metaphorical embellishment) τῶν Ἑλλήνων (which implicitly also allows the inclusion of a wider category of Greeks and is thus another exaggeration), and not just as a good benefactor and ally, certainly makes his status, as well as the moment of his turn to the worse, far more momentous. The comment is of special significance for the rest of his “Histories”, and it would not therefore be altogether surprising if this was a deliberate strategy implemented by the historian. Moreover, the slight exaggerations inherent

33 See Plb. 4.9.5; 7.11.7; 11.4–6. For a comprehensive discussion of the Symmachy, its foundation, members and institutions see K. SCHERBERICH, *Koinè symmachía: Untersuchungen zum Hellenenbund Antigonos’ III Doson und Philipps V. (224–197 v. Chr.)*, Stuttgart 2009.

34 Plut. Arat. 46.1. For Philip’s relationship with Aratos see R. M. ERRINGTON, Philip V, Aratus and the “Conspiracy of Apelles”, in: *Historia* 16, 1967, 19–36; E. GRUEN, Aratus and the Achaean Alliance with Macedon, in: *Historia* 21(4), 1972, 609–25; and GOLAN, The Metabole of Philip V, in *The Metabole of Philip V. The Res Graeciae in Polybios: Four Studies*, Rome 1995.

35 Note his efforts to make his “Histories” as clear as possible by structuring around four-year Olympiads and geographical rotation, as well as the use of a plain writing style (Plb. 29.12.9–10; 16.17.10). For discuss of his structure see F. W. WALBANK, *Symploke: its role in Polybios’ Histories*, in: *Selected Papers*, edited by F. W. WALBANK, Cambridge 1985, 317–24. For his plain writing style, see WALBANK, *Commentary I*, 11; J. MARINCOLA, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge 1997, 11; MILTSIOS, *The Perils of Expectations: Perceptions, Suspense and Surprise in Polybios’ Histories*, 481–82; MCGING, *Polybios’ Histories*, 4–6.

within the phrase would, as discussed above, still be qualified and softened by his earlier admission of hyperbole (μικρὸν ὑπερβολικώτερον).

‘τῶν Ἑλλήνων’ may also reflect the main Greek audience to which Polybios saw himself addressing at this point, and perhaps even throughout his work – the Achaian League and the old members of the Symmachy. It is, of course, impossible to be certain but as this passage inflates the intimacy of the connection between the king and his Greek allies, it would not be surprising if he aimed this part of his work at least at those in his homeland who were previously attached to the king. After all, his “Histories” were meant as an instructive piece and he wanted to explain why the League was originally attached to Philip and Macedonia, why it was appropriate to defect to Rome when it did, and why the later resurgence of pro-Macedonian feeling following the succession of Perseus, Philip’s son, was foolish (note particularly 27.9–10). What better way to remind the Greeks about what their relationship with Macedonia was like under Philip then to point out how it all went suddenly wrong only a few years after Philip had instilled great expectations in them?

### Developing the Metaphor

What helps to create and develop this metaphor is the fact that the various themes surrounding an ἐραστής-ἐρώμενος relationship – aristocratic birth, youth and youthful brilliance, education and coming of age, courtship and reciprocity – are all important parts of Philip’s early years.

Philip is a young king. He comes to the throne and starts to build his relationship with the Greeks at the tender age of 17; it is six years later, at 23 years old, that this stage of his life ends with his shift in focus and attempt on Messene.<sup>36</sup> The age of the Macedonian king fits, therefore, within the age-range deemed suitable for an ἐρώμενος. During this period, Philip is also said to have exhibited startling political and military competence for one so young: he shows leniency and a careful and measured response to Spartan civil unrest and wavering loyalty to Macedonia at the start of his reign, preferring to urge the Spartans to reinforce their oath of alliance instead of resorting to violence (4.22–24, 81); he also shows consideration and goodwill towards the Achaians after hearing about Apelles’ despotic and exploitative treatment of them in 219 by putting a swift stop to it – Apelles had allowed Macedonian soldiers to expel Achaians from their billet and take it for themselves, as well as inflict physical punishment on them for trivial offences (4.76). Philip also demonstrates competency and prowess in war by his successful raids on Thermos in 218 (5.6–14), his successful raid and attack of Sparta in the same year (5.18–24), and his conclusion of the war with Aitolia in 217 under terms beneficial to himself and his allies (5.102–5). Moreover, he always shows awareness of the need to protect and promote the interests of his allies, coming to their need whenever necessary, and sometimes even when not<sup>37</sup>. Thus, he raised great expectations among his

36 Philip was born in 238 BC and came to the throne in 221 BC (Plb. 4.2.5); Justin’s claim at 28.4.16 and 29.1.1 that he was only fourteen upon his accession is incorrect. See J. V. A. FINE, *The Mother of Philip V of Macedon*, in *CQ* 2, 1934, 100, and WALBANK *Commentary I* 290, 450.

37 For Polybios’ development of Philip’s youthful brilliancy, see MCGING, *Youthfulness in Polybios*. For Philip’s continuous attempts to protect his Greek allies at this time, see for instance Plb. 4.19, 22–26, 61–3, 66–69, 76–7; 5.5. For his help uncalled for, see 4.29.2–3, 65, 70–1; 5.18–23.

Greek allies of future magnanimity and benevolence (4.77)<sup>38</sup>, and by this reputation for military brilliance and moral character could have easily represented an ideal youth worthy of attention and adoration, similar to that envisioned in the figure of the ἐρώμενος.

Education and coming of age are equally prominent. As just mentioned, prior to Philip's succession, Aratos became attached to Philip in an advisory capacity at the instigation of Antigonos Doson (see p. 8, fn. 25). This was meant to encourage a familiarity with Greek politics and society in the young prince which would increase understanding of the best way to deal with the Greeks in future, as well as foster valuable personal connections with the Achaian League and its leaders. Upon Philip's succession Aratos continued to hold an influential position, not only becoming one of the φίλοι 'friends' at Philip's court but also, Polybios states, advising him on a number of important occasions upon the best ways to act and behave in politics and war. This is particularly clear in relation to Philip's attack of Thermos (5.6–12) as well as the ultimate decision not to install a Macedonian garrison on the Messenian citadel in 215 BC. In the former, it was suggested that Philip not allow his troops to rest after marching to Thermos, but to attack it immediately – delay would allow the Aitolians time to return from campaign in Thessaly and retaliate. In the latter case, that of Messene, Aratos only just prevented Philip from installing the intended garrison, because he pointed out that doing so would have greatly endangered the goodwill the king had thus far built up with his allies in the Peloponnese (7.12–14). Moreover, according to Polybios it is under Aratos' careful guidance that Philip is able to learn about the political and social customs of his Greek allies, build and preserve a good relationship with them, and manoeuvre himself into a position of esteem (7.13.2–8; cf. 5.12.5–8). In terms of coming-of-age, this was also the time when Philip gradually gained more and more control over his own kingdom and position, and threw off the overbearing and manipulative grip of a number of Macedonian advisers assigned by his uncle to guide him at the beginning of his reign (4.76.1, 4.87). This comes to a head in 218 with the suppression of the conspiracy led by Apelles which aimed to intimidate, undermine and compromise the king and his military endeavours. It ended with the assassination of all of its participants (5.25–28; cf. 4.76, 82–87; 5.1–5, 14–16).

Finally, the Achaian approaches to Philip in 220 BC to aid them in their wars against the Aitolians could also be seen, in a sense, as a type of 'courtship', and the following reciprocal benefactor/beneficiary nature of the relationship between Macedonia and Greece reflects that between an admirer and a beloved (although it should be noted that the analogy here does not work in regard to the different statuses of the participants – Philip is a king and the Greeks are his allies – and therein lies an important difference in power dynamics)<sup>39</sup>.

This period and its main event, the Social War, therefore, represent a clear pedagogical stage in Philip's life. These are the years when Philip learns how best to act and behave as a king, and how

38 P1b. 4.77.1: Φίλιππος μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν ὁμίλιαν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ὑπαίθροις συνδιατρίβοντας καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς πράξιν καὶ τόλμαν οὐ μόνον παρὰ τοῖς στρατευομένοις ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσι Πελοποννησίοις εὐδοκίμει.

39 For this benefactor/beneficiary relationship see P. GAUTHIER, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Athens 1985; K. BRINGMAN, *The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism*, in: *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, edited by A. W. BULLOCH, Berkeley 1993; and J. MA. KINGS, in: *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, edited by A. ERSKINE, London 2003, 179–83. The relationship between the Antigonids and Greeks was based far more on negotiation and therefore more volatile than that between the Seleucids and Ptolemies and their subjects. See MA, *Kings*, 181–83 for kingship and local 'role-assignment'.

best to interact and deal with the Greeks – and it is his Greek allies who help him to do so as the metaphorical *ἐραστής*. With the opportunities that this relationship gave him, the young king establishes himself as a competent monarch and military commander, successful in war. It is not hard to discover, therefore, how Polybios came to see Philip in this period as the *ἐρώμενος* of the Greeks. It is at Messene, however, that this pedagogical period ends. Like the *ἐραστής-ἐρώμενος* relationship, it is inevitable that it must. Philip has grown up and gotten rid of the restraints imposed upon him by his teachers and guardians, Macedonian and Greek. Moreover, having settled himself as king, he has also settled the Peloponnese and his affairs in it by ending the Social War. It is now that Philip, as an experienced king of proven ability, decides to take a different direction and begins to distance himself from the close relationship he possessed with Aratos and his Greek allies that allowed his rise. One could argue that he himself, now a man in his prime, takes on a new relationship – one involving Demetrios of Pharos, the West and Rome, and importantly one in which he does not take on an *ἐρώμενος* role.

## Conclusion

For Polybios, therefore, describing Philip as the *ἐρώμενος* of the Greeks not only marked a crucial moment in the development of Philip's life, but also offered a metaphor which would have more clearly embodied and showcased the pedagogical and reciprocal nature of Philip's early relationship with his Greek allies. Our varying translations reveal a mismatch not only in the ancient and modern acceptance of pederasty, and the appropriateness of references to it in certain situations, but also a misconception about what Polybios was trying to achieve by using the word. The consequence of differences in culture and language mean that we have lost some of Polybios' artistry.

By placing Philip in the role of *ἐρώμενος* he is able to underline to his main Greek audience, with no need for long-winded explanation, that the king was young, still relatively green to the fields of politics and war, but an attractive ally showing great promise for the future, and already conferring benefits upon his Greek allies in exchange for their attention and training at this time. In implicitly assigning Philip's Greek allies to the role of the *ἐραστής*, Polybios also suggests that Philip's early years in Greece were beneficial to his own political and military strategy, and encouraged moral behaviour, leniency and reasoned action (note Polybios' defence of Aratos' guidance and character at 5.12 and 7.12–14). It was not because of anything that his Greek allies did that Philip turned to such cruelty, impiety and excess. In the wider context of the "Histories", the metaphor also contributes to the defence of the Achaian League and Aratos: firstly in regard to their decision to form an alliance with Macedonia after years of anti-Macedonian activity; and secondly in regard to their possession of such a close relationship with the Macedonian king for so long.

The use of the title also allows for more flexibility, however: the description of Philip as a *κοινός* 'shared' or 'common' beloved of the Greeks might also suggest a more derogatory note and encompass implications of promiscuity. Moreover, the Romans, although not the main audience for this episode, would certainly not have considered this a flattering title. Indeed, they may have seen it as an agreeable addition to the description of Philip's infamy. It is possible that such suggestiveness and negativity may also have been intentionally used to foreshadow and reflect on the king's later fall from grace.

As far as we know, Polybios does not apply this description to any other of the Hellenistic kings within what survives of his narrative. But then neither Antiochos III, or Ptolemy IV, or any of their successors were so closely connected with the Greeks of the mainland. Only Philip developed such an intimate connection. This places him in a much more personal relationship not just with the Greeks whom Polybios writes about, but also with the historian himself as an ex-statesmen of the Achaian League and citizen of Megalopolis. This description therefore attempts to inspire a personal connection in those connected, as well as importantly in those unconnected, with the king and surrounding events. It aims to illustrate, in Polybios' eyes, the rightful outrage that should be prompted by the king's actions at Messene. In conjunction with other attempts to inspire anger against Philip (cf. 7.13; 15.20; 22.13; 23.10; 27.10.3), this title and the following dramatic turn for the worse further develops a message of decline which helps to explain why the king's Greek allies were justified in leaving their alliance with Macedonia, and why he ultimately lost the fight for supremacy against Rome.

EMMA NICHOLSON  
University of Exeter

