

Interstate Relations Study Day
Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies & Department of Classical Studies, UW
Balsillie School of International Affairs (BSIA 142)
67 Erb St. W., Waterloo Ontario
8 January 2013

Program with Abstracts

9:00 – Coffee and Tea

9:30 – 12:45 – Morning Session

- 9:30 – 9:45: **Altay Coşkun**, University of Waterloo: Introduction
- 9:45 – 10:45: **Hans Beck**, McGill University: “Of Pigs and Dolphins: Intercommunal Relations in a Hellenistic Federal State”

The Greek world witnessed various attempts to integrate small polis communities into larger entities and, effectively, streamline their intercommunal relations. Federalism was the most prominent of those attempts. When modern scholars have approached the topic of political integration, they have tended to elaborate on the political structures of leagues and confederacies. Only recently have other factors of integration been detected, such as the belief in a joint heroic ancestry and collective primordial descent. Although our picture of Greek interstate integration has thus become more faceted, the study of Hellenistic federalism continues to be dominated by ‘constitutionalist’ approaches; indeed, the seemingly refined structures of some Hellenistic koina are often presented in binary opposition to those of earlier, less advanced federal states. In my paper, I will offer a survey analysis of the ‘longue durée’ of the federal paradigm in Boiotia. It will be striking to see, I believe, how intercommunal relations in the Hellenistic Boiotian League were not so much governed by political arrangements but rather by sentiments of, and references to, the notion of belonging together.

- 10:45 – 11:45: **Sheila Ager**, University of Waterloo: “Middle Powers and Mediation”

Clemens Koehn’s recent work on Hellenistic interstate relations (*Krieg – Diplomatie – Ideologie. Zur Außenpolitik hellenistischer Mittelstaaten*, 2007) explores the role played by the so-called “middle powers” of Achaia, Aitolia, Rhodes, and Pergamon. Middle powers are defined as those states whose status and power (economic, military, or otherwise) is insufficient to allow them to compete with the great powers on the world stage, but is still significant enough to warrant recognition of their influence and role in international affairs (examples of modern middle powers include Australia and Canada). Middle powers tend to self-define through a package of “moral” foreign policy behaviours that include peace-making and peace-keeping, coalition-building, and a general focus on international institutionalism. Koehn emphasizes in particular the ways in which Hellenistic middle powers presented their military actions as selfless and undertaken for the greater good; his work is, however, much less detailed on the matter of diplomatic behaviours. In this paper I would like to explore the question of the diplomacy of Hellenistic middle states, and in particular, their propensity for peace-making.

- 11:45 – 12:45: **Gillian Ramsey**, University of Toronto: “The Seleucids and their Roman Friends”

This paper considers the first generation of contact between the Seleucids and Romans, mainly from the Seleucid side and between 200 and the hostageship of Antiochos IV. The ways that groups act when confronting a new state or culture for the first time reveal much about their own assumptions about and expectations for statecraft and diplomacy, and the early Seleucid-Roman encounters are no exception. The behaviour of Antiochos III and his agents, and later of Antiochos IV, reveals that the Seleucids’ placement of Romans in the spectrum of state-types known to them was changing, based on conceptual disconnects that became apparent during unsuccessful diplomatic negotiations. As more encounters with other Romans took place, Antiochos III focussed upon Scipio Africanus as a Roman who might fit a role within the Roman state similar to that of the more familiar eastern kings, dynasts and ‘usurpers’, and so he sought to build on that as a basis for dealing with Rome – another mis-conception with unfortunate results.

12:45-2:15 – Lunch

2:15-5:00 – Afternoon Session

- 2:15 – 2:30: **Sheila Ager**, University of Waterloo: Introduction
- 2:30 – 3:30: **Art Eckstein**, University of Maryland: “The Treaty of the Ebro”

Several scholars have recently argued against Polybius’ assertion that the Roman government in the 230s and 220s B.C. was focused on a grave threat posed to central Italy by the Gallic peoples of the Po Valley. Polybius connects this threat with the Roman diplomatic effort to establish a northern limit to Carthaginian military expansion in Spain at the Ebro River, and these scholars doubt this assertion as well – that is, the Ebro Treaty had nothing to do with the Gallic threat in Italy. Their position is that Polybius is simply recycling Roman propaganda as found in Q. Fabius Pictor, the earliest Roman historian of Rome. But the paper argues the contrary. First, Polybius was no passive recipient of Fabian propaganda; his account of the Gallic War of the 220s conforms to his own personal framework of causation of wars, and thus he is exercising independent judgment on his evidence. Second, there is important evidence outside of Polybius himself to indicate that the Romans were worried in the 230s and 220s about a Gallic attack. Most important here is human sacrifice of November 228 B.C. performed at Rome, explicitly to avert by magic a serious threat to the city. There is also the unprecedented scale of Roman mobilization in spring 225 – shortly before the Gauls actually launched a major invasion of central Italy. The Roman preparations do indicate concern about Carthage as well, but that only reinforces Polybius’ assertion that Roman diplomacy in Punic Spain was designed to secure the Roman flank at a time when they were confronted by a major Gallic threat.

- 3:30 – 4:30: **Paul Burton**, Australian National University, Canberra: “Friendship and Empire: The Establishment of Rome’s *Amicitia* with Heraclea Pontica (190 BC)”

Rome’s first diplomatic encounter with the small Greek city-state of Heraclea Pontica on the south shore of the Black Sea has been the subject of considerable controversy for decades. Unfortunately, our only source for this event—a fragment (*FGrH* 434 F18.6-10) from the 16-book history of the city by one of its native sons, Memnon—appears to be a melange of fact and fiction,

accuracy and exaggeration. The purpose of this paper will be to argue for the basic reliability of the passage by reading the episode in terms of Roman international *amicitia* rather than viewing it through the traditional Badianesque lens of foreign *clientela*. Such a reading can lend support to the notion (most recently disputed by Eckstein 2008) that *amicitia* with Rome could indeed be established following a third-party mediation attempt that, on the face of it, was not in Rome's current best interest, but was rather apparently designed to benefit Rome's adversary.

- 4:30 – 5:00: Concluding Remarks/Discussion