



Publikationen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts

Peter Funke

Phocis in the Aetolian League. Self-abandonment or self-assertion?

in: Sporn et al. - ANCIENT PHOKIS: New approaches to its history, archaeology and topography
International conference, DAI Athens, 30 March – 1 April 2017 33-44

<https://doi.org/10.34780/2d67-g32j>

Herausgebende Institution / Publisher:
Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Copyright (Digital Edition) © 2025 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut
Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0
Email: info@dainst.de | Web: <https://www.dainst.org>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die [Nutzungsbedingungen](#) von iDAI.publications an. Sofern in dem Dokument nichts anderes ausdrücklich vermerkt ist, gelten folgende Nutzungsbedingungen: Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeber*innen der jeweiligen Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de). Etwaige davon abweichende Lizenzbedingungen sind im Abbildungsnachweis vermerkt.

Terms of use:

By downloading you accept the [terms of use](#) of iDAI.publications. Unless otherwise stated in the document, the following terms of use are applicable: All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de). Any deviating terms of use are indicated in the credits.

Katja Sporn | Alexandre Farnoux |
Eric Laufer
ANCIENT PHOKIS

Athenaia 13
Études méditerranéennes 4

DEUTSCHES ARCHÄOLOGISCHES INSTITUT
Abteilung Athen

ATHENAIA 13

ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'ATHÈNES

**ÉTUDES
MÉDITERRANÉENNES 4**

DEUTSCHES ARCHÄOLOGISCHES INSTITUT
Abteilung Athen

Katja Sporn | Alexandre Farnoux | Eric Laufer (eds.)

ANCIENT PHOKIS

New approaches to its history, archaeology
and topography

International Conference, DAI Athens, 30 March – 1 April 2017

REICHERT VERLAG

Autor/Author:

Katja Sporn (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1845-5113>, ROR ID: <https://ror.org/05nqsnd28>)

Alexandre Farnoux (IdRef: <http://www.idref.fr/032145993/id>, ROR ID: <https://ror.org/02fzvr850>)

Eric Laufer (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8758-6854>, ROR ID: <https://ror.org/05nqsnd28>)

Titel/Title: Ancient Phokis. New approaches to its history, archaeology and topography

Reihe, Band/Series, Volume: Athenaia 13

Reihenherausgeber/Series Editor: Katja Sporn, Reinhard Senff, Oliver Pilz

Reihe, Band/Series, Volume: Études méditerranéennes 4

Reihenherausgeber/Series Editor: École française d'Athènes

Herausgebende Institution/Institutional Editor: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Umfang/Length: X, 526 Seiten/Pages mit/with 244 Abbildungen/Illustrations

Peer Review: Dieser Band wurde einem Peer-Review-Verfahren unterzogen./*The volume is peer reviewed.*

Verantwortliche Redaktion/Publishing Editor: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Athen, Fidou 1, 10678 Athen, Griechenland, redaktion.athen@dainst.de

Redaktionelle Bearbeitung/Editing: Simon Hoffmann, Diana Wolf, Ulrike Schulz

Prepress: le-tex publishing services GmbH, Leipzig

Buchgestaltung und Coverkonzeption/Book Design and Cover Concept: hawemannundmosch, Berlin

Umschlagfoto/Cover Illustration: Blick von Elateia über die Kephissosebene auf den Parnassos

(D-DAI-ATH-2018-17152_2, Foto: Katja Sporn)

Nutzungsbedingungen/Terms of Use

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Eine Nutzung ohne Zustimmung des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts und/oder der jeweiligen Rechteinhaber ist nur innerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes zulässig. Etwaige abweichende Nutzungsmöglichkeiten für Text und Abbildungen sind gesondert im Band vermerkt./*This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law is only allowed with the permission of the German Archaeological Institute and/or the respective copyright holders. Any deviating terms of use for text and images are indicated in the credits.*

Druckausgabe/Printed Edition

Erscheinungsjahr/Year of Publication: 2024

Druck und Vertrieb/Printing and Distribution: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden • www.reichert-verlag.de

Druck und Bindung in Deutschland/Printed and Bound in Germany

ISBN: 978-3-7520-0825-8 (Athenaia), 978-2-86958-624-6 (Études méditerranéennes)

Bibliographische Metadaten/Bibliographic Metadata: <https://zenon.dainst.org/Record/003063459>

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek: Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <https://dnb.de> abrufbar./*Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek: The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available online at https://dnb.de.*

Digitale Ausgabe/Digital Edition

Erscheinungsjahr/Year of Publication: 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34780/xb69-ti55>

Bibliographische Metadaten/Bibliographic Metadata: <https://zenon.dainst.org/Record/003063459>

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort	IX
Phocis, Delphoi, and the amphictyony	1
<i>Peter Londey</i>	
Living on a rock. The cities of ancient Phocis and the importance of place	11
<i>Hans Beck</i>	
Borders and identity in ancient Phocis: some reflections	23
<i>Giovanna Daverio Rocchi</i>	
Phocis in the Aetolian League. Self-abandonment or self-assertion?	33
<i>Peter Funke</i>	
The institutions of the Phocian League	45
<i>Denis Rousset</i>	
Phocis in Roman times: beyond the shadow of Delphi	67
<i>Georgios A. Zachos</i>	
Das phokische Koinon zwischen Bötien, Delphi, Athen und Rom	85
<i>Christoph Begass</i>	
Delphes et Kalapodi au début de l'âge du fer ancien (11 ^e –9 ^e siècles av. J.-C.)	101
<i>Jean-Marc Luce</i>	
Zur Selbstdarstellung der Phoker in Delphi	121
<i>Anne Jacquemin</i>	
Athena. A gateway to Delphi	133
<i>Sandrine Huber – Anne Jacquemin – Didier Laroche</i>	

Terres cuites figurées du dépôt votif de Kirrha: de l'établissement du matériel à son exploitation	147
<i>Stéphanie Huysecom-Haxhi</i>	
The sanctuary of Athena in Phocian Antikyra	165
<i>Athanasios Sideris</i>	
The fortifications of ancient Phocis	
Results and prospects	185
<i>Nicolas Kyriakidis</i>	
Δρόμος με παρελθόν	195
<i>Φανούρια Δακορώνια (†) – Πέτρος Κουνούκλας</i>	
Παναγίτσα Ελάτειας 1979–1981	
Κτερίσματα και ταφικά έθιμα σε κλασσικό νεκροταφείο της Ελατείας	209
<i>Πάντος Α. Πάντος</i>	
Spanning two oracles. The sanctuary of Demeter at Erochos, between Delphi and Abae	219
<i>Elena Partida – Anthoula Tsaroucha</i>	
The rediscovery of a manuscript by Erich Gose and Friedrich Schober on the Kephissos valley from 1926	237
<i>Katja Sporn</i>	
Ο κρίσιμος 4ος αιώνας π.Χ.: παλαιές και νέες οχυρώσεις, παλαιοί και νέοι οικισμοί στην κοιλάδα του φωκικού Κηφισού	249
<i>Φώτης Ντάσιος</i>	
Panopeus	271
<i>Elena Kountouri – Ioannis Mavrommatidis – Nikolaos Petrochilos</i>	
New research on the fortification of Tithorea. A preliminary report of fieldwork 2016–2017	287
<i>Petros Kounouklas – Eric Laufer</i>	
Surveying the caves above Tithorea in 2016	307
<i>Stella Katsarou – Lina Kormazopoulou – Eric Laufer – Sabine Neumann – Katja Sporn – Ioanna Zygouri</i>	

Doric capitals and column drums from Modi in Phocis	339
---	-----

Nils Hellner – David Scahill

Ταφές των Πρώιμων Αυτοκρατορικών Χρόνων από την Υάμπολη στην ανατολική Φωκίδα	349
--	-----

Μαρία Παπαγεωργίου – Δημήτρης Γρηγορόπουλος

Sites of memory in ancient Phocis

The Thessalian-Phocian battles, the Persian Wars, and the changing religious landscape	371
---	-----

Elena Franchi

A transfer of sacred lands from eastern Phocis, IG IX1, 87	383
--	-----

Jeremy McInerney

Kalapodi 2014–2016: Investigating the surroundings, limits and infrastructure of the sanctuary	397
---	-----

Katja Sporn

Ritual burials of temples and ritual depositions accompanying building activities in the oracle sanctuary of Apollon at Abai/ Kalapodi	409
--	-----

Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier

The bronze finds from the Late Geometric ›South Temple 6‹ at Kalapodi

Cult practices and local craft traditions in eastern Phocis	421
---	-----

Gudrun Klebinder-Gauß

The significance of the sanctuary of Kalapodi during the Archaic period based on the pottery finds	439
---	-----

Michaela Stark

A palette of bronze and silver: the monetary perspective of the archaeological site at Kalapodi	455
--	-----

Hristina Ivanova-Anaplioti

New iron finds from the 2016 campaign in Kalapodi – Contexts and compositions	469
--	-----

Sandra Zipprich

A bronze foundry of Classical times in the sanctuary at Kalapodi	479
<i>Johanna Fuchs</i>	

Pagan twilight at Kalapodi: Two pottery assemblages of the third and fourth centuries A.D.	491
<i>Dimitris Grigoropoulos</i>	

Phocis in the Aetolian League.

Self-abandonment or self-assertion?

Peter Funke

»People of the border«. This is what Giovanna Daverio-Rocchi dubbed the Phocians in her article in this volume¹. And this naming, by and large, could be transferred to all the other states in Central Greece. Because of their exposed strategic location these territories and thus the existence of these *ethne kai poleis* were in a permanently precarious situation. The particularism of this world of states facilitated constant quarrels of the big players over these centrally located and non-circumventable regions. So one was eager not only to consolidate one's own political community, but to generate interstate associations, too. It was therefore not by chance that north-western and Central Greece from late Classical times became a centre for the formation of federal states, which in turn shaped the political landscape of Greece in Hellenistic times fundamentally. The federal states known as *ethne* or *koina*² had altered the character of Greece. I refrain from giving all the details of the processes of federalisation³. Still, I would like to present at least the basics since they are of key importance to the understanding of the political history of Phocis in

Hellenistic times. Therefore, I need to start by giving some more general considerations before I can focus on the Aetolian-Phocian relations.

As early as the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. a process of fundamental political change was beginning, especially in the periphery of the polis-world – thus especially in north-western and Central Greece and parts of the Peloponnese.

The changes taking place at that time are likely to have been sparked by the power political quarrels, which culminated in the Peloponnesian War and its war-like aftermath. Even regions which had previously been sheltered from events were increasingly dragged into the conflicts. The pressure to be increasingly engaged in foreign politics led to a progressive dissolution of the traditional tribal structures, because these structures could not meet the new challenges for appropriate action in the interstate domain. This disintegration correlated with a growing political self-confidence on the part of the individual parts of the various collapsing tribal communities.

¹ Cf. the contribution of Daverio-Rocchi to the present volume.

² For problems of terminology Giovannini 1971, 14–24, cf. also Walbank 1976/1977 who rightly contradicts Giovannini's overly narrow interpretation of the terms in question; Beck 1997, 10–13; Funke 1998, 66 f.; Beck – Funke 2015, 14 f.; Rzepka 2017.

³ Cf. details (with further bibliographical references) in Larsen 1968; Beck 1997; Beck – Funke 2015; Funke 2018.

One could indeed speak in this context of a ›politicisation‹ of the individual tribal subdivisions. And although this resulted in a breakdown of the institutional framework of the tribal state structures, it did not lead to a full-scale fragmentation: despite all tendencies to disintegration an awareness of tribal solidarity persisted. This tie rendered it possible to (re)integrate the various sub-tribes, which had assumed a separate existence as independent poleis, in a newly founded federal state; especially external pressure forced a closer cohesion. As a result the newly established federal structures developed a remarkably strong cohesive power, precisely because the individual member states retained an exceptionally large political scope. This structural principle eased the inclusion also of foreign political units under the umbrella of such a federal state. The result was that the tribal element receded into the background and affiliation to a federal state came to be principally politically based, and in consequence legally constituted⁴.

The distinguishing feature of all these *koina* was the so called ›double citizenship‹ of its members, who possessed an additional common citizenship, in that they were citizens of one of the member states of the league, and in this way were directly integrated into the decision-making processes both in their individual *polis* and in their *koinon*. This specific type of citizenship⁵ offered entirely new and flexible ways of interstate interaction and made federal states seem particularly attractive. In this way, the federal states provided entirely new opportunities to take into account the ubiquitous tension between the insistences on individual autonomy of each of the *poleis* on the one hand and providing interstate security on the other hand. Therefore, in Hellenistic times federal associations gained even more appeal, as the political structure of the world of *polis*-states came under continual pressure, in particular as a result of the claims to power of the new kingdoms. The federal principles, which should have secured a balanced political participation, opened new scope in interstate relations. This, however, was not only able to help protect the self-interests of the *poleis*, but at the same time also created new ways for individual states to dress their desire for international power in new constitutional structures.

The Aetolians knew particularly well how to make use of these. Their rise to a leading power in the Hellenistic world was certainly owed to an integration policy that took advantage of the federal structures in masterly fashion. After they had restructured their heartland as a federal state in the 1st half of the 4th century B.C., until the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. they were able to extend their sphere of influence from the Aetolian inland to the northern border at the Corinthian Gulf and West-Locris and Delphi⁶.

It remains uncertain whether also parts of south-western Phocis had been already incorporated in the Aetolian League. At the turn of the 3rd century B.C. in a defensive alliance between the Aetolians and Boeotians one further ally is named: the Φωκεῖς οἱ μετ' Αἰτωλῶν⁷. This formulation often served as an indication of the integration of the parts of Phocis located near Delphi in the Aetolian League⁸. But this need not be the case. It is also possible that only a part of the otherwise independent Phocians joined the anti-Macedonian alliance. Final certainty can hardly be achieved.

After their victory over the Celts in 279 B.C. the Aetolians extended their federal territory over the course of the 3rd century B.C. to the north and to the east over all of Central Greece. The impetus of this powerful expansion was, without a doubt, the Aetolians' resistance to the Macedonian claim to power and their strong will to expand their own hegemonic position. But it is not only due to their imperialistic ambitions that the Aetolians prevailed. It was really both their victory over the Celts and the fact they were the only serious anti-Macedonian power in Greece that provided them with prestige. So they appeared as a welcome or at least the only possible ally for other states. Step by step every Central Greek tribal community, some of them already organised in a federal state fashion, became a member of the Aetolian League by integrating their subunits and *poleis* as individual member states⁹. Nonetheless these tribal communities preserved their identity as a whole, since some institutional structures on a middle level between federal power and individual member state were created in the form of districts (τέλη). These *télē*

⁴ The previous considerations are based on Funke 2018, 112 f.

⁵ The ›double citizenship‹ is usually labelled as *sympoliteia*. The term is not, however, as unambiguous as is often assumed; cf. Beck 1997, 9–29. 174–187; Funke 2007; Freitag 2012; Beck – Funke 2015, 5–19.

⁶ On the expansion of the league, see Flacelière 1937; Lefèvre 1998; Grainger 1995; Grainger 1999, esp. 29–164; Scholten 2000; Sánchez 2001; Tsangari 2007, 22–36; Mackill 2013, 91–128. 359–361. The legal formula under which parts of the Peloponnese

were tied to the Aetolian League cannot be determined securely; see Larsen 1968, 202 f.; Scholten 2000, 116–130; on the Aetolian actions in the Aegean, see Scholten 2000, 105–114; Funke 2000; Funke 2008.

⁷ IG IX 1² 1,170a, line 10; cf. Schmitt 1969, 96–99 no. 463; Jacquemin et al. 2012, 128–131 no. 64.

⁸ On the chronology and the historical context, cf. Jacquemin et al. 2012, 130 f.

⁹ See n. 6; cf. also Rousset 2015; McInerney 2015.

seem to have corresponded to the *koina* of the Lokrians, Dorians, Phocians, etc., which had been absorbed into the Aetolian League¹⁰.

In this generality, the expansion of the Aetolian League in the 3rd century B.C. can be outlined. But it gets trickier when one tries to chronologically order the phases of this expansion and associate them with concrete historical events. The relations between the Aetolian League and the Phocian *koinon* are especially hard to even approximately analyse. The core problem is that there are only very scarce and very disparate historiographical sources for this period of time. It is impossible to paint a well-rounded picture. Instead we are reliant on epigraphic and numismatic sources to reconstruct the advancing expansion of the Aetolian League and the consequential integration of the adjacent *ethne*.

That is why the most important sources still are the lists of names of the *hieromnemes*, who were representatives of the Pylaeic-Delphic amphictyony's members and who regularly attended the meetings of the amphictyonic council. Although the Aetolians themselves were not members of the amphictyony they claimed their over the course of their expansion newly integrated members' seats and votes. So the differing numbers of Aetolian votes in the council displayed in the amphictyonic documents are at least an indicator of the changing territorial size of the Aetolian League.

For quite a long time numerous honorary decrees of 3rd century Central Greece served as another indicator for the territorial expansion of the Aetolian League. Günther Klaffenbach formulated the hypothesis that within the League the members could not exchange honours by awarding each other's *proxenia* and/or *politeia*. Every time such an honouring took place, Klaffenbach says, the bestower or the recipient had not yet been part of the League¹¹. Already George Daux and Lucien Lerat raised concerns against this ›lex Klaffenbach‹¹². But only since Denis Rousset's publication of inscriptions from the Aetolian Kallion do we know with certainty that Klaffenbach's rule is invalid¹³.

So, in terms of the League's expansion we are pretty much dependent on an analysis of said list of

names of the *hieromnemes*. However, such an analysis is not an easy endeavour. Although the lists are in a relatively dense sequence, they are not completely handed down. Their chronological order depends on an accurate dating of the terms of the Delphic archontes, their names being put in front of the lists. Since the beginning of the systematic scientific investigation of Delphi in the 19th century the ›Chronologie Delphique‹ has been of major importance. After proper groundwork by Hermann Pomtow, Tadeusz Bronisław Walek, and Karl Julius Beloch, Robert Flacelière and Georges Daux provided the basic research results¹⁴. Two decades ago François Lefèvre and Pierre Sánchez, in turn, fundamentally revised these lists¹⁵. By now there is a more or less secured chronological framework suited to the list. Generally speaking, the early assumed tendency is confirmed: Ever since the victory over the Celts the Aetolians' number of votes in the amphictyonic council increased from two votes (namely the seats of the western Locrians and Malians) gradually to three, five, six, seven, nine, eleven and finally – at the end of the Social War – to fifteen votes. After 217 B.C. the number decreased to eleven votes at the end of the 90s¹⁶.

Without a doubt the increase and decrease in Aetolian votes correlates with the integration of formerly politically independent members of the Pylaeic-Delphic amphictyony. However, this correlation is not so mechanistically provable in all cases like Pomtow et al. suggested. It is not always the case that an increase in Aetolian votes can be traced back to an integration of a specific *ethnos*. While it is comparatively easy to figure out how it went with the smaller *ethne* in the middle of Central Greece (e.g. Dorians, Dolopians, western Locrians), the situation in the eastern regions of the Aetolian League is more difficult to describe.

Here is where the Phocians come into play again. First excluded from the Pylaeic-Delphic amphictyony after the Third Sacred War (346 B.C.) the Phocians were once again taken in for they had fought well against the Celts in 279 B.C. So, in the 270s and 260s they had two votes, by the end of the 260s even three, possibly due to a temporary annexation of East-Locris by the Phocians. In the lists of the 250s the Pho-

¹⁰ On the districts see Larsen 1968, 197; cf. also Sordi 1953, 442–445; Rzepka 2006, 33–45; Mackil 2013, 380–384. Löbel 2014, 145–161 is as unconvincing as Corsten 1999, 133–159 who interprets the Aetolian districts as administrative districts of equal size and split up ›ohne Rücksicht auf ethnische Zugehörigkeit [with no regard for ethnic belonging]‹ (158); cf. Funke 2015, 95–97 and Funke 2016.

¹¹ IG IX 1² 1, p. XXXVII, lines 36–39; cf. IG IX 1² 1, 30, line 13; 31, lines 36. 37 f.

¹² Daux 1932, 327–330; Lerat 1952, 85–87.

¹³ Rousset 2006.

¹⁴ Pomtow 1901; Walek 1912; Beloch 1927, 385–426; Flacelière 1937; Daux 1943.

¹⁵ Lefèvre 1998; Sánchez 2001; cf. also Scholten 2000, 235–252.

¹⁶ Cf. the lists by Lefèvre 1998 and Sánchez 2001 (below in the appendix).

cians are not mentioned at all. At the same time the Aetolian votes had gone up by two (formerly seven, now nine votes). But it is questionable whether a direct link can be established since said increase remained even when the Phocians returned with one vote in the 240s. After that the Phocians vanished from the lists of the *hieromnemes* and the Aetolians experienced another increase to eleven votes¹⁷.

The increasing number of Aetolian votes in the amphictyonic council in the early 250s and again in the 230s had been interpreted by earlier research as an intermittent integration or at least a partial integration of the Phocian *koinon* in the Aetolian League. Especially, Jo Scholten and Jeremy McInerney rightly pointed out that such an argumentation is too narrow and that there can be other conceivable explanations¹⁸. The omission of the Phocians in the lists of the 250s does not necessarily mean that they were then part of the Aetolian League. It might be the case that – whatever the reason – they simply stayed away from the amphictyonic assembly. Anyhow, there were other members of the amphictyony, too, eager to win the Aetolians as a protecting power in the political turmoil of the mid-3rd century B.C. – and then again others, who were put under pressure to join the Aetolian League.

However, there is no doubt about the Phocians being part of the Aetolian League at some time in the 3rd century B.C. That is also shown by the numismatic sources. There is a lesser known local bronze coinage from Tithorea which displays Aetolian emblems but Tithorea's name is inscribed. Already during the early 3rd century B.C. such emissions existed and are attested also for other places in Central Greece¹⁹. This is further suggested by another striking argument, which can be found in a report by Polybius, according to which in 196 B.C., by order of the Romans, the Phocians and the Locrians were (re)incorporated into the Aetolian League with the explicit note »as had formerly been the case«²⁰. Whether it had been the case already in the 250s is questionable²¹. If so, then in the 240s – at that time Phocians had one vote in the amphictyonic council – a part of the Phocian *koinon* must have left the League just to join it again in the 230s such that all Phocians were members of the League again. Such political mean-

dering cannot be excluded in principle but I would prefer the second alternative, that is a gradual integration of the Phocian *koinon* after 250 B.C. and then after 240 B.C.

Both alternative explanations have in common that it is hard to say anything about the qualities of the Phocian-Aetolian relations with certainty. Due to the limited amount of sources it is even essentially impossible to figure out on a case by case basis whether a member joined the Aetolian League on a voluntary basis or if it was forced to do so. Nevertheless, there are hints for broadly friendly relations between Phocis and the Aetolian League until the beginning 220s. Still, the Phocians' changing votes in the amphictyonic council could indicate that the Phocians tried to remain as autonomous as possible. While doing so, they always bore in mind their relations with their neighbours in the north and east, especially Boeotia and Macedonia.

This became especially clear when in 228 B.C. Antigonus Doson's devastating invasion triggered a radical break between the Aetolians and the Phocians and the exit of the Phocians from the Aetolian League²². From then the Phocians counted on the Macedonians. To what extent this happened voluntarily remains an open question. In any case the Phocians' partisanship for the Macedonians made it easier for the Romans to give back the Phocian *koinon* to the Aetolians in the year 196 B.C.²³ However, this renewed membership in the Aetolian League did not last very long. By the end of the War of Antiochos in 188 B.C. not only did the Aetolians lose control over Delphi but also over the Phocian *koinon*.

Münster

Peter Funke

Anschrift

Prof. Dr. Peter Funke
Universität Münster
Seminar für Alte Geschichte
Domplatz 20–22
48143 Münster
Deutschland
funkep@uni-muenster.de

¹⁷ Cf. McInerney 1999; McInerney 2015 with further references. – See now also the articles by Franchi 2022 and Rousset 2022, which were published only after the completion of the manuscript and can therefore not be discussed in detail here.

¹⁸ Scholten 2000, 83–88. 154 f.; McInerney 2015, 217–221; cf. also Lefèvre 1998, 290. 301 f.

¹⁹ Funke 2016.

²⁰ Plb. 18, 47, 9: »καθάπερ εἶχον καὶ πρότερον«.

²¹ Lefèvre 1998, 30–33; 301 f.; Scholten 2000, 84; 250 f.

²² McInerney 1999; Scholten 2000, 170–183; Grainger 1999, esp. 234–249.

²³ Plb. 18, 47, 9; Liv. 33, 34, 8.

Appendix

Chronologie des listes amphictioniques du III^e siècle (Sánchez 2001, 524–526) (Les dates en italiques indiquent les années pythiques)

Archonte	Date	Composition du Conseil	Références
Hiérôn	279/ <u>8</u> ou 278/ <u>7</u>	2 Thessaliens – 2 Étoliens (1 Locrien de l'Ouest et 1 Malien d'Héraclée) – 2 Béotiens – 2 Phocidiens.	CID IV 12
Aristagoras 1	278/ <u>7</u> ou 277/ <u>6</u>	3 Étoliens (+ 1 Dolope) – 2 Delphiens – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Béotiens – 2 Éniens – 2 Ioniens – 2 Doriens (dont 1 Argien) – 1 Locrien de l'Est.	CID IV 14
Charixénos	277/ <u>6</u> ou 276/ <u>5</u>	3 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 2 Éniens – 2 Phocidiens – 1 Argien – 1 Athénien – 1 Érétrien – 1 Dorien – 1 Locrien de l'Est.	CID IV 15
Charixénos	277/ <u>6</u> ou 276/ <u>5</u>	3 Étoliens – 2 Béotiens – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Érétrien – 1 Argien – 1 Athénien – 2 Éniens – 1 Dorien – 1 Locrien de l'Est.	CID IV 16– 17
[Pra/Syl]ochos	276/ <u>5</u> ou 275/ <u>4</u> ou 278/ <u>7</u>	3 ? Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – [2 Béotiens ou 2 Phocidiens?] – 1 Athénien – 1 Argien – [1 Érétrien].	CID IV 18–19
Héracléidas	274/ <u>3</u>	3 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Argien – 2 (?) Phocidiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Athénien – 1 Érétrien – 1 Locrien de l'Est – 1 Dorien.	CID IV 20
Archiadas	273/ <u>2</u>	3 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Éniens – 1 Érétrien – 1 Trézénien – 1 Locrien de l'Est – 1 Athénien – 1 Dorien.	CID IV 22
Archiadas	273/ <u>2</u>	5 Étoliens (+ 2 Éniens) – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Athénien – 1 Eubéen (d'Érétrie) – 1 Sicyonien.	CID IV 23–24
Eudocos	272/ <u>1</u>	5 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Phocidiens – 3 Béotiens (+ 1 Dorien ou 1 Locrien?) – 1 Eubéen (d'Érétrie) – 1 Athénien – 1 Sicyonien.	CID IV 25–26
Stratôn	271/ <u>0</u> ou 270/ <u>69</u>	5 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Phocidiens – 1 Locrien (Épicnémidien) – 2 Béotiens – Eubéen (de Chalcis) – 1 Athénien – 1 Épidaurien.	CID IV 27
Stratôn	271/ <u>0</u> ou 270/ <u>69</u>	6 Étoliens (+ 1 Dorien) – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Malien (de Lamia) – 1 Locrien Épicnémidien – 1 Athénien – 1 Dorien du Péloponnèse (Éginète).	CID IV 28
Athambos	270/ <u>69</u> ou 269/ <u>8</u>	6 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Eubéen (d'Érétrie, de Chalcis ou d'Histiée) – 1 Athénien.	CID IV 29
Thessalos	269/ <u>8</u> ou 268/ <u>7</u>	6? Étoliens. Le reste est perdu.	CID II 128
[?]	268/ <u>7</u> ou 267/ <u>6</u> ou 266/ <u>5</u>	[6 Étoliens] – 1 Athénien – 2 Phocidiens – [2 Béotiens?] – 2 Delphiens – 1 Histiéen. Traité entre Athènes et l'Étolie.	CID IV 30
[?] ou Damaïos	268/ <u>7</u> ou 266/ <u>5</u> ou 264/ <u>3</u>	6 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Histiéen . Sôtéria amphictioniques.	CID IV 31
Damaïos	264/ <u>3</u>	6 Étoliens – 2 Béotiens – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Athénien – 1 Histiéen – 1 Locrien de l'Est (Scarpée).	CID IV 32– 34
Damosthénès	263/ <u>2</u>	6 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 3 Phocidiens (+ 1 Locrien Epicnémidien?) – 2 Béotiens – 1 Athénien – 1 Histiéen.	CID IV 35
Pleistôn	262/ <u>1</u>	6 Étoliens – 2 Béotiens – 3 Phocidiens – 1 Athénien – 1 Histiéen – 2 Delphiens. Sôtéria amphictioniques.	CID IV 38– 39
Pleistôn	262/ <u>1</u>	6 Étoliens – 2 Béotiens – [2–3 Phocidiens ?] – [1 Histiéen?] – 2 Delphiens.	CID IV 40

Archonte	Date	Composition du Conseil	Références
[?]	261/0	7 Étoliens (+ 1 Locrien de l'Est ou 1 Malien?) – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 2 Phocidiens.	CID IV 41
Peithagoras	260/59	7 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Phocidiens – 2 Béotiens. Sôtéria amphictioniques.	CID IV 42–44
[?]	258/7	9 Étoliens (+ 1 Phocidien et 1 Achéen Phthiote?) – 2 Delphiens – 1 Histien – 2 Béotiens – [1 Phocidien?] – 1 Corinthien. Sôtéria amphictioniques.	CID IV 45–46
Aristagoras II	254/3	9 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Histien. Sôtéria amphictioniques.	CID IV 47
Emménidas	252/1	9 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Histien. Sôtéria amphictioniques.	CID IV 48–50
Nicodamos I	250/49	9 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens. Sôtéria amphictioniques.	CID IV 52–53
Calliclès II	249/8 ou 251/0	9 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Phocidien – 1 Lacédémonien.	CID IV 54
Cléondas	248/7	9 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens Dernières Sôtéria amphictioniques?	CID IV 55
Diôn	247/6	9 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Phocidien.	CID IV 56–57
	247/6 ou 246/5	Institution des Sôtéria étoliennes Archontat de Polyuctos à Athènes.	
	245/4	Premières Sôtéria étoliennes.	
Nicaïdas	245/4 ou 244/3 ou 243/2	9 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Phocidien.	CID IV 58
Amyntas	244/3 ou 243/2 ou 242/1	9 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Phocidien.	CID IV 59
Praochos	241/0	9 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 1 Phocidien. Sôtéria étoliennes.	CID IV 60–61
Praochos	241/0	9 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Phocidien.	CID IV 62
[?]	240/39 ou 239/8	9 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens.	CID IV 63
P[– – –]as	238/7	11 Étoliens (+ 1 Phocidien et 1 Malien?) – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Chiote.	CID IV 64
[?]	237/6 ou 234/3 ou 233/2 ou 230/29	11 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens.	CID IV 65
Hérys	229/8	11 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens. Sôtéria étoliennes.	CID IV 66–67
Nicarchos	228/7 ou 227/6 ou 224/3 ou 223/2	14 Étoliens (+ 1 Thessalien. 1 Perrhèbe et 1 Achéen?) – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens.	CID IV 68–71
[?]	226/5 ou 222/1	14 Étoliens – [1 Chiote?] – 2 Delphiens – [2 Béotiens?].	CID IV 72
[?]	225/4	14 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens. Sôtéria étoliennes.	CID IV 73
Callias	221/0	14 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens – 1 Chiote. Sôtéria étoliennes.	CID IV 74–75
[?]	?	14–15 Étoliens? Le reste est perdu.	CID IV 76
[?]	217/6	15 Étoliens (+ 1 Thessalien?) – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens. Sôtéria étoliennes.	CID IV 79

Archonte	Date	Composition du Conseil	Références
Ar[---]	216-212 ou 228-222 ?	13 ou 14 ? Étoliens – [1 Chiote?] – 2 Delphiens – 2 Béotiens.	CID IV 80
[?]	?	13? Étoliens. Le reste est perdu.	CID IV 81
Nicodamos II	212/1 ?	13? Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Chiote – [2 Béotiens?] – 1 Argien.	CID IV 82
[?]	?	13? Étoliens – 2 Delphiens. Le reste est perdu.	CID IV 83
[?]	209/8	13 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Chiote. Sôtéria étoliennes .	CID IV 84-85
Babylos	207/6 ?	12 Étoliens – 1 Chiote – 2 Delphiens – 1 Athamane.	CID IV 86
Polycleitos	206/5 ?	12 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Chiote – 1-2 (?) Béotiens – 1 Athénien.	CID IV 87
[?]	205/4	12 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Chiote – [1 Athénien?] – 1-2 (?) Béotiens – 1 Céphallénien. Sôtéria étoliennes.	CID IV 94
[Damocrat?]ès	204/3	11 Étoliens – 1 Béotien (énuméré avec les Étoliens) – 1 Athénien – 1 Ambraciote (détaché des Étoliens) – 1 Céphallénien – 1 Chiote.	CID IV 95
Dam[ocratès ?]	204/3 ?	11 Étoliens – 1 Céphallénien (énuméré avec les Étoliens) 2 Delphiens – 1 Athénien – 1 Chiote – 1 Béotien.	CID IV 96
Mégartas	203/2	11 Étoliens – 1 Céphallénien – 2 Delphiens – 1 Chiote – 1 Magnète du Méandre – 1 Athénien.	CID IV 97
Philaitôlos	201/0	11 Étoliens – 1 Céphallénien – 2 Delphiens – 1 Athénien – 2 Béotiens – 1 Magnète du Méandre – 1 Chiote. Sôtéria étoliennes.	CID IV 98-99
[?]	194/3	[11 Étoliens? – 2 Delphiens? – 1 Chiote? – 1 Magnète du Méandre?]	CID IV 100
Écéphylos	193/2	11 Étoliens – 2 Delphiens – 1 Chiote – 1 Magnète du Méandre.	CID IV 101

Bibliography

- Beck 1997** H. Beck, *Polis und Koinon* (Stuttgart 1997)
- Beck – Funke 2015** H. Beck – P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 2015)
- Beloch 1927** K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* IV 2, 2 (Berlin / Leipzig 1927)
- Corsten 1999** T. Corsten, *Vom Stamm zum Bund. Gründung und territoriale Organisation griechischer Bundesstaaten* (Munich 1999)
- Daux 1932** G. Daux, *Notes étolienne*, BCH 56, 1932, 313–330
- Daux 1943** G. Daux, *Chronologie Delphique*, FdD III 7 (Paris 1943)
- Flacelière 1937** R. Flacelière, *Les Aitoliens à Delphes* (Paris 1937)
- Franchi 2022** E. Franchi, *Mille e un modo di diventare Focidese. La Focide tra tendenze centrifughe, vocazione unitaria e Delfi*, Orbis Terrarum 20, 2022, 95–121
- Freitag 2012** K. Freitag, *Zur Integration von Neubürgern in den griechischen Bundesstaaten in hellenistischer Zeit. Ein Problemaufriss*, in: L. M. Günter (ed.), *Migration und Bürgerrecht in der hellenistischen Welt* (Wiesbaden 2012) 83–95
- Funke 1998** P. Funke, *Die Bedeutung der griechischen Bundesstaaten in der politischen Theorie und Praxis des 5. und 4. Jhdts. v. Chr.*, in: W. Schuller (ed.), *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum* (Darmstadt 1998) 59–71
- Funke 2000** P. Funke, *Zur Datierung der aitolischen Bürgerrechtsverleihung an die Bürger von Herakleia am Latmos* (IG IX 1², 1, 173), Chiron 30, 2000, 505–517 [= Funke 2019, 171–183]
- Funke 2007** P. Funke, *Alte Grenzen – neue Grenzen. Formen polisübergreifender Machtbildung in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit*, in: R. Albertz – P. Funke (eds.), *Räume und Grenzen. Topologische Konzepte in den antiken Kulturen des östlichen Mittelmeerraumes* (Munich 2007) 187–204
- Funke 2008** P. Funke, *Die Aitolier in der Ägäis. Untersuchungen zur sogenannten Seepolitik der Aitolier im 3. Jh. v. Chr.*, in: E. Winter (ed.), *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosphorus. Kleinasien in der Antike*. Festschrift Elmar Schwertheim, Asia Minor Studien 65,1 (Bonn 2008) 253–267 [= Funke 2019, 153–170]
- Funke 2015** P. Funke, *Aitolia and the Aitolian League*, in: H. Beck – P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 2015) 86–117 [= Funke 2019, 29–62]
- Funke 2016** P. Funke, *Bundesstaatliche Kompetenz oder Kompetenz der Gliedstaaten? Einige Überlegungen zu den Bronzeprägungen des Aitolischen Bundes*, in: H. Nieswandt – H. Schwarzer (eds.), *›Man kann es sich nicht prächtig genug vorstellen!‹. Festschrift Dieter Salzmann 1* (Marsberg 2016) 103–111 [= Funke 2019, 145–152]
- Funke 2018** P. Funke, *Poleis and Koina. Reshaping the World of the Greek States in Hellenistic Times*, in: H. Börm – N. Luraghi (eds.), *The Polis in the Hellenistic World* (Stuttgart 2018) 109–129
- Funke 2019** P. Funke, *Die Heimat des Acheloos. Nordwestgriechische Studien. Ausgewählte Schriften zu Geschichte, Landeskunde und Epigraphik*, hrsg. von M. Haake – K. Freitag (Göttingen 2019)
- Giovannini 1971** A. Giovannini, *Untersuchungen über die Natur und die Anfänge der bundesstaatlichen Sympolitie in Griechenland* (Göttingen 1971)
- Grainger 1995** J. D. Grainger, *The Expansion of the Aitolian League, 280–260 BC*, Mnemosyne 48, 1995, 313–343
- Grainger 1999** J. D. Grainger, *The League of the Aitolians*, Mnemosyne suppl. 200 (Leiden 1999)
- Jacquemin et al. 2012** A. Jacquemin – D. Mulliez – G. Rougemont, *Choix d’inscriptions de Delphes, traduites et commentées*, Études Épigraphiques 5 (Athens 2012)
- Larsen 1968** J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States. Their Institutions and History* (Oxford 1968)
- Lefèvre 1998** F. Lefèvre, *L’Amphictionie pyléo-delphique. Histoire et institutions* (Paris 1998)
- Lerat 1952** L. Lerat, *Les Locriens de l’Ouest 2* (Paris 1952)

- Löbel 2014** Y. Löbel, Die Poleis der bundesstaatlichen Gemeinwesen im antiken Griechenland. Untersuchungen zum Machtverhältnis zwischen Poleis und Zentralgewalt bis 167 v. Chr. (Alexandria 2014)
- Mackill 2013** E. Mackill, Creating a Common Polity. Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon (Berkeley 2013)
- McInerney 1999** J. McInerney, The Folds of Parnassos. Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis (Austin 1999)
- McInerney 2015** J. McInerney, Phokis, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 199–221
- Pomtow 1901** RE IV,2 (1901) 2583–2700 s.v. Delphoi. C) Zur Chronologie (H. Pomtow)
- Rousset 2006** D. Rousset, Les inscriptions de Kallipolis d'Étolie, BCH 130, 2006, 381–433
- Rousset 2015** D. Rousset, Microfederalism in Central Greece. The Dorians and Oitians, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 222–230
- Rousset 2022** D. Rousset, Aus der Arbeit der ›Inscriptiones Graecae‹. La métonomiasie de Néon en Tithoréa et les relations entre Étoliens et Phocidiens au III^e s. av. J.-C., Chiron 52, 2022, 217–251
- Rzepka 2006** J. Rzepka, The Rights of Cities within the Aitolian Confederacy (Valencia 2006)
- Rzepka 2017** J. Rzepka, Greek Federal Terminology (Gdansk 2017)
- Sánchez 2001** P. Sánchez, L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes. Recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au II^e siècle de notre ère (Stuttgart 2001)
- Schmitt 1969** H. H. Schmitt, Die Staatsverträge des Altertums. Band 3: Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr. (Munich 1969)
- Scholten 2000** J. B. Scholten, The Politics of Plunder. Aitolians and their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279–217 B.C. (London 2000)
- Sordi 1953** M. Sordi, Le origini del koinon etolico, Acme 6, 1953, 419–445
- Tsangari 2007** D. I. Tsangari, Corpus des monnaies d'or, d'argent et de bronze de la confédération étolienne (Athens 2007)
- Walbank 1976/1977** F. W. Walbank, Were there Greek Federal States?, in: ScrCII 3, 1976/1977, 27–51
- Walek 1912** T. B. Walek, Die delphische Amphiktyonie in der Zeit der aitolischen Herrschaft (Berlin 1912).

Zusammenfassung – Abstract – Περίληψη

Phokis im Aitolischen Bund. Selbstaufgabe oder Selbstbehauptung?

Zusammenfassung Der Sieg über die Kelten 279 v. Chr. und die Tatsache, dass sie die einzige ernstzunehmende antimakedonische Macht in Griechenland waren, verschafften den Aitoliern Prestige. Sie erschienen anderen Staaten als willkommenener oder zumindest einzig möglicher Verbündeter gegen die Makedonen. Nach und nach wurden alle kleineren mittelgriechischen *koina* Mitglied des Aitolischen Bundes. Das Datum und die Dauer der Mitgliedschaft sind jedoch schwierig auch nur ungefähr zu bestimmen, da wir auf die Analyse der Listen der Vertreter (Hieromnemones) der Mitglieder der pylaeisch-delphischen Amphiktyonie angewiesen sind. Die Zu- und Abnahme der aitolischen Stimmen korreliert mit der Integration von ehemals politisch unabhängigen Mitgliedern der Amphiktyonie. Diese Korrelation ist jedoch nicht so mechanistisch beweisbar, wie oft angenommen wird. Dies gilt insbesondere für die Beziehungen zwischen den Phokern und dem Aitolischen Bund. Die zunehmende Anzahl aitolischer Stimmen im amphiktyonischen Rat in den frühen 250er Jahren und erneut in den 230er Jahren kann als eine zeitweilige oder zumindest teilweise Integration des phokischen *koinon* in den Aitolischen Bund interpretiert werden. Die wechselnde Stimmenzahl der Phoker im amphiktyonischen Rat deutet jedoch darauf hin, dass die Phoker versuchten, so autonom wie möglich zu bleiben.

Schlagwörter Phokis, Aitolischer Bund, Föderalismus, Pyläisch-Delphische Amphiktyonie

Phocis in the Aetolian League. Self-abandonment or self-assertion?

Abstract The victory over the Celts in 279 B.C. and the fact they were the only serious anti-Macedonian power in Greece bestowed the Aetolians with prestige. In the eyes of other states, they appeared as a welcome or at least the only possible ally against the Macedonians. Step by step, all smaller *koina* in Central Greece became members of the Aetolian League. However, the date and the duration of the membership are difficult to estimate even approximately, as we are very much dependent on the analysis of the lists of representatives (*hieromnemones*) among the Pylaeic-Delphic amphictyony members. Increase and decrease in Aetolian votes in the amphictyonic council correlates with the integration of the amphictyony's formerly politically independent members. Nevertheless, this correlation is not as mechanistically provable as often suggested. This is particularly the case with regard to the relations between the Phocians and the Aetolian League. The increasing number of Aetolian votes in the amphictyonic council in the early 250s and again in the 230s can be interpreted as an intermittent or at least partial integration of the Phocian *koinon* in the Aetolian League. Still, the Phocians' changing number of votes in the amphictyonic council indicate that they tried to remain as autonomous as possible.

Keywords Phocis, Aetolian League, Federalism, Pylaeic-Delphic amphictyony

Η Φωκίδα στην Αιτωλική Συμπολιτεία. Αυτό-Εγκατάλειψη ή Αυτό-Διεκδίκηση;

Περίληψη Η νίκη επί των Κελτών το 279 π.Χ. και το γεγονός ότι αποτελούσαν τη μοναδική σοβαρή αντιμακεδονική δύναμη στην Ελλάδα προσέδωσαν στους Αιτωλούς κύρος. Στα μάτια των άλλων κρατών φαίνονταν ευπρόσδεκτοι ή τουλάχιστον οι μόνοι πιθανοί σύμμαχοι εναντίον των Μακεδόνων. Σταδιακά όλα τα μικρότερα κοινά στην κεντρική Ελλάδα έγιναν μέλη της Αιτωλικής Συμπολιτείας. Παρόλα αυτά, η χρονολογία και η διάρκεια της συμμετοχής είναι δύσκολα να προσδιοριστούν, ακόμα και κατά προσέγγιση, αφού βασιζόμαστε στην ανάλυση των καταλόγων των εκπροσώπων (ιερομνήμονες) των μελών της Πυλαιικής - Δελφικής Αμφικτυονίας. Η αυξομείωση των αιτωλικών ψήφων στο αμφικτυονικό συμβούλιο είχε σχέση με την ενσωμάτωση των παλαιότερα ανεξάρτητων πολιτικά μελών της Αμφικτυονίας. Ωστόσο, αυτή η συσχέτιση δεν μπορεί να αποδειχθεί τόσο μηχανιστικά, όσο συχνά προτείνεται. Αυτό είναι ιδιαίτερα το θέμα όσον αφορά τις σχέσεις ανάμεσα στους Φωκείς και την Αιτωλική Συμπολιτεία. Ο αυξανόμενος αριθμός των αιτωλικών ψήφων στο αμφικτυονικό

συμβούλιο στις αρχές της δεκαετίας του 250 και ξανά κατά τη δεκαετία του 230 μπορεί να ερμηνευτεί ως προσωρινή ή τουλάχιστον μερική ενσωμάτωση των φωκικών κοινών στην Αιτωλική Συμπολιτεία. Εντούτοις, ο μεταβαλλόμενος αριθμός των φωκικών ψήφων στο αμφικτυονικό συμβούλιο υποδεικνύει ότι οι Φωκείς προσπάθησαν να παραμείνουν όσο το δυνατό πιο αυτόνομοι.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά Φωκίδα, Αιτωλική Συμπολιτεία, ομοσπονδιακό σύστημα, Πυλαική - Δελφική Αμφικτυονία