

INTRODUCTION

THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE FRAGMENTS

SINCE from vi onwards the books are fragmentary, the order has to be reconstituted from internal evidence. P. normally allots two books to each Olympiad (ix. 1. 1, xiv. 1 a 5), so that each book usually covers two years. This system is fairly consistently maintained (cf. ix. 1. 2, *τὸ μονοειδὲς τῆς συντάξεως*). Within each of the Olympiad years included in a book P. treats the events of each theatre in turn, following a fixed order which is only rarely broken (cf. xv. 25. 19, xxxii. 11. 2, *τὴν εἰθισμένην τάξιν, ἥ χρώμεθα παρ’ ὅλην τὴν πραγματείαν*), viz. Italy, Sicily, Spain, Africa, Greece and Macedonia, Asia and Egypt (cf. Lorenz, 66). Occasionally two years' events in a particular theatre may be combined in a single section. For books vi to xviii a convenient framework is afforded by the *excerpta antiqua* of the codex Urbinas (F).¹ Comparison of these with Livy's continuous narrative provides a sound chronological basis, though both demand critical use. The *excerpta antiqua* give forty-six extracts from books i to v, of which the full text also survives (cf. Büttner-Wobst's edition, ii, pp. lxiii–lxiv), and of these forty-six only one is displaced (v. 79. 3–86. 7 comes before v. 75. 2–6). This justifies general confidence in the order of the fragments in F and its copies, without excluding the possibility of an occasional displacement.

1. BOOKS VII AND VIII

These cover Ol. 141 = 216/15–213/12; and though P. normally made each of his Olympiad years begin at the beginning of the campaigning season which came half-way through it (cf. Vol. I, p. 36), in following up Cannae he breaks this rule, leaving for vii certain events of 216 which opened up new actions.

The *excerpta antiqua* from vii are, in order: the description of Leontini (vii. 6), the alliance of Philip and Hannibal (vii. 9), Philip's proposal to seige Ithome (vii. 12), Antiochus' seizure of Sardes (vii. 15–18); from viii they are: the death of Ti. Gracchus (viii. 35. 1–36. 9), the magnitude of the war (viii. 1–2), the siege of Syracuse (viii. 4. 1–7. 12), the poisoning of Aratus (viii. 12. 1–8), Philip's capture of Lissus (viii. 13–14), the capture of Achaeus (viii. 15. 1–21. 11), Hannibal's capture of Tarentum (viii. 24. 4–34. 13).

[1]

¹ For the various manuscripts on which the text is based see J. M. Moore, *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius*, Cambridge, 1965.

Of these passages the first, on Leontini, seems to have been introduced in connexion with Hieronymus' death; hence it is correctly followed by vii. 7–8 (from the Valesian excerpts on vice and virtue) summarizing the achievements of Hiero, Hieronymus, and Gelo, with criticism of other authors, and preceded by vii. 2–5 (from the excerpts *de legationibus*) on earlier events of Hieronymus' reign. Hiero died in 215 (Livy, xxiv. 4. 1; he was still alive at the outset of the consular year, Livy, xxiii. 38. 12–13), and Hieronymus reigned thirteen months, dying in 214 (vii. 7. 3) while campaigning was still possible. Livy (xxiv. 4. 1–7. 9) has compressed the Syracusan events of 215–214, down to Hieronymus' death, into one year; and De Sanctis (iii. 2. 333) plausibly suggests that P. did the same. In that case vii contained only one set of *res Siciliae*, which would explain why Hieronymus' death in 214 was mentioned before the PunicMacedonian treaty of 215. This chronology is preferable to that of G. Tuzi (*Studi di stor. ant.* i, 1891, 81–97) and Beloch (iv. 2. 278–80), who date Marcellus' arrival in Sicily (Livy, xxiv. 27. 6) in 213 (instead of 214) and so make all the earlier events a year later, viz. Hiero's death, spring 214; Hieronymus' murder, 213.

vii. 1. 1–3 from Athenaeus, and 1. 4 from Suidas concern the revolt of Capua and the investment of Petelia; the first is specifically attributed to vii, the second was assigned to P. by Fulvius Ursinus (though Suidas does not mention him). Both clearly are from the *res Italiae* which opened vii.

Livy (xxiii. 33. 9) dates the alliance between Philip and Hannibal to A.U.C. 539 = 215, a date which there is no reason to question, though its position in P. does not provide independent confirmation of it (cf. Walbank, *Philip*, 299). It was evidently described under *res Graeciae* before the Messenian events included in the next extract in F; but these Greek events cannot be assigned with certainty to either 215 or 214; Philip's visit to Ithome may be in 215, winter 215/14 or spring 214 (cf. Holleaux, 197 n. 4; and below, ad loc.). The next fragment, on Sardes, gives no help, since it will refer to 214 (see below).

Of the two fragments vii. 10. 1 (from Suidas) and 10. 2–5 (from the excerpts on vice and virtue) the latter clearly refers to the time before Philip's intervention in Messenia; but the former seems to describe the situation after his intervention (see ad loc.) and so perhaps should stand after 10. 2–5 or even after 12. vii. 11 follows 10. 2–5 in the excerpts on vice and virtue, and its last sentence seems to point forward to the account of Philip's enterprise against Messene, which begins with the incident recorded in vii. 12. This supports the present order of vii. 11 and 12 rather than the reverse order, given in Hultsch. The position of vii. 13–14 is confirmed since it comes after vii. 11 in the excerpts on vice and virtue, and after vii. 12 in

the *περὶ γνωμῶν* (M), which is a source for that chapter additional to F.

Büttner-Wobst next prints three fragments referring to Sicilian, Spanish, and Greek affairs. The first, vii. 14 b, from Suidas, mentions a ruse of Hippocrates, and corresponds to Livy xxiv. 31. 6, which Livy puts in 214. But Livy narrates under this year (Livy, xxiv. 21–39) all the Sicilian events from Hieronymus' death in 214 (above, p. 2) to the end of 213; for when in Livy xxiv. 39. 12 Ap. Claudius goes to Rome to stand for the consulship eight months after the opening of the siege of Syracuse (viii. 7. 6), it is the consulship of 212 that is in question (De Sanctis, iii. 2. 330 ff.). It seems likely that the context of this fragment relates to spring 213; but in any case, if there was only one set of *res Siciliae* in vii, and those ending with Hieronymus' death (as De Sanctis has argued convincingly: see above, p. 2) this fragment should be assigned to viii, where it will precede viii. 3 (see further below, p. 5).

vii. 14 c on the Massyli, from Stephanus and Eustathius, cannot be placed; it may form part of the history of Spain, since the Massyli had been left there (iii. 33. 15). vii. 14 d probably belongs to Philip V's disastrous expedition to the Aous, which Livy (xxiv. 40) dates to 214, and so stands correctly here.

Antiochus' seizure of Sardes (vii. 15–18) could, from the position of this fragment in the *excerpta antiqua*, belong to either 215 or 214. After crossing Taurus in summer 216 (v. 107. 4, 109. 5), he may have laid siege to Sardes at once or waited till 215. The events leading to the fall of Sardes occurred *τῆς πολιορκίας δεύτερον ἔτος ἐνεστώσης* (vii. 15. 2), which must mean 'as the siege was entering upon its second year'; but without a firm *terminus a quo* this does not allow us to determine whether the town fell in autumn 215 or spring 214. However, Achaeus' capture, after he had been tricked into leaving the citadel, is described in a fragment (viii. 15. 1–21. 11) from the *excerpta antiqua*, which follows two fragments concerned with Greek events of 213 (viii. 12. 1–8, 13–14) and precedes one relating to the betrayal of Tarentum to Hannibal (viii. 24. 4–34. 13), which seems to belong to winter 213/12 and to form part of the *res Italiae* of Ol. 141, 4 = 213/12. This suggests that if P. is describing the various theatres of war in his usual order, and if there is no displacement in the *excerpta antiqua*, Achaeus' betrayal was in Ol. 141, 3 = 214/13, which probably means 213. Since it is unlikely that Achaeus held out in the citadel of Sardes from 215 to 213, it seems likely that Sardes was captured (vii. 15–18) in 214; and if the events described in viii. 15. 1–21. 11 covered two years (213–212), an unlikely but not impossible hypothesis (see below, p. 6), there would be an even stronger argument for dating the capture of Sardes to 214.

The first passage in the *excerpta antiqua* from viii discusses

examples of generals who have been betrayed by trusting unscrupulous men; and though F does not reveal the context of this discussion, the Vatican palimpsest M (*περὶ γνωμῶν*), before a lacuna of one folium, has the first line of the extract preceded by a sentence, evidently from the excerptor, which shows that P. is speaking of the death of Ti. Gracchus. It is clear from Livy (xxv. 3. 5, 15. 10– 16. 7), Appian (*Hann.* 35), and Zonaras (ix. 5) that Gracchus' death was in 212. Hence Büttner-Wobst assumes a displacement of the fragment in F, and puts it at viii. 35–6, following the arguments of Nissen (*Rh. Mus.* 1871, 257). This brings it into the second half of viii, after the fall of Tarentum (viii. 24–34), as part of the *res Italiae* of 212; but it neglects a point made by Schweigaeuser, that viii. 36. 7 clearly indicates that the account of Achaeus' death by treachery follows the present extract (*ἐναργέστατον δὲ ἔσται καὶ τοῖς καιροῖς ἔγγιστον τοῖς ὑπὲρ ὅν ὁ νῦν δὴ λόγος ἐνέστηκε τὸ κατ' Ἀχαιὸν συμβάν*). This point also disposes of the view of Reiske, Casaubon, and Ernesti that the two chapters under discussion were written as a commentary on Achaeus' fall and came after it; but this refutation has not prevented Paton from placing them immediately after viii. 21, in the Loeb text. Indeed any theory of displacement from the beginning of viii faces the difficulty that in M they preceded ch. 21, of which, very fortunately, it preserves the last three lines after the lost folium. Nissen (*Rh. Mus.* 1871, 267) would explain this agreement between M and F by attributing the displacement to some *Urhandschrift*. But the real solution, as De Sanctis (iii. 2. 335–6) saw, is evidently that Gracchus' death has been mentioned, out of its chronological place, in some general discussion early in viii. De Sanctis himself thinks it came *nel premio del libro*. But after the first six books P. seems to have written *προεκθέσεις καθ' ἔκαστην ὀλυμπιάδα . . . τῶν πράξεων* (xi. 1 a; cf. R. Laqueur, *Hermes*, 1911, 186 n. 2), which would preface only the first book of each olympiad. The general observations which Büttner-Wobst rightly attributes to the introductions to ix, xi, and xiv (ix. 1–2, xi. 1 a, xiv. 1 a) arise in each case out of a *προεκθέσις κατ' ὀλυμπιάδα*, and there is no reason to assume that a book without such a *προεκθέσις* would none the less carry an introduction containing general discussion. Consequently it follows that the discussion in viii on misplaced confidence arose in some other context. Whatever this was, there are no grounds for shifting this extract to 35–36; it should be left (as in Hultsch) at the beginning of viii.

The next extract (viii. 1–2) is on the magnitude of the war. It cannot form part of the prooemium of the book (so Büttner-Wobst) for the reasons just given, but it may well have arisen, like many similar digressions, out of some specific historical point. The short extract which follows in Büttner-Wobst (viii. 3 a) is taken from the

margin of F, 'paulo ante initium eclogae quae sequitur, οὐκ ἀλλότριον cet.' (Hultsch), i.e. it is opposite the last part of the passage on misplaced confidence (viii. 35–36). This could mean that it came from the omitted part of Polybius which lay between that passage and the remarks on the magnitude of the war. Schweighaeuser and Büttner-Wobst have drawn attention to Livy, xxiv. 24. 2, where Adranodorus reveals his plans to Ariston with fatal results to himself, a passage derived from P., and, it is argued above, from viii. If viii. 3 a is a comment on this incident, it will be an extract from the *res Siciliae* in this book; and the position of the relevant passage in Livy suggests that it preceded vii. 14 b. It would also seem that the discussion on the magnitude of the war formed part of the *res Siciliae*, a feasible hypothesis, since such a digression could occur in almost any context; a convenient point would have been that corresponding to Livy, xxiv. 27. 5. On this hypothesis (it cannot claim to be more) the order of the fragments at the beginning of viii will be:

- 35–36 (probably preceded by 38 b: see below, p. 8);
- 3 a (cf. Livy, xxiv. 24. 2);
- 1–2 (perhaps from a passage corresponding to Livy, xxiv. 27. 5);
- vii. 14 b (cf. Livy, xxiv. 31. 6);
- 3–7 (cf. Livy, xxiv. 33. 9–35. 1).

The fragment in F on the siege of Syracuse is viii. 4. 1–7. 12; it carries with it viii. 3 (from T, *περὶ στρατηγημάτων*), which overlaps the passage from F as far as 6. 4, and an extract in Athen. xiv. 634 B (= viii. 6. 6) confirms the position in this book. The siege of Syracuse is narrated in Livy, xxiv. 33. 9–39. 13, a passage which covers down to the end of 213 (see above, p. 3); hence the present fragment, corresponding to this part of Livy, comes from the *res Siciliae* for 213.

The assignment of the remaining fragments from F in viii depends on the placing of the last, which deals with the taking of Tarentum (viii. 24. 4–34. 13). This event occurred in winter (viii. 34. 13, cf. Livy, xxv. 11. 20). Livy (*ibid.*) dates it to 212, but states that some authorities put it in 213. This suggests a date in the winter 213/12; and P. will have included it among the events of Ol. 141, 4 = 213/12, in the *res Italiae* in the second half of the book. In that case the fragments in F dealing with the poisoning of Aratus (viii. 12), the taking of Lissus (viii. 13–14), and the capture of Achaeus (viii. 15. 1–21. 11), all belong to 213 and to the *res Graeciae* or *res Asiae* of that year. Aratus died during his last *strategia* (Plut. *Arat.* 53. 1); it is uncertain whether this began in autumn 214 (Walbank, *Philip*, 300) or in May 213 (cf. v. 106. 1 n.; Walbank, *Aratos*, 202), but either date is consistent with the proposed arrangement. The passage on Aratus is also in the excerpts on vice and virtue, where it follows

immediately on the passage viii. 8. 1–11. 8, which is thus also assigned to viii. The capture of Lissus will also fall in 213, unless P. has run the *res Graeciae* for 213 and 212 into one narrative. There is no positive evidence for this hypothesis, but in the absence of any fragments from the *res Graeciae* which can be proved to have followed the account of the fall of Tarentum, the possibility cannot be excluded; and De Sanctis (iii. 2. 440) in fact dates the fall of Lissus to 212. The references to the Dassaretae and to Hyscana in Stephanus (viii. 14 b 1–2) could have come from the account of campaigns in either 213 or 212.

A firm dating of the fragment concerning Achaeus' capture and death (viii. 15. 1–21. 11) must take account of that assigned to the story of Antiochus at Armosata (viii. 23). This passage is from the Valesian excerpts on vice and virtue (P), in which it falls between the account of Cavarus (viii. 22. 1–2), which Athenaeus (vi. 252 C = P. viii. 22. 3) assigns to viii, and an extract dealing with Hasdrubal and Andobales (ix. 11), which refers to the situation after the death of the Scipios in 211 (on this see De Sanctis, iii. 2. 446 n. 4; Livy dates it to 212) and so belongs to the early part of ix. Since, however, P. usually relates Asian events after Spanish, the passage on Armosata will belong to viii. But does it refer to 213 or 212? Schweighaeuser put it under 213, but from sheer *horror vacui*: 'rettulimus hanc eclogam, cum ea quae sequitur [i.e. viii. 22. 1–2 and 23] ad A.U. 541 non quod certi simus, ad hunc annum eas pertinere; sed ne prorsus uacuus ille annus praetermitteretur.' Nevertheless editors have followed his attribution, making the events at Armosata precede the betrayal of Tarentum, with the implication that they belong to 213. But, as we saw (above, p. 3), Achaeus' capture was probably in 213; in which case we may perhaps assume that the campaign against Xerxes was the next year (212), and accept Nissen's dating (*Rh. Mus.* 1871, 258) of the Armosata chapter (and probably the extract on Cavarus, which may have formed part of the *res Asiae*) after Hannibal's capture of Tarentum (viii. 24–34). The passage in the excerpts on vice and virtue preceding that which concerns Cavarus deals with Aratus' death (viii. 12); but this does not help in dating the extract on Cavarus.

The taking of Tarentum (viii. 24–34) has already been assigned to the *res Italiae* of 213/12 (above, p. 5). F begins at 24. 4; but 24. 1 from M (*περὶ γνωμῶν*) is shown to belong here since two lines of this extract also appear in the margin of the *codex Urbinas* (F), and 24. 2 follows 24. 1 in M. 24. 3 from Suidas was placed here by Schweighaeuser (v. 32), who observed with Gronovius the parallel in Livy: cf. Livy, xxv. 7. 11–14, 8. 1, 15. 7–8.

The placing of the extract dealing with the fall of Epipolae (viii. 37) depends on internal evidence; 37. 2–11 comes from the *περὶ*

στρατηγημάτων (with a controlling account in Hero), but 37. 1, 12, and 13, from Suidas, are easily related to the larger fragment by the corresponding passages in Livy, xxv. 23. 10–12, 24. 6, and 24. 9. Livy describes events at Syracuse from the death of Hieronymus to the sack of the city and its aftermath in three sections: xxiv. 21–39 (under A.U.C. 540 = 214) covers down to the end of 213 (see above, p. 3); xxv. 23–31 (under A.U.C. 542 = 212) from spring 212 to the capture of the city; and xxv. 40–41 (also under A.U.C. 542 = 212) the sending of plunder to Rome and mopping-up operations in Sicily. Of these passages the first corresponds to viii. 3–7 (see above, p. 5), which forms part of the *res Siciliae* of 213; and ix. 10 (from the *excerpta antiqua*) corresponds to the last. What of the middle passage, Livy, xxv. 23–31? The obvious conclusion is that it corresponds to Polybius' *res Siciliae* in the second half of viii, which would thus cover the events of 212 down to the capture of Syracuse.

Against this De Sanctis has argued (iii. 2. 333–4) that the break between Livy xxv. 31 and 40 is artificial, and that both passages refer to the same year; and he attributes the break to Livy's desire to draw a dramatic contrast between Marcellus' victory at Syracuse and, immediately following it, the disaster of the Scipios in Spain (Livy, xxv. 32–39). But this hypothesis depends on the assumption that Syracuse fell in 211, the year to which the events of Livy, xxv. 40–41, certainly belong (though Livy assigns them to 212); and this is far from certain. Livy (xxv. 23. 1) states that 'cum maxime Capua circumuallaretur, Syracusarum oppugnatio ad finem uenit'. Capua was surrounded in autumn 212, and it is hard to reconcile this passage with De Sanctis's view (iii. 2. 331–2) that Syracuse did not fall until spring 211. The Hexapyla was seized at the time of a festival of Artemis (viii. 37. 2), which will be the spring festival of 212. The plague which struck the Carthaginians was in the same autumn (Livy, xxv. 26. 7). The ships sent by Bomilcar (Livy, xxv. 27. 2 ff.) can well have come the same autumn, and can have gone on to Tarentum the same year (see below, p. 9); they need not be postponed until spring 211, with De Sanctis. In two places Livy (xxv. 31. 5, xxxi. 31. 8) makes the siege of Syracuse last into the third year; and it seems certain that it began in spring 213 (viii. 7. 6 n.). This third year may seem hard to reconcile with a siege ending in late autumn 212. But there is an explanation which seems convincing (though not to De Sanctis, iii. 2. 332). Having dated the beginning of the siege in book xxiv under A.U.C. 540 = 214, and its end in book xxv under A.U.C. 542 = 212, Livy has been led to calculate its duration as continuing into the third year, and has in consequence put a reference to three years into Marcellus' mouth (Livy, xxv. 31. 5) and repeated it as his own statement a little later (Livy, xxxi. 31. 8).

There is thus no cogent reason for postponing the capture of Syracuse till spring 211. If it occurred in late autumn 212, there was every reason why P. should mention it under the Olympiad year corresponding to 212, rather than postpone along with it to ix (which nominally deals with 211 and 210) events which occurred in the spring of 212. Livy will have found *res Syracusanae* in both the second half of viii (going down to the capture of the city) and in the first part of ix (its aftermath); and he will have utilized these for xxv. 23–31 and 40–41 respectively. De Sanctis's hypothesis that viii. 37 should be postponed into ix is therefore to be rejected.

The short extract from Suidas, viii. 38, corresponds to Livy, xxv. 36. 7 (dated A.U.C. 542 = 212). But it is clear from the precise statement of Livy, xxv. 36. 14, that the destruction of Cn. Scipio took place 'octauo anno postquam in Hispaniam uenerat', i.e. in 211 (cf. Livy, xxv. 38. 6). De Sanctis (iii. 2. 446 n. 4) argues convincingly that P. related it under Ol. 142, 1 = 212/11, but that Livy put it in the consular year corresponding to 212 (cf. Hesselbarth, 389). Hence this passage should be assigned to ix, where it will precede ix. 11 (cf. Meyer, *Kl. Schr.* ii. 445 n.).

viii. 38 b 1, from Stephanus, and 38 b 2, from M, cannot be placed with certainty; but the latter precedes viii. 35 and so probably belongs to the early part of viii or the end of vii (since these excerpts are not assigned to books).

2. BOOKS IX AND X

These cover Ol. 142 = 212/11–209/8. The *excerpta antiqua* from ix are: discussion of types of history (ix. 1–2), Hannibal's march on Rome (ix. 3. 1–9. 10), the Syracusan spoils (ix. 10. 2–13, preceded by a marginal comment, 10. 1), the art of the commander (ix. 12–20), on the size of cities and on Agrigentum (ix. 26 a–27), speeches of envoys at Sparta (ix. 28–39, with a marginal comment, ix. 40. 1), on sending help quickly (ix. 40. 2–3), Philip's siege of Echinus (ix. 41), the Euphrates (ix. 43); from x they are: the recovery of Tarentum (x. 1), Scipio's character (x. 2. 5–20. 8), cavalry practice (x. 23–24), Macedonian speech against Rome (x. 25. 1–5, with marginal comment, x. 25. 6), Media (x. 27), Antiochus' expedition against Arsaces (x. 28. 1–31. 13), Marcellus' death (x. 32. 1–33. 7), Scipio in Spain (x. 34–40. 12), Philip helps his allies: fire-signalling (x. 41. 1–47. 13), the Oxus (x. 48), Antiochus in Bactria (x. 49).

The first of these is described in F as *ἐκ τοῦ θ λόγου* and clearly comes from the *προέκθεσις* to the Olympiad (cf. xi. 1 a; above, p. 4); this is confirmed by the reference in x. 47. 12 to this passage (ix. 2. 5) as *τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐπαγγελίαν*. With a few excerptor's alterations at the beginning most of the passage is also in M, where it follows viii. 24. 1 and precedes ix. 10. 2. Livy (xxvi. 7–12) describes the siege of

Capua and Hannibal's march on Rome under A.U.C. 543 = 211; clearly therefore ix. 3. 1–9. 10 belongs to the *res Italiae* of 211, the first year of the Olympiad; 8. 2–8. 13 is also in Anon. *de obsid. tol.*, but this gives no further help on the date or position of the fragment. The reference to Atella from Stephanus goes correctly at ix. 9. 10 a in view of Livy, xxvi. 16. 5 'Atellaque et Calatia in ditionem acceptae'.

ix. 9. 11 refers to an attempt by Bomilcar to help the Tarentines, but as it is from Anon. *de obsid. tol.* 78–79 (321 Thévenot), its position in P. is not indicated. Holleaux (240 n. 2) would assign it to 209, when Q. Fabius was besieging Tarentum; he emphasizes the phrase *τὰ περὶ τὴν στρατοπεδεῖαν*, but neglects the first words of the extract, probably because they are clearly the excerptor's, not P.'s (cf. Kahrstedt, iii. 281; Klotz, *Livius*, 175–6). However, the presence of a Punic fleet at Tarentum is attested by Livy, xxvi. 20. 7–11, a passage which opens with the words 'aestatis eius extremo qua capta est Capua et Scipio in Hispaniam uenit', and deals not with the arrival, but with the departure of the Punic fleet. The reference to Scipio may be ignored, for at this point Livy's Spanish events are recorded a year in advance (above, p. 8); but Capua fell in 211 (Livy, xxvi. 14. 6), and there is no reason to doubt Livy's statement that the Punic fleet left Tarentum in 211. It probably arrived late in 212, if indeed it was Bomilcar's fleet that failed to get through to Syracuse, and made for Tarentum instead (Livy, xxv. 27. 2–13; above, p. 7). P.'s phrase, *τοὺς Ρωμαίους ἀσφαλῶς θέσθαι τὰ περὶ τὴν στρατοπεδεῖαν*, which worried Holleaux, can very well refer to the defence of the citadel by the Roman garrison against the Tarentines in the town (Thiel, 105 n. 222); and since P., like Livy, is here concerned with Bomilcar's departure, we may accept the placing of this fragment here among the *res Italiae* of 211.

The relationship between the Polybian fragments dealing with the siege and fall of Syracuse and the account in Livy has already been discussed (above, pp. 5, 6–8). ix. 10. 2–13 (M also has 3–13) corresponds to Livy, xxv. 40–41; Livy puts it under 212, but it clearly refers to 211 (cf. De Sanctis, iii. 2. 333) and will form part of the *res Siciliae* of that year. The marginal comment at the beginning of the extract in F is correctly placed at ix. 10. 1.

ix. 11, from the excerpts on virtue and vice, clearly belongs to the situation after the disaster of the Scipios. It has been argued above (p. 8) that this took place in 211, and that viii. 38 should be included in the *res Hispaniae* in the first part of ix (Ol. 142, 1). The present extract will form part of the same section and stands correctly here; but it should be immediately preceded by viii. 38.

ix. 11 a, recording a Roman embassy to Ptolemy about corn, is from N, a Munich MS. containing excerpts on embassies. In this

collection it follows vii. 2–5, which refers to 215; and it can hardly be later than 210, when the conquest of Sicily will have relieved the grain shortage (cf. Holleaux, 67 n. 2). The reference to ravaging *μέχρι τῶν τῆς Ρώμης πυλῶν* (11 a 2) suggests a date after Hannibal's diversion of 211, which would be confirmed if this embassy could be identified with certainty with that mentioned in Livy, xxvii. 4. 10, under 210 (cf. Meyer, *Kl. Schr.* ii. 420–1 n. 6). But Livy assigns a different purpose to his embassy, which renders the identification uncertain. 211 therefore remains a possible date, making the present fragment part of the *res Italiae* for the first year of the Olympiad; but in the absence of positive evidence the present position may be retained with this caveat about the date. Nissen (*Rh. Mus.* 1871, 258) would place the fragment between ix. 21 and ix. 22, an arguable position if it could be demonstrated that ix. 12–20 referred to 211 (see below); but it cannot form part of the *res Aegypti* of 211 or 210 (as Hultsch implies by making it ix. 44) since there were no *res Aegypti* in v–xiii (cf. xiv. 12).

The long fragment ix. 12–20, on the art of the commander, precedes the passage on Agrigentum (ix. 27), which evidently referred to the taking of that city, an event which occurred, according to Livy, xxvi. 40. 1 *iam magna parte anni* (A.U.C. 544 = 210) *circumacta*. In the margin of F opposite the end of ix. 20 appears a comment which is in fact 22. 6, and this seems to establish the probability that the section on Hannibal as a general (ix. 22–26), from the excerpts on virtue and vice, must have followed ix. 12–20 in the original text. The context in which the latter passage was introduced remains, however, uncertain. Schweighaeuser's suggestion that it referred to P. Scipio's capture of New Carthage may be ignored now that it is clear that this was part of the *res Hispaniae* for 209. Hoffmann (59) thinks the discussion arose in relation to Hannibal; but 22. 7, to which he draws attention, does not carry the implication that P. has recently been discussing Hannibal. It may well be that ix. 12–20, as well as ix. 22–26, forms part of the *res Italiae* of Ol. 142, 2 = 211/10 (i.e. 210); but the fact that the previous extract in F (ix. 10. 1–13) deals with Sicilian events of Ol. 142, 1 = 212/11 (above, p. 9) leaves open the possibility that the digression on the general's art (ix. 12–20) was introduced in relation to Spanish or Greek events of Ol. 142, 1 = 211, e.g. in connexion with the disaster of the Scipios in Spain or some event in Philip's campaigns of that year (so Reiske). In that case, if ix. 11 a referred to 210 (see above, pp. 9–10), it could be placed after ix. 12–20.

This discussion has ignored ix. 21, a fragment from the gnomic excerpts (M), which precedes ix. 44. 2 and ix. 22. 6 in this collection and follows ix. 10 (from the *res Siciliae* of 211). Following Schweighaeuser, Klotz (*Livius*, 115) compares ix. 21 with Livy, xxvi. 37. 1–9

(especially 37. 2), on the state of mind in Rome at the beginning of A.U.C. 544 = 210. The likeness is striking and supports the placing of ix. 21 before ix. 22. It should also be noted that Livy, xxvi. 38. 1–3 (quoted in the note to ix. 26. 2) seems to echo ix. 26. 2 ff., on Hannibal's difficulties in Italy after the fall of Capua. Alone, these parallels could hardly be pressed, since P. is unlikely to be Livy's direct source for the second passage, and Livy is concerned not with Hannibal's character, but with the effect of his actions on other cities. But they support the placing of ix. 21 in its present position. M gives a short passage (ix. 44. 2) between ix. 21 and ix. 22. 6; this Hultsch printed immediately after ix. 21; but Büttner-Wobst removed it to the end of the book, evidently believing it to be out of place and an interruption to the continuity between ix. 21 and ix. 22. This is probably right.

ix. 26 a and ix. 27. 1–9 form a single excerpt in F, as Büttner-Wobst (correcting Schweighaeuser) has shown. Livy, xxvi. 40. 1–13 (not necessarily derived from P.: cf. Klotz, *Livius*, 177), dates the fall of Agrigentum to 210, and ix. 26 a 1–27. 9 is clearly from the *res Siciliae* of Ol. 142, 2 = 210. ix. 27. 10 covers two extracts from Stephanus, who specifically refers the second to ix; comparison with Livy, xxvi. 40. 16–17 confirms its position after the fall of Agrigentum. The former fragment clearly refers to the fall of Agrigentum (cf. ix. 27. 5 for the river), but can have either preceded 26 a or followed 27. 1–9 in the complete text. ix. 27. 11 from Suidas corresponds to Livy, xxvi. 40. 18, on the treatment of refugees from Agathyrna; its position is thus secure.

ix. 28–39 from F contains one sentence (36. 12) also in the gnomic excerpts (M), where it follows ix. 22. 6 and precedes ix. 42. 5. This gives no help in placing the excerpt, which, however, from its position in F clearly forms part of the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 142, 2 = 211/10. 39. 2 indicates that the speeches recorded were delivered after the fall of Oeniadae, Nasus, and Anticyra, but presumably (*ex silentio*) before the seizure of Aegina. The date of these events is controversial. Livy, xxvi. 24. 1–26. 4, covers Greek events from Laevinus' approach to the Aetolians to his return to Rome to take up the consulship for 210; it appears to deal with the years 211–210, recorded under A.U.C. 543 = 211. Now this passage in Livy has usually been taken as derived from P. (cf. Hesselbarth, 512; Soltau, 80; Klotz, *Livius*, 115, 176); but recently McDonald (*JRS*, 1956, 157) has argued that the framework (i.e. Livy, xxvi. 24. 1–6, 26. 4) is annalistic, and that only the central part, Livy, xxvi. 24. 7–26. 3, is Polybian. This Polybian section he believes to represent the *res Graeciae* for Ol. 142, 1 = 212/11. This implies that the Aetolian agreement with Laevinus was made in winter 212/11 according to P., and that the subsequent events recorded in Livy—the capture of

Zacynthus, Oeniadae, and Nasus (Livy, xxvi. 24. 15), Philip's expedition against Illyria and return to Tempe (Livy, xxvi. 25. 1–5), the Aetolian attack on Acarnania under Scopas (Livy, xxvi. 25. 9–16), Philip's expedition to Thrace and return to Dium and Pella (Livy, xxvi. 25. 6–8, 15–17)—all occurred during the first months of 211; and the seizure of Anticyra *ueris principio* (Livy, xxvi. 26. 1–3) will date to spring 211.

There are difficulties in this chronology. The seizure of Anticyra *πρώην* (39. 2) is the latest event mentioned in the speeches at Sparta; and though *πρώην* can certainly be used of events occurring a long time previously (cf. 31. 4), in view of its position in the fragments of P. the Spartan debate cannot have taken place before autumn 211, and it is hard to see why the fall of Anticyra at least six months earlier should be *πρώην* in contrast to the capture of Oeniadae and Nasus only a month or two earlier. Still harder to explain is the Aetolians' delay of between six months and a year (at least) of good campaigning weather since the compact with Laevinus before approaching the Spartans.

On McDonald's chronology, too, there is a year empty of events between Laevinus' seizure of Anticyra *ueris principio* in 211 (Livy, xxvi. 26. 1–3) and his receiving news of his election to the consulate *absens* in spring 210. Were there no events of any consequence in Greece related by P. under 211 after the fall of Anticyra? And if there were, why has Livy omitted them? In fact Livy obviously believes the news of his election to have reached Laevinus shortly after the fall of Anticyra in spring 210 (for the elections at the end of 211 cf. Livy, xxvi. 22. 13); and, quite consistently, Laevinus is delayed by illness, reaches Rome later in 210 (Livy, xxvi. 26. 4) and eventually his province of Sicily *magna parte anni circumacta* (Livy, xxvi. 40. 1).

It has been held that the evidence concerning the Aetolian generals is against this chronology. Scopas, McDonald observes (loc. cit.), was *στρατηγός* in the Aetolian year (autumn-autumn) 212/11. But this is not certain. Scopas was indeed general at the time of the *concilium* with Laevinus (Livy, xxvi. 24. 7) and the following spring *Scopas Aetolique* joined in the taking of Anticyra (Livy, xxvi. 26. 1). The general for 210/09 was Pyrrhias (Livy, xxvii. 30. 1, based on P.); and at the siege of Echinus P. (ix. 42. 1) mentions Dorimachus, *ό τῶν Αἰτωλῶν* (sc. *στρατηγός*). It has therefore been assumed that Dorimachus must be the general for 211/10, leaving Scopas necessarily as general in 212/11. This view (for which I argued in *Philip*, 301–4) is not, however, compelling. It ignores the important fact that ix. 42. 1 is part of a mere précis of the historian's text taken from the Anon. *de obsid. tol.*, and merits no confidence as a record of P.'s words. We cannot be sure that P. described Dorimachus as

στρατηγός,¹ and as an important Aetolian (cf. Livy, xxvi. 24. 7, where Dorimachus, *princeps Aetolorum*, shares the reply to Laevinus along with the *στρατηγός* Scopas) he may well have commanded forces at Echinus without being General of the Confederation.

Nothing then forbids the assumption that Livy, xxvi. 24. 7–26. 3 represents part of P.'s *res Graeciae* for Ol. 142, 2 = 211/10. The Aetolian *concilium* will be shortly after Scopas' election to the *στρατηγία* in autumn 211, the attack on Zacynthus, Oeniadae, and Nasus will be late autumn, Philip's winter campaign will belong to winter 211/10, and the Aetolian attack on Acarnania will be at the same time. The seizure of Anticyra, still in Scopas' *στρατηγία*, is in spring 210, and Laevinus hears of his election shortly after. The debate at Sparta will have taken place in 210 before Philip's attack on Echinus and the seizure of Aegina (which neither speaker mentions).

The fragment on the character of the Athenians (ix. 40. 1) is from the margin of F opposite the end of the preceding fragment. Whether it connects with an Acarnanian appeal to Athens (so Schweighaeuser) or whether, less probably, Athenian envoys were present at Sparta, it can be placed confidently here before ix. 40. 2–3, also from F. This fragment, in *oratio obliqua*, evidently forms part of an appeal for help. Schweighaeuser referred it to the Acarnanian appeal to Philip (cf. Livy, xxvi. 25. 15); but this involves one of two hypotheses. Either the negotiations at Sparta preceded the Aetolian attack on Acarnania (cf. ix. 40. 4 n.), in which case the reference to Oeniadae, Nasus, and Anticyra in Lyciscus' speech (ix. 39. 2) is anachronistic; or there is a displacement in the order of fragments in F and ix. 40. 2–3 should precede ix. 28. There is one example of such a displacement in book v; see above, p. 1. But the hypothesis of another here is one to be accepted only with reluctance. In fact the fragment may well refer to some other appeal in 210, for our knowledge of the events of this year is not sufficient to warrant excluding such a possibility. On the whole this hypothesis would seem to do least violence to the evidence.

In any case, however, ix. 40. 4–6, two passages from Suidas relating to the Acarnanian resistance to the Aetolian attack (cf. Livy, xxvi. 25. 10, 25. 12–13), are misplaced and should stand between 27 and 28. The order of the fragments in this part of ix will thus be: 40. 4, 40. 5–6, 28–39, 40. 1, 40. 2–3.

[13]

¹ Walek (*Rev. phil.* 1928, 9 ff.) also eliminates Dorimachus' *στρατηγία* (as does Clementi, *Studi di stor. ant.* i, 1891, 57); but he tries unsuccessfully to dispose of ix. 42. 1 on the assumption that it represents P.'s own words. For criticism of this see Walbank, *Philip*, 303. His argument that Sulpicius is also called *στρατηγός*, though he was proconsul, is irrelevant in view of P.'s usage; see ix. 42. 1 n.

Of the section dealing with Philip's siege of Echinus (ix. 41. 1–42. 4), 41 is from F (where it follows 40. 3) and 42. 1–4 from the Anon. *de obsid. tol.* 136–9 (323, 25–32 Thevenot). The subject-matter establishes the common context, but the fragment from the Anonymous is much deformed by the epitomator of P. and allows no confidence in the reference to Dorimachus as Aetolian *στρατηγός* (ix. 42. 1: see above, pp. 12–13). The events described form part of the *res Graeciae* for Ol. 142. 2 = 211/10, and belong presumably to the campaigning season of 210. This fits the reference to P. Sulpicius Galba, who was proconsul in Greece that year (cf. viii. 1. 6 n.; Livy, xxvi. 26. 4, 28. 9).

The fragment on the Roman occupation of Aegina (42. 5–8) is from the gnomic excerpts (M), where it is followed by x. 5. 8, part of the *res Hispaniae* of Ol. 142, 3 (210/09). Hence the present fragment must belong to the *res Graeciae* of 211/10, and so fall in the second part of ix. But whether it preceded or followed the account of the siege of Echinus cannot be determined (cf. Holleaux, 239 n. 6).

ix. 43 on the Euphrates follows ix. 41 in F, and so clearly belongs to the *res Asiae* of Ol. 142, 2 (211/10); for the choice between 211 and 210 see the note ad loc. Finally, ix. 44 and 45 contain several fragments the context of which is uncertain. ix. 44. 1, on keen allies, precedes, and ix. 44. 2 on the faults of monographs (apparently from some discussion of universal history) follows, ix. 21; on ix. 44. 2 see above, p. 11. ix. 45. 1–3 contains three geographical references assigned by Athenaeus or Stephanus to this book. Of these Xynia and Phorynna (ix. 45. 3) are from Stephanus; Phorynna (cf. Livy, xxvi. 25. 15) evidently belongs to the Greek affairs of Ol. 142, 1 (211), of which a version survives in Livy, xxvi. 24. 7–26. 3; the passage containing the reference will have preceded ix. 28–39 and followed ix. 40. 5–6 (see above, p. 13). Xynia(e) may have been mentioned under Ol. 142, 2 (211/10) before the siege of Echinus, and Arsinoe and the river Cyathus (ix. 45. 1–2) probably in connexion with the Aetolian attack on Acarnania (cf. ix. 40. 4–6).

x. 1, the first fragment from this book in F, deals with the Roman recovery of Tarentum. The presumption that it is from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 142, 3 = 210/09 is confirmed by Livy, xxvii. 15. 9–16. 9, which dates the event to 209. Next in F comes a fragment on Scipio's character and the taking of New Carthage (x. 2. 5–20. 8), parts of which are also in M and P (the gnomic excerpts and those on vice and virtue) and others in Suidas; the excerpts on vice and virtue also extend the passage backwards (x. 2. 1–3. 2). Its position in F establishes this fragment as part of the *res Hispaniae* of Ol. 142, 3 = 210/9, in effect 209 (cf. x. 6. 1 n.), though Livy (xxvi. 44–46) dates the fall of New Carthage to 210, an error originating out of confusion in equating Olympiad and consular years (cf. xxvii. 7. 5; De Sanctis, iii. 2. 454 n. 18, 468 n. 38; Klotz, *Hermes*, 1952, 340, who suggests

that Livy rejected P.'s chronology in order to reinforce his picture of a Roman recovery beginning from book xxvi onwards). Discussion of Philopoemen and his cavalry reforms comes next in F (x. 23–24) and the context allows the fragment x. 21–22, from the excerpts on vice and virtue, to come immediately before it, as Schweighaeuser first saw. There is no doubt that we are here dealing with the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 142, 3 = 210/9, i.e. 209. Euryleon's Achaean *strategia* (x. 21. 1) will be 211/10 (autumn–autumn), since the general for 210/9, the year of Philopoemen's hipparchy (x. 22. 6), was Cyliadas (Livy, xxvii. 31. 10).

The next fragment in F (x. 25. 1–5) is from a speech and, as Schweighaeuser saw, is probably from the negotiations at Aegium mentioned in Livy, xxvii. 30. 10, 'ibi de Aetolico finiendo bello actum ne causa aut Romanis aut Attalo intrandi Graeciam esset'. Livy relates the Greek events of 209 and 208 under the years 208 and 207 (Livy, xxvii. 29. 9–33. 5, xxviii. 5–8; cf. De Sanctis, iii. 2. 443, with the criticisms of Walek, *Rev. phil.* 1928, 13 ff.), as references to the Heraea, Nemea, and Olympia show. Hence the debate at Aegium falls in 209, and the present fragment will be from the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 142, 3 = 209. The sentence x. 25. 6 occurs in the margin of F opposite the end of x. 25. 1–5; it is in *oratio obliqua* and probably comes from a speech in the same debate.

Two of the excerpts on vice and virtue deal with Philip's character and his behaviour at Argos (x. 26); they clearly refer to the events mentioned in Livy, xxvii. 31. 3–8, under 208, though in fact they belong to 209 (see above). Since these events succeed the debate at Aegium, the fragments are properly placed here.

F contains two separated passages on Asian affairs from x. The first, x. 27. 1–31. 13, with a break indicated after 27, comes next in the fragments and so belongs to the *res Asiae* of Ol. 142, 3 = 209: it concerns Antiochus' expedition against Arsaces. Two towns in Hyrcania and Parthia, mentioned by Stephanus (x. 31. 14–15), evidently belong in this section, since by 208 Antiochus had reached the Oxus and Bactria (x. 48–49); but since Calliope in Parthyene is likely to have been mentioned before Antiochus reached Hecatompylus, 31. 15 should probably be placed between 27. 13 and 28. 1.

That the next fragment from F, on Marcellus' death (x. 32. 1–33. 7), belongs to the *res Italiae* of Ol. 142, 4 = 208, is confirmed by Livy, xxvii. 26–27, and the fact that Marcellus was consul when he died. x. 33. 8, from Suidas, refers to Hannibal's attack on Salapia shortly after Marcellus' death (cf. Livy, xxvii. 28. 10–11), and this determines its position. The account of Baecula from F (with an extract from M in ch. 36) must come from the *res Hispaniae* of Ol. 142, 4 = 208 (x. 34. 1–40. 12). Livy, xxvii. 17–20, dates Baecula to 209; but see

above, pp. 8, 14; cf. De Sanctis, iii. 2. 443, who points out that Baecula must fall in the year before Metaurus, which was in 207.

Next in F comes a fragment on help given by Philip to his allies and on fire-signalling (x. 41–7); it must form part of the *res Graeciae* for 208, which Livy, xxviii. 5–8, recounts after P. For his dating to 207 see above, p. 15; the reference to the Olympic games in Livy, xxviii. 7. 14, shows the real date to be 208. This fragment should be followed by the short passage from Suidas, dealing with events at Opus in 208, which Livy (xxviii. 7. 7–8, 8. 1–3) puts in 207; it is printed by Büttner-Wobst at xi. 7. 1 (on this cf. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos*, 204). Finally come two fragments from F (x. 48 and 49) dealing with the Oxus and Antiochus in Bactria; Stephanus also gives x. 48. 1. Clearly both passages are from the *res Asiae* of Ol. 142, 4 = 208.

3. BOOK XI

This covers Ol. 143, 1–2 = 208/7 and 207/6. The *excerpta antiqua* are: Hasdrubal in Italy (1. 2–3. 6), Thrasylates' speech (4–6), Philopoemen's reforms and the death of Machanidas (9–18), Hannibal's character (19), Ilipa (20–24. 9), Scipio crushes a mutiny (25–30), suppression of Andobales' revolt (31–33), affairs in Bactria (34). The first of these is described in the margin as being *πολυβίου . . . ἡ λόγου*. In Büttner-Wobst it is correctly preceded by xi. 1 a, from the gnomic excerpts (M), in which it follows x. 36 and precedes xi. 3. 7; its subject-matter indicates that it forms part of the *προέκθεσις* to Olympiad 143 (cf. ix. 1–2; xiv. 1 a; above, p. 4). 1. 1 contains two extracts from Suidas; they correspond to Livy, xxvii. 39. 6 and 40. 1 (though it is unlikely that Livy is here deriving from P.), and precede the account of Metaurus (1. 2–3. 6), which is taken from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 143, 1 = 207 = A.U.C. 547, the consulship of C. Claudius Nero and M. Livius Salinator.

3. 7 follows 1 a and precedes 4. 10 in the gnomic excerpts. It concerns speeches and may well belong to the occasion when Thrasylates delivered his (4–6); but Schweighaeuser, Hultsch, and Büttner-Wobst are wrong to compare Livy, xxviii. 7. 13 f., describing the arrival of neutral ambassadors at Elatea, for though dated by Livy to 207, these events belong to 208 (cf. Schmitt, *Rom und Rhodos*, 203; above, p. 15). 3. 7 could equally well refer to some event in the *res Italiae*, or even the *res Siciliae* or *Hispaniae* of 207 (so Büttner-Wobst); but with this caveat, it may be left in its present position. Thrasylates' speech (4–6: F² gives his name in the margin) is from the *res Graeciae* of 207; and that 7. 2–3, on Philip's invasion of Aetolia, a fragment from the excerpts on vice and virtue, follows it, is assured by the fact that the gnomic excerpts (M) contain 4.10 and 7. 3 (with a line of 7. 2) in that order. But 7. 1 from Suidas (cf.

Livy, xxviii. 7. 7–8) refers to 208 and should be transposed to follow x. 47 (see above, p. 16). The two Aetolian towns mentioned in Stephanus may be left at 7. 4–5, though in the original they can just as well have been mentioned before Philip's arrival at Thermum (7. 2–3). 8 consists of three fragments from Suidas, the third of which (8. 7) is also in the margin of F opposite 9. 1. The subject, generalship (with a reference to Achaea, 8. 3), appropriately precedes Philopoemen's reforms (contrast 8. 5–6 with 10. 3); and Suidas has drawn extensively on P. hereabouts. What follows (9–18) on the reforms and Machanidas' death is clearly from the *res Graeciae* of 207; it comes from F, but M appears at 10. 1–2 and the excerpts on vice and virtue at 10. 3–7 (both following 7. 3). For 13. 8–14. 2, 14. 4, 15. 5, 16. 1–2, 16. 5–6 a Berlin papyrus (P. 9570, second century A.D.; Wilcken, *Arch. Pap.* i. 388–95) gives no new information. On the date of Philopoemen's first *στρατηγία* see xi. 8–18 n.

19 a, on causes, is from M, where it falls between 10. 2 and 24 a (*res Hispaniae*); though Hultsch and Büttner-Wobst place it here

at the outset of the *res Italiae* for 206, it could equally well follow Philopoemen's successes or occur in the Spanish chapters. The character-sketch of Hannibal from F (19) is clearly part of the *res Italiae* of 206, and appropriately follows Hasdrubal's failure in 207; there is a similar passage at the corresponding point in Livy (xxviii. 12. 1–9).

Most of the remaining fragments of this book are from the *res Hispaniae* of 206; the account of Ilipa (20–24. 9) is from F. De Sanctis (iii. 2. 496–7 n. 84) argues that in xi P. combined the *res Hispaniae* for 207 and 206 in a single section, and he dates Ilipa to 207. This implies that Livy, xxviii. 12–37, which is nominally on 206, in fact also covers events of 207, and that Livy, xxviii. 12. 10–17. 1 is a doublet of Livy, xxviii. 1–4. 4 (207); Livy, xxviii. 16. 14 will thus mark the transition to Ol. 143, 2 = autumn 207–autumn 206, and Ilipa will be left in 207. Against this Scullard (*Scip.* 304–9) makes these persuasive points:

(a) There is little reason to make Livy, xxviii. 1–4 and 12–17 a doublet; they are quite different narratives.

(b) Livy xxviii. 16. 14 states that the Carthaginians were expelled from Spain in the fifth year of Scipio's command and the fourteenth (read 'thirteenth': cf. Livy, xxviii. 10. 8) of the war; this refers to 206. De Sanctis has to refer it prospectively to events following Ilipa; but it reads naturally as a reference to Ilipa itself, and implies that Livy put this in 206.

(c) For De Sanctis's argument to hold together, with Livy, xxviii. 16. 14 referring to 207, Ilipa must have been fought just before; but the battle was in fact in spring (xi. 20. 1).

Granted, it is hard to fit all that Livy records of Scipio after Ilipa into a time-table which allows him to return to Rome for the consular elections of 206 (Livy, xxviii. 38. 1–6); but it is not impossible, if (a) Scipio returned from Ilipa to New Carthage and not to Tarraco, and Livy reversed the assignment of commands to Silanus and Marcius during Scipio's absence in Africa (so Brewitz, 38 ff.; Scullard, *Scip.* 308–9), or (b) the elections were late and Scipio made a bold return risking bad weather (so Broughton, *MRR*, i. 301). The second alternative is the more probable, but either is preferable to dating Ilipa to 207.

24 a 1–3 and 4 follow 19 a in M; 25 comes next in M and an overlap with the *excerpta antiqua* allows all these to be placed after Ilipa. Hasdrubal's remark about Scipio (24 a 4) is also in Livy, xxviii. 18. 7–8; and 24 a 1–3 may correspond to Livy, xxviii. 17. 2–3. Hultsch and Büttner-Wobst place 24. 10 and 24. 11 between 24. 9 and 24 a 1; the first is a mention of Ilourgeia from Stephanus, the second a citation from Suidas which comparison with App. *HisP.* 33 and Livy, xxviii. 22–23 shows to refer to the destruction of Astapa. The order of events in Appian and Livy shows that both these towns were attacked after Scipio's visit to Syphax; for Ilourgeia cf. App. *HisP.* 32 and Livy, xxviii. 19. 1 f. (where Livy refers incorrectly to the Iliturgi). Hence (as Hesselbarth, 447, saw) 24. 10 and 24. 11 ought to follow 24 a 4. In fact they were rightly placed in Schweighaeuser, in terms of the fragments then available; the error arose when 24 a 1–3 and 24 a 4 were wrongly placed after, instead of before, 24. 10–11.

The Roman mutiny (25–30) from F has an overlap with M at 25. 1–7; that it comes here is confirmed by Livy, who records it in xxviii. 24–29, after the destruction of Astapa (22–23). The lacuna at 26. 1 can be filled from Livy, xxviii. 25. 15. The last Spanish fragment from F (31–33) concerns Andobales' revolt; Livy, xxviii. 31. 5–34 independently confirms its position, and reveals an omission between 33. 6 and 33. 7 (cf. Livy, xxviii. 34. 1 ff.). The extract 34 (F) is part of the *res Asiae* for 206, and deals with Antiochus in Bactria and India.

4. BOOK XII

xii forms a digression (cf. xii. 11. 6), devoted to polemic against Timaeus, and incidentally Callisthenes and others. The *excerpta antiqua* are: Timaeus' errors on Africa and Corsica (3–4), on Locri (5–6. 6), Timaeus on truth (12. 1–3), on falsehood and ignorance (12. 4–5), Timaeus on Demochares and Agathocles (14. 3–15. 11), an incident at Locri (16), Callisthenes as military historian (17–22), Timaeus' version of Hermocrates' speech (26. 1–8), Timaeus' failure to use autopsy (27. 1–28. 9); there are also three marginal insertions

(7. 6, 10. 6, 25 c 5). In this book, however, the order in the gnomic excerpts (M) and those on vice and virtue (P) is more important for the reconstruction of the order of the fragments as a whole. The first excerpt from F (3–4) is headed *Πολυβίου . . . τοῦ ἵβ' λόγου*, and evidently follows a reference to Africa; this supports the view (see xii, introductory note) that P. introduced his criticism of Timaeus in connexion with a description of Africa, Scipio's next theatre of war and part of his province for 205 (the actual invasion was not till 204). Stephanus mentions five African towns from this book, and it seems likely that this was early in the book when Africa was under discussion (1. 1–5); whether they came in polemic against Timaeus is uncertain. The account of the lotus from Athenaeus will also come at the beginning (2). In F Corsica is apparently mentioned (3–4) as just another place on which Timaeus is inaccurate. 4 a–4 d is from M, where it precedes 6 a; the reference to Africa in 4 c 2 justifies placing it here, before P. turns to Locri. Sardinia, mentioned in 4 c 2, must have been discussed in a lost passage.

That a substantial section on Locri came next is clear from 5–6. 6, which follows 3–4 in F. 6. 7 represents two extracts from Athenaeus on the possession of slaves in Greece and Locri; like the fragments 6 a and 6 b, from M, it involves discussing Timaeus' criticisms of Aristotle. It is not, however, clear whether the argument based on the antiquity of slavery (6. 7–8) or those based on probability (6 a–6 b) came first. Pédech (introd. xix) argues that P. deals first with the arguments dealing with autopsy, and then with those based on probability, and is therefore disposed to make 6. 7 follow 6 b; but it is by no means certain that P. followed this order, nor, even if he did, does it follow that 6. 7–8 is out of place. The traditional order may therefore be kept (and indeed is kept also by Pédech). 7–11 are from the excerpts on vice and virtue, but there is an overlap of 7. 4–8. 1 in M, and two comments in the margin of F (7. 6 and 10. 6), inserted opposite a point about half-way though 5–6. The order of these fragments seems assured; for though Valesius wanted to put 5–6 after 7–11, Schweighaeuser rightly follows Reiske in adopting the present order, in view of 7. 2, which suggests that P. has now finished with Timaeus and Aristotle on Locri.

11. 8 is from M, where it follows 8. 1; and since the next passage (12. 1–3) is also in M, as well as in F, the order seems assured; it seems probable that 11. 8 on truth is part of the argument leading up to that in 12. The order in M shows that Schweighaeuser was wrong to put 11. 8 between 6. 6 and 7–11. F and M both give parts of 12; F has 12. 1–3 and 12. 4–5, M has 12. 1–3 and 12. 6–7, in each case as separate passages: the relative order of 12. 4–5 and 12. 6–7 can be determined by the sense. 12 a and 12 b, on the proverb *Λοκροὶ τὰς συνθῆκας*, and Timaeus' criticism of Callisthenes, follow 12. 6–7 in

that order in M. 13–15, on Timaeus' criticism of Demochares and Agathocles, is from the excerpts on vice and virtue, with an overlap at 14. 3–15. 11 from F; this establishes the placing of this extract before 16, also in F, but there is no way of relating this sequence to 12 a and 12 b, which may have followed 15 or even 16. Indeed, the reference to Callisthenes (12 b 2) may have helped to lead up to the discussion of that historian in 17–22; but it is clear from 17. 1 and 22. 7 that P.'s criticism of Callisthenes was accompanied by criticism of Ephorus, and it is not impossible that 16 was concerned with criticism of Ephorus, not Timaeus, which would explain its position here, rather than earlier, when slaves at Locri were under discussion. On the other hand it would fit into a criticism of Timaeus' allegation that Zaleucus did not exist.

23, which concludes the discussion of Timaeus' criticism of Aristotle, Theophrastus, Callisthenes, Ephorus, and Demochares (23. 8), follows 15 in the excerpts on vice and virtue. It therefore seems likely that 17–22 from F (the first sentence of 17 was restored by Schweighaeuser from Suidas) precedes it; but Schweighaeuser's suggestion (vol. vii. 112, 123) that 17–22 might follow 23–25 as a kind of appendix cannot be wholly excluded (cf. Pédech, introd. xxii–xxiii, who envisages that it might at least follow 23). 24–25 consists of three fragments from the excerpts on vice and virtue, all following in order after 23; no break is shown after *λόγους* in 24. 5. 25 a–28 a contains five consecutive passages from M; and since 26 and 27. 1–28. 9 are also in F, the sequence clearly follows 22. It is not, however, certain that all the passages in 25 a–28 a necessarily follow the sequence 24–25, though the development of the argument suggests that they do.

5. BOOK XIII

This covers Ol. 143, 3–4 = 206/5 and 205/4. The *excerpta antiqua* are: Scopas in Alexandria (2. 2), Philip's treacherous policy (3. 1–4. 8), the importance of truth (5. 4–6), Nabis' character (6. 1–7. 11). The first of these is preceded in modern texts by 1. 1–3 and 1 a 1–3, of which 1. 1–3 is from the excerpts on vice and virtue, and Athenaeus quotes part of it as from xiii. Its sense confirms its position before 1 a, which is from M; and that the latter precedes 2 is certain, since the words *ὅτι παρ' οἷς . . . χρησαμένους* are also in the margin of F (at fol. 216^v extr.), and further 2. 1–2 is also in M following on 1 a 1–3. 2. 1–5 is also in the excerpts on virtue and vice, and parts of it are in Suidas.

The passage on Philip's treachery and Heracleides (3. 1–4. 8) also contains an extract from the excerpts on virtue and vice (4. 4–8), and a reference in Athenaeus to Heracleides' role confirms that the book

is xiii. Three fragments from Suidas continue the saga of Heracleides (5. 1–3), but whether 5. 4–6 on truth (from F) should precede or follow these sentences is uncertain; moreover, comparison with Polyaen. v. 17 (2), taken from P., suggests that the Suidas fragments should be printed in this order: 5. 2, 5. 1, 5. 3 (cf. Holleaux, *études*, iv. 136). 5. 4–6 is also in M, with some small verbal discrepancies and the addition of *ώς συνέβη . . . ἀφικόμενον* at the end. 5. 7 is in the excerpts on virtue and vice, and part in Suidas; its position in the former sets it before 6. 1 and after 4. 8. Its reference to Damocles and Python, spies at Rome, makes it likely that it fits into this context, where Philip's treachery is being exposed. The account of Nabis is in the excerpts on virtue and vice (P) as well as in F; but P continues with 8. 1–7, dealing with Nabis' aggression against Megalopolis. All these passages come from *res Graeciae*, but they need not all belong to the same year. For the actions of Heracleides Holleaux (*études*, iv. 124–5) leaves the choice open. As he observes (ibid. 139 n.), the separate peace between Philip and Aetolia was in 206, and the economic distress and appointment of Scopas and Dorimachus as nomographers can well belong to 205 (cf. Steigemann, 28). If, as is perhaps probable, Philip's intrigues in Crete and Rhodes (3–5) followed the peace of Phoenice, their date would be 204 (cf. Steigemann, ibid.; Walbank, *Philip*, 306). Holleaux (loc. cit.) observes that Diod. xxvii. 3, describing the Rhodian declaration of war on Crete, precedes the account of Pleminius' sacrilege at Locri (Diod. xxvii. 4. 1–5) in 205. But Heracleides' activities need not precede the outbreak of the Rhodian war against Crete, and on the whole 204 seems the more likely date for them. There is no reason why the passages describing them should be from the same part of the book as those dealing with Aetolia. In 6. 1 Nabis is said to be in his third year of rule; since Machanidas was killed in 207 (xi. 17), 6. 1–8. 1 is almost certainly from 204.

9. 1–3 from Stephanus and 9. 4–5 from Suidas deal with Antiochus' presence among the Gerrhaeans, his visit to Tylus, and his return to Seleuceia. Since he wintered in Carmania in 206/5 (xi. 34. 13), these events probably belong to the *res Asiae* of Ol. 143, 3 = 205; in which case 9 should precede 3. So long as Antiochus' letter to his satrap in Caria (Welles, 36/37; Holleaux, *études*, iii. 165–81) was dated to spring 204, the visit to the Gerrhaeans had to belong to 205. But the date of this letter, queried by Welles, has now been shown by L. Robert to be 193 (cf. iv. 2. 7 n.); hence this inscription gives no help in the dating of this fragment (cf. Aymard, *REA*, 1949, 333 n.). 10. 1–11 is a collection of place-names from Italy, Crete, Thrace, and Illyria quoted by Stephanus. Fighting among the Brutii against Hannibal, and events in the other areas could belong to either 205 or 204.

6. BOOKS XIV AND XV

These contain each the events of a single year, Ol. 144, 1 = 204/3 (cf. xiv. 1 a 5) and 144, 2 = 203/2. The *excerpta antiqua* from xiv are: the account of Scipio in Africa (xiv. 1. 1–10. 10); from xv: affairs in Africa down to Zama (xv. 1–16), the emotion of the Punic ambassadors (xv. 17. 1–2), the settlement after Zama (xv. 17. 3–19. 9), the Syro-Macedonian pact (xv. 20. 1–8), criticism of the people of Cius and the announcement of Philip's capture of Cius at Rhodes (xv. 21. 3–23. 10), events at Alexandria (xv. 26. 1–36. 10).

xiv. 1. 1–10. 10 is copied, in the codex Urbinas, in the second hand (F²), with the marginal comment: *πολυβίου τοῦ ἱδ λόγου*. xiv. 11–12 are from Suidas, 11 under *κεραία*, 12 under *ὑπηρετικοῖς*. The dating is confirmed by Livy, xxx. 1. 1, 3. 3. Few other fragments survive from xiv. 1 a from the preface is from M, where it follows xiii. 5. 6. 11 consists of two extracts from Athenaeus, which he ascribes to this book; they must form part of the *res Aegypti*, and so follow the *res Africæ* (1–10). 12 is from the excerpts on virtue and vice (P), where it follows xiii. 8. 7; its connexion with the subject-matter of 11 confirms its position here, but whether it should precede or follow 11 cannot be determined.

xv. 1–16 is preceded by the words *πολυβίου . . . τοῦ ἱδ λόγου* in F; and clearly the first three *excerpta antiqua* from this book refer to *res Italiae et Africæ* of 203/2, which appear to be dealt with in a block. The first fragment is extended backwards at the beginning by N (Monacensis, 267), which gives the first two and a half lines of xv. 1. 1 and goes down to 4. 8; M also gives xv. 6. 3–9. 1. xv. 20. 1–8 on the Syro-Macedonian pact evidently falls under the *res Graeciae* of 203/2, and may refer to events of winter 203/2. Following Magie (*JRS*, 1939, 32), Bikerman (*Chron. d'Egypte*, 1940, 130–1) supposes that the moral reflections here presuppose a fuller account of the pact earlier, i.e. in xiv, which would date it to 204/3. This dating would certainly better suit an accession of Epiphanes in autumn 204; but on Bikerman's own hypothesis P. did not describe this accession until xv, and so is unlikely to have described an event which followed directly upon it in xiv. The real date of the pact is another matter. If P. put the date of accession too late, he may also have dated the pact too late; but in fact it is not possible to be wholly certain whether P. believed Epiphanes' accession to have been in 204/3 or 203/2 (see xiv. 11–12 n.).

The affairs of Cius (xv. 21. 3–23. 10) will also belong to the *res Graeciae* and to the campaigning season of 202. xv. 21. 1–2 from the excerpts on virtue and vice (P) seems correctly placed before 21. 3, since there is a reference back to some such details (cf. xv. 21. 3, *διὰ τὴν . . . ἀβουλίαν καὶ κακοπολιτείαν*); Suidas adds a detail on

Molpagoras' death. xv. 21. 5–8 is also in M, and 22. 1–23. 9 in the excerpts on virtue and vice (P). xv. 24 is a series of short fragments: 24. 1 from P, where it follows 23. 9 and precedes 25. 1, 24. 2 and 3 from Suidas, and 24. 4–6 from M. At this point M contains four passages, 24. 4–6, 24 a, 26 a 1–2 and 34. 1–36. 11. Of these 34. 1–36. 11 coincides in part with a long passage in F, and its position is thus certain, while 24. 4–6, which appears to concern Philip (cf. the reference to universal dominion with v. 102. 1), seems correctly placed as a comment on the treacherous occupation of Thasos. The right place for 24 a, 25. 1–2, and 26 a 1–2 has been established by P. Maas in a brilliant piece of analysis (*AIPhO*, 1949, 443–6). xv. 25. 3–37 is from Q, an Escorial MS. $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\iota}\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\omega\iota\lambda\omega\eta$. By a comparison with P, which is extant for xv. 25. 20–25, Maas demonstrates the existence of large gaps in Q, wherever his original contained anything irrelevant to the copyist's subject (cf. xv. 25. 21–23 and 25. 25 $\tau\tilde{\omega}\delta\dot{\epsilon}\dots\tilde{\eta}\gamma\omega\eta$, both omitted by Q). Maas postulates similar gaps between 25. 7 and 25. 20; and indeed compression had already been detected in several places by Hultsch and Büttner-Wobst. Down to 25. 7 Sosibius acts along with Agathocles; afterwards he is not mentioned. Already Schweighaeuser had suggested that the account of his murders in 25. 1–2 (from P) was inserted in connexion with his death; and Niese (ii. 573 n. 3) had drawn the conclusion that he died before Epiphanes' accession, an untenable view (cf. xv. 25. 1–2 n.). Maas suggests that the account of Sosibius' death fell in a lost part of the narrative between xv. 25. 7 and xv. 25. 20, and probably at the end of 25. 10 (for in 25. 11 Agathocles is acting alone).

This hypothesis gains confirmation from the argument relating to xv. 24 a and xv. 26 a 1–2 (both from M). Both these Maas places after xv. 25. 19; and in a *Nachtrag* he proves his point by comparing 25. 19 and 24 a with xxviii. 16. 10–11, which clearly reproduces the two earlier passages in that order (see xv. 25. 19 n.). Similarly, the murder of Deinon (xv. 26 a 1–2) leads up to the statement of xv. 25. 20. The order of all these fragments within xv is assured both from F and from the fragment of P at 25. 20–25; but on the problem of the real date of the events described see xiv. 11–12 n. There are thus no surviving fragments between xv. 25. 37 and the last extract in F, xv. 26. 1–36. 10 (of which M also gives 34. 1–36. 11, adding eight words omitted by F). xv. 37. 1–2, a comment on Antiochus, is from P, where it falls between xv. 25. 25 and xvi. 1. 1; it is therefore from the *res Asiae* of xv. Suidas also quotes it.

7. BOOK XVI

This contains the events of Ol. 144, 3–4 = 202/1, and 201/0. The *excerpta antiqua* are: the battle of Chios (2–9), how men change their minds (10. 2–4), the taking of Prinassus (11), remarks on Iasus (12),

a single sentence in the margin (21. 11), Scipio's return and triumph (23), Philip's conduct compared favourably with that of Attalus and the Rhodians (28), the siege of Abydus (29. 3–34. 12), Philopoemen's expedition against Nabis (36–37).

1, on Philip's operations near Pergamum, is from P, in which it follows xv. 37 and precedes xvi. 13 (Suidas also gives 1. 9 with an extra line). But Holleaux (*études*, iv. 211 ff.) has demonstrated that the attack on Pergamum followed the battle of Chios, since Philip's anger (1. 1) is explicable only if Attalus had provoked his attack; that he had is clear from xviii. 6. 2 and from the fact that Theophiliscus, the Rhodian navarch, precipitated Attalus' action (xvi. 9. 3). The provocation was evidently Pergamene participation in the battle of Chios. Hence Holleaux rightly transposes 1 to a position between 9 and 10, to follow the account of Chios. (For Holleaux's further argument that the attack on Pergamum also followed the battle of Lade, and on the relative chronology of Chios and Lade see the commentary on xvi, introductory note.)

F specifically assigns the account of Chios (2–9) to xvi. The discussion of Philip's behaviour after Lade (10. 1) is from M, where it follows xv. 36. It is followed by 10. 2–3 (also in F, where it continues to 10. 4), but despite the absence of any break in M, other than a stop, between 10. 1 and 10. 2, it is clear that 10. 2–4 does not refer to Philip's failure to sail on Alexandria (10. 1), since P. believes this to have been feasible, whereas in 10. 2 he is talking about abandoning impossibilities. Philip's siege of Prinassus and his attack on Iasus belong to the later part of his campaign of 201 when he has gone south; hence 11 and 12 are clearly rightly placed. All the fragments so far discussed will belong to the *res Macedoniae* of 201; 13 from P (where it follows 1 and precedes 14) seems to belong to the *res Graeciac* of Ol. 144, 3 = 202/1, and it is followed in P by 14–20, a criticism of Zeno and Antisthenes apparently stimulated (cf. 14. 1 with 13. 3) by their account of events in the Peloponnese, even though P. goes on to discuss their version of Lade, etc., as well. 17. 5–7 is also in Suidas.

21–22. 10, also from P (with Suidas at 21. 1–9), follows 20 in that MS. and will form part of the *res Aegypti* for 202/1. 21. 11 is also in the margin of F alongside the passage on Scipio (23); this confirms the original position of 21–22. 10. 22. 11 follows 22. 10 in P, but the words *ζήτει ἐν τῷ περὶ δημηγοριῶν* indicate a lacuna where the rest of Tlepolemus' speech occurred. 22 a is from P, where it follows 22. 11 and precedes 24. 1. Schweighaeuser, despite its place in the MS., made it xvi. 40; but it clearly belongs to 201 and can well stand here as part of the *res Syriae* for that year (cf. Nissen, *KU*, 124 n. 2; Holleaux, *études*, iii. 320–1).

Scipio's return to Italy and his triumph are recounted in Livy,

xxx. 45 under A.U.C. 553 = 201; they will fall towards the end of the year, hence in Ol. 144, 4 = 201/0. 23, describing them, is from F, and is from the *res Italiae* of the second half of xvi. The next fragments are from the *res Macedoniae et Graeciae* of that year; the two seem to have been run together because of the character of the events. 24. 1–8 is from P, where it follows 22 a; 24. 9 is from Athenaeus and belongs to the same context (though Holleaux, *études*, iv. 230–1, has doubts); the presence of hiatus shows Athenaeus to be paraphrasing. 25–26 are from the *excerpta de legationibus* (for which Hultsch collated N, Monacensis 267); they concern Attalus' visit to Athens, and 27 describing the Roman ultimatum to Nicanor follows in the same *excerpta*. 28 from F concerns Philip's 'kingly conduct'; comparison with Livy, xxxi. 15–16 confirms its place after the description of events at Athens (as Schweigaeuser saw). 29. 1 and 29. 2 are from Suidas; the latter, from a passage explaining why Philip attacked Abydus, must stand here, and though the former would fit the context of Livy, xxxi. 28. 6, where Philip after his return to Macedonia from Abydus destroys Sciathus and Peparethus 'ne classi hostium praedae ac praemio essent', this would involve assigning it to xvii, which must be ruled out since, as De Boor has shown, Suidas took his Polybian excerpts from the Constantinian collection, and by the tenth century, when this was assembled, xvii seems already to be lost since no other quotations from it are found.

29. 3–34. 12 is from F, with 34. 1–7 also in N. 35. 1–2, also from N, seems correctly placed according to its sense. 36. 1–37. 7 on Philopoemen's campaign against Nabis comes next in F; evidently Philopoemen is Achaean general for 201/0 (cf. Livy, xxxi. 25. 3: Cyliadas takes over from him in autumn, 200). 38, from Suidas, is on Philip's attempt to overcome Achaean reluctance to fight Rome, and would fit the context of Livy xxxii. 5 (winter 199/8) or Livy, xxxii. 19 (autumn 198) as well as here; Nissen (*KU*, 326) indeed put it with a query in Ol. 145, 1 = 200/199. But the reasons given above against assigning 29. 1 to xvii hold also for the present fragment, which is therefore better left here.

39. 1 is from Josephus (*AJ*, xii. 3. 3), who attributed it to xvi (cod. Oxon., however, reads ἐνδεκάτῃ). Nissen (*KU*, 326) and De Sanctis (iv. 1. 118) challenge this attribution and would put the extract in xvii. Holleaux (*études*, iii. 321–31) defends its present position; for his arguments, which involve dating the battle of Panium to 200, see xvi. 18. 2 n. 39. 2 from Suidas was attributed to P. by Valesius, almost certainly correctly; as De Sanctis (iv. 1. 119 n. 10) suggests, it may well refer to Scopas' siege of Damascus. But the date will be 200, not 198, as De Sanctis makes it, and the fragment will go here before the account of Panium. 39. 3–5 from the same passage of Josephus as 39. 1 refers to Antiochus' conquest of

Palestine after Panium in 200. All the fragments in 39 will form part of the *res Asiae* or *res Aegypti* (if the two were distinguished) for Ol. 144, 4 = 201/0. 40. 1–7 is a series of place-names attributed by Stephanus to xvi. Brabantum (40. 1), Hella (40. 3), and Candasa (40. 5) may refer to Philip's campaign in Asia; Carthaea on Ceos (40. 6) would fit the same context or the Rhodian recovery of the Cyclades (cf. Livy, xxxi. 15. 8), an account of which may have stood between 27 and 28. Gitta (40. 2) will belong to the Palestinian context of 39. Livy (xxxi. 10. 2) records an Insubrian rising under one Hamilcar, which other Gallic tribes joined; P. may have mentioned this (40. 4) and Mantua (40. 7) in the same context. (Münzer's view (*RE*, 'Furius (86)', cols. 362–3) that this campaign is a doublet of that of 196 is contested by Scullard, *Pol.* 95 n. 1; its authenticity gains some further support from this reference in P.)

BOOKS XVII AND XVIII

These contained the events of Ol. 145, 1–2 = 200/199 and 199/8 and Ol. 145, 3–4 = 198/7 and 197/6 respectively; but no fragments of xvii have survived. See above (pp. 25–26) for arguments against assigning xvi. 29. 1, 38, and 39 to this book. The *excerpta antiqua* from xviii are: the conference in Locris (xviii. 1–12), the end of a discussion on treachery (xviii. 15. 15–16), Cynoscephalae (xviii. 18–33), on being deceived (xviii. 40. 1–4), Antiochus and the Roman envoys (xviii. 50–52), Scopas at Alexandria (xviii. 53–55).

The first of these, xviii. 1–12, is assigned *πολυβίου . . . τοῦ ιη λόγου*, and Stephanus also quotes 5. 8 and attributes it to this book; P gives 12. 2–5 and Suidas the same. (The precise date, November 198, is discussed in xviii. 1–12 n.) 13–15, from P, is firmly placed since 15. 15–16 is also in F. Suidas gives 13. 3–6, 13. 5–6, 15. 2–5, 15, 15–16, and 15. 16. P continues with 16 and 17. 1–5, which deal with honours paid to Attalus at Sicyon and the ravages of Nabis' wife at Argos; their position is assured by the parallel account in Livy, xxxii. 40. 8–9 and 40. 10–11, drawing on P., which makes clear that Attalus' visit to Sicyon followed his conference with Flamininus and Nabis at Mycenae. 17. 6, Attalus' remark on valour (from Suidas), fits the beginning of his speech at Thebes, in the course of which he collapsed (cf. Livy, xxxiii. 2. 1–2). 18–33 deals with Cynoscephalae in 197; F is supported by P at 33. 4–7, and Suidas quotes 18. 6, 18. 6–7, 28. 9, and 33. 4.

34–39, on the aftermath of Cynoscephalae, consists of fragments from the *de legationibus* (34. 1–8), from P (34. 7–36. 1), and from the *de legationibus* again (36. 2–39. 7). The only break in continuity is at 36. 1, where, however, the *δέ* clause at the beginning of the embassies fragment seems to correspond to the *μέν* clause in P, and suggests that the two are contiguous. Livy, xxxiii. 12. 1–2, though following

P., omits the discussion of Roman integrity and so gives no help on this point; but Livy, xxxiii. 11 (based on P.), demonstrates that something has been lost between 33. 8 and 34. 1. 35. 4–6 and 35. 9–12 are also in Suidas.

The next passage from F, 'on being deceived', is usually placed at 40. 1–4 (its opening sentence can be enlarged from Suidas, who also has 40. 4). Placed here it would refer to the negotiations following Cynoscephalae; but Schweigaeuser (vol. vii. 373–4) rightly rejected Reiske's suggestion that it was the Aetolians who had been deceived by the Romans, 'multo quam ipsos nequiores . . . orbis terrarum praedones', certainly a sentiment barely credible in P. A more likely context is the discovery of Zeuxippus and Peisistratus as the murderers of the Boeotian Brachylles (cf. 43. 1–13); so Aymard (*Pallas*, iv, 1956, 27–37), who points out that Suidas records that *Πολύβιος δέ φησι περὶ οἰκογενοῦς προδότου*, and that the murderers' downfall was in this case due to such an incident (Livy, xxiii. 28. 10–15). If this is accepted, 40. 1–4 must be transposed after 43. 13. Aymard (art. cit. 37 n. 39) notes one difficulty about this: the fragment 43. 13 (= Livy, xxxiii. 28. 10) is from the margin of F, where it stands opposite the beginning of the extract which is now 50–52, whereas on Aymard's theory it should fall opposite 40. 1, if indeed it preceded this in the complete text. But there are many factors which may have influenced the placing of a passage inserted in the margin of F, and this difficulty hardly disposes of the case for transposing 40. 1–4 to after 43. 13. According to Stephanus, Medion was mentioned in xviii; this citation is usually placed at 40. 5 in the context of L. Flamininus' operations against Leucas in 197, which Livy (xxxiii. 16–17), following P., narrates after the conference at Tempe.

All the above fragments (except 40. 1–4) are from the *res Graeciae et Macedoniae* of 198/7; next came the *res Asiae*. 41 a 1 (from Suidas), on Rhodian resistance to Antiochus, corresponds to Livy, xxxiii. 20. 3, and clearly belongs to the good season of 197; and since Antiochus possessed Ephesus by the end of that year (Livy, xxxiii. 38. 1; he wintered there 197/6), 41 a 2 will come here. Livy has no corresponding passage, but he says (Livy, xxxiii. 20. 13) that he has omitted the details of Antiochus' attack on the Ptolemaic cities of Asia Minor (which P. will have recorded) and the same no doubt applies to the present passage and to P.'s later account of the capture of Ephesus.

41. 1–10 is from P., which attributes it to xviii; 41. 2–10 is also in Suidas. The position is assured by Livy, xxxiii. 21. 1–5, who records Attalus' death at Pergamum and appends a shortened charactersketch immediately after relating the clash between Antiochus and Rhodes. 42 from the *de legationibus* mentions M. Claudius Marcellus

as consul and can therefore be assigned to the *res Italiae* of the second half of xviii, since Marcellus' consulship was in A.U.C. 558 = 196. 43. 1–12 is also from the *de legationibus* and corresponds to Livy, xxxiii. 27. 5–28. 3; 43. 13 (from the margin of F: see above) corresponds to Livy, xxxiii. 28. 10. The combined fragment is thus part of the *res Graeciae* for 197/6; Livy, following P., continues the narrative down to xxxiii. 29. 12. 44–48 from the *de legationibus* deals with the settlement in 196 and corresponds to Livy, xxxiii. 30. 1–35. 12, which ensures its position.

49. 1 is from Suidas; but its assignment to this book depends on the marginal sentence opposite 50. 7 in F: *τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον, τρέχωσι τὴν ἐσχάτην*. Its context remains obscure. Nissen (*KU*, 327 n.) refers it to 'the peaceful policy which Antiochus tried to pursue towards the Greek cities'. But the sentence reads like an extract from a speech urging a peaceful policy because severity will invite an appeal to Rome; and the words *τὴν πόλιν* suggest a particular city. The most likely context is the Lampsacene reply to Antiochus' envoys (cf. Niese, ii. 643 n. 4); see below, xviii. 49–52 n. 49. 1 will fit very well into the Lampsacene speech, which Livy has no doubt abbreviated.

The negotiations at Lysimachia (50–52 from F, extended at the beginning to 49. 2–3 from the *de legationibus* (N)) form part of the *res Asiae* of Ol. 145, 4 = 197/6, and in fact took place in summer 196; this fragment (down to 51. 8) corresponds to Livy, xxxiii. 39. 1–40. 6, but at that point Livy wearis of the detail, omits all mention of the free cities, and leaps ahead to events which no longer survive in our text of P. The last fragment, 53–55, also from F, is part of the *res Aegypti* for 197/6 and concerns Scopas at Alexandria. 55. 7–9 is also in P, with some verbal differences, and 55. 7 is in Suidas.