

## INTRODUCTION

### THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE FRAGMENTS

#### 1. BOOK XIX

The absence from the Constantinian excerpts and Suidas of any fragments from this book suggests that, like xvii, xxvi, and xxxvii, it was already lost by the tenth century (cf. Moore, *GRBS*, 1971, 430–31). Since xx contained Ol. 147, 1 (see below), xix must have dealt with the whole of Ol. 146 (196–192). Passages based on P. in Livy xxxiv and xxxv are: xxxiv. 22. 4–41. 7 (195), the war with Nabis, from *res Graeciae* of Ol. 146, 1 = 196/5; xxxiv. 48. 2–52. 12 (194), Greek events from *res Graeciae* of Ol. 146, 2 = 195/4; xxxiv. 57. 1–61. 16 (193), events in Italy and Carthage from *res Italiae* and *res Africae* of Ol. 146, 3 = 194/3; xxxv. 12. 1–19. 7 (193), 25. 1–39. 8 (192), events from *res Graeciae* and *res Asiae* of Ol. 146, 4 = 193/2; xxxv. 42. 1–51. 10, Antiochus' crossing and subsequent events. This last passage seems to refer to Ol. 147, 1 = 192/1, hence the corresponding passage in P. probably came in book xx; Livy will have included it under A.U.C. 562 = 192 so as to end the book (and the pentad) with a striking event (cf. Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* 1871, 261, modifying his views in *KU*, 174–6).

Only two 'fragments' survive. 1, from Plut. *Cato mai.* 10. 3, will be from the *res Hispaniae* of Ol. 146, 1 = 196/5 (cf. Livy, xxxiv. 8. 4–21. 8). 2 is a sentence from Livy, xxxiv. 50. 5–6, which draws on *res Graeciae* from Ol. 146, 2 (194).

#### 2. BOOK XX

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 2 (Antiochus and Boeotia: exc. 5); 3. 1–7 (embassies to Antiochus: exc. 6); 9. 1–11. 10 (negotiations with Aetolians: exc. 7); *de uirt. et uit.*: 4. 1–7. 5 (condition of Boeotia: exc. 71 and 72); *de sent.*: 12. 1–7 (Philopoemen at Sparta: exc. 97); 12. 8 (value of oral evidence: exc. 98). In *de uirt. et uit.* xx. 7. 5 is followed by xxi. 7. 5–6, and has a marginal note: *τέλος τοῦ κ λόγου τῆς πολυβιβλίου ἱστορίας*. Since xxi. 7. 5–6 corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 12. 8–9 (substitution of Eudamus for Pausistratus), which refers to 190, book xx evidently contained only the events of Ol. 147, 1 = 192/1, leaving the three remaining years of the olympiad to be dealt with in xxi.

It has been argued above that Livy, xxxv. 42. 1–51. 10 corresponds to part of the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 1 = 192/1; 1 (from Suidas) and 2 (from *de legat. gent.*) correspond to Livy, xxxv. 45. 9–46. 1

and 50. 5, and so fall here. Livy, xxxvi. 5. 1–35. 11, relates the Greek campaigns of 191, including Thermopylae, and clearly corresponds to the rest of P.'s *res Graeciae* for Ol. 147, 1 = 192/1; as we saw (p. 1), Antiochus' arrival in Greece had been described in Livy xxxv for reasons of composition. 3. 1–7 (from *de legat. gent.*) and 7. 3–5 (from *de uirt. et uit.*) correspond to Livy, xxxvi. 5 and 6; and 7. 3–5 is preceded in *de uirt. et uit.* by 4. 1–7. 2, on conditions in Boeotia, a digression clearly belonging here, though omitted by Livy (cf. 7. 4, *διὰ τὰς προειρημένας αἰτίας*). Fragments of 4. 1–7. 2 also appear in Athenaeus, x. 418 (6. 6) and Suidas (6. 12). 8. 1–5 (from Athen. x. 439), on Antiochus' wedding, corresponds to Livy, xxxvi. 11. 1, and mentions book xx; 8. 6 is a quotation from Livy, xxxvi. 19. 11, on the battle of Thermopylae. 9. 1–11. 10 (from *de legat. gent.*) corresponds to Livy, xxxvi. 27–29, and the references to Corax (11. 11) and Aperantia (11. 12) from Stephanus, who says they are from book xx, match Livy, xxxvi. 30. 4 and 33. 7 respectively. If fg. 82 refers to Philip's siege of Lamia (see there), it should stand before 9. 1.

This leaves only 12. 1–7 and 12. 8 from *de sententiis*. The former concerns a Spartan gift to Philopoemen, offered (according to Paus. viii. 51. 2) after an incident in which Philopoemen had closed the gates of Sparta against Flamininus and the Achaean general Diophanes, and settled affairs there himself. Plutarch (*Philop.* 15) dates the offer of the gift before Diophanes was made general for 192/1; but, despite inaccuracies in Pausanias, his date seems preferable (Aymard, *PR*, 337–8 n. 25). Errington, III, following Plutarch, dates the offer of the gift to 192; but the absence of other fragments from book xix suggests that it was already lost when the Constantinian excerpts were made, and this is strongly against Errington's view (see p. 1). True, to press this as excluding the Plutarchean date entirely would be to argue in a circle; but the incident seems more properly to be placed in 191 (and book xx) than in 192 (and book xix). According to Plutarch (*Philop.* 16) Philopoemen's intervention at Sparta preceded Thermopylae (late April, 191). Against this it could be argued that a considerable time may have elapsed between the Spartan incident and the offer of the gift; but if, as seems likely (see below), the Spartan embassy to Rome asking for the restoration of hostages was sent and returned in summer 191, there must have been time for the anti-Achaean party to gain power. Hence there is a good case for bringing this fragment (12. 1–7) forward; and since the events in it precede Thermopylae, it should stand between 8. 5 and 8. 6 (rather than immediately before 9, as Aymard, loc. cit., suggests).

The context of 12. 8, on the importance of eyewitness evidence, is unknown. Pédech (*Méthode*, 359–60) suggests that it is from a passage

in the prologue of xxi, in which P. explained that from this point onwards he was an eyewitness of the events he described. This seems improbable since

(a) the passage is a *communis locus* (cf. xii. 27. 1 n.);

(b) the assertion, emphasized by such a position, would tend to detract from the authority of what P. had recorded in his earlier books;

(c) if P. was born around 200 (cf. Vol. I, p. 1 n. 1), he would not be a very effective eyewitness for events from 191 (but Pédech puts P.'s birth in 208: *LEC*, 1961, 145–50).

It seems more prudent to leave it an open question whether 12. 8 belongs to xx or xxi, and what its context was.

xxi. 1. 1–4, recounting the return of Spartan envoys from Rome, follows xx. 11. 10 in *de legat. gent.* Aymard (*PR*, 356 n. 1), following the older editors, restores it to book xx. This must be right; and in its support is the argument (which he does not mention) that since it describes the return of the embassy, it is more likely to be from *res Graeciae* than from *res Italiae*, and since the next passage in *de legat. gent.* is from *res Italiae* of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0, xxi. 1. 1–4 will be part of *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 1 = 192/1. Since the dispatch of the embassy suggests that a party hostile to Achaea is in power, the passage will go after 12. 1–7.

No fragments survive from *res Asiae*, but Livy, xxxvi. 41. 1– 45. 8, based on P., corresponds to part of them, including the Roman naval victory off Corycus.

### 3. BOOK XXI

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–4 (return of Spartan envoys from Rome: exc. 8); 2. 1–6 (*supplicatio* after Corycus: Aetolian embassy: exc. 9); 3. 1–4 (embassy from Philip: exc. 10); 3 b 1–2 (Eumenes' embassy to Achaea: exc. 11); 4. 1–5. 13 (negotiations with the Aetolians: exc. 12); 6. 2–6 (Phocaeen embassy to Seleucus: exc. 13); 8. 1–3 (Scipios inform L. Aemilius and Eumenes of Aetolian truce: exc. 14); 10. 1–14 (Antiochus negotiates: exc. 15); 13. 1–15. 13 (Antiochus' further proposals: exc. 16); 16. 1–17. 12 (conditions imposed after Magnesia: exc. 17); 18. 1–24. 17 (embassies at Rome: exc. 18); 25. 1–11 (western Greece: exc. 19); 26. 1–19 (further events in western Greece: exc. 20); 29. 1–32. 15 (peace with Aetolia: exc. 21); 33. 1 (Manlius and the Galatian war: exc. 22); 34. 3–13 (treatment of Moagetes: exc. 23); 35. 1–5 (Termessus: exc. 24); 36. 1–4 (Sagalassus: exc. 25); 39. 1–14 (Tectosages: exc. 26); 41. 1–44. 3 (peace terms for Antiochus: exc. 27); 46. 1–12 (Asian settlement: exc. 28); *de legat. Rom.*: 11. 1–13 (Antiochus approaches Prusias: exc. 16); 37. 1–3 (Manlius and

Eposognatus: exc. 17); 37. 8–9 (more on Galatians: exc. 17 cont.); *de sent.*: 32 c 1–4 (Philopoemen's wisdom: exc. 99); 40 (on Ariarathes: exc. 100); 47 (Roman march through Thrace: exc. 101); *de uirt. et uit.*: 7. 5–6 (Rhodian admirals: exc. 73); 9. 1–3 (character of Diophanes: exc. 74); 34. 1–2 (Moagetes: exc. 75); *de strategematis* (T): 27. 2–6 (Ambracia: Wescher, 328).

Book xxi contained Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0, 147, 3 = 190/89 and 147, 4 = 189/8. In addition to the fragments there are these passages of Polybian provenance in Livy (square brackets indicate where this provenance is in doubt):

[xxxvii. 1. 1–6 (A.U.C. 564 = 190): *res Italiae* of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0. Reception of Aetolian embassy at Rome. Nissen (*KU*, 188) makes this Polybian, comparing xxi. 2; but doubts subsist.]

xxxvii. 4. 6–45. 21 (A.U.C. 564 = 190): *res Graeciae* and *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0.

[xxxvii. 49. 1–8 (A.U.C. 564 = 190): despite Nissen (*KU*, 197–8), who compares Diod. xxix. 9, this account of an Aetolian embassy to Rome may be annalistic.]

xxxvii. 52. 7–56. 10 (A.U.C. 564 = 190): embassies at Rome; Nissen (*KU*, 198–200) makes this Polybian.

[xxxvii. 60. 1–7 (A.U.C. 564 = 190): Cretan affairs. Nissen (*KU*, 200–1) makes this Polybian; but its position before the Aetolian fighting is odd, if it is from P.'s *res Graeciae* and it may be annalistic.]

If this and the two previous passages are Polybian they will be from the *res Italiae* and *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89.

xxxviii. 1. 1–27. 9 (A.U.C. 565 = 189): Cephallenia and Galatians; from the *res Graeciae* and *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89.

xxxviii. 28. 5–34. 9 (A.U.C. 565 = 189): on Achaea; *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8.

xxxviii. 37. 1–41. 11 (A.U.C. 566 = 188): Asian settlement; *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8.

For the argument that 1. 1–4 should stand in book xx see above, p. 3. Since the naval victory of Corycus (2. 1) was in late autumn, 191 (see Livy, xxxvi, 44. 1–45. 8, especially 45. 8, 'cum iam hiems appeteret'), the Aetolian embassy mentioned in this same fragment of *de legat. gent.* will also fall in winter 191/0 (cf. Livy, xxxvii. 1). The position of 3. 1–4 in the same collection dates Philip's embassy also to 191/0; this fragment is followed in *de legat. gent.* by 3 b, evidently from the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0. Livy, who devotes only xxxvii. 4. 6–7. 7 to *res Graeciae* before hastening on to Asia, omits this detail concerning Eumenes' approach to Achaea, but the troops are mentioned in Livy, xxxvii. 20. 1. 4. 1–5. 13 from the same collection deals with Athenian intervention to secure a truce in the

Aetolian War; the corresponding passage in Livy, xxxvii. 6. 4–7. 7, shows that it is still part of *res Graeciae* of 190. 6. 2–6 (also from *de legat. gent.*) refers to Phocaea and is rightly preceded by a passage from Suidas; this, 6. 1, corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 9. 1, and the mention of two priests of Cybele in 6. 7, also from Suidas, corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 9. 9 (which thus locates the incident at Abydus). But Livy has omitted the dispatch of envoys to Seleucus mentioned in 6. 2–6, and it is possible that these events were described by P. at a point in his narrative corresponding to Livy, xxxvii. 11. 15, where the betrayal of Phocaea to Seleucus is mentioned. In that case 6. 2–6 would stand after 7. 1–4, a passage from Suidas describing Pausistratus' fire-machine, which corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 11. 13. All three passages are from the *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0.

7. 5–7 is a combination of a passage from *de uirt. et uit.* and several extracts from Suidas; 'Pamphilidas' is an error for Eudamus, and the passage corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 12. 7–9, which is still drawing on the *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0. If fg. 142 corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 11. 7, it will stand before 7. 1–4 (see 7. 1–7 n.); and fg. 154, which seems to correspond to Livy, xxxvii. 14. 5, will stand between 7. 7 and 8. 1. 8. 1–3, from *de legat. gent.*, refers to the same summer; there is no corresponding item in Livy, but Livy, xxxvii. 14. 3 mentions the arrival of L. Aemilius Regillus and Eumenes in Samos. 9. 1–3 on Diophanes' character is from *de uirt. et uit.* and 10. 1–14 on Antiochus' negotiations from *de legat. gent.*; the first links with Diophanes' arrival, described in Livy, xxxvii. 20. 1 ff., and the second with Livy, xxxvii. 18. 10 ff. The order of these two fragments should therefore be reversed (cf. Steigemann, 32; Büttner-Wobst, *Phil.* 1900, 572–3; Aymard, *PR*, 374 n. 12); fg. 228 (cf. Livy, xxxvii. 18. 8) will stand between 8. 3 and 10. 1; 11. 1–13, from *de legat. Rom.*, dealing with Antiochus' approach to Prusias, corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 25. 4–14; and its position in *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0 is further confirmed by the marginal note: λ|?| κά i.e. book xxi. The flight of the pirates in 12 (from Suidas) corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 27. 5. Antiochus' further attempt to negotiate, described in 13. 1–15. 13 (from *de legat. gent.*) corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 34. 1–36. 9; and 16. 1–17. 12, which follows in the same collection, and relates the terms imposed after Magnesia, corresponds to Livy, xxxvii. 45. 3–21. Livy's continuous narrative demonstrates that P.'s account of the Asian events of Ol. 147, 2 = 191/0 went down as far as the battle of Magnesia and its immediate sequel, even though this involved considerably overrunning the olympiad year.

18. 1–24. 17, from *de legat. gent.* describes the embassies sent to Rome in winter 190/89; the corresponding passage is Livy, xxxvii. 52. 7–56. 10 (which however ceases to transcribe P. at 24. 15). Although Livy has included these details under A.U.C. 564 = 190, they

must have formed part of the *res Italiae* of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89, and in fact 189, in P. The *res Graeciae* of that year begin at 25. 1–11, also from *de legat. gent.* This, and the next fragment, also from the same collection, 26. 1–19, both recount events of western Greece of 189 and correspond to Livy, xxxviii. 3. 1–8 and 3. 9–11 (Livy omits the adventure of the Aetolians described in 26. 6–19). Three passages from Anon. *de obsid. tol.* (ed. van der Berg), 169–74, 97–99, and 178–95, are transcribed from P. and represent 27. 1–6, 27. 7–9, and 28. 1–17; all three deal with the siege of Ambracia, and that they form part of P.'s account can be seen from a comparison with Livy, xxxviii. 5. 1–5, 5. 6–9, 7. 4–8. 1. This assures their position. The first (27. 1–6) also overlaps *de strateg.* (T) for 27. 2–6 (this MS. is headed *ΑΜΒΡΑΚΙΑΣ ΠΟΛΙΟΡΚΙΑ ΠΟΛΥΒΙΟΥ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΝ*); the third passage, 28. 1–17, is also in T, which continues a sentence further (28. 18). 29. 1–32. 15, from *de legat. gent.*, deals with the Aetolian peace and corresponds to Livy, xxxviii. 9. 3–11. 9; it is thus still part of the events of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89 (i.e. 189), and although it includes the hearing of envoys and ratification of peace at Rome, it seems to form part of the *res Graeciae* of that olympiad year (as the corresponding passage in Livy confirms).

32 b from Suidas on the capture of Same corresponds to Livy, xxxviii. 29. 10, and 32 c from *de sent.* refers to the restoration of Spartan exiles described in Livy, xxxviii. 34. 1–5; though Livy has these events under A.U.C. 565 = 189, both passages clearly belong to *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8 (cf. Livy, xxxviii. 33. 1, *ueris initio*). 32 c 4 is difficult and, towards the end of the passage, impossible to decipher, but it appears to refer to steps taken the same year to prevent the restoration of the Spartan monarchy. Since however 32 b and 32 c belong to Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8, whereas 33–39 is still part of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89, the two passages must be postponed to a place between 39 and 40.

33–39 consists of a group of fragments set in order by reference to the Polybian account of Manlius Vulso's Galatian campaign in Livy; they are: 33. 1 (*de legat. gent.*: Livy, xxxviii. 12. 1); 33. 2 (Suidas: Livy, xxxviii. 12. 7); 34. 1–2 (*de uirt. et uit.*: Livy, xxxviii. 14. 3); 34. 3–13 (*de legat. gent.*: Livy, xxxviii. 14. 4–14); 35. 1–5 (*de legat. gent.*: Livy, xxxviii. 15. 3–6); 36. 1–4 (*de legat. gent.*: Livy, xxxviii. 15. 7–11); 37. 1–3 (*de legat. Rom.*: Livy, xxxviii. 18. 1–3); 37. 4–7 (Suidas: Livy, xxxviii. 18. 7–9); 37. 8–9 (*de legat. Rom.*: Livy, xxxviii. 18. 10–15); 38. 1–7 (Plut. *Mor.* 258 c: Livy, xxxviii. 24. 2–11); 39. 1–14 (*de legat. gent.*: Livy, xxxviii. 25. 1–11). They clearly belong to *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89 (i.e. 189).

40 (from *de sent.*) is a fragmentary passage about Ariarathes, which in M follows 32 c 4 without any mark of separation. Hulstsch (ad loc.) suggests that it belongs at 41. 4–5, where he suspects com-

pression in our extract. In any case it must, in view of its position, refer to Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8. Comparison with Livy, xxxviii. 37. 1– 39. 2, shows that 41. 1–44. 3 (from *de legat. gent.*), dealing with negotiations with Manlius and the peace with Antiochus, forms part of *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8. As we saw (above p. 6), 32 b and 32 c fall between 39 and 40 (or, if Hultsch's hypothesis concerning 40 is accepted, between 39. 14 and 41. 1). 45, from Suidas, also concerns Ariarathes: comparison with Livy, xxxviii. 39. 6 assures its position. 46. 1–12 (from *de legat. gent.*), on the final Asian settlement, corresponds to Livy, xxxviii. 39. 7–40. 1, and is therefore in place. 47, a fragmentary passage from *de sent.*, deals with the Roman return through Thrace; see Livy, xxxviii. 40–41 (188), which indicates that, although recounting events in Europe, P. described Manlius' return here rather than under the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 148, 1 = 188/7, as a strict interpretation of his scheme might have suggested. (The alternative—to make the march through Thrace a pendant to the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8—would have involved describing it before the settlement in Asia.)

#### 4. BOOK XXII

1 and 2 list topics from P. which were to be included in *de legat. gent.* and *de legat. Rom.*; the former (excc. 29–30) follow directly after xxi. 46. 1–2, the latter (exc. 18) after xxi. 37. 3. Büttner-Wobst introduces them as 'ex Polybii libro xxii excerptenda' but there is no reference to book xxii in the MSS., and Steigemann, 35, correctly observes that there is no absolute proof that that book contained all Ol. 148. However, these lists occurring at this point strengthen that hypothesis. They omit passages which figure in the excerpts (xxii. 3–5, 12. 5–10 are omitted from 1, xxii. 15 is omitted from 2) and mention others which do not (xxii. 1. 2–4 and xxii. 2. 1 have nothing corresponding in the text of the excerpts); nor are the topics invariably mentioned in their proper order. Thus the words *ἡ γενομένη σφαγή . . . τὰ προσταχθέντα διὰ τοῦ τῶν* in xxii. 1. 5 occur between references to the negotiations at Tempe and Thessalonica on the one hand and those between Q. Metellus and the Achaeans on the other; yet it is clear that they refer to Ap. Claudius' embassy (xxii. 13–14), which took place the year after that of Q. Metellus (cf. Aymard, *études*, 18–19). Hence the lists are useful mainly as an indication that the events included probably occurred in Ol. 148.

The following extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 3. 1–9 (Philopoemen sends Nicodemus to Rome; the Achaeans renew their alliance with Ptolemy V: exc. 31); 4. 1–17 (trouble in Boeotia: exc. 32); 5. 1–10 (dispute between Rhodes and Lycia: exc. 33); 6. 1–6 (reports at Rome; Q. Metellus sent to interview Philip: exc. 34); 7. 1–10. 15 (embassies from kings to Achaea:

Q. Metellus in Peloponnese: exc. 35); 11. 1–12. 10 (Q. Metellus reports to Rome; other envoys there: exc. 36); 14. 7–12 (Philip decides to send Demetrius to Rome: exc. 37); *de legat. Rom.*: 13. 1–14. 8 (Philip's massacre at Maronea: exc. 19); 15. 1–6 (affairs in Crete: exc. 20); *de uirt. et uit.*: 17. 1–7 (Ptolemy breaks his word to the rebels: exc. 76); 20. 1–8 (Apollonis, Attalus' wife: exc. 77); 21. 1–4 (Ortiagon's ambitions: exc. 78); 22. 1–5 (Aristonicus the eunuch: exc. 79); *de sent.*: 16. 1–4 (Philip II and Ptolemy V compared: exc. 102); 18. 1–11 (Philip V's responsibility for the Third Macedonian War: exc. 103); 19. 1–4 (dispute between Philopoemen and Archon: exc. 104). No fragment is attributed to any particular year of the olympiad, and only at 18. 1 is the olympiad mentioned in the text.

Some help is forthcoming from Livy. In xxiii. 9 P. records under Ol. 149, 2 = 183/2 the arrival at Rome of several embassies and of Q. Marcius Philippus, who had been in Greece and Macedonia; Livy, xl. 2. 6 has the same event under A.U.C. 572 = 182. Marcius' departure is recounted in xxiii. 4. 16, which appears to be dealing with Ol. 149, 1 = 184/3, and this fits Livy, xxxix. 48. 5, who makes it A.U.C. 571 = 183. Marcius, then, probably left in spring 183. If we work back through the Polybian parts of Livy from this point, we get this result:

- Livy xxxviii. 1–11 (A.U.C. 565 = 189): *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89 (see above, p. 4).
- xxxviii. 12–27 (A.U.C. 565 = 189): *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 3 = 190/89 (see above, p. 4).
- xxxviii. 28. 5–34. 9 (A.U.C. 565 = 189): *res Graeciae* of Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8 (see above, p. 4).
- xxxviii. 37. 1–41. 11 (A.U.C. 566 = 188): *res Asiae* of Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8, in effect 188 (see above, p. 4).

Livy takes nothing from P. in A.U.C. 567 = 187 or A.U.C. 568 = 186.

- xxxix. 23. 5–29. 2 (A.U.C. 569 = 185): *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5, in effect 185.
- xxxix. 33. 1–37. 21 (A.U.C. 570 = 184): *res Macedoniae et Graeciae* of Ol. 148, 4 = 185/4, in effect 184.
- xxxix. 46. 6–50. 11, 53 (A.U.C. 571 = 183): *res Italiae, res Macedoniae, res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 1 = 184/3; see below, p. 16, on Philopoemen's death.

The correspondence is clear and facilitates the assigning of the Polybian fragments to the various years of Ol. 148.

6. 1–6, a compressed fragment from *de legat. gent.*, corresponds to Livy, xxxix. 24, where it falls in the middle of an account of Philip's war-preparations. This might suggest that although it concerns the arrival of embassies at Rome, it formed part of *res Macedoniae* of



Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5; and so Nissen (*KU*, 332) assumes. However, the pluperfect tenses in Livy, xxxix. 24. 6–12 show that he is referring to earlier events belonging to the previous winter (186/5), before the sending of the envoys gives him a lead into the conference at Tempe (185) in Livy, xxxix. 24. 13–14. P., however, has plain aorists in 6. 1–6, and he probably reported the embassies at Rome under *res Italiae* in the normal way. Livy will have incorporated their reception in the Macedonian section for compositional reasons, the insertion beginning at § 5, *rediere deinde causae*. This hypothesis is confirmed by the order in which the events are listed in 1. 1–3. A short passage from Suidas, 6. 7, seems to be dealing with conditions in Aenus before Philip seized it; but since it may have formed part of some (now lost) explanation of the background of Philip's action—even coming somewhere within the compressed passage, 6. 1–6—one is scarcely justified in moving it to precede 6. 1 (see further ad loc.).

The three preceding excerpts in *de legat. gent.* (3. 1–9, 4. 1–17, 5. 1–10) refer, the first two to Greek, the third to Asian affairs, and apparently belong to *res Graeciae* and *res Asiae* of Ol. 148, 1 = 188/7 or Ol. 148, 2 = 187/6—though they could fall in different olympiad years provided that 5 is not earlier than 3 and 4. Which year they do belong to has been a matter of debate. 3. 1–4 is much compressed. It mentions the massacre of Compasium, recorded in Livy, xxxviii. 33, which (see above, p. 8) relates the events of 189/8 (in fact 188: cf. Livy, xxxviii. 33. 1, *ueris initio*); next it refers to the dispatch of Spartan envoys to Rome, where they procured a letter from M. Lepidus, when he was consul (A.U.C. 567 = 187), and finally describes how, while the Spartans were still at Rome, Philopoemen sent Nicodemus of Elis to represent him there. Aymard (*études*, 18–30) has argued that Philopoemen must have acted as general, that this is his *strategia* of 187/6, and consequently that Nicodemus was sent to Rome in autumn, 187 (i.e. in Ol. 148, 2 = 187/6); having been delayed at Rome for some time, he reported back in the *strategia* of Aristaenus (186/5), cf. 7. 5. This implies that 3 and 4 are from *res Graeciae* of 187/6 and 5 from *res Asiae* of the same year. This chronology and assignment of the fragments has been challenged by Büttner-Wobst (*Beiträge*, 3–13) and, more recently, by Errington, 255–62. Büttner-Wobst assumes that Livy's Greek dates are all two years out, so that events of (e.g.) 188/7 are dated by him to 186/5; hence he puts Philopoemen's *strategia* of 3. 2–3 back to 189/8. Errington also makes this *strategia* that of 189/8, but since he accepts the accuracy of Livy's chronology, he has to assume that 7–10 contains a conflation of events belonging to 187 and 185, the break coming between 9. 14 and 10. 1. However, he proffers no explanation of such a major dislocation and contamination. Against the hypotheses of Büttner-Wobst and Errington see 3. 1–4 nn.; despite some

difficulties, mentioned there, Aymard's chronology seems the most plausible. But on either view the order of the fragments remains unaffected. 3. 5–9 records a Ptolemaic embassy to Achaëa.

6. 1–6 corresponds to Livy, xxxix. 24. 6–14 (see above, p. 8); but Livy, xxxix. 23. 5 is clearly a drastically compressed précis of the fragment of the *de sent.* now printed as 18. 1–11, in which P. argues that Philip, not Perseus, planned the Third Macedonian War.<sup>1</sup> Livy sums up its argument in one sentence, but gives an account of Philip's grievances clearly taken from a passage in P., no longer extant. De Sanctis (iv. 1. 250 n. 24) therefore argued that (assuming Livy's order to be also P.'s) 18. 1–11 should stand before 6. 1–6. This calls for two comments. First, as we have seen (pp. 8–9), 6. 1–6 probably forms part of *res Italiae* of Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5, the position of the corresponding passage in Livy, xxxix. 24. 6–12 among *res Macedoniae* being due merely to Livy's compositional technique; in which case 18. 1–11 need not precede 6. 1–6. But there is a more serious difficulty. In the excerpts *de sent.* 18. 1–11 is preceded by 16. 1–4, a passage hard to decipher, but clearly contrasting Philip II's clemency after Chaeronea and Ptolemy V's breach of faith to the Egyptian rebels. 17. 1–7, from the *de uirt. et uit.*, has one sentence in common with 16. 4 (at 17. 5), and the two extracts form part of a single passage belonging to the *res Aegypti*. But if 18. 1–11 belongs to *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5, then the comparison of Philip II and Ptolemy V should belong to *res Aegypti* of Ol. 148, 2 = 187/6, and so stand after 5. 10.<sup>2</sup> But, according to 17. 5, Ptolemy V was 25 at the time of the action against the rebels; and since he was born on 30 Mesore 210 (9 October 210)—cf. xviii. 53. 4 n.; Volkmann, *RE*, 'Ptolemaios (23)', col. 1691; some scholars have made the year 209—his twenty-fifth birthday was on 30 Mesore (2 October) 185. This is an obstacle (and perhaps an insuperable one) to assigning 16–17 to Ol. 148, 2 = 187/6, as one is led to do if 18. 1–11 belongs to Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5. On the other hand, if 16–17 is from *res Aegypti*

[10]

<sup>1</sup> Livy also makes the point about Philip's responsibility for the war with Perseus at the end of the same Polybian passage, viz. at Livy, xxxix. 29. 3; and it could be argued that 18. 1–11 came at a point in P. corresponding to this rather than at a point corresponding to Livy, xxxix. 23. 5. This would not affect the order of the fragments (beyond excluding the possibility that 18. 1–11 preceded 6. 1–6); but the account of Philip's grievances (Livy, xxxix. 23. 6–13) is so closely linked with the statement in Livy, xxxix. 23. 5 that this seems likely to be derived from 18. 1–11, and Livy, xxxix. 29. 3 to be merely a repetition of the opening passage, designed to round off the section.

<sup>2</sup> Steigemann, 40, argued that, because 18. 1 begins with the words *ὅτι φησὶν ὁ Πολύβιος ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ δευτέρῳ*, this fragment must be the first extract from that book in the *de sent.*, hence that 16 must belong to Ol. 147, 4 = 189/8, which would bring it forward into book xxi. But 16 and 17 cannot be separated, and the reference to Ptolemy's age excludes Ol. 147, 4 as a date for the events mentioned. See further, p. 12.

of Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5, then 18. 1–11 must go into Ol. 148, 4 = 185/4, and the statement in Livy, xxxix. 23. 5, about Philip's responsibility for the Third Macedonian War must be assumed to have been brought forward from a later passage in P. This is difficult to believe, for two reasons. First, it does not match Livy's normal practice, which is to keep close to the Polybian text (the incorporation of Livy, xxxix. 24. 6–12 from the *res Italiae* (see above, pp. 8–9) is a rather different matter, and can be paralleled in Livy, xxxix. 33. 1–8, which describes the decisions at Rome as a lead in to the embassy of Ap. Claudius of 184); and second, it is not easy to fit such a passage as 18. 1–11 into the Polybian narrative of Ol. 148, 4 = 185/4, as an examination of the remaining Greek fragments will show.

7. 1–10. 15 relates discussion in Achaëa and at 10. 1 mentions Q. Metellus' arrival from Macedonia. 6. 6 and Livy, xxxix. 24. 13 ff. show that Metellus was in Macedonia and Greece in 185; consequently 7. 1–10. 15 forms part of *res Graeciae* of Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5, in fact 185.<sup>1</sup> (Livy, having omitted to recount Metellus' visit to the Peloponnese after xxxix. 29. 1–2, mentions it in parenthesis in xxxix. 35. 5–8, when introducing Ap. Claudius' embassy in 184.) The fragment 7. 1–10. 15 is followed in the excerpts *de legat. gent.* by 11. 1–12. 10, describing Metellus' report at Rome and the various embassies. Clearly this belongs to the next *res Italiae*, of Ol. 148, 4 = 185/4. This in turn is followed, in the same excerpts, by 14. 7–12, which overlaps with 13. 1–14. 8 from the *de legat. Rom.* Comparison with Livy, xxxix. 34–35, which gives his version of the Macedonian events of 184 from P., confirms that 13. 1–14. 12 is from *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 148, 4 = 185/4. But if 18. 1–11 is also part of the *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 148, 4 = 185/4 (as seems to follow from putting 16–17 in Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5), what will be its relationship to 13. 1–14. 12? Comparison with Livy, xxxix. 33. 1–35. 4 shows that it is very difficult to find any place for the discussion of the causes of the Third Macedonian War in this context, for Livy, xxxix. 33. 1–8 gives the preliminaries at Rome and 34. 1–35. 4 gives Philip's actions at Maronea, the interview with Ap. Claudius, Philip's reaction, and his decision to send Demetrius to Rome, in a form which corresponds exactly with P.'s account in 13–14. The departure of the Roman envoys to the Peloponnese in Livy, xxxix. 35. 5 follows immediately on the passage corresponding to 14. 12, and it is clear that there was no place here for a discussion of the remote causes of the war. On the contrary, 14. 8 clearly implies Philip's warlike plans and suggests that P. has already discussed them elsewhere.

It therefore looks as if De Sanctis was right in bringing 18. 1–11 forward into Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5 (though not in placing it before

[11]

---

<sup>1</sup> For Errington's hypothesis of a break between 7. 1–9. 14 (188/7) and 10. 1–15 (186/5) see above, pp. 9–10.

6. 1–6: see above, p. 10). But in that case, what is to be done with 16–17, which should precede 18 because of the order in the *de sent.*? There seem to be two alternatives.

(a) It is possible that this is a rare example of the excerpts' appearing in the wrong order, and that the copyist of M (*de sent.*) omitted 18. 1–11 and then, after copying 16. 1–4, returned to it. On this hypothesis 18. 1–11 could belong to Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5 and 16–17 to the *res Aegypti* of the same year. One fact at least might seem to favour this theory. 18. 1–11 begins with the words *ὅτι φησὶν ὁ Πολύβιος ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ δευτέρῳ*. If in the original manuscript of the *de sent.* 18. 1–11 was the first extract from book xxii, the copyist of M (or some earlier intermediary) may have accidentally omitted it and, having discovered his error while copying the passage comparing Philip II and Ptolemy V (16. 1–4), have inserted it one place late, but retaining the introductory words. Against this is the fact that such dislocations are very rare; and further, the poor condition and fragmentary character of M prevents our knowing the usual practice of the original scribe of the *de sent.* or the copyist of M in indicating changes of book. In other of the Constantinian collections, references to books, normally in the margin, usually (but not invariably: cf. xxviii. 18. 1) indicate the beginning of a new book; see for example xx. 4. 1, xxvii. 12. 1, xxxi. 6. 1. Since however to assume such a dislocation here would both account for the book reference at 18. 1 (which had already led Steigemann to an untenable theory: see p. 10 n. 2), and produce an order of fragments consistent with the indications in Livy and the evidence for the age of Ptolemy V, it has much in its favour.

(b) Alternatively, 16–17 must be from the *res Aegypti* of Ol. 148, 2 = 187/6. Against this is the reference in 17. 7 to Ptolemy V as being 25 years old (see above, p. 10). But it could be argued that P. or the excerptor (often careless at the beginning and end of an extract) has not clearly differentiated between being 25 and being in his twenty-fifth year (this error is in fact to be found in n. 76 of Dittenberger's commentary on *OGIS* 90, discussing this very passage; and see xxiii. 12. 1 n.); or the excerptor could have omitted some word such as *σχεδόν*. As between these two alternatives the first seems, on balance, preferable; in which case 16–17 will stand between 10. 15 and 11. 1 as *res Aegypti* of Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5 (and 18 will stand after 6. 7).<sup>1</sup>

[12]

---

<sup>1</sup> Büttner-Wobst (*Beiträge*, 8) mentions with approval the suggestion of Schweighaeuser (vii. 516) that the mercenaries raised by Aristonicus in Greece (17. 6) were enrolled by virtue of the renewed alliance between Ptolemy and Achaea (3. 5–6); this is quite feasible with 16–17 as part of the *res Aegypti* of Ol. 148, 3 = 186/5, but of course the mercenaries may have nothing to do with Achaea.

We must assume that the events leading to the surrender of the rebels at Sais took place late in 185, when Ptolemy was already 25 years old. They will have been discouraged by the final collapse in 186 of the long-standing rebellion in Upper Egypt. See Addenda, p. 793.

In the excerpts *de legat. Rom.* 13. 1–14. 8 (which overlaps with 14. 7–12 in *de legat. gent.*) is followed by 15. 1–6, dealing with Cretan affairs; the reference to Ap. Claudius shows that this belongs to *res Graeciae* of Ol. 148, 4 = 185/4, in fact 184.

19. 1–4 is from the excerpts *de sent.*, where it follows 18. 1–11. It refers to a *strategia* of Archon, held during Philopoemen's lifetime, but the incident described need not be in its correct chronological place, but may have been introduced in some other context. On that assumption the passage is merely pinned down to the area between Ol. 148. 3 = 186/5 (the date of 18. 1–11 or possibly 16. 1–7: see above p. 12) and Ol. 149, 2 = 183/2 (xxiii. 10. 3, the next passage in M). But it is on the whole more likely that P. related the story in its proper place, in which case Archon must have been general after 186/5 and consequently (since this is the only vacant year before Philopoemen's death) in 184/3; see Aymard, *études*, 31. In that case (as De Sanctis, iv. 1. 242 n. 14, saw), this fragment is from book xxiii (since it refers to Ol. 149, 1 = 184/3) and stands before or after xxiii. 6 (see below, p. 15).

Three fragments, 20, 21, and 22, are from the excerpts *de uirt. et uit.*, where they follow 17. 7. Since the next passage in P is xxiii. 5. 4–14, which must be from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 149, 1 = 184/3— see below, p. 15—these three fragments must belong to *res Asiae* and *res Aegypti* in Ol. 148, i.e. to 185/4 at the latest; and since 17. 7 is from the *res Aegypti* of 186/5 (see above, p. 12), the year in each case must be 185/4. 20 concerns Apollonis, Attalus' wife, and the visit paid by two of her sons to Cyzicus; but it must be mentioned out of place, since it occurred later than the peace between Eumenes and Prusias (20. 8) which was itself after Flamininus' embassy of 183 (xxiii. 5. 1), and so in Ol. 149, 1 = 184/3. Apollonis may have been mentioned in relation to Cyzicus, which was allied to Eumenes against Prusias. Ortiagon (21) may also be mentioned in the context of this war, in which he supported Prusias (iii. 3. 6 n. and references quoted there). 22. 1–5 on the eunuch Aristonicus (already mentioned at 17. 6) will fall under *res Aegypti*. All these three passages will therefore remain in their present position.

There is a further and perhaps decisive argument in favour of dating the surrender of the rebels at Sais to autumn 185. According to the second Philae decree (see xxii. 16. 1–17. 7 n.) the success of Eumenes (?) — who is probably Comanus (Peremans–van 't Dack, *Prosopographica: Studia Hellenistica*, 9 (Louvain, 1953), 27–28; cf. xxviii. 19. 1 n.)—was reported to the synod held at Alexandria on 6 September 186 by Aristonicus. This can scarcely be reconciled with the statement (17. 6) that after the surrender of the rebels at Sais Epiphanes went on to meet and take over mercenaries from Aristonicus at Naucratis, if these events took place late in 186, when Epiphanes was in his twenty-fifth year. But to date the events at Sais earlier than the Alexandrian synod is ruled out by the reference to Epiphanes' age. The most natural assumption is therefore that Aristonicus left for his recruiting visit to Greece after the synod of 186 and returned to Egypt in autumn 185.

## 5. BOOK XXIII

The next firm point comes in book xxvii, where manuscripts of *de legat. gent.* (Y) and of *de legat. Rom.* (U and V in the margins)

record that xxvii. 1 and 3 are from *λόγος κζ*, and the manuscript of *de uirt. et uit.* (P) also has *λο□ κζ* at xxvii. 12. On the likely assumption (see above, p. 7) that book xxii contained Ol. 148, it thus appears that olympiads 149, 150, and 151 were covered in books xxiii, xxiv, xxv, and xxvi. The Constantinian excerpts (and Suidas, which derived from them) contain no fragments from Ol. 151; and this is most easily explained if Ol. 151 was covered in a single book which was lost early. There is however one difficulty. Athenaeus (x. 439) attributes to book xxvi a passage on Antiochus Epiphanes which links closely with Athen. v. 193–4 and can be shown, by a comparison with Livy, xli. 20, to refer to Ol. 151, 1 = 176/5 (in fact 175); but Athen. x. 445 contains a passage, which is also attributed to book xxvi, but can be shown owing to an overlap with other excerpts to belong to Ol. 150, 2 = 179/8. If both attributions are true, book xxvi covered two olympiads, and this both Schweighaeuser (iv. 333–56) and Steigemann, 34, believed. But P. is very unlikely to have covered the events of 180–172 in a single book, and since that assumption leaves the absence of fragments from Ol. 151 (but not Ol. 150) unexplained, it seems more likely that the book reference in Athen. x. 445 is erroneous, and that Ol. 151 was covered in book xxvi.

This leaves two olympiads, 149 and 150, for three books, xxiii, xxiv, and xxv. There is no quite conclusive evidence showing what the division was; for an apparent dearth of events may merely mirror the excerptors' choice or the extent to which Livy has drawn on P. Moreover the lacunae in our text of Livy xli make this a poor guide in any case. Nevertheless, the material that has survived favours the hypothesis that Ol. 149, 1–2 was dealt with in xxiii, Ol. 149, 3–4 in xxiv and Ol. 150 in xxv, which is how Büttner-Wobst arranges his text. Nissen (*Rh. Mus.* 1871, 266–7) assigned Ol. 149, 1 to xxiii, and Ol. 149, 2–4 to xxiv, because he believed Ol. 149, 1 = 184/3 to be crowded with events, including the deaths of Scipio, Hannibal, and Philopoemen; but that is improbable (see below, p. 16).

We may now turn to the fragments of Ol. 149, 1–2. These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–4. 16 (Greek embassies at Rome: exc. 38); 5. 1–3 (Deinocrates: exc. 39); 5. 14–18 (more on Deinocrates: exc. 39 cont.)—these two passages are continuous in the excerpts; 6. 1–3 (envoys from Spartan exiles murdered: exc. 40); 7. 1–7 (Demetrius' return to Macedon: exc. 41); 9. 1–15 (Greek envoys at Rome: Marcius' report: exc. 42); 16. 1–13 (Messenians capitulate: exc. 43); 17. 1–18. 5 (envoys to Rome: Sparta readmitted into the Achaean federation: exc. 44); *de legat. Rom.*: 8. 1–7 (Q. Marcius in Macedonia: Philip's Thracian campaign: exc. 21); *de uirt. et uit.*: 5. 4–14 (Deinocrates: exc. 80); 10. 1–15 (Philip's

crimes and disasters: exc. 81); 12. 3, 7 (Philopoemen's merits: exc. 82); 12. 8–9 (ambition and frankness of Philopoemen: exc. 83); 13. 2 (Hannibal's merits: exc. 84); 14. 1–4 (Scipio's ambitions: exc. 85); *de sent.*: 10. 3 (Philip's conscience: exc. 105); 10. 15–16 (Philip imprisons his enemies' children: Fortune avenges this: exc. 106); 11. 1–8 (Philip's speech to his sons: exc. 107); 12. 3–6 (Philopoemen's character: exc. 108); 14. 5–12 (Scipio and money: exc. 109); 15. 1–3 (on destroying trees and the like in war: exc. 110).

Again Livy is helpful. The parts where he has drawn on P. are:

Livy, xxxix. 46. 6–50. 11 (A.U.C. 571 = 183); see p. 8.

Livy, xxxix. 53. 1–16 (A.U.C. 571 = 183); see p. 8.

Livy, xl. 3. 1–16. 3 (A.U.C. 572 = 182): *res Macedoniae*.

1. 1–4. 16 corresponds to Livy, xxxix. 46, and describes the arrival of Greek embassies at Rome; it must belong to *res Italiae* of Ol. 149. 1 = 184/3. 5. 1–18 is made up from *de legat. gent.*, *de uirt. et uit.*, and two passages from Suidas (5. 5 and 5. 9), with an overlap at 5. 14. It concerns Deinocrates' behaviour at Rome, where he found Flamininus appointed envoy to the east. The year is unchanged, as a comparison of 6. 1–3 (*res Graeciae*) and 7. 1–7 (*res Macedoniae*), which follow on in *de legat. gent.*, with Livy, xxxix. 53 makes clear. Marcus' arrival in Macedonia and Philip's Thracian campaign (8. 1–7: from *de legat. Rom.*) are both in 183 (see Livy, *ibid.*). It has been argued above (p. 13) that xxii. 19. 1–4 probably belongs to the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149. 1 = 184/3; but whether it preceded or followed 6 is uncertain.

9. 1–15, describing the arrival of Greek envoys at Rome, and Marcus' report, forms part of *res Italiae* of Ol. 149, 2 = 183/2, as comparison with Livy, xl. 2. 6, shows. 10. 1–16, on Philip's disasters, is combined from *de uirt. et uit.*, *de sent.*, and several passages from Suidas, and corresponds to Livy, xl. 3. 3 f.; it is from the *res Macedoniae* of the same year, of which another fragment is the reference to the sacrifice to Xanthus in 10. 17 (cf. Livy, xl. 6. 1–3). 11. 1–8, from Philip's speech to his sons, corresponds to part of Livy, xl. 8. 7–20 (especially 10–14), and is also from *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 149, 2 = 183/2 (in fact 182).

12. 1–9 is made up from *de sent.*, *de uirt. et uit.*, and Suidas, and concerns the death and character of Philopoemen; it must be from *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 2 = 183/2, which in this instance followed *res Macedoniae*. (12. 3–7 from *de uirt. et uit.* is excessively abbreviated but contains a sentence about Lycortas missing from *de sent.*) 13 on Hannibal (from Suidas and *de uirt. et uit.*) and 14 on Scipio (from *de sent.*, *de uirt. et uit.*, and Suidas) clearly link with Philopoemen's death. P. must have put all three deaths in the same year. Next follow three passages evidently from *res Graeciae* of this same

year. 15. 1–3 (*de sent.*) condemning the destruction of trees and agricultural installations seems to be a criticism of Lycortas' ravaging of Messenia (cf. xxiv. 2. 3; Plut. *Philop.* 21. 1); 16. 1–13 (*de legat. gent.*) is on the capitulation of Messenia; and 17. 1–18. 5 (*de legat. gent.*) recounts the Roman reply to Achaean envoys and the Achaean readmission of Sparta.

P.'s sequence is straightforward and consistent. A difficulty arises only because Livy, xxxix. 49–50, describes Philopoemen's death under A.U.C. 571 = 183, whereas P. puts it in Ol. 149, 2 = 183/2. The explanation is that Livy, who singled out the one most sensational incident from the war (cf. Livy, xxxix. 48. 6–49. 1), brought it forward into the previous consular year (183), so that it preceded the *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 149, 1 = 184/3 (Livy, xxxix. 53), whereas the corresponding passage in P. (7. 1–7) comes before Philopoemen's death. For detailed discussion of the chronology of the deaths of Philopoemen, Scipio, and Hannibal see the commentary on 12. 1– 14. 12.

If Steph. Byz. s.v. *Γαλάδραι* should be emended to give a reference to book xxiii (Schweighaeuser, v. 59, would read *Π?* or *Κ?* for *Ι?*), this may come in the *res Macedoniae* of either Ol. 149, 1 or Ol. 149, 2 (see Büttner-Wobst, iv. 152 in app. crit.). Schweighaeuser (v. 54) attributes fg. 112 to *res Asiae* of Ol. 149, 2; it could refer to Pharnaces.

#### 6. BOOK XXIV

This probably contained the events of Ol. 149, 3 = 182/1 and Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0; see above, pp. 13–14. These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–7 (embassies at Rome: exc. 44—continuous with xxiii. 18. 5 and not distinguished from it in the manuscripts); 2. 1–5 (Peloponnesian affairs: exc. 45); 5. 1–8 (Eumenes' brothers in Rome: exc. 46); 6. 1–7 (Achaea and Ptolemy V: his death: exc. 47); 8. 1–10. 10 (the Achaeans and Rome: Callicrates: exc. 48); 10. 11–15 (same context: exc. 49); *de legat. Rom.*: 14. 1–15. 9 (war between Eumenes and Pharnaces: exc. 22); 15. 10–13 (same context: exc. 23); *de uirt. et uit.*: 7. 1–8 (Chaeron at Sparta: exc. 86); 11. 1–8 (comparison of Aristaenus and Philopoemen: exc. 87); *de sent.*: 3 (troubles in Crete: exc. 111); 12. 1– 13. 10 (comparison of Aristaenus and Philopoemen: exc. 112). The only relevant Polybian section of Livy is xl. 20. 1–24. 8 (A.U.C. 573 = 181), recording embassies to Rome, Philip's Thracian expedition and the murder of Demetrius. Livy has no Polybian section for A.U.C. 574 = 180.

1. 1–7 from *de legat. gent.* recounts the arrival in Rome and audience before the Senate of envoys from the Spartan exiles, Achaea, Eumenes, Ariarathes, and Pharnaces; Livy, xl. 20. 1–

4



describes the same occasion, mentioning Macedonian representatives as well. The context is clearly *res Italiae* of Ol. 149, 3 = 182/1 and the date winter 182/1. 2. 1–5, describing Achaean decisions following the return of envoys from Rome, must be from the *res Graeciae* of the same olympiad year (in fact 181). 3 (*de sent.*), on troubles in Crete, precedes a passage comparing Aristaenus and Philopoemen, which clearly arises out of a discussion of Achaean policy; and since Cretan affairs normally follow Achaean in any given olympiad year, this passage on Crete must be part of *res Graeciae* of at least the year before that of the Achaean discussions. Since these probably belong to Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0 (see below, pp. 18–19), 3 is likely to be from *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 3 = 182/1; but if 11–13 were to be postponed into book xxv, 3 might logically fall in Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0.

4, from Strabo (vii. 5. 1, C. 313), refers to Philip's ascent of Mt. Haemus in 181 (Livy, xl. 21. 2, 22. 5); but since Livy has no *res Graeciae* for this year, we lack even that indication whether P.'s *res Macedoniae* preceded or followed his *res Graeciae* for Ol. 149, 3 = 182/1, and so whether 4 should stand before or after 2. See xxiv. 1. 6 n. (If, as seems most likely, the Cretan chapters represented by 3 belong to this year, they will follow the Achaean (2), wherever the Macedonian go; Hultsch's order, putting 4 between 2 and 3, is unacceptable.)

5. 1–8, from *de legat. gent.*, describing Eumenes' actions after a truce with Pharnaces and his brothers' reception at Rome, must be from *res Italiae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0; their arrival back in Pergamum in spring 180 is recounted in 14. 4 (see p. 19). See Büttner-Wobst, *Beiträge*, 14–15. 6. 1–7, from the same collection, describes Ptolemy V's offer of pentecontors to Achaea, the decision to send an embassy, and the news of his death. The latest Egyptian dating by Ptolemy Epiphanes (Tait, *Greek Ostraca*, Bodleian no. 96) is Pharmouthi 16 of year 25 = 20 May 180, and comes from Hermonthis (cf. Skeat, 32 n. 9); and Samuel, 139, calculates that, allowing three months for news of Epiphanes' death to get from Alexandria to Hermonthis in upper Egypt, this dating shows Epiphanes to have been still alive on, say, 20 February 180. Since the Canon gives him a reign of 24 years, thus putting his death in the course of his twentyfifth Egyptian year, he must have died between 20 February and 6 October 180 (the year end). So far no document warrants a closer dating. But the evidence seems to confirm that 6. 1–7 is from the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0, and refers to 180.

7. 1–8, from *de uirt. et uit.* and Suidas, concerns the demagogy of the Spartan Chaeron, who had been on an embassy to Rome the previous year (7. 1). If that embassy was the one in xxiii. 18. 4, 7. 1–8 is clearly part of *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0. But in xxiii. 18. 4 *Χαίρων* was Schweighaeuser's emendation (following

Reiske) of *χάρωνα* (Υ); and P. Derow, *Bowra Essays*, 15 n. 1, would keep the manuscript reading, thus making the embassy mentioned here that of 184/3 (cf. xxiii. 4. 5), with the result that 7. 1–8 goes into the *res Graeciae* of 183/2. This is possible; but the emendation is a simple one and may well stand, Charon being otherwise unknown. The placing of this fragment will however be uncertain.

8. 1–10. 15, from *de legat. gent.*, first describes Achaean deliberations on a letter brought back from Rome by the Spartan exiles. Aymard (*études*, 43–4) argues that this is the letter mentioned in 2. 1 and ignored after discussion in spring 181 (2. 5); but this need not be so, for Callicrates, speaking in Rome (9. 14), says: *νῦν δὲ πάλιν ἐκ πλείονος χρόνου γραφόντων αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς καθόδου τῶν ἐκ Λακεδαιμόνος φυγάδων*, which suggests more than one communication. Hyperbatus is now general (8. 1) and Aymard (*ibid.*) argues that his *strategia* was in 181/0 and that, being pro-Roman, he will have raised the question of the letter immediately after entering office in autumn 181, only six months after the earlier discussion. Against this is the fact that the matter comes up in *de legat. gent.* after the account of the cancellation of the embassy to Ptolemy, following his death in 180 (6. 7); and though P. frequently has to revert to an earlier time within the olympiad year in passing from one theatre to another, this does not happen within the affairs of one area such as Achaëa. Further, Errington has shown (263–4) that since Aratus was to have gone to Egypt (6. 6) and did go to Rome (8. 8), the second embassy must have been arranged after the first was cancelled. It follows that the discussion of the Roman letter under Hyperbatus took place, not in autumn 181, but after the news of Epiphanes' death in 180.

This being so, a possible interpretation of the material is that Hyperbatus was general for 180/79 (not 181/0), that the letter was discussed as soon as he entered office and that the embassy went to Rome in autumn 180 and was heard at the usual time in winter 180/79; 8. 1–10. 15 would in that case form part of *res Italiae* of Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79. The order of the fragments would allow this, since the next excerpt in *de legat. gent.* is xxv. 2. 1–15 from the *res Asiae* of Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79; and the central feature of 8. 1–10. 15 is Callicrates' speech at Rome. This reconstruction (accepted by Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* 1871, 249; Niese, iii. 59 n. 1) implies putting Hyperbatus' *strategia* in 180/79, and that of Callicrates in 179/8 (10. 14); the general for 181/0 would be unknown. It is possible; but on balance it seems more likely that 8. 1–10. 15 forms part of *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0, since 10. 14–15 seems to imply that Callicrates was made general soon after his return to Rome. Elsewhere embassies to Rome figure in *res Graeciae*: cf. xxi. 31. 3–32. 15; xxix. 10–11, in both of which passages the assignment to *res Graeciae* is confirmed by comparison with Livy. (In this P. retained a degree of

flexibility; in xxx. 5. 2 ff. affairs of Rhodes and Caria are included in *res Italiae*.)

The chronology will thus be as follows. Hyperbatus, as general for 181/0, raised the matter of the Spartan exiles in early summer 180, on the receipt of yet another letter from Rome; this was after news of Ptolemy's death had caused the cancellation of the mission to Egypt (6. 7). He either summoned a *synkletos* (xxiv. 8. 7 n.)—or possibly raised the matter at a regular *synodos* (cf. Errington, 264 n. 2)—and Callicrates, Lydiades, and Aratus were appointed envoys to Rome and left at once. There they were given an immediate hearing; this was unusual, but not unprecedented (cf. xxxii. 1. 4), and they had of course come in response to a Roman letter. They returned home the same autumn in time for Callicrates to be elected general for 180/79 (10. 14). One reason why P. dealt with this embassy under *res Graeciae* may have been that it fell in the middle of a consular year; for a parallel see xxi. 1 n. (One should, however, note that if new evidence from Egypt were to show that Epiphanes' death was so short a time before 6 October 180 as to leave no room for Callicrates' embassy to Rome before the Achaean elections in autumn 180, it would be necessary to revert to the theory that 8. 1–10. 15 is from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79, and falls in book xxv.)

11–13 (from *de uirt. et uit., de sent.*, and Suidas) is a comparison between the policies of Philopoemen and Aristaenus; it does not indicate in what context P. introduced it. Since Philopoemen's death was in 182, that cannot have afforded the occasion; and Aristaenus' death (its date is unknown) seems an unlikely peg on which to hang it. It is perhaps most likely to have been introduced in relation to a discussion of Callicrates' methods; hence it stands in *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0 (though if evidence from Egypt led to the postponement of 8. 1–10. 15 until book xxv (see above), 11–13 would also have to go into that book, probably as *res Graeciae* of Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79).

14. 1–15. 13 (from *de legat. Rom.*) describes the reopening of the war against Eumenes by Pharnaces in spring 180 before Eumenes' brothers returned from Rome (14. 4); soon afterwards the Roman envoys promised in 5. 8 arrive (14. 10, 15. 1). Clearly then 14. 1–15. 13 is from *res Asiae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0 (cf. Büttner-Wobst, *Beiträge*, 16–17; Steigemann, 43).

## 7. BOOK XXV

For the likelihood that book xxv contained the history of Ol. 150 = 180/76 see above, pp. 13–14. These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 2. 1–15 (end of war between Pharnaces and Eumenes: exc. 50); 4. 1–10 (Lycian embassy at Rome:

exc. 51); 5. 1–5 (Rhodian decision to send an embassy to Rome about Lycia: exc. 52); 6. 1–6 (Rhodian and Dardanian envoys at Rome: exc. 53); *de uirt. et uit.*: 3. 1–8 (Perseus' new policy: exc. 88); 3. 9–10 (Philip's character: exc. 89).

2. 1–15, giving the terms of the settlement between Eumenes and Pharnaces and of the general peace in the area, follows xxiv. 8. 1– 10. 15 in *de legat. gent.* If, as seems likely (above, pp. 18–19), the latter passage is part of *res Graeciae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0, its position in the excerpts would allow 2. 1–15 to form part of *res Asiae* of Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0, or Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79, or Ol. 150, 2 = 179/8, since the next passage in *de legat. gent.* (4. 1–10) is firmly placed in Ol. 150, 3 = 178/7 (see below, pp. 21–2). It seems likely that the general peace mentioned in 2. 1–15 was followed at no great interval by the treaty between Pharnaces and Chersonese recorded in *IPE* i<sup>2</sup>. 402, and dated by the oath sworn in the month Daisios of year 157 καθὼς βασιλεὺς Φαρνάκ[ης] ἄγει (11. 29–31). By the time of Pharnaces' son, Mithridates V Euergetes, Pontus was using an era dating from 296 (cf. Diehl, *RE*, 'Pharnakes (1)', col. 1850); whereas that used in *IPE* i<sup>2</sup>. 402 must be calculated from the accession of Mithridates II to the throne of Cius, which according to Diod. xvi. 90. 2 took place in the Attic year 337/6. R. C. Loeper (cf. Diehl, *RE*, 'Pharnakes (1)', col. 1850) dated this era from October 337, and if Daisios is May, Pharnaces' oath would be May 180 (if year 1 is 337/6, year 157 will be 181/0, not 180/79 as Rostovtzeff, *CAH*, ix. 217 f. states; so too Magie, ii. 1090 n. 45, and Latyshev, *IPE* i<sup>2</sup>. 402, 'annum 157 cadere . . . in annum 179 a. Chr.'). A date for this treaty in May 180 would perhaps allow 2. 1–15 to stand in Ol. 149, 4 = 181/0. But we cannot be certain from which month of the Attic year 337/6 the Pontic era began, and if it began late in that year, the treaty of *IPE* i<sup>2</sup>. 402 may indeed belong to 179. In favour of this (and the placing of 2. 1–15 in Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79) is the fact that after the breakdown of the talks in 180 (xxiv. 15. 12), the Roman envoys left Pergamum and Eumenes prepared to continue the war (xxiv. 15. 12). It seems unlikely that the consequent Pergamene attack can have developed enough to induce Pharnaces to be ready to make peace at any price (2. 1) before the next olympiad year (Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79). Hence, it seems preferable to leave 2. 1–15 where it stands (with a caveat). In view of the date of *IPE* i<sup>2</sup>. 402, it can hardly belong to Ol. 150, 2 = 179/8. Niese (iii. 78 n. 1) leaves 2. 1–15 in book xxv, and assumes that the peace was in autumn 180 (so too Diehl, *RE*, 'Pharnakes (1)', col. 1849); this is possible. See further Büttner-Wobst, *Beiträge*, 17; Steigemann, 43.

1. 1–2 (Strabo, iii. 4. 13, C. 163), recording Ti. Gracchus' exaggerated description of Spanish forts as cities, refers to events of Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79, since Livy, xl. 47. 1 shows Gracchus to have been propractor

in Spain in A.U.C. 575 = 179. As Diod. xxix. 26 is probably following P. in praising Gracchus' vigour, it is likely that P. recorded his campaigns under *res Hispaniae* of this year. However, Schulten (*Hermes*, 1911, 573) has shown convincingly that Strabo mentioned P. here in the context of Poseidonius' polemic, and that whether he took the Polybian reference from Poseidonius, who, since he opened his *History* with the year 144, can only have handled events of 179 in a geographical excursus (which in fact will have drawn on P.'s book xxxiv), or had it direct from P. (whom in book iii he quotes only from book xxxiv and not from the *Histories* generally), in either case, the implication is that 1. 1–2 belongs to book xxxiv, where P. discusses the towns of Celtiberia (cf. xxxiv. 9. 13).<sup>1</sup>

It is clear from the Polybian section of Livy, xl. 54. 1–58. 9, that Philip V died in 179 and that P. must have described his death under Ol. 150, 1 = 180/79. Livy (cf. Walbank, *Philip*, 295–9) suggests that it occurred late in 179 (though the words *Demetriade hibernabat*, Livy, xl. 54. 2, refer to winter 180/79, and have no relevance to the time of his death, as De Sanctis, iv. 1. 254 n. 28 imagined). Consequently, the account of Perseus' new policy in 3. 1–8 (from *de uirt. et uit.* with Suidas at 3. 1–2 and Athen. x. 445 at 3. 6–8: for the false attribution to book xxvi see above, p. 14) must come under *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 150, 2 = 179/8. Winter 179/8 would be appropriate for the renewal of friendship with Rome (3. 1). 3. 9–10 on Philip's character is the next excerpt in *de uirt. et uit.* and probably belongs to a comparison with his successor Perseus.

4. 1–10, 5. 1–5, and 6. 1–6 follow in succession in *de legat. gent.* The first describes the arrival of Lycian envoys at Rome and their hearing ἤδη τῆς θερείας ληγοῦσης (4. 2), the second the arrival of Roman envoys at Rhodes, to convey the Senate's decision following the Lycian embassy, and the third the arrival at Rome of the Rhodian embassy decided upon in 5. 4. These three excerpts must come from *res Italiae*, *res Asiae*, and *res Italiae* respectively, and a reference to the consuls of A.U.C. 577 = 177 (4. 1) seems to establish these as being the *res Italiae* of 178/7 (4. 1–10), the *res Asiae* of the same year (5. 1–5), and the *res Italiae* of 177/6 (6. 1–6). There is however a difficulty, since this implies that the late summer of 4. 2 ('after the expedition of the consuls . . . against the Istrians and Agrians') is summer 177; and this leaves insufficient time for the sending of an embassy to Rhodes, its hearing and the dispatch of Lycophron to Rome, where he has audience in Ol. 150, 4 = 177/6, i.e. probably at the beginning of the consular year 176. It has, therefore, been cogently argued by P. Derow (*Phoenix*, 1973, 350 ff.) that the names of the consuls of 177 have been incorrectly inserted by the excerptor at 4. 1, and that the Lycian envoys were in fact heard at the end of

[21]

---

<sup>1</sup> On Strabo's debt to P. in book iii see Pédech, *Méthode*, 579 n. 362.

summer 178 (cf. Livy, xli. 6. 8–12, who dates their audience before the consular elections for 177; Nissen, *KU*, 239–40, rejects Livy's details as annalistic and improbable, but thinks the date may well be right); see ad loc. for full discussion. In any event, the assignment of the three fragments is unaltered. The arrival of the Rhodian and Dardanian envoys (6. 1–6), described under *res Italiae* of Ol. 150, 4 = 177/6), will be at the end of 177; see Meloni, *Perseo*, 81.

## 8. BOOK XXVI

This book, which was lost before 950, contained Ol. 151 = 176/2; see above, pp. 13–14. Athen. x. 445 is incorrectly attributed to book xxvi (see p. 14); but Athen. x. 439 and v. 193 both belong there and come from a discussion of the character of Antiochus IV, on which Diodorus (xxix. 32) and Livy (xli. 20) also draw. Since this section of Livy is under A.U.C. 579 = 175, and since Diodorus, loc. cit. relates his account to Antiochus' accession, which was in 175 (see 1 a 1 n.), both fragments will be from *res Asiae* of Ol. 151, 1 = 176/5, the first year covered in the book.

## 9. BOOK XXVII

Three excerpts, 1. 1 (*de legat. gent.*), 3. 1 (*de legat. Rom.*), and 12. 1 (*de uirt. et uit.*) contain statements in the manuscripts that they are from book xxvii; and a comparison of the first and second of these with Livy, xlii. 43. 4 and xlii. 45. 1–2 (A.U.C. 583 = 171), and of the third with Livy, xlii. 67. 3 (part of the same Polybian narrative), shows that book xxvii contained Ol. 152, 1 = 172/1 (see above, pp. 13–14). Athen. x. 440 attributes to book xxix statements about Genthius which Livy, xlv. 30. 2 (following P.) places in A.U.C. 586 = 168. This gives the following arrangement:

Ol. 152, 1 = 172/1	Book xxvii
Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0	
Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69	
Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8	Book xxix

This leaves uncertain whether xxvii contained Ol. 152, 1 and Ol. 152, 2 and xxviii Ol. 152, 3, or whether xxvii contained only Ol. 152, 1 and xxviii Ol. 152, 2 and Ol. 152, 3. Büttner-Wobst has assumed the first alternative to be the right one; and it may seem more likely that as the war with Perseus developed events expanded to fill more space,<sup>1</sup> and even that the arrangement 2:1:1 is more probable than 1:2:1 (though as Ol. 144 has 1:1:2 and Ol. 147 has 1:3, this is not to be pressed). However, probability is not proof, and we do not

[22]

---

<sup>1</sup> This seems to exclude the possibility that there was one year each in xxvii and xxviii, and Ol. 152, 3 and 4 in xxix.

know whether the events in 14. 1–20. 3 were in fact in xxvii or xxviii. In the state of uncertainty, they are perhaps best left as Büttner-Wobst has them.

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–2. 12 (events in Boeotia: exc. 54); 4. 1–10 (Perseus and Rhodes: exc. 55); 5. 1–8 (Perseus and Boeotia: exc. 56); 6. 1–4 (same topic: exc. 57); 8. 1–15 (Perseus asks for peace: exc. 58); 14. 1–3 (Perseus' envoy in Rhodes: exc. 59); 19. 1–2 (war between Antiochus and Ptolemy: exc. 60); *de legat. Rom.*: 3. 1–5 (Rhodian support for Rome: exc. 24); 7. 1–16 (attitudes at Rhodes: exc. 25); *de uirt. et uit.*: 12. 1–3 (on Cotys: exc. 90); 13. 1–4 (Ptolemy, the Egyptian commander in Cyprus: exc. 91); 15. 1–16 (Cephalus of Epirus driven to join Perseus: exc. 92); 16. 1–6 (attempt to seize the consul, A. Hostilius: exc. 93); 17 (Pharnaces: exc. 94); 18. 1–3 (Attalus' approach to the Achaeans: exc. 95); *de sent.*: 9. 1–10. 5 (Perseus' position in Greece: exc. 113); 20. 1–2 (remarks about war: exc. 114); 20. 3 (difficulty in attaining to τὰ καλά: exc. 115). Livy, xlii. 29–30 and xliii. 37–67 seem to derive from parts of P. falling within Ol. 152, 1 = 171; but owing to the fragmentary nature of the text of Livy, no sections of it derived from P. have survived for the year 170.

1. 1–2. 12 follows xxv. 6. 6 in *de legat. gent.* (where it is attributed to xxvii: see p. 22) and corresponds to a section of Livy xlii. 43–44, a passage dealing with the relations between Rome and Boeotia and dated to 171. Two chapters later Livy (xlii. 45. 1) records the visit of Roman envoys to Rhodes, and this corresponds to 3. 1–5, from *de legat. Rom.*; but in xlii. 46 Livy returns to events of the same year in Greece, which means that 1. 1–2. 12 cannot be *res Graeciae* and 3. 1–5 *res Asiae* of Ol. 152, 1 = 172/1. Either P. treated the war with Perseus as a single whole (so Büttner-Wobst, who classifies all these fragments under 'Bellum Persicum') or, more probably, he here reckons the affairs of Rhodes as *res Graeciae* (and draws no clear distinction between *res Graeciae* and *res Macedoniae*). The following fragments fall into place when compared with Livy, viz.: 4. 1–10, cf. Livy, xlii. 46. 1–6; 5. 1–8, cf. Livy, xlii. 46. 7–10; 6. 1–4, cf. Livy, xlii. 48. 1–4 (followed by fg. 234; cf. Livy, xlii. 49. 2); 7. 1–16, cf. Livy, xlii. 48. 9–10 (or 56. 1); 8. 1–15, cf. Livy, xlii. 62. 3–15; 9. 1–10. 5 (also in Suidas), cf. Livy, xlii. 63. 1–2 (omitting most of the Polybian original); 11. 1–7 (from Suidas), cf. Livy, xlii. 65. 9. (For the collections from which these fragments come see above.)

12. 1–3 (from *de uirt. et uit.*) follows xxv. 3. 9–10 in that collection, and is said in the margin to be from book xxvii. It is usually placed after 11. 1–7, by comparison with Livy, xlii. 67. 3; but Livy says nothing there on Cotys' character, and such remarks will have come more appropriately earlier, either in a section corresponding to Livy, xlii. 29. 12 where, under A.U.C. 583 = 171, Cotys' support of Perseus

is mentioned (so Reiske), or, more probably, in one corresponding to Livy, xlii. 51. 10, 'uenerat eodem [sc. to Citium] Cotys, Seuthis filius, rex gentis Odrysarum, cum mille delectis equitibus, pari ferme peditum numero'; this is Cotys' first appearance, and judging by Livy, he received a full introduction. In that case 12. 1–3 is from the passage describing the gathering of the Macedonian army at Citium which preceded the account of the sending of the letter to Rhodes (7. 1–16), since that corresponds to Livy, xlii. 56. 1 (see below, xxvii. 7. 1–16 n.); it will stand between 6. 4 and 7. 1.

13. 1–4 (which follows 12. 1–3 in *de uirt. et uit.*) concerns the Egyptian commander in Cyprus, and, as it precedes 15. 1–16 (see below), it must be from *res Aegypti* of Ol. 152, 1 = 172/1. 14. 1–2 follows 8. 15 and precedes 19. 1–2 (on the war between Ptolemy and Antiochus) in the excerpts *de legat. gent.* The cessation of activity against the Romans mentioned in 14. 1 will be a reference to Perseus' retirement to Macedonia at the end of the campaigning season of 171. Büttner-Wobst puts it early in the *res Graeciae et Macedoniae* (he says *bellum Persicum*) of Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0; in that case it may well, though it need not necessarily, precede the account of the events leading up to the attack on the consul A. Hostilius in Epirus (15. 1–16. 6). But it could be a pendant to events in the same theatre in Ol. 152, 1 = 172/1, in which case it would stand after 11. 7.

As indicated above (p. 22), the fragments relating to Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0 may belong to book xxviii. 15. 1–16 and 16. 1–6 follow 13. 4 (in that order) in *de uirt. et uit.*; and 15. 6 is also in Suidas. As they concern the war with Perseus and as the next passage in this collection concerns Pharnaces and is therefore from *res Asiae* (17) they must be part of the *res Graeciae et Macedoniae* of Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0; A. Hostilius (16. 2) is the consul for A.U.C. 584 = 170. 17, as already noted, is from *res Asiae* (of Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0) and precedes (in *de uirt. et uit.*) 18. 1–3, which mentions an approach to some Achaeans by Attalus, and xxviii. 14. 1–4, a passage on Crete, which can be assigned to Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69 (see below, p. 26), in that order. Attalus was operating from Elatea, and there is no reason to put 18. 1–3 under *res Asiae* (as Büttner-Wobst does); and since Attalus and Eumenes returned to Pergamum in autumn 171 and wintered there 171/0 (Livy, xlii. 67. 8), the winter mentioned here (18. 1) must be that of 170/69. In that case, 18. 1–3 will stand early among the *res Graeciae et Macedoniae* of Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69, between xxviii. 2. 8 and xxviii. 3. 1.

19. 1–2, on the sending of Meleager to Rome by Antiochus, follows 14. 1–3 and precedes xxviii. 1. 1–9 (describing the arrival of these and other envoys at Rome) in the excerpts *de legat. gent.* The likelihood is that xxviii. 1. 1–9 is from *res Italiae* of Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69, and 19. 1–2 part of *res Asiae* of Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0 (as Büttner-Wobst



places them); Meleager's embassy is then in winter 170/69. But if 14. 1–3 was a pendant to *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 152, 1 = 172/1 (above, p. 24), then 19. 1–2 could be from *res Asiae* of that year (with this order of fragments: 11. 7, 14. 1–3, 19. 1–2, 13. 1–4), and xxviii. 1. 1–9 could be from *res Italiae* of Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0, standing between 13. 4 and 15. 1 of book xxvii. For this dating see E. Bikerman, *Chron. d'Égypte*, 1952, 398 n. 1. Though consistent with the position of the fragments, it has to be discarded for two reasons:

(a) It would imply that a war that was being prepared in 171 and (cf. xxviii. 1. 1) had already broken out by the late winter of 171/0 left no trace of any action before 169; which is absurd.

(b) The senate's statement to Meleager that they would send instructions about writing to Ptolemy to Q. Marcius Philippus (xxviii. 1. 9) suggests that he was, or was soon to be, in the east; and this could only (at that time) be as *legatus* in 171 (cf. Livy, xlii. 47. 9). This would imply that the embassies were heard in early autumn 171 in time for a letter to go to Marcius before his return to Italy (since there is no evidence that he stayed on in Greece into 170). If Meleager's embassy was in winter 170/69, Marcius could receive the instructions (perhaps before leaving Rome) as consul from 169.

20. 1–2 and 20. 3 follow 10. 5 (Ol. 152, 1 = 172/1) and precede xxviii. 10. 1–2 (from *res Graeciae et Macedoniae* of Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69) in *de sent.* They have been placed where they stand as belonging to the war between Antiochus and Ptolemy; but the very general sententious reflections contained in them could come from almost any context, including the war against Perseus. Their proper place must therefore remain uncertain; nor can we say whether they belong to book xxvii or book xxviii.

#### 10. BOOK XXVIII

Whether this book contained the events of Ol. 152, 2 and 3, or merely those of Ol. 152, 3 is uncertain (see pp. 22–23); but the latter assumption (which is Büttner-Wobst's) is slightly more probable, and therefore it may be made as a working hypothesis.

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–9 (embassies from Antiochus and Ptolemy: exc. 61); 2. 1–8 (envoys from Rhodes: exc. 62); 5. 1–6 (debate in Acarnania: exc. 63); 8. 1–11 (Perseus and Genthius: exc. 64); 9. 1–8 (same topic: exc. 65); 12. 1–13. 14 (Polybius sent to the consul: exc. 66); 15. 1–3 (Cydonia and Eumenes: exc. 67); 16. 1–17. 15 (Rhodian affairs: exc. 68); 19. 1–7 (envoys to Antiochus: exc. 69); 20. 1–13 (same topic: exc. 70); 22. 1–3 (Syrian envoys to Rome: exc. 71); 23. 1–5 (Rhodian envoys to Antiochus: exc. 72); *de legat. Rom.*: 3. 1–4. 13 (Romans in Achaëa and Aetolia: exc. 26); 6. 1–7. 15 (Achaean policy towards

Rome, Perseus, and Eumenes: exc. 26 cont.); *de uirt. et uit.*: 14. 1–4 (Cydoniate treachery towards Apollonia: exc. 96); 18. 1 (remark on Antiochus: exc. 97; said in the margin of P to be from book xxviii); *de sent.*: 10. 1–2 (Perseus blames his general: exc. 116); 13. 9–10 (P. as envoy: exc. 117); 21. 1–5 (Eulaeus persuades Ptolemy to flee: exc. 118). Livy, xliii. 17–23 and xliv. 1–13 are from P. and, placed by Livy under 169, seem to represent the Polybian account of the war with Perseus in Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69.

8. 1–11 and 9. 1–8 (from *de legat. gent.*) correspond to Livy, xliii. 19. 13–20. 4 and 23. 8 (though Livy omits most of the contents of 9. 1–8); hence the three previous excerpts in *de legat. gent.* will go: (a) 1. 1–9 and 2. 1–8 in *res Italiae* of Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69; (b) 5. 1–6, which corresponds to Livy, xliii. 17. 7–9, in an earlier part of the section on the war with Perseus (as before—see p. 23—P. continues to run *res Graeciae* and *res Macedoniae* together). Since 3. 1–4. 13 (from *de legat. Rom.*) corresponds to Livy, xliii. 17. 2–6, it must immediately precede 5. 1–6. For the argument that xxvii. 18. 1–3 on Attalus' approach to the Achaeans in winter 170/69 belongs before 3 see p. 24.

Livy also enables the following passages to be set in order: 10. 1–2 (*de sent.*) = Livy, xliv. 7. 8–9; 11. 1–2 (Suidas) = Livy, xliv. 9. 8–9 (on the *testudo*); 11. 3 (Suidas) from the same context (cf. Livy, xliv. 9. 3 and 6)—but the Livian version suggests that it more properly precedes 11. 1–2. If fg. 66 corresponds to Livy, xliv. 10. 10, it will stand here. 6. 1–7. 15, on Achaean policy, has no corresponding passage in Livy; however, it mentions Archon's entry into office as general for 170/69 (6. 9), and clearly precedes the next passage dealing with Achaea (12. 1–13. 14, from *de legat. gent.* with an overlap in *de sent.*), and its position seems assured since

(a) the first sentence (6. 1) seems to refer to the Roman embassy, whose movements are recorded in 3–5;

(b) in the *de legat. Rom.* it forms a continuous passage with 3. 1–4. 13, except that at 6. 1 there is a jumbled sentence containing a reference to Acarnania, which clearly has to do with the section 5. 1–6, omitted from this selection.

12. 1–13. 14 (on P.'s embassy to the consul) is part of *res Graeciae et Macedoniae*, but P. has dealt with it towards the end of his account of the season's events. 14. 1–4 and 15. 1–3 both concern Cydonia in Crete; the former follows xxvii. 18. 1–3 (from *res Asiae* of Ol. 152, 2 = 171/0) in *de uirt. et uit.* Since Cretan affairs come before *res Asiae* in any year, 14. 1–4 must belong to xxviii, despite the fact that the next excerpt (18. 1) has a marginal note  $\lambda\omicron\kappa\eta$ , which might suggest that it was the first passage taken from book xxviii. 15. 1–3 precedes 16. 1–17. 15 in *de legat. gent.* and is probably rightly placed after rather than before 14. 1–4, since the attack on Apollonia is less likely

to have happened once Cydonia was in the hands of the Pergamene general Leon (15. 3).

16. 1–17. 15, on Rhodian affairs, follows 15. 1–3 in *de legat. gent.*; as in 12. 1–13. 14 the reference to Q. Marcius Philippus (cos. 169) confirms the passage as belonging to Ol. 152, 3 = 170/69. It describes the departure from Rhodes of the envoys (16. 5) whose audience at Rome had already been described (cf. 2. 1–2); but although it records the interview given by the consul to Rhodian envoys in Macedon, the passage mainly concerns Rhodes. In this instance Rhodian affairs seem to be treated as *res Graeciae* (which are not clearly separated from *res Macedoniae* during the war with Perseus); but the mention of an embassy to Alexandria in 17. 15 marks a transition to the war between Antiochus and Ptolemy. 19. 1–7, 20. 1–13, 22. 1–3, and 23. 1–5 are from *de legat. gent.* (in that order) and all concern that war; since the next passage in that collection, xxix. 3. 1–4. 10, belongs to *res Graeciae et Macedoniae* of Ol. 152, 4 = 168 (cf. Livy, xlv. 23), all four must be from book xxviii, since they are from *res Asiae* or *res Aegypti* (however events of this war are classed). 18. 1, from *de uirt. et uit.* (with the marginal note assigning it to book xxviii: above, p. 26), concerns Antiochus' character, and corresponds to Diod. xxx. 18. 1 (from the same excerpts); the obscure reference to Pelusium is clarified in Diod. xxx. 18. 2 (from *de sent.*), which shows that the fragment of P. under consideration stands correctly before 19. 1–7. 21. 1–5 (from *de sent.*), criticizing Eulaeus for persuading Ptolemy to abandon Egypt, corresponds to Diod. xxx. 17; and since Diod. xxx. 17 and 18. 1, based on P. (cf. Schwartz, *RE*, 'Diodoros', cols. 689–90), stand in that order in the excerpts *de uirt. et uit.*, it is reasonable to conclude that the corresponding passages in P. were in the same order, and so that 21. 1–5 preceded 18 (cf. Mørholm, 75 n. 45).<sup>1</sup> This is more satisfactory than Büttner-Wobst's arrangement, which involves putting the account of Eulaeus' advice (21. 1–5) *after* the council led by the new advisers Comanus and Cineas has resolved to approach Antiochus for terms (9. 1–7).

## 11. BOOK XXIX

This book contained Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8 (see above, p. 22). These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 3. 1–4. 10 (Genthius joins Perseus: exc. 73); 10. 1–7 (Rhodian decision to mediate: exc. 74); 11. 1–6 (Genthius' envoys at Rhodes: exc. 75); 19. 1–11 (Rhodian envoys at Rome: exc. 76); 23. 1–24. 16

[27]

---

<sup>1</sup> It is true that Diod. xxxi. 1 and 12 (both from *de sent.*) correspond to xxix. 26 and 22 (from the same excerpts) respectively; but different areas appear to be involved, and Diodorus has evidently rearranged his material.

(Egyptian appeal to Achaea: exc. 77); 25. 1–7 (same topic: exc. 78); *de legat. Rom.*: 2. 1–4 (Senate sends C. Popillius to Antiochus: exc. 27); 27. 1–13 (Popillius meets Antiochus: exc. 28); *de sent.*: 1. 1–3 (speech of Aemilius Paullus: exc. 119); 5. 1–3 (Perseus and Eumenes: exc. 120); 6. 1–9. 13 (same topic: exc. 121); 12. 1–12 (on writing history: exc. 122); 17. 2 (unsuccessful devices: exc. 123); 20. 1–4 (Aemilius Paullus' speech on Perseus' defeat: exc. 124); 21. 1–9 (reflections on Perseus' fall; exc. 125); 22. 1–5 (Galatians attack Eumenes: exc. 126); 26. 1–2 (Antiochus prepares to attack Ptolemy: exc. 127). 13. 1–2 (from Athen. x. 440), on Genthius' crimes, mentions book xxix; 14. 1–3, 15. 1–3, and 18 are from Plut. *Aem.* 15, 16, and 19 respectively; and several extracts from Suidas can be shown to belong to this book. Livy, xlv. 23 (or 22)–46 and xlv. 3. 3–12. 8, covering events of A.U.C. 586 = 168, are based on P.'s account of Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8.

Whether or no Livy, xlv. 22 is partly Polybian (so Nissen), 1. 1–3 (from *de sent.*) clearly corresponds in substance to Livy, xlv. 22. 8 ff. and so belongs to the *res Italiae* of Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8. 2. 1–4 (*de legat. Rom.*), on the dispatch of C. Popillius to Antiochus, is also from the same *res Italiae*; and since 2. 4 indicates a transition to another theatre (see ad loc.), 2. 1–4 must follow 1. 1–3. For the war with Perseus Livy, who uses P., provides a useful framework, which gives this order of fragments: 3. 1–4. 10 (*de legat. gent.*) = Livy, xlv. 23. 1–10; 5. 1–9. 13 (*de sent.*) = Livy, xlv. 24. 9–26. 2. 11. 1–6 (from *de legat. gent.*) corresponds to Livy, xlv. 29. 6–8; hence, although Livy has nothing corresponding to 10. 1–7, the order of the excerpts in *de legat. gent.* warrants placing that fragment where it now stands. (Ullrich, 65, adduces no good reason for reversing the order of 10 and 11.) Livy has omitted the Rhodian decision to offer mediation (10. 1–7) because he takes up Rhodian affairs only with the arrival at Rhodes of Macedonian and Illyrian envoys (Livy, xlv. 29. 6). 13. 1–2 (from Athen.) corresponds to Livy, xlv. 30. 2–5, and 14. 1–3 (from Plut. *Aem.* 15) to Livy, xlv. 35. 14 (though Livy gives less detail). Mueller may well be right in his suggestion that fg. 221 (Suidas) should stand between 13. 2 and 14. 1 (cf. Livy, xlv. 35. 2). Continuing, 14. 4 (Suidas) = Livy, xlv. 35. 19, and 16. 1–3 (Suidas), on the lunar eclipse, = Livy, xlv. 37. 9. Since 15. 1–3 (Plut. *Aem.* 16) precedes the eclipse (Plut. *Aem.* 17) in Plutarch, if it is to be treated as a fragment of P., it stands correctly where it is.

17. 1–4 and 18 concern the battle of Pydna; 17. 1, 17. 3, and 17. 4 are from Suidas, 17. 2 from *de sent.* and 18 from Plut. *Aem.* 19. 2. Of these 17. 3, 17. 4, and 18 seem to be from the same context (cf. οὐχ ὑπέμεινε τῆ ψυχῆ in 17. 3 and 17. 4, and ἀποδειλιᾶν in 17. 3 and 18), viz. Perseus' flight from the field. According to Plutarch this occurred at the beginning of the battle, though in the next chapter

(Plut. *Aem.* 19), he quotes Poseidonius' divergent account; but when the Macedonian line broke, it was *from Pydna* that Perseus fled to Pella (Plut. *Aem.* 23. 1), as Livy (xliv. 42. 1–2) also records. It thus appears that P. recorded Perseus' withdrawal from the battle in a passage which Livy transcribed in that part of his narrative covered by the lacuna (Livy, xlv. 40. 10–41. 1); and since 17. 2 corresponds to Livy, xlv. 41. 4, it follows that the order of the fragments should be: 17. 1, 17. 3, 17. 4, 18, 17. 2.

12. 1–12 stands between 9. 13 and 17. 2 in the excerpts *de sent.*; between 9. 13 and 12. 1 a page has been lost from M, but it is clear that 12. 1–12 represents a separate excerpt. The first words, *πάλιν ἕτεροι περὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ πολέμου*, suggest that there has just been a reference to some other writers of monographs; and the position of the excerpt in the collection suggests that these were monographs on the war with Perseus. But the exact position of the fragment relative to the others dealing with this war cannot be determined.

Hultsch, following Casaubon and Nissen (*KU*, 267), inserted after 18 a fragment from Suidas s.v. *πρωτόπειρος*, as being the equivalent of Livy, xlv. 44. 3 (cf. Diod. xxx. 22); Dindorf and Büttner-Wobst regard it as non-Polybian. Neither vocabulary nor diction seems inconsistent with P.'s style and its provenance should be left open. If it is Polybian, it comes between 17. 2 and 19. 1 (17. 2 being placed after 18: see above). 19. 1–11 (*de legat. gent.*) corresponds to Livy, xlv. 3. 3–8, and though it records the reception of Rhodian envoys at Rome it stands correctly where it has been placed, as part of the *res Graeciae et Macedoniae* (cf. Walbank, *Yale Stud.* 1975, 209); for though P. is willing to reverse the chronological order to maintain the separate 'theatres of action' (as when Rhodian envoys are heard at Rome in xxviii. 2 but do not leave Rhodes until xxviii. 16. 5–9), he could hardly have recounted the Rhodian interview in 168 before the battle on which its whole point depended. 20. 1–4 (*de sent.*) corresponds to Livy, xlv. 8. 6–7, which assures its position; and it should probably be preceded by fg. 74 (Suidas), mentioning the sending of a lictor to conduct Perseus to the consul (cf. Livy, xlv. 7. 4). 21. 1–9, which follows 20. 1–4 in *de sent.*, was perhaps part of a general sketch of Macedonian history represented by Livy, xlv. 9. 2–7 (see further below, xxix. 21 n.).

22. 1–5 and 26. 1–2, on Eumenes' affairs and Antiochus' preparations for a renewal of the war respectively, come from the excerpts *de sent.* and must belong to *res Asiae* of Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8. Since Schweighaeuser, editors have inserted between them two fragments from *de legat. gent.*, 23. 1–24. 16 and 25. 1–7, on an Egyptian appeal to Achaëa for help against Antiochus; but the scene is Achaëa, and it is more likely that they are from *res Graeciae* and therefore must come before 22. 1–5. Since they follow 19. 1–11 in *de legat. gent.*,

they cannot precede P.'s account of the war against Perseus, and should probably go after 21. 9.

27. 1–13 (*de legat. Rom.*) describes the famous episode when C. Popillius drew a circle round Antiochus; it corresponds to Livy xlv. 12. 3–8 and must stand here in *res Aegypti*. In the manuscripts it is followed by the phrase *τέλος τοῦ λ<sup>ο</sup> λόγου*, indicating not that this fragment belongs to book xxx (so Steigemann, 43–5), but that *de legat. Rom.* contains no fragments from that book. Büttner-Wobst adduces the parallel example at the end of book xxxviii, where the same excerpts have the phrase *τέλος τῆς πολυβίου ἱστορίας* (xxxviii. 13. 9). Further proof that 27. 1–13 is from book xxix is adduced by Koperberg, 94, who observes that Diod. xxxi. 2 (*de sent.*) corresponds to xxix. 27 and Diod. xxxi. 5. 2 (*de sent.*) to xxx. 4. 7 (note the reference to the swan-song); since, however, Diodorus is following P. and since the second passage is from *res Italiae* of Ol. 153, 1 = 168/7, the order of the fragments supports (without proving) the placing of xxix. 27 in Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8.

## 12. BOOK XXX

xxxiii. 1. 1, from the excerpts *de legat. gent.*, is attributed to that book in the margin of the manuscripts, and in xxxiii. 1. 5 A. Postumius Albinus is praetor; since his praetorship fell in the consulship of P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica and M. Claudius Marcellus (Cic. *Acad.* ii. 137), book xxxiii evidently contained Ol. 156, 1 = 156/5 (since this would be equated with the consulship of A.U.C. 599 = 155). It has already been established (above, p. 22) that book xxix contained Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8. Consequently, since P. nowhere in the main part of his *Histories* covers more than one olympiad in a single book, it seems likely that book xxx contained Ol. 153 = 168/4, book xxxi Ol. 154 = 164/0, and book xxxii Ol. 155 = 160/56. Analysis of the fragments confirms this hypothesis.

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–5. 16 (Attalus and Rhodians at Rome: exc. 79); 13. 1–11 (Greek embassies to the Romans in Macedonia: exc. 80); 16. 1–2 (the Ptolemies send an envoy to Rome: exc. 81); 17. 1–4 (Cotys' envoys at Rome: exc. 82); 18. 1–19. 17 (Prusias and Eumenes at Rome: exc. 83); 20. 1–7 (Athenian requests at Rome: exc. 84); 21. 1–5 (Rhodian and other envoys at Rome: exc. 85); 23. 1–4 (Cretan affairs: Rhodians send envoys to Rome: exc. 86); 27. 1–4 (Ti. Gracchus reaches Antiochus: exc. 87); 28 (Galatian audience at Rome: exc. 88); 29. 1 (dislike of Callicrates in Greece: exc. 89); 30. 1–31. 20 (embassies at Rome: exc. 90); 32. 1–12 (Achaean embassy at Rome: exc. 91). (30. 7–8 stands after 32. 10 in the manuscripts; it was transposed by Schweighaeuser and subsequent editors have concurred (*contra* Koperberg, 85–86).) *de uirt. et uit.*: 6. 1–9. 21 (Greek

opponents of Rome: exc. 98); 11. 1–6 (chaos in Aetolia: exc. 99); 12. 1–3 (also in Epirus: exc. 100); 29. 2–7 (Callicrates and his followers hated: exc. 101); *de sent.*: 4. 16–17 (part of the passage given in *de legat. gent.*: exc. 128); 5. 3 (the same: exc. 129); 10. 1–2 (an example of *Tyche*: exc. 130); 14 (a saying of Aemilius Paullus: exc. 131); 20. 8–9 (result for Athens of receiving Lemnos: exc. 132); 24. 1–2 (behaviour in Peraea on liberation: exc. 133).

A framework is given by the excerpts *de legat. gent.*, which contain sections from *res Italiae* of four separate years (since they are separated by events from other areas); these need not be, but in fact are, from four successive years. 1. 1–5. 16 (Attalus and Rhodians at Rome) corresponds to Livy, xlv. 19–25 (basically Polybian, but with annalistic or Livian versions of the Rhodian speeches); Livy's date, A.U.C. 587 = 167 points to Ol. 153, 1 = 168/7 for the fragment of P. Two passages (4. 16–17 and 5. 3) are also in *de sent.* where they follow xxix. 26. 2.

6. 1–9. 21, on the behaviour in adversity of three classes of antiRoman Greek statesmen, follows xxviii. 18 in the excerpts *de uirt. et uit.*, and some scholars have wished to locate it in book xxix (Metzung, 7–8; van Gelder, *Rhodier*, 153 n. 1; Koperberg, 88). But its context is the behaviour of Deinon and Polyaratus of Rhodes after Perseus' defeat (6. 1, 7. 1), the war is over (7. 3), Polyaratus has had time to flee to Egypt (9. 2) and have other adventures (9. 2–19). The fragment must therefore be retained in the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 153, 1 = 168/7. But Livy has no corresponding passage, and it remains uncertain whether it followed P.'s account of the reaction at Rhodes to news of the *senatus consultum* (5. 16), or the decision taken at Amphipolis about Aetolia, which led Livy (and so perhaps P.) to some general observations (Livy, xlv. 31). In the latter case, it would stand after 10 or even later; but the former is more likely and there is no cogent reason for displacing it from where it now stands.

10. 1–2 (*de sent.*) corresponds to Livy, xlv. 27. 7, and 10. 3–6 (four passages from Suidas) to Livy, xlv. 28. 2–5, on Aemilius Paullus' tour of Greece in 167; hence the position of 10 in *res Graeciae* of Ol. 153, 1 = 168/7 is assured. 11 and 12 have no passages corresponding to them in Livy, and since the next excerpt in *de uirt. et uit.* (29. 2–7) is from Ol. 153, 3 = 166/5 (see below, p. 33), they could (on the basis of their place in the excerpts) belong to either Ol. 153, 1 or Ol. 153, 2. However, as Schweighaeuser saw, the massacre mentioned in 11. 5 seems to be the one referred to in Livy, xlv. 28. 7 (A.U.C. 587 = 167), which confirms the placing of 11 and 12 in the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 153, 1 = 168/7. 13 (*de legat. gent.*), on congratulatory embassies sent to the Romans in Macedonia, corresponds to Livy, xlv. 31, and must follow 10 (and probably also 11 and 12). 14 (*de sent.*) corresponds to Livy, xlv. 32. 11, and 15, a reference to P. from Strabo, matches

Livy, xlv. 34. 6, on the destruction of seventy Epirote cities; both clearly follow on in *res Graeciae* of Ol. 153, 1 = 168/7. 16. 1–2, which stands between 13. 11 and 17. 1–4 in *de legat. gent.* must be from *res Aegypti* of Ol. 153, 1 = 168/7.

Livy, xlv. 42. 6 (A.U.C. 587 = 167) gives the annalistic version of the arrival of Cotys' envoys at Rome at the end of the consular year; 17. 1–4 (*de legat. gent.*) will therefore be from *res Italiae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6. 18. 1–19. 17, on Prusias and Eumenes at Rome, and 20. 1–7, on the Athenian envoys, are closely linked in the excerpts *de legat. gent.* (cf. 19. 17); Livy, xlv. 44. 1–18, gives the annalistic version of the former section (with a reference to P. at 44. 19), but this is the last chapter in our manuscript of Livy, whose help is therefore lacking from now on. These passages, and 21. 1–5, which follows 20. 7 and precedes 23. 1–4 (on Crete) in *de legat. gent.*, must all concern the same set of audiences in the *res Italiae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6. 20. 8–9 from *de sent.* clearly links with 20. 7.

22. 1–12, from Athenaeus xiv. 615, describes games held to celebrate his victory by L. Anicius Gallus. His triumph was on the Quirinalia (of consular year 167, or Roman year 166) and this date (a.d. xii kal. mart.) is equivalent to 19 Nov. 167 (Jul.) or, if A.U.C. 587 = 167 was intercalary, 11 or 12 Dec. 167 (Jul.) (cf. Michels, 171–2; Derow, *Phoenix*, 1973, 355). But there is no evidence that Anicius' games immediately followed his triumph. Athenaeus assigns P.'s account to book xxx (22. 1); but this does not give us the year. Koperberg, 29, thinks that P. described the games under *res Graeciae* of 168/7, as a foil to those of Aemilius Paullus and a contrast to his *ingenium* (cf. Livy, xlv. 32. 10, 'prudenciam in dandis spectaculis, ad quae rudes tum Romani erant'); this chapter would then stand between 13 and 14. This is quite possible, but hypothetical. Accordingly it seems best to leave 22. 1–12 where it is generally placed, at the end of *res Italiae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6, but to recognize that once it has been separated from Anicius' triumph (and if it is linked with that it will stand *before* 18. 1–19. 12, since Prusias' reception followed Anicius' triumph: Livy xlv. 43. 1–8, 44. 4–21), we cannot know in what context or indeed in which year P. introduced it.

Since 23. 1–4, on Crete and Rhodes, stands at a point in *de legat. gent.* between 21. 5 (*res Italiae*) and 27. 1 (*res Asiae*)—which is in turn followed by 28 (*res Italiae*)—it is likely that 23. 1–4 is from the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6. Because it includes an embassy to Rome, which arrived in summer 166 (23. 3), Koperberg, 64–5, would include it under *res Italiae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6; but the first part of the excerpt hardly fits *res Italiae*, whereas because of the unusual time of its arrival, the embassy may well have been mentioned *en passant* under *res Graeciae*. 24. 1–2 follows 20. 8–9 in *de sent.* and precedes xxxi. 6. 6, which belongs to *res Asiae* of Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3



(see below, p. 35); this would allow it to stand in *res Asiae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6, Ol. 153, 3 = 166/5, Ol. 153, 4 = 165/4, or Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3 (see Fraser and Bean, 121–2). But since the reactions described are more likely to have been mentioned immediately after the liberation of the Peraea, the fragment may be left here.

25. 1–26. 9 (from Athen. v. 194, with overlap in Athen. x. 439 and Diod. xxxi. 16. 2–3) is attributed in Athen. x. 439 to book xxxi; but that attribution is unlikely to be correct. An extract mentioning a remark of Cato on the extravagance of Roman youths (xxx. 25. 5–5a) is also attributed in Athen. vi. 274 to book xxxi; and, as will be demonstrated below (pp. 36–7), it was probably included in the *res Italiae* of Ol. 154, 4 = 161/0. Consequently, if Athenaeus' attribution of the account of Antiochus' procession in 25. 1–26. 9 to book xxxi is correct, that book must have included both this and events of 161/0; but since Antiochus' games must have preceded his departure for the east (1 Macc. iii. 37), which was probably in May 165 (Mørkholm, 98 n. 37, 166), they are likely to have been described under the *res Asiae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6. Hence book xxxi would have to begin with that olympiad year and continue to the end of Ol. 154, an arrangement unparalleled elsewhere. It must therefore be assumed that Athenaeus x. 439 is incorrect in attributing 25. 1–26. 9 to book xxxi. (Steigemann, 46–7, argues that book xxx contained Ol. 153, 1, book xxxi Ol. 153, 2–4, and book xxxii Ol. 154 and 155; and he therefore rejects Athenaeus' attribution of xxx. 25. 5–5a to book xxxi, and puts the passage in book xxxii. This has no plausibility at all.)

If this argument is accepted, 25. 1–26. 9 is from the *res Asiae* of Ol. 153, 2 = 167/6, and Antiochus' games are the sequel to those held by Aemilius Paullus at Amphipolis in 167 (Livy, xlv. 32. 8–33. 1), as 25. 1 indicates. 27 (from *de legat. gent.*) clearly follows on the last passage (cf. Diod. xxxi. 17, with the same sequence from a different set of excerpts): it will be *res Asiae*, and Ti. Gracchus' *legatio* will belong to 166. His return was probably in 165 (cf. xxx. 30. 7 n.). 28, also from *de legat. gent.*, is from *res Italiae* and therefore from a later year. Unless these excerpts contained nothing from Ol. 153, 3 = 166/5, it is to this year that 28 belongs; the Galatian envoys were evidently heard in the winter of 166/5. 29. 1, from the same excerpts, will be from *res Graeciae* of that olympiad year, since it is followed by 30. 1–31. 20 belonging to the *res Italiae* of Ol. 153, 4 = 165/4 (see below). 29. 2–7 (from *de uirt. et uit.*) is clearly from the same context; it is followed in that collection by xxxi. 6. 1–5, which is preceded by the marginal comment  $\lambda\omicron\lambda\alpha$ , which assigns that passage to book xxxi. Evidently there were no excerpts from Ol. 153, 4 = 165/4 in *de uirt. et uit.*

30. 1–31. 20 and 32. 1–12, both from *de legat. gent.*, describe the

arrival of a Rhodian and other embassies at Rome; this round of embassies seems distinct from those mentioned in xxxi. 1. 2–6, where Attalus and Athenaeus reply to the charges brought on the earlier occasion by Prusias and various Asian cities, and they are probably those heard at the beginning of A.U.C. 590 = 164. These excerpts will therefore be part of the *res Italiae* of Ol. 153, 4 = 165/4. This gets some confirmation from Livy, *ep.* 46, which puts the Rhodian embassy which secured the alliance of Rome and Prusias' complaints before the *lustrum* of 164 (cf. Koperberg, 80; Habicht, *RE*, 'Prusias (2)', col. 1114), though indeed the Livian *periochae* are often unreliable on the sequence of events. On the transposing of 30. 7–8 from its original place following 32. 10 see above, p. 30; and for the likelihood that xxxi. 1. 1 (from *de legat. gent.*) is from *res Asiae* of Ol. 153, 4 = 165/4 see below, p. 35.

### 13. BOOK XXXI

For the argument that this book contained Ol. 154 = 164/0 see above, p. 30. These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1 (Ti. Gracchus suppresses the Cammani: exc. 92); 1. 2–8 (embassy from Eumenes: exc. 92 cont.); 2. 1–14 (decisions concerning Syria, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Egypt: exc. 93); 3. 1–5 (embassy from Ariarathes: exc. 94); 4. 1–4 (Rhodian embassy to Rome: exc. 95); 5. 1–5 (Calynda, Caunus, and Rhodes: exc. 96); 7. 1–4 (Ariarathes recovers his sister's and mother's bones: exc. 96 cont.); 10. 1–10 (Ptolemy VI's and his brother's envoys at Rome: exc. 97); 11. 1–15. 12 (Demetrius' escape from Italy: exc. 98); 17. 1– 18. 16 (struggle between the Ptolemies: exc. 98 cont.); 19. 1–4 (same topic: exc. 99); 20. 1–6 (Ptolemies' embassies at Rome: exc. 100); 21. 1–8 (embassies from Carthage and Masinissa at Rome: exc. 101); 32. 1–3 (Prusias, the Galatians, Eumenes, and Ariarathes send envoys to Rome: exc. 102); 33. 1–5 (Demetrius recognized: exc. 103); *de legat. Rom.*: 8. 1–8 (Roman envoys reach Cappadocia: exc. 29); *de uirt. et uit.*: 6. 1–5 (C. Sulpicius encourages accusations against Eumenes: exc. 102); 9. 1–4 (death of Antiochus IV: exc. 103); 22. 1– 30. 4 (Aemilius Paullus and Scipio Aemilianus: exc. 104); *de sent.*: 6. 6 (growth of Greek sympathy for Eumenes: exc. 134); 16. 1–2 (Ariarathes deters Artaxias from murder: exc. 135); 16. 3 (on beauty: exc. 136); 25. 5–5a (Cato's remark on the corrupt youth of Rome: exc. 137); 31. 1–3 (Rhodes accepts a subsidy from Eumenes: exc. 138).

Antiochus IV's death was reported at Babylon between *c.* 20 Nov. and *c.* 18 Dec. 164 (see xxxi. 1. 8 n.); hence 9. 1–4 (from *de uirt. et uit.*) recording it stands correctly in *res Asiae* of Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3. (Part of this fragment is also in Suidas, s.v. *δαίμωνᾶν*.) The previous excerpt in this collection, 6. 1–5 (recording the encouragement by

C. Sulpicius of accusations against Eumenes), is probably the first from this book (see above, p. 33); 6. 6 (*de sent.*), commenting on this, goes naturally here. The sending of C. Sulpicius is mentioned in 1. 6 (from *de legat. gent.*); hence 1. 2–8 must be from *res Italiae* of the same year (Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3). 2. 1–14 and 3. 1–5 from the same excerpts also record embassies to Rome, apparently from the same winter. There could be a year's interval between 1. 2–8 and 2. 1–14; but this is unlikely, for in 3. 5 Ariarathes' envoys are said to have been well received because of Ti. Gracchus' report, and he had returned to Rome the previous olympiad year (xxx. 31. 19). Moreover, the return of these envoys to Cappadocia is recounted in 7. 1–4 (from *de legat. gent.*), and since in 8. 1–8 (from the *de legat. Rom.*) Cn. Octavius and Sp. Lucretius (whose dispatch from Rome was mentioned in 2. 9) arrive in Cappadocia, the order of all these interconnected excerpts within this olympiad year (Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3) seems assured; for the sequence of fragments in *de legat. gent.* determines the assignment of 4 and 5 to *res Asiae* (probably; though it is not always clear whether the affairs of Rhodes are included under Asia or Greece).

On the suppression of the Cammani, mentioned in 1. 1 (*de legat. gent.*), see the commentary ad loc. Though included in one excerpt with 1. 2–8, it cannot form part of the *res Italiae* of Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3, but must be from *res Asiae* of Ol. 153, 4 = 165/4; it will refer to a date early in the olympiad year, since Gracchus returned from the east in late autumn or early winter 165 (cf. xxx. 30. 7 n.). Steigemann, 46, also puts 1. 1 after xxx. 32. 12 in book xxx, but assumes illogically that its date is 164.

There is a slight uncertainty about the position of 9. 1–4 (*de uirt. et uit.*) relative to 7 and 8. Since the death of Antiochus IV (which it records) took place in autumn 164 (above, p. 34), 9. 1–4 could stand between 6. 1–6 and 7. 1–4, especially as the latter passage concerns events which were directly the result of Antiochus' death. But since P. may have dealt with Syrian affairs all together, this possibility does not warrant changing the established order.

Two excerpts which follow each other in *de legat. gent.*, 10. 1–10 (on the presence at Rome of Ptolemy VI's embassy and that of his younger brother, the future Euergetes II) and 11. 1–15. 12 (on Demetrius' escape to Syria), both mention the presence at Rome of Menyllus (10. 4, 12. 8), suggesting that both may refer to the same year. That this is in fact Ol. 154, 2 = 163/2 is clear from the reference to the murder of Cn. Octavius (11. 1), who had been sent out early in 163 (2. 9). Obsequens records the murder under the consuls of A.U.C. 592 = 162, which would equate with Ol. 154, 2 = 163/2. Eusebius, *Chron.* i. 253 Sch., makes Demetrius' first regnal year Ol. 154, 4 = 161/0, but since on arriving in Asia he quickly asserted his position,

this must be corrected to Ol. 154, 3 = 162/1 to fit the death of the boy Antiochus V in 162 (cf. Niese, iii. 246 n. 1). Schweighaeuser, probably rightly, assigned a sentence from Suidas (15. 13) to the account of Demetrius' escape. As to whether it is from *res Italiae* or (more probably) *res Asiae*, see discussion ad loc.; in the latter case it could stand either before or after 16. 1–3 (on uncertainties about that passage see below).

17. 1–18. 16 (*de legat. gent.*) mentions the *legati* Cn. Merula (17. 8) and T. Torquatus (18. 1), whose dispatch to the east was recorded in 10. 9; it will therefore form part of the *res Aegypti* (Büttner-Wobst less probably makes it *res Africae* because of the advance into Cyrenaica) of the same year, Ol. 154, 2 = 163/2. 19. 1–4, from the same excerpts, clearly follows directly after 17. 1–18. 16. Two short excerpts, 16. 1–2 and 16. 3, stand in *de sent.* between 6. 6 and 25. 5, which merely pins them down to a position between the *res Asiae* of Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3 and (see below) the *res Italiae* of Ol. 154, 4 = 161/0. 16. 1–2, on Ariarathes and Artaxias, corresponds to Diod. xxxi. 22, but the position of that passage in the excerpts *de uirt. et uit.* does not help to determine its date. Consequently the position of 16. 1–2 lies open as between Ol. 154, 2 = 163/2 (where Büttner-Wobst places it) and Ol. 154, 3 = 162/1; Ol. 154, 1 = 164/3 cannot be wholly excluded, but in that year Ariarathes was occupied with the Galatians and Syria (8. 1–8). 16. 3 is too brief and general for its context to be determined.

20. 1–6 (*de legat. gent.*) describes the arrival at Rome of Comanus and Ptolemy, whose dispatch is mentioned in 19. 2, and so must be from *res Italiae* of Ol. 154, 3 = 162/1. The next excerpt from *de legat. gent.*, 32. 1–3, describes the sending of a gold crown by Ariarathes to Rome; its arrival is described in xxxii. 1. 1–7, which can be assigned to Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59 by comparison with Diod. xxxi. 28. 32. 1–3 must therefore be from *res Asiae* of Ol. 154, 4 = 161/0; and since 33. 1–5 also belongs (like xxxii. 1. 1–7) to *de legat. gent.*, and concerns the sending of Cn. Octavius' murderer to Rome—his arrival is described in xxxii. 2. 1–3. 13—this passage too will stand in the same *res Asiae*.

A fragment dealing with Masinissa and Carthage (21. 1–8) stands between 20. 1–6 (Ol. 154, 3 = 162/1) and 32. 1–3 (Ol. 154, 4 = 161/0); it could be from the *res Africae* of either year. The order of the two passages, 22. 1–30. 4 (from *de uirt. et uit.*) on Aemilius Paullus and Scipio Aemilianus, and 31. 1–3 (from *de sent.*) on Eumenes' subsidy to Rhodes, is assured by a short extract from the former (25. 5) in *de sent.* (22. 1–30. 4 is also duplicated by Suidas at 22. 3–4, 25. 7, 26. 3–8, 26. 3, 26. 4, 26. 6 and 26. 10, and by Athen. vi. 274 at 25. 5, mentioning book xxxi); they belong to *res Italiae* and *res Graeciae* respectively, but their position in the excerpts does not determine

of which year. The digression on Scipio contained in 22. 1–30. 4 clearly arose on the death of Aemilius Paullus (cf. 22. 1–2). Livy, *ep.* 46 mentions this between Demetrius' return to Syria (162) and the draining of the Pomptine marshes by Cornelius Cethegus, cos. A.U.C. 594 = 160, thus leaving Ol. 154, 3 = 162/1 or Ol. 154, 4 = 161/0 open as the year of Aemilius' death. But internal evidence shows that the later year is the right one. The Greek detainees reached Rome in 167 (cf. xxxi. 24. 1 n.) and the friendship between P. and Aemilianus was established shortly afterwards. After devoting five years to gaining a reputation for moral strictness (xxxii. 25. 8 n.), Scipio set about gaining one for generosity. This involved three incidents, of which two linked with the death of Africanus' widow Aemilia (xxxii. 26. 1–27. 16) and the third, two years later (xxxii. 28. 1), with the death of Aemilius Paullus. Hence approximately seven years elapsed between the conversation of P. and Scipio and Aemilius' death; the conversation was therefore in 167 and Aemilius' death in 160, and 22. 1–30. 4 must be from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 154, 4 = 161/0. 31. 1–3 is from the same olympiad year, since the next passage in *de sent.* is from *res Italiae* of Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59 (xxxiii. 3. 7–9: see below). It describes a subsidy from Eumenes to Rhodes, and could stand in either *res Graeciae* or *res Asiae*.

#### 14. BOOK XXXII

For the argument that this book contained Ol. 155 = 160/56 see above, p. 30. These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–7 (various embassies to Rome: exc. 104); 2. 1–3. 13 (embassy from Demetrius: exc. 105); 3. 14–17 (embassy from Achaëa: exc. 105 cont.); 7. 1–5 (embassy about Delos: exc. 106); 9. 1–5 (C. Fannius sent to Dalmatia: exc. 107); 10. 1–8 (various envoys at Rome: exc. 108); 14. 1–2 (envoys from Epirus: exc. 108 cont.); 16. 1–5 (Athenaeus sent to Rome to complain about Prusias: exc. 109); *de legat. Rom.*: 13. 1–9 (Roman decision to make war on Dalmatia: exc. 30); *de uirt. et uit.*: 5. 1–5 (Charops: exc. 105); 5. 6–6. 9 (the same: exc. 106); 8. 1–7 (Eumenes' character: exc. 107); 12 (Attalus restores Ariarathes: exc. 108); 15. 1–14 (Prusias' campaign against Attalus: exc. 109); *de sent.*: 3. 7–9 (overlap with fragment from *de legat. gent.*: exc. 139); 4. 1–2 (Aetolia after Lyciscus' death: exc. 140); 4. 3 (the same: exc. 141); 11. 1–7 (Orophernes, and Oropus: exc. 142); 11. 8–9 (remark on Orophernes: exc. 143).

It has already been shown (above, p. 36) that 1. 1–7, mentioning the arrival of Ariarathes' envoys at Rome, and 2. 1–3. 13 are from *res Italiae* of Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59. Both are from *de legat. gent.* but there is an overlap with *de sent.* at 3. 7–9.

10. 1–8 (from *de legat. gent.*) recounts Ariarathes' arrival in Rome in summer 158; the date follows from the reference to the consuls of

A.U.C. 597 = 157 in 10. 2, and the extract is clearly part of the *res Italiae* of Ol. 155, 3 = 158/7. 11. 3 shows that P. passed straight from Ariarathes' departure from Italy to the affairs of Cappadocia; hence 11. 1–7 and 11. 8–9, both from *de sent.*, must be from *res Asiae* of the same olympiad year. 11. 10, from Athen. x. 440, is from the same context, but should probably precede 11. 1, since it comes from the account of Ariarathes' restoration. 11. 4 indicates that in this book, exceptionally, *res Graeciae* followed the section of *res Asiae* dealing with Ariarathes; but no fragments survive (unless xxxiii. 2 belongs here: see below, p. 40).

10. 1–8 is preceded in the excerpts *de legat. gent.* by 9. 1–5, which records the arrival of Issan (?) envoys at Rome and the dispatch to Dalmatia of C. Fannius. Before it in this collection comes 7. 1–5 on the arrival of Athenian and Achaean envoys at Rome to discuss Delos, and before that 3. 14–17, describing an Achaean embassy about the detainees. It seems likely that the latter, like 2. 1–3. 13, is from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59, and that 7. 1–5, with its new Achaean embassy, is from Ol. 155, 2 = 159/8, and from the *res Italiae*. 9. 1–5 is also from *res Italiae*, but does it belong to the same year as 7. 1–5 (159/8) or 10. 1–8 (158/7)? The answer is in 13. 1–9, from *de legat. Rom.*, which describes Fannius' return and the decision to make war on Dalmatia. It was now, P. observes (13. 7), ἔτος . . . δωδέκατον since the war against Perseus and the campaigns in Macedonia. Since P. described Pydna and the surrender of Perseus under Ol. 152, 4 = 169/8 (in book xxix), the twelfth year after would be Ol. 155, 4 = 157/6; hence 13. 1–9 will be from the *res Italiae* of that year, and 9. 1–5, recording C. Fannius' departure for Dalmatia, must fall in Ol. 155, 3 = 158/7, and immediately precede 10. 1–8.

Two excerpts, 4. 1–2 and 4. 3, stand (in *de sent.*) between 3. 7–9 (*res Italiae* of Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59) and 11. 1–7 (*res Asiae* of Ol. 155, 3 = 158/7); they concern Lyciscus of Aetolia and belong to the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59 or Ol. 155, 2 = 159/8 (but not Ol. 155, 3 = 158/7, since in that year P. went directly from *res Italiae* to *res Asiae* (11. 3)). 5. 1–6. 9 consists of two passages which follow xxxi. 30. 4 in *de uirt. et uit.*, and record the death of Charops of Epirus; the position of this section immediately after 4. 3 is confirmed by the reference to Lyciscus in 5. 1. It is clear from 6. 5 that Charops arrived in Rome before the death of Aemilius Paullus in 160 (see above, p. 37); hence, if his death at Brundisium (5. 4) occurred on his way home after his interview with the Senate (6. 3–9), this must have followed the entry into office of the consuls for A.U.C. 595 = 159, and his death the same year, i.e., in Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59. This confirms the placing of 4. 1–2, 4. 3, and 5. 1–6. 9 in the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 155, 1 = 160/59 (as in Büttner-Wobst).

8. 1–7, which follows 5. 1–6. 9 in *de uirt. et uit.* (but is also largely in Suidas), is an obituary on Eumenes II; it immediately precedes (in that collection) 12, a statement that the first example of Attalus' principles was his restoration of Ariarathes, which occurred in Ol. 155, 3 = 158/7 (see above, pp. 37–8, discussing 11. 1–10), and is therefore not likely to have been much before. Diod. xxxi. 32 a makes Eumenes survive until after Ariarathes' expulsion; but Niese iii. 250 n. 5 plausibly emends 'Eumenes' to 'Attalus', and the easiest solution is that Eumenes died in 158, and that 8. 1–7 belongs to the *res Asiae* of Ol. 155, 2 = 159/8. 12 seems to be part of the account of Ariarathes' restoration and should therefore stand (with 11. 10) before 11. 1–7.

14. 1–2 follows 10. 8 in *de legat. gent.* and mentions the dispatch of envoys to Illyria 'with C. Marcius'. C. Marcius (Figulus) was consul A.U.C. 598 = 156, when he commanded the Roman forces in Dalmatia (Livy, *ep.* 47; App. *Ill.* 11. 1). 14. 1–2 could stand after 10. 1–8 in Ol. 155, 3 = 158/7; but it is unlikely that C. Marcius was sent out as a *legatus* in 157, since C. Fannius headed an Illyrian mission that year (9. 3, 13. 1). More probably then 14. 1–2 is from *res Italiae* of Ol. 155, 4 = 157/6, following 13. 1–9, since the mention of C. Marcius suggests that war had already been decided on. Either the envoys accompanied Marcius, who went out in command, or there has been some compression of the wording at the end of the extract.

War between Prusias and Attalus is dealt with in 15. 1–14, from the excerpts *de uirt. et uit.* (where it precedes xxxiii. 4. 1–4)—with several passages from Suidas—and in 16. 1–5, which follows 14. 2 and precedes xxxiii. 1. 1–8 in *de legat. gent.*; it is also dealt with in xxxiii. 1. 1–2, 7. 1–4, 12. 1–13, and 13. 1–10. The traditional order for these fragments has to be corrected by comparison with Appian, *Mithr.* 3, a narrative deriving ultimately from P. (cf. Habicht, *Hermes*, 1956, 101–10). xxxiii. 1. 1–8 (from *de legat. gent.*) records the arrival of Athenaeus and P. Lentulus in Rome; a marginal note λογ. λγ' indicates that this is a new book in this collection, κατὰ χειμῶνα (xxxiii. 1. 1) suggests the usual winter hearing of embassies, and the year is Ol. 156, 1 = 156/5, since A. Postumius Albinus is praetor (xxxiii. 1. 5: this was in A.U.C. 599 = 155). This confirms the position of the preceding passage in *de legat. gent.*, 16. 1–5, in the *res Asiae* of Ol. 155, 4 = 157/6. 15. 1–14 (from *de uirt. et uit.*) refers to Prusias' siege of Pergamum; and such a siege also occurs in xxxiii. 7. 1–4. Since it is clear from Appian that Prusias only besieged Pergamum once (cf. App. *Mithr.* 3, associating with the siege the ravaging of the Nicephorium (cf. 15. 3)), the excerpt 15. 1–14 should go in book xxxiii, following the sending of the three envoys (xxxiii. 1. 2); it forms part of *res Asiae* of Ol. 156, 1 = 156/5, standing after xxxiii. 3. 2.

## 15. BOOK XXXIII

Since 1. 1 is attributed in the margin of the manuscript to book xxxiii (see above, pp. 30 and 39), and it is known that book xxxiv was devoted to geography, it is virtually certain that xxxiii, like xxx, xxxi, and xxxii contained the events of one olympiad, Ol. 156 = 156/2. These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 1. 1–8 (embassy sent to Prusias and Attalus: arrival of embassy from Achaëa: exc. 110); 3. 1–2 (return of Achaean envoys: exc. 111); 8. 1–3 (Massiliote envoys report Ligurian attacks: exc. 112); 11. 1–7 (envoys from the Ptolemies; help sent to the younger: exc. 113); 14. 1 (Achaean envoys fail: exc. 114); 15. 1–2 (Heracleides brings Laodice and Alexander to Rome: exc. 115); 15. 3–4 (Astymedes reports on the Creto-Rhodian war: exc. 115 cont.); 16. 1–8 (Achaëans remain neutral in that war: exc. 116); 18. 1–14 (Attalus, Demetrius, and Alexander Balas at Rome: exc. 117); *de legat. Rom.*: 7. 1–4 (envoys report to Rome from Asia: new envoys sent to check on the war between Attalus and Prusias: exc. 31); 9. 1–10. 14 (Ligurians defeated: exc. 32); 12. 1–9 (Roman envoys to Prusias and Attalus: exc. 33); 13. 1–10 (war between Prusias and Attalus ended: exc. 33 cont.); *de uirt. et uit.*: 4. 1–4 (Aristocrates' failure as general: exc. 110); 5. 2–4 (Archias' suicide: exc. 111); 6. 1–9 (Priene refuses to give Orophernes' money to Ariarathes: exc. 112); *de sent.*: 17. 1–5 (Rhodian irrational behaviour: exc. 144); 20 (the behaviour of the masses: exc. 145); 21 (possible criticism of P.'s elaborate refutation of an obvious lie: exc. 146).

1. 1–8 belongs to the *res Italiae* of Ol. 156, 1 = 156/5 (see above, p. 39), and comes from *de legat. gent.* As ch. 2 Büttner-Wobst prints Aul. Gell. vi. 14. 8–10 on the Athenian philosophers' embassy to Rome, a passage which quotes P. Cicero (*Acad.* ii. 137) says they were heard by Postumius Albinus in the consulship of P. Scipio and M. Marcellus (155: see above, p. 30), so that chronologically the passage belongs here; but since P. recounted the trouble between Athens and Oropus in one piece in the *res Graeciae* of Ol. 155, 3 = 158/7 (xxxii. 11. 6), and the philosophers' visit to Rome was part of this, perhaps this passage should stand between xxxii. 11. 9 and xxxii. 13. 3. 1–2 (*de legat. gent.*) follows 1. 1–8 and describes the return of the Achaean envoys; it perhaps belongs more properly to *res Graeciae* than to *res Italiae* (where Büttner-Wobst assigns it). This does not affect the order of the fragments.

The war between Prusias and Attalus lasted two years: it broke out in 156 (xxxii. 16. 1–5), Roman *legati* were sent in winter 156/5 to restrain Prusias (1. 1–2), and after being shut up in Pergamum by Prusias they reported back in 155 (7. 1–3); a new embassy (7. 3–4) arrived in the late winter of 155/4 (12. 1–2), and reported Prusias'



intransigence at Rome (12. 8), and the war eventually ended in 154 (13. 5–10). The relevant excerpts are from *de legat. Rom.* and apparently are from *res Italiae* (7. 1–4) and *res Asiae* (12. 1–9 followed by 13. 1–10) of Ol. 156, 2 = 155/4; 3. 1–2 is followed by xxxii. 15. 1–14, describing Prusias' outrageous conduct (above, p. 39), which stands in the *res Asiae* of Ol. 156. 1 = 156/5.

9. 1–10. 14, which stands between 7. 1–4 and 12. 1–9 in *de legat. Rom.*, describes a Massiliote embassy, a Roman embassy which met with rough treatment from the Ligurians, and the dispatch of Q. Opimius, cos. A.U.C. 600 = 154. This must be from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 156, 2 = 155/4 (P. has no separate section on Gaul), and so confirms the date of the excerpts relating to Prusias and Attalus. 8. 1–3 (from *de legat. gent.*) refers to the same Massiliote embassy, and therefore comes before 9. 1–10. 14; it is followed in the same excerpts by 11. 1–7, mentioning an embassy from the Ptolemies, and clearly part of the *res Italiae* of Ol. 156, 2 = 155/4, since it mentions the sending of Opimius to Liguria. This confirms Büttner-Wobst's arrangement of the fragments of *res Italiae* for this olympiad year.

4. 1–4 (*de uirt. et uit.*), on Aristocrates' failure, is related to the Rhodian war with Crete (cf. Diod. xxxi. 37), and Steigemann, 50–1, assigned it to Ol. 155, 4 = 157/6 (i.e. book xxxii); but as the preceding excerpt in that collection, xxxii. 15. 1–14, should stand in book xxxiii (see above, p. 39), 4. 1–4 must also stay in that book. Since P. normally deals with Rhodes at a point between *res Graeciae* and *res Asiae* (so that it sometimes seems to be reckoned as one and sometimes as the other), the fact that xxxii. 15. 1–14 forms part of the *res Asiae* of Ol. 156, 1 = 156/5 suggests that 4. 1–4 will stand in one of the three subsequent years of the olympiad. In the excerpts *de uirt. et uit.* 4. 1–4 is followed in succession by 5. 2–4 (on Archias' suicide after failing to betray Cyprus to Demetrius) and 6. 1–9 (on the refusal by Priene to surrender Orophernes' money to Ariarathes). 6. 1–9 is followed in the manuscript by a sentence which in fact belongs to book xxxiv (xxxiv. 6. 15), and is therefore likely to be the last excerpt from xxxiii in this collection. Thus, on the evidence of the manuscript, 5. 2–4 and 6. 1–9 might be from any of the last three years of Ol. 156. However, some help is available from Diodorus, from whom the excerpts *de sent.* give a section on the Celtiberian War (Diod. xxxi. 39–40) standing between two passages which correspond to 4. 1–4 (Diod. xxxi. 37) and 17. 1–5 (Diod. xxxi. 43)— P. being Diodorus' source at this point. If two passages on Rhodes were separated in P. by one from *res Hispaniae*, they were probably in separate olympiad years. But the evidence concerning the events at the outset of the Celtiberian War (see below, pp. 43–44) shows that the passage Diod. xxxi. 39–40 (corresponding to xxxv. 1) cannot be earlier than Ol. 156, 3 = 154/3. 17. 1–5 will be from the Rhodian

events of the same year, and consequently 4. 1–4 must be from the Rhodian events of Ol. 156, 2 = 155/4.

It would not necessarily follow that 5. 2–4 (from *de uirt. et uit.*, supplemented by Suidas at 5. 1 and 5. 2a) on Archias' treachery, and 6. 1–9 on Orophernes and Priene were also from that year. But it is on the whole unlikely that Ariarathes waited until 153 or 152 to ask for the money, and this is in favour of putting 6. 1–9 (and so 5. 1–4 as well) in Ol. 156, 2 = 155/4. But in what order they stood relative to the chapters on the war between Attalus and Prusias is in doubt (and consequently whether 12. 1–13. 10 should stand before 5. 1–4, after 6. 1–9, or between the two passages).<sup>1</sup>

11. 1–7 (from the *res Italiae* of Ol. 156, 2 = 155/4; see above, p. 41) is followed in *de legat. gent.* by the following excerpts: 14 (Achaean embassy to Rome concerning the detainees); 15. 1–2 (arrival in Rome, while it is still summer, of Heracleides, bringing Laodice and Alexander Balas); 15. 3–4 (arrival of Astymedes of Rhodes at Rome); 16. 1–8 (Cretan and Rhodian attempt to get Achaean support); 18. 1–14 (senatorial audience for various embassies including Heracleides). Of these, 16. 1–8 is from *res Graeciae* and the rest from *res Italiae*; the reference to Heracleides shows that 16. 1–8 is from the year subsequent to 15. 1–2 and 15. 3–4, and clearly 16. 1–8 must be from the *res Graeciae* of the same year as the two preceding passages. Since 11. 1–7, dealing with events after the dispatch of Q. Opimius to Gaul, probably refers to the second part of summer, 154 (see below, xxxiii. 11. 1–7 n.), the likelihood is that 14, 15. 1–2, and 15. 3–4 are all from the *res Italiae* of the next year, Ol. 156, 3 = 154/3. 16. 1–8 will be from *res Graeciae* of that year, and 18. 1–14 from *res Italiae* of Ol. 156, 4 = 153/2. For the argument that xxxv. 1. 1–6, on the outbreak of the Celtiberian War, should stand between 15. 4 and 16. 1 see below, p. 43.

17. 1–5 on Rhodian despondency follows xxxii. 11. 9 in *de sent.*, and the evidence of Diod. xxxi. 43 (see above, p. 41) shows that it comes after 4. 1–4. Since it is unlikely to be more than a year after the Senate sent 'Quintus' to bring the war to an end (15. 4, dated to Ol. 156, 3 = 154/3; above), it probably belongs to the same olympiad year, and can stand after 16. 1–8, though the relationship of the two passages is uncertain. Four passages from Suidas quote extracts from 17. 1–5. 19, from Athen. x. 440, on Demetrius' addiction to drink, is assigned to this book; it could belong to Ol. 156, 4 = 153/2, when he was under attack, but could equally well be from the previous year.

20 and 21 follow 17. 5 in *de sent.*, but since the next passage is

[42]

---

<sup>1</sup> The argument of Volkmann (*RE*, 'Ptolemaios (24)', col. 1714) that Archias' attempt is to be dated to 151/0 because of a large issue of gold in that year must be rejected, since 5. 1–4 must be from book xxxiii (Ol. 156).

xxxvi. 1. 1–7, they are not necessarily from book xxxiii. The former, on the behaviour of the masses, could come almost anywhere; the latter, polemical in tone, might well belong to book xxxiv, where P. attacks Pytheas, Eratosthenes, and Dicaearchus (cf. Schulze, *Excerpta*, 18 f.); xxxiv. 6. 15 is also from the Constantinian excerpts, evidence that that book was available to the excerptors.

#### 16. BOOK XXXIV

Four geographical fragments are attributed to book xxxiv, viz. 8. 1–2 (Athen. vii. 302), 8. 4–10 (Athen. viii. 330), 10. 1–4 (Athen. viii. 332), and 11. 4 (Steph. Byz. s.v. *Αἰθιάλη*). 6. 15 (from *de uirt. et uit.*: exc. 113) follows xxxiii. 6. 9 in that collection, and clearly belongs to polemic against Eratosthenes. Schweighaeuser's conclusion (viii. 1. 105–7) that book xxxiv contained the geographical excursus promised in iii. 37. 11 and 57. 5 has been generally accepted, but the present arrangement of the fragments, essentially his, is rather arbitrary. Revision must depend, however, on an analysis of the purpose and likely content of the book and not on the chronological and historical considerations, and the economy of the collections of excerpts, which determine the order elsewhere. The problems of the organization of book xxxiv are therefore deferred to pp. 563 ff.

#### 17. BOOK XXXV

2. 1–4. 14 follows xxxiii. 18. 14 in the *de legat. gent.* and since it refers to the consuls of A.U.C. 603 = 151 as having just entered upon their office (3. 7), it must be from the first year of Ol. 157, i.e. 152/1. The next passage in this collection, xxxvi. 3. 1–6. 6, has a marginal note which varies in different manuscripts: X has λζ 'sed ζ dubia', U has λγ, VOW have λα, and R has λζ. Schweighaeuser (viii. 1. 132–3) had conjectured λζ as the original reading and this must be right; the marginal note must indicate a new book. This passage refers to the landing of the consuls in Africa (6. 1), and these were those of A.U.C. 605 = 149 (cf. Livy, *ep.* 49). Hence this passage is from Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49, and book xxxv will contain Ol. 157, 1 = 152/1 and Ol. 157, 2 = 151/0.

Only one extract is from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 2. 1–4. 14 (envoys from Spain: Scipio offers to accompany the consuls: exc. 118). As we saw, it forms part of *res Italiae* of Ol. 157, 1 = 152/1, a date confirmed by the references to M. Marcellus, the consul of 152, at 2. 1, 3. 1, and 4. 3. 1. 1–6 (from Suidas) is a general characterization of the Celtiberian War, which corresponds to Diod. xxxi. 39–40 (two excerpts from the *de sent.* of which the second closely echoes P.) ; see above, p. 41. The position of Diod. xxxi. 39–40 does not permit 1. 1–6 to be later than Ol. 156, 3 = 154/3;

it must however have come immediately after the cancellation of the treaty, and this (cf. App. *Hisp.* 44–45) occurred just before the dispatch to Spain of Q. Fulvius Nobilior, cos. A.U.C. 601 = 153, who entered office on 1 Jan. (On the relationship of Appian to P. see 1. 1–6 n.) Hence 1. 1–6 must stand between xxxiii. 15. 4 and xxxiii. 16. 1, in the *res Hispaniae* of Ol. 156, 3 = 154/3.

5. 1 and 5. 2 (from Suidas) concern Scipio's deeds in Spain; they belong to Lucullus' campaign of 151 (cf. App. *Hisp.* 53; Livy, *ep.* 48) and so to *res Hispaniae* of Ol. 157, 1 = 152/1. Fg. 6 (from Suidas) may refer to Scipio's combat with a barbarian (Müller, *Jahrb.* 1870, 245 f.), and if so will follow 5. 2 under the same year. On whether fg. 18 (from Suidas) goes here see xxxv. 5. 2 n. 6. 1–4 is a passage from Plut. *Cat. mai.* 9, which quotes P. and concerns the release of the Achaean detainees, at a time when Scipio was in Rome and in the seventeenth year of their detention (Paus. vii. 10. 12). This points to 150, and the placing of the passage under *res Italiae* of Ol. 157, 2 = 151/0; but Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49 (which would take the passage into book xxxvi) cannot be wholly excluded (see ad loc.).

## 18. BOOK XXXVI

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. gent.*: 3. 1–6. 6 (Punic *deditio* and surrender of hostages and arms: exc. 119); *de uirt. et uit.*: 15. 1–7 (Prusias' character: exc. 114); 16. 1–10 (Masinissa's character: exc. 115); *de sent.*: 1. 1–7 (on speeches: exc. 147); 2. 1–4 (Romans seek a pretext before making war: exc. 148); 9. 1–10. 7 (Greek views on the Third Punic War: the pseudoPhilip: exc. 149); 11. 1–4 (P. summoned to Lilybaeum: exc. 150); 12. 1–5 (P. speaks of himself in the third person: exc. 151); 13. 1–2 (on the fate of Callicrates' and Lycortas' statues: exc. 152); 13. 3 (on innovation: exc. 153); 14. 1–5 (embassy sent to Attalus: exc. 154); 17. 1–16 (state of Greece and Macedonia: exc. 155).

3. 1–6. 6 is from *res Africae* of Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49 (above, p. 43). According to xxxviii. 1. 1, that book contained the downfall of Greece, which must have taken in Mummius' capture of Corinth; he was cos. A.U.C. 608 = 146, and book xxxviii therefore contained Ol. 158, 2 = 147/6. Since xxxv contained Ol. 157, 1 and 2 = 152/1 and 151/0, this leaves the three years Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49, Ol. 157, 4 = 149/8, and Ol. 158, 1 = 148/7 to be divided between two books; and since P. nowhere overruns an olympiad within a single book, xxxvi must contain Ol. 157, 3 and 4, and xxxvii Ol. 158, 1.

1. 1–7 and 2. 1–4 follow each other in *de sent.* and deal with speeches in history and the Roman emphasis on a just cause before declaring war. They clearly form part of P.'s introduction to the Third Punic War, and since 2. 1–4 has a corresponding passage in Diod. xxxii. 5, an excerpt from *de uirt. et uit.*, in which collection it is preceded by

a long discussion of Roman imperial policy (Diod. xxxii. 4; cf. 2), it is possible that P. had a fuller discussion than the surviving fragments indicate; but Diod. xxxii. 2 and 4 are not to be taken to represent P.'s own views (cf. Walbank, *Entretiens sur Polybe*, 18–20). Clearly then 1. 1–7 and 2. 1–4 precede 3. 1–6. 6, probably under *res Italiae* of Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49. Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* 1871, 275, suggests that fg. 99 on Roman policy (from Suidas) belongs here; if so, it will follow 2. 1–4.

6. 7, 7. 1–5, and 8. 1–8 are constructed from passages in Suidas, the position of which has been determined by comparison with Appian (and occasionally Diodorus). For 6. 7 cf. App. *Lib.* 80 and Diod. xxxii. 6. 2; Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* 1871, 276, would place fg. 192 after 6. 7, but this is doubtful. For 7. 1–2 cf. App. *Lib.* 91 (on the attitude at Carthage before the Roman decision was known). For 7. 3–5 cf. App. *Lib.* 91 (end) and 92. For 8. 1 (on Hamilcar- or HimilcoPhameas) cf. App. *Lib.* 100; his avoidance of a conflict with Scipio (8. 3) is mentioned at the end of the same chapter in Appian, and since the jealousy of Scipio is mentioned in App. *Lib.* 101, 8. 2 should probably follow and not precede 8. 3. 8. 4–5 corresponds to App. *Lib.* 103, but is so compressed as to misrepresent Scipio's reaction. 8. 6 (on reporting Scipio's remarks) was placed here by Schweighaeuser; this, because earlier, is perhaps more likely than, for example, after the Homeric quotation in xxxviii. 22. Fg. 67 may come in here. Cato's famous Homeric line about Scipio (8. 7) is in Diod. xxxii. 9 a 2; both there and in Livy, *ep.* 49, it is linked with Scipio's election to the consulship of A.U.C. 607 = 147, and Walton, in the Loeb edition of Diodorus, puts this fragment under 148 (its position in the *de sent.* allows this). However, it must go in 149, since Cato died in A.U.C. 605 = 149 (Vell. Pat. i. 12. 7; Plut. *Cat. mai.* 27. 5); Livy records his death before Galba's trial in that year (*ep.* 49). The quotation was probably mentioned parenthetically in *res Africae*. 8. 8 (which Büttner-Wobst repeats as fg. 232) mentions a *ὁμολογία* of Scipio, probably that made with Phameas (cf. Diod. xxxii. 17. 1; App. *Lib.* 108–9) shortly before Piso replaced Manilius as consul (for A.U.C. 606 = 148) and Scipio returned to Rome to stand for the consulship of 147. It therefore belongs to Ol. 157, 4 = 149/8, and follows 16. 12. Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* 1871, 276 would place fg. 47, on Scipio's deeds, between 16. 12 and 8. 8; but it is uncertain whether Aemilianus or Africanus is referred to (cf. xxxi. 30. 3 n.).

Appian, *Lib.*, contains a continuous narrative from the Punic declaration of war (*Lib.* 93) to Masinissa's death in 148 (*Lib.* 105), and gives no indication at what point P. halted his *res Africae* of Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49. Hence some of the incidents referred to in the above fragments may have been recorded under Ol. 157, 4 = 149/8.

In the excerpts *de sent.* 2. 1–4 is followed by 9. 1–10. 7, discussing

Greek views about Roman policy towards Carthage and about the pseudo-Philip; this passage precedes 11. 1–4 in this collection, a passage which mentions a letter from Manilius the consul of 149 summoning P. to Sicily, and P.'s return on reaching Corcyra, events which must form part of *res Graeciae* of Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49. 9. 1– 10. 7 must therefore be from the same *res Graeciae*. 12. 1–5 (also from *de sent.*) follows naturally after 11. 1–4. 14. 1–5 (*de sent.*) describes the sending of an embassy to Attalus II to restrain him from war against Prusias II. Appian (*Mithr.* 6) records that Attalus' envoys were heard and the Roman envoys dispatched under the chairmanship of a *praetor urbanus*, which would fit 149, when the two consuls were in Africa; and this date is confirmed by the fact that Cato was still alive. 14. 1–5 must be from the *res Asiae* of Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49 (its order in *de sent.* excludes the possibility of its being *res Italiae*); and 13. 1–2, on what happened to Lycortas' and Callicrates' statues, and 13. 3, on innovation, which stand between 12. 1–5 and 14. 1–5 in the excerpts *de sent.*, must belong to the same olympiad year. 13. 1–2 will be from *res Graeciae*; 13. 3 is probably from *res Graeciae*, but it could be from *res Asiae* (perhaps referring to the rising against Prusias). 15. 1–7, a sketch of Prusias from *de uirt. et uit.*, was probably inserted in connection with his death in 149 (Livy, *Ox. ep.*, 50; Zon. ix. 28. 1); it will be from *res Asiae* of Ol. 157, 3 = 150/49, and 16. 1–10 on Masinissa, which follows in *de uirt. et uit.*, will be from *res Africae* of Ol. 157, 4 = 149/8 (since *res Africae* precede *res Asiae* in any one olympiad year). 16. 1–8 is also in Suidas. 16. 11–12, from Plut. *Mor.* 791 F–792 A, is from the same context.

In *de sent.* 14. 1–5 is followed by 17. 1–16 on the state of Greece and Macedonia; it mentions a Roman defeat at the hands of pseudoPhilip (17. 14), which is probably that of P. Iuventius Thalna, who perished in 148 (Livy, *Ox. ep.*, 50). This passage is probably introduced as a digression in *res Macedoniae* of Ol. 157, 4 = 149/8 (cf. Steigemann, 52–53, against Nissen, *Rh. Mus.* 1871, 276, who includes it under *res Graeciae*).

## 19. BOOK XXXVII

This book contained the events of Ol. 158, 1 = 148/7 (see above, p. 44); but no fragments survive from the Constantinian excerpts and almost certainly none from Suidas. xxxvii (like xix and xxvi: see pp. 1 and 22 above) was probably lost by the tenth century.

Büttner-Wobst prints one possible fragment on a Museum in Macedonia, from Steph. Byz. (1); but the number of the book could be wrong. xxxviii. 19 (from Plut. *Mor.* 200 A) refers to fighting which followed Scipio's construction of a mole across the harbour mouth to furnish a footing on the *χῶμα*, which lay at the south–east extremity of the city on the sea side. This was in autumn, 147

(cf. App. *Lib.* 121–5, 126 *χειμῶνος . . . ἀρχομένου*) and could have been described by P. in book xxxvii (Zon. ix. 29–30; Kahrstedt, iii. 658 n. 3); but since we do not know where P. broke off his account of the action of 147, and since fgs. 145 (on the fighting on the *χῶμα*) and 217 (on the bringing up of *σαμβύκαι*) seem both to belong to this context, it is perhaps safer to leave xxxviii. 19 and these two fragments in book xxxviii (though this argument involves some risk of circularity in its assumption that there were probably no excerpts from xxxvii in Suidas.)

## 20. BOOK XXXVIII

It is clear from xxxix. 8. 8 and the subscription to it in the manuscript of *de sent.* (M) that book xl was devoted to a résumé and some kind of contents list (see below, pp. 743–4); and 1. 1 assigns 'the downfall of the Greeks', which must include the events of Ol. 158, 2 = 147/6, to book xxxviii. It follows that the last three years of Ol. 158 were covered in the two books, xxxviii and xxxix, and though the division is not indicated, the amount of material involved would suggest that Ol. 158, 2 = 147/6 occupied xxxviii and the aftermath of the Achaean War xxxix. Whether the *Historiēs* included any other events of Ol. 158, 4 = 145/4, and how long P. remained in Rome (xxxix. 8. 1), are both unknown; nor is it clear where P. broke off Ol. 158, 2 = 147/6. Perhaps Mummius' capture of Corinth was in book xxxviii, and the destruction of the city (after the arrival of the ten *legati*) in xxxix; see below, p. 49.

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de legat. Rom.*: 9. 1–8 (Sex. Iulius Caesar sent to Achaëa: exc. 34); 10. 1–13. 9 (events in Greece after his arrival: exc. 35); *de uirt. et uit.*: 7. 1–8. 15 (the Punic general Hasdrubal: exc. 116); 14. 1–2 (Pytheas, son of Cleomnastus: exc. 117); 15. 1–16. 10 (affairs under Diaeus: exc. 118); 17. 1–18. 12 (events at Corinth: exc. 119); *de sent.*: 1. 1–4. 9 (the ruin of Greece and earlier disasters : exc. 156); 5. 1–6. 7 (P.'s method of composition: exc. 157); 20. 1–11 (meeting with Hasdrubal: exc. 158); 21. 1–3 (Scipio's fears for Rome: exc. 159); 16. 11 (a surprise for someone unnamed: exc. 160); 16. 12 (someone unnamed compared with a man who dives before learning how to swim: exc. 161); 18. 5 (= *de uirt. et uit.* exc. 119: exc. 162); 18. 12 (the same: exc. 163).

1. 1–4. 9 (*de sent.*) appears to form part of an introductory section on the nature of the Achaean War (though book xxxviii does not open an olympiad), and it is followed in that collection by 5. 1–6. 7, a digression on P.'s method of composition, which involves breaking off his account of events in one area to pass to those of another (5. 2). This passage, which is in fact a description of P.'s normal practice (cf. 6. 3), of which the Third Punic War is merely an example (5. 2 *λόγου χάριν*), misled Büttner-Wobst into assuming that in this

book there were two separate sections on Carthage (7. 1–8. 15 and 19 a–22. 3) divided by a section on Achaëa (9. 1–18. 12). (Steigemann, 54, equally without good reason, took 5. 2 to be evidence that P. treated the Achaean events in book xxxviii in two separated sections.) In fact, as the placing of the excerpts clearly indicates, the *res Africae* of this book were dealt with in one block down to the sack of Carthage, which was in 146 (Livy, *Ox. ep.*, 51), before the *res Graeciae*.

In *de sent.* 5. 1–6. 7 is followed by two passages relating to events towards the end of the assault on Carthage; the first (20. 1–11 in Büttner-Wobst) describes Hasdrubal's surrender, the second (21. 1–3), which follows a long undecipherable passage, a remark of foreboding by Scipio. (The division between these two fragments is not clear and Boissevain and Büttner-Wobst differ slightly in their indication of this.) 7. 1–8. 15 (*de uirt. et uit.*) on Hasdrubal (a passage from which Suidas quotes at 7. 1–5, 8. 7, and 8. 10) must come before the two passages just mentioned; and they in turn will be followed by 22. 1–3 (= *App. Lib.* 132). 19 a (from *Amm. Marc.* xxiv. 2. 14–17) probably concerns an incident in the final stages of the storming of Carthage, and goes between 8. 15 and 20. 1 (see *ad loc.*). For the likelihood that 19 (= *Plut. Mor.* 200 A), together with fgs. 145 and 217 (?), belongs to this book (where they will stand before 7. 1 in the order fg. 217 (?), 19, fg. 145) see above, pp. 46–47. Finally, xxxvi. 8. 6 could equally well come in here after 22. 1–3. This order is supported by that of the parallel excerpts from *de sent.* in *Diod.* xxxii. 22–24, which treat successively Hasdrubal's conversation with Gulussa (cf. 7. 1–8. 15), his suppliant role before Scipio (cf. 20), and Scipio's reaction to the fall of Carthage (cf. 21).

The Achaean events which follow are described more fully in *Paus.* vii. 14 ff., which serves as a check on the order. 9. 1–8 (*de legat. Rom.*) describes the return to Rome of L. Aurelius Orestes, sent as *legatus* in 147 (cf. *Livy, Ox. ep.*, 51), and the dispatch of Sex. Julius Caesar to Achaëa (the passage is specifically attributed to book xxxviii). 10. 1–13. 9, from the same collection, describes the reception of Caesar, and subsequent events through winter 147/6 into 146; this is confirmed by *Paus.* vii. 14. 3–4, recording the sending of Thearidas to Rome (cf. 10. 11), and Critolaus' election as general for 147/6 in autumn 147. 14. 1–2 (which follows 8. 15 in the excerpts *de uirt. et uit.*) is about the Pytheas whom *Paus.* vii. 14. 6 mentions as Boeotarch. Niese (iii. 346 n. 2) assumes a lapse of time between 11 and 12, and suggests inserting 14. 1–2 here; but Pausanias mentions Pytheas after the meeting at Corinth (*Paus.* vii. 14. 5), described by P. in 12–13, and 14 should probably stay where it is. 14. 3 (= *Oros.* v. 3. 3) mentions the one battle, with Critolaus in command; it stands correctly here (cf. *Paus.* vii. 15. 3–4). 15. 1–16. 10, which



follows 14. 2 in *de uirt. et uit.*, gives a hostile account of Diaeus, who succeeded Critolaus as general for the remainder of 147/6.

16. 11 and 16. 12 follow 20. 1–21. 3 in *de sent.*, where (Büttner-Wobst reports) 16. 12 is followed *continuo* by the sentence beginning *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ σκάμματος*, which is 18. 5 in the excerpt 17. 1–18. 12 included in *de uirt. et uit.*, the difference being that there *λό προειρημένος* stands where exc. 162 in *de sent.* has *ὁ Δίαιος ὁ στρατηγὸς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν*. As a result, since Mai it has been assumed that 16. 12 (and 16. 11) refer to Diaeus. In fact 16. 12 and 18. 5 are from quite different contexts, and the fact that M runs them together merely indicates that the copyist *may* have thought both concerned Diaeus. Against the assumption that they did is

(a) the absence of any occasion between the defeats in central Greece and the events described in 17. 1–18. 12 when Diaeus could have been surprised by the enemy and have considered making for home;

(b) the unlikelihood of P.'s having levelled these criticisms against Diaeus in connection with the defeat at Chaeronea (cf. 14. 3 n.), when he can hardly have been surprised, and when Critolaus was the responsible general.

Niese (iii. 347 n. 3) suggested that 16. 11–12 probably referred to Critolaus, and this has been cogently developed by Deininger (*Phil.*, 1969, 287–91). If they are right, 16. 11 and 16. 12 will go between 14. 2 and 14. 3.

As we have seen, 17. 1–18. 12 describes Diaeus' atrocities at Corinth; 18. 5 and 18. 12 also figure (after 16. 12) in the *de sent.* (see above, p. 47), so linking the two sets of excerpts. On the probable division between the Achaean events in books xxxviii and xxxix see p. 47. On xxxix. 1, which may belong to this book, see below, this page.

## 21. BOOK XXXIX

These extracts are from the Constantinian excerpts: *de uirt. et uit.*: 1. 1–12 (on A. Postumius: exc. 120); 3. 4–11 (P.'s comments on Achaeus, Philopoemen, and Aratus: exc. 121); 4. 1–5. 6 (P. and the ten commissioners: exc. 122); 6. 1–5 (character of the Roman general: exc. 123); 7. 1–7 (obituary on Ptolemy Philometor: exc. 124); *de sent.*: 3. 1 (Philopoemen's statues left standing: exc. 164); 3. 2 (a proverb: exc. 165); 8. 1–8 (conclusion to the *Histories*: exc. 166).

As already indicated (p. 47) P. probably ended book xxxviii with the capture of Corinth, leaving its destruction, which was carried out after consultation with the ten commissioners (cf. 2 n.), till book xxxix. 1. 1–12 (*de uirt. et uit.* and Suidas) discusses A. Postumius Albinus, who had been present at Scarpheia and was designated one of the ten commissioners. Its position after xxxviii. 18. 12 precludes

its having been introduced in connection with the battle; but Postumius' later movements are obscure, and it is not known whether he returned in the meantime to Rome. Since P. did not name the commissioners (Cic. *ad Att.* xiii. 30. 2) the sketch is unlikely to have been introduced in that connection; and it must remain open whether 1. 1–12 belongs to book xxxviii or book xxxix.

2. 1–3 (from Strabo, viii. 6. 23, C. 381) quotes P. for the way works of art were treated by soldiers after the destruction of Corinth on the Senate's orders; the passage is probably from *res Graeciae* of Ol. 158, 3 = 146/5 (on the chronology of the capture and destruction see below, ad loc.). 3. 1 (*de sent.*), 3. 3 (Plut. *Philop.* 21. 5–6), and 3. 4–11 (*de uirt. et uit.*) concern Philopoemen's statues and are properly placed here. 3. 2, from *de sent.*, is from somewhere between 3. 1 and the end of the book (cf. 8. 1–8); and if it refers to the thwarting of the 'certain Roman' mentioned in 3. 3, as is not unlikely, it will stand after 3. 3. 4. 1–5. 6 follows 3. 4–11 in *de uirt. et uit.* and mentions the return of the commissioners to Italy in spring 145; it is followed by 6. 1–5 on Mummius' tour round Greece. Both excerpts are rightly placed.

The next excerpt in *de uirt. et uit.* is 7. 1–7, the obituary on Ptolemy VI, and this forms part of *res Aegypti* of Ol. 158, 3 = 146/5. The exact date of Ptolemy VI's death is not known, but the latest dating by him is 15 July 145 (cf. Skeat, 34 and below, 7. 1 n.). Schweighaeuser, ad loc., suggested that xxxiv. 14, belongs here; against this see the introduction to book xxxiv, below p. 568. 8. 1–8, which follows 3. 2 in the excerpts *de sent.*, clearly comes at the very end of book xxxix. 8. 1 mentions P.'s journey to Rome, following the settlement of Greek affairs, but the chronology of this is uncertain. If it began late in 145 and covered winter 145/4, thus falling in Ol. 158, 4, it does not follow that P. discussed other events of that olympiad year. The visit to Rome may well have formed as it were an adjunct to the settlement, and a fitting conclusion to the *Histories*.

## 22. BOOK XL

No fragments survive from this book; on its character see xxxix. 8. 8 n.