

THE FRAGMENTS OF POLYBIUS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF THE ‘TRAGIC’ HISTORIANS DURIS AND PHYLARCHUS*

Abstract: This paper uses the ‘fragments’ of Polybius, i.e., the citations of Polybius found in other authors, as a test case for how to employ such fragments to gain an understanding of now lost works of Hellenistic historiography such as those of Duris and Phylarchus, who have often been denigrated as ‘tragic historians’. Firstly, it compares the distribution of cover-texts citing Polybius with those citing Duris and Phylarchus. Secondly, it compares the types of content of the fragments of Polybius contained in Athenaeus and Plutarch with the types of content of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus in these same cover-texts. Thirdly, it examines the degree of faithfulness of Athenaeus and Plutarch to their Polybian source in those fragments that correspond to independently preserved parts of Polybius’ text. Finally, some thoughts are proposed on what the fragments of lost works of Hellenistic historiography can and cannot tell us about the original works.

Keywords: fragments, Hellenistic historiography, Polybius, Athenaeus, Plutarch, cover-texts, tragic history

Late Classical and Hellenistic historiography is a shadowy area. Between the *Hellenica* of Xenophon, written in the 350s BCE, and the *Histories* of Polybius, written in the middle of the second century BCE, we know of hundreds of names of historians, but not a single work is extant. Apart from a few cases where a couple of papyrus fragments exist (most notably of the so-called Oxyrhynchus Historian), our only access to these hundreds of lost works is references to them in later texts. These references are often mere name-checks, but can also be—or purport to be—summaries or paraphrases of passages, or even quotations.

The difficulties involved in making sense of these ‘fragments’¹ and forming

* This paper has been through a number of iterations before it reached its final form. I would like to thank the audiences who listened to oral versions of it and asked pertinent questions of it at the Celtic Conference in Classics at the University of Coimbra in June 2019, at a research seminar at University College Dublin in November 2019, and via Zoom for the conference *Fragmente einer fragmentierten Welt* organised by the University of Trier in November 2020. I would also like to thank Alexander Meeus and the anonymous referees appointed by *Histos* for vastly improving it and saving me from a couple of embarrassing slip-ups in the tables. Any shortcomings that remain are, of course, entirely my own responsibility.

¹ ‘Fragment’ is a notoriously unhelpful term for these references, and other terms have been suggested, most influentially ‘reliquiae’ (Brunt (1980)). No term, however, solves the

an impression of the lost works on this basis have long been recognised.² The main difficulty lies in determining to what extent the ‘cover-text’, the text in which the fragment is contained, has altered the original text.³ Is what we read a quotation or a summary? Has it been rewritten in the words of the cover-text’s author? Since it has obviously been repurposed and is now used in a different context than that intended by its original author, does this change how we read it? Has it perhaps even been accidentally or deliberately misquoted or misrepresented? As if these difficulties were not enough, the impression we get of the lost work is necessarily determined by the selectivity of the cover-texts which reference it: for instance, Stephanus of Byzantium and other Byzantine lexicographers quote geographical information from any text regardless of genre and leave out any indication of what else was in it.⁴

In order to understand the fragments preserved in this way, we need to understand the referencing and quotation practices of the various cover-texts. The best way to do this is to investigate how they behave when they reference and quote texts which are still extant. This gives us the opportunity to compare the references and quotations with the original text and check the faithfulness of the cover-texts as well as how their selectivity would colour our reading of that text if we had only the fragments. This has been done for the fragments of Herodotus and Xenophon in the most important and baffling cover-text of them all, Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae*,⁵ but it remains untouched territory for most other cover-texts and most other substantially preserved works of historiography. This article will go some way towards remedying that situation in the case of Polybius.⁶

problem of making it sound as if we have actual pieces of the texts themselves when all we actually have is other texts talking about them.

² The fragments were collected by Jacoby in the monumental *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (FGrHist)* in the first half of the twentieth century. Most of them are now available online in *Brill’s New Jacoby (BNJ)* with English translations and recent commentaries, and Jacoby’s original entries for the *FGrHist* can also be accessed there. Lenfant (2009) is a critical review of *BNJ*, which is worth consulting before using it as a resource. The fundamental articles on the methodological difficulties in decoding such fragments are Brunt (1980) and Schepens (1997). An excellent, more recent treatment is Baron (2013) ch. 1, which refers to earlier scholarship.

³ The term cover-text was suggested by Schepens (1997) and is increasingly widely used in anglophone scholarship.

⁴ For the working practice of Stephanus of Byzantium see now Billerbeck–Neumann-Hartmann (2021).

⁵ Most famously Lenfant (1999), (2007), and (2013), but also Ambaglio (1990), Pelling (2000), Carrière (2007), Maisonneuve (2007), and Olson (2018).

⁶ The fragments of Polybius in Athenaeus have been collected by Walbank (2000), who first discusses the question whether Athenaeus accessed Polybius’ text directly or through an intermediary source and why he was interested in Polybius at all, and then focuses on

The cover-texts' handling of Polybius is of special interest for our understanding of fragmentary Hellenistic historiography for two reasons. Firstly, Polybius' work is one of our few substantial examples of the genre from this time period. Polybius' *Histories* is, of course, itself a fragmentary work; but we have a substantial amount of it: the first 5 Books survive intact, as do large parts of Book 6; and through the Byzantine anthology known as the *Excerpta Constantiniana* we have plenty of sizeable chunks of the remaining 34 Books. This is a very different situation from the Hellenistic historiographers of whose works no manuscripts survive and who were never anthologised or epitomised by Constantinian excerptors.

Secondly, it has been a common assumption that Polybius' *Histories* was a historiographical work of a higher quality than most of the contemporary works we have lost. In particular, Hellenistic historiography is often assumed to have been characterised by attention to form over content (sometimes labelled 'rhetorical history') and by the desire to entertain over truthfulness (sometimes labelled 'tragic history').⁷ Two Hellenistic historiographers who have been particularly vilified by scholars are Duris of Samos and Phylarchus of Athens or Naucratis. They wrote historical works at either end of the third century BCE, and both have acquired a reputation as tragic historians on the basis of the fragments preserved of their works by later authors. This means that they are generally thought to have written partly fictionalised accounts of historical events which prioritised entertainment and shock-value over a truthful account or serious engagement with sources, and to have shown a particular interest in stories involving marvels, women, sexual scandal, and the changeability of fortune. Although most scholars at present would hesitate to support the once widely held hypothesis of an actual Hellenistic 'school' of tragic history, this image of Duris and Phylarchus still holds sway.⁸ I have discussed the difficulties with this reading of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus elsewhere, and that is not my purpose here.⁹

In this article, we shall use the fragments of Polybius—in the sense of the passages of Polybius referenced, summarised, and quoted in other texts—as a test case for the extent to which it is possible to form a true impression of a

placing the fragments in the correct Books of Polybius. He does not examine Athenaeus' degree of faithfulness to Polybius' text and does not compare Athenaeus' practice in the case of Polybius with his practice in the cases of any of the more fragmentary works of history.

⁷ For 'tragic' and 'rhetorical' history, see e.g. Meister (1990) 80–102. For a convenient overview with references to earlier literature see Rebenich (1997). For a more detailed overview of the development of the concept of 'tragic history' see Hau (2018).

⁸ See, e.g., Hornblower (1994) 44–5; Luce (1997) 119–22; Gehrke (2001) 299; Zangara (2007) 76–7.

⁹ Hau (2020a) and (2020b).

work of Hellenistic historiography on the basis of its fragments. That is, the aim is not to offer a rounded investigation of the fragments of Polybius in order to reconstruct or form an impression of the large part of his work that is lost; for that one would need a monograph, not an article. The purpose of this article is rather to compare the treatment of Polybius by the cover-texts with their treatment of Duris and Phylarchus in order to ascertain: (1) whether we are justified on this basis in assuming that Duris and Phylarchus wrote a different type of historiography from Polybius; and (2) to what extent the fragments allow us to form an impression of the essence of their lost works. It is a paper about the citation practices of the cover-texts, particularly Plutarch and Athenaeus, not (primarily) about either Polybius or Duris and Phylarchus.

Methodologically, the paper is based on a *TLG* search for the word ‘Polybios’ in all its cases, throughout the Greek textual corpus. This yields 1,258 hits. From these 1258 passages were then removed the passages that use *polybios* as an adjective, refer to a different Polybius from the Hellenistic historian, or are listed twice, either because they are duplicates from two different editions of the same work, or because they appear both under the name of their actual author, say Diodorus Siculus, and under the name of the author he is referencing in a fragment collection of that author, e.g., Posidonius.¹⁰ Finally, the many references to Polybius in the *Excerpta Constantini* have been put to one side since these are fragments of a different kind and reflect the text from which they were excerpted much more directly,¹¹ and as Duris and Phylarchus were not excerpted in this way, they are not relevant for a comparison. When all of these are removed, we are left with 651 fragments of Polybius found in various cover-texts.

For a complete investigation of the fragments of Polybius for their own sake, it would be necessary also to carry out a search of the Latin text corpus. Since Duris and Phylarchus are barely mentioned by Latin authors, however, this seemed unnecessary for the present study. I have restricted my search to the Latin authors who do function as cover-texts for Duris and Phylarchus, namely Pliny the Elder, Cicero, and Hyginus.

¹⁰ The issue of doublets of texts in the *TLG* is particularly acute in the case of the (at first glance) extremely numerous passages of Aelius Herodian which mention Polybius: in fact, these all appear in the edition of Herodian by Lentz, where long passages were taken over verbatim from Stephanus of Byzantium on the assumption that they reproduced Herodian’s work exactly. In the Ps.-Arcadius epitome of Herodian, which is the most reliable guide to Herodian’s original text of *de Prosodia Catholica*, Polybius is not mentioned. See Dickey (2014) and Roussou (2018). For Stephanus’ use of Herodian, see Billerbeck–Neumann-Hartmann (2021) 33–46.

¹¹ For the practice of the Constantinian excerptors see Rafiyenko (2017) and Németh (2018) with references to earlier scholarship. For an overview of this field of scholarship more generally, see the introduction to Manafis (2020). For the Polybian manuscript tradition and the place of the *Excerpta Constantini* in it, see Moore (1965).

For the Polybius passages, no distinction has been made between ‘testimonia’ (text passages which mention the author in question and/or his work, but do not give information about any particular passage) and ‘fragments’ along the lines established by Jacoby and upheld by *BNJ*.¹² The line between the two is often extremely hard to draw and easily becomes subjective. For the sake of comparison, the testimonia and fragments of Duris and Phylarchus are included together in the tables below.

1. Overview of the Fragments of Polybius

1.1 Types of Cover-texts

The first issue of interest is the identity of the cover-texts. Who preserves the Polybius fragments? And are the fragments of Polybius preserved by the same cover-texts as those of Duris and Phylarchus? Table 1 shows the cover-texts for Polybius compared with those for Duris and Phylarchus.

Table 1: Cover-texts Containing Fragments of Polybius, Duris, and Phylarchus

	Polybius 651 fragments total	Duris 15 testimonia + 67 fragments = 82 total ¹³	Phylarchus 7 testimonia + 93 fragments = 100 total
Ach. Tat. <i>Isagoge Excerpta</i>	1	-	-
Ael. <i>Natura Animal.</i>	-	-	2
Ael. <i>Tact.</i>	3	-	-
Ammonius	-	-	1
Apoll. <i>Hist. Mir.</i>	-	-	2
Appian	3	-	-
Athenaeus	36	24	43
Castor, <i>Rhet.</i>	1	-	-
Cicero	6	1	-
Clement of Alex.	-	1	-

¹² See above, n. 2.

¹³ There are 97 fragments and 16 testimonia of Duris in *BNJ*. Of the fragments, 67 seem to come from his three historiographical works, i.e., the *Makedonica* (FF 1–15, FF 35–55 incl. 37a and b and 41a and b, F 94), the *History of Agathocles* (FF 16–21, FF 56a and b–59), and the *Samian History* (FF 22–6, FF 60–71, F 96). These are the only fragments of Duris included in this study. The rest of his fragments seem to come from his varied non-historiographical production or are of uncertain provenance. Of the testimonia, one (T 12d) seems to refer to his work *On the Art of Engraving* and has been left out of this study; the other 15 refer to Duris and/or his works in general and have been included.

Collections of proverbs	-	2	1
Didym. Alex.	-	2	-
Diod. Sic.	3	2	-
Diog. Laert.	-	1	1
Dion. Hal.	3	1	1
Dositheus	1	-	-
Etymological lexica	4	-	1
Eusebius	1	-	-
Eustathius	12	-	-
Harpocration	-	2	1
Hesychius	1	-	-
Himerius	-	1	-
Hyginus	-	-	1
Joannes Lydus	-	-	1
Joannes Zonaras	1	-	-
John Malalas	1	-	-
Josephus	3	-	-
Lexicon Vindobonense	2	-	-
Nicetas	1	-	-
Parthenius	-	-	3
Pausanias	-	1	-
Photius	-	4	3
Phrynichus	-	-	1
Pliny, <i>NH</i>	21	7	6
Plutarch	17	13	13
Polybius	-	-	9
Porphyrius	-	1	-
Ps.-Zonaras	5	-	-
Ptol. Geograph.	1	-	-
Sext. Emp. <i>Adv. Math.</i>	-	-	1
Steph. Byz.	187	3	-
Strabo	49	1	-
Suda	283	3	1
Syncellus	2	-	-
Tactica Byzantina	1	-	-
Tzetzes	-	2	1
Various scholiasts	-	10	7
Zosimus	2	-	-

The first thing to note in the table is the quantity of fragments: we have in total 82 fragments of Duris' historiographical works¹⁴ and 100 of Phylarchus (both including testimonia) compared with no fewer than 651 of Polybius. At first glance, this seems to show that Polybius was much more read in Late Antiquity

¹⁴ See above, n. 13.

and the early Middle Ages than Duris and Phylarchus.¹⁵ This, however, raises the question of whether the two cover-texts which preserve the vast majority of the Polybius fragments, namely the *Suda* and the *Ethnica* of Stephanus of Byzantium, used Polybius directly. It has long been known that the *Suda* relied extensively on the *Excerpta Constantiniana* for most of its source citations. The case of Stephanus of Byzantium is more difficult, but it is possible that he also knew Polybius only second-hand.¹⁶ Their frequent citations of Polybius would then not be evidence that his work was necessarily widely read at the time, but rather that his name was much respected, in a way which was not true of Duris and Phylarchus.¹⁷

This observation is linked with the issue of the genres of the cover-texts preserving the fragments. The cover-text which preserves the greatest number of Polybius fragments after the *Suda* and Stephanus of Byzantium is Strabo. All three of these cover-texts primarily use Polybius for geographical information, i.e. technical information about distances or climate zones, topographical information, or information about the correct names of various peoples. The fact that Polybius was used so extensively for this type of information and Duris and Phylarchus hardly at all may be an indication that his *Histories* contained more technical geography and showed more interest in geographical (including topographical and ethnical) matters than did the works of Duris and Phylarchus. What it certainly indicates is that Polybius was, definitely by the sixth century CE and perhaps already by the time of Strabo in the first century CE, a more trusted and respected source for such information than either Duris or Phylarchus. Another area where Strabo considered Polybius an authority is Homeric geography and the extent to which this bears any relation to the actual shape of the world. In this respect it is interesting that Strabo never references Duris, whose varied literary production included a treatise on *Homeric Questions*. Perhaps this treatise did not discuss geographical matters, or perhaps Strabo did not rate it very highly.

¹⁵ It is, of course, the case with any ancient author that he may well have been read and used by other authors who do not mention his name. This can be discovered in cases where the source in question is also extant, and it is sometimes revealed to us in the case of lost sources by correspondences between passages in different authors which clearly rely on one source although only one (or none) of the authors mention it (see, e.g., Meeus (2017)). However, in the interest of conducting a comparison between the fragments of Polybius and the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus, this paper restricts itself to passages where Polybius is explicitly mentioned as a source.

¹⁶ For the *Suda*'s use of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* see Németh (2018) ch. 9; for Stephanus of Byzantium's use of sources see Billerbeck–Neumann–Hartmann (2021) 59–65, both with references to earlier scholarship. For the more general phenomenon of several later works taking their information and source citations from the same intermediary source without acknowledging it, see Meeus (2017).

¹⁷ For Byzantine interest in Polybius, see Kaldellis (2012).

In fact, Duris, although he is also occasionally cited by geographical lexica and three times by the *Suda*, was more popular with lexicographers interested in mythology, etymology, and the origin of proverbs, and he is also cited by a number of scholiasts of various works for his information about such matters. Phylarchus, alone of the three, is cited by the mythographers Parthenius and Hyginus, who do not cite either Duris or Polybius. So far all of this corroborates the theory that Duris and Phylarchus wrote a different type of historiography from Polybius, or at least had a reputation for having written a different type of historiography: whereas Polybius was known as the place to go for geographical information and technical discussions of geographical matters, Duris and Phylarchus were known as sources for mythology, etymology, and the origins of proverbs.

The main cover-texts for Duris and Phylarchus are, overwhelmingly, Athenaeus and Plutarch. These are also important cover-texts for Polybius because, despite preserving only *c.* 8% of the total number of Polybius fragments (or 10% if we leave out the derivative *Suda* fragments), as opposed to 30% of the Duris fragments and 55% of the Phylarchus fragments, they preserve longer summaries or paraphrases of text passages instead of the brief references we find in the *Suda* and, especially, Stephanus of Byzantium. For this reason, Athenaeus and Plutarch will be the focus of much of the rest of this paper.

1.2 Topics of the Fragments

The next issue of interest, which we have already touched upon briefly, is whether it is possible to see a difference between the topics of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus and those of Polybius. This is of crucial interest because it is the contents of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus which have led scholars to assume that these two works were frivolous and sensational as opposed to the ‘serious’ history written by Polybius. It would burst the banks of this paper to compare the topic of each of his 651 fragments with those of Duris and Phylarchus, so instead we shall focus on the fragments found in Athenaeus and Plutarch, since they are important cover-texts for all three Hellenistic historiographers. Table 2 shows the topics of the fragments of Polybius, Duris, and Phylarchus preserved by Athenaeus and Plutarch. There is some overlap between categories; for instance a passage can be both about drinking and about luxurious habits. (For a complete overview of fragments of Polybius in Athenaeus, including their classification in Table 2, see Appendix A; for a complete overview of the fragments of Polybius in Plutarch including their classification, see Appendix B.)

**Table 2. Topics of the Fragments
(with some overlap between categories)**

	Polybius	Duris	Phylarchus
Athenaeus	<p>Total: 36</p> <p>Luxury: 14 Drinking: 7 Food: 1 Women: 3 Flatterers: 3 Slaves: 2 Music: 1 Ridiculousness of the powerful: 4 Natural phenomena: 4 Place names: 2</p> <p>Pithy sayings in <i>o.r.</i>: 2</p>	<p>Total: 24</p> <p>Luxury: 9 Drinking: 2</p> <p>Women: 3</p> <p>Music: 2</p> <p>Natural beauty: 1</p> <p>Pithy sayings in <i>o.r.</i>: 1</p> <p>Religious customs: 4 Animal–human friendship: 1</p> <p>Theatre: 2</p>	<p>Total: 43</p> <p>Luxury: 14 Drinking: 3</p> <p>Women: 7 Flatterers: 3 Slaves: 1</p> <p>Ridiculousness of the powerful: 4 Natural phenomena: 3 Place names: 1 Proper name: 1 Pithy sayings in <i>o.r.</i>: 10</p> <p>Religious customs: 1 Animal–human friendship: 2</p> <p>Assassination: 2 Mythology: 1 Spartan society: 2</p>
Plutarch	<p>Total: 17</p> <p>Military/political history: 13 Women: 2 (but 1 in a political context) Moralising: 1+1? Characterisation: 1 Pithy sayings: 1</p> <p>Criticised by cover-text: 0</p>	<p>Total: 13</p> <p>Military/political history: 4 Women: 1</p> <p>Moralising characterisation: 2</p> <p>Alternative explanation of oracle/proverb: 1 Religious customs: 1 Polemic against other historians: 1</p> <p>Criticised by cover-text: 3</p>	<p>Total: 13</p> <p>Military/political history: 6 Women: 1</p> <p>Pithy sayings: 1</p> <p>Marvel: 1 Mythology: 2</p> <p>Criticised by cover-text: 3</p>

Let us begin with Athenaeus.¹⁸ In Athenaeus, there are 14 Polybian fragments concerned with luxury, seven related to drinking, four relating anecdotes that make someone powerful look ridiculous, four which concern peculiar natural phenomena, three relating to women or sexual scandal, three dealing with flatterers, two dealing with slaves, one dealing with music, two which give the name of some topographical feature, and two which quote a pithy saying in *oratio recta*. Looking at these fragments alone, one would get a very skewed image of Polybius' *Histories*. The topics are, in fact, very similar to the topics of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus preserved by Athenaeus.¹⁹ For Polybius, we would be able to correct this skewed impression by means of the 283 fragments from the *Suda*, alongside the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, which show plenty of 'serious' politico-military narrative. Since we do not have such a body of material for Duris and Phylarchus, they have acquired a reputation for writing primarily about drinking, luxurious habits, women, and flatterers. On this basis, we might tentatively conclude that Duris and Phylarchus may have written works just as politico-military as the one Polybius wrote, and that our perception of their works has been unduly coloured by the selectivity of their cover-texts. But we can go further.

There are, in fact, some small, but significant differences in the topics of the fragments found in Athenaeus. Firstly, Athenaeus has a penchant for anecdotes about religious customs, mythology, or friendship between animals and human beings, and he references passages from Duris and Phylarchus on these topics, but not from Polybius. Perhaps he could not find any such passages in Polybius; indeed, there are no mentions of animal-human friendship in the surviving parts of Polybius and very little about mythology or religious customs. This may indicate that these particular topics played a larger part in the works of Duris and Phylarchus than they did in that of Polybius.

Secondly, pithy sayings in *oratio recta* figure in no fewer than 10 of the Athenaeus fragments of Phylarchus compared with only 2 of the Athenaeus fragments of Polybius, and only 1 of the Athenaeus fragments of Duris. This probably indicates that direct speech, or at least the kind of direct speech worth quoting, was more frequent in Phylarchus than in either Duris or Polybius. Perhaps, then, even if Duris and Phylarchus' works had a core of politico-military history, they delved into some topics which Polybius tended to neglect or skirt over without much detail, and perhaps Phylarchus was particularly good at writing quotable direct speech.

¹⁸ For a good discussion of Athenaeus' citation practice as part of his own literary project see Jacob (2004) and (2013).

¹⁹ The Athenaeus fragments of Duris have been discussed by Giovanelli-Jouanna (2007), but she does not compare them with those of other Hellenistic historians.

When we turn to look at Plutarch, a different pattern emerges. There is a marked difference in Plutarch's usage of Polybius on the one hand and of Duris and Phylarchus on the other. Plutarch primarily uses Polybius as an authority on military or Roman matters; this is the case in 13 out of the 17 fragments.²⁰ He seems to value him as a trusted insider-source and often compares his versions of events with those of other sources as in these two examples from the *Life of Aemilius Paullus* (15.3 and 16.2, respectively):

ἦσθεῖς οὖν ὁ Αἰμίλιος δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς οὐχ ὅσους Πολύβιος εἴρηκεν, ἀλλ' ὅσους αὐτὸς ὁ Νασικᾶς λαβεῖν φησι, γεγραφὸς περὶ τῶν πράξεων τούτων ἐπιστόλιον πρὸς τινα τῶν βασιλέων, οἱ μὲν ἐκτὸς τάξεως Ἰταλικοὶ τρισχίλιοι τὸ πλῆθος ἦσαν, τὸ δ' εὐώνυμον κέρας εἰς πεντακισχιλίουσ ...

Aemilius, accordingly, delighted, gave them, not as many men as Polybius states, but as many as Nasica himself says they took, in a short letter which he wrote concerning these exploits to one of the kings, that is, 3,000 of his Italians who were not Romans, and his left wing numbering 5,000 ...²¹

τούτοις ὁ μὲν Πολύβιος φησιν ἔτι κοιμωμένοις ἐπιπεσεῖν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, ὁ δὲ Νασικᾶς ὄξυν ἀγῶνα περὶ τοῖς ἄκροις γενέσθαι καὶ κίνδυνον, αὐτὸς δὲ Θραῦκα μισθοφόρον εἰς χεῖρας συνδραμόντα τῷ ξυστῶ διὰ τοῦ στήθους πατάξας καταβαλεῖν ...

These men, according to Polybius, were still asleep when the Romans fell upon them; but Nasica says that a sharp and perilous conflict took place for possession of the heights, and that he himself slew a Thracian mercenary who engaged him by striking him through the breast with his javelin...

In these two examples, Plutarch uses Polybius as an alternative source to Scipio Nasica, in the first example preferring Nasica's version of events, in the second Polybius'. 13 of the 17 Plutarchan references to Polybius reference him for such politico-military information. Of the other four, one quotes a pithy saying by a famous Roman (Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 9.2–3), one cites Polybius for a description of king Massinissa's prowess in old age (Plut. *An seni* 791F), one uses Polybius to

²⁰ Plutarch could not use either Duris or Phylarchus as a source for information about Rome; in that respect, his interests overlap more with the time-period and geographical area covered by Polybius.

²¹ All translations of Plutarch in the paper, unless otherwise stated, are those of Perrin in the Loeb (also used by the Perseus database: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection:Greco-Roman>).

corroborate the evidence of ‘the majority of writers’ for the daughter of Scipio Africanus the Elder being ‘given’ to Tiberius Gracchus because of the great esteem he enjoyed, and the fourth cites Polybius as the interviewer of a Gallic chieftain’s wife, who had been raped by a Roman centurion and then had him killed (Plut. *De mul. vir.* 22).²² This last passage is extremely atypical of Polybius’ work, both because it deals with a woman (and one who is not the cause of significant events)²³ and contains information about a sexual encounter, and because it refers to Polybius himself in the role of interviewer. However, if we only had the fragments to go by, we would not know that. We might then take the passage as evidence that Polybius frequently cast himself in the Herodotean role of interviewer of eyewitnesses (which, of course, he may in fact have done more frequently than we realise since the part of his *Histories* that cover the time period in which he himself was alive only exists in the epitomised form constructed by the *Excerpta Constantiniana*).²⁴ We might even set it alongside Plutarch’s reference to Polybius as an authority on the marriage of Scipio’s daughter and conclude that Polybius was particularly interested in women, marriage, and sexual scandal whereas, in fact, one has to search very diligently indeed through Polybius’ extant text to find any mention of these topics.

Turning to Plutarch’s use of Duris, we see that he is only cited by Plutarch three times out of 13 fragments for information about numbers and military matters (*FGrHist* 76 FF 39, 40, 67); the fourth fragment in the politico-military category in the table is an alternative explanation of the historical friendship between Philip II and Eumenes of Cardia (F 53). By contrast, he is used as a source for moralising characterisation (of Phocion) twice (FF 50 and 51), for an alternative explanation of an oracle or proverb once (F 38), for a story involving a woman and sexual scandal once (F 69), and once for information about a religious custom (F 71). This already shows a difference in the types of information Plutarch took from Polybius and Duris. More tellingly, however, Plutarch three times casts aspersions on Duris’ reliability: In F 39 (Plut. *Dem.* 23.4) and F 53 (Plut. *Eum.* 1.1–3) his version of events is set against the more common and, according to Plutarch, more reliable version, and in T 8 and F 67, which form part of the same passage (Plut. *Per.* 28.1–3), Plutarch goes so far as to accuse Duris of ‘over-tragedising events’ (τούτοις ἐπιτραγωδεῖ) and then states that,

²² Problematically, these passages are often included in modern Polybius editions such as the Loeb as if they were the words of Polybius, not Plutarch. See Appendix B.

²³ Queen Teuta of the Illyrians plays a relatively big part in Pol. 2.4.7f., but this is because she is responsible for bringing the Romans to Greece for the first time.

²⁴ Indeed, Polybius’ scorching remarks about Timaeus’ inability to interview eyewitnesses effectively (12.28a.9–10) indicates that this was a skill on which he prided himself.

At any rate, Duris does not usually master his narrative in accordance with truth even when it has no personal emotional resonance for him, and he seems rather here to have exaggerated the misfortune of his home country for the purpose of slandering the Athenians.²⁵

Even if Plutarch at other times accepts or at least considers Duris' version of events, especially, perhaps, where it offers an alternative version to the mainstream account, it is clear that he did not trust him in the way that he trusted Polybius.

Phylarchus, for his part, is used by Plutarch for politico-military information six times (*FGrHist* 81 FF 48, 51, 52, 59, 60, 77) out of a total of 13 fragments. The fact that almost half of the fragments preserved by Plutarch contains such 'serious' information may well indicate that such narrative did feature prominently in Phylarchus' work, and that Plutarch trusted it enough to rely on it at times. However, Phylarchus is also adduced as a source for obscure mythological information twice (FF 32b and 78), for an incredible marvel once (F 79a), and for a witty altercation of pithy sayings once (F 75). Moreover, many of the details for which Plutarch refers to Phylarchus are of a colourful or emotional kind: Antigonus Doson died from bursting a blood vessel when shouting too loudly on the battlefield (F 60);²⁶ Chilonis, wife of Cleomenes of Sparta, awaited the outcome of a decisive battle with a noose around her neck ready to hang herself rather than fall into enemy hands (F 48); and Themistocles had two sons, who were poorly treated by the Athenians (F 76). In addition, in 3 out of the 13 fragments, Plutarch accuses Phylarchus in strong terms of unreliability due to bias (F 52 = Plut. *Arat.* 38), theatricality (F 76 = Plut. *Them.* 32) or absurdity (F 78 = Plut. *Mor.* 362B–C). It is entirely possible that Plutarch's criticism was influenced to a certain degree by Polybius, who is also mentioned in the first of these three fragments (*FGrHist* 81 F 52 = Plut. *Arat.* 38), which would confirm Plutarch's great respect for the Achaean historian. However, Plutarch was an intelligent reader and is unlikely to have taken over Polybius' opinion of another one of his sources uncritically.²⁷ It is clear that Plutarch did use Phylarchus as a source, but also that he often preferred to use a different text as his main source, supplementing with colourful bits of information and direct speech from Phylarchus, and that he often took Phylarchus' version with a pinch of salt.

²⁵ Δούρις μὲν οὖν οὐδ' ὅπου μηδὲν αὐτῷ πρόσεστιν ἴδιον πάθος εἰωθὸς κρατεῖν τὴν διήγησιν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀληθείας, μᾶλλον ἔοικεν ἐνταῦθα δεινῶσαι τὰς τῆς πατρίδος συμφορὰς ἐπὶ διαβολῇ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. The translation is my own.

²⁶ Polybius mentions this too (2.70.6), but says that the death occurred a few days later due to a condition brought about by the battlefield shouting.

²⁷ For Plutarch possibly having been influenced by Polybius in his criticism of Phylarchus (and Timaeus), see Van der Stockt (2005), but supplement with Pelling (1980) and (2016).

It seems, then, that exactly because the content of our preserved fragments is determined by the interests of Athenaeus and Plutarch, the differences that nonetheless exist between their use of Polybius on the one hand and Duris and Phylarchus on the other are revealing. In Athenaeus' case, he could find in Polybius instances of decadence and drunkenness and information about food, drink, odd place names, and powerful people behaving ridiculously, but he could not find information about bizarre religious customs, mythology, or human–animal friendship. He also did not find much direct speech worth quoting. Plutarch, for his part, could find military information in all three authors, and even a case of sexual sensationalism with direct speech in Polybius (in the passage about the Galatian chieftain's wife), but like Athenaeus he did not use him for information about religious customs, mythology, or human–animal friendship. This surely points to the proportion of such passages being larger in Duris and Phylarchus than in Polybius, and to Phylarchus being particularly apt to report pithy sayings and dialogues in direct speech.

Moreover, Plutarch trusts Polybius in a way that he does not trust Duris and Phylarchus. Between one-fourth and one-fifth of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus preserved by Plutarch are included by him with a view to arguing against their version of events and criticising their authors for lack of truthfulness, whereas Polybius is always referenced with respect even when another source is preferred in his stead. Plutarch also indicates why he distrusts Duris and Phylarchus, by accusing them of bias and over-dramatisation. This might indeed indicate that Duris and Phylarchus wrote histories that were different from the one written by Polybius: histories whose backbone was politico-military narrative, but which often described events in a more dramatic or emotional manner than Polybius had done, and than Plutarch preferred.

2. Faithfulness of Cover-texts: Athenaeus and Plutarch

A frequent problem when working with fragmentary texts is the nagging suspicion that they may be misrepresented by their cover-texts. Athenaeus, in particular, is often accused of such misrepresentation, which has been demonstrated beyond doubt to take place in some—but by no means all—of the fragments of Herodotus and Xenophon contained in his work.²⁸ For that reason, it will be useful to compare the Polybius fragments contained in Athenaeus' text with the preserved text of Polybius in order to gauge the level

²⁸ See Lenfant (1999), (2007), and (2013), Pelling (2000), Olson (2018). Also Gorman–Gorman (2007), but see the arguments in Hau (2016) 127–31 and 142–8.

of misrepresentation.²⁹ Furthermore, Lenfant has investigated the relationship between the phrases used by Athenaeus to introduce information from Herodotus and the level of accuracy in his report, and Olson has confirmed that (a simplified version of) her results holds true also for Athenaeus' references to Xenophon and Plato.³⁰ We shall investigate whether he followed the same practice in his references to Polybius.

Naturally, only the fragments that correspond to preserved parts of Polybius' *Histories* (or, to a lesser extent, the *Excerpta Constantiniana* of his work) are of any use in this exercise, which leaves us with only 9 fragments in Athenaeus.³¹ These fragments are presented in Table 3 below. The numbers in column 1 correspond to the numbering of the Athenaeus fragments of Polybius in the Table in Appendix A.

Table 3. Athenaeus Fragments of Polybius with Corresponding Polybius Passage

Frag. No.	Athenaeus Passage³²	Independently Preserved Polybius Passage	Athenaeus' Introductory Formula
F 8	Ath. 6.251e: 'Polybius in Book XII of his <i>History</i> records that the Philip defeated by the Romans had a flatterer named Heracleides of Tarentum, who brought about the ruin of Philip's entire kingship.'	Pol. 13.4; see below	No verb of speaking
F 13	Ath. 6.274f–275a: 'According to Polybius in Book 31 of his <i>History</i> , the well-known Cato was	Pol. 31.25; see below	ὡς Πολύβιος ἱστορεῖ

²⁹ Walbank (2000) takes a different approach and focuses on the fragments of Polybius in Athenaeus for which we do not have an independently surviving text, in effect using Athenaeus as a cover-text to establish lost parts of Polybius. This is similar to the approach taken by editors of Polybius' *Histories*, most recently the editors of the revised Loeb edition, Walbank, Habicht, and Olson.

³⁰ Lenfant (2007a) and Olson (2018).

³¹ Looks can be deceiving here: if one searches Polybius' text in the *TLG* for some of the phrases used in the fragments of Polybius preserved by Athenaeus in order to check if they match the preserved Polybius text, the search will bring up passages that correspond very neatly to Athenaeus' text. That is, however, because these fragments have been included verbatim from Athenaeus in the Polybius edition used by the *TLG* and not because there is independent evidence of the specific passage in the Polybius manuscripts or the *Excerpta Constantiniana*. The fragments of Polybius preserved by Athenaeus have been collected by Walbank (2000), who numbers them according to its assumed position in Polybius' *Histories* after the fashion of *FGrHist* and lists the corresponding Polybius passage where one exists.

³² All Athenaeus translations are those of Olson in the Loeb.

	disgusted and cried out that certain people had imported foreign luxury into Rome by buying a jar of Pontic saltfish for 300 drachmas, and handsome boys for more than fields cost. ³³		
F 17	Ath. 9.400f: ‘Polybius in Book 12 of his <i>History</i> reports that the so-called <i>kouniklos</i> is a creature that resembles the hare. He writes as follows: “When seen from a distance, the so-called <i>kouniklos</i> appears to be a small hare; but when you get one in your hands, it both looks and tastes quite different. It is generally found underground”.’	Verbatim quotation of Pol. 12.3.10. Athenaeus fails to mention that Polybius is talking about the fauna of Corsica; he has removed the quotation from that context and repurposed it as a piece of evidence about rabbits and hares in a passage that quotes various authors who have things to say about these two animals.	Πολύβιος δ’ ἐν τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν γίνεσθαι φησι ..., γράφων οὕτως
F 18	Ath. 10.418a–b: ‘Polybius of Megalopolis in Book 20 of his <i>History</i> says that after Boeotians got a great reputation for what happened at Leuctra, they gradually allowed themselves to relax, began having feasts and drinking parties, and made arrangements in their wills for their friends to have parties. Even many of those who had families divided up the majority of their property among their messmates, the result being that large numbers of Boeotians had more dinners to attend each month than there were days in it. This is why the Megarians, who despised the situation in Boeotia, revolted to the Achaeans.’	Pol. 20.6.6–7 This is a paraphrase of Polybius’ conclusion to two chapters which detail the politico-military events which led the Boeotians to turn their backs on their alliance with the Achaean League and ally themselves instead with the Aetolians and Macedonians.	Πολύβιος δ’ ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης ἐν τῇ εἰκοστῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν φησιν ὡς...
F 24	Ath. 10.440a: ‘In Book 2 the same Polybius reports that the Illyrian king Agron, who was delighted to have defeated the proud Aetolians, but who consumed large amounts of wine and spent his time at drinking parties and	Pol. 2.4.6 Polybius briefly relates the death of the Illyrian king Agron and the succession of his wife Teuta, who will be	ὁ αὐτὸς Πολύβιος ἱστορεῖ + <i>oratio obliqua</i>

³³ Translation modified slightly from Olson.

	feasts, caught pneumonia and died.’	responsible for bringing the Romans to Illyria.	
F 29	Ath. 10.445d: ‘He (Perseus) was uninterested in women, and did not like wine; instead, not only did he himself drink only a modest amount at dinner, but the same was true of the friends who were with him, according to Polybius in Book 26.’	Pol. 25.3 Wrong book attribution. Polybius talks about the moderation of Perseus’ early reign and gives more details than Athenaeus.	ὡς ἱστορεῖ Πολύβιος
F 30	Ath. 12.527b: ‘as for the Aetolians, Polybius in Book 13 of the <i>History</i> says that they fell deeply into debt as a result of their constant wars and the extravagance in which they lived.’	The relevant passage of the <i>Histories</i> is preserved by the Constantinian collection of excerpts <i>On Vice and Virtue</i> and is usually labelled 13.1.1. Polybius may have said more about this in the original full version of the <i>Histories</i> .	Πολύβιος ... φησιν ὡς ...
F 34	Ath. 14.626a–f: Long polemical discussion to prove the usefulness of music, especially for the Arcadians, who are otherwise made savage by their inclement climate.	Pol. 4.20.5–21.9. Most of this is quoted verbatim with a few minor changes, which certainly means that Athenaeus must have had the text in front of him. The only things that are left out are Polybius’ qualification of his initial criticism of Ephorus: ‘throwing out a statement in no way fitting for him’ (Pol. 4.20.5) and his remark that ‘everybody knows’ the special circumstances surrounding music in Arcadia (Pol. 4.20.8).	‘φησὶν Πολύβιος ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης’ inserted paren- thetically into direct speech
F 35	Ath. 14.634b: Witty, self-ironic utterance by Marcellus on his defeat at sea by Archimedes’ machinations, presented as verbatim quotation of Polybius.	Pol. 8.6.6. Marcellus’ witticism has been quoted verbatim while two sentences by Polybius about his state of mind have been left out.	‘φησί’ inserted parenthetically into direct speech

Several observations can be made on the basis of the Table. Firstly, Lenfant’s and Olson’s conclusions about introductory phrases (see above) hold true for

Polybius as well: when Athenaeus is paraphrasing him, he uses ὡς Πολύβιος ἱστορεῖ, Πολύβιος φησιν ὡς, or Πολύβιος ἱστορεῖ with *oratio obliqua*. When he offers a direct quotation, he introduces it by φησὶν inserted parenthetically into direct speech or by Πολύβιος φησι ..., γράφων οὕτως followed by direct speech. However, as both Lenfant and Olson observe for their respective authors, the quotations are sometimes slightly altered, mainly by leaving out parts of Polybius' text (e.g., FF 33 and 34).

Remarkably, in all of these fragments, Athenaeus is actually relatively faithful to Polybius' text, and there are no disturbing distortions of the kind highlighted by Lenfant and Olson.³⁴ However, the meaning of each fragment is nonetheless always slightly distorted because Athenaeus reports or quotes passages out of context. Passages which in Polybius belong in a politico-military context are transposed into a symposiastic context, which gives the fragments a less serious flavour and might give a reader unfamiliar with Polybius' *Histories* the erroneous impression that it was a work written for light entertainment. Two examples will illustrate this point.

The first is F 7 (Ath. 6.251e):

Πολύβιος δ' ἐν τῇ τρισκαιδεκάτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν [sc. φησι] Φιλίππου τοῦ καταλυθέντος ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων κόλακα γενέσθαι Ἡρακλείδην τὸν Ταραντῖνον τὸν καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν ἀνατρέψαντα.

Polybius in Book 12 of his *History* records that the Philip defeated by the Romans had a flatterer named Heracleides of Tarentum, who brought about the ruin of Philip's entire kingship.

Compare this with what Polybius actually says about Heracleides (13.4):

Philip, as if giving Heracleides a proper subject for the exercise of his talents, ordered him to think of the best means of damaging and destroying the navy of Rhodes, and at the same time sent envoys to Crete to provoke the Cretans and incite them to make war on Rhodes. Heracleides, a fellow by nature suited to evil (ἄνθρωπος εὖ πεφυκὼς πρὸς τὸ κακόν), thinking this commission a godsend and forming some kind of scheme in his mind, waited a little and then set out on his voyage and appeared at Rhodes. This Heracleides was of Tarentine origin, of a family of low-born manual labourers, and he possessed advantages which fitted him for bold and unscrupulous undertakings. For, to begin with, in his early years he had openly prostituted his person, but later he showed great sharpness and an excellent memory, and while he was

³⁴ And by Pelling (2000).

a terrible bully and most bold-faced in dealing with his inferiors, he was most obsequious to his superiors (*κολακικώτατος*). He was originally expelled from his native town as he was suspected of a design of betraying Tarentum to the Romans, not that he had any political power, but because he was an architect and owing to some repairs they were making in the wall had been entrusted with the keys of the gate leading to the interior. He then took refuge with the Romans, but later when he was detected in sending letters and messages from the Roman camp to Tarentum and to Hannibal, he foresaw what would be the result and this time sought safety with Philip, at whose court he acquired such credit and power that he was almost the chief instrument of the ruin of that mighty kingdom (*παρ' ᾧ τοιαύτην περιεποιήσατο πίστιν καὶ δύναμιν ὥστε τοῦ καταστραφῆναι τὴν τηλικαύτην βασιλείαν σχεδὸν αἰτιώτατος γεγονέναι*).³⁵

Polybius' account is much more detailed than Athenaeus'. He does not use the noun 'flatterer' (*κόλαξ*), but describes Heracleides' character in unpleasant and insidious detail, concluding with the damning phrase 'while he was a terrible bully and most bold-faced in dealing with his inferiors, he was most obsequious to his superiors (*κολακικώτατος*)'. 'Flatterer' is a legitimate shorthand for this sort of behaviour and is, indeed, the noun corresponding to the last superlative adjective used by Polybius (*κόλαξ* ~ *κολακικώτατος*). The fact that Heracleides 'brought about the ruin of Philip's entire kingship' (*τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν ἀνατρέψαντα*) is a compressed version of Polybius' final sentence 'at whose court he acquired such credit and power that he was almost the chief instrument of the ruin of that mighty kingdom' (*παρ' ᾧ τοιαύτην περιεποιήσατο πίστιν καὶ δύναμιν ὥστε τοῦ καταστραφῆναι τὴν τηλικαύτην βασιλείαν σχεδὸν αἰτιώτατος γεγονέναι*). In other words, Athenaeus' description of Heracleides matches Polybius' even if it simplifies it. The main difference between the two texts is in what Athenaeus leaves out, namely the politico-military narrative. In Polybius, the passage begins with Philip giving Heracleides a military job to do (left out by Athenaeus), then proceeds to describe his character (retained and simplified by Athenaeus), then gives his background story, which throws light on his character through politico-military events (left out by Athenaeus), and finally crowns the narrative with his role in the destruction of Macedon (retained and simplified by Athenaeus). The result is that, if we only had the fragment preserved by Athenaeus, we might well assume that Polybius talked superficially about Heracleides in the context of court gossip rather than giving

³⁵ All Polybius translations are by Paton for the Loeb, with small modifications, unless otherwise stated.

a detailed description of his character in the context of a politico-military narrative.

Similarly with the next pair of passages. This second example is F 12 (Ath. 6.274f–275a):

The man who initiated the extravagance flourishing today was the Lucullus who defeated Mithridates at sea, according to Nicolaus the Peripatetic. Because when he came to Rome after defeating Mithridates as well as Tigranes of Armenia, and celebrated his triumph, he offered an account of his conduct during the war, but then abandoned his earlier self-discipline and wrecked his life on the reef of extravagance, becoming the first person to introduce the Romans to luxury, by exploiting the wealth of the two kings mentioned above. According to Polybius in Book 31 of his *History*, the well-known Cato was disgusted and cried out that certain people had imported foreign luxury into Rome by buying a jar of Pontic saltfish for 300 drachmas, and handsome boys for more than fields cost (Κάτων δὲ ἐκεῖνος, ὡς Πολύβιος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ τριακοστῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν, ἐδυσχέραине καὶ ἐκεκράγει, ὅτι τινὲς τὰς ξενικὰς τρυφὰς εἰσήγαγον εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, τριακοσίων μὲν δραχμῶν κεράμιον ταρίχων Ποντικῶν ὠνησάμενοι, καὶ μειράκια δ' εὐμορφα ὑπερβαλλούσης ἀγρῶν τιμῆς).

Compare this with what Polybius says (31.25.2–5):

The first direction taken by Scipio's ambition to lead a virtuous life, was to attain a reputation for temperance and excel in this respect all the other young men of the same age. This is a high prize indeed and difficult to gain, but it was at this time easy to pursue at Rome owing to the immoral tendencies of most of the youths. For some of them had abandoned themselves to love affairs with boys and others to the society of courtesans, and many to musical entertainments and banquets, and the extravagance they involve, having in the course of the war with Perseus quickly snatched up the Greek licentiousness in these respects (ταχέως ἠρπακότες ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος εὐχέρειαν). So great in fact was the incontinence that had broken out among the young men in such matters that many paid a talent for a male favourite and many 300 drachmas for a jar of pickled fish. This aroused the indignation of Cato, who said once in a public speech that it was the surest sign of deterioration in the republic when pretty boys fetch more than fields, and jars of pickled fish more than ploughmen (καὶ τηλικαύτη τις ἐνεπεπτόκει περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἔργων ἀκρασία τοῖς νέοις ὥστε πολλοὺς μὲν ἐρώμενον ἡγορακέναι ταλάντου, πολλοὺς δὲ

ταρίχου Ποντικῶν κεράμιον τριακοσίων δραχμῶν. ἐφ' οἷς καὶ Μάρκος ἀγανακτῶν εἶπέ ποτε πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ὅτι μάλιστ' ἂν κατίδοιεν τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον προκοπὴν τῆς πολιτείας ἐκ τούτων, ὅταν πωλούμενοι πλείον ἐύρίσκωσιν οἱ μὲν εὐπρεπεῖς παῖδες τῶν ἀγρῶν, τὰ δὲ κεράμια τοῦ ταρίχου τῶν ζευγηλατῶν).

In this instance, the main difference is historical context. Athenaeus begins the passage with L. Licinius Lucullus and his triumph in 63 BCE, then moves backwards in time to quote a saying of Cato the Elder, who died in 149 BCE, with no indication at all that the two famous Romans were not contemporary. Polybius, on the other hand, mentions Cato's saying in a historically grounded narrative of Scipio Aemilianus and his efforts to gain a reputation for temperance in the years following the defeat of Perseus (167 BCE), where Cato comments on the same prevailing decadence that allows Scipio to shine. The anecdote about Cato is very similar in the two texts, but not identical. Importantly, the two verbs which characterise Cato in Athenaeus, 'was disgusted' (ἐδυσχέραινε) and 'cried out' (ἐκεκράγει), are Athenaeus' interpretation of, and embellishment of, Polybius' text. Polybius says simply that Cato 'spoke, annoyed' (ἀγανακτῶν εἶπέ). In addition, Polybius gives the information that Cato's words were part of a public speech (πρὸς τὸν δῆμον) whereas Athenaeus gives no indication of his addressees.

Interestingly, the tone of moral outrage has not been imposed by Athenaeus; it goes back to Polybius, and the two authors share the evocative mention of a 'jar of pickled fish' (κεράμιον ταρίχων ~ τὰ δὲ κεράμια τοῦ ταρίχου). The idea of 'foreign luxury' (τὰς ξενικὰς τρυφάς) prominent in the Athenaeus passage is Athenaeus' interpretation and simplification of Polybius' statement that the Romans had 'during the Persian War quickly snatched up the Greek licentiousness in this respect' (ταχέως ἤρπακότες ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος εὐχέρειαν). However, what seems at first glance a sideways jab at the Greeks is less black-and-white in Polybius where the participle ἤρπακότες ('having snatched') connects it with the idea of Roman rapaciousness in their dealings with Greece and the East more generally: the Romans 'snatched away' decadent habits along with artwork and wealth.³⁶ Again, Polybius is not seriously misrepresented by Athenaeus, but his original is more subtle and detailed than the cover-text's brief reference.

Overall, then, the examination of the Polybius fragments in Athenaeus that correspond to independently preserved parts of Polybius' text largely conforms to the observations made by Lenfant and Olson about Athenaeus' references to Herodotus, Xenophon, and Plato. The same distinction can be

³⁶ See, e.g., Pol. 9.10 (and 39.2.3 (Loeb), although this latter passage is a fragment found in Strabo).

made between phrases introducing paraphrases of Polybius and phrases introducing quotations of Polybius. In the case of the paraphrases, it is often mere snippets of information that are preserved by Athenaeus out of their original context, which might give a reader unfamiliar with Polybius' *Histories* a wrongful impression of his work. In the case of quotations, Polybius is usually quoted accurately, but longer quotations may have some sentences left out. This is seen most clearly in the long F 33, on the usefulness of music, where the only parts left out are the sentences that explicitly polemicise against Ephorus (see Table 3). When we apply this knowledge to our reading of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus preserved by Athenaeus, it should caution us against a straightforward reading of them as representative of the original works of these two historiographers: like Polybius, their original works most likely contained coherent historical narratives, out of which Athenaeus has plucked his choice information, abbreviating and simplifying in the process.

Turning to Plutarch, we encounter a different situation. Plutarch generally does not pretend to quote Polybius, but usually refers to him quite briefly as a source. Out of the 17 fragments of Polybius found in Plutarch, only 4 are independently attested in the Polybius manuscripts, and 1 in the *Excerpta Constantiana*; these are presented in Table 4. (All Polybius fragments from Plutarch are shown in the Table in Appendix B).

Table 4. Plutarchan Fragments of Polybius with Corresponding Polybius Passage

	Plutarch passage	Independently Preserved Polybius Passage
F 9	<i>Cleom.</i> 25.3: Cleomenes seemed to act with rash daring, but actually he had planned his action carefully, 'as Polybius says'.	2.64.2: 'Most people think that this was precipitous and daring because of the strength of the frontier, but if we judge rightly, it was really safe and rational.' See below.
F 10	<i>Cleom.</i> 27.5: 'his [Cleomenes'] lack of resources forced him to stake the whole issue on a battle where, as Polybius says, he could oppose only twenty thousand men to thirty thousand.'	2.65 first lists in detail the troops available to Antigonos Doson, Cleomenes' opponent, and calculates their total as '28,000 foot and 1,200 horse'. Then Cleomenes' strategy is explained, and we are told that he had 20,000 men.
F 12	<i>Arat.</i> 38.7: 'Polybius, however, says that for a long time, and before the necessity arose, Aratus mistrusted the daring temper of Cleomenes and made secret overtures to Antigonos, besides putting the Megalopolitans forward to beg the	2.45.5–46.6 tells the story of these events and casts Aratus as the hero who could foresee the Cleomenic War, but he does not talk about Aratus 'distrusting Cleomenes' temper'. In 2.47 Aratus approaches Antigonos in

	Achaean to call in Antigonos. For the Megalopolitans were most oppressed by the war, since Cleomenes was continually plundering their territory.’	secret to secure his help for the Achaeans, but this is after the war has lasted for some time.
F 16	<i>De fort. Rom.</i> 12. 325F: the Gauls occupying Rome concluded a treaty with Camillus and left because of trouble in their home land.	2.18.3, although he does not mention Camillus in this passage.
F 17	<i>An seni</i> 791F: Massinissa’s prowess in his old age.	36.16, from the Constantinian Excerpts <i>On Virtue and Vice</i> .

Let us look at the two examples from Plutarch’s *Life of Cleomenes* (FF 9 and 10) as examples of how closely he represents Polybius’ text. First, *Cleom.* 25.3–4:

And this was the reason why the next attempt of Cleomenes, which was thought to be a deed of extravagant and frantic daring, was really made with great forethought, as Polybius says (διὸ καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἐγχείρημα τοῦ Κλεομένους ἔδοξε μὲν τετολμηθῆσαι παραβόλως καὶ μανικῶς, ἐπράχθη δὲ μετὰ πολλῆς προνοίας, ὡς φησι Πολύβιος). For Cleomenes knew that the Macedonians were dispersed among the cities in their winter quarters, and that Antigonos had only a few mercenaries with him at Argos, where he was spending the winter with his friends. Cleomenes therefore invaded the territory of Argos, calculating that Antigonos would either be shamed into fighting and would be overpowered, or, in case he did not venture to fight, would incur odium among the Argives.

Compare this with Polybius’ own words (2.64.1–2):

After the capture of Megalopolis, while Antigonos was still in winter quarters at Argos, Cleomenes at the beginning of spring collected his troops and after addressing them in terms suitable to the occasion, led them out and invaded Argolis, precipitously and daringly, it seemed to most people because of the strength of the frontier, but safely and rationally to those who judged rightly (ὡς μὲν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐδόκει, παραβόλως καὶ τολμηρῶς διὰ τὴν ὀχυρότητα τῶν κατὰ τὰς εἰσόδους τόπων, ὡς δὲ τοῖς ὀρθῶς λογιζομένοις, ἀσφαλῶς καὶ νουνεχῶς). For as he saw that Antigonos had dismissed his forces, he knew well that, in the first place he would be exposed to no danger in invading, and secondly, that, if the country were laid waste up to the walls, the Argives on seeing it would certainly be much vexed and lay the blame on Antigonos.³⁷

³⁷ Translation modified slightly from Paton.

The first thing to note, by contrast with Athenaeus, is that the two passages occur in the same type of context, namely a military narrative. This means that the reader is not led to misjudge Polybius by finding him referenced in connection with symposiastic themes, and the overlap in interest between cover-text and fragmentary text also means that Plutarch has less of a reason than Athenaeus for changing the focus of a given Polybius passage. Nonetheless, he has rephrased Polybius' text, even if there are echoes. Polybius' strong contrast between *τοῖς πολλοῖς*, to whom Cleomenes' actions seemed foolhardy, and *τοῖς ὀρθῶς λογιζομένοις*, who realised that they were not, is not reproduced by Plutarch. The phrases used to describe Cleomenes' bold move, on the other hand, are very similar, although not identical: Polybius has 'it seemed precipitous and daring' (*ἐδόκει παραβόλως καὶ τολμηρῶς*) against Plutarch's 'it seems to have been dared precipitously and crazily' (*ἔδοξε μὲν τετολμηῆσθαι παραβόλως καὶ μανικῶς*). Overall, the two passages are rather close, and if we did not have Polybius' text, we would get a fair impression of it from Plutarch's reference, even if we would lose the intellectual (and class-based?) snobbishness entailed in the contrast between *τοῖς πολλοῖς* and *τοῖς ὀρθῶς λογιζομένοις*.

Since we have Polybius' text, we can go further: in fact, more of the Plutarch passage goes back to Polybius than is immediately obvious. Plutarch's evaluation of Cleomenes' actions comes in the same place of the narrative and refers to the same action, namely the invasion of the territory of Argos, as Polybius'. Plutarch also offers the same reasoning behind Cleomenes' actions (Antigonos' troops were spread out in winter-quarters, the Argives would get angry at seeing their country laid waste without his interference, and he might thus be induced to enter battle with insufficient troops). In fact, when comparing the two texts, it is obvious that Plutarch relied heavily on Polybius as a source for his narrative of the Cleomenic War, but also that he supplemented his text with other sources, e.g., Phylarchus.

The next passage, from the narrative of the same war in the same *Life*, is rather further removed from its source (F 10 = *Cleom.* 27.5):

For if he could have held out only two days, and continued his defensive tactics, he would not have needed to fight a battle, but the Macedonians would have gone away and he could have made his own terms with the Achaeans. But now, as I said before, his lack of resources forced him to stake the whole issue on a battle where, as Polybius says, he could oppose only 20,000 men to 30,000.

Polybius does not say this in so many words, but rather lists in detail (2.65) the many different troops available to Antigonos Doso and calculates their total as '28,000 foot and 1,200 horse'. Then Cleomenes' strategy is explained, and

we are told that he had 20,000 men. The military details of this chapter clearly did not interest Plutarch, who was writing biography rather than history,³⁸ and in a time when it was no longer important which Greek cities had sent troops to support Antigonos and the Achaeans and who led them. If we did not have Polybius' text, we would not be able to see the dramatic extent to which Plutarch has reduced the information from his source here.

Interestingly, the contexts of the two passages are different too: in Plutarch, the statement about Cleomenes' numerical inferiority follows Plutarch's musings on the fact that the decisive battle was fought at all was down to 'fortune, who decides the most important affairs by a narrow margin' (ἀλλ' ἡ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πραγμάτων κρίνουσα τῷ παρὰ μικρὸν τύχῃ), for which reason Cleomenes' misfortune 'should be especially pitied' (ὃ καὶ μάλιστα τὴν δυστυχίαν τοῦ Κλεομένους οἰκτροτέραν ἐποίησεν, Plut. *Cleom.* 27.4). The topic of the changeability of fortune is, as any reader of Polybius knows, dear to the Achaean historian's heart, and if we had lost his narrative of the Cleomonic War, we might well speculate that this interpretation of Cleomenes' bad fortune went back to him. However, in Polybius' text at this point there is no mention of fortune, but a detailed explanation of the strategy and movements of the commanders of both sides, followed by a narrative of the battle, which includes a digression on the heroic actions of a young Philopoemen (Pol. 2.66–9). The reference to fortune comes in 2.70.1–2, after Antigonos' victory, where Polybius recounts the message that made him return to Macedon and comments on the fact that, had Cleomenes only waited a few days before engaging in battle, he would have had no opponent to fight. Polybius then comments: 'Thus ever is it the way of Fortune to decide the most important affairs contrary to reason' (οὕτως αἰεί ποθ' ἡ τύχῃ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πραγμάτων παρὰ λόγον εἴωθε κρίνειν). The verbal echo (ἡ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πραγμάτων κρίνουσα ~ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πραγμάτων ... κρίνειν) makes it likely that the idea that Cleomenes' defeat was decided by fortune originated with Polybius. However, fortune is also one of Plutarch's favourite topics, and he did not take over the passage unthinkingly.³⁹ He placed his musings on it in a different place in the narrative from Polybius (before the battle rather than after), and phrased it slightly differently as well. The idea that we should pity Cleomenes' misfortune is also an addition of Plutarch's. Partly on the basis of this expression of sympathy for Cleomenes, Jacoby classified this and the following

³⁸ See Plutarch's famous distinction at *Alex.* 1.2.

³⁹ I am not persuaded, however, by the argument of Almagor (2018) 191–7, that Plutarch deliberately changed Polybius' phrase in a tongue-in-cheek way in order to alert the reader by this means of intertextuality to the inadequacy of fortune as an explanation for Cleomenes' defeat. It seems unlikely both that Plutarch expected his readers to remember Polybius' exact phrase and that he intended them to take the reference to fortune as a serious analysis of the cause for Cleomenes' defeat.

chapter of the *Life of Cleomenes* as a fragment of Phylarchus, who is referenced in the following chapter (28).⁴⁰ It seems clear that Plutarch consulted both Polybius and Phylarchus as sources, but it does not, of course, follow that everything in the *Life of Cleomenes* that does not go back to Polybius must have come from Phylarchus.

Overall, then, Plutarch turns out to be just as difficult a cover-text as Athenaeus. By combining different sources while narrating everything in his own style and adding his own thoughts and interpretations, he has created masterful biographies, but made it very hard for scholars to uncover the shape of his now lost sources. Sometimes, he stays close to the thought and wording of the original; at other points he abbreviates and changes both the focus and the interpretation of his source. The difficulty is that we cannot tell when he is following which practice unless the text of his source has been preserved.

3. Conclusions

Let us summarise our findings. Firstly, with regard to the identity of the cover-texts that preserve fragments of Polybius compared with those that preserve fragments of Duris and Phylarchus, the fact that Polybius is referenced so much more often, and especially by geographers and lexicographers, shows that he was a much more respected authority, not only on history, but also on geography and word usage, than Duris and Phylarchus.

Secondly, with a focus on Athenaeus and Plutarch, we investigated the topics of the fragments of Polybius compared with those of the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus. It was found that Athenaeus uses Polybius for the same types of information for which he uses Duris and Phylarchus, which proves that even in a serious historical text it is possible to find passages dealing with drinking, luxury, women, and sexual scandal. However, there are certain topics Athenaeus could find in Duris and Phylarchus, but not easily in Polybius, namely mythological stories, odd religious customs, and anecdotes about animal–human friendship. Similarly in the case of Plutarch: he also found a story in Polybius about a sexual scandal, but he uses him primarily to comment on military and political history. This, to a certain extent, parallels how he uses Duris and Phylarchus except that he uses Polybius as a source for politico-military history in a larger percentage of the fragments he preserves of his text, while Phylarchus is more frequently used for dramatic or emotional details, and Duris for elaborate descriptions of extravagance. Both Athenaeus and Plutarch quote direct speech much more frequently from Phylarchus than from either Polybius or Duris. Furthermore, Plutarch often doubts and

⁴⁰ Jacoby, *FGrHist* Komm. IIC, 141.

criticises Duris and Phylarchus in the same breath as he references them, whereas he always shows Polybius the greatest respect.

Finally, we examined the faithfulness of Athenaeus and Plutarch as cover-texts. It was found that Athenaeus usually simplifies Polybius' text and puts snippets of information into a different context from their original one (i.e., most often from a politico-military context into a symposiastic one). This makes Polybius' text look quite as unserious as scholars have often assumed Duris' and Phylarchus' histories to be, based on their representation by Athenaeus. Plutarch was shown to be an equally problematic cover-text, although for different reasons. While he often uses information from Polybius in passages of a similar context to the original Polybian one, he combines different sources and draws his own conclusions from the narrated events. This makes it impossible to see where his use of any one source begins and ends, and it is easy to attribute too much or too little to a specific source in each case.

The issue with which we began this paper was how the fragments of Polybius preserved in different cover-texts can help us interpret the fragments of Duris and Phylarchus, particularly in relation to two questions: (1) whether we are justified in assuming that Duris and Phylarchus wrote a different type of historiography from Polybius; and (2) to what extent the fragments allow us to form an impression of the essence of their lost works. On the basis of the investigation above, I would now suggest that the answer to question 1 is a cautious 'yes, to a certain extent'. The difference between the histories of Duris and Phylarchus on the one hand and Polybius on the other is indicated by the combined evidence of: (a) the respect enjoyed by Polybius throughout antiquity and the early Medieval period compared with the lack of respect shown to Duris and Phylarchus; (b) Plutarch's explicit and repeated criticisms of Duris and Phylarchus for unreliability; and (c) the (small, but significant) differences in the topics of the fragments of Duris or Phylarchus preserved by Plutarch and Athenaeus compared with the topics of the fragments of Polybius. All of this indicates that Duris and Phylarchus did, in fact, write history in a slightly different way from Polybius, including alongside their politico-military narratives more information about mythology, religious customs, as well as, in the case of Duris, the origin of proverbs, and, in the case of Phylarchus, colourful incidents and quotable direct speech. Plutarch, although he used them both as sources, seems to have found them less generally reliable than Polybius, perhaps because of their style and focus. It may also be this different way of writing of history which, by Late Antiquity, made them much less authoritative sources for lexicographers than Polybius.⁴¹

⁴¹ It is tempting to think that the difference between the works of Duris and Phylarchus on the one hand and Polybius' on the other was similar to the difference between Herodotus and Thucydides; see Baron (2016). I explore this further in a forthcoming monograph from Edinburgh University Press.

The answer to question 2, however, namely to what extent the fragments allow us to form an impression of the essence of their lost works beyond these general observations, has to be ‘not very much’. The difficulty of establishing the original characteristics of now fragmentary works of history is illustrated by the fragments of Polybius. Even with all the 651 fragments preserved by different cover-texts including the *Suda*, if we did not have the manuscripts and the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, we would have no way of knowing what Polybius’ *Histories* are really like. One thing that would be completely lost to us is the very feature that makes Polybius’ *Histories* such a unique reading experience: the Polybian historian-narrator’s constant communication with the reader about his project, about his selection of material, about his organisation, and about his purpose in narrating various episodes the way he does. The ubiquity and narrative dominance of this ‘commentary track’ is unique to Polybius (among substantially preserved historiographical texts), but it is completely absent from the cover-texts’ referencing of his work. Another dominant characteristic of the *Histories*, the strong polemical tone, is only preserved in nine out of the 651 fragments.⁴² The logical implication is that similarly distinctive historiographical or narrative techniques may have been present, even ubiquitous, in Duris’ and Phylarchus’ texts, but have disappeared in the retelling. All we have left of them are the indications in certain cover-texts that their histories did not inspire the same confidence as Polybius’, and the occasional accusation of bias or ‘tragedising’, whatever that meant.

In short, on the one hand, this investigation has brought to light new evidence to support a cautious case-by-case approach to working with fragments.⁴³ On the other hand, I believe that the differences demonstrated between the topics of the Polybius fragments preserved by Athenaeus and Plutarch and those of Duris and Phylarchus preserved by the same cover-texts, and the difference in the cover-texts’ attitude to Polybius and to Duris and Phylarchus, show that the latter two did, in fact, write a type of historiography that presented a different reading experience from that of Polybius. Whether their brand of historiography can rightly be called ‘tragic’, and whether it was less historically factual than the historiography of Polybius, is a different matter, which must be discussed elsewhere.

University of Glasgow

LISA IRENE HAU
Lisa.Hau@glasgow.ac.uk

⁴² Steph. Byz. *Ethn.* 22.13; Str. *Geog.* 2.4.2; 4.2.1; 7.5.9; 10.3.5; *Suda* s.vv. δεισιδαιμονία (Δ 368), Δημοχάρης (Δ 472), ἔμφασιν (E 1069), ἔμφασις (E 1070).

⁴³ As practiced by, e.g., Parmeggiani (2011) for Ephorus and Baron (2013) for Timaeus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almagor, E. (2018) 'A Literary Passage: Polybius and Plutarch's Narrator', in A. Meeus, ed., *Narrative in Hellenistic Historiography* (*Histos* Supplement 8; Newcastle) 171–209.
- Ambaglio, D. (1990) 'I Deipnosofisti di Ateneo e la tradizione storica frammentaria', *Athenaeum* 78: 51–64.
- Baron, C. (2013) *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge).
 — (2016) 'Duris of Samos and a Herodotean Model for Writing History' in J. Priestley and V. Zali, edd., *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden) 59–82.
- Billerbeck, M. and A. Neumann-Hartmann (2021) *Stephanos von Byzanz* (Berlin).
- Braund, D. and J. Wilkins, edd. (2000) *Athenaeus and his World* (Exeter)
- Brunt, P. A. (1980) 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *CQ* 30: 477–94.
- Carrière, J.-C. (2007) 'Les citations de Xénophon dans le Banquet des sophistes d'Athénée', in S. David and E. Geny, edd., *Troika. Parcours Antiques. Mélanges offerts à Michel Woronoff*, vol. 1 (Besançon) 219–40.
- Clarke, K. (2007) 'Les Fragments de Posidonios chez Athénée', in Lenfant (2007b) 291–304.
- Dickey, E. (2014) 'A Catalogue of Works attributed to the Grammarian Herodian', *CPh* 109: 325–45.
- Eckstein, A. (1995) *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2001), 'Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in N. Luraghi, ed., *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford) 286–313.
- Giovannelli-Jouanna, P. (2007) 'Les fragments de Douris de Samos chez Athénée', in Lenfant (2007b) 214–37.
- Gorman, R. J. and V. Gorman (2007) 'The *Truphê* of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem', *JHS* 127: 38–60.
- Hau, L. I. (2016) *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus* (Edinburgh).
 — (2018) 'Tragic History', *OCD* online:
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.013.8228>.
- (2020a) 'Pathos with a Point: Reflections on "Sensationalist" Narratives of Violence in Hellenistic Historiography in the Light of Twenty-First Century Historiography', in J. Grethlein, L. Huitink, and A. Tagliabue, edd., *Experience, Narrative and Criticism in Ancient Greece* (Oxford) 81–103.
- (2020b) 'Tragedies of War in Duris and Phylarchus: Social Memory and Experiential History', in J. Klooster and I. N. I. Kuin, edd., *After the Crisis: Remembering, Re-Anchoring and Recovery in Ancient Greece and Rome* (London) 49–64.
- Hornblower, S., ed. (1994) *Greek Historiography* (Oxford).

- Jacob, C. (2004) 'La Citation comme performance dans les *Deipnosophistes* d'Athénée', in C. Darbo-Peschanski, ed., *La citation dans l'antiquité* (Grenoble) 147–74.
- (2013) *The Web of Athenaeus* (Hellenic Studies Series 61; Washington, D.C.) <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5257.christian-jacob-the-web-of-athenaeus> (Accessed 29 Jan. 2021).
- Kaldellis, A. (2012) 'The Byzantine Role in the Making of the Corpus of Classical Greek Historiography: A Preliminary Investigation', *JHS* 132: 71–85.
- Lenfant, D. (1999) 'Peut-on se fier aux "fragments" d'historiens? L'exemple des citations d'Hérodote', *Ktèma* 24: 103–21.
- (2007a) 'Les "fragments" d'Hérodote dans les *Deipnosophistes*', in ead. (2007b) 43–72.
- (2009) 'Jacoby Online', *CR* 58: 395–8.
- (2013) 'The Study of Intermediate Authors and its Role in the Interpretation of Historical Fragments', *AncSoc* 43: 289–305.
- , ed. (2007b) *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens* (Paris 2007).
- Luce, T. J. (1997) *The Greek Historians* (London and New York).
- Maisonneuve, Ch. (2007) 'Les "fragments" de Xénophon dans les *Deipnosophistes*', in Lenfant (2007b) 73–106.
- Manafis, P. (2020) *(Re)writing History in Byzantium: A Critical Study of Collections of Historical Excerpts* (London and New York).
- Marincola, J. (2013) 'Polybius, Phylarchus, and "Tragic History": A Reconsideration', in B. Gibson and T. Harrison, edd., *Polybius and his World: Essays in Memory of F. W. Walbank* (Oxford) 73–90.
- Meeus, A. (2017) 'Compilation or Tradition? Some Thoughts on the Methods of Historians and Other Scholars in Antiquity', *Sacris Erudiri* 56: 395–414.
- Meister, K. (1990) *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (Stuttgart, Berlin, and Cologne).
- Moore, J. M. (1965) *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius* (Cambridge).
- Németh, A. (2018) *The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past* (Cambridge).
- Olson, D. (2018) 'Athenaeus' "Fragments" of Non-fragmentary Prose Authors and their Implications', *AJPh* 139: 423–50.
- Parmeggiani, G. (2011) *Eforo di Cuma: studi di storiografia Greca* (Bologna).
- Pelling, C. (1980) 'Plutarch's Adaptation of his Source Material', *GRBS* 16: 77–85; repr. in B. Scardigli, ed., *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* (Oxford, 1995) 125–54) and C. Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (London and Swansea, 2002) 91–116.
- (2000) 'Fun with Fragments. Athenaeus and the Historians', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 171–90.

- (2016) ‘Tragic Colouring in Plutarch’, in J. Opsomer, G. Roskam, and F. B. Titchener, edd., *A Versatile Gentleman: Consistency in Plutarch’s Writing* (Leuven) 113–33.
- Rafiyenko, D. (2017) ‘Towards the Compilation Principles of the Excerptors in the *Excerpta Historica Constantiniana*’, *Byzantinoslavica* 75: 291–324.
- Rebenich, S. (1997) ‘Historical Prose’, in S. E. Porter, ed., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (Leiden) 265–337.
- Roussou, S., ed. (2018) *Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome of Herodian’s De Prosodia Catholica* (Oxford).
- Schepens, G. (1997) ‘Jacoby’s *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects’, in G. W. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen) 148–72.
- (2007) ‘Les fragments de Phylarque chez Athénée’, in Lenfant (2007b) 239–61.
- Van der Stockt, L. (2005) “Πολυβιάσασθαι”: Plutarch on Timaeus and “Tragic History”, in G. Schepens and J. Bollansée, edd., *The Shadow of Polybius* (Leuven) 271–305.
- Walbank, F. W. (1967) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius II* (Oxford).
- (1979) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius III* (Oxford).
- (2000) ‘Athenaeus and Polybius’, in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 161–71.
- Zangara, A. (2007) *Voir l’histoire: théories anciennes du récit historique* (Paris).

Appendix A
Fragments of Polybius in Athenaeus

	Athenaeus Passage	Independently Preserved Polybius Passage	Topic	Notes
F 1	Ath. 1.16c. Description ascribed to Polybius of the luxuriousness of an Iberian king's palace, which rivalled that of the Phaeacians.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 34.9.14–15)	Luxury	
F 2	Ath. 1.31d. 'Polybius says that' outstanding wine is made in Capua and called <i>anadendrites</i> .	None (included in the Loeb edition as 34.11.1)	Luxury, Drinking	
F 3	Ath. 2.45c. Ptolemaeus Philadelphus sent Nile water to his daughter Berenice after having married her to Antiochus so that she should never drink anything else, 'as Polybius relates'.	None (included in the Loeb edition as F 73)	Luxury	Walbank (2000) 170 suggests that Athenaeus may here mistakenly have written 'Polybius' for 'Phylarchus', but there is no reason why Athenaeus should not have found this piece of information in Polybius.
F 4	Ath. 3.78e–f. Philip V took figs from Magnesia for his soldiers as they had no corn, and later gave the Magnesians Myus in return.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 16.24.9)	Luxury, Food	
F 5	Ath. 3.95d: There is a place called 'Snout' in Aetolia, 'as Polybius testifies in Book 6 of the <i>Histories</i> '.	None	Place name	
FF 6–7	Ath. 5.193d–195f: Long description of the madness of Antiochus IV and	None	Luxury,	

	an extremely elaborate procession organised by him.	(The description is presented as a verbatim quotation of Polybius, but is usually divided into two by editors of the <i>Histories</i> and placed in two different books of his <i>Histories</i> (26.1 and 30.25–27). ⁴⁴	Ridiculousness of the powerful	
F 8	Ath. 6.251e: ‘Polybius in Book 12 of his <i>History</i> records that the Philip defeated by the Romans had a flatterer named Heracleides of Tarentum, who brought about the ruin of Philip’s entire kingship.’	Pol. 13.4	Flatterers	See above, pp. 255–6.
F 9	Ath. 6.251e: ‘And in his fourteenth book, he says that ‘Philo was a flatterer of Agathocles’.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 14.11.1.)	Flatterers	Walbank believes that the attribution to Book 14 is correct. ⁴⁵
F 10	Ath. 6.252c–d: ‘Polybius says in Book 8 of the <i>History</i> “Cavarus the Celt was otherwise a decent person, but was led astray by his flatterer Sostratus, who was a native of Chalcedon.”’ (Καύαρος, φησίν, ὁ Γαλάτης ὃν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὑπὸ Σωστράτου τοῦ κόλακος διεστρέφετο, ὃς ἦν Χαλκηδόνιος γένος).	The relevant part of the <i>Histories</i> is lost, recoverable only from a paraphrase in the Byzantine collection of extracts <i>Excerpta Antiqua</i> (Pol. 8.22.1–2). The Athenaeus passage is included in the Loeb edition as 8.22.3.	Flatterers	The relevant extract gives this description of Cavarus: ‘Cavarus, the king of the Gauls in Thrace, being kingly and high-minded by nature, provided much safety for those merchants who were sailing to the Pontos, and had provided much aid to the Byzantines in their wars against the

⁴⁴ On the provenance of the fragments of Polybius *Histories* 19–40 and the reasoning behind their distribution into Books, see Walbank (1979) 1–62.

⁴⁵ Walbank (1967) 22 and (2000) 170.

				Thracians and Bithynians'. ⁴⁶ It seems likely that it was a description such as this which Athenaeus abbreviated to 'Cavarus the Celt was otherwise a decent person'. In other words, the 'verbatim quotation' is probably a pretence, and the passage is really a paraphrase of what Polybius said.
F 11	Ath. 6.272a–b: Timaeus is wrong about the Greeks not normally owning slaves, 'Polybius of Megalopolis criticizes him for this in Book 12 of his <i>History</i> '.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 12.6.2)	Slaves	
F 12	Ath. 6.273a–b: The Romans used to be a moderate people; for instance, Scipio Africanus took with him only five slaves to the East and sent home for a new one after one of them died, 'according to Polybius and Posidonius'.	None (included in the Loeb edition as F 76)	Slaves, Luxury	
F 13	Ath. 6.274f–275a: 'According to Polybius in Book 31 of his <i>History</i> , the well-known Cato was disgusted and cried out that certain people had imported foreign luxury into Rome by buying a jar of Pontic saltfish for 300 drachmas, and	Pol. 31.25	Luxury Pithy saying	

⁴⁶ Καύαρος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ Γαλατῶν βασιλικὸς ὑπάρχων τῇ φύσει καὶ μεγαλόφρων, πολλὴν μὲν ἀσφάλειαν παρεσκεύαζε τοῖς προσπλέουσι τῶν ἐμπόρων εἰς τὸν Πόντον, μεγάλας δὲ παρείχετο χρείας τοῖς Βυζαντίοις ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τοὺς Θρᾶκας καὶ Βιθυνοὺς πολέμοις.

	handsome boys for more than fields cost.’			
F 14	Ath. 7.302c: ‘Polybius of Megalopolis in Book 34 of his <i>History</i> , in his discussion of the Lusitanian region of Spain, claims that nut-trees grow in the depths of the sea there, and that the tuna grow fat from eating their fruit.’	None (included in the Loeb edition as 34.8.1–2)	Natural phenomenon	
F 15	Ath. 8.330d–331b: A lengthy description of the fertility of Lusitania and the consequent cheapness of various foodstuffs there, with prices, all ascribed to Polybius.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 34.4–10)	Luxury, Natural phenomena	
F 16	Ath. 8.332a–b: Description of a river plain completely undermined by underground fish, ascribed to Polybius.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 34.10.1–4)	Natural phenomena	
F 17	Ath. 9.400f: ‘Polybius in Book 12 of his <i>History</i> reports that the so-called <i>kouniklos</i> is a creature that resembles the hare. He writes as follows: “When seen from a distance, the so-called <i>kouniklos</i> appears to be a small hare: but when you get one in your hands, it both looks and tastes quite different. It is generally found underground”.’	Verbatim quotation of Pol. 12.3.10	Natural phenomena	Athenaeus fails to mention that Polybius is talking about the fauna of Corsica; he has removed the quotation from that context and repurposed it as a piece of evidence about rabbits and hares in a passage that quotes various authors who have things to say about these two animals.

F 18	Ath. 10.418a–b: ‘Polybius of Megalopolis in Book 20 of his <i>History</i> says that after Boeotians got a great reputation for what happened at Leuctra, they gradually allowed themselves to relax, began having feasts and drinking parties, and made arrangements in their wills for their friends to have parties. Even many of those who had families divided up the majority of their property among their messmates, the result being that large numbers of Boeotians had more dinners to attend each month than there were days in it. This is why the Megarians, who despised the situation in Boeotia, revolted to the Achaeans.’	Pol. 20.6.6–7 This is a paraphrase of Polybius’ conclusion to two chapters which detail the politico-military events which led the Boeotians to turn their backs on their alliance with the Achaean League and ally themselves instead with the Aetolians and Macedonians.	Drinking, Luxury	
F 19	Ath. 10.424d: Polybius in Book 9 says that a river in Aetolia is called Wine-ladle (Cyathus).	None	Place name	
F 20	Ath. 10.425e–f: ‘Cleino, the woman who poured wine for King Ptolemy (nicknamed Philadelphus), is mentioned by Ptolemy son of Agesarchus in Book III of his <i>History Involving Philopator</i> . Polybius in Book 14 of his <i>History</i> reports that statues of her wearing nothing but a tunic	None (included in the Loeb edition as 14.11.2)	Women, Sexual scandal, Luxury	This is a surprising passage for Athenaeus to attribute to Polybius. It does not exist in the surviving parts of the <i>Histories</i> , and the focus on promiscuous women is atypical for Polybius. That does not necessarily mean that Athenaeus is misremembering his source, however: Polybius is

	and holding drinking-horn in her hands stood in Alexandria in many parts of the city.’			often keen to show that low-born, low-minded people exercise undue influence over weak rulers, and it is entirely possible that he devoted a digression in Book 14 to the influence held by courtesans over various kings. It is a shame that we do not have the original passage so we can see to what extent Athenaeus is misrepresenting the passage by quoting or paraphrasing it out of context.
F 21	Ath. 10.439a: Shorter version of the mad behaviour of Antiochus IV detailed in FF 6–7.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 26.1a)	Ridiculous behaviour of the powerful	
F 22	Ath. 10.439b–d: Shorter version of Antiochus IV’s procession detailed in FF 6 and 7, with a few new details.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 30.25–26)	Ridiculous behaviour of the powerful, Luxury	
FF 23–7	Ath. 10.439e–f: This is a continuous passage of Athenaeus on powerful men who do stupid things in drunkenness. It references five separate Polybius passages and so has been divided into five fragments. Most of these passages are lost from the <i>Histories</i> , but, as Walbank argues, Polybius often finds occasion to moralise on	None (included in the Loeb edition as 20.8)	Ridiculous behaviour of the powerful	

	<p>drunkenness⁴⁷ so they would not be uncharacteristic of him.</p> <p>F 23 tells of Antiochus III, who, ‘according to Polybius in Book 20,’ was madly in love at the age of 50 and spent the winter celebrating his wedding instead of focusing on the war he was fighting against Rome.</p>			
	<p>F 24: ‘In Book 2 the same Polybius reports that the Illyrian king Agron, who was delighted to have defeated the proud Aetolians, but who consumed large amounts of wine and spent his time at drinking parties and feasts, caught pneumonia and died.’</p>	<p>This refers to Pol. 2.4.6 where Polybius briefly relates the death of the Illyrian king Agron and the succession of his wife Teuta, who will be responsible for bringing the Romans to Illyria.</p>	<p>Drinking</p>	
	<p>F 25: ‘In Book 29 the same author claims that the Illyrian king Genthion drank so much that he engaged in a great deal of ugly behaviour throughout his life and was constantly intoxicated day and night. After he killed his brother Pleuratus, who was about to marry Monounius’ daughter, he married the girl himself and treated his subjects cruelly.’</p>	<p>This passage is lost from the <i>Histories</i>, but Genthion plays a significant and inglorious part in the very fragmentary Books 28–32, so it is likely that Polybius did indeed say this about him, probably with more details, in Book 29.</p>	<p>Drinking</p>	

⁴⁷ Walbank (2000); see also Eckstein (1995) 285–90.

	F 26: ‘In Book 33 Polybius says that Demetrius, who escaped when he was being held hostage in Rome and became king of Syria, drank large amounts and spent most of the day intoxicated.’	There is very little left of Polybius’ narrative of Demetrius after he became king of Syria, and nothing about habitual drunkenness. In the preserved detailed narrative of his escape from Rome, however, Polybius notes that Demetrius was ‘by nature fond of drinking-parties and very young’ (τοῦ Δημητρίου συμποτικοῦ φυσικῶς καὶ νεοτέρου τελέως ὑπάρχοντος, 31.13.8), so it is not unlikely that his narrative of Demetrius’ reign included a comment on his drinking.	Drinking	
	F 27: ‘And in Book 32 he claims that Orophernes, who was briefly king of Cappadocia and rejected the traditional local customs, introduced the elaborate Ionian style of debauchery.’	None, but brief mention of Orophernes at 33.6 from the <i>Exc. Const.</i> (Included in the Loeb edition as 32.11.10)	Luxury	
F 28	Ath. 10.440e–f: Detailed information about Roman women not being allowed to drink wine, and the custom of making matrons kiss every male relative they meet in order to make any unauthorised drinking easily detectable,	None (Included in the Loeb edition as 6.11a4)	Women, Drinking	Although lost from the <i>Histories</i> , this passage would have fit into the part of Book 6 where Polybius discusses Roman customs, and it is characteristic of him to

	‘according to Polybius in Book 6’; Roman women instead drink <i>passum</i> made from raisins.			be interested particularly in preventative measures. ⁴⁸
F 29	Ath. 10.445d: ‘He [Perseus] was uninterested in women, and did not like wine; instead, not only did he himself drink only a modest amount at dinner, but the same was true of the friends who were with him, according to Polybius in Book 26.’	Pol. 25.3	Drinking, Luxury	Wrong book attribution. Polybius talks about the moderation of Perseus’ early reign and gives more details than Athenaeus.
F 30	Ath. 12.527b: ‘as for the Aetolians, Polybius in Book 13 of the <i>History</i> says that they fell deeply into debt as a result of their constant wars and the extravagance in which they lived.’	The relevant passage of the <i>Histories</i> is preserved by the Constantinian collection of excerpts <i>On Vice and Virtue</i> and is usually labelled 13.1.1. Polybius may have said more about this in the original full version of the <i>Histories</i> .	Luxury	
F 31	Ath. 12.528b–c: A comparison, ascribed to Polybius, between the decadence of Capua, brought about by its wealth, which made the citizens invite in Hannibal, and the fortitude of Petelia, whose citizens did not give up during an 11-month siege despite having eaten the bark	None (included in the Loeb edition as 7.1)	Luxury	

⁴⁸ As in his description of the various punishment for soldiers, Pol. 6.37–8.

	off all the trees, and finally only surrendered to Hannibal because they received no assistance or sympathy from Rome.			
F 32	Ath. 13.576f–577a: Same information as F 20, but with more details.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 14.11.2+5)	Women, Luxury	
F 33	Ath. 14.615b–c: Long description of ridiculous musical games put on by L. Anicius when he celebrated his triumph over Genthion.	None (included in the Loeb edition as 30.22)	Ridiculous behaviour of the powerful	
F 34	Ath. 14.626a–f: Long polemical discussion to prove the usefulness of music, presented as verbatim quotation from Polybius.	Pol. 4.20.5–21.9. Much of it is quoted verbatim, but certain details are left out and a few phrases have been changed. (See Table 3).	Music	
F 35	Ath. 14.634b: Witty, self-ironic utterance by Marcellus on his defeat at sea by Archimedes' machinations, presented as verbatim quotation of Polybius.	Pol. 8.6.6. Marcellus' witticism has been quoted verbatim while two sentences by Polybius about his state of mind have been left out.	Pithy saying	
F 36	Ath. 14.651c–f: Detailed account of the appearance of the lotus plant and the class-stratified consumption of it in North Africa, said to derive from Polybius 'as an eyewitness' (<i>αὐτόπτης</i>).	None (Included in the Loeb edition as 12.1.2)	Natural phenomena	

Appendix B
Fragments of Polybius in Plutarch

	Plutarch Passage	Independently Preserved Polybius Passage	Topic
F 1	Plut. <i>Aem. Paul.</i> 15.5: Polybius is mentioned as an alternative source to Scipio Nasica for the number of soldiers taken on an expedition by Nasica and Fabius Maximus. Plutarch prefers Nasica's information.	None (included as Pol. 29.14 in the Loeb edition).	Politico-military
F 2	Plut. <i>Aem. Paul.</i> 16.3: Polybius is mentioned as an alternative source to Scipio Nasica. Polybius says that Perseus' men attacked by Scipio Nasica were still asleep whereas Nasica reports heavy fighting. Plutarch does not decide between the two sources.	None (included as Pol. 29.15 in the Loeb edition).	Politico-military
F 3	Plut. <i>Aem. Paul.</i> 19.4: Perseus fled from the battle like a coward. Unclear if the following moralising condemnation of cowardice is from Polybius too.	None. (The lines about Perseus fleeing are included as Pol. 29.18 in the Loeb edition; the moralising condemnation is left out. It is, however, not unusual for Polybius to moralise on bravery and cowardice.) ⁴⁹	Politico-military Moralising?
F 4	Plut. <i>Pel.</i> 17.2: Number of Spartans at Leuctra. Mentioned as an alternative source, along with "certain others", to Ephorus and Callisthenes for the number of Spartans in a <i>mora</i> ; Plutarch does not decide between the sources.	None	Politico-military

⁴⁹ See Eckstein (1995) and Hau (2016) 23–72.

F 5	Plut. <i>Comp. Pelop.–Marc.</i> 1.4: ‘According to Polybius,’ Hannibal was never defeated before Scipio Africanus.	Not said by Polybius in so many words (in the extant text), but shown clearly by his narrative from Books 3–15. The passage may be inspired by Hannibal’s speech to his men before Zama at Pol. 15.11.7, which similarly uses the rare adjective ἀήττητος. ⁵⁰	Politico-military
F 6	Plut. <i>Cat. Mai.</i> 9.2–3: two quotations of Cato the Elder connected with Polybius’ own petition to the Senate to allow the Greeks deported to Italy to go home. Plutarch does not say who his source for the sayings is, but it is reasonable to expect that he found them in Polybius.	None (included as Pol. 35.6 by the Loeb edition).	Pithy sayings
F 7	Plut. <i>Cat. Mai.</i> 10.3: All the walls of the Spanish cities on this side of the Baetis were torn down on Cato’s command in a single day. Plutarch references Cato and uses Polybius to corroborate his statement.	None	Politico-military
F 8	Plut. <i>Philop.</i> 16.3: Philopoemen put to death 80 Lacedaemonians according to Polybius, 350 according to Aristocrates. Plutarch does not choose between his two sources.	None	Politico-military
F 9	Plut. <i>Cleom.</i> 25.3: Cleomenes seemed to act with rash daring, but actually he had planned his action carefully, ‘as Polybius says’.	Pol. 2.64.2. See discussion above, pp. 259–61.	Politico-military
F 10	Plut. <i>Cleom.</i> 27.5: ‘his [Cleomenes]’ lack of resources forced him to stake the whole issue on a battle where, as Polybius says, he could oppose only 20,000 men to 30,000.’	Pol. 2.65. See discussion above, pp. 261–2.	Politico-military

⁵⁰ This suggestion is made by Perrin in a note to this passage in the Plutarch Loeb.

F 11	Plut. <i>Ti. Gracch.</i> 4.3: After the death of Scipio Africanus, the relatives of his daughter Cornelia gave her to Tiberius Gracchus. Used to corroborate the evidence of ‘the majority of writers’ about the great esteem enjoyed by Tiberius Gracchus.	None. (Pol. 31.27.7 mentions in passing that the daughters of Scipio Africanus the Elder were married to Scipio Nasica and Tiberius Gracchus, but does not say which daughter married whom and why.)	Women
F 12	Plut. <i>Arat.</i> 38.7: ‘Polybius, however, says that for a long time, and before the necessity arose, Aratus mistrusted the daring temper of Cleomenes and made secret overtures to Antigonus, besides putting the Megalopolitans forward to beg the Achaeans to call in Antigonus. For the Megalopolitans were most oppressed by the war, since Cleomenes was continually plundering their territory.’	Pol. 2.45.5–46.6 tells the story of these events and casts Aratus as the hero who could foresee the Cleomenic War, but he does not talk about Aratus ‘distrusting Cleomenes’ temper’. In 2.47 Aratus approaches Antigonus in secret to secure his help for the Achaeans, but this is after the war has lasted for some time.	Politico-military
F 13	Plut. <i>Reg. Imp. Apophth.</i> 82.2 (<i>ad</i> Scipio the Younger): He tried to follow Polybius’ advice and never leave the Forum without making a friend of someone. Plutarch does not name his source, but it is reasonable to expect that he found this in Polybius.	None, but chimes well with Polybius’ description of Scipio’s training for politics under his guidance at 31.22–30	Politico-military
F 14	Plut. <i>Reg. Imp. Apophth.</i> 82.5 (<i>ad</i> Scipio the Younger): Advice of Polybius given to Scipio at Carthage. Plutarch does not name his source, but it is reasonable to expect that he found this in Polybius.	None.	Politico-military
F 15	Plut. <i>De mul. virt.</i> 22: the story of the wife of a Galatian chieftain, who was captured and raped by a Roman centurion and then had one of her husband’s warriors kill him when he was handing her over for a ransom. Quotation in direct speech of the subsequent exchange between her and her husband. Polybius says that he met her and talked to her at Sardis.	None (included as Pol. 21.38 in the Loeb edition).	Women and sexual scandal

F 16	Plut. <i>De Fort. Rom.</i> 12, 325F: the Gauls occupying Rome concluded a treaty with Camillus and left because of trouble in their home land.	Pol. 2.18.3	Politico-military
F 17	Plut. <i>An seni</i> 791F: Massinissa's prowess in his old age.	Pol. 36.16, from the Constantinian Excerpts <i>On Virtue and Vice</i> .	Characterisation