Reconstructing the Transmission of Phylarchus' *Histories*: Fr.53 and Polybius' Habit in Quoting

Marcin Kurpios

P HYLARCHUS in the third century B.C. wrote the only known continuous narrative covering the time from 272 to 220/19 B.C. In antiquity the *Histories* was an authoritative source for that period, but over time it acquired a rather dubious reputation,[1] not least because it survives only through intermediate authors or 'cover-texts', chiefly Athenaeus, Plutarch, and Polybius.[2] Polybius used Phylarchus as one of his sources,[3] but at the same time criticized him severely, destroying his credibility in the eyes of the modern reader.[4] In recent

---

[1] Phylarchus' birthplace is uncertain; the *Suda* points to Athens, Naucratis, and Sicyon. Exact dates of birth and death are impossible to establish. See J. Kroymann, "Phylarchos," *RE* Suppl. 8 (1956) 471–489; W. Africa, *Phylarchus and the Spartan Revolution* (Berkeley 1961) 1–13; P. Pédech, *Trois historiens méconnus: Théopompe, Duris, Phylarque* (Paris 1989) 394–493; F. Landucci, "I Testimonia di Filarco, storico del III sec. a.C.: riflessioni preliminari," in M. Intrieri et al. (eds.), *KOINONIA. Studi di storia antica offerti a Giovanna De Sensi Sestito* (Rome 2018) 557–569.

[2] The term cover-text, coined by G. Schepens, "Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects," in G. W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen 1997) 144–172, implies i.a. that the intermediate text alters the primary context of the original and encloses it in a new one.

[3] F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I (Oxford 1957) 259–263; P. Pédech, *Polybe. Histoires* I.2 (Paris 1970) 21–25.

[4] Polyb. 2.56–63. Detailed analyses of the critique: K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios* (Wiesbaden 1975) 93–126; D. E. McCaslin, "Polybius, Phylarchus, and the Mantinean Tragedy of 223 B.C.," *Archaiognosia* 4

---

years Polybius' treatment of Phylarchus has been hotly de-
bated, but the primary focus has been the methodological ques-
tions in writing history that are addressed by Polybius in the
critique. Little attention has been devoted to the accuracy of
Polybius' Phylarchus quotations and to his impact, as cover-
text, on our reading of the fragments.[5] This relates also to the
editions of Phylarchan *reliquiae*, as they have merely 'collected'
the passages where the author is adduced.[6] Although in the last
two decades studies of historical fragments has gained con-
siderable momentum,[7] the most recent edition of Phylarchus'

_____

(1989) 77–101; G. Schepens, "Polybius' Criticism of Phylarchus," in *The
Shadow of Polybius. Intertextuality as a Research Tool in Greek
Historiography* (Leuven 2005) 141–164. On Polybius' polemics in general
see F. W. Walbank, "Polemic in Polybius," *JRS* 52 (1962) 1–12.

[5] J. Marincola, "Polybius, Phylarchus, and 'Tragic History': A Recon-
sideration," in B. Gibson et al., *Polybius and his World: Essays in Memory
of F. W. Walbank* (Oxford 2013) 73–90; A. M. Eckstein, "Polybius,
Phylarchus, and Historiographical Criticism," *CP* 108 (2013) 314–338; J.
Thornton, "Tragedia e retorica nella polemica sulla presa di Mantinea
(Polibio II, 56–58)," in *Parole in movimento* (Pisa 2013) 353–374; S.
Farrington, "The Tragic Phylarchus," in V. Liotsakis et al., *The Art of
History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography* (Berlin
2016) 159–182. These studies do not involve systematic examination of the
character of the Polybian references. On the vague idea of tragic history see
V. Fromentin, "L'histoire tragique a-t-elle existé?" in A. Billaut et al. (eds.),
Lectures antiques de la tragédie grecque (Lyon 2001) 77–92.

[6] *Phylarchus, Historiarum fragmenta*, collegit J. F. Lucht (Leipzig 1836);
Phylarchus, Historiarum reliquiae, edidit A. Brueckner (Breslau 1839);
Phylarchi fragmenta in Müller, *FHG* I (Paris 1841) 334–358. Jacoby's entry
for Phylarchus, *FGrHist* 81 (1926), has one *testimonium* (T 3) and five
fragments (F 53–56, 58) excerpted from Polybius. On the deficiencies of
Jacoby's edition see Schepens, in *The Shadow of Polybius* 150 n.22.

[7] For an overview of the methodological issues see D. Lenfant, "The Study
of Intermediate Authors and its Role in the Interpretation of Historical
Fragments," *AncSoc* 43 (2013) 289–305. For developments in the field of
historical fragments see E. Lanzillotta, "2002–2012: dieci anni di ricerca sulla
storiografia greca frammentaria," in F. Gazzano et al. (eds.), *Le età della
trasmissione. Alessandria, Roma, Bisanzio* (Tivoli 2013) XIII-XXI. Cf. the
careful case-study of Timaeus' remains by Ch. Baron, *Timaeus of*

fragments does not analyse the Polybian transmission of Phylarchus according to the new methodological approaches.[8] To be sure, Landucci's commentary is overall thorough and judicious, but the question of Polybius' intentions and habits in quoting, essential for evaluation of individual fragments, is left open.[9]

The aim of this article is to scrutinize a single fragment of Phylarchus (F 53a = Polyb. 2.56.6–7) in the light of Polybius' habit in quoting, in order to establish the probable faithfulness of the references. I take F 53a as the starting point, leading into the central questions: the choice of modes of speech and of introductory formulae, subsumed under the phrase *markers of reporting*. I then explore Polybius' practice in quoting by following those two guides. As the result of this section suggests that he strongly prefers to cite using φησί and *oratio obliqua* with the accusative and infinitive construction (AcI), I then try to detect whether and why he cites other authors verbatim in *oratio recta*, so that we can better define the factors that influence his choices in quoting. Next I show how Polybius intermingles verbatim citations with *oratio obliqua* in reporting speeches with

---

Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography (Cambridge 2013), and the new editions of historical fragments in the series *I frammenti degli storici greci* (Tivoli 2002–).

[8] F. Landucci, in *Brill's New Jacoby*, online entry published on 1 October 2017. Three passages are added: F 53b (Polyb. 2.58.10–14), F 54b (2.60.7), F 55b (2.61.10–12).

[9] Landucci dismisses the accuracy of the references in F 53a and 53b without giving any argument (see below); other fragments are not commented on in that aspect at all. This deficiency of some of the BNJ entries has been pointed out by D. Lenfant, *CR* 59 (2009) 397–398, who notes that "despite the recent studies which emphasised these problems, many commentaries in the BNJ take into account neither the context of quotation nor the methods and intent of the transmitting author." Cf. similar observations in R. Thomas, *Mnemosyne* 65 (2012) 872–876. The need for the "horizontal approach" in new editions of fragments had been emphasized earlier by G. Schepens, "Probleme der Fragmentedition," in Ch. Reitz (ed.), *Vom Text zum Buch* (St. Katharinen 2000) 6–7, 29.

φησί+AcI, in order to highlight the adaptability of this mode of quoting. Having provided this wider perspective on Polybius' habits in quoting, I return to F 53a, first reading the references in the main clauses in light of the considerations and findings thus far along with supplementary evidence from Plutarch. Lastly, I discuss the subordinate clauses, identifying Polybius' ascriptions of motives imbedded in the references to Phylarchus' narrative. This final part addresses how Polybius encloses in a new context the pieces adduced from Phylarchus. The paper concludes with a further argument for considering some of the Polybian references more faithful than is generally assumed.

1. *The text of the fragment*

F 53a (= Polyb. 2.56.6–7) is a well-known passage, in which Polybius refers to Phylarchus' description of the capture and destruction of Mantinea by the Achaean League and the Macedonians in the summer of 223:[10]

(6) βουλόμενος δὴ διασαφεῖν τὴν ὠμότητα τὴν Ἀντιγόνου καὶ Μακεδόνων, ἅμα δὲ τούτοις τὴν Ἀράτου καὶ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, φησὶ τοὺς Μαντινέας γενομένους ὑποχειρίους μεγάλοις περιπεσεῖν ἀτυχήμασι, καὶ τὴν ἀρχαιοτάτην καὶ μεγίστην πόλιν τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀρκαδίαν τηλικαύταις παλαῖσαι συμφοραῖς ὥστε πάντας εἰς ἐπίστασιν καὶ δάκρυα τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγεῖν. (7) σπουδάζων δ' εἰς ἔλεον ἐκκαλεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας καὶ συμπαθεῖς ποιεῖν τοῖς λεγομένοις, εἰσάγει περιπλοκὰς γυναικῶν καὶ κόμας διερριμμένας καὶ μαστῶν ἐκβολάς, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις δάκρυα καὶ θρήνους ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ἀναμὶξ τέκνοις καὶ γονεῦσι γηραιοῖς ἀπαγομένων.

(6) Wishing, for instance, to insist on the cruelty of Antigonus and the Macedonians and also on that of Aratus and the

---

[10] The incident took place in the course of the so-called Cleomenean war. On the events see Walbank, *HCP* 260–261; K. Hagemans and E. Kosmetatou, "Aratus and the Achaean Background to Polybius," in *The Shadow of Polybius* 123–139. For general comments on the fragment see Meister, *Historische Kritik* 98–99; E. Gabba, "Studi su Filarco. Le biografie plutarchee de Agide e di Cleomene," *Athenaeum* 35 (1957) 3–55, 193–239, at 7.

Achaeans, he tells us that the Mantineans, brought into subjection, were exposed to terrible sufferings and that such were the misfortunes that overtook this, the most ancient and greatest city in Arcadia, as to impress deeply and move to tears all the Greeks. (7) In his eagerness to arouse the pity and attention of his readers he treats us to a picture of clinging women with their hair dishevelled and their breasts bare, or again of crowds of both sexes together with their children and aged parents weeping and lamenting as they are led away to slavery.[11]

Paragraph 6 starts with the *participium* βουλόμενος, which constitutes the subject of the sentence; the first clause is dependent on this *participium*. What comes next is the clause with the introductory formula φησί and the purported words of Phylarchus in *oratio obliqua*. The paragraph thus begins with a subordinate clause, 'explaining' Phylarchus' motive for writing what is reported as his narrative in the main clause. Paragraph 7 also begins with a subordinate clause dependent on a *participium*, σπουδάζων. In the main clause, the introductory formula is different from that in par. 6, namely εἰσάγει. As a consequence of the use of εἰσάγει, there follow not verbs in infinitive form, but two substantives instead.

These nuances in the Polybian references notwithstanding, Jacoby and BNJ present the fragment in regular typeface from beginning to end, which implies that its relation to the original is uniform throughout.[12] In addition, Jacoby printed part of this fragment also as *testimonium* (T 3), namely the words in par. 7 from σπουδάζων to λεγομένοις, and BNJ reproduces Jacoby's

[11] The Greek text used in this paper is that of Pédech; transl. Paton (Loeb), with minor corrections.

[12] Jacoby distinguished between doubtful passages (presented in smaller font), paraphrases/reformulations (in normal typeface) and verbatim citations (in expanded mode). For Phylarchus' fragments in Polybius Jacoby employed this three-stage explanatory tool rather moderately: apart from 2.62.2–9 (part of F 56) and 2.63.3 (part of F 58), which are printed in petit, no Phylarchan fragment from Polybius is marked with either of the different typescripts. In BNJ the three-stage division of Jacoby's printing styles entirely disappears.

text, including its delineation and the partial double classification. Landucci addresses the question of the faithfulness of Polybius' reporting in a remark on F 53b (= 2.58.10–14), saying that in both fragments "Polybios fails to give his reader a clear view of what Phylarchos actually said." Given the lack of examination of the fragment in the commentary, this statement seems sweeping. Landucci's skepticism is in the tradition of nearly all previous studies, which took Polybius' outright hostility to Phylarchus as clear motive for misrepresenting him.[13] In sum, presenting the whole text with no differentiation in font size, no scrutiny of Polybius' method of quoting, and including part of par. 7 as T 3, the BNJ gives no clear notion of what of Polybius' text actually reflects Phylarchus' narrative and how exactly. Guido Schepens, in the most comprehensive analysis of the testimony to date, conjectured that par. 6 "renders substantially what Phylarchus said," whereas par. 7 is an expression of Polybius' subjective opinion.[14] But what in fact does it mean to "render substantially"? And how to validate such a claim?

Since no independent control material for the narrative in question exists,[15] the best way is through exploration of Polybius as cover-text. The survey above shows that two features can be addressed: (a) the modes of speech occurring in the references (*oratio obliqua* par. 6/*oratio recta* par. 7); (b) the introductory words (φησί par. 6/εἰσάγει par. 7). These two elements can be called *markers of reporting*, as they both have implications for the

[13] For instance, Eckstein, *CP* 108 (2013) 316, seems to take for granted that "we have only paraphrases and reactions in Polybius (and Plutarch)." See also the works cited in nn.4–5 above.

[14] Schepens, in *The Shadow of Polybius* 150 n.22: "a comment made by Polybius himself on what he believes to have been Phylarchus' main intention in setting on stage women clinging to one another"; cf. 148, where he considers as a quote part of par. 6 introduced by φησί.

[15] I.e. Phylarchus' narrative preserved without any intermediary. The passages in Plutarch, based on the parts of the *Histories* under consideration, have to be treated with caution, as he is a cover-text himself (see below).

assessment of the references. I will first offer some general remarks on these two features, and then examine them as the main tools in Polybius' quoting practice.

2. *Markers of and in reporting: general overview*

In par. 6 Polybius relates Phylarchus' narrative with the φησί+AcI formula, i.e. in *oratio obliqua*. In general, the use of indirect speech entails that the reported material is processed by the reporter and presupposes his analysis.[16] The processing involves two chief elements: form (or style) and content. On the one hand, the form and content of the original can be affected by the reporter's choice of words, additional remarks, etc.[17] On the other, the ways of reporting in *oratio obliqua* differ with respect to the faithfulness to the form as well as to the content of the original utterance. A report in *oratio obliqua* does not *ex definitione* entail misrepresentation of the reported material, and can still involve verbatim quotations, with only the necessary adjustments of pronouns, verbs, and other expressions.[18] It has also been argued that the choice of indirect speech by a writer can mean that it is the content (vs. the form) that he wishes to focus on, not that he considerably transforms either of those.[19]

---

[16] See F. Coulmas, "Reported Speech: Some General Issues," in *Direct and Indirect Speech* (Berlin 1986) 1–28; cf. R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*[3] II (Hanover 1897) 543. For the main differences between direct and indirect speech see C. N. Li, "Direct and Indirect Speech: A Functional Study," in *Direct and Indirect Speech* 29–45; E. Welo, "Direct/ Indirect Speech," in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics on Line* (2013; consulted 21 April 2020).

[17] See Coulmas, in *Direct and Indirect Speech* 3–5; C. Scardino, "Indirect Discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides," in E. Foster et al. (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus* (Oxford 2012) 69–71 ("the reporter comes to the fore").

[18] In ancient Greek the boundaries between direct and indirect discourse were blurred and switches between the modes ('mixed quotations') were common. See E. Maier, "Switches between Direct and Indirect Speech in Ancient Greek," *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12 (2012) 118–139.

[19] C. B. R. Pelling, "Speech and Narrative in the *Histories*," in C. Dewald et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge 2006) 103–121, esp. 104: "*oratio recta* tends to direct more attention to how people

---

In reporting by ancient authors additional factors are in play. In ancient Greek script, interweaving literal quotation into a long discourse entailed risk of blurring the boundaries between one's own thought and the reported utterance. The *scriptio continua*, writing without spaces between words, coexisted with the lack of devices to enclose quotations.[20] Quotations were thus marked by other means, among them the infinitive clause.[21] Thus, using the AcI in quoting can be an indicator distinguishing the reported discourse from the reporting author's thought. How this renders the form and content of the original text is a question to be answered in the context of the particular author's habit in quoting.

A writer can introduce the report by phrases qualifying it unequivocally as a report of only the content or, on the other hand, can indicate that he intends his report to be faithful to the form of the original, even in spite of it being phrased in *oratio obliqua*. The reporting author does that especially through his choice of the reporting formula.[22] This can be one of the *verba dicendi*, some other word, or a longer phrase. For example, by such phrases as "the message is that" or "a statement to the

----

are talking, *oratio obliqua* to the substance of what they say."

[20] Cf. P. A. Brunt, "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* 30 (1980) 479.

[21] C. Bary, "Reportative Markers in Ancient Greek," in F. Logozzo et al. (eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives* (Berlin 2017) 293–302, demonstrates that the aim of using an infinitive clause can be "to facilitate a faithful rendering of original discourse relations without losing the information that it is a speech report" (302).

[22] P. Giovannelli-Jouanna, "Les fragments de Douris de Samos chez Athénée," in D. Lenfant (ed.), *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens* (Paris 2007) 223–226, distinguished three degrees of accuracy in Athenaeus' quotations, depending on the reporting verb: (a) γράφει, a literal quotation, (b) ἱστορεῖ, paraphrase or summary, (c) other, e.g. φησί, often close to the exact words of the original. See also the classification in D. Lenfant, "Les citations de Thucydide dans les scholies d'Aristophane: contribution à l'analyse de fragments d'historiens," in S. Pittia (ed.), *Fragments d'historiens grecs. Autour de Denys d'Halicarnasse* (Rome 2002) 426–428.

effect that" the reporter indicates that he reports content, not form.[23] The verb φημί that introduces the quotation in par. 6 of F 53a of Phylarchus is a *verbum dicendi* commonly used by Greek authors and is considered relatively neutral, i.e. implying close portrayal of the text, unlike verbs which would denote more radical transformation.[24] Still, we shall note that φημί carries the subjective connotation of "think/consider" rather than just "say" or "write," being sometimes entirely disconnected from the act of speech or writing.[25]

All in all, it is difficult to assess, by the introductory word alone, what Polybius intends to highlight in par. 6—the content or the form of what he reports. The implications of introducing with φημί+AcI should thus be considered in the context of Polybius' general quoting habit, to which I now turn.

3. *Polybius' habit in quoting*

In Polybius, most references to other authors are not source-citations *sensu stricto*, i.e. such as would have the aim of indicating the source: he hardly ever uses quotation as a means of authority.[26] The vast majority of Polybian references come in polemical contexts, i.e. in cases where Polybius disagrees with an author. That said, we shall observe that in such references Polybius greatly prefers indirect speech, especially the φησί+ AcI construction. Throughout the critique of Phylarchus, he

---

[23] Coulmas, in *Direct and Indirect Speech* 6.

[24] See Scardino, in *Thucydides and Herodotus* 71–72, for neutral vs. more 'telling' introductory words.

[25] In contrast to εἶπον, which denotes a strictly physical 'objective' act of speaking. Hence the infinitive construction after φημί is most closely paralleled and perhaps influenced by that with οἴομαι, "I think." See A. C. Moorhouse, "The Origin of the Infinitive in Greek Indirect Statement," *AJP* 76 (1955) 176–183; B. L. Gildersleeve, "Notes on the Evolution of *Oratio Obliqua*," *AJP* 27 (1906) 200–208.

[26] On Polybius' treatment of sources in general see A. Klotz, "Die Arbeitsweise des Polybios," *La Nouvelle Clio* 5 (1953) 237–248; Th. Cole, "The Sources and Composition of Polybius VI," *Historia* 13 (1964) 440–486; P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris 1964) 356–389.

refers to the *Histories* in this way eight times, against three using φησί in direct speech (within a Polybian line of thought) and four introduced by other verbs.[27] Of nineteen references to Timaeus, those in direct speech and purportedly verbatim are but three; fifteen are quotations introduced by φησί and followed by AcI; one comes with allusive φησί in direct speech.[28] In the polemic on Callisthenes, the number of φησί+AcI quotations is fourteen, of which three are in direct speech.[29] When adducing Theopompus, Polybius takes a long literal quotation from the *History of Philip*, with six φησί+AcI quotes. Other references to Theopompus are four; in those cases we can hardly speak of any introductory words.[30] Polybius mentions Zeno and Antisthenes eleven times with φησί+AcI, once with another

---

[27] φησί+AcI (8): Polyb. 2.59.1–3 (F 54a), 2.59.5 (not included in any of the collections of Phylarchus' fragments), 2.62.1 (F 56), 2.63.2 (F 58). φησί+ direct speech (3): 2.58.10–14 = F 53b BNJ; 2.59.7 (not included in Jacoby/ BNJ), 2.60.7 = F 54b BNJ. References using other introductory words (4): 2.56.7 εἰσάγει, 2.61.1–6 ἐξηγήσατο, ἐδήλωσε, διεσάφησε. 2.61.10–12 = F 55b is about what Phylarchus omitted so it is not a reference proper. In the present section, by "references" I mean instances where Polybius purportedly relates the given historian's work in any way, not those where he merely mentions his name.

[28] Verbatim: Polyb. 12.25.7, reporting a speech from within Timaeus' narrative; 12.25h.1, Timaeus' famous claim that he stayed in Athens for fifty years (introductory φησί+direct speech); cf. 12.26a.1–4, re-citation of Timoleon's speech in Timaeus' work (interjected φησί+direct speech). φησί+AcI: 12.3.8, 12.4b.1, 12.4d.5, 12.9.2–4, 12.9.5, 12.10.7, 12.11.5, 12.13.1, 12.25k.3–6, 12.26.2, 12.26.6–7, 12.28.8, 12.28.9, 12.28a.1, 12.28a.2. Allusive φησί: 12.13.7.

[29] φησί+AcI: Polyb. 6.45.1, Callisthenes mentioned among other authors; 12.17.2, 12.17.6, 12.17.7, 12.18.2, 12.18.9, 12.18.11, 12.19.1, 12.19.4, 12.20.1, 12.20.4, 12.21.1, 12.21.8, 12.22.1–2. Allusions: 4.33.2 καθάπερ καὶ Καλλισθένης φησίν within Polybius' train of thought, cf. 4.33.7; 12.18.2 ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Καλλισθένης φησί; 12.21.7 κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν Καλλισθένην.

[30] For the literal quote see 604 below. φησί+AcI: Polyb. 8.9.1, 12.4a.2, 12.27.8–9, 16.12.7. Others: 38.6.2, allusion to methods of writing history; 9.9.2–4, ἀποδείκνυσι+direct speech; 8.11.1–2; 12.25f.6, mention of Theopompus' battle-descriptions.

---

introductory word (ὁμολογεῖν+AcI), and three times mentions their works in direct speech.[31] Ephorus has two mentions introduced by φησί within a Polybian line of thought, one φησί+AcI in a collective reference, and one general allusion where no content is actually reported.[32] Strikingly, Polybius does not include a single verbatim quotation of Ephorus, even though Ephorus was one of his most appreciated historians.[33] Lastly, when referring to anonymous authors, Polybius either quotes with φησί+AcI or makes general allusions to or assessments of their writings in his own words, using various reporting clauses.[34] He also reports general or widespread opinion with φησί+AcI; in those references, the connotation of φησί as "think/claim" is evident.[35]

We can thus make some general observations about Polybius' quoting habit. First, the great majority of his named references to other authors come in polemical contexts and are non-verbatim, for the most part in *oratio obliqua* in the φησί+AcI mode. Second, in both modes of speech, he uses a variety of reporting formulae, which we can tentatively divide into: (a)

---

[31] φησί+AcI: Polyb. 16.14.5, 16.16.2–3, 16.17.1, 16.17.5, 16.18.4, 16.18.6, 16.18.7, 16.18.8–9, 16.19.1, 16.19.4, 16.19.10. ὁμολογοῦντες γὰρ+ AcI: 16.15.1–6. ἀποφαίνουσι+direct speech: 16.14.5, 16.15.7. ὡς αὐτός φησι+direct speech: 16.19.5.

[32] φησί+AcI: 6.45.1. ἐξηγῆται: 12.25f.1–6. Allusions: 4.20.5, 12.27.7.

[33] Polyb. 12.28.10, cf. words in Ephorus' defence at 12.4a.3–4.

[34] φησί+AcI: Polyb. 5.33.5 = BNJ 83 T 1 ἀλλ' ἔνιοι τῶν πραγματευομένων … φασὶ (translated "claim" by Pitcher in BNJ); 22.18.5 = F 4 ἐξ ὧν ἔνιοί φασι. Others: 15.12.4 τινες εἰρήκασι καὶ τῶν συγγραφέων, 15.34.1 λόγον διατιθέμενοι, 8.8.4 διασαφεῖν ἡμῖν, 22.18.2 ἀποφαίνουσι.

[35] In these cases, Polybius may well not have a written source at all, e.g. 9.22.8 τινὲς οἴονται+AcI ("as some think"); 9.22.9 ἔνιοι φασι+AcI on the assessment of Hannibal's deeds (refutation: "some think" is the rendering of Pitcher on F 6); 9.24.8 φασιν+AcI, "it is claimed," cf. 1.63.9 ἔνιοι δοκοῦσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων; 3.9.4 ἡγοῦνται; 13.3.1 βούλονται λέγειν ἔνιοι; 31.9.4 ὡς ἔνιοί φασι (interjected, direct speech). Cf. criticism against unnamed philosophers at 6.47.7 and 12.26c.2, which adduces some of their claims with no reporting clauses proper.

---

neutral, i.e. suggesting that they report form and content of the original faithfully or alter these only slightly (to be explored further below);[36] (b) telling, i.e. suggesting that they report the content rather than the form of the original;[37] (c) ambiguous or implying that both content and form have been considerably transformed.[38]

Although it is not possible to address here the implications of each of those reporting formulae, from this overview we can surmise that Polybius deliberately differentiates between his ways of quoting by using the two chief markers: introductory formulae and modes of speech. There is undoubtedly a purpose in using φησί+AcI in par. 6 of F 53a compared with εἰσάγει with no *oratio obliqua* in par. 7. Naturally, in both instances Polybius can intervene and misrepresent the quoted historian. But does his strong preference for *oratio obliqua* mean that he—to recall Schepens' phrase—*avoids* verbatim citations?[39] This leads us to the question, when and why Polybius ever *does* quote verbatim.

4. *Why quote verbatim?*

Verbatim citations in *oratio recta* seem to occur in Polybius in specific situations. First, he quotes literally when he intends to prove his point or support his claim with the evidence of the adduced words, rather than to polemicize or intend to refute them. Take, for instance, a quotation of a stele, explicitly stated as support for Polybius' argument (4.33.1–2):

ὁ δὲ λόγος οὗτος ἔχει μὲν ἴσως καὶ διὰ τῶν πάλαι γεγονότων πίστιν. οἱ γὰρ Μεσσήνιοι πρὸς ἄλλοις πολλοῖς καὶ παρὰ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λυκαίου βωμὸν ἀνέθεσαν στήλην ἐν τοῖς κατ' Ἀριστο-

---

[36] λέγει, φησί, ὡς αὐτός φησι, τινες εἰρήκασι.

[37] ὁμολογεῖν, ἐξηγήσατο, ἐξηγῆται, κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν Καλλισθένην, ἀποφαίνουσι, τινὲς οἴονται, ἔνιοι δοκοῦσι, ἡγοῦνται, ἔνιοί φασι.

[38] εἰσάγει (see below), ἐδήλωσε, διεσάφησε, ἀποδείκνυσι, διασαφεῖν ἡμῖν.

[39] Schepens, in *The Shadow of Polybius* 148: "There is a lot of discussion around Phylarchus' text, but 'quotes' seem to be avoided."

μένην καιροῖς, καθάπερ καὶ Καλλισθένης φησί, γράψαντες τὸ γράμμα τοῦτο·

This counsel may perhaps find some support from circumstances that took place many years previously. For besides many other things I might mention, the Messenians set up in the time of Aristomenes, as Callisthenes tells us, a pillar beside the altar of Zeus Lycaeus bearing the inscription: [the text of the inscription follows]

Verbatim quotation can thus function as proof,[40] in contrast to a quotation in *oratio obliqua* that is cited to be refuted (like all the instances surveyed in the previous section). There is one apparent exception, but it actually confirms the rule and helps to define Polybius' quoting practice: a very long verbatim quotation of Theopompus' judgment on Philip II, which *is* the object of criticism. This target is what leads Polybius to quote precisely (8.10.1–2):

ταύτην δὲ τήν τε πικρίαν καὶ τὴν ἀθυρογλωττίαν τοῦ συγγρα-φέως τίς οὐκ ἂν ἀποδοκιμάσειεν; οὐ γὰρ μόνον ὅτι μαχόμενα λέγει πρὸς τὴν αὑτοῦ πρόθεσιν ἄξιός ἐστιν ἐπιτιμήσεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ διότι κατέψευσται τοῦ τε βασιλέως καὶ τῶν φίλων, καὶ μάλιστα διότι τὸ ψεῦδος αἰσχρῶς καὶ ἀπρεπῶς διατέθειται.

For who would not disapprove of such bitterness and impudent loquacity on the part of this writer? For not only does he deserve blame for using language which contradicts his statement of the object he had in writing, but for falsely accusing the king and his friends, and especially for making this false accusation in coarse and unbecoming terms.

These remarks that follow the quotation from Theopompus indicate that Polybius intends to highlight the πικρία ("bitterness") and ἀθυρογλωττία ("impudent loquacity"), traits of the

---

[40] Cf. Polyb. 12.25h.1, Timaeus' claim adduced as evidence of his ἀπειρία; 12.27.10–11, two quotations of the *Odyssey*, aiming to support the claim of the value of autopsy with the poet's authority; 12.26.3–5, two of the *Iliad* and one of Euripides as part of the polemic against Timaeus, which are re-quotations from Timaean Hermocrates' speech, showing the weakness of choosing and combining those passages; 12.25.7, part of a speech in Timaeus' narrative, showing that he is an ignorant historian (ἀφιλόσοφος, ἀνάγωγος).

vocabulary or the style in which Theopompus expressed him-
self about the king (αἰσχρῶς καὶ ἀπρεπῶς διατέθειται). Right
before he proceeds with the long quotation, Polybius says that
it illustrates also Theopompus' ἀτοπία ("uncouthness," 8.9.5).[41]
Hence in this instance it was so important to render Theopom-
pus' expressions word for word, which Polybius indeed does
accurately, as comparison with Athenaeus attests.[42] That is why
the citation is introduced with the words αὐταῖς γὰρ λέξεσιν, αἷς
ἐκεῖνος κέχρηται, κατατετάχαμεν ("I set down the passage in his
own words"), which shows Polybius' focus on λέξεις, i.e. the
phrasing of Theopompus' portrayal of Philip. Along the same
lines, Polybius quotes literally fragments of Timaeus' speeches
to demonstrate how weak they are in terms of composition.[43]

A good case in point here can be a reverse instance, namely
Polybius' reporting of his own speech in the φησί+AcI mode
(28.7.8). In such a case we could expect that he definitely knew
the precise words of the speech—it was his own creation. We
could expect that he gives us its full text word for word. But this
does not happen and Polybius provides only a summary of it in
oratio obliqua. Why? The answer is probably that he does not
aim at presenting his rhetorical ability or stylistic fireworks but
the overall sense of his stance as urged in the speech, the policy

[41] LSJ s.v., "of sounds or words, *uncouthness*"; s.v. ἀθυρόγλωσσος, "*one
that cannot keep his mouth shut, ceaseless babbler*"; cf. Poll. *Onom.* 2.109.3,
6.119.2 (next to γλώσσαλγος "garrulous"). For πικρία and derivatives as
stylistic trait see Ps.-Demetr. *Eloc.* 177; Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 22.44; *Ep. ad
Pomp.* 3.17; *Lys.* 13.4; *Dem.* 8.2, 20.5; *Thuc.* 24.11, 40.1; *Din.* 7.4. For
ἀτοπία, Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 12.3.

[42] See R. D. Milns, "Theopompus, Fragment 225 A and B Jacoby," *PP* 23
(1968) 361–364; M. A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric
in the Fourth Century BC* (Oxford 1994) 105; C. Pelling, "Fun with Frag-
ments. Athenaeus and the Historians," in D. Braund et al. (eds.), *Athenaeus
and his World* (Exeter 2000) 171–190. Cf. A. L. Ch. Reino and G. Ottone,
"Les fragments de Théopompe chez Athénée: un aperçu général," in *Athé-
née et les fragments* 166–167 and 173–174.

[43] 12.26a.1–4: Timoleon's speech as a sample of Timaeus' weak speech-
writing.

he advocated.[44]

To sum up: literal quotations in Polybius occur (a) when they confirm Polybius' argument, (b) when it is not the content of the utterance that is crucial, but rather the choice of words, their placement, etc. Most instances adduced in this section can be considered as combining both of these criteria. In introducing exact quotations Polybius tends to use the reporting verb λέγειν, rather than φημί.[45] Although this is typical in principle, in a few places the exact words are introduced or accompanied by φημί.[46] This can be of importance for the Polybian use of φημί with the AcI construction, as it can imply some kind of mixed character of this mode of reporting, which I will try to highlight now.

5. *Mixed quotations in reporting speeches*

Does the φησί+AcI mode exclude adducing exact expressions or phrases from the reported text? As Stephen Usher has demonstrated, in some cases Polybius conveys a speech in the φησί+AcI construction, but inserts in it some striking phrases as verbatim quotations.[47] For instance, the speech of the consul L. Aemilius Paulus to the people (29.1.1–3; introductory word and the probable verbatim quotation underlined):

ἔφη γὰρ αὐτοὺς μίαν ἔχειν διατριβὴν καὶ παρὰ τὰς συνουσίας καὶ παρὰ τὰς ἐν τοῖς περιπάτοις ὁμιλίας διοικεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν Ῥώμῃ καθημένους τὸν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ πόλεμον, ποτὲ μὲν ἐπιτιμῶντας τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν πραττομένοις, ποτὲ δὲ τὰ παραλειπόμενα διεξιόντας· ἐξ ὧν ὄνησιν μὲν οὐδέποτε γίνεσθαι

---

[44] See S. Usher, "*Oratio Recta* and *Oratio Obliqua* in Polybius," *GRBS* 49 (2009) 509.

[45] Polyb. 8.9.5–10, 12.25.7, 12.26.3, 12.26.4, 12.27.10–11. Cf. one instance of γράφω, 4.33.2: γράψαντες τὸ γράμμα τοῦτο (about the text on a stele).

[46] Polyb. 12.26.5, 12.25h, 12.26a.1–4 (starting with παρακαλῶν+φησί interjected).

[47] Usher, *GRBS* 49 (2009) 487–514, esp. 509, 513. On direct/indirect discourse in Polybius see also C. Wooten, "The Speeches in Polybius: An Insight into the Nature of Hellenistic Oratory," *AJP* 95 (1974) 235–251.

τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασι, βλάβην δὲ πολλάκις καὶ ἐπὶ πολλῶν γε-
γονέναι· καὶ ποτὲ δὲ τοὺς ἄρχοντας μεγάλα βλάπτεσθαι διὰ τὰς
ἀκαίρους εὑρησιλογίας· πάσης γὰρ διαβολῆς ἐχούσης ὀξύ τι
καὶ κινητικόν, ὅταν προκαταληφθῇ τὸ πλῆθος ἐκ τῆς συνεχοῦς
λαλιᾶς, εὐκαταφρονήτους γίνεσθαι τοῖς ἐχθροῖς.

For [Aemilius] said that the sole occupation of some people,
whether at social gatherings or in their conversation when walk-
ing, was to sit quietly at Rome while they directed war in Mace-
donia, sometimes finding fault with what the commanders did
and at others expanding on all they had left undone. All which
was never of any benefit to the public interest, but had fre-
quently and in many respects been most injurious to it. And the
commanders too are at times much injured by inopportune
prating. For as slander has something sharp and provocative in
it, when the minds of the people become prejudiced against
them owing to this constant chatter, our enemies come to de-
spise them.

Although the whole speech is in *oratio obliqua*, the generalization
about the deleterious effects of slander (πάσης γὰρ διαβολῆς …
ἐχθροῖς) should in all probability be taken as a verbatim
quotation of a memorable phrase.[48] Note the play with rare
compound forms: προκαταληφθῇ … εὐκαταφρονήτους, clearly a
stylistic feature of the reported text (cf. Ps.-Demetr. *Eloc.* 275). In
another place, Polybius relates Aemilius' words after Perseus
had been defeated at Pydna. Again, the speech as a whole is in
oratio obliqua in the φησί+AcI construction, but there is little
doubt that the final phrase about the reversals of fortune is
adduced not because of its content, but because both content
and form (phrasing) are highlighted.[49] Aemilius' words in *oratio
obliqua* with φησί+AcI come with verbatim pieces 'integrated'
into this report.

Even though these examples belong to the domain of re-

---

[48] Thus Usher, *GRBS* 49 (2009) 510. On Polybius' sources for this speech
see Pédech, *La méthode* 352.

[49] Polyb. 29.20.1–3; Usher, *GRBS* 49 (2009) 510–511: "A commonplace
sentiment, to be sure, but arresting in this historical context."

porting speeches of historical actors, they still are informative about Polybius' overall habit in references using *oratio obliqua* and φησί+AcI. They show that in some instances he shifts from summarizing the content to a verbatim quotation, even within a single clause. It is the quotation's immediate context and purpose that are decisive in establishing whether exactness matters and in which part. With this in mind, I will now revisit Phylarchus' F 53a, starting with scrutiny of the references proper, followed by discussion of the surrounding text.

6. *Return to F 53a: the main clauses*

In the first paragraph of the fragment (2.56.6), i.e. in the clause introduced by φησί followed by AcI, Mantinea is said to have been called by Phylarchus "the most ancient and greatest city in Arcadia" (ἀρχαιοτάτην καὶ μεγίστην πόλιν τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀρκαδίαν). Ascribing any of these words to Polybius in this context would result in assuming a self-contradiction. Polybius distances himself from considering the Mantineans' suffering throughout the chapters where these words are adduced, and he would have weakened his own case if he had described the polis that way. Rather, he is quoting an example of how Phylarchus inflated the account by abusing the superlative forms. To put it in the framework of the previous sections, we may say that it is one of those instances where the form of the reported words of Phylarchus matters. Polybius seems to mock Phylarchus' hyperbole, by giving us a sample of his language. It is an *ironic quotation*, as Polybius in fact believes the opposite of what he reports. As such, it is likely to preserve the original wording.[50] The subsequent words, τηλικαύταις παλαῖσαι συμφοραῖς ὥστε πάντας εἰς ἐπίστασιν καὶ δάκρυα τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγεῖν ("such were the misfortunes as to impress deeply and move to tears all the Greeks"), can be read along similar lines. It would be illogical, given the immediate context, to ascribe them to Polybius. Rather, these expressions are adduced as proof of

---

[50] The possible exactness of this phrase was suggested by Schepens, in *The Shadow of Polybius* 148 n.15, but without an attempt at an argument.

Phylarchus' exaggeration, and contain words that are indispensable for putting in evidence this exaggeration, in particular the superlatives.

The opening phrase, τοὺς Μαντινέας γενομένους ὑποχειρίους μεγάλοις περιπεσεῖν ἀτυχήμασι ("the Mantineans, brought into subjection, were exposed to terrible sufferings"), is difficult to assess. On the one hand, it can be used by Polybius to point out the general tendency of Phylarchus' description of the fate of the Mantineans. It contains phrases frequent in Polybius, occurring in places where he definitely speaks in his own voice,[51] which can lead to the conclusion that he reports generally the content of Phylarchus' narrative. On the other hand, the use of an amplifying word here—μεγάλοις—is consistent with the overall tendency of the reported passage, i.e. the use of hyperbolic adjectives to describe the fate of the Mantineans.

In sum, the φησί-reference in 2.56.6 is likely to contain, for the most part, Phylarchus' *ipsissima verba*. This is suggested by the context: the superlative forms and their sense could not have been used by Polybius as his own description of the events at Mantinea, as it would result in self-contradiction. He reports not only the content of Phylarchus' narrative, but also seems to draw attention to his specific wording, which requires verbatim quotation. In other words, it is likely that Polybius' intention here was to give a sample of Phylarchus' sensational style.

The character of the reference in 2.56.7 is a completely different case. The clause depends on the introductory word εἰσάγει, which is not a typical or neutral reporting word like φησί or λέγει. The basic sense of εἰσάγω is "lead into/introduce." In Polybius it has a number of meanings: "let in" troops

---

[51] Throughout Polybius, the notion of ἀτύχημα recurs regularly; we find 19 instances of the abstract noun, which is comparable only to Diodorus. The identical phrase is found at Polyb. 4.19.13: μεγάλοις ἀτυχήμασιν … περιπεσόντες; cf. A. Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexikon* I (Berlin 1956) 251. This suggests that the phrase is Polybius' summary of the general tendency of Phylarchus' description of the fate of Mantinea.

to a city or citadel,[52] "introduce" a custom,[53] "import" certain goods,[54] "bring forward/call in" to a court or an assembly,[55] "introduce" one object into another.[56] It is also, sporadically, used in a political or juridical sense.[57] There are also several instances of a more specific connotation, "bring on stage"[58] and "represent" in a narrative.[59] The verb can thus imply the image of a dramatic scene,[60] and scholars have rendered εἰσάγει here in this vein: "he introduces scenes" (McGing), "he treats us to a picture" (Paton), "il met en scène" (Pédech), "so malt er" (Möller), etc.[61] Such a secondary sense of εἰσάγω is undoubtedly in play here, but we shall not ignore also the basic connotation of "being a new import from outside," suggesting that Phylarchus "introduces" the citizens of Mantinea in his text as if from outside and "brings them before" the reader.

Importantly, introducing the quotation with εἰσάγω entails a different structure for the reference, viz. direct speech. There is no indication—such as a proper *verbum dicendi* in the first place —that these are Phylarchus' very words. What does it imply

[52] Polyb. 4.18.7, 5.96.7, 9.18.4, 9.29.6, 21.32b, 28.5.3. Cf. 5.7.9, "bring soldiers into" a pass; 3.96.13, "put in/insert" a garrison into a town. See Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexikon* 675–676.

[53] Polyb. 4.20.6, "introduce" music as a custom, cf. 32.11.10.

[54] Polyb. 23.9.12, "import" arms or food into a city, cf. 23.17.3.

[55] Polyb. 1.79.9, "introduce/call in" and let someone speak, a letter-bearer at an assembly; cf. 21.22.2, 21.24.1, 22.11.5, 23.1.8, 32.6.1. Cf. 15.26.7, "bring forward" a witness; 30.26.5, "lead in" guests to a banquet.

[56] Polyb. 21.28.13, "introduce" a jar into a mine.

[57] Polyb. 4.82.8, "put forward" a candidate; 15.25.34, "introduce" an accusation.

[58] Polyb. 30.22.2, "bring on" flute-players for performance, cf. 30.22.11 (dancers and musicians).

[59] Polyb. 34.4.3, "introduce" battle scenes in a narrative, producing vividness (ἐνάργεια); 12.25.k.5, Timaeus "represents" Hermocrates speaking.

[60] Cf. Walbank, *HCP* I 261; Schepens, in *The Shadow of Polybius* 152.

[61] B. McGing, *Polybius' Histories* (Oxford 2010); Paton in the Loeb; Pédech, *Polybe*; L. Möller, *Polybios. Der Aufstieg Roms* (Wiesbaden 2010). On the rendering in the BNJ entry see n.81 below.

about the faithfulness of the report of his words? Why not quote Phylarchus in this case as well, using the device most often employed in the other references (φησί+AcI)? The aim of variation in quoting can hardly be the answer, since Polybius uses such quotations one after another without hesitation.[62] The hypothetical explanation can be: because here Polybius is faithfully reporting neither the form nor the content of the original. Let us investigate this possibility. The passage (2.56.7) is related to 2.58.10–12:[63]

οὐκοῦν ὁλοσχερεστέρας τινὸς καὶ μείζονος τυχεῖν ἦσαν ἄξιοι τιμωρίας, ὥστ᾽ εἴπερ ἔπαθον ἃ Φύλαρχός φησιν, οὐκ ἔλεον εἰκὸς ἦν συνεξακολουθεῖν αὐτοῖς παρὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἔπαινον δὲ καὶ συγκατάθεσιν μᾶλλον τοῖς πράττουσι καὶ μεταπορευο-μένοις τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν. ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως οὐδενὸς περαιτέρω συν-εξακολουθήσαντος Μαντινεῦσι κατὰ τὴν περιπέτειαν πλὴν τοῦ διαρπαγῆναι τοὺς βίους καὶ πραθῆναι τοὺς ἐλευθέρους…

These men therefore were worthy of some far heavier and more extreme penalty; so that had they suffered what Phylarchus alleges, it was not to be expected that they should have met with pity from the Greeks, but rather that approval and assent should have been accorded to those who executed judgment on them for their wickedness. Yet, while nothing more serious befell the Mantineans, in this their hour of calamity, than the pillage of their means of living and the enslavement of the free citizens…

In this passage, a few chapters after F 53a, Polybius again mentions Phylarchus' narrative of the Mantinean tragedy with the words εἴπερ ἔπαθον ἃ Φύλαρχός φησιν. These ἃ φησί are "the things" Phylarchus says that the Mantineans experienced. Here φησί comes with no AcI and the line of thought is wholly Polybian, so there is no speech reporting in either direct or indirect mode. Thus, this is definitely not a quotation, but an allusion to the Phylarchan narrative about the παθήματα of the

[62] For instance in the discussion of Callisthenes, see n.29 above.

[63] This passage was not included by Lucht, Brueckner, or Jacoby, hence Schepens, in *The Shadow of Polybius* 148, called it a "concealed fragment." That has been corrected in BNJ (Polyb. 2.58.10–13 = F 53b).

Mantineans.[64] In connection with 2.56.7, ἅ would refer to the *locus* δάκρυα καὶ θρήνους ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ἀναμὶξ τέκνοις καὶ γονεῦσι γηραιοῖς ἀπαγομένων ("crowds of both sexes together with their children and aged parents weeping and lamenting as they are led away to slavery"). If we were to detect any more Phylarchan material in this fragment, it could only be the phrase τοῦ διαρπαγῆναι τοὺς βίους καὶ πραθῆναι τοὺς ἐλευθέρους ("the pillage of their means of living and the enslavement of the free citizens"), i.e. the reference to the Mantineans' loss of livelihood and being sold into slavery. This part is not mentioned at 2.56.7. The events in question are also described in Plutarch's narrative, which almost certainly is based on the narrative of Phylarchus that Polybius refers to. Plutarch prefers Phylarchus' version to Polybius' in this instance.[65] The version of Polybius-Phylarchus differs from Plutarch in two details: Plutarch mentions the killing of free citizens, whereas Polybius does not; Plutarch also differentiates between the kinds of treatment of the others.[66] It is therefore possible that Polybius in 2.56.7 deliberately omits these elements in reporting Phylarchus. Moreover, even with these dreadful specifics of ἀνδραποδισμός, as Plutarch has them, there is no trace of the vivid details introduced by Polybius as Phylarchan with εἰσάγει.

Overall, the lack of a neutral reporting formula in Polyb. 2.56.7, his omission of certain details, and, on the other hand, the absence of thrilling details in Plutarch, point to the con-

---

[64] *Pace* Schepens, in *The Shadow of Polybius* 148, who seems to consider it a quotation.

[65] Plut. *Arat.* 38. See McCaslin, *Archaiognosia* 4 (1989) 77–101; Gabba, *Athenaeum* 35 (1957) 7–8, 218.

[66] Plutarch specifies that some of the inhabitants were sold, some send off to Macedonia, and that women and children were sold into slavery. These accounts can be paralleled as follows: Polyb. 2.56.7 ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ἀναμὶξ τέκνοις καὶ γονεῦσι γηραιοῖς ἀπαγομένων ≈ Plut. *Arat.* 45.4 τοὺς μὲν ἐνδοξοτάτους καὶ πρώτους ἀπέκτειναν, τῶν δ' ἄλλων τοὺς μὲν ἀπέδοντο, τοὺς δ, εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἀπέστειλαν πέδαις δεδεμένους, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραποδίσαντο; Polyb. 2.58.11 διαρπαγῆναι τοὺς βίους ≈ Plut. *Arat.* 45.6 τοῦ δὲ συναχθέντος ἀργυρίου τὸ τρίτον αὐτοὶ διείλοντο.

---

clusion that Phylarchus in his narrative on Mantinea simply described the fate of the inhabitants as Plutarch has it. The thrilling details could have been made up by Polybius on the basis of the very mention of the treatment of these groups of citizens as itemized by Plutarch. That would explain why Polybius refers to the Phylarchan story with εἰσάγει: to impose a more dramatic rendering of this part of Phylarchus' narrative. The reference in 2.56.7 would thus be a 'redescription' of Phylarchus' account, rather than a quotation or paraphrase.

7. *F 53a: the subordinate clauses*

As noted at the beginning of this paper, the references in F 53a are introduced by clauses dependent on the participles βουλόμενος/σπουδάζων. These can be identified as causal circumstantial participles, i.e. purporting to tell what were Phylarchus' intentions or endeavours when he was writing (I call such formulae *motivation-statements*).[67] Explaining motivations and interweaving them into the narrative in the form of participles was a standard narrative device of ancient historians. Probably the most adequate name for this device is *imputed motivation*, as it is regularly based on personal conjecture, on inference rather than proof.[68] Polybius makes full use of this narrative technique throughout his *Histories*.[69] In the Phylarchan fragments, Polyb-

[67] At the same time, they are *participia coniuncta*, see E. Vester, "On the So-called 'Participium Coniunctum'," *Mnemosyne* 30 (1977) 243–285.

[68] Although true motives of historical figures were usually inaccessible to historians, they typically appear in narrative as 'facts', in participial form. See M. Tamiolaki, "Ascribing Motivation in Thucydides. Between Historical Research and Literary Representation," in *Thucydides between History and Literature* (Berlin 2012) 41–72. M. L. Lang, "Participial Motivation in Thucydides," *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995) 48–65, at 50–53, shows the unlikeliness of Thucydides' knowledge of most motivations ascribed by him to historical figures.

[69] This technique seems to follow certain patterns. On Polybius' reasoning for finding motives by see N. Miltsios, *The Shaping of Narrative in Polybius* (Berlin 2013) 92–99; cf. S. Podes, "Handlungserklärung bei Polybios: Intellectualisme historique? Ein Beitrag zur hellenistischem Historiographie," *AncSoc* 21 (1990) 215–240. For βούλομαι in Polybius see A. Wifstrand,

ius applies this device to dealing with his historiographical opponent. Polybius' direct or even intermediate knowledge about Phylarchus' aims is improbable; it is also unlikely that Phylarchus stated them explicitly.[70] The form, content, and position (in the subordinate clauses that begin the sentences) of these comments surreptitiously put Polybian interpretation on Phylarchus' words.[71]

Such additions also occur strikingly often in the rest of the references to Phylarchus in Polybius.[72] The specificity of this method for this particular critique in Polybius can be grasped by comparison with his references to, or quotations of, the other named authors surveyed above. In all those references we find only one similar instance, a reference accompanied by a motivation-statement in participle.[73] Why is that? The explanation for those ascriptions of motive to Phylarchus specifically can be the means by which Polybius attacks him. First of these is Phylarchus' προαίρεσις, his aims and purposes; second, his δύναμις or ability to write history.[74] In other words, the moti-

---

"Die griechischen Verba für wollen," *Eranos* 40 (1942) 16–36.

[70] Imagine Phylarchus writing: "It is my aim to insist on the cruelty of Antigonus and the Macedonians and also on that of the Achaeans, hence I depict the fate of Mantinea in this way," which is implied in 2.56.6. We can hardly find such an overt statement of intent in any ancient historian.

[71] The clause with βουλόμενος in 2.56.6 is an adverb clause modifying the reporting verb φησί in terms of purpose ("since he wishes to ... he says"); the clause in 2.56.7 that begins with σπουδάζων is similar ("since he endeavours ... he introduces").

[72] Polyb. 2.56.6 βουλόμενος … φησὶ; σπουδάζων … εἰσάγει; 2.56.8 πειρώμενος; 2.58.12 φησιν … τῆς τερατείας χάριν; 2.59.2 τηρῶν; 2.59.5, βουλόμενος … φησι; 2.61.1 ὑπολαμβάνων; 2.61.5 ἐδήλωσε, βουλόμενος … διεσάφησε; 2.61.12 οὐδεμίαν ἐποιήσατο μνήμην … τυφλώττων.

[73] The quotation of Timaeus at Polyb. 12.28a1: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ βουλόμενος αὔξειν τὴν ἱστορίαν, πρῶτον μὲν τηλικαύτην εἶναί φησι κτλ., "Anyway, his attempt to elevate history starts with the claim that..."

[74] In the words opening the critique, Polybius says that he will "give a fair impression of the προαίρεσις and δύναμις of [Phylarchus'] work." Throughout the critique, he stresses numerous times Phylarchus' alleged omission of προαίρεσις of a given figure and indicates what this was (2.57, 2.58, 2.59,

---

vation-statements in the Phylarchan critique stem from the purposes of Polybius as the mediating author. Those clauses hardly contribute to the reconstruction of Phylarchan text; they are pure creation by the cover-text to assert a specific context in which to read the references proper.

This is by no means a minor issue, as the proper identification of this material as Polybian, not Phylarchan, affects our view of Phylarchus. If the whole passage F 53a = 2.56.6–7 is read as reflecting Phylarchus' historiographical method, we might attribute to him not just the act of describing the events at Mantinea, but a willingness to indulge the passion of raising emotions of anger against Antigonus and the Achaeans and of pity for the Mantineans. Phylarchus has in fact been judged in this manner: scholars seem to mingle those Polybian cover-text's intrusions with what is supposedly Phylarchan. Recently, Scott Farrington read Polybian imputations as if these were representative for Phylarchus' work,[75] and other examples of such misattribution can be found.[76] I do not wish to deny that Phylarchus, like other Hellenistic authors (including Polybius), had a propensity for vivid or emotional descriptions. Instead,

_____

2.60, 2.61). Analogically to historical agents, where he prefers motives over facts, Polybius asserts Phylarchus' intentions in omitting historical figures' προαίρεσις. Discrediting of the second element, δύναμις, takes place in the second part of the critique, from 2.61 onwards.

[75] Farrington, in *The Art of History* 166: "Instead of narrating the events and allowing the reader to experience the emotions that arise from a thorough understanding of the chain of cause and effect that produced any particular outcome, Phylarchus intends rather to make his readers feel pity and make them sympathetic to his account (Plb. 2.56.7)."

[76] Eckstein, *CP* 108 (2013) 318: "Polybius tells us that Phylarchus criticized not only Aratus but also Antigonus for cruelty at Mantineia (2.56.6)." This remark draws on the clause that is of Polybius' authorship. Pédech, *Trois historiens méconnus* 443, echoed 2.56.6 as if it were all Phylarchan expressions: "Phylarque cherchait pareillement à éveiller l'émotion du lecteur en décrivant la détresse des habitants de Mantinée." L. I. Hau, *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus* (Edinburgh 2016) 144–145, also writes about Phylarchus' intentions on the basis of 2.56.6.

_____

what I claim is that his narratives could have been neither mere entertainment, nor directed against the historical figures in a way that Polybius insinuates in his embedded suggestions.

However, while in themselves uninformative for Phylarchus' text, the motivation-statements point toward a more accurate definition of the quotations with φησί in the form motivation-statement clause+φησί clause, as in 2.56.6 βουλόμενος … φησί. Namely, an explanatory clause with motivation-statement makes sense only if it relates to something actually expressed, whether in speech or in writing, reported with some precision.[77] Furthermore, attacking Phylarchus primarily for his intentions rather than for specific claims or facts in his narrative[78] indicates that Polybius had problems in attacking the content.[79] We might say that Polybius brings forward a particular ethical conception ("it is not the bare facts, but the motives of the agent that should be judged"), precisely because he is unable to refute Phylarchus on factual grounds. This can indicate that, in the particular case of Phylarchus, the content need not be misrepresented. Or, it hardly even could have been misrepresented, as Polybius presumes good acquaintance with Phylarchus' *Histories* on the part of his own readers. This is evident from the introduction to the whole discussion of Phylarchus (2.56.1–2):

ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς καιροὺς Ἀράτῳ γεγραφότων παρ' ἐνίοις ἀποδοχῆς ἀξιοῦται Φύλαρχος, ἐν πολλοῖς ἀντιδοξῶν καὶ

---

[77] Note that adding a subordinate adverb clause modifying φημί in the sense "claim/think" would not be logical: wishing ... he *claims/thinks*" is an absurd phrase; "wishing ... he *writes/says*" makes more sense.

[78] The potential exception, Phylarchus' information about the booty of Megalopolis (Polyb. 2.62.1–2, 9–11 = F 56), could be considered as a factual inaccuracy attacked by Polybius. However, some scholars argue that the number is actually an error of a copyist of Phylarchus' work: Africa, *Phylarchus* 33–34; Eckstein, *CP* 108 (2013) 322–323.

[79] See the similar conclusion on Polybius' critique of Zeno and Antisthenes in D. Lenfant, "Polybe et les 'fragments' des historiens de Rhodes Zénon et Antisthène (XVI 14–20)," in *The Shadow of Polybius* 197.

τἀναντία γράφων αὐτῷ, χρήσιμον ἂν εἴη, μᾶλλον δ᾽ ἀναγκαῖον
ἡμῖν Ἀράτῳ προῃρημένοις κατακολουθεῖν περὶ τῶν Κλεομενι-
κῶν, μὴ παραλιπεῖν ἄσκεπτον τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ψεῦδος
ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασιν ἰσοδυναμοῦν ἀπολείπωμεν πρὸς τὴν ἀλή-
θειαν.

Since among those authors who were contemporaries of Aratos,
Phylarchus, who on many points is at variance with and in con-
tradiction to him, is by some received as trustworthy, it would be
useful or rather necessary for me, as I have chosen to rely on
Aratos's narrative for the history of the Cleomenic War, not to
leave the question of their relative credibility undiscussed so that
truth and falsehood in their writings may no longer be of equal
authority.

Polybius seems to write on the assumption that his reader is
likely to have read Phylarchus' account before reading Polyb-
ius' historical work. He implies that Phylarchus was at least as
well known and considered, by some, as reliable as the *Memoires*
of Aratus. That assumption is fairly realistic.[80] But even if
Polybius was not right in assuming this, what matters is his
estimation of his reader's acquaintance with Phylarchus. This
estimation definitely affected his treatment of this author in the
passage scrutinized in this paper. If he thought of Phylarchus'
Histories as known and accessible to his readers, he could hardly
have distorted either the content or the form of the text.

8. *Conclusion*

The view I have tried to set out is, first, that the Polybian
reference to Phylarchus in *oratio obliqua*, marked with the re-
porting clause φησί and the accusative and infinitive construc-
tion, can in parts contain *ipsissima verba* of the quoted historian,
whereas Polybius' other reporting verb (εἰσάγει), accompanied
by *oratio recta*, is a less firm guarantee of verbal exactitude. For

---

[80] Phylarchus was contemporary with Cleomenes and Aratus, and his 28-
book work was probably circulating in the Greek world when Polybius was
writing. As already noted, Polybius used Phylarchus as a source. Plutarch in
the first century still had access to the entire work, as did Athenaeus, who a
century later quotes numbered books.

anyone simply reading F 53 in Jacoby's format (or now that of BNJ), not to mention only the English translation in BNJ, it is hardly noticeable that Polybius shifts from a relatively faithful quotation to a redescriptive allusion.[81] Second, I hope to have demonstrated that when we properly recognize the specific impact of Polybius as cover-text on his references, we are in a position to say with a high degree of probability where it does, and where it does not, imply misrepresentation. In my analysis I have discussed a single fragment of Phylarchus, but that analysis coupled with the explorations of Polybius' quoting habit has bearing on our understanding of other Phylarchan pieces in Polybius, as well as of Polybius as mediating author in general. The differentiation between the accuracy of the φησί-quotation and the reference with εἰσάγει seems a promising route for analysis of other Phylarchan fragments in Polybius[82] involving similar introductory formulae and structure.[83]

September, 2020   marcinkurpios@gmail.com

---

[81] In the BNJ entry, φησί of 2.56.6 is rendered "he accordingly asserts that." The addition of "accordingly" creates a link between the first clause (βουλόμενος κτλ.) and the quotation proper. As I have argued, such a link exists only in Polybius' mind and is a product of his speculation about motivation. Moreover, the rendering of εἰσάγει of 2.56.7 as "he talks of" seems incorrect, given the particular implications of that introductory word.

[82] For instance, in BNJ one sentence from F 54a (Polyb. 2.59.1–2), where Polybius reports Phylarchus' account with φησί+AcI, is put in inverted commas in the translation. This intuitive choice can now be partly substantiated with the results of the present study.