

BOOK REVIEW

Polybius: The Histories Books 28–39. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. *Unattributed Fragments*. Edited and translated by S. Douglas Olson. Loeb Classical Library, 161. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2012. Pp. vii + 619. Hardcover, \$24.00/£15.95. ISBN 978-0-674-99661-8.

This sixth volume of the second edition of the Loeb Polybius has no separate preface or introduction from that given in Volume 1, where a summary of the collaborative revisions can be found. In brief, Walbank had been enlisted to revise and annotate Paton’s translation in the mid-sixties, a project he completed by the mid-eighties. Because of delays and disruptions at the publishers, it wasn’t until 2007 that Habicht was enlisted to implement Walbank’s annotations, write an introduction and explanatory notes, revise the index, and ‘bring everything up to date with current scholarship’ (vol. 1, p. viii). Olson was brought on board to prepare an edition of the fragments not attributed to any specific book. My feelings about the results of this piecemeal endeavour in this sixth volume are mixed. It is a useful addition to any classical library, but less so than it might have been. Furthermore the nature of certain changes and omissions raises questions about the intended audiences of the Loeb series and their potential needs.

The translation remains very much Paton’s work. Walbank’s adjustments are aimed at correcting mistranslations, many of which he already criticised in his *Historical Commentary*.¹ There has been no attempt to update the style or language. This makes for a marked contrast in tone between the bulk of the volume and Olson’s admirably clear and accessible translation of the unattributed fragments. Take, for instance, 38.7.4: following Walbank’s *Commentary*, ‘with true Numidian simplicity’ has become ‘clothed simply in the Numidian fashion’, but in the same section, outdated phrasing like ‘thus armed cap-a-pie’ is retained. Gulussa’s name has been appropriately updated from the poor transliteration ‘Golosses’, but the *Μαυρούσιοι* at 38.7.9 are left as ‘Moors’ with all the modern baggage that word connotes, instead of being updated to ‘Mauri’ or ‘Maurusii’. One might also have expected a note here (or at 15.11.1) flagging for the reader that Polybius provides the

¹ Walbank (1957–79).

earliest testimony about these peoples with cross-references to Pliny *NH* 5.17 and Strabo 17.3.2.

Most of the significant changes made to the translation improve the reader's understanding of the historical circumstances or correct outright inaccuracies. To give just a few examples. Any suggestion that the sending of 'crowns' in diplomatic exchanges might be related to the worship of *Roma* has been expunged from Paton's translation (30.4.5 and 31.32.3). The misreading of τὴν κατάστασιν at 39.4.1 as 'appointment' rather than 'reorganization' previously distorted the activities of the ten commissioners in Greece. Paton thought the unspecified τῆς διαλύσεως of 28.1.8 referred to Antiochus and included a gloss to that effect; the gloss has been removed, leaving only a literal translation of the original Greek with a note that the conflict under discussion is likely the τοῦ διαλύειν τὸν πρὸς Περσέα πόλεμον of 28.1.7.

In a few places the translation has been lightly adapted to shift emphasis, such as εὐδαιμονία rendered as 'prosperity' instead of 'fertility' at 34.9.3. These corrections, not inspired by Walbank's *Commentary*, occasionally feel pedantic: τοῦ διαβουλίου at 38.18.1 is now more accurately translated as 'discussion' rather than 'council', but does not change the meaning of the sentence in any significant way.

There are places where Paton's translation is still allowed to go too far beyond the Greek. Four times in Book 36 the word 'faith' is worked into the descriptions of the Carthaginian surrender when no form of πίστις is evident in the Greek (36.3.9–4.3, 9.12). So, for instance, ἔδωκαν τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν περὶ αὐτῶν is translated 'they committed Carthage to the faith of Rome' (36.3.9). A new note at 36.4.1 points the reader to 20.9.10–12, which is clearly the cross reference meant by Polybius, and where one does find the language of 'faith', δόντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων πίστιν, clearly corresponding to *dedere se in fidem*. However, no such vocabulary is evident in Polybius' Greek in Book 36.

Most of the new notes are: (1) cross referencing within Polybius to discussion of the same individuals or related events; (2) clarification of the identity of individuals or places, most often with reference to Pauly–Wissowa (*RE*); and, to a lesser extent, (3) cross-references to other primary sources; and (4) references to modern scholarship or explanations of relevant scholarly debate. The cross-references within the text and to other ancient literature are eminently useful, timeless, and well within the tradition of the Loeb series, although the form of bibliographical citations is not completely consistent and students may find the heavy use of abbreviations with no key daunting. The references to *RE* may seem outdated, even esoteric, to today's students who are more familiar with the numerous online reference databases, both scholarly (*Brill's New Pauly* in English, *Oxford Reference Online*) and amateur

(Wikipedia).² This reader wonders what proportion of the Loeb's audience still reads German.

Within the notes, Habicht is not afraid to disagree with Walbank's *Commentary*, or even his own previously expressed opinion. This has both positive and negative effects. He brings to bear new epigraphic evidence on the identity of the Cammani in 31.1 and thus corrects a relocation of this fragment to Book 30 proposed in Walbank's *Commentary*. In a note for 32.15.11 Habicht lists scholarship proving Welles, *RC* 68 is from the Imperial period, but no explicit mention is made of Walbank's *Commentary*'s mistaken reference to that inscription as Attalid in origin. The note on 31.4.1 regarding the colossal statue of the Roman People at Rhodes provides useful comparative exempla including a re-dating of Habicht's previous assessment of the Samos colossus. However, Habicht also says Walbank's *Commentary* is mistaken to draw a connection between such a statue and the cult of the goddess *Roma*. This is out of step with other recent scholarship which emphasises how the worship of the goddess *Roma* and the *demos* of the Roman People are often aligned, and how even as separate phenomena they still represent a similar strategy for coping with the emergence of Roman hegemony.³ The note on 36.12.5 claims new information has become known since Walbank observed that there was no inscriptional evidence of anyone else named Polybius before Polybius the historian, citing H. Lauter, *AW* 33 (2002) 375–86. However, Lauter identifies the Polybius of the new inscription with the historian himself (as the note acknowledges!) and thus does not actually change the accuracy of Walbank's original statement. These quibbles, however, do not detract from the overall improvement to the volume made by the inclusion of such generous and full notes.

One fragment from Stephanus of Byzantium not included in the original Paton translation from the otherwise lost Book 37 is printed: 'Mouseion, a place in the area of Mt. Olympus in Macedonia. Polybius in Book 37'. Walbank's *Commentary* allows for the possibility that the fragment might actually belong to Book 36, a fact not mentioned in the notes. It is very hard to find places where Walbank's work on a better arrangement of the fragments is acted upon in the presentation of the text or even acknowledged in the notes. Walbank's *Commentary* III.328 wants 27.18.1–3 inserted between 28.2 and 3; no indication is given in the new Loeb. 34.16.3 is still printed, albeit with a footnote that alludes to the fact that it is not actually a Polybian fragment, but belongs to another, later writer of the same name. No note warns the reader that 11.1, 11.5–7, 14.1–8 have been judged by Walbank to

² Most of the original Pauly–Wissowa is now usefully digitised: <http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/RE>.

³ Erskine (1997) 25–7; Champion (2007) 258; Fears (1978) has been undervalued.

be falsely assigned to this book, let alone any reflection of his full reordering of this book (Walbank, *Commentary* III.568–9). 38.22 from Appian's *Punica* 132 also remains as part of the text, even though Walbank's *Commentary* rejects it as a fragment and (following Astin) finds Diodorus 32.24 closer to Polybius' original than Appian's account.⁴ Similarly, Walbank's *Commentary* on 35.6.1–4 (= Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 9.1) says 'probably draws on Polybius but hardly ranks as a fragment'; it too is still included. Some adjustments to the text itself are adopted, but not all. Walbank's *Commentary* wants to read <δισ>μυρίων at 30.5.4 following Livy 45.25.7, but this is not reflected in the text, translation, or notes. By contrast, <Φιλίππου> is inserted at 36.17.14, as Walbank (following Hulstsch) deemed logical. Both cases assume a copyist error in the Constantinian Extracts.

Olson renumbers the fragments but includes Büttner-Wobst's (B-W) original numbers in parentheses. The changes are not such as to cause much confusion as the new numbers differ from the old by only a place or two at most with two exceptions. Olson has moved B-W's no. 33 to his no. 129 to indicate that it is not specifically attributed to Polybius and B-W's nos. 110 and 178 have been combined into a single fragment, no. 111, to remove the doublet. There are only three new additions, nos. 98, 122, 233, all from the *Suda*, identified as Polybian based on their position within the *Suda* or verbal similarities with other portions of Polybius. Five other unattributed fragments have been removed because they have been found in either Diodorus or Xenophon, B-W's nos. 106, 123, 130, 224, 237; Olson notes each in its place. Those fragments where the attribution to Polybius has been doubted are marked by asterisks.

By contrast with Olson's approach, certain translation and editorial choices within the fragments of the numbered books continue to obscure the fragmentary nature of Polybius' text. Paton's original at 28.6.1 read 'The Greeks² (*sic*) thought that this embassy was worthy of attention' with a note below 'The epitomator should have said "Lycortas, his party."' It has been adjusted to just 'Lycortas' party thought that this embassy required careful consideration.' The discrepancy between the interpretive translation and the actual facing Greek (ὅτι ἔδοξε τοῖς Ἑλλησι περὶ τῆς πρεσβείας ἐπιστάσεως χρείαν ἔχειν τὸ γινόμενον) becomes unmarked and unexplained, as if the student lacking Greek should not care about the existence of the Byzantine epitomator. The important change in gloss in 38.16.12 to make the passage refer to Critolaus instead of Diaeus (Paton followed Mai in this) goes unmarked in the notes, although it received detailed treatment in Walbank's

⁴ That said, Diod. 32.24 puts *Iliad* 6.448–9 into Scipio's mouth as he speaks to Polybius watching Carthage burn, but the Homeric quotation is missing from Polybius 38.21 (from Const. *Exc. De Sent.*).

Commentary III.49. An indication of the origin of each fragment in the Greek, and thus their order in the source material, would make the logic of this new gloss and other corrections more transparent to the reader. The eight fragments which make up 36.6.7–8.7 are all from the *Suda* and can be placed here in the text based on comparison with Diodorus and Appian; it would have been helpful to have these cross-references in the notes. Throughout, there is a lost opportunity to indicate in at least the Greek text the location of fragment breaks and fragment sources where the text derives from the Constantinian Extracts, such as was done in the newest Loeb volume of Diodorus (Vol. XII). This is a shame, as the discrepancy in treatment between these portions of text and those that derive from other sources give the new student of Polybius a false impression that the text is rather more complete than it is, and that it is fixed as it is printed.

On balance, this second edition is definitely an improvement over the original, but there is certainly room for a third edition of a more homogeneous character and quality.

Brooklyn College and Graduate Center, CUNY

LIV MARIAH YARROW
lyarrow@gc.cuny.edu

Bibliography

- Champion, C. (2007) 'Empire by Invitation: Greek Political Strategies and Roman Imperial Interventions in the Second Century B.C.E.', *TAPhA* 137: 255–75.
- Erskine, A. (1997) 'Greekness and Uniqueness: The Cult of the Senate in the Greek East', *Phoenix* 51: 25–37.
- Fears, J. R. (1978) 'Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ Ο ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ GENIUS POPULI ROMANI: A Note on the Origin of Dea Roma', *Mnemosyne* 31: 274–86.
- Walbank, F. W. (1957–79) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols. (Oxford).