

The 'Ancient' Greek History in Polybios' *Historiae*: Tendencies and Political Objectives*

G. A. Lehmann

The modern scholarly discussion concerning Polybios' references and statements about events, personages and *exempla* of the Greek History in the Archaic, Classical and early Hellenistic periods has generally been confined to the famous chapters of the "Polemic in Polybios", *i.e.* his critical digressions against a whole series of prominent historians of the Greek past.¹ On the other hand interest in this field has often been restricted to the literary or rather philosophical learning of Polybios — somewhat in the manner of R.v.Scala's famous work.² However, it seems useful to try a much broader approach, which can lead us to very characteristic aspects and perspectives of Polybios' work, by actually considering and scrutinizing the whole mass of allusions, remarks and comparisons relating to 'Ancient' Greek history which are preserved in Polybios' *Historiae*. Then we might perhaps even get some glimpses not only of Polybios' sources of information, but also of his main standpoints and orientation-marks within past and present of the Greek World. Naturally in this respect even *obiter dicta* could be very

* This is the almost unchanged text of a paper read at a conference on the Attitudes to the Past in Hellenistic historiography, held at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem in 14–15.11.88; bibliographical notes have been restricted to an absolute minimum.

- 1 Cf. esp. F. W. Walbank's famous article in *JRS* 52 (1962) 1–12, and ch.II "Historical Traditions" in his monograph *Polybios* (Berkeley 1972) 32ff., but see now Walbank's analysis: "Polybios Sicht der Vergangenheit", *Gymnasium* 97 (1990) 15–30; cf. also G. A. Lehmann, "Polybios und die ältere und zeitgenössische griechische Geschichtsschreibung," in *Polybe, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*, 20 (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1974) 147–205; Kl. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios* (Wiesbaden 1975) *passim*.
- 2 R. v. Scala, *Die Studien des Polybios* (Stuttgart 1890); cf. K. Ziegler, *RE* 42 (1952) 1464ff.

relevant. And of course one should — apart from the preserved fragments of the *Historiae* — also take into consideration those parts in the fourth and fifth decades of Livy's work which are mostly only an adaption of Polybios' account. Certainly we have to expect here even radical abbreviations, for Livy himself announces several times in these books of his work that as a writer of Roman history he cannot go into many details of ancient Greek history as his main source — Polybios — obviously did.³ Nevertheless there are some remarkable Livian-Polybian references to the history and institutions of Athens in Archaic and Classical times (cf. Liv.31.15.6 and 44.8 with Plb. 16.25.9), to Xerxes' invasion of Greece (cf. Liv.P. 35.17.7; 36.15.11f. and 16.1f.) and likewise to the famous and much debated Peace of Kallias with the Persian kings (cf. Liv.P. 33.20.1–3 with Plb. 18.41a), furthermore statements about the early history of Sparta (Liv.P. 34.38.2) and so on.

However, we have to confine our evaluation to those remarks and accounts, which clearly stem from the historian himself, for there is much evidence in the historical speeches, letters and declarations included in Polybios' account that the historical arguments and *exempla* actually used by the speaker often contradict Polybios' own opinion and terminology. There are, for example, some remarkable (and very significant) historical manipulations in the rival speeches both of the Acarnanian Lykiskos and the Aitolian Chlaineas, which Polybios has presented with real objectivity.⁴ We now have a rather brilliant epigraphical documentation for this period — in close correspondence to our historiographical basis — which shows that in political and diplomatical life in the Hellenistic world the recourse to history by rather detailed and "professional" argumentation was quite common and highly esteemed — presumably in a much higher degree than in Classical times. Perhaps we should also remember that Strabon (1.2.8) clearly attests that at least in the Hellenistic period historical learning had obtained a prominent rank among the general and compulsory subjects in school — equal to philosophy! And this corresponds quite well with Polybios' remarks concerning the well established high esteem of history and historiography in the contemporaneous Greek world (Plb. 12.25e.1f.)!

In spite of his claims to write a work of real universal history as an actual and coherent process Polybios is of course deeply rooted in the traditions

3 Cf. e.g. Liv. 33.2.1 (concerning the history of the Pergamene Monarchy and its merits rendered to Greece), 3.12f., and particularly 35.40.1.

4 Plb. 9.28–39; cf. F. W. Walbank, *Historical Commentary on Polybios 2* (Oxford 1967) 165ff., 169, 180f.; see also the historical items which occur in the speech of the Macedonian ambassadors in Aitolia in 199 B.C. (Liv. 31.29.6f.).

and perspectives of Greek history and historiography even though *e.g.* in 2.37.3f. the 'Ελληνικαὶ πράξεις are characterized as history κατὰ μέρος along with Persian History! In fact, in Polybios' eyes Hellenic history has a rather incomparable dignity/σεμνόν; and his further remarks about τὸ τῆς 'Ελλάδος ὄνομα καὶ πρόσωπον (8.11.3f.) as well as his efforts to link his work carefully with famous authors as predecessors — all this clearly shows that he ranks within the long since established tradition of *historia perpetua* in the Greek world (Cic.*Fam.* 5.12/3.2 — letter to Lucceius) even if he only singles out Ephoros as his *real* predecessor in the field of "universal history" (Plb. 5.33.1f.). Polybios also quite emphatically praises those historians of the past (2.35.7) who have described at length the glorious defence of Hellas against barbarian aggressions like the Persian invasion to Greece and the assault of the Galatians against Delphi in 280 B.C. (cf. 4.46.1f.): these historical works are said to have made a great contribution to the struggle for freedom of the whole Greek world (ὕπερ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν 'Ελλήνων ἐλευθερίας). And facing the actually impending danger of invasions by northern intruders or the Galatians of Asia Minor in the future (cf. 3.3.5), Polybios' description and analysis of the Roman Wars against the Gauls (cf. also the excursus Liv.P. 38.16 and Plb. 21.41.2) takes pains to follow those great meritorious historians of the past. These latter can be identified, I suppose, quite confidently with Herodotos and Ephoros and on the other hand perhaps with Hieronymos of Kardia, for in 1.63.7f. Polybios apparently alludes to Herodotos and Hieronymus, too, as his competitors in historiographical work, while comparing the size of the sea-battles of the First Punic War both with the famous fights in the Persian War and in the Wars of the Diadochoi.

Generally we can be sure that the addressee of Polybios' *Historiae* was in the first place neither the Roman Republic nor the whole Greek world in the East, but very specifically the public of the Hellenic states (*e.g.* Plb. 2.7.3f) in the mainland of Greece and the adjacent Aegean area (without Macedon: Plb. 2.71.1). This becomes clear also with regard to Polybios' terminology relating to *Hellenes* and *Hellas*: in spite of very different opinions on this subject uttered in political and diplomatical speeches in the *Historiae* Polybios himself makes a very modified use of the traditional opposition of *Hellenes* versus *Barbaroi*. For Polybios, as for Eratosthenes, the distinctive criterion for "barbarism" is no longer based on language, origin and a specific political culture, but very pragmatically only on lack of urbanized civilization.⁵ Carthage and Rome in the West, Macedon in the North, the

5 Cf. Cicero's remarks *Rep.* 1.58. A clear distinction is made by Polybios *e.g.* in 23.8 and 13; cf. also 1.65.7f. and cf. 67.6f.; 3.14.6; 10.1,2 (southern Italy); 33.8 and 10.5f.

Hellenistic monarchies and even the “national” kingdoms of Western and Central Asia Minor and the whole range of urbanized communities of the East are, as the Hellenes, opposed to zones of barbarism which have withdrawn rather to the fringes of the Oecumene. On the other hand one has the impression that the terms *Hellas/Hellenes* are consistently shrinking to a rather *regional* circumscription and embrace only the republican states of the Greek mainland and the Aegean world.⁶ It is on *this part* of the Oecumene that Polybios’ main political interests, his personal hopes and fears for the future are clearly concentrated; it is only for these ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις that he even adopts — as an historian and author — the role of a *praeceptor Graeciae* by *direct* advice with abundant political and historical comments; it is especially in the 4th book of the *Historiae* that we find a whole series of detailed memoranda addressed to the state of Elis (ch.74), to Messene and Megalopolis (chs.32–33), to the whole ἔθνος of the Arcades (chs.20–21), an appreciation of the history of Acarnania and its impressive tradition of loyal partnership in an alliance-system (ch.30: in contrast to the attitude of the Epirotes in 220/219), and finally a notice about the most important position of the πόλις Byzantion at the Bosphorus (ch.38) and its proved vital function in the interest of all Hellenes, who should, Polybios argues, therefore feel obliged to a κοινὴ ἐπικουρία for Byzantion in case of a threatening assault of Thracian tribes. Similar political admonitions are also given — on several occasions — to the πόλεις Rhodes and Athens, or even to the Epirotes (cf. 2.6–7). This orientation harmonizes quite well with his marked reserve against the historians (and the functionaries) of the royal courts in the Hellenistic world — the αὐλικοί — whereas Polybios himself demonstrates all features of an historian-“citoyen”.⁷

(Liguria); 34.10 (Str. 4.6.12: Noricum); 34.14 (Str. 17.1.2: Alexandria ad Aegyptum); 35.2.6 and 5.1 (Celtiberians); 38.2.3f. and 18.7.

- 6 Very instructive in this respect is the episode of Kleitomachos’ Olympic victory (in a pankration-fight) which Polybios mentions in 29.9.7f. (cf. 32.2.5; 34.14.4f. and esp. Liv.P. 38.17.9–11). A complete analogy is found in the terminology of the Roman “manifest” against Perseus (171 B.C.E.) *Fouilles de Delphes* III, 4 nos. 75 and 367 (see J. Bousquet, *BCH* 105 (1981) 407f.); cf. G. Zecchini, “Polibio, la storiografia ellenistica e l’Europa,” *CISA* 12 (1986) 124f.
- 7 Cf. e.g. Plb. 5.26.11f.; Liv.P. 34.36.4 and 35.48.2. On the type of “historian-citoyen” in Hellenistic historiography see now the considerations of A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften*, Stuttgart 1988; Polybios’ attitude to the work of Hieronymos is analyzed by J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford 1981) 236 and G. A. Lehmann, “Der ‘Lamische Krieg’ u. die ‘Freiheit der Hellenen’:

In contrast to the rather mechanical views about a firm and abstract κύκλος-scheme in the changes of constitutions and political culture, which are exposed in the 6th book, Polybios has presupposed in his more actual assessments and historical comments about the political traditions and characters of Greek republics that each of these ξῶνη καὶ πόλεις has its special αἴρεσις, and really forms some sort of a "Kollektivpersönlichkeit" with a specific mentality and individually developed constitution, with experiences, interests and achievements of its own (cf. e.g. Plb. 12.25i.4f. and 3.31). Obviously this is also the basis for Polybios' rather sharp and vehement protests against the claims especially of Athenian politicians (and historiography) in past and present for a historically legitimized role of their state as the common spokesman for Hellas: There are many grim remarks of Polybios — but also in diplomatical transactions and speeches in his work — about these notorious ambitions of Athens, and thus it is very characteristic that in his short sketch of the beginning of Achaian history (ἀπὸ Τισαμενοῦ: 2.41) Polybios suppressed all myth-historical links between Achaia, Athens and Ionia, which his Achaicá-source had abundantly treated — as the otherwise clearly parallel record of Strabon proves (8.7.1f.), for he used the same work of regional history.⁸ Indeed, while the classical tradition of Athenian Atthidography — as local history on a great scale and with a specific character — had come to an end with Philochoros and Athens' surrender before Antigonos Gonatas in the Chremonidean War, in diplomatical life and in common historiography even of Polybios' lifetime Athens' ambition to incorporate *all* traditions and highlights of the Hellenic past went on — as is illustrated, for example, by the curious contemporary inscription of the *laudes Atheniensium* from Plataiai.⁹ Polybios thus very consciously had a high esteem for Sparta and its rank and importance as the

Überlegungen zur hieronymianischen Tradition," *ZPE* 73 (1988) 148–9. Very instructive is now the epigram in honour of the politician and historian Kletonymos of Lato (who performed the magistrature of a *kosmos* in 116/5 B.C.E.), M. W. Baldwin Bowsky, *Hesperia* 58 (1989) 118–9, 121.

- 8 As Thomas Lenschau has demonstrated: "Die Gründung Joniens und der Bund am Panionion," *Klio* 36 (1944) 201–37, esp. 208f. Cf. e.g. Plb. 9.40.1 and 30.20; Liv.P. 31.14.6; 44.3–9 and 45.2.
- 9 *IG II²* no. 2788 (= *SEG* 36 (1986) 237). Significant of this process of a rather perverse Atticism is the choice of historical events which has been made in the Parian chronicle (*Marmor Parium*: *FGrH* 239), where even the battle of Plataia is recorded as a purely Athenian victory (A §52). The ancient history of the Lacedaimonians is only mentioned once — in connection with their defeat at Leuktra (A §72)!

predominant hegemonial power of the Hellenic world from the times of Lykurgos till the battle of Leuktra.¹⁰ This liking for Sparta shows throughout his work and very specially in the fact that Sparta belongs to that range of empires and *archai* which Polybios in his prooemium thinks to be particularly fitting for a comparison with Rome (1.2.2f.). Only occasionally is Polybios varying the stress of his judgment: for example in 38.2.2f. Athens' fate and political achievements in the year of Xerxes' invasion and its rise to a hegemonial position in Greece rival to Sparta are commented on much more favourably.¹¹

Thus it would be mere guess-work, I suppose, if we would try to single out a dominant motive for Polybios' general animosity against Athens, its role as sea- and hegemonial-power in the past, and all Atheno-centric interpretation of ancient Greek history, for *principally* this attitude corresponds quite well with his judgement upon *all* hegemonies built up by Hellenes in Hellas:¹² his critical remarks about the complete inability of all Greek states, which came in the position of an ἀρχή in the Peloponnesos, to preserve the κοινὴ ἐλευθερία — that is a status of necessary liberty and autonomous political culture — for their dependant allies (2.37.9f), are certainly not confined to this part of Greece. Polybios' criticism obviously includes even the attempts of Arcadia in the sixties of the 4th century to expand into the territory of Elis and to gain control over Olympia — as his remarks (4.73.9f.) clearly demonstrate. More than once the hegemonial policy of Sparta in Greece during the age of Agesilaos is depicted as a mere tyranny and characterized — together with Athens — as a devastatingly wrong model of φιλαρχία for a ruling power.¹³

10 Cf. e.g. Plb. 4.81; 6.49.4 and 23.11; Liv.P. 40.8.7f.

11 Cf. the remarks of Liv.P. 35.32.7. See also the informative analysis of J.-L. Ferrary, "L'empire de Rome et les hégémonies des cités grecques chez Polybe," *BCH* 100 (1976) 283–9.

12 In 6.49 Sparta is characterized as the *first* Hellenic power which practised an aggressive policy and established a rather oppressive domination in parts of Greece — in an overall comparison with Rome's ability to win over the Italian *socii* mostly by political methods.

13 Cf. e.g. the remarks in 4.27 which should be combined with Polybios' analysis of current Greek judgements upon Rome's action against Carthage in 150 B.C.E. (36.9), especially with the statement that Rome is now violating its own former principles (see also Plb. 10.36.5f. and 13.3.7). See against Walbank's interpretation of the crucial passage in 36.9.5f. with regard to Polybios' own opinion and attitude (esp. "Polybios between Greece and Rome", in *Polybe, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* [Van-

Although Polybios characterizes the battle of Leuktra as a surprising turning-point of Greek history — strongly connected with great political achievements and very important events¹⁴ — he emphasizes in 2.39.8f. (cf. 4.81.12) that the period of Theban hegemony after Epameinondas' victory was characterized by great ἀκρίσια in Hellas — a statement in complete accordance with Xenophon's general view and Isokrates' Archidamos. Nevertheless Epameinondas' (and Pelopidas') personality remained in Polybios' eyes an incontestable model of military and political leadership.¹⁵

Now we might ask what the reasons are that led prominent scholars like the late A. Momigliano and P. Pédech to the opinion that Polybios — as a patriotic-parochial Arcadian of Megalopolis — was only interested in the history of the 4th century (when Megalopolis and the federal state of Arcadia were founded!) and that there was a real "lacuna", a gap in his historical knowledge and interest concerning the history of the 5th century.¹⁶ Pédech has even asserted that Polybios never read Herodotos and was quite unfamiliar with the work of Thukydides while arguing that Polybios' historical learning is not only limited to the historiography of the 4th century, but primarily stems from the generation of Ephoros and Theopompos!

Certainly it is true that Polybios — just in case he yet had some acquaintance with the classical authors of the 5th century — very seldom has made use of historians as we would expect. For in his polemic against Timaios' version of the speech Hermokrates delivered at the congress of Gela,¹⁷ or in his critical remarks about Timaios' treatment of the alleged negotiations

doeuvres-Genève 1974] 3–38) B. Shimron, "Polybios on Rome. A Reexamination of the Evidence," *SCI* 5 (1979/80) 94ff.

- 14 Plb. 8.11.3f. (directed against Theopompos' turn from Helleniká to Philipppiká); cf. also Pausanias' appreciation of the battle of Leuktra (9.6.4) as a victory for the sake of liberty and freedom in Greece.
- 15 Cf. Plb. 6.43.6; 8.35.6 and 9.8; 31.22.6 (comparison of Epameinondas — together with the Athenian Aristeides — with the victorious imperator in the battle of Pydna L. Aemilius Paullus). As is well known Philopoimen had already chosen Epameinondas as his personal model (Plu.*Phil.* 3 and 14.2f., certainly in accordance with Polybios' biographical work).
- 16 Cf. esp. the discussion in *Polybe* (*op. cit.* no. 13 above) 62f.; see also G. A. Lehmann, "Polybios und die ältere und zeitgenössische griechische Geschichtsschreibung," in *Polybe* 165ff.
- 17 Plb. 12.25k.1f. and 26b.1f. (see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybios* 2 (1967) 399f.).

between an embassy of Gelon of Syracuse and the Hellenic League of 481, there are no hints at the almost totally divergent records of Thukydides and Herodotos.¹⁸ But here, as on other occasions, we have to recognize that methodologically Polybios' critique is quite consciously bound to his—often rather doubtful-arguments of historical "Sachkritik" whereas he hardly shows an inclination or marked ability to scrutinize the different traditions and literary sources by making a joint comparison — some sort of "Quellenkritik". And in his methodological remarks in 12.27.2f. Polybios has set forth that he estimates rather low the way of comparing and criticizing the faults of the classical predecessors — συγκρίνειν τὰς τῶν προγεγονότων συγγραφέων ἀγνοίας; for this was just the method by which in Polybios' view the stay-at-home historian Timaios has primarily won his fame as a prominent authority (τὴν τοῦ συγγραφέως προστασίαν: 12.28.6). For Polybios — who often characterizes his own work as the specific task of an historian of *contemporary history*, in his opinion the most important part of history — the μέγιστον μέρος τῆς ἱστορίας (12.27.6) consists in assembling evidence by authentic personal experience and expensive research, that is by travelling and πολυπραγμοσύνη in archives and by a technique of careful interviewing of eye-witnesses (12.4c.3f. and 20.12.8).

Another part of Pédech's argumentation is based on the manifest mistakes Polybios made in some short references to events and personages of the Peloponnesian War¹⁹ — here as in other cases I would not conjecture a use of a different literary source but only slips of memory considering the concrete difficulties in verifying a quotation or some other information out of the scrolls of an ancient historiographical work of great size. Obvious slips of memory or of pencil, as is well known, do even occur when Polybios is giving *direct* surveys or quotations.²⁰ On the other hand we find so many clear connections to Thukydidean methodology and even literal reminiscences of Thukydides in Polybios' work that there must have been a direct and conscious recourse to this classical author — in spite of the fact that

- 18 Th.4.59f.; Hdt. 7.153, 157. In contrast to Polybios' critical approach cf. Plutarchos' clear reference to Timaios' ambitious, but unfounded differences-with regard to the primary records of Thukydides and Philistos (*Nik.* 1.1f.).
- 19 Cf. e.g. the inaccurate remarks Plb. 9.19.1–4 about Nikias' superstitious behaviour and the fatal delay in 413 during the siege of Syracuse with Th. 7.50; P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris 1964) 95.
- 20 See e.g. Polybios' sketchy survey of the first book of Theopompos' Philippiká (Plb. 38.6.2f. = *FGrH* 115 F 28).

Thukydides is mentioned by name only once and quite incidentally — at least in our fragments.²¹

With regard to Polybios' knowledge of the work of Herodotos — although it is not mentioned explicitly — one could refer to his relatively circumstantial survey (38c.1f.) of Athens' glorious role in the defence of Hellas against Xerxes — which is in close accordance with Herodotos' comments (8.41 and 51f.). The reference to the episode of Kleobis and Biton (22.20.7) and perhaps even the argumentation about the offspring of the Spartan constitution is also conclusive.²² Polybios' acquaintance with Xenophon's work — the *Helleniká* and *Agésilaos* included (Plb. 10.20.7) — is more obvious even if Polybios has misrepresented (in 6.45), probably by a slip of memory, Xenophon's real position concerning the Spartan constitution — let alone the well attested admiration of Scipio Aemilianus for Xenophon!

Concerning Hieronymos of Kardias, J. Hornblower has shown that there exist some rather remarkable resemblances between Polybios and the tradition stemming from Hieronymos — a number of examples that could even be enlarged.²³ Furthermore I would suggest that Polybios' rather frequent remarks about the historian's duty to strive for a pleasing literary style (τὸ τερπνόν) in his historical work should perhaps be seen against the background of the clumsy *Historiai* of Hieronymos which were (in a rather careless manner) overloaded with documents in their original wording, size and technicality — as Kl. Rosen has shown convincingly.²⁴ In any case we can conclude that Polybios' basis of historical learning and methodology was much broader than a superficial impression might suggest and that his historical knowledge was by no means confined to the often criticized or highly estimated λογιώτατοι τῶν ἀρχαίων συγγραφέων, i.e. Ephoros, Theo-

21 Plb. 8.11.3; but see the remarks of Fr. Egermann about a direct connection between Th. 1.22.2f. and Plb. 12.28a 5 = 18.5 B.-W. ("Thukydides über die Art seiner Reden und über seine Darstellung der Kriegsgeschehnisse," *Historia* 21 [1972] 587); cf. also G. A. Lehmann, *op. cit.* (n. 16 above) 167f. Even the manifest concentration of great direct ("panhellenic-orientated") speeches just in the description of the crucial period before and during the First Macedonian war looks here like an analogy to the famous first books in Thukydides' work. See also H. G. Strebel, *Wertung und Wirkung des Thukydideischen Geschichtswerkes in der griechisch-Werkes in der Griechisch-römischen Literatur*, Diss. München 1935, 23f.

22 Cf. 6.45-47 and 10.2.8f. with Hdt. 1.65.

23 J. Hornblower, *op. cit.* (n. 7 above) 236.

24 Kl. Rosen, "Political Documents in Hieronymos of Cardia (323-302 B.C.)," *AC* 10 (1967) 41-94.

pompos, Kallisthenes and Timaios. However, this does not imply contesting the enormous influence of just these authors and their important role as sources of information for Polybios.

The same applies to the number of allusions and references to the remoter past, the "Ancient" Greek history in the Polybian tradition. There is a broad scale of remarks and reminiscences including all major periods and parts of Hellenic history — beginning with the Heroic age, the myth-historical origins, the return of the Herakleidai, the κτίσις Ἰωνίας in more than one aspect, the proceeding to the age of colonization in the West, to many events and features of the early history of Sparta, of Messenia and Lokris, of Thessaly and Phocis down to the epoch of the Diadochoi and the 3rd century B.C.E. More than once — that is apart from the Achaiká and Rhodiaká clearly discernible in his work — it becomes quite obvious here that Polybios did often grasp at *local* or *regional* histories to have concise information close at hands for a necessary digression. But in this paper it would be rather inappropriate to go too much into detail.

So I just want to stress the fact that we can substantiate from the hints of the "Polybian" Livy (31.14/5,30 and 44/5) an accurate knowledge of the historian about the historical structures and famous institutions of the Athenian democracy and even the topography of Athens — save that Polybios' antipathy against the pride of the Athenians "ex vetere fortuna" and against the demagogic dynamics of their *ekklesia* is still clear and virulent. All this, however, is in complete harmony with Polybios' explicit or incidental judgements about Themistokles, Aristides, Perikles and Kleon. Thus, we can state as a *positive* conclusion that there really is *no lacuna, no gap* at all in Polybios' references to the remoter parts of Greek history. On the contrary, there is *a marked summit of interest* in the historical discussion and political valuation of the period of Philip of Macedon and his rise to a hegemonic position in the Greek world. Actually, the rival speeches of Chlaineas and Lykiskos with their extraordinary length (9.28–39) and historical perspectives are a good proof of the fact that even down to Polybios' times the discussion about the political character and value of Philip's hegemonial system in Greece, the κοινὴ εἰρήνη of 338/7, had still not come to an end. All other remarks of Polybios upon the achievements and — in his opinion — rather ideal policy of Philip II appear substantially so clearly linked to the arguments used by Lykiskos that we are entitled to take some of the features and hints of this speech as Polybios' general conception of this phase of Macedonian hegemony over Greece. Here, as in Polybios' rather explicit discussion about the political conduct of Greek politicians in the time of

Philip II and his quite respectful polemic against Demosthenes' *De corona* (in the famous excerpt about traitors: 18.13–15), we find the firm conviction of the hegemonial status of Philip as a magnanimous king of Macedon being at least for some of the Greek states, perhaps even for the *majority* of πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη, a *far more precious and desired guarantee* for a status of security and autonomy than an oppressing foreign domination.²⁵ Such a benignant and mightful paramountcy — a *leadership from the outside* of the Greek world, striving as an εὐεργέτης for the εὐνοία of the Hellenes — is explicitly characterized as far more advantageous for the weaker and dependent Greek states than the expansion and execution of hegemonial power by a strong Hellenic neighbour “in visceribus Graeciae”.²⁶ Thus, there is no contradiction at all to Polybios' strictures upon the neutralist policy of the Thebans in 480 and their anti-Hellenic collaboration with Xerxes (4.31.5f.): for Polybios there was no similarity at all between Xerxes' invasion of Greece and Philip's intervention in Thessaly against the Phocian tyrants and mercenaries and in the Peloponnesos by demand of the hard pressed Messenia, Megalopolis and Argos (which had been left in the lurch after 361 B.C.E. by Thebes and Athens too). On the contrary, Philip's position after Chaironeia — when he even obtained the ὁμολογουμένη εὐνοία of the Athenians and made them his συναγωνισταί²⁷ — is clearly Polybios' orientation-mark, the model in background, while appreciating the brilliant status of Philip V in 215 B.C.E. (after the Peace of Naupaktos and before the fatal περιπέτεια in the reign of this king) as recognized hegemon of Hellas (7.11.1f.) with even the κοινόν of Crete included by free will. For in Polybios' eyes this position was won by the σεμνότης τῆς προαίρεσεως

- 25 Nevertheless we find even here a tacit differentiation between the results of Philip's policy in favour of Argos, Megalopolis, Tegea and Messene and the rather distressed situation of Korinthos and Sikyon (under a strong Macedonian garrison) or the political fate of Megara and Troizen which are mentioned — quite emphatically too — by Demosthenes (*De Corona* 295); see now the accurate commentary of H. Wankel, *Demosthenes' Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* 2 (Heidelberg 1976) 1248.
- 26 Liv.P. 33.44.8f. (concerning Nabis of Sparta). Very significant are here the statements of the Chalkidean politicians Mikythion and Xenokleides concerning the imminent consequences of an Aitolian hegemony over Hellas (192 B.C.E.) in comparison with the Macedonian predominance in the past: Liv.P. 35.38.4f. (see also Liv.P. 35.44.6).
- 27 The remark in Liv.P. 38.34.8 clearly proves the high esteem and widely accepted legitimacy of the territorial regulations in the Peloponnesos as made after Chaironeia at the initiative of Philip II; cf. also Plb. 5.9.8f., 10.1f. in connection with 9.33.12 (speech of Lykiskos) and Just. 9.5.1–3.

rather than by force of arms. Therefore it seemed fully compatible with the moderate desires of the dependent Greek allies for an elementary autonomy, identity and security. In this perspective and conception we can perhaps recognize Polybios as a “spokesman” of a Greece far beyond Sparta and beyond Athens who both had established rather wrong and intolerably suppressive symmachial systems. One should not forget that even in Polybios’ times Sparta could still be suspected to be a state with expansionist mind and energies.

On the other hand, the liberal and attractive model of Philip’s hegemony could still play a very important role in Polybios’ expectations and fears concerning the future development of the Roman rule in Greece — and in this frame one can perhaps incorporate those present-day advices Polybios gave to some of the contemporary Greek states as well as to the whole community of the Hellenes. These political suggestions, I think, don’t betray the attitude of an “advocatus jeder causa fortior” — as Nietzsche complained about Leopold Ranke — but rather reveal the author’s aspiration to the role of a *praeceptor Graeciae*. I am not sure whether Polybios was really aware of the difficulties of an historian, especially an historian of contemporary history, to give political advice on current or future issues, but — as several remarks show²⁸ — Polybios knew quite well that all his hopes and recommendations clearly rested on the premise that even after 145 B.C.E. the Romans would be ready to retain at least some rests of their former ἀλρεπτις.

Universität zu Köln

28 Plb. 10.36.5f.; 13.3.7; 36.9.5f.; n. 13 above.