striking. Visitors enjoy the sight of Praxiteles' Aphrodite, who is naked *πλὴν ὅσα τῇ ἑτέρῃ χειρὶ τὴν αἰδῶ λεληθότως ἐπικρύπτειν*. It is possible that Ovid too was thinking of such a statue when he wrote: 'ipsa Venus pubem, quotiens velamina ponit/protegitur laeva semireducta manu' (*AA* 2.613–14).[17]

The play of allusions is stunning: the girl, analogized to a statue, hides her *Εὐρώτας*, even as the description of her supple buttocks summons up descriptions of a statue of that very river. What she hides, however, is a part that is dank in another and, for the poet, less appealing way—and this too lies hidden in the river's name.

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München REGINA HÖSCHELE
Brown University DAVID KONSTAN
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi060

POLYBIUS ON 'SEEING' AND 'HEARING': 12.27[1]

(§1) *δυεῖν γὰρ ὄντων κατὰ φύσιν ὡς ἂν εἴ τινων ὀργάνων ἡμῖν, οἷς πάντα πυνθανόμεθα καὶ πολυπραγμονοῦμεν [ἀκοῆς καὶ ὁράσεως], ἀληθινωτέρας δ' οὔσης οὐ μικρῷ τῆς ὁράσεως κατὰ τὸν Ἡράκλειτον — ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ τῶν ὤτων ἀκριβέστεροι μάρτυρες —* (§2) *τούτων Τίμαιος τὴν ἡδίω μέν, ἥττω δὲ τῶν ὁδῶν ὥρμησε πρὸς τὸ πολυπραγμονεῖν*. (§3) *τῶν μὲν γὰρ διὰ τῆς ὁράσεως εἰς τέλος ἀπέστη, τῶν δὲ διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἀντεποιήσατο. καὶ ταύτης* (δι)*μερ*(*οῦς*) *οὔσης τινός, τοῦ μὲν διὰ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων* ***[2] *τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς ἀνακρίσεις ῥᾳθύμως ἀνεστράφη, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἀνώτερον ἡμῖν δεδήλωται*. (§4) *δι' ἣν δ' αἰτίαν ταύτην ἔσχε τὴν αἵρεσιν εὐχερὲς καταμαθεῖν. ὅτι τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν βυβλίων δύναται πολυπραγμονεῖσθαι χωρὶς κινδύνου καὶ κακοπαθείας. ἐάν τις αὐτὸ τοῦτο προνοηθῇ μόνον ὥστε λαβεῖν ἢ πόλιν ἔχουσαν ὑπομνημάτων πλῆθος ἢ βυβλιοθήκην που γειτνιῶσαν*. (§5) *λοιπὸν κατακείμενον ἐρευνᾶν δεῖ τὸ ζητούμενον καὶ συγκρίνειν τὰς τῶν προγεγονότων συγγραφέων ἀγνοίας ἄνευ πάσης κακοπαθείας*. (§6) *ἡ δὲ πολυπραγμοσύνη πολλῆς μὲν προσδεῖται ταλαιπωρίας καὶ δαπάνης, μέγα δέ τι συμβάλλεται καὶ μέγιστόν ἐστι μέρος τῆς ἱστορίας*. Polybius 12.27.1–6 (ed. Büttner-Wobst)

(§1) We naturally have two, as it were, tools, by which we learn and research everything, [hearing and sight,] but of these the sight is by a long way more truthful, according to Heraclitus—for the eyes are more accurate witnesses than the ears. (§2) Of these Timaeus embarked on his research by the more pleasant but lesser route. (§3) For he completely avoided the things done through sight, but applied himself to the things done through hearing. And given that the latter has two parts, <he engaged in> the part that is done through documents, but acted lazily in the part involving examining witnesses, as I showed earlier. (§4) It is easy to understand his reason for making this choice. Things from books can be researched without danger and hardship, if the person simply has the foresight to adopt a city well-supplied in documents or a library somewhere nearby. (§5) All that is left is to lie back and search out what one is looking for and compare the mistakes of previous historians without any hardship. (§6) But *polypragmosyne*[3] needs a great deal of labour and expense, but is immensely useful and is the most important part of history.

In this famous passage Polybius, like various other ancient historians, distinguishes between two methods of researching history: by the 'eyes'—primarily personal

[17] M. Janka, *Ovid* Ars Amatoria. *Buch 2. Kommentar* (Heidelberg, 1997), ad loc. suggests that the reference is to the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles or, more probably, to a statue that stood on the Capitoline hill.

[1] My thanks to Roger Brock, Malcolm Heath and Chris Pelling for their comments on earlier drafts of this note.

[2] The lacuna must cover some phrase like 'engaged in': Büttner-Wobst proposes *μέρους φιλοπόνως ἀντείχετο*, Pédech suggests *ἥψατο*.

[3] For the significance of this word see below.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi061 Published online by Cambridge University Press

autopsy—or by the 'ears'—hearsay, including reading earlier accounts.[4] But Frank Walbank has recently claimed that the argument here is internally contradictory:[5] Polybius, while initially (§1) asserting the superiority of 'seeing' over 'hearing', goes on (§3) to identify interrogating eye-witnesses as part of the function of the 'hearing', and then (§6) to call it 'the most important part of history' (*μέγιστόν ἐστι μέρος τῆς ἱστορίας*).[6] However, Walbank's interpretation is based on a misreading of the argument of the passage—albeit an understandable one, given the looseness of Polybius' wording. It is worth setting out both the error and the solution in a little detail, since the logic of the passage has never received a proper analysis.

Walbank appears to assume the following analysis:

(A) Polybius (§1) distinguishes 'seeing' from 'hearing', but claims (§2) that Timaeus (his target here, as elsewhere in Book 12) only engaged in the latter.
(B) Polybius then (§3) divides hearing into (i) that involving reading documents (*τοῦ μὲν διὰ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων*) and (ii) questioning eye-witnesses (*τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς ἀνακρίσεις*), and here too Timaeus (he alleges) engaged only in (i).
(C) In order to explain Timaeus' choice, Polybius introduces an elaborate antithesis: reading documents (*τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν βυβλίων*) can be done safely (§§4–5), whereas (§6) *ἡ δὲ πολυπραγμοσύνη πολλῆς . . . προσδεῖται ταλαιπωρίας καὶ δαπάνης*; this is *μέγιστόν . . . μέρος τῆς ἱστορίας*.

Thus it is natural, as Walbank does, to take the antithesis in (C) as elaborating on the division in (B), with *τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν βυβλίων* corresponding to *τοῦ μὲν διὰ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων*, and *ἡ δὲ πολυπραγμοσύνη* to *τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς ἀνακρίσεις*. According to this, *ἡ πολυπραγμοσύνη* refers to questioning eye-witnesses, and it is that which is being described as 'the most important part of history'.

However, although Polybius' antitheses appear naturally to invite such a reading, it is not a possible one, for two reasons:

(a) Earlier in the passage (§§1, 2, 4) Polybius three times uses *πολυπραγμονεῖν* to describe *any* form of historical research, including through reading books—he indeed uses it in the first part of the antithesis in (C) to describe Timaeus' own activity. And this is entirely consistent with Polybius' usage elsewhere (see esp. 12.25e.1, 12.25i.2, 12.26.9, 12.27a.3, 12.28a.3–4).[7] Hence it cannot

[4] On this distinction see J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), 63–86.

[5] F. W. Walbank, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge, 2002), 10. Walbank had thirty years earlier (*Polybius* (Berkeley, 1972), 72–3) identified the same contradiction as arising, not within 12.27, but between 12.4c.3 (in which questioning eye-witnesses is described as *κυριώτατον τῆς ἱστορίας*) and 12.28a.7 (in which *πυνθάνεσθαι παρὰ τῶν εἰδότων ἕκαστα τῶν πραγμάτων* is implied to be *τὸ πάντων ἐλάχιστον καὶ ῥᾷστον*). In this case, however, the reason for the discrepancy appears to be that in the latter passage Polybius is making a distinction between the mere listening to witnesses and the background knowledge which gives one the ability to cross-examine them properly—the former is easy and unimportant, the latter is vital. Cf. G. Schepens, 'Some Aspects of Source-Theory in Greek Historiography', *Ancient Society* 6 (1975), 257–74 [at 268–72]; K. Sacks, *Polybius on the Writing of History* (Berkeley, 1981), 203–9.

[6] The question of whether there is an internal contradiction in 12.27 is separate from the more commonly discussed question of whether the argument in 12.27 is compatible with the position that Polybius adopts elsewhere, especially 12.25e: on this see e.g. G. Schepens. 'The Bipartite and Tripartite Divisions of history in Polybius (XII 25e & 27)', *Ancient Society* 5 (1974), 277–87; Sacks (n. 5), 21–66, especially 24–6.

[7] *Contra* Sacks (n. 5), 56–8, who denies that there is any consistency in Polybius' use of the word, except that it is 'throughout book xii. . . associated with toil, expense, and danger' (57).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi061 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be the case that the cognate noun is here used to mean the questioning of eye-witnesses specifically *as opposed to* other forms of investigation.

(b) In order to demonstrate the truth of his contention here, Polybius goes on (12.27.7–11) to cite in support Ephorus, Theopompus, and Homer. But he does not cite them because they endorse the importance of questioning witnesses, but because they support the importance of the historian's possession of personal knowledge, both in terms of autopsy of the specific events (which is Ephorus' point) and wider experience of such things as warfare and oratory (which is what he derives from Theopompus and Homer). §6 must therefore include these aspects of historical writing.

The real interpretation is ready to hand. The antithesis in (C) does not in fact elaborate on the division in (B). What it rather does is introduce a new contrast between Timaeus' lack of effort and research, and the hard work of the good historian. Thus ἡ πολυπραγμοσύνη in §6 refers to all the historian's activities in research, exactly as it does elsewhere in the passage. But, crucially, it is prescriptive rather than descriptive (hence προσδεῖται)—this is the sort of effort that is required if research is to be done *properly*.[8] And it is research involving such effort—which thus includes both questioning eyewitnesses and autopsy—which is described as μέγιστόν ... μέρος τῆς ἱστορίας, and which is then justified by reference to Ephorus, Theopompus, and Homer. This is loose phrasing on Polybius' part, since it is not ἡ πολυπραγμοσύνη as a whole which is the subject of the second half of the sentence, as the strict grammar implies, but only the type of πολυπραγμοσύνη which conforms to the conditions set out in the first part of the sentence. It is however comprehensible, and the only reading which makes sense of both the logic and the wording.

Consequently Polybius' reasoning in this passage is entirely consistent. History-writing can be divided into that requiring effort (including both autopsy and interrogating witnesses), and that which does not (using books). The former is 'the most important part of history'. But the history-writing which requires effort can itself be further subdivided into that which involves 'seeing' and that which involves 'hearing', and of those, the former is more accurate than the latter. The inferior effortless research, on the other hand, is *all* done by 'hearing'.

University of Leeds D.S. LEVENE
D.S.Levene@leeds.ac.uk
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi061

AUTOCASTRATION OR REGICIDE? LUCIAN, *DE DEA SYRIA* 20[1]

The king of Assyria has ordered his friend Combabus to accompany queen Stratonice to the Holy City and there to help her to build a votive temple to Hera. Immediately

This is doubly wrong. Polybius uses the term in this context to refer to research (of any sort), and the examples that Sacks gives of different meanings are simply specific applications within that general semantic range. And Polybius explicitly uses the term of the researches of Timaeus, which he directly says did *not* involve toil, expense, and danger.

[8] With Polybius' sentiments here one can compare Thucydides 1.20.3, who likewise points out the general need for ταλαιπωρία if one is to determine the truth; so too Theopompus *FGrH* 115F26 (= Dion. Hal., *Pomp.* 6) emphasizes the importance to the historian of παρασκευή and δαπάνη.

[1] I am grateful to Professor Donald Russell for helpful comments.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi061 Published online by Cambridge University Press