

Polybius 3.25.3 («An Alliance concerning Pyrrhus»)

ANDREW J. HEISSERER

1. The passage under question is the initial clause of the agreement made between Rome and Carthage ca. 279/8 B. C. during the Italian adventure of King Pyrrhus of Epirus, and constitutes an important crux in Romano-Punic relations. The full text of this pact (hereafter referred to as P3, i. e., the «third» treaty given by Polybius at 3.25.3-5) is reported by the Greek historian alone¹. The text of 3.25.3 shows:

Ἐὰν συμμαχίαν ποιῶνται πρὸς Πύρρον,
ἔγγραπτον ποιείσθωσιν ἀμφοτέροι, ἵνα
ἐξῆ βοηθεῖν ἀλλήλοις ἐν τῇ τῶν πολεμου-
μένων χώρα.

The critical question about the first clause has always been whether *pros* is to be translated «with» or «against», that is, are Rome and Carthage forming an alliance with Pyrrhus or against him? Scholarship for the most part has been concerned with providing an *explication du texte*, with an occasional

¹ For text and commentary see Hatto H. Schmitt, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums (=StVa)*, vol. 3 (München, 1969), pp. 101-106 (punctuation discussed but not decided for 3.25.3); and F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1957), pp. 349-351; vol. 2 (Oxford, 1967), pp. 635-636; vol. 3 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 766-767. The notes in Jules de Foucault, *Polybe, Histoires Livre III*, Budé ed. (Paris, 1971), pp. 61 and 197 are helpful but I do not follow his punctuation, which agrees with that of Th. Büttner-Wobst, *Polybios, Historiae*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1905-1924), p. 241. For latest discussion of this Polybian passage, see D. Flach, *Historia* 27 (1978), pp. 615-617; Marina R. Torelli, *Rerum Romanorum Fontes* (Pisa, 1978), pp. 177-178; P. Garoufalas, *Pyrrhus, King of Epirus*, 2d ed. (London, 1979), pp. 381-385, ns. 8-12; and E. Badian, «Two Polybian Treaties» in *ΦΙΛΙΑΩ ΧΑΡΙΝ, Miscellanea di Studi Classici in onore di Eugenio Manni*, vol. 1 (Roma, 1980), pp. 161-169. I do not discuss here the controversial topic of the date for P3, for which many proposals have been made (between winter 281/0 and 278), the common one being 279/8.

glance at what might have been the Latin equivalent of the Greek terminology. Polybius himself makes it perfectly clear that the text of the first treaty between Rome and Carthage (P1=3.22.4-13) was written in such archaic Latin that even the most intelligent Romans of his own time (when he was in Rome, ca 168-150) scarcely comprehended its terms (3.22.3); presumably the same was true about the language of the second treaty (P2=3.24.3-13), concluded ca. 348². Provided that archaic Latin developed in a more or less linear fashion, the language of P3 will not have appeared quite so ancient since that document dated from the time of Pyrrhus, but nevertheless there will have been difficulties here also because it, states the historian, was added to the previous compacts (3.25.2). He also asserts that even the most expert Roman and Punic statesmen were ignorant in his day of all these agreements (3.26.2).

There is no question that these conventions were also recorded in Punic, the Carthaginians keeping texts in their own archives. The Romans had their own copies engraved «on bronze tablets beside the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in the treasury of the aediles» (3.26.1). The treaties were bilingual in at least one sense, namely, that each city retained a text in its own language. Given the fact that Carthage was the preeminent power in the Western Mediterranean at the time of the writing of the documents, it is no surprise that modern scholars have discerned «Carthaginian drafting» of their provisions³. The content of the treaties reflects a Latin character wherever a specifically Roman interest is at stake (e. g., the *manus iniectio* mirrored in 3.24.6), but inasmuch as it is recognized that Punic diplomatic form pervades these documents, there should be nothing startling about finding Punic expressions echoed in them. Indeed, acknowledgment of this circumstance is a prerequisite for understanding Polyb. 3.25.3.

2. Let us begin by seeing if Semitic parallels offer any sensible guidelines for comprehending the document translated by Polybius. In this area of investigation we are unfortunately hampered by the lack of sufficiently detailed Phoenician/Punic texts, but comparison with Biblical examples constitutes a legitimate endeavor, for it is well known that Hebrew and Phoenician were especially close with respect to their vocabulary and syntax⁴. It is a pity that the Septuagint does not provide a single example of the expression ποιῆσαι συμμαχίαν πρὸς τινα with a corresponding Hebrew narrative⁵, but general analogy offers many examples.

² The dates for P1 and P2, of course, are also much debated but will not be treated in this paper; for text, commentary, and bibliography see R. Werner and H. Bengtson, *StVA*, vol. 2, 2d ed. (München, 1975), pp. 16-20 (P1) and pp. 306-209 (P2) with Addenda.

³ Walbank, vol. 1, p. 364; so also E. Täubler, *Imperium Romanum* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1913), pp. 263-264 and 270-271.

⁴ S. Segert, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic* (München, 1976), pp. 18-24; he demarcates Western Phoenician (to the 5th century B. C.) from Punic (5th cent. to 146 B. C.) and from Late or Neo-Punic (146 B. C. to the 5th century A. D.). Also very helpful for Phoenician stelae is John C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1982).

⁵ Examples of the Greek expression occur in the Books of the Maccabees, but 1 Macc. is a

There are various ways by which West Semitic expressed the construction, «to make an alliance/league/covenant». The Biblical *krt bryt* (with various prepositions, as we shall see) is the stock phrase⁶, sometimes combined with *'lh* («oath-covenant», Phoe. *'lt*)⁷. The most likely idioms can be grouped under two categories, with references to appropriate passages in the MT (Masoretic Text) with their equivalents in the LXX (Septuagint) and the Vulgate; wherever possible citations from Phoenician/Punic inscriptions are given.

a) The most common expression is *krt bryt l* («to cut a covenant to/for/with»)⁸. The prepositional element here is customarily rendered in the LXX and the Vulgate by the normal Greek dative and the Latin *cum* (Ex. 23.32; Jos. 9.6,7,11; 2 Sam 5.3; 1 Reg. 20.34; 2 Reg. 11.4; Esdr. 10.3; Is. 55.3), although the Latin also employs the dat. (Is. 61.8; Jer. 31.31, 32.40; Ez. 37.26). On one occasion the Greek has *δυναστεύσει ἢ διαθήκη εἰς πολλούς*, for which the Latin is *confirmabit pactum multis* (Dan. 9.27); or an abl. abs. may occur, as at Jos. 9.15 (*cum eis... inito foedere*). The range of expressions found in the Vulgate (and to a lesser extent in the LXX) derives in general from the possible modes of translation, but more particularly from the fact that Semitic *l*, which is an inseparable preposition, always denotes some relationship between or among parties; its basic definition of «concerning, about, with reference to» acquires its proper meaning from the immediate context, an observation underscored by BDB in their comment that *l* with verbs of dealing suggests «acting towards (whether with friendly or hostile intent)⁹».

translation from a Hebrew original that does not exist any more, and 2-4 Macc. were originally written in Greek. See Jonathan A. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, the Anchor Bible series (New York, 1976), pp. 14-16 and 90-103. In Maccabees the preposition in the phrase «to make an alliance with someone» is always *cum* in Latin, *pros* (1 Macc. 12.16; 14.18,24) or *meta* (1 Macc. 8.20) in Greek. This is to be expected in a Hellenistic text so late and has no bearing on the argumentation presented here.

⁶ It is not correct to say that *ῥρκια τέμνειν* corresponds to *krt bryt* because, despite the semantic parallel («to cut a covenant-oath»), the common equivalence of *bryt* is *διαθήκη*; cf. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London, 1930), s. v.; and E. Tov in *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976), pp. 534 and 542. Although A. Penna, *Biblica* 46 (1965), pp. 149-180, points out that *συνθήκη* is the usual Greek word for «treaty» and that *διαθήκη* («testament») is obviously used in the Bible with strong religious overtones, nevertheless there is no question that *diathēkē* means «Alliance», «treaty», «league», etc. Only a few times does *synthēkē* appear in the OT (a variant reading at 2 Reg. 17.14; Is. 28. 15, 30.1; Dan. 11.6). Its sense at 2 Reg. 17.14 is the same as *diathēkē*, which appears a few verses later (17.35,38); at Is. 28.15, a metaphorical passage («We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement»), the first clause is written with *diathēkē*, the second with *synthēkē*. With respect to *krt bryt* it is clear that it denotes not only «treaty» but also «league» and «alliance»; for this expression is «... employée dans tous les genres relatifs à l'alliance»: P. Buis, «Les formulaires d'alliance», *VT* 16 (1966), p. 398.

⁷ For example, *bryt* and *'lh* occur together at Gen. 26.28; Deut. 29.11,13,19-20.

⁸ F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and Ch. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1962), p. 136 (hereafter=BDB). See also Ch.-F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest* (Leiden, 1965), p. 127 (=DISO). Full citations for all Biblical examples of *bryt* can be found in W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum Alten Testament*, I (Leiden, 1967), pp. 150-152. A variant of the usual *krt bryt* occurs with the causative of *qwm* (Gen. 6.18, 9.11, 17.7; 2 Sam. 23.5) and once with *'br* (Deut. 29.11); in later Biblical writings *ntn bryt* also appears.

⁹ BDB, p. 510. These examples from the Bible concern both the covenant between God and

A good example in this regard is *zkr l*, which means «to remember for» (i. e., in favor of) at Jer. 2.2, but «to remember against» at Ps. 137.7. Thus the *lamed* in *krt bryt l* essentially signifies «in regard to» and only a consideration of the literary and historical context determines whether it is equivalent to *dat. commodi vel incommodi*.

Bryt is not attested in any Phoenician/Punic text, but its related term *'lt* does occur in the Arslan Tash I stele, an incantation text of the 7th century B. C., the language of which appears to be a mixture of Phoenician and Aramaic (KAI no. 27)¹⁰:

- line 8) ... k-
 9) rt ln 'lt
 10) 'lm šr krt
 11) ln...

Here too the *lamed* with its pronominal suffix can be translated either «with us» or «against us», but the context of the document makes it evident that the meaning is, «Ashur (line 10) cut with us an eternal pact (covenant-oath); he cut (it) with us». To some extent the same sense could be deduced from linguistic considerations because the idea «to make an alliance» ordinarily denotes a friendly action, the preposition merely linking the verb with the object of the action («with») —provided that the activity of two co-operating parties is being described—. But if a third party is added, the historical situation immediately becomes complicated, especially if an ellipsis has occurred in the critical clause, e. g., «A makes an alliance with B (against C)» is the same as «A and B make an alliance regarding C». Unfortunately, to the best of my knowledge we do not have any Phoenician/Punic text that suggests how this would be expressed, but there is a relevant Biblical *hapax* at Ps. 83.6: *'lyq bryt ykrtw* («and they form a league against you»)¹¹. In the LXX this becomes *κατὰ σοῦ διαθήκην διέθετο* and in the Vulg. *adversum te testamentum disposuerunt*. The Greek and the Latin prepositions here

man as well as treaties between mortals. The Hebrew, generally making no distinction between the contracting parties in its modes of expression, does not lend itself readily to distinctions between *foedus aequum* and *foedus iniquum*. At times the context indicates that a superior entity (God, the Assyrian Empire, etc.) is imposing the terms upon (*l*) the other, i. e., a suzerainty treaty; but more recent investigation shows that *krt bryt* denotes mutual obligations and conditions, especially in the first millennium B. C.: D. J. McCarthy, *Old Testament Covenant* (Richmond, Virg., 1972), pp. 2-4 with bibliography.

¹⁰ Hereafter KAI refers to H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*, 3d ed., 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1971). For the Arslan Tash stele, see also Gibson, *op. cit.*, p. 83 with comm.; Segert, *op. cit.*, p. 209; Richard S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula, Mont., 1978), p. 22 (with reference to a similar idiom in Akk., «written agreement») and p. 149. In an Aramaic inscription from Hadad ca. 750 B. C. the local king speaks about *krt by*, «a firm (covenant) struck with me», but this is not a common preposition with this idiom; see John C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1975), p. 67.

¹¹ Since the construction *krt bryt 'l* does not occur elsewhere in the Bible, M. Dahood has proposed emending the text from *'ālēka*, «against you», to *'ōlēka* (participle from *'ālāh*), «your enemies»: *Psalms II, 51-100* (New York, 1968), p. 274.

correspond precisely to the Hebraic 'l, and subsequent verses, not surprisingly, specify «they» as the enemies of Israel. The difficulty is that Friedrich lists only a few examples in Phoenician/Punic where this Semitic preposition, independently or combined with another preposition, clearly means «against»; its usual sense in Punic is «upon, over, in charge of»¹².

There are other variations to the standard formula. The prepositions in *krt bryt 't* and *krt bryt 'm* both signify «with», there being no essential difference in the two words¹³. These do not present any serious difficulty, and in this idiom 't can be translated as *meta* in one verse (2 Sam. 3.12) and *pros* in the very next verse. So too 'm is represented by *meta* or *pros* in the LXX (Gen. 26.28, Ex. 24.8; Deut. 5.2.3; Hos. 12.2), and for the most part these examples and others show *cum* in the Vulgate¹⁴. Of course, variants occur with these idioms also, as one would expect: the Greek dat. is commonly found representing the Hebraic 't, e. g., Gen. 15.18; Ex. 34.27 (*bis*); Deut. 28.69; Ps. 105.9 (*ad Abraham*); and *syn* appears after *synthēkē* at 2 Reg. 17.24. The is, however, a major difference with the epigraphic evidence. The preposition 'm is attested only once in Phoenician/Punic texts as 'mt («beside»)¹⁵; it need not be considered seriously as a candidate for the Punic clause underlying Polyb. 3.25.3. On the other hand, 't is well attested in the inscriptions, even though never in a treaty formula¹⁶.

¹² J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, 2d ed. (Roma, 1970), pp. 125-126; cf. Tomback, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-244.

¹³ It has been asserted that 't and 'm function in a manner similar to *meta* and *σύν*, the former indicating «accompaniment» and the latter «connection» (B. Davies, *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, 2d ed. (Boston, 1875), p. 72, s. v.). This distinction is hardly correct, for the two Greek prepositions are synonymous (so also their Hebrew counterparts), except that *syn* is preferred in certain phrases (cf. LSJ, s. v.). Stylistic factors explain their use and distribution; in general the LXX uses *syn*.

¹⁴ Even with 'm caution is needed. In modern Hebrew 'mī can mean «with me» or «against me», depending upon context.

¹⁵ Tomback, *op. cit.*, p. 251. The closest linguistic parallel in a treaty is the Sefire stele IA, which records in archaic Aramaic conventions of ca. 750 and which regularly employs 'dy 'm in expressions like «treaty of X with Y» (lines 1, 2, 4-5); see Gibson, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 28-35, who observes that 'dy usually designates a *foedus iniquum* but may in these documents refer to treaties between equals.

¹⁶ Cf. Friedrich and Röllig, *loc. cit.*; Segert, *op. cit.*, p. 213 (66.712); and Tomback, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39. A complicating factor is the presence in West Semitic of the particle 't, which functioned as the sign of the definite direct object. In Phoenician it is usually written 'yt, but in Punic, although 'yr is attested, 't can stand for either the preposition or the *nota accusativi*. There are Biblical instances where a single sentence contains both types of 't, both always in construct (Gen. 17.21; Ez. 16.60a; Zach. 11.10), and marginal glosses to the OT illustrate the irksomeness which this linguistic feature posed for scribes. In light of the ubiquitous appearance of the object-marker in West Semitic, one wonders if it was present in the Punic text of P3 and became a source of confusion, first in being translated into Latin and then into Polybius' Greek, *exempli gratia*, «If they meet Pyrrhus ('t Pr' in the sense of «approach», «encounter») by means of an alliance (*b't*)», which could have produced something along the lines of *societate ad Purrom*. On the object-marker see Friedrich and Röllig, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-126; and especially María-José Fuentes Estañol, *Vocabulario Fenicio* (Barcelona, 1980), p. 76, who gives the Latin transcriptions for both the preposition and the *nota accusativi* found in Plautus' *Poenulus*. Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven, 1936), p. 63 is to be used with caution, especially concerning his remarks on CIS I, 1 (=KAI no. 10), on which see Segert, *op. cit.*, p. 205 and Tomback, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

b) As in other languages, so in West Semitic there are various periphrastic constructions that express the thought, «to make an alliance with someone». Thus at 2 Chr. 20.35 a form of *hbr* is used with the preposition 'm and followed by an infinitive of purpose, for which the LXX has ἐκοινωνήγευ... πρὸς and the Vulg. *iniit amicitias (nomen regis) cum (nomen regis)* = «and Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, joined himself with Ahaziah, king of Israel». Similar instances occur in the same section (2 Chr. 20.36 and 37, the latter showing the Greek dat.) and at Dan. 11.23¹⁷. Forms derived from the same root and meaning «colleagues» or «associates» appear on three Punic stelae of different dates¹⁸, but there is nothing to suggest that these Punic forms were ever part of a treaty formula. The statement «to give assistance» is another way of indicating an alliance, usually represented in the MT by forms derived from 'zr and often combined with the preposition *b* (Jos. 1.14; 1 Reg. 20.16; 1 Chr. 12.21). A reference to «allies» under a form of 'zr appears in CIS I, 91, line 2¹⁹, but this idiom is too rare to be regarded as the expression that appeared in P3²⁰.

To sum up: of the various alternatives within the above two categories, the most logical choice for the Punic text of Polyb. 3.25.3 is the idiom *krt 'lt l*, the last element performing as a dat. of advantage or disadvantage.

3. In the foregoing discussion we have concerned ourselves with techniques of translation²¹. Idiosyncracies inevitably abound in going from one tongue to another. If, for example, we consider verbs of striving, contending, and fighting, we see that these are customarily rendered with the preposition «with» in many language systems. That confusion can arise in these cases every schoolmaster knows who has taught, *Romani saepe cum Gallis pugnant*, for which the corresponding Greek equivalent is μάχεσθαι with πρὸς or the dat., while the statement «to fight against someone with (the help of) others» is expressed by μάχεσθαι/πολεμεῖν πρὸς τινα μετ' ἄλλων/σύν τισιν (citations in LSJ, s. v.). The Hebrew verb *lhm* and its derived noun *mlhmh* are used in this idiom with a host of prepositions but almost always with no confusion because, in a manner perhaps more striking than in I-E, the notion of hostility (i. e., the semantic content) is contained completely within the verb itself, and the preposition has a purely syntactical function; it only denotes the noun with which the verb is to be construed. In the light of this reality, it is all the more interesting to witness occasions where some

¹⁷ At Dan. 11.23 the verb is an Aramaic form of *hbr*, the preposition is 'l (the only use of this preposition in a treaty formula), the punctuation disputed, and the context obscure.

¹⁸ Tomback, *ibid.*, p. 97, citing KAI nos. 69 and 159 and CRAI (1968), p. 117.

¹⁹ Cited by Tomback, *ibid.*, p. 241.

²⁰ For this reason I exclude from consideration Biblical *hapax legomena* such as *brkh* at 2 Reg. 18.31 (=Is. 36.16) and *mmh* at Neh. 9.38 (10.1). On the other hand, one cannot overlook the peculiarly Phoenician/Punic preposition *dl*, which carries the meaning «together with» (German *samt*) in a few Punic inscriptions and which seems to be connected with Aramaic «which belongs to». But there is nothing to suggest its use in treaty formulae; cf. Friedrich and Röllig, *op. cit.*, p. 126; and Segert, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

²¹ See S. Brock, *GRBS* 20 (1979), pp. 69-87.

misconception occurred. For example, at 1 Chr. 5.10 («they fought with/against the Agarites») the preposition 'm becomes *pros* in the Greek, but a few verses later in the same idiom at 5.19 *meta* (both rendered by *contra*). So also at Ps. 55.19 we read, «He will deliver my soul in peace from those who assail me: for there were many with me». The Hebrew usage with 'm means literally, «for with many (allies) are they with me», i. e., they come against me (so Gesenius)²². In the LXX this becomes *ὅτι ἐν πολλοῖς ἦσαν σὺν ἐμοί* and in the Vulg. *quoniam inter multos erant mecum*. Yet clearly *syn* and *cum*, admittedly in a poetic passage, are prone to a misleading interpretation, as *meta* above, and only an examination of the context saves the reader. Other instances can be adduced²³.

As we have noticed above, a friendly idea is implicit in the expression «to make an alliance with someone», and accordingly we would not expect *symmachia pros* to convey a hostile notion — at least not in ordinary circumstances—. But a special difficulty arises in translating *pros* by «with» at 3.25.3, for the sense produced is, «If either the Romans or the Carthaginians make an alliance with Pyrrhus, they both shall...»²⁴. This sense, however, corresponds not to the text at 3.25.3 but to a hypothetical *ὅποτεροι ἂν συμμαχίαν ποιῶνται πρὸς Πύρρον*, as the construction in the next clause (3.25.4) suggests: *ὅποτεροι δ' ἂν χρεῖαν ἔχωσι τῆς βοήθειας...* By this strained and unreal interpretation of the protasis of 3.25.3, the term *ἀμφοτέροι* in the apodosis, *ἔγγραπτον ποιείσθωσαν ἀμφοτέροι*, becomes an absurdity in syntax. There is no getting around this difficulty, especially since the Punic likely will have used an unambiguous form of *šnym* («both», «the two»), as does the Hebrew at Deut. 22.22: «if a man be found lying with a woman married to a husband, then both shall die...» Notice the parallel at Gen. 21.27: *καὶ διέθεντο ἀμφοτέροι διαθήκην*, which in the Vulgate is *percusseruntque ambo foedus*, representing the MT's *krt bryt šnym*²⁵. Thus, even though *ποιείσθαι συμμαχίαν πρὸς τινα* is the normal Greek phrase for «to make an alliance with a person», its presence at 3.25.3, representing a lost Latin text written under the

²² See BDB, p. 767.

²³ At Gen. 14.2, «they made war against Bera, king of Sodom» (St. Jerome's *contra B.*) is rendered by *meta*, which obviously does not mean «on the side of». So too at Jud. 20.20 and 2 Reg. 19.9; similarly 1 Chr. 20.5 (*meta* and *adversum*). Observe that although the phrase «to fight with» frequently employs the preposition 't, «with» (Jos. 24.8; 1 Sam. 17.9; 1 Reg. 20.23; 2 Reg. 19.9; Jer. 37.10), at Ps. 35.1 it is unclear whether the word is the preposition or the object-marker (BDB, p. 535).

²⁴ So Flach, *op. cit.*, p. 616: «Falls sie (die Römer oder die Karthager) ein Bündnis...»; and E. Ruschenbusch, *Talanta* 12-13 (1980-1981), p. 75: «Wenn einer der beiden Vertragspartner...». Both use «with» as does also Walbank, whose commentary exhibits the type of *conundrum* often encountered in dealing with P3: «If they make a written alliance with Pyrrhus, let them make it, each or both...», and his further remark that «The sense is rather "let either (or both, as the case may be) make it"...» (vol. 1, p. 350).

²⁵ Cf. also 1 Reg. 3.18 and 1 Sam. 20.42 («we have sworn both of us in the name of the Lord»). A bilingual inscription (Phoenician and Greek) from Malta, dating from about 180 B. C. (CIS I, 122 et 122bis=KAI no. 47), records a dedication to Heracles by two sons. The Greek does not have *amphoterai* in reference to the pair («A and B, the ones of C»), but both Phoenician texts use the equivalent of the Biblical *šny bny* and the editors of the *Corpus* translate *ambo filii*. For other citations, see DISO, p. 314.

influence of Punic diplomatic forms, provides no guarantee of the true meaning of that text.

Of course, there is a very good reason why so many scholars have translated 3.25.3 by «with Pyrrhus», namely, the fact that Polybius employs the same or similar expression elsewhere in examples that leave no doubt whatsoever about their meaning. Two will suffice: (a) 2.12.4, *καὶ τὰς συνθήκας... ἃς ἐπεποιήντο πρὸς τοὺς Ἰλλυριοὺς*, and (b) 2.44.1, *συνθεμένων τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ συμμαχίαν πρὸς Αἰτωλοῦς*²⁶. Given this fact and the normal translation of the Greek idiom under question, it is no surprise that authorities have rejected the rendering «against Pyrrhus»²⁷. However, these parallels elsewhere in Polybius carry no weight regarding the meaning at 3.25.3 because in those instances, with one exception, he is not quoting a Romano-Punic document composed some 150 years earlier, which itself repeated stipulations of much older conventions²⁸; elsewhere as a rule Polybius refers to documents in the process of delineating Rome's relations with the Greek East (e. g., 11.5; 18.42,44; 21.32.2-14). The exception is the Oath of Hannibal to Philip V and the Macedonians (7.9), preserved by a Byzantine compiler, which Bickerman has shown convincingly to derive from a Semitic original²⁹. Bickerman observed that in the Oath *pros* «occurs ten times in a total of twenty-seven instances of the use of prepositions»³⁰, a frequency that seems excessive. In P1, P2, and P3 the same preposition (excluding sections restored and the Roman oath) occurs 5 times out of a total use of 32 prepositions, surpassed only by *en* which appears 11 times owing to the listing of geographical locations in P1 and P2. This frequency in the Romano-Punic treaties cannot be labelled excessive; nevertheless, there are other elements that suggest, even if they do not prove, a Semitic coloring³¹. Finally, with respect to Polybius' own diction, we must recognize

²⁶ Cf. also his normal use of a related idiom, *εἰρήνην ποιῆσαι/ἄγειν πρὸς τινα* (4.15.10; 4.16.3-5; 5.107.6; 21.16.9; etc.). See A. Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexicon* I.2 (Berlin, 1961), col. 649.

²⁷ See Walbank, vol. 1, p. 350 and *StVA*, vol. 2, pp. 102-104. Among the exceptions who prefer «against» are Jules de Foucault in the Budé ed. (above n. 1) and Ian Scott-Kilvert in the Penguin series, *Polybius, The Rise of the Roman Empire* (New York, 1979), p. 202. Torelli, *op. cit.* (above n. 1), p. 179, gives an up-to-date list of those who translate «with» or «against».

²⁸ Polybius' general survey of all the Romano-Punic treaties covers 3.21.9-28.5, wherein he gives numerous direct quotations. The source for the negotiations between Carthage and the Syracusans is uncertain (7.4.2); see Walbank, vol. 2, p. 31.

²⁹ E. Bickerman, «An Oath of Hannibal», *TAPA* 75 (1944), pp. 87-102, and his «Hannibal's Covenant», *AJP* 73 (1952), pp. 1-23. Walbank, vol. 2, pp. 42-43, seems to accept Bickerman's thesis. See now M. L. Barré, *The God-List in the Treaty between Hannibal and Philip V of Macedonia* (Baltimore, 1983).

³⁰ «Oath», p. 91, n. 17. To some extent this over-employment is explained by the fact that *pros*, which in classical Greek takes acc., gen., and dat., was increasingly confined to the acc. in the *koine*, but used abundantly with that case.

³¹ In the Oath we find also the similar clause with customary Greek, «... and with whomever in the future we may have friendship and alliance in this country» (7.9.6). But this is part of a long construction, which Bickerman labelled «strange and ungrammatically assembled» («Covenant», p. 8) and felt covered a Punic idiom. Compare his same comment («Oath», p. 99) about another section of the Oath (7.9.10), which, like 3.25.3, bothers editors: *ἔσεσθε δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν <σύμμαχοι?> πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον, ὃς ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους*. See further on this topic below.

that he uses *pros* in a more general manner, «in reference to, concerning»³², although apparently never in a sense quite comparable to 3.25.3, which is exceptional under any circumstance. Two examples are especially illustrative: (a) 5.105.6, *πρὸς τοὺς νησιώτας τὸ παραπλήσιον συνέβη γενέσθαι* («the same thing happened in the case of the islanders») and (b) 38.3.10, *ἀπαγόμενοι εἰς φυλακὴν πρὸς τὰ χρέα* («sent to prison concerning the debts») ³³. In the latter case we may say that *πρὸς τὰ χρέα* denotes a double sense in its clause: the debts already existed before the action described in the clause, and are the cause of the imprisonment being effected as the remedy. If we translate 3.25.3 as «If they make an alliance concerning Pyrrhus», then *πρὸς Πύρρον* performs the same double function in its clause, i. e., Pyrrhus exists beforehand and is the immediate cause of the alliance being formed, the intended effect of which is to deal with him in the proper way³⁴.

The Punic text of 3.25.3 obviously contained nothing so simple as a clause with 'It I pr' nor the Latin one with *contra Burrom*³⁵, for in that case Polybius surely would have written *κατὰ Πύρρον*. Nor can we imagine a text such as *sei ferient Romani foedus quom Cartaciniensibus in Burrom*. There will have been too many Roman documents with statements like *si Romani ferient foedus cum Volscis in Samnites* to have misled Polybius into thinking that a hypothetical *societatem in Burrom* should be rendered by *συμμαχία πρὸς Πύρρον*³⁶. Something other than *contra* or *in* must have stood in the

³² For this sense of the preposition, see *LSJ*, s. v., C III 1.

³³ J. Schweighäuser, *Lexicon Polybianum* (Leipzig, 1795), s. v., p. 520. My gratitude to Prof. Jerker Blomqvist for bringing these citations and their meaning to my attention.

³⁴ In this connection we may cite a passage from the NT that illustrates, by a kind of reverse process, the nuances associated with *pros* by speakers of different tongues. In *Acts* 23.30 the historical context concerns the letter of Claudius Lysias to Felix about the activities of St. Paul, in which Lysias instructs Paul's accusers *λεγειν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν σοῦ*. In the King James Version this is rendered, «to say before thee what they had against him» (Vulg. *ut dicant apud te*). The literal sense, as F. Field pointed out long ago in a commentary still valuable, is «to say the things concerning him to you» [*Otium Norvicense*, part 3: *Notes on Select Passages of the Greek Testament* (Oxford, 1881), p. 87]. The hostile tone of Lysias' letter is self-evident, yet the Syriac version has «that they should come and speak with him» (Peschito) —and this where the customary Syriac practice was to render *pros* by *lwat*, «towards», a version that would be fully justified where a verb of saying is tantamount to an accusation (cf. Brock, *op. cit.*, p. 82). Even though in this instance the translator was attempting to convert an I-E text into the proper Semitic idiom, an obscure sense is the result. What then is to be expected where a Greek historian, hard pressed to understand early Latin and with no knowledge of Semitic, approached the «most intelligent» Romans about ancient treaties whose diplomatic form was pervasively Punic but of whose very existence «they were ignorant»?

³⁵ According to Cicero (*de Orat.* 48, 160) *Burrus* was the form used by Ennius for the name *Pyrrhus*, and it was remarked by Q. Terentius Scaurus that *quem Graeci Πυρρίαν nos Byrriam, et quem nos Pyrrum antiqui Burrum*: H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol. 7 (Leipzig, 1880), p. 14. Cf. also Festus p. 28 L (s. v. «Ballenae»); Nonius 226, 29; Porphyrio *ad Hor. Ars P.* 403; and Quint. 1.4.15. The philological rule (Greek *p* becomes Latin *b* in an initial accented syllable before the vowel *u*) is discussed in W. M. Lindsay, *The Latin Language* (Oxford, 1894), pp. 12 and 75. It seems assured that the Latin of P3 also read *Burrus*. But there is no way of determining the orthography of the Carthaginian text; hence I use *p* in transliterating the presumed Punic of P3, i. e., *pr'* = Pyrrhus.

³⁶ A question arises about which precise Latin word or phrase corresponded to Polybius' *symmachia*. The Greek term has strong connotations, both an offensive and defensive league. Latin *foedus* covers a much wider range of meanings, since it may denote «treaty, alliance, pact,

Latin text. The most likely Punic text, as we have seen above, will have been written with *l*, that is, *'m ykrt 'lt 'lpr'* («If they make a pact to/for/concerning Pyrrhus»), the prefixed prepositional element indicating the relationship between verb and noun. In the Bible this preposition is not uncommonly the equivalent of *ad*³⁷. If the Latin text employed something like *icerint ameicitiam ad Burrom*, expressing the dat. of the Punic, it is easy to see how Polybius thought that a correct rendering would be *συμμαχία πρὸς Πύρρον*. This holds true even if the Punic were *krt 'lt 't pr'* because the Semitic preposition *'t* («with») is also represented by *ad* in the Vulgate^{37a}. Nor does it follow that a particular Punic phrase would necessarily have been reproduced as *foedus/societatem quom Burro*, because the Biblical citations given above show the variation possible even for a Latin translator who, writing many centuries later, was concerned with re-capturing in the imperial language the truth of a great religious document. Similarly, in the LXX we have seen treaty formulae rendered with the Greek dat. or with any one of several prepositions. To be sure, proof in this matter is completely beyond reach and I do not pretend to have discovered the definitive solution³⁸. But given the choice among the most reasonable alternatives, and recognizing that a periphrasis may have been present in either the Punic or Latin text, we can say that since *ad* in Latin is the closest semantic equivalent of *pros* in Greek, it is the most likely term corresponding to the Punic preposition in the treaty formula. I suggest that *ad* (or something very similar) stood in the Latin text at 3.25.3, that it represented Punic *l* in the formula *krt 'lt l* (or something very similar), meaning an «alliance concerning Pyrrhus», and that Polybius for reasons which shall remain forever obscure chose to translate *πρὸς Πύρρον*.

league, truce, bond of hospitality» (citations in *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, fasc. 3 (Oxford, 1971), s. v.). Nevertheless, there is no doubt that K. J. Beloch's view about *symmachia* standing at 3.25.3 for *pax* is wrong (*Griechische Geschichte*, 2d ed., vol. 4.2 (Berlin, 1927), pp. 476-479). As Schmitt in *StVA*, vol. 3, p. 102, remarks, «die Wiedergabe von pax durch foedus bzw. *συμμαχία* ist in den Urkunden bzw. bei Polybios nicht belegt». Thus, a «treaty of peace» is out of the question, and Polybius' term represents «alliance» (*societas*) or «treaty of alliance» (*foedus*). To be sure, it has long been known that the term *societas* in St. Jerome regularly stands for *symmachia* in the LXX, an equivalence also attested in documents from the late Roman Republic; cf. R. K. Sherck, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore, 1969), p. 15; and the Greek/Latin bilingual CIL 1² 730.

³⁷ 1 Reg. 12.27; Ps. 22.28; Hos. 5.13.

^{37a} Gen. 17.21; Ps. 105.9. More importantly, *'tm* («to him») in the Punic text of Plautus' *Poenulus* (verse 937) corresponds to the Latin *ad eum* (verse 958, «To him I carry this sherd of hospitality»); see Ch. Krahmalkov, «The Punic Speech of Hanno», *Orientalia* 39 (1970), p. 66. If *ad* were used, there is the further complication that the text may have been written *ob Burrom*, for Festus states that archaic writers such as Ennius used the preposition *ob* for *ad* (pp. 133, 187, 206, 218 L); the examples from Festus are all employed with verbs of motion, but too few examples have survived to posit a rigid rule, and the same may be said about the Plautine verse.

³⁸ For examples of variant expressions, observe that apropos the terms of the Roman treaty of 189 with the Aetolians, an expression of Polybius' (21.32.6), *καθ' ὃν καιρὸν Αἰτωλοὶ μετὰ Ῥωμαίων συνεπολέμουν*, is rendered by Livy as *cum intra praesidia Romana Aetoli essent* (38.11.4). Describing the same event, Polybius has *Ζακανθαῖοι πιστεύοντες τῇ Ῥωμαίων συμμαχία* (3.15.8) and Livy *ut ab Saguntinis, sociis populi Romani, abstineret* (21.6.4). A late poetical writer speaks of the alliance of Hannibal and Philip V against Rome in these terms: *causa novi motus Poenis regique Philippo in bellum Ausonium sociatae foedere vires* (Sil., *Pun.* 15.290).

But that this phrase does not mean «with Pyrrhus» emerges from a look at the historical context, to which I now turn.

4. It is regrettable that a precise date for P3 cannot be determined, for we should like to know how this formed a part of the Senate's plan to cope with Pyrrhus³⁹. However, it is well known that the Senate exchanged embassies with the king over the possibility of a peace with him. In the sources these are always depicted as (delaying?) negotiations, plans that never came to fruition, and never does a Roman or Greek writer voice the opinion that Rome (or Carthage) genuinely wished to make an alliance with its enemy⁴⁰. *Pax* is not *symmachia*. Both Rome and Carthage, we may surmise, realized from the moment the Epirote king arrived in the West that his ambitious character eventually would provoke a clash with one or both of the major powers who possessed deep interests in Greek Italy and Sicily. It was to their advantage to unite against a common threat, and both parties had a long tradition of diplomatic co-operation.

In this respect it is necessary to mention another crux always associated with P3, the so-called Philinus treaty, the existence of which Polybius hotly denied when simultaneously giving its provisions: «That there was a treaty between the Romans and the Carthaginians, according to which the Romans

³⁹ R. E. Mitchell, *Historia* 20 (1971), p. 653, in all likelihood is correct in proposing that P3 was negotiated while Pyrrhus was still in Italy, following the battle of Ausculum, but before he had crossed over into Sicily in 278.

⁴⁰ After the battle of Heraclea (280) Pyrrhus received the envoy Rome had sent to negotiate about the return of prisoners, and in turn sent his own envoy to Rome to discuss the possibility of a peace treaty. [The report in Appian, *Sam.* 10, that Pyrrhus wanted «peace, friendship, and alliance» with Rome, is nothing more than late historiographical reconstruction of the expected diplomatic language; elsewhere Appian speaks only of «peace». The same is true of Plut., *Pyrr.* 19.4, where the Romans send Pyrrhus the message that they would discuss *philia kai symmachia* as soon as he left Italy; a few chapters later (21.4), in a passage repeated almost verbatim, the message is about *philia kai eirēnē*.] A rousing speech by Appius Claudius Caecus, to the effect that Rome must never make peace with any foe who invaded Italian soil, swayed the Senate to reject terms. Another victory for Pyrrhus at Ausculum (279) was followed by further negotiations for peace, the king being anxious to respond to the Syracusan appeal for help against Carthage (on the verge of taking all Sicily). But these negotiations apparently never resulted in a treaty of peace (*contra* Appian, *Sam.* 12, whose *synthēkai* probably refers to a truce; so Garoufalas, *op. cit.* (above n. 1), p. 377 n. 218), partly because Mago appeared at Rome with a Punic fleet and an offer of assistance. The Senate declined Mago's invitation, and possibly declined simultaneously the king's peace offer; Justin alone says (18.2.6) that Fabricius actually made peace with Pyrrhus, but even this source, like every other, admits that it was never ratified by the Senate. The Punic leader then sailed away from Rome to visit Pyrrhus; what was discussed is endlessly debated by moderns, but it seems clear that Carthage's objective was to keep Pyrrhus out of Sicily. The king being obstinate, Mago returned to Rome and concluded an agreement with Rome, usually identified with P3. It is conceded by virtually all modern writers that Rome required Carthaginian naval assistance in order to blockade Tarentum and hinder possible reinforcements from Epirus reaching Pyrrhus, while Carthage realized that in order to complete their subjugation of Sicily, the king must be held in Italy through continued Roman opposition to him; thus, if he did cross over to Sicily, and if the two powers made an alliance «against» him, he would in that case face a war on two fronts. On all this, with full bibliography and references to the confused sources, see Garoufalas, *ibid.*, pp. 93-99, 193-198, and esp. n. 8 on pp. 381-382; also H. H. Scullard, *A History of the Roman World 753 to 146 B. C.*, 4th ed. (London, 1980), pp. 483-484 nos. 16-18.

were obliged to keep away from all Sicily, and the Carthaginians from all Italy» (3.26.3)⁴¹. The Philinus treaty has long been a disputed topic in modern scholarship, but increasingly the consensus is to accept it as authentic, despite Polybius' disavowal⁴², and to identify it with the treaty of 306 B. C. referred to by Livy as «the third» (9.43.26)⁴³. Now if there were a treaty like that called «Philinus», which prohibited both contracting parties from interfering in their respective spheres of influence, then any additional agreement between the two partners concerning Italy and Sicily would need to clarify their obligations vis-à-vis the previous document. The first sentence of P3 at 3.25.3 constitutes precisely such a «qualifying clause», i. e., even though it had been agreed previously that each party was not allowed to intervene in the other's territory, Pyrrhus' awesome military successes in Italy and his anticipated arrival in Sicily compelled both states to lift the prohibition of an earlier treaty. P3 was designed to deal with Pyrrhus, whether in Italy or in Sicily, and from its terms one may reasonably deduce the existence of the Philinus treaty of 306 B. C.⁴⁴

This interpretation, if accepted, offers a sensible means for resolving the problems traditionally associated with the punctuation of the opening clause of 3.25.3 and with the sense of the *hina*-clause. Walbank surveys the history of opinion about whether a comma is to be placed before or after the word «written» and opts, like Beloch, for *συμμαχία ἔγγραπτος* on the basis of other Polybian instances wherein these two words are linked together⁴⁵. But again, Polybian usage elsewhere is essentially irrelevant for a translation of a Romano-Punic document. Although a phrase like «written alliance» conceivably occurred in both early Roman and Punic texts, none is extant today. However, a relevant expression appears in the last lines of the Marseilles Tariff, a Punic stele from the late third or early second century B. C., «Every payment which is not specified in this tablet shall be made in accordance with

⁴¹ In an earlier passage (1.14.2-3) Polybius is very hard on Philinus, accusing him of being pro-Punic; see Walbank, vol. 1, pp. 64-65.

⁴² In favor of the Philinus treaty: A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1965), pp. 543-550; R. E. Mitchell, *op. cit.*, pp. 633-655; F. Hampl in H. Temporini, *ANRW* I, 1 (Berlin, 1972), pp. 422-423; D. Musti in *idem* I, 2 (Berlin, 1972), pp. 1139-1140; J. Heurgon, *The Rise of Rome to 264 B. C.*, Eng. trans. (Berkeley, 1973), p. 212; K. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybius* (Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. 134-138; Scullard, *op. cit.*, p. 487; and Ruschenbusch, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76. Badian, however, in a recent note (*loc. cit.*, above n. 1) favors accepting Polybius' views on the Philinus treaty. For other references see *StVA*, vol. 3, pp. 54-55. Those opposed to acceptance of the Philinus treaty tend to speak in terms similar to Walbank's: «... for it is impossible that at so early a date the Romans claimed Italy as their sphere of influence, with Tarentum untouched and the Samnites not yet finally defeated» (vol. 1, p. 354). Judgment is difficult is so convoluted a topic, but in my opinion the speech of Appius Claudius Caecus, even if preserved in an exaggerated form, reflects the attitude of the Senate ca. 300 B. C.

⁴³ An immediate deduction is that P3, the third in Polybius' list, is actually the fourth treaty concluded between Rome and Carthage. Livy states (*Periocha* 13) that in 279 Rome's treaty with Carthage «was renewed for a fourth time».

⁴⁴ This view is not new; so Mitchell and Meister, *loc. cit.* (above n. 42), and D. W. Bradeen, «Relations between Rome and Carthage to 265 B. C.», unpublished M. A. thesis, Univ. of Cincinnati, 1943, pp. 52-55.

⁴⁵ Walbank, vol. 1, p. 350. Cf. *StVA*, p. 102; and Toynbee, *op. cit.*, pp. 547-548 for a trenchant critique of Beloch's unusual punctuation and emendation of 3.25.3.

how it is arranged in writing (*kmdt št bktb[ʔ]*)...⁴⁶. We should punctuate..., *ἔγγραπτον ποιείσθωσαν ἀμφοτέρω,...* because both states wished to have the «proviso» inscribed on bronze or stone in order that neither would have the occasion for blaming the other with a violation of the Philinus treaty.

Let us now look at the troublesome *ἵνα ἐξῆ βοηθεῖν ἀλλήλοις ἐν τῇ τῶν πολεμουμένων χώρα*. Recognizing that caution must be exercised in any endeavor to re-create the sense of a lost document by analyzing the extant Greek rendering of it, I believe it is plausible to propose that this clause disguises a Punic idiom rather than a Latin one. A striking resemblance is found in a sentence of the Oath (7.9.12): *ἐν ἀξιώσει Ῥωμαῖοι συντίθεσθαι περὶ φιλίας, συνθησόμεθα, ὥστ' εἶναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν αὐτὴν φιλίαν, ἐφ' ὅτε μὴ ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖς κτλ.* In both this sentence of the Oath and in 3.25.3 the verb is repeated (*συντίθημι* and *ποιέω* respectively) and the conjunctions (*ὥστ' εἶναι* and *ἵνα ἐξῆ*) are used to state the intended result. What is beguiling is that the *hina*-clause appears to perform a double function, i. e., it combines the notion of positive purpose («in order that they may provide aid to each other») with the conditions under which that aid might be given («in the other's sphere of influence [the Philinus treaty being temporarily suspended]»). Whereas *ἐφ' ὅτε* of the Oath is equivalent to Latin *ita... ut*, the essence of *ἵνα* at 3.25.3 is that of a final *ut* and in Hellenistic Greek *ἵνα* often has the same consecutive meaning as *ὥστε*, as the example in the Oath illustrates; indeed, clauses of purpose and intended result serve the same function in Biblical Greek⁴⁷. Such clauses often appear in Hebrew as the infinitive-construct (cf. 1 Sam. 11.2), which however was reproduced by the Septuagint translators with a Greek imitation, the monotonous *ἐν τῷ+inf.* of the Bible⁴⁸. Roman senators who read Punic documents, and Polybius who read Latin tablets, were not bound by such practices. The extraordinary syntax of 3.25.3, so resistive to a satisfactory solution, is best taken as an attempt to reproduce a Latin phrase that obscurely mirrored some Punic usage, which was probably an infinitive-construct expressing the designed result of an alliance and the conditions under which that purpose might be achieved: «If they make an alliance concerning Pyrrhus, they both shall have it stipulated in writing, in order that it may be permitted (against previous restrictions)

⁴⁶ CIS I, 165=KAI no. 69; cf. Tomback, *op. cit.*, p. 150. Something similar probably underlies a clause in P2 (3.24.6): «If any of the Carthaginians take any peoples, with whom peace is written with the Romans...» (*πρὸς οὐδὲ εἰρήνη μὲν ἔστιν ἔγγραπτος Ῥωμαῖος*). In the Bible the *engrapton* at Ps. 149.9 is a *hapax*. For this and citations to *engraphen*, see E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (rpt. Graz, 1954), s. v.

⁴⁷ Cf. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans by Robert W. Funk (Chicago, 1961), no. 391, pp. 197-198; and W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2d ed. (Chicago, 1979) (a translation of W. Bauer's *Gr.-d. Wörterbuch zu NT*), s. v. *hina*, II.2, pp. 377-378. These authorities point out that in the NT *hina* can be substituted for the inf. of result, and that often it is impossible to distinguish between purpose and intended result.

⁴⁸ Cf. Brock, *op. cit.*, p. 82. For the infinitive-construct in Punic, see Segert, *op. cit.*, p. 198, who observes that «The construct infinitive with *l* after a finite verb can express finality, consequence, or a more detailed explication».

for the Romans to enter Sicily to help the Carthaginians militarily (*ἐπι πολέμῳ*) and for the Carthaginians to enter Italy to help the Romans militarily⁴⁹.» Accordingly, what appears to be an intolerable tautology in Greek («If they make an alliance..., both shall make it») acquires some logic. That is why 3.25.3 ends with *ἐν τῇ τῶν πολεμουμένων χώρᾳ*, and that is why the text reads *ἐξῆ βοηθεῖν ἀλλήλοις* and not simply *βοηθῶσιν ἀλλήλοις*. When two states create a military alliance, its logical purpose is to *commit* both partners to helping each other against a common enemy, not merely allowing them to help. Clearly, in 279/8 circumstances were different.

Finally and as a consequence of the above argumentation, since we are dealing with a military alliance of positive intent between Rome and Carthage (even if one that was never fully implemented)⁵⁰, it follows that the opening clause (*ἕάν... πρὸς Πύρρον*) expresses the immediate cause for the possibility of that alliance being formed and *eo ipso* indicates the source of hostility to the alliance-partners. The sense of the original Punic and Latin

⁴⁹ The Philinus treaty, on this view, will have contained a stipulation very close in wording to that of P1 (3.22.13) by which the Carthaginians were prohibited from military activity in Latium: *ἕάν ὡς πολέμοι εἰς τὴν χώραν εἰσελθῶσιν, ἐν πῇ χώρᾳ μὴ ἐννοκτερευέτωσαν*. The Philinus treaty marks a natural progression in the restrictions that each party had imposed on the other in P1 and P2; thus, in P1 the Romans and their allies could trade in Libya and Sardinia under certain conditions, but in P2 they are excluded from these areas altogether. Since, however, in Carthaginian Sicily they could trade according to both P1 and P2, and since Carthage still did not have full control of the island in 306, the activity proscribed by the Philinus treaty can have been only military in nature («in arms»). Precisely such a phrase existed in the Ebro treaty (Polyb. 2.13.7; 3.27.9), and a corroborating parallel comes from the proposal of Syphax in 204 (Appian, *Libyca* 17) in his effort to reconcile the Romans and the Carthaginians: *μήτε Ῥωμαίους Λιβύης μήτε Καρχηδονίους Ἰταλίας ἐπιβαίνειν ἐπὶ πολέμῳ*. (Cf. Polyb. 14.1.9 and Zonaras 9.12.)

⁵⁰ The question concerns whether 3.25.3 was ever put into effect as a true alliance, and if it were not, is it correct to designate P3 as an authentic treaty? We may answer these points as follows. First, Polybius explicitly labels his text a *synthekai*, in which «they observe all the provisions agreed upon with respect to the existing agreements» (3.25.2), but more importantly he avers that in the first treaty (*ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν πρώτων συνθηκῶν*) the Carthaginians «swore by their ancestral gods» and the Romans by Jupiter Lapis, «but in the other treaties (*ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων*) by Mars and Quirinus» (3.25.6). The best way to treat the Greek here is «in the second and third treaties» (so J. L. Strachan-Davidson, *Selections from Polybius* (Oxford, 1888), p. 175 n. 6), and although Polybius does not inform us by what gods the Carthaginians swore for P2 and P3, there is no doubt that they did so. One does not swear over a draft of a possible alliance. The special clause of 3.25.3, often termed a «rider», specified a condition for an alliance and was an integral part of the treaty (P3) ratified and sworn to by both parties. There was only one document, which contained a special contingency clause because at the time of swearing both parties anticipated implementing P3 with the full alliance made possible by it (in which case there would have been a separate document). But Rome soon apparently hesitated in actually making the alliance itself, utilizing instead for a short time what we might call the «spirit» of an alliance created by P3. On this point Mitchell (*op. cit.*, p. 653) is surely correct in supposing that the event which precipitated Rome's change of heart was Pyrrhus' crossing over into Sicily; once the king was out of Italy, Rome experienced little desire to strengthen Punic power in Sicily. Secondly, most scholars believe that there is evidence of some co-operation by the two parties against Pyrrhus, though admittedly not much. A fragment from Diodorus (22.7.5) states, «The Carthaginians, having made an alliance (*symmachia*) with the Romans, took 500 men on their own ships, and disembarking these men at Rhegium...». Also, some numismatists are convinced that Punic silver provided the metal for a series of Roman didrachms, the result of P3. However, Mitchell feels that the Diodoran narrative concerns 500 Campanian troops ferried by Carthage from Sicily to Rhegium (*ibid.*, p. 650), and expresses his disagreement with the numismatic interpretation: *Numismatic Chronicle* 6 (1966), pp. 65-70.

texts, therefore, was *über* Pyrrhus, and that in 279/8 meant *gegen*, not *mit* Pyrrhus⁵¹. Polybius did not actually err in writing *πρὸς Πύρρον*. He must have understood that a treaty concerning Pyrrhus in this historical context could only mean an alliance directed against the king. The reason why Polybius did not write *κατὰ Πύρρον* or some other unmistakably hostile phrase was that the Latin original contained a phrase that was ambiguous in the same way as *πρὸς Πύρρον* i. e., the ambiguity is only apparent, for the historical context excludes misunderstanding. It is ironic that Polybius, in attempting to give a most careful rendering of these Latin texts (3.21.9, 22.3), inadvertently caused difficulty for his modern readers⁵².

⁵¹ For these reasons I cannot accept the explanations of 3.25.3 that are put forth by those who translate «with Pyrrhus». To mention only two: Walbank thinks that Rome and Carthage each wished to maintain the right, should either make an alliance with Pyrrhus, to send aid to the one attacked in its own territory, but «such help would not in itself involve committing the partner sending it to a state of war with the aggressor; and in any case the clause is merely permissive, ἵνα ἐξῆ βοήθειν» (vol. 1, p. 350). This view strains credence. It supposes that Rome, if she made an alliance with Pyrrhus who subsequently went to war against Carthage, could give aid to Carthage without embroiling her own relations with Pyrrhus —and this by appealing to the very terms of P3. As we have noted, above, the *hina*-clause is much more than «merely permissive», for it creates special conditions in order that the two parties might assist one another against a common enemy. Flach, *op. cit.* (above n.1), p. 616, has recently proposed a variant of this theme: if either party concluded an alliance with Pyrrhus, it could not be done in such a way as to cause Rome or Carthage to change their relationship: «Pyrrhus could not thereby hope that Rome or Carthage would completely turn around and in a sudden about-face renounce the assurances of the alliance for assistance. His room for negotiating was thus curtailed. The danger that he might manipulate Rome and Carthage against one another was prevented by the cleverly worded agreement». But are we to imagine that the crafty Pyrrhus was fooled into thinking that he could make an advantageous alliance with Rome and Carthage on these terms? Where was the benefit for him in such an agreement, which certainly did not envision serious military assistance for his own aims?

⁵² I express my gratitude to the following scholars, who have offered their help on various portions of this paper but who are in no way responsible for the views propounded herein or any errors that may remain: Prof. Jerker Blomqvist (Copenhagen), Dr. Jesse L. Boyd III (Fort Worth), and Prof. Emeritus Leslie F. Smith (Oklahoma).

