

**SICILY'S ARTFUL HISTORIAN:**

**An investigation into the historical thought and method of Diodorus Siculus'**

*Bibliothèque*

Brian Sheridan

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of  
MA (ModeII) in Greek and Roman Civilisation

National University of Ireland, Maynooth

Department of Ancient Classics

August, 2001

**Head of Department: Professor David Scourfield**

**Supervisor: Dr. Mark Humphries**

## ABSTRACT

Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliothēke* has traditionally been seen as a quarry for the lost historians on whose works he drew while researching it. Consequently, Diodorus has not been studied as a historian in his own right, and the *Bibliothēke* has become little more than a jigsaw puzzle, with sections attributed to any number of lost historians. This dissertation seeks to relocate Diodorus and the *Bibliothēke* within the Greek historiographical tradition. Therefore it will examine four aspects relating to Diodorus and the *Bibliothēke*. First, the General Proem will be examined in order to show how Diodorus informed his readers about his aims and methods. Secondly, it will be argued that the General Proem is not an unintelligent repetition of older ideas, specifically those expounded by Polybius in the Introduction to his *Histories*. Rather, Diodorus builds on the work of Polybius, but more importantly he also interweaves his own original ideas about historiography, particularly universal history. This allows an attempt to elucidate Diodorus' own contribution to the version of the past narrated in the *Bibliothēke*. A third section will argue that the events of his own day and the relative position of Sicily within that world heavily influenced Diodorus as a historian, and that to understand Diodorus' selection and presentation of events in the *Bibliothēke* note must be taken of these influences. Finally it will be shown, through an examination of Books 18-20, that Diodorus' depiction of Rhodes shows that he did not simply follow one source at a time, but often combined several sources when writing sections of the *Bibliothēke*. We can also see that Diodorus did play a creative role in the representation of events in this section.

## CONTENTS

Preface and acknowledgements	iii
General Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The General Proem and Diodorus Siculus' View of History	7
Chapter 2: Diodorus and Polybius	22
Chapter 3: What is the Historical Perspective of Diodorus Siculus?	37
Chapter 4: Diodorus and Hieronymus	63
Conclusion	78
Bibliography	80

## **PREFACE**

Dr. Mark Humphries, my supervisor for the duration of this research, deserves more thanks than I could possibly offer. Nevertheless, I would like to offer my sincere gratitude for everything that he has done for me over the last two years. Despite my vices, Dr. Humphries has been uncommonly generous with his time — even when it is closed, his door is always open — and his kindness — in and out of office hours — has never ceased to overwhelm me. I am also grateful for the help and support that I have received from the other members of the Department of Ancient Classics which has not been inconsiderable, and has always been given without question. Special thanks go to Ruth O’Hara who has had to endure many Diodorus related stories, but always listened and to Louise Keely for her kind words of encouragement during the year.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for everything, without whom I would not have got this far.

Brian Sheridan  
Maynooth  
August 15, 2001

**Note on the citation of sources**

Primary sources are cited according to the abbreviations of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*<sup>3</sup> (Oxford, 1996). Modern studies are cited in full in the footnotes at their first occurrence and thereafter by author and, where appropriate, by year. Full details may be found in the bibliography.

He wrote down the name of the Muses and returned with a sigh to Bismark. One day he would get right to the end and, to zythum. Not that he needed to. He had peeled ahead and seen that it was a kind of ancient Egyptian beer, much recommended by Diodorus Siculus — whoever he was.

Stephen Fry *The Liar*

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

In this dissertation I will investigate the historical thought and method of Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliothēke*. I will do this by means of a close examination of the text of the *Bibliothēke*, while at the same time locating my arguments within current Diodoran scholarship. The General Proem to the *Bibliothēke* will receive special attention because it is there that Diodorus indicates his historical thought and method. To give some added focus, I will also concentrate on Diodorus' presentation of the Diadochoi, the successors to Alexander the Great, in Books 18-20 of the *Bibliothēke*.

Diodorus Siculus was born in the town of Agyrium in Sicily.<sup>1</sup> His contribution to Greek historiography, the *Bibliothēke*, is a universal history of mankind from mythical times down to his own day in forty Books. The *Bibliothēke* survives in a fragmentary state. Books 1-5 and 11-20 are the only completely extant Books. The degree of the fragmentation can be seen if we consider that Books 18-20 fill two volumes in the Loeb series, while only one volume is needed for the remains of Books 33-40.

Although Diodorus was popular among Christian writers and in the Renaissance, his reputation suffered from the advent of source criticism in the nineteenth century.<sup>2</sup> The theory behind this brand of scholarship is simple. We know Diodorus relied on written sources while writing the *Bibliothēke*, therefore

---

<sup>1</sup> 1.4.4.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 1.6.9, describes him as the most "distinguished" Diodorus; John Malalas, *Chronicle*, Preface., speaks of the "learned" Diodorus. Contrast this with Mommsen who

with the right methodology it is possible to identify the sources that are behind the *Bibliothēke*. There is one major assumption behind this theory: Diodorus must have followed only primary one source for any given section of the *Bibliothēke*. We have, then, a strange situation unfolding as a result of this type of approach. The lost historians, who are believed to be the sources of the narrative of the *Bibliothēke*, are seen as more worthy of study than Diodorus. Hieronymus of Cardia, for example, is assumed to be the source for Books 18-20 of the *Bibliothēke*. At the same time we do not have one word of Hieronymus' text. Anyone wishing to study Hieronymus' as a historian must, perforce, sit down with the text of the *Bibliothēke* and those other texts which are thought to derive from Hieronymus.

This approach demands that Diodorus be seen as a mere epitomator. If Diodorus can be seen to have ideas of his own, then it becomes a far more difficult proposition, to dissect the *Bibliothēke* attributing the resulting pieces to various lost historians. The most recent work on Diodorus' *Bibliothēke* typifies the problematic behind this approach.<sup>3</sup> Peter Green in his review of Stylianos' commentary sums up the problem:

For long stretches of his commentary, as a result, we keep reading about what sounds like a textually extant Ephorus, when in

---

described Diodorus as the "most miserable of all writers" (quoted by Hornblower, J., *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford, 1981) 19.

<sup>3</sup> Stylianos, P.J., *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus XV* (Oxford, 1998).



fact what we are dealing with is the much maligned Diodorus. Thus at many points where Diodorus' text gives him what he wants, Stylianou can and does, argue that Diodorus is merely transcribing Ephorus' narrative; but when it doesn't then of course the fault lies with Diodorus' own stupidity, laziness, or unwillingness to revise obvious errors. He has it both ways.<sup>4</sup>

This approach will not increase our understanding of Diodorus, and will only lead to an inadequate understanding of Ephorus. How, then, are we to resolve this problem? I suggest a closer examination of the text of the *Bibliotheke*, while at the same time attempting to develop a more sensitive approach to of Diodorus as a historian in his own right. Consequently, I have decided to explore four aspects that will cast some light on this issue.

In the first Chapter I will delineate the historical theory expounded by Diodorus in the General Proem. In doing this I will suggest that Diodorus does have an identifiable historical thought which, while it builds on an older tradition of Greek historiography also goes beyond that tradition, creates a new type of history. Following on from this I will examine, in the second Chapter, the

---

<sup>4</sup> *BMCR*. 99.10.11.

similarities and differences between the historical thought found in the General Proem and the historical thought found in Polybius' Introduction. This will be an important step for the following reason. It has become axiomatic that Diodorus does not have original ideas, taking those ideas that are present in the General Proem from Polybius among others.<sup>5</sup> By establishing Diodorus, as a historian who could build on the tradition that he inherited it will become possible to attempt a more sensitive understanding of Diodorus and the *Bibliotheke*. The second half of the dissertation will attempt such an approach.

In the third Chapter I will examine Diodorus' historical perspective. By doing this I will suggest that there were many factors that may have influenced Diodorus' views and consequently the *Bibliotheke*. Building on this, I will then look at the presentation of the Diadochoi in Books 18-20 and attempt to discover if Diodorus' historical perspective influences his portrayal of the Diadochoi. In the fourth Chapter I will examine Diodorus depiction of Rhodes in Books 19-20, looking specifically at the question of sources. Did Diodorus simple epitomise Hieronymus? Did he use more than one source for this section? Is their evidence that Diodorus himself embellished the narrative or creatively combines two or more sources when presenting an account in the *Bibliotheke*? By the end of the dissertation I hope to have shown Diodorus, as a historian, to be a worthwhile area of study in his own right. Moreover he will be seen to be a historian who made a positive contribution, not only to Greek historiography, but also to the history of ideas.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ephorus of Cyme and Posidonius are also seen as possible sources for the General Proem.

## Chapter 1

# THE GENERAL PROEM AND DIODORUS SICULUS' VIEW OF HISTORY

## Introduction

Any attempt to understand the *Bibliothēke* of Diodorus Siculus must begin with an analysis of the General Proem. Therein we will find some clues to the general nature of the *Bibliothēke*, and an idea of what Diodorus was trying to achieve. In this chapter therefore I will look principally at the General Proem and attempt to delineate the criteria and conditions for universal history which are there set down by Diodorus. It is possible to divide the Proem into six sections. The General Proem begins with a defence of history as a genre (1.1-1.2). He then discusses earlier historians and the limitations he noticed in their works (1.3.1-4). We then have an explanation of the plan of the *Bibliothēke* and a setting forth of the reasons why it is superior to the works of his predecessors (1.3.5-8). We are then told why and how he wrote the *Bibliothēke* (1.4.1-5). Diodorus then explains the chronological framework that he will use, and offers a brief outline of the forty books which comprise the *Bibliothēke* (1.4.6-5.1). He then ends with a few words on the fate of his history (1.5.2). In each of these sections Diodorus makes some point or explains some aspect of the *Bibliothēke* and the conditions surrounding its birth.

## 1. A defence of the genre of history writing (1.1-1.2)

Diodorus begins with a general discussion of history as a genre stressing the utility of history and gives the reasons why it is a worthwhile area of study:

For by offering a schooling which entails no danger, in what is advantageous they [i.e. historians] provide their readers, through such a presentation of events, with a most excellent kind of experience.<sup>6</sup>

Diodorus stresses at the outset of the *Bibliothēke* that history is a didactic genre. Diodorus is, as we will see, a moral historian, and the General Proem prepares us for just such a history. History for Diodorus is a medium through which both the young and the old may learn; they are enabled to learn from the mistakes of others without undergoing the attendant dangers. Diodorus goes on to assert that if the myths of Hades inspire men to live good lives then how much more powerful an influence must be history:

For if it be true that the myths which are related about Hades, in spite of the fact that the subject matter is fictitious, contribute greatly to fostering piety and justice among men, how much must we assume that history, the prophetess of truth, she who is, as it were, the

mother-city of philosophy as a whole, is still more potent to equip men's characters for noble living!<sup>7</sup>

Diodorus' makes a bold statement of intent in this passage. He compares the benefits to be taken from history with those that accrue from the ancient myths. By doing this Diodorus makes it patently obvious to the reader that he wants people to benefit by reading history. Indeed, Diodorus thinks that history enables people to live better lives.

Diodorus sums up his defence of history with the following statement:

In general, then, it is because of that commemoration of goodly deeds which history accords men that some of them have been induced to become the founders of cities, that others have been led to introduce laws which encompass man's social life with security, and that as many have aspired to discover new sciences and arts in order to benefit the race of men.<sup>8</sup>

Diodorus is convinced as we can see from this passage that history can induce men to behave in a way that is beneficial to mankind. Diodorus continues to amplify his earlier remarks by pointing out to the reader that history does not just

---

<sup>6</sup> 1.1.1.

<sup>7</sup> 1.2.2-3.

make idle promises; in fact, men have been influenced to such an extent that they have founded cities. Julius Caesar's re-founding of Corinth is one example. **Add ref.**

## **2. The problems with earlier historians (1.3.1-4)**

Diodorus now turns to his predecessors and gives his reasons for thinking that they have not achieved all that they might have done:

But when we turned our attention to the historians before our time, although we approved their purpose without reservation, yet we were far from feeling that their treatises had been composed so as to contribute to human welfare as much as might have been the case.<sup>9</sup>

Diodorus expands on this point and explains what he sees as the major problem with earlier historians: the scope of their works. The main problem is the lack of perspective that results from writing the history of isolated events. He explains:

Yet most writers have recorded no more than isolated wars waged by a single nation or state, and but few have undertaken, beginning with the earliest times and coming down

---

<sup>8</sup> 1.2.1.

<sup>9</sup> 1.3.1.

to their own day, to record the events connected with all peoples.<sup>10</sup>

Diodorus' critique of earlier historians focuses on the point that they have not optimised their contribution to what he has just called "human welfare". Diodorus, at no point names the historians whom he has in mind. However, in Diodorus' view some historians have attempted to write universal histories, but have fallen short for one reason or another.

Another passage in the General Proem leaves the identities of the historians Diodorus is considering implicit, though it is possible to speculate on the identities of the historians whom he may be referring to. Diodorus reflects that:

Some have not attached to the several events their own proper dates, and others have passed over the deeds of the barbarian peoples; and some again have rejected the ancient legends because of the difficulties involved in their treatment, while others have failed to complete the plan to which they had set their hand, their lives having been cut short by fate.<sup>11</sup>

Diodorus is referring to historians who have attempted something more than

---

<sup>10</sup> 1.3.2.

<sup>11</sup> 1.3.2.

histories of isolated events or wars. In other words those historians who have attempted to write a universal history. Diodorus does not state the historians by name but as Oldfather suggests he may have be thinking of the following historians. Herodotus does not have a chronological scheme in the *Histories*. Anaximenes of Lampascus who wrote a work called the *Hellenica*, concentrated on the Greek world, while Ephorus of Cyme began his history with the return of the Heracleidae, and did not live to complete his work.<sup>12</sup> Diodorus has created criteria by which it is possible to judge whether a particular work is a universal history. Having done this Diodorus has made his next claim possible, because judged by his own criteria Diodorus is a universal historian.

### **3. Why does Diodorus surpass his predecessors? (1.3.5-8)**

Thus far in the General Proem, Diodorus has been introducing his subject and his predecessors. He is now ready to introduce the *Bibliotheke* itself and to point out the advantages that it will have over earlier historical works. The first and most important claim Diodorus will make is for the sheer universality of the project. Just as Diodorus criticised earlier historians for not aiding human welfare as much as they might have done, he now states that he will write his work specifically to be of benefit to mankind. Diodorus has in mind a type of history that is very different from everything that has preceded him. Herodotus, for example, wrote his *History* “so that human achievements may not become forgotten in time”.<sup>13</sup> When we then turn to Diodorus and consider why he wrote

---

<sup>12</sup> Oldfather, C.H., *Diodorus of Sicily* vol. 1, 14 n.1.I am not sure that Oldfather is right to include Herodotus because Diodorus would not have considered Herodotus' work to be an attempt at universal history.

<sup>13</sup> Hdt, 1.1.



the *Bibliothèque*, a very different motivation becomes apparent. Diodorus explains that:

We resolved to write a history after a plan, which might yield to its readers the greatest benefit and at the same time incommode them the least. For if a man should begin with the most ancient times and record to the best of his ability the affairs of the entire world down to his own day, so far as they have been handed down to memory, as though they were the affairs of some single city, he would obviously have to undertake an immense labour, yet he would have composed a treatise of the utmost value to those who are studiously inclined.<sup>14</sup>

Diodorus, then, is going to write a universal history from the beginnings of time down to his own day. In doing this Diodorus is going to include ancient myths, and events not just in the Greek sphere, but also Sicilian, Roman, Egyptian and Asian as he says the whole world. As a result he will overcome two of his criticisms of earlier attempts at universal history, those two faults being the neglect of myth and of barbarians. By his own criteria Diodorus can justifiably be seen as the first universal historian. Just as he stressed the utility of history at the outset of the General Proem, it is also to the fore when he sets out

the plan of the *Bibliothēke*. Diodorus does not emphasise the recording of events as a primary motivation, it is the benefit that accrues to the audience from the knowledge of such events.

There is another reason why Diodorus believes the *Bibliothēke* to surpass previous attempts at universal history. Diodorus tells us:

The reason for this is that, in the first place, it is not easy for those who propose to go through the writings of so many historians to procure the books which come to be needed, and, in the second place, that, because the works vary so widely and are so numerous, the recovery of past events becomes extremely difficult of comprehension and of attainment.<sup>15</sup>

Having gone through this process himself while writing the *Bibliothēke*, this claim comes from experience. The *Bibliothēke* will make it possible for Diodorus' audience to read about the past without having to rely on large libraries. This may seem like an advertising slogan to the modern reader but it was, if we are to believe Diodorus, a justifiable concern.

#### **4. Why did Diodorus write the *Bibliothēke*, and how? (1.4.1-5)**

---

<sup>14</sup> 1.3.5-7

It seems evident from such comments in the General Proem that Diodorus is embarking on a work that is considerably different from those that have preceded it. Diodorus at this stage in the General Proem relates the conditions and resources available to him, that made it possible to complete the *Bibliothēke*. As well as the hard work that he invested in it, there was also on the one hand the enthusiasm that he brought to the subject and on the other hand the resources provided by the city of Rome where he did most of his research. Diodorus sets out the extent of his research thus:

And so we appreciating that an undertaking of this nature, while most useful, would yet require much labour and time, have been engaged upon it for thirty years, and with much hardship and many dangers have visited a large portion of both Asia and Europe that we might see with our own eyes all the more important regions and as many others as possible; for many errors have been committed through ignorance of the sites, not only by the common run of historians, but even by some of the highest reputation. As for the resources which have availed us in this undertaking, they have been, first and foremost, that enthusiasm for the work which enables every man

---

<sup>15</sup> 1.3.8.

to bring to completion the task which seems impossible, and, in the second place the abundant supply which Rome affords of the materials pertaining to the proposed study.<sup>16</sup>

This is the only positive remark made by Diodorus in his General Proem concerning Rome. This in itself may be a clue to one reason for Diodorus' writing of the *Bibliothēke*. Unlike Polybius he did not view Rome as the culmination of Fortune.<sup>17</sup> As I will argue in Chapter Three, Diodorus may have had, if anything, a slightly anti-Roman bias.<sup>18</sup>

Nevertheless, Rome in Diodorus' day was the most powerful state in the known world, and the only means by which Diodorus could put the city in perspective was to write a universal history. In a history of this kind Rome could not dominate but simply take her place beside the other great cities that had risen and fallen since Troy. We find a similar tactic in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. Although in the case of Ovid we are dealing with an epic, it is an epic that begins

---

<sup>16</sup> 1.4.1-3; Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford, 1981) claims (p.25) that Diodorus cannot be taken at face value in his General Proem and only included traditional Topoi is based to large extent on this passage, specifically on Diodorus' claim to have visited Asia. Because he goes on to place, incorrectly, Niniveh on the Euphrates, she claims that he is being less than honest about his travels. But cf. Billows, *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* p.343 n.32 points out that Ctesias, Diodorus' source for this section, also places Niniveh on the Euphrates. Ctesias is known to have spent a large part of his life in the East. As Billows states "if a man like Ctesias could be wrong about the site of Niniveh, Diodorus' following him in error certainly cannot prove that he never visited Asia". Moreover, it is difficult to prove either way, if Diodorus would have considered Egypt to be in Asia. Sacks *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* 161 n.2 also makes this point stating that Diodorus "acknowledges that he never visited that city, relying on the account of Ctesias (ii 2.2, 7.1)".

<sup>17</sup> Polybius 1.4.1.

<sup>18</sup> Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton, 1990)117-159, see for example Diodorus' comments at 1.50.7,17.52.4 "The city i.e., Alexandria, in general had grown so much in later times that many reckon it to be the first city of the civilised world"

with the origins from chaos and culminates in Ovid's own lifetime.<sup>19</sup> Allowing for the difference in genres, it is not difficult to imagine that both authors have a similar thought in mind. Seen from the perspective of all time, Rome and Augustus can only diminish in importance, and be forced to step back and realise that nothing lasts endlessly. Ovid and Diodorus, have the advantage of knowing that if the past is a good judge, their own works will outlive Rome and Augustus. When we consider, on the one hand, that in Diodorus' day Rome held such a position of dominance and, on the other, Diodorus' relative neglect of Rome in the *Bibliothēke*, it is ironic that Diodorus could not have written the *Bibliothēke* without the using the libraries at Rome.

##### **5. Brief outline and chronological framework (1.4.6-5.1)**

At this point Diodorus gives a brief outline of the *Bibliothēke*. He will begin with the myths of the Greeks and the Barbarians and include everything from the Trojan War down to his own day. Diodorus tells us the exact outline of the *Bibliothēke*:

Our first six Books embrace the events and legends previous to the Trojan War, the first three setting forth the antiquities of the Barbarians, and the next three almost exclusively those of the Greeks, in the following eleven we have written a universal history of events from the Trojan War to the

---

<sup>19</sup> Ov. *Met.* 1.4 "spin an unbroken thread of verse, from the earliest beginnings of the world, down to my own times".

death of Alexander, and in the succeeding twenty-three Books we have given an orderly account of all subsequent events down to the beginning of the war between the Romans and the Celts, in the course of which the commander, Gaius Julius Caesar, who had been deified because of his deeds, subdued the most numerous and the most warlike tribes of the Celts, and advanced the Roman Empire as far as the British Isles.<sup>20</sup>

The most obvious point concerning this passage is the way the *Bibliothèque* is to be divided and the relative space given to each section. Diodorus devotes twenty-three books to the events from the death of Alexander down to his own day. From a purely chronological view, the *Bibliothèque* is heavily weighted towards more recent events. One reason for this may be that Diodorus had far more materials available to him from the death of Alexander onwards. Diodorus is silent with regard to the sources he used for the main body of the narrative, an oversight which may have more to do with the nature of the *Bibliothèque* than with any desire to claim credit that was not his due. To modern critics, this silence is unusual. Moreover, Jane Hornblower has described such information as “the one topic which a serious student would want to hear about”.<sup>21</sup> However, Diodorus claimed to be writing for those who were “studiously inclined”, and did not feel the necessity or obligation to specify his

---

<sup>20</sup> 1.4.6-7.

<sup>21</sup> Hornblower 26.

sources. Furthermore, as Palm has argued,<sup>22</sup> Diodorus completely rewrote the narrative of the *Bibliothēke* in his own style and it would have been impossible to state which sections were from one author and which were a synthesis of several authors. Indeed it must be remembered that it is only as a result of the loss of so many of the historians that this criticism arose.<sup>23</sup>

In contrast to his silence on the question of sources he does set out the source of his chronological framework. He tells us:

As for the period before the Trojan War we follow Apollodorus of Athens in setting the interval from then to the return of the Heracleidae as eighty years, from then to the First Olympiad three hundred and twenty-eight years, reckoning the dates by the reigns of the Kings of Lacedaemon, and from the First Olympiad to the beginning of the Celtic War, which we have made the end of our history, seven hundred and thirty years; so that our whole treatise of forty Books embraces eleven hundred and thirty-eight years, exclusive of the periods which embrace the events

---

<sup>22</sup> Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil Des Diodoros von Sizilien* (Lund, 1955). Cf. Kells, J.H. review of Palm, *Classical Review*, 157, 160-1.

<sup>23</sup> I will try to examine Diodorus' relationship to one author, i.e., Hieronymus in Chapter 4. Even in this instance where it is reasonably clear who Diodorus' main source was it is futile to try and rebuild Hieronymus from the pages of Diodorus, because of the interweaving of several subsidiary sources.

before the Trojan War.<sup>24</sup>

This passage is important for an understanding of Diodorus' method. Diodorus credits Apollodorus for the chronology of the period before the Trojan War. From this we can see that when possible does acknowledge his debt to older works.

#### **6. The fate of the *Bibliothēke***

At the end of the General Proem, Diodorus makes two pleas, that his work will not be the source of envy and that future historians will make the necessary corrections where his work will with time prove to be in error:

We have given at the outset this precise outline, since we desire to inform our readers about the project as a whole, and at the same time to deter those who are accustomed to make their books by compilation, from mutilating works of which they are not the authors. And throughout our entire history it is to be hoped that what we have done well may not be the object of envy and that the matters wherein our knowledge is defective may receive correction at the hands of more able historians.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> 1.5.1.



Coming as it does at the end of the General Proem this passage answers one question surrounding the nature of the *Bibliothēke*. Indeed, one important point that arises from this passage is that Diodorus at least, in contrast to modern critics, did not consider his work to be a compilation. Moreover, he is afraid that his work may be a target for those who do write works of compilation. There is also in my view an implicit bow towards the historical tradition which in tandem with the libraries at Rome allowed Diodorus to write the *Bibliothēke*. It may be worthwhile to consider this point for a moment. What does Diodorus mean here? He surely does not mean that at some stage in the future, someone will edit or revise the *Bibliothēke*, correcting such mistakes as they may find. This passage does not suggest such an interpretation. Instead, Diodorus may be referring to some future work that will have to be written when the *Bibliothēke* can no longer claim to be a universal history. It is inevitable that with the passage of time, much will be seen to be missing from the *Bibliothēke*. At that point in the future, the *Bibliothēke* will no longer be the culmination of a tradition; instead it will be part of the tradition of historiography.<sup>26</sup>

From the point of view of modern criticism there is much missing from the General Proem that would have, had it been included, made Diodorus a far more profitable quarry for the lost histories on which he drew for the *Bibliothēke*. Diodorus must have made a conscious decision to omit any such remarks, on the grounds that it would have compromised his own work. This was not a statement, albeit implicit, that he was simply excerpting material from earlier historians. In connection with this we must make note of Diodorus'

---

<sup>25</sup> 1.5.2.

reluctance to make use of rhetorical devices such as speeches as had been the practice with earlier historians. Diodorus remarks that:

One might justly censure those who in their histories insert over-long orations or employ frequent speeches; for not only do they rend asunder the continuity of the narrative by the ill-timed insertion of speeches, but they also interrupt the interest of those who are eagerly pressing on toward a full knowledge of the events.<sup>27</sup>

In other words if he was going to stamp his own perspective on the *Bibliothēke*, he would have to rewrite the narrative in such a way that the perspectives of the sources on which he drew were not as explicit. It emerged that he did not want his history to be considered a mere compilation. Furthermore, he believed that his *Bibliothēke* could be more usefully read on its own terms. If only the narrative is preserved, and then rewritten in Diodorus' own style with his own added emphasis, then he may have believed himself to be justified in omitting to include information on the sources that he used while researching the *Bibliothēke*.

---

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Marincola *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997) 241.

<sup>27</sup> 19.1.1.

## Conclusion

In this Chapter we have seen that Diodorus envisaged history as a didactic genre. The General Proem sets out Diodorus' views on history as a subject. He then goes on to explain the inherent limitations that he has found with the works of earlier historians. Essentially Diodorus thought that they had achieved as much as was possible because they limited themselves to isolated events. At the same time however Diodorus could not have written the *Bibliothēke* without the help of these earlier historians. In addition to this, Diodorus could not have written the *Bibliothēke* without the libraries at Rome which he acknowledges in the General Proem. The *Bibliothēke* is then introduced as the first truly universal history. Diodorus also sets out clearly the scope and the chronology of the *Bibliothēke*. He also emphasises the importance of the historiographical tradition on which he drew for the raw materials of the *Bibliothēke*. Thus, from the outset, Diodorus gives a clear statement of intent and method and indicates the manner in which he will stamp his own identity on the *Bibliothēke*. In view of this, it is important to re-examine Diodorus' allegedly strong reliance on his predecessors, especially Polybius. This will be the subject of the next chapter.

## Chapter 2

### DIODORUS AND POLYBIUS

#### Introduction

In this chapter I will examine the similarities and differences between the views expressed in the General Proem of the *Bibliothēke* and the Introduction to Polybius' *Histories*. It has become axiomatic to mention the reliance of Diodorus on Polybius for his ideas on the theory of history. Scholars who mention this do not feel the need to defend the view and the burden of proof therefore lies with anyone wishing to advocate the opposite point of view. P.J. Stylianou, for example, repeats the old assumption that Diodorus relies on Polybius for the ideas contained in the General Proem. Stylianou does so without recourse to the text of the *Bibliothēke*, as we would expect, but to previous scholars who have also propagated the argument.<sup>1</sup> This route is however, problematic. The scholars used by Stylianou have never actually used the text of the *Bibliothēke* to prove this argument. The spectre of *Quellenforschung* lurks beneath the surface.

Due to similarities between the text of Diodorus' General Proem and the Introduction to the *Histories* of Polybius, Stylianou and others reach the conclusion that Diodorus must be helping himself to Polybius' ideas. There is, however, enough evidence to be found in the Diodorus' *Bibliothēke* to support an opposing point of view. For this reason I will examine the similarities and

differences between Diodorus' General Proem and Polybius' Introduction. I will begin by setting out Polybius' ideas on universal history. I will then set Diodorus' ideas on universal history. By contrasting the two sets of ideas I will suggest that the historical thought of Diodorus and Polybius is different. I will then examine the relationship between the General Proem and the *Bibliothēke* as a whole to show that Diodorus not only had distinct ideas on history, but that he also carried them out.

### **1. Polybius' view of Universal History**

Near the beginning of his introduction Polybius remarks:

But as it is I notice that while various historians deal with isolated wars and certain of the subjects connected with them, nobody, so far as I am aware, has made the effort to examine the general and comprehensive scheme of events, when it began, whence it originated, and how it produced the final result.<sup>2</sup>

This is one of the most important statements made by Polybius with regard to the type of history that he will be writing, and that is often assumed to be universal history.<sup>3</sup> When Polybius looks back on the works of earlier historians, he notices that the limited scope of their works detracted from their overall

---

<sup>1</sup> Stylianou, P.J., *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus XV* (Oxford, 1998) 23 n.62.

<sup>2</sup> Polyb. 1.4.3.

usefulness. This is only part of the problem as Polybius remarks. As a result of the limited scope of their works, historians have not explained adequately the reasons why isolated wars and events happened. For as Polybius tells us:

We must conclude that specialised studies and monographs contribute very little to our grasp of the whole and our conviction of its truth. On the contrary, it is only by combining and comparing the various parts of the whole with one another and noting their resemblances and their differences that we shall arrive at a comprehensive view, and thus encompass both the practical benefits and the pleasures that the reading of history affords.<sup>4</sup>

However, having noted the problems with earlier works of history and indicating the advantages that universal history has over specialised studies, Polybius subsequently states that it would not be possible to write a universal history. Polybius explains thus:

It will therefore be my task to describe first of all how and at what date the Romans established themselves in Italy, and what considerations impelled them to cross the sea to Sicily, which was the

---

<sup>3</sup> Walbank F.W., *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* vol.1 (Oxford, 1958) 9.

first country beyond the shores of Italy on which they set foot. The actual cause of their crossing must be stated without comment, for if I were to pursue the cause of the cause, I should fail to establish either the starting point or the fundamental principle of my history. The starting-point, must be fixed at a moment which is agreed and recognised by all, and can be clearly identified from events, even though this may require me to retrace my steps for a short period and summarise the intermediate happenings.<sup>5</sup>

It becomes evident from Polybius' remarks quoted above, that he does not believe that it is possible to write universal history. For, had Polybius attempted to find the "cause of the cause" his work would have lost its focus. As a result Polybius is content to fix the starting point of his history at a moment in the recent past, the date he picks is 264 which is the end point of Timaeus of Tauromenium's history. In fact, Polybius own history while it eschews 'isolated wars and their connected events' is in itself, something less than full blown universal history. He famously describes exactly what his theme is to be:

There can surely be nobody so petty or apathetic in his outlook that he has no desire to discover by what means

---

<sup>4</sup> 1.4.10-11.

<sup>5</sup> 1.5.2-5.

and under what system of government the Romans succeeded in less than fifty-three years in bringing under their rule almost the whole of the inhabited world, an achievement which is without parallel in human history.<sup>6</sup>

From this we may be able to speculate as to Polybius' idea of universal history. It is not a history of all events from the beginnings of time down to his own day. He has picked a specific event, the rise of the Roman Empire, to be his subject. Temporal depth is not stressed, instead Polybius is going to settle for an account of the inhabited world.

The problem becomes deeper when we consider that Polybius, at different stages, claims that he has no predecessors in the writing of universal history while claiming at other times that he has predecessors, Polybius tells us in Book 5:

For I do not confine myself, as earlier writers have done, to the history of one nation alone, such as Greece or Persia, but have set myself to describe what was happening in all the known parts of the world at once.<sup>7</sup>

In contrast, Polybius states in Book Five that Ephorus of Cyme was the "first and

---

<sup>6</sup> Polyb. 1.1

<sup>7</sup> Polyb. 2.37.4.



only writer” to attempt such a history.<sup>8</sup> Ephorus wrote a history in thirty Books, which began with the return of the Heracleidae and culminated with the siege of Perinthus, in 340. It included accounts of the Barbarian east as well as the Greek sphere. It is possibly the inclusion of the material pertaining to the Barbarians that Polybius accorded him the honour of being the first universal historian. When we turn to the history as described by Diodorus, in the next section, clear differences arise.

## 2. Diodorus’ view of universal History

If we then turn to the *Bibliothèque* it is easy to see how some may find reflections of Polybius’ Introduction. How deep to these similarities go? Is there a significant difference between the Introduction of Polybius and the General Proem of Diodorus? Diodorus leaves the reader under no illusion regarding the scope of his history and the deficiencies he has noticed in earlier historians.<sup>9</sup> For Diodorus the problem is primarily a matter of temporal depth. The greater the time span covered by a historian the more beneficial the history will be. Diodorus sums up the problem with earlier historians thus:

Most writers have recorded no more than isolated wars waged by a single nation or state, and but few have undertaken, beginning with the earliest times and coming down to their own day, to record the events

---

<sup>8</sup> 5.33.2.

<sup>9</sup> 1.3.1.

connected with all peoples.<sup>10</sup>

It is fair to compare Diodorus comments on earlier historians with those made by Polybius.<sup>11</sup> Any author setting out to write a universal history would make the same observations.<sup>12</sup> Although Diodorus, like Polybius, reflects on the scope of earlier works of history, he shapes the actual problem with them in a manner different from Polybius. He does not emphasise the lack of perspective that results from history written of “isolated wars”. Diodorus sums the problem simply as a failure to “record the events connected with all peoples”. Essentially the problem is a lack of universality in the histories that have been written in the past. While Diodorus, does reflect the statements found in Polybius, he is justified in making the comments because from his point of view nobody including Polybius had written anything but the history of isolated events. Diodorus’ solution to the problem is also different to the solution offered by Polybius. Diodorus tells us:

For if a man should begin with the most ancient times and record to the best of his ability the affairs of the entire world down to his own day, so far as they have been handed down to memory, as though they were the affairs of some single city, he would obviously have to undertake an immense labour, yet he would have composed a treatise of the utmost

---

<sup>10</sup> 1.3.2.

<sup>11</sup> cf. Polyb. 1.4.3.

<sup>12</sup> See below Ch. 3 on Diodorus’ perspective.

value to those who are studiously inclined.<sup>13</sup>

Diodorus, like Polybius, emphasises the advantages that universal history has over the histories of isolated events. Yet when we then turn to consider the scope of the *Bibliothēke* and compare it with the scope of the *Histories* of Polybius the similarities end. Diodorus history will encompass all events from the mythological period before the Trojan War down to the author's own day, "whereas Polybius produced a work organised around a particular moment in history".<sup>14</sup> I do not intend to be unduly critical of Polybius, but seek to emphasise the relationship between the General Proem and the *Bibliothēke*. This is an important task if we are to reach a more sophisticated understanding of the *Bibliothēke*. Only by understanding the *Bibliothēke* on its own terms can we see how it is distinct from the histories that have preceded it. Based on this analysis Diodorus is, from the outset of the *Bibliothēke*, making a statement which is at odds with the ideas found in Polybius' Introduction.

The ideas expressed in the General Proem may seem very "similar in spirit", as Hornblower has noted,<sup>15</sup> to those expressed in the introduction to Polybius but once we examine the ideas more closely and analyse how they effect the historical narrative, the similarities seem to be rather more superficial. It is worth noting at this point that the authors who have raised this argument have provided very little evidence from the texts and this may be why they use the rather vague phrase "similar in spirit". Stylianou, for example, who refers us to

---

<sup>13</sup> 1.3.6.

<sup>14</sup> Sacks, K., *Polybius and the Writing of History* (Berkeley, 1981) 97.

Hornblower and Walbank on this point, is typical. On turning to the pages as specified by Stylianou's notes, all we find is a similar generalisation without any evidence from the texts. It is clear from the respective solutions offered by Diodorus and Polybius that the historical thought underlying on the one hand Polybius' Introduction and on the other hand Diodorus' General Proem is fundamentally different.

Thus far I have looked at the scope of the *Bibliothēke* in the light of the comments made by Diodorus in the General Proem. Diodorus goes on to explain the reasons why the *Bibliothēke* will cover such a long period of time. I will continue to emphasise the connection between the General Proem and the *Bibliothēke* mainly because a link must be ascertained in light of the current trend in Diodoran scholarship. At this time it seems important to channel all arguments through the General Proem.

### **3. The General Proem and the *Bibliothēke***

Does the General Proem bear any relationship to the *Bibliothēke* as a whole? One particular criticism of the General Proem is that Diodorus only included in the Proem those elements that he felt ought to introduce him as a serious historian,

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 19.

without any thought for its relationship with the historical narrative.<sup>16</sup>

Even on an elementary level the General Proem to the *Bibliothèque* is accurate. He tells us that he is going to cover events from the ancient legends down to his own day. This is an honest description of the *Bibliothèque*. Hornblower, however, accuses Diodorus of including in the Proem only those elements that he believed should be there, even when they do not relate to the *Bibliothèque*. She raises, as an example, the passages where Diodorus speaks of the moral utility of history and his claim to have devoted much time to travel and research. Hornblower argues:

He put into his General Proem only those items which he considered the hallmark of a stylish history, and which were designed to announce him as heir to the great historians of the past. He was untroubled about the relevance of the General Proem to the history itself, and did not scruple to make a claim which was demonstrably false; and most of the statements about the way he approached his work cannot be taken as sincere.<sup>17</sup>

Hornblower's basis for this assertion is that Diodorus places Niniveh on the Euphrates, but as we have already seen in Chapter One, this cannot be used as

---

<sup>16</sup> Hornblower, 25

<sup>17</sup> *ibid.*, 26.

evidence that Diodorus did not visit Asia.<sup>18</sup>When we turn to Stylianou's arguments more problems arise. In the course of the introduction to his book he asks a question of the *Bibliothēke*: 'Why the constant moralising?' Stylianou seems to miss the point made by Diodorus in the General Proem. Diodorus describes one of the main benefits of history as being its ability to prepare people for experiences through the 'ignorant mistakes of others'<sup>19</sup>. Surely, therefore, it is unfair to criticise a historian for doing in his work that which he promises to do in his General Proem.

In general, a history of this nature must be held to surpass all others on the same degree as the whole is more useful than the part and continuity than discontinuity, and, again, as an event whose date has been accurately determined is more useful than one of which it is not known in what period it happened.<sup>20</sup>

Diodorus is also explaining the advantage that 'universal history' had over specialised histories. If we return to Polybius we find similar sentiments.

It has always seemed to me that those who believe they can obtain a just and well-proportioned view of history as a whole by reading separate and specialised reports of

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Ch. 1.

<sup>19</sup> 1.1.4.

events, are behaving like a man who, when he has examined the dissected parts of a body which was once alive and beautiful, imagines that he had beheld the animal in all its grace and movement. But if anyone could reconstruct the creature there and then, restoring both its shape and beauty as a living being and show it to the same man, I believe he would immediately admit that his conception was nowhere near the truth, and was more like something experienced in a dream. The fact is that we can obtain no more than an impression of a whole from a part, but certainly neither a thorough knowledge nor an accurate understanding. We must conclude then that specialised studies or monographs contribute very little to our grasp of the whole and our conviction of the truth.<sup>21</sup>

The importance of viewing history as a whole rather than in part that we find in Diodorus could have originated in Polybius. The language used is also similar. It must be noted that Ephorus who also envisaged history, as a whole must have had similar ideas in his history. This idea that 'universal history' is better than 'monographs' may have been older than Polybius and formed an integral part in the arguments for 'universal history'.

---

<sup>20</sup> 1.3.8.

As the author of a 'universal history' Diodorus might therefore be expected to draw on older historiographical theory to support the choice of this particular type of history. Diodorus can hardly be criticised for including, in his General Proem, those elements that were central to his theory of history.<sup>22</sup>

Diodorus' discussion of the benefits of 'universal history' cannot be written off as unrelated to the scope of the history. One aspect of the discussion of 'universal history' found in the *Bibliothēke*, which I have not considered thus far is important. Diodorus tells us that there are considerable benefits to be gained for those who are 'studiously inclined'. Diodorus states one aspect of the problem with numerous specialised studies:

For this reason, since both the dates of the events and the events themselves lie scattered about in numerous treatises and in diverse authors, the knowledge of them becomes difficult for the mind to encompass and for the memory to retain.<sup>23</sup>

In contrast, a universal history overcomes this problem because as Diodorus notes:

The treatise which keeps within the

---

<sup>21</sup> 1.4.

<sup>22</sup> Sacks, K., 'The Lesser Prooemia of Diodorus Siculus', *Hermes*, (1981) 432.

<sup>23</sup> 1.3.4.



limits of a single narrative and contains a connected account of events facilitates the reading and contains the recovery of the past in a form that is perfectly easy to follow.

24

Diodorus implies that he is aiming to make history more easily available. This may be, however, a clever ploy on Diodorus' behalf. Was he trying to persuade those who already had a collection of historical texts to purchase his as well. It is not unreasonable to assume that Diodorus wished the *Bibliothēke* to reach as large an audience as possible. These considerations need to be borne in mind before we interpret passages such as the two quoted directly above.

The *Bibliothēke* when read in the light of the prefatory comments made by Diodorus does add up. There may be constant moralising but Diodorus promises us no more and no less. Diodorus' *Bibliothēke* is original in Greek historiography both in terms of scope and in terms of the chronological precision he aimed for.<sup>25</sup> When one considers the logistical problem faced by Diodorus—Books 11-15 of the *Bibliothēke* cover a period which Ephorus took thirty books to cover— it is understandable in the light of the specific history he was writing and the didactic aspect of the work, that he would be selective. It is equally important while judging Diodorus to keep one eye on the General Proem

---

<sup>24</sup> 1.3.8.

because it does illuminate many of his aims and procedures. We must not only judge them in the context of the *Bibliothèque* and the internal cogency of that work, but also in the context of Diodorus' predecessors. This is especially true of Diodorus' relationship with Polybius who, though undoubtedly an influence, was not the sole source for the General Proem.

---

<sup>25</sup> Rubincam, C., 'The Organization and Composition of Diodorus' *Bibliothèque*', *Echos du Monde Classique*, 31, (1987) 315.

## Chapter 3

# WHAT IS THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF DIODORUS SICULUS?

## Introduction

Diodorus was not typical of the historians writing in or about Rome during the late Hellenistic period. The only reason Diodorus came to Rome was because of the libraries there. He did not teach in Rome or participate in any particular school unlike Dionysius of Halicarnassus who taught rhetoric at Rome. His only motive for living in Rome was the study of history. The *Bibliothēke*, the product of this research, is a work that does not have an explicit political bias, for or against Rome.<sup>1</sup> Rome for Diodorus is just another city that has risen to great heights and will eventually fall,<sup>2</sup> though the fate of Rome is never discussed and is left to the imagination of the reader.<sup>3</sup> Diodorus' historical perspective will be a fruitful area of study for those wishing to develop a more sensitive approach to the *Bibliothēke* of Diodorus. His historical perspective is inevitably tied to his aims and methods and an appraisal must be made of it to keep the other two aspects in context.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sacks (1990) 117.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. both Athens and Sparta lost their Empires because of the way they treated their subjects. Similarly the contrast between Perdikkas and Ptolemy is rooted in their treatment of others. The theme is also to the fore when Diodorus discusses Rome's treatment of Greece.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. comparison with Ovid in Ch. 1. Cf. also Sacks, K., 'Conformity and Creativity', in Simon Hornblower ed. *Greek Historiography* (Oxford, 1994) 219, he notes that Diodorus, unlike his sources Polybius and Posidonius, does not emphasise decadence as a growing problem in Rome,

In this chapter I will examine four areas that informed to some extent the historical perspective of Diodorus. First, the most obvious fact about Diodorus, that he was Sicilian. Secondly the influence of the past which would be the subject of the *Bibliothèque*. By this I mean the events which make up the past. Thirdly, the historical tradition, the emphasis and bias present in the sources on which he would draw for the composition of the *Bibliothèque*. Fourthly, his ideas on the function and utility of history as a genre, and the effect this had on the organisational and selection of material for the *Bibliothèque*. Each of these adds up to an historian whose work is essentially different from any historical text that preceded it.

### **1. Diodorus the Sicilian**

Diodorus tells us in the General Proem that the city of his birth was Agrigium in Sicily.<sup>4</sup> What implications does the fact of Diodorus' homeland have on his historical perspective? I suggest that the implications are probably quite straightforward and vital to the *Bibliothèque*. Sicily benefited from Roman rule initially because it ended the tradition of tyrants to which Sicily was particularly prone, Diodorus remarks that:

More than anywhere else this  
tendency toward the rule of one  
man prevailed in Sicily before the  
Romans became rulers of that

---

he does emphasise Rome's treatment of her provinces as a reason why Rome could have problems in the future.

<sup>4</sup> 1.4.4.

island.<sup>5</sup>

This gives us another clue to Diodorus' perspective. Diodorus is interested in the impact of Roman rule on the island of Sicily. This will be a touchstone for the consideration of the *Bibliothēke* in general.<sup>6</sup> Diodorus was a provincial, coming from an island which benefited and later suffered as a result of Roman rule and the whims of those Romans whose actions impinged on daily life in Sicily.<sup>7</sup> As a result Caesar and Pompey are depicted in a very good light by Diodorus while Octavian's rise to power is neglected. It is neglected because Octavian's actions in Sicily and his subsequent success could not be balanced with Diodorus' ideas on successful leaders. Octavian, for example, imposed a colony in Taormina and the deported all of the citizens, because they had supported Pompey.<sup>8</sup> This may appear overly simplistic, but I do not think that we should look for a more complicated answer, unless consideration of the evidence presents one.

## **2. The influence of the past**

The second area which influenced Diodorus' perspective is history itself, the events which make up the past. By history I am referring to the past, the flow of events as distinct from historians. This is a slippery idea, but basically Diodorus would have seen the past as a series of events rather than as a series of historians.

---

<sup>5</sup>19.1.5; It is interesting to note that Diodorus seems to be attempting certain objectivity, as can be seen from the reference to Sicily as 'ταύτης τῆς νήσου'.

<sup>6</sup>We see similar themes in the depiction of the Diadochoi in Part two of this Chapter.

<sup>7</sup> Julius Caesar granted Sicily Latin rights, this was extended by Mark Anthony and then rescinded by the Senate. Octavian also punished all those who had sided with Pompey during the war. The governorship of Verres may be another example.

<sup>8</sup> 16.7.2.

The two are difficult to distinguish at times but I think the point is important. As will emerge from my analysis of Books 18-20 in Chapter Four, Diodorus did not choose one source and follow it for the duration of its narrative.<sup>9</sup> In the Books covering the era of the Diadochoi it is clear that Hieronymus of Cardia is the central source for Diodorus' narrative. It can be seen however from certain elements in these books that Diodorus supplemented Hieronymus with additional sources. The two most obvious examples of this are the pro-Rhodian sections and the pro-Ptolemaic sections.<sup>10</sup> At the very least these examples show that Diodorus did read more than one source for this section. An example from a section other than this would be the narrative relating the march of the Ten Thousand in Book 14. For this section Diodorus must have supplemented Ephorus with Ctesias and possibly Xenophon.<sup>11</sup> If based on this we assume that Diodorus attempted where possible to collect as many sources for each part of the *Bibliothēke*, the amount of research required would have been substantial.<sup>12</sup>

Diodorus therefore would have read a lot of history.<sup>13</sup> This history influenced his perspective in the following manner. As a result of his research he came to certain general conclusions regarding patterns in history. Diodorus then used these as methods for organising and linking events in the *Bibliothēke*, which were separated by space and time. The most obvious example of this is the rise and fall of empires that Diodorus uses to link different sections of the

---

<sup>9</sup> Ch. 4.

<sup>10</sup> Ch. 4.

<sup>11</sup> Diodorus' description at 14.28.5, for example, shows the same ethnographic interests which are an important aspect of Xenophon's *Anabasis*.

<sup>12</sup> Although it has been suggested that Diodorus only read intermediary sources, who had already conflated two or more accounts of the one event, cf. Simpson, R.H., 'Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus', *American Journal of Philology* (1959) 370.

<sup>13</sup> Sacks(1990) 205.

*Bibliothēke*.<sup>14</sup> The behaviour of those men in positions of responsibility and power is another method by which Diodorus threads the narrative of the *Bibliothēke*. We see this in the narrative relating the career of Eumenes of Cardia:

There is also a good reason for admitting the claim of history, for in the inconstancy and irregularity of events history furnishes a corrective for both the arrogance of the fortunate and the despair of the destitute.<sup>15</sup>

Two points are evident from this comment. First, Diodorus suggests that no person will ever go through life with constant good fortune. This also ties in with Diodorus' comments, in the General Proem, on the utility of history.<sup>16</sup> Secondly, Diodorus' own perspective has been shaped to some extent by history. Diodorus may not have been constructing a deep philosophy in the *Bibliothēke*, but it is evident from the remark just quoted that there was a central theme running through the *Bibliothēke* that has its roots in the research carried out by Diodorus.

It is not a generally held opinion that Diodorus did read a lot of history. In connection with Books 18-20 it has even been argued that Diodorus did not in fact read Hieronymus, that he came to him through an intermediary who had

---

<sup>14</sup> Sacks (1990) 23-54.

<sup>15</sup> 18.59.6.

<sup>16</sup> Ch. 1.

already included other narratives in the Hieronymus' history. Simpson has put Agatharchides forward as the most likely candidate.<sup>17</sup> This view is based however on the assumption that Diodorus was a mere epitomator and is less than convincing in view of what we saw in Chapter One about Diodorus' whole approach to writing the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>18</sup> P.J. Stylianiou typifies this point of view:

The *Bibliothēke* is entirely derivative and Diodorus' methods slipshod, so much so that the work could have been dashed off in a very few years. A superior writer like Dio Cassius wrote eighty books in twelve years.<sup>19</sup>

Even a cursory reading of any section of the *Bibliothēke* and the application of common sense is enough to appreciate the inherent faults in this view. Furthermore this view is based on a methodology which is not aimed at the study of the *Bibliothēke* as a history in its own right but as a mine for quarrying the residues of older historians who are no longer extant.<sup>20</sup> Stylianiou, moreover, is in no doubt that Diodorus would not be read at all had these older historians survived.<sup>21</sup> This is of course based on the assumption that historians are seen primarily as repositories of facts, rather than people who impose their identity on

---

<sup>17</sup> 'Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus' *AJPh* (1959) 370-9.

<sup>18</sup> Hornblower 62-3 all argue this point while Merker, I.L., 'Diodorus and Hieronymus', *Ancient History Bulletin* 90-3 argues in favour of Diodorus having used Hieronymus directly.

<sup>19</sup> Stylianiou 52; Dio Cassius states at 72.23 that he had spent twenty-two years preparing and writing the eighty books.

<sup>20</sup> The two most notable examples are Ephorus and Hieronymus.

<sup>21</sup> Review of Sacks' *Diodorus Siculus and the first Century* BMCR 02.06.19 "Had these survived (the narrative histories and the chronographers) who would pay the slightest attention to Diodorus?" Green BMCR 99.10.11 leans towards agreement with Stylianiou on the grounds that if a is the source for b and both are available one would obviously chose to use a.



the past through the way in which they interpret it?

## 2. The historiographical tradition

The third area of influence on Diodorus' perspective is the historiographical tradition, at the end of which the *Bibliothēke* comes. Diodorus' perspective was limited by the scope of his sources. The influence of the historiographical tradition on Diodorus' perspective is at once the most obvious and at the same time the aspect which has caused Diodorus the greatest problems as a historian in his own right as far as his reputation is concerned. The influence of Polybius, for example, on Diodorus has long been noted, and used as evidence for the derivative nature of the *Bibliothēke*. The relationship between Diodorus is however far subtler than has been generally assumed. There is no doubt that Diodorus looked on Polybius as a good role model. However, as I have argued earlier there are distinct differences between Diodorus and Polybius.<sup>22</sup> Instead, Diodorus' historical perspective is not the result of the influence of any one historian but of the weight of the whole historiographical tradition that allowed Diodorus to write the *Bibliothēke*. Moreover Diodorus and Polybius were fundamentally different in their approach to history: as argued in Chapter Two above, Diodorus was a universal historian while Polybius was not. Furthermore, Diodorus viewed history as important and worthwhile in its own right, not, as Polybius seems to have thought, a means for explaining the current status of Rome. This distinction may become clearer if we consider two passages.

---

<sup>22</sup> Ch. 2

Diodorus tells us in the General Proem:

History excels we know in the multitude of facts at its disposal. For this reason one may hold that the acquisition of a knowledge of history is of the greatest utility for every conceivable circumstance of life.<sup>23</sup>

In contrast Polybius tells us that:

There can surely be nobody so petty or apathetic in his outlook that he has no desire to discover by what means and under what system of government the Romans succeeded in less than fifty-three years in bringing under their rule almost the whole of the inhabited world, an achievement which is without parallel in human history.<sup>24</sup>

For Diodorus history is a 'multitude of facts' whereas for Polybius history is a medium through which one may gain understanding of how Rome came to her current position of dominance. The distinction may be subtle but it may best be described as the difference between universal history and the history of a single event.

---

<sup>23</sup> 1.3.6.

<sup>24</sup> 1.1.5

The advantage Diodorus had over his predecessors was a simple one: he came after them.<sup>25</sup> His boast in the General Proem that no other historian has attempted a history on the scale of the *Bibliothèque* is not disingenuous.<sup>26</sup> He was the first historian to write a universal history from the mythical era down to his own day. He could only have done this by relying upon those who had gone before. For the vast majority of the *Bibliothèque* Diodorus was writing non-contemporary history and had therefore to rely on literary sources. Unlike the historians who wrote the histories on which the *Bibliothèque* depended, Diodorus had the advantage of hindsight as well as the advantage of the proximity to events of the historian he was following at any particular stage. He could look at various versions of the same events and make a decision on how he could best combine them while adding his own structure.<sup>27</sup> Diodorus was reliant on the historiographical tradition, inasmuch as he could not have written the *Bibliothèque* without the tradition from which he drew. That is not to say that Diodorus is derivative. To take one simple example, Diodorus covered in a little over five Books the same time span, which Ephorus covered in thirty Books. The selection process from Ephorus, not to mention the use of supplementary sources, would have been an organisational headache around which Diodorus had to navigate. The process alone would have been sufficient to enable Diodorus to stamp his own identity on the *Bibliothèque*.

To understand Diodorus' perspective we must also remember that he was

---

<sup>25</sup> Marincola, 242-3.

<sup>26</sup> Rubincam 'The Organisation and Composition of the *Bibliothèque*', *Echos Du Monde Classique* (1987) 314.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ch. 4

influenced by the ideas current in his own day. His perception of the world — the inhabited world — was influenced by the ideas prevalent in Hellenistic thinking. He did not however consider the world from a Roman perspective. Although this is partly due to the nature of the historiographical tradition on which Diodorus drew, a Greek tradition, it is also a result of Diodorus' view of Rome. Rome may have been the biggest city in the world and the most powerful, as history could show and did show Diodorus, was not a constant in any historical equation. Empires rose and fell and this is a theme which plays a central role in the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>28</sup> Katherine Clarke has argued recently that universal history as a genre “was the product of the aspirations of the age”,<sup>29</sup> the thrust of my argument does not concur with this view. I do not think that Diodorus was influenced by these aspirations to write the *Bibliothēke*. As we have seen in Chapter One Diodorus wanted to make history more accessible. Diodorus did not consider the world that had come under the control of one city in need of a history to complement this fact. Polybius, who is not considered a universal historian by Clarke,<sup>30</sup> is a more likely candidate for this job. It is however this very concentration on one city and its history in Polybius which is at odds with the universal history as envisaged by Diodorus. We need only ponder the space given to Rome in the first half of the *Bibliothēke* to be convinced that Rome did not and would not play a central role in the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>31</sup> Rome takes up just twenty-five and a half chapters in the

---

<sup>28</sup> Sacks (1990)

<sup>29</sup> ‘Universal Perspectives in Historiography’ in Kraus ed. *The Limits of Historiography* (Oxford, 1999) 278 “The desire for an all-encompassing history was not, however, merely literary one-upmanship. It was the product of the aspirations of the age”.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* 250.

<sup>31</sup> The first half of the *Bibliothēke* is dominated by Greece, Sicily, North Africa, and Asia Minor

completely extant Books of the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>32</sup> This is not due to Diodorus' Sicilian origin, or to any bias against Rome, it is due to the nature of universal history. No one city or person or place could be given a central role. Diodorus was not Livy, he was not writing a history of Rome or of the areas under Roman control, it was a history of the known world, which just happened to be under Roman control at this point in history. The historiographical tradition on which Diodorus drew was a Greek historiographical tradition and would inevitably dictate to some extent the space given to topics not covered by this tradition. Persia and Egypt are given more space than Rome because they had been part of the Greek Historiographical tradition as a result of the work of Ctesias, Herodotus and Hecataeus.

#### **4. The utility of history**

The fourth area that informs Diodorus' historical perspective is the utility of History.<sup>33</sup> This aspect will by its very nature lead Diodorus to select events based on their ability to instruct Diodorus' audience. It will also lead to some apparently strange omissions from the narrative of the *Bibliothēke*. Two examples may suffice to illustrate this. Diodorus' decision to neglect the rise of Octavian could be a result of this perspective as I have already mentioned Diodorus could not balance Octavian's actions and his success. A second example that we have seen may be found in Diodorus' account of the march of the Ten Thousand Greeks in Book 14.<sup>34</sup> The apparent problems surrounding this passage may be solved if we realise that Diodorus was less interested in the Ten Thousand Greeks than he was in the struggle over the Persian throne.

---

<sup>32</sup> I.e. Books 11-20 c.f. Sacks (1990) 16.

<sup>33</sup> See above Ch. 1.

## Part 2

### Diodorus' perspective and the Diadochoi

In the previous section I examined Sicily's relationship with Rome, as an important factor which informed Diodorus' historical perspective. In summary to understand Diodorus on his own terms we need to understand his background. I have argued that this entails looking on Diodorus as a Greek-Sicilian, who lived in a world dominated by Rome. In addition he wrote a universal history, the raw materials for which he drew from the Greek writers who comprise the historiographical tradition. He did not intend to explain Roman behaviour to the Greeks as Polybius had done or justify their origins and current dominance as Dionysius of Halicarnassus had done.<sup>35</sup> Diodorus' primary interest with Rome was in the area of their treatment of their allies and their provinces. An example of this would be Rome's destruction of Corinth in 146 and the subsequent re-founding of that city by Julius Caesar. This is understandable for a provincial who saw his homeland ravaged by the civil wars of the late Republic.

In the second part of this chapter I will look at how Diodorus' perspective informs his depiction of other political units in the *Bibliothēke*,<sup>36</sup> specifically the Diadochoi in Book 18. There is one broadly thematic reason, which suggests that this may be a useful area of study. Simply put that reason is the similarity between the period of the Diadochoi and the late Republic. At the

---

<sup>34</sup> 14.19.1-31.1.

<sup>35</sup> Poly. 1.1; Dion. Hal.1.4.2 "and indeed the more malicious are wont to rail openly at Fortune for bestowing on the basest of the barbarians the blessings of the Greeks"; compare Diod. Sic. 17.52.5 where Alexandria is described as "the first city of the civilised world".

<sup>36</sup> I have already—in the last section—referred to his use of the rise and fall of empires as a theme in the *Bibliothēke*.

boundary of these periods we have the two men-gods, Alexander and Caesar. This is emphasised by Diodorus' division of the *Bibliothēke* in the Proem. It is divided into three sections, of which the second ends with the death of Alexander, and the third with Caesar's subjugation of the Celts:<sup>37</sup> men whom it is obvious Diodorus perceived as coming at a pivotal time in history.<sup>38</sup> The eulogy to Caesar, on the occasion of the re-founding of Corinth,<sup>39</sup> is out of chronological sequence in the narrative coming, as it does, before Caesar has died; while the portrayal of Alexander is "much more favourable... than the more prevalent version".<sup>40</sup> The periods after the deaths of these two men are similar inasmuch as their successors fought over the empires, which they left behind.

Sicily was a pawn in the civil wars of the late Republic. Its survival depended on its relationship with whichever of the generals were closest at hand. This engendered in Diodorus an interest in the dynamics of benefaction, and his vocabulary is replete with words associated with benefaction.<sup>41</sup> Diodorus' interest in benefaction and the relationship between rulers and those whom they rule. This perspective informs Book 18 of the *Bibliothēke*, Diodorus' selection of material and his editorial comments. In Book 18, Diodorus' investigation of the dynamics of benefaction take the form of an interest in generals and their relationship with their allies and their soldiers.<sup>42</sup> Diodorus is interested in how a leader gains support and subsequently holds it or conversely how he abuses his position and as a result comes to a bad end. Book 18 provides many examples of

---

<sup>37</sup> DS 1.4.6-7; this is strengthened by Diodorus' original intention to bring the *Bibliothēke* to a close with Julius Caesar's triple triumph of 45 BC.

<sup>38</sup> cf. Drews 391ff.

<sup>39</sup> 32.27.3.

<sup>40</sup> Drews 'Diodorus And His Sources' 392.

<sup>41</sup> ἐπιείκεια, βιαίως, εὐνοία, φιλανθρωπῶς.

the notions of moderation and harsh behaviour.<sup>43</sup> These are notions, which are present throughout the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>44</sup> I have already, in the last section, mentioned Diodorus' treatment of the Athenian and Spartan empires specifically the reason for their rise and fall as it is presented in the *Bibliothēke*. I am now going to look at some passages from Book 18 to elucidate how Diodorus uses benefaction as theme in Book 18 and can be traced back to Diodorus' historical perspective.

### 1. Alcetas and the Pisidians

I will begin with a passage, which depicts the attempts of Alcetas, a friend of Perdiccas, to gain the support of the Pisidians after Antigonos defeat of Eumenes. The defeat of Eumenes left Perdiccas allies in Asia isolated. Having defeated Eumenes Antigonos turned his attention towards Alcetas, a friend of Perdiccas, who had to develop an alliance with some force. Alcetas concluded an alliance with the Pisidians which, lasted even after his death. This passage is worth discussing in this context because Diodorus interrupts the narrative in order to include his own comments. He concludes the passage with a philosophical comment on benefaction. Initially Diodorus digresses from the narrative to explain the alliance between Alcetas and the Pisidians. Diodorus explains the origins of the alliance thus:

---

<sup>42</sup> Sacks (1990) 42.

<sup>43</sup> The Greek terms are ἐπιείκεια and βιαιώσις. The terms φιλανθρωπῶσις and εὐνοία are also common terms when it comes to benefaction in the *Bibliothēke*.

<sup>44</sup> By this I mean that the ideas could not be dependent on any one source used by Diodorus because they are found throughout the *Bibliothēke*; Barber, G.L., *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge, 1935) 103 argues that the ideas are Ephoran, and when they are found in sections where Ephorus was not the direct source they can be written off as "pathetic attempts" by Diodorus at imitation of Ephorus.



By employing the most friendly language in his conversation with them, by each day inviting the most important of them in turn to his table at banquets, and finally by honouring many of them with gifts of considerable value, he secured them as loyal supporters.<sup>45</sup>

This, Diodorus tells us, is the manner in which Alcetas gained the support of the Pisidians. When Antigonus came to Termessus looking for Alcetas and demanding that he be handed over, the elders of the city made a deal with Antigonus, in which they agreed to hand him over. Antigonus drew the army away from the city and when the opportunity arose the elders handed over Alcetas to Antigonus. Antigonus killed Alcetas and maltreated his body for three days and finally discarded the body. The notable feature of this incident, and the one which Diodorus emphasises, is the reaction of the young men when they returned to Termessus to find that Alcetas had been handed over to Antigonus. Diodorus describes their reaction thus:

At first they gained possession of part of the town and voted to set the buildings on fire and then, rushing from the town under arms and keeping to the mountains to plunder the country that was subject to

---

<sup>45</sup> 18.46.2.

Antigonus.<sup>46</sup>

Why do the young men behave in this way? The reaction of the young men of Termessus is striking, Diodorus provides us with his solution:

But the young men of Termessus, still preserving their goodwill for the victim, recovered the body and honoured it with splendid obsequies.<sup>47</sup>

What is remarkable here is the durability of the young men's loyalty to Alcetas. They had nothing to gain from this behaviour materially. In fact the decision of the elders to hand over Alcetas probably saved the city. It would not have been able to withstand an assault or siege by Antigonus, who had no intention of leaving without his man. Diodorus ends this digression by drawing a philosophical paradigm based on Alcetas and the Pisidians. It is a paradigm that will be echoed throughout the rest of this section and indeed is echoed in other sections of the *Bibliothēke* as well. Diodorus ends the digression as follows:

Thus kindness in its very nature possesses the peculiar power of a love charm on behalf of benefactors, preserving unchanged men's goodwill toward them.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> 18.47.1.

<sup>47</sup> 18.47.3.

<sup>48</sup> 18.47.3.

This passage is interesting primarily because we see Diodorus digressing from the narrative and drawing a general conclusion, which is applicable to the *Bibliothēke* as a whole. The passage takes on even more significance when contrasted with the rest of Book 18. It is particularly worthwhile to contrast it with a passage which follows it very closely in the narrative. In the following passage we see Arrhidaeus, who was Satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia, seek to strengthen his own Satrapy by garrisoning the city of the Cyziceni. Unlike Alcetas however he does not use benefaction or diplomacy but force to achieve his goal. While besieging the city he received the following message:

The city would do anything for him  
except receive a garrison.<sup>49</sup>

As a result of the action taken by Arrhidaeus the Cyziceni sent for help and in the end were able to repel him. Arrhidaeus had to call off the siege and leave the land without accomplishing anything. Coming shortly after the episode involving Alcetas and the Pisidians, it provides a useful contrast. Alcetas may have lost his life but he retained his supporters, Arrhidaeus forceful tactics by contrast, resulted in nothing but angering Antigonus because Arrhidaeus had tried to force a garrison on a city that was technically free and autonomous.<sup>50</sup>

## 2. Perdiccas and Ptolemy

---

<sup>49</sup> 18.51.3.

I am now going to continue this discussion by looking at the actions of Perdikkas and Ptolemy, specifically, examining Diodorus' characterisation of the two generals. It is important to look at the characterisations because Diodorus links this to their successes and failures respectively. Moreover this is worthwhile because of the favourable light in which Ptolemy is presented. Hieronymus of Cardia would not have portrayed Ptolemy in this way and even if Diodorus is following a variant source at this point, it serves to highlight Diodorus willingness and ability to bring his own interests to the fore.<sup>51</sup> I will also look at the attempts of another general, Pithon, to gain allies because of the methods he uses and also because Pithon will gain success in the end even if his initial efforts are scuppered. Let us begin with a passage from opening of chapter 7:

The Greeks, who had been settled by Alexander in the upper satrapies, as they were called, although they longed for Greek customs and manner of life and were cast away in the most distant part of the kingdom, yet submitted while the king was alive through fear; but when he was dead they rose to revolt.<sup>52</sup>

The Greeks, though cut off from their homeland, felt no loyalty towards Alexander or his successors. They only remained obedient "through fear" of

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. 14.2.1 "For the superiority of those who enjoy leadership is maintained by goodwill and justice, and is overthrown by acts of injustice and by the hatred of their subjects".

Alexander. The death of Alexander and the resulting disunity provided them with the opportunity to revolt. As a result Pithon was entrusted with the task of subduing the Greeks. Realising the root of their disaffection Pithon attempted to win them over. His methods for winning them over are interesting, Diodorus reports that:

Pithon, who was a man of great ambition gladly accepted the expedition, intending to win the Greeks over through kindness and after making his army great through an alliance with them, to work in his own interests and become ruler of the upper satrapies.<sup>53</sup>

Pithon, like Alcetas in the earlier passage, understands the importance of benefaction in forming alliances, and as a result Pithon wins over the Greeks. His soldiers, however, were aware of the orders he had received from Perdiccas, namely to kill all he rebels; this they did and Pithon's plan came to nothing.<sup>54</sup> In this instance Pithon's efforts to make an alliance are hampered not by his own actions but by the loyalty of his soldiers to his superior, Perdiccas.

Pithon's methods prove in the long term to be successful. The action of his men in killing the Greeks was a direct command from Perdiccas. This type of violence is typical of Perdiccas and his hold on power. The ensuing events give

---

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Hieronymus' association with Eumenes in Ch. 4.

<sup>52</sup> 18.7.1.

<sup>53</sup> 18.7.3.

<sup>54</sup> 18.7.8-9.

Diodorus an opportunity to show once again the advantages of moderate behaviour. The next passage at which I will look gives Diodorus the opportunity to compare the methods of two of the generals and contrast their relative success or failure. Diodorus begins with a blunt statement regarding Perdiccas:

Perdiccas, indeed, was a man of blood, one who usurped the authority of other commanders and in general, wished to rule all by force.<sup>55</sup>

The phrase “to rule all by force” translates from the Greek *αρχειν βιαως* the word *βιαως* is favoured by Diodorus. In Diodorus’ scheme those in power that behave harshly will eventually suffer a loss. In contrast with this characterisation of Perdiccas, Diodorus presents us with a very favourable description of Ptolemy that is based on the way he uses his power. This is how Diodorus describes Ptolemy:

Ptolemy, on the contrary, was generous and fair and granted to all the commanders the right to speak frankly... This explains why he had, as a rule, the advantage in his undertakings, since he had many persons who were willing to undergo danger gladly for his

---

<sup>55</sup> 18.32.3.

sake.<sup>56</sup>

The contrast between the behaviour of Perdiccas and Ptolemy is marked by the appearance of words favoured by Diodorus. They are also the reasons, which Diodorus gives for Ptolemy's success and Perdiccas' failure and eventual death. The following narrative details Perdiccas' invasion of Egypt, and ends with a description of the death of Perdiccas:

Therefore many of the commanders joined together and accused Perdiccas, and all the phalanx of the infantry, alienated from him made clear their own hostility with threatening shouts...some also of the cavalry conspired together and went to the tent of Perdiccas, where they fell on him in a body and stabbed him to death.<sup>57</sup>

Perdiccas' death and the success of Ptolemy are depicted as a direct result of their relative treatment of their allies and soldiers. Perdiccas' wish to rule all by force ends with his death. The action taken by Ptolemy at this point is notable; though successful and in a strong position Ptolemy does not attempt to take on the guardianship of the kings and claim the legitimacy that would accompany such a course of action. Instead he rewards the men who were foremost in killing

---

<sup>56</sup> 18.32.3-4; see also 18.14.2 "A multitude of friends also gathered about him (Ptolemy) on account of his fairness (ἐπιεικείαν)"; 18.28.6 "The gods also saved him (Ptolemy) unexpectedly from the greatest dangers on account of his courage and his honest treatment (ἐπιεικείαν) of all his friends". The military success of Antigonos Monophthalmos, is also linked by Diodorus to his

foremost in killing Perdiccas. Diodorus describes the events thus:

Although he gained great applause and was in a position to assume the guardianship of the kings through the favour of the rank and file, he did not grasp at this, but rather since he owed a debt of gratitude to Pithon and Arrhidaeus, he used his influence to give them the supreme command.<sup>58</sup>

There is no doubt that Ptolemy, though not dominating the narrative, dominates Diodorus' own asides.<sup>59</sup> The reason for this is that he exemplifies the successful leader in the *Bibliothēke*. He was successful not primarily because of his tactical abilities, but because as Diodorus puts it he was "generous and fair".<sup>60</sup>

The central problem however with this approach to the *Bibliothēke* is that Diodorus at times is more concerned with letting the narrative make his points for him. This is most obvious in the area of speeches, traditionally an area of history writing where the historian had a certain freedom to impose his own

---

ability to treat his soldiers fairly and win them back if their loyalty is beginning to sway, see for e.g. 19.20.1.

<sup>57</sup> 18.36.4-5.

<sup>58</sup> 18.36.6.

<sup>59</sup> Ptolemy appears thirteen times in Book 18, and is treated very positively on nine occasions; he is never portrayed negatively. 18.14.1;21.7;28.5;33.3;34.2;34.4;36.1;36.6;39.5 (the Ptolemy of Book 17 is the same Ptolemy we find in Book 18 see 17.103.7. By aside I mean a comment which is not part of the narrative e.g., "the gods also saved him unexpectedly from the greatest dangers on account of his courage and his honest treatment of all his friends" 18.28.9.



perspective on the narrative. The clearest expression of this freedom comes from Thucydides, he remarks in the Introduction to his work:

So my method has been, while keeping as closely as possible to the general sense of the words that were actually used, to make the speakers say what, in my opinion, was called for by each situation.<sup>61</sup>

Diodorus does not have time for the luxury of such speeches because he prefers to let the narrative flow, and he thinks that speeches interrupt the narrative:

One might justly censure those who in their histories insert over-long orations or employ frequent speeches; for not only do they rend asunder the continuity of the narrative by their ill-timed insertion of speeches, but also they interrupt the interest of those who are eagerly pressing on toward a full knowledge of the events.<sup>62</sup>

For this reason we must look more carefully at the narrative of the *Bibliothèque*, and take note of the repetition of themes. As we have seen in the

---

<sup>60</sup> There are obviously many reasons for the success enjoyed by Ptolemy, which Diodorus does not emphasise, the location of Egypt to name but one, these are not stressed by Diodorus and it is for that reason that I do not stress them.

<sup>61</sup> 1.22.

second half of this chapter, Diodorus can stamp his own interests on the *Bibliothēke* through this process of selection, and even by his reconstruction of the narrative. The juxtaposition of two events involving the Pisidians and then the Cyziceni is an example of this. This may seem to make it more difficult to propose any central unity in the *Bibliothēke*, at least a unity which may be clearly presentable. In fact it makes his selection of sources all the more important and his presentation of the material— specifically his selection and synthesis of sources. Of this I will speak in the next section.

Diodorus also explains to the reader that he has not the time to insert long introductions, in the manner of some of the older historians.<sup>63</sup>

If we were composing a history after the manner of the other historians, we should, I suppose, discourse upon certain topics at appropriate length in the introduction to each Book and by this means turn our discussion to the events which follow; surely if we were picking out a brief period of history for our treatise, we should have the time to enjoy the fruit such introductions yield. But since we engaged ourselves in a few Books not only to set forth, to the best of our ability, the events

---

<sup>62</sup> 20.1.1.

<sup>63</sup> Although he does not indicate Ephorus by name, it is reasonable to assume it is he Diodorus has in mind.

which embrace a period of more than eleven hundred years, we must forego the long discussion which such introductions would involve and come to the events themselves...<sup>64</sup>

We should not expect Diodorus to be as forthcoming as some of his predecessors; he simply does not allow himself the time.<sup>65</sup> Diodorus does not contemplate complex historical *aitiai*, the causes of events. By this I mean that Diodorus believes that events can be explained by looking at the actions of the individuals involved. The narrative is the important element in the *Bibliothēke* and Diodorus is content to let the narrative do most of the work. Despite this reluctance to interrupt the narrative Diodorus own perspective still has an influence. This is the case because Diodorus could not narrate everything that had happened from mythological times down to his own day. As a result, Diodorus reveals his own preoccupations in the selection process which preceded the writing of the *Bibliothēke* .

## Conclusion

In this chapter I have looked at some aspects of the historical perspective of Diodorus. I have stressed the importance which must be attributed to Diodorus' origins in Sicily. This influenced, for example, his views on Rome. Sicily's relationship with Rome led Diodorus to have an interest in benefaction. I have

---

<sup>64</sup> 13.1.1-2.

<sup>65</sup> The more sceptical such as Stylianou and Hornblower would put it down to his laziness.

also suggested that Diodorus' historical perspective is a complex matter. In addition to being Sicilian, Diodorus was also influenced by the historiographical tradition on which he drew while writing the *Bibliothēke*. His view of history as a didactic genre is another area which tells us much about the *Bibliothēke*, and allows us to elucidate Diodorus' aims and methods. Finally, Diodorus' conception of the past as a flow of events led him to draw general conclusions about history. It is through Diodorus that moderate behaviour and benefaction can never fail.

We saw these influences at play in Diodorus' depiction of the Diadochoi in Books 18-20. The contrast between Ptolemy and Perdiccas is made on the basis of the way they treat others. Similarly the presentation of the events surrounding Alcetas and the Pisidians exhibits Diodorus' influence. The reaction of the young men of Termessus proves to Diodorus that benefaction does work. Why else would the young men have behaved in such a way after the death of Alcetas. It is only by developing a more sensitive understanding of Diodorus as a historian with a perspective which is his own that we can really come to understand the inner workings of the *Bibliothēke*.

## Chapter 4

### DIODORUS, HIERONYMUS AND RHODES

#### Introduction

Books 18-20 of the *Bibliothēke* are an account of the years from the Alexander's death in 323 to the Battle of Ipsus in 302. It is the only full and continuous narrative of these years.<sup>1</sup> I am going to look at the background to these Books and at the question of sources. I will do this to show that Diodorus did not write an epitome of Hieronymus' work, instead he used Hieronymus in conjunction with other subsidiary sources. The problem is that Books 18-20 have traditionally been seen as based on only one primary source—the lost history of Hieronymus of Cardia.<sup>2</sup> However, if you consider that he used several sources while writing the previous two Books, it is unlikely that he would then base the next three Books, covering a lesser number of years, on just one account. It is to Diodorus' own preoccupations that we must look to solve this problem. As I have already suggested that Diodorus saw a parallel between his own era and the era of the successors. It is from this position that we could seek to explain the amount of space devoted to the successors in the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Arrian's *Ta Meta Alexandron* covered the same topic but in its present state covers only the years from 323-320. The chapters devoted to Sicily chart the rise of Agathocles.

<sup>2</sup> Brown, T.S., 'Hieronymus of Cardia' *The American Historical Review* 52 (1947) 684-96; Hornblower; Walbank, F.W., *The Hellenistic World* (London,1981); Shipley, G., *The Greek World After Alexander 323-30BC* (London,2000).

<sup>3</sup> Chapter 3.

## 1. Hieronymus of Cardia

Although I will argue that Diodorus used more than one source for Books 18-20, Hieronymus was the most important source for the general outline of the narrative. Therefore it will be useful at this point to look at Hieronymus and sketch the main details about this historian and his work. Hieronymus was born in Cardia and was closely associated with Eumenes of Cardia. Eumenes was originally secretary to Alexander the Great. After Alexander's death Perdiccas, who was at the time regent for the Kingdom and in supreme command, gave Eumenes the task of subduing Cappadocia and Paphlagonia. Eumenes eventually achieved this with the help of Perdiccas. Eumenes remained loyal to the Kings and thus to Perdiccas, their regent. In the aftermath of Perdiccas' death in 320, Eumenes found himself isolated in Asia. For the next four years Eumenes found himself in a constant battle with Antigonus until in 316 he was betrayed by his own troops to Antigonus, tried and executed.

After Eumenes' death Hieronymus served successively the first three Antigonid kings who eventually secured the throne of Macedon: Antigonus Monophthalmos, Demetrius Poliorcetes and Antigonus Gonatus. Hieronymus took on various roles during his time with the Antigonids. He served mainly as either a diplomat or governor while the fact that we never hear of him in a military position suggests that he never played a military role. It is not known when he wrote his history however, it is unlikely that he would have found the time to write it at the time of the events described. Moreover, we know that he was still writing it as late as 272 —the death of Pyrrhus is mentioned— and as a

result it is possible to speculate that he wrote it during his retirement at the court of Antigonus Gonatus. The title of his work is unknown, though Diodorus did refer to him as having written the history of the successors, ὁ τὰς τῶν διαδόχων ἱστορίας γεγραφώς<sup>4</sup> It seems to have been a history of the years from 323 to 272. Hieronymus records the death of Pyrrhus in 272 and therefore must have lived beyond that event. Unfortunately all that remains of Hieronymus' work are fragments from other authors that are believed to originate in Hieronymus.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, there are no verbatim quotations from the work of Hieronymus. This lack of evidence for Hieronymus suggests that modern critics would have to be very careful when discussing the historian and his work. However, it has been assumed that Books 18-20 of the *Bibliothèque* are merely an epitome of Hieronymus' work and on that basis he has been regarded as an historian of merit.<sup>6</sup> Books 18-20 of the *Bibliothèque* are thought to be an epitome of Hieronymus work primarily because of the central position in these Books of the three men whom Hieronymus served during the years covered by these books: Eumenes, Antigonus and Demetrius. It is principally due to the importance in the narrative assumed by these men that Hieronymus has been seen as the ultimate source for Books 18-20 of the *Bibliothèque*.

Though having a good reputation in modern times, Hieronymus was not always regarded in such terms. Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers to the work of Hieronymus as being so boring that you could not read it through to the end

---

<sup>4</sup> 18.42.1.

<sup>5</sup> The fragments and Testimonia of Hieronymus take up only seven pages in Jacoby *Die Fragmente der griechische Historiker*, IIB no.154 pp. 829-835. These pages are also reproduced in Hornblower *Hieronymus of Cardia* (1981) pp. 256-62 with a commentary pp. 238-55. Cf. Brunt 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes' *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980) 477-94.

while Pausanias accuses him of being biased against all the kings except Antigonus Gonatus.<sup>7</sup> Hieronymus was not the only source for this period. Polybius tells us that the successors to Alexander had many accounts devoted to their exploits:

But after Alexander's death, when they became rivals for the possession of an empire, which covered the greater part of the earth, the glory of their achievements was such to fill chronicle after chronicle with the record of their exploits.<sup>8</sup>

Walbank, in his commentary on Polybius, states without a convincing argument that in fact this period was sparingly treated by historians.<sup>9</sup> Walbank seems to base this assertion on the remains of the Greek historians found in Jacoby. If, however, we discount the comment of Walbank the question of sources behind Books 18-20 can be broached more confidently. That is not to say that the *Bibliothèque* is a jigsaw puzzle to be solved backwards. Diodorus, if we were to believe Polybius, would have had more than one source to choose from for the Diadochoi. Indeed if we add to this the comment of Dionysius that Hieronymus was a boring writer, it is possible that Diodorus would have looked beyond Hieronymus for aspects of his account. I will argue in the rest of this chapter that there is evidence to suggest that Diodorus did in fact combine more

---

<sup>6</sup> Hornblower for e.g. and cf. Review of Hornblower a study of Hieronymus is a study of Diodorus Bosworth *JHS* (1983) 209-10.

<sup>7</sup> Dion. Hal. *De Comp. Verb.* 4.30; Paus. 1.9.8.

<sup>8</sup> 8.10.

<sup>9</sup> Walbank *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* Vol. 2 85



than one source for the Diadochoi. To broaden the context of this argument I will begin by comparing the amount of space devoted to Books 16 and 17 with that given to the three Books covering the Diadochoi.

## **2. Comparison of Book 18-20 and Books 16 and 17**

I will argue in this section that Diodorus used more than one source for Books 18-20 based on the amount of space devoted to the Diadochoi in comparison with the previous two Books. If we compare the amount of space given to the events in Books 18-20 with the previous two Books — those that deal with the careers of Philip and Alexander of Macedon respectively — some interesting points arise. First, the number of years covered by Book 16 is twenty-five years. They cover the time from Philip's accession to the throne in 360 down to his death in 336. The following Book covers twelve years from Alexander's accession to the throne down to his death in 324. This gives us a total of thirty-seven years for these two Books. The following three Books cover a period of twenty-one years. This is an average of seven years per Book, which is considerably lower than for the previous two Books, which averaged eighteen and a half years per Book. Secondly, the average is lower than the average for any section in the first half of the *Bibliothēke*. It is only as Diodorus approaches contemporary events that the average comes down to that found in Books 18-20.<sup>10</sup>

The reason for this imbalance is puzzling at first. What are the possible reasons for this imbalance? It cannot be attributed to the lack of sources for the

previous two Books. There were many accounts of the career of Alexander on which Diodorus could draw.<sup>11</sup> He did not for example simply choose the most popular or prevalent account of the career of Alexander. In fact he went to great lengths to compose an account of Alexander's career.<sup>12</sup> Tarn has suggested that Diodorus used at least two sources for the career of Alexander, and, moreover, that he was the first to present Alexander in such a favourable light, while at the same time including many elements which were unfavourable to Alexander.<sup>13</sup> Similarly for the career of Philip, Diodorus did not seem to draw on just one account. As Hammond has demonstrated there are at least three sources behind the account of Philip's career: Ephorus, Theopompus and Diyllus.<sup>14</sup> I would suggest that if Diodorus used multiple sources while composing Books 17 and 18, it is very likely that he adopted the same approach to Books 18-20. In the rest of this chapter I will examine the evidence for more than one source.

### **3. Is there evidence for more than one source?**

In what follows, I will attempt to argue from the particular to the general. I will look at the depiction of Rhodes in Books 19 and 20. My reason for doing this is based on the hypothesis that if Diodorus used more than one source for a small section of the Book, the belief that Diodorus was a mere epitomator of Hieronymus becomes difficult to sustain. I will look at three specific items: the

---

<sup>10</sup> Books 11-20 account for the years 480-302, an average of 17.8 years per Book. The second half of the *Bibliothèque* averages 12.1 years per Book.

<sup>11</sup> Arrian, *Anabasis* I.1 "There are other accounts of Alexander's life—more of them, indeed, and more mutually conflicting than any other historical character".

<sup>12</sup> Drews, 'Diodorus and His Sources' *AJP* 83 (1962) pp.383-92.

<sup>13</sup> *Alexander the Great I* 71,131.

flood of Rhodes in 316, the description of the *helepolis* used by Demetrius Poliorcetes in 305/4 and the description of the climax of the siege of Rhodes in 304. By doing this I hope to show that there are at least three sources being used by Diodorus for this section. In addition to that I will argue that Diodorus own perspective influenced the depiction of Rhodes.

I will begin with Diodorus' description of a flood at Rhodes in 316. His account reads as follows:

The last befell at the beginning of spring, great rainstorms suddenly bursting forth with hail of incredible size. Indeed, hailstones fell weighing a mina and sometimes more, so that many of the houses collapsed because of the weight and no small number of inhabitants were killed. Since Rhodes is shaped like a theatre and since the streams of water were thus deflected chiefly into a single region, the lower parts of the city were straightaway flooded; for, because it was thought that the rainy season of winter had passed, the drains had been neglected and the drainage openings through the city walls had become clogged.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Hammond 'The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI' in *Collected Studies I: Studies in Greek Literature and History, Excluding Epirus and Macedonia* (1993) pp.1-28 Hammond identifies at last three definite sources: Ephorus, Theopompus and Diyllus.

This seems to be a detailed description of the flood and the events surrounding it. We are given the size of the hailstones, details on the topography of the city and a logical explanation of how the flood arose. It is likely, therefore, that the information came from an eyewitness account of the flood. There is too much detail contained for it to come from a history which had no more than a passing interest in Rhodes. The reactions of the inhabitants are also described in detail, Diodorus tells us:

It was to the advantage of those who were endangered that the flood came by day, for most of the people escaped in time from their houses to the higher parts of the city; and also that the houses were not constructed of sun-dried brick but of stone and that for this reason those who took refuge upon the roofs were safe. Yet in this great disaster more than five hundred persons lost their lives, while some houses collapsed completely and others were badly shaken.<sup>16</sup>

The details contained in this passage also suggest that an eyewitness provided it. We have a description that has an intimate knowledge of the events on the day of the flood, and of the reactions of the inhabitants. The statement that many of the houses were made of stone rather than sun-dried brick adds an extra

---

<sup>15</sup> 19.45.2-4.

<sup>16</sup> 19.45.7-8.

layer of detail to the overall picture.

Moreover, this incident which takes up a chapter of the narrative between the death of Eumenes and the death of Pithon. Eumenes, as I have already mentioned, was a closely associated with Hieronymus, and it is strange that Hieronymus would have passed over the death of his friend without some comment or eulogy.<sup>17</sup> Diodorus does not present such a eulogy in the *Bibliothēke*. The amount of detail included in the account suggests that an eyewitness account is the ultimate source.<sup>18</sup> It is possible, therefore, that this account came from a history of Rhodes, rather than from Hieronymus. We even know that there was such a history written in the second century, by the politician Zeno of Rhodes.<sup>19</sup>

Diodorus' use of detail is also evident from the description of the *helepolis* used by Demetrius Poliorcetes during his siege of the Rhodes in 305/4:

The whole structure was moveable, mounted on eight great solid wheels; the width of their rims was two cubits and those were overlaid with heavy iron plates. To permit motion to the side, pivots had been constructed, by means of which the whole device was easily moved in any direction. From each corner

---

<sup>17</sup> It is believed that Hieronymus wrote his history at some stage after the events, and would therefore have been free to comment on Eumenes' death without fear of antagonising Antigonus.

<sup>18</sup> 20.91.

<sup>19</sup> *OCD*<sup>3</sup> 1635. Hornblower 58-59.

there extended upward beams equal in length and little short of a hundred cubits long, inclining toward each other in such a way that, the whole structure being nine storeys high, the first storey had an area of forty-three hundred square feet and the topmost storey of nine hundred. The three exposed sides of the machine he covered externally with iron plates nailed on so that it should receive no injury from the fire carriers. On each storey there were ports on the front, in size and shape fitted to the individual characteristics of the missiles that were to be shot forth. These ports had shutters, which were lifted by a mechanical device which secured the safety of the men on the platforms who were busy serving the artillery<sup>20</sup>

The detailed description of the *helepolis* with the emphasis on its mechanics and the inclusion of its measurements — Diodorus tells us the areas of the first and ninth storey — suggests that the passage is based on a source devoted to military engineering. Furthermore, Diocleides of Abdera was famous for his description of the *helepolis* of Demetrius.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, it is possible that Diodorus drew on a description such as that found in Diocleides.

---

<sup>20</sup> 20.91.3-4.

<sup>21</sup> Ath. v 206 d-e, cf. Hornblower p.56.

There is also a notable difference in style between the description of the flood and the description of the *helepolis*. The description of the flood contains no technical language, whereas the description of the *helepolis* is dominated by technical vocabulary. It is unlikely therefore that they are from the same source. In theory Diodorus could have taken this information from two subsidiary sources: one on local Rhodian history, the other a technical treatise on siege engines. If this is the case, then it would mean that Diodorus, when writing this section of the *Bibliothēke*, used two other sources in addition to Hieronymus. Consequently, the effort expended by Diodorus is much greater than that imagined by those who see him merely as Hieronymus' epitomator.

#### **4. Diodorus' description of the siege of Rhodes**

The siege of Rhodes by Demetrius in 305/4, for which he gained the epithet *poliorcetes*, adds an extra dimension to the narrative while posing further questions about the methods of Diodorus. Thus far I have argued that Diodorus used two subsidiary sources in conjunction with Hieronymus. In this section I will argue that Diodorus combines two accounts of the siege of Rhodes: one from a local Rhodian history, the other from Hieronymus. Moreover, I will argue that Diodorus' own perspective influenced his account of the siege of Rhodes, to such an extent that it is more than the sum of the two primary sources. I will begin with a passage that describes the feelings of the Rhodians just after Demetrius has completed the construction of the *helepolis*. Diodorus captures the balance well in his description of the onset of the siege.

He opens this section with a description of the alarm of the Rhodians:

As everything, therefore, because of the many hands was finished sooner than was expected, Demetrius was regarded with alarm by the Rhodians; for not only did the size of the siege engines and the number of the army which had been gathered stun the them, but also the King's energy and ingenuity in conducting sieges.<sup>22</sup>

The alarm of the Rhodians is emphasised by Diodorus. Indeed, at this point we are looking at the onset of the siege from a Rhodian perspective. However, in the next passage the alarm of the Rhodians gives way to admiration for Demetrius 'the besieger'. Diodorus continues:

And he displayed such superiority and force in his attacks that it seemed that no wall was strong enough to furnish safety from him when besieged. Both in stature and in beauty he displayed the dignity of a hero, so that even strangers who had come from a distance, when they beheld his comeliness arrayed in royal splendour, marvelled at him as he went abroad

---

<sup>22</sup> 20.92.1.



in order to gaze at him.<sup>23</sup>

In contrast to the passage emphasising the Rhodian's alarm, this passage concentrates on Demetrius' heroic qualities. This is patently not the perspective of a Rhodian patriot. Demetrius is described literally as a hero, ηρωικός. Only a source close to Demetrius would describe him in these terms. Hieronymus probably was that source. Yet, this would not explain the Rhodian perspective in the passage describing the onset of the siege.

Another possibility now comes to the fore. Diodorus, himself had an admiration for the great man in history.<sup>24</sup> He also as I have shown elsewhere had a keen interest in benefaction, and in diplomacy.<sup>25</sup> Both Demetrius and Antigonus were hailed as benefactors across the Greek world for their stance on the Greek city-states.<sup>26</sup> Rhodes itself had set up statues in honour of the two Antigonids. Diodorus may have been caught up in a real quandary while narrating this siege. He, was a man from an island which had to balance their own needs with the needs of that of the Romans who controlled Sicily, may have had sympathy and no little admiration for the Rhodians success in optimising their strengths. At the same time perhaps influenced by Hieronymus, the great ideas of Demetrius also capture his admiration. As a result we have a strangely balanced account of the siege.

---

<sup>23</sup> 20.92.2-3.

<sup>24</sup> Julius Caesar and Alexander the Great are given epochal significance because of their place in the plan for the *Bibliothèque*, Rubincam, C. 'How Many Books Did Diodorus Siculus originally intend to write' *Classical Quarterly* 48 (1998) 210-14.

<sup>25</sup> Ch. 3.

However, Rhodes future was in danger if they succumbed to the efforts of Demetrius. The city had not been plundered in recent times and many private individuals accompanied Demetrius fleet in the hope of gaining profit from the expedition. The siege of Rhodes may have earned Demetrius his famous epithet but, as in the earlier aborted invasion of Egypt, Antigonus paid a high price for his belief in his son. The Rhodians were able to build the Colossus from the sale of the *helepolis*. Finally the end of the siege describes the Rhodians in heroic terms. The description comes from an author with a special feeling for the island.

Diodorus describes the final struggle thus:

At first neither side withdrew from its position; but afterwards as the Rhodians constantly added to their numbers and were prompt to face danger —, as is the way with men fighting for their native land and their most precious things, —and on the other hand the King's men were in distress, Alcimus and Mantias, their commanders, expired after receiving many wounds, most of the others were killed in hand-to-hand fighting or were captured, and only a few escaped to the king or survived. Many also of the Rhodians were slain, among whom was the president Damoteles, who had won great acclaim for his

---

<sup>26</sup> Austin, M.M., *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge, 1981) 31 'Letter from Antigonus to Scepis in the

valour.<sup>27</sup>

In the end the bravery of the Rhodians comes to the fore. The chapter ends with the Rhodians honouring all that had showed themselves to be brave during the defence of the city. The Rhodians survive in the end and manage to repel the attack of Demetrius. The account is not at the same time one-sided. The depiction of Demetrius adds balance to the account.

### **Conclusion**

In this chapter we have seen that Diodorus devoted more space to the age of the successors in the *Bibliothèque* than to the combined reigns of Philip and Alexander. This imbalance I have attributed to a particular interest on Diodorus' part with the age of the successors. Moreover we have seen that within the age of the successors, Diodorus had a particular interest in the role of Rhodes. Once again, I have argued that Diodorus interest in Rhodes derived from it occupying a comparable position within the Age of the Successors as that occupied by Sicily in the Diodorus' contemporary world. Furthermore, Diodorus own historical perspective and preoccupations such as his interest in the great man in history allowed, or even encouraged, him to combine several sources and then to add his own spin on the events. The thoughtful balance achieved in Diodorus' depiction of the siege of Rhodes is a result of these factors.

---

Troad (311)'.  
<sup>27</sup> 20.98.9.

## CONCLUSION

The problem that I began with in this dissertation was that Diodorus Siculus, as a historian, is not considered worthy of study in his own right. Although source-criticism is less fashionable today than it has been in the past, Stylianou's work on Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliothēke* has viewed it merely as a conduit for other historians such as Ephorus and Hieronymus of Cardia. The cause of the problem is that the old assumptions about Diodorus still prevail, as is evident especially from the work of Stylianou. Consequently, the aim of this dissertation was to make a close examination of the text of the *Bibliothēke*, while at the same time investigating Diodorus as a historian in his own right. To accomplish this aim I endeavoured to tackle four aspects that would help elucidate the historical thought and method of Diodorus' *Bibliothēke*.

In the first chapter I delineated Diodorus' views on history as they emerge from the General Proem. We saw that Diodorus had definite ideas about history and the way history should be written if it is going to be beneficial. Having done this, I turned to one of the problems surrounding any discussion of the General Proem: the assumption that Diodorus relies on Polybius for his historical thought. In the second chapter I showed that while there are similarities between the views expressed in the Introduction to Polybius' *Histories* and the General Proem to the *Bibliothēke*, the differences are more fundamental. Diodorus envisages universal history on a universal scale, not only will the *Bibliothēke* have temporal depth, it will also have spatial width. In contrast the history envisaged by Polybius concentrates on spatial width.

Polybius will cover the inhabited world at a specific moment in history that is during Rome's conquest of the Mediterranean world while Diodorus will set forth a history of the entire known world from the mythological times down to his own day. In the third chapter I showed that Diodorus has an important historical perspective, a perspective, moreover, that influences to some extent his depiction of events in the *Bibliothēke*. Once this is clear, then it becomes possible to trace certain themes throughout the narrative of the *Bibliothēke*, themes that Diodorus has chosen to emphasise. The example which I have taken during the course of this dissertation is that of benefaction, particularly the relationships between those in differing positions of authority. This can be seen in chapter three during the discussion of Alcetas and the Pisidians; it is also to the fore in the discussion of Ptolemy and Perdikkas. In the fourth chapter, I showed that Diodorus does not simply follow one source at a time for any given section of the *Bibliothēke*. Furthermore, Diodorus was capable of combining two or more sources for one event, with the result that we can see Diodorus as a historian who was in a position to adapt on the sources that he began with. As a result of this examination Diodorus Siculus deserves more serious consideration as a historian in his own right and not merely as a source for the lost histories that he used during his research.

## ANCIENT AUTHORS

Arrian, *The Campaigns of Alexander*, tr. Aubrey de Selincourt,  
(Harmondsworth, 1971).

Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*, tr. C.B. Gulick et. al., (London, 1927-41).

Dio Cassius, *Dio's Roman History* tr. E. Cary et. al., (London, 1914-47).

Diodorus Siculus, *Diodorus of Sicily: The Library of History* tr. C.H. Oldfather  
et. al.,(London, 1947-67).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On literary Composition* tr.W.R. Roberts, (London,  
1910).

Herodotus, *The Histories* tr. Aubrey de Selincourt, (Harmondsworth, 1996).

John Malalas, *Chronicle* tr. E. Jeffreys et. al., (Melbourne, 1986).

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* tr. M.M. Innes, (Harmondsworth, 1979).

Pausanias, *Description of Greece* tr. W.H.S. Jones, (Cambridge, 1918-35).

Pliny, *Natural History* tr. H. Rackham, (Cambridge, 1938-63).

Polybius, *The Rise of the Roman Empire* tr. I. Scott-Kilvert, (Harmondsworth,  
1979).

## MODERN STUDIES

Austin, M.M., *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A selection of Sources in Translation* (Cambridge, 1981).

Barber, G.L., *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge, 1935).

Bosworth, A.B., review of Hornblower (1981) *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 103 (1983).

Billows, R., *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (California, 1991).

Brown, T.S., 'Hieronymus of Cardia', *The American Historical Review*, 52 (1947) 684-96.

Brunt, P.A., 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *Classical Quarterly*, 30 (1980) 477-94.

Burton, A., *Diodorus Book I: A Commentary* (Leiden, 1972).

Clarke, K., 'Universal Perspectives in Historiography' in Krauss ed. *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, Boston, Koln, 1999).

Drews, R., 'Diodorus and His Sources', *American Journal of Philology*, 83 (1962) 383-92.

Flower, M.A., *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC* (Oxford, 1994).

Green, P., review of Stylianou (1998), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 99.10.11.(1999).

Hammond, N.G.L., 'The Sources for Diodorus Siculus XVI in *Collected Studies I: Studies in Greek Literature and History, Excluding Epirus and Macedonia* (Amsterdam, 1993) 1-28.

Hornblower, J., *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford, 1981).

Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker IIB* (Leiden, 1995).

Kells, J.H., review of Palm (1955) *Classical Review*, 71 (1957).

Marincola, J., *Tradition and Authority in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997).

Merker, I.L., 'Diodorus Siculus and Hieronymus of Cardia', *The Ancient History Bulletin*, 2.4 (1988) 90-93.



Palm, J., *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien* (Lund, 1955).

Rubincam, C., 'The Organization and Composition of Diodorus' Bibliothek' in  
*Echos du Monde Classique* 31 (1987) 313-28.

——— 'How Many Books Did Diodorus Siculus Originally intend to  
write?', *Classical Quarterly*, 48 (1998) 210-14

Sacks, K., *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton, 1990).

——— *Polybius on the Writing of History* (Berkeley, 1981).

——— 'The Lesser Prooemia of Diodorus Siculus', *Hermes*, 110 (1981) 434-  
43.

——— 'Diodorus Siculus: Conformity and Creativity', in S. Hornblower ed.  
*Greek Historiography* (Oxford, 1994) 213-32.

Shibley, G., *The Greek World After Alexander 323-30 BC* (London, New York,  
2000).

Simpson, R.H., 'Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus' *American Journal of  
Philology*, 80 (1959) 370-79.

Stadter, P.A., 'Thinking About Historians', *American Journal of Philology*, 113  
(1992) 81-5.

Stylianou, P.J., *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus XV* (Oxford,  
1998).

——— Review of Sacks (1990) in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 02.06.19.  
(1991).

Tarn, W.W., *Alexander the Great I* (Cambridge, 1948).

Walbank, F.W., *A Commentary on Polybius* 3 vols. (Oxford, 1957-78).

——— *The Hellenistic World* (London, 1981).