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NEW AND OLD APPROACHES TO DIODOROS: CAN THEY BE RECONCILED?*

Catherine Rubincam

Abstract: This paper briefly reviews the past century of Diodorean scholarship, noting the changes in attitude and methodology that have taken place gradually over the past 50 years, which have led to more attention being focused on the Bibliotheca Historike for itself, rather than primarily as a source from which to extract fragments of its lost sources. Three case studies are then discussed as examples of the benefits that can result from the attempt to reconcile old and new approaches to Diodoros. It is argued that moving beyond the traditional antagonism to a more integrated methodology would enable us all to benefit from the rich diversity of scholarship currently in progress on this much criticised historian, whose work will surely remain a crucial literary source for so many periods of Graeco-Roman history.

* * *

Poor Diodoros! He never aimed or claimed to be a Thucydidides or a Polybios: he was not, and he knew he was not, a primary historian composing the first narrative account of events of his own lifetime, using contemporary sources. His declared purpose was rather to write a summary digest of all the history worth knowing, mentioning memorable

* Thanks are due first to the Triumvirate of Lisa Hau, Alexander Meeus, and Brian Sheridan, for organising the conference at which the papers here collected for publication were originally presented, and for inviting me to give one of the keynote addresses, and second to all the participants in the conference, for making so rewarding these unusual three days of concentrated conversation about Diodorean studies. The conference and this volume should be sufficient proof that the field is very much alive and capable of generating significant new insights into the Bibliotheca Historike and the vast period of ancient history contained within it. Much of the research on which my paper is based was supported by a series of Standard Research Grants from the Social Sciences & Humanities Research Council of Canada spanning the period 1999-2012. Finally, my husband, Irvin Rubincam, continues to be a source of wonderful support and encouragement, always ready to ask useful questions, to talk through problems, and to critique drafts of what I have written.
achievements by individuals, states, and empires, from mythical times to his own lifetime.\(^1\) He believed passionately in the value of history for moral education, and intended his work to make conveniently accessible as many examples as possible of morally edifying conduct.\(^2\) The principal value of his Bibliothèque was to be: first, its encyclopedic content, which would dispense readers from laboriously perusing the lengthier and more original histories from which he drew his material, and second, the annalistic organisation of its narrative, at least from the eighth century BC, based on the best chronographic table he could find.\(^3\) Thus his work was similar in purpose to a modern encyclopedic summary of world history, such as Will Durant’s *The Story of Civilization*,\(^4\) or a textbook for a first-year world-history survey course. We do not know who were the Bibliothèque’s initial readers, but, in spite of the dearth of references to it by those ‘cultivated pagans’ on whose silence Eduard Schwartz laid such emphasis,\(^5\) the survival of 15 out of its original 40 books surely indicates that the work did excite significant interest. There is therefore no reason to treat Diodoros’ complaint against the production of pirated copies of his work with scornful disbelief.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) Diodoros’ statement of purpose: I 3.5-8.

\(^2\) Diodoros’ general didactic conception of history: I 1.1-3; his concern for the moral dimension of history: I 2.2; his justification for including mythology in his work so as to maximise the number of good moral *exempla*: IV 1.3-4.

\(^3\) Diodoros’ claim for the distinctive value of his own work: I 3.1-8.

\(^4\) Durant (1935-75) surveys the major developments in Western Civilisation from Ancient Greece to the death of Napoleon.

\(^5\) Schwartz 1903, 664: ‘Nur ein günstiger Zufall kann einem solchen Buch zur Fortdauer verhelfen. Kein gebildeter Heide citiert D[iodor] jemals; Plinius erwähnt nur den Titel; erst die Christen waren anspruchslos genug, ihn heranzuziehen: die euhemeristische Mythographie das ihrige dazu. So sind ein oder mehrer Exemplare des Werkes oder einzelner Teile aus dem Altertum in die byzantinische Welt gelangt’. (‘Only a fortunate chance can help the survival of such a book. No cultivated pagan ever cites Diodoros; Pliny mentions only the title; the Christians were the first to be unsophisticated enough to be attracted to it — euhemeristic mythography contributed significantly to this. Thus one or more copies of the work or of some parts of it passed from antiquity into the Byzantine world.’)

\(^6\) D.S. I 5.2 mentions the author’s concern to deter booksellers from issuing premature and unauthorised copies of his work; 40.8 preserves a fragmentary statement that the author wishes to disown some pirated copies put out for sale before final revision. Stylianou (1998: 139) suggests that Diodoros made these statements ‘to obviate the charge of carelessness and incompetence, once the Bibliothèque was completed’.
Unfortunately for Diodoros, the chance that preserved completely three-eighths of his voluminous work, while consigning to destruction the complete texts of so many of the works he used (e.g. the histories of Ephoros, Douris, Kleitarkhos, Hieronymos), has caused scholars who would much prefer to be able to read those earlier works to criticise him by inappropriate standards. These accidents of survival also, almost inevitably, determined that those same scholars would be interested in the Bibliothèque primarily as a means of reconstructing portions of those much desiderated lost histories.

I defended my dissertation on Diodoros in 1969 — a different era in Diodorean scholarship. The twelfth and final volume of the Loeb Classical Library translation of the Bibliothèque, launched by C.H. Oldfather in 1933, came out in 1967. That edition made the whole text of Diodoros’ world history accessible for the first time in a modern English translation — an achievement much in accord with the aims of the series in which it was published. Its publication spanned a period of 34 years, and had to be completed by a series of other scholars when Oldfather himself died before he could finish it. (He might have echoed Diodoros’ plea for the sympathy and tolerance of his readers, given the long time and enormous labour required for its composition.)

Oldfather’s Loeb was the first of several translations of the whole Bibliothèque into various European languages to appear in the 20th and early 21st centuries. It is surely a significant, though little noticed, fact that so many teams of scholars should have taken up in the past half-century the challenge of

---

7 Oldfather was responsible for the first half (vols. 1-6) of the LCL Diodoros. Vol. 6 was published in 1954, the year of his death (see the biographical information from the University of Nebraska, Lincoln: http://unlhistory.unl.edu/exhibits/show/oldfather/life-of-oldfather).

8 The interest of James Loeb, who founded and endowed the series of Loeb Classical Library translations, in ‘mak[ing] the work of classical authors accessible to as many readers as possible’ is highlighted in the account of its founding on the website of Harvard University Press.

9 The remaining six volumes were produced by four other scholars: C.L. Sherman (vol. 7), C.B. Welles (vol. 8), R.M. Geer (vols. 9-10), F.R. Walton (vol. 11); Geer and Walton collaborated on vol. 12.

10 D.S. I 5.2 is his plea for a sympathetic appreciation of the difficulty involved in his undertaking; he mentions the labour and time it required (e.g.) at 3.6 and 4.1.

11 20th-century translations of the whole Bibliothèque are discussed in more detail in Rubincam 2009.
producing translations of Diodoros’ whole huge work. The change in scholarly attitudes to Diodoros in the 19th century caused by the development of source criticism had led, inevitably, to a fragmentation of Diodorean scholarship — a situation in which no scholar dared to claim expert knowledge of more than one section of the work (sections being defined in terms of their respective source traditions). This made it impossible for any individual to attempt the task last undertaken by the great 18th-century Dutch scholar Peter Wesseling, of producing a comprehensive commentary on the *Bibliothèke*.\textsuperscript{12} It had less effect, however, on the production of translations. These, being directed at a larger and less scholarly readership, did not require such formidably comprehensive explanatory matter. Translators, therefore, might reasonably avoid the charge of hubris likely to be incurred by would-be successors to Wesseling. Nonetheless, the enormous size of the *Bibliothèke*, far exceeding the surviving text of every other ancient Greek historical work, still posed a special challenge. Oldfather himself took 20 years (1933-54) to complete the translation of books I-XIV of the *Bibliothèke*. Several other comprehensive translations of the *Bibliothèke* begun in the 20th century remain short of completion in varying degrees.\textsuperscript{13} Such is the difficulty of carrying to completion the production of even a translation, with minimal explanatory notes, of so long and complex a work. Only in the past couple of years has an Italian team begun the process of producing the first full commentary on the *Bibliothèke* since Wesseling, an enterprise that will require many more years to complete.\textsuperscript{14}

The secondary supervisor of my dissertation was Herbert Bloch, one of the younger members of that cohort of brilliant European Jewish scholars whose flight from Nazism so greatly enriched academia in Britain and North America. Among the many fields of expertise he brought with him to his new home at Harvard was source criticism (*Quellenforschung* or *Quellenkritik*) as applied to Greek historiography. That area of scholarship had been a major strength in German universities since the mid-nineteenth century, and provided the foundation for Felix Jacoby’s

\textsuperscript{12} Wesseling 1746.

\textsuperscript{13} The most significant are the Budé French translation (Chamoux et al. 1972-, the only one based on a new edition of the text), Veh’s German translation (Veh et al. 1992-2009), and two different Italian translations. For details see Rubincam 2009.

\textsuperscript{14} Ambaglio et al. 2008 and Rubincam 2009.
magisterial work, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (FGrHist)*. Jacoby’s purpose was to recover and reconstitute as much as possible of the hundreds of Greek historical works whose texts had failed to survive the centuries of transmission by manuscript copying, so as to provide a basis from which to reconstruct the development of Greek historiography. Publication of this massive and encyclopedic work began in 1923. Jacoby, like Bloch, left Germany as a result of the Nazi persecution of the Jews, and found a home-in-exile in Oxford, where he continued to work on the *FGrHist*. Nevertheless, when he died, in 1959, only two and a half of the projected five parts were complete. After his death, his papers went to Herbert Bloch. Bloch, however, was understandably reluctant to shelve his work on the medieval monastery of Montecassino, which had by this time become his major field of research, to finish off the *FGrHist*. The continuation of Jacoby’s great project had to wait until the 1990s, when an international team of scholars began to publish additional volumes.

The tradition of source criticism (*Quellenforschung*) was the main driving force behind scholarship on Diodoros’ *Bibliotheca* for the century from the 1850s to the 1950s. The motivation for this enterprise was twofold. First, since Diodoros was, by his own profession, an encyclopedic historian, who drew material from many predecessors, it was important to determine which earlier writers he had used as sources for different sections of his narrative; this would help readers to decide how much trust should be placed in that narrative. Second, given that the amount of Greek historiography lost so far exceeded what has been preserved, identifying Diodoros’ sources might make it possible to reconstruct some of those lost works, whose survival everyone would much have preferred, had the choice been possible, to that of the *Bibliotheca*. The second of these objectives at least, namely the recovery of as much as possible of the lost historiographic

---

15 Jacoby 1923-30 and 1940-58.

16 See Marincola 2000, summarising the progress made in the 1990s: ‘Fornara’s first volume contained the commentary on Hellanicus’ *Aigyptiaka* (608a) and Aristagoras (608). More recently three volumes of Part IV.A, Biography have appeared: IV.A.1, *The Pre-Hellenistic Period*, edd. J. Bollansée, G. Schepens, J. Engels, and E. Theys (1998); IV.A.3, *Hermippus of Smyrna*, ed. Jan Bollansée (1999); IV.A.7, *Imperial and Undated Authors*, ed. J. Radicke (also 1999).' See also Marincola 2005, and Worthington 2005, outlining the plans for *Brill’s New Jacoby*, to be published online as each section is completed. See also the details provided by the publisher (http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/cluster/JacobyOnline) on the latest developments in completing Jacoby’s project.
works used by Diodoros, made it almost a necessity to assume that Diodoros’ own contribution to the narrative of the Bibliothèque was minimal. Only by making that assumption could one treat portions of Diodoros’ work as essentially excerpts from whatever earlier historical work was hypothesised to have been his source at a particular point. This assumption found frequent expression in the writings of scholars engaged in Diodorean source criticism. It was most authoritatively stated by Eduard Schwartz, the premier Quellenforscher of the generation before Felix Jacoby, in his 1903 article on Diodoros in Pauly-Wissowa. According to Schwartz,17 [Diodoros’] Bibliothèque is and in fact claims to be nothing but a series of excerpts, which are designed to dispense the reader from the time-consuming and expensive necessity of reading the major works of history. Only the style is to a certain extent made uniform, and that not completely, if one looks beyond the actual words to consider the thoughts being expressed. The book is just a bookseller’s speculation, without any claim to originality, and its value consists in the fact that its author’s own contribution must be judged to be so small. No compiler of pre-Byzantine times gives such a comparatively true picture for the most part of his predecessors as Diodoros.

By the 1950s the identifications proposed by the early generations of Diodorean Quellenforscher of the basic source traditions underlying certain parts of the Bibliothèque had won wide acceptance. It was becoming clear, however, that there were ongoing difficulties in other parts (often those, such as book XVI, where one source gave out and another had to be found), and the task of reconstructing in detail how Diodoros worked was proving more complex than many had hoped, so that rival solutions continued to be championed.

Two books published in the 1950s marked the beginning of a new approach to the Bibliothèque. Palm’s 1955 study focused on the writing style of the Bibliothèque, the one element of the work that even Schwartz had

17 Schwartz 1903, 669: ‘[Diodors] Bibliothek ist und will tatsächlich nichts anderes sein als eine Serie von Excerpten, die dem Leser die zeitraubende und kostspielige Lecture der grossen Werke ersparen sollen; nur der Stil ist einigermaßen auf das gleiche Niveau gebracht, doch auch das nicht vollständig, sobald man nicht Worte sucht, sondern auf die Gedanken achtet. Das Buch ist eben eine buchhändlerische Speculation, ohne jeden besonderen Anspruch, und sein Wert beruht darin, dass die eigene Arbeit des Verfassers so gering bewertet sien muss: kein Compiler der vorbyzantinischen Zeit giebt ein verhältnismässig so treues Bild von seinen Vorlagen, wie D[iodor]’.
admitted originated for the most part with Diodoros, rather than one of his sources. By this choice of subject Palm effectively disavowed any intention to challenge the results of traditional Diodorean source criticism, although his detailed comments contain occasional expressions of scepticism. The difficulty of Palm’s undertaking requires some imagination for us, fortunate denizens of the internet age as we are, to appreciate it. He had no concordance to the Bibliothèque — concordances having been produced only for historians of smaller bulk and higher reputation, such as Herodotos, Thucydides, and Polybios — and no easy way of establishing the norms of Diodoros’ prose usage. Nevertheless, his careful comparison of the text of the Bibliothèque with the exiguous fragmentary remains of its presumed sources did succeed in delineating the major characteristics of Diodoros’ writing style. He was able to show how, in spite of some echoes of phraseology from his sources, it had a unified, recognisable individuality, sharing many features with other Hellenistic prose texts.

The second seminal work, Spoerri’s 1959 monograph, was more daring in its challenge to traditional scholarship: it claimed to distinguish Hellenistic elements not just in the style but in the ideas permeating one section of the Bibliothèque. Spoerri argued that this clearly called into question the traditional assumption of the Quellenforscher that Diodoros could be treated as a faithful copyist of his sources, whose own contributions to his narrative were limited to abbreviating and confusing the material he reproduced.

Such were the first stirrings of the winds of change in Diodorean scholarship. In the subsequent half-century those forces of change have gathered significant momentum, as the papers presented at this conference amply attest. Battles are still being fought, however, between the proponents of the two different approaches. As often happens in such a situation, when a challenge has been mounted to a long entrenched orthodoxy, both sides go to extremes in criticising their opponents’ positions. These extreme sentiments make clear the difficulty many scholars...
feel in trying to reconcile the results of traditional with newer scholarship. Can anything be done to assist this process?

Let us look at the difference between the two approaches in some specific cases.

1. The Ephoros papyrus: comparisons between *P.Oxy*. 1610 and Diodoros book XI

The major reason why source criticism of the *Bibliotheke* has absorbed so much scholarly time and energy, and generated so much controversy, is, of course, that the loss of the complete texts of Diodoros’ presumed sources makes it impossible to compare Diodoros directly with them. If we could do this, we would surely be in a much better position to reconstruct how Diodoros used his sources. The publication in 1919 by Grenfell and Hunt of about 60 scraps of papyrus from Oxyrhynchos, which they identified as a section of Ephoros’ *World History*, seemed to offer an opportunity for just such a direct comparison between Diodoros and the work that was generally accepted as his major source for fifth- and early fourth-century Greek history.

Grenfell and Hunt made their identification of the author on the basis of the parallels between the more legible sections of the papyrus and the text of Diodoros XI 59-62, which seemed to describe the same events of the late 470s to early 460s BC. They proceeded to mine the relevant sections of the *Bibliotheke* for words and phrases that might fit into the lacunae in the papyrus. This strategy they justified by reference to the by this time orthodox view of Diodoros as a robotic copyist, who reproduced

---

20 Grenfell and Hunt 1919. The identification of Ephoros as the source for this section of Diodoros’ Greek history was first proposed by Volquardsen 1868.

21 These two texts are presented for comparison in the Appendix, section I. Arguments for the identification of Ephoros as the author are presented by Grenfell and Hunt 1919,104-8. The identification has been questioned by Africa 1962; Rubincam (1976) surveyed the literature (see esp. 357, note 2) and concluded that Grenfell and Hunt were probably right to identify the author as Ephoros, although some of Africa’s criticisms of their argumentation were valid.
the narrative of his source of the moment with exceptional fidelity.\textsuperscript{22} However, their enthusiasm for this ‘rhapsodic’ (in the original sense!) procedure apparently blinded them to the circularity of the argument they went on to make that the extent and closeness of the similarities between the two texts confirmed the picture of Diodoros as a ‘slavish copyist’. In fact, if one sets aside the compulsion to make the text of the papyrus correspond as closely as possible to that of Diodoros, and focuses instead on the quality of the Greek that results from their restoration of the papyrus, several serious problems leap to the eye in the syntax and the word usage of Grenfell and Hunt’s supplements.\textsuperscript{23} This re-examination of the papyrus strongly suggests that the verbatim similarities between the Bibliothèque and its presumed source are fewer and less significant than they had claimed.

A second aspect of Grenfell and Hunt’s discussion of the papyrus text also demands attention. They noted that, although Diodoros’ account of these events is ‘on the whole … distinctly the shorter of the two,’ there are ‘a few passages in which he is fuller than [the papyrus].’ They remark, however, that ‘none of Diodorus’ additional sentences or phrases … implies any real divergence from [the papyrus], except perhaps in line 74.’\textsuperscript{24} The possible divergence alluded to here concerns the figure for the Persian losses at the Battle of the Eurymedon. The papyrus text, as they restored it, reads as follows: ‘… [Kimon] destroyed many of the barbarians’ ships which ran into danger and captured a hundred of them with the crews.’\textsuperscript{25} The parallel sentence in Diodoros runs thus: ‘… the Athenians were victorious, having destroyed many of the enemy ships and captured more than one hundred together with their crews.’\textsuperscript{26} Thus Diodoros’ account qualifies the number of ships captured as ‘more than 100,’ whereas the papyrus text gave just the simple number. Grenfell and Hunt were clearly worried by this discrepancy. Remembering Eduard Schwartz’s comment (in his 1903 \textit{RE} article, quoted above) that Diodoros changed only the style, but not the facts of the material he drew from his sources,\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{22} See the quotation from Schwartz above, note 17.
\textsuperscript{23} These are set forth in Rubincam 1976.
\textsuperscript{24} Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 104.
\textsuperscript{25} Grenfell and Hunt’s translation 1919, 121.
\textsuperscript{26} Oldfather’s translation 1933-67, vol. 4: 283.
\textsuperscript{27} Schwartz 1903, quoted above, note 17.
they found it hard to decide whether to count the insertion of the qualifier ‘more than’ as a change of fact or of style. If it amounted to a matter of fact, they argued, then perhaps an intermediate source would have to be hypothesised between the papyrus and Diodoros, to explain the introduction of the offending qualifier. This kind of reasoning well exemplifies the very rigid mindset typical of old-style Quellenforschung: it was inconceivable that Diodoros should have introduced any changes to the facts that he drew from his source of the moment; so, if the insertion of this qualifying expression before the number of captured ships was deemed such a factual change, then the papyrus historian could not be Diodoros’ immediate source.

How would this case be treated using a new-style approach? The question needs to be rephrased as follows: could evidence be found to provide a basis for assuming that Diodoros was, in fact, capable of attaching this kind of qualifying expression to a numerical datum that he drew from his source? Some statistics on the use of different types of qualification with numbers by Herodotos, Thucydides, Xenophon (HG and An.), Polybios, and Diodoros seem to me to constitute such evidence.28 These were generated by a project that has occupied me for nearly 40 years, of creating a method of quantifying the use of numbers by Greek historians. Greek and English writers alike use qualifying expressions of various kinds to indicate that the qualified number is something other than the result of a precise and accurate measurement or calculation.29 The two most common types of qualification (Q1 and Q2) indicate (respectively) approximation (i.e. that the number is in the neighbourhood of the precise/accurate number) and comparison (i.e. that the number is above or below that specified). Examples of approximating (Q1) qualifiers would be: in Greek, peri, malista; in English, ‘about’, ‘approximately’; comparative (Q2) qualifiers would be: in Greek, pleious, ouk elassous; in English, ‘more than’, ‘not less than’. In all the other historical texts I have studied in this way approximating qualifiers (Q1) are more common than comparative qualifiers (Q2). In Diodoros alone this relationship is reversed, with Q2 outnumbering Q1 in a ratio of 66:34. It is hard to explain this strikingly different pattern except by assuming that Diodoros did sometimes introduce comparative qualifiers into his narrative at points where none stood.

28 See Appendix I.d (36).
29 See Appendix I.c (35-6) for some examples.
in his source. If that is so, one need postulate no intermediate source between the papyrus and the parallel passage of the Bibliotheca. It is only fair to remind ourselves, of course, that Grenfell and Hunt had no means of generating this kind of quantitative evidence, which could not have been reliably compiled before the existence of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. 30

Here, then, we have a case where the older approach to the Bibliotheca concentrated on questions concerning Diodoros’ relationship to his sources: when Grenfell and Hunt found themselves editing a papyrus text that showed considerable similarities to the text of Diodoros XI 59-62, they were concerned primarily to identify its author, which meant checking how closely it resembled the parallel section of Diodoros. Their focus on the troublesome qualifier led to a proliferation of hypotheses about the relationship between the two texts. New-style scholarship, by contrast, can (i) accept the likely identification of the author of P.Oxy. 1610 as Ephoros, while at the same time (ii) taking a fresh look at Grenfell and Hunt’s restorations and admitting that they are not all viable, and therefore that the full text of the papyrus probably differed more than they thought from that of Diodoros. It can then (iii) use the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae to compile evidence concerning an important aspect of Diodoros’ historiographic practice throughout the whole Bibliotheca. This provides the basis for an argument that obviates the need to postulate an intermediate author between Ephoros and Diodoros.

2. Cross-references in the Bibliotheca

A second case that highlights the differences between the old and the new methodologies applied to the Bibliotheca concerns Diodoros’ cross-references. The old assumption, that Diodoros was essentially a robotic copyist, meant that any anomalous elements in the Bibliotheca were explained as having been ‘mindlessly’ copied from his source of the

30 Note that in the first example given (Appendix I.c) of Qt (Th. I 118.2) Crawley’s translation neglects to translate the qualifier. This kind of carelessness (either omission or inconsistent translation) regarding qualifying expressions used with numbers is fairly common in all the standard translations I have consulted. This is symptomatic of the frequent tendency of readers to process qualifiers without really focusing on them — a fact which undoubtedly explains Grenfell and Hunt’s uncertainty about whether to treat the insertion of a qualifier by Diodoros as a factual or a stylistic change.
moment. When scholars of this mindset encountered a statement making a cross-reference from one part of the work to another that appeared to be unfulfilled (i.e. failed to match up with an appropriate correlative passage in another section of the Bibliotheca), they immediately assumed that Diodoros had unthinkingly taken over only the cross-reference, but not the passage to which it referred. If the offending passage in Diodoros happened to contain a book number, then this became one more piece of evidence for the reconstruction of the lost source. A case in point is Diodoros XX 57.6, the statement that the foundation of Meskhela in Libya by Greeks on their way home from the Trojan War had been mentioned previously in book III of the Bibliotheca. Some scholars have suggested that this cross-reference, having no fulfilment anywhere in our text of book III, was taken over from Philinos of Akragas, a pro-Carthaginian historian of the First Punic War, whom they believed to be the lost source of Diodoros. There was no discussion, no canvassing of other possible explanations for the anomaly: this was obviously another case of ‘slavish dependence’ on his sources by Diodoros. No one, apparently, paused to reflect that there were some unfulfilled cross-references in the Bibliotheca (e.g. the promises to describe some of Julius Caesar’s exploits in Gaul in the 50s BC at III 38.3, V 21.2, and V 22.1) that most scholars were perfectly content to attribute to Diodoros having changed his mind about the terminal date of his history — an observation that might surely have led to some hesitation about the automatic invocation of Diodoros the robot.

This case also became a possible subject for more nuanced investigation once the tools for systematic examination of a certain type of passage throughout the Bibliotheca became available. Thanks to the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae it became possible to identify the various kinds of phraseology used by Diodoros to make cross-references, and to compile a database of all the cross-references, which could then be systematically studied to identify the parameters of Diodoros’ use of this device: specificity, context, phraseology, fulfilment, etc. Once categorised in this way, Diodoros’ practice could be compared to those of some other ancient authors, so as to determine how far he conformed to the norms thus established

---

31 See Appendix II.a for the text.
32 For full discussion of the scholarship on this cross-reference see Rubincam 1998a, 79.
for the Graeco-Roman world, keeping in mind that the papyrus roll is a much more linear mode of production than the codex, and one that obviously offered no means of making specific reference to any unit smaller than a book-roll. The result of this investigation was to establish that, among a group of Latin prose writers used as comparators, Diodoros’ practice most closely resembled that of Pliny’s *Natural History* — a similarly enormous and encyclopedic work — and that his record in terms of fulfilment of cross-references was not nearly as bad as old-style perspectives had suggested. Looking at this aspect of Diodoros’ historiographic strategy from this more holistic perspective had the advantage also of encouraging consideration of a whole range of possible explanations for any perceived anomalies. The particular case, for example, of the unfulfilled cross-reference at XX 57.6, could equally well be explained as due to a confusion of memory by Diodoros over whether this incident was reported in his summary account of Libya in book III, or in the lost book VII, as part of his post-Trojan War narrative.

More significantly, the picture that emerges from this more comprehensive study of the cross-references can shed new light on important aspects of the organisation and composition of the *Bibliotheke*. In particular, the surprisingly large number of forward cross-references (i.e. statements that a certain subject will be dealt with in more detail at a specified later point), many of which cross the boundary between the initial six non-annalistic books and the integrated annalistic narrative that began in book VII, after the end of the Trojan War, can be recognised as Diodoros’ way of defining that historiographic boundary between material that could and could not be included in his general annalistic narrative. This heightens

---

33 See Starr 1981.
34 Full discussion of Diodoros’ cross-references can be found in Rubincam 1987, 1989, 1998a.
35 This suggestion was made, though, without any explanation for the apparent mistake in Diodoros’ cross-reference, by the Loeb translators of both book VII and book XX, Oldfather (*ad D.S. VII 7*) and Geer (*ad D.S. XX 57.6*).
36 Of the 95 cross-references I counted in Diodoros, 53 (56%) refer forward and 42 (44%) backward. Among the selection of Roman authors used as comparators, forward cross-references appear in only two (Pliny the Elder and Tacitus), and make up at most 13% of the total. Detailed discussion of the points mentioned here is found in Rubincam 1987, 1989, 1998a.
37 See Appendix II.c for the major organisational divisions in the *Bibliotheke*. 
one’s awareness of, and respect for, the difficulty and complexity of the decisions Diodoros had to make when planning his huge work.

The approach described here, of reconstructing an aspect of Diodoros’ historiographic practice (i.e. his use of cross-references) from a thorough survey of all the instances of the phenomenon in question, is obviously applicable to other passages of certain generic types, such as the (ostensible) contemporary references in the *Bibliotheke*.\(^{38}\)

3. Duplicate passages or ‘doublets’ in the *Bibliotheke*

A third case that gets very different treatment from old and new methodologies is the occurrence of duplicate passages, sometimes called ‘doublets’, i.e. the appearance at two different places in the *Bibliotheke* of essentially the same set of information concerning a particular subject. The most substantial example, and also one of the most famous, is the pair of descriptions of the Dead Sea at Diodoros II 48 and XIX 96-99.\(^{39}\) The first occurrence is found in the first six books of the *Bibliotheke*, the section devoted to ‘events and myths’ of various parts of the world that could not be incorporated into the integrated, annalistically organised, survey of world history that occupied books VII-XL. The organisation of this initial section of the work was geographical, book II being devoted to ‘events that occurred in Asia in ancient times’: i.e. the early history of the Assyrians, Medians, Indians, Skythians, Hyperboreans, Arabians, and ‘the island in the southern ocean’ allegedly visited by Iamboulos. The second, and longer version of the Dead Sea description forms a brief geographical excursus in the narrative of Antigonos Monophthalmos’ campaign against the Nabataians in 312 BC. This pattern, whereby one of the pair of similar passages is located in the non-annalistic section of the *Bibliotheke* and the other in the annalistic section, is common, though not invariable.

The standard term applied to such cases by scholars trained in *Quellenforschung* is the German *Wiederholungen*, rendered into French as *répétitions*.\(^{40}\) Their discussions emphasise the close verbal resemblance between

---

\(^{38}\) I hope to be able to publish such a study in the near future.

\(^{39}\) The texts of these two passages are set out side by side in Appendix III.1, together with three different translations of each (into English, French, and Latin).

\(^{40}\) See Krumbholtz 1889. The editors of the Budé edition render this as *répétitions* (Eck’s Budé edition of book II (2003, 85) translates into French a considerable section of Krumbholtz’s article).
the two passages,\textsuperscript{41} which they take to be \textit{prima facie} evidence that a single source was used for both. They proceed to try to identify that source, and then to canvass various explanations for the duplication.

Statements that in such pairs of passages ‘several sentences are repeated almost word for word,’ or that the first passage ‘is reproduced almost word for word’ in the later passage, suggest that the passages in question contain a substantial amount of text in exactly the same wording. This assumption seems confirmed by the editors’ and translators’ allusions to the possibility of emending errors in the text of one passage by reference to the other. In fact, however, detailed comparison of some of these passages uncovers some significant differences between them. In this case, first, the Dead Sea description is quite differently framed, the information being introduced in a manner appropriate to each particular context. Second, several minor differences occur in wording and syntax. Third, and most significantly, some discrepancies appear in specific details involving numeric data — precisely the type of information that Diodorus was supposed to have copied most faithfully from his sources into his own narrative.

The numbers in question are the measurements given for the size of the Dead Sea and for the large piece of asphalt said to have been spewed up annually from its waters. At II 48.7 we read:

This [lake]\textsuperscript{42} has a length of close to (hôs) 500 stades, and a width of close to (hôs) 60’.

The parallel passage at XIX 98.1 reads:

[This lake] lies in the middle of the satrapy of Idoumaia, extending in length \textit{approximately somewhat} (malista pou) 500 stades, and in width \textit{about} (peri) 60.

Scholars whose main concern was to argue that these passages were sufficiently similar to justify the assumption of a common source were naturally content just to emphasise that the numbers given are the same (500 × 60 stades). If one approaches the comparison with a more open


\textsuperscript{42} The full name, \textit{Asphaltitis limnê}, is found only at XIX 98.1; at II 48.6 it is referred to simply as a \textit{megalê limnê}. 
mind, however, one notices first that, although the words used are very similar, the syntax differs, and second, more significantly, the qualifying expressions attached to the numbers are quite different: II 48 has the same single qualifier, hôs, with both numbers; XIX 98 uses a combination of two qualifiers, malista pou, for the length and a different single qualifier, peri, for the width. The fact that no one seems to have commented on this discrepancy probably has much to do with the tendency of translators to be rather careless in their rendering of qualifying expressions attached to numbers, which we noted above. Thus in this case the Loeb translators (Oldfather in book II; Geer in book XIX) use ‘about’ to translate the qualifiers with all four numbers, even though the Greek contains three different expressions. The Budé translators are hardly more careful: ‘Ce lac a à peu près une longueur de cinq cents stades et une largeur de soixante’ (II 48.7; Eck), and ‘il [le lac] a une longueur de cinq cents stades environ pour soixante de large’ (XIX 98.1; Bizière). In both passages the Budé translation leaves it unclear whether the qualifier attached to the first number is intended to carry over to the second. Neither of the translations of XIX 98.1 makes any attempt to render the double qualifier, malista pou, used with the length of the lake.\footnote{A similar issue arises with the translation of an instance of double qualification in Thucydides, discussed in Rubincam 2001, 81-2.}

What of the numbers in the second pair of passages, describing the size of the piece of asphalt annually spewed out by the lake? Here each passage gives two measurements, apparently the maximum and minimum sizes observed. The first is identically expressed, as regards both number and qualifier, in both books, ‘more than a-three-plethron-extent’ (meizon ê triplethron). The second, however, shows a discrepancy in both number and qualifier: ‘of-two plethra’ (dyoin plethrôn) unqualified in book II ‘not much short of a plethron’ (ou poly leipomenon plethrou) in book XIX.

Obviously, the mindset that each reader brings to these texts significantly influences what s/he draws from the comparison. I have no difficulty accepting the argument that the similarities between the paired passages are sufficient to justify the assumption made by the source critics that Diodoros was drawing on the same source in both places. When, however, they start trying to determine exactly which papyrus roll Diodoros had in front of him when he wrote the so-called duplicate passage — did he pull out of his bookcase the relevant book-roll of the original
source, or was it rather the book-roll containing the previous passage on the subject that he had written in the *Bibliotheca*? — this seems to me a futile and misguided enterprise. The way this question gets posed presumes a particular model, which I think anachronistic, of how Diodoros worked: according to this, Diodoros sits like a 19th-century philologist at a library table, to which he brings whatever books he wants to consult as he needs them, and takes great care to copy out the relevant passage exactly. This model makes it very difficult to accept and explain discrepancies such as the ones just discussed between his two descriptions of the Dead Sea. It also ignores the growing body of scholarship that attempts to reconstruct Diodoros’ working methods on the basis of the information, both explicit and implicit, contained in the *Bibliotheca*, supplemented by some analogies with other ancient historians about whom we have fuller information.  

How did Diodoros set about the difficult and complex task of producing his huge survey of world history? That it was a difficult and complex task should not be doubted, although it is easy to find dismissive comments from scholars who refuse to believe his statement that it took him thirty years (D.S. I 4.1), apparently because they find the result of his labours so disappointing. The text of the completely surviving 15 books of the *Bibliotheca* is more than twice the length of Herodotos’ nine books. Assuming that the remaining 25 books averaged more or less the same size, the full length of the 40 books would have amounted to about six times that of Herodotos’ text. The complexity of Diodoros’ task consisted in (i) identifying and then finding copies of all the possible sources he needed for such a comprehensive survey of world history, (ii) choosing which ones he would actually use, (iii) taking appropriate notes on the contents of his chosen sources, (iv) constructing a general outline of the structure and organisation of his own work, and (v) making the hundreds of small decisions involved in distributing appropriately into his annalistic narrative framework the information found in his sources, most of which were

---

44 On the inferences that can be made from information contained in the *Bibliotheca* about the process of its composition see Zecchini 1978; Sartori 1983 and 1984; Rubincam 1987 (discussed below [31-2]). The analogy of Cassius Dio is discussed below (30).

45 E.g. Stylianou 1998, 21: ‘The *Bibliotheca* is entirely derivative and Diodoros’ methods slipshod, so much so that the work could have been dashed off in a very few years’.

46 A projection made on the same basis for the total length of Polybios’ work, which also ran to 40 books, generates about the same number.
not organised in this way. Each of these five major stages in the compositional process was a necessary prerequisite for the one that followed it: i.e. Diodoros could not choose which sources he would actually use without having checked out a probably larger number of possible sources; his major decisions about the overall architecture of his 40 book-rolls determined the framework into which the specific information he drew from his many sources had to be fitted. And one must always keep in mind that in Diodoros’ world the business of locating and getting access to the text of any book was infinitely more challenging than it is for us. It is surely extremely unlikely that Diodoros could count on having easy access to all the books he needed in the same place throughout the whole 30 years of his work on the Bibliotheka.

Given the lack of specific statements in the Bibliotheka about its composition, it seems legitimate to make use of possible analogies with other writers for whom we have better information. Most interesting are Cassius Dio’s statements about the production of his 80-book Roman History, a work scarcely less ambitious in scope and equally dependent on a large number of earlier histories. He mentions a total of 22 years spent in composing this work, the first ten devoted to choosing his sources and compiling rough notes on the material they supplied, and the subsequent 12 to the actual composition of his text in appropriate literary form. There is much to recommend the assumption that Diodoros’ 30-year period of work was similarly divided into two stages: first, the compilation of material into some sort of intermediate document (syllegein) and second, the actual composition of his literary text (syngraphein).

---

47 Dio LXXII.23.5: συνέλεξα δὲ πάντα τὰ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις μέχρι τῆς Σεουήρου μεταλλαγῆς πραχθέντα ἐν ἕτεσι δέκα, καὶ συνέγραψα ἐν ἕτεσι δώδεκα.

48 On the process of composition of Dio’s Roman History see Barnes 1984, 251.

49 Stylianou (1998, 21) dismissed contemptuously the idea that anyone of Diodoros’ minimal historiographic ability could possibly have needed 30 years to complete the composition of the Bibliotheka, remarking that ‘A superior writer like Dio Cassius wrote eighty books in twelve years: 72.23.5’. Note 56 (ad loc.) admits, ‘Though ten years are also said to have been spent on gathering the necessary material’, and then proceeds to cite the dubious example of Nikolaos of Damaskos, who ‘may have taken no more than ten years to write his massive universal history of 144 books’, while noting, reluctantly, that ‘Nicolaus’ dates are rather uncertain’. This blatant manipulation of the evidence concerning Dio’s compositional process to support his contention that a work of which he has such a low opinion could not have required more than ‘a very few years’ to compose is clearly based on his assumption that the amount of preparatory work Diodoros had to do (i.e. the first
in favour of this has been set out above: namely, the complexity and cumulative nature of the process. A second argument derives from the information implicit in various passages of the Bibliotheca about their date of composition.

There are sixteen passages that supply explicit or implicit information concerning the date of composition of either the whole work or the particular passage. From these a set of arguments can be generated to support the following timetable for the production of the Bibliotheca. Diodoros began work about 60 BC, intending to bring his comprehensive summary of world history down to some point in his own lifetime. After 15 years spent in searching out and compiling information from many sources, he was ready to begin the process of literary composition. At this point (c. 45 BC), influenced no doubt by the rise to supreme power of Julius Caesar, whom he clearly admired, he fixed on the year of Caesar’s triple triumph (46/5 BC) as an appropriate terminus. The first three books were written in that frame of mind. After the Ides of March 44 BC Diodoros’ admiration for Caesar remained undimmed, but the political instability of the second period of civil war, in which Diodoros’ native Sicily suffered severely for choosing the wrong side, and the risks involved in writing about recent history during the triumviral period, made him lose heart and set back the terminus of his work to 60/59 BC.

This reconstruction, according to which Diodoros did not begin the second, literary, stage in the composition of the Bibliotheca until c. 45 BC, has much to recommend it. First, it provides the best explanation for the inconsistency between Diodoros’ stated terminus for the final version of his work (60/59 BC [1.4.7]) and the figures he gives for the span of time covered by his historical narrative (730 years from Ol. 1 and 1138 years from the Trojan War [I 5.1]), which imply a terminal date of 46/5 BC. Needless to say, in 60/59 BC, when he first began work, Diodoros could hardly have formulated a plan for a specific terminal date that was still in the future. Second, the suggested late beginning of the actual literary composition of the Bibliotheca would also account most economically for the fact that six of the eight references to Julius Caesar include some

---

three stages set out above [29] in the process of composition) was negligible. This seems to me to run counter to the evidence (admittedly meagre) of how ancient historians worked: see Avenarius 1956, 71-104.

---

59 See the table in Appendix III.c = Figure 3 from Rubincam 1987, 322-3.
translation of the title *Divus*, which was given to him posthumously c. November 43 BC.\(^9\) The two exceptions are III 38.2 and V 22.1. The absence of the title in the latter passage, which follows only a chapter after another passage that does contain it (V 21.2), hardly requires a special explanation. The omission of the title at III 38.2 can best be accounted for if this passage was written before Caesar became *Divus*, whereas the mentions of *Divus Caesar* in book IV and subsequent books postdate the granting of this title. The variations in Diodoros’ translation of the title should arouse no surprise if the *Bibliothèque* was being composed in the triumviral period, before a standard Greek translation of *Divus* had become accepted.\(^5\) Third, if we leave aside the references to Diodoros’ visit to Egypt in 60/59 BC, all but one of the *termini post quos* indicated by the completion of the definitely datable contemporary references fall between 45 and 35 BC. This would surely suggest that the actual literary composition of the *Bibliothèque* fell in the second half of Diodoros’ 30-year period of work.

The implications of this reconstruction of Diodoros’ large-scale work strategy for our understanding of the process by which he produced the literary text that we have should be clear. If the research and compilation of information was a separate stage, considerably removed in time from the actual composition, then the old picture of Diodoros sitting in a well-equipped library where he could get up from his table to put away one book-roll and take out another, in order to copy out information from the original text of each source in turn, must obviously be set aside. We should more appropriately imagine him engaging in a process something like that which the Younger Pliny describes as practised by his uncle, when he was working on the *Natural History* — an encyclopedic work which, incidentally, the *Bibliothèque* resembles in some significant ways.\(^5\)

\(^9\) Full discussion of the titulature in Diodoros’ seven references to Julius Caesar is found in Rubincam 1992, 94ff. The argument made here was worked out in detail in Rubincam 1987, esp. 321-6, and Rubincam 1998b.

\(^5\) Strabo, for example, writing perhaps 30 years later than Diodoros — the publication of his *Geography* is usually dated early in the reign of Tiberius — regularly uses the simple *Kaisar ho theos* (Str. VI 4.2) or *ho theos Kaisar* (Str. IV 1.1) when he needs to make absolutely unambiguous reference to Julius Caesar; see Rubincam 1992, n. 44.

\(^5\) Pliny Ep. 3.5 describes the amazing and indefatigable industry that his uncle, the author of the *Natural History*, applied to the task of extracting useful information from
the elder Pliny took notes on the information he found in every book he read, which were presumably combined into the kind of intermediate document implied by Dio’s description of his procedure, and worked from this rather than directly from the original sources when actually writing the text of his own book. If Diodoros worked in the manner of Pliny and Dio, then there would have been a considerable gap in time and place between his original reading of sources and his working up of the material drawn from them. If, as everything we know about the book culture of his world suggests, both the compilation of his notes and the transfer of information from them into his literary text relied much more on memory than on the kind of careful perusal and copying out of exact quotations that we enjoin upon our students, that would make it much easier to explain the kinds of errors and confusions so often detected in the Bibliotheca. It should be obvious that these more open-ended assumptions about Diodoros’ methodology seriously undermine the old-fashioned attempt to carve up the text of the Bibliotheca into a series of more or less verbatim excerpts from its lost sources.

* * *

So much for my three case studies. In each case there remain from the century of Quellenforschung some solid nuggets of information about the probable sources of different sections of the Bibliotheca. However, the continued pursuit of questions focused solely on source criticism leads, I would argue, to no fruitful result. Further progress in the elucidation of what Diodoros intended to accomplish and how he worked depends on the refocusing of our attention on the fifteen surviving books of the Bibliotheca, rather than its lost sources. This means accepting two hard truths: (i) that we may never be able to determine the source of every piece of information in the Bibliotheca; and (ii) since the patterns of human

---

every book he read. Pliny the Elder clearly maintained a considerable secretariat of expertly trained readers and secretaries, who made it possible for the reading and extraction of information to continue throughout his waking hours. The efficiency and dedication of this operation must have been exceptional, but the process of reading and taking notes on one’s readings, whether as an individual or as the leader of a team, need not have been so. On the significant resemblances between the Bibliotheca and Pliny’s Natural History, see Rubincam 1997.
error are exceedingly complex, we shall always have to acknowledge that errors in the *Bibliotheke* might have originated at more than one stage in the long and complex historiographic process that underlies Diodoros’ final text.

Let me conclude with a wicked thought. The compositional procedure regularly attributed to Diodoros by the *Quellenforscher* bears a remarkable resemblance to that which they practise themselves: sitting at a desk and looking at the equivalent of one papyrus column of text at a time. They rarely raise their eyes or expand their thoughts to encompass the whole of the *Bibliotheke*, and they assume that Diodoros likewise had no thoughts beyond the particular section of text he was composing at any given moment, and whatever single small passage he is presumed to have been cribbing from some earlier historian’s work. This is an entirely unrealistic picture of how an author would have worked in a world that depended on memory for many more purposes than we do, and lacked anything of the sense that we try (often unsuccessfully) to instil into our students, of the need to keep track obsessively of the sources that they might be paraphrasing or quoting. It is, in fact, a kind of deliberate choice to be near-sighted. Since the publication of Iain McDougall’s *Lexicon to Diodoros* (1983), and still more since the enormous expansion of access, in the past ten years, to the resources of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, there is no excuse for any of us to choose such a limited approach to the *Bibliotheke*. The basic identification of the source traditions represented in many parts of that work (Agatharkhides, Ephoros, Timaios, Kleitarkhos, Hieronymos) we can accept with gratitude as the enduring legacy of a century of *Quellenforschung*, but the more holistic research of the past half-century should have made it impossible to continue treating Diodoros as a transparent intermediary in the attempt to recover the exact text of those numerous lost historians. We must engage with the whole *Bibliotheke*, and pay poor Diodoros the respect of treating him as having a mind and an intention in composing his huge work, however far short by our standards his professed hopes of supreme chronological accuracy may have fallen.
APPENDIX:
Case Studies

I. The Ephoros papyrus
(a) Papyrus text cf. Diodorus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.Oxy. 1610 ll. 62-76</th>
<th>D.S. XI 60.6 (tr. C.H. Oldfather)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Κιμων] ναυμαχησας δε πολον χρονον πολλας μεν των κινθυνουσιων βαρβαριων νεον διεφθειρεν, εκατον δ’αυτοις ανθρασιν ειλε . . .</td>
<td>γενομενου δ’ ἁγώνος ἱσχυροι και των στόλων ἁμορτερων λαμπρος ἁγουνιζομενου, τω τελευταιων ἐνίκων οι Ἀθηναιοι, και πολλας μεν των ἐναντιων νυς διεφθειρειν, πλειονς δε των εκατον σον αυτοις τοις ανθρασιν ειλον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Kimon] having fought a long sea battle, destroyed many of the barbarians’ ships which ran into danger and captured one hundred of them with the crews

A sharp struggle took place and both fleets fought brilliantly, but in the end the Athenians were victorious, having destroyed many of the enemy ships and captured more than one hundred together with their crews.

(b) Bibliography

Grenfell and Hunt 1919; Africa 1962; Rubincam 1976; Volquardsen 1868.

(c) Examples of Q1 (approximating) and Q2 (comparative) qualifiers with numbers

(i) Approximating Qualifiers (Q1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Th. I 118.2</th>
<th>Crawley’s translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ταῦτα δὲ ξύμπαντα δια έπραξαν οἱ Ἑλληνες πρός τε ἅλλους καὶ τὸν βάρβαρον ἐγένετο ἐν έτεις πεντήκοντα μάλιστα μεταξὺ τῆς ξέρξου ἀναχωρήσεως καὶ τῆς ἄρχης τοῦ τοῦ πολέμου.</td>
<td>All these actions of the Hellenes against each other and the barbarian occurred in the fifty years’ interval between the retreat of Xerxes and the beginning of the present war. [[No translation of Q]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Th. II 13.3</th>
<th>Crawley’s translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θαρσεῖν τε ἐκέλευε προσιόντων μὲν ἐξαικοσιων ταλάντων ως ἐπί το πολῦ φόρου κατ’ ἐναυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξακοσιων τῇ πόλει άνευ τῆς ἄλλης προσόδου . . .</td>
<td>Here they had no reason to despond. Apart from other sources of income, an average revenue of six hundred talents of silver [per year] was drawn from the tribute of the allies . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tribute from all the barbarian districts and the Hellenic cities, taking what they brought in under Seuthes, the successor of Sitalces, who raised it to its greatest height, amounted to about four hundred talents in gold and silver.

(II) Comparative Qualifiers (Q2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Th. VII 27.5</th>
<th>Crawley’s translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τῆς τε γὰρ χώρας ἀπάτης ἐστέρηντο, καὶ ἀνδραπόδων πλέον ἢ δύω μυριάδες θυτομιλήκεσαν, καὶ τούτων τὸ πολὺ μέρος χειροτέχνη, πρόβατα τε πάντα ἀπωλώλει καὶ ὑποζύγια.</td>
<td>They were deprived of their whole country: more than twenty thousand slaves had deserted, a great part of them artisans, and all their sheep and beasts of burden were lost;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed they could only be compared to a starved-out town, and that no small one, escaping; the whole multitude upon the march being not less than forty thousand men.

(d) Statistics on ratio of Q1:Q2 in six Greek historical works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFICATION</th>
<th>Herodotos</th>
<th>Thucydides</th>
<th>Xenophon Hellenica</th>
<th>Xenophon Anabasis</th>
<th>Polybios</th>
<th>Diodoros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>84 = 74%</td>
<td>103 = 71%</td>
<td>99 = 68%</td>
<td>76 = 76%</td>
<td>177 = 80.5%</td>
<td>240 = 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>29 = 26%</td>
<td>42 = 29%</td>
<td>47 = 32%</td>
<td>24 = 24%</td>
<td>43 = 19.5%</td>
<td>466 = 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Cross-references in Diodoros

(a) An unfulfilled cross-reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.S. XX 57.6</th>
<th>Geer’s translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τρίτην δ’ εἶλε [sc. Arkhagathos, general of Agathokles] Μεσχέλαν, μεγίστην οὐσίαν, ἐμεσχέλην θ’ το παλαιόν ὕπο</td>
<td>The third city that he [Arkhatagathos, general of Agathokles] took was Meschela, which was very large and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW AND OLD APPROACHES TO DIODOROS

(b) Bibliography


(c) Organisation of Bibliothèke

Books 1-6: events and legends D. S. (praxeis kai mythologiai) before Trojan War of barbarians (1-3) and Greeks (4-6)

Books 7-17: world history (koinai praxeis) from Trojan War to death of Alexander

Books 18-40: remaining world history down to beginning of war of Romans vs. Celts

III. ‘Doublets’ in Diodoros

(a) Texts of D.S. II 48.6-7 and XIX 98.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.S. II 48.6-7</th>
<th>D.S. XIX 98.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ἔστι δ’ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ναβαταίων καὶ πέτρα καθ’ ὑπερβολήν ὑγμά, μάλιν ἁνάβασιν ἔρχουσά, δὴ ἢς κατ’ ὅλως ἁναβαλλόντως ἀποτύπθηνε τάς ἀποσκεύας· λίμνη τε μεγάλη φέρουσα πολλὴν ἄσφαλτον, ἐξ ἧς λαμβάνοντες οὐκ ἄξιον ἀνεπισήμαντο. <
| Ο’ μὲν οὖν Δημήτριος λαβὼν ὧμήρους καὶ τὰς ὁμολογηθεῖσας δωρεὰς ἀνέζευξεν ἀπὸ τῆς πέτρας· διατείνας δὲ σταδίους τριακοσίως κατεστρατοπέδευσε πλησίον τῆς Ασφαλτίτιδος λίμνης, ἡς τὴν φύσιν οὐκ ἄξιον παραδραμεῖν ἀνεπισήμαντον. κεῖται γὰρ κατὰ μέσης τὴν σατραπείαν τῆς Ἰδουμαίας, τῷ μὲν μήκει παρεκτείνουσα σταδίους μάλιστα ποταμῶν μεγάλων τῇ γλύκυττι διαφόρων, τούτων μὲν περιγίνεται κατὰ τὴν δυσωδίαν, ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ μέσης κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν ἐκφυσά ἀσφαλτοῦ μέγεθος ποτὲ μὲν μεῖζον ἢ τριπλῆθρον, ὡς πεντακοσίων σταδίων τῷ ἀρχαιολογικῷ περί ἐξήκοντά καὶ διάπικρον, ὡς μῆκες καὶ διάπικρον, συστείρωσα καὶ διάπικρον, ὡς μῆκες καὶ διάπικρον, τούτων μὲν περιγίνεται κατὰ τὴν δυσωδίαν, ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ μέσης κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν ἐκφυσά ἀσφαλτοῦ μέγεθος ποτὲ μὲν μεῖζον ἢ τριπλῆθρον, τῷ μὲν μήκει παρεκτείνουσα σταδίους μάλιστα ποταμῶν μεγάλων τῇ γλύκυττι διαφόρων, τούτων μὲν περιγίνεται κατὰ τὴν δυσωδίαν, ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ μέσης κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν ἐκφυσά ἀσφαλτοῦ μέγεθος ποτὲ μὲν μεῖζον ἢ τριπλῆθρον, τῷ μὲν μήκει παρεκτείνουσα σταδίους μάλιστα ποταμῶν μεγάλων τῇ γλύκυττι διαφόρων, τούτων μὲν περιγίνεται κατὰ τὴν δυσωδίαν, ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ μέσης κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν ἐκφυσά ἀσφαλτοῦ μέγεθος ποτὺς μὲν
D.S. II 48.6-7

ἔστι δ' ὅτε δύοιν πλέθρων ὑπάρχειν \(\varepsilon\) ὑπάρχειν \(\delta\) συνήθως οἱ περιοικοῦντες βάρβαροι τὸ μὲν μεῖζον καλοῦσι ταῦτα, τὸ δ' ἐλαττὸν μόσχον ἐπονομάζουσιν.

Tr. Oldfather (LCL): It has a length of about five hundred stades and a width of about sixty … . and from its centre it spouts forth once a year a great mass of asphalt, which sometimes extends S. for more than three plethra, and sometimes for only two … .

Tr. Rhodoman: Longitudo eius D stadiorum, latitudo LX … . E medio eius quotannis bitumen eburnit, alias duum, alias trium amplius magnitudine plethrorum.

D.S. XIX 98.1

περιγίνεται κατὰ τὴν δυσωδίαν, ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ μέσης ἐκφυσὰ \(\kappaατ\) ἐνιαυτόν ἀσφάλτου στερεὰς μέγεθος ποτὲ μὲν μεῖζον ἢ τρίπλεθρον, ἔστι δ' ὅτι οὐ πολὺ λειπόμενον πλέθρον \(\varepsilon\) ὑπάρχει \(\delta\) συνήθως οἱ περιοικοῦντες βάρβαροι τὸ μὲν μεῖζον καλοῦσι ταῦτα, τὸ δ' ἐλαττὸν μόσχον.

Tr. Geer (LCL): It lies along the middle of the satrapy of Idumaea, extending in length about five hundred stades and in width about sixty. … . and from its centre each year it sends S. forth a mass of solid asphalt, sometimes more than three plethra in area, sometimes a little less than one plethrum.

Tr. Bizière (Budé): Il s’étend au milieu de la satrapie d’Idumée et il a une longueur de cinq cents stades environ pour soixante de large. … . en son milieu, chaque année, il fait jaillir une masse d’asphalte solide dont la surface tantôt dépasse trois plethres, tantôt est légèrement inférieure à un plethre.

(b) Bibliography

Krumbholtz 1889.

(c) List of passages relevant to composition of Bibliothèque

(from Rubincam 1987:322-3; reproduced by kind permission of the Editor of Mouseion)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE 3: Passages relevant to the dates of composition of the <em>Bibliotheke</em></th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Details of Passage</th>
<th>Terminus post quem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1</td>
<td>30 years spent in process of composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.44.1</td>
<td>Macedonians had ruled Egypt for 276 years at time of Diodorus' visit in OI.180, during reign of Ptolemy [XI] Neos Dionysos</td>
<td>ca. 55 for calculation; 60-56 for visit</td>
<td>5.21.2 Caesar was first foreign general to reach British Isles; promise to describe Caesar's conquest of Britain later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.46.7</td>
<td>Most of the original 47 royal tombs in Egypt had been destroyed by the time of Diodorus' visit in OI.180</td>
<td>60/59 for visit</td>
<td>5.22.1 Caesar's expedition to Britain; promise to describe customs of Britons later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.83.8</td>
<td>He witnessed lynching of a Roman soldier who had accidentally killed a cat during his visit, at the time when Ptolemy had not yet been given title &quot;friend&quot; by the Romans</td>
<td>60/59</td>
<td>4.19.2 Caesar's sack of Alesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.47/1.5.1</td>
<td>Terminus of <em>Bibliotheke</em> as finally published = beginning of Celtic War</td>
<td>60/59 for event mentioned; 51 for end of Celtic War; 30 years from first work</td>
<td>5.25.4 Caesar's bridging of the Rhine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1</td>
<td><em>Bibliotheke</em> includes 730 years from OI.1.1 and 1138 years from Trojan War</td>
<td>46/5</td>
<td>55 or 53 for event; Nov. 43 for nomenclature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.38.2</td>
<td>Promise to describe Caesar's advancement of Roman rule into Britain later</td>
<td>55-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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