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How to Read a Diodoros Fragment*

Liv Mariah Yarrow

Abstract: Significant portions of Diodoros’ Bibliotheke have only been preserved for us through later epitomes, collections of thematic excerpts and learned references, all of which are part of the late antique culture of spoliation; at the same time his work is itself valued for its own transmission of fragments of earlier works. This chapter distinguishes different types of source citation and their relationship to the transmission of fragments, and then employs this typology in a close reading of ‘fragments’ from Diodoros in Tzetzes’ Khiliades and passages where Diodoros himself names multiples sources, particularly for his Cretan myth-history. Through these readings, the current critical edition of the Bibliotheke becomes a case study of the evolution of the culture of spoliation within the historiographical tradition.

* * *

Late antique studies have embraced a holistic approach to what has been called ‘the production of meaning by fragmentation’ or ‘an aesthetic of discontinuity’ in the artistic forms of the late third century onwards.¹ This approach posits a common cultural origin for the spoliation of art and architecture — the Arch of Constantine being the archetypal example — and poetic literary forms such as the cento, in which whole new poems are created by the selection of individual lines from earlier canonical

---

* This paper has its origins in a presentation I first developed for the 2009 Triennial Conference in Oxford. It has benefited from the suggestions and encouragement of many individuals: K. Clarke, J. Quinn, T. Cornell, C. Ebert, B. Sowers, D. Schur, L.I. Hau, M. Hashmi, S.D. Ackerman and many others. It would not have been possible without the heroic efforts of Brooklyn College’s Interlibrary Loan Service. The content of this published version was last edited in June 2013; it has thus not been revised in light of more recent scholarship, most especially Andrzej Dudzinski’s ‘The Bull of Phalaris and the Historical Method of Diodorus of Sicily’ Histos 7 (August 2013), 70-87.

¹ Phrases taken from Miller (1998, 18) and Roberts (1989, 61) and redeployed in Elsner 2000, 176.
works. The connections were first emphasised by Roberts in his controversial book *The Jeweled Style* in the late 1980s, and then further theorised by Miller in her North American Patristics Society Presidential Address in the late 1990s, before being adopted by Jas Elsner and others in the last decade. These last two are especially concerned with how this cultural phenomenon connects late antique to medieval cultural expressions. Instead of disparaging late antique forms as a degeneration of artistic expression, this approach accepts the intentionality of the selections, especially the symbolic potency of each choice. Stripped of their original compositional framework, the meaning of a single verse or relief panel is transformed simply through its redeployment and its juxtaposition against other spolia and new framing devices. And yet it is still the authenticity of the fragment — its connection with a glorified past — that makes it a desirable element within the new composition, connecting past and present, legitimating the new endeavour through that connection. Spolia are rarely deployed in an unmodified form: the creative adaption of the older components is commonplace, a re-carved head here, a spliced verse there. The appropriation at once celebrates continuity with the source material and demands the new composition be appreciated as a whole.

This chapter is the beginning of an argument that this well-documented late-antique cultural phenomenon has deep roots in the classical past, roots that are under-appreciated because of a scholarly inclination to limit our studies either by genre or by period. Diodoros provides an

---

2 On the Arch of Constantine, Elsner 2000 and Marlowe 2006. Marlowe explores how Constantine’s appropriations are not limited to the physical spolia, but also include the positioning of the monument. Critically, she observes that the arch interacts simultaneously with the building projects of Constantine’s immediate predecessors and the long sweep of urban development. On centos, see Verweyen and Witting 1991, Usher 1998, McGill 2005, and Sadness 2011. As early as the second century AD, Ireneaus uses the metaphor of mosaic tiles in his condemnation of the deceptive nature of centos and other pastiche literatures (I 9.4), see Prieto Domínguez 2008, 120.


4 Glucker (1999) borrows the cento metaphor for his study of Platonic passages in Cicero and critiques earlier Quellenforschung. Although he does not consider how a culture of spoliation might be influencing reception of Platonic texts, his work does show how broad and fertile this line of investigation could be. Prieto Domínguez (2008, 133-6) suggests
exceptional type of case study in the historiographical expression of this culture of spoliation because large parts of the Bibliotheca have only been preserved for us through later epitomes, i.e., collections of thematic excerpts and learned references, all of which are part of the late antique culture of spoliation; at the same time, his work is itself valued for its own transmission of fragments of earlier works. Diodoros needs to be read simultaneously as a source author and a transmitting author. Iris Sulimani has argued that Diodoros’ source usage represents a critical change from that observed in earlier extant historiographical texts, such as Herodotos and Polybios, and that he foreshadows later practices by authors such as Dionysios, Livy, Plutarch and Suetonius. Given the paucity of surviving Hellenistic historiography, and especially given the absence of key predecessors such as Anaximenes of Lampsakos, Ephoros, or Agatharkhides of Knidos, we are in a poor position to assert definitively the innovativeness of Diodoros’ approach. That said, Sulimani’s analysis helps us to see how Diodoros exemplifies an emerging trend in ancient historiography. Her work is part of a more general pattern of heightened sensitivity in modern scholarship towards the ancient historian’s control over representation within that comic parody may be part of the cento’s ‘pre-history’: consider Seneca’s Vergilian borrowing to describe Claudius’ limp (Sen. Apoc. 1 from Verg. Aen. II 724). Petrain (2005, 344) argues on the basis of the lithika portion of the Milan papyrus, as well as other evidence, that Roberts’ (1989) analysis of ‘jeweled style’ metaphor should be pushed back into at least the Hellenistic period. Formisano and Sogno (2010) theoretically connect the Latin cento with the same phenomenon that drove epitomisation.

5 For Diodoros as a transmitting author, see Yarrow (2006a, 116-7) with further bibliographical references as well as Ambaglio, Gattinoni, and Bravi 2008, esp. ch. 1.4 and 1.5: ‘La questione delle fonti della “Biblioteca” e i frammenti degli storici greci’ respectively. Optimistic Quellenforschung has often reattributed far too much of Diodoros to earlier authors, especially Poseidonios: see e.g. Theiler 1982 and Malitz 1983. Nevertheless, Diodoros remains a key source for our understanding of earlier authors, such as Agatharkhides, on which see Desanges 1998 with Engels 2004 for updated bibliography. For Diodoros as a source for later compilers and epitomators, see Yarrow (2006a, 108-9) with further bibliographical references, as well as the new case study offered by Gandini 2009.

6 See Sulimani 2008, esp. 560 for a summary of her argument. She identifies and illustrates seven types of source citation in Diodoros: 1) existence of various versions for the subject in discussion, 2) the opinion of the source is different from that of Diodoros, 3) the author mentioned is the main source for the topic in discussion, 4) disagreement regarding numbers and quantities, 5) ascribing credibility to numbers, 6) ascribing credibility to various issues, 7) criticism and praise.
his text, even when relying on earlier written sources. Such discussion of source usage has been paralleled by an equally rich discussion of approaches to fragmentary texts. However, there has not yet been a strong connection drawn between the conversation on source usage and the conversation on fragmentary authors. I believe that a missing bridge between the two may be found in a better understanding of the classical origins of the late antique culture of spoliation. To demonstrate how such a bridge might be built, the following discussion consists of three sections. The

---

7 Key acknowledgement of the power of source citations in ancient historiography is found in Hornblower (1994b, 71): ‘…the historians of antiquity should be treated as products of their age, not as if they themselves were carrying out Quellenforschung, the scientific study of sources. The word ‘sources’ is itself problematic, and covers a range from recent inspection of a text to an inaccurate memory of a snatch of a poem. The motives of ancient historians may be ‘literary’ rather than or as well as historical; and this permitted, for instance, the retentions of anachronism in such ‘sources’, and the preferring of easier and more charming authorities to harder if earlier and better ones.’ And Marincola (1997, 286): ‘… sources are chosen (when they are chosen) because of rhetorical criteria — reliability, numbers, ‘persuasiveness’, the character of the writer. Nevertheless, the selection of certain sources by a historian is an important element in his own credibility, for it is by selecting, criticising, and improving his predecessors that he makes his own abilities and character manifest to the reader.’ For an example of the backlash against the literary analysis of historiographical texts, see Bosworth 2003a and Lendon 2009. There remain divisions in scholarship regarding Diodoros’ originality in his use of his source materials: Hau (2009) finds that references to the changeability of fortune are inconsistent in the Diodoros’ work across different source units; by contrast, Rubincam (1998a) observes that many cross-references are original to the Bibliotheca or if adopted from his sources were done so in an appropriate manner. For a full overview of scholarship on this topic see the Introduction to this volume.

8 Potter (1999, 60-78) gives a solid introduction to the subject, its pitfalls, key scholarship, and the context of the major transmitting authors. Still, Brunt (1980) remains the most critical study. See also Dionisotti (1997, esp. 15-6) on the connotation of fragmenta and reliquiae in classical Latin. Lens (1992) seems oddly unaware of Brunt’s work, but usefully surveys much European scholarship, and is by his own admission particularly influenced by the methodology of Nicosia 1976. The in-depth study of transmitting authors, such as offered by the papers on Athenaios assembled by Braund and Wilkins (2000), is one means of overcoming the segregation of genres found in the study of fragments; see esp. Pelling 2000. Sider (2005, 39) and Arnott (1996, 43) both offer exemplary comments on how to address issues of transmission, not just for the individual authors on whom they work, but also more widely applicable principles.

9 Clarke (2008, ix) calls the collected fragments of the Greek historians ‘a hugely neglected body of evidence for the intellectual history of the ancient world’ (emphasis mine).
first provides a means of categorising fragments and source citations based on the intentions of the transmitting authors, and suggests that certain patterns of source citation become more common over time. The second and third sections demonstrate how the application of these categories affects our reading of Diodoros’ text, both where it is transmitted to us in a fragmentary form by later authors and where Diodoros himself transmits *reliquiae* from earlier authors. These two specific case-studies, one on the bull of Phalaris, the other on the Cretan myth-history, have been selected in order to illustrate how the evolution of a culture of spoliation is reflected in the proposed typology of source citation and fragments.

1. Types of source citations, types of fragments

Elsewhere I have expanded on Brunt’s differentiation of the possible types of fragments, or *reliquiae* as he preferred, in order to assess their potential utility for reconstructing lost originals. The diagram (figure 1) is a simplified representation of the relationship between different types of *reliquiae*. As a whole typology, it can be considered as either a system for categorising fragment types, if we want to prioritise the lost originals, or as a system of representing techniques for source usage if we prefer to emphasise the transmitting author. What follows in this section is an argument for why it is expedient to differentiate types of fragment and source usage in this way, following the order laid out in the diagram from left to right, with special attention to the connection between the historian’s choice of type and the reliability of the transmission for any potential reconstruction of the original source. There is also a chronological trend from ‘suppressed’ or ‘suggestive’ source usage towards more and more frequent explicit use of ‘referential’, ‘compositional’, and then finally ‘intentional’ *reliquiae*. One type never replaces another, but instead genre conventions shift to encourage greater explicit interaction with source materials, hence the connection to the culture of spoliation discussed above.

---

10 Brunt 1980 and Yarrow 2006a, 104-16. Kidd 1997 has also been influential on my approach. The ‘cover-text analysis’ method introduced by Schepens at the Heidelberg conference on ‘Collecting Fragments’ (1997) and widely used in his subsequent publications similarly emphasises the multiple functions of ‘fragments’ in the texts which transmit them; its potential is well exemplified by Baron (2013), who also addresses its limits in his first chapter. Its uniqueness has been questioned by Pitcher (2007).
It was not necessary for any ancient author in any genre to explicitly name the source of his information, ideas, or even direct language. The naming of a source or just the suggestion that a source or sources were used constitutes an authorial choice, one used for specific narrative or rhetorical effect. It was equally a specific choice to suppress one’s source or sources. Such ‘suppressed’ sources may be deduced with greater or lesser accuracy by modern scholars, but only in rare instances can we be certain in our assertions. Likewise, the suggestion of sources — from the non-specific, ‘some say this, others that’, to less veiled references, ‘our earliest chronicles record…’ — provides tempting invitations for modern speculation, while only revealing authorial control of the presentation of the text. A single example may suffice to illustrate both points.

In a letter sent from Cilicia, Cicero responds to questions raised by Atticus on a certain passage in the *Republic*. His answers give us a small window into how Cicero thought about his use of sources, at least in retrospect. The passage from the *Republic* discusses the correlation between proximity to the sea and access to luxuries:

---

Rance (2009) is an exceptional example of how one can construct a solid academic argument for the attribution of a deduced *reliquia*. The argument is based both on the habits of the transmitting author and careful analysis of unusual vocabulary of the fragment with that found in the possible sources.
What I said of Corinth may perhaps be said with truth of the whole of Greece; for even the Peloponnesus is almost in its entire extent close to the sea, and there is no people in it except the Phliasians whose territory does not touch the sea; and outside the Peloponnesus the Aenianes, the inhabitants of Doris, and the Dolopes are the only peoples who lie at a distance from the sea. (Cicero Rep. II 8)\textsuperscript{12}

Atticus seems to have taken exception to the accuracy of this geographical information, which Cicero then defends:

I took the statement that all the Peloponnesian communities adjoin the sea from the accounts of Dicaearchus, no scamp but a man approved by your own judgment. In the course of Chaeron’s story about Trophonius he takes the Greeks to task under many heads for clinging to the coast, and makes no exception of any place in the Peloponnesus. Though I thought him a good authority (after all he was extremely well informed and had lived in the Peloponnesus), I was surprised and almost incredulous, so I consulted Dionysius. He was taken aback at first, but afterwards, having as high an opinion of this Dicaearchan deity as you have of C. Vestorius or I of M. Cluvius, he was satisfied that we ought to trust him. He thought that Arcadia included a place on the coast called Lepreon, while Tenea, Aliphera, and Tritia were recent foundations in his opinion, which he supported by the Catalogue of Ships, where they are not mentioned. So I took the passage over from Dicaearchus just as it stood. As for ‘Phliasians’, I know that this is the correct form, and please put it in your copies as I have done in mine. But I was deceived at first by the analogy of Phlius with Opus and Sipus, which make Opuntians and Sipuntians. But I corrected this at once. (Cicero Att. VI 2,3 = 116.3)\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} et quod de Corintho dixi, id haut scio an liceat de cuncta Graecia verissime dicere; nam et ipsa Peloponnesus fere tota in mari est, nec praeter Phliasios ulli sunt quorum agri non contingant mare, et extra Peloponnesum Aenianes et Doris et Dolopes soli absunt a mari. Translation by C.W. Keyes.

\textsuperscript{13} quoniam respondi postremae tuae paginae prima mea, nunc ad primam revertar tuam. Peloponnesias civilitates omnis maritimas esse hominis non nequam sed etiam tuo iudicio probati Dicaearchi tabulis credidi. is multis nominibus in Trophoniana Chaeronis narratione Graecos in eo reprendit quod mare tantum secuti sint nec ullum in Peloponneso locum excipiit. quom mihi auctor placet (<et>enim erat ἱστορικώτατος et vixerat in Peloponneso), admirabar tamen et vix adredens communicavi cum Dionyio. atque is primo est commotus, deinde, quod de deo [cum] isto Dicaearchcio non minus bene existimabat quam tu de C. Vestorio, ego de M. Cluvius, non dubitabat quin ei crederemus. Arcadiae censebat esse Lepreon quoddam maritimum; Tenea autem et Aliphera et Tritia neōstata eī videbantur, idque τῶν τῶν νεών καταλόγων confirmabat ubi mentio non fit istorum. itaque istum ego locum toidem verbis a Dicaearcho transtuli. ‘Phliasios’ autem dixi sciebam et ita fac ut habeas; nos quidem sic
Cicero claims to have considered carefully the validity of his ‘suppressed’ source, to have discussed it at length with another intellectual, and that they both in turn relied on the authority of Homer for related geographical information. The testimony of the Catalogue of Ships does not seem to bear directly upon Atticus’ question, at least as far as can be deduced from the context; nevertheless, Cicero seems to go out of his way to work in a reference to Homer as he is building up the creditability of his geographical assertions in his correspondence with a friend. Why does Cicero own so freely his use of sources in the letter, but not in the original? He did not shy away from ‘suggestive’ indications of his source elsewhere in the same work. Had Dikaiarkhos’ name appeared in the dialogue near this point, even if circuitously worked into the conversation as Polybios and Panaitios are referenced at the work’s opening, he would never have had to justify himself to Atticus. He could have even referred to Homer. Just as source citation offers a window into the intellectual culture of antiquity, so too does the absence of name-dropping. Cicero carefully decided which particular source citations and manner of incorporation best served the purpose of his text, and intentionally excluded others that might have detracted or distracted from his authorial intention. He was not creating footnotes or an annotated bibliography, and his silence was not a form of deception or false claim to originality. Dikaiarkhos, his friend Dionysios, and Homer all bolster his geographical accuracy in a semi-private communiqué, but the mention of any or all could have detracted from the authoritative persona which Cicero was crafting for his primary interlocutor, Scipio the Elder.

habemus. sed primo me analogia deceperat, Φλιοῦς, Ὀποῦς, Σιποῦς, quod Ὀπούντιοι, Ἐπούντιοι. sed hoc continuo correximus. Translation by Shackleton Bailey.

14 Pliny praises Cicero’s suggestive references to the sources of his inspiration, NH praef. 22; on this passage see McGill 2012, 25-6 and 48-56.

15 On the reference to Polybios and Panaitios at De Republica I 21 [34]. Fox (2007, 92) observes ‘By drawing attention to the writers on whom the following account of the constitution is based, as well as granting historical verisimilitude to the speakers, Cicero is also drawing the reader’s attention to the very problem of questions of verisimilitude within such a setting’.

16 For Cicero’s use of Homer see Chinnici 2000 (non vidi), Zambardi 2001 and Arcidiacono 2007. For Homer as a geographical authority see Schenkeveld 1976, Clarke 1999a (esp. 60 n. 147 for key earlier bibliography), and Kim 2007 and 2010, 47-84. On Diodoros’ own use of Homer as well as other poets see Dueck 2007.

17 This set of texts also stands as a reminder that avoidance of deducing reliquiae can go too far: the passage from the Republic is discussed briefly, but is not printed as a fragment.
This same compositional intentionality is seen in ‘referential’ citations, those instances where the transmitting author invokes the name and/or work of an earlier author or authors in order to lend credibility to his own assertions. The reference to the earlier text can be positive or negative, ‘supporting’ or ‘polemical’. It has been asserted that the polemical tradition is largely concerned with self-definition and that its pervasiveness might be linked to rhetorical training, but the same could be said for all ‘referential’ fragments. In both cases, the transmitting author employs the reference to further his own literary objectives; invoking the name or names of those who have gone before, he signals to his audience his own learning and authority, his place within a wider intellectual tradition. As such, he need have no investment in communicating with fidelity the specific character or contents of the earlier text; it is the name of the source, not necessarily the contents of the original work, which directly augment the transmitting author’s composition. It is thus not uncommon for one passage to have cited as its source numerous earlier authors, which then has allowed modern scholars to count the one passage as a ‘fragment’ of each of the named authors. For instance, Josephus cites six different authors for Antiokhos IV’s sacking of the Temple. Although it seems highly unlikely that all six authors used the same language or even identical justifications to explain the event, the one sentence from Josephus appears in FGrHist as a fragment of five different authors.

‘Compositional’ fragments derive from genres of literature that are primarily arrangements of reliquiae and/or depend heavily on the discussion of such reliquiae, but where the intention of the transmitting author is
still to create his own unique work. So for instance, works like Aulus Gellius’ *Attic Nights* and Athenaios’ *Deipnosophists* fall into this category, as do lexicographical and grammatical works. Most commentaries and Stobaios should probably also be placed in this category. Lurking among these compositional fragments might be some true quotations, although we ought not to assume as much. Moreover, our perceptions of the character of the source text can be irretrievably skewed by the themes of the transmitting author, who may very well intentionally distort the passages. Pelling’s ‘Fun with Fragments’ shines a bright light on the sophistication, perhaps even manipulative tendencies, of Athenaios. His line of inquiry could be productively applied to other authors in this category.

‘Intentional’ *reliquiae* are those collections of extracts and epitomes, mostly from the late antique period, where the transmitter’s — here I hesitate to even use the term ‘transmitting author’ — clear and explicit purpose is to preserve some portion or sense of the source author. This category includes the *Library* of Photios and the collections of Constantine Porphyrogennetos. Translations might also be considered a form of intentional *reliquiae*. The work of such later compilers and epitomators

---

20 Briscoe (2005) uses two categories: non-verbatim paraphrases, i.e. passages ‘cited for content, particularly by subsequent historians and the Vergilian scholiasts’ and verbatim fragments, ‘a large portion of which come from grammatical or lexicographical writers’ (53). His categories map fairly closely on to the ‘referential’ and ‘compositional’ categories used here, although certainly not all ‘compositional’ fragments are verbatim and ‘referential’ citations may be poor reflections of the content of the original.


22 On the nature of Stobaios’ project, see Hose 2005; Piccione 2002; it is unfortunate Hose was unable to comment on Piccione’s similarly themed piece before his own went to press. Curnis (2006) demonstrates how Stobaios’ project may affect the transmission of a source text; more generally on his transmission of historical sources, see Curnis 2011.

23 Pelling 2000, as well as Lenfant 2007. It is a missed opportunity that Holford-Strevens and Vardi (2004) did not include a similar chapter in their volume on Gellius.

24 There has been a paucity of recent scholarship on the extracts of Constantine Porphyrogennetos, although there is still much of value in De Boor 1884; by contrast, Photios’ methodology and intellectual contributions to his own epitomes have received renewed scrutiny: see Cresci (2011) with recent bibliography, while Treadgold (1980) remains the key starting point, along with Diller 1962. On the effects of the extracts of Constantine Porphyrogennetos on the transmission of Diodoros, see Cordiano 2010 and 2011.

25 See comments on translations in n. 19 above. The scholarship on translation in antiquity is vast, but amongst recent contributions Bettini (2012) stands out; see especially in this context chapter four on Roman attitudes towards the accuracy of translation.
should be seen as the natural outgrowth of the same intellectual trends which inspired ever-increasing source references in literature.

This whole process of schematisation allows us to observe a parallel between types of reliquiae and the development of intellectual activity. It also summarises the qualitative differences between types of reliquiae and thus provides a framework for outlining the different limitations encountered when using each type of reliquiae as evidence in further academic discourse. It is important, however, to bear in mind that a single transmitting author may engage in a variety of source-usage practices and that one practice does not completely replace another over time. For instance, Pliny is more self-conscious about his naming and use of source materials than many of his predecessors, and as such readily shifts between ‘referential’ and ‘compositional’ source citations. Moreover, his embracing and development of the encyclopaedic genre foreshadows later literary genres. Diodoros engaged in at least the first three and perhaps the first four types of source usage. And the fragmentary portions of his text as they exist in modern editions are cobbled together from the last three types of reliquiae.

The connection between the evolution of a culture of spoliation and the types of source citation which have just been outlined in a schematic fashion can be clearly illustrated by two passages in modern editions of Diodoros, both of which can be described as ‘referential’ fragments in which the transmitting author is drawing on the authority of his sources as supporting evidence. In the first instance, Diodoros is one of the source authors, and in the second, he is the transmitting author. The comparison of the two passages will demonstrate both the methodological parallels and the ways in which Diodoros’ own historiographical methods foreshadow much later literary developments.

2. John Tzetzes, Khiliades I 649-668, also known as Diodoros IX 19

This Phalaris had Perilaüs, the famous bronze-smith, an Attic man, burned to death in a bronze bull. (650)

Since that man had worked in bronze the contrivance of a bull:

26 See n. 14 above, as well as Murphy 2004, 62-8.
for the oxen’s bellows, he crafted small pipes,
he opened a door in the side of the bull;
and, as a gift, he brings this bull to Phalaris.
Phalaris welcomes the man with gifts
and orders the contrivance be dedicated
to the gods.
Then, opening the side, that bronze-smith,
the treachery of the evil device revealed,
'If you wish, Phalaris, to punish someone,
shut him up within the bull, lay a fire beneath; (660)
the bull will seem to bellow from his groans:
you will delight at the groaning nasal pipes.'
Learning of this scheme, Phalaris reviled the man.
'Come, Perilaüs', he said, 'you first must demonstrate this:
imitate those pipe players; make clear
to me your skill.' (665)
When he crept inside — an imitator, indeed, of pipe music!
Phalaris closes the bull and heaps fire underneath.
Yet so that his death not pollute the bronze creation,
Down the rocks he hurled him, taken out half-dead.
The tale about the bull is told by Lucian of Syria, (670)
Diodoros, and Pindar, among also countless others.27

27 The translation is my own. The standard translation of Diodoros by Oldfather
prints the lines as prose not verse; by contrast, I have attempted to give some sense of
Tzetzes’ poetics, particularly how alien the style is to Diodoros’ own prose.
Chapter 19 of book IX in our standard editions of Diodoros is taken from John Tzetzes’ *Khiliades*, or more properly his *Histories*, which were compiled in the early twelfth century. The work is, in fact, a commentary on his own corpus of letters to historical and contemporary individuals of stature; 108 of these letters are extant. The letters are dense with complex literary allusions, and thus today the *Khiliades* is most valued for its references to over 400 different sources. Tzetzes tells us that he relied on his memory of these works, not the texts themselves. Tzetzes first gives a summary of events including some dramatic dialogue between the two characters before telling us not who his source is, but instead what earlier authors write about the bull. He highlights three names, a second-century AD satirist, a first-century BC historian, and a fifth-century BC poet, and then emphasises that there are innumerable others. His own version is validated by the diversity of authors who uphold the same tradition and his own erudition is confirmed by his command of his predecessors. His seeming selection of just three out of the multitudes to highlight by name confers on those three a special status, perhaps suggesting to his audience that these are to be valued more than the others. So this passage might tell us something about the reception of Diodoros in later periods, but can it tell us anything at all about his own text? This particular passage is valuable because a portion of all three of the named sources survive for comparison, giving us some insight into Tzetzes’ methodology.

Let us begin with Pindar. The same bronze bull does appear at the end of Pindar’s first *Pythian Ode*, but this is unlikely to have been Tzetzes’ direct inspiration. Not only is the allusion far too short on detail, but it leaves out the bull’s origins altogether, and suggests that Phalaris’ use of the device earned him an extended reputation for cruel and abusive tyranny, a presentation directly at odds with the single-use and religious dedication narrative of Tzetzes quoted above:

---

28 Leone (1968) is the current critical edition with detailed notes on Tzetzes’ sources. *Khiliades* is a name derived from how the first editor of the text arranged the material.

29 On Tzetzes’ identity as a commentator see Budelmann 2002.

30 See below, n. 52, 53, and 54.

31 Chil. I 275, 545, VIII 173-81, and X 355-61. Additional references have been collected by Hunger 1955, 46.
... ὁποθετήμερως ἀγχημα δόξας
οἶν ἄπωλυμένων ἀνδρῶν διήτα
καὶ λογίως καὶ ἀνοδοίς· οὐ φλένει
Κροίσου φιλόφρων ἄρετά·
tὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυτῆρα νηλέα
νόον (95)
ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντὰ φάτις,
oὐδὲ νὺν φόρμιγγες ὑπωρόφιαι κοινωνίαν
μαλθακὰν παίδων ὀάροισι δέκονται.

Pindar includes Phalaris as an exemplum of infamous memory, a counterpoint to Kroisos, a poor fit with Tzetzes’ Phalaris who is bent on punishing the bull’s creator. Tzetzes’ reference to Pindar thus seems little more than a learned conceit, a borrowing of Pindar’s antiquity to augment his own reputation.

Lucian’s account is an imaginative rhetorical piece, typical of the Second Sophistic, in which he creates a letter such as Phalaris himself might have sent to Delphi to be read aloud by his ambassadors as he defends his ‘tough-on-crime’ policies and explains his dedication of the bull.33 All the narrative elements of Lucian’s account are paralleled in Tzetzes’ summary, from the idea that Phalaris’ first inclination is to dedicate the lifelike creation to the gods, to the craftsman revealing the secret and being tricked by the tyrant to crawl inside, to his being removed and hurled down the cliffs while still alive so his death might not pollute the votive offering (Luc. Phal. 1.11-12). There are no particular verbal echoes in the two accounts, but it seems quite certain that Tzetzes is drawing his direct inspiration from Lucian, especially in the inclusion of dialogue.34

32 Translation by Race. A more literal reading of the two key lines (τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον / ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντὰ φάτις) would be: ‘the burner with the brazen bull, the one with pitiless spirit / hateful reputation pours onto Phalaris from all sides’. Race has reversed the content of lines 95 and 96 in his translation to give a more readily intelligible English rendering.

33 Lucian’s Phalaris has not received as much scholarly attention as the renewed scholarly interest in the Second Sophistic would lead one to expect; for context see Whitmarsh 2005. Lucian’s Phalaris gets slightly more discussion in Anderson 1993, esp. 63.

34 Luc. Phal. 1.12: “Ἄγε δὴ, ἔφη, ὦ Περίλαε, εἰ μὴ κενὴ ἄλλως ὑπόσχεσι ταῦτα ἔστι, δεῖξον ἡμῖν αὐτὸς εἰσελθὼν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῆς τέχνης καὶ μίμησαι τοὺς βοῶντας, ἵν’ εἴδο-μεν εἰ καὶ ἡ φῆς μέλη διὰ τῶν αὐλῶν φθέγγεται.
I would go further and speculate that Tzetzes was specifically remembering reading a manuscript of Lucian which also contained at least some of the pseudo-autobiographical *Letters of Phalaris*.35 The ‘fragment’ published in our standard editions of Diodoros excises the opening of this section of the *Khiliades* (I 25), which is in fact called ΠΕΡΙ ΣΤΗΣΙΧΟΡΟΥ or ‘concerning Stesikhoros’.36 The original reference in Tzetzes’ letters was to the lyric poet, not the tyrant of Akragas.

Στησίχορος ἦν λυρικὸς καὶ τοῦτον θυγατέρες: Ίμέρα τούτω δὲ πατρίς, πύλης τῆς Σικελίας, Ἀβάρις δὲ σύγχρονος ἦν καὶ τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ. (645)

Διήχθρευσε Φαλάριδι τῷ Ἀστυπαλαιέϊ, ἀνδρὶ τῆς Ἐρυθείας μὲν, πατρί δὲ τοῦ Παυρόλα, ὑφὶ τοῦ Λεωδάμαντος, Ἀκράγαντος τυράννων.

Stesichorus was a lyricist, as were his daughters, Himera his fatherland, a city of Sicily, Abaris his contemporary, so also Pythagoras (645)

And deep his enmity towards Phalaris of Astypalea, the husband of Erytheia, the father of Paurolas, son of Leodamas, tyrant of Akragas.

The details in this passage concerning the relations and acquaintances of both Stesikhoros and Phalaris are only paralleled in the *Letters*. In one letter, Phalaris writes to his ‘Little One’ (Παυρόλας), who is staying with his overbearing mother, Phalaris’ ‘Blushing Bride’ (Ἐρυθεία), about the wonderful example set by Stesikhoros’ daughters for having mastered their father’s artistic skill, thus exceeding the limits of their gender and providing an intellectual model for his own son.37 Abaris and Pythagoras also feature in the *Letters* in a manner much different from their presentation in other accounts of the Phalaris legend.38 The *Letters* are the only

35 Russell 1988, 97 suggests that because some of the *Letters* appear in certain Lucian manuscripts, especially Laurentianus 57.5 I, the second oldest in the Phalaris tradition, in Byzantine times some may have attributed them to Lucian.

36 Davies 1982 does not address this passage, but does make the important observation that Tzetzes never directly quotes Stesichorus and all of his knowledge of this poet appears to be second-hand. His methodology for debunking a false fragment of Stesichorus is not dissimilar from that which I employ in this section.

37 Letter 67, which is partially quoted and summarised by Stobaios IV 8.26. Russell (1988, 96) hypothesises that the otherwise unknown daughters of Stesikhoros ‘are born of a misunderstanding of a poem, something like Pindar’s description of his own poems as “daughters of the Muses”’ (Pind. *Nem.* 4.4)

38 Bentley 1777, 362.
tradition to present all three — Stesikhoros, Abaris, and Pythagoras — as part of the intellectual milieu of the tyrant. The date of the composition of the Letters has not been resolved; it is possible they were an evolving corpus, the core of which was established in the late second century AD and continued to develop through the Byzantine period. For our purposes, we need only note that they seem very far from the Diodoros’ own writings or influence, but very much in Tzetzes’ experience.

Having thus established Tzetzes’ most direct sources for this passage, we have to ask if his naming of Diodoros could in any way suggest that the contents or character of Diodoros’ account were similar to that found in Lucian, or even the pseudo-autobiographical Letters. Is it likely that Diodoros engaged in a similar apologetic portrayal of Phalaris? One in which his reputation as proverbial cruel overlord was rehabilitated into a pious, but tough enforcer of justice?

The Excerpta de Sententiis of Constantine Porphyrogennetos, which are known for their habit of verbatim quotation, suggest that Diodoros’ original account took a significantly different approach (D.S. IX 18 = Const. Exc. 4, p. 286).

ὅτι Περίλαος ὁ ἀνδριαντοποιὸς Φαλάριδι τῷ τυράννῳ κατασκευάσας βοῦς χαλκοῦ πρὸς τιμωρίαν τῶν ὁμοφύλων αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἐπειράθη τοῦ μεγέθους τῆς τιμωρίας· οἱ γὰρ κατὰ τῶν ἄλλων βουλευόμενοι τιφαῦλον ὡς ἐπίπαν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἐπιθυμίαις εἰώθασιν ἁλίσκεσθαι. The sculptor Perilaus made a brazen bull for Phalaris the tyrant to use in punishing his own people, but he was himself the first to make trial of that terrible form of punishment. For, in general, those who plan an evil thing aimed at others are usually snared in their own devices.

This extract is very short and perhaps condensed, but it explicitly says that the function of the bull was for Phalaris to punish his own people and that Perilaos was only the first to suffer in the contraption, implying that others followed. Moreover, in book 13 when recounting the plundering of Sicily by Hamilkar c. 403 BC, Diodoros inserts a digression

39 Hinz (2001) must be the starting point for any serious investigation of the Phalaris tradition or the Letters, but there is still much of value in Murray 1992.
40 Translation by Oldfather.
41 The ὅτι at the being of the extract is the standard means by which the Constantinian epitomator indicates the beginning of a new quotation; see Potter 1999, 72-4, as well as n. 23 above.
criticising Timaios for denying the existence of Phalaris’ bull (XIII 90. 4-7). Diodoros justifies his criticism by pointing out that the bull was part of the Carthaginian spoils which Scipio returned to Akragas in 146 BC and that it was still on display in the city in his own day. Walbank argued convincingly for the originality of this digression back in 1945 — that the details regarding the return and display of the bull are Diodoros’ contribution and not derived from Polybios.\(^{42}\) So, based on the Constantinian excerpt and the digression in book XIII, we would be highly justified in doubting that the Tzetzes passage should be printed amongst the fragments of Diodoros, any more that it could be called a Pindar fragment. Tzetzes is correct in his testimony that both Diodoros and Pindar discuss the bull, but his account does not reflect the character of their accounts.\(^{43}\) And for Tzetzes’ own compositional objectives, this disparity is wholly unproblematic.

However, for those of us more interested in Diodoros, this has problematic consequences due to the cumulative nature of scholarship. Mason’s new commentary on the second book of Josephos’ Judean War is a masterpiece of thorough research, but because the TLG attributes Tzetzes’ language to Diodoros himself, Mason has been led to assume inaccurately that the use of the verb κρημνίζω (ἐκρήμνισεν in Chil. I 669) in the Phalaris episode to describe the hurling of Perilaus off the cliffs predates Josephos’ own use of this otherwise late and unusual verb.\(^{44}\) This

\(^{42}\) Walbank 1945, 41: ‘…to describe the argument of Diodoros XIII 90.4-6 as an insertion from Polybios XII 25 is an over-simplification. Its origin would appear to have been rather as follows. As he excerpted Timaeus, Diodorus will have come upon the discussion on Phalaris’ bull, probably as a polemical digression consequent on Himilco’s capture of Agrigentum. Remembering that Polybios had inveighed against Timaeus for (allegedly) denying the bull’s existence, and knowing that a bull was still exhibited at Agrigentum, he apparently combined the two facts to produce his own original (if naïve and unconvincing) refutation of Timaeus’ theory’. On Diodoros’ use of Timaios as compared to Plb. XII 25.1-5 and Schol. Pindar. Pyth. 1.185 (FGrHist 366 F 28), see Schepens (2008) and Baron (2013, 83), with his general comments at xi. Also of possible relevance is Dudziński 2013 (non vidi).

\(^{43}\) Using a different methodology, Jal (2007) identifies Tzetzes, Chil. II 103-49 as another false fragment of Diodoros, at least with regard to the account of Arkhimedes’ burning mirrors. In standard editions this portion of Tzetzes is printed as D.S. XXVI 18 and as part of Cassius Dio XV. Zonaras’ careful epitome of Dio has the mirrors (IX 4), but lacks other details found in in Tzetzes such as Marcellus’ mourning of Arkhimedes’ accidental death and the construction of an elaborate tomb.

\(^{44}\) The compound form κατακρημνίζω is much more common earlier.
red herring has distracted him from exploring the probably much more significant antecedent usage of the verb in 2 Maccabees.45 Similarly the footnotes in Lewis’ Ancient Tyranny point to Diodoros IX 19 as an alternative tradition to that found in Cicero, thus suggesting to any casual reader that a rehabilitation of Phalaris’ character was already underway in the first century BC, instead of the product of a second sophistic rhetorical satire,46 whereas, in fact, the digression in book 13 on the return of the bull by the Romans well parallels anecdotes in Cicero’s Verrines and both may be partaking in a similar literary tradition recalling the bons mots of Scipio Aemilianus.47 Talking about the characterisation of Phalaris or the linguistic choices in ‘Diodoros IX 19’ as if they belonged to Diodoros is akin to attributing the portrait heads on the roundels of the Arch of Constantine to the Hadrianic period. The roundels themselves are clearly Hadrianic, and Diodoros clearly provided a narration of Phalaris, but the details need to be attributed to a much later period.48

So should we throw out all our Tzetzes fragments? No, but his reliability is highly variable. In his account of the Persian wars, he claims to be following Diodoros exclusively, but in fact there are no direct parallels between the two narratives. It seems instead that Tzetzes is remembering the basic outline of Herodotus.49 And yet, for the story of Milo, the athlete of Kroton, who led his people into battle dressed as Herakles, Tzetzes shows remarkable fidelity to Diodoros, right down to accurately transcribing the numbers of each army. The order of the information and the choice of words vary, no doubt in part because of Tzetzes’ transformation of a prose account into verse, but a relationship to the original could not be clearer:

45 Mason 2008, 33 n. 299.
46 Lewis 2006, 208 n. 10.
47 Walbank 1945, 42.
48 On the arch, see scholarship listed in n. 2 and n. 3. These examples of the dangers of giving equal weight to all fragments are not intended to slight the impressive research of either scholar: we are all dependent on the work of those who edit and publish the canonical editions of our texts.
49 The reference to Diodoros comes at Chil. I 970; the narrative events are similar to D.S. XI 4, but there are no direct parallels. Leone in his notes correlates the text to Herodotus instead. As this portion of Diodoros is extant, no editor has been tempted to include this portion of Tzetzes as a ‘fragment’, but had D.S. XI been lost to us, the case would be much different and we might have been led to assume that Diodoros followed Herodotus much more closely than he did.
After this, when *Pythagoras the philosopher* advised that they grant safety to the suppliants, they changed their opinions and accepted the war on behalf of the safety of the suppliants. When the Sybarites advanced against them with three hundred thousand men, the Crotoniates opposed them with one hundred thousand under the command of Milo the athlete, who by reason of his great physical strength was the first to put to flight his adversaries. For we are told that this man, who *had won the prize in Olympia six times* and whose courage was of the measure of his physical body, came to battle wearing his Olympic crowns and equipped with the gear of Heracles, lion’s skin and club; and he won the admiration of his fellow citizens as responsible for their victory.90

---

90 Translation by Oldfather.
91 The translation is my own.
Notice how Tzetzes compresses Diodoros’ account of Pythagoras’ role in the intercity conflict down to simply a note that he was a contemporary figure. We can assume a similar narrative compression in the opening of his discussion of Stesikhoros (Chil. I 645). Pythagoras is not relevant to accounts of either Stesikhoros or Phalaris or Milo, but the name carries too much intellectual weight not to be dropped at every opportunity. It is a similar instinct that leads Tzetzes to name multiple sources for each account. Yet, the reference to Herodotos at the very end of this passage on Milo is completely spurious; the episode appears nowhere in his Histories. The problem is that when we have no counter-evidence, we do not know how to disentangle ‘Tzetzes’ spoliation of classical literature.

Tzetzes was heir to a rich Byzantine tradition of redeploying the classical past to legitimate contemporary intellectual endeavours. His Histories are, in fact, verse commentaries on his own epistolary corpus: 12,000 lines of poetry organised not along any chronological or geographical pattern, but instead explicating each erudite and arcane reference he had used in his letters to friends, colleagues, and patrons, in the order that those references appear in his letters. The composition celebrates his own knowledge of classical literature; he cares less about the history itself than his ability to partake in the historiographical tradition.

---

52 Prieto Domínguez (2008, 127-33) sees Tzetzes’ work as a direct outgrowth of earlier centos: ‘A partir de las pautas dadas por Ireneo, y sin duda ya dependiente de los poetas centonarios religiosos, surgió una nueva concepción del género, desdibujada y confusa, que pese a seguir reconociendo sus cualidades intertextuales no acertaba a entender en su complejidad toda la maquinaria semiótica que un centón origina’, i.e. ‘Following the guidelines given by Ireneus, and without a doubt dependent on the poets of religious centos, a new concept of the genre arose, confused and imprecise, which while still recognising its intertextual qualities, did not manage to understand in its completeness the semiotic machinery of an original cento’ (transl. by C. Ebert). For general context see Kaldellis 2012.


54 Tzetzes’ cultivation of his self-presentation and artistic innovations have generally been neglected in favour of maligning his methods and style: ‘[The Khiliades] is an uncritical gossiping book, written in bad Greek in that abominable make-believe of a metre, called political verse’, so C.P. Mason in Smith’s 1876 Dictionary of Classical Biography and Mythology; a sentiment not so far off from the more detailed characterisation found in Jeffreys’ 1974, 149: ‘Much space is wasted in the Historiae in speculation whether he could finish the work on the folios available. … Personal reminiscence can obruade even in hexameters. In the Carmina Iliaca Odysseus’ and Diomedes’ mission inside Troy is interrupted by memories of Tzetzes’ own difficulties with the wife of the Eparch of Verroia.
say that Tzetzes stands at the end of the cultural tradition that embraced an ‘aesthetic of discontinuity’ and ‘the production of meaning by fragmentation’, but his work is certainly a mature expression of that tradition. Our appreciation of his methods, especially the variable nature of his engagement with his sources, makes us more careful readers of the ‘fragments’ of Diodoros which he gives us, but it may also make us more appreciative of how Diodoros may be interacting with his own source materials, especially the potential variability of that interaction. As mentioned above, Sulimani and others have already suggested that Diodoros may represent a critical stage in the development of source usage in ancient historiography. He is certainly influenced in his use of sources by his predecessors, Herodotos and Polybios amongst numerous others, but his methods of engagement with his sources, both those he identifies and those which he does not directly name, mark a cultural shift towards the creation of new unique compositions from pre-existing component parts. It is a shift that needs to be seen in a wide socio-cultural, even socio-political, context, a point I will return to at the end of this chapter. Diodoros is paving a road which will continue some thousand years down to Tzetzes. His source usage is messy partly because he does not have the same sort of fixed methodology that will emerge with authors such as Athenaios, or compilers like those working for Constantine Porphyrogenetos. Nevertheless, he, like his later counterparts, is partaking in a culture of spoliation.

His own journey on foot from Verroia to Constantinople is inserted into the Memnon story. He boasts in letters of his swift improvisation of accurate iambics. He quotes Euripides in a scholion, guessing wrongly which play is being quoted, and condemns another Euripidean passage by saying that he is only able to quote it because of a chance note. All that is worthwhile he has learned by heart. His scholia are equally obsessed with wasting paper. He apologizes for unnecessary comment on some lines of Aristophanes, but explains that he would otherwise have had to leave empty space on the page’. The emphasis is my own.

55 See n. 6 above.

56 Eusebius ostensibly quoting Porphyry at PE X 3 reports a fictional sympotic conversation in which a long line of historians and other authors are impuned for their copying of the material of others. It is tempting to take this as evidence of Diodoros’ predecessors, but the polemical nature of the testimony and clear rhetorical function in the two transmitting sources, Eusebius and Porphyry, mean we must hesitate to place too much weight upon it; see McGill (2012, 7) for discussion.
3. Diodoros V 80.4 and the Cretan sources

And since the greatest number of writers who have written about Crete disagree among themselves, there should be no occasion for surprise if what we report should not agree with every one of them; we have, indeed, followed as our authorities those who give the more probable account and are the most trustworthy, in some matters depending upon Epimenides who has written about the gods, in others upon Dosiades, Sosikrates, and Laosthenidas.\(^{57}\)

This passage from the Cretan portion of Diodoros’ myth-history well illustrates his experimentations with source citation, and has inspired numerous speculative interpretations. Jacoby hypothesised that Laosthenidas was the critical name because of his final position in the list, and thus suggested that Diodoros followed his account which itself drew upon the three earlier writers.\(^ {58}\) Fowler’s *Early Greek Mythology* prints the whole of Diodoros’ account as a fragment of Epimenides.\(^ {59}\) The authors of the entries on Dosiades and Sosikrates in Pauly’s *Realencyclopaedie* ascribed conflicting portions of Diodoros to each.\(^ {60}\) Bethe hypothesised that like Strabo, Diodoros was adopting these sources from Apollodoros’ *Catalogue of Ships*.\(^ {61}\) One can imagine that Diodoros might have suppressed Apollodoros’ name, because although authoritative, he was not himself Cretan and thus not as closely tied to the narrative topic. All of these suggestions are possible, but none can be substantiated and most are incompatible with one another. All remain unsubstantiated hypotheses.

Once such speculative tendencies are reigned in, the passage has more value as an assertion of what types of sources Diodoros wanted to be seen to be using, regardless of which, if any, he followed most closely. The

---

\(^ {57}\) Translation by Oldfather.

\(^ {58}\) *FGrHist* III, *Kommentar*, 337. Jacoby’s speculation has been accepted as near-fact by many later scholars: Wacholder 1975, 82.

\(^ {59}\) Fowler 2000, 83-95.

\(^ {60}\) Laqueur 1927, 1160; Schwartz 1905a.

\(^ {61}\) Bethe 1889.
first three names — Epimenides, Dosiades, and Sosikrates — are all well-known writers from Crete; Laosthenidas is otherwise unknown, but prosopography suggests that the name itself is likely to be Cretan.\textsuperscript{62} Epimenides’ name carried particular gravitas because of the association with the legendary sage who miraculously slept for 50 years and was counted by some amongst the seven wise men. Modern scholars want to make a distinction between this mythical figure of the archaic period and the author, or authors, of works attributed to him which are likely to have been composed in the fourth century,\textsuperscript{63} but this distinction was not of particular concern to Diodoros. Epimenides’ name comes first not just because he is the ‘earliest’ source, but because his has the most authoritative resonance, especially in divine matters. Notice that in the ‘some… others’ construction, Epimenides is balanced by not one, but three names, as if the weight of his authority tips the grammatical balance.

The few other places where Diodoros piles up names can help us see his rhetorical inclinations in doing so. The passage at the introduction of his discussion of the Nile is not concerned with naming his particular sources, but instead with outlining why the most reliable of sources are unsatisfactory in this instance (D.S. I 37):\textsuperscript{64}

\begin{verbatim}
(1) Μεγάλης δ’ οὔσης ἀπορίας περὶ τῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ πληρώσεως, ἐπικεχειρηκας πολλοὶ τῶν τε μεταφυσικῶν καὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἀποδιδόναι τὰς ταύτης αἰτίας… (3) οἱ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸν Ἑλλάνικον καὶ Ἡκαταῖον, ἔτι δ’ Ἐκατάιον, καὶ πάντες οἱ τουοήται… εἰς τὰς μυθεῖδες ἀποφάσεις ἀπελέχθησαν… (4) Ἡρόδοτος… ἀντιλεγομέναις ὑπονοίαις εὑρίσκεται, Ξενοφῶν δὲ καὶ Θουκυδίδης… ἀπέσχοντο τελέως κατὰ τὰς μυθικὰς ἀποφάσεις τῶν κατ’ Ἀἴγυπτον οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἡρόδοτον καὶ Ἡθοπόμπου μάλιστα πάντων εἰς ταῦτ’ ἐπιταθέντες ήμιστα τῇς ἀληθείαις ἐπέτυχον…
\end{verbatim}

(1) Since there is great difficulty in explaining the swelling of the river, many philosophers and historians have undertaken to set forth the causes of it. … (3) Hellanicus and Cadmus, for instance, as well as Hecataeus and all the writers like them, …answers offered by the myths; (4) Herodotus, …followed contradictory guesses; Xenophon and Thucydides, …refrained in their writings from any mention of the regions about Egypt; and Ephorus and Theopompus, who of all writers paid most attention to these matters, hit upon the truth the least. …\textsuperscript{65}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{62} Sekunda 2011, ‘Biographical Essay’.  
\textsuperscript{63} Toye 2007, ‘Biographical Essay’.  
\textsuperscript{64} Muntz (2011) engages in a similar, but much more in-depth look at the earlier scholarly assumptions behind Diodoros’ source usage in the first book.  
\textsuperscript{65} Translation by Oldfather.
\end{flushright}
He goes on to attribute this to the inaccessible nature of Egypt before Ptolemy Philadelphos. The polemical cataloguing obviously highlights his privileged position, but also provides justification for why his summary digression may diverge from more familiar accounts. It also emphasises the difference between outsider and insider knowledge: those who are outsiders to Egypt refrained from discussing it or gave inaccurate accounts, until such a time when insider information became available. We see here similar concerns as in the earlier passage on Cretan sources: a desire to defend against accusations of diverging from the canon, and a privileging of knowledge from those from the specific geographical region.

However, this layering of source names, with little connection to specific facts or portions of the text, is relatively rare in the surviving portions of Diodoros. Much more common are statements announcing that he is following a particular account followed by interjections regarding divergent testimony.66 Or, places where he suppresses the name of his source, such as when he echoes Polybios’ criticism of Timaios without directly naming Polybios.67 This pattern also holds up outside the mythological books as well. Another relatively rare instance of multiple source citations comes in the recording of the length of Agathokles’ life and reign after the narration of his death:

Agathocles had committed numerous and most varied acts of slaughter during his reign, and since to his cruelty towards his own people he added impiety towards the gods, the manner of his death was appropriate to his lawless life. He lived for seventy-two years and ruled for twenty-eight, according to Timaeus of Syracuse [sic], Callias, another Syracusan, the author of twenty-two books, and Antander, the brother of Agathocles, who was himself a historian. (D.S. XXI 16.5, transl. by Walton)

66 Sulimani 2008, 244-5.
This passage is only preserved in the Hoeschel epitome, a poorly understood transmitting source for which the original manuscript is now lost.\footnote{On the character of the Hoeschel epitome see Walton 1956, 274, 276. See also Walton (1957, viii-xii, xvii-xx, and xxiii) and Goukowsky 2006, xii-xxix.} While variable in quality, the epitome is known for its interest in Sicilian affairs and at points approaches verbatim accuracy.\footnote{For the potential verbal accuracy of the Hoeschel epitome compare D.S. XXI 18.2 with XXI 18.3 from the Constantinian excerpts.} At this point in his narrative, Diodoros wants to emphasise the convergent nature of the sources regarding this particular information. The sources he is keen to reconcile are all intimately connected to the events: Timaios has been exiled by Agathokles; Kallias seems to have served as a court historian, growing wealthy off the king (D.S. XXI 17.4); and Antandros, the brother of Agathokles, was not only a historian, but also served as his brother’s general and counsellor (D.S. XX 4.1; Just. XXII 7.2). So again we see a concern for insider knowledge. The piling up of references is probably once again inspired by Diodoros’ concerns over potentially divergent traditions. This hypothesis is supported by the subsequent chapters in our edition of Diodoros, taken from the Constantinian excerpts, which discuss the deep biases of both Timaios and Kallias in their narration of Agathokles’ career.

In all three examples, we see Diodoros engaging with sources as a means of augmenting his own credibility. He borrows their authority in order to bolster his own, and he cites more sources at those points where he feels that credibility might be more in doubt. None of this means that he did not at points copy from his sources with greater or lesser degrees of fidelity. He was experimenting with different means of deploying pre-existing materials in his creation of a new type of history. His dependence on earlier authors to provide his basic building blocks did not detract from, but rather enhanced the value of his final product in his own eyes and in the eyes of contemporary and later observers.

4. Contextualising Diodoros’ cultural thought-world

It is a long stretch from this type of close reading of individual fragments to the big picture of the classical roots for the late antique culture of spoliation. A carefully plotted line would have to be drawn from
Diodoros through Nikolaos of Damaskos, to Aulus Gellius and Athenaios, down to Eusebios and Photios, with many other stops and branches and potential precursors explored along the way, but that would test the limits of a single article. However, if we read Diodoros strictly in a literary context as part of a line of historians, or even more broadly within a range of genres, we lose the opportunity to see how his practices might intersect with other prevalent cultural behaviours of his time. Just as the cento and the arch of Constantine have been connected, so too can we find socio-political cultural appropriations that contextualise Diodoros’ adoption and adaptation of his source materials. One of the limits of studies that focus solely on the transmission of fragmentary texts and habits of source citation is the disjunction between our understanding of literary culture and wider social forces. For instance, there has already been good work done on ancient book culture and how the emergence of Romano-Hellenistic libraries effected literary production, but this could be taken a step further to consider how books and libraries were themselves treated as spolia.70 The appropriation and redeployment of collections of texts had at once deep political symbolism and at the same time transformed how texts might be used and by whom. Diodoros himself connects his access to literary texts directly to Roman imperialism: ‘For the supremacy of this city, a supremacy so powerful that it extends to the bounds of the inhabited world, has provided us in the course of our long residence there with copious resources in the most accessible form’.71

Therefore, this preliminary study closes with a contextualising episode which illuminates the cultural thought-world in which Diodoros operated. We may have few other surviving contemporary literary examples in which pieces of the past are redeployed to create new compositions of immediate significance,72 but that behaviour was already well underway in the political use of public monuments. In the Verrines, Cicero condemns Verres’ plundering of Sicily’s sanctuaries for art to be redeployed in his own

---

70 The literature on libraries is vast; see esp. Perrin (2010) and Too (2010) with previous bibliography, but there is still much of value in Marshall 1976. For the impact of libraries on our texts see e.g. Higbie 2010b. For libraries as spoils of war examples include Plu. Aem. 6.5; Plu. Pomp. 4.1; Plu. Sull. 26.1.
71 I 4.3: ἡ γὰρ ταύτης τῆς πόλεως ὑπεροχή, διατείνουσα τῇ δυνάμει πρὸς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἐτοιμοτάτας καὶ πλείστας ἤμιν ἀφορμὰς παρέσχετο παρεπιδημήσασιν ἐν αὐτῇ πλείο χρόνον.
72 See above, n. 56.
private villas, but in doing so he recalls Scipio Aemilianus as a counter-example. After the sack of Carthage, Scipio sought to restore to the cities of Sicily the works of art previously plundered by the Carthaginians. As already mentioned, one of the items returned was said to be Phalaris’ bull. We can doubt the likelihood that the bull Scipio sent from Carthage to Akragas was actually the sculpture of the Phalaris legend, but the authenticity of the bull has little relevance for the potent symbolism of the restoration.

… And when Scipio restored that bull to the Agrigentines, he is reported to have said that he thought it reasonable for them to consider whether it was more advantageous to the Sicilians to be subject to their own princes, or to be under the dominion of the Roman people, when they had the same thing as a monument of the cruelty of their domestic masters, and of our liberality. (Cic. Verr. 2.4.73, transl. by Yonge).

The bull that Diodoros tells us he saw standing in Akragas was not just a connection with the past age of Greek tyrants, but a highly relevant statement of Roman authority. The bronze bull that was transported from Carthage to Sicily memorialised the superiority of Roman rule, not just through their ability to redistribute wealth over continents, but also by encapsulating the idea that the local populations were unfit to govern themselves. Scipio’s actions were not unusual. In the same year, Mummius invested great energy in distributing the famous monuments of Corinth all over the Mediterranean. The artistic productions of Greek masters were re-authored by the Roman general to become not only testimony of his accomplishments, but also his magnanimity. And in the previous generation, Scipio’s own father had claimed Perseus’ unfinished monument at Delphi for his own use, making it a synecdochic embodiment of his conquest of the king’s territory. These literal spoils of war are positioned and labelled in such a manner that they take on new meanings, encoding

---

73 Miles 2008 with Williams 2012.
74 D.S. XIII 90.5; Murray 1992, 55 and Schepens 2008, 60-1.
75 Yarrow 2006b.
Roman hegemony and the *gloria* of individual commanders. And yet, the new meaning, their value as spolia, is dependent on their previous cultural value. The monuments must be recognised as spolia in order to effectively communicate their intended message.

As these anecdotes reveal, Diodoros operated in a world where pieces of the past were being constantly redeployed in new contexts in the creation of a new world order. We ought not be too surprised if he tried his own hand at cultural redeployment.
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