

The Image of Athens in Diodorus Siculus

Thomas A. Schmitz

There's no denying it: Diodorus Siculus has a bad press. In a contribution published 20 years ago, François Chamoux (who edited Diodorus for the Collection Budé) called him an “unloved historian” Chamoux [3], and there is still no sign that classicists are finding more love for his work. It would be all too easy to quote a couple of devastating judgments and angry remarks about him. And it is indeed difficult to like a historian who is careless enough, e.g., to have the Athenian general Chabrias first be assassinated in Abdera, in 375 BCE (15.36.4), and then die gloriously in a battle off the island of Chios in 357 BCE (16.7.4). Diodorus is certainly not a first-rate historian; his account lacks both penetrating critical acumen and factual reliability. Furthermore, Diodorus does not make up for his blunders and inaccuracies by providing readers a brilliant and compelling narrative or a rhetorical masterpiece; in fact, judgments about his style are even more negative than those about his qualities as a historian.¹

It is not surprising, then, that for a long period of Diodorean scholarship, *Quellenforschung* was the only game in town, and it has been argued that Diodorus' only value lies in the fact that he was too inept to alter his sources.² Analysing Diodorus' sources is indeed an important part of coming to grips with his text; if we look at the *Library* as a work of historiography, we need to know where Diodorus received the information he transmits. But this is not the only interesting thing we can say about his work. Recent contributions, most notably the studies by K. S. Sacks,³ have demonstrated that Diodorus may have been a compiler, yet in selecting, arranging, commenting, and rewriting his sources, he followed his own ideology. Even where his *Library* is based on a single source, as is the case for a number of books, Diodorus had to select and compress the material he found, and this very act of choosing what to include and what to omit was controlled by the author's ideological bias. Of course, Diodorus most likely was not conscious of this bias, which was in turn controlled by the cultural outlook of his own time and surroundings. Hence, Sacks has shown one possible way to go beyond *Quellenforschung* when we look at Diodorus' *Library*. |

235

236

This paper will not attempt to rescue Diodorus' reputation as a historical source or as a writer of prose. Instead, when I reread Diodorus' *Library* for this paper, I had one simple question in mind: how can we position Diodorus in the history of Greek prose writing? What can we say about his aims and ideology, about the way in which he looked at the world in general and at the development of Greek culture in particular? And above all: if we accept that imperial Greek literature is markedly different from Hellenistic literature, where is Diodorus' place in this continuum? The analytical tool which I propose to use in order to answer these questions, at least in part, is the place classical Athens occupies in Diodorus' *Historical Library*. As is known, Diodorus sets himself the lofty aim “to describe the events of the entire known world that have been consigned to memory as

1 For an example, see Stylianou [32:15–6].

2 See F. Bizière's comment [2:374]: “Diodore nous apparaît, encore une fois, comme un compilateur qui modifie fort peu ses sources, ce qui, d'ailleurs, fait son utilité, sinon son mérite”; V. J. Gray [11] rightly cautions against this approach.

3 See items Sacks [20]–Sacks [21] in the list of references.

though they were those of a single city.”⁴ For someone looking at historical developments from such a universal perspective, Athens becomes just one Greek city among many others; a city with an immense cultural background, it is true, and with an interesting political history, but by no means comparable to the really big players, above all the Roman Empire.⁵

For the classizing outlook of the second and third centuries CE, on the other hand, Athens played a much more central role: it is a symbolic place, a “semanticized” space which embodies the great classical past and is thus a defining “site of memory.”⁶ Members of the educated elite (πεπαιδευμένοι) regarded the period of Greek history roughly between the battle of Marathon (490 BCE) and the death of Alexander the Great (323 BCE) as the great classical age of Greek culture and the point of reference for defining “Greekness,” and Athens as the symbolic focus of this glorious heritage: not only was the city one of the most important political and military powers during these years; not only was the poetry and prose written in Athens during this period of particular quality and exerted an overwhelming influence; because of the linguistic movement of “Atticism,” all educated Έλληνες had to read and reread Athenian authors, and Athens became something of an intellectual home to all πεπαιδευμένοι, even if they lived far away from Greece and had never actually seen the city.⁷ Hadrian’s Panhellenion had its seat in Athens; this was a highly visible expression of this function of Athens as the religious, symbolic and cultural centre of the Greek world.⁸ |

236

237

From the beginning of the second century CE on, we have an abundance of Greek texts which demonstrate the ways in which this historical model was produced and developed. It was not so much historiography itself which was paramount in this development, but texts in many other genres of (mainly) prose literature: texts around this still enigmatic and ill defined movement of the Second Sophistic such as a number of declamations and orations by Dio Chrysostom, Polemo, Herodes Atticus, and Aelius Aristides as well as the anecdotal account of the movement by Philostratus; rhetorical handbooks and treatises; the entertaining parodies and satirical pieces of Lucian; the Greek novels; Pausanias’s description of Greece, and of course hundreds of inscriptions all over the Roman Empire, to name but a few.

What emerges from these texts is a relatively homogeneous picture of a golden age of Greek culture, with Athens as the centre of a cultural identity attractive and available to all those who saw themselves as Greeks. The texts we have from the late Hellenistic era and the first decades of the imperial period seem to be less interested in the great past and in Athens. Dionysius of Halicarnassus defines and propagates his own brand of classicism, but it seems rooted in language and literature, above all, and is not as easy to pinpoint in terms of a symbolic centre.⁹ Diodorus is one of the few Greek authors of the Augustan period whose works survive, and one of the very few who give an extended, coherent account of classical Greek history. If we succeed in teasing out at least some aspects of his view of Greek culture and its historical development, Diodorus, because of this intermediate position between the Hellenistic world and the Greek renaissance of the imperial period, would fill a real gap in our knowledge of what Greeks thought about their past. So my question will be: is our impression of such a break correct, or can we detect traces in his *Library* that prepare us

4 1.3.6: τὰς εἰς μνήμην παραδεδομένας τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου πράξεις, ὥσπερ τινὸς μιᾶς πόλεως [...] ἀναγράψαι; cf. 1.1.3, about earlier universal historians: οἱ [...] τὰς κοινὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης πράξεις καθάπερ μιᾶς πόλεως ἀναγράψαντες; for the implications of these passages in terms of geographical imagination, see above, p. 40. On the universal aspect of Diodorus’ *Library* and its aims, see the illuminating analysis in Clarke’s article Clarke [4], Corsaro [5] and Corsaro [6], Wiater [36] and Wiater [37], and Most in this volume, p. 165.

5 For an example of this attitude, see the way Polybius gives short shrift to Athens at 6.44.1–2.

6 For the concepts of semanticized space and *lieux de mémoire*, see the Introduction, above p. 37 with footnote 89.

7 This development may have been fostered, at least in part, by Roman interest in Athens as a symbol of Greek culture (and tourist attraction); see above, p. 40.

8 For the Panhellenion and its role in second-century politics and culture, see Spawforth/Walker [28] and Spawforth/Walker [29], Jones [14], Spawforth [27], and Romeo [18].

9 For Dionysius’ classicism, see Fox’s contribution in this volume, Gelzer [10], Hidber [13], and Wiater [38].

for the classicizing outlook of the Second Sophistic?

Hence, what I suggest to do in this contribution is taking a closer look at the place these classical and panhellenic values occupy in Diodorus' *Library*. I will propose to compare his point of view to examples of the full-blown classicizing outlook of the second and third centuries. In so doing, I want to distinguish areas where later developments are at least hinted at in Diodorus' writings from fields where his view of history seems very remote indeed from later writers. I will not be concerned with Diodorus' "sources" in this paper. Obviously, *Quellenforschung* is important for an author like him, and as everybody working in this field, I am deeply grateful to the work of scholars such as Eduard Schwartz, Richard Laqueur, or Felix Jacoby. But I would also insist that every compilation is a new creation in its own right¹⁰ and that we must take Diodorus seriously as evidence of the historiographical discourse of his time. As Philip Stadter [30:85] has rightly reminded us, "Diodorus' history too is a prism, altering the material it transmits." |

237

238

We begin by taking a look at Diodorus' language. Modern commentators are unanimous in criticizing him for his use of a bland, monotonous style, a typical example of the somewhat boring Hellenistic Greek. This observation is certainly true. His use of numerous participles, pale compound verbs, and repetitious vocabulary makes his *Library* not very enjoyable to read. Nevertheless, we can observe that Diodorus paid close attention to questions of literary style. In the elaborate preface to the entire work, Diodorus celebrates the power of speech:

συμβάλλεται δ' αὐτή καὶ πρὸς λόγου δύναμιν, οὗ κάλλιον ἕτερον οὐκ ἂν τις ῥαδίως εὔροι. τούτῳ γὰρ οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνας τῶν βαρβάρων, οἱ δὲ πεπαιδευμένοι τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν προέχουσι, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις διὰ μόνου τούτου δυνατόν ἐστιν ἓνα τῶν πολλῶν περιγενέσθαι· καθόλου δὲ φαίνεται πᾶν τὸ προτεθὲν τοιοῦτον ὅποιον ἂν ἢ τοῦ λέγοντος δύναμις παραστήσῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας ἀξίους λόγου προσαγορεύομεν, ὡς τοῦτο τὸ πρωτεῖον τῆς ἀρετῆς περιεποιημένους.

History also contributes to the power of speech, and a nobler thing than that may not easily be found. For it is this that makes the Greeks superior to the barbarians, and the educated to the uneducated, and, furthermore, it is by means of speech alone that man is able to gain ascendancy over the many; and, in general, the impression made by every measure that is proposed corresponds to the power of the speaker who presents it, and we describe great and good men as "worthy of speech," as though therein they had won the highest prize of excellence.¹¹ (I.2.5–6)

This hymnical praise of the power of speech is reminiscent of a number of classical precedents, e.g., a famous passage in Isocrates's speech *Nicoles* (3.5–9). Diodorus thus seems prepared to pay close attention to matters of language and style, and we can find a few passages in the work itself where this attention is visible. In book 12, Diodorus describes the famous embassy which the Leontinians sent to Athens in 427 BCE and reproaches Gorgias for his style:

πρῶτος γὰρ ἐχρήσατο τοῖς τῆς λέξεως σχηματισμοῖς περιττοτέροις καὶ τῇ φιλοτεχνίᾳ διαφέρουσιν, ἀντιθέτοις καὶ ἰσοκώλοις καὶ παρίσοις καὶ ὁμοιοτελεύτοις καὶ τισιν ἑτέροις τοιοῦτοις, ἃ τότε μὲν διὰ τὸ ξένον τῆς κατασκευῆς ἀποδοχῆς ἠξιοῦτο, νῦν δὲ περιεργίαν ἔχειν δοκεῖ καὶ φαίνεται καταγέλαστα πλεονάκεις καὶ κατακόρως τιθέμενα.

[Gorgias] was the first to use the rather unusual and carefully devised structures of speech, such as antithesis, sentences with equal members or balanced clauses or similar endings, and

10 For compilation as a fundamental principle of the "encyclopaedic universalism" characteristic of the age of Augustus, see Most's contribution in this volume at p. 165.

11 All translations are from Oldfather's Loeb edition.

the like, all of which at that time was enthusiastically received because the device was exotic, but is now looked upon as labored and to be ridiculed when employed too frequently and tediously. (12.53.4)

238 At a first glance, Diodorus' condemnation of Gorgias's language could be seen as a step towards
 Atticist purism; Dionysius of Halicarnassus is equally unimpressed with Gorgias' excessive use of
 rhetorical figures.¹² There is an element of progress | in Diodorus' description which sounds familiar:
 239 the opposition between the admiration for Gorgias' figures *then* (τότε μὲν) and the disdain into
 which they have fallen *now* (νῦν δέ) is reminiscent of Dionysius' classicism, which also proclaims that
 contemporary taste has overcome the vulgarity of Asianism.¹³ However, there is a decisive difference:
 unlike Dionysius, Diodorus does not blame any decadent intermediate period for this rhetorical
 decadence; he simply states that we are "now" above such puerilities.

Nevertheless, such passages are rare in Diodorus' work. Occasionally, his style will rise to rhetori-
 cal heights which would blend into any sophistic declamation of the second century CE. To quote
 just two examples: the description of the battle of Pylos (12.62.6–7) elaborates on one of Diodorus'
 favourite *topoi*, the strange reversals of fortune, and uses a number of paradoxical antitheses that
 would not be out of place in the declamations of, e.g., Polemo; the hymnic praise of the men who
 fought and died at Thermopylae (11.11) sounds like a showpiece coming directly out of the rhetorical
 classroom. But such passages are exceptions in the *Library*; in general, the language and style of his
 writing show that Diodorus is not (yet) an example for the all-pervading Atticism of the second and
 third centuries *ce*, but I would suggest that he was not as careless and monotonous a writer as some
 critics claim.

Another striking aspect of classicism during the Second Sophistic is rigorous canonization. In
 all areas of cultural and historical knowledge, there was a pretty clear distinction between what
 was considered first-rate and part of the cultural baggage of every educated man and what was
 non-canonical and could safely be ignored.¹⁴ Moreover, there was a marked tendency to reduce the
 classical past to this select number of great cultural and historical heroes. One striking aspect of
 this tendency can be observed in a number of historical blunders or inaccuracies. As I have tried to
 show elsewhere,¹⁵ writers and public were quite prepared to accept such inaccuracies and mistakes
 for the sake of a consistent, harmonious image of the classical period. Two examples will suffice:
 Polemo, in his declamations for the aftermath of the battle of Marathon, lets his speakers allude
 to the custom of the funerary oration (which was established at least a decade or so after 490 BCE)
 and emphasize the importance of the poet Aeschylus (whose first victory in the tragic competition
 is posterior to Marathon). Lucian, in his dialogue *Anacharsis*, has Solon explain the institution of
 political comedy to the Scythian Anacharsis, although this literary genre emerged several decades
 239 after Solon's death. These are not merely historical blunders, but features significant for Lucian's and
 the Second | Sophistic's view of classical Athens: for authors of this period (and apparently, for their
 240 audiences as well), Athens becomes a quasi-mythical place, an impressive scene on which heroes like
 Solon, Aristophanes, Socrates, and Themistocles all live together in a freefloating, timeless universe.

Similar tendencies can be discovered in Diodorus. In book 12, Diodorus provides a brief summary

12 *Thuc.* 24 = *Thuc. idiom.* 2 εὔροισι δ' ἄν τις οὐκ ὀλίγα τῶν θεατρικῶν σχημάτων κείμενα παρ' αὐτῶ, τὰς παρισώσεις λέγω καὶ παρομοιώσεις καὶ παρονομασίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις, ἐν αἷς ἐπλεόνασε Γοργίας ὁ Λεοντίνος [...]. "The ostentatious figures of speech are also to be found in this work in no small number – I mean those parallelisms in length and sound, word-play and antithesis, which were excessively used by Gorgias of Leontini [...]" [transl. Stephen Usher]. Cf. *Lys.* 3, *Isaeus* 19, or *Dem.* 25.

13 For Dionysius's classicism, see above, note 9.

14 On the establishment of this classicizing canon, especially the canon of the ten orators, see Smith [26], Worthington [39], and O'Sullivan [16].

15 See my book on the Second Sophistic, Schmitz [22], esp. 201–5, and my contribution Schmitz [23].

of the great advances in all kinds of cultural areas during the *Pentekontaetia*, the period of 50 years between the end of the Persian wars and the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. In this account, Diodorus gives a list of writers and philosophers who were active during this period:

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν παιδείαν ἐπὶ πολὺν προέβη, καὶ φιλοσοφία προετιμήθη καὶ ῥητορικὴ παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν Ἑλλήσι, μάλιστα δὲ Ἀθηναίοις. φιλόσοφοι μὲν γὰρ οἱ περὶ τὸν Σωκράτη καὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Ἀριστοτέλην, ῥήτορες δὲ Περικλῆς καὶ Ἰσοκράτης καὶ οἱ τούτου μαθηταί·
And there was likewise great advance in education, and philosophy and oratory had a high place of honour among all Greeks, and especially the Athenians. For the philosophers were Socrates and Plato and Aristotle, and the orators were Pericles and Isocrates and his pupils.

(12.1.4)

Like the cases in Polemon and Lucian mentioned above, this is of course an embarrassing blunder (and we have seen that Diodorus is liable to commit such atrocious mistakes): Plato and Isocrates were born during the last years of this period and can hardly be said to have been active during it; Aristotle was born several decades after the end of the *Pentekontaetia*. Yet what is more important than another proof of Diodorus' unreliability as a historian: this mistake is quite understandable, almost unavoidable for someone who has an instinctive, vivid picture of what Athens looked like (or should have looked like) on its apex. For this classicizing outlook, it was quite obvious that the greatest politicians, orators, and philosophers must have been contemporaneous, that all these great cultural heroes rubbed elbows in this mythical city of Athens. And it is certainly no coincidence that all the names mentioned here made it into the canon of the Second Sophistic: the very fact that Diodorus could commit this mistake seems to suggest that these men were so present to his mind, embodied the very essence of classical Athens to such an extent, that he could not imagine the famous *Pentekontaetia* without them.

Furthermore, it is worthwhile to emphasize that the very fact that Diodorus thought it important and necessary to include such a list in his account of the fifty years is highly significant. Usually, Diodorus' historical writing has an irritating tendency to concentrate on wars and battles. This marked departure from his usual practice seems to suggest that he was already under the influence of tendencies that emphasize the “cultural” part of Greek history.¹⁶ This is confirmed by the fact that we find a number of similar lists throughout his work. In book 15, after relating the events of the year 365 BCE, Diodorus somewhat surprisingly inserts a list of men who were “memorable for their culture” (κατὰ παιδείαν): |

240

241

ὑπῆρξαν δὲ κατὰ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους ἄνδρες κατὰ παιδείαν ἄξιοι μνήμης Ἰσοκράτης τε ὁ ῥήτωρ καὶ οἱ τούτου γενόμενοι μαθηταὶ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ φιλόσοφος, ἔτι δὲ Ἀναξιμένης ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς καὶ Πλάτων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, ἔτι δὲ τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν φιλοσόφων οἱ τελευταῖοι, Ξενοφῶν τε ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συγγραψάμενος ἐσχατογήρως ὧν μέμνηται γὰρ τῆς Ἐπαμεινώνδου τελευτῆς μετ' ὀλίγον χρόνον γεγενημένης Ἀριστιππὸς τε καὶ Ἀντισθένης, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Αἰσχίνης ὁ Σφήττιος ὁ Σωκρατικός.

In this period there were men memorable for their culture, Isocrates the orator and those who became his pupils, Aristotle the philosopher, and besides these Anaximenes of Lampsacus, Plato of Athens, the last of the Pythagorean philosophers, and Xenophon who composed his histories in extreme old age, for he mentions the death of Epaminondas which occurred a few years later. Then there were Aristippus and Antisthenes, and Aeschines of Sphetta, the Socratic.

(15.76.4)

16 Cf. Borg (p. 234), Whitmarsh (p. 199–201), and Wiater (p. 87) in this volume.

This list emphasizes philosophers. It mentions Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle whom we have already seen in the list closing the account of the *Pentekontaetia* in book 12; in addition, we find Anaximenes the rhetorician, Aristippus, Antisthenes, and Aeschines the Socratic. This is remarkable for unlike Xenophon, who is also mentioned, these men never quite made it into the later canon. Hence, this list is a good illustration for the kind of comparison I propose between Diodorus and the full-blown classicism of the second century: it could of course be argued that Diodorus copied it word for word from his source (which, in this case, is probably Ephorus). But a writer for whom the classicist outlook has become a matter of course, would have hesitated about including figures such as Anaximenes and Aeschines – to him, these were relatively obscure names, not on a par with the great cultural heroes such as Plato and Isocrates. Moreover, even though this is a relatively weak argument as being *e silentio*, I think it is safe to say that no author from the Second Sophistic would have neglected to include the one orator who was probably the greatest of all cultural heroes, Demosthenes. Diodorus appears not to have had such qualms, and I suggest this may be a hint that in his time, the process of canonization was not yet finished.

This becomes even clearer in the case of a third list which is included in book 14, after the account of the events of the year 398 BCE:

ἤγμισαν δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν οἱ ἐπισημότατοι διθυραμβοποιοί, Φιλόξενος Κυθήριος, Τιμόθεος Μιλήσιος, Τελέστης Σελινούντιος, Πολύειδος, ὃς καὶ ζωγραφικῆς καὶ μουσικῆς εἴ-
χεν ἐμπειρίαν.

And in this year [398 BCE] the most distinguished composers of dithyrambic were in their prime, Philoxenus of Cythera, Timotheus of Miletus, Telestus of Selinus, and Polyeidus, who was also expert in the arts of painting and music. (14.46.6)

Again, such generalizations may be dangerous, yet I am reasonably confident that the composers of dithyrambs mentioned here would not have been considered worthy of note in the second century CE because lyric poetry was not part of the classicist cultural canon. Hence, we seem justified in assuming that had Diodorus written (or compiled) his *Library* one century later than he actually did, he would not | have included these names. My tentative conclusion, then, would be: the inclusion of these cultural details and some of the choices Diodorus makes reveal traces of classicism, but this classicism is not very marked yet, it appears to be curiously unpolished.

If we now turn to hard historical facts, we see immediately that Diodorus' plan of writing a universal history is in itself opposed to the classicizing outlook of later centuries.¹⁷ For Greeks of the imperial era, it was just obvious that certain parts of history are so much more important than others; it was obvious that certain geographical and chronological areas could safely be ignored. Of course, the most striking consequence of this view was that in many writers of the second century CE, the Roman Empire just does not seem to exist; it is not mentioned at all. It goes without saying that this is not the case for Diodorus: his *Library* gives a universal account of Greek *and* Roman history; for reasons of patriotism, he is also very much interested in the history of Sicily. It could be argued that his careful balance of these various parts is in itself already an unclassical feature of his *Library*.

This impression is bolstered when we look at the way in which Diodorus highlights various aspects of Greek history. From the classicist point of view, there were two summits of Greek history that eclipsed everything else, viz. the Persian Wars and Athen's fight against Philip. In both cases, Athens played the most important role. Diodorus gives appropriate prominence to the Persian wars. Unfortunately, the part of his work which treated the battle of Marathon is lost, but book 11 narrates in detail the battles against Xerxes and the miracle by which Greece escaped enslavement. After the

17 On Diodorus' universal history, see above, note 4.

lavish praise bestowed on the men who fought and died at Thermopylae, it is somewhat surprising to see that on two occasions, Diodorus writes that other (relatively unimportant) battles were greater than the battles of the Persian wars.

οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι συμμάχων ὄντες ἔρημοι καὶ τὰς ναῦς ὀρῶντες ἀχρήστους γεγενημένας, ταύτας μὲν ἐνέπρησαν, ὅπως μὴ τοῖς πολεμίοις ὑποχείριοι γενηθῶσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐ καταπλαγέντες τὴν δεινότητα τῆς περιστάσεως παρεκάλουν ἀλλήλους μηδὲν ἀνάξιον προᾶξαι τῶν προκατειργασμένων ἀγώνων. διόπερ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς ὑπερβαλλόμενοι τοὺς ἐν Θερμοπύλαις ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀποθανόντας, ἐτοίμως εἶχον διαγωνίζεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους.

The Athenians, being now without allies and seeing that their ships had become useless, set fire to them to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy, and then themselves, undismayed at the alarming plight they were in, fell to exhorting one another to do nothing unworthy of the fights they had won in the past. Consequently, with a display of deeds of valour surpassing in heroism the men who perished in Thermopylae in defense of Greece, they stood ready to fight it out with the enemy. (11.77.3–4)

Δοκεῖ δ' ἡ παρὰ ταῖς αὐτῆς μηδεμιᾶς ἀπολείπεσθαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις γεγενημένων παρατάξεων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις· ἢ τε γὰρ ἐν Μαραθῶνι γενομένη νίκη καὶ τὸ περὶ Πλαταιᾶς κατὰ Περσῶν προτέρημα καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ περιβόητα τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔργα δοκεῖ μηδὲν προέχειν τῆς μάχης ἧς ἐνίκησε Μυρωνίδης τοὺς Βοιωτούς. |

242

243

In my opinion this action was in no way inferior to any of the battles fought by the Athenians in former times; for neither the victory at Marathon nor the success over the Persians at Plataea nor the other renowned exploits of the Athenians seem in any way to surpass the victory which Myronides won over the Boeotians. (11.82.1)

In both cases, the comparison with the Persian Wars seems inappropriate even by today's historiographical standards; for a Greek of the classicizing period, it would appear blasphemous: in 11.77, the Athenians do not fight at all but conclude a truce with the Persians; in 11.82, Myronides' victory over the Boeotians does not mark any important historical event. Again, we see that Diodorus does not (yet) fully share the classicizing outlook of later writers.

This becomes even more obvious in book 16, which narrates Philip's rise and death. This was an important period for writers of the Second Sophistic. The most revered and admired of all Attic orators were active in this period, and they were engaged in pleading for or against Philip. Hence, for the Second Sophistic, this is a predominantly Athenian topic; Philip is seen almost exclusively from an Athenian perspective. In Diodorus, on the other hand, Athens is all but neglected in his account of Philip's rise. The first time the city is mentioned at all is in 16.84 when Diodorus narrates Philip's capture of Elateia and the ensuing panic in Athens. What we see here is quite interesting: on the one hand, Diodorus does not accord any special place to Athens, and hence, Demosthenes plays almost no role in his account; for Diodorus, he is just one among a number of Athenian politicians. This would be impossible within the classicist framework of the second century CE where Demosthenes is possibly the greatest of all cultural heroes. On the other hand, Diodorus' description of the events in Athens after the battle of Elateia closely follows the famous narrative in Demosthenes's *On the Crown* (18.169–178).¹⁸ As always with Diodorus, it is difficult or impossible to decide whether he was using this most famous speech of antiquity directly or whether he is quoting it secondhand;¹⁹ if this is indeed the case, we may also wonder if he was aware that he was following Demosthenes' text. Whatever may be the case, the passage shows no clear signs that Diodorus was using it as an intertextual marker, that his readers were expected to decode it as an allusion to a well-known text.

18 On this narrative and its reception in antiquity, see Wankel [35:2.846–8].

19 On Diodorus' use of Demosthenes, see Schwartz [24:682–3] = [25:64–5].

We can thus conclude that not only is Demosthenes' place in Diodorus' historical narrative very different from what it would have been a century or so later, not even the text of his greatest speech is awarded any special status.

Demosthenes' greatest political opponent, the orator Aeschines, is not mentioned at all in book 16. This is again significant, but here, our conclusion will remain ambivalent: On the one hand, Athenian domestic politics, especially the oratorical battles between Demosthenes and Aeschines, play an important part in the culture of the Second Sophistic because they provided so many opportunities for declamations. On the other hand, imperial authors had a very peculiar understanding of the functioning of Athenian democracy; tyrants are constantly waiting in the wings, the popular assembly is spellbound by overwhelming speeches of overpowering rhetoricians, and these cultural heroes again and again save the day with their powerful words. Diodorus is not interested in domestic politics, as his silence about Aeschines shows. Yet when he refers to discussions in the assembly, his picture curiously resembles what Donald Russell [19] has so aptly called "Sophistopolis." A passage which makes this abundantly clear can be found in book 11: when Themistocles conceives his plan to make Piraeus into the Athenian harbor, he is at first reluctant to tell the Athenian people about it, and is promptly suspected of preparing tyranny.

243

244

διόπερ τῆς βουλῆς πυθομένης τὰ κατὰ μέρος, καὶ κρινάσης λέγειν αὐτὸν τὰ συμφέροντα τῇ πόλει καὶ δυνατά, τὸ λοιπὸν ἤδη συγχωρήσαντος τοῦ δήμου μετὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἔλαβε τὴν ἐξουσίαν πράττειν ὅτι βούλεται. ἕκαστος δ' ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐχωρίζετο θαυμάζων μὲν τὴν ἀρετὴν τάνδρος, μετέωρος δ' ὦν καὶ καραδοκῶν τὸ τέλος τῆς ἐπιβολῆς.

Consequently, when the Council learned all the details and decided that what he said was for the advantage of the state and was feasible, the people, without more ado, agreed with the Council, and Themistocles received authority to do whatever he wished. And every man departed from the Assembly in admiration of the high character of the man, being also elated in spirit and expectant of the outcome of the plan. (11.46.2)

After Themistocles has disclosed his plan to the council, there is no further debate; everybody agrees wholeheartedly and walks home "in admiration of the high character of the man." Themistocles is one of the uncontested cultural heroes of classicizing historiography, so it is inconceivable that his proposal should be subject to discussion. Another indicator of his special status can be found later in book 11: when Themistocles is exiled from Athens, the narrator himself intervenes to express his astonishment at this turn of events and to rebuke the Athenians for their fickleness.

εἰ δέ τις χωρὶς φθόνου τὴν τε φύσιν τάνδρος καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἐξετάζοι μετ' ἀκριβείας, εὐρήσει πάντων ὧν μνημονεύομεν ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς εἰρημένοις πεπρωτευνότα. διὸ καὶ θαυμάσειεν ἂν τις εἰκότως, εἰ στερεῆσαι σφᾶς αὐτοῦς ἀνδρὸς τοιοῦτου τὴν φύσιν ἠθέλησαν.

But if any man, putting envy aside, will estimate closely not only the man's natural gifts but also his achievements, he will find that on both counts Themistocles holds first place among all of whom we have record. Therefore one may well be amazed that the Athenians were willing to rid themselves of a man of such genius. (11.58.5)

With this expression of admiration for one of the great classical heroes, Diodorus is close in spirit to Plutarch's *Lives*. Like Plutarch, he emphasizes the moral value of his writings (e.g., 11.3.1) and presents his protagonists as villains or role models.²⁰ This is certainly one of the classicizing features of the *Library*.

So far, we have seen that Diodorus presents a curious amalgam of elements which are far removed

20 For Diodorus' *Library* as a "moral" text and for possible political implications, cf. Wiater [36].

244

245

from the classicizing world of the second century and evince | that the process of canonization and classification was not yet complete at the time of his writing, and elements where we can sense that developments had set in which would later contribute to the view of the past which was predominant in the Second Sophistic.

We have examined Diodorus' relation to classicism in the areas of style and of his *Geschichtsbild*. We will now turn to a third area, which will concern the creation of Greek identity, of "Greekness." Of course, this concept is intimately connected to the topics we have just discussed: cultural features such as the common language of Atticism and a historical tradition which was modified in a way which allowed it to be claimed as a "heritage" by many different people were, in the multi-ethnic East of the Roman Empire, the only way to produce a cultural identity. Hence, a particular brand of Greek history and Greek culture had to be invented: Athens and Sparta, Homer and tragedy, Demosthenes and Plato all became icons of "Greekdom" by being taken out of their historical, social, or political contexts. By acquiring education in these fields, every person speaking Greek could become a true heir to the glory that was Greece. It should be evident that this process was closely intertwined with the creation of the classical canon: a rigorous selection ensured that this tradition would be attractive and accessible to people from many backgrounds, provided they have the leisure, economic means, and interest to acquire the necessary skills.

As we have already seen, the Persian Wars were one decisive historical moment for the definition of Greekness. Diodorus is candid about the fact that a number of Greek states chose to be neutral, tried to remain outside of the danger so they could choose the winning side, or even fought with the Persians. Nevertheless, he shares the view, which was to become canonical and which represents the Persian Wars as a Greek fight for freedom and sees Athens and Sparta as the natural leaders of all Greeks. This becomes evident, e.g., in his account of Greek cities and tribes who fought on the Persian side.

Χρήσιμον δὲ διορίσαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων τοὺς τὰ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐλομένους, ἵνα τυγχάνοντες ὀνειδούς ἀποτρέπωσι ταῖς βλασφημίαις τοὺς προδότας γενησομένους τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας.

And now it will be useful to distinguish those Greeks who chose the side of the barbarians, in order that, incurring our censure here, their example may, by the obloquy visited upon them, deter for the future any who may become traitors to the common freedom. (11.3.1)

245

246

Again, we note the strong expression of the moral aim of the *Library*. Diodorus' denunciation of these Greek cities as "traitors to common freedom" follows classical precedents;²¹ at the same time, it conforms to the definition of Greek identity that was common in the Second Sophistic. Similar observations could be made, e.g., about Diodorus' eulogy of the Spartans who "gladly offered up their own lives for the common salvation of all Greeks" (11.1.1: τὸν ἑαυτῶν [...] βίον προθύμως ἐπέδωκαν | εἰς τὴν κοινὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίαν). Of course, this had been the continuous tradition since the fourth century BCE, so it cannot be used as an argument for new developments in Diodorus' time. What may be more significant is the heavy emphasis Diodorus places on the special role of Sparta and Athens. When he describes the Greek capture of the Persian camp at Plataea as a competition between the "foremost peoples of Greece," (11.32.4: ἡμιλλῶντο γὰρ πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἡγούμενοι Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι), this expression can be paralleled with a similar formulation in Aelius Aristides (3.328: ὅτι τοίνυν οὐδὲ χείρους ἐγένοντο ἐκ τούτων Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ κατ' ἥπειρον ἔδειξε μὲν ἢ Πλαταιᾶσι μάχη, ἐν ᾗ μόνους Λακεδαιμονίους ἐφραμίλλους ἔσχον "that the Athenians were not getting any worse when it came to fighting land-battles is shown by the battle at Plataea, where they had only the Lacedaemonians for rivals").

21 See, e.g., Isocrates 14.30 (on the Thebans) ἀπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος προδοταὶ καταστάντες "they became traitors of Greece as a whole"; cf. Isocrates 14.62; Demosthenes 15.23.

On the other hand, for Diodorus, the Persian Wars were just one item in a long list of events in his universal history. One small detail is very revealing in this regard: the city of Plataea was destroyed twice, 427 BCE by the Peloponnesians (12.56), and 373 BCE by the Thebans (15.46.6). No writer of the second or third centuries CE would have missed this opportunity for a long and tough diatribe against those who destroyed and enslaved the very city where all Greeks had won their freedom.²² When, e.g., we look at Pausanias' account of Plataea (9.1–4), it is clear that for him, Plataea is interesting because this is the place where this noble fight was fought; the name of the city is coextensive with the great battle. The first monument he mentions within the city itself are “the tombs of those who fought against the Persians” (9.2.5 τάφοι τῶν πρὸς Μήδους μαχεσαμένων). For Diodorus, on the other hand, this connection is less instinctive; he can think of other, equally interesting facts about Plataea. For him, Greek history has not yet been reduced to these few classical moments.

There is another aspect of his Panhellenic ideology which strikes me as being decidedly unclassical, Diodorus' choice of Philip of Macedon as his Panhellenic hero.²³ The following text is just one out of many examples where this could be demonstrated.

ἐπεθύμει γὰρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀποδειχθῆναι στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ τὸν πρὸς Πέρσας ἐξ-
ενεγκεῖν πόλεμον· ὅπερ καὶ συνέβη γενέσθαι.

For he was ambitious to be designated general of Hellas in supreme command and as such to
prosecute the war against the Persians. And this was what actually came to pass. (16.60.5)

246

247

Philip's role in the stereotypical classicizing account is a different one: he is the successful opponent of Demosthenes; the heroic role of Panhellenic leader against the Persians is reserved for men like Themistocles or Alexander the Great.

We will now turn to the “cultural” definition of Greekness. As we have seen, Diodorus includes information about cultural developments in his historical narrative. Furthermore, he refers to the common culture that is at the core of the definition of Greekness. A quotation from Homer's *Odyssey* right at the beginning of the *Library* makes it clear that the author of this work is an educated person; at the same time, this quotation is trivial enough to be immediately recognizable by anybody who would ever pick up this book.

διὰ τοῦτο τῶν ἡρώων ὁ πολυπειρώτατος μετὰ μεγάλων ἀτυχημάτων

πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἶδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω·

This is the reason why the most widely experienced of our heroes suffered great misfortunes
before

Of many men the cities saw and learned their thoughts. (1.1.2)

This use of quotations is typical of writers who emphasize Greekness as common ground between themselves and their audience: the quotation is easily recognizable and will give the reader a feeling of belonging to the same cultural group, of sharing the values (and the knowledge) of the implied

22 See, e.g., the words of the sophist Dionysius of Miletus quoted by Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 1.22.1; 523: ὃ αὐτομολήσασα πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους Βοιωτία. στενάξατε οἱ κατὰ γῆς ἥρωες, ἐγγὺς Πλαταιῶν νενικήμεθα “O Boeotia, you have deserted to the barbarians! Wail, you heroes beneath the earth, we have been defeated near Plataea!”

23 For Diodorus' favourable judgment on Philip, see Anna Maria Prestianni Giallombardo [1].

author.²⁴

Diodorus emphasizes that the historical figures he describes also demonstrate that they share this common heritage, a trait which appealed to later writers as well. Here are two examples for this feature:

ὁ δ' Ἐπαμεινώνδας πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας προσέχειν δεῖν τοῖς οἰωνοῖς εἶπεν
εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης.

Epaminondas replied to those who told him that he must observe the omens:

One only omen is best, to fight for the land that is ours. (15.52.4)

With this apt use of a quotation from Homer (*Iliad* 12.243), Epaminondas proves that he is a true *παιδευμένος*, a true Greek in the full classicizing sense of word, partaking in Greek culture and capable of using it in an appropriate manner.

The next passage claims that it was his classical *παιδεία* which helped Epaminondas develop his innovative tactics: |

ἐπενόησε δὲ καὶ τὴν τῆς φάλαγγος πυκνότητα καὶ κατασκευὴν, μιμησάμενος τὸν ἐν Τροίᾳ τῶν ἠρώων συνασπισμὸν [...].
Indeed he devised the compact order and the equipment of the phalanx, imitating the close order fighting with overlapping shields of the warriors at Troy [...]. (16.3.2)

There is a number of similar stories in the Second Sophistic: for people of this period, it was unquestionable that all members of the political and social elite had to be educated, *παιδευμένοι*, and they projected this expectation back onto the figures of classical Greece themselves. Even Homeric heroes are said to be educated and well-versed in rhetoric.²⁵ Diodorus can be seen to raise similar expectations about Epaminondas: as a great historical hero, he must also be a true *Ἕλληνα*, and to be that, he had to conform to the standards of Diodorus' time.²⁶

However, as we will see, this intimate connection between cultural values and the historical narrative is not yet fully established in Diodorus' work. Two contrasting examples will demonstrate this. After the battle of Salamis, the Greeks awarded prizes to the city and the individual who had fought most bravely. The individual award goes to one Ameinias, as is already mentioned by Herodotus (8.93.1). The later historiographical tradition confuses this man with Cynegirus, the brother of the poet Aeschylus, who lost his hand when he tried to seize one of the Persian ships; this confusion can be found, e.g., in one of the fictitious letters of Themistocles (11), where he is called “the son of Euphorio,” or in Aelian's *Historical Miscellany*.²⁷

24 Cf. Baumbach's contribution in this volume on the function of Homeric quotations in Chariton's *Callirhoe*.

25 See Schmitz [22:143–5].

26 Stylianou [32:11] speculates that Diodorus may have taken this highlighting of Epaminondas's culture from his source, probably Ephorus; this can be no more than a conjecture, cf. Sacks [20].

27 5.19: Αἰσχύλος ὁ τραγῳδὸς ἐκρίνετο ἀσεβείας ἐπὶ τινὶ δράματι. ἐτοίμων οὖν ὄντων Ἀθηναίων βάλλειν αὐτὸν λίθοις, Ἀμεινίας ὁ νεώτερος ἀδελφὸς διακαλυψάμενος τὸ ἱμάτιον ἔδειξε τὸν πῆχυν ἐρημιον τῆς χειρὸς. ἔτυχε δὲ ἀριστεύων ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ὁ Ἀμεινίας ἀποβεβληκῶς τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ πρῶτος Ἀθηναίων τῶν ἀριστείων ἔτυχεν. Nigel Wilson's otherwise excellent translation adds to the confusion by replacing “Salamis” with “Marathon”: “The tragedian Aeschylus was brought to trial on a charge of impiety arising from a play. The Athenians were prepared to stone him, but his younger brother Ameinias rolled back his cloak and displayed the arm which had lost a hand; it happened that Ameinias had performed an exploit at Marathon [sic] which cost him a hand, and he was the first of the Athenians to be decorated for valour.”

This apparent connection of cultural and historical values must have appealed to Diodorus; he includes the reference to Aeschylus in his account:

διὸ καὶ κρίσεως προτεθείσης περὶ τῶν ἀριστείων, χάριτι κατισχύσαντες ἐποίησαν κριθῆναι πόλιν μὲν ἀριστεῦσαι τὴν Αἰγινήτων, ἄνδρα δὲ Ἀμεινίαν Ἀθηναῖον, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Αἰσχύλου τοῦ ποιητοῦ· οὗτος γὰρ τριηραρχῶν πρῶτος ἐμβολὴν ἔδωκε τῇ ναυαρχίδι τῶν Περσῶν, καὶ ταύτην κατέδυσε καὶ τὸν ναύαρχον διέφθειρε.

When, therefore, a judgement was proposed to determine the prizes to be awarded for valour, through the superior favour they enjoyed they caused the decision to be that [...] of men Ameinias of Athens [won the prize], the brother of Aeschylus the poet; for Ameinias, while commanding a trireme, had been the first to ram the flagship of the Persians, sinking it and killing the admiral. (11.27.2)

248

249

Let us now look at a counterexample. In 12.69–70, Diodorus describes the battle of Delium (424 BCE). For him, this is just a battle which the Athenians lost. For every writer of the Greek Renaissance, however, this not just another battle in the course of the Peloponnesian War; instead, there is an instantaneous association with a cultural hero: it is the famous battle in which Socrates fought and which was described, e.g., by Alcibiades in Plato’s *Symposium* (220e–221c).²⁸ I quote just one example out of the numerous passages one could adduce, from Lucian’s *True Stories*:²⁹

ἠρίστευσε δὲ καὶ Σωκράτης ἐπὶ τῷ δεξιῷ ταχθεὶς, πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ ὅτε ζῶν ἐπὶ Δηλῷ ἐμάχετο. Socrates, who was stationed on the right wing, was brave, too – far more than when he fought at Delium in his lifetime. (2.23)

Again, we see that such intuitive connections between historical facts and cultural values are not yet fully established in Diodorus’ account.

I want to conclude this overview by referring to a passage that I found especially revealing. In book 13, Diodorus describes the battle off the Arginusae. The night before the battle takes place, Thrasybulus, the Athenian commander, has a dream:³⁰

τῶν δ’ Ἀθηναίων ὁ στρατηγὸς Θρασύβουλος, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν, εἶδε κατὰ τὴν νύκτα τοιαύτην ὄψιν· ἔδοξεν Ἀθήνησι τοῦ θεάτρου πλήθοντος αὐτὸς τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων στρατηγῶν ἕξ ὑποκρίνεσθαι τραγωδίαν Εὐριπίδου Φοινίσσας· τῶν δ’ ἀντιπάλων ὑποκρινομένων τὰς Ἰκέτιδας δόξαι τὴν Καδμείαν νίκην αὐτοῖς περιγενέσθαι, καὶ πάντας ἀποθανεῖν μιμουμένους τὰ πράγματα τῶν ἐπὶ τὰς Θήβας στρατευσάντων.

And in the case of the Athenians Thrasybulus their general, who held the supreme command on that day, saw in the night the following vision. He dreamed that he was in Athens and the theater was crowded, and that he and six of the other generals were playing the *Phoenician Women* of Euripides, while their competitors were performing the *Suppliants*; and that it resulted in a “Cadmean victory” for them and they all died, just as did those who waged the campaign against Thebes. (13.97.6)

28 See Patzer [17] and von Möllendorff [33:395].

29 For more examples, see, e.g., Maximus of Tyre 18.5; Lucian, *The Parasite* 43; Aelius Aristides 2.299.

30 For dreams and other portents in Diodorus, see Hammond [12].

When told about this dream, the seer in the Athenian army does not hesitate: this means unequivocally that all seven generals will die. Of course, Diodorus may have found this detail in his source,³¹ but it is again significant that he found it worthwhile to include it. He obviously thought that this might be of interest to his readers, and he presupposes some general knowledge about the Euripidean plays mentioned here. Again, it is the intimate connection between the historical figures and the great literary heritage of the classical age which makes this story appealing to Diodorus and his readers. |

249

250

A passage in Artemidorus's book on the interpretation of dreams (*Onirocritica*) provides an apt comment on this story:

ἔτι τῶν ὀνείρων τοὺς φιλολογωτέρους οὐδαμῶς οἱ ἰδιῶται τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὀρῶσι (λέγω δὲ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους), ἀλλ' ὅσοι φιλολογοῦσι καὶ ὅσοι μὴ ἀπαιδευτοὶ εἰσιν. ὅθεν ἂν τις καὶ μάλιστα καταμάθοι ὅτι τῆς ψυχῆς ἔργα εἰσὶν οἱ ὄνειροι καὶ ὅτι οὐχ ὑπὸ τινος ἕξωθεν γίνονται. τῶν δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις λεγομένων ἐπῶν ἢ ἰαμβῶν ἢ ἐπιγραμμαμάτων ἢ ἄλλων ῥήσεων τὰ μὲν αὐτὰ παρέχει τὴν ἀπόβασιν, ὅσα γε αὐτοτελῆ διάνοιαν περιέχει. [...] τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ ποιήματος ἀναπέμπει τὴν κρίσιν, ὅσα μὴ αὐτοτελῆ διάνοιαν περιέχει. οἷον ἔδοξέ τις λέγειν θεράπαιναν τὰ Εὐριπίδεια ἰαμβεῖα ὅπτα,

κάταιθε σάρκας, ἐμπλήσθητί μου.

αὕτη ζηλοτυπηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς δεσποίνης μυρία ἔπαθε κακά· ἦν γὰρ εἰκὸς τῇ ὑποθέσει τῇ περὶ Ἀνδρομάχην ἀκόλουθα γενέσθαι αὐτῇ τὰ ἀποτελέσματα.

Lay people (I mean uneducated persons) never see more literary dreams, only people who love literature and are well educated. This could be understood as a sure hint that dreams are products of the soul and are not induced by any external cause. Of hexameters, iambs, epigrams or other passages that are recited in dreams, some disclose the outcome themselves, when they contain a finished meaning. [...] Others refer the decision to the poem's subject matter, when they do not contain a finished meaning. E. g., a slave girl dreamed that she recited the verse by Euripides

roast and burn my flesh, eat your fill of me.

She aroused her mistress's jealousy and had to suffer innumerable woes. For it was logical that the fulfillment should be according to the plot concerning Andromacha. (4.59)

Artemidorus explains that only educated persons are apt to have such φιλολογώτεροι ὄνειροι, an expression which I find it impossible to translate adequately (a literal translation would be “more educated dreams”). Before giving general rules as to the interpretation of such dreams and providing examples of them, he makes a very insightful remark: these visions suggest that dreams are not induced by any outside force, but are products of our own soul. Not only is this (almost Freudian) remark entirely to the point,³² it also helps us understand Diodorus' historiographical methodology: he found such dreams interesting himself, and he presupposed similar interest in his readers; he expected that such a dream would not strike them as bizarre or unusual (as it might modern readers). And it demonstrates that the common cultural heritage influences even the unconscious.

The results we have found are contradictory and thus difficult to summarize. We have observed

31 The anecdote sounds suspiciously similar to what we hear about the emotional and rhetorical features of so-called “tragic history.” On such emotional passages in Diodorus, see Stylianou [32:3–4].

32 On “modern” aspects in Artemidorus' interpretation of dreams, see Walde [34].

250 that in a number of areas, Diodorus appears to anticipate developments that will be typical of the
 classicizing outlook of the Second Sophistic. On the other hand, there are numerous instances where
 he clearly betrays a vision which is incompatible with the later emphasis on a cultural definition of
 “Greekness” and with the strict classicizing canonization. There is no clear-cut answer to the question
 251 “does Diodorus use classical Athens to produce a Greek identity.” It would seem that he was aware
 of the process of canonization which would soon clearly define which areas of language, literature,
 philosophy, and history were important and required knowledge of every true πεπαιδευμένος and
 which ones were not. Yet we see that this seems to be an ongoing process at his time and that he still
 hesitates what to include and what not. We have seen that his attitude to the great figures of Greek
 history closely resembles that of the classicizing period, but that his choice of such heroes would
 not have been considered appropriate a century later. His emphasis on the cultural elements in his
 historical narrative would have appealed to readers of the second century CE, but the connection
 between these fields is not yet close and automatic enough.

I want to conclude with a speculative remark: I began this paper by pointing out how bad Diodorus’ reputation is in modern scholarship. Eduard Schwartz, in his still fundamental article on Diodorus in *RE*, gives one interesting reason for his negative judgment: Diodorus’ inclusion of Sicilian history, he writes, is “especially tasteless.”³³ Schwartz, like the entire scholarly tradition of the nineteenth century, had inherited a picture of Greek history that was still shaped by classicizing prejudices. Like the classicizing writers of the Second Sophistic, Schwartz was certain that some areas of history are intrinsically more worthwhile than others. Diodorus sits uneasily between two periods: he is neither part of this great classical past nor one of the writers whose veneration for this classical past makes us feel at home in their work because we share their judgments. Maybe this uneasy intermediate position is one of the reasons why Diodorus is such an unloved historian.

33 “Spezielle Geschmacklosigkeit,” Schwartz [24:663] = [25:36].

Works Cited

- [1] Anna Maria Prestianni Giallombardo: “Diodoro, Filippo II e Cesare,” in: [9], 33–52.
- [2] Bizière, Françoise: “Comment travaillait Diodore de Sicile,” *Revue des Études grecques* 87 (1974) 369–74.
- [3] Chamoux, François: “Un Historien mal-aimé : Diodore de Sicile,” *BAGB* (1990) 243–52.
- [4] Clarke, Katherine: “Universal Perspectives in Historiography,” in: [15], 249–79.
- [5] Corsaro, Mauro: “Ripensando Diodoro: il problema della storia universale nel mondo antico (I),” *Mediterraneo antico* 1 (1998) 405–36.
- [6] Corsaro, Mauro: “Ripensando Diodoro: il problema della storia universale nel mondo antico (II),” *Mediterraneo antico* 2 (1999) 117–69.
- [7] Dominik, William J., ed.: *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, London: Routledge 1997.
- [8] Flashar, Hellmut, ed.: *Le Classicisme à Rome aux 1^{ers} siècles avant et après J.-C.* (Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique 25), Vandœuvres: Fondation Hardt 1978.
- [9] Galvagno, Emilio and Concetta Molè Ventura, eds.: *Mito, storia, tradizione. Diodoro Siculo e la storiografia classica. Atti del convegno internazionale Catania-Agira, 7–8 dicembre 1984* (Testi e studi di storia antica 1), Catania: Prisma 1991.
- [10] Gelzer, Thomas: “Klassizismus, Attizismus und Asianismus,” in: [8], 1–41.
- [11] Gray, Vivian J.: “The Value of Diodorus Siculus for the Years 411–386 BC,” *Hermes* 115 (1987) 72–89.
- [12] Hammond, Nicholas G. L.: “Portents, Prophecies, and Dreams in Diodorus Books 14–17,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 39 (1998) 407–28.
- [13] Hidber, Thomas: *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass. Die Praefatio zu De oratoribus veteribus* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 70), Stuttgart: Teubner 1996.
- [14] Jones, Christopher P.: “The Panhellenion,” *Chiron* 26 (1996) 29–56.
- [15] Kraus, Christina Shuttleworth, ed.: *The Limits of Historiography* (Mnemosyne Supplement 191), Leiden: Brill 1999.
- [16] O’Sullivan, Neil: “Caecilius, the ‘Canons’ of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism,” in: [7], 32–49.
- [17] Patzer, Andreas: “Sokrates als Soldat. Geschichtlichkeit und Fiktion in der Sokrates-Überlieferung,” *Antike und Abendland* 45 (1999) 1–35.
- [18] Romeo, Ilaria: “The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece,” *Classical Philology* 97 (2002) 21–40.
- [19] Russell, Donald A.: *Greek Declamation*, Cambridge (Engl.): Cambridge UP 1983.
- [20] Sacks, Kenneth S.: “The Lesser Prooemia of Diodorus Siculus,” *Hermes* 110 (1982) 434–43.
- [21] Sacks, Kenneth S.: “Dating Diodorus’s ‘Bibliothek,’” *MediterrAnt* 1 (1998) 437–42.
- [22] Schmitz, Thomas A.: *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Zetemata 97), Munich: C. H. Beck 1997.
- [23] Schmitz, Thomas A.: “Die Erfindung des klassischen Athen in der Zweiten Sophistik,” in: [31], 71–88.
- [24] Schwartz, Eduard: “Diodoros 38,” *RE* 5.1 (1903) 663–704 (reprinted in [25]35–97).
- [25] Schwartz, Eduard: *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber*, Leipzig: Koehler & Amelung 1957.
- [26] Smith, Rebekah McComb: “A New Look at the Canon of the Ten Attic Orators,” *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995) 66–79.
- [27] Spawforth, Anthony J.: “The Panhellenion Again,” *Chiron* 29 (1999) 339–352.
- [28] Spawforth, Anthony J. and Walker, Susan: “The World of the Panhellenion I. Athens and Eleusis,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 75 (1985) 78–104.
- [29] Spawforth, Anthony J. and Walker, Susan: “The World of the Panhellenion II. Three Dorian Cities,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 76 (1986) 88–105.
- [30] Stadter, Philip A.: “Thinking about Historians,” *American Journal of Philology* 113 (1992) 81–5.
- [31] Steiner-Weber, Astrid, Schmitz, Thomas A. and Laureys, Marc, eds.: *Bilder der Antike* (Super alta perennis 1), Göttingen: Bonn UP 2007.
- [32] Stylianou, P. J.: *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus, Book 15*, Oxford: Oxford UP 1998.
- [33] von Möllendorff, Peter: *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians Wahre Geschichten* (Classica Monacensia 21), Munich: Narr 2000.

- [34] Walde, Christine: *Antike Traumdeutung und moderne Traumforschung*, Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler 2001.
- [35] Wankel, Hermann: *Demosthenes, Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, 2 vols., Heidelberg: Winter 1976.
- [36] Wiater, Nicolas: “Geschichte als imaginäres Museum. Zum Geschichtsmodell in Diodors *Bibliothèque*,” *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* N.F. 30 (2006) 59–85.
- [37] Wiater, Nicolas: “Geschichtsschreibung und Kompilation. Diodors historiographische Arbeitsmethode und seine Vorstellungen von zeitgemäßer Geschichtsschreibung,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 149 (2006) 248–71.
- [38] Wiater, Nicolas: *The Ideology of Classicism. Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 105), Berlin: de Gruyter 2011.
- [39] Worthington, Ian: “The Canon of the Ten Attic Orators,” in: [40], 244–63.
- [40] Worthington, Ian, ed.: *Persuasion. Greek Rhetoric in Action*, London: Routledge 1994.

First published in: Thomas A. Schmitz and Nicolas Wiater (eds.). *The Struggle for Identity. Greeks and Their Past in the First Century BCE*. Steiner: Stuttgart 2011.