Classical Quarterly 61.2 574–594 (2011) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838811000206

THE SOURCES OF DIODORUS SICULUS, BOOK 1*

It is a paradox of ancient history that one of the most important sources for reconstructing the events of the ancient world has also been one of the least understood by modern scholars. For over a hundred years, Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheke* was studied in an attempt to discover what earlier sources he relied on and even to reconstruct those sources, the classic example of this *Quellenforschung* being E. Schwartz's article on Diodorus for *Pauly-Wissowa.* Along the way, Diodorus himself as an author fared less well, little attention being paid to his own concerns, attitudes, contributions and role in creating the work that is published under his name. Meanwhile, scorn was heaped upon him by scholars, happy to denigrate him as 'mechanically abbreviating one source and interpolating into it passages from other works … with such incompetence that it is in general possible to isolate the main source and discuss it sensibly'.[1]

However, over the last twenty-five years or so Diodorus has enjoyed a minor renaissance. Scholars have begun moving away from the narrow focus on problems related to *Quellenforschung* and the often contemptuous attitude towards Diodorus himself, and have instead begun considering Diodorus' own role in the composition and shaping of his work. For example, Catherine Rubincam, in a series of articles, shows that Diodorus imposed his own overall structure on the *Bibliotheke* and actually took more care in his internal citations than many other ancient historians.[2] Kenneth Sacks, in a major study of Diodorus, argues that the *Bibliotheke* is 'a document substantially reflecting the intellectual and political attitudes of the late Hellenistic period'.[3] Perhaps the most extreme reaction against the school of *Quellenforschung* has been Peter Green's commentary on Books 11–12.37.1. In it he refers to older theories of Diodorus' sources, and in particular Diodorus' reliance on a single source for long stretches of his own work, as 'an elaborate house of cards'.[4] In keeping with these trends, some scholars working on other aspects of the ancient world have begun to take greater notice of Diodorus' value outside of reconstructing his sources. For instance, Liv Yarrow makes extensive

* I would like to thank Mary T. Boatwright, Diskin Clay, Peter Burian, Kent Rigsby, Daniel B. Levine, Georgia Machemer and the anonymous *CQ* referee for many helpful and insightful comments on earlier versions of this article, and John Wilkins for seeing it to publication with precision and care.

[1] O. Murray, review of *Diodorus Siculus, Book I: A Commentary*, by Anne Burton, *JHS* 95 (1975), 214–15, at 215.

[2] C. Rubincam, 'The organization and composition of Diodorus' *Bibliotheke*', *EMC* 31 (1987), 313–28; 'Cross-references in the *Bibliotheke Historike* of Diodoros', *Phoenix* 43 (1989), 39–61; 'Did Diodorus Siculus take over cross references in his sources?', *AJPh* 119 (1998), 67–87; 'How many books did Diodorus Siculus originally intend to write?', *CQ* 48 (1998), 229–33.

[3] K. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton, NJ, 1990), 5. Cf. P. Stylianou, review of *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* by Kenneth Sacks, *BMCR* (1991), 02.06.1991.

[4] P. Green, *Diodorus Siculus Books 11–12.37.1: Greek History, 480–431 B.C. – The Alternative Version* (Austin, TX, 2006).

use of Diodorus in her study on Greek attitudes towards Rome in the period of the late Republic.[5] Finally, a new commentary on Diodorus is being undertaken by Italian scholars.[6]

In spite of these, there are still scholars who adhere to the older school and continue to treat Diodorus as simply a window into the content and thought of his presumptive sources.[7] The most prominent scholar in this vein has been P. Stylianou, who referred to Diodorus as 'a mere epitomizer and an incompetent one at that' in his major commentary on Book 15 of the *Bibliotheke*, and essentially treated Diodorus as a stand-in for the presumptive source of that book, Ephorus.[8]

Quellenforschung can still be a useful type of scholarship, provided it is used with care and not dogmatically, and can provide us with a better foundation on which both to evaluate Diodorus' own accomplishments and to understand how much of his sources can be reconstructed. However, most of these basic assumptions about the given source(s) for a particular book of Diodorus have not been critically re-examined for some time. This is especially true of the earlier books of the *Bibliotheke*. The present article is a first step in this process, a re-evaluation of the evidence for the sources for the first book of Diodorus, which scholars have traditionally held was derived from the *Aegyptiaca* of Hecataeus of Abdera (*FGrH* 264). It is my contention that scholars have been far too sanguine about how extensively Diodorus used Hecataeus, and that the actual evidence for this usage is in fact exceedingly thin.

As is so often the case with ancient writers, little is known about Hecataeus. He was from either Teos or Abdera and was evidently already prominent during the reign of Alexander the Great. Afterwards, he was associated with Ptolemy I (T7 = Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 1.183). He seems to have visited Sparta (T5 = Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 20.3), and travelled through Egypt to research a major work that was probably called *On the Egyptians*. He also wrote a work *On the Hyperboreans* and works on Homer and Hesiod (T1 = *Suda*, s.v. *Ἑκαταῖος*). None of these works survive. As an associate of one of the key players in the initial wars of the Diadochoi, Hecataeus has the potential to illuminate the intellectual and political history of the early Hellenistic period. He also stands as an important representative of the now-lost accounts written under the successors about the regions then under Greek control.[9] First, however, we need to understand how much of Hecataeus Diodorus did or did not preserve.

G.J. Schneider first made the attribution of Book 1 to Hecataeus' *On the Egyptians* in his 1880 dissertation, *De Diodori Fontibus*. In an 1885 article, E. Schwartz worked out in detail how the few fragments of Hecataeus could show that virtually all of Book 1 derived from his work.[10] With the exception of chapters 32–41, which H. Leopoldi attributed to Agatharchides in 1892, Schwartz repeated

[5] L. M. Yarrow, *Historiography at the End of the Republic: Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule* (Oxford, 2006).

[6] The first two volumes have recently appeared: D. Ambaglio, *Diodoro Siculo, Biblioteca storica Libro XIII: Commento storico* (Milan, 2008) and F. Landucci, *Diodoro Siculo, Biblioteca storica Libro XVIII: Commento storico* (Milan, 2008).

[7] See n. 13 below for examples relating to Book 1.

[8] P. Stylianou, *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus 15* (Oxford, 1998), 49. Cf. P. Green, review of *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15*, by P.J. Stylianou, *BMCR* (1999), 10.11.1991.

[9] E.g. Megasthenes on India, Berossus on Babylon and Manetho on Egypt.

[10] E. Schwartz, 'Hekataeos von Teos', *RhM* 40 (1885), 223–62.

this view in his classic *Pauly-Wissowa* article on Diodorus. This was in turn accepted by F. Jacoby in his commentary on F25 of Hecataeus (*FGrH* 264), which is essentially Diodorus 1.10–31, 42–98, with possible insertions by Diodorus noted. Since this attribution, scholars have regularly treated Diodorus' Book 1 as almost the equivalent of the lost work of Hecataeus and used Diodorus as a means of reconstructing the thought and philosophy of the earlier author.[11] In an article published in 1970, Oswyn Murray became the most recent scholar to make the formal case that Diodorus' Book 1 is derived from Hecataeus. Murray described Book 1 as an 'epitome' of 'most, perhaps all of' Hecataeus.[12] Since, because of his prominence, Murray's article is regularly cited by more recent scholars as the proof of Diodorus' dependence on Hecataeus, his arguments in particular need to be examined and that is what this article purports to do.[13]

At the outset, it should be noted that Murray's characterization of Diodorus' Book 1 as an epitome of Hecataeus only concerns chapters 10–31 and 42–98. The proem of Book 1, chapters 1–6, which is also the proem to the entire *Bibliotheke*, is now widely agreed to be the work of Diodorus himself, albeit, as A.D. Nock said, the work of 'a small man with pretensions'.[14] Chapters 7–9, which provide a sort of philosophical account of the origin of man and society, have been the subject of much debate and, though possibly based on Hecataeus, can be shown to derive from a more eclectic variety of sources.[15] Finally, chapters 32–41, dealing with the sources and flooding of the Nile, are generally attributed to either Agatharchides of Cnidus (*c.* 215–145) or Artemidorus (*fl.* 104–101).[16]

There has been one notable exception to the scholars attributing Book 1 to Hecataeus. Anne Burton in her commentary noted that certain sections in Book 1 appear to contradict one another, and that for a few passages Diodorus' text seem to be more closely related to other Hellenistic writers rather than Hecataeus. She concluded that Diodorus 'undoubtedly made some use of Hecataeus of Abdera, while at the same time incorporating material from other widely different authors

[11] To give just one example, note P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1972), 496–505. See n. 13 for further examples.

[12] O. Murray, 'Hecataeus of Abdera and pharaonic kingship', *JEA* 56 (1970), 141–71, at 144.

[13] Scholarship relying on Murray (n. 12) includes F.W. Walbank, 'Monarchies and monarchic ideas', in F.W. Walbank and A.E. Astin (edd.), *CAH*^{2} 8.2 (Cambridge, 1984), 62–100, at 77, n. 46; S. Burstein, 'Hecataeus of Abdera's history of Egypt', *Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization* 51 (1992), 45–9, at 45, n. 1; D.E. Hahm, 'Kings and constitutions: Hellenistic theories', in C. Rowe and M. Schofield (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2000), 457–76, at 462, n. 22; M. Schofield, 'Social and political thought', in K. Algra et al. (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2005), 739–70, at 743, n. 12. J. Dillery, 'Hecataeus of Abdera: Hyperboreans, Egypt, and the interpretatio graeca', *Historia* 47 (1998), 255–75, at 256, n. 4, suggests that 'it seems reasonable to modify the notion that Diodorus follows exclusively one source for a given portion of his history, but not to abandon it.' Dillery does not, however, suggest what modifications he has in mind.

[14] A.D. Nock, 'Posidonius', *JRS* 49 (1959), 1–15, at 5.

[15] On 1.7–8, see the exhaustive analyses in W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur, und Götter* (Basel, 1959) and T. Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology* (Cleveland, OH, 1967). Spoerri contends that nothing in these chapters is incompatible with widely held beliefs in Diodorus' own time, while Cole argues that they derive ultimately from Democritus, via Hecataeus, but with considerable reworking by Diodorus.

[16] A. Burton, *Diodorus Siculus Book I: A Commentary* (Leiden, 1972), 20–5.

into the framework of his own construction'.[17] Burton's argument, which was not always clearly made, has not met with much acceptance, and indeed the attitude of a number of scholars has been simply to dismiss it.[18] Murray himself complained that Burton did not consider the 'more sophisticated' arguments – presumably his own – that Hecataeus is the sole source for nearly all of Book 1.[19]

There are four reasons, according to Murray, for supposing the bulk of Book 1 to be an 'epitome' of Hecataeus. First, all the fragments from Hecataeus' work 'can be fitted easily into Diodorus' narrative'. Second, Diodorus' narrative dates chronologically to the late fourth century. Third, the ethnography of Egypt has the same type of structure as Hecataeus' ethnographies of the Jews and Hyperboreans. Finally, the account of Diodorus' Book 1 is a unified one, with an internally consistent tone and a number of details that recur or are echoed at various points in the book.[20]

As is obvious from Murray's first reason, any identification of Hecataeus of Abdera as Diodorus' source for Book 1 must be based on the close equivalence between the fragments that can be securely attributed to Hecataeus' *Aegyptiaca* and the narrative of Diodorus. There are only six of these fragments, with a possible seventh, of which two are from Diogenes Laertius (F1 and F3), two from Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride* (F4 and F5) and two from Diodorus himself (F2 and F6). The possible seventh fragment (F19) is of uncertain origin. One of the Diodorus fragments is from Book 1 (F2), the other from Book 40 (F6). F6 is the ethnography of the Jews, and needs to be considered separately. Hecataeus' *On the Hyperboreans* (F7–14) is somewhat better represented by lengthy fragments from Diodorus (2.47, F7) and Aelian (*NA* 11.1, F12) alongside some shorter quotations found mainly in scholia. There are also three fragments (F15–17) which may derive from a philosophical work. The remaining fragments are doubtful or unclear.[21]

Let us begin with the fragments derived from authors other than Diodorus. Historical fragments must be approached with extreme care, which, as P. Brunt reminds us, is often lacking in this type of analysis.[22] In the case of the *Aegyptiaca* of Hecataeus, the fragments are extremely short, allowing us to know little about the scope, manner or quality of his work. Only long fragments provide reasonably sure guidance for drawing real conclusions about an author, and none of the legitimate fragments of Hecataeus' *Aegyptiaca* outside Diodorus are more than brief quotations. It must be added that, if passages of Diodorus are going to be identified as deriving from Hecataeus on the basis of these short fragments, it is necessary that the fragments and the text correspond very closely.

F1 occurs in the prologue of Diogenes Laertius (who probably lived in the early third century C.E.), where he briefly discusses the philosophy of the Egyptians as it pertains to the gods:

θεοὺς δ' εἶναι ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην, τὸν μὲν Ὄσιριν, τὴν δ' Ἶσιν καλουμένην· αἰνίττεσθαί τε αὐτοὺς διά τε κανθάρου καὶ δράκοντος καὶ ἱέρακος καὶ ἄλλων, ὥς φησι Μανέθως

[17] Ibid., 34.

[18] Note e.g. Walbank (n. 13), 77, n. 46, who mischaracterizes Burton as arguing that Diodorus contains little from Hecataeus, and Burstein (n. 13), 45, n. 1.

[19] Murray (n. 1), 215.

[20] Murray (n. 12), 144–5. Jacoby notes the parallels in the margins of *FGrH* 264 F25.

[21] On the doubtful fragments, see J.G. Gager Jr, 'Pseudo-Hecataeus again', *ZNTW* (1969), 130–9.

[22] P.A. Brunt, 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *CQ* 30 (1980), 477–94.

ἐν τῇι τῶν Φυσικῶν ἐπιτομῇι καὶ Ἑκαταῖος ἐν τῇι πρώτηι περὶ τῆς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φιλοσοφίας· κατασκευάζειν δὲ ἀγάλματα καὶ τεμένη τῶι μὴ εἰδέναι τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μορφήν. τὸν κόσμον γενητὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν καὶ σφαιροειδῆ· τοὺς ἀστέρας πῦρ εἶναι, καὶ τῇι τούτων κράσει τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς γίγνεσθαι· σελήνην ἐκλείπειν εἰς τὸ σκίασμα τῆς γῆς ἐμπίπτουσαν· τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ ἐπιδιαμένειν καὶ μετεμβαίνειν· ὑετοὺς κατὰ ἀέρος τροπὴν ἀποτελεῖσθαι· τά τε ἄλλα φυσιολογεῖν, ὡς Ἑκαταῖός τε καὶ Ἀρισταγόρας ἱστοροῦσιν. ἔθεσαν δὲ καὶ νόμους ὑπὲρ δικαιοσύνης, οὓς εἰς Ἑρμῆν ἀνήνεγκαν καὶ τὰ εὔχρηστα τῶν ζώιων θεοὺς ἐδόξασαν. λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ὡς αὐτοὶ γεωμετρίαν τε καὶ ἀστρολογίαν καὶ ἀριθμητικὴν ἀνεῦρον. καὶ τὰ μὲν περὶ τῆς εὑρέσεως ὧδε ἔχει. (1.10–11)

The sun and the moon are gods bearing the names of Osiris and Isis respectively, and they speak of the beetle, the dragon, the hawk and other creatures as divine, as Manetho says in his *Epitome of Physical Doctrines* and Hecataeus says in the first book of his work *On the Egyptian Philosophy*. They set up statues and temples to these animals because they do not know the true form of the god. They believe that the universe is created and perishable, and that it is spherical. They say that the stars are fire, and that, by the mixing of these, events happen on earth; that the moon is eclipsed when it falls into the earth's shadow; that the soul both survives death and passes into another body; that rain happens because of movement in the atmosphere; for all other phenomena they give natural explanations, as Hecataeus and Aristagoras explain. They also established laws on the subject of justice, which they attributed to Hermes; and they deified animals which are useful. They also say that they discovered geometry, astronomy and arithmetic. So much for the invention of philosophy.

Murray and Jacoby equate the first half of this fragment with the following passage of Diodorus:

Τοὺς δ' οὖν κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἀνθρώπους τὸ παλαιὸν γενομένους, … ὑπολαβεῖν εἶναι δύο θεοὺς ἀιδίους τε καὶ πρώτους, τόν τε ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην, ὧν τὸν μὲν Ὄσιριν, τὴν δὲ Ἶσιν ὀνομάσαι, ἀπό τινος ἐτύμου τεθείσης ἑκατέρας τῆς προσηγορίας ταύτης. (1.11.1)

Therefore the men in Egypt in ancient times … conceived that there were two gods who were both eternal and first, the sun and the moon, whom they named Osiris and Isis respectively, these names coming from the etymology of the words.

Diodorus goes on to explain that Osiris means 'many-eyed' (πολυόφθαλμον, 1.11.2) while Isis means 'ancient' (παλαιάν, 1.11.4). So the only overlap between these two passages is that the Egyptians say that Osiris and Isis are the sun and the moon. However, this was a popular and well-known belief in Hellenistic times, and the association of Osiris with the sun is also seen in other phases of Egyptian religion.[23] The cults of Osiris and especially Isis were widespread throughout the Greco-Roman world by the time Diodorus was writing, and there is no reason to believe that he must have derived such a general belief from Hecataeus.[24] Indeed,

[23] Besides Diodorus, Diogenes Laertius, Hecataeus and Manetho, Plutarch *De Is.et Os.* 51–2, 372a–e; Apuleius, *Met*. 11.1, 24 and Eusebius, *Praep. evang*. 3.2.6 all contain this equation. See also W. Spoerri (n. 15), 204–5; J.G. Griffiths (ed.), *Plutarch's* De Iside et Osiride (Swansea, 1970), on *De Is. et Os.* 52 (pp. 496–7) for further citations.

[24] On the popularity and spread of the cult of Isis during the classical period, see F. Dunand, *Isis, mère des dieux* (Paris, 2000), esp. 41–62 and 65–80; and F. Solmsen, *Isis Among the Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, 1979), esp. 1–26. The most detailed literary description of Isis' cult appears in Book 11 of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, on which see J.G. Griffiths, *The Isis Book:*

Diogenes Laertius attributes the same information to Manetho (see also Manetho F83). He also includes information not present in Diodorus about the beetle, dragon and hawk, which he indicates derives from Manetho and Hecataeus, while Diodorus includes etymological information on the actual names of the gods. The rest of this passage of Diogenes has even less in common with Diodorus, who ascribes a belief to the Egyptians that the sun contributes fire and spirit, the moon wetness and dryness, and both combine for air, and that the universe is composed of these five elements (1.11.5–6). That the Egyptians investigate the natural causes of things is a generalized statement that is too vague to equate with any passage in Diodorus. And while Diodorus does say that the Egyptians credited Hermes with many inventions, laws on justice are not among them (1.16). Finally, the knowledge that the Egyptians deified useful animals was common in the ancient world, and therefore this passage cannot be taken as proof that Diodorus' section on animal worship (1.86–90) comes from Hecataeus.[25] It is worth noting that both times Hecataeus is cited in this passage he is paired with another author, Manetho or Aristagoras, who provide the same information as Hecataeus, indicating that there were multiple sources for Egyptian religion on which Diodorus could draw.

The next fragment (F3) also occurs in the prologue of Diogenes Laertius:

Ἑκαταῖος δὲ καὶ γενητοὺς τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι κατ' αὐτούς. Κλέαρχος δὲ ὁ Σολεὺς ἐν τῶι Περὶ παιδείας καὶ τοὺς Γυμνοσοφιστὰς ἀπογόνους εἶναι τῶν μάγων φησίν· ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐκ τούτων εἶναι. πρὸς τούτοις καταγινώσκουσιν Ἡροδότου οἱ τὰ περὶ μάγων γράψαντες· μὴ γὰρ ἂν εἰς τὸν ἥλιον βέλη Ξέρξην ἀκοντίσαι, μηδ' εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν πέδας καθεῖναι, θεοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν μάγων παραδεδομένους. τὰ μέντοι ἀγάλματα εἰκότως καθαιρεῖν. (1.9)

But Hecataeus says that according to them [the Persian Magi] the gods are subject to birth. Clearchus of Soli in his *On Education* also says that the Gymnosophists are descended from the Magi; and some say that the Jews come from them. In addition, the writers on the Magi criticize Herodotus. They argue that Xerxes would never have thrown javelins at the sun nor cast fetters into the sea, since the sun and the sea are gods according to the Magi. However, that the statues of the gods should be destroyed was natural enough.

Jacoby does not equate this passage on the Magi with any part of Diodorus, but Murray, in his table linking Diodorus to Hecataeus, marks it as belonging with chapter 11, the same chapter quoted above regarding Isis and Osiris. However, this chapter of Diodorus makes no mention whatsoever of the Persian Magi, nor are they mentioned elsewhere in the remainder of the theogony, or in the rest of

Metamorphoses *XI* (Leiden, 1975). On Osiris, see B. Mojsov, *Osiris: Death and Afterlife of a God* (Oxford, 2005), 102–19.

[25] Other authors who discuss Egyptian beliefs about animal worship extensively include Herodotus 2.65–76 and Strabo 17.1. During Diodorus' own lifetime, Cicero (*Nat. D.* 1.101) explicitly says that the Egyptians deified animals because of their utility. That animal veneration was a well-known Egyptian belief can be seen in the wide array of references, often negative, to it in both Greek and Latin sources, from the fourth century B.C.E. on. These include Plato (*Gorgias* 482b), Isocrates (*Busiris* 26–7) and a variety of comic poets (quoted by Athenaeus, 7.299–300). In the 30s B.C.E. Octavian exploited these Egyptian beliefs in his propaganda war against Antony and Cleopatra, as can be seen in various Augustan poets (e.g. Virgil, *Aeneid* 8.698–700, Propertius 3.11.41, 53–4). On Greco-Roman understanding of and reactions to Egyptian animal veneration, see now S.J.K. Pearce, *The Land of the Body* (Tübingen, Siebeck, 2007), 241–64.

Book 1. Murray does not offer any explanation or argument for equating these two passages, and there is no discernible reason to do so.

Fragment 4 comes from Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*:

ἔτι δὲ τῶν πολλῶν νομιζόντων ἴδιον παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ὄνομα τοῦ Διὸς εἶναι τὸν Ἀμοῦν, ὃ παράγοντες ἡμεῖς Ἄμμωνα λέγομεν, Μανέθως μὲν ὁ Σεβεννύτης τὸ κεκρυμμένον οἴεται καὶ τὴν κρῦψιν ὑπὸ ταύτης δηλοῦσθαι τῆς φωνῆς, Ἑκαταῖος δ' ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης φησὶ τούτωι καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶι ῥήματι χρῆσθαι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ὅταν τινὰ προσκαλῶνται· προσκλητικὴν γὰρ εἶναι τὴν φωνήν. διὸ τὸν πρῶτον θεόν, <ὂν> τῶι παντὶ τὸν αὐτὸν νομίζουσιν, ὡς ἀφανῆ καὶ κεκρυμμένον ὄντα προσκαλούμενοι καὶ παρακαλοῦντες ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι καὶ δῆλον αὐτοῖς Ἀμοῦν λέγουσιν. (354c–d, 9)

Most authorities still think that that Amûn (which we make Ammon) is the correct name of Zeus among the Egyptians, but Manetho the Sebennite thinks that it means 'that which is concealed' and that concealment is signified by this word, while Hecataeus the Abderite says that the Egyptians also use this expression whenever they greet each other, since the word is one of address. Therefore they name the supreme god, whom they believe to be one with everything, Amûn, because they address him as unseen and concealed, and call upon him to become manifest and visible to them.

The passage in Diodorus pointed to as equivalent by Jacoby and Murray is:

μεθερμηνευομένων δ' αὐτῶν τινὰς μὲν ὁμωνύμους ὑπάρχειν τοῖς οὐρανίοις, τινὰς δ' ἰδίαν ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίαν, Ἥλιόν τε καὶ Κρόνον καὶ Ῥέαν, ἔτι δὲ Δία τὸν ὑπό τινων Ἄμμωνα προσαγορευόμενον, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἥραν καὶ Ἥφαιστον, ἔτι δ' Ἑστίαν καὶ τελευταῖον Ἑρμῆν. (13.2)

Some of [the terrestrial gods'] names as translated are the same as the heavenly gods, but others have their own individual names: Helios, Chronos and Rhea, and also Zeus, who is named by some Ammon, and in addition to these Hera and Hephaestus, and also Hestia, and lastly, Hermes.

The only thing that this passage has in common with what Plutarch attributes to Hecataeus is that both Diodorus and Hecataeus mention Ammon. But Ammon, or Amun-Re, as the Egyptians called him, was a major god in the Egyptian pantheon. He is perhaps the most fully documented Egyptian deity besides Osiris, and he was certainly well known to the Greeks.[26] Beyond that, Hecataeus explains how the Egyptians use the name as a greeting, information wholly absent from Diodorus. Far from proving that Diodorus drew on Hecataeus, this passage would seem to suggest that Diodorus was not drawing on Hecataeus for this portion of his account.

The fifth fragment is also from Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*:

οἶνον δ' οἱ μὲν ἐν Ἡλίου πόλει θεραπεύοντες τὸν θεὸν οὐκ εἰσφέρουσιν τὸ παράπαν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ὡς οὐ προσῆκον ὑπηρέτας πίνειν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ βασιλέως ἐφορῶντος, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι χρῶνται μὲν ὀλίγωι δέ· πολλὰς δ' ἀοίνους ἁγνείας ἔχουσιν, ἐν αἷς φιλοσοφοῦντες καὶ μανθάνοντες καὶ διδάσκοντες τὰ θεῖα διατελοῦσιν. οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς καὶ μετρητὸν ἔπινον ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὡς Ἑκαταῖος ἱστόρηκεν, ἱερεῖς ὄντες.

[26] For the Egyptian background to Ammon/Amun-Re, see J. Assman, *Egyptian Solar Religion in the New Kingdom* (New York, 1995). Besides Diodorus and Plutarch, other Greek accounts of Egyptian religion that discuss Ammon include Herodotus 2.42 and Strabo 17.1.27. Manetho, cited by Plutarch, must also have included an account of the god. The god was best known to the Greeks by way of the oracle of Amun-Re at Siwa, most famously consulted by Alexander the Great but considered a major oracle by the Greeks at least as far back as Herodotus (2.54–7).

ἤρξαντο δὲ πίνειν ἀπὸ Ψαμμητίχου· πρότερον δ' οὐκ ἔπινον οἶνον οὐδ' ἔσπενδον ὡς φίλιον θεοῖς ἀλλ' ὡς αἷμα τῶν πολεμησάντων ποτὲ τοῖς θεοῖς … ταῦτα μὲν οὖν Εὔδοξος ἐν τῇι δευτέραι τῆς Περιόδου λέγεσθαί φησιν οὕτως ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων. (6.353b–c)

The servants of the god in Heliopolis do not bring wine at all into the sanctuary, since they believe it is improper that they should drink when their lord and king is watching; however the other priests drink wine but only a little. They have many times of purification without wine, and on these occasions they are examining, learning and teaching divine matters. The kings also, being priests, drank an amount of wine according to the sacred writings, as Hecataeus has related. They began to drink it from the time of Psammetichus, but prior to this they did not drink wine or pour it as a libation pleasing to the gods, but as the blood of those who had once made war against the gods … Eudoxus in the second book of his *Description of the World* says that these statements are made by the priests.

The supposed equivalent in Diodorus is at 70.11–12:

τροφαῖς δ' ἔθος ἦν αὐτοῖς ἁπαλαῖς χρῆσθαι, κρέα μὲν μόσχων καὶ χηνῶν μόνων προσφερομένους, οἴνου δὲ τακτόν τι μέτρον πίνοντας μὴ δυνάμενον πλησμονὴν ἄκαιρον ἢ μέθην περιποιῆσαι. καθόλου δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν δίαιταν οὕτως ὑπῆρχε συμμέτρως διατεταγμένα ὥστε δοκεῖν μὴ νομοθέτην, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄριστον τῶν ἰατρῶν συντεταχέναι τῆς ὑγιείας στοχαζόμενον.

It was custom for [the kings] to eat delicate foods, eating only veal and duck meat, and drinking a fixed amount of wine that would not make them overly sated or drunk. And in general their diet was drawn up with such care that it did not seem to be the work of a lawmaker, but rather of the best of doctors focussed solely on the king's health.

All this passage has in common with Hecataeus as quoted by Plutarch is that the kings drank a specified amount of wine. There the similarity ends. Diodorus describes the measured drinking of wine as only part of the highly regulated royal diet, and does not attribute it to any form of religious taboo. In Hecataeus, according to Plutarch, the measured drinking of wine occurred in the context of the king's duties as a priest, with no mention of the rest of the king's diet being regulated as well.[27] Again, the differences in these passages would seem to suggest that, if anything, Diodorus was drawing on a source other than Hecataeus for this section, and the mention of Eudoxus, a fourth-century author, by Plutarch shows that there were other authors writing on the topic. Even if we accept that Diodorus did draw on Hecataeus here, he seems to have reworked the earlier author for a different purpose entirely.

One final passage should be considered before looking at Diodorus' sole citation of Hecataeus in Book 1. This fragment (F19) occurs in both Porphyry, *Quaest. Hom Il.* 9.383 and in Stephanus Byzantinus, s.v. Διόσπολις, with only minor differences between the two. Here is the text of Stephanus:

[27] Griffiths (n. 23), ad loc. (pp. 275–6), notes that, contrary to what Plutarch says here, the Egyptian kings certainly drank before the time of Psammetichus. He suggests that this belief is aetiological in origin, deriving from the Egyptian understanding of the name Psammetichus as meaning 'man of the mixing bowl'. If this is true, it further distinguishes the custom reported by Plutarch from what Diodorus reports at 70.11–12.

Διόσπολις· … κτίσμα Ὀσίριδος καὶ Ἴσιδος. πρὶν δὲ ὑπὸ Περσῶν ἀφανισθῆναι φησὶ †Κάτων, ὅτι <τρισ>μυρίας τρισχιλίας κώμας εἶχε καὶ τριάκοντα, ἀνθρώπων δὲ μυριάδας ἑπτακοσίας, ἀρουρῶν δὲ τόπον μεμετρημένον τρισχιλίων καὶ ἑπτακοσίων, ἑκατὸν δὲ πύλαις διακεκοσμημένη, τετρακόσια στάδια τὸ μῆκος.

Diospolis: … A foundation of Osiris and Isis. †Caton says that before it was destroyed by the Persians it had thirty-three-thousand and thirty villages, and seven million inhabitants, occupied three thousand seven hundred arourae, and had one hundred gates over a length of four hundred stades.

The figures of 33,030 villages and 7 million inhabitants assigned to Diospolis (Egyptian Thebes) by Stephanus and Porphyry tally reasonably well with the figures of over 30,000 villages and cities and about 7 million inhabitants that Diodorus gives, not for Thebes, but for all of Egypt in the pharaonic period (1.31.7–8).[28] The figure of 100 gates at Thebes is given by Diodorus at 45.6, but he also gives an alternate version, in which the number comes not from the gates of the city but from the number of *propylaea* (1.45.7). The length of the circuit is also given by Diodorus as 140 stades, not 400. Still, the closeness of these figures does suggest a common source. Both Porphyry and Stephanus attribute their information to the otherwise unknown Caton (*Κάτων*). Jacoby emended *Κάτων* to *Ἑκαταῖος* on the basis of his attribution of Book 1 of Diodorus to Hecataeus. But at *FGrH* 250 F20, Jacoby quotes the same passages and there emends *Κάτων* to *Κάστωρ*, which would seem to be a more logical emendation than *Ἑκαταῖος*. These passages can hardly be counted as proof that Diodorus draws on Hecataeus for this information, and again point to the existence of other sources that he may have used.[29]

So it is clear that the fragments of Hecataeus from authors other than Diodorus provide virtually no support for the argument that Diodorus drew extensively on Hecataeus, let alone that Book 1 is an 'epitome', as Murray claims. If anything, the fragments of Hecataeus seem to indicate that Diodorus did not use Hecataeus in those passages and show the existence of other writers who covered the same topics. Let us now look at the one fragment of Hecataeus that actually originates in the first book of Diodorus. This occurs in the historical portion (1.45–68) in a section on the tombs and monuments around Thebes (1.46–49), particularly the great tomb of Osymandyas (Ramesses II). In describing the tombs of the city, Diodorus remarks that the priests give the original number of tombs as 47 according to their records, but that only 15 were left by the time of Ptolemy I and fewer still at the time of his own visit. Diodorus then adds:

[28] Some type of census in Egypt goes back at least as far as the New Kingdom. On the pharaonic census, see D. Vabelle, 'Les recensements dans l'Égypte pharaonique des troisième et deuxième millénaires', *CRIPEL* 9 (1987), 33–49. The date of the first Ptolemaic census is unknown, but the first documents showing evidence (in the form of receipts for the salt tax) for the census come from the reign of Ptolemy II. On the nature of the Ptolemaic census and the ancient evidence for it, see W. Clarysse and D.J. Thompson, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (Cambridge, 2006), esp. 2.10–35. There are some textual problems with this passage of Diodorus. Diodorus gives the population of Egypt in the pharaonic period as 7 million, and then under Ptolemy I as 3 million. However, most editors prefer either to delete the second number entirely or to emend to τούτων. Underlying this change is a desire to bring Diodorus into line with the figures provided by Josephus, *BJ* 2.385. For a detailed analysis of Diodorus' figures and the other evidence for the population of Egypt in this period, see D.W. Rathbone, 'Villages, land and population in Graeco-Roman Egypt', *PCPhS* 36 (1990), 103–42, arguing that Diodorus' figures are preferable to Josephus'.

[29] Burton (n. 16), 8, and 126–7 on 31.6 f.

οὐ μόνον δ' οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἱερεῖς ἐκ τῶν ἀναγραφῶν ἱστοροῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν παραβαλόντων μὲν εἰς τὰς Θήβας ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου, συνταξαμένων δὲ τὰς Αἰγυπτιακὰς ἱστορίας, ὧν ἐστι καὶ Ἑκαταῖος, συμφωνοῦσι τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν εἰρημένοις. (1.46.8)

Not only do the Egyptian priests recount this from their historical writings, but also many of the Greeks who visited Thebes during the reign of Ptolemy son of Lagus and wrote Egyptian histories, including Hecataeus, agree with what we have said.

The next passage, a detailed description of the tomb of Osymandyas that runs on for some three pages of text, is introduced by Diodorus with the singular *φησίν* (47.1). This is a clear reference back to Hecataeus, the only author mentioned by name in the preceding passage quoted above, and it is a persuasive indicator that the bulk of the description of the tomb is derived from his work. However, at the end of this description Diodorus remarks that 'such, they say, was the tomb of King Osymandyas' (*τὸν μὲν οὖν Ὀσυμανδύου τοῦ βασιλέως τάφον τοιοῦτον γενέσθαι φασίν*, 1.49.6), shifting from the third person singular at the beginning of the account to the third person plural at the end. Murray notes this, and declares that 'thus Hecataeus is clearly identical with the alleged authors of the *oratio obliqua* throughout'. Murray further uses this passage to condemn Diodorus twice over – first because he mentions Hecataeus 'by name only once, and then in such a way as to suggest that he was a subsidiary source', and second because Diodorus 'gives himself away' by starting with *φησίν* and ending with *φασίν*.[30] Thus, Diodorus is apparently highly deceptive for trying to conceal his dependence on Hecataeus but he is so incompetent that the deception is worthless. If Diodorus were so determined to conceal a dependence on Hecataeus, however, one might reasonably expect that he would never refer to the earlier writer at all, or at least not be so foolish as to 'give himself away' a mere three pages later.

Instead, let us look for more plausible explanations for this *φησίν*/*φασίν* problem. Burton suggests that Diodorus uses the plural *φασίν* in the impersonal sense, common enough in ancient Greek.[31] A better explanation is that Diodorus started out using Hecataeus as his source for the tomb of Osymandyas, but as he progressed worked in other sources for additional information. The likely point at which this happens is during the description of the elaborate tomb reliefs. The first relief depicts Osymandyas in battle accompanied by a lion. Diodorus provides two explanations for the meaning of this with a *μέν*/*δέ* construction: *οἱ μὲν ἔφασαν … τινὲς δ' ἱστόρουν* (1.48.1). In order to provide multiple explanations, there need to be multiple sources to begin with.[32] It is possible that Hecataeus himself cited multiple explanations of the lion relief, but the fact that Diodorus concludes the section with a plural *φασίν* suggests that it is more likely that he himself began to use information from another source, as least for the reliefs. Either conclusion is much more readily supported by the text than believing that Diodorus has sloppily tried to conceal his use of Hecataeus.

In the controversy over how much of this passage is attributable to Hecataeus, an important question has been overlooked. Why does Diodorus suddenly feel the

[30] Murray (n. 12), 144–5 and 145, n. 1.

[31] Burton (n. 16), 6, n. 2.

[32] Diodorus cites multiple explanations in a similar fashion elsewhere in Book 1 at 1.25.1, 1.26.7, 1.45.6–7, 1.64.13–14, 1.87.7–8 and 1.97.5. Nowhere else does he imply that these explanations come from a specific source as he does here.

need to cite Hecataeus here, the only time in Book 1?[33] For much of the historical section Diodorus implies that he has seen the sites and monuments he describes himself, but for the region around Thebes his approach is different.[34] Diodorus did make it as far south as Thebes on his travels through Egypt, since he mentions that only a few tombs were left in his time (*καθ' οὓς χρόνους παρεβάλομεν ἡμεῖς εἰς ἐκείνους τοὺς τόπους*, 1.46.7) and specifies the date, the 180th Olympiad. However, he also freely admits that much of his information about the city and its monuments is second-hand: *παρειλήφαμεν* (1.46.1), either from the priests and their records, or via literary sources including Hecataeus.

There is a logical explanation for this. Thebes may have been famous, but it had also sharply declined in importance during the period of the Ptolemies. It had already been extensively looted by the Persians in the reign of Cambyses, as Diodorus tells us (1.46.4–5), and during the later Ptolemaic period Thebes and the Upper Egypt area in general were hotbeds of resistance to Ptolemaic rule. Thebes itself was sacked several times during Egyptian revolts. The last destruction, in 88 B.C.E. during the reign of Ptolemy IX Soter II, seems to have been particularly extensive, as Strabo reports that in his day only a small village was there (17.1.46). Almost no papyri dating after this destruction have been found, which also suggests that Thebes had greatly declined in importance. So there was far less there for Diodorus to observe at Thebes to begin with than at other sites in the north. Moreover, Ptolemaic authority was weak in the area by the time he was in the country.[35] That, combined with the relative isolation, as well as the distance of Thebes from Alexandria (about 400 miles upstream), makes it likely that any visit Diodorus made was short. The end result of this would be to force him to fall back much more heavily on literary sources for Thebes and the surrounding area than for the monuments he describes in Lower Egypt. So for information on the state of the city prior to the Persian conquest he relied on the priests, perhaps as quoted by another author, and then supplemented them with accounts from Greeks who visited during the early Ptolemaic period, before the sack of 207/206. Far from being proof of Diodorus' extensive plagiarism of Hecataeus, this passage might instead be proof that Diodorus wanted to give places he had not examined personally some proper literary authority. Rather than being typical of his approach in Book 1, it therefore stands out as rather atypical.

[33] Surprisingly, given the amount of scholarship on trying to determine Diodorus' sources, there does not seem to have ever been a thorough examination of why Diodorus would cite another historian by name in the *Bibliotheke*. In Book 1, at least, such citations are very rare, and the mention of Hecataeus here stands out. Diodorus regularly cites the Egyptians, or the Egyptian priests, as his sources (1.10.1, 1.24.5, 1.25.2, 1.26.1, 1.26.6, 1.28.1, 1.29.5, 1.43.6, 1.46.7, 1.69.5, etc.) and once cites the Thebans (1.50.1). But the citations of other Greek authors in Book 1 are very different from this reference to Hecataeus. Diodorus analyses and for the most part discredits explanations for the flooding of the Nile from a number of different authors (1.37–41) and elsewhere only mentions an earlier historian to disparage him (Ephorus at 1.9.5, Herodotus at 1.69.7). On the Herodotus citation, see further below. Attacking one's predecessors is a common element in ancient historiography – see J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997), 217–37; and on Diodorus in particular see Sacks (n. 3) 108–16.

[34] On Diodorus' own observations, note for example his remark that the account he gives of Sesoösis agrees closely with the monuments still extant in Egypt (1.53.1).

[35] K. Vandorpe, 'City of many a gate, harbour for many a rebel: historical and topographical outline of Greco-Roman Thebes', in S.P. Vleeming (ed), *Hundred-Gated Thebes* (Leiden, 1995), 203–39, at 232–5.

To use this passage as a means of attributing other sections of Book 1 to Hecataeus, as some scholars have attempted, therefore becomes problematic. For example, Schwartz notes that one of the reliefs in the tomb of Osymandyas shows the chief justice wearing a figure of Truth (1.48.6). The actual chief justice is described a few chapters later, again wearing a figure of Truth (1.75.4–5). Schwartz takes the coincidence as proving that the latter passage is also derived from Hecataeus, and that therefore the entire section on Egyptian customs (1.70–82, 91–3) must likewise be derived from Hecataeus since it forms a unified entity. The reference to priestly records at 1.46.7–8 must also derive from Hecataeus, and so must every other reference to priestly records in Diodorus, and so on and so forth.[36] But, as Burton points out, there is no reason that whole chapters and sections must be attributed to Hecataeus 'on the basis of a single coincidental sentence or reference'.[37] The chief justice (or vizier) was a real and very important figure in the ancient Egyptian government. There is no reason to suppose, for example, that Hecataeus was the only author who could have mentioned the chief justice, who was the highest secular figure in Egyptian government. Indeed, even in modern times small lapis lazuli figures of Truth (Maat) have actually been found.[38]

Underlying Schwartz's and other similar arguments is of course the belief that Diodorus would not have used multiple sources for the first book, a belief that is impossible to prove satisfactorily without access to Diodorus' source(s) for comparison.[39] Instead the argument is made by falling back on perceived characteristics of Diodorus himself. Alan Lloyd claims, for example, that 'Diodorus … was not the man to take more trouble than he had to', and, if a single source were available that covered the material he wished to cover, 'he would have contented himself largely with that'.[40] This assumes that Diodorus, in spite of spending about five years in Egypt exploring the country at least as far south as Thebes and in spite of his evident fascination with the Egyptians, was so lazy that he was unwilling to go to the trouble of reading another book besides Hecataeus or to employ his own observations in the course of composing Book 1. Indeed, at 1.83.8–9, Diodorus describes how he saw an Egyptian mob murder a Roman soldier over the death of a cat. Later, at 17.52.6, he cites census figures for the city of Alexandria dating to his own visit to Egypt (*καθ' ὃν γὰρ ἡμεῖς παρεβάλομεν χρόνον εἰς Αἴγυπτον*),

[36] Schwartz (n. 10), 223–33.

[37] Burton (n. 16), 3–4.

[38] As the pharaoh's chief administrative deputy, the chief justice or vizier was responsible for guaranteeing justice and thus helping the pharaoh to preserve 'maat', an Egyptian concept that encompassed truth, justice and order. For a brief overview of the vizier, see *OEAE*, s.v. 'Officials'; and, for a more detailed study, see G.F. van den Boorn, *The Duties of the Vizier: Civil Administration in the Early New Kingdom* (London, 1988). A papyrus text describing the vizier can be found in R.O. Faulkner, 'The installation of the vizier', *JEA* 41 (1955), 18–29. For examples of the statuettes of Maat personified, see Burton (n. 16), 223, n. 1.

[39] While older scholars (e.g. Schwartz, Jacoby, Murray) generally accepted the one source/one book hypothesis, more recent scholars of Diodorus' methods of composition, who tend to focus on the later books of the *Bibliotheke*, sharply dispute whether Diodorus relies solely on one source for any given section or book, or whether he is using multiple sources. For a recent overview of the problem from a scholar who argues for Diodorus' usage of multiple sources, see Green (n. 4), 1–34. For evidence of multiple sources in Book 1, see further below.

[40] A.B. Lloyd, review of *Diodorus Siculus Book I. A Commentary*, by Anne Burton, *JEA* 60 (1974), 288.

suggesting that he must have done some research on his own.[41] The only reason these two passages stand out is that Diodorus draws attention to his personal experience. At the very least, he must have talked to the Egyptian priests, as so many travellers before and after him had done.[42]

So much for the actual fragments of Hecataeus. As shown, they provide very little basis for believing that Diodorus derived almost all the content of Book 1 from him, let alone that Book 1 is an 'epitome' of Hecataeus as Murray claims. Murray's second argument for Diodorus drawing on Hecataeus rests on the claim that the narrative of Book 1 dates to the reign of Ptolemy I with only some superficial modification.[43] Indeed, Murray goes so far as to declare that 'the attempts of Diodorus to modernise this narrative are of hair-raising incompetence'.[44] However, even if the narrative of Diodorus Book 1 can be established as dating to the late fourth century, this would not constitute positive proof that it is based on Hecataeus. Nevertheless, let us examine the passages that Murray advances to support this claim.

The first supposed anachronism concerns how Diodorus names the first Ptolemy, the son of Lagus. This Ptolemy is mentioned four times in the first book, at 1.31.7, 46.7, 46.8 and 84.8. In each case he is identified as Ptolemy son of Lagus (*Πτολεμαῖος τοῦ Λάγου*) and not as king (*βασιλεύς*). This is taken by Murray to indicate that not only was Hecataeus, who wrote during the reign of Ptolemy I, Diodorus' source, but also that Hecataeus had written his work on Egypt before Ptolemy declared himself king in 305.[45] But Ptolemy II Philadelphus (r. 282–246) is named twice in this book as well, and in neither case is he identified as king. At 1.33.11 he is labelled *ὁ δεύτερος Πτολεμαῖος* and at 1.37.5 he appears as *Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου προσαγορευθέντος*. Since Ptolemy II chronologically comes after Hecataeus, this renders the above argument untenable. On the other hand, Ptolemy XII Auletes (r. 80–58) is described as 'ruling' (*ἐβασίλευε*, 1.44.1) and as king (*ὁ βασιλεύς*, 1.83.8). Taken together, these passages show that Diodorus himself feels no need to refer to a Ptolemy as king, although he seems to have no qualms in doing so. This is confirmed by an examination of the references to Ptolemy I in Books 20–22. Ptolemy is first identified as king of the Egyptians at 20.27.1, although at that point in the narrative he had not formally assumed the title. Diodorus notes at 20.53 that Ptolemy, along with the other Diadochoi, declared himself to be a king. The next direct reference to Ptolemy, at 20.75, or 22 chapters later, does not refer to him as king. In fact, even though Ptolemy is a major figure in the narrative, he is not called a king again until 20.88.9. Even at 20.82.3, where Ptolemy's rival Demetrius is referred to as king, Ptolemy, in the same passage, is not. In the fragments of Books 21–22, Ptolemy is referred to as one of a group of kings (21.1.4b), but later as simply Ptolemy son of Lagus

[41] Diodorus gives the population of Alexandria in his time as over 300,000. On the accuracy of this figure, see Rathbone (n. 28), 119–20; and D. Delia, 'The population of Roman Alexandria', *TAPA* 118 (1988), 275–92.

[42] Marincola (n. 33), 79–86, notes that Greek historians normally did not invoke their personal experience unless they wished to give credence to something strange or unusual. For ancient references to the Egyptian priests as sources, see Marincola, 108–9, where he remarks that 'the priests seem to have been busy at all times with tourists'.

[43] Murray (n. 12), 145 and n. 3.

[44] Murray (n. 1), 215.

[45] Murray (n. 12), 143 and n. 6.

(22.3.4). Diodorus' inconsistent use of the appellation of βασιλεύς with Ptolemy I is no proof of his dependence on Hecataeus.

Another apparent anachronism involves some of the dates that Diodorus gives in Book 1. At 1.44.1 he says that the period over which mortals ruled Egypt was slightly under 5,000 years, down to the time of Ptolemy XII Auletes. At 1.69.6, however, Diodorus gives a figure of 4,700 for the years of mortal rule in Egypt. Murray claims that the difference is that at 1.44.1 Diodorus counts the 4,700 years of Egyptian rule that come to an end with Amasis at 1.69.6, plus the 195 years of Persian rule that have a terminus of Alexander's arrival, which Diodorus dates to 331 (17.49.1), the chronological marker Hecataeus would have used. Murray feels that 4,895 years is close enough to 5,000 for this to make sense.[46] The problem with this reading is that in both chapters Diodorus explicitly says foreign kings are included in the figures of 4,700 and 5,000. This would cover the years of Persian rule, and Diodorus in fact mentions that the Persian kings are included in the 5,000 years noted at 1.44.1. Sacks suggests that the numbers are close enough that we need not be concerned about a contradiction on Diodorus' part.[47] But the difference between the two figures might be accounted for by Diodorus' failure to include the 276 years of Macedonian rule in the 4,700-year figure at 1.69.6, which he explicitly includes in the 5,000-year figure at 1.44.4. This interpretation could still be used to argue that Diodorus' source was from the period of Ptolemy I. But the conquest of Alexander the Great was so momentous as to make a convenient chronological marker for any writer on Egypt, not necessarily an early Ptolemaic source.[48] Diodorus may have erred in not including the Macedonian period in the figure at 1.69.6, but he has good company among other historians whose maths have been less than accurate at times.[49]

Murray claims a few other passages in Diodorus as indicative of an early Ptolemaic source.[50] At 1.31.6–8 Diodorus describes the coast of Egypt without mentioning Alexandria, although he notes its harbour of Pharos, which was known to the Greeks at least as far back as Homer (*Odyssey* 4.357). Since, however, Diodorus' Egyptian account is of the country before the Macedonian conquest, this is not too surprising. Moreover, Alexandria was certainly a going concern by the time Hecataeus was writing so, even if it could be shown that this passage was drawn from Hecataeus, the absence of Alexandria would still require some explanation. Diodorus himself states at 1.50.7 that the foundation and description of Alexandria is not suitable for the first book, and promises to describe it in its proper chronological place, which he does in Book 17.

Another potential anachronism concerns the Apis bull. Diodorus says at 1.84.8 that an Apis bull died after the death of Alexander the Great and shortly before Ptolemy son of Lagus took over Egypt. Murray claims that this must be the last event recorded by Hecataeus, and that the passage in Diodorus 'ought to suggest

[46] Murray (n. 12), 145, n. 3. Note that Murray adds 195 to 4,700 and comes up with 4,945, which is incorrect.

[47] Sacks (n. 3), 92.

[48] Burton (n. 16), 6, n. 2.

[49] Cf. Herodotus 1.32, where his calculations of the number of days in a human life yields a 375-day year, and n. 25 above. On ancient writers and their preferences for round numbers note C. Rubincam, 'Numbers in Greek Poetry and historiography: quantifying Fehling', *CQ* 53 (2003), 448–63.

[50] M. Stern and O. Murray, 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians', *JEA* 59 (1973), 165.

that no later Apis bull had yet died when Hecataeus made this statement'.[51] But Diodorus is not giving a chronology of Apis bulls here. Rather, he is using this event to demonstrate how devout the Egyptians were in their animal worship. So there is absolutely no reason for Diodorus to say when the next bull was born. Diodorus explains that the keeper of the bull was so determined to honour it properly that he spent not only a huge sum of his own but also borrowed 50 talents of silver from Ptolemy himself. This was probably a highly publicized move by Ptolemy I to gain Egyptian support early in his reign, and so it is not surprising that Diodorus should choose it as an example of how far the Egyptians would go to honour their animals.[52]

Another aspect of Diodorus' account that Murray sees as fitting into an early Hellenistic context is his description of the geography of Egypt. At the start of this section Diodorus emphasizes how isolated, easily defensible and self-sufficient Egypt is (1.30.1). Murray interprets this as reflecting the viewpoint of Ptolemy at the beginning of the wars of the Diadochoi, and believes that Diodorus is referring to the breakup of Alexander's empire when he declares that Egypt ὀχυρότητι δὲ φυσικῇ καὶ κάλλει χώρας οὐκ ὀλίγῳ δοκεῖ προέχειν τῶν εἰς βασιλείαν ἀφωρισμένων τόπων (1.30.1), which Murray translates as '[Egypt] seems to excel by a long way in natural strength and fertility *the other regions separated off into kingdoms*' (emphasis in original). While this is intriguing, it is not the only way to render the Greek, and in particular the participle ἀφωρισμένων does not seem to encompass the act of regions breaking off into smaller kingdoms from a larger whole.[53] In addition, it is also doubtful that Ptolemy would have seen Egypt as perfectly isolated. He seized the important territory of Coele Syria in 319, lost it to Antigonus Monophthalmos, then regained it after Ipsos (301). The territory would continue to be a point of contention between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid dynasties. As Shipley remarks, this struggle to hold part of Syria 'seems odd only if one views Egypt as a self-contained geographical entity with secure natural frontiers'. It seems doubtful, then, that this passage of Diodorus is reflecting a particularly Ptolemaic viewpoint, even at the very start of the Hellenistic period.[54]

Another aspect of Hecataeus' work from which Murray infers an early Hellenistic context is the blending of Greek and Egyptian viewpoints. Murray feels that the work envisages a 'deeper fusion of Greece and Egypt', which would be appropriate to the opening of Ptolemy's reign when he was still legitimizing his rule over Egypt. Ultimately, this did not occur once Ptolemy's essentially Greek dynasty was established and the Egyptians were firmly under control.[55] But this 'fusion' of Greek and Egyptian is actually more suitable to the late Hellenistic context in which Diodorus is writing. The last few Ptolemies relied far more heavily on native support, and in particular on priestly support, for the crumbling dynasty than previously. Ptolemy

[51] Murray (n. 12), 143 and 145, n. 3.

[52] The Ptolemies regularly favoured the Egyptian priests as a means of legitimizing their rule in Egypt. See G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (New York, 2001), 77–90, on Ptolemy I's policies.

[53] Murray (n. 12), 148. I read ἀφωρισμένων as meaning simply 'defined', similar to Oldfather's translation as 'in natural strength and beauty of the landscape [Egypt] is reputed to excel in no small degree all other regions that have been formed into kingdoms'. This is consistent with the account of the formation of the first races of men that Diodorus gives at 1.8.1–4.

[54] G. Shipley, *The Greek World After Alexander, 323–30 BC* (London, 2000), 205. Cf. Polybius 5.34, which makes the same point.

[55] Murray (n. 12), 166–7.

XII Auletes, the ruler when Diodorus was in the country, was particularly close with the Egyptian priestly caste.[56] This suggests that this aspect of the work may have more to do with Diodorus than with his presumptive sources.

More intriguing is Diodorus' section on the spread of Egyptian culture via colonization (1.29–30). Diodorus limits himself to discussing Egypt's supposed colonization of Athens, but also remarks that the Egyptians claim to have sent forth many other colonies without offering any proof (1.29.5–6). Murray quite correctly says that Diodorus must be abbreviating a much fuller account. He goes on to claim that this account must have been part of early Ptolemaic propaganda claiming Egypt as the source for all other civilizations.[57] This is an interesting hypothesis, but sadly there is no evidence to support it other than the assumption that Diodorus' narrative comes from the early Ptolemaic period. And, to sum up, the evidence for that is non-existent.

Murray's third argument is that the ethnography of Egypt has the same type of structure as the ethnographies of the Jews and Hyperboreans that are attributed to Hecataeus by name. But this argument is already problematic because the ethnographies of the Hyperboreans (2.47) and Jews (40.3) are both preserved by Diodorus. It is not possible to separate out how much of the similarities are due to a common source and how much are the result of Diodorus' own concerns and interests when he adapts them to his own narrative.

Diodorus' description of the Jews does seem to have something in common with the Egyptian narrative. Moses is portrayed as a great leader, who founds many cities and establishes the Jewish forms of worship (40.3.3). Osiris is portrayed as accomplishing similar things in Book 1. Moses also establishes a priestly caste to head the country, with whichever priest is regarded as the best as the leader (40.3.4–5). The Egyptians have a king, but Diodorus does emphasize the importance of the priests as advisors (1.73.2–5). Moses also established laws requiring young men to be virtuous and fit, so as to always be ready for warfare (40.7), and Diodorus describes the Egyptian warrior caste in some detail (1.73.7–9). Finally, Moses established marriage and burial customs that were quite different from those of other people. The trouble is that these are all very generic traits – Moses and Osiris both fit the pattern of heroic city-founders, while the idea of a priestly caste leading the state contains echoes of Plato, and the warrior caste echoes the Spartans. Such details do not constitute positive proof that, because the Jewish ethnography is drawn from Hecataeus, the Egyptian ethnography must be as well, and certainly not when we consider that they may reflect the interests and ideals of Diodorus more than the sources he is adapting.

In the case of the Hyperboreans, I simply do not see any details or a structure that seems specifically to recall either the Egyptian or Jewish ethnographies. Indeed, the account of the Hyperboreans lacks the major features of these, most prominently a culture-bringer such as Osiris or Moses to establish the rules of worship and the laws of humankind and to found cities. Only one Hyperborean is mentioned by name – Abaris. Abaris visited Greece to make votive offerings and renew the friendship of the Hyperboreans and Delians (2.47.3), but this is in no way comparable to Diodorus' account of Osiris spreading civilization throughout the world (1.18–20).

[56] Hölbl (n. 52), 222–3, 271–85, 289–90.
[57] Murray (n. 12), 145–7, 152.

This brings us to Murray's final argument, that the account of Diodorus Book 1 is a unified one, with an internally consistent tone and a number of details that recur or are echoed at various points in the book. Thus Diodorus must be drawing on Hecataeus' work wholesale and not including elements from other authors or his own observations.[58] It is worth noting first that there are a number of minor contradictions in Book 1, which Burton points out.[59] Some of these contradictions are really just alternate versions. At 1.15.1 Osiris is named as the founder of Thebes (or Diospolis) but at 1.45.4 it is Busiris who founds Thebes. The problem with this is that Diodorus explicitly acknowledges that there is disagreement among his sources about who actually founded Thebes and that he will be giving two versions.

Another contradiction that Burton identifies concerns the builder of the Egyptian Labyrinth. At 1.61.1, in his historical narrative of Egypt, Diodorus names the builder of the labyrinth as Mendes, but notes that some call him Marrus. However, in the course of his description of Egyptian animal worship, he mentions the labyrinth again (1.89.3) and attributes its construction to an early king named Menas (already mentioned at 1.45.1). Finally, at 1.97.5, Diodorus again attributes the labyrinth to Mendes or Marrus, but here considers them to be separate kings rather than alternate names for the same king. Linguistically, Menas, Mendes and Marrus seem to be variants on the same Egyptian name,[60] but Diodorus is apparently unaware of this. Burton feels that Diodorus is contradicting himself when he names Menas as the first mortal king of Egypt at 1.45.1, Mendes or Marrus as a later king of Egypt at 1.61.1, and then both Mendes and Marrus as possible builders of the labyrinth at 1.97.5. I believe that the situation is more complicated and indicates that Diodorus is collating at least three sources.

There is no question that Diodorus understands that Menas is a separate figure from Mendes or Marrus – the two are described in different sections of the historical narrative, with different achievements. This indicates that his attribution of the labyrinth to Menas at 1.89.3 came from a second source. In discussing the builder of the labyrinth in chapter 61, Diodorus names the builder as Mendes, but adds that some call him Marrus (*τινες Μάρρον προσονομάζουσιν*, 1.61.1). This means that either Diodorus was working from a single source that identified the king with multiple names, or he was working from two sources and recognized that Mendes and Marrus must be one and the same. If he was working from only one source at 1.61.1, then he must have used a different source at 1.97.5, one that identified the builder of the labyrinth by only one name. Diodorus remembered the earlier passage, but forgot that his earlier source had used both names to identify the same king, causing him to offer the names as those of two separate kings. Alternatively, if Diodorus was collating two or more different sources at 1.61.1, then he must have forgotten that he had recognized Mendes and Marrus as one and the same king by the time he wrote 1.97.5. Either possibility indicates a grand total of at least three sources involved in naming the builder of the labyrinth.

These contradictions are so few in number that they appear to be the exception rather than the rule. They are perhaps indicative that the text of Book 1 as we have it did not received a final edit in which Diodorus would have smoothed

[58] Murray (n. 12), 144–5.
[59] Burton (n. 16), 2–3, 33.
[60] J. Vergote, 'Le roi Moiris-Marēs', *ZAS* 87 (1962), 66–76.

these problems out.[61] Otherwise Book 1 is marked by a high degree of consistency overall, indicative of a single author, as Murray says. But this in no way constitutes proof that the author was Hecataeus. Indeed, it is difficult to think of another ancient author besides Diodorus who could produce a narrative and have its internal consistency be taken as proof that said author was not responsible for it!

Attempting to prove that Diodorus used only a single source based on the stylistic consistency of a particular passage or book is in fact futile. Jonas Palm, in an exhaustive analysis of the language and style of the *Bibliotheke*, has shown that Diodorus is actually quite consistent stylistically throughout the entire work, making any argument on the grounds of style untenable.[62] Or, as Brunt remarked in his study of historical fragments, 'Diodorus himself wrote throughout in the same smooth style … to which no doubt … the survival of so much of [his history] can be ascribed.'[63] More recently, Brian Bosworth has argued that secondary source historians such as Diodorus can quite extensively reinterpret their source material: 'Reportage and opinion are selected, adapted, and woven together in a new blend with a different emphasis.'[64] Diodorus' consistency thus cannot be indicative of what Hecataeus may have believed, even if it could be firmly established that Hecataeus was Diodorus' main source for Book 1.

It is worth briefly considering whether any other authors are credible candidates for being one of Diodorus' sources for Book 1. We have already noted the fragment of the mysterious Caton above, but there are a few other places where there is a good overlap between Diodorus and another author. For example, Diodorus claims at 1.82.3 that Egyptian doctors had to follow treatments laid down in written law. There is no evidence for this as an actual Egyptian practice, but Aristotle (*Politics* 1286a) makes the same statement, the only other ancient author to do so.

Even better is the account of Prometheus preserved in the Scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius 2.1248 and attributed to Agroitas:

Ἀγροίτας δὲ ἐν τῇ ιγ΄ τῶν Λιβυκῶν δειπνεῖσθαί φησι τὸ ἧπαρ Προμηθέως δόξαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀετοῦ διὰ τὸ τὴν κρατίστην τοῦ Προμηθέως χώραν τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν καλούμενον Ἀετὸν φθείρειν, ἧπαρ δὲ παρὰ πολλοῖς τὴν εὔκαρπον λέγεσθαι γῆν· Ἡρακλέους δὲ ἐξοχετεύσαντος διώρυξι τὸν ποταμόν, τόν τε ἀετὸν δόξαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κεχωρίσθαι καὶ τὸν Προμηθέα λελύσθαι τῶν δεσμῶν. (*FGrH* 762 F4a)

Agroitas says in the 13th book of his *On Libya* that the story that the liver of Prometheus was eaten by an eagle came about because Prometheus' excellent land was destroyed by a river called Eagle, and 'liver' is said by many to mean 'fruitful earth'. Since Heracles drew off the river with canals, the 'eagle' seemed to have been removed by him and Prometheus freed from his bonds.

This agrees closely with the account in Diodorus, in which Prometheus is a governor in Egypt whose land is devastated by the flooded Nile, which is turned back only through the efforts of Heracles (1.19.1–4). Diodorus also claims that the story of the eagle came from an alternate name of the Nile. This account of Prometheus

[61] Green (n. 4), 8–9, suggests that the *Bibliotheke* may never have been fully revised.

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

[63] Brunt (n. 22), 478.

[64] A. Brian Bosworth, 'Plus ça change …: ancient historians and their sources', *ClAnt* 22 (2004), 167–97, at 195.

is completely different from that normally recorded in Greek traditions, and appears only in Diodorus and this quotation of Agroitas.[65]

Unfortunately, next to nothing is known about Agroitas, but he must predate Diodorus and his rationalizing approach to myth suggests that he wrote in the middle or late Hellenistic period.[66] It is of course entirely possible that both Agroitas and Diodorus used Hecataeus for this passage, or that Agroitas used or knew Hecataeus, and then Diodorus used Agroitas, but everything is pure speculation. Two other passages in Diodorus, 4.26.2–3 and 4.27.1, are very similar to a passage of Agroitas cited by the Scholiast on Apollonius Rhodes 4.1396 (F3a), so it seems very likely that Agroitas was used independently by Diodorus.[67]

There are also a few passages in Diodorus that bear a resemblance to the surviving fragments of Manetho. At 1.26.1 Diodorus recounts that the priests of Egypt say that some of the gods who ruled Egypt lived as long as 1,200 years. However, according to Diodorus, some men felt that this figure was unbelievable. Instead, they argued that in the earliest times the movement of the sun had not yet been recognized and a year was instead based on a lunar cycle of 30 days. So a year by ancient standards would be the same as a month by modern standards. This same explanation is given in Manetho F1.1–5 and in F2.1–2, but is not seen elsewhere.

There is also some similarity between Manetho F83 and Diodorus 1.12–13 on the lesser gods of Egypt, who both authors say are associated with the five elements of spirit, fire, water, earth and air. Indeed, Eusebius, from whom F83 is drawn, remarks that 'Manetho writes about these things at great length, and Diodorus concisely' (*γράφει δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τούτων πλατύτερον μὲν ὁ Μανεθώς, ἐπιτετμημένως δὲ ὁ Διόδωρος*, Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* 3.2, 87d), so the ancients were aware of this similarity too.[68] Unfortunately, it is not possible to go farther than this and Diodorus clearly did not use Manetho's chronology of the Egyptian dynasties.

It is, at the very least, telling that of the five passages that have the closest counterparts in Diodorus, none comes from Hecataeus, and only one comes from a well-known author, Aristotle. The complete obscurity of both Agroitas and Castor/Caton strongly suggests that Diodorus may have dug far deeper into the available material than he is given credit for by those who feel that he is a 'mere epitomizer' too lazy to read more than a single book on a subject, and that his smooth prose style may hide a far greater number of sources than is commonly supposed.

This leaves Herodotus, the most famous of all the Greek historians of Egypt. It is often asserted that Diodorus did not read Herodotus at all.[69] The historical section of Diodorus clearly owes a great deal to Herodotus, and repeats many of the older historian's mistakes, such as the dating of the pyramid-builders. Nevertheless, since there are enough differences in details, especially names, to show that Herodotus could not have been the only source,[70] and since Diodorus has normally been

[65] Burton (n. 16), 11–12.

[66] M.F. Williams, 'Agroitas (762)', in I. Worthington (ed.) *Brill's New Jacoby* (Leiden, 2007); *RE*, s.v. Agroitas; *Der Neue Pauly*, s.v. Agroitas.

[67] This is the conclusion of Williams (n. 66), the most recent editor of Agroitas. She also argues that Diodorus 3.60.2, 4.27.2–4 and 4.56.6 derive from Agroitas as well.

[68] Burton (n. 16), 12–13.

[69] e.g. O. Murray, 'Herodotus and Hellenistic culture', *CQ* 22 (1972), 200–13, at 210.

[70] Both Diodorus (1.63–4) and Herodotus (2.124–34) place the pyramid-builders among the pharaohs of the new kingdom, when in fact they were much earlier. Diodorus names the first two as Chemmis and Cephren, while Herodotus calls them Cheops and Chephren. They agree

assumed to use only one source at a time, Murray and other scholars took that to indicate that Diodorus only came to Herodotus indirectly through Hecataeus.

This does not seem at all probable.[71] Murray himself has shown that Herodotus was very widely read during the Hellenistic period and was, along with Thucydides, the classic example of Greek historiography.[72] Diodorus refers to Herodotus by name four times in the first book. The first, from the section normally attributed to Agatharchides, describes the earlier historian as 'curious for knowledge if anyone was, and very experienced in history' (*ὁ πολυπράγμων, εἰ καί τις ἄλλος, καὶ πολλῆς ἱστορίας ἔμπειρος*, 1.37.4). If anything, this remark is complimentary, even though Diodorus is explaining that Herodotus is incorrect in his theories about the Nile. Similarly, Diodorus' next two mentions of Herodotus are fairly neutral – mere rebuttals based on better knowledge and autopsy of the earlier historian's claims about the Nile (1.37.11, 1.38.8). The final reference is negative. Introducing the section on Egyptian customs, Diodorus complains that 'Herodotus and certain writers on Egyptian matters deliberately preferred the telling of fantastic things and myths for sheer amusement to the truth' (*Ἡρόδοτος καί τινες τῶν τὰς Αἰγυπτίων πράξεις συνταξαμένων ἐσχεδιάκασιν, ἑκουσίως προκρίναντες τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ παραδοξολογεῖν καὶ μύθους πλάττειν ψυχαγωγίας ἕνεκα*, 1.69.7). There are also two passages in the historical narrative where Diodorus criticizes unnamed authorities for explanations based on divine vengeance and oracle fulfilment (1.59.2, 1.66.10), explanations that are given by Herodotus (2.111, 2.151).

Taken together, these statements seem to indicate that Diodorus had a complex attitude towards Herodotus and that he recognized the achievement of the earlier historian while rejecting the more romantic and fanciful elements of his work. It is very significant that at no time does Diodorus embark on any sort of extended polemic against Herodotus. Denouncing the earlier historian seems to have been a regular feature of Herodotus' successors, who needed to justify their own treatments of the same subject matter.[73] Given that Hecataeus was the first writer to produce an account of Egypt to rival Herodotus, it is very likely that he devoted considerable effort to attacking Herodotus in order to burnish his own credentials. Diodorus' failure to attack Herodotus repeatedly by name strongly suggests that, even if Hecataeus was the main source for Book 1, Diodorus has drastically toned down his polemic against Herodotus. Such toning down requires that Diodorus be familiar with the earlier historian, and presumably used him in conjunction with other sources. Beyond that, it is impossible to say more with certainty.

However, it is clear that the evidence for Hecataeus as Diodorus' main source for Book 1, let alone the only one, is essentially non-existent. The fragments of Hecataeus from other authors offer no support for this attribution, and, as we have

that the name of the third was Mycerinus, although Diodorus gives Mencherinus as an alternative. See also Burton (n. 16), 25–9.

[71] Green (n. 4), 25, n. 129, remarks: 'The onus is on those who wish to prove that Diodorus had *not* read [Herodotus], rather than that he had.'

[72] Murray (n. 69), 200–4. Murray's more detailed arguments about how Hellenistic writers were influenced by Herodotus must be approached with care, as they are largely dependent on the belief that Diodorus Book 1 is an accurate reflection of Hecataeus. On Herodotus in the Hellenistic period, see also K.-A. Riemann, 'Das Herodoteische Geschichtswerk in der Antike' (Diss., Munich University, 1967), 47–69.

[73] Murray (n. 69), 205. The most notable piece of ancient evidence for polemic against Herodotus comes from Josephus, *Con. Ap.* 1.16, 'everyone refutes Herodotus'. On polemic in ancient historiography in general, see Marincola (n. 33), 218–37.

seen, the one fragment that does come from Hecataeus appears to be an anomaly. This makes using Diodorus' first book as a window into Hecataeus' writing and philosophy a hopeless endeavour.

It is unfortunate that this article has to be entirely negative on the question of Diodorus' sources for Book 1, but, when we have lost so much from the ancient world, it is important that we do not assume that we know more than we can about what has been lost. There is, however, one positive consequence. Even if we cannot use Diodorus here to reconstruct his sources, Book 1 would seem to offer a basis for better understanding Diodorus' own aims and methods and his place in first-century thought.

University of Arkansas CHARLES E. MUNTZ
cmuntz@uark.edu