

Διόδωρος Σικελιώτης, *Ιστορική Βιβλιοθήκη Βιβλίο XVI*. Εισαγωγή-Ερμηνευτικό Υπόμνημα: Αθανάσιος Ευσταθίου, Μετάφραση: Θεοδόσης Πυλαρινός, Κέρκυρα 2009, 724, ISBN 978-960-931288-2.

In recent years there seems to have been a reappraisal of Diodorus' *Bibliothēke* through the writing of commentaries and monographs on some of the Books of this text, focusing on it as a historical source but also on Diodorus' independence as an author and critic of history. McQueen (1995)¹ has offered us a translation of and a detailed commentary on Book 16. E. offers a new commentary on this Book greater in scope and length, shedding more light on Diodorus as an author and historian.

The commentary is intended for advanced students and fellow scholars. It is headed by a lengthy introduction. E. offers an enlightening biographical sketch of Diodorus, defines the content of the *Bibliothēke* and argues that the historian does not just copy his several sources but has a critical stance towards them; but to define the extent of his sources is not possible. Diodorus either has direct access to his sources and copies them verbatim or gives a summary of them or draws information from of them through citations of them he finds in other authors. Such a way of writing was common and acceptable in his era.

Regarding the sources of Book 16, E. argues that Diodorus used Ephorus but not Theopompus and then Demophilus and Diyllus for the events of the Sacred War. For this issue I may add Sinclair (1963)². Checking Diodorus against the citations of other authorities, E. shows that Ephorus is the source of the Sicilian events and that it is not right to believe that Diodorus used Timaeus for the chapters devoted to Timoleon. E. argues that for his Roman sources Diodorus uses the *Fasti Consulares* and probably Livius. My own remark regarding the use of Theopompus by Diodorus in this Book is that E. could have benefited from Pownall (2004)³.

¹ E.I. McQueen, *Diodorus Siculus: The Reign of Philip II. The Greek and Macedonian Narrative from Book XVI*, Bristol 1995.

² See R.K. Sinclair, Diodorus Siculus and the writing of history, *PACA* 6 (1963), 39-40.

³ See F. Pownall, *Lessons from the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose*, Ann Arbor 2004, 147-148, 150-151, 155, 161-166, 174.

E.'s general description of the organization, historiographical principles and the style, satisfies the student of the genre. He shows the chronological scheme Diodorus imposes on his history, treats his dating methods extensively and shows that the differences in the Greek and the Roman chronological systems made the right chronology of events a confusing subject for Diodorus and led him to chronological mistakes. E. shows that the historian uses a technical vocabulary related to politics which gives his work a distinctive character and denotes that he shaped linguistically the historical material he found in his sources. E. analyzes the way Diodorus shapes and structures his text in a linear style of narrative through the use of parenthetical phrases, recapitulative verbs and phrases and the choice of nouns instead of verbs and participles instead of adjectives. In my opinion, the stylistic analysis of Diodorus is the best part of the Introduction. Then E. records the editions and translations of Diodorus, offers an assessment of the historian from Roman to modern times and makes his own careful and balanced approach to the subject. Finally, he provides a summary of the content of Book 16 and supplies a concise discussion of the manuscript tradition.

The book includes the text and a clear and fluent translation into modern Greek side by side. I have reservations about one point. In XVI 84, 3-5 P. translates the words *κατάπληξις* and *φόβος* as identical but they are not so in Diodorus' mind. Cf. XVI 3, 1: *ὁμως τηλικούτων φόβων ... οὐ κατεπλάγη*. Cf. *LSJ. s.v.*⁴. Note that in XVI 2, 5 P. rightly translates the word *καταπεπληγμένοι* as «terrified» and the word XVI 2, 5 *περίφοβοι* as «having fear».

The commentary follows the translation and is mainly historical, but philological and literary aspects are not neglected. In the notes E. address the problems of the text and in some points he revises it. E. has not commented on every single line of Diodorus but he does comment on many passages, offering a detailed, thorough and lucid work which covers 404 pages in total and is nicely and effectively intertwined with the Introduction. The comments on each passage clarify the points raised in them and contain many cross-references to others in the volume. The sources for the period are not always in agreement and the fact that much of our historical information derives from Diodorus presents special problems for the researcher. These problems command the author's attention throughout the commentary. For the most part E. makes a convincing case for the version of events he prefers and, where necessary, he acknowledges that

⁴ H.G. Liddell - R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.), ed. by H.S. Jones, Oxford 1940.

certainty is impossible. E. is noteworthy because his arguments on the use of the orators as historical sources lead us to rethink or alter our view of their value as sources of facts in some cases. Moreover, E. is very competent in showing how Diodorus changes his point of view, moving from an anti-Macedonian to a philo-Macedonian source. The bibliography is immense and deftly incorporated.

A few notes may be added on points of detail. (1) XVI 84, 1: for the term ἡγεμονία in Diodorus see Wickersham 1994⁵. (2) XVI 23-27; 35, 1; 59-60: for the Sacred War, E's comments are excellent but Pownall, 1988⁶ is missing. (3) 92, 5. Concerning the episode of Philip's statue entering the theatre and its meaning for the Macedonians see Baynham 1994⁷. In his comment on this passage E. says that if the testimony of Clement of Alexandria is right, the Athenians enacted a law to worship Philip. For this issue I may add Versnel 1973⁸ and Fredricksmeier 1979⁹, who consider it historical, Badian 1981¹⁰ who argues for the opposite and finally Long 1987¹¹, who reconsiders the issue and argues in favour of Clement. (4) 93, 2. E. argues that the word φίλος implies a kind of sexual relationship between Philip and Pausanias. This important comment deserves more analysis. Cf. Hammond 1989¹² for the possibility that this incident could be historically accurate and Dover 1989¹³ as a guide for interpreting the passage.

The book is equipped with an index of names at its end and an index of sources that are used in the Introduction and the Commentary at the beginning. For this enterprise a detailed index of passages would be useful, because this would help the readers understand how E. analyzes Diodorus and reveal the author's masterly handling of all the issues that he treats. I have traced two misprints, «μισθοφόρων» instead of «μισθοφόρων» (p. 143) and Αισχ. Περί Παραπρ. 16, 4-5 instead of 19, 4-5 (p. 359).

⁵ See J. Wickersham, *Hegemony and Greek Historians*, Lanham 1994, 150-177.

⁶ F. Skoczylas Pownall, What makes a War a Sacred War?, *EMC* 17 (1988), 35-55.

⁷ See E. Baynham, The Question of Macedonian Divine Honours for Philip II, *MArch* 7 (1994), 35-36.

⁸ See H.S. Versnel, Philip and Kynosarges, *Mnemosyne* 26 (1973), 273-729.

⁹ E. cites E.A. Fredricksmeier, Divine Honours for Philip II, *TAPA* 198 (1979), 39-36, not for the historicity of Clement's text but for the issue of *proskynesis*.

¹⁰ E. Badian, The deification of Alexander the Great, in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, ed. by H.J. Dell, Thessaloniki 1981, 67-71.

¹¹ See C.R. Long, *The Twelve Gods of Greece and Rome*, Leiden - New York 1987, 188.

¹² N. Hammond, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: The So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius*, Cambridge 1989, 34.

¹³ K.J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge (MA) 1989, especially 36, 45, 49, 53, 59, 84, 92, 111-112, 116-118, 144, 194.

These minor remarks do not detract the value of this commentary. The end product is a valuable addition to the study of Diodorus and contributes to our knowledge and understanding of his work. This commentary bears comparison with similarly focused works written in the English-speaking world and deserves a wide readership both of classicists and historians. So let us hope that it will be translated in English soon, since this will increase its impact on international scholarship.

AGGELOS KAPPELLOS
University of Ioannina, Greece
agkap75@yahoo.gr