

lemic against Castor: though acknowledging the issue of racial primacy, he refuses to join in the debate (i 9.3). The only occasion when Diodorus accepts the claims about the early date of certain myths is when, predictably, they concern Sicily (v 1.4).

In another way as well Diodorus worked to defuse the inherent competition regarding the earliest civilization. In the first six books (though book vi is highly fragmentary), Diodorus notes the benefactions of dozens of individuals, most of whom were deified for their service to humanity. These are divided fairly evenly between books i–iii and iv–vi.<sup>49</sup> By including the myths of the East, Diodorus can give credit to both sides.

He also presents barbarian myths sympathetically. In at least four instances, Diodorus may have added to the account of Hecataeus a notice that a particular Egyptian figure had benefited humanity and received divine honors in return.<sup>50</sup> Two of these concern Osiris while on his great expedition (i 17–20). Inconsistencies indicate that the entire story was not part of Hecataeus's original narrative, and similarities with a later event that was in Hecataeus suggest the model Diodorus may have used to invent his version.<sup>51</sup> Osiris is portrayed as a great conqueror and benefactor to humanity, who commanded the likes of Hermes, Heracles, and Apollo. The Egyptian etiology for the discovery of ivory (by Osiris) is juxtaposed and given equal weight with the Greek claim (by Dionysus), and Diodorus appears to favor the Egyptian over the Greek version of how Prometheus was saved.

<sup>49</sup> i 13.1, 17.2, 18.5, 24.7, 90.2–3; ii 34.5, 38.5; iii 9.1–2, 56.5, 61.5–6, 64.2, 70.8; iv 1.4, 1.7, 8.5, 82.5; v 64.2, 66.3, 68.1, 73.3, 74.3, 76.1–2; vi 1.2, 2.1.

<sup>50</sup> i 17.2, 18.5, 24.7; 90.2–3; on which see Murray, *JEA* 56 (1970), 144. Murray is only slightly less radical than E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 40 (1885), 223–62, and Jacoby (*FGH* 264 FF 2 and 25) in arguing that book i is substantially Hecataeus's work rather than Diodorus's. Far more conservative are Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter*; Burton, *Diodorus Siculus Book I*; and Sartori, *Athenaeum* 74 (1984), 492–536.

<sup>51</sup> See Murray, *JEA* 56 (1970), 149–50.

In writing on India, Diodorus generally follows the account of Megasthenes,<sup>52</sup> but again departs to stress his own cosmopolitanism. Diodorus says simply that Dionysus came from "regions to the west."<sup>53</sup> Arrian, however, following Megasthenes more faithfully,<sup>54</sup> depicts Dionysus as being Greek and an invader,<sup>55</sup> as docs Strabo, who quotes Megasthenes here.<sup>56</sup> There was, in fact, another tradition that claimed Dionysus came to India from Assyria,<sup>57</sup> which Diodorus perhaps was here acknowledging. But in any case, by remaining ambiguous about Dionysus's place of birth, Diodorus avoids referring to a possible Hellenic origin. Both Diodorus and Arrian maintain Megasthenes' allusion to an Indian account that Heracles was born in India,<sup>58</sup> and discuss what the two gods taught the Indians and the reverence in which they were held. But Diodorus employs a formula frequently found in the *Bibliothèque* that, by ruling so wisely and making so many benefactions, they were also immortalized there.<sup>59</sup> Also, whereas Arrian makes Dionysus—the fate of Heracles is undiscussed—depart the country,<sup>60</sup> Diodorus emphasizes the local tradition in stating that they both died in India.<sup>61</sup>

As part of his anthropology of India, Diodorus includes the legend of the Indian region named *Meros*, which locals claimed was responsible for the subsequent Greek belief that Dionysus was nurtured in the thigh (*μηρός*) of Zeus (ii 38.4). The story had already been criticized by Theophrastus (*HP* iv 4.1), and, when Arrian tells it in the *Anabasis* where he is not

<sup>52</sup> DS ii 35–42 = *FGH* 715 F 42.

<sup>53</sup> ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἑσπέραν τόπων: ii 37.3.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. O. Stein, *RE* 15.1, 254.

<sup>55</sup> *FGH* 715 F 12 = Arr., *Ind.* 7.4–5.

<sup>56</sup> *FGH* 715 F 11a = Strabo xv 6.1.

<sup>57</sup> P. Wesseling, in Eyring, *Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae Historicae Libri* II, 444, on ii 37.3.

<sup>58</sup> DS ii 39.1; Arr., *Ind.* 8.4 = *FGH* 715 F 13. Strabo, xv 6.1 = *FGH* 715 F 11a, depicts him as a foreigner.

<sup>59</sup> ii 38.5, 39.4: on the construction, see above, n. 49.

<sup>60</sup> *FGH* 715 F 12 = Arr., *Ind.* 8.1.

<sup>61</sup> ii 38.6, 39.4. Dionysus returns from India in another tradition: iv 3.1.

following Megasthenes,<sup>62</sup> he puts it in the mouth of Indian envoys to Alexander.<sup>63</sup> To Arrian, or his source, the explanation was related by Indians who are only anxious to secure Alexander's cooperation. Diodorus, on the other hand, adds legitimacy to the account by making it part of his ethnological narrative.<sup>64</sup> At every place where the treatments of Diodorus and Arrian differ, Diodorus's version is more sympathetic to non-Greeks.

The universalistic treatment of benefactors fits well with Diodorus's anthropology. Underlying human development is *χρεία*, which is common to all mankind and drives civilization. Arising out of emerging societies are exceptional individuals who offer important gifts to humanity. The historicity of these individuals is not important to Diodorus, for he makes known his own skepticism about all myth.<sup>65</sup> But his particular application of Euhemerism provides the logical bridge between *χρεία* and the unique individual. If gods were humans deified for their gifts to mankind, their acts of benefaction occurred while they were members of that evolving civilization. *Χρεία* and *εὐεργεσία* mutually contribute to the development of society: necessity was a general condition for all humans, while culture heroes arose in specific locations to help every civilization progress. As Diodorus carefully celebrates the accomplishments of all culture heroes, Greek and barbarian, necessity and individual benefactors work in harmony and emphasize his universalistic sympathies.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Curt. viii 10.12.

<sup>63</sup> *Anab.* v i 5; cf. v ii 5.

<sup>64</sup> It is argued that Diodorus there augments Megasthenes with another source (Stein, *RE* 15.1, 252ff.), but this is merely denying the possibility of Diodorus's own creativity: cf. the methodology of P. Brunt, *Arrian: History of Alexander and India* II, 448. Diodorus offers another story of the Indian Dionysus when he presents all the versions and seems to give primacy to the Indian account: iii 66.3–5, esp. iv 1.7. Diodorus held his ground against Theophrastus and other Hellenistic writers who attacked the Indian version, on whom see Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* IIa, 343, n. 101.

<sup>65</sup> i 23.8, 69.7; iv 1, 8.8; H. Volkmann, *RhM* 98 (1955), 354–67; E. Gabba, *RSI* 96 (1984), 860–62; Sartori, *Athenaeum* 72 (1984), 520–29.

Diodorus's understanding of progress is closely related to the cosmogony he develops in i 6–8.<sup>66</sup> There, he argues that primitive, hostile conditions set the stage for future development. If Diodorus had adopted the often-expressed alternative cosmogony of an initial, perfected Golden Age and a subsequent decline,<sup>67</sup> it would have conflicted with his notion of continued improvement through the appearance of culture heroes. Consequently, though the *Bibliothēke* is the greatest repository of utopian literature from antiquity, none of it is set in a Golden Age of the past. Following Euhemerus,<sup>68</sup> Diodorus frequently portrays Panchaea in the present tense, as if it were an existing island (cf. v 41.4, 42.4), like many of the others he describes. Perhaps because of its contemporary setting, the society depicted is not perfect: the Panchaeans are generally warlike (v 45.3), and soldiers are needed to protect against dangerous bands of robbers who attack farmers (v 46.1). In detailing other so-called utopias, Diodorus stresses that they are fictitious<sup>69</sup> or implies that they exist in the present.<sup>70</sup> None is portrayed as a Golden Age of antiquity, after which civilization declined. Diodorus yields to the contemporary interest in utopias,<sup>71</sup> but is careful to allow room for continuous progress, in the form of *χρεία* and benefactors.

Diodorus's stress on culture heroes was shaped by contemporary thought. Veneration for exceptional service was central to Hellenistic political and social philosophy.<sup>72</sup> Under the

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Havelock, *The Liberal Temper in Greek Politics*, 78.

<sup>67</sup> On which, most recently I. Kidd, *Posidonius. Vol. II: The Commentary* II, 962–63.

<sup>68</sup> v 41–46 = *FGH* 63 F 1.

<sup>69</sup> Iambulus's Island of the Sun (ii 55.1), which is also part of a different *οἰκουμένη* (ii 56); Dionysius Scytobrachion's island of Hesperia (iii 53.4–5 = *FGH* 32 F 7); and the Hyperboreans of Hecataeus (ii 47 = *FGH* 264 F 7).

<sup>70</sup> Nysa is described in the present tense, whereas the mythology pertaining to it is in the past tense: iii 68.4–69 = *FGH* 32 (Dionysius Scytobrachion) F 8.

<sup>71</sup> For the Hellenistic taste in utopias, see E. Gabba, *JRS* 71 (1981), 58–60; fuller bibliography in G. Aalders, *Political Thought in Hellenistic Times*, 64–73.

<sup>72</sup> M. Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* III, 1358–59, n. 5; Oehler, *RE* 6, 978–81, for the early evidence.

newly established monarchies, benefaction became an obligation to the individual and society, as kings were expected to perform acts of goodwill and beneficence.<sup>73</sup> Greek cities frequently acknowledged Rome's good deeds (κοινὰ εὐεργετήματα), too.<sup>74</sup> At the same time, there developed a strong association between the great benefactor and the divine. Within a generation of Alexander, his achievements were being compared with the labors of Heracles<sup>75</sup> and associated with the deeds of Dionysus, who became the great invader and civilizer of lands from Libya to India.<sup>76</sup>

Among Diodorus's sources for the first six books are several Hellenistic authors credited with the tradition of the deified mortal, especially Hecataeus of Abdera, Euhemerus, Megasthenes, and Dionysius Scytobrachion.<sup>77</sup> But so little of their work exists outside of the *Bibliothēke* that the integrity of their ideas apart from Diodoran intrusion cannot be established with certainty.<sup>78</sup> Indeed, there is substantial reason to

<sup>73</sup> De Romilly, *La douceur dans la pensée grecque*, 216–30; Murray, *JEA* 56 (1970), 159–60, for Ptolemaic kings; in Diodorus, see i 90.3 and cf. ii 28.7 and xxxiv 4.4 for kingly ἐπιθέματα, an attribute closely tied to εὐεργεσία.

<sup>74</sup> E.g., H. Volkmann, *Hermes* 82 (1954), 467; G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, 12–13, 150–51; L. Robert, *CRAI* (1969), 42–64; see also DS xxxi 4.1. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, 112–21, 150–51, and C. Habicht, *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire Romaine*, Fondation Hardt, *Entretiens* 19, 61–62, discuss cults dedicated to Romans.

<sup>75</sup> M. van der Valk, *REG* 71 (1958), 158–59, on the *Tabula Albana* (FGH 40). On the later comparisons with Alexander, see D. Michel, *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar, und Marcus Antonius*, and D. Kienast, *Gymnasium* 76 (1969), 430–56.

<sup>76</sup> A. Nock, *JHS* 48 (1928), 26–30 = Nock, *Essays*, 140–44; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1, 342.

<sup>77</sup> Schwartz, *RE* 5, 670–78, is still generally convincing on the sources for books i–vi. On the redating of Dionysius Scytobrachion, see J. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, 85–92.

<sup>78</sup> E.g., Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter*, 164–211, and Thraede, *RAC* 6, 879–82, are not often followed in assigning i 11–13 to Diodorus rather than Hecataeus. But important questions remain about Diodorus's possible intrusion at i 11.1 and 13.1. Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, 156, n. 29, most recently argues that Diodorus himself separates the οὐράνιοι θεοί from the θεοί εὐεργετῶν, and this is

believe that Diodorus played a significant role in designing the image of culture hero often attributed to his sources.

The theme of civilizers, inventors, and city builders with their resulting deification occurs regularly in the early books of the *Bibliothēke*. Almost seventy times in the first five books and the very few fragments of book vi, Diodorus records a benefactor's gift to humanity<sup>79</sup> and the consequent divine election.<sup>80</sup> The specific description of a benefactor's deification is highly formulaic, with the precise wording being nearly unique to the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>81</sup> Yet it is found in every part of the work, regardless of Diodorus's current source.<sup>82</sup>

Now the explanation that "deities had been generals, ad-

---

strengthened by the comment of Tzetzes (*Chiliades* i 812–20), who states that Diodorus, like Plato and Plutarch, made that distinction himself. It is an especially compelling argument if vi 1.8 is Diodoran: most recently accepted by Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1a, 451, n. 816. Even among the "radicals," Schwartz, Jacoby, and Murray, there is significant disagreement as to the extent of Diodorus's intervention in book i. See also Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1, 497–99.

<sup>79</sup> Discussed generally at i 13.1; ii 25.8; iii 9.1–2; iv 1.4; v 46.3, 64.2, 66.3; vi 1.2, 2.1; individual gifts found in the TLG machine-readable tape, s.vv. εὐεργεσία, εὐθεας, and ἔξευρίστω.

<sup>80</sup> Osiris: i 17.2, 18.5, 20.5; Isis: i 22.2; Dionysus: ii 38.5, iii 63.4, 64.2, 70.8; Uranus: iii 56.5; Titaea: iii 57.2; Hesperus: iii 60.3; daughters of Atlas: iii 60.5; Heracles: i 24.7 and passim; Theseus: iv 62.4; Aristaeus: iv 82.5–6; Orion: iv 85.5; Halia: v 55.7; Phorbas: v 58.5; Althaemenes: v 59.4; Dactyli: v 64.6; the second generation of gods: v 66.3, 67.5; Hestia: v 68.1; Hephaestus: i 13.3 and v 74.3; Demeter: v 68.3; Zeus: v 71.6; Minos: v 79.2; Minos's sons: v 79.4; Tennes: v 83.3; the Dioscori: vi 6.1; Aeneas: vii 5.2; in general: i 2.4; iv 1.4; v 64.2.

<sup>81</sup> On τυχεῖν ἀθανάτων τιμῶν, see Wesseling, in Eyring, *Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae Historicae Libri* 1, 325, on i 17.2, and 319, on i 13.1: Wesseling uncharacteristically cannot cite parallels in Diodorus's usual sources.

<sup>82</sup> A sampling: i 13.1 = FGH 264 (Hecataeus) F 25; ii 34.3–6 = FGH 688 (Ctesias) F 5 (not ii 4, 20.2 = F 1b with FF 1 c, m: Semiramis was born a god); ii 38.5 = FGH 715 (Megasthenes) F 42; iii 9.1–2 = Agatharchides (Schwartz, *RE* 5, 673); iii 56.5 = FGH 32 (Dionysius Scytobrachion) F 7; iv 8.5 = Matris of Thebes (Schwartz, *RE* 5, 676); iv 82.5 = Timaeus (Schwartz, *RE* 5, 677); v 46.2 = FGH 63 (Euhemerus) F 1; cf. v 35.2 = FGH 87 (Posidonius) F 117, on which see Chapter 4.

mirals, and kings who lived a long time ago"<sup>83</sup> is a classic Euhemeran sentiment, and it is an interpretation found frequently in Diodorus's sources. But the theme of lawgivers, inventors, and the like also receiving divine election by a grateful humanity is not found in any of Diodorus's sources outside of what is preserved in his work. Diodorus may well have reshaped much of the traditions he used, emphasizing that civilizing gifts also earned mythological characters their immortality. Some controls are available to support this theory. In drawing on Megasthenes, Diodorus employs his usual explanation—that Dionysus in return for his numerous benefactions received divine honors from the Indians (ii 38.5). But Arrian, using the same source, holds that as part of his benefactions Dionysus taught the Indians to worship him as the god he already was.<sup>84</sup> It is possible that Diodorus refashioned the tradition to conform to his own interpretation. And with some degree of confidence, it can be determined that, at least four times while following Hecataeus of Abdera, Diodorus invents episodes involving deified culture heroes, as noted previously. Further, when discussing who bestowed the gift of literacy on humanity, he knows of Ephorus's version involving nondivine figures, but instead attributes the invention to the Muses who consequently receive immortal fame from humanity.<sup>85</sup> Many writers testified that the gods bestowed the blessings of civilization on mankind, and many asserted that the gods were originally human. But to argue that humans were immortalized by other humans because of these civilizing gifts, instead of for being great generals or kings, was to cross the fine line between those who wrote as euhemerizers

<sup>83</sup> Plut., *Mor.* 360a = FGH 63 (Euhemerus) T 4c.

<sup>84</sup> *Ind.* 7.8 = FGH 715 F 12. Lactantius preserves Euhemeran material that similarly has Zeus establish his own cults after performing benefactions: FGH 63 FF 23 (*Div. Inst.* i 22.21–25) and 24 (*Div. Inst.* 11.45–46). Diodorus infrequently asserts that a god established his own cult: i 86.3; iii 55.9, 65.2, 74.1; iv 24.4.

<sup>85</sup> v 74.1 with v 73.1; cf. Jacoby on FGH 70 F 105.

and those who were euhemerists.<sup>86</sup> Diodorus, even more than the contemporary Varro,<sup>87</sup> may have been among the first and the most eager to be both.

In the historical narrative, too, Diodorus emphasizes the theme of deified culture hero. He notes the deification of nearly a dozen individuals,<sup>88</sup> and at times his attribution of divine honors is somewhat exaggerated. The extant decrees honoring Q. Mucius Scaevola's benefactions, for example, do not mention he was deified, as Diodorus suggests.<sup>89</sup> Caesar is

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, 48–50, and esp. Thraede, *RAC* 5, 1219–21.

<sup>87</sup> Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* xviii 3, 6, 8, 12, 15, 16, which are fragments of *De Gente Populi Romani*; cf. H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* II<sup>2</sup>, 228–34. Yet xviii 10 suggests Varro may have treated the gods as benefactors more collectively than individually and may have cast them in a more mythological light than did Diodorus. Artapanus, a Jewish historian of the third or second century B.C., states that, because of his great benefactions to their land, Egyptian priests deemed Moses worthy of divine honors (τὸν Μωϋσῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων ἰσοθέου τιμῆς καταξιοθέντα; Eusebius, *PE* ix 27.6). Although in using Hecataeus he is generally thought to be reflecting euhemerizing tendencies (e.g., *Old Testament Pseudepigraphica* II, 889–95, ed. J. Charlesworth), it is dangerous to draw that conclusion from this one example, for Egyptians traditionally deified their leaders. Moreover, to Jews and thus to Artapanus himself, Moses was obviously not considered a god. Thus Artapanus is not trying to explain how the gods began as humans.

<sup>88</sup> Gelon (xi 38.5–6); Hieron (xi 66.4); Diocles (xiii 35.2; xiv 18); Dion (xvi 20.6); Alexander (xvii 102.4; xviii 28.4–5); Hephaestion (xvii 115.6; on the text: E. Bickerman, *Athenaeum* 41 [1963], 81–83); Ptolemy I (xx 100.3); Demetrius (xx 102.3, as a founder); Philopocmen (xxix 18); Q. Mucius Scaevola (xxxvii 6). Cassander sought immortal fame (ἀθανάτου δόξης; xix 53.2) for reestablishing Thebes, the kind of city-building that earns Caesar Diodorus's praise. Philip's autodeification at xvi 92.5, 95.1 does not qualify. For a general discussion, see L. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 8–34; most recently, A. Gosling, *AJP* 107 (1986), 586–89. In practice Diodorus does not differentiate among honors granted ἰσῳθεοί, θεοί, and ἥρωικοί, but in theory he does distinguish between men honored as ἥρωικοί and ἰσῳθεοί (i 2.4) or ἡμίθεοι (iv 1.4, 85.7), perhaps supporting the thesis of S. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, 32–40.

<sup>89</sup> Diodorus describes Scaevola as τιμῶν ἰσῳθέων ἔτυχε (xxxvii 6), certainly not indicated by OGIS, 437–39. Diodorus suggests that Leosthenes of Athens was given heroic honors (ταφέντος ἥρωικῶς) by Hyperides (xviii 13.5). Noth-

the most admired of all historical figures, and Diodorus five times refers to him as a god.<sup>90</sup> Diodorus judges him superior to Dionysus, Heracles, and all the other heroes and dynasts for alone being able to bring Britain into the civilized world (v 21.2), and he praises Caesar for being the first since its founding by Heracles to take the Celtic city of Alesia.<sup>91</sup> As he did with mythological benefactors who established great cities, Diodorus eulogizes Caesar for his refounding of Corinth. He calls Caesar the greatest of all Romans and affirms that he justly received the title of *divus* on the basis of his virtues: moderation (ἐπιεικεία), noble birth, military and oratorical skills, and indifference to money. Diodorus uses phrasing reminiscent of his praise of Heracles.<sup>92</sup> Many historians (including Diodorus's occasional source, Megasthenes)<sup>93</sup> compared the feats of historical figures with those of divine char-

---

ing from the surviving *Funeral Oration* indicates that is so, unless chap. 35 is read aggressively; but given the circumstances of the funeral, Hyperides may well have honored him thus: see Bickerman, *Athenaeum* 41 (1963), 70–71. Both Diodorus and a surviving inscription (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*<sup>2</sup>, 624) describe Philopomen's honors as ἰοῦθεοῦ. The terms εὐεργέτης and σωτήρ were not strictly religious titles, but ranged in meaning from patron to having a close association with the godhead: R. Fears, *Principes a Diis Electus: The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome*, 95–98, and Robert, *CRAI* (1969), 42–64. Diodorus once uses it to suggest a patron (xxxiii 1.5), but Mithridates is called θεός καὶ σωτήρ (xxxvii 26.1; on his autodeification, see B. McGing, *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator King of Pontus*, 99–102); Dion is given divine honors while still alive and also called εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ (xvi 20.6; cf. xvi 11.2, Plut., *Dion* 22.4, 29.1; see C. Habicht, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*<sup>2</sup>, 204, n. 47), but Gelon, made divine only posthumously (xi 38.5), had bestowed upon him the same title of εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ while alive (xi 26.6). Demetrius was a σωτήρ at Rhodes (xx 93.6) and Athens (xx 46.2), a status that in Plut., *Demetr.* 10.3, 13.2, borders on the divine: see K. Scott, *AJP* 49 (1928), 137–66, 217–39. Diodorus generally echoes the phrasing of Polybius v 9.9–10.

<sup>90</sup> i 4.7; iv 19.2; v 21.2, 25.4; xxxii 27.3.

<sup>91</sup> iv 19.2. Virgil also would later compare Augustus favorably with Heracles (*Aen.* vi 1061–64).

<sup>92</sup> xxxii 27.3; cf. on Heracles iv 8.5; both have τὴν ὑπερβολὴν καὶ τὸν αἰώμιον . . . ἔπαινον-ἄθανασίαν.

<sup>93</sup> *FGH* 715 F 1 = Josephus, *AJ* x 227; F 11a = Strabo xv 6.1.

acters. But the comparisons involving Caesar must be Diodorus's own interpolation. He may even have created his description of Alesia and the association between Caesar and Heracles there from his own version of Heracles' founding Sardinian Iolais.<sup>94</sup>

Caesar is the contemporary figure Diodorus most admires. And in fact, Caesar's deification and his final plans for a great invasion of the East, have been thought to provide the inspiration for the early books of the *Bibliothēke*.<sup>95</sup> Now it is true that Varro, writing *De Gente Populi Romani* just after 43 B.C., lists several instances from antiquity where great kings were subsequently deified; he may well have done so in order to justify Caesar's controversial apotheosis and ingratiate himself to Octavian, *divi filius*.<sup>96</sup> But the *Bibliothēke* had a more universalistic message. Diodorus had spent some years in Egypt, where pharaohs customarily were worshiped, both while alive and after their death (i 90.3, 95.5).

Deified conquerors were commonplace, and it forces the point to see Caesar behind his entire work. In fact, neither Sesostris of Egypt nor Ninus of Assyria, legendary figures of the early books who are thought to have been fashioned after the Dictator, is especially significant in the narrative, nor does Diodorus say they were later worshiped as gods. If Diodorus shaped Sesostris after any historical figure, it was probably Alexander the Great.<sup>97</sup> Even so, Sesostris does not set out to conquer the world without the wisdom and foresight of his daughter (i 53.8). Nor is Ninus presented in the *Bibliothēke* in grand terms. Although Pompeius Trogus makes him a char-

<sup>94</sup> v 15; J. Harmand, *Latomus* 26 (1967), 968–72; Caesar himself never associated Heracles with Alesia: cf. Rawson, *Intellectual Life*, 263, on Caesar, *BC* vii 68ff.

<sup>95</sup> M. Sartori, *Athenaeum* 61 (1983), 550–52, and *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 492–536.

<sup>96</sup> Taylor, *CP* 29 (1934), 221–29.

<sup>97</sup> See Murray, *JEA* 56 (1970), 162–63. Diodorus calls the Egyptian Sesostris, but Sesostris was popularized by Herodotus (ii 102–110) and others: see especially Wesseling, in Eyring, *Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae Historicae Libri* 1, 396, on i 53.1.

acter of great accomplishments in his history,<sup>98</sup> Diodorus, following Ctesias, devotes only three chapters exclusively to him (ii 1–3). Ninus is then eclipsed by his wife and successor, Semiramis, who thoroughly dominates the Assyrian narrative.<sup>99</sup> Ninus cannot take Bactria without her help (ii 6.4), and only she is awarded divine status (ii 4.4, 20.1–2). In fact, what is especially thematic about the early books is the emphasis on female rulers.<sup>100</sup> Yet Diodorus certainly did not model these women after Caesar, for his ideas of what is admirable in women are quite different from his portrayal of the Roman dictator.<sup>101</sup> And regarding Semiramis's invasion of India, which occupies the better part of her story, Diodorus is consistently critical of her motives.<sup>102</sup> The invasion ends in complete failure—hardly a model derived from Caesar's planned offensive. The figure of Caesar strongly influenced the *Bibliothèque* (see Chapter 6). But it will be seen that his attributes conform to Diodorus's notion of history and not the other way around.

Beside deified characters such as Caesar, other benefactors who do not even receive divine honors are emphasized in the historical portion of the *Bibliothèque*. As part of his annalistic entries, Diodorus includes information on various intellectuals: their acmes, the years in which they produced important

<sup>98</sup> Justin 1, i 1–8: "totius Orientis populos subegit."

<sup>99</sup> ii 4–21 = FGH 688 F 1b; cf. iii 1.2: Diodorus's own words.

<sup>100</sup> Zarina of the Scythians civilized her people, for which she was deified (ii 34.3–6 = FGH 688 [Ctesias F 5]). Female Scythian rulers were exceptionally brave (ii 44.1), and there is a digression on Amazons and the strength of women generally (ii 45–46). Diodorus discusses Amazons at greater length: iii 52–55 = FGH 32 (Dionysius Scytobrachion) F 7. For Egyptian history, women are supreme over men: i 27.2. Throughout the books involving the historical period, there are vignettes of Greek and Roman women: x 21; xii 74; xix 59.3–6, 67. Interest in female anatomy is found in xxxii 10.2–12.3, which may be Posidonian: most recently, Malitz, *Die Historien des Posidonios*, 39. See generally: M. Casevitz, *La femme dans le monde méditerranéen I: Antiquité*, 113–35. The interest in women was well within the Hellenistic historiographical tradition; cf. Pédech, *La méthode*, 71–72.

<sup>101</sup> E.g., iii 55.3.

<sup>102</sup> ii 16.4, 18.1: the Indians in no way provoked the fight.

compositions, and, in the case of historians, the period included in their works.<sup>103</sup> These notations tie the process of cultural benefaction, begun in prehistory, to contemporary times.

Historians are mentioned most often, because Diodorus views them as performing a special service to humanity. Now it is often thought that the references to historians and the material they cover offer a clue to Diodorus's sources. Such a connection is doubtful. Cataloging was becoming fashionable in first-century Rome,<sup>104</sup> and that is, in a sense, what Diodorus did by referring to other historical works. Diodorus, moreover, had spent years of research in Alexandria, possibly working in the Great Library.<sup>105</sup> There, one of the most important literary genres was the *pinax*: a list of books on a particular subject with brief descriptions of each work.<sup>106</sup> The influence of that Alexandrian genre is especially underlined by the title of Diodorus's history. His is the first narrative to be called *Bibliothèque*,<sup>107</sup> the same name as that given to the Library at Alexandria.<sup>108</sup> Diodorus intended that his work recall that great collection, whose books were listed and described by *pinakes*. In naming historians and the periods their works covered, Diodorus is cataloging and memorializing the process of history writing—but not necessarily indicating every source he employed in composing his own *Bibliothèque*.

<sup>103</sup> Schwartz, *RE* 5, 668–69, lists the entries within the accepted text of the *Bibliothèque*. But there may have been others that did become part of the canon: e.g., FGH 71 (Zoilus) T 2 = Tzetzes, ad *Exeg.* i, 126 Herm = uncertain frag. of Diodorus no. 2.

<sup>104</sup> See J. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*, 10–26.

<sup>105</sup> iii 38.1, on which see Chapter 4; cf. xvii 52.6.

<sup>106</sup> Most recently, Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1, 322–35, 452–53, esp. 11b, 654, n. 42.

<sup>107</sup> It seems probable that Diodorus referred to his work only as a *Bibliothèque*, rather than *Bibliothèque historike*: Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, 24, n. 24. See also H. Stephanus, in Eyring, *Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae Historicae Libri Qui Supersunt, e recensione Petri Wesselingii* 1, vi–vii. It means *librorum repositio*, according to Isid., *Or.* vi 3.1: *RE* 3.1, 405.

<sup>108</sup> Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* II 476, nn. 115 and 119.