

HISTORIAE MUNDI

Studies in Universal History

Edited by
Peter Liddel and Andrew Fear



Duckworth

First published in 2010 by
Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.
90-93 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6BF
Tel: 020 7490 7300
Fax: 020 7490 0080
info@duckworth-publishers.co.uk
www.ducknet.co.uk

Editorial arrangement © 2010 by
Peter Liddel and Andrew Fear
The contributors retain copyright in
their individual contributions.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication
may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or
transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher.

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

ISBN 978 0 7156 3833 0

Typeset by Ray Davies
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Henry Ling Ltd, The Dorset Press, Dorchester

Contents

Contributors	vii
Preface	ix
Introduction	
<i>Tim Cornell, Andrew Fear, Peter Liddel</i>	1
1. <i>Metabole Politeion</i> as Universal Historiography	
<i>Peter Liddel</i>	15
2. Polybius and the First Universal History	
<i>François Hartog</i>	30
3. Diodorus' Reading of Polybius' Universalism	
<i>Brian Sheridan</i>	41
4. Diodorus' Good Statesman and State Revenue	
<i>Errietta Bissa</i>	56
5. Strabo and the Development of Ancient Greek Universal Historiography	
<i>Johannes Engels</i>	71
6. The Glory of Italy and Rome's Universal Destiny in Strabo's <i>Geographika</i>	
<i>Marta García Morcillo</i>	87
7. Universal History and the Early Roman Historians	
<i>Tim Cornell</i>	102
8. Universal and Particular in Velleius Paterculus: Carthage versus Rome	
<i>Clemence Schultze</i>	116
9. Focalised Universality: Contextualising the Genre	
<i>Liv Maria Yarrow</i>	131
10. Ennius as Universal Historian: the Case of the <i>Annales</i>	
<i>Jackie Elliott</i>	148
11. Theology versus Genre? The Universalism of Christian Historiography in Late Antiquity	
<i>Peter Van Nuffelen</i>	162
12. Orosius and Escaping from the Dance of Doom	
<i>Andrew Fear</i>	176

Contents

13. A Rose in the Desert? Late Antique and Early Byzantine Chronicles and the Formation of Islamic Universal Historiography <i>Marco Di Branco</i>	189
14. Universal Historiography and World History according to Hegel <i>Allegra de Laurentiis</i>	207
15. Spengler, the Modern West, and Roman Decline <i>John Farrenkopf</i>	221
Index	239

Contributors

Errietta Bissa, Lecturer in Ancient History, University of Wales,
Lampeter.
Tim Cornell, Professorial Research Fellow in Classics and Ancient
History, University of Manchester.
Allegra de Laurentiis, Associate Professor of Philosophy, State
University of New York at Stony Brook.
Marco Di Branco, Professor, University of Basilicata.
Jackie Elliott, Assistant Professor of Classics, University of Colorado at
Boulder.
Johannes Engels, außerplanmäßiger Professor, University of Cologne.
John Farrenkopf, Associate Professor of Government, Wofford College,
Spartanburg, South Carolina.
Andrew Fear, Lecturer in Ancient History, University of Manchester.
Marta García Morcillo, Lecturer in Ancient History, University of
Leicester.
François Hartog, Professor of Ancient and Modern Historiography,
École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris.
Peter Liddel, Lecturer in Ancient History, University of Manchester.
Clemence Schultze, Lecturer in Ancient History, University of Durham.
Brian Sheridan, PhD student and Tutor, National University of Ireland,
Maynooth.
Peter Van Nuffelen, Research Professor in Ancient History, University
of Ghent.
Liv Mariah Yarrow, Associate Professor, Brooklyn College, City
University of New York.

Diodorus' Good Statesman and State Revenue¹

Errietta Bissa

Diodorus is not an admired historian; in modern scholarship he is sometimes condemned as an inept and mindless compiler.² Yet the *Bibliothēke* constantly exhibits Diodorus' own perspective, ideas and exegesis of patterns. As Kenneth Sacks rightly argues: 'once the belief in Diodorus' incompetence is put aside, it is easy to establish his authorship of important concepts in the *Bibliothēke*'.³ His interest in mythology and his criticism of his predecessors who rejected it as the exclusive province of mythographers is a telling example, backed up by six books on the subject.⁴

Diodorus has a particular perspective, both on what universal history is and on what its uses are. For the Sicilian historian, universal history is the history of mankind and the main actors are not events and causality but people.⁵ The focus of Diodorus on people rather than on events is obvious in his vision of the purpose of universal history; it is a teacher, a moralising force for the betterment of mankind, not merely an explanatory tool for current political circumstances.⁶ Unlike Polybius, who follows closely the Thucydidean model of kinetic history, Diodorus does not follow a specific model of static or kinetic but prefers a blending of the two in a vision of history that places man at the centre of the stage; events become the expression of human activity.⁷

In Diodorus' moralising view of history, a special place is reserved for leaders as major players in events and thus as figures of interest, not only as representatives of larger units, but also as individuals.⁸ Diodorus is, of course, a product of his own times. Living and writing during the fall of the republic, a time when great personalities dominated the history of the Mediterranean, certainly influenced Diodorus' perception of previous eras.⁹

Diodorus views history as a means of education for leaders and, thus he provides examples for their edification. The good statesman has some basic characteristics in the *Bibliothēke*, which are best seen in the eulogy for Epameinondas of Thebes:¹⁰

... in (Epameinondas) all virtues were found together, strength of body and natural oratorical ability and in his soul, brilliance, hatred of money (*misarguria*), fairness and most of all bravery and strategic talent, beyond that of anyone else. (15.88.3)

Here, Epameinondas' *aretai* are not merely theoretical but are exhibited in, and proven by, his achievements.¹¹ In Diodorus, the good statesman does not fail, but achieves the ultimate goal of making his homeland greater than before.¹² This characterisation of Epameinondas has often been attributed to Ephorus, mainly because of the sentiment that Epameinondas brought about the Theban hegemony, which Strabo ascribes to the Kymaean.¹³ Yet the characteristics of Epameinondas as a good statesman, his fairness, lack of avarice, bravery, strategic talent and oratorical ability, are common to Diodorus' characterisations of good statesmen throughout the *Bibliothēke*.¹⁴ While Ephorus was most probably the main source for Diodorus' account of the fourth century, the unity of the characteristics of the good statesman in the *Bibliothēke* militate against a purely Ephoran narrative in the case of Epameinondas.

One of Epameinondas' virtues is *μισαργυρία*, 'hatred of money'. The word is found in Diodorus alone and provides us with a window into his view of the relationship between the statesman and the economy.¹⁵ *Μισαργυρία* does not imply ignorance of the economy but, like fairness and brilliance, is one of Epameinondas' *aretai* that have to do with the soul.¹⁶ *Μισαργυρία* is the exact opposite of *φιλαργυρία*, 'avarice' or 'love of money for its own sake'.¹⁷ His usual expression relating to the lack of *φιλαργυρία* is *ἀφιλαργυρία*/*ἀφιλάργυρος*, which means precisely 'freedom from avarice' rather than 'hatred of money'.¹⁸ For the opposites, he uses either *φιλαργυρία*/*φιλάργυρος* or the more common *πλεονεξία*, 'greediness' and 'excess'.¹⁹ *Αφιλαργυρία* is a Diodoran word *par excellence*, since from Homer to the *Bibliothēke* it is used only once in other texts.²⁰ Diodorus' decision to use *μισαργυρία* only for Epameinondas is interesting. *Μισαργυρία* is a very powerful word denoting not simply 'a lack of avarice' as *ἀφιλαργυρία* but an active 'hatred of money'. The use of the stronger word complements the Diodoran view of Epameinondas as the ultimate good statesman.

The relation between leadership and money is a major concern in many of Diodorus' characterisations. From the Greek world, a good example is Pittacus of Mytilene:

(Pittacus) seemed to all to be the perfect man possessing of every virtue. In his laws, he showed himself a statesman and prudent, in his beliefs a just man, in the contest of arms a brave man, and in relation to profit in the greatness of his soul not avaricious (*ἀφιλάργυρος*). (9.11.2)

A considerable part of Diodorus' account of Pittacus, as found in the *epitome*, relates to his lack of avarice, including two anecdotes describing him turning down monetary awards. His judgement of the Mytilenian lawgiver could not be more positive.²¹ Diodorus does not mention revenue specifically but Pittacus' *ἀφιλαργυρία* is stressed repeatedly in the surviving fragments.

The greatest example is, of course, Aristides the Just, whom Diodorus

applauds for his character and conduct during the initial stages of the Delian League:

On the issue of the contributions, he made the division so exact and fair that all the *poleis* were happy. And as he took part in the achievement of impossible things and achieved the greatest glory over his fairness, for the excess of fairness he was called Just. And at that time the evil of Pausanias robbed the citizens of naval hegemony, while the *arete* of Aristides gave Athens that same leadership. (11.47.2-3)²²

Turning to Rome, Diodorus singles out ἀφιλαργυρία as the principal *arete* of Aemilius Paulus, the conqueror of Macedon:

And to many it has seemed that Aemilius Paulus superseded in lack of avarice (ἀφιλαργυρίαν) those of the Greeks, who were until that time praised for this, Aristides and Epameinondas. They, when given money by people for profit, refused to take the bribes, while he having power could have whatever he wanted but wanted nothing. (31.26.2)

Aemilius Paulus is a good statesman in Diodorus and his characterisation is based mainly on his ἀφιλαργυρία; he is even ascribed one of the characteristics of the Diodoran 'culture-hero': invention.²³ Diodorus' source for Aemilius Paulus is Polybius, who also stresses Aemilius' relation with money and compares him with Epameinondas and Aristides.²⁴ Diodorus, however, adds his own take on events, not only by providing the characterisation of ἀφιλάργυρος but also by offering a comparison between Aemilius and current Roman practices.²⁵

Diodorus singles out Caesar as the best of Roman statesmen. Caesar lived during Diodorus' lifetime and his impact on Roman and Mediterranean politics and reality was part of the historian's life. In Diodorus' eyes, Caesar is the ultimate Roman statesman, a parallel to Epameinondas for the Greeks, and deserving both the praise of history and the godhood that has been given him.²⁶ His ἀφιλαργυρία is one of the characteristics that Diodorus specifically mentions:

This man throughout exhibited nobility, oratorical skill, strategic talent and lack of avarice (ἀφιλαργυρία); for that he deserves to be accepted as just and deserving of the praise of history for his kindness. The extent of his deeds was greater than that of any of the Romans before him. (32.27.3)

Conversely, φιλαργυρία is a characteristic of the Diodoran bad statesman, best illustrated in the characterisation of Hiero of Syracuse. His predecessor and brother, Gelon, is used as the exemplary good tyrant that none of the later tyrants in Sicily managed to emulate.²⁷ Gelon is directly contrasted with his brother Hiero, who is specifically called avaricious and violent:

Gelon, being loved by everyone for his goodness, lived his life in peace until his death. Then Hiero, the eldest brother, succeeded to the monarchy but did not rule in the same way. He was avaricious (φιλάργυρος), violent and generally the opposite to his brother's simplicity and goodness of heart. (11.67.3-4)

Avarice was, according to Diodorus, the downfall of Perseus, king of Macedon. Perseus is one of Diodorus' bad statesmen and his φιλαργυρία and desire for personal profit over the enrichment of his homeland are mentioned as the reason for the downfall of the Macedonian kingdom.²⁸

Not abandoning profit and desire for gain even under the most despairing of circumstances can only be thought of as the actions of a man completely insane. One should not wonder how the Romans defeated the Macedonians but rather how the Macedonians managed to resist for four years with such a man as their leader. (30.21.2)

Military issues, strategy and morale do not enter the Diodoran account; for the Sicilian historian, avarice was the downfall of the Macedonians. The comparison with Alexander, the man who made Macedon a world power, is damning for Perseus.²⁹ More importantly, Perseus is directly contrasted with the man who defeated him, Aemilius Paulus.³⁰ The characterisations of the two leaders are directly opposite, since the great virtue of Aemilius was lack of avarice, while the downfall of Perseus and Macedon is attributed specifically to his avaricious character and love of gain.

Φιλαργυρία and its opposite ἀφιλαργυρία (or μισαργυρία in the case of Epameinondas) are seen as attributes of the soul in Diodorus' statesmen, as is expressly mentioned in the cases of Epameinondas and Pittacus. In some cases, however, the Sicilian historian takes the theme beyond character into the political actions of a statesman, particularly in relation to state revenue. Care of revenues is attributed as a defining policy characteristic of some good statesmen, such as Sitalces of Thrace:

In that time, Sitalces, king of the Thracians, took the throne of a small country. And through his own bravery and talent he increased the kingdom greatly, ruling the conquered fairly, being brave and talented in battle and, further, taking good care of revenues. At the end, he achieved such power that his kingdom in Thrace became larger than that of any of the kings before him. (12.50.1)

Sitalces is not a Greek leader but a Thracian barbarian, yet in the Diodoran view of the universality of history, Sitalces becomes a fine exemplum of the good statesman. Sitalces' characterisation precedes the narrative of his involvement in the Peloponnesian War and directly influences the reader's view. The parallels between Sitalces and Epameinondas are clear in their respective characterisations. They are both brave and talented, their rule is fair and these *aretai* are exemplified in their achieve-

ment of making their respective homelands greater and more powerful than before. Sitalces is not a φιλάργυρος: he does not covet money for its own sake, but like his fairness and his bravery, his care for revenues is used to increase the power of his homeland.

The characterisation is the same in the case of Philip II of Macedon, especially as exhibited in his use of the Pangaion mines, the increased exploitation of which, Diodorus notes, enabled Philip to make Macedon a major power in the Greek world.³¹ Philip, like Sitalces, takes care to increase the revenue of the state but is not φιλάργυρος as becomes apparent in the implicit contrast with many of the Greeks who, it is implied, let their love of money make them traitors:

From these, he quickly amassed great wealth and through the abundance of money, he brought the Macedonian kingship to great heights of power. He minted a gold coinage, which was called Philippeion after him, and thus he put together a great force of mercenaries and bribed many of the Greeks to turn traitor to their homelands. (16.8.6-7)

Most importantly, like Sitalces, Philip uses the revenue amassed to further the cause of his homeland. Diodorus is well-disposed towards Philip and considers him a good statesman. Philip's positive presentation in the *Bibliothèque* is seen primarily in the anachronistic relation the historian creates between him and Epameinondas.³² Approval of Philip is also seen in his final characterisation, which differs sharply in its favourable tone to those of Plutarch, Arrian and Theopompus.³³ Philip in the *Bibliothèque* is not the irresponsible meddler we find in Plutarch, he is not Arrian's flawed father of greatness or Theopompus' king of vices, but a successful statesman and king in his own right.³⁴

Another of Diodorus' good statesmen whose economic policy relating to revenue is mentioned is Artaxerxes.³⁵ Artaxerxes' characterisation as a good statesman is seen in his use of fairness in ruling his subjects, parallel to both Sitalces and Epameinondas.³⁶ A further parallel between Diodorus' ultimate good statesman, Epameinondas, and Artaxerxes is his popularity:

(Artaxerxes) took great care of revenues and military affairs and ruled fairly the whole of his kingdom; thus he became extremely popular with the Persians. (11.71.2-3)

The good statesman in the *Bibliothèque* is implicitly popular; popularity, like an increase of the homeland's power, is one of the achievements of the good statesman through his *aretai*.

Diodorus does not consider care of revenue merely a minor characteristic of his good statesman but an important aspect of his leadership. This is best illustrated in the case of certain bad statesmen, the later kings of Cyrene, where misappropriation of state revenue is presented as proof of their wickedness. The Battiads exhibit the opposite behaviour to that of

Sitalces and Philip: instead of increasing the revenue of the state, they appropriate and squander it. The brief comparison with the original Battus is striking, especially since the founder of the dynasty is presented as fair and popular, both characteristics of the good statesman:

The later kings (of Cyrene) did not rule like the first Battus had. He, depending solely on his position as king, had ruled fairly and popularly; more importantly, he honoured the gods greatly. But his successors ruled more and more tyrannically, taking the state's revenues as their own and showing disrespect to the gods. (8.30.1)

Further, the cases of Sitalces and Philip demonstrate that Diodorus does not consider revenue an end unto itself. Care for revenue must play a role in the ultimate goal of the good statesman, the betterment of the homeland. This is best illustrated in Diodorus' summary judgement of Remphis, one of his quasi-mythological pharaohs, who is condemned as a mere steward, since he amassed but did not use revenue.³⁷ Diodorus clearly blames φιλαργυρία for Remphis' failed regime, parallel to the Battiads of Cyrene and opposite to the characterisations of good statesmen:

After the death of Proteas, his son Remphis succeeded to the throne. He devoted his life to taking care of revenues and amassing wealth but due to his small-mindedness and avarice (φιλαργυρίαν ἥθους) he spent nothing either to adorn the gods or help his people. So he became not king but a good steward and instead of the glory of virtue, he preferred to amass more wealth than his predecessors. (1.62.5-6)

The Diodoran view of the purposes of history and specifically universal history is closely connected to his desire to provide exempla for the edification of his contemporaries and future generations. In his characterisation of statesmen, the Sicilian historian considers money-related issues, such as φιλαργυρία, to have been particularly important in the development of one's life and career. That becomes particularly obvious where Diodorus points out a statesman's use and abuse of state revenue. The Sicilian does not provide us with much detail on the practicalities of such use, except in the case of Philip, where the Pangaion mines are specifically mentioned. That is probably a consequence of the brevity of Diodorus' account and of the variability of probable revenues in different states and areas.

It would be easy and well within the tradition of *Quellenforschung* in modern Diodoran scholarship to ascribe the important place of φιλαργυρία and its opposite, ἀφιλαργυρία, as well as its relation to revenue policies in the *Bibliothèque*, to some lost historian. Ephorus would be the obvious choice due to his purported connection with the moral perspectives of Isocrates.³⁸ However, the wide chronological spectrum of examples from semi-mythological Egypt to Diodorus' own lifetime make the subject of

φιλαργυρία/ ἀφιλαργυρία and revenues as part of the characterisation of statesmen a pair of continuous themes in the *Bibliothēke*. As Sacks rightly argued, such unity of theme demonstrates Diodorus' creativity and his political and philosophical perspective on leadership.³⁹

Of particular interest is whether the inclusion of this element in the statesman's characterisation is purely a Diodoran idea or the product of an outside influence beyond that of a particular source. On the one hand, Diodorus was certainly influenced by his own times, experience and political reality. Diodorus was writing at the end of the republic. In the eastern Mediterranean, politics had become the arena of personalities instead of political entities since the death of Alexander. The Hellenistic kingdoms were politically dominated by the kings themselves and the members of court; thus policy was in the hands of individuals rather than councils or assemblies as had been the case in the greater part of the Greek world in the archaic and classical periods. Consequently, a statesman's attitude to money and particularly his policies towards revenue were simultaneously more important politically and more visible to the public. At the time Diodorus was writing, this situation had also become prevalent in the western Mediterranean as the Roman state was dominated by specific individuals rather than the collective political entities of the Romans.

Diodorus was probably more sensitive to this shift since, as a Sicilian, he had been exposed to a long history of individuals dominating politics from as early as the late archaic period, particularly in Sicily's greatest state, Syracuse. The contemporary situation in the Roman empire, with its great and influential leaders whose attitude to money and policies on revenue affected millions, certainly influenced Diodorus' view of statesmen throughout history.⁴⁰

Beyond the contemporary influences on Diodorus' views, one is bound to question whether the Sicilian historian was further influenced by past historians. Certainly, the inclusion of economic matters and particularly revenue in the characterisation of statesmen appears not to be a widespread phenomenon of the first century BC, given that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus' contemporary, does not include it in his characterisations of statesmen. Possibly Dionysius' lack of references to the economy or revenues is a reflection of the state of knowledge about the archaic period in his time.⁴¹

The loss of such a great part of Hellenistic writing makes the inquiry into pre-Diodoran historiography fraught with difficulty and uncertainty, since one can trace trends mainly through their existence, or lack of it, in the historians of the classical period, long before Diodorus, and later authors of the Roman imperial period. The extant historians of the classical period, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon, exhibit interest in both revenue and statesmen but do not connect the two to the degree and in the way that Diodorus does. For Herodotus, the rarity of discussion of revenue

is itself interesting; his characterisations are based on other elements of a statesman's political career. This omission is painfully obvious in the Constitutional Debate where avarice does not even play a role in the tyrant's bad qualities.⁴² Even when matters related to wealth are mentioned in a tyrant's characterisation, such as in the case of Polycrates of Samos, Herodotus is more interested in arrogance than in attitudes to money.⁴³ The only possible exception is Herodotus' reference to the judgement of Darius by the Persians. Darius, because of his institution of regular tribute, is called a *kapelos*, a shop-keeper, and unfavourably compared with his predecessor, Cyrus the Great.⁴⁴

Thucydides was interested in revenue, particularly in relation to its effect on war-efforts, but the role of economic factors (such as those related to the Megarian decree or the Periclean strategy) is overlooked in favour of *hubris* and imperialism.⁴⁵ More importantly, Thucydides' characterisations of politicians are lacking in anything relating to the economy and particularly revenue. That is clearly exhibited in his characterisation of Cleon and the judgement of the politicians of the 420s whose changes in financial policy, successful or not, are known chiefly from inscriptional evidence, especially the tribute reassessment of 425 BC.⁴⁶ Thucydides is less interested in politicians effecting change than in change itself: this is demonstrated in his reference to the imposition of a pan-Aegean import-export tax in lieu of tribute, where the change is implicitly attributed to the Athenians as a people rather than to the proposal of a specific politician or group.⁴⁷

Xenophon exhibits almost no interest in revenue and revenue policy in the *Hellenika*. Interestingly one of the two references to revenue is in a statesman's characterisation. Polydamas of Pharsalus, a minor figure, is judged as a good statesman by Xenophon on the basis of his hospitality and his care for the Pharsalian revenues.⁴⁸ However, Polydamas is the single exception in Xenophon's characterisations, which in their overwhelming majority ignore economic matters.

The three extant historical works of the classical period suggest that attitudes to money and particularly revenue policies were of little interest to classical historians. One may even argue that the economy is not truly considered an element of politics, at least as far as politicians are concerned. Yet, judging from Xenophon's other works, in particular the *Poroi*, it is clear that revenues and economic policy were of interest to politicians. Moreover, Xenophon includes attitudes towards money and particularly revenue policies in his characterisation of statesmen outside the *Hellenika*, such as in the *Hiero*, the *Kyropaideia* and the *Anabasis*.⁴⁹

Clearly, there must be a reason why Xenophon, who otherwise exhibits such interest in revenue policy, excludes it from the *Hellenika*. The relative chronology of Xenophon's works (both the *Hellenika* and the *Poroi* were written late in his life) shows that he did not have a change of heart or a revelation of the importance of revenue that led him to the *Poroi*.

Consequently, judging from Xenophon's different attitude in the *Hellenika* in comparison to his other works, it is possible that the conventions of historiography in the classical period did not encourage the inclusion of revenue and attitudes to the public economy in the characterisations of statesmen in historical works.

The next extant historian is Polybius, who gives revenue and the wealth it accrues for a state a significant role in his work: this is testified by its inclusion in his initial explanation of the power of Rome and its paramount role in explaining the Rhodian disaffection with the Romans.⁵⁰ In the case of Chairon of Sparta, Polybius also includes a politician's attitude to revenue in his characterisation.⁵¹ Polybius exemplifies the tendency to involve the economy in what is essentially a military history as the backdrop to imperialistic expansion. Although on rare occasions he mentions a statesman's relationship to money, he does not take the extra step of connecting his characterisation of statesmen with their revenue policy as Diodorus does. Like his extant predecessors, Polybius examines states and revenue only when it directly affects the larger issues of history.

Diodorus is the next extant historian in line and embodies the step that his extant predecessors never take. The ideas and the shadowy connections were there long before Diodorus but it is not until the Sicilian that they are made explicit. It is possible that at some point in the Hellenistic period, some other historian, now lost, made similar connections. I will not speculate on the content and style of the lost Hellenistic historians. However, it is clear that in the extant texts, Diodorus is the first to link statesmanship and revenue, to make the public economy a major part of political reality. Until something surfaces that proves otherwise, Diodorus is the undisputed first.

The Greek historians of the imperial period are more interested in the public economy and particularly in revenues. Appian singles out revenues, especially those pertaining to the military, as one of the areas of interest to the historian, and throughout his work revenues are mentioned.⁵² However, he does not make revenue policy a consistent part of his characterisation of politicians, except in an indirect manner, such as in Mark Antony's posthumous criticism of Caesar's spending policy.⁵³ Cassius Dio follows a similar route to Appian, since he includes revenues in his presentation of decision-making processes, especially in the early principate as can be seen in the monarchy debate.⁵⁴ Like Appian, however, he does not include attitudes to money or revenue policy in the characterisation of his statesmen. Arrian, possibly influenced by his source material, does not follow the trend of inclusion, since his only mention of a revenue policy in the *Anabasis* is in Alexander's speech at Opis relating to Philip's revenue policies.⁵⁵ The similarities between Arrian's and Curtius' accounts show that this part of the speech is based on an older source.⁵⁶

The nearest to Diodorus' method of inclusion of attitudes to money and revenue in the characterisation of politicians is interestingly not a histo-

rian but a biographer, Plutarch. Plutarch both in his *Lives* and in other works includes both attitudes to money and revenue policies in his characterisations with numerous examples, mainly from the Greek world.⁵⁷ Plutarch's many references and the parallels between his presentation and that of Diodorus provide us with an interesting insight into the Diodoran tendency. Plutarch is a historical biographer and his interest is in individuals rather than the narrative of events. Diodorus, although he primarily deals with the narrative of events in his work, given his interest in leaders as individuals and policy-makers, approaches a biographical mode of thinking and characterisation. Interestingly, this follows a tendency seen since Xenophon, where his biographical works, such as the *Kyropaideia* and the *Hiero* are more interested in revenue policy, than his historical writing in the *Hellenika* (see n. 49).

It is quite clear that while both revenue and statesmen are of interest to historians from Herodotos onwards, Diodorus is the only one to make a clear link between his characterisation of statesmen and their attitude to money and particularly revenue policy. As mentioned above, this to some extent may be attributed to Diodorus' experience of contemporary politics. Given the scope of Diodorus' work, which covered the whole of known history to his own times, it is not surprising that the Sicilian historian extended his understanding of contemporary politics and the role of revenue within them to bygone times.

Attitudes to money, and policy towards revenue and the public economy in general, appear to be mainly part of the anecdotal tradition of biography rather than history. From Xenophon's attempts at inclusion, mainly in the *Kyropaideia*, to Plutarch's many and varied anecdotes about statesmen's relation to money and economic policy, biography rather than history appears to be the inspiration and likely source of information for Diodorus' inclusion of revenue policy in his characterisations. The possible influence of biographical convention in Diodorus' historical method may be the most likely explanation of not only the inclusion of attitudes to money and revenue policies in his characterisation but also of other aspects of his judgement on situations and individuals, such as the importance of piety.⁵⁸

In general terms, the historiography of the late republic and empire exhibits a more profound interest in economic policy, particularly in relation to revenues, and its impact on politics, than classical historiography, a trend apparent since Polybius. However, the inclusion of attitudes to money and particularly revenue policy in the characterisation of statesmen appears to be a purely Diodoran addition to ancient historiography, which, nevertheless, did not take hold in the post-Diodoran era. Diodorus' departure from convention must be attributed to the influence of the biographical tradition as well as on the influence of contemporary politics.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Dr Peter Liddel and Dr Andy Fear, as well as the speakers and audience of the Universal History conference, for their comments and suggestions on an initial version of this paper. My profound thanks to Prof. Hans van Wees for the invitation and to the audience of the Institute of Classical Studies Ancient History Seminar in London for their comments and suggestions on a later version of this paper. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Hans van Wees for his encouragement and support in my exploration of Diodorus. My thanks to Miss Charlotte Greenacre and Dr Federico Santangelo for reading and commenting on versions of this paper. I would also like to thank the personnel at the Institute of Classical Studies library in London and the university library at the University of Wales Lampeter for their help and guidance. As usual all mistakes, miscomprehensions and misadventures are my own. A version of this paper appeared in the Lampeter Working Papers in Classics (http://www.lamp.ac.uk/ric/workin_papers).

2. Volquardsen (1868); Schwartz *RE* (1903); Wilamowitz (1908) 14; Cawkwell (1981) 69; Hornblower (1981) 27; Andrewes (1985) 190; Stylianou (1991), (1998). Of particular interest is the accusation that Diodorus slavishly follows his sources. In the few instances where Diodorus demonstrably follows the works of earlier historians, it is obvious that he follows them closely. Such close attention to his sources should be regarded with admiration and relief, not scorn, since otherwise Diodorus' value would be greatly diminished. In this respect Diodorus' value is not as 'one of the most eligible subjects for the operations of *Quellenforschung*', as Hornblower (1981: 19) suggested, but rather he is valuable as a historian who does not depart from his evidence into wild rides of fancy. For an example from classical Greek history, see the parallels between *FGrH* 70 F191.3-5 and Diodorus 11.59.3. On Diodorus as preserving not creating history, see Sacks (1990: 3). That Diodorus did not follow his sources slavishly or stupidly copying them, see Rubincam (1998a). For the method of the later historians, like Diodorus, who do not depart from their sources, see Bosworth (2003).

3. Sacks (1994) 214. For the most powerful defence of Diodorus the historian, see Sacks (1990). A number of scholars have pointed out Diodorus' strengths and his contributions to historiography. For Diodorus as the first writer of holistic universal history, see Burton (1972) 37. For the epic scope of Diodorus' history and its success, see Rubincam (1987) 314.

4. Diod. Sic. 4.1.2-3; Strogetsky (1986) 103. On the moral lessons of myth and the stoic influence on Diodorus in this issue, see Mortley (1996) 90-1.

5. For the influence/expression of the Stoic ideal of the brotherhood of man in Diodorus, see Baldry (1965) 71, 187-8; although note that Baldry attributes these to Poseidonios not Diodorus himself.

6. Diod. Sic. 4.1.4. Strogetsky (1986) 103; Rubincam (1987) 315; Sacks (1994) 215: 'the use of history as a moral force can be shown to play a significant role in Diodorus' historical outlook'. On the differences in perspective on the value and influence of history between Diodorus and other historians, see Sacks (1990) 24-5.

7. Kinetic history is the history of battles and events as exemplified by Thucydides, while static history is the history of culture and peoples at peace as exemplified by Herodotus. For more on this division, see Strasburger (1966) and the review by Murray (1968). On Diodorus as a blend of static and kinetic history, see Murray (1972) 212. For the differences of Polybius' and Diodorus' views of universal history, see Sheridan in this volume.

4. Diodorus' Good Statesman and State Revenue

8. Diod. Sic. 1.1.5; Strogetsky (1986) 104; Lefèvre (2002).

9. Schwartz (1903); Strogetsky (1986) 101.

10. For Epameinondas as the ultimate good statesman in Diodorus, see Drews (1962) 388.

11. Diod. Sic. 15.88.4.

12. Drews (1962) 392.

13. Str. 9.2.2 (*FGrH* 70 F119). Jacoby (1963) 69 made the connection between Diod. Sic. 15.88.3-4 and Str. 9.2.2. See also Stylianou (1998) 10, 110.

14. Alganza Roldan (1992).

15. LSJ s.v. *μισαργυρία* and *TLG* search (eighth to first century BC).

16. *Ἀφίλαργυρία* is consistently considered an attribute of the soul in Diodorus, as for example in the case of Pittacus (9.11.2).

17. LSJ s.v. *φίλαργυρία*.

18. LSJ s.v. *ἀφίλαργυρία*.

19. LSJ s.v. *πλεονεξία*. Hornblower (1981:50) considers the influence of Hieronymos on Diodorus on the theme of *πλεονεξία* but, as Sacks points out (1990: 20-1) *πλεονεξία* is a constant theme in the *Bibliothēke*, which is found in books that cannot be sourced back to Hieronymos.

20. [Hp.] *Decent.* 5.1. This assertion is based on data from *TLG* search (eighth to first century BC). Even where Diodorus is known to paraphrase his source, as in the case of the characterisation of Aemilius Paulus based on Polybius, *ἀφίλαργυρία* is a purely Diodoran assertion: compare Diod. Sic. 31.26.2 and Polyb. 31.22.

21. Diod. Sic. 9.11.1.

22. The Diodoran account of the beginnings of the Delian League follows another historian, since Thucydides is reticent on the role of Aristides. The similar, if more detailed, account of Plutarch (*Arist.* 24) shows that Aristides' actions regarding the *phoros* were recorded in some historical source.

23. Diod. Sic. 30.20. On culture heroes and their defining characteristics in Diodorus, see Sartori (1984) 494 and Sacks (1990) 68.

24. Polyb. 31.22.

25. Diod. Sic. 31.26.2. Sacks (1990) 47.

26. Diod. Sic. 32.27.3. Rubincam (1998b) 229, 233. Caesar as a 'culture-hero' comparable to Alexander and the mythological demigods: Sartori (1984) 530, Sacks (1990) 74-6.

27. Thus, Gelon is the paradigm that Theodoros brings in his castigating speech to the Syracusans against Dionysius: Diod. Sic. 14.66.

28. I disagree with Sacks (1990: 52) on the supposedly variable characterisations of Perseus in Diod. Sic. 30.21.2 and 32.4, since the second passage has to do with the behaviour of the Romans and other imperialists (Philip, Alexander), particularly relating to the employment of *epieikia*. Perseus is not portrayed as a good statesman nor as a victim on his own right but merely as the recipient of a Roman lack of *epieikia*.

29. Diod. Sic. 30.21.3.

30. Diod. Sic. 30.20.

31. Diod. Sic. 16.8.6-7.

32. Diod. Sic. 16.2.3.

33. Diod. Sic. 16.95. On the characterisation of Philip in Theopompus, see *FGrH* 115 F27, F224-5; Alonso-Núñez (1990) 179; Murray (1946); Connor (1967). On the parallels between Philip and Caesar in Diodorus, see Prestianni (1991) 51.

34. Plut. *Alex.* 9-10; Arr. *An.* 3.6.5-6.

35. Diod. Sic. 11.71.1-3

36. On *epieikia* as part of the good characterisation in Diodorus, see Sacks (1990) 78-9; (1994) 217. For the view that such characterisation shows Diodorus as a poor historian, see Stylianou (1991): 'the indiscriminate use of words like *epieikia* and *philanthropia* is not surprising in a moralising hack and a poor stylist to boot'.
37. Diod. Sic. 1.62.5. On the possible identification of Remphis, see Oldfather (1933) 1.62.5, Wirth et al. (1992) 1.62.5 and Burton (1972) 185.
38. Sacks (1994) 214. I agree with Sacks (1990: 31): 'Judging the worth of a historical figure or event is obviously not the exclusive characteristic of the so-called Isocratean "school of history".'
39. Sacks (1994) 215, 231.
40. On Diodorus' perspective as subject not conqueror: Sacks (1994) 220.
41. Mentions of revenue in Dionysius: *Ant.* 20.15 (Brettioi), 8.73-5 (Distribution of land, traditionally 483 BC). Dionysius does mention care for revenues as part of a politician's responsibilities in his *Rh.* 5.5.
42. Hdt. 3.80-3. On *pleonexia* and its absence in the Constitutional Debate, see Gammie (1986) 174, 191.
43. Hdt. 3.122-5.
44. Hdt. 3.89.
45. Revenue and success in war: Thuc. 2.13. Economic impossibility of the Periclean strategy: Cawkwell (1975) 54-5. For Thucydides pushing into the background the Megarian Decree unlike the comic writers, see Ar. *Ach.* 530-8, and unlike Ephoros, see Diod. Sic. 12.38-40, with Flower (1998) 369.
46. ML 69. For the debate on the exact relation between Kleon and the reassessment, see Meiggs & Lewis (1989) 192-7; Hornblower (1991) 124-5, 137-8. Kallet-Marx (1993) 164-70 argued that Thucydides is interested in results rather than decisions and thus did not mention the reassessment. Although her argument does not consider Thucydides' dislike of Cleon and the politicians of the 420s, as well as the possible impact of mentioning the reassessment on Thucydides' portrayal of the Periclean policy, the main point remains valid. Thucydides is interested in 'first occurrences' and overall results rather than specific politicians and policies in shaping revenue.
47. Thuc. 7.28.4.
48. References to revenue in the *HG*: 5.2.16 (Acanthians), 6.1.2-3 (Polydamas).
49. *Hier.* 9.6-10, 11.5; *Cyr.* 1.6.9-11, 8.1.9-12; *An.* 1.9.19.
50. Power of Rome: Polyb. 6.50.6; along with the Roman *Politeia* and *tychê*, see Alonso-Núñez (1990) 188. Rhodian disaffection: Polyb. 30.31.
51. Polyb. 24.7.1-7.
52. *Praef.* 61.1-62.6, *Pun.* 268-271, *BC* 1.4.27, 4.2.5, 4.12.99-100.
53. *BC* 3.2.20.
54. 47.14, 48.34. Bosworth (1988) 99.
55. *An.* 7.9.3.
56. Quintus Curtius 10.2.15ff. Bosworth (1988) 112. For the similarities and differences between Curtius and Arrian, see Bosworth (1988) 102. Different positions on the initial authorship of the concepts in the Opis speech: Ptolemy: Tarn (1948) 2.290-6; Cleitarchus: Wust (1953/4:187); Arrian: Brunt (1983) 533.
57. *Arist.* 4, 24; *Luc.* 20; *Crass.* 17; *Ages.* 35; *Alex.* 15; *Moralia* 342d, 812f, 842f, 852b.
58. An example of the importance of piety in Diodorus' characterisation of statesmen is his favourable judgement of Philip II of Macedon for the piety and reverence towards the gods he exhibited in the Third Sacred War. Diod. Sic. 16.64.2-3; Drews (1962) 391.

Bibliography

- Alganza Roldan, M. (1992), 'Epaminondas (D.S. XV 88)', *Florentia Iliberritana* 3: 39-46.
- Alonso-Núñez, J.M. (1990), 'The emergence of universal historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries BC', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser (eds), *Purposes of History* (Leuven), *Studia Hellenistica* 30: 173-92.
- Andrewes, A. (1985), 'Diodoros and Ephoros: one source of confusion', in J.W. Eadie and J. Ober (eds), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian* (Lanham), 189-98.
- Baldry, H.C. (1965), *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought* (Cambridge).
- Bosworth, A.B. (1988), *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge).
- Bosworth, A.B. (2003), 'Plus ça change ... ancient historians and their sources', *Classical Antiquity* 22: 167-97.
- Brunt, P. (1983), *Arrian* (Cambridge, MA).
- Burton, A. (1972), *Diodorus Siculus Book I: A Commentary* (Leiden).
- Cawkwell, G. (1975), 'Thucydides' judgement of Periclean strategy', in D. Kagan (ed.), *Studies in the Greek Historians*, *Yale Classical Studies* 24: 53-70.
- Cawkwell, G. (1981), 'The King's Peace', *Classical Quarterly* 31: 69-83.
- Connor, W.R. (1967), 'History without heroes: Theopompus' treatment of Philip of Macedon', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 8: 133-54.
- Drews, R. (1962), 'Diodoros and his sources', *American Journal of Philology* 83: 383-92.
- Flower, M.A. (1998), 'Simonides, Ephorus and Herodotus on the battle of Thermopylae', *Classical Quarterly* 48: 365-79.
- Gammie, J.G. (1986), 'Herodotus on kings and tyrants: objective historiography or conventional portraiture?', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45: 171-95.
- Hornblower, J. (1981), *Hieronimus of Cardia* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. (1991), *The Greek World 479-323 BC* (London).
- Jacoby, F. (1963), *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Teil 2c Kommentar zu nr. 64-105* (Leiden).
- Lefèvre, F. (2002), 'Le livre XVI de Diodore de Sicile: observations sur la composition et sur le traitement des grands personnages', *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 115(2): 518-37.
- Kallet-Marx, L. (1993), *Money, Expense and Naval Power in Thucydides' History 1-5.24* (Berkeley).
- Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D. (1989), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions: To the End of the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford).
- Mortley, R. (1996), *The Idea of Universal History from Hellenistic Philosophy to Early Christian Historiography* (Lampeter).
- Murray, G. (1946), 'Theopompus: or, the cynic as historian' in G. Murray, *Greek Studies* (Oxford): 149-70.
- Murray, O. (1968), 'Most politick historiographer', *Classical Review* 18.2: 218-21.
- Murray, O. (1972), 'Herodotus and Hellenistic culture', *Classical Quarterly* 22: 200-13.
- Oldfather, C.H. (1933), *Diodorus of Sicily*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA).
- Prestianni, A.M. (1991), 'Diodoro, Filippo II e Cesare' in E. Galvagno and C. Moze Ventura (eds), *Mito, Storia, Tradizione. Diodoro Siculo e la Storiografia Graeca* (Catania): 33-52.

- Rubincam, C.R. (1987), 'The organisation and composition of Diodoros' *Bibliothēke*', *Echoes du Monde Classique* 31: 313-28.
- Rubincam, C.R. (1998a), 'Did Diodorus Siculus take over cross-references from his sources?', *American Journal of Philology* 119: 67-81.
- Rubincam, C.R. (1998b), 'How many books did Diodorus Siculus originally intend to write?', *Classical Quarterly* 48: 229-33.
- Sacks, K. (1990), *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton).
- Sacks, K. (1994), 'Diodorus and his sources: conformity and creativity', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford): 213-32.
- Sartori, M. (1984), 'Storia, utopia e mito nei primi libri della Bibliotheca Historica di Diodoro Siculo', *Athenaeum* 62: 492-536.
- Schwartz, R. (1903), 'Diodoros von Agyrion', *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 5.1: 663-704.
- Strasburger, H. (1966), 'Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung', *Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt/Main* 5.3: 1-58.
- Strogetsky, V. (1986), 'Diodoros of Sicily and the problem of universal history', *Concilium Eirene*: 101-6.
- Stylianou, P.J. (1991), 'Review of K. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*' *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*.
- Stylianou, P.J. (1998), *Historical Commentary to Diodoros Book 15* (Oxford).
- Tarn, W.W. (1948), *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge), 2 vols.
- Volquardsen, C.A. (1868), *Untersuchungen über die Quellen der Griechischen und Sicilischen Geschichten bei Diodor, Buch XI bis XVI* (Kiel).
- Wilamowitz, U. (1908), *Greek Historical Writing and Apollo* (Oxford).
- Wirth, G., Veh, O. and Nothers, T. (1992), *Diodoros Griechische Weltgeschichte Buch I-X* (Stuttgart) *Bibliothek der Griechischen Literatur* Band 34.
- Wust, F. (1953/4), 'Die Rede Alexanders des Grossen in Opis, Arrian VII 9-10', *Historia* 2: 177-88.

Strabo and the Development of Ancient Greek Universal Historiography

Johannes Engels

We know of a number of Greek and of Roman authors who considered themselves primarily as writers of a different genre than that to which modern manuals usually attribute them. Strabo, who came from Amaseia, a city in northern Pontus, and lived from about 63 BC to the twenties AD, saw himself as an *aner philosophikos*, a member of the social and economic elite of the Augustan empire, as author of a historical work, and only secondarily as a *chorographos*, that is an author of a cultural or human geography of the Mediterranean world. Strabo's main work was entitled *Historika Hypomnemata*. This continuation of Polybius' universal history focused on big issues, 'world affairs' of the Mediterranean under Roman rule and the actions of leading men, fitting themes for a universal history (see Strabo 1.1.22-3 = *FGrH* 91 F 2). Today, however, except for twenty fragments, this work is lost. The preserved fragments treat incidents of Alexander's lifetime (F 3), Hellenistic and Jewish history of the second and first century BC (FF 4, 6, 7, 10-18), and the lives and deeds of famous Romans, such as Sulla, Pompey and Caesar (FF 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 19). The latest incidents which can be precisely dated are F 19, concerning the *omina* before the assassination of Caesar in 44 BC, and F 18, concerning the conquest of Jerusalem by Sossius and Herodes and the execution of Antigonus in 37 BC. It is probable that F 20 Ambaglio, which tells of a battle between Roman and Ethiopian troops belongs to the first decade of the principate and relates to a campaign led by C. Petronius, if indeed the fragment may safely be assigned to Strabo's *Historika Hypomnemata*. Since Strabo's main work is lost, whereas the description of the world, *Geographika*, has been handed down to us almost completely in seventeen books,¹ today Strabo is usually known as an ancient geographer.

In my view, there are good reasons to assume that the *Historika Hypomnemata* were completed at the end of the twenties BC or shortly after that date and to regard his *Geographika* as a work of the Augustan period.² During the first years of the reign of Tiberius, Strabo merely added updating notes to the first draft of *Geographika* and perhaps also to his universal history, until his death (which should be dated soon after 23 or 24 AD, the latest date mentioned in the *Geographika*).³ The small number