

**DIODORUS AND THE
PELOPONNESIAN WAR: A
DISSERTATION; PP. 1-50**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649248735

Diodorus and the Peloponnesian War: a dissertation; pp. 1-50 by Edwin L. Green

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

EDWIN L. GREEN

**DIODORUS AND THE
PELOPONNESIAN WAR: A
DISSERTATION; PP. 1-50**

1000 81.

DIODORUS
AND
THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

17378

A DISSERTATION

**PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

BY

EDWIN L. GREEN,
PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN CENTRAL UNIVERSITY, RICHMOND, KY.

BALTIMORE:
JOHN MURPHY & CO.
1899.

21-17-30-170

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	5
GENERAL STUDY OF LANGUAGE OF DIODORUS:	8-42
Word-formation, - - - - -	8
Syntax, - - - - -	12
General Observations, - - - - -	27
Prepositions, - - - - -	28
Particles, - - - - -	37
Rhythm and Figures, - - - - -	40
PELOPONNESIAN WAR:	42-51
General Examination, - - - - -	42
Sources, - - - - -	47
CONCLUSION, - - - - -	51

DIODORUS AND THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

Diodorus, known as the Sicilian, was born in Agyrium, a city of Sicily (i 4, 4), in the early part of the first century preceding our era. Under Augustus he completed an universal history in forty books, to which he gave the name Βιβλιοθήκη Ἱστορικῆ. This 'Historical Library'—for such it is—comprises the history of the world from mythical times to the year 60/59 B. C., and according to our author, it required the work of thirty years, the ransacking of Rome's great libraries, and journeys to Egypt and over much of Europe and Asia. His conception of history is excellent, and the breadth of his work is greater than that of any of his predecessors, inasmuch as it embraces also the history of Rome, L. O. Bröcker, *Mod. Quellenforsch. u. ant. Geschichtschreiber*, Innsbruck, 1882, p. 63. But the result does not justify the expectation. According to the great majority of investigators, Diodorus is nothing more than an excerptor, a sorry one at that: G. F. Unger, *Diodors Quellen i. d. Diadochengeschichte*, 1878, p. 370; F. L. Schoenle, *Diodorstudien*, Berlin, 1891, p. 1; C. Wachsmuth, *Alte Geschichte*, 95. H. Nissen is of the opinion that Diodorus shortened his sources, while he transferred their language into that of his own day, *Krit. Untersuch. ü. d. Quellen d. 4. u. 5. Dekade d. Livius*, 110–113. Investigators state that Diodorus uses only one source for the events of any period, though they are agreed that this is always a good one, and that he endeavors to secure a contemporary writer of the time, Unger, l. c.; J. Pöhlner, *Diod. als Quel. z. Gesch. v. Hellas i. d. Zeit. v. Thebens Aufschwung*, Cassel, 1885, p. 11; Wachsmuth, l. c.

Diodorus has been for many years a favorite with makers of dissertations, and his sources have in consequence been very thoroughly sifted. The pamphlet of C. A. Volquardsen, *Untersuch. ü. d. Quel. d. gr. u. sicil. Gesch. b. Diod.*, B. xi bis xvi, Kiel, 1868, has had great influence in determining the method of

investigation of others and their results. There is little dissent from the almost universal contempt for Diodorus. Voices of protest have been raised by Bröcker, l. c.; R. Neubert, *Spuren selbständiger Thätigkeit b. Diodor*, Baulzen, 1890; A. Holm, *Gesch. Siciliens*, ii 360 (though he has since changed his views, *Hist. of Greece, Eng. trans.*, ii 101); E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Sicily*, ii 162 N. 1; iii 1 N. 1. C. G. Heyne, at the close of last century, believed that the writers named from time to time were authorities for the preceding period, *De Fontibus et Auctoribus Historiarum Diodori* (in *Dindorf edit.*). He is followed in the main by G. Grote.

As far as concerns the Peloponnesian War, the opinion of Volquardsen has prevailed, that Diodorus drew his narrative from Ephorus and Timaeus: Wachsmuth, l. c., 101; G. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, ii 105-6; L. Holzapfel, *Untersuch. ü. d. Darstell. d. gr. Gesch.*, Leipzig, 1879, pp. 18, 41; W. Collmann, *De Diodori Sic. Fontibus*, Marburgi, 1869. Holm, *Hist. of Gr., Eng. tr.*, ii 508, follows Breitenbach and assigns the latter part of the narrative, xiii 45-107, to Theopompus. Freeman can see no reason why Philistus and Thucydides were not used as well as Ephorus and Timaeus. To this last historian belong the speeches of xiii 20-32, if we assent to the generally accepted view of E. Bachof, *Timaios als Quelle Diod. f. d. Red.* i. B. 13 u. 14, *Jahrb.* 129, 445-478. Some investigators, as M. Büdinger, *D. Univ. Hist. i. Alterth.*, p. 159, find here and there excerpts from Thucydides.

The many investigations of the sources of Diodorus have been based on his subject-matter. Only in a fitful way has use been made of his language. The most extensive employment of it for determining his sources is that of W. Stern, who endeavors to show that the first twenty books of Diodorus were derived from Theopompus, *Theopompos: Eine Hauptquelle d. Diod.* B. i-xx, in *Comm. z. hon. G. Studemund*, 1889, 145-162; *Diodor u. Theopomp*, Durlach, 1891. The object of this paper was primarily to examine Diodorus' language, for the purpose of finding whether it could be a means of determining his sources; and the narrative of the Peloponnesian War was selected for the investigation. As a direct linguistic comparison with Thucydides and the fragments of Philistus, Ephorus and Timaeus (C. Müller, *Frg. Hist. Gr.* I 185-333) yielded few certain results, it was deemed best to substi-

tute for it a general study of the language, though the symmetry of the paper would be marred. Inasmuch as the bulk of Diodorus is such that it was impracticable to examine its entirety, the study was confined to the second book, the first thirty-four chapters of which come from Ktesias, Wachsmuth, l. c.; Krumbholz, Rhein. Mus., xl 321-341; to the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth books, whose Greek and Sicilian history is by the majority of investigators assigned to Ephorus and Timaeus, Volquardsen, l. c., p. 118; Wachsmuth, l. c.; and to the eighteenth book, which is supposed to have its origin in Hieronymus of Kardia, Droysen, Hermes, xi 464; Wachsmuth, l. c. There seems in this selection to be a sufficient variety in the sources as far as concerns any reflection of their language in Diodorus. Books i, iii, iv and v were also read in connection with the five mentioned. Enough has been examined to give a very accurate idea of the language and style of our author. After this, indirect evidence for more sources than one has been obtained by showing that the narrative breaks into four sections. Each section was then examined for its sources.

Besides the dissertations and papers already referred to, there is scarcely a pamphlet or article relating to Diodorus that has not been surveyed; but as they rarely furnished material for the purpose of this paper they have been left unnamed. The majority of them can be found in Wachsmuth and Schoenle. Most useful in the study of the language have been the *American Journal of Philology* (*A. J. P.*), vols. i-xviii; Prof. Gildersleeve's *Justin Martyr*; W. Schmid's *Atticismus*, especially the fourth vol.; F. Krebs, *Präposit. b. Polyb.*; *Präpositionsadverbien*; *Zur Rection d. Casus i. d. sp. gr. Hist.*; Kaelker, *Quaest. d. eloc. Pol., Leip. Stud.* iv 290; J. Stich, *D. Polyb. dic. genere, Act. Sem. Erlang.*, ii 186. The independent observations on Polybius are based on his fourth book; those on Dionysius Halicarnassus, on the fifth and sixth books of his *Antiquitates Romanae*.

The Teubner text both of F. Vogel and of L. Dindorf has been the text for the investigation, but chiefly the former.

In order to keep this dissertation within moderate compass, I have given at all times only the principal results, omitting unimportant details, and I have dwelt especially on the general study of Diodorus' language. For the same reason I have also not cited many examples under each phenomenon treated.

GENERAL STUDY OF DIODORUS' LANGUAGE.

Diodorus writes in the Κοινή διάλεκτος, understanding by this a dialect that in all essentials but that of pureness of vocabulary is Attic, though in detail it diverges also from Attic syntax, cf. Hewlett, *Art. Infin. in Polybius*, Amer. Jour. Phil. xi 268. Diodorus belongs to the better class of writers of the κοινή. The writer whom he nearest approaches—and he approaches him very near—is Polybius, which will appear in the course of this paper.

A treatise *De Sermone Diodori* was prefixed by Dindorf to his edition, and this is to be found, with additions and corrections, in the edition of Vogel. What will be given below is meant as an addition to the above treatise. The *De Sermone Diodori* is cited from Vogel's *Introduction*.

INFLECTION.

The Doric genitive of proper names has not disappeared, as evidenced by Βούτα, iv 23, 2; Τριόπα, v 61, 3; Ἀμίλκα, xi 21, 4; Ἀναξίλα, ib. 66, 1 (Ἀναξίλου, ib. 76, 5); Καλλικρατίδα, xiii 99, 4.

Higher κοινή does not entirely give up the Attic declension, though it is far gone already in Polybius, W. Schmid, *Atticismus*, iv 582. A few forms are found in our author: νεός, xiii 82, 3; νεός, ib. 41, 3; νεών, ib. 90, 2; νεώς (acc. plur.), xi 25, 1, though forms of ναός are more usual; χρυσόκερων, iv 13, 1; ἔλεων, ib. 24, 4; Τενάγειω, v 61, 1.

The gen. plur. of σ -stems appears to be contracted: ὀρών, v 25, 3; ἐθνών, ib. 24, 1; βελών, xii 42, 5. γήρας has γήρων in the gen. sing. Forms of κρέας are κρεών, v 28, 4; κρέασι, ib. 34, 2; κρέα, ii 59, 1: of κέρας, κέρατος, xviii 30, 3 and κέρως, iv 22, 6; κέρατα, ib. 22, 6. Περικλῆς is declined Περικλέους, xii 38, 3;—εἰ, ib. 38, 2;—έα, ib. 27, 1. The declension of Ἡρακλῆς is similar:—έους, ii 46, 5;—εἰ, iv 21, 3;—έα, ii 46, 3 (—ῆν was not found, though on Attic inscriptions of this period, Meisterhans, *Gr. d. att. Inschr.*, 2nd ed., p. 107).

The gen. plur. of stems in $\epsilon\nu$ preceded by ϵ do not undergo