REVIEW

THE NEW *BUDÉ EDITION OF DIODORUS XXVII–XXXII*


The forty-book *Historical Library* of Diodorus Siculus was a work of great industry, remarkable for its enormous scope—a history of the world from mythical times to the career of Julius Caesar—composed with the ambitious purpose of saving those who wanted to take advantage of the lessons of history from the need to consult a plethora of more specialised works. Had those more specialised works survived, modern scholars would gladly have used them as the basis for their reconstructions of Graeco-Roman history, and Diodorus’ *Bibliotheca* might have had few modern readers. The unfortunate destruction of all but a handful of works by historians writing in Ancient Greek has given the *Bibliotheca* a kind of importance its author never expected it to have for students of that history. Today’s scholars, however, approach Diodorus’ work with a very different set of expectations from the readership he envisaged: they want to know, first and foremost, where he obtained his information and how far he reworked it, so as to be able to judge, in the absence of the more specialised sources on which he drew, how far they can trust what he says. The loss of twenty-five of the *Bibliotheca*’s original forty books (Books 6–10 and 21–40) greatly complicates this scholarly endeavour: hard enough to reconstruct the lost historical sources of Diodorus; even harder when one has first to reconstruct from collections of short excerpts and summaries the lost narrative of Diodorus himself.

This volume, the third in the mini-series of four devoted to the twenty-five fragmentary books (6–10 and 21–40) of Diodorus’ *Bibliotheca Historica*, contains the fragments of Books 27–32, which comprise the narrative of events from 206 to 145 BC. It marks a significant step towards the completion of the Budé edition of the *Bibliotheca*, which began with the publication of Book 12, edited and translated by M. Casevitz, in 1972. Since the publication of the volume under review, Paul Goukowsky’s edition of Volume 4 of the Fragments has also appeared, in 2014. That volume, containing the last eight books of the *Bibliotheca*, completes the publication of the fragmentary books. There remain, therefore,
only four volumes outstanding of the whole twenty-volume publication: those
devoted to the complete books 5, 13, 16, and 20.

The swift completion of this edition of Diodorus’ forty-volume Library of
History is devoutly to be hoped for. While several translations of this enormous
work—of which the fifteen completely surviving books (1–5 and 11–20) amount
to over 400,000 words—have been published in the past century, the Budé is
the only one that offers a new text, in addition to the translation and extensive
notes, instead of relying on that of the Vogel-Fischer Teubner edition of 1890.

The shift in Diodoran scholarship during the second half of the twentieth
century away from the view of the nineteenth-century Quellenforscher, who re-
garded Diodorus as a mere excerptor of his sources, towards a less robotic
characterisation of his method of work has considerably complicated the task
of a translator/editor/commentator in dealing even with one of the com-
pletely preserved books, because it requires that scholar to have a thorough
knowledge of the whole Bibliotheca, rather than focussing just on the particular
book for which s/he is responsible, and to explain the more complex relation-
ship now believed to obtain between Diodorus and his presumed sources. The
complications become more serious for someone working on a group of books
surviving only in fragments, since this requires familiarity also with the mostly
Byzantine sources responsible for preserving those fragments, and the com-
parison of the fragmentary text of the Bibliotheca with potential sources (e.g.,
Polybius) that are no less fragmentary. Paul Goukowsky brings to this difficult
task a lifetime’s experience in working on Hellenistic history and historiog-
raphy, and every page of this volume bears witness to the breadth and depth
of his knowledge.

The format of this volume follows the standard pattern for the Budé series,
accommodated to the presentation of six fragmentary books, rather than a
single completely preserved book. A general introduction (‘Notice’ (VII–
XLVIII)) to issues concerning this section of the Bibliotheca and a set of explana-
tory endnotes (‘Notes complémentaires’ (221–82)) frame the facing-page
Greek text and translation of Books 27–32, each of which is presented as a
separate unit, preceded by its own ‘Examen du livre’, dealing specifically with
the chronological span and contents of that book, as well as particular issues
concerning the sources of its fragments and the relationship between Diodo-
rus’ narrative and those of his presumed sources, insofar as each can be recon-
structed.

The contents both of the introductory ‘Notice’ and of the ‘Examen du li-
vre’ for each fragmentary book treat the major historical and historiographic
issues thoroughly and competently, providing clear answers to the questions
that concern anyone using these fragmentary texts to reconstruct the history
of these crucially important years. The first is, of course, one that confronts
every reader of Diodorus’ compendium of world history: where did Diodorus
get the information contained in his narrative and how far has he reshaped its
presentation? On these issues Goukowsky makes clear throughout (in the introductory ‘Notice’ and in the ‘Examen’ preceding the fragments of each book, as well as in the ‘Notes complémentaires’) his support for late-twentieth-century revisionist views of Diodorus’ sources and methods, as opposed to the views of the great nineteenth-century scholars E. Schwartz and H. Nissen: see, e.g., the scepticism indicated in the initial statement that Books 27–32 of the Bibliotheca are ‘supposed to derive almost entirely … from the Histories of Polybius’ (‘censés dériver presque entièrement … des Histoires de Polybe’) (VII; my emphasis); and later comments such as, ‘It cannot be stated often enough that the Historical Library was not a simple compilation’ (‘On ne dira jamais assez que la Bibliothèque Historique n’était pas une simple compilation’) (17); or his concluding remark that the fragments preserved from Book 32 ‘give a double picture of Diodorus, as, on the one hand, a mind illuminated by the reading of scientific works, but on the other, a theoretician of imperialism, who was bringing Polybius up to date by virtue of his own experience. He was doubtless not a great mind, but neither was he the inept compiler whose memory François Chamoux was one of the first to rehabilitate’ (‘donnent … une double image de Diodore: d’une part, un esprit éclairé par la lecture d’ouvrages scientifiques; de l’autre, un théoricien de l’impérialisme, qui réactualisait Polybe en fonction de sa propre expérience. Ce n’était sans doute pas un grand esprit, mais ce n’était pas non plus l’inepte compilateur dont François Chamoux fut l’un des premiers a réhabiliter la mémoire’) (196).

The fact that the complete text of these six books does not survive, however, necessarily generates a further series of questions: where did the collection of texts here representing each lost book of Diodorus’ work come from? How have these excerpts been preserved? And how faithfully do they represent what Diodorus wrote? These are discussed generally in section VI of the ‘Notice’ (XXXIV–XLVIII), and more specifically in the ‘Examen du livre’ introducing each book. The textual sources for Books 27–30 are limited to excerpts from the Constantinian collection, while for Books 31–32 the Constantinian Excerpts are supplemented by some material from two codices of Photius’ Bibliotheca, which have the advantage of providing some clues to the division of material between the books.

The obvious comparator for this new Budé edition is the Loeb edition (volume 11, containing the fragments of Books 21–32, with an English translation by F. R. Walton (Cambridge, Mass., 1957)). There is, first of all, a clear difference between these two in the amount of supplementary material supplied with the text and translation: if we exclude, as too difficult to factor into the comparison, the footnotes in both editions, then we have 171 pages of supplementary material (consisting of the ‘Notice’ + six ‘Examens du livre’ + ‘Notes complémentaires’) in the Budé versus a mere twenty pages (just the Introduction) in the Loeb. That calculation then needs correction for the approximately 25 percent smaller page size of the Loeb: so the proper comparison is between
the Budé’s 171 pages and fifteen similarly sized pages in the Loeb. This difference reflects the desire to make the new Budé something more like an edition with a commentary that offers a distillation of the most recent scholarship, along the same lines, in fact, as Wesseling’s famous edition of 1745.

A few examples will illustrate the comparison between the Loeb and the Budé volumes in detail, in terms of: (a) text, (b) translation, (c) organisation, (d) supplementary notes. The sample passages listed below were chosen one from each book, to represent as many as possible of the sources that supply fragments of these books:

(i) 27.5 (Budé) = 27.4 (Loeb) < Exc. de Virt. et Vit. 227
(ii) 28.16 (Budé) = 28.15 (Loeb) < Exc. de Leg. Gent. 4
(iii) 29.24 (Budé) = 29.21 (Loeb) < Exc. de Sent. 332
(iv) 30.10 (Budé) = 30.5a (Loeb) < Exc. de Insid. 25
(v) 31.20 (Budé) = 31.15.2–3 (Loeb) < Exc. de Leg. Rom. 1
(vi) 32.14 (Budé) = 32.16 (Loeb) < Photius, Bibl. 384B, p. 145 Henry

(a) The principal source for the fragments of Books 27–32 is the Excerpta Constantiniana, a huge collection of excerpts from the works of both Classical and Byzantine Greek historians made at the behest of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the eleventh century AD. It comprised originally fifty-three rubrics, of which only four now survive. Both Walton and Goukowsky use the standard edition of this work by de Boor, Büttner-Wobst, and Boissevain (Berlin, 1903–10). A second source, however, which comes into play for Books 31 and 32, the Bibliotheca of the ninth-century patriarch Photius, is represented in Walton’s Loeb volume by the edition of I. Bekker (Berlin, 1824–5), whereas Goukowsky was able to use (with minimal changes (XXXVI, n. 136)) the much more recent edition of R. Henry (Paris, 1959). In keeping with the standard format of each series, Walton has a minimal apparatus criticus, whereas Goukowsky’s is much fuller; Walton offers few emendations of his own, whereas Goukowsky has over one hundred. Many of these are minor; some seem to offer a definite improvement in the text (e.g., at 27.4.5, where Goukowsky cites a passage in Herodotus to justify his emendations and interpretation), while others are less convincing (e.g., Goukowsky’s proposed change in the syntax of the second sentence at 32.16). The fuller apparatus and the explanations given in both footnotes and endnotes for some of the emendations (e.g., n. 81 ad 27.29. l. 6) are certainly to be welcomed.

(b) Both translators generally do a good job of rendering the Greek accurately and idiomatically. Goukowsky makes good use of resources not available to Walton (e.g., A. Mauersberger, Polybios-Lexikon (Berlin, 1956), and the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae) in the interpretation of elements in Diodorus’ vocabulary: e.g., n. 48 ad 27.14a; n. 118 ad 29.31; n. 130 ad 29.130; n. 132 ad 29.35; n. 18
These philological issues are discussed sometimes in the footnotes and sometimes in the endnotes.

(c) Goukowsky produces a new arrangement and numbering system for the fragments (signalled by the ‘Table de Concordance’ (XLV–XLVII), and in the heading of each fragment). This is occasioned by the exclusion of two sets of items (‘fragments’ derived from Jerome, Syncellus, and Eustathius, which are more appropriately treated as testimonia, and anonymous fragments from the Souda) and by the decision to preserve the boundaries of the excerpts in their original setting, instead of following Walton’s practice of grouping a whole series of excerpts from the same book of the *Exc. Const.* into a single ‘chapter’. These policies are undoubtedly salutary, in making the reader more aware of the original nature of the excerpts, whereas Walton’s arrangement seems designed to give the impression that one is reading something like the original text of Diodorus.

(d) The volume and variety of supplementary material supplied by Goukowsky far exceeds that in Walton’s Loeb: according to the calculation set out above, Walton’s twenty-page Introduction (= the equivalent of about fifteen Budé pages) amounts to less than 10 percent of the size of Goukowsky’s ‘Notice’, ‘Examens du livre’, and ‘Notes complémentaires’ together. The thorough and detailed treatment of the probable sources used by Diodorus and his methods of reworking their material, as well as of the relationship of Diodorus’ narrative to others that have survived (especially Polybius, Livy, and Appian), and the importance of the information contained in the fragments of the *Bibliotheca*, is undoubtedly the most valuable aspect of this new edition.

When so much is worthy of praise in the content of this volume, it may seem churlish to complain of some formal deficiencies that make it harder for readers to use that content expeditiously. But in a work designed to be consulted, rather than read from cover to cover, it is surely important to find every means of facilitating the access of scholars with varying interests to the complex material here presented.

First of all, it is irritating that the volume under review contains no bibliography of earlier editions of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* on which the text of the fragments is based; nor is there a full bibliographic listing of R. Henry’s edition of Photius’ *Bibliotheca*, from which Goukowsky says he has reproduced, ‘with some very slight modifications’ (XXXVI, n. 136), the text and translation of some fragments and testimonia of Books 31 and 32. In addition, there is no explanation of the *sigla* used in the *apparatus criticus*, or of the editions there cited by their editors’ names. This information was evidently supplied in Volume 2 of the Fragments, but surely needed to be repeated, at least in summary form, in this volume, for the benefit of readers who may not have the earlier volume to hand. A comprehensive bibliography of all the secondary sources cited in the ‘Notice’, the ‘Examens du livre’, and the ‘Notes complémentaires’ would also have been helpful.
Second, a reader who comes to this volume without having read with diligence its predecessor (Fragments, Vol. 2, 2006) will readily perceive, from the Concordance (XLV–XLVII) and from the headings attached to the fragments, that Goukowsky’s arrangement of the fragments differs somewhat from that of Walton. Such a reader will look in vain, however, for any statement explaining Goukowsky’s new arrangement and numbering system, although in this case (unlike the failure alluded to above, to supply full bibliographic information about the textual sources of the fragments), there is at least an explicit reference back to ‘the principles of editing enunciated in the “Notice” of the previous volume’ (XXXV).

Third, the system of headings and sub-headings that articulates the introductory ‘Notice’ and the ‘Examens du livre’ is not just inadequate but positively misleading. One would expect the hierarchy of headings in each section to be indicated by a consistent use of a distinctive typeface for each level of logical subordination. This is by no means the case. Two examples will suffice: (i) the final section of the ‘Notice’, headed, in boldface, ‘VI. Le texte’, is immediately followed by a sub-heading in italics ‘a) Classement des Fragments’ (XXXIV); no continuation of this series of italic sub-headings occurs, but an unnumbered bold heading, ‘Sources subsidiaires’, is found a few pages later (XXXIX); (ii) the ‘Examen’ of Book 27 has only one sub-heading, immediately under the main heading (3), viz., ‘Sujet et étendue du livre’, which does not do justice to the following discussion; subsequent major divisions are indicated (14–15) by extra vertical space occupied by an asterisk, but with no additional heading in either case.

Finally, as has been noticed by a reviewer of the previous volume (N. Wiater, reviewing Volume 2 of the Fragments, Gnomon 81 (2009) 300–6, at 301), the division of the supplementary information between introduction, footnotes, and endnotes makes the reader’s task, regrettably, more complicated. This three-way division was presumably imposed by the standard format of the Budé series; so the author deserves no criticism for it. There is, however, another element in the arrangement of the notes that might cause further confusion: a single series of superscript numbers inserted into the translation directs the reader to both footnotes and endnotes (‘Notes complémentaires’), but the reader is left to figure this out for him/herself. Thus in trying to track down the information relating to a particular superscript number, one must look first to the bottom of the page, and then, if no equivalent footnote number appears there, turn to the appropriate page of the endnotes to find it. From my brief survey of other volumes in the Budé series, it appears that this has not always been the practice: the Budé edition of Strabo Book 11 (F. Lasserre, ed., trans., 1975) uses a single series of superscript numbers in the translation, but those referring to endnotes contain cross-references (e.g., p. 90 of the translation has five superscript note numbers, of which ##3, 4, 5 refer to footnotes, whereas ##1 and 2 contain redirections to the endnotes). This at least saves the reader
from wasting time in wondering why there are strange gaps in the series of footnote numbers.

None of these observations should diminish the admiration due to M. Goukowsky for the industry and erudition with which he has elucidated these sadly fragmentary books of Diodorus’ *Bibliotheca Historica*. He deserves particular gratitude for having now edited a total of five volumes of the Budé Diodorus (volumes 2, 3, and 4 of the Fragments and volumes 12 (= Book 17) and 13 (= Book 18) in the series of complete books)—thus contributing to this important publication more volumes than any other single editor.
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