

# POLITICAL CONFLICT IN DIODORUS SICULUS: THE ΧΑΡΙΕΣΤΑΤΟΙ AND THE HISTORIAN'S MORAL AGENDA\*

---

*Abstract:* This article investigates the historiographic identity of Diodorus through the analysis of select narratives of political conflict. These feature in sections of the *Library* based on different sources and are structured around the contrast between a group of political actors labelled as the *χαριέστατοι* and another to which they are opposed. I show that, whatever the respective position of the factions on the socio-political spectrum, the main role of the *χαριέστατοι* is to act as the mouthpieces of Diodorus' moralising. I also argue that Diodorus' use of this pattern was the result of his engagement with an Aristotelian variant of traditional aristocratic thought, which he adapted to the political scenarios recounted by his sources in order to suit his moral agenda.

---

*Keywords:* Diodorus Siculus; Timaeus; Aristotle; Syracuse; moralism; politics

In introducing the events of 454 BC, Diodorus Siculus narrates how a *stasis* broke out in Syracuse when a man named Tyndarides attempted to set himself up as a tyrant. Characterised as arrogant and bold (*θράσους καὶ τόλμης γέμων ἄνθρωπος*), Tyndarides rallied many of the poor (*πολλοὺς τῶν πενήτων*) and turned them into his personal bodyguard. When his intentions were discovered, he was tried and sentenced to death. His supporters went to his rescue, but the most respectable citizens (*οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν*) captured them and put them to death together with Tyndarides. To thwart further tyrannical attempts, the Syracusans enacted a law similar to Athenian ostracism, called *petalism*. Each voter would write the name of the most powerful citizen (*τὸν δυνατώτατον τῶν πολιτῶν*) on an olive leaf and whoever received the most votes would be exiled for five years. However, since the most important men (*τῶν μεγίστων ἀνδρῶν*) were being exiled as a result of the new law, the most respectable citizens (*οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν*) preferred to withdraw from public life. This situation opened the way for the rise of

\* The idea for this article arose from a paper I delivered at the Scuola Superiore Meridionale in Naples. I am grateful to the audience for their feedback on that occasion. I also would like to thank Mirko Canevaro and Christopher de Lisle for their thoughtful comments on previous drafts, as well as the anonymous peer reviewers for helping me improve the final version. Any remaining mistakes are of course my own.

demagogues and sycophants and caused further civil conflicts, until the Syracusans finally decided to repeal petalism (D.S. 11.86.3–87).<sup>1</sup>

Diodorus describes these events as a struggle between two socio-economic groups:<sup>2</sup> the poor, who had supported Tyndarides, and those whom Diodorus labels οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν. This expression is often translated as ‘the most respectable citizens’ or ‘the most distinguished citizens’,<sup>3</sup> and scholars usually take it to refer to the elite of a given community.<sup>4</sup> This is the case in our passage, where the χαριέστατοι are socially coextensive with those most important citizens (τῶν μεγίστων ἀνδρῶν) who had fallen victim to petalism. But the conflict between the χαριέστατοι and their opponents is above all moral.<sup>5</sup> The χαριέστατοι are characterised by their individual excellence (τῆς ἰδίας ἀρετῆς). After withdrawing from politics, they focused on the management of their private estates and their lives degenerated into luxury (εἰς τρυφήν ἀπέκλινον). The moral degeneration and political inactivity of the most respectable citizens brought with it a moral and political decay in Syracusan civic life.<sup>6</sup> This came to be dominated by the basest and boldest citizens (11.87.4: οἱ δὲ πονηρότατοι τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τόλμη διαφέροντες). The rise of demagogues led many to abandon their ancient and excellent lifestyle (τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ σπουδαίας ἀγωγῆς) in favour of bad endeavours (τὰ φαῦλα τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων), and the increase in wealth due to the peace was accompanied by a lack of concern for concord and justice (τῆς δ’ ὁμοιᾶς καὶ τοῦ δικαιοπραγεῖν) (87.5).

The account of the institution and repeal of petalism, which was probably based on Timaeus of Tauromenium,<sup>7</sup> is a good example of a recurring scheme

<sup>1</sup> On petalism, see Giangiulio (1998) 113–15; Forsdyke (2005) 285–7; Robinson (2011) 70–1; Cordano in Schirripa–Lentini–Cordano (2012) 146–9; Węcowski (2022) 32–5.

<sup>2</sup> See Berger (1992) 38–9.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Oldfather (1946) 349; Haillet (2001) 111. Green (2006) 167 translates οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν as ‘the most responsible citizens’, but at n. 355 identifies them as ‘landowners and merchants, successors of the *Gamoroi*’.

<sup>4</sup> See Casevitz (1972) 26 n. 1; Green (2006) 167 n. 355, 176 n. 380.

<sup>5</sup> See recently Węcowski (2022) 33. It is quite common for Greek terms denoting class such as *χαρίεις* to also have a moral meaning, to the extent that it is not always easy to distinguish the two domains. A notable example is *εὐγένεια*, which could denote both nobility of birth and moral nobility: see Barbato (2020) 91–3 with references.

<sup>6</sup> See Hau (2016) 117–20, who has shown that the potential of luxury for causing a community’s moral, political, and military degeneration is a recurrent theme across the *Library*: cf., e.g., D.S. 5.40.3–5; 11.46.3–4; 17.77.4–7.

<sup>7</sup> See Volquardsen (1868) 80–107; Laqueur (1936) 1092–3. According to Meister (1967) 46–50, the whole section from the *stasis* of Tyndarides to the abrogation of petalism (D.S. 86.4–87) was based on Timaeus, except for the comparison of the procedures of petalism and ostracism (87.2), which would have been drawn from Ephorus of Cyme.

in Diodorus' narratives of political conflict which I shall label 'χαριέστατοι pattern'. In many instances, Diodorus frames political confrontation (whether violent or peaceful) around the contrast between a group of political actors defined as the χαριέστατοι and another group to which they are opposed. While the χαριέστατοι can be identified—most of the time—with the elite (or a subset of it) in a given community, the social identity of their opponents often varies or is not spelled out clearly. In fact, Diodorus is concerned not so much with the exact political contours of the conflicts he describes as much as with the moral lessons these can teach. The χαριέστατοι, as we shall see, embody the virtues that Diodorus wants to foster, whereas their opponents exemplify the vices against which he warns his readers.

The χαριέστατοι pattern has not received much scholarly attention, yet it can provide precious insights into the debated issue of Diodorus' relationship with his sources.<sup>8</sup> A long-established tradition of studies envisions Diodorus as an incompetent historian who mindlessly followed his sources and reproduced them verbatim. This view led many scholars to dissect the text of Diodorus to reconstruct that of his lost sources.<sup>9</sup> As a result, scholars tend to agree on the main sources of various sections of the *Library*, such as Ephorus of Cyme for the Greek mainland in Books 11 or 12 to 15 or Timaeus of Tauromenium for the Sicilian narratives of Books 12–14 and 19–21.<sup>10</sup> Yet, while some still hold a view of Diodorus as a copyist,<sup>11</sup> many now question the underlying assumptions of *Quellenforschung*. In a ground-breaking study, Jonas Palm showed that, although Diodorus drew ideas and narratives from his sources, his language and style were typical of Hellenistic prose and consistent throughout the *Library*, which indicates that Diodorus did not copy his sources to the letter.<sup>12</sup> Palm paved the way for a series of studies which increasingly appreciated Diodorus' authorial voice. Kenneth Sacks most notably argued that Diodorus composed the proems and other non-narrative parts of the *Library*, and showed that recurring themes in his work such as the power of fortune or his interpretation of *parrhēsia* reflected contemporary ideas rather than those of his

<sup>8</sup> For an overview of Diodorean scholarship, see Chamoux in Bertrac–Chamoux–Vernière (1993) xxii–xxxii; Green (2006) 23–34; Muntz (2017) 14–21; Hau–Meeus–Sheridan (2018b).

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Volquardsen (1868); Laqueur (1936); Brown (1952); Meister (1967).

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Hau (2009) 174–5; (2016) 74; Rubincam (2018) 34. Scholars in the *Quellenforschung* tradition, however, have debated whether Diodorus used only one source for each section of his work (e.g., Nissen (1863); Volquardsen (1868)) or used multiple sources at a time (e.g., Laqueur (1936); Meister (1967)). See also Dudziński (2016), who has recently argued that Diodorus used Timaeus especially for non-narrative materials and numbers but not as much for narrative materials.

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., Stylianou (1998) esp. 132–40; Sordi (2005).

<sup>12</sup> Palm (1955).

sources.<sup>13</sup> Other scholars have investigated Diodorus' working method by focusing not so much on his sources as on the criteria he employed in handling them. Catherine Rubincam, for example, analysed cross-references in Diodorus and concluded that, while some were copied from his sources, many others originated directly in the *Library*.<sup>14</sup> Wiater has argued that Diodorus took pride in the compilatory nature of his work and its advantages for his readers,<sup>15</sup> and Rathmann has pointed to Diodorus' local patriotism as key in orientating his choices of sources and historical materials.<sup>16</sup>

Within such a polarised debate, some scholars have tried to achieve a balanced synthesis between traditional and revisionist approaches.<sup>17</sup> Among the most successful is Lisa Hau, who has investigated the originality of Diodorus with regards to his moral agenda.<sup>18</sup> The moralist character of the *Library* is well known.<sup>19</sup> When stressing the didactic power of universal history in his general proem, Diodorus himself stresses how historiography provides men with examples for correcting their mistakes, dissuades the wicked from committing evil, and equips the characters of men to achieve virtue (D.S. 1.1.4–2.2; cf. also 15.1.1). Hau has gone further than any scholar in analysing the implications of Diodorus' programmatic statements and categorised the historian's moralising and its distribution throughout his work. She stresses how Diodorus conveys a consistent moral lesson centred around the idea that divine justice rewards the pious and kind and punishes the impious, arrogant, and greedy. At the same time, she notes that moralising techniques are deployed unevenly across the *Library* and concludes that Diodorus took most of his moralising from his sources but readapted any contradictory passages in his sources to make them fit into his moral agenda.<sup>20</sup>

This article aims to qualify Hau's views and show that Diodorus' framing of political conflict according to the *χαριέστατοι* pattern reveals aspects of relative autonomy in the historian's moralising.<sup>21</sup> I shall first analyse the occurrences of the pattern, which feature in sections of Diodorus' work that are believed to be based on different sources. In most instances, the

<sup>13</sup> Sacks (1990); (2018); see also Spoerri (1959); Pavan (1961) and (1987); Clarke (1999); Sulimani (2011); Holton (2018).

<sup>14</sup> Rubincam (1987), (1989), (1998), and (2018).

<sup>15</sup> Wiater (2006).

<sup>16</sup> Rathmann (2016) esp. 156–270.

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., Parmeggiani (2011) 349–94.

<sup>18</sup> Hau (2009); (2016) 73–123; see also Hau (2018).

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., Sacks (1990) 24–36; Ambaglio (1995) 109–18; Angius (2020) esp. 20–1.

<sup>20</sup> Hau (2016) esp. 120–2.

<sup>21</sup> See also Bearzot (2018), who shows that Diodorus' language of political cooperation and opposition does not derive from his sources.

χαριέστατοι are set in opposition to demagogues or aspiring tyrants and their followers among the masses. In other occurrences, they are aligned with the people against tyrants and oligarchs, whereas in a minority of instances they act as intermediaries between opposing factions. I will show that, whatever their position on the socio-political spectrum, the main role of the χαριέστατοι is to act as the mouthpieces of Diodorus' moralising. I shall then analyse the distribution of the pattern across the *Library* and its possible models in order to trace its origins and assess to what extent Diodorus may have drawn it directly from his sources. I will argue that Diodorus' political as well as moral use of the χαριέστατοι was the result of his engagement with a philosophical (and specifically Aristotelian) variant of classical aristocratic thought, which the historian adapted to diverse political scenarios recounted by his sources in order to suit his moral agenda.

### **The Χαριέστατοι Pattern in Diodorus: Between Moral and Political Conflict**

The χαριέστατοι pattern occurs eleven times in Diodorus in the context of political conflict.<sup>22</sup> Most instances are within anti-popular and anti-tyrannical narratives. One such case is the account of the institution of petalism in Syracuse discussed above, where the χαριέστατοι are opposed to aspiring tyrants, demagogues, and their popular following. Another example appears later in Book 11. Diodorus recounts how the Syracusans were called to decide upon the fate of Ducetius, the defeated leader of the Sicels, who had come to Syracuse as a suppliant. Some of those accustomed to make populist speeches (τῶν δημηγορεῖν εἰωθότων) advised the people to punish Ducetius as their enemy and exact revenge for his wrongs. The most respectable elderly citizens (οἱ δὲ χαριέστατοι τῶν πρεσβυτέρων) instead recommended to spare the suppliant out of respect for fortune and divine retribution (τὴν τύχην καὶ τὴν νέμεσιν τῶν θεῶν) (D.S. 11.92.1–3). Like the section on petalism, this passage was probably based on Timaeus and saw the χαριέστατοι opposed to the demagogues.<sup>23</sup> But this time the proposal of the χαριέστατοι was approved by the people 'as with one voice' (11.92.4: ὥσπερ τινὶ μιᾷ φωνῇ)—an expression suggesting concord within the community. More importantly, the passage shares the moralistic character of the petalism narrative. As noted by Hau, a prominent lesson in Diodorus is that divine justice has a large influence over

<sup>22</sup> The χαριέστατοι also feature in passages which do not deal with political conflict: cf., e.g., D.S. 12.33.3; 29.32; 40.3.3–4.

<sup>23</sup> Laqueur (1936) 1094; Meister (1967) 51–2.

human affairs.<sup>24</sup> This was the main argument deployed by the *χαριέστατοι*, who stressed the value of preserving reverence towards the gods (*τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν*) by sparing the suppliant.<sup>25</sup>

Another parallel occurs in Book 13. The passage, also plausibly deriving from Timaeus,<sup>26</sup> recounts how Dionysius I established a tyranny in Syracuse. Dionysius took advantage of the Syracusans' fear of the Carthaginians to accuse the generals of treason and rouse the anger of the people (13.91.3–92.1). He thus managed to get himself elected on the board of the generals but kept spreading false accusations against his colleagues in the hope that he could remove them and keep the generalship to himself. The most respectable citizens (*οἱ μὲν χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν*) became suspicious and spoke badly of Dionysius at every assembly, but the popular mob (*ὁ δὲ δημοτικὸς ὄχλος*) persisted in their support for the aspiring tyrant (13.92.3). Listening to his continuous accusations against his fellow generals, 'the masses, as they are accustomed, came to the worst decision' (*τῶν πολλῶν, ὥσπερ εἰώθασιν, ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ῥεπόντων*); they appointed Dionysius as general with supreme power, only to quickly realise that they had appointed a tyrant (13.94–95.1–3).

The passage, which has a strongly anti-democratic tone, features the *χαριέστατοι* opposed to a demagogic leader and aspiring tyrant. The *χαριέστατοι* are probably members of the Syracusan elite,<sup>27</sup> but they constitute a morally superior subset of it. Their active opposition to Dionysius sets them apart not only from the masses but also from the generals, who did not dare speak against Dionysius' proposals out of fear of his influence over the people (13.92.6). Rather than denoting a clear socio-political group, the *χαριέστατοι* perform a mainly moral function within Diodorus' narrative. Their foresight and courage in opposing Dionysius contrasts with the cluelessness (13.92.3: *ἀγνοῶν τὴν ἐπιβουλήν*) and panic of the masses.<sup>28</sup> The latter's fear of the

<sup>24</sup> Hau (2016) 88–94. The *χαριέστατοι* are associated with piety and the prevention of divine vengeance also at D.S. 14.77.4–5, though not in the context of political conflict.

<sup>25</sup> The changeability of fortune (and the importance of acting kindly while victorious) is another important theme of Diodorean moralising: see Hau (2016) 97–102. The contrast between the approach of the demagogues, who focus on punishing Ducetius for his wrongs, and that of the *χαριέστατοι*, who urge the people to do what is most appropriate for Syracuse, is also reminiscent of the Mytilenean Debate at Thuc. 3.37–48: see Holton (2018); on the Mytilenean Debate, see Harris (2013).

<sup>26</sup> Laqueur (1936) 1120; Meister (1967) 82–3; Ambaglio (2008) viii–x and 156–7; also Rathmann (2016) 182–3, who stresses how Diodorus may have deliberately chosen a source (possibly Timaeus) unsympathetic to Dionysius because, as a Siceliote, he disliked the tyrant's aggressive policy towards Sicilian cities. Sanders (1981) unconvincingly identifies Diodorus' source with Philistus of Syracuse.

<sup>27</sup> Sanders (1981) 400–1.

<sup>28</sup> See Hau (2016) 102–6 on courage in Diodorus' moral agenda.

Carthaginians is stressed several times within the passage (13.91.3: *μεγάλων φόβων ἐπικρεμαμένων*; 13.92.4: *τοὺς Συρακοσίου καταπεπληγμένους τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων φόβον*); it is this very fear that leads them to fall for Dionysius' demagoguery, and the negative consequences of their choices are highlighted in their belated repentance.

Diodorus deploys the *χαριέστατοι* pattern to construct an equally anti-popular, yet more nuanced narrative when he recounts the establishment of Agathocles' tyranny in Syracuse, in a passage from Book 19 usually attributed to Timaeus.<sup>29</sup> Prior to Agathocles' rise to power, Syracuse had been led by the oligarchy of the Six Hundred (19.3.5, 4.3). When the Syracusans restored the democracy, the oligarchs were expelled, only to be later allowed back into the community (19.4.3–5.4). Several factions developed in the restored democracy, among which the most hostile to Agathocles was that of the former oligarchs.<sup>30</sup> Agathocles took advantage of his generalship to enrol in the army the inhabitants of the inland region, who had previously fought under him and hated both the Six Hundred and the *dēmos* (*πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐν Συρακούσσαις ὀλιγαρχίας κεκοινωνηκότας ἑξακοσίους ἀεὶ πολεμικῶς εἶχον καὶ καθόλου τὸν δῆμον ἐμίσουν*). He was also joined by those citizens who were hostile to the powerful due to poverty and envy (*τοὺς διὰ πενίαν καὶ φθόνον ἐναντιούμενους ταῖς τῶν ἰσχυρόντων ἐπιφανείαις*). Agathocles arrested the leaders of the Six Hundred on false accusations and stirred his followers to kill them and their supporters and plunder their properties. The most respectable citizens (*οἱ μὲν γὰρ χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν*), unaware of the situation, rushed into the streets unarmed to find out the cause of the tumult and were slaughtered by the soldiers (19.6).<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> See Meister (1967) 139–40; Pearson (1987) 225–55, esp. 234–6. Consolo Langher (2000) 31 n. 6, 34, 48 n. 9, and 52 argues that, while at 19.4 Diodorus is sympathetic to Agathocles and may have derived his information from Callias of Syracuse through the mediation of Duris of Samos, the chapters hostile to Agathocles (esp. 19.6–8) were based on an Acragantine tradition, again through the mediation of Duris. Rathmann (2016) 178–87 reviews scholarly hypotheses on Diodorus' sources on Agathocles (Timaeus, Duris, but also Antandros and Callias of Syracuse) and concludes that Diodorus selected materials from these sources to construct a picture of Agathocles motivated by local patriotism; see also de Lisle (2021) 52–62.

<sup>30</sup> Scholars are divided concerning the status of the Six Hundred: Berger (1992) 49 views them as the local aristocracy; Consolo Langher (2000) 36, 45, and 47, believes that they constituted a Council created by Timoleon and still in force up until Agathocles' coup; de Lisle (2021) 185 with n. 12 stresses how they used to be Syracuse's *synedrion* and constituted themselves into a *hetaireia* shortly before Agathocles' coup.

<sup>31</sup> On Agathocles' rise to power and its historical and socio-political background, see Berger (1992) 49–50; Consolo Langher (2000) 29–52; de Lisle (2021) 12–16 and 183–8.

The *χαριέστατοι* have sometimes been identified with the Six Hundred and their supporters.<sup>32</sup> These were Agathocles' main target and surpassed other Syracusans in reputation and wealth (19.5.6: οἱ προέχοντες γὰρ τῶν Συρακοσίων ταῖς δόξαις καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις). This identification, however, is problematic. Diodorus states that the multitude (τοῦ πλήθους) did not distinguish friend from foe and targeted anyone from whom they could get a profit (19.7.1). The historian counts more than 4,000 dead and over 6,000 exiles (19.8.1–2), a number which plausibly exceeded that of the supporters of the oligarchs. Diodorus (19.8.1) also describes the victims as unsuspecting and innocent people, whose only fault was being more respectable than the others (τοῦτο μόνον ἐγκληθέντες ὅτι χαριέστεροι τῶν ἄλλων ἦσαν). This characterisation is incompatible with that of the Six Hundred, whose former leaders, Heracleides and Sostratus, were guilty of plots, murders, and acts of impiety (19.3.3). This inconsistency might be explained by postulating that Diodorus had switched to a different source,<sup>33</sup> but this is not necessary. Diodorus had noted how Agathocles' soldiers hated not only the Six Hundred but also the *dēmos*. Since the historian states that the *χαριέστατοι* 'were unaware of the destruction which had been decided against them' (19.6.6: ἀγνοοῦντες τὸν καθ' αὐτῶν κεκυρωμένον ὄλεθρον) and stresses the greed of Agathocles' followers, we can surmise that the *χαριέστατοι* were wealthy members of the *dēmos* and that they were among the intended targets of the mob alongside the Six Hundred.<sup>34</sup>

If the political leanings of the *χαριέστατοι* are not clearly spelled out, their moral function is clear. Their slaughter highlights the immorality of Agathocles and his followers. Diodorus, as he often does,<sup>35</sup> delves at length on the cruelty of his villains. He states that the city was filled with outrage, murders, and every kind of unlawful act (ὑβρεως καὶ φόνων καὶ παντοίων ἀνομημάτων); he stresses the exceptionality of such crimes, committed by Greeks against Greeks, kinsmen against relatives, with no respect for mankind, treaties, or gods (οὐ φύσιν, οὐ σπονδάς, οὐ θεοὺς ἐντρεπόμενοι); he alludes to the outrage and crimes committed against women (οὐδὲ τῆς εἰς γυναῖκας ὑβρεως καὶ παρανομίας ἀπέσχοντο) (19.7–8). This resonates with the proem of Book 19, where Diodorus singles Agathocles out as the paradigmatic demagogic tyrant and stresses his cruelty (μυαιφονίας ... ὀμότητα) and the *hybris* and slaughter (ὑβρεως δὲ καὶ σφαγῆς) he committed all over Sicily (19.1).

<sup>32</sup> See Consolo Langher (2000) 48.

<sup>33</sup> See n. 29 above.

<sup>34</sup> See de Lisle (2021) 185–8, who identifies three factions at the time of Agathocles' rise to power: the Six Hundred, Agathocles' faction, and the 'moderate' democrats.

<sup>35</sup> See Hau (2016) 112–15, who stresses Diodorus' taste for detailed scenes of cruelty as a means to moralise on human vices.



Similarly complex is an occurrence of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern in Book 16. This is the account of how the Corinthian Timoleon became general in Syracuse (D.S. 16.65), which is believed to be based to some extent on Timaeus.<sup>36</sup> Timoleon's brother, Timophanes, was foremost among the Corinthians for wealth and boldness (*προέχων τῶν Κορινθίων πλούτῳ τε καὶ τόλμῃ*). Timophanes obtained a following amongst the poor (*τοὺς ἀπόρους*) and the basest (*τοὺς πονηροτάτους*), which he wanted to use for establishing a tyranny.<sup>37</sup> Timoleon failed to dissuade his brother from his tyrannical plans and killed him in the marketplace. When the Council of the Elders met to discuss what had happened, Timoleon's enemies accused him, while those who were more respectable (*οἱ δὲ χαριέστεροι*) wanted his release. Since the Syracusans had asked the Corinthians to send someone to serve as general against aspiring tyrants, the *gerousia* voted to send Timoleon. If he ruled fairly, he would be celebrated as a tyrannicide; if not, he would be condemned as a fratricide. Timoleon accepted and administered Syracuse wisely.

The anti-tyrannical and anti-popular tone of the passage is reminiscent of the petalism narrative. The characterisation of Timophanes as excelling in boldness (*προέχων τῶν Κορινθίων ... τόλμῃ*) resembles that of the demagogues who dominated Syracusan politics as an effect of petalism (cf. 11.87.4: *τόλμῃ διαφέροντες*). It is also close to the personality of Tyndarides, an equally arrogant and bold man (cf. 11.86.4: *θράσους καὶ τόλμης γέμων ἄνθρωπος*) who had attempted to become a tyrant with the support of the poor.<sup>38</sup> Diodorus' mention of the uproar (16.65.5: *θορύβου δὲ γενομένου*) caused by the murder of Timophanes may also be indicative of an anti-democratic perspective.<sup>39</sup> The *χαριέστεροι* were therefore plausibly members of the elite who opposed both one-man rule and the popular mob. A few paragraphs later, however,

<sup>36</sup> Diodorus' sources for Timoleon in Book 16 are debated (see Smarczyk (2003) 21 n. 12; Rathmann (2016) 183–6), but Timaeus is usually believed to have had some influence. Direct use of Timaeus: Sordi (1977). Use of Timaeus through an intermediate source: Meister (1967) 119–29. Timaeus used to complement another, main source: Talbert (1974) 22–43; Pearson (1987) 210–25. Brown (1958) 86, in discussing the murder of Timophanes, argues that Diodorus' source in this specific instance may have been Athanis of Syracuse.

<sup>37</sup> But cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1306a22–4, who states that the Corinthian oligarchs, out of distrust of the people (*διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἀπιστίαν*), hired mercenaries and put them under the command of Timophanes, who used them to set up a tyranny. According to Plut. *Tim.* 4.2, on the other hand, the Corinthians had hired the mercenaries out of distrust of their allies.

<sup>38</sup> See Salmon (1984) 385, who notes how the demagogic characterisation of Timophanes is unique to Diodorus.

<sup>39</sup> The *thorybos* normally denoted the clamour of the audience in the Assembly or lawcourts; while an important and even structural aspect of democratic deliberation, it could be used with a negative connotation in authors unsympathetic to democracy: cf., e.g., Pl. *Resp.* 6, 492b–c; *Leg.* 9, 876b; Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.13; see Thomas (2016); Canevaro (2018) 132–3.

Diodorus credits Timoleon with re-establishing democratic laws (*τιθεὶς δημοκρατικούς νόμους*) in Syracuse and paying great attention to equality (*πλείστην φροντίδα τῆς ἰσότητος ποιούμενος*) (16.70.5).<sup>40</sup> This suggests that Timoleon and the *χαριέστεροι*, while members of an oligarchic council and hostile to Timophanes' demagogic strategies for gaining personal power, may have been open to moderate forms of democracy.<sup>41</sup> Whatever the socio-political identity of the *χαριέστεροι*, however, it is the moral element that is paramount in Diodorus' narrative. Timoleon is characterised as excelling in bravery and intelligence as a general and endowed with every virtue (16.65.2: *πρωτεύοντα τῶν πολιτῶν ἀνδρεία τε καὶ συνέσει στρατηγικῇ καὶ καθόλου πάσαις ταῖς ἀρεταῖς κεκοσμημένον*). Diodorus (16.65.9) concludes that he administered Syracuse nobly and advantageously (*καλῶς καὶ συμφερόντως*) not out of fear of punishment but due to his virtue (*διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν*). As Timoleon's supporters, the *χαριέστεροι* are associated with his virtues and highlight Timophanes' negative moral characterisation.

Two more passages may deploy the *χαριέστατοι* within an anti-popular narrative but are not explicit about the socio-political contours of the conflicts. In a fragment from Book 27, whose source may have been Polybius,<sup>42</sup> Diodorus describes the atrocities committed by the Spartan king Nabis. He put to death the most respectable Lacedaemonians (*τοὺς χαριεστάτους τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων*) and hired mercenaries to back his rule (27.1). The *χαριέστατοι* are plausibly members of the elite and victims of the tyrant's cruelty. They are juxtaposed with Nabis' mercenaries, whose characterisation as 'the basest' (*τοὺς χειρίστους*) is more moral than socio-political. We know from other sources that Nabis extended his powerbase by naturalising slaves and redistributing lands (Pol. 13.6.3; 16.13.1–2; Liv. 34.31.11–15).<sup>43</sup> These policies may well have been covered in the lost part of Diodorus' narrative but do not feature in the surviving fragment, which focuses on Nabis' impiety and the

<sup>40</sup> See Berger (1992) 48–9; Robinson (2011) 91–2 stresses how Timoleon's revision of the laws of Dion (D.S. 82.6) is suggestive of an attempt to make Syracusan democracy more moderate.

<sup>41</sup> This seems to be the case at least in Plutarch's version, where Corinth is even depicted as democratically ruled (Plut. *Tim.* 5.1–2) and Timoleon has a degree of popular following (3.1). As noted by Salmon (1984) 385–6 with n. 79, Plutarch's characterisation of Corinth as a democracy is inaccurate and contrasts with D.S. 16.65.6–9, where it is the *gerousia*, a typically oligarchic institution, which debates the case of Timoleon. The possibility that a democracy may have been established in Corinth at some point after the death of Timophanes is entertained by De Luna in De Luna–Zizza–Curnis (2016) 376.

<sup>42</sup> On the sources of Book 27, see Hau (2009) 176; Goukowsky (2012) 3–14. Stronk (2017) 66–7 expresses reasonable doubts on the exclusive derivation from Polybius of Book 27 and specifically of our passage.

<sup>43</sup> See Stewart (2018) 396–7.

crimes of his mercenaries (D.S. 27.1). In Book 14, presumably based on Ephorus,<sup>44</sup> Diodorus recounts Ariston's coup in Cyrene in the late fifth century. The historian states that the 500 most powerful Cyrenaeans (πεντακόσιοι οἱ δυνατώτατοι τῶν Κυρηναίων) were killed and the most respectable of the others (τῶν δ' ἄλλων ... οἱ χαριέστατοι) went into exile (D.S. 14.34.3–5). The χαριέστατοι are probably members of the elite who survived the purge. Diodorus does not spell out the socio-political identity of their opponents, but these were likely democrats.<sup>45</sup> The passage features no explicit moralising, but, if the cases analysed so far are any indication, the very reference to the χαριέστατοι may serve implicitly to stress the wickedness of their opponents.

So far, we have seen how the χαριέστατοι pattern could be framed so as to construct anti-popular, moralistic narratives which contrast the most respectable citizens with demagogues or aspiring tyrants supported by the masses. The pattern, however, could also be used to portray political conflict in a manner sympathetic towards the people. This is the case of a passage from Book 14 dealing with the crimes of the Thirty Tyrants in Athens, whose source is usually identified with Ephorus.<sup>46</sup> Diodorus first narrates the execution of Theramenes. The people had elected him as one of the Thirty because they noticed his fairness (τὴν Θηραμένουσ ἐπιείκειαν) and believed that his nobility (τῇ τούτου καλοκάγαθία) would hinder the greed (τὴν πλεονεξίαν) of the other leaders. Because he was opposing their plans, however, the Thirty executed Theramenes after dragging him away from the altar of Hestia (14.4–5). The Thirty then started to bring false accusations against the wealthy, put them to death and misappropriate their estates. They thus killed Niceratus, a man fair and humane (ἐπιεικῆ καὶ φιλόανθρωπον) towards everyone, and Autolycus, a man notable for his freedom of speech (παρρησιαστήν), and in general chose the most respectable people as their victims (καθόλου τοὺς χαριεστάτους ἐπέλεγον) (14.5.5–7).

In this passage, the χαριέστατοι are wealthy, as they are targeted by the greed of the Thirty, but they are on the same side as the *dēmos* in the struggle against the oligarchs. This is especially evidenced by the depiction of

<sup>44</sup> See Bonnet and Bennet (1997) viii–x; Parker's biographical essay in *BNTJ* 70. But see the excellent discussion of Parmeggiani (2011) 349–94, who challenges the view that Ephorus was Diodorus' only source for non-Sicilian Greek history in Books 11–15 and argues for some level of re-elaboration of Ephorean materials on the part of Diodorus.

<sup>45</sup> See Robinson (2011) 130–1. The identification of the opponents of the χαριέστατοι as democrats is especially likely if one believes this *stasis* to be the one mentioned at Arist. *Pol.* 6, 1319b17–19 as an example of a civil conflict caused by the excesses of the worst kind of democracy: see De Luna in De Luna–Zizza–Curnis (2016) 592–4.

<sup>46</sup> See n. 44 above.

Theramenes as friendly to the people,<sup>47</sup> by the grief of the mass at the news of his death (14.5.1: τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν πλῆθος ἠλέει δυστυχοῦντα τὸν Θηραμένην), and by the association of Autolycus with the democratic virtue of *parrhēsia*.<sup>48</sup> Yet, the main function of the *χαριέστατοι* is moral. Theramenes, Niceratus, and Autolycus embody some of the cardinal virtues within Diodorus' work, such as *epieikeia*, *philanthrōpia*, and *parrhēsia*,<sup>49</sup> the account of the death of Theramenes, who 'bore his bad fortune with a noble spirit' (ἔφερε γενναίως τὴν ἀτυχίαν) (14.5.1), also develops a typical theme of Diodorean moralism, namely the mutability of fortune and human ability (or inability) to cope with it.<sup>50</sup> The *χαριέστατοι* therefore act as a moral foil to the lawlessness of the Thirty. This resonates with the proem of Book 14, where Diodorus comments on the criticism which befalls those who commit evil deeds and mentions the Thirty as examples of leaders whose wicked actions have remained alive in the memory of posterity (14.1–2.1).<sup>51</sup>

The *χαριέστατοι* pattern is used again within a pro-democratic narrative in a passage from Book 13, whose source was also probably Ephorus.<sup>52</sup> Diodorus recounts a *stasis* which broke out in Miletus when some men who desired an oligarchy dissolved the democracy with the help of the Lacedaemonians.<sup>53</sup> While the Dionysia was underway, the oligarchs dragged their main opponents away from their houses and cut the throats of about forty of them; then, when the agora was full, they selected three hundred of the wealthiest men (τοὺς εὐπορωτάτους) and killed them. In fear of the situation, the most respectable among those who were on the side of the people (οἱ δὲ χαριέστατοι τῶν τὰ τοῦ δήμου φρονούντων) fled to the Persian satrap Pharnabazus (13.104.6–7). From a socio-political perspective, the *χαριέστατοι* are a (wealthy?) subset of the democrats. While their moral characterisation is not in the foreground, their juxtaposition to the oligarchs still has a moralistic purpose, as Diodorus stresses the cruelty and impiety of the latter in bursting

<sup>47</sup> See Bearzot (2014), who argues that Diodorus, following Ephorus, provided a positive and democratic portrait of Theramenes as opposed to a tradition which represented him as a 'moderate'. This view is questioned by Parmeggiani (2011) 472–3 (with n. 355) and 488 n. 443, who is also more cautious about the correspondence between Diodorus' and Ephorus' portrayals of Theramenes.

<sup>48</sup> As noted by Sacks (2018), the notion of *parrhēsia* has several meanings in Diodorus, ranging from free, equal speech in an assembly context, to frank advice to those in power, to the intellectual honesty expected of historians. The Athenian setting of the passage suggests that equal speech of the democratic type is meant here.

<sup>49</sup> On the main virtues in Diodorus, see Hau (2016) 94–112.

<sup>50</sup> See Hau (2009).

<sup>51</sup> On the proem of Book 14 as Diodorus' own creation, see Sacks (1990) 19–20.

<sup>52</sup> On Diodorus' sources in Book 13, see Ambaglio (2008) vii–xi.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. also Plut. *Lys.* 8, who recounts the same episode.

into their opponents' houses and putting them to the sword during a religious festival.

Finally, there are two instances where the *χαριέστατοι* do not actively participate in conflict but act as intermediaries between opposing factions. The first is Diodorus' narrative about the succession to Alexander the Great.<sup>54</sup> The passage opens Book 18, whose source is usually identified with Hieronymus of Cardia,<sup>55</sup> and recounts a *stasis* between a 'popular' and an elite faction in the Macedonian army after Alexander's death. The phalanx of the infantry (ἡ μὲν γὰρ τῶν πεζῶν φάλαγξ) supported Arrhidaeus, son of Philip, as the heir to the throne. They were opposed by those of Alexander's friends and bodyguard who had the greatest reputation (οἱ δὲ μέγιστον ἔχοντες ἀξίωμα τῶν φίλων καὶ σωματοφυλάκων) as well as by the cavalry corps of the Companions (τὸ τῶν ἰππέων τῶν ἐταίρων ὀνομαζομένων σύστημα). These sent Meleager as an envoy to the infantry, but he switched sides and became the leader of the phalanx. When the bodyguard was getting ready for war, the most respectable men (οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν ἀνδρῶν) persuaded them to come to terms with the phalanx. Arrhidaeus was chosen as king, Perdiccas was made regent, and the most important of the friends and bodyguard received satrapies (18.2).

While the two factions are somewhat socially characterised,<sup>56</sup> the identity of the *χαριέστατοι* is not easy to determine. One can only make hypotheses through comparison with the main alternative accounts of the episode. Curtius Rufus credits the agreement to Arrhidaeus, who, nominated king by the phalanx, sent three envoys to negotiate with the cavalry on two subsequent embassies (10.8).<sup>57</sup> According to Justin (13.3–4), it was Perdiccas, the leader of the cavalry, who held an assembly with the phalanx and used his eloquence to

<sup>54</sup> The story is told in greater detail by Curtius Rufus (10.6–8) and Justin/Trogus (13.2–4), who, however, contradict each other in several respects. Summaries of the accounts of Arrian (*FGrHist/BNJ* 156 F 1.1–3) and Dexippus (*FGrHist/BNJ* 100 F 8) are preserved by Photius, whereas a brief allusion to the episode features in Plutarch's *Life of Eumenes* (3.1). See Bosworth (2002) 29–63 for an analysis of these sources and their respective accounts.

<sup>55</sup> See Hornblower (1981) 18–75; Chamoux in Bertrac–Chamoux–Vernière (1993) xxiv; Hau (2009) 175; Roisman (2012) 10–11. Some scholars believe that Diodorus drew from Duris of Samos for the history of the Diadochi: see Landucci Gattinoni (2008) xii–xxiv. Rathmann (2016) 255–66 argues that Hieronymus was a very important, yet not the only source of Diodorus for Books 18–20 and believes that Diodorus accessed Hieronymus through an intermediate, compilatory source (possibly Agatharchides of Cnidus). For an overview of the debate, see Goukowsky (1978) xii–xxiv.

<sup>56</sup> See Roisman (2012) 71–8.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Arr., *FGrHist/BNJ* 156 F 1.3, who generically states that the two sides often sent embassies to one another (διαπρεσβεύονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους πολλάκις).

achieve the reconciliation.<sup>58</sup> Diodorus' account generally resembles Justin's, so much so that both are believed to derive from Hieronymus, while Curtius' is thought to belong to a different tradition.<sup>59</sup> In this instance, however, since he credits the mediation to a group rather than a single individual, Diodorus is closer to Curtius, and the *χαριέστατοι* may be loosely identified with Arrhidaeus and his envoys.<sup>60</sup> If Bosworth is right that these were members of Arrhidaeus' entourage perceived as neutral by the cavalry,<sup>61</sup> the *χαριέστατοι* would be members of the elite who did not support the infantry but may have been sympathetic to them. Whatever the case, Diodorus is not too concerned with the socio-political identity of the *χαριέστατοι*.<sup>62</sup> Unlike in most occurrences of the pattern, he does not engage in any explicit moralising.<sup>63</sup> Yet, his choice not to follow Hieronymus in crediting the reconciliation to Perdikkas, whose merits he transfers to the anonymous *χαριέστατοι*, sets the scene for the generally negative characterisation of the regent which becomes apparent in his later narrative. For Diodorus, when commenting on Perdikkas' attack against Ptolemy in Egypt, describes him as murderous and eager to strip the other commanders of their prerogatives and rule violently over everyone (D.S. 18.33.3). This portrait is very far from the conciliatory attitude which Justin (13.3.8–10), possibly following Hieronymus, attributes to Perdikkas in his address to the infantry.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Cf. also Plut. *Eum.* 3.1, who claims that Eumenes of Cardia, despite sharing the view of the Companions, maintained a neutral position and made many in the infantry more disposed towards an agreement.

<sup>59</sup> See Bosworth (2002) 35–43, who identifies Curtius' source with Cleitarchus of Alexandria, and Meeus (2008) 43–6. Errington (1970) 72–5 believes that the accounts of Diodorus, Curtius, and Justin all derived from Hieronymus.

<sup>60</sup> This would be consistent with the view of Rathmann (2016) 264–6 about Diodorus' use of an intermediate, compilatory source. Diodorus may have found allusions to two alternative versions of the mediation in his intermediate source. In that instance, he would have chosen to follow the version which we read in Curtius but simplified it by resorting to the *χαριέστατοι* pattern.

<sup>61</sup> Bosworth (2002) 46–7. But see Rathmann (2005) 49, who believes that Arrhidaeus' three envoys were supporters of Meleager against Perdikkas.

<sup>62</sup> Compared to the parallel accounts available to us, Diodorus is rather vague on the political contours of the conflict. He omits several details, such as Roxane's pregnancy with Alexander's son and Perdikkas' proposal to elect a regent until his birth (Curt. 10.6.9; Just. 13.2.5; Arr., *FGrHist/BNJ* 156 F 1.1; cf. D.S. 18.2.1, where Alexander is said to have died childless), Ptolemy's proposal to place a committee of Alexander's friends in charge of the kingdom (Curt. 10.6.15), and Perdikkas' leadership within the elite faction (Curt. 10.8; Just. 13.3.7).

<sup>63</sup> See Hau (2016) 121, who shows that Diodorus' moralising is 'much more subtle and less world-defining' in the sections based on Hieronymus.

<sup>64</sup> On the negative portrayal of Perdikkas in Diodorus (and in most sources), see Rathmann (2005) 7–8. In his narrative of Perdikkas' Egyptian campaign, Diodorus is

Diodorus' moralising is more explicit in a passage in Book 12, probably based on Roman annalistic sources,<sup>65</sup> which recounts the end of the second decemvirate in Rome.<sup>66</sup> Here the *χαριέστατοι* act as intermediaries between the lawless *decemviri* and the soldiers and plebeians who rose against them. The *decemviri* had been entrusted with the codification of the laws but did not complete this task. One of them, whose name is not mentioned by Diodorus but whom Livy (3.44) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*AR* 11.28) identify as Appius Claudius, became infatuated with a maiden. When he was rejected, Appius Claudius plotted to force the girl into slavery. To protect her honour, the maiden's father killed his daughter. He then went to the army (τὸ στρατόπεδον) and, in tears, addressed the mass (ἐπὶ τὸ πλῆθος). They took up arms and seized the Aventine, whereas the *decemviri* gathered many young men to face them, but the most respectable citizens (οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν) acted as ambassadors and helped the opposing sides to reach an agreement (D.S. 12.24–5).

The *χαριέστατοι* are probably to be identified with the future consuls L. Valerius Potitus and M. Horatius Barbatus,<sup>67</sup> whom Livy (3.51.12–13; 3.53–4) and Dionysius (*AR* 11.45) credit with putting an end to the crisis. Diodorus is not particularly attentive to the socio-political contours of the conflict. His characterisation of the maiden as well-born but poor (D.S. 12.24.2: εὐγενοῦς παρθένου πενιχρᾶς) implies that she belonged to a patrician family; he also does not draw a clear distinction between the soldiers (12.25.1: τῆς τῶν στρατιωτῶν μισοπονηρίας) and the plebs (12.24.5: ἐπὶ τὸ πλῆθος). It is only after the end of the conflict that Diodorus discusses the patricians and plebeians, as he explains that the agreement established that ten tribunes of the plebs should be elected and that one of the consuls should be chosen from among the patricians and the other from among the plebeians (12.25.2–3).<sup>68</sup> Whatever the identity of the

believed to have used a source favourable to Ptolemy which differed from his source for the previous sections of the book: see Landucci Gattinoni (2008) 149–50; Roisman (2012) 97–8. If my interpretation is correct, it would be significant that Diodorus omitted Perdicas' role in the reconciliation to create a consistent moral picture of Perdicas across Book 18.

<sup>65</sup> See Casevitz (1972) xiii; Càssola (1982) 746–53. See also Perl (1957) 164–7, who summarised the numerous, contrasting hypotheses of previous scholars on Diodorus' sources for Roman history. One cannot even rule out that Diodorus' source for Roman history was Timaeus, whose work included Roman affairs to some extent (*FGrHist/BNJ* 566 T 9a, b, c; F 36, 59, 60, 61): see Vattuone (2002) 217–22.

<sup>66</sup> The story is told in greater detail at Liv. 3.44–54 and D.H. *AR* 11.28–45; its historicity is questioned by some scholars (see, e.g., von Ungern-Sternberg (2005); Forsythe (2005) 188–9 and 194) and at least partly accepted by others (see, e.g., Cornell (1995) 275; Gagliardi (2002) 16–18, 27–34).

<sup>67</sup> Green (2006) 213 n. 107.

<sup>68</sup> Livy and Dionysius, by contrast, frame the episode more clearly within the Conflict of the Orders: see von Ungern-Sternberg (2005) 83. Most notably, they state that the maiden,

factions, the *χαριέστατοι* fulfil a clear moral function in embodying the values shared by the historian and highlighting the vices of the *decemviri*. Diodorus portrays Appius Claudius as trying to corrupt (*διαφθεῖραι*) the maiden with money; the girl's father takes his attempt at claiming her as a slave as an act of *hybris* (*τῆς ὑβρεως*); the actions of the *decemvir* cause the soldiers to feel hatred for his wickedness (*τῆς τῶν στρατιωτῶν μισοπονηρίας*). Within this context, the *χαριέστατοι* can foresee the danger of contentiousness (*φιλοτιμίας*) for the city.<sup>69</sup> Their mediation restores concord to the community and puts an end to the lawlessness and wickedness of the *decemviri* while preventing the opposing factions from resorting to violence.

### **The Models of the *Χαριέστατοι* Pattern and Diodorus' Authorial Voice**

As we have seen, the contrast between the *χαριέστατοι* and their opponents is a recurring pattern in Diodorus' depiction of political conflict. In some occurrences, the rival groups have a clear socio-political connotation, while in others their identity is blurred. However, whether they are aristocrats set against demagogues and tyrants, members of the elite sympathetic to the *dēmos* against cruel oligarchs, or intermediaries between opposing factions, the *χαριέστατοι* serve mainly as a narrative ploy for Diodorus' moralising. They embody the values endorsed by the author, such as the piety of the Syracusan elders in the Ducetius narrative, the courage of those speaking against Dionysius I, or the fairness and humanity of Theramenes. Their opponents similarly exemplify a wide range of Diodorean vices, such as the impiety of Nabis, the cruelty of Agathocles' followers, the lawlessness of the Thirty and the effrontery of Tyndarides and Timophanes. In the one instance in which the *χαριέστατοι* abandon their high moral standards and devote themselves to luxury, as in the petalism narrative, this even causes a general deterioration in the moral and political life of the community.

The fact that the *χαριέστατοι* play a comparable role in sections of the *Library* based on different sources and focusing on different societies may suggest that this pattern was Diodorus' own schema for interpreting a range of historical developments in moralistic terms. In this section, therefore, I

called Verginia, was a plebeian (Liv. 3.44.2; D.H. *AR* 11.28.1–2), which makes her a victim of patrician injustice: see Gagliardi (2002) 17 n. 54.

<sup>69</sup> The noun *φιλοτιμία*, which literally means 'love of honour', was rather ambiguous: it could denote a positive ambition which motivated individuals to benefit the community as well as a negative, selfish ambition which drew individuals to compete for honour at the risk of damaging the community: see Whitehead (1983); Ferrucci (2013). Diodorus obviously uses it in the latter sense, probably as a synonym of *φιλονεικία*, 'love of strife'.



investigate the origin of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern by analysing the distribution of its occurrences throughout the *Library* as well as its antecedents in classical authors. I shall argue that Diodorus neither invented this pattern nor drew it from his historiographical sources. The socio-political and moral contrast between the *χαριέστατοι* and another group can in fact be traced back to a philosophical, and specifically Aristotelian variant of traditional aristocratic thought. Diodorus engaged with such a cultural debate and superimposed the *χαριέστατοι* pattern on the narrative of his sources in such a way as to serve his moral agenda in diverse socio-political scenarios.

Tracing the origins of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern in Diodorus' sources is problematic. No political actors labelled as *χαρίεντες*, *χαριέστεροι*, or *χαριέστατοι* feature in instances of political conflict in any of the authors who are commonly counted among Diodorus' main sources: Ephorus, Timaeus, Polybius, Agatharchides, Hieronymus, and Posidonius. This, however, may depend on the fact that, apart from Polybius, these only survive in fragments reported (and possibly paraphrased) by later authors. The *χαριέστατοι* are unattested in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, but the pattern appears once in the Oxyrhynchus Historian (*Hell. Oxy.* 6.2–3 McKechnie and Kern). He discusses how, in 395 BC, the Athenian Demaenetus went to support Conon, who was leading Persian naval operations against the Spartans. This outraged those Athenians who were distinguished and respectable (*[ὄσοι γνώριμοι καὶ χαρίεντες*]), and the followers of Thrasybulus, Aesimus, and Anytus advised the Assembly to deny responsibility for Demaenetus' actions. Those who were moderate and wealthy (*οἱ μὲν ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ τὰς οὐσίας ἔχοντες*) were happy to maintain good relations with Sparta, while the many and populist (*οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ καὶ δημοτικοί*) were persuaded to punish Demaenetus even though they previously opposed Sparta. The passage bears notable resemblances with the Diodorean pattern. It builds a moral contrast between the *χαρίεντες*, identified with the men of property, and their popular opponents. Whereas the latter are led by fear (*φοβηθέντες*) to appease the Spartans, the *χαρίεντες* are characterised by the virtue of *epieikeia*.<sup>70</sup> Moreover, much as the *χαριέστατοι* pattern tends to blur socio-political identities in Diodorus, so the bipolar opposition set up by the Oxyrhynchus Historian simplifies the political spectrum and misrepresents Thrasybulus by implicitly associating him with the *χαρίεντες*.<sup>71</sup> Whether or not Diodorus used his work (directly or through Ephorus),<sup>72</sup> the Oxyrhynchus Historian provides an

<sup>70</sup> See Hau (2016) 247–8, who discusses the passage as evidence of the Oxyrhynchus Historian providing both moral guidance and political steering.

<sup>71</sup> Strauss (1986) 90–2; Occhipinti (2016) 157–60.

<sup>72</sup> For recent discussions of the debate on the relationship between Diodorus and the Oxyrhynchus Historian, see Bearzot (2014) 584–6 and Occhipinti (2016) 57–86.

historiographic precedent for the anti-popular version of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern. Yet, at least at the current state of the evidence, one cannot trace back to him the other variants observed in Diodorus which are more sympathetic towards the people.<sup>73</sup>

The distribution of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern across the *Library* may give us some clues as to its possible derivation from Diodorus' sources but it too is ultimately inconclusive. As shown in Table 1, five of eleven occurrences come from passages attributed to Timaeus. All five relate (directly or, in the case of Timoleon, indirectly) to Syracusan politics; they also share a similar anti-popular and anti-tyrannical perspective, as they tend to portray the *χαριέστατοι* as wealthy individuals opposed to aspiring tyrants or demagogues and their supporters among the mob.<sup>74</sup> The occurrences of the pattern in sections based on other authors are more varied. Of the three instances which are thought to derive from Ephorus, two portray the *χαριέστατοι* as wealthy individuals sympathetic to the *dēmos* and hostile to oligarchs, while one may show the *χαριέστατοι* in a conflict against a democratic faction. The three remaining occurrences are supposedly based on Roman annalistic sources, Polybius, and Hieronymus. While the anti-popular and anti-tyrannical tone of the Polybius passage is reminiscent of the sections based on Timaeus, the other two occurrences are distinctive in that they portray the *χαριέστατοι* as intermediaries between an elite or oligarchic faction and a popular one. Compared to the Timaeian passages, the other occurrences are also heterogeneous as to the setting of the respective conflicts, which span from Athens and Sparta to Miletus, Cyrene, and even Rome.

Passage in Diodorus	Theme	Source	Identity of the <i>χαριέστατοι</i>	Opponents of the <i>χαριέστατοι</i>
11.86.3–87	Petalism in Syracuse	Timaeus	elite	aspiring tyrants; demagogues; the poor
11.92.3–4	Ducetius in Syracuse	Timaeus	elite (?) elders	demagogues
12.24–5	Second decemvirate in Rome	Roman annalistic source	subset of elite	<i>χαριέστατοι</i> mediate between oligarchs and soldiers/plebs

<sup>73</sup> See pp. 20–1.

<sup>74</sup> Only in the case of the Timoleon passage is it possible that the *χαριέστατοι* may be implicitly depicted as 'moderate' democrats: see p. 9.

13.92.3	Coup of Dionysius I in Syracuse	Timaeus	subset of elite	demagogic aspiring tyrant; masses
13.104.6–7	<i>Stasis</i> in Miletus	Ephorus	wealthy (?) subset of democrats	oligarchs
14.5.5–7	Thirty Tyrants in Athens	Ephorus	wealthy aligned with the <i>dēmos</i>	oligarchs
14.34.3–5	<i>Stasis</i> in Cyrene	Ephorus	elite	democrats (?)
16.65.6	Timoleon and Timophanes in Corinth	Timaeus	elite (supportive of moderate democracy?)	demagogic (?) aspiring tyrant; masses (?)
18.2.2–4	Succession to Alexander the Great	Hieronymus	elite (sympathetic to the phalanx?)	χαριέστατοι mediate between elite corps and phalanx
19.6.2–6	Coup of Agathocles in Syracuse	Timaeus	wealthy members of the <i>dēmos</i>	demagogic aspiring tyrant; masses
27.1	Crimes of Nabis in Sparta	Polybius	elite (?)	tyrant (supported by masses?)

Table 1: Distribution of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern across Diodorus' *Library*

The frequent occurrence and consistent tone of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern in Timaeian sections of the *Library* as opposed to the more diversified versions found in sections drawing from other authors may indicate that Diodorus derived the pattern from Timaeus. One might suggest that Timaeus identified the *χαριέστατοι* with the aristocracy and viewed their opposition to demagogues and aspiring tyrants as a significant feature of Syracusan politics. Diodorus, in addition to adopting Timaeus' scheme in his account of the relevant episodes, would also have readapted the *χαριέστατοι* to fit a wider range of scenarios in sections derived from other sources. He probably found the pattern useful to convey his moral lessons and applied the *χαριέστατοι* label to the socio-political groups who in each scenario best represented the values he endorsed or opposed the vices of which he disapproved.

If derivation from Timaeus is a possibility, the origins of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern may more convincingly be traced back to a philosophical (and specifically Aristotelian) variant of classical aristocratic thought. Aristotle

constructs a political and moral contrast between οἱ χαρίεντες and οἱ πολλοί.<sup>75</sup> In Book 1 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle states that both the many and the χαρίεντες consider happiness to be the aim of politics but that the many disagree with the wise (τοῖς σοφοῖς) as to what constitutes happiness (1095a14–22). This seems to imply that the χαρίεντες are to be identified with the wise as opposed to the πολλοί, which would set up an intellectual rather than socio-political contrast.<sup>76</sup> This picture, however, is complicated by Aristotle's analysis of current views of happiness. Aristotle explains that the many and most vulgar (οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ καὶ φορτικώτατοι) identify happiness with pleasure; in doing so, they are like slaves, in that they choose the life of beasts. The χαρίεντες and the men of action (πρακτικοί) believe that happiness coincides with honour; this view too is superficial, because honour lies more in those who grant it than in those who are granted it and because those who seek honour ultimately aim at virtue. To the lives led by these two categories, labelled respectively 'life of enjoyment' and 'political life', Aristotle juxtaposes contemplative life, of which he approves (1095b14–96a5). The χαρίεντες, therefore, should be identified with the political elite. While they are set in opposition to the many, however, the χαρίεντες too are at least partly criticised by Aristotle for their inappropriate understanding of happiness.<sup>77</sup>

The socio-political character of the contrast between οἱ χαρίεντες and οἱ πολλοί is (unsurprisingly) more explicit in Aristotle's political theory. In Book 2 of the *Politics*, Aristotle criticises the constitution of Phaleas of Chalcedon for not addressing the causes of civil strife appropriately. Aristotle explains that the many enter *stasis* because of the unequal distribution of properties, whereas the χαρίεντες do so if honours are equally distributed (1266b40–67a2). He then argues that the equal distribution of property promoted by Phaleas does not prevent civil strife, as the χαρίεντες may be angry because they feel they do not deserve equal parts (1267a40). That the χαρίεντες are to be identified with the (oligarchic) elite as opposed to the (democratic) mass appears clear in the context of Aristotle's theory of *stasis*. In Book 5, the philosopher states that democracy originates from the belief that, since people are equal in some respects, they should be equal in all respects; oligarchy, on the other hand, derives from the belief that, since people are unequal in some respects, they

<sup>75</sup> See Pakaluk (1998) 422.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. D.S. 5.34.3 ('Of the tribes neighbouring upon the Celtiberians the most advanced [χαριέστατον] is the people of the Vaccaei') and 12.33.3 ('after selecting their most accomplished generals [στρατηγούς ... τοὺς χαριεστάτους], [the Corinthians] put to sea against Corcyra'), where the χαριέστατοι are not a political group but denote cultural and technical advancement.

<sup>77</sup> Aristotle's view of happiness, however, is not entirely consistent throughout the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and there is debate over whether it also accommodates a role for the practice of political virtue: see Dahl (2011) with references.

should be unequal in all respects (1301a33–5; cf. also 1301b35–9; 1302a24–31).<sup>78</sup> But the contrast between οἱ πολλοί and οἱ χαρίεντες in Book 2 also has a moral dimension. In criticising Phaleas' egalitarian distribution of estates for failing to take acquisitiveness into account, Aristotle advises that one should educate those who are reasonable by nature (τοὺς μὲν ἐπιεικέως τῇ φύσει) so that they do not wish to have a larger share; on the other hand, one should take care that the base (τοὺς δὲ φαύλους) are not able to be acquisitive but are kept inferior though not treated unjustly (1267b5–9). Aristotle, in other words, credits the upper classes with a natural reasonableness which he does not attribute to the many and which makes it possible for the former to learn moderation.<sup>79</sup>

These passages display some of the basic characteristics of the Diodorean pattern. Aristotle sets the χαριέστατοι in opposition to the many, just as Diodorus' Timaeian sections tend to contrast them to the masses and their demagogic leaders. In Aristotle too the χαριέστατοι fulfil a political as well as moral function. They are ascribed the virtue of *epieikeia*, and their view of happiness, while criticised as incomplete or superficial, is not censured to the same extent as that of the many, who are accused of leading a slavish and bestial life. Some of these ideas were not necessarily new and possibly reflected traditional aristocratic thought. We have seen how the Oxyrhynchus Historian contrasted the *epieikeia* and sound policies of the χαρίεντες with the fearfulness and fickleness of the many (*Hell. Oxy.* 6.2–3 McKechnie and Kern).<sup>80</sup> Similar patterns occur in the Old Oligarch, though without the χαριε- terminology. There, categories such as the πονηροί, πένητες, δῆμος, or δημοτικοί are negatively compared to the χρηστοί, πλούσιοι, γενναῖοι, or βελτίονες ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.1–2, 4; 2.14; 3.10). Such socio-political labels can also hold a moral value. This is most evident where the Old Oligarch contrasts the minimal licentiousness and injustice (ἀκολασία τε ὀλιγίστη καὶ ἀδικία) and maximum care for what is good (ἀκρίβεια δὲ πλείστη εἰς τὰ χρηστά) on the part of the best men (τοῖς βελτίστοις) with the maximum ignorance, disorder, and wickedness (ἀμαθία τε πλείστη καὶ ἀταξία καὶ πονηρία) of the people (τῷ δήμῳ) ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.5).

Aristotle, however, differs from the Oxyrhynchus Historian and the Old Oligarch in that he sometimes envisions the χαρίεντες as sympathetic towards the *dēmos*. In doing so, he provides precedents for the 'pro-democratic' variant of the χαριέστατοι pattern observed in non-Timaeian sections of Diodorus. In

<sup>78</sup> See Pezzoli in Pezzoli and Curnis (2012) 267.

<sup>79</sup> See Balot (2001) 40–1.

<sup>80</sup> Another isolated occurrence of the χαριέστατοι pattern is at Pl. *Resp.* 10 (605b) where admitting the mimetic poet into a well-ordered state is likened to making bad men (μοχθηροὺς) rulers of the state and ruining the more respectable ones (τοὺς δὲ χαριεστέρους).

Book 4 of the *Politics*, Aristotle describes a constitution that corresponds to the correct form of democracy which, in Book 3, he labelled as *politeia* (1279a–b).<sup>81</sup> Aristotle (1297b1–10) advises that political participation should be limited to the hoplites and the property qualification be set in such a way that those sharing in the constitution are more than those who do not. The reason for this is that the poor and those excluded from honours (οἱ πένητες καὶ μὴ μετέχοντες τῶν τιμῶν) can only keep quiet if nobody commits *hybris* against them or deprives them of their properties, but this is not easy because those who participate in the government (τοὺς μετέχοντας τοῦ πολιτεύματος) are not always respectable (χαρίεντας). Since they meet the property qualification, the *χαρίεντες* are wealthier than the poor and those excluded from political honours; yet, they cannot be identified exclusively with the rich due to the relatively inclusive criteria of the property qualification envisioned by Aristotle.<sup>82</sup> In this correct democratic setting, the term *χαρίεις* is used in a moral sense. Those who hold power in a *politeia* should ideally be *χαρίεντες* and respect those under them, but that is not always the case, as they can easily turn out to be the kind of people who humiliate the poor and misappropriate their properties.

In a passage from Book 6 of the *Politics*, *χαρίεντες* again denotes members of the upper class who are respectful of the masses. Aristotle discusses the measures for preserving a given constitution, with a focus on (but not limited to) radical democracy. His main preoccupation is with ensuring that the rights and properties of the rich are not encroached upon while at the same time relieving the masses from extreme poverty.<sup>83</sup> Aristotle advises that the notables, if they are respectable and have good judgement (*χαριέντων δ' ... καὶ νοῦν ἔχόντων γνωρίμων*), divide the poor in groups and provide them with the initial resources for starting a business (1320b1–9).<sup>84</sup> The passage does set an opposition between rich and poor, but the former are expected to be sympathetic to the latter and help them reach a level of economic self-sufficiency. Being *χαρίεντες* is therefore envisioned as an ideal moral quality of the elite which can foster civic concord within the community, limit excessive demands on the part of the poor and avoid the deterioration of democracy.

<sup>81</sup> See Besso in Bertelli and Moggi (2014) 271–2. By *politeia*, two different forms of constitutions are meant in Aristotle's *Politics*. While in Book 3 the *politeia* is the correct form of democracy, in which sovereignty belongs to those who possess hoplite equipment, in Book 4 it is a mixture of democracy and oligarchy: see Bertelli (2015).

<sup>82</sup> Besso in Bertelli and Moggi (2014) 272.

<sup>83</sup> See De Luna in De Luna–Zizza–Curnis (2016) 597–606.

<sup>84</sup> De Luna in De Luna–Zizza–Curnis (2016) 604.

That the *χαριέστατοι* pattern in Diodorus can be traced back to a philosophical (and specifically Aristotelian) variant of classical aristocratic thought is also suggested by a comparison with Isocrates. The orator, who is commonly believed to have influenced some of Diodorus' sources (most notably Ephorus),<sup>85</sup> also often labels a group of individuals as *χαριέστατοι*.<sup>86</sup> In his speeches, however, the *χαριέστατοι* are not political actors. For Isocrates, being *χαρίεις* is an intellectual and oratorical quality.<sup>87</sup> In *To Nicocles*, for example, the orator warns his addressee that, in speeches, one should not seek novelties but regard as the most accomplished (*χαριέστατον*) the speaker who can observe the most ideas held by others and relate them in the noblest way (2.40–1). In the *Panathenaicus*, Isocrates claims that the most accomplished Greeks (*οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων*) have always held him in the highest repute (12.7–8). This statement is a response to the slanders which he claims to have received from obscure and base sophists (*ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν σοφιστῶν τῶν ἀδοκίμων καὶ πονηρῶν*) (12.5), which suggests that the *χαριέστατοι* are not a political category as much as people whom Isocrates considers his intellectual and moral peers.<sup>88</sup> The same is true for a passage in the *Antidosis* which discusses the relative importance of talent and practice for the orator. Isocrates states that, if someone were to master all the principles of rhetorical education, he might become a more accomplished composer of speeches than many others (*λόγων μὲν ποιητῆς τυχὸν ἂν χαριέστερος γένοιτο τῶν πολλῶν*) but, without courage, he would not be able to address a crowd (15.192).

One might also suggest that Diodorus derived the *χαριέστατοι* pattern from Aristotle through the mediation of Timaeus and was merely responsible for readapting it in different political scenarios. This, however, does not seem likely. If we believe Polybius, Timaeus was a bitter critic of Aristotle. In countering Aristotle's account of the foundation of Locri in Italy, Timaeus called the philosopher insolent, unscrupulous and rash, a sophist and a glutton, accused him of slandering the Locrians, and alluded to his connection to Macedon (Pol. 12.8.3–4 = Timaeus, *FGrHist/BNj* 566 F 156). The accusation of gluttony recurs also in another passage, where Polybius suggests that Timaeus referenced Aristotle's description of delicacies in his writings as proof that he was a gourmand (Pol. 12.24.1–2 = Timaeus, *FGrHist/BNj* 566 F 152). A scholion to Hesiod similarly attests that Timaeus' followers falsely stated that

<sup>85</sup> See Pownall (2004) 27–9 with references. The extent of Isocrates' influence on his alleged pupil Ephorus and the existence of the so-called rhetorical historiography has been cogently challenged by Parmeggiani (2011) esp. 34–66. As a student of Philiscus of Miletus, himself a pupil of Isocrates, Timaeus too has sometimes been thought to have been influenced by Isocrates: see Jacoby's introduction to *FGrHist/BNj* 566.

<sup>86</sup> See Raubitschek (1958) 80.

<sup>87</sup> For examples of a similar use in Diodorus, see n. 76.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. also Isoc. 12.86.

Aristotle, after his wife's death, lived with his slave and had a son with her (Hes. *Op.* 405–6 = Timaeus, *FGrHist/BNJ* 566 F 157). Baron might be right that invectives of this sort were common in ancient scholarly debates and that the case for Timaeus' hostility towards Aristotle should not be pressed too hard.<sup>89</sup> Yet, Timaeus' polemic militates against the idea that he may have been positively influenced by Aristotle.<sup>90</sup>

Another piece of evidence suggesting that the *χαριέστατοι* pattern was the result of Diodorus' engagement with some Aristotelian themes without the mediation of Timaeus is a scholion to Aristophanes' *Knights* on Athenian ostracism. There, we read that 'almost all the most respectable people were ostracised' (schol. Ar. *Eq.* 855b: *σχεδὸν δὲ οἱ χαριέστατοι πάντες ὠστρακίσθησαν*). The scholion belongs to the same tradition as a fragment of Philochorus (*FGrHist/BNJ* 328 F 30) on ostracism which states, among other things, that 'Hyperbolus alone among the undistinguished people was ostracised' (*μόνος δὲ Ὑπέβολος ἐκ τῶν ἀδόξων ἐξωστρακίσθη*). The source of this tradition, which plausibly drew a comparison between the *χαριέστατοι* and the *ἄδοξος* Hyperbolus, has securely been identified with Theophrastus.<sup>91</sup> Diodorus' interpretation of the introduction of petalism as the result of conflicts between the *χαριέστατοι* and demagogic aspiring tyrants may have been inspired by this Aristotelian tradition. As convincingly shown by Raubitschek, Theophrastus is the source of Diodorus' digression on the procedure of ostracism in his discussion of Themistocles' ostracism (D.S. 11.54.5–55.3), which in turn provides the basis for his comparison of ostracism and petalism in our petalism passage (11.87.1–2).<sup>92</sup> Diodorus views excessive predominance (*ὑπεροχή*) as central in the rationale of petalism (11.87.2). This echoes several passages in Aristotle's *Politics*, where ostracism is interpreted as a democratic tool for preventing those *staseis* which, due to the excessive prominence (*δι' ὑπεροχὴν*) of a person or group, lead to the establishment of a monarchy or oligarchy (Arist. *Pol.* 5, 1302b16–20; 1308b11–21; cf. 3, 1284a18–

<sup>89</sup> Baron (2013) 113–37. Some scholars instead take Polybius' criticism at face value and believe that Timaeus personally disliked Aristotle and his school: see, e.g., Momigliano (1959) 543; Pearson (1987) 100; Luraghi (2017) 197 and 200, who suggests, however, that Timaeus may have used the library of the Lycaeus and hence had a more complex relationship with the Peripatos.

<sup>90</sup> According to Vattuone (1991) esp. 34–9, Timaeus sometimes echoed Aristotle's own language, but it is significant that he did so to criticise the philosopher.

<sup>91</sup> See Raubitschek (1958); Heftner (2018); Węcowski (2022) 121–2, 129–34, 158–60.

<sup>92</sup> Raubitschek (1958) 93–100. Węcowski (2022) 35 n. 75 believes the relationship between Diodorus' discussion of ostracism at 11.55 and his comparison of ostracism and petalism at 11.87 to be the other way round, but it is more likely that Diodorus, when describing the procedure of the obscure and short-lived institution of petalism, used a source discussing the more famous ostracism.



38).<sup>93</sup> Diodorus therefore probably integrated the core of his historical account of petalism, based on Timaeus, with a Peripatetic source which interpreted ostracism according to the *χαριέστατοι* pattern.<sup>94</sup>

## Conclusions

Diodorus interpreted political conflict first and foremost through moral categories and used it as a didactic paradigm in his moralising. This is most evident in his abstract analysis of the causes of *stasis* which Diodorus inserts in his narrative of the Sicilian slave revolts in Book 34/35. Diodorus states that, just as in the exercise of political power those in a prominent position should behave fairly (*ἐπιεικῶς*) towards those of lower standing, so in private life those who are right-minded should be gentle with their slaves, because arrogance and oppression (*ὑπερηφανία καὶ βαρύτης*) cause *staseis* in the cities and rebellions among slaves. Diodorus stresses how cruelty and unlawfulness (*ὀμότητα καὶ παρανομίαν*) in the customs of those in power (*τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας ... ἦθη*) have a negative impact on the customs of their subjects (*τὰ τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων ἦθη*); for those of low standing, when they are denied the humaneness they are due (*τῆς δὲ καθηκούσης φιλανθρωπίας*), become hostile to their masters (D.S. 34/35.33). This analysis, whether derived from Posidonius or at least partly original to Diodorus,<sup>95</sup> does not amount to a theory of *stasis* and does not fit many of the instances of political conflict discussed in this article. Yet, it shows that Diodorus held a relatively consistent and openly moralistic view of political stability which centred around the virtues (such as *epieikeia* and *philanthrōpia*) he elsewhere attributed to the *χαριέστατοι* and the vices (such as *paranomia* and *ōmotēs*) he ascribed to their opponents.<sup>96</sup>

The *χαριέστατοι* pattern allowed Diodorus to make sense of a range of complex scenarios of political conflict he drew from his sources and present them in such a way as to best serve this moral agenda. The pattern ultimately

<sup>93</sup> Raubitschek (1958) 95–6. On ostracism within Aristotle's theory of *stasis*, see now Barbato (2021) 508–11.

<sup>94</sup> Diodorus may have used Theophrastus directly or through a later Peripatetic source, but not through the mediation of Timaeus as argued by Raubitschek (1958) 102: see Węcowski (2022) 182 n. 186.

<sup>95</sup> See Morton (2018) 548–9; Börm (2019) 129–30; Angius (2020) 28–31.

<sup>96</sup> The paternalistic tone of the passage and the importance of *epieikeia* have been seen as evidence of derivation from Posidonius (see Dowden's commentary at *BNJ* 87 F 108b) but may be equally indicative of Diodorus' engagement with Aristotelian thought. Aristotle's advice that the *χαριέντες* should provide the poor with the resources for starting a business (*Pol.* 6, 1320b1–9; see p. 291 above) is also paternalistic, and his characterisation of the *χαριέντες* also places significance on the virtue of *epieikeia* (*Pol.* 2, 1267b5–9; see pp. 289–90 above).

originated in the (often morally denoted) contrast between the elite and the people typical of traditional aristocratic thought. Yet, as I have shown, the fact that Diodorus sometimes used a ‘pro-democratic’ version of the model indicates that he was in dialogue with a philosophical, and specifically Aristotelian variant of that tradition which could also depict the *χαριέστατοι* as sympathetic towards the *dēmos*. This does not make Diodorus a Peripatetic, nor does it necessarily imply that Diodorus had read Aristotle.<sup>97</sup> Scholars, however, have detected the influence of multiple contemporary philosophical schools in the *Library*.<sup>98</sup> These may also include the Peripatetics. As stressed by Elizabeth Rawson, Aristotelian studies enjoyed a revival during the first century BC after Sulla brought to Italy the library of Apellicon of Teos. The collection, which included the books of Aristotle and Theophrastus, was arranged by the grammarian Tyrannio and later catalogued and published by Andronicus of Rhodes.<sup>99</sup> It can therefore be suggested that Diodorus engaged to some extent with Aristotelian ideas circulating in the intellectual environment of his time,<sup>100</sup> and, at least in his depiction of political conflict, sometimes superimposed them onto the narratives of his sources.

Understanding how Diodorus may have used the *χαριέστατοι* pattern to simplify the accounts of his sources can help us explain possible problems in his narratives of political conflict.<sup>101</sup> The most glaring example is the account of petalism with which I opened my analysis. Scholars have noted that, as a tool to prevent tyranny, petalism could not have been enacted by a popular assembly as Diodorus suggests, since the historian implies that aspiring tyrants in Syracuse relied on the support of the poor (11.86.4). Moreover, as the argument goes, if the most powerful men had been exiled and the most respectable citizens had withdrawn from politics (11.87.4), it is hard to imagine who could have persuaded the assembly to repeal a markedly democratic institution like petalism. On account of these contradictions, some have argued that Syracuse

<sup>97</sup> The fact, noted by Sacks (2018) 48, that Diodorus sometimes mentions Aristotle as an influential philosopher is no proof that he had read his work.

<sup>98</sup> See Rawson (1985) 223 and Sacks (1990) 36, 56–60, who stress the philosophical ‘eclecticism’ of Diodorus. Scholars have focused especially on Stoic influences: see most recently Cancik and Cancik-Lindemaier (2010–11); Angius (2020) 30, 118.

<sup>99</sup> Rawson (1985) 40, 289–91. On the exact nature of Andronicus’ intervention on the Aristotelian corpus (often interpreted as an edition) see recently Hatzimichali (2016).

<sup>100</sup> The two main variants of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern also appear in Diodorus’ contemporary Dionysius of Halicarnassus: cf. D.H. *AR* 15.6 (*χαριέστατοι* as morally upright elites against the mob) and 6.58.3 (*χαριέστατοι* as patricians respectful of the plebs). In two instances, Dionysius (*AR* 10.35.2; 11.9) portrays the *χαριέστατοι* as the morally best among the plebeians. Identity of the *χαριέστατοι* unclear: D.H. *AR* 11.2.

<sup>101</sup> See also Occhipinti (2016) 86 on Diodorus’ tendency to simplify historical realities and misinterpret the identity of political factions.

was not a democracy at this stage of its history,<sup>102</sup> while others have questioned the anti-tyrannical nature of petalism.<sup>103</sup> However, it is equally possible that Diodorus superimposed the *χαριέστατοι* pattern onto the narrative he had found in his source, with the result of blurring the identity of the actors involved or exaggerating (or even inventing) the withdrawal of the *χαριέστατοι* from politics to provide a moralistic explanation of the sudden repeal of petalism. This in turn should suggest caution against using this passage for reconstructing the Syracusan constitution of the mid fifth century BC.

Diodorus' deployment of the *χαριέστατοι* pattern in several instances of political conflict throughout his work reinforces the view of those scholars who question his picture as a mindless copyist and stress his participation in the cultural atmosphere of the first century. Lisa Hau is right that Diodorus took most of his moralising from his sources. Yet, my analysis has revealed that, in handling the narratives he found in those sources, he had enough intellectual autonomy to engage with a terminology and views which stemmed from aristocratic and philosophical traditions of the classical age and were relevant to the cultural and moral debates of his time.<sup>104</sup> In the *Library*, the *χαριέστατοι* are usually the morally best within the upper class. In some instances, they are distinguished from other members of the elite who are negatively characterised or not as exemplary. This too is reminiscent of Aristotle, where being *χαρίεντες* is an ideal quality which not all members of the elite possess. The model was vague enough for Diodorus to use it in different political narratives, which could see the *χαριέστατοι* opposing demagogic tyrants, becoming victims of oligarchs, or acting as mediators between factions. Diodorus, therefore, was neither a mindless copyist nor a professional historian. However, investigating his work from a Diodorean perspective, focusing not so much on his sources but on his moral agenda and historiographical identity, can help us better make sense of blunders and contradictions in the *Library*.

*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*

MATTEO BARBATO  
barbatom@hu-berlin.de

<sup>102</sup> Lintott (1982) 188–9; Rutter (2002) 146–8.

<sup>103</sup> Giangiulio (1998) 113–15.

<sup>104</sup> See Pavan (1961), who argued that Diodorus lacked a consistent politico-ideological view and redeveloped any political tendencies that may have been present in his sources in accordance with the moral purpose of his history.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambaglio, D. (1995) *La Biblioteca Storica di Diodoro Siculo: Problemi e metodo* (Como).
- (2008) *Diodoro Siculo, Biblioteca Storica, Libro XIII. Commento storico* (Milan).
- Angius, A. (2020) *Le rivolte degli schiavi in Sicilia. La narrazione di Diodoro tra razionalismo e storia esemplare* (Rome).
- Balot, R. (2001) ‘Aristotle’s Critique of Phaleas: Justice, Equality, and *Pleonexia*’, *Hermes* 129: 32–44.
- Barbato, M. (2020) *The Ideology of Democratic Athens: Institutions, Orators and the Mythical Past* (Edinburgh).
- (2021) “‘For Themistocles of Phrearrhioi, on Account of Honour’”: Ostracism, Honour and the Nature of Athenian Politics’, *CQ* 71: 500–19.
- Baron, C. A. (2013) *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography* (Cambridge).
- Bearzot, C. (2014) ‘Eforo e Teramene’, *PP* 69: 569–90.
- (2018) ‘Terminology of Political Collaboration and Opposition in Diodoros XI–XX’, in Hau–Meeus–Sheridan (2018a) 329–45.
- Berger, S. (1992) *Revolution and Society in Greek Sicily and Southern Italy* (Stuttgart).
- Bertelli, L. (2015) ‘Law and Justice in Aristotle’, in E. M. Harris and M. Canevaro, edd., *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law* (Oxford, available online, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199599257.013.22>).
- and M. Moggi (2014) *Aristotele: La politica. Libro IV* (Rome).
- Bertrac, P., F. Chamoux, and Y. Vernière (1993) *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque historique: Introduction générale et Livre I* (Paris).
- Bonnet, M. and E. R. Bennett (1997) *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque Historique, Livre XIV* (Paris).
- Börm, H. (2019) *Mordende Mitbürger: Stasis und Bürgerkrieg in griechischen Poleis des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart).
- Bosworth, A. B. (2002) *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors* (Oxford).
- Brown, T. S. (1952) ‘Timaeus and Diodorus’ Eleventh Book’, *AJPh* 73: 337–55.
- (1958) *Timaeus of Tauromenion* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- Cancik, H. and H. Cancik-Lindemaier (2010–11) “‘Oikumenische Geschichte’”: Die Begründung von Universalgeschichtsschreibung bei Diodor von Sizilien’, *Hyperboreus* 16–17: 167–82.
- Canevaro, M. (2018) ‘Majority Rule vs. Consensus: The Practice of Democratic Deliberation in the Greek *Poleis*’, in M. Canevaro et al., edd., *Ancient Greek History and Contemporary Social Science* (Edinburgh) 101–56.

- Casevitz, M. (1972) *Diodore de Sicile*. Bibliothèque Historique. Tome VII, Livre XII (Paris).
- Càssola, F. (1982) 'Diodoro e la storia romana', *ANRW* II.30.1: 724–73.
- Clarke, K. (1999) 'Universal Perspectives in Historiography', in C. S. Kraus, ed., *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden) 249–79.
- Consolo Langher, S. N. (2000) *Agatocle: Da capoparte a monarca fondatore di un regno tra Cartagine e i Diadochi* (Messina).
- Cornell, T. J. (1995) *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264 BC)* (London).
- Dahl, N. O. (2011) 'Contemplation and *Eudaimonia* in the *Nicomachean Ethics*', in J. Miller, ed., *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge) 66–91.
- de Lisle, C. (2021) *Agathokles of Syracuse: Sicilian Tyrant and Hellenistic King* (Oxford).
- De Luna, M. E., C. Zizza, and M. Curnis (2016) *Aristotele. La politica: Libri V–VI* (Rome).
- Dudziński, A. (2016) 'Diodorus' use of Timaeus', *AHB* 30: 43–76.
- Errington, R. M. (1970) 'From Babylon to Tripuradeisos: 323–320 B.C.', *JHS* 90: 49–77.
- Ferrucci, S. (2013) 'L'ambigua virtù. *Philotimia* nell'Atene degli oratori', in M. Mari and J. Thornton, edd., *Parole in movimento. Linguaggio politico e lessico storiografico nel mondo ellenistico* (Pisa) 123–35.
- Forsdyke, S. (2005) *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece* (Princeton).
- Forsythe, G. (2005) *A Critical History of Early Rome from Prehistory to the First Punic War* (Berkeley).
- Gagliardi, L. (2002) *Decemviri e centumviri: Origini e competenze* (Milan).
- Giangiulio, M. (1998) 'Gli equilibri difficili della democrazia in Sicilia: Il caso di Siracusa', in E. Greco, ed., *Venticinque secoli dopo l'invenzione della democrazia* (Paestum) 107–24.
- Goukowsky, P. (1978) *Diodore de Sicile*. Bibliothèque Historique: Livre XVIII (Paris).
- (2012) *Diodore de Sicile*. Bibliothèque Historique: *Fragments; Livres XXVII–XXXII* (Paris).
- Green, P. (2006) *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11–12.37.1: Greek History, 480–431 BC, The Alternative Version* (Austin).
- Haillet, J. (2001) *Diodore de Sicile*. Bibliothèque Historique, Tome VI: Livre XI (Paris).
- Harris, E. M. (2013) 'How to Address the Athenian Assembly: Rhetoric and Political Tactics in the Debate about Mytilene (Thuc. 3.37–50)', *CQ* 63: 94–109.

- Hatzimichali, M. (2016) ‘Andronicus of Rhodes and the Construction of the Aristotelian Corpus’, in A. Falcon, ed., *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Aristotle in Antiquity* (Leiden) 81–100.
- Hau, L. I. (2009) ‘The Burden of Good Fortune in Diodoros of Sicily: A Case for Originality?’, *Historia* 58: 171–97.
- (2016) *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus* (Edinburgh).
- (2018) ‘Narrator and Narratorial Persona in Diodoros’ *Bibliothēke* (and their Implications for the Tradition of Greek Historiography)’, in Hau–Meeus–Sheridan (2018a) 277–302.
- , A. Meeus, and B. Sheridan, edd. (2018a) *Diodoros of Sicily: Historiographical Theory and Practice in the Bibliothēke* (Leuven).
- (2018b) ‘Introduction’, in eid. (2018a) 3–12.
- Heftner, H. (2018) ‘Das Große Verfahrenstechnisch-Historische Scholion über den Ostrakismos [Philochoros FG<sub>GrHist</sub> 328 F 30 / Theophrast fr. 640ab Fortenbaugh]: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion’, *Tyche* 33: 79–112.
- Holton, J. (2018) ‘*Philanthropia*, Athens, and Democracy in Diodorus Siculus: The Athenian Debate’, in M. Canevaro and B. Gray, edd., *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought* (Oxford) 177–208.
- Hornblower, J. (1981) *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford).
- Laqueur, R. (1936) ‘Timaios aus Tauromenion [3]’, in A. Pauly et al., edd., *Pauly’s Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Zweite Reihe, Band VIA, Halbband 11* (Stuttgart) 1076–203.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. (2008) *Diodoro Siculo*, Biblioteca Storica, *Libro XVIII. Commento storico* (Milan).
- Lintott, A. (1982) *Violence, Civil Strife and Revolution in the Classical City, 750–330 BC* (London).
- Luraghi, N. (2017) ‘Timaeus’ Athens Revisited: Culture and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens’, *ASNP* 9: 179–201.
- Meeus, A. (2008) ‘The Power Struggle of the Diadochoi in Babylon, 323 BC’, *AncSoc* 28: 39–82.
- Meister, K. (1967) *Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor von den Anfängen bis zum Tod des Agathokles: Quellenuntersuchungen zu Buch IV–XXI* (Munich).
- Momigliano, A. (1959) ‘Atene nel III secolo a.C. e la scoperta di Roma nelle Storie di Timeo di Tauromenio’, *RSI* 71: 529–56.
- Morton, P. (2018) ‘Diodorus Siculus’ “Slave War” Narratives: Writing Social Commentary in the *Bibliothēke*’, *CQ* 68: 534–51.
- Muntz, C. E. (2017) *Diodorus Siculus and the World of the Late Roman Republic* (Oxford).
- Nissen, H. (1863) *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin).
- Occhipinti, E. (2016) *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia and Historiography* (Leiden).

- Oldfather, C. H. (1946) *Diodorus Siculus. Library of History, Volume IV: Books 9–12.40*. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Pakaluk, M. (1998) 'The Egalitarianism of the Eudemian Ethics', *CQ* 48: 411–32.
- Palm, J. (1955) *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien: Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa* (Lund).
- Parmeggiani, G. (2011) *Eforo di Cuma. Studi di storiografia greca* (Bologna).
- Pavan, M. (1961) 'La teoresi storica di Diodoro Siculo', *RAL* 16: 19–52, 117–51.
- (1987) 'Osservazioni su Diodoro, Polibio e la storiografia ellenistica', *Aevum* 61: 20–8.
- Pearson, L. I. C. (1987) *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaeus and his Predecessors* (Atlanta).
- Perl, G. (1957) *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Diodors römischen Jahrzählung* (Berlin).
- Pezzoli, F. and M. Curnis (2012) *Aristotele. La politica: Libro II* (Rome).
- Pownall, F. (2004) *Lessons from the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose* (Ann Arbor).
- Rathmann, M. (2005) *Perdikkas zwischen 323 und 320. Nachlassverwalter des Alexanderreiches oder Autokrat?* (Vienna).
- (2016) *Diodor und Seine Bibliothek: Weltgeschichte Aus der Provinz* (Berlin and Boston).
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1958) 'Theophrastus on Ostracism', *C&M* 19: 73–109.
- Rawson, E. (1985) *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London).
- Robinson, E. W. (2011) *Democracy beyond Athens: Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age* (Cambridge).
- Roisman, J. (2012) *Alexander's Veterans and the Early Wars of the Successors* (Austin).
- Rubincam, C. (1987) 'The Organisation and Composition of Diodoros' *Bibliothek*', *EMC* 31: 313–28.
- (1989) 'Cross-References in the *Bibliothek Historike* of Diodoros', *Phoenix* 43: 39–61.
- (1998) 'Did Diodorus Siculus Take Over Cross-References from his Sources?', *AJPh* 119: 67–87.
- (2018) 'New and Old Approaches to Diodorus: Can they be Reconciled?', in Hau–Meeus–Sheridan (2018a) 13–39.
- Rutter, N. K. (2002) 'Syracusan Democracy: "Most like the Athenian"?'', in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson, edd., *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece* (Oxford) 137–51.
- Sacks, K. S. (1990) *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton).
- (2018) 'Diodoros of Sicily and the Hellenistic Mind', in Hau–Meeus–Sheridan (2018a) 43–64.
- Salmon, J. B. (1984) *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC* (Oxford).
- Sanders, L. J. (1981) 'Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius I of Syracuse', *Historia* 30: 394–411.

- Schirripa, P., M. C. Lentini, and F. Cordano (2012) 'Nuova geografia dell'ostracismo', *Acme* 129: 115–32.
- Smarczyk, B. (2003) *Timoleon und die Neugründung von Syrakus* (Göttingen).
- Sordi, M. (1977) 'Timeo e Atanide, fonti per le vicende di Timoleonte', *Athenaeum* 55: 239–49.
- (2005) 'L'egemonia beotica in Diodoro, libro XV', in C. Bearzot and F. Landucci, edd., *Diodoro e l'altra Grecia: Macedonia, Occidente, Ellenismo nella Biblioteca storica* (Milan) 3–15.
- Spoerri, W. (1959) *Späthellenistische berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter. Untersuchungen zu Diodor von Sizilien* (Basel).
- Stewart, D. (2018) 'From Leuktra to Nabis, 371–192', in A. Powell, ed., *A Companion to Sparta* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford) 374–402.
- Strauss, B. (1986) *Athens after the Peloponnesian War: Class, Faction and Policy 403–386 BC* (London).
- Stronk, J. (2017) *Semiramis' Legacy: The History of Persia According to Diodorus of Sicily* (Edinburgh).
- Stylianou, P. J. (1998) *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus, Book 15* (Oxford).
- Sulimani, I. (2011) *Diodorus' Mythistory and the Pagan Mission: Historiography and Culture-Heroes in the First Pentad of the Bibliothek* (Leiden).
- Talbert, R. J. A. (1974) *Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily: 344–317 BC* (Cambridge).
- Thomas, R. (2016) 'Performance, Audience Participation, and the Dynamics of Fourth-Century Assembly and Jury-Courts of Athens', in C. Tiersch, ed., *Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jh.: Zwischen Modernisierung und Tradition* (Stuttgart) 89–107.
- von Ungern-Sternberg, J. (2005) 'The Formation of the "Annalistic Tradition": The Example of the Decemvirate', in K. A. Raaflaub, ed., *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders<sup>2</sup>* (Malden, Mass.) 75–97.
- Vattuone, R. (1991) *Sapienza d'Occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenio* (Bologna).
- (2002) 'Timeo di Tauromenio', in R. Vattuone, ed., *Storici greci d'Occidente* (Bologna) 177–232.
- Volquardsen, C. A. (1868) *Untersuchungen über die Quellen der griechischen und sicilischen Geschichten bei Diodor, Buch XI bis XVI* (Kiel).
- Węcowski, M. (2022) *Athenian Ostracism and its Original Purpose. A Prisoner's Dilemma* (Oxford).
- Whitehead, D. (1983) 'Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: Φιλοτιμία in Democratic Athens', *C&M* 34: 55–74.



Wiater, N. (2006) 'Geschichtsschreibung und Kompilation: Diodors historiographische Arbeitsmethode und seine Vorstellungen von zeitgemässer Geschichtsschreibung', *RhM* 149: 248–71.