

Binghamton University

The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB)

Graduate Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations, Theses and Capstones

1972

In the shadow of Macedon: an historiographical study of Duris of Samos

Robert B. Kebric

Binghamton University--SUNY

Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/dissertation_and_theses

Recommended Citation

Kebric, Robert B., "In the shadow of Macedon: an historiographical study of Duris of Samos" (1972). *Graduate Dissertations and Theses*. 100.

https://orb.binghamton.edu/dissertation_and_theses/100

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations, Theses and Capstones at The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.

R. B. KEBRIC

IN THE SHADOW OF MACEDON:
AN HISTORIOGRAPHICAL STUDY
OF DURIS OF SAMOS

R. B. KEBRIC

Ph. D. THESIS

1973

*AS
36
N 55
no. 49

IN THE SHADOW OF MACEDON:
AN HISTORIOGRAPHICAL STUDY
OF
DURIS OF SAMOS

BY
ROBERT B. KEBRIC

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in State University of New York
at Binghamton
1972

* AS
36
N55
no.49



3 9091 01275746 8

Robert Barnett Kebric 1972
All Rights Reserved

Accepted by artist for all part of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Fine Arts in State University of New York at Binghamton.

Robert B. Kebric	<i>[Signature]</i>	Nov. 15, 1972
Robert B. Kebric	<i>[Signature]</i>	Nov. 15, 1972
Robert B. Kebric	<i>[Signature]</i>	Nov. 15, 1972

353363

Accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in State University of New York at Binghamton.

Thomas W. Africa	<u>Thomas W. Africa</u>	Nov. 15, 1972
Gerald E. Kadish	<u>Gerald E. Kadish</u>	Nov. 15, 1972
Saul Levin	<u>Saul Levin</u>	Nov. 15, 1972

PREFACE

No one need be reminded of the formidable obstacles confronting the study of the Hellenistic world. From one of the most complex and fascinating periods in history, Polybius is the only chronicler to survive in quantity. Even Diodorus, who preserves so much of his predecessors' work, breaks into fragments on the verge of the battle of Ipsus in 301. Nonetheless, the efforts to restore this vibrant era and place it in proper perspective must continue.

The historian Duris of Samos remains one of the many enigmas which characterize this difficult period. There has long been a need for a thorough study of his life and writings. The contributions made to date have rarely been comprehensive or conclusive. For some, an exhaustive analysis of a subject about which so little is known may have questionable value. Admittedly, almost nothing may be said about Duris with certainty. But as a major historian of his own time, Duris cannot be idly brushed aside by skeptics. He demands attention. While there is not much hope of his "rediscovery" from the fragments, whatever may be reasonably reconstructed from the scanty remains is valuable. It not only sparks the continuing debate on the merit and character of Duris by presenting new ideas for examination, but it may add significantly to the knowledge of the Hellenistic period. Ultimately, this latter consideration could prove to be the most important result of studying Duris.

This investigation is designed primarily to divert the focus of

Durian scholarship away from the Peripatetic school, which has dominated the discussion of the Hellenistic historian, and to concentrate on the total historical circumstances of which Duris' education was only one very important phase. As might be expected, Duris' best known work, the Macedonian History, is given the greatest emphasis, particularly the part which treated the period of the historian's adult life. The most important problems concerning the minor works, especially the Agathocles biography and the Samian Chronicle, will be considered in the overall analysis. Because of the nature of the study, much of the content is speculative and should be constantly regarded as such.

The author would like to express his deep appreciation to Dr. Thomas W. Africa for his years of guidance and helpful suggestions; Dr. Saul Levin for his very valuable assistance; Dr. Michael Mittelstadt; and Dr. Gerald E. Kadish; all of whom the author has come to regard not only as teachers but as friends. Finally, the author wishes to express his gratitude to his wife, Judy, for her enthusiasm and encouragement.

R.B.K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. AN INTRODUCTION TO DURIS.....	1
II. THE CHARACTER AND ATTITUDES OF DURIS.....	18
III. THE <u>MACEDONIAN HISTORY</u>	35
IV. THE <u>AGATHOCLES</u> AND THE <u>SAMIAN CHRONICLE</u>	55
V. CONCLUSION.....	68
NOTES.....	71
APPENDIXES.....	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	111

CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION TO DURIS

The internecine quarrels of fourth century Hellas rendered the Greeks conveniently susceptible to control by a foreign power. Bankrupt by deficiencies in man power and funds, no city-state could firmly assert itself, and Persian gold, more often than not, decided their success or failure. As a result of the confusion, it was not difficult for Philip of Macedon and his son Alexander to subdue the disorganized Greeks. Viewed as a temporary evil at first, the Macedonians soon demonstrated that they were there to stay as the rule of the Successors followed the reigns of Philip and Alexander. Whether the Greeks liked it or not, their world had become Macedonian.

Because he recorded the history of these difficult times, Duris of Samos stands out as a significant individual. Having watched and experienced the Macedonian occupation of the Greek world, his work, had it survived, might have provided valuable insights into the much misunderstood period. As it is, only a few fragments are left from which the value of his contribution can be judged, and, on the strength of this evidence, critics have been quick to condemn him. Any attempt to understand Duris and his writings necessarily begins with the particulars of his life.

Duris' father was Kaios, who, like his son, was tyrant of Samos.¹ He had two brothers, Lynceus, the comic poet,² and Lysagoras.³ The claim that he was a descendant (ἀπὸγονος) of Alcibiades,⁴ if true,

extends the knowledge of his family back to the late fifth century. Alcibiades had used Samos as a base of operations for several years after 411. The possibility that he fathered a child there is strong. His amorous adventures, though certainly exaggerated, are well attested.⁵ The most famous was the seduction of Timaea, wife of King Agis.⁶ Although some scholars doubt the story,⁷ Duris believed it and recorded it.⁸ His interest in the affair and his report that Alcibiades seduced the queen so that his descendants would rule Sparta suggests that Duris' ancestor on Samos could have been the result of a similar union. However, this is not conclusive. If Duris was claiming legitimate descent from Alcibiades, he might have been rationalizing what seemed to be another embarrassing example of the latter's excesses. Alcibiades' motivation in seducing the queen, then, would not have been lust but a deliberate attempt to establish his descendants in power at Sparta.⁹ Duris also may have been alluding proudly to the indirect relation of his family to the "old Sparta" through Alcibiades. The result of the union was Leotychides, who almost became king. Frustrated by his own age, Duris, like many of his contemporaries, probably sought comfort in the security of the past. Whichever interpretation is fact, Alcibiades' excessive nature has led some such as Jacoby¹⁰ to suspect that the first explanation is correct-- if there were ties with Alcibiades, they must have been illegitimate. Such a view is more the result of modern moral propriety than evidence. What illegitimacy meant to the Greeks is still an open question. There are indications that the relationship between Alcibiades and a Samian woman could have been respectable. He may have remarried since his wife Hipparete, the daughter of Hipponicus, had died some years before.¹¹ If he did not formally remarry, the lack of scan-

dalous stories, which were usually collected and served as propaganda for his enemies¹² (many Athenians were on Samos to witness his movements), argues that the manner of his proposed cohabitation with the woman was not considered controversial-- therefore "legitimate" in the eyes of the Greeks.¹³

In the years after Alcibiades' sojourn on Samos and the Peloponnesian War, the island continued to be involved in Athenian and Spartan politics.¹⁴ But the Peace of Antalcidas in 386 confined its sphere of activity which had already been declining,¹⁵ and eventually Samos fell under Persian influence.¹⁶ Timotheus expelled the Persians and seized the island for Athens in 366/5.¹⁷ Apparently, the Athenians considered Samos a prize of war, and, perhaps recalling its Spartan sympathies before the Peace,¹⁸ exiled the Samians and established a cleruchy.¹⁹

Where Duris' family spent the exile is uncertain. There are indications which suggest Sicily. At least two Samian decrees from the post-exilic period honor Sicilians for services rendered.²⁰ Consequently, some of the islanders must have sought refuge there. Another decree mentions an Agathocles, who might have been the tyrant of Syracuse.²¹ If Agathocles did assist the Samians, then this action and perhaps a personal knowledge of the tyrant may have been stimuli for Duris' history of Agathocles. The crucial argument for placing his family in Sicily, however, rests on an honorary decree which was proposed by Lysagoras, the brother of Duris. It celebrates a certain Epinoides of Heracleia.²² There were several cities named Heracleia accessible to the Samians, and the inscription does not distinguish which was the home of Epinoides. One was a prominent city in Sicily. Since other Samians were in the area, the chances that Epinoides was from Sicilian Heracleia

are strong. If it is accepted that Lysagoras, as proposer of the decree, had a personal interest in seeing that Epinoides was duly honored, the link can be established with Sicily. In support of such a theory, the origin of Duris' father's name, Kaios, may be helpful. The name is unique.²³ Kaios could be a corruption of, or possibly common Italian for the Roman name Caius.²⁴ Since Roman influence was generally confined to Italy at the time of the exile, the name Kaios most likely originated in the West.²⁵ The evidence at least warrants the proposal that Sicily was the family's refuge during the exile.

The Samians returned to the island in 321 after Perdiccas had enforced Alexander's original decree to restore all exiles.²⁶ It was soon apparent that they could not survive Hellenistic power-politics without assistance. The Athenians had grudgingly relinquished Samos,²⁷ and within a few years Polyperchon, regent for Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV, gave it back to them.²⁸ Samian contact with Antigonos may have begun as early as 321,²⁹ but Polyperchon's edict of 319 must have guaranteed their relationship. Antigonos had become master of Asia, declaring himself independent of the kings. He was the logical choice to protect Samian interests and could use the strategic position of the island and its harbor to his advantage. The role of "protector" also had propaganda value. Antigonos' policy of keeping the Greeks "free"³⁰ was often demonstrated by aiding Samos, and there are honorary decrees which cite him, his son Demetrius and their agents.³¹ The Samians established a double festival for the two men, and named one of their tribes, Demetrias.³² Samians also served on Antigonos' staff. An officer, Themison, was with the Macedonians in 315, and commanded ships in Demetrius' great naval battle with Ptolemy in 306.³³

The apparent close relationship between Samos and the Antigonids³⁴ helps clarify another aspect of Duris' life. Athenaeus records that Duris and his brother Lynceus traveled to Athens to study under Theophrastus.³⁵ Lynceus, at least, became an intimate friend of the Peripatetic scholar.³⁶ However, the circumstances under which they came to Athens and the date of their arrival remain obscure. While there is no information about Duris, Lynceus has left several important impressions of his stay in Athens. He had attended Antigonus' banquet which celebrated the festival of Aphrodite at Athens and had also been a guest at the dinner that Lamia, the mistress of Demetrius, had given for the king.³⁷ Since Demetrius had "freed" Athens in 307, Duris and Lynceus probably arrived there not much later.³⁸ The liberal atmosphere of the Lyceum with the patronage of Demetrius of Phalerum, Cassander's puppet in Athens, might have offered the brothers security at an earlier time, but other factors support a date after 307. The Athenians were hostile toward Samos, and there is inscriptional evidence that they may have attacked the island not long before 307.³⁹ If they did, it seems doubtful that Duris and Lynceus, whose father was certainly powerful on Samos, if not tyrant, would have considered it safe to go to Athens until after its capture by their "benefactors." It also seems unlikely that the brothers would have been in the city during Demetrius' assault. Assuming that Duris did go to Athens after 307, a firmer date for his birth may be postulated. He was probably older than Lynceus because he succeeded his father as tyrant and had been given his grandfather's name, Duris.⁴⁰ But he certainly could not have been much older than 25. This was beyond the age at which he might have been expected to begin his higher education. Presuming that he did arrive in Athens ca. 307/6

and that he was 25, he would have been born ca. 332/1.⁴¹ A discrepancy of several years in either direction must be allowed.

Sometime after Duris returned from Athens, he replaced his father as tyrant of Samos. There are no outward signs of tyranny on the island, and without the evidence from Athenaeus, Pausanias and the Suda,⁴² its existence would be unknown. Inscriptional and numismatic sources from the post-exilic period mention magistrates,⁴³ boule, prytany and the demos, which suggests a democracy. This is understandable since tyranny had bad connotations. It was advisable for the tyrant to underplay rather than emphasize his position. A closer inspection reveals that the Samian government may have been a form of plutocracy, perhaps a timocracy. After so long an exile, most of the people who returned to Samos must have had something to gain. These were the old landowners. Naturally, some of the poorer classes could have returned, but most of them had undoubtedly started new lives elsewhere. Thus, the majority of returnees would have favored a rule by the wealthy. Furthermore, plutocracy may have been implied in the decree that restored the exiles since its institution seems to have become a policy with the Macedonians. After the Lamian War in 321, Antipater changed the Athenian government from a democracy to one based on wealth.⁴⁴ All who did not meet the minimum requirement of 2,000 drachmas were removed from the body of citizens. Similar reforms seem to have taken place in other cities,⁴⁵ and in the same year, Perdiccas restored the Samians.⁴⁶ The implications are clear. That tyranny could exist within a form of plutocracy at this time is demonstrated by Demetrius of Phalerum. After 318, though responsible to Cassander, he "supervised" an Athenian government which consisted of citizens worth at least ten minae.⁴⁷

While this may explain the nature of the Samian government, it neither demonstrates the circumstances nor the date of Kaios' tyranny. If Schwartz' supplement to the corrupt Pausanias passage recaptures the original sense,⁴⁸ Kaios may have been raised voluntarily, perhaps as a result of his Olympic victory.⁴⁹ The examples of Cylon and Milo of Croton suffice to illustrate connections between Olympic victors and politics. Since Kaios' triumph had occurred during the exile, it would have had special meaning for the Samians-- one of the few bright spots in a frustrating period. Many problems had to be faced upon the return to the island. Leadership and land distribution were undoubtedly among the most important. After over 40 years of Athenian occupation, property rights must have been an issue. What records there were had probably been lost, and a large number of the returnees would have been a generation removed from the original exiles. Thus, it might be presumed that Kaios, an aristocrat and most renowned of the Samians, was chosen to arbitrate such matters. He also would have been the likely candidate for military leadership.⁵⁰ Once established in a position of authority, Kaios could have become the acknowledged "political boss" of the island, and confirmed as such when relations with Antigonos began. The processes of the plutocracy would have functioned unhindered, while behind them stood Kaios, who really determined who would be elected and what was best for Samos. The high degree of repetition of magistrate's names on the scanty inscriptional and numismatic remains⁵¹ perhaps indicates the tight hold of Kaios' "party" on Samian politics.

Kaios still could have been in power near the end of the fourth century when Duris issued a hemidrachm.⁵² The issue of a smaller denomination coin seems an inappropriate action for a tyrant, but a fitting

one for an official of government-- a position which his brother Lysagoras had presumably filled also late in the century.⁵³ However, this information is so vague that it is of little help in determining a transitional date of the tyranny from father to son (if it was a direct transition). What effect the battle of Ipsus in 301 had on the tyranny, when Antigonus was killed and Demetrius severely weakened, also remains a question. Perhaps Samos experienced several years of complete independence and Kaios or Duris became firmly entrenched as undisputed ruler of the island. Priene had gained a tyrant at this time.⁵⁴ Then too, a power struggle could have ensued in which Kaios or his son defeated the opposition and solidified the tyranny. The most logical assumption may be that very little changed on Samos after 301, and Demetrius continued to exert his influence there. He did not lose all his eastern Mediterranean possessions, and the strategic harbor at Samos may have been particularly important to him. The only concrete fact for the period after 301 is that by 283/2, Lysimachus had assumed responsibility for Samos.⁵⁵ In that year, he interceded in a land dispute between the Samians and Priene. How and when he gained his authority over Samos is unknown.⁵⁶ Whether it followed a brief period of independence for Samos, or came as a direct result of detaching the island from Demetrius, Duris' tyranny could have remained intact. If it did continue to flourish under Lysimachus,⁵⁷ it is doubtful that it survived long after his death in 281. The island became the possession of Ptolemy II.⁵⁸ Duris may have seen his tyranny fall with Lysimachus, whose demise was rapidly followed by that of Seleucus, ending the period of the Successors. This combination of events, the end of his tyranny and the end of an epoch, could have prompted Duris' most famous work, the Macedonian History.⁵⁹

These later years certainly distressed Duris, whose patriotic feelings for Samos are without question.⁶⁰ From the time he returned to the island as a boy in 321, he saw his homeland gradually swallowed up by Macedon. Although Antigonus, Demetrius and later Lysimachus "protected" Samos, they were protecting it from other Macedonians and looking after their own interests. Duris must have resented their presence as did many others throughout Hellas. Perhaps, at one time, he hoped to emulate the success of Agathocles' tyranny in the West. Ultimately, Duris stood by helplessly as Samos became a pawn in international politics. Virtually a foreigner in his own land, he undoubtedly blamed the Macedonians for his own failings and those of Hellas and reflected upon "better" days. Doubtless, he died a disillusioned man.

In addition to the Macedonian History and the biography of Agathocles, Duris wrote a Samian chronicle and works on tragedy, Euripides and Sophocles, Homeric problems, painting, customs (*Περὶ νόμων*), contests (*Περὶ ἀγώνων*), and engraving (*Περὶ τορευτικῆς*). A Libyan history is also mentioned which Jacoby correctly identifies as a part of the Agathocles biography.⁶¹ The tyrant campaigned in Africa for several years after 310, and the material cited as coming from the second book of the Libyan history is repeated in Diodorus' account of Agathocles' Libyan expedition.⁶² The questionable history is probably a confused reference to the second book of the Agathocles, which appears to have dealt exclusively with Libya. The only other fragment from Book II contains information about the Libyan flute.⁶³ Since the source for the existence of the Libyan history is very late (Photius-Suda), the second or Libyan book of Duris' Agathocles may have become separated

from the main work and circulated independently. It was not unusual for epitomizers to reduce larger works to digest form, nor for compilers to combine different writers' treatments of similar topics under a common title.⁶⁴ This would not be the only case of such a thing happening to Duris since Pliny attributes writings to him on monstrous births, dogs, trees and pyramids-- all unlikely subjects for a monograph.⁶⁵

The unmistakable remains of Duris have been preserved by many writers. In the first century B.C., Cicero defended his ability as an historian, but the Alexandrian scholar Didymus discredited his account of the loss of King Philip's eye. Diodorus Siculus incorporated tracts of Duris into his History, while Strabo consulted him concerning the etymology of the Rhagae in Media. By the end of the first century A.D., Pliny had used his authority for several topics. Plutarch cited data from Duris in the lives of Pericles, Alcibiades, Lysander, Agésilas, Alexander, Phocion, Eumenes, Demosthenes, Demetrius and Pyrrhus, and Zenobius, who lived under Hadrian, borrowed proverbs. Clement of Alexandria was familiar with Duris, and Athenaeus, writing in the third century, lifted colorful anecdotes and vivid descriptions of famous people. The lexicographer Harpocration found him valuable as did Diogenes Laertius and Porphyry, who read Duris for details about philosophers. In the fifth century A.D., Proclus chided Duris for his criticism of Plato, and Stephen of Byzantium, probably living in the sixth century, extracted information about Samos, Egypt and Sicily. Photius knew his work in the ninth century, and he was employed by numerous scholiasts, including Tzetzes in the twelfth century. Whether by direct or indirect transmission, Duris' writings enjoyed attention for more than 1300 years.

While this list demonstrates that assorted writers used Duris over

an extended period of time, it helps little in determining the quality of his works-- particularly the histories. A handful of fragments salvaged by a variety of writers, each with different motivation and standard of criticism, is hardly a strong indication of Duris' original designs. Unfortunately, these remains, no matter how distorted, and several disappointing ancient remarks must constitute the criteria on which the conclusion about Duris' merits rest.

It is encouraging to discover that Phylarchus, the major source for the period 272-220 B.C., appears to have consulted Duris about the Successors of Alexander.⁶⁶ Agatharchides, the second century geographer and historian, also seems to have used him.⁶⁷ Nonetheless, Polybius, the most prominent of the Hellenistic historians, does not even mention his name. Duris could have been cited in a lost portion of Polybius' work, but it seems likely that if he were discussed at all, it would have been in relation to Polybius' violent polemic against Phylarchus. Both Duris and Phylarchus had similar views on the writing of history. Polybius regarded Phylarchus' account of the Cleomenic Wars as deliberately sensational and emotional, and strongly voiced his disapproval of his histrionic approach:

δεῖ τοιγαροῦν οὐκ ἐκπλήττειν τὸν συγγραφέα
 τερατευόμενον διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας
 οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐνδεχομένους λόγους ζητεῖν καὶ τὰ
 παρεπόμενα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι,
 καθάπερ οἱ τραγωδιογράφοι, τῶν δὲ πραχθέντων καὶ
 ῥηθέντων κατ' ἀλήθειαν αὐτῶν μνημονεύειν πάνταν,
 κἂν πάνυ μέτρια τυγχάνωσιν ὄντα. τὸ γὰρ τέλος
 ἱστορίας καὶ τραγωδίας οὐ ταῦτόν, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον.
 ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ δεῖ διὰ τῶν πιθανωτάτων λόγων
 ἐκπλήξαι καὶ ψυχαγωγῆσαι κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τοὺς
 ἀκούοντας, ἐνθάδε δὲ διὰ τῶν ἀληθινῶν ἔργων καὶ
 λόγων εἰς τὸν πάντα χρόνον διδάξαι καὶ πείσαι
 τοὺς φιλομαθοῦντας, ἐπειδὴ περ ἐν ἐκείνοις μὲν
 ἡγεῖται τὸ πιθανόν, κἂν ἢ ψεῦδος, διὰ τὴν ἀπάτην
 τῶν θεωμένων, ἐν δὲ τούτοις τἀληθὲς διὰ τὴν
 ὠφέλειαν τῶν φιλομαθοῦντων. χωρὶς τε τούτων τὰς

πλείστας ἡμῖν ἐξηγεῖται τῶν περιπετειῶν, οὐχ
 ὑποτιθεῖς αἰτίαν καὶ τρόπον τοῖς γινόμενοις,
 ὧν χωρὶς οὐτ' ἐλεεῖν εὐλόγως οὐτ' ὀργίζεσθαι
 καθηκόντως δυνατὸν ἐπ' οὐδενὶ τῶν συμβαινόντων.⁶⁸

Other comments throughout the History confirm Polybius' distaste for "tragic history,"⁶⁹ but his opinion should not be taken as definitive. He himself could not escape the influence of "tragic history" or the natural inclination to write it. Strabo accused him of trying to arouse pity in his readers,⁷⁰ and several passages from the History are reminiscent of the best of the "tragic historians."⁷¹ How Phylarchus wrote probably did not concern Polybius so much as what he wrote. Polybius had personal reasons for hating the Spartan apologist and these are the more logical causes for the harangue. As historian of the abortive revolution of Cleomenes, Phylarchus vexed Polybius, a strong supporter of the Achaean League.⁷² The League had been Cleomenes' foremost enemy in his attempt to control the Peloponnesus, and Polybius could not stomach an account which glorified the Spartan reformer. Adopting the pro-Achaean version of the same period by Aratus of Sicyon, Polybius was obliged to discredit Phylarchus so that the "true" story of the affair could be disclosed.

Since it was not specifically "tragic history" that motivated Polybius' polemic against Phylarchus, he should not be expected to have mentioned Duris, even though he had probably read him.⁷³ Polybius also failed to cite an historian much closer to his ideals of historical composition, Hieronymus of Cardia, whose History covered approximately the same period as that of Duris. It was probably the limited scope of Duris' histories and their lack of pertinence to Polybius that resulted in the omission of his name.

In the first century B.C., Didymus, the erudite Alexandrian,

sounded the first note of discord when he accused Duris of indulging in marvels.⁷⁴ Conversely, a more renowned critic, Cicero, had pronounced him a "homo in historia diligens."⁷⁵ Cicero's familiarity with Duris demonstrates that he was still in vogue in the literary circles of Rome, but his compliment may confirm rather than discourage the charge of Didymus-- if Cicero's feelings on how history should be written are reflected in his letter to Luceius. Considering his own career a drama filled with acts and scenes,⁷⁶ Cicero wrote Luceius that he should immortalize his role as saviour of the Republic:

Itaque te plane etiam atque etiam rogo, ut et ornes ea vehementius etiam, quam fortasse sentis, et in eo leges historiae neglegas...eam si me tibi vehementius commendabit, ne aspernere, amorique nostro plusculum etiam, quam concedat veritas, largiare.⁷⁷

Other ancient criticisms further confuse the issue of Duris' merits. The style-conscious Dionysius of Halicarnassus indiscriminately lumped Duris with Polybius, Hieronymus and many others whose approaches to history were entirely different, and censured them all.⁷⁸ Plutarch, in his Pericles, assails Duris rabidly for distorting the truth,⁷⁹ yet he consulted him in nine other biographies and probably based the Demetrius on his account. In the fourth century A.D., Himerius found no distinction between Duris, Hellanicus and the man from Halicarnassus (Herodotus)⁸⁰ and considered them all of little worth.⁸¹ Photius charged Duris with the same faults that he had found in others.⁸²

It would be foolhardy to deduce the value of Duris solely from these testimonies. Indeed, if the comments of Dionysius and Himerius about Polybius and Herodotus were all that survived, their actual quality would not be known. The scant 96 fragments from Duris' vast corpus of works may be misleading, although several of the more impressive remains are at least reason for questioning his idea of history. Duris'

description of Alcibiades' arrival in Athens has all the paraphernalia of a great stage play:

“Α δὲ Δοῦρις ὁ Σάμιος...προστίθησι τοῦτοις, αὐλεῖν μὲν εἰρεσίαν τοῖς ἐλαύνουσι Χρυσόγονον τὸν πυθιονίκην, κελεύειν δὲ Καλλιππίδην τὸν τῶν τραγωιδῶν ὑποκριτὴν, στατοῦς καὶ ξυστίδας καὶ τὸν ἄλλον ἐναγώνιον ἀμπεχομένους κόσμον, ἵστίῳ δ' ἀλουργῶ τὴν ναυαρχίδα προσφέρεισθαι τοῖς λιμέσιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ μέθης ἐπικωμάζοντος...⁸³

The costume of Demetrius Poliorcetes is nothing less than fantastic:

...τὴν μὲν γὰρ ὑπόδεσιν ἦν εἶχεν κατεσκεύαζεν ἐκ πολλοῦ δαπανήματος. ἦν γὰρ κατὰ μὲν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἐργασίας σχεδὸν ἐμβάτης πύλημα λαμβάνων τῆς πολυτελεστάτης πορφύρας. τοῦτω δὲ χρυσοῦ πολλὴν ἐνύφαινον ποικιλίαν ὀπίσω καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐνιέντες οἱ τεχνῖται. αἱ δὲ χλαμύδες αὐτοῦ ἦσαν ὄρνυον ἔχουσαι τὸ φέγγος τῆς χρῶας, τὸ δὲ πᾶν ἐνύφαντο χρυσοῦς ἀστέρας ἔχον καὶ τὰ δώδεκα ζῳδία. μίτρα δὲ χρυσόπαστος ἦν, ἥ καυσίαν ἀλουργῇ οὔσαν ἔσφιγγεν, ἐπὶ τὸ νῶτον φέρουσα τὰ τελευταῖα καταβλήματα τῶν ὑφασμάτων. γινομένων δὲ τῶν Δημητρίων Ἀθηνησιν ἐγράφετο ἐπὶ τοῦ προσκηνίου ἐπὶ τῆς Οἴκουμένης ὀχοῦμενος.⁸⁴

And few could match the extravagance of Demetrius of Phalerum:

Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς, ὥς φησι Δοῦρις...χιλίσων καὶ διακοσίων ταλάντων κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν κύριος γενόμενος καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων βραχέα δαπανῶν εἰς τοὺς στρατιώτας καὶ τὴν τῆς πόλεως διοίκησιν τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα διὰ τὴν ἐμφυτον ἀκрасίαν ἠφάνιζεν, θοίνας καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν λαμπρὰς ἐπιτελῶν καὶ πλήθος τι συνδείπνων ἔχων. καὶ ταῖς μὲν δαπάναις ταῖς εἰς τὰ δεῖπνα τοῦ Μακεδόνα ὑπερέβαλλε, τῇ δὲ καθαρειότητι Κυπρίους καὶ Φοίνικας. ῥάσματα τε μύρων ἐπιπτεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἀνθινὰ τε πολλὰ τῶν ἑδαφῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν κατεσκευάζετο διαπεποικιλμένα ὑπὸ δημιουργῶν. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς γυναῖκας ὁμιλῖαι σιωπῶμεναι καὶ νεανίσκων ἔρωτες νυκτερινοί, καὶ ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις τιθέμενος θεσμοὺς Δημήτριος καὶ τοὺς βίους τάτων ἀνομοθέτητον ἑαυτῷ τὸν βίον κατεσκεύαζεν. ἐπεμελεῖτο δὲ καὶ τῆς ὄψεως, τὴν τε τρίχα τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ξανθίζόμενος καὶ παιδέρῳτι τὸ πρόσωπον ὑπαλειφόμενος καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀλείμμασιν ἐγχρίων ἑαυτόν. ἠβούλετο γὰρ τὴν ὄψιν ἰλαρὸς καὶ τοῖς ἀπαντῶσιν ἡδὺς φαίνεσθαι. ἐν δὲ τῇ πομπῇ τῶν Διονυσίων ἦν ἐπεμψεν ἄρχων γενόμενος, ἦδεν ὁ χορὸς εἰς αὐτὸν ποιήματα Καστορίωνος τοῦ Σολέως, ἐν οἷς ἡλιδόμορφος προσηγορεύετο.

ἔξοχος δ' εὐγενέτας ἡλιδόμορφος ζαθεοῖσ' ἄρχων
σε τιμαῖσι γεραίρει.⁸⁵

There were instances in his histories, however, which suggest that Duris was not entirely uncritical of his source material. Unlike most historians, he refused to believe that Alexander met the queen of the Amazons.⁸⁶ Duris also rejected Ctesias' phenomenal account of the death of Sardanapalus, attributing it more reasonably to the hand of an outraged Mede disgusted with the king's extravagances.⁸⁷ Such examples are useful in demonstrating that caution must be exercised before making "obvious" conclusions about the ability of Duris.

The apparent sensational and dramatic style of Duris and others like him has been labeled "tragic history." Such a vague term is unfortunate and Walbank's warning that it not be defined too rigidly remains wise counsel.⁸⁸ In general, "tragic history" has many of the qualities of tragedy. Heroes and heroines, reversals of fortune, moral lessons, elaborate costumes and scenery are all part of the fabric. Like the tragedians, the "tragic historian's" aim was not factual representation. His desire was to revitalize the past by emotionally involving his audience so that they could experience vicariously the events he described. While "tragic history" does have these identifying characteristics, it would be a mistake to isolate it from Greek historiographical tradition. Too often, it has been viewed as a unique phenomenon, and discussions of its origins have been directed toward philosophical rather than historiographical causes. Schwartz and, later, Scheller convinced themselves and others that Aristotle's literary theories and the Peripatetic school were responsible for "tragic history."⁸⁹ Aristotle's teaching was reversed and the distinction between poetry and history, so clearly represented in the *Poetics*,⁹⁰ was confused. The characteristics of poetry, particularly tragedy, were applied to history. Ullman, however, challenged such a theory and thought that he had found the origin of "tragic

history" in the school of Isocrates.⁹¹ He believed that Callisthenes had indeed adapted Aristotle's views on poetry to history but that he was following Isocrates' school since, according to Cicero, Callisthenes wrote history "rhetorico paene more."⁹² But Cicero's comment does not necessarily connect Callisthenes with the rhetorically-minded Isocrates, nor is rhetorical style an essential ingredient of "tragic history." The fallibility of these theories need not be discussed here since they have been ably refuted by Walbank.⁹³ It is ridiculous to conceive of a particular style of history emerging fully developed from either one of the two schools, and Wehrli and Giovanni are correct in interpreting "tragic history" as a normal aspect of Greek historiography.⁹⁴ From Homer and the earliest "historians" and poets, Herodotus inherited the tragic element. Like Aeschylus, he viewed the defeat of Xerxes as punishment for his *ὕβρις* and repeatedly noted the gods' unwillingness to tolerate excessive human behavior throughout his History. Croesus provoked his ruination by considering himself the most fortunate of men.⁹⁵ Cambyses slew the sacred Apis bull and guaranteed his miserable end.⁹⁶ Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos, knew his destruction was near when he opened the fish and found his ring.⁹⁷ A disillusioned Thucydides attributed moral causes to the fall of Athens, and Cornford, at least, viewed his History as a classic fifth-century tragedy.⁹⁸ Though generally reserved, Thucydides described the Athenian disaster at Syracuse in terms that would move any audience and probably inspired Polybius' account of Hannibal's crossing of the Rhone, which Walbank considers one of his most dramatic episodes.⁹⁹ The Athenians' race to save Mytilene after Diodotus reversed Cleon's death decree stirs the reader,¹⁰⁰ and artificial speeches throughout the narrative enliven the proceedings. Ctesias,

the court physician of Artaxerxes, hounded out sensational details to include in his History. Plutarch accused him of lingering over the gory particulars of Cyrus' death,¹⁰¹ and examples of intrigue and gossip characterize his fragments. Ctesias' description of Sardanapalus is strongly reminiscent of Duris' portrayal of Demetrius of Phalerum:

ὅτε δὴ οὖν Ἀρβάκης, εἷς τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν στρατηγῶν Μήδος γένος, διεπράξατο διὰ τίνος τῶν εὐνούχων Σπαραμείζου θεάσασθαι Σαρδανάπαλλον καὶ μόλις αὐτῷ ἐπετράπη ἐκείνου ἐβελήσαντος, ὡς εἰσελθὼν εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ Μήδος ἐψιμυθιωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον γυναικιστὶ καὶ μετὰ τῶν παλλακίδων ξαίνοντα πορφύραν ἀναβάδην τε μετ' αὐτῶν καθήμενον, τὰς ὀφρὺς μεμελασμένον, γυναικεῖαν δὲ στολὴν ἔχοντα καὶ κατεξυρημένον τὸν πῶγωνα καὶ κατακεκισηρισμένον (ἦν δὲ καὶ γάλακτος λευκότερος καὶ ὑπεγέγραπτο τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς) ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ προσ- εἶδεν τὸν Ἀρβάκην τὰ λευκὰ ἐπαναβαλὼν τοῖν ὀφθαλμοῖν...¹⁰²

There are many more examples, but these few suffice to demonstrate that "tragic history" existed long before Duris. It also becomes evident that there was not just one type of "tragic history," and it varied according to writer. In the Hellenistic period, the tragic element had become a dominant feature of many historians including Duris. Why he chose to write in the tragic manner can only be understood by examining his mentality and the influences upon him. What may have been a legitimate interpretation of history to Duris, may not have seemed so to later critics. If he is to be properly evaluated, it must be in context of the historical forces of his own time.

CHAPTER II

THE CHARACTER AND ATTITUDES OF DURIS

A reconstruction of the character and attitudes of Duris necessarily begins with his childhood. Raised in exile, Duris' youth was certainly filled with talk of Samos. As with any dislocated people, the Samians must have consoled one another. When friends met, the major topic of conversation was undoubtedly how and when they would be able to return home. Left with only memories, they were bound together by the past. Stories would have been retold about famous personages and folk heroes, who had made the Samian cultural tradition one of the richest in the Greek world. The important role that Samos had played in the vicissitudes of Greek history, especially in the later years of the Peloponnesian War, would have been recounted and glorified.

If Duris' father was a leader among the exiles, the emphasis on the Samian past would have been even stronger in his household. By the time he and his family returned to the island, Duris was at least old enough to have formed some definite impression about Samos. Unfortunately, it was an impression distorted by Samian hope. What Duris and others found on the island certainly did not meet their expectations. Some of the earliest returnees, perhaps including Duris' family, were captured by the Athenians and sent to Athens for execution.¹ Luckily, the sympathetic Antileon of Chalcis bribed Athenian officials to release them.² Once in possession of the island, food shortages³ and other problems plagued the Samians.⁴ They had just instituted an honorary

festival to Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV for returning their island,⁵ when they found that they were in danger of being driven into exile once more by Polyperchon's edict. Finally, their helplessness forced them to turn to Antigonus for "protection." The hopes of the Samians must have turned rapidly to frustration and disillusionment. Inheritors of a proud tradition, they found themselves a non-entity in a Macedonian world.

To maintain any identity in the "new world," the strong sense of oral patriotism preserved during the exile became even more crucial, and veneration of past achievements continued to be important. Such an outlook is reflected in the fragments of Duris' Samian Chronicle. Deprived of their self-determination, the landed citizenry of Samos must have turned to cultural pursuits to occupy their forced leisure. Kaios' position of power seems substantiated by the fact that his sons led the way to the cultural rejuvenation of Samos, a matter of importance to a leader in such disturbing times. The writings of Duris and Lynceus reflect the demoralizing tendencies of the age. Lynceus' fragments are full of his inconsequential experiences at lush banquets, his fondness for entertainment, and his love of the fine things of life. He speaks of the frequent drinking parties at his own house in Samos⁶ and also advocates dishonesty if one cannot obtain the objects one desires by conventional means.⁷ A possible friendship with Epicurus may account for his seemingly agnostic viewpoint.⁸ Duris' fragments constantly mirror his cognizance of extravagance and luxury, and the epigrams of two other famous Samians of the time, Asclepiades and Hedylus, are full of the "passions of life."

Even though both brothers appear to have drowned their discontents

in a lax life-style, in reality they may have been completely opposite personalities. Whereas Duris had chosen the tragedy of life as a primary interest, Lynceus had chosen comedy. Almost without exception, the latter's discourses on luxury and extravagance stemmed from his personal experiences. None of Duris' comments did. He seems to have been an observer in the true Peripatetic fashion, not a participant. If Duris did have any personal reminiscences on gastronomy and the like, they certainly would not have escaped the attention of Athenaeus, who was fascinated by the accounts of Lynceus.

Duris' apparent abstention suggests that he was a moralist. That this is true and that moralism was a strong motivation in his histories is indicated by the fragments. Instead of portraying his fellow Peripatetic Demetrius of Phalerum favorably, Duris condemned him for his extravagances.⁹ While he regulated the lives of others with laws that curbed immorality, Demetrius had engaged in the most outrageous acts. Duris accused him of squandering state funds on entertainment and banquets; of entering into homosexual relations; of having secret affairs with women; of disregarding the law; and of being vain. Duris' account that Arbaces, an outraged Mede, stabbed Sardanapalus to death may also reflect his moralist tendencies.¹⁰ Ctesias had recorded the king's death as a suicide.¹¹ Duris must have known the story but chose to ignore it. He may have viewed Arbaces, who was morally repulsed by the king's behavior, as the just instrument of death for the immoral ruler. The fantastic trappings of King Demetrius may have been recounted in minute detail to demonstrate the deterioration of his character.¹² Duris stated that his dress was far more ornate than that of other celebrities who had gained attention for their garb. These included Pausanias the

Spartan, who gave up his simple raiment to wear Persian dress; Dionysius the tyrant, who, like the tragic actors, assumed a mantle, robe and golden crown; and Alexander, who also wore Persian apparel. There is, in addition, the story that Pasicyprus lost his kingdom because of his extravagance;¹³ that the aged and respected Polyperchon made a fool of himself by dancing continually while drunk;¹⁴ and that all monarchs of ancient times drank heavily-- Agamemnon dying while drunk.¹⁵ Alexander entertained almost 6,000 men, seating them on silver chairs and couches spread with purple robes;¹⁶ Philip owned a valuable gold cup which he took to bed with him;¹⁷ and the Samians were not ignorant of luxury.¹⁸ The account of Alcibiades' seduction of Timaea also had possible moral overtones.¹⁹

It is noticeable that the most striking and numerous examples of extravagance are concerned with the Macedonians and their agents. Doubtless, Duris considered them excessive people. He had commented that the sumptuous banquets of Demetrius of Phalerum surpassed even those of the Macedonians.²⁰ In contrast, Greeks who suffered at the hands of the Macedonians or opposed them are treated favorably by Duris. One such Greek was Phocion, who had been executed by Cassander to make room for the puppet government of Demetrius. While portions of his career might be questioned, Phocion was generally regarded as a patriot and was being venerated as such in 304 when Duris was probably in Athens.²¹ In his biography, Plutarch portrays Phocion as a paragon of virtue. Duris seems to have regarded him likewise, noting Phocion's austere character and general excellence.²² Duris also appears to have esteemed Eumenes, who, as the only Greek involved in the struggles of the Successors, died fighting Antigonus.²³ He may have regarded Eumenes as the last hope for

Greek liberty. Arcadion the Achaean was featured because he was no flatterer of the Macedonians, especially not of Philip.²⁴ Following his victory over Philip's mercenaries, Chares of Athens held a feast and offered sacrifices.²⁵

The dichotomy between Greeks and Macedonians and the moralistic character of Duris' writings seem to indicate a deep sense of Hellenic patriotism and disgruntlement. He viewed the Macedonians as the cause of a troubled Hellas and saw their lack of restraint as weakening Greek moral fiber and character. In Athens he witnessed the victors of Marathon sing songs to Demetrius both in public and in private. Duris recorded with disgust that this was the stock that had once slain countless numbers of the barbarians.²⁶ If Greece was ever to be Greek again, a return to the moral behavior as exemplified by Phocion was necessary.

Because Duris was influenced by the rich cultural heritage of Samos while he was growing up, it is conceivable that many of his interests were formed before he came to Athens to study under Theophrastus. Duris' interest in tragedy may have been inspired by the works of the choral lyricists, Ibycus and Stesichorus, who worked at the court of Polycrates, and who were perhaps the most important forerunners of Greek tragedy. His knowledge of Sophocles and Euripides, about whom he wrote, certainly was not restricted to the Lyceum. The Samian festivals provided opportunities for the presentation of the great playwrights. Polus of Aegina, the most famous actor of his day, performed at Samos.²⁷ Agatharchus was a well-known fifth century Samian painter, who wrote a book about his craft. Duris undoubtedly referred to it for his own composition on painting. Theodorus, the renowned metal-craftsman from

Samos, wrote a volume which discussed material that Duris would have found useful for his publication on engraving. Pliny cited Duris as a source for his section on metals,²⁸ and the latter is probably responsible for the information about Theodorus included there.²⁹ Besides the general Ionic interest in Homeric tradition, Samos had boasted its own Homeric poet, Creophylus. Choerilus was an epic poet in the Homeric manner, and Duris claimed Panyasis, the last of the old epic poets and the uncle of Herodotus, as a Samian.³⁰ The writing of local history also had a tradition on Samos going back to the genealogical and quasi-historical accounts of Asius (?7th or 6th century B.C.), and included Eugeon, Semonides and others. Herodotus' brief stay on the island insured the tradition of international history at Samos, and Duris claimed him, too, as a native.³¹ It seems reasonable to propose that Duris chose the school of Theophrastus because it best represented his own interests.

The Peripatetic school also may have been sympathetic towards the Samians. In the Rhetoric,³² Aristotle cited the Athenian treatment of the island as an example to express a condition under which men should feel shame. Perhaps the destruction of his native city Stagirus and his own wanderings affected Aristotle's feelings toward Samos. A possible relationship between Aristotle and Antileon of Chalcis may be additional evidence to support the thesis of Peripatetic sympathy. Antileon, as will be remembered, purchased the freedom of the Samians who had been taken to Athens for execution. After Alexander's death, it became dangerous for Aristotle to remain in Athens. In 323, when the Samian question was still a "hot" issue, he moved to Chalcis where his mother had owned property. Aristotle had mentioned a tyrant of Chalcis named Antileon in the Politics.³³ It is not impossible that this

Antileon and the Antileon who helped the Samians are the same man. Since his family had owned property at Chalcis, Aristotle might have been acquainted with Antileon, who may have offered the fleeing scholar refuge at his court. Aristotle died the following year and not much later the Samians began returning to the island. Antileon's kindness to the exiles may have been the result of his friendship with Aristotle. Undoubtedly, much more would be known about Aristotle's feelings if his treatise on the Polity of the Samians, which he must have composed while the natives were in exile, had survived. Aristarchus, the most famous Samian of the succeeding generation, followed the example of Duris and Lynceus and received a Peripatetic education from Strato, Theophrastus' successor. This might suggest that there was more than just a casual relationship between the school and Samos.

Duris and Lynceus arrived in Athens at a time of great intellectual fervor. Not only was the Peripatetic school prospering and attracting as many as 2,000 students to lectures,³⁴ but also Epicurus had recently established the "Garden,"³⁵ and Menander, the greatest of the comic poets, was producing his finest works. Timaeus in his exile was arousing interest in the Sicilian tyrant Agathocles. The Atthidographers and other historians were weighing the events of the day to see what effect, if any, King Demetrius and the fickleness of Macedonian policy would have on their city and the world. While some intellectuals waited to make their judgments, the populace groveled before Demetrius and declared him and his father gods with all the appropriate ceremony and festivity. Patriots and conservatives remembered the old gods and institutions, while the more realistic turned to Tyche, whose power over men was

becoming increasingly recognizable. In no other city in the Hellenistic world were the problems that divided the old order from the new more pronounced.

Duris must have found others in Athens who felt as he did about the Macedonians. The historian Diyllus' views cannot be reconstructed with precision, but he at least noted the philanderings of Demetrius of Phalerum.³⁶ Demochares, the only other prominent Athenian chronicler of the period (aside from the Atthidographers), had notions similar to those postulated for Duris. Demochares was the nephew of Demosthenes, and he had risen to power after Demetrius had been driven out in 307. He was no lover of philosophy and supported the edict that had forced Theophrastus and other philosophers to leave the city for a short while.³⁷ In his History, which Cicero says was written in an oratorical style,³⁸ Demochares, like Duris, expressed anti-Macedonian sentiment and disgust for his weak and submissive countrymen. He considered Demosthenes' death a favor from the gods who had rescued him from the cruel Macedonians³⁹ and constantly strove to keep his memory as a patriot alive.⁴⁰ Bemoaning the current situation in the city, Demochares denounced Demetrius of Phalerum, whose procession had been led by a mechanical snail that spit, as a vulgar tax farmer.⁴¹ The Macedonian lackey had also ordered donkeys marched through the theater to demonstrate the impotence of the Athenians in face of Cassander's power.⁴² Demochares spoke contemptuously of the Athenian flattery for King Demetrius and recorded that Demetrius himself had commented that Athenian behavior toward him was disgraceful.⁴³ Athenaeus registered Demochares' description of the festivities which celebrated Demetrius' return to Athens in 291. It is significant that this is immediately followed by Duris' version of the

mummers' song sung to Demetrius at the same festival.⁴⁴ This may demonstrate a direct relationship between the two men's histories. While little of Demochares survives to make stronger textual comparisons, details such as the mechanical snail that spit certainly would have attracted Duris' attention. Demochares also wrote on Agathocles,⁴⁵ a topic of interest to Duris.

Among the Atthidographers, Duris' contemporaries Melanthius and Demon, who seems to have been a relative of Demosthenes and may have been associated with the Peripatetics, are of little help.⁴⁶ Almost nothing of their work survives. The greatest of the Athenian local historians, Philochorus, appears to have held views similar to Duris and Demochares. Described by Jacoby as a "religious conservative" and "patriot,"⁴⁷ Philochorus favored the old religion and customs of the city-state. He denounced the Macedonians and voiced his distaste for the conduct of King Demetrius.⁴⁸ It was undoubtedly these same anti-Macedonian sentiments that resulted in his death in the aftermath of the Chremonidean War.⁴⁹ Besides functioning as a religious official,⁵⁰ Philochorus was a scholar of wide interests. In addition to his Athenian history, he wrote at least 26 other works⁵¹ and, like Duris, dealt with subjects such as tragedy, Sophocles, Euripides and Homer. While there is no evidence that Philochorus was a Peripatetic,⁵² he had defended Aristotle against slanderous remarks,⁵³ which suggests that he may have been sympathetic with the school. The common interests and attitudes of Duris and Philochorus make some personal contact between the two in Athens likely, and Duris certainly would have consulted Philochorus' Atthis if it had been available to him.

Besides historians, philosophers also shared Duris' anti-

Macedonian views. Epicurus, born on Samos of parents participating in the Athenian cleruchy,⁵⁴ lost his home when the Macedonians returned the island to the natives. He became a wanderer until he settled in Athens where he witnessed the confusion that the "liberators" had caused. That Duris and Lynceus were in Athens when Epicurus opened his school and that they may have become friends was ironic since each party was indirectly responsible for the hardships of the other. A common friendship with Menander,⁵⁵ a common view of the "accursed Macedonians,"⁵⁶ and the passage of time undoubtedly soothed any feelings of animosity that might have existed. Although the Peripatetic school maintained a flexible policy which depended on the current political situation, it had been generally identified with the Macedonians. Nonetheless, it is probable that other members of the school shared Duris' dislike for the Macedonians and considered Hellas better off without the "new order." Theophrastus himself could not have appreciated his banishment from Athens, which never would have occurred without Demetrius' blessing, and he was certainly dismayed to watch the Macedonians destroy Aristotle's ideal political institution, the city-state.

Such attitudes undoubtedly comforted Duris during his stay in Athens, but what is more important, the interests which he had brought with him to the school were expanded and cast into the "Peripatetic" mode of expression. Many of the subjects on which he wrote had already been treated by other members of the school. In point of fact, there is very little in Duris, ridiculous or realistic, that was not characteristic of the writings of Aristotle and his students. This can be demonstrated without difficulty. While Duris spoke of a dolphin that fell in love with a boy⁵⁷ and a loyal dog that hurled himself into his master's

funeral pyre,⁵⁸ Clearchus of Soli reported that a peacock was so attracted to a maiden that it died when she did and that a goose fell in love with a boy.⁵⁹ Theophrastus added the boy's name and where his family came from.⁶⁰ Chamaeleon of Heraclea commented on flute-players including Callias, the brother-in-law of Alcibiades.⁶¹ In Athenaeus, Chamaeleon's remarks are immediately followed by Duris' story that Alcibiades had learned to play the flute from the reputable Pronomus.⁶² The musical theoretician and pupil of Aristotle, Aristoxenus, is cited in the same passage for additional information on the flute.⁶³ Duris' interest in the Nile was preceded by Aristotle's work On the Rising of the Nile,⁶⁴ and Clearchus had had occasion to speak of the river in conjunction with Psammetichus' quest to determine its source.⁶⁵ Dicaearchus was foremost in demonstrating the school's interest in geography and ethnic history. He also wrote on Thales, Bias and Pittacus as did Duris.⁶⁶ Both Phaenias⁶⁷ and Duris⁶⁸ borrowed stories about Delphi from Theopompus. Duris spoke of Indians who copulate with wild beasts,⁶⁹ and Aristotle described a people who had the left breast of a man and the right breast of a woman.⁷⁰ Members of the school penned accounts of fish raining for three days,⁷¹ of certain birds which emit semen at the sound of their mate's call,⁷² and of Pythagoras, who, in a previous incarnation, was a courtesan named Alco.⁷³ It was also written that Aeschylus composed his tragedies while drunk;⁷⁴ that a man was so opulent that he had not seen the sun rise or set for 20 years, being engaged in debauchery or sleep;⁷⁵ and that the powerful and wealthy naturally find refuge in wine.⁷⁶ Moralism and pleas for moderation generally characterized the Peripatetics' writings. The luxury of the Persians and flattery seemed to be favorite topics at the school.

Aside from these very few samplings which testify to the decidedly Peripatetic nature of Duris' writings, it is remarkable to find how closely his interests and mode of expression parallel those of Aristotle's pupil, Clearchus of Soli. Several examples have already been noted, but a closer examination of the fragments of the two men produces surprising results. Luxury, flattery, sensationalism, anecdotes, proverbs, fascination with individuals and other subjects are common in their writings. And their personal philosophies seem very close. Like Duris, Clearchus felt it necessary to expose the evils of luxury wherever he encountered them. His statement concerning people who become effeminate by improving their complexions and using scents ⁷⁷ recalls Duris' description of Demetrius of Phalerum. So too does the tale of King Midas, who, in his effeminate luxury, lounged in his purple robes or helped the women at their looms.⁷⁸ The Tarentines made their skins smooth, plucking out unsightly hair from their bodies and dressing in effeminate garments.⁷⁹ Both Duris and Clearchus revel in portraying various peoples as luxurious. Clearchus related that Darius had lost his kingdom because of his decadence.⁸⁰ Cantibaris the Persian, when his jaws tired, would have a servant pump food into his mouth.⁸¹ The luxury of Sardanapalus⁸² and even Polycrates,⁸³ the great tyrant of Samos, was noticed. Sagaris the Mariandynian was so dissipated that he had others chew his food for him and he never lowered his hand past his navel.⁸⁴ Clearchus had discussed the origin of the name flatterer and regarded those who practiced the dubious art with contempt.⁸⁵ Duris too registered his disgust, particularly over Athenian flattery for King Demetrius. Duris was accustomed to the Samian practice of honoring individuals as gods,⁸⁶ but flattery had caused Demetrius to transgress all limits of

modesty and had soured the honor.

Duris' belief that Aspasia was responsible for engaging all Greece in war,⁸⁷ his interest in Helen,⁸⁸ parks and gardens,⁸⁹ tombs⁹⁰ and wearing apparel⁹¹ are all paralleled in some degree in the fragments of Clearchus.⁹² Throughout the remains, there is also a plea for virtue and its rewards. Just as Duris had held up the character of Phocion for others to emulate, Clearchus referred his readers to Gorgias of Leontini, who lived in full possession of his senses almost 110 years because he was modest and virtuous.⁹³ In addition, there are several examples of what happens to those led astray by luxury and excessiveness. In an age which was rapidly turning to Tyche as the guiding force of life, it is interesting to note that Clearchus continued to believe in the tragic concept of hubris. A god of decency sent a fly to sting a lad who over-indulged.⁹⁴ Dionysius the Younger, in his insolence and pursuit of pleasure, summoned all the young girls of Locris and violated them.⁹⁵ Consequently, the girls' fathers got hold of Dionysius' wife and children and brutally assaulted them. Following tortures, they killed them, chopped up their bodies, and each tasted a portion of the flesh to demonstrate their unity in the deed. Not only did Dionysius' behavior cause the Locrians to pollute themselves, but he later died pitifully as a mendicant priest who carried a tambourine. The Tarentines, misguided by their extravagance, raped all the boys, girls and young women of Carbina.⁹⁶ The gods became so angered that they obliterated the guilty with a thunderbolt.

Clearchus' use of the tragic concept of hubris shows that the idea of god's punishment of insolence and excess was still strong for some in a doubting world. This is significant when trying to determine Duris'

religious attitudes for which no concrete evidence exists. It is likely that he too believed in the wrath of the gods. This seems reasonable since his ideas and Clearchus' on the evils of luxury and excess and the virtues of moderation are so much alike. Furthermore, Duris' study of tragedy and especially Sophocles, whose characters were so often reminded of the power of the gods, makes such a conclusion even more enticing. Herodotus, whose History is filled with the workings of hubris, was also a favorite of Duris.⁹⁷ Evidently, his examination of Euripides, in whose later plays tyche began to resemble the force which was expressed more fully by Demetrius of Phalerum and Menander, did not have a radical effect on Duris' more conservative views. For him tyche continued to embody its old meaning as "a great destiny, filled with divine forces, though lofty in its final unintelligibility, such as people face in tragedy."⁹⁸ It was not an ill-defined whimsical controlling force. The possibility also exists that Duris was a priest at Samos, since, like Philochorus,⁹⁹ religious matters attracted his attention.¹⁰⁰ As a member of a prominent family and tyrant of Samos, the role of priest could very well have been one of his functions.

The status of tragedy in the Hellenistic period may have contributed to the extensive use of hubris and other characteristics usually associated with that genre in historical writings. Since Duris was so interested in tragedy, he was probably more affected than others of his profession. History and tragedy had both arisen from a common source--epic poetry. While each was a distinct form with particular features, they shared certain elements. Both were generally didactic and contained human lessons. The contemporary themes in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, though couched in mythological terms, were nevertheless

historical phenomena, and Aeschylus' and Phrynichus' Persae are openly concerned with the Persian Wars. When the city-state became outmoded by the Hellenistic metropolis, both literary forms underwent change. While history was the more viable form, tragedy had difficulty in adjusting to the new circumstances. The three great playwrights of the fifth century were canonized and were preferred to all the new creations-- especially Euripides. The chorus, which had represented the collective community of the city-state, declined, then disappeared. Writers such as Diogenes the Cynic reduced tragedy to a purely literary form as a vehicle for philosophy, and Hellenistic tragic poets dealt with historical and contemporary themes in their plays. Philicus composed a tragedy entitled Themistocles, and Lycophron of Chalcis wrote the Cassandreis. All indications are that by the time of Duris, tragedy and history were moving closer together, and in many instances their separate characteristics were becoming blurred. Tragic poets had been used as sources by historians for some time, provoking Polybius' criticism,¹⁰¹ and Duris also incorporated them.

Duris' particular fascination with character delineation is indicative of the times, but owes much to the influence of tragedy. Since the Peloponnesian War, the emphasis on individualism had been growing steadily. The sculptor Lysippus, who was greatly admired by Duris and his countrymen,¹⁰² as well as other artists abandoned the "Classic" idealistic forms and turned instead to Nature for a model. The quest for realism led some to stress the grotesque side of human existence. The emphasis on the individual was also expressed by the increased interest in biography. Theopompus was the first historian to give a large place to biography, and among the Peripatetics Aristoxenus was

first to make anecdotes an essential ingredient of the genre.¹⁰³ To guarantee an audience, all sources of information, even fiction, were called upon to make the biographies appealing. "Types" in society such as the flatterer were carefully delineated in Theophrastus' Characters, and Menander provided more preceptive treatments of human nature. Duris' brother Lynceus also studied character in his comedies. But Duris had to deal with historical personages and capture their individuality. At the same time, the behavior of certain people recalled types depicted in tragedy. Physiognomy, the judgment of character from appearance, had become a popular science among the Peripatetics.¹⁰⁴ Gestures, facial expressions, voice, color, hair, complexion and other traits revealed a person's disposition. A hero or a coward could be easily recognized. The influence of physiognomy on Duris is indicated by his frequent remarks about how a man's dress, bearing or actions reminded him of tragic actors. Duris was a moralist, aware of god's punishment of insolence, and was disturbed by affairs in Hellas. It would not have been difficult for him to notice contemporary tragic situations and characters. Costume, too, was important in depicting disposition and this, no doubt, was why Duris described King Demetrius' trappings so thoroughly.¹⁰⁵ His dress was as extravagant as his actions. His footwear was of the costliest purple; gold patterns distinguished parts of his clothing; and a riding cloak had the stars of heaven and the signs of the zodiac woven into it. By his dress, Demetrius must have deemed himself as worthy to ride on the inhabited world as he was depicted as doing in a painting mentioned by Duris.¹⁰⁶ In a matter of time, the gods would move to secure his ruin.

Whether Duris inserted additional details to Demetrius' costume

to make him conform even more to the role of a tragic actor is difficult to determine. It is not impossible. For example, the dark-grey color of Demetrius' cloak was a color of mourning in tragedy¹⁰⁷ and perhaps hints at his coming misfortunes. Demetrius of Phalerum dyed his hair blond and put rouge on his face to appear more attractive.¹⁰⁸ Fair hair without ringlets and a palid complexion were attributes of a man wasted by disease.¹⁰⁹ Polyperchon, his downfall fast approaching, was clad in a saffron tunic,¹¹⁰ a common color for the mantles of tragic actors.¹¹¹ By applying such details, Duris could more accurately identify character types for his readers.

From the above, it appears that the expression of Duris' writings is mostly a result of his Peripatetic training. He was a scholar turned historian. The Agathocles, the Samian Chronicle and his greatest work, the Macedonian History, contain information which would have attracted the scholar of wide interests but would have been extraneous to a political historian such as Thucydides. When Duris encountered subjects that aroused his curiosity, he utilized all sources to explore each topic even at the expense of the narrative. Since the evidence does point so strongly to Duris' involvement with the practices of the Peripatetic school, the influence of the no longer existent treatises on historical composition by Theophrastus and Praxiphanes cannot be dismissed. However, Duris' inspiration was his own moral and political convictions, which arose mainly from his experiences on Samos.

CHAPTER III

THE MACEDONIAN HISTORY

Duris' motives for writing the Macedonian History were highly personal. Only 15 fragments definitely derive from the work, and another 21 may be safely assigned to it from content. The chronology and sources, the partial reconstruction of the History, and the discussion of related problems must all depend on these 36 fragments.

No conclusive evidence exists concerning the chronology of the work. A fragment from the biography of Agathocles, however, could indicate that Duris followed a system of yearly magistracies. He noted the Roman defeat of the Etruscans and their allies in Fabius' consulship.¹ Nonetheless, such slim testimony does not rule out the possibility of some other system.

A number of writers were utilized in the History. Diyllus, Demochares, and Philochorus were likely sources, and other possibilities can be argued. The fourth century A.D. orator, Himerius, named Herodotus, Hellanicus and Duris as writers of little account.² While the opinion need not be accepted, Himerius' grouping implies that he considered the three writers' approach to history to be quite similar.³ Both Herodotus and Hellanicus undoubtedly were used by Duris. In one fragment, Duris and Hellanicus are said to have agreed that the Achaeans took Troy on the 12th day of Thargelion in the middle of the night.⁴ Since Duris avoided what appears to have been a more widely accepted tradition--that Ilium was captured on the 24th of Thargelion--⁵ he was most likely

borrowing from Hellanicus. He also may have used Hellanicus for details about Helen.⁶

The argument for Herodotus is much stronger. In his History, Herodotus cited a city in Egypt called "Oasis," which was known to the Greeks as the "Isles of the Blessed."⁷ Duris recorded the same information.⁸ There was no city in Egypt with such a name, and the place to which both writers were referring was actually the Great Oasis of Khargeh.⁹ Since Herodotus and Duris incorrectly labeled the site, Duris must have been following the earlier account of Herodotus.¹⁰ Furthermore, Herodotus had mentioned that Samians were living at Oasis. This fact surely would have attracted Duris' attention. Pliny records that Duris, like Herodotus, wrote on the pyramids.¹¹ The results of Herodotus' investigation of the Egyptian pyramids were readily available to Duris. Finally, Duris believed that the source of the Nile was in Libya.¹² Herodotus recounted that the Nile flowed out of Libya and inferred that the sources of the river, while unknown, were in the same region.¹³ Duris' claim that Herodotus was a Samian¹⁴ demonstrates his desire to attach the historian to his homeland and indicates that he had more than a passing interest in Herodotus and his writings.¹⁵

The dramatic style of Ctesias argues that he was a prime source for Duris concerning details on Persia and the Near East. Athenaeus infers that Duris followed Ctesias' account of Arbaces and Sardanapalus up to the death of the latter.¹⁶

Duris had read Ephorus and Theopompus, for he criticized their shortcomings as historians in the opening book of his History.¹⁷ The two fourth century chroniclers lacked *μύθος* and *ἥδονή* which Duris found so pleasing in Herodotus, who fulfilled his concepts of historical

composition better than any other historian. Duris' criticism of Ephorus and Theopompus may reflect the opinion of the Peripatetic school which was concerned with the literary questions of the day. Non-Peripatetics such as Philochorus were also questioning the histories of both writers.¹⁸ Attacks from all sides could be expected since Ephorus and Theopompus had "revolutionized" the writing of history. Previous histories were short and digestable in comparison. What a change it must have been to turn from the few books of Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon to the 30 books of Ephorus and over 50 books of Theopompus' Philippica. While the increase in volume was apparently not accompanied by an increase in talent, a new trend had been established. With the larger scope, organizational problems became much more acute. Diodorus may have echoed Duris' complaints against Ephorus and Theopompus when he wrote:

Ταύτη δ' ἂν τις καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν καταμύψαιτο,
θεωρῶν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ βίου πολλὰς καὶ διαφόρους
πράξεις συντελουμένας κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν, τοῖς
δ' ἀναγράφουσιν ἀναγκαῖον ὑπάρχον τὸ μεσολαβεῖν
τὴν διήγησιν καὶ τοῖς ἅμα συντελουμένοις μερίζειν
τοὺς χρόνους παρὰ φύσιν, ὥστε τὴν μὲν ἀλήθειαν
τῶν πεπραγμένων τὸ πάθος ἔχειν, τὴν δ' ἀναγραφὴν
ἐστερημένην τῆς ὁμοίας ἐξουσίας μιμεῖσθαι μὲν
τὰ γεγενημένα, πολλὰ δὲ λείπεσθαι τῆς ἀληθοῦς
διαθέσεως.¹⁹

If histories were to continue to grow in size-- the complexities of the Hellenistic world practically guaranteed that-- then writers who expected to hold their audiences had to entertain them. The Herodotean coherency and palatability had to be maintained in the more lengthy histories and adjusted, of course, to suit the current tastes of the public. Nowhere is the wooing of Hellenistic audiences so clearly demonstrated than in Polybius' History. He constantly apologizes for the length of his work and interjects his justification for dwelling on particular episodes.²⁰ Polybius informs his readers that he has avoided the

meaningless niceties many writers employ. Realizing that this may cost him popularity, he has aimed at the elite who will appreciate truth more than fantasy.²¹ Even with Polybius' encouragement and flattery of his audience, it must have taken a "hearty soul" to read through his 40 books. Polybius' comments demonstrate that most Hellenistic writers did what he was trying to avoid-- entertain rather than inform. In his particularly "tragic" style, Duris must have thought that he had found a solution to the new historical demands of his period. Intensifying the approach of Herodotus, Duris attempted to make his History, which was at least 24 books,²² as interesting to his readers as a "stage production" of life itself. His success was enough to make him one of the best known historians of his time.

There are no obvious signs in the fragments that Duris borrowed from Ephorus. In fact, where reasonable comparisons can be made, the two writers always disagree.²³ Theopompus' Philippica seemingly would have provided a storehouse of material for the early part of Duris' work. There are two instances in the fragments where both writers related the same story-- that of Arcadion the Achaean, who was no flatterer of Philip,²⁴ and Chares of Athens, who celebrated his victory over Philip's mercenaries with a feast and sacrifices.²⁵ It seems that Duris was not averse to using information from historians whom he criticized. The biographical, moralistic and anecdotal tendencies of Theopompus makes his heavy use by Duris very likely. Nonetheless, he did not accept Theopompus' account of the loss of Philip's eye²⁶ and differs with him elsewhere in details.²⁷

Alexander's chamberlain, Chares, who wrote a history of the king, would have undoubtedly appealed to Duris.²⁸ Luxury and excessiveness²⁹

were common interests, though not necessarily for the same reasons. Both Duris and Chares wrote about trees³⁰ and the loyalty of animals to their masters.³¹ Duris' story that Alexander honored Phocion by addressing him with "χαίρειν" (after he had dropped the salutation in his correspondence with all save Antipater)³² must have been taken from Chares, who recorded the same information.³³ The account of the extravagant banquet of Alexander related by Duris³⁴ probably had its origins in Chares' personal observations.³⁵ Finally, Duris, like Chares, considered Alexander's meeting with the queen of the Amazons fictitious.³⁶

Didymus states that Duris agreed with Marsyas about the details which preceded the loss of King Philip's eye.³⁷ At a musical contest, all the musicians had been playing the "Cyclops" on their flutes. This Marsyas is most likely Marsyas of Pella,³⁸ whom the Suda lists as the brother of Antigonus,³⁹ and who commanded Demetrius' fleet with Themison of Samos in the great sea battle of 306.⁴⁰ Marsyas wrote a Macedonian History and a work on Alexander, which originally may have been part of the former composition.⁴¹ If Marsyas' writings were filled with anecdotes similar to the one about the musical contest, Duris probably made frequent use of him. Marsyas' personal involvement in the events he narrated may have lent authority to his accounts.

Perhaps Duris also borrowed information from his contemporary, Idomeneus. Idomeneus, who was a friend of Epicurus, seems to have written in an anecdotal fashion, not unlike Duris and other Peripatetics. In his life of Demosthenes,⁴² Plutarch states that both Duris and Idomeneus concurred that Alexander had demanded ten Athenian hostages after the abortive attempt to expel the Macedonians in 335. He adds, however, that the most reputable writers record that only eight hostages were required. Since Duris and Idomeneus agreed on the number of hostages,

and, according to Plutarch, their account was the least reliable,⁴³ one writer probably took his report from the other. It is impossible to determine whether Duris or Idomeneus did the borrowing. Conceivably, they could have used a common source.

It is unlikely that Duris did not employ Callisthenes, the most prominent Peripatetic historian and the great-nephew of Aristotle.⁴⁴ Executed in 327 after being implicated in a conspiracy against Alexander, Callisthenes left a record of his observations of the king's expedition. His Hellenica and monograph on the Sacred War might also have been valuable to Duris. However, there is no evidence in the fragments to suggest that Duris used Callisthenes. He agreed with Duris that a man named Aster had blinded Philip's eye but said the assailant had used a bow and arrow⁴⁵ whereas Duris cited a javelin.⁴⁶ Callisthenes also disagreed with Duris on the date of the fall of Ilium.⁴⁷ Athenaeus listed both historians as sources for wars which were caused primarily by women and lasted ten years.⁴⁸ While this demonstrates that the two men had similar interests, it does not prove that Duris took information from Callisthenes. Indeed, he apparently borrowed an anecdote about Aspasia, the cause of the Samian and Peloponnesian Wars, from Theophrastus.⁴⁹

Obviously, Duris could have used writers other than these, and without complete knowledge of them any conclusions are suspect. The fragmentation of nearly all the potential sources causes further complications. It is difficult to ascertain whether Duris used a writer's actual history, or if he simply borrowed a pertinent passage already digested by someone else. The exception is, of course, Herodotus, whom Duris must have read. Nonetheless, a few observations may be hesitantly

ventured. While Herodotus, Hellanicus and Ctesias could have supplied only supplementary details to Duris' History, at least one of the four historians (Theopompus, Chares, Marsyas or Callisthenes) of Philip and Alexander could have been a major contributor. Duris' criticism of Theopompus cannot be regarded as a general alienation from his work. The writers had too many interests in common for Duris not to have occasionally consulted him. But Theopompus certainly did not have the intimacy with either Philip or Alexander that the other historians did and could have been useful only for the first few books of Duris' chronicle, which covered the affairs of Philip. Perhaps the absence of any clear signs of Callisthenes in the fragments is due to the fact that he was a Greek who had turned his writings into a vehicle for Macedonian views.⁵⁰ Callisthenes' Peripatetic background would not have assured his use by Duris, who had so vigorously attacked one of the most prominent Peripatetics, Demetrius of Phalerum.⁵¹ Since Chares and Marsyas had covered the same period and have also been identified in the fragments, Callisthenes need not have been a major source for Duris-- especially since his history of Alexander was incomplete. The material from Chares and Marsyas is the anecdotal type which characterizes much of Duris' work. Presuming that their histories were filled with similar trivia, they certainly would have attracted Duris. Furthermore, Chares was not a Macedonian, but came from Mytilene. Duris' preference for Greeks has been plausibly established, and there is no reason why this could not have carried over into his use of sources. Marsyas was a Macedonian and presumably wrote from a Macedonian viewpoint. But his apparent close relationship with Themison of Samos as fleet commander of Antigonos and Demetrius may have brought him into contact with Duris' family on

Samos. Perhaps Duris used Marsyas as a source because he knew him personally. If these few observations do reveal Duris' considerations in choosing his major sources (and they might not), then he was not as interested in "accuracy" as he was in content. He selected writers close to the actual events they narrated and probably preferred Greek historians. Duris' final determination of a source, as in the case of Marsyas, may have depended on his personal feelings toward the man.

By using the fragments with book numbers, Duris' History may be partially reconstructed.⁵² In the first book, Duris followed a standard practice by criticizing his predecessors, questioning the abilities of Ephorus and Theopompus.⁵³ He undoubtedly included an introduction stating his concept of history⁵⁴ and set the limits of his work. That the actual narration of events began in Book I is likely, but not demonstrable. According to Diodorus, the History began in 370/69 B.C.⁵⁵ It was a significant date since Philip's father, Amyntas, died in that year. Thus commenced the chain of events which led to Philip's rise and, ultimately, the Macedonian dominance of the Eastern Mediterranean world. The death of two other leaders, Agesipolis of Sparta and Jason of Pherae, in the same year added a dramatic touch to Duris' opening, but his interest in them was certainly subsidiary.⁵⁶ Duris must have rapidly narrated the events from 370/69 to Philip's ascension to the throne in 359. In Book II he was already discussing the Sacred War which began in 357/6.⁵⁷ Philip's conversation with Arcadion the Achaean was placed in Book V⁵⁸ and can probably be dated somewhere in the years 338/6.⁵⁹ Philip's death in 336 would have made a fit end for the same book. This is feasible because Alexander's siege of Tyre in 332 was in Book VII,⁶⁰ and

at least one book would have been needed to discuss the pacification of Greece⁶¹ and his preparations for the Persian expedition.⁶² Books VII-VIII must have followed the progress of Alexander's campaign.⁶³ If the date 324/3 is legitimate for his visit to the boy and his dolphin,⁶⁴ then Alexander had returned from the expedition in Book IX, which probably ended with his death in 323. Book X must have included the Lamian War,⁶⁵ which broke out as a result of Alexander's demise, and Books XI-XIII were undoubtedly concerned with the political settlement in Athens and the various intrigues and struggles for the Macedonian throne.⁶⁶ Book XIV likely concluded with Cassander's consolidation of power in 316.⁶⁷ Book XV appears to have related the campaign of Cassander against Polyperchon in 315/4,⁶⁸ and Book XVI must have begun in 307,⁶⁹ when Demetrius Poliorcetes drove Demetrius of Phalerum from Athens. Another fragment from XVI may be associated with Demetrius' campaign against Cassander in 303/2.⁷⁰ The great battle of the Successors at Ipsus in 301 was probably in Book XVII.⁷¹ The next few books must have included the events following Ipsus, Cassander's death, and Demetrius' rise to the throne of Macedon. As king, Demetrius visited Athens in 291, and Duris recorded the mummers' song, sung by the Athenians in his honor, in Book XXII.⁷² In the same book, Duris described the king's fantastic costume.⁷³ The last book number mentioned is XXIII. Duris asserted that all ancient monarchs drank heavily.⁷⁴ The inclination to associate this comment with Demetrius is strong. The king drank himself to death while he was a prisoner of Seleucus in 283,⁷⁵ and in the fragment Duris mentioned that Agamemnon died while indulging in drink. No more than one additional book would have been necessary to reach the death of Lysimachus in 281, the last datable occurrence in the History,⁷⁶ and Seleucus' death, which

ended the period of the Successors.

From these calculations, it appears that the years before Philip's kingship did not interest Duris beyond their value for background since he had reached 357/6 in the second book. Three additional books related the incidents of Philip's reign to his death in 336 at the rate of approximately six years per book. Alexander's activities received a more detailed treatment as would be expected. Four books covered the 13 years between 336 and Alexander's death in 323-- an average of a little over three years per book. The events after 323 became very complicated, and Duris spent more time relating them. Five books were produced by 316 at an average of almost one and a half years per book. These years were the most crucial in deciding the fate of Hellas and of Samos. The contrast between the coverage of the years 323-316 in five books and the narration of the incidents from 316-307 in one book demonstrates that Duris did not feel the latter period deserved extensive treatment. He was writing a history of Macedon, and the major events after 316 were mostly away from Macedon in the East. The next important turning point on the mainland was Demetrius' seizure of Athens in 307, and from that date the History again became detailed. The proceedings of the next 24 years (307-283) were covered in eight books averaging about three years per book. At the center of the action was, of course, Demetrius Poliorcetes. No other figure in the History has as many books devoted to his activities. Considering that Duris' adulthood was contemporary with that of Demetrius, this is not surprising. It was the period in his work with which Duris was most familiar and in which he could make an original contribution. The few years until the death of Lysimachus and Seleucus in 281/0 perhaps rounded out the History at 24 books.⁷⁷

The results of this analysis may be summarized as follows:

Book I.....	370/69	<u>History</u> begins
Books II-V.....	to 336	Philip's death
Books VI-IX.....	to 323	Alexander's death
Books X-XIV.....	to 316	Cassander's con- solidation of power in Macedon
Book XV.....	to 307	Demetrius' sei- zure of Athens
Books XVI-XXIII.....	to 283	Demetrius' death
Book XXIV.....	to 281/80	Conclusion of the reign of the Suc- cessors-- <u>History</u> ends

Since the central figure of Duris' History appears to have been Demetrius, Waldo Sweet's contention that Duris was a major source for Plutarch's Demetrius is well-founded.⁷⁸ Aside from the account of Hieronymus of Cardia, Duris' treatment of Demetrius was perhaps the most extensive in antiquity. DeLacy has described the Demetrius as a "Plutarchian tragedy,"⁷⁹ and this also is indicative of Plutarch's strong reliance on Duris. The prominence of tragic allusion in this biography above all others is too coincidental for Plutarch not to have taken his inspiration from the tragically oriented Duris. Plutarch unmistakably incorporated Duris' description of the fantastic costume of Demetrius. Compare:

Demetrius XLI.4f.

ἦν δὲ ὡς ἀληθῶς τραγωδία μεγάλη περὶ τὸν Δημήτριον,
οὐ μόνον ἀμπεχόμενον καὶ διαδοῦμενον περιττῶς
καυσίαις διμήτροις καὶ χρυσοπαρῦφοις ἀλουργίαις,
ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῖς ποσὶν ἐκ πορφύρας ἀκράτου
συμπεπιλημένης χρυσοβαφεῖς πεποιημένον ἐμβάδας.

ἦν δὲ τις ὑφαινομένη χλανὶς αὐτῷ πολὺν χρόνον,
ἔργον ὑπερήφανον, εἴκασμα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν
κατ' οὐρανὸν φαινομένων...

with:

Athenaeus XII.535F-536A (J76 F14)

Δημήτριος δὲ πάντας ὑπερέβαλεν· τὴν μὲν γὰρ
ὑπόδεσιν ἦν εἶχεν κατεσκευάζεν ἐκ πολλοῦ
δαπανήματος· ἦν γὰρ κατὰ μὲν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς
ἐργασίας σχεδὸν ἐμβάτης πύλημα λαμβάνων τῆς
πολυτελεστάτης πορφύρας· τοῦτ' αὖ δὲ χρυσοῦ πολ-
λὴν ἐνύφαινον ποικιλίαν ὀπίσω καὶ ἔμπροσθεν
ἐνιέεντες οἱ τεχνῖται. αἱ δὲ χλαμύδες αὐτοῦ
ἦσαν ὀρφνινον ἔχουσai τὸ φέγγος τῆς χρῶας, τὸ
δὲ πᾶν ἐνύφαντο χρυσοῦς ἀστέρας ἔχον καὶ τὰ
δώδεκα ζῳδία. μίτρα δὲ χρυσοπάστος ἦν, ἣ
καυσίαν ἀλουργῇ οὖσαν ἔσφιγγεν, ἐπὶ τὸ νῶτον
φέρουσα τὰ τελευταῖα καταβλήματα τῶν ὑφασμάτων.⁸⁰

Duris' portrayal of Alcibiades' arrival in Athens closely resembles
Plutarch's depiction of Demetrius' "dramatic" and "theatrical" funeral
procession. Compare:

Demetrius LIII.1ff.

Ἔσχε μέντοι καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν ταφὴν αὐτοῦ
τραγικὴν τινα καὶ θεατρικὴν διάθεσιν. ὁ γὰρ
υἱὸς Ἀντίγονος, ὡς ἦσθετο τὰ λείψανα κομιζόμενα,
πάσαις ἀναχθεῖς ταῖς ναυσὶν ἐπὶ νήσων ἀπῆντησε·
καὶ δεξιόμενος εἰς τὴν μεγίστην τῶν ναυαρχίδων
ἔθετο τὴν ὑδρίαν χρυσοῦς οὖσαν. αἱ δὲ πόλεις
αἷς προεῖχον, τοῦτο μὲν στεφάνους ἐπέφερον τῇ
ὑδρίᾳ, τοῦτο δὲ ἄνδρας ἐν σχήματι πενθήμῳ
συνθάψοντας καὶ συμπαραπέμψοντας ἀπέστελλον.
εἰς δὲ Κόρινθον τοῦ στόλου καταπλέοντος ἢ τε
κάλπεις ἐκ πρύμνης περιφανῆς ἑώρατο πορφύρα
βασιλικὴ καὶ διαδήματι κεκοσμημένη, καὶ
παρειστήκεισαν ἐν ὅπλοις νεανίσκοι δορυφοροῦντες.
ὁ δὲ τῶν τότε αὐλητῶν ἐλλογιμώτατος Ξενόφαντος
ἐγγὺς καθεζόμενος προσηύλει τῶν μελῶν τὸ
ἱερώτατον· καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο τῆς εἰρεσίας ἀναφερομένης
μετὰ ῥυθμοῦ τινος, ἀπῆντα ψόφος, ὥσπερ ἐν κοπετῷ,
ταῖς τῶν αὐλημάτων περιδδοῖς· τὸν δὲ πλεῖστον
οἶκτον καὶ ὀλοφυρμὸν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀντίγονος τοῖς
ἡθροισμένοις ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ὀφθεῖς ταπεινὸς
καὶ δεδακρυμένος παρέσχεν.

with:

Plutarch Alcibiades XXXII.2ff. (J76 F70)

Ἄ δὲ Δοῦρις ὁ Σάμιος...προστίθῃσι τούτοις,
 αὐλεῖν μὲν εἰρεσίαν τοῖς ἐλαύνουσι Χρυσόγονον
 τὸν πυθιονίην, κελεύειν δὲ Καλλιππίδην τὸν τῶν
 τραγῳδιῶν ὑποκριτὴν, στατοὺς καὶ ξυστίδας καὶ
 τὸν ἄλλον ἐναγώνιον ἀμπεχομένους κόσμον, ἰστίῳ
 δ' ἄλουργῶ τὴν ναυαρχίδα προσφέρεισθαι τοῖς λιμέσιν,
 ὥσπερ ἐκ μέθης ἐπικωμάζοντος...

It is interesting to note that Plutarch's Antony, the parallel life to the Demetrius, contains a description of Cleopatra's barge which closely resembles the shipboard details of the above passages.⁸¹ If Plutarch "doctored" up the Antony to imitate the account of Demetrius' funeral ship, ascribed here to Duris, then this is additional evidence of his unreliability as a critic. It also would raise the question of how much Plutarch altered the sources from which he borrowed. The striking coincidence between the Demetrius and Antony passages, however, could be the result of Plutarch's use of a Roman writer who was inspired by Duris.

Other portions of the Demetrius suggest Duris. Aristodemus concealed the news of Demetrius' victory in the crucial naval battle of 306 from Antigonus,⁸² and Erasistratus discovered that Antiochus, the son of King Seleucus, was in love with the queen.⁸³ Both emotion-packed stories were designed to move their audiences. The accounts of a starving father and son fighting over a dead mouse and Epicurus' rationing beans to his followers during Demetrius' blockade of Athens in 297 are not unlike Duris.⁸⁴ Characters in the Demetrius appear as tragic actors moving across the stage of life. Carelessly exposing himself to his enemies, Demetrius barely escapes by donning a shabby cloak and running for his life.⁸⁵ When the Successors assumed the title of "King," they became pompous and ostentatious, and just like tragic actors they adapted their walk, dress, voice, and other traits to befit their new roles.⁸⁶ In reference to Lamia, Demetrius' mistress, Lysimachus jeered that he had

never seen a harlot coming forth to play a great tragic role.⁸⁷ After recapturing Athens, Demetrius ordered the frightened people into the theater, then dramatically appeared through the *parados* like the tragic actors and relieved the Athenians' apprehensions.⁸⁸ Pyrrhus proved himself worthy of Alexander by his deeds, while Demetrius and the other kings, like actors, only imitated Alexander's majesty and pomp.⁸⁹ His soldiers having deserted him for Pyrrhus, Demetrius went to his tent and, ὥσπερ οὐ βασιλεὺς, ἀλλ' ὑποκριτῆς, μεταμφιέννυται χλαμύδα φαιὰν ἀντὶ τῆς τραγικῆς ἐκείνης, καὶ διαλαθὼν ὑπεχώρησεν.⁹⁰ Until he recovered his former power, Demetrius went from city to city dressed as a private man without the ornaments of a king.⁹¹

Disgust over the disingenuous Athenian flattery that continued to pervert Demetrius' mind, which was not entirely sound,⁹² is conspicuous throughout the biography.⁹³ Individual flatterers such as Stratocles⁹⁴ are condemned. The highly luxurious and extravagant character of Demetrius, the prime debauchee of all the kings of his time,⁹⁵ is noted repeatedly. His arrogance⁹⁶ in all matters draws the attention of the gods, who demonstrate their disapproval with ominous signs.⁹⁷ Conversely, modest and virtuous men like the comic poet Philippides are praised.⁹⁸ One handsome Athenian lad, who saved his virtue by boiling himself to death to escape Demetrius' unwelcome attentions, is lauded for exhibiting a spirit worthy of his country and his beauty.⁹⁹ Duris is the most likely source behind Plutarch's description of the end of Demetrius, dissipated by food and wine and dying. Through Plutarch, Duris passed judgment on Demetrius' career:

τί γὰρ ἄλλο τῶν πολέμων καὶ τῶν κινδύνων πέρας
ἐστὶ τοῖς φαύλοις βασιλεῦσι, κακῶς καὶ ἀνοήτως
διακειμένοις, οὐχ ὅτι μόνον τρυφῇ καὶ ἡδονῇ
ἀντὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ διώκουσιν, ἀλλ'

ὅτι μηδὲ ἡδεσθαι μηδὲ τρυφᾶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἴσασιν;¹⁰⁰

Quotes from Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Philippides, Aeschylus, Sappho, Archilochus, Timotheus and Pindar distinguish passages that could be Durian.¹⁰¹ Duris also may be responsible for the anecdote about the soldier, who, doubtful of Demetrius' leadership abilities, wrote before his tent the altered opening of Oedipus at Colonus:

τέκνον τυφλοῦ γέροντος Ἀντιγόνου· τίνας
χώρους ἀφίγμεθα;¹⁰²

Elsewhere, some kings applied their ingenuity to idle pursuits and played the flute, painted or worked with metals,¹⁰³ which were all subjects of interest to Duris. Such fascinations may account for the details in the biography concerning the iron suits of mail worn by Demetrius and his favorite soldier, who died near a theater,¹⁰⁴ and Demetrius' sparing of Protogenes' great work of art at Rhodes.¹⁰⁵ The massive war machines of Demetrius, spectacles in themselves,¹⁰⁶ would not have escaped Duris' notice. The fact that Lynceus, whom Duris certainly would have utilized since he was his brother, is the only source mentioned by name in the Demetrius,¹⁰⁷ lends further support to the argument for Plutarch's heavy reliance, directly or indirectly, on Duris. Duris was no stranger to Plutarch, who used him in nine other Lives. Five of these biographies, Alexander, Demosthenes, Phocion, Eumenes and Pyrrhus, contain information from the History.¹⁰⁸

The apparent consistency between the attitudes reflected in Duris' fragments and parts of the Demetrius, particularly after 307,¹⁰⁹ may be helpful in distinguishing Durian material in Diodorus' account of the same period (Book XX.45ff.). Unfortunately, Diodorus breaks off after 302 (Book XXI), and the narrative of the following years is

fragmentary.¹¹⁰ Therefore, the years 307-302 must be the focus of study.

Those features of the Demetrius which have been identified as characteristically Durian are missing in Diodorus. The outrageous honors voted to Antigonus and Demetrius by the Athenians, which were so passionately discussed in the Demetrius, are passed over in a single statement with no expression of disgust or any other feeling.¹¹¹ Strato- cles, assailed for his flatteries in Plutarch's biography, is simply men- tioned as the author of an honorary decree for the two rulers.¹¹² Antigonus and Demetrius take the diadem without any of the Demetrius' anecdotal material.¹¹³ In Plutarch, the arrogant "request" of Demetrius to be initiated into the mysteries without proper qualification outraged the Athenians, who only complied because they were powerless to do otherwise. Diodorus, however, records that the Athenians granted Demetrius' request in appreciation for his past benefactions.¹¹⁴ While the Demetrius is full of comments about the lax lifestyle of the king, the only such reference in Diodorus concerns Demetrius' desire for drink and merriment in times of peace. This is quickly dismissed as a "pecul- iar" trait of his personality.¹¹⁵ The almost total absence of the most striking aspects of Duris' style discourages any attempt to find him in this part of Diodorus' narrative. In general, Diodorus is "straight- forward" and not unfavorable to Demetrius. This supports the widely held contention that Hieronymus of Cardia, the court apologist of the Antigonid house, was Diodorus' main source for Greek and Macedonian history in Book XX.¹¹⁶ Similarly, Books XVIII-XIX, also assigned by most authorities to Hieronymus, provide little encouragement for an identification with Duris-- except for one passage about the Rhagae in Media which resembles a Durian fragment. Compare:

Diodorus XIX.44.4f.

‘Ο δ’ Ἀντίγονος τὴν δύναμιν ἅπασαν ἀναλαβὼν
εἰς Μηδίαν... τοὺς δὲ στρατιώτας ἐπιδιεῖλεν
... μάλιστα εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν τὴν προσαγορευομένην
‘Ράγας, ἣ ταύτην τὴν προσηγορίαν ἔσχεν ἀπὸ τῶν
γενομένων περὶ αὐτὴν ἀτυχημάτων ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν
χρόνοις· πλείστας γὰρ ἔχουσα πόλεις τῶν ἐν ἐκείνοις
τοῖς τόποις καὶ μάλιστα εὐδαιμονούσας τηλικούτους
ἔσχε σεισμοὺς ὥστε καὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τοὺς
ἐνοικοῦντας ἅπαντας ἀφανισθῆναι, καθόλου δὲ τὴν
χώραν ἀλλοιωθῆναι καὶ ποταμοὺς ἀντὶ τῶν
προϋπαρχόντων ἄλλους φανῆναι καὶ λίμνας.

with:

Strabo I.3.19 (J76 F54)

Δοῦρις δὲ τὰς ‘Ράγας τὰς κατὰ Μηδίαν ὠνομάσθαι
φησὶν ὑπὸ σεισμῶν ῥαγεῖσθαι τῆς περὶ τὰς Κασπίους
πύλας γῆς, ὥστε ἀνατραπῆναι πόλεις συχνὰς καὶ
κώμας καὶ ποταμοὺς ποικίλας μεταβολὰς δέξασθαι.

While remarkably close in content, scholars have been reluctant to designate Duris as Diodorus' source for the passage.¹¹⁷

The sources for Books XV-XVII of Diodorus, which also coincide with the period of Duris' History, have, like the Hieronymian books XVII-XX, been the subject of intense investigation. Duris' name has been raised in some of the discussions. Little can be said about Book XV, except that Diodorus recorded late in the book that Duris began his History in 370/69.¹¹⁸ But Momigliano has offered Duris as a major source for Book XVI and identified what he thought to be pertinent characteristic passages.¹¹⁹ His arguments have been correctly questioned by N.G.L. Hammond, who has suggested Diyllus as a more likely candidate for most of the same passages.¹²⁰

While the discussion of the sources for Book XVII on Alexander has centered primarily around Cleitarchus and Aristobulus,¹²¹ M. Fontana has proposed that Duris was an intermediary between several historians of Alexander and Diodorus.¹²² The possibility is certainly worth

consideration, but it has not been convincingly argued by Fontana.¹²³ This is especially true if Chares and Marsyas, whom Fontana does not even mention, were as important to Duris as the fragments may indicate.¹²⁴ The generally favorable attitude toward Alexander also discourages an identification with Duris since the "god-king," although having begun the process for the return of the Samians to their homeland, stood in opposition to all in which Duris appears to have believed. Nonetheless, there are Durian characteristics in Book XVII, and several instances where direct comparisons with fragments can be made. Both Diodorus and Duris agreed that in 335 Alexander demanded ten hostages from Athens in order to stifle resistance.¹²⁵ Plutarch says that this number of hostages is the weaker tradition¹²⁶ and cites Duris and Idomeneus as the only ones he knows who report it. Diodorus paused in his narrative to remark on Prometheus' experience with the eagle on Mt. Caucasus,¹²⁷ a subject which had also attracted Duris' attention in his History.¹²⁸ Perhaps the most arresting example, however, concerns Diodorus' comparison of Alexander's narrow escape from drowning to Achilles' battle with the river.¹²⁹ Duris knew Homer's description of Achilles' struggle in the Iliad, and in two of his fragments, he criticized the poor imagery in parts of the passage.¹³⁰ Encouraging as these similarities are, Diodorus disagreed with Duris by asserting that Alexander did meet the queen of the Amazons.¹³¹

From such evidence, it is difficult to establish dependable conclusions about the relationship of Duris and Diodorus. Diodorus could have consulted Duris directly. His contemporaries Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus were familiar with Duris' work,¹³² and Diodorus does pause to mention the starting date of Duris' History.¹³³ But the signs

of Duris in Diodorus' narrative are not as profuse nor as pronounced as the material from the fragments and the Demetrius, and they could easily be assigned to other writers who possessed similar traits.¹³⁴ The absence of Duris in Diodorus' Demetrius account cannot be rationalized as being due to Diodorus' toning down of Duris since he admits such anecdotal material elsewhere in his work. There is no reason why Diodorus would vary here if such details were available in his source. It therefore seems illogical that Diodorus would consult Duris for subjects such as Alexander and completely avoid him for the Diadochi (except, perhaps, for the Rhagae passage), and Demetrius.¹³⁵ Nonetheless, the voluminous research on the methods of Diodorus has demonstrated that he cannot be depended upon to be consistent. If the passages identified above are from Duris, they are most likely the result of indirect borrowing, but the possibility that Diodorus used Duris directly, or that he did not use him at all in any form cannot be eliminated.

As the only other significant continuous account of Macedonian history that survives from antiquity, Justin's epitome of Trogus Pompeius also must be mentioned. No one in recent times has seriously considered Duris as an important source for Justin via Trogus,¹³⁶ and it will not be argued here. To be sure, there are passages in Justin with a Durian flavor, but these are neither consistent nor convincing. Not one fragment of Duris can be positively compared with Justin,¹³⁷ and Demetrius Poliorcetes, Duris' major figure, receives only scant notice compared with the other important characters of the period.¹³⁸ Therefore, with the present state of information, it is virtually impossible to confidently establish Justin's (Trogus') use of the Samian historian.

It would appear that the popularity of Duris' History had waned by the first century B.C. since there is no substantial evidence to demonstrate that Diodorus or Trogus (Justin) used him to any extent. By the second century A.D., however, Duris enjoyed a renaissance in the writings of Plutarch (particularly the Demetrius) and, later, in those of Athenaeus. Perhaps they found in Duris reflections of their own times. The Roman autocracy may have affected non-Romans much like the Macedonians had affected Duris, and his writings, though remote, became pertinent once again.

CHAPTER IV

THE AGATHOCLES AND THE SAMIAN CHRONICLE

Little more than a single fragment survives from the majority of Duris' minor works. The Agathocles and the Samian Chronicle are exceptions. Next to the History, the Agathocles biography was undoubtedly the best known of Duris' writings. It conceivably would have been more popular than the Samian Chronicle, which was more limited in appeal. The Agathocles later may have formed an adjunct to the Macedonian narrative,¹ but Duris had probably originally planned it as a separate work, written after Agathocles' death while interest was still great. The Sicilian tyrants were a popular topic among the Peripatetics. Phaenias of Eresus, Duris' senior and pupil of Aristotle, had written a treatise on them.² No doubt the controversial Agathocles was a fascination to the school which enjoyed observing the many aspects of human nature and politics. Outside the school Agathocles was also drawing attention. Timaeus' presence in Athens served to emphasize the exploits of the man who was responsible for his lengthy exile.³

These factors certainly must have influenced Duris, particularly during his stay in Athens. But there were several, more personal reasons for the only major contemporary record of Agathocles by an "Eastern" writer. Agathocles could have given succor to Samians who had found refuge in Sicily while they were in exile. Duris' family may have been among them.⁴ Also, the "empty" tyranny of Duris, restricted by the Macedonians, accentuated the independence of Agathocles' tyranny in the

West. He was the most powerful Greek of his time and exemplified the old "liberty" and "strength" of Hellas. In his only conflict with the Macedonians, Agathocles soundly defeated Cassander.⁵ The "new order" learned to view the Sicilian tyrant as an equal.⁶ Many years later, the elder Scipio Africanus may have echoed the feelings of Duris when he praised the courage and wisdom of Agathocles.⁷ In addition, Duris seems to have been partial to famous men who had risen from humble origins.⁸ Agathocles had begun his career as a simple potter.

While these observations indicate a favorable attitude toward Agathocles, there were facets of the Sicilian tyrant Duris would have criticized-- if he had considered them legitimate failings. Agathocles' faults have been exaggerated, particularly by Timaeus, but he did not always respect the gods.⁹ He never equalled the arrogance of Demetrius Poliorcetes, who considered himself a god, but Duris, a religious conservative, could not have approved of any excessive impious behavior. Perhaps the Samian moralist also noted the cruelty of Agathocles even though, as a tyrant himself, he recognized the necessity of force. There is nothing, however, to support E. Manni's insistence that Duris was hostile toward Agathocles.¹⁰

Not much can be learned about the Agathocles from the small number of fragments, which, like the History, are characterized by trivia.¹¹ Nothing from Book I remains, but presumably it covered the early life of Agathocles, becoming more detailed after he assumed the tyranny in 317. Fragments from Book II indicate that it related the African campaign of Agathocles which began in 310.¹² Book III may have focused on the tyrant's exploits in Italy. Southern Italy had become accustomed to outside intervention, and Duris cited the Tarentine champion, Cleonymus of

Sparta, who seized 200 beautiful women from Metapontum in 303/2.¹³ Agathocles' siege of Hipponium in 293 was recorded in the fourth and probably final book,¹⁴ which must have ended with the tyrant's death in 289.

In addition to the few fragments, the meager remains of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus no. 2399, apparently concerned with events in the autumn of 310, have been assigned to Duris by E.G. Turner.¹⁵ Column I of the papyrus describes a Carthaginian attack on Albus Tunes which sorely distressed Agathocles and his men, while the remaining columns recount an attempt at sedition in Syracuse by an otherwise unknown Diognetus. Diognetus' efforts were thwarted by Agathocles' brother, Antander, who had the troublemaker removed from the assembly. More recent arguments by Manni¹⁶ have suggested that Antander, who wrote a history of his brother,¹⁷ was the author of the papyrus. Brown¹⁸ also considers Antander a likely candidate because of his importance in the action of the piece. K. Meister¹⁹ has questioned the choice of both Antander and Duris and maintains that the search for the papyrus' source must continue. The tenuousness of any argument is obvious considering the present state of information. Further investigation into the papyrus' origin would be of little value. Diodorus and Justin are the only other sources of any consequence which may contain portions of Duris' Agathocles.

Source criticism in the concise history of Agathocles by Justin (Trogus) is practically impossible. The hostile introductory remarks, however, make clear Justin's opinion of the Sicilian tyrant and suggest Timaeus' influence.²⁰ Even so, the possibility that the sympathetic and emotional death scene of Agathocles is from Duris should be considered. Justin writes:

Igitur Agathocles, cum morbi cura et aegritudo graviores essent et inter se alterum alterius malo cresceret, desperatis rebus uxorem suam Theoxenam genitosque ex ea duos parvulos cum omni pecunia et familia regalique instrumento, quo praeter illum nemo regum ditior fuit, navibus inpositos Aegyptum, unde uxorem acceperat, remittit, timens, ne praedonem regni sui hostem paterentur. Quamquam uxor diu ne ab aegro divelleretur deprecata est, ne discessus suus adiungi nepotis parricidio posset et tam cruenta haec desernisse virum quam ille inpugnasse avum videretur. Nubendo se non prosperae tantum, sed omnis fortunae inisse societatem, nec invitam periculo spiritus sui empturam, ut extremos viri spiritus exciperet et exequiarum officium, in quod profecta se nemo sit successurus, obsequio debitae pietatis impleret. Discedentes parvuli flebili ululatu amplexi patrem tenebant; ex altera parte uxor maritum non amplius visura osculis fatigabat. Nec minus senis lacrimae miserabiles erant. Flebant hi morientem patrem, ille exules liberos, hi discessu suo solitudinem patris, aegri senis, ille in spem regni susceptos relinqui in egestate lugebat. Inter haec regia omnis adsistentium fletibus tam crudelis discidii inpleta resonabat. Tandem finem lacrimis necessitas profectionis inposuit et mors regis proficiscentes filios insecuta est.²¹

While Justin's (Trogus') use of Duris remains a question, there is no doubt that Diodorus employed him. A fragment from the twenty-first book cites Duris as the source for information that the Romans killed 100,000 Etruscans, Gauls, Samnites and their allies in 295.²² Two other passages in Diodorus, while not identified with any author, closely resemble Durian fragments. They are concerned with Lamia, a mythological beauty of Libya, and Cleonymus, the Spartan opportunist who aided the Tarentines. Compare:

Diodorus XX.41.3

...περὶ δὲ τὴν ῥίξαν αὐτῆς ἄντρον ἦν εὐμέγεθες, κιττῶ καὶ σμίλακι συνηρέφες, ἐν ᾧ μυθεύουσι γεγονέναι βασίλισσαν Λάμιαν τῷ κάλλει διαφέρουσαν. διὰ δὲ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγριότητα διατυπῶσαι φασὶ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτῆς τὸν μετὰ ταῦτα χρόνον θηριώδη. τῶν γὰρ γινομένων αὐτῇ παίδων ἀπάντων τελευτώντων βαρυθυμοῦσαν ἐπὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ φθονοῦσαν ταῖς τῶν ἄλλων γυναικῶν εὐτεκνίαις κελεύειν ἐκ τῶν ἀγκαλῶν

ἐξαρπάζεσθαι τὰ βρέφη καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀποκτείνειν.

with:

Photius-Suda s.v. Λάμια (Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1035) (J76 F17)

ταύτην ἐν τῇ Λιβύῃ Δοῦρις...ἱστορεῖ γυναῖκα
καλὴν γενέσθαι, μιχθέντος δ' αὐτῇ Διδῶ ὑφ' ἧρας
ζηλοτυπουμένην ἃ ἔτικτεν ἀπολλύναι· διόπερ ἀπὸ
τῆς λύπης δύσμορφον γεγονέναι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων
παιδία ἀναρπάζουσιν διαθείρειν.

Compare:

Diodorus XX.104.3f.

...τῶν δὲ Μεταποντίνων οὐ προσεχόντων αὐτῷ τοῦς
Λευκανοὺς ἔπεισεν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν χώραν καὶ τῷ
καιρῷ συνεπιθέμενος κατεπλήξατο τοῦς Μεταποντίνους.
παρελθὼν δ' εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὡς φίλος ἐπράξατο μὲν
ἀργυρίου τάλαντα πλείω τῶν ἑξακοσίων, διακοσίας
δὲ παρθένους τὰς ἐπιφανεστάτας ἔλαβεν εἰς ὀμηρίαν,
οὐχ οὕτω τῆς περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἀσφαλείας χάριν, ὡς
τῆς ἰδίας ἐνεκεν λαγνείας. ἀποθέμενος γὰρ τὴν
Λακωνικὴν ἐσθῆτα διετελεῖ τρυφῶν καὶ τοῦς
πιστεύσαντας αὐτῷ καταδουλοῦμενος.

with:

Athenaeus XIII.605DE (J76 F18)

...Κλεώνυμος ὁ Σπαρτιάτης...λαβὼν παρὰ Μεταποντίνων
γυναῖκας καὶ παρθένους τὰς ἐνδοξοτάτας καὶ καλλίστας
διακοσίας, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Δοῦρις ὁ Σάμιος...

Since it is certain that Diodorus used Duris in the Agathocles narrative, these two passages may also be assigned to him with some confidence. The one on Cleonymus particularly reflects familiar Durian traits-- excessiveness and luxury-- and Cleonymus' rejection of the simple Spartan garb is reminiscent of Pausanias' action in a bonafide fragment of Duris.²³ Consequently, the question that must be considered when studying Diodorus' history of Agathocles is not whether, but to what extent Duris is present.

A.F. Roesiger proposed Duris as Diodorus' source for the Agathocles

narrative in the last century,²⁴ and since then there have been frequent studies. Schubert, Schwartz, DeSanctis, Laqueur and many others have mulled over the source problem. They have arrived at a variety of conclusions which have been usefully catalogued in a recent analysis by Meister.²⁵ Some combination of Duris and Timaeus has been the majority opinion among critics, but consensus does not necessarily equal correctness, especially when the complications offered by the Agathocles history are considered. Therefore, it is essential to review these complications to determine the extent of Duris' claim to Diodorus' account of the Sicilian tyrant.

The three major contemporary historians of Agathocles besides Duris were Timaeus, Callias and Antander, the brother of Agathocles. Diodorus had occasion to mention all four and even recorded his opinion of Timaeus' and Callias' works. At the conclusion of the Agathocles narrative, Diodorus accuses Timaeus of distorting his account because of personal enmity,²⁶ while Callias is censured for being too enthusiastic.²⁷ How Diodorus' criticism affects the evaluation of his sources is difficult to determine. It certainly does not imply that since Duris and Antander are not chastised, they are to be regarded as the major contributors to the narrative. For Duris, at least, the opposite is probably true. The only apparent advantage in Diodorus' using Duris was that the latter's work of four books²⁸ was shorter than the 22 books of Callias²⁹ and, thereby, easier to digest. But Timaeus, whom Diodorus cites by name more often than any of the others,³⁰ wrote only five books on Agathocles³¹ and Antander's account could have been just as short. More importantly, Duris was not Sicilian and was in the least advantageous position to gather detailed information about Agathocles. No mat-

ter how good his informants, at Samos he was too far removed from the action and could never have matched the eye-witness records of Callias and Antander. Timaeus too, while in Athens, must have had relatives and friends still in Sicily who had known the vicissitudes of Agathocles' rule. The historian himself had presumably returned to Sicily after the tyrant's death.³² It seems unlikely, then, that Diodorus would have depended upon an "outside" authority who must certainly have utilized at least one of the three better-informed Sicilian authorities or else have been vastly inferior to them. Also, as a Sicilian himself, Diodorus would naturally have been partial to Sicilian writers.³³

The recognition of individual Durian characteristics in the narrative is insufficient grounds for asserting that Duris was Diodorus' major source. The account would have to have been generally favorable toward Agathocles, and would have to have highlighted excessive behavior -- especially luxury and drinking. It would have revealed Duris' respect for the gods and would have been filled with academic and frivolous trivia as well as dramatic incidents. While most of these features are present somewhere in the text, except for a continual reference to the gods, they are not extensive enough to automatically indicate Duris. This is especially true since there are "Durian characteristics" in parts of the Sicilian narrative which predate Agathocles and could not have come from Duris.³⁴ Timaeus was emotionally involved in his account of the tyrant which could explain some of the drama,³⁵ and a comparison of Durian traits with Brown's fine study of Timaeus reveals many similarities between the two historians. Nothing is known about Callias except that he favored Agathocles. There is no way of knowing what information he is responsible for in the narrative. Antander, too, is a problem.

Not one piece of his work survives. One might assume that, as the brother of Agathocles, his account would be favorable. Such an assumption is dangerous. It has been frequently demonstrated that brothers do not necessarily have to like each other. From what little information exists about Antander, several points which could have affected the tone of his History stand out. Before Agathocles seized power, Antander had been a Syracusean general whereas his brother was only chiliarch.³⁶ Antander was superseded by his brother, who may have been younger than he. Elsewhere, Antander is called the direct opposite of Agathocles in boldness and energy.³⁷ If true, this raises the question of what effect the terrible massacre of the Syracuseans, carried out at Agathocles' order, had upon him.³⁸ In these instances alone, Antander may have felt jealousy and guilt. The contributions of Diodorus and perhaps others to the narrative must also be considered in the final analysis. In light of all these complications, the recent valiant attempts of T. Orlandi and Meister to assign individual passages in Diodorus to Duris are extremely questionable.³⁹

From all the possibilities (and there are many), only two passages really have strong justification for inclusion with the others attributed to Duris. One concerns the failure of historians to properly record the past:

Ταύτη δ' ἂν τις καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν καταμέμψαιτο,
θεωρῶν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ βίου πολλὰς καὶ διαφόρους
πράξεις συντελουμένας κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν, τοῖς
δ' ἀναγράφουσιν ἀναγκαῖον ὑπάρχον τὸ μεσολαβεῖν
τὴν διήγησιν καὶ τοῖς ἅμα συντελουμένοις μερίζειν
τοὺς χρόνους παρὰ φύσιν, ὥστε τὴν μὲν ἀλήθειαν
τῶν πεπραγμένων τὸ πάθος ἔχειν, τὴν δ' ἀναγραφὴν
ἐστερημένην τῆς ὁμοίας ἐξουσίας μιμεῖσθαι μὲν
τὰ γεγενημένα, πολὺ δὲ λείπεσθαι τῆς ἀληθοῦς
διαθέσεως.⁴⁰

This is perhaps the clearest statement of historical μύθοις that survives. Walbank, Ullman and others have assigned it to Duris, who had attacked Ephorus and Theopompus because their writings lacked such a quality.⁴¹ His presence in other parts of the Agathoclean narrative makes Duris the most likely inspiration for this passage in Diodorus.

The other selection contains too many Durian characteristics not to have come from him:

Ἀγαθοκλῆς δὲ ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις καὶ περὶ καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν νενικηκὼς τοὺς πολέμους ἔθου τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ λαμπρὰς ὑποδοχὰς τῶν φίλων ἐποιεῖτο. ἀπειθήτο δ' ἐν τοῖς πότοις τὸ τῆς τυραννίδος ἀξίωμα καὶ τῶν τυχόντων ἰδιωτῶν ταπεινότερον ἑαυτὸν ἀπεδείκνυεν, ἅμα μὲν διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης πολιτείας θηρώμενος τὴν παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν εὐνοίαν ἅμα δὲ διδοὺς ἐν τῇ μέθῃ καθ' αὐτοῦ παρρησίαν, ἀκριβῶς κατενόει τὴν ἐκάστου διάνοιαν, τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκφερομένης ἀπαρακαλύπτως διὰ τὸν οἶνον. ὑπάρχων δὲ καὶ φύσει γελωτοποιὸς καὶ μῖμος οὐδ' ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἀπείχετο τοῦ σκώπτειν τοὺς καθήμενους καὶ τινὰς αὐτῶν εἰκάζειν, ὥστε τὸ πλῆθος πολλάκις εἰς γέλωτα ἐκτρέπεσθαι καθάπερ τινὰ τῶν ἠθολόγων ἢ θαυματοποιῶν θεωροῦντας. δορυφορούμενος δὲ ὑπὸ πλῆθους εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας εἰσφέρει μόνος, οὐχ ὁμοίως Διονυσίῳ τῷ τυράννῳ. οὗτος γὰρ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἀπίστως διέκειτο πρὸς ἅπαντας ὥστε κατὰ μὲν τὸ πλεῖστον κομᾶν καὶ πωγωνοτροφεῖν, ὅπως μὴ συναναγκασθῇ τῷ τοῦ κουρέως σιδήρῳ παραβαλεῖν τὰ κυριώτατα μέρη τοῦ σώματος. εἰ δὲ καὶ ποτε χρεῖα γένοιτο τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποκεῖρασθαι, περιέκαε τὰς τρίχας, μίαν ἀσφάλειαν τυραννίδος ἀποφαινόμενος τὴν ἀπιστίαν. ὁ δ' οὖν Ἀγαθοκλῆς παρὰ τὸν πότον λαβὼν ῥυτὸν μέγαν χρυσοῦν εἶπεν ὥς οὐ πρότερον ἀπέστη τῆς κεραμευτικῆς τέχνης ἕως τοιαῦτα ἐκπαμάτων πλάσματα φιλοτεχνῶν ἐκεραμεύσατο. οὐ γὰρ ἀπηνεῖτο τὴν ἐπιστήμην, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸναντίον ἐκαυχᾶτο, διὰ τῆς ἰδίας ἀρετῆς ἀποφαινόμενος ἀντὶ τοῦ ταπεινοτάτου βίου τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον μετεिल्φέναι. καὶ ποτε πολιορκούντος αὐτοῦ τινὰ τῶν οὐκ ἁδόξων πόλεων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους βοῶντων "Κεραμεῦ καὶ καμινεῦ, πότε τοὺς μισθοὺς ἀποδώσεις τοῖς στρατιώταις;" ὑπολαβὼν εἶπεν "Ὅταν ταύτην ἐξέλω." οὐ μὲν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς πότοις εὐτραπελίαν κατανοήσας τῶν μεθύοντων τοὺς ἄλλοτρίως τὰ πρὸς τὴν δυναστείαν ἔχοντας παρέλαβεν αὐτοὺς ποτε κατ' ἰδίαν πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐστίασιν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Συρακοσίων τοὺς μάλιστα

πεφρονηματισμένους, τὸν ἀριθμὸν πεντακοσίων
 ὄντας· οἷς περιστήσας τῶν μισθοφόρων τοὺς εὐ-
 θέτους ἅπαντας ἀπέσφαξεν. σφόδρα γὰρ εὐλαβεῖ-
 το μὴ χωρισθέντος αὐτοῦ εἰς Λιβύην καταλύσῃ
 τὴν δυναστείαν, ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τοὺς μετὰ Δεινο-
 κράτους φυγάδας. τοῦτον δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἀσφα-
 λισάμενος τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξέπλευσεν ἐκ τῶν
 Συρακουσῶν. 41a

The reasons for attributing this passage to Duris are the following. Agathocles' rise from a humble origin is stressed. Duris noted that Eumenes, Bias and Socrates all had modest beginnings.⁴² Agathocles pays proper respect to the gods as Duris, a religious conservative, would want him to do. The passage contains the type of anecdotal material which characterizes portions of the Demetrius assigned to Duris (see chapter III, pp.45ff.) and the fragments. Duris spoke of Dionysius the tyrant elsewhere,⁴³ and the great gold cup of Philip⁴⁴ is reminiscent of Agathocles' gold cup. Duris warned against the dangers of excessiveness. Here it is not Agathocles who is seduced by wine, but he who seduces others with it, pointing out his strength and the weakness of his fellows. The deception practiced by Agathocles is not indicative of the author's disapproval of the tyrant's behavior, but is rationalized when it is explained that such measures were needed to preserve the tyranny. As a tyrant himself, Duris would understand such practices. Agathocles is called a "buffoon" and a "mimic." These are not necessarily derogatory terms, but ones that might relate to the tyrant's mean origin. Such interesting traits were sure to attract the Peripatetic's eye. These many Durian characteristics discourage the identification of this passage with Timaeus, who, while he did note Socrates' mean origin,⁴⁵ condemned Agathocles as irreligious.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the selection does not have the tone of an invective as might be expected from Diodorus' and Polybius' charges of Timaeus' degradation of Agathocles' character,⁴⁷

but rather seems designed to highlight particulars of the tyrant's complicated personality.

If the entire Agathocles narrative of Diodorus resembled the character of the above passage, there would be little doubt that the account was based on Duris. But it does not. This passage and all the others that can be reasonably associated with Duris contain subsidiary material, not particularly pertinent to the narrative.⁴⁸

Those scholars who have attempted to identify individual passages of the Agathocles history have been too willing to distinguish "concrete" traits among the four historians involved. Ultimately, their findings may be proven correct, and even Roesiger's original thesis, that Duris is responsible for the whole narrative, may be substantiated. However, on the basis of what has been discussed here, Duris was only one of four sources used by Diodorus, and as a non-Sicilian, his use was probably restricted to that of a supplemental "color" source.

The Samian Chronicle was probably the earliest of Duris' historical works. Pride and patriotism were undoubtedly the chief motivation. The Macedonians had robbed the Samians of their initiative in the Hellenistic world, and it was important to produce a work of "native" history in order to rally the people. Duris perhaps composed the Chronicle after his return from Athens where the Atthidographers had been stirring up controversy over the city's history. What effect these Atthidographers had on Duris is difficult to estimate. Beginning with Hellanicus in the fifth century, they recorded Athenian history in a form which was prone to rationalize and modernize mythical history.⁴⁹ Their patriotism

sometimes caused them to distort or exaggerate events. Since Atthidographers viewed the history of the city according to their own convictions, political or other, the same incidents were treated with different emphases. The chronicler was not so much concerned with historical accuracy as he was with making his material conform to his particular interpretation. Apparently, Duris' chronicle also distorted historical facts in the interests of patriotism, since Plutarch accused him of manipulating history in order to discredit Pericles and Athens.⁵⁰ Undoubtedly, there were many similarities between the chroniclers of the two cities-- the nature of local history would guarantee that. But Duris would not necessarily have need Athenian models since Samos had a tradition of local historians going back as far as Asius.⁵¹

There are 17 fragments which can be safely assigned to the Samian Chronicle. They tell nothing about the physical nature of the work except that it contained at least two books.⁵² Duris paid particular attention to the Samian and Peloponnesian Wars. This is understandable since these two events so greatly affected fifth-century Samos. Concerning the Samian War, Duris wrote that Aspasia was its cause;⁵³ that the prisoners of both sides were branded with the mark of their captors;⁵⁴ and that Pericles treated the Samian prisoners brutally.⁵⁵ The Peloponnesian War brought Alcibiades to Samos and, as an ancestor,⁵⁶ Duris must have treated him fully. He referred to the mutilation-of-the-Hermæ incident in 415;⁵⁷ noted the seduction of Timæa;⁵⁸ and described the dramatic arrival of Alcibiades in Athens in 408.⁵⁹ Lysander, who defeated the Athenians and restored the Samian oligarchy, was also celebrated.⁶⁰ In pursuit of his study, which apparently was not entirely restricted to Samos, Duris already displayed the varied interests which

would characterize his more important histories. He recorded the tomb inscription of Pherecydes of Syros⁶¹ and information about a votive offering set up in the temple of Hera by Arimnetus, the son of Pythagoras.⁶² He also discussed the long hair⁶³ and luxury⁶⁴ of the Samians; local religion;⁶⁵ the ancient boundary between Priene and Samian territory;⁶⁶ Polycrates the tyrant;⁶⁷ and reasons for Athenian dress and appearance.⁶⁸ He incorrectly, but understandably, claimed Herodotus and his uncle Panyasis as Samians.⁶⁹ The rest of the Chronicle, which must have become the definitive work on Samos until superseded, probably contained similar material.

CONCLUSION

Duris was one of many Greeks affected by the Macedonian conquest of Hellas. His life and works are a study in frustration and resentment. A conservative grappling with the forces of change, Duris clung to the past but did not fail to recognize the popular trends of his own times. Combining the best of both past and present, he produced histories which fascinated the general reading public but at the same time condemned the "new order" and appealed for moral regeneration. His entreaties undoubtedly fell on deaf ears for his readers were more interested in a good story than in exhortations.

Modern criticism has not been entirely fair to Duris. There is no doubt that by today's standards his histories would not be acceptable, but few scholars have gone beyond the "face value" of the fragments in judging Duris' motivation. While lack of information continues to obstruct analysis, this study has shown Duris to be well-qualified to record the events of his day. He came from a political family, and as tyrant of Samos, he must have understood the nature of local and international politics. Duris was personally familiar with Antigonos, Demetrius and probably Lysimachus, and had frequent occasion to observe and feel the effects of their policies on Samos and at Athens. He was as well-educated as any man of his day, and he certainly does not deserve the poor reputation as a scholar usually so hastily assigned to him. His authority on many literary questions was acceptable to scholars many centuries later as the fragments attest.

Much in Duris' histories can be found in most ancient writers-- myth, anecdote, moral lessons, marvelous stories, proverbs, poetry and etymology. Nevertheless, these features appear to have dominated Duris' works and owe a lot, though not all, to his Peripatetic training. From the time Aristotle instigated the serious systematic study of man and his environs, his generally high standards of critical analysis were not closely maintained. The trend that he had begun toward compilation resulted in the collection of all available details about a particular subject. In many cases, there was no conscious effort to distinguish the real from the fanciful. This was especially true in biography and history and was greatly encouraged by the demands of the general Hellenistic reading public, who sought entertainment rather than enlightenment. But the Peripatetics cannot be accused of being entirely seduced by their audiences' whims. It is true that some of the material that moderns have criticized as ridiculous defies explanation, but much of what the schools' authors wrote was completely acceptable and relevant to them. For example, as far as they knew, distant little-known places could have been the home of people who had the left breast of a man and the right breast of a woman, and of swift men with hairy tails. In an age when human loyalty and virtue appeared to be declining, the faithfulness of animals to their masters was very noticeable and certainly worth recording. Cases such as the friendship of a boy and a dolphin may not have attracted attention just because of the novelty, but as a result of genuine scientific curiosity. It is difficult to fathom an intellect over two thousand years old, and neither Duris nor his Peripatetic fellows can be justly censured for following the interests and practice of expression sanctioned by an entire school of thought and acceptable to a large audience.

They felt that they were meeting the literary demands of the day. But what separates Duris from the rest of the Peripatetics and makes his writings unique is also his greatest failing. Entrenched too deeply in the political and moral issues of his homeland and, to a lesser extent, the Hellenistic world, Duris was unable to restrain his own emotional reaction to the events he chose to describe.

NOTES

NOTES

CHAPTER I

¹Ed. Schwartz, "Duris," Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, V (1905), col.1853, concluded from the emended text of Pausanias VI.13.5 (F. Jacoby, Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (1923--), IIA 76, "Duris" T4: see below) that the Duris mentioned there was not the historian, but his grandfather. In the same text, καὶ ὅς has been emended to read Skaïos, the name of the son of Duris and the Olympic victor in the boys' boxing contest when ὁ Σαμίων δῆμος ἔφευγεν ἐκ τῆς νῆσου. It was Skaïos who was the father of Duris the historian and who preceded his son as tyrant of Samos. A recently published inscription (Chr. Habicht, "Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit," Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, LXXII (1957), no.23, pp.190ff.) demonstrates that the name of Duris' father is more correctly Kaios (the name Kaios and other evidence solely dependent on inscriptions will not be "Latinized" in this paper). The fine points of the correlation of the emended Pausanias passage, Schwartz' theories, and the inscription are masterfully presented by J. Barron, "The Tyranny of Duris of Samos," Classical Review, N.S. XII (1962), pp.189ff. For the tyranny of Duris see Athenaeus VIII.337D (J76 T2); and the Suda s.v. Λυγκεὺς

Pausanias VI.13.5:

Χιδνίδος δὲ οὐ πόρρω τῆς ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ στήλης Σκαῖος ἕστηκεν ὁ Δοῦριος, Σάμιος, κρατήσας πυγμῇ παῖδας· τέχνη δὲ ἡ εἰκὼν ἐστὶ μὲν Ἰππίου τοῦ * * τὸ δὲ ἐπίγραμμα δηλοῖ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῷ, νικῆσαι {Χίονιν} ἥνικα ὁ Σαμίων δῆμος ἔφευγεν ἐκ τῆς νῆσου, τὸν δὲ + καιρὸν * * ἐπὶ (4) τὰ οἰκεία τὸν δῆμον. παρὰ δὲ τὸν τύραννον Δφαλλος ὁ Πόλλιδος ἀνάκειται....

1 χίονιν em.L² δὲ οὐδὲ LP^{1y2} Σκαῖος Schubart-Walz: καὶ ὅς codd.: παῖς Eckertz, de Duride Samio (1842) ὁ καὶ ὁ L δ...Σάμιος}{ὁ} Δοῦρις Σάμιος Eckertz 2 τέχνης L τοῦ om. L¹: lac. ind. Schubart 3 {Χίονιν} Schwartz, R.E. V (1905), col.1853: Σκαῖον Schubart-Walz: Δοῦριν Hulleman, Duridis Samii quae supersunt (1841), et al. lac. post καιρὸν L¹: Σκαῖον <τυραννεῦσαι ἐπαναγαγόντα> Schwartz: τὸν δὲ καιρὸν <καθ' ὃν> ἐπὶ τὰ οἰκ. τ.δ.<κατελθεῖν συνέβη, ὁ Δοῦρις αὐτὸς καταλέγει κτλ.> Lübbert, de Pindari poetae...(1886).

²Athenaeus VIII.337D (J76 T2); the Suda s.v. Λυγκεὺς

³First recognized by Barron, loc. cit.; cf. Habicht, loc. cit.

⁴Plutarch Alcibiades XXXII.2 (J76 T3).

⁵According to the sources, Alcibiades had seduced the Spartan queen, Timaea (Plutarch Agesilaus III.1f.; Alcibiades XXIII.7; Lysander XXII.3; Athenaeus XII.535BC; XIII.574D; cf. also Xenophon Hellenica III.3.1ff.; Pausanias III.8.7ff.; Justin V.2), and had fathered a son by a Melian slave (Alcibiades XVI.4f.). He also had affairs with numerous courtesans (Alcibiades VIII.3; XXXIX.1ff.; Athenaeus XII.535C; Nepos Alcibiades X.6), lay with his mother, sister, and daughter, and chased the wives of other men (Athenaeus V.220CD; XII.534F-535A; cf. XIII.574DF; also Lysias XIV.41f.). One story says that he was killed by the brothers of a young maiden whom he had corrupted (Plutarch Alcibiades XXXIX.5).

⁶See note 5.

⁷H. Michell, Sparta (Cambridge, 1964), p.157, note 3.

⁸Plutarch Agesilaus III.1f. (J76 F69).

⁹Whether Duris realized it or not, the seduction of Timaea may have had a deeper significance. According to Thucydides (VIII.6.3), Alcibiades was an hereditary friend of the Spartan ephor Endius, and they were very intimate. The two men may have been in collusion as early as 420 when Endius was a member of the Spartan embassy to Athens that Alcibiades caused to fail (V.44.3). Endius was certainly ready to help discredit King Agis at the suggestion of Alcibiades (VIII.12.2f.). Perhaps the seduction of Timaea was part of a plot aimed at undermining Agis' power while he was on campaign, and seizing control of the government.

¹⁰Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.116.

¹¹Plutarch Alcibiades VIII.4. Alcibiades' son, Alcibiades, said that his mother died soon after his birth (Isocrates XVI.45). That Medontis of Abydos was ever married to Alcibiades is doubtful: see Athenaeus XII.534F-535A; also XIII.574E.

¹²See note 5.

¹³The possibility that Alcibiades was only indirectly involved, and that one of his offspring married into Duris' family must also be considered. However, there is no way of determining how many children he had or their movements. He definitely had one son by Hipparete, who was also named Alcibiades (Lysias XIV; XV; Isocrates XVI; cf. also Plutarch Alcibiades I.4). Whether the children Lysias speaks of as having received an inheritance after Alcibiades' death (XIX.52) are also Hipparete's, cannot be decided. The son by the Melian slave (Alcibiades XVI.4f.) is certainly likely, and he must have had a daughter or there would have been no purpose to the charges that he had slept with her (see note 5). The son by Timaea cannot be dismissed. The complications of this theory certainly make it less attractive than the more obvious one stated in the text.

¹⁴The pro-Athenian faction was expelled from the island by Lysander in 404, and Samos received a Spartan harmost. In 394 Conon defeated the Spartan fleet at Cnidus, and the Samians reacted by raising a statue of

the Athenian admiral (Pausanias VI.3.16), and briefly joining an anti-Spartan alliance (see P. Gardner, Samos and Samian Coins (London, 1882), pp.53ff.; also J. Barron, The Silver Coins of Samos (London, 1966), p.118, which is the most recent study of Samos and its coins). By 390, however, Teleutias the Spartan was able to dock his fleet there, and he received seven ships from the Samians (Xenophon Hellenica IV.8.23).

¹⁵On the basis of numismatic evidence, Barron, The Silver Coins of Samos, p.119, says that Samian maritime enterprise, at least, had "contracted to be of a more exclusively local significance" during the period 398-365.

¹⁶Demosthenes XV.9f.; see also G. Grote, History of Greece (London, 1862), VII, p.258. Samos was not assigned to Persia by the terms of the Peace of Antalcidas (Xenophon Hellenica V.1.31; and Diodorus XIV.110.3), but its proximity to the Persian Empire guaranteed its absorption.

¹⁷For the date, see especially Inscriptiones Graecae II², 108: K. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte III.ii², pp.245f. For Timotheus, see Isocrates XV.111; Demosthenes XV.9f.; Nepos Timotheus Iff.; cf. also Grote, loc. cit.

¹⁸See note 14.

¹⁹Since Grote, three stages of the cleurchy have been assumed: the first in 365/4, soon after Timotheus seized the island, and two "reinforcements" in 361/0 and 352/1. For details about the cleurchy, see Diodorus XVIII.8.7; XVIII.18.9; Jacoby, op. cit., IIIB 328, "Philochorus," F154; and IIb (supplement) I, p.529; Strabo XIV.1; Aristotle Rhetorica II.6.1384b, 29ff.; Aeschines I.53; Scholia Aeschines I.53; Diogenes Laertius X.1; Inscriptiones Graecae II², 1952 and 1609: E. Schweigert, "The Athenian Cleurchy on Samos," American Journal of Philology, LXI (1940), pp.194ff.; 1437.20; and 3207. Inscriptiones Graecae II, 699.20. For the extent of the Athenian occupation, see C. Michel, Recueil D'Inscriptions Grecques (Bruxelles, 1900), no.832, pp.678ff.; and Gardner, op. cit., pp.58ff. Barron, The Silver Coins of Samos, p.134, note 13, believes that there may be evidence to demonstrate that at least one important Samian, a priest, was allowed to stay on the island.

²⁰Habicht, op. cit., no.30, pp.197f., which mentions Syracuse; and Michel, op. cit., no.368, pp.284f., where Gela is cited.

²¹Habicht, op. cit., no.25, p.193:

⁴ {τῇ βουλῇ καὶ} τῷ δήμῳ· ἐπαινέσ{αι μὲν}
{τὸν δεῖνα} Ἀγαθοκλέους ἀρετῆς ἐνε-
{κε καὶ εὐνοίας} ἣν ἔχων δΐατελεῖ vac.)

Agathocles' name is in the genitive case, and he is probably not being directly honored in this inscription. Agents of Antigonos and Demetrius were honored in other Samian decrees (see note 31 below), and perhaps it is an agent of Agathocles who is being celebrated here. The argument that this Agathocles is the tyrant of Syracuse rests primarily on the

fact that Samian exiles were in Sicily (see note 20), and that no geographical location follows his name. Such locations were used for purposes of identification, and are mentioned in other Samian honorary inscriptions except for prominent people such as Antigonus and Demetrius. Since Agathocles was so well-known, a geographical identification would be superfluous.

²²Habicht, op. cit., no.23, pp.190ff.

²³Barron, "The Tyranny of Duris of Samos," p.191.

²⁴W. Pape and G. Benseler, Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen (Braunschweig, 1911), record that Kaios is actually the equivalent of Caius.

²⁵This would argue that Kaios was born in exile. If Duris' grandfather, Duris (see note 1), was the son of Alcibiades, then he would have been middle-aged when he fathered Kaios (after 365/4).

²⁶Diodorus XVII.109.1; XVIII.8.2ff.; XVIII.18.9.

²⁷Habicht, op. cit., no.1, pp.156ff. Habicht assigns the details of this inscription, which speaks of a hostile Athenian action against the Samians, to a date soon after the return to the island. See also Diodorus XVIII.8.7.

²⁸Diodorus XVIII.56.7. This was ineffectual.

²⁹Habicht, op. cit., p.155.

³⁰Diodorus XIX.74-75. Stated no more clearly than by Antigonus himself in his letter to Scepsis of 311 B.C. (see C.B. Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period (New Haven, 1934), pp.3ff.). Cf. also Plutarch Demetrius VIII.1f.

³¹These inscriptions can be separated into two groups. Those before Antigonus and Demetrius assumed the king title in 306: M. Schede, "Aus dem Heraion von Samos," Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, XLIV (1919), 5M, pp.11f.; Habicht, op. cit., no.3, pp.169ff; no.13, pp.178ff; and those after 306: Schede, op. cit., 5G, p.6; 5H (Habicht, no.21, pp.186ff.), pp.6f; 5I, pp.7f.; Habicht, no.20, p.186; no.22, pp.188ff.

³²Schede, op. cit., no.7, pp.16ff.; and 5K, pp.8f. Both festival and tribe were probably instituted in 306 after Demetrius' victory over Ptolemy at Salamis, which led to the assumption of the king title. See Habicht, Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte (München, 1956), p.62.

³³Diodorus XIX.62.7; XX.50.4.

³⁴However, Lynceus mentions that he attended a banquet of Ptolemy at an unknown date (Athenaeus III.100E; III.101EF; and IV.128AB), and a Samian honorary inscription from the post-exilic period cites a Ptolemy, who may have been the ruler of Egypt (Habicht, op. cit., no.16, pp.180f.).

This could argue that Samos had some degree of free association while under the "protection" of Antigonos and Demetrius, but both instances may be the result of a period of peace between the Successors as in 311.

³⁵Athenaeus IV.128A; VIII.337D (J76 T1-2); and the Suda s.v. ἀνγκεδς

³⁶Athenaeus III.100E.

³⁷Athenaeus IV.128AB; III.101EF; Plutarch Demetrius XXVII.2.

³⁸Theophrastus was exiled after the capture of Athens because of his close ties with Demetrius of Phalerum and the general discontent with philosophers (Pollux IX.42; Diogenes Laertius V.38; Athenaeus XIII.610EF). The law which banished the philosophers seems to have been quickly rescinded since Epicurus was able to open his school before the end of 307/6. Theophrastus' exile could not have lasted very long (see W. Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens (London, 1911), pp.104ff.; and J.B. Bury, "The Hellenistic Age and the History of Civilization," The Hellenistic Age (first published 1923; reprint: New York, 1970), pp.6f. The affair does not discourage a date of soon after 307 for Duris' arrival in Athens to study under Theophrastus.

³⁹Habicht, op. cit., nos.18-19, pp.182ff. The inscriptions mention a foreign attack on Samos and the Athenians (19) are somehow involved. The context is badly mutilated, but considering the hostility of Athens toward Samos (see note 27), Habicht believes that their role in the affair was that of an aggressor. The date of the attack is not clear. Habicht places it near the end of the century, but before 307 when Athens was captured by Demetrius. Cf. Barron, The Silver Coins of Samos, p.136.

⁴⁰See note 1.

⁴¹This is a very reasonable birth date for Duris if his father Kaios was born in exile soon after 365/4 as suggested earlier (see note 25).

⁴²See note 1.

⁴³Barron, The Silver Coins of Samos, pp.139f., has attempted to reconstruct the details of the Samian magistracy.

⁴⁴Diodorus XVIII.18.3f.

⁴⁵Diodorus XVIII.18.8. Citizen bodies were reduced.

⁴⁶Diodorus XVIII.18.9.

⁴⁷Diodorus XVIII.74.3.

⁴⁸See note 1. Modifications by Barron, "The Tyranny of Duris of Samos," pp.190ff.

⁴⁹Pausanias says that Kaios won the boys' boxing contest

(VI.13.5: see note 1). The "boy" classification does not necessarily detract from the importance of Kaios' victory, or the theory that the triumph helped him gain power on Samos. The only distinction between the "boys'" and "men's" categories was a vague age limit-- perhaps 17-20 (see E.N. Gardiner, Athletics of the Ancient World (Oxford, 1930), p.41). There was no way of proving ages, and the final determination of one's qualifications probably rested on size. An Athenian "boy" was almost ruled out of the Olympics because of his stature and strength (Plutarch Agessilaus XIII.3). Another "boy" was forced to compete with the men and won (Pausanias VI.14.1). A predecessor of Kaios, Pythagoras of Samos, was victorious in the men's boxing contest after he was refused admittance to the boys' competition (Diogenes Laertius VIII.47). Certainly there were other examples of boys who could and did defeat the competitors in the men's division. Thus, the winner of the boys' contest was not to be lightly regarded. Kaios' victory undoubtedly won him great renown and probably provided a rallying point for the disunified Samians.

⁵⁰Particularly against Athens: see note 27.

⁵¹As demonstrated by Barron, The Silver Coins of Samos, pp.137f.

⁵²Ibid., and plate XXV no.4.

⁵³Barron, "The Tyranny of Duris of Samos," p.191.

⁵⁴F. Hiller von Gaertringen, Inscriptionen von Priene (Berlin, 1906), nos.11 and 37, pp.65ff., 111ff.

⁵⁵Welles, op. cit., no.7, pp.46ff.

⁵⁶Habicht, op. cit., pp.155f., thinks that Samos joined the Ionian League in honoring Lysimachus' general in Asia, Hipposstratus, in 289/8, and may have belonged to Lysimachus at that time.

⁵⁷W.W.Tarn, Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge: fourth impression 1969), VII, pp.91 and 98, believes that the tyranny continued under Lysimachus.

⁵⁸See Habicht, op. cit., pp.156 and 209ff.; Beloch, op. cit., IV. ii², p.340; Barron, The Silver Coins of Samos, p.144; Tarn, loc. cit.; and Hellenistic Civilisation (Cleveland: revised edition 1952), p.181.

⁵⁹There are no indications that the History, which began in 370/69, continued much past the death of Lysimachus, the last datable reference from the work (Pliny Naturalis Historia VIII.143 (J76 F55)).

⁶⁰Duris wrote a history of his homeland, and Plutarch accused him of distorting the truth in the interests of Samos (Pericles XXVIII.1ff. (J76 F67)).

⁶¹Photius-Suda s.v. Λάμια (Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1035) (J76 F17).

⁶²Diodorus XX.41.3f.

⁶³Athenaeus XIV.618BC (J76 F16).

⁶⁴T.W.Africa, Phylarchus and the Spartan Revolution (Berkeley, 1961), p.4, suggests that a similar thing happened to Phylarchus, and that digressions were extracted from his History and given separate titles.

⁶⁵Pliny Naturalis Historia I.7; I.8; I.12; I.36 (J76 T12).

⁶⁶See Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76 "Duris," pp.119, 124; and IIC 81 "Phylarchus," pp.136, 138, 142, for probable connections between Duris and Phylarchus. Phylarchus also appears to have borrowed the story of Arcadion and Philip from Duris (Athenaeus VI.249CD (J76 F3) (J81 F37)).

⁶⁷See Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.124.

⁶⁸Polybius II.56.10ff. See Walbank's comments (A Historical Commentary on Polybius (Oxford, 1957--), I, pp.259ff.).

⁶⁹II.16.13f.; III.47.6-48.12; III.58.9; VII.7.1ff.; XII.24.5; XII.26b.4f.; XV.34.1-36.11; XVI.12.7ff.; XVI.17.9; XVI.18.2; XVI.20.4; XXIX.12.1ff.

⁷⁰Strabo VIII.6.28.

⁷¹See Polybius III.43.7f. (Walbank, op. cit., pp.14ff.); XXX.22.1ff. (from Athenaeus XIV.615A-E; cf. Livy XLV.43.1); and XXX.25.1ff. (Athenaeus V.194C-195F; and X.439A-D) for good examples of "tragic history."

⁷²Polybius' father, Lycortas, had been general of the League, and Polybius himself had carried the ashes of the great Achaean hero, Philopoemen, who was instrumental in the final defeat of Sparta.

⁷³Duris must have been included in the frequent comments Polybius makes about his predecessors (see note 69), and he had probably read the Samian's account of Agathocles (see IX.23.2).

⁷⁴Didymus De Demosthene {Berl. Klass.-T I} XII.50 (J76 T7, F36).

⁷⁵Cicero Epistulae ad Atticum VI.1.18 (J76 T6, F73).

⁷⁶Cicero Epistulae ad Familiares V.12.6.

⁷⁷Cicero Epistulae ad Familiares V.12.3.

⁷⁸Dionysius Halicarnassensis De Compositione Verborum IV (II 20, 16 UR) (J76 T10).

⁷⁹Plutarch Pericles XXVIII.1ff. (J76 T8, F67).

⁸⁰"The man from Halicarnassus" must be Herodotus since Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not fit Himerius' description as ὁσοῖς λόγῳ γράψαι τὴν οἰκουμένην σπουδῇ ἐγένετο....See note 81.

- 81Himerius Declamationes XIV.27 (J76 T11).
- 82Photius Bibliotheca 176 p.121^b 3 (J76 T9).
- 83Plutarch Alcibiades XXXII.2ff. (J76 F70).
- 84Athenaeus XII.535F-536A (J76 F14).
- 85Athenaeus XII.542B-E (J76 F10).
- 86Plutarch Alexander XLVI.1f. (J76 F46).
- 87Athenaeus XII.529A (J76 F42).
- 88Walbank, "Tragic History: A Reconsideration," Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London II (1955), p.11.
- 89Schwartz, Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman² (Berlin, 1943), pp.123ff.; P. Scheller, De hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte, Diss. Leipzig, 1911. See also the more recent study of K. von Fritz, "Die Bedeutung des Aristoteles für die Geschichtsschreibung," Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité (1958), pp.85ff.
- 90Poetica IX.2-9.1451b.1ff.
- 91B.L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXXIII (1942), pp.25ff.
- 92Cicero De Oratore II.58.
- 93Walbank, op. cit., pp.4ff.; and "History and Tragedy," Historia IX (1960), pp.216ff.
- 94F. Wehrli, "Die Geschichtsschreibung im Lichte der antiken Theorie," in Eumusia, Festgabe für Ernst Howald (Zürich, 1947), pp.54ff.; G. Giovanni, "The Connection between Tragedy and History in Ancient Criticism," Philological Quarterly XXII (1943), pp.308ff.
- 95Herodotus I.30ff.; 86ff.
- 96Herodotus III.27ff.; 64ff.
- 97Herodotus III.40ff.
- 98F. Cornford, Thucydides Mythistoricus (London, 1907).
- 99Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, I, pp.14ff.
- 100Thucydides XXXVI.1-XLIX.4.
- 101Plutarch Artaxerxes XI.6 (J688 F20).
- 102Athenaeus XII.528F-529A (J688 F1p).

CHAPTER II

¹Habicht, op. cit., no.1, pp.156ff.

²Ibid.

³Schede, op. cit., no.6, pp.15f.

⁴See chapter I, p.7.

⁵Habicht, loc. cit.

⁶Athenaeus XI.499C.

⁷Athenaeus VII.295A.

⁸See page 27 and note 55 below.

⁹Athenaeus XII.542B-E (J76 F10).

¹⁰Athenaeus XII.529A (J76 F42).

¹¹Ctesias' account of the suicide taxes the imagination. After a 400' pyre was built, Sardanapalus constructed a wooden chamber on top and filled it with gold furniture. Having placed millions of talents of gold and silver in the chamber, he was cremated with his queen and concubines: Athenaeus XII.529B-D (J688 F19).

¹²Athenaeus XII.535E-536A (J76 F14); cf. Plutarch Demetrius XLI.4f.

¹³Athenaeus IV.167CD (J76 F4).

¹⁴Athenaeus IV.155C (J76 F12).

¹⁵Athenaeus XII.546CD (J76 F15).

¹⁶Athenaeus I.17F (J76 F49).

¹⁷Athenaeus IV.155D (J76 F37b).

¹⁸Athenaeus XII.525EF (J76 F60).

¹⁹Plutarch Agesilaus III.1f. (J76 F69). See chapter I, pp.2f.

²⁰Athenaeus XII.542C (J76 F10).

²¹Ferguson, op. cit., p.120; cf. Plutarch Phocion XXXVIII.1.

²²Plutarch Phocion IV.2 (J76 F50); XVII.5f. (J76 F51).

²³Plutarch Eumenes I.1f. (J76 F53). Duris mentioned Eumenes'

bravery, intelligence and his rise to a strong position from poverty.

- 24Athenaeus VI.249CD (J76 F3).
- 25Athenaeus XII.532D-F (J76 F35).
- 26Athenaeus VI.253D-F (J76 F13).
- 27Schede, op. cit., no.7, pp.16ff.
- 28Pliny Naturalis Historia I.33 (J76 T12); XXXIV.61f. (J76 F32).
- 29Pliny Naturalis Historia XXXIV.83.
- 30Suda s.v. Πανύασις Πολυάρχου Ἀλικαρνασσεύς. (J76 F64).
- 31Ibid.
- 32Rhetorica II.1384b.32ff.
- 33Politica V.1316a.32.
- 34Diogenes Laertius V.37.
- 35See chapter I, note 38.
- 36Athenaeus XIII.593EF (J73 F4).
- 37J.G.Baiter and H. Sauppe, Oratores Attici (Zürich, 1838--), II. 341; Athenaeus XIII.610F; cf. Ferguson, op. cit., pp.106f.
- 38Cicero Brutus 286 (J75 T3).
- 39Plutarch Demosthenes XXX.4 (J75 F3).
- 40{Plutarch} Vitae decem oratorum 847D (J75 T1); cf. Ferguson, op. cit., pp.156f.
- 41Polybius XII.13.9ff. (J75 T2, F4).
- 42Ibid.
- 43Athenaeus VI.253AB (J75 F1).
- 44Athenaeus VI.253D (J76 F13).
- 45{Lucian} Macrobian 10 (J75 F5).
- 46Jacoby, op. cit., IIIb 326 "Melanthius" (supplement) I, p.197, believes that Melanthius may have been a contemporary of Demon and Philochorus and he is treated as such here. For Demon see Jacoby, IIIb 327 "Demon" (supplement) I, pp.201f., and Atthis (Oxford, 1949), p.55.
- 47Jacoby, op. cit., IIIb 328 "Philochorus" (supplement) I, pp.223f.

⁴⁸a) Harpocraton s.v. ἑρπωπτευκδτων.; and b) Harpocraton (Suda) s.v. ἁνεπδπτευτος (Synag. Lex. p.398, II Bkr.; Phot. Berol. p.133, 14 Rei) (J328 F69-70).

⁴⁹For a discussion of the details surrounding the death of Philochorus, see Jacoby, op. cit., IIIb 328 (supplement) I, pp.220ff.

⁵⁰Dionysius Halicarnassensis De Dinarcho 3 (J328 F67). Philochorus was officially active as a mantis in 306/5 B.C. See Jacoby, op. cit., IIIb 328 (supplement) I, p.220.

⁵¹See Jacoby's list (IIIb 328 (supplement) I, p.242).

⁵²Jacoby, op. cit., IIIb 328 (supplement) I, p.231.

⁵³De Vita Aristotelis ex codice Marciano p.428.6 Rose (J328 F223).

⁵⁴Diogenes Laertius X.1; Strabo XIV.1.18.

⁵⁵Menander and Epicurus had been ephebes at the same time (Strabo XIV.1.18). Since Menander was associated with the Peripatetic school (he was very close to Demetrius of Phalerum (Diogenes Laertius V.79) and probably a student of Theophrastus), he must have also known Duris and Lynceus. Lynceus wrote a work on Menander (Athenaeus VI.242BC), and the Suda (s.v. Λυκευς) states that he competed successfully against Menander's comedies.

⁵⁶Ferguson, op. cit., pp.145, 174.

⁵⁷Athenaeus XIII.606CD (J76 F7).

⁵⁸Pliny Naturalis Historia VIII.143 (J76 F55).

⁵⁹Athenaeus XII.606C (F. Wehrli, Die Schule des Aristoteles (Basel, 1967--) III "Clearchus," F27-28).

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Athenaeus IV.184D (Wehrli, op. cit., IX "Chamaeleon," F3).

⁶²Athenaeus IV.184D (J76 F29).

⁶³Athenaeus IV.184DE (Wehrli, op. cit., II "Aristoxenus," F96).

⁶⁴On its genuineness, see J. Geffcken, Griechische Literaturgeschichte (Heidelberg, 1934), II, part 2, p.209, n.47.

⁶⁵Athenaeus VIII.345E (Wehrli, op. cit., III "Clearchus," F98).

⁶⁶Diogenes Laertius I.41 (Wehrli, op. cit., I "Dicaearchus," F32); for Duris: Diogenes Laertius I.22 (Thales) (J76 F74); I.74 (Pitticus) (J76 F75); I.82 (Bias) (J76 F76).

⁶⁷Athenaeus VI.231EF (Wehrli, op. cit., IX "Phaenias," F11).

- ⁶⁸Athenaeus XII.532D-F (J76 F35).
- ⁶⁹Pliny Naturalis Historia VII.30 (J76 F48).
- ⁷⁰Pliny Naturalis Historia VII.15f.
- ⁷¹Athenaeus VIII.333A (Wehrli, op. cit., IX "Phaenias," F17a).
- ⁷²Athenaeus IX.389F (Wehrli, op. cit., III "Clearchus," F36).
- ⁷³Gellius Noctes Atticae IV.11.14 (Wehrli, op. cit., I "Dicaearchus," F36).
- ⁷⁴Athenaeus I.22A (Wehrli, op. cit., IX "Chamaeleon," F40b)
- ⁷⁵Athenaeus VI.273C (Wehrli, op. cit., IX "Chamaeleon," F8).
- ⁷⁶Athenaeus XI.461A (Wehrli, op. cit., IX "Chamaeleon," F9).
- ⁷⁷Athenaeus XV.687A (Wehrli, op. cit., III "Clearchus," F41).
- ⁷⁸Athenaeus XII.516B (Wehrli, F43).
- ⁷⁹Athenaeus XII.522D (Wehrli, F48).
- ⁸⁰Athenaeus XII.539B (Wehrli, F50).
- ⁸¹Athenaeus X.416B (Wehrli, F52).
- ⁸²Athenaeus XII.529DE (Wehrli, F51d).
- ⁸³Athenaeus XII.540F-541A (Wehrli, F44).
- ⁸⁴Athenaeus XII.530C (Wehrli, F53).
- ⁸⁵Athenaeus VI.255C-257C (Wehrli, F19).
- ⁸⁶See Plutarch Lysander XVIII.3f. (J76 F71); and Athenaeus XV.696E (J76 F26) where Lysander is honored as a god. Habicht, op. cit., no. 1, pp.156ff., demonstrates the existence of a cult to Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV on Samos shortly after the islanders' return.
- ⁸⁷Harpocration s.v. Ἀσπασία. (J76 F65).
- ⁸⁸Athenaeus XIII.560B (J76 F2); Scholia in Lycophronem 513 (Tzetz. 102.143.183) (J76 F92).
- ⁸⁹Athenaeus XII.542A (J76 F19).
- ⁹⁰Scholia in Lycophronem 614 (J76 F34); and Diogenes Laertius I.119f. (J76 F22).
- ⁹¹The best example is the costume of King Demetrius: Athenaeus

XII.535E-536A (J76 F14).

⁹²See Athenaeus XIII.589D (Wehrli, F30); Athenaeus II.57EF (Wehrli, F35); Athenaeus XII.515E (Wehrli, F43); Athenaeus XII.540F (Wehrli, F44); Athenaeus XIII.573AB (Wehrli, F29); Athenaeus XII.543C (Wehrli, F42); Athenaeus II.516B (Wehrli, F43a); and Athenaeus VI.255C-257C (Wehrli, F19). There are other examples.

⁹³Athenaeus XII.548CD (Wehrli, F62).

⁹⁴Athenaeus VI.257BC (Wehrli, F19).

⁹⁵Athenaeus XII.541C-E (Wehrli, F47).

⁹⁶Athenaeus XII.522DE (Wehrli, F48).

⁹⁷See chapter III, pages 1f.

⁹⁸A. Leskey, A History of Greek Literature (New York, 1966), p.660.

⁹⁹Jacoby, op. cit., IIIb 328 (supplement) I, pp.234ff.

¹⁰⁰E.g. Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Γόρυρα• (J76 F61).

¹⁰¹Polybius IV.40.1ff.

¹⁰²Pliny Naturalis Historia XXXIV.61f. (J76 F32); and W.R. Paton, Anthologia Graeca XVI.120 for Duris' countryman, Asclepiades of Samos.

¹⁰³A. Momigliano, The Development of Greek Biography (Cambridge, 1971) pp.48, 76.

¹⁰⁴E.C. Evans, "Physiognomy in the Ancient World," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society N.S. LIX, part 5 (1969), pp.6ff.

¹⁰⁵Athenaeus XII.535E-536A (J76 F14).

¹⁰⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁷A.E. Haigh, The Attic Theatre (Oxford, 1889), pp.226f.

¹⁰⁸Athenaeus XII.542B-E (J76 F10).

¹⁰⁹Haigh, op. cit., p.221.

¹¹⁰Athenaeus IV.155C (J76 F12).

¹¹¹Haigh, op. cit., p.226.

CHAPTER III

- ¹In 295 B.C. Diodorus XXI.6.1 (Exc. Hoesch. p.490 W) (J76 F56a).
- ²Himerius Declamationes XIV.27 (J76 T11); for the identification of Herodotus as the "Halicarnassian," see chapter I, page 13, note 80.
- ³Otherwise it seems strange that Himerius would pick Duris from all the possibilities to compare with the two older historians. The similar religious views of Duris and Herodotus and a common interest in biography partially substantiates Himerius' grouping.
- ⁴Tzetzes Posthomerica 770 (J76 F41b); for Hellanicus (J4 F152b).
- ⁵Plutarch Camillus XIX.4f., mentions that Ephorus, Callisthenes, Damastes and Phylarchus all gave the date as the 24th of Thargelion.
- ⁶See Scholia in Lycophronem 513 (Tzetz. 102.143.183) (J76 F92); for Hellanicus (J4 F168b).
- ⁷Herodotus III.26.
- ⁸Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ἀυασις· πόλις Αἰγύπτου... (J76 F45).
- ⁹See W. How and J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus (Oxford, 1928) I, p.262, for Herodotus' confusion about Oasis.
- ¹⁰Cf. R. Schubert, Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit (Leipzig, 1914), p.84.
- ¹¹Pliny Naturalis Historia XXXVI.79 (J76 F43).
- ¹²Scholia in Lycophronem 848 (J76 F44).
- ¹³Herodotus II.33f.
- ¹⁴Suda s.v. Πανύσις Πολυάρχου Ἀλικαρνασσεύς· (J76 F64).
- ¹⁵Duris also agreed with Herodotus that Thales was of Phoenician descent but added the names of Thales' parents: cf. Diogenes Laertius I.22 (J76 F74) and Herodotus I.170; cf. also Scholia M in Euripidis Hecubam 934 (J76 F24) and Herodotus V.87 about the messenger from Aegina. The subject matter is similar but the details differ. Schubert, loc. cit., would still attribute Duris' account of the episode to Herodotus' influence.
- ¹⁶Athenaeus XII.529A.
- ¹⁷Photius Bibliotheca 176 p.121a 41 (J76 F1).
- ¹⁸Jacoby, op. cit., IIIb 328 (supplement) I, p.230; (J328 F209-10, 218).
- ¹⁹Diodorus XX.43.7. The passage comes from the Agathoclean nar-

rative of Diodorus in which Duris is known to be present (see chapter IV, pp.1ff.). Many scholars have considered it to be an example of Duris' concept of *μῆνις*.

²⁰Some examples are: II.71.1ff.; III.31.1ff.; V.31.2ff.;XXX.9.20f.

²¹Polybius is explicit about this particularly at IX.1.1f.

²²See below page 44, note 77.

²³Ephorus disagreed with Duris on the date of the fall of Ilium: cf. (J70 F226) and (J76 F41b); on where the name Eurybates came from: cf. (J70 F58) and (J76 F20); on the brutality of Pericles at Samos: cf. (J70 F195) and (J76 F67); and on details concerning the arrival of Alcibiades in Athens: cf. (J70 F220) and (J76 F70).

²⁴Athenaeus VI.249CD (J76 F3); for Theopompus (J115 F280). A. Momigliano, "Le fonti della storia greca e macedone nel libro xvi di Diodoro," *Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo* LXV (1932), pp.523ff., believes that Duris relied heavily on Theopompus.

²⁵Athenaeus XII.532D-F (J76 F35); for Theopompus (J115 F249). The episode is said to have been related in Theopompus' treatise On Funds Plundered from Delphi.

²⁶Cf. Didymus De Demosthene {Berl. Klass.-T I} 12.50 (J76 F36) and 12.43 (J115 F52).

²⁷Such as the arrival of Alcibiades in Athens: cf. Plutarch Alcibiades XXXII.2f. (J76 F70) and Theopompus (J115 F324).

²⁸Duris' brother Lynceus also may have used Chares for information about Callisthenes: see Athenaeus X.434D.

²⁹Among other things, Chares commented on the luxury of the Persians (Athenaeus XII.514EF (J125 F2)), and recorded that 41 men died in a drinking contest sponsored by Alexander. The winner was to have received a prize worth a talent (Athenaeus X.437AB; and Plutarch Alexander LXX.1 (J125 F19ab)).

³⁰Pliny Naturalis Historia I.12 (J76 T12c); for Chares (J125 T3a).

³¹Pliny Naturalis Historia VIII.143 (J76 F55) records Duris' story that Lysimachus' dog hurled himself into his master's funeral pyre, while Gellius Noctes Atticae V.2.1 (J125 F18) noted Chares' account of Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, who saved his master's life before dying of wounds (presuming that Gellius' entire account of Bucephalus' heroics derives from Chares).

³²Plutarch Phocion XVII.6 (J76 F51); cf. Schubert, op. cit., pp. 91f.

³³Ibid; Jacoby, op. cit., also accepts Chares as Duris' source here (IIB 125 "Chares," p.433).

³⁴Athenaeus I.17F (J76 F49).

³⁵Cf. Athenaeus XII.538B-539A (J125 F4); Jacoby, op. cit., IIB 125 pp.433, 434, believes that Chares was Duris' source.

³⁶Plutarch Alexander XLVI.1 (J76 F46); for Chares (J125 F12).

³⁷Didymus De Demosthene {Berl. Klass.-T I} 12.50 (J76 F36); cf. 12.55 (J135-6 F17). However, Marsyas did not agree with Duris that it was a javelin that blinded Philip's eye, but an arrow: 12.43 (J135-6 F16).

³⁸Jacoby, op. cit., IIB 135-6 "Marsyas," pp.480ff.; not Marsyas of Philippi, who also wrote a Macedonian History, and whose floruit is not certain.

³⁹Suda s.v. Μαρσύας Περιάνδρου Πελλαῖος· (J135-6 T1); Christ-Schmid, Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur⁶, p.537, and H. Berve, Das Alexanderreich aus prosopographischer Grundlage (München, 1926) II, p.247, believe that Marsyas was the step-brother of Antigonus.

⁴⁰Diodorus XX.50.4 (J135-6 T3); see also R. Laqueur, "Marsyas," Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft XIV,2 (1930) cols. 1995f.

⁴¹See Jacoby, op. cit., IIB 135-6, p.481, for discussion.

⁴²Plutarch Demosthenes XXIII.3f. (J76 F39); for Idomeneus (J338 F11).

⁴³It is interesting to note that while Plutarch accepted the correct number of hostages as eight, he ultimately recorded the names of ten. Two new hostages appear in the discussion of the same incident in the Phocion (XVII.2f.). Thus, Plutarch agrees with Duris and Idomeneus (see Appendix I). Diodorus (XVII.15.1) also gives the number of hostages as ten (see page 52).

⁴⁴Not the nephew; see Jacoby, op. cit., IIB 124 "Callisthenes," p. 411; Suda s.v. Καλλισθένης Αθηναίου· (J124 T1); Plutarch Alexander LV.4f. (J124 T2).

⁴⁵Stobaeus III.7.67= {Plut.} Parall. 307D (J124 F57).

⁴⁶Didymus De Demosthene {Berl. Klass.-T I} 12.50 (J76 F36).

⁴⁷See notes 4 and 5.

⁴⁸Athenaeus XIII.560BC (J76 F2); for Callisthenes (J124 F1).

⁴⁹Harpocration s.v. Ἀρχιδάμια· (J76 F65). The "Archidamian" phase of the Peloponnesian War lasted ten years so Theophrastus, like Callisthenes and Duris, evidently had a particular interest in wars of such length caused by women. Therefore, he could have been Duris' source for all the other wars involving women.

⁵⁰See Jacoby, op. cit., IIB 124, p.411.

⁵¹Athenaeus XII.542B-E (J76 F10). Even if Callisthenes' death, which soured Alexander's image among the Peripatetics, did mean something to Duris, it could not change the tone of what Callisthenes had already written.

⁵²Since the physical form of Duris' History is so ambiguous, extreme caution must be exercised when attempting to reconstruct it. Book numbered fragments cannot be positively identified as coming from the beginning, middle or end of a particular book, and incidents may be out of sequence. Assignments have been made on reasonable assumptions, which may not be entirely correct but suffice to give a general notion of the whole work.

⁵³See note 17.

⁵⁴Perhaps similar in thought to the Diodorus passage cited on page 37.

⁵⁵Diodorus XV.60.3ff. (J76 T5).

⁵⁶L. Ferrero, "Tra poetica ed istoria: Duride di Samo," Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni (1963), p.100, has overemphasized the meaning of the deaths of Agesipolis and Jason for Duris. Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.116, is more correct in accepting the date as the most logical for the beginning of a Macedonian history.

⁵⁷Athenaeus XIII.560B (J76 F2). Duris speaks of the causes of the Sacred War.

⁵⁸Athenaeus VI.249CD (J76 F3).

⁵⁹See Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.118.

⁶⁰Athenaeus IV.167CD (J76 F4).

⁶¹E.g. Plutarch Demosthenes XXIII.3 (J76 F39).

⁶²E.g. Plutarch Alexander XV.1f. (=De Alex. fort. I.327E) (J76 F40).

⁶³E.g. Athenaeus IV.167CD (J76 F4); Athenaeus X.434EF (J76 F5); Scholia in Dionysii Thracis {Gr. Gr. III} p.184, 27 Hilgard (J76 F6); Clemens Alexandrinus Stromateis I.139.4 p.86.21 Stä, and Tzetzes Post-homerica 770 (J76 F41ab); Athenaeus XII.529A (J76 F42); Pliny Naturalis Historia XXXVI.79 (J76 F43); Scholia in Lycophronem 848 (J76 F44); Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ἀναοῖς· πόλις Αἰγύπτου... (J76 F45); Plutarch Alexander XLVI.1f. (J76 F46); Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium II.1249 (J76 F47); Pliny Naturalis Historia VII.30 (J76 F48); Athenaeus I.17F (J76 F49).

⁶⁴Athenaeus XIII.606CD (J76 F7); for the date see Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.118.

⁶⁵Suda s.v. $\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \iota\epsilon\rho\delta\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\rho\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \phi\upsilon\sigma\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$. (J76 F8); see Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.118.

⁶⁶E.g. Plutarch Phocion IV.2 (J76 F50), and Phocion XVII.5f. (J76 F51) relate details about Phocion, who was executed in 318; Athenaeus XIII.560F (J76 F52) where Duris mentions the war between Olympias and Eurydice; and Plutarch Eumenes I.1f. (J76 F53) which describes Eumenes' rise to a position with Philip.

⁶⁷Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.117. By 316 all of Cassander's immediate opposition had been eliminated and Alexander IV had become his "hostage."

⁶⁸Scholia in Apollonius Rhodius IV.264 (J76 F9). In this fragment, Duris discussed the etymology of the Arcadian city of Orchomenus. From Diodorus XIX.63.5, it is known that Cassander was fighting the forces of Polyperchon at Orchomenus in 315/4; see Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.119.

⁶⁹Athenaeus XII.542B-E (J76 F10).

⁷⁰Scholia B in Euripidis Alceste 249 (J76 F11); see Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.119.

⁷¹Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.117, thinks that Ipsus was in Book XVIII.

⁷²Athenaeus VI.253D-F (J76 F13).

⁷³Athenaeus XII.535E-536A (J76 F14).

⁷⁴Athenaeus XII.546CD (J76 F15).

⁷⁵Plutarch Demetrius LII.1ff. Plutarch probably took his information from Duris; see page 48.

⁷⁶Pliny Naturalis Historia VIII.43 (J76 F55). Duris' fragment about Macaria and Macedonian funeral practices might be assigned to Lysimachus' cremation: see Scholia in Platonis Hippiam maiorem 293A (J76 F94).

⁷⁷There is no conclusive evidence that Duris' History ended in 281/0. Phylarchus began his History with Pyrrhus' death in 272 (Africa, op. cit., p.1), and his similar style might suggest that he started writing where Duris left off (as Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.117, has noted). Hieronymus of Cardia, whose history of the Successors coincided with that of Duris, may have terminated his work with the death of Pyrrhus (T. Brown, "Hieronymus of Cardia," American Historical Review LII (1946/7) pp.684ff.). M. Fontana, "Il problema delle fonti per il xvii libro di Diodoro Siculo," Kokalos I (1955), p.190, would make the date as low as 270, believing, like DeSanctis, Ricerche sulla storiografia siceliota (Palermo, 1957), p.98, Schubert, op. cit., s.v. Duris, p.286, and others, that Duris wrote after Hieronymus. Jacoby leans toward the date of 281/0 and accepts Droysen's contention that

Hieronimus wrote in reaction to Duris ("Zu Duris und Hieronimos," Hermes XI (1876) p.465). Whether this is correct or not, there is much more to support the date of 281/0 than 272. 281/0 marked the death of the last of the Successors, Lysimachus and Seleucus. It formed a distinct unit (Ferrero, loc. cit.) from Philip to the end of the first generation monarchs of the Hellenistic world. It has been postulated here that Duris' tyranny fell soon after Lysimachus' death and that his History was an emotional reaction to what Macedon had done to Hellas, Samos and himself. Furthermore, there is no evidence of Pyrrhus in Duris' fragments, and any material about him which can possibly be identified with Duris (see Appendix I) could easily have been contained in the 24 books. In Plutarch's Demetrius, a considerable portion of which may be assigned to Duris (see pages 45ff.), Pyrrhus, although fairing better than the other kings (e.g. XLI.3; XLIV.5), is called a newcomer and a foreigner (XLIV.4), hardly encouragement in suggesting that Duris would follow his exploits down to 272. Finally, there is no evidence that Duris even lived until 272.

⁷⁸W. Sweet, "Sources of Plutarch's Demetrius," Classical Weekly XLIV (1951), pp.177ff. Sweet's arguments are not necessarily those of this paper.

⁷⁹P. DeLacy, "Biography and Tragedy in Plutarch," American Journal of Philology LXXIII.(1952), pp.168ff. For more on tragedy in Plutarch see A.M. Tagliacchi, "Plutarcho e la tragedia greca," Dioniso XXXIV (1960), pp.124ff.

⁸⁰Plutarch's version of Demetrius' costume is a poor paraphrase of Athenaeus' account, which purports to be a direct quote. This might imply that Plutarch did not use Duris directly. Jacoby (IIC 76, p.119) suggests Phylarchus as an intermediary. Sweet is prepared to support a theory that Plutarch used a digest based on Duris.

⁸¹Plutarch Antony XXVI.1ff.

⁸²Plutarch Demetrius XVII.2ff. Demetrius dispatched Aristodemus the flatterer to convey the news of his victory to Antigonus. Aristodemus conceived of a plan whereby he would conceal his tidings as long as possible in order to make his announcement more dramatic. Upon reaching his destination, he began his way toward the palace and spoke to no one, including the king's messengers. Quietly and solemnly Aristodemus approached Antigonus, who, having been informed already of the man's strange behavior, expected the worst. Noting the anxiety of the king, and seeing that his ruse had been successful, Aristodemus broke his silence and exuberantly proclaimed Demetrius' victory. In an instant, Antigonus' greatest fears were turned into supreme joy.

⁸³XXXVIII.2ff. Antiochus fell in love with his father's wife and being unable to express his passions, decided to waste himself away. Worried over his son's condition, Seleucus summoned the court physician, Erasistratus, who soon perceived that Antiochus was in love. Observing the lad's highly emotional reaction whenever Stratonice visited him, Erasistratus wondered how to relate what he had discovered to the king. Pretending that it was his own wife whom Antiochus loved and hearing the

king's plea for him to give her up, Erasistratus asked Seleucus if he would do the same if it were Stratonice whom Antiochus loved. The king, desirous of any remedy to bring back his son's health, said that he would. Erasistratus then told him the truth and Seleucus, true to his word, gave his wife to his son to marry.

⁸⁴XXXIV.2 for both stories. Sweet, op. cit., p.179, would attribute these episodes to Philochorus.

⁸⁵IX.4.

⁸⁶XVIII.3.

⁸⁷XXV.6. Lysimachus hated Demetrius for his jest that while he was "King," Seleucus was "Master of Elephants," Ptolemy was "Admiral," Agathocles was "Lord of the Isles," and Lysimachus was "Treasurer." Since treasurers were usually eunuchs, Lysimachus was incensed at the allusion.

⁸⁸XXXIV.3f.

⁸⁹XLI.3f.

⁹⁰XLIV.6.

⁹¹XLV.3.

⁹²XIII.2.

⁹³Particularly chapters X-XIII; see also XVIII; XXIII.2ff.; XXIV.4f. Sweet, op. cit., p.180, has misinterpreted Duris' disgust for Athenian flattery as hate as have many others. See chapter II, pages 24ff.

⁹⁴Plutarch refers to Stratocles as a man of the stage (XII.5); see also XI; XXIV.5; XXVI.2f.

⁹⁵XIV.3; see also II.3; IX.3f.; XIV; XIX.3ff.; XXIV.1ff.; XXVII; XLII.1; XLIV.6; LII. The hostile anecdotes about Demetrius do not begin until 307 (IX). Since Duris resumed his History in detail in the same year (see page 44), the implications are obvious.

⁹⁶E.g. XXIV; XXVI; XXVII.1f.; XL.2f.; XLII.

⁹⁷XII.2ff. The sacred robe into which the Athenians had decreed that the figures of Demetrius and Antigonus should be woven with those of Zeus and Athena was ripped by hurricane winds; the altars erected to the kings as Savior-gods teemed with growths of hemlock. Unnatural, severe cold canceled the sacred procession at the Dionysia, and a heavy frost destroyed vines, fig trees and unripened grain.

⁹⁸XII.5. Stilpo the philosopher, who lived a tranquil life, is also cited for rebuking Demetrius' attempts to reconcile him after the king had captured Megara.

⁹⁹XXIV.2ff.

¹⁰⁰LII.3

¹⁰¹Homer (XLII.5); Sophocles (XLIV.2); Euripides (XIV.3; XLV.3); Aristophanes (XII.2); Philippiades (XII.4; XXVI.3); Aeschylus (XXXV.2); Sappho (XXXVIII.4); Archilochus (XXXV.4); Timotheus and Pindar (XLII.5). It should not be forgotten, however, that quoting poets was characteristic of Plutarch's method throughout his biographies.

¹⁰²XLVI.5.

¹⁰³XX.1.

¹⁰⁴XXI.3ff.

¹⁰⁵XXII.2f.

¹⁰⁶XX.4ff. Demetrius' "city-takers" and galleys of 15-16 banks of oars so impressed Lysimachus that even though at war with Demetrius, he asked if he might be permitted to take a closer look at them. The Rhodians, having successfully defended themselves against Demetrius' siege, asked for some of his war machines as a memento of the occasion.

¹⁰⁷XXVII.2.

¹⁰⁸See Appendix II for a listing of individual passages from the Lives. For the Pyrrhus, see Appendix I.

¹⁰⁹See note 95.

¹¹⁰Nonetheless, it should be mentioned that several of the fragments on Greek and Macedonian history in Book XXI are highly moralistic (e.g. 1.4a ff.; 21.1ff.) and not unlike Duris. The long anecdote about Dromichaetes and Lysimachus (12.3ff.) is also reminiscent of his style. The problems in assigning these passages to Duris, however, are manifold and obvious.

¹¹¹Diodorus XX.46.2. The details are so different from Plutarch that reconciliation is impossible; cf. Demetrius passages listed in note 93.

¹¹²Ibid. Cf. Demetrius passages listed in note 94.

¹¹³Diodorus XX.52.2ff. Cf. Demetrius XVII-XVIII.

¹¹⁴Diodorus XX.110.1. Cf. Demetrius XXVI where the details differ substantially.

¹¹⁵Diodorus XX.92.1ff. This passage is very similar to one in the Demetrius (II.2ff.), which occurs in a more sober part of Plutarch's biography. Both can probably be safely assigned to Hieronymus. At Demetrius XIX.3ff., however, like qualities of Demetrius are discussed

in what appears to be Durian style.

¹¹⁶There are many adherents to this theory. For a few see Brown, *op. cit.*, pp.692ff.; Jacoby, *op. cit.*, IIB 154 "Hieronymos," p.544; and "Hieronymos," *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* VIII,2 (1913) cols. 1540ff.; Schwartz, "Diodoros," *Real-Encyclopädie* V,1 (1903) cols. 684f.; K. Rosen, "Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia 323-302," *Acta Classica* X (1967), pp.41ff.; R.M. Greer, "Diodorus Siculus," *Loeb Classical Library* IX (1947), pp.vii ff.

¹¹⁷Jacoby, *loc. cit.*, thinks it is a "Zusatz Diodors"; Schwartz, "Duris," *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* V,2 (1905) col. 1856, calls it a "Coincidenz," and denies Duris' presence in Diodorus' history of the Diadochi. De Sanctis, *loc. cit.*, attributes the passage to Hieronymus and suggests that either Duris borrowed the information from Hieronymus or that both writers drew from a common source. Cf. also Schubert, *op. cit.*, p.96.

¹¹⁸See note 55.

¹¹⁹Momigliano, *loc. cit.*, with bibliography to date.

¹²⁰N.G.L.Hammond, "The Sources of Diodorus XVI," *Classical Quarterly* XXXI (1937), pp.78ff., and *Classical Quarterly* XXXII (1938), pp.148ff. Hammond depends too much on the pro-Athenian sentiment in some of the questioned passages to discourage an identification with Duris. Duris was more disgusted with the Athenians than hateful of them (see note 93). Nevertheless, Hammond's choice of Diyllus may be the correct one. R.K.Sinclair, "Diodorus and the Writing of History," *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* VII (1963), pp.36ff., concurs with Hammond on Diyllus. See also on Book XVI: P. Treves, "Per la critica e l'analisi del libro xvi di Diodoro," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* II.6 (1937), pp.255ff.; C.B.Welles, "Diodorus Siculus," *Loeb Classical Library* VIII (1963), pp.2ff.; R. Drews, "Diodorus and his Sources," *American Journal of Philology* LXXXIII (1962), pp.389ff.

¹²¹Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1950) II, pp.63ff., who argues also for a "Mercenaries Source," has become the focus of the endless debate over the sources of Book XVII. For recent criticism, discussion and bibliography see E. Borza, "Cleitarchus and Diodorus' Account of Alexander," *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* XI (1968), pp.25ff.; Sinclair, *op. cit.*, pp.41ff.; Welles, *op. cit.*, pp.6ff.; J.R. Hamilton, "Cleitarchus and Aristobulus," *Historia* X (1961), pp.448ff.; L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, *Philological Monographs* XX (New York, 1960), pp.78ff.

¹²²Fontana, *loc. cit.*, particularly pp.182ff.

¹²³E. Badian, "Alexander the Great, 1948-67," *Classical World* LXV no.2 (1971), p.48, says "too much poor argument."

¹²⁴See pages 38ff.

¹²⁵Cf. Diodorus XVII.15.1 and Plutarch *Demosthenes* XXXIII.3

(J76 F39).

¹²⁶Plutarch ibid.

¹²⁷Diodorus XVII.83.1.

¹²⁸Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium II.1249 (J76 F47).

¹²⁹Diodorus XVII.96.3.

¹³⁰Scholia Genavensis in Homeri Iliadem ϕ 257 (J76 F89); and 262 (J76 F90). For Iliad passage, II.228-382.

¹³¹Cf. Diodorus XVII.77.1ff., and Plutarch Alexander XLVI.1f. (J76 F46). This disagreement led DeSanctis, op. cit., p.95, to question the presence of Duris in Book XVII. Fontana, op. cit., p.190, has tried to rationalize the discrepancy.

¹³²Cicero Epistulae ad Atticum VI.1.18 (J76 T6, F73); and Dionysius Halicarnassensis De Compositione Verborum 4 (II 20, 16 UR) (J76 T10)

¹³³See note 55.

¹³⁴Even Hieronymus could be mistaken for Duris. The elaborate description of Alexander's funeral car in Book XVIII.26.3ff. can be safely attributed to him: see Athenaeus V.206E (J154 F2).

¹³⁵The possibility that Diodorus did not have the complete History of Duris but only random volumes must also be considered. However, when speaking of Theopompus' Philippica, Diodorus notes that five books of the work are missing (XVI.3.8). This implies that he would have done the same for Duris if lost books were a problem.

¹³⁶In the last century, e.g. L. Geschwandtner, Quibus fontibus Trogus Pompeius in rebus successorum Alexandri M. enarrandi usus sit. Diss. inaug. historica. Halis Saxoni (1878), p.28. For recent work see G. Forni, Valore storico e fonti di Pompeo Trogo, I (Urbino, 1958) pp.22ff., which contains all important work to date.

¹³⁷In a few examples where comparisons may be made, Justin disagrees about the circumstances of Philip's eye being blinded (cf. VII.6 and Didymus De Demosthene {Berl. Klass.-T I} 12.50 (J76 F36)); he mentions that Alexander called for Athenian hostages but gives no number (cf. XI.4 and Plutarch Demosthenes XXIII.3 (J76 F39)); in Justin the queen of the Amazons does visit Alexander (cf. XII.3 and Plutarch Alexander XLVI.1 (J76 F46)); the Caucasus is cited, but nothing is said about Prometheus (cf. XI.6 and Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium II.1249 (J76 F47)). Plutarch Demetrius XXVII.3 and Justin XV.3; and Etymologicum Magnum 460.49 (J76 F27) and Justin XII.7 may refer to the same incidents.

¹³⁸Justin's only reference to Demetrius that can be compared to the Demetrius concerns Antigonus' and Demetrius' assumption of the diadem (XV.2). Justin's account is devoid of the anecdotal material which characterized Plutarch's version. See note 111.

CHAPTER IV

¹As Schwartz, "Duris," Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft V (1905), col.1855, and others have suggested.

²Wehrli, op. cit., IX "Phaenias," F11-13? Too little of the work survives to know if Phaenias mentioned Agathocles.

³Timaeus was banished from Sicily by Agathocles (Diodorus XXI.17.1 (J566 T4a)). He lived in Athens for fifty years (Polybius XII.25h.1 (J566 F34)). For a complete review of the details of Timaeus' exile, see T. Brown, Timaeus of Tauromenium (Berkeley, 1958), pp.1ff.

⁴See chapter I, pages 3f.

⁵Diodorus XXI.2.1ff. In 299 Agathocles fought Cassander for the possession of Corcyra and won. He later gave the island as a dowry for his daughter's marriage to Pyrrhus (Plutarch Pyrrhus IX.1).

⁶Agathocles assumed the title of king in 304 following the example of the Diadochi. Among the Successors, Demetrius, with whom he concluded an alliance in 291, was Agathocles' closest contact (Diodorus XXI.15). Agathocles' daughter, Lanassa, married Demetrius after her unsuccessful marriage to Pyrrhus (Plutarch Pyrrhus X.5). The tyrant's power was clearly recognized by the "Eastern" rulers, and even Demetrius' flatterers, who upgraded Demetrius at the expense of the other kings, referred to Agathocles as "Lord of the Isles" (Plutarch Demetrius XXV.5).

⁷Polybius XV.35.6.

⁸Duris recorded that Eumenes (Plutarch Eumenes I.1 (J76 F53)), Bias (Diogenes Laertius I.82 (J76 F76)), and Socrates (Diogenes Laertius II.19 (J76 F78)) had humble origins. Only the fragment on Eumenes is extensive enough to reconstruct Duris' feelings, which were certainly not negative (see chapter II, page 21). There is no obvious reason why Duris would have disliked Bias or Socrates either, since both men had sterling characters.

⁹Timaeus' personal involvement with Agathocles (see note 3) caused him to exaggerate the tyrant's shortcomings for which Diodorus and Polybius chastise him (Diodorus XXI.17.1ff.; Polybius XII.15.1ff.). However, Diodorus (XXI.17.4) and Polybius (XII.15.1) both agree that Agathocles was impious.

¹⁰E. Manni, "Timeo e Duride e la storia di Agatocle," Kokalos VI (1960), p.172; and "Note Siceliote," Kokalos XII (1966), p.165. Manni admits that he has no proof and depends primarily on his own intuition.

¹¹The fragments of the Agathocles contain information about the Libyan flute (Athenaeus XIV.618BC (J76 F16)); about Lamia, a mythological beauty of Libya (Photius-Suda s.v. Λάμια (Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1035) (J76 F17)); and about Cleonymus of Sparta, who seized 200 Metapontine women (Athenaeus XIII.605DE (J76 F18)). They mention the beautiful

grove near Hipponium (Athenaeus XII.542A (J76 F19)); tell where the saying "Eurybates, a good-for-nothing," came from (Suda s.v. Εὐρύβατος· πονηρός. (J76 F20)); and the lustful Penelope, who gave birth to Pan, is named (Scholia in Lycophronem 772 (J76 F21)). The Romans defeated the Etruscans and their allies (Diodorus XXI.6.1f. (Exc. Hoesch. p.490 W); and Tzetzes Lycophron 1378 (J76 F56ab)); the juggler Nymphodorus first ridiculed the people of Rhegium for their cowardice (Athenaeus I.19EF (J76 F57)); Polyphemus established the shrine of Galatea near Etna because of the good pasture for animals and the great quantity of milk (Scholia in Theocritum VI f p.189.18 Wendel (J76 F58)); and most Sicilian cities are named after rivers (Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ἀκράγαντες· πόλεις ε. (J76 F59)).

¹²Athenaeus XIV.618BC (J76 F16); Photius-Suda s.v. Λάμια (Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1035) (J76 F17). See chapter I, pages 9f. for discussion.

¹³Athenaeus XIII.605DE (J76 F18).

¹⁴Athenaeus XII.542A (J76 F19). There is some confusion as to whether fragment 19 comes from Book IV of the Agathocles or Book X (Jacoby's text: δ{εκατι}). Since events before 317 down to at least 303/2 (F18) were covered in only three books, it is unlikely that it would have taken seven more books to reach 293, when the action of the fragment in question took place. Book IV is a more feasible location for the fragment. It is doubtful that another book was needed to narrate events to the death of Agathocles in 289. Jacoby, op. cit., IIC 76, p.120, says "buchzahl kaum über vier, keinesfalls zehn."

¹⁵E.G. Turner, "Anonymous (Duris?), Sicily under Agathocles," Oxyrhynchus Papyrus no.2399, XXIV (1957), pp.99ff.

¹⁶Manni, "Note," pp.163ff.

¹⁷Diodorus XXI.16.6.

¹⁸Brown, Timaeus, p.88.

¹⁹K. Meister, Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor von den Anfängen bis zum Tod des Agathokles. Diss. (München, 1967), p.197.

²⁰See notes 3 and 9 for Timaeus' dislike of Agathocles.

²¹Justin XXIII.2. Justin's (Trogus') description of Agathocles' death is particularly long considering the brevity of the rest of the narrative and is far more dramatic than Diodorus' account (XXI.16.4f.). The addition of Agathocles' wife and infant children by Justin is an excellent example of the "innocent suffering" found so often in tragedy, and the concern for details about the family's final parting serves nothing other than emotional interests. Since Agathocles was at least 72 when he died (Diodorus XXI.16.5), the story that he had infant children must be suspect (though it is not impossible). All these features point to Duris as the source of the account.

²²Diodorus XXI.6.1f. (Exc. Hoesch. p.490 W); and Tzetzes Lycophron

1378 (J76 F56ab). The fact that Duris is cited here for Roman and not Sicilian affairs poses no serious problem. The information must ultimately come from the Agathocles. Duris also spoke about Cleonymus the Spartan in the same work (Athenaeus XIII.605DE (J76 F18)). Cleonymus' activities in behalf of the Tarentines were directed mainly toward the Lucanians and the Romans, although he considered attacking Agathocles in Sicily (Diodorus XX.104.1ff.). There can be no doubt that Diodorus knew and used Duris' Agathocles.

²³Athenaeus XII.535E (J76 F14).

²⁴A.F.Roesiger, De Duride Samio Diodori Siculi et Plutarchi auctore (Gottingae, 1874).

²⁵Meister, op. cit., pp.131ff.

²⁶Diodorus XXI.17.1ff.

²⁷Diodorus XXI.17.4.

²⁸See page 57 and note 14.

²⁹Diodorus XXI.16.5.

³⁰Diodorus cites Timaeus three times (XX.79.5; XX.89.5; and XXI.16.5). The others are mentioned only once: Duris (XXI.6.1f.); Callias (XXI.16.5); and Antander (XXI.16.5).

³¹Diodorus XXI.17.3.

³²See note 3.

³³It cannot be denied that Diodorus, who described his homeland as "τὴν μεγίστην καὶ καλλίστην τῶν πασῶν νήσων" (XIX.1.7), and devoted so much of his work to its history, was a patriot. He would thereby want to use Sicilian sources when possible. If it was not Diodorus who organized the Agathoclean narrative, but an earlier author, the latter may have been even more inclined to consult Sicilian sources. C. Dolce, "Diodoro e la storia di Agatocle," Kokalos VI (1960), pp.124ff., has argued for such an intermediary between the contemporary historians of Agathocles and Diodorus. Manni, "Note," p.164, and "Sileno in Diodoro?" Atti dell'accademia di scienze, lettere e arti di Palermo (1957/8), pp. 81ff., has tabbed Silenus, the pro-Carthaginian Sicilian historian, and has been supported by R. Lauritano, "Sileno in Diodoro?" Kokalos II.2 (1956), pp.206ff. For someone like Silenus, who watched his homeland being absorbed into the Roman Empire, feelings of patriotism would be extremely strong. In composing his Sicilian history, Silenus would have had little regard for Duris. Walbank, "The Historians of Greek Sicily," Kokalos XIV-XV (1968/69), pp.476ff., however, makes a rather negative evaluation of the Silenus hypothesis. The intermediary theory is not new. C. Bottin proposed Agatharchides of Cnidus ("Les Sources de Diodore de Sicile," Revue Belge de Philologie et D'Histoire VII, part 2 (1928), pp.1317ff.

³⁴Diodorus XIV.73-74 is a good example. The passages relate the final stages of Dionysius' victory over the Carthaginians in 396, and include elements of drama, emotion, piety and other characteristics which might be attributed to Duris if it were not known that he was not present in this part of Diodorus' narrative.

³⁵See note 9.

³⁶For Antander as general, see Diodorus XIX.3.3 (J565 T1); for Agathocles as chiliarch, see Diodorus XIX.3.1.

³⁷Diodorus XX.16.1 (J565 T3).

³⁸Diodorus XX.72.1ff. (J565 T4).

³⁹T. Orlandi, "Duride in Diodoro xix-xxi," *La Parola del Passato* XIX (1964), pp.216ff.; Meister, *op. cit.*, pp.137ff. Meister's study is particularly vulnerable since he believes that "Moralische Kriterien spielen...überhaupt keine Rolle" for Duris (p.136), an assertion which has no justification.

⁴⁰Diodorus XX.43.7. See chapter III, pages 36f.

⁴¹Walbank, "Tragic History," p.7; Ullman, *op. cit.*, p.38. For Duris' criticism of Ephorus and Theopompus, see chapter III, pages 36f.

^{41a}Diodorus XX.63.1ff.

⁴²See note 8.

⁴³Athenaeus 535E (J76 F14).

⁴⁴Athenaeus 155D (J76 F37b).

⁴⁵Cyrillus *Adversus Iulianum* VI p.208 (J566 F15).

⁴⁶Diodorus XXI.16.5, where the charge of impiety is made, is completely negative in regard to Agathocles' character and most likely has its origin in Timaeus, who is mentioned by name in the same passage.

⁴⁷See note 9.

⁴⁸The passages about the Roman victory (XXI.6.1f.), and Cleonymus (XX.104.3f.) are concerned with Italian affairs. The information on Lamia (XX.41.3) is contained in an unnecessary digression about local folklore. The comments about the failing of historians to properly recapture the past (inspired in part, perhaps, by the actions of Agathocles and Bormilcar, i.e. XX.43.1ff.) are an interruption in the narrative which reflects personal beliefs on the composition of history (XX.43.7). The anecdotal passage about Agathocles (XX.63.1ff.) suddenly digresses into detailed character traits of the tyrant-- a departure from the general straightforward narration.

⁴⁹The definitive studies of the Atthidographers are Jacoby, Atthis; and op. cit., IIb (supplement), I.

⁵⁰Plutarch Pericles XXVIII.1ff. (J76 F67).

⁵¹See chapter II, page 23.

⁵²Fragments 22 (Diogenes Laertius I.119f.), and 23 (Porphyry Vita Pythagorae 3) come from the second book. There is nothing to confirm that the work was any longer unless the emendation of {ι}β is accepted for fragment 24 (Scholia M in Euripidis Hecubam 934).

⁵³Harpocration s.v. Ἀσπασία.

⁵⁴Photius-Suda s.v. Σαμίων ο δημὸς ἐστὶν ὥς πολυγράμματος.

⁵⁵Plutarch Pericles XXVIII.1ff. (J76 F67).

⁵⁶See chapter I, pages 1ff.

⁵⁷Harpocration s.v. Ἀνφοκίδου Ἑρμῆς (J76 F68).

⁵⁸Plutarch Agesilaus III.1f. (J76 F69).

⁵⁹Plutarch Alcibiades XXXII.1ff. (J76 F70).

⁶⁰Athenaeus XV.696E (J76 F26); and Plutarch Lysander XVIII.3f. (J76 F71).

⁶¹Diogenes Laertius I.119f. (J76 F22).

⁶²Porphyry Vita Pythagorae 3 (J76 F23).

⁶³Proverbiorum Codex Parisinus graecus 676 (S: Bresl. Phil. Abh. II.2.80) (J76 F62); cf. Diogenes Laertius VIII.47f.

⁶⁴Athenaeus XII.525EF (J76 F60).

⁶⁵Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Γόργυρα.

⁶⁶Inscripfen Priene 37.107 (J76 F25).

⁶⁷Zenobius Proverbia V.64 (J76 F63).

⁶⁸Scholia M in Euripidis Hecubam 934 (J76 F24).

⁶⁹Suda s.v. Πανόασις Πολυάρχου Ἀλικαρνασσεύς. (J76 F64).

APPENDIXES

INDEXES OF PLATARCH'S LIVES

In the search for original fragments of Plutarch's Lives we have found many interesting results. However, the present volume of Plutarch's Lives (1911) is not sufficiently necessary for any system of study. Plutarch's Lives are the second largest source of fragments, after the Plutarch's Lives (1911) and the Plutarch's Lives (1911). Although it is not specifically mentioned in the text, it is clear that Plutarch's Lives are for a long time in the hands of the reader (Chapter III, p. 100). There are many other possible sources of fragments in Plutarch. The Plutarch's Lives (1911) are particularly valuable and other sources are also available. But otherwise such material is not so much as it is any reasonable way it could be some-thing. The Plutarch's Lives (1911) could be very useful. Assign-ments must be made, with some lives, and the Plutarch's Lives (1911) are only those which can be reasonably assigned to Plutarch. It does not claim to be exhaustive, nor are the results unquestionable.

The Plutarch's Lives (1911) are the first of the Plutarch's Lives (1911) and the Plutarch's Lives (1911) are the first of the Plutarch's Lives (1911).

APPENDIXES

INDEXES

is a candidate for at least part of Plutarch's Lives.

APPENDIX I

TRACES OF DURIS IN PLUTARCH'S LIVES

In the search for additional fragments of Duris, Plutarch's Lives provide the most encouragement. Athenaeus, the greatest storehouse of Durian fragments (24), lacks the continuity necessary for any systematic study. Plutarch supplies the second largest number of fragments, eleven of which are spread through seven biographies (see Appendix II for an individual fragment listing). Although he is not specifically mentioned, it has been suggested that Plutarch also used Duris for a large portion of the Demetrius (see Chapter III, pp.45ff.). There are many other potential Durian passages in Plutarch. The boyhood stories of Pyrrhus (Pyrrhus, I.1ff.) are particularly suspicious and other biographies contain similar possibilities. But attributing such material to Duris simply because it may resemble his style would be senseless. Any writer with common interests could be responsible. Assignments must be made, therefore, with some basis, and this appendix contains only those passages which can be reasonably ascribed to Duris. It does not claim to be exhaustive, nor are the results unquestionable. All citations are, with the exception of the Pyrrhus, from Lives which include bonafide Durian remains.

I. From the Macedonian History:

Demosthenes XXVIII.3; XXIX.2-5

Duris is a candidate for at least part of Demosthenes' death

scene (XXVIII-XXIX). After Demosthenes had taken refuge in the temple of Poseidon at Calauria, Antipater sent Archias to arrest him. Plutarch records that Archias was once a tragic actor and that Polus of Aegina, the best actor of his time, was Archias' pupil (XXVIII.3). Polus was well known on Samos and is the subject of a Samian inscription (Schede, *op. cit.*, no.7, pp.16ff.). Duris, who had conceivably seen him perform, may have been responsible for this incidental information about Polus in Plutarch.

The heavy dependence on tragic allusion in the narrative also supports Duris' presence. The night before Archias arrived, Demosthenes dreamed that he was acting in a tragedy and competing with Archias for the prize. His performance won him the approval of the audience, but lack of stage decorations and costumes cost him the contest (XXIX.2). Because of this dream, Demosthenes answered Archias, who was trying to persuade him to surrender, by saying, "ὦ Ἀρχία... οὔτε ὑποκρινόμενός με ἔπεισας πώποτε οὔτε νῦν πείσεις ἐπαγγελλόμενος (XXIX.2f.)." Archias then turned to threats and Demosthenes observed, "Νῦν... λέγεις τὰ ἐκ τοῦ Μακεδονικοῦ τρίποδος, ἄρτι δ' ὑπεκρίνου... (XXIX.3)." Later, when Demosthenes had taken poison, he said to Archias, "Οὐκ ἂν φθάνοις... ἤδη τὸν ἐκ τῆς τραγωδίας ὑποκρινόμενος Κρέοντα καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦτο ῥίπτων ἄταφον... (XXIX.5)."

Phocion XVII.2-3

Alexander had demanded hostages from Athens after the city's unsuccessful attempt to defeat him in 335. The exact number was unclear to Plutarch, who offers two versions in the Demosthenes. Duris and Idomeneus recorded that ten hostages were required (XXIII.3 (J76 F39)), but Plutarch decided in favor of a more reputable tradition of eight. The list included Demosthenes, Polyeuctus, Ephialtes, Lycurgus, Moerocles, Demon, Callisthenes and Charidemus.

The Phocion (XVII.2) also contains a report of the incident. Here Plutarch mentions Hypereides, whom he did not name among the eight hostages in the Demosthenes. A speech made by Phocion includes another new hostage, Nicocles. Since Duris and Idomeneus are the only ones who reported ten hostages and Hypereides and Nicocles are not in the Demosthenes' list of eight, the two new names must have come from either Duris or Idomeneus. Duris is responsible for other information in the same chapter (XVII.6 (J76 F51)) so he is the most likely source.

Pyrrhus VIII.1; XI.6

There are passages in the Pyrrhus which resemble ones identified with Duris in the Demetrius (see Chapter III, pp.45ff.)

too closely not to have originated with the same author.
Compare:

Pyrrhus VIII.1

Ὁ δὲ ἀγὼν οὗτος οὐ τοσοῦτον ὀργῆς ὢν
ἐπαθον οὐδὲ μίσους ἐνέπλησε τοὺς Μακεδόνας
πρὸς τὸν Πύρρον, ὅσῃν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ θαῦμα
τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ λόγον ἐνεργάσατο τοῖς ἰδοῦσι τὰ
ἔργα καὶ συνενεχθεῖσι κατὰ τὴν μάχην. καὶ γὰρ
ὄψιν ᾤοντο καὶ τάχος εἰκέναι καὶ κίνημα τοῖς
Ἀλεξάνδρου, καὶ τῆς φορᾶς ἐκείνου καὶ βίας
παρὰ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐν τούτῳ σκιάς τινος ὁρᾶσθαι
καὶ μιμήματα, τῶν μὲν ἄλλων βασιλέων ἐν πορ-
φύραις καὶ δορυφόροις καὶ κλίσει τραχήλου καὶ
τῷ μείζον διαλέγεσθαι, μόνου δὲ Πύρρου τοῖς
ὅπλοις καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν ἐπιδεικνυμένου τὸν
Ἀλέξανδρον.

with:

Demetrius XLI.3

...οὐ γὰρ οὕτω μισηθεῖς ὁ Πύρρος ἀφ'
ὧν ἐπραξεν ὡς θαυμασθεῖς διὰ τὸ πλεῖστα τῇ
χειρὶ κατεργάσασθαι, μέγα τε καὶ λαμπρὸν
ἔσχεν ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης ἐκείνης ὄνομα παρὰ τοῖς
Μακεδόσι· καὶ πολλοῖς ἐπῆει λέγειν τῶν Μακε-
δόνων ὡς ἐν μόνῳ τούτῳ τῶν βασιλέων εἶδωλον
ἐνορῶτο τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τόλμης, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι,
καὶ μάλιστα Δημήτριος, ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τὸ βάρος
ὑποκρίνοιντο καὶ τὸν ὄγκον τοῦ ἀνδρός.

Compare:

Pyrrhus XI.6

...ἤδη δὲ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν τινες ἐτόλμων λέγειν
τὸν Δημήτριον ὡς ὑπεκτὰς καὶ προέμενος τὰ
πράγματα καλῶς δόξει βεβουλευθῆναι. τούτοις
τοῖς λόγοις ὅμοιον ὄρων τὸ κίνημα τοῦ στρατο-
πέδου καὶ φοβηθεῖς κρύφα διεξέπεσε, καυσίᾳ τινὶ
καὶ λιτῷ χλαμυδίῳ περιστείλας ἑαυτὸν.

with:

Demetrius XLIV.6

...εἴτα φανερώς ἅπαν εἶχε κίνησιν καὶ ταραχὴν
τὸ στρατόπεδον, τέλος δὲ τῷ Δημητρίῳ τολμήσαντές
τινες προσελθεῖν ἐκέλευον ἀπιέναι καὶ σῶζειν
αὐτόν· ἀπειρηκέναι γὰρ ἤδη Μακεδόνας ὑπὲρ τῆς
ἐκείνου τρυφῆς πολεμοῦντας. οὗτοι μετριώτατοι
τῶν λόγων ἐφαίνοντο τῷ Δημητρίῳ πρὸς τὴν τῶν

ἄλλων τραχύτητα· καὶ παρελθὼν ἐπὶ σκηνήν, ὥσπερ
οὐ βασιλεὺς, ἀλλ' ὑποκριτῆς, μεταμφιέννυται χλαμύδα
φαίδαν ἀντὶ τῆς τραγικῆς ἐκείνης, καὶ διαλαθὼν
ὑπεχώρησεν.

II. From the Samian Chronicle:

Pericles XXVI.3-4; XXIV.1; XXV.1

Plutarch discussed the Samian War in chapters XXIV.1, XXV.1-XXVIII.3 of the Pericles, and included Duris' censure of Pericles' brutality (XXVIII.1ff. (J76 F67)). It is probable that the account of the branding of prisoners in the same war also comes from Duris since it conforms in most respects to a genuine Durian fragment (cf. Pericles XXVI.3-4 and Photius-Suda s.v. Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος ἐστὶν ὡς πολυγράμματος· (J76 F66)). In the fragment, Athenian prisoners were branded with the Samian symbol, the samaena, while the Samian captives were marked with Athen's sign, the owl. However, Plutarch appears to have confused the details and records just the opposite. The Samians were branded with their own samaena, and the Athenians had owls stamped on them. It seems unlikely that prisoners would be branded with symbols of their own "country" rather than the sign of the power that defeated them. How the story became confused is not clear. Photius-Suda still had the more reasonable version many centuries later, so the blame probably rests with Plutarch, who admitted that he sometimes wrote from memory (Pericles XXIV.7).

Since Duris appears responsible for a sizeable portion of the Pericles' Samian War narrative, it should also be mentioned that both Duris and Plutarch cited Aspasia as the cause of the war (cf. Harpocration s.v. Ἀσπασία· (J76 F65) and Pericles XXIV.1; XXV.1). With potential Durian presence in chapters XXIV, XXV, XXVI, and known presence in XXVII, the possibility that Duris is accountable for the entire Samian War narrative of the Pericles must be considered (see H.N. Fowler, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology XII (1901), pp.211ff.

Alcibiades XVI.5

A lengthy passage from Athenaeus (XII.535B-536A) exhibits all signs of being Duris and includes accounts of Alcibiades' seduction of Timaea (cf. Plutarch Agesilaus III.1f. (J76 F69)), Alcibiades' arrival in Athens (cf. Plutarch Alcibiades XXXII.1ff. (J76 F70)), and Duris' description of the fantastic costume of Demetrius Poliorcetes (J76 F14). If the entire passage is Durian, which it appears to be, it is the

longest continuous fragment known. In this passage, it is also observed that Sparta could not have endured two Lysanders nor could Athens have put up with two Alcibiades. A similar remark may be found in Plutarch's Lysander (XIX.3), except that Hellas has been substituted for the city names. Theophrastus, Duris' teacher, is cited as having attributed the comment about Alcibiades, at least, to a man named Archestratus. The reference to Theophrastus, whom Duris appears to have consulted on other matters (i.e. Harpocration s.v. Ἀσπασίας (J76 F65)), and the parallelism between the content of the Athenaeus passage identified with Duris and the Lysander, suggests that Duris is responsible for both instances. If this is accepted, then Duris is probably also answerable for the passage in the Alcibiades where Archestratus' slur is repeated (XVI.5).

Alcibiades XXIII.7

Plutarch cited Duris for details about Alcibiades seduction of Queen Timaea in the Agesilaus (III.1f. (J76 F69)). Similar material in the Alcibiades (XXIII.7) and the Lysander (XXII.3) may also depend on Duris. Compare too Athenaeus' account of the seduction (see above).

Lysander XIX.3

See Alcibiades XVI.5.

Lysander XVIII.4-5

Proclus questioned Duris' criticism that Plato was a poor judge of poets (In Platonis Timaeum commentarii I.90.20 Diehl (J76 F83)). Heracleides Ponticus had praised Plato for preferring the works of Antimachus of Colophon when others were showing their esteem for Choerilus. Heracleides himself had been persuaded by Plato to collect Antimachus' poems when he traveled to Colophon. Thus, Proclus could not understand the reason for Duris' disapproval of Plato. It is not clear what exactly Duris disliked about the philosopher's critical abilities. Presumably, he found fault with him because he did prefer Antimachus over Choerilus, who was one of the greatest Samian poets. Considering Duris' strong feelings of patriotism, this certainly would have raised his ire.

In the Lysander (XVIII.2f.), Plutarch consulted Duris for the honors bestowed upon Lysander by the cities of Asia. Altars were erected, sacrifices were made, and songs of triumph were sung to him. The Samians even went so far as to change the name of the festival of Hera to Lysandreia.

In the passage (XVIII.4-5) following the recognized Durian fragment, there are several similarities to the fragment from Proclus. Choerilus was so esteemed that Lysander retained him to celebrate his deeds in verse. Antimachus of Colophon is also cited. Lysander judged against him in a poetry competition at the Lysandreia. Plato is depicted as an admirer of Antimachus. He consoled the poet after he had lost the contest and charged that Antimachus had not been defeated because he lacked talent, but because of the judge's ignorance.

The suggestion that Duris' criticism of Plato stemmed from the latter's preference of Antimachus over Choerilus is probably correct. Since Lysander had decided against Antimachus at the Lysandreia, Duris may not have been able to understand why Plato continued to favor the poet over Choerilus, whom Lysander had chosen to keep at his side. Lysander XVIII.4-5 indicates Duris not only because of its apparent consistency with the views reconstructed from Proclus' fragment, but also because it follows a known Durian fragment.

Lysander XXII.3

See Alcibiades XXIII.7

Lysander XXIII.4; XXV.1; XXVI.4

There are several examples of tragic allusion in the Lysander which should be mentioned as indications of Duris' presence. When Lysander had come to Asia with King Agesilaus, his friendship with influential leaders caused him to supersede the king's importance. Plutarch writes (XXIII.4):

...οἷον ἐν τραγωδαῖς ἐπικρικῶς συμβαίνει περὶ τοὺς ὑποκριτάς, τὸν μὲν ἀγγέλου τινὸς ἢ θεράποντος ἐπικείμενον πρόσωπον εὐδοκίμεῖν καὶ πρωταγωνιστεῖν, τὸν δὲ διάδημα καὶ σκῆπτρον φοροῦντα μηδὲ ἀκούεσθαι φθεγγόμενον, οὕτω περὶ τὸν σύμβουλον ἦν τὸ πᾶν ἀξίωμα τῆς ἀρχῆς, τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τοῦνομα τῆς δυνάμεως ἔρημον ἀπελείπετο (cf. Agesilaus VII.2).

Later, after Lysander was properly rebuffed by Agesilaus and was plotting to overthrow the Spartan monarchy, he took precautions to insure his success:

ἔπειτα τὴν ἀτοπίαν καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ καινοτομουμένου πράγματος ὁρῶν ἱταμιωτέρας δεόμενον βοηθείας, ὥσπερ ἐν τραγωδῇ μηχανὴν αἴρων ἐπὶ τοὺς πολίτας, λόγια πυθόχρηστα καὶ χρησμοὺς συνετίθει καὶ κατεσκεύαζεν... (XXV.1).

Ultimately, Lysander's play was ruined when one of his actors became unnerved (XXVI.4).

Agesilaus VII.2

See Lysander XXIII.4.

APPENDIX II

A LIST OF THE FRAGMENTS OF DURIS

<u>Jacoby No.</u>	<u>Müller No.</u>	<u>Source</u>
IIA 76 T1	II 466-69	Athenaeus IV.128A
T2		Athenaeus VIII.337D-- Suda s.v. Αὐγ- κεὸς Σάμιος
T3		Plutarch Alcibiades XXXII.2f.
T4		Pausanias VI.13.5
T5		Diodorus XV.60.3ff.
T6		Cicero Epistulae ad Atticum VI.1.18
T7		Didymus De Demosthene XII.50
T8		Plutarch Pericles XXVIII.1ff.
T9		Photius Bibliotheca 176 p.121 ^b 3
T10		Dionysius Halicarnassensis De Compositione Verborum 4 (II 20, 16 UR)
T11		Himerius Declamationes XIV.27
T12 ^a		Pliny Naturalis Historia I.7
b		I.8
c		I.12.13
d		I.{33}.34
e		I.36
F1	F1 469-88	Photius Bibliotheca 176 p.121a 41
F2	F2	Athenaeus XIII.560B
F3	F8	Athenaeus VI.249CD
F4	F12	Athenaeus IV.167CD
F5	F13	Athenaeus X.434EF (Eust. Od. σ 3)
F6	F16	Scholia in Dionysii Thracis {Gr. Gr. III} p.184, 27 Hilgard
F7	F17	Athenaeus XIII.606CD
F8	F21	Suda s.v. ὅτι τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ οὐκ ἔξεστι φυσῆσαι.
F9	F26	Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium IV.264
F10	F27	Athenaeus XII.542B-E
F11	F28	Scholia B in Euripidis Alcestem 249
F12	F29	Athenaeus IV.155C
F13	F30	Athenaeus VI.253D-F
F14	F31	Athenaeus XII.535E-536A
F15	F32	Athenaeus XII.546CD
F16	F34	Athenaeus XIV.618BC
F17	F35	Photius-Suda s.v. Λάμια (Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1035)

F18	F37	Athenaeus XIII.605DE
F19	F41	Athenaeus XII.542A
F20	F38	Suda s.v. Εὐρύβατος· πονηρός.
F21	F42	Scholia in Lycophronem 772
F22	F51	Diogenes Laertius I.119f.
F23	F56	Porphyry Vita Pythagorae 3
F24	F50	Scholia M in Euripidis Hecubam 934
F25	F--	Inscripfen Priene 37.107
F26	F65	Athenaeus XV.696E
F27	F71	Etymologicum Magnum 460.49
F28	F69	Athenaeus XIV.636F
F29	F70	Athenaeus IV.184D
F30	F--	Scholia Genavensis in Homeri Iliadem φ 499
F31	F77	Diogenes Laertius I.38
F32	F79	Pliny Naturalis Historia XXXIX.61
F33	F74	Photius-Suda s.v. σελίνου στέφανος· πένθιμος.
F34	F73	Scholia in Lycophronem 614
F35	F5	Athenaeus XII.532D-F
F36	F--	Didymus De Demosthene {Berl. Klass.- T I} 12.50
F37a	F4	Athenaeus VI.231BC
F37b		Athenaeus IV.155D
F38	F6	Plutarch Demosthenes XIX.3
F39	F9	Plutarch Demosthenes XXIII.3
F40	F10	Plutarch Alexander XV.1 (=De Alex. fort. I.327E)
F41a	F11	Clemens Alexandrinus Stromateis I. 139.4 p.86.21 Stā
F41b		Tzetzes Posthomerica 770
F42	F14	Athenaeus XII.529A
F43	F15	Pliny Naturalis Historia XXXVI.79
F44	F36	Scholia in Lycophronem 848
F45	F48	Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Αὔασις· πόλις Αἰγύπτου...
F46	F18	Plutarch Alexander XLVI.1f.
F47	F19	Scholia in Apollonius Rhodius II.1249
F48	F19a	Pliny Naturalis Historia VII.30
F49	F20	Athenaeus I.17F
F50	F22	Plutarch Phocion IV.2
F51	F23	Plutarch Phocion XVII.6
F52	F24	Athenaeus XIII.560F
F53	F7	Plutarch Eumenes I.1
F54	F25	Strabo I.3.19
F55	F33	Pliny Naturalis Historia VIII.143
F56a	F40	Diodorus XXI.6 (Exc. Hoesch.)
F56b		Tzetzes Lycophron 1378
F57	F44	Athenaeus I.19EF
F58	F43	Scholia in Theocritum VI f p.189.18 Wendel
F59	F46	Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Ἀκράγαντες· πόλις Ε.
F60	F47	Athenaeus XII.525EF

F61	F49a	Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Γόργυρα.
F62	F--	Proverbiorum Codex Parisinus graecus 676 (S: Bresl. Phil. Abh. II.2.80)
F63	F49	Zenobius <u>Proverbia</u> V.64
F64	F57	Suda s.v. Πανύασις Πολυάρχου 'Αλικαρνασσεύς.
F65	F58	Harpocraton s.v. 'Ασπασία.
F66	F59	Photius-Suda s.v. Σαμίων ὁ δημὸς ἐστὶν ὡς πολυγράμματος.
F67	F60	Plutarch <u>Pericles</u> XXVIII.1ff.
F68	F62	Harpocraton s.v. 'Ανδοκίδου 'Ερμῆς (Phot. Berol. 125.18 Rei).
F69	F63	Plutarch <u>Agesilaus</u> III.1f.
F70	F64	Plutarch <u>Alcibiades</u> XXXII.2f.
F71	F65	Plutarch <u>Lysander</u> XVIII.3f.
F72	F45	Athenaeus XI.504B
F73	F61	Cicero <u>Epistulae ad Atticum</u> VI.1.18
F74	F52	Diogenes Laertius I.22
F75	F53	Diogenes Laertius I.74
F76	F54	Diogenes Laertius I.82
F77	F55	Diogenes Laertius I.89
F78	F78	Diogenes Laertius II.19
F79	F66	Etymologicum Magnum 469.45
F80	F83	Etymologicum Magnum 513.26 (Et. Gud. 321.50)
F81	F83	Lexica Segueriana 451.31 Bk
F82	F75	Photius s.v. ἀγών (Phot. Berol. 28.7)
F83	F67	Proclus <u>In Platonis Timaeum</u> I.90.20 Diehl
F84	F80	{Plutarch} <u>De proverbiis Alexandrinorum</u> I.48
F85	F81	Proverbiorum Bodleiana {Paroem. Gr. I.83} 374
F86	F28	Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium I.211
F87	F39	Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium I.501
F88	F3	Scholia BT in Homeri Iliadem T 326
F89	F--	Scholia Genavensis in Homeri Iliadem φ 257
F90	F--	Scholia Genavensis in Homeri Iliadem φ 262
F91	F--	Scholia Genavensis in Homeri Iliadem φ 481
F92	F3	Scholia in Lycophronem 513 (Tzetz. 102.143.183)
F93	F76	Scholia in Platonis Phaedrum 89C
F94	F72	Scholia in Platonis Hippiam maiorem 293A
F95	F82	Zenobius <u>Proverbia</u> II.26
F96	F68	Zenobius <u>Proverbia</u> II.28 (Anon. in Aristot. Rhet. II.21; Comm. Arist. Gr. XXI.2.128.20)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 101-102.

2. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 103-104.

3. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 105-106.

4. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 107-108.

5. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 109-110.

6. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 111-112.

7. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 113-114.

8. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 115-116.

9. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 117-118.

10. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 119-120.

11. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 121-122.

12. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 123-124.

13. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 125-126.

14. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 127-128.

15. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1951, 44, 129-130.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Note: all ancient references not from Jacoby's fragments belong to the Loeb Classical Library with the exception of Justin (Trogus) for whom the Teubner text is used.)

Africa, Thomas W. Phylarchus and the Spartan Revolution. University of California Publications in History. Vol. LXVIII. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.

Barron, John P. The Silver Coins of Samos. London: Athlone Press, 1966.

———. "The Tyranny of Duris of Samos." Classical Review, N.S. XII (1962), pp.189ff.

Berve, Helmut. Die Herrschaft des Agathokles. München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1953.

Bottin, Camille. "Les Sources de Diodore de Sicile." Revue Belge de Philologie D'Histoire, VII, part 2 (1928), pp.1317ff.

Brink, C.O. "Tragic History and Aristotle's School." Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, N.S. VI (1960), pp.14ff.

Brown, Truesdell S. Timaeus of Tauromenium. University of California Publications in History. Vol. LV. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958.

———. "Hieronymus of Cardia." American Historical Review, LII (1946/7), pp.684ff.

Bruce, I.A.F. "Theopompus and Classical Greek Historiography." History and Theory, IX (1970), pp.86ff.

Connor, W.R. Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens. Cambridge: distributed by Harvard University Press, 1968.

Cook, S.A.; Adcock, F.E.; Charlesworth, M.P., eds. The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. VII. Fourth impression. Cambridge: The University Press, 1969.

DeLacy, Philip. "Biography and Tragedy in Plutarch." American Journal of Philology, LXXIII (1952), pp.168ff.

DeSanctis, G. Ricerche sulla storiografia siceliota: Appunti da lezioni accademiche. ΣΙΚΕΛΙΚΑ: Collana di monografie pubblicate dal

- centro siciliano di studi storico-archeologici. Palermo, 1957.
- Dolce, Concetta. "Diodoro e la storia di Agatocle." Kokalos, VI (1960), pp.124ff.
- Droysen, Johann G. "Zu Duris und Hieronymos." Hermes, XI (1876), pp. 458ff.
- Evans, E.C. "Physiognomy in the Ancient World." Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N.S. LIX, part 5. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1969.
- Ferguson, William S. Hellenistic Athens. London: MacMillan and Co., 1911.
- Ferrero, L. "Tra poetica ed istoria: Duride di Samo." Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni (1963), pp.69ff.
- Fontana, Maria J. "Il problema delle fonti per il xvii libro di Diodoro Siculo." Kokalos, I (1955), pp.155ff.
- Fritz, Kurt von. "Die Bedeutung des Aristoteles für die Geschichtsschreibung." Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité IV (1958), pp.85ff.
- _____. "The Historian Theopompus: His Political Convictions and His Conception of Historiography." American Historical Review, XLVI (1941), pp.765ff.
- Gardner, Percy. Samos and Samian Coins. London: MacMillan and Co., 1882.
- Giovanni, G. "The Connection between Tragedy and History in Ancient Criticism." Philological Quarterly, XXII (1943), pp.308ff.
- Greer, Russel M. "Diodorus Siculus." Loeb Classical Library, IX (1947), pp. vii ff.
- Haake, August. De Duride Samio Diodori auctore. Bonnae: Georgi, 1874.
- Habicht, Christian. "Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit," Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, LXXII (1957), pp.190ff.
- Hammond, N.G.L. "The Sources of Diodorus XVI." Classical Quarterly, XXXI (1937), pp.78ff.
- _____. "The Sources of Diodorus XVI." Classical Quarterly, XXXII (1938), pp.148ff.
- Hulleman, J.G. Duridis Samii quae supersunt. Utrecht, 1841.
- Jacoby, Felix. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Berlin, 1923--.

- _____. Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1949.
- LaPenna, Antonio. "Coniectanea et Marginalia I." Philologus, CVI (1962), p.267.
- Laqueur, R. "Timaios." Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, VI, ser.2 (1937), col. 1161.
- Lesky, Albin. A History of Greek Literature. Translated by J. Willis and C. de Heer. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1966.
- Manni, Eugenio. "Timeo e Duride e la storia di Agatocle." Kokalos. VI (1960), pp.167ff.
- _____. "Note Siceliote." Kokalos XII (1966), pp.163ff.
- Meister, Klaus. Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor von den Anfängen bis zum Tod des Agathokles. Diss. München, 1967.
- Mehnert, G. De Duride Samio et Hieronymo Cardiano Diodori Siculi auctoribus eorumque arte et ratione. Diss. Leipzig, 1921.
- Michel, C. Recueil D'Inscriptions Grecques. Bruxelles, 1900.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Le fonti della storia greca e macedone nel libro xvi di Diodoro." Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo, LXV (1932), pp. 523ff.
- _____. The Development of Greek Biography. Cambridge: The University Press, 1971.
- Müller, Carl. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Parisiis: A.F.Didot, 1841--.
- Orlandi, Tito. "Duride in Diodoro xix-xxi." La Parola del Passato, XIX (1964), pp.216ff.
- Roesiger, August F. De Duride Samio Diodori Siculi et Plutarchi auctore. Gottingae: Huth, 1874.
- Rostovtzeff, Mikail I. The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World. 3 Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1941.
- Schede, M. "Aus dem Heraion von Samos." Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, XLIV (1919), pp. 1ff.
- Scheller, P. De hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte. Diss. Leipzig, 1911.
- Schubert, R. Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit. Leipzig, 1914.
- _____. Geschichte des Agathokles. Breslau, 1887.

Schwartz, Ed. "Duris." Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, V (1905), cols. 1853ff.

_____. Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman. 2nd edition. Berlin, 1943, pp.123ff.

Susemihl, Franz. Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinzeit. 2 Vols. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1891-2.

Sweet, Waldo. "Sources of Plutarch's Demetrius." Classical Weekly, XLIV (1951), pp.177ff.

Tarn, William W. Hellenistic Civilisation. 3rd edition. London: Arnold, 1952.

_____. Alexander the Great. 2 Vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1948.

Tillyard, H.J.W. Agathocles. Cambridge, 1908.

Treves, P. "Per la critica e l'analisi del libro xvi di Diodoro." Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. II.6. Bologna: Zanichelli (1937), pp.255ff.

Turner, E.G. "Anonymous (Duris?), Sicily under Agathocles." Oxyrhynchus Papyrus no. 2399, XXIV (1957), pp.99ff.

Ullman, B.L. "History and Tragedy." Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXXIII (1942), pp.25ff.

Walbank, Frank W. "Tragic History: A Reconsideration." Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London, II (1955), pp.4ff.

_____. "History and Tragedy." Historia, IX (1960), pp.216ff.

_____. "Avenarius, Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung." Review. Gnomon, XXIX (1957), pp.416ff.

_____. A Historical Commentary on Polybius. 2 Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1957-67.

_____. "The Historians of Greek Sicily." Kokalos, XIV/XV (1968-69), pp.476ff.

Wehrli, Fritz R. Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar. Basel: B. Schwabe, 1967--.

_____. "Die Geschichtsschreibung im Lichte der antiken Theorie." Eumusia, Festgabe für Ernst Howald (Zürich, 1947), pp.54ff.

Welles, Charles B. Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period.

New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.

. "Diodorus Siculus." Loeb Classical Library, VIII
(1963), pp.2ff.

