

after Chaeronea. ‘Athens, Sokles and the Exploitation of an Attic Resource’ (xvi; on *IG* ii² 411) edits a decree which has commonly been linked with agriculture or the silver mines, but suggests that the resource may rather have been something such as salt, wild honey or resin, and that the decree is evidence of increasing intervention by the city in what had previously been considered private rights. ‘Inscribed Treaties ca. 350-321’ (xvii) notes that treaties with and honours for states become rare between Chaeronea and the Lamian War but honours for individual foreigners (including grain traders and men connected with drama: cf. Chapters ix, xv) do not: Athens could not play the same role on the international stage after Chaeronea as before, but its diplomatic activity was refocused rather than reduced.

On its own at the end we have ‘Athenian Chronology 352/1-322/1 B.C.’ (xviii), consolidating the discussions of chronology on many individual texts in previous chapters. Lambert notes that for the dates of particular texts the possibilities have more often been widened than narrowed, and updates what can be said for this period on various disputed issues: it is likely that ordinary and intercalary years were determined by Metonic cycles, and that the longer prytanies in each year were regularly at the beginning, as stated in *Ath. Pol.* 43. 2 (but in each case we cannot be confident that there were no exceptions), but the omitted day in hollow months may have varied according to the festivals prescribed towards the end of the month in question. An Appendix contains ‘Select Addenda and Corrigenda (2011)’; there are good indexes; a complete list of Lambert’s publications in the field would have been welcome (and cross references between chapters would have been improved by incorporation of the chapter numbers of this book).

‘This is a work for specialists’, to quote the opening words of the Preface of W. S. Ferguson’s *The Treasurers of Athena*. Greek text and detailed arguments abound, and this is not a book for the bedside of the “general reader”. However, Lambert is interested in and is good at investigating broader issues of importance as well as the *minutiae* of inscribed texts. He himself has plans to make translations of all his texts available on line, and to write a book devoted to the wider interpretation of the material. Meanwhile it is good to have so many of his articles collected in one volume. There is plenty here to benefit all those who work at an advanced level on Greek history in general, as well as those who are devoted to Athenian public documents, and it is to be hoped that they will disseminate the results in their teaching and writing.

P. J. Rhodes

University of Durham

Iris Sulimani, *Diodorus’ Mythistory and the Pagan Mission: Historiography and Culture-Heroes in the First Pentad of the Bibliothekē* (Mnemosyne Supplements 331), Leiden: Brill, 2011. 409 pp. ISBN: 978-90-04-19406-9.

Diodorus’ reputation has fluctuated widely over the centuries. The author of the largest surviving ancient Greek history, he was highly regarded as a historian from the rediscovery of the *Bibliothēkē* in the Renaissance through the eighteenth century. Beginning in the nineteenth century, however, Diodorus’ reputation declined precipitously and characterizations of him as “stupid”, “ignorant”, and an “incompetent compiler” became increasingly common. The value of his work according to scholars holding such views consisted solely in the quality of the sources he used in compiling it. As a result, scholarship on the *Bibliothēkē* was dominated by *Quellenforschung* intended to identify its superior but unfortunately lost sources.

Few trends in scholarship are permanent. The closing decades of the twentieth century were marked by a more positive reevaluation of Diodorus and his work, spearheaded by scholars such as Catherine Rubincam and Kenneth Sacks. In their studies the emphasis was placed not on identifying Diodorus’ sources but on elucidating his role as an author who actively shaped his

history. Iris Sulimani's (=S.) monograph, a revision of her Hebrew University of Jerusalem doctoral dissertation, is a significant contribution to this scholarship.

Unlike previous studies, which tend to focus on the books of Diodorus' history that treat the fifth and especially the fourth centuries BCE, S.'s work treats the relatively neglected first *pentad* of the *Bibliothēkē*, particularly the treatment of mythology in books Four and Five. The six chapters of the monograph are divided into two groups of three chapters each. Chapters One to Three are devoted to establishing the originality of Diodorus' work through analysis of his methodology. Chapters Four to Six analyze what the author claims is a central theme of the *Bibliothēkē*, 'the pagan mission', as it is reflected in Diodorus' accounts of six culture heroes: Osiris, Sesostris, Semiramis, Myrina, Dionysus, and Heracles.

The first chapter examines the place of the *Bibliothēkē* in the genre of universal history and the nature of Diodorus' contribution to the development of the genre. According to the author, Diodorus' contributions to the genre were twofold: he was the first to discuss in detail the character and methodology of universal history and he also defined the genre more comprehensively than any of his predecessors. This he did while maintaining that a universal history should (a) provide a comprehensive account of the history of all peoples and places from earliest times to the author's own time organized as a single unified narrative, and (b) it should include ancient mythologies. As to the date of the author's "own time," S. argues that, while the narrative of the *Bibliothēkē* ended in 60/59 BCE, similarities between developments under Augustus and Diodorus' account indicate that he was still writing at least as late as 27 BCE and did not complete his work in 30 BCE as most scholars believe.

In Chapter Two the focus of the study shifts from Diodorus' plan for his work to his methodology. The chapter treats Diodorus' use of his sources, arguing that while he usually used one main source for each topic, he did not merely copy his sources, but supplemented his principal ones with information drawn from additional sources, then edited and modified both in the light of his own ideas. The *Bibliothēkē* contains, therefore, two levels of ideas: one drawn from Diodorus' sources and one reflecting Diodorus' own ideas. Discriminating between these two levels is not easy, but S. suggests that motifs confined to a single book such as, for example, Osiris' role in ending cannibalism in Book One were probably drawn from Diodorus' source, in this case, Hecataeus of Abdera. By contrast, motifs which recur in multiple books and are expressed in similar terminology, such as the idea that great men were deified because of the benefactions they conferred on humanity, an idea that is repeatedly expressed in the *Bibliothēkē* by means of a prepositional phrase with *διὰ* or *πρὸς* followed by the accusative form of the noun *εὐεργεσία* probably reflect Diodorus' own ideas. While similar ideas certainly occur in the works of other first century BCE authors such as Strabo, Varro, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the frequency with which Diodorus employs them and the repetitiveness of his phrasing confirm that he is responsible for their presence in the *Bibliothēkē*.

Chapter Three completes the analysis of Diodorus' methodology by examining the organization of the *Bibliothēkē*. S. argues that by saying that he followed Ephorus' principle of organizing his work *κατὰ γένος* Diodorus meant that the *Bibliothēkē* was organized geographically with each book being devoted to a single subject as much as possible. The remainder of the chapter examines the techniques Diodorus employed to enable readers to find their way easily around the *Bibliothēkē*, focusing specifically (a) on his use of prefaces to each book to explain such topics as the nature of universal history, the proper role of speeches, and the place of moral issues in such works, and (b) his use of devices such as summary conclusions and formulaic phrases, which S. exhaustively documents, to mark transitions between topics within books and the divisions between books.

Having defined Diodorus' goals in writing the *Bibliothēkē* and his success in achieving them, S.'s focus shifts to consideration of the pagan mission proper. Chapter Four treats the relationship between Diodorus' mythical geography and reality. S. makes two points: (1) the journeys of

Diodorus' mythical heroes follow major campaign and trading routes of the Hellenistic period, and (2) whenever possible Diodorus portrays them as visiting regions particularly relevant to the history of the first century BCE. Consequently, Diodorus' mythological books, S. suggests, can be said to function also as a geographical introduction to the *Bibliothēkē* as a whole.

Chapter Five treats the pagan mission proper, namely, the role of Diodorus' heroes in civilizing humanity, a process S. divides into three parts: (1) the cultural mission involving the introduction of agriculture and its related technologies, (2) the religious mission in which they spread their own cults as well as those of other deities throughout the world, and (3) the political mission which was marked by the foundation of cities and the establishment of law. In the final chapter S. examines the varying relationships between Diodorus' heroes, treated as missionaries, and the peoples they encountered: conferring benefits on those who received them well and punishing those who rejected them, in accordance with Diodorus' idealized view of the behavior of his historical heroes, Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar.

Diodorus' Mythistory and the Pagan Mission is a large and complex study, so it is not surprising that not all of its arguments are equally persuasive. The parallels, for example, between the *Bibliothēkē* and the works of various Augustan writers which S. cites in support of her claim that Diodorus was still writing as late as 27 BCE are, in fact, too vague to bear the weight she places upon them. Equally unconvincing is the parallel S. draws between encyclopedic works such as Strabo's *Geography* and Pliny's *Natural History* with their explicit citations of sources and Diodorus' erratic citation of sources, as evidenced, for example, by his omission of source references for his accounts of India, Libya, and Arabia in Books Two and Three. Nevertheless, these flaws are outweighed by the work's positive contributions including but not limited to the clarification of Diodorus' place in the development of the genre of universal history, the analysis of *euergetism* as a major theme in the *Bibliothēkē*, the explication of the compositional devices Diodorus used to organize his work, and the identification of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar as paradigmatic figures in Diodorus' view of history. These make S.' work one of the most significant contributions to Diodoran studies in recent years.

Stanley M. Burstein

California State University, Los Angeles

Francesco de Angelis (ed.), *Spaces of Justice in the Roman World (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 35)*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010. 434 pp. ISBN: 978-90-04-18925-6.

Classicists benefit from a long tradition of scholarship on both the textual and material cultures of the areas and periods we study. As the humanities grapple with wider questions about the relationship between the material world and the realm of ideas, we are well placed to use our data to exploit new hypotheses and approaches. One set of such approaches — not exactly “new” any longer but yet to be exploited to its full potential — has found enough popularity and coherence in recent decades to win a name, ‘The Spatial Turn’. Under this rubric, space is not merely an inert backdrop to human activity but an active participant. Our conceptions of what space is shape our knowledge and understanding; on a smaller scale, the architecture around us limits our behaviour not only because we cannot walk through walls, but also by giving literal and metaphorical form to our ideas of what a house, or an office, or a courtroom is and can be, and how we should relate to it. Acknowledging the importance of these relationships can help us bring together archaeologically attested spaces and cultural concepts not just as illustrative ‘contexts’ for each other, but as interpretative partners.

The spatial turn is nothing new to many classicists. To take two examples from Roman studies, each going back several decades: historians have found new approaches to Republican politics by looking seriously at its spatial setting, while archaeologists have made great strides in interpreting