In 413 BC, the destruction of Athens’ fleet at Syracuse foreshadowed the outcome of the Peloponnesian War. According to Thucydides, the battles dragged on for years and the greatest war of the Greek history culminated in the destruction of the Athenian Armada,1 which partly led to the fall of Athens’ hegemony. The Sicilian defeat clearly indicated that the Athenians recognized the frailty of their political power and victories and the fact that they suffered from their own power politics described in the Melian dialogue (Thuc. V, 84–114).

We can read about the hardships the rest of the Athenian army had to face after the Sicilian failure in Thucydides’ Historiae (Thuc. VII, 72–87). The decimated troops attempt to reach the interior of the island.2 Firstly they head to the north – to their ally, Katanē. However, their plan has to be changed since the Syracusans march towards them so they turn southwest.3 By this time the situation is obvious: the Athenian army’s collapse is inevitable. First Demosthenes chooses to surrender with about 6000 people,4 and then Nicias as well following the events at the Asinarius-River.5 Then the victors capture the rest of the Athenians and take the seven thousand captured to Syracuse.6 The Spartan command, Glylippus wants to take the Athenian generals as trophies to Sparta

---

1 Thuc. VII, 87.5. The present paper has been prepared with the support of the Campus Hungary Scholarship of the Balassi Institute.
2 Thuc. VII, 73.1.
3 Thuc. VII, 80.2.
4 Thuc. VII, 82.3.
5 Thuc. VII, 85.1.
6 Thuc. VII, 87.4.
in the hope that he can get a reward. Nevertheless, the strategi are executed in the city against his will and the hostages are immediately sent to the quarries, where the Athenians work under inhumane conditions. We do not know any more about the fate of the Athenian prisoners.

The defeat in Sicily must have been a sore point for the Athenian historian, which may explain why he does not detail the circumstances of the conviction of the Athenian hostages. The Syracusans only express the *timōria*-principle towards the prisoners of war. Thucydides does not mention any other possible alternatives. The strategi are immediately executed and the fate of the Athenian prisoners is not discussed for and against.

The post-Thucydidean – but possibly already the 4th century BC – historical tradition tried to make up for this lack of the Athenian historiographer. In this paper I intent to examine this circumstance of the Sicilian expedition in Book 13th of Diodorus Siculus’ *Bibliotheca Historica*.

Unlike Thucydides, Diodorus aims at describing the history of the Athenian hostages’ conviction from other viewpoints and compensating the one-sided decision of the Syracusans. Let us see how.

After the Syracusans return to the city, Diodorus gives an account of an assembly consulting about the fate of the Athenian prisoners and a heated debate that takes place there. The ecclesia is an excellent field for the Sicilian historiographer to deliver speeches. Perhaps Diodorus uses the indirect and the direct speeches to highlight the difference between these *orationes*. At first, the demagogue Diocles wants to speak. In the politician’s opinion the Athenian generals have to be tortured to death immediately, while the prisoners have to be sent to the quarries. After this proposal, Hermocrates appears before the Syracusan assembly. He claims that κάλλιόν ἐστι τοῦ νικᾶν τὸ τὴν νίκην ἐνεγκεῖν ἀνθρωπίνως. The Syracusan command’s attempt is in vain since the raucous clamour of the people silences him. Thus, he has to finish his oratory.

This is followed by a lengthy speech delivered in *oratio recta* (XIII, 20.1–27.6). It is also a great opportunity for Diodorus to show off his oratorical skills to his

---

7 Thuc. VII, 86.1–2.
9 Cf. Plu. *Nic*. 28. In the account of Plutarch, Eurycles, one of the demagogues speaks in the same way.
10 D.S. XIII, 19.4.
12 D.S. XIII, 19.6.
readers. Unlike the Thucydidean historical tradition, a new character appears on the rostrum in a rather theatrical manner. Nicolaus is neither a general nor a politician but only an old Syracusan man. However, his appearance on the rostrum is justified. The speech of Nicolaus tells about his personal tragedies (ἐστερημένος ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ δυεῖν υἱῶν) and the audience listens to it carefully. The dēmos believes that Diocles’ proposal will be supported by Nicolaus, but on the contrary, Nicolaus agrees with Hermocrates in his oratio. Now I am going to describe briefly the structure of Nicolaus’ speech.

The beginning of his oration has a personal tone. He has every right to have a hatred of the Athenians (εἰκότως οὖν μισῶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους), since his sons died in the war against Syracuse while fighting against Athens. Overcoming his personal pains, he urges the assembly to take the interest (τό τε κοινῇ συμφέρον) and fame (δόξα) of the city into consideration and judge the prisoners not by the timōria-principle, but by the mercy to their enemies (ἀμα τῷ πρὸς τοὺς ἦτυχηκότας ἐλέῳ κρίνεται).

Nicolaus warns the Syracusans of the hybris. In his opinion, the gods always punish the arrogant men, which is illustrated by the exemplum of the defeated Athens (ὁ μὲν οὖν δῆμος τῶν Ἀθηναίων τῆς ἰδίας ἀνοίας ἀξίαν κεκόμισται τιμωρίαν). The financial background guaranteed by the Delian League seemed to have been futile (ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς τηλικαύτης παρασκευῆς οὔτε ναῦς οὔτ’ ἄνηρ οὐθεὶς ἐπανῆλθεν, ὥστε μηδὲ αὐτοῖς τὸν ἀγγελοῦντα τὴν συμφορὰν περιλειφθῆναι.).

He presumes that Tychē, who has a higher and superhuman (ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον) power, has something to do with the events (ἣ φύσει ταῖς ἀνθρωπίναις ἡδομένη συμφοραῖς ὀξείς τῆς εὐδαιμονίας ποιεῖ τὰς μεταβολάς).

Further, in his speech, he points out that those who want to take a leading political position (τοὺς τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀντιποιουμένους), cannot obtain it by the force of the armies and the fear, but by the epieikeia (μὴ οὕτως τοῖς ὀπλοῖς

---

13 D.S. XIII, 20.5.
15 D.S. XIII, 21.3. τίς γὰρ ἄν ἤλπισεν Ἀθηναίους μῦρια μὲν εἰληφότας ἐκ Δήλου τάλαντα, τριήρεις δὲ διακοσίας εἰς Σικελίαν ἀπεσταλκότας καὶ τοὺς ἀγωνισομένους ἄνδρας πλείους τῶν τετρακισμυρίων, οὕτως μεγάλαις συμφορὰῖς περιπεσεῖσθαι; Cf. Isoc. De pace 84–86.
16 D.S. XIII, 21.3. “From the gigantic force they fitted out not one ship, not one man has returned home, so that there is not even a survivor left to bring them the news of this disaster.” (Diodorus’ English translations – if not otherwise indicated – by Green, P.)
17 D.S. XIII, 21.5. “who by her nature delights in human suffering and works such sharp changes in human prosperity.”
The old man continues like this:

οἱ γὰρ ὑποτεταγμένοι τοὺς μὲν φόβῳ κατισχύοντας καιροτηρήσαντες ἁμύνονται διὰ τὸ μῖσος, τοὺς δὲ φιλανθρώπως ἀφηγουμένους βεβαίως ἀγαπώντες ἀεὶ συναύξουσι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν.19

To justify his claim, Nicolaus takes the tone of Herodotus and illustrates the necessity of philanthropy with more exempla from the past. He recalls the fall of the Median Empire, which happened because of its brutality (ὠμότης), the history of the philanthrōpos Cyrus and Croesus and Gelo who is endowed with epieikeia.20

After having introduced these political and ethical concepts,21 he tries to persuade his audience that this event offers the opportunity to establish the friendship with Athens (τίνα καλλίω καιρὸν εὑρήσετε τοῦ νῦν ὑπάρχοντος, ἐν ὣ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπταικότας φιλανθρωπίαν ἀφορμὴν τῆς φιλίας ποιήσεσθε;).22

In the rest of his oratio, Nicolaus focuses on the political and cultural merits of Athens. This is nearly like an enkōmion:

---

19 D.S. XIII, 22.1. “The subjugated watch for their opportunity to retaliate, out of hatred against those who use fear to repress them; whereas humane leaders they regard with constant affection and thus invariably help to strengthen their authority.”
20 D.S. XIII, 22.1–5.
21 D.S. XIII, 23.1–24.6. In the following chapters, Nicolaus expresses with the idealized image of the unity of humanity that the aim is not to slaughter each other, but rather to show compassion, kindness and gentleness towards each other. According to him, everyone is weak, helpless and dependant on the power of Fortuna. It is important to note that Nicolaus always uses the word οἱ ἄνθρωποι for the Greeks. See Burde, P.: Untersuchungen zur antiken Universalgeschichtsschreibung. München 1974, 18. According to his belief, there is a concept which connects the whole humankind (τὰ κοινὰ πάντων νόμιμα). The sympathy resides in the civilized (i.e. Greek) soul, it is the part of human nature. He provides another historical example to demonstrate it. The Athenians captured many Lacedaemonians in the battle of Sphacteria (in 425 BC) in the Peloponnesian War. However, the brutal massacre did not happen since the Lacedaemonians could ransom the prisoners. Nicolaus says that the hatred between the Greeks is only allowed until victory but who goes further and “wreaks vengeance upon the vanquished who flees for refuge to the leniency of his conqueror is no longer punishing his enemy but, far more, is guilty of an offence against human weakness.” The old man keeps reminding of the vagaries of Tychē, who can make the winners weaker than their subjects at any time. Nicolaus quotes some old commonplace sayings to highlight the power of the goddess: ἀνθρωπε, μὴ μέγα φρόνει: γνῶθι σαυτόν; ἰδε τὴν τύχην ἀπάντων οὕσαν κυρίαν.
οὕτω γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ πρῶτοι τροφῆς ἡμέρου τοῖς Ἑλλησί μεταδόντες, ἣν ἰδίᾳ παρὰ θεῶν λαβόντες τῇ χρείᾳ κοινὴν ἐποίησαν· οὕτω πρῶτοι τοὺς καταφυγόντας διασώσαντες τοὺς περὶ τῶν ἱκετῶν νόμους παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἱσχὺσαν· ὧν ἀρχηγοὺς γενομένους οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτοὺς ἀποστερῆσαι.23

He points out that the Athenians offered their city to the common school of mankind (τοῖς τὴν πατρίδα κοινὸν παιδευτήριον παρεχομένοις πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις) so the Syracusan people must be owed a debt of gratitude for their benefits to mankind (χάριν δ’ αὐτοῖς ἀπομερίσαι τῶν εἰς ἄνθρωπον εὐεργετημάτων).24

The Syracusan man emphasizes that Athens’ Sicilian failure does not mean the loss of its leading role. He underlines his statement by mentioning the Athenian hardships during the Greco-Persian War – by the exempla of the destruction of the fleet in Egypt or Athens burned down by the army of Xerxes in particular. Despite these defeats, Athens was able to endure. The enforced peace of Callias,25 the victory over Xerxes and the gain of the hegemony over Hellas (τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν ἡγεομονίαν ἐκτήσατο) can all justify it.26

Nicolaus closes his speech with the exemplum of Nicias, the proxenos of Syracuse, who was the biggest loser of this campaign. Maybe the fate of the general makes the audience think or rather terrifies them. By means of diaphora, he contrasts the glorious past of Nicias with his tragic present. Here, in Syracuse, Tyche also displays her ferocious power (δύναμις). By creating unexpected situations, the goddess of Fate strikes down and interferes in the life of Nicias.27 Nicolaus’ final sentence sums up the message of his speech well:

23 D.S. XIII, 26.3. “It was the Athenians who first introduced the Greeks to cultivated grain: though they had it as a gift from the gods for their own use, they made it available to all at need. They it was also who discovered laws, by means of which the life of mankind advanced from a savage and unregulated state to that of a civilized and law-abiding society. They likewise were the first to spare the lives of those who sought refuge with them and by so doing ensured that their laws regarding suppliants would come into force worldwide. Since they pioneered these laws, it would be unseemly to deprive them [of their protection].”

24 D.S. XIII, 27.1.


26 D.S. XIII, 25.2.

27 D.S. XIII, 27.5–6. πρότερον μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἑπισημοτάτοις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑπάρχων καὶ διὰ τὴν καλοκάγαθιαν ἐπαινούμενος μακαριστὸς ἦν καὶ περίβλεπτος κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν· νυνὶ δ’ ἐξηγκωνισμένος καὶ ἐν ἀσχήμονι τινὶ προσόψει τῶν τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας οἰκτρῶν πεπείραται, καθαπερεὶ τῆς τύχης ἑν τῷ τοῦτον βίῳ τὴν εαυτῆς δύναμιν εὐπεπείρασθαι βουλομένης.
His words seem effective. By the end of the speech, he is able to elicit the sympathy of the Syracusans for the Athenians. However, Diodorus knows all the way that he could not change the fate of the Athenian prisoners. He has just one purpose: to make the audience ponder on their responsibility. The contemporary readers also knew that the ideas of Nicolaus had been doomed to failure from the beginning. The destiny of the captured Athenians is *hic et nunc* inevitable.

Then the Spartan Gylippus is about to speak. By legitimating the proposal of Diocles, he ultimately decides the fate of Athenian hostages. The discussion continues in direct speech (XIII, 28.2–32.6). The general, that is, Gylippus strives for one goal: to destroy the ideas of Nicolaus in his speech against the Athenian archē, based on the concept of *pleonexia* and *timōria*.

He accuses those who are responsible for the lust of power in Athens. He does not only criticize Alcibiades who suggested this Sicilian campaign, but also the orators, the key figures of the Athenian democracy, the institutions of the democracy and the whole Athenian community:

> **ναί, ἀλλ' οὐκ αἴτοιν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀλλ' Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ ταῦτα συμβουλεύσας. ἀλλ' εὑρήσομεν τοὺς συμβούλους κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον στοχαζομένους τῆς τῶν ἄκουόντων βουλήσεως, ὥσθ' ὁ χειροτονών τῷ ῥήτορι λόγον ὑποβάλλει τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προαιρέσεως, οὐ γάρ ὁ λέγων κύριος τοῦ πλήθους, ἀλλ' ὁ δῆμος ἐθίζει τὸν ῥήτορα τὰ βέλτιστα λέγειν χρηστὰ βουλευόμενος. (...) εἰ δὲ καὶ κατ' ἀλήθειαν αἴτιοι γεγόνασιν οἱ σύμβουλοι τοῦ πολέμου, μεμφέσθω τὸ μὲν πλῆθος τοῖς ῥήτοροιν ὑπὲρ ὤν ἐξηπάτησαν, ὑμεῖς δὲ δικαίως μετελεύσεσθε τὸ πλῆθος ύπερ ὤν ἡδίκησοθε. (D.S. XIII, 31.2–5)31

---

28 D.S. XIII, 27.6 “The prosperity she gives we must needs bear with proper humanity and not display barbarous savagery in our dealings with those of our own race.”

29 D.S. XIII, 28.1.

30 In my paper, I will not go into details about the Gylippus-speech. I would like to emphasize the significance of the *pleonexia*-idea, by which Gylippus destroys the praise for Athens expressed by Nicolaus. By falling a victim to greed and lust of power, Athens began an uninhibited expansion. This desire made Athens intervene in the affairs of Sicily. Gylippus did not omit to recall the three most expressive examples of the aggressive foreign policy of Athens (in Mytilene [in 427 BC], in Melos [in 416 BC] and Scione [in 421 BC]). In details, see D.S. XIII, 30–31.

31 “Yes, but it’s not the Athenian people as a whole who are to blame – only Alcibiades, who proposed this expedition.’ In fact, we shall find that, by and large, advisers hew very close to
Although the speech of Nicolaus is in the centre of this paper, his oration closely relates to the dictum of Gylippus. The correspondence between the two speeches can be proven by the following arguments.

The first common element is their communication mode, namely the oratio recta. These two, much longer direct speeches immediately stand out of the indirect speeches, which introduced the readers to different details of the Thucydidean tradition. The indirect speeches forecast the speech of Nicolaus and Gylippus while the direct speech allows the historian to elaborate not only on the character of his speakers, but also to illustrate the dramatic impacts and the emotional moods. The political and ethical ideas lying behind these speeches also prove the coherence between them. Thus, it is likely that one historian wrote both speeches. However, there is no consensus on the source Diodorus used for these speeches. There are several theories, but the answers are not convincing. It is also questionable to what extent Diodorus preserves the original form of the speeches, and from where he borrowed them. In the following, we try to find answers to these questions.

It is well known that regarding the history of the Greek mainland in the Book 11th–15th (maybe even also the 16th) of his Bibliotheca Historica Diodorus followed excerpts (?) from the main chapters of Historiae of Ephorus of Cyme and/or filled it with other sources (?). The same applies to the narrative

the wishes of their audience, so that in fact it is the voter who suggests to the speaker an argument germane to his own purpose. An orator is not the master of the many: quite the reverse. It is the demos that, by adopting excellent resolutions, accustoms the orator likewise to advocate what is best. (…) But if it is really true that responsibility for the war lies with those who advocated it, let the masses blame the speakers for the upshot of their deception; but you will then be justified in seeking retribution from those same masses in respect of the wrongs that you suffered.”


34 Cf. Diodorus suggests he is quoting only a part of the original speech (τὸ τελευταῖον εἶπεν) of the Spartan general, Callicratidas (D.S. XIII, 98.1).

35 See Volquardsen, C. A: Untersuchungen über die Quellen der griechischen und sizilischen Geschichte bei Diodor, Buch XI bis XVI. Kiel 1868; Holzapfel, L.: Untersuchungen über die Darstellung der griechischen Geschichte von 489 bis 413 vor Chr. Bei Ephoros Theopomp U.a. Autoren. Leipzig 1879, 1–46; Schwartz, Ed. In PWRE V (1905) 679, s. v. Diodoros. Until the middle of the 20th century, it was generally assumed that these books of Diodorus were only epitomes of Ephorus. However, the philologists’ opinions are more sceptical recently: Drews, R.: Diodorus and His Source. AJPh 83 (1962) 383–392; Reid, C. I.: Diodorus and His Sources. Harvard 1969. non vidi. Reid’s opinion can be found: Wickersham, J. M.: Hegemony and Greek
of the Peloponnesian War. Consequently, it is assumable that Ephorus is the author of these speeches. Based on the biographical tradition regarding the relationship between Ephorus and Isocrates affirmed this theory, since allusions of the speeches of Isocrates can be noticed in the speech of Nicolaus, especially in the chapters regarding the merits of Athens. These rhetorical topoi may have come into the narrative of Diodorus from the *Historiae* of Ephorus. The universal worldview displayed in Nicolaus’ speech (tà κοινὰ πάντων νόμιμα: the generally accepted customs of mankind or the mentioning of the Barbarian-Greek conflict) perfectly matches with the main idea of the first Universal history. The presence of Tychē implies that the chance concept was also an influential element on the whole course of human history in the *Historiae* of Ephorus. Besides Ephorus, there are other alternatives that must be taken into consideration. Let us see them.

The Syracusan locale may refer to the fact that the writer of the speeches was a Sicilian historian. These addresses could derive from one of the *Sikelika* on the history of the Western Greeks. If so, then maybe this Sicilian author aimed at exempting the Syracusans from sentencing the Athenian generals to death.


38 See *FGrHist* 70 T 1; T 2a; T 3; T 4; T 5; T 7; T 8; T 27; T 28. Most recent, see Parker, V.: Ephoros (70). In Worthington, I. (ed.): *Brill's New Jacoby. Brill Online* 2007, Comm. ad T 1. (http://www.encquaran.brillnl/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/ephoros-70-a70) (08. 10. 2013).


40 See Burde (n. 21) 18–19.

One of the candidates is Philistus of Syracuse who was the younger contemporary of Thucydides and he had autopsy of the events in Sicily (Plu. Nic. 19.6: τῶν πραγμάτων ὁρατής). Concerning the carefully composed speeches, the note of the Suidas should also be involved in the research. According to the Byzantine writer of the entry of “Philistus,” “he was the first man who wrote about history in accordance with the art of rhetoric” (ὁς πρῶτος κατὰ τὴν ῥητορικὴν τέχνην ἱστορίαν ἔγραψε).

Furthermore, the research has also brought up Timaeus of Tauromenium. Besides Ephorus, he may have been the other main source for the Sicilian narrative for Diodorus and he was also famous for his speeches in his historical work. According to Klaus Meister, Ephorus was the source for the history of the Sicilian campaign, but Diodorus borrowed the address of Nicolaus and Gylippus from the Historiae of Timaeus. His arguments are in fact parallels which can be found in Diodorus’ Sicilian narratives based on the account of Timaeus, and in the loci of Nicias-vita of Plutarch. According to Polybius, who also provides evidence, Timaeus destroys the peculiar value of history (ἀναιρεῖ τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἴδιον), when “introduces false rhetorical exercises and discursive speeches” (ψευδῆ δ’ (…) ἐπιχειρήματα καὶ διεξοδικοὺς λόγους). Lionel Pearson says that the moralizing speech of Nicolaus is in

---

42 “Though this speech, and its rebuttal by Gylippus (28–32) are no more to be taken as accurate reports of what was actually said than those of Thucydides, it is reasonable to suppose that some such public debate did take place, that Nicolaus was as a real person as Gylippus, and that the historian Philistus recorded their exchange, having almost certainly witnessed it.” Green, P. (Trans.). Diodorus Siculus, the Persian Wars to the Fall of Athens: Books 11–14. 34 (480–401 B.C. E.). Austin 2010, 180, note 20.

43 Suda s.v. Philistos.


45 There was a heated discussion about the issue that from where Diodorus borrowed the material for his Sicilian narratives. There is no communis opinio regarding this as well. The majority of the philologists believe that this pattern may be Timaeus or/and Ephorus for Diodorus. See Volquardsen’s locus classicus writing: Volquardsen (n. 35) 72–107. For discussion and further bibliography, see Stylianou (n. 39) 51, note 145.


47 See Meister (n. 44) 68.

48 See Meister (n. 44) 65–66. These arguments were adopted: HAU (n. 35) 190. On the other hand, the parallels offered by Meister are unfounded: “But this is the kind of unwarranted assumption which makes nonsense source of criticism.” See Stylianou (n. 39) 170, note 61.

49 In details, see Plb. XII, 25b, 25e–i. Translated by Edwards, H. J.
perfect harmony with the value judgment of Polybius. Although Timaeus knows the written sources perfectly well, he does not seek to shed light on the underlying causes behind the scenes of the assembly, but he gives only banal addresses about the events.

Likewise, the *paradoxon*, which can be seen in the Nicolaus-oratio, refers to Timaeus: although Nicolaus lost his two sons in the war, he steps on the podium to ask for forgiveness for the killers of his sons. The issue of the possible author of the Gylippos-speech confused Pearson as well. He did not rule out the possibility that the oratio of the Spartan general may derive from the *Historiae* of Ephorus.\(^50\)

In recent decades, researchers have begun to pay attention to the historiographical conception of Diodorus Siculus: his universal history is considered a coherent whole. As a result of these investigations, his work seems to contain a coherent and conscious concept. The philanthropy, the *epieikeia*, the *hybris*, the human weakness and the moderate behavior are commonplace of *Bibliotheca Historica* – especially in the speeches.\(^51\) The debate in Syracuse is no exception to this. The description of the debate can also be Diodorus’ own writing, but if there was some kind of source – according to Drews that was the rhetorical handbook of a schoolmaster\(^52\) – he adapted it to his own political philosophy and ethical program and the taste of the stylistic of his own age. Thus, the direction of the research seemed to change and the Diodorus-philologist dealt with *how* his sources helped the Sicilian historian to find his own writing voice. In the following, I will try to argue that, although partly adapted, Ephorus was the model for Diodorus, when he composed the speech of Nicolaus and Gylippus. There are no fragments collected by Felix Jacoby of the Sicilian expedition of Athens, so I can only rely on the text of Diodorus Siculus.

The relationship between Ephorus and the speeches is the first stage of my investigation. Although there is no evidence of these in the fragmentary tradition, we can be sure that they were originally in the *Historiae*. On the one hand, some evidence for this can be seen in the recently found papyrus-fragment of


\(^{52}\) Drews (n. 35) 387.
Theramenes (P. Mich. 5982 + P. Mich. 5796b), and on the other hand, in the testimonia, which can also provide guidance on the issue.

According to Polybius, Ephorus convincingly talked about the comparison of the historiography and the epideictic oratory (ο γαρ Ἐφορός (...) κατὰ δὲ τινα συντυχίαν εὐχαριστότατα καὶ πιθανώτατα περι τῆς συγκρίσεως εἴρηκε τῆς τῶν ἱστοριογράφων καὶ λογογράφων (...). However, we do not know from this fragment handed down by Polybius what function of the addresses could have in the Universal history of Ephorus. It may be assumed that from Ephorus’ point of view the historiography is considered more laborious than the oratory. Thus, it is likely that he intended to draw the attention to the differences between the two genres in this way. The praefatio of the 20th Book of Diodorus can give us some guidance (XX, 1–2). Diodorus, while seeking the harmony of the logoi and the erga, recommended (I, 2.8) the brief speeches and their moderate use in the historical works. He condemned those who used the speeches excessively or made the whole historical narrative an attachment of the public addresses (νῦν δ’ ἔνιοι πλεονάσαντες ἐν τοῖς ρητορικοῖς λόγοις προοθήκην ἐποιήσαντο τὴν ὅλην ἱστορίαν τῆς δηνηγορίας). Let us see the main thoughts of this prooemium:

Τοῖς εἰς τὰς ἱστορίας υπερμήκεις δημηγορίας παρεμβάλλουσιν ἢ πυκνὰς χρωμένους ρητορείας δικαίως ἄν τις ἐπιτιμήσειεν· οὐ μόνον γὰρ τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς διηγήσεως διὰ τὴν ἀκαιρίαν τῶν ἰκαρίαν τῶν ἐπεισαγομένων


54 Plutarch’s criticism clearly indicates that Ephorus of Cyme used rhetoric and grand periods, when he mustered the arming troops. It is assumed that these were the exhortations that the generals said to their soldiers. See FGrHist 70 T 21: ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Ἐφόρου καὶ Θεσσαλίου καὶ Ἀναξιόμενος ρητορείας καὶ ρητορομαντικών, ἀς περαίνουσιν ἢ ἀπεκτάνυσιν ἢ διεξάγουσιν. For the testimomium, see PARKER (n. 38) Comm. ad T 21. Diodorus borrowed the Spartan Callicratidas’ exhortation (D.S. XIII, 98.1) from the Historiae of Ephorus. See BREITENBACH (n. 53) 133; SACK (n. 35) 99–100.

55 FGrHist 70 F 111. In details, see PARKER (n. 38) Comm. ad F 111.


57 D.S. XX, 1.3.
Nevertheless, the insertion of the speeches is necessary, since the narrative will be really varied by means of these. The historiographer, however, must follow the principle of *mēden agan*, when he creates the speeches.

There is no reassuring answer among the classical philologists to the question that where Diodorus borrowed these ideas from. The conception reminds of

---

58 “One might justly censure those who in their histories insert over-long orations or employ frequent speeches; for not only do they rend asunder the continuity of the narrative by the ill-timed insertion of speeches, but also they interrupt the interest of those who are eagerly pressing on toward a full knowledge of the events. Yet surely there is opportunity for those who wish to display rhetorical prowess to compose by themselves public discourses and speeches for ambassadors, likewise orations of praise and blame and the like; for by recognizing the classification of literary types and by elaborating each of the two by itself, they might reasonably expect to gain a reputation in both fields of activity.” Translated by Oldfather, C. H.

59 “Nevertheless, in disapproving rhetorical speeches, we do not ban them wholly from historical works; for, since history needs to be adorned with variety, in certain places it is necessary to call to our aid even such passages – and of this opportunity I should not wish to deprive myself – so that, whenever the situation requires either a public address from an ambassador or a statesman, or some such thing from the other characters, whoever does not boldly enter the contest of words would himself be blameworthy.” Translated by Oldfather, C. H.

Thucydides’ method, namely that he lays down the methodological foundations for the speeches created by him. However, he does it in a different manner than Thucydides. Laqueur and Jacoby supposed a certain model behind this Diodorean prooemium. According to them, this is Ephorus of Cyme,61 because he drew the line between the historiographical and the rhetorical genre. As we have seen, Diodorus did the same as Ephorus. If this premise is accepted as correct, then we can explain the relationship between Ephorus and the speeches. Based on this, Ephorus did not take objection to the speeches per se, but rather to their profusion and generally faulty integration into their context. If this locus bears the imprint of the thoughts of Ephorus in some form, it cannot be excluded that the Cymean historian attacked Thucydides in this way who broke the continuity of his narrative by employing ample public speeches.62 As the speech of Nicolaus and Gylippus indicated, the enkōmion and the psogos can be used as a type of speech in the historiography in Diodorus’ opinion. These addresses provide opportunity for the historians not only to show off their oratorical skills, but also to offer the examples of the moral lessons by means of the powerful logos rhētorikos.63

Without any doubt, Ephorus, the father of the rhetorical historiography, was the first really significant historian to introduce the categories of epainoi-psogoi into the historiography, which he borrowed from the practice of epideictic oratory based on Gorgias and Isocrates.64 Let us see how he used them.

The so-called critical appraisal, the ἐπιμετροῦντες λόγοι, which Polybius also appreciated, completed and commented the “objective” historical facts in the Historiae.65 It is quite possible that the enkōmion and the psogos were allowed to infiltrate into the narrative via such “channels,” since this is an excellent possibility for the historiographer to examine the human deeds and the human character. That is the key to the essence and success of the Ephoran

62 Sack (n. 35) 94.
64 According to Fornara, Philistus applied these categories in his historical work as well (FGrHist 556 T 16). By the age of Ephorus, these concepts became accepted, grounded in theory as the accessories in the Greek historiography. See Fornara (n. 60) 108, note 25; 109.
65 FGrHist 70 T 23. See Avenarius (n. 61) 160–161. In detail, see also Parker (n. 38) Comm. ad T 23.
historiography. His aim is to encourage the readers for a better, more virtuous lifestyle by the exempla of this historiē. Do not forget: as Fornara said “the history became a moralistic schoolroom.”

Let us summarize the findings so far. It is possible that there was a certain model for Diodorus, when he composed his methodological introduction. As we have seen, Ephorus of Cyme is also among the candidates. However, we must be careful. It can hardly be true that Diodorus reflects Ephorus’ view expressis verbis.

For this reason, Sack’s suggestion deserves attention. The researcher sought to demonstrate that the prooemium of the 20th Book regarding the speeches is solely Diodorus’ own creation. The text clearly shows that Diodorus Siculus works with the terms used in contemporary rhetorical theory. In this locus, we can see the separation of the rhetoric and the historiography in a more mature form (τὸ γὰρ ἱστορίας γένος ἁπλοῦν ἐστὶ καὶ συμφυὲς αὑτῷ), and he took the needs of the (reading) public into consideration which is more characteristic of the 1st century BC. Although we have no intention to draw foregone conclusions on the basis of these two theories, we find that these are not mutually exclusive. It is possible that Diodorus really used Ephorus’ work, but he did not only borrow the concept appealing to him from 4th century BC, but he adapted to the tastes of the 1st century BC.

The first major prooemium of the Historiae provides another viewpoint, where we can find reference to the speeches, too. Ephorus notes in particular that “we assume that neither any of the events nor most speeches are likely to be remembered to so great an extent” (ὑπολαμβάνοντες οὐτε τὰς πράξεις ἁπάσας οὔτε τῶν λόγων τοὺς πλείστους εἰκός εἶναι μνημονεύεσθαι διὰ τοσούτων). Beyond the credibility issues regarding the speeches, this statement may imply that to prepon was the guiding principle of logos, that is, what words suit the speaker, the subject and the occasion. This concept may not be far from a disciple of Isocrates. The reasons are the following.

---

66 See Fornara (n. 60) 109.
67 Sack (n. 35) 98.
68 In detail, see Sack (n. 35) 97, esp. note 52, 54, 55.
69 See D.S. XX, 1.5 and D.S. I, 76.
70 Cf. Thuc. I, 1.2; 20.1; 22.1.
71 FGrHist 70 F 9. Translated by Parker, V. See the Commentary Parker (n. 38) Comm. ad F 9.
72 The case of to prepon in Diodorus: D.S. XIII, 52.2; 92.1; XIV, 32.2; XVI, 88.2; XX, 2.2.
Ephorus belongs to the age, when the political and cultural decline of the *polis* already began; the political stages of the Periclean Athens no longer play their old role. The public, improvising and agonistic political speeches became emptied, and slowly started to lose their significance.\(^73\) However, the 4th century BC is believed to be the golden age of the rhetoric and the Greek prose. Thanks to the spread of literacy, the carefully developed orations gradually spread in written form as well (see: Isocrates only published his political pamphlets in written form).\(^74\) Therefore, the *kairos* and the *prepon* become the significant concepts in the rhetorical theory and practice of the 4th century BC as well. This is especially true for the conception of Isocrates.\(^75\) Of course, the rhetoric has a significant influence on the historiography and the style of Isocrates will determine the further development of the Greek prose as well.\(^76\)

Although Ephorus is still at the beginning of this process, we believe that he felt necessary to rethink the role of the speeches in the historiography. He does it opposite to Thucydides.\(^77\) The continuous appearance of the written sources and long-haired attitude typical of Ephorus made it much more necessary to review the previous ideas. As he himself says, he undertook a Herculean task, thus, it is impossible to reconstruct the speeches accurately, which are recorded by the personal inquire – at least if the historical tradition of the 5th century BC is considered a standard. Under these conditions, Ephorus suggested the modest use of speeches in the historical works. If he used them, he did it in the spirit of the isocratic *paideia*. I think that the speech-duel of Nicolaus-Gylippus correspond to this. The educated audience fully understood that Ephorus did not give the *ipsissima verba* of his character by means of the speeches, but rather his own moralizing advice which befits for a historical situation.\(^78\)

---

\(^73\) Cf. Fornara (p. 60) 150.  
\(^76\) Cf. Green (p. 36) 40.  
\(^77\) Avenarius (p. 61) 153.  
\(^78\) Cf. Pownall (p. 35) 140.
Although the Syracusan locale itself could serve as evidence for the fact that the author of the speeches was a Sicilian historiographer, other aspects should also be considered. The bias of the speakers can be associated with the bias of Ephorus as well. It also points to the fact that Diodorus borrowed these addresses from Ephorus. The appearance of the unknown Syracusan man and his speech given in defense of Athens reflect Ephorus’, the disciple of Isocrates, bias towards Athens. This bias is not without precedent. His bias towards the hometown, Cyme is also well documented in the fragmentary tradition.

In the next and the final part of my paper, I will analyze the relationship between Thucydides and the speech of Nicolaus and Gylippus, which offers new possibilities for interpretation. The debate of Nicolaus and Gylippus is probably just a literary imitation of Thucydides, namely mimēsis of the speech-duel between Cleon (Thuc. III, 37–40) and Diodotus (Thuc. III, 42–48) on the fate of the Mytilenean prisoners in 427 BC. Further, in the Nicolaus-speech, especially in that part where he praises Athens, there are not only Isocratic allusions, but also some references of the Epitaphios Logos of Pericles.

79 Cf. Ambaglio (n. 51) 77.
80 Kroll, W. In PWRE XVII (1936) 359, s. v. Nikolaos.
81 For the bias of Ephorus towards Athens see FGrHist 70 F 31b; F 63; F 189; F 198. Further see Parker (n. 38) Bibliographical Essay: E. In generally Barber (n. 37) 84–105.
84 Cf. FGrHist 70 F 189; F 116; F 117. See Parker (n. 38) Bibliographical Essay: E; in details, see Pesely, G. E.: The Speech of Endius in Diodorus Siculus 13. 52. 3–8. CPh 80 (1985) 321, note 5.
85 Pesely (n. 84) 320.
The *imitatio Thucydidis* can be found in another speech of Diodorus Siculus, namely, in the speech of the Spartan *ephor*, Endius, who visited Athens as an ambassador (D.S. XIII, 52.3–8). In fact, here Endius is the opposite of the Thucydidean Pericles. While Pericles urges the Athenians to begin the war (cf. Thuc. I, 140–144), Endius – imitating the periclean arguments – asks for peace when he arrives in Athens after the destruction of the Spartan fleet at Cyzicus in 410 BC. The direct source of the Endius-speech is Ephorus of Cyme, who – similarly to the speech of Gylippus – described the speech of Cleophon, the opponent of Endius, in details. However, Diodorus did not do this in this case. He just summarized the arguments of Cleophon, who destroys the peace proposal of Endius.\(^{87}\)

Parmeggiani provides further arguments for the relationship between Thucydides and Ephorus. The Italian researcher’s view is that the rhetorical examples of the speech-duel of Nicolaus-Gylippus on the good hegemony of Cyrus, Croesus, Gelo and the bad hegemony of the Athenians clearly show continuity with the dilemmas of the political philosophy of the 5th century BC, namely with the Melian dialogue of Thucydides.\(^{88}\)

Thucydides puts the words into Melians’ mouth, namely that the hegemony continues to exist, if the power rules by complying to the *koinos agathos* the *dikaios*-ideas (Thuc. V, 90). Nicolaus knows this very well. Being scared of future punishment, he encourages the Syracusans, the current rulers of Sicily, to the *epieikeia* and the philanthropy, since he knows that these principles are the requirements for the stable and peaceful functioning of the hegemony. Gylippos, however, disapproves of the Athenian democracy. He accuses not only the *cheirotronía* legitimizing the Sicilian expedition, but also the speakers and the whole Athenian community of the outbreak of the war.\(^{89}\)

This criticism evokes the immediate causes of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, which Diodorus wrote on the basis of Ephorus in the 12th Book of the *Bibliotheca Historia* (D.S. XII, 38–41).\(^{90}\) According to him, the personal motives of Pericles, the celebrated statesman of the Athenian democracy,

---

\(^{87}\) Pesely (n. 84) 320; Breitenbach (n. 53) 132–133.

\(^{88}\) Parmeggiani (n. 35) 465.

\(^{89}\) Parmeggiani (n. 35) 466.

\(^{90}\) See Parker (n. 38) Comm. Ad F 198; Parmeggiani (n. 35) 417–457.
the excellent orator and demagogue stand behind the war.\textsuperscript{91} Pericles armed himself with the \emph{logou deininotēs}, thus he was able to begin a war by persuading the citizens of Athens. Thus, the criticism of Gylippus does not only apply to the Sicilian expeditions of Athens, but also to a whole era of the Athenian history. Presumably, this criticism regarding the institution of democracy really derives from a historian lived in the 4th century BC (Ephorus?), who interpreted the Athenian defeat in 413 BC as a justification of the Melian dialogue and who wanted to make his readers think about Athens’ political mistakes in the 5th century BC and the responsibility of the Athenian politicians.\textsuperscript{92}

In summary, we can say that it is not possible rather most likely that Ephorus was the author of the speech of Nicolaus and Gylippus by reason of his hegemony-centric aspects,\textsuperscript{93} his ethical approximation of the rise and fall of it and his conscious \emph{aemulatio} of Thucydides.\textsuperscript{94} Further, it is also likely that the \emph{Historiae} of Ephorus was one of the models for the historiographical \emph{ars poetica} of Diodorus. Perhaps it does not sound far-fetched if we complete the previous proposal of Breitenbach with the \emph{Redeagon} of Nicolaus-Gylippus besides the addresses of Callicratidas (D.S. XIII, 98.1) and Endius so that it could also enrich the collection of the fragments of Ephorus.\textsuperscript{95} Further, maybe we have to look for the answer to the question of why the fragmentary tradition did not preserve any of the speeches of Ephorus’ Universal history in Diodorus’ work. Diodorus may somehow have preserved for posterity the above-mentioned speeches of the Ephoran \emph{Historiae} in his \emph{Bibliotheca Historia}. If he did indeed, then the \emph{Historiae} of Ephorus of Cyme, just like Thucydides’ historical work, remained \emph{ktêma es aei} after all, although only in the library of Diodorus.

\textsuperscript{91} For the portrait of Pericles, see more details \textsc{Schubert} (n. 25) 5–18.

\textsuperscript{92} \textsc{Parmeggiani} (n. 35) 466.

\textsuperscript{93} The Universal History of Ephorus wanted to describe the Greek history as a continuous reconfiguration of subsequent hegemonies. This can be concluded from the \emph{FGrHist} 70 F 118 and F 119. Some ethical factors are needed for a state (\emph{politeia}) to acquire the leading power over Hellas. These are all concepts borrowed from Isocrates: the \emph{paideia}, the \emph{agōgē}, the \emph{homonoea}, the \emph{logos} and the \emph{eusebeia}. Keeping power is not easy. Ephorus gives a detailed explanation of the reasons for the fall of the hegemony. According to him, the dispatch of the \emph{paideia} and the harmful effect of \emph{tryphē} and the \emph{pleonexia} can be blamed for the loss of the power. Cf. \textsc{Wickersham} (n. 35) 119–177; \textsc{Pownall} (n. 35) 131–132; \textsc{Blankenship, C.: The Role of the Individual in Ephoros’ Histories}. (Thesis) 2009, 16–17. (http://www.dartmouth.edu/~classics/docs/christopherblankenshiptesis.pdf) (10. 08. 2013).


\textsuperscript{95} \textsc{Breitenbach} (n. 53) 134.