



VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

MYKOLAS DEGUTIS
STUDY PROGRAMME
CLASSICAL STUDIES MASTER

A Cretan Theogony of ‘Epimenides the Theologian’ in Diodorus Siculus 5

Master Thesis

Assoc. Prof. Mantas Adomėnas

Vilnius

2026

ANNOTATION

Mykolas Degutis, *A Cretan Theogony of 'Epimenides the Theologian' in Diodorus Siculus 5*. Master's thesis, Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Mantas Adomėnas, Vilnius University, Faculty of Philology, 2026, 64p.

Keywords: Diodorus Siculus, *Quellenforschung*, Crete, Epimenides, Kretika, Theogony, Theology

This paper analyzes a passage in Diodorus Siculus' *Universal History* in which the author presents the island of Crete. In this passage, Diodorus relies on four authors, one of whom is Epimenides. The study seeks to crystallize this particular source and its theoretical implications. To achieve this goal, the paper is divided into two parts. First, the passage is analyzed philologically, examining its narrative coherence, linguistic peculiarities, and possible source references. On this basis, the passage is divided into preliminary blocks that form coherent narrative units or distinct ideological positions. The second part of the study focuses on the content of the passage itself. An analysis of the views presented reveals that one consistent narrative line reflects a clear theological stance: that the gods should not engage in violent acts, since the divine order of the world is fundamentally peaceful and just. This theological position is attributed to Epimenides, as it accords both with Diodorus' cues and the broader context of the author.

Table of Contents:

Introduction	4
Preliminary observations on <i>Quellenforschung</i>	5
A Bibliography	8
The Three Historians	9
Epimenides	10
Method for Extraction	12
Narratological Analysis	14
Sections 1 to 3.	14
Sections 4 to 5.	16
Sections 6 to 7	18
Sections 8 to 10	21
Conclusions on structure	23
Rough Gem	25
Euhemerization – a Diodorean input	25
The roots of the genealogical tree	26
Cronus and Zeus: like father, like son.	29
The Gigantomachy	32
The benefactions of Titans and Gods	36
Were gods really so peaceful?	40
Conclusions – a Cretan Theogony	42
Sources:	43
Bibliography:	43
Summary	47
Santrauka:	48
APPENDICES	49
Appendix I: Two case–studies	49
Appendix II: An edition of the Theogony of Epimenides the Theologian	57

Introduction

Topic and Problem. This work examines a passage in Book 5 of Diodorus Siculus' *Universal Library* (5.65–80). Diodorus' overarching aim is to present a universal history of the known world, including the mythological age and barbarian tribes. The first six books cover the period up to the Trojan War (1.4.6); Book 5 focuses largely on Aegean islands, including Crete. At the end of his Cretan account, Diodorus states that he relied on four authors, one of whom is 'Epimenides the Theologian' (5.80.4). However, he does not specify which parts derive from which author but fuses them into a single narrative.

Thesis. Diodorus Siculus used Epimenides' *Theogony* as one of his sources in Book 5, and this source can be extracted. This *Theogony* reflects a theological position that promotes a non-violent notion of divinity.

Methodology and Objectives. This work aims to extract the Epimenidean source from Diodorus' text and to understand its theological implications. To achieve this, two main objectives are set. First, the passage is analyzed philologically, identifying breaks in narrative flow and consistency, noting specific linguistic expressions and references. This allows for preliminary divisions marking where one account may end and another begin. The second objective is to attribute one of the accounts to Epimenides the Theologian, mainly through thematic analysis of the content within each account. Once this is done, a clear narrative strand emerges, attributable to Epimenides both through its narrative and stylistic coherence and through its consistent theological standpoint.

Novelty and relevance. In contemporary scholarship, Diodorus remains a highly underrated and ignored historian, while the passage in question has received almost no serious attention in scholarship on Epimenides. No dedicated attempt has been made to disentangle the Epimenidean 'Cretan Passage' from its surrounding context¹ (Jacoby, 1954; Fowler, 2013, 388–9). Although the text appears in editions of ancient historian fragments (Jacoby, 1954; Fowler, 2000), it has been disregarded as too convoluted to work with. Scholars have also readily concluded that the source is both pseudepigraphic and euhemeristic. While the first claim is not challenged here, the second is highly dubious. The Epimenidean source most likely represented a very different theological position, upon which Diodorus later imposed a euhemeristic lens. If so, the text belongs in a very different intellectual context, closer to Xenophanes than Euhemerus.

¹ Fowler titles all testimonies (including Diodorus') of Epimenides under the name *Epimenides Cres Pseudepigraphus* (Fowler, 2000, 79)

Literature overview. Literature on this topic is largely non-existent. Still, several studies discuss the passage more broadly, among them the commentaries of Felix Jacoby (2020), Robert Fowler (2013), and the more recent *Brill's New Jacoby* (henceforth BNJ) by Toye (2018) and Dowden (2015). Jacoby's treatment comes closest to the present enquiry, though his analysis was impeded by the contemporary scholarly consensus on Diodorus. He argued that Laosthenidas was Diodorus' sole source, while the other authors could not be securely distinguished, though he offered a few suggestions. Fowler likewise concluded that identifying the sources was impossible and focused instead on the passage's content. The recent BNJ commentary is more critical of several conclusions reached by Jacoby and Fowler, especially in Toye's discussion, yet it also stops short of attempting a full source identification.

Preliminary observations on *Quellenforschung*

Diodorus' *Universal Library* may be regarded as a kind of 'graveyard' – it cites a myriad of authors, almost none of whom have come down to us in textual form. Thus, *Quellenforschung* has long been one of the dominant approaches to Diodorus' *Library*. With this in mind, we must note a great divide between older source criticism and more recent scholarship. For a long time, Diodorus was regarded as a mere compiler of sources (Lloyd, 1974; Spyridakis, 1963, 337) lacking both authorial voice and character. Whenever the Diodorean perspective was considered at all, he was dismissed as a 'sloppy' or 'stupid' historian, some going even as far as calling him 'perverse' (Drew, 1962, 383).

In recent scholarship, Diodorus has undergone an almost complete re-evaluation². Most modern scholars now regard him as an independent author and his *Library* as 'monumental and invaluable' (Roubekas, 2017, 41). The Diodorean renaissance has prompted a new look at most aspects of his work and has opened the possibility of approaching his text more critically. Important advances have also been made in understanding Diodorus' treatment of sources. To present these new scholarly attitudes, we may consider the cases of Hecataeus of Abdera (Book 1) and Dionysius Scytobrachion (mainly Book 3, but also Book 4)³.

The first case is that of Hecataeus of Abdera. For a long time, he was regarded as the 'true' author of Diodorus' Book 1. Scholars like Schwartz (1903), Jacoby (1940), and Murray (1970) believed that

² I mention here only the most important scholars I have encountered. Modern scholarship increasingly emphasizes Diodorus' authorial voice and worldview. On myth, see Marincola (2019) and Said (2014); on history, Sheridan (2010) and Muntz (2017). A useful overview of late antique and Byzantine reception is in Viola (2025). The most prominent modern scholar is Charles E. Muntz (2008; 2017; 2024), whose work spans several key studies.

³ Two full case studies on these authors as sources of Diodorus are included in Appendix I. There I show not only how scholarly consensus on these authors has changed but also propose my own 'light' hypotheses regarding their use in the *Universal Library*. Since these case-studies are not essential to the main argument, they are placed in the appendix.

Diodorus had essentially copied Hecataeus' *Aegyptiaca* as his own text. Murray advances two main arguments for this view. First, Diodorus begins his account of the tomb of Osymandias with the expression 'φησὶν', but later shifts to 'φασὶν' for no apparent reason; Murray views this as a 'deception' (1970, 145), intended to trick the reader into thinking that Diodorus had turned to other sources, when in fact he kept relying on Hecataeus throughout the book. Second, Book 1 displays a solid 'structure' and 'internal consistency' (1970, 144–5), which Murray believed Diodorus could not have achieved on his own, as he supposedly depended on his sources for that. On this basis, Murray aligns surviving Hecataeus' fragments from other sources with passages from Diodorus to support his thesis.

Understandably, modern scholars have been highly critical of such a reductive view of Diodorus. The main critic of this type of *Quellenforschung* is Charles Muntz (2011), who argues that such a simplified understanding of Diodorus' capabilities as a historian is entirely unwarranted⁴. First, the supposed 'deception' need not be understood as trickery at all. Instead, if one does not assume that Diodorus is merely a compiler, for there is little reason, then the shift from 'φησὶν' to 'φασὶν' simply marks a transition to other sources. Diodorus nowhere explicitly states that he has ceased relying on Hecataeus, but a historical narrative need not do so. Second, Muntz shows that Murray's proposed matches between non-Diodorean fragments of Hecataeus and Book 1 are completely unfounded; the similarities are vague and minimal (Muntz, 2011, 580).

We draw two lessons from the case of Hecataeus. First, we must be careful not to attribute to a source more than there really is; in hopes of recovering Hecataeus' *Aegyptiaca*, scholars often approached Diodorus' text uncritically. Second, Diodorus is not a mere plagiarist but an independent historian capable of combining several sources, which does not make our task easier but does provide important guidelines⁵.

The second important case is that of Dionysius Scytobrachion. Diodorus mentions Dionysius multiple times throughout Books 3 and 4, chiefly in connection with the Amazons (3.52), the various traditions on the Libyan Dionysus (3.66), and the Argonauts (4.40). For our purposes, we will focus mainly on the Amazons and Dionysus, since both appear within the same book. Diodorus introduces the Amazons during his account of Libya, which begins rather scientifically – he analyses Libyan soil and some curious meteorological phenomena. Eventually, the narrative turns to the Amazons, since, as Diodorus says:

But now that we have examined these matters it will be fitting, in connection with the regions we have mentioned, to discuss the account which history records of the Amazons who were in Libya in ancient times.

⁴ See Muntz (2024), where he shows the complex compositional techniques used in Diodorus' Book 5.

⁵ A more recent commentary by Anne Burton on Book 1 likewise shows that multiple identifiable sources are indeed present throughout the book (2015).

Τούτων δ' ἡμῖν διευκρινημένων οἰκεῖον ἂν εἴη τοῖς προειρημένοις τόποις διελθεῖν τὰ περὶ τὰς Ἀμαζόνας ἱστορούμενα τὰς γενομένας τὸ παλαιὸν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην.

(3.52.1)⁶

After this, Diodorus recounts a consistent tale of the Amazonian queen Mylina (3.52–6), which he openly attributes to Dionysius Scytobrachion (3.52.3). This account mainly covers military conquests (3.53.6; 3.54.7; 3.55.4, etc.) and the founding of cities (3.53.4; 3.55.6–7). Though largely historical in tone, the narrative is unified by a clear fictional core: the life and death of Queen Mylina.

So, it seems that Diodorus simply retells Dionysius' narrative in his own words. There is, however, one controversial section. Among the tribes conquered by the Amazons, the 'Atlanteans' are mentioned. Diodorus refers to them first as victims of Mylina's conquests (3.54), and later as a curious people who share mythology with the Greeks (3.56–61). Most scholars treat both mentions as part of the same Dionysius' narrative (Rusten, 1982, 78; Muntz, 2017, 152). Their main argument is that, after the Amazons, Diodorus again relies on Scytobrachion in his discussion of Dionysus (3.66.5–6), which suggests that everything in between is from the same source. I would argue otherwise. The two mentions of the Atlanteans are clearly narratively disconnected; when Diodorus first mentions them, he states that he 'shall speak in detail a little later' (3.54.1–2), and he does indeed return to them, but only after completing the story of Mylina's life. Moreover, the Atlantean account is completely different in style from the Amazonian tale: instead of historical and ethnographic material, it recounts their specific myths. Thus, the Atlantean episode is likely an interpolation from another source.

This is strengthened further by the fact that after the Atlantean passage, Diodorus begins his second long reliance on Dionysius when introducing the Libyan myths concerning Dionysus' conquests (3.61.1). This narrative closely resembles the Amazonian one, since it is also notably historical and euhemeristic. Most importantly for our purposes, Diodorus mentions Dionysius Scytobrachion again (3.66.5–6), clearly telegraphing that he had at some point ceased relying on him and now resumes doing so – why else would he mention the author again at the start of a new topic?

Thus, three main conclusions may be drawn from the case of Dionysius Scytobrachion in Book 3. First, the sources used by Diodorus can significantly influence the style of his narrative: the Libyan section begins scientifically but shifts into a tale narration, once the Amazonians appear. Second, Diodorus includes cultural curiosities such as the Atlantean myths simply because they interest him; the Atlanteans could have remained in the background as victims of Queen Mylina, but were brought back in order to recount their odd beliefs. Lastly, as in the case of Hecataeus, there is no need to assume that Diodorus relies on his sources

⁶ Here and elsewhere, I use Oldfather's translation from the Loeb edition.

without interruption. The case of the Atlantean passage shows this quite clearly: once Diodorus finds an interesting topic, he can easily deviate from the preceding narrative.

A Bibliography

We may begin our extraction from the very end of the Cretan passage. Here Diodorus does something unusual in the broader context of the *Library* – he provides us with a ‘bibliography’ of his Cretan sources:

And since the greatest number of writers who have written about Crete disagree among themselves, there should be no occasion for surprise if what we report should not agree with every one of them; we have, indeed, followed as our authorities those who give the more probable account and are the most trustworthy, in some matters depending upon Epimenides who has written about the gods, in others upon Dosiades, Sosicrates, and Laosthenidas.

ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν τὰ Κρητικὰ γεγραφότων οἱ πλεῖστοι διαφωνοῦσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὐ χρὴ θαυμάζειν ἔαν μὴ πᾶσιν ὁμολογούμενα λέγωμεν· τοῖς γὰρ τὰ πιθανώτερα λέγουσι καὶ μάλιστα πιστευομένοις ἐπηκολουθήσαμεν, ἃ μὲν Ἐπιμενίδῃ τῷ θεολόγῳ προσσχόντες, ἃ δὲ Δωσιάδῃ καὶ Σωσικράτῃ καὶ Λαοσθενίδῃ.

(5.80.4)

Diodorus notes that plenty (οἱ πλεῖστοι) of authors have written on the ‘Cretan matters’ (τὰ Κρητικὰ) and disagree with one another (διαφωνοῦσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους). For this reason, it seems, he has chosen to narrow down his sources to a select number of authors as his main leading sources, since they are, in his own opinion, most ‘convincing’ (πιθανώτερα) and ‘trustworthy’ (πιστευομένοις). In this manner, we are given four names: Epimenides the Theologian (Ἐπιμενίδῃ τῷ θεολόγῳ προσσχόντες), Dosiades (Δωσιάδῃ), Sosicrates (Σωσικράτῃ) and Laosthenides (Λαοσθενίδῃ).

Several oddities deserve mention in this short yet informative paragraph. As noted above, such bibliographies at the end of a section are almost absent from the broader context of the *Library*. Moreover, nowhere else in the first six books does Diodorus rely on so many sources for a single topic (or at least he does not inform us of such pluralities). These unusual features complicate the analysis, since we possess no close parallels for comparison. Still, the lessons from the previous case-studies remain important: the Cretan passage is riddled with interpolations, narrative breaks, and other phenomena already familiar to us.

Although brief, the passage offers several useful clues. First, we may be certain that somewhere within the Cretan passage Epimenides is either quoted or otherwise used as a source. At the same time, we need not assume that his text underlies the whole passage. Second, Diodorus hints at where and in what

context Epimenides was quoted. Of the four authors, only Epimenides is marked by the epithet *θεολόγῳ*, giving us a possible direction: whatever in this passage concerns gods, must be from Epimenides and not the other three authors. Lastly, Diodorus expresses himself in quite a peculiar fashion with a grammatical construction of *μὲν ... δὲ*:

in some matters depending upon Epimenides who has written about the gods, in others upon Dosiades, Sosicrates, and Laosthenidas

ἃ μὲν Ἐπιμενίδῃ τῷ θεολόγῳ προσσχόντες, ἃ δὲ Δωσιάδῃ καὶ Σωσικράτῃ καὶ Λαοσθενίδῃ.

(5.80.4)

This *μὲν [...] δὲ* construction suggests that Diodorus separates these authors into two distinct groups. One, a unitary group, consists of ‘Epimenides the Theologian,’ while the other contains the remaining three authors. Such phrasing further implies that we should look for two distinct positions or themes within the text; once identified, these may be attributed to each group. The epithet ‘theologian’, then, would suggest that material concerning the gods derives from Epimenides, whereas the remaining parts come from the other authors.

However, this is unlikely to be Diodorus’ real intention, since the whole passage is concerned mainly with gods and rarely anything besides. If all the mythological and theogonic matters derived solely from Epimenides, then the remaining three authors would share a couple, if not just a single, paragraph in the entire Cretan passage. This seems unlikely, especially since Diodorus explicitly names his sources, which, as already noted, is rare; thus, he must be using them meaningfully. What I suggest instead is that Diodorus calls Epimenides ‘the Theologian’ because he sees him as drawing on a specialized mythological tradition and articulating a distinct theological approach, one that sets him apart from the other three authors. Sosicrates, Dosiades and Laosthenidas, then, likely represented a more ‘orthodox’ Greek opinion rather than the theological approach of Epimenides.

The Three Historians

A brief note on the other three authors is in place here. We know very little, if anything, about the other authors that Diodorus mentions. The best attested of the three is Sosicrates. He is often quoted by Diogenes Laertius in the *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*⁷ for biographical facts and curiosities. Athenaeus reports that Sosicrates wrote at least two books: one entitled *Φιλοσόφων Διαδοχή* (*Ath.* 4.163f) and another *Κρητικά* (*Ath.* 6.264e). *Κρητικά* is obviously the text that interests us more here. We can form a comparatively clear picture of the nature of this book. Athenaeus quotes Sosicrates *Κρητικά* three times

⁷ 1.38; 1.49; 1.62; 1.68; 1.75; 1.95; 1.101; 1.106; 1.107; 2.84; 6.80; 7.163; 8.8.

in the *Learned Banqueters*: he mentions a Cretan custom of sacrificing to Eros before battle (*Ath.* 13.561–2), the Cretan ‘habit of saying funny things’ (*Ath.* 261a), and how the Cretans call their slaves *μνοίαν* and *ἀφαμιώτας* (*Ath.* 264a). Strabo also mentions Sosicrates, as having given an accurate measurement of Crete (Strabo 10.4.3). In the *Suda*, he is said to have mentioned a slave city in Crete (*Suda s.v. del.*1423). Thus, Sosicrates seems mostly concerned with Cretan customs and peculiarities; like Hecataeus in Book 1, he was most likely an ethnographic and geographic author.

A little less is known about Dosiades. He too is mentioned by Athenaeus in the same passage noted above (*Ath.* 6.264a) about Cretan slave names. The second mention, fittingly enough, is about the Cretan drinking customs (*Ath.* 4.143a–d). Pliny states that, according to Dosiades, Crete was named after an eponymous nymph (Plin. *HN* 4.58.20). Clement of Alexandria also uses Dosiades as a source for the claim that the people of Lesbos sacrificed humans to Dionysus (Clem. *Al. Strom.* 3.1).

About the last author, Laosthenidas, we know nothing apart from the Diodorean passage where he is mentioned. It is worth noting that Jacoby (Jacoby, 2020, fl⁸) argued that Laosthenidas was in fact the main source of the passage, since he could not attribute its entirety to any of the other authors. Here, however, the lesson already learned from the case of Hecataeus in Book 1 is important. None of these sources needs to dominate, since Diodorus is capable of adjusting and adapting sources to his own textual structure.

Epimenides

Epimenides was a highly enigmatic character of ancient Greece, encompassing everything from folk legend to theology. According to Strabo, he was born in Phaestus (Strabo, 10.4.14), while Diogenes Laertius tells us that he slept for 57 years in a cave somewhere in Crete (*Diog. Laert.* 1.109). After waking from this long slumber, he became ‘most loved by the gods’ (*Diog. Laert.* 1.110: *θεοφιλέστατος*); after his death, his skin⁹ was preserved and said to bear tattoos (*Suda s. v. Epimenides*, II 370, 6). Many sources also connect him with a pestilence in Athens, which he supposedly helped cure,¹⁰ though the dates vary greatly. Diogenes (*Diog. Laert.* 1.110–11) and Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 1) state that Epimenides purified Athens after the Cylon Affair in 592 B.C., whereas Plato (*Leg.* 642d) places the event ‘ten years before the Persian War’, nearly a century later, around 509 B.C.

⁸ Since this is an online edition, here and elsewhere I provide the relevant fragment to which the commentary is attached.

⁹ Scholars present very different interpretations of this curious testimony. Dodds suggests that it is symbolic of Epimenides’ subservience to the gods as *servus dei* (Dodds, 1951, 142), whereas Svenbo views it as an identification between the author and his writing (Svenbo, 1993, 135–44). Bremmer has suggested that it was simply a leather scroll with oracles (Bremmer, 1993, 235).

¹⁰ Epimenides fr. 10T (Bernabe, 2007, 120).

There is also a varied tradition of attributing all kinds of texts to Epimenides. For instance, Eratosthenes mentions a mythographer Epimenides who tells of a dragon-like beast reared together with Zeus that helped him fight the Titans (Eratosth. *Catast.* 27; also, *Schol. Arat.* 46). Other sources claim that Epimenides said he was the son of Selene¹¹, who also bore the Nemean lion. Elsewhere, he is said to have speculated on mythical creatures such as the Harpies¹² and many others¹³.

Also of note is the tradition of Epimenides' supposed *Theogony*, which most likely is not identical with the one analyzed here. According to Damascius (who cites Eudemus), Epimenides claimed that the first cosmic pair was Night and Aether (Damasc. *De princ.* 124). Damascius also attests that from this primordial pair was born Tartarus, from whom an unnamed pair of Titans descended. There are many scholarly interpretations of this fragment. Andrei Lebedev has recently painted a wholly Orphic¹⁴ image of Epimenides on the basis of this passage (Lebedev, 2023, 239–50). Most earlier scholars, however, rightly questioned the authenticity of the account, since it employs very late Orphic concepts not known to have existed in Epimenides' time (Kirk, Raven, & Schofield, 1983, 27–32).

One of the most famous fragments attributed to Epimenides is quoted by Callimachus¹⁵ in his *Hymn to Zeus*:

Cretans are always liars. They even built a tomb for you,

Lord, but you did not die, you are forever.

Κρηῆτες ἀεὶ ψεύδονται· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὃ ἄνα, σεῖο

Κρηῆτες ἐτεκτῆναντο· σὺ δ' οὐ θάνες, ἐσσι γὰρ αἰεὶ.

(Callim. Hymn 1.8–9)

It seems that this quote¹⁶ expresses a highly critical stance towards Cretan tradition – specifically that of Zeus' tomb¹⁷. We may speculate that at his time, a euhemeristic tendency existed in Cretan thought, transforming religious monuments into tourist attractions,¹⁸ which could be why Euhemerus mentions Crete in his stories (Winiarczyk, 2013, 4–5).

As is probably apparent, it is difficult to say anything definitive about Epimenides himself. He seems to have captivated the ancient Greek imagination, prompting a long tradition of pseudepigraphic

¹¹ Epimenides fr. 33F (Bernabe, 2007, 134–5).

¹² Epimenides fr. 47F (Bernabe, 2007, 154).

¹³ Epimenides fr. 52F on Echidna and fr. 53F on Typhon (Bernabe, 2007, 158).

¹⁴ West has suggested a similar image, though a little more critical (West, 1983, 45–52).

¹⁵ It is also attested in later biblical sources like *Acts* 17:28 and *Titus* 1:12.

¹⁶ Also of interest is that this line likely alludes to Hesiod's *Theogony* lines 26–32 (West, 1983, 47).

¹⁷ We do not know where this tomb resided, though it is worth noting that Diodorus also mentions a famous tomb on Crete, which he attributes to the Achaean hero Idomeneus (5.79.4).

¹⁸ Similar to the Memnon in Egypt, described by Pausanias (1.42.3).

attributions, legends, and historical fictions. We are not even sure when, and even if, he truly lived. Diogenes Laertius attributes six works to him, three poems and three prose works (*Diog. Laert.* 111–2), while other traditions raise the number to as many as eleven books (Lebedev, 2023, 249). Martin L. West argued quite confidently that all poems attributed to Epimenides are pseudepigraphic (West, 1983, 47), and that his name continued to be used well into Hellenistic times (West, 1983, 53).

The precise Epimenidean passage examined here has received almost no serious scholarly attention¹⁹, mainly because it has been regarded as pseudepigraphic. The source used by Diodorus has come to be simply called *Κρητικά*, since both Eratosthenes and Diodorus mention this supposed ‘title’. Yet this attribution is quite dubious. First, Diodorus never assigns such a title to Epimenides, but merely states that the authors who wrote ‘on the Cretan matters differ from one another’ (5.80.4: *δὲ τῶν τὰ Κρητικὰ γεγραφότων οἱ πλεῖστοι διαφωνοῦσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους*). To me, this seems less like a title than a reference to a broad literary theme, to which Diodorus in fact assigns three more authors. Second, although Eratosthenes cites Epimenides twice and does call his work *Κρητικὰ* (Eratosth. *Catast.* 5; 27), the contents of the quotes are quite odd and do not match the source used by Diodorus, as will become clear later. Nevertheless, scholars have called the source *Κρητικὰ* and concluded that it was a late pseudepigraphon (Fowler, 2000, 79). Notably, Toye speculates in his BNJ commentary on whether this was not the title of Epimenides’ ‘epic theogony’ (Toye, 2018, 2), only later called *Κρητικὰ* by Diodorus and others.

For our purposes it is not essential to possess a clear historical portrait of Epimenides. Even if West is correct in stating that all works ascribed to him are pseudepigraphic, there nevertheless existed in Greek literature a distinct tradition of ‘Epimenidean’ texts. In this sense, the tradition may be compared to that of the *Homeric Hymns*, where multiple poems were attributed to an author who did not actually compose them. Certain themes seem to unite all these pseudepigrapha: mythological narratives, theogonic speculation, and criticism of impious traditions. This brief survey of Epimenides should help us to pin down the Epimenidean source in Diodorus.

Method for Extraction

With these distinctions in mind, we may attempt a careful extraction of the source in question. First, we shall provide a thorough table of contents for the entire Cretan passage. Then, after preparing the passage in this way, we shall attempt to single out the Epimenidean source. The passage on Crete can be ordered by sections²⁰:

¹⁹ In Bernabe’s collection of Epimenides’ fragments (2007, 136), it is simply cited (35T), but not given in full

²⁰ This table of contents is based closely on the one given in Dowden (2015) 17–18.

1. Introduction	5.64.1–2
2. Idaean Daktyls and the first Cretans	5.64.3–4
3. Curetes	5.65
4. The Titans	5.66
5. Children of Kronos	5.68–9
6. Zeus	5.70–2
7. Children of Zeus	5.72–6
8. Diffusion of Religion	5.77.3
9. Cretan Heroes	5.78
10. Population mixture in Crete	5.80

For convenience I will go on to call these parts of the passage as ‘sections’ and the whole passage on Crete as simply the ‘Cretan Passage’ or ‘Passage’.

My hypothesis is that Epimenides’ text was a theogony²¹, similar to that of Hesiod, but also idiosyncratic in some aspects. The Theogony can be found within the Diodorean text, admittedly, it is not presented as coherently as one would hope. However, it is my belief that the overarching structure of this Theogony can be found within the text. It begins in section 4, where the birth of the Titans is established and continues through sections 5, 6 and 7. At the end of the seventh section the whole pantheon is enumerated and their different ‘roles’ are established. This, I argue concludes the Theogony.

Since the source we are looking for is buried deep within Diodorus’ compilation from four sources, we will need to examine the entire passage not only multiple times, but also from multiple directions and perspectives. First, I suggest analyzing the narratological breaks in Diodorus text, which may indicate where one theme or question is dealt with and where another is begun. Of course, the narrative which we wish to extract is the hypothesized theogonic account of Epimenides. This we will do by analyzing the flow of narrative and attempting to find any indications of where it breaks – either linguistically or stylistically²². If we succeed in this, we should possess by then a preliminary structure of this text. After this, we may look at broad breaks we found and attempt to assign each of these parts to an individual source – mostly

²¹ This is a title given by Diogenes Laertius (1.111: *Θεογονία*) in his biography of Epimenides. Admittedly, Diogenes calls it a poem, whereas the *Κρητικά* was believed to be prosaic. We will not deal with the difficult question of whether this was a prosaic or poetic text, since we can attest nothing with certainty from Diodorus’ testimony and we have already sufficiently shown that the title of *Κρητικά* is likely falsely attributed to Epimenides.

²² These ‘narrative breaks’ will be represented in one more table of contents, in which we will provide demarcation lines – where one narrative breaks and another begins.

according to theoretical bias, which is implied in Diodorus' 'bibliography'. If we manage this, then we should be able to identify the passages in which the Epimenidean source was utilized.

Narratological Analysis

Sections 1 to 3.

The first part, the introduction, presents the task of the following passage – to describe the island of Crete (5.64.1: *περὶ δὲ Κρήτης νῦν διέξιμεν*). Dowden's (2015) label "introduction" seems to imply that this passage is attributable only to Diodorus himself, since it merely provides an overview of what follows. This is partly correct, for at the end of the section Diodorus promises to 'give account of the most reputable Cretan sources' (*διέξιμεν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐνδοξοτάτοις τῶν τὰς Κρητικὰς πράξεις συνταξαμένων*), suggesting that real 'reliance' on sources begins only afterwards.

Yet, we may question this view somewhat. Several concrete opinions are immediately presented here, and a mandatory break in narrative flow occurs at the section's end, as differing traditions begin to clash. First, the earliest inhabitants of Crete, the so-called Eteocretans (the 'genuine Cretans'), are introduced, along with their king Cres (5.64.1–2). The passage thus opens quite 'rationally', presenting an ethnographic claim about the island's first inhabitants. The Eteocretans are described as the 'oldest' (*ἀρχαιοτάτους*) people of Crete and, in mythological fashion, as autochthonous (*αὐτόχθονας*). The term *αὐτόχθων* denotes not only origin from the soil, but also origin 'from themselves' (*αὐτό-*), without descent from any foreign people or land. They are thus presented as the ideal 'first' Cretans. This forms a natural opening to a historical account, asserting both priority and antiquity. Notably, a closely related term, *γηγενεῖς*, appears only a few paragraphs later (5.65.1) to describe the birth of the Curetes²³. Already we see a possible clash of traditions which Diodorus marks through different terminology: *αὐτόχθων* versus *γηγενεῖς*. Both the Eteocretans and the Curetes are contestants for the very first inhabitants of Crete. The same idea appears elsewhere: Nonnus (13.154) calls the Curetes *προτέρων χθόνιον γένος*, while Servius the Grammarian²⁴ (3.131) describes them as *primi cultores Cretae*.

These are two competing traditions concerning the first inhabitants of Crete. This tension is deepened by the figure of their king, Cres. Little is known about him beyond this brief mention in Diodorus. Other sources likewise describe him as a king of the Cretans (Ps.–Scymnus, *Circuit of the Earth* 535; St. Jerome, *Chronicon* B1962), and in one instance, a Curete (St. Jerome, *Chronicon* B1957). Oddly, Diodorus

²³ Nonnus uses the same word to describe the Dactyls and Corybantes, which he fuses into a single group (14.24–5): *Δάκτυλοι Ἰδαῖοι, κραναῆς ναετῆρες ἐρίπνης, Γηγενέες Κορύβαντες*.

²⁴ Servius, *Commentary on Virgil's Aeneid* 3.131

neither returns to this figure (assuming, he belonged to the time of the Curetes), nor explains why he is mentioned or what role he plays in the inception of Cretan history. While other sources at least credit Cres with giving Crete its name, Diodorus merely states that he had ‘helped’ (*ώφελησαι*) humans live better lives.

By contrast, the Idaean Dactyls and the Curetes, introduced immediately after the opening section, are praised for specific benefactions. The Dactyls discovered the use of fire and metalworking, while the Curetes learned to tame animals, shoot the bow, and so forth. Most importantly, they established ‘concord’ (5.65.3–4) and made human coexistence possible. Narratively, then, the Curetes seem to mark the beginning of civilized life on the island. In this context, it appears somewhat inconsistent that a kingly rule should precede the establishment of civil coexistence: if there is not yet concord among men, how can monarchy and social order come about? The narrative would make more sense if the Curetes preceded Cres, yet this is not the case.

Thus, the passage seems to contain two beginnings and two temporal chronologies, which Diodorus attempts to present simultaneously. First comes the account of Cres and the Eteocretans as the first earth-born people of Crete. Then follows the tale of the Idaean Dactyls, who are likewise granted a primordial status. Diodorus introduces the Dactyls as *Πρῶτοι τοίνυν τῶν εἰς μνήμην παραδεδομένων* (5.64.3), whereas the Eteocretans are merely said to be *φασιν ἀρχαιοτάτους* (5.64.1), and the Curetes are introduced with *ἱστοροῦσι* (5.65.1). Finally comes the narrative of the Curetes, their inventions, and their civilizing of the islanders. This already complex account of Crete’s beginnings becomes even more troubled once the story of Cronus is told, as we shall see later.

The Cretan passage thus presents not two but three overlapping beginnings and competing temporal frameworks: the story of Cres and the Eteocretans as the island’s first earthborn inhabitants (section 1), the inserted account of the Idaean Dactyls (section 2), and the narrative of the Curetes as civilizers and inventors (section 3). Diodorus attempts to integrate these traditions into a single system, yet they do not form a fully unified account. This raises the possibility of multiple underlying sources even within the opening sections, though it is difficult to determine precisely where one tradition ends and another begins.

It is possible that these positions are not reconciled and do not produce a chronologically or conceptually coherent narrative. The Dactyls clearly predate the Curetes, but what of Cres? If he precedes them all, why is he not granted greater benefactions and honours? Why is he mentioned so briefly, and how could kingship exist before concord and civilized life had been established? We may think that Diodorus was likewise confused when he attempted to impose a single narrative structure on the material.

But perhaps this disorder need not necessarily indicate multiple sources. It may instead reflect a single historical work presenting different theories about the origins of the Cretans, all reproduced by Diodorus without any attempts to reconcile them conceptually.

Sections 4 to 5.

Our hypothesis on the first three sections fits well with the two narratological clues that follow. First, Diodorus makes a temporal jump backwards to tell the story of Cronus and Zeus; second, the style changes from a rational account to a theogonic catalogue. Let us examine these changes more closely.

At the end of the section on the Curetes, Diodorus briefly mentions their role in rearing and hiding the infant Zeus from Cronus at the time of his birth. This allusion to myth arises from the mention of swords, helmets, and war-dances – inventions of the Curetes – which helped conceal Zeus from his infanticidal father. Yet to expound this myth properly, Diodorus must break his ongoing narrative and move the temporal perspective further back:

And we are told that, when Rhea, the mother of Zeus, entrusted him to them unbeknown to Cronus his father, they took him under their care and saw to his nurture; but since we purpose to set forth this affair in detail, we must take up the account at a little earlier point.

φασὶ δ' αὐτοὺς τὸν Δία, λάθρα τοῦ πατρὸς Κρόνου παραδόσης Ῥέας τῆς μητρός, ὑποδέξασθαι καὶ θρέψαι· περὶ οὗ τὰ κατὰ μέρος μέλλοντας ἡμᾶς δηλοῦν ἀναγκαῖον ἀναλαβεῖν μικρὸν ἀνωτέρω τὴν διήγησιν.

(5.65.4)

The wording of this brief sentence points to a clear narrative break. Diodorus states that he must ‘go back’ (ἀναλαβεῖν) in his ‘narrative’ (τὴν διήγησιν) if he wishes to ‘elaborate’ (δηλοῦν) on the tale of the Curetes. This is reinforced by the fact that the text up to this point has been mostly informational, presenting accounts of early Cretan history, details about important figures, and contemporary religious practices. Once Diodorus introduces the Curetes, Zeus, and Cronus, the narrative shifts into a more coherent theogonic account. The chronology of the Cretan narrative is pushed further back through the claim that Cronus was born ‘at the time of the Curetes’ (5.66: κατὰ τὴν τῶν Κουρήτων ἡλικίαν). In this sense, Cronus and the entire Titan ‘section’ retroactively interrupt²⁵ the chronology established in the introduction, before aligning with it again in section 5.

The Titan account begins with two primordial pairs of divinities, after which their offspring are listed. The passage proceeds through a genealogical catalogue of the Titans (as well as the offspring of Cronus and Rhea) and their benefactions to the islanders. Titans such as Hyperion, Coeus, Phoebe, Iapetus, Prometheus, Mnemosyne, and Themis are mentioned alongside their respective contributions. Cronus and

²⁵ We could carefully speculate that here Diodorus’ source also changes. Perhaps the source which Diodorus was using for the first three sections of his Cretan Passage did not possess the much-needed narrative of Cronus and Rhea or it played an insignificant role, since the myth is only mentioned in brief, as an addition to the list of inventions.

Rhea are then singled out, and their offspring enumerated: Hestia, Demeter, Hera, Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades.

There are, I believe, several interpolations within an otherwise coherent theogonic tale. The first appears at 5.66.3, where Diodorus mentions Roman and Carthaginian festivals held in honour of Cronus. Such a historical reference sits awkwardly within the theogonic account up to this point. Equally important is the long citation from Hesiod's *Works and Days*. After mentioning contemporary Roman and Carthaginian beliefs, Diodorus justifies them through a well-known poetic source. This resembles not a continuous theogony, but an insertion from a different type of source. The point is reinforced by the concluding phrase: *περὶ μὲν οὖν Κρόνου τοιαῦτα μυθολογοῦσιν* (5.66.6). The plural *μυθολογοῦσιν* implies multiple mythical traditions rather than a single unified source.

The second interpolation occurs at the end of the section, when Cronus' children are listed. At 5.69, after mentioning the myth of Persephone's abduction, Diodorus begins a lengthy discussion on Demeter's discovery of corn, presenting several local variations. The Egyptians identify Demeter with Isis, the Athenians place the discovery in Attica, and the Sicilians in Sicily. Diodorus, naturally, supports the Sicilian version, arguing that the island's remarkable fertility makes it unlikely that it had not first received Demeter's blessing. This long speculative excursus suggests that the tale of Demeter and the Rape of Persephone, likewise may not derive from a single source, but was instead shaped by Diodorus himself.

Thus, sections 4 and 5 seem to form a coherent Titanogonic narrative. From 5.66.1 to 5.66.4 the genealogical tree of the Titans is established, though with some disagreement, after which the exceptional importance of Cronus is brought up. The peaceful nature of Cronus prompts further argument and a quote from Hesiod – the first major interpolation, interrupting the narrative flow. At 5.67, Cronus' siblings are listed and described. As in Hesiod's *Theogony*, the Titans are barely mentioned, and the focus shifts to Cronus and Rhea's children. Their gifts and honors are listed until Demeter appears at 5.68.2, prompting a lengthy discussion of corn traditions from Egyptian Isis to Eleusis. After this dispute is resolved, Diodorus introduces Poseidon and Hades, Zeus' remaining brothers. This completes the theogonic list.

Besides the two major interpolations discussed above, several smaller discrepancies appear within the otherwise coherent theogonic account. First, there are two beginnings to the theogony: one centered on Uranus and Ge, the other, on one of the Curetes and Titaea. These parallel accounts will become important later, when we attempt to clarify the different perspectives within the passage. Second, Prometheus is portrayed in two ways – either as a thief or as an inventor. Finally, Mnemosyne's invention of 'communicative powers' is attributed by 'some people' instead to Hermes. Though seemingly minor, these inconsistencies will later prove significant. At this point, the two sections appear to conclude, since Diodorus introduces another temporal break, similar to the previous one though less abrupt.

Sections 6 to 7

At the very outset of section six, Diodorus once again sets two theories against one another:

Regarding the birth of Zeus and the manner in which he came to be king, there is no agreement. Some say that he succeeded to the kingship after Cronus passed from among men into the company of the gods, not by overcoming his father with violence, but in the manner prescribed by custom and justly, having been judged worthy of that honour. But others recount a myth, which runs as follows: There was delivered to Cronus an oracle regarding the birth of Zeus which stated that the son who would be born to him would wrest the kingship from him by force.

Περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Διὸς γενέσεώς τε καὶ βασιλείας διαφωνεῖται· καὶ τινες μὲν φασιν αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τοῦ Κρόνου μετάστασιν εἰς θεοὺς διαδέξασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν, οὐ βία κατισχύσαντα τὸν πατέρα, νομίμως δὲ καὶ δικαίως ἀξιοθέντα ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς· τινὲς δὲ μυθολογοῦσι τῷ Κρόνῳ γενέσθαι λόγιον περὶ τῆς τοῦ Διὸς γενέσεως, ὅτι παραιρήσεται τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ βιαίως ὁ γεννηθεὶς παῖς.

(5.70.1)

Even the *μὲν [...] δὲ* formula reappears here, the same construction Diodorus uses in the ‘bibliography’, as discussed above. The first theory, that of a peaceful succession, remains secondary, while violent seizure of power is foregrounded. This is followed by the familiar myth of Cronus’ deception by Rhea and the Curetes’ war–dance. Finally, after the long Titan genealogy, Diodorus returns to the point where he first broke off the narrative (5.65.4). This suggests that, although the current myth is disconnected from the Titan genealogy, it is conceptually linked to it insofar as the genealogy had to be told first.

Cretan mythology revolves around Zeus’ birth. Diodorus adds several details linking the god’s birth to the island, presenting ‘evidences’ (*σημεῖα*) that may have convinced him of the correct account²⁶. The Omphalian plain is said to be named after the god’s umbilical cord. Diodorus also mentions the sacred cave of Zeus’s birth and the meadow beside it, vaguely locating them near Mount Ida. He then recounts the curious story of bees changing colour at Zeus’ command and the honours accorded to Amaltheia, his goat nurse. Finally, Zeus is credited with founding the city of Dicta. This collection of fun facts appears to be an interpolation into the narrative of Zeus’ birth and upbringing, since Diodorus presents miscellaneous traditions connected with contemporary practices and beliefs rather than the theogonic narrative itself.

²⁶ Diodorus has a methodology of deciding which myth or historical account is right. In the Book 1 when he starts talking about king Sesostri (1.53) he states that ‘we for our part shall endeavour to give the most probable account and that which most nearly agrees with the monuments still standing in the land’.

Further on, the gigantomachy is recounted (5.71–72). Zeus, it is said, establishes justice and order in the world, even establishing the institution of ‘court’ (δικαστηρίῳ). He does so after ‘putting to death robbers and impious men’ (τοὺς μὲν ληστὰς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἀναιροῦντα) who plague the land. Here the passage requires closer analysis, since it seems to mix two separate narratives.

At the beginning of the passage, Zeus is said to establish order for ‘human life’ (5.71.1: τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον). He does this by punishing other ‘men’ who act against order. Although the word ἄνθρωπος is not repeated, it seems implied by expressions such as τοὺς δὲ φαύλους and τοὺς μὲν ληστὰς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς. This is especially so since at 5.71.2 Diodorus leaves a linguistic clue that he is adding something new to the narrative. The expression is:

[...] and it was in this connection, they say, that he slew the Giants and their followers, Mylinus in Crete and Typhon in Phrygia.

[...] ὅτε δὴ φασιν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς γίγαντας ἀνελεῖν, ἐν μὲν Κρήτῃ τοὺς περὶ Μύλινον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν τοὺς περὶ Τυφῶνα.

(5.71.2)

The phrase ὅτε δὴ φασιν suggests that Zeus’ battles with the giants ‘also’ transpired during this period. Diodorus seems to imply that some authors depict Zeus’ fight against bandits, while others portray his confrontations with Giants. He then narrates the conflicts with Mylinus, Typhon, and Musaeus. The Gigantomachy culminates in Musaeus’ ἀπόστασις, which turns the conflict in favour of the Olympians. This is linked to the fact that Musaeus received ‘peculiar honours’ (τυχεῖν ὀρισμένων τιμῶν) while all enemies of the Gods were slain (κατακοπῆναι δ’ ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἀντιταξαμένους). Although the story appears complete, Diodorus continues by adding further details connected with Macedonia and Italy:

Συστῆναι δὲ καὶ ἄλλους πολέμους αὐτῷ πρὸς γίγαντας [...]

Zeus also had other wars against the Giants [...]

(5.71.4)

The verb συνίστημι combined with the adjective ἄλλους implies that Diodorus is quite literally adding further accounts to the tale already told. The Gigantomachy therefore combines three separate accounts: the establishment of justice against the ἀσεβεῖς, the defection of Musaeus, and the battles in Macedonia and Italy.

The main focus of the section, however, seems to be the first account of banditry and the establishment of justice. The episode begins with the punishment of men who are ἀσεβεῖς (5.71.2) and ends with the punishment of the same ἀσεβεῖς (5.71.6). Moreover, Diodorus seems to connect these narratives by stating that the Giants were punished specifically for disobeying ‘the laws of justice’ (5.71.5: ἀπειθεῖν

δὲ τοῖς περὶ τοῦ δικαίου τιθεμένοις νόμοις), established by Zeus at the start of the episode, rather than simply for opposing his rule.

After the Gigantomachy follows a description of Zeus' epithets and their etymological relation to his benefactions (5.72). Then begins a long list of Zeus' offspring and their benefactions. It seems reasonable to separate the Gigantomachy and praise of Zeus from the list of his children. Yet the two are narratively linked. At 5.71.6 Diodorus states how Zeus 'distributed honours' (ἀπονεῖμαι τιμάς) among 'gods, heroes and men' (τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἡρώων, ἔτι δ' ἀνδρῶν) after his battles. Later, once the catalogue of epithets is completed, the same verb 'ἀπονεῖμαι' reappears. This suggests that the etymological discussion on his epithets is itself a brief interpolation separating an otherwise unified narrative of the Gigantomachy and Zeus' offspring, who likely participated in the conflict.

It is also important to note that Athena's birth is mentioned together with Zeus' epithets. Though seemingly irrelevant, two things are of note here. First, Athena's birth appears to derive from the same source used in Book 3 (3.70), namely Dionysius Scytobrachion. More importantly, this is another clue that Diodorus is interrupting the narrative flow: he first mentions Athena's birth, then gives a full list of Zeus' offspring, and at 5.73.7–8 returns to Athena once again. This further shows how Diodorus sometimes epitomizes his material, since he could easily have postponed Athena's birth until her proper place in the catalogue.

From here follows a long and narratively coherent account of Zeus' offspring: Athena, Aphrodite, the Graces, Eileithyia, Artemis, Hours, the Muses, Hephaestus, Ares, Apollo, Hermes, Dionysus, Heracles, Britomartis, and finally Plutus. The last two names – Britomartis and Plutus – seem to be later additions rather than part of the same account. This becomes clear at 5.77.5, where Diodorus briefly summarizes the children of Zeus whom he is about to describe in more detail:

To Zeus also were born, they say, the goddesses Aphrodite and the Graces, Eileithyia and her helper Artemis, the Hours, as they are called, Eunomia and Dikê and Eirenê, and Athena and the Muses, and the gods Hephaestus and Ares and Apollo, and Hermes and Dionysus and Heracles.

Τοῦ δὲ Διὸς ἐκγόνους φασὶ γενέσθαι θεὰς μὲν Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Χάριτας, πρὸς δὲ ταύταις Εἰλείθυιαν καὶ τὴν αὐτῆς συνεργὸν Ἄρτεμιν, καὶ τὰς προσαγορευομένας Ὁρας, Εὐνομίαν τε καὶ Δίκην, ἔτι δ' Εἰρήνην καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ Μούσας, θεοὺς δὲ Ἥφαιστον καὶ Ἄρην καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἑρμῆν καὶ Διόνυσον καὶ Ἡρακλέα²⁷.

²⁷ It is quite possible that Heracles and Dionysus were also not part of this list, since their names are an addition by Iensius (cf. 1). Still, we retain it, as it appears in the Loeb edition.

As we can see, Britomartis and Plutus are not included. We may thus speculate that the preceding descriptions derive from a single unified source. The final two figures are either additions by Diodorus himself or belong to another source. The latter is more likely, since the myth of Britomartis also appears in Strabo's account of Crete (10.4.12).

We should also note an important structural feature of the list and its descriptions. Each deity is introduced in almost the same way: first comes an enumeration of the deity's *τιμή* or *τιμαί*, then an argument for or against some alternative tradition or myth connected with that figure.

A few examples will suffice. According to 5.73.2, Aphrodite governs the youth of maidens, the age of marriage, and related matters (*τιμή*). A clarification follows: 'Nevertheless, all men make their first sacrifices to Zeus the Perfecter and Hera the Perfectress' (5.73.3). Likewise, after crediting the Muses with the discovery of writing, a counter-argument against a similar Phoenician claim is added (5.74.1). The same structure appears earlier in sections 4 and 5. Mnemosyne, for example, is said to have invented 'the power of reason', followed by a competing Egyptian account (5.67.3). More examples could be added, but these suffice to show the pattern. Each description usually begins positively, assigning some aspect of human life to a deity and ends with an argumentative or corrective qualification.

For the moment, we will not speculate on the reasons behind this structure, beyond suggesting that the different *τιμαί* probably derive from different literary sources.

Sections 8 to 10

The long list of the Olympians and their *τιμαί* is brought to a close with the concluding expression:

Such, then, are the myths which the Cretans recount of the gods who they claim were born in their land.

Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν θεῶν οἱ Κρήτες τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς λεγομένων γεννηθῆναι τοιαῦτα μυθολογοῦσι.
(5.77.3)

It seems that Diodorus has finished recounting matters connected with the gods and is ready to move to a new theme, as indeed he does. What follows is an interesting argument about cult practices, namely that all Hellenic cults and mystery practices originated in Crete. The argument is twofold. First, the teachings of Cnossus are said not to be secretive like Eleusinian or Thracian mysteries. What is taught at Eleusis remains there, whereas Cretan teachings can spread freely (5.77.3). Second, entirely euhemeristically, the gods themselves are said to have travelled across Greece, sharing their benefactions with locals, who in turn bestowed local epithets upon them.

The argument is interesting and deserves attention, but for our purposes, it must be set aside. It seems unlikely that the Epimenidean Theogony, for which we search, would contain such an elaborate cultural argument. First, it clashes with both the conventions and aims of theogony. Instead of describing the nature of the gods or the establishment of cosmic order, the text would shift toward questions of cult, mystery traditions, and ritual practice. Such concerns belong more naturally to an ethnographic or historical work, the kind of source Diodorus is known to use. Second, it would make little narrative sense for the Cretan theogony suddenly to fill with foreign customs and place-names unrelated to either the island or the narrative itself.

After presenting this cult argument, Diodorus once again distances the text from the Olympian narrative, this time chronologically, stating that:

Many generations after the birth of the gods, the Cretans go on to say, not a few heroes were to be found in Crete [...]

Μετὰ δὲ τὰς τῶν θεῶν γενέσεις ὕστερον πολλαῖς γενεαῖς φασὶ γενέσθαι κατὰ τὴν Κρήτην ἥρωας οὐκ ὀλίγους [...]

(5.78.1)

The heroic age, to which Diodorus now turns, centres mainly on three figures: Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Sarpedon. Each receives a brief summary touching on familiar myths: Europa²⁸, Minos conversing with Zeus about laws and later becoming the judge of the Underworld²⁹, Oenopion ruling Chios and inventing wine³⁰, and finally the Achaean expedition against Ilion.

An overarching historical narrative of Cretan expansionism also emerges in this section. Minos is credited with founding Cnossus, Phaestus, and Cydonia, as well as establishing good laws (5.78). Rhadamanthys continues Minos' practice of administering justice. He is also said to have 'come into possession' (*κατακτήσασθαι*) of many islands around Crete, which he distributed among his sons and generals (4.79.1–3). Finally, Sarpedon leaves Crete and conquers territories around Lycia, where he likewise establishes his descendants; these heirs later join the Trojan war (5.79.3–4).

The account of the heroic age, like the cult argument before it, seems not to belong to the Epimenidean theogony we are attempting to isolate. First, Diodorus himself twice separates it from the preceding material: first, by stating that the matters concerning the gods have been concluded (5.77.3), and later, by noting that the heroes were born many generations after the gods (5.78.1). Moreover, the whole passage appears far too historical and factual to fit naturally within the preceding theogonic narrative. By

²⁸ Hdt. 1.2; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.7; Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.11.2, etc.

²⁹ Hom. *Il.* 13.450; Hom. *Od.* 19.175; Verg. *Aen.* 432.

³⁰ Aratus, *Phaen.* 634; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.4.3, etc.

this point, the narrative appears complete: Zeus has established his rule and imposed order among gods and men.

It is also worth noting that the final paragraph of the Cretan passage contains more than Diodorus' bibliography of sources. It is likewise clearly detached from what precedes it, since Diodorus begins by stating:

But now that we have examined these matters it remains for us to discuss the peoples who have become intermixed with the Cretans.

Τούτων δ' ἡμῖν διευκρινημένων λείπεται περὶ τῶν ἐπιμιχθέντων ἔθνων τοῖς Κρησὶ διελθεῖν.

(5.80.1)

Clearly, Diodorus now turns to a different theme – that of population mixture. He mentions the Eteocretans (already introduced in the first section), migrations of Pelasgians and Dorians. This final section is plainly neither theogonic nor theological, so we leave it largely aside. Still, it is possible that the source used at the beginning of the passage reappears here as well, since the sections are thematically connected. The opening sections of the Cretan Passage explain the origins of Cretan civilization, while the final paragraph concludes with its historical emergence as a political power.

Conclusions on structure

Having analyzed the Cretan passage in broad narratological strokes, we may now return to the outline presented earlier and revise its structure. Now we shall update it with demarcation lines marking clear transitions from one narrative to another.

1. **5.64–5:** The first three introductory sections likely form a unified ethnographic account, mainly because they present partially irreconcilable versions of early Cretan history. Their style is also more rationalistic, differing noticeably from the later titanogonic and theogonic sections.

2. **5.66.1–4:** At the end of this first unit, once Diodorus discusses the inventions of the Curetes, the narrative moves back in time to recount the myth of Zeus' birth. Yet the shift is not directly to Zeus himself, but first to his Titan predecessors.

3. **5.70–2:** This narrative eventually reconnects with the earlier timeline as Zeus' birth finally takes place.

4. **5.71:** Zeus' wars and conquests against the Giants are then described.

5. **5.72.5–76.1–2:** This is followed by the 'distribution' of inventions and benefactions among Zeus' offspring, with two additional myths about Britomartis and Plutus (5.76.3–77.2).

6. **5.77.3–78:** The passage then concludes with quasi–mythological accounts of the conquests of Minos, Radamanthys, and Sarpedon throughout Crete and the wider world.

7. **5.80:** Finally, Diodorus gives a brief account of the Cretan population and migrations.

Thus, we may state, with some preliminary caution, that the passage contains three overarching sections. First comes the opening triplet, all concerned with the first inhabitants of Crete and the rise of Cretan civilization. The narrative then shifts to the Titans and gods, forming a broadly coherent account across the next five sections – from the first Titan pair to the offspring of Zeus. This long section, which interests us most, is filled with interpolations and edits by Diodorus, most of which I have marked in red in the table below; sections unlikely to belong to the theogonic narrative, though not interpolations themselves, are marked in yellow. Finally, the passage turns to the exploits of Cretan heroes, ending with remarks on the population of the island. These concluding sections, reminiscent of the opening triplet though slightly different, are likewise marked in yellow.

The structure of the theogonic section may therefore be represented in greater detail as follows:

1. Introduction	5.64.1–2
2. Idaean Daktyls and the first Cretans	5.64.3–4
3. Curetes	5.65
4. The Titans	5.66
4.1. Contemporary festivals of Cronus	5.66.4–6
5. Children of Cronus	5.68–9
5.1. A dispute on corn	5.69.1–3
6. Zeus’ birth and rise to power	5.70–2
6.1. ‘Evidences’ of Zeus’ birth	5.70.4–6
6.2. The Gigantomachy	5.71
6.3. Zeus’ titles	5.72–1–4
7. Children of Zeus	5.72.5–76.1–2
7.1 Britomartis and Plutus	5.76.3–77.2
8. Diffusion of Religion	5.77.3
9. Cretan Heroes	5.78
10. Population mixture in Crete	5.80

Rough Gem

What we now possess is a rough gem that needs cutting and polishing. The Cretan passage contains several narratives: one historical, another concerned with contemporary traditions, and so on. Yet its core is clearly the mythological strand concerning Zeus' rise to power and the establishment of just order. Even with its many interpolations and pauses, this theogonic narrative remains discernible. Certain clear positions can be identified within the text. I therefore suggest returning to the passage and examining its theoretical standpoints, in order to definitively pinpoint the Epimenidean account.

We should recall two basic clues from the bibliography at the end of the passage. First, Diodorus names four sources: Epimenides the Theologian, Sosicrates, Dosiades, and Laosthenidas. Second, he seems to distinguish Epimenides from the other three through the *μὲν ... δὲ* formula. If so, then among the mythological strata we should be able to identify a distinctly theological approach.

I choose to analyze the passage by contrasting it with Hesiod's *Theogony*, which seems the most relevant comparison. It is not only the single extant theogonic poem, but also closely resembles the Cretan passage: many myths overlap, and genealogical trees recur. The differences between the two texts are therefore especially important.

Euhemerization – a Diodorean input

Before beginning the search for the Epimenidean source, we must briefly address several hermeneutic problems, chiefly Diodorus' philosophical biases. In composing the 'Library', Diodorus displays a clear ideological commitment: a broad euhemeristic lens through which he interprets most myths.

That Diodorus is a euhemeristic author is beyond dispute (Sulimani, 2022, 180–1). In multiple places he presents entire narratives in a euhemeristic mode (3.57–62; 4.11.3–28.4), while elsewhere he interprets otherwise conventional myths euhemeristically (4.13.2; 4.18.2). The important question is whether Diodorus imposes this framework onto originally non-euhemeristic material, or whether he simply selects euhemeristic sources from the outset.

This is, of course, difficult to determine, since Diodorus' primary sources do not survive. Still, some clues may be drawn from his own comments, where these are available. For instance, in Book 5 Diodorus presents the myth of Prometheus:

[...] to Iapetus was born Prometheus, of whom tradition tells us, as **some writers of myths record**, that he stole fire from the gods and gave it to mankind, **though the truth is** that he was the discoverer of those things which give forth fire and from which it may be kindled.

[...] Ἰαπετοῦ δὲ Προμηθέα τὸν παραδεδομένον μὲν **ὕπό τινων μυθογράφων** ὅτι τὸ πῦρ κλέψας παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔδωκε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, **πρὸς δ' ἀλήθειαν** εὐρετὴν γενόμενον τῶν πυρείων, ἐξ ὧν ἐκκάεται τὸ πῦρ. (5.67.2–3)

As Diodorus states, one account comes from ‘the mythographers’ (*ὕπό τινων μυθογράφων*), while the other is ‘according to truth’ (*πρὸς δ' ἀλήθειαν*). Interestingly enough, the alternative account is not of some other source, but the ‘truth’ itself. Diodorus therefore seems deeply committed to the ‘correct’ (=euhemeristic) version, even where he has no source for it. Mythical tales, in his view, may be false, whereas the euhemeristic interpretation reached through rationalization is inherently true. This tendency is reinforced elsewhere, where Diodorus repeatedly rationalizes myths (1.12.27; 2.10.1–2; 3.60.3; 4.77.6) or reshapes narratives toward a didactic end³¹ (Said, 2014, 72; Sulimani, 2022, 180). Roubekas even argues that Diodorus is so committed to ideological motifs – such as the ‘heroes of culture’ – that he imposes them onto sources which originally lacked such concerns (Roubekas, 2017, 53–55). Moreover, the language Diodorus uses for divine ‘benefactions’ and related ‘deifications’ is suspiciously repetitive (Sulimani, 2011, 65–70), suggesting that he often reuses a preferred formula.

Thus, we may safely conclude that Diodorus often superimposes euhemerism onto his sources. Usually, this serves to illustrate ethical lessons, or more broadly, to present the ‘cultural heroes’ as ideal rulers. These ideas are meant to inspire contemporary readers and perhaps even political leaders. For our purposes, this is crucial, since many euhemeristic details mentioned by Diodorus likely belong to him rather than to the original source. Nevertheless, we must stay vigilant.

The roots of the genealogical tree

The first fundamental difference between Hesiod’s *Theogony* and Diodorus’ account concerns the initial pair of gods. Diodorus states that:

³¹ Historicizing mythology carries clear political and ideological implications, and scholars disagree on whether Diodorus uses his work for political commentary. Sheridan argues that, unlike Polybius, Diodorus is relatively critical of Rome (Sheridan, 2010, 48–50), while Sacks even suggests he criticizes Rome and implicitly foresees its decline (Sacks, 1994, 217–20). In contrast, Sulimani sees admiration rather than criticism, arguing that Diodorus models his mythic figures on Hellenistic rulers and Roman leaders such as Augustus and Caesar (Sulimani, 2011, 103–108, 233, 283, 296). Still, mythological rulers and generals consistently function as exemplars of ideal leadership among Romans, Greeks, and barbarians (Muntz, 2017, 139).

The Titans numbered six men and five women, being born, as certain writers of myths relate, of Uranus and Gê, but according to others, of one of the Curetes and Titaëa, from whom as their mother they derive the name they have.

ὑπάρξαι δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἑξ μὲν ἀνδρας, πέντε δὲ γυναῖκας, ὡς μὲν τινες μυθολογοῦσιν, Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Γῆς ὄντας, ὡς δὲ τινὲς φασιν, ἕκ τινος τῶν Κουρήτων καὶ μητρὸς Τιταίας, ἀφ' ἧς αὐτοὺς ταύτης τετευχέναι τῆς προσηγορίας.

(5.66.2–3)

Diodorus presents two theories concerning the first divine pair from whom the Titans were born. Once again, he juxtaposes them through the formulaic μέν [...] δέ construction. The first is the familiar pairing of Uranus (Οὐρανοῦ) and Ge (Γῆς), found in many other sources³². The second is otherwise unattested: the Titans are said to be the children of mother Titaëa (μητρὸς Τιταίας) and one of the Curetes (τινος τῶν Κουρήτων). Their offspring are then enumerated. Male children are Cronus, Hyperion, Coeus, Iapetus, Crius, and Oceanus; the female are Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Phoebe, and Tethys.

We should analyze both members of this pair. The maternal figure is especially elusive, since almost nothing is known about the deity Titaëa. The only other mention of her appears in Diodorus' Book 3, within the Atlantean Theogony discussed above:

To Uranus, the myth continues, were born forty-five sons from a number of wives, and, of these, eighteen, it is said, were by Titaëa, each of them bearing a distinct name, but all of them as a group were called, after their mother, Titans. Titaëa, because she was prudent and had brought about many good deeds for the peoples, was deified after her death by those whom she had helped and her name was changed to Gê.

Οὐρανοῦ δὲ μυθολογοῦσι γενέσθαι παῖδας ἐκ πλείονων γυναικῶν πέντε πρὸς τοῖς τετταράκοντα, καὶ τούτων ὀκτωκαίδεκα λέγουσιν ὑπάρχειν ἐκ Τιταίας ὄνομα μὲν ἴδιον ἔχοντας ἐκάστους, κοινῇ δὲ πάντα ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ὀνομαζομένους Τιτᾶνας. τὴν δὲ Τιταίαν, σώφρονα οὔσαν καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίαν γενομένην τοῖς λαοῖς, ἀποθεωθῆναι μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν ὑπὸ τῶν εὖ παθόντων Γῆν μετονομασθεῖσαν.

(3.57.1)

This account has some clear similarities to the Cretan passage. First, it explicitly mentions goddess Titaëa; second, her name is connected with the Titans – the idea also present in the Cretan account (5.66.2–3), which we will explore later. Yet, there are notable differences. Titaëa is here the wife of Uranus, not one

³² The best-known is, of course, Hesiod's *Theogony* (126). It also appears in Aeschylus (*PV* 207), Apollodorus (*Ps.-Apollod. Bibl.* 1.12), and many others.

of the Curetes. Moreover, after giving birth, her name is said to change to Ge³³, thus collapsing the genealogy into the traditional version in which gods descend from Uranus and Ge. This transformation also coincides with Titaea's deification, suggesting either that Diodorus used a euhemeristic source or imposed one³⁴. Although it is suspicious that the name Titaea appears only in Diodorus, the two mentions belong to markedly different mythologies.

Titaea's role as name-giver to her children is perhaps more revealing. It is highly suspicious that this same detail appears in both accounts, though it is also possible that Diodorus was simply content with this theory, wherever he heard it, and chose to repeat it³⁵. We can contrast this account with a very different explanation found in Hesiod's *Theogony*, where the Titans receive their name not from their mother, but because Uranus foresaw the wickedness (*ἀτασθαλίη*) they were 'straining' (*τῖταινοντες*) to commit (*Th.* 207–9). As we know, this alludes to the castration of Uranus by Cronus and, later, the Titanomachy between the Titans and the Olympians (*Th.* 154–210; 617–725). This might seem a minor divergence, yet Diodorus' Cretan passage entirely omits the binding of the Titans, the castration of Uranus, and the Titanomachy³⁶. In fact, after their initial mention the Titans play almost no role at all; only Cronus plays a very theologically fractured role, as we will show in the next chapter. Thus, not only are the Titans no longer associated with wickedness, but they may not even suffer the same fate as in the Hesiodic narrative.

The second member of this theogonic pair is entirely idiosyncratic to Diodorus' account and appears nowhere else in Greek mythology. Jacoby is partly correct in arguing that this unique figure (regarded by him as an invention of the source-author³⁷) serves to relocate the 'first panhellenic god-generation' (Jacoby, 2020, f1: *die erste panhellenische Göttergeneration*) to Crete via the Curetes. Yet Jacoby's reading is very reductionist, since he attributes the whole passage to Laosthenidas and therefore leaves its theological dimension largely unexplored, treating the Cretan passage mainly as a piece of euhemeristic 'divine history' (Jacoby, 2020, f1). We may instead interpret this figure in light of the themes already established through Titaea's role as name-giver and our broader hypothesis that the passage derives from 'Epimenides the Theologian'. As stated above, Titaea's naming function aligns with the absence of both Uranus' conflict and

³³ It is also worth noting that the Cretan list of Titaea's offspring is identical to Hesiod's (*Th.* 126–138), except for one name: Theia (Θεία). This becomes relevant in the subsequent Atlantean narrative, where Hyperion's wife Basileia appears – likely corresponding to Theia, also associated with Hyperion. Basileia assumes a maternal role over her brothers and is described as the 'great mother' (μεγάλην μητέρα). It is therefore possible that Theia, Basileia, and Titaea function as partially interchangeable figures, though their precise symbolism remains uncertain.

³⁴ A simple solution would be to attribute the Atlantean Theogony to Dionysius Scytobrachion, as some scholars have done, yet this is unconvincing for the reasons already discussed. The rarity of the name Titaea might suggest a common source behind both references, presumably Dionysius, but this too is unlikely. He is not cited in Book 5, whereas other sources are explicitly named.

³⁵ A similar case may be the etymology of Dionysus' name. Diodorus repeats three times (1.15.6; 3.64.3; 4.2.3) that Dionysus derived his name from his native Nysa. It seems unlikely that several independent sources would repeatedly preserve the same detail, making it more likely a Diodorean addition.

³⁶ Important to note is that in the Atlantean Theogony the Titans are in fact 'wicked,' committing horrible acts (3.60–1).

³⁷ As is the name of Titaea (Jacoby, 2020, f1).

the Titanomachy from the Cretan passage. The same logic may apply to the Curetes: the father of the Titans is no longer the infanticidal Uranus, but an entirely different figure. Indeed, the myth of the Curetes itself seems to reject the infanticidal themes common in Greek mythology; through their intervention, the vicious cycle of fathers destroying their children is broken. Seemingly, Epimenides' *Theogony* aimed to distance itself from the Hesiodic model, where the first pair of gods produce continual cosmic conflict and thus must be overthrown through force.

Moreover, the Curetes remained active cult figures in Cretan religion, unlike Uranus. Jane E. Harrison suggested that the Palaikastro hymn reflects an initiatory ritual³⁸ in which young citizens imitate the mythical dance of the Curetes (Harrison, 1977, 11–13). The Curetes also belonged to an ancient ethnographic tradition: Homer mentions them several times (*Il.* 9.529–32; 549–51; 589), while Strabo devotes an entire chapter to them (10.3), discussing the nature of their ritual practices. Particularly interesting is Euripides' testimony on the *Idaeian* initiates in the lost drama *Cretans* (Euripides *fr.* 472, CC&MC).

Admittedly, little more can be said about this curious pair of parent–gods. Still, we may cautiously conclude that Diodorus presents a highly original account of the origins of the Titans, one that departs significantly from traditional Greek versions. Not only does Titaea replace Ge as mother of the Titans, but her maternal role is also firmly preserved, whereas in the Atlantean Theogony it is quickly dissolved back into the traditional account. Even more striking is the replacement of Uranus by one of the Curetes. This deity remained central to Cretan cult and was not removed from the Greek cultural horizon.

Cronus and Zeus: like father, like son

Cronus is presented by Diodorus as the king of the golden age. Although the concluding expression of the section on Cronus seemingly suggests a plurality of sources (5.66.6: *μυθολογοῦσιν*), the account is quite one–dimensional. Cronus is the great king of the golden age, who introduced a 'gentle life' (5.66.4: *βίον ἡμερον*), 'justice' (5.66.4: *δικαιοσύνην*), and 'sincerity of the soul' (5.66.4: *ἀπλότητα τῆς ψυχῆς*). Diodorus adds that, under Cronus, people not only began to live well, but also abandoned the *ἀγρίου διαίτης* (5.66.4) of their past. But what exactly was this *ἄγριος* life that preceded him?

Here it is worth noting the contrast between this golden age and the earlier account of the Curetes, who, in Diodorus' chronology, precede the time of Cronus. A careful reader may recall that the Curetes themselves were credited with strikingly similar benefactions. They too introduced fundamental innovations into human life, teaching humankind how to:

³⁸ Archeological evidence from Palaikastro could be seen to support this reading (MacGillivray & Sackett, 2000, 166).

[...] live and associate together in a common life, and they were the originators of concord and, so to speak, of orderly behaviour.

[...] τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους κοινῆς ὁμιλίας καὶ συμβιώσεως, ἔτι δ' ὁμονοίας καὶ τινος εὐταξίας ἀρχηγοὺς γενέσθαι.

(5.65.3–4)

It now becomes clear that the Curetes introduced only a basic level of human coexistence, not full 'justice'. Diodorus uses four terms to describe their benefactions to humanity: *ὁμιλία*, *συμβίωσις*, *ὁμόνοια*, and *εὐταξία*. The first two denote a basic capacity of 'living together,' as *συμβίωσις* literally suggests. The latter two are more developed, implying a broader idea of order and good life. In particular, *εὐταξία* combines the prefix *εὐ* with *τάξις*, literally meaning 'good order'³⁹; the Curetes therefore establish a harmonious social order among humans.

This is reinforced by the third term in the list, *ὁμόνοια*. It is usually translated as 'concord', denoting a general agreement to live peacefully – the sense in which Lysias employs it when arguing against unjust confiscation of property, even calling it *μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν* (*Lys.* 18.17). In other contexts, however, the term signifies not merely a 'benefit', but the restoration of good life after long perils. For instance, Thucydides regards *ὁμόνοια* as the final task to be achieved by the state, which had just evaded civil war; 'calmness' (*Thuc.* 8.93.3: *ἡπιώτερον*) engulfs the citizens in search of *ὁμόνοια*. Andocides likewise praises the Athenians for restoring the city into a state of *ὁμόνοια* rather than perpetual revenge (*τιμωρία*) against their enemies (*And.* 1.140). In all these cases, the term conveys the establishment of peace and tranquillity after violent conflicts and division. If such were the benefactions of the Curetes, why is their condition later described as *ἀγρίου διαίτης* (5.66.4), when Cronus had changed it?

The simplest explanation, once again, is that Diodorus is unable to fully reconcile multiple sources into a coherent conceptual narrative. As noted earlier, the opening sections already preserve three different beginnings of Crete and humankind, which Diodorus presents as compatible even though they are not. Here we may be dealing with a fourth account, deriving from a very different tradition. This tradition is closely tied to the mythological and theogonic conception of the first age of humanity – the golden age – as inseparable from the divine generations of gods and Titans. From a theoretical standpoint, clouded somewhat by Diodorus, the sections of the Introduction, the Dactyli, and the Curetes are disconnected from the later material not only narratively, but conceptually as well. With Cronus and the Titans, we enter a unified theogonic narrative.

³⁹ A conceptual usage of the word *τάξις* is already present in Anaximander (*Simpl. In Phys.*, p. 24.13–25).

Yet immediately afterwards, following the description of Cronus' siblings, Cronus participates in the familiar myth of the Curetes, devouring his children before being deceived by Rhea – hardly a flattering role for the god of justice and felicity. Admittedly, this paradox is not unique to Diodorus. Hesiod already presents it in his two major poems. In the *Works and Days*, Cronus rules the golden age (*WD.* 109–127), when men lived ‘in festivities, outside all evil’ (*WD.* 115: ἐν θαλίῃσι κακῶν ἔκτοσθεν ἀπάντων). In the *Theogony*, however, he is ‘wicked’ (ἀγκυλομήτης) and ‘most terrible of children’ (δεινότατος παίδων) (*Th.* 136–7). Yet in Hesiod, these contrasting portrayals are divided between separate poems and can therefore be treated as consciously distinct traditions. One poem draws on the golden age tradition, portraying Cronus as the ruler of a human utopia; the other draws on the myth of patricidal Cronus and Zeus. In the *Theogony*, Cronus functions as an antagonistic figure to legitimize Zeus' rule and his tyrannical control over the human condition⁴⁰. In the *Works and Days*, by contrast, that antagonistic role is played by Prometheus, with no need to villainize Cronus anymore.

Interestingly, Diodorus presents both approaches within a single narrative. Yet even if he himself does not reconcile this paradox, this does not mean that his sources failed to do so. When the question of Zeus' ‘birth and ascent to power’ (5.70.1: δὲ τῆς τοῦ Διὸς γενέσεώς τε καὶ βασιλείας) arises, Diodorus admits that the accounts ‘differ’ (5.70.1: διαφωνεῖται). There is the usual case, where ‘force’ is used (5.70.2: βιαίως) to wrest the power from Cronus, corresponding to Hesiod's *Theogony*. The other, which Diodorus leaves unexplained, presents Zeus as receiving rule ‘not by force’ (5.70.1: οὐ βίᾳ), but ‘in the manner prescribed by custom and justly’ (5.70.1: νομίμως δὲ καὶ δικαίως ἀξιωθέντα ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς). This account may belong to the same golden-age tradition reflected in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. It seems to derive from an entirely different narrative, where the myth of the Curetes does not take place, since Cronus is no cruel tyrant who needs be deceived by Rhea, but rather a just ruler willing to pass his crown to his successor.

With this in mind, we may return briefly to the question of Cronus' birth. Diodorus offers a great clue here that might easily pass unnoticed. Cronus is called *πρεσβύτατον*, which is substantivized as the justification for his ascension to rule, implying a peaceful succession through dynastic inheritance. This stands in stark contrast to Hesiod's *Theogony*, where Cronus is called *όπλότατος* (*Th.* 137), the youngest child and therefore the least entitled to rule by birth. Only through Gaia's plotting (*Th.* 163–7) does he overthrow Uranus by force and violence. His rise is thus profoundly unnatural and conflictual. As *όπλότατος*, Cronus is effectively a usurper, since he cannot take the throne by birthright. By contrast, the eldest son (*πρεσβύτατον*) inherits rule legitimately.

⁴⁰ Clays' interpretation of Hesiod's poems is especially convincing; Cronus (2003, 18–9 and 25) and Prometheus (2003, 101–3) are shown as both antagonists and political tools for Zeus' order.

If this peaceful model of succession, one that suppresses the familiar Greek narrative of violent usurpation, derives from a single source, then that source must itself have been unusual. Most likely, it was a source concerned with ‘theological’ matters and questions. The curious account of theogonic beginnings, in which Titaia and one of the Curetes are the first pair of gods, may well belong to the same source, since it accords closely with what we have described so far. If one of the Curetes is indeed Cronus’ father, then his ascension no longer requires the violent removal of the previous generation, as in Hesiod’s account of Uranus.

We may therefore conclude that a recurring theological idea is beginning to emerge, bringing us back to the distinction already noted in Diodorus’ ‘bibliography’ (5.80). A clear divide between different approaches to mythology becomes visible. On the one hand stand the familiar myths of divine conflict and succession through violence; on the other, material from a different source, in which the gods are non-violent and power passes peacefully rather than through bloodshed. The contrast is striking; one would naturally assume that this latter, more theological account belongs to Epimenides the Theologian, while the former derives from the other three historians. We already anticipated this possibility in the previous chapter when discussing Titaia and the Curetes, both of whom functioned, in different ways, as figures opposed to divine violence. The same pattern appears in the story of Cronus and Zeus, where the emphasis falls on lawful conduct and legitimate succession. It seems, then, that Epimenides’ *Theogony* strayed from the traditional narrative of violent struggle for power, opting instead for the natural transfer of rule.

The Gigantomachy

The episode of the Gigantomachy is perhaps the most difficult part to interpret in the entire Cretan passage, precisely because it employs the idea of μάχη. As noted in the previous chapters, a consistent narrative thread runs through the passage denying any μάχαι amongst deities and presenting a completely peaceful image of the Cretan Gods. In the reconstruction proposed by us, there is no struggle between Uranus and Cronus, since Cronus’ father is one of the Curetes – a figure integrated into a living cult and religious practice. There is also no Τιτανομαχία, since Zeus ascends to power ‘justly’ (δικαίως) (5.70.1), without armies or war. Indeed, Zeus is portrayed positively both before and after the Gigantomachy, presiding over the τιμή of justice and even life (5.72.1–2: ζῆν). How, then, can the Gigantomachy fit into this otherwise peaceful narrative? If it cannot, should we conclude that the episode does not belong to the Epimenidean *Theogony*?

Perhaps it is precisely because of these ‘philosophical’ discrepancies that the Gigantomachy is noticeably odd in context. The episode begins immediately after the catalogue of Zeus’ benefactions, and

this preceding passage deserves attention before we turn to the Gigantomachy. Zeus is said to excel in ‘bravery, wisdom and justice’ (5.71.1: *ἀνδρεία καὶ συνέσει καὶ δικαιοσύνη*), which is evidenced by his many great benefactions to humankind. These benefactions directly illustrate the virtues just named. First, Zeus changed the previous state of humankind, just like Cronus changed human life from *ἀγρίου διαίτης* to *βίον ἥμερον* (5.66.4). Similarly, Zeus in his reign removed the need to act with ‘force’ (*βία*) upon one another, replacing it with ‘giving justice to one another’ (*τὸ δίκαιον ἀλλήλοις διδόναι*). It is worth mentioning that this transformation of human relationships almost identically mirrors Zeus’ peaceful ascent to power: Zeus establishes himself ‘not with might’ (*οὐ βία*), but ‘justly’ (*δικαίως*) (5.70.1). Then he sets down the same principle for the humans under his reign. This warrants a question of whether a consistent portrait of Zeus and his realm is being painted here – the portrait of a virtuous and just ruler, who favours rule and law over violence.

This spread of Justice concludes with the establishment of a court of law (*δικαστηρίῳ*), where men may appeal with cases and to receive justice about their differences (*τὰς ἀμφισβητήσεις διαλύειν*). Diodorus concludes this initial introduction to Zeus’ character with the remark that:

In short, he contributed in abundance to the practices which are concerned with obedience to law and with peace, prevailing upon good men by persuasion and intimidating evil men by threat of punishment and by their fear.

καθόλου δὲ τὰ περὶ τε τῆς εὐνομίας καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης προσαναπληρῶσαι, τοὺς μὲν ἀγαθοὺς πείθοντα, τοὺς δὲ φαύλους τῇ τιμωρίᾳ καὶ τῷ φόβῳ καταπληττόμενον.

(5.71.1–2)

It seems intentional that the words *εὐνομία* and *εἰρήνη* are used here, the very same words which in later parts of the passage (and other mythological texts by other authors) match the names of Zeus’ daughters⁴¹. It would seem that Diodorus or his sources present the same idea of Zeus’ establishment of lawful life with both theological and non-theological vocabulary. What is even more interesting is the second part of this sentence, where Zeus is said not only to have encouraged *ἀγαθοὺς* actions, but to have intimidated the wrong-doers with *τῇ τιμωρίᾳ καὶ τῷ φόβῳ*. Notably, these too are distant relatives of Zeus⁴². Thus, both laws and punishments are established; we see this in practice when the wars with the Giants are presented. The expression which introduces the episode sounds like this:

⁴¹ Hs. *Th.* 901–3

⁴² They are the sons of Ares and Cytherea (Hs. *Th.* 933–4)

He also visited practically the entire inhabited earth, putting to death robbers and impious men and introducing equality and democracy; and it was in this connection, they say, that he slew the Giants and their followers, Mylinus in Crete and Typhon in Phrygia.

ἐπελθεῖν δ' αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην σχεδὸν πᾶσαν τοὺς μὲν ληστὰς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἀναιροῦντα, τὴν δ' ἰσότητα καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν εἰσηγούμενον· ὅτε δὴ φασιν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς γίγαντας ἀνελεῖν, ἐν μὲν Κρήτῃ τοὺς περὶ Μύλινον, κατὰ δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν τοὺς περὶ Τυφῶνα.

(5.71.2–3)

It seems from this sentence that Diodorus connects the Gigantomachy to the rest of the narrative, almost as if it was not a part of the same story. He states that at the same time as the introduction of ‘equality and democracy’ were happening, the gigantomachies also took place: ‘ὅτε δὴ φασιν αὐτὸν καὶ [...]’. So, it already seems as if the Gigantomachy is an awkward addition.

Secondly, there is a jarring amount of unique place-names and specific names in this short episode. For instance, the Giant Mylinus is not present in any other mythological source. Typhon is of course well-known, but his usual demise is connected either to Tartarus (*Th.* 868; *Pind. Pyth.* 1.15) or Mount Etna (*Aesch. PV* 363–5), nowhere else is Phrygia mentioned. The traitor Musaeus is also not mentioned in any other source that we know of – usually this name is reserved for a quasi-mythical Athenian poet (*Diod.* 4.25.1; *E. Rh.* 945). Moreover, there are also additional locations for battles with the giants suggested: like Macedonia (Pallene) and the Phlegraean (or Cumaeian) plain in Italy. The latter is actually quite well-known and repeated not only in many earlier (*Hdt.* 7.12.1; *Aristoph. Av.* 823–5) and later (*Paus.* 1.25.2; 8.29.1) sources, but even by Diodorus himself, in connection to Heracles (4.21.5). Lastly, there is an odd account of bull sacrifice:

Before the battle against the Giants in Crete, we are told, Zeus sacrificed a bull to Helios and to Uranus and to Gē [...]

πρὸ δὲ τῆς μάχης τῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Κρήτῃ γίγαντας λέγεται τὸν Δία θῦσαι βοῶν Ἥλιῳ καὶ Οὐρανῷ καὶ Γῇ [...]

(5.71.3)

It is important to note that this account is twofold in nature. First, it clearly relies on the traditional genealogy, where Gaia and Uranus are Zeus’ progenitors (*Th.* 126), not one of the Curetes and Titaea. What is more, it also utilizes the traditional tale of Gaia’s prophesy (*Th.* 886–901). Secondly, this narrative seems

to twist these two traditional themes slightly, most likely influenced by Euhemerus' mythographic strategies, since we can find very similar motives in his fragments⁴³.

However, even if all these oddities do in fact signify an alien source here, the gigantomachy is still narratively embedded to the rest of the passage. As we have noted earlier, in our narratological analysis of this section, there is a clear linguistic connection between this episode and the super-important episode later, where the *τιμαί* of Olympians are divided. If we were to conclude that the Gigantomachy was not a part of the Epimenidean Theogony, then the allotment of *τιμαί* would most likely have to meet the same fate, and then what would be left of the Epimenidean material in Diodorus would be only a couple of myths, not a full-blown Theogony – which is discordant with the prominence given to Epimenides as a source by Diodorus himself.

The narratological clues we had presented earlier become very important here. We noted two important facts about this short passage: first, the gigantomachy mixes two tales and three separate accounts – one concerns the bandits, and two others concern the Giants. The second is that the tale of the Giants with its subsequent accounts and names seems to be secondary to the overarching narrative of the establishment of justice and punishment of the *ἄσεβεις*. Thus, the myths of the battles with the Giants irrupt into the overarching narrative.

With these narratological clues in mind we can now speculate that these irruptions are definitely from some other source, or even more likely, even two sources. It is worth noticing that the myths on the Giants are noticeably non-Cretan: Typhon is said to have perished in Phrygia and the Cumaen plain resides in Italy. Only Mylinus is truly connected to Crete. What this might signify is that we are dealing with a non-Cretan author who simply writes about Crete, which we know Sosicrates and Dosiades to have been doing. If this is truly the case, then perhaps we can conclude, that the Epimenidean part of this episode has nothing to do with the named Giants (Mylinus, Typhon, and Musaeus) or locations (like Macedonia, Italy, and Phrygia), but only with the general founding of justice by Zeus.

Yet there is one more brief problem we must deal with. We have attributed to Epimenides a jarringly untheological episode, opposed to actual myths. The establishment of justice is a much more euhemeristic episode, that is not really in accordance to the mythological aspects, that we have encountered so far. However, this does not present a great problem, since we have noted before that Diodorus can superimpose euhemerism onto a non-euhemeristic narrative. In this case, we can be sure of this, since he does in fact

⁴³ In one fragment, Zeus is said to create an altar for Jupiter and pray to him for the first time in human history (Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.11.63). This has led to the hypothesis that Euhemerus may have been a source for Diodorus, especially since Crete plays a central role in Euhemerus' mythology and Diodorus draws on him extensively in Books 5 and 6. However, this identification is unlikely, as key differences remain: for example, the Curetes are presented as Zeus' sons (Lact. *Div. Inst.* 1.11.46: *Curetes filii sui*), whereas in Diodorus they predate Zeus by a considerable time.

use quite repetitive expressions in attempt to euhemerize the tale⁴⁴. If we remove this hermeneutic bias, what we find is a tale where Zeus' order is questioned and consequently reestablished through a conflict.

Thus, in conclusion, the gigantomachy is beset by many sources and facts that most likely do not derive from Epimenides. It is difficult to say why Diodorus chose to inject these alien accounts into this narrative – the most likely reason is that one of his sources did so. But we need not remove the gigantomachy in its entirety, even if it is full of interpolations. We are left with a basic skeleton of the gigantomachic narrative, which is intrinsically connected to Zeus establishing justice in the world and punishing impious Giants for breaking his laws.

The benefactions of Titans and Gods

The Theogony is brought to a conclusion with a final and most important episode that establishes order – the distribution of *τιμαί*. The concept of *τιμή* is essential to Greek religious culture. In most contexts it simply expresses honour that a man can possess in his life. For instance, in Homer and Hesiod, *τιμή* is bestowed upon kings by Zeus (*Il.* 1.510; *Th.* 83–6; *WD.* 39–40), in this way legitimizing their rule and judicial power over their subjects (*WD.* 36). In the case of Gods or Titans, *τιμή* takes a very different meaning. As Jean Rudhardt states, 'The act of distributing *timai* (honors) constitutes an essential expression of Greek mythical thought' (Rudhardt, 1994, 198).

It is an essential part of any theogonic thought and text, which is meant to constitute a clear order of the cosmos and its divine aspects (Clay, 2006, 9–11). This distribution of honours (*τιμαί*) among both Titans and Gods most likely constituted a great chunk of the Epimenidean *Theogony*. We have observed that there are three separate episodes of distributing honours in Diodorus' text. One for the initial eleven Titans (5.66), one for Cronus' offsprings (5.68–9), and the last one for the Olympians (5.72–6). This is not unusual: Rudhardt also notices that the distribution is not a one-time event; rather, it happens gradually throughout a theogonic narrative (Rudhardt, 1994, 199–200), embedded in events like births, battles, and rewards.

The benefactions that Diodorus attributes to the gods in these three passages are in no way novel; many of the inventions or *τιμαί* are well-known and traditional. What is more interesting, is the structure in which Diodorus presents them. We will analyze here only the very last list of Olympian deities, mainly, because it possesses most of the curious and noteworthy aspects, that are relevant to our purposes.

We have already noted in the first part of our investigation, that these descriptions are often twofold: the first statement is a positive demarcation of the god's *τιμή*, and the second statement is usually about

⁴⁴ Compare 5.71.1: *τῆς ἐννομίας* to 5.71.5: *τοῦ δίκαιου [...]* νόμοις; 5.71.1: *ἐβέργετῆσαι* to 5.71.6: *ἐβέργεσίας*.

some other cultural account or question important there. It is worth reinforcing the hypothesis raised much earlier, viz., that the initial positive statements of each description are in fact Epimenidean. We may give two arguments for it: first, the list and its descriptions obviously represent a ‘theological’ theme, which easily connects them to ‘Epimenides the Theologian’ we are looking for. As for the second, we may also carefully speculate on the practical reality of copying a source. If Diodorus is in fact utilizing the Epimenidean Theogony as his leading source here, it would be more than natural that, not only does his list follow the same theogonic order as the original, but that also that any statements present in the source would be copied first. This leaves us with the fact that the second part of each description must belong to some other source (or sources) – it is an *addendum* to what was provided by the Epimenidean Theogony.

With the knowledge we have gathered so far, we could speculate on this matter further – it is important to notice that these type of comments on cultural differences, which we find in the second half of the descriptions, have already made an appearance in section 8 mentioned above, where Diodorus conveyed the Cretan argument for the diffusion of religious mysteries. If this is the same source, then perhaps we can speculate that one of Diodorus’ authors concerned himself mostly with cultural and cultic questions.

In the Olympian list this attention to cult differences is quite sharply noticeable, since a lot of non-Cretan epithets and traditions are introduced. The first cult epithet which Diodorus brings up has to do with Zeus and Hera, who are called *Διὶ τῷ τελείῳ* and *Ἡρᾷ τελείᾳ* (5.73.2). There are also two Attic cult peculiarities. The description of Artemis is concluded with her epithet *Κουροτρόφον* (5.73.5–7), which is usually connected with the Athenian sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia. Likewise, Athena’s description is concluded with the epithet *ἐργάνην* (5.73.8), which is mentioned by Pausanias twice (*Paus.* 1.24.3; 5.14.5.), both times in connection to Athens. A little more elusive is the epithet *Κοινὸν* given to Hermes (5.75.1). It seems to only appear in Diodorus, but it must have represented his function as a peace-bringer and messenger (Bauslaugh, 1991, 10; 37–8). We may speculate that this epithet is likely to have been connected to some other popular epithets of Hermes like *Ἀγοραῖος* (*Paus.* 1.15.1; 2.9.7; 9.17.1), or *Χαριδότης* (*h.Hom.* 18.12).

Overall, it seems that there is a clear source which Diodorus uses for cult questions in the second part of his descriptions. A good candidate for this source, though hardly provable, could be Dosiades. As we mentioned before, from the scarce non-Diodorean evidence that we possess about this historian, Dosiades seems to have concerned himself somewhat with religious and cultural matters. He is mentioned by Pliny in connection to a nymph which gave Crete its name (*Plin. HN* 4.58.20), and Clement of Alexandria connected Dosiades’ testimony to human sacrifices for Dionysus in Lesbos (*Clem. Al. Protr.* 3.1). This is not much in terms of evidence, but a careful hypothesis regarding Dosiades as Diodorus’ principal secondary source could be raised. However, a more important note here is that it is clearly not Epimenidean,

since it does not fit stylistically or factually with any other contents of the hypothetical *Theogony* we have excavated so far.

Before we pay attention to the actual list of the Olympians, a part preceding it is worthy of our attention. As we have stated above, the list is preceded by an interpolated account of Athena's birth (and also, the marriage of Zeus and Hera) (5.72.3–4). Only after this does the actual Olympian list commence. It is interesting to note that the very same structure can be found in Hesiod's *Theogony*. First, Hesiod mentions Athena's birth as *Τριτογένειαν* (*Th.* 894–6) and connects her to the prophecy of Gaia and Uranus – Zeus' daughter will overthrow her father (*Th.* 886–901). Then, later on, in his list of Olympian offsprings, the poet describes her birth again (*Th.* 924–5), this time giving no attention to the usurpation of power, but rather to the jealousy of Hera⁴⁵. Diodorus follows the same structure; the first time he mentions Athena, he gives her the same epithet of *Τριτογένειαν*, but no similar usurpation tale – rather, Diodorus states that her name derives from the river Triton. The second time he talks of Athena, he mentions only her benefactions (5.73.7). Thus, in the passage 5.72.3–5 only the second half, concerning the holy marriage, could be regarded as an interpolation, not a part of the list. We may suppose so, since it seems that this double mention of Athena's birth is a structural theme in both Hesiod's and Epimenides' Theogonies.

With these preliminaries considered we may finally analyze the actual Olympian list. Hesiod provides a similar list in his *Theogony* (901–938), which we will rely on closely here for comparison. The differences between these lists begin from the very start. Diodorus starts his list with Aphrodite, whom he deems responsible for weddings and all related matters (5.73.2). In contrast, Hesiod begins his list with Zeus' daughters by Themis: Horae (Seasons), Eunomia (Lawfulness), Dike (Justice), Eirene, and the Destinies (*Th.* 901–7). The description of Aphrodite's birth takes place much earlier (*Th.* 194–200); this key difference is not only structural, but also chronological and mythological. For Hesiod, Aphrodite is connected to the myth of Cronus' castration (since she is born from his seed in the sea). However, in the list given by Diodorus, Aphrodite is not connected to Cronus' castration, since Epimenides, as we have stated before, does not include this parricidal episode in his Theogony; thus, Aphrodite is simply the daughter of Zeus (and likely Hera⁴⁶), a version which is present in some other Greek sources⁴⁷.

In connection to Aphrodite, a very important fact about another deity – Hera, wife of Zeus – is provided for the reader. Aphrodite's benefactions are almost parenthesized for the moment, to reiterate that:

⁴⁵ Also, different epithets are given to Athena like *δεινὴν* and *ἐγρεκύδοιμον*.

⁴⁶ This point is examined in the next paragraph.

⁴⁷ This version is much rarer, but can be found in some sources. In Homer's *Illiad*, she is the daughter of Zeus and Titaness Dione (*Il.* 5.370; also, in Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.13). In the *Odyssey*, Aphrodite is also the daughter of Zeus, although Dione is not mentioned (*Od.* 8.627; also, in Nonnus, 14.193).

Nevertheless, all men make their first sacrifices to Zeus the Perfecter and Hera the Perfectress, because they are the originators and discoverers of all things, as we have stated above.

προθύουσι δὲ πρότερον ἅπαντες τῷ Διὶ τῷ τελείῳ καὶ Ἡρᾷ τελείᾳ διὰ τὸ τούτους ἀρχηγούς γεγονέναι καὶ πάντων εὐρετάς, καθότι προεῖρηται.

(5.73.2–3)

The ‘as stated above’ part probably refers to the statement in 5.71.6, where Diodorus explains how after the Gigantomachy Zeus ‘distributed honours as they were merited among the noblest of the gods and heroes and men’. In this second instance, Hera is added to the agents that distribute the *τιμαί*. Hera, thus, seems to be an important deity for Crete, since Diodorus mentions her in specified contexts not once, but twice. Before this passage, she is also mentioned in connection to the river Theren, where the holy marriage between Zeus and Hera took place (5.72.4–5)⁴⁸. The second instance, presented here, is also very interesting, since it gives both Hera and Zeus epithets – the ‘Perfecters’⁴⁹.

This might be an important clue into one more theological idea expressed in Epimenides’ Theogony. Nowhere in the proceeding list of Olympians does Diodorus specify any other wife or mistress of Zeus, apart from Hera at the very beginning. In contrast, Hesiod enumerates more than four such partners, before finally arriving at Hera⁵⁰. This might seem like simply sloppy copying from Diodorus part, in that he does not bother to record the female half of the parents, but this is likely not the case, because at the second half of the list Diodorus actually does mention a single name – Persephone as the mother of Dionysus (5.75.4)⁵¹. Moreover, this statement seems to reside in the first half of the descriptions, which we deem Epimenidean⁵². Furthermore, if we take a quick look at the Britomartis and Plutus, which we have deemed non–Epimenidean, we find that their parentage is elaborated on immediately. Britomartis is the daughter of Zeus and Carne (5.76); Plutus is the son of Demeter and Iasion (5.77.1)⁵³.

Apart from these theological ideas, the Diodorean list is not too extraordinary. There are some minor differences present, which are worth mentioning. For instance, deities like the Destinies (Moirai), Persephone, Triton, Phobos, Deimos are mentioned in Hesiod, but are omitted in Diodorus. Hermes, Dionysus and Heracles are referred to in a triple succession in both sources. However, these minor details likely harbour no theological significance, so we leave them rest.

⁴⁸ We have deemed this an interpolation connected to the myth of Athena’s birth, since it is not connected narratively.

⁴⁹ On the importance of this epithet in Greek religion see Pirenne–Delforge, V., Pironti, G., & Graf, F. (2022); especially 107–24; 173–226.

⁵⁰ Hesiod mentions Themis (*Th.* 901), Demeter (*Th.* 912), Mnemosyne (*Th.* 915), Leto (*Th.* 918), and finally – Hera (*Th.* 921).

⁵¹ One more rare genealogical pair, which seems to not appear in any other source.

⁵² The second half of Dionysus’ description that follows after this, concerns Orpheus and an account of Dionysus forming the so-called Dionysiadae islands around Crete.

⁵³ Also, their birth–places are given: Britomartis is born in Caeno and Plutus is born in Cretan Tripolus.

What we can state with clarity is that the list of Olympian *τιμαί* presented by Diodorus is not any less unique than the sections we have analyzed before. In some respects, it clearly differentiates itself from Hesiod's account: Zeus only has one wife, Hera, and Aphrodite is his offspring, not Cronus'. Yet, in other respects, it seems to mirror Hesiod: the contents of the list are quite similar, and a similar structure is followed. Thus, we may conclude that Epimenides' Theogony was typical of the genre in the general sense – it did not stray from the established structure and content. However, a theological charge can still be felt; Olympian offsprings are unified through a single divine pair, not a myriad of mistresses. What is more, the distribution of *τιμαί* establishes an Olympian order of the world in a positive sense, which was likewise being shown in its negative aspect (through battles and punishments) in the prior section of the Gigantomachy.

Were gods really so peaceful?

The entire narrative of the Epimenidean Theogony is pervaded by a very curious, and theologically charged, semantic field. From the very beginning, it is expounded that divine agents are not violent figures, as is usual in other Greek narratives. The very first pair of gods – Titaea and one of the Curetes – establish a completely different conception of divinity. The Titans derive their name from their mother and thus are never connected to any wicked acts or injustice, as they are in Hesiod. For this reason, their father is not dethroned, as is Hesiodic Uranus, but remains a highly important cult figure in Crete. Likewise, neither Cronus nor Zeus exercise any violence in taking control of the cosmos, since the precedent for such actions has not been set before. One may understandably question whether we are not utilizing an overly philosophic reading of this Theogony; perhaps it has come to look so theologically strict through a testimony of a much later euhemeristic historian? After all, our comparative analysis has shown, that it differs greatly from Hesiod's Theogony, that is full of violence and injustice.

However, this theological idea is not alien to the Greek world at all. In fact, it goes all the way back to the 6th century B.C., to the philosopher Xenophanes. According to Xenophanes, humans attribute their own traits and appearances to gods (Xenophanes, fr. D12 (LM) Clem. *Alex. Strom.* 5.109.1), which is theologically erroneous. Especially wrong is the assumption that divinities, just like men, could act viciously against one another (Xenophanes, fr. D8 (LM) Sext. *Emp. Adv. Math.* 9.193). Xenophanes expresses his disdain for poetic narratives that contradict his theological ideas in these lines, preserved by Athenaeus:

[...] it is not meet to make an array of the wars of the Titans or Giants or Centaurs, creations of our predecessors, or violent factions—there is nothing useful in them; and it is meet always to have a good regard for the gods.

[...] οὐ τι μάχας διέπειν Τιτῆνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων οὐδέ τι Κενταύρων, πλάσματα τῶν προτέρων, ἢ στάσιος σφεδανὰς—τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστιν θεῶν δὲ προμηθεῖν αἰὲν ἔχειν ἀγαθήν.

(Xenophanes, fr. 1 (DEG): 1.21–3 (*Ath.* 11.462c))

These tales of *μαχαί*, whether it be with the Titans, Giants, or the Centaurs, are in no way useful (*χρηστὸν*). The usefulness that Xenophanes speaks of here is most likely not connected to the Platonist approach to poetry as a tool, but rather to a theological ideal that gods should be presented as ‘good’ (*προμηθεῖν αἰὲν ἔχειν ἀγαθήν*). Similar approaches of critique to the divine *μαχαί* are present throughout the classical period after Xenophanes⁵⁴.

Thus, we find that the theological notion presented in Epimenides’ Theogony can be situated in an already existing context. We may add to this the facts we had already discussed previously, when presenting the character of Epimenides. First, his extant fragment calling Cretans liars seems like a culture–critical statement on false religious practices. The fragment preserved by Callimachus criticizes the idea of gods’ mortality; so, it would not seem unlikely that a critique of violence in general would have met similar disdain. What is more, the Cylon Affair, which brought the so–called ‘Curse of Cylon’ (*Κυλώνειον ἄγος*) upon Athens (*Hdt.* 5.71) is intrinsically connected to political violence. Cylon himself exercised violence in an attempt to seize power and after his death, his supporters hoped to avoid a similar treatment; they were promised such an exemption, but the promise was broken and blood was shed. It is an historic account on the cyclical nature of violence and revenge, quite fitting to Greek culture. After such acts, Athens were cursed with a plague and needed an outsider to fix their sorry state (*Diog. Laert.* 1.110–11), much like Orestes needed Athens once his appeal to justice was overshadowed by these same cycles of vengeance in Mycenae (Aesch. *Eum.*). Perhaps, this Theogony of Epimenides the Theologian, which we have analyzed here, could find a suitable place in such a concord–promoting context.

Thus, not only the idea of peaceful gods can be found within the Theogony, but also an episode that criticizes the opposite standpoint. We had previously noted that the episode of the Gigantomachy remains in Diodorus in a quite demythologized state, the cause of which is likely Diodorus’ own merit. However, we could also speculate that it was so, since it did not attempt to present the mythological account *per se*, but rather focused on the idea to be conveyed. The mentality of the giants does seem to mirror a notion,

⁵⁴ Wright (2018) has written a highly informative and important dissertation on this very topic covering the periods from archaic Greece all the way to the Roman republic. He gives some interesting notes on the archaic period, but most convincing in my opinion are the sections on Aeschylus (2018, 47–56), Cratinus (2018, 57), Aristophanes (2018, 61), and Euripides (2018, 67).

ingrained deep within the Greek mentality, that power is achieved by brute strength. The Giants break a long reign of peace by carrying out unjust and impious deeds. For this, they are punished; not because they question Zeus' rule, as is the case in Hesiod, but because they act against the correct order of the world. They attempt to repeal the laws already established by Zeus – laws which permit men to act without might (*βία*), but with justice (*δίκη*).

Conclusions – a Cretan Theogony

We may conclude our investigation of the Epimenidean *Theogony* with some preliminary observations on its theology. What emerges from Diodorus' Cretan Passage is a narrative line that preserves a coherent theogonic account of the gods. It presents a distinctive approach to mythology, allowing us to speculate that it derives from Epimenides the Theologian, mentioned at the end of Diodorus' Cretan Passage, in what we have called his 'bibliography'. Among the other authors cited by Diodorus, only Epimenides is singled out as the 'Theologian', and the source we have reconstructed has clear theological implications.

The source may be reconstructed roughly as follows⁵⁵. The genealogy of the gods begins with a curious pair – Titaea and one of the Curetes. From them descend eleven children, the Titans, who derive their name from their mother. Each contributes to a fundamental aspect of human existence: astrology, rational thought, memory, and so forth. One of these Titans, Cronus, establishes a utopian cosmic order in which humanity flourishes and lives peacefully. To Cronus and his wife Rhea are born six deities who assume control over further spheres of reality, such as burial, seafaring, and agriculture. After Cronus, Zeus succeeds to rule and continues the just practices already established. This order is challenged by the Giants, who commit impious and unjust acts, for which Zeus punishes them. Around the time of the Gigantomachy, Zeus marries Hera, and together they beget more than 16 children. These offspring receive the final set of *τιμαί*, which conclude the *Theogony*.

We find a clear philosophical and theological position present within this theogonic narrative. The gods are not violent, nor is their rule established through usurpation, but through justice. We have shown that this idea fits well within the intellectual context of late archaic and classical Greece. Viewed together with Epimenides' testimonial contexts – which often present him as critical of culture, myth, and politics – the *Theogony* may likewise be read as a critique of the violent principles embedded in Greek myth and history.

⁵⁵ The appendix provides an actual 'edition' of this *Theogony*.

Sources:

1. Bernabé, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Poetae epici graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta. Pars II, Fasciculus 3: Musaeus, Linus, Epimenides, Papyrus Derveni, indices*. Walter de Gruyter.
2. Callimachus. *Hecale. Hymns. Epigrams*. Edited and translated by Dee L. Clayman. Loeb Classical Library 129. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022.
3. Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Volume I: Books 1–2.34*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 279. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.
4. Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Volume II: Books 2.35–4.58*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library 303. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
5. Plutarch. *Moralia, Volume V: Isis and Osiris. The E at Delphi. The Oracles at Delphi No Longer Given in Verse. The Obsolescence of Oracles*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Loeb Classical Library 306. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Bibliography:

1. Bauslaugh, R. A (1991). *The Concept of Neutrality in Classical Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
2. Bigwood, J. M. (1980). Diodorus and Ctesias. *Phoenix*, 34(3), pp. 195–207.
3. Bremmer, J. N. (1993). The Skins of Pherekydes and Epimenides. *Mnemosyne*, 46(2), pp. 234–236.
4. Burton, A. (2015). *Diodorus Siculus, Book I*. Leiden: Brill.
5. Clay, J. S. (2006). *The politics of Olympus: Form and meaning in the major Homeric hymns* (2nd ed.). Bristol Classical Press.
6. Cole, T. (1967). *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, The American Philological Association: Western Reserve University.
7. Dodds, E. R. (1951). *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
8. Dowden, K (2015). Anonymous, On Crete (468) in *Jacoby Online, Brill's New Jacoby, Second Edition, Part III*, Ian Worthington (ed.) Leiden: Brill.
9. Drews, R. (1962). Diodorus and His Sources, *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 83, No. 4, pp. 383–392.

10. Dudziński, A. (2023). Drafting the *Bibliothèque*. Diodorus Siculus' Writing Process. *Klio*, 105(1), pp. 151–172.
11. Fowler, R. (2000). *Early Greek Mythography I: Texts*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Fowler, R. (2013). *Early Greek Mythography II: Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Harrison, J.E., (1977). *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion*, The Merlin Press Ltd.
14. Jacoby, Felix (1940). Hekataios von Abdera (Teos) (264) In *Jacoby Online. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Part III*, edited by Felix Jacoby. Brill: Leiden.
15. Jacoby, Felix (1954). Epimenides von Kreta (457) In *Jacoby Online. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Part III*, edited by Felix Jacoby. Brill: Leiden.
16. Jacoby, Felix (2020). Anhang zu Kreta (Sammelzitate; Anonymes) (468) In *Jacoby Online. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Part III*, edited by Felix Jacoby. Brill: Leiden.
17. Kirk, G. S., Raven, J. E., & Schofield, M. (1983). *The Presocratic philosophers* (2nd ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. Lebedev, A. (2023). The Aegean origin and early history of the Greek doctrines of reincarnation and immortality of the soul: Epimenides, Pherecydes, Pythagoras, and Onomacritus' Orphica, *Festschrift in Honour of Professor N.V. Braginskaya*, pp. 238–299.
19. Lloyd, A. B. (1974). Book Review: Diodorus Siculus Book I. A Commentary. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 60(1), pp. 287–290.
20. MacGillivray, A., & Sackett, H. (2000). The Palaikastro Kouros: the Cretan god as a young man. *British School at Athens Studies*, 6, pp. 165–169.
21. Marincola, J. (2019). Diodorus the Mythographer?. In A. Romano & J. Marincola (Ed.), *Host or Parasite?: Mythographers and their Contemporaries in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods* (pp. 75–94). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
22. Muntz C. E. (2024). Across space and time: Diodorus's island book, *Ktèma: Civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grèce et de Rome antiques*, 49, pp. 155–170.
23. Muntz, c. E. (2011). The sources of Diodorus Siculus, book 1. *The classical quarterly*, 61(2), pp. 574–594.
24. Muntz, C. E. (2017). *Diodorus Siculus and the World of the Late Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
25. Muntz, C.E. (2018). The Argonautica of Diodorus Siculus. *TAPA* 148(2), pp. 331–360.
26. Murray, O. (1970). Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 56, pp. 141–171.

27. Nelson, T. J. (2023). *Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Pirenne-Delforge, V., Pironti, G., & Graf, F. (2022). *The Hera of Zeus: Intimate Enemy, Ultimate Spouse*. (R. Geuss, Trans.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
29. Roubekas, N. P. (2017). *An ancient theory of religion: Euhemerism from antiquity to the present*. London, New York: Routledge.
30. Rudhardt, J. (1994) 'Concerning the Homeric Hymn to Demeter' (L. Lorch & H. P. Foley trans.), in Foley (1994), pp. 198–211.
31. Rusten, J. S. (1982). *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften Wiesbaden.
32. Sacks, K. (1990). *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, New Jersey, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
33. Sacks, K. (1994). Diodorus and his Sources: Conformity and Creativity in: *Greek Historiography* ed. Simon Hornblower, Oxford: Clarendon Paperbacks, pp 213–33.
34. Said, S. (2014). Between mythography and historiography: Diodorus' "Universal Library, The Norwegian Institute at Athens.
35. Schwartz, E. (1903). Diodoros (38). In G. Wissowa (Ed.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Bd. V,1). Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
36. Sheridan, B. (2010). Diodorus' reading of Polybius' universalism. In P. Liddell & A. Fear (Eds.), *Historiae mundi: Studies in universal historiography* (pp. 41–55). Duckworth.
37. Schneider, G. J. (1880). *De Diodori fontibus*, J. Draeger.
38. Spyridakis, S. (1968). Zeus Is Dead: Euhemerus and Crete. *The Classical Journal*, 63(8), pp. 337–340.
39. Strauss–Clay, J. (2003). *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
40. Sulimani, I (2022) "Diodorus Siculus", in S. M. Trzaskoma & R. S. Smith (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Mythography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
41. Sulimani, I. (2011). *Diodorus' Mythistory and the Pagan Mission*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
42. Svenbo, J. (1993). *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (Janer Lloyd trans.), Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
43. Toye, D. (2018). *Epimenides (457) in Jacoby Online, Brill's New Jacoby, Second Edition, Part III*, Ian Worthington (ed.) Leiden: Brill.
44. Viola, L. (2025). The Historical Reception of Diodorus Siculus: An Analysis of the Status Quaestionis of Diodorian Studies. (2025). *Nuntius Antiquus*, 21(2), 1–43
45. West, M. L. (1983). *The Orphic poems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

46. Winiarczyk, M., (2013). *The Sacred History of Euhemerus of Messene*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
47. Wolf, F. A. (1795). *Prolegomena ad Homerum*. Halle: Libraria Orphanotropei.
48. Wright, D. J. (2018). *Giants, titans, and civil strife in the Greek & Roman world down through the age of Augustus*, a dissertation defended in Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Summary

Diodorus Siculus' *Universal History* is one of the longest surviving historical texts from Ancient Greece, written around the first century B.C. The work aims to present the history of the entire world, including mythological times and the history of the barbarian people. The first six books of this massive work present the mythological era up to the Trojan War. In describing this period, Diodorus often relies on ancient sources, most of which are now lost. The analysis presented in this Master's thesis focuses on a passage in Book 5, which describes the island of Crete (5.64–80). Here Diodorus presents a lengthy account that combines mythological, historical and ethnographic material. Most curious is the fact that, at the very end of the passage, Diodorus states to have used four sources. One of them is called 'Epimenides the Theologian' (5.80.4). What is more, the specific linguistic formula of *μὲν [...] δὲ* signifies that Epimenides is distinguished from the other three authors; this is very likely because Epimenides was a 'theologian', whereas the remaining authors were simply 'historians'. Thus, this study aims to use these and similar clues to extract the Epimenidean source from the Cretan Passage.

This is achieved in two stages. First, the narratological flow of the passage is analysed. Relying on narrative breaks, linguistic clues, and possible intertextual references, the text is divided into broad sections consistent in style. From this, it emerges that a clear theogonic narrative is present within the passage, though it is framed by ethnographic and historical sections at the beginning (5.64–5) and end (5.76.3–80) of the chapter. What is more, there are numerous interpolations that most likely derive from stylistically different sources than the Epimenidean source under investigation. The second stage analyses concepts and opinions, allowing for the reconstruction of a consistent narrative line that reflects a distinctive theological position. According to this view, gods should not be represented as violent beings, but rather as peaceful and just, as shown in the differing myth-versions presented. First, neither Cronus nor Zeus seizes power by force; instead, both attain rule in a peaceful and just manner. Second, the only major outbreak of violence occurs within the Gigantomachy, whose central purpose is the restoration of concord, rather than the destruction of political enemies, as is more typical in other Greek contexts. For these reasons, the *Theogony* is situated within the intellectual context of Xenophanes rather than that of Euhemerus, with whom it has more commonly been associated. We attribute this narrative to Epimenides because it accords both with the clues provided by Diodorus and the broader context of Epimenides in Greek tradition.

Santrauka

Diodoro Siciliečio „Visuotinė istorija“ yra vienas ilgiausių išlikusių senovės Graikijos istorinių šaltinių, parašytas maždaug I a. pr. Kr. Šiame veikle siekiama aprašyti viso pasaulio istoriją, nepraleidžiant mitologinių laikų ar „barbarų“ amžių. Pirmosios šešios šio didžiulio kūrinio knygos apima laikotarpį nuo mitologinių įvykių iki Trojos karo. Aprašydamas šį laikotarpį, Diodoras dažnai remiasi senoviniais šaltiniais, kurių dauguma neišliko iki šių dienų. Šio magistro darbo dėmesio centre – penktosios knygos ištrauka, kurioje aprašoma Kretos sala (5.64–80). Čia Diodoras pateikia išsamų salos istorijos aprašymą, kuriame susipina mitologiniai, istoriniai ir etnografiniai pasakojimai; įdomiausia tai, kad pačioje ištraukos pabaigoje Diodoras nurodo keturis šaltinius, kuriais rėmėsi. Vienas iš jų pristatomas kaip „Epimenidas Teologas“ (5.80.4). Lingvistinė formulė *μὲν [...] δὲ* rodo, kad Epimenidas yra dėl kažkokios priežasties išskiriamas iš kitų trijų minimų autorių; taip yra tikriausiai todėl, kad Epimenidas buvo „teologas“, o likusieji autoriai – tiesiog „istorikai“. Pasitelkus šias ir kitas užuominas, šiame darbe siekiama identifikuoti Kretos pasaže panaudotą epimenidiškąjį šaltinį.

Tai atliekama dviem etapais. Pirmiausia analizuojama pasakojimo eiga. Remiantis naratyviniais lūžiais, lingvistiniais požymiais ir intertekstinėmis nuorodomis, tekstas suskirstomas į plačius, stiliaus požiūriu nuoseklius blokus. Toks suskirstymas atskleidžia, kad ištraukoje vyrauja aiškus teogoninis pasakojimas, nors skyriaus pradžioje (5.64–5) ir pabaigoje (5.76.3–80) jį užgožia etnografiniai ir istoriniai pasakojimai. Negana to, tekste randame daug interpoliacijų, kurios, tikėtina, kyla iš kitų, nei mūsų ieškomas Epimenido, šaltinių, mat pasižymi skirtingu stiliumi. Po naratyvinės analizės pereinama prie sąvokų ir nuomonių analizės, leidžiančios nustatyti nuoseklų pasakojimo linijos branduolį, atskleidžiantį įdomią teologinę poziciją. Pasak jos, dievai neturėtų būti vaizduojami kaip smurtaujančios būtybės, bet veikiau kaip taikios ir teisingos, kaip rodo pateiktos kitokios įprastų teogoninių mitų versijos. Jose nei Kronas, nei Dzeusas nepasisavina valdžios jėga, bet tai pasiekia taikiau ir teisėtu keliu. Antra – vienintelis smurto protrūkis aptinkamas gigantomachijoje, kurios pagrindine idėja išlieka santarvės atkūrimas, o ne politinių oponentų panaikinimas, kaip įprasta kituose graikiškuose kontekstuose. Šią Teogoniją aš siūlau gretinti ksenofaniškam kontekstui, o ne Euhemerui, kaip įprastai linkstama daryti. Šį pasakojimą aš priskiriu Epimenidui, nes jis atitinka tiek Diodoro pateiktas užuominas, tiek platesnį Epimenido reputacijos graikų kultūroje kontekstą.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Two case–studies

Hecataeus of Abdera

Hecataeus is actually referenced by name only once in the first book (1.46.8) and, moreover, merely as a corroborative source for the Egyptian priests’ ‘records’ (1.46.8: *ἱερεῖς ἐκ τῶν ἀναγραφῶν*) upon which Diodorus depends. Nonetheless, he is considered the primary source for Diodorus’ first book; several scholars even asserted that Diodorus plagiarized his lost work *Aegyptiaca* verbatim (Schneider, 1880, 27; Schwartz, 1903; Sacks, 1990, 91), which helped to establish the common belief that Diodorus is a mere *epitomizer* (Schwartz, 1903, 663).

In the passage, Diodorus indicates that Hecataeus is merely one of several Greek historians (*πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων*) who concur with the Egyptian assertion (and Diodorus’ own eye–witness account) that forty–seven royal tombs were located in Thebes. By the time of Diodorus, only fifteen or fewer had survived, as he himself observes. Oswyn Murray (1970) has suggested that in this passage the reliance on Hecataeus is not as brief as Diodorus makes it out to be. Only a paragraph later, when Diodorus describes one of the tombs that belonged to King Osymandias (1.47) he apparently still relies on Hecataeus, since a marker of allusion⁵⁶ ‘φησὶν’ is used (1.47.1). Interestingly enough, as the passage goes on, the marker changes to ‘φασὶν’ (1.49.6), meant to denote general Egyptian reported statements, rather than a single source. Murray sees this change as a clear ‘deception’ and these two markers, according to Murray, ‘give away’ the fact that ‘Hecataeus is clearly identical with the alleged authors of the *oratio obliqua* throughout’ (Murray, 1970, 145).

This instance of supposed ‘deception’ by Diodorus convinced Murray to fully concur with the earlier interpretations of both Schwartz (1903) and Jacoby (1940) that Hecataeus is the central source in Book 1. According to all these authors, not only is Hecataeus the main leading source of Book 1, but he is also epitomized without much consideration or change to the original text. To support the thesis that Hecataeus has reached us in such good condition in Diodorus’ account Murray gives a couple of additional arguments. Firstly, the ‘structure’ and ‘internal consistency’ of his text must mean that the source has not received much alteration or authorial input by Diodorus (Murray, 1970, 144–45). Second, Diodorus’ text is also identical with the ‘genre of ethnography which Hecataeus is known to have practised’ (Murray, 1970, 145). Thus,

⁵⁶ I borrow the term ‘marker of allusion’ from Thomas Nelson (2023). He uses it to denote linguistic expressions like *μύμημαι*, *πάλλαι*, *επενθόμεθα* (Nelson, 2023, 1–4) and latin *fama*, *annis*, and *ferunt* (Nelson, 2023, 4) that are employed in poetry to reference some alternate source or opinion, usually much older than the current text. These markers usually stand in for lacking names and references, but most importantly imply intertextuality.

the ‘structural integrity’ and ‘genre’ of the text, according to Murray, indicate then that Diodorus is not so much the author as only a medium conveying another author.

This understanding of Diodorus as a primitive historian is convenient enough, when one aims to reconstruct a long-gone text of some otherwise unknown writer. We indeed have little ground to stand upon if we wish to extract the lost authors that Diodorus cites. But if Diodorus is simply an epitomizer, then there is no real need for philological effort and the actual source is easily and directly furnished by Diodorus, barely altered. Murray avails himself of this simplified image of Diodorus. He goes on to provide a full table of contents which aligns all known extra-Diodorean fragments of Hecataeus with Diodorus’ actual text (Murray, 1970, 146) – or rather any instances where their contents are even slightly similar. Thus, Diodorus’ Book 1 is equated with Hecataeus *Aegyptiaca*. Although such a simplified approach to Diodorus is highly appealing for our purposes of source archeology, we will not reach the actual truth in this manner.

First, Murray’s argument for the epitomizing nature of Diodorus lies in the fact that his first book has a clear and consistent structure throughout. For Murray this seems reasonable enough, since Diodorus for him was a primitive compiler, rather than a serious historian. Had his source not been consistent, and, more importantly, had he not quoted it in extensive extant chunks, no coherent structure would have appeared within the text. Yet we have no real reason to subscribe to such a degrading view of Diodorus – in fact, he manages to impose quite complex structures on his text, where many sources are employed⁵⁷ and most later scholars have argued that a broad range of sources have been collected in his first book⁵⁸.

Charles E. Muntz has been highly critical of the classical approach to Diodorus *Quellenforschung* with regards to many other passages in Diodorus, some of which we will explore later. Among these is of course the belief of Murray, that Hecataeus is simply copy-pasted. Muntz gives a detailed account of how Diodorus’ text in Book 1 does not in fact align with Hecataean fragments, as Murray would suggest. We may glance at Hecataeus’ fragment 4 (Muntz, 2011, 580), which comes from Plutarch’s *De Iside et Osiride*:

Moreover, most people believe that Amoun is the name given to Zeus in the land of the Egyptians, a name which we, with a slight alteration, pronounce Ammon. But Manetho of Sebennytus thinks that the meaning “concealed” or “concealment” lies in this word. Hecataeus of Abdera, however, says that the Egyptians use this expression one to another whenever they call to anyone, for the word is a form of address.

⁵⁷ On the general structure of The Library and its writing process see: Muntz (2017, especially: 217–221) and Dudzinski (2023). Also, Muntz (2024) shows how Diodorus is able to create a complex structure in his ‘Island Book’, juxtaposing temporal and geographical lenses to create a thorough view of the Greek islands and their cultural significance for world history.

⁵⁸ Cole (1967) is a good example of how Diodorus uses Democritus for his passage on human evolution. Anne Burton in her monumental commentary on book 1 of Diodorus also manages to find many later and different sources apart from Hecataeus (Burton, 2015).

Ἔτι δὲ τῶν πολλῶν νομιζόντων ἴδιον παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ὄνομα τοῦ Διὸς εἶναι τὸν Ἀμοῦν (ὃ παράγοντες ἡμεῖς Ἀμμωνα λέγομεν), Μανεθῶς μὲν Δό Σεβεννύτης τὸ κεκρυμμένον οἶται καὶ τὴν κρύψιν ὑπὸ ταύτης δηλοῦσθαι τῆς φωνῆς· Ἐκαταῖος δ' ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης φησὶ τούτῳ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῷ ῥήματι χρῆσθαι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ὅταν τινὰ προσκαλῶνται· προσκλητικὴν γὰρ εἶναι τὴν φωνήν.

(354c–d, 9)

This passage, according to Murray and Jacoby, is equivalent to Diodorus':

Their names, when translated, are in some cases the same as those of the celestial gods, while others have a distinct appellation, such as Helios, Cronus, and Rhea, and also the Zeus who is called Ammon by some, and besides these Hera and Hephaestus, also Hestia, and, finally, Hermes.

μεθερμηνευομένων δ' αὐτῶν τινὰς μὲν ὁμωνύμους ὑπάρχειν τοῖς οὐρανίοις, τινὰς δ' ἰδίαν ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίαν, Ἥλιόν τε καὶ Κρόνον καὶ Ῥέαν, ἔτι δὲ Δία τὸν ὑπὸ τινῶν Ἀμμωνα προσαγορευόμενον, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἥραν καὶ Ἥφαιστον, ἔτι δ' Ἑστίαν καὶ τελευταῖον Ἑρμῆν.

(1.13.2)

Muntz correctly notes that 'the only thing that this passage has in common with what Plutarch attributes to Hecataeus is that both Diodorus and Hecataeus mention Ammon' (Muntz, 2011, 580). Apart from the common name of Ammon there is no other reason to suggest that Diodorus relies on the same source. Furthermore, the idea that Diodorus was familiar with the god Ammon (or Amun–Re), without relying on some specific source is not so unbelievable since he was one of the main deities of the Egyptian pantheon (Muntz, 2011, 580). We may also add in support of Muntz's argument that Plutarch ascribes to Hecataeus a very specific piece of information; not only, according to him, is Ammon the real name of Zeus, but the Egyptians use his name as a 'greeting'. Such a fact would seem significant enough to mention in Diodorus' account, since etymologies and linguistic significance of divine names seemed to interest Diodorus⁵⁹. Thus, the implication that Hecataeus is the common source for both authors is completely fictitious and based on a 'straw man' image of Diodorus.

What of the case where Hecataeus is actually mentioned? Murray believes, as presented above, that the interchange of 'φησιν' and 'φασίν', suggests that Diodorus has 'concealed' his reliance on Hecataeus. Muntz sees no reason for such a far-fetched conclusion. He suggests that, in doing so, Diodorus is not 'sloppily' concealing his actual source but beginning to incorporate other sources by the end of his passage on Osymandias' tomb (Muntz, 2011, 583–4). This approach would not only seem more likely for an historian, but it also explains the curious change of expressions. If one does not keep to the basic attitude

⁵⁹ Like Zeus' names in book 5 (5.72.1–4) and the origin of Dionysus' name (1.15.6; 3.64.3; 4.2.3)

towards Diodorus as a simple compiler, there is no reason to insist that Hecataeus is quoted at all beyond the first statement attributed to him.

Muntz regards his own conclusions on Book 1 as purely ‘negative’ and the question of source archaeology concerning Hecataeus as futile (Muntz, 2011, 594), and maintains that the only viable approach is to analyze Diodorus’ worldview and not that of the earlier authors. Yet I argue that we need not be so strict, since the matter is somewhat more nuanced. There are two important points to gather from the case study of Hecataeus.

The first lesson to be learned is that we have no reason to suppose a source where there is no trace of one⁶⁰. Diodorus is an author in and of himself – an elementary fact which is nonetheless often overlooked in the earlier scholarship. He is fully capable of constructing his own text according to his own agenda. Consistency and fluency are not alien to him; we need not say that he uses sources in an exemplary fashion or melds them beyond recognition, yet he is definitely not reliant on them for coherence. It is understandable that many have been eager to recover lost texts through Diodorus, yet one must remain extremely vigilant in order not to attribute more material to a source than the evidence warrants. If we possess no real evidence for a source, then there is no need to assume one.

The second important point is that Diodorus’ method is not as straightforward as some scholars assume. Unsurprisingly, he is perfectly capable of using multiple sources simultaneously. Whenever he needs to ‘prove’ a fact, he may mention one source and, without any clear indication, transition to another. Unfortunately, these transitions are rarely telegraphed by him in any explicit way, but we need not expect that from a self-sufficient historian concerned above all with producing a coherent historical narrative. To identify the source within his text, we must therefore pay close attention to shifts in both language and content.

Dionysius Scytobrachion

Dionysius was purportedly an author of several interesting texts on mythological subjects⁶¹. He was believed to be a 3rd century myth-teller (3.66.6: *μυθοποιίας*), mainly concerned with classical Greek myths

⁶⁰ Quite different is the study of Bigwood on Ctesias in Book 2. Bigwood finds a sufficient number of clues scattered in the text to suggest Diodorus’ close reliance on Ctesias as a source material – idiosyncratic words like ‘Cinnabar’ (2.14; Bigwood, 1980, 199), nominal forms of province names (1980, 200), etc. Nevertheless, he is professionally careful in not attributing Diodorean text to Ctesias wholesale. A lot of effort is put into reflecting the number of abbreviations and cuts that Diodorus most likely exercised (Bigwood, 1980, 198) and the clear movement between sources is recognized, which removes the assumption, that Ctesias is ‘epitomized’ (Bigwood, 1980, 199).

⁶¹ Diodorus tells us that Dionysius has covered the wide range of topics, such as the conquests of Dionysus, the Amazons, the Expedition of the Argonauts and the Trojan War (3.66). Suda attributes to Dionysius three books titled ‘Argonauts’ ‘On the Campaign of Dionysus and Athena’ and ‘Myths of Parmenon’ (*Suda*, s.v. 1175 delta). Whether these topics were covered in a unified work or several texts is up for debate (Rusten, 1982, 76–92).

and their euhemeristic interpretations (Rusten, 1982, 102). This is crucial for our objectives, as, in contrast to Hecataeus, Dionysius is a writer of genuine mythology rather than generic history. Therefore, in his case, we can analyze how Diodorus engages with mythology-based accounts rather than rigid ethnographic or historical facts. Besides, in Dionysius we can find a theogonic narrative that bears some resemblance to the one in the Cretan passage. Diodorus relies on Dionysius in several instances throughout the *Library*: when relaying the tales of the Amazons (3.52) and the Argonauts (4.40), and the differing myths pertaining to the Libyan Dionysus (3.66). The arduous task of reconstructing his writings is not our focus here; rather, we remain interested in Diodorus' approach to these narratives and the scholarly discourse on the matter.

When it comes to Dionysius, Diodorus seems a lot more transparent than he was with Hecataeus (or actually any source) in Book 1. At the conclusion of his discourse on Libya (3.49–52), Diodorus ultimately concludes his 'scientific' exposition of the Libyan soil and meteorological phenomena with the transition to the tale of the Amazons, as their narrative is apparently associated with the location. Interestingly, Diodorus clearly discloses his choice of sources:

For our part, however, since we find that many early poets and historians, and not a few of the later ones as well, have made mention of them [the Amazonians], we shall endeavour to recount their deeds in summary, following the account of Dionysius, who composed a narrative about the Argonauts and Dionysus, and also about many other things which took place in the most ancient times.

οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς εὐρίσκοντες πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων, οὐκ ὀλίγους δὲ καὶ τῶν μεταγενεστέρων μνήμην πεποιημένους αὐτῶν, ἀναγράφειν τὰς πράξεις πειρασόμεθα ἐν κεφαλαίοις ἀκολουθῶς Διονυσίῳ τῷ συντεταγμένῳ τὰ περὶ τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ τῶν ἐν τοῖς παλαιοτάτοις χρόνοις πραχθέντων.

(3.52.3)

If we are to believe Diodorus' claims here, he has examined a variety of earlier sources but has chosen to rely solely on Dionysius' text as his primary source on the Amazonian tribe. Thus, what follows is a lengthy retelling of the Amazons' conquests (3.52–6). The narrative is quite historical in character, recounting the subjugation of various Libyan and Asian tribes and cities, at times accompanied by the foundation of new settlements⁶². Among peoples like the Ethiopian Ichthyophagi (3.53.6), the Gorgons (3.54.7), the Egyptians (3.55.4), the Syrians (3.55.4), the Cilicians (3.55.5–6), and the Lesbians (3.55.7–8) Diodorus also includes the conquest of the civilization of the Atlanteans (3.54)⁶³. Even though the

⁶² The Amazonians supposedly settled the entire island of Hespera upon which they lived (3.53.4). After defeating all enemy tribes, they founded the city of Cherronesus. In their later conquests, Diodorus states that they also founded cities like Myrina, Cymê, Pitana, Prienê (3.55.6) and Mytilene (3.55.7).

⁶³ These are not to be confused with the platonic citizens of Atlantis (in dialogues *Timaeus* and *Critias*). The Libyan Atlanteans derive their name from the Atlas mountain range.

Amazonian ‘history’ is mostly ethnographic and informative, there is a clear fictional core to the whole story: the life of Mylina, Queen of the Amazons, which serves as the connective thread linking the entire passage together.

Scholars believe that the entire Atlantean episode which follows belongs to Dionysius as well, since it is narratively connected with the Amazonian conquests (Rusten, 1982, 78; Muntz, 2017, 152). I am inclined to believe that here Diodorus’ reliance on Dionysius clearly ceases. The passage on the Amazonians, which interrupts the general overview of Libya, is a consistent narrative tale, featuring conquests, battles, the foundations of cities, and Mylinas’ life and death. The story of queen Mylina and her wars is retold with barely any deviations, which would suggest that this is the promised ‘summary’ of Dionysius’ text (3.52.3). The Atlantean passage which proceeds after the killing of queen Mylina by the Thracian king Mopsus (3.55.10–11) lacks a narrative connection to the Amazonian tale. It is an entirely novel project.

An important break is found at 3.54.1–2 where the Atlantean people are first introduced as victims of the Amazonians. However, Diodorus promises to speak of them later (*περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρὸν ὕστερον διέξιμεν*), almost as if anticipating another source, which he refrains from introducing at this point, in order not to disrupt the flow of the narrative he is recounting here⁶⁴. For now, Diodorus (and probably Dionysius also) aim to narrate the wars between queen Mylina and the Atlanteans; an informative passage on Amazonian warfare equipment (3.54.2–3) and the slaughter within the city walls of Cernê (3.54.4) is provided. When Diodorus comes back to the Atlanteans properly, not as part of the Amazonian narrative, but as a separate culture by itself, his introduction (3.56.1–2: *διελθεῖν τὰ μυθολογούμενα παρ’ αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς τῶν θεῶν γενέσεως*) almost verbatim repeats the same expression that he used when beginning his Amazonian narrative (3.52.1: *διελθεῖν τὰ περὶ τὰς Ἀμαζόνας ἱστορούμενα*). What is even more noteworthy, right at the beginning, the narration style of this passage changes significantly. It seems that now Diodorus is interested in presenting the curious mythological tales told by the Atlanteans (5.56.1: *τὰ μυθολογούμενα παρ’ αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς τῶν θεῶν γενέσεως*), which he notes are very similar to the Greek mythological accounts (5.56.1–2: *μὴ πολὺ διαλλάττειν αὐτὰ τῶν μυθολογούμενων παρ’ Ἑλλήσιν*). This shift in focus is reinforced further by the sudden quotation of Homer (*Il.* 14.200–1), supporting the view that Dionysius Scytobrachion was, very likely, no longer the principal source at this point, since no similar quotes appeared earlier, where reliance on him was definite.

After the account on the Atlantean mythology, to which we will come back shortly, a lengthy passage of Dionysus’ tales commences. Diodorus is quick to acknowledge the difficulties in his endeavour to present

⁶⁴ A surprisingly important quality for Diodorus as has been shown by Marincola (2019, 84)

the varied beliefs of poets and historians about Dionysus. Since there are many differing accounts, he promises to synthesize multiple sources as best as he can:

Consequently, in order not to omit anything which history records about Dionysus, we shall present in summary what is told by the Libyans and those Greek historians whose writings are in accord with these and with that Dionysius who composed an account out of the ancient fabulous tales.

διόπερ, ἵνα μηδὲν παραλίπωμεν τῶν ἱστορημένων περὶ Διονύσου, διέξιμεν ἐν κεφαλαίοις τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Λίβυσι λεγόμενα καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν συγγραφέων ὅσοι τοῦτοις σύμφωνα γεγράφασι καὶ Διονυσίῳ τῷ συνταξαμένῳ τὰς παλαιὰς μυθοποιίας.

(3.66.5–6)

This, I believe, is one more argument for excluding the Atlantean passage from the source material supplied by Dionysius, insofar as Diodorus seems to quite openly signal the return to his text. Why else would he mention Dionysius' name twice in the same book, and only at the beginnings of new topics? Clearly, a great gap with no identifiable sources yawns in Diodorus' narrative between the Amazonian tales (3.56) and the beginning of Dionysus' conquests (3.62). Thus, we must conclude on this matter that either Diodorus has given up trying to name his sources and began plagiarizing the entire second half of his Book 3 from Dionysius after the Amazonians were mentioned, sloppily concealing this reliance, or he only used Dionysius' text in some places, when it came to select tales he wished to convey. Clearly, the latter is more likely, insofar as if we attributed everything to Dionysius Scytobrachion simply because he has been mentioned, we would fall upon the same fallacy we identified in the case of Hecataeus in Book 1.

If we circle back to the introduction of the Dionysus passage (3.66), we may notice some other significant points. This passage gives us some idea of how Diodorus approaches difficult cultural topics, where accounts are intensely varied. He clearly brings to our attention the fact that he is not working with a single source, and we have no reason to distrust his statement. In fact, he says he is working with several sources of a very different nature. First, some general myths told by the Libyans (real textual source of which we do not know). Second, according to Diodorus, these general beliefs are also 'in accord' with Greek historians' accounts, among whom the only source singled out is Dionysius Scytobrachion.

This paints quite a typical and representative picture of Diodorus' general approach to any culturally significant topic. There is usually a dual perspective at work: first, a 'leading' source, which directs the whole text throughout, providing narrative framework to the historical account, and second, a series of peripheral sources, which occupy far less space and serve primarily as material for occasional interpolations. It is difficult to state confidently how much Dionysius' text influenced any other sources which Diodorus implies to have used here, but what is clear is that the overarching fabula is that of Dionysius. A more pressing problem is that we can hardly form any guesses as to why Diodorus prefers

some sources over others. For instance, why does Diodorus favour the clearly fictional narrative of Queen Mylina over some possibly more scientific accounts⁶⁵?

A fragile academic consensus has emerged on the subject in Dionysius' case. According to some scholars, Diodorus faithfully represents a great part of Dionysius' text, but shifts the perspective for his own purposes. Since he is interested in informing his readers about the Libyan Dionysus and some similar mythic accounts, and not Zeus, who was the real focus of his story, he alters the angle of the tale – it is not so much a mythical account of Zeus' Titanomachy, but an informative compendium on differing Dionysian traditions. As Rusten states, Dionysus 'had no place in the traditional Titanomachy' (1982, 109), yet the narrative concerns him mostly, which is unfitting. Muntz also provides some good arguments of this shift of perspective, which is exemplified by repeating of already familiar names (2017, 156–7). Dionysus is on the spotlight, though he should not have been.

There are some important notes to be made here. First, Rusten's claim that the traditional Titanomachy is not about Dionysus is fundamentally correct, but it relies on the idea that all accounts of this myth repeat the Hesiodic version of Titanomachy. But why should the Libyan account be Hesiodic? It is not unlikely that Diodorus recounts a non-traditional Titanomachy here, precisely because of its unconventionality. Moreover, the passage on Amazonian conquests, also a little untraditional, follows a similar storytelling style, focusing mostly on conquests, foundations of cities, and interesting figures (in this case, Dionysus). Second, Muntz's case relies on the supposition that the Atlantean theogony is derived from Dionysius Scytobrachion, which, as we have sufficiently shown, is completely unfounded⁶⁶.

I believe there are three lessons to be learned from this second case-study. First, just as in the case of Hecataeus in Book 1, we do not need to suppose that once Diodorus introduces a source, the author's pen begins moving as *vis irresistibilis*, with no more conscious input from the historian himself. This is clearly indicated by the Atlantean passage, which should be excluded from the tales of Dionysius Scytobrachion, although scholars choose not to.

The second important point is that Diodorus prefers to use one principal source, on which he relies, adding only minor interpolations when he sees fit. Not only does a source become a guide information-wise, but also in style – Dionysius alters Diodorus' narration style. While Diodorus' general approach to history in Book 2 seemed mostly rationalist and informative in character, he willingly broke the trend to

⁶⁵ That such sources existed is apparent from the very informative and factual Geography of Strabo, which describes the Amazonian tribe (11.5.1) and cities (11.5.4) very differently.

⁶⁶ The claim that Diodorus greatly manipulates the text of Dionysius is also unfounded since in other uses of his text, no such extensive manipulation is witnessed. We have already mentioned the Amazonian passage, but there is also the case of the Argonauts in Book 4 (4.40–56) which is internally consistent, save for a single contradiction about the existence of a son of Pelias (Muntz, 2018, 339). Diodorus admittedly shortened Dionysius' narrative, since his original was six books-long (Muntz, 2018, 339–40). Apart from these minor observations, there is no real proof of serious manipulation of Dionysius' narrative.

recount mythical narratives from a different type of sources. This solidifies his extraordinary portrait of an historian more than willing to engage with myth.

The last point directly follows from the previous: Diodorus is interested in preserving local variants of mythical tradition and is therefore prepared to preserve a lengthy chunk of fictional or theogonic narrative. Because of this, we find an Atlantean theogonic account within an otherwise historical book. Diodorus implements this belief and preserves not only its general structure but also its more idiosyncratic features and contrasts it with the Cretan passage (3.61.3). He does not appear to force the Atlantean theogony into a Greek framework; why, then, would he shift the perspective of the Titanomachy? Diodorus, in this sense, is a thorough and faithful historian, more likely to alter a source through cuts and abbreviations than through changes to its actual content.

Appendix II: An Edition of the Theogony of Epimenides the Theologian

1. 5.66.1–6	
ὑπάρξαι δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἕξ μὲν ἄνδρας, πέντε δὲ γυναῖκας [...] ἕκ τινος τῶν Κουρήτων καὶ μητρὸς Τιταίας, ἀφ' ἧς αὐτοὺς ταύτης τετευχέναι τῆς προσηγορίας. ἄρρενας μὲν οὖν γενέσθαι τὸν τε Κρόνον καὶ Ὑπερίωνα καὶ Κοῖον, ἔτι δὲ Ἰαπετὸν καὶ Κριὸν καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον Ὠκεανόν, ἀδελφὰς δὲ τούτων τὴν τε Ῥέαν καὶ Θέμιν καὶ Μνημοσύνην, ἔτι δὲ Φοίβην καὶ Τηθύ. ὧν ἕκαστόν τινων εὐρετὴν γενέσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καὶ διὰ τὴν εἰς ἅπαντας εὐεργεσίαν τυχεῖν τιμῶν καὶ μνήμης ἀενάου.	The Titans numbered six men and five women, being born [...] of one of the Curetes and Titaea, from whom as their mother they derive the name they have. The males were Cronus, Hyperion, Coeus, Iapetus, Crius, and Oceanus, and their sisters were Rhea, Themis, Mnemosynê, Phoebê, and Tethys. Each one of them was the discoverer of things of benefit to mankind, and because of the benefaction they conferred upon all men they were accorded honours and everlasting fame.
Τὸν μὲν οὖν Κρόνον ὄντα πρεσβύτατον βασιλέα γενέσθαι, καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀνθρώπους ἕξ ἀγρίου διαίτης εἰς βίον ἡμερον μεταστῆσαι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποδοχῆς μεγάλης τυχόντα πολλοὺς ἐπελθεῖν τόπους τῆς οἰκουμένης.	Cronus, since he was the eldest of the Titans, became king and caused all men who were his subjects to change from a rude way of living to civilized life, and for this reason he received great approbation and visited many regions of the

εἰσηγήσασθαι δ' αὐτὸν ἅπασι τὴν τε δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἀπλότητα τῆς ψυχῆς· διὸ καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ Κρόνου γενομένους ἀνθρώπους παραδεδόσθαι τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις εὐήθεις καὶ ἀκάκους παντελῶς, ἔτι δ' εὐδαίμονας γεγονότας. [...] διὰ δὲ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς εὐνομίας ἀδίκημα μὲν μηδὲν ὅλως ὑπὸ μηδενὸς συντελεῖσθαι, πάντας δὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τούτου τεταγμένους μακάριον βίον ἐζηκέναι, πάσης ἡδονῆς ἀνεμποδίστως ἀπολαύοντας.	inhabited earth. Among all he met he introduced justice and sincerity of soul, and this is why the tradition has come down to later generations that the men of Cronus' time were good-hearted, altogether guileless, and blest with felicity. [...] And because of the exceptional obedience to laws no injustice was committed by any one at any time and all the subjects of the rule of Cronus lived a life of blessedness, in the unhindered enjoyment of every pleasure.
2. 5.67.1–2	
Ὑπερίονα δέ φασι τοῦ τε ἡλίου τὴν κίνησιν καὶ σελήνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἄστρον, ἔτι δὲ τὰς ὥρας τὰς συντελουμένας ὑπὸ τούτων, πρῶτον ἐξ ἐπιμελείας καὶ παρατηρήσεως κατανοήσαντα τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰς γνῶσιν παραδοῦναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸν πατέρα τούτων ὀνομασθῆναι, καθαπερεὶ γεγεννηκότα τὴν τούτων θεωρίαν καὶ φύσιν.	Of Hyperion we are told that he was the first to understand, by diligent attention and observation, the movement of both the sun and the moon and the other stars, and the seasons as well, in that they are caused by these bodies, and to make these facts known to others; and that for this reason he was called the father of these bodies, since he had begotten, so to speak, the speculation about them and their nature.
3. 5.67.3–6	
καὶ Κοίου μὲν καὶ Φοίβης Λητὼ γενέσθαι, Ἰαπετοῦ δὲ Προμηθεά [...] ὅτι τὸ πῦρ κλέψας παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἔδωκε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, [...]. τῶν δὲ Τιτανίδων φασὶ Μνημοσύνην λογισμοὺς εὐρεῖν καὶ τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων θέσεις ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὄντων τάξαι, δι' ὧν καὶ δηλοῦμεν ἕκαστα καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὁμιλοῦμεν [...]. προσάπτουσι δὲ τῇ θεᾷ ταύτῃ καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀνανέωσιν καὶ μνήμην γινόμενα παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀφ' ὧν δὴ καὶ τῆς προσηγορίας τυχεῖν αὐτὴν ταύτης. Θέμιν δὲ μυθολογοῦσι μαντείας καὶ θυσίας καὶ θεσμούς	To Coeus and Phoebê was born Leto, and to Iapetus was born Prometheus, [...] he stole fire from the gods and gave it to mankind [...]. Of the female Titans they say that Mnemosyne discovered the uses of the power of reason, and that she gave a designation to every object about us by means of the names which we use to express whatever we would and to hold conversation one with another [...]. And to this goddess is also attributed the power to call things to memory and to remembrance which men possess, and it is this power which gave her the name

τοὺς περὶ τῶν θεῶν πρώτην εἰσηγήσασθαι καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν εὐνομίαν καὶ εἰρήνην καταδειῖξαι.	she received. Themis, the myths tell us, was the first to introduce divinations and sacrifices and the ordinances which concern the gods, and to instruct men in the ways of obedience to laws and of peace.
4. 5.68.1–2	
Κρόνου δὲ καὶ Ῥέας λέγεται γενέσθαι τὴν τε Ἑστίαν καὶ Δήμητραν καὶ Ἥραν, ἔτι δὲ Δία καὶ Ποσειδῶνα καὶ Ἄϊδην. τούτων δὲ λέγεται τὴν μὲν Ἑστίαν τὴν τῶν οἰκῶν κατασκευὴν εὐρεῖν, καὶ διὰ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν ταύτην παρὰ πᾶσι σχεδὸν ἀνθρώποις ἐν πάσαις οἰκίαις καθιδρυθῆναι, τιμῶν καὶ θυσιῶν τυγχάνουσιν· Δήμητραν δέ, τοῦ σίτου φρυομένου μὲν ὥς ἔτυχε μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης βοτάνης, ἀγνοουμένου δὲ παρ’ ἀνθρώποις, πρώτην συγκομίσαι καὶ τὴν κατεργασίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ φυλακὴν ἐπινοῆσαι καὶ σπεῖρειν καταδειῖξαι.	To Cronus and Rhea, we are told, were born Hestia, Demeter, and Hera, and Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades. Of these, they say, Hestia discovered how to build houses, and because of this benefaction of hers practically all men have established her shrine in every home, according her honours and sacrifices. And Demeter, since the corn still grew wild together with the other plants and was still unknown to men, was the first to gather it in, to devise how to prepare and preserve it, and to instruct mankind how to sow it.
5. 5.69.4–5	
Τῶν δ’ ἄλλων θεῶν τῶν ἐκ Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας γενομένων φασὶν οἱ Κρηῖτες Ποσειδῶνα μὲν πρῶτον χρήσασθαι ταῖς κατὰ θάλατταν ἐργασίαις καὶ στόλους συστήσασθαι, παραδόντος αὐτῷ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ταύτην τοῦ Κρόνου· διὸ καὶ παραδίδοσθαι τοῖς ἐπιγινόμενοις τοῦτον κύριον ὑπάρχειν τῶν κατὰ θάλατταν πραττομένων καὶ θυσίαις ὑπὸ τῶν ναυτιλλομένων τιμᾶσθαι. προσάπτουσι δ’ αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ τοὺς ἵππους δαμάσαι πρῶτον καὶ τὴν ἐπιστήμην καταδειῖξαι τὴν περὶ τὴν ἵππικὴν, ἀφ’ ἧς ἵππιον αὐτὸν ὠνομάσθαι. τὸν δ’ Ἄϊδην λέγεται τὰ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς καὶ τὰς ἐκφορὰς καὶ τιμὰς τῶν τεθνεώτων καταδειῖξαι, τὸν πρὸ τοῦ χρόνον μηδεμιᾶς οὔσης ἐπιμελείας περὶ αὐτοῦ· διὸ καὶ τῶν τετελευτηκότων ὁ θεὸς οὗτος παρεῖληπται	As for the rest of the gods who were born to Cronus and Rhea, the Cretans say that Poseidon was the first to concern himself with sea-faring and to fit out fleets, Cronus having given him the lordship in such matters; and this is why the tradition has been passed along to succeeding generations that he controls whatever is done on the sea, and why mariners honour him by means of sacrifices. Men further bestow upon Poseidon the distinction of having been the first to tame horses and to introduce the knowledge of horsemanship, because of which he is called “Hippius.” And of Hades it is said that he laid down the rules which are concerned with burials and funerals and the honours which are paid to the dead, no concern having been given to the

κυριεύειν, ἀπονεμηθείσης τὸ παλαιὸν αὐτῷ τῆς τούτων ἀρχῆς καὶ φροντίδος.	dead before this time; and this is why tradition tells us that Hades is lord of the dead, since there were assigned to him in ancient times the first offices in such matters and the concern for them.
6. 5.70.1	
[Ζεύς] [...] διαδέξασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν, οὐ βία κατισχύσαντα τὸν πατέρα, νομίμως δὲ καὶ δίκαιως ἀξιωθέντα ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς.	[Zeus] succeeded to the kingship [...] not by overcoming his father with violence, but in the manner prescribed by custom and justly, having been judged worthy of that honour.
7. 5.71.1–2	
Διενέγκαι δὲ τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον ἀπάντων ἀνδρεία καὶ συνέσει καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀπάσαις ἀρεταῖς· διὸ καὶ παραλαβόντα τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ Κρόνου πλεῖστα καὶ μέγιστα τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον εὐεργετῆσαι. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀπάντων καταδείξαι περὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων τὸ δίκαιον ἀλλήλοις διδόναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τοῦ βία τι πράττειν ἀποστῆσαι, κρίσει δὲ καὶ δικαστηρίῳ τὰς ἀμφισβητήσεις διαλύειν. καθόλου δὲ τὰ περὶ τε τῆς εὐνομίας καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης προσαναπληρῶσαι, τοὺς μὲν ἀγαθοὺς πείθοντα, τοὺς δὲ φαύλους τῇ τιμωρίᾳ καὶ 2τῷ φόβῳ καταπληττόμενον. ἐπελθεῖν δ' αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην σχεδὸν πᾶσαν τοὺς μὲν ληστὰς καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἀναιροῦντα, τὴν δ' ἰσότητα καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν εἰσηγούμενον· [...].	Now Zeus, the myth goes on to say, surpassed all others in manly spirit and wisdom and justice and in the other virtues one and all, and, as a consequence, when he took over the kingly power from Cronus, he conferred benefactions of the greatest number and importance upon the life of mankind. He was the first of all, for instance, to lay down rules regarding acts of injustice and to teach men to deal justly one with another, to refrain from deeds of violence, and to settle their differences by appeals to men and to courts of justice. In short, he contributed in abundance to the practices which are concerned with obedience to law and with peace, prevailing upon good men by persuasion and intimidating evil men by threat of punishment and by their fear. He also visited practically the entire inhabited earth, putting to death robbers and impious men and introducing equality and democracy; [...].
8. 5.71.5–6	
κολασθῆναι δὲ τοὺς γίγαντας ὑπὸ Διὸς διὰ τὴν εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους παρανομίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ ταῖς τοῦ σώματος ὑπεροχαῖς καὶ ῥώμαις	Now the Giants were punished by Zeus because they had treated the rest of mankind in a lawless fashion and, confiding in their bodily

πεποιθότας καταδουλοῦσθαι μὲν τοὺς πλησιοχώρους, ἀπειθεῖν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τοῦ δικαίου τιθεμένοις νόμοις, πόλεμον δ' ἐκφέρειν πρὸς τοὺς διὰ τὰς κοινὰς εὐεργεσίας ὑπὸ πάντων θεοὺς νομιζομένους. τὸν δ' οὖν Δία λέγουσι μὴ μόνον ἄρδην ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀφανίσει τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ πονηροὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀρίστοις τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἡρώων, ἔτι δ' ἀνδρῶν τὰς ἀξίας ἀπονεῖμαι τιμὰς. διὰ δὲ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῆς δυνάμεως συμφώνως αὐτῷ παρὰ πάντων συγκεχωρησθαι τὴν τε βασιλείαν εἰς τὸν αἰὲ χρόνον καὶ τὴν οἴκησιν τὴν ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ.	superiority and strength, had enslaved their neighbours, and because they were also disobeying the rules of justice which he was laying down and were raising up war against those whom all mankind considered to be gods because of the benefactions they were conferring upon men generally. Zeus, then, we are told, not only totally eradicated the impious and evil-doers from among mankind, but he also distributed honours as they were merited among the noblest of the gods and heroes and men. And because of the magnitude of his benefactions and his superior power all men accorded to him as with one voice both the everlasting kingship which he possesses and his dwelling upon Mount Olympus.
9. 5.72.3–5	
Μυθολογοῦσι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν κατὰ τὴν Κρήτην ἐκ Διὸς ἐν ταῖς πηγαῖς τοῦ Τρίτωνος ποταμοῦ γεννηθῆναι· διὸ καὶ Τριτογένειαν ὀνομασθῆναι. [...] Τοῦ δὲ Διὸς ἐκγόνους φασὶ γενέσθαι θεὰς μὲν Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Χάριτας, πρὸς δὲ ταύταις Εἰλείθυιαν καὶ τὴν ταύτης συνεργὸν Ἄρτεμιν, καὶ τὰς προσαγορευομένας Ὠρας, Εὐνομίαν τε καὶ Δίκην, ἔτι δ' Εἰρήνην καὶ Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ Μούσας, θεοὺς δὲ Ἥφαιστον καὶ Ἄρην καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἑρμῆν καὶ Διόνυσον καὶ Ἡρακλέα.	Athena, the myths relate, was likewise begotten of Zeus in Crete, at the sources of the river Triton, this being the reason why she has been given the name Tritogeneia. [...] To Zeus also were born, they say, the goddesses Aphrodite and the Graces, Eileithyia and her helper Artemis, the Hours, as they are called, Eunomia and Dikê and Eirenê, and Athena and the Muses, and the gods Hephaestus and Ares and Apollo, and Hermes and Dionysus and Heracles.
10. 5.73–76	
Τούτων δ' ἐκάστῳ μυθολογοῦσι τὸν Δία τῶν εὐρεθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ συντελουμένων ἔργων τὰς ἐπιστήμας καὶ τὰς τιμὰς τῆς εὐρέσεως ἀπονεῖμαι, βουλόμενον αἰώνιον αὐτοῖς περιποιῆσαι μνήμην παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις.	To each one of the deities we have named, the myth goes on to relate, Zeus imparted the knowledge of the things which he had discovered and was perfecting, and likewise assigned to them the honour of their discovery, wishing in this way to

παραδοθῆναι δὲ τῇ μὲν Ἀφροδίτῃ τὴν τε τῶν παρθένων ἡλικίαν, ἐν οἷς χρόνοις δεῖ γαμεῖν αὐτάς, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἐπιμέλειαν τὴν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν τοῖς γάμοις γινομένην μετὰ θυσιῶν καὶ σπονδῶν, ὥς ποιοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι τῇ θεῷ ταύτῃ· προθύουσι δὲ πρότερον ἅπαντες τῷ Διὶ τῷ τελείῳ καὶ Ἥρᾳ τελείᾳ διὰ τὸ τούτους ἀρχηγοὺς γεγονέναι καὶ πάντων εὐρετάς, καθότι προεῖρηται. ταῖς δὲ Χάρισι δοθῆναι τὴν τῆς ὀψεως κόσμησιν καὶ τὸ σχηματίζειν ἕκαστον μέρος τοῦ σώματος πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον καὶ προσηγνὲς τοῖς θεωροῦσι, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τὸ κατάρχειν εὐεργεσίας καὶ πάλιν ἀμείβεσθαι ταῖς προσηκούσαις χάρισι τοὺς εὖ ποιήσαντας. Εἰλείθυιαν δὲ λαβεῖν τὴν περὶ τὰς τικτούσας ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ θεραπείαν τῶν ἐν τῷ τίκτειν κακοπαθουσῶν. διὸ καὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις κινδυνεύουσας γυναῖκας ἐπικαλεῖσθαι μάλιστα τὴν θεὸν ταύτην. Ἄρτεμιν δὲ φασιν εὐρεῖν τὴν τῶν νηπίων παιδίων θεραπείαν καὶ τροφάς τινας ἀρμοζούσας τῇ φύσει τῶν βρεφῶν· ἀφ' ἧς αἰτίας καὶ Κουροτρόφον αὐτὴν ὀνομάζεσθαι. τῶν δ' ὀνομαζομένων Ὁρῶν ἑκάστη δοθῆναι τὴν ἐπώνυμον τάξιν τε καὶ βίου διακόσμησιν ἐπὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὠφελείᾳ· μηδὲν γὰρ εἶναι μᾶλλον δυνάμενον εὐδαίμονα βίον παρασκευάσαι τῆς εὐνομίας καὶ δίκης καὶ εἰρήνης. Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ προσάπτουσι τὴν τε τῶν ἐλαιῶν ἡμέρωσιν καὶ φυτείαν παραδοῦναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τὴν τοῦ καρποῦ τούτου κατεργασίαν [...].

endow them with immortal fame among all mankind. To Aphroditē was entrusted the youth of maidens, the years in which they are expected to marry, and the supervision of such matters as are observed even yet in connection with weddings, together with the sacrifices and drink-offerings which men perform to this goddess. Nevertheless, all men make their first sacrifices to Zeus the Perfecter and Hera the Perfectress, because they are the originators and discoverers of all things, as we have stated above. To the Graces was given the adornment of personal appearance and the beautifying of each part of the body with an eye to making it more comely and pleasing to the gaze, and the further privilege of being the first to bestow benefactions and, on the other hand, of requiting with appropriate favours such men as have performed good acts. Eileithyia received the care of expectant mothers and the alleviation of the travail of childbirth; and for this reason women when they are in perils of this nature call first of all upon this goddess. And Artemis, we are told, discovered how to effect the healing of young children and the foods which are suitable to the nature of babes, this being the reason why she is also called Kourotraphos. And as for the Hours, as they are called, to each of them, according as her name indicates, was given the ordering and adornment of life, so as to serve to the greatest advantage of mankind; for there is nothing which is better able to build a life of felicity than obedience to law and justice and peace. To Athena men ascribe the gift to mankind of the domestication and

	cultivation of the olive-tree, as well as the preparation of its fruit; [...].
Ταῖς δὲ Μούσαις δοθῆναι παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν τῶν γραμμάτων εὕρεσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐπῶν σύνθεσιν τὴν προσαγορευομένην ποιητικὴν. [...]	To the Muses, we are further told, it was given by their father Zeus to discover the letters and to combine words in the way which is designated poetry. [...]
Ἡφαιστον δὲ λέγουσιν εὕρετὴν γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ τὸν σίδηρον ἐργασίας ἀπάσης καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν χαλκὸν καὶ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐργασίαν ἐπιδέχεται, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δὲ χρείας τὰς τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπάσας προσεξευρεῖν καὶ παραδοῦναι τοῖς τε τὰς τέχνας ἐργαζομένοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις· [...]	Hephaestus, we are told, was the discoverer of every manner of working iron and copper and gold and silver and everything else which requires fire for working, and he also discovered all the other uses to be made of fire and turned them over both to the workers in the crafts and to all other men as well. [...]
τὸν Ἄρην δὲ μυθολογοῦσι πρῶτον κατασκευάσαι πανοπλίαν καὶ στρατιώτας καθοπλίσαι καὶ τὴν ἐν ταῖς μάχαις ἐναγώνιον ἐνέργειαν εἰσηγήσασθαι, φονεύοντα τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας τοῖς θεοῖς.	Ares, the myths record, was the first to make a suit of armour, to fit out soldiers with arms, and to introduce the battle's fury of contest, slaying himself those who were disobedient to the gods.
Ἀπόλλωνα δὲ τῆς κιθάρας εὕρετὴν ἀναγορεύουσι καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὴν μουσικῆς· ἔτι δὲ τὴν ἱατρικὴν ἐπιστήμην ἐξενεγκεῖν διὰ τῆς μαντικῆς τέχνης γινομένην, δι' ἧς τὸ παλαιὸν συνέβαινε θεραπείας τυγχάνειν τοὺς ἀρρωστοῦντας· εὕρετὴν δὲ καὶ τοῦ τόξου γενόμενον διδάξαι τοὺς ἐγχωρίους τὰ περὶ τὴν τοξείαν, [...]. Ἀπόλλωνος δὲ καὶ Κορωνίδος Ἀσκληπιὸν γενηθέντα, καὶ πολλὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν εἰς ἱατρικὴν μαθόντα, προσεξευρεῖν τὴν τε χειρουργίαν καὶ τὰς τῶν φαρμάκων σκευασίας καὶ ῥιζῶν δυνάμεις, καὶ καθόλου προβιάσαι τὴν	And of Apollo men recount that he was the discoverer of the lyre and of the music which is got from it; that he introduced the knowledge of healing, which is brought about through the faculty of prophecy, whereby it was the practice in ancient times that the sick were healed; and as the discoverer of the bow he taught the people of the land all about the use of the bow, [...]. To Apollo and Coronis was born Asclepius, who learned from his father many matters which pertain to the healing art, and then went on to discover the art of surgery and the preparations of drugs and the strength to be found in roots, and, speaking generally, he introduced such

τέχνην ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὥστε ὡς ἀρχηγὸν αὐτῆς καὶ κτίστην τιμᾶσθαι.	advances into the healing art that he is honoured as if he were its source and founder.
Τῷ δ' Ἑρμῇ προσάπτουσι τὰς ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις γινομένας ἐπικηρυκείας καὶ διαλλαγὰς καὶ σπονδὰς καὶ τὸ τούτων σύσσημον κηρύκειον, ὃ φορεῖν εἰώθασιν οἱ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων τοὺς λόγους ποιούμενοι καὶ διὰ τούτου τυγχάνοντες παρὰ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀσφαλείας· [...]. φασὶ δ' αὐτὸν καὶ μέτρα καὶ σταθμὰ καὶ τὰ διὰ τῆς ἐμπορίας κέρδη πρῶτον ἐπινοῆσαι καὶ τὸ λάθρα τὰ τῶν ἄλλων σφετερίζεσθαι. παραδεδόσθαι δ' αὐτὸν καὶ κήρυκα τῶν θεῶν, ἔτι δ' ἄγγελον ἄριστον διὰ τὸ σαφῶς αὐτὸν ἕκαστα τῶν εἰς ἐντολὴν δοθέντων ἐρμηνεύειν· [...]	To Hermes men ascribe the introduction of the sending of embassies to sue for peace, as they are used in wars, and negotiations and truces and also the herald's wand, as a token of such matters, which is customarily borne by those who are carrying on conversations touching affairs of this kind and who, by means of it, are accorded safe conduct by the enemy [...]. They also say that he was the first to devise measures and weights and the profits to be gained through merchandising, and how also to appropriate the property of others all unknown to them. Tradition also says that he is the herald of the gods and their most trusted messenger, because of his ability to express clearly each command that has been given him [...].
Διόνυσον δὲ μυθολογοῦσιν εὐρετὴν γενέσθαι τῆς τ' ἀμπέλου καὶ τῆς περὶ ταύτην ἐργασίας, ἔτι δ' οἰνοποιίας καὶ τοῦ πολλοὺς τῶν ἐκ τῆς ὀπώρας καρπῶν ἀποθησαυρίζεσθαι καὶ τὰς χρείας καὶ τὰς τροφὰς παρέχεσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον [...].	As for Dionysus, the myths state that he discovered the vine and its cultivation, and also how to make wine and to store away many of the autumn fruits and thus to provide mankind with the use of them as food over a long time. This god was born in Crete, men say, of Zeus and Persephone [...].