CROSS-REFERENCES IN THE *BIBLIOTHEKE HISTORIKE* OF DIODOROS

C. I. R. RUBINCAM

A RECENT ARTICLE BY R. J. STARR[1] surveyed the use of cross-references in parts of the writings of eight Roman authors who wrote between the mid-first century B.C. and the early second century A.D., and drew some interesting conclusions concerning the vocabulary, specificity, and uses of these writers' cross-references. Starr found (431–433) that most cross-references were very imprecise, making use of common phrases such as *ut supra diximus* or *ut dicemus*, and that they normally traversed a very short distance, for both the scroll form in which these writers probably worked and the impossibility of producing standardized editions of any text in manuscript necessarily precluded reference by any regular division of the text. He also distinguished several different purposes served by cross-references in different kinds of writing. In general, they remind readers that the subject under discussion has been mentioned before or make them aware that it will come up again (434). More specifically, as he says, "In essays cross-references help organize and advance arguments by providing transitions and summaries" (435), while historians use them to "keep the reader abreast of the large number of people, places, and actions" referred to, and to "coordinate parallel accounts" (435). They also "provide a way to resume an earlier account after a digression or the intervention of other material" (436). The encyclopedist Pliny found cross-references of particular assistance in organizing an enormous "mass of facts without endless repetition" (436).

In this article I propose to survey the use of cross-references by a single Greek author, Diodoros. The vocabulary of his cross-references will, of course, be different. It will be found, however, that in different parts of the *Bibliotheke* cross-references are used in ways distinguished by Starr as characteristic of two different genres of writing. The main historical narrative, which makes up the bulk of the *Bibliotheke* (Books 7–40), naturally shows affinities with the practice of the Roman historians Caesar, Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus, whereas the introductory section of the work (Books 1–6), which collects a large and heterogeneous mass of geographic, ethnographic, and mythological information, much more resembles in its use of cross-references Pliny's *Natural History*.

---

[1] R. J. Starr, "Cross-references in Roman Prose," *AJP* 102 (1981) 431–437. This article will be cited henceforth by author's name alone.

Cross-references in the *Bibliotheke* refer both backwards and forwards. For some purposes both types can be grouped together, but for others separate consideration is necessary.

CROSS-REFERENCES FORWARDS IN THE *BIBLIOTHEKE*

If we look first at the vocabulary of Diodoros' forward cross-references, we find that the commonest verb by far is ἀναγράφειν, most often in the form ἀναγράψομεν. Slightly less commonly the promise to treat a particular subject later on is expressed by διέξιμεν or πειρασόμεθα διελθεῖν, or by the simple ἐροῦμεν. A few other verbs also occur, more rarely, while in certain cases an unusual purpose for the cross-reference dictates a special, unique form of words.[2]

The situation that most often gives rise to these cross-references to later parts of the text is the occurrence of a chance mention, in connection with the main subject under discussion, of some person, situation, place, event, or whatever, of which Diodoros plans to give a full account in its own right at some later stage in the *Bibliotheke*. The cross-reference, therefore, usually includes the specification τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγράψομεν, or τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβῶς ἀναγράψομεν, or τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀκριβέστερον ἐροῦμεν, or, less commonly, ἕκαστον ἀναγράψομεν σαφέστερον. Sometimes the specification μικρὸν ὕστερον is added.

Let us now look more closely at the specificity of the cross-references. I have counted 53 forward cross-references in the *Bibliotheke*.[3] Six of these (2.17.3, 15.48.4, 16.8.7, 17.1.4, 17.6.3, 19.59.6) look forward only in general terms to the immediately following stretch of narrative. Fourteen specify that the matter in question will be treated (μικρὸν) ὕστερον, six of these passages making cross-reference from one part of the archaeological section (Books 1–6) to another, and seven from one part to another of the main historical narrative (Books 7–40), while one refers from the archaeological section to part of the main historical narrative. The distance across which these references carry varies from four sections to about seven books.[4] At the other end of the range of specificity, there is one passage (11.90.4; cf. 12.9.1 ff.) which refers forward specifically to the following book, while nine passages promise a fuller treatment of the point

---

[2]The actual figures are: ἀναγράψομεν, 26; ἀναγράψαι πειρασόμεθα, 2; διέξιμεν, 8; πειρασόμεθα διελθεῖν, 1; ἐροῦμεν, 6; δηλώσομεν, 2; μνησθησόμεθα, 1; ἐπιμνησθησόμεθα, 1; ὁ προιὼν λόγος δηλώσει, 1; μηνύσει . . . προιὼν ὁ λόγος, 1; αἱ κατὰ μέρος πράξεις δηλώσουσι, 2; αἱ κατὰ μέρος πράξεις μηνύσουσι, 1; τὸ γενόμενον βεβαιώσει τὸ νῦν εἰρημένον, 1. A complete tabulation of all the cross-references discussed in this article will be found in the Appendix (below, 54 ff.).

[3]Excluding statements that are really topic sentences, summarizing the contents of the immediately following section of the work, as, e.g., 1.6.2, 1.9.4, 2.1.3, 18.75.3.

[4]See the tabulation of all the cross-references in the Appendix (below, 54 ff.).

mentioned in connection with some particular subject matter.[5] The short-
est distance traversed in this group is two chapters, and the longest 21
books,[6] but it is noteworthy that only two of these cross-references are
picked up within the same book. As regards the nature of these cross-
references, four refer forward within the archaeological books (1–6), three
refer from the archaeological books to parts of the main narrative (Books
7–40), while the last one refers from one part to another of the historical
narrative.

In between the vagueness of the passages that promise to revert to the
subject in question μικρὸν ὕστερον and the relative specificity of the passages
that look forward across a few chapters or several books to an anticipated
fuller discussion under a particular rubric falls a large group of 29 cross-
references which specify only that the fuller treatment will take place "at
the proper time" or "at a more appropriate time." A variety of phrases
involving χρόνος or καιρός are used in these passages, the commonest being
ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις.[7]

CROSS-REFERENCES BACKWARDS IN THE *BIBLIOTHEKE*

So much for the vocabulary, specificity, and frequency of cross-references
forwards. Of cross-references backwards I have counted 42. The commonest
form of words is a parenthetical καθάπερ προείρηται or καθότι προείρηται.
Next in order of frequency comes the personal form of the same verb,
προειρήκαμεν, followed by two forms of ἀναγράφειν, and a scattering of less
common expressions.[8]

As regards specificity the references range from a group of nine which
specify a particular book or books in the earlier portion of the *Bibliotheke*,

---

[5] 2.15.5: ὅταν καὶ τὰς παλαιὰς [sc. τῶν Αἰθιόπων] πράξεις καὶ μυθολογίας διεξίωμεν (cf. 3
passim); 3.38.2: ὅταν τὰς Γαίου Καίσαρος πράξεις ἀναγράφωμεν (cf. 40.7.2); 3.61.3: ἐν τοῖς
περὶ Κρήτης (cf. 5.64.1 ff.); 3.67.4: ὅταν τάς πράξεις αὐτοῦ [sc. Ὀρφέως] διεξίωμεν (cf. 4 and
5, passim); 4.15.4: ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν στρατείᾳ (cf. 4.42.1 ff. and 49.3 ff.); 4.32.1: ἐν
τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις (cf. 4.42.1 and 49.3 ff.) 5.22.1: ὅταν ἐπὶ τὴν Καίσαρας γενομένην στρατείαν
εἰς Πρετανίαν παραγενηθῶμεν (cf. 40.7.4); 5.37.4: ὅταν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀρχιμέδους ἡλικίαν ἔλθωμεν
(cf. 26.18.1 ff.); 17.114.4: ὅταν τὸν περὶ τῆς ἐκφορᾶς [sc. τῆς τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου] λόγον ἀποδῶμεν
(cf. 17.116.1 ff.)

[6] Leaving out of account the two promises to discuss Julius Caesar's exploits in
Britain and Gaul, which were almost certainly not fulfilled. (On the general question of
unfulfilled cross-references in the *Bibliotheke* see below, n. 27.)

[7] For the details see the full tabulation in the Appendix (below, 54 ff.). In six cases a
double specification is found: (μικρὸν) ὕστερον is combined with a more specific direction
either to the "appropriate time" (at 2.32.3, 16.65.9, 18.53.7) or to a certain context (at
2.15.5, 4.32.1, and 17.114.4).

[8] The actual figures are: καθότι προείρηται, 10; καθάπερ προείρηται, 6; καθάπερ/ὡς προ-
ειρήκαμεν, 3; καθάπερ/ὡς προεῖπον, 3; ὡς εἴρηται, 1; καθάπερ ἀνεγράψαμεν, 1; προειρήκαμεν,
7; προειρηκότες, 1; ἀναγεγράφαμεν, 4; ἀνεγράψαμεν, 1; εἴρηται, 2; διήλθομεν, 2; ἡ πρὸ ταύτης
περιέχει βύβλος, 1. This makes a total of 24 parenthetical expressions, and 18 non-
parenthetical.

through five which specify a context, and four which give vaguer specifications,[9] to the large group of 25 which include no specification whatever. Some regular patterns can be discerned in Diodoros' usage here.

First of all, and most obviously, the forms προείρηται and προεῖπον appear always in a parenthetical phrase introduced by καθάπερ or καθότι, and are never accompanied by any further specification of the earlier passage to which they direct attention, except at 31.26.4, where Diodoros adds the vague ἤδη. These cross-references normally go back a very short distance in the text.[10]

With the exception of 11.67.2, which refers back 47 chapters, and 31.26.4, which refers back to the previous book (in this case ἤδη is added), the extent of text traversed by these references varies only between one section (11.84.8 to 11.84.7) and about ten chapters (2.32.6 to 2.23.1 ff.). Obviously, when Diodoros was referring back such a short distance, he had no need to include any specification of what passage he meant his reader to think back to, but he also lacked any means of making his reference more specific, save for such vague additions as ἤδη, μικρῷ πρότερον (16.78.4, referring back most particularly to 16.61.1 ff., although other relevant material is found also at 16.56.8, 58.5–6, and 64.2), or ἐν ἄλλοις (3.31.4, referring back to 3.1 ff. and also to Book 1 *passim*). As Starr observed in his survey of Roman writers' practice, "many references go back a very short distance, thereby making precision unnecessary" (433).

When making more precise references to earlier parts of the text, Diodoros uses the forms προειρήκαμεν (four times), προειρηκότες (once), ἀναγεγράφαμεν (twice), ἀνεγράψαμεν (once), διήλθομεν (twice), εἴρηται (twice), and ἡ πρὸ ταύτης βύβλος (once). As one would expect, references specifying in which book the reader will find the related matter treated can go back much further than the unspecific cross-references discussed above, but seven of the nine cases involve a reference to the immediately preceding book or books,[11] the first three of these referring between two parts of the archaeological section of the *Bibliotheke*, and the other four between two parts of the historical narrative. Only two passages refer back across a substantial number of books: 16.46.4 (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ) goes back to 1.30.4–9, while 20.57.6 (ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ βίβλῳ) is apparently mistaken in its reference to

[9]Particular book(s) specified: 4.1.6, 5.35.2, 6.1.5, 12.2.2, 16.46.5, 18.9.1, 19.3.3, 19.10.3, 20.57.6; context specified: 1.82.6, 3.41.1, 3.62.2, 5.35.2, 5.78.4; vaguer specifications: ἐν ἄλλοις, 3.31.4; ἐν οἰκειοτέροις, 5.75.4; ἤδη, 31.26.4; μικρῷ πρότερον, 16.78.4. 5.35.2, εἴρηται . . . καὶ ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις ἐν ταῖς περὶ Ἡρακλέους πράξεσι, is unusual in mentioning both a specific book and a context. Hence this passage is counted in both these categories in the Appendix (below, 61).

[10]See the Appendix (below, 58 ff.) for details.

[11]4.1.6: ἐν ταῖς προειρημέναις βίβλοις, referring back to ἐν . . . ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις τρισίν at 4.1.5; 5.35.2: καὶ ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις ἐν ταῖς περὶ Ἡρακλέους πράξεσι; 6.1.5: ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλαις; 18.9.1: ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βύβλῳ; 19.3.3: ἡ πρὸ ταύτης περιέχει βύβλος; 19.10.3: ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ βύβλῳ; 12.2.2: ἐν δυσὶ βίβλοις, ταύτῃ τε καὶ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης.

Book 3.[12] These last two are the only passages that traverse the gap between the historical narrative and the archaeological section of the text, for all five of the cross-references which contain some specification by context involve pairs of passages within the archaeological section.[13]

PURPOSES SERVED BY DIODOROS' CROSS-REFERENCES

What of the purposes served by Diodoros' cross-references? Since the passages analyzed by Starr mostly refer backward, it will be convenient to take Diodoros' backward references first. These can be analyzed into three types, as follows: first, resumptive statements, returning to the main thread of narrative or exposition after a short digression; second, "encyclopedic" signposts, directing the reader to another of several places in the complex construction of the *Bibliotheke* at which a particular subject is treated; and third, "annalistic" cross-references, which attempt to overcome the breaking up of related subject matter by the division of the historical narrative into annals. The first type, resumptive statements, is sometimes introduced by the particles μὲν οὖν.[14] They generally carry over very short distances, only a few sections or chapters, and they are found in both Books 1–6 and Books 7–40. I would assign 15 of the 42 backward references to this category.[15] My second type I have called "encyclopedic" since they knit together parallel accounts of the same subject matter which inevitably occur, often widely separated, in the course of such a wide-ranging and complex work as the *Bibliotheke*. The distance over which these references carry

[12] If the editors are correct in thinking that the matter in question, the foundation of Meschela in Libya by Greeks on their way home from the Trojan War, was actually reported in Book 7 (the passage at 20.57.6 is listed in Vogel's Teubner edition as a fragment of that almost entirely lost book, 7.7), then Diodoros' mistake is readily understandable: he might well have found it hard to remember whether an event that took place in Libya in the generation following the Trojan War had been narrated in the summary account of Libya in Book 3 or in the first book of the main historical narrative. In any case, this mistake exemplifies the hazards of referring back to books written a number of years earlier, of which the author would no longer have a clear memory. (The problems of such unfulfilled cross-references in the *Bibliotheke* merit independent treatment: see below, n. 27.)

[13] 1.86.2: ἐν τοῖς θεολογουμένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν [sc. τῶν Αἰγυπτίων] (cf. 1.21.1); 3.41.1: ὅτι Πτολεμαίου τὴν ἐλεφάντων θήραν ἀπηγγείλαμεν (cf. 3.18.4); 3.62.1: ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτιακοῖς (cf. 1.11.3 and *passim*); 5.78.4: ὅτε τὰ περὶ Δαίδαλον ἀνεγράψομεν (cf. 4.79.1–2; 5.35.2), which is counted both in the category of "context" and in that of "specific books," because it contains both kinds of specification, is an uncompleted reference, but the context mentioned, τὰ περὶ Ἡρακλέους, is found in Book 4.

[14] See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*[2] (Oxford 1954), 470–473, who labels this usage "retrospective and transitional οὖν with prospective μέν" (470), and observes (472) that it is "very frequent in prose," where "often the μέν clause sums up and rounds off the old topic, while the δέ clause introduces the new one."

[15] The details of this analysis can be seen in the section of the chart headed "Purpose" in the Appendix (below, 58 ff.).

is usually much longer than for the resumptive references, and they are found connecting passages within Books 1–6 and between Books 1–6 and Books 7–40. This category comprises 19 passages. Thirdly, "annalistic" references, so called because they result from the limitations of annalistically organized historical narrative, traverse usually some intermediate distance between resumptive and encyclopedic cross-references, and are found only within Books 7–40. The remaining eight passages belong in this category. It will be seen that my three categories of cross-reference correspond roughly to the specialized purposes that Starr discerned in the historical works that he analyzed and in Pliny's *Natural History*. Thus for historians he concluded that cross-references "provide a way to resume an earlier account after a digression or the intervention of other material" (436)—my "resumptive" type—as well as to "keep the reader abreast of the large number of people, places, and actions" referred to, and to "coordinate parallel accounts" (435)—my "annalistic" type. As for my "encyclopedic" type, although Starr did not define specifically the nature of the cross-references used by Pliny, he did attempt to explain the unusually high rate of cross-reference in the *Natural History* by the peculiar organizational difficulties posed by the compilation of an encyclopedic work (436).

Forward cross-references can be classified into three very similar types. Correlative to backward "resumptive" statements are forward "anticipatory" statements, which note that certain details have been mentioned slightly in advance of their logical place in the narrative or exposition. These, like their backward counterparts, usually traverse very short distances, and are found within both sections of the *Bibliotheke*, 1–6 and 7–40. Six of the 53 forward cross-references are of this type. Second, "encyclopedic" forward references are the obvious counterparts to "encyclopedic" backward references, and behave similarly: they also traverse relatively long distances, and make reference either within Books 1–6 or between 1–6 and 7–40. There are 27 references of this type. The third type, "annalistic" forward references, often comprise a summary of the career of some famous person, or the extrapolation of a general pattern from the narrative, both of these being comments of a kind that cannot be easily made within the bounds of annalistic structure. The distance traversed by these references varies from one chapter to about one and a half books, and they occur only in Books 7–40. There are 20 references of this type.[16]

To summarize, the *Bibliotheke* appears to contain examples of two kinds of cross-references (the resumptive/anticipatory[17] and the annalistic) which Starr found to be characteristic of historical works, and a third type (the

[16]For details of the forward cross-references see Appendix (below, 54–59.)

[17]Since most of Starr's Roman authors used only backward cross-references (see below, 51), he saw no need to distinguish these two reciprocal forms of what is essentially the same kind of reference.

encyclopedic) which I have argued to be characteristic of encyclopedias or compendious collections of miscellaneous material. The incidence of the three types is not, however, uniform throughout. The first type, the resumptive/anticipatory, is found in both sections of the work, the encyclopedic books, 1–6, and the historical books, 7–40. This type, I would argue, is not specific to one genre, but can be used, in different forms, in several.[18] The encyclopedic type of reference, however, occurs only within Books 1–6, i.e., making reference from one part to another of these books, or connecting the two sections of the work, i.e., referring from the encyclopedic to the historical section or *vice versa*. Annalistic references, in their turn, can occur by definition only within the historical part of the *Bibliotheke*, 7–40. I think this pattern of distribution reflects the difference of genre between Books 1–6 and Books 7–40, the former section resembling Pliny's encyclopedic work, the latter historical works such as those of Livy and Tacitus.[19]

Some correlation appears, as one might expect, between the purpose of a cross-reference and its phraseology. Among the backward references all 15 of the resumptive type take the simplest form, of a parenthetical two-word phrase consisting of καθάπερ, καθότι, or ὡς with a verb ([προ]είρηται, προειρήκαμεν, or προεῖπον) but without any helping expression.[20] Only five of the encyclopedic references and two of the annalistic type take this form. Three more of the encyclopedic references consist of just a simple verb, not in a parenthetic construction, but with no helping expression. The remaining eleven encyclopedic references and six annalistic ones include some kind of helping expression. This is all as one would expect. Resumptive cross-references, which normally carry over only a few sections or chapters, can be brief and parenthetic, whereas annalistic and encyclopedic references have a tendency to be more specific, in order to supply some of the more detailed information that the reader needs to look backwards across a number of chapters or books.

Since all the forward references contain helping expressions, any analysis that attempts to relate phraseology to purpose must be at a finer level. The most general kind of helper, a simple μικρὸν ὕστερον, occurs in a few cases of each type. However, eight out of the nine references that include context are of the encyclopedic type, while passages that promise to revert to a particular subject matter "at the proper time or place" divide 17 to 12 between the categories "encyclopedic" and "annalistic." Once again the more specific information is found in those types of cross-reference that require it because they traverse longer distances.

[18]Note Starr's description (435) of a similar resumptive use of cross-references in the philosophical works he surveyed.

[19]See further below, 49, for further discussion of this point.

[20]This is Starr's term for any additional word or phrase that limits in some way the vagueness of the cross-reference.

COMPARISON OF DIODOROS' CROSS-REFERENCES WITH THOSE
OF NINE ROMAN AUTHORS

So much for the details of Diodoros' practice in making cross-reference. Some more systematic comparisons can now be attempted of Diodoros' usage with Starr's findings for his Roman authors. Tables 1 and 2 set out the data concerning cross-references in the nine Latin works analyzed by Starr and in Diodoros' *Bibliotheke* as far as possible in comparable form. Look first of all at the general incidence of cross-references.[21]

The Latin authors range from Livy (1–5) and Suetonius (*De vita Caesarum*) at the low end of the scale, then in order through Tacitus (*Ann.* 1–6), Seneca (*De ira*), Sallust (*Cat.*), Caesar (*BC*), and his continuators (*BH, BAl,* and *BAf*), to Cicero (*Off.*) and Pliny (*HN* 8–11) at the upper end. If genre of writing were the only factor that determined how frequently an author used cross-references, then the separation of the two philosophical works on the scale (Cicero's *De officiis* has the second highest rate, while Seneca's *De ira* ranks sixth) would be surprising. The historical writers do seem to fall into two groups: the minor Caesarian works, Caesar's *Bellum civile*, and Sallust's *Catilina* rank third, fourth, and fifth, respectively, while Tacitus' *Annales*, Suetonius' *De vita Caesarum*, and Livy fall at the lowest end of the scale. One might hypothesize, therefore, that writers of shorter and more concentrated historical works use more cross-references than writers of full-scale histories. Pliny's *Natural History* is a unique example of an encyclopedia. Starr commented on its relatively high frequency of cross-references, and suggested that this might be related to the encyclopedist's special need for signposts to help organize a huge and varied mass of material without too much repetition (436), and also that those who consult such an encyclopedia need more direction from one section to another discussing similar subject matter because they will probably not read through the whole text, as they would a narrative history or a philosophical essay, and thus come upon similar passages for themselves (433). As for the philosophical writers, Starr noted (435) that cross-references provide a useful means of summarizing the purport of an argument as a foundation for the next stage. That Cicero used this device much more frequently than Seneca should warn us against attributing the variations between one work and another in respect of cross-references exclusively to the influence of genre: clearly, individual writers' style played an important role.

How does Diodoros compare with the Roman writers surveyed by Starr? In overall frequency of cross-references he falls near the low end of the

---

[21]Here the figures for the number of words in each text are only approximate estimates, but the variation from one author to another is great enough that it should not be affected by this imprecision.

Table 1   Summary Figures for Diodoros' Cross-References

	Forwards	Backwards	Totals	%Forwards Total	%Backwards Total	%Overall Total	%Horizontal Fwds	%Horizontal Bwds
With helping expression	47	17	64	89%	40%	67%	74%	27%
Without helping expression	6	25	31	11%	60%	33%	19%	81%
Crossing book boundaries	30	12	42	57%	29%	44%	71%	29%
Within the same book	23	30	53	43%	71%	56%	43%	57%
Specific book mentioned	1	9	10	2%	21%	11%	10%	90%
Context mentioned	8	4	12	15%	12%	14%	62%	38%
"At appropriate time"	29	1	30	55%	2%	32%	97%	3%
Definitely completed	34	36	70	64%	86%	74%	49%	51%
Probably completed	14	1	15	26%	2%	16%	94%	6%
Improbably completed	5	5	10	9%	12%	10%	50%	50%
Totals	53	42	95				56%	44%

Notes

1. Cross-references containing more than one helping expression are counted here in the more specific category: e.g., 5.35.2, which gives a reference both to specific books and to a context, is counted in the former category; 16.65.9, which contains both a minimal specification (μικρὸν ὕστερον) and one to the appropriate time, is counted in the latter category.

2. 12.2.2 is a unique case of a reference both forwards and backwards. It is counted here in the latter class.

Table 2   *Summary Figures for Cross-References in Roman Authors*

	Rate per 10,000 words	With Helper	Without Helper	Forwards	Backwards	Across Book-Boundary	Specific Context Appropriate			Totals
							Book-Boundary	Book	Time	
Pliny, *HN* 8–11	25.569	29 48%	32 52%	8 13%	53 87%	27 44%	0	5 8%	5 8%	61
Cicero, *De off.*	11.74	30 70%	13 30%	0	43		5 12%	0	1 2%	43
[Caesar], *BH, BAl, BAf*	9.527	22 71%	9 29%	0	31	N/A	N/A	0	0	31
Caesar, *BC*	9.497	18 53%	16 47%	0	34		0	0	0	34
Sallust, *Cat.*	7.138	6 86%	1 14%	0	7	N/A	N/A	0	0	7
Seneca, *De ira*	6.378	5 33%	10 67%	0	15		2 13%	0	0	15
Tacitus, *Ann.* 1–6	5.609	9 31%	20 69%	3 10%	26 90%		1 3%	0	3 10%	29
Suetonius, *XII Caesars*	1.296	3 30%	7 70%	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Livy 1–5	0.532	4 67%	2 33%	0	6	1	0	0	0	6
Totals		125	110	11	224		8	5	9	236
%		53%	47%	5%	95%					

Note

Starr gives no precise figures for references across book-boundaries in works other than Pliny *HN*. However, his discussion on pages 433–434 clearly implies that the incidence in Pliny is by far the highest he found in any of the works he sampled.

scale, between Tacitus' *Annales* and Suetonius' *De vita Caesarum*. How-
ever, Diodoros' cross-references are not distributed evenly throughout the
Bibliotheke: a disproportionately high percentage of the total (56 of 93,[22]
or 60%) come from the first five books, an average rate of just over 11
per book as compared to only 3.7 per book in 11–20. The overall average
rate of cross-reference in the *Bibliotheke* is 2.186 per 10000 words of text;
while the rate for Books 1–5 rises to 4.313, almost twice the overall average
rate, and that for Books 11–20 sinks to 1.252, just over half the overall
average rate. Even though these two sections of the *Bibliotheke* do not fall
at significantly different points on the scale of Roman authors, I think it
likely that the difference in the frequency of cross-references between them
has to do with their difference of genre. Books 11–20 contain historical
narrative annalistically arranged, not so different from that in Tacitus' *An-
nals* or Livy's *History*. Starr pointed out how Tacitus uses cross-references
to compensate for the disjointing effect of annalistic structure (435). This
tends to be the predominant reason for Diodoros' cross-references in his
main historical narrative: when he wants either to remind the reader of
details mentioned in a previous year's narrative, or to point out some large
development of events which has to be extrapolated from the details of
several years' narrative, he uses cross-references, sometimes mentioning
specifically his concern not to violate annalistic structure (e.g., at 13.37.6,
15.39.3). The introductory books of the *Bibliotheke*, on the other hand,
contain not annalistic history, but ἀρχαιολογία/μυθολογία, which means in
fact a collection of very varied geographic, ethnographic, and mythologi-
cal material. This kind of subject matter required much more deliberate
organization by its compiler, who must have found himself in a situation
resembling that of Pliny the encyclopedist. Thus it seems to me possible
that the difference in the frequency of cross-reference between the encyclo-
pedic archaeological section (Books 1–5) and the annalistic narrative sec-
tion (Books 11–20) of the *Bibliotheke* is due in part at least to some of the
same factors that led the encyclopedist Pliny to use cross-references much
more frequently than the historians Tacitus and Livy.

More interesting than these observations and hypotheses based on the
comparison of overall rates of cross-reference in Diodoros and in the Roman
authors are some of the differences in the finer details of usage. Starr
suggested several levels of analysis of the specificity of cross-references.
Most generally, he noted that "helping words or phrases (e.g., *supra*) occur
frequently in cross-references" (432). Table 2 displays the incidence of
such helping words in his nine Roman authors. Sallust has the highest

[22]The total number of cross-references is here given as 93, whereas throughout most
of the text and in the tables the overall total for Diodoros is given as 95. This is due
to the deliberate exclusion for the purpose of the present argument of the two passages
that occur in the fragmentary books (viz., 6.1.5 and 31.26.4).

proportion of cross-references including helping words (86%). The order thereafter runs: minor Caesarian works (71%), Cicero (70%), Livy (67%), Caesar (53%), Pliny (48%), Seneca (33%), Tacitus (31%), and Suetonius (30%). Diodoros, with 67% of his cross-references including a helping word, ranks with Livy, well in the top half of the sample of Roman authors. The mere addition, however, of such a general helping word as *supra* hardly gives the reader much help in finding the passage to which the author is referring. A finer analysis of the kinds of helping words used in cross-references is needed. The most specific direction an ancient writer could give was to a particular book of his work. Since texts were not regularly divided into subsections of a standard size smaller than books, finer reference within a book could only be either by context or by allusion to some obvious general principle on which the work was organized. Reference by specific books turns out to be surprisingly rare: among all the 236 cross-references collected by Starr, only eight include such specifications (five in Cicero, two in Seneca, and one in Tacitus), a rate of only 3.4% of the total.[23] The highest rate in any individual author is 13% in Seneca, followed by 12% in Cicero. In the *Bibliotheke* there are ten of these references to specific books, which thus make up 10.5% of the total of 95 cross-references. Among the Roman authors reference by context is found five times, all of them in Pliny. This category thus constitutes 8% of the 61 cross-references in Pliny. For the *Bibliotheke* the comparable figure is 12 of 95, or 13%. The third way of making a cross-reference more specific, the allusion to some obvious principle of organization, is typified by statements in the Roman authors that the matter in question has been or will be discussed elsewhere *suo loco*, "in its proper place," while the comparable phrase in Diodoros is ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις.[24] Here the difference between the Roman authors and Diodoros becomes more striking. Only nine of Starr's 236 cross-references were of this type (= 4%), one in Cicero (2% of that author's total), five in Pliny (8%), and three in Tacitus (10%), whereas this category made up 30 of Diodoros' 95 cross-references (= 32%). If one counts together these three most specific kinds of cross-reference, the total for the Roman authors is 22 out of 236 (= 9.3%), whereas 52 of Diodoros' 95 cross-references (= 55%) contain these more specific helping expressions. Thus while Diodoros ranks only moderately high among the Roman authors by the simplest criterion of specificity in his cross-references, he outdoes them all significantly when the degree of specificity is taken into account.

[23]It should be noted that reference from one book to another within the same work is not possible in Sallust's *Catilina* and the minor Caesarian works, each of which consists of only one book.

[24]Other, equivalent, phrases are: ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις χρόνοις, ἐν οἰκειοτέροις καιροῖς, ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις καιροῖς, κατὰ τοὺς οἰκείους χρόνους; also ἐπὶ or πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους χρόνους used with a verb implying motion.

This very high incidence of certain kinds of specification in Diodoros appears to correlate with another unusual aspect of his cross-references. Only two of the Roman authors in the sample (Pliny and Tacitus) make cross-references forwards as well as backwards, and in neither case do the forward cross-references make up a large proportion of the total: they are 13% for Pliny and 10% for Tacitus. In Diodoros, by contrast, 53 of the 95 cross-references, or 56% of the overall total, refer forwards. Of his forward references 89%, as opposed to only 40% of his backward references, include some kind of helping expression. Furthermore, 72% of the helping expressions attached to the forward references, as compared to only 35% of the helping expressions used with the backward references, are of the three most specific types discussed above (viz., references to specific books, to contexts, or to another discussion of the subject "at the proper time or place"). It seems clear, therefore, that the high incidence of forward references in Diodoros is related to the high incidence of more specific helping expressions used with cross-references.

Another factor also seems to enter into the picture here, namely, the distance across which references carry. Starr noted of his Roman authors that "many references go back a very short distance, thereby rendering precision unnecessary" (433); in other words, a correlation seems likely between lack of precision and reference across a short distance. Only in Pliny, who, as he pointed out, "was faced with prodigious problems of organizing his material" (434), did he find a significant proportion of the cross-references carrying over long stretches of text: "In Pliny, *HN* 8–11 ... almost one-half of the 61 cross-references pass over one or more book boundaries, while only 13 allude to material less than 10 sections away" (434). In Diodoros 35 of the 85 definitely or probably completed cross-references,[25] or 41%, pass over a book boundary, a similar proportion to that in Pliny. In Diodoros, however, there is a much clearer correlation between distance traversed and specificity of reference: 55% of the gross total of 95 cross-references include one of the three most specific types of helping expression; and all but three of the most general cross-references are to passages within the same book.

The use of cross-references is an aspect of ancient historiography which appears not to have been very systematically studied, although for certain works arguments concerning the process of composition have been based on them.[26] The attempt made here to quantify Diodoros' use of cross-references and to compare the *Bibliotheke* in this respect with a number of Latin works shows that Diodoros was by the ancient standard thus

[25]Ten of the overall total of 95 Diodoran cross-references were either certainly or probably not completed. See the tabulation in the Appendix (below, 54 ff., and n. 27).

[26]See, for example, J. E. Powell, *The History of Herodotus* (Cambridge 1939).

established unusually specific in his cross-references, especially those refer-
ring forwards, of which he makes much more lavish use than any of the
Roman authors surveyed.[27] This suggests that he was conscious of, and
spent some time wrestling with, the problems of organization presented by
his unusually encyclopedic work.[28] The process of collecting and organiz-
ing the material for the first six books alone must have been very long and
demanding. A true estimate of the labour involved in organizing, as well
as in collecting, the materials for his uniquely compendious work makes it
easier to understand why he might not have begun the actual process of
literary composition until perhaps half of his 30-year period had elapsed—a
view recently reiterated by several scholars on other grounds.[29]

   The *Bibliotheke* is a work which we read generally for want of the better
and fuller narrative histories which it has supplanted, and it is fair to say
that its general unevenness and its many imperfections of detail justify

---

[27]In this study I have deliberately avoided raising the question whether Diodoros took
over some of his cross-references from the earlier works which he used as his sources.
This has, of course, been suggested, especially in the case of some of the unfulfilled cross-
references (on which see above, n. 25, and the Appendix [below, 54 ff.]). It seemed to me
that a survey of all the cross-references in the *Bibliotheke* was a necessary preliminary
to the discussion of these particular problem cases. I hope to devote another paper to
this problem in the near future. Given that the category I have called "certainly un-
fulfilled cross-references" comprises only ten out of the total of 95 passages, the general
conclusions drawn in this paper about Diodoros' use of cross-references should not be
subverted, even if it were decided that in all these problem cases the cross-reference was
taken over from Diodoros' source of the moment.

   One of the journal's referees suggested, however, that the conclusions of this paper
would be considerably strengthened if I included a rough count of the number of cross-
references that cross over boundaries between sources. This is, of course, not an entirely
simple matter, as some questions regarding the sources used by Diodoros remain contro-
versial. However, if one treats as standard the account of the sources of Diodoros given
by Schwartz in his article in *RE* 5 (1905) 663 ff., the following figures can be compiled:

	Definitely fulfilled	Probably fulfilled	Improbably fulfilled	Total
Forwards	9	11	3	23 out of 53
Backwards	6	1	2	9 out of 42

   I note that none of the forward cross-references in this group are found in the an-
nalistic books. The particular passages concerned are indicated by * in the tables of
cross-references in the Appendix.

   [28]As Starr says, defining the last of several functions which he saw as fulfilled by
the cross-references he studied in his survey of nine Roman authors: "Cross-references
assert the author's presence in his work and his control over his material," a function
which "by itself explains very few passages, but ... may underlie other more obvious
purposes" (437).

   [29]See C. Rubincam, "The Organization and Composition of Diodoros' *Bibliotheke
Historike*," *EMC/CV* NS 6 (1987) 313–328, esp. 323 and 324–328.

to a large extent the negative judgments so often passed upon it. Those
negative judgments, and the desire to use Diodoros' work as a means of
recovering something of the lost works that lie behind it, as well as the sheer
bulk of the *Bibliotheke*, have caused it to be most often studied piecemeal.
Now that computer technology has provided us with the tools to study the
text as a whole,[30] it has become possible to investigate systematically some
important aspects of Diodoros' historiographical practice in general. I hope
that the light thrown here on one aspect of the *Bibliotheke*'s composition
will be found to contribute helpfully to the intelligent use of this work as
a source for many periods of ancient history.[31]

ERINDALE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
MISSISSAUGA, ONT. L5L 1C6

APPENDIX: TABULATION OF CROSS-REFERENCES

Forward Cross-References

Ref.	Form of words
1.15.3	περὶ οὗ τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
1.31.9	περὶ ... τούτων τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρὸν ὕστερον ἀναγράψομεν
1.50.7*	περὶ ... ταύτης τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
1.69.1*	τὰς λοιπὰς [sc. πράξεις] ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
1.92.3*	ὑπὲρ οὗ τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρὸν ὕστερον ἀναγράψομεν
2.15.5*	τὰ κυριώτατα καὶ μνήμης ἄξια μικρὸν ὕστερον ἀναγράψομεν, ὅταν καὶ τὰς παλαιὰς αὐτῶν πράξεις καὶ μυθολογίας διεξίωμεν
2.17.3	περὶ ὧν ἀκριβέστερον ὁ προιὼν λόγος δηλώσει
2.31.2*	ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡμεῖς τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν οἰκειοτέροις ἀναγράψομεν καιροῖς
2.31.2*	ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡμεῖς τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν οἰκειοτέροις ἀναγράψομεν καιροῖς
2.32.3*	περὶ ὧν νῦν ἡμεῖς τὰ κεφάλαια προειρηκότες τὰ κατὰ μέρος ὕστερον ἀκριβῶς ἀναγράψομεν, ἐπειδὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκείους χρόνους ἐπιβάλωμεν
2.34.6*	περὶ ὧν ἡμεῖς τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις χρόνοις ἀκριβῶς ἀναγράψομεν
3.16.2	περὶ ἧς μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν
3.38.2*	διέξιμεν, ὅταν τὰς Γαΐου Καίσαρος πράξεις ἀναγράφωμεν
3.44.8*	περὶ οὗ τὰς κατὰ μέρος εὐχρηστίας ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις πειρασόμεθα διελθεῖν
3.54.1	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρὸν ὕστερον διέξιμεν
3.61.3*	περὶ ὧν ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς περὶ Κρήτης τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγράψομεν
3.67.4*	τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγράψομεν, ὅταν τὰς πράξεις αὐτοῦ διεξίωμεν
4.15.4	περὶ ... τούτων ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν στρατείᾳ τὰ κατὰ μέρος διέξιμεν
4.23.4*	περὶ ... τούτων τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
4.29.6*	περὶ ... τούτων ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
4.32.1	περὶ ὧν ἐν τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρὸν ὕστερον διέξιμεν
4.55.3*	περὶ ὧν ἐν οἰκειοτέροις μνησθησόμεθα καιροῖς
4.58.5*	ὧν τὰς πράξεις ἀναγράψομεν, ὅταν εἰς ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους παραγενηθῶμεν
5.3.6*	περὶ ὧν ἀκριβῶς ἀναγράψομεν ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις
5.6.4*	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
5.21.2*	περὶ ... τούτων τὰς κατὰ μέρος πράξεις ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν

1. In the column headed "Specificity" the symbol "g′" indicates that the general cross-reference in question includes absolutely no helping expression, while "g" signifies the presence of a minimal helping expression, such as μικρὸν ὕστερον or ἤδη.

COMPLEMENTARY REF(S)	DISTANCE TRAVERSED Book same	other	FULFILMENT d(efinite) p(robable) i(mprob.)			SPECIFICITY b(ook) a(ppr. time) c(ontext) g(eneral)			PURPOSE e(ncyc.) r(esump./ anticip.) a(nnal.)
1.45.4	30 chs		d			a			e
1.63.9	22 chs		d					g	e
17.52.1 ff.; 18.28.1 ff.		16/17 bks	d			a			e
11.2.1 ff. & passim		10 bks	d			a			e
3,4,5 passim esp. 4.25.3		2½ bks	d					g	e
3 passim	45 chs		d				c		e
2.19.1 ff.	2 chs		d					g'	r
17.112.1 ff.; 19.55.8–9		15/17 bks	d			a			e
19.55.8–9; [21.1.3]		17/19 bks		p		a			e
[9.20.4]		7 bks?		p		a			e
[9.20.4]		7 bks?		p		a			e
3.16.6–7	4 ss		d					g	r
[40.7.2]?		?			i		c		e
[32.13.1]		29 bks		p		a			e
3.56.1 ff.	2 chs		d					g	r
5.64.1 ff.		2 bks	d				c		e
4,5 passim esp. 4.25.2–4	10 chs		d				c		e
4.40.1 ff.	25 chs		d				c		e
[10.18.6]		6 bks		p		a			e
11.20.4; 14.63.4, 77.6; 15.24.2–3; [25.7.1]		7 bks	d			a			e
4.42.1 ff. & 49.3 ff.	10 chs		d				c		e
[7.7.1]		3 bks		p		a			e
[7.7.1]		3 bks		p		a			e
34/35.9		30 bks	d			a			e
frag. incert. Teubner pp. 219–220		?		p		a			e
[40.7.3]?		?			i	a			e

2. The symbol * indicates cross-references which appear to cross over the boundaries between sources used by Diodoros. See note 27.

Forward Cross-References (continued)

Ref.	Form of words
5.22.1*	περὶ ... τῶν κατ' αὐτῶν νομίμων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἰδιωμάτων τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγράψομεν, ὅταν ἐπὶ τὴν Καίσαρος γενομένην στρατείαν εἰς Πρεταννίαν παραγενηθῶμεν
5.37.4*	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ὅταν ἐπὶ τὴν 'Αρχιμήδους ἡλικίαν ἔλθωμεν ἀκριβῶς διέξιμεν
5.80.3*	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
5.84.4*	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
11.64.3	ἀλλὰ ... περὶ τούτων τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
11.90.2	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγράψομεν ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις
11.90.4	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος κατὰ τὴν ἐχομένην βίβλον ἀναγράψαι πειρασόμεθα
13.37.6	ἀλλὰ περὶ ... τούτων ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀκριβέστερον ἐροῦμεν, ἵνα μὴ παρὰ φύσιν προλαμβάνωμεν τῇ γραφῇ τοὺς καιρούς
13.96.4	τὰς ... κατὰ μέρος αὐτοῦ πράξεις καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις διέξιμεν
14.2.3	περὶ ... τούτων ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἕκαστον ἀναγράψομεν σαφέστερον
14.63.2	περὶ ἧς μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν, ἵνα μὴ προλαμβάνωμεν τῇ γραφῇ τοὺς καιρούς
14.117.6	περὶ οὗ κατὰ τοὺς οἰκείους χρόνοις ἐπιμνησθησόμεθα
15.39.3	περὶ ... τούτων μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐν τοῖς κατὰ μέρος ἐκτεθεῖσι σαφέστερον δηλώσομεν, νῦν δ'ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς ἱστορίας τρεψόμεθα
15.48.4	περὶ ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀκριβῶς ἀναγράψαι πειρασόμεθα τῇ κατὰ μέρος ἱστορίᾳ
15.79.2	περὶ ... τούτων τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρὸν ὕστερον ἀκριβῶς διέξιμεν
16.8.7	περὶ ... τούτων αἱ κατὰ μέρος πράξεις ἕκαστα δηλώσουσι, ἡμεῖς δ'ἐπὶ τὰς συνεχεῖς πράξεις μεταβιβάσομεν τὸν λόγον
16.60.5	περὶ μέν τούτων ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγράψομεν, νῦν δ'ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς ἱστορίας τρεψόμεθα
16.65.9	περὶ ... τούτων τὰ κατὰ μέρος μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις χρόνοις ἀναγράψομεν
17.1.4	αὗταὶ γὰρ αἱ κατὰ μέρος πράξεις ἱκανῶς μηνύσουσι τὸ μέγεθος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ
17.6.3.	ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων αἱ κατὰ μέρος πράξεις ἕκαστα δηλώσουσιν· ἡμεῖς δ'ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχὲς τῆς ἱστορίας τρεψόμεθα
17.114.4	περὶ ὧν μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν ὅταν τὸν περὶ τῆς ἐκφορᾶς λόγον ἀποδῶμεν

COMPLEMENTARY REF(S)	DISTANCE TRAVERSED Book same	other	FULFILMENT d(efinite) p(robable) i(mprob.)	SPECIFICITY b(ook) a(ppr. time) c(ontext) g(eneral)	PURPOSE e(ncyc.) r(esump./ anticip.) a(nnal.)
[40.7.4]?		?	i	c	e
26.18.1 ff.		21 bks	p	c	e
[7.10.1]		1 bk?	p	a	e
[7.10.1]		1 bk?	p	a	e
12.38.1 ff.	½ bk		d	a	a
[21]?		?	i	a	a
12.9.1 ff.		10 chs	d	b	a
13.41.4 ff. *passim*	4 chs		d	a	a
13.108–16.74 *passim*	12 chs		d	a	a
14.3.1–16.74 *passim*	1 ch		d	a	a
14.70.4 ff.	7 chs		d	g	r
?		?	i	a	a
15.40.1 ff.	1 ch		d	g	a
15.49.1–6; 16.61.1?	1 ch		d	g′	r
15.82.1 ff.	3 chs		d	g	a
16.53.2–3, 54.2–4	45 chs		d	g′	a
16.69–89 *passim*	9 chs		d	a	a
16.66.1–90 *passim*	1 s		d	a	a
17 *passim*	1 ch		d	g′	a
17 *passim*	1 ch		d	g′	a
17.116.1 ff.	1½ chs		d	c	r

Forward Cross-References (continued)

Ref.	Form of words
18.53.7	ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν μικρὸν ὕστερον ἀκριβέστερον διέξιμεν ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις και-ροῖς
19.55.9	περὶ ἧς τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐροῦμεν, ὅταν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκείους χρόνους ἐπιβαλώμεθα
19.59.6	μηνύσει δ'ἀκριβέστερον τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς ἦθος προιὼν ὁ λόγος
20.10.4	περὶ οὗ μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν
20.47.6	περὶ ... τούτων ἀκριβῶς ἕκαστα δηλώσομεν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκείους χρόνους παρα-γενηθέντες
20.101.4	ὑπὲρ ... τῆς καταστροφῆς Ἀγαθοκλέους, ὅταν πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους χρόνους ἔλθωμεν αὐτοῦ, τὸ γενόμενον βεβαιώσει τὸ νῦν εἰρημένον

Backward Cross-References

1.23.7	καθάπερ προείρηται
1.57.8	καθάπερ προείρηται
1.66.12	καθότι προείρηται
1.81.7	καθάπερ προειρήκαμεν
1.86.2	ὃ προειρήκαμεν ἐν τοῖς θεολογουμένοις ὑπ'αὐτῶν
2.10.6	ὡς προεῖπον
2.17.2	καθότι προείρηται
2.32.6	καθότι προείρηται
2.52.9	καθάπερ προεῖπον
2.54.2	καθάπερ προείρηται
3.16.6	ὡς εἴρηται
3.31.4	ἀναγεγράφαμεν ἐν ἄλλοις
3.41.1	προειρήκαμεν ὅτε Πτολεμαίου τὴν τῶν ἐλεφάντων θήραν ἀπηγγείλαμεν
3.62.1*	προειρήκαμεν ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτιακοῖς
3.63.2	καθάπερ προεῖπον
3.71.3	προειρήκαμεν
4.1.6*	εἴρηται ... ἐν ταῖς προειρημέναις βίβλοις
4.5.2	καθότι προείρηται
4.77.4	προειρήκαμεν

COMPLEMENTARY REF(S)	DISTANCE TRAVERSED Book same	other	FULFILMENT d(efinite) p(robable) i(mprob.)	SPECIFICITY b(ook) a(ppr. time) c(ontext) g(eneral)	PURPOSE e(ncyc.) r(esump./ anticip.) a(nnal.)
18.58–19.44 *passim*	5 chs		d	a	a
[21.1.3]	1½ bks		p	a	a
[21.19.2]		1 bk	p	g′	a
20.43.1–44.6	33 chs		d	g	a
[21.1.6]		½ bk	p	a	a
21.16.5		½ bk	d	a	a
Totals	23	30	34d 14p 5i	1b 29a 9c 14g	27e 6r 20a

1.23.2	6 ss		d	g′	r
1.55.11	2 chs		d	g′	r
1.66.1	2 ss		d	g′	r
1.70,74	10 chs		d	g′	e
1.21.1	61 chs		d	c	e
2.10.1 ff.	5 ss		d	g′	r
2.16.9	½ ch		d	g′	r
2.23.1 ff.	10 chs		d	g′	e
2.52.1 ff.	8 ss		d	g′	r
2.48.1–2	6½ chs		d	g′	e
3.16.5	1 s		d	g′	r
3.1 ff.; 1 *passim*	31 chs		d	g	e
3.18.4?	23 chs?		i	c	e
1.11.3 ff. *passim*		2½ bks	d	c	e
3.62.2	1 ch		d	g′	r
3.5.2 ff.; 2.44.1 ff.	63 chs		d	g′	e
1.11.3 ff.; 2.38.3–4; 3.52.3 ff.		1 bk	d	b	e
4.4.2	1ch		d	g′	e
4.60 ff.	17 chs		d	g′	e

Backward Cross-References (continued)

Ref.	Form of words
5.5.1	ὡς προειρήκαμεν
5.23.4	καθότι προείρηται
5.35.2*	εἴρηται ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις ἐν ταῖς περὶ Ἡρακλέους πράξεσι
5.73.2	καθότι προείρηται
5.75.4*	ἐν οἰκειοτέροις καιροῖς ἀναγεγράφαμεν
5.78.4	περὶ ἧς τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγεγράφαμεν ὅτε τὰ περὶ Δαίδαλον ἀνεγράφομεν
5.80.1	προειρήκαμεν
6.1.5*	ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις ἀναγεγράφαμεν
11.2.2	καθότι προείρηται
11.56.1	καθάπερ προειρήκαμεν
11.67.2	καθότι προείρηται
11.84.8	καθότι προείρηται
12.2.2	περὶ ... τούτων ἀκριβέστερον τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀνεγράψαμεν ἐν δυσὶ βίβλοις, ταύτῃ τε καὶ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης
16.46.5*	προειρηκότες ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ
16.78.4	καθάπερ μικρῷ πρότερον ἀνεγράψαμεν
18.9.1*	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βύβλῳ διήλθομεν
18.11.1	καθάπερ προείρηται
19.3.3	περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἡ πρὸ ταύτης περιέχει βύβλος
19.10.3	περὶ ἧς ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ βύβλῳ τὰ κατὰ μέρος διήλθομεν
19.41.3	καθότι προείρηται
20.57.6*	ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ βίβλῳ προειρήκαμεν
20.83.1	καθάπερ προείρηται
31.26.4*	καθάπερ ἤδη προείρηται

COMPLEMENTARY REF(S)	DISTANCE TRAVERSED Book same	other	FULFILMENT d(efinite) p(robable) i(mprob.)	SPECIFICITY b(ook)	a(ppr. time)	c(ontext)	g(eneral)	PURPOSE e(ncyc.)	r(esump./ anticip.)	a(nnal.)
5.4.2	1 ch		d				g'		r	
5.23.1	4 ss		d				g'		r	
4.19.1?		1 bk	i	b		c		e		
5.71.6–72.1	1½ chs		d				g'	e		
3.62.1; 4.1.6–7; 1.11.3 ff.		1 bk	d		a			e		
4.79.1–2		1 bk	d			c		e		
5.64.1 ff.	17 chs		d				g'	e		
5.41 ff.		½ bk	d	b				e		
11.1.3 ff.	1 ch		d				g'		r	
11.55	1 s		d				g'		r	
11.21.1 ff.	47 chs		d				g'			a
11.84.7 ff.	1 s		d				g'			a
11 *passim*; 12 *passim*	1 ch	1 bk	d	b						a
1.30.4–9		16 bks	d	b				e		
16.56.8, 58.5–6, 61.1–62.4,64.2	16 chs		d				g			a
17.108.7 ff.		7 chs	d	b						a
18.9.5	1½ chs		d				g'		r	
?		?	i	b						a
?		?	i	b						a
19.41.1	2 ss		d				g'		r	
[7]?		13 bks?	i	b				e		
20.82.5	1 s		d				g'		r	
30.22.1		1 bk?	p				g			a
Totals	30	13	36d 1p 5i	9b	1a	5c	28g	19e	15r	8a