

GREEKS AND BARBARIANS
IN FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURY SICILY

By

ANDREW T. ALWINE

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2006

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank first of all my parents, my sister, and my family, who provided me with the educational, moral, and religious background to succeed at this level. I am also very grateful to Konstantinos Kapparis, Jim Marks, and Victoria Pagán for their help and guidance. I would also like to express my appreciation to all the teachers, colleagues, and friends who have been there for me on so many occasions. Finally, I would like to thank my dear wife for supporting me throughout my life and education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
CHAPTERS	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE	3
3 MERCENARY WARFARE	12
4 COSMOPOLITANISM	19
5 DIONYSIUS AND THE CARTHAGINIANS.....	28
6 THE VIEW FROM THE MAINLAND	36
7 BARBARIANS IN THE SOURCES	43
8 THE HOSTILE TRADITION	55
BIBLIOGRAPHY	57
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	60

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

GREEKS AND BARBARIANS
IN FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURY SICILY

By

Andrew T. Alwine

May 2006

Chair: Konstantinos Kapparis
Major Department: Classics

Ethnic interaction in Sicily has a long and rich history. Indigenous peoples saw the arrival of immigrants from southern Italy, supposed refugees from Troy, Phoenician settlers, and Greek colonists. By the fifth century mercenaries from Campagna, Iberia, Sardinia, and Libya had also settled on the island, contributing to the great blend of ethnic and cultural groups which is certainly a hallmark of the Sicilian experience.

This thesis argues that Sicilian Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries, because of a long history of intermarriage, multiculturalism, and cosmopolitanism, lacked a strong sense of Hellenic identity. Dionysius I was the first to attempt a unification of Greek Sicily behind an anti-barbarian ideology, though only halfheartedly. Mainland writers and historians, who were influenced by Panhellenic doctrine, viewed Sicilian affairs in terms of the “Greek vs. barbarian” motif and evaluated Dionysius I on that basis. This contributed substantially to the hostile historiographical and anecdotal tradition against him.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Ethnic interaction on the island of Sicily has a rich and long history. Evidence from the very beginnings of the historical period attests to the great mixture of peoples and cultural groups which would become one of the dominant features of this region's demographic makeup. Indigenous peoples saw the arrival of immigrants from southern Italy, supposed refugees from Troy, Phoenician settlers, and Greek colonists. By the fifth century mercenaries from Campania, Iberia, Sardinia, and Libya had also settled on the island, sometimes founding their own settlements and sometimes being absorbed into one of the many multicultural cities on the island. This blend of ethnic origins and interaction between racial and cultural groups is certainly a hallmark of the Sicilian experience.

In this thesis I argue that Sicilian Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries, because of a long history of intermarriage, multiculturalism, and cosmopolitanism, lacked the strong sense of Hellenic identity which began to form in the minds of mainland Greeks after the Persian Wars and crystallized in the Athenians' Panhellenic doctrine of the fourth century. Chapter 1 examines the political events in Sicily which reveal the weakness of ethnic consciousness and concludes that, despite the biases of the literary sources, there is no evidence that ethnic allegiances were primary motivations in the decision-making processes of Sicilian states. Chapters 2 and 3 explore possible causes behind this state of affairs. The second chapter argues that the predominance of mercenary warfare from a relatively early time undermined ethnic perceptions, since it tended to professionalize and depersonalize armed conflict. Chapter 3 investigates

evidence from archaeological and literary sources which supports the conclusion that social life in Sicily was essentially multicultural and cosmopolitan, with no clear dividing lines between ethnic groups. In Chapter 4 I look specifically at the rule of Dionysius I and attempt to demonstrate that, while he portrayed himself as an anti-Carthaginian ruler in order to maintain his power, he did not significantly change the multi-ethnic situation, since Sicily continued to be an essentially cosmopolitan island with many different intermingling peoples.

Chapters 5 and 6 consider other Greeks' perceptions of Dionysius and Sicilian affairs. Chapter 5 argues that evidence from Plato, Lysias, and Isocrates shows that they evaluated Dionysius based on his success in repelling the barbarian invaders of Sicily, the Carthaginians. Because Dionysius failed in this respect, he was held in low esteem by Panhellenic theorists in Hellas proper. In Chapter 6 I further suggest that the historians who wrote about Dionysius were influenced by Panhellenic doctrine and, like contemporary Athenians, viewed Sicilian history as dominated by the conflict between Greeks and barbarians. These authors therefore assessed Dionysius' rule in accordance with this "Greek vs. barbarian" motif. Chapter 7 offers some thoughts on the consequences of this information and concludes that Dionysius' low reputation with regard to the Panhellenic ideal of driving out the barbarian and uniting Greek cities contributed substantially to the hostile historiographical and anecdotal tradition.

CHAPTER 2 POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE

The complexity of the political history of Sicily, like the situation in many of the Greek colonies, stems largely from the extensive mixture of competing peoples in a limited geographical area. On this island many cities of diverse and often mixed ethnic descent existed alongside each other, trading, allying, and warring with each other. Native Sicilians (the Sicani), early Italian immigrants (the Siceli), supposed refugees from Troy (the Elymi), Carthaginians, and Greek colonists from Dorian and Ionian origins interacted with each other on a daily basis, often inhabiting the same cities and fighting in the same armies. Mercenaries from Greek Italy, Campagna, Sardinia, Iberia, and Libya who settled on the island or were granted territory in return for their services to Sicilian potentates added to the great medley of cultural origins. It is not surprising, then, that Sicilian history displays many twists and turns, shifting alliances, wars between ethnically similar cities, and conflicts crossing ethnic boundaries. While cultural identities certainly did exist in Sicily, no deep-seated ethnic conflict between Greeks and non-Greeks emerges from the factual evidence for the fifth and early fourth century. In fact, the political events indicate that in Sicily there was a distinct lack of ethnic consciousness in the decision-making processes of the various states.

In the early fifth century, when many cities on the Greek mainland began to band together against the common Persian foe, Sicily had no such experience which would have aided the Sicilian Greeks in the formation of an ethnic consciousness. According to Herodotus, when envoys from Hellas arrived at Syracuse and asked Gelon for aid against

the barbarian, the tyrant denied their request, despite their appeals to their common Greek heritage: σὺ δὲ δυνάμιός τε γὰρ ἤκεις μεγάλως καὶ μοῖρά τοι τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐκ ἐλαχίστη μέτα ἄρχοντί γε Σικελίης, βοήθεέ τε τοῖσι ἐλευθεροῦσι τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ συνελευθέρου. ἀλῆς μὲν γὰρ γενομένη πᾶσα ἡ Ἑλλὰς χεῖρ μεγάλη συνάγεται (7.157.2). Gelon requested the command of either the army or the navy, knowing that this was a demand unacceptable to the Athenians and Spartans. Thus, he cleverly extricated himself from any obligation, for when the emissaries refused, Gelon sent them away.¹ Furthermore, the tyrant sent three penteconters laden with gold to Delphi to bear tribute to the Persian king in the case of a Greek defeat (7.163). Whether or not the speeches of Gelon and the envoys (if not the entire embassy to Sicily) are Herodotus' invention,² this story may preserve the mainland Greeks' correct opinion that the Siceliot cared little for the troubles of Hellas proper. Certainly Gelon was capable of sending aid to the Greek resistance, for he controlled the greater part of the island and had become extremely wealthy (Diod. 11.26.1). Afterwards, some Greeks, probably reacting to the mainland Greeks' negative evaluation of his actions,³ excused Gelon for his absence from the Persian Wars by asserting that he had been forced to reserve his resources in Sicily for the fight against the Carthaginians at Himera (Herod. 7.165.1). However, the battle of Himera was originally between Theron of Acragas and the Punic-Greek force under Hamilcar. Gelon, who was apparently still at Syracuse when the fighting began, arrived only later when Theron was in danger of defeat (Diod. 11.20.5).

¹ Asheri (1988) 772.

² Treves (1941) argues that Herodotus has taken parts of the speeches from the embassy to Gelon from a funeral speech of Pericles and suspects that the whole mission is fictional. Asheri (1988) finds "no reason to reject Herodotus' story" (772).

³ Asheri (1988) 772.

Despite later comparisons with the Persian Wars, the conflicts between the Deinomenids and the Carthaginians in Sicily did not foster the idea of the barbarian outsider who must be resisted by true Greeks, as the Persian resistance did on the mainland.⁴ Though comparisons of the victory at Himera over the Carthaginians to the battle for Greek independence at Plataea were naturally made (Pind. *Py.* 1.72-80; Diod. 11.23; Herod. 166.1), this war was as much an intra-Greek struggle as a war between opposing ethnicities vying for control of the island. Herodotus states that the Carthaginian army had come at the behest of Terillus, the tyrant of Himera, who had been driven from his homeland. Terillus had obtained friendship (χειρίην) with Hamilcar, the Carthaginian general, and the support of Anaxilaus, who was tyrant of Rhegium, an Ionian city always at odds with the Dorians in Sicily. Furthermore, Hamilcar was a product of one of the many mixed marriages between Greeks and foreigners,⁵ for he was half-Carthaginian and half-Syracusan (7.165). Hamilcar had also obtained an alliance with another Greek city, Selinus, making the forces opposing Theron and Gelon truly a coalition of Greeks and Phoenicians, initiated by a Greek leader (Terillus), not a Punic expeditionary force bent on the subjugation of the Greek cities of Sicily (Diod. 11.21.5).⁶

After the defeat of the Carthaginians at Himera, Gelon concluded a peace very favorable to the Carthaginians (Diod. 11.26.1). In this instance the victor was not

⁴ Hall (2002) 172-189.

⁵ Hall (2004) 41.

⁶ Diodorus differs from Herodotus in this account, stating that the Persians had contracted an alliance with the Carthaginians to crush the Greeks in the East and West (11.1). This, however, does not provide a firm reason to discount Herodotus' version, for Diodorus has been shown to be prone to careless and insensitive abbreviation and simplification (Gray [1987]). Diodorus was also predisposed to view Carthage as the perpetual enemy of the Greeks (see below, Chapter 6) and may have been influenced by the traditional association between the Carthaginian conflict and the Persian wars (Pind. *Py.* 1.72-80; Diod. 11.23; Herod. 166.1) and the tradition that the battle of Himera occurred on the same day as Thermopylae (Diod. 11.24.1) or Salamis (Herod. 7.166).

vindictive or demanding; Diodorus praises Gelon for his clemency, even to the Carthaginians, whom Diodorus calls his worst enemies (πολεμιωτάτων, 11.26.1). Thus, these events reveal no deep-seated animosity towards the Carthaginians, for the conflict began as an intra-Greek conflict and the Carthaginians were simply the most powerful contingent of a Greek-Punic alliance. For many Greeks, especially on the mainland, Gelon's crushing defeat of the Carthaginian-led army at Himera in 480 proved a fitting western parallel to the Greek defeat of the barbarian enemy in the East. In fact, however, the "Carthaginian" War was a dispute between several states with opposing political interests, not an ethnic conflict.

If Diodorus' portrayal of the Carthaginians as the perpetual enemies of the Greeks were correct, the Siceliots might have been expected to follow up their grand victory in 480 by liberating the island from Phoenician influence. If ever the Siceliots had opportunity to rid the island of the Carthaginians, it was when Gelon had united most of the Greek cities in Sicily under his rule and had defeated the Carthaginian army. Nevertheless, neither Gelon nor his successors ever undertook a campaign against the Phoenicians in the West. Even after the overthrow of the Deinomenids in 466/5, the democracy would have been better equipped for eliminating the Punic presence, since Carthage may have been suffering from internal discord due to revolts against the power of the Magonids, severely hampering their ability to deal decisively in the colonies.⁷ However, the next seventy years appear to have been free from conflict with the Carthaginians. The Syracusans undertook campaigns against Catana (Diod. 11.76.3), Ducetius and the Siceli (11.91-2), Acragas (12.8), and Leontini (12.53-5) and continued to expand their influence, but they never resumed a war with the Carthaginians.

⁷ Sanders (1988).

Hermocrates' advice to the Syracusans in 416 to seek an alliance with the Carthaginians shows that he considered the non-Sicilian Greeks more of a threat than the Phoenicians in the West (Thuc. 6.34.2).

The Carthaginians must have also pursued a *laissez-faire* policy in Sicily, for when Syracuse went through a period of considerable civil strife (Diod. 11.73), Carthage made no move to detach Syracusan dependencies or to strengthen their presence on the island. The Punic empire during this period had secured numerous resources: gold from Guinea, silver from Spain, and tin from Galicia, which led to a thriving bronze industry.⁸ After 460 Carthage had gained considerable wealth and power from its trade in the western Mediterranean and was afforded several opportunities for revenge by the Greeks' internal difficulties, including the revolt of Ducetius which lasted throughout the 450s, and the wars with Acragas (12.8) and Leontini (12.53-5). The Carthaginians also refused to join Athens against Syracuse in 415 (Thuc. 6.88.6), although the Athenians had already landed a very large army in Sicily. Had the Carthaginians been active in the western half of the island while the Athenians besieged Syracuse, they certainly would have made significant gains in territory and possibly effected the downfall of Syracuse, which would have been deprived of its Greek allies on the island while facing two of the most powerful states in the Mediterranean. Of course, Carthage may have feared Athenian presence on the island more than Syracuse's in 415, but their reluctance in 409 to go to war with Syracuse even when it had become the preeminent Sicilian power reveals a distinct distaste for intervention in Greek affairs on the island (Diod. 13.43.5).⁹

⁸ Piccard (1968) 100.

⁹ Piccard (1968) 101.

Following the failure of the Athenian expedition against Syracuse, Carthage began to take a more active part in Sicilian affairs once again. However, as in the time of Gelon, there is no evidence that the Carthaginian campaign was motivated by ethnic hatred of the Greeks. Diodorus reports that the Segestans, when Athens deserted them, could not make peace with Selinus and therefore appealed to Carthage for help (Diod. 13.43). The Carthaginians at first balked at undertaking a war which would potentially bring them into conflict with Syracuse, but were persuaded by Hannibal, their foremost citizen (πρωτεύωντος, 13.43.5). Hannibal, the grandson of the Hamilcar who had been defeated at Himera, had his own motives for invading Sicily, as he himself later demonstrated when he tortured and slaughtered 3000 Greeks as a sacrifice to the spirit of his grandfather on the battlefield at Himera and then razed the city (13.62.4). Therefore, Carthage entered the war under the influence of a suffete with a personal vendetta and, after many years of peace, only began hostilities at the request of a largely Hellenized Elymian city.¹⁰ The Phoenician-Greek conflict that began in 409 may have had the appearance of an ethnic conflict between Carthaginians and Greeks, but the underlying motives belie this simplification of the events.

Even with the emergence of a real Carthaginian threat to the Siceliots, the political situation in Greek Sicily at this time continued to be very divisive. Dionysius, who took tyrannical power at Syracuse in 405, immediately encountered defections of Greek cities to the Carthaginian side (Diod. 14.41.1) and faced the prospect of an alliance between Carthage and the Chalcidian and Ionian cities to the North. His fear of this coalition against Syracuse was real enough to induce him to cede to Messena a large

¹⁰ By the fifth century Segesta, along with the other main Elymi cities (Eryx and Entella), were thoroughly Hellenized. See Asheri (1988) 741-2.

portion of territory, to seek a marriage alliance from Rhegium, and to promise to help the Rhegians expand their territory (14.44.4). Dionysius had not worried foolishly, since in 383 Carthage finally did secure an alliance with the Italian Greeks against Dionysius of Syracuse (15.15.2).

Dionysius' concern that these Greek cities would join with Carthage seems exceedingly ill-founded if we are to believe the stories that Diodorus reports about the sacking of Greek cities.¹¹ Diodorus states that when the Carthaginian army took Selinus, ἡκρωτηρίαζον δὲ καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος, καὶ τινὲς μὲν χεῖρας ἀθρόας περιέφερον τοῖς σώμασι, τινὲς δὲ κεφαλὰς ἐπὶ τῶν γαίσιων καὶ τῶν σαυνίων ἀναπεύροντες ἔφερον. [...] τοσοῦτο γὰρ ὠμότητι διέφερον οἱ βάρβαροι τῶν ἄλλων (13.57.3, 5). Likewise, when Hamilcar entered Acragas, σχεδὸν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐγκαταλειφθέντας ἀνείλεν (13.90.1). Diodorus also reports that when the news of the sack of Acragas spread many Greeks left Sicily and transferred their families and possessions to Italy (13.91.1). If the Carthaginians had acted in such barbaric fashion and many Greeks had fled to Italy, certainly the Italian Greeks who had received refugees would have been unlikely to undertake an alliance with the Carthaginians. Since the Italian Greeks did join Carthage against Dionysius of Syracuse (15.15.2), Diodorus' stories about the cruelty and hatred of the Phoenicians should be received with skepticism.¹²

It is more likely that the Carthaginians had a reputation in Sicily for even-handed dealings and fair administration. Testaments to this are the defection of several Greek cities from Dionysius' control to Carthage (14.41.1) and the loyalty with which the Greek

¹¹ The destruction of cities and removal of whole populations was not a new atrocity committed by the Carthaginians; Gelon had already destroyed three Greek cities and moved multiple peoples from their habitations, thus anticipating the first Carthaginian acts of this kind in 409 (Asheri [1988] 769-70).

¹² See below, Chapter 6.

citizens of Motya withstood the siege of Syracuse, even in the absence of a Carthaginian army or leader (14.53.4). Hence, when Theodorus speaks against Dionysius, he

advocates dependency on the Carthaginians rather than subservience to the tyrant:

Καρχηδόνιοι μὲν γάρ, κἄν πολέμῳ κρατήσωσι, φόρον ὠρισμένον λαβόντες οὐκ ἂν ἡμᾶς ἐκώλυσαν τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις διοικεῖν τὴν πόλιν (Diod. 14.65.2). In fact, some later authors did not

consider the Carthaginians barbaric. Eratosthenes, the third century Alexandrian librarian, suggested that the Greeks should consider non-Greeks according to their merits,

for some barbarians are admirable in their administrations, as Strabo reports: βέλτιον εἶναι

φησιν ἀρετῆ καὶ κακία διαιρεῖν ταῦτα. πολλοὺς γάρ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἶναι κακοὺς καὶ τῶν

βαρβάρων ἀστείους, καθάπερ Ἰνδοὺς καὶ Ἀριανοὺς, ἔτι δὲ Ῥωμαίους καὶ Καρχηδονίους, οὕτω

θαυμαστῶς πολιτευομένους (1.4.9). The Carthaginian constitution was the only non-Greek

government which Aristotle considered in his study (*Pol.* 1272b24-1273b25) and

Isocrates also praised Carthage as one of the best governed states in the world (τοὺς

ἄριστα τῶν ἄλλων πολιτευομένους, *Nic.* 24). Cicero also lauded the Carthaginians' system

of administration (*De Rep.* 1.3).

Thus, the evidence from the political history of Sicily does not point to any deep divisions between Greeks and barbarians, despite Diodorus' attempts to portray Carthage as the perpetual enemy of the Sicilian Greeks. The changing alliances crossing ethnic lines, extended periods of peace, the desertion of Greek cities to the Carthaginian side, and the fact that the Greek-Carthaginian conflicts began at the instigation of other Greek or Hellenized cities indicate that the political situation in Sicily in the fourth and fifth century was divided and capricious, but not primarily ethnically defined. Certainly Greek identity was present in Sicily to some degree, but states in Sicily generally made political

decisions based on their own interests rather than an allegiance to their ethnic or cultural group.

CHAPTER 3 MERCENARY WARFARE

The absence of clear ethnic dividing lines in the political makeup of the Sicilian states may have in part resulted from the predominance of mercenary warfare from a relatively early date. Many different peoples from all over the Mediterranean fought for hire on the sides of both the Carthaginians and Sicilian Greeks: Italiots, Siceli, Sicani, Elymi, Sardinians, Campanians, Iberians, Libyans, and even mainland Greeks. The great diversity in armies composed primarily of foreign soldiers tended to professionalize and depersonalize conflict in Sicily. Just as Demosthenes worried that the Athenians' heavy dependence on hired soldiers had resulted in citizens' apathy (*Philippic 1*), the prevalence of mercenary warfare in Sicily could have led to the distancing of the common citizen from the war and the perception of the enemy. The contingent of citizens in a Greek army would usually have been small compared to the numbers of mercenaries and would rarely have encountered Phoenician soldiers, who were infrequently committed to battle. Therefore, the Carthaginian threat should have been much less tangible than if the battles had been drawn along these ethnic lines. Warfare in Sicily in the fifth and early fourth centuries demonstrates that both Carthaginians and Greeks predominantly employed armies consisting of many different ethnic groups and that many mercenary groups changed sides, further obscuring ethnic boundaries. Because of the great diversity among the soldiers on both sides, armed conflict in Sicily probably contributed much less to cultural divergence than warfare in Hellas proper, where citizen armies of the fifth century fought against the Persians and other outsiders.

The Carthaginians only rarely committed citizens or even Phoenician soldiers to combat; instead they relied heavily on foreigners to fight for them. The wealth which their trading empire had brought them allowed the Carthaginians to hire great armies for their campaigns. Diodorus mentions particularly the mines in Iberia which yielded enough gold to bring numerous soldiers into their pay early in the development of their western Mediterranean thalassocracy (5.28.2-3).¹ Before each major campaign in Sicily the Carthaginian government or the general who oversaw the expeditionary force traveled far and wide to recruit mercenaries for the war. When the Carthaginians first decided to aid Segesta after the withdrawal of Athens, they did not send a Phoenician army, but gathered the Libyan and Campanian mercenaries who had been hired by the Chalcidians in support of Athens and sent them to Segesta's aid (13.44.1). Subsequently, Diodorus refers to this army as "the Carthaginians" (τῶν Καρχηδονίων, 13.44.4), though he has already given the numbers of Libyans and Campanians in the army and omitted any reference to Carthaginian presence. Diodorus' readiness to call a group of mercenary recruits under Carthage's aegis, "Carthaginians," warns us to be wary of Diodorus' terminology. When he uses the term "Carthaginian" of an army, he designates only Carthaginian leadership and does not indicate the ethnic makeup of the troops. Hannibal joined the mercenary group later, bringing with him many (πολλούς, 13.44.6) Iberians, Libyans from every city (ἐχ' ἀπάσης πόλεως), and not a few (οὐκ ὀλίγους) Carthaginians citizens. The Carthaginian contingent with Hannibal was probably quite small compared to the combined force of Libyans and Campanians already employed in Sicily and his new recruits from Iberia and Libya, but no doubt Hannibal knew that it was necessary to keep a body of loyal soldiers who would check the common fickleness of mercenaries.

¹ Miller (1984) 157.

Given their habitual absence from battle, this was probably the citizen soldiers' chief purpose.

Again in 396 the Carthaginians summoned as many of their allies as possible and sent Himilcon along with mercenaries from Libya and Iberia to invade the Greek cities. The numbers of mercenaries gathered are not believable (300,000 infantry, 4000 cavalry, four-hundred war ships, and six-hundred other ships and engines of war, as Ephorus states them; 100,000 troops from Libya and 30,000 enrolled in Sicily, according to Timaeus), but they do indicate that Ephorus and Timaeus were aware of how heavily Carthage depended on hired soldiers (Diod. 14.54.5). In 392 the Carthaginians, probably running low on their supply mercenary recruits, supplemented their Libyan forces with Sardinians and native Italians. Notably, mention of citizens enrolled in this army is once again absent from Diodorus' account (14.95.1).

Carthage's difficulty in putting down the Libyan revolt following Himilcon's disastrous campaign also shows its heavy reliance on foreign warriors. The Carthaginians apparently put up little resistance as the Libyans quickly occupied Tynes, a city not far from Carthage. The Phoenicians retreated to the city of Carthage and remained there, supplied by sea from Sardinia, to outlast the rebels. Eventually, the manifest futility of the siege, the lack of any obvious leader, and a shortage of provisions brought the Libyans into discontent and a good number of them succumbed to bribery by the Carthaginians. In this manner the Carthaginians did put down the rebellion, but they never dared to fight the insurgents. As in their military affairs in Sicily, gold from the wealthy trading city proved a better weapon than a citizen army recruited from merchants and sailors (14.77).

Plutarch, in the account of Timoleon's conflict with Carthage, states that the Carthaginians lost 3000 citizens, the most that had ever fallen in a battle. When the propensity of ancient sources to exaggerate the casualties of the opposing army is taken into account, this figure is a very small number in view of all Carthage's military activity in its colonies and dependencies and it indicates how infrequently the Carthaginians were willing to commit their citizens to battle.² This passage from Plutarch confirms the tendency of the Carthaginians to rely heavily on their mercenary armies and to avoid using their own troops in battle. Contingents of citizen soldiers probably served the purpose of overseeing the foreigners more often than they took part in the fighting themselves.

The Siceliots likewise made frequent use of mercenaries when engaged in large wars such as the conflicts with the Carthaginians. In 406 the Sicilian Greeks enlisted the services of the Campanians whom the Carthaginians had employed on their previous expedition and subsequently discarded after their withdrawal (13.85.4). The Acragantini also hired Sicilian Greeks, who deserted along with the Campanians when the situation began to look desperate (13.88.5). So too did Dionysius make use of mercenaries frequently, both for fighting the enemy outside the walls of Syracuse and maintaining his own power within. Indeed, the two mainstays of Dionysius' tyranny were his fortress on Ortygia and his mercenary armies. He led an army of mercenaries against the Carthaginians at Gela in 405 and then returned to the city while the Syracusan cavalry went ahead of him. When the Syracusan citizens revolted against him at the instigation of the knights who had returned beforehand, Dionysius forced his mercenary army to cover 400 stades in a day and take the city by surprise (13.109-113). This was not the

² Warmington (1964) 123.

only time Dionysius had to rely on his hired soldiers to regain his rule. The next year a group of Syracusan soldiers revolted against Dionysius again, even calling on the cavalry who had taken refuge at Aetna to join in the rebellion. Dionysius was shut up in his palace in a seemingly hopeless situation, but he was able to sneak out to the mainland and entice some Campanian mercenaries with the prospect of a great deal of gold, thereafter winning his tyranny back with the swords of foreigners (14.8-9).

Dionysius was acutely aware of his dependence on his mercenaries and was quick to dispose of potentially troublesome groups. Thus, during Himilco's siege of Syracuse he gave the order to a particularly bothersome band of mercenaries to attack while he withdrew his cavalry, leaving the mercenaries to be slaughtered (14.72.2-3). Later, when he suspected that his hired soldiers were becoming hostile towards him, he arrested their leader and dismissed the troops, only to recruit other mercenaries immediately afterwards. Dionysius had to maintain the loyalty of his mercenaries; they were his elite troops³ and constituted his bodyguard. Dionysius even received criticism in later times for his dependence on foreign soldiers. Plutarch says that Dion had warned Dionysius that a good rule was formed on goodwill with the people and not his huge bodyguard of foreigners (βαρβάρων μυριάνδρον φυλακὴν, *Dion* 10.4). Likewise, in Diodorus' most anti-Dionysian section Theodorus delivers a speech against the tyrant asserting, τὸ δὲ τῶν μισθοφόρων πλῆθος ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ τῶν Συρακοσίων ἤθροισται (14.65.3). Theodorus later accuses Dionysius of giving the citizens' arms to barbarians and foreigners (βαρβάρους καὶ ξένους, 14.66.5). However, the practice of hiring large groups of foreign soldiers was not uncommon before Dionysius, nor after him, for even Dion, the pupil of Plato and

³ The notice at Diod. 14.52.5 that an Italian Greek (Archylus of Thurii) led the elite troops of Dionysius indicates that at least in this instance he relied on foreigners for this part of his army.

supposed liberator of Syracuse, found himself fighting against the Syracusan citizens with a hired army (Plutarch, *Dion*, 22).

The changing allegiances of mercenary armies further contributed to the breakdown of ethnic demarcations in warfare. Mercenary armies in Sicily, just as other groups of hired soldiers, tended to offer their services to the highest bidder. After Athens' withdrawal from Sicily, Carthage found no reason to recruit soldiers from the far reaches of their colonies; they simply rehired the soldiers who had been in the employ of the Chalcidian cities of Sicily (13.44). After the successful campaign in 409 in which Hannibal sacked Selinus and Himera, the Carthaginians left their Campanian mercenaries in Sicily, as they retired to Carthage for the winter (13.62.5-6). As the Carthaginians had suspected, when they returned to Sicily in 406, they met with the same Campanian mercenaries, disgruntled at what they considered unfair treatment and now in the service of the Greeks. Despite forcing the Campanians into the arms of the enemy, Carthage would eventually reclaim their allegiance at the siege of Acragas. Though the Phoenicians' own mercenaries had at first threatened to leave when their provisions were slow in coming, Hamilcar was able to capture a Syracusan provision fleet and quiet the discontent. Then, as Acragas' position became extremely precarious, the Campanians on Acragas' side deserted to the Carthaginians (13.88.2-5).

The Siceli are another good example of a group who switched sides frequently. Hannibal, having taken Selinus, received into his army a number of Siceli and Sicani, whom Diodorus insinuates were natural enemies of the Sicilian Greeks (13.59.6). However, Dionysius, after he had sacked Motya, left a garrison composed mostly of Siceli in charge of this strategically and morally significant city (14.53.5); clearly he had

some reason to trust them. The Siceli, unmoved by Dionysius' faith in them, soon revolted against him and went back over to the Carthaginians when it became expedient for them to do so (14.58.1).

The prevalence of mercenary armies in Sicily and the frequent changes of allegiances led to a great permeability in the ethnic boundaries between battling forces. The Carthaginians only rarely committed citizens to battle, relying heavily on mercenaries, while the Greeks also enlisted the aid of foreigners in order to match the numbers of their opponents. In battle no doubt only a small portion of the fighting was between Greek and Carthaginian and foreigners who fought on both sides played the greater role in the actual hostilities.

The situation in Sicily was completely unlike that in mainland Greece during the fifth century, where citizen armies met the Persian foe and brought back their war stories which stimulated fear of and disdain for the Eastern army. In Sicily the Carthaginian threat must have been much less visible, since the borders between the sides were so fluid and warfare was predominantly a professional affair. The fluctuation of alliances confused ethnic demarcations and contributed to the depersonalization of warfare. No "us vs. them" mentality ever developed and Greek citizens rarely came face-to-face with their actual enemy, the Carthaginians.

CHAPTER 4 COSMOPOLITANISM

The lack of ethnic demarcations in the political realm of Sicily no doubt stemmed from a long history of cultural mixing. Evidence from the early Greek colonial period to the fourth century supports the conclusion that Greeks mingled with the non-Greek inhabitants of Sicily and blurred ethnic and cultural lines. Archaeological records and primary sources attest to intermarriage, bilingualism, cultural sharing, trade connections, and personal interactions between Greeks and barbarians. The great degree of race-mixture that took place in Sicily explains the divisiveness of the political situation discussed above and provides some reasons for the lack of strong ethnic and cultural identities in Sicily. Through the time of Dionysius, the dominant feature of the cultural scene in Sicily was cosmopolitanism.

One of the primary means for cultural intermixing seems to have been mixed marriages. Although the archaeological record in the West is highly debated, some information from the primary sources indicates that intermarriage did in fact take place in Sicily. As to the nature of the earliest colonial activities, scholars have mostly rejected the idea that the omission of reference in ancient sources to women in these ventures provides solid evidence for their absence in earlier colonial foundations.¹ However, intermarriage certainly was being practiced in Sicily as early as the fifth century, for Thucydides implies that residents of Selinus and Segesta married from the same groups of women when he states that one of the reasons for the conflict between these two cities

¹ Hall (2004) 40.

was about marriage rights (περί τε γαμικῶν τιμῶν, 6.2.2). Carthaginians, even in the most upper strata of society, also married among the Greeks, for Hamilcar, one of the two Carthaginian suffetes, was in fact half-Greek (Herod. 7.165). Even if one does give credence to story in Herodotus, the instance does at least show that such a union was not unthinkable.

Archaeology has shed some light on the cultural mingling between Greeks and barbarians in the West, but many recent scholars have highlighted the obstacles to using the archaeological record in determining ethnicity.² Previously, several scholars interpreted the great number of Italic fibulae found at Pithekoussai as an indication of widespread mixed marriages in Western Greek colonies.³ The fibulae showed no similarity to those at Euboea or anywhere in Greece, but very closely resembled the ones found at Villanovan sites in Etruria, particularly Veii. The native Italian items unearthed were mostly for women, so Buchner concluded, “most, if not all, of the colonists’ women were not Greeks but natives.”⁴ However, Hodos rejected this interpretation of the material evidence and stated that trade with the native inhabitants, not intermarriage, was the more likely cause of widespread Italic items.⁵ Other scholars have likewise rejected the argument that these fibulae can prove intermarriage between Greeks and indigenous peoples. However, at the very least these archaeological finds do imply a high level of cultural interaction between Western Greek colonists and non-Greek peoples.

² Jones (1997); Hall (1997), (2002).

³ Buchner (1979); Coldstream (1993).

⁴ Buchner (1979) 135.

⁵ Hodos (1999).

Moreover, other archaeological evidence does suggest that intermarriage was practiced in Western Greece at a much earlier date than the fifth century, as the primary sources attest. In a recent article on Western Greek identity, Jonathan Hall offers several pieces of firm evidence for cultural interaction and possibly intermarriage and bilingualism. Some seventh-century artifacts from Etruria contain the names Rutile Hipukrates and Larth Telikles, which probably resulted from marriages between Greeks and Etruscans. In Sicily a sixth century amphora found at Montagna di Marzo attests the names Tamura and Eurumakes in a non-Greek inscription and a curse-tablet of the same time records the name Pratomekes. These names apparently derived from Greek names (θαμύρας, Εύρύμαχος, Πρατόμαχος), but notably lack the aspiration from the Greek letters *theta* and *chi*. Ancient grammarians noticed the absence of aspiration in native Sicilian dialects (Greg. Cor. *De Dialecto dorica* 151) and modern study of non-Greek Sicilian inscriptions has not produced any instances of the letters *theta*, *phi*, or *chi*. As Hall notes, these Sicilianized Greek names could point to the results of intermarriage between Greeks and native Sicilians.⁶

The use of Greek names in native Sicilian contexts also suggests a bilingual environment. Such an atmosphere would have aided the well documented spread of the Greek alphabet to the Siceli, Sicani, and Elymi. Natives of the West obtained their scripts from a variety of Greek cities; the Chalcidian script, the script of Gela, and the script of Selinus are all attested in non-Greek areas. Also, the ending *-emi* which appears in Elymi inscriptions may have been borrowed from the Greek εἰμί. Interestingly, Iamblichus records a story stating that Pythagoras ordered his Greek followers to speak

⁶ Hall (2004) 40-1.

Greek, thus implying that many Greeks in the area were speaking a native language or at least a hybrid language which employed words and phrases from both Greek and native tongues (*Vit. Pyth.* 34.241).⁷ In fact, several native places names, words concerning weights and measures, foods, and domestic objects did make their way into the Sicilian Greek dialect.⁸ The possible prevalence of bilingualism and the use of native elements in the Greek language is especially important for the study of Greek identity in the West, since it complicates the idea that the Greeks primarily defined themselves based on their common language.⁹

Trinity Jackman has recently provided further evidence for the cultural diversity of Sicily by illustrating the fragmentary nature of the Sicilian political experience. Through analysis of the burial material at three sites throughout Italy, she concludes that Sicilian Greeks “were much more interested in defining themselves in reference to a much smaller group” than the Greeks of the Aegean region.¹⁰ The disconnected nature of Greek settlements in Sicily and the high number of native artifacts found alongside Hellenic ones suggests a high level of cultural interaction and possibly intermarriage. She also states that non-Greek indigenous centers often became a part of Greek settlements and continued their traditions through the fifth century, thus maintaining a hybrid identity with the Greek colonists. Admittedly, it is very difficult to employ archaeology to reconstruct ethnicity. However, the fluidity of the colonial experience in Sicily attested by the material record and the fragmentary concept of political identity

⁷ Hall (2004) 41-3.

⁸ Asheri (1988) 747-8.

⁹ Hall (2004) 43.

¹⁰ Jackman (2005) 1.

strongly suggest that Sicilian Greeks were particularly inclined to maintain relations with non-Greek inhabitants; political communities were locally defined and their ties to broader identities were weaker, while interaction with other inhabitants of the island was common.

The sources also attest the presence of Greeks and Carthaginians in each other's armies and cities, which would have encouraged bilingualism and cultural communication between the two peoples. In 409 Hannibal, depicted by Diodorus as a crude barbarian and a natural hater of the Greeks (καὶ φύσει μισέλλην, 13.43.6), actually had Greeks serving in his army (13.57.3). Moreover, at the siege of Motya the inhabitant Greeks fought with the Carthaginians against Dionysius in a desperate struggle. That the Greeks of Motya remained faithful to the Carthaginians is all the more remarkable in view of that fact that Dionysius controlled the entire island except for five cities (Halicyae, Solus, Aegesta, Panormus, and Entella, 14.48.4) and that Himilco had already withdrawn the main Carthaginian force from Sicily (14.50.4). The outlook for Motya was indeed bleak and Carthage was unable to dispatch an army in time to save the city, yet the Greeks of Motya were loyal to the Phoenicians to the bitter end, eventually meriting crucifixion for their efforts (14.53.4).

Just as a number of Greeks had taken up residence in Motya, in the heart of the Carthaginians' sphere of influence on the western end of the island, some Carthaginians made their homes in Syracuse on the eastern side. These Phoenicians were evidently numerous and wealthy members of society: οὐκ ὀλίγοι γὰρ τῶν Καρχηδονίων ᾤκουν ἐν ταῖς Συρακούσαις ἀδράς ἔχοντες κτήσεις, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐμπόρων εἶχον ἐν τῷ λιμένι τὰς ναῦς γεμούσας φορτίων, (14.46.1). The presence of Carthaginians in Syracuse and other Greek cities should come as no surprise, since Carthage was essentially a timocracy and was

always ready to establish trading connections in foreign cities. The emphasis on trade and wealth which dominated Carthaginian politics no doubt provided the impetus for merchants to establish themselves in the wealthiest Greek city in Sicily. In fact, Diodorus implies that Phoenician traders had also made residence in many other Greek cities, since after Dionysius' expulsion of the Phoenicians from Syracuse, the other Greek states (οἱ λοιποὶ Σικελιώται, 14.46.2) cast out the Phoenicians living among them (τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῖς οἰκοῦντας τῶν Φοινίκων).

The city of Carthage accommodated several Greeks within its walls. The plague on the Carthaginian army thought to have been caused by Himilco's sacrilege against the temples of Demeter and Core (14.63.1) caused the citizens of Carthage to choose the most prominent (χαριεστάτους) Greeks and to appoint them as priests to Demeter and Core, serving the goddesses according to Greek rituals (14.77.5). The presence of Greeks in Carthage probably satisfied the city's trading interests, as they provided direct links to Western Greek cities. Carthage was in the habit of importing a great deal of Greek goods even in the fourth century and must have had a lively trade with other Greek states; Diodorus supplies at least one example: Acragas' trading relations with Carthage, 13.81.4. Greeks and Greek culture must have been quite prevalent in the city to warrant an edict from the Carthaginians forbidding Greek literacy, though the date of this law has been disputed (Justin 20.5.13).

Archaeology has confirmed the cosmopolitan nature of Phoenician cities in Sicily. Carthage's three main outposts on the island, Motya, Panormus, and Soloeis, all provide examples of cultural sharing and non-native inhabitants. In Motya archaeologists have found numerous Proto-Corinthian and Corinthian pots, a Doric capital, and archaic Greek

inscriptions, along with Attic black-figure and red-figure vases. This evidence led David Asheri to postulate that half of the city's population was Greek.¹¹ In Panormus a Punic cemetery near Corso Calatafimi which archaeologists began excavating in 1953 has revealed material of mixed Phoenician and Greek origin. In Soloeis two sarcophagi which resemble eastern Phoenician sarcophagi and have two female figures with Greek traits, one wearing a Doric chiton, have been found.¹² The blend of Greek and eastern elements in pottery is also well documented in both Sicily and Carthage itself.¹³

The literary sources supplement the general picture of cosmopolitanism in Sicily by providing several specific instances of Greeks and Carthaginians who had personal connections or sympathies with the other side. Herodotus says that Hamilcar, a person of considerable political weight in Carthage, in addition to being half-Greek, had friendship (*χειρίην*) with Terillus of Himera (7.165). The connection was strong enough that Terillus was able to prevail upon Hamilcar to persuade Carthage to aid him in 480 against Gelon. Even if the authenticity of Herodotus' Sicilian narrative in Book 7 is suspect, the story at least demonstrates that such a friendship was not unthinkable in Herodotus' time. Diodorus offers an example of a Greek who had favored the Carthaginians at the expense of his Greek allegiances: when Hannibal sacked Selinus, he released Empedion along with his kinsmen, αἰὲ γὰρ τὰ Καρχηδονίων ἦν πεφρονηκῶς καὶ πρὸ τῆς πολιορκίας τοῖς πολίταις συμβουλευκῶς μὴ πολεμεῖν Καρχηδονίους (13.59.3). Not only does this story show that prominent Greeks with Carthaginian sympathies could live unmolested even in cities at

¹¹ Asheri (1988) 743-4.

¹² Asheri (1988) 744-5.

¹³ Asheri (1988) 746; Piccard (1968) 110.

war with the Carthaginians, but it also implies that Carthaginians were in communication with the Greek cities, since Hannibal knew that Empedion had always favored Carthage.

During his tyranny Dionysius tried to rouse anger against the Carthaginians,¹⁴ but interpersonal relationships between Greeks and Carthaginians continued even after his time. Dion had carried on some of Dionysius' embassies with Carthage for many years and had evidently gained many friends. Having been exiled from Sicily, he later returned from Athens, intending to overthrow Dionysius II. Dion's fleet encountered a heavy storm and was forced to land near Minoa in a region controlled by the Carthaginians. Fortunately for Dion, the expedition happened to come to anchor in a region under the control of Synalus, a guest friend (ξένος ὃ καὶ φίλος, Plutarch *Dion* 25.12) of Dion's, whom he had no doubt met when he was carrying on diplomatic relations at Carthage. Synalus entertained and supplied Dion and his troops and allowed them to leave their baggage with the Carthaginians while Dion made his expedition to Syracuse. Thus, Dion, the student of Plato who had spent several years at Athens when Panhellenism had begun to foster the "Greek vs. barbarian" motif, never forsook his personal relationships with barbarians and he found his connections most useful during his time in the West.

The evidence from both literary and archaeological sources for ethnic interaction in Sicily certainly supplements the picture of the political atmosphere as essentially diverse and divided. As Jackman argues, identity in Sicily as revealed by burial sites was very fragmented and localized in nature.¹⁵ In conjunction with other evidence which suggests an interracial and bilingual environment, Jackman's findings provide more support for a largely cosmopolitan atmosphere in Sicily, with no sharply defined ethnic

¹⁴ See below Chapter 4.

¹⁵ Jackman (2005).

boundaries. Greeks, native Sicilians, Carthaginians, and many other peoples lived side-by-side in cities throughout the Greek, Carthaginian, Siceli, Sicani, and Elymi spheres on the island. As the next chapter will show, this diversity was to be threatened by Dionysius' anti-Carthaginian campaign, yet the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Sicily would endure through his reign.

CHAPTER 5 DIONYSIUS AND THE CARTHAGINIANS

The growing tide of Panhellenism from the mainland probably began to influence the Siceliots in the late fifth and early fourth century, by the cosmopolitan atmosphere in Sicily continued well into the fourth century. Nevertheless, ethnic perceptions began to change significantly after the fall of the Syracusan democracy and the rise of Dionysius. Diodorus may be criticized for his misleading portrayal of hostility between Greeks and Carthaginians and depiction of the Carthaginians as the perpetual enemy of Greece in Sicily, but the information he provides on Dionysius' attempts to foment fear of the Carthaginians may be generally accepted. In the face of severe opposition to his rule from neighboring Greek cities, indigenous inhabitants, and the Syracusan citizens themselves, Dionysius needed an enemy to take the focus off his own autocratic regime. He found this rival in Carthage and was at pains to increase the Greeks' fear of the Phoenicians. This chapter will consider why Dionysius would have profited from dislike of the Carthaginians and why the Greeks were disposed to fear and hate Carthage in 406 more than ever before. It will then consider Dionysius' actions intended to create this fear and finally evaluate the success of his anti-Carthaginian policy.

One fact that probably encouraged Dionysius to set himself as the anti-Carthaginian tyrant was that he began his political career and became the ruler of Syracuse based on his role in the Carthaginian conflicts of 406. Dionysius grew up as a relatively insignificant private citizen and made no appearance on the political scene of Syracuse until his sudden rise in 405. He first became a character of importance during

the attack of Acragas and Gela, when the Carthaginians were relentlessly marching towards Syracuse. In this Carthaginian campaign Dionysius, having already distinguished himself in fighting the Carthaginians (Diod. 13.92.1), came to the fore as a political player and eventually secured his own tyranny in Syracuse.

During the confusion and clamor that followed the sack of Acragas, Dionysius made an appearance in the assembly to accuse the Syracusan generals of betraying the city and accepting bribes from the Carthaginians (13.91.3). At this point the fears of the citizens of Syracuse were no doubt great, since never before had they witnessed the Carthaginians gain so many victories against Greek cities and march inexorably into the eastern half of the island, which had been dominated by the Siceliot for so many years. Here Dionysius saw his opportunity and played off the fears of the crowd in order to assure his own position. This foundational period of Dionysius' career was very significant for his later fame. Themistocles and Pausanias provide similar examples, as both made their fame in the resistance to the Persian in 480-79 and were hailed by the Greeks as instrumental parts of the defeat of the Mede. Likewise, Dionysius' reputation and regime were founded on anti-Carthaginian concepts, since he had begun with a war against Carthage. He therefore had the perfect opportunity from the beginning of his career to establish himself as an anti-Carthaginian tyrant and to use the fear of the Syracusans to stay in power.

Maintaining the façade of an anti-Carthaginian administration was also important for Dionysius to transfer the citizens' focus from his own authoritarian government to the Carthaginian threat. The Syracusan citizens adopted him to the same office as Gelon (στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ, 13.95.1) only in the most dire emergency of state and because of

the great fear of the Phoenician campaigning in Sicily. The Siceliots had probably never faced a danger from the Carthaginians as real as that which followed the Athenian expedition and certainly almost no one who had experienced the invasion of 480 was alive to compare the situation in 409 and 406-5. The Carthaginians had pursued a relatively laissez-faire policy in Sicily since the defeat at Himera in 480 and had stayed out of Greek political affairs as much as possible. They had not been a threat to the Greeks for a long time and their sudden reappearance on the Sicilian scene in 409 was no doubt startling to most Sicilian Greeks. Hannibal invaded Sicily, quickly sacked Selinus, and razed Himera, according to Diodorus sacrificing three-thousand Greeks to the shade of his grandfather before returning to Carthage with his war booty. Hannibal began the next wave of conquests with co-general Himilcar, continuing along the southern shore of the island. They took Acragas and began to move on toward Gela, which was completely unable to resist an army of the magnitude of the Carthaginian force. The quick destruction of Selinus, Himera, and Acragas and the Phoenicians' penetration deep into the Siceliot half of the island was so far unprecedented. At this time, when the Syracusans could see the march of the enemy from the West along the coast from Selinus to Acragas to Gela towards their own city, Dionysius was elected general.

The Syracusans, having experienced a long period of a relatively successful democracy, were probably not so willing to throw away their constitutional government and install an autocrat. Dionysius' tyranny was adopted in an extreme emergency of state and was not an expression of the Syracusan citizens' desire to change their type of government. Thus, Dionysius, having taken advantage of the state of war and secured his tyranny, soon faced the discontent of the Syracusan citizen body, which became his most

significant obstacle in the first few years of his reign, and subsequently had to impose his rule upon his fellow citizens. Even before the Carthaginian threat had withdrawn, the tyrant faced internal opposition to his regime. Dionysius' Italian Greek mercenaries deserted him after the battle at Gela, as did the Syracusan cavalry. These aristocrats rode ahead of the main army and entered Syracuse, raped Dionysius' wife, and encouraged the citizenry to revolt against him. Dionysius responded with a forced march to Syracuse, catching the rebels off guard and slaying all his opponents (Diod. 13.112-113). After this episode Dionysius, clearly understanding the hostility of many of the citizens, secured for himself a personal bodyguard in the mold of Pisistratus of Athens. He then built a massive fortress for himself on Ortygia (14.7.3) and created a fortification on Epipolae to control the city (14.18). Creating a stronghold on the island proved to be a prudent move for Dionysius, since soon afterwards his soldiers revolted against him and invited the cavalry who had fled to Aetna following their revolt in 405 to join in the struggle against the tyrant. Dionysius retreated to the safety of his fortress where he had time to plan against the insurgents. He was finally able to reestablish his rule by hiring Campanian mercenaries and advancing on the city unawares (14.8-9).

Thus, Dionysius faced considerable opposition from his own citizens, especially in the early going of his regime. Just as he had made his start by exploiting the Syracusans' fear of an outside enemy, he needed a common foe which would take the citizens' focus off his own tyranny. Carthage was the obvious choice; it was certainly the greatest threat to the Sicilian Greeks and Dionysius had made his reputation in fighting the Carthaginians. Diodorus' account of Dionysius' actions in propagating hatred of the Carthaginians is, therefore, believable, though elsewhere he may be justly censured for

exaggerating the hostile feeling between Greeks and Phoenicians. Dionysius had much to gain from portraying the Carthaginians as the perpetual enemy of Syracuse.

Diodorus states that Dionysius began his second Punic war in 398 because he noted that many Greek cities had deserted him and thought that a war against Carthage would draw the Sicilian Greeks together under his rule (14.41.1). After his politically motivated marriages to Doris of Locri and Aristomache of Syracuse,¹ Dionysius gave a speech, encouraging the Greeks to take a stand against the Carthaginians: ἀποφαίνων αὐτοὺς καθόλου μὲν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐχθροτάτους ὄντας, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς Σικελιώταις διὰ παντὸς ἐπιβουλεύοντας [...] ἅμα δὲ συνίστα δεινὸν εἶναι περιορᾶν τὰς Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις ὑπὸ βαρβάρων καταδεδουλωμένας, ἃς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον συνεπιλήψεσθαι τῶν κινδύνων, ἐφ' ὅσον τῆς ἐλευθερίας τυχεῖν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν (14.45.2, 4). After the meeting Dionysius ordered the citizens to expel the Phoenicians who dwelt in Syracuse from the city and to plunder their property. Following Syracuse's lead, other Sicilian Greek cities also drove out their Phoenician inhabitants and took their property, which in some cities was evidently considerable, as the Phoenicians had become wealthy through their trade connections (14.46.1-2). The policy had immediate benefits for Dionysius, since Greek cities under Carthaginian rule deserted to Dionysius or revolted against Punic rule soon after he declared war on Carthage (14.46.3). Furthermore, as he made his march into the Western part of the island, Dionysius received many reinforcements from Greek cities (14.47.5-6). After the sack of Motya, Dionysius crucified Greeks who had fought on the side of the Carthaginians, an Eastern punishment normally abhorrent to the Greeks. He thus clearly demonstrated that he intended to be the sole leader of the Sicilian Greeks and that he

¹ Dionysius took led the two maidens into matrimony simultaneously. He hoped that Doris would win him an alliance with one of the foremost cities in southern Italy, while he took Aristomache in order to secure his position in Syracuse.

considered those who fought for the Carthaginians traitors, putting them to death with an appropriately Semitic punishment (14.53.4).²

Dionysius continued throughout his rule to stir up anti-Carthaginian feeling, going to war with Carthage on numerous occasions and keeping the focus on the barbarian outsider. He no doubt wanted to cast himself in the mold of Gelon, as a unifier of the Greek cities in Sicily and also needed the presence of Carthage to provide his foil. However, Dionysius never took the war with the Carthaginians to the next level, expelling them from the island. Of course, in his expedition of 397 he penetrated deep into the heart of the Phoenician sphere of the island, even sacking Motya and taking all but a few of the western cities. But he certainly knew that the Carthaginians would not stand idly by; they would send an expeditionary force which, once landed in Sicily, would force him to make concessions. Under Himilco the Carthaginian army forced Dionysius all the way back to the eastern shore to fight for the freedom of Syracuse itself. Unfortunately for the Carthaginians, plague struck their camp and precipitated two military defeats that wholly disheartened the army. Dionysius now had the Carthaginians in an extremely vulnerable position. He negotiated with Himilco and accepted a sum of three hundred talents, only allowing the Carthaginian citizen soldiers (τοὺς [...] πολιτικούς, 14.75.2) to withdraw to Libya and forcing the mercenaries to stay behind, betrayed by their employers. Despite Diodorus' censure of Dionysius for allowing the Carthaginians off so easily, this was actually a shrewd and clever diplomatic move. The Carthaginian army was weakened, but was not so devastated as to be at Dionysius' mercy. He could not have been sure that another attack would meet with success, nor could he have dealt

² Alexander the Great, also wanting to portray himself as the crusader for Hellas, imitated Dionysius after the battle of the Granicus by sending all the Greeks who had fought for the Persians as slaves to Macedonia (Hammond [1980] 76-7).

with the Carthaginians in unconditional terms. Furthermore, since the Carthaginians generally sent few citizens along with their army, under the treaty only a small portion of the force was able to withdraw, while the bulk of the army was left behind without leadership, an easy target for Dionysius to annihilate. Also, since Himilco had manifestly betrayed all his mercenaries and allies, these negotiations would hurt Carthage's credibility in later wars and other soldiers would be more reluctant to join Carthage.³

Dionysius' ruse worked; he destroyed a large part of the mercenaries and took many others into his service. Carthage's defeat and withdrawal also stimulated a revolt among the Libyans, who were no doubt angry at Himilco's betrayal of their brethren. This insurgence caused considerable alarm to the Carthaginian citizens, as the rebels marched all the way to the gates of the city (14.77). Thus Dionysius had achieved a great victory over the enemy while allowing them to continue to exist on the island. Dionysius did indeed show that he had no desire to end the Carthaginian threat, for if Dionysius intended to expel the Carthaginians from Sicily, this was the prime opportunity for the Syracusans to finish the fight. Carthage's credibility on the island was ruined, the military forces had either been withdrawn, destroyed, or bought off by the Greeks, and the city itself was being besieged by discontented Libyans. Yet, Dionysius used the interlude to undertake a siege of Rhegium and extend his empire into Italy, fighting against the Italian Greeks. Like Gelon and the other Deinomenids, Dionysius did not show the desire to wipe the Carthaginian influence out of Sicily. Indeed, the complete removal of the Carthaginian threat would have been against his own interests, since he needed an external enemy to distract the people from disaffection with his own rule.

³ Caven (1990) 120-1.

In this examination of Dionysius' policy towards the Carthaginians it becomes clear that Dionysius did succeed at least partially in uniting the Greeks against the Phoenician threat. His portrayal of Carthage as the enemy of the Siceliots is especially evident in the second of his Punic Wars. A testament to his creation of an anti-Carthaginian sentiment among the Syracusans is the relative tranquility of his rule after the Second Punic War. Though in the first few years of his reign Dionysius was forced to fight his fellow citizens on several occasions, no significant civil discord after the second war is recorded by Diodorus, who was always ready to point out the supposed hatred of the citizens of Syracuse for the tyrant. However, Dionysius' policies probably did not lead to a great Panhellenic feeling in Sicily comparable to the contemporary movement that was taking place on the mainland. Though he no doubt had opportunities to prosecute the war with Carthage to the point of their expulsion from the island, he never took advantage, since he benefited from having the Carthaginian threat in the West as a prop to his own tyrannical power. Dionysius' anti-Carthaginian rhetoric ultimately fell flat, since he did not support his rhetoric and propaganda with his actions. Indeed, even during the Second Punic War Himera and Cephaloedium allied with Carthage (14.56.2) and after the war Carthage managed to bring the Italian Greek cities into a pact against Dionysius (15.15). No doubt he successfully portrayed Carthage as the prime political enemy to the Sicilian Greeks, but the Carthaginians did not become the decedent barbarian enemies as the Persians had for the mainland Greeks. Sicily continued to be an essentially cosmopolitan island with many different intermingling ethnicities.

CHAPTER 6 THE VIEW FROM THE MAINLAND

Dionysius may have successfully portrayed Carthage as the political enemy of the Syracusan Greeks, but he could not change the ethnically heterogeneous situation in Sicily. The island was still composed of a great plethora of different cultural groups and no clear-cut differentiation between the Greek “race” and the barbarians or Carthaginians emerged. However, Greeks on the mainland had begun to develop the doctrine of Panhellenism in the late fifth and fourth centuries and consequently began to view Greek history in those terms. The Athenian sources especially betray a view of Sicilian history as defined by the struggle of Greek and Carthaginian, though this idea was a simplification of the actual situation on the island.

The seeds of the Hellenic consciousness can be found in the writings of Herodotus, whose often-quoted passage concerning the Athenian response to the Spartan attempt to dissuade them from allying with Persia provides some of the earliest evidence for Panhellenic thought:

πολλά τε γὰρ καὶ μεγάλα ἐστὶ τὰ διακωλύοντα ταῦτα μὴ ποιέειν μηδ' ἦν
ἐθέλωμεν, πρῶτα μὲν καὶ μέγιστα τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα
ἐμπερησμένα τε καὶ συγκεχωσμένα, τοῖσι ἡμέας ἀναγκαίως ἔχει τιμωρέειν ἐς τὰ
μέγιστα μᾶλλον ἢ περ ὁμολογέειν τῶν ταῦτα ἐργασασμένων, αὐτίς δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν
ἔον ὄμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματα τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἥθεά τε
ὁμότροπα, τῶν προδότας γενέσθαι Ἀθηναίους οὐκ ἂν εὖ ἔχοι (8.144.2).

As Hall states, many scholars have considered this passage from Herodotus the definition of Hellenic identity.¹ Another indicator that Panhellenic doctrine goes back to the mid fifth century is the summons of Pericles to all the Hellenes for the purpose of deciding

¹ Hall (2002) 189-90.

what they should do about the sanctuaries destroyed by the Persians, to offer sacrifices and to make peace among the Greeks (Plut. *Pericles* 17.1). However, Panhellenism really crystallized in the minds of some of the literati in the late fifth and early fourth centuries with the works of Gorgias, Lysias, and, most prominently, Isocrates.

During the reign of Dionysius mainland Greeks became even more acutely aware of the contrasts between Greeks and barbarians, since after the end of the Peloponnesian War the Spartans proved themselves betrayers of Hellas in the eyes of many. Sparta immediately began ruling the Greek cities under its control with heavy hand and paid home to the Persian king, eventually concluding the Peace of Antalcidas in 387. Thus, Isocrates attacks the Spartans in the *Panegyricus* for razing Mantinea after they had signed a truce, seizing Cadmea, and besieging Olynthus and Phlius while they assisted enemies of Hellas: Amyntas, Dionysius, and the Persian king (126). The betrayal of Sparta no doubt also reflected badly on Syracuse in view of their Dorian kinship and alliance with Sparta. Hence, during Dionysius' rule (405-367) Panhellenism was coming into its own on the continent, and the foremost Athenian proponents of this doctrine were deeply conscious of the perceived Spartan treachery.

The influence of Panhellenism and anti-barbarian sentiment on the mainland Greeks' perception of Sicilian affairs is evident in contemporary writings. The Platonic *Epistles* addressed to the Sicilian rulers, a partially preserved speech of Lysias criticizing Dionysius' Olympic entourage (33), and Isocrates' speeches reveal the impact of Panhellenic thought on their viewpoints. They evidence the concept of definite boundaries between Greeks and barbarians and the idea that Greeks are naturally enemies of barbarians and should unite in the common cause against them. Thus, these sources

view the fundamental aspect of Sicilian politics as the perpetual conflict between Greek and Carthaginian and therefore often arrive at a very negative picture of Dionysius, who never undertook a crusade to oust the barbarians from Sicily.

In Plato's second letter the author clearly understands the events in Sicily as connected with Hellas a whole. He states that under his authority he would have improved the situation in Syracuse and brought benefits to all the Greeks: εἰ γὰρ ἦρχον ἐγὼ οὕτω τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ σοῦ καὶ Δίωνος, πλείω ἂν ἦν ἡμῖν τε πᾶσιν ἀγαθὰ τοῖς τε ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν (310c). Again in the third letter the author connects the welfare of Syracuse and Greece, asserting that if Dionysius had recalled Dion he would have done well for both Syracuse and Greece: ἦν εἰ ἐμοὶ τότε ἐπέιθου, τάχ' ἂν βέλτιον τῶν νῦν γεγονότων ἔσχεν καὶ σοὶ καὶ Συρακούσας καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν (317e). In accordance with Panhellenism, Plato clearly saw Sicily as a fundamental part of Hellas, intimately wrapped up in the welfare of the whole.² This view of the Greeks in Sicily as part of the universal Greek *ge/noj* would naturally lead to the concept of the Carthaginians and other barbarians of Sicily as outsiders who must be repulsed.

Not surprisingly, the epistles show that Plato has extended the "Greek vs. barbarian" theme of the mainland to his understanding of the events in Sicily. The author accuses Dionysius of being unable to establish loyal comrades in cities which had been destroyed by the non-Greeks (331e-332a). The tyrant should have rebuilt these cities so that they would join him in the struggle against the barbarians: ὥστε αὐτῶ τε οἰκείας καὶ ἀλλήλαις εἶναι πρὸς τὰς τῶν βαρβάρων βοηθείας (332e). Plato expresses the expectation that Dionysius would unite the Greek cities into a Hellenic alliance so that he might enslave

² Plato states also that many mainland Greeks are very concerned with Sicilian events (310d, 320d, 335d). This would explain the importance of the Sicilian tyrants as an icon of the Hellenic fight against barbarians.

the Carthaginian enemies (δουλώσασθαι Καρχηδονίους, 333a), but is disappointed that just the opposite happened: Dionysius has paid tribute (φόρον) to the barbarians.

In the defense of Dion later in the seventh letter, Plato states that Dion would have done his utmost to free Sicily from barbarian influence by conquering and expelling them: πᾶσαν Σικελίαν κατοικίξειν καὶ ἐλευθέραν ἀπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ποιεῖν, τοὺς μὲν ἐκβάλλων, τοὺς δὲ χειρούμενος ῥᾶον Ἰέρωνος (336a). This passage shows that the author considered the removal of the Carthaginians from the island one of the primary goals of the Greek rulers of Sicily. Plato also states that Dion would have done these things, had he come to power, thus implying that he considered Dionysius a failure in this respect. The idea that Dion would have liberated Syracuse from tyranny and barbarians permeates the seventh letter, tacitly condemning the Dionysii for their un-Greek government and foreign policy.

In the eighth letter these two threats to Greek freedom are paired again at the beginning of the letter: τόθ' ὅτε κίνδυνος ἐγένετο ἕσχατος Σικελία τῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑπὸ Καρχηδονίων ἀνάστατον ὅλην ἐκβαρβαρωθεῖσαν γενέσθαι. τότε γὰρ εἶλοντο Διονύσιον (353a). Plato here connects Dionysius with his pretended anti-Carthaginian policy, understanding that the origin of his tyranny was in the Punic Wars of 406-5. The author denounces Dionysius' tyranny in Sicily, especially because Dionysius was either unwilling or unable to drive the Carthaginians out of Sicilian cities. Indeed, the letter shows great fear of the Carthaginian enemy and calls on all Greeks to oppose their actions in Sicily: ἤξει δέ, ἐάνπερ τῶν εἰκότων γίγνηται τι καὶ ἀπευκτῶν, σχεδὸν εἰς ἐρημίαν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς φωνῆς Σικελία πᾶσα, Φοινίκων ἢ Ὀπικῶν μεταβαλοῦσα εἰς τινα δυναστείαν καὶ κράτος. τούτων δὲ χρὴ πάση προθυμίᾳ πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας τέμνειν φάρμακον (353e). Plato no doubt seriously overestimates the Carthaginian threat, since they were not interested in embarking on a costly war to expel the Greeks completely from Sicily. After the Athenian expedition

Carthage felt threatened because Syracuse had emerged as a very powerful state, having repulsed the Athenian expedition and brought most of Greek Sicily under its hegemony. The Carthaginians therefore pursued a vigorous war against Syracuse in order to curtail Syracuse's increasing power which might have threatened Phoenician commercial supremacy. Yet, Carthage had maintained a lively trade with Greece and the complete subjugation of the Sicilian Greeks was probably never part of Carthaginian policy, for they desired only to continue their trade in Sicily and not to dominate it militarily. This letter of Plato, then, shows a misunderstanding of Sicilian affairs and has generalized the threat of Carthage as that of a barbarian state seeking the dominance of Greek-speakers. The author has superimposed the doctrine of Panhellenism on Sicily and understood the events in terms of "Greek vs. barbarian," though the actual situation in Sicily was very different.

Another primary witness to mainland perceptions of Dionysius is Lysias' Olympic speech which Dionysius of Halicarnassus partially quotes (*Lys.* 33). Diodorus also attests this oration by Lysias at the Olympic games in 388, though he does not quote the speech, only stating that Lysias urged the Greeks not to admit Dionysius' representatives (14.108.3). Like the Platonic epistles, Lysias depicts the Sicilian Greeks as intimately connected with Hellas as a whole and also connects Dionysius' rule with the barbarian enemy. He states that many parts of Greece are under the control of barbarians and tyrants, certainly referring to Dionysius with the latter term and associating him with the Persian king: οὕτως αἰσχρῶς διακειμένην τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν αὐτῆς ὄντα ὑπὸ τῷ βαρβάρῳ, πολλὰς δὲ πόλεις ὑπὸ τυράννων ἀναστάτους γεγενημένας (3). Lysias also specifically compares the fleet of Dionysius to the fleet of the king of Persia and seems to

view them both as enemies to Greece (5). Again, he equates Dionysius and the Persian king in warning the Greeks to take action against the forces of both their enemies (αἱ δυνάμεις ἀμφοτέρων, 8). He exhorts his listeners to remember their ancestors who fought against the barbarians and encourages them to do the same: πρὸς τοὺς προγόνους, οἳ τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους ἐποίησαν τῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἐπιθυμοῦντας τῆς σφετέρας αὐτῶν στερεῖσθαι, τοὺς δὲ τυράννους ἐξέλασαντες κοινὴν ἅπασι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν κατέστησαν (6).

The comparison of Dionysius and the Persian king has a parallel in the seventh epistle, where Plato juxtaposes Dionysius and Darius, depicting them both in the role of the stereotypical tyrant which became a popular subject of fourth century literature (332a). Lysias also constantly pairs the threat from Dionysius with that of the Persian king in the East and bemoans the subjugation of Greek cities to barbarians. Thus, both authors present the association of Dionysius with a barbarian ruler and grieve over the subjugation of Greek cities to barbarian rule. Perhaps Lysias, like Plato in the *Epistles*, condemns Dionysius' halfhearted efforts at the liberation of the Siceliots from the Carthaginian yoke. Lysias consistently mentions Dionysius in comparison with the barbarian enemy and treats him as if he himself were not Greek or at the very least a betrayer of Hellas.

Isocrates, at first favorably disposed towards Dionysius (*Nic.* 23; *Epistulae* 1) and later antagonistic (*Paneg.* 126),³ provides further evidence for the association of Dionysius and barbarians. In the *Archedamus* Isocrates praises Dionysius for his fortitude in fighting the Carthaginians, stating that he killed many thousands of

³ The change of Isocrates' opinion may have been due to the gap between Dionysius' propaganda and his actual policies. Dionysius would have been an attractive prospect to lead a Panhellenic crusade in the earlier part of his regime, when he was portraying himself as the champion of Greeks against Carthage, but when it became clear that the Carthaginians were simply a means for the maintenance of his power, Panhellenic sympathizers no doubt took a decidedly more negative view of the tyrant.

Carthaginians (πολλὰς μὲν μυριάδας Καρχηδονίων διέφθειρεν, 45). Even this positive account of Dionysius shows that he was evaluated in relation to the slaying of barbarian enemies. Another passage from *Philip* reveals the association of Dionysius and the Persian king once again, showing that both Dionysius and Cyrus rose from obscure birth to become rulers of entire regions (65-6). Also, Isocrates attacks the Spartans in the *Panegyricus* for razing Mantinea after they had signed a truce, seizing Cadmea, and besieging Olynthus and Phlius while they assisted enemies of Hellas: Amyntas, Dionysius, and the Persian king (126). The presence of Dionysius in the list of the wrongful alliances which the Spartans had concluded with barbarians indicates what Isocrates and others favorable to his message thought about the Sicilian tyrant.

These passages from mainland authors exhibit the consequences of Panhellenic thought on Greeks' perceptions of Sicilian events. Although, as was argued in chapters 1-4, a consciousness of a specifically Greek identity was much less developed in Sicily than in other parts of the Greek world, nevertheless mainlanders tended to view the Siceliot's actions in terms of the struggle between Greeks and barbarians. Therefore, Plato, Lysias, and Isocrates evaluated Dionysius based on his expulsion of the barbarians and unification of the Greeks of Sicily and southern Italy. His apparent failure in both respects contributed substantially to the hostile picture of the tyrant which has come down through the works of these authors.

CHAPTER 7 BARBARIANS IN THE SOURCES

The previous section has argued that the contemporary literati on the mainland, especially Athenians, took a view of Sicilian affairs that reflected the Panhellenic sentiments which were gaining credence in Greece during the fourth century. The historical tradition concerning fourth century Sicily, shows some signs of emphasizing the same themes, that is, the continual portrayal of the Greek-Carthaginian conflicts as the defining political event on the island. Though the evidence for the fragmentary histories is naturally quite slender, an examination of the primary fourth century writers and Diodorus Siculus provides some information which suggests that these historical authors viewed the history of Sicily out of its context, overemphasizing the differences between Greeks and barbarians that were much weaker than supposed.

Of the ten pre-Diodorean historians who wrote about Dionysius, six (Dionysius himself, Alcimus Siculus, Hermias of Methymna, Athanis of Syracuse, Polycritus of Mende, and Silenus of Caleacte) have left almost nothing by which their work might be appraised.¹ Only concerning Philistus, Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus do we possess sufficient evidence to speculate on their writings and lives. Diodorus certainly made use of all these authors, but his primary source has remained a matter of speculation among scholars. Laqueur has argued that Diodorus relied mostly on Ephorus, while

¹ For a summary of what is known about these authors, see Sanders (1987) 41 ff.

Stroheker and Pearson reject this thesis and assert that Timaeus was his chief source.² Sanders disagrees that Diodorus' main source was mostly hostile to Dionysius and instead proposes that Philistus' monograph, Περὶ Διονυσίου, is the foundation of Diodorus' narrative.³ However, the argument concerning which of these authors provided Diodorus with most of his Sicilian history will become irrelevant to the present thesis, since all can be shown to have been exposed to and possibly influenced by Panhellenic doctrine and mainland conceptions of Sicilian affairs. Therefore, no matter which source Diodorus used for his history, we can be sure that he could have inherited the "Greek vs. barbarian" flavor from any of them.

Philistus, a wealthy aristocrat who supported Dionysius' regime from its inception, began composing his Περὶ Διονυσίου during Dionysius' lifetime. This historian was an inner member of Dionysius' ruling circle, but his history was probably not as pro-Dionysius as some have supposed. Nepos states that Philistus was more of a friend to tyranny than to any particular tyrant (*amicum non magis tyranno quam tyrannidi*, *Dion* 3), thus marking him as a tyrannophile, not simply a lackey of Dionysius.⁴ His history of Dionysius' reign was probably more of a treatise on tyranny than a panegyric of Dionysius, as Sanders has points out, and therefore could be expected to contain criticism of Dionysius.⁵ Philistus was also exiled by Dionysius and may not have been recalled,⁶

² Laqueur (1937); Stroheker (1952); Pearson (1984).

³ Sanders (1981), (1987) 81-2.

⁴ Sanders (1987) 50-2; Pearson (1987) 24-5.

⁵ Sanders (1981) 399.

⁶ Diodorus states that Dionysius recalled Philistus shortly after his exile (15.7.3). Sanders (1987) believes that version of Plutarch (*Dion* 11.4) and Nepos (*Dion* 3.2), an exile which extended until the death of the tyrant, is more credible (44-6). Cf. Pearson (1987) 20-21.

so the history of Dionysius' rule could likely have contained some material unflattering to the tyrant.

Diodorus states that Philistus spent his exile in Thurii (15.7.4). If this is true, Philistus would have come into contact with an increased degree of Panhellenic sentiment while he continued to work on his history. The city of Thurii was actually a Panhellenic foundation with participants from Sybaris and many other mainland cities (Diod. 12.10.4-5), while Athens claimed the leading role and therefore probably had the strongest connections with the Italian outpost. The collaboration of many different Greek peoples in the foundation of Thurii may very well have left its mark on the inhabitants, who lived and worked together in a common Greek identity. Furthermore, if Philistus continued his work in Thurii, being part of the educated elite, he would have encountered Athenians and the writings of Athenians at the time when Panhellenism was its strongest. Thurii was essentially an Athenian colony and enjoyed connections with the mainland city by which the literati benefited. Even if Sanders is correct in arguing that the story of Philistus' exile in Thurii is erroneous and that he actually spent his exile in Epirus (Plut. *De Exil.* 605C),⁷ the historian may well have had closer contact with mainland literature and Panhellenism in Epirus, considering his residence in a mainland city.

Though very little is known about Philistus, the sources do provide some evidence which suggests that Philistus was especially concerned with Dionysius' relations with Greeks and barbarians. Philistus' political alliance with Dionysius' brother, Leptines, may be the first indicator. Dionysius exiled Philistus because of a marriage alliance between the aristocrat and Leptines (Plut. *Dion* 11.4), since his marriage would have threatened the security of Dionysius' family. That Leptines would attempt to associate

⁷ Sanders (1987) 44-6.

himself with Philistus by family ties shows that they had developed a strong enough connection to attempt to oppose Dionysius' will. Diodorus' story of Leptines' and Philistus' parallel exile, stay at Thurii, and return also preserves the tradition of a political alliance between the two men, whether the account is true or invented.⁸ Diodorus also states that the Italiots welcomed Leptines and Philistus, which may hint at the two Siceliots' sympathies with the Greeks of southern Italy (15.7.4).

The alliance between Leptines and Philistus shows the historian in league with a strong pro-Italiot and enemy of Carthage. Leptines fought against the Carthaginians on numerous occasions and later became famous for his glorious death during Dionysius' third war against Carthage (15.17). He also opposed Dionysius' military actions against the Italiots and even interceded for an Italian Greek army against the barbarian Lucanians, shirking Dionysius' express command, for which he was relieved of his post by Dionysius (14.102.1-3). Thus, the exile of both men at the beginning of Dionysius' ventures into southern Italy may have been due to their opposition to Dionysius' policies in pursuing war against his fellow Greeks. If Sanders is correct in arguing that Philistus was Diodorus' chief source for Sicilian history during Dionysius' rule,⁹ then Diodorus' narrative provides further confirmation of this idea. The account of the first and second wars against Carthage are extremely favorable to Dionysius, portraying him as the popular leader against the Carthaginians, while the following accounts of his wars against Italian Greeks are very negative and include anecdotal stories, such as the Rhegians' offer to Dionysius of the hand of the executioner's daughter (14.106.2-3) and Dionysius' barbaric torture of Phyton and his son after the capture of Rhegium (14.112). Quite

⁸ Sanders (1987) 55-6.

⁹ Sanders (1981), (1987) 81-2.

possibly Philistus backed Dionysius in 405 as a strong leader who opposed the Carthaginian invasion and supported him in his subsequent campaigns against the Phoenician presence, but he began to criticize Dionysius when he turned his war machine from Carthage to Italy and he thereafter included his anti-Carthaginian and pro-Greek sentiments in his writings.

Ephorus, a native Italiot who has been widely considered the main source of Diodorus' fourth century narrative,¹⁰ also probably concerned himself with the interplay of Greeks and barbarians during Dionysius' rule. He received his schooling under Isocrates, the foremost proponent of the Panhellenic movement, and according to Polybius was the first to compose a universal history, connecting Greeks all over the world through his comprehensive approach (5.33.2). Ephorus has been shown to have a distinct pro-Athenian bias, which is significant considering that city's prominence in the development of Panhellenic thought.¹¹ His education, methodology of historical writing, and Athenian sympathies suggest that Ephorus would have been particularly predisposed to view history in the terms of "Greeks vs. barbarians." In the case of Sicily, his repeated inflation of the numbers of non-Greek troops arrayed against the Siceliots (in comparison with Timaeus') may have been an attempt to stress the threat of the barbarians of the West and to connect Sicilian Greek victories over non-Greeks with the universal Greek experience.¹² Further, more negative angle on the contrast between Greeks and barbarians is apparent in his comparison of Dionysius II with the king of Persia (F 211).

¹⁰ Sacks (1990); Laqueur (1937).

¹¹ Barber (1935).

¹² Sanders (1987) 74.

Theopompus, like Ephorus, flourished several decades after Dionysius' death, when Panhellenism had taken hold on the mainland and Greeks had begun to view history in terms of Greeks and non-Greeks. He too was a pupil of Isocrates (*FGrH* T 1, 5a), no doubt absorbing much of the great orator's Panhellenic doctrine during his tutelage. Following Ephorus, Theopompus wrote a universal history which connected Greeks of the entire world within a single narrative and probably made the clear demarcation between Greeks and barbarians (τὰς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων πράξεις, *FGrH* F 25) which was becoming the standard by his time. Though we know very little about both Ephorus and Theopompus, their association with Isocrates and position in late fourth century Greece speak for themselves; they would have been quite conscious of the conflict between Greeks and barbarians and their histories no doubt reflected that. Whether they were hostile to Dionysius or favorable is a matter of debate, but it can be reasonably surmised that that they were conscious of a demarcation between Greeks and barbarians and that their writings reflected this premise.

The evidence for the last major pre-Diodorean historian of Dionysius, Timaeus of Tauromenium, is more secure than the sources for the previous three. The son of Andromachus and an avid supporter of Timoleon, Timaeus praised both Andromachus and Timoleon excessively, while in his histories he denounced the later tyrants of Sicily, Dionysius, Dionysius II, and Agathocles. Like Philistus, Ephorus, and Theopompus, Timaeus had a connection with the mainland, though he was a native of Sicily. He spent fifty years at Athens (*FGrH* F 34) during which time he did the bulk of his writing. In the course of his stay at Athens he certainly would have had access to other Sicilian historians with Panhellenic sentiments, most notably Philistus, from whom Timaeus drew

most of his information about Dionysius.¹³ In fact, it is quite likely that Timaeus was more concerned with affairs of Greeks and barbarians on Sicily than any of the previous three Sicilian historians, since one of his main programs was to establish Sicily as the chief preserve of Hellas. Indeed, Timaeus received criticizing from Polybius for his extreme patriotism (12.26) and he probably exaggerated the numbers of armies opposed to the Siceliots in order to show their achievement.¹⁴ Timaeus also praised Gelon excessively, despite his dislike for tyrants, as part of his attempt to have Himera recognized as the Salamis or Plataea of the West and therefore to equate the struggle of the Sicilians against the Carthaginians with that of the mainland Greeks against the Persians (Polyb. 12.26). Timaeus desired to reveal a perpetual struggle between the Greeks and the Carthaginians in Sicily in order to demonstrate the Siceliots' contribution to Hellenism in the West by keeping the Phoenician foe at bay.

Other evidence suggests that Timaeus condemned Dionysius for his inability or unwillingness to subdue the Carthaginians during his own rule. Timaeus supplants Philistus' version of a dream predicting Dionysius' greatness with an ominous dream of a lady from Himera, who sees that Dionysius would play a part in the downfall of Greek Sicily (*FGrH* F 29). The choice of a Himeran is certainly significant, for it recalls the destruction of Himera by Hannibal and thus the injurious expeditions of the Carthaginians through the Greek sphere of Sicily. Timaeus suggests that the advent of Dionysius would bring to the Siceliots ruin and enslavement to the Carthaginians, echoing the sentiments of Theodorus' speech in the narrative of Diodorus, which is

¹³ Sanders (1987) 81-2.

¹⁴ Pearson (1987) 43.

certainly derived from Timaeus (14.65-69). Timaeus implied a similar idea in his account of Euripides' birth and death. He equated Euripides with the greatest period of classical Greece,¹⁵ stating that he was born on the day the battle Salamis was fought and died on the day that Dionysius was born (*FGrH* F 105). Clearly the implication is that the day of Salamis, which was the eastern equivalent of Himera, brought freedom to the Greeks in both East and West from barbarian enslavement, while Dionysius' birth ended the great period of Greek freedom which had existed during Euripides' life.

The extant information concerning Philistus, Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus suggests that these historians were conscious of Greek identity to a greater degree than the Sicilian Greeks and that they probably attempted to portray conflict between Syracuse and Carthage in terms of the larger struggle between Greeks and barbarians.

Consequently, these writers may also have depicted Dionysius as a very un-Greek ruler because of his unwillingness to subdue the barbarians. Diodorus' narrative will show that his history of Dionysius' times, the first fully extant account, demonstrates a tendency to exaggerate the ill will between Greeks and barbarians in Sicily. Probably drawing much of this theme from his primary sources (Philistus, Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus), Diodorus portrays the Carthaginian wars and the ethnic conflict between Phoenician and Greek as a fundamental characteristic of Sicilian history.

When the Carthaginians reentered the Sicilian political scene in 409 after a seventy year period of abstaining from intervention, Diodorus was prepared to describe their reemergence within the scope of the perceived deep-seated animosity between Greeks and barbarians. Hannibal, who led the expeditionary force against the Greeks,

¹⁵ Pearson (1987) 157.

was of course a hater of Greeks by nature (καὶ φύσει μισέλλην,¹⁶ 13.43.6) bent on taking vengeance on the Siceliot for his grandfather's defeat. In this case the reader is surprised to find out that Hannibal in fact had Greeks in his army (13.57.3). In addition, Hannibal himself must have had at least some Greek blood in him, if he was truly descended from Hamilcar the half-Greek (Diod. 13.53.5; Herod. 7.165). Furthermore, Hannibal initially tried to avoid conflict with the Greeks, sending ambassadors to Syracuse to resolve the dispute and by Diodorus' own admission trying to stay away from conflict with the Syracusans (13.43.6). Contrary to Diodorus' implication, neither Hannibal nor the Carthaginians were interested in pursuing an ethnic war against the Greeks in Sicily or they would have already taken advantage of the disunity and civil wars of the Greeks in the seventy years between the battle of Himera and the sack of Selinus. Carthage did not undertake the war in 409 because they wanted to destroy the Greek race or because Hannibal, their foremost citizen, had an obsessive desire to wipe out Hellenic influence on the island. Carthage's trade hegemony on the island was threatened when Syracuse emerged as the dominant power after the Athenians' expedition and Segesta, an Elymian ally of Carthage deep in the western sphere of Carthaginian influence, was under attack from the Greeks of Selinus. Therefore, Diodorus' attribution of Hannibal's hatred of Greeks as the primary motivation for his Sicilian campaigns is probably due to the tendency of later authors to portray historical events through the lenses of their own biases and does not reflect the actual situation of the fourth century.

Diodorus is always ready to include rhetorical passages on the hatred between Greeks and Carthaginians, making it seem as though the distinction between the two was

¹⁶ This word was probably an especially strong one, as it occurs in Diodorus only here.

ancient and clear-cut. The narrative frequently plunges into descriptions of butchery which were no doubt motivated by the false of the notion of intense hatred between Greeks and barbarians in late fifth and early fourth century Sicily. No where is this technique more apparent than in the descriptions of the sacking of various Greek cities.

When Hannibal took Selinus, Diodorus states:

οἱ δὲ τοῖς εὐημερήμασιν ἐπηρμένοι σφάττειν παρεκελεύοντο. [...] τῶν δὲ ἐγκαταληφθέντων σωμάτων ἃ μὲν ταῖς οἰκίαις συγκατέκαιον, τῶν δ' εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς βιαζομένων οὐ διακρίνοντες οὔτε φύσιν οὔθ' ἡλικίαν, ἀλλ' ὁμοίως παῖδας νηπίους, γυναῖκας, πρεσβύτας ἐφόνευσον, οὐδεμίαν συμπάθειαν λαμβάνοντες. ἠκρωτηρίαζον δὲ καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος, καὶ τινὲς μὲν χεῖρας ἀθρόας περιέφερον τοῖς σώμασι, τινὲς δὲ κεφαλὰς ἐπὶ τῶν γαίσεων καὶ τῶν σαυνίων ἀναπείροντες ἔφερον. [...] τοσοῦτο γὰρ ὠμότητι διέφερον οἱ βάρβαροι τῶν ἄλλων, ὥστε τῶν λοιπῶν ἔνεκα τοῦ μηδὲν ἀσεβεῖν εἰς τὸ δαιμόνιον διασωζόντων τοὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερά καταπεφευγότες Καρχηδόνιοι τούναντίον ἀπέσχοντο τῶν πολεμίων, ὅπως τοὺς τῶν θεῶν ναοὺς συλήσειαν. [...] πᾶς δ' ἦν τόπος αἵματος καὶ νεκρῶν πλήρης. [...] αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ἐστερημέναι τῆς συνήθους τρυφῆς ἐν πολεμίων ὕβρει διενυκτέρευον, ὑπομένουσαι δεινὰς τλαιπωρίας: ὧν ἔνιαι θυγατέρας ἐπιγάμους ὄραν ἠναγκάζοντο πασχούσας οὐκ οἰκεία τῆς ἡλικίας (13.57.1-3, 5-6; 58.1).

Diodorus describes the sack of Himera in similar terms: κατὰ κράτος οὖν ἀλούσης τῆς πόλεως, ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον οἱ βάρβαροι πάντας ἐφόνευσον τοὺς καταλαμβανομένους ἀσυμπαθῶς (13.62.3). After the Carthaginians' murder of many of the remaining inhabitants of the city, Hannibal dragged the survivors outside the city walls and sacrificed them to the *manes* of Hamilcar: τῶν δ' αἰχμαλώτων γυναῖκας καὶ παῖδας διαδοὺς εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον παρεφύλαττε, τῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν τοὺς ἀλόντας εἰς τρισχιλίους ὄντας παρήγαγεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐν ᾧ πρότερον Ἄμιλκας ὁ πάππος αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Γέλωνος ἀνηρέθη, καὶ πάντας αἰκισάμενος κατέσφαξεν (13.62.4). The inhabitants of Gela, having learned of the sack of Selinus, Himera, and Acragas, were quite aware of the Carthaginians' savagery: οὐδεμία γὰρ ἦν παρ' αὐτοῖς φειδῶ τῶν ἀλικομένων, ἀλλ' ἀσυμπαθῶς τῶν ἠτυχηκότων οὓς μὲν ἀνεσταύρουν, οἷς δ' ἀφορήτους ἐπῆγον ὕβρεις (13.111.4).

In this way Diodorus describes the awful destruction of these cities as a result of the Carthaginians' hatred for the Greeks. These stories, however, have more of the appearance of embellished folktale than recorded history. If the survivors of such terrible atrocities escaped to Italian Greek cities as Diodorus states (13.91.1), it seems unlikely that the Italiots would ally with Carthage against the Sicilian Greeks (15.15.2). The ruthless destruction of Himera would also make an alliance between the Carthaginians and the Himerans just a decade later quite improbable (14.56.2). Diodorus certainly exaggerates the Carthaginians' evil deeds in the sack of these Greek cities. The movement of populations and razing of cities actually had a parallel in earlier Sicilian history, as Gelon had destroyed three Greek cities and moved numerous peoples from their lands.¹⁷ Therefore, no ethnic hatred needs to be envisioned in Hannibal's campaign in Sicily; his actions against Greek cities had a precedent with the most renowned of Sicilian tyrants.

Diodorus' narrative displays the same tendencies of the mainland authors and the fragmentary historians to perceive Sicilian events in Panhellenic terms, portraying the war between Syracuse and Carthage as an ethnic conflict. However, the rhetorical passages which present the animosity between Greeks and Carthaginians are often at variance with information provided elsewhere in the text and are therefore suspect. Diodorus certainly attempted to represent Carthage as the Persia of the West, even in an alliance with the great king against the Greek race.¹⁸ His view of the ethnic and cultural situation in Sicily is therefore tainted by his own thematic concerns, since the notion that Carthaginians and Greeks in Sicily were naturally and pointedly hostile to one another

¹⁷ Asheri (1988) 769-70.

¹⁸ Randall-MacIver (1970) 90.

does not agree with the evidence which was presented in chapters 1-4. In fact Greek identity in fourth century Sicily was much less developed than on the mainland or during later periods of Sicilian history. The views of these authors result from superimposing Panhellenic doctrine on the essentially fragmented and heterogeneous ethnic situation in Sicily.

CHAPTER 8 THE HOSTILE TRADITION

The situation in Sicily in the fourth century was very different from the perceptions of mainland authors and other historians. Chapters 1-4 attempted to demonstrate that ethnic identity in Sicily was quite weak and that a high degree of multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism dominated the political and social scene on the island. Chapters 5 and 6 showed that other Greek authors who were exposed to the doctrine of Panhellenism and the growing consciousness of Greeks in the East viewed the situation in Sicily as essentially dominated by the conflict between Greeks and non-Greeks. Since all the authors who wrote about fourth century Sicily were influenced by their perception of history as a struggle between Greeks and barbarians, this view permeated the historiographical and anecdotal tradition.

Dionysius, though certainly an outstanding ruler in many respects, appeared a very poor head of state when evaluated for his success in driving out the non-Greek inhabitants of Sicily. Other Greeks knew that he had clearly portrayed himself as the defender of the Siceliots against Carthage (as had his associate Philistus)¹ and thus they found fault with him for being unwilling to finish the war against the Carthaginians and for at times postponing his campaigns to attack his fellow Greeks. Dionysius clearly used the Carthaginian threat to maintain fear of the enemy among the Syracusan citizen body and to preserve his own power. His apathy in fighting the barbarians surely frustrated Panhellenic theorists, who had once looked to him to lead the Panhellenic

¹ Sanders (1987) 51-2.

crusade against the barbarians. Therefore, Dionysius probably gained the reputation of being a barbarophile or at least an un-Greek ruler, which supplemented the hostile depiction of him as the stereotypical paranoid tyrant.²

Sicilian Greeks continued to have a much weaker sense of identity than the Greeks on the mainland. They still mingled with other ethnic groups throughout the island, trading and interacting with them. Dionysius, a native Siceliot, probably did not understand the conflict between Syracuse and Carthage as an essentially ethnic war, nor did the other inhabitants of Sicily. Dionysius portrayed himself as the defender of Syracuse against the Carthaginian state, not the Phoenician race, and did attempt to curtail its influence on the island. However, he did not see the Punic wars as a perpetual racial struggle for dominance of the island as other mainland Greeks did. Thus, his actions reflect the policies of a monarch concerned with the extension of his rule and maintenance of power, not a betrayer of Panhellenism, for such a concept had not fully developed in Sicily enough to decisively influence the political atmosphere.

² For the hostile tradition see Stroheker (1958); Sanders (1979-80); Sanders (1987); Pearson (1987) 157-90; Caven (1990).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asheri, D. 1988. "Carthaginians and Greeks." In Lewis et al. (1988), 739-80.
- Aubet, M. E. 1993. *The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, Colonies and Trade*. Cambridge.
- Barber, G. L. 1935. *The Historian Ephorus*. Cambridge.
- Brown, T. S. 1958. *Timaeus of Tauromenium*. Berkeley.
- Buchner, G. 1979. "Early Orientalizing Aspects of the Euboean Connection." In Ridgway and Ridgway (1979), 129-43.
- Caven, B. 1990. *Dionysius I: War-Lord of Sicily*. New Haven.
- Coldstream, J. N. 1993. "Mixed Marriages at the Frontiers of the Early Greek World." *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 12: 89-107.
- Coleman, J. E. and Walz, C. A., eds. 1997. *Greeks and Barbarians: Essays on the Interactions between Greeks and Non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism*. Bethesda.
- Dunbabin, T. J. 1948. *The Western Greeks: The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 B.C.* Oxford.
- Finley, M. I. 1968. *Ancient Sicily to the Arab Conquest*. New York.
- Gray, V. J. 1987 "The Value of Diodorus Siculus for the Years 411-386 B.C." *Hermes* 115: 72-89.
- Hall, J. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- _____. 2002. *Hellenicity*. Chicago.
- _____. 2004. "How 'Greek' Were the Early Western Greeks." In Lomas (2004), 35-54.
- Harrison, T., ed. 2002. *Greeks and Barbarians*. New York.
- Hodos, T. 1999. "Intermarriage in the Western Greek Colonies." *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 18: 61-78.

- Jackman, T. 2005. *Political Communities in the Greek Colonies of Archaic and Classical Sicily and Southern Italy*. Stanford.
- Jacoby, F. 1923-1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin-Leyden .
- Jones, S. 2002. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*. London.
- Kingsley, P. 1995. "Artillery and Prophecy: Sicily in the Reign of Dionysius I." *Prometheus* 21: 15-23.
- Laqueur, R. 1938. "Philistos (3)." *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 19: 2410-29.
- _____. 1937. "Timaios (3)." *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 19: 1076-03.
- Lewis, D. M., Boardman, J., Hornblower, S. and Ostwald, M., eds. 1988. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Cambridge.
- Lomas, K., ed. 2004. *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean*. Leiden.
- Malkin, I. 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Washington.
- McKechnie, P. 1994. "Greek Mercenary Troops and Their Equipment." *Historia* 43: 297-305.
- Miller, H. F. 1984. "The Practical and Economic Background to the Greek Mercenary Explosion." *G&R* 31: 153-160.
- Morrison, J. 1990. "Tetrereis in the Fleets of Dionysius I of Syracuse." *C&M* 41: 33-41.
- Pearson, L. 1984. "Ephorus and Timaeus in Diodorus. Laqueur's Thesis Rejected." *Historia* 33: 1-20.
- _____. 1986. "The Speeches in Timaeus' History." *AJPh* 107: 350-368.
- _____. 1987. *The Greek Historians of the West. Timaeus and His Predecessors*. Atlanta.
- _____. 1991. "The Character of Timaeus' History as It Is Revealed by Diodorus." *Mito, storia, tradizione*: 17-29.
- Piccard, G. C.. 1968. *Carthage: A Survey of Punic History and Culture from Its Birth to the Final Tragedy*. London.
- Randall-MacIver, D. 1970. *Greek Cities in Italy and Sicily*. Westport.

- Ridgway, D. and Ridgway, F., eds. 1979. *Italy Before the Romans*. London.
- Robinson, E. 2000. "Democracy in Syracuse, 466-412 B.C." *HSCP* 100: 189-205.
- Sacks, K. 1990. *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*. Princeton.
- Sanders, L. J. 1979. "Plato's First Visit to Sicily." *Kokalos* 25: 207-19.
- _____. 1979-1980. "Dionysius I of Syracuse and the Validity of the Hostile Tradition." *SCI* 5: 64-84.
- _____. 1981. "Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius I of Syracuse." *Historia* 30: 394-411.
- _____. 1986. "Cicero and Philistus." *Kokalos* 32: 3-17.
- _____. 1987. *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek tyranny*. London.
- _____. 1988. "Punic Politics in the Fifth Century B.C." *Historia* 37: 72-89.
- _____. 1988. "The Dionysian Narrative of Diodorus 15." *Hermes* 116: 54-63.
- _____. 1990-1991. "From Dionysius to Augustus : Some Thoughts on the Nachleben of Dionysius I of Syracuse." *Kokalos* 36-37: 111-37.
- _____. 1991. "Dionysius I of Syracuse and the Origins of the Ruler Cult in the Greek World." *Historia* 40: 275-87.
- _____. 1994. "Nationalistic Recommendations and Policies in the Seventh and Eighth Platonic Epistles." *AHB* 8: 76-85.
- Shrimpton, G. S. 1990. "Dionysius of Sicily." *AHB* 4: 101-3.
- Smith, C. and Seratti, J., eds. 2000. *Sicily from Aeneas to Augustus: New Approaches in Archaeology and History*. Edinburgh.
- Stroheker, K.F. 1952. "Platon und Dionysios I. von Syrakus." *HZ* 173: 225-60.
- _____. 1958. *Dionysios I: Gestalt und Geschichte des Tyrannen von Syrakus*. Wiesbaden.
- Treves, P. 1941. "Herodotus, Gelon, and Pericles." *CP* 36: 321-45.
- Warmington, B. H. 1964. *Carthage*. Baltimore.
- Woodhead, G. 1970. "The 'Adriatic Empire' of Dionysius I of Syracuse." *Klio* 52: 503-512.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Andrew Alwine was born in Sewanee, Tennessee, on September 16, 1982. In 2001 he graduated from Temple High School in Temple, Texas. He graduated from Baylor University in 2004 with a Bachelor of Arts in history and classics. He will receive his Master of Arts in classical philology from the University of Florida in 2006.