

## Summary of doctoral dissertation

Andrzej Dudziński

### „Carthaginian presence in Sicily 480-301 BC in light of Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*”

Prof. dr hab. Sławomir Sprawski, May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016

History of Sicily before the I Punic War remains a much less studied subject than the history of mainland Greece and Rome. One of the reasons for this is a very limited source base. Books 11-20 of Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*, covering the history of the ancient world 480-301 BC, provide the only continuous account of the island's history. Thus, in order to study the history of ancient Sicily, it is necessary to put also Diodorus himself and his work under close scrutiny.

Diodorus is generally considered a poor historian by the modern scholars who draw attention to his mistakes and faults and tend to reduce his work to a mere collection of fragments taken by the author from his sources without any critical approach whatsoever. Recently, some scholars started to underline the independent value of *Library of History* in itself. The issue of Diodorus' value as a historian, his reflection on history, and his method of working is discussed in the first part of this dissertation. Conducted analysis suggests, that Diodorus' historiographical reflection did leave a mark on his work. The hypothesis has been also put forward that *Historical Library* was in fact never completed, which might explain some of its shortcomings.

Identifying both the sources employed by Diodorus and the method he used when dealing with them is of crucial importance for any attempt to work with *Library of History*. Presented findings suggest that traditional *Quellenforschung* does not provide satisfactory answers to these questions. Considering the evidence present in the *Library*, it seems plausible that Diodorus knew and made use of works of a large number of authors interested in the history of the ancient Sicily. Furthermore, it seems impossible to identify any one of them as his main source. Thus, the analysis leads to the conclusion, that more faith should be put in Diodorus' abilities as a historian, for he seems to be much more critical and independent author, than it was usually assumed. Therefore, the information we find in the *Library of History* should be taken seriously and considered trustworthy until proven otherwise.

The change in approach to Diodorus makes it vital to pay more attention to his choices of words and terms throughout his work. When employed in case of history of Sicily, this attitude allows to reinterpret some crucial elements of the island's history. In particular, the new interpretation has been suggested for the peace treaty of 376/5. This treaty – it now seems – introduced direct Carthaginian control over some territories in Sicily, which may be henceforth considered a Carthaginian eparchy.

Analysis of the terms *eparchia* and *epikrateia*, used by Diodorus and other ancient authors to describe the Carthaginian presence in Sicily, suggests that – contrary to the modern scholars' *communis opinio* – they are not synonymous. *Epikrateia*, which appears for the first time in reference to the late 5<sup>th</sup> century, is a very wide term, which includes many various forms of sovereignty, while *eparchia* is found exclusively in contexts where there is also a Carthaginian military presence. Distinguishing both terms from one another allows to put forward new interpretation of the Carthaginians' policy towards Sicily, which emphasizes the process of gradual taking over control over their allies rather than subduing the island through military conquests.

The findings made it possible to distinguish and describe four major strategies, employed by the Carthaginians in their policy towards the island. They allow for a better understanding of a complex task that Carthage faced: to protect the interests of her and her allies and stabilize the

Andrzej Dudziński