

SICILY 210–70 B.C.: LIVY, CICERO AND DIODORUS*

GERALD P. VERBRUGGHE

Rutgers University, Camden

After the Second Punic War Sicily was of vital importance to Rome for its grain. Cicero states that Sicily fed Rome (2 *Verr.* 3.11). Cato, quoted by Cicero (2 *Verr.* 2.5), called Sicily “cellam penariam rei publicae nostrae,” as Strabe (6.2) called Sicily Rome’s *ταμείον*. In modern scholarship Sicily’s role as Rome’s warehouse of grain has also been adequately recognized.

In the revival of production in Sicily from 210 B.C. onwards, the Roman authorities promoted cereal cultivation at the expense, apparently, of the specialized culture of vines and olives . . .¹

Yet the three main sources for the period after the Second Punic War to Verres’ governorship of the island totally disagree on Sicily’s economic importance to Rome. Not only do they disagree on what was the main industry of the island, but also on the nationality of the main landowners and on the composition of the island’s work force. Livy and Cicero maintain that cereal production was the most important industry of the island, Diodorus animal husbandry. Diodorus states that Roman citizens and Italians formed a large part of the landowners, as they employed large numbers of slaves as herders. Cicero and Livy, however, maintain that Sicilians formed the majority of the landowners, and Cicero implies that they performed most of the labor themselves.

* This article derives from the first chapter of my doctoral dissertation. I am deeply grateful to Professor T. James Luce of Princeton University for his help and concern both for my dissertation, which he directed, and for this article. The views expressed in this article are, of course, my own.

¹ Arnold Toynbee, *Hannibal’s Legacy* 2 (London 1965) 213.

I want to investigate the three sources' description of the economic situation of the island to determine whether or not they can be reconciled, or, if they cannot be, which one(s) is (are) to be rejected.

Toynbee² has detailed rather extensively Livy's picture of Sicily both during and after the Second Punic War. In a brief summary I want to indicate only the broad outline of the events in Sicily which Livy describes.

After the great wealth of the fifth and fourth centuries, Sicily at the beginning of the third century was spent with the struggles of Agathocles and Pyrrhus against the Carthaginians. The First Punic War, while damaging Sicily further, merely transferred the western portion of the island to new ownership and the eastern to a new sphere of influence. During the Second Punic War the island was devastated because most of the island's cities, seizing the wrong moment, chose the Carthaginians. Sicily became the scene of another battle front in the struggle between Rome and Carthage.

Syracuse, the leading city, made the wrong choice first (Livy 24.6.7). Soon after, the Carthaginians captured Heraclea Minoa and Agrigentum (Livy 24.35.6). Morgantina revolted (Livy 24.36.10), and Henna was only prevented from revolting by the indiscriminate slaughter of most of its inhabitants (Livy 24.37-39). And even after the battle of Capua, some Sicilian cities still revolted: in 211 Morgantina again, Ergeta, Hybla, Macella and some others (Livy 26.21.14).

However, as quick as the Sicilian cities were to revolt, so were the Roman successes in recovering them. They took Leontini first, which controlled the great plain on which so much of the wealth of Sicily depended (Livy 24.30). They razed Megara (Livy 24.35) and captured Syracuse despite Archimedes' siege defenses (Livy 25.25). Heraclea Minoa was taken (Livy 25.41), and all of Agrigentum's citizens, along with the population of six other towns, were enslaved (Livy 26.40). After that, the rest of Sicily realized that there was no hope in trying to hold out against the Romans, and they surrendered.

Yet it was not only the cities who had sided with Carthage who suffered directly from the war. Rome's faithful allies also endured much the same hardships from the Carthaginians, especially the burning of their land by the Numidian cavalry (Livy 26.21.15 and 26.40.4).

² Toynbee (above, note 1) 1-35 and 210-27.

However, though the war had thoroughly ruined much of Sicily, work was begun immediately to rehabilitate the island. Laevinus reported to the senate in 210 that the island was completely pacified, the Sicilians had returned to their cities, and the farmers had begun to cultivate their land (Livy 27.5.4-6). This merely confirmed what he had set out to do as soon as possible—to set the island's economy in motion again, not for altruistic purposes, but to help Rome (Livy 26.40.15-16).

From the very beginning of the island's recovery the Romans made every effort to ensure that the island's grain would once more be available to them. Valerius himself traveled throughout the province to make sure that the land was cultivated (Livy 27.8.18). The recovery of Sicily was important to the Romans even as early as 210, as supplies from Sicily were the only hope that the Roman commander at Tarentum had to enable him to try to withstand the siege of the enemy (Livy 26.39.1). In 208 Rome took special care to promulgate a message that the Roman people were restoring to the Sicilians all their former possessions (Livy 27.35.3-4). In fact, some thought that Rome was spending too much time and effort on Sicily, which could be put to better use in Latium itself (Livy 28.11.8).

After Sicily's liberation from the Carthaginians, Livy records an unvarying story of a Sicily that was prosperous, in that it could supply the various wants and needs of the Roman people as they made war. Sicily was of prime importance for the ultimate defeat of Carthage. In 205 Scipio levied a tax on grain (Livy 29.1.14). Livy specifically mentions that Sicily sent supplies to Scipio in Africa in 204 (29.36.1) and in 203 (30.3.2), and that, to show his gratitude, Scipio sent some of his war booty there to further enrich the province (29.29.3 and 29.35.1). In 198 Sicily sent out war supplies to the Roman armies in Greece (Livy 32.27.2).

The Sicilians had reestablished the grain industry in Sicily so thoroughly and quickly that they oversupplied Rome (Livy 30.38.5). Livy also records that in 196 the Sicilians gave free grain to Rome to be distributed as a sign of respect for C. Flaminius (33.42.8). The only other times that Livy mentions Sicily are, of course, to record who was praetor of the province for each year, but also to record when there was need of a second tithe of grain from the province. He mentions

the need of a second tithe for the years 191 through 189 (36.2.12; 37.2.12; 37.50.9) and again in the year 171 (42.31.8). Also, from Polybius (28.2), we know that Sicily even shipped grain to Rhodes in 169.

It is interesting to note that after the Carthaginians had been expelled from the island the Romans made the *ager Leontinus* public land. The Romans confiscated all the former Syracusan king's land (Livy 25.28.3), and from Cicero (*Philippica* 2.39.101) we know that the Leontine plain belonged to the Roman people.³ While it may seem reasonable as an act of reprisal that all the king's land should be confiscated, it is also true that the *ager Leontinus* was the most fruitful and extensive of all the grain growing land in Sicily. While encouraging the Sicilians to plant their land, the Romans made sure that they themselves would own the best land to offer for rent to the Sicilians for the very planting that they were encouraging.

Cicero's picture of the economy of Sicily, though a hundred thirty years after Livy, is still remarkably close to Livy's. The wealth of the island and its importance to Rome depended in Cicero's time on the same thing as it had after the Second Punic War—grain. There were, of course, many occupations and businesses in Sicily. The main four as listed in 2 *Verr.* 2.188, "Mercator an negotiator an arator an pecuarius," were the most common ways for a man to earn his living. But, although there are a great number of charges to be made against Verres from the days of his quaestorship to the very last day of his rule in Sicily, Cicero in the third book of the *Actio Secunda* deals exclusively with Verres' abuse of the laws governing the tithe collection. In no other part of Cicero's speeches is there any charge against Verres for

³ The *ager Leontinus* is not specifically mentioned by Cicero as being *ensorius* in the *Verrinae*. Cicero does mention that the *ager Leontinus* suffered under Apronius, one of Verres' tax collectors, in the *venditio decumarum* (2 *Verr.* 3.110). This would seem to imply that the *ager Leontinus* was *ager decumanus*. But not enough is known on exactly what the status of the *ager censorius* was, whether it was different from the *decumanus* or was the same as the *decumanus*, but had still more obligations in taxes. See S. Calderone, "Il problema delle Città censorie e la storia agraria delle Sicilia Romana," *Kokalos* 6 (1960) 1-25; and "Problemi dell' organizzazione della provincia di Sicilia," *Kokalos* 10-11 (1964-65) 63-99. The simplest solution to the status of Leontini is that the king's personal property, and therefore the *ager Leontinus*, was made *ager censorius*, as Livy 26.21.11 states. Leontini, as *ager censorius*, suffered under Apronius because in some way it was liable to the *venditio decumarum* as were cities which were not *censoriae* but only *decumanae*.

tampering with any of Sicily's other industries on such a scale or so profitably. The tithe abuse formed an important part of the charge against Verres since the tithes were vital to Rome. Cicero tries to show not only that Verres acted unjustly in his treatment of the Sicilian farmers themselves, but that he also wronged Rome in denying her her rightful share of the tithe. Roman senators would consider this a very grave charge.

But in showing Verres' violations of the law of the province, Cicero incidently gives an over-all economic picture of the island. He mentions where grain was grown (2 *Verr.* 3, *passim*), how many farmers grew it in some areas (2 *Verr.* 3.120) and the amounts of grain paid as tax that some districts had to provide (2 *Verr.* 3, *passim*). But what is interesting are the cities or areas he has named as growing grain. Of course the Leontine plain and the Aetna district are mentioned repeatedly, but cities are mentioned that are located throughout the island.⁴ Almost every possible area of the island except the inhospitable southwestern interior⁵ has a major city that Cicero mentions as growing grain. Cicero's purpose was to show that Verres did not restrain himself by exploiting only a part of Sicily, but made all of Sicily his own personal territory for extorting money from the grain farmers.

Cicero's list of cities shows, besides Verres' rapacity, two things: 1) that the cultivation of grain was carried on all over the island, and 2) that it must have been done profitably, at least before Verres' arrival. Cicero also mentions the actual tithes some of the various districts had to pay Rome. Obviously Leontini is the primary wheat growing area, paying thirty-six thousand *medimni*⁶ (2 *Verr.* 3.110), while the Lipari islands paid but six hundred (2 *Verr.* 3.84). The next three most

⁴ The following cities are mentioned by Cicero in the third speech of the *Actio Secunda* in connection with the grain tithe: Acesta, Aetna, Agrigentum, Agyrium, Amestratus, Apollonia, Assorus, Caleacte, Capitum, Catania, Cephaloedium, Cetaria, Engyium, Entella, Gela, Haluntium, Henna, Helorum, Heraclea Minoa, Herbita, Hybla, Ietae, Imachara, Ina, Leontini (see note 3), Lipara, Menae, Morgentina, Mutica, Petra, Schera, Solus, Thermae, Tissa, Tyndaris and Tyracium.

⁵ By southwestern interior portion of Sicily I mean the area between the Salso river (Himera river in antiquity with its mouth at ancient Phintas) and the Modine river (Hypsas river in antiquity with its mouth at ancient Selinus).

⁶ A *medimnus* is a Greek measure of wheat, a Greek bushel. It equals six Roman *modii* or about one and a half Imperial bushels.

extensive grain growing areas after Leontine are Herbita, paying three thousand *medimni* (2 *Verr.* 3.75), Thermae, eight thousand *medimni* (2 *Verr.* 3.99), and Henna, eight thousand two hundred *medimni* (2 *Verr.* 3.100). None of these three is in the vicinity of Leontini and the area in Sicily with the second greatest wheat yield lies in the island's deep interior.

Diodorus, however, gives a completely different picture from that of Cicero and Livy. In his account of the Slave Wars the main industry of the island is not cereal production, but animal husbandry. Diodorus relates that the Sicilians had acquired great wealth and had bought many slaves. They used the younger men for animal herders, while they employed the others as needed⁷ (Diod. 34/5.2.1-2).

Diodorus says the rebellion began because the slave owners mistreated their herders (34/5.2.27-28 and 34/5.2.29-30). The man who triggered the slave revolt, Damophilus, owned many herds of cattle, besides engaging in grain cultivation (Diod. 34/5.2.34). The first revolt began in Henna, under a certain Eunus. While it is clear that he was not employed as a herder, some of the slaves in Henna who began the rebellion and who belonged to Damophilus were herders (Diod. 34/5.2.36).

At the same time another slave rebellion began in the southwestern portion of the island led by a Cilician named Cleon, a horse herder (Diod. 34/5.2.43), who organized the slaves in that part of the island. The slaves who did join him must have been animal herders also, since for that portion of the island grain production was never very high.⁸

In the account of the Second Slave War there is no mention of the occupations of the slaves that revolted, or for that matter, any indication at all of the economic situation of Sicily. Whether it was the same or had changed there is no indication. But at least for the First Slave War in Sicily c. 140-132⁹ according to Diodorus animal husbandry was the

⁷ It is true that Diodorus records that there were other tasks for the slaves to perform, but the emphasis in 34/5.2.1-2 is on animal husbandry. Young male slaves are what would be desired for any kind of slave labor, whether herding or agricultural. Only some domestic tasks and what could be classified as household industries would require females or older men.

⁸ See page 540 and note 5.

⁹ For the dates of the First Slave War see E. Ciaceri, "Roma e le Guerre Servili in Sicilia," *Processi Politici e Relazioni Internazionali* (Roma 1918) and my forthcoming article "The *Elogium* from Polla and the First Slave War", *CP* 58 (1973) 25-35.

main industry, whereas Livy writing of the period before the Slave Wars and Cicero writing of the period after the Slave Wars say the main industry was cereal production.

However, this is not the only discrepancy between the accounts of Livy and Cicero on the one hand and Diodorus on the other. There is also disagreement on the role of Italians and Romans in the industries of Sicily from 210-70 B.C. Livy and Cicero show that native Sicilians, i.e., Sicilians of Greek background, or at least in name, were the ones who controlled the Sicilian grain industry. Diodorus states that Roman knights and Italians controlled the Sicilian animal husbandry industry.

The racial make-up of ancient Sicily is as complex as that of medieval and modern Sicily. At the very beginnings of the island's recorded history there were three kinds of peoples who had settled the island: the original Sikans, the refugee Elymi and the invading Sikels (Thucydides 6.2.2-5). When the Greeks and the Carthaginians came, there were then five types of peoples, usually engaged in making war upon one another. The Romans invaded the island during the First Punic War, after they had been called in by the Mamertines, Italians who had served as mercenary troops for Agathocles. Also as a result of this war Ligurians, Celts and Iberians entered the island (Polybius 1.17.4 and 2.7.6). Whether all these peoples maintained a national sense of their origins and passed it on to their descendents we have no way of knowing. Different cultures did not exist side by side in Sicily, but all peoples had become part of the Greek or Hellenistic civilization. Still, however, some were aware of their separate backgrounds, as the example of the Mamertines illustrates.

During the Second Punic War Rome settled mercenary troops in Sicily, giving Morgantina to Spanish troops in 211 (Livy 26.21.12-13 and 17). Italians who came into Sicily for trading or for farming to make their livelihood seem to have kept their identity, if the fort (*φρούριον*), Italion, mentioned by Diodorus (24.6.1), received its name from those who inhabited it. It would seem, if this is true, that Italians came and settled to farm land sometime before 246, when it was attacked by Barca, the Carthaginian general.

Livy shows the Italians' desire to capitalize on the chaotic conditions which prevailed during the period of reconstruction after the

Carthaginians had been expelled from Sicily. Italians had occupied land unjustly at Syracuse, probably claiming it as *ager publicus*. Scipio, perhaps with an eye to making sure that the province would remain quiet while he launched his attack on Carthage, gave the land back to its rightful owners, Greek Sicilians (Livy 29.1.15-18). The inscription ITALICEI L. CORNELIUM SCipioneM HONORIS CAUSSA (CIL X.7459).¹⁰ shows there were Italians in Sicily who were conscious of being Italians. However, they must have been acting as a business group or some sort of private organization, because, as we know, there were no Italian colonies established in Sicily until Augustus' time.¹¹

There were, then, in Sicily many different groups of peoples with various degrees of consciousness of their national origins. Which one of them managed as a class to outstrip the others either in number or in wealth?

Livy (29.1.15-18), as I mentioned, speaks of the Italian business men, but, while he accurately emphasizes wheat as of prime importance to Sicily's economy, he does not mention who or what groups owned the most land or who were the most wealthy. Nor would we expect him to, since his history is told exclusively from a Roman point of view. But from all the passages previously cited,¹² it is obvious the Romans were using Sicilians, not Italians or foreign mercenaries settled on the land, to reactivate the Sicilian economy.

Cicero is concerned with the people who had the most cause to care how Verres was ruining the island, the rich, since they, as the wealthiest, were Verres' main victims. But to get Verres convicted, Cicero had to consider the Roman jurors who were judging Verres and who would be most susceptible to rendering the right verdict for Cicero if Verres were shown to be injuring Roman interests. Cicero devoted a great part of the third speech of the *Actio Secunda* to showing how Rome was hurt because Verres caused the grain yield to decrease by his unjust treatment of the farmers. He devoted all of the fifth speech of the *Actio Secunda* to showing how Verres, defying the law, mistreated Roman citizens. Thus, in the *Verrinae* there is, as would be expected,

¹⁰ Mommsen refers this to Scipio Africanus' brother, who was a praetor in Sicily in 193 (Livy 34.54.5). This inscription was found in Halaesa in Sicily.

¹¹ T. Frank, *CAH* 7 (1927) 800.

¹² Especially Livy 26.40.15-16; 27.5.4-6; 27.8.18; and 27.35.3-4.

an overwhelming emphasis on the injury done to Roman interests in Verres' handling of the province. Yet of the approximately one hundred eighty people mentioned in the *Verrinae* as living in Sicily at the time of Verres' praetorship, only forty-two are Roman citizens, and a good number of these were Romans in Verres' own service. Tenney Frank had ably summed up what conclusions can be drawn from Cicero's *Verrinae* concerning the extent of Italian penetration into Sicily.

My conclusions from this brief and incomplete survey would be that people of Rome and Central Italy had not to any great extent migrated to Sicily, that the Sicilians had themselves engaged in large-scale farming and ranching to a wide extent and had adequately taken care of their own business . . .¹³

Thus, while there is evidence that other peoples continued to arrive in Sicily after the Second Punic War and that they and those who had arrived even before were conscious of their separate identity, Cicero's *Verrinae* show that the native Sicilian Greeks, those with Greek names, still controlled the land. As Tenney Frank pointed out, Cicero has mentioned over sixty names of Sicilians of importance; and when Cicero enumerates the large estates on which Verres' agents had found slaves who were accused of fomenting revolt, Cicero gives the names of five native Sicilian landlords, but only one Roman (2 *Verr.* 5.10-16).

There were a number of reasons why Roman and Italian businessmen had not penetrated the island's economy. The bidding for the collection of the province's taxes had to be held in Sicily (Cicero 2 *Verr.* 3.14), putting the powerful Roman tax companies at a decided disadvantage.¹⁴ Also, since the island was geared immediately after the Second Punic War for the full use of the land, there was no time when Sicily could have been sufficiently attractive to draw large numbers of non-Sicilians to it for exploitation. There was never any opportunity to take advantage of cheap land or collecting taxes there, or at least we do not know of any.

"Relatively few Romans possessed land there (Sicily) before the time of Verres."¹⁵ If there were a great number of Romans in Sicily,

¹³ T. Frank, "On the Migration of Romans to Sicily," *AJP* 4 (1935) 64.

¹⁴ See J. Carcopino, *La Loi de Hiéron et les Romains* (Paris 1914) 80-84.

¹⁵ Frank (above, note 11) 800.

Cicero would have capitalized on it. Instead, the largest land owners he mentions were mostly Sicilian Greeks. He concentrates on the damage done by a Roman magistrate to them as individuals and not as a class, and on the damage done to Rome by Sicily's not being able to give to Rome the tax rightfully due her. The Roman magistrate by his embezzlement had discouraged grain cultivation. But in the fifth speech of the *Actio Secunda*, when dealing with abuses perpetrated by Verres on Romans, Cicero concentrates on those who were Roman citizens who had suffered under Verres. The two groups, Roman citizens who had suffered under Verres and rich land owners who had suffered because of Verres' tithe abuses, did not comprise the same interest group.

Diodorus, however, presents a different picture. For the First Slave War he states that most of the landowners in Sicily were Roman knights (34/5.2.31). In another section Diodorus states that the Italian slave owners together with the Sicilian slave owners were the ones who made the revolt possible by their ill-treatment of the slaves (34/5.2.27). And in yet another section, which is a fragment whose exact position in the narrative is unknown, Diodorus seems to blame the Italians alone for the Slave War because of their cruel treatment of slaves (34/5.2.32).

In the narrative as preserved, however, the only names of actual slave owners that are mentioned are all Greek: Damophilus and his wife Megallis (34/5.2.10), Antigenes and Pythos, Eunus' owners (34/5.2.15), and a Gorgus of Morgantina, surnamed Cambalus (34/5.11).

In the account of the Second Slave War Diodorus does not mention who formed the majority of the landowners, but he does mention a certain Publius Clonius (36.4.1), a Roman knight who had been murdered by rebellious slaves. This is the only name of a slave owner in Sicily mentioned by Diodorus in his whole account of the Second Slave War, and nothing further is known about him. However, in the passage which describes the cause of the Second Slave War Diodorus says Nerva, the governor, was either bribed or intimidated by the οἱ δ' ἐν ἀξιώμασι (36.3.3). While any group of rich men could attempt to bribe a Roman governor, the only ones who could intimidate him would be the Roman knights who controlled the courts which had jurisdiction over provincial governors. While it must be surmised that this type of coercion is what Diodorus is referring to in his account of

the Second Slave War, in his account of the First Slave War (34/5.2.3) he specifically states that Roman knights did prevent the governors from attempting any reprisals against the bands of robber-slaves by intimidating them. Diodorus states that the Roman knights controlled the courts which had jurisdiction over governors of provinces. But this is impossible during the First Slave War. The knights did not gain control of these courts until 122 under the *Lex Acilia*.

While there is great confusion in Diodorus over which group, Sicilian, Italian or Roman knight, caused the slave rebellions, and while Diodorus is certainly guilty of a grave anachronism concerning the Roman court system, in his account of the Slave Wars he does maintain that Roman knights and Italians had penetrated to a considerable degree the economy of Sicily as large landowners and large slave holders and that they were a considerable force to be taken into account by the Roman governors of the province.

There are now two distinct areas of disagreement between Livy and Cicero on the one hand and Diodorus on the other: the main industry of the island and the nationality of the landowners. There is yet a third: the class which formed the labor force.

For this Livy is of no use. He does record the revival of Sicily's economy, but he does not give any indication on whose actual labor the revival depended.

Cicero, however, does show who performed the majority of the work. To be sure, Cicero does mention slaves, especially in the context of the two slave wars which had occurred during the last half of the previous century. He does not give any numbers or percentages, though, as to how much of the work force was made up of slaves vis-à-vis the free labor force. But he does show that the Sicilians and the Romans were still to a large degree worried about another slave uprising. In the fifth speech of the *Actio Secunda* Cicero tried to show that the situation in Sicily, while Spartacus was leading a slave revolt in southern Italy, was not serious. Cicero maintains that the reason why a slave rebellion did not break out when Verres was governor was not that Verres was a good and vigorous governor in a time of crisis. Although one would think that a province that had endured two slave revolts within the last seventy years would need a courageous governor to keep it from rising once again in rebellion, Cicero shows that the

previous governors had thoroughly pacified the island and that, henceforth, their regulations were strictly obeyed. Cicero records the action of Lucius Domitius who crucified a slave because he had had a spear in his possession. The law specifically forbade any slave to have arms (2 *Verr.* 5.7). While this of course, gives us no idea of numbers or percentages, it does show that whatever the number was, there were enough slaves to cause worry.

In the third speech of the *Actio Secunda*, which deals directly with the farmers who were growing wheat, there is no indication of the number of slaves used by the larger landowners, as indeed there is no indication of how much grain the large landowners produced who would have used slaves to work their land. In the fifth speech of the *Actio Secunda* Cicero mentions the names of six large landowners who owned slaves whom Verres had accused of being rebellious (2 *Verr.* 5.10-16). However, once again no numbers are mentioned, and, with only six landowners named as actually possessing slaves, it is impossible to estimate either the number of large landowners or the number of their slaves.

But from one remark from Cicero we can say that, for the most part, the economy of Sicily, at least for its agriculture, was not dependent on slave labor, but on the individual free farmer who worked only as much land as he himself and his family could farm.

Quid? qui singulis iugis arant qui ab opere ipsi non recedunt, *quo in numero magnus ante te praetorem numerus ac magna multitudo Siculorum fuit* (my emphasis), quid facient, cum dederint Apronio [a tax collector] quod poposcerit? relinquent arationes, relinquent Laren familiarem suum? (2 *Verr.* 3.27).

There are also two inscriptions which indicate that the small farms were numerous, at least in the territories in which these inscriptions were found.

Two inscriptions, IG XIV.217 and 352, point to the existence of many small farms. The first apportions 24 tracts of land to as many holders in the territory of Acrae. To my mind it refers to a section of that city-state, not to the entire domain; and it probably belongs to the Roman period. The second document, from Halaesa, certainly refers to small holdings, localized in most cases from olive tree to olive tree.¹⁶

¹⁶ V. M. Scramuzza, "Roman Sicily" in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. Tenney Frank, 3 (Baltimore 1937) 318. I am also dependent on Scramuzza for the

In addition to these two inscriptions and Cicero's statement that the small property holders were *magnus numerus ac magna multitudo* there is further evidence in Cicero that a large part of the population of Sicily was engaged in wheat farming on a small scale. Verres' plan to steal the statue of Chrysas in the dead of night from its shrine in Assori was foiled when the guards signaled to the people to come and defend the shrine. They came *ex agris* and forced Tlepolemus, Verres' agent, to flee (2 *Verr.* 4.96). In other words, the citizens from their homes located on their small farms rallied and saved their statue of their god, Chrysas *amnis qui per Assorinorum agros fluit*.

Cicero tells in the *Pro Scauro* 24 that he went and talked personally to the farmers when he was gathering evidence against Verres: *Adii casas aratorum, a stiva ipsa homines mecum conloquebantur*.

Of course there were men who owned or leased land to run large farms. Cicero in the *Verrinae* mentions men of this type over and over, e.g., Diocles of Palermo (2 *Verr.* 3.93), Leonidas of Triocala (2 *Verr.* 5.10), Epicrates of Bidis (2 *Verr.* 2.53), Nympho of Centuripe (2 *Verr.* 3.53), Sthenius of Thermae (2 *Verr.* 2.92), Apollonius of Panhormus (2 *Verr.* 5.20), and so on. But these large property owners were of such importance not because they were numerous, but because they were rich, had suffered the most from Verres and were the most interested in seeing Verres punished. There were many more small free property holders who worked their own land and who formed the primary economic mainstay of the island.¹⁷

Diodorus, however, presents another picture. He states that there were large numbers of slaves who, because of the ill-treatment they were forced to endure, revolted (34/5.2.27).

But Diodorus also gives actual figures in his accounts of the Slave Wars. At first, of course, the revolt was small and local, but as the rebellious slaves gained success after success, their numbers grew. Only six days after the rebellion began, Eunus had six thousand armed men (Diod. 34/5.2.16). Soon this number grew to twenty thousand and later reached two hundred thousand (Diod. 34/5.2.18).

following information leading to the conclusion that small farms were numerous in Sicily: Cic. 2 *Verr.* 4.96; and *Pro Scauro* 24.

¹⁷ On the numbers of free men and slaves involved in grain production see below, note 40.

There are two other sources which also give actual figures on how many rebels there were.

Cleon quoque alter servus ad $\overline{\text{LXX}}$ servorum contraxit, et iunctis copiis adversus exercitum Romanum bellum saepe gesserunt. (Livy Periocha 56.)

Hoc miraculum [breathing fire] primo duo milia ex obviis mox iure bello refractis ergastulis sexaginta amplius fecit exercitum. (Florus 2.7.6.)

Some scholars believe that these numbers (Livy Periocha's seventy thousand and Florus' sixty thousand plus) represent the true figures for the rebels at the height of the rebellion.¹⁸ But they are misreading the texts. The Livy Periocha says Cleon, one of the two leaders of the revolt, had seventy thousand men and that he and his men then joined with Eunus and made war on the Romans. The passage from Florus mentioning a force of some sixty thousand men occurs early in his brief account of the First Slave War; the revolt is still in its beginnings. There is no justification to prefer these figures to Diodorus' for the numbers of the rebels at the *height* of the rebellion. The numbers mentioned by Florus and Livy Periocha 56 refer to the strength of the slaves' army at different times in the rebellion. According to Diodorus there were some two hundred thousand rebellious slaves during the First Slave War.¹⁹

For the Second Slave War Diodorus says there were forty thousand slaves in arms at the height of the rebellion (36.8.2).

There are then three major areas of disagreement between Livy and Cicero on the one hand and Diodorus on the other. The most important industry of Sicily after the Second Punic War would seem to have been cereal production according to Livy and Cicero, but animal husbandry according to Diodorus.²⁰ The control of the economy during this period would seem to have been in the hands of

¹⁸ Scramuzza (above, note 16) 245 and M. I. Finley, *A History of Sicily* (London 1968) 141.

¹⁹ I do agree that 200,000 rebels is much too large a figure for the number of rebels, especially if all shepherds (see below, pages 552-53), but this is the figure Diodorus gives, and actually, the figures in Livy Periocha 56 and Florus support Diodorus.

²⁰ Undoubtedly both wheat cultivation and animal husbandry were important industries of the island. The question is which was the more important industry, employing the most people and the most land, *according to the literary sources*. Livy and Cicero name one, Diodorus another.

the Sicilian Greeks according to Livy and Cicero. Diodorus, however, gives three different groups—Roman knights, Sicilians and Italians—as being responsible for the war since they treated their slaves so harshly that they rebelled. Diodorus does not give any figures to show how many Roman knights or Italians there were in Sicily, but it is obvious that Roman knights exercised considerable influence on the island, as they were able, at least according to Diodorus, to intimidate the Roman governors.

In Cicero's *Verrinae* there are three distinguishable economic strata on the island: the rich landowners, the slaves and the small free farmers. According to Cicero the last was the mainstay of the economy. According to Diodorus the economy depended entirely on the large landowners who used slaves to perform the labor.

There have been only two basic methods²¹ of dealing with the differences between Livy and Cicero and Diodorus. But these ways create additional problems.

One way to deal with these three sources is to take all three at their word and find in the years not specifically described by the sources the

²¹ There is a third way of dealing with these sources, but it does not so much deal with them as attempt to cut the Gordian knot in a swift oversimplistic manner. This is done simply by combining all the sources and not taking note of the differences. M. I. Finley (above, note 18) does this when he says: "It appears that the pastoral and agricultural slaves provided the mass of the insurgents, though possibly fewer of the leaders" (139). Earlier in his account he had characterized these slaves: "At the one extreme were the herdsmen and shepherds, probably the most brutalized of them all, armsbearing and solitary, without education or specialized skills, brigands when the opportunity arose. More numerous still were the agricultural workers, among whom there were also gradations, from the chained labourers to the privileged, though nonetheless servile, bailiffs (the Latin *vilici*)" (138-39). While the first sentence of this last quotation "At the one . . ." is but a rephrasing of Diod. 34/5.2.1-4, the last sentence is Finley's own addition to the account, as Diodorus nowhere mentions agricultural slaves as having taken part in the rebellion, even less that they were "on an even greater scale." Finley makes no attempt to account for his adding numerous agricultural workers to the rolls of the rebellious slaves. He probably got his agricultural workers from Cicero's emphasis on grain in the *Verrinae*, but in the *Verrinae* there is emphasis on wheat agriculture, not on slaves engaged in agriculture. Finley must have presupposed the existence of agricultural slaves from Cicero's detailed description of the wheat growing economy and the vast numbers of them from Diodorus' account of thousands of revolting slaves. This, however, is begging the question. If the situation in Sicily were as Finley describes it, why didn't Diodorus describe it that way? Also, Finley pays no attention to the differences between Cicero and Diodorus on the question of who owned the land. Finley does not even mention the importance given by Diodorus to the Roman knights and Italians in his accounts of the Slave Wars.

causes for the differences that exist between them. Toynbee has the most complete and ingenious way of doing this. In the first of two chapters on Sicily²² Toynbee details, as I mentioned before, the Roman preoccupation with Sicily, for it bears directly on his main thesis, the growth of the *latifundia* in Italy. Sicily had cornered the market in grain production for Rome and the landowners in Italy turned to other products. In his second chapter Toynbee accepts without qualification the account of Diodorus on the causes of the First Slave War: large numbers of slaves devoted to animal husbandry and subjected to inhuman treatment. He then accepts a shift from the wheat oriented economy described by Livy to the animal husbandry oriented economy dependent on slave labor described by Diodorus.

The cause of this sinister local development [slavery] was the rapid extension into Peninsular Italy and Sicily, after the Hannibalic War, of the nomadic animal husbandry and the plantation agriculture that have been described in the two immediately preceding chapters of this volume.²³

While Toynbee here mentions plantation agriculture, in his account of the Slave Wars he mentions only the herders.

The Slave-shepherds in Sicily were in a position to take Damophilus at his word [engage in robbery].²⁴ . . . The slave-herdsmen's disappointed expectation combined with their economic straits and their military equipment to make an explosive mixture.²⁵

Toynbee does not even mention in his accounts of the wars that agricultural slaves might have taken part in the rebellion.

But this shift from an economy based on wheat growing to one based on animal husbandry and dependent on slave labor could not have happened. Sicily could not have hoped to compete with the mainland in the mainland's special industry. For in Italy the animal husbandry industry along with the intensive cultivation of olives and vineyards on the *latifundia* had been in steady development since the end of the Second Punic War because of a particular set of circumstances: Sicilian grain had forced Italian grain off the Roman market;

²² Toynbee (above, note 1) 210-27; 313-31.

²³ Toynbee (above, note 1) 317.

²⁴ Toynbee (above, note 1) 323.

²⁵ Toynbee (above, note 1) 324.

the *ager publicus* had been greatly increased; vast stretches of land had remained uncultivated as a result of Hannibal's scorched earth policy and the long absence of the peasant farmers from their land; and, most important, there was money available for investment in this new type of industry. Even if a set of circumstances, the same as or different from the one that existed in Italy, did arise which would have forced Sicilian landowners to concentrate on raising livestock sometime after the end of the Second Punic War, where would the grain Rome would still have needed have come from? We know of no other sources that could have produced grain in such quantities to take Sicily's place as the *cella penaria rei publicae nostrae* (2 *Verr.* 2.5), especially in the first half of the second century B.C. Toynbee cannot be correct in postulating a shift in Sicily's economy from wheat to animal husbandry.

To account for Cicero's picture of small independent farmers growing wheat Toynbee must postulate still another shift in the Sicilian economy, now one away from animal husbandry and back to wheat. He accepts an idea originally proposed by Carcopino, that Rupilius legislated Sicily back to growing wheat.

The Sicily whose portrait Cicero has drawn in his *Verrinae* is the Sicily that Rupilius had created. It is not a cattle country or a plantation country; it is a cereal country cultivated in relatively small holdings.²⁶

Rupilius certainly did make the shepherds give ground to the ploughman.²⁷

Carcopino²⁸ thought that Rupilius had performed the same type of land reform in Sicily that he supposed P. Popilius Laenas, Rupilius' colleague, was carrying out in southern Italy. Carcopino identified Popilius as the author of the *elogium* from Polla (*CIL* I.551) which seems to refer to the Gracchan reforms in southern Italy.²⁹ Although Carcopino realized that there was no textual evidence for extending the

²⁶ Toynbee (above, note 1) 327.

²⁷ Toynbee (above, note 1) 327.

²⁸ J. Carcopino, "La Sicile Agricole au dernier siècle de la République Romaine," *Vierteljahrschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 4 (1906) 166-67.

²⁹ For the authorship of the *Elogium* see Wiseman, "Viae Anniae Again," *PBSR* 24 (1969) 82-91; F. T. Hinrichs, "Nochmals zur Inschrift von Polla," *Historia* 18 (1969) 254; and my forthcoming article "The *Elogium* from Polla and the First Slave War" *CP* 58 (1973) 25-35.

land reform being done in southern Italy to Sicily, he felt justified in supposing that such reform would have been likely because he supposed the problems in southern Italy and Sicily were similar. Thus Carcopino, and also Toynbee, having accepted Diodorus' account of extensive animal husbandry, supposed it done on *ager publicus*. According to them, then, the basic problem which caused the First Slave War was the misuse of public lands for animal husbandry, which, in turn, necessitated the use of many slaves. Therefore, to get at the source of the problem, Rupilius must have corrected the illegal use of *ager publicus*.

But this solution of a second shift in Sicily's economy, now back to wheat farming, is no more acceptable than Toynbee's solution of a first shift, away from wheat farming. There is absolutely no proof that Rupilius was performing the same sort of land reform that the Gracchan reforms were doing in Italy. Carcopino had none when he first proposed this idea, and Toynbee offers none when he accepts it. Also, it is hard to imagine that the reforms involved in a Roman land bill would be applicable to Sicily. The *Lex Sempronia* was passed to enforce previous legislation on the amount of *ager publicus* in Italy that a Roman could hold. There is no indication that the *ager publicus* in Sicily was being misused in any way, let alone misused in defiance of laws which were applicable only to Romans and regulated their use of land in Italy. If the bill were extended to Sicily, the only ones to benefit would be poorer Greek Sicilians, since there is no record that Roman colonists were ever to be sent to Sicily in a Gracchan reform. There is no reason to believe land legislation would be carried out in a province for such altruistic purposes.

Toynbee's connecting narratives on the history of the periods not specifically covered by the three sources cannot be true. He has postulated vast shifts in the nature of the main industry of the province for a very short period of time, first to and then away from animal husbandry, without adequate reasons.

The other way to deal with the sources is to make an adroit change in Diodorus' account of the Slave Wars in order to bring it in line with Cicero's picture of the island; Scramuzza has the most complex and inventive way of doing this. The first and most valuable thing Scramuzza does is to reject the idea that the slaves who participated in

the Slave Wars were all herders.³⁰ Using the figure of seventy thousand found in Livy Periocha 56 as the absolute number of rebels at the height of the rebellion, Scramuzza shows that Sicily could not have supported 70,000 shepherds. He compares the situation in Italy in 1921 and the situation in Sicily as described by Diodorus. If the 70,000 rebels mentioned by Livy Periocha 56 were all shepherds, this would mean there were some 7,000,000 head of livestock in Italy at that time, since one shepherd usually cares for about one hundred head of livestock. In 1923 Sicily had 1,181,820 head of horned livestock for a population of nearly four million, whereas in the second century it would then have had 7,000,000 head of livestock for a population estimated at 1,000,000.

Since there could not have been seventy thousand shepherds in Sicily during the First Slave War, there surely could not have been 200,000 which is Diodorus' number of the rebels and is not contradicted by either the numbers given by Florus or Livy Periocha 56.³¹ These slaves, if they did exist in these numbers, must have been used for some other purpose than herding. Scramuzza postulated that these slaves were used to tend Sicily's grain crop now grown on *latifundia*. To account for Diodorus' emphasis on animal husbandry as the main industry of Sicily Scramuzza postulated a 10-15% shift towards more animal grazing around 140. Scramuzza implies that Diodorus merely over-emphasized the extent of this shift to animal husbandry. Scramuzza also rejected the idea of great multitudes of slaves so ill-treated that they finally rebelled, but, instead, says that many of the slaves were once free men who rebelled because they would not accept their condition as slaves.³²

By making these changes in Diodorus' account Scramuzza does not have to give a reason why Sicily would change from an economy based on grain to one based on animal husbandry. But if his changes in Diodorus' account are correct, he has created other difficulties. Scramuzza does not give a reason why Diodorus would have made such a mistake and over-emphasized a small shift towards animal husbandry, or why there should have been this small shift towards

³⁰ Scramuzza (above, note 16) 245-46.

³¹ See above, page 548.

³² Scramuzza (above, note 16) 241-42.

animal husbandry in Sicily in the first place. Scramuzza's 10-15% is a guess, and there is nothing in the account of Diodorus to warrant such a guess except a need felt by Scramuzza to account for Diodorus' description of an extensive animal husbandry industry.

Scramuzza does not answer the question why there should be so many *latifundia* which needed more slaves at this time, around 140, for Scramuzza accepts Diodorus' account of a new influx of slaves (34/5.2.1). If Sicily was immediately geared for production of wheat after the Carthaginians had left the island in 210, what set of circumstances could there have been to create a sudden need for many more slaves?

To get Sicily back to the picture Cicero gives, a land of small free farm owners after the Slave Wars, Scramuzza also accepts Caropino's idea of an extension of the Gracchan land reform legislation to Sicily. We have already pointed out why that cannot have been true. But Scramuzza also lists other reasons which in his view show that the small free farm had been restored as the main economic unit: (1) only forty thousand slaves revolted during the Second Slave War (Diod. 36.8.2). (2) In the first war one landowner, Damophilus, had 400 slaves (Diod. 34/5.2.11), while the largest single slave gang during the Second Slave War consisted of 30 men (Diod. 36.3.4). (3) In 105 B.C. the governor, Nerva, freed by judicial proceedings 800 slaves. This was apparently the first of what was intended to be a series of similar acts, but the landlords forced Nerva to stop. As a result, the slaves rebelled. (4) Because so many thousands of men were killed in the two wars, the personnel and size of many farms must have been reduced. (5) Also many landlords who experienced two revolts may have preferred to parcel or sell their estates rather than expose themselves to new perils.³³

But these additional reasons for the restoration of a small farm economy are far from conclusive. Because there were only forty thousand rebels in the Second Slave War does not necessarily point to a decrease in the number of *latifundia* or of the slaves. It might mean that better precautions had been taken and the rebellion was not allowed to spread to the eastern section of the island. For the slaves in

³³ Scramuzza (above, note 16) 246-47.

the Second Slave War were confined to the southwestern portion of the island, while in the First Slave War they controlled most of the island.

Scramuzza in his second reason considers it important that thirty was the largest number of slaves owned by anyone during the Second Slave War. But this number was not given to indicate the relative size of a work gang, but because that was the number of the slaves who first rebelled. And besides, it is not the largest number of slaves owned by one man mentioned by Diodorus for this war. Athenion, the bailiff of two wealthy brothers, was in charge of the two hundred slaves owned by his masters (Diod. 36.5.1).

Scramuzza's third consideration, which would in his view point to a shrinking of the large estate, is a *non-sequitur*. He says that because large scale emancipations were going to take place the number of the large estates was declining. That this emancipation was to be the start of a series of similar acts does not mean that the *latifundia* were being phased out of existence by law. All Diodorus says is that the Senate directed the governor to free those free-born allied peoples who had been enslaved illegally, without any indication that there was an intention to reduce the numbers of the *latifundia*. These emancipations may have had that effect if they had been carried out. But the point is that they were not.

Scramuzza's fourth suggestion, that the fatalities in the Slave Wars reduced the personnel and the size of many *latifundia*, does not mean that there was a change from an economy based on large estates which Diodorus described. Scramuzza used the word *reduce*, but his intent is *change*. Did the revolt of Spartacus change the pattern of land use in ancient Lucania and Bruttium?

Scramuzza's last supposition that many landlords parcelled out their estates is an unfounded hypothesis. To whom were the estates to be rented? The poor? In any war the poor never emerge with money to rent land. Neither Scramuzza's changes in the account of Diodorus nor the reasons he cites pointing to a change in the *latifundia* system can be maintained. There is no indication in Diodorus that large estates were being phased out of existence either by pressure from the Roman authorities or from the effects of the wars themselves.

There is one aspect of Diodorus' account that both Scramuzza and

Toynbee have not attempted to explain: how and when did the Roman knights and Italians mentioned by Diodorus settle in Sicily. Only Maria Capozza has attempted to answer these questions.³⁴ She cites Livy 31.13.5-6. In this passage the use of public land was to be given in 200 B.C. to those who had lent money to the state. Her implication is that public land in Sicily would have been available. However, the Livy passage plainly states that this public land was to be within fifty Roman miles of Rome. There is no mention in this passage of any land outside this limit, let alone as far away as Sicily. Besides, as we know from Livy, the Roman senate allowed the redevelopment of Sicily to be done by the Sicilians themselves. There is no evidence, either literary or epigraphical, that Roman knights and Italians emigrated to Sicily in any numbers to be a significant factor in the economy.³⁵

There is, then, no adequate explanation of how an economy, as Diodorus described it, based on animal husbandry, run by large landowners, many of whom were Roman knights and Italians, employing large numbers of slaves, could (1) have developed from what was originally a grain producing economy run by Sicilians, and then (2) have changed back to a grain producing economy based on small scale farming with Roman and Italian interests having declined so as to be almost non-existent by 70 B.C. How could Sicily have competed in the animal husbandry industry with the mainland when the mainland originally started the trend to animal husbandry because Sicilian grain had captured the Roman market?

Even if one assumes that Diodorus is only mistaken in his emphasis on animal husbandry and on Roman and Italian business interests in the island, the existence of 200,000 rebel slaves or even 70,000 would

³⁴ Maria Capozza, "Le Rivoltte Servile di Sicilia nel Quadro della Politica Agraria Romana," *Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti. Classe di Scienze Morali e Lettere*, 115 pt. 2 (1957) 85-87.

³⁵ Capozza (above, note 34) 91-92 also tries to offer proof from Diodorus that there was a distribution of land in Sicily after the First Slave War. She cites Diodorus 36.11.1 where Diodorus tells that free men who did not have their own land joined the rebellious slaves. Because this passage mentions free men who did not have their own land, there must also have been those free men who did have land. Capozza then deduces that those free men who owned land after the First Slave War must have received it as a result of Roman land distribution, since Diodorus' account of the First Slave War concentrated exclusively on the large landowners. However, it is but a very ingenious piece of reasoning to deduce a land distribution from Diodorus 36.11.1.

still have to be explained. The grain industry could not have supported these numbers, nor would investors, whether Italian, Roman or Greek, have risked their money to go into growing grain on *latifundia* employing slave labor.

Cato the Elder's views on farming show that a smart investor, as Cato certainly was, would never put his money into grain. Even to do everything wrong in the animal husbandry industry showed better sense than trying to grow grain (Cicero *De Officiis* 2.89). The reasons for the unattractiveness of investing in grain as opposed to the type of investment that Cato describes in his *de Agri Cultura* are easy to see. Only $9\frac{1}{2}$ to $10\frac{1}{2}$ man days (a man-day is the amount of labor one man does in one day) are needed for a *iugerum* of wheat-producing land, from ploughing and sowing to the harvesting.³⁶ If large-scale wheat farming were done in Sicily, extraordinary numbers of slaves would be needed for the initial planting in autumn (4 man-days per *iugerum* for ploughing and sowing) and needed again only sporadically for hoeing, weeding and harvesting.

Olive groves and vineyards needed more constant care spread out over the year which could most profitably be done by slave labor, if the olive grove and vineyard tasks were combined with other duties, as Cato suggests. Figures provided by Columella show that a total of 63 man-days per *iugerum* was required for a vineyard.³⁷

Wheat farming would not be practical on a large scale using slave labor. If there were 200,000 rebels as Diodorus says (34/5.2.18) and if Scramuzza's estimate that 791,000 *iugera*³⁸ were in wheat cultivation during a year, each slave would only work 40 days out of the year ($791,000 \text{ iugera} \times 10 \text{ man-days} \div 200,000 = 39.5$). If there were 70,000 slaves, each slave would work 113 days ($791,000 \text{ iugera} \times 10 \text{ man-days} \div 70,000 = 113$). There are 250 work days in a year, allowing time off for inclement weather, holidays, sickness, etc.³⁹ It would not be practical to employ large numbers of slaves for wheat cultivation and then have them sit idle for most of the year. Note also that Scramuzza's estimate of 791,000 *iugera* employed in wheat cultivation would also include the land farmed by the small independent farmer.

³⁶ K. D. White, *Roman Farming* (Cornell 1970) 413 based on Columella 2.12.1.

³⁷ White (above, note 36) 373 based on Columella *De Arb.* 5.3f.

³⁸ Scramuzza (above, note 16) 261.

³⁹ White (above, note 36) 373 based on Columella 2.12.9.

There would then be even less work for the slaves to do than my figures allow.⁴⁰

It is interesting to note that of the six wealthy landowners mentioned by Cicero as having their slaves unjustly accused of rebellion (2 *Verr.* 5.10–16) only one is mentioned as having also suffered from Verres' abuses of the tithe (Gaius Matrinius, a Roman citizen, in 2 *Verr.* 3.60). If slaves were used in large numbers in cereal production, the same people who suffered from Verres' tithe abuse should also have suffered from Verres' unjust seizure of their slaves.

There has been, then, no satisfactory way to deal with the differences in the three sources for the period 210–70 B.C. in Sicily. Diodorus states that animal husbandry was the main industry of the island around 140, and it employed large numbers of slaves and that Roman knights and Italians formed an influential part of the wealthy landowners who engaged in this industry. Cicero and Livy state that before and after the Slave Wars the main industry of Sicily was wheat growing and that Greek Sicilians owned the land and did the farming. From Cicero we know that most of these Sicilian farmers owned only a small plot of

⁴⁰ R. T. Pritchard in a recent article, "Land Tenure in Sicily in the First Century B.C." *Historia* 18 (1969) 554, using figures from Cicero (2 *Verr.* 3.116 and 120) estimates that the size of the average farm in Leontini was 2,237 *iugera* with 937 *iugera* used for wheat production (the rest would either lie fallow or be used for pasture; 2.5 is the coefficient of crop rotation). But Pritchard warns, "Leontini, however, cannot indicate the average for the island for there are too many contradictions in Cicero's account" (554). He then goes on to show that there is considerable evidence for the existence of much smaller farms. Scramuzza (above, note 16) 320, using the same figures that Pritchard used, determined that the size of the average farm in Leontini was 903 *iugera* with 361 *iugera* in wheat cultivation (again the rest would either lie fallow or be used for pasture). The difference in the two estimates shows the difficulty in using the evidence in the *Actio Secunda*. For Pritchard divided the 30,000 *iugera* liable to the tithe by 32, the number of farmers in the last year of Verres' governorship, while Scramuzza divided by 84, the number of farmers in Verres' first year. There is no indication in the text that 30,000 *iugera* is the figure for the amount of land that either the 84 or 32 farmers cultivated. Cicero's purpose in citing exact figures was to show the outrages Verres committed: that even with so many *iugera* planted the tax was still exorbitant; that so many good farmers were driven from their trade. The figures were not meant to be taken together, for their relation in the speech is left unclear. The *Actio Secunda* was never delivered. Its figures would never be disputed. Determining average size from these figures is impossible, and even if it could be determined what the average size of a grain growing farm was, it would be difficult to determine if it would be profitable to farm it with slaves. We are woefully lacking figures to arrive at a cost analysis. It should, however, be an indication of the feasibility of farming grain for a profit that the Roman agrarian writers never go into the subject and speak of grain as a crop to be grown on the side to provide for the needs of the farm itself and perhaps serve as a quick cash crop.

land. No reconstruction of the events that occurred in the years not covered by the sources adequately explains the differences.

Toynbee's suggestion that Sicily shifted from grain growing to animal husbandry sometime before 140 and then shifted back to grain growing from animal husbandry after the Slave Wars is untenable for a number of reasons. Scramuzza's suggestion that grain production employed the large numbers of slaves is also untenable. As he has shown that large numbers of slaves could not have been employed in the animal husbandry industry, I have tried to show that large numbers of slaves could not have been employed in cereal production. Also, there has been no adequate explanation why Roman knights and Italians, who are so predominant in the animal husbandry industry of Sicily in Diodorus' account, are almost non-existent in Livy's and Cicero's accounts of an economy based on grain.

It is, I think, impossible to imagine a plausible set of economic circumstances to account for the differences in the three sources. There can be only one way to explain adequately Diodorus' picture of the island. It is incorrect. The difficulties his account presents are insurmountable, as it is so different from the basic agreement of Cicero's and Livy's accounts and so unlikely on economic grounds. Diodorus' account of the economic situation of Sicily must be rejected. As he made a horrible anachronistic error in dating the control of the courts which had jurisdiction over governors of provinces before 122 to explain how the governors of Sicily were intimidated (34/5.2.3), so he has made another horrible error in his general economic picture of Sicily.

No longer should accounts of the economic history of Sicily include a discussion of the Slave Wars based on the economic information Diodorus supplies. Diodorus' description of the island is not valid. There could not have been a large scale animal husbandry or cereal production industry that employed the large numbers of slaves who rebelled, nor could Roman knights and Italians have penetrated the Sicilian economy to any degree during the second century B.C. The underlying economic causes Diodorus gives to explain the two Slave Wars are false.⁴¹

⁴¹ In further work I hope to show that the inaccuracies of Diodorus' account are due to Posidonius' (Diodorus' source) identification of the agricultural situation in Sicily with that of Italy. I also hope to show that in the two slave revolts the poorer Greek citizens played a more important part than our ancient sources could realize.