

TYRANNIZING SICILY: THE DESPOTS WHO CRIED 'CARTHAGE!'

JONATHAN PRAG

The subject of the negative and stereotypical portrayal of Carthaginians, Punic, and Phoenicians¹ in the ancient literary tradition is hardly a new one, although greater attention has been paid to their portrayal by the Romans than by the Greeks.² The impact of the ancient literary tradition upon the modern reception of the same peoples has also been placed under the spotlight in recent years.³ This chapter focuses on one particular aspect of this broad field: the (negative) portrayal of the Carthaginians as barbarians in the western Greek tradition, down to the time of the Punic Wars. The primary source for this negative portrayal in the western tradition is the discourse generated by many of the Sicilian (and especially Syracusan) tyrants. As we shall see, there is no difficulty in demonstrating the emptiness or falsity of the negative portrayal of the Carthaginians and western Phoenicians in the Sicilian context, but

¹ Terminology: 'Punic' is the modern term derived from the Latin *poenus*, usually, but not consistently, applied to all the originally Phoenician peoples in the western Mediterranean; 'Phoenician', from the Greek *phoinix*, is used to refer to the eastern Phoenicians and frequently also to the original Phoenician diaspora in the West prior to approximately the sixth century BC (the century in which Carthage first rose to power in the West); 'Carthaginian' properly only refers to those from the city-state of Carthage itself—Carthaginians are Punic, but not all those who are Punic (or western Phoenician) are Carthaginian. For clarity, in modern usage 'eastern' and 'western Phoenician' are increasingly the preferred terms, with 'Punic' best avoided except in the realm of linguistics. Note that Greek lacks an equivalent to *poenus*, using *phoinix* universally, while, *vice versa*, early Latin seems to have lacked the distinct term *phoenix*, using *poenus* universally. See further López Castro 2007 105; Prag 2006 4–7; Aubet 2001 10–13; Bunnens 1983.

² Sources for the Classical period collected in Mazza, Ribichini and Xella 1988. The bibliography on the portrayal of Phoenicians and Carthaginians, especially in the Roman literary sources, is substantial. For overviews, e.g. Prag 2006 (also on epigraphic self-representation); Mazza 1988; Bunnens 1979. Specifically on the Greek tradition, e.g.: Barceló 1994; Musti 1991; Bondi 1990; Schepens 1987; Ribichini 1983. Krings 1998 discusses sources on early Greco-Carthaginian interaction; Whittaker 1978 60–71 considers the western tradition in relation to Carthaginian imperialism. On the Roman tradition, e.g.: Camous 2007; Poinssotte 2002; Devallet 1996; Franko 1994; Bellen 1985 20–35; Dubuisson 1983; Prandi 1979; Thiel 1994 [1954].

³ See especially Bonnet and Krings 2006; Liverani 1998; Vella 1996; Bernal 1987 cc. 8–9.

that is hardly the point: it is in the very nature of a stereotype that counter-examples do not disprove its existence, rather they only prove that it is indeed a stereotype. It is with this in mind that such a study belongs within the context of a volume on ‘despotism and deceit’: the prejudice generated against Carthage and the western Phoenicians in the western Greek literary tradition is, on one view, a work of deceit for the furtherance of personal power on the part of the Sicilian despots.⁴

Little, if anything, in the pages that follow has not been commented on before. Individual elements of the Sicilian tradition, in particular those surrounding Gelon and 480 BC, or Dionysius I, have been extensively discussed. Nonetheless, a diachronic overview (which is all that space permits) may be of value for several reasons. Firstly, the western Greek tradition and Carthage’s treatment within it is all too often ignored in broader studies of Greeks and Barbarians, or Hellenism and identity.⁵ The tradition may be fragmentary, but the material exists and is well studied.⁶ Secondly, treating the various surviving elements of the tradition in isolation tends to encourage a view that they are merely derivative of the eastern Greek (principally Athenian) tradition, and therefore subordinate to that tradition. It is undeniable that the initial manifes-

⁴ The underlying concepts at issue here—racism, (ethnic) prejudice, and stereotypes—have been repeatedly and very fully discussed elsewhere. In general, see Isaac 2004 c. 1, esp. the various definitions offered at 23–25: “The major difference between racism and ethnic and other prejudices is that such prejudices do not deny the possibility of change at an individual or collective level in principle. In these other forms of prejudice, the presumed group characteristics are not by definition held to be stable, unalterable, or imposed from the outside through physical factors: biology, climate, or geography.” And “[...] both racist attitudes and ethnic prejudice treat a whole nation or other group as a single individual with a single personality. The varied individuality of the members of such groups is ignored in both cases, but ethnic prejudice, as distinct from racism, maintains some flexibility towards the individual.” Furthermore (quoting Ackerman and Jahoda 1950 3–4) “In its broad etymological sense, prejudice—prejudgment—is a term applied to categorical generalizations based on inadequate data and without sufficient regard for individual differences ... The stereotype is distinguished from prejudgment only by a greater degree of rigidity. Prejudgment occurs where facts are not available. But stereotyping is a process which shows little concern for facts even when they are available.” On stereotypes, see in particular Hall 1989 102–113, Brigham 1971, and Bohak 2005 (emphasizing the variety and individuality of stereotypes for different ethnic groups beyond basic dichotomies such as Greek/barbarian). On ethnicity e.g. Hall 2002 c. 1.

⁵ E.g. almost wholly absent from the specific surveys of the Phoenician image in Isaac 2004 c. 6 and Bohak 2005 223–230; and more general studies such as Mitchell 2007 (see 209), Hall 2002, Coleman 1997 (NB 176 nn. 5–6). Note, however, Antonaccio 2001, Harrison 2000, Malkin 1998, Dench 1995.

⁶ On the western Greek historiographical tradition see Vattuone 2002 with earlier bibliography.

tation of the western tradition seems to develop in clear *dialogue* with the concurrently developing 'eastern' tradition of the Persian Wars (see below); but to suggest, as for example Dench has done, that the later Roman negative portrayal of the Carthaginians was informed (directly?) by the fifth-century Athenian anti-Persian discourse would seem to collapse the distance of centuries (and seas) and be unnecessarily Atheno-centric.⁷ Precisely because language and ideology can have a life of their own, I hope that an overview might encourage a sense of the broader historical context of such discourse.⁸ Although, by stopping at the Punic Wars, this study risks perpetuating the common practice of dividing off Greek from Roman, I shall conclude by suggesting that two themes which are observed as standard within the Roman tradition, namely the negative portrayal of the Carthaginian enemy and the claim to liberate the Greeks, are best understood within the pre-existing western (and particularly Sicilian) tradition.⁹ Thirdly, in a recent study Barceló has argued that the western tradition lacks a negative portrayal of the Carthaginians, at least before the time of Timaeus, and that, Timaeus aside, the negative tradition is entirely written "under the influence of malevolent Roman propaganda and prejudice."¹⁰ It will be obvious that I wish to revise this view, but the argument serves also as a useful reminder of the importance of being clear about what exactly it is that we are looking for.

Barceló is entirely right to insist upon the neutral or positive representation of Carthage as a *polis*, and indeed an exemplary one, in Aristotle's *Politics* (and subsequently, one might add, in authors such as Eratosthenes and Polybius).¹¹ It is indeed possible to catalogue a broad range of Greco-Carthaginian interactions which clearly undermine the negative presentation with which the rest of this chapter will be concerned. The

⁷ Dench 1995 72.

⁸ Cf. Bohak 2005 231: "ethnic stereotypes in Classical literature are pervasive, repetitive, and often remarkably durable." Dench 1995 72: "pre-existing stereotypes commonly inform the way in which an individual or group is perceived, and, in particular, the kind of features upon which attention is focused."

⁹ For the Sicilian influence, note the brief comments of Hoyos 1998 113, and the succinct contextualization of Theoc. 16 in Hans 1985 (see further below). Feeney 2007 43–59 (esp. 56) is perhaps the fullest exploration of this theme, although still skipping from Gelon to Timaeus; Dench 1995 51–53 on similar lines. Malkin 1998 201–202 and 209 suggestively links the first Romano-Carthaginian treaty to the participation of Rome in the Greek thought-world already in the sixth century BC; see also Zevi 1999 (esp. 343) for fifth-century interaction.

¹⁰ Barceló 1994 10.

¹¹ Arist. *Pol.* 1272b–1273b; Eratosth. ap. Str. 1.4.9 (= II C 24 Berger); Plb. 6.51. Cf. Asheri 1991 73, linking much of this to a third-century *Zeitgeist*.

Carthaginian general Hamilcar, who led the army at the battle of Himera in 480 BC, had, as Herodotus tells us, a Syracusan mother and relations of *xenia* with the tyrant of Himera (Hdt. 7.165–166); over 250 years later, the two Syracusans Epicydes and Hippocrates who led Hieronymus, the last king of Syracuse, astray, are described by Polybius as having served for some time under Hannibal, “having adopted Carthage as their country, since their grandfather had been exiled because he was thought to have assassinated Agatharchus, one of the sons of Agathocles” (Plb. 7.2.4). There are many examples in between, such as Synalus, the Carthaginian commander at Heraclea Minoa who assisted Dion, with whom he had relations of *xenia* and *philia*; or Agathocles’ father, Carcinus of Rhegium, who consulted the Delphic oracle through the agency of Carthaginian envoys.¹² At a basic level, we can recall that Philistus of Acragas wrote a history in Greek from the Carthaginian perspective, or that Hannibal made a treaty with Philip V of Macedon and took refuge in the court of Antiochus the Great. From epigraphy we get further glimpses of a complex world of relationships: the well-known ivory *tessera hospitalis* from Lilybaeum, of the Hellenistic period, bears witness to the reality of such relations of *xenia*, recording one instance between Imulch Inibalos Chloron, son of Himilcho, and one Lyson, son of Diognetos; more generally, Punic names are relatively common in Sicilian epigraphy.¹³ Other examples beyond Sicily, such as the Boeotian grant of *proxenia* to one Nobas(?), son of Axioubas, of Carthage, or the fragmentary decree from Athens of 406 BC apparently recording negotiations with Carthage, show quite regular engagement with Carthage and Carthaginians.¹⁴ Greek funerary inscriptions from Motya, or a Carthaginian buried at Lipara, serve to confirm the occasional glimpses in the literary sources of a Greek community at Carthage or Motya, or of Phoenicians present in the other cities of Sicily.¹⁵ The point risks being banal, and examples could be multiplied many times. In contrast to the anti-barbarian, panhellenic message proclaimed by Dionysius I in 397 BC, some at least thought

¹² Plu. *Dion* 25.12–14 (see Sanders 1994 80 n. 12–13); D.S. 19.2.3.

¹³ *IG* 14.279 (Di Stefano 1984 no. 153 and fig. 70); for Punic onomastics, see De Simone 1999.

¹⁴ Rhodes and Osborne 2003 no. 43; Meiggs and Lewis 1988 no. 92.

¹⁵ Birgi necropolis inscriptions: Jeffery 1990 272, Griffo 1997 915–916; note also a Greek *abecedara* from Motya, *SEG* 41.822; Lipara: Bernabó-Brea, Cavalier and Campagna 2003 no. 744 (if ethnic, not personal name) and cf. no. 431; D.S. 14.77.5, 14.53.4, 14.46.

Carthage a preferable overlord.¹⁶ Carthage, or the western Phoenicians in general, presented as the barbarian other, and frequently stereotyped as such, is very far from the wider historical reality.¹⁷

Nevertheless, Carthage and the Carthaginians were negatively portrayed at various historical moments from at least the fifth century BC and that negative presentation is an important element in western Greek history. Leaving aside speculation on earlier contexts in which such a presentation might have developed (such as colonization attempts in Sicily in the seventh and sixth centuries, or the battle of Alalia c. 535 BC), the earliest identifiable thread has its origins in the battle of Himera in 480 BC.¹⁸ The earliest evidence for any such presentation is to be found in Pindar's *First Pythian Ode*, written to commemorate a chariot victory of Hieron of Syracuse in 474/470 BC.¹⁹ Most obviously, Pindar links the Syracusan victories at Himera (against the "Phoenicians," 480 BC) and Cumae (against the "Tyrsanoi," Etruscans, 474 BC) with those of Salamis and Plataea, praising the action of the ruler of the Syracusans in "rescuing Hellas from oppressive slavery."²⁰ The general theme is developed throughout the poem as Pindar weaves a complex parallelism between Cumae and Himera, their respective geographically proximate (and recently active) volcanoes of Vesuvius and Etna, the savage and barbarous Tryphon underlying both volcanoes, Zeus who tamed him, and Hieron founder of Aetna and victor over the barbarians.²¹ Although the surviving inscription from Gelon's dedication at Delphi after the battle of Himera is more neutral in tone ("Gelon, son of Deinomenes, the Syracusan, made the dedication to Apollo"), the scholiast to Pindar claims that Simonides composed an epigram to accompany the dedication, which

¹⁶ E.g. D.S. 14.41.1, 14.65.2.

¹⁷ For Siculo-Carthaginian relations generally see e.g. Bondi 1980, Hans 1983, Anello 2002. The point is frequently made (e.g. Bondi 1990–1991, cf. Whittaker 1978) that Carthaginian 'imperialism' in Sicily lacks a meaningful historical reality much before the fourth century and is in part a creation of the historiographical tradition.

¹⁸ Detailed survey of sources on Alalia and Dorieus in Krings 1998 93–215 (note 99 and 104–106 on the absence of such a presentation in the case of the Alalia). On Himera and its central role in such development, Krings 1998 261–326.

¹⁹ Commonly dated to 470 BC, although 474, the year of the battle of Cumae, cannot be ruled out; for a detailed summary of the problem of Pythian dating see Finglass 2007 19–27 (favours 470) and Currie 2005 25–26 (neutral).

²⁰ Pi. P. 1.71–80. On the broader theme of liberation, which in Sicily subsequently (460s onwards) becomes focused around the tyrants themselves, see e.g. Raaflaub 2004 (esp. 106), Ostwald 1995.

²¹ See esp. Carey 1978 21–27 for elucidation of these themes and arguing, *inter alia*, that Pi. P. 1.47–55 also alludes to both the battles of Himera and Cumae.

described it as “a tithe of the tithe of the booty they had of their victory over the barbarian *ethnê*, when they gave a great army to fight beside the Hellenes for freedom”; nothing further can be gleaned from Pausanias’ mention of a second dedication at Olympia.²² As Meiggs and Lewis observed:

In the event, even if not in intention, [the dedication at Delphi—and at Olympia] formed a pendent to the golden tripod dedicated by the Spartans and their allies for their victory over the Persians, and Gelo [...] asserted that his victory over Carthage was as important to Apollo and to Greece as that victory.²³

One might also compare Bacchylides’ *Third Epinician Ode* in praise of Hieron (468 BC), which draws an analogy between Hieron’s dedications at Delphi (“finely wrought tripods that flank the Delphic temple’s entrance”—i.e. the tripods erected by Gelon after Himera and Hieron after Cumae) and Croesus’ generosity to Pythian Apollo, while describing Hieron as appointed by Zeus to rule over many Hellenes, and Croesus as preserved by Zeus after being conquered by the savage Persians.²⁴

Gelon also seems to have erected temples to Athena at both Himera and Syracuse after the battle of Himera, as part of his commemoration of the victory.²⁵ However, the Simonides epigram and the general action of dedication at Delphi aside, there is little direct evidence to suggest that Gelon himself constructed his success as an explicit victory for Hellenes against the barbarian, as opposed to a more general programme of self-legitimation through military victory. On the other hand, that his successor Hieron did so, not least in the wake of the battle of Cumae against the Etruscans in 474 BC, seems much more likely.²⁶ In addition to the victory odes that he commissioned, Hieron had Aeschylus’ *Persae* performed at Aetna in 472 BC.²⁷ The presenta-

²² *Syll*³. 34a = Meiggs and Lewis 1988 no. 28; Schol. ad Pi. P. 1.152, cf. AP 6.214 (see Page 1981 247–250 no. 34 (sceptical); detailed discussion in Molyneux 1992 220–224; for Simonides and Hieron see Molyneux 1992 224–236 and Podlecki 1979); Paus. 6.19.7.

²³ Meiggs and Lewis 1988 61. The attested dedications by Gelon and Hieron at Delphi and Olympia are collected in *Syll*³. 33–35.

²⁴ B. 3.17–21 for the tripods. The dedications of Gelon and Hieron at Delphi are likewise linked with those of Gyges and Croesus in Athenaeus’ report of Theopompus on Hieron’s dedication (*FGrH* 115 F193 = Ath. 6.231e–232b).

²⁵ Gras 1990; van Compernelle 1989 45–51, 1992 24–37, 51–61 (with the possibility of a third commemorative temple at Gela); Luraghi 1994 318–321.

²⁶ Luraghi 1994 362–365.

²⁷ *TGF* III T 56a (Eratosth. fr. 109 [Strecker]) and T 1.9–11, 18 (*Aesch. vita* 9–11, 18); Herington 1967 (with all relevant texts); Guardì 1980 38–41 (*non vidi*).

tion by Hieron of Gelon's victory against Carthage at Himera as a battle for Hellas against the barbarians (the association of Himera/Gelon and Cumae/Hieron was made visible at Delphi through the adjacent tripods) serves an obvious function in legitimizing Hieron not only as successor to Gelon but also as defender of the Sikeliotes specifically and the Hellenes in general against the barbarian through his own victory at Cumae. Diodorus captures the value of Gelon's victory for his successors, even if not explicitly their own exploitation of it, when he observes that "so strong was the goodwill which the citizens felt for him (Gelon) that the kingship was maintained for three members of his house" (D.S. 11.23.3).

Such a presentation of their victories by the Syracusan tyrants (which is to be placed alongside their more general self-presentation as Hellenes at Delphi and Olympia²⁸) provides the background for the subsequent appearance of the even more explicit (and inventive?) claims that first appear in the surviving sources in the account of Herodotus. In favour of the view that Gelon himself may have been the first to promote his actions against Carthage in this light is the speech attributed to him by Herodotus in which he accuses the mainland Greeks of failing to support him previously in his avenging of the failed Spartan colonist Dorieus, or in his war to liberate *emporía* in Sicily from the "barbarians" (Hdt. 7.158.1–3). However, the only other source to mention this earlier episode is the very confused, and much later, account of Justin, and the claim cannot be linked to any known event in the earlier part of Gelon's rule.²⁹ One other element that is attributed to Gelon, and which can be traced back as far as Theophrastus (reported in the scholiast to Pindar, repeated by Plutarch, and attributed instead to Darius by Justin and to Hadrian by Porphyry) is the story that, as part of the peace settlement after Himera, Gelon ordered the Carthaginians to cease human sacrifice.³⁰ Here we perhaps see the first signs of a portrayal of the Carthaginians that goes beyond the basic 'othering' of the term barbarian, more than

²⁸ For which see, e.g., Harrell 2002, Antonaccio 2001 134.

²⁹ Iust. 19.1.9–13. Positive analysis in Franco 2008 119–120 with bibliography; a more sceptical view in Luraghi 1994 278–281; see esp. Gras 2000 on the likely significance of *emporía*.

³⁰ Theophr. ap. Schol. Pi. P. 2.2 (= Fortenbaugh and others 1992 vol. 2 no. 586: "At least Theophrastus in his (work) *On Etruscans* says that on Gelon's order they stopped performing human sacrifice"; the work *On Etruscans* is not otherwise known, Podlecki 1985 249 n. 95); Plu. *Moralia* 175A, 552A; cf. Iust. 19.1.10, Porph. *Abst.* 2.56.3. The tradition could go back, e.g., to Philistus (Zahrnt 1993 384). Mafodda 1996 90 discusses it within the context of a possible religious policy of Gelon.

merely an external foe, an enemy which can be presented as morally inferior.³¹

Herodotus' famous account of the appeal by the Hellenes to Gelon for help against Xerxes has been much discussed.³² The variations within the account that prompted Herodotus to seek out a Sicilian version relate only to Gelon's justification for not helping the mainland Greeks; Herodotus is in no doubt it seems about the competitive claims to being the best of the Hellenes that were in circulation.³³ For the purposes of this discussion, the interest lies not in the question of whether any particular version has any 'truth' to it—the point is rather that such claims and counter-claims were already in circulation at the latest within a generation of the events. The notorious synchronism of Himera and Salamis is explicitly attributed by Herodotus to the Sicilian version.³⁴ As Asheri has emphasized, the point of a synchronism lies in its potential meta-historical message, not in the mere fact of the synchronism. Indeed, that point was made by Aristotle himself, when he denied the significance of this particular synchronism—although, interestingly, he appears to have accepted the basic fact of the synchronism (Arist. *Poet.* 1459a24–27). The synchronism of Himera with any of the major battles against Xerxes (in later versions Himera was also compared to Plataea and synchronized with Thermopylae) serves precisely the function of promoting the action of the Sicilian tyrants against the barbarian Carthaginians to the same level as that of the Athenians or Spartans against the barbarian Persians (just like Hieron's staging of Aeschylus' *Persae*).³⁵ In similar vein, parallels are apparent already in the Herodotean account between the Carthaginian force and Xerxes' expedition; by the time of Ephorus' version, the Carthaginian expedition was explicitly co-ordinated with the

³¹ Brown 1991 surveys the literary, epigraphic, and archaeological sources for this difficult subject, although she misses the Theophrastus text just quoted (cf. 1991 22–24); recent overview in Xella 2006 56–57 and esp. the articles by Bonnet and Quinn (both forthcoming). For the posture of prohibition cf. Julius Caesar's treatment of the western Phoenician inhabitants of Gades in the first century BC (Cic. *Balb.* 43) and see generally Grottanelli 1999.

³² Besides Gauthier 1966 (with earlier bibliography), see, e.g. Brunt 1993 [1953]; Lo Cascio 1973–1974; Asheri 1991–1992; Luraghi 1994; Mafodda 1996; Krings 1998 270–284.

³³ Sicilian version: Hdt. 7.165–166; competitive Hellenism: 7.161.3–162.

³⁴ Hdt. 7.166.1, on which see esp. Gauthier 1966, Asheri 1991–1992 56–60, Feeney 2007 43–52; cf. Harrell 2006.

³⁵ Ephor. ap. Schol. ad Pi. *P.* 1.146b (= *FGrH* 70 F186); D.S. 11.23–24; cf. Plb. 12.26.b on Timaeus' account (= *FGrH* 566 F94).

Persian invasion, with an embassy sent by Xerxes and the Phoenicians to Carthage to match that of the Hellenes to Gelon; and in Diodorus' version, whether derived from Ephorus, Timaeus, or elsewhere, both of these aspects are expanded further.³⁶ Ephorus' version even goes so far as to claim that in defeating the Carthaginians the Syracusan tyrant freed not merely the Sikeliotes, but all the Hellenes (and the close parallel with Pindar's "freeing Hellas" is what prompted the scholiast's report of it in the first place).³⁷

It should be made clear that few of these texts except the latest versions (principally in Diodorus) describe any of this in language that is more negative than the classic dichotomies of barbarians and Hellenes, freedom and slavery. The only real move towards a more strongly negative presentation lies in the report already mentioned of the treaty clause post-Himera outlawing human sacrifice; but since that last element can be traced back to Theophrastus and the end of the fourth century at the latest it is very definitely pre-Roman, and almost certainly pre-Timaeus.³⁸ Nonetheless, it appears undeniable that the struggle of 480 BC against the Carthaginians on the part of Gelon and the Syracusans was being actively presented as defending the freedom of the Hellenes from the barbarian before a decade had passed. Polybius' strictures on Timaeus notwithstanding, it is also apparent that a more fully developed version of this had currency already in Herodotus' day, and had developed even further by Ephorus' time.³⁹ The original exponent of that claim must surely have been Hieron, if not Gelon himself.

Whether Gelon or Hieron is the source, it is clear that an appeal to the model of Gelon, specifically as conqueror of the barbarian Carthaginians, became a key part of the appeal of many of the later tyrants in Sicily.⁴⁰ The fact that much of this tradition survives only in the later Diodorus should not be considered a serious obstacle—it can hardly be an invention of

³⁶ See e.g. Brown 1952 for discussion of Diodorus' version and his sources; Vattuone 1991 163–166 on the expansion by Ephorus and Timaeus.

³⁷ *FGrH* 70 F 186: "[Gelon] having fought freed not only the Sikeliotai, but all Hellas." On Pindar's line (*P.* 1.146b), the scholiast further observes "Some understand *Hellas* as Sicily, some as Attica."

³⁸ The Pindar scholiast reports different elements of the same treaty from each of Theophrastus and Timaeus (*FGrH* 566 F20).

³⁹ *Plb.* 12.26b.4: "Timaeus, in commenting on all this, is so long-winded and so obviously anxious to manifest that Sicily was more important than all the rest of Greece [...]."

⁴⁰ See the general observations on continuity in Sicilian tyranny in Lewis 2000, esp. 105.

Diodorus himself, and there are occasional glimpses of the use of Gelon in earlier sources.⁴¹ Diodorus records that Dionysius I's appointment as *stratêgos autokrator* against the Carthaginians in 406 BC was justified on the model of Gelon at Himera;⁴² perhaps more tellingly, the anti-Dionysius speech attributed to the Syracusan Theodorus in 396 BC by Diodorus (D.S. 14.65–69) includes an extended rejection of the parallel:

Surely no one would think of comparing Dionysius with Gelon of old. For Gelon, by reason of his own high character, together with the Syracusans and the rest of the Sicilian Greeks, set free the whole of Sicily, whereas this man, who found the cities free, has delivered all the rest of them over to the lordship of the enemy and has himself enslaved his native state [...].

The negative surely implies the existence of the positive, a point to which we shall return, and the argument employed revolves around the appropriation of the claim to liberation, turning it upon the tyrant himself, rather than allowing its use by the tyrant against an external enemy.⁴³ Plutarch has Dion rebuke Dionysius I for ridiculing Gelon (Plu. *Dion* 5.9–10). [Plato]'s *Seventh Epistle* echoes both of these (or rather, as a source, precedes them), observing that: “it would be an easy task to enslave the Carthaginians far more than they had been enslaved in the time of Gelon, whereas now, on the contrary, his father [Dionysius I] had contracted to pay tribute to the barbarians.”⁴⁴ When Timoleon had not only ejected tyrants from Sicily but also won a victory over the Carthaginians at the Crimisus, according to Plutarch, “It was at this time, they say, that the statue of Gelon, their ancient tyrant, was preserved by the Syracusans, although they condemned the rest, because they admired and honoured him for the victory which he had won over the Carthaginians at Himera.”⁴⁵ Diodorus claims that Timoleon urged on

⁴¹ Detailed consideration of Timaeus' portrayal of Gelon in Vattuone 1991 159–178.

⁴² D.S. 13.94.5–95.1; cf. Pl. *Ep.* 8.353a–b on his appointment for the safeguarding of Sicily. For the use of Gelon by Dionysius I, Bearzot 1991.

⁴³ For the speech of Theodorus, note the comments of Vattuone 1991 155–157, 224–225 and Sanders 1987 134–141 esp. 136–137; for a different reading of this passage, see Barceló 1994 7. Raaflaub 2004 on the development of liberation ideology in the Greek world.

⁴⁴ *Ep.* 7.333a; cf. 8.355d (“[...] those who crave to win back that tyranny—the men whose ancestors in those days performed the mightiest deed in saving the Greeks from the barbarians”). 7.336a suggests that Dion would have made Sicily free from barbarians more easily than did Hieron I. On *Epistles* 7 and 8, and their apparent context of apologetic for a previously pro-Carthage Dion, see Sanders 1994.

⁴⁵ Plu. *Tim.* 23.8; cf. Sordi 1961 54 n. 1 on parallel implications in contemporary coinage.

his troops at the Crimisus with the example of Gelon—a speech which Polybius condemns in Timaeus, but which at least takes us back to the early third century and a Sicilian author.⁴⁶ It has been very plausibly argued by Coarelli that the 27 *imagines Siciliae regum ac tyrannorum* recorded by Cicero in the Temple of Athena at Syracuse constituted a deliberate attempt on the part of Agathocles to construct himself as the culmination of a line of anti-barbarian leaders of Sicily, beginning with perhaps Gelon himself.⁴⁷ Hieron II chose the name Gelon for his son, probably not long after 270 BC, as part of a deliberate self-fashioning.⁴⁸

Naturally, other routes to self-legitimation were available, and the Sicilian tyrants could appeal to other things, justify war on other grounds. Even in the case of war with Carthage, wealth alone stands as a perfectly acceptable motive, with no need for the language of barbarians at the gate. Thucydides is in any case more interested in conflict between Greeks than with external enemies and in his account, when Alcibiades suggests to the Athenians the conquest of Carthage after Sicily, it is quite simply on grounds of wealth and honour; his fellow generals subsequently appealed to Carthage for aid against Syracuse—a move contemplated also by the Syracusans themselves.⁴⁹ But the claim of barbarism was made by many. Much the most obvious example of the appeal to what we might class as ethnic prejudice revolves around Dionysius I's seizure of power, and in particular the campaign he waged in 398/397 BC, beginning with a 'Sicilian vespers' against the Carthaginians resident in Syracuse and elsewhere on the island, and concluding with the sacking of the Phoenician settlement of Motya and the crucifixion of their Greek supporters.⁵⁰ It is of course true that the lurid account which we possess of these events is to be found in the rather later work of Diodorus, although this itself undoubtedly owes much to Timaeus.⁵¹ In his account of the Carthaginian

⁴⁶ D.S. 16.79.2; Plb. 12.26a (= *FGrH* 566 F31b); Vattuone 1991 109–110.

⁴⁷ Cic. *Ver.* 4.123 with Coarelli 1982 esp. 557.

⁴⁸ Iust. 23.4.4 (from Timaeus? see De Sensi Sestito 1977 205) records the tradition that Hieron II claimed descent from the Deinomenids; De Sensi Sestito 1977 183 (115 n. 17 for the birth of Gelon between c.270 and c.266 BC); Domínguez Monedero 1993 175–179.

⁴⁹ Th. 6.15.2, 6.90 (Alcibiades) and 6.34.2, 6.88.6 (appeals to Carthage); see Harrison 2000 on the Thucydidean construction of identity in the Sicilian expedition, suggesting parallels with the war against Persia (likewise Antonaccio 2001 140 n. 6 on Th. 4.59–61).

⁵⁰ Principally D.S. 14.45–55; see e.g. Sordi 1992 33–49.

⁵¹ On the Dionysian tradition in general see e.g. Sanders 1987, Sordi 1992 93–104. For a sophisticated and wide-ranging discussion of Diodorus' account of this and associated episodes between 409 and 397 BC, focused on issues of representation rather than source criticism, see Cusumano forthcoming.

sack of Gela, Diodorus cannot resist Timaeus' rather far-fetched synchronizing claim that a colossal bronze of Apollo was liberated from Tyre by Alexander the Great (in 332 BC) on the same day, and at the same hour, as it had originally been seized by the Carthaginians from Gela in 405 BC. Such a synchronism of course implies parallels between the liberating and avenging actions of Alexander against the barbarians in the East and those campaigning in the West.⁵² But, [Plato]'s *Epistles* aside, we are not dependent upon Diodorus alone for the Dionysian position.⁵³

In 388 BC the Syracusan-born orator Lysias openly attacked Dionysius I in his *Olympic Oration*, drawing a direct parallel between Artaxerxes II and Dionysius I for those engaged in the Panhellenic struggle against the barbarian.⁵⁴ Since the speech was made at Olympia, when Dionysius was himself present at the games precisely to promote himself and his actions as a Hellene, like his Deinomenid predecessors, Lysias' speech must have gained much of its force from the fact that it subverted Dionysius' own claims. Only 20 years later, as the political pendulum swung the other way, another Athenian orator, Isocrates, could appeal to Dionysius to take up the mantle of Panhellenic defender.⁵⁵ The strikingly similar Olympic episode in Plutarch involving Themistocles and Hieron a century earlier is usually seen as a doublet fashioned upon the Lysias-Dionysius episode, itself reflecting further the use of the Deinomenids on the part of Dionysius already referred to above.⁵⁶ The progress throughout Dionysius' career of such inversion (unsurprisingly, the majority of what comes down to us is the anti-Dionysian tradition) is set out explic-

⁵² D.S. 13.108.4–5 (= *FGrH* 566 F106), cf. Curt. 4.3.22 wrongly attributing the statue to Syracuse; also Plut. *Alex.* 24.6–7 and D.S. 17.41.8, 46.6 for the statue but without the Sicilian connection. On this synchronism see Asheri 1991 80–82 (esp. 82), Vattuone 1991 299, Feeney 2007 48–50. Arr. *Anab.* 2.24.5, D.S. 17.40.3, Iust. 11.10.12–14, Curt. 4.3.19–20 and 4.4.18 all offer elements of a different parallelism, involving Carthaginian envoys at Tyre, possible offers of help, and the sending of Tyrian refugees to Carthage. Interestingly it was the Carthaginians in Sicily who adopted the famous Alexander / Heracles coin-type late in the fourth century (Jenkins 1978 8–11).

⁵³ Besides the passages noted previously, see e.g. Pl. *Ep.* 8.353a and e for a notorious statement of the potential barbarization of Sicily (for the broader western context of which e.g. Frascchetti 1981, Asheri 1999, Dench 2003; cf. Vattuone 1991 210–227 for related considerations in the Sicilian tradition).

⁵⁴ Especially Lys. 33.5, with D.S. 14.109.

⁵⁵ Isoc. *Ep.* 1 (*ad Dion.*), esp. 7–8: “But since I am preparing to offer advice about the security of all Greeks, to whom would I more justly speak than to the one who is the foremost of our race and who has the greatest power? [...] now, when our city would gladly offer itself to you as an ally if you would act on Greece's behalf?” (trans. Papillon).

⁵⁶ Plu. *Them.* 25.1 (attributed to Theophrastus by Plutarch); on all this see Coppola 2002 384–386; contrast Barceló 1994 7 and Sanders 1987 8–9.

itly in Diodorus, not least in the speech of Theodorus, noted above. Such a process is commonly identified as being behind the tale of the Himeran woman's dream of Dionysius as the *alastôr*, the vengeful spirit, of Sicily and Italy, chained to the throne of Zeus. First alluded to by Aeschines—who claims that Demosthenes had likened him (negatively) to Dionysius and so recounts the dream—the most natural interpretation is that the tale's origins lie in positive claims by Dionysius to be the *alastôr* of Carthage, on behalf of Sicily, a claim subsequently turned against him—as for example by Timaeus, whose version is recounted by the scholiast to Aeschines.⁵⁷ The historical context is not difficult to imagine: already by the 380s BC the Italian Greeks had first formed their own league to resist Dionysius, and then themselves allied with the Carthaginians against him.⁵⁸

The theme of the divine *alastôr* for Sicily appears to be revived with Timoleon, whose supporters, according to Plutarch, “anticipated that men would revere and protect Timoleon, looking upon him as a sacred personage, and one who had come, under divine guidance, to avenge the wrongs of Sicily” (Plu. *Tim.* 16.12). In the case of Timoleon, in the aftermath no doubt of Plato, Dion, and Dionysius II, the rhetoric is principally that of freeing Sicily from tyrants, rather than barbarians; but with the Battle of the Crimisus (c.340/339 BC), if not before, the prior claim of liberation from the barbarian resurfaces.⁵⁹ The surviving epigraphic dedication from Corinth merely records spoils “from the enemies”, but Plutarch claims Corinth was:

... decked with barbarian spoils (*barbarika skula*), which set forth in fairest inscriptions the justice as well as the valour of the victors, declaring that Corinthians and Timoleon their general set the Greeks dwelling in Sicily free from Carthaginians, and thus dedicated thank-offerings to the gods.⁶⁰

A fragmentary stone from Delphi may record a dedication of spoils to Apollo from the Carthaginians, which would be in line with the practice of earlier Sicilian victors over Carthage.⁶¹ Both Plutarch and Diodorus

⁵⁷ Aeschin. 2.10; Schol. ad Aeschin. 2.10 (= *FGrH* 566 F29); V. Max. 1.7 ext. 6. See Vattuone 1991 131–134 with earlier bibliography; Lewis 2000 101.

⁵⁸ Italiotes and Carthaginians against Dionysius: D.S. 14.91.1, 15.15; Coppola 2002 and Sanders 2002 on the complexities of the pro- and anti-barbarian positions entailed by Dionysius' activities in southern Italy and the Adriatic; cf. McKechnie 1989 35–39.

⁵⁹ See e.g. Sordi 1961 24–27, 57–61, who draws connections with the contemporary panhellenic rhetoric against Persia, to be taken up by the Macedonian court.

⁶⁰ Rhodes and Osborne 2003 no. 74; Plu. *Tim.* 29.6.

⁶¹ Talbert 1974 49–51.

record the decree of the Syracusans at Timoleon's death, honouring him "because he overthrew the tyrants, subdued the barbarians, re-peopled the devastated cities and restored the laws to the Sikeliotai" (*or* in Diodorus' very similar version, "became the author of freedom for the Sikeliotai").⁶² Both get us onto safer ground perhaps than the speech of Timoleon, attributed to Timaeus by Polybius, mocking Carthaginian underwear. This probably tells us more about Timaeus (and Polybius), but it also reflects the more extreme versions and embellishments that such a tradition of course attracts, once one descends below the level of Panhellenic oratory, and the sort of prejudice and stereotyping which any discourse of this sort employs.⁶³ As Plutarch puts it, Timoleon was "the only one to succeed in those achievements to which the sophists in their speeches at the national assemblies were ever exhorting the Greeks."⁶⁴

There are some grounds for thinking that the idea of the *alastôr* of Carthage, defending Sicily, was also employed by Agathocles and subsequently inverted against him (by his principal detractor in the tradition, Timaeus).⁶⁵ It is probably due to Timaeus that the surviving accounts of Agathocles, even of his campaigns in north Africa, are strikingly lacking in the language of claims to liberation from the barbarian, even while repeating the associated negative stereotypes *en passant*, such as the occasion when Carthaginian ships cruelly treated the crews of a pair of Athenian merchantmen captured in Syracuse harbour.⁶⁶ It is perhaps relevant that the most famous description of the practice of child sacrifice at Carthage relates to the resumption of the practice at the time of Agathocles' invasion of North Africa; the strongly negative emphasis upon the practice from within the Western Greek tradition, as seemingly in 480 BC, is perhaps to be linked with Greek propaganda of the time.⁶⁷ The language associated with the overthrow of tyrants had doubtless become even more dominant in the wake of Timoleon, quite apart from Timaeus' obvious hostility to Agathocles. The clearest claim to liberation from the

⁶² Plu. *Tim.* 39.5; D.S. 16.90.1.

⁶³ Plb. 12.26a (= *FGrH* 566 F31b); Vattuone 1991 109–110; Sordi 1961 28 on the *anandria* of the barbarians.

⁶⁴ Plu. *Tim.* 37.4; cf. Isoc. *Ep.* 1, cited above.

⁶⁵ So Lewis 2000 101–102, with reference to D.S. 19.2.3; in detail Vattuone 1991 193–195 and c. 6 *passim*.

⁶⁶ D.S. 19.103.4–5 (although see e.g. Vattuone 1991 73–74, 188–189 on the relevance of the *Agathoklea* of Duris of Samos (*FGrH* 76 F16–21) for this part of Diodorus); Consolo Langher 1998 21–27 for the view that "Probabilmente ... Timeo sosteneva la irrilevanza dei meriti antipunici di Agatocle."

⁶⁷ D.S. 20.14. For discussion, see Quinn forthcoming.

barbarian in this period comes from the city of Acragas, which attempted under Xenodocus to seize power in Sicily during Agathocles' absence, in 309 BC: as reported by Diodorus, they believed that other cities "would gladly answer the summons through hatred for the barbarians."⁶⁸ If, in this case, the claim was not being put about by a tyrant, nonetheless, it strongly suggests the very active currency of the discourse within late fourth-century Sicily. In the case of Agathocles, it is only in the context of competing on the 'world' stage that the language of panhellenic achievements appears, specifically in Agathocles' rivalry with the Macedonians and the other *diadochoi*. The most obvious parallels for the series of paintings depicting Agathocles in a cavalry battle, on the walls of the Temple of Athena in Syracuse, are those showing Alexander and his generals in such a setting; it is but a short step from that parallelism to the inference that Agathocles presented his campaigns in North Africa against Carthage in the by-now familiar language of Greeks against barbarians, echoing the eastward-looking panhellenic tradition.⁶⁹

The twin themes of liberation from tyrants and eviction of the Carthaginians reappear in the appeals to Pyrrhus which our sources attribute to the Sicilians—interestingly to the Sicilians rather than Pyrrhus himself and the appeal itself, in our surviving sources, is never rendered directly in the language of the barbarian threat or the defence of the Hellenes (even if frequently recounted in just these terms in modern accounts). On the other hand, Plutarch's subsequent account of events makes repeated reference to the barbarians, in the storming of Eryx, with reference to the Mamertines of Messana (see below), and in the demand made by Pyrrhus that the Carthaginians abandon Sicily, making "the Libyan Sea a boundary between themselves and the Hellenes."⁷⁰ However likely such an appeal may seem, not least in the light of the evidence cited so far for his predecessors, Pyrrhus' relevance here is perhaps more as another

⁶⁸ D.S. 20.31, 20.56.1–2.

⁶⁹ D.S. 21.2.2: "[...] the Sikeliotes wished not only to be regarded as victors over the Carthaginians and the barbarians of Italy, but also to show themselves in the Greek arena as more than a match for the Macedonians, whose spears had subjugated both Asia and Europe." (cf. Consolo Langher 2000 328–329). Coarelli 1982 (esp. 549–551) on Cic. *Ver.* 4.122 and the Syracusan paintings.

⁷⁰ Plu. *Pyrrh.* 22–24 (at 14.8–10 Pyrrhus' attitude to Sicily and N. Africa is strikingly reminiscent of Thucydides' Alcibiades (see above)); Iust. 18.2.11–12; 23.2.13–23.3.12; D.H. 20.8; Zonar. 8.5; Paus. 1.12.5–13.1. Consolo Langher 1998 24 notes Syracusan appeals to Pyrrhus as another Agathocles (D.S. 22.8.2), and similar echoes in the case of Hieron II. Zambon 2008 75 (cf. 123, 125) takes this to be "[...] another episode of the never-ending fight between the Greeks of Sicily and the punic *barbaroi*."

example of the east-west parallelism observed earlier. Such parallels increase in the wake of Alexander the Great, and not only in the case of Agathocles, but with comparisons implied between Alexander and those campaigning westwards such as Alexander the Molossian, Cleonymus of Sparta, and Pyrrhus himself, albeit principally in relation to the defence of Tarentum, rather than Sicily.⁷¹

Last, but not least, is the figure of Hieron II. Hieron seems to have come to power on the back of his participation in Pyrrhus' campaign in Sicily, and it may partly have been with that in mind that Theocritus composed *Idyll* 16, probably in 275/4 BC, in a bid for Hieronian patronage.⁷² The *Idyll* (16.76–81) confronts the theme head on:

Even now beneath the setting sun the Phoenicians that dwell in the outmost skirts of Libya tremble for fear; even now Syracusans grip their spears by the middle and charge their arms with shields of wicker, while Hieron, in their midst, girds himself like the heroes of old with crest of horsehair shadowing his helm.
(trans. Gow)

Furthermore, the poet encourages associations with Hieron's Deinomenid predecessors through strong reminiscences of Pindar, and in particular *Pythian* 1.⁷³ Theocritus may have misjudged, in the sense that Hieronian patronage was not forthcoming and Hieron did not in the end lead a campaign against the Carthaginians. But his choice of motif was clearly a very well-established one and, as we shall see in a moment, Hieron made considerable use of it, albeit with a slight shift in focus. Hieron's self-promotion as a Hellene should not itself be in doubt, whether through the dedications at Olympia and Delphi by his family and by communities under his rule (echoing the activity of his predecessors), or his very active euergetism towards Rhodes after the earthquake of 227 BC, or his activities within his own kingdom. In particular, the dedication of his own arms at the sanctuary of Athena Lindia on Rhodes invites comparison both with his presumed Sicilian ancestor Deinomenes, and above all with Alexander the Great and Pyrrhus.⁷⁴

⁷¹ For the theme of the barbarization of Magna Graecia in the fourth and third centuries, see above; Nenci 1953 132–135 (cf. Santagati Ruggeri 1997 24–27) for observations on the relationship of Alexander's 'last plans' (cf. D.S. 18.4.4–5) to the actions of Pyrrhus and others. Alexander of Epirus, *Iust.* 12.2.1–2; Cleonymus, D.S. 20.104–105.

⁷² On Hieron's early career and likely link to Pyrrhus see *Iust.* 23.4.14 (cf. Zonar. 8.6, *Plb.* 1.8.3); Gow 1952 2: 305; De Sensi Sestito 1977 16–17. On *Id.* 16 see esp. Hans 1985.

⁷³ Hunter 1996 82–90.

⁷⁴ See Portale 2004, Campagna 2004, and Domínguez Monedero 1993. Dedications at Olympia/Delphi: Paus. 6.12.2–5 (confused on other aspects), 6.15.6; Moretti, *ISE I*

Polybius emphasizes his positive treatment of, and reception by, the Hellenes (Plb. 1.16.10).

In the event, it was Hieron's campaign against the Campanian Mamertines of Messana in the early 260s that was, at least in Polybius' version, constructed as an attempt to drive the barbarians out of Sicily (compare Plutarch on Pyrrhus and the barbarous Mamertines, above). The flexibility of the discourse is laid bare with Hieron's subsequent decision in 264 BC to ally with Carthage in order to drive the barbarian Mamertines (now aided by Rome) out of Sicily.⁷⁵ It is unsurprising that, having been portrayed by Hieron as the barbarian invader, the Mamertines appealed for aid to both the old (Carthage) and the new (Rome) foreign powers in the vicinity, their fellow 'barbarians'. Famously, the appeal to Rome was made partly on the grounds of *homophylia*, which must be a shared Italic identity.⁷⁶ By accepting the appeal, the Romans allowed themselves to be placed squarely in the role of the barbarian invader of Greek Sicily, confronted by Hieron II and in due course the Carthaginians.⁷⁷ With this shift of focus we come to the final part of this survey, in which I shall briefly consider the adoption of this discourse by the Roman invaders, within the Sicilian context.

Since the (unsuccessful) attempt by Ernst Badian to argue that the *ciuitas libera* was born during Rome's campaigns in Sicily in the First Punic War, it has become very much the accepted view that Rome's use both of the status of 'free city' and of the ideological appeal to the 'freedom of the Greeks' belongs firmly in the context of the war against Macedon in the 190s BC. I certainly do not wish to argue that Rome developed the category of the *ciuitas libera* in third-century Sicily in the form in which it is found in second- and first-century Greece and

(1967), no. 58; Portale 2004 230–238, 258–262. Rhodes: Plb. 5.88. For the dedication to Athena Lindia, see *Chron. Lind.* (Blinkenberg 1941 149–199; translation in Higbie 2003) C. 29–35 (Deinomenes), 103–109 (Alexander), 114–121 (Pyrrhus), 122–126 (Hieron) with Portale 2004 238–240.

⁷⁵ Plb. 1.9.3–5, 1.11.7; cf. D.S. 22.13. On the Mamertines see Tagliamonte 1994 191–198, Crawford 2007. On the events, e.g. Hoyos 1998 33–46, 67–81. Construction of the Campanians in Sicily as barbarians probably goes back to their arrival in the late fifth century BC (plenty of examples in Tagliamonte 1994 124–157); note esp. D.S. 14.61 for a Carthaginian expressing the idea of the Greeks being hostile to Carthaginians and Campanians alike as non-Greeks, and see the discussion of Cusumano forthcoming at nn. 38–40.

⁷⁶ Plb. 1.10.2. See now Russo forthcoming.

⁷⁷ So e.g. Tagliamonte 1994 198 with n. 109.

elsewhere.⁷⁸ But I do think that the potential employment by Rome of the ideological claim to free Greeks from the barbarian in the context of a war with the Carthaginians for control of Sicily in the mid-third century BC has been seriously undervalued.⁷⁹ From the moment in 263 BC that Hieron II withdrew his opposition to Rome, and the conflict in Sicily became a struggle between Rome and Carthage, a crucial part of the Roman strategy, as in almost every attempt to win control in Sicily since the fifth century, involved trying to win over Sicilian, i.e. 'Greek', cities for the campaign against the Carthaginians.⁸⁰

If the 'barbarian' Mamertines sought help from fellow Italians, subsequently at least two Sicilian communities appealed to putative kinship with Rome. Centuripae and Segesta both went over to Rome in the initial phase of the war (263 / 2 BC), and by the time of Cicero were two of only five cities in Sicily with special immunity from taxation (alongside three others with treaties of alliance).⁸¹ We know from Cicero and other sources that Segesta, an Elymian city, appealed to Rome on the grounds of shared Trojan kinship. Cicero's evidence may be the earliest surviving attestation for this overture to Rome (70 BC), but Zonaras (after Dio) associates Segesta's kinship appeal explicitly with the switch of allegiance in 263 / 2 BC and Segesta had already made claims of Trojan descent from at least as early as the fifth century BC in dialogue with Athens (Thuc. 6.2.3).⁸² It should no longer need to be argued that Roman association with the Trojan legend was well established by the third century BC.⁸³

⁷⁸ Badian 1958 33–43; for more recent views on Sicily see esp. Ferrary 1988 5–23 and Pinzone 1999; for the *ciuitas libera* more generally, see esp. Ferrary 1991 and 1999.

⁷⁹ For instance, Ferrary 1988 12 argues that Rome could not be sensible to the potential of such propaganda claims at this date.

⁸⁰ Eckstein 1987 103–115 for one detailed analysis of 263 BC; for Hieron's transfer of allegiance, compare Eckstein 1987 115–131 and De Sensi 1977 101–112. Hoyos 1998 53–57 offers an attractive picture of escalation from a limited conflict in 264 BC principally directed against Syracuse to a war with Carthage for control of Sicily (cf. De Sanctis 1916 113–114).

⁸¹ Segesta: Cic. *Ver.* 4.72, 5.83, 5.125; Zonar. 8.9; cf. D.S. 23.5; Battistoni 2009 79–81, 96–97 and forthcoming. Centuripae: Cic. *Ver.* 5.83 (cf. 2.163, D.S. 23.4); *AE* 1990.437 / *SEG* 42.837 with Manganaro 1963 and 2006 (and cf. *SEG* 26.1123 with Battistoni 2006). Later status, Cic. *Ver.* 3.13.

⁸² Zevi 1999 esp. 317–318 on Segesta and Athens in the fifth century (with bibliography).

⁸³ Note esp. Gabba 1976 94–101 on the third-century exploitation of the theme (highlighting the Sicilian elements at 100); Zevi 1999 319–320 for bibliography on Troy and Rome, also Erskine 2001; Martorana 1993–1994 esp. 385–386 for Trojan *nostoi* in Sicily; cf. Schettino 2009 on Pyrrhus, and Coarelli 2001 arguing for the early exploitation of kinship in the case of Saguntum in Spain.

Centuripae, a Sikel city, seems rather to have based its appeal on kinship between Latins and Sikels, links which almost certainly had a much earlier foundation than the third century.⁸⁴ If Rome was open to the label of barbarian, it was no less open to integration within the Hellenic world, and it is hard to imagine a more plausible moment in Romano-Segestan, or Romano-Centuripae, relations when this appeal might have been made.⁸⁵

The idea that the Romans can move from being barbarian Italians supporting barbarian Campanians to pro-Hellenic Trojans supporting the 'Greek' Sicilians against barbarian Carthage within a matter of a year or two should not be hard to accept—that is in the very nature of such claim and counter-claim. The later discourse of barbarian or pro-Hellenic Rome is very familiar.⁸⁶ Fabius Pictor's Greek history of Rome is direct testimony to the efforts to develop a positive presentation of Rome for a Hellenic audience: "He was trying, no doubt, to redress the balance against the pro-Carthaginian historians from Sicily and Magna Graecia, in an unprecedented attempt to influence Greek opinion."⁸⁷ Rawson's assessment requires some qualification, lest we fall victim once again to the bias of the later Romano-centric tradition. In the light of what has been traced above, and the situation in the mid-/later third century BC, it cannot be right to place all the emphasis and contrast upon 'pro-Carthaginian' historians of the West; it is the pro-Greek, pro-Syracusan historians, no less anti-Carthaginian than they could be anti-Roman, who were surely the target of Fabius and others in this period, at least as much as any presumed pro-Carthaginians. We know that the Greeks portrayed the Romans as barbarians (see below). Furthermore, we know that the Sicilians themselves were reading Fabius, from the record of his work's presence in a Hellenistic library in Taormina.⁸⁸ The context for the

⁸⁴ Zevi 1999, esp. 321–322 arguing for a third-century BC renewal of the link, 322–327, 339 for Sikel and Latin kinship at least as early as Antiochus of Syracuse and the fifth century, and 330–332 for Rome and the Sikels in the late 490s BC. Briquel 2001 esp. 303 for the suggestion that it was at this moment (c. 263 BC) that the Sikel connection was incorporated into the Aeneas legend.

⁸⁵ Eckstein 1987 103–115 is unnecessarily sceptical; contrast e.g. De Sanctis 1916 118 n. 46. Kienast 1984 114–117 considers Sicilian kinship claims in a First Punic War context.

⁸⁶ See e.g. Erskine 2000 and Champion 2000 on the discourse of barbarian Rome within Polybius.

⁸⁷ Rawson 1989 425; cf. Dillery 2002 esp. 8–9, 13–15, 22–23.

⁸⁸ Battistoni 2006 with earlier bibliography.

Roman adoption of the portrayal of the Carthaginian as the barbarian (the Romans had, after all, had good relations with the Carthaginians in earlier times) must be the need to persuade the Greek audience of Rome's claim to be a (non-barbarian) liberator of Greek cities such as Syracuse from the Carthaginian barbarian; with Syracuse now as their principal ally, the Romans could have had no better teacher. All of this becomes still more comprehensible if we can see that such a discourse has a very long and active history over the preceding centuries within Sicily itself. It would be naïve to deny Roman knowledge and awareness of the Sicilians and Sicilian history: Campanians had been serving as mercenaries in Sicily since the fifth century and Italians had been going to the island for a long time, as had the Romans themselves for grain, at least according to the later historians; Hieron II was their close supporter from 263 BC onwards; M. Claudius Marcellus (*cos.* 222 BC) dedicated spoils to Athena Lindia on Rhodes not long after Hieron himself had done so (Plu. *Marc.* 30.6–8, cf. 8.11); the paintings of Agathocles à la Alexander the Great at Syracuse are described by Cicero (with obvious tendentiousness) as the most famous things in Syracuse—until Verres stole them (Cic. *Ver.* 4.122–123); both Philistus and Timaeus were still being read by Cicero over two centuries later.⁸⁹ The Roman claim to liberate Syracuse in 212 BC was likewise hardly an invention—there had been attempts to liberate Syracuse from tyrants since at least the 460s BC, and the transformation and inversion of claims made by tyrants to liberate Syracuse and Sicily into claims to liberate Sicily from the tyrants themselves had been witnessed in Sicily as recently as Pyrrhus, who was accused of becoming a tyrant rather than a liberator.⁹⁰ Barely a decade later, according to Livy and Polybius, and before the Romans had yet proclaimed the freedom of the Greeks in the mainland, Greeks were in turn decrying the tyranny of

⁸⁹ Campanians, Tagliamonte 1994; early Roman interest see esp. Gallo 1992; Corsaro 1982 and Torelli 2008 for two specific examples of Italians in Sicily in the mid-third century BC. Philistus in Cicero: Cic. *Q.fr.* 2.11.4, *de Orat.* 2.57, *Brut.* 66; Timaeus: Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.2, 7, *de Orat.* 58, *Brut.* 63, 325, *Att.* 6.1.18, *Rep.* 3.43, *Leg.* 2.15, *N.D.* 2.69; also Duris of Samos (who wrote an *Agathoclea*), *Att.* 6.1.18. On Timaeus' reception by Cicero, Taiphikos 1980.

⁹⁰ Liv. 31.29.7 (*ut Syracusas oppressas ab Carthaginiensibus in libertatem eximerent*—the cynical report of a Macedonian speaker); cf. Liv. 25.28.7 for pro-Roman Syracusans presenting Rome's siege as being to free Syracuse from cruel tyrants (repeated by a Roman speaker at Liv. 31.31.8). On themes of liberty in Livy's presentation of the siege of Syracuse, Jaeger 2003, cf. Gabba 1982. On Pyrrhus as tyrant, Plu. *Pyrrh.* 23, D.H. 20.8 (contrast Plb. 7.4.5).

the Romans in Sicily and southern Italy.⁹¹ The painting of the external foe as the barbarian is no less deep-rooted in the western tradition than in the East. The speed of the Roman adoption of this discourse in the East, most obviously in the conflicts with Philip V and Antiochus the Great in the 190s BC, likewise becomes far more comprehensible if we allow a greater importance in the process to the less visible and more fragmentary, but clearly no less complex discourse in the western Greek tradition.⁹² Seen in this light, elements usually overlooked, such as the Roman claim to have liberated the Greeks from the piratical Illyrians, as announced to various Greek communities and at the Isthmian games in 228 BC, are in no way surprising or unexpected (Plb. 2.12.4–8). The strongly negative Roman portrayal of the Carthaginians likewise had deep foundations.

It is surely naïve to think that the Romans were not fully engaged in this language of liberation, whether from tyrant or barbarian, already in the third century—the language had a long and rich history of use in the West, principally, but certainly not solely, between the Carthaginians and the Syracusan tyrants. As the Greeks were to discover, there was little reason to credit the Romans with any greater sincerity than the Sicilian tyrants whom they emulated:

They say that Publius Scipio, who was the first to bring Carthage to her knees, when some one asked him whom he thought the greatest statesmen combining courage and wisdom, replied “Agathocles and Dionysius the Sicilians.” (Plb. 15.35.6)

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the editors for their kind invitation to participate, their warm hospitality, and their considerable patience; to Filippo Battistoni, Corinne Bonnet, Nicola Cusumano, Josephine Quinn, and Federico Russo for letting me see advance copies of forthcoming work; to Bruno Currie for advice on *Pindarica*; and to Josephine Quinn for typically sane and timely comments.

⁹¹ Liv. 31.29, a Macedonian speaker in 199 BC (doubtless based upon Polybius, Briscoe 1973 129); Plb. 24.13.4 (speech of Philopoemen, taken by Walbank 1979 265 to reflect views “actually put forward and debated in Achaëa between 198 and 182”). See Champion 2000 esp. 434–435 and n. 34.

⁹² See e.g. Walsh 1996 on Rome’s use of ‘freedom of the Greeks’ in the East (with excessive emphasis upon the ‘discovery’ of *eleutheria* by T. Quinctius Flaminius).

Bibliography

- Ackerman, Nathan W. and Marie Jahoda. 1950. *Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation*. New York: Harper.
- Anello, Pietrina. 2002. "Siracusa e Cartagine", in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisî*, eds. Nicola Bonacasa, Lorenzo Braccisi and Ernesto de Miro. Rome: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider. 343-60.
- Antonaccio, Carla M. 2001. "Ethnicity and colonization", in *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, ed. Irad Malkin. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. 13-157.
- Asheri, David. 1991-1992. "The art of synchronization in Greek historiography: the case of Timaeus of Tauromenium." *SCI* 11: 52-89.
- Asheri, David. 1999. "Processi di 'decolonizzazione' in Magna Graecia: il caso di Poseidonia Lucana", in *La colonisation grecque en Méditerranée occidentale*, CEFR 251. Rome. 361-70.
- Aubet, Maria E. 2001. *The Phoenicians and the West. Politics, Colonies and Trade*. Translated by Mary Turton. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Badian, E. 1958. *Foreign Clientelae: 264-70 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barcelo, P. 1994. "The perception of Carthage in classical Greek historiography." *Acta Classica* 37: 1-14.
- Battistoni, Filippo. 2006. "The ancient *pinakes* from Tauromenion. Some new readings." *ZPE* 157: 169-180.
- Battistoni, Filippo. 2009. "Rome, kinship and diplomacy", in *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, Mnemosyne Supplement 304, ed. Claude Eilers. Leiden: Brill. 73-97.
- Battistoni, Filippo. Forthcoming. "La συγγενεία tra Roma e Segesta", in *Ritorno a Segesta Ricerche storiche, archeologiche ed epigrafiche, Pisa 16-17 dicembre 2003*. Pisa.
- Bearzot, Cinzia. 1991. "Gelone strategos autokrator tra storicità e propaganda dionigiana." *Hesperia* 2: 79-87.
- Bellen, Heinz. 1985. *Metus Gallicus-Metus Punicus. Zum Furchtmotiv in der römischen Republik*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Bernabò-Brea, Luigi, M. Cavalier and Lorenzo Campagna. 2003. *Meligunìs Lipára. XII. Le iscrizioni lapidarie greche e latine delle isole eolie*. Palermo: Mario Grispo Editore.
- Bernal, Martin. 1987. *Black Athena. The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization. I. The Fabrication of Ancient Greece, 1785-1985*. London: Free Association Books.
- Blinkenberg, C. 1941. *Lindos, fouilles de l'acropole 1902-1914. II. Inscriptions. I (N^{os} 1-281)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bohak, G. 2005. "Ethnic portraits in Greco-Roman literature", in *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*, Oriens et Occidens 8, ed. Erich S. Gruen. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. 207-37.
- Bondì, S.F. 1990-1991. "L'eparchia punica in Sicilia. L'ordinamento giuridico." *Kokalos* 36-37: 215-31.
- Bondì, Sandro F. 1980. "Penetrazione fenicio-punica e storia della civiltà punica in Sicilia. La problematica storica", in *La Sicilia Antica*, eds. Emilio Gabba and Georges Vallet. Naples. 1.1: 163-218.
- Bondì, Sandro F. 1990. "I Fenici in Erodoto", in *Hérodote et les peuples non grecs*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 35, eds. Walter Burkert, Giuseppe Nenci, and Olivier Reverdin. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. 255-86.
- Bonnet, Corinne and Veronique Krings. 2006. "Les Phéniciens, Carthage et nous: histoire et représentations", in *Nuevas Perspectivas I: La investigación fenicia y púnica*, Cuadernos de arqueología mediterránea 13, eds. J.P. Vita and J.Á. Zamora. Barcelona. 37-47.

- Bonnet, Corinne. Forthcoming. "On gods and earth. The tophet and the construction of a new identity in Punic Carthage", in *Cultural Identity and the Peoples of the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. E.S. Gruen. Berkeley.
- Brigham, J.C. 1971. "Ethnic Stereotypes." *Psychological Bulletin* 76: 15-38.
- Briquel, Dominique. 2001. "Les deux origines de Lanuvium", in *Origines Gentium*, eds. Valérie Fromentin and Sophie Gotteland. Bordeaux. 297-308.
- Briscoe, John. 1973. *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI-XXXIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brown, Susanna S. 1991. *Late Carthaginian Child Sacrifice and Sacrificial Monuments in their Mediterranean Context*, JSOT/ASOR monograph series 3. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Brown, Truesdell S. 1952. "Timaeus, and Diodorus' eleventh book." *AJPh* 73: 337-55.
- Brunt, Peter A. 1993 [1953]. "The Hellenic League against Persia. Addendum A. The Hellenic League and Gelon", in *Studies in Greek History and Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 75-80.
- Bunnens, Guy. 1979. *L'Expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée. Essai d'interprétation fondé sur une analyse des traditions littéraires*, Etudes de Philologie, d'Archéologie et d'Histoire anciennes 17. Brussels: Institut historique belge de Rome.
- Bunnens, Guy. 1983. "La distinction entre phéniciens et puniques chez les auteurs classiques", in *Atti del I Congresso internazionale di Studi fenici e punici*. Rome. Vol. 1, 233-38.
- Camous, T. 2007. "Les Phéniciens dans l'historiographie romaine et la sous-évaluation du rôle joué par les influences phéniciennes dans la république avant les guerres puniques." *REA* 109: 227-46.
- Campagna, Lorenzo. 2004. "Architettura e ideologia della basilica a Siracusa nell'età di Ierone II", in *Nuove prospettive della ricerca sulla Sicilia del III sec. a.C. Archeologia, numismatica, storia*, Pelorias 11, eds. M. Caccamo Caltabiano, Lorenzo Campagna and A. Pinzone. Messina. 151-85.
- Carey, Chris. 1978. "Pindarica", in *Dionysiaca. Nine Studies in Greek Poetry*, eds. R.D. Dawe, J. Diggle, and P.E. Easterling. Cambridge. 21-44.
- Champion, Craige. 2000. "Romans as *barbaroi*: Three Polybian Speeches and the Politics of Cultural Indeterminacy." *CPh* 95: 425-44.
- Coarelli, Filippo. 1982. "La pugna equestris di Agatocle nell'Athenaion di Siracusa", in *ΑΠΙΡΧΑΙ. Nuove ricerche e studi sulla Magna Grecia e la Sicilia antica in onore di Paolo Enrico Arias*, eds. M. L. Gualandi, L. Massei and S. Settis. Pisa: Giardini. 2: 547-57.
- Coarelli, Filippo. 2001. "Origo Sagunti. L'origine mitica di Sagunto e l'alleanza con Roma", in *Origines Gentium*, eds. Valérie Fromentin and Sophie Gotteland. Bordeaux. 321-26.
- Coleman, John E. 1997. "Ancient Greek ethnocentrism", in *Greeks and Barbarians. Essays on the Interactions between Greeks and Non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism*, eds. John E. Coleman and Clark A. Walz. Bethesda, MD. 175-220.
- Consolo Langher, Sebastiana N. 1998. *Storiografia e Potere. Duride, Timeo, Callia e il dibattito su Agatocle*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Consolo Langher, Sebastiana N. 2000. *Agatocle. Da capoparte a monarca fondatore di un regno tra Cartagine e i Diadochi*, Pelorias 6. Messina: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità dell'Università di Messina.
- Coppola, A. 2002. "Mito e propaganda alla corte dionisiana", in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisî*, eds. Nicola Bonacasa, Lorenzo Braccisi and Ernesto de Miro. Rome: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider. 373-88.
- Corsaro, Mauro. 1982. "La presenza romana a Entella: una nota su Tiberio Claudio di Anzio." *ASNP* series 3, 12.3: 993-1032.

- Crawford, Michael H. 2007. "The Mamertini, Alfius and Festus", in *La Sicile de Cicéron. Lectures des Verrines*, eds. Julien Dubouloz and Sylvie Pittia. Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté. 273-9.
- Currie, Bruno. 2005. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cusumano, Nicola. forthcoming. "Gérer la haine, fabriquer l'ennemi. Grecs et Carthaginois en Sicile entre les V^e et IV^e siècles av. J.-C.," in *Diodore d'Agyrion et l'histoire de la Sicile*, Journée d'étude 24 avril 2009, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée J. Pouilloux, CNRS-Université Lumière Lyon 2, ed. S. Collin Bouffier
- De Sanctis, Gaetano. 1916. *Storia dei Romani. III. L'Età delle guerre puniche, Parte I*. Turin: Fratelli Bocca editori.
- De Sensi Sestito, Giovanna. 1977. *Gerone II. Un monarca ellenistico in Sicilia*, Kleio 1. Palermo: Editrice Sophia.
- De Simone, R. 1999. "Riflessioni sull'onomastica punica", in *Sicilia Epigraphica. Atti del convegno internazionale Erice, 15-18 Ottobre 1998*, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, serie IV, Quaderni 1-2, ed. M.I. Gulletta. Pisa. 1: 205-219.
- Dench, Emma. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men. Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dench, Emma. 2003. "Beyond Greeks and Barbarians: Italy and Sicily in the Hellenistic Age", in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ed. Andrew Erskine. Oxford: Blackwell. 294-310.
- Devallet, G. 1996. "Perfidia plus quam punica: l'image des Carthaginois dans la littérature latine, de la fin de la République à l'époque des Flaviens." *LALIES* 16: 17-28.
- Di Stefano, Carmela A. 1984. *Lilibeo. Testimonianze archeologiche dal IV sec a.C. al V sec. d.C.* Marsala: Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici della Sicilia Occidentale.
- Dillery, J. 2002. "Quintus Fabius Pictor and Greco-Roman Historiography at Rome", in *Vertis in usum. Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney*, eds. John F. Miller, Cynthia Damon, and K. Sara Myers. Munich: Saur. 1-23.
- Domínguez Monedero, A.J. 1993. "Hierón II de Siracusa, entre Roma y el mundo helenístico", in *Homenaje a José M^a. Blázquez*, eds. J. Mangas and J. Alvar. Madrid. 1: 171-205.
- Dubuisson, M. 1983. "L'image du Carthaginois dans la littérature latine", in *Redt Tyrus / Sauvons Tyr / Fenicische geschiedenis*, Studia Phoenicia 1-2, eds. E. Gubel, E. Lipiński and B. Servais-Soyez. Leuven: Peeters. 159-67.
- Eckstein, Arthur M. 1987. *Senate and General: Individual Decision Making and Roman Foreign Relations 264-194 B.C.* Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Erskine, Andrew. 2000. "Polybius and Barbarian Rome." *MediterrAnt* 3: 165-82.
- Erskine, Andrew. 2001. *Troy between Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feeney, Dennis C. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Sather Classical Lectures 65. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Ferrary, Jean-Louis. 1988. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique*, BEFAR 271. Rome: Ecole Française de Rome.
- Ferrary, Jean-Louis. 1991. "Le statut des cités libres dans l'Empire Romain à la lumière des inscriptions de Claros." *CRAI* 135: 557-77.
- Ferrary, Jean-Louis. 1999. "La liberté des cités et ses limites à l'époque républicaine." *MediterrAnt* 2: 69-84.
- Finglass, Patrick J. 2007. *Pindar, Pythian Eleven*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fortenbaugh, William W. and others. 1992. *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*, Philosophia Antiqua 54. Leiden: Brill.

- Franco, Antonio. 2008. *Periferia e frontiera nella Sicilia antica*, Suppl. Kokalos 19. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra editore.
- Franko, George F. 1994. "The use of *Poenus* and *Carthaginiensis* in early Latin literature." *CPh* 89: 153-58.
- Fraschetti, A. 1981. "Aristosseno, i romani e la 'barbarazione' di Poseidonia." *AION(archeol)* 3: 97-115.
- Gabba, Emilio. 1976. "Sulla valorizzazione politica della leggenda delle origini troiane di Roma fra III e II secolo a. C." *CISA* 4: 84-101.
- Gabba, Emilio. 1982. "Posidonio, Marcello e la Sicilia." in *ΑΠΙΛΑΡΧΑΙ. Nuove ricerche e studi sulla Magna Grecia e la Sicilia antica in onore di Paolo Enrico Arias*, eds. M. L. Gualandi, L. Massei and S. Settis. Pisa: Giardini. 2: 611-14
- Gallo, L. 1992. "La Sicilia occidentale e l'approvvigionamento ceralicolo di Roma." *ASNP series* 3, 22: 365-398.
- Gauthier, Philippe. 1966. "Le parallèle Himère-Salamine au Ve et IVe siècle av. J.-C." *REA* 68: 5-31.
- Gow, A.S.F. 1952. *Theocritus, Edited with a Translation and Commentary*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gras, Michel. 1990. "Gélon et les temples de Sicile après la bataille d'Himère." *AION (archeol)* 12: 59-69.
- Gras, Michel. 2000. "La Sicile, l'Afrique et les ἐμπόρια," in *Damarato. Studi di antichità classica offerti a Paola Pelagatti*, eds. I. Berlingò, H. Blanck, F. Cordano, P.G. Guzzo, and M.C. Lentini. Milan: Electa. 130-34
- Griffiths, M. 1978. "Aeschylus, Sicily and Prometheus", in R.D. Dawe, J. Diggle, and P.E. Easterling (eds), *Dionysiaca. Nine Studies in Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 105-139.
- Griffo, M.G. 1997. "La necropoli di Birgi", in *Seconde Giornate Internazionali di Studi sull'Area Elima (Gibellina, 22-26 ottobre 1994)*. Atti. Pisa, Gibellina: Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. 2: 909-21.
- Grottanelli, Cristiano. 1999. "Ideologie del sacrificio umano: Roma e Cartagine." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1: 41-59.
- Guardì, T. 1980. "L'attività teatrale nella Siracusa di Gerone I." *Dionisio: Bollettino dell'Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico* 51: 25-47.
- Hall, Edith. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hall, J.M. 2002. *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hans, Linda-Marie. 1983. *Karthago und Sizilien*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Hans, Linda-Marie. 1985. "Theokrits XVI. Idylle und die Politik Hierons II. Von Syrakus." *Historia* 34: 117-25.
- Harrell, Sarah E. 2002. "King or private citizen: fifth-century Sicilian tyrants at Olympia and Delphi." *Mnemosyne* 55: 439-64.
- Harrell, Sarah E. 2006. "Synchronicity: the local and the panhellenic within Sicilian tyranny", in *Ancient Tyranny*, ed. Sian Lewis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 119-34.
- Harrison, Thomas 2000. "Sicily in the Athenian Imagination: Thucydides and the Persian Wars", in *Sicily from Aeneas to Augustus. New Approaches in Archaeology and History, New Perspectives on the Ancient World 1*, eds. Christopher Smith and John Serrati. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 84-96
- Herington, C.J. 1967. "Aeschylus in Sicily." *JHS* 87: 74-85.
- Higbie, Carolyn. 2003. *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hoyos, B. Dexter. 1998. *Unplanned Wars: The Origins of the First and Second Punic Wars*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hunter, Richard L. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Isaac, Benjamin H. 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jaeger, Mary. 2003. "Livy and the Fall of Syracuse", in *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*, eds. Ulrich Eigler and others. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft. 213-34.
- Jeffery, Lilian H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.* Revised edn A.W. Johnston. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jenkins, G.K. 1978. "Coins of Punic Sicily, Part 4." *SNR* 57: 5-68.
- Kienast, Dietmar. 1984. "Die Anfänge der römischen Provinzialordnung in Sizilien," in *Sodalitas. Scritti in onore di Antonio Guarino*, ed. Luigi Amirante. Naples: Jovene editore. 1: 105-23
- Krings, Veronique. 1998. *Carthage et les Grecs c. 580-480 av. J.-C.: textes et histoire*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lewis, Sian. 2000. "The Tyrant's Myth", in *Sicily from Aeneas to Augustus. New Approaches in Archaeology and History, New Perspectives on the Ancient World 1*, eds. Cristopher Smith and John Serrati. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 97-106.
- Liverani, Mario. 1998. "L'immagine dei fenici nella storiografia occidentale." *StudStor* 39: 5-22.
- Lo Cascio, Elio. 1973-1974. "Le trattative fra Gelone e i confederati e la data della battaglia d'Imera." *Helikon* 13-14: 210-55.
- López Castro, J.L. 2007. "The western Phoenicians under the Roman Republic: integration and persistence", in *Articulating Local Cultures. Power and Identity under the Expanding Roman Republic*, JRA Supplementary Series 63, eds. Peter van Dommelen and Nicola Terrenato. Portsmouth, RI. 103-25.
- Luraghi, Nino. 1994. *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia. Da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*. Florence: Olschki.
- Mafodda, Giuseppe. 1996. *La monarchia di Gelone tra pragmatismo, ideologia e propaganda*. Messina: Società Messinese di Storia Patria.
- Malkin, Irad. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Manganaro, Giacomo. 1963. "Un senatus consultum in greco dei Lanuvini e il rinnovo della cognatio con i Centuripini." *RAAN* 38: 23-44.
- Manganaro, Giacomo. 2006. "Il S.C. dei Lanuvini per il rinnovo della 'parentela' con i Centuripini", in *"Troianer sind wir gewesen"—Migrationen in der antiken Welt. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums 8, 2002*, eds. Eckhart Olshausen and Holger Sonnabend. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. 184-93.
- Martorana, Giuseppe. 1993-1994. "I nostoi e la Sicilia: tra mito e storia. Troia, Roma, imperium romanum." *Kokalos* 39-40: 363-394.
- Mazza, F. 1988. "L'immagine dei Fenici nel mondo antico", in *I Fenici*, ed. Sabatino Moscati. Milan. 548-67.
- Mazza, F., Sergio Ribichini and Paolo Xella (eds). 1988. *Fonti classiche per la Civiltà fenicia e punica*, Collezione di Studi fenici 27. Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche.
- McKechnie, Paul. 1989. *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century B.C.* London: Routledge.

- Meiggs, Russell, and David Lewis. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC*. Revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, Lynette G. 2007. *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.
- Molyneux, John H. 1992. *Simonides. A Historical Study*. Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- Musti, Domenico. 1991. "Modi e fasi della rappresentazione dei Fenici nelle fonti letterarie greche", in *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di Studi fenici e punici*. Rome. Vol. 1, 161-8.
- Nenci, Giuseppe. 1953. *Pirro: aspirazioni egemoniche ed equilibrio mediterraneo*. Turin: University of Turin.
- Ostwald, Martin. 1995. "Freedom and the Greeks", in *The Origins of Modern Freedom in the West*, ed. R.W. Davis. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press. 35-64.
- Page, Denys L. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pinzone, A. 1999. "Civitates sine foedere immunes ac liberae: a proposito di Cic. II Verr. III 6,13". *MediterrAnt* 2: 463-95.
- Podlecki, A.J. 1979. "Simonides in Sicily." *PP* 34: 5-16.
- Podlecki, A.J. 1985. "Theophrastus on History and Politics", in *Theophrastus of Eresus: On his Life and Work*, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 2, eds. William W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby and A.A. Long. New Brunswick NJ. 231-49.
- Poinsotte, Jean-Michel. 2002. "L'image du Carthaginois à Rome", in *L'Afrique du Nord antique et médiévale: mémoire, identité et imaginaire*, eds. Claude Briand-Ponsart and Sylvie Crogiez. Rouen: Publications de l'Université de Rouen. 77-86.
- Portale, E.C. 2004. "Euergetikotatos ... kai philodoxotatos eis tous Hellenas. Riflessioni sui rapporti tra Ierone II e il mondo greco", in *Nuove prospettive della ricerca sulla Sicilia del III sec. a.C. Archeologia, Numismatica, Storia*, Pelorias 11, eds. M. Caccamo Caltabiano, Lorenzo Campagna, A. Pinzone. Messina. 229-64.
- Prag, Jonathan R.W. 2006. "Poenus plane est—but who were the 'Punickes'?" *PBSR* 74: 1-37.
- Prandi, L. 1979. "La 'fides Punica' e il pregiudizio anticartaginese", in *Conoscenze etniche e rapporti di convivenza nell'antichità*, CISA 6, ed. M. Sordi. Milan. 90-7.
- Quinn, Josephine C. Forthcoming. "The Cultures of the Tophet: Identification and Identity in the Phoenician Diaspora", in *Cultural Identity and the Peoples of the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. Erich S. Gruen. Berkeley.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. 2004. *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece*. Translated by Renate Franciscono. Revised edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rawson, Elizabeth. 1989. "Roman tradition and the Greek world". *CAH* 8: 422-76.
- Rhodes, P.J. and Robin Osborne. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ribichini, Sergio. 1983. "Mito e storia: l'immagine dei Fenici nelle fonti classiche", in *Atti del I Congresso internazionale di Studi fenici e punici*. Rome. 2: 443-48.
- Russo, Federico. Forthcoming 2010. "Il concetto di Italia nelle relazioni di Roma con Cartagine e Pirro." *Historia*.
- Sanders, L.J. 1987. *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny*. London: Croom Helm.
- Sanders, L.J. 1994. "Nationalistic recommendations and policies in the seventh and eighth Platonic Epistles." *AHB* 8.3: 76-85.
- Sanders, L.J. 2002. "The relations of Syracuse and Magna Graecia in the era of the Dionysii", in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisî*, eds. Nicola Bonacasa, Lorenzo Braccisi and Ernesto de Miro. Rome: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider. 473-92.
- Santagati Ruggeri, Elena. 1997. *Un re tra Cartagine e i Mamertini: Pirro e la Sicilia*, Seia II.1. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider.

- Schepens, G. 1987. "The Phoenicians in Ephorus' Universal History." *Phoenicia and the Eastern Mediterranean in the First Millenium B.C.* Studia Phoenicia 5. Leuven: Peeters. 315-30.
- Schettino, Maria T. 2009. "Pyrrhos en Italie: la construction de l'image du premier ennemi venu de l'Orient grec." *Pallas* 79: 173-84.
- Sordi, Marta. 1961. *Timoleonte*, Sikelika 2. Palermo: S.F. Flaccovio.
- Sordi, Marta. 1992. *La Dynasteia in Occidente (Studi su Dionigi I)*. Padova: Editoriale Programma.
- Tagliamonte, Gianluca. 1994. *I figli di Marte: mobilità, mercenari e mercenariato italici in Magna Grecia e Sicilia*. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider.
- Taiphakos, I.G. 1980. "Cicero and the Sicilian Historiography, Timaeus." *Ciceroniana* 4: 177-89.
- Talbert, Richard J.A. 1974. *Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily, 344 - 317 B.C.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thiel, J.H. 1994 [1954]. "Punica fides", in *J.H. Thiel, Studies in Ancient History*, ed. H.T. Wallinga. Amsterdam. 129-50.
- Torelli, Mario. 2008. "Un italico nel regno di Ierone II: Cn. Modius e il suo *balneum* di Megara Iblea." *Sicilia Antiqua* 4: 99-104.
- Van Compernelle, Thierry. 1989. "Architecture et tyrannie." *AC* 58: 44-70.
- Van Compernelle, Thierry. 1992. *L'influence de la politique des Deinomérides et des Emménides sur l'architecture et l'urbanisme sicéliotes*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Vattuone, Riccardo. (ed.) 2002. *Storici greci d'Occidente*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Vattuone, Riccardo. 1991. *Sapienza d'Occidente. Il pensiero storico di Timeo di Tauromenio*, Studi di Storia 4. Bologna: Pàtron editore.
- Vella, Nicholas C. 1996. "Elusive Phoenicians." *Antiquity* 70: 245-50.
- Walbank, Frank W. 1979. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius. III. Commentary on Books XIX-XL*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Whittaker, C. Richard. 1978. "Carthaginian imperialism", in *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, eds. P.D.A. Garnsey and C.R. Whittaker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 59-90.
- Xella, Paolo. 2006. "La religione fenicia e punica: studi recenti e prospettive di ricerca", in *Nuevas Perspectivas I: La investigación fenicia y púnica*, Cuadernos de arqueología mediterránea 13, eds. J. P. Vita and J.Á. Zamora. Barcelona. 51-9.
- Zahrnt, Michael. 1993. "Die Schlacht bei Himera und die sizilische Historiographie." *Chiron* 23: 353-90.
- Zambon, Efrem. 2008. *Tradition and Innovation: Sicily between Hellenism and Rome*, Historia Einzelschriften 205. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Zevi, Fausto. 1999. "Siculi e Troiani (Roma e la propaganda greca nel V secolo a.C.)", in *La colonisation grecque en Méditerranée occidentale*, CEFR 251. Rome. 315-43.