

# The Relations between Tyre and Carthage during the Persian Period

JOSETTE ELAYI

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

The history of the founding of Carthage by Tyre is still a matter of some uncertainty, in spite of the numerous works dealing with this problem.<sup>1</sup> In particular, there is no certain evidence of the date of the founding; many scholars who have recently dealt with this subject accept the traditional date 814 B.C. although it does not exactly fit the archaeological facts.<sup>2</sup> The documents relating to the government, constitution, and social structure of Tyre are so meager that their influence upon the formation of Carthaginian institutions cannot be determined exactly. This is in spite of the fact that there is perhaps more archaeological and historical evidence about Carthage than about all the other Phoenician cities combined.<sup>3</sup> As to the relations between Tyre and Carthage after the foundation of this colony,<sup>4</sup> evidence is almost completely lacking for the period before the middle of the sixth century B.C. Therefore we shall be concerned here only with the state of the relations between Tyre and Carthage from the beginning of the Persian period. In this paper we shall try to explain how the relations between Tyre and Carthage, which seem to have been friendly at the beginning of this period, changed and precipitated the crisis of the fourth century, and why, in 333 B.C., when the city of Tyre was besieged by Alexander, the Carthaginians did not come to aid the

---

1 The general background of this problem may be read, for example, in B. H. Warmington, *Carthage* (London, 1960); G. Ch. Picard, *The Life and Death of Carthage* (London, 1968), *passim*; P. Cintas, *Manuel d'Archéologie punique*, I (Paris, 1970), 99-242; S. Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens* (Paris, 1971), 161-66; H. J. Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre* (Jerusalem, 1973), *passim*, especially pp. 117-22 and 188-89; S. Tlatli, *La Carthage punique* (Paris, 1978), 47-54; G. Bunnens, *L'expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée* (Brussels-Rome, 1979), 368-74.

2 See references in Cintas, *Manuel*, especially p. 469, and Katzenstein, *History*, 117-22, who discusses the classical tradition and the main modern theories.

3 The loss of the Tyrian archives, which are explicitly mentioned by Josephus, *Against Apion*, I:107, 111; *Jewish Antiquities*, VIII:55, 144; IX:283, 287, is irreparable. For the Carthaginian institutions, see for example the study of M. Szymer, "L'assemblée du peuple dans les cités puniques d'après les témoignages épigraphiques," *Semitica* 25 (1975), 47-68.

4 Some scattered remarks on this question may be found in S. Gsell, *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord I* (Paris, 1920), 395-97; *CAH IV*: 350; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 165; Picard, *Carthage*, 46; Katzenstein, *History*, 337; and *idem*, "Tyre in the Early Persian Period (539-486)," *BA* 42 (1979), 23-24; Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 285-89.

Tyrians who asked for help, although they probably had enough time to do so since the siege lasted seven months.

The establishment of the Persian domination over Tyre roughly corresponds to the beginning of the Magonids' rule in Carthage. Under the Magonids, Carthage rose quickly.<sup>5</sup> Meanwhile Tyre declined, mainly since she was besieged by Nebuchadnezzar in the first half of the sixth century, and was replaced by Sidon as the leading city of Phoenicia.<sup>6</sup> The Magonids, who had reigned for one century and a half, were succeeded by the rich Carthaginian aristocracy.<sup>7</sup> Little is known of the political situation of Tyre during the same period; possibly the slave revolt and the dynastic change mentioned by Justin should be ascribed to this period.<sup>8</sup> At any rate, the decline of Tyre continued, while the power and prosperity of Carthage increased. It is generally assumed that the Carthaginian empire was established about the beginning of the fourth century, since the treaty concluded in 405 with Dionysius of Syracuse had given Carthage domination over half of Sicily.<sup>9</sup>

We shall first consider whether Carthage was under political dependence upon her mother city at the beginning of the Persian period. We know that a Tyrian colony in Cyprus, probably Kition, had a Tyrian governor as late as the fourth century B.C.<sup>10</sup> But the relations between Carthage and her mother city were not necessarily the same as the relations between Kition and Tyre because of the remoteness of Carthage, because of her exceptional growth in power and prosperity and, maybe, because the Phoenician colonization could have had different forms as was the case with the Greek colonization. It is obvious that a Greek scheme must not be imposed on the Phoenician colonization, but our knowledge of the Greek colonization may help sometimes to understand the Phoenician colonization. Even if Carthage was under political dependence upon Tyre at the beginning of her history,<sup>11</sup> there is no doubt that, before

5 Carthage may have been strengthened by some noble Tyrian families (Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses*, 25.7; Katzenstein, *History*, 347).

6 In the council of war held by Xerxes before the battle of Salamis, the king of Tyre was only at the second place behind the king of Sidon (Herodotus, VIII:67). Tyre had been exhausted by several sieges and civil disorders. See, for example, *CAH* IV: 349-50, and J. Elayi, "The Phoenician Cities and the Assyrian Empire in the Time of Sargon II," *Second International Symposium on Babylon, Ashur and Hamrin* (Baghdad, 1979, in press). On Phoenician cities in the Persian period, see Katzenstein, *History*, 23-34; J. Elayi, "The Phoenician Cities in the Persian Period," *JANES* 12 (1980), 13-28, and *idem*, "Studies in Phoenician Geography during the Persian Period," *JNES* 41 (1982), 83-110.

7 The rule of the aristocracy was going to last till the coming to power of the Barcids' dynasty.

8 Justin, *Epitoma*, XVIII 3.6-16; J. Elayi, "La révolte des esclaves de Tyr relatée par Justin," *BaghdMitt* 2 (1981), 139-50. Justin abbreviated the *Historiae Philippicae* of Trogus Pompeius who was, as far as we know, an author worthy of confidence. Justin is much disputed because he has been mainly interested in dramatic or moral events; however, he does not seem to have changed what he summarizes. On the city of Tyre in the Persian period, see Katzenstein, *History*, *passim*; Elayi, *Studies*, *passim*.

9 *CAH*, IV: 349, 356; Warmington, *Carthage*, 38; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 167; L. Maurin, "Himilcon le Magonide," *Semitica* 12 (1962), 36. See for example Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10: "... at that time the seas were in great part beset by the Punic fleets."

10 As we can see from the inscription *KAI* 64.47 (H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften* [Wiesbaden, 1966]) on a sarcophagus found in Kition; O. Masson and M. Sznycer, *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre* (Genève, 1972), 69-75; A. Dupont-Sommer, "Les Phéniciens à Chypre," *RDAC* (1974), 86-87.

11 Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 286-89, with a recent bibliography.

the Persian period, she had freed herself from Tyre's political dependence, since Tyre, exhausted by various vicissitudes, was decaying by that time. Malchus' wars in Sicily and Sardinia about the middle of the sixth century gave certain evidence of Carthage's political independence.<sup>12</sup> According to Diodorus Siculus, Carthage used to send "a tenth of all that was paid into the public revenue . . . in the earlier period" (ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις).<sup>13</sup> Though Diodorus is a late author, it is possible to trust him because he was a conscientious historian; however, a single piece of evidence does not have the force of several.

From Justin's account, which we can accept with much caution, it is suggested that Carthage continued to pay tithe until the middle of the sixth century, because Malchus, after his campaigns in Sardinia and Sicily, sent the tithe of his booty to the Tyrian Melkart.<sup>14</sup> According to Diodorus, the Carthaginians stopped paying the tithe "when they had acquired great wealth and were receiving more considerable revenues."<sup>15</sup> It is difficult to know exactly what he meant, but since it is generally assumed that the Carthaginian empire was established about the beginning of the fourth century, we shall see that this period corresponds to the beginning of the crisis in the relations between Tyre and Carthage. We do not know what was the significance of the tithe paid by Carthage, and whether it can be compared, for example, with the taxes levied in the fifth century by Athens from her colonies of Hellespont.<sup>16</sup> If the Phoenician temples had participated in the financial transactions of the colonies, no doubt they themselves would have paid the tenth of their revenues to the mother cities;<sup>17</sup> but little is known in fact of the role of these temples.

According to Arrian and Curtius, Carthage never failed to dispatch sacred envoys to the festival of Tyrian Melkart every year: "... some Carthaginian envoys had come to their mother-city to pay honor to Heracles, according to an ancient custom"; "Envoys of the Carthaginians had come at that time to celebrate an annual festival in the manner of their country; for the Tyrians founded Carthage and were always honored as the forefathers of the Carthaginians."<sup>18</sup> Curtius' testimony is somewhat dubious because he is wont to incorporate legendary and rhetorical elements in his history, but it is confirmed by Arrian's. Though he is a late author, Arrian is quite worthy of confidence because he has carefully selected his sources. The Tyrian Melkart, whose temple Herodotus visited about the middle of the fifth century,<sup>19</sup> had been identified with Heracles by the Greeks. Every year, in honor of the resurrection of the god (ἐγερσις),

12 CAH, IV: 349-50, and 356; Katzenstein, *History*, 337 and 347, n. 284, with references.

13 Diodorus Siculus, XX:14.

14 Justin, *Epitoma*, XVIII:7.7; the date ascribed to Malchus' campaigns is not quite certain: CAH, IV: 356; Maurin, *Himilcon*, 13.

15 Cf. *supra*, n. 13.

16 As Bunnens conjectures (*L'expansion*), 283-86.

17 C. Mossé, *La colonisation dans l'antiquité* (Paris, 1970), 74.

18 Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:24.5; Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10.

19 Herodotus, II:44. The main temple of Melkart was on the island and there was another one on the mainland. On Melkart, see, for example, R. Dussaud, "Melkart," *Syria* 25 (1946-48), 205-30 and *idem*, "Melkart d'après des récents travaux," *RHR* 151 (1957), 1-21; B. C. Brundage, "Herakles the Levantine: a Comprehensive View," *JNES* 17 (1958), 225-36; H. Seyrig, "Antiquités syriennes," *Syria* 40 (1963), 19-28; C. and G. C. Picard, "Hercule et Melkart" in *Mélanges J. Bayet* (Brussels, 1964), 569-78; H. W.

the Tyrians celebrated a festival, the magnificence of which was pointed out by Strabo: "Heracles is paid extravagant honors by them [the Tyrians]." <sup>20</sup> Herodotus' and Strabo's testimonies may be trusted because the first one was contemporaneous with the Persian period, and is in most cases reliable, and the second one had a quite scientific conception of geography.

Little is known of the religious rites performed in Melkart's festival; it is indeed doubtful whether they can be compared with the rites performed by Alexander at Tyre, which obviously belonged to the worship of the Greek Heracles (he sacrificed to Heracles, held a procession, a naval review, athletic games and a relay torch-race in his honor, and dedicated to him the engine which battered down the wall, as well as the Tyrian sacred ship; when he came back from Egypt, he sacrificed again to Heracles and held athletic and musical games). <sup>21</sup> As far as the Phoenician ritual of this festival is concerned, we know only from Curtius and Polybius, who is a late author but quite reliable, that offerings of tithes, spoils and perhaps first fruits were brought to the temple of Melkart. <sup>22</sup> It is impossible to determine what kind of sacrifices were offered to the god and whether they included a "molek" (human sacrifice); <sup>23</sup> Pliny the Elder tells us about the annual sacrifice of a human victim to Heracles at Carthage, <sup>24</sup> but we can never be sure that Roman historians narrated the Carthaginian events in an unbiased fashion, because of the rivalry between Rome and Carthage. Curtius recounts that when some Tyrians proposed in 333 to renew the sacrifice of a freeborn boy to Cronos, the elders of Tyre opposed it; <sup>25</sup> since this single testimony is dubious, we may only conjecture that the Tyrians abolished this cruel custom, before the end of the Persian period.

---

Haussig, *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, I (Stuttgart, 1965), 297-98; M. Sznycer, "Mythes et Dieux de la religion phénicienne," *Archeologia* 20 (1968), 27-33, and *idem*, "Les religions des Sémites occidentaux," *Dictionnaire des mythologies* (Paris, 1980), 60-63.

20 Strabo, *Geography*, XVI:2.23. On the meaning of this festival, see R. Dussaud, "Melkart," 206-08; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 63; Katzenstein, *History*, 92-93; for the date of this festival, some scholars (for example, Dussaud, "Melkart," 207) give February-March; others, December (V. Bérard, *Origine des cultes arcadiens* [Paris, 1958], 25); and some others, January (Brundage, *Herakles* 225-27); see also E. Lipiński, "La fête de l'ensevelissement et de la résurrection de Melkart" in *Actes de la XVIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Brussels, 1969), 30-58; A. E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology* (Munich, 1972), 294.

21 Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:24, III:6; Diodorus Siculus, XVII:46; Plutarch, *Alexander*, 29.

22 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:13.19; Polybius, *The Histories*, XXXI:12.12; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 193; Katzenstein, *History*, 91 and n. 80.

23 The ancient authors refer many times to the worship of Melkart in Tyrian colonies, but never describe the sacrifices offered to this god (cf., for example, Strabo, *Geography*, III:5.5; Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:16.4; Pomponius Mela, III:6.46; Appian, *Roman History*, VI:1.2). On the "molek," see for example I Kings 16:31; R. Dussaud, "Les sacrifices puniques d'enfants: précisions épigraphiques," *CRAI* (1946), 387ff.; J. G. Février, "Molchomor," *RHR* 143 (1953), 8-18 and "Essai de reconstitution du sacrifice molek," *Journal asiatique* 248 (1960), 167-87; N. H. Snaith, "The Cult of Molech," *Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1966) 123-27; S. Moscati, *L'épopée*, 81; Sznycer, *Dictionnaire*, 61ff.

24 Pliny, *Natural History*, XXXVI:39; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 197.

25 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10. On Cronos, see, for example, W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1884-1924), s.v. Kronos; Daremberg-Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines* (Graz, 1962-1963), s.v. Cronos; Haussig, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. Baal-Hammon; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 195. Cronos has been identified with Baal-Hammon.

The religious importance of Melkart in Phoenician colonization should be noted: as is shown from the ancient authors and a few archaeological remains, the Tyrians used to build a temple to this god when they founded a new trading colony.<sup>26</sup> According to the tradition, it was in Melkart's name that the Tyrians founded Carthage: Elissa's husband was the chief priest of this god<sup>27</sup> and, before leaving Tyre, the Tyrian colonists offered a sacrifice to him.<sup>28</sup> Two documents, which unfortunately are late, might suggest a comparison between Melkart and the Delphian god, Apollo "Archegetes," who was the leader and the lord of the Greek colonists: in the bilingual inscription CIS, I, 122 (second century B.C.), *mlqrt b'l šr* is translated 'Ηρακλεῖ ἀρχηγέται, and Strabo named him τὸν 'Ηρακλέα τὸν παρὰ τοῖς ἀποίκους, "Heracles, protector of the colonists."<sup>29</sup> Phoenician oracles might have played, as far as the colonization is concerned, the same role as Delphian oracles for the Greeks by designating the oikist (leader of the colonization) or the best place to found a colony.<sup>30</sup> Melkart was the first Tyrian god honored at Carthage where he had a temple,<sup>31</sup> and the frequent occurrence of his name in Carthaginian onomastics gives evidence of his popularity.<sup>32</sup> The fact that Carthage continued to dispatch sacred envoys to the festival of Tyrian Melkart centuries after her foundation seems to indicate that there still existed between Tyre and her colony religious and sentimental ties. It should be noted that the Carthaginians honored not only Melkart, but also the other gods of their mother city, as we may judge from ancient sources and onomastics: for example, they believed that they were defeated by Agathocles in 310 B.C. because they had neglected the honors of "all the gods of Tyre" (πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ θεῶν).<sup>33</sup>

Further evidence of the ties between Tyre and Carthage is the fact that the Carthaginians occasionally sent booty to Tyre, so that: "... with many ... spoils of the cities which they had captured, they adorned Tyre rather than Carthage"; Curtius' testimony is confirmed by Diodorus and Herodotus.<sup>34</sup> We may suppose that most of the

26 Herodotus, II:44; Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:16.4; Appian, *Roman History*, IV:1.2. Cf. Dussaud, "Melqart," 213-14; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, II:2 (Stuttgart, 1928), 81ff.

27 See references in Katzenstein, *History*, 188-89. On the character of the foundation of Carthage, see Mossé, *La colonisation*, 20-24.

28 Justin, *Epitoma*, XVIII:4.2-15: *sacris Heraclis ... repetitis*. Another interpretation is possible: they took away with them the objects of the cult.

29 Or ἀποικισταῖς: Diodorus Siculus, 14:1-2. Cf. Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 158 and 235, discussing Tertullian, *De anima*, 30.2.

30 Strabo, *Geography*, III:5.5; Justin, *Epitoma*, XLIV:5; Athenaeus, IIIB.513F1. Cf. Meyer, *Geschichte*, 81, and n. 3; Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 130-31. For the role of Delphian oracles in Greek colonization, see for example G. Roux, *Delphi* (Munich, 1971), *passim*; J. Elayi, "Le rôle de l'oracle de Delphes dans le conflit gréco-perse d'après les Histoires d'Hérodote, II," *Iranica Antiqua* 14 (1979), 67ff. On the relations between the Greek colonies and their mother cities, see for example A. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (Manchester, 1964); J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas* (London, 1964); Mossé, *La colonisation*, 29ff.

31 KAI 101.86. Cf. Gsell, *Histoire*, 395ff.; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 193.

32 G. Halff, "L'onomastique punique à Carthage," *Karthago* 12 (1963-64), 63-66.

33 Diodorus Siculus, XX:14.2. For example, the cult of Ba'al-Šaphon is attested in onomastics: Moscati, *L'épopée*, 194.

34 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:3.22; Diodorus Siculus, XIII:108; Herodotus, II:44. It is impossible to say whether this booty was apart from the tithe of the revenues or belonged to it.



Carthaginian spoils adorned the temple of Melkart because he was the god "Archegetes," and that when other Tyrian colonies wanted to make offerings to their mother city, they also dedicated them in the temple of this god. Being thus adorned, the temple of Tyrian Melkart could probably be compared with the temple of Delphian Apollo. It is hardly necessary to say that Herodotus, whose particular faith in Delphian Apollo and interest in his sanctuary are well-known, could not fail to visit and admire the temple of Tyrian Melkart: "I saw this sanctuary decorated in wealth with a lot of offerings."<sup>35</sup> We have no means to determine when the Carthaginians began to send to Tyre offerings of the first fruits which are related by Polybius to the Roman period, but he seems to speak of an ancient custom: "Such ships (as the one used by Demetrius I Soter in his flight) were specially selected at Carthage for the conveyance of the traditional offerings of the first fruits to their gods that the Carthaginians sent to Tyre."<sup>36</sup> If Polybius' testimony is true, it seems likely that the first fruits were brought to the festival of the ἑγερσις of Melkart because of the agrarian character of this god.

The religious and sentimental ties between Tyre and Carthage seem to have been reciprocal. According to Herodotus, when Cambyses made plans for a campaign against Carthage, the Phoenicians refused: "they were, as they said, bound by great oaths, and they would behave impiously if they fought against their children."<sup>37</sup> There is no reason here to doubt Herodotus' account even though it is the only one; he is almost contemporaneous with this event, and it is not surprising that, after the conquest of Egypt, Cambyses would have made plans to complete the conquest of the north-eastern part of Africa by attacking Ethiopia, the oasis of Ammon, and Carthage.<sup>38</sup> His project did not mean that Carthage depended upon Tyre at this time, nor that the Persian king planned the conquest of Tyrian colonies. The refusal of the Tyrians pointed to the existence of strong sentimental and religious ties between them and their colony, which seems to have been usual in Phoenician colonization.<sup>39</sup> The substantive plural ὀρκίοισι used by Herodotus designates the oaths which accompanied a mere promise or a treaty. If this be so, these oaths could be compared with the oaths accompanying the agreement made by the colonists of Cyrene with Thera;<sup>40</sup> but did they accompany an agreement in the case of Carthage? It is worth noting that there is a little evidence of this kind of agreement in Greek colonization. There was probably also another reason for the refusal of the Tyrians: they wanted to be left to pursue their commerce freely in the western Mediterranean.

Herodotus gives two reasons to explain why Cambyses abandoned the project of an expedition against Carthage: first, Phoenician participation in the Persian fleet was based on friendship because the Phoenicians "had undertaken to serve him of their free

35 Herodotus, II:44; cf. J. Elayi, "Le rôle de l'oracle de Delphes dans le conflit gréco-persé d'après les Histoires d'Hérodote, I," *Iranica Antiqua* 13 (1978), 96-97, 115-18.

36 Polybius, *The Histories*, XXXI:12.11-12.

37 Herodotus, III:19.

38 Cambyses' project may be compared with Alexander's later project: cf. Diodorus Siculus, XVIII:4. For Cambyses' project, see *CAH*, IV, 20, 350; Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 286-87.

39 For example, if we may trust Justin (*Epitoma*, XLIV:5.2-3), Carthage helped her colony Gades to repel an attack of Spanish people (*auxilium consanguineis Karthaginienses misere*).

40 Graham, *Colony*, 27-28, 40-68.

will";<sup>41</sup> secondly, the whole naval power of the Persians was dependent on them. The first reason is likely, but the second one is more dubious because the Phoenicians do not seem to have held in Cambyses' fleet a place as important as the Greeks;<sup>42</sup> there was a third reason, not mentioned by Herodotus, which was certainly the main one: after the complete failure of Persian expeditions to Ethiopia, and to the oasis of Ammon,<sup>43</sup> Cambyses realized that his forces were not sufficient for his projected conquest of Africa.

As far as the Persian wars were concerned, there is no general agreement to accept the tradition according to which the Persians and the Carthaginians had a concerted plan against the Greeks, in which the Tyrians might have participated.<sup>44</sup> According to Diodorus, Xerxes "... sent an embassy to the Carthaginians to urge them to join him in the undertaking and concluded an agreement with them, to the effect that they would wage war upon the Greeks who lived in Greece, while the Carthaginians should at the same time gather great armaments and subdue those Greeks who lived in Sicily and Italy."<sup>45</sup> Ephorus states that there were in this embassy Persian and Phoenician envoys;<sup>46</sup> both authors relate that the Carthaginians agreed with the Persians and helped them by fighting against the western Greeks. There is apparently no reason to doubt the testimony of these ancient authors because it is reasonable to think that, while the Greeks sought alliance with Gelon of Syracuse, Xerxes wanted to do the same with the powerful city of Carthage, inasmuch as he was probably on good terms with the Tyrians.<sup>47</sup> Even if the exact synchronism between the battles of Salamis and Himera had only a symbolic value for the ancient historians,<sup>48</sup> Tyre and Carthage had both fought against the Greeks, having the same interests as the Persians, and they were about the same time likewise defeated by the Greeks.<sup>49</sup> However, it does not follow that the two cities had always tried to have the same policy.<sup>50</sup>

Two last pieces of evidence seem to confirm that the relations between Tyre and Carthage were good till the end of the fifth century. According to Diodorus, during his campaign of 406 B.C. in Sicily, Hamilcar, one of the two Carthaginian generals, sacrificed a young boy to Cronos in order to stop a plague which had broken out in his army.<sup>51</sup> Although we have no traces of *tophets* in Phoenicia till now, the human sacrifice to Cronos seems to have been an ancient custom inherited from Tyre, for in

41 Herodotus, III:19.

42 See Ph. E. Legrand's note 3, p. 51 (Herodotus, III:19).

43 Herodotus, III:25-26.

44 For example Maurin (*Himilcon*, 25 and n. 3.) does not accept this tradition; D. Harden (*The Phoenicians* [London, 1962], 69) is doubtful about it; Picard (*Carthage, Le monde*, 39-40) and Ph. Gauthier ("Grecs et Phéniciens en Sicile pendant la période archaïque," *RH* [1960], 269ff.) accept it.

45 Diodorus Siculus, XI:1.4.

46 Ephorus, in *Fragmenta Historicum Graecorum*, I:264.111.

47 Herodotus, VII:157-62. See *supra*, n. 6: the king of Tyre ranked just after the king of Sidon, the great favourite of the Persian king.

48 *CAH*, IV, 378-79; see also Legrand's note 1, p. 166 (Herodotus, VII:167).

49 According to Moscati (*L'épopée*, 170), the defeat of Himera delayed the development of Carthage.

50 Moscati (*L'épopée*, 168) supposes that the annual Carthaginian embassies to Tyre had also a political purpose; unfortunately, this hypothesis cannot be checked.

51 Diodorus Siculus, XIII:86.

333 some Tyrians proposed to renew it in order to conciliate their gods, and in 310, the Carthaginians renewed it with the same purpose.<sup>52</sup> The sacrifice performed by Hamilcar could show that the Carthaginians remained faithful to the religious ritual inherited from the Tyrians. We know from Curtius, whose testimony is confirmed by Diodorus, that during the victorious campaign of 405, Himilcon, the other commander of the Carthaginians, destroyed several Sicilian cities including their temples; in the territory of the Geloans, he seized a bronze statue of Apollo of colossal size and sent it to Tyre;<sup>53</sup> we know that this statue adorned the temple of Melkart because the Tyrians attached it to the altar of this god during the siege of Tyre by Alexander, in which it played an important role.<sup>54</sup> According to Justin, Himilcon attributed his military successes in Sicily to his gods (. . . *tanta belli decora et tot ornamenta victoriarum, quae ipsi (dei) dederant* . . .),<sup>55</sup> but this testimony is not quite sure.

After this period of good relations between the two cities, the refusal of the Carthaginians to help the Tyrians in 333 B.C. reveals the existence of a crisis in these relations. Several indications that we shall examine successively show that this crisis might have its origin in the beginning of the fourth century. We shall examine first the crushing defeat inflicted on Himilcon by Dionysius of Syracuse in 396 B.C., its significance and its consequences. Diodorus and Justin agree to present this defeat as the revenge of the gods because Himilcon had treated Greek temples and graves with irreverence. According to them, his most reprehensible act was the plunder of the sanctuary of the two principal Syracusan deities, Demeter and Core, in the suburb of Achradine.<sup>56</sup> When Himilcon came back to Carthage, he blamed the Phoenician gods for his defeat: "Stretching out his hands to the sky, he deplores by turns his destiny and the fortune of his city. He accuses the gods (*deos accusat*) of having taken back the numerous honors and trophies that they had given him before."<sup>57</sup> Afterwards, the Carthaginians solemnly introduced, for the first time in their city, the cult of the two Greek deities, Demeter and Core: ". . . they voted to propitiate by every means the gods who had been sinned against. Since they had included neither Core nor Demeter in their rites, they appointed their most renowned citizens to be priests of these goddesses, and consecrating statues of them with all solemnity, they conducted their rites, following the ritual used by the Greeks. They also chose some of the most prominent Greeks who lived among them and assigned them to the service of the goddesses."<sup>58</sup>

52 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10; Diodorus Siculus, XX:14. However, Curtius' testimony must be considered with caution and anyway it does not follow that this custom still persisted at Tyre by that time: see *supra*, n. 24.

53 Diodorus Siculus, XIII:108; Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:3.19.

54 According to the ancient authors, it helped Alexander to win victory against the Tyrians.

55 Justin, *Epitoma*, XIX:3; cf. Maurin, *Himilcon*, 33.

56 Diodorus Siculus, XIV:63.1, 70.4, 73.5. This impiety, even though committed against Greek gods, was considered by the Carthaginians as a serious offense because all the ancient peoples used to respect foreign gods. Maurin (*Himilcon*, 34) conjectures that the Carthaginians possibly reproached Himilcon for not having killed himself like Hamilcar in 480 B.C., but this hypothesis cannot be checked; at any rate, his flight after he had abandoned his army could not be tolerated by his fellow citizens.

57 Justin, *Epitoma*, XIX:3. According to the tradition (*Ibid.* and Diodorus Siculus, XIV:76.4), he killed himself, but the circumstances of his death are not quite clear; cf. Maurin, *Himilcon*, 27-29.

58 Diodorus Siculus, XIV:77.4-5.



It seems to have been a true religious revolution because, instead of assimilating the two foreign deities with their own, they introduced them into their pantheon without any change. The reasons for such a revolution have been well pointed out by L. Maurin.<sup>59</sup> The defeat of 396 provoked a true religious and moral crisis: the Carthaginians assumed the culpability of Himilcon towards the Greek gods and introduced the cult of Demeter and Core in order to expiate the offense of their general.<sup>60</sup> The following passage of Diodorus shows the exact role of Himilcon in this religious change: "... he bequeathed to his fellow citizens a deep respect for religion."<sup>61</sup> ἡ δεισιδαιμονία means here the respect for Greek gods as is shown from the context. However, the introduction of a Greek cult, which quickly became very popular,<sup>62</sup> was probably possible because the city of Carthage had been open to Greek influences, mainly since the Carthaginian campaigns in Sicily.<sup>63</sup> The reappearance of Greek products, which had almost disappeared from Carthage for more than a century, may be dated to the beginning of the fourth century B.C., in connection with the opening of the city to Greek influences.<sup>64</sup> It was probably the hellenized Carthaginian aristocracy who took advantage of the favourable circumstances to introduce the Greek cult of Demeter and Core in Carthage.<sup>65</sup>

Such a religious revolution was probably followed, more or less quickly, by a decrease in piety towards the Phoenician gods, including the Tyrian gods, because in 396 B.C., the Greek gods had proved to be more powerful than the Phoenician gods. Therefore the Carthaginian people seems to have honored them first<sup>66</sup> and neglected somewhat the Phoenician gods, if we may judge from Diodorus' testimony which seems confirmed by archaeological evidence. In his account concerning the events of 310 B.C., Diodorus mentions the offenses committed by the Carthaginians against the Phoenician

59 Maurin, *Himilcon*, 31-36; however, as Picard suggests (*Carthage*, 128), this revolution was probably not sudden but progressive.

60 Justin, *Epitoma*, XIX:2.8: "When the news of the defeat was announced to the Carthaginians, the city was plunged into affliction as if she herself had been taken; only lamentations could be heard, the private houses were closed, so were the temples of the gods, all the religious ceremonies and private works were interrupted." Cf. also Diodorus Siculus, XIV:77.4.

61 Diodorus Siculus, XIV:76.4.

62 J. Carcopino, *Aspects mystiques de la Rome païenne*, 13-47; G. Camps, "Massinissa ou les débuts de l'histoire," *Libya* 8 (1960), 35-56; Maurin, *Himilcon*, 34-35.

63 According to Maurin (*Himilcon*, 32), the afflux of Sicilian booty (see for example Diodorus Siculus, XIII:90.4) and Greek prisoners of war probably produced at Carthage great interest in Greek civilization; moreover, Greek traders were established at Carthage while Carthaginian traders were established in the Greek cities of Sicily; it is possible, too, that before the campaign of 406 B.C. in Sicily, the Carthaginians had allied themselves with the Athenians (Cf. B. D. Meritt, "Athens and Carthage," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Supplementary Vol. I [1940], 247-53).

64 Moscati, *L'épopée*, 175; L. F. Stager, "Excavations at Carthage 1975," *AASOR* 43 (1976), 169. The interdiction of the Greek language at Carthage mentioned by Justin (*Epitoma*, XX:5), if it is not misdated (368-367 B.C.), would seem to indicate that the government of Carthage had tried to stop the progress of Hellenism (Maurin, *Himilcon*, 32).

65 Maurin, *Himilcon*, 26-29; P. Xella, "Sull'introduzione del culto di Demetra e Kore a Carthagine," *SMSR* 40 (1969), 215-28.

66 For the hellenization of the Punic religion after 396 B.C., see G. Ch. Picard, *Les religions de l'Afrique antique*, 80-99.

gods, which in their minds had caused their defeat. First they had neglected to honor the Tyrian Melkart: "... they believed that Heracles, who was worshipped in their mother-city, was exceedingly angry with them . . . ." <sup>67</sup> They did not send him as many offerings as previously; if we may believe Diodorus, we ought to conclude that, since the beginning of the fourth century B.C., they no longer paid the tithe of their revenues to Melkart. <sup>68</sup> Besides this god, they had also neglected the other gods of Tyre; <sup>69</sup> they had tried to cheat with regard to the ritual of human sacrifices which they had probably inherited from Tyre: "... in former times they had been accustomed to sacrifice . . . the noblest of their sons, but more recently, secretly buying and nurturing children, they had sent these to the sacrifice; and when an investigation was made, some of those who had been sacrificed were discovered to have been supposititious." <sup>70</sup>

Archaeological discoveries reflect that a change occurred in the fourth century B.C. in the Punic ritual of human sacrifices: in the *tophet* of Sousse, bones of small animals replaced children's bones. <sup>71</sup> Even if Diodorus did not mention explicitly the sacrifices of small animals, we must note that the Carthaginians showed less zeal for performing the Phoenician ritual. It does not follow that they cease all relations with their mother-city, for perhaps they could not completely lose their faith in the Tyrian gods nor forget that the Tyrians were their forefathers or they just wanted to save appearances. Whatever could be the reason, they continued to dispatch an annual embassy to the festival of Tyrian Melkart. <sup>72</sup> We know also from Polybius that in the second treaty between Carthage and Rome, the name of Tyre was quoted together with the name of Carthage. <sup>73</sup> Polybius is a very serious reference because he is not far from the events that he related and he tries to write scientific history. In fact, as long as relations between Tyre and Carthage had not been tested, the crisis did exist but was not manifest; it took place in 333 B.C. when the Tyrians needed help of the Carthaginians.

When Alexander arrived in the territory of Tyre, envoys of the Carthaginians were present in the city to celebrate the annual festival of Melkart; the presence of this delegation is well attested by ancient authors, in particular Arrian and Diodorus. <sup>74</sup> For this period, Arrian and Diodorus can be trusted though they are late authors: Diodorus (first century B.C.) based his history of Alexander on Hieronymus of Cardia, a relative of Eumenes of Cardia, who was secretary to Alexander; Arrian (second century A.D.)

67 Diodorus Siculus, XX:14.1. Melkart had been identified with Heracles by the Greeks.

68 Diodorus says that they no longer sent the tithe "once they had acquired great wealth and were receiving more considerable revenues" (XX:14.2).

69 Diodorus Siculus, XX:14.1.

70 Diodorus Siculus, XX:14.4. See also Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10.

71 Picard, *Carthage*, 150; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 196. For *tophets* and *moleks*, see *supra*, n. 23.

72 Cf. *supra*, n. 18.

73 Polybius, *The Histories*, III:24.3. See Gsell, *Histoire*, 396 and n. 5; Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 286; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 176-77; J. Heurgon, "La Carthage primitive en Méditerranée occidentale," *Archéologie vivante* 1 (1969), 25.

74 Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:24.5; Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10; C. Bradford Welles (in Diodorus Siculus, XVII:40, p. 231, n. 2) states that the Tyrians did not allow Alexander to sacrifice during the festival inside the city because it would have meant acknowledging his sovereignty; it seems rather likely that they just wanted to keep the independence of their island, as they had kept it under the Assyrians, the Babylonians and the Persians; cf. J. R. Hamilton, *Commentary on Plutarch, Alexander* (Oxford, 1969), 62-65.

used two authorities, Ptolemaeus and Aristobulus, who both served as Alexander's generals. They attest also that the Tyrians hoped to be helped if necessary by the Carthaginians: "They . . . hoped for help from their colonists, the Carthaginians; . . . they had much courage because of their confidence in the Carthaginians."<sup>75</sup> It is not surprising that the Tyrians had hoped to be helped by the Carthaginians: at that time, Carthage had become much more powerful than her mother city;<sup>76</sup> on the other hand, Tyre had been weakened by many difficulties since the last siege by Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander was a more redoubtable adversary than the Babylonian king.<sup>77</sup> Moreover, although the Carthaginians had probably been neglecting their mother city since 396 B.C., so far as we know, the Tyrians had not changed their sentiments towards their colonists. This request for help seems to confirm that there was an ancient agreement between the two cities, possibly similar to the military alliance between Corinth and Syracuse or Corcyra.<sup>78</sup>

If the ancient authors agree on the fact that the Tyrians hoped for help from their colonists, they differ on the answer of the Carthaginians. Diodorus and Arrian are silent on this subject. Justin just writes that the Tyrians asked for help and that, not a long time after (*non magno post tempore*),<sup>79</sup> the island was conquered by Alexander, but it is difficult to know what he meant to say exactly. Curtius gives another version: ". . . they (the Carthaginian envoys) began to urge the Tyrians to endure the siege with a courageous spirit; soon help would come from Carthage."<sup>80</sup> He writes that, accordingly, the Tyrians engaged in the war with Alexander and that, later, when Tyrian affairs were going wrong, thirty new Carthaginian envoys arrived, announcing "that the Carthaginians were involved in a war at home and were fighting, not for dominion, but for their lives."<sup>81</sup> According to him, the arrival of these envoys was a consolation to the Tyrians: "Nevertheless the Tyrians did not lose courage in spite of being abandoned by this great hope . . ."<sup>82</sup> It is quite difficult to believe Curtius' version because he is wrong when he says that at that time the Syracusans were devastating Africa not far from Carthage: they did not wage war in Africa until the time of Agathocles, twenty-two years later.<sup>83</sup> However, it could be likely that the Tyrians received a verbal promise of help from Carthage, destined at least to save appearances.<sup>84</sup>

75 Diodorus Siculus, XVII:40.3; Justin, *Epitoma*, IX:10-14. According to Justin, whose testimony seems quite dubious, their courage came chiefly from the fact that they were stimulated by the example of Dido who had founded a colony such as Carthage although she was a mere woman.

76 Cf. *supra*, n. 9.

77 However, the Tyrians were still confident in the strong position of their island and in the fact that they had always been besieged in vain. Cf. Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:18.1-2: "The fact is that the siege of Tyre was manifestly a large task. The city was an island and had been fortified all around with high walls."

78 Mossé, *La colonisation*, 78ff.

79 Justin, *Epitoma*, IX:10-14.

80 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10.

81 *Ibid.*

82 *Ibid.*

83 Cf. Justin, *Epitoma*, XXII:6. Curtius perhaps used Diodorus Siculus (XVII:23), where the African campaign of Agathocles is mentioned before the siege of Tyre, but he has failed to read: κατὰ τοὺς ὕστερον χρόνους.

84 Without giving conclusive arguments, some modern authors (for example Warmington, *Carthage*, 105; CAH, IV: 376) consider the Carthaginians' promise of help a legend.

The evacuation of a part of the Tyrian population to Carthage during the siege of Tyre is attested by ancient authors and perhaps by archaeological evidence: "... as the work [the building of the mole] proceeded with unexpected rapidity, the Tyrians voted to transport their children and women and young men to Carthage . . . ." <sup>85</sup> According to Justin, they organized the evacuation a short time before the capture of their city. <sup>86</sup> Curtius relates this evacuation to the second Carthaginian embassy: "... (they) entrusted to the envoys their wives and children to be taken to Carthage, being ready to bear more bravely whatever might befall them if they could keep their dearest treasures without share in the common peril." <sup>87</sup> What we may retain is that these three authors agree on the fact that the evacuation did not occur at the beginning of the siege but rather when the Tyrians had understood the danger.

According to Diodorus, the Tyrians evacuated to Carthage were very numerous, perhaps more than 13,000 persons: "Although most of the non-combattants had been removed to Carthage, those who remained to become captives were found to be more than thirteen thousand." <sup>88</sup> This testimony is somewhat dubious because in another passage <sup>89</sup> Diodorus speaks only of "a part" of them: τῶν τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν μέρος. If we may believe the same author, this evacuation succeeded: "They did succeed in getting a part of their children and women to safety with the Carthaginians." <sup>90</sup> This statement could be confirmed by the archaeological evidence: excavations at Carthage have shown that there was a very large extension of the town southwards in the fourth century B.C. and the same phenomenon has been observed in Utica: <sup>91</sup> both cities were Tyrian colonies and not far apart, so that it is logical to think that the Tyrians were removed to these two cities; but it is not sure at all that the extension of Carthage and Utica was due to the arrival of Tyrian refugees.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the evacuation of Tyrians to Carthage was more a necessity than a proof of confidence: if their Cyprian colony Kition was situated farther from Tyre, in a more secure place, no doubt the Tyrians would have removed the non-combattants to this city because their relations with the Kitians were far tighter at that time than their relations with the Carthaginians, as is shown from the presence of a Tyrian governor in Kition at this time.

How can one explain the fact that Carthage did not help her mother city as she normally ought to do? It is possible that at the beginning of the siege the Carthaginians, as well as the Tyrians, had believed that the island of Tyre was impregnable. But when the Tyrians understood the danger and called for help, the Carthaginians could not ignore it because of the presence of Carthaginian envoys at Tyre and maybe because of

---

85 Diodorus Siculus, XVII:41.

86 Justin, *Epitoma*, IX:10-14.

87 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:3.19.

88 Diodorus Siculus, XVII:46.4.

89 Diodorus Siculus, XVII:41.2.

90 Diodorus Siculus, XVII:41.2. If it is true, it is a proof that the relations between Tyre and Carthage were not quite broken.

91 A. Lézine, "Utique, note d'archéologie punique," *AntAfr* 5 (1971), 92-93 (with references); S. Lancel, "Nouvelles fouilles de la mission archéologique française à Carthage sur la colline de Byrsa: campagnes de 1974 et 1975," *CRAI* (1976), 78; "Fouilles française à Carthage (1974-1975)," *AntAfr* 11 (1977), 47, 49 and *Byrsa I* (Rome, 1979), 95.



the arrival of Tyrian evacuees. We cannot exclude the possibility that they had heard too late of the difficulties of the Tyrians. But it seems rather unlikely for we know from Arrian's testimony, which can be trusted, that the siege had lasted seven long months!<sup>92</sup> According to the tradition, Carthage was also threatened by Alexander's projects of conquest: "... (Alexander) spared the Carthaginian envoys, but added a declaration of war, although the war was delayed by the urgency of present affairs."<sup>93</sup> Diodorus confirms Curtius' testimony by telling that after Alexander's death, a document was found in which was mentioned a proposed conquest of northern Africa as far as the Columns of Heracles, including Carthage.<sup>94</sup>

It should not be surprising if Alexander had made plans of conquest in Africa like Cambyses two centuries earlier.<sup>95</sup> If this be so, it might be true that the Carthaginians had been terrified when hearing of the capture of Tyre and had sent Hamilcar to Alexander in order to gain his trust and to collect information on his projects.<sup>96</sup> One thing we may retain from these somewhat confused sources is that the Carthaginians did not help the Tyrians perhaps for fear of Alexander. Such a prudent and selfish decision would have suited the new policy of Carthage.<sup>97</sup> As far as we know in the present state of documentation, the Carthaginians seem to have held the Tyrians of little account, probably since 396 B.C., but only the events of 333 showed everyone that in spite of appearances, their relations with their mother city were changed. Carthage, which was opened to Greek influences and in particular to Greek gods, had become in the fourth century B.C. much more prosperous and powerful than Tyre and therefore seemed to behave as if she did not need anything else from her mother city. The tradition presented the capture of Tyre by Alexander as the victory of Greek gods over Phoenician gods, which confirmed that the religious choice of Carthage in 396 B.C. was the right one: the statue of Apollo which had been offered to the Tyrians by Himilcon in 405 passed symbolically to the Greek side;<sup>98</sup> Melkart too, in whom the Tyrians had so much confidence,<sup>99</sup> abandoned them, so that Alexander, identifying him with the Greek Heracles, attributed his victory to him.<sup>100</sup>

92 Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:24.

93 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:4.18. Why in this case did he spare the Carthaginian envoys? Perhaps he wanted to let them return to Carthage in order to tell what had happened at Tyre.

94 Diodorus Siculus, XVIII:4.4.

95 Moscati (*L'épopée*, 177) contra Warmington, *Carthage*, 105, who considers these plans of conquest a legend.

96 Justin, *Epitoma*, XXI:6. The beginning of this story may be compared to the dispatch of an observer to Xerxes by Gelon of Syracuse during the second Persian war (Herodotus, VII:163). But Justin tells that when Hamilcar came back to Carthage with much information, he was accused of treason and put to death.

97 In any case, it is not certain that, if the Carthaginians had helped the Tyrians, their city would not have been captured by Alexander.

98 Diodorus Siculus, LXXI:41; Plutarch, *Alexander*, XXIV:4; Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:3.19. Alexander thanks Apollo after his victory (Diodorus Siculus, XVII:46.3-6).

99 As is shown for example by the fact that a suppliant during the siege, and the king and notables at the end of the siege took refuge in the temple of Melkart (Diodorus Siculus, XVII:41; Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:24).

100 Diodorus Siculus, XVII:46.3-6; Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:24.3-6. Melkart-Heracles had not kept the god Apollo whose statue the Tyrians had fastened to his altar (Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:3.19), and he had given Alexander a favourable dream (Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*, II:18).



Although we have no document from the following period, there is no reason to suppose that the crisis in relations between Tyre and Carthage came to an end. This seems to have occurred only in 310 B.C., when a new moral and religious crisis in Carthage had a result contrary to that of the previous crisis in 396. According to Diodorus, who is unfortunately our only source for this period, after the disembarking of Agathocles in Africa and his victory over Hannon and Bomilcar, the Carthaginians, "... turning to repentance because of their misfortune, ... bethought them of all the gods of Tyre."<sup>101</sup> They repented of having neglected the honors of the Phoenician gods "that had been established by their fathers";<sup>102</sup> they sent to Tyre magnificent offerings and offered to Cronos a holocaust of two hundred children; three hundred other persons sacrificed themselves voluntarily.<sup>103</sup> When the Carthaginians emerged rapidly from their difficult situation and signed the advantageous treaty of 305, they may have believed that the Phoenician gods, satisfied with their repentance, had given them the victory. But the recovery of good relations between Tyre and Carthage, if it happened, coincided also with the recovery of prosperity by Tyre: in 315 B.C. (only eighteen years after her capture by Alexander) Tyre, besieged by Antigonos, resisted for fifteen months;<sup>104</sup> and in 306, the Tyrians struck tetradrachms, which meant their return to the international trade.<sup>105</sup> Probably it was not a mere coincidence: we may conjecture that the Carthaginians had understood since Agathocles' expedition that Carthage was not invincible, and that Tyre was again a prosperous city with whom it would be profitable to maintain good relations.

Thus, as far as we know, we can say that from the middle of the sixth century to the end of the fifth century B.C. the relations between Tyre and her colony Carthage seem to have been good. The documents furnish ample evidence of the permanence of religious and sentimental ties between them: Carthage continued to honor the gods of Tyre, and especially Melkart, by sending a tithe, booty and perhaps the first fruits. However, it is impossible to know whether Melkart, who had assisted the Tyrian colonists in founding Carthage, continued to play an active role in the administration of this colony, which could be compared for example with the role of the Delphian Apollo in the history of Cyrene.<sup>106</sup> It is impossible to know the exact nature of the oaths binding the two cities which prevented the Tyrians from attacking Carthage and obliged the Carthaginians to help the Tyrians in difficulty: was it a mere religious obligation or a kind of military alliance?

Of course, there were also commercial ties between the two cities because Tyre had founded Carthage for a commercial purpose.<sup>107</sup> It does not seem likely that there was

---

101 Diodorus Siculus, XX:11.13. Cf. Maurin, *Himilcon*, 33; Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 158; Moscati, *L'épopée*, 197.

102 Diodorus Siculus, XX:14.

103 If the tradition is true, we may conjecture that the Tyrians evacuated to Carthage in 333 B.C. could have played a role in the policy of the city; cf. Picard, *Carthage*, 177.

104 Diodorus Siculus, XIX:56-61.

105 H. Seyrig, "Sur une prétendue ère tyrienne," *Syria* 34 (1957), 97.

106 Hérodote, IV:147-67; on this subject, see for example F. Chamoux, *Cyrène et la monarchie des Battiiades* (Paris, 1953), *passim*; Elayi, "Le rôle," *passim*.

107 Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 313.

any rivalry between them because archaeological remains provide evidence that Phoenician products (no doubt including Tyrian ones) continued to be exported in the western Mediterranean,<sup>108</sup> the increasing number of Carthaginian products in all western sites was a natural consequence of the growth of Carthage. The crisis of the relations between the two cities, which became manifest only in 333 B.C. when Carthage betrayed her mother city, seems to have begun in fact in 396 and lasted till 310. As far as we know, Carthage seems to have borne full responsibility for this crisis, which may be imputed to her opening to Greek influences and to her prudent and selfish policy. After 310, although the documentation is meager, it seems that the relations between Tyre and Carthage remained good. We may note the artistic influence of Phoenician anthropoid sarcophagi upon Carthaginian sarcophagi dated to the Hellenistic period.<sup>109</sup>

According to Polybius and Livy (who uses Polybius), the Carthaginians would have sent offerings to Tyre in 195 and 162 B.C.<sup>110</sup> During the second Punic War, Hannibal, defeated by the Romans, escaped by ship to Tyre where he was received with every mark of honor. He then succeeded in convincing Antiochus III to wage war against Rome. According to Livy whose testimony is unfortunately alone, there would have been Tyrian and Sidonian ships in the fleet employed by Antiochus in the battle against the Romans and Rhodians at Myonnesus.<sup>111</sup> anyway, we do not know whether the Tyrians had voluntarily participated in this expedition, forgetting that they had been abandoned by the Carthaginians in 333 B.C. We learn from Curtius that afterwards the Carthaginians never lost their faith in the Phoenician gods: "... the Carthaginians are said to have performed [the human sacrifices] until the destruction of their city";<sup>112</sup> his testimony seems to be true because we know that, even after 146 B.C. and in spite of their interdiction by the Romans, such sacrifices were continued in many places.<sup>113</sup>

108 Moscati, *L'épopée*, 174; Katzenstein, *History*, 91; Bunnens, *L'expansion*, 310, 313 (with references in notes 115, 116).

109 See for example A. W. Lawrence, *Later Greek Sculpture* (New York: 1969), 51-52. For other artistic influences, see A. M. Bisi, "Les sources syro-palestiniennes et Chypriotes de l'art punique (à propos de quelques objets de Carthage)," *AntAfr* 14 (1979), 17-35.

110 Livy, XXXIII:48.3; Polybius XXXV, *The Histories*, XXXI:12.11-12.

111 Livy, XXV:48.6, and XXXVII:30.1-10. Cf. Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, *Etudes d'archéologie orientale* (Paris, 1880), 70-71; Warmington, *Carthage*, 197; N. Jidejian, *Tyre through the Ages* (Beirut, 1969), 82.

112 Curtius, *History of Alexander*, IV:2.10.

113 Moscati, *L'épopée*, 182.