

Carthage Must Be Destroyed: The Rise and Fall of an Ancient Civilization By Richard Miles my longer review: this is a really great and in depth overview of a civilization tht has left scant archaeological evidence (on account of how rome burned them to the literal ground lmao). richard miles does an excellent job both of reframing a lot of the propogandist greek and roman histories of carthage and mining them alongside the archaeological evidence we DO have to bring this city.

About the threat to Rome from Carthage. One of the more interesting is that Carthage was important as an opponent to Rome and the conflictual history with Carthage forced the Roman state to mature in order to survive and thus contributed to the long period of Roman dominance under the Empire. Another line of thinking that I had not appreciated until now was the role of ideology in the wars between Carthage and Rome -- which Gods were triumphant and how did these states adapted the array of gods in an area to serve their needs. 9780141018096 華文著作裡面，關於迦太基的專著，就我所知，之前只有遠流出的日本人寫的《黃金迷城迦太基》，薄薄的一本，始終沒啥勁去看。麥田有一本漢尼拔的傳記，可惜翻譯不怎樣。之前在三民看到這本《迦太基必須毀滅》(Carthage must be Destroyed)的原文，看Goodread風評不差，但對英文沒啥信心就沒買，後來得知社科甲骨文要翻譯，等一出就立馬搶了本先睹為快。說真的，迦太基算是上古文明中相當不幸的一個。究其淵遠跟文化，深度跟廣度都是當時地中海的佼佼者，但後來跟羅馬爭奪霸權失敗，結果被視為眼中釘肉中刺，從地圖上抹去，歷史也被毀壞，甚至還被黑的閃閃發亮，後來一兩千年都是被視為“野蠻”的代名詞，實在是千古奇冤。本書作者Richard Miles是考古學家，寫過幾本古文明的書，風評似乎不差。他寫這本，個人覺得最大的特色是作者運用了很多神話學上的考據，還有著重文化交流的研究，算是比較特別的角度。要追溯迦太基的歷史，當然就得從東地中海的腓尼基開始，這群商業民族，憑藉著其才能，在列強環伺的情況下維持自身的獨立跟影響力，不斷的對外擴張其觸角，一路延伸，甚至穿過直布羅陀，來到西非，當時人類在地中海範圍的確有點超乎人們想像之廣。作者從一些古文獻記錄中討論，後來迦太基人似乎最遠曾到達過今日的奈及利亞，但證據不充分。不過希羅多德也有埃及人環繞非洲成功的記載，或許我們不該低估當時人類的航海技術。但不管怎樣，腓尼基人很早就活躍於地中海兩岸，他們在今日的摩洛哥、西班牙南部、阿爾及利亞、突尼西亞、利比亞、義大利南部各大島、希臘等地，都有商業據點或者殖民地。他們開創了一條漫長的海上商業路線，讓許多人們需要的物資交流其中，而他們憑藉著這種能力贏得了許多帝國的重視。其中最強大的腓尼基城邦就是泰爾，不過他們的好日子也有到頭的一日，最終還是逃不過亞述的帝國主義進逼。當母邦衰弱或失去政治獨立後，西地中海的那些腓尼基人殖民地就開始走出自己的道路，其中閃閃發亮的就是位於當時貿易路線上中樞，位於今日突尼西亞的迦太基。關於迦太基的建城傳說也不少，其中還有相當耳熟的，用一張牛皮圈地的故事，但最有趣的討論還是關於童祭這件事情，◆◆◆一向是迦太基被視為“野蠻”的最大把柄跟痛腳。Richard Miles運用考古證據，拿出了各種說法，其中一種是在迦太基的托菲特(現代學者替獻祭場所取的名字)挖掘出的考古證據中，顯示有些兒童是死去後才被拿來獻祭，學者推測用意應該是希望那些夭折的孩子們可以在神的身邊得到幸福。不過其他的研究結果顯然又不是這麼回事。關於這個問題的爭議性始終不小，但這是從腓尼基母國那邊就傳來的風俗，雖然作者也指出，在其他地方都已經不再進行這樣的祭儀時，迦太基似乎還是依舊會在緊要關頭獻出兒子。不過，以此做為攻擊點或許並不妥當，畢竟放諸整個人類遠古文明，類似這樣的行為其實並不少見，純粹的道德批判只是一種無聊的舉措而已。對於西地中海霸權的爭奪從很早就開始了，最初的行動者當然是從腓尼基人跟希臘人之間展開。作者花了一兩章討論這段經過，他描述的重點並不純在於政治軍事的角力，它更重視的是兩個民族之間鬥爭又彼此融合的文化交流，還有從神話學上展開的宣傳戰。正所謂名正言順，沒有理由、藉口是沒有辦法號召人們行動；今天我們以意識形態做為擋箭牌，在古代就是使用神話來做為依據。希臘人拿他們最喜愛的大力士赫拉克勒斯及其在西地中海的冒險傳說，當做自己對於這些土地的合理要求。迦太基人的回擊就是將自己的主神麥卡勒斯與之融合，構成新的故事。這種在今人眼中看來有些荒誕的神話，且先不討論古人是否真的深信不疑，至少它拿來◆◆神主牌是有效果的。不論是在政治上的口號，行為上的要求，鞏固民心力量等。後來加入這場霸權爭奪遊戲的羅馬人也不能免俗，他們也努力的編造自己的神話，把城市的起源跟特洛伊扯成一塊，讓自己加入希臘“文明”的一方來爭取認同，可見其重要性。而這些也都是經常被忽略的部分，雖然我們不用太高估其重要性，但人類就是這種有時後需要一點自欺欺人。中國所謂的天命觀在地中海世界也有類似的存在，沒有獲得神祐的民族終將滅亡。敘拉古跟迦太基在西西里的爭奪戰是這場西地中海霸權遊戲的主旋律，它糾纏很久，令人感到不解。迦太基是當時的海上王者，它接管了母城泰爾過去的資源，擁有最強的艦隊，整體實力遠在敘拉古之上。但今人從稀有的文獻上考察迦太基的政府體系，就可以發現一些缺陷。主要是寡頭政府中的權貴鬥爭◆◆響了軍事效率，還有使用不可靠跟欠缺忠誠的雇傭兵，以及當時存在的北非內陸至上和海權爭奪優先兩種國策的分裂導致資源不集中。這場戰爭糾纏了許久，中間我們仔細閱讀就可以以歷史的後見之明，看到日後迦太基敗在羅馬手上的種種原因，在當時早已存在，只是當時的對手，敘拉古的獨裁者阿加托克利斯雖然有看透弱點的眼光，卻沒有

加以徹底擊敗的實力。新一批加入戰局的重要影響者是伊庇魯斯的皮洛士，他自視為亞歷山大第二，而事實上此人在戰術能力上確實無人能敵，玩弄宣傳戰上也被認為極為卓越。他打著讓所有大希臘(南義地區)跟西西里的人民解放的大旗參戰，一度讓當時義大利新興的霸權羅馬跟迦太基不得不聯手。但這場戰爭的結果正如皮洛士離開之前所說的：「接下來就換他們去廝殺了。」羅馬跟迦太基的戰爭是否不可避免，就歷史記載上，確實是也。早在他們結盟共同對付皮洛士時，就可以看到元老院拒絕腓尼基人主動的支援所流露的一種提防。新興擴張中的羅馬你要它收手基本上不太可能，我們也很難想像迦太基人在西西里糾纏了這麼久會願意放棄。戰爭的經過正如大家熟悉般，這也不是作者擅長的部分。重點是宣傳戰，羅馬人也加入了赫拉克勒斯的傳說之列，並且開始正式編寫自己城市的歷史，採取文攻武嚇並行的方式，宣告自己對大希臘、西西里統治的正當性。迦太基的失敗顯然不讓人意外，令人錯愕的是最終他們放棄的原因是受不了兩線作戰的經濟負擔，是的，同時他們也在跟努比底亞人交手。也就是說，直到大敵當前，迦太基人仍未對國策有個結論。但說來諷刺的是，失去西西里跟之後的薩丁尼亞，他們在這些地方的交易量反而上升。畢竟迦太基人手上還是有人家所需的商品，少了政治上的分歧，反而容易坐下來談生意。而且這樣就強迫他們未來只能在北非內陸發展，擴張了的農業產量成為地中海的糧倉。第一次布匿戰爭的另外一個結果是巴卡家族的出頭，漢米爾卡就作者所斷言，是個政治手腕比軍事才能強的人。他總是能避開任何損害其聲望的不幸事件，爭取到最大的支持把敵對家族漢諾打壓的抬不起頭。傭兵之亂後，他前往西班牙南部發展，自己籌組傭兵，攻城掠地，就放諸四海皆準的定義來說，都是一支軍閥，或唐朝的藩鎮水平。最顯而易見的證據是，這個勢力的首領從漢米爾卡傳到女婿哈斯德魯巴再傳到漢尼拔，迦太基政府都只能事後追認，無力干涉。他們一心要向羅馬復仇，顯然再一次的戰爭是不可避免？可能是吧。畢竟之前羅馬人奪取薩丁尼亞如此惡劣行徑，連擁護者波里比烏斯都在書中直言痛斥。到這時候，這個新興強權的帝國主義連後世學者都難以辯護，儘管二十世紀中葉以前的確他們都認為羅馬人是“防守反擊”，“都是人家先來招惹的”。這或許只能說元老院的宣傳戰實在太強大吧。對Richard Miles來說，漢尼拔的遠征另外一個更值得注意的成就是他那效仿皮洛士發動的宣傳戰。他把赫拉克勒斯從西班牙延著法國南岸穿越阿爾卑斯山經過義大利回國的英雄事蹟，特別是傳說在羅馬打敗邪惡的土匪拯救原住民的故事跟自己的計劃結合，不只加強軍隊的向心力，也拿來向義大利各城邦宣傳，當然，這一切的背書當然是其戰績。而這也的確讓羅馬人頭痛不已，以至於費邊還要去希臘祈求神諭，加強其正當性。但說來無奈的是，漢尼拔企圖分化羅馬的拉丁聯盟政策絕對是正確的，可義大利南部諸城邦彼此之間的分歧卻超乎他的想像，在強權壓制下或許暫時消弭於無形，當一旦解放後，矛盾反而導致它們不見得願意就這樣倒向迦太基人。漢尼拔爭取卡普阿的支持讓他失去了解放者的名聲，同時也堅定了這座城市的敵人對羅馬的忠誠，這之間的得失連作者的筆調下都顯得無奈。西庇阿是漢尼拔送給羅馬的贈禮，前者的一切都是後者的影子，甚至連命運都是。戰後，漢尼拔選則從政，他支持平民的立場招致貴族的憎惡，以至於甚至他們寧願向敵方借刀殺人，把這位英雄驅逐出國，並讓其被迫害致死，也不能忍受。而那位跟漢尼拔英雄相惜的西庇阿在元老院也被老加圖釘的滿頭包，最後為了一本說不清的帳本鬱鬱而終。說起來老加圖也確實有能耐，他分別解決當時兩位軍事上的奇才的威脅，拯救(?)了羅馬共和，未來其子孫可就沒這個本事了。迦太基是不是真的完全無法跟羅馬共存？到底是什麼原因讓老加圖斷的叨念“Delenda est Carthago”是很多歷史學家嘗試回答的一個題目。曾有位蘇聯史家把重點放在階級問題上，不過這已經被否定了。但或許在經過漢尼拔那幾場如此痛心疾首的幾場屠殺式的勝利後，羅馬人可能已經很難放下對迦太基的成見了。這無關乎道德問題，而是國與國之間的利益威脅。儘管戰後的迦太基就跟二戰後的日本，幾乎是非武裝化，但也正由於減少了國防開支，反而讓它的財政寬裕到可以到處灑錢，這種炫富式的做法更加招致羅馬人的憎惡，也許有人會說這本來就是吹毛求疵，不過考慮到八零年代美國對日本的態度，或許也不是沒有其道理。或許如果迦太基能夠用比較不那麼深刻仇恨的方式被接納入羅馬帝國之中，其高度文化也許也能像希臘那樣被吸收，最終形成一個三元式文明，西歐歷史也許會有所不同？不過，至少這個文明是不用這樣被抹黑，當時流傳著“迦太基的誠信”，指的是一種背信棄義跟不可靠，但據說希臘人也好不到哪兒去，其實都是半斤八兩，可待遇就差遠了。Richard Miles的評論則是帶著一種歷史的諷刺。他說，後來，羅馬人還是重建了迦太基城，雖然是其殖民地，但相信應該也還有一些帶有前仇敵血統的居民及殘餘的文化存在。帝國時代，塞維魯以其血統成為第一位北非出身的皇帝，並不是說他跟古迦太基有什麼直接關聯，但以當時的融合程度來說，這種結果或許是加圖等舊顯貴不能接受的事實。又過了一兩個世紀，當羅馬人死守著迦太基城來抵抗汪達爾人的入侵時，或許漢尼拔泉下有知，不知道是該做何表示了。西方對於迦太基研究的書不少，但目前被引進的也就本書，它的表現也不負期望，是個頗有自己見地的著作。譯者基本上也算合格，雖然有些長句子還是沒有按照漢語語法調整，以至於變的拗口難讀，但還在可接受範圍內。在此推薦之

9780141018096 The historiography on this is appalling. " While Heracles was associated with the Punic god Melqart and Hannibal chose Heracles-Melqart as the figurehead of his campaigns.

From our view point of history we can see that Carthage would be destroyed. The sacred chickens drink  
In 249 BC the Roman consul Publius Claudius Pulcher—a man variously described as being mentally unstable an arrogant snob and a drunk—decided to launch an attack on the Carthaginian-

held port of Drepana. The mission got off to a rocky start when the sacred chickens used to gauge divine favour went off their feed prompting the impetuous Claudius to throw them overboard with the pithy remark that perhaps they were thirsty. By the third century BC Rome was on the rise and showing an almost insatiable hunger for conquest; the empires drifted into the first Punic war less for reasons of strategy and more for lack of political will to prevent it. Departing from Spain in 218BC with 50000 troops Hannibal attempted the unthinkable: to invade Italy by land marching through Spain France and the trackless snow-covered Alps meeting hostile tribesmen at every turn. One might think that part of the reason for this is that Carthage Must Be Destroyed did not need to be translated (inevitably there were some places where Lancel's text became unwieldy). Apart from the obvious following of Carthage's history he goes into great depth about subjects such as the manner in which Hannibal aped the feats of Hercules in order to show that he had divine backing and how the Romans fought back against this religious propaganda. He also explains in depth how from the time of the Second Punic War onwards the Romans made it their business to portray the Carthaginians as untrustworthy perfidious liars and cheats. Not only were there no Carthaginian histories to survive there is the interesting history of the Greek and Roman histories where the best source may be reconstructed from the quotations taken from another work which also did not survive but drew heavily on the original source. )This gets discussed across its history covering its wars its colonies its government insofar as it can be discerned its religion and its interactions with Rome and with other forces allied with one or the other or shifting between. Everything from the details such as the Carthaginians first coined money to pay off mercenaries in Sicily to the intense efforts of both sides in the Punic War to claim religious sanction and the other side's impiety. I vaguely knew it had been there for a few hundred years when its wars with Rome started I loved the story of Cato's *Delenda est* speeches in the Roman Senate and as a fan of military history I had read a few accounts of Hannibal's amazing victory at Cannae. Beyond all that I always had a sense more feeling than thought that Carthage was somehow other not a part of the great Graeco-Roman Mediterranean civilization that is a direct ancestor of my own. This book beautifully lays out the case for the critical role of Carthage and of the Phoenician culture of which it was the last bastion in the broader cultural history of the Mediterranean world. Indeed the author had me hooked when in his introduction he quoted a few historians making disparaging remarks about the paucity of lasting Phoenician contributions to nearby civilizations and then rather diffidently pointed out that all of these authors wrote their condemnations in alphabets derived from Phoenician. That does rather call the whole small contribution claim into question doesn't it?The book does a masterful job of narrating the history of the founding growth trade and cultural relations colonial expansion wars and eventual defeat of Carthage. The author combines careful analysis of those sources with archaeology trade records religious syncretism and a dozen other sources to build solid conjectures about how Carthaginian society worked both in Carthage itself and in its clients and colonies in places like Sicily Sardinia and Spain. Obviously a book like this is going to end up covering the Punic Wars and the Roman destruction of Carthage as its climax and the author does a wonderful job of providing the economic political cultural and personal factors that led to each strategy and to the outcome of each campaign. As a coda the author discusses how later Roman sources used the story of Carthage in different ways -- either as a warning that the great may always fall or as a proof of Rome's divine destiny to rule. I was astonished to learn that Vergil was a bit transgressive in the *Aeneid* -- Dido displays all the key Roman virtues of honesty faithfulness and hospitality while Aeneas resorts to lying and sneaking away when he decides that he must fulfill his destiny in Italy. I'm rather surprised Vergil didn't get in trouble for writing this during the reign of Augustus!In short this book has opened my eyes to a world that was always at the dim edge of my understanding of classical Mediterranean history. In an epic series of battles both mighty empires vied for supremacy of the Mediterranean before the Carthaginians finally buckled and their great capital city was razed to the ground burning for 6 days and nights its inhabitants slaughtered or enslaved. *Carthage Must Be Destroyed* tells the story of this lost empire - from its origins in Lebanon to its apotheosis as the greatest sea-power of its age - and brings to life legendary figures such as the military genius

Hannibal who almost toppled Roman power its people and history to life. its starts with its earlier than the actual city's settling by dido and her followers and traces out its phoenician origins going through its rise as a naval power its conquest of much of north africa italy sardinia and southern spain to its fall. it also does what many books i feel often fail to do especially in regards to rome and greece and emphasizes the cultural syncretism and exchange of the entire area especially in regards to the cult of heracles-melqart (was this my favorite thing? maybe). 9780141018096 The title refers to a famous quote of Cato the Elder a Roman statesman this point is made concerning Hannibal and his ineffectiveness in following up on his military triumphs. Those annals apparently referred to the Tyrian king Mattan I leaving his throne to his 11-year-old son Pygmalion in 820 which in turn had led to the subsequent flight of and foundation of Carthage by his sister Elissa in 814 BC. Miles has somehow confused Philo's Phoenician History with the Tyrian records translated by Menander and subsequently quoted by Josephus even though Miles cites Menander/Josephus elsewhere (see Ch. 1 endnotes 22 25 32 52) without further comment! Although he correctly observes that we find most of our additional information in the fragments of Timaeus as well as Justin's epitome of Pompeius Trogus' *Historia Philippicae* Miles also fails to mention that Timaeus himself followed Tyrian records and that Trogus most likely copied Timaeus. Moreover a gold pendant had been found in a tomb in Carthage inscribed with the names Pygmalion and Astarte which led to theory that the tomb's incumbent Yada'milk must have been a military officer from the original Tyrian expedition and that the presence of Pygmalion's name on the pendant proved that it had probably been the king himself who had encouraged the dissidents to found Carthage (citing Krahmalkov 1981). [paragraph break] However any such hopes for the partial historical veracity of the Elissa story were dashed by the discovery that the tomb of Yada'milk was not from the late ninth century BC but from up to three centuries later. Indeed the earliest occupation layers found by archaeologists in Carthage stretch back only as far as 760 BC although new advances in our extremely limited knowledge of the first phases of the city may yet push that date further back (citing Docter et al. Moreover significant doubts exist about Philo's historical testimony and most suspect that rather than having gleaned his information from ancient Phoenician texts he simply took the story from the same Hellenistic Greek authors as those Roman writers who mention Elissa (citing Barr 1974 and Edwards 1991). He completely ignores any of the arguments advanced in the pendant's defense; moreover he has obviously not read Krahmalkov's publication where Krahmalkov does discuss the dating of the tomb and specifically suggests that the pendant was passed down as an heirloom. Miles somewhat disingenuously in my view likewise emphasizes that the earliest occupation layers found by archaeologists in Carthage stretch back only as far as 760 BC but relegates the results of recent radiocarbon dating (which tentatively pushes the earliest settlement back to the late ninth century!) to the endnotes. For one example of this filter even our terminology for the civilization and culture Punic comes with its own baggage since Romans used the term in a pejorative and disparaging context. Miles spends time on the background and history of Phoenicia showing how the expansion to Carthage and other areas in the west were motivated by survival rather than greed or glory. Yet as some lines in the Iliad and the Odyssey show there seem to be negative attitudes toward the Phoenicians maybe as a result of the commercial rivalry or in differing views on colonial expansion. With the rise to power of the tyrant Agathocles in Syracuse in the 320s BC "Once more the totally erroneous but seductive idea that the Sicilian wars [conflicts between Carthage and Greek-backed Syracuse:] were a western extension of the age-old struggle between the civilization of Greece and the dark forces of the barbarian East would have renewed capital. " The resulting war with Agathocles even though ultimately successful would highlight at least two structural problems for Carthage which would return to haunt them during the Punic Wars with Rome. Or as Miles puts it "In fact the main antagonists of the First Punic War drifted into the conflict less for reasons of grand strategy and more for the lack of political will to prevent it. " As it turns out during the Second Punic War a change to a temporary autocrat which was allowed by the Roman constitution during an extreme crisis would allow Rome to pursue longer-term strategies against Hannibal and emerge victorious. In the wake of the First Punic War Carthage underwent a political transformation that no

longer balanced aristocratic oligarchic and democratic factions in the manner that Aristotle had admired. Regarding Hannibal the Roman historian Cassius Dio would so astutely point out "He was not sent forth in the beginning by the magistrates at home nor later did he obtain any great assistance from them. For although they were to enjoy no slight glory and benefit from his efforts they wished rather not to appear to be leaving him in the lurch than to cooperate effectively in any enterprise. Polybius fails to take into account that the locals he interviewed were Roman settlers relocated after the Second Punic War instead of the Celts that fought Hannibal before he even made it to the Alps. I understand where Miles was going with this approach and agree with many aspects of it but the Heracles presence or influence works more symbolically than practically (and to be fair Miles notes this on some of his tie-ins). Carthage Must Be Destroyed is truly about the rise and fall of that ancient civilization and while Rome and the battles are given adequate detail and background the amount included is appropriate for focusing on Carthage's history. While mentioning that Carthage "featured prominently in Roman literature and history throughout antiquity" and providing several of the more famous (or maybe more accessible) examples I would have loved to see even more instances (the footnote on this quote points to another book of his which I may have to seek). I'll close with the book's concluding paragraphs (with a couple of publishing typos fixed) which look at the role Carthage played in Rome's development points that Miles supports throughout the book: "It is impossible to assess the debt that Rome owed to Carthage with the same confidence as for the debt to Greece. This had little to do with any lack of originality but was at least partly the result of the phenomenal success that the Greeks had in claiming sole ownership of advances that had in fact been the result of centuries of exchange and cross-fertilization. The brutal destruction of the city gave the Romans the freedom to transform Carthage into the villainous antitype against which the 'Roman' virtues of faithfulness piety and duty could be applauded, Carthage Must Be Destroyed: The Rise and Fall of an Ancient Civilization this took me so many months to read/listen to but it was worth it and the narrator is GREAT: The book is a case study of the rise and fall of Carthage. Another interesting line is the complex politics within these states, Both Rome and Carthage were far from monolithic actors and understanding the politics was critical for success: Indeed.

I am sympathetic to the author's efforts to inform and provide background and the book is fairly successful at this. Just to take one glaring example.

Would be able to shape not just the history of Carthage but also their pre-history through the works of Roman epic poets, The Punic Wars became cast as divinely ordained battles tied to Rome's and Carthage's founding: The Aeneas legend was well in place before Virgil but Miles shows how The Aeneid added dramatic flair in addition to fashioning a new Rome under Augustus: Miles makes clear that "a constant presence throughout this book is the great hero Heracles (or Hercules), To the people of that time no one was knew which city would rule the Mediterranean - Carthage or Rome. If they won't eat then let them drink! He then went on to lose the battle, Rome's nemesis came in the form of Hannibal a ruthless and daring general, For all his audacious battles Hannibal still lost to the determined Romans, 9780141018096 Until the publication of this excellent book the preeminent text about Carthage was the 1995 volume Carthage: A History by the French historian Serge Lancel. This an outstanding contribution to the patchy knowledge we have of Carthage has just been eclipsed: It's far from that: this is a better written easier to follow more rounded book than Lancel's. Miles begins with the Phoenicians the people who founded Carthage and goes on from there: His style is at all times enjoyable and his arguments well presented: This in turn allowed them to show themselves as more heroic and steadfast. Anyone who is interested in learning the full (well what is known) details about Carthage and its history needs to read this book: I for one will be returning to it again and again in the future: Another interesting text is Daily Life in Carthage at the Time of Hannibal by the academic Gilbert Charles-Picard: Although it was written in the 1960s it has some useful information about Carthaginian culture, Carthaginian inscriptions give brief accounts and other

information can be pieced together: (The optimistic claim of early archaeologists that the claims of sacrificing children were false -- was too optimistic, Considerably more evidence for it has turned up include inscriptions that carefully state that the child offered was actually the offspring of the person sacrificing the child, The period of the Punic Wars gets covered most thoroughly of course because of the most records -- including the peaces between with the Mercenaries War. It covers the campaigns the battles with discussion enough of strategy to show how they were won and the side effects. Hercules was of particular importance and the road he took driving Geryon's cattle was fraught with significance: A general whose first act on appointment was to try to counteract the frantic superstitious practice of unauthorized sacrifices and divination by consulting the Sibylline books. I found the treatment of Roman/Greek/Carthaginian syncretism particularly interesting because of my interests in the area; it's very well done. 9780141018096 Carthage has always been a background character in my personal narrative of history. I knew that Dido mythic queen of Carthage was a major character in Vergil's Aeneid: There was something alien and vaguely decadent or corrupt about it, As it turns out I had succumbed to 2000-year-old Roman propaganda. This is a difficult task thanks to the relative lack of primary Carthaginian sources. Most of the texts we have that describe Carthage and its colonies were written by its foes and thus rather predictably are often more myth and propaganda than fact, It's a fascinating picture similar to the Greek trade empire but with intriguing crucial differences, The battle for religious legitimacy between Scipio and Hannibal is absolutely amazing; I didn't know that armies conducted hearts and minds campaigns in the 2nd century BCE: When the end comes for Carthage it is excruciating; even knowing the outlines of what happened I was freshly appalled by the Roman perfidy and cruelty involved. 9780141018096 A great overview of Carthaginian culture religion and military campaigns. The Punic wars aren't covered in great detail and for that i recommend the book by B, Great for people new to this segment of history may be a bit boring for those who are quite familiar with it already. 9780141018096 The devastating struggle to the death between Rome and Carthage was one of the bloodiest dramas of the Ancient World: highly recommend if you're into north africa the mediterranean or that weird historical spot between the bronze age collapse and the rise of the roman empire, The ability of the winners in a conflict to write the official history is also clearly brought across in the narrative. Finally Miles does a good job covering Hannibal and Scipio and brilliant tactical generals and key battles such as Cannae are well covered: On its weaker side the book seems a bit willing to digress in order to fill in detail - and lengthen the page count, Given the lack of common familiarity with ancient African Roman and pre-Roman history he alleges that Dido didn't exist and that all evidence points to her being fictional, Some have pointed to a second-century-AD history of the Phoenicians whose Levantine author Philo of Byblos claimed to have studied the ancient annals of Tyre. Walbank A Historical Commentary on Polybius 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1967) 411f. Asheri The Art of Synchronization in Greek Historiography Scripta Classica Israelica 11 (1991) 62-4; K. Haegemans Elissa the First Queen of Carthage through Timaeus' Eyes Ancient Society 30 (2000) 280 with references, He then repeats his (incorrect) statement about Philo citing two articles as evidence that most believe the tale of Elissa-Dido to be false: Of course neither article actually mentions Elissa or Pygmalion or Carthage or Tyrian history in general because Philo simply did not discuss these topics, I think the great tragedy is that this is one of the only 'pop-history' books on Carthage if it were one of many it'd be easy to dismiss, Given however that this is not the case Miles' incompetencies are beyond irritating and do nothing but proliferate misinformation, I highly recommend Miles' book for his reconstruction of Carthage's history while trying to minimize the Romans' filter. The view toward the Phoenicians by the Greeks seems to have been a mixed bag: There is evidence of Phoenician and Greek cooperation in trade and settlements as the goals of the two states were complementary in some areas, In later writings Aristotle praised Carthage's government as excellent while Plato presented Carthage as a well-ordered state: Carthage's aims were constantly misrepresented by those that felt threatened by their expansion, The first problem was their reliance on mercenary armies and their unreliability: The second problem developed as these armies would become mostly independent institutions outside the control of Carthage's



government: Carthage and Rome had been on the same side during one of many Sicilian skirmishes but Carthage misplayed its role and Rome established a secure base in Syracuse: From here although neither side seemed to desire war both sides continued expansionist policies that guaranteed conflict: "Miles does a good job of following the Punic Wars providing enough detail about the conflicts for the reader to follow without getting bogged down in minutiae. At the same time he shows how Carthage's and Rome's political actions fit into an central arc that guaranteed continuing war, Also of importance he lays out how the different government structures meant very differing approaches to war: One example of the differences: Rome with its generals/consuls having only a one year term would be more aggressive in order to conclude a decisive action, Carthaginian generals elected for an open term could "dictate the pace and style of the conflict and the Romans could do little about it. Foreign policy now became an extension of the factional struggles within (and outside) the government or even carried out by the military with the government along for the ride." Miles also reviews how ancient historians covered the Punic Wars and how their biases and mistaken assumptions are reflected in their work. Polybius for example visits the area surrounding the Alps and interviews the locals before writing off Hannibal's mountain crossing as an ordinary occurrence: There were writers such as Philinus a Sicilian Greek who were sympathetic to Carthage and their views would provide a little influence over later historians, Miles makes a convincing display regarding the propaganda used during the conflicts (most notably by Hannibal) and its effectiveness both at the time and echoed later. But Rome as the winner the importance of this tie-in can feel overstated at times, Also I wanted to note that anyone wanting a history of Rome or a detailed military history should go elsewhere. We can clearly trace the impact of Greek art science literature etc. on Roman culture: indeed educated Romans were often happy to acknowledge that influence: Carthage however was afforded no such place in the Roman cultural canon. The cultural marginalization of Carthage was a Greek achievement the city's destruction a Roman one, "Carthage did however play an important role in the development of the Roman Empire. Rome hugely benefited from the appropriation of the economic and political infrastructure that Carthage had previously put in place in the central and western Mediterranean, In Sardinia Sicily North Africa and Spain the Romans inherited not wild virgin lands but a politically economically and culturally joined-up world which was Carthage's greatest achievement: "Less tangible but equally important was the key role that Carthage played in the creation of a Roman national character: As long as the Romans needed proof of their greatness the memory of Carthage would never die[1]

But would ultimately lead to his people to disaster. It is very thorough and mostly interesting. There are several nice lines in the book. They make a desolation and they call it peace. That was the end of Carthage. Enjoy!. In my opinion leading Lancel's book is also a good idea. 9780141018096 A history of Carthage. Insofar as it can be reconstructed. .There is also some archaeological evidence. And that was pretty much the extent of it. Read this book and you will find marvels awaiting you. H. Liddel Hart on Scipio Africanus or Polybius' Histories. All around interesting read tho and I'm glad I read it. Philo says no such thing in the extant fragments. On Timaeus' Tyrian sources see Polybius 12.28a3 with F. W.; D. 2006). Here Miles proves downright dishonest. 9780141018096 <http://bookcents.blogspot.com/2010/07/> 9780141018096



