

Barbara Scardigli  
University of Siena

### APPIAN, THE *SIKELIKÉ* AND *NESIOTIKÉ*: PRESENTATION AND TENDENCIES

I would like to make some considerations on a text by Appian. Although only very few fragments have come down to us, it is full of news and tendencies which are little known or present in other works at our disposal. Let us remember that Appian wrote *Ῥωμαϊκά* in 24 books in chronological order on the Roman conquests, later provinces. Some of these are fully preserved, such as the *Iberiké*, *Libyké*, *Syriaké*, a monograph on Hannibal and one on Mithridates. We have the title of other works, but they have been lost, such as the *Hellenic and Ionian History*, *Partika* and *Egypt*, while of others, such as the *Italiké*, *Samnitiké*, *Keltiké* and indeed *Sikeliké* we have only fragments.

Like those of other monographs, the preserved fragments of this text come from the 10th-century *Excerpta Constantiana*. To be specific:

1) fragments 1, 2 and 6 from the *excerpta De legationibus gentium*, that is diplomatic missions of non-Roman people to the Romans. The sixth fragment is also present in the *excerpta De legationibus Romanorum*, therefore the *exceptor* (or *excerptores*) copied Appian's text twice, as he (they) also did on other occasions, for example in the case of fr. 11 of the *Keltiké* which is almost identical to fr. 6 of the *Samnitiké*.

2) The first half of fragment 1 comes from two different collections: it is found not only in *De legationibus gentium*, but also in *De sententiis*. In addition, fr. 3 comes from the *exceptor De virtutibus et vitiis*, and is also found in the *Suda* under the entry *Ἐπικύδης*.

3) Fragments 4, 5 and 7, which give moral judgements, are only found in *De virtutibus et vitiis*.

In substance the content of the *Σικελική καὶ Νησιοτική* in two cases concerns a proverb, then diplomatic relations and moral judgements.

At the time of Appian a wealth of Greek literature already existed on the islands. However, the only example to have come down to us entirely, is the fifth book of Diodorus,<sup>1</sup> which, unlike our text, concentrates on the mythology of the islands rather than on their political and historical importance. Our text is comparable to other texts which mention Sicily, for example, to the Libyan book. In this Appian (2,10) says: “ἡ Σικελικὴ γράφη” speaks of the events concerning Sicily” therefore it must predate the Libyké.

The preserved fragments of Appian concern two islands, Sicily and Crete, and perhaps also a third (see below). Even though it is unlikely that Appian spoke of all the islands present in Diodorus’s fifth book, since not all of them offered historical or political material, he must have dealt with a certain number of them in his text, especially with the islands in the West.

A large fragment is preserved on Crete – fr. 6 – centring around the wars against piracy, which Mithridates of Pontus supported and also practised.<sup>2</sup> To fight the piracy Rome appointed M. Antonius in 73–72, Q. Caecilius Metellus<sup>3</sup> in 69 and Cn. Pompey in 67<sup>4</sup>: Antonius’ regiment<sup>5</sup> perhaps provided the model for Pompey’s extremely large force in 67. The portrait Appian paints of the three Romans is not very positive: about Antonius, he claims that, though *οὐ πρᾶξαι καλῶς*, he received the surname Creticus; and he also states that Pompey, to whom the Cretans turned, ordered Metellus (whom Appian nevertheless recognises as having subjugated the island) to leave the island so that he himself could accept its capitulation, but Metellus did not abide by the order.<sup>6</sup> Appian, therefore, speaks of these three commanders with a certain detachment. On the other hand, compared to the other preserved sources,<sup>7</sup> he offers more information – which could come from a local source – on the leader of the pirates, Lasthenes.

<sup>1</sup> See Ceccarelli, *I Nesiotika*, p.904 ff; S. De Vido, *Insularità*, p. 113ff.

<sup>2</sup> See the various mentions in Appian’s *Mithridateios* (63.262f., 94.428f. with Mastrocinque, *Appiano*, p. 190f.

<sup>3</sup> See Münzer, “Caecilius no. 87,” *RE*, col. 1210; Ormerod, *Piracy in the Ancient World*, p. 226 f.; Sherwin White, “Lucullus, Pompey and the East,” p. 250ff.; Seager, “The Rise of Pompey,” p. 229ff.

<sup>4</sup> The *Lex Gabinia de bello piratico* (Rotondi, *Leges*, p. 371f.): Plut., *Pomp.* 25.2; App. *Mithr.* 94.428; Dio C. 36.23.4s. On the powers of Pompey see Mastrocinque, *Appiano, Le guerre mitridatiche*, no. 233, p. 203.

<sup>5</sup> See E. Maróti, “On the Problem of M. Antonius Creticus’ Imperium Infinitum,” p. 259.

<sup>6</sup> See R. Seager, “Pompey the Great,” p. 48ff; G.W.M. Harrison, *The Romans and Crete*, p. 24; C. Koehn, *Pompeius, Cassius*, p. 311ff.

<sup>7</sup> Diod. 40.1.1ff.; Plut. *Pomp.* 29.6; Dio C. 36.18-19; Vell. 2.1.4; Liv. *Per.* 98; Flor. 1.42.5.

The last fragment, number 7, does not speak of an island but of the famous sacrilege by P. Clodius Pulcher at the rites of the Bona Dea at the house of Caesar in December 62. During the feast, Clodius went in dressed as a woman, but he was discovered, thrown out and underwent a trial.<sup>8</sup> The fragment has been linked, first of all by H. Valesius<sup>9</sup> and then by many more after him, with an event that concerns the island of Cyprus. Clodius was a friend of Caesar, and, as tribune of the plebs (59/58), in December 59 promulgated a law<sup>10</sup>, which meant that the island – for purely personal reasons – would be downgraded to a province and the regent's assets brutally confiscated and taken to Rome by M. Porcius Cato Uticensis.<sup>11</sup> The regent, an ally of Rome (Cic., *dom.* 52) was Ptolemy Philopator Philadelphus (80–58 BC),<sup>12</sup> brother of the Egyptian king, Ptolemy XII Auletes. One of the accusations against Ptolemy was precisely that he had favoured the western pirates,<sup>13</sup> as King Mithridates had also done (see above). The island could therefore be Cyprus and Clodius present in the fragment because of his law, but the hypothesis is not convincing either from a chronological point of view (the event recounted dates from 62, whereas Cyprus was annexed in 58), nor in geographical terms (it could also be Sicily instead of Cyprus).<sup>14</sup>

As for Sicily, fr. 1 refers to 248 BC, namely to a moment just before the end of the First Punic War and depicts a Carthage and Rome that are completely exhausted. Sicily (and not Africa, as Appian claims by mistake) is only mentioned here as a place where the Romans would send soldiers for the war since they could not send any more ships.<sup>15</sup> However, from the context it

<sup>8</sup> Cic., *Att.* 1.12.3, in Clod. et Cur. 5, Schol. Bob. p. 336 Orelli; Cic. *har.* 37.44; Plut. *Caes.* 10, Cic. 28, Dio C, 37.45. Cfr. Moreau, *Clodiana Religio*, p. 81ff.

<sup>9</sup> Polybii, Diodori Siculi, Nicolai Damasceni, *Dionysii Halicarnassensis, Appiani Alexandrini, Dionysii et Johannis Antiocheni excerpta ex collectaneis Constantini Augusti Porphyrogenetae H. Valesius nunc primum Graece edidit, Latine vertit, notisque illustravit*, Parisiis 1634, p. 558s.

<sup>10</sup> *lex Clodia de rege Ptolemaeo et de insula Cypro publicanda*: Rotondi, *Leges*, p.397; Mitford, "Cyprus," p.1290.

<sup>11</sup> Cic. *dom.* 20; 65; Vell. 2.45.4-5; Flor. *Liv. per.* 104; see Oost, Cato "Uticensis", p. 98ff., Badian, "M. Porcius", p.110ff., Carsano, *Appiano* II, p. 103.

<sup>12</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 57; App. *Bell. civ.* 2.23.85. See Volkmann, "Ptolemaios no. 34," *RE* 46, col.1756.

<sup>13</sup> Schol. Bob., pro *Sestio* 60, 133 St.; Dio C. 38.30.5. See Ormerod, *Piracy*, p. 32; Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis*, p. 141ff.

<sup>14</sup> See Scardigli, "Appiani SIKELIKH Fr.7," p. 229f.

<sup>15</sup> See De Sanctis, *Storia*, III 1, p. 255 ff.. The Carthaginians had intercepted many Roman ships (Pol. 1.53.10ff.; Diod. 24.1.6), other ships were destroyed by fires and storms (Pol. 1.54.8, Diod. 24.1.9, Oros. 4.10.3; see Thiel, *Roman Sea-Power*, p. 255 ff.).

seems that a long narration had been devoted to events in Sicily (for example, the Roman siege of Lilibaenum in 249, the Carthaginian victory in Drepanum, etc.). According to Appian, the Romans were no longer able to build ships, and the Carthaginians did not manage to exploit their slight advantage even though they still had a fleet.<sup>16</sup>

So the Carthaginians sent a delegation to Ptolemy II Philadelphus in Egypt (367–246) to ask to lend them 2,000 talents. The result is the sentence attributed to Ptolemy that the *excerptor* found in Appian. Egypt had been on friendly terms with Rome, perhaps since 273<sup>17</sup>; the king replied that one should not support friends against friends and tried to mediate between them. No other source speaks of the diplomatic mission, which is nevertheless deemed credible<sup>18</sup> and coming from some Greek historian.

The lengthy fr. 2, centring around the capture of Sicily by the Romans, ends with an attempt at reconciliation, in this case the Romans turning to the Carthaginians and against rebel mercenaries.

The main topics dealt with in the fragment are:

- 1) the end of the First Punic War and the truce of Lutatius Catulo in the spring of 241 (Pol.1.62.7)<sup>19</sup>;
- 2) the departure of the Carthaginian delegation to Rome to negotiate peace. A member of the delegation was the mediator M. Atilius Regulus, defined a prisoner of the Carthaginians;
- 3) The peace conditions, the establishment of the province of Sicily and the particular position of Hiero of Syracuse;
- 4) The Mercenary War of 241–238 (fr. 2.11; Lib. 5.19 – *see below*).

As for peace clauses negotiated by Catulus in Appian, almost all correspond to the preliminary clauses in Polybius.<sup>20</sup>

Like in fr. 1, Africa is confused with Sicily here too. It is by associating M. Atilius Regulus (suffect consul in 256) with Si-

<sup>16</sup> Hannak, *Appian und seine Quellen*, p. 132; De Sanctis, *Storia III 1*, p. 167ff.; Thiel, cit.; Heftner, *Der Aufstieg Roms*, p. 156ff.

<sup>17</sup> Liv. per. 14, Dio C. fr. 41; Val. M. 4.3.9. See Heinen, *Die politischen Beziehungen*, p. 638f.; Huss, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Karthago und Aegypten*, p. 119f.

<sup>18</sup> Meltzer, *Geschichte II*, p. 312f., 576; De Sanctis, *Storia III.1*, p. 234; Badian, "Foreign Clientelae," p. 33, Thiel, *Sea-Power*, p. 31; Heinen, *Beziehungen*, p. 638.

<sup>19</sup> On which for ex. Hannak, *Appianus*, p. 134f.; Dahlheim, *Gewalt und Herrschaft*, p. 19; Scardigli, *Trattati*, p. 205ss.

<sup>20</sup> 1.62.8-9; 63.1-3. See Dahlheim, *Gewalt und Herrschaft*, 26, no. 29.

cily instead of Africa that the misunderstanding could arise over the presence of Atilius among the delegates sent by Catulus from Sicily to Rome to ratify the temporary peace sued for by Hamilcar and Catulus. Here it does not matter if the error is due to Appian himself or to the *excerptor*. The correct version can be found in the *Libyké* (4.15), which was written, as already said, after the *Sikeliké*. Both in the fragment of the *Sikeliké*, and in the whole account in the *Libyké* Atilius advises the Roman senate to continue the war (the one in Africa); therefore he acts in the interest of his country. From the *Libyké* (3.12-15) a negative variation also emerges regarding Atilius. Appian hints at serious tactical errors,<sup>21</sup> following which Atilius was taken prisoner (Lib. 3.14; see Pol.1.34.8). In addition, earlier, in 256, after his victory in Adys, he is said to have prepared a siege of Carthage, but the Carthaginians asked him to enter negotiations. Atilius is said to have arrogantly imposed unacceptable conditions upon them.<sup>22</sup> Hence Polybius defines him as βαρύς (1.31.7) and Diodorus accuses him of *ὑπερηφάνια*.<sup>23</sup> According to Polybius (1.35.5) he begged the Carthaginians to spare his life and, indignant, the author adds (1.35.6): “I wanted to add this as a useful morale for the readers of this story”. Diodorus (23.12) comments that Atilius did not respect; τὸ τῆς πατρίδος ἔθος or take account of the divine nemesis.

Therefore, there existed a negative tradition of Greek origin about Atilius, perhaps resulting – through Polybius and Diodorus – from Philinus, that is, a local source<sup>24</sup>. On the other hand, there was also a patriotic Roman tradition,<sup>25</sup> also present in the *Σικελική*, which attributed Atilius's fate to the moods of the τύχη and not to his haughtiness. This was perhaps already present in Naeivius,<sup>26</sup> it was definitely present in Fabius Pictor<sup>27</sup> and Sempronius

<sup>21</sup> Lib. 3.13, cfr. Pol. 1.33.10-11; 34.1 ff.; Diod. 23.15.1-4; see De Sanctis, *Storia III 1*, p.149ff.

<sup>22</sup> Pol. 1.31.4ff., Diod. 23.12 and 15.1; Dio C. 43.22-23, Eutr. 2.21.4; Oros. 4.9.1. See Schmitt, *Staatsverträge*, no. 483, p. 153; Lippold, *Consules*, p.35

<sup>23</sup> 23,15,1; see 23,12. Cfr. Eckstein, *Senate and general*, p.132; Heffner, *Der Aufstieg*, p.135 ff.

<sup>24</sup> See for example De Sanctis, *Storia III 1*, p.221 f.; Lippold, *Consules*, p. 35, 70; Walbank *Commentary I*, p. 90; Cassola, *Gruppi*, p. 189f.; La Bua, *Filino-Polibio-Sileno-Diodoro*, p. 75ff.; Eckstein, *Moral Vision*, p. 63; Bleckmann, *Regulus bei Naevius*, p. 64 f.

<sup>25</sup> See Liv., per. 18; 28.43.1; 30.30.23 and Cassius Dio (Zon. 8.13.5). Cfr. Cassola, *Gruppi*, p. 190.

<sup>26</sup> VII 11, v.53-55 Vahlen. See Mazzarino, *Appunti sul bellum Poenicum*, p. 639; Lippold, *Consules*, p. 36; Bleckmann, "Regulus," p. 61ff.; Eckstein, *Senate and General*, p. 132.

<sup>27</sup> De Sanctis, *Storia III 1*, p. 211f.

Tuditanus, consul in 129 BC,<sup>28</sup> and found widely in Cicero.<sup>29</sup> This tradition may have invented Atilius's diplomatic mission to Rome, his return to Africa – which according to Diodorus (24.12.1) and Dio Cassius – Zonaras (8.13.5) he did not leave after being taken prisoner – and his martyrdom.

As for the last part of fr. 2 & 7 ff., the account of the Mercenary War<sup>30</sup> did not have anything to do directly with Sicily either. Sicily was only the starting point for the revolt that notoriously broke out in Africa, which is where Hamilcar had the rebels transported to.<sup>31</sup> Appian himself (*Lib.* 5.18) remembers that, however, the mercenaries had fought with the Carthaginians for Sicily. In this case, the account in the *Libyké*, which one would expect to be more extensive, turns out to be quite poor.

He speaks of two groups of rebels, a Celtic group, and a group of Libyans who he defines as ὑπήκοοι ὄντες Καρχηδονίων:<sup>32</sup> they paid tribute to Rome (Pol. 1.72.2, Diod. 20.3.3), but fought in the Carthaginian armies. Like other sources,<sup>33</sup> Appian also asserts – contrary to what had been established in the peace of Catulus (Pol. 3.27.4)<sup>34</sup> – that the Romans would allow the Carthaginians to enlist mercenaries in Italy only for this war.<sup>35</sup> His account is hostile to the mercenaries and favourable to the Carthaginian cause, especially to the Barcids, as, moreover, Polybius and Diodorus also were.<sup>36</sup> The whole account could come from a Greek source. In the same way as the attempt by Ptolemy II of

<sup>28</sup> See HRR 1.143s., fr.5 P.= Chassignet II fr. 5, p. 42 from Gell. 7.4.1. See Zon. 7.15.5.

<sup>29</sup> off. III 99; 111; *Cat.* 75; *Nat.deor.* 3.80; *Fin.* 5.82; Pis., 43; see Lippold, *Consules*, p. 38. On the heroic tradition after Cicero: Lippold, cit.; Bleckmann, "Regulus," p. 67 f.; Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero*, p. 619ff.

<sup>30</sup> The sources: Pol.1.65-88, Diod.25.2.2; App. *Ib.* 4.15-16, Zon. 8.17.8. See Eckstein, *Moral vision*, p.174 ff.; a list in L. Loreto, *La grande insurrezione libica*, p. 7

<sup>31</sup> Pol. 1.68.1, see De Sanctis, cit. III 1, p. 371ff.

<sup>32</sup> Which perhaps refers to all the mercenaries in revolt and perhaps was the strongest group (A.C. Fariselli, *I mercenari di Cartagine*, p. 139ff.; Ameling, *Karthago*, 212f.), Ligurians (Ameling, 213s.), Phoenicians (Ameling, 180f.), inhabitants of the Balearics (Ameling, 220 f., Zuffa, p. 69 ff.) and μῆλληνες (Walbank, *Commentary I*, 134; on the Greeks: Huss, *Geschichte*, p. 253 no.8, Ameling, p. 218).

<sup>33</sup> Pol. 1.83.5-11; see App. *Lib.* 5.19 see 23. See Walbank, *Commentary I*, p. 355; Huss, *Geschichte*, p. 257. On some contradictions about this group see Loreto, *Insurrezione*, p. 13ff.

<sup>34</sup> See Huss, *Geschichte*, p. 257, Tagliamonte, *I figli di Marte*, p. 231; Scardigli, *Trattati*, p.231f.; Farielli, *Mecenari*, p. 333ff.

<sup>35</sup> See Liv. 21.41.12, Zon. 8,17,9; see Hannak, *Appianus*, p.136, Händl Sagawe, *Beginn*, p. 263.

<sup>36</sup> Cfr. Loreto, *Insurrezione*, p. 9ff., 17ff.

Egypt to reconcile the Romans and Carthaginians had failed (fr.1, p. xx), so did Rome's mediation between the Carthaginians and the mercenaries after the First Punic War.

Fr. 3 of the *Sikeliké*, which contains the same events as are found in the now fragmentary Polybius (7.2ff.) and Livy (24.6ff.), is instead fully centred around the history of Sicily during the Second Punic War. The "Sicilian" protagonists are:

- 1) Hieronymus, the easily influenced grandson of Hiero II. He had been the great ally of Rome in the First Punic War<sup>37</sup> and was awarded for his loyalty. Hieronymus came to the throne in 215 at the age of 15 (Liv. 24.4).<sup>38</sup>
- 2) The brothers, strategists Hippocrates and Epikydes, sons of a Punic mother, and on the father's side probably of Syracusan origin<sup>39</sup>. As they were probably sons of an exiled Syracusan therefore they were pro-Carthaginian.

Indeed under the influence of the two brothers and his advisors, Hieronymus abandoned his grandfather's pro-Roman policies, and entered negotiations with Carthage, with which he drew up a treaty.<sup>40</sup> This stipulated aid to Hieronymus from Carthage by sea and by land, the expulsion of the Romans from the whole of Sicily and the subsequent division of Sicily between the Carthaginians and the Syracusans, with the boundary on the River Himera (Pol. 7,3,2). The protest of the Romans, who had hoped to renew their alliance with Hiero II with his grandson, was quick in coming (Pol. 7,5,1). However, in the spring of 214 Hieronymus was assassinated at Leontini.<sup>41</sup>

It is interesting that the relatively long fragment in Polybius on these events prior to the Sicilian war comes from the collection by Constantine, *De legationibus*, while the passage by Appian in the *Sikeliké* comes from *De virtutibus et vitiis*, which centres around the internal arguments between the Syracusans and Leontines and the respective negative relations with the Romans. The principal source for these events is Livy (24,29 ff.), which probably fol-

<sup>37</sup> See Cimma, *Reges*, p. 37ff.; Huss, *Geschichte*, p. 257, Tagliamonte, *I figli di marte*, p. 231; Scardigli, *Trattati*, p. 231f.; Farielli, *Mercenari*, p. 333ff.

<sup>38</sup> Pol. 7.2.3-5; Liv. 24.6.2: See Huss, *Geschichte*, p. 351; Briscoe, "The Second Punic War," p. 61; Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 138, Edwell, "War Abroad," p. 32.

<sup>39</sup> Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 138f.; Dreher, *La Sicilia antica*, p. 84f.

<sup>40</sup> Pol. 7.4.1ff., Liv. 24.6.7f. See Schmitt, *Staatsverträge III*, no. 259, p. 251ff; cfr. Huss, *Geschichte*, p. 351; Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 264.

<sup>41</sup> Pol. 8.2 ff., Liv. 24.7; Plut. *Marc.* 13.2. See Huss, *Geschichte*, p. 354; Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 140; on the date Goldsberry, *Sicily*, p.268 no. 57.

lows the lost Polybius.<sup>42</sup> After the brothers' various intrigues and misadventures, the mob of Syracuse elected them as strategists (Liv. 24.32.9)<sup>43</sup> and so once and for all the city threw away the possibility of negotiating with Rome. Syracuse was defended by Hippocrates who asked Carthage for reinforcements during the long siege of the city by Appius Pulcher and Claudius Marcellus, who had vainly attempted to renew Hiero's treaty.<sup>44</sup>

The fragment by Appian only depicts the moment of the brothers' arrival in Leontini and is a type of introduction to the two following fragments, also from the collection *De virtutibus et vitiis*, which put Marcellus in a bad light.

The first (fr. 4) concerns the cruelty (ὠμότες) used by Marcellus to treat the Sicilians, and the indignation as to how, defended by Hippocrates and Epikydes,<sup>45</sup> he had taken possession of Syracuse: namely through betrayal.<sup>46</sup>

The second (fr. 5) accuses Marcellus of scarce reliability, hence no one would trust him without the guarantee of a sworn agreement. As a result, in 212 he had to come to a sworn treaty with the inhabitants of the *civitas* Tauromenion, free since 263 – who had surrendered to him (and had perhaps never joined forces with the Carthaginians<sup>47</sup>) – with particular assurances towards them.<sup>48</sup>

Notoriously, there are various traditions on the seizure of Syracuse. The betrayal version is present in all the sources;<sup>49</sup> the accusations and perplexities towards Marcellus almost always result from the fate of Archimedes who, as is known, was assassina-

<sup>42</sup> The sources (above all Livy and Plutarch) note sacking and cruelty on the part of the Romans towards the Magna-Graecian populations, in particular towards Leontini, Megara and Enna, and the difficult relations of the Sicilian cities with each other. See Lippold, *Consules*, p. 257ff.; Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 158, Bocci, *Marcello*, p. 307. On other modes of conduct towards the cities in Sicily: Goldsberry, *Sicily*, notes 267 and 269.

<sup>43</sup> Liv. 24.32.9. See Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 139.

<sup>44</sup> Liv. 24.33. See Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 144ff.

<sup>45</sup> On the alliance between Sicilian cities and Hippocrates which foresaw the prohibition of a separate peace: see Schmitt, *Staatsverträge III*, no. 533, p. 256.

<sup>46</sup> See the various versions on the betrayal in Pol. 8.4-7, Diod. 26.18, Plut. *Marc.* 18.3-6, Liv. 25.34 ff. Cfr. Münzer, "Claudius nr. 220," col. 2748; Marincola, *Marcellus*, p. 220ff.

<sup>47</sup> See Manganaro, *Tauromenitana*, p. 25; Goldsberry, *Sicily*, p. 234.

<sup>48</sup> See Schmitt, cit. On the previous relations between Taormina and Rome: Dahlheim, *Gewalt und Herrschaft*, p. 175f.; Marino, *Sicilia*, p. 17ff.

<sup>49</sup> See above n. 46.



ted by a Roman soldier during the siege.<sup>50</sup> All the sources also mention the plundering from the city of all its art treasures which were taken to Rome (for example Plut. *Marc.* 19.7-10). The judgements on this act, which inaugurates the great series of thefts of artwork by the Romans, vary.<sup>51</sup>

In 210 a Syracusan delegation denounced Marcellus before the senate<sup>52</sup> due to his conduct towards the city, but the accusations ended up with a solemn reconciliation and his total reinstatement (Plut. 23.10). The Syracusans asked Marcellus to be accepted among his clientele and some games were named after him in his honour.<sup>53</sup>

The positive judgement of Marcellus is confirmed in Cicero's orations against Verres,<sup>54</sup> and even more so in the *Life of Marcellus* by Plutarch for example. In the trial, Cicero needed Marcellus as a counterweight to Verres's unjustified and personal appropriation of works of art<sup>55</sup>: Marcellus had not taken anything for himself, but made Greek art known to the Romans for the first time.<sup>56</sup>

In substance, from the preserved sources, there emerge various negative stories about Marcellus, some accusing him, others defending him. This will have depended on the domestic political situation, which was anything but consistent, as Cassola clearly underlined.<sup>57</sup> In the same way as for Atilius, for Marcellus there

<sup>50</sup> See the comment by Bocci, *Plutarco, Marcello* p. 316 ff. and Ghilli, *ibidem* p. 447, no. 179.

<sup>51</sup> See the discussion in Pol. 9.10.1ff., Liv. 25.40.2; 26.29-30, Diod. 26.20 and also the renowned judgement by Cato in Liv. 34.4.4. Cfr. Lippold, *Consules*, p. 262f., Walbank *Commentary II*, p.134ff.; Briscoe, *Commentary on Livy*, p. 51; Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 174.

<sup>52</sup> Liv. 26.26.5ff.; Plut. *Marc.* 23.4. See Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 173ff., Bocci, *Plutarco, Marcello*, p. 297f.

<sup>53</sup> Cic., *Verr.* II 4.151. See Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 176; Lazzeretti, *Commento*, p. 428.

<sup>54</sup> Cic., *Verr.* 4.31.9ff., Val. M. 8.7, ext.7, Plin. 7.125. See Lippold, *Consules*, p. 268ff.; Eckstein, *Senate*, p. 144ff.

<sup>55</sup> For the thefts of artwork after the seizure of Syracuse see Galsterer, *Kunstraub und Kunsthandel*, p. 857ff.; Scuderi, "La raffigurazione," p. 408ff.; Lazzeretti, "Furti d'arte," p. 261ff.; Frazel, *Furtum and the description*, p. 364ff.

<sup>56</sup> Plut. 21.4; see Lippold, *Consules*, p. 265, Lazzeretti, *Commento*, p. 32.

<sup>57</sup> p. 314ff.: the tendencies in Cornelius Scipio and Fabius Maximus for example are hostile (Bocci, *Plutarco, Marcello*, p. 299ff., 328). They negate Marcellus's triumph, which was reduced to a triumph on Mount Alban and an ovation (Plut. 22.1 – see Eckstein, *Senate*, p.170 f.; Ghilli, *Plutarco, Marcello*, nos. 209 and 210, p. 459 and also McDonnell, *Roman Manliness*, p. 226 ff.

was also a Greek tradition, from which derives his fame as cruel man in Appian and his scarce reliability stem. In contrast, there is a patriotic Roman tradition which defines Marcellus as a man full of φιλανθρωπία, mild, generous and always willing to negotiate.<sup>58</sup> This could have come for example from the Claudis' family archive or from Coelius Antipater<sup>59</sup>, or from the same annals which indeed must have included material both in favour and against him.

My aim in this short presentation was to suggest that: 1) even though these few fragments contain several errors, owing to a certain degree of superficiality, they nevertheless deserve our attention, 2) they contain traces of interesting historiographic traditions in contrast with the prevailing Roman tradition; the negative remarks on Marcellus could imply positive remarks towards Roman and non-Roman adversaries: I remember that Appian uses words of appreciation for Hannibal and Viriathus; 3) among the other possibilities, the source of this evidence could partly be local; it seems to be used somewhat randomly and in a form already drawn up by others. The entirely preserved *Libyké* itself contains one or more anti-Roman traditions, with a Carthaginian or Libyan perspective; from the *Libyké* then there emerges a climate of criticism towards certain Roman ways of conduct in the Third Punic War. I would like to conclude these considerations with an intuition from Santo Mazzarino<sup>60</sup>: "anche un Appiano trascrittore sarebbe sempre un uomo che pensa, e a suo modo sceglie".

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ameling, W., *Karthago. Studien zu Militär, Staat und Gesellschaft*, Munich 1993.
- Badian, E., "M.Porcius Cato and the annexation and early administration of Cyprus," *Journ.Rom.St.* 55, 1965.
- Beck, H., Walter, U., *Die frühen römischen Historiker I: von Fabius Pictor bis Gn. Gellius*, Darmstadt 2001.
- Bleckmann, B., "Regulus bei Naevius: zu fr. 50 und 51 Blänsdorf," *Phil.* 142, 1998.
- Briscoe, J., *Commentary on Livy, Books XXXIV–XXXVII*, Oxford 1981.
- Briscoe, J., "The second Punic war," *CAH VIII*<sup>2</sup>, 1989.
- Carsano, Ch., *Commento storico al libro II delle "Guerre Civili" di Appiano*, Pisa 2007.

<sup>58</sup> For example Plut. *Marc.* 1.3; 20.1. See Ghilli p. 456, no. 202.

<sup>59</sup> Münzer, *Claudius* no. 220, col. 2754, De Sanctis, *Storia III* 2, p. 639ff.

<sup>60</sup> *Il pensiero storico classico*, p. 194.

- Cassola, F., *Gruppi politici romani nel III sec. a.C.*, Trieste 1968.
- Ceccarelli, P., "I Nesiotika," *Ann.Sc.Norm.Pisa* 19,1989.
- Chassignet, M., *L'annalistique romain*, II, Paris 1999.
- Cimma, M.R., *Reges socii et amici populi Romani*, Milano 1976.
- Dahlheim, W., *Struktur und Entwicklung des römischen Völkerrechts im 3. und 2. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1968.
- Dahlheim, W., *Gewalt und Herrschaft: Das provinzielle Herrschaftssystem der römischen Republik*, Berlin 1977.
- De Sanctis, G., *Storia dei Romani*, Firenze 1960<sup>2</sup>.
- De Vido, S., "Insularità, etnografia, utopie. Il caso di Diodoro", in C. Ampolo (ed.), *Immagine e immagini della Sicilia e di altre isole del Mediterraneo antico*, vol. 1, Pisa (Scuola Normale) 2006.
- Dreher, M., *La Sicilia antica*, Bologna 2008.
- Dyck, A.R., *A commentary on Cicero, De officiis*, Michigan 1996.
- Eckstein, A.M., *Senate and General: Individual decision making and Roman foreign relations, 264-194 B.C.*, California Press 1987.
- Eckstein, A.M., *Moral visions in the Histories of Polybios*, California Press 1995.
- Edwell, P., "War Abroad: Spain, Sicily, Macedon, Africa," in D. Hoyos (ed.), *A Companion to the Punic Wars*, Oxford 2011.
- Fantar, M., "Régulus en Afrique," in H. Devijer, E.Lipinski (edd.), *Studia Phoenicia 10*,1989.
- Fariselli, A.C., *I mercenari di Cartagine*, La Spezia 2002.
- Fehrle, R., *Cato Uticensis*, Darmstadt 1983.
- Frazel, Th. D., "Furtum and the description of stolen objects in Cicero, In Verrem 2.4," *Am.Journ.Phil.* 126, 2005.
- Galsterer, H., *Kunstraub und Kunsthandel im republikanischen Rom, in Das Wrack. Der antike Schiffsfund von Mahdia*, Cologne 1994.
- Goldsberry, M.A., *Sicily and its cities in Hellenistic and Roman times*, Chapel Hill 1973.
- Händl-Sagawe, C., *Der Beginn des zweiten punischen Krieges, Einleitung und Kommentar*, Munich 1995.
- Hannak, E., *Appianus und seine Quellen*, Wien 1869.
- Heftner, H., *Der Aufstieg Roms*, Regensburg 1997.
- Heinen, H., "Rom und das Ptolomäerreich," *ANRW II*, 1972.
- Holleaux, M., *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. (273-205)*, Paris 1981.
- Huss, W., "Die Beziehungen zwischen Karthago und Aegypten in hellenistischer Zeit," *Anc.Soc.*10,1979.
- Huss, W., *Geschichte der Karthager*, München 1985.
- Koehn, C., "Pompeius, Cassius und Augustus. Bemerkungen zum imperium maius", *Chiron* 40, 2010.
- Klebs, E., Atilius nr. 51, RE, *Halbbd. IV*, 1896.
- La Bua, V., *Filino-Polibio-Sileno-Diodoro*, Palermo 1966.
- Lazzeretti, A., "Furti d'arte ai danni di privati nelle Verrine di Cicerone: città, derubati, opere d'arte," *Kokalos* 46, 2004.

- Lazzeretti, A., *M.Tulli Ciceronis In C.Verrem actionis secundae Liber quartus (De signis). Commento storico e archeologico*, Pisa 2006.
- Leidl, Ch., *Appians Darstellung des 2. Punischen Krieges in Spanien (Iberiké 1-38, & 1-158), Text und Kommentar*, Munich 1996.
- Lenschau, Th., "Hippocrates nr. 10," *RE VIII 2*, 1913, col.1780.
- Lippold, A., *Consules. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des römischen Konsulats von 264 bis 201 v.Chr.*, Bonn 1963.
- Loreto, L., *La grande insurrezione libica contro Cartagine del 241–237 A.C.*, Roma 1995.
- McDonnell, M., *Roman Manliness. Virtus and the Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2006.
- Manganaro G., "Tauromenitana," *Archeol.Class. 15*, 1963.
- Manganaro, G., "Per una storia della Sicilia Romana," *ANRW I 1*, Berlin 1972.
- Manni, E., "L'Egitto tolomaico nei suoi rapporti politici con Roma," *Riv. Fil. Class. 27*, 1949.
- Marincola, J., "Marcellus at Syracuse (Livy XXV.24.11–15): a historian reflects", in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Coll.Latomus 287, Bruxelles 2005.
- Marino, R., *La Sicilia dal 241 al 210 a.C.*, Roma 1988.
- Maróti, E., "On the problem of M.Antonius Creticus' imperium infinitum," *Acta Ant. Hung. 19*, 1971.
- Mastrocinque, A., *Appiano: Le guerre di Mitridate*, Milano 1999.
- Mazzarino, S., "Appunti sul bellum poenicum in Nevio," *Helikon 6*, 1966.
- Mazzarino, S., *Il pensiero storico classico II 2*, Bari 1966.
- Meltzer, O., *Geschichte der Karthager*, Berlin 1896.
- Mitford, T.B., "Roman Cyprus," *ANRW II 7.2*, 1980.
- Moreau, Ph., *Clodiana Religio. Un procès politique en 61 av.J-C.*, Paris 1982.
- Münzer, F., "Claudius nr.220," *RE III 2*, 1899.
- Münzer, F., "Caecilius nr.87," *RE III 1*, 1897.
- Oost, S.I., "Cato "Uticensis" and the annexation of Cyprus," *Class.Phil. 50*, 1955.
- Ormerod, H.A., *Piracy in the Ancient World*, Chicago 1967.
- Plutarco, *Vite Parallele, Pelopida-Marcello*, (a cura di S.Bocci e L. Ghilli), Milano BUR 1998.
- Rosalia, M., "Città di Sicilia tra violenza e consenso nell'età delle guerre romano-puniche," *Hormos 8*, 2006.
- Rotondi, G., *Leges publicae populi Romani*, Milano 1966<sup>2</sup>.
- Scardigli, B., "Appiani SIKELIKH Fr. 7," *Annali Fac.Lett. Siena 7*, 1986.
- Scardigli, B., *I trattati romano-cartaginesi*, Pisa 1991.
- Schmitt, H., *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums III: Die Verträge der griechischen und römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v.Chr.*, München 1969.
- Scuderi, R., "La raffigurazione ciceroniana della Sicilia e dei suoi abitanti: un fattore ambientale per la condanna di Verre," in *Studi per Albino Garzetti* (edd. C.Stella, A.Valvo), Brescia 1996.
- Seager, R., "The Rice of Pompey," *CAH IX*<sup>2</sup>, 1994.

- 
- Seager, R., *Pompey the Great. A political biography*, Oxford 2002<sup>2</sup>.
- Sherwin White, N., "Lucullus, Pompey and the East," *CAH IX*<sup>2</sup>, 1994.
- Tagliamonte, G., *I figli di Marte. Mobilità, mercenari e mercenariato italici in Magna Grecia e Sicilia*, Roma 1994.
- Thiel, J.H., *A history of Roman sea-power before the second Punic war*, Amsterdam 1954.
- Volkman, H., "Ptolemaios nr. 34," *RE 46, Halbbd.*, 1959.
- Walbank, F. W., *A historical Commentary on Polybios I*, Oxford 1957.
- Walsh, P. G., *Livy, Book XXI*, Cambridge 1985.
- Zucca, R., *Insulae Baliares. Le isole Baleari sotto il dominio romano*, Roma 1998.