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Abstract
There is no evidence for a contemporary ancient concept analogous to our ‘Punic World’, and such modern ethno-cultural categorizations can obscure more interesting ancient communities of identification and practice. This essay looks at a case study of such a community, the small set of Phoenician-speaking cities in the central Mediterranean that established child-sacrifice sanctuaries. I start not from an assumption that these so-called tophets reflected generic colonial identities but from the specific identifications that the sanctuaries made between themselves. I argue that these cannot be satisfactorily explained simply in the context of a diasporic ‘Punic World’, or solely through the actions of Carthage, and that taken on their own terms these cultural phenomena have the potential to reveal new narratives in the western Mediterranean.
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1. The problems of the Punic World

Despite its popularity among scholars¹, the ‘Punic World’ wouldn’t have made sense to the people who are supposed to have lived there, and this paper is an attempt to go beyond and below that abstract concept to get to their own stories. We can start with the problem of defining the modern term ‘Punic’, which does not map onto contemporary ancient vocabulary: Jonathan Prag demonstrated some years ago that there is no good evidence for anyone ever calling themselves (or for that matter their culture) ‘Punic’², and more recently that there is no basic difference in sense between Greek Phoinix and Latin Poenus or Punicus: both could be applied interchangeably to eastern or western Phoenicians until at least the middle of the first century BCE, long after the destruction of Carthage³. It is unsurprising then that the modern term ‘Punic’ can carry a great variety of meanings. In English it is now used solely as an adjective, after the noun
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² PRAG 2006.
³ PRAG in press; already noted in passing at AUBET 2001: 12.
“Punick” fell into disuse in the seventeenth century\(^4\), but in other languages it can also refer to people (‘un Punique’, ‘i Punici’). Either way, it most straightforwardly means ‘western Phoenician’, but is often used more or less interchangeably with ‘CARTHAGINIAN’, and sometimes with reference to mixed populations and cultures resulting from Phoenician colonization of a region. And in the mid-twentieth century a very specific chronological definition became almost standard, whereby the term refers to the Phoenician West only from the sixth century BCE onwards. On this model, most closely associated with Sabatino Moscati, but still widespread\(^5\), the ‘Punic World’ is centred on Carthage, which from the sixth century exerted some form of imperial hegemony over the over the other Phoenician colonies: in the West, ““fenicio” definisce … le testimonianze che precedono la costituzione dell’impero di Cartagine e le vicende che ne conseguono. “Punico”, ciò premesso, definisce le testimonianze dell’intera area occidentale a partire da tali eventi … anche come parte del mondo punico, Cartagine vi esercita una particolare funzione enucleabile come tale”\(^6\).

This narrow definition has naturally found its critics. In a recent discussion, for instance, Peter van Dommelen and Carlos Gómez Bellard point out that although the sixth century saw significant cultural change in some Phoenician-speaking settlements and regions – such as a general shift from cremation to inhumation burials – there is little to tie these changes to specific Carthaginian activities, there was also a considerable amount of continuity, and other significant shifts in settlement patterns and material practices took place in both earlier and later periods\(^7\). They and others also stress the immense diversity of material practices found among the western Phoenician colonies, as well as their complex connections with local populations and practices\(^8\). It is worth noting too that the period around the sixth century saw a great deal of cultural, political and economic change throughout the Mediterranean, not just in the Phoenician West. In terms of burial practices, for instance, similar shifts from cremation to inhumation can be seen in Greece in the mid-sixth century\(^9\), and inhumation was already the norm in the Sicilian Greek colonies\(^10\): the assumption that Carthage was a more immediate model to other Phoenician-speaking colonies in the central Mediterranean is simply that.

This wider perspective calls into question not only the specialness of the group experience of Phoenician-speakers in the West, but also the catalytic role in that experience of the “impero di Cartagine”. Carthage was their largest settlement in the central Mediterranean both before and after the sixth century\(^11\), and as such undoubtedly a major player in the events that unfolded there\(^12\). All the same, the nature, date and
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\(^4\) PRAG 2006: 1, n. 1.

\(^5\) E.g., in a recent textbook: “Si intende come punico quanto attiene alla fase storica apertasi nelle colonie occidentali nella seconda metà del VI sec. a. C. e caratterizzata dal primato politico, militare e culturale di Cartagine” (BONDÌ et al. 2009: x).

\(^6\) MOSCATI 1988: 5.

\(^7\) VAN DOMMELEN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 5-12.

\(^8\) LÓPEZ CASTRO 1995: 9; CAMPUS 2006; VAN DOMMELEN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 4; BONDÌ in press.


\(^10\) SHEPHERD 1995.

\(^11\) TELMINI et al. in press.

\(^12\) VAN DOMMELEN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 237.
scope of a Carthaginian ‘empire’ have been questioned since the 1970s, when C. R. Whittaker characterised Carthaginian imperialism until the fourth or even third century as primarily involving the control of ports of trade rather than territorial annexation or taxation. There is certainly evidence for increasing territorial control on fourth-century Sicily, including the issue of coins with the legend B’RṢT, ‘in the territories’, and for claims at least to economic and political hegemony on Sardinia, where the fourth-century treaty between the Carthaginians and Romans no longer subjects the latter to trade-regulation, as in the earlier treaty of 509, but forbids them from trading or founding cities on the island at all. But no one has yet succeeded in disproving Whittaker’s basic hypothesis.

As a result of these misgivings, various redefinitions of the term ‘Punic’ have more recently been proposed: the scope of the term can be enlarged, for instance, to include the contribution of local cultures, so van Dommelen and Gómez Bellard “will not use this term to denote ethnic or political identities but rather as an archaeological or historical label”, “referring generically to the five western Mediterranean core regions [western Sicily, southern Sardinia, Ibiza, southern Iberia, and the coastal Maghreb] during the 6th to 1st centuries BC”. Alternatively, the chronological limits can be elongated, so that the label applies to the Phoenician colonial West from the earliest times; it is now standard among archaeologists at Carthage itself to refer to the 9th-6th century evidence as ‘Early Punic’ or ‘Archaic Punic’. Some have even queried whether we should use the word Punic at all: José Luis López Castro has long advocated the use of the phrase ‘Western Phoenician’, which avoids the problem of designating a chronological turning point as well as the negative connotations of the Latin word “Punic”.

Brill’s 2010 Historical Atlas of the Ancient World shows the ambiguity of the current state of play in the title it gives to its map of “The Phoenician and West Phoenician/Carthaginian world in the western Mediterranean area (9th-2nd cents. BC)” (Fig. 1). This phrase avoids the controversial term ‘Punic’, but Carthage is still given a central role, and it is clear from the key, if not the title, that we are to understand a shift from an earlier world of ‘Phoenician’ settlements (9th-7th/6th centuries BCE) to a later
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16 Polybius 3.24.11; cf. 3.22.9.

17 This does not of course mean that his interpretation has been universally accepted: see recently for instance D’ANDREA – GIARDINO 2011: 133 n. 5. “I dati archeologici e le fonti storiche indicano chiaramente una progressiva espansione di Cartagine a partire dalla prima metà del VI sec. a.C. prima in Sardegna e Sicilia Occidentale, successivamente nell’entroterra africano”.

18 VAN DOMMELEN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 5.

19 SAGONA 2002: 4-5.


21 LÓPEZ CASTRO 1995: 9: “Bajo la palabra “púnica” subyace la imagen peyorativa de los poeni de las fuentes latinas, que sustenta una concepción de Cartago como imperio cultivada con éxito por la historiografía clásica y la historiografía europea contemporánea, empeñadas en justificar la destrucción de Cartago y el imperialismo romano”.
‘West Phoenician/Carthaginian’ one, involving 6th/5th century settlement. The shaded area of the map, which is described in a rather tortured fashion as “Carthage and its territory and/or sphere of influence, the ‘Carthaginian Empire’, in the late 6th to 4th cents. BC”, when taken together with the map’s title suggests a coherence in ethnic (‘Phoenician’), political (‘Carthaginian’) and cultural (‘World’) terms across a very large part of the Mediterranean sea and lands.

This illustrates another problem with the ‘Punic World’: the potential danger of putting those two words together. Van Dommelen and Gómez Bellard carefully “delimit” their Punic World to exclude ethnic or political implications, but too often it is not defined, or is defined in such a way as to emphasise such an aspect. For Moscati, for example, ‘mondo’ is equivalent to ‘civiltà’, or ‘civilization’. The earlier ‘Phoenician’ phase in the West “non è soltanto differenziata cronologicamente ma riflette ben diverse circostanze storiche e culturali”22. For him, “la civiltà del mondo punico”23 is a clearly delimited geographical, historical, political and cultural entity, a subset (geographically and chronologically) of a larger ‘Phoenician’ “civiltà”. This understanding of the ‘Punic World’ is still current: Hédi Dridi’s 2006 Carthage et le monde punique was published in a series of ‘Guides Belles Lettres des Civilisations’.

The best-known advocate of thinking in terms of these ‘civilizations’ or ‘cultures’24 in Mediterranean history is Fernand Braudel, who described a “civilization” as “a collection of cultural characteristics and phenomena” found within “a space, a ‘cultural area’”25, and attributed to these civilizations or cultures “characters”26 and a “collective psychology, awareness, mentality or mental equipment”27 that is “an unexpressed and often inexpressible compulsion arising from the collective unconscious”28. More recent examples include Samuel Huntington’s theory of the Clash of Civilizations, and the work of Martin Jacques on the (Han) Chinese ‘civilization-state’29, which provoked Perry Anderson to comment that “Talk of ‘civilisations’ is notoriously self-serving, and delimitations of them arbitrary: Samuel Huntington arrived, rather desperately, at eight or nine – including an African, Latin American and Eastern Orthodox civilisation. Nothing is gained by affixing this embellishment to the PRC”30. Moscati, Braudel, Huntington and Jacques all provide examples of the ‘culture-history’ theory of the past, the idea that patterns of variation in the material record of the world (‘cultures’), can be mapped on to particular peoples or ethnic groups, and that changes in those patterns (‘history’) can be explained by what those groups do or what is done to them31. This approach suffers from what Paul Gilroy has called “an overintegrated sense of cultural
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22 MOSCATI 1988: 3.
23 MOSCATI 1963: 486.
24 For the various relationships and the changing hierarchy between ‘culture(s)’ and ‘civilization(s)’ in various European languages see BRAUDEL 1993: 5-6.
26 BRAUDEL 1993: 11.
27 BRAUDEL 1993: 22.
28 BRAUDEL 1993: 22.
30 ANDERSON 2010.
and ethnic particularity”\(^32\), and had already been comprehensively debunked by archaeologists by the later twentieth century.

Stephen Shennan, for instance, pointed out the practical impossibility of classifying the archaeological record into neatly geographically bounded patterns of material assemblages: “if we examine the distribution of individual types of archaeological material, especially if we use quantitative rather than mere presence-absence information, we find not neatly bounded entities but an enormous variety of cross-cutting patterns”\(^33\). This is something that is certainly true of the ‘Punic World’, where the existence and combination of particular artefacts and practices varies enormously within its traditional geographical boundaries and within any arbitrary sub-regions – not just between centre and periphery, but also between town and country, and between colonies and indigenous settlements. Furthermore, ancient artefacts often break the conceptual boundaries of the ‘world’ in which moderns locate them, as with the frequent ‘Greek’ mythological scenes on ‘Punic’ razors.

Both Shennan and Siân Jones noted the theoretical weakness of the culture-history model, which assumes that “within a given group cultural practices and beliefs tend to conform to prescriptive ideational norms or rules of behaviour”\(^34\) whereas in fact “different aspects of variation in pottery, for example, may relate to vessel function, cooking techniques, the size of the domestic group, the rank of the individuals using the pottery, whether the pottery is made by specialists, as well as the milieu in which the potters learned their craft”\(^35\). Cultural practices can convey messages as well as fulfilling functions, and perhaps they always do, but they don’t have to reflect, generate or symbolise corporate identity. As Shennan put it, it is now generally accepted that “spatial variation in archaeological material is the product of a variety of different factors, not merely of the fact that different people in different places have different ideas about how to do things”\(^36\).

At the same time, Jones emphasised that this way of understanding the ancient world developed alongside the practice of archaeology itself in the specific political context of emerging nationalisms in nineteenth century Europe, and has described in particular detail its contribution to “the political manipulation of the past in Nazi Germany”, in which “a deep antiquity was attributed to the Aryan ‘race’ alongside a decisive, creative role in the course of history through its continuous expansion into new areas”\(^37\). The culture-history approach is still widely used to justify the claims of self-identified ethnic groups to land on the basis of a continuous ethno-cultural heritage\(^38\): a curious recent example is the dispute over the name of the former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia and its attendant claim to Alexander the Great as a national hero, including the renaming of Skopje Airport in 2007 Skopje Alexander the Great Airport; the 2009 protest letter against these appropriations, which was signed by 372 international
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\(^{32}\) Gilroy 1993: 31.  
\(^{34}\) Jones 1997: 24.  
\(^{36}\) Shennan 1989: 12.  
Classics scholars, made the equally dubious argument that the Macedonians, including Alexander, were “thoroughly and indisputably Greek”39.

This, then, is the fundamental difficulty with the ‘Punic World’ as it is usually understood: not the exact chronology or geography we attach to the phrase, but the fact that an ethno-cultural label, even a broad or conventional one, is attached to a demarcated geographical area at all. Such labels offer an answer to questions about historical explanation before they have been explicitly put. They focus attention on the role of that culture and/or ethnicity in the events which take place within that world, at the expense of any or all others present, and indeed all other factors. In the process, they reify and freeze in time particular ethnicities and cultures that were in a constant process of construction, from inside and out. And they encourage historical explanation at a very large and abstract scale, hiding more concrete, conscious and interesting communities and their stories: they provide too easy a way (or way out) of reading the historical evidence. So rather than assuming that there simply was a distinct western Phoenician or ‘Punic’ culture or civilization that on some level explains cultural phenomena in the Phoenician-speaking western Mediterranean, let alone one attached to a corporate ethnic or diasporic identity, what I want to look at in this paper is a case study of a community that we can actually see being constructed between Phoenician-speaking settlements in the western Mediterranean.

2. The possibilities of other worlds

But how can I do this? There is no obvious way to deduce identity from material evidence alone – absent unequivocal and usually religious symbols and practices such as menorahs or the avoidance of pork, we simply don’t know what people meant, or purported to mean, by what they did, unless they tell us. But even if we can’t read identity off archaeological evidence in the absence of texts, one thing we can see in material culture is identifications with others: deliberate, mindful references in the culture of one settlement to that of another or others. This is not about ‘influence’, a concept which gets historical agency the wrong way round: earlier artefacts don’t act on later ones; people choose to quote, adapt, subvert or simply avoid available ideas and imagery40. Instead, I’m interested in the extent to which a self-constructed community of Phoenician-speakers supports the assumptions lying behind traditional definitions of the ‘Punic World’, and even more interested in the world(s) it creates itself.

Tophets make an ideal case study41. They seem to have been important within their settlements: they were large, often carefully respected by city walls, and in some cases outlasted the cities themselves. Another reason to see them as particularly significant is the fact that they were, among a variety of other functions and rituals, sites of infant
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41 For useful general summaries and commentary, see MOSCATI 1992a, CIASCA 2002 and XELLA 2012. A single marker with a dedication to Baal Hamon and Tinnit now in Palermo is no longer widely considered as evidence for a tophet there, as there is no evidence for its provenance (DE SIMONE 1997). I also exclude from this short discussion the sanctuaries found in African settlements of non-Phoenician origin, starting in the third century BCE, though this is certainly a somewhat arbitrary distinction.
sacrifice: places where religion, ritual, civil society, family, death and burial came together in a way that gave them a peculiar power to bring together and represent a community. Furthermore, the users of the tophets must have formed a self-conscious group: this is a rare and highly distinctive ritual choice, and we see evidence for the same basic practices at all the surviving sites where alongside a variety of chapels, shrines and altars, the cremated remains of infants and animals are buried in urns. The sanctuaries often also have stone markers which share a developing repertoire of forms and iconography, and, sometimes, inscriptions that reproduce very similar formulae across different sites and periods. As Corinne Bonnet has noted, “Most ancient and modern authors consider the tophet as one distinctive element of the Punic culture and identity”… “human sacrifices” are considered typically Punic; for Sabatino Moscati, for instance, “il tofet ci appare ormai come una componente distintiva degli impianti punici nell’area mediterranea”. But to what extent are they in fact distinctively or typically ‘Punic’?

The tophets were certainly a diasporic phenomenon: all were in Phoenician-speaking settlements, and in almost all cases it seems very likely that they were set up when the sites were first properly settled, or very soon after: a tophet was part of the colonial toolkit right from the start. But the sites don’t map onto anything like what is normally thought of as the Phoenician diaspora or ‘Punic World’ (Fig. 2). In fact, the phenomenon is very geographically constricted: this is not a choice made by all Phoenician-speakers in the central Mediterranean, and it is not a choice made by Phoenician-speakers west of Carthage at all, including that city’s near neighbour of Utica, something which is hard to explain within a single colonial paradigm. The people who established these tophets identified with each other in a way that would also have served to differentiate them from their Phoenician-speaking counterparts elsewhere in the Mediterranean.

At the same time there are in the Carthage tophet in particular other signs of openness to and even pride in the non-Phoenician: the marker inscriptions reveal that some people with Greek and Libyan names made sacrifices at the sanctuary, and the dedicatee of one well-known marker traces his ancestry back sixteen generations to one MŠRY or ‘Egyptian’. Corinne Bonnet has suggested that the population of Carthage was a hieron soma, “a “sacred body” that shared holy places, festivals, religious symbols, and ritual codification… The religious practices are meant both to unify the community and to make clear its intrinsic diversity.” The tophet was a place that brought these people of different origins together in a ritual context, what we are seeing here in the tophet is a community of practice rather than an ethnic or ethno-cultural group.
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42 I’m not going to defend this claim, which is not crucial to my argument here: see recently XELLA 2010, Garnand et al. and other contributions in this volume, and XELLA et al. 2013.
43 BONNET 2011: 373; see also CIASCA 2002: 122.
44 MOSCATI 1972: 206.
45 AUBET 2001: 254; VAN DOMMELEN 2005: 149; D’ANDREA - GIARDINO 2011: 137-138. The exception is Monte Sirai, which, contra QUINN 2011: 390, may well have been a settlement in its own right from the mid-eighth century: VAN DOMMELEN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 178.
47 CIS I 3778 = KAI 78.
48 BONNET 2011: 376.
Valentina Melchiorri has already suggested that “il est opportun de nuancer un concept historique ‘monolithique’ et presque toujours donné pour sûr: celui d’un Occident phénicien compact et homogène, à l’intérieur des dynamiques historiques de la première génération de colons venus du Levant… Je me réfère à l’exigence d’établir des catégorisations internes spécifiques, en vue d’élaborer une distinction en macro-régions qui – grâce aussi à l’évidence des tophet – puisse identifier une série de sous-horizons coloniaux particuliers”49; this essay is an attempt to do just that. I will argue in what follows that while the users of the tophets do in a sense construct their own Phoenician-speaking ‘world’ in the West through a set of mutual identifications at a practical and visual level, it is by no means the only one, or an exclusive one, and I will suggest that we can’t in fact pin the explanation for the inter-relationships involved to ‘Phoenician’ or ‘Punic’ culture or ethnic identity in general, or to the actions of Carthage in particular. Instead, we should look at the specifics of those relationships, which open up a series of interesting questions about the changing nature of colonialism, power and connectivity in the Phoenician-speaking Mediterranean.

3. The Circle of the Tophet

3.1 Foundation

The earliest tophets for which we have evidence were established in the middle of the eighth century (c. 770-750) at Carthage in Tunisia50, Mozia on Sicily51, and Sulcis on Sardinia52. The order in which they were set up is hard to ascertain, and although it has often been assumed that Carthage was the first, they may well have been more or less simultaneous. The evidence for another early sanctuary at Rabat on Malta is little-known and badly-dated but on balance convincing: 60 urns with bones taken to be those of children or small animals were discovered in 1816, along with two markers with inscriptions which have been dated on the grounds of letter-forms to the seventh century and bear formulae typical of those found later in other tophets53. The evidence for colonial settlement on Malta, as at Carthage, Sulcis and Mozia, goes back to c. 75054, and in the absence of any documentation we might suspect the same of the Malta tophet. The close relationship between these four early Western tophets is underlined by the similarity of the seventh-sixth century epigraphy found in them, which shows “le stesse formule in località diverse, con varianti e uno sviluppo in apparenza comuni”55. We might also consider including in this original group Amathus in Cyprus, if the section of

49 MELCHIORRI 2009: 512.
50 Site: BÉNICHOU-SAFAR 2004, with earlier bibliography. Markers: BARTOLONI 1976 for a large sample of the earlier examples; BROWN 1991 for an overview of the later ones; both have earlier bibliography.
the cemetery there that contains only cremated infants and animals is to be identified as an eighth-century tophet.56

Why did some groups of Phoenician-speaking migrants choose to establish tophets, thus establishing a mutual set of identifications, and others not? In a stimulating recent article, Bruno D’Andrea discusses the popular theory that distinguishes between ‘commercial’ settlements in the West, and true ‘colonial’ foundations in the central Mediterranean, which have tophets.57 He focusses in particular on Paolo Bernardini’s intriguing version of this hypothesis, which divides Phoenician settlement between the ‘Circle of the Strait’ and a ‘Circle of Carthage’.58 The former would be colonial communities focussed on the commercial exploitation of mineral resources, mostly in the Far West but with outposts at mineral-rich locations in the central Mediterranean such as Nora; the latter a set of larger settlements in the central Mediterranean, founded some decades later by political exiles from Tyre to exploit agricultural territory. On Bernardini’s model, the tophet was a fundamentally Carthaginian phenomenon, invented there c. 750, some time after the initial foundation of the city in the late ninth century.59 For him this new kind of sanctuary was for the burial of children who died of natural causes and constituted a ritual recognition and reinforcement of the importance of childbirth to the new agricultural/settlement colony: “il favore degli dei verso i nuovi nati è elemento fondamentale di crescita e di progresso”, as he sees it, similar sanctuaries were then established in Carthaginian sub-colonies (sensu lato) on Sicily and Sardinia as they came into being. D’Andrea questions this aspect of the hypothesis, and the primary role of Carthage in the archaic tophet phenomenon more generally, pointing among other things to the variety of urn-types found in the archaic tophets and the evidence from ceramics for the simultaneous foundation of the tophet and the colony at Carthage and Sulcis; the same is a little less certainly true of Mozia.60 He proposes instead of Bernardini’s ‘Circle of Carthage’ a ‘Circle of the Tophet’, which is a convenient label for the community at issue.

And one could add to his reservations. Even if the settlements involved were in any sense Carthaginian colonies, if Carthage was in the business of establishing tophets, it is surprising that there is no evidence for one on Ibiza, the one place where we have unambiguous literary evidence for a Carthaginian foundation in the archaic period.61 And while all the tophets may have been very similar in terms of function and basic form, in some senses the Carthaginian one was actually the odd one out, established to the south of the town on a low plain while other tophets tended in this period and later

57 D’Andrea – Giardino 2011.
58 Bernardini 1996. D’Andrea also discusses the versions of this thesis proposed by Aubet, Acquaro and Moscati, with useful commentary in particular on the eccentricities of the latter.
59 The primacy and centrality of Carthage in the phenomenon is also argued at Aubet 2001: 255.
60 Bernardini 1996: 43, overtly taking a position contrary to that of Stager – Wolff 1984, who suggests that the tophets were a method of population control.
64 Diodorus 5.16.
to be founded to the north on rocky hills and heights. Furthermore, the tophets give little sense of central direction or co-ordination: there is good evidence at Mozia, Sulcis and Carthage for a great deal of variety in the eighth and seventh centuries with regard not only to the types of pottery used, but also the nature and treatment of the dedications (from humans to tortoises), and the kinds of objects buried with them, all of which show "caratteristiche forti di individualità, di fluidità, di sperimentazione".

With regard to the general idea of agricultural settlement in the central Mediterranean, there is very little evidence at Carthage itself or at other Phoenician-speaking coastal settlements in the central Mediterranean for exploitation of a rural territory in this period. The locations of the early tophets also call into question the supposed non-commercial nature of the ‘Circle of the Tophet’: indeed, they might suggest that the commercial interests of these settlements, far from being subordinated to agricultural ones, were in fact a primary factor in their foundation. Carthage, Sulcis and Mozia are grouped around a small and strategically important zone of the Mediterranean, circling the strait between Sicily, Sardinia and North Africa through which, according to the ancient literary sources, almost all East-West shipping travelled. The suspected tophets on Malta and Cyprus could also fit into a shared strategy of exploiting East-West commerce, which could also have represented a challenge to established trading practices and networks. There is no evidence that Carthage was at the front or heart of such a process.

The question remains then: how can we explain the ‘Circle of the Tophet’? At this point we need to look away from Carthage and back to the homeland: just as there were ‘sous-horizons coloniaux’, there must have been ‘sous-horizons métropolitains’. D’Andrea suggests some generic possibilities: the settlers involved may have come from a different political faction in Tyre, as claimed in Carthage’s foundation myth; or from other parts of Phoenicia, explaining the distinction observed in the classical sources between ‘Tyrian’ and ‘Phoenician’ foundations; or, as Sallust’s description of the colonial population might suggest, from a lower social class than those involved in ‘official’ Tyrian foundations. I think we can take such speculations even further: the specific nature of the tophet rituals may be as revealing as the literary sources on the phenomenon of colonization.

The actual votive acts practiced in these sanctuaries were probably imported by the migrants from the Levant, where Iron Age child sacrifice is well-attested amongst
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65 CIASCA 2002: 124-6. There are exceptions: the likely tophet at Cagliari would have been on the coast to the west of the town.
69 BERNARDINI 2008: 645.
70 BECHTOLD 2008: 75 (on Carthage); VAN DOMMELEN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 232-3. This is also true of contemporary Greek colonies in Southern Italy: VAN DOMMELEN 2005: 147.
71 ARNAUD 2005: 154-155, with 152-153 on the problems of travel through the alternative routes of the Straits of Messina and Bonifacio; VELLA 2004: 9 for Malta’s strategic value.
72 D’ANDREA – GIARDINO 2011: 139-140.
Canaanites, Israelites and others, which suggests that these early colonists were keen to emphasise their ritual connection with their homeland as a core aspect of their new settlement. At the same time, no archaeological sites equivalent to the western tophets have yet been found on the Levantine coast. At least on the current evidence, therefore, it seems likely that the practice only became fully institutionalised and ritualised with special sanctuaries in the colonial world. This cultic shift involved the reiteration of the relationship with home at the same time as a move towards cultural independence: such phenomena are standard in diasporic culture but each has its own story. We know from the Hebrew Bible that child sacrifice aroused ire and disgust among some at least of the Israelites, and it seems likely that this was also true among their northern neighbours on the Levantine coast. During Alexander’s siege of Tyre in 332, Curtius Rufus tells us that there was an attempt to “revive” the old tradition of sacrificing a freeborn boy to Saturn; that it was unsuccessful suggests some reservations about this custom in the city, and one wonders about the circumstances in which it died out – or was stopped. However that may be, I want to suggest that the settlers who practiced this particular and unusual form of cult came from a different or indeed dissident religious tradition and left at least in part for that reason. In this scenario, social, cultural, and religious links emerge as more important than ethnic or political ones, and distinguish this group of commercial colonists from others who speak the same language. And for a while at least, this group both thrives in the West, and draws even closer together.

3.2 Consolidation

Not all the tophets themselves thrive – there is no post-archaic evidence for Malta – but the ‘Circle of the Tophet’ expands over time. New sanctuaries are set up later in the eighth century at Tharros and perhaps on the island of Su Cardulinu at Bithia; in the late seventh century we have the first evidence for another tophet in Africa, at the new settlement of Hadrumetum; and then more are established back in Sardinia at Nora in the sixth century, and Cagliari in the fifth or fourth. All seem likely to have been

74 XELLA 2010: 261.
76 For a useful summary of relevant passages, see XELLA 2012.
77 Curtius Rufus 4.3.23.
78 I thank Joseph Greene for making this suggestion to me after a lecture at Tufts University, and for his illuminating comparison with the Plymouth Brethren’s migration to New England.
81 CINTAS 1947. For a convenient summary of the archaeological evidence, MCCARTY 2011; for the latest dating, D’ANDREA – GIARDINO 2011: 136 n. 27, though see MCCARTY 2011, 208 n. 20 on the promised revision of the chronology by Wafa Messaoudi. The markers have never been fully published, but there are partial presentations in CINTAS 1947, BISI 1967 and MOSCATI 1996 (with new material).
established along with the urban settlement in which they are found. Sardinia rather than Carthage appears to be at the heart of this network: unlike in Sicily, and very unlike in Africa, all the major early settlements of Phoenician-speakers on Sardinia had a tophet. Furthermore, Carthage was still in a sense the odd man out: articulated monuments such as ‘cippi’ and ‘thrones’ start to appear in the tophet there from the mid-seventh century or earlier, but at none of the other tophets until the sixth century – meaning that until then they looked more like each other than like the sanctuary at Carthage.

The fact that most of the other tophets did start to feature such articulated markers in the sixth century, that many of them took the form of aediculae or little shrines, and that the urns used for the burials also became much more similar, might however seem to support Moscati’s model of a major shift in that period towards dependence on Carthage. After all, the change in burial practices in ‘normal’ cemeteries discussed in section 1 above happens at more or less the same time in the same settlements on Sardinia that had tophets, and this is also the period in which new elements of material culture appear in these settlements, such as ceramic types and ostrich eggs, which seem to have come through Carthage. It is hardly surprising that for D’Andrea, despite his spirited deconstruction of the central role traditionally given to Carthage in the archaic ‘Circle of the Tophet’, the foundations of the new “tofet punici” from the mid-sixth century on “appaiono collegati direttamente all’imperialismo ed alla religiosità cartaginese”.

I want to suggest though that there is another way of looking at the situation, that accepts religious links between Carthage and the other settlements but questions the role of empire. Quite apart from the fact that serious doubts can be expressed about the scope and enthusiasm of Carthaginian imperialism in Sardinia in this period, it is not very clear why tophets would be a useful part of or response to imperial strategy. It would certainly be hard to use both the extension and the consolidation of the tophets in the sixth century as evidence that they were imposed and/or controlled from outside, as the ‘new’ tophets seem least interested in the consolidated visual model; Nora does not seem to have had markers in its earliest stages, and Hadrumetum did not have them until the late fifth or even fourth century. Instead, it seems likely that most of the new tophet-sites reflect a secondary settlement dynamic of informal emigration involving those of a similar religious persuasion from places that already had tophets, whether other settlements on Sardinia or elsewhere (including Carthage). While some of the new foundations may relate to the commercial model proposed above – Hadrumetum could exploit or control coastal access via Cap Bon to the strait linking Carthage to Sicily, and Cagliari became a particularly important node in Mediterranean shipping networks – it
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84 Bernardini argues that although the first traces of colonial presence (most notably at Nora) are rather earlier, the tophets appear with intensive settlement at these sites (1996: 544).
85 I use the generic term ‘marker’ to avoid the terminological confusion surrounding various distinctions made between the terms ‘cippus’ and ‘stele’. It should be noted that the relationship between ‘markers’ and urns is often rather unclear.
86 BONDI 2004: 22.
87 D’ANDREA - GIARDINO 2011: 144.
88 Most recently VAN DOMMELEN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 6-8 with earlier bibliography.
89 D’ANDREA – GIARDINO 2011: 133.
90 MOSCATI 1992a: 25.
has been argued convincingly that Bithia, Cagliari, Nora and Monte Sirai were agricultural centres, founded to capitalise on contacts and exchange with the indigenous population; there seems no reason to invoke central direction in this process.

Looking in more detail at the relationships constructed between the markers where they do occur suggests that we do not need to invoke active imperialism on Carthage’s part to explain the consolidation of the visual aspect of the tophet phenomenon. Even when the same visual strategies are used, it isn’t necessarily the case that the other sites copy them from Carthage: the throne-forms that act as incense burner bases seem to start around the same time at both Carthage and Mozia. But more generally, as is well known to specialists, the markers used at other tophets don’t suggest a slavish imitation of Carthage; often in fact the choices that are made about forms and motifs often suggest ambivalence towards and even differentiation from that Carthaginian model. There are of course differences of a purely practical nature – the type of stone available, which has consequences for the techniques applied to it, for instance, or the details of the mouldings, which are probably due to local workshops and apprenticeship networks. These differences might tell us some interesting things about social history, but they don’t in themselves carry social meaning. Other differences however seem to involve more deliberate dissociations.

The most dramatic distinction is between the iconography on the markers from Carthage and Sulcis, very likely the two earliest tophets. Geometric motifs, including ‘baetys’, lozenges and the so-called bottle idols were very popular at Carthage, especially among the earlier markers there which might have been thought to ‘influence’ those found at Sulcis (which sadly lack stratigraphic dating): such geometric forms appear on 57% of the 627 catalogued markers from the sixth-fourth centuries (Fig. 3). But in fact the only geometric symbol found at Sulcis is the baetyl, and even that occurs on only 11% of the 825 non-fragmentary markers published from that sanctuary, compared with 40% of the pre-Hellenistic markers published from Carthage. Instead, there is an immense emphasis on the human figure, which is found on 71% of the markers from Sulcis, but only 6% of the markers from Carthage. At Sulcis men and women are featured in a variety of poses, clothed and nude (Fig. 4); at Carthage, by contrast, the range of human types is much more restricted. These human figures also illustrate the way in which a significant amount of the marker iconography that makes reference to the homeland in the East is rarer at Carthage than in the other tophets:

92 The tophet markers have attracted much scholarly attention and a large bibliography: useful summaries include BISI 1967 and (much more briefly) MOSCATI 1992b.
94 Noted with regard to Mozia at BERNARDINI 1996: 45 n. 56.
95 On the problems of this designation, see QUINN 2011: 408 n. 54.
96 All the statistics presented here and in the following paragraphs should be assessed with full awareness that they involve small and poorly-dated data-sets, which are in no case a complete record of the material excavated, much of which may have been lost to private collectors: see MOSCATI – UBERTI 1985: 77 on the problems of the Nora collection. In all cases I have ignored fragments and bases of markers and, given the difficulty of second-guessing from photographs, taken the editors’ best guesses as to form and iconography.
there are ten markers at Carthage with a woman holding a disk (probably a tambourine) at her chest⁹⁸, which is at Sulcis the dominant type, with over 250 examples⁹⁹. There are also examples of identifications with the homeland on Sardinian and Sicilian tophet markers that seem to bypass Carthage entirely: the stool-altar (*altare a sgabello*) which is found in the Levant is depicted on markers at Mozia, Sulcis, Tharros and Nora, but not at Carthage¹⁰⁰. And in a more technical vein, a few markers at Mozia and Tharros use a *polymaterico* technique also found at Sidon, but which is again entirely absent at Carthage¹⁰¹. Moscati puts this Sicilian-Sardinian phenomenon down to a sea-route from the East that “presumably excluded Carthage” which had “Sicilia come punto di passaggio fino alla Sardegna”. This may have something to it, but Sicilian and Sardinian traders and travellers were hardly unaware of fashions at Carthage, and ideas do not travel on their own: choice is involved here as well.

So Carthage is not, or not always, the central reference point for the tophets in this period, but it will already be apparent that the iconographic evidence doesn’t point to straightforward regional or island patterns either: instead it suggests that the tophets are a polythetic set, with a criss-crossing series of identifications across the whole network. Hadrumetum, the only other tophet in Africa in this period, provides a good example. Although the tophet goes back to the seventh century, the community at Hadrumetum only started to use markers at all in the late fifth century at the earliest, some considerable time after the Sardinian and Sicilian tophets followed Carthage’s lead in this respect. Just seven examples have been positively dated to the disturbed stratum II (c. 400-250) and these have never been fully published, so it is impossible to make reliable generalisations¹⁰². It seems clear however that these markers already take the form of flat slabs, an innovation that we also see replacing the earlier *aedicula* form at Carthage at this time¹⁰³; and two depict the baetyl common to most of tophets in this period¹⁰⁴, although the fact that at Hadrumetum they are triple baetyl puts them closer to the markers from Nora than those from Carthage¹⁰⁵. Several others, however, show unusual scenes with human figures. In two (perhaps three¹⁰⁶) cases women holding round objects are seen in profile seated before incense burners (Fig. 5)¹⁰⁷. These recall, without reproducing, the standing females holding round objects at Nora (Fig. 6), Mozia and (only in frontal view) Sulcis (Fig. 4). In a third scene a male figure, again in profile, sits in an elaborate sphinx throne, holding a sceptre and facing a smaller figure¹⁰⁸.
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¹⁰² MCCARTY 2011 for a fuller account of the problems involved.  
¹⁰³ QUINN 2011: 396.  
¹⁰⁶ One of the markers found in this stratum was extremely fragmentary, showing only the feet of a person seated before what might have been an incense-burner: CINTAS 1947: 24-5. Moscati publishes what may be a fourth example of the same type (1996: 253 and fig. A).  
Presumably a deity, he is not found at Carthage, but has very close iconographic parallels in contemporary or slightly earlier western and eastern Phoenician-speaking contexts\textsuperscript{109}. A fourth appears to be a representation of the Egyptian goddess Hathor\textsuperscript{110}. As Moscati put it, “si caratterizzano, nelle loro iconografie, per l’assoluta originalità rispetto a Cartagine, nonché per gli evidenti richiami vicino-orientali”\textsuperscript{111}.

We can see similar complexity in the Sardinian and Sicilian tophets, so that the woman holding her breasts is popular not only at Mozia, appearing on 10% of the markers from that sanctuary\textsuperscript{112}. but also at Sulcis, whereas it occurs on one or two published markers from Carthage\textsuperscript{113}, just one from Tharros\textsuperscript{114}, and at most two or three from Nora\textsuperscript{115}, which in general “si lega particolarmente e direttamente a Cartagine”\textsuperscript{116}. The point emerges more clearly from a comparison of the catalogued markers from Carthage, Mozia, Tharros and Nora, all conveniently dateable to the sixth-fourth centuries BCE (Fig. 7). While baetyls, and, to a lesser extent, bottle idols are fairly popular everywhere, the Sardinian tophets have very different proportions of human figures: high at Nora and Mozia, as they were at Sulcis, but much lower at Tharros. At the same time, the iconographic differences between Carthage and its maritime near-neighbour Mozia are almost as great as those between Carthage and Sulcis: this is particularly obvious in the distribution of the lozenge/hexagon symbol: quite popular at Carthage, it is much less so at Tharros and Nora, very rare at Mozia – and, we could also note, completely absent at Sulcis and Hadrumetum.

Some concepts from the body of social network theory recently used by Irad Malkin to elucidate the archaic Greek world can help us understand what is going on here in the Phoenician West. Malkin argues that networks of relationships were consolidating everywhere in the Mediterranean in the sixth century, in a “transition from the more mixed, many-to-many, decentralized networks of the early archaic Mediterranean to the more homogenized ones of the late archaic period (ca. mid-sixth century), where many actors or nodes had fewer links, and few nodes acquired a growing number of links”\textsuperscript{117}. He explains this development as a process of ‘preferential attachment’ that could also offer us an alternative explanation for the undoubted if partial new focus on Carthage within the ‘Circle of the Tophet’, and it is one that does not require imperialism or even agency on that city’s part: the normal experience in networks of all kinds, from friendship circles to the internet, is that in choosing what connections to make, nodes (i.e. in this case individual settlements or sanctuaries) tend to prefer to link with nodes that already have a lot of links: as the largest and most successful of the Phoenician-speaking cities, Car-

\textsuperscript{109} OGGIANO 2008: 284 fig 1.5, with earlier bibliography; for substantial lists of Levantine comparanda, CINTAS 1947: 16-17; BISI 1967: 95-96.
\textsuperscript{110} CINTAS 1947, no. 116: it should be noted that this marker was found in a favissa, and its dating to this level (CINTAS 1947: 56) is therefore stylistic rather than stratigraphic. It is accepted at BISI 1967: 93 and MOSCATI 1996: 249.
\textsuperscript{111} MOSCATI 1996: 249.
\textsuperscript{112} MOSCATI 1986: 57; MOSCATI – UBERTI 1981: 46-49.
\textsuperscript{113} BARTOLONI 1976: nos 63 (?), 601.
\textsuperscript{114} MOSCATI – UBERTI 1985: no. 139.
\textsuperscript{115} MOSCATI – UBERTI 1970: nos 61-63.
\textsuperscript{116} MOSCATI 1992b: 39.
\textsuperscript{117} MALKIN 2011: 40.
thage would exercise an obvious attraction to the others. At the same time, however, the
dissociations from Carthage and the cross-cutting visual identifications within the Circle
of the Tophet appear to demonstrate a continuation of the proliferation of weak links
between these settlements which add up to a coherent and dynamic but non-centralised
system, or a 'small world'\textsuperscript{118} where peer polity interaction and socio-cultural links still
prove stronger than imperialism or political relationships.

3.3 Fragmentation

Most of the tophets continue into the Hellenistic period, and in the case of
Hadrumentum well beyond. The Mozia tophet seems to have survived that city's
destruction at the hands of Dionysius I of Syracuse in 397, perhaps even into the third
century\textsuperscript{119}, and it may well have been replaced or supplemented by a tophet at Mozia’s
successor settlement of Lilybaeum, where eight Hellenistic-period markers were found
that resemble tophet markers elsewhere\textsuperscript{120}. On Sardinia a new sanctuary was established
at Monte Sirai in the mid-fourth century\textsuperscript{121}, and the sanctuaries seem not to have been
affected by the Roman annexation of the island in the mid-third century: the sanctuaries
operated until the third or second centuries at Nora; into the second at Monte Sirai; and
until the second or first at Tharros and Sulcis. The attraction of Carthage as a visual
model, however, does not seem to have lasted as long: at Mozia, for instance, markers
seem to stop being erected by the end of the sixth century, more than a century before
the destruction of the city\textsuperscript{122}, and at Tharros and perhaps Nora very few markers have
been dated later than the fourth century\textsuperscript{123}. Where markers did continue to be erected,
by contrast with the criss-crossing links of the consolidation phase, Carthage’s example
seems now to have been compelling only to its closest neighbours in Africa and Sicily.

While neither the markers from Hadrumentum Level III (c. 250-150) nor from from
the hypothesised Hellenistic-period tophet at Lilybaeum tend to reproduce the overall
style of the markers from Carthage in this period – the faces are rarely sub-divided, for
instance\textsuperscript{124} – they do make multiple identifications with them: in both cases we find
gables and acroteria, ‘Hellenising’ features, inscriptions to Tinnit as well as Baal
Hammon, and depictions of Signs of Tanit and caducei, which are all now very popular
at Carthage. The mapping is not of course complete: the hand, which was also common
in the final period of the Carthage tophet, is missing at Lilybaeum and only one
example has been published from Hadrumentum\textsuperscript{125}, and baetyls remain in wide use at
Hadrumentum long after they were abandoned at Carthage. Multiples continue to be

\textsuperscript{118} MALKIN 2011: 5, 26-27. This conception of ‘worlds’ constructed of the links between far-flung nodes
neatly avoids giving ethnic labels to geographical blocks.

\textsuperscript{119} CIASCA 1992: 139.

\textsuperscript{120} Seven are presented at DI STEFANO 1993: 39-40; an eighth is discussed at BISI 1967: 50-51. Overview
at MOSCATI 1987: 145-146.

\textsuperscript{121} BONDI 1995, with earlier bibliography; Markers: BONDI 1972; 1980.

\textsuperscript{122} CIASCA 1992: 132, 135.

\textsuperscript{123} MOSCATI – UBERTI 1970: 43-45; MOSCATI – UBERTI 1985: 51-57. In both cases the arguments depend
on style.

\textsuperscript{124} BROWN 1991: 110 on this phenomenon at Hadrumentum; this is also true of all but one of the
Lilybaeum sample.

\textsuperscript{125} MOSCATI 1996: fig. S.
preferred: there are 51 triple baetyls from third-first century Hadrumetum as opposed to eight altogether from Carthage. Triple baetyls are also found on one of the Lilybaeum markers, alongside images of a Sign of Tanit, a caduceus, and a human figure (apparently a priest) before an incense burner (Fig. 8) that finds just two, much less high quality, parallels among the thousands of stelai from Carthage. Four other representations of similar scenes from Lilybaeum have a very different visual style, showing in their main field a female human figure or (in one case) figures wearing Greek-style chitons and himations, standing in profile before an incense burner and holding round objects (Fig. 8). Details of the costume aside, these echo the seated female figures from the Hadrumetum markers of the fourth or early third centuries. All in all, the markers from Hadrumetum and Lilybaeum seem to take a similar stance towards models supplied by Carthage, and sometimes to relate more directly to each other, suggesting that the identifications involved continued to operate as a small regional network rather than two sets of bilateral relationships with Carthage.

Sardinia presents a rather different image in this period. Some Signs of Tanit do appear at Nora and Tharros before markers stop being erected at those sanctuaries, but no hands are found on any of the Sardinian markers, and just one or two caducei. In terms of form, and as far as can be ascertained from the uncertain dating, the markers at Sulcis are the closest to the Carthaginian ones: they too became flatter and thinner and acquired gables and acroteria, often combining ‘Egyptianising’ and ‘Hellenising’ architectural elements. Frontal female figures remain the iconographic norm however, and there are also about 70 markers with semi-circular tops in the Eastern style and representations of animals in profile, which have been tentatively dated to the third century, and find two parallels at Hadrumetum. The 140 markers that survive from the new and neighbouring sanctuary at Monte Sirai are highly dependent on Sulcitian models for their iconography: as at Sulcis the baetyl is the only geometric figure, and two thirds of the markers feature humans, in particular the woman with a disk. The people of Monte Sirai do however mark some distinctions from their near-neighbours: the repertoire of imagery is rather limited and the humanoid figures can be rather odd, with enlarged heads, trapezoidal bodies, and, in the case of the women, unusually long arms. In terms of form and decoration, only a single marker reproduces, inexacty, the third-century semi-circular form commonly found at Sulcis, and most of the markers are still ‘Egyptianising’ aediculae rather than flat slabs – a strikingly archaising choice given the available models at that time, including at Sulcis – and there is little sign of decorative elements associated with the Greek-speaking Mediterranean.

In general we can say that the Hellenistic period, and in particular the period of the Punic Wars, saw a fragmentation in the ‘Circle of the Tophet’, with the Sardinian sites in particular moving further away from the model of Carthage, as well as from each
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127 BISI 1967: 151.
128 MOSCATI 1986: 84; note that this dating is stylistic.
129 MOSCATI 1986: 16.
130 MOSCATI 1986: 75-79.
131 MOSCATI 1986: 77-78.
other. Political and imperial connections also seem to come to the fore for the first time: Lilybaeum had been founded by Carthage\textsuperscript{133} and Hadrumetum was allied with Carthage from at least the late fourth century until it submitted to Rome in 149\textsuperscript{134}. The context of the partial dislocation of the tophet sites in Sardinia from those further south is less clear. This phenomenon seems to predate the Roman victory in the first Punic War and their subsequent ‘annexation’ of the island in 237 BCE if the markers at Nora and Tharros do indeed stop before that point; it is certainly true that references to the goddess Tinnit appears in inscriptions from Carthage – and Mozia – long before Rome’s victory, but never on Sardinia. It is also the case that most or all of the Sardinian tophets continue to operate under Rome, at least for a while; and at Monte Sirai major works take place in the tophet towards the end of the third century\textsuperscript{135}; we might compare the evidence from Sardinian rural survey, which shows striking continuity in settlement patterns and in sites themselves from the late fifth to the first centuries BCE\textsuperscript{136}. But if the shift was not related to the end of Carthaginian power on Sardinia, can it be explained instead by the rise of Carthaginian imperialism there? As noted above, the literary evidence at least points to a greater political interest in Sardinia on the part of Carthage in the fourth century, just as the users of the tophets there seem to be severing their visual identifications with the North African city. Cultural and political or imperial links are not it seems always co-terminous, as on the standard ‘Punic World’ model, but may be positively at odds with each other.

4. Conclusions

If there was a corporate Western Phoenician or ‘Punic’ diaspora culture, the tophet sanctuaries weren’t part of it. Instead, ritualised child sacrifice was a cultural practice that was shared among a small group of Phoenician-speaking migrant communities in the central Mediterranean, and one that shows us those communities choosing to identify with each other in such a way as publicly to constitute a distinct set of privileged relationships: the creation of a central Mediterranean ‘sous-horizon colonial’ that was at its height in the sixth century BCE. As the same time the distinctive material cultures of these sanctuaries allowed the different settlements to undermine this mutual identification and underline their difference and distance from each other, distances which increased over time. In particular, these distinctions suggest not a series of cultural alliances with Carthage, but an interconnected criss-crossing network of sites throughout its history: as has been said of software development and of Greek networks in the Mediterranean, the ‘Circle of the Tophet’ was not a neat, hierarchical cathedral, but more like a bazaar.\textsuperscript{137} Once this is recognised, and the central role of Carthage in the phenomenon is questioned, new historical possibilities emerge which challenge traditional connections between religion, commerce, culture and imperialism.

\textsuperscript{133} Diodorus 22.10.4.

\textsuperscript{134} Appian, \textit{Libyka} 94.

\textsuperscript{135} BONDI 1995: 230.

\textsuperscript{136} VAN DOMMELN – GÓMEZ BELLARD 2008: 172.

\textsuperscript{137} Eric Raymond’s classic essay on the open-source development process of Linux and fetchmail in the 1990s (http://www.catb.org/esr/writings/homesteading/cathedral-bazaar/index.html) is cited at MALKIN 2011: 9.
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Figures

Fig. 1: The “Phoenician and West Phoenician/Carthaginian World” in Brill’s Historical Atlas of the Ancient World (after WITKE et al. 2010: 71).

Fig. 2: Certain and likely tophet sites in the Phoenician-speaking colonies of the Mediterranean. (Map: Maxine Anastasi).
Fig. 3: Markers with geometric motifs (lozenge and baetyl) in the Carthage tophet. (Photograph: author.)

Fig. 4. Marker depicting woman holding a round object from the Sulcis tophet: BARTOLONI 1986: no. 263. (Photograph: author.)
Fig. 5. Marker depicting woman seated before an incense burner from the Hadrumetum tophet. (Photograph: INP Tunis).

Fig. 6. Marker depicting woman holding a round object from the Nora tophet. (After Moscati 1992b: fig. 28)
Fig. 7. Comparison of major motifs chosen at Carthage, Mozia, Tharros and Nora (sixth – fourth century BCE). (Chart: Maxine Anastasi).

Fig. 8. Markers from Lilybaeum depicting a priest and two women before incense burners. (After Di Stefano 1993: tav. 38).