The Phoenicians in Brazil and Uruguay

A clamoring international press announced in 1929 that a Brazilian scholar, Professor Ludovico Ciunhanej, had revealed in a Conference Paper delivered at the Academy of History and Geography in Sao Paolo, that the Phoenicians had been to Brazil at the time of the Trojan Wars; that

55) The Phoenicians having supposedly discovered the Americas and reached Brazil millennia before Columbus is still a question fraught with controversy. The Phoenician inscription to which Charles Corin refers in this segment is presumably the famed Paraiba Stone; an inscription supposedly discovered on the plantation of one Joaquim Alves da Costa, whose son was reported to have copied on paper and sent to the Viscount of Sapucahy, President of the Instituto Historico of Rio de Janeiro for analysis and review (see Cyrus Gordon's Before Columbus, 122-123.) After much quibbling over the inscription, namely a few disagreements involving the illustrious French philologist Ernest Renan, it was decided that the Phoenician inscription in question had to be a fake. And so, the issue would remain dormant until in 1966 Dr. Jules Piccus, a professor of Romance Languages at the University of Massachusetts happened upon an 1874 edition of the inscription in an old scrapbook he had recently purchased. Piccus would send copies of the Phoenician text to his friend Cyrus Gordon (Department of Mediterranean Studies at Brandeis University.) Gordon promptly translated the inscription as follows:

We are Sidonian Canaanites from the city of the Merchant King. We were cast up on this distant island, a land of mountains. We sacrificed a youth to the celestial gods and goddesses in the nineteenth year of our mighty King Hirwan and embarked from Ezion-Geber into the Red Sea. We voyaged with ten ships and were at sea together for two years around Africa. Then we were separated by the hand of Baal and were no longer with our companions. So we have come here, twelve men and three women, into "Island of Iron."
is, more than 1000 years before Christ. Ciunhanej corroborated his finds by way of examining inscriptions, architectural finds, and etymological studies. The evidence he adduced can be summed up as follows:

INSCRIPTIONS:

The most important piece of evidence presented by Ciunhanej consisted of a text engraved on a stele discovered on a sandy bank of the River Serido in the Province of Rio Grande do Norte. The stele was submitted to the scrutiny of a number of archaeologists during the reign of Emperor Pedro II, and namely to the analysis of Ernest Renan who had just recently published his famous *Mission de Phénicie*. Renan confirmed that the stele indeed dated back to some 800 before Christ, and he provided the following translation:

*After a long journey at sea, fraught with dangers, I came ashore a new harbor, with my companions and thirty craftsmen aboard our four remaining ships. Following a march of a few days inland, we came to this mountain where we happened upon a number of mines. We worked here for six (or ten) years and quarried gold, copper, and a wealth of precious stones. Signed: Alkhton, Commander and President; Nada, Assistant and Secretary.*

Another inscription found in 1892 on an ancient sarcophagus in Montevideo was deciphered, and read as follows: "And during the (?) Olympic year, when Alexander the Great, son of Philip, was King of Macedon, Ptolemy was sent on a mission." A correspondent covering the Sao Paolo Conference wrote that "in the opinion of [Ciunhanej] the Brazilian scholar, this inscription suggests that Alexander the Great, after having destroyed Tyre, dispatched a mission to South America, and that the mission had reached its destination. But doesn't the fact that Alexander would even dispatch a mission to South America prove that such transatlantic contacts already existed in those days? Moreover, is it fathomable that, back in those times, Alexander the Great would have been able to embark on such a venture without soliciting Phoenician help; the only mariners then capable of such an undertaking?"

MONUMENTS:

In addition to this sarcophagus, which is manifest revelation of the Phoenicians' presence in the modern capital of Uruguay, Mr. Ludovico Ciunhanej demonstrated that "the Amazon city of Maranon was built atop a network of ancient underground tunnels measuring a total of some 4200 meters, featuring a number of side corridors and perpendicular...

57) In 332 BC, Alexander the Great is reported to have laid a seven month siege to the island opposite the Tyre harbor – where Phoenicians were known to garrison and take refuge during times of danger. He ultimately built a causeway from the mainland to the island, laid waste to the besieged city killing some 10,000 of its Phoenician inhabitants and selling 30,000 more into slavery.
apertures leading to chambers large enough to, each, accommodate fifty people at a time.” Mr. Cunjhanej has personally examined these structures, “initially believing them to have been elaborate Christian catacombs. However, following a period of scrupulous cogitation, in collaboration with a number of colleagues in the field, including the Archbishop of the city – who was himself a qualified and licensed scholar – Cunjhanej and his colleagues finally accepted the obvious, and admitted the vestiges under examination to have been precious stones mines, excavated by the Phoenicians, etc...”

ETYMOLOGY:

Additionally, Mr. Cunjhanej has demonstrated that the very name of the city of Maranon, built in the middle of the Amazon River, in the eponymous Principality of Marahao, was itself of Phoenician origin. He argued that “in fact, the ancient inhabitants of Tyre used the appellation “eion,” “ion,” or “elion” in reference to an island or an archipelago. “Mar-ion,” with its corrupted cognate derivations “Maranion,” “Maraphon,” “Marahon,” and “Marahao,” is none other than “The Great [or lofty 58] Ion” in the Phoenician language”; an accurate description of that city, smack in the middle of the Amazon River, whose waters offered protection against neighborhood incursions. Cunjhanej further claims that “the Brazilian city of “Turus,” or “Taurus,” derives the origins of its name from that of the Phoenician metropolis of Tyre. Even the name of my own country, Brazil (“Bar-Sil”; with a cognate prefix

58) The Canaanite/Phoenician prefix “Mar” or “Mor,” which is still used in modern spoken Lebanese in reference to Christian Saints, means “Lord” or “Sovereign Ruler” etc... “Mar” has also the semantic connotation of “loftiness,” “height,” and “grandeur.”
The Phoenicians in Polynesia, New Zealand, Tahiti, Hawaii, Samoa, and the Bering Strait

A bevy of arguments tear into the opinions of historians appraising whence and by way of which routes the Phoenicians were able to reach America. Archaeologist Hume Bolden, along with a number of other scholars, believes the Phoenicians to have reached America from the Far East, by crossing the Bering Strait at a point between the Alaska and Kamchatka Peninsulas, on the threshold of the Arctic Ocean. Other scholars maintain that our Phoenician mariners reached the New World by crossing the Pacific Ocean, following a string of Polynesian islands and atolls where more than mere traces of their passage have been recently revealed. Dr. Ciumhanej admits that one is justified in accepting both proposed assumptions as possible Phoenician navigation routes. Personally, I happen to be of the opinion that had our ancestors employed either the Northern or Southern Pacific routes, does not preclude them from having reached America by way of the Atlantic Ocean as well. Either way, in a monograph titled The Maoris of New Zealand historian James Cowan\(^{59}\) argues that the Polynesian

---

59) James Cowan (1870-1943) was a journalist and non-fiction writer noted for his works on Maori ethnography. The Maoris are the indigenous Polynesian peoples of New Zealand.
Maoris belong to a more or less distant branch of the Caucasian people; and, as we know, the Caucasus and the area around the Black Sea is a region where the Phoenicians are known to have had an important presence during antiquity, long before the times of the legends of Jason and the Argonauts. 60

The passage below is excerpted from the Saturday October 24 1936 issue of The Wireless News journal, published by the Pacific Wireless Press Agency (247 George Street, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.) The article in question deals with the Maoris of Polynesia, and the portion that concerns us reads as follows:

Customs are more persistent than language, and some of the most common habits of these people [the Maoris] are identical to those one notes among the ancient mariner peoples; this is corroborated by the fact that the Maoris have racial affinities with the ancient Chaldeans, from whom they seem to have acquired most of their knowledge in astronomy, and that they also have blood ties with the Phoenicians, who were the most adventurous of ancient mariners.

In his book *Man, Present and Past* [sic.] 61 Professor A.H. Keane concurs with key anthropologists who believe that the “Polynesians of the East Pacific, and namely those hailing from the Archipelago clusters of Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, Tahiti, Hawaii, Cook Islands, and New Zealand, can trace their ancestry to any

given one of the historic boats that made it to their shores prior to the fourteenth century.”

All of these above mentioned scholars are *bona fide* academics, not naïf amateurs or impostors. Yet they profess and publish their discoveries *urbi et orbi*, and earn from the placid High Court of conservative historians nothing but sanctimonious shrugs in return; their evidence meriting not the slightest consideration. What we should hope for, therefore, is not the Phoenicians miraculous discovery of America, but rather the miracle of crediting those brave Phoenicians with that discovery!... And so as to help us patiently endure the waiting, we shall conclude this lecture with a few quotes culled from President Georges Bidault’s keynote address to the UNESCO’s General Assembly convening in Beirut:

*Going forth from their country’s triple-splendor of sky, soil, and sea, the Phoenicians have set the example and given a valuable lesson on how to go beyond the Mediterranean […] Thanks to the Phoenicians, the sea has ceased being the abyss and was rendered a roadway […] Thanks to them, inquiry and discovery, industry and progress, have suddenly all become accessible and feasible.*
ROOTS OF THE
PHOENICIAN EXPANSION
ITS SPLENDORS
AND ITS INCARNATIONS

Giant painting by Frederic Lord Leighton (1830-1896) in the main hall of the London Royal Exchange Building titled "Phoenician bartering with ancient Britons".
WE HAVE already seen that the Phoenicians left their lands of origin because they were enterprising people, because they felt a calling to set sail and accomplish something grand, and because sitting astride their mountaintops, peering into the lure of the Mediterranean, it was easy for them to grow wings.

Yet, these answers do not exactly explain it all, and indeed give rise to serious and legitimate questions. Why did the Phoenicians opt to wander off so far astray, and so dangerously so, from the Mediterranean? Why did they not go for an easier option, moving deeper into the North African hinterland, where the weather was more temperate, and where they’d already been well established on coastal areas such as Utica (Atik; Old), Carthage (Kart Hadasht; New Land, Neapoli, Napoli, New York), Ghadir (like the Lebanese town of Ghazir), Tarshish or Tartessos (like our Tartous), Cadiz (a cognate of Kasdir, the tin that they mined), or Malaga, as in Mallaca (Mallaha), the other Phoenician settlement in the Far East? Why did they risk their lives and their property by opting to travel so far afield, instead of choosing to expand and prosper locally, and cautiously?...

The only plausible explanation to these daring
Their Peaceful Pacifist Spirit

The Phoenicians were peaceful pacifists not only because war arguably disrupted their commercial ventures and posed a threat to their market infrastructures; rather, they were loath to war because belligerent proclivities and sanguinary instincts were the very antitheses of their liberal and conciliatory religious spirit.

“In order to conclude a peace treaty,” wrote Fustel de Coulanges in his *La Cité Antique*, a religious act was necessary.” 62 Deeply religious by nature, the Phoenicians carried their local gods along with them on their travels, fixing them on the bows of their vessels, setting them on the high-places of their newly settled territories, housing them in magnificent temples, even before raising their new cities off the ground and before building their own dwellings. We know this not only because of the Phoenician temples in Tyre, Carthage, Byblos, and Utica; but also due to their no less famous temples at Pathos on Cyprus, Kythera in Greece, and the temple of Heracles in Monaco and Gibraltar. But perhaps the greatest of them all was the temple of

62) Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique* (Paris: Flammarion, 1984), p. 245. What is remarkable about this work (1864) is that, in it, Fustel de Coulanges attempts to demonstrate the importance of religion in shaping the political and social character of ancient Greece and Rome.
Venus of Eryx, built on the western tip of the island of Sicily, on the site of the ancient harbor of Lylibaemum, which still known to this day by its Phoenician name, Marsala—a region whose modern wines are incidentally compared to Lebanon’s famous Vins d’Or. We already know, thanks to the Periplus of Hanno, that two days after having set sail from the Strait of Gibraltar on the Atlantic Ocean, our brave Phoenicians reached a point on the coast, in the vicinity of Cape Shiloh, where they established a new city, which they named Thymiatetum. They hastened to erect on the site a temple dedicated to Neptune, their god of the sea to whom they dedicated this latest expedition. This explains the reason why, in order to conclude a peace treaty, the Phoenicians developed a series of sacrificial rites evincing the utmost devotion and ceremony. Taking their gods as witness of their sincerity, the Phoenicians’ peace treaties had strikingly solemn and sacrosanct characteristics.

Yet, Fustel de Coulanges never went as far back as the Phoenicians in evaluating the institutions of the “ancient city” — in his La Cité Antique. Indeed, acquiescing in the common assumptions of conventional wisdom, he never considered possible progenitors to classical civilization beyond the Greeks and the Romans, hardly suspecting the latter to have in fact been students and heirs of the Phoenicians. “We have already seen in the Iliad,” writes Fustel de Coulanges:

how noble heralds fetched the offerings, lambs and wine, to ratify their solemn oaths pledged to the gods; then the army chief, with his hand on the victims’ heads, addressed the gods and swore his sacred oaths

63) Lylibaemum was one of the major Carthaginian strongholds on the island of Sicily, built in 396 BC by H��ΙΙικο.)

He then proceeded to immolate the lambs and pour out the libation while the army intoned the following prayer: “O gods immortal! As this victim has been struck down by the sword, so shall the first who violates this oath also be so stricken down, with his head also so crushed.”

Speaking of Roman customs, Fustel de Coulanges added that

Virgil, who described with such scrupulous accuracy the manners and rites of the Romans, did not stray much from Homer when he described how a treaty was concluded; a hearth was built between the two armies and an altar was raised to their common deities. A priest clothed in white robes brought forth the victim; the two chiefs then proceeded to pour out the libation, invoking the gods, and pronouncing their oaths; the victim was then slain and its flesh cooked over the flame of the altar.

In the end, both the Greeks and the Romans adopted religious rituals similar to those of the Phoenicians in concluding their peace treaties. But these rituals were a foreign loan, utterly alien to their innermost impulses and their true natures. For in the conduct of both their public and private lives, both ancient Greeks and Romans displayed a sort of utilitarian temperament that, in today’s parlance, is often referred to as Realpolitik; a temperament whereby they conveniently degraded the gods so as to render them more mundane and involve them more easily in their own base passions. Whereas for the Phoenicians the gods were a subject of reverence, worship, and veneration, for other nations they were often mere instruments of histrionics and ostentatious pageantry; devices with which to better exalt one’s own lust for power and one’s warlike appetite. Indeed, the Romans observed precious
little of the religious spirit that they feigned in their official oaths, that they repeatedly violated their peace treaties with the Phoenicians, all the while noisily crying foul and accusing the latter of infamy. Alas, deception and war propaganda tactics are hardly a modern invention, and the Romans seemed to have performed brilliantly in that field. Alas, it is in this manner, and thanks to the sordidness of an evident inversion of realities, that the false accusations of fad faith – that the victorious Romans leveled against the defeated and silent Phoenicians – became a synonym of “Punic Faith!”…"

64) The infamous Punic Faith utterance was essentially an accusation of treachery leveled by the Romans against the Poeni (or Punî), that is the Carthaginian descendants of the Phoenicians. In reality, however, and as noted by Corm, whatever betrayal and duplicity the Phoenicians were guilty of – this is obviously one of the earliest forms of anti-Semitism – the Romans seem to have surpassed them by leaps and bounds. In this sense, Roman accusations of Phoenician treachery seem like a brilliant example of “a pot calling a kettle black.”

65) Titus Livius (59 BC – 17 AD), also known as Livy, was a Roman historian and author of Ab urbe condita (From the Founding of a City), a monumental history of Rome spanning some 800 years.

Their Treaties of Peace and Alliance Facts

Yet, to our knowledge, one of the first cities with which Rome has concluded an alliance pact was Caere, in Etruria. Livy gave the following motives behind the treaty:

In the midst of the disaster that was the invasion of Gaul, the Roman gods had taken refuge in Caere. They dwelt in that city; they were worshiped in it; a sacred bond of hospitality was therefore formed between them and the Etruscan people. As a result, it was religion that made it well nigh impossible for Rome and Caere to oppose one another; they had become allies, eternally.

Yet, as we shall see a little later as we begin examining Phoenician art and the splendid Punic ivory unearthed in its tombs, Caere, not unlike its sister cities of Aliusium and Zambra, was in fact a Phoenician city, albeit in the land of the Etruscans. “An intimate relationship linked the Etruscans and the Carthaginians,” wrote Aristotle. And the Romans had so fastidiously “honored” their treaties with the Etruscans in general, and with Caere in particular,
that they eventually ended up subjugating and eliminating them – just as they ultimately ended up absorbing and oppressing the entire Italian Peninsula, Sicily, Greece, Carthage, and the whole then known world.

But let us go back to these Peace Treaties so characteristic of the Phoenicians’ spirit.

The first such treaty that we’re aware of is one whose Assyrian text has been restored and brought down to us in Hugo Winckler’s 1898 Allorientalische Forschungen, 66 a work which, to our knowledge, does not exist in French translation, but to which Contenau makes reference in his masterpiece La Civilisation Phénicienne. 67 In any case, this treaty, as described by the German scholar, is one that had been concluded around the end of the Sixth Century BC, between Esarhaddon, King of Assyria, and Baal, King of Tyre. In it, alongside the names of Assyrian deities, were invoked a number of Phoenician gods whose names, in Assyrian transcription, appeared as follows: Baal Shamir (god of the heavens,) Baal Melki (god almighty,) Eshmun (god of Spring,) Astarte, or Asherah (goddess of fertility,) and finally, the Baal Tiil mentioned by Philo of Tyre, as well as in the Old Testament. 68 We must keep in mind, however, that the Phoenicians’ apparent polytheism – that is their invocation of multiple deities – did not mean that their roster of gods expanded to match the multiple attributes that they used in their rituals worshiping the Supreme Being. Instead, their religion “tended very strongly towards monotheism,” explained Ferdinand Hoefer who was intimately acquainted with the Phoenicians’ social and religious practices.

Three major Peace Treaties were concluded in 509 BC, 348 BC, and 279 BC, between the Romans and their allies on the one hand, and the Carthaginians, the inhabitants of Tyre and Utica, and their allies on the other. The most salient terms of these Treaties have come down to us by way of Polybius’ The Histories, Book III, Chapters 22-25. 69 There, we are told that the Romans conceded to no longer “sail with long ships beyond the Fair Promontory [at the edge of Tunisia, Northeast of Carthage], unless forced by storm…” They were further forbidden from sailing “beyond Mastia and Tarseum.” Indeed, as argued by Polybius, the Romans seemed to have acknowledged the Phoenicians’ supremacy on the Western Mediterranean and beyond the Pillars of Hercules, as well as “on the parts of Sicily that have submitted to Carthage, and on Sardinia and Libya.” Indeed, Rome further acknowledged that

66) Winckler was a late 19th and early 20th century German archaeologist, historian, and philologist specializing in the ancient Near East. In 1904 he became professor of Oriental Languages at the University of Berlin. He wrote extensively on cuneiform, and was a translator of the famous Amarna Letters and the Code of Hammurabi.

67) Georges Contenau (1877-1964) was a French writer and a Phoenician enthusiast. He headed archaeological missions to Sidon-Lebanon twice between 1914 and 1920, and wrote many books on the Levant, Mesopotamia, and the Phoenicians, most notably his La civilisation Phénicienne.

68) Philo of Byblos (c. 20 AD-141 AD) was a lexicographer and grammarian from Byblos (modern-day Lebanon.) He is most famously known as a translator of Sanchuniathon’s works on Phoenician history, which he translated into Greek and compiled under the title Phoenician History.

69) Polybius (203-120 BC) was a Greek Historian who wrote extensively on Roman expansion and politics, covering in some detail the Punic Wars.
no Roman shall trade or found a city in Sardinia and Libya, nor remain in a Sardinian or Libyan post longer than is required for taking in provisions or repairing his ship. If he be driven there by stress of weather, he shall depart within five days. If a Roman gets water or provisions from any place over which the Carthaginians rule, he shall not use these provisions to wrong any member of a people with whom the Carthaginians have peace and friendship. Rome will be doing itself justice [by observing this treaty], otherwise the entire Roman nation will be held accountable [for violating it].

Nevertheless, as stipulated by the treaty of 348 BC, a Roman in Carthage “may do and sell anything that is permitted to a citizen; [and] a Carthaginian in Rome may do likewise.” However, what the Romans later referred to as the “Punic Wars” — albeit they were wars that they had themselves plotted and prosecuted against Carthage — demonstrated, in spite of Roman propaganda and Phoenician silence, that Rome cheapened and devalued its own oaths to the gods, and that its peace treaties had been no more than “paper scraps” that, in modern times would have brought forth three odious wars of extermination in less than seventy years.70

We owe other interesting details relative to the 217 BC Treaty of Hannibal and Philip V of Macedon to Livy’s Book XXIII, Chapters 33 and 34, as well as to Polybius’ Book VII chapter 9 — both supplemented by the Great Italian Encyclopedia, which, interestingly enough, remained a most enduring glory of Mussolini’s regime in modern times. According to these texts:

Rome, which had brought under its domination all of Italy, all the way to the south of Pisa and Rimini, including much of conquered Sicily and the province of Sardinia, established its rule over all of Northern Italy, and proceeded to launch a mortal combat against Carthage.

Taking into account a pretext raised by the Aetolian League71 in 213 BC, Rome then resolved to engage a new military operation with the aim of wresting Philip V away from his ally, Hannibal:

Rome was able to accomplish this aim fairly early in its campaign, in spite of the treaty concluded between Hannibal and Philip the Macedonian. Thus, taking advantage of Philip’s defection with whom they had meanwhile signed a separate peace treaty, the Romans successfully proceeded to end the Punic Wars by annihilating Carthage; subsequently, taking advantage of a quarrel between Philip and the Athenians, they turned against Philip himself — their ally of the night before — and launched, in collusion with the Athenians, another war against him; a war the final consequence of which was the usurpation of Philip’s kingdom to the benefit of Rome, and the conquest of Greece itself — which would ultimately suffer the same fate as Carthage under the Roman yoke...

70) The allusion here is, of course, to the broken treaties that led to the Franco-Prussian War (what the French refer to as the 1870 War) and both World Wars One and Two.

71) The Aetolian League was a confederation of Greek tribal communities in opposition to Macedon. The Aetolians were not highly regarded by other Greeks, and were known to have become the first Greek allies of the Roman Republic, taking the side of Rome in its attempt to defeat Philip V of Macedon, an ally of Carthage.
The Content of their Treaties

In order to get a clear idea of the content of our Phoenicians' Peace Treaties, let us consider more carefully their texts, which have been immortalized in the works of Livy and Polybius.

Below is the list of actors and characters on the stage of the last treaty signed between the Carthaginians and Macedonians:

This is a sworn treaty between us, Hannibal the general, Mago, Myrcan, Barmocar, and all other Carthaginian senators present with him, and all Carthaginians serving under him, on the one side, and Xenophanes the Athenian, son of Cleomachus, the envoy whom King Philip, son of Demetrius, sent to us on behalf of himself, the Macedonians and their allies.

And here are the terms of the Carthaginians' oath, verbatim; words whose profound beauty, majestic gravitas, cosmic grandeur, and impressive restraint have no equivalent in any corpus of epic poems, nor in any patriotic document of any nation on the face of this earth. Listen to the concise and unbounded eloquence of this speech, the resonance of which never ceases to touch us to the depths of our being:

In the presence of Zeus, Hera, and Apollo; in the presence of the Genius of Carthage, of Heracles, and Iolaus; in the presence of Ares, Triton, and Poseidon; in the presence of the gods who battle for us and the
Sun, Moon, and Earth [that is, Moloch, Thanit, and Eshmun]; in the presence of Rivers, Lakes, and Waters; in the presence of all the gods who possess Carthage; in the presence of all the gods who possess Macedonia and the rest of Greece; in the presence of all the gods of the army who preside over this oath. Thus saith Hannibal the general, and all the Carthaginian senators with him, and all Carthaginians serving with him...

And lastly, here is the meat of the Treaties, that is to say, the explicit stipulations whereby both countries proceed by outlining their areas of influence:

That as seemeth good to you and to us, so should we bind ourselves by oath to be even as friends, kinsmen, and brothers, on these conditions. That King Philip and the Macedonians and the rest of the Greeks who are their allies shall protect the Carthaginians, the supreme lords, and Hannibal their general, and those with him, and all under the dominion of Carthage who live under the same laws; likewise the people of Utica and all cities and peoples that are subject to Carthage, and our soldiers and allies and cities and peoples in Italy, Gaul, and Liguria, with whom we are in alliance or with whomsoever in this country we may hereafter enter into alliance.

King Philip and the Macedonians and such of the Greeks as are the allies shall be protected and guarded by the Carthaginians who are serving with us, by the people of Utica and by all cities and peoples that are subject to Carthage, by our allies and soldiers and all peoples and cities in Italy, Gaul, and Liguria, who are our allies, and by such others as may hereafter become our allies in Italy and the adjacent regions.

We will enter into no plot against each other, nor lie in ambush for each other, but with all zeal and good fellowship, without deceit or secret design, we will be enemies of such as war against the Carthaginians, always excepting the kings, cities, and ports with which we have sworn treaties of alliance. And we, too, [Carthaginians] will be the enemies of such as war against King Philip, always excepting the Greeks, cities, and people with which we have sworn treaties of alliance. You will be our allies in the war in which we are engaged with the Romans until the gods vouchsafe the victory to us and to you, and you will give us such help as we have need of or as we agree upon. As soon as the gods have given us the victory in the war against the Romans and their allies, if the Romans ask us to come to terms of peace, we will make such a peace as will comprise you too, and on the following conditions; that the Romans may never make war upon you; that the Romans shall no longer be masters of Corycra, Apollonia, Epidamnus, Pharos, Dimale, Parthin, or Atinaia. And that they shall return to Demetrius of Pharos all his friends who are in the dominions of Rome. If ever the Romans make war on you or on us, we will help each other in the war as may be required on either side. In like manner if any others do so, excepting always kings, cities, and peoples with whom we have sworn treaties of alliance. If we decide to withdraw any clauses from this treaty or to add any we will withdraw such clauses or add them as we both may agree...

But what is the worth of sincerity, goodwill, honesty, and the commitments of one party that swears by its dearest – its very religion – to keep its solemn vows, when the other party hardly deems itself bound by mere words, and when it retains for itself the freedom of perjuring itself at the first opportunity that perjury might be deemed propitious?... But, alas, not unlike the shadows of a motion-picture, fleetingly stealing across a movie screen, it's all "gone with the wind!..."