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The Phoenicians had a profound impact on every major civilization with which they interacted, permanently altering the cultural, linguistic, and geographic trajectory of Western civilization. This thesis demonstrates the unity of Phoenician civilization alongside others in the Near East, Greece, and Rome. While Phoenician history, culture, and language have been researched in the context of other Ancient and Classical civilizations, scholars have consciously brushed aside the study of Phoenicia as a single cultural entity over time and through space resulting in a deliberately incomplete understanding of Phoenician history as a whole. Specifically discussed will be the consistency and details of Phoenician identity shaped through the elements of civilization including government, language, religion, and artistic expression from its beginnings in the third millennium BCE through its later forms into the fifth century CE.
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I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The topic of Phoenician civilization has long held a place in the margins of Egyptian, Greek, Persian, Roman and even Near Eastern studies. Nor has it held a central place in the histories of North and West Africa, Iberia, and the islands in between as this early Mediterranean civilization was occluded beneath the Hellenic shadow, targeted by adversarial contemporary witnesses, and brushed aside by modern Classicists. Classical authors with secondary and tertiary degrees of separation remain the primary ancient source of information on Phoenician civilization, with few exceptions. The tantalizing few Latinized Punic lines in Plautus’ *Poenulus* or the liberal Greek translation of the Phoenician *Periplus* of Hanno are rare glimpses into actual Phoenician history, language, and culture.

This thesis seeks to explore Phoenician civilization as a single entity, rejoining the eastern and western halves of the culture so long separated by time, scholarly habit, and lack of data. This inquiry into the distribution, norms, motives, and cultural modes exhibited by the Phoenicians will provide a more complete and accurate historiography of a civilization that was the *sine qua non* of a number of early achievements in Western civilization. The implications of this research are vast, as fragments of Phoenician civilization fit into a mosaic of Egyptian, Classical, and Near Eastern studies, and new conclusions should draw attention to previously isolated research especially in North and West Africa.

This thesis will not examine Phoenician foreign policy with neighboring powers except where relevant to the argument. Additionally, the hypotheses for the Phoenician movement west such as Assyrian pressure on Sour, lack of resources in the Levant, or political disunity among
cities will not be addressed in detail. This thesis identifies several gaps in the current scholarship on Phoenician civilization, but does not penetrate them in detail as each would require its own study. This thesis proposes new approaches to identifying as yet undiscovered Phoenician settlements but stops short of conducting such identification for the same reason. For the purposes of this thesis, six components defining Phoenician civilization will generally be explored across the Levant, Mediterranean Sea, Iberia, and Africa from circa 3000 BCE to 500 CE: cities, government, writing, religion, art and monumental architecture.

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF PHOENICIAN CIVILIZATION

The Phoenician civilization entered the historical record through its position as an economic participant in the Egyptian sphere of influence in the third millennium BCE. This initial phase of Phoenician civilization was dominated by the city of Jbeil, the first of the Phoenician cities to exploit the demand of a more powerful neighbor by providing niche goods and services, in this case including timber, crafts, and nautical expertise to Egypt. The second phase of Phoenician civilization was characterized by the activities of competing city-states Sour and Sidon as their economic activity ebbed and flowed under the pressures of Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian political turmoil. This phase was marked by the westward direction of commercial activity and settlements in the Mediterranean, Iberia, North and West Africa by the ninth century BCE, while the unrelenting pressures of Assyria, Babylonia, and Persia worked to make these movements more permanent. This permanence marks the beginning of the third

---

1. Known endonyms are used in the current work whenever possible, e.g. SR is Sour, not Τῑρός or Tyre; GBL is Jbeil and not βύβλος or Byblos; and MLQRT is Melqart, not Ἡρακλέος τὸ ἐν Τύρῳ or Tyrian Herakles. Greek and Latin exonyms are avoided to reduce artificial separation of Phoenician names, places, and dialects.

phase of Phoenician civilization, in which the loci of power shifted from Sour and Sidon primarily to Carthage, but also to Gadir in Iberia to a lesser degree, amidst drastic political changes in the Classical world at the end of the first millennium BCE.

Overall, the Phoenician civilization began to take shape at the beginning of the second millennium BCE, with uniquely Phoenician culture lasting in North Africa until at least the fourth century CE. Stylistic improvements in pottery, glassware, and jewelry production are evidenced over centuries in the archaeological record, all the while retaining a uniquely Phoenician type. The Phoenician language and writing system, the latter originating as early as the ninth century BCE, followed a similar mode of change, eventually giving way to dialectical shifts and other common linguistic alterations associated with distance, time, and exposure to adjacent cultures.

Phoenician civilization was widespread and its effects are indelible on the development of Western civilization as a whole. The impact of its reach, economic activity, and cultural unity especially from the Hellenistic through Roman periods are understudied and lack focus despite representing the most specialized and developed period of Phoenician cultural history.² The current work takes into account new archaeological discoveries and updated linguistic studies under the umbrella of a broader geographic approach to interpolating data on Phoenician culture, the results of which will be examined throughout this thesis.³

---


II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Phoenicians have long held a relatively minor role as afterthoughts and adversaries in Ancient, Classical, and Near Eastern studies. The antagonistic trend in scholarly literature concerning Phoenician history has dutifully followed the bias of the literary sources, resulting in a generally negative perception of Phoenician civilization today. This bias is evident from the first serious inquiry into Phoenician history of the modern era, beginning with the circa 1695 discovery in Malta of a Cippus dedicated to the Phoenician deity Melqart.4 The Phoenician inscription was considered “rude and almost barbarous” compared to the parallel ancient Greek text, as scholars heard remarks delivered on its translation recorded at the Royal Society in 1764.5 Soon afterward, an inscription was recovered from Nora, Sardinia in 1773, but the Phoenician inscription was not correctly identified for another sixty years.6

The habit of minimizing the significance of, and an unwillingness to acknowledging the existence of, a unique Phoenician history at the turn of the eighteenth century has continued unabated. The ancient literary sources are generally biased against Phoenician civilization, and the lack of archaeological study treating Phoenicia as a unique cultural unit stretching from the Atlantic coast of Africa to the Levant has further suppressed the importance of its contribution to Western civilization. Historians such as John Grainger have viewed the various stages of Phoenician development through the lens of Greek and Roman history, opining that “their


history is ... part of Roman history” following the fall of the Ptolemies, making it “no longer Hellenistic” history. Why are scholars so resistant to an independent Phoenician history?

This pattern of negative scholarly opinion has stifled serious research into archaeological, linguistic, and cultural study of the subject into the twenty-first century, as the respected historian Rhys Carpenter lamented that new archaeological evidence confirming the antiquity of Phoenicia relative to Greece would remain an “obstinately persistent illusion destined to be revived and intensified in modern times.” Miriam Balmuth admitted little attention had been paid to the Phoenician archaeological sites in Sardinia, “partly because there are no Greek remains that would have stimulated research.”

Egyptologists have portrayed Phoenicia as an amalgam of vassal city-states under the hegemony of Egypt rather than a system of culturally unified trading partners with shared religious and linguistic legacies affecting successor civilizations such as Israel, Greece, and Rome. Although James Breasted concluded Jbeil was an important trading partner rather than a dutiful subject in his analysis of the Twentieth Dynasty Report of Wenamon, Alessandra Nibbi devoted much of her monograph Ancient Byblos Reconsidered arguing against the

8. For the most recent complete gloss of the known Phoenician corpus, see Charles Krahmalkov, A Phoenician-Punic Grammar (Leuven: Brill, 2001).
significance and position of Phoenicians in the context of Egyptian and Greek history. Stacie Olsen concluded Nibbi reached unsupported conclusions lacking archaeological evidence, but the Nibbi study reflects the continuing trend of reducing Phoenician chronology and impact in the spirit of Rhys Carpenter five decades before Nibbi, and John Grainger only a decade ago.

Excavations at Phoenician sites in the Levant have done little to elevate the civilization. E. Renan first excavated Jbeil in 1860, followed by Pierre Montet, Maurice Dunand, and Rene Dussaud. These represent the most significant archaeological excavations of Jbeil and other Phoenician sites in the Levant. Montet conducted the first methodical excavations on the Phoenician layer of Jbeil, during which the Phoenician inscriptions on the sarcophagus of Ahiram were discovered in 1923, but the significance of this find has been constantly downplayed by scholars such as Carpenter and Nibbi. Dunand was unfortunately not interested in small denominations of coins at Jbeil, keeping only shekels and ignoring the fate of any smaller coins, so an unknown number of Phoenician inscriptions were lost. He also used outdated excavation methods, eschewing the advances in stratigraphy at the time, inhibiting future scholarship on his finds while employing dating methods within the Egyptian dynastic system, the reliability of which was debated soon afterward. Dussaud was the first to compare

---


orthographic evidence from the Mesha Stele to date the Ahiram inscription to the thirteenth century BCE,\(^{19}\) while Aime-Giron, Maisler, and Albright all argued against such an early date, instead proposing a date in the tenth century BCE. Meanwhile, Torrey argued the thirteenth century BCE date was certain.\(^{20}\) Despite these disagreements, there was consensus that Phoenician influence on the orthography and development of Hebrew was at its height at the time of these inscriptions.\(^{21}\) In light of these and other findings, inscriptions should be collected to form the basis for an independent history of Phoenician civilization rather than fill a “need to be integrated into the history of the Persian empire,” as Elayi and Elayi have suggested.\(^{22}\)

Scholars have long debated the chronology of Phoenician events, including its rise relative to nearby powers, the advent of the alphabet, and particular achievements in settling in the western Mediterranean.\(^{23}\) Carpenter championed the critical view toward obscuring Phoenician historical chronology in his 1933 essay “The Antiquity of the Greek Alphabet,” but Pryke later demonstrated the rather elevated nature of Phoenician-Egyptian relations, especially in Jbeil, through her analysis of obeisant language in the sixty-four Amarna tablets sent from Rib-Hadda of Jbeil to Pharaohs Amenophis III and Akhenaton in the fourteenth century BCE.\(^{24}\)

During the nineteenth century, scholars debated the degree of Phoenician involvement with

---


21. Ibid., 270.


adjacent powers, especially Egypt. These disagreements are related to the antiquity of the Phoenicians and their impact on Classical civilizations because the results have modern political implications in, for example, Israel, Cyprus, or the Spanish exclaves of Melilla and Ceuta.

A few scholars have recently argued for a united Phoenician civilization, but traditionalists have quickly stepped in to protect past positions of inflexibility. For example, David Neiman concluded the Phoenicians were “one of the more remarkable peoples of the ancient world, they were the innovators and inventors of some of the most important elements of Western civilization,” leading to a period of “unassailable control over the commerce and shipping of the Mediterranean” after the twelfth century BCE. Neiman noted settlements were made at Cyprus, Malta, Sicily, Ibiza, Corsica, Sardinia, and along other sites on the Atlantic coasts of Spain and North Africa. Scholars still refuse to settle on an accepted geographic definition of Phoenicia despite this forceful conclusion. Ora Negbi noted there was a lack of hard archaeological evidence for the settlement dates of these sites, and their settlement narratives were based mostly on Greek and Roman literary tradition. In another example, John Myres concluded Phoenician colonies preceded Phokaian colonies by sixty years in the western


Mediterranean based on a passage in Herodotus.²⁹ Despite such evidence, Carpenter again took a position favoring Greece and obscuring Phoenicia in his essay “Phoenicians in the West,” indirectly concluding Phokaians were likely to have preceded Phoenicians in Iberian settlements, contradicting the conclusions drawn by Myres and others. This was based on the line of reasoning that the Etruscans likely needed an intermediary to trade with the Atlantic coast of Spain, whereby Carpenter concluded this “did not constitute any proof of Phoenician trade with Tartessos in this period,” while using the same reasoning to conclude “it is highly probable that it was Greek Phokaian ships” who were the intermediaries bringing bronze items west.³⁰ Striking a middle ground, P. Bosch-Gimpera identified a period of localized Phokaian thalassocracy following the founding of Massalia circa 600 BCE, while acknowledging this growth in maritime trade and power was due mainly to the consequent loss of extant Phoenician sea power following the war between Sour and Assyria in the middle of the sixth century BC.³¹

D.B. Harden described Phoenician funerary urns found in the earliest layer of Carthage dating to 800 BCE at the latest, with thousands of urns found in subsequent layers dating up to its destruction by the Romans in 146 BCE.³² Harden concluded there was a certain “western Phoenician” style of urn found throughout the western Mediterranean, including at Sicily, Sardinia, Malta, Spain, and the Balearic Islands.³³ In his analysis of the Roman geographical

³⁰. Carpenter, “Phoenicians in the West,” 50.
³³. Ibid., 297.
treatise *Chorographia* of Mela, Batty noted “it is a moot question whether the impact of Phoenicia on the ancient world of the Mediterranean has ever received the recognition it deserved” and despite its profound impact, “information is often given only grudgingly” and “modern accounts, in turn, are hardly noteworthy for emphasis on Phoenician civilization as a whole.”

In fact, this conscious separation between east and west, “Phoenician” and “Punic” history, has led to a tradition of minimizing the links between closely related units of a single civilization, which, like Greek, Roman, and Egyptian culture, have split, relocated, and evolved dramatically over time. Treaties concluded between Rome and Carthage from 509 to 348 BCE indicate Carthage was the dominant maritime power in the western Mediterranean during that time, but scholars including R.L. Beaumont disagree about the relevance of these treaties to the onset of the Punic Wars with Rome beginning in 264 BCE. Jean Turfa concluded in 1977 that these relations were “emerging only now from relative obscurity” due to lack of archaeological interest and adversarial treatment in the literary sources of both Carthage and Etruria in the Punic Wars. Indeed, Aubet observed the Phoenician impact and presence in the west “has never been judged objectively.” Others, such as Ellen Semple, have shown the uniformity of Phoenician religious beliefs, nomenclature, and material culture across time and space, while Philip Schmitz used the Phoenician texts from the Etruscan sanctuary at Pyrgi to show “Phoenician dialects, and


its representation in writing, are remarkably consistent” until the progression of later Neo-Punic
developed under the Roman Empire.38

However, many scholars have attempted to discredit the increasingly obvious evidence of
Phoenician civilization. Benjamin Sass devoted an entire study to discrediting the authenticity of
the Report of Wenamun, echoing the work of R.D. Barnett five decades earlier, in which he
described Phoenician craftsmanship as having “great technical accomplishment, but little
conviction or real form” while Egyptian art of the same period was the result of being “drilled in
the thorough grounding of Egyptian schools,” with Phoenician products instead “borrowed
wholesale, often to clothe purely Semitic ideas.”39 Bosch-Gimpera described pottery found in
Carthage as “monotonous repetition of stereotyped geometric patterns” compared to
contemporary Greek examples, while Barnett described the elements of Phoenician influence at
the Temple of Artemis Orthia at Sparta as “the dullest in Greece.”40 Even Phoenician written
sources were not safe from these scholars with, for example, Barr dismissing the writings of
Sanchuniathon as a “Hellenistic eclectic pastiche of Hesiod and later cosmological sources.”41
David Gill noted how this point of view pervaded twentieth century Classical and Near Eastern
scholarship, especially regarding Phoenicia, and was likely “a by-product of European anti-
Semitism,” which was not an attitude adopted by all scholars but nevertheless affected their


41. James Barr, Philo of Byblos and His Phoenician History (Manchester: Rylands University, 1974), 20.
This habit has continued into the twenty-first century. In an essay on Assyrian power in the Levant, Ariel Bagg proposed two parameters of “world empire,” including duration and physical space, concluding Rome and China achieved such a status due to their “civilizing compulsion,” with Phoenicia accomplishing the same yet excluded from this category.

Respected modern scholars continue wrapping Phoenician history into the more familiar histories of the Mediterranean, despite the mounting evidence in favor of a unified and separate Phoenician history. *Hellenistic Phoenicia* by John Grainger is an excellent example of the old ways of marginalizing Phoenician history carefully hidden beneath the trappings of objective modernity. This work is important because it is the most recent, and perhaps most complete, monograph specializing in Levantine Phoenicia during the Hellenistic period. The title is deceiving, because it is only a history of three cities, focusing mostly on Sour, Sidon and Arwad. It provides an in depth, albeit adversarial, analysis of Phoenicians in the Levant from the fourth through first centuries BCE. The main thrust of this work focuses on the role of the three Phoenician cities as nothing more than pawns in the grand affairs of the Greek, Persian, and Roman spheres of influence of that period.

Grainger maintains a fairly negative and skeptical view of Hellenistic Phoenicia in the manner of Millar. His primary sources for this period include literary works by the familiar enemies of Phoenicia such as Diodorus and Livy, incorporating the inaccurate chronology of Josephus, all while dismissing the archaeological evidence as “bad archaeology and bad history.


[that] can be ignored.”\textsuperscript{44} He discredits his own main primary source describing Phoenician cities federated through representative councils as “manifest nonsense,” presumably because such a claim goes against his opinion that Hellenistic Phoenicians lacked any organization or political unity outside of Greek, Persian, or Roman hegemony.\textsuperscript{45} In his monograph \textit{Itineraria Phoenicia}, Lipinski analyzed centuries of evidence contradicting these conclusions, for example in his discussion of high commissioners in Cypriot Carthage and Kition who were appointed and controlled by Hiram of Sidon in the ninth century BCE.\textsuperscript{46} Assyrian inscriptions from the library of Ashurnasirpal composed circa 673 BCE also negate the conclusions reached by Grainger and Aubet in which “the history of Phoenicia was the history of Sour,” as sixteen cities under vassalage to Sidon are listed as being captured on the Levantine coast following the revolt of the latter against the Assyrians.\textsuperscript{47} Further, Jbeil and its dependent cities were not captured during this Assyrian campaign, indicating an additional power center active at the time that, albeit small, was a city-state independent from Sidon and Sour.\textsuperscript{48}

Regarding Phoenician literacy, Grainger denied Phoenicians credit for influencing writing systems lasting into the modern era, clearly following in lockstep the same persistently negative attitudes and assumptions presented by Millar.\textsuperscript{49} Still, some scholars disagree. Ra’ad

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{44} Grainger, \textit{Hellenistic Phoenicia}, 25.
\textsuperscript{46} Lipinski, \textit{Itineraria Phoenicia}, 46.
\end{flushright}
wrote against this attitude, concluding Phoenicians “were, by any measure, more advanced than the entities that history says disinherit them.”\textsuperscript{50} Naveh also departed from the pessimistic view of Millar and Grainger, instead concluding Greek culture “knew a Dark Age of illiteracy” prior to the introduction of the Phoenician writing system.\textsuperscript{51} Robinson went further, noting that despite the relatively small size of the Semitic confederations such as the Phoenicians, their achievements have had a “greater influence on the course of human history as a whole than the large races of mankind.”\textsuperscript{52} Stuart Creason provided examples from outside the Greek world, showing direct Phoenician impact on orthography including Tifinagh, the Libyo-Berber writing system used currently in parts of the Maghreb, while Semitic languages including Hebrew and Arabic provide examples of Phoenician child systems via Aramaic.\textsuperscript{53} Potsherds from the ninth century BCE in Kition exemplify the Cypriot language written in Phoenician letters, while Peter Mitchell presented the Zenata stone as an exemplary find showing the Phoenician child script Tifinagh in use as far west as the Canary Islands during the sixth century CE.\textsuperscript{54}

On Phoenician politics, Grainger displayed further bias toward Greek influence in the Mediterranean in his description of the political activity in Arwad. Although Arwad belongs to one of the earliest examples of a republican form of government, Grainger misattributed their constitution, classifying it as “of the Greek type” in lieu of a monarchy “adapted to the local

\textsuperscript{50} Ra’ad, “Primal Scenes of Globalization,” 25.


\textsuperscript{53} Stuart Creason “Aramaic,” in Roger Woodard, \textit{The Ancient Languages of Syria-Palestine and Arabia} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 110.

situation,” when in fact this system existed at Arwad long before its use in Greece.55 Maria Iacovou gave another example of instructive Phoenician politics in her description of Kition, in which the “Tyrian colony-turned-kingdom … provided the model for state formation in Iron Age Cyprus.”56 Despite this information, Grainger minimized the geographic importance of Phoenicia by characterizing its reach to include only six important cities along the Levantine coast in the mid-sixth century BCE, which is an incorrect and incredibly narrow conclusion excluding all settlements westward from Cyprus despite hundreds of such cities known to line North Africa, ringing Mediterranean islands, dotting the Atlantic coasts of the Iberian peninsula, and scattered along the Atlantic coast of northwest Africa, which Lipinski describes in further detail in his consideration of the abundant archaeological evidence.57 Indeed, Grainger displays his deliberate occlusion of Phoenician importance by determining Egypt as the Western boundary of Phoenicia in the face of evidence to the contrary.58

Despite spending the first hundred pages of his monograph attempting to show the disunity and insignificance of Phoenicians as “a small, divided people,” Grainger did sometimes acknowledge evidence to the contrary later in his work, falling short of acknowledging anything more than nostalgia and tenuous mercantile connections.59 He noted Phoenician cities far from the Levant “continued contact with the [Phoenician] homeland,” while “men living in… Delos

---


57. Strab. 3.5.5; Grainger, *Hellenistic Phoenicia*, 33; Lipinski, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, 36.


59. Ibid., 187.
claimed [Berytos] as their homeland.” In addition, he concluded that the relationship between Arwad and its *perea* during the Seleukid period in the middle of the second century BCE functioned similarly to other Phoenician metropoles, *apoikia*, and their *perea* throughout the Mediterranean. He conceded Hellenistic Phoenician successes in their Levantine cities, noting “peace under first the Ptolemies and then the Seleukids… had enabled the Phoenician cities to expand and grow rich. The expansion had been economic, demographic, and agricultural.” Still, Grainger maintained a course on par with Carpenter and Millar, describing Phoenicians having “elaborated myths to explain their relationships by language, and they were proud of their cultural achievements… they all worshipped the same deities—yet they were capable of fighting and betraying each other,” while the same conclusions could be made in reference to a number of contemporary Mediterranean powers, with no small example being the “quarrelsome and destructive” Greeks city-states, who were “notorious rivals.”

The existing archaeological evidence revealing the continuity and history of Phoenicia is muddied by the solvent action of Greek nomenclature, Roman hostility, and later literary transmission used to characterize Phoenician civilization. The result is a failure to link all of these related settlements under a single Phoenician civilization despite the archaeological, numismatic, and literary evidence. In addition to anachronistically classifying Phoenician language as a dialect of Aramaic, scholars including Grainger confused other elements of interdisciplinary research including erroneous etymologies of, for example, the Phoenician
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61. The Greek terms are used here as no Phoenician words for these types of sites are known. For a description of parallel *perea* structures in ancient Greece, see Karl-Wilhelm Welwei, “Peraia,” in *Brill’s New Pauly*, Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, eds. (Leuven: Brill, 2006).

political position of *suffette*, claiming the complete disappearance of the Phoenician language during the Hellenistic period, and the claim of “no evidence” and a “blank in the records” regarding Phoenician settlements west of Italy during that time, despite contrary evidence.  

Grainger provided more speculation than analysis in his exposition of Hellenistic Phoenicians. For example, he drew an erroneous conclusion about Phoenician royal succession in the fifth century BCE based on anecdotal observation of completely unrelated Islamic Arab succession in Egypt following the Napoleonic War. This and other speculations in *Hellenistic Phoenicia* are common Eurocentric generalizations about the weakness and dependency of “oriental” powers further east than familiar Athens and Rome, in which Phoenicians were considered “politically inferior Asiatics.”  

On the contrary, archaeological evidence shows, for example, Hiram of Sidon maintained hegemony over cities in Cyprus in the seventh century BCE.  

This rejection of archaeological evidence in favor of outdated conclusions from scholars such as Grainger, Carpenter and Millar is expressed, for example, through doubts surrounding Phoenician political involvement in Cyprus despite inscriptions indicating the contrary, specifically that “the Phoenician presence in [Ptolemaic] Cyprus is in fact quite insignificant in total,” and “Phoenicians are recorded in various places in the Aegean, but, once again, their significance is not great.”  

Despite this claim, mounting archaeological evidence demonstrates “the Phoenicians obviously participated in commercial and cultural contact across the entire


Mediterranean region.”67 Considering any assumption of Phoenician trade in the Aegean during the Ptolemaic period to be “inevitably wrong” due to lack of data is a line of reasoning which should, like that of Millar, negate its own conclusions.68 Krahmalkov lamented the stereotype “propagated by the Romans and disseminated even today by some classicists” that Phoenicians were not “sufficiently competent intellectually to adapt and use Greek literature and to reproduce it in their own language” in the face of contrary archaeological, literary, and artistic evidence.69

Influential scholars promoting “modern ‘phoenicophobia’” including Carpenter, Grainger and Millar undermine the necessity of a Phoenician history and, in the words of Schmitz, “underlines the current state of our archaeological ignorance, which requires us to presume historically attested identities (e.g. Phoenicians) that we cannot independently demonstrate except by the employment of assumptions that we know are woefully naive.”70 Still, scholars including Lipinski and Krahmalkov demonstrated the objective and rigorous study the field of Phoenician history so desperately needs. The scholarly habit of placing Phoenician history as peripheral and tangential to Egyptian, Classical, and Near Eastern history left significant gaps in the study of the causes, effects, and legacy of Phoenician culture on Western civilization from the Levant to the Atlantic coasts of Spain and North Africa. These lacunae warrant further study.


68. Grainger, Hellenistic Phoenicia, 75.

69. Krahmalkov, Phoenician-Punic Grammar, 12.

III. METHODOLOGY

CHALLENGES

Historians are faced with several obvious challenges when attempting to synthesize a history of Phoenician civilization. Perhaps the greatest challenge is the lack of literary source material, written records, and other first-hand accounts composed by the Phoenicians themselves. Closely related is the comparatively massive repository of primary source material composed by the adversaries of Phoenicia through the centuries. For example, Roman accounts of Phoenicia echo the famous final line of every speech uttered by Cato the Elder ahead of the Third Punic War: “Carthage must be destroyed.”\(^{71}\) Surely, the desire of a civilization as great as Rome calling for the complete and total destruction of a nation forever would have lasting negative effects on the historiography of the latter. Indeed, the sole surviving dialogue written in Phoenician is the Latin play *Poenulus* written between the Second and Third Punic Wars, in which the plight of Carthaginian Phoenicians is clear: surviving parents were separated from their children, the boys were sold into slavery, and the girls were made into prostitutes for Rome.\(^{72}\)

Other Classical sources, perhaps not as hostile, are tantalizingly scant. Greek sources include brief mentions of Phoenician participation in the Peloponnesian and Persian Wars, while featuring as minor characters in, for example, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.\(^ {73}\) Phoenicians were used as
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literary fixtures who were merchants, in love with money and luxury. The few primary sources dealing with Phoenicians directly through Greek authors do provide some insight, including the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Skylax, the *Geographica* of Strabo, and the anonymous Greek translation of the *Periplus of Hanno*. Still, these latter works feature Phoenicians in the economic sense, largely ignoring the everyday lives of Phoenician women, children, and craftsmen.

Prose authors and historians of Rome wrote about the Phoenicians with unabashed enmity, thus undermining the credibility of many accounts. Phoenicians featured as “foreign strumpets” in Juvenal, while Horace considered the Phoenician culture far too extravagant for Roman tastes. Vergil described Phoenicia as “a commonplace for expensive self-indulgence,” despite Rome having a “frantic passion” for expensive Phoenician purple dye and its byproducts. The overt hostility of such authors is typified by Polybius in his account of the Third Punic War, describing Carthaginian general Hasdrubal as “an empty-headed braggart, very far from being a competent statesmen or general,” who lacked judgment, was obese, “pot-bellied and was unnaturally red in the face … living like a fatted ox in the plenty of a festival” about whom Polybius invites readers to be “amazed by his ignobility and cowardice.” Numerous examples of this attitude exist and call into question the authenticity, objectivity, and credibility of such sources in attempting to describe actual Phoenician civic, religious, or linguistic elements of their civilization.

75. Strab. 17.3.1.
77. Juv. 3.60-6; Hor. *Od.* 2.16.36.
The Phoenicians did not leave material behind countering such claims, leading to a further imbalance in primary source bias. This was likely due in part to Phoenician merchants endeavoring to protect their commercial assets and maritime methods, resulting in maritime and commercial superiority in the western Mediterranean at the time the Classical sources were being composed.\(^{80}\) The lack of a Phoenician literary tradition resulted in the fragmented and biased accounts from Herodotus to Polybius. This fact, coupled with the fate of the Carthaginian possessions being “utterly exterminated by the calamity which overtook them,” left little in the Classical literary sources concerning the objective historiography of the Phoenician civilization and its impact on its successors and neighbors.\(^{81}\) This is partly due to the preponderance of Greek and Roman sources and the relative absence, whatever the cause, of a Phoenician voice. The story of Phoenician civilization is then a story of a series of destructive events, a history all the more challenging to tell.

Just as the Punic Wars erased the historiography of Carthage, later conflicts have had a similar effect on the remains of the larger Phoenician world.\(^{82}\) The Crusades devastated the Levant, Malta, and other locations of important Phoenician archaeological sites. In the nineteenth century, the European “Scramble for Africa” altered the landscape and created difficult political divisions in Northwest Africa, preventing access to important Phoenician and Berber sites there into the modern period. The Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 instigated an unresolved conflict between the Arab world, Israel, and others, destroying archaeological sites and preventing access to others. Ruins were obliterated in the National Museum of Beirut following Syrian and Israeli
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invasions in Lebanon since 1975, while important Phoenician artifacts disappeared into the black market. Phoenician archaeological sites were shelled during a subsequent Lebanese-Israeli conflict ending in 2008. Similarly, the Islamic State controlled Iraqi territory surrounding Assur, the ancient capital of Assyria near modern Sharqat, in which many critically important sites and artifacts were intentionally destroyed or sold on the black market to fund the extremist group between 2014 and 2016. The Phoenician civilization has been subjected to intentional and unintentional erasure like few other civilizations in history.

The current approach of modern scholarship to historical periods and geographic areas poses a related challenge. The fields are broken into Egyptian, Near Eastern, Classical, Roman, and so on, which obviously impose artificial timelines on civilizations that are not Egypt, Assyria, Israel, Persia, Greece, and Rome.83 Some scholars have noted that Phoenicia is hard to classify, or that it falls somewhere between Near Eastern and Islamic history, but have failed to integrate anything west of Cyprus, including the “distant outlier” of Carthage, into a unified field.84 In addition, the gap between Semitic and Classical studies is growing and causing the connections between Greek and Phoenician history to be overlooked.85 For example, a study of the cothon element of many Phoenician harbors in Africa, the Levant, and Mediterranean islands immediately forces one to choose a discipline with which to associate their work, at the expense of capturing a full scope of these locations in the absence of a Phoenician option.

Scholars from various fields cannot agree on otherwise simple points due to the lack of a united Phoenician historiography. The debate on which demonym to use for Phoenicians in

85. Barr, Philo of Byblos, 21.
certain geographic areas favors the artificial division of related Phoenician cultural settlements while ignoring corresponding endonyms provided in the historical record. 86 Other problems arise in settling on political nomenclature or the relative importance of cities. For example, scholars refer to Sour as a kingdom, republic, city, and state. 87 In a single monograph, Sour is variously styled “a tiny state,” “a unified state,” “a single state” but is also “a Phoenician nation” ironically composed of “people without a state, a territory, and without political unity,” while “the history of Phoenicia [is] the history of [Sour],” in which the city is invoked as an epithet describing the entire Phoenician civilization. 88 This and other examples stoke confusion and further divide modern scholars researching Phoenician history.

These challenges are not limited to geographic distribution and chronology. Indeed, many scholars make a conscious choice to study Phoenician history in pieces, as fragments of the more famous Mediterranean civilizations. For example, Elayi and Elayi admit Phoenician coinage “has always been considered Greek,” and has therefore never attained its own total study as a unique product of Phoenician culture. 89 Epigraphers interested in monumental inscriptions tend to ignore numismatic evidence and vice versa, so no combined study has been produced beyond straightforward Phoenician grammar compendia. 90 Phoenician history has been forced into the margins and footnotes of broader disciplines and its impact on those great civilizations is unjustly minimized as a result.

86. See note 1, above.
87. Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, 15; Krahmalkov, Phoenician-Punic Grammar, 11; Elayi and Elayi, Monetary and Political History, 8-9; Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 57.
88. Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 9, 17, 25, 30-1, 46, 59.
89. Elayi and Elayi, Monetary and Political History, 8-9.
METHOD

The main purpose of this thesis is to provide a synthesis of primary sources often separated by scholarly discipline, bias, and tradition in order to demonstrate the unity of Phoenician civilization over time, distance, and external pressure. Secondary sources are an important element of this research, as the vast body of Egyptian, Near Eastern, Persian, Greek, and Roman primary sources have been analyzed at length by eminent scholars of their respective disciplines. However, material directly produced by Phoenicians throughout history including numismatic, epigraphic, and material artifacts provide important information often lost in the grander scheme of Mediterranean scholarship, especially in Classical studies. Unique elements of Phoenician identity are examined in the context of the conventional components of a civilization. This thesis provides a basis for the concept of a unified Phoenician civilization with original research incorporating such critical information while surmounting the challenges described above.
IV. RESULTS: PHOENICIAN URBAN LIFE AND GOVERNMENT

SITING AND URBAN DESIGN

The Phoenician worldview has been ignored in the ancient literary sources and in modern scholarship. However, this worldview must be understood in order to explain why they chose particular settlement locations, how they maintained internal order without a capital city, and what caused their civilization to persist despite the annihilation of important cities throughout their history. This understanding is challenged by the prevailing Classical worldview of the Mediterranean Sea as an entity ringed by empires, monarchs, and dynasties. For example, the Roman worldview was centered around the city of Rome, in which all its outlying territories were aligned toward this metropolis. Phoenicia was not organized in this manner, but Romans artificially viewed it this way and so referred to the entire civilization west of Cyprus as Carthage. An example of this artificially imposed perspective is present in the writings of Greek author and Roman citizen Plutarch, in which he quotes Pyrrhus saying, “What a wrestling ground we are leaving, my friends, for the Carthaginians and the Romans.”\(^{91}\) This statement is problematic, as a Roman would see no issues using a major city as an epithet for the entire empire, while a Phoenician living even in Carthage considered himself neither Punic nor Carthaginian, but rather Phoenician, Caananite or a man from Sour, as this civilization was one composed of many cities rather than an empire subjugated by just one.\(^{92}\)

A complete understanding of Phoenician geography requires a new map and a complete cartographic study combining the ancient literary sources and recent advances in modern
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archaeology. Without mentioning the ethnocentric Ptolemaic maps, one can observe the lack of serious detail regarding Phoenician settlements in modern maps of the Classical world such as the Breasted map describing the Near East circa 1400 BCE, which remained authoritative through the twentieth century.93 Points of departure for such an updated study exist in the ancient literary sources in, for example, *De Chorographia* of Pomponius Mela. He composed his Phoenician history circa 44 CE in Iberia, borrowing at times from Hanno and Q. Metellus Celer. Mela eschewed the worldview emanating from Homeric Greece for a geography more favorable to an Iberian provincial—indeed, a Phoenician. The African and Spanish sides of the Straits of Gibraltar were united, not separated, by the waterway, “in a community whose origins were Phoenician and whose location was in Spain.”94 In contrast, even the relatively positive account provided by Strabo presented Phoenician geography in a foreign context, therefore not paying particular attention beyond its relationship to Roman mercantile interests.

The environmental separation between sea colonies was manifested not by territorial boundaries or manufactured obstacles but by the sailing season, which offered a window of 50 to 100 days per year for travel across the Phoenician world.95 This required some sailors to stop periodically based on the season, their location, and trip timing. Further, each day of sailing required an anchorage after a certain distance was reached. These conditions invited the settlement of lesser Phoenician towns at set distances for daily anchorage services, while cities sprung up at the beginning, middle, and end of the sailing circuit for seasonal anchorage.

This distributed and practical geography contrasts with the Modernist and core-periphery dependency theories still stubbornly affecting scholarship on Classical civilizations such as

95. Hes. 10; Veg. 10; Lipinski, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, 431-2.
Greece and Rome. Instead, Phoenicia was a nebulous civilization with multiple nuclei and overlapping circuits of influence. The eastern anchor points of these circuits included Sour, Sidon, Arwad, and Jbeil. Cities facilitating the overlap of Phoenician sailing circuits developed early, with Kition, Utica, and Nora rising to prominence concurrently with westward expansion in the ninth century BCE, followed by Carthage in the sixth century BCE. The western circuit was dominated by Gadir, and touched Atlantic points along Iberia and West Africa beginning no later than the eighth century BCE.

These coastal sailing settlements are attested in both ancient literary sources and archaeological sites across the entire expanse of the Phoenician world; in fact, they define it. Strabo and Pseudo-Skylax described and named more than 100 such settlements about 30 to 45 kilometers apart along what Strabo called “the Phoenician coastline.” Smaller villages related to local activity such as fishing, specialized crafts, and pottery were situated between them one to five kilometers apart, and were an average of one to five hectares in size. The string of archaeological sites along the entire coast from Gadir to Villarios provides concrete evidence of this pattern. There were 20 ports of call from Arwad to Askalon at the usual interval of 30 to 45 kilometers, while “all the towns and emporia” from the Syrtis River to Gadir were Phoenician cities, including nearly 50 anchorages and important city-states, according to Pseudo-Skylax. This account was strictly for navigational purposes, naturally omitting otherwise significant Phoenician cities or towns such as the royal residence Herodotus identified at Ashdod.


99. Hdt. 2.57; Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, 267-331.
Population growth and urban design were limited by the absolute size of the island, isthmus, and river delta settings in which these settlements were located. Additionally, most prominent cities grew out of earlier ports of call and were therefore generally separated at least a day of sailing apart and sometimes further isolated from one another by neighboring empires, as with Egypt between Gaza and Lepcis Magna from the earliest expansions throughout the entirety of Phoenician history. These restrictions affected even the most prominent Phoenician cities, as Gadir was limited to 10 hectares due to its placement on a tiny string of islands. Sites located on greater islands or coastal plains grew larger, with Toscanos at 15 hectares, Motya at 40 hectares, Sour at 57 hectares, and Kition at 70 hectares. However, where physical separation had a typically degenerative effect on other civilizations such as Rome after Constantine or Greece after Alexander, Phoenicians overcame the divided land by embracing the uniting character of the sea.

The Phoenician settlement movement took place over time and was not due to a single specific event, although some events in the Levant led to periods of increased expansion activity. Settlement zones included initial sites along the Levantine coast and islands in the Aegean, focusing on Cyprus and Crete. The settlement and political arrangement was complex, even on the Levantine coast. Sidon exercised hegemony over 16 cities on the Levantine coast in the eighth century BCE, with control ranging from Al Mina in the north to Nahr Qasimiye in the south, but skipping independent Jbeil, which itself extended control from Nahr Ibrahim in the south to Amchit, Botrus, and Thum in the north. At least 20 locations produced evidence of

100. Pseudo-Skylax, Periplus §104-12; Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, 333 and 337.
101. Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 312.
102. K 3500, K 4444, K 10235; Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, 17, 36.
Phoenician presence on Cyprus, ranging from cities to merchant dwellings before the tenth century BCE, with evidence of Lapethus being initially related to Jbeil.\textsuperscript{103} These were followed by islands further west, especially Malta, Sicily, and Sardinia, but also included minor islands such as Ibiza. Pithekoussai was the first Greek overseas colony, but a Phoenician graffito on a potsherd exhibited orthography consistent with the eighth century BCE at the latest, indicating the Phoenicians may have either arrived there first or around the same time.\textsuperscript{104} Concurrently, settlements were forming on the North African coast, the Atlantic coast of West Africa, and the Iberian peninsula. All of these settlements coalesced into three major Phoenician trade circuits by the eighth century BCE and were tethered to Gadir, Carthage, and Sour, among others. 

The earliest Phoenician mercantile contacts were sporadic, seasonal, and impermanent, thereby leaving minimal archaeological evidence and few mentions in the early ancient literary sources. The relationship between Phoenicia and the indigenous people of Sardinia is an excellent example of this problem, which remains relatively unexplored by modern scholars. Egyptian mentions of the \textit{SRD} tribe of Sea People in 1300 BCE are perhaps the earliest attested example of contact, but the exact nature of such contact is as yet unknown.\textsuperscript{105} An alliance of Sea People tribes led by those of Lukka destroyed Ugarit in 1180 BCE, while leaving Jbeil and other Phoenician cities intact.\textsuperscript{106} In fact, the Phoenician sites maintained uninterrupted activity while most civilizations encountering the Sea People were annihilated. Was there a correlation?

\textsuperscript{103} Lipinski, \textit{Itineraria Phoenicia}, 38-44, 46; Elayi and Elayi, \textit{Monetary and Political History}, 98.
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Perhaps the Phoenicians had continuous positive economic relations with some of the tribes of Sea People despite other civilizations succumbing to the Late Bronze Age “collapse,” and were therefore spared. Indeed, the Phoenicians maintained trade contacts with the Sardinians at least through 900 BCE, finally leaving solid archaeological evidence for study at Nora on Sardinia starting at that time.¹⁰⁷ The Phoenician presence at Nora and Sulcis, the most ancient in Sardinia, became permanent circa 825 to 750 BCE.¹⁰⁸ The Phoenician city of Kition on Cyprus was the founding metropole of these places, around the same time Phoenicians from Gadir settled Ibiza, contrary to the popular misconception and conflation of Sour with the entire Phoenician colonizing movement.¹⁰⁹ Sardinia was a logical location for an intermediate settlement between Iberia and the Levant, as it was centered between the terminal points of the Phoenician trade circuits, providing sailors a guaranteed resupply point and safe refuge during unexpected variations in the sailing season. Diodorus attributed this reasoning to the founding of Malta, similarly situated: “This island is a colony planted by the Phoenicians, who, as they extended their trade to the western ocean, found in it a place of safe retreat, since it was well supplied with harbors and lay out in the open sea.”¹¹⁰ Other settlements followed this pattern of initial contact, seasonal settlement, and permanent dwelling, not the least of which was Carthage.

Phoenician settlement chronology is further complicated by the disparity between the archaeological record and the ancient literary sources. Examples abound. The first settlers of the Moroccan coast came from Gadir, not Carthage, and their purpose was expanded commercial
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fishing territory, not trade in metals. Numerous ancient literary sources attest to the antiquity of Gadir and Utica, traditionally placing these after events around the end of the Bronze Age collapse while archaeological evidence shows permanent settlement no later than the ninth century BCE. Although Sallust, lifelong enemy of Phoenicia, popularized the idea that Carthage and Lepcis Magna were settled due to political dissent, excess population, and the spirit of conquest emanating from Sidon, the evidence suggests this founding may have been instead a joint economic venture between Kition and Sour, similar to the joint founding of Tripoli by Sour, Sidon, and Arwad.

Ancient authors possessed a limited understanding of the extent of Phoenician civilization. The Sebou River was the most southerly point mentioned by ancient literary sources regarding Phoenician settlements in West Africa despite many existing hundreds of kilometers onward. These ancient authors were unaware of the location of Mogador for example, indicating complete reliance on Phoenician sources who likely concealed these sites from Greek merchants in order to protect Phoenician commercial interests. Written sources record no Phoenician presence in the Azores, but a pot of Phoenician coins found under a ruin at Corvo indicates otherwise. Similarly, the presence of silver in Gadir was first attested in the ancient literary sources in the early fifth century BCE, three centuries later than the Phoenicians began permanent silver extraction activity there.

111. Vel. Pat. Hist. 1.2.3, 1.8.4; Pomp. Mela 3.46, 3.6.46; Avien. 440, 449-60; Strab. 1.3.2, 3.2.14, 3.4.2-3; Sil. Ital. 3.241-2; Plin. Nat. 19.216, 19.63; Pseudo-Aristot. 134.

112. Diod. 1.46.1, 16.41.1; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.74.1; Vel. Pat. 1.12.5; Justinus 18.4-6; Thuc. 6.2.6; Plin. Nat. 5.76; Sal. Bel. 19.1-2, 78; Sil. Ital. Pun. 3.256; Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 76, 217.

113. Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, 454, 463.


115. Strab. 3.2.2; Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 279.
Greater flexibility is therefore required for establishing an accurate representative chronology for Phoenician settlements west of Cyprus. Settlements were not only deliberately concealed from ancient authors, but some were also inhabited by seasonal or small communities for years prior to the establishment of permanent outposts yielding archaeological evidence, as at Mogador and Saltes in the eighth century BCE.  

The impermanent Phoenician colony of Saltes was situated on the island opposite Onoba, modern Huelva, consistent with settlement patterns at Mogador, Sour, and Arwad. Saltes was a trading outpost established during the earliest Phoenician activity in Iberia in order to acquire goods for eastward shipment from the indigenous people at Onoba, which was likely the actual location of Tartessos. In the central zone, Lepcis Magna featured three aspects of different development periods of Phoenician settlement occurring concurrently in the seventh century BCE, including a sheltered anchorage with a beach, a natural spring with fresh water, and a cemetery located at the outskirts of the city. Architectural elements at that level of the excavation were Levantine-Phoenician rather than Punic-Carthaginian, just as at Gadir, Ibiza, and Lixus. Details such as these indicate a series of settlements and accompanying stylistic developments overlapping and changing rather than a single moment of westward Phoenician expansion.

Three primary styles of Phoenician settlements are attested in ancient literary sources and supported by archaeological evidence. These are the river delta and isthmus, the seaside rocky


promontory, and the *apoikia* island controlling a mainland *peraia*, each settled based on the level of cooperation with the indigenous people, the resources being traded, the relative safety of the inhabitants, and the religious elements of Phoenician site selection. Characterizing these archetypes provides a starting point for future identification of seaside ruins not marked as obviously as tells further inland.

Phoenician settlements included several standard elements serving functional purposes including religious rites, funerary practices, economic activity, and government. The most common elements were the *cothon*, temple, necropolis, and *tophet*, the latter of which featured prominently later in their history. Phoenicians chose to settle at locations easily accommodating shrines reached by sea as early as the fourteenth century BCE. Homes were organized into a specific area of the city, while permanent market stall structures were built using the rubble technique that originated in Levantine Phoenicia and spread to the farthest reaches of their civilization at, for example, Salle, Oualili, and Lixus in West Africa (see figures 3, 4, and 5). A grid pattern of buildings and narrow streets were laid at Carthage, featuring a main city square surrounded by tall market buildings, with an “Old City” and “New City” already differentiated in the fifth century BCE and also present at sites not settled by Carthage such as Lixus. Archaeological evidence found in the channel dug between the *cothon* and Tanit precinct of Carthage demonstrates sophisticated horticultural techniques in use by the urban population such as grafting, with remains indicating regular consumption of “pomegranate, fig, grape, olive,

120. The rocky promontory, *GDR*, is also rendered as Gadir, Gades, Gabes, or Cadiz. It occurs in both Phoenician and Libyo-Berber toponyms into the present day, cf. Agadez in Niger, Gulf of Gabes in Libya, Nahr al-Gadir in Lebanon, and Agadir and Rusadir in Morocco.
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peach, plum, melon, [Libyan] lotus, … almonds, pistachios and filberts,” using growing techniques present in other locations such as Sicily prior to Greek and Roman arrival there.123

These three forms of settlement were evident at the earliest Phoenician cities in the archaeological record, with the rocky promontory at Jbeil, the isthmus near a river delta at Sidon, and the islands of Sour and Arwad. The harbors of Sour and Sidon were chosen for their shape, while reefs and manmade structures created anchorages sheltered from heavy waves at Jbeil.124 Arwad and Sour were situated on islands and controlled territory on the mainland. These basic settlement styles were transported across the Mediterranean and most Phoenician sites display a mixture of these characteristics.

A brief survey of early Phoenician settlements reveals the ubiquity of this pattern. In the Levant, Sour was the apoikia over the peraia of Akko, Akhzib, Tell Abu Hawam, Sarepta, Aksapa, Qraye, Tamburrit, Dakermann, Khalde, and Khirbet Salim. In Andalusia, Almunecar was situated on an isthmus, and maintained a peraia and necropolis on shore, with archaeological evidence indicating Phoenician settlement no later than the eighth century BCE, while Castillo Dona Blanca was the peraia of Gadir. Elsewhere in Andalusia, the river delta settlement was apparent in the Phoenician towns at Toscanos, Cerro del Prado, Cerro del Villar, Torre del Mar, and La Caleta. On Sardinia, Tharros, Sulcis, Bithia, Nora, and Cagliari all follow in a similar fashion. On Sicily, Motya was settled on a small island before the eighth century BCE and featured a cothon, necropolis, city walls, and a temple at the oldest level of the site. It was the apoikia for the peraia of Panormo and Solunto, with indigenous allied cities at Eryx and


Segesta. In fact, Thucydides found Motya and its dependent settlements important enough to provide an entire passage describing “Phoenicians living all round Sicily, who had occupied promontories upon the sea coasts and the islets adjacent for the purpose of trading.” In North Africa, the *apoikia* and *peraia* at Rashgoun and Akra likely maintained a *cothon* before the sixth century BCE, while the port and rocky isthmus at Rusadir and Sebta possessed similar characteristics. The *apoikia* of Kerkennah was established on an island with two harbors off the coast of what is now Sfax. The remotest Phoenician settlement at Mogador also followed the earliest form of an island *apoikia* and mainland *peraia* situated near a river delta for access to indigenous merchandise from the Atlas Mountains via the river.

While several features of Phoenician urban siting and design are ubiquitous throughout their territorial space, these cities could not have existed and flourished without a single feature among them: the harbor. The necessary expertise for effective harbor construction was established in the earliest moments of Phoenician history. The harbors were typically composed of two anchorages at medium to large cities, including a larger harbor for merchant activity and smaller harbor for naval or miscellaneous use, facing in opposite directions. Examples of typical Phoenician dual shipyard construction include those at Arwad, Sidon, Sour, Tell Sukas, Jbeil, Gadir, Motya, Malta and Carthage. The harbor system at Carthage represented a deliberate and carefully planned quay system, in which 120,000 cubic meters of earth were excavated from
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former marshland in order to make the *cothon*, and 115,000 cubic meters were excavated to create the circular naval harbor that was protected by a double wall. Excavations revealed one of the quays in the naval harbor was likely built using ashlar blocks of sandstone from Cap Bon in conjunction with a damming method described by Vitruvius centuries later, rather than the Roman hydraulic cement method. The technical knowledge and collective intelligence of Phoenician harbor engineers led historian Keith Beebe to remark that “few ancient construction jobs required of their builders greater knowledge of natural conditions, more plans for contingencies, and closer attention to upkeep.” The Phoenicians invented a system for removing silt from harbors using ramps, sluicegates and a basin for collecting the excess later adopted by Roman harbor engineers, in addition to innovations in quay construction, excavation, and design. This harbor technology was accompanied by the existence of superior Phoenician shipwrights upon which Persia depended for its navy, a mistake Rome did not repeat.

**POLITICAL SYSTEMS**

The earliest form of governance in Phoenicia originated in the context of the economic and political partnership between Jbeil and Egypt as early as the Middle Kingdom circa 2050 to
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1788 BCE, and was well-developed by the Twenty-Eighth Dynasty circa 1580 to 1375 BCE. Egypt maintained contact with Uruk and Syrian settlements through Jbeil, while goods reached Ebla in the same manner. Egypt eventually lost commercial ties to Phoenician cities amid the prioritization of the monotheistic cult led by Akhenaton circa 1358 BCE, while some Phoenician cities sought new alliances with the Hittites and other regional powers afterward. The most important political offices increasingly favored the city council in conjunction with westward expansion after the ninth century BCE.

Phoenicia experienced a transformative period between the decline of Egypt after the fourteenth century BCE through the Assyrian incursions of the ninth century BCE, growing from a string of a few cooperative city-states in the Levant to a civilization expanding westward across the Mediterranean to the Atlantic. This colonization process brought the Phoenicians into contact with nascent Greek and Italic cultures in the Aegean and further west, while Phoenicia strengthened internally through the economic competition of rival cities. Phoenicia underwent additional changes after the first treaty between Carthage and Rome in 509 BCE to the landing of Pyrrhus at Syracuse in 278 BCE. The final period of Phoenician political development occurred from the outbreak of the First Punic War in 264 BCE and witnessed the fading of Phoenician civilization, which effectively ended with the Vandals crossing into Africa in 429 CE. While many events occurred over this period of nearly three millennia, Phoenician social order and associated political organization remained relatively consistent once the specific offices were in


place before the ninth century BCE. Ruling councils of *suffettes* managed each city and its nearby dependent settlements, while the city chief served as the high priest and figurehead of the area, which seemed unsurprising to Aristotle given his claim that Phoenicians naturally favored democracy over monarchy.\(^{139}\)

Men in Phoenician society fell into certain groups based on their professional orientation. The *MLR* were traders, *SHR* were merchants, *MHSBM* were commercial agents, and *NGR* witnessed commercial transactions.\(^{140}\) The most important group were the *B’LM*, consisting of landowners, ship owners, wealthy private citizens, judges and priests. The title contains the singular *B’L*, or Ba’al, meaning “lord,” having here a secular character. Notably, the latter two types of *B’LM* were the most powerful men in Phoenicia, as they held the positions of *ŠPT* and *MLK*, in which the former made up the *suffettes* who comprised the city council of elders, and the latter were the chief priests and city kings.\(^{141}\)

The city council comprised of *suffettes* was undoubtedly the most important political element of the Phoenician civilization. Modern scholars misinterpreted or misunderstood Phoenician political institutions, thereby minimizing the role of the *suffette* because the idea of kingship was more familiar and accessible to many Classicists writing in a European vernacular.\(^{142}\) However, Phoenicia, like other Semitic cultures, had a long tradition of city councils executing legislative and judicial functions, while an important man related to the
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140. Plb. 3.22.8-9; Aubet, *Phoenicians in the West*, 229; Lipinski, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, 241.

141. The transliteration of ŠPT used in the present work is *suffette* because it is commonly used in general Semitic studies. This is problematic because it is an outdated transliteration based on Hebrew and not Phoenician. The correct transliteration would be closer to *shopet*. The erroneous Greek conflation of the *suffettes* with kings still affects modern scholarship. For additional information, consult the following: *CIS I* 4937.4; Aubet, *Phoenicians in the West*, 146-8; Krahmalkov, *Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, 160, 197; Lipinski, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, 436.

council served as a figurehead and chief priest of the city pantheon. Scholars erroneously use “king” to describe the titles B’L and MLK, which are respectively “lord” and “chief of the land,” attested for example at Lapethos in numismatic evidence from the fourth century BCE.¹⁴³

The suffetes were the city oligarchy and handled all domestic, foreign, and intercity matters of government, military, and economic importance. The story of Aqhat, preserved on a fourteenth century BCE fragment from Ugarit, provides a brief description of the judicial duties of the suffette, in which Danel “got up and sat at the entrance to the gate, among the leaders on the threshing floor. He judged the cases of widows, presided over orphan hearings,” and later he “sat to judge his people.”¹⁴⁴ The treaty between Neo-Assyrian King Esarhaddon and Baal of Sour explicitly identified the council as the decision making body, just as the council of ten was identified as the authority at Jbeil in the Amarna tablets and the Report of Wenamon.¹⁴⁵ The Phoenicians “held their common council and deliberated on matters of supreme importance” at Tripoli, at which representatives from Arwad, Sidon, and Sour participated.¹⁴⁶

Suffetes held military generalships and ensured colonies maintained administrative ties to their metropoles. Hiram of Sidon appointed a suffette to oversee Cypriot Carthage and likely Kition, which was continued through the Hellenistic period as Achaemenid Persia relied on Phoenician government administration of Cypriot cities including Marion, Kition, and Lapethos, while Cambyses placed another Hiram in charge of Salamis.¹⁴⁷ Sour was without a city chief and

¹⁴³. Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, 85.
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was instead governed by the oligarchy of suffettes during the Neo-Babylonian period, while a city chief with an assembly governed Jbeil in the fifth century BCE.\textsuperscript{148} Citizens of each city fought together under these suffettes, paralleling the contemporary Greek hoplites, as depicted on coins from Jbeil.\textsuperscript{149} These citizen soldiers not only fought foreign battles, but also put down civil war, as in the case of Bomilcar in his attempt to take a weakened Carthage during the campaigns of the tyrant Agathocles circa 310 BCE.\textsuperscript{150} Phoenician inscriptions at Volubilis regarding suffettes indicate the presence of the representative council there, indicating the system of government was not restricted to Levantine Phoenicia and North Africa, and was practiced at the furthest reaches of the civilization.\textsuperscript{151} Justinus provided an explanation for the origin of the suffettes in his examination of Phoenician leadership:

\begin{quote}
...as so numerous a family of commanders was dangerous to the liberty of the state … a hundred judges were chosen out of the senate, who were to demand of the generals, when they returned from war, an account of their proceedings, in order that, under this control, they might exercise their command in war with a regard to the judicature and laws at home.\textsuperscript{152}
\end{quote}

The councils in each major Phoenician city made their own decisions, consulting with other cities when required by necessity or mutual benefit. The Roman perception of “Punic” versus “Phoenician” identity was reinforced by Roman exposure to this arrangement through its treaties with Carthage and other treaties Carthage made with its neighbors independently of Sour,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{148} Elayi and Elayi, \textit{Monetary and Political History}, 17.
\textsuperscript{149} Diod. 16.42.2; Elayi and Elayi, \textit{Monetary and Political History}, 101.
\textsuperscript{150} Diod. 20.43; Just. 22.7.
\textsuperscript{151} Sabatino Moscati, \textit{The Phoenicians} (Rizzoli, 2000), 215-6.
\textsuperscript{152} Just. 19.2.
\end{flushright}
as with Etruria on two separate occasions. Similarly, Sour sent an embassy to the Ionian city of Teos, indicating unilateral syngeneia between these Phoenician and Greek cities. Treaties and peace agreements were made between Jbeil and nearby powers independently, evidenced by a ninth century inscription indicating acknowledgement of a previously agreed upon regional boundary. Despite these apparently independent actions, a system of deference among the cities existed whether founded upon religious, political, or economic principles. Phoenicians from Utica to Leptis Magna spoke a Berber-Phoenician creole but, Sallust observed, “their laws and customs continued for the most part Sidonian; which they have preserved with the greater case, through living at so great a distance from the royal dominions” in Levantine Phoenicia.

The case of Carthage and Sour is illustrative of this hierarchy. Carthage spoke for its “sister republics” on matters in North Africa rather than Sidon or Sour, as with the voyage of Hanno being “decreed by Carthaginians … for Libyo-Phoenicians.” Despite Carthage controlling the North African region of Phoenicia, the city continued paying an annual monetary tribute to Sour until its destruction in 146 BCE, with Carthaginian ships anchored at the mouth of the Tiber in Rome “for the conveyance of the traditional offering of first-fruits to their gods that the Carthaginians sent to [Sour],” while its subordinate status was further described in the Septuagint poem “Vision of Sour.”
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after the Assyrian annexation of the Levant in 738 BCE and the defeat of Necho by Nebuchadnezzar in 604 BCE, but the subordination of Carthage to Sour remained, if at an ideological level.159

ECONOMY AND TRADE

Phoenician economic relations with other civilizations have often been categorized as forms of tribute, unfair exchange, or piracy, while they were instead ancient, highly sophisticated and market-oriented.160 Additionally, modern scholars have continued favoring Greece over Phoenicia in the debate on the antiquity of maritime trade in the Mediterranean with, for example, D. Roller lauding the fourth century BCE Greek explorer Pytheas, who “can be set apart from the other explorers and travelers of antiquity: a scientist who traveled…for reasons of pure research…becoming the first to see the entire ocean as his area of endeavor,” despite centuries of Phoenician activity predating the travels of Pytheas.161 Scholars have also disproportionately assessed Phoenician trade through purple dye and cedar wood, while downplaying the importance of the principle goods supporting the overall economy such as silver and wine. This myopia is due in part to the reliance on Biblical sources, which discuss the cedar used in the temple of Solomon and the excesses in Phoenician wealth associated with

---


160. For example, Aubet claimed Phoenician trade in Gadir was “an example of unfair exchange,” because “unequal exchange [was] typical of the early stages of colonial trade,” also penning a chapter entitled ‘Trade with Tartessian Hinterland - An Example of Unfair Exchange’ in Phoenicians in the West, 285-91. See also Ellen Semple, “Pirate Coasts of the Mediterranean Sea,” Geographical Review 2, no. 2 (Aug., 1916): 140.

murex. Phoenician economy and trade was instead a complex network of relationships built around an early form of comparative advantage, employment of local labor, diversity in shipping routes, and cornering markets on niche and luxury items while accumulating vast wealth funding exploration and expansion.

Egyptian consumption fueled the earliest economic relationship Phoenicia held. This activity included not only the transmission of consumable items such as timber, but also included decorative items and labor. Egyptian-Levantine relations likely began no later than around the fifth millennium BCE with Semitic migration across the Sinai, lending Semitic linguistic elements to the Egyptian language. Phoenician clay vessels found in Egypt, and Egyptian sherds in Phoenicia from the same period, indicate a trade relationship existing from at least the third millennium BCE.162 This relationship began in the Late Pre-Dynastic Period and continued through the Old Kingdom, as an inscription shows pharaoh Snefru received forty shiploads of timber from the Levant circa 2600 BCE.163 Levantine Phoenicia was particularly suited for an early monopoly on fine glass production due to the composition, access, and prevalence of good quality sand near coastal settlements.164 Egypt did not exercise political control over the Levant at that time; instead, the relationship was based on trade and mutual settlement especially focused around Phoenician copper mining settlements in Sinai.

The ivory trade grew as routes were operated separately to India and Africa in conjunction with the increased demand from Egypt and emerging powers. Phoenicia was


increasingly moving ivory, glass, and copper in the middle of the second millennium BCE, shipping these items to Egypt along with balsam wood, while Ugarit depended upon Phoenician cedar, mentioned in the Baal Cycle. Phoenicia began producing cylinder seals and ivory crafts after 1750 BCE for export throughout the Near East, in addition to customers in Egypt. Their involvement in the ivory trade with India was evident from 1000 BCE, while Sudan and Somaliland provided alternative sources of raw materials through Arabia. The ivory trade continued with the northern Kush empire in the eighth century BCE, evidenced by finds in Sanam and Gebel Barkal. Phoenicia also controlled the ivory trade with Judean customers, as evidenced by finds at Megiddo. While Barnett, et al., describe ivories from these centuries of trade as “Greek and oriental,” such a classification is erroneous given the origins of the materials from India and Africa through Phoenician trade in operation before the existence of Greece.

Phoenicia maintained trade relationships with its neighbors over the centuries, whether friend or foe. The economic relationship between Ugarit and Jbeil in the middle of the second millennium BCE was evident from the text of a loan payment by an official in Ugarit to an official in Jbeil, in which Jbeil received a number of silver shekels guaranteeing the use of a ship and a separate payment of silver shekels for its outfitting. Cyprus became an important trade
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partner following the decline of Egypt and Phoenician expansion out of the Levant. Phoenician trade with Cyprus began in the eleventh century BCE soon after Phoenicians destroyed the fortified city at Tell Dor, inhabited at that time by the Sikil tribe of Sea Peoples. Nearly identical bowl industries at sites in Cyprus and Italy provide additional evidence of Etruscan-Phoenician trade, in this case emanating from Kition. Assyrian tablets from 858 to 727 BCE indicate Assyria was becoming an increasingly burdensome regional power, demanding tribute in addition to the usual trade goods. Phoenician economic activity was forced to orient toward Assyria during the *pax Assyrica* of the eighth and seventh centuries BCE. Assyria maintained mutually beneficial economic relations with Phoenicia despite the establishment of tribute requirements, evidenced by a trade agreement between Tiglath-Pileser III and Sour defining harbor use and tax structure. Neo-Assyrians received their tin from Iberia through Phoenician trade, while obtaining olive oil from Ekron in the same manner. Tripoli was founded around this time by Sour, Sidon, and Arwad, and its explicit function was common knowledge to neighboring powers, as Diodorus observed:

> In Phoenicia there is an important city called Tripoli, whose name is appropriate to its nature, for there are in it three cities, at a distance of a stade from one another, and the names by which these are called are the city of the Aradians, of the Sidonians, and of the Tyrians. This city enjoys the highest repute amongst the cities of Phoenicia, for there, as it happens, the Phoenicians held their common council and deliberated on matters of supreme importance.
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Was the founding of Tripoli a direct result of these three cities seeking a more effective strategy for paying Assyrian tribute? This would explain the exclusion of Jbeil, as the latter was not included in the Assyrian tribute list.\textsuperscript{177} Regardless of the reason, the consolidation and cooperation reached through Tripoli in the east marked an important development in foreign economic activity, as was the ascendency of Rome in the west shortly thereafter.

The Phoenician economic relationship with Rome began late in the history of the former and early in that of the latter. Phoenicia had long been engaged with the Italian peninsula before Rome began forming its own identity there. The Etruscan relationship was an important balance against Greek hegemony in the northern areas of the Mediterranean, while Phoenician cities existed on Sicily, Sardinia, and Malta for centuries, as previously discussed. The first treaty between Rome and Carthage was primarily economic, and briefly touched upon military matters. Rome was seeking to increase its economic activity in the region, while Carthage was maintaining a tradition of cooperation between foreign and Phoenician cities.\textsuperscript{178}

This cooperation between foreign cities was not only limited to direct economic agreements, but also included labor, land use, and the formalization of Phoenicia as a trade intermediary between larger civilizations. For example, Rhodian ships chose Phoenician ports in their Mediterranean grain shipping circuit in the third century BCE.\textsuperscript{179} This role continued through the first century CE, as evidenced by a first century Chinese account, in which silk was
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purchased by Phoenician merchants in Levantine cities including Sour, Sidon, and Berytos, destined for Roman consumers.\textsuperscript{180} Indeed, Chinese and Indian silk merchants were regulated under a state-controlled monopoly in Rome during the fourth century CE, while dying and processing facilities for Roman consumption were located at Sour, Sidon, and Berytus from the first century CE onward.\textsuperscript{181}

The warm relations between Phoenicia and its indigenous trade partners assisted in the establishment of reliable shipping routes in use for centuries.\textsuperscript{182} Archaeological evidence provides insight into the extent of these trade routes. Phoenicia was involved in long-distance trade from the Proto-Literate Period in Mesopotamia and the Pre-Dynastic Period in Egypt, as evidenced by cylinder seals found in Sumer.\textsuperscript{183} Daggers found with similar manufacture and breakage patterns in Crete and Jbeil suggest relations between these locations during the Early Bronze Age were well established and this contact was direct.\textsuperscript{184} Likely Linear B inscriptions were found on stirrup jars in Sidon and Cyprus, both with a likely Cretan origin.\textsuperscript{185} Crete was an


\textsuperscript{182} For a useful map of Phoenician sea routes, see Aubet, \textit{Phoenicians in the West}, 188, fig. 40.


important transshipment point for Phoenician trade, especially for the westward voyages.\(^{186}\)

Transshipment points such as Cyprus and Malta were of critical importance, as Phoenician traders in the eighth century BCE would take direct routes over deep water out of sight of land, as evidenced by a wreck discovered using high resolution photographic mosaics and military sonar.\(^{187}\) Wrecks such as this indicate standardized production of amphorae and navigation methods in the most dangerous waters in the Mediterranean.\(^{188}\)

Studies of these ubiquitous Phoenician amphorae illuminate the extent of the trade routes and relationships maintained in the first millennium BCE beyond the Levant. For example, Ibero-Phoenician pottery found at Banasa confirms contacts with Iberia prior to Carthaginian attempts at control of the area, and at Mogador from the fifth to sixth centuries BCE.\(^{189}\)

Similarly, the area of the North African coast west of the Nile Delta was increasingly involved in Levantine trade between 750 and 625 BCE but was interrupted as a result of turmoil in the Near East.\(^{190}\) Phoenician amphorae originating in the Levant began appearing in Carthage in the eighth century BCE, and the types of amphorae found there indicate Carthage was a Phoenician trading center from the eighth through fifth centuries BCE. The Phoenician city of Cerro del Villar conducted interregional pottery production, creating goods for both Greek and Etruscan customers during the sixth century BCE, while trading oil and wine with the interior of
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Andalusia. At the same time, iron smelting activity was taking place on Mogador, and trade with indigenous communities around the river basin adjacent to the island are evident. Relations with indigenous Berbers in Africa were not only trade oriented, but also provided Phoenicia with necessary labor for processing certain items near their source of acquisition.

Labor in Phoenician society was not restricted simply to slave labor. Phoenicians did employ slave labor in the North African grain fields, but Berber tribes maintained autonomous control of cattle, goats, and horses. The slave labor described by the hostile ancient sources was likely a form of tribute and conditions of military alliances rather than forced labor, as Phoenicians intermarried with Berbers and shared a creole. Phoenicians also purchased land from Berbers, and paid settlement fees to local Berber tribes for land at Carthage. The congenial nature of the labor relationship with the Berbers indicates there was a high level of cooperation and unity between the two, as the victories against Rome would have been impossible using a mixed military if the Berber allies lacked the will to fight beyond a simple coercive power in complex military campaigns such as in the Punic Wars.

Phoenician artifacts and craftsman were located throughout Greece, Etruria, and Assyria, while colonies near the Red Sea existed from at least the sixth century BCE. Heaps of Phoenician potsherds, amphorae, and an ostracon found at sites such as Tell el-Maskhuta echo
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the canal works and spice trade described by Herodotus. The Phoenician merchant settlements in Egypt described by Herodotus are corroborated by inscriptions recently found there, with inscriptions in Memphis alone spanning the seventh through first centuries BCE.

Phoenicians continued running a complex trade network in the Mediterranean Sea into the Common Era even after the destruction of Carthage and ascension of Rome. Sour maintained a statio both in its own harbor and in Rome in 176 CE while grave inscriptions paint a picture of a vibrant and diverse economy in the later Roman Empire. The harbor Santa-Marinella at Caere was labeled “punicum” on the Puetinger Table, indicating a permanent Phoenician merchant establishment there. Phoenicians from Sour maintained colonies in Rome and Puteoli, which were ports of entry for eastern merchants, as evidenced by correspondence between the two regarding a financial matter dated to 174 CE. More than 100 inscriptions placed after 134 CE have been recovered near Jbeil, marking the limits of the Roman imperial forest and designating four types of trees as protected for this purpose. This protection was necessary as deforestation began limiting the amount of wood available for both public and private use. Indeed, several types of timber had been continuously cut and sold to foreign powers since at least the time of Snefru circa 2600 BCE, followed by every major power throughout
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Antiquity and into the Common Era. Romans adopted grain storage methods developed from Phoenician techniques in the Carthaginian district of Osca, modern Huesca in Aragon, while Romans knew of a Phoenician method of carting grain in Iberia in the second century BCE. Wealthy Romans hired merchants to deliver grain from Punic North Africa and Sardinia, while their wine came from Kos and Kios, preferring these sources over domestic producers.

All of these locations were integral to Phoenician trade with neighboring powers, but exploration outside these areas ensured access to new sources of goods. The Phoenicians conducted exploratory expeditions at the fringes of their sphere of influence in order to maintain old ties and forge new ones. The Necho voyage is the most well known example, in which an expedition in the seventh or sixth century BCE strengthened ties to distant Phoenician communities from Salle to Lixus, and as far south as Mogador and Lanzarote. The ancient literary sources writing from Greece and Rome were aware of some faraway Phoenician trade sites, but did not know enough about them to separate myth from reality, leaving archaeological research as the sole means for determining the extent of these settlements. The broad spectrum of Phoenician trade goods enabled amassing of wealth while encouraging expansion and exploration westward.
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The items traded fluctuated over time based on foreign demand, such as ivories early in their history and silk later, while gold, iron, copper, glass, garum, oil, grain, and timber were always popular. The Gadir circuit quickly began answering the growing demand for emerging powers in the Mediterranean. This circuit included all of the West African and Iberian settlements, in addition to some islands in the Western Mediterranean such as Ibiza. The Oran area of North Africa, including Rachgoun and Mersa Madakh, served as the eastern limit of this circuit, overlapping the western limits of the Carthage circuit.207 The Gadir circuit included ivory, gold, copper, iron, and lead from Lixus, while Mogador provided whale, fish, iron, and ostrich shells for religious purposes.208 Tingis, Tetuan, Lixus, Sexi, Malaka, and Abdera produced garum, while Almunecar, Toscanos, and Morro de Mezquitilla all specialized in murex processing (see figure 6).209 Tuna was another important aspect of the Gadir circuit, as sailors obtained tuna from the Atlantic coast of Iberia for transport onward to Carthage with privately financed ships.210 Pliny reported certain cases of individual tuna weighing nearly a ton.211 Other items, such as wine and silver remained popular and were arguably the most important exports of the Phoenician civilization.
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Ancient authors considered the production and sale of wine the most important aspect of Phoenician trade, and it was one of the earliest exports from the Gadir trade circuit.\footnote{Diod. 5.17.} Phoenician colonists brought grapes to the western Mediterranean in the earliest periods of their presence there.\footnote{Ballard et al., “Iron Age Shipwrecks,” 166.} Soon after, large scale oil and wine production were underway, while dozens of bread bakeries and other local infrastructure were in place at sites such as Oualili.\footnote{Plin. Nat. 5.1; Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 316.} Archaeological evidence of this activity, especially wine production, provides a useful method for examining the extent of Phoenician trade in the early first millennium BCE. A specific type of wine decanter associated with overseas transport was a trademark of these sites, while their datable residues provide insight into Iron Age dietary habits across the Mediterranean.\footnote{David Tanasi et al., “1H-1H NMR 2D-TOCSY, ATR FT-IR and SEM-EDX for the identification of organic residues on Sicilian prehistoric pottery,” Microchemical Journal 135 (Nov., 2017): 140-7.} Ballard, et al., considered these jars “the calling card of the Phoenicians from the Levant to the Pillars of Hercules,” while his team excavated Phoenician shipwrecks.\footnote{Ballard et al., “Iron Age Shipwrecks,” 166.} Wine was perhaps one of the oldest goods traded long distances in the Mediterranean, as new evidence suggests wine production had been taking place on Sicily from the second millennium BCE, while central Italy adopted Phoenician alcoholic drinking equipment and habits by the eighth century BCE ensuring unceasing demand remained steady through the Roman Republic and Empire.\footnote{Diod. 5.17; Dan Stanislawski, “Dark Age Contributions to the Mediterranean Way of Life,” Annals of the Association of American Geographers 63, no. 4 (Dec., 1973): 397-410; Tanasi, et al., “Identification of Organic Residues,” 140; Joffe, “Alcohol and Social Complexity in Ancient Western Asia,” Current Anthropology 39, no. 3 (Jun., 1998): 308.}
The Phoenician silver trade is remarkable in its volume and technical achievement but, like other aspects of their civilization, it started from humble beginnings. Early demand for silver was limited by access to silver mines. There were no silver mines in the Levant, thus trade with Anatolia and Iberia became options. Anatolia was providing silver for Greece. Iberia, with its already centuries old Phoenician settlements, proved a viable alternative. Evidence of Phoenician metallurgic activities are apparent from the eighth century BCE onward, at sites such as Toscanos.218 Significantly, the Assyrian adoption of a silver standard forced increased production, leading to the rapid growth of western settlements near silver mines and entrepôts, as innovations in industrial production concurrently arose. Surveys around the Huelva area have revealed at least 39 metallurgical processing sites related to this industry.219 Mines were quickly exhausted, while others were discovered throughout Iberia using rapid burning and clearing techniques to expose ore beneath forested areas.220

The silver industry was related to the rapid growth of coinage as a means of communicating value in the middle of the first millennium BCE. Phoenician coins using standardized circular molds began first in Jbeil circa 450 BCE, followed by Sidon and Sour circa 365 and 357 BCE, respectively.221 Arwad continued issuing coins of Attic weight between 174 and 110 BCE, while Sour produced coins through the first century CE.222 Coins produced in all of these cities differed in markings and composition but retained common symbolism, hierarchy,
and issue types, with shekels for wealth accumulation and one gram pieces for daily transactions.  

223 Coins from Jbeil contained only silver and were circulated internally, and scholars have catalogued 1,662 such coins from Jbeil.  

224 The relative value of silver, whether as coins or other forms, was perceived differently in various contexts.  

225 Silver profit funded Phoenician expansion and stoked the envy of neighboring powers, regardless of how indigenous producers valued this commodity.  

Phoenicians processed and shipped silver on an industrial scale in order to meet incessant foreign and domestic demand. Each boat moved 1,000 to 2,000 kilograms of ore, while anchors were reportedly made of silver rather than lead in order to increase the volume each ship could move.  

226 Phoenician technicians produced more than 15,000,000 tons of slag at Rio Tinto near Tartessos around the first millennium BCE, representing the greatest concentration of pyrometallurgical residue of a single site anywhere in history.  

227 The Rio Tinto industry produced 16 pounds of silver per ton of ore.  

228 Evidence of the domestic Phoenician demand for silver in coin production provides a glimpse into the sheer volume of silver mined in Iberia and moved east across the Mediterranean to the Levant. ‘Ozba’al of Jbeil minted an estimated 340,000 shekels during his time in power. This would require around 4.76 tons of silver considering the standard weight of a shekel was 14 grams. At the same time, ‘Ozmilk of Sour
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used around 16.32 tons of silver over a 17 year period to produce his issue of coins, while Arwad and Sidon maintained minting activities on a similar scale. All of these data points lend credence to claims Pliny made that the mine at Baebelo produced 300 pounds of silver per day for Phoenicia during the Punic Wars.

Punic war indemnities imposed on Carthage were indeed immense. The massive trade network still controlled by the Phoenicians during the second century BCE is demonstrated by the successful payment of 10,000 silver talents, equivalent to around 340 tons, over 50 years following the Second Punic War. This was all the more impressive, considering the Phoenicians were able to raise and fund their army and navy despite being specifically forbidden from doing so as part of their peace terms with Rome. Indeed, they were able to inflict several crushing defeats upon the Roman military even during the Third Punic War, all financed by continued monopoly of the silver trade through the second century BCE.


231. Plin. *Nat.* 31.6; Diod. 5.38.2.
V. RESULTS: PHOENICIAN WRITING AND LANGUAGE

PHOENICIAN LINGUISTIC IDENTITY

Language is one of the major elements defining a civilization. A study of the Phoenician language provides valuable insight into why the Phoenicians across the Mediterranean considered themselves one people, how their identity expanded as their expeditions grew, and what constituted their legacy upon later cultures. Phoenician language and culture persisted especially in North Africa, as Phoenician was spoken there through the fifth century CE despite the Phoenician alphabet eventually fading in favor of Latin letters. All of Andalusia, North Africa, and Sardinia spoke Phoenician until at least the first century CE. Scholars long viewed Phoenician and Punic as separate languages, but this is no longer a valid conclusion. Indeed, the continued division of the language for ideological rather than practical reasons constitutes an intentional subterfuge of Phoenician identity.

It is first necessary to identify what the Phoenicians called themselves and where those names came from in order to characterize Phoenician identity through their language. The earliest reference to the original Levantine Phoenician territory is attested in the Late Bronze Age Egyptian inscription identifying PT, or Put, ranging from Sidon in the north to Akko in the south. The later Biblical term for this geographical area was KN’N, or Canaan, which eventually entered the Phoenician vernacular for their own homeland. However, the term KN’N and its related forms were ultimately foreign, possibly from Hurrian or other nearby provenance.

232. Strab. 1.3.2, 3.2.13-4; Mart. 1.61.9, 5.78.26; Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 257, 259; Gordon, “Northwest Semitic Texts,” 287; Krahmalkov, Phoenician-Punic Grammar, 5 and 19; idem, “Notes on Tripolitanian Neo-Punic,” Journal of the American Oriental Society 114, no. 3 (Jul. – Sep., 1994): 453.
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in the third millennium BCE and later, first used to designate the geographic space between the Orontes and Mount Carmel and only later becoming an ethnonym.\footnote{Moscati, “‘Israel’s Predecessors’ A Re-Examination of Certain Current Theories,” Journal of Bible and Religion 24, no. 4 (Oct., 1956): 253, 247.} The Phoenician name of the Phoenician language was \textit{PNYMH}, or Ponnim, as seen for example in Psalm 45 and the identical \textit{PNYMH} in Plautus.\footnote{Pl. Poen. 5; Psalm 45.} Authors writing in the fourth century BCE identified Phoenicians living in North Africa as “Libyo-Phoenicians.”\footnote{This demonym is given by Ephorus, quoted in the \textit{Ethnica} of Stephen of Byzantium; see also Lipinski, \textit{Itineraria Phoenicia}, 353.} The Phoenicians living in North Africa in the fourth century CE still called themselves collectively \textit{KN’N}, while some Libyo-Phoenicians nostalgically called themselves “Sorima,” or “people from Sour,” according to third century CE inscriptions at Tripolitania in North Africa and literary sources such as Augustine of Hippo.\footnote{Aug. Epist. 66.2, 108.14, 209.3; idem, \textit{Expositio ad Romanos inchoate} 13.1; Krahmalkov, \textit{Phoenician-Punic Grammar}, 1-5.} This led to the Biblical and Hellenic understanding of Canaan as the geographic homeland of a Semitic people speaking Ponnim. Whence \textit{Phoenicia} and \textit{Punic}?

The Phoenicians transmitted their alphabet to Greece through Crete, an important nexus for Greek and Phoenician interaction in the ninth century BCE.\footnote{This development is described in the next section. See also Drews, “Phoenicians, Carthage,” 46; Lipinski, \textit{Itineraria Phoenicia}; Erickson, “Crete in Transition: Pottery Styles and Island History in the Archaic and Classical Periods,” Hesperia Supplements 45 (2010): 6.} The Greek language adapted Phoenician in the context of Linear B and existing Phoenician forms, which is supported not only by references in Herodotus and Diodorus, but also through the use of tablets shaped like palm leaves upon which the Phoenician alphabet is first attested in Greek use.\footnote{F. Ahl, “Cadmus and the Palm-Leaf Tablets,” American Journal of Philology 88, no. 2 (Apr., 1967): 189.} The tablets may have
replaced the actual use of palm leaves for scribal practice, which happen to be called “Phonike” in Greek.\(^{240}\) The Greeks called this script written on palm-shaped tablets the “Phoinikia Grammata” during the ninth century BCE adoption of the alphabet, while “the scribe is called poinikastas … the man who writes in Phoenician letters.”\(^{241}\) In addition, the constellation Ursa Minor was known as *Phoinike* by ancient authors before Strabo but was unknown to Homer, hinting at the etymological pathway this term may have taken, as this constellation had a long tradition in Semitic and Akkadian use.\(^{242}\) Tradition has created the perception of a unilateral etymology for *Phoinike* and *Phoenix* in the purple dye of the murex but this, like many traditions, must be reevaluated.\(^{243}\)

The shift from Greek *Phoinike* to Latin *Punicus* is not difficult to trace, but the simple change brought with it the negative associations and misunderstandings now so commonly applied to Phoenician civilization. The Greeks did not distinguish between Phoenicians on the Levantine coast and those in Africa or Iberia. Some Romans began using *Phoinix* to refer to Levantine Phoenicians in the fifth century BCE, the Greek term for all Phoenicians regardless of geographic location. For Romans following this convention, Phoenicians west of the traditional “Phoenicia proper” in the Levant were referred to as *Punicus* and *Poenus*, while the Roman Eastern Diocese districts of both *Phoenice* and *Phoinice Libanensis* were under military

\(^{240}\) Ahl, “Cadmus,” 191.


\(^{242}\) Strab. 1.1.6; Hyginus *Astronomica* 2.2; Robert Brown, *Eridanus: River and Constellation* (London: Longman’s, 1883), 67; Aubet, *Phoenicians in the West*, 168.

\(^{243}\) For a discussion on modern interpretations of the origin of these terms, see Michael Astour, “The Origin of the Terms ‘Canaan,’ ‘Phoenician,’ and ‘Purple,’” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 24, no. 4 (Oct., 1965): 348.
responsibility of the *Dux Foenicis*.

In an analysis of Roman vocabulary on Phoenician demonyms, philologist George Franko concluded “*Poenus* is not merely an ethnic tag, but also the term of choice for negative discourse,” and “*Poenus* is the defamatory and pejorative term” used by Romans to feed “stereotypes and slanders later constructed as a justification for the annihilation of Carthage.”

However, not all Roman authors chose the latter term, with Avienus noting many settlements and cities along the coast of southern Andalusia, importantly identifying them as Phoenician and not Punic in his Latin text, following the Greek distinction demonstrated by Plato of “Phoenicians, especially Carthaginians.” Why did this demonym change when transferring from Greek into Latin?

The answer lies in the Latin approximation of foreign loan words. Pre-literary Latin speakers commonly dropped the consonantal *h* aspiration of initial ϕ in ϕοινίκη, while modifying ϕι to *u*, and shifting consonant final κη to *us*, transforming the Greek “phoinike” to *punicus*. This convention would have already been in use by the time Naevius wrote *Bellum Punicum* in the middle of the third century BCE, as Roman heroic verse began to take shape. A similar situation occurred in the Old Latin interpretation of Phoenician *QRT HDŠT*, in which this name was rendered as *Cart-hada*, followed by incorporation of a Greek *theta* in place of the aspirated *h*.

---

244. *Notitia Dignitatum* 32.


h, resulting in Carthada and the later Carthago. Meanwhile, Phoenicians in Carthage referred to their city by the Phoenician QRT HDŠT through at least the second century BCE.  

Dialects and regionalization persisted under a “magna Phoenicia” with the primary dialect in the east characterized by Sour-Sidonian, and with Punic the dominant western dialect having Egypt geographically separating the two. Interestingly, this pattern is followed almost exactly by a close successor of both Phoenician culture and orthography with the Mashriqi and Maghrebi dialects of Arabic covering nearly the same territory also separated by Egypt. The Latin transcription of Phoenician in Poenulus is the best example of Punic as a dialect rather than a separate language, and this passage is the longest known example of Phoenician dialogue. Phoenician was also still spoken on Crete through the Hellenistic period, as evidenced by inscriptions from Praisos, Psychro, and Dreros. The Phoenician language was spoken by the majority in Roman North Africa through the second century CE with changes primarily in some consonantal forms and sibilants defining the Punic dialect. Upon combining the Phoenician dialects into a single gloss, Krahmalkov concluded “Phoenician was the mother tongue of a powerful and brilliant colonial culture that extended from Cyrenaica to Morocco, from Sicily and Sardinia to southwestern Spain.” The lack of literary sources in traditional Phoenician, beyond some quotations, inscriptions, and bilingual dedications, results in the current understanding of

---


249. KAI 9, 10, 24, 26; Krahmalkov, Phoenician-Punic Grammar, 1-7. The Maghrebi dialect of Arabic spans all of North Africa west of Egypt, while Egypt leans toward Classical and Modern Standard Arabic, followed by Mashriqi Arabic spoken across the Levant, from Syria to Jordan and down the gulf into Oman.
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the Phoenician language that is “perforce fragmented, incomplete, and always problematic,” and must be studied further as a single language with important dialectical differences rather than several separate but related languages. This unity is demonstrated in the continuity and legacy of Phoenician orthography.

PHOENICIAN ORTHOGRAPHY

The Phoenician alphabet originated in the context of its primary trade relationship with Egypt. The volume of trade between Phoenicia and Egypt necessitated record keeping, just as cuneiform did further east. The earliest examples of uniquely Phoenician orthography are inscriptions on hard objects such as spatulae and sarcophagi, precluding the use of cuneiform in favor of a more versatile writing system. The Phoenician alphabet originated in a decentralized manner representative of the expansive trade networks in use at the time, bringing scribal practices into contact with Egyptian, Hittite, and Luwian cultures, among others. The final orthographic form emerged after a few intermediate methods failed to catch on, such as the syllabary from Jbeil. The so-called “Byblos Syllabary” featured 37 total graphemes, with 3 having close Egyptian hieroglyphic links, while the other 34 clearly correspond with Hittite hieroglyphics. Eight of the signs in this group correspond to letters of the later Phoenician alphabet, indicating a mostly Egyptian hieratic lineage with some Hittite influence. This intermediate example did not survive the eventual dominance of the Phoenician orthography


developed in closer contact with the writing techniques of pen, ink and paper used by writers of Egyptian hieratic.

The use of pen ink, and paper from Egypt was adopted in the Levant around the same time the Phoenicians adapted hieratic writing for their own distinct alphabetical system. The adoption of this particular kit of scribal tools makes sense given they did not use cuneiform in record keeping during the second millennium BCE because their scribal technology was not adapted to work with cuneiform, as Breasted observed “a script worse suited to such writing materials than cuneiform can hardly be imagined.”

The pathway for Greek adoption of the Phoenician alphabet is so far the first attested instance of a Semitic writing system adopted to write Indo-European languages. The first step in this process did not occur in the Aegean, but instead along the land routes from northern Phoenicia, across the Orontes, over the Anatolian plains toward Lukka between the Bronze Age collapse and the Assyrian period of regional dominance. This pathway is illustrated by the Luwian-Phoenician-Assyrian trilingual texts and Luwian-Phoenician bilinguals from the eighth century in Anatolia, and the Phoenician fragments found throughout Cilicia from the same period. The Phrygian adoption of the Phoenician alphabet predates Greek adoption, and some scholars suggest the passing of the Phoenician alphabet to Greece and the Aegean may have come across this land route rather than the other hypothesized route hopping across Cyprus and Crete. A definitive answer is still lacking.


Increasing trade activity outside the declining Egyptian sphere of influence ensured the Phoenician alphabet would not only be exposed to, but also be adopted by, emerging cultures further west into the Aegean and the rest of the Mediterranean. As Egyptian power weakened, Phoenicians began expanding trade with the Aegean islands in response to increased demand following recovery from the Bronze Age collapse with a focus on Crete and Cyprus. Phoenician letters were used to write the Eteocypriot language by the tenth century BCE, while writers of the Cretan language had already widely adopted the Phoenician alphabet before the sixth century BCE. A bronze mitra with inscriptions written in the Indo-European Eteocretan language using the Semitic Phoenician alphabet is an example of this adoption.259 Meanwhile in the western Mediterranean, a seal with Phoenician writing was found in Tomb S of the Macchiabate cemetery in Calabria deposited circa 750 BCE, while a bronze vessel in Phoenician relief was excavated in Vetulonia. A cuneiform inscription in Phoenician language on a bronze vessel from a seventh century BCE tomb in Falerii lends additional credence to the cosmopolitan position of these western outposts.260 These deposits indicate Indo-European exposure to the Phoenician writing system from the tenth through sixth centuries BCE, with subsequent assimilation and adopted of this system in the proceeding centuries. Phoenician inscriptions on Cyprus only began diminishing during the second and first centuries BCE with a shift in preference from Phoenician to Greek after pressure from Ptolemaic dominance in the region at that time.

Experimental writing techniques were occurring in the context of decentralized Phoenician trade rather than conquest with a singular purpose, and orthographic differences and experimentation were therefore widespread in the absence of an official form, in contrast to


“Imperial Aramaic” in the Persian period. Early Latin and Greek adopters of the Phoenician alphabet not only attempted writing right to left, but also occasionally used boustrophedon as seen in the *Lapis Niger* from the late period of the Roman monarchy, before eventually settling on the final left to right format.\(^{261}\) The early Greek system of writing numbers from right to left was also a result of the constant contact between the writing systems of these cultures.\(^{262}\)

Unique orthographic modifications occurred during the adoptive process, but the original word order and letter structure remained relatively intact. For example, the Greek alphabet adopted the names of each letter borrowed from Phoenician, since Phoenician letters were named for a word beginning with the sound of that letter in the Phoenician language.\(^{263}\) Therefore \(A\) was ‘*aleph*, i.e. ox; \(B\) was *bayt*, i.e. house; \(G\) was *giml*, i.e. camel; \(D\) was *dalt*, i.e. door; and so on in the Phoenician alphabet. Compare these pronunciations and orthographic forms to \(alpha\), \(beta\), \(gamma\), and \(delta\) in ancient Greek. In the Latin adoption process, the seventh century BCE “Alphabet of Marsiliana” is the earliest known example of the Etruscan alphabet, child of the Phoenician alphabet and parent of the Latin, Oscan, and Umbrian alphabets.\(^{264}\)

Despite the experimentation, adaptation and modification of the Phoenician alphabet into Greek, Etruscan, Latin, Aramaic, Hebrew, Syriac, Brahmi, and other forms, the Phoenician language written in the Phoenician alphabet maintained orthographic consistency across the span of its civilization especially from the seventh century BCE onward, evidenced by finds at

\(^{261}\) *CIL* \(1^\text{st}\).  


Mogador in Morocco, Kition on Cyprus, and Toscanos in Spain.\textsuperscript{265} In Greece, a Hellenistic grave stele provides evidence of a literate Phoenician-Greek speaking population between the fourth through second centuries BCE, in which the bilingual inscription demonstrates the continuity of the Phoenician language with the usual \textit{interpretatio Greaca} in the Attic translation.\textsuperscript{266} Punic orthography, when following formal conventions, is virtually the same as eastern Phoenician with minor differences, such as the use of ‘\textit{aleph}’ at the end of words indicating final vowels.\textsuperscript{267} An eleventh century BCE financial transaction inscribed in so-called “Byblian Phoenician” dialect on a spatula from Jbeil bears similarities to later Punic forms, especially in expressing negatives, and shows undeniable continuity across the Phoenician dialects over a millennium.\textsuperscript{268}

Phoenician writings were held in high regard even by their greatest detractors. Phoenician was the only other language translated into Greek literature besides Latin.\textsuperscript{269} The Romans were indebted to Phoenicians for their developments in agricultural techniques developed in the Bagradas River Valley. The Roman senate ordered official translations of Phoenician agricultural treatises into Latin, and Roman farmers were encouraged to read these volumes “handed down in large numbers.”\textsuperscript{270} Varro presented an impressive multidisciplinary list of Classical literary sources used in his agricultural treatise, finishing by stating “all of these are surpassed in
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reputation by Mago of Carthage, who gathered into twenty-eight books, written in the Punic
tongue, the subjects they had dealt with separately.271 Sallust relied on translations of a lost
Libyan history written in Phoenician during the Jugurthine War, specifically noting he trusted
these above the vernacular sources.272 In Utica, Cassius Dionysus also produced an abridged
Greek translation of the now lost Mago work, compressing the twenty-eight books into eight.273
In addition to dramatic abridgements, ancient literary authors took liberties with their translations
leading in part to the modern misunderstandings of Phoenician language and their civilization.
For example, Diodorus reproduced a relatively lengthy Phoenician military campaign narrative
describing the apparent barbarity of Phoenician tactics from 406 BCE that was considered fact
into modern times until the Phoenician inscription upon which his account was based was
recently found, demonstrating propagandistic revisionism characteristic of a hostile outsider.274

The Phoenician writing system and elements of culture remained in use by Berbers in
North and West Africa long after a unified Phoenician civilization faded away. This process
occurred through Phoenician adoption of indigenous toponyms at their settlements, such as at
Oualili, meaning “oleander” in the local Berber dialect. The Phoenicians retained this toponym,
which the Romans later modified into Volubilis.275 The survival of Libyo-Berber toponyms
along the North and West African coasts indicates the peaceful accommodation and assimilation
of the Phoenician settlers by indigenous Berber groups. The Phoenician-Berber creole process

271. Varr. 1.1.9-10.
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274. Diod. 13.90.1; CIS I 5510, 9-11; Krahmalkov, Phoenician-Punic Grammar, 13.
275. Barnaby Rogerson, Marrakesh, Fez, and Rabat (Cadogan, 2010), 207.
was already obvious during the second century BCE as Sallust noted the Phoenician “language alone has been altered by their intermarriages with Numidians.” The creole spoken at a military outpost at Bu Njem demonstrates the Punic dialect was the vernacular in Tripolitanian North Africa at least through the third century CE. Hundreds of inscriptions on ostraca from this site demonstrate Roman power weakening in the province during the upheavals of the “crisis of the third century,” while the older Phoenician influence remained in force through the dialect spoken and personal names of the individuals living there.

The Phoenician expeditions to the islands of Macaronesia as early as the seventh century BCE introduced their orthography to the various Berber groups living there. These Berbers used Phoenician orthography until at least the fifth century CE, as evidenced by the so-called “Zanata stone” from Lanzarote. The inscription on this stone is written using a modified Phoenician alphabet adapted for the Guanche language, an Amazigh Berber dialect spoken on Lanzarote. A form of this alphabet was likely in use in Macaronesia since Phoenician contact and subsequent settlements were established there a millennium earlier, activity seeming perfectly natural to Pliny as he observed the islands were “in fact adapted to that of maritime discovery.” This process was likely conducted in the context of continuous trade, attested by a

276. Sal. Bel. 78.
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279. Macaronesia includes the four archipelagoes of the Azores, Canaries, Madeira, and Cabo Verde. The name is derived from the Greek μακάρων νήσοι, lit. “fortunate islands,” or Islands of the Fortunate.
280. The name of this island in the native Guanche language is Taterogaka. “Piedra Zenata,” Museo de la Naturaleza, Tenerife; Hanno Periplus 16; Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, 470.
recent find of a Phoenician coin hoard under a ruin on Corvo in the Azores. The relationship between Phoenician writing and the Berber languages as a whole has remained persistent throughout North and West Africa, as Berbers presently use a modified Phoenician alphabet, called Tifinigh in the Amazigh dialect of Berber. This alphabet is presently taught to school children in Morocco and Algeria, and can be seen on street signs, government buildings, and official documents in Northwest Africa, underscoring the important connection between Phoenician and Berber identity currently overlooked by scholars.

VI. RESULTS: CULTURAL IDENTITY

RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS

Phoenician religion has been viewed as a novelty cult in the Greek world, an aberration in Rome under the reign of Elagabalus, and as a localized offshoot of Near Eastern practices among scholars since the nineteenth century. The connection between “Punic” culture in North Africa reported by Roman authors, Phoenician religion in the Levant reported by Greek authors, and the archaeological evidence spread throughout this space, was not fully articulated or understood by those ancient authors, contributing to the current gap in their study. Phoenician history has been obscured by interpretatio Graeca, distorting the identity and origins of major deities while hiding the existence of minor ones. However, it is possible to reconstruct Phoenician traditions, beliefs, and practices through the ancient literary texts, archaeological finds, and numismatic evidence. Phoenician religious traditions and belief systems originated in the Near East during the third millennium BCE and were shaped by neighboring influence and internal differentiation over time. These latter forms were then exported through the expansions of the first half of the first millennium BCE. Evidence of this development and subsequent distribution is retained in mythological traditions, funerary practices, and urban religious rituals.

The interaction between Greek, Roman, and Phoenician traders likely encouraged the transfer of ideas, and this was not just one way as scholars such as Carpenter have suggested. Instead, Herakles, one of the most prominent deities in the Greek pantheon is “beyond doubt” a


Phoenician borrowing, in the words of Hellenic scholar G. Levy. This adoption is evidenced by many inscriptions and ancient literary sources, described below. The retention of this syncretism in the Roman Empire is evident as well, for example in the nearly complete mosaic featuring the Twelve Labors at a domicile in Volubilis with obvious Phoenician iconography and religious themes (see figure 7).

The Greek and Roman appropriation of Phoenician religious elements was not only limited to practices and ideas, but also included the transmission of people. Some Phoenician women were sacred prostitutes at the temple of Phoebus Apollo at Delphi during the late fifth century BCE, while Phoenician women filled a similar role at the temple of Venus in Rome. This use of Phoenician women in foreign temples was likely part of the official kinships established between these cities, such as that between Delphi and Sour. In the first century CE, Trajan and Hadrian elevated Herakles to the imperial cult, an interesting fact due to their Iberian birth, a place in which Melqart had long been worshipped. Later, Elagabalus replaced Jupiter with Semitic deities in the Phoenician pantheon during his short reign. These indicate not an erasure but a subsuming of Phoenician religious ideology by these successor civilizations.

Phoenicians tended to follow a pattern of veneration in which a pair of deities were associated with a particular city. This preferential treatment did not force abandonment of the
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entire pantheon, instead prioritizing artistic and religious activities in each location. This practice is a reflection of the overall Phoenician political ideal of decentralization and power generated through the urban center rather than a unifying monarch or other single governing body. Two or three major deities were associated with urban centers, but the particular deity sometimes changed based on environmental, cultural, or external factors. In Jbeil, the deities El and Ba’alat were worshipped in the earliest period, while Adonis and Astarte came into vogue later, and would remain the principle pair of deities for the rest of Phoenician existence there. At Sour, Melqart and Astarte were worshipped together, while Sidon preferred Astarte and Eshmun, evidenced by the sixth century BCE temple at Bostan esh-Sheikh dedicated to their worship.290

Religious rites associated with these deities were observed at various times, including harvest, seasonal changes, and for specific personal invocation. The Adonis cycle is a well-attested Phoenician religious tradition associated with Jbeil. The annual festival of Adonis was observed in Jbeil, in which his death was lamented on the first day and his resurrection celebrated the following day. Adonis was associated with both the local male deity and the river south of Jbeil, now called Nahr Ibrahim.291 The annual observance also included the sacrifice of the potted garden filled with small annual plants, a miniaturization of a home farm plot and the natural representation of the dying Adonis.292 The association of the Adonis death and resurrection cycle and its parallel to the dramatic withering and growth of a plant can be inferred from the second century BCE Latin play Pseudolus, in which Calidorus likens himself to “a

290. Betlyon disagreed with Dunand regarding the definite attribution of the temple to ‘Eshmun, attributing it instead to ‘Asherah/’Elat, the local goddess. See also Barr, Philo of Byblos, 45; Betlyon, “The Cult of Asherah,” 53.


summer plant; suddenly I have sprung up, suddenly I have withered,” upon learning of his Phoenician mistress being sold to a Roman soldier.\textsuperscript{293} Porphyry explicitly related Adonis “with the analogy of fruits … the symbol of the cutting of the perfect fruits.”\textsuperscript{294} The Adonis example is one of many personifications in the Phoenician belief system.

The fusion of deity and inanimate object was prevalent in Phoenician practice, especially with the association of a deity and a city as one. This idea is an essential component for understanding the naming habits of Phoenician city kings and in tracing the origin of colonies based on the deities worshipped at their first temples. The god Melqart is a prime example, whose name meant “lord of the city,” and whose worship was exported to Gadir and Carthage from Sour, both grand cities worthy of the grandest deity. The unity of Carthage to the Phoenician mainland is further demonstrated by the inscription found in Carthage dedicated to two goddesses, reading “to the ladies Astarte and Tanit in Lebanon,” and another inscription on an ivory plaque found in Sarepta following a similar dedicatory formula for the two goddesses.\textsuperscript{295} Cities were personified as deities, with foreigners such as Justinus noting in the third century CE that “as long as Carthage remained unconquered, she was worshipped as a god.”\textsuperscript{296} The city of Arwad was similarly personified on coinage as a female deity, crowned with the familiar sacred pillars.\textsuperscript{297}
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Melqart was the principal deity of many Phoenicians cities, adopted into Greek mythology as Herakles. 298 Herodotus acknowledged the Greek Herakles was not an originally Hellenic deity. He noted the deity was worshipped in Egypt since the earliest period of Egyptian collective memory, a claim echoed by Arrian, and which led Pomponius Mela to conflate the Egyptian deity with Melqart. 299 Herodotus did not engage in a cosmological argument on the difference between Melqart and Herakles other than their locations of provenance, despite noting the obvious syncretism in Greek mythology also present in Homer. 300 Diodorus noted the complex origin of the Greek Herakles, while Arrian continued the comparison given by Herodotus in the Egyptian, Phoenician, and Greek deities, identifying the Phoenician Melqart as the oldest version and also indirectly indicating that the deity was exported to Greece through the Theban founding myth of Cadmus. 301 Herodotus concluded, “Therefore, what I have discovered by inquiry plainly shows that [Melqart] is an ancient god,” distinguishing the Hellenized Tyrian Herakles and Phoenician Melqart. 302 Even Tripoli, which G.F. Hill noted lacked a foundational myth due to its administrative rather than spiritual purpose, “nevertheless certainly falls into line with its neighbors in respect of the worship of the celestial deity,” referring to Melqart. 303 The Phoenicians in Sour were prepared to allow Alexander the Great access to their city and obey any command except to allow Persians or Macedonians into the precincts of the Melqart temple,

298. Aubet, Phoenicians in the West 151-3.

299. Hdt. 2.43-4; Arr. An. 2.16; Pomp. Mela 3.6; Diod. 17.46.

300. Hdt. 2.44.5; Hom. Od. 11.601.

301. Diod. 4.8.1-39.4; Arr. An. 2.16.

302. Hdt. 2.44.5

and their willingness to withstand a seven month siege by Alexander on this sacred principle was a testament to the importance of this deity and the depth of their convictions.  

Astarte was also important and shared a similar syncretism in Greek mythology as Aphrodite. Herodotus suggested an eastern origin for Aphrodite and suggested Cyprus was the nexus for this syncretism, which supports the borrowing of other deities into the Greek pantheon including Adonis and Herakles. This syncretic fusion of Phoenician and Greek deities is also present in Nonnos, in which Adonis is killed by Ares in the form of a wild boar. The Astarte cult was especially prevalent in Sidon, and Lucian attested the worship of Astarte was transported to Cyprus from Sidon, giving rise to the Greek story of Europa and the bull, as Astarte always bore bull horns on her head. Archaeological evidence on Cyprus confirms the early transfer of Astarte worship to the island. Claiming firsthand knowledge, Lucian also identified cults of Astarte at Jbeil and Sour, in which each location applied local interpretations and characteristics to the goddess, such as the bull crown representation in Sour.

The accounts of religious rites at the Melqart temple of Gadir provide insight into religious practice across the Phoenician world despite scholars dismissing the Phoenician pantheon as “complicated and obscure.” Worshipers wore linens covering all visible parts of
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the body, and the head was shrouded with a flax cloth headband. Robes were loosely worn when incense was offered. The priests were celibate, had shaved heads, and walked barefoot. All foreigners were expelled from the city during annual festivals, such as the one for Melqart in Gadir.311 Women, pigs, and wine were not permitted even near the entrance to the sacred space.312 The doors of the temple were decorated with scenes from the mythology of their respective deities, and so the Melqart temple at Gadir was decorated with the exploits of its eponymous deity.313

SACRED ARCHITECTURE

The use of a temple for worship was a relatively recent innovation in the ancient Near East, and the worship of specific sites or aspects of a landform such as a stream, mountain, or tree were the original sources of veneration. Hence, the association of Adonis with the river near Jbeil is a logical continuation of first venerating the life giving spring, then assigning anthropomorphic value to it through the birth-death-rebirth cycle of Adonis and the sacrifice of plants each year to create a link between the worshiper, the worshipped, and the power of the deity. The sacred tree and pillar were forms of this concept, and the sacred pillar especially dominated Phoenician religious practices. Single pillars and pairs of columns are attested in ancient literary sources, pictured on coins, and represented by archaeological evidence across the Phoenician world.
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Pairs of pillars, sometimes rendered as columns in the texts, were widespread as sacred objects in the Phoenician world, in much the same manner as the paired worship of deities. The two columns at most temples is likely related to the rationale for pairing deities. Parallels are evident in numismatic evidence with, for example, a Hellenistic period coin minted in Sidon featuring the two columns in front of three temple facades, one of which is dedicated to Europa and the Bull, the Astarte myth borrowed into Greek mythology.\textsuperscript{314} This imagery can be found on coins from various Phoenician mints, and shows the Phoenicians placed importance on the outdoor area for their most sacred sites, in contrast to the Greco-Roman habit emphasizing indoor sanctuaries. The underlying differences between the philosophies of Greek and Phoenician religious rites is highlighted by the symbolism in these architectural traditions.\textsuperscript{315}

The oldest known Phoenician temple is the temple of the “Lady of Jbeil,” located near modern Byblos. It features structural elements evident from 2800 BCE, while nearby stone foundations were built over the site in the early second millennium BCE to facilitate the Reshef and Obelisk Temples.\textsuperscript{316} It is the oldest of several layers of sacred architecture on the hillock near the port of Jbeil, upon which Greek, Roman, and Crusader era structures are imposed. Phoenician religious rites were performed at this site through the Roman imperial period.\textsuperscript{317}

\textsuperscript{314} For images of this coin, see “Seventieth General Meeting,” 246.
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The Phoenician layer of the temple complex at Kommos on Crete is another example of the convention for creating a shrine in an open space with simple walls and columns in use during the eighth and ninth centuries BCE. Additionally, temples with these features were located on the Atlantic coast of Africa at Lixus and Oualili. Temples tended to be established in conjunction with the founding of a city, and dating the earliest temple complex in a city may assist in identifying the age of these further Phoenician settlements, such as the Malaka Melqart temple and its associated settlement.

Herodotus described several Phoenician temples and their locations, both in the Levant and elsewhere. He identified a temple for Astarte at Memphis located in a precinct composed entirely of Phoenicians from Sour, which was named for them. There was another temple of Astarte at Askalon, plundered by the Scythians following their defeat of the Medes and peace with Egypt, and yet another Melqart temple on the coast near Memphis offered protective blessings to visitors, a practice continued during his time. Herodotus claimed first-hand knowledge of the temples of Melqart in Sour and Thasos, describing them thus:

I took ship for Tyros in Phoenicia, where I had learned by inquiry that there was a holy temple of [Melqart]. There I saw it, richly equipped with many other offerings, besides two pillars, one of refined gold, one of emerald: a great pillar that shone at night … At Tyros I saw yet another temple … Then I went to Thasos, too, where I found a temple of [Melqart] built by the Phoenicians, who made a settlement there when they voyaged in search of Europe.

---
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The Melqart temple in Sour is also discussed by Josephus, along with its sister temple for Astarte. Josephus recounted how Hiram of Sour rebuilt the Melqart and Astarte temples on top of older versions of the temples. Cedar wood was used for their roofs, while a gold pillar was erected at each, dedicated to their respective deity. The annual tithe of ten percent of public revenue from Carthage to the Melqart temple at Sour is illustrative of the relationship between Carthage and Sour, especially the spiritual and economic connection between polis and apoikia, a model for the preferred relationship among colonial settlements in the Phoenician world.

Strabo described the two Phoenician temples in Gadir. He identified the one for Melqart facing east from the city, and its sister temple situated on the opposite side. He acknowledged the importance of the temple, with the Greco-Roman world considering it the gateway to the Atlantic. The Melqart temple in Gadir followed common Phoenician architectural and stylistic conventions of Melqart temples in Sour, elsewhere in the Levant, Thasos, and Ara Maxima. The temple faced the ocean, and was set in the convergence of two rocky outcroppings.

Silius Italicus provided the most complete description of the interior of the Melqart temple at Gadir. The temple consisted of an outer and inner sanctum, with the latter requiring special access permitted by the priests. The horned statue of Melqart was situated in a grove in the inner sanctum, and was consulted for prophetic information. The altars were perpetually lit and there were no icons or statues besides the Melqart piece in the inner sanctum, because “the
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gods filled the place with solemnity and sacred awe." Relics from Sour were held in the temple, and Carthage came to defend them along with the forces of Gadir against indigenous attempts to overrun the place.

The “Pillars of Herakles” were an important physical and ideological landmark to the Greeks and Romans. These pillars were most likely the two pillars at the Melqart temple at Gadir, and not any physical landform such as mountains or rocky promontories. Diodorus, Arrian, and Justin all considered the Gadir Melqart temple to house the Pillars, and Strabo noted the local Libyan and Iberian people nearby also placed the Pillars in Gadir, while Porphyry identified them at the Melqart temple in his description of an augury during the Mauritanian siege against Gadir. Pindar noted these pillars marked the end of the easily navigable waters known to the Greeks, and the beginning of what Pindar called the “trackless sea” and Mela dubbed “the immeasurable ocean,” mastered only by the Phoenicians and which was still a mythical place in Greek and Latin literature into the Common Era. The pillars are described by Pliny as *Herculi columnas Gadibus sacratas*, the Herakles columns at sacred Gadir, which Avienus also associated with the same, while Strabo described an inscription on them in what was likely an old orthographic convention of Phoenician letters, unintelligible to the Greek observer and ancient in appearance even to Phoenicians living there at the time of his writing. He noted these pillars were four meters tall and made of bronze, and discussed the uncertainty
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amongst some of his contemporaries as to where the Pillars of Herakles were actually located and whether they were in fact these temple pillars. He offered a weak argument against them being these two massive bronze pillars, but the argument was clearly based on a restricted Hellenic worldview and as such the very nature of that argument lends further credence to the Pillars of Herakles being those at the Gadir Melqart temple.  

Other architectural conventions existed beyond the temple and its pillars. For example, domicile construction between Monte Sirai, Sardinia, and the eighth century BCE Phoenician building projects in Jerusalem all had uniquely elongated rooms partitioned in a specific manner, while the masonry was identifiably Phoenician at these locations and others including African sites at Salle, Lixus, and Oualili. Additionally the “Punic joint” and “Punic window” were well-known to ancient authors as architectural elements unique to Phoenician convention, but their exact characteristics are not yet described by scholars, much like the Phoenician couches mentioned by Cicero. Phoenician temples and pillars provide the most accessible evidence of architectural conventions both in the archaeological record and in ancient literary accounts. Foundations, walls, funerary deposits, and harbors all provide important archaeological evidence, but they so far lack unified study (see figures 1, 2 and 5).

FUNERARY PRACTICES

Phoenician funerary practices were already established by the early third millennium BCE and continued throughout the Phoenician world well into the Common Era in some areas.
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Early Phoenician funerary habits began in Jbeil, with several methods rising and falling in popularity through the first millennium BCE. These included sarcophagi, pottery accompaniments, and hoard burials. Jars deposited with seals at tombs as early as 2130 BCE in the necropolis near Jbeil set a pattern later followed for the remainder of Phoenician history. Cremation eventually became the dominant funerary rite at the city necropolis. The necropolis was often placed outside the city walls, providing a landmark for determining the size of Phoenician cities in archaeological excavations.

There were five features common to cremation funerary rites across Phoenician civilization from the early first millennium BCE through the fifth century CE. A standard type site included the ashes of the deceased, two red-slip jugs, amphorae with jewels or valuable items, plates for food, and a lamp or censer near these remains. Additionally, sites across the Phoenician world from the Mediterranean islands, Iberia, North and West Africa all used the stone and rubble construction technique for hypogea graves otherwise exclusive to the Levant.

The origin and development of the Phoenician cremation rite sprang from local influence in the Levant as it matured into a unique type. Burial customs, architecture, and pottery found in Jbeil certainly bear borrowings from Egyptian culture, though dating these pieces proves difficult due to lack of contextual information and disruption at Levantine sites continuously inhabited from prehistory through the modern era, such as Jbeil, Sidon, and Sour. However, the practice of burying important items in jars adjacent to a temple was continued throughout the entire
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existence of Phoenician civilization, with the earliest known deposit from Jbeil dated to the end of the third millennium BCE. The eighth century BCE cinerary urns and general burial patterns at Sour are examples of the uniform cremation rite that spread throughout the Phoenician settlements during the expansion period.

The expansion of ideas, religion, and traditions through increasing trade networks are evidenced in the adoption of cremation as the dominant funerary rite from coastal Iberia to the Levant by the eighth century BCE. This included the funerary urns at the precinct of Tanit in Carthage, with deposits beginning by the ninth century BCE. Additional burials of the same type have been excavated at many sites in North Africa including Collo and Hadrumentum, while still more were found in Andalusia, Sardinia, Malta, and Sicily, all dated to periods before Carthaginian hegemony was widespread in these places indicating it was a Phoenician practice not restricted solely to Carthage. Similar urns and burial techniques were found at Lilybaeum and date to 397 BCE.

Cremation became the primary rite in the urban centers as a result of siting Phoenician cities on rocky promontories, small islands, and tight islets forcing the older inhumation necropolis tradition to fade in favor of the more practical method. Phoenician funerary rites maintained or, in some cases such as at Carthage, increased with the abandonment of inhumation in favor of cremation. Phoenician cremation sites were generally uniform across their geographic distribution following the stabilization of its practice with, for example, the cremation necropolis
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and Phoenician town near the Sado estuary in modern Portugal bearing parallel construction to those at Lixus and Mogador.\textsuperscript{341}

Another unique Phoenician funerary rite revolved around the rise of the *tophet* in ritual burial. The *tophet* was viewed controversially by contemporary foreign authors, especially in Rome where it was viewed as a barbaric practice of child sacrifice. Archaeological evidence has shown this was not the case, and it was instead a method of dealing with the high infant mortality rates in a religious way.\textsuperscript{342} Urns containing the remains of minors accompanied by a sacrificial animal such as a goat were offered by the thousands over the years in Carthage. Importantly, the children had already died of natural causes before being ritually buried at the *tophet*. Justinus described the immolation by fire and sacrifice associated with the *tophet* for the removal of plague.\textsuperscript{343} Such plagues may well have been the causes of death for many of these children, and it would make sense their burials were associated with exhortations to halt these very plagues.

The unique Phoenician funerary practices influenced trade partners and neighboring territories at the far reaches of their civilization. For example, the mixed Phoenician-Berber site at Thapsus Minor, or Tapsir in the local Berber dialect, exemplifies the true mixing of Phoenician and Berber customs. The Berber burials found there bear the indigenous technique of using red ochre cast upon the deceased, while the burials themselves show Phoenician burial traditions. Lipinski concluded sites like these across North Africa are evidence of “a Libyo-Phoenician population of African Phoenicians mixed with Libyo-Berbers.”\textsuperscript{344} The practice of Berbers burying their dead, especially the elite, using Phoenician funerary practices are evident
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at the necropolis of Salle in modern Rabat, Morocco, in which a mixture of Phoenician and Berber culture flourished from the middle of the first millennium BCE through the Roman conquest of Mauritania Tingitana (see figure 4). Phoenician sepulchral burial traditions found at fourth century CE sites all along the North African coast indicate cultural continuity.345

Funerary inscriptions were a common feature of Mediterranean cultures, and Phoenicia was no exception. However, the Phoenician dedicatory inscription had five unique characteristics setting it apart from the others. This pattern was identified by Lipinski, and includes the name of the dedicated object, the relative pronoun referring to the object, the verb, the title of the dedicatory inscription, and the name of the recipient.346 Not all of the inscriptions were panegyrics. For example, the inscription on the Eshmunazar II sarcophagus from Sidon was a formulaic grave curse warding away robbers.347 Phoenician inscriptions warning thieves to stay away from grave goods have a long tradition with examples from early in the first millennium BCE through the sixth or seventh centuries BCE in Carthage. These resemble later curse formulae in Judges and Latin inscriptions against thieves.348 The proximity of Greek and Phoenician merchants was maintained even in death, evidenced by a fourth century BCE bilingual Greek Phoenician inscription on an Attic funerary stele.349 While the Greek inscription maintained the common
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Greek epigrammatic formula, the Phoenician text followed Near Eastern convention by using a realistic narrative concerning the decedent following the convention identified by Lipinski.350

The dedicatory patterns on Phoenician stelae are consistent across time and transcend the artificial Phoenician-Punic boundary. For example, the Pyrgi inscription dedicated to Astarte from the sixth century BCE features the five elements of the Phoenician dedicatory inscription identified by Lipinski.351 In another example, the dedicatory inscription from El-Hofra, Algeria presents a Phoenician language dedication in Greek letters of five lines.352 The dedicatory inscription on the statue of Osorkon I is dated to the tenth century BCE and bears the Lipinski formula.353 The oldest example is the scarab-seal for a prince Hathor of Jbeil, deposited between 1991 and 1549 BCE, demonstrating the dedicatory pattern started early and remained relatively unchanged throughout Phoenician history.354 Examples exist despite the aforementioned widespread use of cremation because these inscriptions tended to be for the wealthiest decedents.

ARTISTIC FORMS AND ICONOGRAPHY

Phoenician artistic forms were initially influenced by Egyptian expressions and symbols, later emerging as an independent style with recognizable conventions. Phoenician art was


expressed through various media, from small religious and luxury items to large sculptures and architectural adornments. A large sculpture of a Phoenician male found at Motya demonstrates that Phoenician art was not just confined to jewelry and small objects as previously thought, while the sculptural elements bear a cosmopolitan mix of Egyptian, Assyrian, and archaic Greek elements.355 Phoenician art was always being exported to neighboring cultures, many of whom were customers of Phoenician craftsmanship in the Aegean, Near East, and Africa. The sustained economic contact and ideological relationships with these areas allowed uniquely Phoenician conventions to arise, while innovations and styles were incorporated in both directions.

The earliest art forms in Phoenicia emerged from the influence of the primary economic and military relationship with Egypt from the third to first millennia BCE. This period was characterized by the use of sarcophagi for royal funerals, standardization of bronze statuettes, production of ivory seals, and personal accumulation of small faïence figurines following Egyptian iconography. Egyptian influence during this period set a precedent for later development of independent forms after Egypt faded from power.

The primary sources of artistic material for the period under Egyptian cultural influence were found in Jbeil. The several hundred faïence figures found at the “Lady of Jbeil” temple date to circa 2130 BCE and represent a stylistic combination of contemporary Egyptian and Mesopotamian forms.356 Items include animal figurines such as lions and human bronze statuettes bearing close resemblance to seventh century BCE Phoenician bronze statues recovered in Andalusia. Additional items representative of this period include bronze statuettes found in Sidon and Jbeil. Phoenician ivories in the second millennium BCE shared similarities
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with Mykenaean and Northern Syrian artistic schools. These similarities likely reflect the influence of established Phoenician conventions on nascent Mykenaean, Minoan, and later Cretan art forms. This Phoenician influence is dramatically attested by a so-called “proto-Aetolian” capital with clear Semitic form found in Andalusia dated circa the eighth century BCE. The misleading nomenclature belies the chronology of Phoenician influence on this stylistic element as it passed from Phoenicia to Greece.

The Egyptian influence on Phoenician artistic forms persisted through subsequent cultural incursions by Greek, Persian, and Roman campaigns against the Phoenician identity. A gold pectoral from Jbeil dated to the New Kingdom demonstrates the manner in which early Egyptian iconographic influence evolved into a local Phoenician form and was subsequently retained for two millennia. Another example is the crook and flail represented on coins from Jbeil of the fifth century BCE, with the analogous Egyptian hieroglyph symbolizing aspects of Osiris. This connection was likely related to the combined Egyptian-Phoenician religious narrative of Isis and Horus in their flight to Jbeil following the murder of Osiris, paralleled locally at Jbeil with the sacred union of Astarte and Adonis. Later examples include Egyptian inscriptions on gold foil found in Sardinia and Carthage as grave goods. This represents a nostalgia for the antique and a veneration of Egyptian forms which, because of their antiquity by
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the latter half of the first millennium, took on an increasingly sacred air long after the meaning of specific hieroglyphic inscriptions faded.

Phoenician luxury items were exported to consumers throughout the Near East from the Neo-Babylonian through Acheamenid periods, including carved ivories, furniture, ostraca, decorated metallic vessels, and metal bowls in addition to the typical Phoenician torpedo jars and red-slip pottery.\textsuperscript{362} Ivories and cylinder seals were an important export of the Phoenician art industry to consumers in Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria.\textsuperscript{363} Demand was accelerated with the arrival of Nebuchadnezzar at Sour in 573 BCE.

Archaeological evidence shows the Phoenician terracotta molding methods developed on the Levantine coast were exported to Cyprus and Crete.\textsuperscript{364} For example, the male and female figurines found north of Sour near the Litani River share similarities with archaic statuettes found in Sardinia and Cyprus.\textsuperscript{365} They likely represented a god and goddess pair, and were made together out of a metallurgical mold process, indicated by marks on their surfaces. The hair braiding and eye socket features are characteristic of this period across the Phoenician settlements throughout the Mediterranean. The Phoenician statue form was not restricted to the Levant, Crete, and Cyprus: three statues of Hannibal had even been erected in Rome.\textsuperscript{366}

Phoenician artisans maintained workshops outside their home cities in order to market directly to foreign consumers. Phoenician presence is obvious on Crete from the Proto-
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Geometric through Hellenistic periods, including at Knossus, Tekke, and Itanos. An eighth century BCE Cypro-Phoenician workshop produced imitative works at Tekke, receiving widespread distribution and popularity in the Hellenic world. In another example, three generations of sculptors from Sour lived and worked at a workshop in Rhodes during the mid-second century BCE, producing sculptures of various forms for Greek customers, including a piece on display in the Athenian agora.

Other small items found throughout the Phoenician world provide examples of continuity and a common set of artistic traditions. A Phoenician finger ring found in a rock-cut tomb in Malta depicts a galley at sea similar to galleys commonly represented on coins from Sidon and Sour. The seated child Horus scaraboid from the Puig des Molins necropolis at Ibiza is an example of the assimilation of Egyptian motifs into Phoenician art, with internal stylistic developments during the earliest periods crystalizing into a common Phoenician convention even in the western colonies in the eighth century BCE, leading Philip Schmitz to coin these pieces “western Phoenician glyptic.”

A nearly complete carved rhyton from the fifth century BCE was found at a dwelling in Tell Ghaza, with petrographic analysis revealing its Phoenician origin and indicating continuous instruction and application of Egyptian artistic conventions in Phoenicia during the Achaemenid period. Gold amulets were worn with miniaturized


dedicatory inscriptions invoking a deity for the protection of the wearer on pieces from Sour, Memphis, Carthage, Ibiza, and Tharros all with the same formula and stylistic convention.\footnote{372. KAI 48; ICO Sard. 15; ICO Sard. 31; CIS I 6067a; CIS I 6067b; Schmitz, “Reconsidering a Phoenician Inscribed Amulet,” 817.}

Hellenistic mosaics at Dor exhibit the Phoenician origin of some techniques, and similar Phoenician conventions remained in use through the second century CE.\footnote{373. Will Wootten, “Making and Meaning: The Hellenistic Mosaic from Tel Dor,” American Journal of Archaeology 116, no. 2 (Apr., 2012): 228-9.} These and many other examples show the common artistic tradition spread across Magna Phoenicia, expressed through images representing the religious, economic, and historical traditions of Phoenician civilization.\footnote{374. Elayi and Elayi, Monetary and Political History, 41.}

Phoenician pottery was ubiquitous across the Mediterranean and beyond. Torpedo-shaped jars and other amphorae were common, as were smaller containers for everyday use. Handles from Alishar and Jbeil were prototypical of Greek Geometric seals.\footnote{375. John Boardman, “Island Gems Aftermath,” The Journal of Hellenic Studies 88 (1968): 7.} The third stage of Phoenician pottery, red slip ware, spread to Cyprus, North Africa, the western Mediterranean islands and Iberia by the ninth century BCE at the latest. Concurrently, uniquely shaped storage jars used by Phoenician merchants began appearing at the start and end points of particular trade routes.\footnote{376. Lipinski, Itineraria Phoenicia, xiv.} For example, pottery from the eighth century BCE in Sour mirrored pieces from the same period in Andalusia. Pottery from this period in Malta closely paralleled pieces at Lixus, Mogador, Oran, and Andalusia, indicating Malta was an early participant in the Gadir circuit.\footnote{377. Aubet, Phoenicians in the West, 41, 235.}
The export of wine, oil, and grain demanded a high production of pottery. These pottery forms are another method for analyzing Phoenician artistic forms in the practical sense.

The Berbers in North and West Africa carried on elements of Phoenician artistic tradition through their close, continuous contact over the centuries of mutually beneficial economic interaction. A stele from ‘Annaba at Hippo features typically Semitic iconography and is dated to the first or second century BCE. Soon after, approximately 850 stelae were deposited at el-Hofra by the Berber Numidians during the second century BCE. These Berbers were influenced by Phoenician culture through Carthage, as at Hippo Regius, until at least the third century CE. Similarly, numerous Phoenician artifacts at Tapsir and Skikda indicate continuous Phoenician cultural transmission to the Berbers until at least the first century CE despite the destruction of nearby Carthage two centuries earlier. More dramatically, stelae produced locally at Gunugu feature iconography of Levantine Phoenician origin starting from the eighth century BCE until at least the second century CE, demonstrating cultural transmission and positive relations between Phoenicia and this Berber group for nearly one thousand years.

DISCUSSION

Phoenician civilization was characterized by its common features of political, linguistic, and material culture across time and space. These features were underpinned by religious, social, and economic activities that were carried throughout the geographic area in which Phoenician civilization flourished from the third millennium BCE to the fifth century CE. This thesis provides the beginnings of a single Phoenician history, encourages a reevaluation of existing evidence, and promotes new archaeological research in areas of crucial importance for the understanding of this important Mediterranean civilization.

This civilization, originating in the Levant, spread throughout the Mediterranean Sea, Iberia, North and West Africa, bringing along a unique culture, language, and way of life. Phoenicians provided Egypt and Judea with skilled craftsmen and raw materials available nowhere else. They equipped Persia with a navy because Persia had none. They gave Greece and Rome a writing system and introduced important trade mechanisms and partners to these empires. They funded the Roman conquest of the known world and fed the Roman empire. The Phoenician civilization should now be liberated from the tiny strip of land encompassing three cities given by Grainger or the disparaging “Punic landscape” of Cintas. Instead, these people came from humble beginnings and adapted to their environment to achieve extraordinary success. Claudius Iolaus described the founding of Dor, which could be applied to any of the Phoenician colonies as the civilization expanded in the Mediterranean and beyond:

Phoenicians settled here because of the somewhat rocky nature of the beaches and the abundance of the murex. At first they built themselves cabins, about which they placed stakes. When their business prospered, however, they split the rocks, and with the stones thus set free they built city-walls, and made a harbor with good and safe anchorage. They called the place in their native tongue ‘Dor.’

Dor can be substituted for anyplace from Sour to Gadir, and the product for anything from silver to silk, but the Phoenician settlement pattern, cultural radiation through trade and decentralized power mechanisms remained the underlying *modus operandi* of this influential civilization.

Phoenicians resiliently maintained unique political, economic, epigraphic, religious, and artistic traditions despite constant assaults against their character, way of life, and civilization for nearly three millennia. It was indeed a single culture and people, much like the Danubian culture about which Childe observed “we find certain types of remains – pots, implements, ornaments, burial rites and house forms – constantly recurring together. Such a complex of associated traits we shall call … a ‘culture.’” We assume that such a complex is the material expression of what today we would call ‘a people.’” Lipinski defined a nation as a “community bound together by common traditions, customs, civilization, and idiom.” As such, new research requires a reevaluation of the method and purpose for constructing Phoenician history in a much broader sense than previously accepted.

This need is recognized by some scholars, although most stop short of initiating such a shift. For example, Aubet evaluated the Phoenician site at Acinipo in Andalusia and concluded “a study of the interrelations between a colonial system and the indigenous world in terms exclusively of ‘acculturation’ and ‘orientalizing,’ as had been done until now, is insufficient, not to say inadequate,” while at the same time she continued dividing and lumping portions of Phoenician history into Persian, Greek, and Roman history. Misleading and vague terms such

as “Orientalizing” and “proto-Aetolian” should be dropped in favor of calling these cultural elements what they are: Phoenician.

A study of Phoenician civilization should then be restructured. Phoenician civilization represents a unified people with normal regional differences and expected linguistic changes over time as is true in all other civilizations. It should no longer be divided into individual sections using artificial or foreign appellations such as Oriental, Punic, or Hellenistic. Perhaps more appropriate divisions are geographic identifiers retaining the overall Phoenician identity, i.e. Ibero-Phoenician, Libyo-Phoenician, and Levantine Phoenician, as Plato, Strabo, and Augustine did. In addition, studies of Phoenician relationships with North African Berbers, inhabitants of the Fortunate Islands, and the history of Phoenician interaction with the indigenous people of Sardinia must be conducted. These subjects would also benefit from a geographical study based on the concepts of settlements at intervals of the sailing day and the Phoenician type sites discussed in this thesis in order to identify previously unknown archaeological sites.

The way the Phoenicians saw themselves should no longer be ignored. Pomponius Mela lived in the Phoenician world, and a careful reading of his *Chorographia* reveals the Phoenician worldview: it is decentralized, there is no absolute cultural center, and it is based on regions of power rather than an ultimate monarch, league, or capital city, as at Persia, Greece and Rome. The divisions of east and west are only acceptable as long as such divisions are deliberately constructed beneath a unified history with internal logic rather than through the arbitrary external ideology of the modern historian.

The spread of the Phoenician writing system provides related examples of both their impact on Western civilization through trade and the modern misconceptions of this process. The Phoenician writing system came into contact with a wide variety of language families over the
centuries through a vast mercantile network in which their alphabet was spread. However, the Phoenician alphabet is interpolated into the specialized areas such as Near Eastern, Biblical, and Hebraic studies, lacking a mature discipline of its own and leading to a fragmented history of this important step in the cultural and technological advancement of the West. There appears to be a natural inclination toward misattributing Phoenician innovations in favor of, for example, Hebrew, Ugaritic, or Luwian systems because scholars in these disciplines naturally focus on their respective cultures and not Phoenicia. However, Ugaritic does not belong to the Canaanite branch of the Semitic language family, and is not an older or parent language of Phoenician or Hebrew.384 Hebrew and Aramaic also owe their parentage to Phoenician, while Amazigh Berbers adopted the Phoenician alphabet to write Tifinagh in North and West Africa. In fact, Tifinagh literally means “in the Phoenician manner.” In Italy and the Aegean, Classical historians were Greek and Roman, while their earliest alphabetically inclined scribes were Phoenician-writing, viz., history was written in Greek and Latin using Phoenician-derived alphabets.385 Phoenician settlements in the Mediterranean, Africa, and the Atlantic were mercantile rather than colonial, making it all the more remarkable that their writing system and language were adopted voluntarily, in contrast to interpretatio Graeca and Roman assimilation through conquest.386

The complexity of long-distance Phoenician trade networks required unity, stability, and flexible leadership that could not be accomplished by each city acting alone. Instead, despite having no common monarch or political entity to tie them together, these city-states operated


within the cultural context of their shared Phoenician civilization.\textsuperscript{387} In fact, Phoenician city-states are more prototypical of Venice and Genoa in the Renaissance or Singapore and the United Arab Emirates in the modern era than the archaic, greedy, artless string of colonies described by scholars such as Carpenter and Millar. Writing in the nineteenth century, Moffet observed that Phoenicia, “with her colonies, gave the earliest example of the more liberal culture which springs from commerce.”\textsuperscript{388} Indeed, Phoenician culture was by nature decentralized and succeeded because of it.

What are those characteristics Phoenician civilization so masterfully embodied? Future studies of Phoenician civilization should include an examination of three activities explaining the success of this decentralized union of city-states: conducting non-linear trade, maintaining microcosms of society in foreign lands, and seeking cooperative relationships with indigenous trading partners in lieu of conquest. Phoenician city-states achieved a concert of powers in harmonious anarchy united through the common culture, language, religion, and traditions of their civilization while Persia fell, Greece faded, and Rome burned. The Phoenician civilization accomplished what Western Civilization could not until the treaties at Westphalia in the seventeenth century: a civilization voluntarily united without a single monarch. Phoenicia was much like the place Alexander Pope described in \textit{Windsor Forest}, with its progeny entering “with each swelling tide, and seas but join the regions they divide.”\textsuperscript{389}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{387} Aubet, \textit{Phoenicians in the West}, 95.
\end{flushright}
Figure 1. The Phoenician merchant stalls and defense wall at Jbeil in Byblos, Lebanon.

Figure 2. Phoenician ruins at Mogador off the coast of modern Essaouria, Morocco.

\[390^a\] All photographs were taken by the author between 2015 and 2017.
Figure 3. Phoenician Oualili, the “old quarter” of Roman Volubilis, near Meknes, Morocco.

Figure 4. The merchant stalls at the Phoenician ruins of Salle in Rabat, Morocco.
Figure 5. The Phoenician ruins of Lixus above the Lixus River at modern Al-Araich, Morocco.

Figure 6. Phoenician garum pits by the Lixus River near modern Al-Araich, Morocco.
Figure 7. Mosaic depicting the twelve labors of Herakles at a domicile in Volubilis, Morocco.
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