

The Phoenician Cities in the Persian Period

JOSETTE ELAYI
University of Paris

Several general works on Phoenicians and Phoenicia include attempts to describe what a Phoenician city was.¹ However, these overly general and short descriptions are unsatisfactory because they do not take sufficient consideration of the changes which occurred in this area throughout the centuries and the differences between the Phoenician cities themselves. Certain more specialized studies deal with the Phoenician cities under Assyrian rule² but none deals with their organization under Achaemenid rule. The lack of documents on this subject is less important for this period as it represents the last stage of Phoenician culture before its progressive absorption by Hellenistic civilization.

We have basically two valuable Greek sources dating from the Persian period: the *Histories* of Herodotus and the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Scylax. We also have a few Persian³ and Hebrew sources, which unfortunately do not tell us many things about the Phoenician cities at this time. The archaeological material from Persian levels that has been published is not very large; we have only some Phoenician inscriptions and scant material remains dated to this period. These documents may be complemented (with due caution) by later Greek and Latin sources or sources earlier than the Persian period, or by reference to analogous and better known Cyprian, Punic, or Greek cities.

1 See, e.g., F. K. Movers, *Die Phönizier* (Berlin, 1849), 2:1, *passim*; G. Contenau, *La civilisation phénicienne* (Paris, 1949), 27ff.; D. Baramki, *Phoenicia and the Phoenicians* (Beirut, 1961), 2-3, 10-11; D. Harden, *The Phoenicians* (London, 1962), 22-23; S. Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens* (Paris, 1971), 52-55 (his definition of the political organization of the Phoenician cities is interesting, but needs to be supplemented).

2 P. Garelli gave a communication on this subject in the First International Congress of Phoenician and Punic Studies (Rome, 5-10 Nov. 1979); see also B. Oded, "The Phoenician Cities and the Assyrian Empire in the Time of Tiglath-Pileser III," *ZDPV* (1974); J. Elayi, "The Phoenician Cities and the Assyrian Empire in the Time of Sargon II," *Proc. 2nd International Symposium on Babylon, Ashur and Himrin* (Baghdad, 1-6 Oct. 1979) [in press].

3 See, e.g., J. B. Pritchard, ed., *ANET*, 430; G. Wilhelm, "La première tablette cunéiforme trouvée à Tyr," *BMB* 26 (1973), 35-39; Th. Pinches, *Records in the Past* (London, 1890), 4:99ff.; idem, *The Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 49 (1917), 128ff.; E. Unger, *ZAW* 44 (1926), 314ff.; R. Ph. Dougherty, *Archives from Erech, Time of Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus* (New Haven, 1923), 3, no. 94; idem, *Archives from Erech, Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods* (New Haven, 1933), 2:22, no. 3.

In the present study, an attempt will be made to use the existing documentation to suggest what the Phoenician cities in the Persian period were like, sketching their common features and their differences, and the changes that resulted from their incorporation into the Persian empire.⁴

We shall try to define some common features that characterized the Phoenician cities in the Persian period.⁵ First, we have a problem of terminology: what were the inhabitants of these cities called?

While the Greeks called the inhabitants of Phoenician cities Φοίνικες, Hebrew sources called them "Canaanites" (Kinaḥnu).⁶ This Semitic gentilic that generally designated the Phoenicians in the second millennium continued to be used during the first millennium, as we can see for example from Berytian coins dated to the second century B.C. ("Laodicea in Canaan").⁷ It was still used by Philo of Byblos⁸ and Augustine, who wrote about African colonists of Phoenician origin as follows: "*Unde interrogati rustici nostri quid sint, punice respondententes Chanani . . .*"⁹ Although these two names were roughly synonymous in the Persian period, we prefer to use the word "Phoenician," because it is more familiar to us.

The Phoenicians of the first millennium are to be distinguished from the Phoenicians of the second millennium (or Proto-Phoenicians) because new circumstances compelled them to develop a somewhat different civilization.¹⁰ They were confined to the coastal cities by the creation of powerful Israelite and Aramaean kingdoms about 1200 B.C. This had two results. First, the insufficiency of native resources compelled them to undertake a colonial expansion which mainly characterized their history. Secondly, their isolation from the peoples of the hinterland by the coastal range compelled them to develop their own civilization (with common language, religion, art, customs, economy, etc.). Archaeological discoveries have confirmed that Phoenician sites were only located on the seashore,¹¹ a fact which is corroborated by ancient sources. Herodotus, whose testimony is first-hand since he visited Phoenicia about the middle of the fifth century

4 For the geography of Phoenicia in the Persian period, see my forthcoming paper "Studies in Phoenician Geography in the Persian Period" (to be published in *JNES*).

5 As far as we know, there were six Phoenician cities in the Persian period: Sidon, Tyre, Arados, Byblos, Tripoli, and Berytos.

6 Among the numerous works on this subject, see especially those of S. Moscati, "Sulla historia del nome Canaan," *Studia Biblica e Orientalia* 3 (1959), 266-69; M. C. Astour, "The origin of the terms 'Canaan', 'Phoenician' and 'Purple'," *JNES* 24 (1965), 346-50; G. D. Young, *The Historical Background of Phoenician Expansion into the Mediterranean in the Early First Millennium B.C.* (Ann Arbor, 1970), 5-6; J. Mully, "Homer and the Phoenicians," *Berytus* 19 (1970), 19-64. We must notice however that in Phoenician sources, Phoenicians designated themselves by the name of each city: *ṢDNYM* 'Sidonians', *ṢRWDYM* 'Aradians', etc.

7 E. Babelon, *Catalogue des monnaies grecques de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Les Preses achéménides* (Paris, 1893), 166.

8 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio Evangelica* in Felix Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Leiden, 1958), 1:9.20-10.55.

9 Augustine, *Patrologia Latina*, 35:col. 2096.

10 Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens*, 20-22.

11 Cf. Elayi, "Studies in Phoenician Geography." In this article I have tried to determine approximately the geography of Phoenicia during the Persian period by using the ancient texts and the available archaeological documents. Phoenicia was a juxtaposition of coastal city-states.

B.C., writes that the Phoenicians were . . . οἰκέουσι τὰ παρὰ θάλασσαν “the inhabitants of the seacoast.”¹² In the *Periplus*, Pseudo-Scylax gives the same definition:

. . . οικουσι τα παρα θαλατταν.¹³ An Aramaic precept from the late fifth century B.C. found at Elephantine says: “Do not show an Arab the sea nor a Sidonian the desert; for their work is different.”¹⁴

For commercial purposes, the Phoenicians journeyed inland. This is attested for this period, for example, at Jerusalem, where there was a Tyrian trading community that Nehemiah blamed because it did not observe the Sabbath rest: “Men of Tyre also, who lived in the city, brought in fish and all kinds of wares and sold them on the Sabbath to the people of Judah, and in Jerusalem.”¹⁵ At Memphis, too, there was a Tyrian community: “Phoenicians from the city of Tyre dwell all round this precinct (of Hephaestus), and the whole place is known by the name of the camp of the Tyrians. Within the enclosure stands a temple which is called that of Aphrodite the Stranger . . .”¹⁶ As far away as the shore of the Red Sea, at Ezion-Geber (now Tell el-Kheleifeh), a station on the road of incense, myrrh, and spices, cursive Phoenician scripts dated to the Persian period have been found.¹⁷ J. Naveh points out that these scripts do not prove that Phoenicians lived at that site, but at least that they were trading there.¹⁸

It is necessary to distinguish the Phoenicians from the Philistines, Hebrews, Aramaeans, Syrians, Greeks, and other peoples who were also settled on the coast of the eastern Mediterranean during the Persian period. This is not always easy because there could have been foreign communities within the Phoenician cities. A passage of Arrian implies that the city of Tyre, at the end of the Persian period, was cosmopolitan. When Alexander took possession of the island, “he sold 30,000 persons as slaves, Tyrians and foreigners, whom he had captured at Tyre” (. . . ἐπράθησαν Τυρίων τε καὶ τῶν ξένων ὅσοι ἔγκατε λήφθησαν μάλιστα ἐς τρισμυρίους).¹⁹ In the Phoenician cities, whichever Phoenician community was most powerful imposed its rule. Some towns, however, could belong to the territory of a Phoenician city even though the Phoenician community was a minority, for example, Ashkelon, a Philistine town which belonged to Tyre in the Persian period according to Pseudo-Scylax (πολις Τυρίων “town of the Tyrians”).²⁰ There were also minor Phoenician communities in non-Phoenician towns of the eastern Mediterranean that we shall not take into account since these towns were

12 Herodotus, *Histoires*, Ph. E. Legrand, ed. (Coll. Universités de France: Paris, 1941), 7:89.

13 *Periplus* of Pseudo-Scylax of Karianda, C. Müller, ed. (*Geographi Graeci Minores*; Paris, 1855), 1:78. Cf. also Strabo, *Geography*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), 16:239: the Phoenicians were trademen (ἐμπορικούς) dwelling on the seashore (ἐν τῇ παραλίῳ).

14 *ANET*, 430.

15 Neh. 13:16.

16 Herodotus, *Histoires*, 2:112.

17 N. Glueck, “The First Campaign at Tell el-Kheleifeh (Ezion-Geber: Elath),” *BASOR* 71 (1938), 5; idem, “The Second Campaign at Tell el-Kheleifeh (Ezion-Geber: Elath),” *BASOR* 75 (1939), 21 (with bibliogr.); idem, “Ezion-Geber,” *BA* (1965), 86; idem, “Tell el-Kheleifeh Inscriptions,” in H. Goedicke, ed., *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore and London, 1971), 225–42.

18 J. Naveh, “The Scripts of 2 Ostraca from Elath,” *BASOR* 183 (1966), 28.

19 Arrian, *Anabasis*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), 2:13.7. The cosmopolitan character of the Phoenician cities is pointed out by Strabo for later periods (*Geography*, 16:2.2).

20 Pseudo-Scylax, loc. cit.

not Phoenician.²¹ Phoenicia was not, of course, a country in the modern sense of the word. Yet, it is often more convenient to say "Phoenicia" instead of "Phoenician cities," just as there is a convention to use the word "Greece" to designate the Greek cities. The Phoenician city was an autonomous and political entity like the Greek city. In most cases it comprised a chief agglomeration which gave its name to the city, for example, Arados. The city of Sidon, however, did not comprise a single main agglomeration but several important agglomerations, scattered probably because of the multiplicity of springs in this area: "Great Sidon, Little Sidon, Sidon-Yam, Sidon-Sade, Ain-Yidlal."²² The Phoenician city also comprised a territory with several secondary towns and villages. For example, the towns of the mainland opposite the island of Arados belonged to the territory of Arados (Carne, Enhydra, Antarados, Marathos, Simyra).²³ The Cyprian cities (Phoenician and Greek ones) were of the same type, as is shown by the description of Diodorus, who is referring to the fourth century B.C.: "In this island, there were nine populous cities on which depended the small towns forming the outskirts of these nine cities. Each of these cities was governed by a local king and was subject to the Persian king."²⁴

The Phoenician city always comprised a more or less extended territory, necessary for providing agricultural supplies. This territory never spread very far to the interior. Even in the tenth century B.C., at the time of the greatest prosperity of Tyre, its territory did not stretch far eastwards because the region of Cabul, which is located only fifteen kilometers from the coast, was in litigation between the kings Hiram and Solomon.²⁵ The territories of the Phoenician cities rarely went beyond the coastal range, apart from the case of Mariamme, Marsya, and Raphanea, which probably belonged to Aradian territory.²⁶ The Phoenicians no doubt settled everywhere they could control the main trading roads to the interior. The coastal plain was rich but narrow and could not supply the needs of the prosperous and populous Phoenician cities of the Persian period.²⁷ From Ezra, for example, we know that the Phoenicians exchanged timber for wheat, oil, and wine with the Jews coming back from Babylon.²⁸

21 See above, nn. 15 and 16. The cosmopolitan character of the Canaanite cities emerges from a passage of the Hebrew Bible, which may be a late text: "Ephraim did not expel the Canaanites dwelling at Gezer, and the Canaanites dwelled among (Ephraim) at Gezer . . . Asher did not expel the inhabitants of Acco, Sidon, Achlab, Achzib, Helba, Aphik, Rehob; and the Asherians dwelled among the Canaanites, inhabitants of the country, for they did not expel them" (Judg. 1:29-32).

22 ANET³, 662; D. D. Luckenbill, *ARAB*, 2: 118-19, 239; Josh. 11:8: 19:28. Cf. R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale* (Paris, 1927), 39-40.

23 Cf. Elayi, "Studies in Phoenician Geography."

24 Diodorus Siculus, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), 16:42.4-5. Most Cyprian cities were Greek, the most famous being Salamis, but a few of them were Phoenician, for example, Kition. It is impossible to say how many Phoenician cities there were in Cyprus in the Persian period. A late Biblical passage illustrates the same conception for Philistine cities: "Ashdod, the towns of its territory, and its villages; Gaza, the towns of its territory and its villages, till the river of Egypt and to the great sea, which delimits it" (Josh. 15:46-47).

25 1 Kgs. 9:11-14. Cf. H. J. Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre* (Jerusalem, 1973), 104-5.

26 See discussion and references in Elayi, "Studies in Phoenician Geography."

27 For the population of Tyre, see Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre*, 10 (with references).

28 Esdras 3:7. During the Roman period (44 A.D.), the people of Tyre and Sidon sent an embassy to Herod asking for peace because their country depended on the king's country for food (Acts 12:20).

The most populous and powerful cities of central Phoenicia were obliged to look north and south to increase their agricultural supplies, extend their trading markets, and control the main commercial roads to the interior. During the Persian period, Sidon spread particularly to southern Phoenicia.²⁹ In consequence of that, the territories of the Phoenician cities could be discontinuous. We know from the *Periplus*, for example, that, beyond the town of Dor, which was controlled by the Sidonians, there were southwards the towns of Crocodeilon and Ashkelon belonging to the Tyrians.³⁰ The fact that these last two towns were separated from the territory of Tyre did not much matter because the Phoenician coastal plain itself was fragmented by nature (note, for example, that the promontory of Theouprosopon completely interrupts coastal communications); and because the Phoenicians could easily communicate by sea.

According to some authors, the Phoenician cities manifested a homogeneous character.³¹ This is probably more valid for the Phoenician colonies because, when the Phoenicians were looking for a new site on which to found a colony, they could freely choose the site which offered the best conditions to them. But in Phoenicia, they had less latitude since they were constricted by Aramaean and Hebrew expansion.

Nevertheless, some common features do emerge in most of the Phoenician cities of the mother-land. The Phoenicians preferred to settle on islands (Arados, Tyre) or promontories which they could protect more easily against attack (Berytos).³² Their main interest, however, was to have good harbors, well sheltered from the winds. Some cities (Sidon, Tyre) even had two harbors, oriented to different sides. Each city had in its vicinity a fertile plain to supply the needs of the inhabitants. Rocky cliffs were used as quarries.³³ The Phoenicians seem to have established less important settlements on neighboring mountains. These were used both to control the roads to the interior and as cultic high places.

The Canaanite cultic high places are often mentioned in the Hebrew Bible: “. . . [the Canaanites] sacrificed at the top of the mountains.”³⁴ Until recently, archaeologists have found few traces of these establishments, probably because, unlike the temples built in the towns, they consisted only of altars and standing stones (*maššebot*). Tacitus relates that when Vespasian ascended Mount Carmel in the first century A.D. in order to consult the oracle, he found neither a temple nor a statue, only an altar in the open air.³⁵ Roman coins from Tyre dated to the third century A.D. also give an idea of the Phoenician cultic high places. The cultic high place of the city of Tyre comprised a

29 Cf. Elayi, “Studies in Phoenician Geography.”

30 Pseudo-Scylax, loc. cit.

31 See, e.g., Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens*, 148; P. Cintas speaks of a Punic typical aspect; *Contribution à l'étude de l'expansion carthaginoise au Maroc* (Paris, 1954), 10.

32 According to Moscati (*L'épopée des Phéniciens*, 146), this was because disembarking was easier in those places and the ships more protected from the winds.

33 We may note, however, that almost the entire Phoenician coast is rocky.

34 2 Kgs. 12:3, 14:4; 15:4; 16:9–12; Hos. 4:13 and 15; 10:5 and 8, etc. . . . Cf. Harden, *Phoenicians*, 93–94; W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (London, 1968), *passim*; R. du Mesnil du Buisson, *Nouvelles études sur les dieux et les mythes de Canaan* (Leiden, 1973), 31–43 (with bibl.).

35 Tacitus, *Histories*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), 2, 78.

sacred olive-tree, a spring, two standing stones, and a flaming altar.³⁶ Deir el-Qalaa, Baetocaece, and Sfire (?) seem to have been high places of the cities of Berytos, Arados and Tripoli respectively.³⁷

The organization of the Phoenician cities in the Persian period is not well known. Their economy was always based on trade, mainly maritime, with a system of colonies which furnished them with most of their resources. This topic has been studied in several works.³⁸ We shall just point out that in the Persian period the Phoenicians had also expanded in southern Phoenicia (Dor, Jaffa, Strato's Tower) and in northern Phoenicia (Sukas); nor did they neglect to control the main trading roads to the interior, where they also traded (for example, at Jerusalem and Ezion-Geber). This period of relative peace enable them to enjoy a measure of prosperity, evidenced by the fact that they struck their own coins.

There is general agreement that the Phoenicians were sailors rather than soldiers, but this is less true in the Persian period. In particular, during the Persian wars the Phoenicians proved that their fleets could rival those of Athens.³⁹ At the time of Alexander the reputation of the Phoenician fleets had not changed. The Macedonian conqueror feared to penetrate deeply into the Persian empire without first having secured their loyalty. Phoenician land warfare seems to have been as good as their sea warfare since the Phoenician armies inflicted a crushing defeat upon the armies of Belesys, satrap of Syria, and Mazaeus, governor of Cilicia, who had joined forces to put down the rebellion of Sidon in 351 B.C.⁴⁰ Although documents are wanting on this question, we know from Diodorus that the Phoenicians used mercenaries in the first half of the fourth century B.C.⁴¹ This practice was probably even more ancient in Phoenicia because it had become quite usual at Carthage in the Persian period. A sixth century reference in Ezekiel also seems to indicate mercenary service at Tyre: "Persia and Lud (Lydia) and Put (part of Africa) were in thine army, thy men of war."⁴² The military equipment of the Phoenician soldiers, as described by Herodotus, was probably not very different from that of the Greeks: "They wore linen corselets and carried shields without edge and javelins."⁴³ We also learn from Herodotus about their ingenuity in military engineering. By dint of their labor, the canal of Mount Athos was successfully completed: "In the section of the canal ascribed to the Phoenicians they took out a trench double the width of the original plan, and by digging a slope gradually contracted

36 Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Nouvelles études*, 33-43 (with bibl.).

37 Elayi, "Studies in Phoenician Geography."

38 For this question, see, e.g., Harden, *Phoenicians*, 157-79; Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens*, 119-27 (with bibl.).

39 Diodorus, 11: 13.2. On the contrary, Herodotus (*Histoires*, 8, 17) states that the Egyptian fleet was the most worthy in the battle of Salamis. In Xerxes' fleet at Salamis there were 300 Phoenician triremes out of a total of 1,207.

40 Diodorus, 16: 42.1-2.

41 *Ibid.*, 16: 41.4-6.

42 Ezek. 27:10.

43 Herodotus, *Histoires*, 7:89. The use of mercenaries, several of them probably Greek, must have encouraged a certain uniformity in the equipment.

it as they got further down until at the bottom their section was the same width as the rest of the canal."⁴⁴

There is much evidence about the Phoenician cities' system of defense. They had excellent fortifications as we can judge from the impressive Tyrian walls: "The walls facing the mole (built by Alexander) were about 150 feet high and of corresponding breadth, constructed of big blocks of stone fitted in mortar."⁴⁵ Their system of defense under siege was greatly developed, at least at the time of Alexander's conquest: "(The Tyrians) had a wealth of catapults and other engines employed for sieges and they had no difficulty in constructing more because of the engineers and artisans of all sorts who were in the city. All kinds of novel devices were fashioned by them, so that the entire circuit of the walls was covered with machines . . ."⁴⁶ The Phoenician methods of siege-warfare were also excellent; Alexander himself collected engineers "from Cyprus and the whole of Phoenicia"⁴⁷ to build engines to attack the island. From Arrian's testimony⁴⁸ it does not seem that the Macedonian conqueror could have taken Tyre without the help of other Phoenician cities. Of course, the Persians encouraged the military power of the Phoenicians since their fleets were the trump card for maintaining the empire. Such an advanced capacity for warfare proves that the Phoenicians already had a long experience of fighting. The geographical situation of Phoenicia, which lay on the land route between Egypt and the best lands of western Asia, a regular route for conquerors moving in either direction, could explain it.

We know almost nothing about the political organization of the Phoenician cities. The Phoenician system of the city state can be in some way compared to that of the Cyprian, Greek, or Punic cities. The Phoenician cities were in principle governed by hereditary kings.⁴⁹ We know of some dynasties from the dynastic lists, such as the Byblian dynasty of Yehawmilk: "I am Yehawmilk, King of Byblos, the son Yeharba^cl, the grandson of Urimilk, King of Byblos . . ."⁵⁰ If the king was too young to ascend the throne, there could be a regency; for example, Amo^cashtart was regent while her son, Eshmun^cazar II, was still a minor.⁵¹ The mothers of the kings seem to have been particularly respected, as is shown by the inscription on Batno^cam's sarcophagus: "In this sarcophagus I, Batno^cam mother of Ozbaal, King of Byblos, son of Pillet-Baal, priest of Baalat, do lie; garbed in a gown and headdress with a gold plate covering my mouth, in the same apparel as all royal persons before me."⁵² The first function of the Phoenician king was military; we have evidence that he was at this time the commander

44 Ibid., 7:23.

45 Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:21.4.

46 Diodorus, 17:41.3-4. See also 43.1: "The Tyrians had bronze workers and machinists, and contrived ingenious countermeasures . . ." such as rotating wheels against the missiles.

47 Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:21.2. There is in his account a precise description of all the Phoenician engines and stratagems.

48 There is no reason to doubt it since Arrian was a Greek and based his history on two authorities contemporary with Alexander, Ptolemaeus and Aristobolus.

49 See, e.g., M. Dunand, "Les rois de Sidon au temps des Perses," *MUSJ* 49 (1975-76), 491-99.

50 *ANET*, 502; M. Dunand, *Fouilles de Byblos* (Paris, 1939), 1:31; H. Donner-W. Röllig, *KAI* I, no.10.

51 *ANET*³, 662.

52 Dunand, *Fouilles de Byblos*, loc. cit.; *KAI* I, no.11.

of the fleet, but he was probably also the commander of all his troops. In the Persian wars, each Phoenician king was the chief commander of his fleet: "... the Sidonian Tetramnestos, Anysos' son, the Tyrian Matten, Eiomos' son, the Aradian Merbalos, Agbalos' son . . ." ⁵³ When Alexander arrived in Phoenicia, the kings of Tyre and Arados were with their fleets under Autophradates' supreme authority. ⁵⁴

The Phoenician king was also the religious leader as is shown by the dynasty of Eshmun'azar at Sidon: "I, Tabnit priest of Astarte, King of Sidon, son of Eshmun'azar, priest of Astarte, King of Sidon, am lying in this sarcophagus" ⁵⁵; during her reign, Amoshtart was priestess of Astarte; ⁵⁶; Ozbaal, king of Byblos, was the son of Pillet-Baal, priest of Baalat. ⁵⁷ The religious activity of the kings which is shown by the inscriptions consisted of repairing or building temples, and carving statues. We do not know whether the Phoenician king was also the supreme judge (*šôfet*). This seems likely, however, because this was the case at Carthage ⁵⁸ and because several times the epithets 'just' and 'righteous' were given to the Phoenician kings. ⁵⁹ These epithets may relate to their function of judge. The Phoenician kings must not have been very different from the Cyprian kings such as Evagoras I of Salamis: they were oriental monarchs, with a court of rich princes, fond of luxury and display, encouraging artists and open to foreign artistic creations, as is shown, for example, by the Greek choregraphic tribune found at Sidon. ⁶⁰ They also liked hunting in the mountains of Phoenicia. As the scenes represented on architectural sarcophagi (such as the sarcophagus of the Satrap) ⁶¹ indicate, these mountains abounded in game.

The authority of the Phoenician king in this city must have been strong because the famous Athenian decree of the first half of the fourth century B.C. was directed not to the city of Sidon but to Strato and his descendants. By this decree, the Athenian council gave the king of Sidon honors and privileges and exempted from taxes the Sidonians who came to Athens for trading purposes. ⁶²

The king's power, however, was not absolute. It was limited by Persian authority (as we shall see below) and, as we learn from ancient sources, ⁶³ it was also limited by the

⁵³ Herodotus, *Histories*, 7:96, 98.

⁵⁴ Arrian, 2:13.24; 15.7. At Carthage, too, the king was the commander of the army (Aristotle, *Politics*, Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge, 1958], 2:8.2f.). For the function of the king of Sidon in the Persian fleet, see H. Hauben, "The King of the Sidonians," *Ancient Society* 1 (1970), 1-8.

⁵⁵ *ANET*³, 662; *KAI*, I, no.13.

⁵⁶ *ANET*³, 662; *KAI*, I, no.14.

⁵⁷ *KAI*, I, no.11.

⁵⁸ Justin, *Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi* (Lipsiae, 1886), 19:2.5-6; Aristotle, *Politics*, 2:8.2f.

⁵⁹ *ANET*, 502. Such a conception of the kingship reflects the ancient Canaanite ideal of kingship (J. Gray, *The Canaanites* [London, 1964], 104f.).

⁶⁰ M. Dunand, "Le temple d'Echmoun à Sidon. Essai de Chronologie," *BMB* 26 (1973), 16 and pls. VIII-IX.

⁶¹ I. Kleemann, *Der Satrapen-Sarkophag aus Sidon* (Berlin, 1958). It seems to be now admitted that the Orientals represented on this sarcophagus were Phoenicians, not Persians.

⁶² *CIG*, 1:126, no. 87. Cf. J. Elayi, "L'importation de vases attiques en Phénicie à l'époque perse," *Proc. I° congresso internazionale di Studi Fenici e Punici* (Roma, 5-10 Nov. 1979) [in press].

⁶³ Diodorus, 15: 1.45; Ezek. 27:9. For the Sidonian council at the end of the Persian period, see S. F. Bondi, "Istituzioni e politica a Sidone dal 351 al 332 av. Cr.," *Rivista di Studi Fenici* 2 (1974), 149-60.

existence of a council. This council was probably constituted by citizens from the rich merchant classes of the city. Unfortunately, it is impossible to define the nature of this council more precisely. The ancient sources,⁶⁴ as well as the discovery of many sumptuous sarcophagi at Sidon,⁶⁵ testify to the existence of a rich aristocracy in the city. We also learn from Aristotle that at Carthage the senators had to have belonged to rich and powerful families.⁶⁶ As far as we know, the government of the Phoenician cities probably resembled more the Carthaginian government of the first Magonids than the Carthaginian constitution of the fourth century B.C. described by Aristotle.⁶⁷ The tripartition of powers among the magistrates, the senate, and the general assembly was evidently influenced by occidental systems.⁶⁸

If the Phoenician cities in the Persian period were mainly characterized by common features, some differences, of varying importance, also emerge from the documents. Thus, some political differences appear in the government and policy of the Phoenician cities. We compare first the Aradian and Tyrian delegations which welcomed Alexander in 333 B.C.⁶⁹ The situation of the two cities was identical: Azemilcus, the king of Tyre, and Gerostratus, the king of Arados, were both far from their cities with Autophradates, who commanded the Phoenician and Cyprian fleets. The Aradian delegation was conducted by Strato, Gerostratus' son. In the absence of his father, Strato decided to surrender, and, after having crowned Alexander by himself with a golden crown, he gave him not only the island of Arados but also the entire Aradian territory. Of course, the city of Tyre was too jealous of its independence to surrender like Arados, but it is surprising to see that the role of Azemilcus' son in the Tyrian delegation was very different from that of Gerostratus' son in the Aradian delegation: ". . . on the way Tyrian envoys met him (Alexander), sent by the community (πρέσβεις Τυρίων ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ἑσταλμένοι) to say that Tyre had decided to accept Alexander's orders."⁷⁰ τὸ κοινόν has several meanings: 'state, government, senate, public authority, common will'. It is difficult to choose the appropriate one because we do not know whether there was a popular council at Tyre.⁷¹ But we may consider as certain the existence of a popular authority which dictated the words of welcome of the delegates (ἐγνωκότων Τυρίων "all the Tyrians having decided") and their answer to Alexander's claims (ἔδοξε σφίσι "they decided").⁷² Azemilcus' son had no particular

64 Diodorus, 16: 41.4–6; 45.3–6.

65 See, e.g., E. Kukahn, *Anthropoide Sarcophage in Beyrouth* (Berlin, 1955); M. L. Buhl, *The Late Egyptian Anthropoid Stone Sarcophagi* (Copenhagen, 1959), esp. 35–86.

66 Aristotle, *Politics*, loc. cit.

67 Justin, *Epitoma*, loc. cit. For the government of the first Magonids, see references in L. Maurin, "Himilcon le Magonide," *Semitica* 12 (1962), 13ff.

68 Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens*, 186 (for example, the fact that there were two suffetes, elected annually, is not Phoenician but recalls the Roman institution of consulate).

69 The political situation of Tyre in the first half of the fourth century B.C. has been studied in my forthcoming paper, "La révolte des esclaves de Tyr relatée par Justin," *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 12 (1981).

70 Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:15.6–7.

71 Bondi, "Istituzioni e politica a Sidone," 160.

72 Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:16.7.

role in this delegation; Arrian did not even mention his name, including him among the best known Tyrians (καὶ γὰρ ἦσαν τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἐν Τύρῳ οἱ τε ἄλλοι καὶ ὀτοῦ Βασιλέως τῶν Τυρίων παῖς “for they were Tyrian nobles and included the son of their king”).⁷³ He did not take any initiative, and Alexander did not speak to him, only to the Tyrians (ἐκέλευσεν ἐπανελθόντας φράσαι Τυρίους “he told them to return and inform the Tyrians”).⁷⁴ The fact that Alexander forgave King Azemilcus and the best known Tyrians—perhaps the family and entourage of the king—(τῶν Τυρίων οἱ μάλιστα ἐν τέλει καὶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς Ἀζέμιλκος “the men of most authority among the Tyrians and King Azemilcus”)⁷⁵—seems to indicate that they were not quite responsible for the resistance of the Tyrians. Neither does Diodorus mention in his account the king of Tyre, only the Tyrians (Οἱ δὲ Τύροι . . . διεκώλυσαν αὐτὸν τῆς εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσόδου “The Tyrians . . . overhastily barred him from entering the city”).⁷⁶ None of the decisions concerning the organization of the resistance came from the king; all of them were taken by vote (ἐψηφίσαντο “they voted”).⁷⁷ Therefore, the comparison of the Aradian and Tyrian monarchies shows that the Aradian king had strong executive power and his son was viceroy in his absence, but that in Tyre executive power does not seem to have belonged to the king but to the people (under a form that we cannot define) and the king’s son had no power in the absence of his father.⁷⁸

Foreign policy also differed among the Phoenician cities, as we may judge from their attitudes on the coming of Alexander. After having received the city of Arados in surrender, “Alexander marched from Marathos and received the surrender of Byblos and Sidon; the Sidonians who loathed Persia and Darius, called him in themselves.”⁷⁹ Sidon and Byblos had no other choice than to surrender, even if they wanted to resist; but Arados, whose island was as well fortified as the island of Tyre, had the possibility of resisting. While the Aradians preferred to submit, the Tyrians did not want to surrender to Alexander until they were sure that Darius was decisively defeated.⁸⁰ Sidon seems to have been more open to Hellenism, as we can see, for example, from the Athenian decree in favor of Strato I⁸¹; Tyre had probably better relations with Egypt, as is shown, for example, by the Egyptian influence on Tyrian coins.⁸²

73 Ibid., 2:15.

74 Ibid. It could be objected that Azemilcus’ son may have been younger than Gerostratus’ son, but if he would still have been a child, he would not have belonged to the delegation; and if he would have been a very young man, he could have replaced his father during his absence, for we know that Philippus, during his expedition against Byzantium, entrusted Alexander, who was then only sixteen years old, with his kingdom.

75 Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:24.

76 Diodorus, 17:40.

77 Ibid., 17:41. We do not know exactly who the ἀρχοντες mentioned by Diodorus some lines later were.

78 Possibly the Tyrian monarchy had been weakened by the revolt of slaves ascribed by Justin to the Persian period; Elayi, “La révolte des esclaves de Tyr.”

79 Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:13.7–8 and 15.6.

80 According to Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:16.

81 See above, n. 62. His true name was Abdashtart, but he was called “Strato-the-Philhellen” because of his interest in Greek civilization.

82 The Tyrian coins bear the crook and the flail; E. Babelon, *Catalogue des Monnaies Grecques. Les Perses achéménides* (Paris, 1893), CLXXXIX–CXCI and 290–95; G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia* (Bologna, 1965), CXXIII–CXXIX and 227–33. The cult of the sun was probably also

The main difference between the Phoenician cities was that of wealth. We find evidence of coinage in the cities of Tyre, Sidon, Arados, and Byblos,⁸³ but, as far as we know, Tripoli and Berytos did not have their own coinage in the Persian period. The wealth of the cities is also shown by the monuments built during the Persian period and the discovery of fine works of art. We have many examples from Sidon and Byblos, which were no doubt prosperous cities.⁸⁴ As regards Sidon, we have further testimony from ancient authors such as Diodorus: “. . . Sidon was distinguished for its wealth and its private citizens had amassed great riches from its shipping . . .”⁸⁵ We know nothing of the other Phoenician cities, which lie under modern towns and have not yet been excavated. However, the excavations of M. Dunand at ‘Amrit (Marathos, a town belonging to Aradian territory) have shown that this town was very prosperous—to judge from several buildings (a temple, graves) dated to the Persian period,⁸⁶—which probably means that the entire city of Arados was prosperous. The distribution of the Phoenician coins found in southern and northern Phoenicia shows that Sidonian trade was more prosperous than that of Tyre and Arados⁸⁷; no Byblian coin has been found in these areas. It seems likely that the main Phoenician cities competed in trading.

The differential in wealth between the Phoenician cities corresponded exactly to a difference in power. The weakest cities had been incorporated into the territory of the most powerful cities; for example, Simyra, which had been an independent city before the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III,⁸⁸ came to belong to Aradian territory. Only the most powerful cities, namely Sidon, Tyre, and Arados, exerted their control in southern and northern Phoenicia.⁸⁹ The Phoenician cities did not all possess a powerful fleet; during the Persian wars, the best Phoenician fleet was by far the Sidonian and the second that of Tyre. In the Persian council of war which preceded the battle of Salamis “. . . each commander of the ships . . . sat in the rank assigned by the king to him; in the first rank the king of Sidon, after him the king of Tyre, the others after them.”⁹⁰ The ancient

introduced at Tyre about the same time under Egyptian influence, cf. J. P. Rey-Coquais, *Arados et sa Pèrèe* (Paris, 1974), 241 (with bibl.).

83 Scholars do not agree on the date of the first coins of the different cities; the dates proposed range from the middle of the fifth to the beginning of the fourth century B.C.; e.g., Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens*, 115f.; Baramki, *Phoenicia and the Phoenicians*, 79–95; Harden, *Phoenicians*, 166–68.

84 See, e.g., the Achaemenid podiums of Sidon and Byblos (M. Dunand, *BMB* 26 [1973], 7–26; *BMB* 22 [1969], 93–99), and the numerous sarcophagi found in the famous royal necropolis of Sidon (E. Kukahn, *Anthropoide Sarcophage in Beyrouth* [Berlin, 1957]; J. C. Assmann, *AA* [1963], 690–716).

85 Diodorus, 16:41.4–6 and 45.3–6.

86 M. Dunand, “Les sculptures de la favissa du temple d’Amrit,” *BMB* 7 (1944–45), 99–107; idem, “La favissa du temple d’Amrit,” *BMB* 8 (1946–48), 81–107; idem, “Recherches archéologiques dans la région de Marathos. Note préliminaire,” *AAS* 3 (1953), 165–70; idem, “Les fouilles d’Amrith en 1954, Rapport préliminaire,” *AAS* 4–5 (1955), 189–212; idem, “Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles d’Amrith en 1955,” *AAS* 6 (1956), 3–10; M. Dunand–M. Saliby, “Le sanctuaire d’Amrit, Rapport préliminaire,” *AAS* 11–12 (1961–62), 3–12; S. Abdul-Hak, “Découvertes archéologiques récentes dans les sites gréco-romains de Syrie,” *AAS* 8–9 (1958–59), 86–89. M. Dunand is preparing a book on the temple of Amrit.

87 Elayi, “Studies in Phoenician Geography,” fig. 3.

88 Elayi, “The Phoenician Cities and the Assyrian Empire.”

89 Elayi, “Studies in Phoenician Geography.”

90 Herodotus, *Histoires*, 8:67.

sources relating to the time of Alexander's conquest mention the fleets of Tyre, Sidon, Arados, and Byblos.⁹¹ We may suppose that Tripolis and Berytos had no fleet in the Persian period, or that they had only some triremes which joined with the fleets of more important cities.

In Phoenicia, as well as in Cyprus or Greece, the major cities enjoyed some hegemony over the others. In the Persian period it was Sidon which held political leadership, as the ancient sources relating to the Persian wars indicate. But its leadership was probably more ancient. Tyre had lost its hegemony during the sixth century (we do not know exactly when),⁹² because it was isolated on its island, had been besieged several times by Assyrian and Babylonian kings,⁹³ and had lost its political control over Carthage and its other western colonies.⁹⁴ After its destruction by Artaxerxes III in 351 B.C., Sidon, too, lost its hegemony. From the existing documentation, it is difficult to say whether Tyre or Arados became the leading city after that. The fact that Tyre resisted Alexander and that Arados surrendered to him (though both cities were able to resist because of their insular situation) could mean that Tyre was the leading city. Moreover, it seems likely that after the destruction of Sidon, Tyre received some Sidonian possessions in southern Phoenicia.⁹⁵ Anyway, if we do not know with certainty whether Tyre was then more powerful than Arados, we do know that Byblos was less important. As for Tripoli and Berytos, we may conjecture that they were even less important, but documentation on these cities is lacking. The only text relating to the city of Tripoli in our period is particularly enigmatic: "In Phoenicia there is an important city called Tripoli, the name of which is appropriate to its nature, for there are three cities in it, 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 reputation amongst the cities of Phoenicia for there, as it happens, the Phoenicians held their common council and deliberated on methods of supreme importance."⁹⁶ Although this text comprises late evidence of the first century B.C., Diodorus seems to refer to a reliable tradition relevant to the time of Tennes' revolt. According to him, the decision of the revolt was taken in a common council held in this important city (πόλις ἀξιόλογος ὀνόματι Τρίπολις, "an important city called Tripoli"). This single passage does not allow us to specify the nature of the confederacy and the date of its formation. It was probably not a real confederacy because the Phoenician ships were not under one commander-in-chief: there were three Phoenician commanders in the Phoenician contingent in Xerxes' fleet in 480⁹⁷ and

91 Arrian, *Anabasis*, 2:20.1-2.

92 H. J. Katzenstein ascribes this event to the end of the sixth century ("Tyre in the Early Persian Period [539-486 B.C.E.]," *BA* 42 [1979], 23-34); this hypothesis is interesting, but the documents that support it are somewhat meager.

93 J. Elayi, "L'essor de la Phénicie et le passage de la domination assyro-babylonienne à la domination perse," *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 9 (1978), 27-29 and 37.

94 If the slave revolt ascribed by Justin to the Persian period (*Epitoma*, loc. cit.) is not misdated, it could be another reason of the decline of Tyre; cf. Elayi, "La révolte des esclaves de Tyr."

95 U. Kahrstedt, "Syrische Territorien in hellenistischen Zeit," *Abh. der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse* 19: 2 (1926), 39 and n. 1.

96 Diodorus, 16:41.1-2.

97 See above, n. 53.

apparently four in Autophradates' fleet in 333 B.C.⁹⁸ Therefore, we may confidently affirm one thing, that an attempt was made to unify the Phoenician cities under the leadership of Sidon,⁹⁹ but that this attempt was quite insufficient to establish a true nation. Such a situation may be compared to that of Cyprian or Greek cities in the classical period.

Finally, we have to mention some minor differences among the Phoenician cities: differences of language (for example between the languages of Byblos and Sidon¹⁰⁰), of religion (for example, the three main deities were El, Balaat and Adonis in Byblos, but Baal, Astarte and Eshmun in Sidon¹⁰¹), and of artistic style (for example, the style of the anthropoid sarcophagi is not exactly the same at Sidon and Arados¹⁰²). The documents relevant to the Persian period are too meager to allow a precise study on this question.

Persian domination over the Phoenician cities caused partial changes in their organization. Phoenicia was incorporated by the Persians in the fifth satrapy. The boundaries of this satrapy have not been identified with certainty because the pertinent ancient sources are not sufficiently clear nor do they mesh. Besides Phoenicia, the satrapy seems to have included Syria, Palestine, and Cyprus, but the extent of its territory changed several times during the Persian period and these changes are not well-known.¹⁰³ Anyway, the knowledge of the boundaries of the fifth satrapy is not useful to our study because they have no bearing on the boundaries of the Phoenician territories since the Persian kings had given the Phoenician cities a special place in this satrapy, with considerable autonomy.¹⁰⁴ As far as we know, they were allowed to keep their local kings, political organization, religion, customs, and trading activities, with the understanding that they would serve the interests of the Persian empire, not threaten the peace, pay tribute, and put their forces at the disposal of the Persian kings.¹⁰⁵ The Persians had a good system of control: periodical inspections of the satrapies were made by a high official specially appointed by the king, who bore the significant title "the King's Eye" and who travelled with a military escort provided by the king's Persian army. This periodical control undoubtedly limited the autonomy of the cities.

This control was not established in the same way in each city. Sidon had been chosen as the capital of the fifth satrapy; the satrap dwelt in this city, probably with his court,

98 See above, n. 54.

99 The main attempt seems to have been made in the fourth century B.C. against Persian domination; we note that it was also when they fought against the Persians that the Cyprian and Greek cities were nearest to unity (Cyprian cities under Evagoras I and Greek cities in the time of Persian wars).

100 See, e.g., J. Friedrich-W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik 2* (Rome, 1970), 2-3.

101 Moscati, *L'épopée des Phéniciens*, 59-68 (with bibl.).

102 See, e.g., Kukahn, *Anthropoid Sarcophages, passim*.

103 For this question see Elayi, "L'essor de la Phénicie," 33-36 (with bibl.).

104 See for example Strabo (*Geography*, 16:257): Τὸ παλαιὸν μὲν οὖν (in the Persian period) οἱ Ἀράδιοι καθ' αὐτοὺς ἐβασιλεύοντο παραπλησίως ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐκάστη πόλεων τῶν Φοινικίδων "Now in ancient times the Aradians were governed independently by kings, as was also the case with each of the other Phoenician cities."

105 Elayi, "L'essor de la Phénicie," 35-36.

his servants, and his troops. Sidon was also the meeting-place of Persian officials; for example, we know from Diodorus that in 351 B.C., when the Persians were preparing a campaign against Egypt, "... the King's satraps and generals dwelt in the city of the Sidonians ..."¹⁰⁶ Several architectural remains of Achaemenid style have been found in the modern town of Saida and at the site of Eshmun's temple.¹⁰⁷ We may conjecture that the Persians had built at least a palace for the satrap, a citadel for the troops, and probably other buildings for the Persian residents. Diodorus tells us that there was also "the royal park (τὸν . . . βασιλικὸν παράδεισον) in which the Persian kings were wont to take their recreation."¹⁰⁸ The Persian presence at Sidon was no doubt oppressive, limiting the authority of the local king and disturbing the population, especially when many Persians gathered there in order to prepare military operations. We have evidence from Diodorus that in 351 B.C., the Sidonians revolted against the Persians because the latter "... behaved in an outrageous and high-handed fashion . . . in ordering things to be done . . ."¹⁰⁹ In the other Phoenician cities, there were probably Persian governors, shown, for example, by the architectural remains of Achaemenid style found at Byblos.¹¹⁰ But we may suppose that the Persian presence was less oppressive there than at Sidon. As far as we know, the Persians were particularly interested in some Phoenician sites either as strategic positions (fortresses of Byblos and Baniyas(?) used to control the coastal road¹¹¹) or as bases of operations (Acre for campaigns against Egypt,¹¹² Sidon for campaigns against Egypt and Greece¹¹³). As for the island of Tyre, it diverged even more from the other Phoenician cities since the Tyrians probably allowed the Persians to enter it no more than they had allowed the Assyrians and the Babylonians.

The influence of Persian domination on the status of the Phoenician cities finally depended upon the difference in relations between each city and the Persian king and upon the evolution of these relations throughout the Persian period. It seems that relations between the Phoenician cities and the first Persian kings were good, for Herodotus tells us that the Phoenicians "had taken service under him (Cambyses) of their free will."¹¹⁴ Moreover, Cambyses accepted that they refused to help him to conquer Carthage. During the Persian wars, relations between the Phoenicians and the

106 Diodorus, 16:40.2; 41.4-6.

107 Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, "Le paradesos royal achéménide de Sidon," *RB* 30 (1921), 106-8; M. Dunand, "Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles de Sidon en 1964-1965," *BMB* 20 (1967), 28-43; idem, "La défense du front méditerranéen de l'empire achéménide," in *The Role of the Phoenicians in the Interaction of Mediterranean Civilizations*, Papers presented to the Archaeological Symposium at the American Univ. of Beirut (1968), 43-44.

108 Diodorus, 16:41.5; Clermont-Ganneau, loc. cit.

109 Diodorus, 16:41.2.

110 Dunand dates the monumental podium from the last third of the sixth century B.C., the glacis of the podium from the beginning of the fifth century and the fortress from the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth centuries B.C.; "La défense du front de mer," 45-46; idem, "L'architecture à Byblos au temps des Achéménides," *BMB* 22 (1966), 93-99.

111 Dunand, "La défense du front de mer," loc. cit.

112 Diodorus, 15:41.3.

113 Herodotus, 3:136; Diodorus, 16:40.2; 41.4-6.

114 Herodotus, 3:19. Cf. Katzenstein, "Tyre in the Early Persian Period," 25-28.

Persians remained good, particularly those between Sidon and Xerxes who openly favored this city.¹¹⁵ Difficulty began after the Persian defeat of Salamis, if we may believe Herodotus. In a moment of anger, Xerxes ordered some Phoenician crews to be put to death.¹¹⁶ From then until the fourth century B.C. we have no documents; then the hostility of the Phoenician cities (especially Sidon) toward Persian domination increased from the revolt of Evagoras I of Salamis (in Cyprus) to the great revolt of the satraps and to the Phoenician revolt of 351 B.C., led by the city of Sidon.¹¹⁷ Possibly the nature of Persian domination had changed, but it should be stressed that the Phoenician cities had become much more prosperous and powerful and that they wanted to profit by the weakness of the Persian empire to obtain freedom. We have evidence that after Sidon was destroyed its political status was changed by Artaxerxes III. Since some coins of Mazaïos were struck at Sidon,¹¹⁸ it seems that the local dynasty was interrupted for a few years and Mazaïos was appointed satrap of Cilicia and Phoenicia. After the short and unsuccessful reign of Evagoras II of Salamis (349–346 B.C.), the Persian kings appointed a local king, Strato II, who was favorable to them (*Darei opibus adiutus*¹¹⁹). As S. F. Bondi has explained well,¹²⁰ until 333 B.C., the king of Sidon was completely subservient to the Persians; the council—if there was one—had no power. The population was not sympathetic to the king but was obliged to obey. When Alexander arrived at Sidon, Strato surrendered against his will (*deditionem magis popularium quam sua sponte fecerat*¹²¹).

The prosperity of the Phoenician cities had increased much during the Persian period, which means that the Persian kings protected their trade, receiving Phoenician tributes and products.¹²² The fact that Sidon had been chosen as the capital of the fifth satrapy and was favored by the Persian kings until the beginning of the fourth century B.C.¹²³ no doubt contributed to its development. The isolation of Tyre on its island, by contrast, was certainly, as we have seen, one of the reasons of its decline.¹²⁴

Thus, in spite of inadequate documentation concerning the Persian period, it is possible to draw a first approximate description of the Phoenician cities in this period; when more information becomes available, the description can be refined. The cities were quasi-autonomous, cosmopolitan city states. In general, each of them consisted of a main town with small towns all around and of a more or less diffuse and possibly

115 Herodotus, 7:44, 100, 128; 8: 67.

116 Ibid., 8:90.

117 Evagoras I stretched his domination over the greater part of Cyprus and some towns of Phoenicia: Diodorus, 15: 2; Isocrates, *Evagoras*, 4:161; 9:62. For the revolt of the satraps, see, e.g., Diodorus, 15, 90. For the Sidonian revolt, see, e.g., Diodorus, 16:41–45.

118 In fact, the exact role of Mazaïos and the datation of his coins struck at Sidon are not clear; cf. Bondi, "Istituzioni e politica a Sidone," 156 and n. 29 (with bibl.).

119 Curtius, 4:1.16.

120 Bondi, "Istituzioni e politica a Sidone," 149–60.

121 Curtius, 4:1.16.

122 See the numerous archaeological finds of Byblos, Marathos, and Sidon.

123 We have evidence that yet in 396 B.C. Sidonian ships played an important role in the Persian fleet; Diodorus, 14:79.8; *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, V. Bartoletti, ed. (1959), 9:2; I. A. F. Bruce, *An Historical Commentary on the "Hellenica Oxyrhynchia"* (Cambridge, 1967), 66–75.

124 For other reasons of this decline, see above, nn. 91–93.

discontinuous territory. The Phoenician cities had basically the same civilization, economic interests, and political organization, but some differences of detail distinguished each of them. Their incorporation into the fifth Persian satrapy did not change their status much, except in 351 B.C. when the leadership of Sidon was pitilessly annihilated. It seems that the Persian kings had first favored the differences between Sidon and the other cities, but when they understood the danger of the growth of Sidon they tried rather to suppress the differences between the Phoenician cities, thus following the same policy as Thrasybulos, the tyrant of Miletus, who to illustrate this, cut down the tall ears of a corn field that all of them would be the same size.¹²⁵ Achaemenid rule allowed the Phoenicians to develop for the last time. The domination of the Greeks, whose culture had attracted the Phoenicians even before Alexander's conquest,¹²⁶ was more powerful and uncompromising than the Achaemenid, and it progressively destroyed the Phoenician civilization.

125 Herodotus, 5:92.

126 A study on this subject is in preparation.