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1. Political contact between Phoenicians and Arameans.[1]
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1. Political Contact between Phoenicians and Aramaeans

Even though the core region of the Phoenician city-states—reaching from Arwad in the north to Tyre in the south, including their hinterland—was never a coherent kingdom, it did form an interconnected cultural unit. The coastal region and the Lebanon Mountains were predominantly influenced by the Phoenicians, while the Beqa' and the Anti-Lebanon were within the influence sphere of different Aramaean kingdoms, Šobah, Geshur, and especially Damascus. The Phoenicians expanded into the Beqa' and the Anti-Lebanon only during Achaemenid and Hellenistic-Roman times.

The large Phoenician royal cities were located in the Lebanese homeland between Tyre in the south and Byblos in the north, as well as in the Syrian coastal region from Tripolis to Arwad. Nevertheless, Phoenician traces can be found as far as Gabala and Ras Shamra, ancient Ugarit, to the north; however, they must be distinguished from the Phoenicians, Aramaeans, and Greeks in al-Mina north of Ugarit. The Phoenicians in Anatolia are beyond this article’s scope.

First, a few remarks on Phoenician-Aramaean relations in the region north of Lebanon. The coastal cities, as well as the island of Arwad and its hinterland in the territory of Amrit, bordered directly on the kingdom of Hamath in the mid-8th century B.C.; this led to a temporary domination by the Aramaean kings of Hamath over the Phoenicians of this northern coastal region.

---

1 I would like to thank my colleagues Julien Alieuan (Lyon), François Briqueel-Chatonnet (Paris), and Wolfgang Röllig (Tübingen) for reviewing and discussing this article, and Jessica Baldwin (Tübingen) for the English translation.
7 Cf. Lipiński 1992b: 36 and the article by H. Sader in this volume.
A glance at a map of the Phoenician core region shows that Lebanon was bordered in the east and southeast by the kingdoms of Sobah, Geshur, and Damascus. King Hazael (ca. 843–803 B.C.) of Damascus was temporarily able to extend his realm into the territory of Israel and even into the region of the Philistine royal cities, and gain access to the Mediterranean coast. Only during this period did Damascus have access to a Mediterranean harbor. This expansion of King Hazael meant that even Tyre was temporarily confined in the south by the Aramaean sphere of influence.

It should be noted that there were no political or military confrontations between Phoenicians and Aramaeans. Both cultures profited from their mutual cultural and mercantile contacts. One also gains the impression that, with the continuing consolidation of the Aramaean kingdoms in Syria, the Phoenicians kept out of the inner-Syrian region and concentrated their interests on the coastal region and the bordering mountains. Later, they also concentrated on their growing number of trading posts in the Mediterranean, such as those on Cyprus, Rhodes, Crete, Sicily, and Sardinia, as well as in Spain and North Africa, to name but a few. With this went a continuous balance of interest between the Phoenicians in Lebanon and the Aramaeans in Syria.

In the Mediterranean, trading contacts of Syrian Aramaeans are unverifiable and the presence of Aramaeans cannot be proven on the basis of what few Aramaic inscriptions there are. This is especially true of the Aramaic inscriptions on the votive offerings on Samos and in Eretria. These objects were probably the loot of Greek mercenaries in the service of Tiglath-Pileser III (756–727 B.C.), who acquired them during the sack of Damascus in 732 B.C. They must have reached Samos and then Eretria by way of these mercenaries, perhaps even over several intermediate stops. Based on the inscriptions of Pithecusae we are dealing here with Phoenicians, not Aramaeans. Likewise, the presence of Aramaeans cannot be substantiated by a few toponyms in Tripolitania alone.

---

8 Cf. the maps in Wittke – Olshausen – Szydlak 2010: 47, 49.
10 See the maps in Wittke – Olshausen – Szydlak 2010: 69, 71.
11 Also Peckham 2001: 20–22, 37.
13 See in detail Niehr 2010b: 287f.
Well attested are the joint actions of Phoenicians and Arameans against the Assyrian expansionist politics to the west, for example, their joint efforts against the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III (858–824 B.C.) in the battle at Qarqar in 853 B.C., in which the allied troops of Damascus, Hamath, Israel, Egypt, Byblos, Irqata, Ushnu, Siyanno, and Arwad fought against the Assyrians.  

A similar coalition also existed with the coastal kings during the 10th, 11th, and 14th regnal year of Shalmaneser III.  

Phoenicians and Arameans probably also fought together against the Assyrians during the reign of Assyrian king Adad-nirari III (810–783 B.C.). The same holds true for the time of Tiglath-Pileser III (745–727 B.C.), when a conspiracy of King Hiram of Tyre with King Rezin of Damascus is documented.  

It is uncertain, due to gaps in textual transmission, whether Phoenicians involved themselves in the last insurgency mounted against the Assyrians from Hamath at the battle at Qarqar in 720 B.C.

Even so, these military actions against the Assyrians cannot disguise the fact that the kings of Arwad, Byblos, and Sidon had been paying tribute to the Assyrians since the time of Tiglath-Pileser I (1114–1076 B.C.). Further tributes by Arwad, Byblos, Sidon, and Tyre are attested for the reign of Ashurnasirpal II (883–859 B.C.). Sources also speak of tributes by Tyre and Sidon to the Assyrians on the occasion of various military campaigns against Damascus by Shalmaneser III. Finally, a relief on the Balawat Gates shows Tyrians presenting their tribute to Shalmaneser III (858–824 B.C.).

2. Phoenician Cultural Influence on the Arameans in Syria

Historically, a cultural influence of Lebanese Phoenicians on some of the Aramean kingdoms in Syria is initially ascertainable. Arameans adopted the Phoenician script with its 22 consonant alphabet at the beginning of
the 9th century B.C. The transition from Phoenician to Aramaic is visible in early inscriptions of the Aramaean kingdoms, especially in Sam’al, where the oldest inscription was written during the time of King Kulamuwa (ca. 840–810 B.C.). This inscription was composed using the Phoenician language and script (KAI 24); a somewhat more recent inscription, however, was in Aramaic and used Phoenician script (KAI 25).

The Phoenician inscription at Sam’al (KAI 24) definitively proves the existence of Phoenician scribes in Aramaean lands. The existence of a Phoenician scribe by the name of Abdilim is documented for the time of King Kapara of Guzana (Tell Halaf). A definite Phoenician cultural influence on Aramaean literacy in Syria is clearly revealed by their adoption of the Phoenician alphabet and by the work of Phoenician scribes. The related religious Phoenician influence on the Syrian Aramaeans will be discussed later.

Furthermore, the amulet tablets from Hadattu (Arslan Tash) should also be mentioned in this context. These amulets are written in a mixed Phoenician-Aramaic dialect and in Aramaic script and they attest a reception of Phoenician magical practices by the Aramaeans of Syria.

3. Aramaic in Lebanon

There have been different approaches to prove the Aramaization of Lebanon based on linguistic criteria; however, the results have been sketchy. For instance, only a limited influence of Aramaic on Phoenician can be traced. Secondly, there are very few inscriptions in Aramaic from Lebanon. This includes northern Phoenician city-states as far as Arwad.

Regarding the influence of Aramaic on Phoenician inscriptions in Lebanon, there is little use of Aramaic words or constructions. For

25 Cf. for example Naveh 1970; Peckham 2001: 33–37; Sass 2005: 13–74; and above, section 2, of H. Gzella’s contribution to this volume.
29 It was also primarily the Phoenicians who passed their alphabet on to the Phrygians and to the Greeks and thus to the west; cf. Röllig 1998: 367–372; Brixhe 2004; Krebernik 2007; and Lemaire 2008b: 51f. Though one should not underestimate the role of the Aramaeans, cf. especially Knauf 1987; Bordreuil 2007: 81; Sass 2005: 133–146.
30 Cf. section 2.5 in H. Niehr’s chapter on religion in this volume.
31 Cf. the overview and discussion in Healey 1983: 664–666; Lipiński 1990: 105 n. 78; id. 1992b: 36. Nevertheless, the strong influence of Aramaic on the older inscriptions from Byblos postulated by Healey 1983: 664f is no longer consistent with the current state of research in Phoenician philology.
example: bgw ("among", KAI 17: 1) and *š ly ("hers", KAI 17: 2), respectively, *š ly ("his") in inscriptions from the 2nd century B.C. Add to these *š ly ("my", KAI 43: 9) as well as two Aramaic loan words, šqyt ("very", KAI 43: 9) and r't ("decision", KAI 60: 4), from Phoenician inscriptions outside Lebanon. Further influences can be found through Greek transcriptions of Phoenician lexemes in Plutarch and Porphyrio. An Aramaic orthographic influence on Phoenician orthography is revealed through plene writing.

In addition, there are a few Aramaic personal names, such as Hadad and Gusi, found on the stelae in the necropolis of Tyre (7th century B.C.), and the royal names Ba'ana' of Sidon (last decade of the 5th century B.C.) and Ain'el of Byblos (4th century B.C.), the latter written in Aramaic orthography. A definite increase in Aramaic personal names is identified only in the onomastica of Arwad and Tyre dating to the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. Here, one should be extremely aware of issues involved in drawing conclusions about the spoken language from personal names. Some cases of Aramaization of divine names during the Roman period do not change this impression, so that no general linguistic Aramaization of Lebanon can be concluded from this.

The observation that Phoenician inscriptions such as KAI 12 were still composed during the 2nd century B.C. originates from these findings. Further inscriptions from this time are Greek-Phoenician bilinguals from Arwad and other places. Phoenician inscriptions minted on coins dating as far back as the 3rd century A.D. cannot be adduced as a proof for Phoenician as a spoken language at that time. From Hellenistic-Roman

---

35 KAI 60 is from the 3rd century B.C.; cf. Teixidor 1986: 457–460.
times onward the inscriptions show the distribution of Greek and Latin\textsuperscript{46} in Lebanon more than anything else.

Phoenician as a spoken language went out of use at the beginning of the Christian era.\textsuperscript{47}

The number of Aramaic inscriptions found at or originating in Lebanon is very small, further emphasizing that an Aramaization of Lebanon cannot be substantiated. The inscriptions of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C. mentioned here support this conclusion. Geographically, they do originate from Lebanon but their makers were not Phoenicians.

A letter (ND 2686), found at Nimrud, reports on a sealed document written in Aramaic and sent to Nimrud from Tyre between 738 and 734 B.C.\textsuperscript{48} However, the letter is a communiqué from the Assyrian administration and is therefore no proof of the use of Aramaic by Phoenicians, but rather evidence of the Aramaization of Assyria,\textsuperscript{49} or rather its administration.\textsuperscript{50}

One further Aramaic inscription, possibly from northern Lebanon and dating from the 6th century B.C., must be mentioned. It concerns an edict from the Neo-Babylonian authority requiring that Aramaean (?) fugitives from Babylon be returned to Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{51} Like the Nimrud letter, this is no indigenous text but rather a command from Babylonian officials written in Official Aramaic.

An Aramaic inscription from Lebanon must be distinguished from the previous two cases. It was found at Yahu located to the north of Byblos in the upper part of the valley of Ibrahim and was built into a ‘Basilica’ as spolia. The inscription consists of two lines in Aramaic reporting on the building of a temple; its writing is similar to Nabataean script and can be dated to 110 or 109 B.C. It was written not by Phoenicians but by Ituraeans,\textsuperscript{52} who had by then already expanded into the hinterland of Byblos.


\textsuperscript{47} Cf. Briquel-Chatonnet 1991: 8, 11.


\textsuperscript{49} Cf. the contribution by M. Nissinen in this volume.

\textsuperscript{50} Cf. Garelli 1982 and Tadmor 1982.


\textsuperscript{52} Regarding the inscription and its interpretation, cf. Briquel-Chatonnet – Bordreuil 2001; Aliquot 2009: 34; Myers 2010: 130f.
Recent research on the Ituraeans has not been able to establish beyond a doubt their long-suspected Arabian origin; modern Ituraean research emphasizes an Aramaean origin.\textsuperscript{53}

The Ituraeans are possibly the descendants of the Aramaeans in the Beqa', perhaps of the kingdom of Ṣobah. In the mid 2nd century B.C., they entered the stage of history when the Seleucid power structures that had ruled the Beqa' and Lebanon dissolved and the Hasmonaeans entered the Beqa' from the south. The Ituraeans managed to gain control over not only the Beqa' but also some regions of central Lebanon.\textsuperscript{54}

Thus, an Aramaean cultural influence on Lebanon proceeded from the Beqa' westward into the Phoenician heartland. Further confirmation of this occurrence (next to the already mentioned inscription of Yanuh) could be the worship of the god Ba‘alšamem in Qadeš in the hinterland of Tyre and in Rahle, which extended as far as Palmyra.\textsuperscript{55} It is within this context and perhaps also during the following period that Aramaic toponyms in Lebanon\textsuperscript{56} should be placed. Aramaic was found in Lebanon up until the 17th century A.D. and was gradually replaced by Arabic.\textsuperscript{57}

4. \textit{Religion}

An adoption of Phoenician deities into the Aramaean pantheon and vice versa, can be determined. In the case of the adoption of Phoenician deities into the Aramaean pantheon, the goddess Pahalatis is mentioned in Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions from Hamath in the 9th century B.C. The theophoric element \textit{b'lt}\textsuperscript{58} can be found in Aramaic graffiti from Hamath dating to the 9th and 8th centuries B.C. This goddess had been worshipped since the 2nd millennium B.C. and was the principal deity of the city of Byblos, the "Lady of Byblos," who appears in the 1st millennium B.C. under her Phoenician name, \textit{b'lt gbl}.

The Phoenician god Adon, who appears in a personal name in Hamath,\textsuperscript{59} also originates from Byblos.

\textsuperscript{58} For instances, see Niehr 2003: 92 nn. 15 and 16.
\textsuperscript{59} For instances, see Otzen 1990: 275–277.
From Hamath comes confirmation of the adoption of the Phoenician god Ba’alšamem as Ba’alšamayin in the inscription of King Zakkur of Hamath (KAI 202), shortly after 800 B.C. According to the inscription, Ba’alšamayin called on the Aramaean Zakkur, a foreigner from ‘Anah on the Euphrates to be king in Hamath. He supported Zakkur and in addition made him king over Hazrak. King Zakkur raised his hands in supplication and the god answered through seers and prophets, and ensured his release from his rivals.\(^{60}\)

The stele from Breg near Aleppo, with an inscription by King Bar-Hadad (KAI 201) from the second half of the 9th century B.C., is a votive offering to the god Melqart. Melqart was the principal deity of the city of Tyre but his cult was also practiced in northern Syria. Apart from this inscription, the contract between kings Ashur-nirari V (754–745 B.C.) of Assyria and Mat’el of Bit Agusi (SAA II no. 2) mentions him. Perhaps he had a prominent sanctuary near Aleppo, where King Bar-Hadad erected the stela in gratitude for a rescue from an unspecified threat.\(^{61}\)

Several Aramaean deities were adopted into the Phoenician pantheon, for example, Atargatis, Ba’al Hammon, Belos, Demaros, and Jupiter of Yabrud.\(^{62}\) With the exception of Ba’al Hammon in Carthage and its surroundings,\(^{63}\) none of them ever attained any primary position. The divine name Belsamen in Philo Byblios shows that the Phoenician god Ba’alšamem had undergone an Aramaean influence.\(^{64}\)

Two small amulet tablets present an interesting instance of Phoenician religious influence on the Aramaeans. They date to the 7th century B.C. and were found at Arslan Tash. Their inscriptions were originally Phoenician incantations, which were copied and modified by an Aramaean scribe. The latter is evident in the fact that the god Ashur is mentioned; he appears in Aramaic inscriptions from northern Syria but not in Phoenician inscriptions. They were found in a city settled by Aramaeans, which also points to an adoption of Phoenician incantations practices in Aramaean religion.\(^{65}\)

---

\(^{60}\) An exhaustive analysis of the Zakkur inscription can be found in Niehr 2003: 89–96.


\(^{65}\) Cf. in further detail Niehr 2010a: 24ff.
5. Conclusion

As has become apparent in the previous sections there were Phoenician-Aramaean cultural contacts that had a limited influence on the Phoenicians in Lebanon.66 This is based on the following conclusions:

1. Generally, one must emphasize, from a Syrian perspective, the ‘peripheral position’ of the Phoenician royal cities beyond the Lebanon Mountains. This situation allowed for the development of independent politics and economics by the Phoenicians in Lebanon and made the continuation of Phoenician traditions—linguistic, cultural, and religious—possible. Added to this was the growing Phoenician interest in their trading posts within the Mediterranean region. Therefore, an interchange of cultures between Aramaeans in Syria and Phoenicians in Lebanon existed, which laid the basis for a lasting peaceful coexistence.

2. The time of the Assyrian and Babylonian conquests and deportations (9th–6th centuries B.C.) was less devastating for the coastal cities of Lebanon than for the Aramaean cities and kingdoms of Syria. While the deportation of Phoenicians and inhabitants of Tyre as laborers to Nineveh during the reign of Sennacherib (704–681 B.C.) is well-documented, as is the forced relocation of people from Sidon to Kār Asarhaddon during Esarhaddon’s reign (681–669 B.C.), and other similar situations,67 there were no resettlements of Aramaeans from Syria to Lebanon due to their close proximity.68 Therefore, the important phase of Aramaization by relocation of Aramaean deportees is not applicable here, unlike in other regions of the Near East such as Assyria or northern Palestine.69 However, the flight of Aramaeans from Syria to the Phoenician regions in the face of Assyrian invasions must be taken into consideration.

3. During Achaemenid times70 the Phoenician royal cities in the satrapy of Transeuphratene enjoyed greater independence than, for example,

66 Cf. also Peckham 2001: 37: “The relations between Phoenicians and Aramaeans were rare and mostly ephemeral.”
68 I owe this important piece of information to my colleague Andreas Fuchs (Tübingen).
the provinces of Yehud and Samaria. The sweeping triumph of Official Aramaic passed by Lebanon, and a displacement of Aramaic by Official Aramaic, as was the case for Hebrew, cannot be established for Lebanon. Instead, Phoenician remained the written and spoken language until the beginning of the Christian era.71

4. In Hellenistic-Roman times,72 imposed by education and trade, the language used by the upper class in the Phoenician cities of Lebanon shifted to Greek, with Latin being adopted later.73 However, most of the population wrote and spoke Phoenician until early Christian times.74 Only in the 2nd century B.C., with the advent of the Ituraeans, did Aramaic slowly begin to displace Phoenician.75

Thus, it is clear that there was coexistence and cooperation between Phoenicians and Aramaeans, rather than domination of Phoenicia by the culture of the Aramaeans of Syria.

---

73 See above, footnote 46.