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1. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Phoenician is a member of the Semitic language family, specifically the Northwest Semitic branch of Central Semitic. Within Northwest Semitic it is a Canaanite language, the closest relatives of which are Hebrew, Moabite, Ammonite, and Edomite.

1.1 Phoenicia

A description of the sources for the Phoenician language depends to a certain extent on what "Phoenician" is held to mean. The term "Phoenicia" is generally reserved for the strip of land sixty miles long (from Acco in the south to Tell Sukas in the north) and at most thirty miles wide, on the northern coast of the Levant, bounded on the west by the Mediterranean and on the east by the Lebanon Mountains — that is, the modern coast of Lebanon and part of the northern coast of modern Israel. As a scholarly convention, this area is referred to as Phoenicia after 1200 BC, the beginning of the Iron Age. In the early Iron Age, the ravages of the so-called Sea Peoples along the coast of ancient Canaan and into Egypt forced the withdrawal of Egyptian control over Canaan. This withdrawal allowed the Philistines and other Sea Peoples to gain control over the southern coastal plain, and even to expand eastward, where they met a westward-expanding Israel. The northern coastal plain, however, does not seem to have been invaded from the outside, nor do any disenfranchised or other "settling" peoples seem to have taken over, so that once Egyptian control was gone, the cities in this last remaining part of what had earlier been called Canaan flourished. It is this loose assembly of coastal cities that was called Phoenicia by the Greeks and by modern scholars. The cities were never united into a political entity, although in various periods one or another city was ascendancy over the others; the people of Phoenicia continued to think of themselves as Canaanites, or to identify themselves according to their native city.

1.2 Textual evidence

Phoenician inscriptions have been found in and around the ancient Phoenician cities, but also throughout the Mediterranean world. The first inscriptions of any length are a series of royal inscriptions from tenth-century BC Byblos, but beginning in the ninth and lasting until the first century AD, there are inscriptions from Asia Minor, Cyprus, Sicily, Sardinia, Malta, Rhodes, Egypt, Greece, the Balearic Islands, and Spain.
A few texts dating even earlier than 1000 BC might be called Phoenician. Several dozen inscribed arrowheads come apparently from the Beqa’, the valley between the Lebanon and Anetilbanon Mountains, and from farther south in Palestine (twelfth–eleventh centuries BC), and inscribed clay cones from Byblos date to the middle of the eleventh century. In both cases, the texts are almost entirely personal names and patronymics, so linguistic classification is difficult. The inscription on an eleventh-century fragmentary stela from Nora on Sardinia is most reasonably, given script and provenance, identified as Phoenician. Although the extant inscription contains parts of only four words, the stances of the letters indicates boustrophedon writing. The archaic Nora inscription is an artifact important for tracing the history of Phoenician expansion into the Mediterranean, but it is unfortunately not useful in a survey of the language.

The dialect of the Phoenician colony at Carthage and of inscriptions found throughout the Carthaginian empire is referred to as Punic, for which we have evidence beginning in the sixth century BC. Inscriptions dating after the fall of Carthage in 146 BC are said to be written in Late Punic or Neo-Punic, although the distinction is more one of script than of dialect. Neo-Punic inscriptions will be treated in this chapter as simply a late form of Punic that shows the drift that occurred, especially in phonology, after the stabilizing effect that Carthage’s hegemony had had on the language was removed. Punic inscriptions date as late as the second century AD, and there are even later Latino-Punic inscriptions. Punic written in Latin script, that date to the fourth–fifth centuries AD, Punic inscriptions have been found in North African sites in modern Tunisia, Algeria, and Libya, as well as in Malta, Sardinia, Sicily, France, Spain, and the Balearics.

Besides Phoenician and Punic inscriptions proper, we have names transliterated into Hebrew, Akkadian, Greek, and Latin, plus a few transliterated lexemes found in Greek and Latin inscriptions and in classical sources, notably in Augustine (fourth century AD). Objects inscribed with personal names include seals, bowls, and ostraca. The Poenitius of Plautus includes some passages in Punic, but the process of transmission has garbled these passages badly enough that they must be used with suspicion.

Most of the Phoenician and Punic inscriptions can be described as royal inscriptions, tomb inscriptions (both royal and nonroyal), and cultic inscriptions (dedications of buildings or paraphernalia, votive inscriptions). The largest corpus consists of the hundreds of Punic child sacrifice (votive) inscriptions from North Africa, stelae which report that a *milk* sacrifice is presented to the god or gods who answered the prayer of the supplicant. Most of the stelae are no longer in situ, but beneath some of the stelae the burned remains of children, usually newborns, are found, and sometimes the remains of a substitute lamb or other animal.

1.3 Dialectal variation within Phoenician

In the linguistic discussion which follows this section, the focus will be on Standard Phoenician, with dialectal variants noted. In addition, a brief overview of dialectal differences occurring within Phoenician is presented here.

Even the earliest Phoenician inscriptions of the tenth–nineteenth centuries BC show evidence of dialectal differences. The dialect of Byblos is especially distinct from the other early inscriptions (said to be written in Standard Phoenician) and is treated separately in the grammars. Common Phoenician, then, must antedate the first millennium BC. Old Punic inscriptions from the tenth–nineteenth centuries retain the *-y* of the third consonant of the root was *-y*; see §4.1; use *z* (prolific on the verb) as the relative pronoun (see §4.3.5); and show *r* as the masculine singular demonstrative (see §4.3.2). In the earliest of these inscriptions, the sarcophagus inscription of Ahiram, the third masculine singular possessive suffix on a genitive noun is *-r*, presumably /-rit/: see §4.3.1.2.

After the Old Bryblian period, our evidence for Bryblian is lacking until the fifth century. At this point, however, Bryblian looks more like Standard Phoenician, with relative *r* and demonstrative *z*. The third weak verbs have lost the third root consonant altogether.

Standard Phoenician inscriptions from the ninth century forward are reasonably homogeneous, with some local variants, especially in inscriptions from Cyprus, where consonant mergers seem to have taken place and the use of "prothetic" *y* is more prominent than elsewhere.

Punic, the dialect of the western colonies, is extant from the sixth century onwards, but only begins to diverge from Standard Phoenician in late texts, especially after the fall of Carthage in 146 BC. These divergences are largely phonological: modification and loss of the four pharyngeal and glottal obstruents /h/(<h>), /w/ (<w>), /h/ (<h>), and /l/ (<l>); and confusion of sibilants (see §3.1). The Punic lexicon is also affected by the number of loanwords and foreign names that make their way into the inscriptions from Greek, Latin, and Numidian. The third masculine passive possessive suffix on nouns that end in a vowel is *-y* in Standard Phoenician, but *-n* in late Punic texts (see §4.3.1.2).

2. Writing system

Phoenician inscriptions are written in a consonantal alphabet, the form of which indicates that it actually developed in Phoenicia, whence it was borrowed by the Hebrews and Arameans, and eventually the Greeks. The Phoenician stage of the script is part of a long history of alphabetic development that can be traced in inscriptions from earlier Canaanite-speaking peoples.

The earliest known inscriptions using this alphabet are two graffitis recently found near Luxor that date from c. 1800 BC. That we have materials from Serabit el-Khadem in the Sinai peninsula that is perhaps only slightly later, and other exemplars of fairly high date from Palestine (seventeenth–sixteenth centuries), suggests a date for the invention of the alphabet as far back as 2000 BC.

This writing system was entirely consonantal in origin and operated according to the alphabetic principle: drawing a picture, or pictogram, to represent the first consonant of the word which the picture depicts (such as drawing a bee to represent [b], and so on). In this early form of the alphabet the original *b* depicts a house, as the Canaanite word for house, *bayn*, begins with [b]; [p] ("palm of hand") is *kapp*, a word that begins with [k], and so the *b* symbol is a pictogram depicting a hand. The Canaanite-speaking people who invented this writing system would have been familiar with Egyptian writing (see Ch. 7, §2.1), but they simplified the process dramatically so that each of the original symbols corresponded to only one distinct consonantal phoneme.

Throughout the second millennium the consonantal script continued to develop. Whereas the earliest inscriptions were written both vertically and horizontally, horizontal came to predominate. A given early inscription could be written dextragrade, sinistragrade, or boustrophedon, but by 1000 BC, the direction of Phoenician writing had stabilized as sinistragrade. Since several of the pictograms changed stance according to the direction of the line of writing, when the direction stabilized, so did the stance of the characters.
be the eleventh century BC, virtually all of the pictographic forms had developed into stylized ‘linear’ descendants. This linear script is used through the first millennium to write Phoenician and Punic, while the Hebrew and Aramaic scripts had begun to follow separate paths by the tenth century. We know that both Hebrew and Aramaic borrowed their writing systems from elsewhere because the scripts they use do not provide an exact match for the consonant repertoire of either Hebrew or early Aramaic. Moreover, the letter names that we know from Hebrew and Aramaic actually correspond to the pronunciation of those words in Phoenician, another clue that the source script was Phoenician.

Though the linear Phoenician script was purely consonantal, a means was eventually developed, as in other consonantal Semitic scripts, to signal the presence of certain vowels consonantly. Consonants so used are conventionally termed the *matres lectionis* (“mothers of reading”). Thus, in late Punic inscriptions we see an inconsistent “vowel notation”; in fact, two systems of *matres lectionis* had merged by this time. The earlier system of Punic *matres lectionis*, named the “Domestic Orthography” by Menken (1981), was used for Semitic words in Punic inscriptions (sporadically from the third century BC); the character ‘*‘* on the end of a word indicated that the word ended in some vowel; occasionally y was used explicitly for final *‘‘*. In Phoenician, a final vowel usually marks a morphologically significant addition to a simpler form of the word in question – a pronominal suffix on a noun or verb, for example – with the result that this ‘*‘* often served as a morpheme marker as well. A second system of *matres lectionis*, Menken’s “Foreign Orthography”, came into use slightly later than the Domestic Orthography (i.e., late second century BC). This system was used in Punic for spelling foreign names and words, then consistently in later inscriptions for many words, both foreign and Punic: ‘*‘* for *‘o*-vowels and *‘w*-vowels; ‘*‘* for *‘a*-vowels; *‘w* for *‘u*-vowels; *‘r* for *‘i*-vowels.

Because of their limited land resources, the people of the coastal cities who were eventually called the Phoenicians early on turned to the sea and to mercantile activities, and it was such maritime occupation that brought the Phoenician people and script into contact with the Greek world. The Greek adaptation of the Phoenician writing system is generally dated at c. 800 BC, on the basis of the variety of scripts already evident in the earliest Greek inscriptions of the late eighth century, indicating both a common origin and some period of development to account for differences. But the antiquity of some Greek letter-forms and the amount of development beyond Phoenician forms suggest a long period of contact between Phoenicians and the West before the final form of the Greek alphabet emerged. Like the early Canaanite inscriptions, the direction of writing of early Greek inscriptions can be dextrograde, sinistrograde, or boustrophedon; Greek eventually settled on dextrograde, in contrast to Phoenician from 1000 BC onward. All of these features argue for a complicated and extended process of the Greeks' acquiring their alphabet from the Phoenicians, rather than one date that can be proposed as the moment of transmission.

3. PHONOLOGY

Since Phoenician is no longer spoken, its phonology must be reconstructed on the basis of (i) transcriptions found in Hebrew, Assyrian, Greek, and Latin writings; and of (ii) comparative phonology of the Semitic languages.

### 3.1 Consonants

In this chapter, the transliteration scheme commonly utilized in the philological study of Phoenician will be followed, for both consonants and vowels. In Table 11.2 these conventional symbols are used, but are followed by a phonetic transcription within parentheses, where such transcription differs from the conventional representation.

Twenty-nine consonants are reconstructed for Proto-Semitic (see Ch. 6, §3.2.1). Proto-Central Semitic retains all of them, as does Proto-Northwest Semitic. The following consonant mergers occur between Proto-Northwest Semitic and Canaanite (conventional transcription is given in parentheses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.2: The consonantal phonemes of Standard Phoenician</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manner of articulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilabial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral approximant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 11.1: The Phoenician consonantal script](image-url)
3.2.1 High vowels

High vowels undergo several changes within the history of Phoenician. The short high-front \( /i/ \) (from PS *i̯) shows three developments:

1. In syllables which had been originally open (see §3.2.5), accented \( /i/ > [e] \). Note the name \( βαλακλής \) (CIL VIII 16) for \(/bəlaklī/ "Baal has sent," among other evidence, all of which is late (Hellenistic or beyond).
2. In syllables which had been originally open (see §3.2.5), unaccented \( /i/ > [e] \). Consider the name \( γραστάρτος \) (Josephus, Ap. 1, 157) for \(/gir-astār/ "one bound to Astarte," among other evidence, all late.
3. Elsewhere \( *i \) is preserved (but see §3.2.3). Thus, Assyrian \( u-rū-mīl-ki \) (Senn. Ol. Prism, col. II, line 53, 8th century BC) for Phoenician \(/u-rū-mīl/ "the [divine] king is light."

The long vowel \( *i̯ \) remains stable; we assume the length in names such as \( αββαλός \) (Josephus, Ant. 8, 5) for \(/abi-bašil/ "Baal is my [divine] father."

Both the short and long high-back vowels, \( *u \) and \( * ū \), were preserved, though appear to have been eventually fricatized, and perhaps rounded, in certain environments. The evidence for the shift is, however, meager, late, and rather unreliable (Poenelus), but it forms one end of a proposed chain (Fox 1996) that is otherwise well grounded. Thus, in Poenelus, we see evidence of \( /aU/ > [u] \) in the Latin transcription chyl, representing \(/kull/ "all," and even perhaps of \( /u/ > [i] \) in chyl, a transcription of the same word. For the fronting of \( /aU/ \) to \(/u/; /ɛ/; \) Poenelus provides the (perhaps equally unreliable) evidence of the spellings \( li \) for \(/li̯/ "O that...!"; \( hy \) for \(/hu̯/ "he.""

3.2.2 Low-central vowels

The observed Phoenician development of Proto-Semitic \( *a > /a/ \) (possibly with intermediate stage of \( */ə/ \)) is actually a broader phenomenon known as the Canaanite Shift. This process occurs early in Canaanite, as is evidenced by the fourteenth-century Canaanite glosses in the Akkadian texts found at el-Amarna in Egypt (see Ch. 8, §1.1). The resulting \( /a/ \) merges with the \( /o/ \) reflex of Proto-Semitic \( *aw, and both were eventually raised to \( /u/ \) – note the Punic divine name in Greek transcription, \( χωσαράτ < *kawšara\) (Eusebius PE 1.10.11), and feminine plural SANUATH for \(/sanaw/ "years" (KAI 180 c, e).

In syllables which had been originally open (see §3.2.5), Phoenician accented short \( /a/ \) (from PS *a) > [a]. There is evidence that this change, known as the Phoenician Shift, had occurred by at least the eighth century BC. Note the eighth-century Assyrian transcription of the name \( bi-tu-um-mu < β(3) \) for \(/bāt-il-māl\/ "Baal has ruled" (Assurb. Rassam, col. II, line 84). The [a] that was the result of the Phoenician Shift did not merge with \( /o/ \) as \( "a" \) and \( "aw" \) and therefore was not raised to \( /u/ \); recall the above \( χωσαράτ < *kawšara \) (Eusebius PE 1.10.11). The feminine of this same word, \( χωσαράτ < *kawšara \) (Eusebius PE 1.10.43), provides evidence that the \( /a/ > [i̯] \) shift did not take place in originally closed syllables.

Elsewhere, Proto-Semitic short \( *u \) is preserved in Phoenician (but see §3.2.3).

\( (1) \) Proto-Northwest Semitic

Canaanite

\( *θ \) and \( *s (s) \) → \( /s/ (s) \)

\( *θz (z) \) → \( /s/ (s) \)

\( *θ (θ) \) and \( *i^\prime (s) \) and \( *i' (s') \) → \( /s' (s') \)

The following mergers then occur between Canaanite and Phoenician:

\( (2) \) Canaanite

Phoenician

\( /S/ (s) \) and \( /y/ \) → \( /S/ (s) \)

\( /h/ (h) \) and \( /s/ (s) \) → \( /h/ (h) \)

\( /h/ (h) \) and \( /s/ (s) \) → \( /s/ (s) \)

Throughout Northwest Semitic, \( r \) assimilates to a following consonant, producing a geminate cluster. Geminate consonants are not indicated in the Phoenician script, however, and must be reconstructed, as with other features of the language, on the basis of Phoenician transcriptions into languages with scripts which do indicate gemination and by comparison with other Semitic languages.

There is no evidence for the spirantization of voiced and voiceless stops that is evident in Aramaic and Hebrew from the middle of the first millennium BC onward.

In Phoenician and Punic \( /p/ \) (\( < s > \)) is often elided. In Punic, \( /h/ \) is modified (e.g., the definite article is sometimes written \( < h > \) rather than \( < s > \)) or omitted altogether. Pharyngeals and glottals are generally modified and eventually confused or lost.

3.2 Vowels

The vowels of Phoenician are less well understood than the consonants, since Phoenician inscriptions do not include any vowel notation until very late. Judging from related languages and from transcriptions into other scripts, the vowel phonemes of Figure 11.1 are identified for Standard Phoenician:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\textbf{FRONT} & \textbf{CENTRAL} & \textbf{BACK} \\
\hline
\textbf{HIGH} & \( i \) & \( u \) \\
\textbf{MID} & \( e \) & \( o \) \\
\textbf{LOW} & \( a \) & \( \) \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{Figure 11.1.} Vowel phonemes of Standard Phoenician

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{HIGH} \( i \) \( u \)
\item \textbf{MID} \( e \) \( o \)
\item \textbf{LOW} \( a \)
\end{itemize}

The vowels reconstructed for Proto-Semitic are \( "u", "i", "u", "a", "i", "o" \) (see Ch. 6, §3.2.2), as well as the diphthongs \( "au" \) and \( "aw" \) (see Ch. 6, §3.2.3). In the development of Phoenician, however, the Proto-Semitic diphthongs became long mid vowels: \( "ai" > /e/ \) and \( "aw" > /o/ \).
3.2.3 Vowel reduction

There is some evidence (again, Poemus) that short vowels in open syllables are reduced to schwa pretonically in verbs and proprotonically in nouns and adjectives, as in Biblical Hebrew.

3.2.4 Syllable structure

Syllables in Phoenician (again to the extent that such information can be reconstructed) appear to have the standard Semitic syllable shape: CV or CVC.

3.2.5 Accent

Accent also must be reconstructed, but there are clues. Earlier Northwest Semitic had short final case-vowels: *-u for nominative, *-i for genitive, and *-a for accusative. At some point, short final vowels were lost in the Canaanite languages, although there is evidence (see §3.2.1.2) that the genitive case ending remained in Phoenician. As we saw in §3.2.1.2, lengthening or raising of certain vowels occurred in the (newly) final syllable, as long as the syllable had been originally open. This situation suggests that the accent in Phoenician, as in Hebrew, was on the syllable preceding the case-vowel; then with loss of the case-vowel, it fell on the new final syllable of the word.

4. MORPHOLOGY

4.1 Word structure

Most Phoenician words, like those in all Semitic languages, are built around a triconsonantal root, which denotes a semantic field. The words themselves are discontinuous morphemes composed of a sequence of three consonants (the root) and the vowels and affixes that are morphologically significant. For instance, if the root k-t-b means "to write," the Proto-Central Semitic (and Arabic) *kata'at would mean "she wrote," *yakatihat would mean "he will write," *kattihum would mean "those who write," and so forth. There is evidence for triconsonantal roots in Afro-Asiatic, the family of which Semitic is one branch; there are furthermore, "weak" verbal roots, roots with first, second, or third consonants which were originally or 2 or 3, and which had dropped out of the root (usually elided intervocically) in many of the languages, including Phoenician. But for most words, the triconsonantal root is still recoverable.

4.2 Nominal morphology

Many nouns are derived from verbal bases, such as participles, infinitives, agent nouns, nouns of place, time, instrument, inter alia. Such nouns are often formed with affixes and vocalic patterns that carry specific meanings.

4.2.1 Case, gender, and number

Nominals in Phoenician are marked for gender and number: masculine singular (masc. sg.), masculine plural (masc. pl.), feminine singular (fem. sg.), feminine plural (fem. pl.). There is some slight evidence of the retention of the Semitic dual. Proto-Northwest Semitic retained the three cases of Proto-Semitic (nominative, genitive, accusative), and there is evidence of at least the genitive in Phoenician (see §4.3.1.2), and possibly the accusative (see §4.4).

4.2.2 State

Nouns occur in two states, the absolute state and the construct state. A noun in the construct state (called nomen regens) is "in construct" with (governs) a following noun in the genitive case (the nomen rectum). Together they make up a construct chain. If the nomen rectum is definite, it includes the definite article; it is written with a possessive pronoun as suffix; or is a proper noun, the entire chain is definite. If šbrkt b'r in KAI 26 A 11 means "the one blessed by Baal," then we have an example of a construct chain modified in its entirety by one definite article written on the nomen regens (see Lambdin 1971).

4.2.3 Noun endings

Masculine singular nouns have -O ending, in both the absolute and construct states. Feminine singular nouns end in -T, in both absolute and construct states. This ending represents -t or -T (< -t/at): both occur in Semitic, and the unvocalized inscriptions do not allow us to make a distinction, except in rare cases such as it (<satt-l < sant-t; <natt-t) would be written šnut. Note the original *-at ending on the personal name ab-di-mi-il-ku-at-ti (Eshar., p. 48, line 65) for šabd-milkitu "servant of the [divine] queen." In late Punic, the final -T is apparently lost; witness the Latin transcription Himilco (CISI 149; CII VIII 10525) for Ita(h)-milkitu "brother of the [divine] queen, and Punic hqby (KAI 154, 3) "the righteous one," a feminine noun, and so vocalized [*haddiktu] < [*haddiktu] < [*haddīktu].

Masculine plural nouns end in -M in the absolute state: -IM, as in gublim "boundaries" and abnut "gods" in Poemus; note also a late Punic miter lectionis in the ending, -nym of rhym, KAI 161, 6, meaning uncertain. Dual nouns apparently end in -IM as in iādem "hands," KAI 178, 1. Masculine dual and plural nouns in construct end in -T as in the goddess Tani's epithet fannūthāt for /pan/Gaβat "face of Baal.

Feminine plural nouns end in -M, in both absolute and construct states. This ending represents -T < -TAT < -AT, as in alowat "goddesses" (in Poemus). In the late Latin-Punic inscriptions, the -T is sometimes missing. KAI 180 a and d have same, while c and e in the same inscription have sanat, all meaning "years." The feminine dual absolute maTm for the numeral 200 is probably maTatem with ending -TEM (cf. the masculine dual absolute: colloquial modern Arabic -TEM).

4.2.4 Adjectives

Adjectives in Semitic have the same external morphology as nouns. In Phoenician, then: masculine singular -O, feminine singular -T, masculine plural -M, feminine plural -T.

4.3 Pronouns

Phoenician attests personal pronouns, as well as demonstratives, interrogative pronouns, and relative pronouns.
4.3.1 Personal pronouns

Personal pronouns in Phoenician are of two kinds: independent and suffixed. Both sets occur in singular and plural forms, and both lack a gender distinction in the first person (but not in the second and third). There are also sometimes case distinctions, as we will see.

4.3.1.1 Independent personal pronouns

Because Phoenician verbs are conjugated for person, number, and gender, a pronominal subject in a verbal clause is usually not expressed outside the verb itself; that is, an independent pronoun is not necessary, and when used is meant to emphasize the function of the pronominal subject. Independent pronouns can, in fact, be used to emphasize any nominal form in a sentence, such as the direct object of a verb, a pronominal suffix on a noun, or the object of a preposition. The standard forms of the independent personal pronouns and their reconstructed pronunciations are given in (3):

(3) Singular

| 1st com. | 'nk  
/ənokɔː/ (occasionally in Punic 'nky, with -y for /-ɔː/)
| 2nd masc. | t  
/ɔtaː/;
| 2nd fem. | t  
/ɔtt/i;
| 3rd masc. | h  
/huː/;
| 3rd fem. | h  
/huːt/;

Plural

| 1st com. | 'nhn  
/ənɔhm(V)/
| 2nd masc. | not attested
| 2nd fem. | not attested
| 3rd masc. | hmt  
/huːmat/;
| 3rd fem. | hmt  
/huːmat/;

4.3.1.2 Enclitic personal pronouns

The standard forms of the personal pronouns suffixed to nouns (as possessive) and to prepositions are presented in Table 11.3. The form of the enclitic pronouns attached to nouns shows some variation according to their morphophonetic context, those contexts being: (i) a nominative/accusative singular noun or a feminine plural noun (i.e., occurring after a consonant); (ii) a genitive singular noun (i.e., occurring after /-i/); and (iii) a masculine plural noun (i.e., occurring after some other vowel). The enclitics are in effect forms following a consonant, while enclitics attached to genitives are forms occurring after a vowel.

Phylian third-person pronouns are different from the standard Phoenician forms of Table 11.3. The attested Phylian forms are given in (4):

(4) Enclitics on singular nouns and prepositions

| 3rd masc. sg. | h  
/-oː/;
| 3rd fem. sg. | h  
/-aḥaː/;
| 3rd masc. pl. | hmt  
/-huːmaːt/;

Enclitics on plural nouns

| 3rd masc. sg. | /-i/-yuh();
| 3rd fem. sg. | /-i/-yu();
| 3rd masc. pl. | /-i/-nu;

Table 11.3 The enclitic personal pronouns of Standard Phoenician

| 1st com. | Ø  
/-i/-;
| 2nd masc. | k  
/probably /-kāː/;
| 2nd fem. | k  
/-k/i;
| 3rd masc. | Ø  
/-uː/;
| 3rd fem. | Ø  
/-uː/;

Plural

| 1st com. | n  
/-oː/;
| 2nd masc. | not attested
| 2nd fem. | not attested
| 3rd masc. | m  
/-uːn/;
| 3rd fem. | m  
/-uːn/;

Notes to Table 11.3

1. The variant -y may be a later lection (see §2) or by analogy with the genitive singular -y.
2. We assume the nominative/accusative form is patterned on the genitive; */-uː/ > */-i/-;
3. In these cases, /-i/- arises as a palatal off-glide following a front vowel. The genitive ending on singular nouns is /i/- and on plural nouns is /i/-; thus, */-uːn/ > */-i/-n/;
4. Again, the nominative/accusative form is patterned on the genitive; */-uːn/ > */i/-;
5. See PYBABEI2 "our lady" KAI 175 r2.
6. Again, assuming the accusative form has been taken over by the nominative; */-uːn/ > */-i/-;
7. From an old plural verbal ending -i-ins, *yaṭu/Yuṭu-n/iins. After loss of intervocalic /i/-, *yaṭu/Yuṭu-n/iins gives /yaṭu/Yuṭu/iins. The form /-u/-n/iins is extended to use on nouns as well (see Huet 1935:190-194; Harris 1936:35-36).
8. Amadi (1999) notes Krahmalkov’s cautious approach (1993; either the 3rd masc. pl. /-i/- was leveled through, or the 3rd fem. pl. comes from /-i/- /-i/- /-i/- /-i/-, but argues that the former is less likely than the latter.
9. Guzzo argues that /m/ and /n/ are to be differentiated from masculine plural /m/ and /n/ e. n. b.

The third masculine singular h is the earliest form and is only attested in the genitive /-uːn/; the interpretation of the third masculine singular form occurring on plural nouns, w, assumes a dual oblique ending before suffixes, as in Biblical Hebrew; thus, */-uːn/ > */-e/w/ /-e/w/ > */-e/w/ /-e/w/; spelled /w-

Late Punic third-person forms are different in part. After a consonant, Punic shows the same enclitic forms as Phoenician proper (in third singular forms, the character 2 functions as a nunt lection; see §2):

(5) Enclitics on plural nouns

| 3rd masc. sg. | /-oː/;
| 3rd fem. sg. | /-a/-;
| 3rd masc. pl. | /-uːn/;

After a vowel, early Punic texts show the same pronouns as Phoenician:

(6) Enclitics on plural nouns

| 3rd masc. sg. | y  
/-i/-yu();
| 3rd fem. sg. | y  
/-i/-yu();
| 3rd masc. pl. | nm  
/-n/-u;

In later Punic texts, however, the third masculine singular usually appears as /-m /-i-m/; Huet argues that /-i-/ would have been pronounced the same as /-w/; and that the /m/ suffix simply demonstrates a nasalization of the word-final /-w/ (for details, see Huet 1991).
Phoenician and Punic enclitic pronouns suffixed to verbs are like those attached to nouns and prepositions with a few exceptions:

(7) Singular

1st com. n /-ni/ /-ni/ Phoenician after a noun
2nd masc. k /-ka(ː)/ Old Byblian
2nd fem. k /-ka(ː)/ later Byblian
3rd masc. h /-bu(ː)/ Standard Phoenician, after a consonant
w /-bu(ː)/ Standard Phoenician, after a vowel
0 /-bu(ː)/ Punic mater lectionis

Plural

1st com. n /-nu(ː)/ /-nu(ː)/ Phoenician after a noun
2nd masc. not attested
2nd fem. not attested
3rd masc. m after a consonant
nm after a vowel

4.3.2 Demonstrative pronouns

The demonstratives in Phoenician are declined for person and number. They are used in conjunction with the definite article (see §4.4) only sporadically, even when modifying a definite noun: in other words, “this house” would be bht z (“the house this”) or bht h: (“the house the”). Occasionally, even combinations like bt z (“house this”) are found when the phrase must be definite.

The various forms of the near demonstrative (“this, these”) are presented in (8):

(8) Phoenician Byblian Cypriot Punic variants

| Masc. sg. | z | zn, z | z | s, z, hz, st, zt, inter alia |
| Fem. sg. | z | z’z, z’ | z | st, zt |
| Pl. | l | l | l | l |

Standard Phoenician z is from Proto-Semitic *dzand is also seen in other Semitic languages as the base for the near demonstratives. Prothetic *z is common in Cyprus before word-initial biconsonantal clusters (note that the use of prothetic *z recommends that Cypriot Phoenician z was pronounced as a double consonant sound, like Greek zeta; see Harris 1936:23–24; Woodard 1997:172). Late forms with s indicate a confusion of sibilants. Vocalizations are unknown. The form extended with -n is known so far only at Byblos and on an inscription of Hiram, origin unknown, KAI 29. Extension with -n is common on prepositions, however.

The far demonstrative (“that, those”) is identical to the independent third-person pronouns (see §4.3.1.1), as in Biblical Hebrew.

4.3.3 Interrogative pronouns

The interrogative pronouns in their use at the beginning of questions are known in Phoenician only from Qena. In Phoenician proper, my (probably /miyã/ “who?” and m (probably /miyã/ “what?” serve as indefinite relative pronouns as well: “whoever” espouses this inscription (KAI 24:14); “whatever” (m ’s) I did (KAI 24:4). Note the occurrence of mna in a Roman-era Punic inscription, IRT 873, 2, written in Latin characters, with a prothetic vowel.

4.3.4 Indefinite pronoun

Phoenician attests the indefinite pronoun mma. Compare Peripheral Akkadian minimmû.

4.3.5 Determinative-relative pronouns

The pronouns s, k along with late variations are probably equivalent to the Biblical Hebrew construction of še + gemination, which replaces the more usual ḥisîr in very early and relatively late biblical texts (perhaps denoting a dialectal difference rather than a chronological one).

The Semitic source of this relative pronoun (and its Biblical Hebrew cognate) is obscure. It might be the reflex of *m-, as known from Old Akkadian bûr and bût, and from standard Akkadian šû (reflex of Old Akkadian accusative masculine šû), Phoenician and Hebrew š-, however, are the only West Semitic forms that can be so explained, all other West Semitic relative pronouns being derived from the voiced counterpart *d. An alternate interpretation is one which posits earlier Canaanite *bûtâr or the like, which was clipped to bâ or even š- in Phoenician and some Hebrew dialects (northern?). But developed into šîr in the dialect of Hebrew most represented in the Bible (Judahite) (see Huehnergard forthcoming).

The Old Byblian relative pronoun z is, as in most other West Semitic languages, from *d (see §4.3.2).

4.4 Definite article

The Phoenician definite article, when written, appears as a prefixed h- accompanied by gemination of the ensuing consonant, as in Biblical Hebrew (in later texts, the glottal consonant sometimes appears as š, or is lost altogether). Though consonant gemination is not regularly indicated in Phoenician orthography, we know the following consonant was doubled because of the unusual spelling *mmām, ear /himmàk, et bâd /himmàk, the place* (KAI 173:5). The origin of the definite article in West Semitic is, however, controversial, and the explanation for the Phoenician definite article is bound up with various theories. Of these, two theories predominate. The most common sees the West Semitic definite article as originating in a dedicatory particle, as in Indo-European. The second, championed by Lambdin 1971, identifies the origin of the West Semitic definite article in junctural doubling between a noun and a demonstrative, or between a noun and a relative, with the accusative ending of the noun -(a) levied after final vowels had been lost and the quality of the vowel between noun and demonstrative or relative no longer had meaning. According to Lambdin, in Arabic, Biblical Hebrew, and, we assume, Phoenician, Moabite, Ammonite, and Edomite (which we know only in consonantal texts), the chain [noun + i/š + doubling] is reanalyzed as [noun] + /š + doubling. Since words in West Semitic ordinarily do not begin with a vowel, /š- or /t- was added before /š/. Aramaic has a slightly different development, but one that gives Lambdin’s theory its explanatory force: in Aramaic, [noun + i/š + doubling] became [noun + i/š + /š/], where the glottal stop simply provides a boundary between the
short vowel and the next word, as can happen elsewhere in Semitic (this Aramaic sequence subsequently becomes [noun + /ən/]).

The definite article in Phoenician was lost after the inseparable prepositions b-, l-, k- (as in Biblical Hebrew), and after some free-standing prepositions, depending on dialect and chronology. Consider, for example, the Yahwism inscription from fifth-century Byblos (KAI 10), in which the definite article disappears after all prepositions; the Eshmunazor inscription from fifth-century Sidon (KAI 14), in which it is lost after all prepositions and after the direct object marker 'y'; and the Karatepe inscription, from late eighth-century Asia Minor (KAI 26), for loss even after the w-“and” conjunction.

4.5 Verbal morphology

Phoenician verbs are inflected for person, gender, and number through the use of affixes and vowel patterns which are added to the (usually) triconsonantal root.

4.5.1 Verb-stems

All the Semitic languages have a verbal system that includes a basic stem (called the G-stem, from German Grundstamm), and several derived stems: passive, causative, reflexive, and so on. A general description follows, although the stems have individual histories in each of the Semitic languages (see also Ch. 6, §§3.3, 5.2):

1. **N-stem**: formed with a prefix n-, functioning as the passive of the G-stem, or as a reflexive.
2. **D-stem**: characterized by doubling of the middle root consonant; pluralizing or transliterizing (or raises the transitivity valence), or simply lexical.
3. **C-stem**: formed with a prefix c- (originally) or h- or k-, functioning as a causative.
4. **T-stems**: (Gt, Jg, D, Dτ, and so on): built by either prefixing or infixing of a t; usually reflexive/reciprocal, and sometimes passive.

In addition, G, D, and C also have internal passives, in other words, related passive stems that are constructed by changes in the vowel pattern of the active stem. These are identified by the sigla G-D, C.

The verbal morphology of Phoenician is fairly simple. The stems of which we have evidence are G, N, D, C, IG, DT, and possibly some internal passives.

4.5.2 The Northwest Semitic system

The Northwest Semitic verbal system is characterized by the following constructions:

1. A **perfective**: the “Suffix-Conjugation”.
2. A **perfective/passive**: the “Prefix-Conjugation” A.
3. An **imperfective**: the “Prefix-Conjugation” B (the only prefix-conjugation attested in Phoenician).
4. **Active and passive participles**: verbal adjectives indicating essential features or ongoing activity.
5. An **infinitive “construct”**: a verbal noun that serves as both infinitive and gerund.
6. An **infinitive “absolute”**: actually an adverb, which stands with a finite verb to emphasize the verb, or stands alone and can be interpreted as any verb form required.
7. An **imperative**.

There is no evidence of the preterite use of Prefix-Conjugation A in Phoenician; in its jussive use, it is indistinguishable in attested forms from Prefix-Conjugation B. In Proto-Canaanite, Conjugation A was “yiqtol” and Conjugation B was “yiqtolû” when short final vowels were lost, the morphological distinction between A and B consequently disappeared for most verbs.

4.5.3 The Phoenician system

The Northwest Semitic verbal system with its Phoenician reflex, as far as the latter is known, is set out below. The root q-t-l is used; vocalization is given when it is secure, even if known solely by reconstruction.

4.5.3.1 G-stem

The Suffix-Conjugation of the Phoenician G-stem is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st con.</td>
<td>*qataltû &gt; qataltî</td>
<td>*qatalnû &gt; qtopl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd masc.</td>
<td>*qatalû &gt; qtl</td>
<td>*qatalumû (û) &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd fem.</td>
<td>*qatalî &gt; qtl</td>
<td>*qatalin (ûna) &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd masc.</td>
<td>*qatala &gt; qatal ({qatal})</td>
<td>*qatalû &gt; qatalnû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fem.</td>
<td>*qatalat &gt; qatala</td>
<td>*qatala &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Krahmalkov 1979 for the third feminine singular qatala, rather than expected qatâle; note that this -a is not from an originally open syllable.

The Prefix-Conjugation of the Phoenician G-stem is given in (10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st con.</td>
<td>*aqullû &gt; iqtul</td>
<td>*aqullû &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd masc.</td>
<td>*taqullû &gt; tiqullû</td>
<td>*taqullû &gt; tiqullû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd fem.</td>
<td>*taqulluna &gt; tql (tiqullû?)</td>
<td>*taqullûn &gt; tql (tiqullûna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd masc.</td>
<td>*yaqullû &gt; yiqullû</td>
<td>*yaqullûna &gt; yiqullû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fem.</td>
<td>*taqullû &gt; tiqullû</td>
<td>*yaqullûn &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The imperative (second person) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masc.</td>
<td>*qutul &gt; qtl</td>
<td>*qutulû &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>*qutul &gt; qtl</td>
<td>*qutulûn &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Northwest Semitic infinitive construct *qutul* gives Phoenician qtl, and the infinitive absolute *qutul* becomes Phoenician qtul. Active and passive G-stem participles are presented in (12):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participle</td>
<td>*qâtîl- (+ case ending) &gt; qôtîl</td>
<td>*qôtîlûma/ûqôtîlûma &gt; qôtîlim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive participle</td>
<td>*qâtîl- &gt; qôtîl</td>
<td>*qûtîlû &gt; not attested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No finite G-stem forms are attested in Phoenician.
4.3.2 Derived stems

In the construction of the derived stems, the prefixes and suffixes are used as the same as those of the G-stem. The following are the most basic forms, (third) masculine singular, when appropriate, from Northwest Semitic to Phoenician, as far as can be determined:

The N-stem functions as a passive in Phoenician:

1. Suffix-Conjugation: "naqala > nqtl
2. Prefix-Conjugation: "yaqattu = yqtl; note that the "n-" affix assimilates and doubles the first root consonant.
3. Participle: "naqal- > nqtl (only attested as fem. sg. nqtl; and masc. pl. nqtlmn).

The D-stem is generally not distinguishable from the G by morphology alone.

4. Suffix-Conjugation: "qattala > qttl
5. Prefix-Conjugation: "yaqattu > yqttl
6. Imperative: "qattil > qttl
7. Infinitive construct: "qattil > qttl
8. Infinitive absolute: "qattal > qttal
9. Participle: "nqattil > nqattl

One or two D passive (D-) Suffix-Conjugation forms are perhaps attested, recognized as such by context and by comparison with usage in related languages. There is some evidence for the special form used for the D of roots that are middle weak, that is, missing the middle consonant and therefore having nothing to double in this conjugation: thus, "quttal, yqattal from a root q-w-t; mpp, "drummer," participle from a root r-t-w-p.

Various Phoenician C-stem forms are attested:

10. Suffix-Conjugation: "huqilt > yqilt; qtil in late Punic. It is assumed that the h-prefix was lost by palatalization, which would have taken place in a high-vowel environment. One suggestion assumes ha- > hi- (as in Biblical Hebrew) with the addition of the negative l-; *l haqilt > lyqilt and probably > lyqilt.
11. Prefix-Conjugation: "yitaqiltu > yqyl. Note the loss of intervocalic h; the Phoenician form is perhaps suqilt.
12. Infinitive: "y > yqyl. The preposition l marks a purpose clause. Whatever the vowels in the Phoenician C infinitive, it is noteworthy that there is no evidence of a h- or y-prefix in the form; perhaps laqilt.
13. Participle: "nuqattil > nqyl. Note again the loss of intervocalic h; Phoenician perhaps has naqilt, although late Punic texts have a -y- between the m-prefix and the root, representing either a high vowel (mnuqilt), or the reanalysis to mVyaqilt; by analogy with the Prefix-Conjugation (yqilt).

Again, one or two C passive (C-) stem forms are perhaps attested.

Regarding the t-stems, two passive tG forms are attested at Byblos (yntqilt), and two reflexive Dt forms elsewhere (yqaqilt).

There is evidence that the infinitive construct of some weak verbs ends in "feminine" -t, as in Biblical Hebrew, thus, l-qitt (preposition l-marking a purpose clause, and infinitive qytit, from a root l-q-t; which, although a strong verb in the perfect, behaves like a l- n verb in the imperfect, imperative, and infinitive construct; l-d't, from a root y-d'-t; l-tt, from a root y-t-m; lbt, from a root y-b-h).

4.6 Prepositions and particles

Phoenician, like many of the Semitic languages, has both free-standing and inseparable (proclitic) prepositions. Inseparable prepositions are b"-"in, consisting of; b"-"to/for; b"-"at; and b"-"like/as. The definite article is lost after these three inseparable prepositions. The preposition m"-"from usually occurs as inseparable m-, with the n- assimilated to, and presumably doubling, the following consonant.

Many prepositions in Phoenician are extended, either by "prothetic," as in b" for b-, or by the addition of -n or -t at the end, as in bn for b-, ltn for l-, ltn for l"up(on) over," and put "before." Prepositions are often combined with nouns to make new prepositions, such as bn in front of l-"at and bn or bn"face of." and they are also combined with each other, even the proclitic prepositions - lm from l- and m- < min even lm bn "in, from," on account of l- or m-, and b-.

In Phoenician, the marker of a definite direct object is ytn from b"-"iyyat / b"-"iyyit (Iyyat), and is clearly distinct from the preposition b"-"with (b"-"itt). In Punic, the direct object marker is written -t or even a", indicating loss of the consonantal y and eventual elision of the v", as well. In Punic, the Latin transcription yth indicates that the vowel has become rounded.

The most interesting adverbs in Phoenician are the several negative adverbs, usually modifying verbs. The most common is b'l, presumably b'al as in Biblical Hebrew, usually negating a verb but also used with nouns. There is also a negative y", presumably b"il as in Biblical Hebrew, with y as a matur lectionis (see §2), which is used as both a particle of nonexistence and a verbal negative. The two can be combined, b'l or y'b'l. For negative commands and prohibitions, -l"al is used. For a negative purpose clause, lm "so that not, lest" is used, a combination of preposition l- and negative m-. There is no evidence for the negative l- so common in Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic.

There is evidence for the use of a locative l-/d- ending (originally *wth consonantal b, in some Punic forms with matur lectionis at the end of the word: mt' and m" [sic] for "above" and "below," KAI 145, 14.

4.7 Conjunctions

The most common conjunctions in Phoenician are w- (/wa-t; later /u/) "and"; m (/mi/) "if/when"; k (/kiz/) "that; because; when"; and p (/ap/) "moreover." Prepositions can be used as conjunctions when paired with the relative 3 (see §4.2.3.5).

5. Syntax

The survey of our sources for Phoenician (see §1) makes clear that very little of what we have in Phoenician provides evidence for the syntax of the language. Our longest inscription, from Karatepe in Asia Minor, is a translation of a Luwian inscription, and so must be used with caution as evidence for Phoenician syntax. A large percentage of our inscriptions are formulaic and simply identify the object on which they are written: "that which PN vowed to DN." There are some clear features of syntax, however, that can be dealt with here.

5.1 Word order

Phoenician, like other Semitic languages, makes frequent use of verbless or "nominal" clauses. There is no verb to "be" in the present tense in Phoenician, so equational clauses/sentences are often written as subject + adverb or predicate adjective, and
occasionally subject + predicate nominative. Verbal clauses – clauses that contain a conjugated verbo in Phoenician, as elsewhere in Semitic, are usually V–S–O. A switch in word order so that the subject precedes the verb is often a marker of emphasis on the subject.

5.2 Hendiadys

Verbal hendiadys is known in Phoenician, as in Biblical Hebrew. This conjoined construction takes one of two forms: (i) [finite verb A + w– “and” + finite verb B]; or (ii) [finite verb A + preposition l– + infinitive construct of verb B]. Such structural combinations, of course, need not be examples of hendiadys, but when they are, verb B is the main verb of the clause, and verb A is to be translated adverbially, as in:

(13) w–kl ‘dm ’ ysp l–pl’ mlkt ‘lt mzbh zn…
“and any person who would increase to do work on altar this…” (KAI 10, 11–12).

The causative ysp is being used to denote repeated or continuous action, and is not interpreted literally.

5.3 Infinitive absolute

The infinitive absolute in Phoenician can be used to represent any verbal form if the context has made clear which form is expected (i.e., it functions as an unmarked verb form). This use of the infinitive absolute is especially pronounced in the Karatepe inscription, where infinitives absolute even take pronominal objective suffixes.

5.4 The vocative

Vocative l– is known in Phoenician, as in Ugaritic and Arabic, but is rare. To express a wish. Phoenician can use the particle l– hbd “O that!...!”, proclitic on a verb, but that too is rare. Ordinarily, a wish is conveyed by the volitive forms of the verb: (i) the first-person volitatorius, which is indistinguishable from the imperfect (but note ‘qpr in KAI 50.3, where the -n seems to be a volitive particle, like Biblical Hebrew na’); (ii) the imperative, in most cases indistinguishable from the perfect; and (iii) the third-person jussive, ordinarily indistinguishable from the imperfect.

5.5 Relative clauses

Relative clauses in Phoenician are generally introduced by the relative pronoun ’s (z in Old Byblian), and occasionally by the "interrogative" pronouns (see §4.3.3). There are rare occurrences also of a resumptive pronoun after: 3:

(14) ’nk xhmilk… ’s p’hn hbt b’hn ghl mnlkt ’l ghbl
l Yehawmilk… who she made me the lady the Lady of Byblos sovereign over Byblos
“I am Yehawmilk whom the lady, Lady of Byblos, made sovereign over Byblos”
(KAI 10, 1–2).

6. LEXICON

The Phoenician lexicon is, for the most part, typically Semitic, but the Phoenicians spread throughout the Mediterranean as merchants and eventually colonists. Those Phoenicians

would, of course, have had exposure to other languages and would have adopted words and names from other cultures. These loanwords come from a number of other languages and language families. The Kilamuwa inscription from Anatolia, where an Aramaic dialect is the local language, describes Kilamuwa as br “son of” Hayya; using Aramaic br rather than the Canaanite br that is usual in Phoenician. There are also Luwian personal and place names in Phoenician inscriptions from Anatolia, such as the name Kilamuwa itself, and several in the Azazibada inscription from Karatepe. We also see Egyptian personal and place names in Phoenician inscriptions found in Egypt.

Greek and Latin names and their (usually nominative) case endings are fairly common in later inscriptions, plus a few words like drachma, imperator, senator, and podium. Numidian words and personal and place names are known from the North African inscriptions: mysik “ruler,” from Numidian mnsik “head, chief”; personal names Massinissa (massi) and Micipsa (mksipa); and the place name Thugga (thgg).

7. READING LIST

Ward 1997 is a good, standard overview of Phoenician history and culture. Markoe 2000 also provides an overview, but stresses material culture. Moscati 1968 and Harden 1962 are classic book-length descriptions.

McCarther 1975 traces the development of the Canaanite/Phoenician alphabet, as does Navah 1982. More generally, Woodard 1997 is an excellent source for early Greek alphabets and their relationship to the Phoenician and Phoenicians.

Amadasi Guzzo 1997 is a nice summary of the Phoenician language. Huchnergard 1992 and 1995 place Phoenician within the Semitic languages. Harris 1936 is still a useful structuralist introduction, although dating of inscriptions is especially out of date, and recent finds are, of course, not included. Segert 1976 is more up to date and includes more about the use of classical and other sources for our knowledge of Phoenician, something between an introductory and reference grammar. Friedrich, Röllig, and Amadasi Guzzo 1999 is a sound reference grammar, with abundant citations to evidence for Phoenician language and grammar outside the Phoenician corpus itself.
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CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. 1862–. Berlin: Reimer.


Josephus Ant. Josephus, Jewish Antiquities.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>divine name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>personal name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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