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[After summarizing the state of research concerning the grammatical and lexical forms of Phoenician-Punic, this study presents seventeen recently identified Greek loanwords in Phoenician-Punic inscriptions. These loanwords are considered as evidence of Phoenician orthographic practice in representing foreign words and are examined synoptically with respect to their morphology, considering the word stem, suffixes, and representation or non-representation of Greek case endings or other derivational suffixes. The study concludes with an estimate of the frequency of Greek loans in the Phoenician-Punic corpus.]
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It can be reasonably argued that the study of the Phoenician language, including the dialects of Byblos and the Punic texts from the margins of the Mediterranean, is approaching maturity as a discipline. The three volumes of the Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum, Pars prima (CIS I) published known Phoenician and Punic inscriptions until 1962. Since then, a number of newly discovered texts have appeared in learned publications. Handbooks of Phoenician and Punic inscriptions have recently been supplemented with critical text editions and histories of smaller segments of the text corpora: Phoenician inscriptions from Kition, Cyprus; the Iberian peninsula; the Anatolian inscriptions; the Neo-Punic corpus; and the heretofore enigmatic Latino-Punic inscriptions of North Africa. A standard grammar of the language is available, with a new edition in progress. Grammatical and linguistic treatments of the Phoenician

1. Abbreviations are listed alphabetically in the bibliography.
3. KAI 280-305; see also the survey by Schmitz (2012: 6-12).
5. José-Ángel Zamora Lopez is systematically publishing and studying the entire Iberian corpus of Phoenician-Punic. The following citations are a mere sample: Zamora 2008; 2010a-c; Zamora et al. 2010.
10. The Phoenician-Punic Grammar by Krahmalkov (2001) represents his “personal understanding of the individual texts of the Phoenician-Punic literary corpus” and is thereby “necessarily selective” (2001: xiii).
language and its dialects continue to appear steadily. Numerous texts have been subject to sustained critical study, leading to new readings and interpretations.


The attested Phoenician-Punic vocabulary is not large or very well understood. In a recent study of the Northwest Semitic lexicon, Halayqa (2008: 473) tallies 1038 Phoenician-Punic words in DNWSI and PPD.11 The meaning of more than one-fourth of the words is unknown or uncertain. Every new identification of words or clarification of meaning is potentially significant. In this circumstance, studies of individual Northwest Semitic words have been valuable in building the lexicon of Phoenician-Punic. Paolo Xella is a particularly tireless explorer of the Phoenician vocabulary.12

Non-Semitic words in Phoenician and Punic texts have also been a subject of interest.13 Many of the non-Semitic loans in Phoenician and Punic come from the Greek language. Proper names are a significant category of these, and the study of proper names raises special challenges.14 Some Greek names in Phoenician texts are readily seen and interpreted. For example, the Phoenician-Greek bilingual text KAI 56 includes both Phoenician ḫnt and its Greek equivalent βυζαντα. Even without a corresponding Greek text, the name ṣgmlyn in the inscribed gold medallion from the Douimès necropolis of ancient Carthage (KAI 73.1-2, 6) was instantly recognized as the Greek name Πυγμαλίον, a king of Tyre mentioned by Menander of Ephesus (as cited by Josephus, Ant. 1.125).15

Recognition of the Sicilian toponym ḍgrnt ‘Agragant’ (KAI 302.10) in a fifth-century Punic inscription from Carthage proved more difficult. Once accepted, the name illuminated the text’s precise historical context: the Carthaginian sack of Agrigentum in 405 B.C.E.16 Mention of the bt mpš ‘house of Mopsos’ in Anatolian Phoenician inscriptions from Karatepe and Çineköy has brought about a reconsideration of the historical character of an early Greek myth.17 From Neo-Punic inscriptions found at Tas Silg come three Greek names, each incised in a pottery surface before firing, all without additional text: ṣglw = Ἀγησίλαος; ʾntgn = Ἀντίγον(-ος(-α)/(-η)); and ṣpl = Ἀπόλλον.18

11. DNWSI reflects the status of the Phoenician-Punic lexical inventory as of 1991 (p. xvi); PPD was completed about eight years later.
13. Concerning foreign words in Biblical Hebrew, see especially Ellenbogen (1962) and Mankowski (2000). In the study of the Ugaritic language, attested only in the Late Bronze Age, identification of non-Semitic words has been an ongoing project. For example, from 1995 to 2008, Wilfred G. E. Watson has devoted seven papers and a general survey (2005) to this quest. (I am very grateful to Watson for sending me a complete collection of these important publications.) The larger question of language contact (see, e.g., Kaufman 2002) is beyond the scope of the present study.
14. With reference to the study of Greek personal names, Anna Morpurgo Davies has aptly summarized the risks of onomastical studies: “on the one hand we require a set of generalities which may seem either woolly or dull or both (and will not be new for the linguist), on the other all general statements must be supported with very detailed information which comes close to pedantry” (2000: 15).
I should also mention an erroneous identification of a Greek word in archaic Phoenician. The segment \( \text{tm}^\prime \) in \( \text{KAI} \) 1.2 (the Ḥāriōm inscription) has been thought to designate some variety of military authority,\(^{20}\) but the specific etymology, phonetic shape, and meaning of the segment itself have remained uncertain. A number of scholars adduce the Late Punic word \( \text{tmy} \) (EH 104.2),\(^{21}\) which has been judged from context to be an occupational title, generally translated ‘chief’.\(^{22}\) Concerning the latter, Gevirtz (1967: 15-16) plausibly suggested a relationship with Greek \( \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota \alpha \varsigma \) ‘overseer, manager’, and this view is influential.\(^{23}\) I do not accept the Greek derivation, because the entire segment \( \text{wtm}^\prime \) in \( \text{KAI} \) 1.2 is unambiguously Phoenician.\(^{24}\)

My own recent research has led to the identification of seventeen additional Greek words (one with a variant) that occur in Phoenician, Punic, and Neo-Punic inscriptions (table 1). The purpose of the present study is to examine these words synoptically, and to make several observations concerning the transcription of Greek by Phoenician writers. Table 1 lists the words in Phoenician alphabetical order, followed by source citations and classification as proper nouns (PN), common nouns (CN), adjectives (Adj.), or adverbs (Adv.). Six of the terms studied below are proper nouns, and eleven are common nouns. The identity of each proposed etymon is rated as either ‘positive’ (pos) or ‘uncertain’ (unc). The basis of this determination will become evident from the discussion of individual words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Certainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʾgn</td>
<td>ἀγών</td>
<td>Dothan 1985, line 1</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḳknʾ</td>
<td>εἰκώνα</td>
<td>Hr. Maktar N 64.30</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḳktr</td>
<td>κίτρον</td>
<td>( \text{KAI} ) 160.1</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣwmywš</td>
<td>ἀντισουμαίως</td>
<td>( \text{KAI} ) 160.3</td>
<td>Adv.</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡlgst</td>
<td>γαλαξί- + -t</td>
<td>Hr. Maktar N 64.34</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫl[m]nmš</td>
<td>Γυλαμώνυμος</td>
<td>Röllig in Čambel (1999: 72)</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>unc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḳyst</td>
<td>ἑθος ( ? / \text{us(us)} ) ?</td>
<td>Hr. Maktar N 76.3</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>etym. unc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫlnpyš</td>
<td>κλινοποιός</td>
<td>Röllig in Čambel (1999: 71-72)</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>unc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krntryš</td>
<td>*κορυνητήριος</td>
<td>( \text{KAI} ) 26 A II 19; III 2-3, 4; C III 17, 19; IV 20</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>pos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


20. Gevirtz (1961: 146-47 n. 8) observes that “some such meaning as commander, officer, or the like for \( \text{TM}^\prime \), is clearly required by the context.”

21. Berthier and Charlier (1955: 85-86, no. 104 and pl. xvi C) = Constantine N 69 (Jongeling 2008: 220). Other instances of this word that have been alleged involve dubious interpretations (see the following note).

22. For example, Abou Samra (2005: 37) translates \( \text{tmy} \) as “chief” and reviews other explanations of the word \( \text{tm}^\prime \) in \( \text{KAI} \) 1.2. Jongeling (2008: 220) translates the word \( \text{tmy} \) in Constantine N 69.2 as “chief.” I maintain that Late Punic word \( \text{tmy} \) is not related to the form \( \text{tm}^\prime \) in \( \text{KAI} \) 1.2.


24. This assertion will be demonstrated in a new handbook of Phoenician-Punic inscriptions (Holmstedt and Schmitz forthcoming). The alternative interpretation suggested by Watson (2013: 333 n 103) correctly identifies the segment \( m \) of Phoenician \( \text{wtm}^\prime \) as the number ‘one hundred’.
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ʾykn (Hr. Maktar N 64.30 = KAI 145.30) This word is a personal name that occurs in the list of signatories to the text of the long Neo-Punic inscription from Hr. Maktar (Jongeling 2008: 116-23). I analyze the name as a representation of Greek ἑικόνα ‘likeness, living image’ (LSJ s.v.; see Schmitz 2011: 87). The name Ἐικὼν is attested once in Greek inscriptions (LGPN). I consider this identification certain.

gʿlgst (Hr. Maktar N 64.34) This personal name derives from the Greek noun γαλαξία (an Athenian festival for Cybele involving a milk-offering) or the adjective γαλαξαῖος ‘milky’ + -t. The Greek stem γαλαξ- occurs once in a Greek inscription as a formant of a personal name. The additional suffix –t is potentially a Punic or Berber hypocoristic morpheme. Note the regressive dissimilation of voicing in the consonant cluster: Greek ξ > Punic gs. I consider the Greek etymon reasonably certain.

wl[m]nmš The reading wlmχnmš has been established by Röllig in line 2 of the fragmentary ‘Separate Inscriptions’ from Karatepe, meticulously assembled from fragments (Çambel 1999: 68). The texts date to the second half of the eighth century B.C. (Çambel 1999: 72). The letter m is a possible restoration of the damaged area, and the name wlmχnmš can be explained with reference to the archaic Greek epithet Οὐλαμώνυμος ‘named from an armed throng’ (LSJ s.v.; Schmitz 2008: 6). In classical Greek sources, the title is attributed by Lycurgus to Neoptolemus (LSJ 1270 s.v.; Lyc. 183). A scholion points out that

25. In the late Neo-Punic orthography of this inscription, the letter ‘/’ represents the vowel /e/ of any length, not a consonant; the letter ‘/’ represents the vowel /a/.

26. On the etymology, see Frisk (1960-72: 1:283 s.v. γάλα); Chantraine (1968-80: 206-207 s.v. γάλα).

27. The LGPN database records one instance of the personal name γαλαζίφρος.

28. Note the transliterated Greek name μλγςς (CIS I 60.4), apparently representing Μενεσφήνης or Μνασιγένης (both occurring 11 times in the LGPN database). The change of [ŋ] to [l] following a bilabial consonant is the probable explanation (cf. PPG 30 §56c). The Semitic spelling [gs], rendering of Greek ζ, occurs in the Aramaic version of the trilingual inscription from Xanthus: Aramaic пгѡдѡ[ŋ] (KAI 319 Arm. 3); Greek Πιξώδαρος (KAI 319 Gr. 1-2).

29. Οὐλαμώνυμος does not appear as a name in the indexes or files of LGPN. The name Οὐλαμος is attested once.
Homerian meter would require initial \textit{digamma} (\textit{LSJ} Suppl. 233 s.v. \textit{Οὐλαμός} II).\textsuperscript{30} Thus the vocalism \textit{Wulamónumos} implied by the Phoenician spelling with initial \textit{w-} is possible in the Archaic period. Because of the damaged condition of the text, the restoration and interpretation must be considered uncertain.

\textit{shlkny} (Hr. Maktar N 64.16, 20)\textsuperscript{31}; var. \textit{slkny} (Hr. Maktar N 64.31; N 76.29) Among the four attested bearers of this name is the \textit{rh nzrh} or commander of the military unit responsible for the large Neo-Punic inscription from Maktar (Hr. Maktar N 64, KAI 145, Jongeling 2008: 116-22; Schmitz 2011: 69 n10). The name is attested in Greek epigraphs as \textit{Σέλευκειας} (\textit{LGPN}). Related names are also found in Middle Hebrew: \textit{šlwyk} = \textit{Σέλευκες} (\textit{ew} > /əβ/), Krauss 1898: 56-57 §§72-73), and the more frequent clipped form \textit{slyq-} (< \textit{Σέλευκες}-, Krauss 1898: 394). The former is spelled consonantally \textit{slk}-, and the vocalism of the latter with medial /i/ illustrates the raising of unstressed \textit{ev} to /i/.\textsuperscript{32} This vocalism appears also in Lat. \textit{Seliacinus} (Röllig, \textit{KAI} vol. 2, p. 144; Teixidor 1967: 178; Szncyer 1986: 11, no. 5; Ferjaoui 2007: 35).

\textit{tmkl} (KAI 37 B 5) This name occurs in line 5 of the Phoenician ritual account B from Kition. The full context is: \textit{lnpš bt 'š l 'št tmkl wš[rš . . . ] “For the members of the household that is his: his wife Τιμόκλε and his offspring . . . . . . . ”}\textsuperscript{33} Interpreted as a Greek personal name, \textit{tmkl} is probably the Greek women’s name \textit{Τιμόκλες(a)}, attested epigraphically in the western islands, including Sicily (\textit{LGPN} 3, -ε 4x; -εα 2x). The orthography is similar to that of other Phoenician-Punic transcriptions of Greek names.\textsuperscript{34} I consider the identification uncertain, but quite possible.

2. \textit{Common Nouns and Other Forms}

\textit{gn} (Dothan 1985, line 1) The word occurs in the first line of an ostracon from Akko bearing a Phoenician text written in black ink on both sides. The beginning of the introductory clause can be translated \textit{bdī lbn hrš ‘š ytn gn ‘In the custom of the artisans’ association that held a contest’ (lines 1-2a). As a lexical form \textit{gn} is ambiguous; it has been interpreted as a Semitic word cognate to Hebrew \textit{אֶגָּנ}, Ugaritic \textit{gn}, Akkadian \textit{aganna}, designating a bowl (for discussion see Dothan 1985; Guzzo Amadasi and Karageorghis 1977: 169; 1990: 22; \textit{DNHSI} 9-10). Contextually, however, that meaning is out of place, because in the list of vessels that follows (lines 2b-7), each vessel name is followed by hieratic numerals indicating the quantity of vessels. The opening sentence makes better sense if \textit{gn} is interpreted as a loanword from Greek \textit{ἄγων} with the post-classical meaning ‘contest’ (Stauffer 1964: 135).\textsuperscript{35} The Phoenician verb phrase \textit{ytn ‘gn ‘hold a contest’, employing the verb \textit{ytn ‘give’, has a parallel in Late Biblical Hebrew: \textit{ẘeʾṭṭēn ‘ālēhem q̊hillā g̊dōlā “and I held a great assembly against them” (Neh 5:7 [RSV]), with the cognate verb \textit{ntn ‘give}."

\textsuperscript{30} For additional Greek etymological comments, see Frisk (1960-72: 2:443 s.v. \textit{οὐλαμός}); Chantraine (1968-80: 836 s.v. \textit{οὐλαμός}.)
\textsuperscript{31} In this inscription, \textit{ḥ} represents /e/.
\textsuperscript{32} See also Krauss (1898: 90 §136.2), and cf. the discussion of \textit{phym} below.
\textsuperscript{33} I had the privilege of presenting this reading and interpretation during the 10th Mainz International Colloquium on Ancient Hebrew (MICAH), in November 2011. I am grateful to Reinhard G. Lehmann and international colleagues for their comments and suggestions.
\textsuperscript{34} For bibliography, see Schmitz (forthcoming a).
\textsuperscript{35} On the Greek etymology, see Frisk (1960-72: 1:18 s.v. \textit{ἄγω}); Chantraine (1968-80: 17 s.v. \textit{ἄγω}).
Other elements of this inscription illustrate Greek linguistic and cultural influence as well. The text itself, as well as its subject matter, serve as an example of the characteristic receptivity of the East to cultural and linguistic influence from the West after the end of the Orientalizing Period (Lembke 2004: 1-2; 124-28).

ʾktr (KAI 160.1) The Neo-Punic inscription also labeled Hr. Medeine N 2 (Jongeling 2008: 157-58) has remained mostly unintelligible to scholars. A more recent interpretation of the text (Schmitz forthcoming b) depends on new word divisions. The first line can be read as follows: [. . .]š ytn ʾlyt ʾktrt b’ytn š kʾrnm “[w]ho placed green garlands on the helixes (of the horns) of their rams.”36 The stem ʾktr- derives from Greek κίτρον (LSJ 954), itself a borrowing from Latin citr-(us).37 The final {t} represents the feminine plural suffix /-ūt/.38 The word functions as an adjective.

A similar borrowing took place in Middle Hebrew, resulting in the color term ʾaktar ‘greenish, blighted’ (Jastrow 1985: 66 s.v.). Possibly Late Punic ʾktr- derives directly from the Latin citr-.

The color term is the most likely explanation of ʾktrt in this inscription also.

ʾtšwmywš (KAI 160.3)39 This word occurs in line 3 of the same inscription as the previous word: [. . .]šn k ʾtšwmywš knš š t “[. . .] flock as ewes gathered correspondingly.” I identify ʾtšwmywš as an adverb representing the unattested Greek form ἀντισουμαίος. This form derives from the Greek verb ἀντισόομαι “oppose on equal terms” (LSJ 210 s.v.; Chantraine 1968-80: 92 s.v. ἀντα; Frisk 1960-72: 738 s.v. ἴσος).40 The Late Punic spelling of the prefix ἴ- is to be vocalized /att-/, representing Greek ἀντ-, with assimilation of the /n/ to the following /t/. The Late Punic letter {w} probably represents the diphthong ow that appears in derived stems in the late period. It must remain uncertain whether the Neo-Punic spelling of the suffix -ywš represents Greek –ιως or the Latin –ius.41 The suffix is common in adverbs of manner (Smyth 1956: 100 §343; Moulton and Howard 1929: 163-64). The form ʾtšwmywš /attisumaius/ is probably a Greek loanword in Late Punic.42

ʾwyst (Hr. Maktar N 76.3) The Neo-Punic inscription in which this word occurs is very obscure (Jongeling and Kerr 2005: 36-38; Jongeling 2008: 126-28). My own contribution to its interpretation is the realization that the document has to do with the making and decoration of banners and standards, and that its lexicon involves textile terminology (see Schmitz 2010a; forthcoming a). The word in question is not a textile term, however. Line 3 of the text includes the phrase ‘lʾwyst mšlt š ṣ “according to the manner of

36. Note the verb ytn with prepositional complement introduced by ʾ-. Parallels to this construction are Phoenician bbty , ytt “in his temple I put it!” (Larn 3.5; Honeyman 1938: 286), and ytn . . . bb “he put . . . in the temple,” in the Pyrgi inscription (KAI 277.2, 5). Biblical Hebrew employs the same construction, as in wayyittēn ʾōkel be ārim “and he put in each city the grain” (Gen. 41:48; NJPS). On the Ugaritic construction ytn b- , ‘put into’, see Pardee (1975: 351; 1977: 215).
38. In agreement with the feminine plural noun lyt ‘garlands’ that precedes it.
39. In this inscription’s orthography, {w} represents long or short /w/.
40. Classical ἀντισόομαι occurs only once (Thuc. 3.11); in later Greek the form becomes ἀντισουμαία- (Stephanus, Thesaurus graecae linguae, vol. 1, col. 988).
41. That is, singular neuter of the comparative of the corresponding adjective, in Latin the regular comparative form of the adverb.
42. The adaptation of the prefix to Phoenician-Punic phonological constraints suggests this.
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the stitchers of byssus.\textsuperscript{43} The material reading of the first letter of the word is difficult. Février and Fantar (1963-64: 51) thought it partly overlapped the previous letter, reading it as \(\ddot{m}\), spelling the (indecipherable) word \(\ddot{m}yst\) (also Jongeling and Kerr 2005: 36 and Jongeling 2008: 126). In my judgment, the correct reading is \(\ddot{w}\).\textsuperscript{44} The resulting word, \(\ddot{w}yst\), is cognate to Mishnaic Hebrew \(\text{weset}^\prime\) ‘habitual doing, condition; conduct, way, manner’ (Jastrow 1985: 374 s.v.).\textsuperscript{45} Krauss (1898: 1:62 §82) derived Hebrew \(\text{weset}^\prime\) from Greek \(\ddot{e}\theta\omicron\omicron\zeta\), a derivation described as a folk-etymology (ibid. 1:196 [§346]). It is also possible that Neo-Punic \(\ddot{w}yst\) and Middle Hebrew \(\text{weset}\) do not derive from Greek, but represent Latin \(\text{usus}\).

\(\textit{kl}\eta\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\) This word is read and restored by Röllig in line 4 of the ‘Separate Inscriptions’ from Karatepe (Çambel 1999: 71). As Röllig observes, \(\textit{kl}\eta\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\) could be a Luwian name, possibly *\(\text{kula}(n)a\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\), although no such name is currently known.\textsuperscript{46} I see reason to interpret \(\textit{kl}\eta\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\) as the Greek noun \(\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\), ‘maker of beds or bedsteads’ (LSJ 961), perhaps in the broader meaning ‘cabinetmaker’ or ‘carpenter’ (Schmitz 2008: 7).\textsuperscript{47} The occupational title is suitable in the context, which refers to construction. The damaged context compels this suggestion to remain unproven.

\(\textit{krntry}\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (\textit{KAI} 26 A II 19; III 2-3, 4; C III 17, 19; IV 20) This word occurs six times in the extant Phoenician texts of the long Phoenician-Luwian bilingual inscription from Karatepe-Aslantaş in Cilicia (\textit{KAI} 26; Bron 1979; Guzzo Amadasi and Archi 1980; Çambel 1999), always in the phrase \(\textit{b}\text{’l krntry}\omicron\omicron\omicron\). I recently demonstrated that \(\textit{krntry}\omicron\omicron\omicron\) is an adjective related to Archaic Greek \(\kappa\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\eta\tau\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\) ‘mace’ (Schmitz 2009). The divine epithet designates a mace-bearing representation of the Storm god, probably the Storm god of Aleppo. The exact Greek form implied by the Phoenician orthography is unattested: *\(\kappa\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\eta\tau\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) is a masculine adjective with the suffix \(-\tau\iota\rho-\tau\iota\omicron\) (Smyth 1956: 238, par. 858 no. 14).\textsuperscript{48} This explanation of the form has already been accepted by a number of scholars.\textsuperscript{49}

\(\textit{kwalb}\) This word also occurs in the Neo-Punic inscription Hr. Maktar N 76, line 4. It represents the Greek word \(\kappa\lambda\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\), which generally signifies a (three-legged) stand or pedestal (LSJ 117 s.v.). In context, the inscription concerns—in part—the making and display of banners or military insignia in preparation for a ceremony (Schmitz 2010a; forthcoming a). According to the text, stands were made with or for the banners that were made.

\(\textit{kyndmyn}\) This word occurs on two seal impressions in clay discovered during excavations at Tel Kedesh (northeast quadrant, Corridor CB 3.8, Sealing A [K00 BL316], and Sealing B [K00 BL462]). The

\textsuperscript{43} The spelling *\(\ddot{v}\)\(\textit{myst}\) that appears in Schmitz (2010a: 34) is an unfortunate typographical error; the correct spelling is \(\ddot{w}\)\(\textit{yst}\).

\textsuperscript{44} For the rationale, see Schmitz (forthcoming a). Krahmalkov (1975: 181) mentions the possible reading \(\ddot{v}\). In the Late Punic orthography of this inscription, the letter \(\ddot{y}\) is a vowel letter not a consonant.

\textsuperscript{45} On the use of \(\text{weset}\) as a halakhic term for menstruation, see “\textit{Weset},” \textit{Talmudic Encyclopedia}, 11 (1965): 501-88 [Hebrew].

\textsuperscript{46} Amadasi Guzzo (2010: 11) does not comment directly on the non-Semitic names in this text.

\textsuperscript{47} See also Chantraine (1968-80: 544 s.v. \(\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\omicron\omega\)). M. Egetmeyer, although not rejecting my explanation, points out cautiously that “\(\pi\omicron\omega\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\)-formations are secondary, old is \(-\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (this only Cypriot)” (e-mail message, 2/26/2012). I remain grateful for this important observation. Watson (2013: 337) has endorsed the Greek derivation discussed above.

\textsuperscript{48} Markus Egetmeyer points out that the conservation of Indo-European \(-\tau\iota-\tau\iota\omicron\) is an archaism (e-mail message, 2/26/2012).

\textsuperscript{49} W. Röllig (2011: 128) considers the identification attractive, but prefers a derivation involving the divine name \(\text{Kur}(ra)\).
sealings from Tel Kedesh were published by Ariel and Naveh (2003). Having seen images of the sealings, I noted that the seal that made the impressions was bilingual, with a text in Phoenician including the word kyndmyn (line 2), and a Greek legend that reads κοινόδημον. The publication of this sealing incorporated these readings. The word κοινόδημος ‘common assembly’ (LSJ 137 s.v.) is itself attested only once in classical Greek (Ph.1.678). The rarity of the word makes this identification certain.

lm[n] (KAI 37 B 4) This word occurs in the fourth line of the Phoenician ritual account B from Kition (CIS I 86; KAI 37). I argue, partly on the basis of a new division of the words of line 4, that side B of this inscription concerns the expenses incurred during the reception of a foreign emissary. As I analyze it, the text of line 4 reads: lbʾ lm m ym bsbb ‛lm[n . . .] “For the master of the waters of the sea in the vicinity of the har[bor . . .]” (Schmitz 2013: 199-200). The prepositional phrase bsbb implies that the following word is a location or a geographic name. I explain lm[n] as a loan from Greek λίμην ‘harbor, haven, bay’. Because the word precedes a broken edge of the tablet on which the text was written, the interpretation must retain a degree of uncertainty. In context, however, my proposed interpretation fits well with the remainder of the text.

qîlʾnt (Hr. Maktar N 76.3) As discussed above with reference to the word ʿyst, the Neo-Punic inscription Hr. Maktar N 76 has a theme involving textile production and decoration (Schmitz 2010a; forthcoming a). The word qîlʾnt in line 3 is related to this theme. Unrecognized by previous interpreters, the word derives from Greek κελλάριον (< Lat. cellarium). Middle Hebrew qillārîn ‘receptacle for food, pantry; provisions’ (Jastrow 1985: 1361 s.v.) and Syriac qîlīnṭh ‘provisions’ (Brockelmann 1928: 671) represent analogous borrowings. In the context of the Neo-Punic inscription, qîlʾnt probably designates a place for storage of textiles.

qpʾ (KAI 37 A 3, 7, 11, 14, 16; B 3, 7, 11) This word occurs nine times in the Phoenician ritual accounts from Kition. Together with the words qr (8 times) and pʾ (2 times) it designates a monetary unit in which workers were paid (CIS vol. 1, p. 95; van den Branden 1966: 245-46; Masson and Szynyer 1972: 35-37; Guzzo Amadasi and Karageorghis 1977: 107-108; Manfredi 1987: 82; Amadasi Guzzo 2004: 210). In my view, qpʾ represents the Greek letter-name ωοππα (later κόππα [LSJ s.v.]). It may be relevant that some coin series minted at Corinth (Ravel 1935; Coupar 2000) and at the Corinthian colony Syracuse were marked with the archaic letter q (for ωορίνθος). The symbol also represented the number ‘ninety’ in the Greek numeral system. As attractive as it may be, this explanation must remain uncertain.
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πλῦτη (Hr. Maktar N 64.9) This word is found in the ninth line of the large Neo-Punic inscription from Hr. Maktar (Jongeling 2008: 116). This inscription, repeatedly studied since its publication in 1893, has two sections: lines 1-15 (columns i-iii) appear to be a narrative, followed in lines 16-47 (columns iv-x) by a list of personal names. It has attracted a variety of interpretations, most of which suppose that it concerns the repair of a mqdš ‘sanctuary’ mentioned in the first line. My interpretation (Schmitz 2011) diverges from these: the narrative portion of the text concerns military service in Syria by a unit called a mzrh, who experienced an outbreak of factionalism leading to armed confrontation with comrades. As a consequence the thirty-two signatories were banned from a celebration at the temple, giving rise to the dissenting document that constitutes the body of the inscription, whose origin, I surmise, was a letter sent in protest. The word πλῦτη appears in a sentence describing factionalism apparently instigated by tribal leaders: (8) . . . wʾhr st [q]š tʾ drt (9) rʾ sʾ šʾ lm ṭm πλῦτη “And after this, the nomad nobility became difficult. Its head divided the citizenry with them.”58 In this context, πλῦτη appears to be Greek πολίτευμα, probably in the sense “corporate body of citizens resident in a foreign city” (LSJ s.v. πολίτευμα IV.2).

Greek words from the same stem provided loans in other Northwest Semitic languages also: Middle Hebrew plytmwn and Syriac plywmn (< Gk. πολίτευμα = Lat. decurio [Krauss 1898: 425 s.v.]); Middle Hebrew plyqyn (< πολίτηκοι ‘city people’ [Jastrow 1985: 1141 s.v.]); Palmyrene plty (< πολιτεία ‘tenure of public office’ [PAT 1378; DNWSI 915]). On the basis of the context of πλῦτη in Hr. Maktar N 64.9, and taking into consideration the cognate loans in other languages, this identification seems certain.

3. Orthographic and Linguistic Analysis

As transcriptions of foreign words, the Phoenician-Punic spellings listed above fall into four classes on the basis of their orthographic features. The classes are (1) mixed forms that have a Greek stem with a Phoenician-Punic (or possibly Berber) suffix; (2) forms that represent the final consonant of a Greek derivational suffix; (3) forms that do not represent the final consonant of a Greek derivational suffix; and (4) forms that represent a Greek word ending in a vowel. Words are listed according to these classes in table 2 below.

Table 2: Representation of Final Consonants and Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllables</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Greek Stem + Phoenician/Berber Suffix</th>
<th>Greek Final Consonant Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 PN</td>
<td>g’lgs-</td>
<td>/galagsí-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CN</td>
<td>q’ln-</td>
<td>/qillarin-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CN</td>
<td>’gn</td>
<td>/agôn/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adj.</td>
<td>’ktr</td>
<td>/iktir/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CN</td>
<td>kl[ŋ]pyš</td>
<td>/klinopoös/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 PN</td>
<td>pgmlyn</td>
<td>/pugmaliôn/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 PN</td>
<td>w[ŋ]mnš</td>
<td>/Wulamônemos/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CN</td>
<td>kyndmyn</td>
<td>*/koinodêmiôn/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CN</td>
<td>’šwmywš</td>
<td>*/attisumaiòs/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Adj</td>
<td>krnryš</td>
<td>*/korunêtêriôs/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. For complete philological commentary, see Schmitz (2012: 76).
The two words *g’lgst* and *ql’rnt* fall in the first class, insofar as they appear to have a Punic or Berber suffix, either */–t/ or */–Vt/. The Phoenician and Punic spellings in classes (2) and (4) represent whole Greek words. Class (3) has one member.

Of the eight forms in class 2 (Greek final consonant represented), five have a final syllable whose onset is a palatal glide, represented by Greek {ι} or Phoenician {y}. These are words of four to six syllables. The archaic form /Wulamônunos/ retains the final consonant of the final syllable despite the absence of a palatal glide.

The two examples of class 3 (Greek final consonant unrepresented) are the noun *kwlb* and the name *shlkny*. Both examples are from Late Punic texts, and both involve the loss of the Greek case ending. The omission of Greek case endings is common in Semitic transcriptions and loans, from early to late periods. For example, the names of ten kings and the names of their kingdoms, all located in Cyprus (A V 63-71), are transcribed into Akkadian cuneiform in records of the court of the Neo-Assyrian king Esarhaddon (Prism A V 40-VI 1 [Borger 1956: 59-60]). The following transcriptions from this list can be noted: *Damasu* (= Damasos, line 67); *Pappa* (= Paphos, line 66). The Late Babylonian transcription *Siluku* (Σέλευκος) shows similar omission of the case ending. While cuneiform orthography implements different principles of segmentation than Semitic alphabetic writing, the interpretation of Greek inflectional suffixes is very similar. From eighth-century B.C.E. Phoenician, note the Anatolian personal name *mpš* (KAI 26 A I 16; A III 11), which does not represent the case ending of Greek *Mopsos*. Greek loans into Hebrew and Aramaic show loss of case endings with a similar frequency (Krauss 1898: 1: 118-20). The conditions under which the omission of Greek case endings takes place are not yet understood.

The common noun *kwlb* occurs in the plural, spelled *kwlbm*. The suffix is a Phoenician-Punic plural morpheme. This detail signals that Greek word *κιλλίβας* had probably been assimilated into Punic as a lexical item for some time, and was no longer perceived as a foreign term (Noonan 2012: 13-14).

Regarding the name *shlkny*, the Greek masculine form *Σέλευκανιος* involves a suffix */–ιος/*, not fully represented in the Late Punic orthography. Latin names ending in */–ius/* are transcribed in Neo-Punic with final {ι}, and in Latino-Punic orthography with final {i}. Kerr (2010: 44-45; 68-74) argues that this orthography represents the vocative case, a reasonable and consistent analysis. The name *shlkny* adheres to this pattern. As the Latin form *Selecianius* occurs, we should perhaps view *shlkny* as a Latin vocative form.

---

59. A copy of the list also occurs in Assurbanipal Prism C I 43 (from 664 B.C.E.).
60. BM 55437, 5' (Stolper 1993: 48).
61. Mankoski’s careful study (2000) provides significant methodological guidance, although its scope is limited to inner-Semitic loans.
Regarding class 4 (Greek final-vowel forms), it is worth noting that *bznty* has a vocalic suffix introduced by a glide.

The treatment of the consonant cluster in *g’lgs* - (Gk. γαλαξί - ‘milky’) is somewhat similar in its orthography to that of the cluster in the name *mpš*. The name γαλαξί- involves the Greek digraph {{\text{ξ}}}, resolved as {{gs}}; Μόψος involves the digraph {{\text{ψ}}} resolved as *ps*. The Late Punic spelling *g’lgs* with {{g}} rather than {{k}} in the final cluster implies regressive dissimilation of voicing. The sibilant letter {{s}} in this cluster is also a later usage than the more archaic Phoenician {{š}}.62

To place this small corpus in perspective, we can consider it as a portion of the complete lexical stock of the Phoenician-Punic textual legacy. The estimate of 1039 lexemes in the extant corpus of Phoenician and Punic inscriptions recently made by Issam Hala yqa (2008: 18) is based on the standard lexicon (*DNWSI*), and could be augmented by little more than a percent to account for newly published inscriptions and a small number of still unpublished inscriptions. Greek lexemes, whether names, loanwords, or nonce-borrowings, account for somewhat less than 2 percent of the lexicon of epigraphic Phoenician-Punic.63 Recognizing and properly interpreting them, however, is a significant step in the path to more complete and accurate understanding of the linguistic and cultural heritage of Phoenician civilization.
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