

## Who Exiled Whom? Another Interpretation of the Phoenician Inscription From Cebel Ires Daği<sup>1</sup>

G.A. Long - Baguio City (Philippines) and Chicago  
D. Pardee - Chicago

[The authors argue that MSNZMŠ in the Cebel Ires Daği Phoenician inscription was the one who was exiled and that taking 'yt msznmš in line 7B as an objective phrase results in an interpretation that is not only intelligible but preferable to that given in the *editio princeps*.]

As Paul G. Mosca and James Russell have themselves stated, crucial to the understanding of the Phoenician inscription from Cebel Ires Daği is the clause *wkm 'š ygl 'yt msznmš* in lines 7A-7B (C12)<sup>2</sup>. Specifically, who is the subject of *ygl* and what is the morphosyntax of '*yt*'?

Mosca and Russell acknowledge that it was their "initial impulse... to take 'YT as governing the proper name MSNZMŠ"<sup>3</sup>. Yet they felt themselves compelled to abandon such an "attractive course", believing that if followed, "the careful tracing of land-claims up to this point becomes meaningless"<sup>4</sup>. Apparently, their main difficulty is that if MSN(°)ZMŠ<sup>5</sup> were exiled he could not have

---

1. We wish to thank Mr. David M. Clemens, Ms. Cynthia L. Miller, both of the University of Chicago, and Mr. Philip C. Schmitz for reading earlier drafts of this article and providing valuable comments.

2. P.G. Mosca and J. Russell, "A Phoenician Inscription From Cebel Ires Daği in Rough Cilicia", *Epigraphica Anatolica* 9 (1987) 1-28, plus 4 photographs, [*editio princeps*]. Specifically for them, at the crux of the interpretation are the two words '*yt msznmš*' (p. 17). Although Mosca is responsible for the text, translation, and commentary (p. 1, footnote 1), we will, simply as a matter of convention, refer to both of them when citing this article since their work is jointly signed. Hereafter, the references within the text will be cited according to our own clause numbering (abbreviated C) given on pp. 212-213, *Clausal Division of Text*.

3. p. 17.

4. p. 17.

5. We accept the conclusion that MSNZMŠ and MSN'ZMŠ are to be equated (p. 18). This appears likely for two reasons: 1) If MSN'ZMŠ were not the same person as MSNZMŠ, why is he not identified other than by name? 2) Though probably not the same person, PHLŠ (C14) and PHL'Š (C17) appear to be variants of the same name (pp. 21, 24) and the second shows an intrusive '*aleph*'. The editors also cite HY and HY' in KAI 24 (p. 18), though the fact that the '*aleph*' is final renders the parallel less than perfect. It may not be merely coincidence, however, that the spelling with '*aleph*' occurs only for the person reinstated. If MSN'ZMŠ is indeed a person other than MSNZMŠ, he would most likely have been the legal heir to MSNZMŠ's possessions. The historical events would have been: MSNZMŠ receives

been the recipient of the lands turned over to him by WRYK. Rather, the editors propose that 'yt is a definite direct object marker plus a 3ms object pronoun (they vocalize \*/iyyātōl and translate, "And when MSNZMŠ drove him (i.e., KLŠ) into exile..."). They are aware that this "would constitute a unique example... in Phoenician proper"<sup>6</sup>.

We will argue that the so-called *nota accusativi* (henceforth, NA) 'yt governs the following proper noun, MSNZMŠ, and that the following clause (C13) implies MSN(°)ZMŠ's reinstatement from exile. We propose the following arguments in favor of this interpretation.

The extant Phoenician corpus<sup>7</sup> indicates that where a PN, GN, DN or a gentilic is the direct object, it is normally governed by a NA<sup>8</sup>.

Secondly, the same corpus shows that in clauses where both a finite verb and the NA are used, as in the case in C12, the following syntactic strings are attested<sup>9</sup>:

1) V - NA - O<sup>10</sup>

1') V - S - NA - O<sup>11</sup>

land; MTŠ, and KLŠ receive *wlwy*; KLŠ receives land; KLŠ (with or without MTŠ's connivance) exiles MSNZMŠ; the latter dies in exile; MSN'ZMŠ is reinstated in his father's (??) possessions.

6. p. 18.

7. The "corpus" is composed of texts belonging to Byblian (Northern), Tyro-Sidonian (Central), and Cypriot (Western) dialects, i.e., Phoenician proper. Furthermore, we have limited citations in this article to those which in general are clear and present little trouble for analysis. We were interested in limiting conjecture as much as possible.

8. Texts where the NA is used are: KAI 10:8 (PN); KAI 26. A.iii:2-3; 26.C.iii:16-17 (PN); KAI 60:1-2 (PN); KAI 14:18-19 (GN); KAI 14:15-16 (DN); KAI 26.A.i:3-4 (gentilic). An instance where the NA is not utilized before noun phrases of these types is KAI 26.A.i:21-ii:1 (gentilic). See also perhaps Kition Bowl: line 2 (PN), with uncertainty --see A. Dupont-Sommer, "Une inscription phénicienne archaïque récemment trouvée à Kition", in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 44 (1970) 1-28 (for different readings of this text see, among others, J. Teixidor, *Syria* 49 (1972) 434, entry #118 and Robert B. Coote, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 220 (1975) 47-50).

9. S = SUBJECT constituent expressed by a noun phrase in concord with the verb; V = a VERBAL PREDICATE expressed by a finite verbal form having, of course, an intrinsically marked subject; NA = *NOTA ACCUSATIVI*; O = OBJECT, the adverbial component depending on a transitive verb and expressed by a noun phrase; AM = ADVERBIAL MODIFIER, an adverbial component.

10. See, for example, KAI 13:3 = *tpq* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *h'rn z* (O), "(you) find this coffin"; KAI 14:4 = 'l *yph* (adverb of negation + V) - 'yt (NA) - *mškb z* (O), "may he not open this lying-place"; KAI 14:5, 21 = 'l *yš'* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *hlt mškby* (O), "may he not pick up my receptacle where I lie" (literally, the receptacle of my lying-place); KAI 14:7 = *yš'* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *hlt mškby* (O), "(who) lifts up my receptacle where I lie"; KAI 14:10-11 = *yš'* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *hlt z* (O), "(who) lifts up this receptacle"; KAI 14:15-16 = *bnn* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *bt 'lnm* (O) - 'yt (NA) - [*bt 'štr*]t... (O), "we built the gods' temples, the temple of DN...; KAI 14:16 = *wyšrn* (V) - 'yt (NA) - 'štrt... (O), "we established (read *wyšbn*) Ashtart...; KAI 19:9-10 = *bn* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *kl 'hry [hmqdš]m 'š b'rš* (O), "they built all the other sanctuaries in the land"; KAI 26.A.iii:14-15, C.iv:16-17 = *yhmd* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *hqrt z* (O), "(he) covets this city"; KAI 37.A:5 = *bn* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *bt 'štrt* (O), "(who) built DN's temple"; KAI 60:3 = *bn* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *hšr bt 'lm* (O), "he built the courtyard of the god's temple"; KAI 60:3-4 = *wp'l* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *kl 'š 'lty mšrt* (O), "he did everything which was incumbent on him as (his) duty"; RÉS 1204:5 = *p'l* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *hšy hsp z* (O), "he made half of this basin"; RÉS 1204:6 = *ytn* (V) - 'yt (NA) - *hšy hsp z* (O), "he gave (the) half of this basin".

11. KAI 10:8-9 = *tbrk* (V) - *b'lt gbl* (S) - 'yt (NA) - *yhwmlk mlk gbl* (O), "may the Mistress of GN bless PN, king of GN"; KAI 10:15 = *tsrh[wl]* (V) - *hrbt b'lt gbl* (S) - 'yt (NA) - *h'dm h' wzr'w* (O), "may the Lady, the Mistress of GN, destroy that man and his progeny"; KAI 26.A.iii:2-3, C.iii:16-17 = *wbrk* (V) - *b'l krntryš* (S) - 'yt (NA) - *z'zwd* (O), "may DN bless PN"; KAI 26.A.iii:18-iv:1 = *wmh* (V) - *b'lšmm...* (S) - 'yt (NA) - *hmmlkt h'* (O) - *w'yt* (NA) - *hmlk h'* (O) - *w'yt* (NA) - *'dm h' 'š 'dm šm* (O), "may DN... efface that kingdom and that king and that man of renown".



- 1A) V - AM - NA - O<sup>12</sup>      1A') V - AM - S - NA - O<sup>13</sup>  
 2) NA - O - V<sup>14</sup>              2') S - NA - O - V<sup>15</sup>

What is particularly cogent about this empirical evidence is that where the constituent "S" appears (1', 1A', 2'), it always immediately precedes the NA (-O). We have been unable to find \*V - NA - O - S<sup>16</sup> attested in Phoenician. Furthermore, there is no example of \*V - NA+suffix (= independent objective pronoun) - S, Mosca and Russell's syntax, and the above data suggest that if "S" were to be independently expressed, it would not follow the NA(+suffix). That is, \*V - S - NA+suffix or \*S - NA+suffix - V would be expected rather than what the editors propose. It must be pointed out that though the syntactic string V - O - S, i.e., "S" after "O", does occur elsewhere in Phoenician dialects<sup>17</sup> (but not in this inscription), in no instance is the NA part of the clause.

Thirdly, where the direct object is pronominal, it is affixed to the verb, not the NA<sup>18</sup>. The one exception to the last statement occurs in CIS 580:3 where we agree that 't' is best taken as the NA+3fs pronominal suffix. Here, however, the clause is structured V - NA+suffix (= independent pronoun), not \*V - NA+suffix - S, i.e., there is no independent "S" constituent following NA. Additionally, one must be careful to take 't' for what it is -- a solitary occurrence among all the extant Phoenician and Punic corpus in what seems to be a late Punic text.

Thus accepting Mosca and Russell's interpretation not only means subscribing to a morphosyntax not yet attested within Phoenician proper, as they quickly point out, but it also means endorsing an anomalous syntax as well. Moreover, with regard to the overall interpretation, it remains a mystery, in the editors' interpretation, why KLŠ, who had the power of a curse to validate his rightful land-holdings, should be exiled by MSN(°)ZMŠ and then the latter be rewarded by receiving KLŠ's land. Whether MSN(°)ZMŠ's action towards KLŠ was legal, as Mosca and Russell argue<sup>19</sup>, or not, why should the land originally given to KLŠ be legally given to MSN(°)ZMŠ without explicit reason in the face of an explicitly stated curse? In our estimation, the interpretation that results from taking 'yt *msnzmš* as an objective phrase, which the above cited syntactic data suggest one should do,

12. KAI 43:7 = *yšt* (V) - *bmqdš mlqrt* (AM) - 'yt (NA) - *ms pn 'by* (O), "I placed the image of my father's face in the sanctuary of DN".

13. KAI 14:18-19 = *yt* (V) - *ln* (AM) - 'dn *mlkm* (S) - 'yt (NA) - *d'r wypy* (O), "the lord of kings gave GN and GN to us".

14. KAI 18:3-4 = 'yt (NA) - *hš'r z whdlht 'š l* (O) ('š l being a subordinate nominal relative clause whose antecedent is *whdlht*) - *p'lt* (V), "I made this gate and its doors".

15. KAI 15 = *mlk bd'štrt...* (S) - 'yt (NA) - *hbt z* (O) - *bn* (V), "King PN... built this temple"; KAI 16 = *mlk bd'štrt...* (S) - 'yt (NA) - *hbt z* (O) - *bn* (V), "King PN... built this temple".

16. Whereas elsewhere in this article the asterisk (\*) signifies a reconstruction, the asterisk preceding a syntactic string, in accordance with standard linguistic practice, specifies the syntax as unattested and presumably ungrammatical.

17. For example, KAI 10:2 = *p'lt* (V + O suffix) - *hrbt b'lt gbl* (S), "the Lady, Mistress of GN, made me"; KAI 24:15 = *yšht* (V) - *r'š* (\**/rō'šō/*) (O) - *b'l šmd* (S), "may DN destroy his head"; KAI 24:16 = *wyšht* (V) - *r'š* (O) - *b'l ḥmn... wrkb'l...* (S), "may DN... and DN... destroy his head"; KAI 26.A.i:3 = *p'ln* (V + O suffix) - *b'l* (S), "Baal made me".

18. Mosca and Russell correctly state that "Phoenician proper... regularly (our italics) employs suffixes added directly to the verb" (p. 18). See, for example, KAI 10:2,9; KAI 13:4,6,7; KAI 14:6,9; KAI 18:8; KAI 24:11,12; KAI 26.A.i:3,12; KAI 26.A.ii:11; KAI 43:15; KAI 50:2,3; RÉS 297:2; *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966) 247.

19. p. 17.

answers this basic question and gives a satisfactorily well-rounded understanding of the text as a whole.

The inscription begins by stating that MSN(°)ZMŠ was the first recipient of land from the governor. In C5 *w'p* "furthermore" seems to indicate that the governor then gave *wlwy* to MTŠ and KLŠ, as Mosca and Russell believe<sup>20</sup>. In C6 *w'p* initiates a sentence describing how MTŠ gave various types of fields to KLŠ. "Furthermore" (*w'p* in C8), MTŠ settled Baal KR in the land and uttered a curse, probably in the name of that deity, that none should strip KLŠ's fields from him. Following this scenario, *wkm 'š ygl 'yt msnzms bymt 'zwšš* would be formally a clause coordinate to the preceding one (*w*) and dependent to the following (*km 'š*) composed of COORDINATING CONJUNCTION - SUBORDINATING CONJUNCTION - V - NA - O - AM. Without yet identifying an explicit subject, we translate the entire sentence (C12-C13), "When, however (i.e., sometime consequent to the event when), SUBJECT exiled MSNZMŠ during 'ZWŠŠ's term of office (literally, "in the days of PN"), King WRYK turned all these fields over to MSN'ZMŠ"<sup>21</sup>. The clause could also be causal, "... since SUBJECT exiled MSNZMŠ during 'ZWŠŠ's term of office..."<sup>22</sup>. What then does this mean?

It seems that this sentence (C12-C13) describes the action of one who deposed MSN(°)ZMŠ from his rightful land but that a certain King WRYK intervened by giving to MSN(°)ZMŠ all the aforementioned fields --an action that, on the one hand, righted an injustice and, on the other, served as punishment for the initial deposer. Who was this deposer, though? That is, who is the subject of *ygl*?

The options are ŠLPRN, MTŠ, KLŠ, or MTŠ and KLŠ acting together. The verbal form itself is not explicit for it could be a 3ms or 3mpl Yiphal<sup>23</sup>.

The first option, ŠLPRN, is unlikely because MTŠ becomes the explicit subject in the new sentence beginning at C6 and it may be that 'ZWŠŠ was a new governor after ŠLPRN<sup>24</sup>. Such a change in administration may have been seen as an opportunity to exile MSN(°)ZMŠ. The most probable candidates, then, are MTŠ and/or KLŠ.

20. p. 12.

21. The temporal use of the conjunction *km 'š* may be seen in KAI 10:6-7 = *p'l 'nk yhwmlk mlk gbl lrbty b'lt gbl km's qr't 't rby b'lt gbl wšm' ql...*, "I, PN, king of GN made (them) for my Lady, the Mistress of GN, when (i.e., consequent to / after the time) I prayed to my Lady, the Mistress of GN, and she heard my prayer (lit. voice)...". See in particular, J.C.L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, vol. III, Oxford 1982, p. 95. Further afield, the Biblical Hebrew (BH) semantic equivalent, *ka'āšer*, is used temporally in Gen. 12:11; 18:33; 20:13, etc.

22. Among scholars who have taken *km 'š* as being causal in KAI 10:7 are A. Dupont-Sommer, *Semitica* 3 (1950) 37 and F. Rosenthal, *ANET*<sup>3</sup>, p. 656. Note this use of *ka'āšer* in Gen. 26:29.

23. Yet another option would be to take *ygl* as a Yuphal perfect 3ms. The objective phrase *'yt msnzms* would be the subject of a passive clause, "PN was exiled". Note the BH construction V [Hophal] - 't - PN in Exodus 10:8, *wayyūšab 'eḏ mōšeh*, "Moses was brought". This syntax, however, is not at all common within Phoenician; indeed, we have found no clear attestation of it. In BH, where the picture is clearer, of the 6997 instances in which the particle 't is found, passive clauses having definite subjects marked with a so-called 't *nominativi* occur merely twenty-four times. Of these twenty-four instances only thirteen roots are involved. This construction, then, is not common, and *gly* is not one of the thirteen attested roots. (The statistical data were taken from Belinda Bicknell, "The Distribution of 't with Passives", an unpublished paper read at the 1984 AOS/SBL/ASOR Midwest Regional Meetings).

24. The editors suggest that 'ZWŠŠ was ŠLPRN's "immediate successor" (p. 18). Note the parallel phrases, *bymt 'šlprn* (C2) // *bymt 'zwšš* (C12, C16). The phraseology is reminiscent of BH *bîmê 's'*, "during the reign (days) of PN" (I Kings 22:47), and similar expressions where *ywm* denotes regnal years or a period of time in office.



We at first thought MTŠ to be the most likely candidate. It is he who has been the subject of action in C6-C11. Within the clause under consideration (C12), no new explicit subject has been introduced. Yet a problem remains. The phrase *kl hšdyt 'l* in C13, at the very least, must refer to the various types of fields which were given to KLŠ<sup>25</sup>. If MTŠ had acted alone, it is difficult to account for the land being stripped from KLŠ since he would have been innocent of any wrongdoing. Therefore, KLŠ must either have acted alone or been in cahoots with MTŠ. One detail of the text, though, seems to furnish an argument against the two acting together: C13 refers to the returning of "all these *fields(!)*". Nowhere is it stated that MTŠ received a field. *wlwy* is what he did receive, but there is nothing to indicate that this unknown lexeme is the name or the type of a field like *šd zbl* (C6) or *bšd bkr* (C2). Therefore, it defies clear definition, and we believe it prudent not to assume that it is a type of field until such a meaning can be substantiated. *šd* and *krm* are reserved in the third part<sup>26</sup> of the inscription for what MTŠ gave to KLŠ and in C13 *hšdyt* should refer to these types of land<sup>27</sup>. Thus only land belonging solely to KLŠ is stated to have been turned over to MSN(°)ZMŠ and one may presume that he, then, was the one being punished and the one who did the exiling according to C12. This is corroborated by the additional penalty imposed in C15-16; there KLŠ's wife, daughter of MTŠ, is given to MSN(°)ZMŠ<sup>28</sup>. It is uncertain why *wlwy* is not mentioned as being turned over to MSN(°)ZMŠ. One may hypothesize two principal options: 1) The fields of KLŠ which became MSN(°)ZMŠ's contained or somehow included KLŠ's portion of *wlwy*, which was separate from MTŠ's portion; 2) MTŠ and KLŠ had been co-owners of what was an indivisible entity and the innocent party (MTŠ) was allowed to keep the entirety of *wlwy*<sup>29</sup>.

25. The following evidence may be given in support that the phrase *hšdyt 'l* includes *krmm*. Within the inscription, MTŠ only gave one *šd* (*šd zbl*, C6), but *krmm* in two different locations. If a clear distinction were to be made between *šd* and *krm*, one would expect the singular form of the former word to have been used and *krmm* to have been explicitly mentioned. The use of the plural *hšdyt* suggests that it can be used as a general term to denote cultivated land. In this respect it is similar to its BH cognate *šādeh*, which can also be construed to designate cultivated land in general (e.g., Genesis 37:7; Leviticus 27:16). Furthermore, in C6 the *krmm* are *within šd zbl*, i.e., they are a part of it. We may note here that the phrase *kl hšdyt 'l* may also refer to MSN(°)ZMŠ's land because it is only natural that he receive back what originally was his.

26. "Third part" according to the topical outline on p. 214.

27. See note 25 for the discussion of the evidence.

28. It is likely that the giving of MSD to KLŠ by MTŠ was linked with the transfer of real estate from MTŠ to KLŠ. (A Levantine example of such land/wife linkage is described in Judges 1:11-15). Thus when KLŠ lost these fields, he also lost his wife. In further support of this interpretation being preferable to "the foundation of the/his house", I Samuel 18:20-27; 25:44 and II Samuel 3:12-16 also provide a striking biblical parallel. As Mosca and Russell mention (p. 23), Jeremiah 6:12 describes the action of aliens who would turn homes, fields, and wives over to others; such an action is more understandable if outsiders are responsible for the overturning. A natural question, though, is how likely is it for members within a community to give a wife to one and then turn her over to someone else? The first passage in I Samuel describes how Saul gave his daughter, Michal, to David. The second shows that Saul later gave her to Palti. The citation in II Samuel describes how David regained her as part of a political bargain. This is at least a Levantine example for such inner-community behavior.

29. One can only speculate as to why MTŠ is not mentioned as an actor in the exile nor as being punished in its aftermath. The two main options are either that he simply was not involved in exiling MSN(°)ZMŠ or that there was some form of distance between him and KLŠ. Within the second option, he may have been geographically removed from the fields of MSN(°)ZMŠ and from those of KLŠ which were in dispute; or he may have been socially removed, i.e., too powerful to be punished for the acts of an underling (that MTŠ gave land to KLŠ lends support to the latter having a subservient position); or he may have been definitively removed from the scene, i.e., deceased at the time of the exile and reinstatement.



If the phrase *kl hšdyt 'l* is not taken as referring only to explicit mention of fields in the earlier lines, and if *wlwy* is assumed to include fields, then the following possibilities are open. 1) MTŠ was the exiler. His field(s) (*wlwy*) was/were forfeited as well as KLŠ's --the latter's fields being forfeited due to his subordinate position under MTŠ. The verb *ygl* would be 3ms and the sequence of clauses with MTŠ as subject would continue through C12. 2) MTŠ and KLŠ acted together as exilers and both were punished. The verb would be 3mpl.

In all of the interpretations in which KLŠ is involved as the exiler, the curse uttered by MTŠ on KLŠ's behalf, which served to authenticate KLŠ's exclusive ownership of property, must be considered as having been rendered null and void by KLŠ's participation in the exiling of MSN(°)ZMŠ.

Among these several options, our preference is to take *ygl* as Yiphil perfect 3ms, with KLŠ, the recipient of lands in the preceding clauses, as subject. This explains most efficiently why *šdyt* is used in the reinstatement clause, why KLŠ loses his wife, and why the curse uttered by MTŠ was of no effect.

The Cebel Ires Daği inscription, then, has as its central figure MSN(°)ZMŠ. It commences by establishing first his own land-allotments. This is followed by the giving of *wlwy* to MTŠ and KLŠ. It is then explicitly stated that KLŠ received various types of fields from MTŠ. It continues by describing how MSN(°)ZMŠ lost his holdings, but through the intervention of a king, how he gained the fields of his exiler, KLŠ, and, presumably, how he regained those that originally had been his. In addition, the wife of KLŠ was turned over to him. The purpose of the inscription was apparently to explain and establish MSN(°)ZMŠ's right to possess those lands and that woman.

*Clausal Division of Text.* We offer here the text broken down into both independent and dependent clauses.

- C1 <sup>1A</sup>šlprn skn ylbš y<sup>1B</sup>tn grl l'bdy lmsnzmš btmrs  
 C2 nṭ' h' <sup>2A</sup>mṭ'm bšd bkr <sup>2B</sup>bymt 'šlprn<sup>30</sup>  
 C3 wkrm zr ytnl b'drwz wkr<sup>3A</sup>m  
 C4 'š bkw  
 C5 w'p wl<sup>3B</sup>wy ytn lmtš wklš bwrykly

30. ŠLPRN, of course, is not the subject here in C2. Rather, *h'*, having as its nearest referent MSN(°)ZMŠ, is the subject. One will readily notice that relative and infinitival clauses are not *waw*-initial and have been indented in the clausal analysis. Aside from C2, all other independent clauses (except the first, C1) within the inscription are *waw*-initial. (The dependent clause C12 is also *waw*-initial). Does such inner inscriptional syntactic consistency indicate that non-*waw*-initial C2 is on a different narrative level? This clause may be termed "disjunctive", meaning only that it is not *waw*-initial, as in BH disjunctive clauses, which may be initiated by *waw* + non-verb or by non-verb in an asyndetic structure. Among other functions, BH disjunctive clauses often provide explanatory or parenthetical information (e.g., Genesis 29:16, I Samuel 1:9) and do not necessarily move the main narrative along. Perhaps within the inscription, conjunctive clauses move along the "main/primary" narrative while the disjunctive clause provides a parenthesis to the "main" story. When the main narrative continues with *waw*-initial C3, ŠLPRN is not restated as the subject. It is clear from the sense, though, that it is he who is the actor. Note the same phenomenon (CONJUNCTIVE CLAUSE 1 -DISJUNCTIVE VERBAL CLAUSE with different subject - CONJUNCTIVE CLAUSE 2 with same subject as CONJUNCTIVE CLAUSE 1) in BH (Exodus 12:37-39 = *wayyis'û hēnē yisrā'el mēra'mēsēs... - wēgam 'ereḥ raḥ 'ālāh 'ittām... - wayyō'pū 'et habbāšeq...*, "The Israelites journeyed from GN... Now many others went up with them... They (the Israelites) baked the dough...").

- C6 w'p <sup>4A</sup>mtš ytn lklš šd z<sup>4B</sup>bl wkrmm bšd zbl tḥt qrt wkr<sup>5A</sup>mm  
 C7 'š tḥt ml  
 C8 w'p <sup>5B</sup>b'l kr yšb bn  
 C9 wqb mtš qbt 'drt  
 C10 <sup>6A</sup>lbl gzly 'dm šd <sup>6B</sup>m krm bd špḥ klš bkl  
 C11 'š ytn <sup>7A</sup>lmtš  
 C12 wkm 'š ygl <sup>7B</sup>yt msnmš bymt 'zwšš  
 C13 w<sup>8A</sup>ysb mlk wry<sup>8B</sup>k lmsn'zmš kl hšdyt 'l  
 C14 <sup>9A</sup>wmš' l<sup>9B</sup>pnny phlš hml'k wlgbš 'ḥ l' <sup>C1</sup>wnmš  
 C15 w'p msd bt ytn myš lklš  
 C16 <sup>C2</sup>wbymt 'zwšš ysb lmsn'zmš  
 C17 <sup>C3</sup>whspr z št phlš hspr

## Translation

- C1 <sup>1A</sup> 'ŠLPRN, the governor of YLBŠ, <sup>1B</sup> gave a land-allotment to MSN(°)ZMŠ, his servant, in TMRS.  
 C2 He (MSN(°)ZMŠ) did <sup>2A</sup> planting in the BKR-Field during <sup>2B</sup> 'ŠLPRN's term of office.  
 C3 He ('ŠLPRN) gave him another vineyard in 'DRWZ as well as a <sup>3A</sup> vineyard  
 C4 in KW.  
 C5 Furthermore, he ('ŠLPRN) <sup>3B</sup> gave WLWY in WRYKLY to MTŠ and KLŠ.  
 C6 Further, <sup>4A-4B</sup> MTŠ gave the ZBL-Field to KLŠ and the vineyards within the ZBL-Field below  
 C7 the city / QRT as well as the <sup>5A</sup> vineyards  
 C8 below ML.  
 C8 Additionally, <sup>5B</sup> he (MTŠ) settled Baal KR in it,  
 C9 and MTŠ pronounced a mighty curse  
 C10 <sup>6A</sup> so that no person should seize<sup>31</sup> a field <sup>6B-7A</sup> or vineyard from KLŠ's family among  
 C11 everything  
 C11 which MTŠ had given to him.  
 C12 When, however, he (KLŠ) exiled <sup>7B</sup> MSN(°)ZMŠ during 'ZWŠŠ's term of office,  
 C13 <sup>8A-8B</sup> King WRYK turned all these fields over to MSN'ZMŠ.  
 C14 <sup>9A</sup> Present before <sup>9B</sup> him were: PHLŠ, the envoy, and LGBŠ, the brother of L' <sup>C1</sup> and NNMTŠ.  
 C15 Moreover, MTŠ had given MSD, his daughter, to KLŠ

31. We understand the -y of *gzly* to be a proleptic 3ms possessive pronoun representing the subject, i.e., -y is proleptic to 'dm. Note the similar construction of a suffixed verbal noun + appositional nominal phrase where the suffix appears to be proleptic to the subject: CIS I 4:1-2, *m[lk]y mlk bd'srt*, "King PN's reign(ing)"; KAI 14:1, *lmlky 'šmn'zr*, "of PN's reign(ing)"; KAI 26.A.i:17-18, *lšbtm dnyym*, "so that the Danunians might dwell"; perhaps KAI 26.C.iii:19, *lty b'l krnryš*, "by DN giving". The problem with the last citation is that the parallel Luwian text has a dative suffix, referring to 'ZTWD rather than to B'L KRNTRYŠ. Does the Phoenician text here attempt to parallel the Luwian syntax? It seems that there is much ambiguity among scholars when it comes to understanding a pronoun affixed to a verbal noun as the subject or the object of the action. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to investigate the linguistic environment which surrounds this syntactic structure in various Northwest Semitic languages for any linguistic phenomena which would serve to make the situation more explicit.

C16 <sup>C2</sup> but during 'ZWŠŠ's term of office, he (WRYK)<sup>32</sup> turned her over to MSN'ZMŠ.  
 C17 <sup>C3</sup>PHL'Š, the scribe, set down this inscription.

*Outline.* The major topical progression of the text may be outlined as follows:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| I. Circumstances Regarding MSN(')ZMŠ Receiving Land             | C1-C4   |
| A. Land Given by 'ŠLPRN in TMRS                                 | C1      |
| B. MSN(')ZMŠ's Action   | C2      |
| C. Land Given by 'ŠLPRN in 'DRWZ and KW                         | C3-C4   |
| II. MTŠ and KLŠ Receiving <i>wlwy</i>                           | C5      |
| III. Circumstances Regarding KLŠ Receiving Land                 | C6-C11  |
| A. Land Given by MTŠ to KLŠ                                     | C6-C7   |
| B. Establishment of Deity                                       | C8      |
| C. Utterance of Curse   | C9-C11  |
| IV. Circumstances Regarding MSN(')ZMŠ's Exile and Reinstatement | C12-C13 |
| A. MSN(')ZMŠ's Exile  | C12     |
| B. MSN(')ZMŠ's Reinstatement                                    | C13     |
| V. List of Those Attesting the Veracity of Circumstances        | C14     |
| VI. Circumstances Regarding MSD                                 | C16-C16 |
| VII. Colophon   | C17     |

---

32. Since it is King WRYK who took the action expressed by *ysb* in C13, we believe it most likely that the same action should be attributed to him as well here in C16.