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Vocalizing a Phoenician text is not a superfluous exercise. Instead of staying on the surface of such a text, it allows an in-depth analysis and interpretation. Of course this vocalization will always be hypothetic. However if a sound method is used, the results can be interesting. The method has already been developed in two previous articles. It may be useful to recall here the major principles.

The method premises a great affinity between Hebrew and Phoenician. In general ancient Phoenician texts are not written with matres lectionis which could be a real help for the vocalization. The only way is to take a look at the historical grammar and at the ancient transcriptions. Almost all nouns and adjectives in Phoenician have a corresponding form in Hebrew lexicography. It is therefore relatively easy to find the patterns, the ground-forms

(schèmes in French, Stammbildungen in German) on which these words were built. And indeed the historical grammar of Hebrew devotes a large part of its work identifying these primitive patterns. From this point of view two major works are essential: the historical grammar of Hebrew by Bauer and Leander, and the last edition of the Hebrew dictionary by Koehler and Baumgartner. The latter follows in general the observations of Bauer-Leander, but it also includes the results of more recent research. Once the information concerning Hebrew has been collected we then turn to Phoenician. The main work here is the grammar of Friedrich and Röllig updated by Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo. By the means of Assyrian, Greek and Latin transcriptions, it is possible to know the evolution of the primitive patterns in Phoenician. For example the word ‘lf « ox » is originally a monosyllabic qatl as attested by the known forms. The Greek transcription λασου-αλφ for the name of the plant (literally ox-tongue), and also the name of the letter αλφ indicate that the word has remained monosyllabic without the anaptyx of a vowel. Are we allowed to extrapolate this conclusion to all the monosyllabic qatl forms? I think so, unless we explicitly find a counter-example. We do know, via the transcriptions, that some words have evolved differently in Phoenician. For example the word milk « king » appears as milk (ahimilk, Μλικατων, Milqart « milk-qart « king of the city ») indicating a transition from qatl to qitl. It also happens that the transcriptions give conflicting information. For example the word ἵρ « seed » is attested as ζερα (Pliny, XXIV, 71) and as ζεξα (Dioscorides, II, 103). How can we decide in this case on the primitive pattern: qatl or qitl? A second difficulty is that the transcriptions are often very late compared to the dates attributed to the inscriptions. It is therefore necessary to consider the possibility of changes in ancient vocalism. Fortunately the grammar of Friedrich-Röllig provides keys to understanding this evolution. It should also be noted that the transmission itself of the transcriptions may have suffered accidents: the Phoenician extracts in the Poenulus were copied by generations of copyists who did not understand a single word.


4 Koehler-Baumgartner, sub voce.


6 Although it may be the opposite: for A. Sperber, « Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations », Hebrew Union College Annual 12/13 (1937-1938), p. 237, the primitive form is qitl. Bauer-Leander, p. 457r, think that the primitive form is qatil (as in Arabic, malik). In any case these considerations are irrelevant to our research. There is no doubt that the word was vocalized milk in Phoenician.
For the verbs we can proceed in the same way using the primitive forms such as grammar can reconstruct them beyond Hebrew. In this area the reconstitution of the Canaanite verbal system proposed by Meyer\(^7\) can complete the analysis made by Bauer-Leander. We will compare these forms with the data from transcriptions. But one must be careful not to project onto Phoenician texts what is problematic in Hebrew, such as the forms with waw-inversive the existence of which is highly challenged today\(^8\). Our vocalization also assumes that, unlike archaic Phoenician, standard Phoenician (which includes the inscription of Eshmunazar) has lost the final short vowel of the third person perfect: qatal instead of qatala. We also consider with Friedrich-Röllig that for the nouns with suffixes a distinction is still made between nominative/accusative (connecting vowel -a-) and genitive (connecting vowel -i-).

The sarcophagus was constructed in Egypt in black basalt and transported to Sidon to contain the body of Eshmunazar II (465-451), king of Sidon and son of king Tabnit\(^9\). It was unearthed in 1855 in a site near Sidon and offered by the Ottoman Sultan to Napoleon III. It is now located in the Louvre Museum in Paris.

The stonecutter began to write just below the head but, due to a serious mistake, he started his work again on the top of the sarcophagus (with a few errors). Originally the sarcophagus contained a hieroglyphic text that was replaced by the Phoenician inscription. The text below comes from the editions of Donner-Röllig (KAI 14) and Gibson\(^10\).

1. Text

1. \(\text{BYRH BL BŠNT 'SR W'RB' 14 LMLKY MLK 'ŠMN'ZR MLK SDNM}\)
2. \(\text{BN MLK TBNT MLK SDNM DBR MLK 'ŠMN'ZR MLK SDNM L'MR NGZLT}\)
3. \(\text{BL ʼTY BN MSK YMM ʻZR M YTM BN ʼLMT WŠKB ʼNK BHLT Z WBQBR Z}\)

---


\(^9\) For the chronology of the kings of Sidon, see J. ELAYI, « An Updated Chronology of the Reigns of Phoenician Kings during the Persian Period (539-333 BCE) », *Transphthraïne* 32 (2006), p. 11-43 (with bibliography and references to her preceedings articles).

Translation

1. In the month of Bul, in the fourteenth year of the reign of king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, 2. son of king Tabnit, king of the Sidonians, king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, said as follows: I was carried away 3. before my time, son of a limited number of short days (or: son of a limited number of days I was cut off), an orphan, the son of a widow, and I am lying in this coffin and in this tomb, 4. in a place which I have built. Whoever you are, king or (ordinary) man, may he (si!) not open
this resting-place and may he not search in it after anything because nothing whatsoever has been placed into it. And may he not move the coffin of my resting-place, nor carry me away from this resting-place to another resting-place. Also if men talk to you do not listen to their chatter. For every king and every (ordinary) man, who will open what is above this resting-place, or will lift up the coffin of my resting-place, or will carry me away from this resting-place, may they not have a resting-place with the Rephaïm, may they not be buried in a tomb, and may they not have a son or offspring after them. And may the sacred gods deliver them to a mighty king who will rule them in order to exterminate them, the king or this (ordinary) man who will open what is over this resting-place or will lift up this coffin, and (also) the offspring of this king or of those (ordinary) men. They shall not have root below or fruit above or appearance in the life under the sun. For I who deserve mercy, I was carried away before my time, son of a limited number of short days (or: son of a limited number of days I was cut off), I an orphan, the son of a widow. For I, Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, son of king Tabnit, king of the Sidonians, grandson of king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, and my mother Amo[...]astart, priestess of Ashtart, our lady, the queen, daughter of king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, (it is we) who have built the temples of the gods, [the temple of Ashtar]t in Sidon, the land of the sea. And we have placed Ashtart (in) the mighty heavens (or: in Shamem-Addirim?). And it is we who have built a temple for Eshmun, the prince of the sanctuary of the source of Ydll in the mountains, and we have placed him (in) the mighty heavens (or: in Shamem-Addirim?). And it is we who have built temples for the gods of the Sidonians in Sidon, the land of the sea, a temple for Baal of Sidon, and a temple for Ashtart, the Name of Baal. Moreover, the lord of kings gave us Dor and Joppa, the mighty lands of Dagon, which are in the Plain of Sharon, as a reward for the brilliant action I did. And we have annexed them to the boundary of the land, so that they would belong to the Sidonians for ever. Whoever you are, king or (ordinary) man, do not open what is above me and do not uncover what is above me and do not carry me away from this resting-place and do not lift up the coffin of my resting-place. Otherwise, the sacred gods will deliver them and cut off this king and those (ordinary) men and their offspring for ever.
3. Vocalization

1. biyarh bûl bišanôt 'asr we'arba' lemulkiyû milk 'èshmûn'azar milk šidônîm 2. bin milk tabnît milk šidônîm dabar milk 'èshmûn'azar milk šidônîm li'môr nagzaltî 3. bîlô 'itiya bin masok yômîm 'azzîrin yatum bin 'almat wèsèkèh 'anôkî bihallat zô wêbiqar zê 4. bimaqâm 'es baniti qennumîyîa 'atta ku mamlokât wekul 'adam 'al yiptaḥ 'iyat mishkob zê 5. we'el yebaggêš bin(n)û mînumma ka 'iya šômû bin(n)û mînumma we'al yiśśo' 'iyat ḫallat mishkobiya we'al 6. ya'musênî bîmiškob zê 'alôt mishkob šenîy âp 'im 'adômîm yedabberînÎakâ 'al tišîa' baddânom kakul mamlokât 7. wekul 'adam 'es yiptaḥ 'alôt mishkob zê 'im 'ès yiśśo' 'iyat ḫallat mishkobiya 'im 'es ya'musênî 8. bîmiškob zê 'al yakûn lôm mishkob 'ét rapa'în we'al yiqqâberî bîqabr we'al yakûnû lôm wezgar' 9. ta'bênom wêyasgirûnêm ba'âlîm hagqaddosîm 'êt mamlokût:t 'addîr 'ezîr bîl(n)ûm 10. laqišsitômîm laqasîtônêm 'iyat mamlokût 'im 'adôm hû'a 'ès yiśśo 11. 'alôt zô 'im 'adômîm humatu 'al yiptah 9. ya'musênî bimiškob zê 'al yakûn lôm mishkob 'ét rapa'în we'al yiqqâberî bîqabr we'al yakûnû lôm wezgar'.

4. Commentary

1-2. BYRH BL BŠNT 'SR W'RB' 14 LMLKY MLK 'ŠMN'ZR MLK ŠDNM BN MLK TBNT MLK ŠDNM DBR MLK 'ŠMN'ZR MLK ŠDNM L'MR (biyarh bûl bišanôt 'asr we'arba' lemulkiyû milk 'èshmûn'azar milk šidônîm bin milk tabnît milk šidônîm dabar milk 'èshmûn'azar milk šidônîm li'môr) « In the month of Bul, in the fourteenth year of the reign of king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, son of king Tabnit, king of

---

11 In this article we have reduced the vocalism to the following vowels: a/â (patah, qames), e (vocalic shewa; nothing for the silent one), ê (segol), ē (šere), i/i (hireq), o (holom; exponent for qameš ḫātuf), u/û (shureq, qibbus). We assume that the complexity of the Hebrew vocalic system (as noted by the Naqdanim of Tiberias) is absent from the Phoenician.
the Sidonians, king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, said as follows. The word *yrh* « month » is a monosyllabic qatl in Hebrew (*yèrah*), hence the vocalization *biyarh*. We assume that the prepositions have retained their original form *bî-, la-, ka-.* Bul is the eighth month of the Canaanite calendar (cf. 1 Kings 6:38: *bîyrâh bîl bîl baḥodēš baṣṣâminî*). In the indication of the year, the word is a plural here (*bîšanôt*), while in Hebrew it is usually singular (construct state) in this construction (e. g. *bīs naṭ ‘ēš ‘rim l ‘yarob’ām*, 1 Kings 15:9). In the nouns with nun as third radical, in the singular the nun is assimilated to the feminine ending -t (*šat* « year » [<*šantu*]). The cardinal number *‘sr* « ten », here written with -s, while we would expect -š, is a qatl-form, hence the vocalization *‘asr*. In the Semitic languages the numeral *‘arba‘* « four » always appears with a prosthetic alef (Ugaritic, Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, Epigraphic South-Arabic, Ethiopic; it is not written in Accadian *erbe, arba‘u*, only because Accadian has no sign to render the phonem). First spelled out in words the number is then rendered in numeric signs: 1 I I I, i.e. 10+3+1. The sequence of the chronological indications is rather unusual: we would first expect the year and then the month. With Donner-Röllig, we may interpret *lmīlky* as an infinitive construct (*mulk*) followed by a 3m. sg. pronominal suffix (proleptic as for example in Syriac) here vocalized -yû. It is more probably the substantive *mulk* « reign » (cf. Num 24:7) already present in the inscription of Ahiram. The theophoric name *‘èšmûn’azar* combines two words: the name of the god Ešmûn, god of medicine and maybe also of vegetation, which is identified with Aesclepius, and the verb *‘azar* « to help »; thus « Ešmûn has helped (me) ». Ešmûn is known in Syria from the third millennium onwards, but little is known about him.

« eight » (*šmn > šmûn) with prosthetic alef, or to šém « name », or to šamm « oil » (šêmîn in Hebrew, qatl as in Accadian, Arabic), the latter could better suit his status as a god of medicine. The vocalization šîmûn (šmûn after a vowel) is based on the following transcriptions: ls-sû-šu-na, ša-su-na, Ešmûn, Ēsûn, šamun, samun. The element ṣazar also appears in ṣaṙuβας, Azrubal where ‘azar + Ba’l « Baal has helped » has become ‘azr-Ba’l, pronounced ‘azrub’al. We could also vocalize ‘azor. There are indeed forms of the perfect in -o- and not in -a-: ναδωρ « he made vow », Ba’l-hašrû-šû « Baal released », Balîaton = Ba’l-yatôn « Baal gave ».

The element ṣazar also appears in ṣaṙuβας, Azrubal where ‘azar + Ba’l « Baal has helped » has become ‘azr-Ba’l, pronounced ‘azrub’al. We could also vocalize ‘azor. There are indeed forms of the perfect in -o- and not in -a-: ναδωρ « he made vow », Ba’l-hašrû-šû « Baal released », Balîaton = Ba’l-yatôn « Baal gave ».

The element ṣazar also appears in ṣaṙuβας, Azrubal where ‘azar + Ba’l « Baal has helped » has become ‘azr-Ba’l, pronounced ‘azrub’al. We could also vocalize ‘azor. There are indeed forms of the perfect in -o- and not in -a-: ναδωρ « he made vow », Ba’l-hašrû-šû « Baal released », Balîaton = Ba’l-yatôn « Baal gave ».

The verb dbr « to talk, to say » appears a few times in Phoenician: for example in the Poenulus as dôbér/dôbîr (qal active participle sg. and pl. = dôbîr or dôbrîm) and here. It may be either qal (dabar) or piel (dibbûr; the vocalization of the piel is confirmed by the transcription Ba’l-šulîn « Baal sent »). The Canaanite primitive form of the infinitive construct is qtol (> Hebrew q’tol). The expected form here would be la-’mor. However, two observations should be made. First the spelling lišûl (Poenulus 945/935) shows a shift from la- to li- as in Hebrew. Then the question arises: in the case of a Pe Alef verb, is the alef quiescent (as in Hebrew26) or not? In many cases there is an elision of the alef in nouns27. Presumably the same phenomenon occurs also with verbs, hence the vocalization li’môr (the form lišûl indicates moreover that the final syllable is long).

2-4. NGZLT BL ‘TY BN MSK YMM ‘ZRM YTM BN ‘LMT WS KB ‘NK BHLT Z WBQBR Z BMQM ‘S BNT (naggalti bôl’ utiyâ bin masak yômîn ’azṣîrîm yatum bin ’almat wsôkéb ’anîki bihallot zô webiqâbr zê bimaqôm ’êš bantî) « I was carried away before my time, son of a limited number of short days (or: son of a limited number of days I was cut off), an orphan, the son of a widow, and I am lying in this coffin and in this tomb, in a place which I have built ». The major part of these two lines will be repeated in lines 12-13. The verb ngzlt is a 1st sg. nifal perfect. The root gzl (attested two times in Phoenician28) means « seize by force, acquire illegitimately » (qal) and « to be snatched (i.e. from life), to be carried away by a violent death » (nifal). It is also attested in Hebrew, frequently in qal (« tear away, seize, rob »), but there is only one clear case in the nifal: Prov 4:16: « their sleep is taken away » (KJV), « they are robbed of sleep » (NAS); the case of Micah 3:2 (« who pluck off their skin » KJV, « who tear off their skin » NAS) is not clear. The vocalization naggalti is con-

21 BAUER-LEANDER, p. 456 j.
22 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 96 bis.
23 With K/1, p. 21.
24 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 78 c.
25 MEYER, § 65.
26 MEYER, § 77 1 d, § 22 3 a.
27 See examples in FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 14.
firmed by Tell-el-Amarna (EA 93,5) na-aq-ṣa-ṣa-ti = naqqapti « I was asked ». In Hebrew there has been a shift from naqqalti to nizqalti. It is not clear if this shift has also occurred in Phoenician. It is possible but not certain. In the case of doubt we have kept the na- form. In the expression bl ḫ, bl is certainly not the negation bal, which is normally used before a verb or to negate a substantive (bal ḫ « non-man »). Could it be the preposition bi- followed by the negation lô? There is a difficulty: this negation is totally unknown in Phoenician and in Punic. However, the expression has an excellent parallel in Eccles 7:17: làmmáh tāmūt belo ’ittèkha « why should you die before your time? ». Ultimately we have chosen bilô. The noun ‘itt « time » is originally a qil-type noun with a feminine ending29 *’idd, and after total regressive assimilation *’idd becomes *’itt-, ‘ittiya with the 1m. sg. suffix. The word msk appears only in this inscription (lines 3 and 13). Its meaning is still unknown. Three etymological derivations have been proposed30: from skk, from swk/śwk or from sky, roots which evoke the idea of limitation31. The context invites us to understand « limited time, limited number ». Could we have a maqtal-type noun (masok or masôk)? There is great hesitation about the analysis and meaning of ‘zm (known only by its two occurrences in this inscription)32. The word is either an adjective referring to yômîm or a verbal form. Traditionally it has been explained as an adjective meaning « short » (’azîirim if qatil, ’azîzirim if qattîl). The meaning would be « son of a limited number of short days ». Others prefer to interpret it as a verbal form of a root ‘zm unattested in Phoenician but known in Hebrew34 and Arabic35: either a 1m. sg. nifal imperfectif ‘azzarîm (*’aqqatîl > *’aqqatîl > ’aqqatîl), ’ezzarîm (the two forms in ’a- and in ’i- are attested in Hebrew), or qal imperfective 1m. sg ’azrum (’aqtul). The nifal of the verb means « to be cut, cut off », and the qal « to cease ». The meaning would be « son of a limited number of days I was cut off/I stopped (living) ». Following a suggestion made by R.S. Tomback, E. Puech36 assumes that the word means a kind of sacrifice (’azîrim or ’azîrim, qatal-type), but what is the link with the context? Lipiński divides37 the text differently: bûm sk yûm ‘zm « with the sleep of a deaf (man) I must break off the days (of life) ». He interprets nûm as an infinitive. The verb is attested in Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic,

---

29 BAUER-LEANDER, p. 450 j. The qil-type nouns do not change in Phoenician, see for example ʿazz « strength », FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 192 bis b.  
30 DNWVI, p. 664, see already K-II, p. 21.  
31 See skk I in KOEHLER-BAUMGÄRTNER, p. 712; Hebrew iākk « to make a hedge » in Job 1:10; 3:23; Syriac sôkô’ « end, limit, boundary ».  
33 These are the most attested patterns for the adjectives, cf. FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 196, 199.  
34 Only two occurrences: Ps 90:5 (qal « thou hast swept them away ») and 77:18 (poel « the clouds poured out water »).  
35 KAZIMIRSKI, I, p. 987: « interrupt, stop ».  
and Ethiopic; in Akkadian the noun munattu « morning-sleep » derives from the same root. The sleep in question here is the sleep of deafness: sk must be related to the Akkadian sakku and the Arabic asakk, both meaning « deaf ». The Hebrew equivalent of ytm « orphan » is yâtim (yâtim in Arabic), a qatul-type noun. There is no evidence on the vocalization of qatul-type nouns in Phoenician. Hypothetically we assume that they remain qatul in Phoenician, hence yatum. The word 'lmt « widow » (Hebrew 'almânâh) is attested in Akkadian as almattu, the primitive form being likely *'almantu ('almân with feminine ending). We assume for the Phoenician the following evolution: 'almantu > 'almant > 'almat(t). When 'Esmonazar presents himself as the son of a widow, he indicates that his father Tabnit was already dead when 'Esmonazar was born. The word bll « sarcophagus, coffin » occurs five time in Phoenician, and all of the occurrences are in this inscription. The meaning is clear. The word could derive from the root bll « pierce » well attested in the Semitic languages (Arabic halla, « pierce », hillat « stone sarcophagus », hallat « gap, crack »; Aramaic halâl « empty space »). We could vocalize hallot. In Hebrew gîbîr « tomb » is originally a monosyllabic qatl, accordingly we vocalize qabr. The word qwm « place » comes from a root qwm, and is a maqtal-type word: maqwam, in Phoenician *maqwom > maqôm; this vocalization is confirmed by the Punic spellings maqom (Poenulus 940A/930) and macum (Poenulus 940B). The vocalization banît (< *banâytî) may find support in the Canaanite form b[a-nî]-t[i] (EA 292, 29) despite the uncertainties.

4-5. QNMY 'T KL MMLKT WKL 'DM 'L YP'TH 'YT MŠKB Z W'L YBQ'S BN MNM K 'Y ŠM BN MNM (qenummiya 'atta kul mamlokût wekul 'adom 'al yipta 'iyat miškob zè we'al yebaqqéš bin(n)û mînumma ka 'iya śômû bin(n)û mînumma) « Whoever you are, king or (ordinary) man, may he (!) not open this resting-place and may he not search in it after anything because nothing whatsoever has been placed into it ». The first word of the sentence consists of the substantif qnm (or qn’m) and the interrogative pronoun my, the whole being an equivalent of an indefinite pronoun « whoever (you are) ». We vocalize the first word on the basis of the Syriac qûn « person ». In the interrogative pronoun the -y is not a mater lectionis, but a full consonant. Presence of this -y indicates that we have here the non-reduced form miya. In the Poenulus we find the reduced forms: mi (mi < *miy) et mû (< *mû). Assuming the assimilation of the two mem, we could vocalize qenummiya. The vocalization 'atta « you » makes no diffi-

38 BAUER-LEANDER, p. 467 p.
39 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 196 e.
40 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 214.
41 KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, sub voce hll 2 (p. 307).
42 BAUER-LEANDER, p. 458 s.
43 BAUER-LEANDER, p. 491 g.
44 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 201-202.
45 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 120.
We find an expression similar to *qenummiya 'atta* in the inscription of Tabnît (KAI 13) line 13 (*miya 'atta kul 'adom 'ēš ...*), and probably also in the inscription of Yehawmilk (KAI 10) line 11 (*qenummya 'attâ kul mamlokût wekul 'adom 'ēš ...*), but in the latter the passage is restored on the basis of our inscription. The word *kl* is a qull-type word (> *kol* in Hebrew).

We would expect the vocalization *kul* (as in other Semitic languages), but the attested forms in Punic (*Poenusulus* 935, 945) are *cil*, *cel*, *chil*, *chyl*. We will keep the vocalization *kul(l)* assuming a particular development for Punic.

In Hebrew *mamlâkâh* and *mamlâkût* « kingdom, reign, dominion » are maqtal-type words; this pattern becomes maqtol in Phoenician, hence with the abstract ending *mamlokût*. The abstract form « kingdom » is used here for « king ».

The word *'dm* (*'âdâm* in Hebrew) is a qatal-type word that becomes qatol in Phoenician, the vocalization is confirmed by the Punic form *adom*.

The prohibitive consists of the negation *'al* followed by the jussive form *yiptah* (yaqtul with vowel -a- before the pharyngeal, then shift from ya- to yi- according to the Barth-Ginzberg law) from *patah* « open ». We observe a change in person: from the second (*'atta*) to the third person (*yiptah*). In Phoenician the nota accusativi is attested with two spellings: *'yt* and *'t* (Standard Phoenician and Punic). The first occurrence of the spelling *'yt* is found in the funeral inscription of Cyprus (KAI 30, lines 3 et 6) towards the end of the ninth century. In *'yt* the *y* is not a mater lectionis but a full consonant. Given the situation in Aramaic where the word is pronounced *yât*, we can propose *'iyat* as primitive vocalization.

But how can we explain the later forms: *'ît* in Standard Phoenician, and *et*, *yth* in Punic (*Poenusulus* 940B, 945, 940A/930, 932, 935, 936, with variants)? The development is probably similar to what happened to *kul(l)* « all ». We see that there has been a weakening of *kul* to *kil* or *kil* (*Poenusulus* 945/935: *cil*, *cel*, *chil*, *chyl*). In the case of the nota accusativi there would have been a shift from *'iyat* to *'ît*, and thence (similarly to what happened to *kul*) to *'êt* or *'ît*. In Hebrew *miškâb* is a miqtal-type form « place of lying, couch ». The verb *bgš*
"search" is used in the piel in Hebrew. We could reasonably assume that it is also used in the intensive form in Phoenician, hence the vocalization yeḥaggēš (there is only one occurrence in Phoenician). The preposition bi- is followed by the 3rd m. sg. suffix -hû: *binhû > binû or binnû.

The indefinite pronoun mnm (attested five times in Phoenician and Punic) corresponds to the Ugaritic mnm and Akkadian minnumma or minumma « whatever ». We may maintain the vocalization minumma. We assume that the conjunction ka has kept the primitive vowel –a (in Punic, due to a particular development, ka became ke [see e and chy in Poenulus 935]). The negation 'î is attested elsewhere in the Semitic languages: it is frequent in Ethiopic, rare in Biblical Hebrew (‘î-nâqi « non-innocent » in Job 22:30 hapax), but common in Mishnaic and Modern Hebrew (‘î-éphšâr « impossible », ‘î-sèder « disorder », etc.). Since the matres lectionis are still unknown, we vocalize ‘iya here. In śômû (from śwm or śym; *śawamû and *śayamû > śômû) « they put », š represents ś (also in nš' four words below). The expression ‘î mînumma means « nothing ».

5-6. 'P 'M 'DMM YDBRNK 'L TŠM' BDNM ('up 'im 'adomîm yedabberînakâ 'al tiśma' baddanôm) « Also if men talk to you do not

---

60 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 254 I a; GIBSON, TS2I, p. 110. In note 5 Friedrich-Röllig say: "The prepositions b- and tht before suffixes are lengthened with -n; see Hebrew tahbînîy « beneath me » in 2 Sam 22:37.40.48 and tahbînîh « in her place » in Gen 2:21. There is still no explanation for this phenomenon ».

61 DNWSI, p. 661.

62 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 167 and 46b.

63 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 170, 172.

64 DNWSI, p. 872. The verb is also attested in Hebrew (nine times: seven in the qal and two in the hifil) with the meaning « carry a load, load (upon ass) ». It is not necessary to assume with GIBSON, TS2I, p. 110, that the verb is used here in the piel. His hypothesis is based on Ugaritic where we find the piel participle (m’mi), see J. TROPPER, Ugaritische Grammatik (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 273), Münster, 2000, p. 554 and 563.

65 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 244.
listen to their chatter». With the words 'ap 'îm a new conditional proposition begins. The conjunction 'ap is frequent in Hebrew, and also in Phoenician (Archaic, Standard, Punic, and Neo-
punic), on the other hand the synonym gam (Hebrew, Moabite, Sam'alian) is absent from Phoenician. The verbal form ydbrnk (from dibbér « to talk » piel as in Hebrew) consists of the 3 pl. long imperfect followed by the 2m. sg. suffix. The long imperfect (with a present-future meaning) is identifiable by the ending -ûn. Assuming that the connecting vowel before a suffix is -a- (see the form ti-mi-tu-na-nu = timitiçani « you have killed us [literally « you have made us die »] » in El-Amarna), we could vocalize yadabberûnakâ « they (will) talk to you ». The construction dibbér with an objective suffix for the person is rare in Hebrew. Usually the verb is used with a preposition (‘îl, l’, ‘ît, ‘îm or b’). It seems that Gen 37:4 (« they hated him and could not speak to him [dabbrro] on friendly terms ») is the only one example of the use of a suffix for the person with this verb. For ‘al tišma’, « do not listen », we can compare ‘al yiptah (line 4, but here in the 2d m. sg.). bdnm is generally explained as the substantive bd with 3rd m. pl. suffix. The suffix should be read -nôm, more precisely here -anôm with the connecting vowel -a- for the accusative. The vocalization of the suffix is known via the transcription labunom = la-‘abûnôm « for their father ». The presence of the nun before the suffix -ôm (« *Vhum ») is still largely unexplained. The word bad « idle talk » is known in Hebrew, see Isa 16:6 and Jer 48:30 (« his idle boasts »); Job 11:3 (« boasts »); 41:4 (« his limbs ») (add conjectures for some other passages). It is also attested in Syriac bdô (« to contrive, to chatter »), bdyô (« nonsense, invention »). We could vocalize baddanôm, with reduplication of the second consonant before a suffix as in Hebrew. Others have proposed to correct the text, and to read either dbrnm (dabor « speak ») or bdbrnm. This is not necessary, especially as concerns the second proposition since after tišma’ the preposition bi- (that would give the word the meaning « obey », as in Hebrew) is not suitable to the context.

6-9. KKL MMLKT WKL 'DM 'S YPTH 'LT MŠKB Z 'M 'S YŠ' 'YT HT P MŠKB BY 'M 'S YMSN BMŠKB Z 'L YKN LM MŠKB 'T RP'M W'L YQBR BQBR W'L YKN LM BN WZR' THTNM (kakul mamlokût wekul 'adom 'éš yiptah 'alot miškob zè 'im 'èš yifath 'iyat halič miškob 'èš yiptah 'et rapa'îm we'al yiqqaberû biqabr we'al

---

66 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 257 b.
67 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 135 a.
68 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 188.
69 KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, p. 202, which also refers to our inscription.
70 FRIEDRICH-ROLLIG, § 29 c, § 112 (and note 2), § 234 (p. 156).
72 KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, p. 105.
73 For example Cook, Donner-Röllig, Segert, Bron, Puech, all the references are in DNWSI, s. v. bd 3.
For every king and every (ordinary) man, who will open what is above this resting-place, or will lift up the coffin of my resting-place, or will carry me away from this resting-place, may they not have a resting-place with the Rephaim, may they not be buried in a tomb, and may they not have a son or offspring after them. Compared to the preceding lines, only a few words are original here. The particle 'îm, in 'îm 'îš (also line 10), has lost its original meaning «if»; here it means « or » 74. We vocalize the preposition with the suffix as lôm (< *lāhum). The common translation for Hebrew rēpha'îm (always plural) is « shadows, spirits of the dead ». The etymology is nevertheless disputed: either from rapa'a « to cure, to heal » or more probably from rapha « to be weak » 75. The word is also used in Ugaritic (either the god rāpi'u « the healer » ou rapha'um [doubtful vocalization] « spirit of the dead »). We could vocalize here rapha'îm. At the end of the inscription of Tabnît (KAI 13, lin. 7-8) we find a similar curse: 'al yakûn lakâ zar' babayyim taḥt šamîš wemîskob 'ît rapha'îm « may there be for you no descendants in the life under the sun or resting-place with the Raphaîm ». Here the verb yiqqâberû is a 3rd m. pl. nifal imperfective « they will be buried ». We put the verb yakûnû in the plural, although the singular could be justified since the two following subjects may be considered as collectives. For the connecting vowel between ταχτ (qatal-type as in Hebrew, Arabic) and the suffix -nôm, we choose the vowel of the construct state plural -é as in Hebrew, hence: taḥtēnôm « beneath/after them ».

9-12. WYSGRN M H'LN M HQDŠM T MMLKT< T> 'DR Š MŠL BNM LQSTNM 'YT MMLKT 'M 'DM H 'Š YPTH 'LT MŠKB Z 'M 'Š YŠ 'YT HLT Z W'YT ZR' MML<K>T H 'M 'DMM HMT 'L YKN LM ŠRŠ LMT WPR LM'L W'TR BHYM THT ŠMŠ (weysgrînôm hâ'ulûnim baqâdûnîm hâsâmîkatû<n> 'addûr 'îš môšîl bin(n)ûm laqîshûnîm/ laqâsîthûnîm 'îyat mamlokût 'im 'adom bû'a 'ès yiptâh 'alô mîskob zê 'îm 'îš yiššô 'îyat hâ'îlût zê we'yiptâh zê mamîlo< kût>D bû'a 'im 'adûnim hâ'âmût 'al yakûnû lôm šurš lamâtû we pari lama'tû wêtû'r babayyîm taḥt šamîš) « And may the sacred gods deliver them to a mighty king who will rule them in order to exterminate them, the king or this (ordinary) man who will open what is over this resting-place or will lift up this coffin, and (also) the offspring of this king or of those (ordinary) men. They shall not have root below or fruit above or appearance in the life under the sun ». We must be careful not to interpret the form weysgrnm as a consecutive imperfect (wayyiqtol after prohibitive forms as in Hebrew): it is merely a coordinated jussive with the 3m. pl. suffix, the waw having no energetic function. The verb sagar is attested twice in Phoenician (here and again in line 21). We may hesitate between a yifil or a piel. Both are attested in Hebrew for this verb. However, the hifil is more frequently

74 DNWSI, p. 69 (under B 1).
75 See the discussion in KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, p. 1188-1189.
used. So we could vocalize yasgirûnôm (yifil)\textsuperscript{76} or yesaggerûnôm (piel). The meaning is « to deliver (to someone’s power) ». The preposition ‘ît therefore means « to »; it is not the \textit{nota accusativi} (always written ‘yt in this inscription). Note that in the expression bâ’dalônîm baqqadašîm « the sacred gods », the two words carry the article, unlike the second occurrence of the expression in line 21 where only the adjective has the article. The vocalization ‘alônîm is based on the form alônîm found in Poenulus 940/930. For the article we assume a compensatory lengthening (ba- > bâ-), regular in Hebrew before alef. The adjective qâš « sacred, holy » is a qatul-type adjective. We have no example of what this type becomes in Phoenician, but we could consider, by analogy with the qill-type, that it remains identical, hence baqqadašîm (with reduplication of the first consonant after the article as in Hebrew). The adjective ‘addîr « powerful » is a qattîl-type adjective, which remains identical in Phoenician as we can see from the following names: Abaddrî (< ‘ab-‘addîr), Balidîdir (< ba’l-‘addîr), Aderbal (< ‘addîr ba’l) or Kusad(d)îr (toponym)\textsuperscript{78}. It has here a masculine form because, despite its feminine form, the word mmlkt means « king » and not « kingdom ». Gibson\textsuperscript{79} thinks that the powerful king here in question could be a euphemism for the « king of the death ». The verb mîl II « dominate, rule » (mîl I « compare » is not appropriate in the context) is well attested in Hebrew in the qal and in the hifil. But the tense is problematic: we expect to find an imperfect form: « a powerful king who will rule over them ». Instead of that, we find what could be a perfect form mašâš. Gibson\textsuperscript{80} analyzes it as a prophetical perfect (known in Hebrew). This interpretation does not fit the context: we can hardly qualify the context as prophetic. The « prophetical perfect is not a special grammatical perfect, but a rhetorical device », as underlined by Joüon\textsuperscript{81}. We could add: a rhetorical device in a prophetic context.

It is better to understand the form as a participle with a future meaning, and to vocalize màšèl\textsuperscript{82}. Known in Hebrew the word « end » appears in three forms: qés, qâshê, and qâsâb. Words of the qill-type\textsuperscript{83} remain qill, the feminine form of which is qillot, hence qissot, and with the 3m. pl. suffix laqisotônôm (with the connecting vowel -i- of the genitive\textsuperscript{84}) « for their end », i.e. « so they die ». It could also be a verb, in this case an infinitive construct of qîš with

\textsuperscript{76} FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 190 7 a, see also KAI, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{77} BAUER-LEANDER, p. 467 p.
\textsuperscript{78} FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 199.
\textsuperscript{79} TSSI, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{80} TSSI, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{82} For DNWSI, p. 702, it is also a participle. On the temporal sphere of the participle in Phoenician (present or future, the context always guides the interpretation), see FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 271. « The use of the participle to express the near future and the future in general is an extension of the use of the participle as present », JOÜON-MURAOKA, § 125 e.
\textsuperscript{83} BAUER-LEANDER, p. 454 d.
\textsuperscript{84} With GIBSON, T33I, p. 111, but piel for KAI, p. 22, DNWSI, p. 1022, and FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 233.
an objective suffix « to kill them »: either qal (laqṣūtinōm) or piel (laqṣūtinōm), both forms being used in Hebrew. The independent 3rd m. pl. personal pronoun appears as humatū. The substantive šārī « root » is a monosyllabic qutl in Hebrew, which remains identical in Phoenician, hence šārī. We may find a confirmation of this in the Greek spelling σωζείς/σωζείς (Dioscorides II, 163). The two adverbs lmt and lml correspond to each other: « above » and « below ». The Hebrew cognates are lemat and lema’lah, two words of the maqtal form. Maqtal becomes maqtol in Phoenician as has already been seen (see mamlokût above). The first form is constructed from the root nṭh « to stretch out, to spread out, to extend » and the second on the root ‘lh « to go up, to ascend ». We could vocalize lamat and lama’lô respectively. The substantive pr (p’riy in Hebrew) « fruit » is a monosyllabic noun (in Hebrew there has been an assimilation of the vowel to the yod, hence *pary > *piry > *piry > p’riy). How can we vocalize the word in Phoenician? Probably parī, since qatl-type words remain identical. Neither the etymology nor the formation is clear for the Hebrew word tô’ar « appearance, form ». Koehler-Baumgartner proposes, after reference to Bauer-Leander, a qutl formation, which could produce tu’r in Phoenician. The expression bahayyīm tēḥt šamī already occurs in the inscription of Tabnît (KAI 13), lines 7-8. We vocalize hym as in Hebrew, assuming a similar reduplication of the yod: bahayyīm « life »; with the article, bahayyīm (virtual reduplication as in Hebrew), hence here bahayyīm. The expression tēḥt šamī (tēḥt šamī, two qatl-type words; it can be observed that there is no article before šamī) is frequent in Ecclesiastes (1:9: ‘ēn kol-hâdâš tēḥt haššâmèš [pausal form] « there is nothing new under the sun »). What does the expression « appearance in the life under the sun » mean? Probably: « to have fame, good name or dignity »92. See e contrario Isa 53:2: « For he grew up before him like a tender shoot, and like a root out of parched ground, he has no stately form or majesty that we should look upon him, nor appearance that we should be attracted to him »93.

12-13. K ’NK NHN NGZLT BL ’TY BN MSK YMM ’ZRM YTM BN ’LMT ’NK (ka ‘anākkī nābān nagzalti hilô ‘ittiya bi’n masok yōmîm ’azzārim yatum bi’n almat ‘anôkî) « For I who deserve mercy, I was carried away before my time, son of a limited

85 In Phoenician the infinitive construct has a feminine ending as in Hebrew, see the Punic transcription caneth = qanôt (-ō- becomes -é- in Punic); cf. Friedrich-Röllig, § 178 a.
86 Friedrich-Röllig, § 111. The form is reconstructed on the basis of the comparative grammar of Semitic languages.
87 Bauer-Leander, p. 460 h.
88 See Bauer-Leander, p. 490 b and 492 o. The final -āh in Hebrew is a vestige of an ancient accusative, see Bauer-Leander, p. 527 r.
89 Bauer-Leander, p. 577 h.
90 Koehler-Baumgartner, p. 1545 (there are several other propositions), cf. Bauer-Leander, p. 460 h.
91 See our article cited in note 1.
92 And not simply « beauty », as in Jer 11:16; Isa 52:14.
93 Cited by Gibson, TTSI, p. 111.
number of short days (or: son of a limited number of days I was cut off), I an orphan, the son of a widow». There is only one new element compared with lines 2-3: nh, which comes from the geminate verb bn « to shew favour, to be gracious » (qal), « be pitied » (nifal) (attested twice in Phoenician: here and in a Punic text\(^9\)). The only possible form here is the nifal participle the corresponding form of which in Hebrew would be nähän (unattested as such in the MT) « deserving compassion, mercy ». We propose to follow the Hebrew vocalization.

13-16. K 'NK 'ŠMN'ZR MLK ŠDNM BN MLK TBNT MLK ŠDNM BN BN MLK 'ŠMN'ZR MLK ŠDNM W'MY 'M'STRT KHNT 'ŠTRT RBTN HMLKT BT MLK 'ŠMN'ZR MLK ŠDNM '[isión'IM BN 'YT BT 'LN'N 'YT 'BN 'STR'T BSĐN 'RŠ YM (ka 'anóki 'èšmûn'azar milk 'sidônîm bin milk tabnît milk 'sidônîm bin bin milk 'èšmûn'azar milk 'sidônîm we'ammaya 'amo'aštart kôbant 'aštart rabbotanî bammîlîk ot bat milk 'èšmûn'azar milk 'sidônîm '[isión'IM banînî 'iyat 'alonîm 'iyat <bit 'aštâr>t bîšdîn 'ars yim) « For I, Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, son of king Tabnit, king of the Sidonians, grandson of king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, and my mother Amo[t]astar, priestess of Ashtart, our lady, the queen, daughter of king Eshmunazar, king of the Sidonians, (it is we) who have built the temples of the gods, [the temple of Ashtar]t in Sidon, the land of the sea ». We vocalize 'ammaya « my mother » with the connectig vowel -a- for the nominative (subject of bn). The personal name 'm'strt means « my mother is Astart » if we vocalize 'amî'aštart, but many believe that the stonecutter has made a mistake here and has forgotten the letter -t after the mem. The name should be read 'm'tstrt = 'amot'aštart « maid of Astart ». The word 'amot « maid » is indeed used to construct several names well attested in Phoenician such as A-ma-tî-ba-al, 'Amat(GEMÈ)-as-ta-ar-tî, Amobal, Amobbal, Amotmicar\(^95\). But the aphaeresis\(^96\) of the -t is also attested in theophoric names with 'èšmûn such as 'm'smn and 'mśmn. In conclusion the two explanations are possible. 'Amot'aštart is said to be a daughter of 'Eshmunazar I; she is therefore half-sister of Tabnit. No doubt she was regent during the childhood of 'Eshmunazar II. This is confirmed by the fact that she was associated with major projects, as stated just below in the inscription. She was like the biblical gebîrâh (Athaliah for example). She bears the title of priestess of Astart: kôbant. The vocalization kôbant (qôtalt for the feminine participle) relies on the spelling kbt attested in Archaic Phoenician\(^97\). This form could only be explained as the result of a total regressive assimilation of the nun before the feminine ending -t-. This assimilation would not have happened if the nun had carried a vowel, as in a Hebrew qôtèlèt-form.

---

\(^9\) DNWSI, p. 389. We leave aside all the emendations proposed for our text.

\(^95\) FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 240 6 (with references).

\(^96\) In the case of Amobbal, it is rather an assimilation (tb > bb) than an aphaeresis of the tav.

\(^97\) FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 198 b.
'Amot'aštart is also presented as rbtn hmlkt, rabbotanû hannya₂₃kot « our lady the queen » (just as the queen-mother, the gebirāh). We vocalize rabbotanû with the connecting vowel -a- (a nominative)\(^{98}\) as suggested by the Greek transcription ρυβαθων (rabbatōn < rabbatā-nû\(^{99}\)). The vocalization bat « daughter » is warranted by the Neo-Punic spelling b’t where the ’āïn represents the vowel -a-. The word ’m is obviously an error made by the stonecutter for ’š, the relative pronoun (’ēš); all the commentators agree on this\(^{101}\). The verb banînû (from bnh) is a 1st pl. perfect qal « we have (re)built ». The word bt « house, temple » must be a plural here since several buildings are mentioned below, hence bît (but bâṭ in Hebrew). The vocalization bît (or bêt) is confirmed by the transcription Bi-ti-rum-me (Bît-rōm)\(^{102}\). What was the size of these buildings? Certainly not large constructions, but more probably little sanctuaries\(^{103}\). The city of Sidon is called ’rs[yim « land of the sea » (’ary yim). In Hebrew ’ry is a qatl-type monosyllabic noun, hence ’arṣ. Since the word yam « sea » is a qall-type noun, we would expect a similar vocalization in Phoenician. However the transcriptions\(^{104}\) lead us in another direction. The names As-du-di-im-μu (Ashdod), In-im-me « spring of the sea », Qar-ti-me « city of the sea », Da-la-im-me « gate of the sea », Incite us to vocalize yim.

16-18. WYSR’N ’YT ’STRT ŠMM ’DRM WNHN ’Š BNN BT LŠMN [S]JR QDŠ ’NYDLL BHR WYSBNY ŠMM ’DRM WNHN ’Š BNN BTM L’LN ŠDNM BŠDN ’RS YM BT LB’T. ŠDN WBT ’LSTRT ŠM B’L (wéyōšibnû ’yat ’aštart šanêm ’adderim we’anahšnu ’ēš baninû bît la’èšmûn <śa>r qudš ’în ydll bihar wéyōšibnûyû šanêm ’adderim we’anahšnu ’ēš baninû bêtîm la’alone šidônûm bîsidôn ’ars yim bît laba’l sidôn webît la’aštart šim ba’l) « And we have placed Ashtart (in) the mighty heavens (or: in Shämem-Addîrim’). And it is we who have built a temple for Eshmun, the prince of the sanctuary of the source of Ydll in the mountains, and we have placed him (in) the mighty heavens (or: in Shämem-Addîrim’). And it is we who have built temples for the gods of the Sidonians in Sidon, the land of the sea, a temple for Baal of Sidon, and a temple for Ashtart, the Name of Baal ». Everyone agrees in considering that the stonecutter has made an error: he has written wysrn instead of wysbn (there is just a small difference between the two letters), as shown by the repetition of the verb in line 17. The verbal form is a 1st pl. coordinate yifil perfect of yašeb « to dwell, to sit »: wéyōšibnû « and we have placed » wēyōšib

\(^{98}\) FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 233. On the other hand GIBSON, TSSI, p. 66, who relies on the Greek transcription, prefers to vocalize rabbatōn(û).

\(^{99}\) We assume the following development: -*šnu > -*šn > -*šn. For ρυβαθων, see FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 93; 97; 233; 237; 240 17b. Despite the spelling rabbatōn, we maintain the feminine ending rabbot, hence rabbotanû.

\(^{100}\) FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 107 3 (many examples are given).

\(^{101}\) See K-M, p. 22, and DNWSI, p. 1090 (lin. 6-7).

\(^{102}\) FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 241 11.

\(^{103}\) GIBSON, TSSI, p. 112.

\(^{104}\) FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 192 bis.
< *yawšib < *yahawšib). We have to supply the preposition bi- before šamèm ‘addîrîm « in the mighty heavens » (unless it is a proper name: Shamem-Addîrîm?). The transcriptions Σαμημ-ρουμος (= šamêm-rômîm) « exalted heavens », Ba-al-sa-me-me, Balsamem (Poenulus, 1027A)\(^{105}\) indicate that the plural was pronounced šamèm < *šamâîm (after reduction of the diphthong). For ‘addîrim, see above. The restitution š[r] is not unanimously accepted\(^{106}\). The word šar (here written with ʃ) means « prince », as in Hebrew. It is a qall-type word (see for example šarru « king » in Akkadian)\(^{107}\), and remains identical in Phoenician. Also monosyllabic, but in the qutl form, qdt « sanctuary » is to be vocalized qudš. After reduction of the diphthong -ay\(^{108}\), ‘n « eye », here, « spring » must be read ‘ên or ‘în, as shown by In-im-me « spring of the sea » (see above). In order to vocalize the word hr « mountain », we can rely on the transcription Ha-ru-sa-pu-uu (« Mountain of the North »)\(^{109}\), hence har. The spring of Ydll occurs again in the inscription of Baalshillem\(^{110}\) (but spelled Ydl there). Here it is located in the mountain, i.e. in the highest part of the city far from the shore. According to Gibson\(^{111}\) the title of 'Ešmûn here « prince of the sanctuary of the spring of Ydll in the mountain » recalls the title borne by senior officials in 1 Chron 24:5 « officers of God ». There is however something odd about saying that a god is prince of a sanctuary as if he was his own officiant and official. Eshmunazar and his mother have installed 'Ešmûn in the mighty heavens (maybe a toponym, see above): weyôšibnûyû\(^{112}\) « and we have placed him ». The primitive form of the word šm « name » (here in the construct state) is šim\(^{113}\). As noted by Donner-Röllig\(^{114}\), the expression « Ashtart, the Name of Baal » occurs also in Ugaritic: 'ttr šm b'[y].

18-20. W'D YTN LN 'DN MLKM 'YT D'R WYPY 'RST DGN H'DRT 'S BŠD ŠRN LMDT ŠMT 'S PI'T WYSPNNM 'LT GBL 'RŠ LKNNM LŚDNM L'T[M] (we'ôd yatan lanû 'adôn mîkmîm 'yat du'r weyapay 'arsôt dagonôn hâ'addîrît 'êš bišadê šarôn lamiddot 'asîmôt 'êš pa'altî weyasapnîm 'alât gubûl(ê) 'ars lakûninêm lassîdîônîm la'ôol<ê>m>) « Moreover, the lord of kings gave us Dor and Joppa, the mighty lands of Dagon, which are in the plain of Sharon, as a reward for the brilliant action I did. And we have annexed them to the boundary of the land, so that they...
would belong to the Sidonians for ever». The adverb ‘ôd « still, even, yet » (in Hebrew ‘ôd) is originally a qâl-type substantive; -ô- becoming -ô- in Phoenician, we vocalize ‘ôd. In Punic the word ‘dn « lord » appears with the spelling donni (=’adôn ‘my lord » Poenulus, 998). We therefore vocalize ‘adôn, and this vocalization is confirmed by the development of a qatâl-type word in Phoenician. The lord of the kings can only be the Persian king. In Akkadian, the name of Dor is du-u'-ru, which leads us to a vocalization du'r. In the cuneiform documents Jaffa/Joppe is known with the following spellings: yapû, yâpu, yppû. How can one vocalize the Phoenician form with a final yod? We could start from yppû < *yappayu, hence yappay. According to Gibson, the cities of Dor and Jaffa were given to the Phoenician king by Artaxerxes I (465-424) as a reward for his naval help during the wars against the Greeks (the Median wars). The two cities are qualified as ‘arsôt dagôn ha'addirôt. The divine name Dagon (in Babylonian Dagana or Daguna) is mentioned several times in the Old Testament as Dagôn, god of the Philistines, god of Gaza (Judg 16:23) or Ashdod (1 Sam 5:1-7; cf. 1 Chron 10:10). The expression « mighty lands of Dagon » echoes the fertility of the soil in the coastal area. Regarding the etymology of Dagon, two solutions are possible. Either a proximity with the Hebrew dâgôn « corn, grain »: Dagan would be a vegetation-god (that is precisely what Philo says: ὁς ἐστι Σίτων). Or, less probably, a proximity with the plural of dâg « fish »: Dagan would be a fish-god.

The word śd (written here with š) « plain » is well known from Hebrew (śâday, commonly śâdèh). It is a qatl-type word: *

śady has become śadé, as indicated by the transcription σαδε in Dioscorides (I, 97; III, 96). The fertile Plain of Sharon spreads out between Jaffa and the Carmel. The gift of the Persian king was so appreciated by Eshmunazar that he considers it worth mentioning in his inscription. In mdít we can recognize the feminine substantive mdh « measure » (construct state). The Hebrew cognate is middâh « measure », and not middéy (<> min + day « sufficient measure ») as suggested by Friedrich-Röllig. It is a qill-type word, which re-

---

115 KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, p. 752 refers to BAUER-LEANDER, p. 451 n.

116 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 79 a.

117 BAUER-LEANDER, p. 469 f.

118 KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, p. 405.

119 GIBSON, TSSI, p. 113. An example is given by Pseudo-Scylax: Tyr would have obtained coastal cities in similar circumstances, cf. M. AVI-YONAH, The Holy Land from the Persian to the Arab Conquest, Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1966, p. 278s.

120 Cf. KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, p. 205.

121 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 195 e; cf. BAUER-LEANDER, p. 502 d (« the -ay is certainly part of the root », but there is no certainty, cf. KOEHLER-BAUMGARTNER, p. 1218-1219).

122 See Cant 2:1: « I am the rose of Sharon, the lily of the valleys ».

123 DNWFIII, p. 595-596 (which mentions the hypothesis of Lipiński followed by others: the word could mean « tribute »).

124 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 252 (the form should have been mdýt, since day comes from day).
mains identical in Phoenician, thus with the feminine ending 
middot, and in the context lamiddot « in proportion to, as reward
for ». Hebrew attests an adjective ‘asîm « mighty », which is a
qatûl-type adjective125. Words of this type remain identical in
Phoenician, as we know from the name Ba-(‘a)-al-ha-nu-nu (Ba’l +
banûn « Baal is merciful »)126, hence ‘asîmot (feminine singular). In
the context it is an adjectival noun: « mighty deed, brilliant ac-
tion ». In Hebrew the verb yâsap is either qal or hifil always with
the meaning « to add ». Two vocalizations are therefore possible:
veyasaṣpînînîm (1st pl. qal with the suffix -nîm), or veyâṣpînînîm (yifil, see
veyâṣîbînîyû above). According to the grammar the suffix must
be feminine (-nîm) since the names of cities are feminine, but
there are many exceptions (the suffix -nôm would have also have
been justifiable). Note the change in persons: « I did ... we have
annexed ». The vocalization gubûl « border, territory » is based on
the Punic gubûnim (Poenulus 938). If in Punic the original ū (gubûl is
a qutûl-type word) is still attested, the chances are that it remained
throughout the development of the Phoenician language127. Here
we have either a singular (gubûl) or a plural (gubûlê) construct state.
In lknûn the verb kûn « to be » is an infinitive construct qal with
the feminine suffixe -nîm « so that they are », hence lâkûninîm
(with the connecting vowel -i)128. The word ’lm « eternity » is a
qâtal-type word (as indicated by Hebrew129) which became qûtol
in Phoenician130.

’LTY WŁ. Y’R ‘LTY WŁ. Y’MSN BMŠKB Z WŁ YŚ’ YT
HLT MŠKBY (qetnûnû ‘atta kul mamlokût wekul ’adam ’al
yiptah ’alîhya we’al ya’ar ’alîhya we’al ya’nnûsîn bimiskob zê we’al yiśšo’
’gyat halît mitkobiya) « Whoever you are, king or (ordinary)
man, do not open what is above me and do not uncover what is above
me and do not carry me away from this resting-place and do not
lift up the coffin of my resting-place ». This is mainly a doublet of
lines 4-6. Only the verb ’y ‘ to denude, to uncover » is new. This
verb, here a piel imperfect (jussive) to be vocalized ya’ar31
(*yugalliyu > *yugally > *yagalîy > *yagalîh > yagal for the
apocopated form > yagal [since a word does not end with a dou-
ble consonant]), occurs only here in Phoenician.

21-22. LM YSGRNM ‘LN M HQDŠM ‘L WYQSN
HMMLKT H’ WH’DMM HMT WZR’M L’LM (lamâ
yasgirûm ’alônîm haqqdošîm ‘illê wyeqasînûa bammamlokût bi’a
wehî’adonîn bunnût weyârûm la’ôlom) « Otherwise, the sacred gods
will deliver them and cut off this king and those (ordinary)
men and their offspring for ever ». The conjunction lamâ consisting of

125 BAUER-LEANDER, p. 471 u.
126 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 197 c.
127 So also K/Al, p. 23.
128 FRIEDRICH-RÖLLIG, § 190 8, cf. § 233.
130 FRIEDRICH- RÖLLIG, § 198.
the preposition *la*- and the interrogative pronoun for things -*mâ*, means strictly speaking « why », but here « so that ... not, otherwise ». Compared to line 9, in *alônîm haqqadošîm* *îllê* only the adjective carries the article (the noun is sufficiently determined by the demonstrative pronoun). The vocalization of the demonstrative pronoun plural *îllê* (< *îlay*) is based on the Punic transcriptions *illî, ily* (Poenusus 938) showing that it consists of two syllabes as in Hebrew.\textsuperscript{132} Coordinated to the preceding verb, *yqsh* is an imperfective piel of *qsh* « to cut off ». Others propose to analyze it as a qal imperfect meaning « to perish ». Hebrew uses the piel of *qsh* (the qal occurs in Hab 2:10, but the meaning is not clear\textsuperscript{133}).

We choose therefore a piel form: *yeqasûna* (< *yaqasûna* < *yaqasîyûna*).\textsuperscript{134} The ending -*ûna* is characteristic of the long imperfect *yaqtulûna*.

5. Syntactic observations

Throughout the inscription we have noticed changes of persons: from the second to the third (lines 4-5), from the first singular to the first plural (line 19). In the indication of year, the word « year » is a plural while in Hebrew it is usually singular. We can note the indefinite pronouns: *qenummiya* « whoever » and *mînumma* « whatever ». The expression « they placed nothing » equals « nothing is placed » (line 5). We also note the peculiar use of the following words: *bi* - meaning « far from » (line 6), *dibbêr* with an objective suffix for the person (line 7), *îm* meaning « or » (lines 7 and 10), *lamâ* « why » meaning « so that ... not, otherwise » (line 21). The article is sometimes present sometimes absent in the expression « the sacred gods » (lines 9 and 21). The participle may express the future (*môšêl* line 9, [not a prophetic perfect!]).

\textsuperscript{132} Friedrich-Röllig, § 113 and 116.
\textsuperscript{133} See Koehler-Baumgartner, p. 1046.
\textsuperscript{134} K-A, p. 23; Friedrich-Röllig, § 63 b; 135 a; 174; 177 b.