

SCRIPTA SIGNA VOCIS

Studies about
Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes and Languages
in the Near East,
presented to

J. H. HOSPERS

by his pupils, colleagues and friends.

Edited by

*H. L. J. Vanstiphout, K. Jongeling,
F. Leembuis and G. J. Reinink*

Egbert Forsten Groningen 1986

K and variants in Punic

K. Jongeling, Leiden

J. Friedrich and W. Röllig in their grammar of Phoenician and Punic give a short discussion on the use of original consonant signs to denote vowels in later Punic¹⁾. After the treatment of the supposed two different systems of vowel notation²⁾, the authors conclude this section with the following remark:

"Sonstige seltener vorkommende Schreibungen scheinen einfach aus der völligen Unsicherheit über die Verwendung der Zeichen für die verstummtten Laryngale erklärbar, z.B. *HDN* für **'adōn* "Herr" Np 3, 1, *PN^c B^cL* für **panē Ba^cal* "Angesicht des Ba^cal" 992, 1. 1834, 2. 2005, 1. 2992, 1. 3363, 1f., KAI 97, 1, *Š'ŠM* für **ššīm* "sechzig" Np 123, 2, *QLH* für **qūlō* "seine Stimme" Eph. 1, 41 oben 3, *K'* 2595, 6. 3390, 3 usw., *K^c* Np 7, 1. 8, 1 usw., *KH* Np 36, 5. 112, 4 und *KH* JA 1917/2, 37 b, 4 für **kī* "denn" usw. Vgl. ferner in lat. Wörtern: *^cKSNDR^c* "exedra" KAI 129, 2, *YHLY^c* "Julia" KAI 122, 1, *NPTHN* "Nyptan" KAI 140, 1 und *Q W^cR T H* "Quarta" ebd."³⁾.

This remark calls for some close scrutiny, the more so since not all the examples are equally felicitous. One might ask why the Berber name Nyptan is mentioned as a Latin word⁴⁾. Also, would it not have been more appropriate to transscribe *HDN* as **adūn*, since the loss of ' in pronunciation is discussed by the authors in an earlier section of their grammar⁵⁾, where the first syllable of *LDN* for historical *L'DN* is correctly represented by **la-*, and the development /ō/>/ū/ has also been mentioned earlier⁶⁾? Perhaps it would even have been preferable to transcribe *LHDN* as **ladūn*, which then ought to have been discussed in connection with other instances of the use of *H* for /a/. Then again one might be surprised by the representation **ba^cal* - with anaptyctic vowel - for *B^cL*, since the development in Phoenician-Punic must have been /ba^cl/>/bal/⁷⁾. But these are minor points, and much more important is the really unavoidable observation that it seems hardly possible to explain *K'*, *K^c*, *KH*, *KH* as mere orthographical variants of *K* = /kī/⁸⁾, among other things because an expected **KY* has so far not been attested.

In the first place it is advisable to get a more complete picture of the geographical distribution of *K* and variants. This conjunction is frequently used in the stereotyped formula *K ŠM^G QL'* "because he heard his voice", and variants, in the numerous votive texts that remain in North Africa and adjacent territories; therefore the very few and dubious other examples of *K* were left aside. Because the number of occurrences is so high, detailed references are only given for the smaller groups of texts.

a) Distribution of *K*:

Carthage	346	times	on	a	total	of	348	instances ⁹⁾
Lepcis Magna N	2	.	.	.	.	.	2 ¹⁰⁾	
Sousse	6	.	.	.	.	.	6 ¹¹⁾	
Tunisia OU ¹²⁾ N	1 ¹³⁾	.	.	.	.	.	5	
Arseu	1	.	.	.	.	.	1 ¹⁴⁾	
Constantine	67	.	.	.	.	.	95 ¹⁵⁾	
Constantine N	9	.	.	.	.	.	18 ¹⁶⁾	
(Constantine+	76	.	.	.	.	.	113 ¹⁷⁾	
Malta	3	.	.	.	.	.	3 ¹⁸⁾	
Sicilia	3	.	.	.	.	.	3 ¹⁹⁾	
Sardinia	3	.	.	.	.	.	3 ²⁰⁾	
Pyrgi	1	.	.	.	.	.	1 ²¹⁾	
Spain	1	.	.	.	.	.	1 ²²⁾	;

b) Distribution of *K'*:

Carthage	2 ²³⁾	.	.	.	.	348
H. Medeine N	1	.	.	.	.	1 ²⁴⁾
Constantine	22	.	.	.	.	95
Constantine N	8	.	.	.	.	18
(Constantine+	30	.	.	.	.	113)

c) Distribution of *KH*:

H. Maktar N	2	.	.	.	.	12 ²⁵⁾
Tunisia OU N	1 ²⁶⁾	.	.	.	.	5
Constantine	2 ²⁷⁾	.	.	.	.	95 (resp. Const.+ 113)

d) Distribution of *KH* (or read *KH?*):

Tunisia OU N	1 ²⁸⁾	.	.	.	.	5
--------------	------------------	---	---	---	---	---

e) Distribution of *K^G*:

H. Maktar N	10	.	.	.	.	12
Tunisia OU N	2 ²⁹⁾	.	.	.	.	5
Constantine	4 ³⁰⁾	.	.	.	.	95
Constantine N	1 ³¹⁾	.	.	.	.	18
(Constantine+	5	.	.	.	.	113)

Instead of *K* and variants in a few cases another conjunction is found, ending in *-N*. This conjunction is attested in four texts; in all instances the complete word is repeated:

f) $K\dot{H}N$ $K\dot{H}N$:

H. Maktar N $2^{32)}$ 3

g) $K^C\dot{N}$ $K^C\dot{N}$:

H. Maktar N $1^{33)}$ 3

Tunisia OU N $1^{34)}$ 1

It is obvious that the normal form of the conjunction is K (used in 100 % of the instances in Lepcis Magna, Sousse, Arseu, Malta, Sicilia, Sardinia, Pyrgi and Spain, and also, what is more important, in 99 % of the numerous instances in the texts from Carthage³⁵⁾; the only significant deviations occur in H. Maktar (and Tunisia OU, cf. note 12) and Constantine. In Constantine K is used in 65 % of the instances, in Tunisia OU 20 %, and in H. Maktar K is not yet attested. The distribution of the deviating forms, i.e. K' , $K\dot{H}$, KH , K^C , also is worthy of note: of the 33 instances of K' , 30 are found in texts from Constantine, whereas the texts from H. Maktar (together with the texts from unknown but Tunisian origin) are in favour of the forms ending in $-\dot{H}$ ($-H$) and $-^C$. Such forms are attested a few times in Constantine, but not in the so much larger group of texts from Carthage. The same preference for $\dot{H}$ and C in H. Maktar (and Tunisia OU) can be detected in the spelling of the reduplicated longer conjunction. Although certainty is impossible here, this phenomenon makes it probable that $K\dot{H}/K^C$ and $K\dot{H}N/K^C\dot{N}$ are closely related.

Another interesting feature of the list is that most of the forms in which a laryngeal occurs, are found in texts in Neo-Punic script. Among the 512 examples of K only 12 are found in Neo-Punic texts, whereas among the forms with laryngeal 30 are found in Neo-Punic texts, i.e. 50 %; the other examples are mainly from Constantine (28), and only twice is a form with laryngeal attested in Carthage. As laryngeals in these later texts often indicate vowels, we will have to establish which vowel is meant by ' in texts from Constantine, and by C and $\dot{H}$ in H. Maktar.

In Constantine ' is used as a vowel-letter as indication of the suffix of the 3rd person sing. after nouns and verbs: QL' "his voice" and BRK' "blessed him" occur passim; in both words the realisation of the vowel has been $/\bar{o}/$, cf. the transcriptions of these words in Greek script, in an inscription from Constantine³⁶⁾: $koul\bar{o}$ resp. $barakh\bar{o}$; in the same text $sam\bar{o}$ is found, which pronunciation is reflected several times by the spelling $\check{S}M'$ for historical correct $\check{S}M^{a37)}$. However, ' is found indicating $/\bar{e}/$, thus e.g. in the ending of the construct state of a masculine plural noun, cf. $PN'/P^C\dot{N}$,³⁸⁾ (for older PN) which is rendered in the just mentioned text in Greek script by $phane$ ³⁹⁾. This use of ' for both $/\bar{o}/$ and $/\bar{e}/$ is attested in most later Punic texts⁴⁰⁾.

In H. Maktar ^c usually indicates /a/ when used as a vowel-letter, cf. Ξ^c , for normal BT^{41}), "daughter", ND^cR^{42}) "vow", N^cDR^{43}) "he vowed", Ξ^c ⁴⁴), for original 'BN, "stone" etc.; $\dot{H}$ is not extensively used in H. Maktar as a vowel-letter, but it may be supposed that it could be used for /a/ like ^c; cf. BHL^cMN^{45}), which might be explained as a simple lapsus for B^cLHMN , cf. however from outside H. Maktar $BHLHMN^{46}$), which was probably pronounced /bal amūn/, a pronunciation also indicated by the text in Greek script from Constantine, where this name is rendered by *bal amoun*⁴⁷); cf. further some words spelled with historically correct $\dot{H}$, which are several times attested with ^c instead, indicating the usual pronunciation: HMS^{48}) // MS^{49}) "five", $HMSM^{50}$) // MSM^{51}) "fifty", $BHYM^{52}$) // B^cYM^{53}) "during his/her life", $\dot{H}W^{54}$) // $\dot{H}W^c^{55}$) // c_W^{56}) // $c_W^c^{57}$) "he/she lived", cf. also c_{WH}^{58}), THT^{59}) // T^cT^{60}) "under"; whether in TNH^{61}), instead of normal TN^{62}), $\dot{H}$ indicates /ō/ or /a/ cannot be ascertained, as the spelling TN^c is also attested⁶³). From outside H. Maktar the personal name $NPTHN^{64}$) may be compared, where $\dot{H}$ indicates /a/ as is proven by the Latin parallel text, which offers *Nyptanis*; in the same text the personal name *Quarta* occurs, but the Neo-Punic text is damaged in the corresponding place, the reading being given as $[Q]W^cR[T]\dot{H}$ or --H. Perhaps the use of $\dot{H}$ for /a/ is also to be compared, cf. HBN^{65}) for historically correct 'BN⁶⁶) "stone"; the pronunciation is secured by the spelling ^cBN (v. supra).

Apart from the indication of vowels as occurring in later Punic and Neo-Punic texts, our most important source for the study of the vocalization of Punic is the *Poenulus* by Plaute, in which several Punic words and sentences and one longer text in Punic are preserved. In this longer text the conjunction under discussion has been preserved. In the second version of this text⁶⁷) it is written *co*, which form has been compared by Sznycer to the variant forms K' , K^c , $K\dot{H}$, KH in the later Punic texts⁶⁸). This comparison shows beyond doubt that in the case of K' the pronunciation must have been /ko/, not /ke/ with a front vowel as might be supposed from a comparison to Hebrew $k\bar{i}$. In the first version of this text⁶⁹) the conjunction appears as *chy*. The relative frequency of y and the digraphs *ch* and *th*, as well as the form of the name of the son of Hanno's former host (*agorastocles*) are in favour of a Greek original of this first version of Hanno's speech. If this is correct the vowel in the conjunction *chy* was originally written *u* (= *upsilon*). In several other instances *upsilon* seems to have been used to represent / ϵ / ⁷⁰), and there is no reason to postulate, as did Sznycer and others⁷¹), a pronunciation /ki/ on the evidence of *chy*. One is tempted to regard the spelling with ^c and

$\dot{H}/H$, i.e. with vowel-letters normally representing /a/, as an attempt to render /ě/ (see however also below p. 98). It is difficult to give a historical explanation of the form of the conjunction /ko/ - /ke/. Sznycer⁷²⁾ rather easily remarks that in Phoenician the pronunciation of the conjunction probably was /ki/, and that the change /ki/ > /ko/ is a later development in Punic. As this would be the only example of a sound-change /i/ > /o/ in Punic, this explanation seems to be unsatisfactory. Before we proceed with our remarks on the internal situation in Phoenician and Punic it seems advisable to have a look at some cognate languages, to see whether information of a comparative kind can be of any use.

In Hebrew the same conjunction is attested in the form /kī/⁷³⁾; the same form can be supposed for Moabite (spelled KY), Aramaic (also spelled KY), and most probably also Ugaritic, where the conjunction is normally written K, but at least once KY is attested⁷⁴⁾. In Akkadian $k\hat{i}$ is also attested, with an alternative form $k\hat{e}$ ⁷⁵⁾, used as conjunction ("when, as soon as, after, if, in case, whether, that, because, according to, as, just as") as well as preposition ("like, in the manner of, as, according to, instead of")⁷⁶⁾. Related to this $k\hat{i}$ is most probably the Arabic conjunction *kay* "that, in order that"⁷⁷⁾, which seems to be unrelated to the element *kay-* in *kayfa* "how"⁷⁸⁾, cf. however also Akkadian $k\hat{i}/k\hat{e}$ "how"⁷⁹⁾. Also in several non-Semitic Afro-Asiatic languages comparable particles are to be found, cf. e.g. Egyptian $k\hat{z}$ ⁸⁰⁾, and perhaps also Berber *akka*⁸¹⁾. The difficult matter of the presumed relationships between these words cannot be described in a satisfactory way without taking into account several other words, and/or morphemes, in which a so called "deictic k" is attested. There is e.g. the pronominal element indicating the 2nd person in the suffix pronouns, the element - *ku/-ki* attested in the pronoun of the first person sing. in Akkadian, *anaku*, Hebrew, *anoki* (cf. Phoenician 'nk), also attested in Egyptian, cf. Coptic *anok*, etc. Prominent among these words we find the preposition *ka-* "as, like" in Hebrew, Aramaic, North- and South-Arabian. The same original **ka*, used in an accented position as adverb, developed > **kā*, Hebrew $k\bar{o}$ (also in the reduplicated form $k\bar{a}k\bar{a}$) "thus", Aramaic $k\bar{a}$ "here, now". It seems probable that /ko/ in Punic has to be related to this particle. For its use as a conjunction one may compare the relation between Hebrew $k^em\bar{o}$ (< **kamā*) used as variant form of the preposition, "as, like", and Arabic *kamā*, used as a conjunction introducing verbal sentences (cf. also the situation in Akkadian, where $k\hat{i}$, with palatal vowel, as in the conjunction $k\hat{i}$, is used as preposition)⁸²⁾.

If this reasoning is correct, and Punic *K'* is to be explained as /ko/ < *kā* < *ka*, then one might propose another explanation for the forms attested in H. Maktar *K^c*, *KḤ*. As was remarked above, the most probable reading for these forms is /ka/, and perhaps this /ka/ might be understood as the older form of this conjunction without the lengthening of /-a/ attested in Constantine (<ē/ in the Poenulus-form *chy*, is easier to explain as a shortening of /-a/ than as shortening of a long /-ō/. In other parts of speech, the same phenomenon is attested elsewhere in Punic, cf. *nadōr*⁸³), *ND'R*⁸⁴) (= /n(-)dor/), *NDWR*⁸⁵) (= /n(-)dor/), to *N^cD^cR*⁸⁶) (= /nadar/)⁸⁷). Related to this /ka/ is the longer form /kan/, used in H. Maktar (*K^cN K^cN*, *KḤN KḤN*). Perhaps this word is to be compared to Hebrew *kēn* "thus"⁸⁸), with the same variation of vowels as in Hebrew *kî* versus Punic /ka/ (palatal vowel versus central vowel); cf. also, with central vowel, Akkadian *akanna*, *kanna*, adv. "thus"⁸⁹), resp. *akanna*, adv. "here"⁹⁰). In Phoenician *kn* is attested, as an adverb "thus"⁹¹), possibly pronounced /ken/ (for which pronunciation one is referred to *chen* in the Poenulus, where however only *chem* is attested⁹²)⁹³); but this adverb *kn* is, of course, only indirectly related to /kan/. Since the only attestations of /kan/ are from late texts, possibly reflecting a special dialect of Punic as spoken in H. Maktar, it is impossible to say whether this /kan/ existed in earlier stages of the language or is to be explained as an innovation in (some form of) Punic. A comparable problem arises in connection with *K*, conjunction, in Phoenician and older Punic. Although it remains possible that in all instances, also in Phoenician, *K* represents /ko/, resp. /ka/, it is perhaps more probable that /ko/ - /ka/ only occurs in Punic, and that *K* in Phoenician should be read /ki/⁹⁴).

- 1) J. Friedrich - W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik (Analecta Orientalia, vol. 46; = FR)*, Roma 1970², pp. 41-44.
- 2) If the second system of vowel notation, as described in *FR* p. 44, really exists, then at least some of the examples should be dismissed as inadequate; cf. e.g. *QL^c*, which is quoted as proof of the use of ^c for /o/, without reference to the rest of the text in which it occurs (P. Berthier - R. Charlier, *Le sanctuaire punique d'El-Hofra* (= *EH*), Paris 1952-1955, no. 151), whereas the word directly following *QL^c* is *BRK'*, in which ' is used to represent /o/; two systems of vowel notation in the same text is improbable, and cf. *N'DR* from NP 79, the reading of this word is extremely uncertain, but rather *NDR* than *N'DR*.
- 3) *FR* p. 44.
- 4) On this type of Berber personal names, cf. the author, *Names in Neo-Punic Inscriptions* (= *NNPI*), Groningen 1984 (diss., pp. 57ff.
- 5) *FR* p. 12f.
- 6) *id.*, p. 30f.
- 7) Cf. *FR* pp. 37, 94; the examples quoted for anaptyctic vowels in the neighbourhood laryngeals, *id.*, *ibid.*, are unconvincing: Greek *baal* originates from a Jewish author used to the form /ba al/, whereas -a in Greek *zera* must be explained as representation of /^c/, which explanation is given by Friedrich and Röllig, p. 38, only as a secondary possibility; in the spelling ^l*ba-'a-lu*, 'a probably is meant for an audible laryngeal closing the syllable, for which the syllabic writing system of Akkadian did not have a proper sign; the only case in which anaptyxis can be made probable is in a double-closed syllable ending in /-r/, cf. *QBR* (</qabr/) // *QB^cR*, *QB'R*, *NDR* (</nidr/) // *ND^cR*, *SKR* (</sikr/) // *SK^cR*, *CSR* (</^casr/) // *CS^cR* (for references cf. *DISO* s.v.).
- 8) The same explanation can be distilled from A. van den Branden, *Grammaire Phénicienne*, Beyrouth 1969, p. 121.
- 9) The material is from CIS i.
- 10) *KAI* 119 line 8; 129.
- 11) *KAI* 98; *Revue Africaine* vol. 88, 1947, p. 38, T9; p. 39 no. 3; p. 41 no. 24; p. 43 no. 288; p. 44 no. 289.
- 12) OU = origin unknown; the texts of unknown, but Tunesian, origin used in this study were probably found in H(enchir) Maktar.
- 13) *Punica xvii* (= *JA* vol. xi, 10, 1917, pp. 31-38) 10.
- 14) P. Schröder, *Die Phönizische Sprache*, Halle 1869, p. 265 no. 5.
- 15) An overview of the inscriptions from Constantine known in the beginning of this century is to be found in Chabot's *Punica xviii* (= *JA* vol. xi, 10, 1917, pp. 38-79); many more texts were published in 1952 in *EH*.
- 16) Cf. note 7; the letter after some place names refers to the Neo-Punic inscriptions from that place; for a survey of Neo-Punic inscriptions, cf. *NNPI* pp. xvff.
- 17) Sub Constantine+ we have combined the Punic and Neo-Punic material from that town.
- 18) M.G. Guzzo Amadasi, *Le iscrizioni Fenicie e Puniche delle colonie in Occidente (Studi Semitici, vol. 28; = ICO)*, Roma 1967, Malta-Pu 1, 1bis, 4.
- 19) *ICO* Sicilia-Pu 1, 5, 10.
- 20) *ICO* Sardinia-Pu 17, 34, 39.
- 21) *ICO* App. 2.
- 22) *ICO* Spagna-Pu 16.
- 23) CIS i 2592, 3390.
- 24) *KAI* 159 line 7.
- 25) For a survey of Neo-Punic texts from H. Maktar, cf. *NNPI* pp. xviii-xix; the texts containing *KH* are to be found in *Punica xii* (= *JA* vol. xi, 9, 1917, pp. 145-166) 3, 11.
- 26) *Punica xvii* 11.

- 27) Punica xviii ii 105, *EH* 251.
- 28) Punica xvii 3; apart from this text (= NP 112), *FR* p. 44 also quotes NP 36 (Punica xii 3) where the reading K^H is given by Chabot.
- 29) Gesenius *Monumenta*, tab. 22 lviii (NP 8), *NNPI* p. 12 (NP 9).
- 30) Punica xviii ii 125, *RES* 1931, *EH* 101, 182.
- 31) *EH* 104.
- 32) Punica xii 6 and 9, on the reading cf. *NNPI* p. 5.
- 33) Punica xii 8; Chabot reads $P^c N K^c N$; lapsus for $K^c N K^c N$ or read $K^c N K^c N$, cf. *NNPI* p. 5.
- 34) Punica xvii 2.
- 35) The reading K^c , tentatively proposed in CIS i ad 4440, is less probable, read rather *M* lapsus for *K*.
- 36) *KAI* 175, cf. also *FR* pp. 48, 49.
- 37) Cf. also *FR* pp. 59f.
- 38) For $P^c N$ cf. e.g. in Punic script: *RES* 1537, 1562, Punica xviii ii 73, 102, *EH* 16, 17, 54, 81 etc., and in Neo-Punic Script Punica xviii ii 26, *EH* 24, 270; for $P^c N$ cf. e.g. in Punic script: Punica xviii ii 63, 88, *EH* 4, 80 etc., in Neo-Punic script: Punica xi (= *JA* vol. xi, 8, 1916, pp. 483-520) 35bis, xviii i 31, ii 86, *EH* 21, 271, 277.
- 39) Cf. also *FR* p. 105.
- 40) Cf. *FR* p. 43.
- 41) $B^c T$ is attested in Punica xii 3; the same person is mentioned again in Punica xii 5 where the affiliation is expressed by *BT*.
- 42) Punica xii 3, 10.
- 43) Punica xii 10.
- 44) Punica xii 20, 22, 24, 28, 31, *KAI* 134.
- 45) *Cahiers de Byrsa* vol. 8, 1958-1959, p. 31.
- 46) CIS i 1165, *EH* 187.
- 47) Cf. also *NNPI* p. 116 and p. 133.
- 48) M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, Weimar 1898, p. 436 C 8 (for this text cf. also Chabot, Punica iv (= *JA* vol. xi, 7, 1916, pp. 87-103) A 6).
- 49) Punica xii 23, 28, xv 3, *KAI* 135.
- 50) Punica iv D 4.
- 51) Punica xv 3.
- 52) *KAI* 152.
- 53) *KAI* 134.
- 54) Lidzbarski, *Handbuch* p. 436 C 8 v. supra note 48).
- 55) Punica xii 28.
- 56) Punica xii 23, 24 etc.
- 57) Punica xii 22, *KAI* 149.
- 58) Punica xii 33.
- 59) Lidzbarski, *Handbuch* p. 436 C 8 (v. supra), Punica iv A 8.
- 60) Punica iv A 7.
- 61) Punica xii 27, 32.
- 62) Punica xii 14, 15, 16 etc.
- 63) *KAI* 150; cf. also *FR* p. 60 with note 1.
- 64) *KAI* 140.
- 65) Punica iv A 7, E 7, xii 25, *KAI* 151.
- 66) Punica xii 14, 16, *KAI* 133 etc.
- 67) For the Punic passages in the *Poenulus*, cf. M. Sznycer, *Les passages Puniques en transcription Latine dans le "Poenulus" de Plaute* (= *PPP*), for the text of the second version, see *ibid.*, p. 114, l. 941.
- 68) Sznycer, *PPP*, pp. 120f.
- 69) *ibid.*, p. 46, l. 931.
- 70) Cf. e.g. Greek *bun* in *KAI* 175, which represents rather /ben/ than /bin/ (and which cannot be explained as /bun/ as is done inadvertently by Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (*Analecta Orientalia*, vol. 38) Roma 1965, p. 373 sub no. 481), Greek *ly* in the same text (cf. *FR* p. 34); the examples adduced in *FR* p. 34 to show that *y* may be

- used for /i/ remain uncertain; the first *ys* in Poenulus, l. 935, is perhaps to be explained as the Punic equivalent of Hebrew *yēš*, rather than Hebrew 'זש, whatever the correct explanation is, however, one may assume that the vowel underwent reduction > /e/.
- 71) Sznycer, *PPP*, pp. 56, 121, *FR* p. 34.
 - 72) Sznycer, *ibid.*
 - 73) It seems unnecessary to give references for the following words from different Northwest-Semitic languages; cf. e.g. *DISO*.
 - 74) Cf. *UT*, Glossary s.v. *k*.
 - 75) Cf. *CAD* s.v.
 - 76) Cf. also Von Soden, *GAG*, p. 165, 170.
 - 77) On this relationship, cf. also Brockelmann, *GVG* vol. 1, p. 74.
 - 78) J. Barth, *Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Semitischen I*, Leipzig 1907, p. 17.
 - 79) Cf. *CAD* s.v.
 - 80) Cf. A. Erman - H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache*, Band 5, Leipzig 1931, p. 84; R.O. Faulkner, *A concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford 1972, p. 283, "so, then", possibly related to the verb *k3i*, cf. e.g. A.H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford-London 1950², p. 181; cf. perhaps also *kw*, a particle preceding a verbal used as an imperative, cf. E. Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik*, vol. 2 (*Analecta Orientalia*, vol. 34 (39), Rome 1958/1964, p. 431.
 - 81) Cf. e.g. J.-M. Dallet, *Dictionnaire Kabyle-Français*, Paris 1982, p. 388: *akka* "ainsi, de cette façon, comme".
 - 82) Cf. also the uncertainty in 2 Sam 16:10 ketib *KY*, qerē *kōh*.
 - 83) *KAI* 175.
 - 84) *CIS* i 3992, 4475.
 - 85) *CIS* i 2522.
 - 86) *Punica* xvii 1.
 - 87) Cf. e.g. J. Friedrich in *ZDMG* vol. 107, 1957, p. 286; *FR* p. 60, and also M. Sznycer, "La vocalisation des formes verbales dans l'écriture Néopunique" in *Actes du Premier Congrès international de Linguistique Sémitique et Chamito-Sémitique 1969*, The Hague-Paris 1974, p. 209ff., esp. p. 212.
 - 88) A relationship of Hebrew *kēn* (< **kin*) with the root *kwn*, seems less probable.
 - 89) Cf. *CAD* s.v. *akanna* A.
 - 90) Cf. *CAD* s.v. *akanna* B.
 - 91) Cf. *DISO* s.v.
 - 92) Cf. Sznycer, *PPP*, pp. 84f.
 - 93) Cf. also *FR* p. 124.
 - 94) Differences between Phoenician and Punic of what might be called a dialectal type are known, of course, cf. e.g. the suffix indicating the 3rdp. m. sg. -*M*, which is almost exclusively attested in Punic (where also -*Y* (-*Y'*) and -' are found), against Phoenician where -*H*, -*W* and -*Y* are used; cf. *FR* pp. 47f.