

PHOENICIAN ANIMAL NAMES

GIUSEPPE MINUNNO*

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to provide a repertoire of the currently identifiable zoonyms in the Phoenician language. The available data are collected, presented, and analysed. Several animal names are directly mentioned in Phoenician inscriptions, but they also are attested as constituting elements of personal names, names of plant and names of place. Some texts by classical authors are also discussed.

Keywords: Zoonyms; Phoenician Language; Phoenician Vocabulary; Names of Animal.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to provide a repertoire of the currently identifiable zoonyms in the Phoenician language. To this aim, the available data, derived from a variety of sources, of different natures, in different scripts (Phoenician, Greek, Latin) and with varying degrees of reliability, are collected, presented, and analysed. The scarcity of contextual data and the transformation undergone by words that were adapted to Greek or Latin script make proposals for the identification of zoonyms highly hypothetical in many cases. In this context, it has been decided, for the sake of completeness, to report and discuss, where necessary, all relevant proposals made in this regard, even when they are highly uncertain or appear implausible.¹ The dispersion of data and studies relating to a Phoenician semantic area makes this kind of repertoire very useful.

The first documentary source here examined consists of the Phoenician inscriptions, starting with the most informative textual category, the so-called sacrificial tariffs. The inscriptions also mention several personal names corresponding to zoonyms or employing them as components. They will be examined separately. Next toponyms and phytonyms will be presented, which are often known to us only through Greek and Latin sources. Finally, some texts by classical authors relevant to our theme are considered.

Since the intention here is not to present an etymological/comparative study of individual zoonyms in the proper sense, but rather a lexical repertoire, comparisons with other Semitic languages are as a rule deliberately limited to Hebrew (as the closest referent) and North-Western Semitic, except in those cases in which, in the absence of a direct comparison in the languages of this sphere, they are necessary.

The asterisk indicates terms not attested in Phoenician epigraphy. The symbol √ has been adopted to indicate a Semitic root. In the summary table, an approximate indication of the degree of likelihood of the identification of a term as zoonym (in the first column) and of its proposed translation (in the second column) is given by the use of the symbols: (?), “doubtful”, (??), “unlikely” and (???), “speculative”. The indication regarding the translation of the term, in the second column of the table, is to be understood as referring to its plausibility (on a comparative basis) assuming that the term was indeed

* University of Genoa and University of Florence; giuseppe.minunno@edu.unige.it; <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8249-3665>. I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Maria Giulia Amadasi and Paolo Xella for their insightful comments and suggestions. A former draft of this paper was presented at the Annual Conference of the European Association of Biblical Studies, University of Warsaw, 11-14 August 2019.

1 In particular, this is often the case for the proposals of Tomback and Fuentes Estañol. Krahmalkov and Lipiński are also sometimes excessively bold.

to be considered a zoonym, thus irrespective of the probability of its actual attestation/existence in the Phoenician language.²

2. PHOENICIAN INSCRIPTIONS

The name “sacrificial tariffs” refers to a group of inscriptions (*CIS* I, 165=*KAI* 69, the longest and best-preserved one,³ and the fragmentary *CIS* I, 167=*KAI* 74, *CIS* I, 168, *CIS* I, 169, *CIS* I, 170, *CIS* I, 3915, *CIS* I, 3916=*KAI* 75, *CIS* I, 3917).⁴ These inscriptions come from 4th-2nd century BCE Carthage: in fact, although *CIS* I, 165 was found in Marseille (therefore it was labelled the “tariff of Marseille”), it is very likely that it was originally displayed at Carthage, in the sanctuary of a deity who, from the traces that remain of his name, should be Baal Saphon. The purpose of this genre of inscriptions was to establish, for each offer envisaged and according to the kind of sacrifice to be celebrated, the fees for the priests and what pertained to the offerer. The scheme followed by *CIS* I, 165 was probably common to the whole group, and is of major help in identifying what kinds of animals are involved. In this inscription the animals which were envisaged as possible material for offering were listed according to their size, from the larger to the smaller ones, with birds as the last (but there might be a reference to game further on, in a section otherwise concerned with non-animal offerings). The text can be divided into sections, on the grounds of the rules of distribution applied. These rules vary according to the size of the animals with which they are concerned, therefore evidencing groups of two or three kind of animals to which the same rules apply. The first two zonyms mentioned in *CIS* I, 165, *'lp* and *'gl*, indicate bovines.

'gl

'gl means “calf”,⁵ like its Hebrew cognate *'egel*⁶ and Ugaritic *'gl*.⁷

'lp

'lp is commonly translated as “ox”,⁸ corresponding to Hebrew *'elep*⁹ and Ugaritic *alp*.¹⁰ A (yearly) sacrifice of a *'lp* is also mentioned in *KAI* 26 (A III 1), a celebrative inscription of Azatiwada (8th or early 7th century) found at Karatepe, in Cilicia.¹¹ That the word *'lp* could occasionally have a broader sense, indicating “any mature bovine, whether bull or cow”,¹² is suggested by its use in another passage of the same inscription

2 In view of the possibility of differences in nuance, in the course of the following discussion, translations offered by scholars in languages other than English are given in the original.

3 Text and commentary in Guzzo Amadasi 1967, pp. 169-182.

4 The most comprehensive and balanced presentation is Amadasi Guzzo 1988, pp. 108-118. Cfr. also Capuzzi 1968; Xella – Lipiński 1992; Xella in press. D'Andrea 2020 does not add anything substantial; furthermore, *CIS* I, 168 and *CIS* I, 169 are uncritically included among the tariffs (D'Andrea 2020, p. 151, note 4), but their belonging to this genre is far from certain and, in the case of *CIS* I, 168, unlikely.

5 Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 824; Tomback 1978, p. 238; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 194 (“ternero”); Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 113 (“vitello”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 359.

6 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, pp. 784-785; Clines 1993-2011, VI, pp. 248-249.

7 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 149-150. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 43-46.

8 E.g. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 64.

9 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 59; Clines 1993-2011, I, p. 299.

10 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 58-59. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 6-7; cfr. Cohen – Bron – Lonnet 1970-2012, p. 21 (*'LP*).

11 It was found in triplicate (together with two copies in Anatolian hieroglyphic).

12 Pardee 2003, n. 10 p. 306; cfr. Segert 1976, p. 283 “piece of cattle, ox”. Cfr. Fronzaroli 1969, p. 304 (not specifically on Phoenician): «[i]l termine comune per indicare il bue o per meglio dire il singolo capo di bestiame grosso, sarà da riconoscersi piuttosto in *'ALP*». The claim that *'lp* in the tariff specifically indicates a “bull” (Van den Branden 1965, pp. 118-119: “taureau”) is unsupported.

(*KAI* 26 A III 8-9; C IV 8-9), where *'lpm* is used in parallelism with *š'n*. Perhaps the value of *'lp* as “head of cattle” is to be supposed in a passage of another inscription, *KAI* 24¹³ (ll. 11-12): *w my bl ḥz pn š šty b'l 'dr wmy bl ḥz pn 'lp šty b'l bqr*, “him who had never seen the face of a *š* I made owner of a flock; him who had never seen the face of a *'lp* I made owner of a herd”. Here *'lp* is paralleled by the word *š*. In this passage *š* and *'lp* might broadly indicate a head of, respectively, small livestock and cattle, rather than precisely “a sheep” and “an ox”. In the Ivriz inscription¹⁴ (line 7 of left edge, line 1 of the reverse, and probably also on the first line of the back) *'lp w š'n* in a fragmentary passage may be interpreted in three different ways: either a single bovine and more than one sheep were meant,¹⁵ or *š'n* indicates here a single animal of the flock,¹⁶ or *'lp* is used with a collective value, corresponding to *'lpm*.¹⁷

š'n

š'n is a word indicating “small cattle”, “sheep” as a collective name,¹⁸ a value shared with its Hebrew cognate *šō'n*¹⁹ and Ugaritic *šin*.²⁰ In all its occurrences (*KAI* 26 A III 8-9; C IV 8-9; Ivriz inscription, line 7 of left edge and probably line 1 of the reverse), *š'n* is paralleled or associated to *'lp(m)*. In the Ivriz inscription, as noted above, *š'n* might indicate a single animal of the flock.

š

A broad meaning of “small livestock beast” is that of the Hebrew cognate of *š*, namely *šeh*.²¹ The word *š*, commonly translated as “sheep” (cfr. Ugaritic *š*, “ram, sheep”),²² is attested elsewhere in Phoenician: again *KAI* 24 (at line 8); *KAI* 26 A II 19-III 2; C III 2-6,²³ and, according to the interpretation of Schmitz²⁴ also in *CIS* I, 86=*KAI* 37, a plaquette from Kition, on both sides of which a number of payments was listed, written in ink (the text, or the two non-contemporary texts, is dated between the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 4th century BCE).²⁵ The sheep should be mentioned in a difficult passage (face B, line 8) where shepherds (*r'm*) are also mentioned.

13 *KAI* 24 is a 9th century celebrative inscription by Kilamuwa. It was found at Zincirli (ancient Sam'al), in eastern Turkey.

14 Röllig 2013. Dating back to the 8th century BCE, the text is inscribed on a stele found at Ivriz in Cappadocia (Turkey), which also carries a Luwian inscription, to which the Phoenician text probably corresponded, at least in terms of content. The inscription was ordered by a son of the king of Tyana.

15 But, if the phrase referred to victims of sacrifice(s), as suggested by Röllig (2013, p. 315), one would expect the number to be specified, as in *KAI* 26, C IV 4-6.

16 Cfr. Ugaritic *šin*, meaning in ritual texts «specimen from the mixed herd of sheep and goats» (Pardee 2000, p. 328).

17 Röllig (2013, pp. 314-315) translates *'lp w š'n* as “Rind(er) und Kleinvieh”.

18 Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 954; Tomback 1978, p. 275; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 215 (“ganado menor”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 411.

19 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, pp. 992-993; Clines 1993-2011, VII, pp. 59-63.

20 Watson 2006, p. 448; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 764. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 283-285.

21 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, pp. 1310-1311; Clines 1993-2011, VIII, pp. 115-116.

22 Watson 2006, p. 448; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 783. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 280-282.

23 The suggestion of the occurrence of *š* (twice, once in the form **š'*) on an inscribed bowl from Kition (Amadasi Guzzo – Karageorghis 1977, pp. 150-160; Yon 2004, n°1100; around 800 BCE), as well as of a word **kbs*, comparable to Hebrew *kebeš* and meaning “lamb”, proposed in lines 2-3 by Dupont-Sommer (1972, pp. 287-289), does not correspond to more recent readings of the text (Amadasi Guzzo – Karageorghis 1977, p. 150; Yon 2004, p. 188): the *š* is joined to the previous letters, giving *mlš* on both occasions, while the supposed *k* of *kbs* is read as *p*.

24 Schmitz 2013, pp. 206-207.

25 Yon 2004, n° 1078 pp. 184-185; Amadasi Guzzo 2004, pp. 209-211.

'yl

CIS I, 165 considers together 'gl and 'yl (also attested in *CIS* I, 3915.1'). The word 'yl²⁶ has been interpreted as “deer”,²⁷ corresponding to Hebrew 'ayyāl²⁸ and Ugaritic ayl,²⁹ or as “ram”,³⁰ corresponding to Hebrew 'ayil³¹ and to Ugaritic allil.³² The interpretation of 'yl as “deer” is supported by a philological consideration,³³ since to Hebrew 'ayil would better correspond a Phoenician writing 'l (without yod), rather than 'yl.³⁴ Furthermore, the position of 'yl in the frame of the text suggests that the size of a 'yl was more similar to that of a calf than to that of an adult ovine or caprine, which are mentioned in the following group. In support of the interpretation of 'yl as “ram” it was sometimes brought up the assumption that only domestic animals were suitable to be offered and should therefore be mentioned in the “tariffs”. This, however, is not a safe assumption. At line 12 of the “tariff of Marseille” (as well as in *CIS* I, 167.9) the word šd,³⁵ among several possible interpretations (like “flour”³⁶ or “food”³⁷), may mean “game” (cfr. Hebrew šayid).³⁸ We will see further on that offerings of wild birds were probably allowed.³⁹

ybl

The interpretation of the zoonym *ybl*, mentioned in *CIS* I, 165 (also occurring in *CIS* I, 3915.2'), after 'gl and 'yl, and together with 'z, is dependent on that of 'yl, since, if a translation as “ram” is accepted for the latter, the same meaning should not be assumed for *ybl*.⁴⁰ Therefore, those who translate 'yl as “ram” are forced to consider *ybl* as some different kind of ovine.⁴¹ But *ybl* corresponds to Hebrew yōbēl⁴² and perhaps to Ugaritic ybl⁴³ therefore the interpretation as “ram”⁴⁴ is surely preferable and supports the value of “deer” for 'yl.

26 Amadasi Guzzo 1988, pp. 113-114; Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 45. Cohen – Bron – Lonnet 1970-2012, p. 17 (v'YL).

27 Février 1958-1959, p. 41 (“cerf”); Capuzzi 1968, pp. 50-51; Tomback 1978, p. 14 (“stag”); Xella 1983, pp. 41-43; Pardee 2003, n. 24 p. 307.

28 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 40; Clines 1993-2011, I, p. 212.

29 Watson 2006, p. 448; Watson 2007, p. 94; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 131. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 37-40; cfr. Fronzaroli 1968, p. 283.

30 Dussaud 1921, pp. 139-141; (“bélier”); Van den Branden 1965, p. 119 (“bélier”, perhaps also “bouc”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 47.

31 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 40; Clines 1993-2011, I, pp. 210-211.

32 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 46. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 34-37.

33 Xella 1983, pp. 41-43.

34 About the monophthongization in Phoenician cfr. Friedrich – Röllig – Amadasi Guzzo 1999, p. 44, §86a; Steiner 2007.

35 Cfr. Amadasi Guzzo 1988, pp. 114-115; Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 959.

36 Février 1958-1959, p. 41 (“farine”).

37 Van den Branden 1965, p. 123.

38 Cfr. e.g. Harris 1936, p. 139; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 215; Krahmalkov 2000, pp. 411-412.

39 Xella (1983, p. 43) drew the scholarly attention to a passage of Porphyrius of Tyre (*Abst.* II 25) where deer appear together with ovine, caprine and birds as matter of offerings.

40 Krahmalkov (2000, pp. 47 and 204) does not notice the inconsistency and translates both terms as “ram”.

41 “Castrated ram” («le bélier châtré, autrement dit le mouton», Dussaud 1921, pp. 139-140); Van den Branden 1965, pp. 119-120 (“mouton”).

42 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 398; Clines 1993-2011, IV, p. 163.

43 Watson 2007, p. 96; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 936. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 314-316.

44 Février 1958-1959, p. 41 (“bélier”); Tomback 1978, p. 123; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 127 (“morueco”); Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 113 (“ariete”); Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 433.

‘z

The zoonym ‘z (cfr. *CIS* I, 167.4; *CIS* I, 3915.2’) means “goat” or “she-goat”,⁴⁵ compared to Hebrew ‘ēz⁴⁶ and Ugaritic ‘z.⁴⁷ While there is no evidence supporting the assumption that the tariff only mentions male mammals, and therefore that ‘z here must indicate a he-goat,⁴⁸ it is possible, instead, that ‘z, as perhaps ‘lp and ʕ, may on occasion indicate generically a goat, either male or female.

The three following zoonyms of *CIS* I, 165, namely ‘mr, gd, and ʕrb ʕl, most likely all indicated the babies of previously mentioned animals:

‘mr

‘mr (also in *CIS* I, 3915.3’) corresponds to Ugaritic *imr*,⁴⁹ Old Aramaic ‘mr (*KAI* 222.23; *KAI* 309.20)⁵⁰ and means “lamb”.⁵¹ It also occurs in the phrase *mlk ʕmr*, attested in inscriptions from the tophet, which record the offering of a lamb in those sanctuaries.⁵² The presence of this word is much more uncertain in *KAI* 27, a 7th century BCE magical text from Arslan Tash (ancient Ḥadattu, in Upper Syria), in which a negative entity is mentioned, whose name might mean “Strangler-of-the-Lamb”.⁵³

gd

gd (also in *CIS* I, 3915.3’), corresponds to Hebrew *gēdī*⁵⁴ and to Ugaritic *gd(y)*,⁵⁵ and means “(goat-)kid”.⁵⁶

ʕrb ʕl

ʕrb ʕl⁵⁷ (also in *CIS* I, 167.5 and probably *CIS* I, 3915.3’: ʕrb [...]), granted for ʕl the meaning “deer”, as the young of the latter should be translated as “fawn”.⁵⁸ Those who prefer to translate ʕl as “ram” are forced to translate ʕrb ʕl as “young ram”.⁵⁹ It cannot be excluded, however, that ʕrb ʕl does not actually indicate a young ʕl but rather a different species, possibly a small African goat, perhaps a wild one.⁶⁰

The next section of *CIS* I, 145, on line 11, concerns bird-offerings. Here the phrase *bʕ]pr ʕnn ʕm ʕʕ ʕlm kll ʕm ʕʕp ʕm ḥzt*, rises several issues. Syntactically, it seems preferable to integrate *bʕspr ʕnn ʕm ʕb ʕʕ*,⁶¹ according to

45 Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 875; Tomback 1978, pp. 240-241; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 196 (“cabra”); Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 113 (“capra”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 362. Cfr. St. Byz. I 77, claiming that Ἀζα meant “she-goat” (χίμαιρα).

46 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, pp. 804-805; Clines 1993-2011, VI, p. 321.

47 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 193. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 53-56.

48 Capuzzi 1968, p. 51. Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 875.

49 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 70.

50 Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 7-9.

51 Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 78; Tomback 1978, p. 24; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 68 (“cordero”); Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 113 (“agnello”). Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 7-9.

52 Cfr. Amadasi Guzzo – Zamora López 2012-2013, especially p. 171.

53 Militarev – Kogan 2005, p. 7.

54 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 178; Clines 1993-2011, II, p. 321.

55 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 292.

56 Tomback 1978, p. 63 (s.v. *gd); Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 96 (“cabrito”); Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 113 (“capretto”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 136, s.v. *gd III*. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 213 prefer “goat”. The word possibly occurs, used as an insult, also in verse 1017 of Plautus’ *Poenulus*, as *gade* (Gray 1923, p. 82) or *gad* (Szyner 1967, pp. 143-144). Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 113-115. Cfr. Cohen – Bron – Lonnet 1970-2012, pp. 100-101 (√GDY).

57 Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 114; Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 975.

58 Février 1958-1959, p. 41 (“faon”); Tomback 1978, pp. 280-281 (“young stag”); Pardee 2003, n. 27 p. 307.

59 Krahmalkov 2000, p. 421. Van den Branden 1965, p. 120, “agneau de lait”.

60 Capuzzi 1968, p. 51 (probably «qualche tipo di capra africana più o meno selvatica»).

61 Baker 1987, p. 190; Mosca 2001, p. 405.

both *CIS* I, 3915.5' (*bšpr 'gnn 'm bšš*) and *CIS* I, 167.7 ([] *bšš*). The most probable interpretation considers *špr 'gnn* and *šš* as indicating kinds or classes of birds, *ššp* and *hzt* as kind of sacrifice.

špr, špr 'gnn, šš

The word *špr*, “bird”,⁶² corresponding to Hebrew *šippôr*⁶³ and Ugaritic *špr*,⁶⁴ appears here as part of *špr 'gnn*.⁶⁵ It also appears on line 15 (for *špr* on line 12 see below).⁶⁶ In the plural form *šprmm* the word also occurs on a Neo-Punic (1st century AD?) ostrakon (*IP*T 86.7, an economic account from Al-Qusbat, Lybia),⁶⁷ where *šprmm 'rrm* has been interpreted as “birds of decoy”,⁶⁸ rather than as a bird-species (“the ‘*rr*-bird”).⁶⁹ A problematic point in *CIS* I, 165 is the occurrence of *špr* on line 12, where a further reference to birds appears unexpected. Here the word *špr* may rather be a homograph of *špr* “bird”. Some scholars aimed to explain *špr* in this section as no animal victim, but rather meaning “semolina”⁷⁰ or “perfume”.⁷¹ Other scholars, however, disagreeing with the assumption that this section does not actually mention animal offerings, interpret *špr* as “bird”⁷² and *šd* as “game”.⁷³ Indeed, according to a completely opposed (and unconvincing) hypothesis, most of the offerings mentioned in this section are to be considered as animal-offerings,⁷⁴ or even as bird-offerings.⁷⁵

The most commonly accepted interpretation of *špr 'gnn* and *šš* considers them two broad classes complementing each other, together including all or most of the groups of birds: respectively “domestic” and

62 Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 275-277.

63 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1047; Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 148.

64 Watson 2006, p. 449; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 777-778. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 973; Tomback 1978, p. 280; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 217 (“pájaro”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 420. The word most probably is recognizable in the toponym *bit šupuri* (**bt špr*, “bird’s house”), perhaps to be identified as Ornithopolis: *RE*, XVIII,1, s.v. “Ὀρνίθων πόλις”, col. 1129 (E. Honigmann); Lipiński 2004, p. 18.

65 Against an interpretation of the phrase *bšpr 'gnn 'm šš* as “in (the case of) a bird, (whether it be)”, followed by the specification of the birds (Pardee 2003, p. 308), stands *CIS* I, 3915.5' (*bšpr 'gnn 'm bšš*), where *špr* appears to be a part of the zoonym *špr 'gnn*. Therefore “in (the case of) a ‘*gnn*-bird or a *šš*” is preferable.

66 Reshep *šprmm* (*KAI* 26 A II 10-12) may mean neither “of the birds” nor “of the goats” (or “of the darts” or “of the claws”, as proposed by Garbini 1992: “dei dardi”, “degli artigli”), being rather a place-name (Lipiński 2009, pp. 228-229; Niehr 2021, p. 202).

67 Cfr. most recently Jongeling 2008, pp. 41-44.

68 Levi Della Vida 1964, p. 14 (“uccelli da richiamo”); Tomback 1978, pp. 33 and 280 (“calling birds”). Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, pp. 114, s.v. ‘*rr*₃).

69 Krahmalkov 2000, p. 420.

70 Van den Branden 1965, p. 123.

71 Février 1955, pp. 50-52; Delcor 1983.

72 Cfr. e.g. Guzzo Amadasi 1967, p. 172. Pardee 2003, p. 308, translates “bird (offering)”. A meaning as “male goat” has also been suggested (Cooke 1903, p. 120), by comparison with Hebrew *šāpîr* (Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1048; Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 149). Indeed, a mention of a caprine at this spot would hardly fit better in the structure of the text than a mention of a bird.

73 *CIS*, p. 233: *sacrificium venationis*; Harris 1936, p. 139; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 215; Krahmalkov 2000, pp. 411-412.

74 Krahmalkov 2000, p. 424, s.v. *qdm*t I.

75 Pardee 2003, p. 308: «[(In the case of) every (other)] bird (offering), (whether it be) holy first-born (birds), game-(bird) sacrifices, or (bird-)fat sacrifices». The hypothesis that *špr* at line 12 does not refer to an animal victim would seem to be supported by the fact that the definitely animal offerings are introduced by *b-* (for the birds in line 11 of *CIS* I, 165 *b-* is reconstructed, but is attested in *CIS* I, 3915.5' and *CIS* I, 167.7 [] *bšš*). Subsequent potentially bloodless offerings are or appear to be introduced by ‘*L*, including the *špr* at line 12. At line 15, where cattle or bird sacrifices are mentioned, the preposition is again *b-*. However, one might assume that the difference lies not in the nature of the victim, but in the nature of the ritual offering. At line 12 *špr* may indicate any (other) bird, apart from *špr 'gnn* and *šš*, the only ones permitted for prescribed forms of sacrifice (*šlm kll*, *ššp*, and *hzt*).

“wild” birds (already the editors of the *CIS* translated as *avis domestica vel silvestris*).⁷⁶ The identification of *špr*’*gmn* as “domestic bird” is based on the meaning of the root √GNN, “cover, protect”,⁷⁷ whence Hebrew *gan*, “garden”,⁷⁸ Ugaritic *gn*,⁷⁹ and therefore a supposed Phoenician *’*gmn* meaning “farmyard”.⁸⁰ For *šš*, whose meaning is even more controversial,⁸¹ by comparison to the uncertain Hebrew *šš*, “wing”⁸² a meaning as “a free-flying bird”⁸³ is mostly accepted.⁸⁴

Indeed, the hypothesis that *špr*’*gmn* and (*špr*) *šš* were classes complementing each other, for instance if they together included both domestic and wild birds, doesn’t quite convince me, since *špr* alone would then have sufficed. A different possibility is to consider both *špr*’*gmn* and *šš* as less general, not complementary types of birds.⁸⁵ The occurrence of *špr* at line 12 might then be interpreted as “a(ny other) bird”, rather than as a homograph.⁸⁶ Therefore, since the tariff is organized by size of the victims, *špr*’*gmn* and *šš* might rather be some sort of large birds, suitable for *ššp* and *hzt* sacrifice.⁸⁷ Some scholars, instead, consider *ššp* and *hzt* as kinds of birds.⁸⁸ According to Paul Mosca, *ššp* and *hzt* would indicate two complementary classes of birds, according to the nature of their feet: *ššp* would mean “split(-footed)” as opposed to *hzt*, which instead would

76 Cfr. Cooke 1903, p. 120 (domestic bird/wild bird); Lidzbarski 1907, p. 49 (“zahmer Vogel” and “wilder Vogel”); Février 1955, p. 51; Février 1958-1959, p. 41 (“oiseau de basse cour” and “oiseau volant”); Van den Branden 1965, p. 121; Fuentes Estañol 1980, pp. 60, 217-218: *špr*’*gmn* possibly “pájaro doméstico”, “ave de corral”; *šš* “pájaro silvestre”; Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 114; Delcor 1990, p. 90 «*šš* ne peut signifier que “oiseau volant” par opposition à l’oiseau de basse-cour qui ne vole pas»; Mosca 2001, pp. 404-411 (“bird of the enclosure” and “winged bird”, i.e. “free-flying” bird).

77 Cohen – Bron – Lonnet 1970-2012, pp. 147-158 (√GN’/W/Y/L).

78 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 198; Clines 1993-2011, II, p. 366.

79 Del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 299.

80 The interpretation of *špr*’*gmn* as «a bird prepared in a ’*gmn* bowl» (Tomback 1978, p. 3) is far-fetched. In the tariffs the treatment of the victim as a rule is implied in the kind of ritual, not in the kind of victim. Furthermore, the form remains unexplained since a Phoenician word ’*gn* exists, indicating «un récipient grand, à embouchure large» (Amadasi Guzzo 1990, pp. 21-23).

81 Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, pp. 973-974.

82 Perhaps “wings”, cfr. Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 118.

83 Cfr. Harris 1936, p. 139 (*šš* “bird of wing”). Pardee 2003, p. 308. Rather far-fetched appears to me van den Branden’s (1965, p. 121) reference to the root √ŠYŠ, whence Hebrew *šš* “flower, blossom” (Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1023; Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 118), resulting in a meaning of *šš* as a “bird of nature” (“de la nature”), i.e. a wild one.

84 Scholars do not agree about the species included within these categories. Pardee considers the “free-flying birds” not as “wild birds” but rather as pigeons and/or doves, while Mosca (2001, p. 411) assumes that the “free-flying birds” may in addition have included wild but edible birds, such as quails, partridge and geese. On the other hand, he concedes that wild birds fattened in captivity might also have been included in the *špr*’*gmn* (Mosca 2001, p. 406).

85 Cfr. Krahmalkov 2000, pp. 420-421. However, Krahmalkov’s proposal of interpreting *šš* as possibly indicating a “hawk” (by comparison with Aramaic *ššā*), raises doubts. Hawks appear a rather uncommon offering material. Thus, although the possibility cannot be ruled out, one would rather expect other species to be mentioned in a list regulating the sacrificial practice of a sanctuary. Dussaud’s (1921, p. 141) proposed translation of *špr*’*gmn* and *šš* as, respectively, “cock” (“coq”), and “hen, chicken” (“poule, poulet”), is not adequately grounded.

86 Pardee translates the beginning of line 12 as follows: «[(In the case of) every (other) bird (offering)]. In fact, if *špr*’*gmn* and *šš* correspond to the distinction between domesticated and wild birds (cfr. Pardee 2003, p. 308, note 28), then *špr* in line 12 could not mean “every (other) bird”; therefore, he interprets it as “every (other) bird (offering)”. Consequently, according to this interpretation, this section of the text would concern different types of offering, all of them employing birds: “holy first-born (birds), game-(bird) sacrifices, or (bird-)fat sacrifices”, which seems to me a forced interpretation. Furthermore, if *šš* are wild birds, then the mention of “game-(bird) sacrifices” is difficult to justify. This expression apparently does not indicate any sacrificial mode, different from those mentioned in the previous line. Therefore, the difference between a sacrifice of wild birds and a sacrifice of game remains to be explained.

87 Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 1185 (*ššp*) and 357 (*hzt*). Krahmalkov’s swinging interpretation of [*bs*]’*gmn*’*m šš šlm kll* as «For an entirely intact ’*gmn*-bird or a hawk» (Krahmalkov 2000, pp. 420-421) or «For an ’*gmn*-bird or for an entirely whole hawk» (Krahmalkov 2000, p. 441) is based on his personal and unconvincing interpretation of *šlm kll* as “entirely intact”.

88 Dietrich – Loretz – Sanmartín 1975. Cfr. Krahmalkov 2000, p. 181). Actually, *ššp* also appear among Phoenician personal names, a common feature for zoonyms, as we shall see shortly, but far less so for sacrificial terms (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 185, who considers *ššp* a type of sacrifice, p. 425). Furthermore, the possibility of a homograph should not be excluded.

indicate a “web-footed bird”, that is a “palmate” one.⁸⁹ Such an interpretation of *ššp* and *hzt* as complementary categories, however, raises the same difficulty as mentioned above for *špr* ’*gmn* and *šš*.

To sum up, the sacrificial tariffs represent a major source of information about zoonyms in Phoenician language.⁹⁰ Due to their purpose, however, they are mostly concerned with some domestic mammals and with birds. Furthermore, they only concern animals which were allowed to be offered, which were probably a subset of those which were considered suitable to be eaten. Thus, not eatable animals are likely excluded *a priori*.

Besides the tariffs, possible zoonyms occur in several other Phoenician inscriptions. Due to the scarcity of contextual information, it is often uncertain which kind of animal is mentioned and, at times, even whether or not zoonyms are involved at all. Surely attested are:

ss

The word *ss*, “horse”,⁹¹ corresponding to Hebrew *sūs*,⁹² Ugaritic *ššw/ssw*⁹³ is attested in two Phoenician-Luvian celebrative bilinguals from Cilicia: the Karatepe inscription (*KAI* 26 A I 7, 8th or early 7th century), and the of Çineköy (second half of the 8th century BCE), a royal inscription by Awarikas, king of Que (at line 6).⁹⁴

klb, gr

The word for “dog”, *klb*⁹⁵ (cfr. Hebrew *keleb*,⁹⁶ Ugaritic *klb*⁹⁷) is attested in the 9th century celebrative inscription by Kilamuwa from Zincirli (*KAI* 24.10). On the plaquette from Kition *CIS* I, 86 = *KAI* 37, already mentioned, *klbm* and *grm* are referred to together (line 10 of face B, and on line 15 of face A, where *klbm* is integrated).⁹⁸ The two terms are possibly to be translated, respectively, as “dogs” and “whelps”,⁹⁹ *gr* corresponding to Hebrew *gūr*.¹⁰⁰ The meaning of *grm* as whelps, however, is not unanimously accepted: another possible translation is “lions”.¹⁰¹ Since the text is an account of payments to people of various description,

89 Mosca 2001.

90 Krahmalkov (2000, p. 424, s.v. *qdmnt I*) also considers the word *qdmnt*, following *špr* in line 12, as «a kind of animal offered in sacrifice», but apparently, since a more precise identification is not even attempted, it must be assumed that this interpretation is only due to the context, where the scholar considers all the offering of the group as concerning animals, excepted *šmn* which, however, he accordingly translates as “fat” rather than “oil”. However, while the mention of “holy” firstlings is easily explainable, much less tenable is the offering of a “holy” animal (common enough to be envisaged in the tariff). The interpretation of *qdmnt* as a kind of animal should therefore be discarded. The word is commonly interpreted as “firstlings”, “first-fruit”, cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 992; Tomback 1978, p. 285; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 219 (“primicias”); Amadasi Guzzo 1988, p. 112 (“primizie”).

91 Tomback 1978, p. 231; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 187 (“caballo”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 346.

92 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 746; Clines 1993-2011, VI, pp. 130-132.

93 Watson 2006, p. 446; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 760-761. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 261-263.

94 The text is inscribed on the base of a statue of the god Tarhunza (Tekoğlu *et al.* 2000).

95 The proposal by Coote (1975) of reading the name *klb* as the contemptuous appellation of a demon in the text inscribed on the bowl from Kition (Yon 2004, n°1100), should be rejected because the reading of the word actually appears to be *plb* (cfr. Yon 2004, p. 188). The text itself is most probably a dedication to Astarte, not an incantation as assumed by Coote.

96 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 476; Clines 1993-2011, IV, p. 415.

97 Watson 2006, p. 449; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 433-434. Common Semitic, see Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 156-158.

98 Masson – Sznycer 1972, pp. 21-68; Amadasi Guzzo – Karageorghis 1977, pp. 103-126; Yon 2004, p. 185; Amadasi Guzzo 2004, pp. 209-211.

99 Cfr. Watson 1997, p. 93; Healey 1974, pp. 55-56; Heltzer 1987, p. 313 (“cubs”).

100 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 185; Clines 1993-2011, II, p. 337. For the root see Fronzaroli 1968, pp. 280-281. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 120-123. It is perhaps noteworthy that of the attestations of compound names with the element *klb*, 5 out of 16 come from Cyprus (see below, in the section on personal names).

101 Peckham 1968, p. 317; Healey 1974, p. 56; Tomback 1978, p. 67 “lion whelp”. Van den Branden (1966, p. 259) interpretation of Phoenician *grm* as “lambs” (“agnelli”), assumes for Hebrew *gūr* a value of “lamb” that the term does not seem to possess.

it was suggested that these expressions indicated people, perhaps (male) prostitutes¹⁰² or some other cultic personnel masked like dogs and lions¹⁰³, rather than real animals.¹⁰⁴ However, completely different meanings for both *klbm* and *grm* in this text have also been proposed.¹⁰⁵

Other terms, of dubious interpretation and/or reading, for which a zoonym value has been proposed, are:

'rw

A 4th century inscription from Kition (*CIS* I, 10=*KAI* 32.3),¹⁰⁶ engraved on a marble altar, recalls the dedication of the altar itself and of two *'rwm*. The word *'rw* may correspond to Hebrew *'aryēh*, “lion”,¹⁰⁷ Ugaritic *arw*,¹⁰⁸ and the two objects might have been two sculptures of lions.¹⁰⁹

byk

The word *byk*¹¹⁰ is a *hapax*, attested in an inscription from Carthage (*CIS* I, 5523=*KAI* 96.2), recalling building activities and mentioning sculptures. The existence of the word¹¹¹ and its tentative interpretation as “falcon”¹¹² is only based on a comparison with the Egyptian word *bik*.¹¹³

dtm

According to a suggestion,¹¹⁴ the inscription on an anchor found along the coast of Spain,¹¹⁵ dated to the end of the 9th-8th century BCE, should be to read *ldtm*, where *dtm*, supposedly the name of the ship to which the anchor belonged, might be “the name of a large fish”, cfr. Akkadian *ditānu*.¹¹⁶ This suggestion involves a reading of the text, its interpretation and an identification of a zoonym which are all extremely uncertain.

kp̄rt

A 3rd century BCE dedicatory inscription from Umm el-‘Amed,¹¹⁷ engraved on the socle of a sculpture formerly representing a lion or a sphinx (only the front legs remain), mentioned something that was dedicated (possibly, but not necessarily, the sculpture itself). A comparison with Hebrew *kep̄r*, “young lion”¹¹⁸ suggest-

102 Cfr. e.g. *CIS*, p. 95: *klbm* “scorta virilia”; van den Branden 1966, pp. 257-259; Delcor 1979, pp. 161-163; Gibson 1982, p. 130; cfr. Yon 2004, p. 185 (“les chiens” and “les jeunes garçons”). *KAI*, II, pp. 54-55, translates “Tempelpäderasten (?)” and “Klienten”.

103 Peckham 1968, n. 4 p. 317; Healey 1974, p. 56.

104 For real dogs: Halévy 1881, pp. 200-202; Reinach 1884; Heltzer 1987, p. 313; also Hermay (2014, pp. 249-253) advocates the hypothesis of expenses for the maintenance of real dogs.

105 Krahmalkov (2000, p. 227, s.v. *klb II* and p. 144, s.v. *grr*), translates *klbm* and *grm* “the wielders of the pickax” and “the sawyers”, respectively. Schmitz 2013, p. 209, prefers “light troops” and “archers”.

106 Yon 2004, n°1002, p. 174.

107 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 87; Clines 1993-2011, I, p. 377.

108 Watson 2006, p. 449; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 107. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 24-26.

109 Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 104; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 71 (“leones”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 71. A different, not compelling (cfr. Amadasi Guzzo 2004, p. 208) interpretation as zoonym is proposed by Lipiński (1995, p. 187, note 482): “bouquetin” (cfr. Akk. *arwū*, “gazelle”, *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 1, s.v. *armū*). For an entirely different interpretation, cfr. *KAI*, II, pp. 50-50, “Altarherde”; Magnanini 1973, p. 95 (“fornelli”).

110 Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 152.

111 *KAI*, I, p. 19, renounces dividing letters into words.

112 Krahmalkov 2000, p. 101.

113 Erman – Grapow 1971, I, p. 444. Cfr. Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 3-4.

114 Lipiński 2004, p. 254-255.

115 Solá-Solé 1967, pp. 28-33.

116 Cfr. *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 3, p. 165.

117 Dunand – Duru 1962, pp. 192-193.

118 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 493; Clines 1993-2011, IV, pp. 453-454.

ed to Caquot the restoration $k[p]rt$, $*kprrt$ meaning “lioness”, or “sphinx”.¹¹⁹ Different reconstructions¹²⁰ have been proposed, and even accepting the reconstruction of $k[p]rt$, different interpretations are possible,¹²¹ and Caquot himself in his translation anteposes “lid” to “sphynx”.¹²² A difficulty is the possible indication that the object referred to was made of gold.¹²³

nhr

The word *nhr* appears only in a neo-Punic inscription from Qalat abi s-Siba, in Algeria (*KAI* 165).¹²⁴ In this text, a bilingual Latin-Neopunic funerary inscription, the word *nhr*¹²⁵ (at line 3) has been hypothetically translated as “dolphin”,¹²⁶ by comparison with Akkadian *nāhiru*,¹²⁷ whose meaning is, however, in turn much discussed.¹²⁸ In the Qalat abi s-Siba inscription, the zoonym supposedly indicates not a real animal, but an image of it, decorating the pedestal of a funerary monument. However, this assumption is rather uncertain and a different translation for the line has been proposed,¹²⁹ where not only *nhr* is not considered to be a zoonym, but it has nothing more to do with a sculpted decoration.

ʿpt

A 5th century BCE dedicatory inscription by Yehaumilk, king of Byblos (*CIS* I, 1=*KAI* 10.5), mentions a golden *ʿpt*, set in a stone standing above a “golden” *pth* (perhaps a gateway).¹³⁰ On comparison with Hebrew *ʿôp* (“bird”, but also everything that flies¹³¹), Ugaritic *ʿp* (“bird”),¹³² Krahmalkov¹³³ suggests to interpret *ʿpt* as “bird”, but most scholars prefer to interpret it as “winged disk”.¹³⁴

119 Caquot 1965, p. 30. Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 532 (probable).

120 Dunand reconstructed $k[s]rt$, meaning “sculpture” (Dunand – Duru 1962, pp. 192-193). Krahmalkov (1971, p. 35) proposes $k[k]rt$, which he translates as “two talents”.

121 Gibson 1982, p. 122: “propitiatory offering”.

122 Caquot 1965, p. 31: “Couvercle (*ou* sphyngé)”.

123 The proposed solution, that the sculpture was (partially) gilded or gold plated (“partiellement doré”), clashes with the supposed reference, in the text, to the offering of a “sculpture toute d’or” (Dunand – Duru 1962, pp. 192).

A difficulty accentuated by the translation proposed by Gibson (1982, p. 122) interpreting *hrš* not as “gold” but as a passive participle from $\sqrt{HRŠ}$, meaning “sculpted object” or something similar.

124 Jongeling 2008, pp. 249-251.

125 Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 725, s.v. *nhr*, “Ohne Deutung” for *KAI*, II, p. 154.

126 Van den Branden 1974, pp. 145-146; Watson 2013, p. 335.

127 Cfr. *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 11, p. 137 (“whale”).

128 Bordreuil – Briquel-Chatonnet 2000; Lundström 2012, pp. 328-329; cfr. Elayi – Voisin 2014. The *nāhiru*, which according to Assyrian sources was (locally?) called ANŠE.KUR.RA *ša* A.AB.BA “sea-horse”, may have been a hippopotamus rather than a dolphin. The term *nāhiru* may be the local term for hippopotamus, either derived from *nhr* “river” or from the same root *nhr* of Ugaritic *anhr* (Bordreuil – Briquel-Chatonnet 2000, p. 123; cfr. Elayi – Voisin 2014, p. 75). The meaning of Ugaritic *anhr* is also uncertain (cfr. del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 76; “dolphin/sperm whale” according to Watson 2007, p. 107). The phrase *nāhina ša* ANŠE.KUR.RA *ša* A.AB.BA *iqqabbīšūni* “a *nāhiru*, which is called a sea-horse” (cfr. A.K. Grayson, *RIMA* 2, Tiglath-pileser I A.0.87.1, 24-25; A.0.87.4, 87; A.0.87.15, 12’), instead of “a sea-horse, which is called a *nāhiru*”, might suggest that the local name of the animal rather corresponded to ANŠE.KUR.RA (*ss ym?*). Saporetti (1996, p. 1230) suggests that *nāhiru* might indicate a class, so that the sentence should be rather interpreted as “the/that *nāhiru* which is called sea-horse”.

129 Jongeling 2008, pp. 249-251.

130 Cfr. Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 951.

131 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 801; Clines 1993-2011, VI, pp. 312-313.

132 Watson 2006, p. 449; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 170. Cfr. Fronzaroli 1968, pp. 283-284; Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 66-68.

133 Krahmalkov 2000, p. 384. Militarev – Kogan 2005, p. 66, judge the attestation of this zoonym not very reliable.

134 Cfr. *KAI*, II, p. 14 (“Flügelsonne”); Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 878; Magnanini 1973, p. 27 (“sole alato”); Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 203 (“disco alado”), doubtful; Gibson 1982, 97.

p'r

An inscription from Ras el-Hadagia (Libya), from the beginning of the 1st century AD (*KAI* 118), might mention a statue of a *p'r*, which might mean “bull”, corresponding to Hebrew *par*¹³⁵ and Ugaritic *pr*.¹³⁶ The presence of such a word and its possible interpretation are, however, subject to discussion.¹³⁷

A series of words indicating classes or groups of animals are also attested in Phoenician inscriptions:

bqr

“Cattle”¹³⁸ (*KAI* 24.12), corresponding to Hebrew *bāqār*,¹³⁹ Ugaritic *bqr*.¹⁴⁰

mqn'/mqnt

“Livestock, cattle”¹⁴¹ (in the tariffs *CIS* I, 165.15; *CIS* I, 167.6; *CIS* I, 169.1', and in *KAI* 138.3¹⁴²), corresponding to Hebrew *miqneh*.¹⁴³

'dr

“Flock” of sheep¹⁴⁴ is attested in *KAI* 24.11, corresponding to Hebrew *'ēder*.¹⁴⁵

hyt

The word *hyt*, meaning “animals”,¹⁴⁶ corresponding to Hebrew *ḥayyāh*,¹⁴⁷ possibly appears in *KAI* 43¹⁴⁸ (at line 9, maybe repeated in line 10) where *hyt* are said to have been “consecrated” to Melqart by a high official.¹⁴⁹ The interpretation of *'h'yt* in an extremely fragmentary passage of *KAI* 30 (a 9th century BCE funerary inscription from Cyprus)¹⁵⁰ is only hypothetical.¹⁵¹

The claim that *'zrm* could be a zoonym indicating a domestic ovine, whose sex was specified by the addition of *'š* or *'št*, so that *'zrm š* and *'zrm št* indicated, respectively, a male and a female lamb,¹⁵² is to be

135 Cfr. Péter 1975; Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, pp. 960-961; Clines 1993-2011, VI, pp. 750-753.

136 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 678. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 239-242.

137 Cfr. Jongeling 2008, pp. 11-12.

138 Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 187; Tomback 1978, p. 54; Fuentes Estaño 1980, p. 89 (“ganado mayor”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 124.

139 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 151; Clines 1993-2011, II, pp. 250-252.

140 Watson 2006, p. 447; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 232-233. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 83-85.

141 Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 681 (“cattle”); Tomback 1978, p. 197 (“cattle”); Fuentes Estaño 1980, p. 167 (“rebaño, ganado”); Krahmalkov 2000, pp. 309-310 (“livestock, cattle”).

142 Jongeling 2008, pp. 66-67. *KAI* 138 is a Neopunic dedicatory inscription from Bir Tlelsa (Tunisia), concerning an “altar of cattle” (*hmzbh š hmqnt*), of cereals, cakes and perfume.

143 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 628; Clines 1993-2011, V, pp. 468-469.

144 Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 831; Tomback 1978, p. 239; Fuentes Estaño 1980, p. 195 (“rebaño”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 361.

145 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 793; Clines 1993-2011, VI, p. 285.

146 *KAI* II, p. 60 (“Tiere”); Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 369; Tomback 1978, p. 104; Fuentes Estaño 1980, p. 118 (“animales”); Gibson 1982, p. 137 “beasts”.

147 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 310; Clines 1993-2011, III, pp. 207-209.

148 A 3rd-century BCE dedicatory inscription engraved on a base from Lapethos.

149 An alternative translation as “temples” has been suggested by Krahmalkov (2000, p. 183).

150 Cfr. Gibson 1982, p. 29 (line 6).

151 Lipiński 2004, p. 44. The scholar speculates that the curse against who would violate the tomb wished for a transformation of his people into excrement and animal carcasses, but the condition of the text does not seem to support neither this nor any other interpretation of lines 6-7 (cfr. Müller 1975, p. 106; Gibson 1982, p. 29).

152 Février 1955, pp. 57-63.

discarded: *'zrm* is used to indicate a human being of a premature age,¹⁵³ not a kind of animals, and therefore is not to be considered as a zoonym.

3. ZOONYMS IN PERSONAL NAMES¹⁵⁴

Several zoonyms appear in the Phoenician onomastics, many of them indicating wild animals, otherwise underrepresented in the Phoenician epigraphy. This kind of evidence, however, is not without its flaws. In fact, zoonyms employed as personal names¹⁵⁵ do lack any surrounding context which could help to recognize them. Thus, zoonyms otherwise unattested in Phoenician are mostly identified through comparison with other Semitic languages, mostly Hebrew (where similar zoonyms are sometimes also attested as personal names), or through etymological speculation. Notwithstanding these difficulties, several other Phoenician personal names have been tentatively identified as zoonyms. The animals involved are mainly insects and mammals:

dbr, “bee”,¹⁵⁶ corresponding to Hebrew *d^ebôrāb*.¹⁵⁷

hld, “mole”, “weasel”,¹⁵⁸ corresponding to Hebrew *hōled*.¹⁵⁹

kysr, “elephant” (?).¹⁶⁰ The interpretation of this term has been proposed on the grounds of Latin sources (see further on, in the relevant section).¹⁶¹

klb, “dog”,¹⁶² already considered as a common noun, also appear in personal names (also in the feminine form *klbt*).¹⁶³

*kpr*¹⁶⁴ may mean “young lion”,¹⁶⁵ by comparison to Hebrew *k^epîr*.¹⁶⁶

153 Xella 2007.

154 Benz 1972, p. 239. See Benz also for occurrences of names and their variants.

155 Cfr. Miller Albà 2000; Dirbas 2017.

156 Benz 1972, p. 300; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 101. Benz records three attestations from Carthage and one from Lebanon (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 108).

157 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 208; Clines 1993-2011, II, p. 384. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 96-99.

158 Benz 1972, p. 310. Benz records 16 attestations of the name *hld*, which is also attested once in the form *hld* and is once probably misspelled as *hldl*. All the occurrences are from Carthage (cfr. Benz 1972, pp. 108-109).

159 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 316; Clines 1993-2011, III, p. 227. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 147-148.

160 Clermont-Ganneau 1886; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 139; cfr. Benz 1972, p. 330.

161 The personal name *kysr* is attested 10 times, *kysrm* twice. All instances are from Carthage (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 131).

162 Benz 1972, p. 331; Tomback 1978, pp. 142-143; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 140; Krahmalkov 2000, p. 227, s.v. *klb I*.

163 Attested in the names *klb'* (four times at Carthage, three times at Kition, once at Constantine), *klb'lm* (twice at Carthage, once at Kition), *klby* (once in Byblos and once in Sidon), *klbl* (once, at Elephantine), *klbn* [] (once, at Idalion), *klbt* (once, at Tyre: Sader 2005, p. 63). See Dixon 2018, Table 4 p. 35; Benz 1972, pp. 131-132.

164 The name appears on two Phoenician seals, cfr. Sanders 1991, p. 71 (with note 1).

165 Benz 1972, p. 334; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 143, “cachorro de león”. According to an alternative proposal, it would be to consider as *D*-stem form or $\sqrt{\text{KPR}}$, meaning “he forgives” (Sanders 1991). Since, however, in Hebrew, which is the nearest related language to Phoenician, the use of the zoonym as a personal name is attested, while the use of the *D*-stem form or the root $\sqrt{\text{KPR}}$ would find no certain parallel in Semitic onomastics, as observed (Layton 1993), the interpretation of *kpr* as a zoonym appears preferable, although dubious (cfr. Krahmalkov 2000, p. 240: «vocalization and meaning uncertain»).

166 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 493; Clines 1993-2011, IV, pp. 453-454.

lb' / lbt “lion”, “lioness”,¹⁶⁷ corresponding to Hebrew *lābī' / libyāh*,¹⁶⁸ Ugaritic *lbu*.¹⁶⁹

nml, “ant”,¹⁷⁰ corresponding to Hebrew *nēmālāh*,¹⁷¹ and perhaps to the Ugaritic personal name *nimaliya* (written *ni-ma-la-ya*).¹⁷²

nmr, a big feline (perhaps “leopard” or “panther”),¹⁷³ corresponding to Hebrew *nāmēr*,¹⁷⁴ Eblaitic *na-me-lum*.¹⁷⁵

ss', “moth” (?),¹⁷⁶ or another cloth-eating insect, corresponding to Hebrew *sās*,¹⁷⁷ to the Ugaritic personal name *ss* (perhaps also *ssn*),¹⁷⁸ and to Eblaitic *sa₃-su₂-um*.¹⁷⁹

'glt as a feminine personal name (meaning “heifer, young cow”) probably occurs on a funerary inscription, presumably from Tyre and dating from around the 8th to 7th century BCE,¹⁸⁰ corresponding to the Hebrew personal name *'eglāh*.¹⁸¹

'kbr, “mouse”,¹⁸² corresponding to Hebrew *'akbār*,¹⁸³ and to the Ugaritic personal name *ak-ba-ru*, doubtfully attested also alphabetically as *'kbr*.¹⁸⁴

'nZR, “boar”,¹⁸⁵ corresponding to Hebrew *h^azīr*,¹⁸⁶ Ugaritic *h₁nZR*, as a personal name,¹⁸⁷ *hu-zi-ru₃*.¹⁸⁸

167 Fuentas Estañol 1980, pp. 147-148; Krahmalkov 2000, p. 252. Benz (1972, pp. 337-338) considers *lbt* as feminine of *lby*, “Libyan”, not excluding that even *lb'* should be better explained as a variant writing of *lby*. He records 16 attestations of *lbt*, all from Carthage, and one of *lb'*, from Sardinia (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 133).

168 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 517; Clines 1993-2011, IV, p. 513.

169 Watson 2006, p. 449; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 486. Parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 194-197.

170 Benz 1972, pp. 360-361; Fuentas Estañol 1980, p. 179. Attested 10 times at Carthage and once at El-Hofra; the name *nmlm* is attested three times at Carthage (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 147).

171 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 701; Clines 1993-2011, V, p. 696. Common Semitic, cfr. Fronzaroli 1968, p. 286; Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 214-216.

172 Watson 2007, p. 106.

173 Benz 1972, p. 361 (“leopard”); Fuentas Estañol 1980, p. 179 (“leopardo”); Krahmalkov 2000, p. 329 (“panther”). A single attestation, from Carthage (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 147). It is not possible to specify more precisely what feline (or group of felines) was meant; it is moreover very probable that, in reality, the term was adapted to the various local contexts and to the different environments, therefore actually indicating different species in different contexts.

174 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 701; Clines 1993-2011, V, p. 696.

175 Sjöberg 1996, p. 11. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 216-219. Cfr. Fronzaroli 1968, p. 281.

176 Benz 1972, p. 368. A single attestation, from Carthage (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 148).

177 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 761; Clines 1993-2011, VI, p. 173.

178 Watson 2006, p. 452.

179 Sjöberg 1996, p. 18. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp.

180 Abousamra – Lemaire 2013, pp. 238-239.

181 Cfr. Friesen 2019, p. 47.

182 Benz 1972, p. 377; Krahmalkov 2000, p. 367, s.v. *'kbr I*; Fuentas Estañol 1980, p. 198. The name is attested 51 times, mostly at Carthage, but also twice at El-Hofra, and once each at Volubilis, Elephantine and in Sardinia. The feminine forms *'kbrt* (twice, at Carthage) and *'kbrt* (once, at El-Hofra) are also attested, as well as the names *'kbrm* (20 times, all from Carthage but one from El-Hofra) and *'kbr'* (three times, at Carthage). Cfr. Benz 1972, p. 171.

183 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 823; Clines 1993-2011, VI, p. 384.

184 Watson 2007, p. 97. For further parallels see Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 47-48.

185 Benz 1972, p. 381 (“wild pig”); Fuentas Estañol 1980, p. 202 “jabali” (?). Three attestations, all of them from Constantine (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 173).

186 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 302; Clines 1993-2011, III, p. 184.

187 Watson 2012, p. 332.

188 Huehnergard 1987, p. 128. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 149-152. Cfr. Fronzaroli 1969, p. 307.

pr'š, “flea”¹⁸⁹ corresponding to Hebrew *par'ōš*,¹⁹⁰ Ugaritic *prjt* (also as a personal name),¹⁹¹ Eblaite *pur-ha-sum*.¹⁹²

šp', “snake” (?)¹⁹³ corresponding to Hebrew *šepa'*.¹⁹⁴

špn, “badger”,¹⁹⁵ corresponding to Hebrew *šāpān* (“rock badger”, “rock hyrax”, *Procavia capensis syriaca*),¹⁹⁶ Ugaritic *špn*.¹⁹⁷

ššp, as we have seen, is considered by a few scholars¹⁹⁸ as a kind of bird. A personal name

ššp is known,¹⁹⁹ whose relationship, if any, with the term in *CIS I*, 165 is not known.

For the personal name Abdi-Li'ti of a king of Arwad, S. Parpola²⁰⁰ proposed an etymology as “Servant of the [divine] Cow” (cfr. Akk. *littu*),²⁰¹ but the name is better explained as “servant of the mighty one” (feminine).²⁰²

4. ZOONYMS IN PLANT-NAMES

Some Phoenician animal-names are supposedly recognizable in Phoenician plant-names, known to us through Greek and Latin transcriptions which were included in ancient herbals. Textual uncertainties, obscurities in the transcription and difficulties of interpretation make the identification of zoonyms extremely uncertain.

A bunch of plant-names seems to include the word **hšr*, “herb” (Hebrew *hāšîr*).²⁰³ So, the name of the herb *azirchalbe* ([Apul.], *Herb. LXXXVII*) might mean the “dog grass” (**hšr klb*).²⁰⁴ Similarly, *αστιρκοκ* (Dsc., IV 100) may be interpreted as **hšr *qq*, perhaps “herb of the lamb/of the flock”²⁰⁵ or, according to a different proposal, “herb of the partridge”, supposing a Phoenician word **qq* (comparing modern Hebrew *qāq*).²⁰⁶ The *azirguzol* ([Apul.], *Herb. LXVI*) might be the “herb of the dove” (**hšr *gzl*),²⁰⁷ Phoenician **gzl* supposedly

189 Benz 1972, p. 395; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 213; Krahmalkov 2000, p. 407, s.v. *pr'š I*. A single attestation, on a gemstone of unknown provenance.

190 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 971; Clines 1993-2011, VI, p. 776.

191 Watson 2007, p. 101; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 669.

192 Sjöberg 1996, p. 18. Other parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 246-248.

193 Cfr. Harris 1936, p. 141. A single attestation, from Carthage (Benz 1972, p. 178). The personal name *šp'* (*CIS I*, 788.3) could rather be a variant of the personal name *šp'* (Benz 1972, p. 400).

194 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1050; Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 152.

195 Benz 1972, pp. 239, 424. A single attestation, on a scarab found in Egypt.

196 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, pp. 1633-1634; Clines 1993-2011, VIII, 544.

197 Watson 2006, p. 454. Afroasian parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, p. 306 (neither Phoenician *špn* nor Ugaritic *špn* is taken into consideration).

198 Dietrich – Loretz – Sanmartín 1975. Cfr. Krahmalkov 2000, p. 181.

199 Benz records 23 occurrences, all of which from Carthage (cfr. Benz 1972, p. 185).

200 In Radner 1998, p. 6.

201 *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 9, pp. 217-219 (s.v. *littu A*).

202 Cfr. Benz 1972, pp. 336-337; Lipiński 2004, p. 281, note 65.

203 The word is variously attested in the manuscripts (*ασιρ-*, *ατιερ*, *ατιρ-*, *ατιερ-*, *ατιερ-*, *αστιρ-*, *αστειρ-*, *αστιερ-*, *azir-*), cfr. Steiner 1982, pp. 60-61; Hofstijzer – Jongeling 1995, p. 400. The form *atzi-* «does not inspire confidence» to Steiner (1982, p. 60).

204 Vattioni 1976, p. 529.

205 Vattioni 1976, p. 521, cfr. Buxtorf 1875, p. 996, s.v. *qwq*.

206 Krahmalkov 2000, p. 431. Also comparable is the Akkadian bird-name *qaqû* (cfr. *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 13, pp. 124-125). Further possible parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 172-173.

207 Vattioni 1976, p. 529: “erba della colomba”.

corresponding to Hebrew *gōzāl* (“young bird”, especially young pigeon),²⁰⁸ Ugaritic personal name *gzl* (“young bird”).²⁰⁹ Comparison might rather point to “young bird”,²¹⁰ but another name of this same herb, *zizuinnim* ([Apul.], *Herb.* LXVI), might be understood as *šš **ynm*, “flower (cfr. Hebrew *šîšāh*) of the doves/pidgeons”, supposing a Phoenician **ym*, comparable to Hebrew *yōnāh*,²¹¹ Ugaritic *yni*.²¹²

Of the other zoonyms which are supposedly detectable in names of plants, some are already attested in Phoenician: the word *ss*, “horse”, might occur in the plant name *abussussim* ([Apul.], *Herb.* XXXIV), if the latter is really derived from ’*b ssm*, “father of horses”²¹³ (but the reading *abussusi* is adopted in the critical edition of Howald and Sigerist).²¹⁴ From *klbt* (“bitch”), attested as a personal name, may derive the plant name *didacbolbot* (κυνόσβατος, Ps.-Dioscorides, *De herbis femininis* LXI), perhaps to be read as *didachalboth*,²¹⁵ namely **dd klbt* “udder/nipple of the bitch(es)”.²¹⁶ The word *prš*, “flea”, similarly also attested as a personal name, might be recognizable in the plant name ουαργουγουμ (supposedly a corruption of ουαργουσουμ or ουαργουσομ) carried by the ψύλλιον, “flea-wort”.²¹⁷ The word ’*lp* presumably occurs in αλσουναλφ, the “ox-tongue” (βούγλωσσο: Dsc., IV 127; cfr. [Apul.], *Herb.* XLI: *lasimsaph*), namely **lšn ’lp*,²¹⁸ with addition of a prothetic vowel (λασουναλφ is a correction proposed by Harris).²¹⁹ The word ’*z* might perhaps be recognized in the plant-name ἀχοισίμ, indicating a plant called τράγιον (Dsc., IV 50), which might be interpreted as **hy ’zm*, “herb of the goats”.²²⁰ The presence of the word ’*mr* in the name of the herb *saramuris* (if derived from *š r ’mr*, “hair of lamb”, “capigliatura dell’agnello”) is not supported by the different vocalization of ’*mr* on the stelae.²²¹

Other supposed Phoenician zoonyms, which are not otherwise attested, are:

**qw*, “deer”, corresponding to Hebrew *’aqqô* (“wild goat”),²²² tentatively recognized in ασκαουκαυ or ασκαουκαου, the Phoenician name of the herb ἐλαφοβόσκον (Dsc., III 69), interpreted as **hšq ’qw*, *desiderium cervi*.²²³

**hmr*, “ass”, corresponding to Hebrew *h^amôr*,²²⁴ Ugaritic *hmr*,²²⁵ which might occur in the plant name *saramuris* ([Apul.], *Herb.* XXVIII), if the latter really corresponds to “hair (cfr. Hebrew **šē’ār*) of the ass”, but also “hair of the lamb (’*mr*)” may explain it.²²⁶

208 Cfr. Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 182; Clines 1993-2011, II, p. 329.

209 Watson 2006, p. 449. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 127-128.

210 Cfr. Krahmalkov 2000, pp. 138-139, s.v. *gzl II* (“chick, birdling, fledgling”).

211 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 402; Clines 1993-2011, IV, p. 187.

212 Watson 2006, p. 451; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 957. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 321-322.

213 Vattioni 1976, p. 528.

214 Howald – Sigerist 1927, p. 78.

215 Friedrich – Röllig – Amadasi Guzzo 1999, p. 40, § 78b.

216 Cfr. Buxtorf 1875, p. 259; Vattioni 1976, p. 529-530.

217 Gesenius 1837, p. 394; Vattioni 1976, p. 525.

218 Harris 1936, p. 115; Vattioni 1976, p. 525; Friedrich – Röllig – Amadasi Guzzo 1999, p. 20, §37.3a.

219 Steiner 2001, pp. 98-103.

220 Gesenius 1837, p. 386; Vattioni 1976, p. 522.

221 Vattioni 1976, p. 531.

222 Cfr. Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 82; Clines 1993-2011, I, p. 365.

223 Gesenius 1837, p. 386; cfr. Vattioni 1976, p. 521.

224 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 327; Clines 1993-2011, III, pp. 252-253.

225 Watson 2006, p. 446; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 358-359. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 137-139. Cfr. Fronzaroli 1969, p. 306.

226 Vattioni 1976, p. 531.

**qrr*. The *atircoris* ([Apul.], *Herb. IX: herba botracion*), might be the “herb of the frog/toad”, supposing a Phoenician word **qrwr*²²⁷ or rather *qrr*.²²⁸

5. ZOONYMS IN TOPONYMS²²⁹

Phoenician animal-names also occur in some place-names. Some of the latter are only known through Greek and Latin transcription, which makes more uncertain, and often highly speculative, the identification of a supposed Phoenician zoonym. Furthermore, most of the zonyms possibly recognizable in place-names are not independently attested elsewhere.

A group of zonyms appears to consist in a construct chain composed by the word “island” (’*y*) plus a zoonym. To this group belong the following place-names:

’*yksm* (Algiers),²³⁰ possibly to be interpreted as “island of the owls”,²³¹ comparing **ks* to Hebrew *kôš*.²³²

’*yṣm* (present-day Island of San Pietro),²³³ is to be explained as “island of the hawks” (’*y ṣm*),²³⁴ Phoenician **nš*, “hawk”, corresponding to Hebrew *nēš*,²³⁵ Ugaritic *nš*.²³⁶ This interpretation is confirmed by the correspondent Greek toponym, which is simply a translation of the Punic name, namely *ἱεράκων νῆσος*.²³⁷

’*yrm* (present-day Pantelleria),²³⁸ perhaps “island of the ostriches”,²³⁹ comparing the supposed zoonym **rn* to Hebrew *r^enānīm*.²⁴⁰

’*ytnm*, probably in the region of Hadrumetum,²⁴¹ might be interpreted as the “island of the jackals”,²⁴² by comparison of a supposed zoonym **tn* with Hebrew *tan*²⁴³ or maybe “island of the tunnies”.²⁴⁴

Much less compelling is the explanation of the modern name of the Zembra island (Arabic *زميرة*), off the Tunisian coast, as derived from its supposed Punic name ’*y *gmr*, “island of the buck”,²⁴⁵ as suggested by its

227 Vattioni 1976, p. 529.

228 Krahmalkov 2000, p. 433. In support, Krahmalkov mentions Egyptian *qrr* (cf. Erman – Grapow 1971, V, p. 61), and Aramaic *yaqûr*, but cfr. also Syriac *yakrura* (Militarev – Kogan 2005, p. 186).

229 On animal names in Semitic toponyms see Dirbas 2021 (who does not include Phoenician in his discussion).

230 For the attestations of the name see Filigheddu 2006, p. 154.

231 Szyncer 1977, p. 173 (“hiboux”); cfr. Lipiński 2004, p. 403.

232 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 466; Clines 1993-2011, IV, p. 377. Militarev – Kogan 2005, p. 166.

233 *CIS* I, 139 = *KAI* 64 = *ICO* Sard. 23 (from Sardinia), line 1; *CIS* I, 5606 (from Carthage); Plin. *Nat.* III 7,84: *Enosim*.

234 Szyncer 1977, p. 173; Tomback 1978, p. 219; Fuentes Estañol 1980, p. 65; Krahmalkov 2000, p. 48.

235 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 714; Clines 1993-2011, V, p. 735.

236 Watson 2006, p. 451; del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, p. 637. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 222-223.

237 Ptol., *Geogr.* III 3,8.

238 *CIS* I 265.3 (from Carthage) and on coins of Pantelleria (see Filigheddu 2006, p. 155).

239 Szyncer 1977, p. 173.

240 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1249; Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 504.

241 The place name (not considered in Filigheddu 2006) is attested in three inscriptions from Hadrumetum (Cintas 1947, pp. 38-40, of which one is *KAI* 99).

242 Szyncer 1975, p. 62; Szyncer 1977, p. 173; Tomback 1978, p. 343.

243 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1759; Clines 1993-2011, VIII, p. 650.

244 Lipiński 2004, p. 12, on the assumption of a common Mediterranean word corresponding to the Greek *θύννος*. Segert (1976, p. 283) proposes, doubtfully, “island of dragons”.

245 Lipiński 2004, p. 374.

transcription as Αιγίμουρος (Strab. II 5,19; VI 2,11; Zonar. IX 27) and *Aegimurus* (Flor. *Epit.* I 18). By translating “buck” Lipiński avoids a too precise identification of the species.²⁴⁶ But the Ugaritic word *gmr*, on which his hypothesis rests, probably designates neither a buck nor any other animal.²⁴⁷

Another group of toponyms might derive from a construct chain composed by the word *rʿš* (“cape”) plus a zoomyn:

Rusguniae (Algeria)²⁴⁸ might be “Cape of the Francolin”²⁴⁹ supposing a Phoenician word **gn(y)*, comparing Arabic *ǧūnī*.²⁵⁰

Rusubbicari (Algeria)²⁵¹ might be related with *bqr*,²⁵² so would mean “Cape of the Cattle”.

Rusazus (Algeria)²⁵³ might be interpreted as “Cape of the Goat” (‘*z*).²⁵⁴

Also for the name of the cape called Κώτης ἄκρον,²⁵⁵ or αἱ Κώτεις²⁵⁶ (probably in present-day Morocco), an attempted interpretation detects a trace of a Phoenician zoomyn, **qʿt*²⁵⁷ (maybe “pelican”), by comparison with Hebrew *qāʿat*.²⁵⁸

Indeed, some toponyms have tentatively been explained as composed of the Phoenician word *rʿš* (“cape”) plus Libyan zoomyns:

Rusibis (Morocco)²⁵⁹ and *Rusippisir*²⁶⁰ (probably in present-day Algeria) may supposedly be the “Cape of the Hyena”, from Libyan *iffis* “Hyena”.²⁶¹

*Rusuccuru*²⁶² may supposedly be the “Cape of the Partridge”, from Libyan *uskurt/usekkurt* “partridge”.²⁶³ If the latter interpretation is correct, the Libyan zoomyn might have coexisted with Phoenician **qq* (if the identification and interpretation of this zoomyn in the plant-name αστιρκοκ is correct), or might have replaced it locally. Moreover, *Rusuccuru* as “Cape of the Partridge” might be considered as entirely Phoeni-

246 Lipiński 2004, p. 374 n. 187.

247 Cfr. del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015, pp. 297-298. Watson (2006 and 2007) does not include *gmr* among the Ugaritic names of animals.

248 Ptol., *Geogr.* IV 2,6 (Πουσιγότιον (manuscripts have Πουσιτότιον); Plin., *Nat.* V 20, *Rusguniae*. Cfr. *RE*, IA.1, s.v. “Rusguniae”, col. 1236-1237 (H. Dessau).

249 Lipiński 1992-1993, p. 298; 2004, p. 402.

250 Cfr. Bodenheimer 1935, p. 172. Lipiński 2004, p. 402, note 373, mentions also (modern?) Hebrew *gūnī*.

251 Ptol., *Geogr.* IV 2,6 (Πουσίκιβαρ/Πουσίβικαρ).

252 Segert 1966, p. 21.

253 Ptol., *Geogr.* IV 2,9 (Πουσαζοῦς); Plin., *Nat.* V 20, *Rusazus*. Cfr. *RE*, IA.1, s.v. “Rusazu”, col. 1234 (H. Dessau).

254 Segert 1966, pp. 21-22. According to Segert (p. 22, note 29), the ending *-us* of the toponym might perhaps represent the plural feminine ending *-ūt* (occasionally appearing as *uth* in Latin, cfr. Friedrich – Röllig – Amadasi Guzzo 1999, p. 151, § 231).

255 Ptol., *Geogr.* IV 1,2.

256 Strab. XVII 3,2.

257 Lipiński 2004, p. 448.

258 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1059-1060; Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 169. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 172-173.

259 Ptol., *Geogr.* IV 1,2 (Πουσιβίς). Cfr. *RE*, IA.1, s.v. “Rusibis”, col. 1237” (H. Dessau).

260 Ptol., *Geogr.* IV 2,8 (Πουσουβιρσίρ/Πουσουβίσιρ). Cfr. *RE*, IA.1, s.v. “Rusubirsir”, col. 1245 (H. Dessau).

261 Mercier 1924, p. 266.

262 Ptol., *Geogr.* IV 2,8 (Πουσουκκό(υ)που); Plin., *Nat.* V 20 *Rusucurum*. Cfr. *RE*, IA.1, s.v. “Rusuccuru”, col. 1245 (H. Dessau).

263 Mercier 1924, p. 287.

cian,²⁶⁴ supposing the existence of another Phoenician word for “partridge”, namely **qr*,²⁶⁵ by comparison to Hebrew *qôrē*.²⁶⁶

An entirely Phoenician etymology has been proposed for the toponym *Cabarsussis* or *Cebarsussis*,²⁶⁷ which might be explained as *kpr ss(m)* “village of the horse(s)”.²⁶⁸

6. GREEK AND LATIN SOURCES

Some Phoenician animal names are occasionally reported by Greek and Latin writers. Mentions of Phoenician animal names in Greek and Latin sources present two main problems: the interpretation of a Phoenician word offered by a non-native speaker may be incorrect, and its phonetical adaptation to a different graphic system is generally, and necessarily, imprecise.

According to Plutarch (*Sull.* XVII 5: θῶρ γὰρ οἱ Φοίνικες τὴν βοῦν καλοῦσι), Phoenicians called a cow θῶρ, which (although š is not usually rendered by θ),²⁶⁹ seems to point to a Phoenician word *šr, corresponding to Hebrew šôr. Most probably, like its Hebrew cognate,²⁷⁰ *šr could indicate a male as well as a female bovine. The claim of Plutarch, that Phoenicians called θῶρ the cow (τὴν βοῦν), does not exclude that a bull could also be indicated as θῶρ; his reference to a female was specifically required by the context, an etymological tale explaining a Greek toponym by reference to the cow whom Cadmus had notoriously followed. In another passage. (*Quaes. conv.* IX 2,3) Plutarch gives ἄλφα as the Phoenician word for τὸν βοῦν.

According to a tradition, also the (Greek) name of Ashdod, namely Ἄζωτος, supposedly originated from its founder’s wife name, Ἄζα, which meant “she-goat” (χίμαιρα).²⁷¹ Since the founder was said to be of one of those who had escaped from the “Red Sea” (therefore a Phoenician, according to a well-known tradition),²⁷² this is an allusion to a Phoenician context: therefore, the name Ἄζα presumably corresponds to the Phoenician word ‘z.²⁷³

Latin sources (Serv., *A I* 286 and others), claim that Caesar’s name was derived by the Carthaginian or Maurian name of the elephant, namely *caesa* or *caesai*. It is to be kept in mind that the Carthaginians raised elephants for military purposes, and that they captured the animals which were indigenous in North Africa, and different from those living in Asia. Carthaginians could have adopted the local name for these elephants together with the animals themselves. The Phoenician name should rather be derived from the root *pil* (cfr. Hebrew *pil*, Akk. *pilum*).²⁷⁴

Our knowledge of the names of marine fauna in Phoenician is very scanty, if extant at all. Fishing and the fishing trade, however, certainly were of considerable importance in the Phoenician world. This fact

264 Lipiński 2004, p. 400.

265 Lipiński 2004, p. 400.

266 Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994, p. 1132; Clines 1993-2011, VII, p. 304; Jastrow 1903, p. 1341. Further parallels in Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 183-184.

267 Cfr. *RE*, III.5, s.v. “Cabarsussis”, coll. 1161-1162 (H. Dessau).

268 Vattioni 1978, p. 718.

269 Cfr. Friedrich – Röllig – Amadasi Guzzo 1999, p. 26, §45b.

270 Cfr. Péter 1975.

271 St. Byz. I 77.

272 Hdt. I 1,1; VII 89,2; Strab. XVI 3,4; Plin., *Nat.* IV 36,120; Just., *Epit.* XVIII 3,2.

273 This etymology may suggest that ‘z was also used as a personal name, but there is no supporting evidence in Phoenician epigraphy.

274 Cfr. Fronzaroli 1968, p. 282; Militarev – Kogan 2005, pp. 227-230.

seems to have been acknowledged by those ancient etymologies explaining the names of Tyre and Sidon as referring to fish. Indeed, while a tradition assumed that the name of Sidon arose *a piscium ubertate* of the city, since *piscem Phoenices sidon vocant*,²⁷⁵ on the other hand an explanation of the name of Tyre referred to a *sar*-fish which supposedly abounded in her waters.²⁷⁶ Although these etymologies are not unquestionable (the name of Tyre probably derives from the word *šr*, “rock”), nevertheless they hint to the existence, respectively, of a Phoenician word *š(y)*d*, probably meaning “fishery (and hunting)”, and of a Phoenician fish-name *š(?)*r*, which cannot be identified.²⁷⁷

Pliny’s statement (*Nat. IX 51,97*), that the *carabi*-crabs were called *hippoe* in Phoenician language (*in Phoenice hippoe vocantur*) is due to a misunderstanding. Aristotle (*HA II 3, 526a*) mentioned crabs living in Phoenicia which were called “horses” (ἵππους) because of their speed (περὶ δὲ τὴν Φοινίκην γίνονται ἐν τῷ αἰγιαλῷ οὓς καλοῦσιν ἵππους διὰ τὸ οὕτω ταχέως θεῖν ὥστε μὴ ῥάδιον εἶναι καταλαβεῖν). Aristotle simply meant that such crabs were called “horses”, therefore they were presumably called *ssm*.

7. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

From the various sources available, the following evidence concerning possible zoonyms can be collected:

'yl	“deer” (?)
'mr	“lamb”
'lp	“ox”, “head of cattle”
*'qw (???)	“deer” (?)
'rw (?)	“lion” (?)
byk (???)	“falcon” (?)
bqr	“cattle”
gd	“(goat-)kid”
*gzl (???)	“pigeon”
*gmr (???)	“buck” (?), “mountain sheep” (?)
*gny (?)	“francolin” (?)
gr	“whelp” (?), “lion” (?)
dbr	“bee”
hzt (???)	a kind of bird
hld	“mole”, “weasel”
*hmr (???)	“ass”
ybl	“ram”
*yn (???)	“dove”
kyšr	“elephant” (?)
klbl/klbt	“dog”, “bitch”
*ks (???)	“owl” (?)
kpr/kprt (?)	“young lion” / “lioness” (?)
lb'l/b't	“lion” / “lioness” (?)

275 Just., *Epit. XVIII 3,4*; cfr. Isid., *Orig. XV 1,28*: *a piscium copia Sidon appellaverunt. Nam piscem Phoenices 'sidon' vocant*. Cfr. Steiner 2007, pp. 75-77.

276 Serv., *G. II 506*: *Tyros dicitur, olim Sarra vocabatur a pisce quodam, qui illic abundat, quem lingua sua sar appellant*; Isidorus, *Etymologiae XII 6,38*: *Civitas Syriae, quae nunc Tyrus dicitur, olim Sarra vocabatur a pisce quodam qui illic abundat, quem lingua sua 'sar' appellant*.

277 The similarity of the *sar*-fish with *sardae sardinaeque* (Isidorus adds *ex quo derivatum est huius similitudinis pisciculos sardas sardinasque vocari*), is most probably just etymological speculation.

<i>mqn' /mqnt</i>	“livestock”
<i>nhr</i> (???)	“dolphin” (???)
<i>nml</i>	“ant”
<i>nmr</i>	a big feline
<i>nš</i>	“(sparrow)hawk” (?)
<i>*sd</i> (?)	“fish”
<i>ss</i>	“horse”
<i>ss'</i>	“moth” (?)
<i>'gll' glt</i> (?)	“calf” / “heifer”
<i>'dr</i>	“flock”
<i>'z</i>	“goat” or “she-goat”
<i>'kbr</i>	“mouse”
<i>'nzt</i>	“boar”
<i>'pt</i> (???)	a kind of bird
<i>p'r</i> (???)	“bull”
<i>pr'š</i>	“flea”
<i>š'n</i>	“flock”, “(head of?) small livestock”
<i>šp'</i> (?)	“snake”
<i>špr</i>	“bird”
<i>špr' gnn</i>	a kind of bird
<i>špr' rr</i> (?)	a kind of bird
<i>šš</i>	a kind of bird
<i>šrb' yl</i>	“fawn” (?), “young ram” (?)
<i>*q't</i> (???)	“pelican”
<i>*qq</i> (???)	“partridge” (???), “lamb” (???)
<i>*qr</i> (???)	“partridge” (?)
<i>*qrr</i> (???)	“frog, toad”
<i>*rn</i> (?)	“ostrich” (?)
<i>š</i>	“lamb”, “kid”, “head of small livestock”
<i>špn</i>	“badger”
<i>ššp</i> (???)	a kind of bird
<i>*šr</i>	“head of cattle”
<i>*tn</i> (???)	“jackals” (?), “tunny” (??)

Due to the peculiarity of their contexts, the interpretation of such names is often mainly depending on the corresponding Hebrew cognate, according to the rule that comparisons should proceed starting from the nearest and progressing to the more distantly related languages, and to the latter only when comparisons with the former have been exhausted without conclusive results. As we have seen, the identification and interpretation of Phoenician zoonyms is hindered by several biases and limits in our evidence, mostly the paucity or even complete lack of contextual information. Furthermore, in addition to the uncertainty of the identification of the zoonym lying behind a toponym, especially in the case of zoonyms indicating wild animals there is the possibility of a semantic shift, as a consequence of the differences in the local environments. Phoenician language was used from the Levant to the Atlantic Ocean, including a variety of landscapes where different ecosystems lived; it is therefore quite possible, if not inevitable, that a zoonym which was connected to a specific Levantine species in the Phoenician motherland referred to a different species in another natural context, where the species which was originally meant was lacking, while other, although similar, species were present. On the other hand, Phoenician zoonyms could coexist or even be replaced by

zoonyms in different languages spoken by native people. Comparison with Hebrew, therefore, while often seminal in identifying an animal name, is not necessarily a trustworthy guide for interpreting its meaning, which may be supposed to have been closer in the Phoenician homeland (which was culturally and ecologically related to the Biblical context) but could well have changed in other Phoenician settlement areas, whose environmental and faunal contexts were different.

REFERENCES

- Abousamra – Lemaire 2013 = G. Abousamra – A. Lemaire, *Quatre stèles funéraires phéniciennes inédites*, in F. Briquel-Chatonnet – C. Fauveaud-Brassaud – I. Gajda (edd.), *Entre Carthage et l'Arabie heureuse: mélanges offerts à François Bron*, Paris 2013, pp. 235-242.
- Amadasi Guzzo 1988 = M.G. Amadasi Guzzo, *Sacrifici e banchetti: Bibbia ebraica e iscrizioni puniche*, in C. Grottanelli – N.F. Parise (edd.), *Sacrificio e società nel mondo antico*, Roma-Bari 1988, pp. 97-122.
- Amadasi Guzzo 1990 = M.G. Amadasi Guzzo, *Noms de vases en phénicien*, in «Semitica» 38, 1990, pp. 15-25.
- Amadasi Guzzo 2004 = M.G. Amadasi Guzzo, *Mise à jour bibliographique des inscriptions publiées dans Kition III (1977)*, in Yon 2004, pp. 205-215.
- Amadasi Guzzo – Karageorghis 1977 = M.G. Amadasi Guzzo – V. Karageorghis, *Fouilles de Kition III. Inscriptions Phéniciennes*, Nicosia 1977.
- Amadasi Guzzo – Zamora López 2012-2013 = M.G. Amadasi Guzzo – J.Á. Zamora López, *The Epigraphy of the Tophet*, in «StEpigrLing» 29-30, 2012-2013, pp. 159-192.
- Baker 1987 = D.W. Baker, *Leviticus 1-7 and the Punic Tariffs: A Form Critical Comparison*, in «ZAW» 99, 1987, pp. 188-197.
- Benz 1972 = F.L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*, Rome 1972 («Studia Pohl», 9).
- Bodenheimer 1935 = F.S. Bodenheimer, *Animal Life in Palestine: An Introduction to the Problems of Animal Ecology and Zoogeography*, Jerusalem 1935.
- Bordreuil – Briquel-Chatonnet 2000 = P. Bordreuil – F. Briquel-Chatonnet, *Tiglath-phalasar I a-t-il pêché ou chassé le nahiru?*, in «Topoi» Suppl. 2, 2000, pp. 117-124.
- Buxtorf 1875 = J. Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, Leipzig 1875.
- Capuzzi 1968 = A. Capuzzi, *I sacrifici di animali a Cartagine*, in «StMagreb» 2, 1968, pp. 45-76.
- Caquot 1965 = A. Caquot, *Le dieu Milk'ashtart et les inscriptions de Umm el Amed*, in «Semitica» 15, 1965, pp. 29-33.
- Cintas 1947 = P. Cintas, *Le sanctuaire punique de Sousse*, in «Revue Africaine» 91, 1947, pp. 1-80.
- Clermont-Ganneau 1886 = C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Cesar et le nom punique de l'éléphant*, in C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale II*, Paris 1886, pp. 230-234.
- Clines 1993-2011 = D.J.A. Clines (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, Sheffield 1993-2011.
- Cohen – Bron – Lonnet 1970-2012 = D. Cohen – F. Bron – A. Lonnet, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*, Paris-La Haye-Leuven 1970-2012.
- Cooke 1903 = G.A. Cooke, *A Text-book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford 1903.
- Coote 1975 = R.B. Coote, *The Kition Bowl*, in «BASOR» 220, 1975, pp. 47-50.
- D'Andrea 2020 = B. D'Andrea, *Sacrificare "alla maniera" fenicia? I sacrifici animali nel mondo fenicio e punico: caratteri e specificità*, in S. Celestino Pérez – E. Rodríguez González (edd.), *Un viaje entre el Oriente y el Occidente del Mediterráneo. Actas del IX Congreso Internacional de Estudios Fenicios y Púnicos* (Mérida, 22-26 de octubre de 2018), Mérida 2020, pp. 149-165.
- Delcor 1979 = M. Delcor, *Le personnel du temple d'Astarté à Kition d'après une tablette phénicienne (CIS 86 A ET B)*, in «UF» 11, 1979, pp. 147-164.
- Delcor 1983 = M. Delcor, *À propos du sens de špr dans le tarif sacrificiel de Marseille (CIS I, 165, 12): parfum d'origine végétale ou parfum d'origine animale?*, in «Semitica» 33, 1983, pp. 33-39.
- Delcor 1990 = M. Delcor, *Le tarif dit de Marseille (CIS I, 165). Aspects du système sacrificiel punique*, in «Semitica» 38, 1990, pp. 87-93.
- Del Olmo Lete – Sanmartín 2015 = G. del Olmo Lete – J. Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, Leuven-Paris-Bristol (CT) 2015³.

- Dietrich – Loretz – Sanmartín 1975 = M. Dietrich – O. Loretz – J. Sanmartín, *Zu šlm kll im Opfertariff von Marseille (CIS I 165)*, in «UF» 7, 1975, pp. 561-562.
- Dirbas 2017 = H. Dirbas, *Thy Name is Deer. Animal Names in Semitic Onomastics and Name-giving Traditions: Evidence from Akkadian, Northwest Semitic, and Arabic*, PhD. Diss., University of Leiden 2017.
- Dirbas 2021 = H. Dirbas, *Animal Names in Semitic Toponyms*, in L. Recht – C. Tsouparopoulou (edd.), *Fierce Lions, Angry Mice and Fat-tailed Sheep. Animal Encounters in the Ancient Near East*, Cambridge 2021, pp. 103-111.
- Dixon 2018 = H. Dixon, *Late 1st-Millennium B.C.E. Levantine Dog Burials as an Extension of Human Mortuary Behavior*, in «BASOR» 379, 2018, pp. 19-41.
- Dunand – Duru 1962 = M. Dunand – R. Duru, *Oumm el 'Amed. Une ville de l'époque hellénistique aux échelles de Tyr*, Paris 1962.
- Dupont-Sommer 1972 = A. Dupont-Sommer, *Une inscription phénicienne archaïque récemment trouvée à Kition (Chypre)*, in «MemInstNatFr» 44, 1972, pp. 273-294.
- Dussaud 1921 = R. Dussaud, *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice israélite*, Paris 1921.
- Elayi – Voisin 2014 = J. Elayi – J.-F. Voisin, *Quelques précisions sur le nāhīru péché au sud d'Arwad*, in «AulaOr» 32, 2014, pp. 71-77.
- Erman – Grapow 1971 = A. Erman – H. Grapow (edd.), *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, V, Berlin 1971.
- Février 1955 = J.G. Février, *Le vocabulaire sacrificiel punique*, in «Journal Asiatique» 243, 1955, pp. 49-63.
- Février 1958-1959 = J.G. Février, *Remarques sur le grand tarif dit de Marseille*, in «CahByrsa» 8, 1958-1959, pp. 35-43.
- Filigheddu 2006 = P. Filigheddu, *Die Ortsnamen des Mittelmeerraums in der phönizischen und punischen Überlieferung*, in «UF» 38, 2006, pp. 149-265.
- Friedrich – Röllig – Amadasi Guzzo = J. Friedrich – W. Röllig – M.G. Amadasi Guzzo, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. 3. Auflage*, Rome 1999 («Analecta Orientalia», 55).
- Friesen 2019 = H. Friesen, *Untersuchung zu den hebräischen Frauennamen der biblischen und rabbinischen Literatur. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Köln im Fach Judaistik*, 2019.
- Fronzaroli 1968 = P. Fronzaroli, *Studi sul lessico comune semitico, V. – La natura selvatica*, in «RendLinc» 23, 1968, pp. 267-303.
- Fronzaroli 1969 = P. Fronzaroli, *Studi sul lessico comune semitico, VI. – La natura domestica*, in «RendLinc» 24, 1969, pp. 285-320.
- Fuentes Estañol 1980 = M.-J. Fuentes Estañol, *Vocabulario fenicio*, Barcelona 1980 («Biblioteca fenicia», 1).
- Garbini 1992 = G. Garbini, *ršp špr̄m*, in «RStFen» 20, 1992, pp. 93-94.
- Gesenius 1837 = W. Gesenius, *Scripturae linguaeque Phoeniciae monumenta quotquot supersunt*, Leipzig 1837.
- Gibson 1982 = J.C.L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions, III. Phoenician Inscriptions*, Oxford 1982.
- Gray 1923 = L.H. Gray, *The Punic Passages in the "Poenulus" of Plautus*, in «The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures» 39, 1923, pp. 73-88.
- Guzzo Amadasi 1967 = M.G. Guzzo Amadasi, *Le iscrizioni fenicie e puniche delle colonie in Occidente*, Roma 1967 («Studi Semitici», 28).
- Halévy 1881 = J. Halévy, *Les inscriptions peintes de Citium*, in «Revue des Études Juives» 3, 1881, pp. 173-204.
- Harris 1936 = Z.S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, New Haven 1936 («American Oriental Series», 8).
- Healey 1974 = J.P. Healey, *The Kition Tariffs and the Phoenician Cursive Series*, in «BASOR» 216, 1974, pp. 53-60.
- Heltzer 1987 = M. Heltzer, *The gēr in the Phoenician Society*, in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C.*, Leuven 1987 («Studia Phoenicia», 5), pp. 309-314.
- Hermay 2014 = A. Hermay, *Les textes antiques ont-ils créé le mythe d'une prostitution sacrée à Chypre?*, in «CahCEC» 44, 2014, pp. 239-260.
- Hoftijzer – Jongeling 1995 = J. Hoftijzer – K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, Leiden 1995 («Handbuch der Orientalistik», I.21).
- Howald – Sigerist 1927 = E. Howald – H. Sigerist (edd.), *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum*, IV, Leipzig-Berlin, 1927
- Huehnergard 1987 = J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, Atlanta 1987 («Harvard Semitic Studies», 32).

- Jastrow 1903 = M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, London-New York 1903.
- Jongeling 2008 = K. Jongeling, *Handbook of Neo-Punic Inscriptions*, Tübingen 2008.
- Köhler – Baumgartner – Stamm 1994 = L. Köhler – W. Baumgartner – J.J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Leiden 1994.
- Krahmalkov 1971 = C. Krahmalkov, *Notes on the Inscription of ‘Abd’adony from Umm el-‘Amed*, in «RSO» 46, 1971, pp. 33-37.
- Krahmalkov 2000 = C.R. Krahmalkov, *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*, Leuven 2000 («Studia Phoenicia», 15).
- Layton 1993 = S.C. Layton, *The Phoenician Name KPR: “Young Lion” or “He Forgives”? A Rejoinder*, in «Andrews University Seminary Studies» 31, 1993, pp. 53-56.
- Levi Della Vida 1964 = G. Levi Della Vida, *Ostrakon Neopunico dalla Tripolitania*, in «Or» 33, 1964, pp. 1-14.
- Lidzbarski 1907 = M. Lidzbarski, *Altsemitische Texte I. Kanaanäische Inschriften (moabitisch, althebräisch, phönizisch)*, Giessen 1907.
- Lipiński 1992-1993 = E. Lipiński, *Sites “phénico-puniques” de la côte algérienne*, in «Reppal» 7-8, 1992-1993, pp. 287-324.
- Lipiński 1995 = E. Lipiński, *Dieux et déesses de l’univers phénicien et punique*, Leuven 1995 («Studia Phoenicia», 14).
- Lipiński 2004 = E. Lipiński, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Leuven 2004 («Studia Phoenicia», 18).
- Lipiński 2009 = E. Lipiński, *Resheph. A Syro-Canaanite Deity*, Leuven 2009 («Studia Phoenicia», 19).
- Lundström 2012 = S. Lundström, *The Hunt is on Again! Tiglath-pileser I’s and Aššur-bel-kala’s nāhirū-Sculptures in Assur*, in H. Baker – K. Kaniuth – A. Otto (edd.), *Stories of Long ago. Festschrift für Michael D. Roaf*, Münster 2012 («AOAT», 397), pp. 323-338.
- Magnanini 1973 = P. Magnanini, *Le iscrizioni fenicie dell’Oriente*, Roma 1973.
- Masson – Sznycer 1972 = O. Masson – M. Sznycer, *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre*, Genève-Paris 1972.
- Mercier 1924 = G. Mercier, *La langue libyenne et la toponymie antique de l’Afrique du Nord*, in «Journal Asiatique» 205, 1924, pp. 189-320.
- Militarev – Kogan 2005 = A. Militarev – L. Kogan, *Semitic Etymological Dictionary. II. Animal Names*, Münster 2005 («AOAT», 278/2).
- Millet Albà 2000 = A. Millet Albà, *Les noms d’animaux dans l’onomastique des archives de Mari*, in «Topoi» Suppl. 2, 2000, pp. 477-487.
- Mosca 2001 = P.G. Mosca, *For the Birds. The Terms ŠSP and ḪZT in the Marseilles Tariff (Line 11)*, in «UF» 33, 2001, pp. 403-418.
- Müller 1975 = H.-P. Müller, *Die phönizische Grabinschrift aus dem Zypern-Museum KAI 30 und die Formgeschichte des nordwestsemitischen Epitaphs*, in «ZA» 65, 1975, pp. 104-132.
- Niehr 2021 = H. Niehr, *Resheph*, in H. Niehr – P. Xella (edd.), *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Phoenician Culture. II Religion – Deities and Mythical Characters*, Leuven-Paris-Bristol (CT) 2021, pp. 200-203.
- Pardee 2000 = D. Pardee, *Animal Sacrifice at Ugarit*, in «Topoi» Supplément 2, 2000, pp. 321-331.
- Pardee 2003 = D. Pardee, *A Punic Sacrificial Tariff*, in W.H. Hallo – K. Lawson Younger (edd.), *The Context of Scripture*, I, Leiden-Boston 2003, pp. 305-309.
- Peckham 1968 = B. Peckham, *Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)*, in «Or» 37, 1968, pp. 304-324.
- Péter 1975 = R. Péter, *Note de lexicographie hébraïque: שׁוּר et פֶּר*, in «Vetus Testamentum» 25, 1975, pp. 486-496.
- Radner 1998 = K. Radner (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, I/1:A, Helsinki 1998.
- Röllig 2013 = W. Röllig, *Die phönizische Inschrift der Relieftstele von Ivriz, Türkei*, in O. Loretz – S. Ribichini – W.G.E. Watson – J.Á. Zamora (edd.), *Ritual, Religion, and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, Münster 2013 («AOAT», 404), pp. 311-320.
- Reinach 1884 = S. Reinach, *Les chiens dans le culte d’Esculape et les kelabim des stèles peintes de Citium*, in «RA» 4, juillet-décembre 1884, pp. 129-135.
- Sader 2005 = H.S. Sader, *Iron Age Funerary Stelae from Lebanon*, Barcelona 2005 («CuadAMed», 11).
- Sanders 1991 = T.K. Sanders, *“Young Lion” or “He forgives?”: A Note on the Name kpr*, in «Andrews University Seminary Studies» 29, 1991, pp. 71-72.

- Saporetti 1996 = C. Saporetti, *Il problema del nāhiru*, in E. Acquaro (ed.), *Alle soglie della Classicità. Il Mediterraneo tra tradizione e innovazione. Studi in onore di Sabatino Moscati*, III, Pisa-Roma 1996, pp. 1223-1231.
- Schmitz 2013 = P.C. Schmitz, *The Ritual Accounts from Kition (CIS I 86 = KAI, 37) in Historical Context*, in «Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt» 15, 2013, pp. 189-229.
- Segert 1966 = S. Segert, *Some Phoenician Etymologies of North African Toponyms*, in «OrAnt» 5, 1966, pp. 19-25.
- Segert 1976 = S. Segert, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic*, München 1976.
- Sjöberg 1996 = Å.W. Sjöberg, *The Ebla List of Animals MEE 4, no. 116*, in «WO» 27, 1996, pp. 9-24.
- Solá-Solé 1967 = J.M. Solá-Solé, *Miscelánea púnico-hispana IV*, in «Sefarad» 27, 1967, pp. 12-33.
- Steiner 1982 = R.C. Steiner, *Affricated Šade in the Semitic Languages*, New York 1982 («The American Academy for Jewish Research Monograph Series», 3).
- Steiner 2001 = R.C. Steiner, *Albounout “Frankincense” and Alsounalph “Oxtongue”: Phoenician-Punic Botanical Terms with Prothetic Vowels from an Egyptian Papyrus and a Byzantine Codex*, in «Or» 70, 2001, pp. 97-103.
- Steiner 2007 = R.C. Steiner, *On the Monophthongization of *ay to ī in Phoenician and Northern Hebrew and the Preservation of Archaic/Dialectal Forms in the Masoretic Vocalization*, in «Or» 76, 2007, pp. 73-83.
- Szzyrmer 1967 = M. Szzyrmer, *Les passages puniques en transcription latine dans le “Poenulus” de Plaute*, Paris 1967.
- Szzyrmer 1975 = M. Szzyrmer, *L’“assemblée du peuple” dans les cités puniques d’après les témoignages épigraphiques*, in «Semitica» 25, 1975, pp. 47-68.
- Szzyrmer 1977 = M. Szzyrmer, *Recherches sur les toponymes phéniciens en Méditerranée occidentale*, in *La toponymie antique. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (12-14 juin 1975)*, Leiden 1977, pp. 163-175.
- Tekoğlu *et al.* 2000 = R. Tekoğlu – A. Lemaire – I. Ipek – A.K. Tosun, *La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy*, in «CRAI» 144, 2000, pp. 961-1007.
- Tomback 1978 = R.S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages*, Missoula (Montana) 1978 («Society of Biblical Literature. Dissertation series», 32).
- Van den Branden 1965 = A. van den Branden, *Lévitique 1-7 et le tarif de Marseille, CIS I. 165*, in «RSO» 40, 1965, pp. 107-130.
- Van den Branden 1966 = A. van den Branden, *Elenco delle spese del tempio di Cition CIS.86 A e B*, in «Bibbia e Oriente» 8, 1966, pp. 245-262.
- Van den Branden 1974 = A. van den Branden, *Quelques notes concernant le vocabulaire phénico-punique*, in «RStFen» 2, 1974, pp. 137-147.
- Vattioni 1976 = F. Vattioni, *Glosse puniche*, in «Augustinianum» 16, 1976, pp. 505-555.
- Vattioni 1978 = F. Vattioni, *Minima Africana*, in «Latomus» 37, 1978, pp. 714-718.
- Watson 1997 = W.G.E. Watson, *Comments on the Phoenician Tariff Inscriptions from Kition*, in «WO» 28, 1997, pp. 89-95.
- Watson 2006 = W.G.E. Watson, *Names for Animals in the Ugaritic Texts*, in G. del Olmo Lete – L. Feliu – A. Millet Albà (edd.), *Šapal tibnim mû illakû. Studies Presented to Joaquín Sanmartín on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Sabadell-Barcelona 2006 («AulaOr Supplementa», 22), pp. 445-58.
- Watson 2007 = W.G.E. Watson, *Additional Names for Animals in the Ugaritic Texts*, in «Historiae» 4, 2007, pp. 93-116.
- Watson 2012 = W.G.E. Watson, *Ugaritic Onomastics (8)*, in «AulaOr» 30, 2012, pp. 323-351.
- Watson 2013 = W.G.E. Watson, *Loanwords in Phoenician and Punic*, in O. Loretz – S. Ribichini – W.G.E. Watson – J.Á. Zamora (edd.), *Ritual, Religion, and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, Münster 2013 («AOAT», 404), pp. 327-346.
- Xella 1983 = P. Xella, *Quelques aspects du rapport économie-religion d’après les tarifs sacrificiels puniques*, in «Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques» 19, 1983, pp. 39-47.
- Xella 2007 = P. Xella, *Eshmounazor, áhōros? ZRM en phénicien et punique*, in «Or» 76, 2007, pp. 93-99.
- Xella in press = P. Xella, *Tariffs (sacrificial)*, in *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Phoenician Culture*, II.2. *Cult & Ritual*, Leiden, in press.
- Xella – Lipiński 1992 = P. Xella – E. Lipiński, *Tarifs sacrificiels*, in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la civilisation phénicienne et punique*, Turnhout 1992, pp. 439-440.
- Yon 2004 = M. Yon, *Kition dans les textes. Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et Corpus des inscriptions*, Paris 2004 («Kition-Bamboula», 5).