This document adds additional documentation in support of the encoding of Phoenician (N2746).


   א dõiר is the Aramaic form for the Heb. ידידי.
   אedis. The curved longitudinal stroke signifies 10, and the perpendicular strokes are units (Gesen. *Mn. Phœn.* p. 85, sqq.)
   There are two coins published by Swinton (Philos. Trans. Vol. 4, Pl. 31), but omitted by Gesenius, which bear the dates
   אדידיד (year cxxvi) and אדידיד (year cxxvii).

   Under both of them occurs the character א (whose alphabetical value is that of 3), of which Swinton offers no explanation. Perhaps it may be a contraction for ב ל = Heb. ל.*circle, cycle, age,* but employed in the sense of annual revolution, year. In that case we may read ב ל = the 13th anniversary, or year, of my king or the king. For this use of the
   pronoun, comp. the Heb. ידידי, Syr. מ teşekkür, Fr. monsieur.

   Ashmuwuyer. On No. 17 of the inscriptions found by
   Pococke at Cium is the name אדו, which Gesenius reads אדו אדוועוער *Eshmuwuyer* (*quem Aesculapius restituit*) (Mn. *Phœn.* p. 145). He remarks, however,

   Note the use of Phoenician numbers in the example above.
A second example from “Remarks on the Phoenician Inscription at Sidon” by William W. Turner, *JOAS*, vol. 7, 1860, p. 50:

There is one feature which disadvantageously distinguishes our productions from all the rest; it is the erroneous value given almost throughout to the character Ϝ. We were led astray by Gesenius’s alphabet in the *Monumenta*, Tab. 1, in which he has given it only the value of ϝ, although he had correctly read the character as $\ddot{r}$ in the third Athenian inscription (Tab. 10), being guided by the accompanying Greek.

2. As stated in my original message on 2 May 2004 in support of Phoenician (contained in L2/04-149), the subject of the history of the alphabet is of interest to Indo-Europeanists. It is perhaps of even greater interest to those studying Classics, for whom the history of the Greek alphabet is part of required background knowledge. Charts showing Phoenician and the early Greek forms appear in one of the standard handbooks used, Carl Darling Buck’s *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago, 1933, p. 69), and specific details on the Greek alphabet in relation to its Phoenician progenitor likewise appear in *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* by Andrew Sihler (Oxford, 1995, pp. 18-20).

3. The following examples demonstrate the use of Phoenician glyphs within inline text, all within the context of the history of the Greek alphabet.

The original Greek shape of $\iota$ must have been some kind of vertical zigzag (ι), different from the ordinary Phoenician $\ddot{r}$. Another eighth-


$M$ steht in den ältesten Inschriften regelmäßig auf zwei Senkrechthasten, das phönizische Zeichen $\partial$ wenigstens auf einer, die griechische Form ist m. E. recht einfach aus der phönizischen ableitbar.

Translation: “M [GREEK CAPITAL LETTER SAN, 03FA] in the oldest inscriptions regularly stands on two perpendicular legs, the Phoenician sign [SADE, proposed for U+10911] at least on one; the Greek form is, in my opinion, simply derived from the Phoenician”


(Note: In the above examples, I would use a font to reflect the early Greek iota.)

4. As an example of the type of problem that might occur if Phoenician is not separately encoded, compare the following:
If the sentence above were written with Square Hebrew, the sentence would make no sense, because the Square Hebrew ALEF glyph does not have the shape Powell refers to:

(b) With Square Hebrew:

In its usual Greek upright position (א < א), alpha is rotated 90 degrees, compared to the Phoenician.

5. Legibility of Hebrew amongst Greek and Indo-European scholars

In a survey of my handbooks for Indo-European and Greek, I was not able to find any examples of the original Hebrew script in use for Phoenician (or Hebrew). The books were all published in the U.S. or western Europe. I was able to find Latin transliteration used, but not square Hebrew. Markus Egetmeyer, who worked on the “Epigraphische Mitteilungen” section of the journal Kadmos, a journal devoted to pre- and early Greek epigraphy, concurred that square Hebrew is rare. I would therefore suggest that relying on a default square Hebrew for displaying Phoenician would be difficult to read for many scholars from North America and western Europe and, because discussion is often on specific letter shapes, would cause problems in sense, as describe in point 4 above.
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