

TO: Unicode Technical Committee
FROM: Deborah Anderson
Subject: Expert Feedback on Phoenician
DATE: 31 May 2004

L2/04-177

1 Summary

The following is a summary of Phoenician feedback received from my inquiry sent to the Ancient Near East (=ANE) email list on 29 April 2004 and to selected individuals for whom the encoding of Phoenician may have an impact. Scholars were from the fields of Semitic studies, archaeology, and Classics, and included professors, students, publishers, and numismatic specialists. The message sent out was a general one and has already been appeared on the Unicode list.¹ The goal of the inquiry was to announce the proposal and to solicit scholarly feedback. The full responses are included below (if relevant) in **2a** (Semitic scholars) and **2b** (Others), with the full list of people to whom email was sent in **2c**. (In one or two instances, I refer to comments sent to the Unicode list from a community similar to that being queried here.)

From my inquiries to 20 individuals (see **2c**), 11 people replied. On the ANE list, 7 out of a total readership of 1,921 (ANE and ANE Digest) wrote in, either to the ANE list and/or to me personally.

a In favor of the Phoenician proposal

One Semitic scholar strongly in favor of a separate Unicode encoding for Phoenician was Jo Ann Hackett, who is Professor of the Practice of Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Epigraphy at Harvard. She is against using a Hebrew encoding (with a Phoenician font). Though admitting many scholars may not use it for publication, she said the new script would be useful to students and laypeople. Indeed, *she says she would use it* and suggests the particular glyph shape in the code chart could even become the default “standard.” She adds: “And I would argue that even with only Eshmunazor available [represented by the glyphs in the proposal’s codechart], there would be times when it would be nice to distinguish between Phn and Hebrew and Aramaic.”

Others in favor of the proposal included:

- Dr. Peter Haarer, Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, Oxford University, who will be editing a book for Oxford University Press based on papers from a conference in July 2004 on “Alphabetic Responses to Western Semitic Writing”;
- Barry Powell, Professor of Classics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, who has written on the history of the Greek alphabet;
- Miguel Carrasquer Vidal, an author with a degree from Leiden University in Slavic languages and literature, who is currently writing a chapter on the transmission of

¹ See Dean Snyder’s message 1 May 2004 “Re: Arid Canaanite Wasteland (was: Re: New contribution)”

the Phoenician alphabet to Greece, Anatolia, and Italy for the International Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, and who will be using Phoenician fonts for the article;

- Andrew Beck, Commissioning editor of Religion and Anthropology at Cambridge University Press, for whom the proposal could be of potential use.²

In general, those in favor of encoding Phoenician were those for whom being able to access the letter shapes in plain text is important, i.e., for pedagogical materials and those interested in the history of the Greek alphabet. Note that two other Semitic scholars, two (Parker and Kaufman) did mention a “Phoenician” font with Phoenician glyphs (and not square Hebrew) could be of use for pedagogical materials.

b Other responses

The remaining responses, all from Semitic scholars, students, and a publisher of ANE books, raised a number of issues, discussed below.

- *Encoding Phoenician is not useful or needed*

In general, the respondents felt encoding Phoenician separately was not useful or needed (though Lehmann could see no “hurt” in encoding it). From this survey, no one explicitly stated any problems a new Phoenician block would cause, either in terms of storage or the interchange of their existing data, or for searching (though they may have an incomplete understanding of Unicode).

The “point” of encoding Phoenician was not understood, in part because several respondents consider the 22-letters of square Hebrew and Phoenician to be “identical”:

“Phoenician glyphs are conceptually identical to Hebrew (and essentially physically identical to epigraphic Hebrew)”; “Phoenician script is no more different from square Hebrew than Epigraphic Hebrew is from Square Hebrew. It is strictly a matter of a different font” (Kaufman),

“My basic question is why Phoenician would be treated as distinct from Hebrew...The character set is identical in Hebrew and Phoenician. ...I haven’t followed the Unicode process at all and am probably missing something basic, but it appears that whatever has already been done for Hebrew (ancient, medieval, and modern) could be applied more or less directly to Phoenician” (Pardee)

“What will [adding this block] do that the Hebrew block is not already capable of? It’s the same set of consonants...we’re really talking about encoding a new set of glyphs” (Peterson)

² To this list may be added the opinion of the PhD Candidate from Department of Ancient History and Archaeology, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, Paul James Cowie, who wrote in on the Unicode list on 6 May 2004 (and contained in L2/04-149).

The above comments suggest that the *characters* are viewed to be the same, but the *glyphs* are different. Yet Jim Eisenbraun, publisher of books on the ancient Near East, noted:

“Most people are content to transliterate or use square Hebrew/Aramaic script...to represent the glyphs that the Phoenician alphabet had....Most people would not want to typeset graphically orig[i]nal Phoenician, since that cuts off at least some readers who don’t recognize the paleographical forms but do know the linguistics.”

Hence, the question of legibility of Phoenician amongst some Semitic scholars is mentioned as an issue.

When asked to describe how he would put Phoenician on the Web, Steve Kaufman stated that he would use Hebrew encoding with Hebrew fonts, since

“In no case that I know of has any serious scholar saw reason to resort to a ‘Phoenician’ font for any kind of publication, though many such have been available for the past twenty years or so, perhaps useful for student assignments and such. I would use Unicode Hebrew encoding³ without hesitation because, unfortunately, Unicode is still lacking in the area of an agreed set of transliteration symbols for the Semitic languages.”

He does not mention using the original Phoenician glyphs.

- *No “standard” Phoenician script exists / glyph chart comments*

Several respondents mentioned that there is no single “standard” Phoenician alphabet and that the letter forms can vary widely by location and time (Kaufman, Eisenbraun, Parker, Lehmann). Simon Parker wrote after reading the proposal:

Frankly, I do not see much value in having fonts as described. They may possibly be of some pedagogical use; but for scholarly purposes, one needs to see the script of the individual inscription. The variations in letter forms, even within several of the eleven categories you suggest, are quite wide.

This represents a basic misunderstanding about the proposal glyph chart, the role of fonts, and insight into how markup can—and probably should—be used to capture details of an individual inscription. In a similar vein, Reinhard Lehmann did not find the glyphs in the chart “useful,” since they capture a “Polaroid” of a specialized Phoenician script. Again, the notion that the chart was not prescriptive was not clear, nor that fonts can be used to provide glyphs for specific geographical and temporal locations.

- *Confusion about Unicode*

³ I queried him specifically whether he meant here Hebrew glyphs or Phoenician glyphs and he replied, “Hebrew glyphs in the standard Unicode positions.”

Besides the confusion about fonts and Unicode above, a number of the ANE postings contained misinformation about Unicode.⁴

In the following example from Bob Whiting's posting to the ANE list on 30 April 2004, we see a number of grave misconceptions:

[from Miguel Carrasquer]

> So it's not a question of whether there _has to be_ a
> separate encoding. It's a question of whether it's
> practical, and whether we want to.

Yes, this is the real issue, practicality and whether it is wanted, not necessarily whether it is needed. Much of unicode has been devoted to encoding languages rather than writing systems.

In many cases it seems to be a matter of national, or, for dead languages, discipline prestige to have a unicode block of one's own. It is rather like deciding the difference between dialects and languages (i.e., there is no objective, purely linguistic, metric for doing it).

▪ *Other comments*

Steve Kaufman mentioned that some scholars (among which he includes himself) tend to use Latin transliteration "in order to not offend the sensibilities of Arab scholars in particular." I wrote to a Semitic scholar involved with the Beirut Phoenician project (Dr. Paolo Xella, whom Prof. Kaufman recommended) in order to get the names of Arab scholars, in order to get feedback on a Phoenician block from Arab scholars. Unfortunately, I received no reply from Dr. Xella.⁵

▪ *Personal observations*

As one who has worked with academics in reviewing Unicode proposals, it is clear to me that this user community needs further education on Unicode, both general information and specific details on Unicode's guiding principles for encoding scripts. This is particularly true as work on other ancient scripts in the Near East is undertaken in the near future. It was difficult to accurately assess the feedback I received from Semitic scholars since I did not feel that most respondents fully understood the basic tenets of Unicode. The approximate 50% response rate on my query and the low response on the ANE list suggest the topic of Unicode is confusing, of not much interest, or both. I have repeatedly invited scholars to participate in the Unicode process, and am hopeful that there will be more in the future, but past misinformation may have jaded their opinion of Unicode and its workings.

⁴ The full set of responses is publicly available at: <https://listhost.uchicago.edu/pipermail/ane/>.

⁵ I also wrote to Dr. Hélène Sader, Prof. of History and Archaeology, American University of Beirut, Lebanon and cooperative partner on the Tell Burak excavation in Lebanon, but received no answer.

Concerns about the results of using a Hebrew encoding in XML were raised only by myself and Paul James Cowie (L2/04-149), but no one else. This suggests that there may be a lag time in adopting more recent technology for scholarly publication. I do think that it is possible the availability of Phoenician glyphs may assist a shift in scholarly publication methods (i.e., from transliteration to inline Phoenician).

No matter what the outcome of the Phoenician proposal, I personally would advocate that the user communities themselves come up with "Best Practices" guides for their own fields of study. In the very least, all digital documents should specify what encoding they are using.

2. Details

a Responses from Semitic scholars (in alphabetical order)

Jo Ann Hackett, Professor of the Practice of Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Epigraphy, Dept. of NELC, Harvard University⁶

- > I have noted that even
- > though an article might contain an image with an inscription in the
- > original Phoenician, the accompanying article will often use the
- > Hebrew script. Would you view Hebrew in this context as being a
- > variant of Phoenician or this is more "transliteration" into Hebrew?
- > Do you think most Semiticists view Phoenician as being just a variant
- > of Phoenician?

Epigraphers would say that Hebrew is actually an offshoot of Phoenician [=Phn], not the other way around. When people write Phn in Hebrew characters, it is, as you say, a transliteration. The languages, Phoenician and Hebrew, are closely related, but they are not variants of *each other*. They are both languages within the Caananite branch of Northwest Semitic. But the earliest alphabetic script (in the second millennium BC) develops first into what we call Phoenician by around 1100, while our earliest extant Hebrew script dates to the 10th century. It's possible, given the paucity of evidence, that both these scripts developed independently out of the earlier alphabetic script, but most epigraphers would follow the dates and suggest that Hebrew script is an offshoot of Phoenician script (and that Aramaic script and Moabite script are also offshoots of Phn script, for that matter).

- > 2. Would it be helpful to be able to cite the original Phoenician
- > letters in articles, etc.?

As I looked at the proposal you sent me, I was a bit confused. The proposal gives all sorts of Phn scripts from various dates, but at the end only one form of each letter is given (taken from the Eshmunazor sarcophagus inscription, Sidon, 5th c. BC). Is that correct? Unlike Hebrew script and Syriac Aramaic script (which I assume is being done), there is no "standard" Phoenician script, from a single date and place, that is then used for Phn

⁶ Prof. Hackett was sent the same general inquiry about the proposal as others, but she was delayed in replying until 21 May 2004. As new questions were raised on the Unicode list, these were sent in follow-up messages. The questions I sent precede her replies.

inscriptions (and for scholarly transcriptions of Phn inscriptions) from that point on. The script continued to develop in its various locales, down through the centuries, till the 3rd or so century AD. The Eshmunazor script is a particularly pleasing one, and I can see myself using it when I want to distinguish Phn from Hebrew, and once there's that possibility, this script might *become* the standard for computer citation of Phn, but at the moment, the script that's proposed for "Phoenician" is simply one of many.

Phoenician should not, I think, be encoded as Hebrew. All western alphabetic scripts derive from that 2nd millennium alphabetic series that I mentioned earlier, and hence from Phoenician, probably. So this logic would have what I'm typing right now encoded as Hebrew also. Give Phoenician its own slot. Surely Aramaic is getting something? (For that matter, what we now call "Hebrew" script derives from an ancient Aramaic script. The true Hebrew script died out--see the answer to question 3 below.)

> 3. How do you regard Palaeo-Hebrew? Would you classify this with
> Hebrew or with Phoenician?

Palaeo-Hebrew is the name given to the continuation of Hebrew script after the point where Jews began writing almost entirely in Aramaic, so from the 6th c. BC onward. The Palaeo-Hebrew is used rarely, but does show up in the Dead Sea Scrolls, usually for writing the name of the god of Israel, but in one case it is used for an entire scroll of the book of Leviticus. In the case of Qumran (the DSScrolls), they are using the Palaeo-Hebrew as an archaizing script, although, as I just wrote, a few inscriptions show up now and then, between the 6th and 1st centuries, written in Palaeo-Hebrew instead of Aramaic. Coins, for instance, minted in Israel in the Persian period (called Yehud coins because that is what the Persian province was called, and that is what is written on the coins) write YHD (for Yehud) in Palaeo-Hebrew.

So, after that long explanation--the answer is, that P-Hebrew is a survival of a true Hebrew script, used rarely alongside the Aramaic script that came to be used in writing the Hebrew Bible and which is now what we mean when we speak of "Hebrew" script (confusing enough?), and all of these go back eventually to Phoenician, and beyond to alphabetic inscriptions of the second millennium BC.

Message 2:

I can agree with Steve [Kaufman] and Dennis [Pardee] in that it is rare that one would use Phn in a paper, but I still think it is worth having, unless it is taking up space that is badly needed elsewhere. Many people simply like to use the script--students and lay people alike. And I would argue that even with only Eshmunazor available, there would be times when it would be nice to distinguish between Phn and Hebrew and Aramaic. So if it's possible to get it done, we might as well ask for those few spaces.

Prof. Stephen Kaufman, Professor of Bible and Cognate Literature, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, editor of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon

Message 1 (not complete here, since it was already sent out on Unicode list):

Anyone who thinks there has to be a separate encoding for Phoenician either does not understand Unicode or (and probably "and") does not understand what a glyph is...

Message 2:

> when doing working on Phoenician texts, do you use a Hebrew encoding?

A very good question. Phoenician glyphs are conceptually identical to Hebrew (and essentially physically identical to epigraphic Hebrew), and Phoenician was usually printed in Hebrew (i.e. square Aramaic) characters through the middle of the 20th century. Indeed, it is still rendered as such in the most recent reference grammar: *Phönizisch-punisch Grammatik*, 3. Auflage neu bearbeitet von Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo, Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1999. Others, such as myself, tend to use Roman transliteration in order not to offend the sensibilities of Arab scholars in particular. In no case that I know of has any serious scholar saw reason to resort to a "Phoenician" font for any kind of publication, though many such have been available for the past twenty years or so, perhaps useful for student assignments and such.

When putting up any Phoenician on the web, I would use Unicode Hebrew encoding without hesitation because, unfortunately, Unicode is still lacking in the area of an agreed set of transliteration symbols for the Semitic languages.

Message 3:

> Just to clarify: Would you use Phoenician glyphs in a Hebrew font for this? Or > use Hebrew glyphs in a Hebrew font?

> In this context, do you consider using Hebrew as a form of "transliteration" of

> Phoenician, or do you think of Phoenician as a clear variant of Hebrew? (This

> particular question was raised on another list.)

Hebrew glyphs in the standard unicode positions. Phoenician script is no more different from square Hebrew than Epigraphic Hebrew is from Square Hebrew. It is strictly a matter of a different font. Moreover, Phoenician is attested in many different script styles over the course of at least a millennium. There is no such thing as one standard Phoenician script. I do not consider the use of square Hebrew to be conceptually the same as a transliteration: why? 1) It is a conceptually identical consonantal system written right to left with the exact same intended phonic values as in the common usage of that script. 2) A Roman transliteration is written left to right using artificial symbols with values not otherwise normally associated with them.

Message 4 (in response to a comment about the historical background of Greek as deriving from Phoenician)

I fail to understand how what script the Greek was borrowed from is relevant for Unicode issues. As a matter of fact, however, many scholars now believe that it was from Aramaic, NOT from Phoenician! By his argument then, we need rather an ancient Aramaic Unicode encoding, not a Phoenician one.

Dr. Reinhard G. Lehmann, AkOR, Forschungsstelle für Althebräische Sprache und Epigraphik, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

Hallo out there,

I fully agree with what has been said by Steven Kaufamn and Bob Whiting [on ANE list]⁷, and in my humble opinion Unicode Phoenician seems to be as superfluous as a Phoenician typewriter. But of course it does not hurt someone...

Some expert feedback is requested - here it is:

[specific comments on the proposal]

3. The glyphs table page 14 are beautiful - like those of the Imprimerie nationale, which are, to be sure, Phoenician types cutted for the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum by famous script designers of the 19th century. Even Bodoni made a proposal (which had been rejected by the Academie des inscriptions et belles-lettres).

They are *beauti*ful, and correct as abstraction of a certain stage of development in the Phoenician script - but I do not know for what they should be *use*ful. I myself would never use them, even for teaching, because students should not learn a certain 'polaroid' of a specialized Phoenician script, but the structures of that kind of Northwest Semitic linear alphabetic script and the general parameters and regularities of its Phoenician, South Canaanite (including Hebrew), and Aramaic branches of the first millenium BCE.

4. I have no idea what benefit should have the Unicode representation of several NWS regional handwritings like "font Proto-Sinaitic/Proto-Canaanite, Punic, Neo-Punic, Phoenician proper, Late Phoenician cursive, Phoenician papyrus, Siloam Hebrew, Hebrew seals, Ammonite, Moabite, and Palaeo-Hebrew" - for example, what really *is* (or was) "Phoenician proper"? Byblos 10th century, Tyrus 6th?, Byblos 5th? Byblos 2nd? or Sidon 6th? What really is "Siloam Hebrew"? It is not a script type, but the hazardous remnant of *only one single* inscription of only a few lines! What means "Hebrew seals"? Who ever studies the corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals should know that here is not a certain script of "Hebrew seals". Who knows exactly how Ammonite or Moabite or Edomite script has to look like? We only do know the different remnants of such a script in only few lines of several inscriptions from different locations and different times.

Dennis Pardee, Professor of Northwest Semitics, University of Chicago

My basic question is why Phoenician would be treated as distinct from Hebrew (the list below refers to one inscription [Siloam Hebrew], to a category of inscriptions [seals], and to a more generic category [Palaeo-Hebrew], but not to Hebrew in general). The character set is

⁷ Bob Whiting wrote several posts, the longest one dating to 3 May 2004. The URL to the archive is contained in footnote 4.

identical in Hebrew and Phoenician. According to the traditional vocalization of Hebrew, one of the characters has two phonetic values ("sin" and "shin"). I haven't followed the unicode process at all and am probably missing something basic, but it appears that whatever has already been done for Hebrew (ancient, medieval, and modern) could be applied more or less directly to Phoenician.

Then the problem arises of Aramaic, which was originally written in Phoenician script and maintained that writing tradition even through evolutions/adaptations to the Aramaic phonetic system. What has been done for Aramaic?

Simon Parker, Professor of Hebrew Bible; Harrell F. Beck Scholar of Hebrew Scripture, Boston University

Frankly, I do not see much value in having fonts as described. They may possibly be of some pedagogical use; but for scholarly purposes, one needs to see the script of the individual inscription. The variations in letter forms, even within several of the eleven categories you suggest, are quite wide. And some categories are not parallel--Palaeo-Hebrew, Siloam Hebrew, and Hebrew seals seem to refer to a period, a place, and a medium!--and also exclude quite a lot of other Hebrew inscriptions! And if you have Moabite and Ammonite as categories, why not Edomite (admittedly the least well attested). But the boundaries between those three are also quite uncertain and vigorously contested (does one go by geography, by letter forms, by personal and divine names, or . . .).

So, you see, I see problems and little value.
Sorry,
Simon B. Parker

Trevor Peterson, graduate student in Semitics, Catholic University of America

I don't get what we're supposed to gain by adding this block. What will it do that the Hebrew block is not already capable of? It's the same set of consonants, joining characters are not an issue, and there is no living speech community that needs it. As far as I can tell, we're really just talking about encoding a new set of glyphs, which shouldn't be the point.

Robert Whiting, Managing Editor / Senior Researcher, The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, (State Archives of Assyria)

[The following is one sampling of his postings, all publicly available on the ANE archive, listed in footnote 4]

I rather think you are misunderstanding Steve [Kaufman]'s point. Phoenician graphs are already completely covered by other scripts already in unicode.

It is not a question of whether there should be a means of encoding Phoenician or not. It is a question of whether there needs to be a separate unicode entity known as "Phoenician script."

Your point about cuneiform would be a valid comparison if you are maintaining that there should be two separate encodings for "Akkadian cuneiform" and "Sumerian cuneiform." Only one set of cuneiform characters needs to be encoded. Since the "Phoenician characters" are already fully represented by encodings for other languages, there is no more need for a separate encoding for Phoenician than there is for separate encodings for Akkadian cuneiform and Sumerian cuneiform.

2b. Other Responses:

Andrew Beck, Commissioning Editor, Religion and Anthropology, Cambridge University Press

This could of potential use to us, but only on a very limited scale.

Jim Eisenbrauns, Publisher, Eisenbrauns, publisher of ANE books

Briefly, I've followed some of the debate on the ANE list re this issue. And in general, unless one is wanting to cite Phoenician in the original scripts (and then: which script? since there are sometimes significant graphic variants), there's not a lot of point or need. Most people are content to transliterate or use square Hebrew/Aramaic script ("typeset Hebrew", if you will!) to represent the glyphs that the Phoenician alphabet had. If one speaks of a "Hebrew font," even, one has to think of the various forms that it could take as well (what era? which place?). So the issue is somewhat the issues that Bob Whiting raises in his rather lengthy post to the list the last couple of days (I forget which day)⁸; but it is a matter of how one divides this. I don't feel competent to comment. Most people would not want to typeset graphically orig[i]nal Phoenician, since that cuts off at least some readers who don't recognize the paleographical forms but do know the linguistics.

Dr. Peter Haarer, Center for the Study of Ancient Documents, Oxford University

Message 1:

I am responsible for editing the conference proceedings ["Alphabetic Responses to Western Semitic Writing" at Oxford from 1-3 July 2004] for publication, and the ms will be submitted to OUP. To date I have had limited exposure to Phoenician texts, but what you say [regarding a new proposal for Phoenician] seems sensible and surely only for the good. What are the grounds for objection other than convention?

So far as the CSAD is concerned, I can't see why we would oppose your plan, and I shall raise it with my colleagues.

Message 2:

We discussed your proposal for a unicode block for Phoenician at a meeting this morning [May 31 2004] and agreed that the academic case in favour seems strong, especially with reference to research on the development of alphabets derived from the Phoenician, such as Greek.

⁸ Dated 3 May 2004. URL to the archive is given in footnote 4.

Barry Powell, Halls-Bascom Professor of Classics, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Message 1:

anyway, it would be a benefit to those working on the history of writing, Semitic studies in general, to have "Phoenician" fonts from, say, the Mesha stone, good 8th century ...

Message 2:

>Are you in support of encoding Phoenician

>separately from [square] Hebrew?

yes, definitely in favor.

Miguel Carrasquer Vidal, author (holds a degree from Leiden University in Slavic languages and linguistics)

Although not an expert on the Phoenician script itself, I am currently writing the chapter on the transmission of the Phoenician alphabet to Greece, Anatolia and Italy for the *International Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics (ELL2)*. I intend to use Phoenician fonts for this article, so the proposal affects me directly.

>* Are you in favor of encoding Phoenician in Unicode?

Yes.

[Comments on the proposal follow]

2c A full list of those to whom I wrote or who responded to me privately (including those who wrote to me as a result of the ANE posting)

(This list includes the names of those teaching Phoenician as listed on the "Less Commonly Taught Languages" portion of the CARLA website, <http://www.carla.umn.edu/lctl/>, people whom I have met at the Society of Biblical Literature/Oriental Institute panel on "Electronic Markup and Publication of Ancient Near Eastern Texts", and references from scholars, all designated with an asterisk.)

*Andrew Beck, Commissioning Editor, Religion and Anthropology, Cambridge University Press

*Dr. Anke Beck, editor-in-chief of linguistics section and Mouton de Gruyter for the de Gruyter publishing firm, publisher of the journal *Kadmos* (which discusses topics on "pre-Greek and early Greek epigraphy, i. e. to inscriptions from the whole of the Mediterranean area dating back either 1) to the time before or during the spread of Greek in the relevant regions or 2) to the early phase of the development of Greek (in Linear A, Linear B or an archaic alphabetic script)")

*Jim Eisenbraun, publisher, Eisenbrauns (publisher of many books for ANE)

*Dr. Brien Garnand, formerly research assistant on the ASOR Punic Project, Carthage, Tunisia

- *Dr. Peter Haarer, Center for the Study of Ancient Documents, Oxford University
- *Jo Ann Hackett, Professor of the Practice of Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Epigraphy, Dept. of NELC, Harvard University
- *Robert Hawley, Lecturer, Northwest Semitic Languages, University of Michigan
- *Sebastian Heath, Director of Information Technology, American Numismatic Society
- Stephen Kaufman, Professor of Bible and Cognate Literature, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, editor of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon
- Dr. Reinhard G. Lehmann, AkOR, Forschungsstelle für Althebräische Sprache und Epigraphik, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz
- *Dr. Marilyn Lundberg, Associate Director, West Semitic and the InscriptiFact Projects, University of Southern California, and Adjunct Assistant Professor at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, co-editor of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue*
- Tomas Marik, graduate student, Akkadian and Sumerian Philology, Institute of Comparative Linguistics, Charles University, Prague
- *P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., Professor, William Foxwell Albright Chair in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies, Johns Hopkins
- *Dennis Pardee, Professor of Northwest Semitics, University of Chicago
- *Simon Parker, Professor of Hebrew Bible; Harrell F. Beck Scholar of Hebrew Scripture, Boston University
- Trevor Peterson, graduate student in Semitics, Catholic University of America
- *Barry Powell, Halls-Bascom Professor of Classics, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- *Dr. Hélène Sader, Prof. of History and Archaeology, American University of Beirut, Lebanon and cooperative partner on the Tell Burak excavation in Lebanon (a Phoenician site)
- *David Schloen, Associate Professor of Syro-Palestinian Archaeology, University of Chicago
- Tom Urban, Editor, Oriental Institute Publications The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago
- Miguel Carrasquer Vidal, author, holds a degree from Leiden University in Slavic languages and linguistics.
- *Roger Woodard, Andrew V. V. Raymond Professor of the Classics, Professor of Linguistics, Dept. of Classics, University of Buffalo, author of forthcoming *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*
- *Prof. Norman Yoffee, Professor of Archaeology and Near Eastern Studies. Dept. of Anthropology, University of Michigan
- *Prof. Paolo Xella, Italy, Beirut Phoenician project
- *Bruce Zuckerman, Professor, School of Religion, Director, Archaeological Research Collection, University of Southern California Director, West Semitic Research and InscriptiFact Projects.

Respondents who did not write to me directly but who wrote in to ANE:

Peter Daniels, author (and co-editor, *The World's Writing Systems*)

Robert Whiting, Managing Editor / Senior Researcher, The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, (State Archives of Assyria), <http://www.helsinki.fi/science/saa/cna.html>