Genealogical Classification of Semitic

*The Lexical Isoglosses*

Leonid Kogan

Institute for Oriental and Classical Studies
National Research University – Higher School of Economics
**Introduction**

**Genealogical classification of Semitic and the role of lexical isoglosses**

1. **Genealogical classification of Semitic: state of the art**

   **1.1.** A skeptical attitude towards genealogical classification is widespread in present-day Semitic philology and linguistics. It is, therefore, not unexpected that negative evaluation of the “questionable usefulness of classificatory schematizations”\(^1\) can easily be found throughout the pages of Semitological treatises. A characteristic statement representing this trend comes from Ullendorff 1961:30: “Classification is harmless, unobjectionable, and at times even useful if limited to describing present-day habitat and the prevailing geographical circumstances, but it becomes positively dangerous, i.e. obscuring rather than illuminating, if meant to explain genetic connections.”\(^2\)

   In spite of this prominent negative trend, various aspects of genealogical subgrouping of Semitic have continuously occupied many of the brightest minds working in this branch of comparative linguistics. The importance of the subgrouping procedure as applied to the Semitic languages has been admirably emphasized in a recent summary description by John Huehnergard, who rightly qualifies Ullendorff’s stance as something “without parallel in comparative work in other language families” (Huehnergard 2002b:130). In his passionate defense of Semitic genealogical classification, Huehnergard correctly observes that “classification and subgrouping of language families are among the most important of the comparativist’s task, and this obtains in our field, too. Indeed, classification and subgrouping should inform comparative work and historical reconstruction, for these activities are inextricably interwined ... In other words, classification is not simply a mind game.” A few decades earlier, a similarly positive assessment of the relevance of genealogical classification for Semitic diachronic linguistics had been emphatically pronounced by Gideon Goldenberg (1977:461), with appropriate references to such outstanding figures of general and Indo-European comparative studies as I. Baudouin de Courtenay, A. Meillet and J. Greenberg.

   The author of the present monograph is willing to adhere to the relatively small group of Semitic linguists who continue to believe that genealogical classification is not a mental game, but indeed one of the principal tasks of the diachronic investigation of this linguistic family. However, before a comprehensive inquiry into the subgrouping problem is undertaken, a quick look at the object of research, its methods and goals is in order. What has to be classified and how should one proceed?

   **1.2.** While working with genealogical subgrouping of Semitic, one can conventionally distinguish between two principal facets of the classificatory procedure.

\(^{1}\) Renfroe 1992:7.

\(^{2}\) Cf. also Blau 1978:44 (“These experiments in classification are, to a great extent, intellectual speculations”) and Renfroe 1992:7 (“It is, frankly, difficult to attach very much significance to the (occasionally heated) debate over the membership of one or the other Semitic idiom in a particular category or sub-group which has no reality beyond its existence as a descriptive theoretical construct”).
On the one hand, a few major splits and unities are to be postulated and justified, such as East Semitic vs. West Semitic or Central Semitic vs. South Semitic. In the past decades, it was this aspect of Semitic classification that was the primary focus of the debate. As a result, a few crucial problems pertaining to this category — such as the genealogical position of Arabic — have been analyzed rather extensively (if not always successfully).

On the other hand, the common origin of each minor subdivision of the Semitic family (such as Cannanite, Aramaic, Ethiopian Semitic, Epigraphic South Arabian or Modern South Arabian) must be demonstrated as clearly as possible. Unlike the former, this direction of research has attracted comparatively little attention from Semitic linguists, most probably because the historical unity of such smaller groups is often perceived intuitively and taken for granted. Difficult questions like “What is Aramaic?” or “How to define Canaanite?” do sporadically emerge in connection with limited-corpus and/or newly-discovered languages (like Ugaritic, Samalian or Deir ṬAllâ), but are very rarely asked (let alone answered) elsewhere.

In the framework of the present monograph, the former aspect of the subgrouping problem will be treated in the chapters from Two to Four, where the historical unity of West Semitic, Central Semitic and North-West Semitic will be analyzed. Four later chapters will deal with smaller units of West Semitic. In principle, the two aspects are given equal weight in this book, although the methodology chosen may presuppose a certain bias towards the latter. The amount of space dedicated to the historical unity of minor subdivisions of Semitic is, therefore, somewhat more extensive.

1.3. According to a broad consensus, the principal method by which genealogical classification of Semitic has to be guided is that of shared morphological innovations. This method, known to Semitists mostly from a series of important contributions by Robert Hetzron (1972, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977b), and to some extent anticipated by the pioneering works of Otto Rössler (1950, 1981), has been fruitfully applied by these two scholars (and later, by their followers) to demonstrate the unity of West Semitic as opposed to East Semitic (Akkadian) as well as the separate status of Central Semitic (consisting of Canaanite, Aramaic, Arabic and ESA) within the West Semitic branch.

Both positive and negative aspects of the Rössler–Hetzron methodology will be discussed at greater length in the corresponding chapters of this monograph. However, three fundamental problems are already worth of a brief mention at this introductory stage of our inquiry.

1.3.1. Perhaps the most obvious concern is that morphological innovations which are both fully reliable and sufficiently specific are hard to detect in the Semitic-speaking domain. This is at least partly due to the fact that the inventory of derivational and inflectional morphemes is relatively restricted throughout Semitic, whereas most Semitic languages (especially the ancient ones) are rather conservative in their morphology and tend to preserve the old stock of affixes and patterns instead of elaborating new ones.

At first sight, such a claim may look impressionistic, but a deeper inquiry quickly provides abundant proof of its correctness. Thus, as will be shown below in Chapters 2
and 3, two major splits postulated within the Rössler–Hetzron classification have for many decades been justified by one single isogloss each, viz. the $^*C_1aC_2iC_3a$ perfect in West Semitic (as opposed to the $^*C_1aC_2iC_3$ stative in East Semitic) and the $^*ya-C_1C_2VC_3u$ imperfect in Central Semitic (as opposed to the $^*yV-C_1aC_2VC_3$ imperfect in Ethiopian and Modern South Arabian). Such limited evidence can scarcely be considered a sound basis for any classification model.

In a similar vein, the North-West Semitic hypothesis (Chapter 4) has been usually supported by one phonological feature ($^*w->y$-) and two morphological ones (the $^*C_1aC_2iaC_3a$ pattern of the perfect of the intensive stem and the plural $^*C_1aC_2aC_2-ūma$ of segolate nouns), which is by no means the expected amount of evidence for such a (supposedly) tightly-knit subgroup.

Finally, there is hardly any linguist who would seriously doubt the Ethiopian Semitic affiliation of Tigre, yet there is probably no single morphological innovation of this subgroup that Tigre would share (Chapter 7).

Further examples, the number of which could easily have been multiplied, are discussed elsewhere in this monograph.

Last but not least, many valuable morphological features simply cannot be detected in a variety of ancient Semitic languages because of the fully or partly consonantal nature of their scripts, let alone the brief and incomplete nature of many ancient Semitic text corpora.\(^3\)

1.3.2. The advocates of an exclusively morphological approach to Semitic classification too often disregard the fact that not each and every morphological feature which looks tolerably specific to a given Semitic subgroup can automatically be qualified as an innovation. In fact, the opposite is true: the innovative nature of this or that morpheme is always in need of systematic and elaborate justification. Morphological innovations do not emerge from nothing, but should be traced back to other, formally and/or semantically more archaic features. Unless the diachronic development of the pertinent morpheme is persuasively elicited, it simply cannot be considered a (shared) innovation, which drastically reduces its significance for the classification procedure.

Now, one is forced to recognize that this is precisely the case in some of the most crucial morphological isoglosses behind the commonly accepted pattern of Semitic classification: the thematic vowel -$a$- in the West Semitic “New Perfect” $^*C_1aC_2C_3a$, the ending -$u$ of the Central Semitic “New Imperfect” $^*ya-C_1C_2VC_3u$, the vowel $i$ after the second radical in the perfect of D-stem ($^*C_1aC_2C_2iC_3$) in Ugaritic, Canaanite and Aramaic. To the best of our knowledge, this fundamental problem has been extremely rarely acknowledged by the proponents of the morphology-oriented classification models.\(^4\)

1.3.3. Not infrequently, morphological innovations adduced in support of one or another subgrouping hypothesis are apparently contradicted by other innovative features which suggest different, sometimes radically divergent patterns of

\(^3\) Anticipating the ongoing discussion, one may observe that at least some essential elements of the basic vocabulary are normally present in every written document of reasonable length.

\(^4\) A highly atypical example is J. Huhnergerd’s fair evaluation of the $^*C_1aC_2aC_3a$-problem in 2002b:126.
classification. A classical example, extensively discussed below in Chapter 3, is the Central Semitic affiliation of Arabic, proposed by Rössler and Hetzron on the basis of one prominent feature of the verbal system, but disclaimed by a number of distinguished scholars in view of several remarkable morphological peculiarities apparently uniting Arabic with Ethiopian Semitic and/or Modern South Arabian. A proper application of the Rössler–Hetzron method thus presupposes a certain hierarchical arrangement of the features under scrutiny: some of them must be given more weight in the classification procedure than others. This highly intricate task has rarely been undertaken in comparative Semitic linguistics, and those few attempts that are known to us can scarcely be considered successful.

1.4. The observations above are by no means intended to undermine the fundamental validity of the Rössler–Hetzron method, nor to reject the essential correctness of the results achieved on its basis — which, as we shall see at the end of this book, are rather confirmed than refuted by our own evidence and conclusions. It is equally certain, however, that this method should not be applied uncritically. Moreover, it is preferably to be used side by side with other potentially illuminating tools of genealogical classification. What is primarily meant here are the relevant features of the basic vocabulary. Indeed, various aspects of conflict and interaction between morphological and lexical factors in the genealogical classification of Semitic will constitute the main subject of the following pages.

2. Lexical isoglosses and genealogical classification of Semitic


As one can see from the statements quoted in the preceding footnotes, this claim is often presented in an apodictic form, but whenever attempts have been made to support it by concrete arguments, the following three turn out to be most popular.

---

5 “Order of importance of isoglosses categories: phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, literary features ... The experience provided by attempts to classify Ugaritic should provide sufficient warning against ascribing improper attention to lexicon.”

6 “That, under any circumstances, vocabulary is an unreliable measure by which to determine the relationship between any two given languages is a widely recognized fact.”

7 “Als nicht zentral, weil offener und damit leichter von außen veränderlich, gelten die Syntax und insbesondere die Lexikographie.”

8 “In languages which have complex morphological systems, such as the Semitic languages, it is comparison of morphological forms and structures that must necessarily constitute the bedrock of any comparative work.”

9 “The lexicon will not be covered, since it is the most susceptible to change and borrowing, and not very useful for classification.”
a. Lexicon is open to borrowing, whereas morphological features — especially those pertaining to inflectional morphology — can seldom be borrowed.\(^\text{10}\)

b. The relevance of individual lexical features for genealogical subgrouping is hard to assess.\(^\text{11}\)

c. Chronological difference between a given pair (or group) of languages can be so deep that potentially revealing lexical facts may of necessity be obliterated.\(^\text{12}\)

2.2. While there is hardly any doubt that each of these arguments deserves most serious attention, it is our conviction that none of them should compel Semitists to desist from using lexical evidence as a means of genealogical classification.

2.2.1. The problem of borrowing — well-known to be notoriously acute as far as inter-Semitic loanwords are concerned — becomes much less serious as soon as the analysis is restricted to the most basic strata of the vocabulary, where loanwords are empirically known to be rare. Among better-known non-Semitic languages, English and Persian are prime illustrations of this phenomenon: whereas the general amount of lexical items borrowed from Latin/French and Arabic respectively is immense, its presence among the concepts included into the Swadesh wordlist is, for all practical purposes, totally insignificant (three\(^\text{13}\) and one\(^\text{14}\) respectively). In the Semitic domain, not a single Sumerism was able to penetrate into the Swadesih wordlist of Akkadian, in spite of the fact that several hundreds of Sumerian loanwords\(^\text{15}\) are attested from Old Babylonian onward and many among them are deeply integrated phonologically, morphologically and semantically. In a broader perspective, the number of proven loanwords in the Swadesh wordlists of “classical” Semitic languages (such as Akkadian, Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic and Geez) varies from zero to five.\(^\text{16}\)

\(^{10}\) “One must also be very careful with vocabulary in classification ... Neighboring languages may use the same root and it is sometimes difficult to find out whether it is a recent borrowing from one of them or an old one going back to the proto-language ... One must proceed with extreme prudence in dealing with the vocabulary of limitrophe languages” (Hetzron 1972:12–13), “The receptiveness of the lexicon to change and outside influence, more perhaps than any other level of linguistic analysis, means that this kind of lexical isogloss cannot be employed alone in language classification” (Appleyard 1977:5), “Furthermore, it is often difficult to rule out borrowing, especially among closely related languages, where loans can be notoriously hard to detect” (Huehnergard 2005:190).

\(^{11}\) “It is very difficult, however, to assess the diagnostic value of individual lexical items for classification. It is particularly difficult to evaluate the significance of the presence of a root or word in one dialect when that root or word is missing in a possibly related dialect, since its presence in the former is usually an inherited characteristic, and inherited features are not generally useful in establishing genetic relatedness” (Huehnergard 1995:276), “Lexical items pose special difficulties, for the most part because it is not clear what it means when one subset of languages exhibits a lexeme that is not found in another subset ... It is also possible to find roots and words in subsets of languages that would indicate other subgroupings” (Huehnergard 2005:190).


\(^{13}\) Person, mountain, round.

\(^{14}\) šaḥṣ/nafar/ensān ‘person.’

\(^{15}\) 980 lexical items (or 7% of the attested lexemes) according to Edzard’s statistics based on a (not yet complete) set of the CAD volumes (Edzard 2003:178).

\(^{16}\) Five proven Cushitisms in the Geez list: dammanā ‘cloud,’ ṣaq‘r ‘leather,’/hair,’ ṛāšā ‘fish,’ ṣogā ‘meat,’ ḫis ‘smoke.’ Needless to say, a few modern Semitic languages can show a substantially deeper level of penetration of the foreign elements into their basic vocabulary. For example, Arabic loanwords in the
In view of the paramount importance attached to the borrowing problem by most opponents of the lexical approach to genealogical classification, one of the — regrettably, very few — concrete elaborations on this important subject is worthy of a more detailed analysis in the present context.

R. Hetzron’s warnings against the use of the vocabulary as a subgrouping tool because of the high risk of borrowing have been already quoted above in the preceding section of this Introduction. However, differently from most of his followers, Hetzron tried to provide some explicit arguments in favor of this negative assumption.

Hetzron’s first illustration is quite infelicitous: no serious scholar would ever dare to group together Harari, Gurage and a few Cushitic languages simply because they all have borrowed the Arabic lexeme yazw-‘raid’ (Hetzron 1972:12).

The second example is admittedly of different nature. According to Hetzron, “the use of the Northern root *ngr for ‘to say’ in Amharic ... can be explained by the northern character of the Amhara civilization, and by the fact that (in historical times at least) Amharas had much more contact with the North than with other South Ethiopic speakers” (Hetzron 1972:12). Since “to say” clearly belongs to the most fundamental layers of the basic vocabulary, Hetzron’s argument, if correct, can be easily expanded to the extent that all exclusive coincidences in the basic vocabulary of Ethiopian Semitic — quite numerous as they are — could potentially be explained as interborrowings resulting from a series of “wave innovations” (Hetzron 1975:108). Needless to say, such a possibility would completely invalidate the results of the lexical analysis proposed in the Chapter 7 of this book and, on a broader scale, its entire methodological framework.

Fortunately, there are serious reasons to believe that Hetzron’s hypothesis, while not improbable in some individual cases (*ngr ‘to say’ may well be one of them), is hardly suitable as a general explanation for the bulk of the available lexical evidence.

On the one hand, in order to explain the pan-Ethiopian spread of such basic terms as *bl? ‘to eat’ or *kil? ‘two,’ one would be forced to postulate not merely a single act of borrowing from language X into language Y, but virtual chains of loanwords involving at least half a dozen of languages. While quite conceivable for a term meaning “raid,” such a massive spread would be at best a rarity for more fundamental concepts like “two,” “sun” or “to eat.”

On the other hand, Proto-EthS lexical innovations usually exhibit a deeply structured pattern common to each of the affected languages. Thus, if PS *rawn?-‘earth’ or PS *samš- ‘sun’ are missing from EthS, they are eliminated completely from all languages of the group. But even if PS *škl ‘to eat’ does leave a trace, it is — both formally and semantically — one and the same trace throughout EthS (namely, *škl- ‘cereals, food’). The original meaning of the newly established basic root undergoes, in its turn, a similar systematic shift: as soon as PWS *bl? ‘to eat’ becomes specialized with the neutral meaning “to eat,” its earlier meaning “to swallow” disappears completely

Swadesh list of some Mehri dialects can amount to 10–12 positions in the list (see below, Chapter 8, pp. 518–522). As an extreme case, one can mention the East Gurage language Zway where, according to M. Bulakh’s estimate (personal communication), Cushitic loanwords occupy no less than one fourth of the list.
from all EthS languages, where it is expressed by a different root *wḥt (most probably, an extension of the PWS biconsonantal element *γή with the meaning “to choke”). Such a picture unambiguously suggests the existence of a compact and well-shaped proto-language whose main lexical features were faithfully inherited by its daughter tongues — rather than a mere chain of borrowings.

In summary, Hetzron’s caution is probably justified as far as some concrete examples are concerned, but does not seem to be warranted for the bulk of lexical coincidences in the basic vocabulary. In other words, the possibility of lexical borrowing, while obviously to be kept in mind, is hardly to be perceived as a serious impediment for a productive use of the basic vocabulary as a means of genealogical classification.

2.2.2. Correct evaluation of the lexical evidence in the framework of the subgrouping procedure is indeed a challenging task, but, upon a careful examination, only slightly more difficult than a meaningful assessment of morphological isoglosses. A methodological background appropriate for such an evaluation will be developed below in section 4 of this introductory chapter.

2.2.3. The third objection is the easiest one to refute, as it is clearly erroneous to consider the chronological gap between a given pair of languages a crucial obstacle for establishing a special genealogical unity between them. A statement like “comparison between contemporary languages is more reliable than comparison from languages from diverse periods” (Sivan 2003:534) is both naive and puzzling: the very essence of comparative linguistics of necessity presupposes that languages belonging to chronologically remote periods — Sanskrit and Lithuanian, Old Akkadian and Mehri, and so forth — can productively be compared to each other in all possible respects.¹⁷

The “chronological” objection is, in principle, not bound to lexical isoglosses, but pretends to get rid of the classification procedure in general.¹⁸ Nevertheless, there is a widespread assumption according to which it is precisely the vocabulary that is prone to abrupt and unpredictable changes. This claim, too, can scarcely be correct. The importance of the basic vocabulary for the communication process is by no means inferior to that of morphological markers. Accordingly, any kind of quick and massive replacement in this segment of the lexicon would inevitably threaten the very existence of the language in question as an independent idiom: if such changes were possible, they would have quickly disrupted mutual comprehension between speakers of different generations, which is a safe prerequisite for the death of any human language.¹⁹ The evidence of Aramaic — a Semitic subbranch with the longest attested history of almost three thousand years — plainly demonstrates that several dozens of

17 As duly emphasized by Tropper in his response to Sivan’s criticism: “Allen Beteiligten sollte klar sein, daß gerade hier das zentrale Problem der Diskussion um die Klassifikation des Ugaritischen überhaupt liegt. Hätten wir eine Reihe von zeitgenössigen nordwestsemitischen Sprachen zum Ugaritischen zur Verfügung, wäre die Klassifikationsfrage vermutlich schon längst geklärt. Da die Situation aber so ist, wie sie ist, bleibt — sofern wir in der Frage weiter kommen wollen — kein anderer Weg, als das Ugaritische doch mit jüngeren Sprachen typologisch zu vergleichen, wohl wissend, daß gewisse Differenzen chronologisch bedingt sind” (Tropper 2001b:622). In more general terms, cf. also Rössler 1951a:104-105.
18 As immediately becomes apparent from Sivan 2003:533.
lexical features characteristic of this subdivision have been practically immune to changes from the earliest written documents up to this day (Chapter 6 below). An examination of the Ethiopian evidence (from Geez to Harari, with a chronological distance of at least 1500 years) in Chapter 7 points to the same direction even more clearly.

2.3. In view of these considerations, we can safely conclude that no coherent objection against the use of the lexical evidence in the genealogical classification of Semitic has been advanced so far. Needless to say, the recognition of this fact is still very far from a systematic elaboration of the principles by which such a lexical research should be guided. Before we proceed to this important task, some lines must be spent on the analysis of one concrete lexicon-based method of classification which, to a varying extent, is familiar to most students working in the field of linguistic diachrony (including Semitics), viz. lexicostatistics.

3. Lexicostatistics as applied to the Semitic languages


3.1.1. The scope of D. Cohen’s article of 1961 is limited to what the author calls “des dialects du Sud,” viz. classical and dialectal Arabic, Ethiopian Semitic and Modern South Arabian. Cohen’s study begins with a persuasive defense of the validity of the basic vocabulary for the purpose of genealogical classification, followed by a few general observations on the glottochronological method and its application to the Semitic languages. On the following pages, Cohen presents lexical evidence for 116 basic concepts as reflected in Koranic Arabic, Soqotri and eight major Ethiopian languages. Cohen’s selection of the pertinent lexemes is relatively reliable, but since his basic concepts do not fully coincide with those used by Swadesh and most of his followers, meaningful comparison of Cohen’s results with those achieved by other Semitists becomes rather problematic.

3.1.2. H. Fleming’s article of 1968 also focuses on the languages of the South Semitic area, viz. Ethiopian Semitic and Modern South Arabian. The author’s conclusions are based on the evidence of the Swadesh wordlists for Mehri, Soqotri, Jibbali, Tigre, Wolane and Chaha. Given the fact that at least the MSA lists are entirely dependent on outdated and incomplete lexicographic sources (and even these, it seems, were not always used with due accuracy), Fleming’s results are to be treated with much caution. Some of his conclusions (such as the lack of close genealogical

\[20\] Reproduced without changes in his collected papers of 1970 and quoted below according to this later reprint.

\[21\] “Chaque élément lexical en lui-même n’a pas de force probante. Mais la statistique globale du vocabulaire n’en est pas moins susceptible de refléter la nature des rapports interdialectaux, et dans une certaine mesure le degré de la parenté.”

\[22\] For example, the Soqotri list is likely to be corrected in some 10–12 positions, but this not surprising in view of the fact that the author’s only source was — of necessity — the Vienna corpus as reflected in LS.
connection between MSA and either ESA or EthS) are broadly in agreement with the present-day scholarly consensus, whereas a few others can hardly be reconciled with it. This is the case of Fleming’s direct derivation of Ethiopian Semitic languages from Sabaic(-like) prototype(s) as well as his attempt to demonstrate that the Southern EthS languages have an independent Arabian source and, contrary to the widespread conviction, do not go back to any single Proto-EthS language dispersed on the Ethiopian soil.

### 3.1.3. Genealogical classification of Ethiopian Semitic

Genealogical classification of Ethiopian Semitic has been the focus of several lexicostatistic studies by M. L. Bender, whose results are conveniently summarized in Bender 1986. According to Bender, lexicostatistic evidence confirms the traditionally-assumed diachronic unity of Northern EthS, with a more or less equal distance between Geez and both Tigre and Tigrinya. Among the Southern languages, Hetzron’s “Transversal” subgroup appears to closer to the Northern languages than the “Outer” one. Bender’s list of specifically EthS basic lexemes with no plain cognates elsewhere in Semitic (such as *mwaḥ ‘to be warm’ or *bdh ‘many’) may be considered a remote precursor of our “Proto-EthS terms with uncertain status” below in Chapter 7. The reliability of Bender’s lexical lists for 15 major EthS languages (1971:230–237) is still in need of independent verification.

### 3.1.4. Ch. Rabin’s study of 1975

Ch. Rabin’s study of 1975 is the first attempt to apply the glottochronological procedure to the Semitic linguistic family as a whole. For several decades, it was also the only one of this kind, and it was certainly for that reason that it has quickly become a sort of prototypical case used by Semitists in order to demonstrate how (and whether) one can (or, more often, cannot) make a meaningful output from Semitic lexicostatistics.

In reality, Rabin’s laconic and highly schematic exposition is hardly suitable for such a purpose. After a brief theoretical introduction, Rabin presents the lexical evidence from six major Semitic languages (Hebrew, Ugaritic, Syriac, Akkadian, Arabic and Geez), provided with a relatively detailed commentary mostly pertaining to the choice of one word or another to fill this or that semantic slot of the Swadesh wordlist.23 Perhaps the most interesting results achieved by Rabin are the lack of special genealogical proximity between Arabic and Geez and, conversely, a fairly high number of lexical coincidences between Arabic and Syriac. The extremely innovative nature of the basic vocabulary of Arabic is duly acknowledged, probably for the first time in the history of Semitic linguistics.

### 3.1.5. J. Rodgers’ article (1991)

J. Rodgers’ article (1991) has a narrower “South Semitic” basis roughly coinciding with that of Cohen 1961, but, in agreement with the Rössler–Hetzron trend, excluding Arabic. No material evidence is explicitly adduced in Rodgers’ study, which makes it unsuitable for a proper critical evaluation. Nevertheless, we will return to some of his results (such as the division of MSA into the Mehri–Jibbali and Soqotri subgroups) later in this monograph.

### 3.1.6. In his 1991 contribution, J. Hayes tries to assess the degree of proximity between Ugaritic and Epigraphic South Arabian as reflected in the basic vocabulary. As

---

23 All its shortcomings notwithstanding, Rabin’s commentary undoubtedly represents a very welcome methodological innovation which, to the best of our knowledge, has never been imitated.
is already well-known for Ugaritic, a sufficiently reliable list of basic concepts like Swadesh’s is notoriously difficult to compile.\(^{24}\) As for Epigraphic South Arabian (in practice, Sabaic), such a task is with all probability deemed to be unsuccessful because of the very nature of the extant textual evidence.\(^{25}\) In other words, both languages are more or less unsuitable for any kind of lexicostatistical enquiry, whereas Akkadian is by no means a reasonable \textit{tertium comparationis} in this particular case. As a result, the general output of Hayes’ study is rather insignificant.

3.1.7. F. Corriente’s brief but insightful contribution of 2006 is intended to test the lexical foundations of the Central Semitic hypothesis. In this sense, Corriente’s article is an immediate forerunner of Chapter 3 of the present monograph, where a comprehensive analysis of its merits and deficiencies can be found (pp. 219-222 below). At present, it will probably be sufficient to observe that Corriente’s statistical evidence, intended to refute the validity of the Central Semitic hypothesis, in fact provides some penetrating arguments in its favor: as convincingly shown by Corriente, lexical features shared by Arabic with the “Central Semitic” Hebrew are much more numerous than what Arabic has in common with Geez, its traditional “South Semitic” counterpart.

3.1.8. A. Militarev’s detailed contributions regularly published since 2000 up to the present (2000, 2004, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2012a, 2014) provide by far the most solid factual background for Semitic lexicostatistics. As major advantages of Militarev’s studies, one can mention a broad selection of languages (nearly all ancient and modern Semitic idioms are processed); a fairly accurate choice of the pertinent lexemes, many of which are collected directly from ancient texts and native speakers rather than exclusively from lexicographic tools; and reasonable application of the etymological method in the evaluation of the cognate relationship. Many of Militarev’s results are in full agreement with the Rössler–Hetzron pattern of classification, although a few others are not (see below in this Introduction).

3.2. Ever since the discussion closing Rabin’s 1975 paper,\(^{26}\) criticism against Semitic lexicostatistics has been lapidary, apodictic and destructive (Faber 1980:13, 1997:5, Appleyard 1996:204, Huehnergard 2002b:124), mostly directed against the method in general or some technical infelicities of its application to the Semitic languages.\(^{27}\) To the best of our knowledge, no attempt has ever been made to compare

\(^{24}\) For some rather tentative results see below, Chapter 5 (pp. 241-257).

\(^{25}\) It might happen that the newly-published everyday documents written on wood will somehow mitigate this situation, but at least today, such a possibility appears very slim.

\(^{26}\) W. Leslau (“No particular hundred words should be used in a dogmatic way for glottochronology for all cultures, and etymologies should not be used for this purpose”) or A. Kaye (“It is very interesting that lexicostatistics or glottochronology has not really been applied to Semitic and I think we shall all be thankful for that position”). Curiously enough, very little has been said about Rabin’s rather infelicitous choice of many exponents of the basic concepts. A. Saggs’ brief observations in this respect are themselves mostly questionable or even plainly erroneous (such as \textit{eperu} for “ashes” or \textit{emēdu} for “to stand” in Akkadian).

\(^{27}\) “I believe ... that lexical comparison of this kind, namely the typical lexicostatistical 100 or 200-item word-list, is to say the least too crude a tool and altogether unsatisfactory device for establishing the finer points of relationship between languages” (Appleyard 1996:204), “I will not discuss lexicostatistic approaches to the structure of the Semitic language family ... since lexicostatistics is based on assumptions about rate of lexical replacement that may not be applicable to the Semitic languages. Furthermore, it is in practice subject to pragmatic difficulties involving semantic shifts and the
the results of Rabin and his followers with those obtained through morphology-oriented classification procedures, nor to provide a rationale for the discrepancies between the two approaches. However, the positive potential of such a comparative analysis can be easily illustrated by the following — by no means exhaustive — list of examples.

The virtual lack of lexical proximity between Arabic and Geez, correctly observed in Rabin 1975:98–99, is very much in agreement with the Central Semitic affiliation of Arabic as advocated by Rössler and Hetzron. Similarly, there is hardly anything to detract from Rabin’s penetrating remarks about the highly specific nature of the core vocabulary of Classical Arabic (1975:99).28

The high number of lexical coincidences between Harari and Wolane observed in Cohen 1970:21 perfectly correlates with the historical unity of Harari and East Gurage universally accepted since Hetzron 1972.

Rodgers (1991:1327) observes that there is no lexical evidence for a special relationship between Ethiopic Semitic and Modern South Arabian — not unlike Huehnergard (2005:161–162), although on quite different grounds.

Militarev’s Central Semitic, comprising Arabic, Aramaic and Canaanite (2000:303), is fully identical to the same subdivision in the Rössler–Hetzron pattern. Militarev’s hypothesis about a very early separation of Modern South Arabian from the common Semitic stock (2000:303) is admittedly hard to reconcile with morphological facts, but his observations are helpful to draw proper attention to the highly specific nature of the basic vocabulary of this subgroup.

3.3. A sympathetic, constructively critical or just merely neutral stance towards lexicostatistics is a rarity in Semitic linguistics. For several decades, S. Kaufman’s judicious remarks were almost the only quotable example: “Lexicostatistics, however one must criticize the absolute chronologies suggested by strict application of the original formulas of the glottochronological method, assumes — certainly correctly — that the basic vocabulary has greater resistance to change than do other sections of the vocabulary and that it is therefore of greater use as a diagnostic tool” (1988:47). F. Corriente’s recent evaluation (2006) is a welcome addition to this otherwise poorly-represented trend. In this study, he qualifies as “ill-advised” the common tendency of “altogether rejecting the usefulness of glottochronology” and rightly observes that the “partial validity [of lexicostatistics] cannot be easily refuted in any thorough way” (2006:142).29

identification of loanwords” (Faber 1997:5), “It is disappointing that a number of scholars continue to use glottochronology and lexicostatistics as the basis of their internal classification of Semitic” (Huehnergard 2002b:124). Note that Faber (1980:13), generally unsympathetic towards the common belief according to which only morphology can provide solid grounds for genealogical classification and urging scholars to simultaneously apply each of the four possible types of classification tools (phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary), explicitly refrains from considering lexical evidence in her dissertation.

28 For which now see Corriente 2006.
29 One has to admit that Corriente’s approach to the chronological dimension of the lexicostatistic method (“It cannot be denied that the increasing lexical divergence between sister languages keeps a certain computable pace, related to the amount of time elapsed and to a characteristic coefficient”) is almost certainly overly-optimistic.
4. Diachronic stratification of the basic vocabulary

4.1. The uniformly critical attitude towards the application of the lexicostatistical method to the Semitic languages has deeply discredited the basic vocabulary as a classification tool in general. This is only natural in view of the fact that for most scholars interested in the subject glottochronology/lexicostatistics has quickly become the lexical method of classification. A few mildly dissenting voices (Appleyard 1977:3–5, Greenfield 1969:97–99, Hetzron 1972:13, Kaufman 1988:47–48, Rainey 2007) have changed little in this overwhelmingly negative panorama.

4.2. It is clear, nevertheless, that lexicostatistics is not the only method by which the role of the lexical factor in genealogical classification can be assessed. A rarely observed drawback of lexicostatistics is that within this procedure equal weight is given to all lexical coincidences independently of their diachronic nature. In the reality, however, each shared lexical feature — not unlike the morphological ones — can be either archaic or innovative. Now, if shared morphological innovations are generally recognized to be of paramount importance for classification, whereas the value of shared morphological retentions ranges from comparatively high to zero (depending on their specificity), why not to apply the same gradation to lexical features?

Within such a framework, every lexical isogloss shared by language X with language Y can be attributed to one of the following categories:

1. trivial retentions
2. non-trivial retentions
3. formal or semantic innovations
4. loanwords
5. words of unclear origin

30 “A comparative lexical study can provide not only finer details of linguistic connections and contacts, but also indications of extra-linguistic factors”; “We may reasonably look to lexical evidence to relate to the classification and interaction of the various Ethiopian Semitic languages amongst themselves”; “Whatever the merit or otherwise of the glottochronological application of this notion of ‘basic’ vocabulary is, the recognition of these two broadly identifiable poles of the lexicon [basic vs. cultural] cannot, I believe, be seriously objected to”; “Lexical criteria are, of course, not the first or the principal means that should be used in classification work, precisely because of the vulnerability of the lexicon to change and outside influence. Nevertheless, a few important lexical isoglosses can be found which broadly seem to coincide with those established on morphological evidence.” As one can easily observe, in his later studies on the subject, Appleyard has become much more critical towards the validity of the lexical factor in the genealogical subgrouping.

31 “Naturally, we do not mean that vocabulary must be discarded from among the criteria for linguistic classification. On the contrary, it is one of its most important bases.”

32 “If the lexically based conclusions contradict the evidence of grammar, the evidence of grammar must prevail. If they complement each other, however, the lexical evidence has every right to be adduced as corroborative evidence.”

33 Cf. already Cohen 1970:12: “Dans les cas les plus favorables il est possible, avec un degré de probabilité raisonnable, d’affirmer que de deux formes nommant le même concept, l’un est une innovation soit par déplacement de sens, soit par emprunt, tandis que l’autre remonte au stock primitif.”
4.2.1. **Trivial retentions** are exact phonological and semantic descendants of their Proto-Semitic ancestors, which, in turn, can be shown to function as the basic exponents of the respective concepts in the proto-language. That such terms are inherited by the daughter languages is only to be expected. For example, there is no serious reason to doubt that the concepts “dog,” “ear” and “to die” were expressed by *kalb-*, *udn-* and *mwt* in Proto-Semitic. In view of this circumstance, it would be pointless to argue that a given pair of Semitic languages preserving these roots as their main terms for “dog,” “ear” and “to die” are united by any particularly close genealogical relationship.\(^{34}\) In short, trivial retentions are not helpful for the purpose of genealogical subgrouping. It is rather their absence — a shared loss — that may occasionally be suggestive.\(^{35}\)

4.2.2. For many fundamental concepts, no single basic designation can be reconstructed for PS. Thus, Proto-Semitic likely possessed several verbal roots with a relatively diffused meaning of “to come,” “to reach,” and “to arrive” (such as *bawr*, *etw*, *mfr*), but none of them can be confidently reconstructed as the PS verb for “to come.”\(^{36}\)

In such cases, the daughter languages had at their disposal a rather broad set of options from which their basic terms could evolve. In other words, lexemes belonging to this category do have relatively reliable cognates in other languages, but it cannot be demonstrated with certainty that the basic meaning like “bird” or “black” in one or another individual Semitic language is a direct continuation of the PS picture and not a result of an independent semantic evolution.

The subgrouping relevance of such **non-trivial retentions** is certainly not zero, but crucially depends on the degree of specificity of each particular feature.

If the root in question functions as the main term for the given concept not only in the language under scrutiny, but also in a broader circle of languages, its significance for classification is usually quite low. Here belong, for example, such relatively widespread verbal roots as *kil ‘to kill,’ *whb ‘to give,’ *ry ‘to see’ or *kwm ‘to

---

\(^{34}\) A useful illustration is provided by the list of lexemes common to each of the three idioms of the inscriptions from Zincirli compiled by J. Tropper (1993a:278). Few Semitists would disagree with the assumption that such notions as “father,” “brother,” “house” or “all” were expressed by anything but *ab-, *ah-, *bayt- and *kal-/*kull- in Proto-Semitic. Accordingly, the presence of their reflexes in Phoenician, Old Aramaic and Samalian says nothing about the genealogical proximity between these three idioms.

\(^{35}\) Not unlike the shared loss of an otherwise very widespread morphological feature. As will be shown below in chapters 6, 7 and 8, massive disappearance of some otherwise nearly ubiquitous lexical items is actually a hallmark of several minor subdivisions of Semitic, such as Aramaic, Ethiopian Semitic and especially Modern South Arabian.

\(^{36}\) To be sure, it is rather improbable that PS had no basic verb for “to come” (which would make all the corresponding words in the daughter languages equally innovative). It is more likely that such a term either did exist and simply coincides with one of the attested candidates, or several synonyms without substantial semantic difference were present already in PS and have been subsequently generalized in individual languages. A prime example of such a situation is provided by the basic color terms “black,” “red” and “white.” For all practical purposes, these clear-cut concepts are virtual semantic universals and, incidentally, belong to the most basic ideas immediately perceived by every speaker of a human language. In spite of this (as seen already in Cohen 1970:11), there is hardly any segment of the Semitic basic vocabulary that would display more diversity than the color terms, almost none of which can be safely reconstructed for Proto-Semitic. This enigmatic fact is still in need of further investigation.
stand,’ each of them missing from Akkadian and Modern South Arabian (and, therefore, not traceable to either PS or PWS), but rather evenly distributed over Central Semitic and Ethiopian.

A radically different picture is obtained when a given root is highly prominent in one subgroup, but only sparsely attested elsewhere. Typical examples include *hbl ‘to say’ in Proto-EthS or *hšv ‘to be dry’ and *sšwát- ‘fire’ in Proto-MSA. The relevance of such terms for establishing the linguistic specificity of the corresponding Semitic subdivision can be rather high.

An important characteristic of non-trivial retentions is that they can (and do) occur in clusters. Accordingly, if one single isogloss belonging to this category can well be accidental, it is rather unlikely that two languages with no special genealogical proximity would have made the same choice in five, seven or ten cases. Statistically significant clustering of non-trivial retentions is thus by no means unimportant. For example, a language combining *rawp- for “bird,” *lmy for “to be black,” *whb for “to give,” *mṛp for “to come” and *šVbh- for “fat” is deemed to belong to the Ethiopian Semitic subgroup, although taken individually each of these roots is also attested in a variety of other Semitic languages and in some of them even displays the same basic status.

In summary: the use of non-trivial retentions as subgrouping criteria requires some caution, but it is almost certainly unproductive to discard them entirely from the classification procedure.37

4.2.3. Formal and semantic innovations hardly require any special explanation: either the form, or the meaning of a PS term may undergo a non-trivial modification specific to one particular group of languages, such as Proto-Ethiopian *blv ‘to eat’ (originally ‘to swallow’) replacing PS *hl ‘to eat,’ or Proto-Aramaic *ma-nay- ‘vessel’ with an obligatory ma-prefixation absent from numerous other Semitic languages where PS *N̄V̄V̄y- ‘vessel’ is attested. Needless to say, accidental convergences due to independent formal and semantic developments are always to be considered as a theoretical possibility, but most of the lexical innovations analyzed below in this monograph do not seem to possess any remotely close precedent in the remaining branches of Semitic.38

The relevance of shared lexical innovations for genealogical classification is, therefore, very high. The major deficiency of this category of shared lexical features is that — in Semitic at least — they are usually not very numerous.

4.2.4. The similarity between the terms in question may be due to borrowing from a foreign source. Unless we are able to demonstrate that the relevant term was


38 One should not lose sight of the fact that also morphological innovations can be more and less specific and, accordingly, have more and less value in the framework of the subgrouping procedure. Thus, as rightly acknowledged in Huehnergard 1995:271–272, generalization of the pattern ma-C₁C₂C₃C₄ as the infinitive of the basic stem in most Aramaic languages finds an exact parallel in Modern Ethiopian. It nevertheless remains a relatively important Common Aramaic characteristic, even if only marginally preserved in the earliest Aramaic documents and largely obliterated in most of Neo-Aramaic (cf. Bulakh–Kogan 2010:293).
already borrowed into the common proto-language of one or another Semitic sub-branch rather than separately into each individual tongue, such isoglosses are clearly useless for the subgrouping procedure. In Chapter 7 (pp. 438-439, 441-442), the problem of shared lexical loans will be analyzed more closely because of its importance for the structure of the basic vocabulary of Ethiopian Semitic.

4.2.5. Not a few shared lexical features, while highly specific of a given Semitic subgroup, have no reliable etymology: they have no convincing cognates elsewhere in Semitic but, incidentally, do not exhibit any markedly foreign features. Their origin is thus unknown (or uncertain).

Shared lexical features belonging to this category (which are fairly numerous in some of the most important Semitic subdivisions) bring us to the thorny glottogonic problem: where do the “new” lexemes appear from? As long as one believes that human words to not emerge *ex nihilo*, terms belonging to this group, too, must have some origin. Feasible possibilities are not numerous: they are either inherited PS lexemes completely lost elsewhere in Semitic, or highly atypical phonological and/or semantic modifications which cannot be convincingly detected with the help of the traditional tools of etymological analysis, or borrowings from an unattested foreign source. All this means that, in theory, they must be attributed to one of the categories already described above, but we simply do not know to which one.

The first option is a promising one in many cases, but cannot be exploited *ad infinitum*: as pointedly observed by Huehnergard (2005:190), the PS vocabulary is unlikely to be so much broader than those of the attested daughter languages.

The second option necessarily invites the Semitic etymologist to spend more attention to the historical typology of semantic shifts both within and outside Semitic and, possibly, to a more liberal attitude to phonological irregularities and a few related phenomena such as metathesis, root blending and the like.

The third possibility is rather hard to explore in view of the fact that, for the majority of Semitic languages, no substantial substratum influence can be postulated with any degree of certainty.

With these considerations in mind, the relevance of such terms for genealogical classification can be evaluated as comparatively high: most of them must be qualified as either highly specific retentions from PS, or as innovations involving some hitherto undiscovered semantic and/or phonological phenomena.

4.3. In view of the aforementioned — and all practical obstacles notwithstanding — one may safely conclude that the basic vocabulary can no longer be perceived merely as a chaotic agglomeration of words. Rather, we are faced with a deeply structured system of terms filling a relatively restricted number of semantic slots reserved for fundamental ideas.\(^{39}\)

In such conditions, the concept of main (or basic) designation of a given meaning acquires a prime importance within our methodology.

Although languages do often possess several synonyms for many ideas (sometimes, even for the most fundamental ones), the neutral term, one used outside

---

\(^{39}\) As clearly seen already by D. Cohen: “Un point de vue assez commun postule un défaut de structuration presque total pour le vocabulaire. Or les recherches les plus récentes tendent à y retrouver au contraire des principes d’organisation assez nets et assez constants” (1970:9).
any special semantic and stylistic connotations, tends to be only one. When lexical evidence is used for the purpose of genealogical classification, such basic terms alone are to be seriously considered. In other words, mere presence of the lexeme \( n \) not only in the languages \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) (for which a closer genealogical relationship is hypothesized), but also in the language \( Y \), does not undermine the relevance of the lexeme \( n \) for this subgrouping hypothesis — unless we are able to demonstrate that \( n \) is used in \( Y \) with the same functional value as in \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \). Proper recognition of this very important fact is still a rarity in Semitic studies.\(^{40}\)

It must be acknowledged that, for a variety of objective and subjective reasons, this principle has not always been rigorously followed throughout this monograph: in many of its chapters, simple presence of one or another lexical item in two or more Semitic languages was also considered as supporting evidence for their hypothetic genealogical closeness. Nevertheless, whenever such data have been found to contradict the straightforwardly identical word-pairs like those belonging to the Swadesh wordlist, the latter type of evidence has always been given unconditional priority.

4.4. There is no need to emphasize that our methodology owes much to lexicostatistics. At the same time, it seems to be free of some of its problematic aspects. Let us briefly outline the major differences between the two approaches.

First of all, the present method is not — and by its very nature, cannot be — an exercise in absolute chronology of genealogical splits. Proving the common origin of, say, Ethiopian Semitic is not necessarily connected with establishing the date of its separation from the Proto-West Semitic stock, nor that of the subsequent disintegration of Proto-EthS into individual languages.\(^{41}\)

More subtle, but no less important, is the second difference: whereas we are primarily interested in innovations only (albeit less trivial types of retentions can be relevant as well), lexicostatistic calculations are based on both retentions and innovations indiscriminately. As a result, conservative and innovative trends in the development of the basic vocabulary are mixed together, which leaves one fully uncertain about why the languages \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) are united by so many lexical coincidences: because both are lexically conservative tongues which tend to preserve the PS lexical heritage intact, or rather because they share a common innovative period in their historical development.

\(^{40}\) As an atypical positive example, one must quote Kaufman’s fine evaluation of the Aramaic–Canaanite lexical dichotomy in 1988:52–55: “True, in almost every case these Aramaic lexemes are known from Biblical Hebrew texts. But these are rare and poetic Hebrew terms, the common terms in Aramaic ... Others simply ignored such vocabulary altogether because they found it in the Biblical lexicon. But where does such vocabulary typically occur? Often these terms are the B words of parallel pairs in poetry (or even the C and D words!), but usually they occur in passages long since seen to be strongly Aramaizing, such as the dialogues of Job.” Contrast Pardee 1991:104: “All of these dialects were so closely related that most lexical items appear in more than one dialect.”

\(^{41}\) Cf. in this sense L. Bender’s remarks in Rabin 1975:101: “Now I am not saying by this that I am defending glottochronology. Personally I am one of those people also who have dropped the whole idea. I think however that the idea of using basic vocabulary and percentage figures of cognates, forgetting about what relationship this may or may not have with time of separation, still has some validity.”
Finally, our investigation is not restricted to any fixed segment of the basic vocabulary, but can be carried out on the basis of whatever sufficiently primitive and well-defined semantic concepts. This is an important advantage as far as limited-corpus ancient Semitic languages are concerned, for which the Swadesh wordlist can rarely be compiled with enough precision and certainty.

5. Previous research on lexical isoglosses in Semitic


This is, however, not to deny the merits of the earlier generations of Semitic scholars, many of whom — consciously or intuitively — have made serious contributions to both methodological and material aspects of our investigation. In such a context, a brief survey of the most important achievements of our predecessors is virtually unavoidable.

5.1.1. J. Cantineau’s pioneering article of 1932, on which the present-day understanding of Semitic classification still largely depends, is only rarely concerned with lexical evidence.42 Still, on p. 179 of his study Cantineau correctly observes that the characteristically Ethiopic replacement of PS *ṭin-ā ‘two’ by *kil-ay ‘both’ is an important argument in favor of the common origin of the EthS subgroup. Furthermore, on pp. 200–201 a valuable discussion on the dialectal distribution of *raḥad- and *rašt- for “one” can be found.

5.1.2. A. Haldar (1964:274) was able to make a few important observations about exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Akkadian, although his concrete examples are not particularly impressive (see Chapter 5, p. 347 below).

5.1.3. For J. Greenfield (1969:97–100), lexical isoglosses represent an important tool by which the genealogical proximity between Ugaritic and Canaanite can be positively assessed. Admitting that “it is easy to disregard the evidence from common vocabulary by arguing that vocabulary is borrowed with comparative ease,” Greenfield correctly observes that “the great bulk of the vocabulary of Ugaritic, when not gemeinsemitisch ... has its strongest ties with Canaanite.” As will be shown in Chapter 5

42 On p. 184 of his article Cantineau briefly observes that “divers faits de vocabulaire, dont je compte m’occuper plus tard, sont commun aux différents dialects sudarabiques.” To the best of our knowledge, no such comprehensive inquiry has been ever published by him. The only example adduced ibid. (“l’absence dans tout ce domaine, des noms *ḥatan- ‘gendre’ et *ḥallat- ‘bru’”) is not very impressive, the more so since the latter term is to some extent preserved in Modern South Arabian (see Chapter 8 below, p. 568).
below (p. 342), most of Greenfield’s concrete lexical illustrations are, however, not very felicitous.

5.1.4. H. L. Ginsberg (1970:103) opens his case for the Canaanite affiliation of Ugaritic with lexical evidence, but mentions only six pertinent lexical features, most of which can scarcely be attributed to truly basic layers of the vocabulary. Similarly patchy is his list of specific lexical traits of Aramaic (ibid. 119–120). Conversely, Ginsberg’s remarks on the lexical evidence for the internal division of the Ugarito-Canaanite group are quite penetrating (see especially an important list of specific Phoenician-Ugaritic isoglosses on p. 105 of his study, further analyzed in Chapter 5 below, pp. 342-343).

5.1.5. D. Appleyard’s study of 1977 is primarily a descriptive overview of the diachronic background of the basic vocabulary of Amharic. Nevertheless, in the introductory section of his article (pp. 4–5) Appleyard spends considerable attention to the potential of lexical isoglosses for establishing the genealogical position of Amharic within Ethiopian Semitic. Appleyard has been able to detect a few remarkable lexical peculiarities characteristic of Southern EthS in opposition to Geez, Tigre and Tigrinya. At the same time, a proper distinction between archaisms and innovations is not fully consistent in his study. The possibility of inter-EthS loanwords is duly emphasized, especially in what concerns a few remarkable exclusive isoglosses between Amharic and Tigrinya. Since the problem of the internal division of EthS is basically outside the scope of the present monograph, a more detailed analysis of Appleyard’s observations will not be undertaken here, being scheduled for a future comprehensive investigation.

5.1.6. In spite of R. Hetzron’s unambiguous statement in favor of the use of the vocabulary as a tool of genealogical classification, lexical evidence has not been analyzed systematically in any of his numerous studies on the topic. By far the most explicit manifestation of Hetzron’s attention to the basic vocabulary is the term Gunnän-Gurage, coined by him in order to designate the majority of the languages of Gurageland (where terms for “head” derive from *gunnän, of uncertain etymology) in opposition to dum ‘head’ (probably from *dVmäy-, cf. SED I No. 52) in Eastern Gurage. According to Hetzron (1972:1), this feature is “a very good lexical isogloss.” Other lexical arguments scattered over Hetzron’s classical monograph include the negative particles *rVy in Northern EthS vs. *ral in Southern EthS (1972:28),43 *tisr- vs. *zahrän-as designations of the numeral “nine” in Northern and Southern EthS respectively (1972:29),44 and the verbs *hlf vs. *hur for ‘to go’ in Northern vs. Western Gurage (1972:59). It is also noteworthy that one of the most prominent features among “the first independent innovations that separated it [EthS] from South Arabian” (Hetzron 1972:18), namely the fact that “the same morphemic exponent is used adnominally in the meaning of ‘like’ and adverbially as a purposive ‘in order that’” is actually a lexical feature.45

---

43 For a recent evaluation of this opposition see Bulakh 2012, whose conclusions are substantially different from Hetzron’s.
44 The former term is a retention from PS, the origin of the latter is uncertain (Appleyard 1977:59).
45 Its emergence is attributed by Hetzron to an early Agaw influence, but note that the same polysemy is observable for Akk. kīma at least in Old Assyrian: kasram melûtum irramiškunu kīma
5.1.7. S. Kaufman’s sympathetic stance towards the use of the lexical evidence (to some extent at least, including lexicostatistics) for genealogical classification of Semitic has been already mentioned above in this Introduction. The practical consequences of Kaufman’s reasonable approach have been, however, relatively modest: what Kaufman considers to be “a complete lexical analysis” of the Deir ṭAllā text (1988:52) occupies one paragraph and two footnotes.

5.1.8. In spite of J. Tropper’s explicit recognition of the peripheral status of the lexical evidence for genealogical subgrouping (1993a:283), on pp. 278–311 of his monograph dedicated to the linguistic landscape of Samal/Zincirli one can find a fairly detailed diachronic analysis of the lexical features which characterize each of the three pertinent idioms (Samalian, Phoenician and Old Aramaic). In this analysis, the concepts of “specifically Canaanite” and “specifically Aramaic” lexemes are prominent and play not a small role in Tropper’s attribution of Samalian (and Deir ṭAllā) to the archaic Aramaic linguistic type.

Tropper’s arguments in favor of the Canaanite affiliation of Ugaritic (1994) are mostly of morphological nature, but on p. 351 of this article he observes — correctly, in our opinion — that Canaanite is the only Semitic subgroup which shares with Ugaritic a more or less substantial body of common features in the basic vocabulary. In the wake of Ginsberg, Tropper spends some attention to the specific lexical coincidences between Ugaritic and Phoenician, which he prefers to ascribe to an areal spread rather than to a particularly narrow genealogical connection.

5.1.9. In her study of the language of the Deir ṭAllā plaster inscription, J. A. Hackett (1984) expresses serious doubts about the validity of the lexicon for defining the linguistic specificity of the dialect under scrutiny.46 At the same time, she was the first Semitist who successfully applied to the vocabulary the very concept of shared innovation.47 In Hackett’s view, the potential of this methodological discovery for establishing the Canaanite vs. Aramaic affiliation of the Deir ṭAllā idiom is comparatively low, but, as will be shown below in Chapter 6 (pp. 406-413), this is probably an underestimation.

5.1.10. As already observed above in this Introduction, profound reservations towards the possibility of exploiting the lexical factor in the Semitic genealogical classification are characteristic of J. Huehnergard’s numerous studies on this topic. At the same time, Huehnergard’s skepticism did not prevent him from formulating a few remarkably interesting suggestions — both practical and methodological — about the use of lexical isoglosses in the subgrouping procedure.

Already in his 1995 article dealing with the diachronic unity of Aramaic, Huehnergard was able to develop the concept of “shared lexical innovations” (1995:276) which, not unlike the morphological ones, are potentially helpful for establishing the common origin of this or that bundle of Semitic idioms. Huehnergard

---

46 “It is usually difficult to distinguish the retention of rare but indigenous lexical items from valid borrowings” (Hackett 1984:120) and a few related statements on the same page.

47 Following an oral suggestion by T. O. Lambdin.
is right to observe that such innovations “might take the form of new roots or words or, more often, of new semantic values.” The practical consequences of this observation have admittedly been rather modest: only one characteristically Aramaic lexical innovation (viz. the verb *šbd with the meaning “to do, to make”) has been detected.

Ten years later, a more refined methodology accompanied by a broader accumulation of concrete examples has been developed in Huehnergard’s study dealing with the Central Semitic hypothesis (2005:189–191). Most recently, a few valuable examples of specifically Central Semitic lexical features have been collected in an encyclopedic article by Hasselbach and Huehnergard (2007:420).

A more detailed analysis of the impact of Huehnergard’s studies on the lexical aspect of the Central Semitic problem can be found in Chapter 3 below.

5.1.11. Lexical isoglosses play a key role in A. Rainey’s (2007) definition of Hebrew as a “Transjordan” language which he opposes to the “coastal Canaanite” Phoenician (and, presumably, Ugaritic). Rainey’s promising hypothesis will be further developed below in Chapter 5 (pp. 342-344), where three lexical features discussed by Rainey (*hwy vs. kwn ‘to be’, *ṣy vs. *y ‘to make’ and *dahab- vs. *l ṣVṛV ‘gold’) will be supplemented by a few other structurally similar examples.

5.1.12. In his recently published summary description of what is traditionally described as “North-West Semitic” (see Chapter 4 of the present monograph), H. Gzella adheres to the common opinion according to which “the lexicon is easily affected by borrowing and cannot serve as a criterion for classification of its own” (2011:446). He rightly admits, nevertheless, that “several common lexemes regularly used in one language are marginal or absent in another” and observes that “shared semantic shifts, too, bear on subgrouping, because individual words may survive in one particular language simply by chance.” It is a pity that Gzella’s attempts to apply these reasonable principles to the main problem of his survey, viz. the historical unity and the internal division of NWS, are at best sketchy: potentially significant lexical isoglosses exclusive to NWS are not listed nor is their absence explicitly recognized; Ugaritic-Canaanite lexical features do not go beyond the few cases acknowledged by Ginsberg more than forty years ago (see above in this Introduction); only three or four specifically Aramaic isoglosses are mentioned, side by side with a few other phenomena (the nisbe in -āy, the pattern qāṭāl) which belong to morphology (nominal derivation) rather than lexicon.

Chapter 1.
The basic vocabulary of Proto-Semitic: form and meaning

1. Proto-Semitic lexical reconstruction: the Swadesh wordlist

1.1. The fundamental dichotomy between retentions and innovations in the basic vocabulary of a given Semitic language can be meaningful only with respect to the corresponding Proto-Semitic reconstructions.48 Whenever one speaks about Ugaritic,

48 This very important fact was perceived — admittedly, in a somewhat impressionistic way — by D. Cohen, who is rightly concerned about the fact that some adjectival concepts (first of all color terms, but
Aramaic or Geez lexemes which are exact phonological and semantic descendants of their Proto-Semitic ancestors, how can one be sure that such proto-lexemes were indeed the basic terms for the respective concepts? In other words, is it possible to demonstrate with a reasonable degree of certainty that a given root not only can be reconstructed as Proto-Semitic, but also that it functioned there as the main exponent of the notion in question?

In our view, the answer to this question must be generally positive: for many basic concepts — both nominal and verbal — one single Proto-Semitic reconstruction can indeed be postulated without much hesitation.

On a more practical level, one can formulate two types of criteria by which our choice of such reconstructed basic lexemes should be guided.

1.2. If a PS root appears with the same basic meaning in all major Semitic languages, there can be hardly any reason to doubt that it also did so in the proto-language. Thus, *ʼayn- with the meaning “eye” is preserved in all Semitic languages without exception and undoubtedly functioned as the basic term for this concept already in PS.

The same conclusion can be safely achieved if the root in question has lost its basic function in a limited number of languages or minor subdivisions (usually one, more seldom two). In most of such cases, the root in question does not disappear entirely, but is more or less sparsely preserved with a related, but less fundamental meaning. Thus, PS *dam- ceased to mean “blood” in MSA (replaced by *dVr- of uncertain origin), but is preserved with the meaning “pus” throughout this subgroup (see Chapter 8, p. 524 below). Similarly, if a term is lost in some languages of a minor subdivision, but persists in others, its archaic status is evident. This is the case of PS *ʼabn- ‘stone,’ whose preservation in Soqotri (as opposed to continental MSA) can only be interpreted as an archaic remnant inherited from PS.

Applying these criteria (in their essence, established already in Cohen 1970:12), one can confidently fill the following positions in the Swadesh wordlist of Proto-Semitic.

1. “all” — *kal/*kull- (CDG 381).

Passim except Soqotri where kal is preserved with the meaning “each, every”
(LS 219), note both meanings in Mhr. kāl (ML 110). The Soqotri term for “all” is fāhre (LS 335), whose cognates in other MSA mean “together” (on the MSA picture see further Chapter 8, p. 524). The latter meaning is likely the original one in view of Akk. paḫaru ‘to assemble, to congregate; to gather, collect’ (CAD P 23, AHw. 810).

   In Arabic, ntk is preserved with the meaning ‘to undo, to untwist; to dissolve, to break a covenant’ (Lane 2847), whereas the main verb for “to bite” is ḥḏḏ (Lane 2069), with no clear parallel elsewhere in Semitic.
   In MSA, *ntk/*ntq ‘to bite’ is preserved in Mehri (nakt, ML 305), but lost in Jibbali and Soqotri. Jib. žāvār (JL 322) has no reliable cognates, the same is true of Soq. žávab (LS 363). On the MSA picture see further Chapter 8 (p. 524).

9. “blood” — *dam- (SED I No. 50).
   Passim except MSA, where the reflexes of *dam- mean “pus” rather than “blood.” The latter concept is expressed by *ḏvr- of unclear origin. On the MSA picture see further Chapter 8 (p. 531).

10. “bone” — *ratm- (SED I No. 25). Passim except Syriac and MSA.
   In Syriac (as in most other Aramaic dialects) *ratm- acquired the meanings “thigh,” “side,” “flank” (SED I No. 25), whereas “bone” is designated by the reflexes of *garm- (SED I No. 94).
   For the marginal preservation of *ratm- in continental MSA and its replacements (*rVg- in the continental languages, ǧhlo in Soqotri) see further Chapter 8 (p. 527).


---

51 As our fieldwork shows, not even this in today’s language, where kāl is replaced by the Arabic loanword kāllt. It is only in a few very archaic poetic compositions that kāl ‘each, every’ is attested. Needless to say, it may well be that other Soqotri dialects are different in this respect.

52 See further Qat. f-l-hr ‘to enter into partnership, to associate with’ (LIQ 129) and Pho. mḥrt ‘assembly’ (DNWSI 673), both ḫaptēx legomena. Ugr. ḥmr ‘assembly’ (DUL 669, Watson 2007:99) might have been influenced by Akk. ḫmr (note especially the combination ḥmr ḫlm ‘the assembly of the gods’ = Akk. ḫmr īlt), but this is less likely in the case of ḥmr ‘whole, totality’ (DUL 669) for both formal and semantic reasons (attested in a neutral context in parallelism with kl-h-n ‘in their entirety,’ KTU 1.14 i 25).

53 Gez. ṛaṣṣa ‘to deprive, to cause harm, to rob, to take away by force’ has more straightforward cognates in Arabic, cf. CDG 58.

54 In view of its specific meaning, Jib. nkḥ ‘to make a false oath’ (JL 189) is likely an Arabism. Note that the same semantic nuance is present also in Min. mnkt ‘abrogation’ (LM 68), Sab. nkḥ ‘to remove something from its place’ (SD 96), Qat. mnkt ‘one who violates; violation’ (LIQ 106). Are we faced with an areal Arabian semantic isogloss?

55 Cf. perhaps Gez. sāvara ‘to cause pain, to torment, to torture, to oppress, to vex’ (CDG 544), with parallels elsewhere in EthS.

56 For the marginal presence of ḫmr ‘bone’ in a Jewish Aramaic curse formula v. DJPA 226.
17. “to die” — *mwt (SED I No. 43i). Passim except Jibbali and Soqotri.

The root *mwt preserves its basic status in Mehri, but only marginal traces are attested in the remaining two languages. Jib. ḫārg ‘to die’ (JL 304) is clearly related (with a common euphemistic shift) to Hrs. ḫerōg ‘to go out, depart’ (HL 142), Mhr. ḫrūg ‘to take out, drive out’ (ML 447) and, ultimately, to Arb. ḫryṯ ‘to go out’ (Lane 718) and Min. ḫrg ‘sortir, déplacer’ (LM 44).57 Soq. ẁmā ‘mourir’ (LS 353) has been compared to Arb. gny ‘to die on the spot’ (Lane 1729), to which nothing new could be added.58 On the MSA picture see further Chapter 8 (pp. 524-525).

18. “dog” — *kalb- (SED II No. 115).

Passim except Southern EthS, where this term is replaced by Cushitic loanwords like Amh. wüşša and Har. buči (v. EDH 39).

In the continental MSA, *kalb- has acquired the meaning “wolf,” but continues to be used with the meaning “dog” side by side with *ma-bral- (see further Chapter 8).

19. “to drink” — *šty (CDG 518). Passim except Amharic, Arabic and MSA.

While in Arabic and MSA *šty left no trace, its absence from Amharic — replaced by tuṭta (AED 2185), of uncertain origin — is more or less accidental in view of its overall presence elsewhere in EthS (including the closely related Argobba, v. CDG 518).

PS *šty is replaced by the reflexes of *ṣrḥ ‘to sip, to suck up, to absorb’ (CDG 533) in Arabic (ṣrḥ, Lane 1525), *šty ‘to irrigate, to quench one’s thirst’ (HALOT 1639) in Mehri (ḥṣ, ML 155) and Jibbali (šūṣi, JL 262)59 and *rwy ‘to be abundant (water), to drink one’s fill’ (CDG 478) in Soqotri (ri, LS 395).

21. “ear” — *uḏn- (SED I No. 4).

Passim except Amharic, where it is replaced by žoro, ḫoro (AED 1858), of uncertain origin (a Cushitism according to Appleyard 1977:14). Amharic is the only EthS language where *uḏn- is lost: even in the closely related Argobba ḵiniz is preserved (Leslau 1997:194), although žoro is also attested (ibid. 227).


In EthS, *rαrš- left no trace and was replaced by the reflexes of *mVdr-, *mra-yt- and *rαpar- (CDG 330, 361 and 10 respectively).60

57 Presumably also Sab. ḫrg ‘to bring a lawsuit against someone before judge’ (SD 62). No cognates outside the Arabian area have been discovered so far (JA ḫargā ‘dying agony’ in Jastrow 498 is too isolated and too sparsely attested to be seriously considered). It is not impossible that the MSA terms are ultimately borrowed from Arabic.

58 Cf. perhaps Gez. ǧimawwa ‘to toil, labor, endure hardship, be wearied, tormented, vexed’ (CDG 558, with cognates in other EthS).

59 A similar (but obviously independent) replacement took place throughout Günna-Gurage (e.g. Soddo sāṭṭa), where it could be facilitated by the influence of the phonetically similar outcome of palatalization of *šty (cf. EDG 534).

60 In most languages, reflexes of each of these three terms are attested as synonyms (see further Chapter 7, pp. 435 and 452).
In MSA *\textit{war}*- is preserved in Jibbali (\textit{war}, JL 4), but replaced by \textit{kā} in Mehri (ML 246) and by \textit{hōyi} in Soqotri (LS 166). Soq. \textit{hōyi} is related to Jib. \textit{hāši} ‘soil’ (JL 118) and Hrs. \textit{hōhi} ‘earth, land, soil, dust’ (HL 57), to be further connected with Arb. \textit{hīsa} ‘accumulated sand beneath which is hard rock; soft or plain ground in which water remains and collects’ (Lane 572–573), Tna. \textit{hašāwa} ‘sand, strand, sandbank’ (TED 212), Amh. \textit{ašäwa}, \textit{ašawa} ‘sand’ (AED 1182), Cha. Eža Enm. Gyt. Muh. Sod. Wol. \textit{ašawa}, End. \textit{ašawā}, Msq. Gog. \textit{ašāwa} ‘sand’ (EDG 102). As for Mhr. \textit{kā}, it is obviously related to Arb. \textit{qār} ‘an even place, plain or level land’ (Lane 2994) and may be borrowed from it.\footnote{For the broad presence of \textit{qār} in the South Arabian dialectal area v. GD 2540, Piamenta 417.}

On the MSA picture see further Chapter 8 (p. 525).

23. “to eat” — *\textit{kvl} (HALOT 46). Passim except EthS and MSA. Throughout EthS, *\textit{kvl} as the main verb with the meaning “to eat” is replaced by reflexes of *\textit{bk} ‘to swallow’ (CDG 94), but is preserved in the derived noun *\textit{ukl-/*ikl-} ‘food, bread, grain’ (CDG 15), see further Chapter 7, p. 435 below.

In MSA, *\textit{kvl} left no trace, the basic word for “to eat” goes back to *\textit{twy}: Soq. \textit{ty} (LS 440), Mhr. \textit{twā} (ML 404), Jib. \textit{té} (JL 273), see further Chapter 8, pp. 528–529 below.


In Geez, \textit{šōrt} (CDG 525) is still one of the main terms for hair, but already here it is threatened by the Cushitism \textit{šagīr} (CDG 550), which ousted *\textit{šwr-} completely in all modern languages (see further Chapter 7, p. 439).

In MSA, *\textit{šwr-} is preserved in Hrs. \textit{šōr} ‘hair, wool’ (HL 117) and Soq. \textit{šawyr} ‘cheveux’ (LS 432), but basic designations of “hair” throughout this subgroup go back to *\textit{šwp-}, comparable to Akk. \textit{šūtātu} ‘wool’ (SED I No. 259). On the MSA picture see further Chapter 8, p. 529.


Passim except Akkadian, where it is replaced by \textit{kātu} (CAD Q 183, AHw. 908), of uncertain origin. The archaic term \textit{idu} is still widely present in a variety of idiomatic meanings and expressions (CAD I 10, AHw. 365).

38. “head” — *\textit{rāš-} (SED I No. 225).

Passim except Akkadian, where it is replaced by \textit{kākūdu} (CAD Q 100, AHw. 899) < PS *\textit{kVdVd-} ‘skull’ (SED I No. 159). PS *\textit{rāš-} is well preserved as \textit{rēšu} (CAD R 277, AHw. 973), mostly (although not exclusively) in idiomatic meanings and expressions.

40. “heart” — *libb- (SED I No. 174).
   Passim except Arabic, where it is replaced by qalb-, probably related to Akk. ḫablu ‘middle’ (SED I No. 161). PS *libb- is preserved in Arabic as lubb- ‘what is in the inside; understanding, intelligence, mind’ (Lane 2643).\textsuperscript{62}


42. “I” — *ānā(ku) (CDG 26).
   Passim except for MSA, as forms like Mhr. hoh are scarcely derivable from *ānā(ku) (cf. Zaborski 1994:256 and further discussion in Chapter 8, p. 532).

44. “knee” — *birk- (SED I No. 39).
   Passim except most of Southern EthS, where it is replaced by Cushitisms (v. references in EDG 272). Within the Southern EthS area, it is nevertheless preserved as bərk in Selti and Wolane (EDG 153). Arb. rukbat- (Lane 1143) is clearly related with metathesis (v. SED I No. 232).

   In Akkadian, *kabid(-at) is preserved as khubbatu (kabtatu, kabittu) with the transferred meaning ‘emotions, thought, mind, spirit’ (CAD K 11, AHw. 416), the main term for liver likely being amūtu (CAD A 96, AHw. 46) < PS *mVay- ‘intestines, entrails’ (SED I No. 185).\textsuperscript{65}
   In Amharic *kabid- is preserved as hōd ‘belly’ (AED 29, see further SED I No. 141 and Chapter 7, p. 435). The origin of Amh. gubbāt ‘liver’ (AED 1981) and the related Gurage forms (EDG 258) is uncertain (cf. EDG 258, Appleyard 1977:13 and SED I No. 141).

56. “mouth” — *pay- (SED I No. 223).
   Passim except MSA, where this root is completely ousted by *ḥaw- (Mhr. ḥā, ML 454; Jib. ḥō, JL 310; Soq. ḫe, LS 158), likely a semantic evolution from “opening, hole” (see further Chapter 8, p. 530).

57. “name” — *스Vm- (CDG 504). Passim throughout Semitic.

\textsuperscript{62} At first sight, the same replacement took place in Harari, where the Arabic loanword ḥalbi (EDH 124) is the only term with the meaning “heart” recorded by Leslau. However, as M. Bulakh’s fieldwork inquiry has shown, the strictly anatomic term with this meaning is rather the Cushitic loanword wäzänä, missing from EDH.

\textsuperscript{63} To what extent khubbatu may still be attested in purely anatomic contexts remains to be investigated (cf. CAD kabattu, discussion section, and especially Stol 2007:334). One has to admit that amūtu is not attested in such contexts either, but only in connection with extispicine.
59. “new” — *ḥḍl (CDG 225). Passim except Arabic and MSA.

In the Qur’anic corpus, it is ḟadīd- (Lane 386-387) rather than ḥḍl- that is used with the meaning “new,” although elsewhere in Classical Arabic ḥḍl- ‘new’ is, of course, well attested (Lane 529). The origin of ḟadīd- is uncertain, the only immediate parallels are Syr. gaddudā ‘adolescens, juvenis’ (LSyr. 104) and Sab. h-gdd ‘to enforce, validate a decree’ (SD 49), Qat. s1-gdd ‘to renew, to validate’ (LIQ 35). An ultimate derivation from PS *gdd ‘to cut, to make an incision’ is not improbable.

In MSA, *ḥḍl left no trace. In the continental languages, the main terms for “new” go back to *ydn (Mhr. yādīn, ML 461; Jib. ʿūdīn, JL 287), of uncertain origin (cf. Chapter 8, p. 527). In Soqotri, the Arabic loanword gedīd (LS 101) is used instead.

60. “night” — *layliy- (CDG 314). Passim except Akkadian and MSA.

In Akkadian, *layliy- is preserved as lūlātu ‘evening’ (CAD L 184, AHw. 552), the main term for “night” being mūšu (CAD M 291, AHw. 687) < PS *mušy- ‘evening’ (v. CDG 368 for cognates).

Throughout MSA, *layliy- is either completely lost (as in Jibbali), or rather deeply marginalized in favor of innovative terms such as Mhr. ʿāṣr (ML 31), Jib. ʿāṣr (JL 17) and Soq. ħte (LS 194). The Mehri and Jibbali lexemes are probably borrowed from Arb. ʿaṣr- ‘time, day; the morning before or after the afternoon’ (Lane 2062), in its turn without reliable Semitic cognates. The origin of the Soqotri term has not been elicited so far.


Throughout EthS, *lā left no trace, other PS negative elements (*rāy/*rī and *rāl) are used instead (v. CDG 1, 18, Hetzron 1972:21, 28, Bulakh 2012).

In MSA, *lā is preserved in the continental languages, but lost in Soqotri, where only al < *rāl is used (Simeone-Senelle 1994).

64. Akk. gadādu ‘to chop’ (CAD G 8, AHw. 273), Hbr. gdd ‘to make incisions upon oneself’ (HALOT 177), JBA gadd ‘to cut off’ (DJBA 210), Syr. gad ‘abscidit, amputavit’ (LSyr. 103), Mnd. gdd ‘to cut off’ (MD 80), Arb. ḫdd ‘to cut, to cut off’ (Lane 384), Cha. Eṣa gūdd, Eṣa Muh. Msq. Gog. Sod. gūddā, Emm. gūđā, End. gūṭū ‘to tear, to make a hole’ (EDG 262). There is hardly any immediate connection with either Arb. ḫdd ‘to be great; to be serious’ (Lane 384), Sab. gdd ‘great’ (SD 49), Gez. gūbud ‘serious, severe’ (CDG 181, with references to other EthS) or Hbr. gad ‘fortune’ (HALOT 176), JPA gaddā ‘luck’ (DJPA 121), Syr. gadda ‘fortune, sors’ (LSyr. 104), Mnd. gadda ‘fortune, success, luck’ (MD 73), Arb. ḫdd ‘to be fortunate’ (Lane 384), ḫadd ‘fortune’ (ibid. 385), Tgr. gūd ‘luck, fortune’ (WTS 602), Tna. gūdd ‘luck, good luck or good fortune’ (TED 2356), Amh. gūdd ‘luck’ (AED 2034).

One wonders whether Hbr. ʿaṣrā ‘holiday, celebration, festive assembly’ (HALOT 871-872) might be compared with the meaning shift “feast, celebration day” > “date, time” > “period of time” > “evening”?

66. In spite of the fact that the first consonant is now known to be *ḥ (Simeone-Senelle 1996:312). Still, this circumstances prompts one to consider the possibility of comparing the Soqotri lexeme to PS *yṭiy ‘to be dark,’ with secondary devoicing of *y before t. The main representatives of this root (Kogan 2001:266) are Akk. esū ‘to be troubled, blurred or dark’ (CAD E 378, AHw. 259) and Arb. ḥṭ ‘to be clouded; to be confused’ (Lane 2230).
63. “one” — *raḥad- (CDG 12). Passim except Akkadian, Tigre and MSA.
In Akkadian, *waḥ(V)d- is preserved as ʷəḏu ‘individual, solitary, single’ (CAD E 36, AHw. 1494), whereas the main term for “one” is ʾištēn (CAD I 275, AHw. 400), going back to the otherwise marginally attested PS *rāšt-: Ugr. ṟāšt(y) ‘one,’ ṟāṣ ṟāš(h) ‘eleven’ (DUL 190), Hbr. ṟāṣṭē ṟāṣār/ṭāṣrē ‘eleven’ (HALOT 898), Min. ṣrēl ‘onze’ (LM 15), Qat. ṣr-l-n-m ‘one’ (LIQ 125). 67

In Tigre, *raḥad- is preserved as ḥatte ‘one (feminine)’ (WTS 81) and ḡ̣əd ‘one another’ (WTS 94), but the main term for “one (masculine)” is ʷwor (WTS 433), whose origin is unknown.
PS *raḥad- left no trace in MSA, where the terms for “one” go back to *ṭad- (JL 274, ML 406, LS 199), whose only cognate is Qat. ṭd ‘one’ (LIQ 77).

73. “seed” — ẓdarrḥ, ẓzarṛ (CDG 642). Passim except Arabic and continental MSA.
In Arabic, *ḏr and *zrv are preserved with the meanings ‘to sow’ (Lane 957) and ‘to sow, to cast seed’ (Lane 1225) respectively, but none of the two roots has produced the main term for “seed,” which is baḏr- (Lane 173), to be compared to Hbr. ḏr ‘to scatter’ (HALOT 118), JPA ḏr ‘to disperse, to scatter’ (DJPA 86), Syr.  bdar ‘sparsit, dispersit’ (LSyr. 60), Mnd. ḏd ‘to strew, scatter’ (MD 52), Qat. ḏd ‘field, arable land’ (LIQ 23).
Arb. baḏr- was likely borrowed into continental MSA as Mhr. bēḏor (ML 44) and Jib. bēḏor (JL 23). In these languages, PS *ḏarrḥ is lost, whereas *zarṛ- is preserved as Mhr. zūra ‘(plants) to grow,’ zarv ‘tall grass’ (ML 469) and Jib. zér ‘(plants) to grow’ (JL 320). 68 In Soqotri, *ḏarr- is preserved as dér (LS 135), which is used as the basic term for “seed.”

80. “star” — *ḥabbak- (CDG 280).
Passim except Harari, where it is replaced by ṭūy (EDH 157), borrowed from Cushitic according to Leslau.

82. “sun” — *šamš- (HALOT 1589). Passim except EthS and, likely, MSA.
There is no trace of *šamš- in EthS, its most typical replacement is *ṣaḥay- (CDG 149), for which see further Chapter 7, p. 436 below. 69
For the complex history of this root in MSA v. Chapter 8 (p. 569). 70

67 The possibility of reconstructing *rāšt- as the most archaic PS designation of “one,” recently advocated by A. Wilson-Wright (2014), is worth serious consideration. If correct, this hypothesis would shift *raḥad- ‘one’ to the PWS level or, more precisely, to the common ancestor of CS and EthS tentatively postulated below in Chapter 2 (pp. 110-126).
68 Unless these terms are borrowed from Arabic, which is not unlikely.
69 For Har. ʾr ‘sun’ and its possible Cushitic origin v. EDH 30.
70 The main truth of our analysis of the MSA terms for “sun” is that Soq. ẓm is unlikely to be derived from the present root, being rather a hypercorrect distortion of PS *yawn- ‘day.’ The Soqotri picture is thus identical to what we find in the continental languages: “sun” is expressed by a reflex of PS...
84. “tail” —  *qanab-  (SED I No. 64).
Passim except most of modern EthS, where it is replaced by such terms as Tna. and Amh. ṣ̣ọra (probably borrowed from Cushitic, cf. Dolgopolsky 1973:125) or Har. ḳānāwa (for possible Semitic cognates v. SED II, pp. 332–333).

86. “this” —  *ḏV  (CDG 629). Passim except Akkadian and Tigre.
There is no trace of *ḏV in Akkadian. The Akkadian pronoun “this” is annā (CAD A 136, AHw. 53), with all likelihood going back to the PS deictic element *hanān-  (Tropper 2001a:17).
There is apparently no trace of *ḏV in Tigre, whose deictic pronouns ṣ̣ọlī (masculine) and ṣ̣ọlla (feminine) are based on the element *vV(l)-  borrowed from the corresponding plural forms.

87. “thou” —  *rantā (CDG 32). Passim except some of modern EthS.
In Tigrinya, rantā/atta is used as vocative, whereas the normal form of the pronoun is nasṣakā < *napšu-ka (TED 1306). The origin of Har. ḳaxāx is not entirely clear, cf. EDH 23.

88. “tongue” —  *lišān-  (SED I No. 181).
Passim except most of modern EthS,71 where various replacements are found: Tna. māḷhas (TED 69), Amh. molas (AED 55), both < *ḥṣ ‘to lick,’ for which v. CDG 311; Har. arrāt (EDH 32, a Cushitism). For a variety of Gurage forms likely going back to the same source as the Harari one v. EDG 89 (under Sel. Wol. Zwy. arāmāti).

89. “tooth” —  *šinn-  (SED I No. 249). Passim except Tigre, Amharic and most of MSA.
PS *šinn-  is preserved in most of EthS, which makes the Tigre and Amharic picture rather exceptional. In Amharic, this term is replaced by ḳ̣ṛ̣s < PS *ṣ̣iṛ-  ‘molar’ (cf. SED I No. 275, Appleyard 1977:17), although *šinn-  is preserved in Argobba as ṣ̣m (Leslau 1997:220). In Tigre, *šinn-  is replaced by nib (WTS 337), whose etymology is discussed in SED I No. 203 and Bulakh–Kogan 2011:4.
In MSA, *šinn-  is preserved in Jib. šin (JL 262), but disappears from the remaining languages, where various replacements are found: Mhr. muẓ̣ṛḥ (ML 478) < *ṣ̣iṛ-  ‘molar’ (cf. SED I No. 275) and Soq ṭ̣āle (LS 309), of uncertain origin.72

71 It is only in Tigre that the main term for “tongue” goes back to *lišān- : nasṣal (WTS 325), with metathesis.
72 Leslau’s identification with PS *ḥṣ ‘to be high’ (“originairement ‘dents supérieurs’”) carries little conviction. Similarly unclear from the etymological point of view is Soq ṣ̣̣ṛāl ‘dent, crochet’ (LS 431, completely unknown to our informants). Phonologically comparable terms in the continental languages mean “wax, honeycomb”: Mhr. sāḷēt (ML 370), Jib. sạ̄ṛ̣ẓ̣ (JL 244). In view of Arb. sạ̄ṛ̣ḷ-  ‘a whiteness in the tail of a horse, and the forelock’ (Lane 1563), one is tempted to suppose that the basic meaning of
91. “two” — *ṭin-ā (HALOT 1605).
Passim except EthS, where *ṭin-ā is replaced by the reflexes of PS *kîl- ‘both’ (CDG 282). For the marginal preservation of *ṭin-ā in Geez (sànāy ‘the next day’) see CDG 509, for the EthS picture in general see Chapter 7 (p. 436).

Together with Argo and Gafat, Amharic is the only EthS language where *māy- is lost, being replaced by uṣba (AED 1469), likely a Cushitism (for the pertinent Cushitic forms v. Leslau 1956:173, Dolopolavsky 1973:273–274).
PS *māy- is preserved in continental MSA, but replaced by riho in Soqotri (LS 396). This lexeme goes back to PS *ray ‘to be abundant (water), to drink one’s fill’ (CDG 478).

95. “we” — *niḥnu (CDG 395). Passim throughout Semitic.

98. “who?” — *man(nu) (CDG 348).73

1.3. If a PS root functions as the main term for a given basic concept in several geographically distant languages with no special genealogical proximity, it is likely that this situation is inherited from PS. This criterion is less reliable than the first one, but in most cases the degree of certainty is still tolerably high.

3. “bark” — *ḥVlp-at-. Preserved75 in Akk. kuliptu (CAD Q 296, AHw. 926), Syr. klāptā (LSyr. 670), Zwy. ḫĪfī (EDG 497), Mhr. ḫālīfū (ML 230), Soq. ḫalīfā (LS 376). In Arabic qīl- and qulāfāt- are well attested (LA 9 347, = ṣal-qīṣr-), but a few alternative candidates like qīṣrat- ‘peel, rind, bark, coat, crust’ (Lane 2525) are also known.76

*ṣl is “to be white, bright,” from which a term for “tooth” could rather plausibly be derived. Another possible source of derivation would be comparison of a row of teeth with cells of a honeycomb.

73 The impersonal interrogative pronoun (“what?,” No. 96) was not included into the present list, although it is tempting to suppose that *mān(ū), resulting from the comparison between Akk. mānu and such EthS forms as Geez mānt and Harari mīn, is actually the most archaic common term with this meaning. Given the fact that *mān(ū) ‘what?’ is not present either in CS or in MSA, this assumption is difficult to prove (cf. further Chapter 3, p. 176).

74 There is no reason to agree with P. Noorlander’s hypercritical statement “we do not know whether something like *mannu or *mīya was the Proto-Semitic form, perhaps they even coexisted with a functional distinction that was lost in a later stage.” (2012:218).

75 Here and elsewhere in this section, “preserved” amounts to “preserved with the basic status.”

76 Since the concept “bark” is not attested in the Koran, a meaningful judgment about the priority of one of these terms is difficult without special textual research. Etymological parallels to qīṣrat- are mostly restricted to MSA and may be Arabisms: Mhr. ḥāṣür ‘to peel,’ ḥāṣyīr ‘coconut husk, shell’ (ML 242), Jib. ḥāṣir ‘to peel, shell,’ ḥāṣīt ‘husk, peel, skin’ (JL 153). Gez. ḥaṣṣara ‘to peel, scrape’ (CDG 448) does not...
In EthS, most of the relevant terms go back to *lWb*- (for which see Chapter 7, pp. 434-435) and it is only in Zway that *kVl(V)p*- seems to keep its basic status.\footnote{It is uncertain whether a term with the meaning “bark” is attested in Biblical Hebrew.\footnote{The origin of Sel. Wol. Zwy. dāl, Cha. Gyt. dān, Eža Muh. Msq. Gog. dānn ‘abdomen, belly, stomach’ (EDG 205) is uncertain.}}

A likely related variant root *kVrp-* is widely attested in EthS, at least some of its reflexes probably functioning as main terms for “bark”: Gez. kōraft ‘bark, skin, peel’ (CDG 441), Tgr. kārāf ‘cruet, peel, rind, scales’ (WTS 245), Tna. kārāf ‘skin, peel, husk, shell, paring, bark,’ kōrafti ‘scab, scale, peel, hull, shell, husk, bark’ (TED 959), Amh. kōraf ‘peel, crust, bark, shell’ (AED 748), Arg. kōrf ‘bark of tree’ (Leslau 1997:217), Har. kārf ‘hard bark of a tree’ (EDH 129), Zwy. kōraf ‘bark of tree’ (EDG 497), Sod. kōraf id. (ibid.).\footnote{The origin of Sel. Wol. Zwy. dāl, Cha. Gyt. dān, Eža Muh. Msq. Gog. dānn ‘abdomen, belly, stomach’ (EDG 205) is uncertain.}

4. “belly” — *kariʃ-. Preserved in Akk. karšu (CAD K 223, AHw. 450), Syr. karsā (LSyr. 347), Gez. kars (CDG 294),\footnote{Outside EthS, *kVrp-* seems to be attested in Arabic only: qirf- (LA 9 333, = ḻhāru š-aš-ahri).} Arg. kārs, kāss (Leslau 1997:209), Har. karsi (EDH 94), Gaf. ārsā (Leslau 1956:182), Sod. kārs (EDG 351), End. Enm. kās (EDG 351).

In Hebrew and Arabic, the reflexes of *kariʃ-* are used only for “stomach” (HALOT 500, WKAS K 129), whereas “external belly, abdomen” is designated by the reflexes of *bāṭn-* (see SED I No. 42 as well as Chapter 3, pp. 172-173).\footnote{Outside EthS, *kVrp-* seems to be attested in Arabic only: qirf- (LA 9 333, = ḻhāru š-aš-ahri).} A similar semantic narrowing took place throughout MSA, whose designations of “belly” are extensively discussed in Chapter 8 (pp. 526 and 576).

In Arabic, qrr ‘to be cold’ is widely attested (Lane 2499), but the basic exponent of this meaning is clearly brd (Lane 183).\footnote{In Arabic, qrr ‘to be cold’ is widely attested (Lane 2499), but the basic exponent of this meaning is clearly brd (Lane 183).} The same replacement is observable in Harari (EDH 45) and Tigre (WTS 280), as well as in most of Gurage (EDG 152) where *krr* is

15. “cold” — *kš. Preserved in Hbr. kš (HALOT 1127, 1149), Syr. kš (LSyr. 689), Gez. k’avara (CDG 443) and Tgr. k’ārārā (TED 929).\footnote{The only potentially pertinent passage seems to be Gen 30:37: wa-yâyikha lō yâvîhōb maḥkal libnā lah wa-lît wa-zârûnīn wa-yappâl bâhen pasallo bâhanâ ṭaḥîsîn ha-ilâbân râsîr ‘al-ha-mnâfâlōti ‘Then Jacob took fresh rods of poplar (and almond and plane tree) and peeled strips of bark from them (so as to lay bare the white on the rods)’ (translation from Westermann 1985:479).}

In Arabic, qrr ‘to be cold’ is widely attested (Lane 2499), but the basic exponent of this meaning is clearly brd (Lane 183).\footnote{In Arabic, qrr ‘to be cold’ is widely attested (Lane 2499), but the basic exponent of this meaning is clearly brd (Lane 183).} The same replacement is observable in Harari (EDH 45) and Tigre (WTS 280), as well as in most of Gurage (EDG 152) where *krr* is

seem to be attested in the corpus of classical Geez literature and may be an Arabism as well, but kāšār ‘squama’ (LLA 421) is present in the Ethiopian Bible and is probably autochthonous.

\footnote{Outside EthS, *kVrp-* seems to be attested in Arabic only: qirf- (LA 9 333, = ḻhāru š-aš-ahri).}

\footnote{The only potentially pertinent passage seems to be Gen 30:37: wa-yâyikha lō yâvîhōb maḥkal libnā lah wa-lît wa-zârûnīn wa-yappâl bâhen pasallo bâhanâ ṭaḥîsîn ha-ilâbân râsîr ‘al-ha-mnâfâlōti ‘Then Jacob took fresh rods of poplar (and almond and plane tree) and peeled strips of bark from them (so as to lay bare the white on the rods)’ (translation from Westermann 1985:479).}

\footnote{Outside EthS, *kVrp-* seems to be attested in Arabic only: qirf- (LA 9 333, = ḻhāru š-aš-ahri).} Its semantic relationship to the apparently synonymous kabd ‘(liver, stomach, belly,’ CDG 273) is still to be clarified, but as far as one can judge from the passages adduced in LLA 835 and 851, both terms are relatively well attested with the meaning “external belly, abdomen.” The same considerations may apply to Tgr. kārāt ‘belly, stomach, interior’ vs. kâbd ‘belly, heart, interior’ (WTS 399, 412) and Tna. kārī ‘belly, stomach, abdomen’ vs. kābdī ‘stomach, belly, liver, abdomen’ (TED 1592, 1635). In Amharic, “belly” is definitely hod (AED 29), whereas kārs ‘belly, stomach, abdomen’ is marked as “Geez” in AED 1387.

\footnote{Its semantic relationship to the apparently synonymous kabd ‘(liver, stomach, belly,’ CDG 273) is still to be clarified, but as far as one can judge from the passages adduced in LLA 835 and 851, both terms are relatively well attested with the meaning “external belly, abdomen.” The same considerations may apply to Tgr. kārāt ‘belly, stomach, interior’ vs. kâbd ‘belly, heart, interior’ (WTS 399, 412) and Tna. kārī ‘belly, stomach, abdomen’ vs. kābdī ‘stomach, belly, liver, abdomen’ (TED 1592, 1635). In Amharic, “belly” is definitely hod (AED 29), whereas kārs ‘belly, stomach, abdomen’ is marked as “Geez” in AED 1387.}

\footnote{Its semantic relationship to the apparently synonymous kabd ‘(liver, stomach, belly,’ CDG 273) is still to be clarified, but as far as one can judge from the passages adduced in LLA 835 and 851, both terms are relatively well attested with the meaning “external belly, abdomen.” The same considerations may apply to Tgr. kārāt ‘belly, stomach, interior’ vs. kâbd ‘belly, heart, interior’ (WTS 399, 412) and Tna. kārī ‘belly, stomach, abdomen’ vs. kābdī ‘stomach, belly, liver, abdomen’ (TED 1592, 1635). In Amharic, “belly” is definitely hod (AED 29), whereas kārs ‘belly, stomach, abdomen’ is marked as “Geez” in AED 1387.}

\footnote{Possibly a denominative verb derived from PS *barad- ‘hail’ (v. CDG 103 for cognates).}
scarcely attested at all.\textsuperscript{83}

In Amharic, \textsuperscript{4}hr is preserved as \textit{kērra} ‘to be cold’ (AED 717), but the main verb with the meaning “to be cold” is \textit{küzákēzą} (AED 811), with no cognates outside EthS (for which see CDG 457).

PS \textsuperscript{4}hr left no trace in Akkadian, where the principal term for “(to be) cold” is \textit{kaṣṭu} (CAD K 269, AHw. 459), with no certain etymology.\textsuperscript{84}

Possible preservation of \textsuperscript{4}hr in MSA as well as the complex pattern of its replacement are extensively discussed in Chapter 8 below (pp. 527 and 551).

28. “fire” — \textsuperscript{2}iš(-āt)-. Preserved in Akk. \textit{išätu} (CAD I 227, AHw. 392), Hbr. \textit{ʁēš} (HALOT 92), Gez. \textit{ʁásāt} (CDG 44) and most of modern EthS.

In Syriac (and in a few other varieties of Aramaic) \textsuperscript{2}iš- is replaced by \textit{nūrā} (LSyr. 421) < PS \textsuperscript{4}nwy ‘to be bright,’ but this replacement is relatively recent and it was undoubtedly a reflex of \textsuperscript{2}iš- that functioned as the main term for “fire” in Proto-Aramaic (see further Chapter 6, pp. 414-415).

A similar replacement took place in Arabic (\textit{nār}, Lane 2865), but \textsuperscript{2}iš(-āt)- left virtually no trace here.

PS \textsuperscript{2}iš-āt- is lost in Tigrinya, where it is replaced by \textit{ḥawwān},\textsuperscript{85} and MSA, where it is replaced by \textsuperscript{3}šiwāt-, for which see further below in Chapter 8 (p. 529).

35. “green” — \textsuperscript{3}wrk. Preserved in Akk. \textit{warḵu} (CAD A 2 300, AHw. 1471), Hbr. \textit{warkhī} (HALOT 441), Syr. \textit{yurāḵa} (LSyr. 162), Har. \textit{warīk} (EDH 9). A comprehensive etymological discussion of this root (including languages where it is preserved with meanings other than the basic color term “green”) can be found in Bulakh 2003:8–10.

PS \textsuperscript{3}wrk left no trace in MSA, on the etymological background of its pan-MSA replacement \textsuperscript{3}šīr v. extensively Bulakh 2004:276–277 as well as Chapter 8 (pp. 531-532). The etymological relationship between Common MSA \textsuperscript{3}šīr and Arb. \textit{raḥḍar-} ‘green’ (Lane 756) is uncertain.

Throughout EthS, the meaning “green” is expressed by a variety of innovative terms of different, sometimes uncertain origin extensively discussed in Bulakh 2005a:79–121: Gez. \textit{ḥamāmlīl} (CDG 233),\textsuperscript{86} Tgr. \textit{savorṣavoro} (WTS 194),\textsuperscript{87} Tna. \textit{kāṭālya} (TED 80),\textsuperscript{88} Amh. \textit{arāng’ade} (AED 1153).\textsuperscript{89}

\textsuperscript{83} Zwy. \textit{korra} ‘frost of morning’ (EDG 495) is tentatively considered a loanword from Oromo by Leslau.

\textsuperscript{84} Any connection to Common MSA \textsuperscript{4}km discussed in Chapter 8 (p. 531).

\textsuperscript{85} No cognates outside EthS (for which v. CDG 248 under Gez. \textit{ḥaw} ‘fire’).

\textsuperscript{86} Etymologically uncertain. According to Bulakh, likely derived from a nominal root with the meaning “vegetables, cabbage,” in its turn probably of Cushitic origin.

\textsuperscript{87} From PS \textsuperscript{4}savr- ‘grass’ (v. CDG 525 under ŭavv ‘herb, grass’).

\textsuperscript{88} From Common EthS \textsuperscript{4}kāgl- ‘leaf’ (v. CDG 450 for concrete forms). As Bulakh correctly points out, -\textit{f-} in the Tigrinya form suggests an Amharism.

\textsuperscript{89} Etymologically obscure.
45. “to know” — *wdr, *ydr. Preserved in Akk. îdû (CAD I 20), Hbr. ydr (HALOT 390), Syr. ydr (LSyr. 296).

PS *wdr is well documented throughout MSA (Mhr. wdà, ML 421; Jib. ēdà, JL 286; Soq. ēdà, LS 52), but does not function as the main term for “to know” in any of these languages. See further Chapter 8 (p. 532) where the etymological background of its Common MSA replacement *rb is also discussed.

PS *ydr left marked traces in Geez (wadr `to make known, inform,’ CDG 626; ṭuhr ‘I do not know; perhaps, probably,’ ibid. 28), where the main term for “to know” is, however, wàmara (CDG 25, with a detailed discussion of its possible etymological background). The same replacement took place in Tigre: rámārā (WTS 354).

In Tigrinya, the meaning “to know” became to be expressed by fullaṭṭ (TED 2645), which likely implies a semantic evolution from *plṭ ‘to split, to separate’ (CDG 161).

In Amharic and Harari, the verb “to know” goes back to *sdr, attested already in Geez (v. concrete forms in CDG 78) and likely borrowed from Cushitic (Dolgopolsky 1973:264).

In Gurage and Gafat, the verbs for “to know” go back to *khl ‘to be able’ (v. EDG 173 and 368 under ḍalū and xarū respectively, Leslau 1956:238 under ṣalū).

PS *wdr/ydr left no perceptible trace in Arabic, whose main term for “to know” is ʾlm (Lane 2138), with no reliable cognates.

54. “moon” — *warḥ-. Preserved in Akk. warḥu (CAD A 259, AHw. 1466), Hbr. yārēâ (HALOT 438), Gez. warḥ (CDG 617), Tgr. wārḥ (WTS 433), Tna. wār ḥ̣ (TED 1723), Har. wāhrī (EDH 159), Sel. Wol. wārī (EDG 660).

Elsewhere, *warḥ- is mostly attested with the meaning “month,” whereas “moon” is expressed by various innovative terms, often with no certain etymology. Such a picture is observable:

– in a few Southern EthS languages (Amh. wār, AED 1499 — čārākha, ibid. 2215;

---

90 Gez. ʿyarās is paralleled by Sab. hydr ‘to make known, to inform’ (SD 67), Min. s̄yar ‘promulger’ (LM 108), note also Qat. ydr ‘to inquire, find out’ (LIQ 81). It remains to be established whether *ydr functioned as the basic term for “to know” in any of the ESA languages. Gez. r̄udārī is continued by Tna. r̄udārī ‘I do not know; perhaps’ (TED 1494), Amh. ṣ̄yā id. (AED 1242), Sod. ṣ̄yā id. (EDG 64).

91 The meaning shift is unproblematic, cf. Hbr. bān, bēbīn ‘to understand’ (HALOT 122).

92 It is interesting to observe that, judging by the references collected in LLA 996, nearly all attestations in the classical Geez literature are represented by the imperative ʾyāk.

93 For the possibility of interpreting ʿyarās as ‘to show’ (rather than ‘to impose’) v. Nöldeke 1910:202.

94 Shared by Sab. ʾlm ‘to make acknowledgment,’ ṣ̄lm ‘to take notice, cognizance,’ ʾlm ‘sign, mark’ (SD 15), Qat. ʾlm ‘to sign’ (LIQ 119). Gez. ṣ̄lāmām ‘to write, to seal, to teach, to make a sign, to mark’ (CDG 61) and related EthS forms are rightly considered Arabisms by Leslau. Contra HALOT 834, there is hardly any connection with Hbr. ʾlm ‘to be hidden, concealed.’
Zwy. wär — ṭarḵa, Muh. wārā — ūṟṟāḵa, Gog. wārā — ūṟṟāḵa, Sod. wārā — dāṟṛqa, EDG 660, 632)

– in Syriac and other Aramaic languages (yārḥā — sahrā, LSyr. 309, 462)
– in continental MSA (Mhr. wārḥ — ḥā-ʾrūt, ML 430, 7; Jib. šīḥ — ṣerāt, JL 292, 4).

It is only in Soqotri and Arabic that *warḥ- left no trace at all, being fully replaced by ēre (LS 72) and qamar- (Lane 2562) respectively.

61. “nose” — *ʔanp-. Preserved in Akk. appu (CAD A 194, AHw. 60), Hbr. ṣap (HALOT 76), Arb. ʔanf- (Lane 116), Gez. ṣanf (CDG 28) and most of modern EthS.

In Aramaic, *ʔanp- tends to acquire the meaning “face,” whereas “nose” is designated by the reflexes of PS *nahīr- ‘nostril’ (see further Chapter 6, p. 369 below).

The origin of ḥanīʿa, which replaced *ʔanp- in Amharic and some dialects of Tigrinya (AED 1358, TED 1550), is uncertain (contra Appleyard 1977:11, there is hardly any connection between these terms and PS *ʔanp-).

In MSA, *ʔanp- left meager traces only, the terms for “nose” going back to PS *nahīr- ‘nostril’ (v. Chapter 8, p. 530 below).

68. “root” — *šIrš-. Preserved in Akk. šuršu (CAD Š 363, AHw. 1286), Hbr. šōrš (HALOT 1659), Gez. šārṣ (CDG 535, also throughout modern EthS), Jib. šīrṣh (JL

---

95 Forms of the ēʔāḏa type are borrowed from Cushitic (Dolgopolsky 1973:48–49).
96 Common Aramaic *šar-, (attested as a theonym — side by side with šmš ‘sun(-god)’ — already in the Old Aramaic inscription KAI 202B:24) goes back to PS *šahr-, represented by Hbr. šahārēnīm (‘little moons (as amulets or jewelry)’) (HALOT 1311), Arb. ʾahr- ‘the new moon, when it appears’ (Lane 1612), Sab. šērtu ‘beginning of month’ (SD 132), Min. šehr ‘début du mois’ (LM 86), Qat. šehr ‘new moon, first day of the month’ (LIQ 165), Gez. šehr ‘moon, first day of the month’ (CDG 528), Mhr. šehr ‘first crescent of moon’ (ML 376), Jib. šehr id. (JL 250), Soq. šehr ‘lune, mois’ (LS 426). Akk. šurta, attested in close connection with the moon-god Sin and possibly denoting “a characteristic such as brilliance” (CAD Š 327), may also well belong to this root. It is uncertain to what extent *šahr- was synonymous to *warḥ- in PS: could the former designate specifically the “new moon,” “crescent?”
97 The etymology of Common MSA *šIrš- ‘moon’ is discussed in Chapter 8 (p. 530).
98 No etymological parallels for qamar- have been discovered so far.
99 This becomes especially clear in view of the early South Ethiopian form *wafanča, transcribed as ṣur ṣu ṣe ḥe ḫe ṣe ḫe in the Arabic-Ethiopic glossary of al-Malik al-Afdal (Muth 2009–2010:98). As suggested by M. Bulakh in personal communication, the underlying form is probably to be reconstructed as *ma-fn-tag-iyā, a metathesis from ma-nfag-iyā, a wnom instrumenti < *nft ‘to blow one’s nose.’

**Possible source of the Ethiopic gloss:** Tna., Amh., Arg.

§ Muth 2009-2010:98

Jib. ʾṣəfī ‘first, ancient,’ ʾṣəfīt ‘a while ago’ (JL 4).

This conventional reconstruction does not pretend to describe with full adequacy all the extant cognates. Problems connected with the reconstruction of the PS term for “root” are extensively discussed in Faber 1984:213–219. Faber’s treatment of this question provides many valuable insights (notably, the impossibility of deriving a form with two *š like Hebrew šīnāš from a biconsonantal prototype represented by Gez. šārṣ and the MSA forms with *š). Faber’s attempts to reduce a number of semantically disparate terms from various Semitic languages to a single PS “Root Strength” are, however, mere fancy in terms of both phonology and meaning.
In Aramaic, *šVrš-* tends to be replaced by *rückar-* but is, nevertheless, relatively well attested and even predominates in some dialects (see further Chapter 6, pp. 370-371).

The main Arabic term for “root” is *yasl-* (Lane 64), whereas *šVrš-* is usually thought to be preserved as *širs-* ‘small thorny trees’ (Lane 1532), with a somewhat peculiar shift of meaning.

Mhr. *šârî* ‘wand; lopped, dressed branch’ (ML 385) is with all probability related to the MSA designations of “root” adduced above, but the main term with this meaning is *šark* (ML 28, also ‘artery, sinew, nerve’), whose etymology is analyzed in SED I No. 20.


PS *šabn-* is lost in continental MSA, where it is replaced by Mhr. *šawar* (ML 368) and Jib. *fudân* (JL 51).

In Arabic, *šabn-* is completely ousted by *ḫazar-* (Lane 517), for which no clear cognates have been discovered so far.

In Aramaic, *šabn-* tends to be replaced by *širâ*, but this process is comparatively recent (see further Chapter 6, p. 418).

---

102 It is admittedly debatable whether the MSA forms can be directly identified with this PS root, especially since *ḏ* (not *ḥ*, contra LS 433) does not normally function as a triconsonantizing extension in Semitic (note, furthermore, that an obviously related form in *ḏ* is attested also in Arabic: *šârî* ‘origin, source, root,’ Lane 1531). An ultimate relationship between the two types of forms is, nevertheless, rather likely.

103 With no transparent etymology, possibly related to the anatomic terms analyzed in SED I No. 289.

104 One has to agree with Leslau (CDG 533) who believes that Arb. *širš-* ‘root’ (Dozy I 745) “does not give the impression of being an original Arabic root.”


106 Although *ňâbiôn* ‘Stein’ was recorded in some Mehri-speaking areas by the Vienna expedition: “Das Wort wird in Hâsuwêl und Wôdî gebraucht” (Jahn 1902:194).

107 No cognates even in the remaining MSA. As rightly observed in Fronzaroli 1968:298, comparison with Hbr. *šûr* ‘rock’ (HALOT 1016) suggested in Jahn 1902:228, Leslau 1958:44 and elsewhere is scarcely possible given the fact that it is *š* rather than *š* that underlies Hbr. *š* in this form (cf. Arm. *ṭûr*, Ugr. *γτ*). If, in spite of the phonological difficulty, this comparison is still taken into consideration, Sab. *ṭwâr* ‘rock’ (SD 173) with *-w-* is noteworthy. See further Chapters 3 and 8, pp. 201 and 525 respectively.

108 Clearly related to Soq. *fâdhôn* ‘montagne’ (LS 333), but with no reliable parallel elsewhere (see further Chapter 8, p. 584).

109 Shall we tentatively surmise a derivation from *ḥâr-* ‘to prevent, to hinder, to restrain’ (Lane 516), with the semantic development “obstacle, border” > “stone”? For possible cognates to the Arabic verbal root v. HALOT 291.
90. “tree” — *ṭiḵš-. Preserved in Akk. ʾaṣu (CAD I 214, AHw. 390), Hbr. ṭēš (HALOT 63), Gez. ḍaš (CDG 57), Tgr. ṭaṭṭāt (WTS 490) and most of Gurage (EDG 12).

In Aramaic, *ṭiḵš- is relegated to the meaning “wood,” whereas the meaning “tree” is expressed by *ṭālān- (see Chapter 6, p. 418 below).

A similar process can be observed in some of modern EthS, where reflexes of *ṭiḵš- are preserved with the meaning “wood” only, whereas “tree” is designated by a variety of terms with uncertain etymological background: Tna. ṣmāyti vs. ṣom (TED 1897, 1422), Amh. ṣmāčat vs. ṣaf (AED 1252, 1682), Har. ʾinṭi vs. ḍif (EDH 28, 99).

In Arabic, *ṭiḵš- is preserved as ṭidāl- ‘small thorny trees,’ ṭiddāl- ‘thick, large firewood’ (Lane 2070), ṭidāḥ- ‘any great trees having thorns’ (ibid. 2076), the meaning “tree” being expressed by ṣāṣār- (Lane 1507).¹¹⁰

PS *ṭiḵš- left no trace in MSA, where the main terms for “tree” go back to *ḥaram- (Mhr. ḏarmāyṭ, ML 160; Jib. ḥérūm, JL 99; Soq. ʾetḥom, LS 422), etymologically obscure.

99. “woman” — *ṭanṯ-at-. Preserved in Hbr. ṭiššā (HALOT 93), Syr. ʾattṭālā (LSyr. 31), Sab. Ṿitt (SD 7), Min. Ṿṭ, Ṿitt (LM 6), Tgr. Ṿṣṣit, pl. Ṿanṣ (WTS 371), Arg. ʾanṣāča (Leslau 1997:192), Gaf. Ṿanṣṭāl (Leslau 1956:180). It is tempting to suppose that Mhr. tēl (ML 6) and Jib. ūt (JL 4) go back to this root, but no full certainty is possible (see further Chapter 8, pp. 525-526).

In Akkadian, *ṭanṯ-at- is relegated to the meaning “wife” (CAD A₂ 462, AHw. 83), whereas the meaning “woman” is expressed by the etymologically obscure ʾinnišṭu (CAD S 286, AHw. 1047).

In Arabic, *ṭanṯ-at- is preserved as ṣanṯā ‘female, feminine’ (Lane 112), the main term for “woman” being ṣimaraʔ-at-, marʔ-at- (Lane 2703).¹¹¹

Gez. ṣanṣṭ is mostly used as collective and plural (LLA 771), whereas for the singular only ṣamṣṭ is attested (ibid. 520).¹¹² In Tigrinya, ṣanṣṭ is preserved as a suppletive plural of sāḥāyti (TED 1476). Throughout Gurage, *ṭanṯ-at- is preserved with the meaning “female” (Gog. Sod. Wol. ʾanst, Sel. Zwy. ṣanṣṭ, Gyt. ṣanst, Muh. Msq. ṣanst, End. ast, Enn. Gyt. ʾast, Cha. Eža Gyt. ʾarṣṭ, Eža ʾarṣṭ, EDG 74), whereas in Gunnān-

¹¹⁰ Etymologically unclear. Can it be derived from ʾṣj ‘to be intricate, complicated, intermixed’ (Lane 1506), alluding to branches of a tree as interwoven, interlaced (so the Arab lexicographers quoted by Lane)? The verbal root goes back to PS *ṣgr whose basic meaning “is perhaps that of interlacing things for a net” (CDG 527): Gez. ʾṣāgara ‘to catch in a net, ensnare, entangle’ (with cognates in other EthS), Jib. ʾṣgēr ‘to divert; to set difficult conditions’ (JL 248), Soq. ʾṣgōr ‘faire un grillage, fermer, tendre un piège’ (LS 425). Mhr. ʾṣgēr ‘plants and trees’ (ML 374) and Jib. ʾṣgēr ‘blood relations; family tree, lineage’ (JL 248) are almost certainly borrowed from Arabic.

¹¹¹ Going back to PS *marʕ- with a rather diffuse meaning “man; son; lord”: Akk. māru ‘son,’ mārtu ‘daughter’ (CAD M₂ 308 and 300, AHw. 614–615), Common Aramaic *māri- ‘lord’ (see Chapter 6, p. 386), Sab. mrr ‘man; lord; male child,’ mrr ‘woman; lady; female child, girl’ (SD 87), Min. mrr ‘séigneur’ (LM 62), Qat. mrr ‘man, person; lord; male child,’ mrr ‘(free) woman’ (LIQ 98–99).

¹¹² A feminine of ḏarṣ ‘man,’ with no certain etymology (cf. CDG 83). Whenever ṣanṣṭ is used for the singular, its meaning is specifically “female” (in opposition to ʿabār ‘male,’ often about animals) rather than simply “woman.”
Gurage an additional, formally different set of forms is used for the plural “women” (Cha. Eža Gyt. ḍšṭa, Muh. ḍšṭṭa, Msq. Gog. Sod. ḍnšṭṭa, Gog. Sod. ḍnšṭṭṭätä, End. ḍšča, Gyt. ḍšča, End. ḍššä, EDG 102). For the singular, these languages use mšt (EDG 434). The meaning “female” for the reflexes of *an-ṭ-at- is also typical of Amharic and Harari: mšt (AED 1214), mštši (EDH 29). The main terms for “woman” in these languages are set (AED 531) and idōč (EDH 19) respectively.

PS *anṭ-at- left no trace in Soqotri, where the basic designation of “woman” is vāže (LS 307).

1.4. Applying both types of criteria outlined above, one can fill 52 positions of the Proto-Semitic Swadesh wordlist, 40 among them with a fairly high degree of reliability.

Extrapolating these results on the basic lexicon as a whole, one may confidently conclude that at least for a half of the Proto-Semitic basic vocabulary not only the phonological exponents can be reliably reconstructed, but also the corresponding semantic concepts can be established with enough precision. A cursory perusal of PS reconstructions proposed in Fox 2003:72–87, SED I and SED II suggests that such precise combinations of form and meaning are indeed not a rarity also outside the Swadesh list. A representative selection of such reconstructions includes *rāb- ‘father,’ *ḥam- ‘father-in-law,’ *šap-at- ‘lip,’ *ḥayt- ‘house,’ *kVly-at- ‘kidney,’ *ʾimm- ‘mother,’ *ḥaraḵ- ‘lightning,’ *ḥatip- ‘shoulder,’ *ṣyb ‘to have grey hair,’ *mīv-at- ‘hundred,’ *ḥavl- ‘lord, owner,’ *ṭel ‘to ask.’ Throughout this monograph, these and other semantically well-defined PS reconstructions will be of prime importance for our analysis.

1.5. It is of course interesting to see in which languages the reconstructed PS terms are better preserved and where they are more frequently lost.

From this point of view, the highly innovative nature of the basic vocabulary of Modern South Arabian is amazing. As far as the first part of our list (40 fully reliable positions) is concerned, it is in no less than 17 positions that Soqotri deviates from the reconstructed prototype (14 cases for each Mehri and Jibbali). Similarly, the MSA languages participate only in 3 out of 12 positions of the second part of the list (less reliable reconstructions). Elsewhere in Semitic, only Southern EthS languages show a comparable degree of innovation (14 deviations in Harari, 15 in Amharic).117

Hebrew and Syriac are the most conservative languages, exhibiting almost no deviations in the first part of the list and participating in almost all the reconstructions of the second one. Akkadian and Arabic occupy an intermediate position (6 and 5 deviations in the first part of the list respectively), but it is noteworthy that Akkadian

---

113 Related terms mean “wife” elsewhere in Southern EthS (Amh. mist, mšt, AED 213 and 230; Har. mištši, EDH 114). Their origin is uncertain.
114 Presumably from *sabayt-.
115 According to Leslau, a Cushitism.
116 Going back to Common MSA *payy- ‘man’ with no reliable etymology (see further Chapter 8, pp. 532-533).
117 Interestingly enough, Harari shares no less than 7 positions of the second part of the list, but only 2 positions are shared by Amharic.
participates in most of the reconstructions from the second part of the list, whereas in Arabic they are only rarely preserved (on this remarkable phenomenon see further Chapter 3, pp. 219-222).

At first sight, our statistics might suggest a transparent chronological tendency: the older is a language’s textual attestation, the more trivial retentions are preserved. The importance of the chronological dimension is not to be underestimated, but it is by no means the only factor at work. Thus, the OB Akkadian texts (on which the Akkadian list is based) are at least 1800 years older than the Ethiopic Bible, but the average preservation of trivial retentions in OB Akkadian and Axumite Geez is nearly the same (6 losses in the first part of the list, 10 and 8 terms preserved in the second part of the list). Both Soqotri and Tigre are contemporary living languages with no significant written tradition. However, Tigre has lost only 8 terms in the first part of the list and participates in 8 positions of the second one, whereas the corresponding Soqotri figures are 17 and 3. Finally, the Tigre picture is only slightly more innovative than that of both Koranic Arabic and Geez, in spite of more than 1000 years time difference in each case.

Chapter 2.

Historical unity and internal division of West Semitic as reflected in the basic vocabulary

1. East Semitic vs. West Semitic: history of research and some methodological issues

1.1. In the history of research, the split between Akkadian and the other Semitic languages (traditionally labeled as East and West Semitic respectively) has become one of the least controversial and most broadly accepted subgrouping hypotheses: “Most scholars, I think, are at least agreed on the most basic split of the family into two main branches, East Semitic comprising Akkadian and Eblaite and West Semitic comprising everything else” (Huehnergard 2006:2).119

118 The statistics for Geez are 6 losses in the first part of the list and 8 shared positions in the second one. For Arabic, we have 5 and 1.

119 Special studies where the East/West dichotomy is advocated (or just tacitly accepted) are countless. A reasonably concise list of references, with a special emphasis on both the earliest and the most recent publications, includes Nöldeke 1911:621, Brockelmann 1908:6, Rössler 1950:333, Hetzron 1974:185, Blau 1978:25, Faber 1997:6, Stempel 1999:15–21, Kouwenberg 2010a:20 and 595–598, and Huehnergard–Rubin 2011:263. Clearly formulated alternative patterns are not many and, it seems, not very felicitous. Thus, E. Lipiński’s division into North, East, West and South Semitic (1997:49) has virtually no linguistic basis behind it and is to be abandoned. A. Militarev’s early separation of Proto-MSA (2000:303 and elsewhere) pays due attention to the profound lexical specificity of this subgroup, but is based exclusively on lexicostatistics and is difficult to correlate with the pertinent morphological isoglosses.
This consensus, unique in the history of the otherwise increasingly hot debate about the genealogical subgrouping of Semitic, is paradoxically both expected and surprising.

It is expected because, until very recently, Akkadian linguistics and philology have had little in common with mainstream Semitological scholarship. Many Semitists have perceived Akkadian as an exotic idiom only remotely similar to such pillars of traditional Semitology as Hebrew, Arabic or Syriac.\footnote{“Assyrian seems to be so completely sui generis that we should be well advised to separate it from all the cognate languages, as an independent scion of Proto-Semitic” (Nöldeke 1911:621).} For many, this perception alone has been sufficient to separate Akkadian from the remaining Semitic languages without needing to care too much about the linguistic grounds for such a hypothesis.

It is surprising because methodological and material obstacles for defining Proto-WS as a genealogical unit are, in reality, truly formidable — perhaps more than for any other classification hypothesis dealt with in the present monograph.

The impact of the aforementioned consensus on our understanding of the earliest stages of the development of Semitic can be legitimately defined as devastating: until a few years ago, the ES/WS opposition has nearly always been presented as an axiom, so that the linguistic specificity of each of the two branches has never been properly described. Recent years have witnessed serious improvements in this respect, but the complexity of the problem coupled with the scarce and contradictory nature of extant evidence still leave ample room for further elaboration.

1.2. While the material foundations of the ES/WS dichotomy will be the main topic of this chapter, it seems wise to now consider some of the methodological difficulties with which this hypothesis is faced.

1.2.1. First and foremost, by no means is each and every feature distinguishing Akkadian from the rest of Semitic relevant for genealogical subgrouping. Indeed, morphological features of Akkadian which are not shared by any of its West Semitic parents are plentiful,\footnote{Thoroughly composed, up-to-date lists of such features can be found in Huehnergard 2006 and Kouwenberg 2010a:595–596. The most conspicuous examples are: masculine adjectival plural in -ūt- (Huehnergard 2006:9, Kouwenberg 2010a:595); a set of independent and enclitic dative pronouns (Huehnergard 2006:11–12); the t-perfect (Huehnergard 2006:13–14); and the tan-stems (ibid. 15).} yet almost none of them are even remotely suitable for defining West Semitic as a genealogical subgroup. If they are Akkadian innovations, all the remaining languages turn out to be archaic — yet not necessarily related to each other. If they are archaisms inherited from PS but lost elsewhere, all the remaining languages become innovative, but again, such a negative innovation need not be a shared one, but could have easily affected each of them independently. In other words, West Semitic cannot be defined as just “the part of Semitic that did not go along with the innovations of (Proto-)East Semitic” (Kouwenberg 2010a:596): within such an approach, Akkadian — with all its specific innovations and sufficiently non-trivial retentions — could have split from any relatively early stage of the development of Semitic.\footnote{Let us hypothesize, for the sake of convenience, that Akkadian was an offshoot of early Central Semitic. Could such a language, after its separation from the Hebrew-Aramaic-Arabic common stock, develop such a feature as the adjectival masculine plural in -ūt-? Why not? Or could it transform the “energetic” ending *-am (or *-an) into the marker of the ventive/dative? Most probably, yes. All in all,} For similar reasons, J. Huehnergard’s claim that “a feature present in
Akkadian but absent everywhere else may simply have been lost once, in Proto-West Semitic” (2006:3) is only partly correct: not necessarily once, and not necessarily in PWS.

In such conditions, it seems desirable to shift our attention from Akkadian to West Semitic: what is of prime relevance for our investigation are linguistic phenomena shared by each of the three conventional subdivisions of WS (CS, EthS and MSA), but missing from Akkadian. But here, too, only common innovations can potentially be relevant. “A feature absent in Akkadian but present everywhere else may be a once-only innovation of Proto-West Semitic” (Huehnergard 2006:3) — it may, but certainly need not, especially in view of the fact that the attested WS languages are much more numerous and have statistically better chances to preserve archaic features of the proto-language.124

1.2.2. The chronological gap between the ES/WS split and the earliest written attestations of all known WS languages is extraordinarily broad: if 4000 B.C. is taken as an approximate date of the earliest genealogical separations in PS, it yields a more than two-and-a-half-millenium distance between Proto-WS and Ugaritic, let alone such languages as Geez or Mehri. The pre-written history of Akkadian as an independent language must have been fairly long as well. In such conditions, many of the potentially relevant morphological and lexical features must have been seriously eroded or disappeared altogether. It is not surprising that reliable isoglosses which would unite all the three WS branches in opposition to Akkadian are, as we shall see below, rather difficult to find.

1.2.3. The ES group is represented by one single language, Akkadian. This circumstance seriously hampers our ability to evaluate the diachronic background of the potentially relevant shared isoglosses of PWS: if they are archaisms, they could have been completely lost in Akkadian, but some traces of them could have been preserved in its regrettably non-existent closer parent languages; if they are innovations, we could have learned more about their sources and development, otherwise completely obscure as long as Akkadian itself does not provide any hint. The Semitic forms attested in the Ebla texts — independent of whether or not they represent one unified idiom and whether this idiom is an Akkadian dialect or an independent Semitic language125 — only rarely provide a reliable makeshift. At the

there is hardly any specifically Akkadian morphological feature whose emergence (or preservation) would compel us to assume the historical unity of WS.

123 The same query applies to Wilson-Wright 2014:2: “A feature found in several West Semitic languages could be innovation after the split” — but a PS archaism more or less accidentally lost in Akkadian is by no means less plausible! If only in view of this circumstance, it is certainly an overestimation to say that in PS reconstruction and Semitic classification “Akkadian holds as much weight as the other Semitic languages combined” (ibid.)

124 A feature lost in Aramaic and Arabic can be preserved in Hebrew and thus counted as (Proto-)Central Semitic, and so on. But what is lost in Akkadian is lost forever.

125 This issue has become a prominent part of the present-day Akkadological discourse, v. Huehnergard 2006:3–5, Kouwenberg 2010a:22 (both treating “Eblaite” as an independent ES language), and Krebernik 1996:249, 2006:84 (“Eblaite” is an Akkadian dialect). In our view, M. Krebernik is correct to emphasize that “the question of whether ‘Eblaite’ should be called an Akkadian dialect or a second East Semitic language” is basically a matter of terminology.” Cf. also Huehnergard 2006:4 (fn. 16).
present state of our knowledge, the same is true of the potentially very important external verification from non-Semitic Afroasiatic languages.

2. The key isogloss

For nearly a century, the linguistic specificity of Proto-WS was almost always described with the help of one single isogloss: “The main diagnostic feature, the main innovation, that characterizes the West Semitic languages is the change of the *paris form, originally a conjugated verbal adjective, into a fientic, perfective verbal form, with a concomitant change of voice (thus *qatil- ‘is killed’ > *qatal- ‘has killed’) and a concomitant relegation of the earlier perfective form *yaqtil to secondary usage” (Huehnergard 2006:2).

However conspicuous this feature may be, it is certainly disturbing that such a major, crucial split in the history of the Semitic languages should be reflected in one single morphological trait. However, loneliness is not the only problem of the qatala-isogloss: much more troublesome is the uncertainty of its diachronic background.

The historical relationship between the Akkadian *paris and the WS qatala has been analyzed in numerous studies, but the debate has predominantly been focused on morphosyntactic aspects of the problem, viz., the shift from “stative” to “perfect.” Whenever the formal features of the two conjugations have been considered, scholars’ attention has been mostly concentrated on the presence vs. absence of the ending -a and the origin of this ending (notably, its connection with the Proto-Semitic *-a/-Ø absolutive). Very little has been said about the different vocalism of the base (Akkadian -i- vs. WS -a-) — that very feature which, for all practical purposes, should

126 The results achieved by this group of studies (notably, Tropper 1995c) appear to be both positive and persuasive and will not be discussed here; see most recently Kouwenberg 2010a:181–193, particularly p. 181 (“The function of the West Semitic perfect can be understood as a further development of the resultative function of the verbal stative in Akkadian ... It underwent the well-attested grammaticalization process from resultative to perfect and further to perfective or simple past”) and p. 186 (“Semantically, the derivation of an active/transitive perfect from an originally passive/intransitive participle is unobjectionable”).

127 In itself, this issue is not pertinent to the present discussion: the presence of *-a is likely to be original, and the WS picture is thus archaic (with Tropper 1999; doubts to this effect expressed in Kouwenberg 2010a:187–189 are, in our view, mostly unwarranted). Conversely, the likely related issue of the presence vs. absence of the “connecting vowel” *-a- between the base and the suffix (paras-ta vs. qatal-ta) might be relevant if one agrees with J. Tropper (1999), who ascribes the difference between paras-ta and qatal-ta to different stress patterns in the respective proto-languages: *parasāta but *qatālata (that sequences of four (perhaps even three) open syllables with short vowels were undesirable in early Semitic has been seen already by Kuryłowicz, 1972:43). Tropper’s conclusion has been put to doubt by Kouwenberg (2010a:183), who believes that the WS picture in this case is archaic and the connecting ţ in Akkadian was introduced secondarily, first in the first person singular under the impact of the independent pronoun ounâku and then, analogically, in the remaining positions of the paradigm (cf. already Kuryłowicz 1972:56–57). This is, in our opinion, rather unlikely. As far as we can see, the traditional reconstruction described in detail and then rejected in Kouwenberg 2010a:182–183 is still the best way to explain the available facts: a heterogeneous paradigm with ţ in the 1st person singular and no connecting vowel in the remaining forms (as is actually the case in the pronominal paradigm itself). Within such an approach, generalization of the direct juncture throughout the paradigm in WS could be considered a shared innovation of this group, although perhaps a rather trivial one.
have been placed in the very focus of the debate: before the innovative origin of the a-vowel in the Proto-WS form is demonstrated, the “New Perfect” can scarcely be qualified as a true innovation.

It is to N. J. C. Kouwenberg that modern Semitic scholarship owes its most explicit recognition of our complete ignorance of this aspect: “It is unclear what kind of mechanism can be made responsible for the rise of the stem vowel a in the great majority of transitive verbs of the yaqtilu and yaqtilu verbs” (2010a:186). On the same page, Kouwenberg considers and — in our opinion, correctly — rejects a few hypotheses that have been advanced in this connection in the previous Semitic scholarship.\footnote{Such as the influence of the adjacent guttural (Kuryłowicz 1972:66), in Kouwenberg’s words, “a typically structuralist argument that awaits confirmation from factual and typological parallels.”} Particularly open to criticism (Kouwenberg 2010a:186–187) are various versions of the Ablautpartner theory developed by O. Rössler (1950:510–512), R. Voigt (1988:116–117) and J. Tropper (1995c:509), which presupposes that the a vowel of qatala was somehow “borrowed” from iparras.\footnote{Or the perfect iptarəs, as in Voigt 2004:46–47.} It is hard to see why the speakers of early Semitic should have been so prone to maintain at every cost the opposition a : u, i as the core element of their verbal system on a purely formal level, completely disregarding the functional value of the respective vowels (present : past in Akkadian vs. past : present in WS).\footnote{Lack of any formal and semantic association between qatala and iparras falsifies Tropper’s understanding of qatala as a specifically CS (rather than WS) feature, supposedly spreading to EthS and MSA via borrowing (1995c:505–509): by Tropper’s reasoning, the emergence of the “New Past” must have triggered the loss of the “Old Present,” but there is hardly any justification for such a bizarre development except for the early CS speakers’ alleged unwillingness to have two a-Ablautpartners for the short form of the prefix conjugation yVC\textsubscript{1}C\textsubscript{2}u/iC\textsubscript{3}.\footnote{Similar arguments apply to Tropper’s second (complementary) hypothesis (1995c:305), according to which a in qatala could also be “borrowed” from the adjectival pattern C\textsubscript{1}əC\textsubscript{2}əC\textsubscript{3} because the latter “den mit Abstand seltensten Adjectiv-Bildungstyp im Semitischen darstellt”: morphological markers, particularly the least productive ones, are unlikely to travel ad libitum from one paradigm to another. Let us observe, parenthetically, that precisely in early West Semitic (as far as one can judge from the attested Hebrew evidence) the adjectival C\textsubscript{1}əC\textsubscript{2}əC\textsubscript{3}-pattern was quite prominent — maybe the most prominent one (Kogan 2008b:94, 109).} Apart from the a-vocalism, of course.

As an alternative, the very attempt to “derive” qatala from paris can be abandoned. Instead, the *C\textsubscript{1}əC\textsubscript{2}əC\textsubscript{3}- base may be considered an independent morphological body (presumably, a kind of active participle, cf. Rössler 1951b:370–371) to which the predicative suffixes could be attached in just the same way as they were to the “stative” base *C\textsubscript{1}əC\textsubscript{2}əC\textsubscript{3}. Such a hypothesis, not implausible per se, is difficult to prove: as shown by N. J. C. Kouwenberg (2010a:185–186), there is hardly any trace of active *C\textsubscript{1}əC\textsubscript{2}əC\textsubscript{3}- in either Semitic or Afroasiatic. However, if correct, this approach would be seriously detrimental to our understanding of qatala as a WS

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{Such as the influence of the adjacent guttural (Kuryłowicz 1972:66), in Kouwenberg’s words, “a typically structuralist argument that awaits confirmation from factual and typological parallels.”}

\footnote{Or the perfect iptarəs, as in Voigt 2004:46–47.}

\footnote{Lack of any formal and semantic association between qatala and iparras falsifies Tropper’s understanding of qatala as a specifically CS (rather than WS) feature, supposedly spreading to EthS and MSA via borrowing (1995c:505–509): by Tropper’s reasoning, the emergence of the “New Past” must have triggered the loss of the “Old Present,” but there is hardly any justification for such a bizarre development except for the early CS speakers’ alleged unwillingness to have two a-Ablautpartners for the short form of the prefix conjugation yVC\textsubscript{1}C\textsubscript{2}u/iC\textsubscript{3}.\footnote{Similar arguments apply to Tropper’s second (complementary) hypothesis (1995c:305), according to which a in qatala could also be “borrowed” from the adjectival pattern C\textsubscript{1}əC\textsubscript{2}əC\textsubscript{3} because the latter “den mit Abstand seltensten Adjectiv-Bildungstyp im Semitischen darstellt”: morphological markers, particularly the least productive ones, are unlikely to travel ad libitum from one paradigm to another. Let us observe, parenthetically, that precisely in early West Semitic (as far as one can judge from the attested Hebrew evidence) the adjectival C\textsubscript{1}əC\textsubscript{2}əC\textsubscript{3}-pattern was quite prominent — maybe the most prominent one (Kogan 2008b:94, 109).} Apart from the a-vocalism, of course.

\footnote{Tropper’s interpretation of the EthS facts also fails to persuade us. In Tropper’s view, qatala cannot be autochthonous in EthS because the “Old Present” is preserved here (1995c:509), which would disrupt the a-Ablaut partnership. However, the Geez imperfect ɣuŋγgré is not identical to iparras in its vocalic shape. The Akkadian-like Ablaut opposition iprus : iparras does not exist in EthS, nor can it be convincingly projected to its prehistory.}
\end{footnotesize}
innovation: why not hypothesize that we are rather faced with a PS archaism lost in Akkadian? As argued by R. Voigt (2002–2003),\textsuperscript{133} this was actually the case: in Voigt’s view, Proto-Semitic had two different types of suffix conjugation: the “active” *paras-tā and the “passive” *mariš-tā.\textsuperscript{134}

3. More morphological features?

As we have tried to show in the preceding section, the traditional justification of the ES/WS opposition by one single morphological isogloss is far from blameless, and not only in terms of quantity: the origin of the supposedly innovative “New Perfect” \textit{qatala} has proved to be obscure. In such a context, the importance of Huehnergard’s recent attempt to enrich the East-West dichotomy with more morphological features (2006) can hardly be overestimated. In the present section, we will critically analyze the hypothetical Proto-WS features put forward by Huehnergard (and other scholars). We will also propose and discuss a few additional features which, it seems, have not attracted enough attention in the previous discussion on this topic.

3.1. Features suggested in previous research

3.1.1. Throughout West Semitic, intransitive verbs show a strong predilection towards \textit{a} as the thematic vowel of the prefix conjugation. Conversely, in Akkadian the number of \textit{a}-verbs is very restricted (Kouwenberg 2010a:74–75). Nevertheless, their semantic properties are usually well compatible with those characteristic of \textit{a}-verbs in WS: \textit{lamādu} ‘to know,’ \textit{rakābu} ‘to ride,’ \textit{șalālu} ‘to sleep,’ \textit{takālu} ‘to trust,’ \textit{labbāšu} ‘to wear,’ \textit{pašāhu} ‘to calm down.’\textsuperscript{135} Therefore, we have good reasons to follow J. Kuryłowicz (1961:48–49, 51, 1972:64–65, 67–68), D. Cohen (2003:146–147) and N. J. C. Kouwenberg (2010a:74) who believe that the extant \textit{a}-verbs in Akkadian are remnants of a once much broader class of “middle verbs” directly comparable to what we find in WS.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{133} In a rather axiomatic form, already by J. Kuryłowicz: “En sémitique commun \textit{qatala} = perfectif transitif, \textit{qatila} = perfectif intransitif” (1961:48).
\textsuperscript{134} The possibility of treating \textit{qatala} as a PS relic is somewhat obliquely rejected by both Huehnergard (2006:6) and Kouwenberg (2010a:191). In both cases, Voigt’s study went unmentioned, which is curious in view of the fact that the potentially supportive Egyptian evidence by which Voigt was obviously inspired is analyzed by Kouwenberg in great detail. As far as we can see, Voigt’s new hypothesis of necessity cancels the \textit{Ablautpartner} theory advocated in several of his earlier studies on the topic. This is not quite in agreement with Voigt 2002–2003:143 ("eine Lösung ... die diesen Ansatz ergänzt," italics added).
\textsuperscript{135} It remains enigmatic why \textit{ṣabāṭu} ‘to seize’ and \textit{maḥāṣu} ‘to hit’ have become \textit{a/i} verbs in Akkadian. In any case, the different patterns of the imperative (\textit{ṣibat} and \textit{maḥuṣi} vs. \textit{thīl}, etc.) make it clear that we are faced with two different (sub-)classes of \textit{a}-verbs with no inherent connection to each other (cf. Kouwenberg 2010a:134–136).
\textsuperscript{136} Direct comparison between actually attested Akkadian and Arabic lexemes yields only two reliable reconstructions of PS \textit{a}-verbs: *-lbaš- ‘to wear’ and *-rkaše- ‘to ride.’ It stands to reason that many of the original \textit{a}-verbs in Akkadian shifted to the \textit{i/i} and \textit{u/u} classes because of the typically Akkadian association between the thematic vowel of the stative (usually \textit{i}, more rarely \textit{u}) and the prefix conjugation in adjectival verbs, extensively discussed in Kouwenberg 2010a:58–66. Probable instances of such a shift
In such conditions, the thematic vowel *-a- as a feature of intransitive or “middle” verbs must be traced back to PS and cannot be regarded as a WS innovation.\textsuperscript{157} What might be considered innovative is the systematic use of a : non-a alternation as a means of expressing oppositions in diathesis within one verbal root. This phenomenon, to some extent attested throughout WS,\textsuperscript{138} is virtually unknown in Akkadian. According to Kouwenberg (2010a:71), “it is hard to say whether the West Semitic cases are a secondary development in which Akkadian took no part or the remains of a Proto-Semitic system that was discarded in Akkadian.” Kouwenberg is inclined to accept the first solution, which may be right: as soon as *C₁uC₂aC₃-a started to function as a straightforward intransitive perfect in PWS, it was only natural for this form to become associated with a similarly intransitive a-imperfect, resulting, in Kouwenberg’s words, “in a class of ‘middle verbs’ of the pattern qatila/yiqṭalu.”\textsuperscript{139}

3.1.2. The internal passive — the prefix conjugation *yuC₁C₂aC₃ and the suffix conjugation *C₁uC₂aC₃/*C₁uC₂C₃ — is a shared feature of CS and MSA and, arguably, a Proto-WS innovation (Huehnergard 2006:15). This generally plausible assumption is nevertheless faced with several obstacles which are worth treating at some length here.

3.1.2.1. As is well known, there is no trace of the internal passive in EthS. It is not too hard to suppose that this feature was simply lost in Proto-EthS (Blau 1978:25),\textsuperscript{140} but there is no reason to exclude the possibility of “an innovation in a lower node within West Semitic” (Huehnergard 2006:15 and below in this chapter). In

\textsuperscript{157} Which, admittedly, creates serious theoretical problems of its own. According to a broad consensus, the thematic vowel of the prefix conjugation in Akkadian (and Proto-Semitic) was a purely lexical element with no semantic or functional properties (Kuryłowicz 1972:69, Kouwenberg 2010a:69). A close association between one particular thematic vowel and a certain semantic class of verbs (“des verbes qui ne connaissaient que la flexion médiopassive,” Kuryłowicz 1961:49) disrupts this system and is hard to explain in terms of functionality: if the a-vowel of the intransitive verbs was not grammatically opposed to any other vowel, the reasons behind its association with this semantic class become elusive, as the lexical oppositions were certainly expressed by the consonants alone. Kuryłowicz’s treatment of this problem in his 1961 book is a telling witness of its complexity. As we have just seen above, Kuryłowicz is willing to recognize the PS status of *-a- as a feature of the “middle” verbs, yet on p. 70 we read that “le vocalisme a ... a peu à peu cessé d’exister comme vocalisme fondamental (immotivé) de R₂ des racines verbales, étant désormais affecté à une fonction flexionnelle, le médiopassif.” Especially in the context of \textit{Chapitre VII. Le verbe ouestique}, this statement plainly means that the emergence of the “middle” a-verbs is ascribed to PWS (or even to some later stages of the development of WS). On the same page Kuryłowicz says that “le problème de la survivance, en ouestique, d’un vocalisme autonome a mérite un examen détaillé,” but the very existence of a as a non-motivated root vowel in PS does not seem to be mentioned anywhere else in the book, so it is not clear what exactly could “survive” in this case.

\textsuperscript{138} A masterly presentation of the Hebrew evidence can be found in Joosten 1998:209–216 and Joosten 2000, together with a useful summary of the comparative Semitic evidence. In Joosten’s view (2000:216–218), the WS-like opposition had once existed also in Akkadian, its abandonment being interpreted as a secondary innovation of ES.

\textsuperscript{139} More affirmatively on p. 286. Unlike Kouwenberg, we do not believe that the internal passive has any direct relevance to this issue, as its emergence is only a secondary (and perhaps comparatively late) consequence of the emergence of the a : non-a opposition.

\textsuperscript{140} Needless to say, Blau is wrong when he speaks of “the existence of qatala and qutila in all the Semitic languages with the exception of Akkadian.”
any case, the deeply rooted and highly prominent system of the internal passive in MSA can scarcely be considered a result of CS (or just Arabic) influence (contra Appleyard 1996:220).

3.1.2.2. A coherent reconstruction of the internal passive can be achieved only for the prefix conjugation and, at first sight, only for PCS (Weninger 2011a:159).

3.1.2.2.1. The familiar Arabic form *yuqtalu ‘he will be killed’ is matched by forms like *tu-da-nu-na ‘let them be given,’ and *tu-am-ha-*ṣū ‘it is struck’ in early Canaanite (Rainey 1996 II 75–80).141 Comparison of this reconstruction with the MSA facts is not an easy task, as in these languages not one, but two forms of the prefix conjugation are involved.

From the structural point of view, only the short form (the jussive) is directly comparable with the CS reconstruction, but since the prefix vowel throughout MSA is diachronically opaque, only the thematic vowel (*a > o) in forms like Soq. *līḥbōs ‘may he be imprisoned’ can be identified with certainty. At this point, the correspondence between CS and MSA is exact.

The problem with the long form (the imperfect) is that the two-vowel melody of CS (*yu-C₁C₂aC₃) must somehow fit the tri-syllabic structure (*yV-C₁VC₂VC₃) in MSA. In Soqotri, this desideratum is effectively fulfilled by inserting the “prefixal” *u after the first radical: *yūḥūbos ‘he will be imprisoned’ (Johnstone 1968:524). As for the prefix vowel itself, o is opaque in terms of historical phonology, but since the passive forms are subject to the prefix-loss rule in Jibbali and Soqotri, always conditioned by an underlying *u (see Chapter 8, p. 461), its reconstruction as *u is fairly certain. Since *o- < *a in the last syllable is clear, the proto-Soqotri form can be rather confidently reconstructed as *yuḥūbas. A structurally similar, but probably more archaic form without secondary u-insertion can likely be reconstructed for proto-Jibbali on the base of the attested form *irŷafas ‘it is trampled’ (*yurafaṣ). It is only in Mehri that the long form was altogether abandoned in the passive, where the imperfect and the jussive are identical: *yūvīṣ ‘he will be killed’/‘may he be killed’ (Johnstone 1975:19, Rubin 2010:90).

We may conclude that, upon a deeper inquiry, the MSA evidence becomes rather transparent and well compatible with the commonly accepted CS reconstruction (*u...a). Our results clearly obviate the necessity to treat the MSA internal passive as either an independent development (Weninger 2011a:159) or a result of Arabic influence (Appleyard 1996:220).

3.1.2.2.2. In the suffix conjugation, the extant picture is more contradictory: *qutila ‘he was killed’ in Arabic is opposed to *luḥḥalā in Biblical Hebrew. Weninger (2011a:159) opts for *u-a in PWS, but there are several arguments, both material and structural, in favor of the priority of the Arabic picture (Brockelmann 1908:537).

141 A detailed discussion of the Ugaritic evidence, perhaps pointing to *yu-C₁C₂aC₃, can be found in Tropper 2000:510–514.

142 Yet even here the situation is less desperate than it may look at first sight: In Soqotri, the t-prefix of the passive jussive is elided and replaced by l-: *lāḥbōs instead of *tāḥbōs ‘may she be imprisoned.’ This is a rather safe indication of a background *u as the prefix vowel of the passive jussive.
The early Canaanite forms "ji-ir-ti 'I am hard pressed' and "si-ir-ti 'I am slandered' (Rainey 1996 II 286) unambiguously imply the presence of *i in the second syllable (Lipiński 1997:408). Theoretically, they would be compatible with the prototype *C₁aC₂C₃ deduced by Rainey from the evidence of the strong verb (Rainey 1996 II 303–305), but one has rather to agree with Tropper (2000:515) who believes that such forms are influenced by the Akkadian stative C₁aC₂C₃ and have no direct bearing on the early Canaanite situation.

In MSA, forms like Jib. "dšli 'he was killed' and Soq. "ãk'i 'it was left' (Johnstone 1975:19, Simeone-Senelle 1997:407) necessarily presuppose the presence of *i in the proto-form.  

The long *i in the early Aramaic base *C₁aC₂C₃ remains a vexing problem, but secondary lengthening of an originally short *i (Brockelmann 1908:537, Lipiński 1997:409, Tropper 2000:515) is perhaps no harder to digest than secondary verbalization of the passive participle *C₁aC₂C₃ (Loesov 2009:484, Weninger 2011a:159).

The reconstruction of *i in the second syllable provides an important formal link with the medial *C₁aC₂C₃ base, which is, in all probability, the diachronic source of the internal passive. The ensuing picture is fully symmetrical with what one obtains for the prefix conjugation, where *yuC₁C₂aC₃ is inherently connected with, and almost certainly derived from, the medial *yiC₁C₂C₃.

The shift *i > a in Hebrew can easily be explained by the influence of the thematic vowel of the imperfect, whereas the opposite development *a > i which has to be postulated for Arabic is hard to interpret.

3.1.2.3. While the innovative nature of the WS internal passive is bolstered by its eventual derivation from the PS *C₁aC₂C₃/*yiC₁C₂aC₃ medial conjugation, the origin of the marker *u — which is, after all, the hallmark of the internal passive as a whole — is still difficult to retrieve.

These difficulties notwithstanding, the internal passive is, and will likely remain, one of the most promising PWS innovations.

3.1.3. According to Kouwenberg 2010a:596, PWS is characterized by "the new causative by means of a laryngeal prefix." However, as rightly observed by

---

143 We cannot say whether the same is true of Mhr. "dšli 'he was killed' (Johnstone 1975:19) as assumed by Lipiński (1997:409).

144 For Kuryłowicz (1961:73) the ancient background of the Aramaic forms was, apparently, axiomatic. One has to admit that the passive perfect of the causative stem displays a Hebrew-like a-form hussak (Da 6:24).


147 Thus, strongly against Stempel’s cavalier dictum “Die Passivformen nirgends lautgesetzlich auf ein gemeinsames Modell zurückgeführt werden können. Wir müssen davon ausgehen, daß die einzelsprachlichen Formen rezente Bildungen vermutlich auf der Grundlage von Partizipien und Verbalnominata sind” (Stempel 1999:123), going back to Retsö 1989. Needless to say, our conclusions are in crass contradiction with Retsö’s, which we find totally unacceptable in terms of both methodology (emphatic rejection of “a Stammbaum with regular derivations and correspondences of words and forms,” p. 197) and interpretation (“No common Semitic passive conjugation has ever existed ... No common Semitic causative conjugation has ever existed,” p. 203).
Huehnergard (2006:8), this feature “cannot be assigned to Proto-West Semitic, since there are West Semitic languages ... in which it did not occur; rather, it is a notable example of a change that spread by areal diffusion, which did not reach some of the more peripheral regions.” Indeed, the distribution of the shift 
\[ *\partial > h/\partial \] in the causative morpheme throughout WS is such that it can scarcely be attributed to the proto-language of this branch.

3.1.4. Another characteristically WS phenomenon mentioned by Kouwenberg (2010a:596) is “the plural formation in the noun.” If the apophonic (“broken”) plural is meant, this feature certainly has no chance to be a Proto-WS innovation. Quite independently of the validity of Huehnergard’s hypothesis about “broken plurals” in Akkadian (Huehnergard 1987c and 2006:8–7), it is fairly clear that at least the a-apophony is one of the most archaic features of Proto-Semitic and Proto-Afroasiatic nominal morphology, whose complete loss in Akkadian is a most striking innovation of this otherwise very conservative language (Huehnergard 2006:9). Whether or not some specific patterns of “broken plural” were innovated in PWS rather than inherited from PS is a moot question which will probably never be answered because of the lack of comparable evidence from Akkadian.

3.1.5. The external masculine plural in Akkadian lacks the nasal augment, familiar to us from such Arabic and Hebrew forms as molâkim ‘kings’ and muwallîmuña ‘teachers.’ We agree with Huehnergard (2006:9–10), who considers the Akkadian picture innovative: it would be strange if mimation (nunation), obviously possessing some functional load in PS (Dolgopolsky 1991), were present in the singular and the dual, but missing from the plural. Thus being a PS archaism, this feature cannot have

---

148 Kouwenberg (2010a:350) is undoubtedly correct to reaffirm the diachronic priority of the *-causative in Proto-Semitic and Proto-Afroasiatic as against Retsö’s unfounded allegations in 1989:86–90 (including the truly perplexing remark about “only scattered lexemes of sibilant augmented denominal verbs,” p. 88).

149 One has to admit, incidentally, that Huehnergard’s analysis of the -causatives in WS is somewhat too laconic and not always transparent enough. Thus, “some of the Old South Arabian languages,” in which the sibilant prefix is attested synchronically, are accepted, together with “Proto-Modern South Arabian” (although the extant MSA languages, including Jibbali, show only h and r). Conversely, Ugaritic, where - is the normal causative marker, is thought to have had undergone the *- > h shift, the synchronically attested sibilant prefix being ascribed to a secondary influence of the Št stem. This reasoning is likely based on the assumption that the consonant of the causative marker must be identical to that of the third person pronouns — which is in ESA, *š in Proto-MSA, but h- in Ugaritic. This assumption, however, is perfectly circular (Kogan 2011:107) and, at least in what concerns MSA, is contradicted by the rules of the historical phonology of these languages (Proto-MSA *š does not yield a glottal stop in Jibbali, which, however, functions as the marker of the causative stem in this language).

150 As far as the Afroasiatic evidence is concerned, Ratcliffe (1998b:101) observes that such well-known features of the “Southern Semitic” broken plural as the prefixation of *-a- and the u-vocalism are mostly unattested in non-Semitic Afroasiatic languages. In such a context, the possibility of a secondary innovative expansion becomes rather likely. This expansion has to be located either in the Arabic-including “South Semitic” (this is the opinion preferred by Ratcliffe, see particularly 1998b:120–121), or in Proto-WS with a subsequent narrowing in Aramaic and Canaanite (Huehnergard 2005:159–160), or somewhere in the South Arabian geographic area with a subsequent drift to the languages of that region independent of any special genealogical proximity between them (an opinion favored by the present author and developed below in Chapter 3, pp. 164-169).

151 In a few vestiges, even in the attested Sargonic Akkadian documents (Kogan–Markina 2012:483–484).
any relevance for the problem of the historical unity of WS, all the more since the external masculine plural is altogether missing from two of the three WS branches (EthS and MSA).

3.1.6. Huehnergard (2006:10) is undoubtedly correct to observe that the *C₁aC₂aC₃- and *C₁aC₃uC₂- adjectives, highly prominent in the majority of the WS languages, are very rare in Akkadian.¹⁵² Huehnergard considers this feature a shared innovation of the PWS derivational morphology and even suggests a plausible rationale for its emergence (for which cf. also Kuryłowicz 1961:37–41, 1972:96). What is disturbing, however, is the distribution of this isogloss. Its broad presence in CS and EthS is beyond doubt, but what about MSA? There are, of course, scores of *C₁aC₃uC₂- (> C₁aC₃uC₂) adjectives in Mehri, yet a quick look at the lexical evidence collected in Bittner 1909:78-80 and Rubin 2010:79-82 immediately reveals that in almost every case we are faced with transparent Arabic loanwords. The same is true of the few Jibbali examples collected in Bittner 1915b:57, whereas in Soqotri *C₁aC₃uC₂- adjectives are practically unattested. Similarly, there is hardly any trace of autochthonous *C₁aC₃uC₂- adjectives in any of the MSA languages.¹⁵³ Throughout MSA, non-borrowed adjectives usually display quite different patterns, as illustrated by such Mehri examples as ʾiḏawr ‘blind’ (ML 37), ḥōwṣ ‘black’ (ML 195), ṭāḥ ‘far’ (ML 321) or kāš‘ūm ‘cold’ (ML 240). Whether some of these adjectives can eventually be traced back to *C₁aC₃uC₂- is hard to say at present. Perhaps rather not than yes — structural comparison with “old,” non-lengthened Akkadian- or Hebrew-like patterns seems much more promising. In such conditions, it is wise to restrict the validity of this feature to the common ancestor of CS and EthS (see further below in this chapter, pp. 105-126).

3.1.7. Akkadian and West Semitic are sharply distinguished by the shape of their auxiliary words, such as prepositions,¹⁵⁴ negations, etc. These differences have played an important role in the modern debate on the ES/WS dichotomy,¹⁵⁵ but it should be kept in mind that by their nature such features do not belong so much to grammar as to vocabulary and are best described as individual lexical items, as will actually be done below in this chapter.

3.2. Newly suggested features

As J. Huehnergard correctly admits (2006:6), the list of ES/WS isoglosses offered in his pioneering study is not exhaustive. Indeed, further perusal of Semitic grammars allows one to spot a few other morphological features opposing Akkadian to the majority of the WS languages.

¹⁵² In fact, fully reliable instances do not seem to be attested at all (Fox 2003:187–188, 198–199).
¹⁵⁴ Profound differences between the Akkadian and West Semitic pronominal systems have lead St. Weninger (2011a:169) to the conclusion that “hardly any prepositions ... can be ... safely stated for PS.” Correct in its essence, this claim is somewhat exaggerated in view of such reliable reconstructions as *kV(-ma) ‘like,’ *talay ‘on, over,’ and *bV(lay) ‘without.’
¹⁵⁵ See Huehnergard 2006:16 for some of the key prepositions and Faber 1997:8 for the negative particle *natal.
3.2.1. Ever since Barth 1913:1, 10, 18, the gender distinction in the 2 and 3 plural of the personal pronoun has been almost universally reconstructed in the WS fashion, with the \( m:n \) opposition as its core element, optionally accompanied by the vocalic contrast \( u-u : i-a \) — that is, \( *-umu : *-ina \) or similar.\(^{156}\) Only a few scholars professing a manifestly Akkadocentric approach to the PS reconstruction dared to advocate the originality of the Akkadian picture (Zimmern 1898:58, Castellino 1962:21–22, Gelb 1969:6–8 and 52–53, Kienast 2001:40–41), where the distinction is achieved via vocalic contrast alone and the consonantal element \((n-)\) is identical in both the masculine and the feminine \((\text{att}u\text{nu} : \text{att}i\text{na} \text{and} \text{s}u\text{nu} : \text{s}i\text{na})\). In fact, the unanimous evidence of non-Semitic Afroasiatic languages shows that, in this particular case, there are good grounds to be Akkadocentric.

- Throughout Afroasiatic, only \( n \)-forms are attested (Castellino 1962:21).\(^{157}\)
- While both \( u : a \) and \( u : i \) are well attested as the exponents of the gender contrast elsewhere in the pronominal and verbal systems of \((\text{Proto})\text{-Semitic} \text{ (Castellino} \text{ 1962:21, Gelb} \text{ 1969:31–34, Kogan} \text{ 2009:54)\text{, there is hardly any evidence for} m \text{ as the marker of the masculine.}

- Analogical accommodation of the masculine \( m \)-forms to the feminine \( n \)-ones (Barth 1913:10, Arbeitman 1991:88) is not easy to imagine as the feminine forms are less common in use.

If this reconstruction is correct, we are faced with a rare example of a true morphological innovation uniting all WS languages in opposition to Akkadian. While this is indeed the case in our opinion, at least two potential objections are not to be neglected.

On the one hand, there are WS languages (Aramaic,\(^{158}\) Soqotri\(^{159}\)) which superficially display systems more or less exactly matching the Akkadian one. This circumstance is not detrimental to the PWS status of our isogloss, as in both cases the diachronic priority of the \( m:n \) contrast is evident.\(^{160}\) There is, however, a different sort of danger: if the \( n \)-generalization could independently take place in two unrelated WS subgroups, the possibility of a similar secondary shift in Akkadian cannot be ruled out.

The validity of this objection would be undermined if we were able to detect certain

---

\(^{156}\) Y. Arbeitman (1991:89) is probably right to claim that “no Semitic language preserves the putative original double distinction of both vocalism and consonantism between masculine and feminine.” While it is true that synchronically attested systems of this type are not completely unknown (Jibbali \( \text{šḏmn} : \text{šḏ}m \) or Tigre \( \text{šmtn} : \text{šmtn} \), it is rather unlikely that we are faced with direct reflexes of the P(W)S picture. A secondary, comparatively recent labialization before \( -m \) in the masculine forms is much more probable.\(^{157}\) See the comparative charts in Diakonoff 1988:71–78 (above all, \( n\text{-tn} \) and \( n\text{-sn} \) in Egyptian). All Afroasiatic forms are admittedly epicene, but it is hard to believe that \( n \) was taken over from a (lost) feminine in each language involved.

\(^{157}\) E.g. JPA \( \text{t}ḏ\text{mtn} / \text{t}mtn \) and \( \text{h}n\text{mtn} / \text{h}n\text{mtn} \) (DJPA 79, 81).

\(^{158}\) In the speech of our informants, 2 pl. \( \text{t}m \) (epicene), 3 pl. m. \( \text{yhm} \), f. \( \text{sm} \). Partly different accounts can be found in Müller 1905:373, Johnstone 1975:25, Simeone-Senelle 1997:387.

\(^{159}\) In Aramaic, this is assured by the evidence from the oldest documents (Arbeitman 1991:90, 99). In MSA, the priority of the \( m:n \) contrast is clear from the data of the continental languages.
well-defined factors behind the $m > n$ shift specific to the languages in question (Aramaic and Soqotri), but the existence of such factors is far from obvious.\footnote{Y. Arbeitman (1991:88) speaks of “a late Aramaic sound change,” but does not specify what he means. H. Gzella (2011:436) tentatively surmises an analogy with the $n$-ending of the plural forms of the imperfect.}

On the other hand, the morphophonemic background of the hypothetical shift $n > m$ in the masculine forms of PWS remains to be established. Labialization of $n$ between two labial vowels (*-$unu$* → *-$umu$*), suggested most explicitly in Kienast 2001:40 (and cf. already Zimmern 1898:58), is not implausible, but does not seem to have any serious precedent in the Semitic-speaking domain (cf. Gelb 1969:52–53).

### 3.2.2. Quadriradical verbal roots of the reduplicated structure $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ are attested throughout WS languages (Gensler 1997:244, Conti 1980\footnote{G. Conti’s book is exclusively dedicated to one particular manifestation of this phenomenon, viz. $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots augmented with $n$-prefix in EthS (less commonly, also in MSA) and in Egyptian. As one can infer from Conti 1980:96, he is inclined to treat the presence of $n$-$C_1C_2C_1C_2$ in Ethiopian and Egyptian as two independent manifestations of a common trend towards accommodation of originally biconsonantal elements into triradical and quadriradical structures: “Il trait d’union di queste attestazioni egiziane con il semitico non è la struttura, ma la base bilittera che tutte sotintendono e cui tutte rimandano.” Within this approach, the presence of $n$-$C_1C_2C_1C_2$ in Egyptian is not an obstacle for treating $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ as a PWS innovation. On pp. 41–42 and 116–119 Conti tentatively discusses the possibility of a common “African” substratum behind the Egyptian and Ethiopian facts, but this is, in our opinion, quite unlikely in view of the comparatively recent appearance of Semitic on Ethiopian soil.\footnote{For a thorough, pioneering treatment of this important question v. Fischer 1993:52–58 (a further elaboration which would encompass the relatively rich MSA evidence remains an important desideratum). Fischer was able to collect appx. 25 comparable $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ strings between Arabic, Aramaic and post-Biblical Hebrew as well as appx. 20 similar examples between Arabic and Geez. In appx. 10 cases, each of the three major (groups of) languages (Arabic, Hebrew/Aramaic, Geez) are involved. At first sight, these figures are not so low, but there are good reasons to believe that not all of Fischer’s comparisons would withstand a critical etymological survey (independent onomatopoetic formations, semantically loose relationships, etc.). Furthermore, the $C_1C_2C_2 > C_1C_2C_1C_2$ process has become so productive in Arabic (Fischer 1993:41, 49) that the possibility of independent formation with no common Semitic basis can hardly ever be excluded. Nevertheless, one willingly agrees with Fischer (1993:58) that some four or five $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots can indeed be traced back to PWS, and thus not only “das Ableitungsprinzip” through which they are formed.\footnote{Five lexemes in Tropper 2000:680, all rather sparsely attested.\footnote{It is certainly not without significance that, throughout Fischer’s study, most of the Hebrew evidence comes from post-Biblical sources.}}) and, last but not least, comparative rarity of $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ in archaic WS languages like Ugaritic\footnote{Kienast 1974:51–3} and Hebrew (cf. Fischer 1993:49).\footnote{Fischer 1993.}} and Hebrew (cf. Fischer 1993:52).

Such a conclusion would be corroborated by a few other circumstances, such as scarcity of reliable lexical reconstructions displaying the reduplicated quadriradical structure,\footnote{Kouwenberg 2010a:320) that some} onomatopoetic or descriptive origin of many $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ roots in the attested WS languages (cf. Fischer 1993:49), the well-attested secondary emergence of $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ from “weak” root types (particularly from the geminate roots $C_1C_2C_2$)\footnote{H. Gzella (2011:436) tentatively surmises an analogy with the “das Ableitungsprinzip” through which they are formed.} and, last but not least, comparative rarity of $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ in archaic WS languages like Ugaritic\footnote{H. Gzella (2011:436) tentatively surmises an analogy with the “das Ableitungsprinzip” through which they are formed.} and Hebrew (cf. Fischer 1993:49).\footnote{H. Gzella (2011:436) tentatively surmises an analogy with the “das Ableitungsprinzip” through which they are formed.}
The validity of this isogloss is to some extent undermined by possible remnants of reduplicated quardiradical verbs in Akkadian. Indeed, N. J. C. Kouwenberg (2010a:320) has tentatively argued that the Akkadian quardiradical class na-parpurû/šu-parpuru goes back to an earlier *na-parpurû/šu-parpuru. If this comparison is accepted, the existence of reduplication as a means of root-formation must necessarily be projected back to PS.\(^{167}\)

3.2.3. The inventories of \(mV\)-prefixed nominal patterns in Akkadian and West Semitic are quite dissimilar.

In his exemplary study of the \(ma\)-patterns in Akkadian, M. P. Streck has shown that the overwhelming majority of \(ma\)-substantives in this language belong to one signle morphological shape, viz. mapras- and its feminine extention mapras-t-: 403 lexical examples altogether (Streck 2002:251). The remaining patterns are represented by statistically insignificant numbers (15 for maprās-, 12 for maprīs(-t)-), but even these are not always entirely reliable.\(^{168}\) Semantically, mapras- nouns cover a wide variety of functions (Streck 2002 passim): nouns of place, time, vessel, instrument, or just verbal nouns with no clearly defined semantic role (Verbalinhalt).

The picture observable in the majority of the WS languages is different: here we find at least two, more often three, derivational patterns with \(mV\)-prefixation, to which different functions are ascribed.\(^{169}\) For example, in Hebrew (Joûon–Muraoka 2005:256–259, Bauer–Leander 1922:489–493) there is a richly represented \(miC_1C_3\) class (both \(< *maC_1C_3t\)) with various semantic properties broadly comparable with the Akkadian evidence as described by Streck; a comparatively small but semantically well-defined \(maC_1C_3\) class of nomina instrumenti; a minor class \(miC_1C_3\) (both probably \(< *maC_1C_3\)). In Arabic, the patterns \(maC_1C_3\) and \(maC_1C_3\) are traditionally defined as nouns of place and time, whereas the instrumental meaning is assigned to \(miC_1C_3\) and \(miC_1C_3\) (Fischer 2002:49–51). In Geez, \(maC_1C_3\) (< \(*miC_1C_3\)) is predominantly associated with nouns of place, whereas \(maC_1C_3\) (more rarely \(miC_1C_3\)) is reserved for other meanings (Dillmann 1907:244–248).

In principle, one is willing to conclude that a relatively broad variety of \(*mV\)-patterns in West Semitic is a specific (and perhaps innovative) trait of this branch, opposing it to the almost completely uniform Akkadian picture.\(^{170}\) There are, however, two important caveats which prevent us from accepting this feature as a fully reliable PWS isogloss.

On the one hand, the WS evidence is not internally consistent: the functions of different \(*mV\)-patterns do not overlap even between Arabic and Hebrew, let alone

\(^{167}\) But cf., e.g., Tropper 2000:680 where a more traditional equation between naparruru and the Arabic IX stem (ṣifarra), together with its possible NWS parallels like Hbr. ṛawān and šūwān, is maintained.

\(^{168}\) See concrete examples with discussion in Streck 2002:242–244, 254–256. The chief guide for positing a long ā in an Akkadian ma-lexeme is the lack of vocalic accommodation in Assyrian; occasional plene-spellings are, it seems, less reliable in this respect. For a sober evaluation of these criteria v. Streck 2002:254.

\(^{169}\) At least in the traditional grammars. A comprehensive semantic analysis of \(mV\)-nouns in WS in the style of Streck 2002 must remain an important desideratum of comparative Semitic morphology.

\(^{170}\) As against Kuryłowicz (1961:132), who postulates a secondary generalization of maqtal- to the detriment of maqtīl- in Akkadian.
Ethiopic. What we can reconstruct is the variety of *mV-patterns as such, not concrete morphological shapes with well-defined semantics (cf. Barth 1894a:235–238).

On the other hand, the MSA facts, which have never been seriously touched upon since Bittner 1909:28–32, remain heavily understudied and, before a special synchronic and diachronic investigation is carried out, cannot be used for any meaningful comparison with the CS and EthS evidence. A full account of the Soqotri data would be particularly rewarding since in this language, almost unaffected by Arabic influence, the majority of *mV-nouns have a good chance of being true reflexes of the Proto-MSA picture.171

3.2.4. The patterns *C₁aC₂C₃ and *C₁aC₂aC₃, highly prominent in the nominal derivation systems of the majority of the WS languages, are practically missing from Akkadian.

3.2.4.1. Verbal nouns with the pattern *C₁aC₂C₃ are reliably attested in at least three representatives of the WS branch, viz. Arabic, Geez and Hebrew (Fox 2003:133–138).172 This way of nominal formation can thus be safely projected to the common ancestor of CS and EthS. However, it is hard to say whether this feature is shared by Proto-MSA.173 Its nearly complete absence from Akkadian is, at first sight, rather certain: with very few possible exceptions, derived *C₁aC₂C₃-nouns are missing from

---

171 A survey of the 200-page Soqotri glossary to the first volume of our Corpus of Soqotri Oral Literature reveals the following major types of substantives with mV-prefixation: məzhīro ‘seasonal transhumance to lower areas,’ məRhīyo ‘seasonal transhumance to upper areas,’ məRhīyo ‘tethering rope,’ məRhīmo ‘scratch, abrasion,’ məRhīro ‘cauterization,’ məRhīlo ‘doorstep,’ məRhīzo ‘fold of garment used for wrapping,’ məRhīd ‘pillow,’ məRmīmo ‘rope attached to the milk-skin for shaking,’ məRhēlo ‘three stones supporting a cooking pot,’ məRhēlo ‘a worn-out milk-skin’; məRhīre ‘woolen mantle,’ məRhēre ‘carrying pole,’ məRhēle ‘fault, shame,’ məRhāme ‘suspicion’; məRhīdū ‘anything with which a door-opening can be blocked,’ məRhīr ‘dung,’ məRhīr ‘cauterizing instrument,’ məRhik ‘a mat for trampling dates,’ məRhīm ‘area around the pen,’ məRhīb ‘milking place for large cattle; məRhēk ‘a wooden stick on which cuts of meat are strung;’ məRhīz ‘a food which breaks the monotony of one’s diet;’ māRhāl ‘clay plastering over a burial pit,’ māRhāz ‘neck segment of a slaughtered animal;’ māRhāḥ ‘stick;’ māRhēk ‘tethering rope;’ māRhēr ‘buttermilk thickened by boiling,’ māRhāzHEL ‘spindle,’ māRhāk ‘rock, boulder.’ A comprehensive formal and semantic assessment of this evidence is beyond the scope of the present chapter, but the high prominence of məRh₁C₂C₃ and məRhC₁C₄C₅ is evident.

172 As rightly observed by J. Fox (2003:137–138), the Hebrew examples are sparse (a convenient summary of the attested lexemes can be found in Bauer–Leander 1922:458), particularly in comparison with the rather numerous verbal nouns formed after the pattern *C₁aC₂C₃. In view of the high prominence of *C₁aC₂C₃ verbal nouns also in Ugaritic (Tropper 2000:485–486), one may surmise that the role of *C₁aC₂C₃ at the earliest stages of the development of WS was relatively modest. Within this approach, the high prominence of *C₁aC₂C₃ in the nominal derivation system of Arabic must be regarded as the final stage of a long, gradual process. In such a context, it is not surprising that concrete derived lexemes produced after this pattern and traceable to PWS or even PCS are few and, in most cases, not quite reliable (Kogan 2008b:96–97).

173 A sound conclusion in respect to this issue is hampered by at least three circumstances: (I) verbal nouns formed through non-augmented patterns are not very common in MSA (particularly in the continental languages); (2) in the continental languages (especially in Mehri) the number of non-borrowed verbal roots from which such nouns could be produced is seriously reduced under the impact of Arabic loanwords; and (3) rules of historical phonology of (Proto-)MSA are still poorly understood so that in many cases we simply cannot say with confidence what a canonical reflex of *C₁aC₂C₃ is expected to look like.
Akkadian, this morphological shape being almost exclusively reserved for primary nouns (GAG 71, Buccellati 1996:73, Fox 2003:132–133). However, as already hinted at by W. von Soden, what is true for the synchronically attested Akkadian need not be automatically projected to its more or less remote prehistory: such nominal formations as *garr ‘seed,’ *varg ‘sunset,’ *hābr ‘grave,’ *mawet ‘death,’ *tum ‘taste’ (Kogan 2008b:95–96) have good chances to be deverbal rather than primary, yet their reflexes (zēru, erbu, ḫabru, mātu) are well attested and firmly rooted in Akkadian. As soon as the eventually derived nature of such nouns is recognized, one is forced to project the derivational process to an earlier, pre-Akkadian stage, which means to implicitly acknowledge the existence of the *C1aCaC3– pattern as early as in PS.

We may conclude that the status of the derivational pattern *C1aCaC3– as a PWS isogloss is not unambiguous: its presence in Proto-MSA cannot be shown conclusively; its importance in individual WS languages is uneven; and one cannot exclude that at least some *C1aCaC3– verbal nouns were produced as early as in PS.  

3.2.4.2. As far as the *C1aCaC3– pattern is concerned, the Arabic picture is, again, the most systematic and transparent: as pointed out by J. Fox (2003:160), this pattern is a “very common, almost regular [masdar] for intransitive qatila verbs.” In Hebrew, the number of *C1aCaC3– verbal nouns is more restricted and their association with the “middle” verbs is less prominent (Bauer–Leander 1922:462–463, Kuryłowicz 1961:110, Fox 2003:163), yet there are good reasons to believe that the two systems go back to a common CS prototype. In G Geez, the productivity of the *C1aCaC3– pattern for verbal nouns seems to have been eroded rather drastically (Fox 2003:161), but at least one concrete Proto-EthS lexeme, *raḥab- ‘hunger,’ has straightforward formal and semantic parallels in both Arabic and Hebrew and can be reliably projected to PWS (SED I No. 59.). There is, finally, a substantial body of evidence in favor of a relatively high productivity of *C1aCaC3– verbal nouns in Proto-MSA. Thus, not a small number of verbal nouns arguably going back to *C1aCaC3– are attested in Soqotri: vāgeb ‘wish, need,’ bēdal ‘dirt, dung,’ ṣeṭa- ‘speech’ (LS 254), nēfaw ‘work, profession; affair, thing’ (LS 271), raḥāk ‘distance’ (LS 396), ṣīḥār ‘drought, starvation’ (LS 432), ṭēḥaf ‘preparation,’ ṭāhem ‘urine,’ wākar ‘old age’ (LS 325), nāḥag ‘play’ (LS 259), rākah ‘female inlorescence’ (LS 406), ṭēfēs ‘slowness’ (LS 404). In many of such cases, a “middle” verb as the source of derivation is either synchronically attested, or can easily be supplied diachronically. In Jibbali, cf. ṣeṭol ‘vegetation

---

174 It is hard to say whether a few Old Assyrian examples of pars- where Old Babylonian has pars- (gamru ‘expenditures,’ malku ‘advice,’ Kogan 2006c:207) may have any bearing on this issue. As observed by J. Fox (2003:133) and L. Kogan (2006c:205–207), similar contrasting pairs are attested among primary nouns as well and, in at least some such cases (zakrum ‘man,’ napašum ‘life’), the Old Assyrian forms appear to be closer to the respective PS proto-types than their Old Babylonian parallels.

175 “In einigen Fallen ... ist es nicht klar, ob das Substantiv oder das Verbum primär ist.”

176 J. Kuryłowicz (1961:101) postulates “l’association primitive de qott avec le perfection transitif qatala, et celle de qitl, avec le perfection intransiiti qatila,” but such a reconstruction can hardly be supported by any material evidence and is likely to be rejected.

177 Including some concrete lexical reconstructions such as *samal– ‘work, toil, labor’ (Kogan 2008b:101).

178 Examples with no reference to LS have been collected during our fieldwork on the island.

179 vēgab ‘to want,’ bēdel ‘to be dirty,’ ṣīḥāro ‘to happen (draught),’ ṭēkof ‘to be correct, well-arranged.’
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growing after rain’ (JL 25), ġélēb ‘early morning’ (JL 46), gédém ‘leprosy’ (JL 71), héleb ‘difficulty’ (JL 97), hézél ‘isolation’ (JL 122), héfér ‘hard time’ (JL 156), mérég ‘illness’ (JL 174), šélêr ‘stiffness of the neck’ (JL 246). A few concrete lexical reconstructions may be traceable to Proto-MSA: *ryāgab- ‘need, wish, love’ > Soq. rağēb, Mhr. rağēb (ML 16), Jib. rağšēb (JL 9), perhaps *raḥkā- ‘growth’ > Soq. raḥkar, Mhr. raḥkor (ML 20), Jib. raḥkor (JL 11), *raḥiym- ‘urine’ > Soq. ṭāḥem, Mhr. ṭāḥom (ML 83), Jib. ṭāḥom (JL 49).

Verbal nouns with the pattern *C₁aC₂aC₃- are not attested in Akkadian, but the true picture is obviously more complex than this simple statement: as is well known, the sequence *C₁aC₂aC₃- could not have been preserved in Akkadian because of the vocalic syncope rule. In principle, the expected outcome would be *pars-, but empirical observation on primary nouns with *C₁aC₂aC₃- in the prototype shows that *pars- is the most frequent, almost the regular reflex of this morphological shape (Dolgopolsky 1991, Fox 2003:157–159, Krebernik 2006:84–88). Should we suspect that a similar process might have affected the derived substantives as well? In other words, is it possible that some of the Akkadian verbal nouns of the pattern *pars- go back to PS *C₁aC₂aC₃- rather than to *C₁iC₂C₃? This question does not seem to have ever been raised in the existing studies of the *C₁aC₂aC₃- > *pars- problem.¹¹⁸ In our opinion, while not impossible per se, such a development is not very likely for semantic reasons: the typical function of the *pars- pattern in Akkadian is to produce substantives designating the result of an action expressed by a transitive verb (nomina passiva) (see Fox 2003:141–142). This is not in agreement with the WS picture summarized above: as we have just seen, in Proto-WS *C₁aC₂aC₃- was primarily associated with intransitive (or low-transitive) verbs and had no passive-resultative meaning.

We may conclude that the status of the derivational pattern *C₁aC₂aC₃- as a PWS innovation has a relatively safe footing. Moreover, one can plausibly relate the emergence of this innovation to the introduction of the “middle” verbs qatila : yiqtatu as a special morphological class — in itself, one of the most promising morphological innovations uniting all WS languages in opposition to Akkadian.

4. In search of Proto-West Semitic lexical features

Most of the remaining sections of this chapter will be occupied by a systematic inquiry into the lexical features potentially relevant for defining Proto-West Semitic as a genealogical unity. Concepts included into the Swadesh wordlist will serve as a conventional starting point, to be further supplemented by other strata of the basic vocabulary.

4.1. The Swadesh wordlist

¹¹⁸ For nǐṣaw, cf. Jib. nīṣaw ‘to be useful’ (JL 181) as opposed to násaw ‘to work’ (active type) in Soqotri; for nāḥak, cf. Jib. nēḥak ‘to be far away’ (JL 209), no basic stem in Soqotri where the verbal meaning “to be far away” is expressed by the causative-reflexive śēḥak.

¹¹¹ Unlike the *C₁aC₂VcC₃- adjectives, whose immunity to the a > i shift has been duly acknowledged by A. Dolgopolsky and J. Fox.
4.1.1. A quick look at the Akkadian basic vocabulary as reflected in the Swadesh wordlist reveals that in at least five cases the Akkadian lexeme is opposed to a clear-cut unified WS equivalent: ḫātu vs. *yad- ‘hand,’ ḫakkādu vs. *raš- ‘head,’ amūtu vs. *kabid-(at)- ‘liver,’ māšu vs. *layliy-(at)- ‘night,’182 sinništu vs. *ant-at- ‘woman.’ Unfortunately, these features are practically irrelevant for defining WS as a genealogical unity: in each and every case we are faced with transparent PS archaisms whose reflexes are reliably, even if residually, preserved also in Akkadian.183

4.1.2. A less transparent case is that of the demonstrative elements *qV (singular) and *rVll (plural) which permeate the system of the near deixis in almost all WS languages, but are completely unattested with this function in Akkadian, where it is carried by the inflected forms of annû.184

In view of the Sargonic spelling with Á (Hasselbach 2005:160), the Akkadian form can easily be reduced to *hanni, whose reflexes can be seen in a variety of deictic morphemes and lexemes in WS languages, including the article *han and the adverb *hanni (Tropper 2000:737, Rubin 2005:72–81).

Etymological parallels to the *dV/*rVll system in Akkadian are not quite transparent. As argued by J. Huehnergard (2006:116–118), *qV is cognate with the Akkadian relative pronoun ša, whose prototype *tu can be reliably established on the basis of the Sargonic orthography with ŠV signs. An obvious problem faced by this comparison (otherwise quite appealing if only for distributional reasons) is the apparently unmotivated shift from *t to *q (or vice versa).185 As for the plural morpheme *rVll, it is thought to be preserved in ullû, the remote demonstrative pronoun in Babylonian (Hasselbach 2007:23). This comparison implies that the plural form of the near deixis was somehow generalized as the unified exponent of the remote deixis — a possible, yet rather intricate development.186

These difficulties notwithstanding, it still seems easier to assume (with Hasselbach 2007) that the WS situation reflects the original PS picture, whereas Akkadian, here again, has innovated. If this conclusion is correct, this case cannot be of relevance for the historical unity of WS either.187

4.1.3. A methodologically less rigid approach to the lexical evidence from the Swadesh wordlist will allow us to bring into the discussion two additional proto-lexemes, namely *ḥrr ‘to be cold’ and *ṭaw ‘to come.’

The reflexes of *ḥrr ‘to be cold’ have already been listed and analyzed in Chapter 1 (pp. 38-39). Its status as the main PWS exponent of this meaning cannot be established with absolute certainty, yet it is very likely at least for Proto-CS and Proto-

182 For the status of this root in (Proto-)MSA see Chatper 8, p. 527 below.
183 See Chapter 1 (pp. 28-44) for a detailed survey of the lexical and etymological facts.
184 A detailed and up-to-date survey of the evidence can be found in Hasselbach 2007:5–17.
185 Another obstacle, viz. the Hebrew relative šā, is considered immaterial by Huehnergard, who derives šā from nāšār.
186 The situation in Tigre, where ṭall- was generalized for all forms of the near deixis, is thus not exactly parallel.
187 It is only the hypothetical shift from *t to *q that can potentially be regarded as a shared innovation of PWS.
EthS. If the possible MSA cognates discussed below in Chapter 8\textsuperscript{188} are found acceptable, this evaluation is likely to be projected to PWS. Conversely, there is no trace of *\textit{ḫwr} in Akkadian,\textsuperscript{189} where the meaning “to be cold” is expressed by the etymologically uncertain \textit{kasū} (CAD K 269, AHw. 459).

The reconstruction of *\textit{ttw} (or *\textit{ty}) as the main PWS exponent of the meaning “to come” is also a feasible possibility. Basic status is safely attested for several of its CS reflexes, such as Syr. \textit{etā} (LSyr. 54),\textsuperscript{190} Arb. \textit{yā} (Lane 14)\textsuperscript{191} and, with all probability, Sab. \textit{tw}/\textit{ty} (SD 9).\textsuperscript{192} The meaning “to come home,” “to return” characteristic of Gez. \textit{natawa} (CDG 46) can easily be traced back to a more original “to come”; the same is likely true of Jib. \textit{iṭā} ‘to come upon, to happen to be’ (JL 294). The semantic shift “to come” > “to pass by,” to be postulated for Soq. \textit{ēṭā} ‘passer, traverser’ (LS 76), is unproblematic and finds an excellent parallel in Akk. \textit{bāru} ‘to walk along’ (CAD B 178, AHw. 116) vs. Hbr. \textit{bā}‘ (‘to come’ (HALOT 112) and Gez. \textit{bāna} ‘to enter’ (CDG 114). There is, in our view, no fully reliable cognate for *\textit{ttw}/*\textit{ty} in Akkadian, contra DRS 650–651 where *\textit{ttw} is confidently identified with Ackk. \textit{watū} ‘to find’ (AHw. 1493, CAD A 518).\textsuperscript{193} While both the shift *\textit{r} > *\textit{w}- (or vice versa?) and the meaning development from “to come” into “to find” are conceivable,\textsuperscript{194} taken together they constitute a rather serious obstacle, and it is certainly not accidental that this comparison is left unmentioned in the respective entries of the major tools of Semitic lexicography (AHw., HALOT, LSyr., CDG, LS).

In both of these cases, there is no compelling evidence in favor of a hypothetical lexical innovation in PWS, but in view of the absence of transparent remnants of the respective roots in Akkadian such a possibility is not to be discarded.

The third, rather interesting, case is *\textit{wabh} ‘to give.’ In two WS sub-branches, Aramaic and Ethiopion, reflexes of this root function as the main exponents of the meaning “to give”: Syr. \textit{y(h)ab} (LSyr. 298), Gez. \textit{wahaba} (CDG 609). The same was likely the case in ESA: Sab. \textit{whb} (SD 158), Min. \textit{whb} (LM 103), Qat \textit{whb} (LIQ 49). In Arabic, \textit{whb} is quite common (Lane 2968), but not as the basic verb for “to give.”\textsuperscript{195} In Hebrew, only the imperative \textit{hab} (mostly \textit{hābā}) is attested (HALOT 236), more or less exactly parallel to Soq. \textit{hāba} ‘donna!’ (LS 140). This evidence allows us to reconstruct this root as a PWS feature, apparently with no Akkadian cognate. Its exact functional status in

\textsuperscript{188} Mhr. \textit{hakrāwr} ‘to go at midday’ (ML 233), Jib. \textit{kārēr} ‘tomorrow’ (JL 148), Soq. \textit{kārēr} ‘dēmain’ (LS 388). See further p. 551.

\textsuperscript{189} One has to agree with W. Leslau (CDG 444), who rejects any connection between PWS *\textit{ḫwr} and Akkadian \textit{ḫāraru} accepted in Fronzaroli 1965a:142, 147, whatever the exact meaning of the Akkadian verb may be (‘to flow, to overflow’ in CAD Q 127 vs. ‘sich krümmen, schlängen’ in AHw. 902).

\textsuperscript{190} And elsewhere in Aramaic; see further Chapter 6, p. 383.

\textsuperscript{191} At least in the Koran, \textit{nād} appears to be nearly as frequent as \textit{ʒāw}. Possible semantic and/or stylistic distribution between these two roots in the Koranic corpus, let alone elsewhere in Classical Arabic, would deserve a comprehensive study of its own. At present, it is rather a morphological distinction that most readily suggests itself: \textit{ʒāw} is used exclusively in the suffix conjugation, where \textit{nād} is quite uncommon.

\textsuperscript{192} Admittedly, not for Ugr. \textit{ntw} (DUL 123); see Chapter 4, p. 251.

\textsuperscript{193} ”Sans doute en relation ...” Contrast DRS 36-37 (“il faut probablement séparer ...”).

\textsuperscript{194} A prime example is, of course, Hbr. \textit{ms̄r} ‘to find’ < PS *\textit{mr} ‘to come, to reach’ (HALOT 619).

\textsuperscript{195} But rather with a special emphasis on “giving as a free gift, disinterestedly” (= to grant).
PWS remains to be established.¹⁹⁶

Let us finally mention the concept “to be round.” At first sight, this semantically peripheral member of the Swadesh list has a disparate variety of exponents throughout Semitic. However, the coincidence between Hbr. ūgōl (HALOT 784) and Soq. gāvalhal (LS 113)¹⁹⁷ as the basic terms with this meaning is remarkable enough to make one consider the metathetic pair *gol/*gol as a candidate for the PWS term for “to be round.” Further confirmation for this assumption comes from the Ethiopian domain, where *gol with the meaning “to be round” is rather prominently attested (even if does not seem to achieve the basis status in any of the languages concerned): Gez. ragala ‘to make an enclosure, to surround with a wall’ (CDG 59), Tgr. aggālā ‘to pile up in a circle, to assemble,’ ṣaggal ‘round’ (WTS 487), Amh. aggālā ‘to build a hedge or palisade’ (AED 1318). In Arabic, both ṭl ‘to be quick, hasty’ (Lane 1963) and ẓ̱wāl- ‘a black insect that rolls along a little ball of dung’ (ibid. 431) deserve attention. See also Chapter 3 (pp. 204-205) for PCS *ragal-at- ‘wagon,’ clearly derived from this root. There is no trace of either *gol or *gol in Akkadian.

4.1.4. We may conclude that the Swadesh wordlist provides a rather limited amount of evidence for the historical unity of West Semitic: with the possible exception of the demonstrative pronoun *qšV, there is hardly any position in the list where the the WS picture would be both sufficiently unified (that is, reliably represented by each of the three conventional WS branches) and potentially innovative. It is now time to expand our survey to other segments of the basic vocabulary.

4.2. Other lexical strata¹⁹⁸

1. Ugr. ṭāl̥p (DUL 62), Hbr. ṭāl̥āp (HALOT 59), Syr. ṭal̥pā (LSyr. 22), Arb. ṭal̥- (Lane 80), Sab. ṭl̥f (SD 5), Min. ṭl̥f (LM 5), Qat. ṭl̥f (LIQ 11), Gez. ṭal̥f (CDG 19), Mhr. ṭ̥lf (ML 5), Jib. ṭ̥lf (JL 3) > PWS *ṭāl̥p- ‘thousand.’

◊ There is no trace of *ṭal̥p- ‘thousand’ in Akkadian. Its semantic equivalent is ḥim(u) (CAD L 197, AHw. 553), presumably related to Ugr. ḥim ‘people, clan’ (DUL 487), Hbr. ḥim ‘nation’ (HALOT 513), Arb.*bm ‘to put together,’ ḥm- ‘agreement, concord’ (WKAS L 55, 60), eventually also Sab. bm ‘to make a peace settlement’ (SD 81), Tgr. ḥāramā ‘to be attached, friendly’ (WTS 42), Tna. ḥāramā ‘to be good, patient, docile’ (TED 107).

¹⁹⁶ To reconstruct *ṭḥb as the main PWS exponent of the meaning “to give” would be somewhat far-fetched. One may rather suspect that the most archaic situation is preserved in Hebrew and Soqotri, where the biconsonantal element *ṭḥb functions as a kind of exhortation particle or interjection. The subsequent generalization of the fully-fledged triconsonantal root *ṭḥb (at the expense of *ṭṭb?) was particularly strong in the Arabian area (Arabic/ESA/Proto-EthS). The well-known paradigmatic syncretism in Aramaic apparently marks the utmost Northern limit of the progress of this isogloss.

¹⁹⁷ See also Jib. gāval̥ ‘round,’ kindly registered on our behalf by Miranda Morris during her fieldwork in Dhofar.

¹⁹⁸ In this section, ◊ introduces the discussion of possible traces of the pertinent WS root in Akkadian as well as its Akkadian semantic equivalent and its origin; ♦ introduces the discussion of the hypothetical origin of the WS term (if there is one).
♦ Direct identification with PS *rałp- ‘head of large cattle,’ taken for granted in Fox 2003:74, is semantically difficult. An eventual connection with Arb. *dāf ‘to keep to something,’ (II) ‘to unite, to bring together’ (Lane 79–80) is worth considering.

2. Ugr. ṛimt ‘truth’ (DUL 75), Hbr. ṭmn (nip.) ‘to be reliable, faithful,’ (hip.) ‘to have trust, to believe’ (HALOT 63), Syr. ṭette(ḥ)men ‘perseveravit, mansit,’ ṭammīnā ‘constans, assiduus, continuus’ (LSyr. 25), Arb. ṭmn ‘to be safe, secure’ (Lane 100), Sab. ṭmn ‘to be secure’ (SD 6), Min. ṭmn ‘protéger’ (ML 5), Qat. sī-ṭmn ‘to protect, to secure’ (LIQ 12), Gez. ṭamma ‘to believe, to trust’ (CDG 24), Mhr. šāmnā ‘to believe’ (ML 5), Jib. šin ‘to believe,’ reyēn ‘truth’ (JL 3), Soq. émon ‘dire la vérité,’ šēram ‘croire,’ īmen ‘vérité’ (LS 64) > PWS *ṭmn ‘to be true, trustworthy; to have trust’ (DRS 23, Marrassini 1971:80–82).

♦ There is no trace of *ṭmn ‘to be true’ in Akkadian. Its main semantic equivalent is takālu (CAD T 63, AHw. 1304), presumably going back to PS *wkl (DRS 539–540, CDG 573, Kaufman 1974:106).

♦ An eventual relationship with PS *yamVn- ‘right hand, right side’ (SED I No. 292) is an intriguing, yet hardly demonstrable possibility.

3. Ugr. ṛāšbē (DUL 115), Hbr. ṛāšbā’ (HALOT 81), Syr. ṣebā’ā (LSyr. 227), Arb. ṛāšbē- (Lane 1646), Sab. ṣbē (SD 140), Gez. ṛāšbēt (CDG 45), Mhr. ṣbāp (ML 397), Jib. ṛāšbē (JL 5), Soq. ṣbē (LS 70) > PWS *risbâr- ‘finger’ (SED I No. 256).

♦ There is no reliable trace of *risbâr- ‘finger’ in Mesopotamian Akkadian: ni-ış- bit-tū in the left column of Malku (IV 217) must be considered a WS (loan)word (CAD N₂ 190), even if the n-prefixation is unusual and remains to be explained. The cognate forms reliably attested in the Ebla vocabulary (i-sa-ba-um and similar, Kerenbenik 1983:18) might be attributed to WS influence, but in view of the presence of dḥb ‘finger’ in Egyptian (Wb. V 565) it is more likely that the Ebla forms represent a PS archaism lost in Mesopotamia.

The standard Akkadian replacement ubānu (CAD U/W 3, AHw. 1398) goes back to the PS designation of “thumb” (SED I No. 34). As rightly observed by G. Conti (1990:143), the dichotomy “finger” : “thumb,” lost in Mesopotamian Akkadian, was still maintained in Ebla (i-sa-ba-um vs. ba-ṣā-ṇu in VE 499).

199 “Herd of cattle” > “a lot” > “thousand” according to HALOT 59, but, as aptly observed in Fronzaroli 1969:20, “rałp- non indica il gruppo ma l’individuo.” Contrast DRS 21 where the two terms are carefully kept apart.

200 Most of the remaining forms in continental MSA are certain or likely Arabisms. It is noteworthy that the Soqotri verb as recorded in our fieldwork notes is morphologically unique because of the stable open e in the first syllable (in a normal Soqotri verb, e would be expected in this position). A borrowing readily suggests itself, but there is hardly any suitable semantic source, as the verbal meaning “to tell the truth” does not seem to be directly attested for this root anywhere in Semitic.

201 To some extent, also kānu (cf. Lämmerhirt 2010:11).

202 Read i-iṣ-bit-tū with Streck 2002:249?
4. Hbr. ֶת, with pronominal suffixes ָת- (HALOT 100), Pho. ֲת (Friedrich–Röllig 1999:184–185, 196–197), OArm. ֲת (DNWSI 48), Sam. ֲת- (ibid.), Arb. ֶיְה- (Lane 135), Gez. ֶי (CDG 300), Mhr. ַ (ML 398), Jib. ַ- (JL xxvi, 269), Soq. ַ- (LS 436) > PWS *יָת- nota accusativi.204

♦ ♦ In spite of the superficial attractiveness of this feature as a potential PWS innovation, a coherent reconstruction of its diachronic background is faced with numerous difficulties which seriously undermine its relevance for the purpose of our analysis.

– The reconstruction *יָת- , tentatively proposed above, does not easily account for the emergence of each and every hypothetical cognate. For example, the diachronic identity of MSA ַ- with Hebrew ֶת, acknowledged by C. Broekelmann (1908:315) and M. Bittner (1913a:52), is hard to demonstrate persuasively — which is only natural for a monoconsonantal morpheme with a relatively trivial grammatical function.205 Even more problematic is the background of the Geez particle ֶי , and as long as the origin of the element ֶ is left without explanation, its diachronic identification with Arabic ֶי (Brockelmann 1908:314, Testen 1997–1998:215, Correll 1994:22 and elsewhere) must remain an unproved hypothesis.206 But even the apparently more straightforward CS forms are fraught with diachronic difficulties, such as the contraction *יָת- > *ָ > *ַ in Hebrew, the hypercorrect (?) ֶ- in Samalian or the unexpected double ָ- in Arabic. One willingly adheres to Testen’s pessimistic conclusion in 1997–1998:216: “The diversity of shapes observed ... runs counter to the phonological developments as we currently understand them. In view of this fact, it is impossible to identify any one shape which could have served as the linear, lautgesetzlich ancestor of all the documented forms.”

– Reflexes of *יָת- are totally missing from two prominent representatives of the Central Semitic branch, viz. Ugaritic and ESA. While it is of course not impossible that in both cases we are faced with a traceless loss of an archaic PWS feature, an alternative solution immediately suggests itself: it may be that these languages are too

---

204 For the earliest attestation of *יָת- in an Arabian context v. Stein 2012 (י-המ in a fifth century B.C. Sabaic inscription on wood). As reasonably argued by Stein, this feature is to be considered a North Arabian infiltration (together with other similar phenomena in the inscriptions coming from the Amirit tribal area) rather than an otherwise unattested authentically Sabaic element.


206 Even if the Late Punic ִ- provides a fine precedent for the reduction of *יָת- to *ִ (for a survey of similar reduced forms in later Hebrew and Aramaic v. Correll 1994:22, 25). As pointed out by D. Testen (1997–1998:216), “the Modern South Arabian ַ- will not figure in the following discussion, because the limits of our current understanding of the historical phonology of these languages prevent us from determining the position of the attested ַ- with respect to the data provided by the remaining Semitic languages” (cf. also Correll 1994:21).

207 This etymology is not even mentioned (let alone properly considered) in CDG 300. As far as we can see, there is no suitable morphological element beginning with ַ whose fusion with *יָת- could yield the attested Geez form. The comparative preposition *יָ is not a feasible candidate because of the semantic difference. Perhaps more fitting would be the terminative preposition ַ in Minaean and Hadramitic (LM 52), and cf. further Amh. ָה ‘at, to’ (AED 1361). C. Correll (1994:37–39) tentatively surmises generalization of the second person oblique pronoun *יָ (for a more general framework behind this hypothesis see below), but this is not very likely.
ancient (and/or too archaic) to have been affected by a relatively recent innovation originating in a certain nuclear area and spreading across genealogical subdivisions via geographic diffusion. Such a hypothesis is corroborated by the well-known observations on the gradual (and comparatively late) establishment of the reflexes of *nāyāl- in Phoenician \(^{207}\) and Hebrew.\(^{208}\)

– There is no fully satisfactory explanation for the emergence of *nāyāl-. In our view, its eventual relationship with the element *qāl(i)- in the oblique forms of the personal pronouns in Akkadian (šwālī)\(^{209}\) and some of the WS languages (Ugr. and Sab. hwīt) is the only possibility to be taken into serious consideration, as recognized by numerous scholars from Brockelmann 1908:313 to Correll 1994:32–39.\(^{210}\) Within this approach, the absence of *nāyāl- from Ugaritic and ESA acquires a totally new meaning which does not seem to have been recognized by earlier researchers: as is well known, these are the only representatives of the WS branch where the independent oblique forms of the personal pronouns are preserved.\(^{211}\) One could tentatively surmise that when these forms started to fall into disuse, the element *qāl(i)- could somehow be re-used as an accusative preposition.\(^{212}\) A comprehensive exposition of various stages of this process is far beyond the scope of our presentation.\(^{213}\) More important in the present context is the chronological dimension of this hypothesis. By its very nature, it cannot be reconciled with the interpretation of *nāyāl- as a PWS feature: since independent oblique pronouns were certainly a PWS (and even PCS) feature, the gradual extinction and replacement with *nāyāl- can only be attributed to comparatively


\(^{208}\) See already Gesenius 1910:363: “The rare occurrence of the *nota accusativi in poetic style ... may be explained from the fact that in this as in other respects ... poetry represents a somewhat more archaic stage of the language than prose.”

\(^{209}\) There is hardly any alternative cognate for *nāyāl- in Akkadian. Correll (1994:22, 36–37) is undoubtedly correct to dissociate the possessive element attu- in later Akkadian from *nāyāl- (contra Brockelmann 1908:315 and AHw. 88). The origin of attu- is uncertain, but this is not the only example of a diachronically opaque morpho-lexical innovation in post-OA/OB Akkadian.

\(^{210}\) Particularly infelicitous are the attempts to derive it from non-attested nominal lexemes with a variety of abstract meanings, emphatically rejected in Correll 1994:23 yet undertaken anew in Testen 1997–1998.

\(^{211}\) Non-productive remnants of the oblique t-forms detected in various Semitic languages are irrelevant from this point of view (cf. Correll 1994:32–33). The functional parallelism between nāyāl- and the independent oblique pronouns has been pointedly observed in Stein 2012:464–466.

\(^{212}\) This approach presupposes that the original domain of *nāyāl- was the personal pronoun only, with a subsequent spread to the pre-nominal position. The cumulative evidence of Arabic, Geez and MSA would speak in favor of such a possibility even outside the diachronic framework developed here (see Correll 1994:24 and Joüon–Muraoka 2005:344, in contrast to D. Testen’s hesitating position in 1997–1998:215).

\(^{213}\) One may wonder whether the hybrid forms of the independent oblique pronouns of the first person singular (ia-ti-ia, ia-sī-ia) and plural (ia-ti-nu, ia-sī-nu) in Amarna Canaanite (Rainey 1996 I 53–56, 68, 70) could provide a structural analogy for the hypothetical development envisaged here: the base of an independent oblique pronoun is re-used as an unchangeable core element to which pronominal suffixes are appended (cf. Correll 1994:36). That such hybrids actually reflect the scribes’ attempts to render Canaanite forms based on *nāyāl- is not to be ruled out entirely, but the chronological pattern of introduction of *nāyāl- outlined above suggests that this was too early a date for this.
late stages of the development of individual Semitic languages. It is a moot question how this development could independently affect so many idioms with no special geographic and genealogical proximity (later NWS, Arabic, Geez and MSA), even if it is precisely such an independent development that could best explain the perplexing variety of the attested reflexes. A reasonable alternative has already been envisaged above: a comparatively late diffusion from a certain nuclear area, admittedly hard to establish at present.

5. Hbr. ֵןפ (HALOT 814), Syr. ֵנהפ (LSyr. 520), Arb. ֵף (Lane 2079), Sab. ֵף (SD 22), Gez. ֵנהפ (CDG 76), Mhr. ֵנהפ (ML 34), Jib. ֵף (JL 18) > PWS *ֵנפ ‘to wrap, to fold’ (LS 305).

◊ There is no trace of *ֵנפ ‘to wrap’ in Akkadian, unless one compares ֵעופט ‘household goods, belongings’ (CAD U/W 359, AHw. 1446). The underlying semantic derivation is not implausible (“something wrapped,” “a bundle”), but the phonetic aspect of this comparison is problematic since the word is attested exclusively in Old Assyrian, where the second and third root consonants cannot be identified with certainty.

6. Hbr. ֵֽד (HALOT 795), BArm. ֵֽד (ibid. 1944), Arb. ֵֽד(a), Gez. ֵֽד (CDG 55), Mhr. ֵֽד (ML 35), Jib. ֵֽד (JL 19), Soq. ֵֽד (LS 302) > PWS *ֵֽד- ‘(he is) still’.

◊ ♦ Standard etymological treatments of *ֵֽד- ‘(he is) still’ typically present it as having no Akkadian cognates. It may therefore appear as a likely candidate for a PWS lexical innovation, ultimately connected with the verbal root *ֵֽד ‘to turn.’ It is hard to avoid thinking, however, that the functional equivalent of *ֵֽד- in Akkadian, namely

---

214 The importance of this point has been duly recognized by C. Correll (1994:15–19), who does not hesitate to explain the different attested shapes of the nota accusativi by the difference in the underlying pronominal element: 1 sg. for *ֵֽד- (and similar) in Phoenician and Aramaic, 3 sg. m. for ֵֽד- in Samalian/Hebrew, and 2 sg. for ֵֽד- in Geez. In this extreme form, Correll’s hypothesis is too straightforward to be correct, but the main avenue of his argumentation, viz. the possibility of explaining the variety of the attested forms of the nota accusativi via different strategies of adaptation of the original oblique pronominal forms, deserves serious attention. As one can infer from Brockelmann 1908:314, he considered *ֵֽד- to be primary and the Akkadian pronouns to be secondarily derived from it, but in view of the existence of independent oblique forms in Ugaritic and ESA this analysis can hardly be correct (Testen 1997–1998:217).

215 With references to other (admittedly not very copious) Aramaic parallels.

216 The use of ֵֽד- with the meaning ‘still, yet’ is curiously absent from the classical sources and is not recognized by the standard dictionaries of classical Arabic (such as Lane 2188–2189). This is in glaring contrast with its broad presence in a variety of modern Arabic dialects and in post-classical written sources (Nöldeke 1904:66, Landberg 1901:421–422, BK 2 398, Dozy II 186, GD 2338–2339, BH 607, Wehr 653). Nöldeke’s inability to cope with this contradiction is more than understandable: “So nahe es liegt, dies ֵֽד einfach mit דע zu identifizieren, so wäre das doch angesichts der historischen Entwicklung unrichtig” (1904:66).

217 For possible parallels in Ugaritic and Sabaic v. Tropper 2000:747 and SD 22 respectively.

218 Reliably attested in a rather narrow circle of WS languages: Hbr. ֵֽד ‘to surround’ (HALOT 795, very marginal), Arb. ֵֽד ‘to return’ (Lane 2188), Sab. ֵֽד ‘to return’ (SD 22), Min. ֵֽד ‘returner’ (ML 17), Gez. ֵֽדה ‘to go around, to turn around’ (CDG 77).
adûni ‘until now; not yet’ (CAD A₁ 125, AHw. 13), has something to do with it also in terms of etymology.²²⁹ In a broader perspective, an eventual connection between *råd- and the PS preposition *ruÂday ‘until’ is not to be excluded.²²⁰

7. Hbr. râdša (HALOT 814), Syr. râdša (LSyr. 521), Arb. ṣš (Lane 2078), Gez. râdša (CDG 77), Mhr. râwša (ML 34), Jib. râsš (JL 19), Soq. râšš (LS 306) > ṣšš ‘to sneeze’ (SED I No. 4.). ◇ There is no trace of ṣšš in Akkadian, but the very meaning “to sneeze” is hardly ever attested in the extant Akkadian corpus. Our dictionaries consider šēhekhu as a candidate (CAD Š 263, AHw. 1209), for which see further SED I No. 70.
     ◇ PWS ṣšš ‘to sneeze’ is probably onomatopoetic (descriptive) in its origin.

8. Ugr. ṣw (DUL 195), Hbr. ṣwâ (HALOT 803), Syr. ṣwâ (LSyr. 518), Arb. ṣwâ- (Lane 2193),²²¹ Gez. ṭora (CDG 79), Mhr. ṭawâr (ML 37), Jib. ṭâr (JL 19), Soq. ṭôhr (LS 303) > PWS ṣw ‘to be blind’ (SED I No. 5.). ◇ There is no trace of ṣw ‘to be blind’ in Akkadian; all the alleged cognates mentioned in SED I No. 5., are highly unreliable. As demonstrated in W. Farber’s detailed study (1985), the main Akkadian exponent of the meaning “blind” was ḥûppdu (later uppâtu), cf. CAD Ḥ 240, AHw. 357, and CAD U/W 189. There are no WS cognates for any of the two variants.

9. Ugr. b (DUL 198), Hbr. b (HALOT 103), Syr. b (LSyr. 56), Arb. bi (Lane 141), Sab. b (SD 24), Gez. ba (CDG 82), Soq. b (LS 79) > PWS *bi ‘in; by means of (instrumental).²²²
     ◇ There is no reliable trace of *bi ‘in’ in Akkadian. That “*b- is undoubtedly trapped in the verb bašûm” (Huehnergard 2006:16) is, in our opinion, quite unlikely, at least before the mechanism leading to such a formation is persuasively expounded.²²³ There is, similarly, no reliable parallel for the Akkadian preposition ina (combining the locative and instrumental meanings exactly as its WS homologue does) anywhere in

²²⁹ Von Soden explains adûni as ‘bis zu uns,’ but this is, of course, merely a guess.

²²⁰ The semantic link between “still” and “until”/“as long as” is evident, cf. Russian Пока я живу! ‘I am still alive!’ vs. Я буду бороться, пока я живу ‘I will fight as long as I am alive.’ One can easily imagine how a sequence like adî balû ... ‘As long as she is alive ...’ could be transformed into ‘She is still alive.’ There remains, of course, the well-known phonological irregularity (PS *ruÂday > Akk. adî instead of the expected *edi), v. Kogan 2011:109–110.

²²¹ In Arabic, semantic marginalization from “to be blind” into “to be one-eyed” took place. The basic meaning “to be blind” is expressed by the root tym, of uncertain etymology (cf. SED I No. 3.).

²²² The vocalic reconstruction is rather conventional and relies on Arb. bi and the syllabic spelling bi-i in Ugaritic (Huehnergard 1987a:112). There is no good explanation for the shift *i > a in Geez (according to Brockelmann 1908:495, it took place under the influence of le).

²²³ The oft-suggested parallelism with Arb. fiÅ already and Gez. bo, going back to Brockelmann 1908:495 and most recently considered in Rubin 2005:45–46, 62 and Blažek 2007:31 is completely excluded on orthographic grounds (Hassellbach 2005:53, Kouwenberg 2010a:56). A fusion with isÅ ‘to have’ would be orthographically unassailable, yet the underlying semantic development is hard to imagine, even if the Akkadian verb originally meant “to be” rather than “to have” as in the attested sources.
WS. Huehnergard (2006:16) is almost certainly correct to reject Testen’s comparison of *ina with *min ‘from’ (Testen 1993b:10–11), but the identification with the element *m- in the Geez prepositions *mbala ‘without’ and *mbayna ‘because of’ (CDG 27), to which Huehnergard adheres,224 is, in our view, also quite doubtful.

◊ An eventual derivation from either *bayt- ‘house’ or *bawr ‘to come’ is not to be excluded (cf. Voigt 1999:37, 39–40, Blažek 2007:31).

10. Ugr. *bër (DUL 204), Hbr. *barad (HALOT 141), Arb. *barda (Lane 225), Sab. *ber (SD 25), Min. *ber (LM 19), Mhr. bād (ML 40), Jib. bard (JL 21), Soq. mm-bărād (LS 90) > PWS *baʿda ‘after, behind.’

◊ It stands to reason that the adverbial/prepositional element *bard- is the most archaic common manifestation of this consonantal root.225 In a few languages the (presumably derived) verbal meaning “to be far away” is attested: Syr. *bēd (aph.) ‘removit’ (LSyr. 83), Arb. *ber ‘to be removed, far off’ (Lane 224), Sab. *ber ‘to take away’ (SD 25), Jib. *bērēd ‘to send far away’ (JL 21, likely an Arabism). The meanings “to change,” “to separate,” “to render alien,” characteristic of Gez. *barada and its EthS cognates (CDG 83), likely represent a further semantic developmen from “to be far away” or similar.

There is no trace of *baʿda ‘after, behind’ in Akkadian.

11. Ugr. *bēl (DUL 222), Hbr. *bēl (HALOT 134), Syr. bēs (LSyr. 76), Arb. *bēl (Lane 249), Gez. *babra (CDG 95), Mhr. bōla (ML 49), Jib. bēlas (JL 25) > PWS *bēl ‘to swallow.’

◊ For the semantic shift “to swallow” > “to eat” in Proto-EthS v. Chapter 7 (pp. 435–436). The meaning “to swallow” in EthS came to be expressed by the reflexes of *wyet (Gez. *wēyya, CDG 611), whose original meaning was likely “to choke on a piece of food” (Kogan 2005c:202), cf. Arb. *wyt (II) (Lane 2309), Mhr. *wyt (ML 144), Jib. *wet (JL 90). The same semantic shift took place, presumably independently, in Soq. *wet (LS 305).

There is no trace of *bēl in Akkadian. Its semantic equivalent *wālātu (AHw. 35, CAD A1 336), with a later, and apparently secondary,226 variant *lārātu (AHw. 521, CAD L 6), is etymologically obscure (Kogan 2001:291–292).


---


225 It is not quite certain whether Gez. *bâd ‘other, different, strange’ (CDG 83) is ultimately to be traced to the same prototype or rather represents an independent nominal formation internally derived from *bard- ‘to alter, to separate.’

226 So explicitly Kouwenberg 2010a:73.

227 As is well known, the only EthS reflex of this root is Gez. banta *yāyn ‘pupil of the eye’ (CDG 99, with a widely attested semantic shift, Kogan–Militarev 2003:293–295). Amh. *bārūt in yā-ayn bārūt ‘pupil of the
The Akkadian reflexes of *bin- are binu, buntu ‘son’ (CAD B 242, 322, AHw. 127, 138) and bintu, buntu ‘daughter’ (CAD B 258, 319, AHw. 127, 138). The standard ditionaries implicitly treat them as autochthonous Akkadian lexemes, although in fact the possibility of a WS borrowing is to be seriously considered in view of their predominantly late and marginal attestation.

The standard Akkadian equivalent of *bin- is māru (CAD M1 300, AHw. 615), going back to PS *marr- ‘adult male’; otherwise represented by Proto-Aramaic *mārī- ‘lord’ (see Chapter 6, p. 386 below), Arb. ( TMPro marr- ‘man’ (Lane 2702), Sab. marr- ‘man; male child; lord’ (SD 87), Min. marr- ‘seigneur’ (LM 62), Qat. marr- ‘man; male child; lord’ (LIQ 98–99), perhaps Amh. māra ‘young man who has just attained physical maturity’ (AED 168).

In view of the rather transparent etymology of māru, its secondary nature with respect to a more original, presumably Proto-Semitic, *bin- would appear quite certain, even if the exact date of the replacement is hard to establish. One disturbing circumstance is the presence of the meaning “son” for the reflex of *mar- not only in Akkadian, but also in ESA: are we dealing with a completely independent semantic drift from the same PS source, or shall we rather assume that the meaning “male child” was present in nuce already in the proto-language? At any rate, one must acknowledge that the reflexes of *mar- in Akkadian and ESA are totally different with eye’ may be further related (Kogan 2003a:127–128). On *wald- as the Proto-EthS replacement of *bin- see below in Chapter 7 (p. 448). On the enigmatic shift *n- > -r- in the singular forms in Aramaic and MSA v. Testen 1985 and Chapters 6 and 8 below (pp. 388 and 567 respectively). The presence of brw ‘son’ (side by side with bn) in Sabaic and Minaean (SD 32, LM 24) is noteworthy; cf. also Amh. hotāt above in this footnote.

228 The corresponding derivations with the meaning “daughter,” formed through the addition of the feminine suffix *-t-, are ubiquitous and, for the sake of brevity, will be omitted from the discussion.

229 The presence of bu-ta-ta ‘daughter’ in the OA incantation BIN 4, 126:5 is, in principle, not very favorable for such an assumption, even if other possible examples of WS lexical influence on Old Assyrian are known (Kogan 2006c:212–213). Another intricate point is that a contemporary WS loanword in the Akkadian sources of the first millennium is practically excluded since the corresponding Aramaic form is *bir-, not *bin-. Perhaps we have to take both processes into account: a PS lexical archaism could have been marginally maintained due to the speakers’ (and writers’) awareness of the existence of a highly prominent cognate in the neighboring WS tongues.

230 As in the case of *bin-, feminine formations from *mar- with the meanings “woman; daughter; lady” are attested throughout the pertinent languages and will not be reproduced here.

231 According to Fronzaroli 1964:28–29 and 42, PS *mar- may ultimately be related to the verbal root *marr ‘to be fat, well-fed,’ represented by Akk. marā ‘to fatten’ (CAD M1, 307, AHw. 617), Ugr. marr ‘fattling’ (DUL 571), Hbr. mōri ( TMPro) ‘fatted steer’ (HALOT 635), Arb. marr ‘to be wholesome, easy to swallowing (food)’ (Lane 2702), perhaps Amh. mōra ‘animal fat’ (AED 174), Msq. Gog. Sod. mōra, End. mōra, Sel. mōra, Wol. dzōv. mōra ‘animal fat that is not eaten’ (EDG 418).


233 Mhr. ḫbr-marr ‘children’ (ML 271) would strongly favor the second assumption if it is indeed related to the root under scrutiny and does not represent an abbreviation of ḫbr-marratun with the same meaning (ML 54), in its turn identical with Soq. mābrhe (pl. māorye) ‘enfant’ (LS 95) and Jib. ambrēt ‘boy’ (JL 28), all from Proto-MSA *brē ‘to give birth.’
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respect to their functional status: in Akkadian, *māru* is the normal, indeed the only commonly attested term for “son,” whereas in ESA *mr* is used only sporadically, apparently when the sex of the child had to be emphasized.


◊ There is no trace of *bayna* ‘between’ in Akkadian, as its semantic equivalent *biri* (AHw. 128, CAD B 246) cannot be reduced to *bayna* for obvious phonological reasons (*contra* Brockelmann 1908:498 and HALOT 123 where the etymological relationship between the two forms is tacitly taken for granted). At the same time, the sequence *ba-na* in VE 817 has been reasonably identified with *bayna* by M. Krebernik (1983:32), A. Archi (2002:20) and M. V. Tonietti (2005:320).

♦ An eventual relationship between the preposition *bayna* and the PWS verbal root *byn* ‘to (be) separate(d)’ (DRS 62) is not in doubt, but the priority of the verbal root over the nominal formation *bayn* (Lipiński 1997:468) rather than vice versa remains to be substantiated (cf. Blažek 2007:32).


◊ As usually assumed, there is no reflex of *dād-* in Akkadian, where the meaning “uncle” is normally rendered by periphrastic composite designations like *aḫi abim* (CAD A 1:199–200). However, several possible examples of *dādu* ‘uncle’ in Old Babylonian Akkadian have been elicited by J.-M. Durand (1983:216–217) and C. Wilcke (1985:220). While Durand’s examples come from Mari and might be explained by WS influence (Charpin 2005–2006:287), this is not necessarily the case of Wilcke’s evidence, which derives from core Babylonian sources. If these examples are autochthonous, *dād-* ‘(paternal) uncle’ must be projected back to PS and removed from the present list.

◊ There are good reasons to believe that the origin of *dād-* ‘uncle’ is onomatopoetic. An eventual relationship with Akk. *dādu* ‘love-making; object of love, darling, favorite’ (CAD D 20, AHw. 149), Hbr. *dōd* ‘beloved; love’ (HALOT 215) is also conceivable.

234 It is not quite certain whether the paternal : maternal dichotomy familiar from Arabic and a few other languages has to be reconstructed for PS, in which case the specific meaning “paternal uncle” would have been attributed to *dād-. The possible candidate for the semantic slot “maternal uncle” is *ḥāl-, but its reflexes are considerably more sparse and do not allow one to postulate a reliable PWS reconstruction.

235 AbB 3, 39:36, TIM 4, 32:16.

236 The presence of *da-duum* (almost certainly with the meaning “uncle,” Krispijn 2004:108) in the entry VE 1161 does not help us to solve the controversy: in this case, too, we may be dealing with either a PS archaism lost in Mesopotamian Akkadian or with a WS lexical infiltration.
15. Ugr. ḍr (DUL 288), Hbr. zărōa (HALOT 280), Syr. drāvā (LSyri. 168), Arb. ḏirā– (Lane 961), Gez. mazzāt (CDG 379), Mhr. darr (ML 81), Jib. ǧērāv (JL 47) > PWS *ḏirār- ‘elbow’ (SED I No. 65).

◊ There is no trace of PWS *ḏirā- ‘elbow’ in Akkadian as NA durāw ‘arm, foreleg’ (CAD D 190, AHw. 177) is clearly borrowed from Aramaic (Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:29).

◊ The traditional derivation from *ḏr ‘to sow’ (Fronzaroli 1964:34, 48 and 1969:9) is difficult to prove.

16. Ugr. gzm ‘piece’ (DUL 315), Hbr. gzm ‘to cut’ (HALOT 187), Syr. gzr ‘deformavit (lapidem); excedit; circumcidit’ (LSyr. 112), Arb. ḏwr ‘to cut off’ (Lane 418), Gez. gazar ‘to circumcise’ (CDG 211), Mhr. gzōr ‘to slaughter for a bride’ (ML 129), Jib. gҗzr id. (JL 82) > PWS *gzr ‘to cut.’

◊ There is no trace of PWS *gzr ‘to cut’ in Akkadian.

17. Ugr. ḥdr ‘room, chamber’ (DUL 355), Hbr. ḥāḏār ‘dark room’ (HALOT 293), Arb. ḥādr- ‘a chamber that conceals a person’ (Lane 708), Sab. ḥdr ‘chamber’ (SD 59), Qat. ḥdr ‘trading stall’ (LIQ 70), Gez. ḥadara ‘to dwell, to reside’ (CDG 258), Mhr. ḥądōr ‘to put up a sunshade, shelter, tent’ (ML 438), Jib. ḥâdor ‘cave used as a house or pen’ (JL 298)237 > PWS *ḥādr-/ḥādr- ‘inner room, living quarters.’238

◊ There is no trace of *ḥādr-/ḥādr- ‘inner room, living quarters’ in Mesopotamian Akkadian. A clearly related form ḥa-da-ru12, reliably attested in Ebla (= É.TUR in VE 337, = ŠÀ in VE 595, v. Krebernik 1983:14), is probably to be attributed to WS influence.

18. Ugr. ḥkm ‘to be wise’ (DUL 358), Hbr. ḥkm id. (HALOT 313), Syr. ḫkm ‘cognovit’ (LSyr. 230), Arb. ḫkm ‘to give judgment; to order, to decree; to be wise; to prevent, to restrain to withhold from an evil’ (Lane 616), Sab. ḡḥkm ‘settlement of dispute’ (SD 67), Gez. taḥakama ‘to restrain’ (CDG 228), Mhr. ḫḥām ‘to be old’ (ML 174), Jib. ḫkm id. (JL 107), Soq. ḫkm ‘devenir vieux’ (LS 174) > PWS *ḥkm ‘to be wise.’

◊ The status of this isogloss as a PWS feature is undermined by several circumstances which, in view of the cultural significance of the root, deserve to be mentioned in full.

(1) The autochthonous vs. borrowed status of Akk. ḫakāmu ‘to know, to understand’ (CAD ḫ 33, AHw. 309) has been hotly debated by several generations of Assyriologists and Semitists (v. Kogan 2011:111 for a select bibliography). Personally,

237 Perhaps also Soq. ḥdr ‘s’arrêter’ (LS 165), attested in Müller 1905:287 (ḫedairoh ‘sie ließ sich nieder’). Soq. ḥdr ‘to build’ (missing from the Vienna corpus and LS) rather belongs to *ḥdr (cf. DRS 840–841).
238 The phonological discrepancy (*ḥ in Arabic, ESA, EthS and MSA vs. *ḥ in Ugaritic and Ebla) is noteworthy, but hardly sufficient to undermine the diachronic identity of all the cognates listed above.
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we tend to favor the borrowing hypothesis (especially if several waves of WS influence are assumed), but no complete certainty in this respect is possible.

(2) The Geez verb is attested only once in Pr 17:28. The semantic link between ‘se cohibere, continere’ (LLA 112) and “to be wise” is far from trivial, but fits well the sapiential context of “restraining one’s lips in order to look wise.”

All other representatives of *ḥkm in EthS are borrowed from Arabic (Leslau 1990:341).

(3) Most of the meanings associated with this root in MSA are almost certainly due to Arabic influence. This is, however, much less evident as far as the meaning “to be old” is concerned: while also attested in Arabic (ḥakam- ‘a man advanced in age to the utmost degree,’ Lane 617), it seems to be too marginal there to be considered a reliable source of borrowing.

(4) As reasonably argued by A. Jeffery (1938:111), the genuinely Arabic meanings of ḫkm are “more in connection with the sense of govern,” whereas the meaning “to be wise” is likely due to Hebrew and Aramaic influence.

19. Ugr. ḥē-ḳu (Huehnergard 1987a:72, 124), Hbr. ḥēḳ (HALOT 312), Arb. ḥāḳw-, ḥīḳw- (Lane 613), Sab. ḥḳw-ḥhm (SD 69), Gez. ḥḳe (CDG 239), Mhr. ḥāḳw (ML 176), Jib. ḥḳe (JL 108) > PWS *ḥḳw- ‘hip, loin, lap’ (SED I No. 113).

◊ There is no trace of *ḥḳw- ‘hip, loin, lap’ in Akkadian. Among its semantic equivalents, sūnu ‘lap’ (CAD S 387, AHw. 1059) is to be singled out because of its broad attestation (no fully reliable Semitic etymology for this term has been suggested so far, cf. SED II, pp. 334–335).

20. Ugr. ḥl-b (DUL 360), Hbr. ḥālāb (HALOT 315), Syr. ḥalbā (LSyr. 232), Arb. ḥalab-, ḥālīb- (Lane 624), Gez. ḥalīb (CDG 229), Jib. ḥlīb (JL 109), Soq. ḥēḥob (LS 174) > PWS *ḥalab- ‘milk’ (DRS 867–868).

◊ There is no trace of *ḥalab- ‘milk’ in Akkadian as NA ḥalāpu ‘to milk’ and ḥālpū ‘milk’ (CAD H 36, 187, AHw. 309, 345) are obvious Aramaic loanwords (Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:33). The Akkadian semantic equivalent is šīṣbu ‘milk’ (AHw. 1253, CAD š, 148), with no reliable etymology.

21. Ugr. ḥlm (DUL 360), Hbr. ḥlm (HALOT 320), Syr. ḥılm (LSyr. 234), Arb. ḥlm (Lane 631), Sab. ḥlm (SD 68), Gez. ḥalama (CDG 230), Mhr. ḥāylam (ML 179), Jib. ḥelm (JL 110), Soq. ḥ’lem (LS 176) > PWS *ḥlm ‘to dream’ (SED I No. 25).

259 The meaning “to restrain, to withhold,” also rather prominently attested in Arabic, opens an interesting possibility of comparison between PWS *ḥkm and Akk. ekēmu ‘to take away’ (CAD E 64, AHw. 194), otherwise with no WS etymology.

240 On the semantic marginalization into “curds” under the impact of the innovative *ṣʾṭʾn in MSA v. Chapter 8, p. 562 below.

241 The consonantal root can be established as *ṣʾṭʾb or *ṣʾṭʾb thanks to sa-ša-bu = Sum. ṇiṣka in VE 82.

242 According to our informants, the only autochthonous reflex of this root in Soqotri is the causative stem ḥ’lem (ṣayālamluḥ’hlem) ‘to send a portentous dream (God to a man)’: ḥ’lem tho ḏiryo ḟaninhin ‘My Lord sent me a portentous dream.’
There is no trace of *hlm ‘to dream’ in Akkadian, where the nominal concept “dream” is expressed by šuttu (CAD Š 405, AHw. 1292), a secondary formation from PS *šin-at- ‘sleep.’\textsuperscript{243}

22. Hbr. ḫēk (HALOT 313), Syr. ḫenkā (LSyr. 244), Arb. ḫanak- (Lane 659), Gez. ḫanaka (CDG 237),\textsuperscript{244} Mhr. ḫmnāk (ML 183), Jib. ḫônūk (JL 112) > PWS *ẖVnVk ‘palate’ (SED I No. 124).

◊ There is no trace of *ẖVnVk ‘palate’ in Akkadian.

23. Hbr. ḫrm (hip.) ‘to put under a ban’ (HALOT 354), Syr. ḫrm (ap.) ‘devovit’ (LSyr. 257), Arb. ḫrm ‘to be forbidden, prohibited’ (Lane 553), Sab. ḫrm ‘to put under restraint’ (SD 70), Min. ḫrm ‘proclaimer sacré’ (LM 49), Qat. ḫrm ‘to be forbidden’ (LIQ 67), Gez. ḫarama ‘to forbid’ (CDG 242), Mhr. ḫrōm ‘to repent; to swear not to do something,’ ḫrām ‘to bring disaster by doing something forbidden’ (ML 186), Jib. aḫrām ‘to forbid’ (JL 115), Soq. ḫrōm ‘maudire’ (LS 190) > PWS *ḣrm ‘to forbid.’

◊ PWS *ḥrm has been often compared with Akk. ḫarimtu ‘prostitute’ (CAD ḫ 101, AHw. 325), which is far from evident either phonologically or semantically (v. Kogan 2011:111, with references to earlier studies where this comparison is accepted).\textsuperscript{245} To the best of our knowledge, Akkadian has no exact verbal match corresponding to the semantic sphere of PWS *ḥrm. Partially equivalent are the nouns asakku (AHw. 73) and ikkibu (AHw. 368), both borrowed from Sumerian.

Complete absence of *ḥrm from extant Ugaritic texts is noteworthy.

24. Ugr. ḫṣ (DUL 374), Hbr. ḫṣāš (HALOT 344), Syr. ḫṣāš (LSyr. 250), Arb. ḫṣā (Lane 587), ḫṣiš (LA 7 18), Gez. ḫṣā (CDG 266), Mhr. ḫṣṣāyt (ML 189), Soq. ḫṣāš, mahṣāse (LS 185) > PWS *ẖVṣVṣ ‘sand, gravel.’

◊ There are good reasons to believe that Akk. ḫṣṣu ‘rubble, gravel,’ attested in NB/LB only (CAD ḫ 204, AHw. 349) and displaying an irregular ḫ, is not autochthonous, but goes back to a WS source.

25. Ugr. ḫṭb (DUL 376), Hbr. ḫṭb (HALOT 306), Arb. ḫṭb (Lane 593), Gez. ḫṭaba (CDG 248), Mhr. ḫṭāw (ML 192), Jib. ḫṭb (JL 119), Soq. ḫṭab (LS 170) > PWS *ḥṭb ‘to gather firewood’ (DRS 858).

◊ There is no trace of *ḥṭb ‘to gather firewood’ in Akkadian.

26. Ugr. ḫwy, ḫyy (DUL 379), Hbr. ḫāyā (HALOT 309), Syr. ḫwā (LSyr. 228), Arb. ḫayya (Lane 679), Sab. ḫw (SD 74), Min. ḫw (LM 51), Gez. ḫaywa (CDG 252), Mhr. ḫwy.

\textsuperscript{243} Conversely, such a usage is totally alien to WS, where *šin-at- and *ušn are strictly reserved for the concept “(to) sleep.”

\textsuperscript{244} The nominal root itself is not attested in EthS, but the semantic shift “palate” > “to munch,” “to chew” is unproblematic.

\textsuperscript{245} The presumably related verb ḫarāmu ‘to separate’ is very sparsely attested (CAD ḫ 89, AHw. 323).
The verbal root *hyy *‘to live’ is not directly attested in Akkadian, but according to a broad consensus it underlies the theonym Ea (= *u-a [hayya]), v. Roberts 1972:20, 80, Selz 2002:665–670, Weeden 2009. The standard semantic equivalent in Akkadian is balātu (CAD B 52, AHw. 99), whose most immediate formal counterpart in WS is Arb. bā qa = farra, bulu- = ra-l-fārāna mina l-askari (LA 7 300). The archaic nature of *hyy is explicitly acknowledged by P. Fronzaroli (1964:23–24: “una parola evidentemente molto antica”) who rightly attributes its loss in Akkadian to the inherent instability of this root, deemed to yield zero according to the rules of the Akkadian historical phonology.

27. Hbr. ḥlp ‘to pass on, to pass away,’ hip. ‘to change, to substitute’ (BDB 322), Syr. ḫlap *‘permutavit, substituit; mutatus est’ (LSyr. 235), Arb. ḥlf ‘to follow, to succeed’ (Lane 792), Gez. ḫala ‘to pass by’ (CDG 260), Mhr. ḥlylf ‘to succeed, to come after’ (ML 439), Jib. ḫlkjf ‘to take the place of someone’ (JL 299), Soq. ḫlkjf ‘alterner’ (LS 177) > PWS *ḥlp ‘to pass by, to leave behind, to replace’ (DRS 991–992).

There is no Akkadian reflex of *ḥlp ‘to leave behind’ unless some of the meanings of the semantically complex verb ḫalāpu (notably, “to slip in”) are attributed to a separate lexeme related to this root, v. Kogan 2001:270. Obviously borrowed from Aramaic (and therefore of no relevance for the present discussion) is NB ḫalpu ‘substitute’ (cf. AHw. 313, CAD ḫ 49).

28. Ugr. ḫsr ‘to fail, to be missing’ (DUL 410), Hbr. ḫsr ‘to decrease’ (HALOT 338), Syr. ḫsr ‘defect, periti’ (LSyr. 248), Arb. ḫsr ‘to suffer loss or diminution’ (Lane 736), Min. ḫsr ‘payer le prix’ (LM 44), Gez. ḫasra ‘to be disgraced; to be wasted’ (CDG 265), Mhr. ḫasr ‘to pay a bride-price’ (ML 449), Jib. ḫsr ‘to lose; to pay a bride-price’

---

246 As far as one can judge from the references adduced in LS 171, the verb is only marginally attested in Soqotri, and Arabic influence can be legitimately suspected in this case. However, as rightly suggested by Leslau, the root is likely preserved in two very common nominal derivates, viz. ḫyhi ‘person’ and ḫy ‘abundance of green fodder.’ The Mehri and Jibbali verbs are probably autochthonous (rather than borrowed from Arabic) because of their phonetic shape and the specific meaning “to be cured,” “to become better.”


248 The root ḫlt, attested with the meaning “to escape” in Ugaritic, Hebrew and Aramaic (DUL 673, HALOT 930, LSYr. 573), must be related in spite of the phonological irregularity. More problematic is Arb. ḫlt ‘to escape’ (Lane 2435), usually compared as well (Fronzaroli 1965b:250, 263, 267 and elsewhere).

249 P. Fronzaroli assumes that the meaning “to escape from death,” well attested for Akkadian balātu, directly reflects the original semantics of *ḥlt supposedly preserved in WS, but this is far from evident: after all, the meaning “to revive” is well attested also for Hbr. ḫūḏā (BDB 311, meaning 2) and may represent an inherent pan-Semitic connotation of the basic meaning “to be alive.”
(JL 306), Soq. dī-ḥāsir ‘à bon marché’ (LS 184) > PWS *ḥsr ‘to be deficient; to lose’ (DRS 1012).

◊ PWS *ḥsr ‘to be deficient; to lose’ has been often compared to Akk. ḥēsēru ‘to blunt, to chip, to trim’ (CAD Ḥ 176, AHw. 329). If accepted, this comparison certainly implies the priority of the Akkadian meaning and, hence, points to a shared semantic innovation in PWS.

29. OArm. khl ‘to be able’ (DNWSI 489), Arb. kahl- ‘mature, fully grown man’ (WKAS K 409), Sab. khl ‘to be successful’ (SD 77), Gez. kḥla ‘to be able’ (CDG 277), Mhr. kḥöl ‘to be able’ (ML 205), Jib. khel ‘to be able to tolerate’ (JL 128), Soq. k̄l ‘pouvoir, connaître’ (LS 214) > PWS *khhl ‘to be able’ (DRS 1185).

◊ There is no direct trace of PWS *khl ‘to be able’ in Akkadian,251 where its principal semantic equivalent is leṯu (CAD L 151, AHw. 547), whose only established WS cognate is Ugr. byr ‘to conquer, to prevail’ (DUL 488).252 For the possibility of connecting PWS *khhl with PS *wkl, and therefore Akk. waklu, v. Chapter 4 (p. 237).

30. Ugr. kn (DUL 447), Pho. kn (DNSWSI 493),253 Arb. kw̄n (WKAS K 451), Sab. kw̄n (SD 80), Min. kw̄n (LM 54), Qat. kw̄n (LQ 84), Gez. kona (CDG 299), Jib. kun (JL 138), Soq. kw̄n (LS 215) > PWS *kw̄n ‘to be.’

◊ ♦ The immensely broad geographic and chronological distribution of the reflexes of *kw̄n with the meaning “to be” leaves little doubt that we are faced with a deeply rooted PWS isogloss, all the more since Akk. kānu ‘to be firm in place, to remain stationary, to be reliable, correct’ (CAD K 159, AHw. 438) provides a suitable source of semantic development.254

As is well known, the meaning “to be” for the reflexes of *kw̄n is (almost) completely missing from Hebrew and Aramaic,255 where it is expressed by the reflexes of *hwy/*hyy: Hbr. hāyā (HALOT 243) and Syr. hwā (LSyR 173). As far as Aramaic is concerned, a more or less routine lexical innovation would not present any serious difficulty.256 The Hebrew picture is more problematic because of the presence of kw̄n

250 No such meaning is known to our informants, who are only aware of ḥāsir ‘bad pasture,’ also attested in the Vienna corpus (LS 184). The corresponding verb is ḥēsâr (yāḥāsor/yēḥāsir) ‘to be scanty.’
252 Unless an enantiosemantic relationship with Hbr. lāḇā ‘to be tired’ (HALOT 512) and its cognates is assumed, which does not seem very likely.
253 For an early Canaanite forerunner v. the lengthened imperative ku-na in EA 147:36 (CAD K 171, Tyre).
254 “Original meaning ‘to be firm, straight’” (HALOT 464). We do not find appealing the (theoretically possible) opposite course of events: a more original meaning “to be” undergoes a semantic narrowing into “to firm” in Akkadian, which leaves the supposedly parallel development in Hebrew totally unexplained.
255 For a few marginal examples of kān ‘fuit, exstitit’ in Syriac v. LSyr. 321.
256 Except for the rather problematic etymological background of the root *hw̄y/*hyy itself, whose assessment in the Semitic historical lexicography has been rather contradictory. On the one hand, Akk. ēwā ‘to turn into’ (CAD E 413, AHw. 266) is an excellent match both formally and semantically. On the other hand, the traditional comparison with Arb. hw̄y ‘to fall’ (Lane 3046) preserves its attractiveness in view of the well-known semantic parallelism with wqer ‘to fall’ > ‘to be(come)’ in post-classical and modern.
‘to be’ in the Canaanite sister tongues: one has to assume that this feature was once present in Proto-Canaanite, but then was lost in Hebrew and replaced by the same new exponent as in the neighboring Aramaic. As we shall see below in Chapter 5 (pp. 342-344), the same type of lexical change is attested for a few other basic semantic slots in Hebrew. The broad presence of the presumably original meaning “to be steadfast, permanent” for קון in Hebrew (HALOT 464) is noteworthy.257

The Akkadian semantic equivalent באזא remains etymologically obscure in spite of the fact that the root consonants *בֶּטֶי can be established with certainty on the basis of the Sargonic orthography (Hasselbach 2005:266).

31. Hbr. קבל (pi.) ‘to accept, to receive’ (HALOT 1061),258 Syr. כַּבֵּל ‘obviam ivit; se opposuit,’ läקבל ‘adversus, contra’ (LSyr. 640), Arb. قبّل ‘to receive, to accept,’ qابل ‘before’ (Lane 2983), Sab. קבל ‘to accept,’ l-קבל ‘in front of’ (SD 103), Min. כָּבָל ‘en face de’ (LM 70), Qat. קבל ‘to receive,’ קבל ‘before, prior to’ (LIQ 141), Gez. תַּקַּבְבַּל ‘to go out to meet, to approach, to receive’ (CDG 418), Mhr. כַּבָּל ‘to come forward, to arrive,’ סַקְבַּל ‘be opposite to’ (ML 221), Jib. קבל ‘to accept,’ ĕקבל ‘to come forward, to arrive,’ סֶקַּבַּל ‘to be opposite to’ (JL 140), Soq. קבל ‘être content’ (LS 366) > PWS כֶּבֶל ‘to face, to be in front of.’

◊ The Akkadian semantic equivalent is מַהֲרָו ‘to face, to approach, to accept’ (CAD M 50, AHw. 577), remarkably similar to PWS כֶּבֶל in many of its semantic derivations. The only marginal trace of כֶּבֶל in Akkadian is כָּבַל ‘battle’ (CAD Q 12, AHw. 888), plausibly derivable from an original meaning “facing one another,” “confrontation.”259 The WS reflexes of מָהְרָי are slightly more varied, yet also very sparse.260 Both roots are thus to be traced back to PS, but their subsequent generalization vs. marginalization can reasonably be attributed to the ES/WS dialectal split.

32. Hbr. כֶּלֶב ‘sling,’ כֵּל ‘to sling stones’ (HALOT 1106), Syr. כֵּלֶב ‘fundā’ (LSyr. 669), Arb. מִקְלָה ‘sling’ (Lane 2992).261 Gez. מֶלְכֶל ‘sling’ (CDG 426), Mhr. كَلَّا ‘to

---

257 Much less prominently, the presumably original meaning of הַקְּנֵה is preserved also in Syriac (Rundgren 1965–1966:69).
259 Very interesting in this sense is Akk. tamḥāru ‘battle’ (CAD T 116, AHw. 1314). For a close association between כָּבַל and מַהֲרָו in Akkadian texts v. AHw. 888 (under 1).
260 PCS מַהֲרָי- ‘tomorrow’ (for which see Chapter 3, p. 192 below), as well as Arb. מָהְרִי ‘to cleave the water with its stem; to face the wind (ship)’ (Lane 2693), Sab. מָהְרִי ‘to face, to run, to extend towards’ (SD 84), Soq. מָהְרִי ‘offrir’ (LS 240).
261 Cf. alsoquel = til-ḫašar wa-yatāra mina l-ranû wa-yārûnā bīhī (LA 8 345). The basic meaning of the verbal root גֶּל in Arabic is “to pluck out,” “to extract” (Lane 2992), whose relationship with “to throw” is far from obvious (cf. rather Gez. ḫabra ‘to uncover, to bare, to remove,’ CDG 426). More promising are the meanings “to leave off,” “to leave, to quit” registered for the IV stem (Lane 2992).
let, to allow, to leave’ (ML 229), Jib. ḫēlav ‘to let, to allow’ (JL 144), Soq. ḫālav ‘jeter, abandonner’ (LS 375) > PWS *ḫēr ‘to throw (stones from a sling).’

◊ There is no trace of *ḫēr ‘to throw (stones from a sling)’ in Akkadian.

The semantic difference between MSA (‘to throw’262) and the rest of WS (“sling,” “to throw stones from a sling”) is noteworthy and requires an explanation. Shall one consider the semantic narrowing from “to throw” into “to sling” as a specific feature of Proto-CS/EthS? This hypothesis might be corroborated by the fact that another, perhaps more archaic, common designation of “sling” is preserved in Akk. wašpu (CAD A2 339, AHw. 1475), Arb. waḏaf- (Dozy II 826)263 and Gez. wašafa, moṣaf (CDG 606).

33. Hbr. ḫnr (HALOT 1109), Syr. ḫene(r)tā (LSyr. 675), Gez. ḫanva (CDG 433), Mhr. ḫāynra (ML 232), Jib. ḫēni (JL 147), Soq. ḫnr (LS 377) > PWS *ḫnr ‘to be jealous.’264

◊ There is no autochthonous reflex of *ḫnr ‘to be jealous’ in Akkadian, as NA ḫēru ‘envy’ (CAD Q 285, AHw. 924) is best explainable as a WS loan.265 Interestingly, the very concept “to be jealous/zealous” seems to be thoroughly missing from the Akkadian vocabulary.

34. Ugr. ḫny (DUL 706), Hbr. ḥānā (HALOT 1111), Syr. ḥnā (LSyr. 674), Arb. qny (Lane 2994), Sab. ḫny (SD 106), Min. ḫny (LM 71), Qat. ḫny (LIQ 147), Gez. ḫanaya (CDG 437) > PWS *ḫny ‘to acquire, to possess.’266

262 Particularly in Soqotri, where the reflex of ḫēr functions as the basic exponent of this meaning, of very common use.
263 As rightly observed by T. Nöldeke (1910:55–56), the word is completely missing from the Classical lexicographic sources. It is hard to say whether its broad presence in (pre-)modern dialects of Yemen and Maghrib (DRS 599) is due to South Arabian influence.
264 Possible attestations of this root in Arabic are problematic. Many scholars accepted its connection with Arb. qnr ‘to be intensely red’ (Lane 2565), very tentatively mentioned in Brockelmann 1932:115, but this is semantically rather far-fetched. Perhaps more promising as a cognate would be Arb. qnr ‘to incite, to induce to kill someone’ (Lane 2564) = “to kill out of envy”?
265 Cf. Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:47 and Frahm 2009. As cautiously observed by E. Frahm, other forms produced from the same root “scheinen gegen die Annahme eines Wortimportes aus dem Westsemitischen zu sprechen.” In our view, the corresponding lexemes, viz. ḥēnā ‘to be jealous, envious’ (CAD Q 209), ḥannār ‘envier’ (CAD Q 81, AHw. 897) and ḥinnūtu ‘concubine, second-ranking wife’ (CAD Q 254), are still so marginal and (predominantly) so late that the possibility of WS influence remains quite feasible, even if more caution in this respect is probably in order. For further possible evidence from the lexical lists v. Civil 1990. As kindly pointed out to us by N. J. C. Kouwenberg, the noun ḥēnū ‘jealousy’ has been recently identified by K. Veenhof in the Old Assyrian letter AKT 5, 18:12 (Veenhof 2010:112), and more examples from yet unpublished Old Assyrian letters are known. This is, of course, a strong argument in favor of the autochthonous origin of this root, yet the very question why it is so exceedingly rare in the extant corpus (particularly in the Babylonian sources) remains essentially valid.
266 The reflexes of this root in MSA are worth a detailed separate treatment. The Proto-MSA meaning of the verbal root *ḫny is “to feed, to suckle,” “to rear”: Mhr. ḫanā (ML 233), Jib. ḫnā (JL 147), Soq. ḫāna (LS 377). The exact semantic relationship between these meanings and “to possess” (or even “to create”) is unclear (cf. SED I No. 83, where contamination with PS *ynk ‘to suck(le)’ is tentatively considered). However, much more straightforward cognates have long ago been recognized in Soq. ḫēnho ‘bétail’ (LS 378) and ḥanīnīn ‘seigneur, maître’ (LS 378). In the former case, we are almost certainly dealing with an
While both standard Akkadian dictionaries display a verb ḫanû ‘to acquire’ (CAD Q 91, AHw. 898), there are weighty reasons to doubt that an autochthonous Akkadian lexeme with this meaning has ever existed. The only OB example comes from AbB 2, 177:19 and the translation ‘you must not keep her’ for la ta-ḥā-an-ni-ši is rather uncertain.\textsuperscript{267} As for the numerous NA attestations (including the noun ḫīnītu, Deller 1991), they are most probably to be explained by Aramaic influence.

35. Hbr. kr̄h ‘to have one’s head shaved,’ ḫor̄hā ‘bald patch’ (HALOT 1140), Syr. kraḥ ‘calvus occipite factus est,’ ḫarāhā ‘calvium’ (LSyr. 694), Arb. qurḥat- ‘whiteness in the face of a horse’ (Lane 2511), Gez. ḫ̣arṛh‘a ‘to shave,’ ḫ̣ẉṛḥ ‘tonsure’ (CDG 441), Mhr. haẉṛḥ ‘to shave’ (ML 235), Jib. ḫ̣ṛḥ ‘to cut all the hair off’ (JL 149) > PWS *kr̄h ‘to be bald; to shave,’ *hụṛḥ-at- ‘baldness’ (SED I No. 38.),

There is no trace of *kr̄h ‘to be bald’ in Akkadian.

36. Ugr. mhr ‘trained warrior, soldier’ (DUL 536), Hbr. mhr ‘to hasten,’ māhīr ‘skilful, experienced’ (HALOT 553), Syr. mahīrā ‘habilis, sollers’ (LSyr. 376), Arb. mhr ‘to be skilled’ (Lane 2740), Sab. tmhr ‘contingent of bedouin mercenaries’ (SD 84).\textsuperscript{268} Gez. mahara ‘to teach, to instruct’ (CDG 334), Mhr. məṭār ‘to try and do something; to think one can do something,’ məhár ‘skilled, clever’ (ML 262–263), Jib. əmtəhēr ‘to make an excuse to go, to run away,’ mēhūr ‘sly, two-faced’ (JL 169) > PWS *mhr ‘to be skilful, experienced.’\textsuperscript{269}

There is no trace of *mhr ‘to be skilful’ in Akkadian.

37. Ugr. mḷh ‘salt,’ mḷḥ ‘salted’ (DUL 549), Hbr. mālāh ‘salt’ (HALOT 588), Syr. melhā id. (LSyr. 390), Arb. milh- id. (Lane 2732), Sab. mḷh id. (Stein 2010:155, 727), Gez. mallahā ‘to season with salt’ (CDG 343),\textsuperscript{270} Mhr. məḷḥāt ‘salt’ (ML 266), Jib. mîḷḥt id. (JL 171), Soq. mḷho id. (LS 243) > PWS *milh- ‘salt’ (Bulakh 2005c:333–336).

According to a widespread assumption, the Akkadian reflex of *milh- ‘salt’ is mḷru (milhû) ‘saltpetre’ (CAD M 69, AHw. 653), but there are weighty reasons to doubt that this late (SB, NA) and rare word is autochthonous in Akkadian: if at all related to

\textsuperscript{267} The sequence [ta-ḥa-an-nu-û] in ARM 4, 86:34 has been read differently in Durand 1998:563.
\textsuperscript{268} For possible cognates in Sabaic minuscule texts v. Stein 2010:727.
\textsuperscript{269} One is tempted to treat the MSA forms as due to Arabic influence, but only some of them appear to have formally and semantically suitable source words in Arabic.
\textsuperscript{270} The primary noun *milh- ‘salt’ is only marginally attested in EthS, cf. perhaps Gez. mḷḥ(ā) ‘sapor, judicum, scientia’ (LLA 146), extensively discussed in Bulakh 2005c:333–334. Gez. sew ‘salt’ and its cognates in other EthS are usually thought to be borrowed from Cushitic (CDG 565), but cf. Kogan 2006d:271 for a possible Semitic etymology.
*milḫ-*, it is better to be treated as a comparatively late WS (Aramaic?) loanword.\(^{271}\) As for the plant name *mallâytu* (CAD M\(_1\) 169, AHw. 596) its connection with *milḫ-* (taken for granted in AHw. 596, Tropper 1995b:62 and elsewhere) is, again, purely conjectural.\(^{272}\)

Akk. *ṭāбу* ‘salt’ (CAD Ṭ 10, AHw. 1377) goes back to the adjective *ṭāбу* ‘good,’ with the meaning shift discussed in Fronzaroli 1972:621 and Bulakh 2005c:335–336.

38. Ugr. *mlk* ‘to reign, to rule,’ *mlk* ‘king’ (DUL 549–555), Hbr. *mālāḵ* id. (HALOT 590), Syr. *malkā* id. (LSyr. 391), Arb. *mlk* ‘to possess,’ *malīk* ‘king’ (Lane 3023), Sab. *mlk* ‘king,’ *mlk* ‘property’ (SD 85–86), Min. *mlk* ‘roi,’ *mlk* ‘propriété, biens; domaine’ (ML 60–61), Qat. *mlk* ‘king,’ *mlk* ‘property’ (LIQ 97), Gez. *malaka* ‘to possess, to dominate’ (CDG 343, LLA 150–151),\(^{273}\) Mhr. *malīk* ‘to possess’ (ML 266), Jib. *mîlšk* ‘to own’ (JL 171) > PWS *mlk* ‘to rule,’ *mal(i)k*- ‘king.’\(^{274}\)

◊ As rightly observed by M. Streck (2000:104), the standard dictionaries (CAD M\(_1\) 166, AHw. 595) do not consider the possibility of Akk. *malku*, *malku* being a WS loanword. However, *contra* Streck,\(^{275}\) such a hypothesis is certainly not unlikely in view of the word’s predominantly late attestation,\(^{276}\) its close connection with the West (particularly Mari) in the early periods\(^{277}\) and the specific meaning “foreign king” in a good part of the attested examples. In view of the extraordinary prominence of *mal(i)k-* throughout the neighboring WS cultural and linguistic area, its comparatively massive infiltration into late Akkadian sources (notably the NA royal inscriptions) does

---

\(^{271}\) The phonetic shape of the Akkadian word also speak against a cognate relationship, as PS *h* seldom yields "strong aleph" in Akkadian (Kouwenberg 2010a:523).

\(^{272}\) Even if it is identical to Hbr. *mallāḏ* (HALOT 587), of uncertain meaning (let alone botanical identification), cf. Arb. *mālāḵyāt*- (Lane 2734), with *h* rather than *ḥ*. Furthermore, the Akkadian lexeme is both rare and late and may well be a WS loanword.

\(^{273}\) As is well-known, in EthS this root underwent semantic marginalization: the meaning “king” is not synchronically attested, although *mālāḵ* ‘Lord, God’ (CDG 344) is likely to be analyzed as a lexicalized *pluralis majestatis* from a non-attested *mal* (LLA 151). For the replacement *mlk* > *ngš* in Proto-EthS v. Chapter 7 (pp. 446–447).

\(^{274}\) The specific meaning “to own, to possess” (with no connection with kingship) appears to be a development characteristic of the Arabian-Ethiopian area and, with all probability, is not to be traced back to PWS.

\(^{275}\) More emphatically also Hrůša 2010:196: “Da es im Akkadischen seit der altakkadischen Zeit begegnet, sollte man es nicht einfach als ‘westsemitisch’ aussondern; man darf es wohl eher als festen Bestandteil des akkadischen Wortschatzes betrachten.”

\(^{276}\) The often-quoted “Old Akkadian” reference comes from the Sargonic literary text MAD 1, 172:9 where *la ma-al-ku[m]* is usually understood as “non-king.” However, as duly acknowledged in CAD M\(_1\) 168, the difficult and partly broken context of this expression should prevent us from its direct identification with the present lexeme (a derivation from *malāḵu* ‘to deliberate,’ such as *malku* ‘counsel’ or even a non-attested *maluku* ‘reasonable, endowed with common sense’ could well be considered as an alternative).

\(^{277}\) We do not see any core Old Babylonian example in the rather extensive entry *malku* in CAD. It is certainly not accidental that *namlaktu* ‘realm, controlled territory’ (CAD N\(_1\) 233, AHw. 728) is attested only in Mari (cf. Durand 1997:475, where it is hypothesized that the royal title of the Mari king was actually *malkum* rather than *šarrum*). D. Charpin (2005–2006:287) explicitly qualifies this term as a WS loan.
not appear surprising. All in all, the opposition *šarr- vs. *mal(i)k- as a feature of the East/West Semitic dichotomy (advocated in Diakonoff 1990:14 and elsewhere) still preserves its attractivity. Within this approach, reliable attestation of mlk ‘to rule’ (and, probably, *malik- ‘king’) in the Ebla sources (for which see Krebernik 1983:38, Sanmartín 1991:194 and numerous other studies quoted in DUL 549–550) should be attributed to WS influence.

The origin of the Akkadian semantic equivalent šarru ‘king’ (CAD Š 76, AHw. 1118) is rather uncertain, as its WS cognates are restricted to Ugr. šir ‘prince, sovereign’ (DUL 842) and Hbr. šar ‘official, commander’ (HALOT 1351).

The MSA verbs are probably borrowed from Arabic, as certainly is Mhr. malēk ‘king’ (ML 266), Jib. mēlik id. (JL 171). The verbal root mlk is prominently attested in Soqotri (where it is certainly autochthonous), but its relationship to PWS *mlk (taken for granted in LS 244) is far from certain in view of the semantic difference: mélok ‘to be in front of; to ascertain,’ émlök (causative) ‘to tame,’ šomēlik (intensive causative-reflexive) ‘to be in front of.’

It is not impossible, therefore, that *mlk is a CS-EthS lexical feature rather than a strictly PWS one.

The meaning of the genuine Akkadian verb maliku ‘to give advice; to ponder, to deliberate’ (CAD M 154, AHw. 593) has been often (and perhaps not unreasonably) considered as the semantic source of PWS *mal(i)k- ‘king’: “as orig[inally] counsellor, he whose opinion is decisive” (BDB 572, also LSyr. 391 and elsewhere).

◊ The meaning of the genuine Akkadian verb malāku ‘to give advice; to ponder, to deliberate’ (CAD M 154, AHw. 593) has been often (and perhaps not unreasonably) considered as the semantic source of PWS *mal(i)k- ‘king’: “as orig[inally] counsellor, he whose opinion is decisive” (BDB 572, also LSyr. 391 and elsewhere).

39. Hbr. min (HALOT 597), Syr. men (LSyr. 393), Arb. min (Lane 3024), Gez. māminna (CDG 25), Mhr. mān (ML 267), Jib. mān (JL 172), Soq. mān (LS 245) > PWS *min ‘from.’

◊ There is no trace of *min in Mesopotamian Akkadian, where the ablative meaning is expressed by ina and ištu, both without reliable WS parallels. However, mi-nu ‘from’ is widely attested in Ebla (Tonietti 1997:83–84, Archi 2002:13–14). The diachronic significance of this fact has not yet been properly assessed. We may be faced with a PS archaism lost in Akkadian (Tonietti 2005:332), but the possibility of an early WS influence on the Eblaite prepositional system is not to be discarded altogether.

The absence of *min from two prominent representatives of the CS branch, viz. Ugaritic and ESA, is puzzling and has not yet received any convincing explanation. In Sabaic, the ablative meaning is expressed by the prepositions bn and ln which, according to Beeston 1962:57 and Stein 2003:210–212, 235–236, are to be analyzed as combinations of b and l with an ablative enclitic -n. The most common Ugaritic equivalent is l (Tropper 2000:760, DUL 477–478).

278 These forms and their meanings go back to our fieldwork notes. Only the causative-reflexive stem is reliably attested in the Vienna corpus, rendered by Leslau as ‘tenir fermement, connaître, reconnaître’ (LS 244).

279 For Proto-Aramaic *mlk with the same meaning and the possibility of early Akkadian influence on it v. Chapter 5, p. 408.

280 As repeatedly observed by the specialists in the Ebla texts, the apparently similar preposition mi-in has quite a different (locative) meaning and, from the synchronic point of view, is completely autonomous from mi-nu (Tonietti 1997:87–89, 2005:328–329, Archi 2002:7–8). The background of this peculiar dichotomy remains to be elucidated.

75
There is no convincing internal reconstruction for PWS *min ‘from.’ Derivation from the verbal root *mny ‘to count’ (hardly anywhere attested as “to divide,” “to separate”) in Brockelmann 1908:498, Lipiński 1997:465 and Voigt 1999:41 is rather unlikely.

40. Hbr. māraḵ (HALOT 638), Arb. maraq- (Lane 3019), Gez. marāḵ (CDG 359), Mhr. marēḵ (ML 270), Jib. mīrēḵ (JL 173), Soq. māraḵ (LS 251) > PWS *marāḵ- ‘broth.’

◊ The PWS status of this term is not quite certain since the EthS and MSA parallels can be borrowed from Arabic.281

There is no trace of *marāḵ- ‘broth’ in Mesopotamian Akkadian, but mar-ḵūm, ma-la-ḵit-um = A.AKA in VE 602 has been identified with this term in Conti 1990:167.

41. Hbr. ngh ‘to gleam, to shine’ (HALOT 667), Syr. ngah ‘luxit’ (LSyr. 414), Gez. nagha ‘to dawn, to grow light’ (CDG 391), Jib. m ngh ẖ ẗ ‘to dawn’ (JL 183), Soq. nigōho ‘devenir matin’ (LS 256) > PWS *ngh ‘to shine.’

◊ We agree with Leslau (CDG 391) who believes that the widely accepted connection between PWS *ngh and Akk. nagû ‘to rejoice’ (CAD N 1123, AHw. 712) is semantically doubtful (contra Fronzaroli 1965a:145 and others). Leslau is also correct to reject the cognate relationship between PWS *ngh and Arabic nāž = vistiqhālu r-rażūli bi-mā yuqrahu wa-ra-dduka niyāhu ran ḫājatihi (LA 13 677), cautiously suggested in Nöldeke 1910:196 and taken for granted in Fronzaroli 1965a:145.

42. Hbr. nky (hip.) ‘to strike, to smite’ (HALOT 697), Syr. nkā ‘laesit’ (LSyr. 428), Arb. nky ‘to be defeated (an enemy),’ nikāyat- ‘slaying and wounding among the enemy’ (Lane 3038), Sab. nky ‘mischievous person’ (SD 96), Qat. nky ‘to injure, to diminish’ (LIQ 105), Gez. nakaya ‘to injure, to hurt, to damage’ (CDG 397), Jib. enké ‘to hurt’ (JL 189), Soq. mónki ‘wound’ (cf. LS 267) > PWS *nky ‘to hurt, to wound.’

◊ Akk. nakū, tentatively compared with this root in AHw. 724, is highly unreliable and probably does not exist (cf. CAD N 197).

43. Hbr. naps- (HALOT 712), Syr. naps- (LSyr. 441), Arb. nafs- (Lane 2827), Sab. nfs₁- (SD 93), Min. nfs₁- (LM 66), Qat. nfs₁- (LIQ 109), Gez. nafs- (CDG 389), Mhr. ḥor-nōf- (ML 283), Jib. nūf- (JL 181), Soq. nhf- (LS 260) > PWS *naps- ‘self.’

◊ Throughout WS,282 the reflexes of PS *naps- ‘soul’ with pronominal suffixes are regularly used as reflexive pronouns. No such usage seems to be attested in Akkadian, where the meaning “self” is most typically expressed by the special word ramānu (CAD R 117, AHw. 949), of uncertain etymology.283

281 So explicitly about Gez. marāḵ and its EthS cognates in Leslau 1990:352 (with less certainty also in CDG 359). According to LLA 166, the Geez word is attested only once in a late source.

282 With the remarkable exception of Ugaritic. One wonders whether the meaning “self” is actually attested in the extant Ugaritic sources.

283 To be sure, CAD N; 301–302 does adduce a substantial number of examples under the heading “self,” but in a great majority of cases the meaning “my life,” “your life,” etc. appears to be preferable. It
44. Ugr. nṣr (DUL 650), Hbr. nāšār (HALOT 166), Syr. nešṭā (LSyr. 451), Arb. nasr- (Lane 2789), Hdr. nsṛ (Sima 2000:127), Gez. nṣr (CDG 403), Mhr. nūḥr (ML 290), Soq. nōyḥr (LS 260)\[^{284}\] > PWS *nṛṣr- 'eagle' (SED II No. 166).

◊ Akk. našru (CAD N² 79, AHw. 761), attested once in a late lexical list, is clearly borrowed from WS. The standard Akkadian designation of eagle is erū (CAD E 324, AHw. 247), etymologically uncertain (cf. SED II No. 40).

45. Hbr. nāḥ(?) ‘raw, underdone (meat)’ (HALOT 657), Arb. nyṛ ‘to be unsufficiently cooked’ (Lane 2869), Gez. nāṛ ‘unleavened bread’ (CDG 410, LLA 679), Mhr. nēr ‘raw, uncooked’ (ML 309), Soq. nyṛ ‘être cru’ (LS 266) > PWS *nyṛ ‘to be raw.’

◊ There is no trace of *nyṛ ‘to be raw’ in Akkadian.

46. Hbr. pārāš (HALOT 182), Syr. parrāšā (LSyr. 609), Arb. faras- (Lane 2367), Sab. frš (SD 46), Qat. frš (Sima 2000:71), Hdr. ifrš (ibid.), Gez. faras (CDG 166), Mhr. farhāyn (LM 98) > PWS *paraš- ‘horse’ (SED II No. 182).

◊ There is no trace of *paraš- ‘horse’ in Akkadian, where this meaning is expressed by 𒊨𒊲, with all probability of non-Semitic origin (cf. SED II No. 199). Total absence of *paraš- from Ugaritic is noteworthy and probably not accidental.

47. Ugr. pr ‘fruit’ (DUL 678), Hbr. prī ‘fruit,’ pārā ‘to bear fruit’ (HALOT 967, 963), Syr. p(e)₀(r)ā ‘fructus,’ pri ‘fertilis fuit’ (LSyr. 555, 596), Gez. fšē ‘fruit,’ faraya ‘to bear fruit’ (CDG 167), Jib. efrēr ‘to become ripe, to ripen’ (JL 62) > PWS *piry- ‘fruit,’ *piry ‘to bear fruit.’\[^{285}\]

◊ This root has to be separated from the eventually related terms with the same biconsonantal sequence *pr, particularly from Akk. peru ‘shoot, offshoot’ (CAD P 416, AHw. 856), which cannot go back to *piry- for phonological reasons (Kogan 2012a:233).

48. Hbr. ptt (HALOT 991), Syr. pat (LSyr. 615), Arb. ft (Lane 2327), Gez. fatata (CDG 171), Mhr. ft (ML 106), Soq. mfēṭit (LS 344) > PWS *ptt ‘to crumble, to break into small pieces.’

◊ There is no trace of *ptt ‘to crumble’ in Akkadian.

49. Ugr. pty ‘to seduce’ (DUL 687), Hbr. pālā ‘to be simple, inexpert, gullible,’ (pi.) ‘to entice, to seduce’ (HALOT 984), Arb. fata ‘a youth’ (Lane 2337), Min. fty

---

[^284]: In Modern South Arabian, a semantic shift into “large bird” (Mehri) or “bird in general” (Soqotri) took place.

[^285]: Not attested directly in Arabic, but the well-known verb fry (VIII) ‘to forge, to fabricate’ (Lane 2391) may well go back to a more original meaning “to produce fruit.”
‘enfant, petit garçon’ (LM 34), Gez. fatawa ‘to desire, to love, to covet, to lust for’ (CDG 171), Soq. fiti ‘to ejaculate’ > PWS *ptw ‘to desire.’

◊ The original meaning of this semantically complex root seems to be best preserved in Ethiopian Semitic, although it is not unlikely that a more specific meaning “to be lustful,” “to have sexual desire” has to be reconstructed for PWS. The semantic development in Soqotri finds an exact parallel in Arb. mny ‘to ejaculate’ < PS *mny ‘to desire’ (SED I No. 41). Similarly, Arb. fata ‘youth’ < PWS *ptw ‘to desire’ is mirrored by Arb. ṣabīyy- ‘a youth’ (Lane 1650) < PS *šbw ‘to wish, to desire’ (HALOT 997).

50. Ugr. ṛḥb (DUL 736), Hbr. ṛḥb (HALOT 1211), Arb. ṛḥb (Lane 1051), Sab. ṛḥb (SD 116), Gez. ṛḥba (CDG 466), Soq. ṛḥāb (LS 397) > PWS *ṛḥb ‘to be wide, broad.’

◊ There is no reliable trace of *ṛḥb ‘to be wide’ in Akkadian. Its principal semantic equivalents are ṣadātu (CAD Ś, 35, AHw. 1122) and rāpāšu (CAD R 153, AHw. 955), each with no transparent WS cognates.

Akk. ṛḥātu ‘main street’ (CAD R 317) has often been derived from *ṛḥb in Semitic lexicography (BDB 931, HALOT 1212 and elsewhere). In view of numerous semantic parallels throughout WS, this comparison to some extent preserves its attractiveness, but is nevertheless likely to be abandoned since the morphological shape of the Akkadian word is scarcely compatible with *ṛḥb in the prototype.

51. Hbr. rōmah (HALOT 1243), Syr. runḥā (LSyr. 735), Arb. rumḥ- (Lane 1153), Sab. ṛnḥ (SD 117), Gez. ṛmḥ, ṛmḥ (CDG 470), Mhr. ṛmḥāt (ML 327), Jib. ṛmḥāt (JL 213) > PWS *ṛVmḥ- ‘spear.’

◊ There is no trace of *ṛVmḥ- ‘spear’ in Akkadian.

52. Ugr. ṛ ‘gust, breath; wind; aroma’ (DUL 736), Hbr. rūḥ ‘wind’ (HALOT 1198), rēḥ ‘odour, fragrance’ (ibid. 1226), ṛwḥ (hip.) ‘to smell’ (ibid. 1196), Syr. riḥā ‘ventus; odor’ (LSyr. 727), Arb. ṛḥ (IV) ‘to breathe,’ ṛḥ ‘wind’ (Lane 1177–1180), Sab. h-ṝwḥ ‘to increase, to enlarge’ (SD 119), Gez. ṛḥya ‘to emit an odor, to be fragrant’ (CDG 467), Mhr. ṛḥ ‘hot wind’ (ML 333), Jib. ṛḥ ‘hot west summer wind’ (JL 218),

286 This verb, missing from the published lexical sources, has been recorded in the course of our Soqotri fieldwork.

287 In the latter case, metathesis from *prš ‘to spread,’ well attested in Hbr. prš (HALOT 975) and Arb. frš (Lane 2369), but conspicuously missing from Akkadian, is perhaps a suitable solution (P. Jensen apud LSyr. 600). As far as sadḥša is concerned, Arb. 'sd ‘to let loose, to lower, to let fall,’ sadḥ ‘a thing that is extended across or sideways in the space from side to side’ (Lane 1333–1334) is of some interest.

288 Hbr. ṛḥōb ‘open plaza’ (HALOT 1212), Gez. ṛḥhāb ‘public place, square, street’ (CDG 466), Mhr. ṛḥbēt ‘town’ (ML 320). The meaning of the Mehri lexeme (which is the main designation of “city,” “town” in that language) is particularly remarkable in view of the translation ‘urban center,’ ‘capital city’ proposed for ṛḥbātu in some of its attestations by J.-M. Durand (1991) and D. Charpin (1991).

289 Ugr. ṛń ‘spear’ (DUL 574) is usually thought to represent this term (with metathesis).

290 For this semantic development in other WS languages v. extensively Bulakh 2005b:418.

◊ There is hardly any reliable trace of *ruḥ ‘to blow’ in Akkadian (cf. Fronzaroli 1965a:139, 145). As far as the meaning “wind” is concerned, the main semantic equivalent is šāru (CAD Š 133, AHw. 1192), perhaps related to Hbr. ẓāʿārā ‘storm’ (HALOT 1345), in spite of the irregular reflex of the guttural.

In EthS, semantic marginalization coupled with the structural difference (*ḥḥy instead of *ruḥ) is noteworthy.

53. Hbr. rāwā (HALOT 1194), Syr. rwā (LSyr. 719), Arb. ṭaw (Lane 1194), Sab. h-rawy (SD 119), Qat. ṧmr (LIQ 153), Gez. ṭawaya (CDG 478), Mhr. ṭāwū (ML 334), Jib. ṭī (JL 218), Soq. ṭī (LS 395) > PWS *rawy ‘to drink one’s fill.’

◊ There is no trace of *rawy ‘to drink one’s fill’ in Akkadian.

54. Ugr. rm ‘high, exalted’ (DUL 741), Hbr. rwm ‘to be high’ (HALOT 1202), Syr. rāmā ‘altus’ (LSyr. 720), Arb. rym ‘to be distant, remote, far off,’ ṭawm ‘excess, redundancy, superiority; small mountains’ (Lane 1203–1204),293 Sab. ṭawm ‘height’ (SD 120), Gez. ṭawm ‘heights, the high, the highest’ (CDG 41),294 Tgr. rēmā ‘to be far, to be long’ (WTS 161), Amh. rāzzīm ‘high, tall, long’ (AED 405),295 Jib. ṭīm ‘tall, long’ (JL 219), Soq. ṭīṣm ‘long, profound’ (LS 399) > PWS *ṛym/*rwm ‘to be high, tall, long.’

◊ As rightly pointed out in HALOT 1202, there is no trace of *ṛym/*rwm ‘to be tall, long’ in Akkadian. For the meaning “tall,” the semantic equivalent is šākū (AHw. 1180, CAD Š₂ 19).

In the majority of WS languages, this root has to some extent been marginalized, but one cannot exclude that its status as the basic exponent of the meaning “tall, long” in Tigre, Jibbali and Soqotri reflects the original PWS (or, if a secondary loss in Akkadian is assumed, PS) picture.

291 For the reflexes of PS *ḥḥy ousting those of PWS *ruḥ in EthS v. Chapter 7, p. 446.
292 Gez. ṭaw ‘flabellum ventilare,’ ṭawwaḥa ‘ventilare frigus, vento excitato refrigerare,’ marawāḥ ‘flabellum’ (LLA 306) are so sparsely attested that the possibility of borrowing from Arabic appears to be reasonably high (not recognized in CDG 477). We hesitate to agree with M. Bulakh (2005b:416), for whom Jib. ṭaw ‘to lick’ (JL 210) represents the same variant root *ḥḥy (Soq. ṭaw, translated as ‘flairer’ in LS 397, actually means “to lick,” as repeatedly confirmed by native speakers). Generally speaking, the presence of *ruḥ in MSA is relatively weak and one cannot exclude that the attested lexemes are borrowed from Arabic.
293 For rēm ‘Dach, Haus’ in the Arabic dialects of Yemen v. Behnstedt 481 (most probably due to South Arabian substratum influence). The same is true of ṭawm- ‘stairs,’ registered as a Yemenite word in Classical lexicography (al-Selwi 1987:101).
294 This is the most reliable reflex of *ṛym in Geez. The exact philological background of rayyām ‘to be high, to be long,’ ṭayyum ‘raised, elevated’ and ṭayyām ‘high, elevated’ remains to be established insofar as none of them is listed in LLA.
295 Most probably from *rayyām, as a hypercorrect reaction to the sporadic shift z > y in Amharic (for which see Podolsky 1991:44). A further hypercorrect development is found in the verb ṭāzzāmā ‘to be high, tall, long’ (AED 404).
55. Hbr. str (nip.) ‘to hide oneself,’ (hip.) ‘to hide’ (HALOT 771), Syr. setrā ‘secretum’ (LSyr. 502), Arb. str ‘to cover, to hide, to protect’ (Lane 1304), Gez. satara ‘to hide, to conceal’ (CDG 518), Mhr. sētur ‘to cover’ (ML 352), Jib. str ‘to cover, to hide’ (JL 231), Soq. stre ‘tente’ (LS 291) > PWS *str ‘to cover, to hide.’

◊ There is no clear trace of *str ‘to hide’ in Akkadian, although an eventual link with OA śītru ‘a textile’ (CAD Š 134), tentatively considered by W. von Soden in AHw. 1252, is not to be ruled out completely.

56. Hbr. shb (HALOT 749), Arb. shb (Lane 1314), Sab. sshb (SD 138), Gez. saḥaba (CDG 492), Mhr. saḥāb (ML 344), Jib. šhab (JL 225), Soq. šob (LS 284) > PWS *shb ‘to draw, to drag.’

◊ While there is no trace of *shb ‘to draw, to drag’ in Mesopotamian Akkadian, a clearly related form is attested in VE 73 (sa-ra-bū = Nī.KAR, with an unexplained sibilant irregularity, Conti 1990:73–74). It is difficult to say whether we are faced with a PS archaism lost in Mesopotamia or rather with a WS lexeme.

57. Hbr. šahārōnīm ‘little moons (as amulets or jewelry)’ (HALOT 1311), Syr. sahrā ‘luna’ (LSyr. 462), Arb. šahr- ‘the new moon, when it appears’ (Lane 1612), Sab. sahr ‘beginning of month’ (SD 132), Min. sḥr ‘début du mois’ (LM 86), Qat. sḥr ‘new moon, first day of the month’ (LIQ 165), Gez. šahr ‘moon, first day of the month’ (CDG 528), Mhr. šēhr ‘first crescent of moon’ (ML 376), Jib. šēhr id. (JL 250), Soq. šēher ‘lune, mois’ (LS 426) > PWS *sahr- ‘new moon, crescent.’

◊ There is no obvious trace of *sahr- ‘crescent’ in Akkadian, although one cannot exclude that Akk. šērtu, possibly denoting “a characteristic such as brilliance” (CAD Š 327, often about moon) may ultimately be related to this root.296

58. Hbr. ṣifrā ‘thread, wreath’ (HALOT 1048), Arb. ḍfr ‘to plait, to braid’ (Lane 1795), Gez. żafara ‘to braid, to plait’ (CDG 148), Mhr. žafūr ‘to plait the hair’ (ML 473), Jib. ḟāfr id. (JL 324), Soq. ḥāfr ‘tresse’ (LS 364) > PWS *ṣpr ‘to plait.’

◊ PWS *ṣpr ‘to plait’ is not reflected in Akkadian: with W. von Soden, NA šipirtu ‘a sash woven in a special technique’ (AHw. 1103, CAD Š 201) is likely to be considered a WS loanword.

59. Ugr. šhk (DUL 782), Hbr. šhk (HALOT 1315), Syr. ghek (LSyr. 113), Arb. ḍhk (Lane 1771), Gez. saḥak (CDG 528), Mhr. ḍhk (ML 475), Jib. ḍhak (JL 325), Soq. ḍhak (LS 361) > *šhk ‘to laugh’ (SED I No. 70.).

◊ As rightly emphasized by J. Huehnergard (1991a:707), PWS *šhk ‘to laugh’ can hardly be related to Akk. šālu with the same meaning (AHw. 1096, CAD Š 64)297 in view of the phonological difference. Also probably unrelated is Akk. šēlēku ‘to sneeze’ (CAD Š 263, AHw. 1209), tentatively compared by W. von Soden.

297 Huehnergard prefers to relate the Akkadian verb to Arb. šēh ‘to cry, to shout’ (Lane 1751) and its WS cognates in spite of the semantic difference and the phonological irregularity (ḥ vs. h).
60. Syr. ʿaršā (LSyr. 551), Arb. ḏirs- (Lane 1785), Sab. ṣirs₂ (SD 42), Gez. ẓars (CDG 153), Mhr. ẓaṣṭaḥ (ML 478), Jib. ṭaṣṭaṣ (JL 327), Soq. ṭaṣṭaḥ (ibid.) > PWS *ṣirṣ- ‘molar tooth’ (SED I No. 275).

◊ There is no direct parallel to this root in Mesopotamian Akkadian, but ṣiršu ‘protuberance’ and ṣurrušu ‘to grow shoots’ (CAD § 209, 260, AHw. 1093, 1085) are clearly related to it. If one surmises that the meaning “protuberance” is original, we would be faced with a shared semantic innovation in PWS, but in view of ṣa-ra-sa-tum = ZÚ.GUL in VE 227 and related forms discussed in Krebernik 1983:10 and Conti 1990:101, the opposite possibility, viz. semantic marginalization of an original anatomical term in Babylonian, may appear more attractive.

61. Hbr. tāmār (HALOT 1756), Syr. tmartā (LSyr. 828), Arb. tamr- (Lane 317), Sab. tmr (SD 148), Min. tmr (LM 96), Gez. tamr, tamart (CDG 576), Mhr. tāmar (ML 402), Jib. tmartē (JL 271), Soq. āmr (LS 443) > PWS *tam(a)r- ‘date palm; dates.’

◊ Hardly any connection with Akk. ḡišimmaru (CAD G 102, AHw. 292), nor its Sumerian parallel ḡišimmar (Kogan 2012a:255).

62. Ugr. ḫ (DUL 889), Hbr. ḫal (HALOT 374), Syr. ḫlā (LSyr. 275), Arb. ḫall- (Lane 1862), Gez. ḫall (CDG 591), Mhr. ḫal (ML 409), Jib. ḫel (JL 277) > PWS *ḫall- ‘dew.’

◊ There is no trace of *ḫall- ‘dew’ in Akkadian.

63. Ugr. ṭry ‘fresh food’ (DUL 890), Hbr. ṭānār ‘fresh’ (HALOT 379), Syr. ṭarrunā ‘recens’ (LSyr. 289), Arb. ṭrw ‘to be fresh, juicy, moist’ (Lane 1851), Gez. ṭarāy ‘raw, crude’ (CDG 598), Mhr. ṭāyri ‘to get wet, damp; to be fresh’ (ML 411), Jib. ṭērīv ‘to be damp, fresh’ (JL 279) > ṭry ‘to be fresh, raw.’

◊ There is no direct parallel to PWS ṭry ‘to be fresh, raw’ in Akkadian, but cf. perhaps ṭerā ‘to extract, to press out liquid; to ooze’ (CAD ṭ 103).

64. Hbr. ẓl ‘to limp, to be lame’ (HALOT 1030), JPA ṭl ‘to limp’ (DJPA 225), Arb. ḏl ‘to limp’ (Lane 1917), Gez. ṣalra ‘to be wounded, superficially healed’ (CDG 554), Mhr. ḏāwa ‘to be crippled, to limp’ (ML 84), Jib. ḏalāʾ id. (JL 49) > ṭl ‘to limp; to be wounded’ (SED I No. 78).

◊ There is no trace of *ṭl ‘to limp’ in Akkadian.

65. Ugr. ṣl (DUL 947), Hbr. ṣāvel (HALOT 420), Syr. ṣavlā (LSyr. 305), Arb. wawil- (Lane 3056), Sab. wēl (SD 155), Qat. wēl (LIQ 52), Had. wēl (Sima 2000:160), Gez. wartlā (CDG 603), Mhr. wēl (ML 420), Jib. ṣbrīz (JL 286) > PWS *wasīl- ‘ibex’ (SED II No. 244).

---

298 In the speech of our informants, māzīt (du. moẓrīt, pl. maẓōrīt). The final -i is likely hypercorrect.
299 Including the enigmatic sa-ma-lum = GIŠ.GIŠIMMAR in VE 399.
The form *wa-i-lum in VE 1452’ (= IGI.DÀRA) has been identified with this root in Bonechi-Conti 1992:10 (with all probability, a WS word).

66. Ugr. yrš (DUL 982), Hbr. yrš (HALOT 441), Syr. rieve (LSyr. 310), Arb. wrṯ (Lane 2934), Sab. wrṯ (SD 162), Min. wrṯ (LM 105), Qat. wrṯ (LIQ 56), Gez. warasa (CDG 618), Mhr. wrṯ (ML 430), Jib. erṯ (JL 292), Soq. erti (LS 76) > PWS *wṛṯ ‘to inherit.’

While not directly attested in Akkadian, this root has a good chance of being related to Akk. rašū ‘to acquire, to obtain’ (CAD R 193, AHw. 961), as plausibly suggested in HALOT, DUL and elsewhere. In such a case, wa-ru₁₂-sum/wu-ru₁₂-sum 1 DAM (= Ú.MUNUS.DU₁₁) in VE 1214, convincingly identified with this root by Å. Sjöberg (2003:557), is probably to be attributed to the WS stratum of the Ebla vocabulary.

4.3. Lexical evidence for the ES/WS dichotomy: conclusions

4.3.1. In the preceding section of this chapter, 66 basic lexemes opposing Akkadian and West Semitic outside the Swadesh wordlist have been collected and analyzed. Such a substantial amount of lexical evidence is a welcome addition to the relatively meager output obtained from the Swadesh list itself. Not each and every one of these lexemes is of equal weight for our analysis. In some cases, the concepts involved are not sufficiently well-defined to provide a clear-cut semantic equivalence between Akkadian and WS, or else the dialectal distribution of a given proto-lexeme is not broad enough, or the possibility of borrowing (Akkadian > WS, or vice versa, or within WS) is relatively high. Yet in more than half of the positions the relevant lexical items deserve serious consideration: indeed, our perception of a Semitic idiom as belonging to the Eastern or Western branch is in no small degree conditioned by the choice of the exponents of these very concepts.

4.3.2. Let us try to present the most important of our findings in a condensed, tabular form. Our “Akkadian-West Semitic phrasebook” will comprise 34 concepts, listed in the central column of the chart. Their basic exponents in Akkadian and PWS will be presented to the right and to the left respectively. Further to the right and to the left, possible traces of the respective proto-lexemes in WS and Akkadian will be summarized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akkadian cognates</th>
<th>WS</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>WS cognates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*salp-</td>
<td>‘thousand’</td>
<td>lim(u)</td>
<td>Perhaps related to Ugr. lim ‘people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

300 Note that the meaning “to take possession,” with no direct connection with inheritance, is commonly postulated for the reflexes of this root in Ugaritic and Hebrew.

301 The presence of ṣ in the protoform of the Akkadian verb is fully confirmed by the consistent spelling with ŠI of the onomastic element ar-ṣi ‘I acquired’ in the Sargonic period (Sommerfeld 2010:154). Needless to say, W. von Soden’s derivation of rašū from išū (AHw. 961: “Ingressiv”) has very little to recommend.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mān</em></td>
<td>‘to be true, reliable’</td>
<td>takālu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*-derivation from PS *wkl, preserved in Akk. waklu ‘a person in charge of something’ and, in WS, Arb. wkl ‘to entrust.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ni-iš-bit-tū</em> in Malku IV 217 (rather unreliable); well attested in the Ebla vocabulary (i-sa-ba-um, etc.).</td>
<td><em>rišbar-</em></td>
<td>‘finger’</td>
<td>ubānu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Related to *būḫān- ‘thumb’ in the majority of WS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Akkadian and WS lexemes are perhaps distantly related to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>råd-</em></td>
<td>‘still’</td>
<td>adīnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Akkadian and WS lexemes are perhaps distantly related to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From PS *wark- ‘thigh,’ well attested in most of WS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>bāda</em></td>
<td>‘after, behind’</td>
<td>warki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS *mar- ‘adult male’ is well attested in most of WS; the meaning “male child” in ESA is noteworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>blī</em></td>
<td>‘to swallow’</td>
<td>ṭalātu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>bin-</em></td>
<td>‘son’</td>
<td>māru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PS *mar- ‘adult male’ is well attested in most of WS; the meaning “male child” in ESA is noteworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This and similar compound terms are based on ubiquitous PS kinship designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>dirāš-</em></td>
<td>‘elbow’</td>
<td>aḥu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ḥalab-</em></td>
<td>‘milk’</td>
<td>šizbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*ḥlm</td>
<td>'to dream'</td>
<td>šuttu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*ḥrm</td>
<td>'to forbid'</td>
<td>asakku ikkibu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*ḥyy</td>
<td>‘to live’</td>
<td>balāṭu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*ḥkl</td>
<td>‘to be able’</td>
<td>lerū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*ḥkn</td>
<td>‘to be’</td>
<td>baṣū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*ḥbl</td>
<td>‘to face, to be in front of’</td>
<td>maḥāru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*milḥ-</td>
<td>‘salt’</td>
<td>ṭābṭu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>*mal(i)k-</td>
<td>‘king’</td>
<td>šarru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps related is ḫarimtu ‘prostitute.’

Likely underlies the theonym Ea: ṣa-a [ḥayya].

The original meaning “to be steadfast, reliable” is preserved in Akk. kānu (in WS, also in Hbr. kwn).

Probably ḫ abl ‘battle.’

Neither mību ‘salpetre’ nor mallaṭu ‘kind of plant’ can be considered reliable cognates.

Most attestations of Akk. malku are best explainable by WS influence. Well attested in Ebla. An eventual etymological connection with Akk. malāku ‘to give advice; to deliberate’ is not to be ruled out.
| **mi-nu** is common in Ebla, but not in Mesopotamian Akkadian. | *min* | ‘from’ | *ina ištu* | — |
| The use of *napštu* with the meaning “self” is uncommon, perhaps even unattested, in Akkadian. | *napš-* | ‘self’ | *ramānu* | — |
| — | *našr-* | ‘eagle’ | *erū* | — |
| — | *paraš-* | ‘horse’ | *sīsū* | — |
| Hardly any connection with Akk. *riḫtu* ‘main street.’ | *rḫb* | ‘to be broad’ | *šadālu rapāšu* | — |
| — | *rīḫ-* | ‘wind’ | *šāru* | — |
| — | *rwm* | ‘to be tall’ | *šakū* | — |
| Not in Mesopotamian Akkadian, but cf. *su-₃u-bū* (VE 73), with an irregular sibilant. | *šḥb* | ‘to pull, to draw’ | *šadādu* | — |
| Perhaps preserved in *šērtu*, often appearing as an attribute of the moon-god. | *šahr-* | ‘new moon, crescent’ | *uskāru* | — |
| — | *šẖk* | ‘to laugh’ | *šīḫu* | — |
| — | *tam(a)r-* | ‘date palm, dates’ | *gišimmaru* | — |
| — | *ṭall-* | ‘dew’ | *nalšu* | — |
| Probably related to Akk. *rašū* ‘to obtain, to possess’ | *wrţ* | ‘to inherit’ | *aplu* | The verbal concept “to inherit” has no
| Comparable forms are attested in NWS: Hbr. *sūs*, etc. | | | |
| Perhaps related to PWS *priš ‘to spread’ and Arb. *sdl ‘to let loose’ respectively. | | | |
| Probably related to Hbr. *šērā ‘storm.’ | | | |
| Probably related to Arb. *šē ‘to grow.’ | | | |
| Borrowed from Gez. *sadada ‘to drive out,’ Hbr. *šdd ‘to deal violently.’ | | | |
| Borrowed from Sum. *u₁-sakar* whose second element may, in turn, go back to *šahr-. | | | |
| Probably related to Ugr. *şh, Arb. *šh ‘to cry, to shout’ in spite of the semantic and phonological problems. | | | |
| Borrowed from Sumerian. | | | |
It is by no means surprising that the severe impediments discussed at the beginning of this chapter in connection with the hypothetical morphological innovations of PWS turn out to be applicable to a great majority of the lexical features from our chart: in most cases, it is exceedingly difficult to show that in any particular case we are faced with a newly created lexical feature of PWS rather than with a PS lexical archaism lost in Akkadian.

4.3.3. Clear-cut word pairs like idu > kātu ‘hand’ or rēšu > kakādātu ‘head,’ making the archaic nature of the WS term with respect to its innovative Akkadian counterpart quite certain, are not numerous outside the Swadesh wordlist. To be sure, relatively reliable formal and/or semantic innovations in Akkadian are not so rare (lām ‘thousand,’ takālu ‘to be true, reliable,’ ṣubānu ‘finger,’ warēki ‘after,’ māru ‘son,’ ṣābṭu ‘salt’), but the diachronic status of the corresponding WS lexemes (PS archaism or shared innovation) is usually far from transparent: there are no marginal traces in Akkadian (which would point to an incompletely extinct archaism), yet no convincing path of semantic development in WS (suggesting a common innovation of this branch) can be proposed. Here belong the majority of the terms adduced in our chart: PWS *ṭalp- ‘thousand,’ *ṭm ‘to be true, reliable,’ *ṭiš ‘to sneeze,’ *ṭw ‘to be blind,’ *ṣi ‘in,’ *bār ‘after,’ *bb ‘to swallow,’ *bāyna ‘between,’ *dīrā‘ ‘elbow,’ *ḥalab- ‘milk,’ *ḥlm ‘to dream,’ *ḥrm ‘to forbid,’ *ḥbl ‘to be able,’ *milḥ- ‘salt,’ *nasr- ‘eagle,’ *paraš- ‘horse,’ *ṣḥ ‘to be broad,’ *rīy ‘wind,’ *rīm ‘to be tall,’ *ṣš ‘to laugh,’ *tamar- ‘date palm, dates,’ *ṭall- ‘dew.’ Exceptions are rare and not always fully persuasive: PWS *rād- ‘still’ < *rāmd ‘to turn,’ *kwān ‘to be’ < *ṭām ‘in front of, to face’ (the path of semantic derivation can be suggested, hence innovative); PWS *ḥin- ‘son,’ *ḥy ‘to live’ (more or less reliably preserved in Akkadian, hence archaic). For one concept (“to be in front of, to face”), a relatively balanced perservation of the remnants of *mhr in WS and *ḥbl in Akkadian prompts one to consider the existence of two broadly synonymous roots already in Proto-Semitic, outing each other in the ancestor tongues of the two principal branches.

4.3.4. The existence of cognate lexemes (preferably with well-defined basic semantics) in non-Semitic Afroasiatic languages would provide an ideal proof of the archaic nature of the corresponding Semitic term (no matter whether in Akkadian or West Semitic). A prime example is ḏbr ‘finger’ in Egyptian, which assures the diachronic priority of PWS *rīšbar-. Due to the enormous chronological gap between PAA and PS, examples of this kind are very difficult to find, at least at the present stage of the development of Afroasiatic etymology.

4.3.5. The lexical evidence from Ebla is rarely helpful for the purpose of our investigation. As is well known, for quite a number of basic concepts the Eblaite exponents side with PWS rather than Mesopotamian Akkadian (*rīšar ‘finger,’ *bāyna ‘between,’ *dād- ‘uncle,’ *malik- ‘king,’ *min ‘from,’ *ṣḥ ‘to pull, to drag’) or else the

| (*l confirmed by Sargonic orthography). | lexical expression in Akkadian. | There is no reliable WS etymology for aplu ‘heir.’ |
very concept in question is not sufficiently well represented in Babylonian and Assyrian sources, but reliably attested in Ebla (*ḫadr- ‘inner room,’ *ṣirš- ‘molar tooth,’ *wr ‘to inherit,’ *wāwil- ‘ibex’). Very ancient attestation of such terms coupled with the relative independence from the Sumerian influence would suggest that we are faced with PS archaisms lost in Mesopotamia. However, in view of the geographic and cultural proximity to the West Semitic area the possibility of WS influence can rarely be discarded. Furthermore, a great bulk of the Eblaite evidence goes back to the bilingual lexical list, which means that the exact meaning (let alone functional status) of the respective words in the hypothetical East Semitic language of Ebla is impossible to ascertain.

4.3.6. A few concepts prominent in the majority of West Semitic languages do not seem to display well-shaped Akkadian equivalents of Semitic origin: “to sneeze,” “blind,” “uncle,” “inner room,” “to dream,” “to forbid,” “to gather firewood,” “to be jealous,” “new moon,” “to inherit.” Akkadian does not distinguish between “finger” in general and “thumb,” “tooth” and “molar”; it has no predicative element with the meaning “still.” While some of such cases can be discarded in view of the incomplete textual evidence, a few other certainly reflect true conceptual differences between the two major branches of Semitic. But here again, it is usually hard to say which of the two is archaic and which is innovative.

* * *

If Proto-West Semitic has ever existed, it must have developed a substantial number of specific, innovative lexical features of its own: it is simply hard to believe that Akkadian alone was a constantly innovating party whereas PWS was always 100 per cent faithful to the inherited PS lexical inventory. Many of such innovative features must be before our eyes — it is our hope that there are few candidates better than those selected and analyzed above. This selection is thus the most significant positive outcome of our investigation: the linguistic landscape of early West Semitic is now much better defined in terms of both variety and precision. Regrettably, such features can rarely be adduced as real proof of the historical unity of WS without incurring the sin of circularity.

5. The internal division of West Semitic

5.1. Morphological isoglosses

As long as the diachronic unity of Central Semitic is accepted as a feasible possibility (see Chapter 3), its relationship to the remaining two West Semitic branches — Ethiopian Semitic and Modern South Arabian — is expected to fit one of the four alternative subgrouping patterns: (1) CS is opposed to MSA and EthS, which are genealogically closer to each other; (2) CS, EthS and MSA are three totally independent branches of WS with no special proximity between any of them; (3) EthS is closer to CS; and (4) MSA is closer to CS. Let us now consider to what extent each of
these four patterns is supported by morphological evidence. After this examination, a similar analysis will be undertaken on the basis of lexical isoglosses.

5.1.1. The first hypothesis (ES + MSA vs. CS), perhaps the most popular one in today’s Semitics, represents a modernized (“post-Hetzronian”) version of the traditional “South Semitic” theory: “true” South Semitic is what is left when Arabic and ESA are reassigned to CS, as prescribed by O. Rössler, R. Hetzron, R. Voigt and others.

In his recent survey of the “South Semitic” question, St. Weninger (2011b:1116) agrees that “MSA and E[th]S ... share many features.” Having listed eight potentially relevant phenomena, he readily (and in our view correctly) admits that three of them are quite unreliable. However, at least three other phenomena listed by Weninger are no less problematic.

– **Contra** Weninger (and Müller 1964:51), none of the MSA languages seem to display the characteristically Ethiopian “system of seven vowels” and it is altogether unclear whether such a system can be traced back to Proto-MSA.

– The a-Ablaut in the formation of the feminine adjectives, characteristic of Geez, Tigré and Tigrinya, does not in any way match the MSA picture, where exactly the opposite way of gender marking (*-י- for the feminine) is observed (see Chapter 8, p. 460).

– The masculine plural ending -ן of adjectives and participles in Geez can hardly be identified with the Proto-MSA element *-ן on either formal and functional grounds (see Chapter 8, pp. 464-465).

---

302 “Representation of PS emphatics as ejectives,” “existence of two prefix-conjugations,” “suffixes with -יו for first and second person singular in the perfect.”

303 For both Mehri and Jibbali, T. M. Johnstone proposes eight-member vocalic systems (ML XIII, JL XV), which are, by the way, quite different from each other. Furthermore, at least in Mehri many of the alleged vocalic oppositions are unlikely to be phonemic, as recently recognized by J. Watson (in Sima 2009:10–22). For Soqotri, the results of our fieldwork suggest only five phonemically distinct vocalic qualities: a (= [a]/[e]), o, i, u, e (= [e]/[o]/[a]).

304 This argument goes back to Müller 1964:51 (in its turn, relying on Bittner 1909:75 and 1913a:89).

The first case referred to by Bittner and Müller is the opposition between bīt ‘sons’ (not in ML, supposedly from *bīn-t) and ḫa-bāntum ‘daughters.’ In our opinion, any connection between this pair and the gender Ablaut in EthS is highly unlikely (or at least unprovable). It is admittedly more difficult to get rid of the second example, viz. the numeral “five,” which displays *i-forms with the feminine substantives and *a-forms with the masculine ones throughout MSA (Johnstone 1975:115): Mrh. ẖáymah vs. ẖāmmāh (ML 445), Jib. ẖiss vs. ḫōṣ (JL 302), Soq. ḫāmīs vs. ḫāmōy (LS 182). Since the principle of gender polarity in the syntax of the numerals fully applies in MSA, one has to acknowledge that, in this particular case, the masculine form is marked with *i and the feminine with *a, as in EthS (unrecognized in Lonnet 2008:123). It is hard to say whether this lone coincidence should be ascribed to a common heritage of EthS and MSA or rather be treated as a chance coincidence. Furthermore (as seen already by Bittner), the MSA picture may be due to secondary re-arrangement conditioned by the fact that the i-vowel is an inherent feature of the numeral “five” in PS (*ẖāmīs- > Akk. ḫāmīš, Hbr. ḫāmēš).

305 With no direct parallels elsewhere in EthS: Tigré -きちんと is similar functionally, but different materially. The etymological relationship between Gez. -ן and Tgr. -ן is deemed to remain a thorny issue in the historical morphology of EthS.
The remaining two features appear to be more promising, but require a far deeper elaboration.

Thus, Weninger’s “combination of causative, reflexive and causative reflexive morphemes with 0/0₂-stems in the verbal derivation” can deservedly be considered an adequate description of the Geez-like twelve-member system of verbal stems. However, only one member of this system, viz. the causative-reflexive based on the intensive stem, has an exclusive formal parallel in MSA: Gez. ṭastḥayyasa ‘to prefer’ — Soq. šḥābūt ‘to learn’ (see further Johnstone 1975:13 and Simeone-Senelle 1998:83–85). All other coincidences are either trivial retentions from PS preserved in many other Semitic languages (the Dt stem) or do not exist in MSA (the ŠD stem, all the conative stems).306 To ascribe this lone feature to the common heritage of the alleged “South Semitic” proto-language is, in our view, rather adventurous.

The “existence of quadri- and quinque-radical verbal roots” (Weninger 2011b:1116) is, of course, no specific property of either EthS or MSA: such roots are well attested in Central Semitic and, strictly speaking, also in Akkadian. Moreover, the conjugational patterns of the quadriradical verbs in EthS and MSA are quite different from each other and can scarcely be reduced to a single shared pattern. Weninger’s observation admittedly does bring us to one remarkable feature of the quadriradical verbs in MSA and EthS which the CS languages do not share, viz. a close association with n-prefixation (Kouwenberg 2010a:314–315). Theoretically, this peculiarity might be considered a shared innovation of “South Semitic,”307 but the alternative possibility advanced by N. J. C. Kouwenberg is far more plausible: a PS archaism abandoned in CS but transparently reflected in the morphological structure of the n-quadriradicals in Akkadian.

There is hardly anything positive to be added to the allegedly exclusive morphological parallels between EthS and MSA, either from the previous research or from our own observations.308 One possible exception is the element -i- appearing before the pronominal suffixes on plural nouns in Geez and Mehri (Cantineau 1932:183): Gez. ṭammät-i-homu ‘their mothers,’ ṭadaw-i-homu ‘their hands’ (Dillmann 1907:351–353), Mhr. ḥādāt-i-sm ‘their hands,’ ḥādāt-i-sm ‘their clothes’ (Rubin 2010:36). As far as the sound feminine plural is concerned, this phenomenon is hard to separate from the well-known parallels in Hebrew (ḥmāt-i-hām ‘their daughters’) and Akkadian (šarrāt-ū-šunu/šarrāt-i-šunu ‘their queens’) and, as such, should be considered a PS archaism. It is hard to say whether its hypothetical spread to the broken plural

---

306 Cantineau (1932:190), Leslau (1943:10) and Müller (1964:53) refer to the opposition yihaktēb (Š) vs. yihakōtēb (ŠD). Their source is Bittner 1911:33–42, where this opposition is indeed frequently referred to and explicitly compared to the Geez picture. However, three or four concrete examples mentioned on p. 41 of Bittner’s study are by no means impressive. Given the fact that the “second causative” in Mehri has not been detected by any subsequent observer, Bittner’s evidence has to be met with utmost caution (cf. Voigt 1994:302).

307 Leslau 1943:11. Leslau is right to emphasize that in both MSA and EthS the n-prefix has no derivational function in the triradical paradigm.

308 For example, the element -gī/-ūt in some verbal nouns from the causative and causative-reflexive stems in Mehri is the regular shape of the feminine gender morpheme in this language and, contra Müller 1964:54, has nothing to do with the ending -o(t) in the Geez infinitives.
has to be considered a shared innovation of EthS and MSA\(^{309}\) or rather an independent process, at least partly triggered by the complete abandonment of the external masculine plural in both subgroups. Furthermore (as pointed out in Appleyard 1996:209), the *i*-vowel in Mehri appears only before dual and plural suffixes. This peculiar distribution has no parallel in EthS and may cast legitimate doubts on the diachronic identity between the EthS and MSA facts.

We may conclude that sufficiently reliable exclusive morphological features uniting Ethiopian Semitic and Modern South Arabian are practically lacking. A few potential candidates are rarely persuasive and, moreover, tend to involve rather marginal phenomena and do not affect the core of either the verbal or nominal morphology.\(^{310}\) Therefore, the time-honored South Semitic hypothesis has to be abandoned.

5.1.2. The second model, regarding CS, EthS and MSA as three independent WS branches with no special connection to each other, has been cautiously adopted in Huehnergard 2005:161 and Huehnergard–Rubin 2011:263.\(^{311}\) As pointed out by J. Huehnergard, the idea goes back to Porkhomovsky 1997:222, where it is rightly observed that the presence of the long form of the prefix conjugation is (or at least is thought to be) a PS archaism and, as such, cannot have any bearing on the alleged genealogical proximity between the two groups.

This new model is to be welcomed insofar as it parts from the traditional South Semitic theory, critically analyzed in the preceding subsection of the present chapter. However, because of its negative nature it is highly non-committal and difficult to either prove or disprove. Before sticking to such a negative theory, it is clearly recommendable to consider two positive alternatives, involving a special proximity between CS and one of the two traditional “South Semitic” branches.

5.1.3. One remarkable feature uniting CS and EthS in opposition to MSA is the adjectival patterns with length discussed above in this chapter. Of particular interest is the stem \(\ast C_1aC_2\tilde{u}C_3\)-, with all probability generalized as the pattern of the passive participle in the ancestral language of these two subgroups (Fox 2003:197–202).

---

309 “Une innovation singulière qui peut être considérée comme une bonne preuve de l’unité primitive du domaine” (Cantineau 1932:184).

310 Needless to say, such a qualification cannot be applied to N. J. C. Kouwenberg’s theory according to which both EthS and MSA have replaced the Present \(*yiq\tilde{atul}\) with the intensive stem form \(*yaqattil(u)\) (2010a:117–123 and passim). For Kouwenberg, this supposedly shared replacement is the hallmark of South Semitic as a genealogical unity, a concept to which he adheres throughout his monograph. A detailed analysis of the merits and drawbacks of Kouwenberg’s theory will be undertaken in Chapter 3 (pp. 156-164), but it is important to observe that even if the aforementioned replacement did take place, most of the remaining key elements of the verbal morphology of EthS and MSA remain too radically different to be traced back to a specific common node. Note in particular that Kouwenberg’s “renewal of most of the ancient imperfective forms by means of the extension of gemination to all non-basic imperfective forms” cannot in any way be applied to MSA.

311 N. Pat-El still speaks of “Ethio-Semitic, the closest relative of MSA” (2012:24), although the chart on p. 39 of the same study follows Huehnergard’s modified pattern.
Another interesting phenomenon coming from the sphere of nominal derivation are the substantival patterns \( *C_1VC_2C_3\)\(^{312}\) common throughout CS\(^{313}\) and, incidentally, rather productive in Geez (Dillmann 1907:259).\(^{314}\) The \( *C_1VC_2C_3\)\(^{\tilde{a}n}\)-patterns do not exist in Akkadian: what we do find is the suffix \( \tilde{a}n\)- attached to the already existing primary and derived nouns, but even this is at best sporadic (cf. Goetze 1946:127–130, Streck 2005:237, 240). The same is true for Modern South Arabian, as seen already by Bittner 1909:25 (“nur ganz vereinzelt”).

These features are, obviously, too narrow a basis for any serious conclusion about an eventual genealogical proximity between the two groups.

5.1.4. As far as the possible special link between CS and MSA is concerned, the internal passive, also discussed above in this chapter, immediately suggests itself as a shared feature. This important but lone isogloss is also insufficient for any far-reaching verdict. More important could be the ending \( *-na\) (rather than \( *-\tilde{a}\)) in the feminine plural forms of the second and third person of the prefix conjugations, but the innovative nature of this feature is far from obvious (see Chapter 3, p. 128 below). The same is true of the \( n\)-energetic, also to be discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 134-141).

5.1.5. Our conclusions are thus mostly of a negative nature: while the traditional “South Semitic” hypothesis, postulating a special proximity between EthS and MSA, lacks any serious morphological support, almost the same can be said about the two alternative possibilities: EthS + CS or MSA + CS. The provisional output must be to treat the three branches as independent offshoots of the West Semitic proto-language.

5.2. The internal division of West Semitic: lexical isoglosses

Let us now try to correlate the results of our morphological investigation with the lexical evidence, beginning with the Swadesh wordlist and then proceeding to other strata of the basic vocabulary.

5.2.1. The Swadesh wordlist

5.2.1.1. The evidence of the Swadesh wordlist provides strong evidence in favor of one of the two positive hypothesis outlined in the preceding section, namely, a special genealogical link between Central Semitic and Ethiopian Semitic in opposition to Modern South Arabian.

In two positions of the list, this type of evidence is unanimous and hardly needs any special justification: \( *ybš\) ‘(to be) dry’ (Hbr. \( yābēš\), Syr. \( yabbiš\), Arb. \( yābis\), Sab. \( ybs\)\(^1\) + Gez. \( ybus\)) and \( *rāhad\) ‘one’ (Ugr. \( rāhd\), Hbr. \( rāḥād\), Syr. \( ḥad\), Arb. \( rāḥad\), Sab. \( ḥd\) + Gez. \( rāhadu\)). In both cases, Akkadian and MSA cognates either do not exist, or are formally and semantically different, or at least have no basic status.

---

\(^{312}\) Needless to say, the substantival patterns \( *C_1VC_2C_3\)\(^{\tilde{a}n}\)- are to be sharply distinguished from the use of the suffix \( *\tilde{a}n\)- in a variety of adjectival formations (including participles, nouns of agent, etc.), relatively widespread throughout Semitic and certainly traceable to PS.


\(^{314}\) Ca. 12 reliable cases, including \( rīkhān\) ‘nakedness,’ \( šalān\) ‘separation,’ and \( šāhān\) ‘seniority.’
A closer analysis of the list reveals more positions whose exponents must go back to the common CS/EthS stage.

The most transparent are *ktl ‘to kill,’ *kw*m ‘to stand’ and *røy ‘to see.’ In each case, the CS evidence is a bit uneven, yet broad enough to project the corresponding roots to the PCS level with a high degree of reliability: *ktl (Syq. κτλα, Arb. qatala, Sab. ƙṭl + Gez. ḫatala),315 *kw*m (Ugr. ƙm, Syq. ƙām, Arb. qwm, Sab. ƙwm + Gez. ƙoma),316 *røy (Hbr. ṛ qed, Arb. ṛy, Sab. ṛy + Gez. ṛyəya).317 Here again, etymological parallels from Akkadian and MSA are totally lacking.318

Less evident, yet promising, are *baṣar- ‘meat,’ *škb ‘to lie down,’ *ราวَ- ‘bird’ and *հAML- ‘louse.’

The anatomical term *baṣar- is attested as the main exponent of the meaning “meat” in the majority of CS: Ugr. ƙšr, Hbr. ƙaṣār, Syq. ƙeṣr, Sab. ƙṣr (SED I No. 41).319

The same basic status is attested for its reflexes in several South Ethiopian languages (Har. ƙaṣār, Gaf. ƙaṣá vå, Gur. ƙaṣķær), and there is little doubt that its loss in Geez, Tigre, Tigrinya and Amharic is due to a comparatively recent replacement by the Cushitic loanword šagā. The root is missing from MSA,320 whereas Akk. ƙiṣru (hapax legomenon in a late lexical list) has good chances to be a WS loanword.321

The root *škb as the basic exponent of the meaning “to lie down” is attested only in CS and EthS: Ugr. škb (DUL 814), Hbr. ƙkb (HALOT 1486), Syq. škeb (LSyr. 775) + Gez. saḥaba (CDG 496). It has no cognates in MSA, whereas Akk. saḥāpu ‘to lie down’ (CAD S 74, AHw. 1011) is rather marginally attested and displays two phonological irregularities.

Ethiopian Semitic is the only subgroup where the reflexes of *ราวَ- have become the basic exponents of the meaning “bird”: Gez. ṣof, Amh. ƙof, etc. (CDG 78). However, the root is also attested nearly throughout CS: Ugr. ṣp, Hbr. ṣp, Syq. ṣawpā, Arb. ṣawf- (SED II No. 48). At the same time, its reflexes are totally missing from both Akkadian and MSA.

---

315 Missing from Ugaritic (> mḥs), marginal and perhaps not autochthonous in Hebrew (> ḥrg), competing with ḥrg in Sabaic and Qatabanian.
316 Replaced by ṭmd in Hebrew, where ƙwm is relegated to the less basic (yet very well represented) semantic slot “to rise, to stand up.”
317 Missing from Ugaritic and Aramaic. In both cases, reflexes of *ḥdy/*ḥzāy have become the most prominent replacements. A curious parallel drift in the same direction took place in South EthS.
318 Within a strictly formal approach, *layliy- ‘night’ should also be ascribed to this group (Ugr. ll, Hbr. ḥy, Syq. lēlāyā, Arb. ḥy-, Sab. ḥy + Gez. ḥelīt), but the remnants of this root in both Akkadian and MSA are so well attested that one can safely evaluate its basic status in CS and EthS as an independently preserved archaism.
319 In Arabic, baṣar- was relegated to the meanings “epidermis” and “mankind” under the impact of laḥm- (originally, “food” in general).
320 Mhr. ḥṣwet ‘skin, complexion’ (ML 56) and Jib. ḥṣwet id. (JL 30) are clearly borrowed from Arabic.
321 Explicit Malku I 305: bi-iṣ-ṣ-r = ʂe-er-ṣu (Hrubša 2010:441). The word has usually been interpreted as ‘small child,’ which may be justified in view of bi-ịn bi-nim = ḥip-ịp-ị in the next entry of the list. However, it is hard to avoid thinking that the whole entry emerged from a confusion between ʂeru ‘baby’ and ʂeru (ṣeru, šeru) ‘meat,’ thus indirectly pointing to the author’s acquaintance with WS *baṣar- ‘meat.’ The combination mē BI-iṣ-ṣ-r-im ‘amniotic fluid’ (Michel 1997:64) is best to be explained as “water of release” = mē pišrim (Kogan–Koslova 2006:594).
Gez. ḫemāl ‘louse’ and related terms in modern EthS have no direct cognates beyond CS: OArm. ḫml, Arb. qaməl-, Sab. ḥmlt and, with methatesis, Syr. ḫalmā and Sab. ḥlm (SED II No. 130). Akk. ḫalmatu is probably related, but displays a non-emphatic k. Much less certain is an eventual relationship with Hbr. kinnām, Mrh. kəmmət, Jib. šinit, Soq. kōnym (SED II No. 116), which do not share with this root any single consonant in the correct sequence.

Finally, one has to mention *whb ‘to give’ and *κrr ‘to be cold.’ As we have seen above in this chapter (pp. 68-69), both display relatively reliable cognates in MSA, yet it is only in CS and EthS that their reflexes are attested as the main exponents of the respective meanings.

5.2.1.2. The only position in the list where we find a clear-cut exclusive isogloss between EthS and MSA is *ṣVḥ for “fat”: Gez. ṣḥḥ + Mhr. šabḥ, Jib. šabḥ, Soq. šabḥ (SED I No. 261).

Much more difficult to assess is the relevance of the negative particle *rəl, listed as one of the two “South Semitic” features in Faber 1997:11. According to Faber, “this marker was generally retained in Central Semitic as a prohibitive, but in South Semitic it was generalized as an indicative marker of negation.”

Descriptively, Faber’s statement is best applicable to Sabaic, Qatabanian and Hadramitic where ḥ is the only attested form of the negative particle (Beeston 1962:66, Stein 2003:238–239). But this is also the most problematic aspect of her hypothesis: most of today’s supporters of the Rössler–Hetzron classification pattern firmly believe that at least Sabaic is a legitimate member of the Central Semitic subgroup (Huehnergard 2005:162 and elsewhere in Chapter 3 below).

In a slightly more historically oriented approach, Faber’s description is also true for Modern South Arabian. As persuasively argued in Lucas–Lash 2010:399–400, Watson 2012:310–312 and Pat-El 2012:24–25, the Soqotri picture, with the prepositive al as the only negative marker, is the most archaic one, whereas in the continental languages different stages of encroachment of the postpositive *lā are attested.

---

322 The prohibitive *rəl is, in fact, characteristic of a very narrow circle of North-West Semitic languages: Ugaritic, Hebrew, Phoenician and early Aramaic (v. references in DUL 46, HALOT 1812 as well as Pat-El 2012:28).

323 Reflexes of *lā are hardly ever attested in ESA. For a possible lone exception in Minaean v. Beeston 1962:66, LM 56.

324 So in the speech of our informants, who are only vaguely aware of the existence of a special prohibitive marker with ṛ (for which see Simeone-Senelle 1994:207–208) and never use it in their everyday speech.

325 As long as this is viewed as an plain internal development, one has to assume that *lā was somehow preserved in Proto-MSA and lost only in Soqotri. However, the possibility of a prolonged outside pressure from a lā-language is not to be ruled out. An early form of Arabic is, of course, a likely candidate. The presentation of the MSA facts in Pat-El 2012:23–25 is rather confused. First we read that “MSA retained lā for some restricted functions, mostly as a negative answer,” but then it turns out that “in the dialects of Meḥrī (sic), Jībbālī and Hobyot” postpositive lā is regularly used as part of the double negation or even alone as the main negative marker. It is wrong to state that “all MSA dialects (sic) attest to it [postpositive lā]” and “the change must be dated to Proto-MSA”: as just mentioned above, this phenomenon is missing from Soqotri, hence any Proto-MSA background for it can be safely excluded.
The bewildering complexity of the Ethiopian facts, recently analyzed in Bulakh 2012, is only partly reflected in Faber’s treatment of the problem. According to Bulakh, the “North Ethiopian” picture, with *ʔal/*ʔay as the main negative marker and *ʔal restricted to the combination *ʔal(a)-b- ‘there is not,’ rather faithfully reflects the situation in Proto-EthS. In a deeper perspective, one might speculate that *lā was first ousted by *ʔal,326 which was later relegated to the negative existential construction by yet another newcomer (*ʔal/*ʔay). Alternative solutions are not to be ruled out, however.327

We may conclude that weakening and disappearance of *lā is a common feature of ESA, MSA and EthS, side by side with a growing prominence of *ʔal. Given the fact that the spread of the latter feature is uneven, whereas ESA has been classified as Central Semitic on other grounds, it is hard to accept this isogloss as a reliable witness of the hypothetical South Semitic unity.328

There remain the MSA designations of “egg” — Mhr. kāwhol, Jib. kahēzin, Soq. ḫālīḥin — which are remotely similar to Tna. ʔmkulalih and Amh. ʔmkulal (SED I No. 170). The relevance of this coincidence for the purpose of our investigation is quite uncertain.

5.2.1.3. There is not a single position in the Swadesh wordlist which would support a special genealogical proximity between CS and MSA.329 This subgrouping possibility can therefore be safely discarded on lexical grounds.

326 One may doubt that “Proto-GS**327**” is an appropriate label for this level of reconstruction (Pat-El 2012:22).
327 Strangely enough, the diachronic interplay between the two sets of forms (*ʔal vs. *ʔi/*ʔay) is left without discussion in N. Pat-El’s survey of the EthS facts (2012:22–23).
328 Tricky diachronic behavior of negative particles elsewhere in Semitic invites much caution in this respect. Thus, as we have just seen, three of the four ESA languages use only ʪ as the negative marker, but Minaean has ʪhm (Beeston 1962:66, LM 57), probably cognate with Arabic lam. PS *lā is famously missing from Phoenician, where it is replaced by ʪl and, perhaps, ʪ (Friedrich–Röllig 1999:225–226, Pat-El 2013). N. Pat-El’s recent attempt to use the negation morphemes as a classification tool (2012) cannot be considered successful. While it is certainly true that both *ʔal and *lā are to be traced back at least to PWS, there are weighty reasons to reject Pat-El’s reconstruction of the original distributional pattern between the two particles (indicative *ʔal vs. non-indicative *lā) as well as the hypothetical path of their development in individual languages. On the one hand, it is wrong to claim (Pat-El 2012:30) that “Except for OSA, the distinction in the Central Semitic set of negation particles is indicative/non-indicative. Arabic has a rich modal system, where this is evident.” What is evident is exactly the opposite: no special “non-indicative” or “modal” negation marker has ever existed in Arabic, and Pat-El’s attempt to subsume the Arabic imperfect under “modal” forms (fn. 29 and passim) has very little to recommend. On the other hand, Pat-El’s suggestion that the regular use of *lā as the main verbal negation in Hebrew, Aramaic and Ugaritic is due to “borrowing” from the nominal system (2012:36) is an ad hoc hypothesis with hardly any material argument behind it.
329 One intriguing exception is, perhaps, *lbn ‘to be white,’ extensively discussed in Bulakh 2004:270–274 and 2006a:185–195. As is well known, this root produced basic terms with the meaning “white” in Hebrew (labān-, HALOT 517) and throughout MSA (Soq. ḥabon, LS 228; other references v. in Chapter 8, p. 528 below). There are good reasons to believe that also Ugr. ʾlm (DUL 490) and Pho. ʾlm (DNWSI 564) functioned as the main terms with this meaning, whereas Arb. labān- ‘milk’ (LA 13 457) certainly goes back to a more original meaning “white” (the coincidence of derivational patterns in Hebrew, Arabic and, perhaps, MSA is quite noteworthy). Given the fact that transparent cognates to this root are
5.2.1.4. The diachronic unity of CS and EthS is thus the only positive hypothesis for which the Swadesh list provides enough evidence. For each of the three major CS languages, there are from six to nine exclusive lexical connections with Geez. 330 Nothing similar can be said about EthS and MSA, nor about MSA and CS. The CS/EthS diachronic unity can thus be reasonably accepted as a working hypothesis, to be verified on the basis of broader lexical evidence.

5.2.2. Other lexical strata

5.2.2.1. CS + EthS

1. Ugr. řid ‘when,’ řid-k ‘then, so then’ (DUL 16-17, Tropper 2000:796), Hbr. nāz ‘then’ (HALOT 26), BArm. yādayin (HALOT 1807, with references to other Aramaic data), Arb. ṣid ‘when,’ ṣidā ‘then; when,’ ṣidān ‘then’ (Lane 38–41), Sab. ṣd ‘when’ (SD 2), Qat. ṣīw ‘then’ (LIQ 6), Gez. ṣanza ‘while, when’ (CDG 34), 331 māṣe ‘when?’ (ibid. 324), ṣe ‘now, just now’ (ibid. 625), Tgr. ṣaze ‘now’ (WTS 380) > *ṣVd(ay) ‘when; then.’

◊ The core element of this adverb must be identical with the deictic pronoun *dV. It is missing from both Akkadian (in which there is no trace of *dV at all) and MSA.

2. Ugr. ṣap (DUL 89), Hbr. ṣāpā (HALOT 79), Arb. ṣaf‘a (Lane 2421), Gez. ṣafot (CDG 9) > *ṣapraw- ‘snake, viper’ (SED II No. 10).

◊ This animal name is attested in Ebla: ṣ-pā-û-um = Sum. ama.muš (EV 034, Civil 1984:91), perhaps a WS word.

3. Ugr. ʾl (DUL 65), Hbr. ʾūl (HALOT 797), Syr. ʾilā (LSyr. 516), Gez. ṣwāl (CDG 78), Tgr. ṣlu (WTS 450) > *ṣVwVl- ‘young animal, foal, suckling’ (SED II No. 47).

◊ This nominal root is not directly attested in Arabic, but ṣawīl- ‘the persons whom a man feeds’ (Lane 2201) and similar formations are most probably related to it.

4. Ugr. ṣmk ‘valley’ (DUL 165), Hbr. ṣmk ‘to be deep’ (HALOT 947), Syr. ṣmak ‘profundus evasit’ (LSyr. 531), Arb. ṣmq ‘to be deep’ (Lane 2157), Gez. ṣamaka ‘to be deep’ (CDG 63) > *ṣmk ‘to be deep.’ 332

missing in both Akkadian and Ethiopian, there is no serious obstacle against tracing it back to the would-be common ancestor of CS and MSA. But this is a truly unique example of this kind.

330 Six in Hebrew, seven in Arabic, nine in Syriac.

331 The epigraphic form ṣza in RÍÉ 187:20 is probably to be normalized as [ṣza] with secondary assimilation nz > zz, cf. ṣanza in RÍÉ 189:16 and elsewhere. It is, therefore, not to be regarded as more archaic nor closer to the CS data than the classical Gez form.

332 The earliest attestations of this PWS lexeme come from OB Mari (reference courtesy I. Arkhipov): ṣamk- (Streck 2000:93).
Semantically unambiguous cognates to this root are missing from both Akkadian and MSA. For Akk. *emēku* ‘to be wise’ (AHw. 213, CDG 63) v. Chapter 5 (pp. 328-329); for MSA *tamḵ- ‘midst, interior’ v. Chapter 8 (p. 538).

5. Hbr. bārād ‘hail’ (HALOT 154), Syr. bardā ‘grando’ (LSyr. 95), Sab. brd ‘cold weather, hailstorm’ (SD 30), Arb. brd ‘to be cold,’ barad- ‘hail’ (Lane 183–184), Gez. ḍabrađa ‘to cool,’ barad ‘hail, snow, hoarfrost’ (CDG 103) > *brd ‘to be cold,’ *barad- ‘hail.’

◊ The presence of this root in Mehri (brēd ‘frost, hail,’ ML 51 and bôred ‘kalt machen,’ Jahn 1902:169)335 is likely to be attributed to the Arabic influence, particularly in view of its absence from Jibbali and Soqotri.

6. Ugr. mdbr ‘desert’ (DUL 525), Hbr. midbār ‘pasture, steppe, desert’ (HALOT 547), Syr. dabrā ‘ager, campus; desertum’ (LSyr. 140), Arb. dabr- ‘a portion of ground separated from the adjacent parts for sowing or planting’ (Lane 845), Gez. dabr ‘mountain’ (CDG 121) > *dabr- ‘open country.’334

7. Hbr. gēb (HALOT 170), Syr. gubbā (LS 100), Arb. jubb- (Lane 371), Gez. gōbb (CDG 176) > *gibb- ‘pit, well.’

◊ Akk. gubbu ‘well’ (CAD G 117, AHw. 295) is borrowed from Aramaic (cf. Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:31).

8. Ugr. gr ‘to lodge, to take refuge, to be protected,’ gr ‘protected, guest, foreigner’ (DUL 305–306), Hbr. gwr ‘to dwell as alien,’ gēr ‘protected citizen, stranger’ (HALOT 184, 201), Syr. gīȳorā ‘peregrinus, cliens’ (LSyr. 110), Arb. žār- ‘neighbor’ (Lane 483), Sab. gr ‘master, lord; business partner’ (SD 51), Gez. gor ‘neighbor’ (CDG 207) > *gwr ‘to dwell together, to be a neighbour.’

◊ Mhr. šāgbēwr ‘to become neighbor; to ask (God) for protection’ (ML 127), Jib. šāgbēr (JL 80) are likely borrowed from Arabic. The same is true of Soq. gārhēten ‘female neighbors,’ attested in Müller 1902:59 where it renders Arb. al-žārāt-.

9. Ugr. ḫdy ‘to see, to look, to observe’ (DUL 356), Hbr. ḫāzā ‘to see, to behold’ (HALOT 301), BArm. ḫāzā ‘to see’ (ibid. 1872, with references to other Aramaic languages), Arb. hźw ‘to divine from the flight of birds’ (Lane 563), Amh. ayyā ‘to see’ (AED 1282), Arg. hānča ‘to see’ (Leslau 1997:205), Har. ḫēṣa ‘to look, to watch something’ (EDH 81), Sel. Wol. anže ‘to see’ (EDG 123), Cha. ažā, Eṣa Muh. Msq. Gog. Sod. aţţā, Cha. End. Gyt. ašā, End. aššā id. (ibid.), Gaf. aţţā ‘voir’ (Leslau 1956:173) > *ḫdy/*ḫzy ‘to see.’

---

335 On the Mehri root see further in Chapter 8 (p. 483).
334 The earliest attestation of *madbar- comes from OB Mari (Streck 2000:103), reference courtesy I. Arkhipov.
In spite of the well-known phonological difficulty (Ugr. \(d\) presupposes \(*d\) in the prototype,\(^{335}\) as against \(*z\) patent in Aramaic and Arabic\(^{336}\)), it is very likely that all the aforementioned forms have the same etymological background (cf. DRS 838–839, 854). The dialectal distribution of this root with respect to PWS \(*r\gamma\) is no less puzzling, particularly in EthS where it seems to be completely absent from the languages of the northern branch,\(^{337}\) but has become highly prominent almost throughout the southern one.

There is no trace of this root in either MSA or in Mesopotamian Akkadian, but \(i\)-\(\dot{s}a\)-\(um\) = IGI.BAR.DA (EV 0126) has been identified with it by J. Krecher (1984:165). If this identification is correct,\(^{338}\) one may wonder whether we are faced with an archaic East Semitic term preserved only in Ebla or rather with a WS lexical infiltration (as apparently hinted at by Krecher himself).

10. Hbr. \(\text{hbr}\) (HALOT 284), Mnd. \(\text{hba}\) (MD 128), Arb. \(\text{hbr}\) (Lane 692), Sab. \(\text{hbr}\) (SD 58), Gez. \(\text{hab}\) (CDG 255) > \(*\text{hbr}\) ‘to hide.’

\(\diamond\) Possible attestations of \(\text{hab\(û\)}\) in later varieties of Akkadian (AHw. 306, 1557) are likely WS loans. The same may be true of \(\text{ki\(h\)}-\text{bu{t}i}\) in KBo 1, 1r.:26 if it indeed means ‘heimlich’ (AHw. 344), cf. CAD \(\underline{H}\) 182.

11. Hbr. \(\text{h}l\) ‘to divide, to apportion, to give a share’ (HALOT 322), Syr. \(\text{hlak}\) ‘distribuit’ (LSyr. 237), Arb. \(\text{hlq}\) ‘to measure, to proportion’ (Lane 799), Gez. \(\text{h}l\)\(a\)\(\text{a}\)‘a ‘to count, to number’ (CDG 261) > \(*\text{h}l\)‘to divide, to measure.’

12. Ugr. \(\text{hl}\) ‘strength, vigor’ (DUL 359), Hbr. \(\text{hayil}\) ‘power’ (HALOT 311), Syr. \(\text{hayl}\) \(\dot{a}\)‘vis, potentia’ (LSyr. 229), Arb. \(\text{hawl}\) ‘strength, power, might’ (Lane 675), \(\text{hayl}\) id. (ibid. 688),\(^{339}\) Sab. \(\text{hyl}\) ‘power, might’ (SD 64), Qat. \(\text{r-hyl}\) ‘resources, means, aid’ (LIQ 72), Gez. \(\text{hayl}\) ‘power, strength’ (CDG 269) > \(*\text{hayl-}\)**\(\text{hayl-}\) ‘strength.’

\(\diamond\) The discrepancy between \(\text{h}\) and \(\text{hl}\) still awaits an explanation, but there is little doubt that all or most of the aforementioned forms go back to a single etymological source.

Contra HALOT 311, CDG 269 and many others, there is hardly any connection between this root and Akk. \(\text{illatu}\) ‘kinship group, clan; army, troops’ (CAD I 82, AHw. 372).

---

\(^{335}\) The ancient and probably original nature of this feature is confirmed by the Ebla form discussed below.

\(^{336}\) One cannot exclude, however, that the root-variant with \(*d\) is behind \(\text{h}d\text{w}\) (III) ‘to face, to be in front of’ (Lane 537).

\(^{337}\) Unless one compares Tgr. \(\text{haz\(â\)}\) ‘to seek, to try’ (WTS 92), semantically not improbable.

\(^{338}\) In his discussion of this equation, Krecher refers to D. O. Edzard’s criticism (in personal communication) against the underlying sibilant correspondence, but in view of the Ugaritic cognate with \(d\) this query becomes largely superfluous. Considerably more troubling is NI = \(i\), not expected to correspond to the sequence \(*\text{h}i\) in the Ebla syllabary.

\(^{339}\) Also \(\text{hayl-}\) ‘horses; riders’ (Lane 835) has often been considered a cognate (cf. Marrassini 1971:59).
13. Ugr. kry (DUL 458), Hbr. kārā (HALOT 496), JBA kry (DJBA 600), Arb. kry (WKAS K 159), Gez. karaya (CDG 294) > *kry ‘to dig.’

14. Hbr. ksm 'to seek divination, to predict' (HALOT 1115), Syr. kšam 'vaticinaus, hariolatus est' (LSyr. 687, with secondary emphatization), Arb. qsm (X) ‘to seek to know what was allotted to him by means of divinatory arrows’ (Lane 2988), Min. mksm ‘décision oraculaire’ (LM 73), Gez. wašaksama ‘to practice divination’ (CDG 446) > *ksm ‘to practice divination.’

15. Ugr. kl ‘voice, shout, cry’ (DUL 699), Hbr. kōl ‘voice’ (HALOT 1083), Syr. kālā ‘vox’ (LSyr. 651), Arb. qwl ‘to say,’ qawl- ‘the thing said’ (Lane 2994–2995), Gez. ḫāl ‘voice, word’ (CDG 426) > *ḥawl-/*ḥał- ‘voice,’ *ḵawl ‘to say.’

◊ The widespread equation between this root and Akk. kālu ‘to become silent, to stay quiet’ (CAD Q 72, AHw. 895) is hard to justify semantically.

16. Ugr. l (DUL 475), Hbr. la (HALOT 507), Syr. la (LSyr. 354), Arb. li (Lane 3006), Sab. l (SD 81), Gez. la (CDG 303) > *li ‘to.’

◊ The preposition *li is completely missing from MSA\(^{341}\) which makes its reconstruction as a Proto-WS feature opposed to Akk. ana methodologically unsound (contrast Huehnergard 2006:16).

If the preposition *li is diachronically identical with the precative marker *li (Huehnergard 2006:16), which, in our opinion, is not unlikely,\(^{342}\) one may trace it back to PS, assuming an independent loss of its prepositional function in Akkadian and MSA (the l-precative is prominently attested in both). If this relationship is rejected, the preposition *li may be regarded as a shared innovation of the CS/EthS genealogical unity.

In such a context, the hypothetical etymological relationship between Akk. ana and its MSA semantic equivalents in h-, first suggested by V. Christian (1924:159, 1944:18) and then tentatively accepted in Fronzaroli 2005:161, Huehnergard 2006:16 and elsewhere, becomes of crucial relevance. J. Huehnergard takes the presence of h-in MSA (and Hadramitic) at face value and reconstructs the prototype of the Akkadian preposition as *ha-naḏ. This is, however, quite unlikely on orthographic grounds as the syllabograms A in Sargonic and NI in Ebla (Hasselbach 2005:167, Archi 2002:4) would

---

\(^{340}\) As in the case of *bi discussed above in this chapter, the vocalic reconstruction *li, directly taken from the Arabic form, is conventional. We have no ready explanation either for the contrast between the Arabic and Ethiopic forms or for the alternation i (before nouns) vs. a (before suffixes) within Arabic (Brockelmann 1908:495 assumes the priority of *a). The vocalization le-e (vs. bi-i) in Ugaritic can scarcely be relevant for this problem; see Huehnergard 1987a:53 and Tropper 2000:187 for a comprehensive discussion.

\(^{341}\) For a detailed discussion of the MSA semantic equivalents v. Chapter 8 (pp. 545-546).

\(^{342}\) Yet rarely considered in recent scholarly literature (thus, the preposition is not even mentioned in N. J. C. Kouwenberg’s survey of the historical background of the precative in Kouwenberg 2010a:213–217). The two elements are systematically kept apart throughout Huehnergard 1983, where their eventual etymological identity is not considered either (cf. also Testen 1993b:3 and 1998b passim).
not be used for an etymological *h. A secondary “hardening” of *r into h in MSA\textsuperscript{345} and Hadramitic is, in our view, also rather improbable. If, all these misgivings notwithstanding, the Akkadian–MSA–Hadramitic isogloss is thought to be valid, the status of *lī as a shared innovation of CS/EthS becomes seriously bolstered, as it would imply that the archaic *ha-nā in these languages was replaced by a more innovative *li.

The preposition *lī lacks any suitable internal etymological reconstruction; its derivation from the verbal root *wly 'to adhere, to be near' advocated in Voigt 1999:41 is highly unlikely.

17. Ugr. bīk 'to send a message' (DUL 486), Hbr. malvāk 'messenger,' molā(?)/kā ‘business, work’ (HALOT 585–586), Arb. alik 'deliver a message!' (WKAS I 51), Sab. bīk ‘schicken’ (Stein 2010:726), Gez. laʾaka ‘to send, to commission,’ malvāht ‘letter, message; duty, business, service’ (CDG 303) > *bīk 'to send.'

18. Ugr. mhāw (DUL 538), Hbr. māḥā (HALOT 567), Arb. mhāw (Lane 3018), Gez. maḥawa (CDG 337) > *mhāw 'to wipe clean, to erase.'

19. Ugr. ngš 'to pursue, to enclose' (DUL 623), Hbr. ngš 'to spur on; to force to work, to oppress' (HALOT 670), Arb. nāzš 'to pursue game; to drive vehemently' (Lane 2771), Sab. ngș2 'to gain control' (SD 93), Min. ngš2 ‘prélèver les impôts’ (LM 66), Qat. ngșa ‘to demand, to impose tribute’ (LIQ 103), Gez. nagša ‘to become king, to rule’ (CDG 392) > *ngš ‘to pursue, to drive to work, to oppress.’

◊ Probably related to Akk. nagāšu ‘to leave, to go away’ (CAD N\textsuperscript{1} 108, AHw. 710), in which case the transitive meaning “to drive” may be regarded as a common innovation of CS/EthS. Conversely, there is hardly any connection between this root and Mhr. nagūš ‘to shake milk for butter’ (ML 288), Jib. ngūš id. (JL 184).

20. Ugr. ranš ‘muscle, tendon,’ Hbr. gid ha-nnāša ‘sciatic nerve’ (HALOT 729), Syr. gennēšyā ‘nervus ischidaicus’ (LSyr. 126), Arb. nāsa ‘the sciatic vein’ (Lane 3033), Amh. anisa ‘iliac bone; a sort of cartilage which extends from the tail joint to the tail’ (AED 1213) > *naʃy- ‘sciatic tendon’ (SED I No. 201).

21. Hbr. ūprōah (HALOT 80), Syr. pāraḥtā (LSyr. 594), Arb. farḥ- (Lane 2362), Gez. farḥ (CDG 166) > *parḥ- 'chick, young of a bird' (SED II No. 179).

◊ Almost certainly connected with this this root are the MSA terms for “bastard”: Mhr. farḥ, Jib. ferḥ, Soq. forḥ (ML 102, JL 62, LS 341). In view of farḥ ‘bastard’ in the Arabic dialect of Hadramaut (Landberg 1901:673), it is likely that we are faced with Arabic loanwords in MSA.

22. Ugr. ryb 'to be hungry' (DUL 735), Hbr. ryb 'to be hungry,’ rārāb ‘hunger’ (HALOT 1257), Arb. ryb 'to desire eagerly, greedily,' rayab- 'desire' (Lane 1110), Gez.

\textsuperscript{345} Which would mean, in particular, that the pre-nominal allomorph e in Soqotri is diachronically primary with respect to the pre-suffixal form hₐr.
raḥba ‘to be hungry,’ raḥab ‘hunger’ (CDG 468) > *ṛḥ ‘to be hungry,’ *raḥab- ‘hunger’ (SED I No. 59).

23. Hbr. yrḥ (HALOT 440), ṭḥk (ibid. 1292), Syr. ṭḥk (LSyr. 742), Arb. ṭḥq- (Lane 1203), Gez. ṭḥḥ (CDG 617) > *ṛḥ ‘to spit’ (SED I No. 81).344

24. Hbr. ṭḥm (HALOT 1290), Syr. tḥkmātā (LSyr. 744), Arb. ṭqm (Lane 1138), Gez. ṭḥama (CDG 473) > *ṛḥm ‘to embroider.’

25. Ugr. ṭph ‘to heal’ (DUL 742), EA ṭph ‘cure, medication’ (CAD R 367), Hbr. ṭph ‘to heal’ (HALOT 1272), Syr. ṭph ‘sanavit’ (LSyr. 740), Arb. ṭph ‘to reconcile, to appease, to calm,’ ṭifā ‘concord, tranquility’ (Lane 1117), Sab. ṭḥ ‘safeguard’ (SD 115), ṭph ‘schützen’ (Stein 2010:730), Gez. ṭafār ‘reparator, restitutor (medicus)’ (LLA 320) > *ṛph ‘to heal, to protect.’

◊ The meaning “to cure, to heal” is only sporadically attested in Geez, whereas the normal meaning of ṭafā is “to sew, to mend,” which is also common for ṭph in Arabic. While Leslau is certainly right that the relationship between “to heal” and “to sew” is not unexpected, the direction of semantic shift remains to be established: the a priori more appealing “to sew” > “to heal” would imply that the most ancient attestations of this root are also the most innovative ones from a semantic point of view. It would probably also mean that the meaning “to heal,” sporadically attested in Geez, is an independent secondary development.

Comparison between this root and Soq. térof ‘être guéri, en bonne santé’ (LS 446) is (with Leslau) probably to be rejected in favor of formally more straightforward parallels with t- such as Gez. tafā ‘to be left; to survive, to be spared, to abound, to be excellent’ (CDG 579).

An ultimate connection with *ṛph ‘to relax’ is not to be excluded: Hbr. ṭaph ‘to grow slack’ (HALOT 1276), Syr. ṭph ‘laxus fuit’ (LSyr. 740), perhaps Arb. ṭph ‘to be easy, soft, delicate’ (Lane 1128), Soq. bā-ṛēfēyl/bā-ṛēfēš ‘lentement, doucement’ (LS 404).345

26. Ugr. ṭ (DUL 750), Hbr. ṭāṣ (HALOT 1207), Syr. ṭēṭ (LSyr. 716), Gez. ṭōṣa (CDG 477) > *ṛṭ ‘to run.’

◊ This root does not seem to be attested in Arabic: Arb. ṭāṣ ‘to train a riding beast’ (Lane 1186) is quite remote both phonetically and semantically.

The widespread equation with Akk. ṭāṣu ‘to come to help’ (CAD R 187, AHw. 972) is semantically uncertain, even if the meaning shift “to run” > “to help” is sufficiently well attested in Indo-European (Buck 1949:1353–1354).

344 Reconstructed as a biconsonantal element with various triconsonantizing augments in individual languages.
345 Assuming a hypercorrect -š, which is not uncommon in Soqotri.
27. Ugr. ṣḏḵ ‘justice, legitimacy’ (DUL 779), Hbr. ṣḏḵ ‘to be right’ (HALOT 1003), OffArm. ṣḏḵ ‘to be just’ (DNWSI 961), Arb. ṣḏq ‘to tell truth’ (Lane 1666), Sab. ṣḏḵ ‘to maintain in proper order’ (SD 141), Min. ṣḏḵ ‘s’acquitter d’un devoir’ (LM 93), Qat. ṣḏl ‘to grant one his due’ (LIQ 133), Gez. ṣḏḏa ḳ ‘to be just’ (CDG 548) > *ṣḏḵ ‘to be just.’

◊ Mhr. ṣḏḏk ‘truth’ (ML 358) is clearly borrowed from Arabic.

28. Hbr. šāw(verbs) ‘worthless’ (HALOT 1425), Arb. šwr ‘to be evil, bad’ (Lane 1457), Sab. šāwr ‘bad, wicked’ (SD 129), Min. šāwr ‘mal’ (LM 84), Gez. saywr ‘flagitium, actio turpis vel mala’ (LLA 394, CDG 521)³⁴⁶ > *šwr ‘to be bad.’

29. Hbr. šḥt (nips) ‘to be ruined, spoiled’ (HALOT 1470), Arb. šḥt ‘to destroy utterly,’ suḥt- ‘a thing that is forbidden, prohibited’ (Lane 1314), Sab. šḥt ‘to defeat, to throw into disorder’ (SD 125), Gez. soḥṭa ‘to make a mistake, to err, to get lost’ (CDG 494) > *šḥt ‘to err, to be corrupt.’

30. Hbr. šyḥ ‘to melt away’ (HALOT 1477), Syr. šāḥ ‘evanuit’ (LSyr. 763), Arb. syḥ ‘to run upon the surface of the earth’ (Lane 1482), Gez. sayyaḥa ‘tabescere facere’ (LLA 392, CDG 522) > *šyḥ ‘to melt.’

31. Hbr. šāmār (HALOT 1035), Syr. ẓamrā (LSyr. 533), Gez. šamr (CDG 150) > *šamr- ‘wool, fleece.’

◊ This root is conspicuously missing from Arabic.

32. Hbr. ḫāšān (HALOT 344), Syr. ḫānnā (LSyr. 242, SL 469), Arb. ḫiṅ- (Lane 591), Gez. ḫān (CDG 226) > *ḫišn- ‘lap, bosom’ (SED I No. 129).

◊ Akk. ḫāšānu ‘sash’ NB (CAD ḫ 259, AHw. 361), ḫišn ‘protection’ SB (CAD ḫ 203, AHw. 348) and ḫāšānu ‘to shelter, to receive in a friendly way’ SB, NA, NB (CAD ḫ 129, AHw. 331) are unlikely to be autochthonous in view of the irregular ḫ coupled with the late attestation. Rather, we must be faced with WS loanwords, even if the exact source of borrowing is not easy to establish (Aramaisms are of course unlikely because of ḫ). The genuine semantic equivalents in Akkadian are sūnu (CAD S 386) and ʿuttu (CAD U 335), both without reliable WS parallels.

If Soq. ḵānḥ ‘giron’ (LS 363) is thought to be related with metathesis (which is not unlikely), this anatomical term should rather be projected to PWS. However, according to our informants the word has ṣ as the last consonant ( ḵavr).

33. Ugr. ṭlm (DUL 870), Hbr. tālām (HALOT 1740), Arb. talm- (LA 12 76), Gez. ṭlm (CDG 574) > *tVm- ‘furrow.’

³⁴⁶ Very sparsely attested, but cf. perhaps Tna. sāyyāret ‘she became a whore’ (TED 768), apparently considered an Arabism by T. L. Kane.
34. Ugr. ṭḥ (DUL 865), Hbr. ṭḥḥ (HALOT 1721), Syr. ṭḥḥ (LSyr. 821), Arb. ṭḥḥ (Lane 298), Sab. ṭḥ (SD 147), Gez. ṭḥḥ (CDG 572) > ṭḥḥ ‘under.’

There is no trace of ṭḥḥ ‘under’ either in Akkadian or MSA.347 No convincing internal etymological reconstruction suggests itself, although the similarity between ṭḥḥ and the Proto-Aramaic root *nḥḥ ‘to go down’ (HALOT 1929) is noteworthy (cf. LSyr. 821).

35. Ugr. ṭhr (DUL 888), Hbr. ṭhr (HALOT 369), Arb. ṭhr (Lane 1886), Sab. ṭhr (SD 153), Gez. ṭhr (CDG 589) > ṭhr ‘to be pure.’

◊ Certainly borrowed from Arabic are Mhr. ṭḥḥr ‘to be ritually clean’ (ML 408), Jib. ṭḥḥr id. (JL 275), Soq. ṭḥḥr ‘pur’ (LS 200).

36. Hbr. ṭḥḥ (HALOT 375), Syr. ṭḥḥ (LSyr. 276),348 Arb. ṭḥḥ (Lane 1875), Sab. ṭḥ (SD 153), Qat. ṭḥ (LIQ 78), Gez. ṭḥ (CDG 590) > ṭḥḥ ‘lamb’ (SED II No. 232).

37. Hbr. ṭḥḥṛ ‘tendon’ (HALOT 452), Syr. ṭḥḥṛ (LSyr. 313), Arb. ṭḥḥṛ- ‘string, chord’ (Lane 2918), Gez. ṭḥḥṛ ‘sinew, cord’ (CDG 622) > ṭḥḥṛ- ‘sinew, tendon’ (SED I No. 290).

38. Ugr. ṭn ‘wine’ (DUL 968), Hbr. ṭyn ‘wine’ (HALOT 409), Arb. ṭyn- = ṭn- ṭyn ‘wine, grapes’ (CDG 623) > ṭyn- ‘grapes, wine, vine.’

5.2.2.2. EthS + MSA

Most of the lexical features supposedly uniting “Ethiopic and South-Arabic” (Leslau 1943:11–14) have little to recommend for phonological and/or semantic reasons, not least due to the fact that ESA and MSA are not properly distinguished in Leslau’s study. Examples that are both relatively well defined semantically and truly exclusive are very difficult to find, cf. perhaps Gez. ṭawāṣṣḥa ‘to have labor pains’ — Soq. ṭaḥ ‘avoir mal,’ Jib. ṭaḥ ‘to be fed up, depressed’ (CDG 606, LS 70, JL 296, Leslau 1943:11), Amh. ḏan ‘clitoris, vagina’ — Soq. ḏan ‘vulva’ (AED 797, LS 379, SED I No. 163, Leslau 1943:13), Gez. ṣẓn ‘span’ — Soq. ṣẓn ‘vulva’ id. (CDG 523, LS 414, SED I No. 251, Leslau 1943:14). Our own perusal of the pertinent lexicographic sources did not add anything promising to this meager amount. This is a telling confirmation of what we have just seen in the Swadesh wordlist: there is almost no lexical evidence suggesting a special genealogical proximity between the two alleged “South Semitic” branches.


348 Mostly with the meaning “young boy” throughout Aramaic.
5.2.2.3. CS + MSA

The situation with lexical isoglosses uniting CS and MSA is less dramatic. A systematic perusal of HALOT on the one side and LS on the other has revealed the following cases.

1. Hbr. ʼ góc ‘to desire sensuously,’ ʼagābā ‘passion’ (HALOT 783), Arb. ʼagb ‘to wonder; to love, to like’ (Lane 1956), Mhr. ʼagāb ‘to love, to like, to want’ (ML 15), Jib. ʼagāb ‘to love, to want’ (JL 9), Soq. ʼegāb ‘vouloir’ (LS 296) > *ʼ góc ‘to wish, to desire.’

2. Ugr. ṛ (DUL 178), Hbr. ṛayir (HALOT 822), Arb. ṛayr- (Lane 2208), Mhr. ḫayr (ML 198) > * génér- ‘donkey’ (SED II No. 50).

◊ Tgr. ṛyro ‘young camel three years old’ is too isolated to be taken as a reliable cognate. W. Leslau (1990:165) assumes a borrowing from Arb. ṛayrān- ‘a swift camel’ (Lane 2209), which may be reasonable in spite of the formal difference.

For the early WS form ḫa-a-ra-am [/ayr-] in OB Mari v. Streck 2000:94 and further references in SED II No. 50.

3. Hbr. ḏb rā (HALOT 208), Syr. ḏbbrā (LSyr. 140), Arb. ḏbr- (Lane 845), Soq. ḏbr (LS 122) > *dvbr- ‘bee’ (SED II No. 66).

◊ This root is conspicuously missing from both Akkadian and Ethiopian, where “bee” is designated by the reflexes of *nūb- (SED II No. 156), perhaps the most archaic term with this meaning in Semitic.

4. Ugr. ḟ sr (DUL 716), Hbr. ḟ sr (HALOT 1126), CPA ḟ sr (Schulthess 183), Arb. ḟ sr (Lane 2532), Mhr. ḟ sr (ML 240), Jib. ḟ sr (JL 152), Soq. ḟ sr (LS 383) > * ḟ sr ‘to be short.’

◊ It is uncertain whether Gez. ḟ sr ‘to enclose with a wall, to blockade, to delimit’ (CDG 450) is related to this root.

5. Ugr. ḷ ḷ (DUL 722), Hbr. ḷ ḷ (HALOT 1098),349 Syr. ḷ ḷ (LSyr. 664), Arb. ḷ ḷ (Lane 2579), Sab. ḷ ḷ (SD 112), Mhr. ḷ ḷ (ML 247), Jib. ḷ ḷ (JL 157), Soq. ḷ ḷ (LS 374) > * ḷ ḷ ‘summer.’

◊ Shall one tentatively compare Akk. ḷ ḷ ‘to be cold’ (CAD K 269) — otherwise virtually without Semitic etymology — with an enantiosemic shift of meaning possibly paralleled by Akk. šarāpu ‘to burn’ (CAD Š 50, AHw. 1185) — šurāpu ‘ice’ (CAD Š 3, AHw. 1284), for which see Eilers 1986:41? Cf. also Gez. ḷ ḷ ‘ashes’ — ḷ ḷ ‘snow’ (CDG 231–232, Appleyard 1977:34). On this hypothetical semantic development see also Fronzaroli 1965a:142.

6. Ugr. Ṡr (DUL 536), Hbr. Ṡr (HALOT 554), Syr. Ṡr (LSyr. 376, SL

349 Already in Amarna Canaanite: ŠE.MEŠ ḷ-e-š ‘summer crops’ (EA 131:15), v. AHw. 918, CAD Q 243.

103
Culturally determined Arabic loanwords in MSA are rather likely.


There is no reliable reflex of this root in Akkadian, as both  namlu (CAD N 1 208) and  lamattu (CAD L 67) do not give the impression of being autochthonous Akkadian words (see SED II No. 163 for a comprehensive discussion; cf. also Hrůša 2010:255). The normal designation of “ant” in Akkadian is  kulbābu (CAD K 501), with no transparent WS cognates.

8. Ugr.  ʿprš (DUL 683), Hbr.  ʿprš (HALOT 975), Syr.  pras (LSyr. 600), Arb.  frš (Lane 2369), Min.  frš (LM 34), Mhr.  f̣rāš (ML 101), Jib.  fīršš (JL 61) > * prš ‘to spread.’

The possibility of Arabic loanwords in MSA is not to be ruled out (note that this root is missing from Soqotri).

Akk.  naprusu ‘to fly’ (CAD N 1 314, AHw. 740) has often been considered cognate to this root, but the semantic link (presumably < “to spread wings”) is far from trivial. A metathetic relationship with Akk.  rapššu ‘to be broad’ (CAD R 153, AHw. 955), tentatively suggested above in this chapter (p. 94), is perhaps more promising.

9. Hbr.  rṣy (HALOT 1280), Syr.  ṛe (LSyr. 738), Arb.  ṭṣw, rṣ (SD 115), Min.  ṭṣw (LM 76), Mhr.  ṭayţi (ML 336), Jib.  fīrž (JL 220), Soq.  rīţi (LS 404) > *rsw ‘to be glad, satisfied.’

Arabic loanwords in MSA are not unlikely.

10. Hbr.  ʿšk (HALOT 1042), Arb.  ṣq (Lane 1690), Min.  ʿšk (LM 93), Qat.  ʿš (LIQ 137), Mhr.  ʕakh (ML 356), Jib.  ʿarāk (JL 234), Soq.  ʿarāk (LS 355) > *ṣw ‘to shout.’

11. Hbr.  ʿshl (HALOT 1007), Syr.  ṣḥl (LSyr. 622), Arb.  ṣhl (Lane 1738), Mhr.  ṣḥel (ML 360), Jib.  ṣḥ él (JL 237) > *ṣhl ‘to neigh.’

12. Ugr.  ʿtd (DUL 889), Hbr.  ṭād (HALOT 1416), Syr.  ṭādā (LSyr. 816), Arb.  ṭady- (Lane 333), Mhr.  tōdī (ML 415), Jib.  ṭāde (JL 283), Soq.  tōdi (LS 439) > *ṭad(y)- ‘breast’ (SED I No. 280).

13. Hbr.  ʿṣāpān (HALOT 1633), Mhr.  ʿṭfān (ML 417), Jib.  ʿṭf(un (JL 283) > *ṭapan- ‘hyrax’ (SED II No. 240).

\textsuperscript{350} This sparsely attested lexeme (designating an ant hill rather than the insect as such) seems to be the only reflex of the present root in Aramaic.
14. Hbr. śāvālām (HALOT 992), Syr. รว(Nālā (LSyr. 503), Arb. dāl- (Lane 1816), Mhr. Ẓāl (ML 478), Jib. Ẓad (JL 327), Soq. Ẓawād (LS 359) > *ṣar- ‘ziziphus’ (Blau 1971b:5–8).

◊ The dissimilatory shift l > d/l in the MSA terms is clearly no obstacle for their etymological identity with the CS forms in -l.

15. Hbr. sāb (HALOT 994), Syr. sabbā (LSyr. 503), Arb. ḍabb- (Lane 1761), Mhr. Ẓāb (ML 472), Jib. Ẓab (JL 322) > *ṣabb- ‘monitor lizard’ (SED II No. 221).

◊ Arabic loanwords in MSA are not to be excluded.

16. Hbr. ẓohōrayim (HALOT 1008), Syr. ṭahrā (LSyr. 269), Arb. ḏuhr- (Lane 1929), Mhr. ḏahr- (ML 83), Jib. ḏjahr (JL 48) > *ṭuhr- ‘noon.’

◊ This term is usually thought to go back to PS *ṭahr- (for the meaning shift v. HALOT 1008, SED I No. 284). Arabic loanwords in Mehri and Jibbali are not to be ruled out; clearly borrowed from Arabic is Soq. ḏuhr, ḏuhr (LS 361).

6. The internal division of WS in light of the lexical evidence: conclusions

The lexical evidence analyzed in the preceding section is broadly compatible with the preliminary conclusions obtained from the Swadesh wordlist.

Well-defined exclusive isoglosses between EthS and MSA are practically absent, which, once again, lays to rest any possibility of a special connection between these two subgroups. The “narrow South Semitic” hypothesis has absolutely no lexical support behind it.

Exclusive lexical isoglosses uniting CS and EthS are more than twice as numerous as those shared by CS and MSA. Such a picture does not contradict the hypothesis postulating a special proximity between CS and EthS as advanced above in this chapter, yet it is a bit unexpected in view of the fact that in the Swadesh wordlist unique features shared by CS and MSA are nearly entirely absent.

There is no ready explanation for this peculiar discrepancy, but it lies at hand to suspect that the problem stems from the Arabic influence on MSA. Indeed, every quest for exclusive lexical connections between MSA and CS is deemed to be doubly biased because of the prolonged and multi-faceted interaction between Modern South Arabian languages (particularly the continental ones) and Arabic. Some lexical features included in our list may be alternatively evaluated as Arabic loanwords in MSA, even if there is hardly any formal proof to justify such a possibility. But, at the same time, a few potentially relevant examples have likely been excluded from the list exactly for the same reason — again, on more or less intuitive grounds. Given the fact that these two tendencies run in opposite directions, our eventual output is expected to be relatively balanced. Nevertheless, it would be quite natural to assume that the more conservative strata of the basic vocabulary as represented by the Swadesh wordlist are less open to the Arabic influence and, therefore, better reflect the original situation in
Proto-MSA. The fact that seven out of sixteen positions of our MSA/CS list show no cognates from the more conservative Soqotri seems to point in the same direction.

Chapter 3.
Lexical isoglosses and the Central Semitic hypothesis

1. The Central Semitic hypothesis before 2005

In its present-day form, the Central Semitic hypothesis, postulating a special genealogical proximity between Arabic and North-West Semitic (Aramaic and Canaanite), goes back to Otto Rössler’s pioneering article of 1950. Contrary to the predominant trend of the epoch, Rössler dissociated Arabic from other languages of the “South Semitic” area (such as Geez and Mehri) on the basis of one fundamental feature of the Arabic verbal system: abandonment of the “Old Present” *yV-C\textsubscript{1}\textsubscript{a}C\textsubscript{2}(C\textsubscript{2})VC\textsubscript{3} and its replacement by the “New Imperfect” *yV-C\textsubscript{1}C\textsubscript{2}VC\textsubscript{3}-u (Rössler 1950:467).\footnote{It was only slightly later that the diachronic priority of *yV-C\textsubscript{1}\textsubscript{a}C\textsubscript{2}(C\textsubscript{2})VC\textsubscript{3} was independently defended by Joseph Greenberg (1952), admittedly with no explicit conclusions about its relevance for the genealogical classification of Semitic (but cf. Greenberg 1952:2). Greenberg’s hesitating mention of the alleged presence of *yV-C\textsubscript{1}\textsubscript{a}C\textsubscript{2}(C\textsubscript{2})VC\textsubscript{3} in early Canaanite as reflected in the Amarna tablets (1952:1, 5) may suggest that he considered possible the existence of such a form in what we now call Proto-Central Semitic.} Together with other languages displaying the same development (viz. Aramaic and Canaanite), Rössler separated Arabic into a genealogical branch which he called zweite jungsemitische Stufe (1950:506, 511, cf. also 1951b:373). Notwithstanding its chronological rather than geographical connotations, this label is a precise match of the modern concept of Central Semitic.\footnote{Voigt 1988:119. In exactly the same way, Rössler’s opposition of altsemitische Stufe to erste jungsemitische Stufe fully corresponds to the present-day East Semitic vs. West Semitic dichotomy, MSA and EthS being considered the most archaic representatives of the latter branch.}

For reasons difficult to ascertain, Rössler’s contribution had little impact on the subsequent research into genealogical classification of Semitic and is hardly mentioned at all in the present-day summary treatments of this question.\footnote{Thus, neither Rössler 1950, nor its English translation of 1981, are present in Huehnergard’s extensive bibliography (2005:193–203); the same is true of Faber 1997 and Appleyard 2002. In his earliest study on the subject, Hetzron does briefly acknowledge Rössler as his immediate predecessor (1974:184, 189), but in his subsequent articles dealing with genealogical classification, Rössler’s article is hardly mentioned at all (cf. Hetzron 1976:103, where it is referred to in connection with a minor point of historical morphology not directly pertinent to the CS hypothesis, and Hetzron 1977a:13–14, where the studies of Rössler’s predecessors are discussed at some length, but Rössler’s own contributions are left unmentioned). As pointed out by R. Voigt (1987a:2–3), Rössler himself was to some extent anticipated in his conclusions by V. Christian (1919–1920), who, however, was much less interested in the relationship between Arabic and Aramaic/Canaanite than in the hypothetical proximity between Akkadian and EthS/MSA. That this alleged proximity is based entirely on shared archaism was already clear to J. Cantineau (1932:203–204), see further Hetzron 1977:13–14.} Conversely, Robert Hetzron’s studies from the mid-seventies (1972:15–16, 1974, 1975, 1976), essentially
built on the same type of evidence and yielding similar results, have quickly obtained popularity, and his conclusions have been widely — if not universally — accepted (Faber 1997, Appleyard 2002 and numerous other studies mentioned below in this chapter).

Neither Hetzron nor his followers succeeded to expand the material evidence behind the CS hypothesis once provided by Rössler: the emergence of the “New Imperfect” continued to be the principal (and quite often, the only) supporting isogloss. By far the most important addition to the Rössler–Hetzron subgrouping pattern was the inclusion of Sabaic into Central Semitic (Huehnergard 2005:160–161), made possible through the definitive establishment of the existence of the “New Imperfect” in that language (Nebes 1994b; cf. already Blau 1978:28–29, Voigt 1987a:13–15, 18). Also the internal division of CS has been re-analyzed and improved: Hetzron’s “Arabo-Canaanite” subgroup (1976:103) has been rejected in favor of the more traditional Aramaic-Canaanite (North-West Semitic) unity (Blau 1978:32–33, Voigt 1987a, Huehnergard 1992:217).

2. Huehnergard’s Features of Central Semitic

John Huehnergard’s detailed investigation from 2005 marks a new beginning in the history of the CS hypothesis. However crucial the emergence of the “New Imperfect” may be, most historical linguists will agree that a subgrouping pattern based on one single morphological feature can scarcely be persuasive: if indeed so significant, such a feature is expected to be paralleled by other innovative traits in different areas of verbal and nominal morphology. It is, therefore, somewhat perplexing that, before 2005, none of the advocates of the CS hypothesis has ever tried to systematically look for additional arguments in its support. The importance of Huehnergard’s pioneering study, where such a comprehensive inquiry has been finally undertaken, is thus hard to overestimate.

355 The most important dissenting voices are those of J. Blau (1978:29–36), F. Corriente (2003), R. Ratcliffe (1998b) and A. Zaborski (1991). Most of their arguments will be discussed below in this chapter.
357 As pointedly observed by A. Avanzini, “the whole reconstruction is based on one isogloss alone and, what is more, one that is charged with uncertainty” (2009:209). Interestingly enough, Hetzron himself (1975:108) does seem to believe that “the shape of the imperfect was possibly the only major difference between the dialects.”
358 In her brief account of the CS hypothesis, A. Faber (1997:8–9) adduces three more potentially diagnostic features, none of which is particularly convincing (v. the next footnote and elsewhere below in this chapter).
In the concluding section of his article (2005:191–192), Huehnergard adduces 11 morphological features which, in theory, could corroborate the CS hypothesis—
but, in practice, probably or certainly do not. In each of these cases, Huehnergard’s
doubts are, in our opinion, well-founded, which makes superfluous any further
discussion of the corresponding phenomena in the present context.\(^{359}\)

As a positive outcome of his investigation, Huehnergard lists 5 morphological
isoglosses which, in his opinion, do provide valuable support for the CS hypothesis.
Since our evaluation of these features does not always coincide with Huehnergard’s,
they are worth mentioning here, accompanied by a brief critical analysis.

2.1. By far the most remarkable among Huhenergard’s isoglosses is what he calls
“the tense-mood-aspect system in general” (2005:164–165). Indeed, the “New
Imperfect” \(y\text{-}VC_1C_2VC_3\text{-}u/y\text{-}VC_1C_2VC_3\text{-}\text{ānā}\) is not the only specific trait of the prefix
conjugation which seems to unite Arabic with Aramaic and Canaanite. At least two
additional features mentioned by Huehnergard are to be seriously considered, namely
the subjunctive \(*y\text{-}VC_1C_2VC_3\text{-}\text{ā}a\) and the energetic \(*y\text{-}VC_1C_2VC_3\text{-}\text{V(}n\text{)na}\. The relevance of
these phenomena for the problem under discussion is, moreover, so high that
discussing them at some length is almost mandatory in the present context.

2.1.1. The subjunctive \(*y\text{-}VC_1C_2VC_3\text{-}\text{ā}a\) is thought to be preserved in Arabic and
Canaanite (including Ugaritic).

2.1.1.1. The use of the subjunctive as described by standard grammars of
Classical Arabic is uncontroversial: the ending \(-\text{ā}a\) regularly marks the predicate of the
purpose clause (less commonly, a few other types of subordinate clauses as well), mostly
after the particle \(\text{yān}\) (Fischer 2002:109–110). Only forms without suffixes are affected
(yaqtul\(-\text{ā}a,\ taqtul\(-\text{ā}a,\ aqtul\(-\text{ā}a,\ naqtul\(-\text{ā}a,\) elsewhere the opposition between the subjunctive
and the jussive is neutralized.

2.1.1.2. Conversely, there is no consensus on what concerns the synchronic and
diachronic analysis of the Canaanite picture.

The Hebrew cohortative is strictly bound to the first person singular and plural:
\(\text{nāḥšōl}\text{-ā}a\) and \(\text{nīḥšōl}\text{-ā}\) (Joüon–Muraoka 2005:138).\(^{360}\) As far as the function of this form is
concerned, a distinction is usually made between direct volitive (“may I do”) and
indirect volitive (“so that I do”) depending on another (preceding) volitive form, to
which it is linked by the conjunction \(\text{w}\text{-}\) (ibid. 374–376, 381–383).

As shown by J. Tropper (2000:455–457), the Ugaritic picture is largely identical
to the Hebrew one: the \(\text{a}\)-forms are reliably attested for the first singular only
(\(\text{nīḥr}\text{āa ‘let me call’}\) and, as far as the usage is concerned, both direct and indirect volitive
examples can be detected among the few orthographically significant cases
(\(\text{nīḥr}\text{āa nilm n\text{-}\text{mm} ‘Let me invoke the handsome gods’ in 1.23:1 vs. pt\text{-}\text{ḥ bt w ṭmbr}\text{ā ‘Open the house
so that I may enter’ in 1.100:72}).

The existence of the \(\text{a}\)-subjunctive in the Amarna Canaanite has been hotly

\(^{359}\) Two such features have been proposed as diagnostic by Faber (1997:8–9): pharyngalized
realization of emphatics and generalization of \(-\text{t}\) in the suffix conjugation (Arabic \(\text{katabtu, katabta}\) vs. Geez
\(\text{nagarku, nagarka}\), both opposed to Akkadian \(\text{parsāku, parsāta}\)). A persuasive critical analysis of the
relevance of these features can be found in Huehnergard 2005:165–166 and 168–169 respectively.

\(^{360}\) A handful of second and third person examples are almost certainly to be considered secondary,
analogical formations (Tropper 1997c:404).
In his classic study of 1960, W. Moran established the syntactic positions (notably, direct and indirect volitive) in which the a-forms are attested in the EA letters from Byblos, comparing these forms to the Hebrew cohortative and the a-subjunctive in Arabic. Moran’s hypothesis, which has found a broad acceptance in Semitological literature, has been questioned by A. Rainey (1991–1993, 1996 II 254–263), for whom many (perhaps most) of Moran’s examples are invalid or at least inconclusive because the a-ending in these cases can (or should) be alternatively understood as the Akkadian ventive suffix: “The EA texts have not given us any conclusive evidence for the existence of a Canaanite yaqtula pattern. In spite of Moran’s brilliant mustering of the evidence, it is still possible to argue that the -a suffix is merely the Akkadian ventive” (1991–1993:115). A new approach to this problem has been developed by Tropper (1997c, 2000:457), who observes that precisely those EA attestations which are unlikely to be explained away as Akkadian ventives tend to be restricted to the first person singular. In the light of Tropper’s discovery, the EA evidence becomes remarkably similar to the Hebrew and Ugaritic picture — an important fact hardly ever recognized before the appearance of Tropper’s study.

2.1.1.3. The interpretation of *-a as a PCS innovation is faced with two main obstacles: the extant pieces of the internal CS evidence are not easily reconcilable with each other, and further etymological background of this morpheme is obscure.

Even within the classic presentation of the facts, the functions of *-a in Canaanite and Arabic appear to be rather divergent. Nevertheless, they do look similar enough to enable one to conclude that “it seems quite unlikely that, despite the formal identity and the affinity of usage, there is no historical relationship between these two types of usage” (Blau 1971a:142). Within such an approach, the question “has the volitive developed from the subjunctive or the subjunctive from the volitive?” appears fully legitimate, and on the next pages of his article, Blau does make a convincing case for the second option. His reasoning, however, is flawed by a serious deficiency: the strong connection between the a-form and the first person in Canaanite has been almost entirely ignored.


Cf. Blau 1971a:135: “The Hebrew cohortative is limited to the first person, whereas Early Canaanite yqṭla is spread over the whole paradigm” (also ibid. 140). On p. 138 of his study, Blau admits that also in EA the first person singular environment could be considered the basic one: “One could imagine that in the Early Canaanite of Byblos as well as in Hebrew yqṭla was limited to the first person, and its occurrence in the other persons in the Amarna letters of Byblos was due to its misunderstood equation with the Akkadian ventive.” He is, nevertheless, reluctant to develop this idea: “Yet one will readily admit that it is simpler to assume a difference in usage between Hebrew and Early Canaanite.”

For an explicit recognition of the a-subjunctive as a specific CS feature see already Tropper 1997c:404.

Partly in the wake of H. Fleisch (1968), for whom the very usage of yqṭla in purpose clauses after ʾan is a late and secondary development with respect to the more original indirect volitive usage. For a reasonable critique of this extreme position v. Blau 1971a:144–146. All in all, the diachronic priority of the volitive function is now widely accepted: “The use of the subjunctive in Arabic must be a derivative of the original volitive function of this form” (Joüon–Muraoka 2005:382).
What might have appeared as an insignificant detail in 1971 has acquired a crucial relevance today, after the appearance of S. Fassberg’s groundbreaking study of 1999. As is well known, in Hebrew the a-extension is possible not only in the prefix conjugation, but also in the imperative (koll-â). It was this extended imperative, until then mostly neglected in the scholarly debate around the origin of yaqtul-a, that became the primary object of Fassberg’s investigation. In a masterly way, Fassberg succeeded to demonstrate that the extended imperative is by no means a functionless stylistic device, but rather an exponent of a consciously applied grammatical category with a clear distributional pattern: in the majority of cases, its use is conditioned by the presence of benefactive indicators related to the speaker, thus tân-â li ‘give to me’ vs. tên-O lô ‘give to him.’

Fassberg’s discovery has far-reaching consequences for our understanding of the diachronic background of the suffix *-a in Canaanite.

On the one hand, the newly established function of *-a in the extended imperative explains the close connection between *-a and the first person in the extended imperfect: it lies at hand to suspect that, at least originally, a form like ṭâℓâhâ meant something like ‘let me go for myself.’ Blau’s otherwise plausible observation (“the occurrence of -â in the Hebrew imperative (second person!)” also hints at this

365 "The original usage might have been in the first person, as in Hebrew, but was afterwards extended to the other persons; or it might have been used in the whole paradigm, to be limited later in Hebrew to the first person" (Blau 1971a:138).

366 That *-a in the prefix conjugation and the imperative represent one and the same morpheme is a common opinion (Blau 1971a:138, Tropper 2000:455).

367 In Fassberg’s own terminology, “the lengthened imperative is used when the action of the verb is directed to the speaker (usually motion towards the speaker); the regular imperative, on the other hand, is used when the action of the verb is directed elsewhere. Occasionally, one finds that the lengthened form of the imperative marks a more general relationship to the speaker, such as an action that benefits the speaker, or takes place near the speaker” (1999:10). The Ugaritic evidence for the a-imperative is predictably scarce (Tropper 2000:428), but the available examples are not incompatible with Fassberg’s hypothesis. The most remarkable coincidence can be found in the letter 2.15:5: ry šâya ʿâdān ūm šìl ‘My friend, issue a permission for me.’ In 1.14 ii 22–24, the direction towards the speaker is also clearly implied: šâya yâdk šìmm dîyy l tî ṣâkh nl ‘Raise your hands towards the heaven, sacrifice to the bull, your father Nîl’ (nl is speaking). The least transparent case is 1.5 v 13–14 (šâya yâr ū yâm ḥîb l tî ṣâkm ‘Lift up a mountain on your hands, a hill on your palms’), largely because of the uncertainty of the meaning of the whole passage. Still, the direction towards the speaker is manifest here as well (cf. pnk ṣâl šnu šî ʿâr knkny ‘March towards the mountain of my abode’ in the preceding line). Shall we translate šâa as ‘lift (and carry) to me ...’? The only reliable example of the a-imperative in EA, too, probably does not contradict Fassberg’s rule: ku-nà a-na ṣâ-ni ERÎN.MEŠ GAL ‘Be ready for the coming of the great army!’ (147:36–37, Rainey 1996 II 265–266). This passage reproduces the direct speech of the Egyptian king, who urges his vassal to prepare himself for meeting his (in the context of the letter, my) army.

368 Any reference to the extended imperfect is conspicuously missing from Fassberg’s article of 1999 (but cf. Fassberg 1994:32), and it remains to be investigated whether his rule is to any extent also applicable to this form in the extant Biblical corpus. Needless to say, the benefactive ending as such could in principle be attached to the third person forms as well (‘may he do for me,’ etc.), but one can plausibly suppose that at some stage of the development of the Canaanite languages its use became restricted to the first person self-exhortation clauses (‘may I do something for myself’). Still another, more serious, question is why the hypothetical benefactive ending in Canaanite was so closely connected with the volitive forms (the jussive and the imperative) to the detriment of the narrative ones (‘I did something for myself’ is quite a natural idea, after all).
ending not being restricted to the first person,” 1971a:138) cannot be valid anymore: the ending is indeed connected with the first person in both cases, what is different is merely the actor (“may I do something for myself” vs. “(you) please do something for me”). Conversely, Fassberg’s hypothesis corresponds nicely to I. Gelb’s claim that “the Hebrew cohortative, occurring as it does in both the fientive verb and imperative, cannot easily be taken to represent a primary mood (case), such as the subjunctive, because imperatives cannot have a primary mood” (Gelb 1969:101): within Fassberg’s approach, the a-ending is indeed not a marker of “primary mood.”

Last but not least, Fassberg’s theory makes even broader the already existing semantic gap between the supposed reflexes of PCS *-a in Arabic and Canaanite: while the semantic evolution from volitive to subjunctive might look plausible, this is hardly the case with benefactive-ventive.

On the other hand, the meaning of *-a as established by Fassberg provides a close functional link between the Canaanite a-forms and the Akkadian ventive — a striking fact that could not have escaped the attention of Fassberg himself: “The form and function of the final morpheme -ā brings to mind the use of the ventive morpheme -a(m) in Akkadian” (1999:13 and, with more details, 1994:34–35). Indeed, what is prominent in both cases is the benefactive first person singular nuance (“for me,” “on my behalf,” “towards me,” etc.). Shall we suppose that the similarity between the two morphemes is not only functional, but also etymological (*-am > *-a)?

As is well known, there is an alternative Akkadian parallel for the Canaanite (and/or Arabic) morpheme *-a, viz. the subjunctive ending -a discovered by Gelb in a few Sargonic documents from the Diyala region. Gelb, who was able to collect five attestations of this marker, connected it with -a in both Arabic and Canaanite (1955:190, 1961:170–171, 1969:101–105), but this analysis has not been universally accepted (Kienast 1960:152, 2001:272, Blau 1971a:142), mostly because of the functional difference between Akkadian (predicate of subordinative clauses, exactly corresponding to the normal Akkadian “subjunctive” in -u) and CS (within the traditional approach, direct or indirect volitive). No feasible alternative explanation for the origin of the Akkadian form has yet been suggested.

The results of our survey can be summarized as follows: the very existence of *-a

---

369 Indeed, within Fassberg’s approach the a-ending becomes completely unconnected to the volitive meaning: the latter is rendered by the base itself (the imperative qutul or the short form of the prefix conjugation yaqtul), to which -a is attached.

370 If the CS energetic is indeed etymologically related to the Akkadian ventive (see the next section of this chapter), Fassberg’s hypothesis becomes compatible with the well-known equation between the Hebrew cohortative and the Arabic energetic in -a, quite prominent in earlier Semitological literature, but strongly overshadowed by the a-volitive hypothesis ever since Moran’s study of 1960 (cf. Gelb 1969:101, Blau 1977b:29–30). An important argument in favor of this equation has been provided by J. Joosten (2000), who has shown that a-extended imperatives before pronominal suffixes in Biblical Hebrew usually display a benefactive meaning (“for me”): ṯmānnā lī ‘Give it to me’ (1S 21:10) and similar.

371 Each of the five available attestations is in a relative clause.

372 Particularly infelicitous has been B. Kienast’s suggestion (1960:152–153) to treat these forms as ventives without mimation: as rightly pointed out by Gelb (1969:102–103) and others (Hasselbach 2005:204, Kouwenberg 2010a:224), loss of mimation (especially such a systematic one) would be without precedent in Sargonic Akkadian.
as a PCS morpheme is far from evident, and its innovative nature, even less so.\textsuperscript{373}

\textbf{2.1.2.} The energetic \textit{yVC,C2VC,C3-Vn(na)} is most transparently attested in the Amarna Canaanite, Ugaritic and Arabic.

\textit{2.1.2.1.} In Arabic (Fischer 2002:118), the energetic suffix is \textit{-an(na)} when attached to forms without suffixes (\textit{yagtul-anna}) and \textit{-n(na)} elsewhere, with a concomitant shortening of the suffix vowel (\textit{yagtul-u-n(na)}). Syntactic environments typical of the Arabic energetic have been described by T. Zewi (1999:16–63): promises, wishes, threats and warnings. Additionally, energetic forms are common in both parts of conditional sentences.

\textit{2.1.2.2.} The evidence for the energetic forms in Ugaritic has been analyzed by J. Tropper (2000:497–506).\textsuperscript{374} Forms with a single \textit{n} seem to be attested in all temporal and modal environments (past, present, jussive), which suggests that this morpheme could be attached to both long and short forms of the prefix conjugation.\textsuperscript{375} The use of the double \textit{nn} always implies the presence of a third person pronominal enclitic; the origin of the second (pre-suffixal) \textit{n} is uncertain. The semantic properties of the Ugaritic energetic are rather difficult to establish (cf. Tropper 2000:730–734).

\textit{2.1.2.3.} Energetic forms are well attested in the Amarna Canaanite (Rainey 1996 II 234-244, Zewi 1999:156–172). Most typically, the energetic ending \textit{-na}\textsuperscript{376} is attached to the indicative forms in \textit{-u} (long form of the prefix conjugation): \textit{i-pu-šu-na} ‘(what can) I do?’ (EA 74:63). As far as the syntactic environments are concerned, the energetic is usually attested in questions and asseverations. The energetic affix is not used with short forms of the prefix conjugation denoting actions in the past (which are, admittedly, not very common in general in the EA corpus).\textsuperscript{377} Energetic jussives are poorly attested (Rainey 1996 II 263–264, Zewi 1999:169, with a few probable additions in Tropper–Vita 2005), but there are two reliable examples of energetic imperatives (Rainey 1996 II 271–272, Zewi 1999:170).

\textit{2.1.2.4.} In Biblical Hebrew, the \textit{n}-extension is primarily associated with pronominal enclitics; the existence of free-standing \textit{n}-forms is questionable.\textsuperscript{378} As shown by M. Lambert (1903) and accepted in many subsequent studies, \textit{n}-extension is normal for those prefix conjugation forms that can be morphologically and/or syntactically identified with the long form of the prefix conjugation. Whenever the

\begin{itemize}
\item It is not superfluous to observe that accepting an eventual etymological connection between the hypothetical PCS *\textit{yagtula} and the Akkadian subordinative in \textit{-a} (as actually done in Huehnergard 2005:165 and Hasselbach 2005:204–205) practically means that this feature cannot be a shared innovation of PCS, but, at the very best, a shared retention from PS. But given the rather fundamental semantic differences between Arabic and Canaanite, even this qualification may be open to doubt, as it is unclear which function of *\textit{-a} is to be ascribed to generalization on the PCS level.
\item With reference to earlier studies, notably Krebernik 1993 and Zewi 1999:175–186.
\item For many of the relevant passages from the Ugaritic corpus, correct syntactic evaluation can be extremely difficult (if at all possible).
\item With one exception, gemination of \textit{n} does not surface in the orthography.
\item One possible (but by no means compelling) exception is discussed in Tropper–Vita 2005:60–61: \textit{ù ù-ul tu-wa-āš-ša-ru-na ù-nu-tu\textsuperscript{65}šu} ‘But his implements were certainly not sent’ (or: ‘are not being sent,’ KL 72:600:9–10).
\item A prime example is \textit{yddāk la-ṣyātēd ṭshmnh} in Judges 5:26 (see further Robertson 1972:117–118). It has been argued that \textit{n} in forms like \textit{tiḥākīn, yikhīrīn,} etc. should be identified with the energetic ending rather than with the indicative suffix *\textit{-na} (cf. Zewi 1999:72–75).
\end{itemize}
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jussive or the “Old Preterit” are involved, non-extended forms are used. The principal syntactic environments where the n-forms typically occur have been carefully investigated by Zewi (1999:75–114). They include commands, prohibitions, questions, oaths, as well as conditional sentences (both protases and apodoses).

For the n-forms before pronominal enclitics in early Aramaic v. Degen 1969:80, Rosenthal 2006:58–59, Muraoka–Porten 2003:142–153. In Old and Biblical Aramaic, the n-extension is also associated with the long form of the prefix conjugation and is not used with the jussive and the imperative.

2.1.2.5. The presence of the CS energetic in Sabaic has been advocated by Tropper (1997b). Tropper’s observations are based on Nebes’ pioneering study of 1994, where the usage of the n-agumented forms of the imperfect in Sabaic (3 sg. m. yqtln, 3 pl. m. yqtlnn) has been systematically investigated. As shown by Nebes, the non-augmented forms are predominant when the prefix conjugation describes past events as well as in modal contexts (note especially the vetitive ʼl yqtl). Nebes has shown, furthermore, that the distribution of yqtl and yqtl-n has a chronological dimension: the opposition between the two forms is more clearly pronounced in the earliest Sabaic inscriptions. On the basis of this evidence, Tropper identified the non-extended form yqtl/yqtlw with the short form of the prefix conjugation (preterit/jussive). As for the n-form yqtln/yqtlnn, he thought it to represent primarily the CS “New Imperfect” *yaqtul-u/*yaqtul-u-na. The n-augment is, in Tropper’s opinion, to be identified with the CS energetic morpheme *-Vn(nV).

Tropper’s analysis has two different aspects which are best to be evaluated separately.

As far as the distribution of simple and augmented forms is concerned, it is indeed so strikingly similar to the classic CS opposition of short vs. long forms of the prefix conjugation that their fundamental identity with these categories is, in our opinion, very hard to avoid.380

More problematic is the diachronic background of the n-augment. Its identification with the CS energetic is, in fact, by no means new: it was first advanced by M. Höfner (1943:71–82) and then critically analyzed by N. Nebes (1994a:193), E. Wagner (1993:334) and P. Stein (2003:166–167).381 The main arguments against this identification can be summarized as follows.

1) The plural form in Sabaic displays two n graphemes, whereas in the Arabic form yaqtulun(na) there is only one (Wagner 1993:334, Nebes 1994a:193). This argument can be rather easily refuted: while the Arabic form is energetic volitive,382 the
Sabaic one, in Tropper’s interpretation, is energetic indicative, parallel to the Amarna forms discussed above in this section. In such a form, preservation of -n — which is the marker of the indicative in the plural — can only be expected.

(2) In a similar vein, the functional gap between Sabaic and Arabic (Nebes 1994a:193) is to be explained by the (predominantly) indicative nature of the Sabaic n-forms (Tropper 1997b:51).

(3) One may wonder why the energetic morpheme should be so closely associated precisely with the long form of the prefix conjugation, but it is remarkable that the same association is patent in the Amarna Canaanite, in Biblical Hebrew and in early Aramaic. In a deeper chronological perspective, this association may provide interesting insights on the origin of -n in the present of the intensive stem in MSA, as well as on the nature of the element -ni- in the Akkadian ventive allomorph -nim. The special connection between the n-extension and the present is indeed emphasized throughout T. Zewi’s monograph on the subject (note especially 1999:8–9).

(4) By far the strongest argument against the association of -n with the CS energetic comes from Stein 2003:182. Stein’s objection derives from the plural imperative form sfrnn ‘write,’ which he was able to detect in the minuscule document Mon.scrip.sab. 97:13 (Stein 2003:187). As reasonably argued by Stein, the plural imperative is not expected to display the indicative ending -n and, therefore, only one -n should have been written in the augmented plural imperative (**qtl-n = **qutulu-nna).

To be sure, Tropper (1997b:49) was already aware of the latter objection: although no augmented imperatives were known to him, Tropper did surmise that whenever the n-forms are attested in volitive contexts (notably, after the precative particle l-), they should be analyzed as energetic jussives. He naturally wondered why such forms should exhibit a double -nn-: “Daß eines der betreffenden n-Elemente von den Personalendungen her rührt, scheidet aus, da der betreffenden Form aus funktionalen Gründen nicht die PKLF zugrunde liegen kann” (1997b:49). Tropper’s solution was to compare the Sabaic forms with the Akkadian ventives in -am/-nim: the allomorph -nim (= Sab. nn) can only appear after a long vowel, which is present in the jussive (yqtl-nn = *yaqtulā-nin), but not in the indicative, where the first allomorph (-am

383 On this problem see Chapter 8 (pp. 462-463).

384 If the Akkadian ventive allomorphs -am and -nim are compared to each other, the origin of -ni- in the latter form may look puzzling, and its formal identity with the subordinative ending -ni, preserved in Sargonic and Old Assyrian, purely accidental: there can hardly be any reason why the ventive morpheme should be systematically combined with that of the subordinative. However, as we have seen above, the subordinative ending -mi is undoubtedly identical with the plural marker of the CS “New Imperfect.” If we assume (with N. J. C. Kouwenberg and others, see below in this chapter) that the original function of the endings *-u/*-nV was to mark the present, one can easily hypothesize that at some stage of the development of proto-Akkadian the -Vm suffix was primarily associated with the present, and it was only after that the combination of two independent morphemes (*-ni-m) was reanalyzed as a single ventive allomorph -nim. Note that Krebernik (1993:128) postulates *-ni as the original shape of the ventive plural allomorph, being nevertheless aware that the ensuing homonymy with the subordinative ending -ni is undesirable and requires an explanation.
= -n) must therefore be used instead (yqtln-n = *yaqtulūnā-n). This analysis, presupposing a completely different morphological analysis of -nn in the indicative and the jussive, is not easily compatible with the evidence of Arabic and Ugaritic, where energetic jussives and imperatives display only one n in the plural form, exactly as the corresponding singular forms. At the same time, it is potentially capable of providing a decisive formal link between the Sabaic (and, mutatis mutandis, CS) energetic and the Akkadian ventive.

In order to explain the extended plural imperative qtlwn, Stein (2003:166–167, 182) accepts a more radical solution: all Sabaic -n/-nn endings are directly comparable with the Akkadian ventive allomorphs -am/−nim. In other words, the plural pattern yqtlnn is always to be analyzed as *yaqtulū-nin, never as *yaqtulūna-n(na). However, as Stein himself admits (2003:182), the interpretation of the first n in yqtlnn as the indicative ending *-n has the advantage of reconciling the Sabaic picture with the evidence of Qatabanian and Hadramitic, where yqtlnn is the normal plural form and the n-extension is not attested.

In our opinion, it is still preferable to identify the -n ending in Sabaic with the CS energetic and to analyze the double nn in the plural forms as belonging to two different morphemes, the indicative *-na and the energetic *-nna (> *-nanna). The nn-forms in the jussive and the imperative can probably be explained by the — otherwise well-pronounced — trend of replacing the non-augmented forms by the augmented ones in Sabaic.

2.1.2.6. We may conclude that the formal and functional similarity between the n-suffixes in Canaanite, Arabic and, probably, Sabaic are sufficient to postulate the existence of energetic as a relatively uniform grammatical category in PCS. What is more difficult to demonstrate is the innovative background of this form.

2.1.2.6.1. By far the most evident parallel to the CS energetic is the MSA conditional in -m, attested in some varieties of Mehri, in Jibbali and, against the common opinion, in Soqotri. The MSA conditional is mostly restricted to one peripheral syntactic environment — the apodosis of unreal conditional sentences. Since this syntactic context is broadly compatible with the Arabic usage, the MSA morpheme is probably indeed related to the Arabic and CS energetic. If this

385 Arabic jussive plural yaqtulūnna rather than **yaqtulūnin, Ugaritic imperative dual *rb-n ‘enter’ (1.3 iii 9, Tropper 2000:500) rather than **verb-n (thus *ṣurūbā:-nna, not **ṣurūbā:-nin). One has to admit that Testen (1993a:305–306) does reconstruct the Arabic form as *yaqtulūnin, assuming a further shift to *yaqtulūn > yaqtulūnna.

386 The situation in these languages was presumably similar to what we observe in later Aramaic, where the opposition of the long and short forms of the prefix conjugation was neutralized in favor of the n-extended forms. On the semantic level, the opposition is maintained by other means, such as prefixation of b- to the indicative forms in Qatabanian. For a few (presumably archaic) non-augmented preterite forms in Qatabanian (w-yhrgw ‘they killed’) see Avanzini 2009:213.

387 “The final results of the research, which are based on the identification and the classification of the syntactic contexts containing verbs with -n(n) endings, connect the appearance of the -n(n) in classical Arabic, Biblical Hebrew and the Akkadian of El-Amarna to the modal functions of indicative of the prefix conjugation, i.e., the indicative referring to the sphere of the future. That is, the modal functions of the indicative of the prefix conjugation in these languages are grammatically marked by an -(n)n ending” (Zewy 1999:8).

388 More details on the MSA conditional can be found in Chapter 8 (pp. 463-464).
comparison is valid, the energetic cannot be a CS innovation, but must be traced back at least to PWS.\textsuperscript{389}

2.1.2.6.2. The CS energetic has been often compared to the Akkadian ventive \textit{-am/-nim}.\textsuperscript{390} Both formal and semantic aspects of this — now very popular\textsuperscript{391} — comparison are worth discussing in some detail.

Firstly, the unconditional shift of \textit{*-m} to \textit{-n} in WS (or, \textit{vice versa}, \textit{*-n} to \textit{-m} in Akkadian) remains a serious problem, as clearly witnessed by the polarity of opinions on the subject: while D. O. Edzard (2003:175) postulates a unique shift \textit{*-an > -am} "in word-final position only,"\textsuperscript{392} D. Testen (1993a:302) appeals to a "regular sound change in Arabic," as in Arb. \textit{kalb-u-n} 'dog' vs. Akk. \textit{kalb-u-m}. As Testen himself admits, this hypothesis is rather hard to reconcile with the Sabaic and Canaanite facts (such as mimation in the nominal paradigm, but \textit{n}-extension in the verb\textsuperscript{393}).

Secondly, the semantic evolution from energetic to ventive (or \textit{vice versa}) remains to be explained. Most scholars who compared the CS energetic with the Akkadian ventive surmised that the former function (however imprecise) was the primary one, whereas the directional meaning in Akkadian has been implicitly or explicitly ascribed to the influence of the Sumerian substratum (Pedersén \textit{1989:433–434}, Testen \textit{1993a:299–301}, Edzard \textit{2003:175}, Zólyomi \textit{2011:398}). Within this approach, both the form and the meaning of the CS energetic must be traced back to PS, which completely deprives this category of any innovative status. However, Fassberg’s discovery of the benefactive \textit{*-a} in Canaanite makes one wonder whether the reverse semantic evolution (from directional-benefactive to "emphatic") could be

\textsuperscript{389} Theoretically, the emergence of the MSA conditional could be explained by the Arabic influence, but this is rather unlikely in view of the clearly vestigial nature of this form and the lack of direct functional overlap between Arabic and MSA. Conversely, the uniform semantic function of the conditional throughout MSA may be considered a shared innovation of this group.

\textsuperscript{390} See already above in connection with the Sabaic \textit{n}-forms. Note that for Tropper the Akkadian ventive and the CS energetic are diachronically identical (1997b:49), whereas Stein (2003:167) apparently considers them as two alternative options for comparison. For Tropper (2000:501-502), another direct link between the Akkadian ventive and the CS energetic is provided by the Ugaritic \textit{nn}-forms, but this — in principle, quite plausible — hypothesis is, at least for two reasons, speculative: (1) there is no evidence that \textit{nn} has ever been restricted to verbal forms ending in a long vowel; (2) its association with pronominal enclitics remains to be explained.

\textsuperscript{391} Note, for example, Zólyomi's apodictic statement: “The morphological marker of the ventive in Akkadian is cognate with the marker of the Semitic energetic mood” (2011:398).

\textsuperscript{392} In his opinion, the original \textit{*-n} can be deduced from assimilated forms like \textit{iddinakkum} 'he gave to you' < *\textit{yiddin-an-kum}. However (\textit{contra} Edzard, Krebernik \textit{1993:128} and Testen \textit{1993a:304}), an original \textit{*-m} could as easily be assimilated to the following consonant, as shown by \textit{herbuššu} 'within it' < *\textit{kerbūšu-šu}.

Generally speaking, internal sandhi phenomena can be remarkably different from the synchronically operative phonetic shifts and are preferably not to be analyzed upon this synchronic background (cf. Kouwenberg \textit{2010a:241}).

\textsuperscript{393} In Canaanite, cf. Ugr. \textit{hm}, Hbr. \textit{nim} 'if' vs. Arb. \textit{nim}. Testen’s hypothetic solutions for these problems do not seem very persuasive. This applies, first of all, to his attempts to dissociate the nominal ending \textit{-m} in ESA from its Akkadian homologue and to relate the latter to the ESA definite article \textit{-n} (1993a:306–308). This comparison is patently wrong in view of the fact that the full form of the ESA definite article is \textit{-hn}, which, in its turn, is hard to separate from the well-known PS deictic element \textit{*\textit{h}nu(ni)}.
preferable. A highly interesting piece of evidence in favor of such a possibility comes from Soqotri, where two verbs unconnected with the intensive stem in the perfect and the jussive nevertheless display the characteristically “intensive” ending -in in the imperfect: gédaḥ — l’igdāḥ — yagodihin and enkāv — l’ánkāv — ymokīvin. Now the first verb means “to come” and the second, “to bring” — by far the most prototypical “ventive” meanings well known to the students of the Akkadian morphosyntax.

Thirdly, the Akkadian ventive morpheme -am can scarcely be separated diachronically from the enclitic dative pronouns. The ending -m after the “core” pronominal element is, obviously, the hallmark of the dative enclitics (-ku-m, -šu-m, -šunūši-m) and one feels almost compelled to believe that -a-m (and -mi-m) are to be analyzed in the same way. The diachronic identity between -kum/-šum on the one hand and -am on the other is not incompatible with the deictic-terminative interpretation of -am analyzed above, yet it would mean that all personal pronouns in Proto-Semitic were regularly inflected for the terminative case. Needless to say, within such an interpretation the “emphatic” function of -n in West Semitic can only be regarded as a secondary innovation rather than the other way round.

2.1.2.6.3. The close connection between the energetic endings and the pronominal enclitics in NWS inevitably brings to mind similar phenomena in Ethiopian Semitic, as exemplified by Geez yasabr-a-kka ‘he will break you,’ yasabr-a-nni ‘he will break me’ (Mittwoch 1926:77; for the essentially similar Tigre and Tigrinya facts v. Raz 1983:38–40, Leslau 1941:52–56). Needless to say, the EthS picture is not to be treated as the main truth of Joosten 2000 is, effectively, that -a and -nn are positional allomorphs (free and pre-suffixal respectively) of one and the same morpheme in Biblical Hebrew. The same reasoning is applicable to the situation in Arabic: do the subjunctive -a and the energetic -am represent one and the same proto-morpheme with secondary differentiation in both form and meaning? As mentioned above, the main truth of Joosten 2000 is, effectively, that -a and -nn are positional allomorphs (free and pre-suffixal respectively) of one and the same morpheme in Biblical Hebrew. Unless one assumes, with Zólyomi 2011:399, a secondary analogical spread of -m from the first person to other paradigmatic positions within Akkadian — which is, of course, hard to prove or to disprove. One may doubt, anyway, that Sumerian influence could be responsible for such a process, affecting not only Babylonian, but also Assyrian and Eblaite.

2.2. As pointed out in Huehnergard 2005:182–184 (in the wake of Blau

394 This observation brings us to still another serious problem: if the Akkadian ventive is identified with the Canaanite first person benefactive *-a, how can it be simultaneously related to the energetic -n, synchronically attested in the same languages? Shall we suspect that the original benefactive meaning of *-am/*-a-a was preserved in some restricted environments, but shifted to “energetic” elsewhere? The same reasoning is applicable to the situation in Arabic: do the subjunctive -a and the energetic -am represent one and the same proto-morpheme with secondary differentiation in both form and meaning? As mentioned above, the main truth of Joosten 2000 is, effectively, that -a and -nn are positional allomorphs (free and pre-suffixal respectively) of one and the same morpheme in Biblical Hebrew.

395 Unless one assumes, with Zólyomi 2011:399, a secondary analogical spread of -m from the first person to other paradigmatic positions within Akkadian — which is, of course, hard to prove or to disprove. One may doubt, anyway, that Sumerian influence could be responsible for such a process, affecting not only Babylonian, but also Assyrian and Eblaite.

396 Note, in particular, that gemination of the first consonant of the suffix is also found in many forms of the perfect (sabarmá-kka ‘we broke you,’ sabarató-kka ‘she broke you,’ sabarató-nni ‘she broke me’), whereas in a few forms of the perfect, the imperative and the jussive it is rather the last consonant of the verbal form that is geminated (yasbarr-o ‘let him break it,’ saborr-o ‘break it,’ sabaratt-o ‘she broke it’).

397 Cf. Leslau 1939:89. Leslau is at lost to explain the origin of the a-vowel in the imperfect, but excludes categorically the possibility of its “connecting” nature (“l’impossibilité d’envisager cette voyelle comme voyelle de liaison”). In view of what has been said about the connection between the energetic and the present, the contrast between ymaggarakka and ymgarka appears quite striking. One can, of course, ascribe it to the difference in syllabic structure, but if this is the case, one wonders (with Leslau) why the undesirable consonantal accumulation was broken by a rather than a.
1978:35), a peculiar feature uniting Arabic with Aramaic and Canaanite is the morphological shape of the tens, formed by the addition of the masculine plural markers -ūna/ūna to the corresponding numerals of the first decade: Arb. ṯalāṯ-ūna/ṯalāṯ-ūna, Ugr. ṣīl-m, Hbr. ṣāloṣ-ūm, Syr. ṣāl-ṁ ‘thirty’.\footnote{This PCS system is opposed to what we find in Akkadian and EthS, where all forms of tens display -ā.\footnote{This was indeed the logic of such a brilliant Semitist as Cantineau: “Nous avons évidemment là une innovation très ancienne. Étant donné sa singularité, il est peu vraisemblable qu’elle ait été réalisée parallèlement par l’accadien et le sudarabique. Il est donc possible que ce fait atteste une parenté dialectale entre l’accadien et le sudarabique” (1932:202; for a more cautious approach to this question v. ibid. 203).} This ending, often identified with the nominative dual suffix, provides a seemingly easy explanation for the origin of the whole distributional pattern: the tens from thirty to ninety were originally formed by the addition of the plural ending, whereas for “twenty” the dual ending was employed (Hetzron 1977b:193, Blau 1978:35).

Within such an approach, the subgrouping value of the CS picture can easily be put in doubt: if the “plural” leveling is relevant for the hypothetic CS subgroup, the much more specific “dual” leveling must be all the more significant for the — clearly illusory — genealogical unity of Akkadian and EthS.\footnote{The priority of the dual ending was advocated by Hetzron (1977b:194–195), who does not advance, however, any formal or semantic reason for the formation of all the tens by means of the dual ending (Powell 1979:18). His explanation of ʿāṣr-ūm, šīr-ūm and ṣīr-ūm as early duals whose dual ending was later mechanically replaced by the plural one is not unattractive, but (as he himself admits) to some extent weakened by the unusual vocalic shape of the base in ʿāṣ-r-ūna/āṣr-ūm. As argued by W. von Soden (1961, 1983), two sets of endings should be reconstructed for the tens in PS, an external masculine plural and an external feminine plural. It was the latter, in its absolute state form -ā, that would have...} The innovative nature of the CS feature would become more feasible if the Akkadian/EthS forms were shown to represent the original PS picture (rather than a result of still another generalization), but there is hardly any direct evidence for such a hypothesis.\footnote{The somewhat fragmentary MSA picture still awaits a comprehensive synchronic and diachronic analysis (v. Simeone–Senelle 1997:396, Hetzron 1977b:192–193). As pointed out by T. M. Johnstone (1982:227), the Jibbali form ṣāṣrī displays the regular dual ending -i. The Soqotri form ṣāṣrāh, about which M.-C. Simeone–Senelle (1991:128) explicitly states that “la forme soqotri n’est pas un duel,” does not look reliable: the form elicited from our informants is ṣāṣrī, practically identical with Johnstone’s Jibbali cognate. Interestingly enough, the Soqotri lexeme for “thirty” displays the ending -a (ṣālā, as opposed to ẓalē ‘three’), but its relevance for the present discussion is difficult to estimate.}
Huehnergard spends a welcome attention to the ESA picture in order to establish whether the CS way of formation of the tens was shared by this subgroup. As is well known, all the relevant Sabaic forms end in −y in the absolute/construct state and in −nhn in the determinate state (Stein 2003:105). Huehnergard is right to observe that “a final -y marks the bound form of both the dual and the external masculine plural, so that if the ‘tens’ are construed as bound forms before the nouns they quantify, it is not possible to determine whether the forms are plural as elsewhere in Central Semitic, or instead are cognate with the final -ā of Akkadian and Goṣaq.” For several reasons, this problem requires further clarification.

(1) According to Huehnergard, the aforementioned ambiguity is only valid if the numeral and the noun counted appear in the genitive construction. He refers to Beeston (1984:65) who believes that “the decade numerals are not syntactically construct” at least in Qatabanian. No alternative syntactic arrangement is explicitly mentioned by either Huehnergard or Beeston, but according to a recent hypothesis (Wagner 2002:263–267, Stein 2003:86–88, 111–112, 116) the numerals in Sabaic were indeed not used in the construct state, but rather in a special absolute state without case endings. The validity of this hypothesis may be questioned, but even within this approach it is unclear why the dual interpretation is preferable to the plural one, given the fact that the hypothetic absolute endings of either plural or dual are not attested elsewhere.

(2) As long as one is willing to identify the ending -y with the dual, one has to bear in mind that in Old Sabaic the nominative and the oblique in the construct state were graphically opposed as -Ø [*-ā] vs. -y [*-ay] (Stein 2003:92–95). Provided that the Sabaic numerical phrase can still be understood as a genitive construction, we would wish the form syl-γ to appear in those syntactical environments where the oblique

been generalized in Akkadian and EthS. Not unlike the traditional “dual” hypothesis, this theory implies an independent analogical development in Akkadian and EthS and, indirectly, weakens the subgrouping relevance of the CS picture: a similar “masculine” leveling could also take place independently in individual CS languages. Contra Hetzron (1977b:194), von Soden’s theory is not incompatible with the ESA evidence: while certainly not identical to the feminine external plural, the ESA endings -hy and -nhn can well represent masculine external plural (contrast Hetzron’s “unmistakable dual” — allegedly taken from Beeston! — with Beeston’s own “dual or external masculine plural,” 1984:65).

The hypothesis of E.-M. Wagner and P. Stein is mainly based on two types of argument: (1) syntactically isolated numerals can be used without mimation (i.e., not in the “normal” indefinite state); (2) when numerical phrases are determined, the postpositive article is attached to both the numeral and the noun counted. As far as the first argument is concerned, it is indeed quite probable that in some adverbial expressions the numerals — and with all probability, other nouns as well — were not compatible with mimation, and it may be legitimate to think of a special “absolute state” in order to describe such a usage. One may doubt, however, that this highly specific syntactic environment should of necessity bear on the usage of numerals in “normal” (non-adverbial) numerical phrases. As for the second argument, double determination for numerical genitive phrases is standard in Classical Arabic: rat-tisatu l-kutubi ‘the nine books’ (Fischer 2002:81, Reckendorf 1895:284).

Cf. Stein’s cautious remarks in 2003:105. He is nevertheless inclined to think that “die Endung -γ wie auch die determinierten Formen auf -nhn machen immerhin einen Zusammenhang mit der Dualendung des Nomens nicht unwahrscheinlich.”
is expected, and the (so far unattested) s₂̄l̅-Ø to be present elsewhere. Whether or not the -y forms are indeed syntactically oblique in the extant Old Sabaic corpus must be established by a competent Sabeologist.\footnote{As P. Stein kindly informs us in personal communication, all the attested -y-examples in Old Sabaic are indeed in non-nominative syntactic positions. Generally speaking, it is not clear why the hypothetical absolute state of the dual should be identical to the construct oblique: the only reliable parallel comes from Akkadian (tin-à ‘two’) and rather suggests the nominative.}

\textbf{(3) Exactly the same reasoning can be applied to the plural hypothesis: as shown by Stein (2002b, 2003:91), in Old and Middle Sabaic the external masculine plural marker in the construct state distinguished between the nominative in -\textit{aw} and the oblique in -\textit{ya}. Here again, the CS-like reconstruction of the Sabaic forms would presuppose that, at least in Old Sabaic, forms in -\textit{ya} would only be attested in non-nominative syntactic positions.}

In summary, in spite of some reservations, Huehnergard’s identification of the form of the tens as a shared CS innovation seems promising. It is still uncertain whether this feature was shared by Epigraphic South Arabian.

\textbf{2.3. In Huehnergard’s view (2005:180–181), an important morphological innovation opposing the CS languages to the rest of Semitic is Barth’s law: in the prefix conjugation, the vowel of the prefix correlates with the thematic vowel (\(V_p\, a \rightarrow V, i/u\) vs. \(V_p\, i \rightarrow V, a\)). No such correlation seems to be observable in EthS and MSA (where the vowel of the prefix is uniformly \(a\)), nor in Akkadian, where different prefixes are characterized by a fixed \(a\) or \(i\) vocalism (e.g., 2 sg. \textit{ta-} vs. 1 pl. \textit{ni-}). The phenomenon is best attested in Hebrew and Ugaritic. Its presence in Aramaic is much more restricted (Testen 1994:428, Bar-Asher 2008:7), whereas in Arabic only some vestiges have been detected, mostly in early dialects (Bloch 1967, Schub 1973; cf. already Barth 1894b:5 with references to several 19th century studies). The nature of the prefix vowel in ESA can hardly be elicited,\footnote{Nebes (1994a:192), Hayes (1994:255–258) and Stein (2003:184–185) assume that the vowel of the prefix in ESA was -\textit{i}-. This reconstruction is based on the fact that the 3 sg. masc. prefix -\textit{y}- can be elided in the script when preceded by the prejective particle \textit{li}: “Lediglich bei einer Vokalisation /li-yi-f\textit{ō}/ ist eine Kontraktion der beiden ersten Silben zu /li-f\textit{ō}/ (vielleicht mit weiterer Verkürzung zu *lî-f\textit{ō}/ möglich” (Stein 2003:184). There are several reasons not to concur with this reconstruction. (1) The vocalism of the prejective particle in ESA is unknown, and since the comparative Semitic evidence leaves ample room for each of the three possibilities (*\textit{la}-, *\textit{li}-, *\textit{lu}-, Testen 1998b:125–129), postulating \textit{li}- as the ESA form of this particle amounts to circular reasoning (cf. Tropper 1997b:50). Indeed, if *\textit{la}- or *\textit{lu}- are taken as the point of departure, completely different reconstructions could be obtained. (2) The very assumption that contraction of -\textit{y}- is only possible between two identical vowels remains to be substantiated: cf. the Akkadian D and Š forms \textit{lipparris} and \textit{lisapris}, obviously going back to prototypes with different vowels around -\textit{y}- (*\textit{li}-\textit{yuparris} or *\textit{la}-\textit{yuparris}, cf. Huehnergard 1983:587–589), thus flagrantly contradicting Hayes’ claim that “a change of /\textit{wa-li-}yusa\textsubscript{ṣ}id/ to /\textit{wa-li-}ṣa\textsubscript{ṣ}id/ ... is much more plausible than a change of /\textit{wa-li-}yusa\textsubscript{ṣ}id/” (1994:257). (3) Most importantly, the loss of -\textit{y}- is also attested in the intensive and the causative stems in Sabaic, which leads Heyes (1994:257–258) and Stein (2003:185) to reconstruct -\textit{i}- as the vowel of the prefix here too (\textit{ṣif\textsubscript{ṣ}īl}, \textit{ṣiha\textsubscript{ṣ}īl}) — quite an implausible hypothesis contradicting most of what we know about the vocalism of the derived stems in ancient Semitic languages. At the same time, there seems to be some evidence that at least in one type of weak verbs, viz. \textit{iy}, the vowel of the prefix was indeed \textit{a} rather than \textit{i}: a form like \textit{yɪ-yɪf\textsubscript{w}n ‘it will be proclaimed’ can only be vocalized as *\textit{yi}-\textit{yɪf\textsubscript{w}Vn(nV)}, the alternative vocalization *\textit{yi}-\textit{yɪf\textsubscript{w}Vn(nV)} being simply impossible: the combination \textit{iy} is phonologically equivalent to \textit{i} and cannot exist as an independent
Since Hetzron 1973–1974:40, Barth’s law has often been considered a common CS innovation, which, at first sight at least, does look quite appealing. Nevertheless, several scholars have recently tried to discover traces of Barth’s law outside CS, thus postulating its existence already in PWS or even PS. An appropriate evaluation of these recent hypotheses is of paramount importance for the status of the present isogloss.

2.3.1. As R. Hasselbach has recently claimed, “traces of Barth’s Law can be found in every sub-branch of West Semitic, suggesting that this law was operative at the earliest stages of WS” (2004:27). In our view, the arguments behind this claim can hardly be considered satisfactory. The ρ-vocalism of the prefixes in Geez may be due to analogical leveling (*a ousted by *i throughout the paradigm), but, contra Hasselbach, such a leveling need not be connected with Barth’s law: the Hetzronian heterogeneous reconstruction (*′ta- vs. *yi-, *ni-), Hetzron 1973–1974:47) would provide enough grounds for analogy. The same is true of *-γ- as the prefix vowel in MSA. Moreover, as will be shown below, at least for MSA, a purely phonetic solution (vocalic reduction) may provide a solid alternative to any kind of morphological analogy.

2.3.2. Traditionally, Barth’s law has been considered absent from Akkadian. Thanks to David Testen’s pioneering contributions to the subject (1992a, 1994, 2000), this position is considerably more difficult to maintain today. Testen’s argumentation is

consonantal-vocalic sequence anywhere in Semitic, whereas a purely vocalic i is not expected to be written plene in Sabaic. Now, the alternative reconstruction *ya-yfarc actually implies that Barth’s law was not operative in Sabaic: r as the third radical presupposes a as the thematic vowel, which would have conditioned i in the prefix if the law were in work. The reconstructions *lyy’V’Vn and *li-yy’V’Vn proposed in Stein 2003:184 and 189 are acceptable as theoretical constructs, but not as normalizations of the attested forms lyf’vn (non-contracted) and hyf’vn (contracted), probably better to be vocalized as *IV-ya-y’frV’Vn(νV) and IV-y’frV’Vn(νV) respectively. Needless to say, etymologically oriented, non-phonetic orthography with γ- “borrowed” from the non-prefixal forms of this verb always remains a possibility, as tentatively suggested in Stein 2003:189.

The title of Hayes’ article (Traces of Barth’s Law in Epigraphic South Arabic) is, in fact, misleading: as Hayes himself acknowledges on p. 256 of his study, the i-vowel of the prefix (as reconstructed by him) is not restricted to stative (intransitive) verbs and, therefore, is not bound to the thematic a-vocalism. In other words, there are no traces of Barth’s law in ESA — even if Hayes’ reconstruction of i as the vowel of the prefix is accepted. Hayes’ observation seems to be overlooked (or misunderstood) by Hasselbach who states: “Presumably, this sound change did not take place when the prefix had the form ya-” (2004:27) — for Hayes at least, such a prefix vocalism did not exist at all in ESA.

“All of these are Central Semitic languages; there is no evidence of this phenomenon in Ethiopian Semitic, in the MSA languages, or in Akkadian” (Huehnergard 2005:181).

Much less so are a few concrete manifestations of this approach. Thus, Faber’s account of Barth’s law and its relevance for the genealogical classification of Semitic (1997:9) is rather confused: clear evidence in favor of its presence in Aramaic and Arabic is disregarded, which forces Faber to conclude that it is rather “the leveling of prefix vowels in all prefix conjugations” that should be considered a real CS innovation. However, leveling of the prefix vowels also occurred in EthS and MSA (cf. Zaborski 1991:369).

On p. 30 of her study, Hasselbach explicitly qualifies Barth’s law as “WS innovation” (cf. also ibid. 34).

Such a possibility would be admittedly more difficult to imagine for EthS, where *a is normally not reduced to ρ (Hasselbach 2004:24).
essentially based on two pieces of evidence: (1) different behavior of active and stative
verbs *Iw and (2) specific features in the conjugation of the irregular verb idû 'to know.'

2.3.2.1. There are two different morphological classes of verbs *Iw in Akkadian,
conventionally labeled “active” (ābil ‘he brought’) and “stative” (ākur ‘it was rare,
precious’). In the framework of Testen’s hypothesis, this distinction reflects an early
manifestation of Barth’s law, the i-vowel of the prefix being restricted to the “stative
verbs. In Kogan 2004a, a few shortcomings of Testen’s argument were critically
analyzed, but as a whole his hypothesis was enthusiastically accepted. Our today’s
attitude towards this aspect of Testen’s theory is considerably less optimistic. On the
one hand, ı in a 3 masculine singular form like ākur is not necessarily conditioned by
Barth’s law — the standard Akkadian form of this prefix (yı-) would yield exactly the
same result. Only forms with a-prefixes could potentially be decisive (**)ākur ‘I was
precious,’ **yākur ‘you were precious’ < **y-ākur, *ti-ākur), but such forms are almost
entirely missing from the extant Akkadian text-corpus (Kogan 2004a:344). On the
other hand, the diachronic background of the u-vowel in ābil remains sorely uncertain:
while certainly not *i (which would yield **yābil), it can hardly be a straightforward *a
either, given the fact this u is with all probability short, being subject to the syncope
rule (u-bil — u-bl-ı).411 Taken together, these considerations make it difficult to
reconstruct here any of the two members of the a : i opposition predicted by Barth’s
law.

2.3.2.2. Conversely, Testen’s understanding of the history of the verb idû ‘to
know’ (Testen 2000:84) is, in our opinion, practically unassailable. The Sargonic forms
yı-da ‘he knows’ and ti-da ‘you know’ are almost certainly to be normalized and
reconstructed as [yı-da] < *yı-udār and [tı-da] < *ti-udār. While in the former case the
i-vowel of the prefix can be simply identified with that of the normal Akkadian form of
the 3 masculine singular prefix (yı-), this is clearly impossible in the second case, where
i in ti- can by no means be reduced to the standard form of this prefix (tā-).
Theoretically, the Sargonic spelling TI-DA could be alternatively normalized as [tēda] <
*yu-ya, implying a derivation from a root ıy (as in the case of the infinitive idû <
yu-ya)u). Such a reconstruction would amount to a fatal blow for Testen’s hypothesis,
but it is not compatible with the OA forms ∗-de-e ‘I know’ and ∗-i-de-e ‘you know’
(Hecker 1968:168), which clearly exclude **a-ya and **la-ya since *ay yields ē and
not ı in Assyrian.412

411 Testen’s derivation from *y-ābil (1994:433–434) is of course purely hypothetical, although one
has to admit that his comparison between the Akkadian verbal forms and Arabic nouns like tu-nat-
sticks to the analogy with the present yubbal once proposed by Huehnergard (1987c:193), but this
interpretation is hardly more persuasive than Testen’s, notably because the phonetic background of the
hypothetical shift *yawabbal > *yubbal has never been explained. In Hasselbach 2004:29, it is the second
person singular form *y-awabbal > tubbal that is used to illustrate this hypothesis (presumably in order to
obtain two identical vowels around the semivowel, which would not be the case in 3 m. sg. where the
prefix vowel was, with all probability, -i- throughout the history of Akkadian), but neither *iwaCC- nor
*iwaCC should normally yield -uCC- (nor -āCC-, nor -ūCC-) in Akkadian.
2.3.3. It was the merit of A. Ungnad (1905) to observe that the *i—*a sequence in the imperative of *a*-verbs in Arabic and (mostly) in Akkadian can be extrapolated on the corresponding forms of the prefix conjugation: *rīkāb/*yīrīkāb* presupposes *yīrīkāb*, as opposed to *purus/*wāktub* = *ya*p*rus/*ya*k*ītub* and *pi*ki*d/*fik*īd* = *ya*p*ki*d.* With more or less substantial changes, this theory has been accepted and developed by J. Kuryłowicz (1972:47), R. Voigt (1988:109–114), D. Testen (1994:431–432) and, most recently, E. Bar-Asher (2008). It is in the latter study that this phenomenon has been most explicitly put in connection with Barth’s law.414

2.3.4. The evidence of Modern South Arabian has rarely been used in the discussion of Barth’s law (and the history of the prefix vocalism in general). The usual perception of the MSA facts is that the prefix vowel is more or less uniformly *a*, which practically amounts to Ø in terms of synchronic phonology — and to any of the three PS short vowels in an etymological perspective. This perception is, however, not entirely correct: at least in two areas of verbal morphology, there are traces of different vocalic qualities in the prefix.

2.3.4.1. According to Johnstone 1975:13–14 and JL XVII–XVIII, “active” and “stative” verbs in Jibbali display different qualities of the prefix-vowel in the jussive: *kāḏār* — *yākāḏār* ‘to be able,’ but *fēḏūr* — *yāfēḏūr* ‘to be frightened.’ At first sight, this picture can be taken for a clear manifestation of Barth’s law: the prefix vowel *a* < *ya* correlates with “non-*a*” (*a* < *u* or *i*) in the base, and vice versa. However, a deeper inquiry quickly reveals that this similarity is merely apparent. The pertinent forms are different not only vocally, but also accentually: the “active” form is prefix-stressed, whereas the “stative” one is base-stressed.415 Indeed, whenever the prefix of the “active” type loses the stress, its *a*-vowel immediately shifts to *a*: 3 masc. pl. *yākāḏār*, 3 fem. pl. *tākāḏārm*, 1 pl. *nākāḏār*, etc. In other words, the presence of *a* in the prefix of the “active” type is conditioned by the stress and not by a morphological rule.

2.3.4.2. In Mehri, the reduced vowel *a* is nearly ubiquitous in the verbal prefixes. A remarkable exception is provided by the jussive of verbs *īw*, where two morphological classes are opposed (ML XXVIII): “active” (*wāzūm* — *yāzīm* ‘to give’) and “stative” (*wīṣāl* — *yāwīṣāl* ‘to reach’). In this case as well, the similarity to Barth’s law is, at first sight, quite conspicuous: *yāa(w)āzīm/*yāa(w)āzūm*416 vs. *yīwīṣāl*. The actual

also Huehenergard 2005:181) is largely unwarranted (Kogan–Markina 2006:574–576). As pointed out in Kogan–Markina 2006:575–576, a similar background probably underlies the forms of the irregular verb *išū* ‘to have’ (*išū* < *yi*-*yāw*), contra Testen (2000:85–88), whose derivation of these forms from the root *ṇāt* ‘to raise’ is virtually impossible.

415 Strangely enough, the latter two authors hardly ever refer to Ungnad and Voigt as their predecessors.

414 In Testen’s view, the similarity is more structural than material.

416 The long vowel after the prefix in the Mehri forms is highly peculiar and deserves further study. In the proto-form *ya*-*zīm*, which would be expected on comparative grounds, a short unstressed *a* in an open syllable must have been reduced to *a* (cf. *yamāt* ‘let him die’ < *ya*-*māt*, ML. xxix), but this is not the case. Such a “compensatory lengthening” of *a* is reminiscent of *ā* in Akkadian causative verbal forms from roots *Īw* (*wābūl*) and nominal lexemes like *tāltîtu* ‘offspring’ (CAD T 96). Note that this phenomenon is apparently missing from Jibbali: *yāḏēd* ‘let him go down’ < *wād* (JL 292).
relationship is, however, more than doubtful since it is impossible to demonstrate that $\alpha$ in yawṣāl indeed goes back to *$\dot{i}$ rather than *$\alpha$: both are regularly reduced to $\alpha$ in unstressed syllables.\(^{417}\)

2.3.4.3. One can thus safely conclude that there is no evidence for the existence of Barth’s law in MSA. Moreover, the cumulative evidence of Jibbali and Mehri suggests that at a certain stage of the development of these languages (perhaps already in Proto-MSA) the prefix vowel was uniformly $\alpha$.\(^{418}\) Its subsequent shift to $\alpha$ was probably conditioned by accentual factors (reduction of full vowels in unstressed syllables) rather than by morphological leveling of an originally heterogeneous system (either Barthian or Hetzronian).

2.3.5. One’s final evaluation of Barth’s law as a PCS innovation is deemed to be ambiguous. On the one hand, CS languages are the only ones where this feature is sufficiently well pronounced in its “classic” form, and it is probably not unreasonable to suspect that its crystallization did take place in PCS.\(^ {419}\) On the other hand, the Akkadian forms *yīḏar, *tūḏar and rikab, limad make it fairly plausible that the basic principle underlying this phenomenon is considerably more ancient.\(^ {420}\)

2.4. Two other features adduced by Huehnergard (2005:186–189) as reliable PCS innovations will not be discussed here as they are more lexical/syntactic than strictly morphological: the relative-demonstrative element *hal-la-di'y- and the complex interrogative *ma(ha) di'at(i).

3. More morphological features?

Notwithstanding the broad scope of Huehnergard’s *Features*, this study is in all likelihood not completely exhaustive: a few additional morphological phenomena potentially explainable as shared innovations of PCS can still be discovered.

---

\(^{417}\) Strictly speaking, the same logic could be applied to Hebrew forms like *yīraš ‘he will inherit’: in the proto-form *yi-wraš, the i-vowel *could* go back to *$\alpha$, as elsewhere in the paradigm of the strong verb (yiktḥāb < *yaktūb). Our willingness to identify this vowel with an etymological *$\dot{i}$ is conditioned by our knowledge of other, more transparent manifestations of Barth’s law in Hebrew, such as yēṣāš ‘he will be ashamed’ or yēḥal ‘it will be light.’

\(^{418}\) Contrast Lonnet 1994:248: “La structure syllabique qu’avait le subjonctif *yokḥār avant d’évoluer vers yāḏan.” As far as the prefix vowel is concerned, it is hard to imagine how $\alpha$ could be original with respect to $\alpha$, whereas the reverse process is easily conceivable. The priority of the $\alpha$-vocalism in Mehri can also be deduced from the jussive of the verbs I* (yamūr — ya’mēr ‘to say,’ ML xxiv).

\(^{419}\) For a different, much more critical evaluation of the relevance of Barth’s law for the Semitic genealogical classification v. Blau 1978:31–32.

\(^{420}\) It is often claimed (Testen 1992a:131, 1994:431, Hayes 1994:251, Huehnergard 2005:181) that already Barth himself considered his law to go back to PS. This is essentially correct (cf. Barth 1894b:5–6), but one has to keep in mind that Barth’s general account of the phenomenon under discussion is rather contradictory: on the very same page of his study, he tentatively suggests that “im Ursemitischen die Präfixe der verschiedenen Personen ursprünglich nicht dieselben Vocale gehabt zu haben brauchen, vgl. das ni im Assyr. gegenüber dem ta im Sing. und Plur.” At any rate, Barth’s general vision of PS was so much different from ours that Testen’s theory can hardly be considered a re-establishment of Barth’s original concept. The chronological dimension of Kuryłowicz’s reconstruction of Barth’s law (1972:46–47) is difficult to ascertain, but, as far as one can see, he considered it a very ancient feature.
3.1. Throughout CS, the infinitive patterns of the derived stems display *ā before the third radical: Hebrew (Bauer–Leander 1922:322–323, 326–327) nikṣāl/ḥiḵṣāl (N), ḫaṭṭāl (D), ḫuṭṭāl (Dp); Biblical Aramaic (Bauer–Leander 1927:109, 111–112, 115) hiḵṣāl-ā (Gt), ḫaṭṭāl-ā (D), hiḵṣāl-ā (Dt), ḫuṭṭāl-ā (Š)\(^{421}\); Arabic (Fischer 2002:122–123) qīṭāl- (L), qīṭāl- (Š), (i)nqīṭāl- (N), (i)qīṭāl- (Gt), (i)ṣṭīqāl- (Št).

As seen already by Brockelmann (1908:346),\(^{422}\) the emergence of such forms is due to analogy with the pattern of the infinitive of the basic stem (*C₁aC₂āC₃̀*), where *ā* is original and can be traced back to PS. No such analogy can be observed in the formation of the infinitives of the derived stems in other Semitic languages, notably Akkadian (von Soden 1995:13*) and Geez (Dillmann 1907:269–271): naprus- (N), parrus- (D), šaprus- (Š),\(^{423}\) tanagr-o (Gt), naggar-o (D), \(\ddot{u}g\)gar-o (Š).\(^{424}\) Since Geez o and Akkadian ū are diachronically compatible (< PS *ū*), it stands to reason that it was *ū* that characterized the last syllable of the infinitive of the derived stems in Proto-Semitic. This assumption is corroborated by the preservation of *ū* in the mašlārs of Dt and Lt in Arabic (taqattūl- and taqāṭūl- respectively, Fischer 2002:123).\(^{425}\)

A weak point of this isogloss is that, at least theoretically, o in such Hebrew forms as nikṣāl or ḫaṭṭāl may also go back to *ū* rather than *ā*.\(^{426}\)

3.2. Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic display a uniform strategy in the conjugation of quadriradical verbs, whose paradigm is identical to that of the triradical verb in the intensive stem. The second and third radicals are structurally parallel to the geminated middle radical, as in Arabic yutarjīmu ‘he translates’ = yuvallīmu ‘he teaches’ (Gensler 1997:229–230).

This Central Semitic type of conjugation is neatly opposed to what we observe in Akkadian, where quadriradical roots are normally associated with the N and Š stems. In the preterit, the conjugation is largely identical to the triradical verb, whereas in the present, a-Ablaut in the last syllable is accompanied by the a-insertion after the second radical together with the gemination of the third one: ibbalūtu ‘he transgressed’ — ibbalakkat ‘he will transgress’ (Gensler 1997:243–246). A similar picture is observed in

\(^{421}\) The Aramaic forms are expanded with the feminine suffix -ā.

\(^{422}\) “Wohl schon im Ursemit. wurde diese Bildung des Inf. auch auf die abgeleiteten Stämme übertragen.” In this case (and many others) Brockelmann’s Ursemitisch does not go too far beyond Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic, thus roughly corresponding to the present-day concept of Central Semitic.

\(^{423}\) For D and Š, Assyrian forms are added here as more archaic.

\(^{424}\) The origin of the o-extension in Geez is uncertain.

\(^{425}\) We are somewhat reluctant to consider the ta-C₂aC₃̀ substatives in Akkadian (Kouwenberg 2010a:277) and Geez (Dillmann 1907:234) as residual Gi-infinitives of the Central Semitic type (contra Testen 1999:4–5), although one has to admit that the almost regular formation of na-C₂aC₂āC₃̀ verbal nouns from n-quadriradicals in Geez (na-g‘adgādā ‘thunder’ < ṭang‘adg‘ada, Dillmann 1907:239) may indeed speak in favor of the PWS origin of this feature. Insertion of ā is among the regular means of formation of verbal nouns from the derived stems in Tigre (Bulakh 2013a:244–245), but here the possibility of Arabic influence is to be seriously considered.

\(^{426}\) Rainey (1996 II 377) argues that the form na-akhṣa-pu, attested as a Canaanite gloss in EA 82:51, can be interpreted as an N-infinitive. If this interpretation is correct, one wonders why the long *ā* of the original *nākṣāl- was immune to the Canaanite shift. Note that the syntactic position of na-akhṣa-pu (corresponding to Akk. w-āl ta-ṣa-aš, with an uncertain subject) is highly ambiguous, which makes Rainey’s interpretation rather uncertain (cf. Liverani 1998:179).
Geez, where the jussive *yamazbar* ‘may it lie in ruins’ is opposed to the imperfect *yamazabbir*. One may doubt, however, that the coincidence between Akkadian and Geez should indeed be projected to PS as argued throughout Gensler 1997. The Geez-Akkadian type mirrors a naturally expected development for each of these languages, which preserve the “Old Present” with *a*-Ablaut and/or gemination as opposed to CS where such form does not exist. It is not impossible that the Geez-Akkadian type reflects the PS picture, but parallel developments individually in each of the two languages can hardly be excluded (Kouwenberg 2010a:122–123).

Similarly inconclusive is the innovative nature of the CS type apparently hinted at in Gensler 1997:255.

On the one hand, the identity between the imperfect forms of the intensive and the quadriradical paradigms is complete also in the EthS languages Tigre and Tigrinya (Gensler 1997:239): Tigrinya *yândâ*‘el ‘he will take a handful’ (TED 2123) — *yândanno* ‘he will be astonished’ (TED 2122).

On the other hand, a certain relationship between the intensive and the quadriradical paradigms is visible in MSA. Throughout MSA, the imperfect of quadriradical roots without reduplication does not display the *-n* ending characteristic of the corresponding form of the intensive stem, but is rather formed by means of the *a*-Ablaut (Mehri *yakhibū* ‘he will crawl’). This feature dissociates the MSA system from the CS one and makes it closer to the Akkadian system described above. At the same time, the prefix-conjugation forms of quadriradical roots in Jibbali and Soqotri are subject to the rule of non-occurrence of the *t*-prefix, which, as established by Testen (1992b), only affects forms with *u* as the prefix-vowel — in the present case, a likely witness to a D-stem background.

In view of these facts, paradigmatic similarity between quadriratical verbs and the intensive stem must be considered either a PWS phenomenon (Kouwenberg 2010a:124), or a feature extremely prone to emerge via independent analogical shifts. In each case, its relevance for defining the CS languages as a specific genealogical unit becomes seriously reduced.

427 As rightly observed by Kouwenberg (2010a:124), the Geez jussive *yamazbar* is perfectly compatible with Arabic *yutar* and may well be diachronically identical to it.

428 One is reluctant to concur with Gensler’s evaluation of the MSA quadriradical paradigms as “at best distant witnesses to the Proto-Semitic state of affairs” and “an outcome of multiple layers of complex and largely unrecoverable innovations, under which any traces of a preserved proto-pattern would surely be masked to invisibility” (Gensler 1997:250). It is regrettable that Gensler’s presentation of the MSA facts is marred by such a crass misunderstanding of well-known facts, long ago detected and explained by Rössler, Johnstone, Testen and others — and fully confirmed by recent research, including our own fieldwork.

429 Further details on the MSA quadriradical conjugation can be found below in Chapter 8 (p. 574).

430 But not identical to it: it is exclusively in MSA that the *a*-Ablaut functions as the only marker of the quadriradical imperfect and there is no trace of a geminated third radical. Kouwenberg (2010a:125) is almost certainly correct to consider the MSA forms as the most archaic ones, corresponding to the non-attested opposition *ibbalkit* — *ibbalkat* in pre-historic Akkadian. This claim, however, is scarcely compatible with the statement “Mehri has also preserved the West Semitic conjugation in the imperfective” on just the previous page of Kouwenberg’s book.

431 For a similarly critical stance towards Gensler’s approach to the quadriradical present/imperfect in Akkadian and EthS v. Kouwenberg 2010a:121–123. There is, admittedly, one remarkable coincidence
3.3. A characteristic feature of the CS nominal derivation is the adjectival pattern *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$C$_5$. Productive use of this pattern is restricted to Arabic (Fischer 2002:74, 76–77), where it displays such well-known applications as the elative (*$\alpha$kbar- ‘larger’) and designations of colors/bodily deficiencies (*$\alpha$hmar- ‘red,’ *$\alpha$war- ‘one-eyed’). Its presence elsewhere in CS is marginal, but probably still broad enough to reconstruct it as a PCS feature.\footnote{432}

(1) The earliest attestations of *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$- are found among WS loanwords in the Old Babylonian texts from Mari (Streck 2000:84, 334-335): *$\alpha$harātu ‘western bank,’ *$\alpha$damātu ‘eastern bank,’ *$\alpha$akdamū ‘former times.’ Streck is correct to surmise that these substantives go back to the adjectives *$\alpha$'hār- and *$\alpha$'kdam- with an (at least originally) elative function.

(2) Reliable examples of *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$-nouns in Ugaritic are few (Tropper 2000:265), but at least for *$\alpha$alāy(u) the elative meaning (‘the mightiest’) is not unlikely.

(3) There are three *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$-adjectives in Hebrew (Jotijn–Muraoka 2005:256): *$\alpha$zkāb ‘deceptive (torrent),’ *$\alpha$ʿēlān ‘perennial (torrent),’ *$\alpha$zkār(i) ‘cruel.’ The first lexieme can be internally derived from the verbal root kzb ‘to lie,’ the second one has no internal source of derivation, but is well compatible with Arb. *$\alpha$tn ‘to be constant, to flow permanently’ (LA 13 546). The etymology of *$\alpha$zkār(i) is uncertain.

(4) There are several attestations of *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$- in ESA (Stein 2003:61, Kogan–Korotaev 2007:179): Sab. *$\alpha$fr ‘another time’ (SD 4), *$\alpha$dm ‘front part; previous occurrence’ (SD 104), *$\alpha$yl ‘complete’ (SD 136), *$\alpha$fl ‘lower’ (Stein 2003:87), Min. *$\alpha$m ‘strongest’ (R 3307:3).\footnote{433} The lexical overlap between Sabaic and early WS loanwords in Mari is noteworthy.

No reliable traces of *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$- can be detected in Akkadian, EthS and MSA.

The origin of the *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$- pattern is uncertain. E. A. Speiser (1952) identified the prefix *$\alpha$- with the PS causative marker *$\alpha$V-; comparing Arabic *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$- with Akkadian *$\alpha$C$_4$C$_2$C$_3$-\footnote{434} This identification, already present in a somewhat different form in Nyberg 1920:262–270 and tentatively accepted in Tropper 2000:265, is faced with an obvious difficulty: it is only in Arabic that the prefix *$\alpha$- is an

\footnote{432} To be sure, the contrast between Arabic and the rest of CS is so drastic that one might be tempted to suppose that *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$C$_5$- is primarily an Arabic feature whose presence elsewhere in CS is due to an early (proto-)Arabic infiltration. The circumstances of such a borrowing process are, however, difficult to retrieve, and it seems better — at least provisionally — to treat *$\alpha$C$_1$C$_2$C$_3$C$_5$- as a PCS innovation which achieved its full blossom in Arabic, but was marginalized in the remaining languages of the group.

\footnote{433} For this commonly accepted translation v., e.g., Beeston 1962:28 (contrast ‘ouvrier, gardien’ in LM 94).

\footnote{434} The elative meaning of the Akkadian *$\alpha$C$_4$C$_2$C$_3$- adjectives is accepted in GAG 82 and elsewhere.
exact phonological match of the causative prefix. According to H.-J. Sasse (1991:273–274), *vC1C2aC3r- contains a broadly attested Proto-Afroasiatic prefix *v- with “collective/intensive” meaning, but this hypothesis would require much more additional evidence in its favor.

3.4. Some of the CS languages are characterized by a specific structure of the numerals of the second decade, as illustrated by the Arabic forms sabrata rašara ‘17 masc. counted n.,/sabrā rašrata ‘17 fem. counted n.’ (Fischer 2002:82). The main structural peculiarities of the Arabic forms can be summarized as follows: (1) the “digit—teen” order of elements; (2) the use of special forms of the numeral “ten” in the teen (rašar-/rašrat- vs. rašr-/rašarat- in the normal form of “ten”); (3) gender polarity between the digit and the teen, the gender of the digit being the opposite of that of the counted noun; (4) the ending -a in both elements.

The degree of preservation of these four peculiar features elsewhere in CS is uneven.

(1) The corresponding Hebrew forms šib’ā rašār/šabav rašrē (Joüon–Muraoka 2005:324–326) are remarkably similar to the Arabic ones: the order of the elements is the same; the masculine element rašār is an exact match of Arb. rašar-; the rules of the gender polarity are identical. The main differences are connected with the element rašrē, where the feminine gender is apparently expressed by the ending -ē < *-ay and the base *rašē- suggests *išē- in the prototype (cf. rašēm ‘twenty’). Also remarkable is the (quasi-)construct relationship between the digit and the teen.

(2) As pointed out by Muraoka and Porten (2003:90), most Aramaic dialects “show the basic structure of m. עשר חמשת vs. f. עשרי חמש,” which is generally compatible with the Arabic-Hebrew picture. For a diachronic overview of the highly varied Aramaic evidence v. Hetzron 1977b:184–188.

(3) The Ugaritic system as described by Tropper (2000:349–350, 396–400) is more divergent (note especially the lack of the t-ending in the digit in forms like ḫmś ʾšr ‘15 masc. counted n.’). For a diachronic analysis of the Ugaritic picture in comparison with other CS languages (made rather difficult by the unvocalized nature of the script) v. Tropper 2000:398.

(4) In Sabaic, only forms with masculine counted nouns are reliably attested: sibt ṣṣēr ‘17’ (Stein 2003:102). Such forms do not contradict the evidence of other CS languages, but their purely consonantal rendering does not allow one to clarify some of the key issues of the present discussion. At the same time, the Minaean phrase sib’ ṣṣēr ṣmh ‘17 cubits’ (R 2774:4), quoted by Beeston (1962:41) and Stein (2003:102) suggests that at least in this language the form of the teen was stable and did not depend on the gender of the counted noun.

All in all, the similarity between the Arabic and Hebrew forms is such that one can safely conclude that at least in these two languages the pertinent sets of forms must

---

435 Speiser, who hardly ever deals with *vC1C2aC3r- adjectives outside Arabic, is rarely aware of this problem. His attempt to dissociate Hbr. rašāb from this pattern (1952:83, taken for granted in Edzard 1964:144) is difficult to accept.

436 The terminology is borrowed from Hetzron 1977b.
go back to a common prototype (Hetzron 1977b:170). At the same time, no direct parallel to the Arabic system can be detected outside CS. Thus, the Geez forms *aššartu wa-šalastu/rašru wa-šašlaš ‘13’ (Dillmann 1907:369) are exactly the opposite in almost every respect. The same is true of the corresponding Mehri forms *nāṣarīl ṣa-šāyrti/rašr wa-šahrtl (Simeone-Senelle 1997:396). The extant Akkadian forms seem to be better compatible with the CS picture, but the extreme paucity of data (GAG 113–114), coupled with a few uncertainties of diachronic phonology, prevents one from definite conclusions (cf. Powell 1979 for a critical assessment of Hetzron’s analysis of the Akkadian facts in Hetzron 1977b).

The apparent uniqueness of the CS picture does not necessarily imply its innovative nature, as assumed by Hetzron (1977b). At least as likely is the opposite: the CS languages may preserve, with different degrees of completeness, the highly idiosyncratic PS picture, which was replaced by more straightforward systems in EthS, MSA and, to some extent, Akkadian.

3.5. As argued in Kogan 2008b, the CS languages share many deverbal substantives produced from the same roots according to the same morphological patterns with roughly the same meaning. A representative selection of examples (in total, ca. 50 proto-lexemes) includes *ḥiḥt- ‘attention,’ *ṣumk- ‘depth,’ *ṣamal- ‘toil,’ *našam-at- ‘breath,’ *ṣubb- ‘multitude,’ *ṣatāl- ‘thread,’ *ṣilār- ‘fullness,’ *ṣibād-at- ‘work.’ While some of such reconstructions may well be considerably older than PCS, whereas in a few other cases borrowing from one CS language to another can be surmised, these circumstances cannot account for such a large accumulation of relevant examples. We may thus be entitled to believe that many of such derivations did take place in the common ancestor of the CS languages.

4. Conflicting evidence

As mentioned above, the acceptance of the CS hypothesis has not been unanimous. Its critical evaluation tends to develop along two principal avenues (Zaborski 1991:366): (1) to refute morphological isoglosses supposed to unite Arabic with Aramaic and Canaanite and (2) to detect potential shared innovations between Arabic and EthS/MSA. Both possibilities have been systematically explored by Semitists reluctant to adhere to the Rössler–Hetzron pattern of genealogical classification.

4.1. The most prominent trend of “negative criticism” of the CS hypothesis is the disclaimer of the innovative nature of the “New Imperfect” *yVC₁C₂VC₃-u. This rather influential way of thought has two principal ramifications.

Some scholars believe that *yVC₁C₂VC₃-u is the PS form of the Imperfect and cannot be, therefore, either “new” or “innovative.” What they do consider an innovation is precisely the “Old Present” *yV-C₁aC₂(C₃)VC₃. Within such an approach, there is clearly no room for treating *yVC₁C₂VC₃-u as a reliable CS isogloss. As we attempted to show in a recent summary article on the subject (Kogan 2008a), the analysis of the “Old Present” *yV-C₁aC₂(C₃)VC₃ as an independent innovation of Akkadian, EthS and MSA (F. Rundgren’s réemploi de l’intensif) is virtually incompatible with the bulk of the Semitic and Afroasiatic evidence and must be emphatically rejected.
Within an alternative approach, \*yVC\_1C\_2VC\_3-u and \*yV-C\_1aC\_2(C\_2)VC\_3 are both treated as inherited PS categories with different, albeit related, semantic values. A detailed exposition of this concept, in its nuclear form present already in Rössler 1950:466, Kuryłowicz 1961:53 (more clearly, 1972:53–54), von Soden 1991:469 and Blau 1971a:144, 1978:27, has been recently expounded by N. J. C. Kouwenberg (2010a:88–90, 95–112, 2010b:634–637). Admitting that the PS reconstruction of \*yV-C\_1aC\_2(C\_2)VC\_3 is unavoidable (“there are compelling reasons to reconstruct it”), Kouwenberg rightly wonders about the origin of the presumably innovative \*yVC\_1C\_2VC\_3-u. This is indeed a formidable dilemma rarely (if ever) taken into consideration by the proponents of the Rössler–Hetzron theory.

As is well known, the “New Imperfect” \*yV-C\_1C\_2VC\_3-u/*yV-C\_1C\_2VC\_3-u\^\(\mathrm{n}\) is inseparable from the Akkadian Subjunctive in -u/-ni (Kuryłowicz 1972:60, Huehnergard 2005:165, Kouwenberg 2010a:103). However, the development of a subordinative suffix into a marker of the Present is cross-linguistically problematic (Zaborski 1991:367–368, Kouwenberg 2010a:98). It is also unclear why the “New Imperfect” should have developed through the addition of the subordinative marker to

437 It is cross-linguistically problematic (Zaborski 1991:367–368, Kouwenberg 2010a:98). It is also unclear why the “New Imperfect” should have developed through the addition of the subordinative marker to

438 In this formulation, Kouwenberg is much less radical than in his groundbreaking monograph of 1997. On pp. 36–37 and 47 of that study, the PS status of the Present \(yV\-C\_1C\_2VC\_3\)-u is presented as axiomatic, its replacement by \(i\)\(p\)arr\(a\)s being attributed to “a prehistorical stage of Akkadian” (a similar evolution can be observed in J. Kuyłowicz’s views on the subject, contrast 1961:48 and 1972:53). As one learns from Kouwenberg 2010a:99 and 2010b:634–635, one of the main reasons why he is now ready to acknowledge the PS status of \(i\)\(p\)arr\(a\)s is that “because of the (probable) time stretch separating Proto-Semitic from Akkadian, we should regard all Akkadian verb forms as Proto-Semitic, since however long this period may have lasted, it was certainly too short to allow for the rise of the relatively opaque verbal categories of Akkadian.” This argument is not persuasive: apart from the fact that the time stretch mentioned by Kouwenberg cannot be established with any degree of precision, absolute time is certainly no decisive factor in the emergence of exponents of grammatical categories. A quick look at the verbal systems of Modern South Arabian and North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic provides abundant proof thereof: while in the former case the main elements of the prefix conjugation are largely identical to their Akkadian counterparts both formally and semantically, in the latter case such forms simply ceased to exist. In more general terms, there can hardly be any doubt that Akkadian morphology displays serious innovations with respect to its PS and PAA ancestors — let us only mention the complete loss of \(\mathrm{a}\)-as the plural marker in the nominal paradigm, undoubtedly one of the most ancient and widespread traits of Afroasiatic inflectional morphology (Zaborski 1991:371).

439 This is especially evident in view of the distribution of these allomorphs in Sargonic Akkadian and Old Assyrian (Hecker 1968:133–135 and Hasselbach 2005:204–209 respectively): in both dialects \(-\mathrm{ni}\) tends to be attached only to forms ending in a vowel, admittedly with a certain amount of “consonantal” forms displaying a pleonastic \(-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{ni}\) (note that no such distribution can be deduced from the extant examples of the subjunctive ending \(-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{na}\) in (pre-)Old Babylonian as described in Whiting 1987:43 and Kouwenberg 2010a:226). Hasselbach rightly projects the \*yV-C\_1C\_2VC\_3-u/*yV-C\_1C\_2VC\_3\(-\mathrm{ni}\) allomorphy to PS, but does not specify the function of these forms in the proto-language. Conversely, the hypothetical preservation of \(-\mathrm{ni}/\mathrm{na}\) in Gurage, advocated by Leslau (1967) and Hetzron (1968:166–169, 1977a:90–92) cannot be accepted, as convincingly shown by D. Appleyard (2002:417).

440 So explicitly Voigt (1988:118): “Das indikativische Imperfekt ist also im Zentralsemitischen nicht neu gebildet worden … sondern geht auf die relative Form des Akkadischen zurück. Die Verwendung der relativen Form im Hauptsatz anstelle des Präsens stellt jedoch die entscheidende Innovation des Zentralsemitischen dar” (the same idea is expressed in Voigt 1987a:17). Cf. also Huehnergard 1991b:283: “The innovative feature shared by this group of languages is that the form \(ya\)\(q\)\(tt\)\(v\)\(lu\), which was originally simply the perfective form \(ya\)\(q\)\(tt\)\(v\)\(l\) marked for subordinate clauses (as in Akkadian), came to replace the earlier \(ya\)\(q\)\(att\)\(v\)\(o\)\(l\) as the main clause imperfective form.”
the base of the “Old Preterit” (*ya-prus-u ‘who divided’ ≠ *ya-ḥṭul-u ‘he kills’) — presumably instead of enlarging the “Old Present” *yV-C₁aC₂(C₂)VC₃ (*ya-parras-u ‘who divides’ = **ya-ḥattal-u ‘he kills’).

The explanatory power of Kouwenberg’s alternative concept (2010a:229–230) is hard to deny: meta-analysis of the “Old Present” *yV-C₁C₂VC₃-u — once relegated to the subordinate clauses — into *yV-C₁C₂VC₃ + subordinative marker is considerably easier to imagine than a spontaneous transformation of the subordinative *yV-C₁C₂VC₃-u into a “New Imperfect.” Still, this hypothesis also prompts numerous queries, which can be briefly summarized as follows.

(1) Not unlike the Hetzronian transformation, Kouwenberg’s meta-analysis involves a shift in temporal value: *ša yī-prusu-u ‘who decides’ must have been reinterpreted by the early speakers of Akkadian as ‘who decided.’ Such a reinterpretation is not implausible per se, especially if the influence of Sumerian, with its prominent subordinative suffix -a is considered (Streck 1998a:527, 1998b:193, Zólyomi 2011:401). However, within such a paradigm one has to postulate, for some stage of the history of Akkadian, a tripartite system *yī-prus ‘he decided’ — *yī-parras ‘he decides’ — *yī-prus-u ‘(who) decides,’ where the opposition Subordinative : non-Subordinative exists only in the Present. The cross-linguistic probability of such a system, not too far from I. M. Diakonoff’s “atemporal Subordinative” (1965:94–95, 1988:89–90), remains to be substantiated.441

(2) As pointed out by M. Streck (1998a:527), hypothetical relegation of the Present *yV-C₁C₂VC₃-u to subordinate clauses does not exactly correspond to the typologically well-known trend of the emergence of the subjunctive forms from the indicative ones: the Akkadian u-form has no modal function and its usage is not equivalent to the traditional concept of the subjunctive mood.442

(3) PS word-final short vowels are usually lost in Akkadian (Huehnergard 2000:591–594).443 Therefore, the form *yV-C₁C₂VC₃-u, if indeed an inherited PS category, was unlikely to survive in proto-Akkadian. In view of this circumstance (kindly brought to our attention by M. Krebernik), the Akkadian u-forms can only be regarded as secondary and comparatively recent “nominalized” structures, perhaps

440 More concretely, for the period when the hypothetical Present *yV-C₁C₂VC₃-u was already relegated to the subordinate clauses, but had not yet been re-analyzed as “Preterit + the subordinative suffix -u.”

441 To put it more straightforwardly: how did the Proto-Akkadians say ‘who decided?’ It may certainly be argued that it was precisely the instability of such a system, coupled with the fact that the bases of the Preterit Indicative and the Present Subjunctive were identical, that led to its eventual rearrangement in the historically attested Akkadian. Cf. in this sense the following remark by Kouwenberg: “The initial replacement of *yiqVlu by *yiqattal may have been caused by the inadequacy of the formal contrast with the corresponding preterite *yiqVl” (2010b:640, cf. also 2010a:591).

442 For an admittedly sound rejoinder to this query v. Kouwenberg 2010a:228–229, where the use of the Old (simple) Imperfect in all kinds of subordinate clauses in Amharic is adduced as a fine parallel to the Akkadian picture.

445 For a rather sceptical attitude towards this assumption, see now Kouwenberg 2010a:188.
attributable to the Sumerian influence. However, Krebernik’s important observation fails to explain the emergence of the allomorph -ni, which is hard to separate from the ending -n in the CS “New Imperfect.”

(4) Together with the majority of present-day students of the Proto-Afroasiatic verbal system, Kouwenberg recognizes the diachronic identity between Akkadian iparras and similar formations in Berber and Beja. Within his approach, such a recognition must imply that “the development from derived pluractional imperfective to basic imperfective occurred independently in Akkadian, Berber and Beja” (Kouwenberg 2010a:107). As he himself admits, the probability of such an independent shift is a matter of opinion, but in our view it is quite unlikely: it seems much more economic to postulate an ancient inflectional form faithfully inherited by Proto-Semitic, Proto-Berber and Proto-Beja, especially since (at least in Akkadian and Berber) striking formal similarities can be detected not only in the basic stem, but also in the derived ones, quite different in their morphological shape.

(5) As rightly acknowledged by Kouwenberg, “we should generally avoid multiplying the number of morphemes that we reconstruct, not only for the sake of simplicity, but also because the more categories we posit, the weaker the explanatory power of our model becomes” (2010a:101). Reconstruction of two co-existing verbal forms functionally corresponding to the Present does not fit this principle. In our view, the fundamental structural parameters of the PS verbal system should preferably be identical to what we observe in its most archaic daughter tongues, where the nucleus of the temporal system always consists of two members, with virtually no trace of the alleged “double present.”

(6) While it is true that an innovative verbal form should be “more contrasting, more voluminous ... more transparent than the old one” (Kouwenberg 2010a:98–99, 2010b:636), one may doubt that the “New Imperfect” with suffixes was indeed less “transparent” than the “Old Present” with apophonic changes in the base. Perhaps rather the opposite is true: the suffixes -u/-na could actually have been more easily perceivable than internal vocalic shifts.

(7) In Kouwenberg’s view (2010a:99, 2010b:636), the virtual lack of any trace of *yV-C₁C₂VC₃(VC₂) in CS makes unlikely the possibility that such a form could be the main exponent of the Present in PS: such a prominent element of the verbal system of the proto-language is not expected to vanish completely throughout some of its rather

---


445 See in this sense Voigt 1987b:343: “Otherwise we would be obliged to assume that the same innovation took place independently in all branches of Semito-Hamitic ... or even independently in different sub-branches of Semitic and Cushitic. This does not seem plausible. Generally speaking, if a relevant grammatical feature occurs in various branches of a language family, it is usually not regarded as a result of independent innovations, but as a common heritage, even if we think we know its origin.” Cf. also Blau 1978:27: “Yet one has to admit that the existence of a strange feature such as gemination outside D, occurring in Akkadian, Ethiopic and Berber makes it much more likely to assume that Akkadian iparras (as well as its Ethiopic and Berber parallels) continue a Proto-(Hamito-)Semitic feature.”

446 On this question see most recently Kerr 2001:132–148 (in response to Kottsieper 2000).
archaic daughter tongues.\footnote{447} However, exactly the same reasoning can be applied to the fate of the \*yV-C1C2VC3-n/\*yV-C1C2VC3-\~anV in EthS and MSA: while the short final \*\~u could not be preserved in these languages, this is not the case of the n-containing suffixes \*\~i-nV, \*\~a-nV and \*\~\~a-nV, which could easily show up at least as fossilized remnants (Goldenberg 1977:476 and 1979).\footnote{449} A prime example of such a preservation is offered by early Aramaic, where, due to the loss of final short vowels, the opposition between long and short forms of the prefix conjugation ceased to exist in forms without suffixes, but continued to be expressed elsewhere by the presence vs. absence of -n (Degen 1969:65, Bauer–Leander 1927:89). In a more blurred form, the same dichotomy is observable also in Biblical Hebrew (Bauer–Leander 1922:300).\footnote{449} It seems surprising why — if the respective forms are indeed Proto-Semitic — virtually no such remnants are attested in such an early and generally conservative language as Geez.\footnote{450} Let us observe, finally, that Akkadian iprusu, presumably the reflex of the “basic” present \*yiC1C2VC2C3\~a, does not seem to display any trace of its supposedly original meaning.\footnote{451} To sum up, throughout Semitic the two Presents are always in complimentary distribution whose geographic dimension — \*yiC1C2VC2C3\~a in the center, \*yiC1aC2C2C3 in the periphery — is, at first sight at least, better compatible with the Rösslerian theory than with the Rundgrenian one.

(8) According to Kouwenberg, \*yi-parras was originally not “part of the basic stem, but ... a derived stem with pluractional function” (2010a passim, 2010b:637). The morphology of this pluractional stem, whose reconstructed paradigm can be found in Kouwenberg 2010a:116, is characterized by a few remarkable idiosyncrasies in comparison to “normal” derived stems in Akkadian and Semitic. Thus, unlike other derived stems, where the Present was marked by the a-Ablaut, the pluractional stem made use of the -\~u/-\~Vna affixation, as the basic stem does. At the same time, its Preterit \*yiC1aC2C2C3 displays -a- after the second radical — again differently from all other derived stems where we typically find -i- . Its imperative is reconstructed with -\~i- (C1aC2C2C3) and is thus identical to that of the D-stem. The same is true of the active participle muC1aC2C2C3\~a. As long as this reconstruction is accepted, the pluractional stem cannot be defined as a true derived stem, but as something else — “a secondary derived stem” (Kouwenberg 2010a:115).\footnote{452} But the very fact that only one member of its paradigm is preserved, and even this in just one Semitic language (Akkadian iparras)
prompts one to seriously doubt the probability of its reconstruction. In a sense, the whole theory thus shifts from substance to terminology: we have to choose between a “non-basic” inflectional Present on the one hand and a morphologically atypical “plurational stem” of which only one paradigmatic form could survive on the other: if “yiqattal ... was unspecified for tense/aspect in the plurational stems” (Kouwenberg 2010a:117) one may legitimately wonder whether such a stem is necessary at all.

(9) For Kouwenberg, “gemination of R₂ is the hallmark of the Akkadian imperfective” (2010a:88). We should keep in mind, however, that the Akkadian Present has another, no less prominent, exponent, viz. the a-vocalism after the second radical. The inability to cope with this phenomenon is a fatal drawback of the Rundgrenian concept in its classic form (Kogan 2008a): on the one hand, the a-Ablaut deprives the Present of any special connection with gemination (and, in particular, with the intensive stem). 453 on the other hand, it is so deeply rooted elsewhere in Semitic and Afroasiatic (notably, in MSA and Cushitic) that its secondary and independent emergence in these languages and in Akkadian is scarcely conceivable. Indeed, Kouwenberg’s analysis mostly focuses on the Present of the basic stem (iparras). However, the grammatical category of “Present” is operative throughout the Akkadian verbal system, where it is mostly expressed by the a-Ablaut (uparras, ušaprás, etc.). Is there any relationship between such Present forms — with no visible iconic link to iterativity or multiplicity — and the hypothetical plurational stem? The importance of this question can hardly be overestimated given the fact that the same a-Ablaut is quite prominent in the formation of the Present in the basic stem, too. 454

(10) In his treatment of the *yV-C₁tC₂(C₃)V𝐶₃ problem, Kouwenberg does not completely abandon the Rundgrenian trend: while the historical priority of the Akkadian Present iparras is reestablished, no such concession is made for the corresponding “South Semitic” forms, which are still explained by a “much later”

453 By other implication, also with such otherwise attractive by-products of the réemploi as iconicity and grammaticalization.

454 In other words, it is hardly possible to dissociate the a-marker in iparras, imuṭ, ubbal and iddan from the functionally identical -a- in uparras, ušaprás, etc. Admittedly, this identity is sporadically acknowledged by Kouwenberg (e.g. 2010a:109–110) who, nevertheless, hardly ever attempts a coherent chronological (hierarchical) reconstruction of the relationship between the two markers. For instance, on p. 112 of his monograph Kouwenberg adheres to the widely accepted claim that “gemination was initially specific to the G-stem ... and a/i apophony to the other derived verbal stems.” Does this statement mean that -a- in the last syllable of iparras is a secondary intrusion? Such a recognition would be of no small consequence for many of the crucial points of the debate, in particular for the alleged incompatibility between Akk. iparras and Gez. yənaggur (Cohen 2003:67, Kouwenberg 2010a:118–120): there is no reason why the ancestor of the Geez form, easily reconstructible as *y-naqgar/*y-naqgar, could not be considered diachronically primary with respect to Akk. iparras where the structural change of the preterite iprus coexists (redundantly, it would seem) with the a-Ablaut. However, the secondary nature of -a- in iparras is not easily compatible with Kouwenberg’s other (and, per se, very reasonable) statements such as “the idea that *yiqattalu has replaced an earlier pluractional category without gemination but characterized by the stem vowel a deserves further consideration” (2010a:589) and “the stem vowel of *yiqattalu also is a plural marker of its own right and contributes to the pluractional function of the form” (2010a:593).

Thus, radically differently from Kuryłowicz (1972:59), for whom the very reason why “the formation *yaqattal should be considered a Semitic heritage, a derivative form in Semitic, but at the same time a potential successor of the old root-present yəqattal, is the Ethiopian counterpart yeqattel.”
process of “incorporating the form of the D-stem ... into the paradigm of the basic stem” (2010b:637). While theoretically conceivable for yanaggar in Geez, this approach can hardly be applied to the MSA picture, whose similarity to the Akkadian one is, in many senses, so obvious that an independent development of the two systems is practically out of question.\footnote{This deficiency is an evident corollary of Kouwenberg’s reluctance to acknowledge the a-apophony as a (or the) principal means of formation of the “Old Present”: what makes the Akkadian and MSA systems so amazingly similar is precisely the prominence of a as the marker of the Present in the derived stems and in some classes of weak verbs in the basic stem. Exaggerated attention to gemination of the second radical in the formation of the “Old Present” is a characteristic feature of the Rundgrenian trend as a whole (for a detailed criticism of this approach v. Kogan 2008a) and it is probably not by chance that in the works of Rundgren and his adherents the “South Semitic” picture is usually illustrated by Geez rather than by Mehri. Indeed, the MSA evidence in favor of the diachronic priority of *yV-C₁aC₂(C₂)VC₃ is very hard to refute (Goldenberg 1977:476–477, 1979, Appleyard 1996:209–213, 2002:405–406, contra Cohen 1974), especially after Testen’s brilliant analysis of 1992b: while Geez yanaggar could theoretically be identified with the D-stem, this is not the case of Mehri yafšbar, since the prefix-vowel *u should have induced the loss of the personal prefix i- in *ytuḥbir ‘you break,’ which does not happen in the corresponding forms in Jibbali and Soqotri. Moreover, in view of the high prominence of the a-Ablaut elsewhere in the formation of the Present in MSA, the very importance of the yafšbar-like forms becomes rather restricted, which makes largely irrelevant Cohen’s alternative derivation of yafšbar from *yašbaru (in our view, extremely improbable on its own). Kouwenberg 2010a:596.

For several reasons, Geez is the best (perhaps the only) convenient candidate for comparison as far as the broken plural systems are concerned. The Tigrinya system is considerably poorer, whereas in Tigre the risk of Arabic influence is high (see extensively Bulakh–Kogan 2011). A proper analysis of the MSA evidence is hampered by the well-known difficulties in the historical phonology of these languages; besides, for some patterns the possibility of Arabic influence is considerable. The features one can confidently detect today on the basis of our own fieldwork research in Soqotri (undoubtedly the most archaic language in this and many other respects) are *a- (less common than in Arabic and ES),}
summarized by Blau (1978:29).\footnote{117}

(1) Patterns with $^\ast \text{a}$-: Arb. $\text{a}C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3$ — Gez. $\text{a}C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3$, Arb. $\text{a}C_1C_2uC_3$ — Gez. $\text{a}C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3(t)$.

(2) Patterns with $^\ast \text{u}$- or $^\ast \text{ũ}$- after the second radical: Arb. $\text{a}C_1C_2uC_3$ — Gez. $\text{a}C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3(t)$, Arb. $C_1uC_2\ddot{u}C_3$ — Gez. $C_1uC_2\ddot{u}C_3$.

(3) The pattern $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3C_4$- for quadriradical nouns: Arb. $C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3iC_4$ — Gez. $C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3\ddot{a}C_4$.

A few other conspicuous similarities can be detected, such as the use of $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$- or $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}yC_3$- as the plural patterns of nouns with a (historically) long vowel in the second syllable (Ratcliffe 1998a:170, 1998b:117): Arb. $\text{a}$ some- $^\ast \text{a}$- ‘bride,’ $\text{a}$arídat - $^\ast \text{a}$arídn- ‘newspaper,’ Gez. $\text{a}$msd — $^\ast \text{a}$msd- ‘neck,’ $\text{a}$as — $^\ast \text{a}$as- ‘priest,’ $\text{a}$híz — $^\ast \text{a}$híyaz ‘stream.’

There is, finally, much similarity in the types of correlation between the plural pattern and the morphological shape of the singular. The relevance of this phenomenon, seriously downplayed in most traditional descriptions of the broken plural, has been admirably elicited in R. Ratcliffe’s important contributions of 1998. Its most obvious manifestation is the almost uniform use of the $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$- pattern for $C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$-, $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}yC_3$- and $C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$- singulars: Arb. $\text{a}$qam- $^\ast \text{a}$qámm- ‘foot,’ $\text{a}$mn- $^\ast \text{a}$mn- ‘color,’ Gez. $\text{a}$znab — $^\ast \text{a}$znáb ‘tail,’ $\text{a}$q — $^\ast \text{a}$qswák ‘thorn,’ $\text{a}$et — $^\ast \text{a}$býát ‘house.’ Also remarkable is the preference of the $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$- for $C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$-/ $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$- as opposed to patterns with $^\ast \text{u}$- after the second radical for $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$- (Ratcliffe 1998a:206–207, 1998b:116–117): Arb. $\text{u}$ism- $^\ast \text{u}$ism- ‘body,’ $\text{u}$stl- $^\ast \text{u}$stl- ‘lock,’ Gez. $\text{u}$lml — $^\ast \text{u}$ttl ‘furrow’ vs. Arb. $\text{a}$sh- $^\ast \text{a}$sh- ‘furrow,’ $\text{a}$shur- ‘month,’ Gez. $\text{a}$yn — $^\ast \text{a}$ynt ‘eye,’ $\text{a}$tr — $^\ast \text{a}$ttr ‘rod.’

An interesting coincidence of semantic order is the use of the pattern $^\ast C_1aC_2\ddot{a}C_3$- $^\ast \text{a}$- for nouns of agent, notwithstanding the morphologically divergent patterns of the singular: Arb. $\text{a}$lél- $^\ast \text{a}$lél- ‘student,’ Gez. $\text{a}$stf $^\ast \text{a}$stf ‘scribe’ (Blau 1978:29, Ratcliffe 1998a:170–171, 1998b:118).

4.2.2. The thematic vowel $^\ast \text{a}$- in the suffix conjugation of D and Š: Arabic qattala, raqatla, Gez. naggara, rangara, Mehri arakk, h̄ansūm vs. Ugaritic šal-li-ma, Hebrew kiqqel, hikkel, Syriac ḫaqēl, ṭaqēl.

4.2.3. As observed by Kouwenberg (2010a:119, 597), Arabic and Gez display $^\ast \text{a}$- as the thematic vowel of the imperfect/jussive of the Dt stem (yataqattal/yatnaggar), as

\footnote{117}

To be sure, some of Blau’s structural comparisons are invalid. As convincingly shown by R. Ratcliffe (1998b:90), Arb. $C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3$- and Gez. $C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3$- occur with different types of singulars ($C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3$- vs. $C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3$-) and should be kept apart in a diachronic analysis. As for Gez. $\text{a}$C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3$, it is more likely to correspond to Arb. $\text{a}$C_1C_2uC_3- than to Arb. $\text{a}$C_1C_2\ddot{a}C_3- . What Blau means by “Gez q₂h₂l” is unclear to us as no such pattern seems to be attested in this language.
opposed to the (presumably archaic) yišqatjēl in Hebrew.

4.2.4. Derived stems with *qā after the first radical (the so-called L and Lt stems): CqāCqāCqā and ta-CqāCqāCqā. Productive use of these stems, extensively discussed in H. Fleisch’s monograph of 1944, is characteristic of Arabic and EthS, but not attested in either Hebrew or Aramaic.460

4.2.5. The use of the active participle pattern *CqāCqāCqā for ordinal numbers (Blau 1978:30): Arb. tāhēz, Gez. ʒāoras, Mhr. ʒōləl ‘third’ (Fischer 2002:83, Dillmann 1907:369–370, Simeone-Senelle 1997:397, ML 380). Elsewhere in Semitic, other patterns are used, such as *CqāCqāCqā and *CqāCqāCqā in Akkadian, *CqāCqāCqāy in Hebrew, etc. (Moscati 1964:118–119).

4.3. The advocates of the CS hypothesis were not unaware of these conflicting isoglosses and, predictably, tried to disqualify them in one of the following ways: either the alleged “South Semitic” innovations were reinterpreted as PS archaisms inherited independently by Arabic, EthS and MSA (but lost in Hebrew and Aramaic), or the presence of such features in Arabic was explained by borrowing.

4.3.1. A prime illustration of the former approach is provided by Hetzron’s attitude to the broken plural problem: throughout his paradigmatic studies from the mid-seventies (1972:15, 1976:102, 1977a:11), Hetzron emphasized that the apophonic formation of the plural is not the exclusive property of the “South Semitic” languages, but rather reflects a very ancient, Proto-Afroasiatic type of nominal inflection. Hetzron’s position has been accepted by G. Goldenberg (1977:474), who believes that “the accumulated evidence of inner plural forms outside ‘South Semitic’ and especially the highly systematized plural formation of Hebrew segholates and their parallels which involves primitive inner plural bases, do not allow very much for such a period of ‘South Semitic’ common development.” 461

However, as pointed out by J. Blau, “even if the notion of broken plurals should

460 As repeatedly observed by Fleisch (1944:118–420, 422–423, and elsewhere), the formal overlap between Arabic and EthS is not complete: many of the discernable semantic values of Arabic qātala are expressed by taqātala in Ethiopian.

461 On the same page of his article, Goldenberg raises the important issue of the material (or lexical) similarity in the formation of the broken plural in Arabic, ESA, EthS and MSA: do the reflexes of this or that PS noun employ the same patterns of broken plural in all (or most) of these languages? From a purely theoretical perspective, the relevance of this issue for the present discussion is ambiguous. Since the inventories of the plural patterns are largely similar and the same is true of the main types of structural correlation between singular and plural (as convincingly argued throughout Ratcliffe 1998a), these trends are of necessity expected to be rather prominently reflected on the level of individual cognate lexemes. But precisely because of this high degree of predictability, the value of such lexical coincidences is rather limited. Nevertheless, a systematic lexical investigation focused on this problem is still an important desideratum. At present, it is fairly certain that Goldenberg’s divergent examples like Gez. ʒanab — ʒanab ‘tail’ (CDG 640) vs. Tgr. ʒanab — ʒanamb, ʒanamb(p) (WTS 500) can be easily counterbalanced by numerous cases where Geez, Tigré and Tigrinya do agree with each other, as in Gez. ʒam ‘bone’ — ʒam (CDG 58), Tgr. ʒam — ʒam(t) (WTS 491), Tna. ʒami — ʒamiti (TED 1942) or Gez. ʒyg ‘foot’ — ʒygar, ʒygar (CDG 11), Tgr. ʒygar — ʒygar, ʒygar (WTS 386), Tna. ʒgri — ʒgar (TED 1538). According to Diem (1980a:71), many convergent examples can also be detected for Arabic and Geez, but no concrete cognate pair has been adduced in Diem’s study (for a few valuable lexical comparisons of this kind v. Ratcliffe 1998a:167–168). Faber’s comparison between Sabaic and Jibbali (1997:13) is too superficial to be considered a serious argument.
turn out to be an ancient Hamito-Semitic feature, it is not the existence of broken plurals as such that proves the close affinity of Arabic, South Arabic and Ethiopic, but rather their widespread formal identity” (1978:29). A similarly critical approach to the Hetzronian evaluation of the broken plural problem has been developed by W. Diem: “Die Existenz einfacher Formen innerer Plurale im Nordwestsemitischen beweist zunächst nur, daß ... die Erscheinung des inneren Plurals dem Ursemitischen nicht fremd war, aber nicht, daß das Ursemitische eine derartig reiches System wie das Südostsemitische und vor allem das Arabische kannte” (1980a:70).

While it is not to deny that some structural rules underlying the “South Semitic” patterns of broken plural may belong to common Semitic and even Afroasiatic heritage (Ratcliffe 1998b:100-114), it would require a considerable stretching of one’s imagination to assume that such a huge accumulation of highly peculiar coincidences can be due to straightforward linear development from PS and PAA: the Arabic and Geez systems are so very similar and so very specific that their independent emergence is simply hard to conceive.

In response to these challenging facts, J. Huehnergard (2002b:129-130, 2005:159-160) was able to present a considerably more explicit and refined version of the Hetzronian hypothesis: not only the morphological principle of the inner plural formation, but also the “South Semitic” patterns themselves were already developed in PWS, survived until PCS, and only later were lost in Aramaic and Canaanite — but preserved in Arabic and ESA. This reconstruction, by far superior to Hetzron’s rather sketchy observations on the topic, is not implausible, but the suggested path of development is admittedly intricate and one would wish to have much more material evidence in its support, especially since the putative traces of “South Semitic” plural patterns in Hebrew are too meager and unreliable to be seriously considered within the framework of Huehnergard’s hypothesis.

Note that, contra Diem 1980a:70, the alleged morphological independence of the broken plural form from its singular is by no means the principal hallmark of the “South Semitic” system, v. Ratcliffe 1998a:206.

Cf. already Diem 1980a:70 (“Bei dieser Differenzierung der semitischen Sprachen bei der Bildung innerer Plurale fällt es schwer, die nordwestsemitischen inneren Plurale als Relikte eines reicher, noch im Arabischen und Südostsemitischen vorliegenden Bestandes aufzufassen”) and Ratcliffe 1998b:121 (“The NW Semitic facts cannot be interpreted as a simplification of a hypothetically archaic system preserved in SW Semitic. If the SW system is Proto-Semitic, then the NW Semitic system would represent a mysteriously incomplete simplification, combined with an unmotivated complication”).

Our attitude towards such remnants, treated in much detail in Wallace 1988 (cf. already Brockelmann 1908:427-428), is extremely skeptical (cf. Ratcliffe 1998b:99-100). Thus, the well-known suppletive pair pāsīl — pōsīllum ‘idols’ is indeed an unexplained oddity, but the hypothetical *C₁uC₂C₃-plural pattern is so uncommon even in Arabic that its fossilized preservation in Hebrew would be quite unusual (note that the unattested singular *pāsīl is morphologically well-motivated as nomen passivum of psīl ‘to hew,’ BDB 820, cf. Huehnergard 2007:20, 22–23). As for gābūrā ‘heroism’ and ṣābūdā ‘service,’ these lexemes are formed after well-known patterns of abstract nouns (Bauer–Leander 1922:467, 472), whereas the corresponding concrete nouns ʕābūd ‘slave’ and gābūr ‘man’ display well-attested regular plural forms ʕābūdim and gābūrin. The hypothetical *zākūr ‘males’ is attested only before suffixes, which makes impossible to ascertain whether the basic form was indeed *zākūr < *zure or rather *zakūr, with no immediate relationship to the Arabic C₁uC₂C₃- pattern. Evidently enough, there is nothing
All in all, one is forced to acknowledge that the interpretation of the “South Semitic” broken plurals as innovations as advanced by Diem (1980a:82) and Ratcliffe (1998a:211–212, 1998b:119–122) is the easiest and the most appealing way of understanding this phenomenon. Accordingly, it is rather the second possibility outlined above — infiltration into Arabic of innovative “South Semitic” features — that may look to be a more attractive way of defending the CS affiliation of the Arabic language.

As aptly observed by Ratcliffe (1998b:120), broken plural is a very expansive morphological means, which easily spreads to borrowed nouns structurally similar to the inherited lexical stock. As a recent study has shown (Bulakh–Kogan 2011), a few singular-plural correlations opposing Arabic and Tigre to the rest of the languages where the broken plural is attested are indeed suspect of being borrowed from Arabic into Tigre at some early stage of the contact relationship between these languages. Although the direction of borrowing in this case (Arabic > “South Semitic”) is evidently the opposite with respect to the one postulated presently (“South Semitic” > Arabic), this case should not be neglected in the discussion of the genealogical position of Arabic. It shows that not only patterns, but also singular-plural correlations can be borrowed from one language to another.465 In our view, such a borrowing is considerably easier to assume than that of the entire core of the verbal morphology as explicitly done by Ratcliffe.466 Within such a borrowing paradigm, ban-ʿīna < ʿībn- ‘son,’ ʿaraḍīna < ʿard- ‘land’ and ʿahlīna467 < ʿahl- ‘people’ (Nöldke 1905b:69) would represent the last remnants of the “true” CS stratum in the Arabic nominal plural morphology, elsewhere mostly obliterated by “South Semitic” infiltrations (cf. Blau 1978:29–30, 34).468 The feminine external plurals with a-insertion (kisr-ʾalt- ‘fragment’ > kisar-ʾāl-, Fischer 2002:67) should also be attributed to this early CS stratum.

4.3.2. Diachronic priority of *a or *i as the thematic vowel of the perfect in the intensive and causative stems is a thorny problem unlikely to ever be resolved in anything approaching a conclusive way. The evolution of Huenhergard’s views on this question is a telling witness to its extreme complexity. In his detailed treatment of the

inherently plural in ḡbrāl ‘border.’ By far the most interesting case is that of ʿārār — ʿārūr ‘juniper’ (BDB 883–887). Contra Ratcliffe (1998b:100), the latter form is attested not only as a place name and, moreover, there seems to be a clear opposition in number between ʾ aw-hāyā Ḳ-ʾarrār ʿār-ʾāmiddār ‘He will be like a juniper in the steppe’ (Jer 17:6) and tiḥyāna Ḳ-ʾarrār ʿār-ʾāmiddār ‘You will be like junipers in the steppe’ (Jer 48:6). Comparison between ʿārār — ʿārūr in Hebrew and ʿārār- — ʿārūr- in Arabic is hard to avoid, but it may be doubted that the two sets of forms are straightforward morphological cognates. Shall one rather postulate some sort of early Arabian borrowing or influence (cf. Ratcliffe 1998b:100) — after all, ʿārūr is a trans-Jordanian city! But even this possibility is hard to reconcile with the fact that the Hebrew form is affected by the Canaanite shift *d > ð. As for ʾkalākēl (HALOT 1106) and ʾāṣgal (HALOT 1031), these forms are semantically obscure hapax legomena with no transparent plural connotations and can hardly be relevant for the present discussion.

465 As Ratcliffe also admits (1998a:213, 1998b:123), although, needless to say, his general evaluation of the borrowing solution is negative.

466 Ratcliffe’s attempt to describe (in eight lines) the fundamental peculiarities of the CS verbal system as “loss of gemination” (1998a:212, 1998b:123) cannot be persuasive.

467 Likely from an unattested *ḥahālīna.

subject, Huehnergard has tentatively assumed that *-i-, displayed by the NWS forms, is original (1992:226–229). However, as far as one can judge from his more recent remarks on the subject, he now seems to believe that the reverse reconstruction may actually be true (2005:160). In such a context, it is by no means surprising that the relevance of this feature for the subgrouping procedure has been very cautiously evaluated in most of the pertinent studies.\footnote{Goldenberg (1977:475) hesitates to pronounce a decisive judgment on this matter which, in his opinion, “ought not to be ignored.” For Diem (1980a:67–68), the archaic nature of *-a- is axiomatic, which makes this feature unsuitable for the purpose of grouping together Arabic and Geez (note that Diem’s assumption that the introduction of *-i- in NWS took place independently in Canaanite and Aramaic — which would make this isogloss, too, unsuitable for classification — is rather unlikely). Zaborski’s evaluation of this feature (1991:371) is rather vague: “This isogloss alone ... is not sufficient to separate Arabic altogether from North West Semitic since we do not know the real vocalization of several North West Semitic languages and on the other hand it is not clear whether all dialects of Old Arabic had only this vocalization of all perfects since the situation in a number of Modern Arabic dialects is different and it is possible that this does reflect a very old Arabic dialect differentiation.” Note that the presence of *-i- in the second syllable of the suffix conjugation is a prominent feature of the intensive stem in NWS languages, primarily in Hebrew: mosōpet ‘opponent’ (Job 9:15), molōṣen ‘slanderer’ (Ps 101:5) and a few others (Fleisch 1944:6–26). According to Hasselbach–Huehneragrd 2007:420, “rare occurrences of Hebrew Povel forms of strong roots resemble the Classical Arabic qāṭala both formally and semantically.” However, in the wake of Diem 1980a:69, it is hard to concur with the second part of this assertion: as already seen by Fleisch (1944:417), “l’examen des significations [du qōkel canaanén] ne révèle pas une valeur spéciale de IIIe forme et il n’y a pas lieu de leur attribuer autre chose qu’une valeur d’intensif” (see also ibid. 19–22). In other words, the highly peculiar semantic properties of L-forms shared by

4.3.3. The *yat(a)qattal isogloss is indeed an interesting (and, it seems, previously unnoticed) feature uniting Arabic and Geez, yet its ultimate validity for the purpose of genealogical subgrouping is open to doubt: it may be observed, for example, that the corresponding Aramaic form also shows *-a- (*yitqattal). Furthermore, the similarity in the formation of the Dt stem is counterbalanced by the difference in Gt (*yxanagar vs. yaqatal). Kouwenberg’s assumption that the EthS forms of Gt are diachronically secondary (2010a:380–382) does not undermine the relevance of this counter-argument: it would mean, at any rate, that Arabic did not participate in one important “Southern Semitic”\footnote{In reality, only Ethiopian Semitic, as the corresponding MSA forms always have infixed -t-.} innovation.

4.3.4. The archaic vs. innovative nature of the L-stem(s) has been controversially assessed in Semitological literature. For Blau, (1978:30), the L-stem is “a general West Semitic innovation” and it is only “its development in quite a similar manner in Arabic and Ethiopic” that “has ... to be interpreted as an additional proof for the inclusion of Arabic in the South Semitic group.” What is meant by the “general WS innovation”\footnote{As argued by Zaborski (1991:371), the L-stem is no innovation at all, but an Afroasiatic archaisms preserved also in Beja. A proper evaluation of this claim is far beyond the scope of our competence.} are the hypothetical traces of the L-stem in NWS languages, primarily in Hebrew: mosōpet ‘opponent’ (Job 9:15), molōṣen ‘slanderer’ (Ps 101:5) and a few others (Fleisch 1944:6–26). According to Hasselbach–Huehneragrd 2007:420, “rare occurrences of Hebrew Povel forms of strong roots resemble the Classical Arabic qāṭala both formally and semantically.” However, in the wake of Diem 1980a:69, it is hard to concur with the second part of this assertion: as already seen by Fleisch (1944:417), “l’examen des significations [du qōkel canaanén] ne révèle pas une valeur spéciale de IIIe forme et il n’y a pas lieu de leur attribuer autre chose qu’une valeur d’intensif” (see also ibid. 19–22). In other words, the highly peculiar semantic properties of L-forms shared by

\footnote{As argued by Zaborski (1991:371), the L-stem is no innovation at all, but an Afroasiatic archaisms preserved also in Beja. A proper evaluation of this claim is far beyond the scope of our competence.}
Arabic and EthS cannot be detected in Hebrew and, accordingly, can still be regarded as a shared innovation of the traditional (pre-Hetzronian) “South Semitic” subdivision.475

4.3.5. The use of the $^*\text{C}_1\text{C}_2\text{C}_3$- for ordinal numbers provides an important link between Arabic and Eths/MSA (Blau 1978:30), but, as admitted by Blau himself, “it might ... also be the result of parallel development and contact.”

* * *

Robert Ratcliffe (1998a:212–213, 1998b:122) has correctly emphasized that, however complex and contradictory our isoglosses may be, agnostic concepts like dialect continuum do not provide any sound alternative to the traditional subgrouping procedure. Even if some morphological features are best explainable by borrowing, the borrowing process itself must be described systematically and in linguistically adequate terms. A hierarchical reconstruction of inherited and borrowed features is thus, in any case, indispensable.

As far as the CS hypothesis is concerned, there are only two fundamental alternatives, clearly outlined by Ratcliffe:

“The linguistic ancestors of Arabic speakers belonged to a Proto-SW Semitic speech community. They separated from this community and came to live in close proximity with speakers of a NW Semitic language”

or

“The linguistic ancestors of Arabic speakers belonged to a Proto-NW Semitic speech community. They separated from this community and came to live in close proximity with speakers of a SW Semitic language.”

As we have just seen, morphological arguments brought into the discussion by several generations of scholars are not sufficient to tip the balance decisively to either of these alternatives. In such conditions, it seems only legitimate to take into consideration the evidence of the basic vocabulary.

5. Central Semitic: the lexical features

5.1. Basic lexicon in the Swadesh wordlist

As elsewhere in this book, the Swadesh wordlist will provide a convenient starting point for a comprehensive investigation of the common CS vocabulary as a

475 Cf. in this sense Fleisch 1944:418: “Dans ce sémitique de l'Ouest, les langues du Sud manifestent une originalité par le grand développement accordé à qātala qui avait sa racine dans la période commune (du sémitique de l'Ouest)”; ibid. 421: “Je suis persuadé qu’un tel accord de ces différentes langues [étiopiennes] avec l’arabe postule l’existence, à un moment donné, d’une période commune de l’arabe avec les langues sud-arabiques.”
whole. A preliminary analysis of the evidence of the Swadesh wordlist (after Militarev 2000) reveals that Syriac and Hebrew are statistically the closest partners of Arabic, with 47 and 44 shared isoglosses respectively. The percentage for other languages (38 between Arabic and Geez, 30 between Arabic and Akkadian, 23 between Arabic and Mehri) is so greatly inferior that, within the standard lexicostatistical procedure, any special genealogical relationship between these languages and Arabic is completely excluded.

In the particular case of Arabic, these statistics are all the more significant. As we have tried to show in Chapter 1 (pp. 45-46), preservation of PS exponents of the basic concepts from the Swadesh wordlist in individual Semitic languages is uneven. Some of them are more (Ugaritic, Hebrew, Aramaic) or less (Akkadian, Geez, Tigre) conservative, while a few others (MSA, Amharic) appear to be highly innovative. It is to the latter group that Arabic clearly belongs: for many fundamental concepts, deeply rooted PS lexemes persisting in the majority of Semitic languages are either completely lost in Arabic or deprived of their basic status: *nḥh/*nṯḥ ‘to bite’ > ḵḏd, *šṭy ‘to drink’ > šrb, *šīš-(ād)- ‘fire’ > nār-, *wṅ ‘to be green, yellow’ > ḥḏr, *lībb- ‘heart’ > qalb-, *ydš ‘to know’ > šlm, *wawr-h- ‘moon’ > qamar-, *šVṛš- ‘root’ > ṣaḏ-, *ḏar- ‘seed’ > baḏr-, *wṯb ‘to sit’ > q’d, *r̥ḥb- ‘stone’ > ḥḏḏar-, *š⟨i⟩š- ‘tree’ > šaḏar-, *Vnt-at- ‘woman’ > *imravaṭ-.474

This observation — which we shall return to in the concluding section of this chapter — has an important practical consequence: whenever the Swadesh wordlist displays a special degree of statistical proximity between Arabic and any other Semitic language, this proximity is unlikely to be explained in terms of shared archaisms, simply because such archaic lexical features are typically not preserved in Arabic in their original function. It is, therefore, more likely to be due to the presence of a certain amount of non-trivial, exclusive coincidences going back to a common stage of historical evolution shared by Arabic with the language(s) in question.

Indeed, there are six concepts in the Swadesh wordlist whose exponents are exclusive to Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic (more rarely, only to Arabic and Hebrew).475 These lexemes can, on good grounds, be qualified as specifically Central Semitic.476

1. EA ba-ḥt-nu-ma (CAD B 178, DNWSI 151, Sivan 1984:131, 210),477 Hbr. bāḥṭān

---

474 Many Semitists will undoubtedly find this assertion paradoxical and hard to digest: most of us are accustomed to believe that a good PS root must be somehow preserved in the inexhaustible lexical resources of Classical Arabic. What is often forgotten is precisely the latter restriction: many of the relevant proto-lexemes are indeed somehow present in Arabic texts (or at least in Arabic dictionaries), but their functional load is drastically reduced in comparison to the status of their cognates in other Semitic languages — ancient and sometimes even modern. But many of the pertinent lexemes are indeed lost altogether. We are thus faced with a peculiar kind of tension between the extreme conservatism of the Arabic vocabulary as a whole and the highly innovative nature of some of its most basic segments. The diachronic background of this contradictory picture is enigmatic.

475 Compare only one exclusive isogloss between Arabic and Geez (nāma — noma ‘to sleep’).

476 Two exclusive isoglosses between Arabic and Aramaic are not shared by Hebrew: *ṭy ‘to come’ and *ṭār-/*nār- ‘fire.’ They will not be considered here since bilateral comparisons between geographically contiguous languages cannot be relevant for our purpose in view of the high possibility of mutual influence.

477 In EA 232:10 (Akko), as a gloss to i-na pa-an-te-e ‘on the chest.’
The basic meaning “belly” is not preserved in Aramaic, where *baṭn- was presumably ousted by the reflexes of PS *hārīš- ‘stomach’ (SED I No. 151). Its existence in Proto-Aramaic can nevertheless be reliably deduced from the widespread verbal root *ḥmn ‘to be pregnant’ (DJPA 91, DJBA 198, LSyg. 67, MD 47), obviously derived from a non-attested *baṭn- ‘belly, womb.’ PCS *baṭn- is not attested in Ugaritic, but it is uncertain whether the very concept “external belly, abdomen” is present in the extant Ugaritic corpus (see chapter 5, p. 256 below). Comparable forms in EthS478 and MSA480 are almost certainly Arabisms.

The origin of PCS *baṭn- ‘belly’ is uncertain. According to HSED 85–86, it represents an extension of PAA *but- ‘belly,’ thought to be attested in Berber and Chadic.

2. Hbr. bēšā (HALOT 123), Syr. bēštā (LSyg. 41, SL 143), Arb. bayḍat- (Lane 282) > PCS *bayš-at- ‘egg’ (SED I No. 43).

⇒ Not attested in Ugaritic, but the concept “egg” is absent from the available Ugaritic corpus. Comparable forms in EthS480 and MSA481 are clear Arabisms.

The origin of PCS *bayš-at- ‘egg’ is debatable. According to a widespread opinion, it goes back to the color term *baš ‘to be white, bright, yellow,’ preserved in Gez. bēšā and Amh. baši ‘yellow,’ Tgr. bāyāšā ‘to be bright, brilliant’ (CDG 116). If this etymology is correct, we are faced with a PCS semantic innovation, but the opposite way of derivation (“egg” > “white”) has also been suggested (F. Rosenthal apud CDG 116). In HSED 86, PCS *bayš-at- has been compared to hypothetical West Chadic cognates, which would mean that the PCS term is a retention from PAA.482

3. Ugr. ri-[g]-lu (Huehnergard 1987a:72, 176), Hbr. rāgāl (HALOT 1184), Syr. reglā (LSyg. 712, SL 1434), Arb. riṣl- (Lane 1044), Sab. rgl (SD 116), Min. rgl (LM 77) > PCS *rigl- ‘foot’ (SED I No. 228).

⇒ The origin of PCS *rigl- ‘foot’ is uncertain; no directly comparable roots or forms are attested in either Akkadian,483 or EthS,484 or MSA. One may suspect that *rigl- was the PCS alternative to a more ancient general designation of “foot,” viz. *paṭm- (perhaps the main PS term with this meaning in view of its basic status in

---

478 Tgr. bāth ‘belly’ (WTS 300), Har. bāṭmi ‘voracious’ (EDH 48).
479 Mhr. boṭyān ‘having a big belly’ (ML 58), Jib. ebṭi ‘to have a big belly’ (JL 31).
480 Tgr. bāyā ‘egg’ (WTS 295).
481 Mhr. bāyati ‘egg’ (ML 60).
482 Note that there is no reliable PS designation of “egg.” From the etymological point of view, most of the relevant terms in individual Semitic languages are either problematic (Mhr. kāwš, Amh. ḫnālah, Gez. ḥnqot, v. SED I Nos. 160 and 170) or completely obscure (Akk. pelā, Ahw. 853, CAD P 320).
483 There is hardly any reason to follow I. Gelb (1935:63–64) who tentatively connected with this root OA ri-IG-li/ri-IG-li, sparsely attested and possibly designating a foodstuff (cf. Ahw. 982, CAD R 328).
484 Notwithstanding numerous attempts to prove the contrary (cf. Kaye 1991b, Voigt 1998a), Gez. nggr ‘foot’ is probably not to be identified with this root (cf. SED I No. 7).
Ugaritic, Phoenician and some of MSA, v. Chapters 5 and 8 below, pp. 224 and 491-493 respectively). The spread of this replacement was uneven. In Aramaic and Arabic, *paʾəm*- was completely (or almost completely) ousted by *rīgl-*, whereas in Hebrew the presence of *paʾəm*- ‘foot’ is rather marginal (purely anatomic attestations listed in HALOT 952 scarcely exceed half a dozen). Conversely, in Ugaritic and Phoenician *paʾəm*- fully preserves its basic status (Ugr. *pən*, Pho. *pəm*, DUL 660, DNWSI 928), whereas *rīgl-* is hardly attested at all.


⇒ This root is not immediately reflected in ESA, but Sab. *mṭr* ‘rain-watered field’ (SD 88) and Min. *mṭr* ‘champ arrosé par la pluie’ (LM 63) apparently suggest that *maṭar*- was one of the main terms for “rain” in these languages. In Hebrew, *māṭār* is partly ousted by *gāšām*.

The origin of PCS *maṭar*- is uncertain as no reliable cognates are attested anywhere else in Semitic. In a purely theoretical perspective, one could venture to connect it with PWS *py* ‘to be fresh, raw, wet’ (for which v. HALOT 379, CDG 598), cf. Takács 2008:738 and p. 98 above.


485 There seems to be no trace of *paʾəm-* in Aramaic. In Arabic, cf. perhaps *fim* ‘to be full-formed, thick in her shank (a woman)’ (Lane 2421).

486 It has been argued that the meaning “foot” for *paʾəm* is a Northern (Israelite) feature (Rendsburg 2006:322).

487 It is of course enigmatic why *rīgl-* so conspicuously absent from Ugaritic texts, found its way into the quardilingual lexical list. Note, on the one hand, that its position in the list (= Sum. *ūr*, Akk. *pē-nu*) does not favor a general meaning “foot,” but rather “thigh” — not attested for the reflexes of *rīgl-* in any other Semitic language. On the other hand, this is probably not the only case when the choice of the ancient Ugaritic lexicographer does not fully match our expectations. Why, for example, *nāḏānu* (rather than *ābu*) was chosen to designate “father” (Huehnergard 1987a:104) or *tunnunu* (rather than *nāḥatašu* or *ḥaṭ(ā)nu*) was used for “snake” (ibid. 185)? As for Phoenician, the hypothetical *mrīl* ‘servant at the feet of ...’ is very uncertain (DNWSI 1060).

488 As kindly pointed out to us by I. Arkhipov, the earliest attestation of this root in the WS domain probably comes from OB Mari: *i-na ma-ṭa-ra-tim* ‘au moment des pluies’ (Durand 1999–2000:192–193)

489 For Hadramitic, cf. *w-n̥mr̥m̥n w-n̥mr̥n* in Ja 2456:3 (context fragmentary).

490 For a detailed account of this process, see Chapter 5, pp. 286-287 below.

491 W. von Soden (AHw. 663) tentatively compares Akk. *miṯtu*, *miṭtu* ‘Wasserlauf,’ ‘a type of field or orchard characterized by a special irrigation system; a type of canal or ditch’ (CAD *M* 144, 147). This comparison has been accepted in Dolgopolsky 1978:2 and Krebernik 2006:85. A more straightforward Akkadian cognate may be *muqaru* ‘oozing moisture’ (Kouwenberg 1997:381, 414), not recognized by the standard dictionaries (cf. AHw. 572, CAD *M* 11), but fitting the attested contexts well, both orthographically and semantically (reference courtesy N. J. C. Kouwenberg).
(SD 6), Min. ḫnš ‘personne de sexe masculin’ (LM 6), Qat. ḫnš ‘person, someone, one, each; friend, companion,’ ḥns ‘man, someone, one’ (LIQ 13, 16) > PCS *ḫns- ‘man, person.’

⇒ Diachronic analysis of many forms belonging to this root is fraught with difficulties, which can be only briefly outlined in the present context.⁴⁹² It is nevertheless certain that designations of “man, person” employing the consonantal sequence *ḥns (let alone the morphological shape *ḥns-, clearly underlying most of the attested CS forms) are not attested anywhere outside CS.⁴⁹³

The origin of PCS *ḥns- is unclear, but it is almost certainly related to Akk. ṃuš-ū ‘mankind, human beings, people’ (AHw. 796, CAD N2 283) and Ugr. ṃuš-m ‘people, men’ (DUL 649). It is probably significant that in Ugaritic — the only WS language which preserves *nVš- with its likely original meaning “people” — PCS *ḥns- is scarcely attested, being restricted to the divine designation ṭns nilm (DUL 84). See further Chapters 5 (p. 336) and 6 (pp. 381-382) below.

6. Ugr. m(h) (DUL 534).⁴⁹⁴ Hbr. ṃa (HALOT 550), Sam., OArm., OffArm. ṃ (DNWSI 600), Arb. ṃa (Lane 3016), Sab. mh(n) (SD 84)⁴⁹⁵ > PCS *maha ‘what.’⁴⁹⁶

---

⁴⁹² (I) The phonological background of *ḫns ‘man, person’ in Hebrew and Aramaic: < *ḫnš- < *ḥnš-? Cf. Dolgopol’sky 1999:57–58, Kogan 1995:11, SED I No. 236, SED II No. 197. (2) The semantic history of Common Aramaic *ṭnas ‘man; people’ and its relationship to Common Aramaic *ḥns- ‘man’ and its plural *ṭnas-ū-na (cf. HALOT 1818–1819). (3) The etymological and semantic relationship between ṣ(y)ns and ḫns in Sabaic. Valuable remarks on this problem can be found in Stein 2003:56, where these terms are semantically opposed as “male individual, warrior” vs. “man, person; people” respectively. The latter form can apparently be used with both singular and plural meanings, which makes it remarkably similar to Common Aramaic *ṭnas- (the consonantal spelling ḫns may theoretically conceal more than one morphological pattern, but lack of assimilated forms seems to suggest the presence of a long vowel after the second syllable). Stein explicitly compares the form ṣ(y)ns to Hbr. ṃa, observing that spellings with -y- are missing from the Old Sabaic corpus and comparatively rare elsewhere. Shall one consider -y- as a mater lectionis for ḫ, assuming for Sabaic the phonological development tentatively outlined above for Hebrew and Aramaic (*ḥns < *ḥnš- < *ḥns-)⁴ (4) Morphological structure and semantics of Ugr. ṭns, variously vocalised and interpreted in Ugaritological literature (cf. Pardee 2000:88–89 for an extensive discussion).

⁴⁹³ The only conspicuous exception is Tgr. ṭrṇās ‘man’ (WTS 371), completely isolated in EthS. It is tempting to explain away this lexeme as an Arabic loanword (so Leslau 1990:165), but this easy solution is problematic in view of the fact that Arb. ṭnsān ‘man’ (explicitly compared to the Tigre form by Leslau) is different in shape, whereas the structurally identical form ṭnās- is used with the plural meaning “men” (see further Bulakh–Kogan 2011:4).

⁴⁹⁴ For the possibility of Akkadian mannu ‘who’ being used with the meaning “what” under the influence of Canaanite *maha in Amarna Canaanite v. Rainey 1996 I 105–106.

⁴⁹⁵ Synchronic and diachronic analysis of the Sabaic form(s) (not attested as direct interrogatives, but only with the meanings “what” (relative), “whatever,” and “nothing”) is not unproblematic. According to Stein (2003:151), the regularly attested form is mh, whereas the (presumably original) non-augmented form mḥ is present only once, in combination with the enclitic particle (mḥ-m <<y>>w). The existence of the form mḥ makes unlikely the “parasitic” interpretation of n-mḥ in mḥn (contra Kogan–Korotaev 1997:224), but rather suggests a connection with Syriac mān (LSyr. 393), perhaps from *mah(h)-an (cf. Tropper 2000:240–241 and, with a different interpretation of the Syriac form, Huenenergard 2005:187). Both mḥ and mḥn ‘whatever’ seem to also be attested in Minean: kl ḫnym ḫn mḥ [k-γ]dk ‘All the
The specifically CS nature of *maha ‘what’ has been widely acknowledged in Semitological literature, where it has been thought to replace the (presumably, more archaic) form *mīnu, preserved in Akkadian and EthS (Huehnergard 2005:189).\(^{497}\) We tend to agree with Huehnergard, who believes that Blau’s skeptical evaluation of this feature (1978:34) is largely unwarranted (note in particular that, contra Blau, an interrogative pronoun is not likely to be “easily borrowed from dialect to dialect,” italics added). More disturbing is, however, the fact that *ma-like pronouns with the meaning “what” are rather widespread in non-Semitic Afroasiatic languages (Takács 2008:9–13).\(^{498}\) Besides, the hypothetical phonological (or morphological) development from *mīn- to *maha remains to be explained.

5.2. Basic lexicon outside the Swadesh wordlist

What follows is a list of reconstructed PCS lexemes which can be regarded as exclusive features of this sub-branch. In practice, it means that a given lexeme should be present\(^{499}\) in Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic, but missing from Akkadian, Ethiopian Semitic and MSA.

A few bilateral Hebrew-Arabic cognate pairs have been included (in most of such cases there are good reasons to believe that the relevant root was lost in Aramaic), as well as a few less common combinations (notably, Hebrew–Aramaic–Sabaean, but not Arabic). While Ugaritic and ESA parallels are of prime importance for considering this or that root a specific CS feature, their presence cannot be mandatory in view of the very restricted size of the respective text corpora.\(^{500}\)

1. Hbr. ֶדֶמָ (HALOT 15), Syr. ֶדֶמָ (LSyr. 6, Sl 10), Arb. ֶדֶמָ- ‘the interior of earth or ground’ (Lane 36) > PCS *ʁadam- at- ‘earth, ground’ (DRS 9).

⇒ The origin of PCS *ʁadam-at- ‘earth, ground’ is uncertain (for a convenient summary of possible, mostly highly uncertain, connections v. DRS 9). The functional status of the Hebrew and Arabic reflexes is not identical: while the Hebrew word is highly prominent and at least partly competing with ֶירָעָ, the Arabic word is only marginally attested. As for the Syriac lexeme, Sokoloff may be correct to analyze it as a Hebraism.

possessions which they acquitted temselves of’ (M 27:8), ֶכֶיֶ בֶתֶּ ‘And all that the house possessed’ (M 43:2–3), cf. Beeston 1962:51.

\(^{496}\) For *h in the proto-form, v. Faber 1991:412, where Ugr. mh has been aptly compared to Arb. mah-mā ‘whatever’

\(^{497}\) Within such an approach, one is tempted to suppose that the old form is preserved in the indefinite pronoun mn-m in Ugaritic and Phoenician (DUL 563, DNWSI 661, Tropper 2000:243–244).

\(^{498}\) Moreover, Huehnergard (2005:189) is probably correct to compare PCS *maha with the Akkadian particle mà expressing doubt, disbelief (CAD M 1, AHw. 570). For this particle see further Kienast 1961.

\(^{499}\) As in the Swadesh wordlist, “presence” normally implies basic functional status, at least for clearly definable fundamental concepts. Deviations from this principle are specifically acknowledged throughout the list. The problem is further discussed in the concluding part of this chapter (p. 223).

\(^{500}\) The possibility of a meaningful absence of a PCS term from Ugaritic is discussed in the concluding section of this chapter (p. 224).
2. Ugr. *nīlh (DUL 55), Emr. i-la-ú, i-la-i (Pentiuc 2001:82–83), Hbr. ʾālōah (HALOT 53), Syr. ʾāl(l)āhā (LSyr. 21, SL 47), Arb. ʾālāh- (Lane 82), Sab. Min. Qat. ʾāl (SD 5, LM 4, LIQ 11) > PCS *ʾālāh- ‘god.’

⇒ PCS *ʾālāh- represents an extension of PS *ʾāl- ‘god’ (Fronzaroli 1965b:248, 262, 267), tentatively considered a “shared morphological change in the lexicon” by Huehnergard (2005:191, cf. also Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:420). The non-extended form *ʾāl-, known from Akk. ilu (AHw. 373), Mhr. ʾāl (Lonnet 2005:206) and, possibly, Jib. ʾālā (JL 3), was almost completely ousted by *ʾālāh- in Aramaic and Arabic. Comparatively rare in Hebrew (*ʾāl, HALOT 48), *ʾāl- is fairly well preserved in ESA and especially in Ugaritic. The origin of the -āh extension cannot be established with certainty, but as plausibly argued in Huehnergard 2005 (following Brockelmann 1908:334; cf. Pardee 1999:286, 2000:36), it may represent a back-formation from the plural *ʾāl-āh-ūma: on the one hand, h-extension in the plural of biconsonantal nouns is common throughout CS; on the other hand, a close association of *ʾāl-āh- with plurality can be observed in at least some of the CS languages.


⇒ The origin of PCS *ʾāl(ay) is uncertain, although it is tempting to agree with E.

---

501 Lonnet considers (and rejects) the possibility of borrowing from Jib. ʾālā (see next footnote).
502 Alternatively < PS *ḥarāl ‘lord,’ cf. the by-forms ʾālā, ʾālā, ʾālā in JL 22, as well Mhr. ʾābēl ‘God’ (ML 41). In Soqtri, ʾāl ‘God’ seems to be attested in a few archaic poetic compositions recorded by our fieldwork team.
503 Already in Old Aramaic, the augmented form ʾāl is the only attested one (DNWSI 58). The non-augmented form ʾl, found several times in Ahiqar, is tentatively ascribed to ʾl ‘god’ in DNWSI 53, but B. Porten and A. Yardeni (1993:lv) may be right to treat it as a theonym. Pardee’s very early dating of the replacement of *ʾāl- by *ʾālāh- in Aramaic (1999:286) is thus quite persuasive.
504 For the curious ʾāl- ‘God’ see LA 11 31, Lane 75.
505 SD 5, LM 4, LIQ 10, Stein 2003:52.
506 The marginal status of the augmented form ʾāl in Ugaritic is noteworthy: this term is not used as an appellative with the meaning “god,” but is rather attested as a theonym in a restricted group of ritual texts (Pardee 2000:35–39). As tentatively surmised by Pardee, “le fait que cette forme est caractéristique et de l’araméen et de l’arabe permet d’envisager l’hypothèse selon laquelle ʾLH serait proprement araméen, représentant donc un emprunt en ougaritique.”
507 In Ugaritic, ʾālām is better attested than ʾālḥ (for a comprehensive list of examples v. Pardee 2000:1112), whereas the h-extended form ʾāl-lat is the regular plural of ʾāl-t ‘goddess’ (DUL 66). Hbr. ʾālāhām is much more common than ʾālāh (Pardee 1999:287), and the secondary nature of the latter form is commonly accepted in Hebrew dictionaries (BDB 52, HALOT 52). Given the predominantly late attestations of ʾālāh, the possibility of Aramaic influence (rather than a purely internal Hebrew development) is thus seriously to be considered. The Canaanite shift is probably no obstacle for such an assumption (cf. Pardee 1999:289): what is borrowed from Aramaic is not the form ʾālāh itself (as a secondary abbreviation of the genuine plural ʾālāhām, it naturally shares with the latter the Canaanite shift), but its use as a singular instead of ʾāl and ʾālāhām (for a partly similar situation with Hbr. ʾānāh ‘man’ cf. Wagner 1966:26–27).
Lipiński (1997:461), who assumes an eventual connection with PS *li- ‘to, towards.’ Less attractive is the derivation from the verbal root *wly ‘to approach’ in Voigt 1999:38 (*wilay- ‘Annährung’).

The absence of *-nil(ay) from Ugaritic and ESA is conspicuous, as is its disappearance from later Aramaic.

The exclusively CS status of this preposition is undermined by the presence of possibly related forms in MSA (Blažek 2007:24–25): Hrs. wpl ‘towards’ (HL 136), Jib. ydl ‘towards’ (JL 314), Soq. a† (more often in di-nil) ‘towards’ (LS 59–60, Simeone-Senelle 1997:410). The etymological background of the MSA forms is, however, rather uncertain, cf. Mhr. ḥal ‘to, with, into’ (ML 155) and īwâlī ‘to, towards’ (ibid. 401).

Har. ilā and ilāwa ‘until, till’ (EDH 24–25) are likely borrowed from Arabic (so Leslau 1990:140), although -wē in the latter form is difficult to explain. As for Tgr. ʔal ‘for’ (WTS 349), compared to *-nil(ay) by V. Blažek (2007:24), it is certainly to be derived from an earlier *IV- with prothetic ʔ- (for an exact parallel cf. ʔdb ‘in’ < *bV-, WTS 365).


⇒ PCS *ʔabd- ‘slave’ is undoubtedly connected with the verbal root *ʔbd, whose attestations are, however, also limited to CS: Ugr. ʔbd ‘to work (a field), to cultivate, to produce’ (DUL 139), Hbr. ʔbd ‘to work’ (HALOT 773), Syr. ʔbd ‘laboravit; fecit’ (LSyr. 504, SL 1054), Arb. ʔbd ‘to serve, worship, adore’ (Llane 1934). Besides, since the meaning “to serve” is probably the original one (cf. Huehnergard 1995:276), it is not unlikely that we are faced with a denominative verb rather than with a deverbal noun (note that the C₁aC₂C₃ pattern is not commonly used to produce nouns of agent either in PCS or in PS).508

The form ib-dum, i-ba-dum (= Sum. sag.kēš) in VE 253a has been identified with *ʔabd- by M. Krebrenik (1983:12). If this identification is correct (contrast Conti 1990:108), this entry is probably to be ascribed to the CS stratum of the Ebla lexicon.

5. Hbr. ʔāḳār (HALOT 874), Syr. ʔaḳār (LSyr. 544, SL 1133), Arb. ʔaqîr- (Llane 2110) > PCS *ʔkr- ‘to be barren.’

⇒ Contra SED I 1., PCS *ʔkr ‘to be barren’ is probably related to *ʔkr ‘to uproot,’ attested in Hebrew (HALOT 874) and Aramaic (DJPA 416). In SED I 1., it was assumed that *ʔkr ‘to be barren’ is also metathetically preserved in Geez (ʔarka, təarka ‘to be orphaned’), but an independent semantic development from the main meaning of

508 As is well known, no designation of male slave can be reliably reconstructed for PS. (1) Gez. gabr (CDG 178) could have been derived from gabra ‘to do, work’ (or vice versa?), but an eventual connection with Hbr. gābîr, Syr. gabra ‘man’ cannot be excluded (see Chapter 6, pp. 371-372 below). (2) Mhr. bā-gōr and Jib. bîgōr (ML 3–4, JL 2) go back to PS *ʔgr ‘to hire,’ whereas Soq. nāhbał, melēlo (LS 91) are connected with PS *lāl ‘to own.’ (3) There is no etymology for Akk. ṣārdu (AHw. 1464). Interestingly enough, at least Gez. gabr and Akk. ṣārdu may share with PCS *ʔabd- its unusual morphological pattern.

148
Gez. ʿarḥa ("to be bare, naked") is also conceivable. 509

6. Ugr. ʾm (DUL 161), Hbr. ʾim (HALOT 839), JPA ṭəm (DJPA 410), Sab. ṭm (SD 16), Min. ṭm (LM 13), Qat. ṭn- (LIQ 120) > PCS *rimm(-a) ‘together with’ (Huehnergard 2005:190, Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:420).

⇒ In its basic form, this PCS preposition is not attested in Arabic, 510 but according to a widespread consensus (BDB 767, cf. Blažek 2007:29–30, 35), it is preserved there in the metathetic form ʿmarṣa ‘with’ (Lane 3022), as well as in ʿindīa (< *im-di) ‘by’ (Lane 2171). 511

The origin of PCS *rimm(-a) ‘with’ is uncertain. Traditionally, it is thought to be derived from the verbal root *rimm ‘to be common, general, to embrace,’ 512 but this root is hardly attested anywhere beyond Arb. ṭm (Lane 2148). See further Blažek 2007:29–30.

7. Hbr. ʾam (HALOT 837), Syr. ʾammā (LSyr. 529, SL 1108), Arb. ʾamm- (Lane 2149), Min. ṭm (R 2813:3) 513 > PCS *ʾamm- ‘people, nation.’ 514

⇒ PCS *ʾamm- ‘people’ probably represents a semantic extension of the kinship term *ʾamm- ‘grandfather, ancestor,’ attested throughout CS as well as in EthS and MSA: Ugr. ṭm (DUL 163), Hbr. ʾam (HALOT 837), Syr. ʾamālā (LSyr. 529, SL 1114), Arb. ʾamm- (Lane 2149), Sab. ṭm (SD 16), Min. ṭm (LM 13), Had. ṭm (ibid.), Tgr. ʾammāt (WTS 455), Mhr. ṭom (ML 36), Jib. ṭom (JL 19). 515

8. Ugr. ʾny (DUL 172), 516 Hbr. ʾny (HALOT 852), Syr. ʾanwāyā (LSyr. 535, SL 1115), Arb. ṭnw (Lane 2178), Sab. ṭnw (SD 17), Min. ṭnw (ML 14) > PCS *ʾny, *ṭnw ‘to be distressed, humbled.’

509 Cf., furthermore, Soq. ʾšwrḥm ’sterile palm’ (LS 157), clearly going back to *ḥwr and thus likely representing still another metathetic variant of the present root.

510 What is meant by “Arb. ʿmarṣa and ʿamā (q)” in HALOT 839 is unclear to us.

511 One is tempted to follow P. Jensen ( ʾapud LSyr. 529), who compared PCS *ʾimm also with Arb. ʾan ‘from’ (Lane 2163), otherwise with no etymology. Given the fact that *-m shifts to -n in a few other non-lexical or semi-lexical morphemes in Arabic (ʿin ‘if’ < *śm, nunation instead of mimation), this comparison seems to be acceptable from the formal point of view. More problematic is the semantic gap between “with” and “from,” but note that both meanings clearly co-exist in Sabaic.

512 E.g. Lipiński 1997:465 (“It is obviously related to the noun ʾam(m), ‘people,’ and to the verb ʾamma, ‘to be common’”) or Voigt 1999:39 (“*ʾimm-a ‘Einschluß’”).

513 w-ṭhm ṭm ṭnw k-gd w-ṭhm ‘Et le peuple de Mən a reconnu comme propriété inaliénable et ancestrale’ (Bron 1998).

514 The earliest attestation of this meaning for *ʾamm- can probably be found in the epithet mušāṣer am-ṣi in the Prologue of the Laws of Hammurabi (CH iv 53 || RA 45, 75 iv 10). See further CAD A2 77, Good 1983:16–17, Streck 1999:667, Kogan 2014:99.

515 Early cuneiform attestations of this term (ḥammu) together with its general etymological background (notably, the semantic development “grandfather” > “paternal uncle” in Classical Arabic) are extensively discussed in Kogan 2014:95-99.

516 In 1.16 vi 58 (b ḥppṣ ʾṭm b ṭn ‘In your greediness I will be humiliated’), perhaps also 1.19 i 12 (ʾakḥt ṭn ‘Akbḥt was humiliated’) and 1.2 i 26 (ṭʾḥḥ ʾḥṭ ṭm ‘The message of the envoys of Yʾm humiliate you’).
The origin of PCS *rny, *rne *‘to be humbled’ is uncertain, cf. perhaps Tna. ranāvā *‘to collapse, to crumble, to fall; to be emaciated, look old beyond one’s years’ (TED 1889).

9. Hbr. rēšāb (HALOT 889), Syr. resbā (LSyr. 536, SL 1118), Arb. rūšb- (Lane 2050) > PCS *rVšb- ‘grass, herb.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *rVšb- ‘grass’ is uncertain. The only possible trace of this root outside CS can be found in Akk. esēbu *‘to grow luxuriantly,’ sparsely attested from MB onwards (AHw. 253, 1555, CAD E 352). Its relationship to the Akkadian plant name išhabtu (AHw. 393, CAD I 233) is considerably less certain because of the peculiar morphological shape of the Akkadian word.

Tgr. rēšbay *‘a plant with tendrils’ (WTS 466) seems to be borrowed from Arabic.

Sab. rēšb ‘pastureland’ (SD 21) and Qat. rēšb ‘crops, produce’ (LIQ 126), often compared to this root (Fronzaroli 1968:289), can hardly be related in view of the phonological irregularity (ESA ṣs normally does not correspond to PS ṣ).

10. Ugr. ḇkr (DUL 235), Hbr. bāḵār (HALOT 151), Syr. bāḵrā (LSyr. 88, SL 177), Arb. baqar- (Lane 234), Sab. ḇkr (SD 30), Min. bkr (LM 23), Hdr. bkr (Sima 2000:50) > PCS *baḵar- ‘large cattle’ (SED II No. 59).

⇒ PCS *baḵar- ‘large cattle’ has been compared to the PS verbal root *ḇkr *‘to split, to cleave, to plough,’ which does not seem sufficiently well-founded.

Mhr. baḵārēl *‘cow’ (ML 47) is clearly borrowed from Arb. baqarat- (Sima 2000:47). The Eblaite form ba-ša-lum (= Sum. āb.udu, VE 1101) must belong to a CS lexical stratum; the same is true of a few sparse attestations in later cuneiform sources (Streck 2000:87, Pentiuc 2001:36–37).

It is noteworthy that *baḵar- is only marginally attested in Ugaritic and Phoenician, where the collective meaning “large cattle” is usually expressed by the plural of *alp- *‘bull, ox’ (v. DUL 61, DNWSI 64 and Chapter 5, pp. 343-344 below).

11. Ugr. ḇl (DUL 221), Pho. ḇl (Krachmalkov 2000:102), Hbr. bāl (HALOT 131), Arb. bal (Lane 257) > PCS *ḇal ‘not’ (DRS 65).

⇒ The PCS negative particle *ḇal is likely related to the PS preposition *bVl(Vy) ‘without’ (cf. Pat-El 2013) and, perhaps, eventually to the verbal root *bly *‘to be old, worn out’ (CDG 27, 98, not accepted in Pat-El 2013).

The specifically CS nature of this negative particle has been emphasized by Faber (1991), who lists it as one of the (comparatively few) shared CS innovations (1997:9). It is not without hesitation that one can subscribe to this opinion, mostly because the functional overlap between the attested reflexes of *ḇal is rather loose (Corriente 2003:192, Pat-El 2013:55). The use of *ḇal as a main negative particle with

517 E.g. BDB 133: “name from ploughing.”
518 Hapax legomenon in 4.691:1 (hms̱ alpm ḇkr ‘five oxen from the herd’). The Ugaritic form has been inadvertently omitted from SED II No. 59.
519 Hapax legomenon in KAI 24:11–12 (bl ḇkr ‘owner of large cattle’).
finite verbal forms is most conspicuous in Phoenician, where it has ousted PS *lā (Friedrich–Röllig 1999:178, Pat-El 2013). The same usage is attested in Hebrew, but it is very rare and exclusively poetic (BDB 115). In Ugaritic, verbal forms negated with bl are extremely rare and, according to Tropper 2000:817, always imply a “fragend-volitivischer Nuance.” As for Arabic bal, “it denotes emendation, wherever it occurs, in the case of a negation or an affirmation” (Lane 243). Note, finally, that no reflex of *bal seems to be attested in Aramaic. Nevertheless, it is hard to agree with N. Pat-El who believes that “*bal is an inherited form in Central Semitic, not an innovation” because “the particle *bal occurs outside Central Semitic, namely, in Akkadian and Ethiopic” (2013:55): as duly recognized by Pat-El, the Akkadian and Ethiopic lexemes are negative prepositions, not verbal negations, hence their diachronic identity is purely formal. In terms of function, the negative particle *bal can still be considered among PCS lexical innovations (even if, as just stated above, not without hesitation).

12. Ugr. gdy (DUL 295), Hbr. gadī (HALOT 178), Syr. gadyā (LSyr. 104, SL 205), Arb. ḥady- (Lane 393) > PCS *gady- ‘kid’ (SED II No. 76).

⇒ The origin of PCS *gady- ‘kid’ is uncertain. For a tentative comparison with the verbal root *gdy ‘to cut’ v. DRS 100–101. For a possible connection with PIE *gʰaid-v. Gamkrelidze–Ivanov 1984:872.

Related terms outside CS are borrowed from Aramaic or Arabic: Akk. (LB) gaddū ‘kid’ (CAD G 9),520 Gez. gaday ‘capricorn’ (CDG 183).

13. Ugr. gpn (DUL 304), Heb. gāpān (HALOT 200), Syr. gpettā (LSyr. 128, SL 254), Arb. ḥfn- (Lane 434) > PCS *gapn- ‘vine’ (DRS 171).521

⇒ The origin of PCS *gapn- ‘vine’ is unknown. The only parallel outside CS is Akk. gaŋnu, guŋnu ‘(fruit) tree, vine’ (AHw. 281, 298, CAD G 44). The Akkadian term is not attested before the first millennium (NA, SB, NB), which makes it tempting to consider it a West Semitism (so explicitly CAD G 45, DRS 171). Such a conclusion may be somewhat premature however, given the fact that the meaning “vine” for gaŋnu is sparsely attested in NB only. Elsewhere (notably, in the NA royal inscriptions), gaŋnu and guŋnu are used with a broad meaning “(fruit) tree” (Thureau-Dangin 1912:39, 42–43, Meissner 1931:27–28), which cannot be easily reconciled with the extant CS lexical evidence.522 It is not impossible, therefore, that gaŋnu, guŋnu is an inherited (perhaps specifically Assyrian?) word, which preserves the original PS meaning “tree, trunk,” shifted to “vine” in PCS.523 Such a hypothesis, explicit already in Fronzaroli 1969:8,524 is

520 The probability of a cognate relationship between the Akkadian word and the CS terms is, in our view, close to zero (contra Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:30): it is hard to see how such a cognate lexeme could be latently preserved in Akkadian without showing up in early sources (where other terms for “kid” are commonly used instead) and would then start to be actively used in Late Babylonian.

521 Sab. gšnt ‘vine,’ quoted in HALOT 200 and elsewhere, is unreliable (v. references in DRS 171).

522 Meissner’s reference to gapnā ṣādā, designating a kind of wild gourd in 2K 4:39, is hardly sufficient to prove the contrary; this exceptional example is almost certainly to be considered a metaphoric application of the basic meaning “vine,” very stable for *gapn- throughout CS.

523 The meaning “vine” in NB can still be plausibly explained by comparatively late CS (Aramaic?) influence.
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It is uncertain whether *gapn-* as surmised in Arcari 1984:324. If this comparison is correct, the Eblaite forms must represent the earliest forms of this root (Akkadian or CS?), but the reduplicated *n* followed by a guttural or *y* remains enigmatic. Accordingly, the alternative identification with “cumin,” suggested by P. Steinkeller (1992:77) and accepted by A. Catagnoti (2010:143–146) is likely to be preferred.

14. Hbr. *gārām* ‘bone’ (HALOT 203), Syr. *garmā* ‘os’ (LSyr. 133, SL 261), Arb. *ţirm*–‘body,’ *ţārām*–‘date-stone’ (Lane 413), Sab. *grm* ‘body’ (SD 50) > PCS *gVrm-* ‘bone; body’ (SED I No. 94).

⇒ The origin of PCS *gVrm-* ‘bone; body’ is uncertain. Possible cognates outside CS discussed in SED I No. 94 are all relatively unreliable.


⇒ The origin of PCS *gawzal-* ‘young pigeon’ is unknown.


⇒ The origin of PCS *yālm-* ‘boy, young man’ is unclear. Arb. *ylm* ‘to be vehemently affected with lust’ (Lane 2286) is usually considered to be denominative from *yulām-* (so HALOT 835), but cf. Jib. *yēlm* ‘(camels) to run wild (after the summer)’ (JL 85), with no comparable nominal form (an Arabism?). There is hardly

524 “… un significato non specializzato, che potrebbe essere più antico di quello tecnico della viticoltura.”

525 The Hebrew word is rather sparsely attested: *rūaḥ nēḵā lp̄aḇbōṣ-gārām* ‘A depressed spirit dries up the bones’ (Pr 17:22), *lāšon rakkā tīšūr-gārām* ‘Tender words are able to break bones’ (Pr 25:15), *nāḇāmāw nāḇēḵē nēḥāšā gārāmāw ki-mēṯ barzāl* ‘His bones are tubes of bronze, his frame like bars of iron’ (Job 40:18), *yēḵāhār ḥāmār gārām* ‘Issachar is a strong donkey’ (Gn 49:14). Note the transferred meaning in 2K 9:13: *wa-yēḵēḥū ṭīḇ bigād wa-ya-rāšīmū tāḥāw vāl-gārām ha-mīmavālūti* ‘Each of them took his clothes and spread them under him on the bare steps’. The denotative verb with the meaning “to break (the bones)” is attested in Nu 24:8 (ʾuṣmōtēhām yaqārēm). The meaning of the expressions *wa-rāʾāšēhā tāḥāw* in Ez 23:34 and *z̄βēkē ṭārib lōt* (gārūm la-bīhākār in Zp 3:3 is uncertain.

526 Doubts about this meaning in the only attestation of the Sabaic term (l-grm mhrth ‘for the body’ of his young she-camel’ in Ja 752:9) have been expressed in Sima 2000:118.


528 Throughout the history of Aramaic, this root is represented in the pattern *yulāym-*., presumably diminutive in origin and possibly related to Arb. *yulām-* (see Chapter 6, pp. 378-379 below).

529 An early form of this CS root is likely attested in the lexical list Explicit Malku I 236: ʾka-al-mu = *šēfrî* (AHw. 895, CAD Q 66), cf. Kogan 2002:286.

530 The functional/semantic prominence of the reflexes of this term in individual CS languages is clearly uneven (see Chapter 6, p. 379 below).
any connection with PWS *γływ ‘to be dark,’ which would presuppose a rather unlikely meaning shift from “unknowing, uninitiated” (cf. HALOT 835).

17. Ugr. ywb (DUL323),532 Hbr. yēnāb (HALOT 851), Syr. yenbtā (LSyr. 534, SL 1114), Arb. yinab- (Lane 2167), Sab. ywb (SD 17)533 > PCS *yinab- ‘grape.’

⇒ PCS *yinab- ‘grape’ is likely related to Akk. inbu ‘fruit’ (AHw. 381, CAD I 144), with semantic narrowing (Fronzaroli 1969:8, cf. Kaufman 1974:59).534

18. Hbr. ṣn (HALOT 854), Syr. ṣn (pa.) (LSyr. 533, SL 1116), Arb. ṣn (II) (Lane 2302) > PCS ṣn ‘to sing.’535

⇒ The origin of PCS ṣn ‘to sing’ is unknown.

In Hebrew, the meaning “to sing” is most clearly attested in such passages as Ps 147:7 (yānū la-YHWH ḥa-tōdā zamārā l-(r)ēlōhēnū ḥa-kinnōr ‘Sing to the Lord a song of thanksgiving, play the harp for our God’). Elsewhere, a proper distinction between ṣn ‘to answer’ and ṣn ‘to sing’ can be difficult. In the Syriac lexicography the meaning “to sing” of ṣn is usually regarded as a secondary extension of “to answer” (‘to intone, to sing responsively,’ SL 1116), which is probably unwarranted.

Clearly borrowed from Arabic is Mhr. ayūnī ‘to sing’ (ML 139).

531 Ugr. ylv ‘concealment, darkness’ (DUL 320), Hbr. ylm (hip.) ‘to be darkened, black’ (HALOT 835), Gez. tawalma ‘to be hidden, disappear’ (CDG 61), see further Kogan 2005c:195.

532 The only reliable attestation is 1.19 i 40–42 (yv ṣrpt tnv b ḫl ḫl ʾlw l ṣnwbm), but even here the meaning “grapes” can hardly be deduced from the context (‘The rain that the clouds may pour down in summer’, the dew that they may pour down on the grapes’), contrast ‘On the summer fruits ... on the grapes’ in Pardee 1997:351. The context of ṣnwbm in 1:23:26 is too fragmentary for a coherent translation (cf. Pardee 1997:279). The presence of y in the Ugaritic form is difficult to explain. For M. Dietrich and O. Loretz (1967–1968), the Ugaritic form is secondary with respect to the Arabic one. Conversely, Fronzaroli (1969:25, 33) considers y to be original in this root, whereas r in Arabic points, in his opinion, to an Aramaism (note, however, that an Aramaic loanword in Sabaic is considerably less likely, whereas the morphological shape of the Arabic word matches exactly that of its Hebrew cognate). Rössler’s evaluation of this problem (1961:170) is somewhat contradictory: admitting that the meaning “grapes” cannot be deduced from the extant passages, he compares the Ugaritic word to the Akkadian verb ḥanābu ‘to grow abundantly’ (CAD H 75, AHw. 319), which he, incidentally, considers a WS loanword. Since ḥanābu is reliably attested in OB, Rössler’s borrowing hypothesis appears rather problematic. At the same time, he is certainly right that Ack. ḫ is more likely to correspond to *γ than to *r — at least within a cognate relationship. Shall we indeed postulate two PS variant roots (*rinab- and *rînab-) with different Akkadian reflexes?

533 Distinct from its CS cognates, the Sabaic term designates “vineyard” rather than “vine” or “grapes” (Simca 2000:195–196).

534 Comparison between Ack. inbu and Hbr. nāb ‘shoot,’ nālōb ‘ears of corn’ (HALOT 2, 4), Arb. nubb ‘herbage’ (Lane 3), Amh. abāba ‘flower’ (AED 1197) is thus to be abandoned (contra EDG 6 and numerous early studies).

It is uncertain whether this root is attested in Ugaritic. According to DUL 172, there are two probable examples in the Ugaritic corpus: 1.17 vi 31–32 (ṣbd w yār šl n̄n[ñ n yγyn w γyn] ‘Al que entona y canta en su presencia, al aedo apuesto que le celebra,’ del Olmo Lete 1981:378) and 1.23:12 (ṣbd ybgm l ṣl w ṣnwb γyn ‘Siete veces se recita frente al trono y los oficiales lo corean,’ del Olmo Lete 1981:442). For a different approach to these passages see Pardee 1997:278 and 347, where it is emphasized that the hypothetical verb “to sing” in Ugaritic should have displayed y as its Arabic cognate.
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19. Hbr. ṣōpār (HALOT 862), Arb. γυπρ- (Lane 2273) > PCS *γυπρ- ‘young of fallow deer’ (SED II No. 88).

⇒ The origin of PCS *γυπρ- ‘young of fallow deer’ is unknown. Its very marginal presence in Aramaic is noteworthy.

20. Hbr. ħālōm (HALOT 249), Arb. halumma (Lane 3044) > PCS *halumma ‘hither’ (DRS 408).

⇒ PCS *halumma probably consists of the widely attested deictic element *hal-expanded with the adverbial ending -um and the enclitic -ma. The formal and semantic agreement between Hebrew and Arabic is remarkable enough to assume for it a common CS background.

21. Ugr. hrg (DUL 346), Hbr. hrg (HALOT 255), Sam. hrg, OArm. hrg (DNWSI 293), Arb. hrğ (LA 2 454), Sab. hrg (SD 56), Qat. hrğ (LIQ 47), Hdr. hrğ > PCS *hrg ‘to kill.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *hrg ‘to kill’ is uncertain.

As is well known, the functional load of this root in individual CS languages is very uneven. It was clearly the basic verb for “to kill” in Hebrew (probably also in Samalian), but apparently quite marginal in Ugaritic and early Aramaic (cf. Chapter 6, p. 400 below). If hrg was the main exponent of the meaning “to kill” in ESA, the cumulative Hebrew-ESA evidence might suggest its basic status as early as in PCS (to be grouped, accordingly, with the terms treated above under 5.1 as the meaning “to kill” belongs to the Swadesh wordlist). Judging by the evidence collected in Biella 116–117, this may indeed be the case (compare the relatively meager number of attestations of kil ibid. 470).

22. Hbr. ḫbl ‘to be pregnant,’ ḫēbāl ‘labor pains; foetus’ (HALOT 286), Syr. ḫbl ‘parturivit,’ ḫēblā ‘dolor partus’ (LSyr. 210, SL 406, 408), Arb. ḫbl ‘to be pregnant,’ ḫabal- ‘foetus’ (Lane 504–505) > PCS *ḥbl ‘to be pregnant, to have labor pains’ (SED I Nos. 110 and 21v).

---

536 Hapax legomenon in ATNS 99:2 (mškíy prn ‘hides of stags’).
537 There is, admittedly, a functional difference between the Hebrew and Arabic particles: while the former one is a true deictic adverb, the latter is normally used as a kind of predicative element (“come here!” or “bring here!”). Note that Ugr. ḥlm ‘sobald als,’ ‘siehe als,’ ‘dann’ (Tropper 2000:746, 797) can hardly be identified with PCS *ḥalumma in view of the semantic difference.
539 šiddatu l-ḥuqq wa-kāfratuḥu. Interestingly enough, one authority mentioned in LA 2 454 explained hrğ as ‘to kill’ (qtl) in “Ethiopian” (bi-liṣqni l-ḥabašati). Since no such verb is attested in any known EthS language, it is tempting to suspect that this designation refers to an early South Arabian idiom. Shall we assume that this verb (or at least the meaning “to kill”) is not indigenous in Arabic?
540 Ingrams 1:2: w-hrgw ḫbl t mnr w-ḥdnhw ‘They killed four leopards and two cheetahs’; Ja 949:2–3: w-hrgw ḥms, w-sḥy ḫrm w-ft ṣḥmny haww w-ḥms, w-sḥy  ṣḥm w-ṣḥmn t ḥbd ‘They killed 35 oryxes and 82 young oryxes and 25 gazelles and eight cheetahs’ (v. Sima 2000:56).
The origin of PCS *ḥbl ‘to be pregnant’ is uncertain, cf. SED I Nos. 110 and 21, for its possible connection with the MSA terms for umbilical cord (such as Mhr. ḥablāt) and, perhaps, PS *ḥabl- ‘rope.’

23. Hbr. ḥag (HALOT 289), Syr. ḥaggā (LSyr. 213, SL 411), Arb. ḥażẓẓ- (Lane 514), Sab. ḥg (SD 66), Qat. ḥg (LIQ 60) > PCS *ḥagg- ‘festival’ (Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:420).

➢ The origin of PCS *ḥagg- ‘festival’ is unknown. An ultimate relationship to Gez. ḥagg ‘law, decree, regulation, canon, rite’ (CDG 227) is not to be excluded.

Clearly borrowed from Arabic are Tgr. ḥagg ‘a type of sacrifice’ (WTS 100), Mhr. ḥag ‘to go on ḥajj’ (ML 171), Jib. ḥagg id. (JL 105), Soq. ḥgg ‘faire le pèlerinage' (LS 162).

24. Ugr. ḡl ‘desacralized, free’ (DUL 359), Hbr. ḡll (nip.) ‘to be defiled,’ (hip.) ‘to profane’ (HALOT 319), Syr. ḡullā ‘profanum’ (LSyr. 231, SL 425), Arb. ḡl ‘to become lawful, allowable, free’ (Lane 619), Sab. ḡll ‘für erlaubt erklären’ (Stein 2010:724, cf. also SD 67), Qat. ḡll ‘to cancel, to relieve’ (LIQ 63) > PCS *ḥll ‘to be profane.’

➢ The origin of PCS *ḥll ‘to be profane’ is uncertain. An ultimate relationship with Akk. eḫētu ‘to become pure’ (CAD E 80, AHw. 197) has been almost universally accepted (v. references in DRS 870–872), but the enantiosemantic correspondence “to be pure” : “to be profane” is, in fact, far from evident. If this equation is nevertheless correct, the specific meaning of the CS root still makes it a remarkable exclusive feature of this group.

Clearly borrowed from Arabic are Tgr. ḡallātā ‘to render allowable’ (WTS 52), Mhr. ḡdāl (ML 177), Jib. ʾahlēl ‘to forgive; to make legal’ (JL 109).

25. Ugr. ḡlm ‘mature animal’ (DUL 361), Hbr. ḡlm ‘to be healthy, strong’ (BDB 321), Syr. ḡallimā ‘sanus, integer, validus’ (LSyr. 235, SL 456), Arb. ḡlm (V) ‘to become fat,’ ḡalim- ‘fat’ (Lane 632–633) > PCS *ḥlm ‘to be mature, fat, vigorous.’

➢ PCS *ḥlm ‘to be mature’ is usually derived from PWS *ḥlm ‘to dream’ > ‘to have nocturnal pollution.’ The latter two meanings for *ḥlm are also attested in CS (as well as in EthS and MSA), cf. SED I No. 25.

---

541 “Das Heg-Opfer ist das islamische Opferfest (Beiram)” (Littmann 1915:816).


545 Attested twice in the Biblical corpus: Job 39:4 (yāḥlām bənēhām yirbū ba-bḥr yāḇṣū wa-šl(l) tāḇā lāmū ‘Their kids become mature, growing in the wild, they go away and to not return to them’) and Is 38:16 (wa-tahālūmēni wa-halāyēnēni ‘Restore me to health and make me live’). HALOT 320 (where this meaning is not systematically distinguished from “to dream”) adds two attestations from Sir: b ḡlām ṭaṣā ykb ‘He gave no strength to liars’ (15:20) and ʾś ḡlāmē n ṭiḥb ‘Since they gave strength to Jacob…’ (49:10).
26. Hbr. ḥēlāb ‘fat’ (HALOT 315), Syr.  ḥēlbā  ‘omentum’ (LSyr. 233, SL 451), Arb. ḥīlāb- ‘diaphragm, midriff; a white thin thing adhering to the liver’ (Lane 782) > PCS *ḥīlāb- ‘fat, fatty tissue’ (SED I No. 131).

⇒ The origin of PCS *ḥīlāb- ‘fat’ is unknown.

27. Hbr. ḥālād ‘lifespan; world’ (HALOT 316), Arb. ḫūld- ‘permanent stay in an abode from which one does not go out’ (LA 3 202), Min. ḫulld ‘pour toujours’ (LM 43) > PCS *ḥūľld- ‘long period of time, lifespan, eternity.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ḥūľld- ‘long period of time’ is unclear. Note that the root is absent from Aramaic.

28. Hbr. ḥūlād (HALOT 316), Syr. ḥulda (LSyr. 233, SL 425), Arb. ḫūld- (Lane 784) > PCS *ḥūlād- ‘mole’ (SED II No. 108).

⇒ The origin of PCS *ḥūlād- ‘mole’ is unknown.

29. Ugr. ḫtn (DUL 413), Hbr. ḫāṭān (HALOT 364), Syr. ḫatnā (LSyr. 264, SL 505), Arb. ḫātan- (Lane 704), Sab. ḫtn (Stein 2010:726), Hdr. ḫtn (R 4878:1–3) > PCS *ḫātan- ‘son-in-law.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ḫātan- ‘son-in-law’ is uncertain, its connection with the verbal root ḫtn ‘to circumcise,’ completely isolated in Arabic (Lane 703), is widely accepted (HALOT 364–365), but difficult to prove.

Akk. ḫātanu ‘son-in-law, bridegroom’ (CAD ḫ 148, AHw. 335) is probably to be considered a WS loanword (with Goetze 1947:246–247). This hypothesis is attractive in view of the fact that Akk. emu was clearly polysemic (“father-in-law”/“son-in-law”) in OB and OA, whereas ḫātanu is only sparsely attested in early periods (Kogan 2014:104-105). Also the morphological shape of the Akkadian word (non-syncopated *a in the second syllable) is unusual.

---

544 Ugr. ḫltb ‘massif, promontory’ (DUL 390), tentatively compared in SED I No. 131 (with reference to WUS 112 where it is, however, translated as ‘die Haut oder die Gedärme bedeckende Fette’), is hardly related. In KTU 1.4 viii 5–6, it is attested in synonymous parallelism with yr ‘mountain’: ṣa yr ṣl ḫltb l šr ḫtn ‘Lift up a mountain on (your) hands, a plateau on (your) palms.’ The same parallelism is clear in 1.82-4, notwithstanding the textual difficulties (del Olmo Lete 2004:374). The combination gd ḫlb, attested as a designation of materia medica in the hippiatric text KTU 1.85:20, has been variously understood as ‘coriander of Aleppo’ or ‘coriander of the hill’ (cf. Cohen–Sivan 1983:37, Pardee 1985:26, 64). In DUL, the Ugaritic form is reasonably connected with Akk. ḫalbu ‘forest’ (CAD ḫ 40, AHw. 311) which, peculiarly, is not attested outside the Gilgamesh Epic and a few late lexical lists.

545 dawwānu l-bagā‘ī fī dārin lā yuḥṣabā‘ī minhā.

546 KTU 1.24:24–26 (l wmm `ūlām l ḫtn-n b’l tēh ṣdr y b’[r] ‘Oh pleasant among the gods, oh son-in-law of B’l! Marry Psdr, daughter of the light!’) and ibid. 32 (wmm nkl ḫtn ‘With Nkl is my marriage’). For the syllabic attestation (ḥa-at-mi) v. Huehnergard 1987a:130. An early Canaanite example is found in the Tanach letter TT 2:24: ṭ l-u-u i-pa-su ḫa-at-nu-tam ‘And I will certainly arrange a marriage.’

547 rmr bn ṣm fšnm nll ṣa ḫtn-s, ydvāl byn mlh ḫrmt bn rbs深度融合, rmr, son of ṣwfm, of the tribe ṣs, went to hunt with his son-in-law Ydvāl Byn, king of Hadramawt, son of Rbs深度融合.’
30. Hbr. *kēb* ‘to be in pain’ (HALOT 454), Syr. *k(r)b* ‘dolore affecit’ (LSyr. 314, SL 592), Arb. *kēb* ‘to be grieved, sad, distressed’ (WKAS K 11) > PCS *kēb* ‘to be in pain’ (SED I No. 34).

⇒ The origin of PCS *kēb* ‘to be in pain’ is unknown.


⇒ PCS *karm-* ‘vineyard’ is probably related to Akk. *karmu* ‘hill’ (CAD K 218, AHw. 449) and Mhr. *karmāym* ‘mountain’ (ML 214), pointing to PS *karm-* ‘hill’ (cf. Müller 1985:272, Fronzaroli 1969:7–8, CDG 293).548 The semantic narrowing from “mountain” to “vineyard” is conceivable (cf. German Weinberg).

Leslau (1990:70) is most probably correct to consider Gez. *krm*, *karm* ‘vineyard’ (CDG 293) to be borrowed from Arabic (sparsely attested in late sources only, LLA 834).


⇒ The origin of PCS *kēb* ‘to lie’ is uncertain. There is an intriguing possibility of connecting it with Akk. *kuzzubu* ‘luxuriant, full of charm,’ *kuzzu* ‘luxuriance, abundance, attractiveness, charm, sexual vigor,’ *kuzzubu* ‘to fawn, to flatter’ (CAD K 614, 617), but hypothetical semantic shifts underlying this comparison are hard to establish (rejected in Driver 1953:33).550 Also uncertain is the internal history of the Akkadian root(s): note that CAD K apparently treats the verb *kuzzubu* and the noun *kuzzu* as belonging to homonymous roots, whereas in AHw. 467 all of them are listed together under a non-attested *kazābu* ‘füllig sein.’

Leslau (1990:346) is likely correct to assume that all representations of this root scattered over Neo-Ethiopian are borrowed from Arabic: Tgr. *kāzbā* ‘to lie’ (WTS 421), Har. *kiz* ‘lie,’ *kizzāb* ‘liar’ (EDH 96), End. *kāzbā* ‘to lie,’ Muh. *kāzābā* ‘to lie’ (EDG 359).

33. Hbr. *kōrē* *laylā* ‘pollution’ (HALOT 1138), Syr. *kēryāt* ‘menstrua passa est,’ *keryā* *d-lelyā* ‘pollutio nocturnis’ (LSyr. 691, SL 1407), Arb. *qrt* (IV) ‘to menstruate,’ *qratt-* ‘menstruating’ (Lane 2503) > PCS *krr*, *kry* ‘to have bodily effusion.’

⇒ As argued in Kogan 2003a:125–126, the widespread identification of the CS terms with the roots *krr*, *kry* ‘to meet, to occur, to happen’ is hardly more than a

---

548 Contra Fronzaroli and Leslau, we hesitate to identify PCS *karm-* with Akk. *karānu* ‘wine, grapevine, grapes’ (CAD K 202, AHw. 446) and the undoubtedly related Sumerian *ka-ra-an* ‘clusters of fruit’ (from Ur III onwards).

549 Well attested already in the Amarna Canaanite, see references under *kazābu* ‘to lie’ and *kazbānu* ‘lie’ in CAD K 309–310, to be supplemented by *ki-zi-ib-tu* ‘lie’ in ZA 86, 100:5 (Huehnergard 1996:100, 105).

550 Shall one compare Pr 31:30: *šāqūr ha-hēn wa-hābāl ha-yyāpī* ‘Charm is deceitful and beauty is vain’? Haṭpax legomenon in Dt 23:11.
popular etymology.\footnote{See already Torczyner 1916:561 (contrast Schorch 2000:192–193).}

\underline{34.} Ugr. ʰkš (DUL 717)\footnote{\emph{Hapax legomenon} in 1.16 vi 47–48: ʰl̥dy <<t>>ʰš̥m ʰl̥dl̥ ‘You have not expelled the oppressors from the poor.’} Hbr. ʰkšy (HALOT 1152), Syr. ʰkšā (LSyr. 703, SL 1418), Arb. qsw (Lane 2988) > PCS *ʰkšw ‘to be harsh.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ʰkšw ‘to be harsh’ is uncertain. Cf. perhaps Tgr. ḫāššā ‘to dry up (corn in the sun); to bear no fruit’ (WTS 247).

Mhr. ʰkōsi ‘cruel’ (ML 238) is almost certainly borrowed from Arabic.

\underline{35.} Ugr. ʰl̥m ‘grain; bread; food’ (DUL 497), Hbr. ḥām ‘bread’ (HALOT 526), Syr. ḥāmā ‘panis’ (LSyr. 364, SL 685), Arb. ʰl̥m- ‘meat’ (WKAS L 348) > PCS *l̥hm- ‘food.’

⇒ PCS *l̥hm- ‘food’ is probably derived from the verbal root *l̥m- ‘to eat, to taste,’ attested in Akk. lēmu ‘to take food or drink’ (CAD L 126, AHw. 543), Ugr. ʰl̥m ‘to eat’ (DUL 495) and Hbr. ḥl̥m ‘to eat, to taste’ (HALOT 454).\footnote{For Fronzaroli (1972:616), *l̥hm- is a PS archaism lost in Akkadian.} One is tempted to agree with P. Fronzaroli (1972:615), who believes that the meaning shift from “bread” to “meat” represents a comparatively late innovation in Arabic.

Both Gez. lāhm ‘ox, bull’ (CDG 309) and Soq. ḥēhim ‘grand poisson, requin’ (LS 232) are definitely unrelated to this root (Fronzaroli 1972:615).

\underline{36.} Hbr. ḥayiš (HALOT 529), TArm. ḥētā, ḥaytā (Jastrow 710, WT I 410), SArm. ḫy (DSA 438), Arb. ḡayt- (WKAS L 1951) > PCS *ḡayt- ‘lion’ (SED II No. 147).

\underline{37.} Hbr. māgād ‘excellence (of gifts of nature)’ (BDB 550), Syr. ḫagdā ‘fructus’ (LSyr. 373, SL 707), Arb. maḏl- ‘glory, honor, dignity, nobility’ (Lane 2690) > PCS *maḏd- ‘excellence.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *maḏd- ‘excellence’ is uncertain, but one is tempted to analyze it as an old ma-prefix derivate from the PWS biconsonantal element *gd with a general meaning “to be good, lucky, excellent” (cf. DRS 99–100, 105–106 and Chapter 1, p. 33 above). This element is represented, \emph{inter alia}, by Hbr. gad ‘fortune’ (HALOT 176), Arb. ḫadd- ‘good fortune’ (Lane 385), ḫwād ‘to be good, approvable, excellent’ (ibid. 481), Sod. gud ‘wonderful, marvelous, splendid’ (EDG 261, also in most of the other modern EthS languages).

\underline{38.} Hbr. ḫwārā (HALOT 615)\footnote{For the Egyptian syllabic rendering of the early Canaanite form māgāra (and similar) v. Hoch 1994:172.} Syr. ʰmārātā (LSyr. 545, SL 805), Arb. ḫwārat-
(Lane 2307) > PCS *mayār-at/*/mayarrat- 'cave.'

⇒ PCS *mayārat/*/mayarrat- 'cave' is probably related to the verbal root *γwr ‘to sink down, to be depressed,’ preserved in Arb. γwr (Lane 2306) and, perhaps, Ugr. γr ‘to tumble, fall, hurry’ (DUL 323). For this etymology v. Kopf 1976:160 and Takács 2008:681.

39. Hbr. māḥār (HALOT 572), Syr. ṣmā (LSyr. 381, SL 742), Sab. ṣmhr (SD 84) > PCS *maḥār- ‘tomorrow.’

⇒ PCS *maḥār- ‘tomorrow’ goes back to the PS verbal root *muhr ‘to face,’ represented by Akk. maḥāru ‘to face, to approach, to accept’ (CAD M1 50, AHw. 577), Arb. muhr ‘to cleave the water with its stem; to face the wind (ship)’ (Lane 2693), Sab. muhr ‘to face, to run, to extend towards’ (SD 84), Soq. móhor ‘offir’ (LS 240). It is probable that this PCS lexeme can be directly identified with Akk. muḥru ‘past, bygone time; before, in the presence, in front of’ (CAD M1 50, AHw. 585). The alternative derivation from *θhr (Brokelmann 1908:78, 241) is hardly acceptable.

The complete absence of *maḥār- ‘tomorrow’ from Arabic is remarkable.

40. Ugr. nvm ‘handsome, pleasant, good’ (DUL 613), Pho. nvm ‘agreeable, good’ (DNWSI 738), Hbr. nvm ‘to be pleasant, delightful’ (HALOT 705), Arb. nvm ‘to become plentiful and easy; to be good, pleasant’ (Lane 3035), Sab. nvm ‘to be favorable, prosperous’ (SD 90), Qat. nvm ‘to be favorable, auspicious’ (LIQ 107), Min. nvm ‘prospérité, succès’ (LM 65) > PCS *nvm ‘to be pleasant, handsome, good.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *nvm ‘to be pleasant’ is uncertain. Its prominence in individual CS languages is uneven. In Ugaritic and Phoenician, *nvm has probably become the main exponent of the basic meaning “good” (fully or partly ousting *tyb), cf. Chapter 5 below (pp. 252 and 262). Conversely, *nvm is practically unattested in Aramaic (its marginal presence in JPA registered in DJPA 354 may be due to Hebrew influence).

557 Not very reliable, thought to be attested in 1:2 iv 6-7 (w ttn gh yyr ḫt kšr zbl ym), variously translated as ‘Dando un grito, se precipitó a los pies de (su) trono el Príncipe Yammu’ (del Olmo Lete 1993:43, Durand 2000:218 and Streck 2000:107: ana namlāt bēlīya u LŪ.MEŠ hana na-aḥ-mu-um) ‘There is prosperity for the kingdom of my lord and the people of Hana’ (ARM 27, 2:11–12).
560 So already BDB 563. Since the pattern(s) CwCz(t)Cz- are not synchronically productive in Akkadian, maḥru is unlikely to be derived from maḥāru ‘to face’ within the history of Akkadian. Rather, we are probably faced with an archaic, pre-Akkadian derived noun, also preserved in PCS with a shift of meaning. Admittedly, most *CwCz(t)Cz- have become *CpCzCz- in Akkadian, but this process is not completely uniform (cf. Krebernik 2006:84–89).
562 More surprising is the high prominence of the adjective našmu in Turoyo, where it functions, side by side with szuro, as one of the main exponents of the basic meaning “small.” It must be an
Certainly borrowed from Arabic are Mhr. *hənāum* ‘to grant a favor,’ *nārmēt* ‘well-being,’ *nəwāym* ‘soft, smooth’ (ML 278) as well as Har. *nārmāt* ‘bounty, blessing’ (EDH 116).


⇒ The origin of PCS *npl* ‘to fall’ is uncertain. The traditionally accepted comparison with Akk. *napālu* ‘to tear down, to demolish’ (CAD N₁ 272, AHw. 733), implying a change in diathesis and a rather serious semantic shift,⁵⁵⁴ is not quite certain, yet may be bolstered by Mhr. *nafīl* ‘to break a splinter off a bone,’ *hānīfīl* ‘to throw stones down’ (ML 284), Jib. *npf* ‘to cut a sliver (of wood), to break off a chip,’ *enfīl* ‘to cut down, to destroy, to throw down stones’ (JL 182). The root is conspicuously missing from Arabic: *contra* Nöldke 1910:180, there is no connection between this root and Arb. *nfl* ‘to give a free and disinterested gift’ (Lane 3036), which (with von Soden), together with Akk. *napālu* ‘to make a supplementary payment, to compensate,’ belongs to a completely independent, homonymous PS root. Amb. *naffīlā* ‘to be in flood; to fall; to be in distress, anxious’ (AED 1080) looks too isolated to be seriously taken into consideration in spite of the semantic similarity.


⇒ According to a widely accepted theory (Bauer–Leander 1927:617, DUL 650, Huehnergard 1987a:77, Krebernik 1985:54), PCS *nVš-ūma* ‘women’ represents a semantic narrowing of an original meaning “people,” thought to be preserved in Akk. *nīš-ū* (AHw. 796, CAD N₂ 283, fem. agreement) and Ugr. *nš-m* (DUL 649). It is noteworthy that this isogloss is not shared by either Ugaritic or ESA, where *ʔatt *(n)ṯl ‘woman’ displays non-suppletive plural forms (Ugr. *ʔatt*, Sab. *(n)ṯl, mṯl, rṯl*). See further Chapter 5 below (p. 336).

43. Hbr. *pah* (HALOT 921), Syr. *pahhā* (LSyr. 562), Arb. *faḥ*- (Lane 2348) > PCS *pahh*- ‘snare, trapping net.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *pahh*- ‘snare, trapping net’ is unknown.

44. Hbr. *polōnī* (HALOT 934),⁵⁴⁶ Syr. *plān* (LSyr. 1575, SL 1201), Arb. *fulān*- (Lane 2444)⁵⁶⁵ > PCS *pulān*- ‘so and so.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *pulān*- ‘so and so’ is uncertain (for a possible connection with *pły* ‘to separate, to distinguish’ v. BDB 811).

Clearly borrowed from Arabic are Tgr. *follon* (WTS 652) and Mhr. *fālān, fālānī*

adaptation of such meanings of Arb. *nwm* as ‘to be soft, tender’ (Lane 3035), cf. in particular *nwm* ‘klein, jung (von Alter); klein, fein, dünn’ in Anatolian Arabic (Jastrow 2005:143).

⁵⁴⁶ Thus, the Akkadian verb also means ‘to dig out, to quarry, to gouge out (eyes).’

⁵⁵⁴ Always in the combination *plōnī rashōnī*.

⁵⁶⁵ For the peculiar (abbreviated?) form *fulu* v. Lane 2433.
45. Hbr.  parāḥ 'bud, blossom' (HALOT 966), Syr. parḥā 'flos' (LSyr. 594, SL 1236), Arb. farḥ- 'offset, shoot' (Lane 2362) > PCS *parḥ- 'sprout, blossom, flower.'

⇒ PCS *parḥ- 'sprout, blossom' comes close to PWS *parḥ- 'chick, brood' (SED II No. 179), but the diachronic identity between the two sets of forms is not evident. Cf. also PWS *piry- 'fruit' (HALOT 967, CDG 167).

46. Ugr. rb 'great, large' (DUL 727), rb 'chief' (ibid. 728), rbt 'lady' (ibid. 731), Hbr. rbb 'to be numerous' (HALOT 1175), rab 'numerous, many; great' (ibid. 1171), rōb 'quantity, wealth' (ibid. 1174), Syr. rbb 'magnus evasit, fuit,' rabbā 'magnus' (LSyr. 706, SL 1425), Arb. rabb- 'lord, possessor,' rbb (V) 'to be collected, congregated,' rubba-mā 'often,' raba- 'much water' (Lane 1003–1005) > PCS *rbb 'to be large, numerous.'

⇒ PCS *rbb 'to be large, numerous' is obviously related to PS *rby 'to be large,' attested in Akkadian and in most of CS: Akk. rabū 'to be large' (CAD R 37), Hbr. rby 'to become numerous; to be great' (HALOT 1176), Syr. rbā 'magnus evasit' (LSyr. 707, SL 1427), Arb. rbw 'to increase, augment' (Lane 1023). Semantic values and functional prominence of the reflexes of *rbb may vary considerably from one CS language to another, but in spite of these differences, the historical homogeneity of this variant root — unattested elsewhere in Semitic — is quite remarkable.

47. Ugr. rbt (pl. rbt, rbb)572 (DUL 730), Hbr. rabbā, ribbîa(r) 573 (HALOT 1175, 1178), Syr. rebbu (LSyr. 707, SL 1426), Arb. ribbiyy-, rabbîyy-, rubbiyy- (Lane 1006), rabw-, rubwat-, ribwat-, rubat- (ibid. 1023) > PCS *rib(a)b-at-, *ribw-at- 'ten thousand, myriad.'

⇒ PCS *rib(a)b-at-, *ribw-at- 'ten thousand, myriad' is clearly related to the verbal roots *rbb/*rbw 'to be numerous.'

Most of the cuneiform attestations of this term can be plausibly explained by WS

---

566 Neither *parḥ- nor *piry- can be directly related to Akk. peru 'shoot, offshoot, leaf' (CAD P 416, AHw. 856) since Akk.  is very unlikely to correspond to either PS *ḥr or PS *y. As pointed out in SED II No. 179 and Kogan 2006d:272, the most likely prototype for the Akkadian term is *pary-, otherwise preserved in Mhr. fāry 'to bloom' (ML 98), Jib. fēry 'flower' to open up' (JL 60) and, probably, Syr. perā 'germen, flos' (LSyr. 603), Tna. farrā 'to flourish' (TED 2667).

567 For the syllabic evidence pointing to the reading rabb- v. Huehnergard 1987a:176. The root underlying the verbal form rbt 'you are great' in KTU 1.4 v 3 cannot be established (cf. DUL 730). For *EN ra-ab-ba 'the great Lord' in Emar v. Pentiu 2001:151–152.

568 While the former term may be borrowed from Hebrew or Aramaic (Jeffery 1938:136–137), the latter ones are clearly genuine. It is admittedly true that (as correctly observed by Jeffery) the basic meanings of PCS *rbb have become somewhat marginalized in Arabic.

569 According to J.-M. Durand (1998:84), the earliest attestation of *rbb can be found in the OB Mari letter ARM 4, 21:15 (u-ud ni-bi-b[a] 'They are not numerous'), but cf. Streck 2000:111.

570 Such as "to be large" in Aramaic vs. "to be numerous" in Hebrew, cf. Chapter 5 (p. 259) below.

571 Leslau (CDG 460) is probably correct to separate from this root Gez. rb 'to stretch, to expand, to spread out (transitive)' and its EthS cognates (contra LLA 286, BDB 912, etc.).

572 For this morphological distribution v. Tropper 2000:363–364.

573 The latter form has been considered an Aramaism (cf. Wagner 1966:104).
influence: *rabbatu* in OB Mari (CAD R 14, AHw. 1585),574 *riibbatu* in early OB Mari, OB Alakakh (CAD R 314, AHw. 980), *ri-PAP* in Ebla (Krebernik 1996:246). Gez. *rabbawāt* ‘myriads’ is almost certainly an Arabism (LLA 287, CDG 462), the same is true of *varbāh* ‘myriads; name of a body of angels’ (LLA 287, CDG 36).

48. Hbr. *rrk* ‘to be soft’ (HALOT 1236), Syr. *rak* (LSyr. 730, SL 1469), Arb. *rrk* (Lane 1141) > PCS *rkk* ‘to be tender, soft, slender.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *rrk* ‘to be tender, soft’ is unknown. Cf. Jib. *rek* ‘to be poised to fall; to shake something till it is ready to fall,’ *rātāk* ‘to be moved, shaken loose; to be loose’ (JL 211), probably an Arabism.


⇒ The origin of PCS *rr-* ‘saliva’ (SED I No. 234) is unknown. Hardly any connection with Akk. *līru* ‘a mineral color’ (CAD L 147, AHw. 546).

50. Hbr. *rr* (HALOT 1285), Syr. *rr* (LSyr. 737, SL 1482), Arb. *rrld* (Lane 1095) > PCS *rr* ‘to smash.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *rr* ‘to smash’ is uncertain. Leslau (EDG 529) compares Muh. Msq. Gog. *artārrāštā*, Cha. Gyt. *arțānnāštā* ‘to be about to break (wood), to become very old.’

51. Hbr. *šl* ‘to prosper, to be good for’ (BDB 852), Syr. *šlaḫ* ‘bene cessit, crevit’ (LSyr. 629, SL 1287), Arb. *šl* ‘to be good’ (Lane 1714), Sab. *šl* ‘to give prosperity’ (SD 142) > PCS *šl* ‘to be well, to prosper.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šl* ‘to be well, to prosper’ is unknown, but note Mhr. *šeylōh* ‘fat’ (ML 363).575 Clearly borrowed from Arabic are Mhr. *hošlēh* ‘to arrange a truce’ (ML 363), Jib. *šelāh* ‘to be suitable, fine’ (JL 239).

52. Ugr. *šr* ‘to remain’ (DUL 797),576 Hbr. *šr* id. (HALOT 1375), Syr. *šārā* ‘decidua, residua’ (LSyr. 774, SL 1554),577 Arb. *šr* ‘to remain’ (Lane 1282), Sab. *šr* ‘rest, remainder; other’ (SD 121), Min. *šr* ‘reste; encore; autre’ (LM 80) > PCS *şr* ‘to remain.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *şr* ‘to remain’ is unclear. Tgr. *sāvar* ‘what remains, rest’


575 If it is genuinely MSA and not a peculiar semantic development from the verbal root *šl* borrowed from Arabic.

576 Not fully reliable: 1.18 iv 15 (*rīštir b qdtm* ‘He has stayed on in tents,’ cf. Pardee 1997:349: “The precise nuance of *rīštir*, normally ‘remain behind/after,’ is not clear”) and 4.290:3 (*kd rīštir bn krt* ‘A “jar” remains for delivery to the administration’ according to DUL 430).

577 For earlier Aramaic attestations v. HALOT 1989.
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(WTS 190) is likely borrowed from Arabic (Leslau 1990:153).

53. Ugr. šlw ‘to rest’ (DUL 821), Hbr. šlw ‘to have rest, to be at ease,’ šalwā ‘ease, rest’ (HALOT 1505), Syr. šle ‘quievit, desiit’ (LSyr. 778, SL 1563), Arb. šlw ‘to be forgetful; to be free from anxiety,’ salwat- ‘content, happiness, comfort’ (Lane 1417) > PCS *šlw ‘to have rest, to be at ease.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šlw ‘to have rest’ is uncertain.

Akk. šēlā ‘to be negligent, careless, inattentive,’ widely attested in NB (CAD Ș 274, AHw. 1211), is clearly borrowed from Aramaic (contra Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:53).

Mhr. sōli ‘to amuse, entertain,’ slū ‘to be happy’ (ML 350) and Jib. essōli ‘to amuse, entertain,’ ‘eslé ‘to amuse’ (JL 229) are almost certainly borrowed from Arabic in view of their specific meaning, highly prominent for sly throughout Modern Standard and dialectal Arabic (Wehr 426–427, Behnstedt 577).

54. Ugr. šr (DUL 842), Hbr. šōr (HALOT 1650), Syr. šerrā (LSyr. 802, SL 1599), Arb. surr- (Lane 1338) > PCS *šurr- ‘navel(-string)’ (SED I No. 254).

⇒ The origin of PCS *šurr- ‘navel(-string)’ is uncertain, its attribution to the hypothetical biconsonantal element *Sr(S) “clustering about the notion of strength and stability” (Faber 1984:213–215) is scarcely convincing, although an eventual connection with the verbal root *šrr ‘to be firm, hard,’ represented by Hbr. šarrūt ‘stubbornness’ (HALOT 1658) and Syr. šar ‘convaluit, firmatus est’ (LSyr. 802, SL 1611), cannot be ruled out. Possible MSA cognates discussed in SED I No. 254 are rather unreliable (cf. Chapter 8, p. 570 below).

55. Hbr. šwy (HALOT 1435), Syr. šwy (LSyr. 760, SL 1524), Arb. swy (Lane 1476) > PCS *šwy ‘to be equal.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šwy ‘to be equal’ is unknown.

Mhr. sōwi ‘to level,’ astūwi ‘to be level’ (ML 354) and Jib. essōi ‘to act justly,’ ššē ‘to be equal,’ siep ‘equal’ (JL 233) are almost certainly borrowed from Arabic, although Soq. se ‘être’ (LS 282) is more problematic because of the semantic difference (Leslau apparently assumes a genetic relationship to PCS *šwy).

Akk. sawū ‘desert, wasteland’ (CAD S 202, AHw. 1033) is clearly borrowed from CS (Streck 2000:115).

578 Hapax legomenon in 1.14 iii 45: ṭašlw b šp ṣnh ‘I will rest in the glance of her eyes.’

579 Attestations of the Ugaritic term are doubtful. The reading w ḫr w šr bh accepted in DUL 842 for 1.103+:58 (‘If it has intestines and a navel…’) is epigraphically unreliable (cf. Pardee 2000:546, 563). In 1.114:30, the difficult combination w ṭris ṣḥḥ w šrh has been interpreted in a variety of ways (for a survey of proposals v. Pardee 1988:71–72), which makes the translation ‘on (his) head, mouth, throat and navel’ (del Olmo Lete 2004:387) necessarily conjectural. Even more obscure is 1.10 iii 25 (yśl šrh w ṣḥḥ), rendered as ‘He sucked his navel’ in DUL 842.

580 Possibly related is Min. syyy ‘terrace d’une maison’ (LM 84), with a plausible semantic development from “to level.” Cf. also Qat. syy ‘to do, make’ (LIQ 159), with a meaning shift comparable to Arb. syy (II) ‘to make in a suitable manner’ (Lane 1476) and widely represented in modern Arabic dialects (such as Yemeni sawwa, Piamenta 238).
56. Ugr. šyr (DUL 798), Hbr. švôrâ (HALOT 1346), Syr. švârtâ (LSyr. 489, SL 1028), Arb. šawêr- (Lane 561), Sab. šôr (SD 131, Sima 2000:247–248) > CS *śvīr(V)r- ‘barley.’

⇒ PCS *śvīr(V)r- ‘barley’ likely goes back to a PS botanic term with a more general meaning “straw, grass,” represented by Gez. šôr ‘herb, grass, vegetation, straw’ (CDG 525, with related terms elsewhere in EthS), Mhr. šêr ‘straw’ (ML 370) and Jib. šâwr ‘dry grass, straw’ (JL 244). A derivation from PS *šawr- ‘hair,’ assumed as certain in Fronzaroli 1969:12–13 and elsewhere in Semitological studies, is difficult to prove, although a contamination with this widespread anatomical term cannot be excluded.  

The designations of “barley” in Tigre (šôrîr, WTS 226), Mehri (šôrîr, ML 391), Jibbali (šôrîr, JL 259) and Soqotri (šávrîr, LS 420) are clearly borrowed from Arabic.

57. Hbr. šyr (HALOT 1344), Arb. šyr (Lane 1559), Sab. šôr (SD 131), Min. šôr (LM 85) > PCS *šôr ‘to know.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šôr ‘to know’ is unknown.

58. Ugr. škr ‘to hire out’ (DUL 816), Hbr. škr ‘to hire’ (HALOT 1330), Arb. škr ‘to recompense, to reward one’s work’ (Lane 1584), Sab. škr ‘als Strafe auferlegt werden,’ šškr ‘Bußzahlung, Strafe’ (Stein 2010:731) > PCS *škr ‘to reward, to hire.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *škr ‘to reward, to hire’ is uncertain. Note that this root is conspicuously missing from Aramaic.

Gez. šâkur ‘hired,’ usually compared to Hbr. škr and Arb. škr, is hapax legomenon in Is 7:20 (malāqe šâkārt), which more or less exactly corresponds to tawar ha-ššākērā ‘hired razor’ in the Hebrew original. This highly marginal attestation is suspicious and makes one think of some kind of Hebrew influence on the translator.

Mhr. šêkâr ‘to give much milk after shortage’ (ML 378) and Jib. šëkêr ‘to have much milk’ (JL 251) must be borrowed from Arabic because of the highly specialized meaning also attested for Arb. škr (Lane 1584).

59. Hbr. šmlā (HALOT 1337), OffArm. šâ-am-lat (DNWSI 1162), Arb. šmlat-(Lane 1600) > PCS *šaml-at- ‘outer garment, cloak.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šaml-at- ‘outer garment’ is uncertain. It might be related to the verbal root *šml, represented by Arb. šml ‘to cover, to envelop’ (Lane 1599), but

---

581 At any rate, combining stârta ‘hair’ and stârta ‘barley’ into one entry in a synchronic lexicographic description (LSyr. 489, SD 1028) can hardly be justified.

582 Reliably attested in KTU 1.14 ii 44–45 (elahnt škr šskr ‘The widow hires out her services’ or ‘The widow hires a hireling’) and KTU 9.424:2 (šmn škrn ‘Oil for hirelings’). See further Bordreuil–Pardee 2001:354.

583 In view of their characteristic meaning, Plm. škr ‘to reward’ and škr ‘rewarding’ (DNWSI 1135) must be considered Arabic loanwords (Cantineau 1935:42, 150. Diem 1980b:76).

584 Several examples in the Uruk incantation seem to be the only attestations of this root in Aramaic (Diem 1974:246).
not attested anywhere else.\footnote*{585}

Mhr. šīmlāh ‘woolen garment’ (ML 395) is certainly borrowed from Arabic because of š.

60. Ugr. šnu ‘to hate, loathe,’ šnu ‘enemy’ (DUL 832),\footnote*{586} Hbr. šnu ‘to hate’ (HALOT 1338), Syr. snā ‘odit’ (LSyr. 483, SL 1023), Arb. šnu ‘to hate’ (Lane 1603), Sab. snu ‘personal enemy, ill-wisher’ (SD 133), Qat. snu ‘enemy’ (LIQ 169) > PCS *šnu ‘to hate.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šnu ‘to hate’ is uncertain. Akk. šannel ‘one who hates’ (CAD Š, 388) is so sparsely attested\footnote*{587} that one is tempted to follow W. von Soden (AHw. 1164) and R. Zadok (1993:331) who consider it a WS loanword (cf. Streck 2000:117). However, a cognate relationship may be surmised for Mhr. šāna ‘to be unkind, to humiliate,’ šatna ‘to look unwell, to have an ill-favored countenance, to be unpleasant to behold,’ šītina ‘to look unwell, to be ill-favored’ (ML 380–381).\footnote*{588}

61. Hbr. šrd ‘to run away, to escape,’ šārd ‘someone fleeing in battle’ (HALOT 1355-1356), Syr. srad ‘terroritus est’ (LSyr. 497), Arb. šrd ‘to take fright and flee, to run away at random’ (Lane 1531) > PCS *šrd ‘to flee away.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šrd ‘to flee away’ is unknown.

62. Hbr.ṭmā ‘to be ceremonially unclean’ (HALOT 375), Syr. ṭma ‘impurus’ (LSyr. 279, SL 535), Arb. ṭmā ‘to be unclean (a woman during menstruation)’ (TA 1 329),\footnote*{589} Sab. ṭmā ‘defilement,’ h-ṭmā ‘to defile, to make impure’ (SD 153) > *ṭmā ‘to be unclean.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ṭmā ‘to be unclean’ is unknown.

\footnote*{585} Tgr. šāmlā ‘to bend together’ (WTS 208) is probably borrowed from Arabic (Leslau 1990:175), but cf. Amh. šāmāللā ‘to roll up something flat which was spread out’ (AED 611).
\footnote*{586} Reliably attested in 1.4 iii 17 (tn ḏḥm šnw btl ‘Two kinds of sacrifices Btl hates’) and 1.4 vii 36 (rib btl ṭīḥd yrn šnw hd gpt yr ‘Btl’s enemies grasp hold of (the trees of) the forest, Hd’s adversaries (grasp hold of) the flanks of the mountain(s),’ translation from Pardee 1997:263).
\footnote*{587} Hapax legomenon in YOS 10, 31 i 23 (šarrum ʾša’-na-i-šu iptattālāh ‘The king will be constantly afraid of those who hate him’).
\footnote*{588} Johnstone does not separate these meanings from ‘(animal) to stand (against a tree) on the hindlegs.’ As shown by Jib. šāw (JL 253), the common MSA root with this meaning has *r in the prototype. However, the semantic shift “to stand against a tree” > “to be unkind,” apparently assumed by Johnstone, is far from evident and since the meaning “to be unkind” is not attested for šn in Jibbali, there is no obstacle for postulating two homonymous, but historically different verbs šāna in Mehri (< *šnā and < *šn). The former would be a good match for PCS *šnr ‘to hate’ which, in such a case, could no longer be considered an exclusive CS isogloss.
\footnote*{589} Apparently, very marginally attested ʾtamrat il-narratu ʾšāla ḏāfay ṣaw-ṭawmā ʾl-hayyit) and perhaps not genuine in Arabic.
63. Ugr. *tkl (DUL 903), Hbr. škl (HALOT 1491), JPA tkl (DJPA 581), Arb. *tkl (Lane 345) > PCS *tkl ‘to be bereft’ (SED I 76).
⇒ The origin of PCS *tkl ‘to be bereft’ is unclear. Akk. šakālu ‘sich auf fast nichts reduzieren,’ tentatively compared to this root in AHw. 1134 and 1589, almost certainly does not exist, cf. CAD Š 9, 12 (under šakālu D, N) and HALOT 1492.

64. Ugr. *tn (DUL 913), Hbr. šām, šammā (HALOT 1545), Old. Arm. šm (DNWSI 1159), BArm. tammā (HALOT 2007), Syr. tammān (LSyr. 827, SL 1653), Arb. *tamma (Lane 350) > PCS *tamma ‘there.’
⇒ The origin of PCS *tamma ‘there’ is uncertain. Contrary to a widespread opinion (AHw. 1272, HALOT 1546, DUL 913), neither Akk. šumma ‘if’ (AHw. 1272) nor Arb. tamma ‘then, afterwards’ (Lane 351) can be related to *tamma. Akk. šumma, analyzable as *šim-ma, is to be equated with WS conditional particles (Hbr. ḫim, Arb. ḫin, etc.), which display a well-known shift *ḏ > ḫ > ḫ in (semi-)grammatical morphemes (Voigt 1995). The origin of Arb. *tamma is less certain, but one is tempted to analyze it as *tin-ma, tracing it back to the numeral *tin-a ‘two’ with a plausible semantic shift: “afterwards” < “another time, again.”

65. Ugr. *tpṭ ‘to judge’ (DUL 926), Hbr. ḫṣṭ ‘to pass judgment’ (HALOT 1662), Sab. ḫṭ ‘legal decision’ (SD 150), Min. ḫṭ ‘décéter’ (LM 98), Qat. ḫṭ ‘to decide’ (LIQ 181) > *tpṭ ‘to pass judgment.’
⇒ It is hard to see how PCS *tpṭ ‘to pass judgment’ could be related to Gez. safata ‘to mislead, to deceive, to seduce’ and its cognates in Neo-Ethiopian (see references in CDG 489).

One is inclined to agree with M. Streck (2000:117–118) that Akk. šapātu ‘to issue orders, to exercise authority’ (CAD Št 450, AHw. 1172), šāpītu ‘district governor; judge’ (CAD Št 459, AHw. 1173) and šīpu ‘judgment, verdict’ (CAD Š 91, AHw. 1247) are borrowed from WS, even if the rather broad attestation of these terms in the core Babylonian area is unexpected.

Total absence of *tpṭ from Arabic and Aramaic is noteworthy.

590 Reliably attested in 1.100:61 (ṣ w *tkl bmt ‘She will be deprived of her offspring’) and 1.23:8–9 (bdl ḫṭ škl bdl ḫṭ rdhm ‘In his hand is the scepter of bereavement, in his hand is the scepter of widowhood’).
591 For the unexpected ḫ (or ḫ) instead of a in a geminated base ending in -m cf. ḫām (pl. ḫāmmām) ‘hot’ (BDB 328), ḫām (pl. ḫāmmām) ‘sea’ (BDB 410), tām (fem. tammā) ‘perfect’ (BDB 1070), as well as ṣāmīm (pl. ṣāmmām) ‘people’ (BDB 766).
592 For the early Akkadian orthographic evidence against ḫ in the prototype of šummā v. Frayne 1992:633.
593 Similar to some extent are Akk. šanīs ‘a second time, again,’ šanītam ‘another time, a second time, again’ (CAD Š, 386–387).
594 Cf. Edzard 1964:147. As far as we understand, Edzard believes that only šapātu and šīpu are borrowed from West Semitic, whereas šīpu is autochthonous.
66. Ugr. ԁⲰⲙ ‘to return’ (DUL 895), Hbr. 偲ⲱ (HALOT 1427), Syr. ⲧⲱⲧ ‘rediit’ (LSyr. 817), Arb. ԁⲰⲙ ‘to return’ (Lane 361), Sab. ԁⲰⲙ ‘zurückkehren’ (Stein 2010:733), Min. ԁⲰⲙ ‘réparation, récompense’ (LM 99), Qat. h-ⲧⲧ ‘to deliver, to turn over’ (LIQ 178) > PCS Ⲁⲧⲯⲙ ‘to return.’

⇒ PCS Ⲁⲧⲯⲙ ‘to return’ has been often compared with Akk. ؾⲥⲧu ‘to tremble, to sway’ (AHw. 1120, CAD Salir 18), but the underlying semantic connection is far from transparent. Even more uncertain is the relationship between Ⲁⲧⲯⲙ and Gez. ⲑⲧⲧa ‘when’ discussed in CDG 482.

Mhr. ԁⲰⲥⲧ ‘to requite’ (ML 419) and Jib. Ⲣⲧⲧ id. (JL 285) are evidently borrowed from Arabic.

The basic status of Ⲁⲧⲯⲙ as the main exponent of the meaning “to return” has been preserved in Canaanite, Aramaic and, probably, ESA, whereas in Arabic it was largely ousted by rⲧ and rⲧd.

67. Ugr. ⲛⲣ (DUL 324), Hbr. ⲙⲣ (HALOT 1016), Syr. ⲝⲣⲧa (LSyr. 272, SL 521), Sab. ⲛⲣ (SD 173) > PCS ⲍⲧⲣ- ‘mountain.’

⇒ It seems reasonable to follow P. Fronzaroli (1968:271, 287, 298), who reconstructs ⲍⲧⲣ- ‘mountain, rock’ as a geographically restricted secondary derivation from a more broadly attested PS root ⲇⲧⲧⲣ- ‘flint.’ Fronzaroli qualifies his reconstruction as nortoccidentale, but in view of the reliably attested Sabaic lexeme it is rather to be considered PCS.

The functional load of the reflexes of ⲍⲧⲣ- in individual CS languages is uneven. In Ugaritic and Aramaic, the corresponding terms are the basic exponents of the meaning “mountain” (cf. Chapter 5, p. 265 below), whereas Hbr. ⲙⲣ is a common but still rather marginal and predominantly poetic term (Fabry 2003:314). The functional status of Sab. ⲛⲣ cannot be established, which prevents one from treating ⲍⲧⲣ- as the PCS exponent of the basic meaning “mountain.” It is noteworthy that there is no trace of PCS ⲍⲧⲣ- in Arabic.

One is tempted to agree with M. Streck (2000:117) who considers ⲙⲣⲧu ‘cliff, rock’ in an OB Gilgamesh tablet from Tell Harmal a WS loanword, but a rare but authochnous Akkadian lexeme cannot be ruled out completely (reference courtesy R. Nurullin). If this is the case, the subgrouping value of this feature becomes considerably reduced.

68. Hbr. Ⲉⲧⲱ ‘to advise’ (HALOT 421), BArm. Ⲇⲧⲧ id. (ibid. 1891), Arb. ⲉⲧⲧ ‘to
advise, to admonish’ (Lane 2953), Sab. ѣṭ ‘demand, summons, call’ (SD 155) > PCS *wṭ ‘to advise.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *wṭ ‘to advise’ is unclear.

69. Ugr. msdt ‘foundations’ (DUL 581), Hbr. ysd ‘to found, establish,’ yasōד ‘foundation’ (HALOT 417), māsād ḫd. (ibid. 557), Syr. men ʔessāde ‘a capite’ (LSyr. 32), ‘pillow; at the head’ (SL 66), bessādyā ‘pulvinar’ (LSyr. 80, SL 163), sattā ‘vitus’ (LSyr. 502, SL 1051), Arb. wīsād- ‘pillow; a thing upon which one reclines or rests’ (Lane 2940), Sab. msād ‘base, plinth (of statue)’ (SD 420), Min. mwsād ‘base’ (R 2869:6) > PCS *wsd ‘to lay the foundations.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *wsd ‘to lay the foundations’ is uncertain. One is tempted to connect it with *viṣd- ‘backside, lower leg, base, foundation,’ but this comparison implies serious structural and phonological problems (cf. DRS 565, SED I No. 255).

One cannot exclude that Soq. sed (yasōd/lāṣd) ‘mettre sur le feu’ (LS 282), a regularly formed causative stem from *w-s-d, is derived from this root, although the underlying semantic shift appears to be rather peculiar.

70. Hbr. yāḥēd (HALOT 450), Arb. watid- (Lane 2917) > PCS *watid- ‘peg.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *watid- ‘peg’ is uncertain; its complete absence from Aramaic is noteworthy. Tgr. wāṭāḏ- ‘to fix into the ground, to erect’ (WTS 439) and related nominal forms (such as mātād ‘peg,’ ibid. 440) are usually thought to be borrowed from Arabic (DRS 650, Leslau 1990:152), which is far from obvious. If the Tigre lexemes are related to *watid- as cognates, the PCS status of this term becomes problematic. Note also Gez. wadda ‘to put into, to join together’ (CDG 604), which Leslau rather unconvincingly relates to PS *wdd ‘to love.’

71. Ugr. ḱmr (DUL 960), Hbr. yahmūr (HALOT 407), Syr. yaḥmūrā (LSyr. 241, SL 572), Arb. yaḥmūr- (Lane 642) > PCS *yaḥmūr- ‘kind of antelope’ (SED II No. 249).

⇒ The origin of PCS *yaḥmūr- ‘kind of antelope’ is uncertain, its hypothetic derivation from the verbal root *ḥmr ‘to be red’ (Gradwohl 1963:20) is a mere etymological guess.

5.3. PCS lexemes including probable Arabisms in MSA and EthS

600 Hapax legomenon in 1.4 i 40: dbbm d msdt wārṭ ‘The beasts’ from the foundations of the earth.’
601 The shift *-sd- [s] > *-šd- [sd] could probably be interpreted as de-affrication conditioned by the following dental (for such a process in Akkadian v. Streck 2006:224), but the initial ḫ is more difficult to explain. A possible relationship to *šīṭ-, *riṣṭ- with the same or similar meanings further obscures the picture.
602 Hapax legomenon in 1.6 i 28. The first sign is broken (yḥmrn), but the context favors this reconstruction (Ginsberg 1973:131–132) since donkeys (ḥmrn) are less likely to be slaughtered for a funeral banquet. Note, however, that D. Pardee preserves ‘asses’ in his recent translation (1997:268), with an extensive commentary.
603 The verbal root itself is only doubtfully attested outside Arabic (Bulakh 2005a:64–70).
As is well known, the vocabulary of the Modern South Arabian languages underwent a profound Arabic influence, sometimes affecting even the most fundamental semantic strata.\textsuperscript{604} It is equally certain that Arabic loanwords in MSA are notoriously difficult to detect: strictly formalized linguistic criteria allowing one to distinguish between inherited and borrowed lexemes are not many, and even less numerous are individual lexemes to which such criteria can be applied. The same is true of some of the modern Ethiopian Semitic languages, notably Tigre.

These circumstances are of no small importance for the purpose of the present investigation. Mere presence of an otherwise well established “Central Semitic” lexical feature also in Mehri or Tigre does not automatically mean that the proposed CS attribution is not correct and the root in question should be projected back to PWS. In many cases, it seems considerably more justified to continue treating such terms as specifically CS and to attribute their presence in EthS and/or MSA to Arabic influence.

A few examples of this kind have already been dealt with in the preceding section of this chapter — whenever the Arabic origin has been considered compelling in view of transparent phonological and/or semantic arguments. However, as just mentioned, the diagnostic potential of such criteria turns out to be very restricted.

In such a context, an automatic exclusion of scores of potentially reliable CS lexical isoglosses because of the formal presence of related terms in Tigre and/or MSA cannot be warranted. At the same time, it would be unfair to treat them on the same level as truly exclusive examples. A detailed presentation in a separate subsection has been considered a reasonable compromise between common sense and methodological strictness.

\textbf{1.} Ugr. \textit{ṛṭm} ‘to fall into debt’ (DUL 125),\textsuperscript{605} Hbr. \textit{šm} ‘to be guilty’ (HALOT 95), Arb. \textit{ṛṭm} ‘to fall into sin, to do what is unlawful,’ \textit{ṛṣm-}, \textit{raḥām-} ‘sin, crime, fault’ (Lane 21–22) > PCS \textit{sṭm} ‘to fall into debt, to be guilty.’

$\Rightarrow$ The origin of PCS \textit{sṭm} ‘to be guilty’ is uncertain.\textsuperscript{606} Note that the root is missing from Aramaic.

Jib. \textit{sṭm} ‘sin’ (JL 5) is almost certainly borrowed from Arb. \textit{ḥrw}.\textsuperscript{607} The same is likely true of Mhr. \textit{ṣawṭm} ‘to be kind to someone’ (ML 433), Jib. \textit{sṭtm} ‘to feel sorry; to feel guilty about an unfulfilled obligation’ (JL 294), correctly identified with this root in DRS 658.

\textbf{2.} Ugr. \textit{ṭdr} ‘to help,’ \textit{ḥfr} ‘help’ (DUL 153),\textsuperscript{607} Hbr. \textit{ṛzr} ‘to help’ (HALOT 810),\textsuperscript{608}...
The origin of PCS *ḏdr ‘to help’ is unknown. Note that the semantic gap between the meaning “to excuse” in Arabic and “to help” reconstructed for PCS is considerable.

Mhr. ḥāḏōr ‘to excuse’ (ML 13), Jib. ḥāḏōr id. (JL 7), Soq. māvdōr ‘permis, excusable’ (LS 300) are almost certainly borrowed from Arabic. Less transparent in this respect is Mhr. ṣūḏōr ‘to offer food’ (ML 13).

3. Hbr. ṭāgālā (HALOT 785), Syr. ῠḡaltā (LSyr. 510, SL 1068), Arb. ῠḡalat- (Lane 1965) > PCS *ḡgal- ‘wagon, cart.’

PCS *ḡgal- ‘wagon’ is likely connected with the verbal root *ḡgl to be circular, to roll: Hbr. ḡṭāl ‘round,’ ḡṭāl ‘earring’ (HALOT 784), JPA ḡl ‘to tie or wrap around, to roll around’ (DJPA 395), Arb. ḡl ‘to hasten’ (Lane 1963), Gez. ḡṭala ‘to make an enclosure, to surround with a wall, to fence in’ (CDG 59), Tgr. ḡṭgālā ‘to pile up (in a circle),’ ḡṭgul ‘round’ (WTS 487), perhaps Soq. ḡṭālyl ‘se rouler, se vautrer’ (LS 113, with metathesis).

Mhr. ṭāgālēl ‘wheel’ (ML 16) is almost certainly borrowed from Arabic.

4. Hbr. ṣāḥāb (HALOT 265), Syr. ḍabbā (LSyr. 142, SL 275), Arb. ḍḥāb- (Lane 983), Sab. Min. Qat. ḍḥb (SD 38, LM 29, LIQ 44) > PCS *ḏḥāb- ‘gold.’

The origin of PCS *ḏḥāb- ‘gold’ is uncertain. According to A. Sima, “die unterschiedlichen, einzelsprachlich ausgebildeten Bedeutungen von *ḏḥb ‘Gold; Regen, Überschwemmung; Oase, Regenstromgebiet’ ... lassen sich ohne Schwierigkeiten auf die Grundbedeutung ‘fließen’ zurückführen, die über ‘schmelzen’ auch zur Bildung von Metallbezeichnungen geführt hat” (2000:320), but this is rather hard to accept (Kogan–Korotaev 2003:110).

The root is also attested in MSA: Mhr. ḍḥēb (ML 80), Jib. ḍḥēb (Bittner 1994:83).

609 The verb ḍdr is translated as ‘to help’ in Biella 355, but the rendering of SD 13 is ‘to bring to account, exact reprisals on someone,’ with no apparent connection to the general meaning of the present root.

610 Also in Sabaic: ṣḥḏdr ‘to seek pardon’ (SD 13).

611 Cf. ṭāḏdr- ‘attainment, accomplishing of what one wants, success, victory’ (Lane 1985). Does this derived noun preserve a more archaic meaning “success” (< “help”), lost elsewhere in Arabic? For the semantic relationship between “help” and “victory, success” cf. Arb. ṭṣṣār- (Lane 2803).

612 For the Egyptian syllabic rendering of an early Canaanite form of this noun (†ṛgerštā) v. Hoch 1994:83.

613 The verb ḍḥb is also translated as ‘to help’ in Biella 355, but the rendering of SD 13 is ‘to bring to account, exact reprisals on someone,’ with no apparent connection to the general meaning of the present root.

614 Also in Sabaic: ṣḥḏdr ‘to seek pardon’ (SD 13).

615 Cf. ṭāḏdr- ‘attainment, accomplishing of what one wants, success, victory’ (Lane 1985). Does this derived noun preserve a more archaic meaning “success” (< “help”), lost elsewhere in Arabic? For the semantic relationship between “help” and “victory, success” cf. Arb. ṭṣṣār- (Lane 2803).

616 For the Egyptian syllabic rendering of an early Canaanite form of this noun (†ṛgerštā) v. Hoch 1994:83.

617 The verb ḍḥb is also translated as ‘to help’ in Biella 355, but the rendering of SD 13 is ‘to bring to account, exact reprisals on someone,’ with no apparent connection to the general meaning of the present root.
1917:24), Soq. dheb (LS 123). The Arabic origin of the MSA terms is likely.

PCS *dahab- ‘gold’ is completely missing from Ugaritic and Phoenician, where “gold” is designated by reflexes of *jurūs-/*jurūs- (DUL 406, DNWSI 407), also known from Akkadian and Hebrew (CAD ḫ 245, AHw. 358, HALOT 352). Shall we assume that *dahab- was lost in Hebrew and Phoenician,616 or rather that the spread of this isogloss did not reach these languages?

5. Hbr. gēbinā ‘cheese’ (DUL 173),617 Syr. gbettā (pl. gubne) (LSyr. 102, SL 203), Arb. ʿābun- (Lane 376) > PCS *gVbn-at- ‘cheese.’

⇒ PCS *gVbn-at- ‘cheese’ is likely connected with the root *gbn ‘to be curved, bowed, hunchback’ (SED I No. 67, cf. CDG 178).

Mhr. gōbn (ML 113) and Jib. gōbn (JL 70) are likely borrowed from Arabic.

Akk. (LB) gubnatu (CAD G 118, AHw. 295) is a transparent Aramaism (contra Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:33).618

According to Leslau (CDG 177, 1990:72), Gez. gōbnat, gʷōbnat is borrowed from Arb. ʿābun-, but this question requires further study in view of several potentially early attestations listed in LL 1168. The Arabic origin is certain for modern EthS forms like Tna. žḥānā (TED 2190, Leslau 1990:336).

6. Ugr. gadr (DUL 295),619 Hbr. gādēr (HALOT 181), JBA gādēnā ‘fence,’ gdr ‘to fence in’ (DJBA 261),620 Arb. ʿadr-, ʿidār-, ʿidārat- (Lane 389–390), Min. gdr (ML 86) > PCS *gVdVr- ‘fence, wall.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *gVdVr- ‘fence, wall’ is unknown.

The root is also attested in MSA and EthS: Tgr. gādar ‘in the surroundings of; at the side of,’ gudur ‘parois de hutte, mur de la maison’ (WTS 600), Tna. gidaro ‘a kind of enclosure made of sticks and thorns in which cattle spend the night while in the fields’ (TED 2363), Mhr. gīdār ‘wall, cairn, piled stones’ (ML 114), Jib. gēdār id. (JL 71). In both cases, Arabic loanwords are likely (explicitly recognized for the EthS forms in DRS 102 and Leslau 1990:152, but cf. Marrassini 1971:50–53).621

---

616 This is the opinion of the authors of DRS 328: “Remplacé en ak. oug. et phén. par un autre mot de rac. ḫRṣ.”

617 Hapax legomenon in Job 10:10: ḫā-lō(i) ḫā-ḥālāb tatūkēnī wa-kā-ɡgābēnā takpēnē ‘Did not you pour me out like milk, did not you curdle me like cheese?’


619 Hapax legomenon in a difficult context: k ṭasp ʾil b gadr ‘Like a divine viper in a hedge’ (1.19 i 13).

620 Since the root is sparsely attested in Aramaic, one may be inclined to consider the JBA forms to be Hebraisms.

621 Cha. Enm. Muh. gādār, Enm. End. Gyt. gāvaḍār, Sel. gātra ‘cattle pen inside the house’ (EDG 265) are thought to be borrowed from Cushitic by Leslau.
7. Ugr. gn 'garden, orchard' (DUL 302), Hbr. *gannā ‘garden’ (HALOT 198-199), Syr. *gannā ‘hortus’ (LSyr. 122), Arb. *gannat- ‘garden’ (Lane 463), Sab. *gnt (pl. *gntn) ‘garden, orchard,’ t-gn ‘to gather crop’ (SD 50), Min. gnt ‘jardin’ (LM 36), Qat. gnn ‘garden,’ gnn ‘to cultivate’ (LIQ 39) > PCS *gann-, *gann-at- ‘garden’.\textsuperscript{622}

\[ \Rightarrow \text{PCS } *gann-, *gann-at- ‘garden’ has been commonly derived from the verbal root *gnn ‘to enclose, to protect, to shelter’ (DRS 147–149): Akk. gannānu ‘to confine’ (CAD G 40, AHw. 280), Hbr. gnn ‘to enclose, to fence, to protect’ (HALOT 199), Syr. gnn (aph.) ‘texit’ (LSyr. 122), Arb. *gann ‘to veil, to conceal, to cover, to protect’ (Lane 462). Root variants with \*y or \*y cf. in Sab. gn ‘to surround with a wall,’ gn ‘wall of town’ (SD 50), Min. gn ‘entourer d’une enceinte’ (ML 36), Qat. gn ‘wall’ (LIQ 39), Mhr. gōna ‘sheltered’ (ML 122), Jib. egni ‘to protect from cold’ (JL 76).

According to a widespread opinion, Arb. *gannat- was borrowed from Aramaic (cf. Nöldeke 1910:42, CDG 199, with references). If correct, it to some extent undermines the PCS status of this term, but the validity of the borrowing hypothesis is rather hard to verify in this case (let alone the fact that comparable forms are attested also in ESA, where Aramaic loanwords are considerably less expected).

Gez. gannat ‘garden’ (CDG 199) is usually thought to be a loanword (“allem Anschein nach ein altes Lehnwort aus der nordöstlichen Kulturwelt,” Nöldeke 1910:42), but this is hard to prove conclusively: the examples collected in LLA 1176 make it clear that this lexeme is well attested in early Ethiopian literature, and the culturally determined meaning “Paradise” is far from ubiquitous. If the Geez word is autochthonous, the present lexeme cannot be considered a specific feature of PCS.\textsuperscript{623}

Note, furthermore, that a reflex of *gann- ‘garden’ is probably to be seen in Amh. gānnānā ‘to flourish, to grow well (plants, trees), to be abundant (vegetation)” (AED 2006).

Clearly borrowed from Arabic are Mhr. gmnēt ‘paradise’ (ML 121), Jib. gcēt id. (JL 76), Soq. ginneh id. (LS 112).

Akk. gannu, gannatu ‘Garten’ (AHw. 280, CAD G 41) is an Aramaism (Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:30).

8. Ugr. ḥbs ‘cinch, belt; waist’ (DUL 353), Hbr. ḥbs ‘to wind round, to wrap, to bind up’ (HALOT 289), Syr. ḥbas ‘cepit, captivum tenuit’ (LSyr. 213), Arb. ḥbs ‘to shut in, to imprison’ (Lane 500) > PCS *ḥbs ‘to tie, to band’.\textsuperscript{624}

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Comparable EthS lexemes are clearly borrowed from Arabic (Leslau 1990:341): Gez. ḥbs ‘prison’ (CDG 225, MLA 103), Tgr. ḥbbāsā ‘to take prisoner’ (WTS}\]

\textsuperscript{622} On Ugr. gt (DUL 310) and Hbr. gat (HALOT 206) as probably representing this root see Chapter 5 (pp. 287-288). The verbal root *gny ‘to collect fruit,’ attested in Arb. *gn ‘to gather, to pluck the fruit’ (Lane 472) and Sab. gny ‘garden crop,’ ‘gnu ‘cultivated garden area’ (SD 50), is likely related to *gann-, *gann-at-.

\textsuperscript{623} Let us observe that the relatively broad presence of the reflexes of this lexeme in ESA obviates the necessity of postulating a “Northern” borrowing in Ethiopian, as assumed by Nöldeke (and Leslau, who explicitly qualifies gannat as an Aramaism).

\textsuperscript{624} I. Arkhipov kindly reminds us of ḥabāsum, probably designating a belt or a part thereof in OB Mari (extensively discussed in Arkhipov 2012:108–109). If interpreted in this way, this lexeme is to be considered the earliest witness of this PWS root.
The same is almost certainly correct of Mhr. ẖabūs ‘to imprison’ (ML 165), Jib. ẖās id. (JL 102), Soq. ḥēbos ‘emprisonner’ (LS 160).

Akk. abšānu ‘rope (as part of the yoke)’ (CAD A 165, AHw. 7), compared to this root in LSyr. 213 and elsewhere, is borrowed from Sum. ab-sag ‘top strap (as part of the yoke)’ (PSD A 2171). As for abšu ‘a strap or band,’ hapax legomenon in a late lexical list, it is more likely to be a WS (loan)word, particularly in view of a, which is unlikely to correspond to *ẖa in an autochthonous Akkadian word.

9. Ugr. ẖmd ‘to desire,’ mhmd ‘desirable, precious object’ (DUL 363), Hbr. ẖmd ‘to desire, to take pleasure in,’ hāmād ‘loveliness, beauty,’ hāmdā ‘desirable, precious things’ (HALOT 325), JPA ẖmd ‘to desire, covet’ (DJP 204), Arb. ẖmd ‘to praise’ (Lane 639), Sab. ẖmd ‘to praise, to thank’ (SD 68) > PCS *ẖmd ‘to be pleasant, desirable.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ẖmd ‘to be pleasant, desirable’ is unknown. Note that the semantic diversity within CS is considerable (the meaning “to praise,” characteristic of Arabic and Sabaic, is presumably declarative with respect to the more original “to be desirable” = “to be praiseworthy”).

Almost certainly borrowed from Arabic are Tgr. ẖammādā ‘to praise, to thank’ (WTS 63, Leslau 1990:154), Mhr. ẖomūd ‘to thank, to praise’ (ML 180), hōd ‘to thank’ (JL 111), Soq. ḥemōd ‘aimer’ (LS 179).

10. Hbr. ḥpš ‘to take pleasure in, to desire; to be willing, to feel inclined,’ ḥēps ‘joy, delight; wish; matter, business’ (HALOT 339–340), Syr. ḥpt ‘alicui operam navavit, studuit,’ ḥepša ‘adhortatio, admonitio, sollicitudo’ (LSyr. 249–250, SL 480 and 429), Arb. ḥfd ‘to keep, to preserve, to take care of,’ ḥif‘- ‘care, attention’ (Lane 602, LA 7 498), Min. ḥ-t-f ‘garder’ (ML 48) > PCS *ḥpt ‘to be attentive, to care,’ *ḥiṭ– ‘attention.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ḥpt ‘to be attentive, to care’ is unknown.

Mhr. ḥafūd ‘to keep safe, to preserve, to look after’ (ML 168) and Jib. ḥfḍ id. (JL 104) are probably borrowed from Arabic.

11. Hbr. yāḥēp (HALOT 407), Syr. ḥepayay, nhp (LSyr. 249, 423, SL 481, 908), Arb. ḥpy (Lane 604) > PCS *ḥp ‘to walk barefoot.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ḥp ‘to walk barefoot’ is unknown.

Mhr. ḥāyfi ‘to be without sandals and unable to walk’ (ML 170) is likely borrowed from Arabic.

12. Hbr. ḥōr (HALOT 348), Syr. ḥev(?)rā (LSyr. 252, SL 402), Arb. ḥurr– (Lane

---

625 For an early Canaanite parallel v. EA 138:126–129: u [i]a-?u ḫa-mu-du ša šapir iššu šarri bēlī lā nadin jāši ‘Something beautiful (gloss: precious) that was sent from the king, my lord, was not given to me.’

The origin of PCS *hurr- ‘free ones’ is uncertain. Its relationship to Gez. ḥarā is a complex issue which deserves further investigation. The meaning of the Geez term is “army, troops,” and its nisbah-derivate ḥarāwī, too, is usually connected with the military sphere (‘soldier, captain,’ CDG 240). However, in one late attestation quoted in LLA 85–86 ḥarāwī denotes a freeborn person (as opposed to a slave). The same meaning is prominent in modern EthS: Tgr. ḥara ‘freedom, free’ (WTS 65), Tna. ḥara ‘liberty, freedom; free,’ ḥarmnāt ‘liberty’ (TED 182), Amh. ara ‘person of good breeding,’ armnāt ‘state or condition of being free’ (AED 1140), Sod. Sel. armnāt ‘freedom’ (EDG 89). Leslau (CDG 241) is probably correct to suspect that the meanings “army” and “freeborn, noble” are probably unconnected (note, moreover, the formal difference between Gez. ḥarā and PCS *hurr-). It lies at hand to suppose that the meaning “free” in Geez is due to a late Arabic infiltration.

Further connections of PCS *ḥarb- ‘sword’ are rather uncertain.

Mhr. ḥərab ‘to be at odds with someone’ (ML 185), Jib. ḥərb ‘to fight’ (JL 114), Tgr. taharaba ‘to fight’ (WTS 68) and Har. ḥarbī (EDH 85) are almost certainly borrowed from Arabic. The same is true of Jib. ḥarbēt ‘arrow, bayonet’ (JL 114). More problematic is the situation in Amharic and Gurage, where the meaning of (ḥ)arb is not only “war,” but also “spear” (AED 1149, EDG 727), unattested in Arabic.

PCS *ḥarb- has been often identified with Akk. ḥarbu ‘a special kind of plow’ (CAD ง 97, AHw. 325), which implies a phonological irregularity (Tropper 1995b:64) and a somewhat peculiar semantic development.

Note that the formal/semantic correspondence between Hebrew/Aramaic and Arabic is not exact: Arb. ḥarb- does not preserve the presumably original meaning “sword,” whereas ḥarbät- designates a different kind of weapon and displays the feminine ending not attested elsewhere.

---

627 The Geez form is often quoted with a geminated r, but this is not accepted by Leslau.
628 “I wonder whether the Ethiopic root for ‘free, freedom’ is not borrowed from Ar. hurr ‘free’ and is not to be connected with G. hara ‘army’” (EDG 89). Clearly borrowed from Arabic are Tgr. ḥr ‘free’ (WTS 65), Tna. ḥarrārā ‘to liberate’ (TED 187), Amh. hurr ‘free’ (AED 9), Sel. hurr bālā, Wol. hurr balā (EDG 328), see Leslau 1990:343.
629 As pointed out to us by M. Bulakh, the polysemy of “spear”/“war” is characteristic of EthS (Amh. ṭor, AED 2113 or Tna. k‘mat, TED 1649) and may well have been secondarily introduced into a borrowed lexeme.
630 But note the meaning “ploughshare” in Syriac. Or shall we rather ascribe it to Akkadian influence?
14. Ugr. ẖmr (DUL 395),  Hbr. ḥāmār (HALOT 330), Syr. ḫamrā (LSyr. 241, SL 467), Arb. ḫmr- (Lane 808) > PCS *ḥamr- ‘wine’.  
⇒ PCS *ḥamr- ‘wine’ is likely related to the verbal root *ḥmr ‘to foam, to ferment,’ attested, outside CS, also in Tigr and MSA: Hbr. ḫmr ‘to foam’ (HALOT 330), CPA ḫmr ‘fermentatus est’ (Schulthess 66), Arb. ḫmr ‘to make dough ferment’ (Lane 808), Tgr. ḫmrā ‘to ferment, to turn sour’ (WTS 60), Mhr. ḥāmār ‘to be dirty and smell bad’ (ML 444), Jib. ḫāmār ‘to go rotten, to ferment; to be dirty and smell bad’ (JL 302), Soq. ḫāmār ‘saleté, lie’ (LS 181).

The functional status of the reflexes of this PCS term in individual CS languages is uneven, from clearly marginal in Ugaritic and Canaanite to basic in Aramaic and Arabic (see further Chapter 6, pp. 309-310 below).

Mhr. ḫāmār ‘wine’ (ML 444) and Jib. ḫār id. (JL 302) are likely borrowed from Arabic. The Arabic origin is certain for the EthS terms listed in Leslau 1990:344.

15. Hbr. ḫūt (HALOT 296), Syr. ḫūṭā (LSyr. 220, SL 423), Arb. ḫayt- (Lane 831) > PCS *ḥawt-, *ḥayt- ‘thread.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ḥawt-, *ḥayt- ‘thread’ is unknown.

The root is also attested in MSA: Mhr. ḫāyət ‘string; thread, bowstring’ (ML 458), Jib. ḫayət ‘to sew, to stitch,’ ḫītət ‘thin, fine thread made of fibre’ (JL 312), Soq. ḫeyət ‘coudre’ (LS 172). Borrowing from Arabic is likely.

16. Ugr. ḫn (DUL 433), Hbr. kōhēn (HALOT 461), Syr. kāhnā (LSyr. 319, SL 601), Arb. kāhin- (WKAS K 417) > PCS *kāhin- ‘priest, wizard.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *kāhin- ‘priest, wizard’ is unknown. In MSA, note Mhr. kūtān ‘to pretend to something in order to attain one’s object,’ kōhān ‘cunning’ (ML 206) and Jib. kūthān ‘to be cunning, to pretend to get what one wants’ (JL 129), perhaps autochthonous as no corresponding meanings seem to be attested in (Classical) Arabic.

Gez. kōhan ‘priest, clergyman’ (CDG 278) is likely borrowed from Aramaic (Nöldeke 1910:36–37). According to Nöldeke, the same is true of Arb. kāhin-., but this is considerably less likely in view of the specific meaning of the Arabic term (“seer, soothsayer, magician, wizard, priest”), which Nöldeke considered to be late and secondary (see further Fischer 1908–1934:669 and Jeffery 1938:247–248).

631 In 1.3 i 15–17 (ʿalp kūd yēl b ḫmr rāb yusr b mskh ‘He took one thousand jars of wine, ten thousands he blends into his mixture’) and 1.23:6 (ḥmr b ḫmr w ḫmr w ḫmr w ḫmr w ‘Eat from every meal, and drink from every sparkling’ wine’).

632 Hapax legomenon in Dt 32:14 (wa-dam yēnāt tātā hāmār ‘You will drink the blood of the grapes, fermented’). See further Sir 34:30 (marḥ ḫmr l-ḵṣāl maḵš ‘Abundance of wine is a trap for the stupid’) and cf. Sir 37:27. The Sirah attestations are probably to be explained by Aramaic influence.


634 The Tigre and MSA verbs themselves can admittedly be borrowed from Arabic as well.

635 Shall one tentatively compare Gez. kīn ‘art, craft, skill, trick, fashion’ (CDG 286)?

⇒ Ever since Nöldeke 1905:419, the meaning “to write” of *ktb* has been derived from “to sting, to carve,” attested in Syr. *maktbā* ‘subula’ (LSyr. 352, SL 762), Arb. *ktb* ‘to sew together’ (WKAS K 38), Tgr. *katābā* ‘to vaccinate’ (WTS 414), Tna. *katābā* id. (TED 1642), Amh. *kättābā* ‘to inoculate, to vaccinate; to cut, to scrape, to pick or scratch’ (AED 1430).

Mhr. *katūb* ‘to write’ (ML 217), Jib. *ktb* id. (JL 137), Soq. *ktob* ‘écrire’ (LS 226) are likely borrowed from Arabic. The same is true of Gez. *kätäb* ‘writing, message, letter, book’ (CDG 297) and related nominal and verbal forms in modern EthS (Leslau 1990:347). The Arabic verb itself has often been thought to be borrowed from Aramaic (Jeffery 1938:248–249).


⇒ The origin of PCS *kr̩* ‘to call’ is uncertain. Akk. *kerû* ‘to invite’ (CAD Q 242, AHw. 918), often compared to this root, may rather belong to the (nearly) homonymous **kr̩*, *kr̩* ‘to meet’ (v. the next entry in this section).

Tgr. *kāra* ‘to read prayers, to recite’ (WTS 243) and related forms elsewhere in modern EthS are clearly borrowed from Arabic (Leslau 1990:357). The same is likely the case of Mhr. *kārū* ‘to read’ (ML 237).


⇒ PCS *k∀ry-at-* ‘town, village’ is probably derived from the verbal root *kry* (with variants *kry, *kr̩* ) ‘to meet, to gather,’ reliably attested only within CS: Ugr. *kry* ‘to meet, encounter, go to meet’ (DUL 714), Hbr. *kr̩, kry* ‘to meet’ (HALOT 1131, 1137), Syr. *kr̩* ‘obviam venit, invasit; causa factum est, accidit’ (LSyr. 691, SL 1407), Arb. *qr̩* ‘to collect, to put together,’ (IV) ‘to approach, draw near’ (Lane 2502), *qr̩* ‘to collect’ (LS 15 206), probably Sab. *krw* ‘channel opening into a basin’ (SD 107), Qat. *krw* ‘water reservoir’ (LIQ 149). Further etymological connections of this root are more

---

636 *Hapax legomenon* in 2.19:8–9: nḥmd mlk ngrt ktb spr hmd ‘Niqmaddu, the king of Ugarit, wrote this document.’

637 In such a context, comparison between *ktb* and Akk. *takāpu* ‘to pierce, to puncture, to stitch’ (CAD T 68, AHw. 1305), suggested to us by M. Krebernik in personal communication, turns out particularly illuminating. On the one hand, the meaning of the Akkadian verb fits amazingly well the “marginal” meanings of *ktb* in West Semitic. On the other hand, the combination *tkip santakki* is well attested with the meaning “cuneiform sign; cuneiform writing” (CAD T 404, cf. CAD S 150).

638 Sab. *kr* ‘town outside South Arabian culture area’ (SD 107) probably does not belong to the genuine Sabaic vocabulary. For a different etymological explanation of the only relevant attestation (Ja 574:4) v. Jamme 1962:61.

639 “The accepted basic meaning is ‘meeting point, place of meeting’” (HALOT 1142).

640 From ‘to collect, to congregate (waters)?'
problematic. Ugr. kry ‘to present, to offer’ (DUL 714), Min. krw ‘offrir,’ krw ‘offrande’ (LM 73) and Gez. ṣakārāya ‘to offer a sacrifice, to consecrate’ (CDG 445) could be related to *kry, implying a meaning shift from “to bring near, to approach” (for a similar semantic evolution cf. Ugr. kreb and its cognates in DUL 708–709). Leslau does not explicitly identify these terms with the present root, preferring to connect them with Arb. qry ‘to entertain a guest’ (Lane 2988) and Akk. kerū ‘to invite’ (CAD Q 242, AHw. 918), kerītu ‘banquet, festival’ (CAD Q 240, AHw. 917).641 However, the meaning “to invite, to organize a feast” can probably also be derived from “to meet (a guest).”642 Note, finally, Sab. krw (in yṯtrn) ‘to be punished’ (SD 107), Qat. krw ‘to accuse, prosecute’ (LIQ 148), perhaps from the original meaning “to try to meet” (cf. Arb. qrw (I, VIII) ‘to follow, to persecute,’ LA 15 201).

Jib. šērēt ‘town, collection of houses’ (JL 150) and Soq. kēryeh ‘ville’ (LS 385)643 are likely borrowed from Arabic.

Contra LSyr. 695, PCS *kVry-at- ‘town’ is hardly related to Akk. karītu ‘storeroom, granary’ (CAD Q 132, AHw. 903), which both AHw. 903 and HALOT 1091 connect instead with Hbr. kōrā ‘beam.’

20. Hbr. mnw (HALOT 602), JPA mnw (DJPA 318), Arb. mnw (Lane 3024), Sab. mnw (SD 86), Min. mnw (ML 61) > PCS *mnw ‘to hold back, to prevent.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *mnw ‘to hold back’ is unknown.

Tgr. mānāwa ‘to withhold, to refuse’ (WTS 129, Leslau 1990:182), Mhr. mūna ‘to catch, to get, to take’ (ML 267) and Jib. mīnas ‘to hold, to take hold of’ (JL 172) are likely borrowed from Arabic.

21. Ugr. mnh ‘to deliver,’ mnh ‘delivery’ (DUL 562), Hbr. minḥā ‘gift, present’ (HALOT 601), Arb. mnh ‘to lend, to give, to give a gift,’ minḥat- ‘a loan, a gift’ (Lane 2737) > PCS *mnḥ ‘to give, to grant,’ *minḥ-at- ‘grant.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *mnḥ ‘to give, to grant’ is unknown. Note that the root is poorly attested in Aramaic: OffArm. mnhh (DNWSI 659) and JPA minḥā (DJPA 317) are probably Hebraisms.

Tgr. mānwaḥa ‘to let a cow (as a loan) in usufruct, to give a cow as a present’ (WTS 127, Leslau 1990:176) and Soq. mnḥ ‘offrir, donner’ (LS 246) are likely borrowed from Arabic.

22. Hbr. navel (HALOT 705), Syr. naslā (LSyr. 435, SL 928), Arb. navl- (Lane 3035) > PCS *navl- ‘shoe, sandal.’

⇒ PCS *navl- ‘shoe’ could be plausibly connected with *nvl ‘to lock, to secure,’

641 In von Soden’s view, the WS parallel to this Akkadian verb is *kry ‘to call.’
642 Cf. Jib. kērē ‘to kiss, to visit, to greet’ (JL 150).
643 Translated as ‘palm grove’ in JL 150.
644 It is uncertain whether this term is attested in Ugaritic. In 1.4 i 36, nvl appears among specifications of furniture, which makes rather unlikely its interpretation as ‘sandal(s)’ (v. Pardee 1997:256). The contexts of nvl(m) in 1.107:2, 21 are too broken for a coherent interpretation.
but this verbal root is too sparsely attested: Hbr. nɪ́l ‘to secure, to bolt’ (HALOT 705), manwāl, minwāl ‘bar, bolt’ (ibid. 602).

Also in MSA: Mhr. nərə́l ‘sandals’ (ML 278), Soq. naːr̥al ‘chaussure’ (LS 269). It is not impossible that the MSA terms are borrowed from Arabic (note that the Mehri form is explicitly qualified as an Arabism by Johnstone).

Ever since LLA 676, Gez. nərult ‘widow whom the late husband’s brother marries by levirate’ has been compared to PCS *nəral- ‘shoe,’ but this is rather far-fetched (cf. CDG 382).

One cannot exclude that *nəral- represents a PCS replacement of a more ancient common designation of “shoe” *ṣārn-, preserved in Akk. šēnu (earlier šānu) (CAD Š2 289, AHw. 1213), Syr. nsā(ʔ)nā (LSyr. 454, SL 786), Gez. šōn (CDG 524, also in the rest of EthS).

23. Ugr. ṉhɛ́l ‘heir,’ ṉhlt ‘property, inheritance’ (DUL 627–628), Hbr. nḥl ‘to maintain as a possession,’ naẖālā ‘inalienable, hereditary property’ (HALOT 686–687), Arb. nḥl ‘to give,’ nɪḥlāt- ‘a grant’ (LA 11 775), Sab. nḥl ‘to grant lease,’ nḥlt ‘grant, lease, concession, bail’ (SD 95), Min. nḥl ‘louer à bail, concéder une propriété,’ nḥl ‘concession, bail, bien affermé’ (LM 67), Qat. nḥl ‘to grant lease, to give a part of, to share, to distribute’ (LIQ 103) > PCS *nḥl ‘to inherit, to possess,’ *nɪḥl-at- ‘inheritance.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *nḥl ‘to inherit, to possess’ is unknown. Note that the root seems to be missing from Aramaic.

Likely borrowed from Arabic are Mhr. nə̃hāl ‘to give one’s son his portion of one’s livestock’ (ML 291), Jib. nahāl id. (JL 186).

24. Hbr. ṉkm (HALOT 721), OArm. ṉkm (DNWSI 758), Arb. ṉqm (Lane 3037), Sab. ṉkm (SD 97) > PCS *ṉkm ‘to take revenge.’

⇒ PCS *ṉkm ‘to take revenge’ is clearly related to Gez. ƙim ‘revenge,’ taḥayyama ‘to take vengeance’ (CDG 456, also in modern EthS). Shall we agree with Nöldeke (1910:180) in assuming that ṉ- in the CS forms represents a fossilized reflexive marker?

Soq. ṉkm ‘venger’ (LS 274) is likely borrowed from Arabic.

25. Hbr. ṉḵy (HALOT 720), JPA ṉḵy (DJPA 360), Arb. ṉq̱y (Lane 3037) > PCS *ṉḵy ‘to be clean.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ṉḵy ‘to be clean’ is uncertain. Hardly any connection with Akk. naḥu ‘to pour out as a libation’ (CAD N1 336, AHw. 744).

Mhr. ṉy̱ki ‘to be pure, clean, cleansed’ (ML 298), Jib. nīki ‘to be pure; to be found innocent’ (JL 191), Soq. nīki ‘être propre’ (LS 273) are probably borrowed from

645 The earliest attestations of this root come from OB Mari: nahalu ‘to hand over (property)’ (CAD N1 126), nihluatu ‘property handed over’ (CAD N2 219), see further Streck 2000:106, 108.

26. Ugr. ȵšb ‘to erect, to fix’ (DUL 646), Hbr. ȵšb (nip.) ‘to place on oneself;’ (hip.) ‘to place, to set up’ (HALOT 715), ӌš (hitpa.) ‘to take one’s stand’ (HALOT 427), Syr. ȵsab ‘plantavit’ (LSyr. 442, SL 938), Arb. ȵšb ‘to set up, to set upright’ (Lane 2799), ӌš ‘to be fixed, settled, firm’ (ibid. 2944), Sab. ȵšb ‘to set up, to place (a monument)’ (SD 99) > PCS *ȵšb (*ӌš) ‘to stand/set upright.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *ȵšb (*ӌš) ‘to stand/set upright’ is uncertain.

Also in MSA: Mhr. ȵáwb ‘to set up, to put up, to erect’ (ML 300), Jib. ȵb ‘to put’ (JL 192), Soq. ȵساب ‘dresser’ (LS 272). Arabisms in MSA are not unlikely, but difficult to prove. 647

27. Hbr. ȵšm (HALOT 730), Syr. ȵšm (LSyr. 451, SL 953), Arb. nsm (Lane 3032) > PCS *ȵšm ‘to breathe’ (SED I No. 50). 648

⇒ The origin of PCS *ȵšm ‘to breathe’ is uncertain, but, as surmised already in LSyr. 451 and HALOT 730, this root cannot be separated from PS *ȵšb and *ȵšp, perhaps also *ȵpš with comparable meanings (cf. SED I Nos. 47v, 49v, 51v). 649

Also in MSA: Mhr. hŋsām ‘to breathe’ (ML 300), Jib. ntsím (JL 192). The MSA forms are likely borrowed from Arabic (note s instead of h or š), but this is not absolutely certain. 650

28. Hbr. rgm (HALOT 1187), Syr. rgm (LSyr. 712, SL 1435), Arb. rğm (Lane 1047) > PCS *rgm ‘to stone.’

⇒ As argued in CDG 465, the meaning “to stone” for *rgm in PCS represents an extension of the more original “to speak (emphatically), to curse,” 651 represented by Akk. ragāmu ‘to call; to prophesy; to summon; to lodge a claim, to sue’ (CAD R 62, AHw. 941), Ugr. rgm ‘to say, to tell, to announce’ (DUL 732), Arb. rğm ‘to revile, to utter evil speech,’ (III) ‘to plead in defense of someone’ (Lane 1047–1048), Gez. ragama ‘to curse, to insult’ (CDG 465), Jib. šērēgōm ‘to blame one another with harsh words’ (JL 207). Within this approach, Soq. ṭīgēm ‘être lapidé’ (LS 394) can be plausibly explained as an Arabism.

The diachronic background of *rgm in MSA remains problematic. Throughout MSA, the basic meaning of this root is “to cover, to protect”: Mhr. ragūm ‘to cover (usually food to keep the flies off it)’ (ML 318), Jib. ergūm ‘to cover, to put a lid on’ (JL

647 For possible attestations of this root in MSA v. Morris 2012:485 (t-stem of *ӌš ‘to be straight’).
648 Note also the PCS derived substantive *ȵšm-at- ‘spirit, soul’: Hbr. ȵšāmā (HALOT 730), Syr. ȵšatā (LSyr. 451, SL 954), Arb. nasamat- (Lane 3032).
649 Perhaps via assimilation *p > m or *b > m under the influence of n.
650 Of considerable interest is Soq. nišīme ‘vertebral column’ (the spelling with the emphatic š in Simeone-Senelle-Lonnet 1991:1467, which would point to *h, has been rejected as incorrect by our informants). If originally designated the neck vertebrae or the throat, it could easily be derived from a verbal root meaning “to breathe,” cf. Akk. ṅapištu (CAD N, 296).
651 “In view of the various meanings within Semitic, the development seems to be: ‘speak, say’ > ‘speak against, bring legal action against’ > ‘abuse, curse’ > ‘cast stones.’”
207), Soq. régom ‘couvrir, protéger’ (LS 394). As such, this meaning can hardly have anything to do with stoning, and it seems wise, therefore, to keep apart Soq. rigem ‘to be stoned’ and régom ‘to cover, to protect’ as different (homonymous) roots, as actually done by Leslau in LS 394. At the same time, it is noteworthy that one of the prominent applications of rgm in Jibbali is connected with covering a dead body with stones: erógam ‘to cover (a dead body, with stones and soil),’ rýgım ‘(corpse) to be buried,’ šergim ‘to be covered, buried alive (as, e.g., a witch),’ rnginx ‘stoned, covered by stones; covered by stones and soil (in the grave)’ (JL 207). The same semantic nuance is attested in Arabic: raşğam- ‘stones that are placed upon a grave,’ rỳjm (II) ‘to place a stone on one’s grave’ (Lane 1048). These facts may prompt one to abandon the traditional semantic explanation outlined in the preceding paragraph, disconnecting the meaning “to stone” from “to blame, to curse” and deriving it instead from “to cover (with stones).”

It is more likely, however, that the meaning “to cover with stones” in Arabic represents a secondary development from “to stone (as punishment),” which, in its turn, influenced Jib. rgm ‘to cover,’ originally unconnected to the present root.

29. Ugr. rm (DUL 742), Hbr. rnn (HALOT 1248), Arb. rnn (Lane 1164) > PCS *rnn 'to shout.'

⇒ PCS *rnn ‘to shout’ is likely onomatopoetic. Akk. irnittu ‘outbreak of divine anger against a specific enemy, terminating with a cry of triumph over his annihilation; triumph, victory’ (CAD I 178, AHw. 242) has often been connected with PCS *rnn (HALOT 1247–1248, AHw. 242), but this equation is far from certain either formally or semantically. Note that attestations of this root in Aramaic are rather marginal: JPA rnn ‘to murmur’ (DJPA 527), JBA rnn ‘to complain, gossip’ (DJBA 1089).

Mhr. rm ‘to reverberate, to ring’ (ML 327) and Jib. rin id. (JL 214) are likely borrowed from Arabic.

30. Ugr. gd ‘to hunt’ (DUL 778), Hbr. şwd ‘to hunt’ (HALOT 1010), sayid ‘game’ (ibid. 1020), Syr. şánd ‘venatus, piscatus est’ (LSyr. 623), şayidā ‘venatus, piscatus’ (ibid. 626), Arb. sd ‘to hunt, to fish’ (Lane 1752), Sab. gd ‘to hunt’ (SD 146), Qat. gd ‘to hunt’ (LIQ 135) > PCS *sd ‘to hunt.’

⇒ One can hypothesize that the original meaning of PS *şwd was “to go to and fro,” as in Akk. šadu ‘to prowl, to make one’s rounds, to turn about’ (CAD § 57, AHw. 1073). It is still attested in Ugaritic (‘to scour, to comb, to traverse,’ DUL 778), but already in PCS a semantic shift from “to prowl” to “to hunt” took place. In such a context, şayyādu ‘hunter’ in a few literary texts of the first millennium (CAD § 66, AHw.

As actually done in HALOT 1187: “The basic meaning develops from ‘to heap up stones’ > ‘to stone’ > ‘to curse’ > ‘to make a statement’” (cf. already Nöeldeke 1910:47: “Im Gész hat die Grundbedeutung ‘steinigen’ durchaus die übertragene Bedeutung ‘verfluchten’ angenommen ... Das Verb ist ein Denominativ von einem Worte das ‘Stein’ bedeutet”). This reconstruction, presupposing a diametrical reversal of Leslau’s semantic hypothesis mentioned above, appears highly improbable, especially in its latter step (“to curse” > “to make a statement”).

Hapax legomenon in a fragmentary context (rm ŋrn kl ‘I will raise my voice,’ 1.82:6).

“The relationship to the Hebrew correspondence remains obscure” (CAD I 179).
One cannot exclude that this root is preserved in the common MSA designation of “fish”: Mhr. ɾayd (ML 369), Jib. ɾod (JL 243), Soq. ɾode (LS 349). However, in view of the broad presence of ɾayd ‘fish’ in the Arabic dialects of Southern Arabia it is more likely that we are faced with a relatively early Arabism in MSA (v. Chapter 8, p. 529). Clearly borrowed from Arabic are Mhr. ɾasd ‘to fish’ (ML 369), Jib. ɾased id. (JL 243).

31. Ugr. Šby (DUL 807),655 Hbr. Šby (HALOT 1382), Syr. Šbh (LSyr. 750, SL 1502), Arb. Šby (Lane 1303), Sab. Šby (SD 123) > PCS *Šby ‘to take captive.’

⇒ The origin of PCS *šby ‘to take captive’ is unknown. Mhr. šbū ‘to capture’ (ML 341) is likely an Arabism.656

32. Ugr. škn (DUL 815),657 Hbr. škn (HALOT 1496), Syr. Škn (LSyr. 776, SL 1558), Arb. škn (Lane 1392), Sab. škhn (Stein 2010:730) > PCS *škn ‘to stay, to reside’ (Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:420).

⇒ PCS *škn ‘to stay’ is undoubtedly identical to Akk. šakānu ‘to place, to establish’ (CAD Š 116, AHw. 1134). The meaning “to stay” is a passive transformation of “to place,” which is probably original for *škn in PS.

Tgr. säknä, Mhr. škän and Jib. škun ‘to dwell’ (WTS 191, ML 346, JL 227) are in all probability borrowed from Arabic.

33. Hbr. typeparam (HALOT 1752), Syr. tamiminā (LSyr. 826, SL 1652), Arb. typeparam (Lane 315), Sab. typeparam (Stein 2010:732) > PCS *typeparam ‘to be completed’ (Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:420).

⇒ The origin of PCS *typeparam is unclear.

Mhr. typeparam ‘to be finished; to finish’ (ML 402), Jib. typeparam id. (JL 271), Soq. tem(_dept) ‘être au complet’ (LS 442) must be borrowed from Arabic. The same is almost certainly true of Tgr. tämmä ‘to be complete’ (WTS 305) and similar forms in other modern EthS (Leslau 1990:367).

6. Conclusions

6.1. In the present chapter, 110 lexical isoglosses shared by Arabic with Canaanite and Aramaic and separating Arabic from Akkadian, EthS and MSA have

655 Hapax legomenon in 1.2 iv 29–30: k šbyn zb[l ym k] šbyn ġpt nhr ‘Because Prince Ym is our captive, Judge Nhr is our captive.’ For šbtm in 1.3 iii 40 and šbm in 1.83:8 v. Chapter 5, p. 317 below.
656 Leslau compares with this root Soq. šōbi ‘emporter, ravir’ (LS 280). The Soqotri verb séb (1 sg. šōbik) actually means ‘to transfer one’s family temporarily to another place,’ and the semantic link with “to take captive” is at best tenuous. Cf. rather Sab. šbr ‘to carry out a journey’ (SD 122)?
657 Correct analysis of the relevant Ugaritic forms is sometimes difficult because of the graphical homonymy with the Š-stem forms of kwn ‘to be.’ Identification with škn is highly likely at least in k Šby škn šd ‘You will settle in the field like locusts’ (1.14 ii 50–51). Conversely, numerous examples parsed as belonging to the D-stem of škn with the meanings “to assign,” “to impose,” “to equip” in DUL may rather belong to kwn š.
been collected and analyzed. The merits of individual examples constituting our three lists (6 + 71 + 33 entries respectively) are obviously not equal, but even if a half of them are accepted as sufficiently specific, such a high number of shared peculiarities in the basic lexicon — numerically far superior to any published collection of the kind — is unlikely to be accidental. Rather the contrary: it has good chances of being significant from the point of view of genealogical classification, plainly suggesting that Arabic does have some kind of shared linguistic past with Aramaic and Canaanite. In other words, the evidence of the basic vocabulary — both within and outside the Swadesh wordlist — does yield valuable support to the Central Semitic hypothesis. The relevance of this evidence increases greatly in view of the fact that morphological arguments in favor of this theory are rarely unambiguous.

6.2. Scholars skeptical of the lexical factor in genealogical subgrouping have often emphasized the arbitrary nature of lexical isoglosses similar to those accumulated in the present chapter. As pointed out by John Huehnergard, “there are scores of such words and roots [restricted to the CS languages ... but] it is also possible to find roots and words in subsets of languages that would indicate other subgroupings” (2005:190). As we have seen above in this chapter, the evidence of the Swadesh wordlist hardly leaves any room for arbitrariness: 44 shared lexical features between Arabic and Hebrew (six of them exclusive) are opposed to 38 isoglosses between Arabic and Geez (only one exclusive). While the exclusive lexical isoglosses between Arabic and EthS elsewhere in the basic vocabulary are certainly more than one, our preliminary impression — the onus probandi resting on the proponents of the “South Semitic” theory — is that both the number and the quality of such features cannot be compared to the Arabic-Hebrew-Aramaic lexical isoglosses collected and analyzed in the present chapter.

658 A comparable list in Hasselbach-Huehnergard 2007:420 comprises 13 entries. Most of them are quite appealing (cf. the appropriate references above in this chapter), but a few other are less felicitous: (1) *ḥabb- ‘palm of hand’ — also in MSA and, with all probability, in Akkadian (SED 1 No. 148); (2) *laban- ‘white’ — also throughout MSA (note, besides, that the meaning of Arb. laban- is “milk,” not “white”); (3) *ḥa‘ (or rather *ḥa‘ē, at least as a by-form) ‘to see’ — also in Southern EthS (EDG 123); (4) *ḥa‘āl ‘to console’ — not in Arabic with this meaning (‘to sigh, to groan; to roar,’ LA 12 678); (5) *ṭrāf ‘to pluck’ — not with this meaning in any of the relevant languages, see Hbr. ṭtr ‘to tear, to rend (wild beasts)’ (HALOT 380), Syr. ʿṭr ‘to knock, to dash’ (SL 555). As for Arb. ṭr ‘to strike one’s eye’ (Lane 1842), it is almost certainly denominative from ṭārāf- ‘eye’ (ibid.). Similarly denominative is ṭr ‘to departure the sides, lateral parts of the pasturage’ (ibid.) < ṭārāf- ‘extremity, end.’

659 Cf. Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:420: “The Northwest Semitic languages and Arabic share a significant number of lexical items that are not attested in other Semitic languages ... There are also, however, many items that are found in Arabic but not in Northwest Semitic, and vice versa.”

660 In the framework of his skeptical evaluation of Hetzron’s version of the CS hypothesis, Blau (1978:31) refers to “shared lexical features between Arabic and Ethiopic” in Littmann 1954:353. A closer look at Littmann’s “einige Beispiele der äthiop. Sprachverwandtschaft” reveals that at least a half of his 27 lexical comparisons between Arabic and Geez are transparent retentions of the most basic and widespread elements of the PS vocabulary (*Všān- ‘tongue,’ *ḥabl- ‘rope,’ *ra‘ās- ‘head,’ *tamānīn- ‘eight,’ *krb ‘to be near,’ *ḥayt- ‘house,’ *rinān- ‘mother,’ *kalb- ‘dog,’ *wrd ‘to go down,’ *ṭayn- ‘eye,’ *ybs ‘to be dry,’ *ṭlm ‘to be dark,’ *ṭḥ ‘to catch’). Among the remaining cases, only eight lexical features can be, at times with serious reservations, considered exclusively “South Semitic”: *ḥdr ‘to be quiet,’ *ṣfr ‘to set in order,’ *ṣl ‘to take off,’ *ṭlw ‘to follow,’ *nwm ‘to sleep,’ *dvr ‘to sow,’ *ẓfr ‘to dance,’ *ḡbr ‘to return’ (note
A telling witness of the correctness of this supposition can be found in a recently published lexical study by one of the most radical and consistent opponents of the Central Semitic theory, Federico Corriente (Corriente 2006). Having counted the lexical coincidences between Arabic, Hebrew and Geez in the 200-item wordlist of Bennet 1998, Corriente comes to a result which, at first sight, is very favorable for the advocates of the CS hypothesis: 37 specific lexical coincidences between Arabic and Hebrew are opposed to the meager 5 between Arabic and Geez. The proportion (1 : > 7.4) is not very far from what we have obtained on the evidence of the 100-item Swadesh wordlist (1 : 6). Given the fact that the conceptual overlap between Bennet’s and Swadesh’s wordlists is by no means complete, the results yielded by such a vast body of lexical evidence are all the more significant. The difference is somewhat less drastic (but still quite conspicuous) in Bennet’s 100-item wordlist: 19 specific coincidences between Arabic and Hebrew as opposed to 6 between Arabic and Geez.

that only in a few cases, like næma — noma, the semantic equivalence between Arabic and Geez is complete). The remaining examples either display sufficiently reliable cognates elsewhere in Semitic (Gez. tafaqqh ‘to rejoice’ — Akk. ṣaḏhu ‘to be appeased,’ CDG 168; Gez. ṭḥb ‘to be wise’ — Syr. ṭb and Soq. ṭb ‘to know,’ CDG 585; Gez. ᵃḥ ‘to shout’ — Hbr. ᵃḥ, CDG 563), or are problematic for other reasons (*ḥṭm ‘to seal’ is borrowed from Egyptian; Gez. dabr ‘mountain’ and Arb. dabr- ‘back’ can hardly be directly compared to each other; the root *pqd has a complex semantic history throughout Semitic and the meaning overlap between Arabic and Geez is not significant enough to consider this word-pair a specific lexical isogloss). Our own perusal of CDG has revealed a few other conspicuous cases (vām ‘year,’ CDG 62; bdn ‘corpse,’ CDG 87; badw ‘desert,’ CDG 87; bāḥr ‘sea,’ CDG 91; ḏfn ‘to cover, to hide,’ CDG 124; ḡqzn ‘demon,’ CDG 198; ḫzn ‘to be sad,’ CDG 255; rdv ‘to help,’ CDG 462; smr ‘to be fruitful,’ CDG 503; šrk ‘to rise (stars, sun), to shine forth,’ CDG 534; ᵋḥ ‘morning,’ CDG 545; ṭḥb ‘breast,’ CDG 587; ᵃḥ ‘interior,’ CDG 620), but the general output is overtly meager in comparison to the extant Arabic–Hebrew–Aramaic isoglosses. We are well aware, nevertheless, that a careful examination of these and similar cases, with a special attention to their origin and functional status in the languages in question, remains an important desideratum in Semitic historical lexicography.

It is appropriate to express here our admiration towards Corriente’s open-minded treatment of the problem, his willingness to test a variety of methodological approaches potentially useful for solving the problem under scrutiny, as well as his detailed and honest exposition of the results of his inquiry — including those truly or apparently contradicting his own concept.

It must be observed that Bennet’s selection of relevant lexemes is not always felicitous. As a result, only 31 among Corriente’s 37 Arabic-Hebrew isoglosses are acceptable (“barley,” “breast,” “to build,” “call,” “chair,” “daughter,” “donkey,” “to eat,” “earth,” “goat,” “gold,” “grass,” “he-goat,” “to hunt,” “kid,” “king,” “lip,” “rain,” “rib,” “river,” “salt,” “sheep,” “short,” “slave,” “son,” “two,” “well,” “wheat,” “wind,” “to write”). Six entries are certainly or likely to be deleted: “beard” (the main Arb. term is ḥṣḥ, not ḥaq; “bird” (the main Arb. term is ṣṯr, not ṣfr), “fat” (the anatomic designations of “fat” in Hebrew and Arabic are ḥlāb and ᵃḥm- respectively, not ṣmān and dḥm), “to return” (the main Arb. terms are ṭwdb and ᵃṯ rather than ḥwdb), “skin” (the main Hbr. term is ṣṭr, not ḡlād), “small” (the main Hbr. term is ḥṭmn, not ᵃṯ). Incidentally, four clear coincidences have been omitted: “day” (Hbr. ym, Arb. ywm; note that Gez. ym means “today,” as opposed to the basic term māw), “good” (Hbr. ṭḥb, Arb. ṭḥyḥ-), “sun” (Hbr. ṣmān, Arb. ᵃḥm-), “to wash” (Hbr. ṣḥ, Arb. ṣḥl; Gez. ṣḥ means “to perspire,” the basic term for “to wash” is ṣḥḥ). The correct number is, therefore, 35. The five Arabic-Geez coincidences (“to be,” “bread,” “morning,” “sea,” “year”) are correct, but they should be supplemented by “to kill” (ḥlqḥlq vs. Hbr. ᵃḥ) and “to sleep” (nwm vs. Hbr. yḥn). The final proportion is thus a bit less radical: 35 : 7 (1 : 5).

In this case, Corriente’s figures are exact (“to call” is missing from the list but, as a
A seemingly inescapable conclusion ensuing from these statistics is that the Arabic basic vocabulary is much closer to that of Hebrew than to that of Geez. For both Corriente and the present author, this would be a serious argument in favor of the CS affiliation of Arabic. Unwilling to accept this conclusion, Corriente advances two principal objections.

(1) The number of shared lexical isoglosses between Hebrew and Geez in the 200-item wordlist turns out to be unusually high: 14 examples — almost three times higher than the Geez-Arabic coincidences. In Corriente’s words, “it would appear that Ge’ez, indubitably South Semitic, is lexically closer to Northwest Semitic Hebrew than to Arabic.”

(2) Many of the shared Hebrew-Geez isoglosses which are missing from Arabic are nevertheless present in Epigraphic South Arabian, “which cannot be included under the proposed label of Central Semitic without doing away with the very concept of South Semitic.”

To begin with, the number of Hebrew-Geez isoglosses is still very much inferior in comparison to the lexical items shared by Hebrew and Arabic (14 vs. 37). Already this proportion means that the comparatively high number of Hebrew-Geez coincidences by no means invalidates Corriente’s basic discovery, namely, the extraordinary high number of Hebrew-Arabic isoglosses. It is also worth observing that in Bennet’s 100-item list the number of Hebrew-Geez isoglosses is quite modest (only 4 examples).

Much more important, however, is the nature of the lexical coincidences between Geez and Hebrew. In nearly every case, we are faced with roots which, with all probability, were the main exponents of the respective concepts already in PS: *nḥk ‘to bite,’ *šty ‘to drink,’ *wšr ‘to exit,’ *ṛḥk ‘to be far,’ *niš- ‘fire,’ *libb- ‘heart,’ *ṛḇ ‘to be hungry,’ *warḥ- ‘moon,’ *švrš- ‘root,’ *vbn- ‘stone,’ *ṣr ‘to tie,’ *ḥš- ‘tree.’ As argued throughout this monograph, a high level of preservation vs. loss of such archaisms can only mean that the basic vocabulary of the respective languages is either conservative (as that of Hebrew and, in principle, Geez) or innovative (as that of Arabic).\(^{664}\) In this sense, “South Semitic” Geez is indeed quite “close” to “Northwest Semitic” Hebrew, but compensation, “small” must be excluded).

\(^{664}\) Indeed, Corriente’s brilliant evaluation of the deeply innovative nature of the Arabic basic vocabulary is almost without precedent in Semitological literature: “In the case of Arabic its divergence from South Arabian and departure from the Semitic common core can be explained as the result of drift in a highly dialectalized and widespread language without literary models and prestige centers for millennia ... Lexicostatistics simply confirm that the Arabic lexicon has at times gone its own way, drifting away from the Semitic common core. Which cannot come a surprise to any trained Semitic scholar since Arabic, in spite of its being generally speaking the most conservative Semitic language, has long since been known to have a strong trend to innovation” (2006:142–143). Interestingly enough, a partly similar conclusion had already been achieved by Ch. Rabin more than 30 years ago: “The separateness of the South Semitic vocabulary, and especially of the Arabic one, generally passes unnoticed because one looks at the dictionary as a whole, including all the rare and out-of-the-way words, and because Arabic in particular serves so much as a reservoir for the etymologist. It is one of the advantages of lexicostatistics to bring out such hidden features” (1975:99).
this fact says nothing about any special genealogical relationship between them. Conversely, no less than one quarter of the Hebrew-Arabic isoglosses (9 out of 35) are specifically CS terms with no clear cognates elsewhere in Semitic (“barley,” “to call,” “gold,” “grass,” “kid,” “rain,” “short,” “slave,” “to write”).

As far as Corriente’s second objection is concerned, it is indeed a common opinion among the proponents of the CS hypothesis that also ESA (or at least Sabaic) does not belong to the South Semitic branch (if there is one), but rather to Central Semitic. Corriente’s observation about the generally conservative nature of the ESA vocabulary with respect to that of Arabic is undoubtedly correct, but it can hardly be in any sense damaging to the CS hypothesis as formulated by Voigt, Huehnergard and others.

6.3. The impressive amount of lexical evidence supporting the CS hypothesis should not prevent us from giving due attention to some serious difficulties entailed by the application of our method to the CS lexical facts.

6.3.1. By far the most acute problem is connected with the impossibility of tracing back the semantic evolution of the majority of the hypothetical CS lexical innovations. Indeed, as argued throughout this monograph, lexical innovations cannot be reliably qualified as such unless the path of formal and/or semantic rebuilding is established with a satisfactory degree of persuasiveness. As we shall discover later on in this book, the application of this principle to smaller subdivisions of Semitic is never completely unproblematic, but in the majority of cases a more or less significant number of lexical innovations are indeed available. The situation with specific lexical features of PCS is different: it is only in a relatively small minority of examples that the innovative nature of the pertinent isogloss can be convincingly demonstrated.

This difficulty inevitably brings us to the thorny glottogonic question: where do the “new words” come from? As correctly acknowledged by J. Huehnergard (2005:190), the only reasonable alternative to innovation is archaism: “It is usually possible — and probably often correct — to suggest that such lexemes are inherited from the proto-language and were simply lost in the languages in which they fail to appear.” Shall we indeed assume that *rigl- ‘foot,’ *abd- ‘slave,’ *bačar- ‘cattle,’ *yalm- ‘boy’ and scores of other specifically CS lexemes are straightforward retentions from PS, lost without a trace in Akkadian, EthS and MSA? The danger inherent in this approach was clear to Huehnergard himself: “Such reasoning also leads inevitably to the unlikely conclusion that the lexicon of the proto-language must have been larger than that of any of its descendants.” Indeed, all etymologically opaque lexemes reconstructed for smaller and larger Semitic subdivisions are treated as PS archaisms,

---

With varying degrees of plausibility, one may quote *bojš-at- ‘egg’ < *byš ‘to be white,’ *naktar- ‘rain’ < *ry ‘to be fresh, wet,’ *แทนม ‘people, nation’ < *ramm- ‘grandfather,’ *hlt ‘to be mature’ < *hlm ‘to dream,’ *karm- ‘vinedyard’ < *karm- ‘hill,’ *מגד ‘excellence’ < *gd ‘to be good,’ *מباحث ‘cave’ < *ywr ‘to be low, depressed,’ *מהאר- ‘tomorrow’ < *מה ‘to face,’ *נינ ‘women’ < *נינ ‘women,’ *ריבא ‘to be numerous,’ *סומ ‘barley’ < *סומ ‘hair,’ *תור ‘mountain’ < *תור ‘flint,’ *טיג ‘waggon’ < *טיג ‘to roll,’ *גבע ‘cheese’ < *גבע ‘to be curved,’ *חמר- ‘wine’ < *חמר ‘to foam,’ *קב ‘to write’ < *קับ ‘to sew,’ *קבר- ‘town’ < *קבר ‘to meet, to gather,’ Formal innovations are probably involved in *נינ ‘man’ < *נינ ‘man,’ *נת ‘god’ < *נת, *את ‘towards’ < *ל ‘to take revenge’ < *ל.”
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the PS vocabulary will of necessity become extraordinary large, full of redundancy, and displaying numerous semantically highly evolved terms disguised as primary nouns.

All in all, while it is quite possible that some of the specific lexical features of PCS are indeed archaic retentions from PS, this solution is scarcely conceivable for the bulk of our examples. It is far more reasonable to suspect that we are faced with formal and/or semantic innovations whose development has been obscured by the very long time-span separating PCS from the earliest attested Semitic languages, allowing the hypothetical source-roots (or source-meanings) to die out in both the CS languages themselves and the rest of Semitic.

6.3.2. The semantic broadness of our investigation inevitably implies a fair amount of conceptual blurring. As repeatedly emphasized in this monograph, absolute functional equivalence between the terms under comparison is of paramount importance within the methodological framework endorsed. However, this requirement is sometimes difficult to apply outside the clear-cut semantic concepts like those constituting the Swadesh wordlist. Indeed, as far as the 104 entries dealt with above in sections 5.2 and 5.3 are concerned, full semantic equivalence between, say, Hebrew and Arabic or Sabaic can be surmised for ca. 50 cases only. Elsewhere, it is rather the mere presence of the relevant root in Arabic and/or Sabaic that is involved. The negative consequences of this methodological looseness are not to be forgotten.

6.3.3. As pointed out by J. Huehnergard (2005:190), some of the lexical features potentially traceable to PCS may in fact have spread from one CS language to another — most typically, from Aramaic to Arabic. Huehnergard’s own example is the root ḫtb, whose original meaning in Arabic is presumably “to sew together,” whereas the well-known meaning “to write” must have emerged via borrowing from Aramaic. It is indeed quite possible that some of the allegedly PCS features of the Arabic vocabulary are not autochthonous, especially when less fundamental and more culture-bound concepts are concerned. However, borrowing is unlikely to dismiss such a large accumulation of examples, some of which belong to the very core of the basic vocabulary.

6.3.4. As one can easily observe, many of the CS lexical features discussed in this chapter are unattested in Ugaritic (54 out of 110 entries), but even if they are, their

666 Let us mention that the highly non-trivial nature of such hypothetical retentions makes them, too, to some extent relevant from the point of view of genealogical classification.

667 Such as “towards,” “slave,” “to be barren,” “with,” “grass,” “cattle,” “kid,” “vine,” “grape," “to kill,” “son-in-law,” “vineyard,” “to lie,” “tomorrow,” “women,” “so-and-so,” “to remain,” “navel,” “to be equal,” “barley,” “pegs,” “gold,” “cheese,” “to walk barefoot,” “to write,” “to call,” “to be short,” “dowry,” “shoe.”

668 Such as “slave,” “vine,” “grape,” “vineyard,” “wagon,” “gold,” “festival,” “priest,” “eternity,” “excellence” and a few others.

669 *baṭtn- ‘belly,’ *ḥayṣ- ‘egg,’ *rādam-at- ‘soil,’ *rīl(ay) ‘towards,’ *yagal-at- ‘wagon,’ *ḥfr ‘to be barren,’ *āramm- ‘people, nation,’ *wāq- ‘grass,’ *ḥaban- ‘gold,’ *gVm-at- ‘cheese,’ *gVrm- ‘bone, body,’

*gawzal- ‘young pigeon,’ *yyn ‘to sing,’ *yyp- ‘young of fallow deer,’ *halumma ‘bither,’ *ḥbl ‘to be pregnant,’ *ḥag- ‘festival,’ *ḥp ‘to walk barefoot,’ *ḥppt ‘to care,’ *ḥfr- ‘free,’ *ḥVld- ‘long period of time,’

*ḥlbb- ‘fat,’ *ḥlbd- ‘mole,’ *ḥawt-, *ḥyṣ- ‘thread,’ *ḥkb ‘to be in pain,’ *ḥld ‘to lie,’ *ḥfr, *ḥry ‘to have a bodily infusion,’ *ḥyṣ ‘lion,’ *mṣgd- ‘excellence,’ *mayaḥ-at- ‘cave,’ *mḥṣr ‘tomorrow,’ *mns ‘to hold back,’

*nš ‘shoe,’ *nk ‘to take revenge,’ *nky ‘to be clean,’ *nṣm ‘to breathe,’ *nVš-šuma ‘women,’ *pulān- ‘so-
functional status is sometimes quite marginal in comparison to the key positions they occupy in the vocabulary of other CS languages. Many of such gaps can be more or less convincingly explained by the obvious deficiencies of the extant textual documentation, but at least some of the relevant concepts are very well attested in the Ugaritic corpus, yet expressed by roots different from those filling the same semantic slots in Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic. Taken together, these facts yield a rather coherent picture which requires an explanation. Two possibilities suggest themselves: either the relevant features were present in PCS, but subsequently lost in Ugaritic, or we are faced with comparatively late and/or geographically restricted innovations which did not reach this language. It is not unlikely that both trends ought to be taken into account, being responsible for the absence of different individual isoglosses. As a whole, they provide an interesting background for the complex problem of the “Canaanite lexical type,” to be extensively discussed in Chapter 5.

and-so,’ *pahl- ‘trap,’ *parh- ‘sprout,’ *rgm ‘to stone,’ *rkh ‘to be soft,’ *rir- ‘saliva,’ *ršš ‘to break,’ *ršw ‘to be glad,’ *ṣlk ‘to shout,’ *ṣdh ‘to prosper,’ *ṣwy ‘to be equal,’ *ṣyr ‘to know,’ *šaml-at- ‘outer garment,’ *ṣrd ‘to flee,’ *tmm ‘to be completed,’ *ṭr ‘to advise,’ *watid- ‘peg.’

Here belong *rigl- ‘foot,’ *inis- ‘people,’ *nḏḥ- ‘god,’ *baḥar- ‘cattle,’ *hrg ‘to kill,’ *ḥamr- ‘wine.’

Such as *pnn instead of *rigl- ‘foot,’ *mt, *adm, *bnš and *nš-m instead of *inis- ‘man,’ *alp-m instead of *baḥar- ‘cattle,’ *mhš instead of *hrg ‘to kill,’ *nt-s instead of *nVš-ūma ‘women,’ *ḥrš instead of *ḏahab- ‘gold,’ *yn instead of *ḥamr- ‘wine.’
Chapter 4.
North-West Semitic as a genealogical unity:
grammar and lexicon

1. The North-West Semitic hypothesis: a general overview

In the wake of the traditional summary descriptions (Brockelmann 1908:6, Nöldeke 1911:621, Moscati 1964:7–8 and many others), most of the present-day studies in the genealogical classification of Semitic maintain the existence of a North-West Semitic subgroup, comprising Canaanite, Ugaritic (independently of its more precise affiliation, for which see Chapter 5 below) and Aramaic (Blau 1978:40, Faber 1997:6, 9–10, Tropper 2000:3, Huehnergard 2005:192). Thus, according to Tropper, “von den zentralsemitischen Sprachen lassen sich das Kanaanäische und das Aramäische aufgrund ihrer zahlreichen grammatischen und lexikographischen Übereinstimmungen auf eine gemeinsame Vorstufe zurückführen, die traditionell als Nordwestsemitisch bezeichnet wird.”

The purpose of the present chapter is to test the validity of the North-West Semitic hypothesis. How numerous and how reliable are the grammatical innovations shared by Canaanite and Aramaic? To what extent is the evidence of grammar supported (or disproved) by lexical features?

2. Phonological and morphological features of Proto-NWS

An overview of the existing studies on the topic quickly reveals that grammatical features shared by Canaanite and Aramaic can rarely be considered relevant for genealogical subgrouping. In fact, only three such isoglosses readily come to mind:

(1) the shift of word-initial *w into y
(2) the double plural-marking of the segolate nouns (*malak-úma ‘kings,’ *malak-ätu ‘queens’)
(3) the shape *C₁aC₂C₃C₄ (rather than *C₁aC₂C₃aC₄) of the suffix conjugation of the intensive stem.

Only the first isogloss is indeed unassailable, and one willingly subscribes to the opinion of J. Blau who believes that this is “quite a strong (admittedly phonological) piece of evidence for the unity of North West Semitic, since it is not easy to explain it phonetically” (1978:35).

As for the two remaining features, their relevance for the NWS hypothesis is open to doubt. The principal arguments behind this conclusion have been expounded in Chapter 3 above and will be only briefly summarized here.

J. Huehnergard’s claim that “the regular pluralization of monosyllabic triradical nouns by means of a-insertion in addition to the usual external plural markers” is a specifically NWS feature (1991b:284, also Gzella 2011:425, 439) is undoubtedly correct in a synchronic perspective, yet one may seriously doubt that this phenomenon is a Proto-NWS innovation rather than a retention from PCS. Indeed, the Arabic forms ban-ʔuna ‘sons,’ zarad-ʔuna ‘lands’ and rahl-ʔuna ‘peoples’ — let alone the almost regular feminine formations like darab-ʔat- ‘blows,’ kisar-ʔat- ‘fragments,’ qualam-ʔat- ‘dark places’ — strongly suggest that the NWS-like plural formation was also once regular in Arabic (Nöldeke 1905b:69, Blau 1978:30, cf. Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:414 and Chapter 3, pp. 168-169 above).

The diachronic status of *-i- in the second syllable of the perfect base of the intensive stem — a Proto-NWS innovation or a retention from PWS? — remains a hotly debated issue (for a detailed description v. Chapter 3, pp. 165 and 169 above). This feature, therefore, can hardly be taken for a reliable shared isogloss characterizing the hypothetical NWS unity.

In summary, there is only one fully reliable phonological argument in support of the NWS hypothesis. Morphological evidence favoring the existence of Proto-NWS as a special genealogical unity is scarce and, for the most part, rather weak. It is, therefore, by no means surprising that a recent summary description of “Northwest Semitic Languages” (Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007) provides a wealth of information on the similarities between Canaanite/Aramaic and Arabic, but says very little about the differences between these two hypothetical subgroups of Central Semitic.

3. The lexical evidence

It is now time to see what can we find in the lexical domain, the more so since lexical evidence has never been systematically used in the discussion on the NWS question. The evidence of the Swadesh wordlist will provide a starting point for the discussion, then to be supplemented by lexical features belonging to other strata of the basic vocabulary.

3.1. The Swadesh wordlist

Biblical Hebrew and Classical Syriac display 56 shared features in the Swadesh wordlist. This impressive amount of common vocabulary items is by far superior to what each of the two languages shares with any other Semitic language: contrast 47 between Syriac and Arabic, 44 between Syriac and Akkadian or 47 between Hebrew

---

673 “zaradʔuna genügt jedoch, zu erweisen, dass einst auch im Arabischen solche Formen allgemein zu den Hebräischen stimmen.”

674 “Forms parallel to these a-plurals are well attested in Arabic ... and they must not be interpreted as ancient broken plurals with later addition of the sound plural suffixes, since in Classical Arabic it is the broken plural that expands to the detriment of the sound plurals.”
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and Akkadian, 44 between Hebrew and Arabic.\textsuperscript{675}

Moreover, there are good reasons to admit an even higher degree of lexical proximity between Biblical Hebrew and those Aramaic idioms which were roughly contemporary with it.\textsuperscript{676}

In some cases, such an assumption finds direct corroboration in the Old Aramaic text corpus. A typical example is the concept “nose”: as will be argued below in Chapter 6 (pp. 368-369), the replacement of PS *\textsuperscript{7}anp- ‘nose’ (= Hbr. *q\textsuperscript{2}p) by the reflexes of PS *\textsuperscript{7}na\textsuperscript{7}\textsuperscript{5}\textsuperscript{7}j\textsuperscript{7}r- ‘nostril,’ characteristic of some later Aramaic dialects (including Syriac), did not affect the language of the Old Aramaic inscriptions.\textsuperscript{677} A similar picture is obtained for the concept “fire,” whose only representative in Old Aramaic is etical (*< PS *\textsuperscript{7}nt\textsuperscript{7}ṣ\textsuperscript{7}ṣ = Hbr. *\textsuperscript{7}ē\textsuperscript{7}ṣ) rather than the innovative *\textsuperscript{7}n\textsuperscript{7}r-, so familiar to us from later Aramaic idioms.

But even when pertinent Old Aramaic evidence is lacking (most typically, because of the absence of the corresponding concepts from the Old Aramaic documents), the list of Hebrew-Aramaic shared lexical features can still be expanded thanks to the evidence of other, less innovative Aramaic languages of later periods. Thus, the basic status of Syr. ṣ\textsuperscript{7}rp\textsuperscript{7}nā ‘bird’ (LSyr. 635, SL 1298) is threatened by ū\textsuperscript{7}yr\textsuperscript{7}r (LSyr. 274, SL 528) and ṭ\textsuperscript{7}rh\textsuperscript{7}l\textsuperscript{7}h\textsuperscript{7}r (LSyr. 594, SL 1236),\textsuperscript{678} but the evidence from other Aramaic languages (such as JPA ṣ\textsuperscript{7}pr, DJPA 463) suggests that the hypothetical Old Aramaic exponent was identical to Hbr. ṣ\textsuperscript{7}pp\textsuperscript{7}r (HALOT 1047). Similar conclusions can be obtained for such cognate pairs as Hbr. bē\textsuperscript{7}ṣā — Syr. b\textsuperscript{7}r\textsuperscript{7}ltā ‘egg’ (HALOT 123, LSYR. 69, SL 143)\textsuperscript{679} and Hbr. ṭ\textsuperscript{7}b\textsuperscript{7}nā — Syr. ṭ\textsuperscript{7}m\textsuperscript{7}nā ‘stone’ (HALOT 7, LSYR. 3, SL 4).\textsuperscript{680}

As soon as these two groups of supplementary examples are brought into discussion, the total amount of lexical coincidences between Biblical Hebrew and what one can conventionally label “Early Aramaic” can be rather confidently raised to 61 — an extraordinary figure rarely met with on the pages of this book, even in the discussion of such universally accepted genealogical unities as Ethiopian Semitic and Modern South Arabian. Nevertheless, in the methodological framework of our inquiry, the subgrouping relevance of the lexical features shared by Hebrew and Aramaic — independently of their number — can only be assessed through a systematic and unbiased diachronic analysis of each pertinent cognate pair.

\textsuperscript{675} The only exceptional language pair is Hebrew–Ugaritic (58 features in common). Lexical proximity between Hebrew and Ugaritic and its potential for genealogical classification will be discussed extensively in Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{676} Further details on the historical development of the Aramaic vocabulary can be found in Chapter 6, where special attention will be paid to those archaic lexical features which were still in full blossom in Old Aramaic, but went out of use or were heavily marginalized in later dialects.

\textsuperscript{677} One may wonder whether this is a specifically Eastern Aramaic isogloss.

\textsuperscript{678} Admittedly, establishing the main exponent of the general concept “bird” in Classical Syriac is a rather complicated task which falls outside the present author’s philological competence.

\textsuperscript{679} The Syriac term seems to have lost its basic status in favor of the innovative bartā (LSyr. 94, SL 192), but its cognates elsewhere in Aramaic (such as JPA ṣ\textsuperscript{7}pr, DJPA 96) continue to function as the basic exponents of the concept “egg.”

\textsuperscript{680} The Syriac word is very rare and may be a Hebraism, the basic exponent of the concept “stone” being ke\textsuperscript{7}p\textsuperscript{7}ḥā (LSyr. 315, SL 594). This replacement affected most of later Aramaic, yet in the Official Aramaic corpus š\textsuperscript{7}m is common and kp practically unattested (DNWSI 6 and 529).
3.1.1. Trivial retentions from PS, PWS and PCS

3.1.1.1. From PS (43)


---

681 For formal reasons, *tyḥ was not included into the list of PS exponents of basic concepts from the Swadesh wordlist as outlined above in Chapter 1. Indeed, autochthonous cognates in EthS and MSA are lacking for this root: Mhr. ṭyḥ ‘to enjoy’ (ML 413), Jib. ṭh id. (JL 282) and related forms are almost certainly borrowed from Arabic, whereas the Arabic origin of Tgr. ṭyḥ ‘good’ (WTS 620) is obvious. However, the basic status of *tyḥ in PCS is assured by Ugr. ṭh (DUL 886), Arub. ḥayyib- (Lane 1902), Sabh. ṭh ‘to be well-disposed’ (SD 154), Min. ṭyḥ ‘bon, précieux’ (LM 100), whereas Akk. ṭhū (CAD T 19, AHw. 1377) makes one willing to extrapolate this semantic reconstruction also to PS. Accordingly, at least for the purposes of the present chapter, the presence of this root in Hebrew and Syriac must be qualified as a rather trivial retention.
“we”: Hbr. ḥannah — Syr. ḫman (HALOT 71, LSyr. 242); 99. “woman”: Hbr. ḫissā — Syr. ḥattā (HALOT 93, LSyr. 31).

3.1.1.2. From PWS (4)


3.1.1.2. From PCS (3)


3.1.2. Other types of isoglosses (11)


\diamond Diachronic evaluation of this cognate pair is necessarily contradictory. On the one hand, the underlying morphological shape *şippur- and its prominently general meaning are specific enough to be considered an exclusive lexical feature of Proto-NWS. On the other hand, the existence of a more ancient (PWS or even PS) prototype is hard to avoid in view of several potential cognates throughout Semitic listed and analyzed in SED II No. 212.


\diamond No further etymology, cf. SED I No. 112 for a tentative comparison to Arb. ḥidārā, ḥidwata ‘in front of’ (Lane 537).


\diamond Also in Arb. ṣanān- ‘clouds’ (Lane 2166), where the basic exponent of this concept is, however, saḥāb- (ibid. 1314). Further etymology unknown.

33. “to give”: Hbr. ntn (HALOT 732) — Syr. nētel (LSyr. 298, SL 995).

\diamond Also in Ugr. ytn (DUL 990), Pho. ytn (DNWSI 478). Contra Militarev 2010:72, there is hardly any possibility to separate this root from Akk. nadānu ‘to give’ (CAD N, 42, AHw. 701) in view of the striking structural and semantic similarity.\textsuperscript{684} The

\textsuperscript{682} Also in Arabic and Geez (CDG 626), hence probably the main exponent of this concept in PWS.

\textsuperscript{683} Probably the main exponent of the concept “meat” in PWS in view of the exact parallels in Southern EthS: Har. ḥasār (EDH 47) and similar (see further SED I No. 41).

\textsuperscript{684} Conversely, it is precisely because of its structural and semantic remoteness that Arb. ḏyn ‘to borrow; to lend’ (Lane 942), compared with nadānu by Militarev, is not to be considered a promising cognate.
irregular correspondence of the dentals is admittedly unique, but can probably be accounted for by the influence of \( n \) (dissimilation \( *dn > tn \) or assimilation \( *tn > dn \)), v. Kouwenberg 2010a:474. No further etymology is at hand.\(^{685}\)

49. “long”: Hbr. \( 
\text{ריוד} \) (HALOT 88) — Syr. \( \text{sarr} \) (LSyr. 49, SL 99).

◊ Also in Akk. \( \text{arku} \) (CAD A\( _2 \) 283, AHw. 69), Ugr. \( \text{ Annunci } \) (DUL 102). With Nöldeke 1886:724 and DRS 33, probably also Arb. \( \text{รก} \) ‘to remain, to continue in a place’ (Lane 50), Sab. \( \text{รก} \) ‘duration of time’ (SD 7). No cognates in EthS and MSA.

58. “neck”: Hbr. \( \text{שואו} (\text{ר}) \text{ר} \) (HALOT 1009) — Syr. \( \text{sawr} \) (LSyr. 625, SL 1281).

◊ Proto-NWS \( *\text{sawwar} \) has rather reliable cognates elsewhere in Semitic (SED I No. 258) and, as such, probably goes back to PS. Its high semantic prominence is, nevertheless, exclusive to Hebrew and Aramaic.

70. “sand”: Hbr. \( \text{הָוֹל} \) (HALOT 297) — Syr. \( \text{חָלָא} \) (LSyr. 221, SL 451).

◊ With Nöldeke 1900:159 and DRS 846, probably related is Arb. \( \text{חָל} \) — ‘black fetid mud; soft earth; hot ashes’ (Lane 675).

71. “to say”: Hbr. \( \text{מִר} \) (HALOT 65) — Syr. \( \text{מֶר} \) (LSyr. 26, SL 57).

◊ Clearly related are Arb. \( \text{מִר} \) ‘to order, to command’ (Lane 95), Min. \( \text{מִר} \) ‘ordonner’ (LM 5), Qat. \( \text{مَر} \) ‘to command, to proclaim’ (LIQ 13). Further etymological background of PCS \( *\text{mir} \) is discussed in Chapters 5 (p. 327) and 8 (p. 534).

75. “to sit”: Hbr. \( \text{הֵשְׁב} \) (HALOT 444) — Syr. \( \text{יִטְב} \) (LSyr. 311).

◊ Also in Akk. \( \text{wasābu} \) (CAD A\( _2 \) 386, AHw. 1480). Further cognates are discussed below in this chapter.

83. “to swim”: Hbr. \( \text{שִׁי} \) (HALOT 1314) — Syr. \( \text{שָׁה} \) (LSyr. 465, SL 992).

◊ Further etymology unknown.

92. “to walk”: Hbr. \( \text{הל} \) (HALOT 246) — Syr. \( \text{הל} \) (LSyr. 177).

◊ Also in Akk. \( \text{אַלְכְ} \) (CAD A\( _1 \) 300, AHw. 31). Further possible cognates are discussed below in this chapter.

3.1.3. Summary of the evidence

The total number of Canaanite–Aramaic lexical isoglosses potentially indicative of a narrower genealogical relationship between these languages amounts to \( \text{11} \) out of \( \text{100} \). Even if taken at face value, this proportion does not look very impressive, but more serious problems emerge as soon as one tries to classify its constituents according to their etymological background.

\(^{685}\) As reasonably argued in CDG 578, there is hardly any connection with Gez. \( \text{нстانتانا} \) ‘to ponder, to be preoccupied with something assiduously.’
Some of the Canaanite–Aramaic isoglosses display cognates with the same basic status in Akkadian. Here belong the concepts “to give,” “long,” “to sit” and “to walk.” The origin of this type of dialectal distribution, well known also outside the Swadesh wordlist, is intriguing. The most likely possibility is that the corresponding terms already functioned as the basic exponents of the respective concepts in PS, but were lost or marginalized everywhere except Akkadian, Canaanite and Aramaic. It is hard to say at present whether this coincidence is purely accidental or rather conditioned by such factors as the (relatively) archaic nature of the languages in question and/or the geographic proximity between them. One thing is certain, however: lexical features of this type can scarcely be considered as hallmarks of the hypothetical Proto-NWS stage.

The same is almost certainly true of *mr ‘to say’: the meaning “to command, to order” in Arabic and ESA almost necessarily presupposes some kind of semantic narrowing from the original meaning “to say.” In its essence, this isogloss is, thus, more PCS than PNWS.

It is only in the remaining 6 cases that some kind of semantic and/or formal crystallization can be attributed to a genealogical stage comprising specifically Canaanite and Aramaic. But even this group is by no means homogeneous: some of the relevant lexemes may well be inherited from PCS (“cloud,” “sand”), or even PS (“bird,” “neck”), whereas a few others are etymologically obscure (“breast,” “to swim”).

In summary, one may conclude that lexical evidence of the Swadesh wordlist does not yield much support to the concept of North-West Semitic as a well-established genealogical unity. An immense majority of lexical coincidences between Hebrew and Syriac are trivial retentions from PS, PWS or PCS. Their preservation in these languages clearly characterizes them as lexically archaic, yet does not suggest any special genealogical proximity between them. Truly exclusive lexical features shared by Canaanite and Aramaic do not exceed six positions in the Swadesh list. These features, whose etymological background tends to be rather obscure (no feasible semantic

686 This is especially likely in the latter two cases, as the respective roots are also rather well attested outside NWS and Akkadian, but with less fundamental meanings. For *hlk, v. DRS 413: Arb. hlk ‘to perish, to become in a bad state; to die’ (Lane 3044), Qat. hlk ‘to comply, to conform,’ s1-hlk ‘to complete, to bring about’ (LIQ 45). The meaning “to die” must be a metaphorical development from “to go (away)” somewhere in the prehistory of Arabic, as shown by the well-known semantic parallels in Hebrew and Akkadian. Furthermore, one cannot exclude that a more direct association with the basic meaning “to walk” is found in taháalkati l-mar’atu = táméyyátat fi mi’ṣiythā (TA 27 407). The meanings of the Qatabanian forms can also be easily traced back to the original meaning “to go” (> “to make run,” “to bring into movement”). As for Mhr. hIlk ‘to be very tired and thirsty’ (ML 156), Jib. helk id., ehIlk ‘to annihilate’ (LQ 97), Soq. hóItélk ‘pérír’ (LS 143), they may be borrowed from Arabic, as similar meanings for hlk are widespread in Arabic dialects, cf. hIlk ‘to be exhausted, to be consumed’ in Egyptian (BH 909). Arabic origin is even more likely for Tgr. halkà ‘to exert oneself; to die’ (WTS 4, Leslau 1990:167) and Tna. halékkì ‘to toil, to get weary’ (TED 6). Clearly autochthonous is, however, Soq. télék ‘guider’ (LS 441), a causative stem from *tlk which may well go back to *hlk with a fossilized t-prefix. For *wéb, v. DRS 656: Sab. wéb ‘to sit, to reside’ (SD 165), Min. wéb ‘être assis, résider dans’ (LM 106), Qat. mewb ‘sanctum, seat, shrine’ (LIQ 58), Gez. rassaba ‘to take a wife, to marry’ (CDG 619), perhaps Arb. wéb ‘to jump’ (Lane 2919).
innovations, no clear-cut replacements of more archaic lexical features) by no means correspond to what one would expect from such a narrow genealogical subdivision as North-West Semitic as perceived by the Semitological tradition. What seems more probable is rather the opposite: if such a subgroup had ever existed, it must have been both relatively loose and short-lived.

A striking, with all probability not accidental, fact is that the concepts for which more or less specific Proto-NWS exponents could be postulated tend to belong to what is empirically known as less fundamental, more peripheral areas of the Swadesh list: “bird,” “breast,” “cloud,” “neck,” “sand,” “to swim.” For none of these concepts is there a single well-established PS exponent, and, with rare exceptions, they are typically missing from the features which characterize the basic lexicon of all major and minor Semitic subgroups dealt with in this monograph (Proto-Central Semitic, Proto-Aramaic, Proto-Canaanite, Proto-EthS, Proto-MSA). This may be indicative of a rather superficial nature of the NWS linguistic community and might suggest that at least some of the pertinent isoglosses are due to borrowing rather than common background.

3.2. Other lexical fields


◊ For the historical background of PNWS *ḫarway-*/*ḥaryay- ‘lion’ v. extensively SED II Nos. 17, 18 (semantic narrowing from a more general meaning “wild beast” in PWS is likely).

In most of NWS, *ḫarway-*/*ḥaryay- has more or less seriously ousted *labV-, the only designation of “lion” reliably traceable to PS (SED II No. 144). It is noteworthy that ḫarw is only marginally present in Ugaritic, where lbv is, on the contrary, rather well attested (DUL 490).


◊ PNWS *dmy ‘to resemble’ has no obvious cognates, with a possible exception of Tna. ḏammāwā ‘to be handsome, beautiful, to have a well-proportioned, well-formed or perfect figure’ (TED 2068). Arb. dumyat- ‘image, effigy’ (Lane 917) is certainly borrowed from Aramaic, cf. Syr. ḏumyā ‘imago, figura, forma’ (LSyR. 156). Tgr. ḏumāt ‘uncertain outlines of a figure or of an object’ (WTS 516), in its turn, seems to be borrowed from Arbic dumyat- (Leslau 1990:176). Akk. damtu, dattu ‘figure (of a man)’ (CAD D 74, CDA 55), if at all related, may well be borrowed from Aramaic (hapax legomenon in a late lexical list).

PNWS *dmy ‘to be similar’ has partly ousted *mīl, with all probability the main

687 By “empirically known,” we primarily mean what can be deduced from the Semitic facts analyzed on the pages of the present study. It remains to be established whether at least some of them reflect more general trends also observable in other linguistic families. As far as one can judge from the large body of cross-linguistic evidence collected and analyzed by S. Starostin, this is indeed largely the case. Starostin’s “ranking of stability” (2007:838) shows that the concepts pertinent to our discussion tend to be found in the mid-low segments of the list: “bird” (37), “neck” (48), “breast” (49), “to swim” (78), “cloud” (99), “sand” (103).
exponent of this meaning in PS (HALOT 647, AHw. 623, CDG 365). Note in particular that neither in Hebrew nor in Syriac are the reflexes of *mfl used with the fundamental meaning “to be similar” in the basic stem.

3. Ugr. gəran ‘arrogance’ (DUL 291), Hbr. gֶהֶו ‘to be high; to be arrogant’ (HALOT 168), Syr. gərəyā ‘altus, superbus’ (LSyr. 99, SL 198).

◊ The origin of PNWS *gəy ‘to be high, haughty, arrogant’ (DRS 92) is unknown.


◊ PNWS *gnb ‘to steal’ is likely related to the anatomical term *ganb- ‘side’ (SED I No. 85), with a semantic shift from “to put aside” or similar (cf. Kopf 1976:192).

PNWS *gnb has completely ousted *šr ‘to steal,’ almost certainly the main exponent of this meaning in PS as one can infer from its broad presence outside NWS:

Akk. šarātu (CAD Š 253, AHw. 1185), Arb. srq (Lane 1352), Sab. sərk (SD 128), Gez. saraʔa (CDG 514), Mhr. hərək (ML 159), Jib. šérək (JL 263), Soq. yhɛrək (LS 146).

5. Ugr. yrpl ‘cloud, large storm cloud’ (DUL 326), Hbr. vərəpəl ‘thick darkness’ (HALOT 888), Syr. ərəpələ ‘vapor, nubes’ (LSyr. 549, SL 1141).

◊ The origin of PNWS *yarpil- ‘storm cloud’ is uncertain, but an ultimate relationship with with Akk. erpetu ‘cloud’ (CAD E 302, AHw. 243), Ugr. yrpt id. (DUL 184) is not to be ruled out.

6. Hbr. ḫšk, Syr. ḥšk ‘to be dark’ (HALOT 361, LSyrr. 262, SL 501).

◊ The origin of PNWS *ḫšk ‘to be dark’ is uncertain as the hypothetical Arabic cognates are rather remote both formally or semantically.688

PNWS *ḫšk has gradually ousted PS *ṭlm ‘to be dark, black.’ This PS root, well preserved in Akk. šallmu ‘black, dark’ (CAD § 77, AHw. 1078), Arb. ŋlm (IV) ‘to become dark’ (Lane 1921), Gez. šallim ‘black, dark’ (CDG 556), Soq. ŋlm ‘obscurcir’ (LS 204, not recognized by our informants),689 is still attested in Ugaritic as šlm ‘darkness’ (DUL 1004), but is almost entirely missing from Hebrew.690 In Aramaic, it is only preserved with the transferred meaning “to oppress,” “to accuse falsely”: Syr. šləm (LSyr. 277).

7. Hbr. ḳṣp, Syr. ḳṣp ‘to be angry’ (HALOT 1124, LSyrr. 687, SL 1397).692

◊ The origin of PNWS *ḳṣp ‘to be angry’ is uncertain. There is hardly any connection between this root and PS *ḳṣp ‘to break,’ represented by Hbr. ḳṣəp

688 On the one hand, ḥšk ‘to bear rancor, malevolence’ (Lane 569); on the other hand, suḥkāk- = ḡaswadu, ṭš녁hakka ḫ-lylu ʕidā šṭaddat jəlmalatu (LA 10 529).
690 Probably also ŋlm with the same meaning (ibid. 320).
691 A well-known exception is the problematic šallmawait ‘gloom’ (HALOT 1029).
692 For the earliest attestations of this root in the Amarna letters (na-ʔə-go-ʔa-pū in EA 82:51, [na]-ʔə-go-ab-ʔa-pū in EA 93:5) v. CAD Q 146, Rainey 1996 II 307–308.
   ♦ PNWS *naḵib-at- ‘woman, female’ is evidently derived from PS *nḳb ‘to tear, to pierce, to bore,’ well attested both within and outside NWS: Akk. naḵābu ‘to deflower; to rape’ (CAD N 328, AHw. 743), Hbr. nḳb ‘to bore through’ (HALOT 719), Syr. nḳb ‘perforavit’ (LSyr. 444), Arb. nḳb ‘to pierce, to bore’ (Lane 2833), Sab. nḳb ‘to cut, to excavate’ (SD 97), Qat. nḳb ‘to bore a hole, to pierce’ (LIQ 111), Gez. naḵaba ‘to disjoin, to separate’ (CDG 399), Tgr. nākbā ‘to seize and tear off, to pinch’ (WTS 328), Amh. nākkābā ‘to pierce, to perforate’ (AED 1029), Mhr. nḳḥb ‘to be cracked’ (ML 296), Jib. nḳḥb ‘to break, to snap’ (JL 189). The underlying semantic shift refers either to defloration (Brockelmann’s coeundo perforata, cf. especially the meaning of the cognate Akkadian verb above) or to the shape of the female genital organs.

   ♦ The origin of PNWS *šmḥ ‘to sprout’ is unknown. Cf. perhaps Arb. ṣimraat-ṣamīḥat- = ṣim[pa] ṣamīḥat- (TA 7 294).

   ♦ The origin of PNWS *šῳl- (or *š_words) ‘handful’ is uncertain. Curiously similar are Tgr. šğgāt ‘a handful’ (WTS 206) and Sum. silig ‘fist’ (Civil 2007:26, = Akk. upmu).

11. Hbr. šrḳ, Syr. šrḳ (aph.) ‘to whistle’ (HALOT 1656, LSyr. 810, SL 1611).
   ♦ The origin of PNWS *šrḳ ‘to whistle’ is unknown. Hardly any connection with Amh. šrḳ alā ‘to hiccups’ (AED 488).

12. Ugr. ṣyṛ, Hbr. šavār, Syr. tarrā ‘gate’ (DUL 901, HALOT 1614, LSyr. 836, SL 1670).694
   ♦ Almost certainly identical with Arb. ṣayṛ- ‘gap, opening, breach’ (Lane 338). The Arabic noun is inseparable from the verbal root ṣyṛ ‘to break’ (ibid.), in its turn going back to PS *ṭyṛ with the same meaning, likely represented by Gez. šavara ‘to violate, to break, to frustrate’ (Marrasini 1971:127–130, CDG 481, Kogan 2005c:200–201) and, perhaps, Akk. ṭavāru ‘to be victorious, to vanquish’ (CAD Š 2, AHw. 1118, Kogan 2002:315–316). Given the fact that Arb. ṣayṛ- is also attested with such meanings

---
695 The only attestation of the Ugaritic verb (KTU 7.63:9) is rather unreliable.
694 With metathesis ṣṭ[yṛ-] > ṣṭ[yṛ-] throughout Aramaic (HALOT 2010).
as ‘a frontier-way of access to a country; the part of a country from which the invasion of
the enemy is feared’ (Lane 338), one cannot exclude that *ṭayr- ‘gate’ actually
belongs to the PCS lexical heritage and underwent a kind of semantic “deterioration”
in the early history of Arabic.

13. Hbr. ykl, JPA ykl ‘to be able’ (HALOT 410, DJPA 240).
   ◇ There is no established opinion on the origin of PNWS *ykl ‘to be able.’ On
   the one hand, it may be considered as a by-form of the well-known PWS *khel with the
   same meaning represented, among others, by OArm. khel ‘to be able’ (DNWSI 489),
   Arb. kahl- ‘mature, fully grown man’ (WKAS K 409), Sab. khel ‘to be successful’ (SD 77),
   Gez. kohla ‘to be able’ (CDG 277), Mhr. kohel ‘to be able’ (ML 205), Jib. khel ‘to be able to
tolerate’ (JL 128), Soq. kəf ‘pouvoir, connaître’ (LS 214).696 On the other hand, one
   might venture a direct comparison with PS *wkl ‘to (en)trust’ (DRS 539): Akk. waklu
   ‘overseer (person in charge of a group of soldiers, workers or craftsmen’ (CAD A 1
   277), Arb. wk (II) ‘to appoint as one’s deputy’ (Lane 3059), Sab. wk ‘to entrust’ (SD 160),
   Gez. twakkala ‘fidere, confidere,’ wakul ‘confisus, fretus,’ twakelt ‘confisio, fiducia, spes’
   (LLA 920).697

14. Ugr. ym, Hbr. yām, Syr. yammā ‘sea’ (DUL 965, HALOT 413, LSyr. 303, SL
   575).698
   ◇ No cognates outside NWS, as Arb. yamm- (LA 12 772) is almost certainly
   borrowed from Hebrew or Aramaic (Jeffery 1938:293).
   PNWS *yamm- (Fronzaroli 1968:273, 288, 299) has gradually ousted *tihām(-at)-,
   perhaps the main designation of “sea” in PS (Fronzaroli 1965a:136–137, 144, 149)
   represented by Akk. tiāmtum (AHw. 1353, CAD T 150), Ugr. thm, thmt (DUL 864), Hbr.
   tshōm (HALOT 1690), Arb. tihāmat- (Lane 320).

4. Conclusions

A comprehensive inquiry into the basic vocabulary of Aramaic and Canaanite
can only strengthen the preliminary impression obtained from the evidence of the
Swadesh wordlist: the amount of exclusive lexical features shared by these two minor
subdivisions of Semitic is surprisingly small. Fourteen shared isoglosses between
Hebrew and Syriac is certainly too little to allow one to speak of any sufficiently narrow
genealogical proximity between these two languages. In other words, the cumulative

---

695 Further data on the distribution of this root in Aramaic are conveniently summarized in HALOT
1891.

696 For this opinion cf., e.g., CDG 277, HALOT 1891 and, most recently, Huehnergard–Olyan
2013.

697 Many other representatives of this root in EthS and MSA adduced in CDG 612 and DRS 539 are
likely borrowed from Arabic. While it is certainly true that “‘to trust’ is not semantically close to ‘to be
able’” (Huehnergard–Olyan 2013:13), the gap is probably not so drastic either (“to have trust” > “to
have power to do something” > “to be able”).

698 The earliest attestations of this term probably come from Ebla (Fronzaroli 1998): PI-mu, PI-mu-
um = Sum. pap.a (VE 623), lū šā Pi-mu-mu ‘one who is in the sea’ (ARET 5, 4 iv 6).
evidence of the basic vocabulary from both within and outside the Swadesh list scarcely supports the traditional concept of North-West Semitic as a relatively recent and tightly-knit genealogical unity.\footnote{699}

The supplementary evidence analyzed in the preceding section is too restricted to be helpful for a meaningful choice between the two models of explanation briefly envisaged above in connection with the evidence from the Swadesh wordlist:

(1) the North-West Semitic community was a historical reality, yet a very short-lived and amorphous one

or

(2) there was no Proto-North-West Semitic at all, a few similarities between Aramaic and Canaanite being explainable as a result of relatively ancient and intensive interaction between two completely independent Central Semitic branches.

Since some of the features analyzed in the preceding section of this chapter can be rather confidently described as semantic innovations and, incidentally, are connected with sufficiently deep structural shifts in the basic vocabulary,\footnote{700} the former solution is probably to be preferred.

\footnote{699} As also observed in a recent summary description by H. Gzella (2011:446): “It is hard to define NWS in genetic or geographic terms, since significant features are too few, too ambiguous, and too unevenly spread across the data in order to allow for a completely consistent subclassification or a dialectal map.”

\footnote{700} PNWS *\textit{arway}/*\textit{aray} ‘lion’ (< “wild beast,” ousting PS *\textit{lab}V- ‘lion’); PNWS *\textit{dmy} ‘to resemble’ (partly ousting PS *\textit{mfl}); PNWS *\textit{gnb} (< *\textit{ganb} ‘side,’ ousting PS *\textit{šk} ‘to steal’); PNWS *\textit{šk} ‘to be dark’ (ousting PS *\textit{lm}).
Chapter 5.
Lexical isoglosses and the genealogical position of Ugaritic

1. Introduction

1.1. The genealogical position of Ugaritic has been hotly debated ever since the discovery of the language. The history of research and the variety of opinions are extensive, but two trends are generally prevalent today: Ugaritic is thought to be either a representative of an independent branch of North-West Semitic, or a member of its Canaanite subgroup. These two approaches are represented by such influential studies as Huehnergard 1991b and Tropper 1994.

In his 1994 article, J. Tropper attempted to justify the Canaanite affiliation of Ugaritic using the following criteria:701

(1) loss of the emphatic lateral *š
(2) contraction of the sequences *aw and *ay
(3) mimation in the dual and masculine plural
(4) validity of Barth’s law
(5) the forms γυudades, γυudades, γυudades, γυudades and γυudades in the prefix conjugation of the verbs with the meaning “to perish,” “to love,” “to take,” “to eat” and “to collect,” comparable to Hbr. υο(ξ)bad, υο(ξ)kal etc.
(6) loss of h in the prefix conjugation of the verb ḫlk ‘to go’
(7) the form *miya of the interrogative pronoun “who”
(8) preservation of the terminative-adverbial marker -Vh
(9) t-prefix in the 3 pl. f. of the prefix conjugation
(10) a-extended forms of the prefix conjugation (mostly in 1 sg. and pl.) and the imperative
(11) narrative use of the infinitive absolute.

In his turn, J. Huehnergard (1991b:285–286) was able to adduce two arguments against the Canaanite affiliation:

(1) Ugaritic does not participate in the shift a > i in the first syllable of the base of the suffix conjugation of the intensive and causative stems, which is typical of Canaanite languages of the first millennium (Hebrew ƙittel, ḥiktil), but first attested already in the Amarna Canaanite
(2) the Auslaut of the 1 sg. personal pronoun did not change from *-ū to -ʕ (a-na-ku vs. Hbr. ƙanōkī).703

701 For Tropper’s criteria 1–3, 6 and 8 see also Isaksson 1989–1990:58, for Tropper’s criteria 6 and 9 see also Ginsberg 1970:103–104.
702 In Tropper’s opinion, loss of the non-emphatic lateral *š in Ugaritic and Phoenician is also relevant in this respect.
703 Huehnergard emphasizes that this criterion is not identical to the generally recognized fact that Ugaritic does not participate in the Canaanite shift. Still, an eventual relationship between these two
In our opinion, both of Huehnergard’s arguments are cogent. Some of Tropper’s arguments are problematic, but many of them (notably, mimation in the dual and the masculine plural, the γυμδ- like forms of the imperfect of verbs primae ḫ, a- extended imperatives) are definitely worth considering. Moreover, a few additional Canaanite-like features in Ugaritic can be detected:


2. Biconsonantal structure of the active participle from roots II w/y in the basic stem (Ugr. ƙm, Hbr. kām ‘standing’) as opposed to Arb. qāʾēm-, Arm. ƙāʾēm, Akk. šāʾēmu (Ginsberg 1970:104)


1.2. Clearly enough, Ugaritic shares some of the characteristically Canaanite innovative isoglosses, but does not participate in a few others. A promising reconciliatory hypothesis would be to consider Ugaritic as representative of a special branch of Canaanite which underwent some of the specific changes typical of this subgroup, but separated from it too early to take part in a few other innovations. In other words, Ugaritic could be classified as a separate branch of NWS which is, nevertheless, closer to Canaanite than to Aramaic.

The phenomena is hardly in doubt. In our view, the Canaanite shift itself represents quite a strong isogloss separating Canaanite from Ugaritic (cf. Isaksson 1989–1990:59).

Thus, merger of *ṭ̣ and *ṣ is not truly specific as it took place also in Akkadian and in Modern EthS; contraction of *ṭaw and *ṭay is a very trivial phenomenon (Sivan 2003:537), which, nevertheless, was not fully developed even in such an obviously Canaanite language as Hebrew; Barth’s law is at least a common CS phenomenon (Sivan 2003:538), but can be much more ancient (v. extensively in Chapter 3, pp. 144-150 above); Canaanite is not the only branch of Semitic where the verb *ḥlk ‘to go’ exhibits peculiar morphological features (cf. Akk. ilities/illak, Blau 1978:37), whereas at least in one Canaanite language (Moabite) the prefix conjugation of *ḥlk does preserve h (u-ḥlk ‘I went’ in KAI 181:14–15); the *mīyāl/*mīhā system of interrogative pronouns is indeed not found in any Semitic language outside Canaanite and Ugaritic, but does occur in a few Afroasiatic languages such as Berber and may, therefore, be archaic rather than innovative (cf. Chapter 3, p. 176 above); preservation of the terminator-adverbial ending is an obvious archaism; the t-prefix in 3 pl. f. of the prefix conjugation is characteristic not only of Canaanite, but, as pointed out in Blau 1978:37 and Huehnergard 2005:169–170, also of MSA (Johnstone 1975:108) and ESA (Stein 2003:205, Nebes–Stein 2004:464); the narrative use of the infinitive absolute is very rare in Hebrew, whereas in Phoenician it is restricted to the 1 sg. personal pronoun as subject (Friedrich–Röllig 1999:192–193).

3 plural masculine forms in t- in the prefix conjugation of course represent another very peculiar isogloss between Ugaritic and Amarna Canaanite (Ginsberg 1970:103, Blau 1978:38). Their disappearance from later Canaanite dialects is intriguing (cf. further below in the concluding part of this chapter, p. 344).

It is hard to agree with the negative evaluation of this criterion in Blau 1978:37.

For this criterion applied to a few extant Ugaritic forms (all somewhat problematic) see Tropper 2000:540–541.

as a starting point, positive and negative criteria advanced by Huehnergard, Tropper and other scholars are to be thoroughly investigated and arranged in a certain hierarchical order.

In the meantime, it seems reasonable to turn our attention to the evidence of the basic vocabulary, which may provide valuable arguments in favor of one of the two hypotheses outlined above.

2. Basic vocabulary of Ugaritic: the Swadesh wordlist

2.1. The Swadesh wordlist: the evidence

Ugaritic is a dead language with a relatively restricted (and, quite often, poorly understood) text corpus. In such conditions, the very procedure of establishing the basic designations for several dozen fundamental concepts turns out to be a complex philological task which, to the best of our knowledge, has never been carried out consistently. It was found necessary, therefore, to check each pertinent slot of the Swadesh wordlist anew against the most up-to-date textual and lexicographic evidence. The results of this inquiry are presented below.  

2.1.1. Certain

This section includes 62 positions of the list that can be filled with reasonable confidence.  

1. “all”: kl (DUL 436).
   ⇒ Passim (e.g. 2.81:9–10: kl d ḫl [l špš m]lk rb ‘All that belongs to the Sun, the great king’).


709 We are well aware of the fact that linguistic evidence available from the extant Ugaritic texts is not homogeneous (Held 1959:169, Tropper 1993b, especially p. 393). Texts belonging to different periods and genres exhibit various peculiarities, and it is in the lexical domain that these specific features are expected to be especially well pronounced. A nice example is provided by Ugaritic terms for “donkey”: literary texts practically never use hmwr and prefer v and phl which, in their turn, are absent from economic and administrative documents (Kogan 2003b:250–251). As far as the Swadesh wordlist is concerned, this problem is not particularly acute, however: a great majority of positions are filled with terms attested in myths and epics and it may be stated with confidence that it is this stratum of the Ugaritic lexicon that the present list basically represents. Terms included into the list, but absent from the corpus of myths and epics are not many (klb ‘liver (strictly anatomic),’ dvr ‘seed,’ hnd ‘this,’ švr ‘hair,’ hnh ‘that,’ hbn ‘white’), and it is only in one case (mt vs. bnš ‘person’) that there are reasons to suspect that the concept under scrutiny was indeed expressed differently in texts of different genres.

710 Here and elsewhere below in this chapter, the headings of such entries will appear in bold.
7. “to bite”: ܢܳܟ (DUL 653).
⇒ Reliably attested in 1.6 vi 19: ܢܨܳܟܐ ܟ ܒܪܢ̣ ܝܡ ‘They bite themselves like snakes.’

⇒ Widely attested (e.g., 1.18 iv 23–24: ܫܦ̣ ܟܡ ܲܝܝ ܕܡ̣ ‘Spill (his) blood like an assassin’).

⇒ Reliably attested in 1.12 i 23–25 (ܟܪܝ ܪܡܬ ܨܡ̣ ܝܠ ܪܓܪܡ̣ ‘Drive your elbow into the dust, the bone of your hand into the ground’) and 1.19 iii 10–11 (ܝܒ݂̣ ܟܒܕܬܗ̣ ܘ ܝܠ ܝܗܕ̣) ܫܡ̣ ܒܝܢ̣ ܫܡ̣ ܠܫܢ̣ ‘He opened their entrails and saw: there was no fat, there was no bone’).

⇒ Reliably attested in 1.101:16–17 (ܛܘܠܒܕ ܟушки̣ ܒ ܝܕܠ̣ [ܛܫ] ܒܝܫܬ̣ ܠ ܒܝܫܬ̣ ‘She took the harp in her hands, placed the zither to her breast’) and 1.6 iii 19 (ܘ ܠܢܗ̣ ܒ ܒܝܫܬ̣ ܢܦ̣̣ ܐ ‘And my soul will rest in my breast’). For the lexical evidence (not fully reliable) v. Huehnergard 1987a:109.

12. “to burn”: ܫܳܦ̣ (DUL 844).
⇒ Reliably attested with the basic meaning “to burn” = “to destroy by fire” in 1.6 ii 31–35 (ܒ ܚܪܒ̣ ܛܒܩܢ̣ ܒ ܚܡ̣ ܛܕܪܢ̣ ܒ ܒܝܫܬ̣ ܛܫܡ̣ܢ̣ ܒ ܪܗ̣̣ ܛܫܡ̣ܢ̣ ܒ ܫܕ̣ ܛܕܪܢ̣ ‘With a knife she split him, with a sieve’ she winnowed him, with fire she burned him, with a hand-mill she ground him, in the field she scattered him’) and 1.6 v 13–14 (ܐܠܟ̣ ܗܡ̣ ܫܳܦ̣ ܒ ܒܝܫܬ̣ ‘Because of you I saw burning by fire,’ paralleled by other destructive actions).

The verb ܚܪ̣, adduced as a synonym in A. Militarev’s list (2004:298), is widely attested, but apparently not with the basic meaning “to destroy by fire” (translated ‘to dry up, to shrivel, to burn up, to catch fire’ in DUL 368): 1.5 ii 4–5 (ܒ ܦܗ̣ ܝܪܕ̣ ܟ ܚܪ̣ ܙܬ̣ ‘He will descend to his mouth like a roasted olive,’ Tropper 2000:584), 1.23:41 (ܟܫ̣ ܬܗܪ̣ ܠ ܒܝܫܬ̣ ‘A bird you roasted on fire’), 1.12 ii 37–38 (ܩܢ̣ ܦܢ̣ܢ̣ ܫܡ̣ܪ̣ [ܦ ... ] ܒ ܡܕܢ̣ܢ̣ ܫܡ̣ܡ̣ ‘The vigor of the face burned u[...] in the loins [it’ became hot’). Similarly, ܒܗ̣ ‘to ignite, to burn; to scorch the earth’ (DUL 212) does not appear in contexts immediately connected with fire.

⇒ Widely attested, e.g., ܝܪ̣ ܝܫܡ̣ ܛܡܐ ‘Let the clouds bring rain’ (1.19 i 40–41).
In Rabin 1975:87, ܝܫܡ̣ is adduced as an alternative, but this is hardly warranted (hapax legomenon in 1.107:34, context partly broken).

17. “to die”: ܡܛ̣ (DUL 596).
⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 6.30:1 (ܝܗ̣ ܘ ܠܝܡ̣ ܡܛ̣ ‘May he live and not die’).

18. “dog”: ܟܠܒ̣ (DUL 439).
Widely attested, e.g. 1.14 iii 18–19 (zīt (HttpContext 'barking of the hunting dogs,' paralleled by ti'īgt ūbrīh ‘neighing of his stallions,' nhki ḫmrḥ ‘braying of his donkeys' and ġīt ḥalp ḫrīt ‘bellowing of the plowing oxen').

⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.23:6 (w šty b ḫmr ṣn ṭay ‘And drink every kind of fermented wine').

⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.16 vi 42 (rīštum w ṭky ʿudn ‘Listen and let (your) ear be alert').

⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.23:61–62 (špt l ʿarṣ špt l šmm ‘One lip to the earth, one lip to the heaven'). For the lexical evidence v. Huehnergard 1987a:110.

23. “to eat”: ʾlhm (DUL 495).
⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.22 i 23–24 (ʾlhm rṣpm tṣyn ‘The rṣpm ate (and) drank').

PS *ʾkl ‘to eat’ is also preserved in Ugaritic, but its attestations are so infrequent in comparison with those of ʾlhm that it can hardly be treated as a real alternative (contra Militarev 2004:307 and especially Rabin 1975:87 and Hayes 1991:615, where only ʾkl is taken into consideration). Ugr. ʾkl may have had a more restricted meaning (such as “to devour,” “to consume”), applied to animals (1.6 ii 35) and fire (1.4 vi 24, possibly also 1.88.3).

⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.4 ii 12 (b Ṽṣi ʾnh w ṭḥmn ‘On lifting her eyes she saw her’).

26. “fat”: šmn, šmt (DUL 827).\(^{711}\)
⇒ The meaning “human or animal fat,” “grease” is clear in šmn ṭaz ‘goose fat' (4.247:22) and 1.19 iii 10–11 (ybḵ̡r ḳbdṭmn w [yḥd] ʾin šmt ṭin ṭym ‘He opened their entrails and saw: there was no fat, there was no bone’).

⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.6 ii 33 (b rīšt tšrpmn ‘With fire she burned him'). For the lexical evidence v. Huehnergard 1987a:110.

⇒ Well attested, the meaning is clear from 1.23:62–63 (ʾṣr šmm w dg b ṣm ‘The

\(^{711}\) The latter form is probably to be analyzed as [Šamattu] < *šaman-t-ia.
bird(s) of the sky and the fish(es) in the sea’).

31. “foot”: $\text{pnh}$ (DUL 660).
 ⇒ Widely attested, the basic meaning “the part of the leg below the ankle joint” (Kassian et al. 2010:61) is clear from 1.6 i 59–61 ($\text{pnh l tm\text{yyn hdm ri\text{\textsh}} l ym\text{y} \text{yapsh}$ ‘His feet do not reach the footstool, his head does not reach its (that of the throne) edge’).

32. “full”: $\text{ml}$ (DUL 545).
 ⇒ Reliably attested as a verbal root only (e.g. $\text{ymbru lh} \text{b s\text{nh}t}$ ‘Her heart is filled with joy,’ 1.3 ii 25–26). It is uncertain whether $\text{mlbru}$ in 1.87:20 and 1.39:10 is a nominal form (substantivization of the non-attested adjective *$\text{malV}*$) as assumed in DUL.

33. “to give”: $\text{ytn}$ (DUL 990).
 ⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 3.2:3–10 (PN₁ $\text{mlk \text{ugrt ytn bt PN}_2 \ldots [l P]N_3$ ‘PN₁, the king of Ugarit, gives the house of PN₂ ... [to P]N₃’).

37. “hand”: $\text{yd}$ (DUL 952).
 ⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.14 iii 53 ($\text{yr} \text{ydh \text{yamth}}$ ‘He washed his hands up to the elbow’).

38. “head”: $\text{r\text{\textis}}$ (DUL 724).
 ⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.6 i 59–61 ($\text{pnh l tm\text{yyn hdm ri\text{\textis} l ym\text{y} \text{yapsh}$ ‘His feet do not reach the footstool, his head does not reach (the throne’s) edge’).

39. “to hear”: $\text{\text{\textsm}}$ (DUL 823).
 ⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 2.4:18–19 (ht $\text{y\text{\textsm} u} \text{y} \text{ly}$ ‘Now, may my brother listen to my voice’).

40. “heart”: $\text{lb}$ (DUL 489).
 ⇒ Widely attested, but mostly in passages dealing with the heart as receptacle of thoughts and emotions. A strictly anatomic meaning is possible in 1.39:8-9: $\text{lb \text{rm\textst}}$ ‘a burnt heart (an offering)’ according to DUL.\footnote{More details (with a special emphasis on the precise anatomical meaning “heart”) can be found in Pardee 2000:58–59.}

41. “horn”: $\text{krn}$ (DUL 710).
 ⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.12 i 30–31 ($\text{bhm krn} \text{km \text{t}rm$ ‘They have horns like bulls’).

42. “I”: $\text{\text\text{\textan}, \text{\textank}}$ (DUL 76).
 ⇒ Both forms are well attested, although the former one is much less common and restricted to the poetic corpus (Tropper 2000:208). For the lexical evidence (*a-naku*) v. Huehnergard 1987a:108.
44. “knee”: *brk* (DUL 237).
   ⇒ Well attested, e.g. 1.2 i 27 (šrö vilm raškm l ı pr brkkm ‘Lift, oh gods, your heads from your knees’). For the lexical evidence (not fully reliable) v. Huehnergard 1987a:115.

45. “to know”: *ydv* (DUL 954).
   ⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 2.16:6–8 (retty tlv k ı yrbl l pn šsp ‘Let my mother know that I entered the presence of the Sun’).

47. “to lie”: *škb* (DUL 814).
   ⇒ Well attested, e.g. 1.14 i 33–35 (šnt tlrvrn w yškb njmmt w ykmš ‘Sleep overcame him and he lay down, the drowsiness, and he curled up’).

   ⇒ Attested several times in connection with sacrifices (e.g. 1.119:21–22: w kbd ... l brl vrgt ‘And liver ... for Bel vUgr’) and extispicine (kbd PN ‘the liver (= the omen) of PN’ in 1.143:1, possibly also kbdm tbhkrn ‘Two livers are to be inspected,’ 1.78:5). The lexical entry *kabidu* postulated in Huehnergard 1987a:62, 135 proved to be unreliable (Huehnergard 2008:392).

49. “long”: *yrk* (DUL 102).
   ⇒ Only the verbal root *yrk* ‘to be long’ (DUL 102) is attested: ḫrk ydv šl k ym ‘rll’s hand was as long as the sea’ (1.23:34). It is possible that *yrkt* in 1.3 v 23 represents a substantivized adjective *vark* ‘long’ with the meaning “arm” (‘I can reach them with the power of my long arm’ according to DUL).

   ⇒ Only *bšr* seems to be clearly attested with the meaning “flesh as food, meat” (Buck 1949:201, Kassian et al. 2010:69): yd b šv tšlh ḫrb b bšr īstn ‘They stretched the hand to the plate, put the knife in the meat’ (1.15 iv 24–25).

As for *šlr* (DUL 797), it is always attested in contexts which describe the consumption of one’s body and can be appropriately translated as “flesh” (e.g. 1.96:53: tsplr šrl ḫrb īst dmh l bl ḫs ‘She ate his flesh without a knife, drank his blood without a cup’). The lexical equation between Akk. *šīru* and Ugr. *ši-i-ru* (Huehnergard 1987a:180) is not relevant for establishing the basic designation of meat in Ugaritic as the Akkadian term conveys both meanings.

54. “moon”: *yrā* (DUL 979).
   ⇒ Widely attested, note especially the moon omina of 1.163 (e.g. 1. 14: [hm] yrā b

---


Cf. ‘in my broad grasp’ in Pardee 1997:254 (Pardee’s literal translation is “in the greatness of my length”).
"lyh yr₃k ‘If the moon in its ascension is yellow’) and the combination špš w yr₃k ‘sun and moon’ (e.g. 1.108:26).

55. “mountain”: yr (DUL 324).
⇒ Widely attested, e.g. 1.10 iii 29–31: w tbl bkm b ṣarr bm ṣarr w b špn b nım b yr ṭdvṣṭ ‘Thus she climbed up ṣArr, ṣArr and ṣPn, the beautiful one, the mountain of victory.’

56. “mouth”: p (DUL 657).
⇒ Well attested: b ph rgm l ṣyra ‘No word has gone out of his mouth’ (1.19 ii 26), ṭal yrdbkm k ṣinmr b ph ḏ ‘Let him not put you in his mouth like a lamb’ (1.4 viii 17–18).

57. “name”: šm (DUL 822).
⇒ Well attested, e.g. 1.2 iv 11–12: w yprv šmḥm šmk ṣat ygrš ṣ ‘And he proclaimed their names: as for you, your name is Ygrš.’

⇒ Attested in the expression ṣṛ ḥdt ‘the newly-wed’ (1.14 ii 47–48) as well as in several economic contexts such as 4.205:19 (ḥdwṭ ḥdt ‘a new ḥdwṭ-garment’).

60. “night”: ll (DUL 497).

61. “nose”: ṣḥp (DUL 88).
⇒ Reliably attested in 1.18 iv 24–26 (ṭṣi km ṣḥ ṳḥš ... km ḫt b ṣḥḥ ‘May his soul go out like wind ... like smoke from his nose’), cf. also its frequent use in hippiatric texts (Pardee 1985:50). For the lexical evidence v. Huehnergard 1987a:108.

62. “not”: l (DUL 482).
⇒ Passim.

63. “one”: ṣḥdl (DUL 32).

68. “root”: šrš (DUL 845).
⇒ Reliably attested in 1.19 iii 53–54: šršk b ṣarš ṣal ypr ṣrš ṣyḥ bd ṣṭḥk ṣ ‘May your root not grow in the earth, may (your) crown wither in the hands of those who uproot you.’

71. “to say”: rgm (DUL 733).
73. “seed”: \( dr\), \( dr\) (DUL 280).
⇒ Well attested, notably in 4.243 and 4.636, records of quantities of grain \( (dr)\) and chaff \( (dr)\). Cf. also \( dr\) in 1.72:29 (hippiatric), where the context is broken, but the seed of a certain medical plant is most probably intended (Pardee 1985:66).

74. “to sit”: \( y\) (DUL 994).
⇒ Well attested, e.g. \( y\ l\ kst\ mlk \) ‘He sat on the royal throne’ (1.16 vi 23).

76. ‘to sleep’: \( ysn\) (DUL 988).
⇒ Reliably attested in 1.14 i 31–35 \( (bm\ bkyh\ w\ ysn\ b\ dmt\ nhmmt\ šnt\ tl\r\an\ w\ yskb\ nhmmt\ w\ yskn\) ‘In his weeping he fell asleep, in shedding his tears, drowsiness (came); sleep overcame him and he lay down, drowsiness — and he curled up’) and 1.14 iii 15–16 \( (l\ ysn\ pbl\ mlk\ l\ kr\ †tr\ rbrh\ †Pbl\ the\ king\ will\ not\ be\ able\ to\ sleep\ because\ of\ the\ noise\ of\ the\ neighing\ of\ his\ horses)’.

79. “to stand”: \( km\) (DUL 702).
⇒ The meaning “to be standing up,” “to be upright” is most clearly seen in 1.2 i 30–31: \( l\ p\n\ ril\ l\ p\ tl\ l\ tšt\t\ r\ p\r\ m\ mlkm\ r\ tr\ r\ nr\ km\ ‘They fell down to \( r\rl\)’s feet, prostrated themselves in the plenary assembly, (and then), standing, transmitted their demand.’ Cf. also \( b\i\ km\ r\ r\ il\ ‘Brl\ was\ standing\ near\ \( r\rl\)’ in 1.2 i 21.

81. “stone”: \( r\bn\) (DUL 9).
⇒ Well attested: \( r\bn\ r\ l\ l\ n\ r\ ab\ ‘a\ matter\ of\ wood\ and\ a\ chatter\ of\ stone’\) (1.3 iii 22–23), \( r\bn\ yd\ ‘stone\ projectiles’\) (1.14 iii 13), \( r\bn\ mtnm\ ‘weights’\) (1.24:36–37).

82. “sun”: \( špš\) (DUL 836).
⇒ Widely attested: \( š\tr\ špš\ ‘sunrise’\) (1.3 ii 8), \( r\b\ špš\ ‘sunset’\) (1.15 v 18), \( ym\ špš\ w\ y\lh\ ‘Days\ of\ the\ sun\ and\ the\ moon’\) (1.108:26).

86. “this”: \( h\) (DUL 344).
⇒ Pertinent examples are extensively discussed in Tropper 2000:229.

87. “thou”: \( r\) (DUL 120).
Huehnergard 1987a:108.

⇒ Reliably attested in 1.169:11–12 (val tlvg šnḫ ‘May your tongue not confuse’) and 1.83:5-6 (šnḫ šmm šnḫ ‘With its tongue it licked the skies’). For the lexical evidence v. Huehnergard 1987a:143.

89. “tooth”: šn (DUL 832).
⇒ Reliably attested in 1.19 i 8–10 (k ḫrš ṣbn ṭh šnḫ w ṭḥl b ḫmn tšt ‘The “stones of his mouth” tore, his teeth seized, they put food in his devouring (maw),’ Pardee 1997:351).

90. “tree”: ṭš (DUL 186).
⇒ Reliably attested in 1.5 ii 5–6 (ybl ṣarr w pr ṣmm ‘yield of the earth and fruit of the trees’), ḫn [l]bnn w ṭš šryn ṣḥmḏ ṣarzḫ ‘Here is ḫmn and its trees, Šryn praised for its cedars’ (1.4 vii 20–21), ṣgm ṭš ṭḥš ṣmḥ ‘A matter of wood an a chatter of stone’ (1.3 iii 22-23). For the lexical evidence v. Huehnergard 1987a:161, 2008:395.

91. “two”: ūn (DUL 918).

92. “to walk”: ḫlk (DUL 337).
⇒ Widely attested, e.g., ḫm dlṯ tlk ‘Like a poor woman you shall walk’ (1.82:24), ṭlḥ ṭš ṭlḏ ṭmḏ ṭṯm ṭḥš ṭmḏ ṭš ṭmḏ ṭḏm ‘The king shall walk to welcome the gods; after the gods he shall walk on foot’ (1.43:23–25).

⇒ Reliably attested in 1.3 ii 38 (ṭḥy ṭm ṭḥy ṭḥy ‘They drew water for her and washed her’).

96. “what”: ṭḥy (DUL 534).
⇒ Well attested, e.g., 1.6 ii 13–14 (ḥy ṭršḥ ‘What do you wish of me?’).

98. “who”: ṭḥy (DUL 607).
⇒ Reliably attested in 1.16 v 14 (ḥy b [ḥlḏ] ‘Who among the gods?’), RS 92.2016:14’ (ḥy ḫḏš ‘Who is like ḫḏš?’).
The pronoun ṭḥy, apparently meaning “which,” is extensively discussed in Tropper 2000:238–239.

⇒ Widely attested: 1.19 iv 46 (ṭḥy ṭḥy ṭḥy ‘She put on the clothes of a woman’),
1.23:39 *(rɪl ʁaṭm k ʁyt ‘IL indeed tried to seduce the two women’).

2.1.2. Probable

What follows is a list of concepts for which the basic Ugaritic exponent was established with less certainty than in the previous section. These lexemes are, therefore, of less value for the comparative procedure, but in view of the scarcity of the lexical material at our disposal, their impact can hardly be overestimated.

2. “ashes”: ʿmr (DUL 165).

⇒ *Hapax legomenon* in 1.5 vi 14–16 (description of mourning): ʾyšk ʿmr ʾun l ʾrīš ʿpr ʾplt l ḫòḏh ‘He poured the ashes of grief on his head, dust of humiliation’ on his skull.’ The general context and the parallelism with ʿpr (cf. Hbr. ʾāpār wā-ʾēpār) favor the identification of ʿmr with the meaning “ashes” (so both Rabin 1975:87 and Militarev 2004:289), but no certainty is possible (cf. a number of alternative — albeit generally less attractive — proposals in DUL 165).

5. “big”: rb (DUL 727).

⇒ The meaning “big with strict reference to size” (Buck 1949:879)\(^\text{715}\) is probably present in 1.5 iii 3: rb tḥt ‘The seat is big’ (likely paralleled by rḥbt ‘is wide’ in the preceding line, although the context is broken). All other attestations of rb rather convey the idea of greatness as “importance,” “weight”: mlk rb ‘the great king’ (3.1:26 and elsewhere), ʾilm rbm ‘the great gods’ (1.124:2; cf. 1.3 iii 39), rbm ʾmḥs b ktp dkym ʾmḥs b šmd ṣvr mḥṣ ṣ ʾns ‘The big ones he struck with a scimitar’, the humble’ ones — with a mace, the small ones he pulled to the ground’ (1.6 v 2–4). For possible syllabic attestations with the meaning “large, great” v. Huehnergard 1987a:176.

As a serious alternative, the adjective ʿadr may be considered, translated as ‘wonderful, magnificent, strong, of good quality’ in DUL 20. The possibility of interpreting ʿadr as the basic adjective with the meaning “big,” “large” in Ugaritic will be extensively discussed below in this chapter (p. 275-276).

The adjective gdl ‘broad, wide’ (DUL 294) is attested only once: kdwṭ gdlm ‘large kdwṭ-garments’ (4.152:6), which is clearly insufficient for treating it as one of the basic terms for “big” (contra Hayes 1991:614 and Rabin 1975:87). Rabin also adduces ʾwād as an alternative, but this is hardly justified either.

16. “to come”: ʾmr (DUL 533).

⇒ According to Hayes 1991:616 and Militarev 2004:302, ʾtw (DUL 123) is the only representative of this semantic slot, reliably attested in such passages as 1.4 iv 32 (*rik ʾatwt ḫnyt ʾlm* ‘How is that the progenitress of the gods came?’) and 1.15 iii 18 (*tš̄ty ṣlm ʾrāḥlm* ‘Gods came to their tents’). However, there are weighty reasons to believe that the basic term for “to come” in Ugaritic is ʾmr (listed as one of the

\(^{715}\) “Big” = “large.” Cf. Buck 1949:878 where “big” is said to be a “more colloquial and expressive equivalent” of “large.”
alternatives in Rabin 1975:87).

- The number of attestations of mγγ is by far superior (more than 50 examples as opposed to only 10 for nw according to a rough count based on the evidence included in DUL). If nw were the main term for such a basic concept as “to come” (and mγγ, in its turn, were expressing a less fundamental meaning like “to reach,” “to arrive”) a reverse statistical distribution would be expected.

- The use of nw is restricted to the epic corpus, whereas mγγ is more or less evenly distributed among various literary and non-literary genres.

- That nw and mγγ are virtually synonymous (which means, by implication, that mγγ does not convey any specialized meaning such as “to arrive”) is clear from such structurally identical passages as 1.4 ii 21–24 (vick mγγ nšrm bn mγγ kš bl[t]l nʃt ‘How is it that Bbl the Victorious came, how is it that the Virgin nšt came?’), 1.3 iii 36 (vick mγγ gpn w ugr ‘How is it that Gpn and Ugr came?’) and 1.4 iv 31–32 (vick mγγ rbt nʃt[t] ym vik nʃt kl nʃt ‘How is it that the Lady nʃt came, how is it that the progenitress of the gods came?’).

The verb bw (DUL 203), listed as one of the alternatives in Rabin 1975:87, is quite infrequent and apparently means “to enter” rather than “to come” in all of its attestations.

30. “to fly”: ṣp (DUL 173).

⇒ Attested with this meaning in 1.19 iii 42–44 (knþ nšrm bnl ybr … hŋm ṣp nʃl ṣbln mγγ ‘May Bbl break the wings of the eagles … if they fly over the grave of my son’) and, probably, in 1.10 ii 11 (lšn knþ w tr b ṣp ‘She lifts the wing and moves’ flying’). Less transparent is 1.10 ii 23 (blt ymšk hm b ṣp, interpreted as ‘Bbl will anoint them with (the power) to fly’ in DUL, about horns). The context of w ṣp in 1.13:8 is partly broken, but the meaning “to fly” is supported by the presence of nšrk ‘your eagles’ in the same line.

Other possible candidates include:

- dyr ‘to fly’ (DUL 259) in 1.19 iii 13–14 (nšrm tpr w drw ‘May the eagles begin to fly’) and 1.108:8 (vnt dvi dvr ‘May vnt fly off’ according to DUL), adduced as the only representative of this position in Hayes 1991:616;

- npr ‘to fly, to start to fly’ (DUL 635) in 1.19 iii 13–14 (nšrm tpr w drw ‘May the eagles begin to fly’);

- n其所 ‘to take flight, to fly’ (DUL 648) in 1.117.10 (n其所 k n其所 ‘I shall take flight like a bird’).

That ṣp was the main Ugaritic verb with the meaning “to fly” is likely in view of its statistical preponderance, but no certainty is possible.

34. “good”: nm (DUL 613).

⇒ Both Rabin (1975:88) and Militarev (2004:317) opt for ḫb as the main representative of this position, but in fact ḫb is a relatively infrequent adjective mostly attested in the fixed expressions ksp ḫb ‘sterling silver,’ šmn ḫb ‘perfumed oil’ and yn ḫb
'generous wine’ (DUL 886). Conversely, nwm is attested in a wide variety of combinations (ššwm nwm ‘good horses’ in 2.45:17, rgnk nwm ‘your good word’ in RS 92.2010:18–19, ḫn nwm ‘good quality cane’ in 4.247:29, etc.). A strong proof of the basic status of nwm is the wide range of derivatives produced from this root (nwm ‘grace,’ nwm ‘handsome,’ nwm ‘delight’ and nwm ‘delight’) as opposed to their virtual absence in the case of ḫb. Admittedly, it is ta-bu that corresponds to Sum. dūg, Akk. ṭabu in the lexical list (Huehnergard 1987a:60, 131).

In Rabin 1975:88, dmk and mlah are adduced as alternatives to ḫb, which in both cases is completely unwarranted (cf. DUL 274 and 548 respectively).


⇒ Very widely attested, but nearly always about wool as material (thus corresponding more to šipātu than to šårtu in Akkadian). The only exception seems to be švr ḫlb ‘hair(s) of a dog’ in 1.114:29 (as materia medica), rightly compared to Akk. šårat kalbi (for which v. CAD Š₂ 128–129, written with the logogram SÍG) in DUL.

43. “to kill”: mḥš (DUL 540).

⇒ The basic meaning “to kill” is probable in such passages as 1.19 iv 34 (vmtḥš mḥš ṭalḥy ‘I will kill those who killed my brother’), 1.19 iii 52–53 (vmt ṭmt ṭakht ṭsr ‘Killing ṭAkht the hero is upon you’), 1.4 ii 24–25 (mḥšy hm [m]ḥš bny ‘They are those who are killing me, those who are killing my sons’). The same choice has been made in Hayes 1991:616 (and cf. already Held 1959:170). From a semantic point of view, Ugr. mḥš is thus not equivalent to Akk. maḥḥaṣu, which basically means “to hit,” “to strike.” The same is true of Hbr. mḥš, a rare poetic verb whose meaning was probably “to hit” (= ḥikkā) rather than properly “to kill.”

That ḥrg ‘to kill’ (DUL 346) was the main Ugaritic verb with this meaning (so Rabin 1975:88, Militarev 2004:325) is very unlikely in view of its scarce attestation (hapax legomenon in a fragmentary context in 1.13:5: ḥrg ar[br] ymm ‘Kill during four days!’).

52. “many”: ṣvr, ṣvrd (DUL 511–512).

⇒ No expression fully corresponding to Hbr. ṭanāʾim rabbim ‘many people’ seems to be attested in Ugaritic. The closest approximation is perhaps šḥak ṭal ṣvr ‘Your army is a numerous force’ (1.14 ii 35). Cf. also ṣvr ṣṣim ‘great number of ewes’ in 1.5 iii 22–23 (context broken) and šgr ṣvr ‘numerous offspring’ in 1.5 iii 16–17 (context broken).

64. “person”: bnš (DUL 230), mṭ (DUL 598).

716 As will be pointed out below in this chapter, visible prominence of nwm in Ugaritic no doubt correlates with its high frequency in Phoenician (DNWSI 738), where ḫb is conspicuously absent.

717 The meaning “to kill” ascribed to maḥḥaṣu in CAD M₁ 71 is rarely compelling. Interestingly enough, the most convincing examples come from the Canaanite Amarna letters and likely reflect the local usage. Note especially EA 245:14, where ma-ḥḥaṣ-u-a appears as a gloss to da-ku-ṣu ‘they killed him.’ For a somewhat contradictory evaluation of our hypothesis see Levine 2010:1157–1160.
In Rabin 1975:88, bnš is adduced as the only representative of this position, which may be justified in view of such passages as ħm mt yrł bnš ‘If death threatens a man ...’ (1.127:30) and reliable lexical evidence for bu-nu-šu = Akk. amīlu (Huenehergard 1987a:114). Note, however, that bnš is conspicuously absent from the epic corpus, where mt is attested in a context rather similar to 1.127:30 (mt ṛḥṛṭ mh ykḥ mh ykḥ mt ṛḥṛṭ ‘A man, as (his) final destiny, what can he attain, what can a man attain as the final outcome?’, 1.17 vi 35–36). One cannot exclude, furthermore, that radm (DUL 17) could also be used with the general meaning “human being,” as probably in l radm ‘Oh man!’ (1.169:14) and piṭ radm ‘temples of a man’ (1.107:3).  

65. “rain”: mṭr (DUL 603).

The meaning “rain” for mṭr is suitable in all of its three attestations (1.16 iii 7: nvm l ṣavṣ mṭr brl ‘Bēl’s rain is good for the earth’; 1.4 v 6–7: ṣdn mṭrḥ brl ‘Bēl will be able to store his rain’; 1.5 v 6–8: ṣḥ rḥḥ ṭḥḥ mḏlk mṭrḥ ‘Take your clouds, your wind, your watering device’, your rains’). However, at least two other terms with comparable meanings (ṭl, ṛḥḥ) are no less frequent: ṭl ṣmm ‘dew of the skies’ (1.3 ii 39), ṭl ṣmm l ṣyḥm ‘May the dew drop upon the grapes’ (1.19 i 41–42), ṭl ṭl ṭl ṛḥḥ ‘There was neither dew nor drizzle’ (1.19 i 44), ṛḥḥ ṣḥkh ṣḥkh ṣḥkh ‘Drizzle that the stars poured on her’ (1.3 iv 44), ṛḥḥ ṣḥḥ ṣḥḥ ṣḥḥ ‘Drizzle of the Charioteer of the clouds’ (1.3 ii 39–40). Additionally, several less common synonyms are known: ṣḥ ’rmm ‘rain, downpour’ (DUL 310), ḫḥḍ ‘downpour, sqll’ (DUL 387), yr ‘early rain’ (DUL 977). In such conditions, a meaningful selection of one basic term for “rain” turns out to be quite difficult.  

67. “road”: ntb(t) (DUL 651).

This is the only suitable candidate, reliably attested in 1.119:33–34 (ntbt b[t brl] ṭḥlk ‘We shall tread the path of the temple of Bēl’) and 1.82:37 (w ṛḥḥ l ntbḥ ‘I will return to your path’). It is hardly possible to ascertain whether ntb(t) was indeed the main Ugaritic term for “road, way” (functionally equivalent to Hbr. dāvāk) or just a relatively rare poetic synonym (”path,” like Hbr. nāṭīḥ, nāṭībā). The former possibility seems to be supported by the fact that ntbḥ is also attested outside the literary corpus (translated as ‘toll, right of way’ in DUL).  

72. “to see”: ḫḥ (DUL 667), ḫḥ (DUL 167), ḫḥ (DUL 356).

A definitive choice between these three synonyms is difficult, although it may be observed that ḫḥ is the least frequent verb with this meaning, whereas only ḫḥ is attested outside the literary corpus. Contra Rabin (1975:89), there is no reason to treat ṛmr as one of the basic verbs with the meaning “to see” in Ugaritic (cf. DUL 71–72 as well as below in this chapter, p. 327).

---

718 For this term see further below in this chapter (pp. 273-274).
719 Discussed below in this chapter (pp. 286-287).
720 Thus, it is hard to agree with Hayes (1991:615), who adduces ḫḥ as the only representative of this position.
75. “skin”: γρ (DUL 325).
→ Likely attested in 1.19 iv 11 (πτύμ γρ ‘those who gash (their) skin’) and 1.5 vi 17–18 (γρ b ṭaḥn ṣdy ‘He ripped (his) skin with a stone (knife)’). Both passages most probably refer to the well-known practice of gashing one’s skin in mourning. As pointed out in Huehnergard 1987a:47, Ugr. ῥῡ-所所,721 equated to Sum. su and Akk. mašku in the lexical list, is not easily compatible with the alphabetic evidence as γ is expected to be rendered with ṣ-signs in the syllabic cuneiform.

78. “smoke”: ḫtr (DUL 720).
→ This is the most probable meaning of Ugr. ḫtr in 1.169:2–3 (ταμ … ḫ tr ṭrbbtm ‘Let them go out … like smoke from a window’). In 1.17 i 27 (l Ṗατ mışou ḫ ph) the meaning of ḫtr is disputed: ‘Que de la “tierra” libere su “espíritu” (del Olmo Lete 1981:369) vs. ‘to send up from the earth his incense’ (Pardee 1997:344). In 1.18 iv 24–26, ḫtr is usually rendered as “smoke” (ταμ km ṭ h ṭpsk … km ḫ tr b ṭaph ‘May his soul go out like wind … like smoke from his nose’), but the alternative translation “wind” cannot be completely excluded.

84. “tail”: Ḿb (DUL 288).
→ Likely attested in 1.114:20 (bṭ kram ṭ Ḿb ‘He of two horns and a tail’) and ṭrpy ṭm Ḿbttm ‘It covered’ the sea with its tails’ in 1.83:6–7.

85. “that”: ḥnk, ḥnkt (DUL 344).
→ Presumably attested in such passages as 1.33:22–24 (w mlk bṭly ḥm ḥnk l ṭbdh ‘Why did the king my lord impose that on his servant?’), but cf. Tropper 2000:229: “… ist damit zu rechnen, dass einige oder gar alle Belege von ḥndt, ḥnk und ḥnkt als Adverbien und nicht als DemPrr fungieren.”

97. “white”: Ṽbn (DUL 490).
→ Probably attested in 4.182:4 (ḥs ṭaḷm lbnm ‘white ṭaḷ-garments’), opposed to ṭaḷ šmt and ṭaḷ ṭikvr (cf. Bulakh 2005a:31). It is likely that Ṽa-ba-nu in the lexical list represents the adjective “white” (Huehnergard 1987a:142).

100. “yellow”: ṭrḥ (DUL 982).
→ Translated as “greenish yellow” in DUL, but according to Bulakh 2005a:35, the specification “greenish” is largely conditioned by etymology. Bulakh follows Pardee (1997:290) who assumes that ṭrḥ in 1.163:14 ([ḥm] ṭ ṭ h ṭrḥ) denotes the yellow color of the moon which, together with the reddish color (ḥϕm), is opposed to the moon’s normal color (presumably, white).

2.1.3. Not established

---

721 For the reading, confirmed by van Soldt’s collation, see now Huehnergard 2008:376.
For twenty positions of the Swadesh wordlist, it was impossible to establish the basic Ugaritic term with sufficient degree of certainty. These positions are listed below in the alphabetic order. Proposals made in previous studies, but found unconvincing upon deeper scrutiny, are mentioned and briefly analyzed in footnotes.


722 That *ḥmt in 1.82:7 is etymologically identical with PS *ḥamit- (and, therefore, denotes the lower part of the abdomen) is possible (so DUL 365), but this difficult context (cf. del Olmo Lete 2004:375) is by no means sufficient to conclude that *ḥmt was the main Ugaritic term for belly. Another, perhaps more likely, candidate is *kbd which, besides the original meaning “liver,” also denotes “innards,” “entrails” and “womb.” As pointed out in Rabin 1975:89, the meaning “external belly,” “abdomen” is conceivable for *kbd in 1.19 iii 24–25 (yḥkš *kbdh w yḥd ṭm snt ṭm qm ‘He opened his belly and saw: there was no fat, there was no bone’). If this conjecture is correct, the semantic evolution of PS *kabid- in Ugaritic would be similar to one observed in Ethiopian Semitic (cf. Gez. kábdl ‘liver, stomach, belly,’ CDG 273). This interpretation would provide a suitable geographic context for the expression kabātum-ma ‘on the belly’ in the Amarna Canaanite (note that the reflexes of *kabid- are not attested with this meaning either in Akkadian or in the rest of NWS). As for *krs, selected for this position in Hayes 1991:615, it probably does not exist at all (cf. DUL 457).

725 *brd, added for this position in Hayes 1991:616, does not seem to be attested with the relevant meaning (cf. DUL 236).

724 The verbal root *hrb, added for this position in Rabin 1975:87, is hapax legomenon (*b gvn yḥb in 1.19 i 30, context broken). It is highly uncertain whether it functioned as the main verbal root with the meaning “to be dry” in Ugaritic.

725 The only potentially relevant passage is 1.23:39–40 (rātm tšm y mt mt ‘Both women shouted: o man, man!’), but the general context and the parallelism with *wd ‘father’ strongly suggest the meaning “husband” rather than simply “male individual,” “man.” Differently from many other Semitic languages, the neutral concept “human being,” “person” is much better articulated in the extant Ugaritic corpus (cf. pp. 253-254 above in this chapter).

726 That *ḥlk means “neck,” “throat” (Rabin 1975:88, Hayes 1991:615) is possible, but hard to prove (cf. DUL 361 for a number of alternative suggestions).

727 Several competing terms for “red” suggest themselves, but since for none of them even a minimal degree of certainty is possible, we thought it wise to drop this concept entirely from our list (contrast Rabin 1975:88). Thus, *ḥmn (< PS *ḥamn- ‘coal, ember,’ DUL 668, HALOT 924) likely denotes the reddish color of the moon in 1.163:12–13: ḫmn yrḥ b ḥ[yḥ] w ḥmn ṭm[n] yḥ[n] ‘If the moon, when it rises, is reddish, it will be favorable’ (elsewhere this term designates a kind of fabric, presumably dyed with red purple). As for *snt (originally ‘carnelian’), it is used as a genitive attribute of *ḥmn in 4.182:5 (*ḥmn *snt) as opposed to *ḥmn *ḥmn and *ḥmn *ḥmn immediately before and after in the same text (see further ḫmn d ḥḥw d ṭm snt in 4.168:1, ḫmn ṭm w ṭm snt in 4.341:7, etc.). The verbal root *ḥmn is usually interpreted as “to become red” (DUL 17), attested in 1.19 iv 42 (ṭrhmn b ḥḥw ymn ‘She rouged herself with the sea snails’) and 1.14 ii 9 (ṯḥḥ ḥ ṭm[n] ‘Wash yourself and put on make up’), see further p. 273 below in this chapter. As for *ḥmn ‘red, reddish’ (DUL 364), it is not attested outside hippiatric texts (e.g. 1.85:17), where it is used as an attribute of ḥmn/ḥmn, denoting some kind of materia medica. Its interpretation as “red” (e.g. Cohen–Sivan 1983:31–32) is arbitrary.

728 None of the two synonyms adduced in Rabin 1975:89 is a satisfactory representative of this meaning: in all passages where *ṣmr is attested it means “young,” “youngster” rather than “small” with strict reference to size, whereas ḏlk is mostly applied to garments and might express a wide variety of
2.2. The Swadesh wordlist: analysis

As shown in the preceding sections of this chapter, fully reliable basic terms can be revealed for 62 positions of the Ugaritic wordlist. For 21 positions, likely or probable candidates have been found. Only 20 positions are vacant, a surprisingly small number for such a limited-corpus ancient language as Ugaritic.

Within the framework of the standard lexicostatistical procedure, this list could be immediately submitted to statistical comparison with those of cognate languages. The present investigation requires a different approach. First of all, an internal analysis of the Ugaritic list is necessary: trivial retentions must be separated from more specific terms, which alone are potentially valuable for the subgrouping procedure.

2.2.1. Trivial retentions amount to 44 (42 + 2) cases out of 83,730 or 53% of the list.

1. “all”: kl < *kull- (CDG 281); 7. “to bite”: nṯk < *nṯk (CDG 402); 9. “blood”: dm < *dam- (SED I No. 50); 10. “bone”: ṭm < *ṭm- (SED I No. 25); 17. “to die”: ml < *mwl (SED I No. 43); 18. “dog”: klḥ < *kalḥ- (SED II No. 115); 19. “to drink”: št < *št (CDG 518); 21. “ear”: ṭdḥ < *ṭdḥ- (SED I No. 4); 22. “earth”: ṣrš < *ṣrš- (HALOT 90); 25. “eye”: ṣḥ < *ṣhm- (SED I No. 28); 28. “fire”: ṣḥš < *ṣḥš- (CDG 44); 32. “full”: mlḥ < *mlḥ (CDG 342); 36. “hair”: šrṣ, šrt < *ṣdrṣ- (SED I No. 260); 37. “hand”: ṣdh < *ṣdh- (SED I No. 291); 38. “head”: ṣḥš < *ṣḥš- (SED I No. 225); 39. “to hear”: šmḥ < *šmḥ (CDG 501); 40. “heart”: ḫḥ < *ḥḥ- (SED I No. 174); 41. “horn”: ḫrn < *ḥhrn- (SED I No. 168); 42. “I”: ḫn, ḫnk < *ḥnV, ḫnḫ (CDG 26); 44. “knee”: ḫbh < *ḥbh- (SED I No. 39); 45. “to know”: ṣdv < *ṣdv (CDG 626); 48. “liver”: ḫbd < *ḥbd- (SED I No. 141); 54. “moon”: ṣḥḥ < *ṣḥḥ- (CDG 617); 56. “mouth”: ḫḥ < *ḥḥ- (SED I No. 223); 57. “name”: ḥm < *ḥm- (CDG 504); 58. “new”: ḥṭ < *ḥṭ (CDG 225); 60. “night”: ḫl < *ḥlš (CDG 314); 61. “nose”: ḥḥp < *ḥḥp- (SED I No. 8); 62. “not”: ḫl < *ḥlḥ (HALOT 511); 63. “one”: ḫḥd < *ḥḥd- (CDG 12); 68. “root”: šrš < *šwrš- (CDG 535); 73. “seed”: ḥr, ḥr < *ḥdr- (CDG 642); 80. “star”: ḫḥḥ < *ḥḥḥ (CDG 280); 81. “stone”: ḫmh < *ḥmh (CDG 4); 82. “sun”: ḥḥ < *ḥḥ (HALOT 1589); 84. “tail”: ḫḥb < *ḥḥb- (SED I No. 64); 86. “this”: ḫḥd < *ḥḥdV + *ḥḥ (CDG 629); 87. “thou”: ḫ ḫ < *ḥḥt (CDG 32); 88. “tongue”: ḫḥn < *ḥḥn- (SED I No. 181); 89. “tooth”: ḫn < *ḥḥn (SED I No. 249); 90. “tree”: ṭs < *ṭšš- (CDG 57); 91. “two”: ḫṭ < *ṭṭ (HALOT 1605); 94. “water”: ḫḥ < *ḥḥ- (CDG 376); 99. “woman”: ḫḥḥ < *ḥḥḥ-

meanings such as “fine,” “thin” (the lexical evidence discussed in Huehnergard 1987a:79, 119 is not entirely reliable, but cf. Huehnergard 2008:386). Nevertheless, the opposition ḫḥ < *ḥḥ- in economic texts makes it tempting to interpret these lexemes as the basic adjectives with the meanings “large” and “small” respectively (see further pp. 275-276 below in this chapter).

729 ḫḥḥ adduced in Rabin 1975:87 is not used as an adjective. As for the verbal root ḫḥḥ, there is hardly any compelling reason to treat it as the main exponent of the meaning “to be hot” in Ugaritic (cf. DUL 362-363).

730 The additional three terms have emerged because for two semantic slots (“person” and “to see”) more than one exponent have been accepted.
2.2.2. The remaining examples \((39 = 20 + 19)\) can be subdivided in two categories.

2.2.2.1. Examples of the first category \((13 = 9 + 4)\) can be conventionally described as “less specific.” They include Ugaritic terms which cannot be traced back to the most trivial PS prototypes, yet are paralleled by cognates in so many languages (notably, Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian) that their value for genealogical subgrouping of Ugaritic turns out to be very low. In the terminological framework adopted in this monograph, most of these terms can be qualified as non-trivial retentions from PS, PWS or PCS.

5. “big”: \(rb\) — Akk. \(rabû\) (CAD R 26, AHw. 936), Syr. \(rabbā\) (LSyr. 706).

⇒ The roots \(*rb\), \(*rb\) are attested in several other Semitic languages, but nowhere outside Akkadian, Ugaritic and Aramaic do they function as the basic exponents of the meaning “(to be) big, large.”\(^{731}\)

12. ‘to burn’: \(šr̄p\) — Akk. \(šarāpu\) (CAD Š 50, AHw. 1185), Hbr. \(šr̄p\) (HALOT 1358).

⇒ Also in some varieties of early Aramaic (DNWSI 1194). Clearly related are Mbr. \(šr̄f\) ‘to build up sticks for a fire’ (ML 383), Jib. \(šér̄f\) ‘to build a fire to heat milk-heating stones; to put milk-heating stones on the fire’ (JL 254), Soq. \(šērof\) ‘to boil on a strong fire.’\(^{732}\)

33. “to give”: \(ytn\) — Akk. \(nadānu\) (CAD N 42, AHw. 701), Hbr. \(ntn\) (HALOT 733), Syr. \(nettel\) (LSyr. 298).

⇒ Further etymology unknown.

47. “to lie”: \(škb\) — Hbr. \(škb\) (HALOT 1486), Syr. \(škeb\) (LSyr. 775), Gez. \(sakaba\) (CDG 496, with cognates in other EthS).

⇒ Akk. \(sakāpu\) ‘to lie down’ (CAD S 74, AHw. 1011) must be related in spite of two phonological irregularities, but this relatively uncommon verb is clearly not the main exponent of the meaning “to lie” in Akkadian.

49. “long”: \(ørk\) — Akk. \(arku\) (CAD A 283, AHw. 69), Hbr. \(ørš\) (HALOT 88), Syr. \(ørrik\) (LSyr. 49).

⇒ Further cognates are sparse and not fully reliable: Arb. \(ørk\) ‘to keep in a place, to remain, to continue’ (Lane 50), Sab. \(ørk\) ‘duration of time?’ (SD 7).\(^{733}\)

\(^{731}\) See further Chapter 3 above (pp. 194-195).

\(^{732}\) Not in the published sources, recorded in the course of our fieldwork.

\(^{733}\) The meaning of the Sabaic lexeme is rather uncertain, but note the translation ‘für alle Zeit’ tentatively accepted in Sima 2000:219 for C 584:9.
53. “meat”: bšr — Hbr. bāšār (HALOT 164), Syr. besrā (LSyr. 82), Har. bāšār (EDH 47), Gur. bāšār (EDG 159) < PWS *bašar- ‘meat’ (SED I No. 41).

65. “rain”: mṭr — Syr. meṭrā (LSyr. 382), Arb. mṭar- (Lane 2722).
 ⇒ Further possible cognates of PCS *maṭar- ‘rain’ are analyzed in Chapter 3, pp. 174-175 above. For the functional status of Hbr. māṭār (HALOT 574) in comparison to gāšām (ibid. 205) see below in this chapter (pp. 286-287).

75. “to sit”: yšb — Akk. wašābu (CAD A 386, AHw. 1480), Hbr. yšb (HALOT 444), Syr. yīteb (LSyr. 311), Sab. wṭb (SD 165), Min. wṭb (LM 106).
 ⇒ Gez. ṣawṣāba ‘to take a wife, to marry’ (CDG 619) is usually compared with this root, which is not implausible. PS *wṭb left no transparent reflex in Arabic: wṭb ‘to sit down’ as well as wṭāb- ‘throne, couch’ (Lane 2919–2920) are qualified as Himyarite words in the traditional lexicography and must be traced back to a South Arabian substratum (v. extensively al-Selwi 1987:216–217). The meaning “to jump,” normal for wṭb in Classical Arabic, does not immediately fit “to sit down” in PS.

79. “to stand”: ḳm — Syr. Ḳām (LSyr. 652), Arb. qwm (Lane 2995), Gez. Ḳoma (CDG 455).
 ⇒ Also in ESA: Sab. Ḳwm ‘to stand (crops), to be planted’ (SD 110), Min. Ḳwm ‘dresser’ (LM 73), Qat. Ḳ-km ‘to set up’ (LIQ 144). Hbr. Ḳwm is well attested, but mostly with the meaning “to rise,” “to get up” rather than simply “to stand” (HALOT 1068), for which ṣmd is used (ibid. 840).

92. “to walk”: ḥlk — Akk. alāku (CAD A 300, AHw. 31), Hbr. ḥlk (HALOT 246), Syr. ḥlk (pa.) (LSyr. 177).
 ⇒ In Arabic, ḥlk is preserved with the meaning “to perish” (Lane 3044), clearly a semantic extension of “to go away.” A variety of terms derived from the root ḥlk are attested in Qatabanian (LIQ 45–46), but their exact meanings and relationship to PS *ḥlk require further study.

96. “what”: mh — Hbr. mā (HALOT 550), Syr. mā (LSyr. 372), Arb. mā (Lane 3016).
 ⇒ Further discussion of *maḥa ‘what’ as a PCS feature opposed to *mīnu in Akkadian and EthS can be found in Chapter 3, p. 176 above.

97. “white”: lbn — Hbr. lābān (HALOT 517), Mhr. wbōn (ML 251, also in other MSA).
 ⇒ Further possible cognates are extensively discussed in Bulakh 2004:270–273. None of them functions as the basic color term with the meaning “white.”

---

734 Probably borrowed from Arabic are Tgr. ḥalkā ‘to exert oneself; to die’ (WTS 4), Tna. halākā ‘to toil, to get tired’ (TED 5) and Soq. ḥotēlık ‘périr’ (LS 143). See further p. 232 in Chapter 4 above.
100. “yellow”: ṣwrk — Akk. warku (CAD A 300, AHw. 1470), Syr. yarkānā (LSyr. 309).

⇒ According to Bulakh 2005a:170, PS *wrk is to be reconstructed with a non-differentiated meaning “(bright) green-yellow,” but languages where the reflexes of this root are reliably attested with the basic meaning “yellow” are rather few.

2.2.2.2. It is only the second group (26 entries, or 31% of 83 terms included into the Ugaritic list) that is truly specific and, therefore, pertinent for our purpose. These 26 cases can be subdivided into three main sub-categories.

(1) The largest subgroup (12 = 3 + 9) comprises Ugaritic lexemes whose basic status is not shared by cognate words in any other Semitic language.


⇒ According to a broad consensus (DUL 533, and, with some reservations, also Tropper 2000:95), Ugr. μγγ must be explained as a peculiar offshoot of PS *μτρ ‘to reach.’ This etymology, in spite of its obvious attractiveness, is faced with two obstacles: (1) PS *μτρ is already attested in Ugaritic as μτ, which is perfectly regular from the phonological point of view735; (2) the shift *r > γ has no reliable precedent in Ugaritic. While the first obstacle is probably not crucial,736 the second one is serious enough to force one to look for an alternative etymology of μγγ — so far without success.

23. “to eat”: lhm.

⇒ The verbal root *lhm with the meaning “to eat” is also attested in Hbr. lhm ‘to eat, to taste’ (HALOT 526) and Akk. lēmu ‘to take food or drink’ (CAD L 126), but both verbs are very marginal. For *laḥm- ‘bread, food’ as a PCS lexical isogloss v. Chapter 3, p. 191 above.


⇒ PS *šamn- is widely attested (SED I No. 248), but most of its reflexes designate “fat” as food stuff rather than an anatomic category: “Indica le sostanze grasse animali e vegetali, quindi l’olio, il grasso e in alcune lingue anche il burro” (Fronzaroli 1964:28). Thus, Hbr. šämän is very seldom used as an anatomic term.737 Similarly, only a small minority among numerous attestations of Akk. šammu (CAD Š 329) refer to animal (let alone human) fat. The corresponding anatomic designations are Hbr. ḫēlāb (HALOT

---

735 As is well known, in 1.12 i 36–37 these two roots are even attested in parallel hemistichs: wn γγγγ γακλμ || w γγγγ γακλμ ‘Now he is coming to the devourers || and reaches the destructors.’

736 At least one more potentially similar pair of etymological doublets is attested in Ugaritic, viz. PS *ptw ‘to be thirsty’ yielding ptw in 1.15 i 2 and γw in 1.4 iv 34. Also PS *flm ‘to be dark’ probably underwent a similar development, with two etymological doublets again attested within one bicolon: bn γılmtn γγγγ γατ || bn γılmtn γγγγ γατ (1.8:7–8). Although the interpretation of the whole passage is problematic, the translation ‘darkness’ is likely for both γılmtn and γılmtn.

737 The only pertinent passage listed in BDB 1032 seems to be ḫsārī ḫlḥαš mi-ššāmān ‘My flesh has become emaciated’ (Ps 109:24).
315) and Akk. *lipû (CAD L 202, AHw. 555).

34. “good”: *n̂vm.
⇒ From PCS *n̂vm, extensively discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 192-193 above). It is only in Ugaritic and Phoenician (DNWSI 7389) that this root has become the main exponent of the meaning “(to be) good.”

43. “to kill”: *m̩š.
⇒ A semantic evolution of PS *m̩š ‘to strike, beat’: Akk. maḫšu ‘to hit, to wound, to strike’ (CAD M 71, AHw. 580), Hbr. mš ‘to smash’ (HALOT 571), OArm. mš ‘to beat’ (DNWSI 610), Syr. mšā ‘verberavit, cecidit’ (LSyr. 380), Sab. mšl ‘to smite, to defeat’ (SD 84), Qat. mš ‘defeat’ (LIQ 95), Gez. mašā ‘to smite, to cut, to destroy’ (CDG 337), Tna. masha ‘to break, to split’ (TAD 353), Arg. masha ‘to hit’ (Leslau 1997:211), Har. maša ‘to hit, to beat, to strike’ (EDH 105), Gaf. maš ‘frapper’ (Leslau 1956:218), Zwy. mā ‘to hit, beat, strike’ (EDG 437).

64a. “person”: bnš.
⇒ Etymologically uncertain. Hypothetical derivation from *binu (♀)nāši ‘son of man’ is faced with formidable difficulties (Huehnergard 1987a:47).

64b. “person”: mt.
⇒ From PS *mut-, whose original meaning is somewhat uncertain: the cumulative evidence of Akk. mutu (CAD M 2 313), Ugr. mt (DUL 598) and Gez. mṭ (CDG 371) would suggest “husband,” but note that a more general meaning “man” is the only one registered for Hbr. mṭim (HALOT 653, a rare word attested only in the plural).

67. “road”: ntb(t).
⇒ No parallel outside Hbr. nātb, nṭibā ‘path’ (HALOT 732), both rare poetic words. Cf. perhaps Arb. ntb ‘to swell forth, to become prominent, protuberant’ (Lane 2761): for the meaning shift “to be high, protruded” > “way, road” cf. Hbr. masillā < sll (HALOT 606).

---

738 The reflexes of *m̩š are also attested with the meanings (1) “to suffer from labor pains” (v. SED I No. 40, and SED II, p. 346); (2) “to weave” (Akk. maḫšu, CAD M 78; JPA mš, DJPA 300; Soq. maḫš, LS 240); (3) “to make butter” (Arb. mšl ‘to churn, to beat, to agitate the milk,’ Lane 2693; Tgr. maḥš ‘to shake (milk), to make butter,’ WTS 111). Each of these is likely to go back to the basic meaning “to strike” even if the underlying semantic shifts are not yet fully understood (cf. Held 1959). While the meanings “to travail” and “to make butter” may look like South Semitic areal isoglosses, the distribution of the meaning “to weave” suggests a more deeply rooted semantic development.

739 Attested only once in 1.23:39-40, but the meaning is clear from the context: hm nṭim tẓm y mt mt ‘If both women shout: oh husband, husband!’ (paralleled by y rād rād ‘Oh father, father!’ in l. 43).

740 For the marginal presence of mutu ‘man, warrior’ in Akkadian v. CAD M 2 316.
71. “to say”: *rgm.
⇒ Semantic generalization of PS *rgm ‘to speak affectively, to shout,’ extensively discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 215-216 above).

72a. “to see”: *phy.
⇒ Etymologically obscure.

72b. “to see”: *šn.
⇒ Denominative from PS *šayn- ‘eye’ (SED I No. 28). Similar formations are found in a few other Semitic languages (cf. HALOT 817), but all of them are functionally peripheral.

85. “that”: *hnk(t).
⇒ Both *hanni- and *ka are well attested throughout Semitic (Tropper 2000:229, 835–836), but nowhere outside Ugaritic does their combination function as the basic exponent of remote deixis.

The remaining two subgroups comprise exclusive isoglosses shared by Ugaritic with Hebrew and Akkadian.

(2) Ugaritic–Hebrew: 5 (3 + 2)

29. “fish”: *dg — Hbr. dāg (HALOT 213).
⇒ Further etymology unknown.

30. “to fly”: *šp — Hbr. šwp (HALOT 800).
⇒ Probably goes back to PWS *šwp- ‘bird’ (SED II No. 48). Similarly derived verbs are attested elsewhere in Semitic, but it is only in Hebrew and Ugaritic that šwp came to function as the main verb with the meaning “to fly.”

75. “skin”: *ṣr — Hbr. šfr (HALOT 803).
⇒ Also in Phoenician (ṣr, DNWSI 887) and, possibly, in the Old Assyrian dialect of Akkadian (CAD A₂ 318, Kogan 2006:c:181). Further etymology uncertain, for a few very tentative proposals cf. SED I No. 106.

76. “to sleep”: *ṣn — Hbr. šn (HALOT 447).
⇒ This verbal root is probably derived from the noun *šn-at- ‘sleep,’ much more widely attested (SED I No. 82). The verb ṣn ‘to sleep’ is present also in Arabic, but its functional status is clearly non-basic.

98. “who”: *my — Hbr. mî (HALOT 575).
⇒ The interrogative pronoun *mîya is typical of Ugaritic and Canaanite as

741  n̂al-wawanu =  n̂awalin n-nawmi;  qaʃtun n-nawmi;  ʃan-nin̂āsu.
opposed to *man(nu) in the remaining Semitic languages. Admittedly, Gez. \( mî \) is structurally very close to the Canaanite form, but its meaning is “what” (CDG 323, rarely attested) rather than “who.”\(^{742}\)

(3) Ugaritic–Akkadian: 6 (3 + 3)

2. “ashes”: \( \text{mr} \) — Akk. \( \text{tumru} \) (CAD T 472, AHw. 1370).

⇒ This comparison, suggested by A. Militarev (2004:289), seems to provide a reasonable etymological explanation for both the Akkadian and the Ugaritic forms, otherwise with virtually no Semitic cognates. Prefixation of \( tV- \) in a primary noun in Akkadian is admittedly a rarity, but note that another Akkadian word with a similar meaning seems to display the same feature: \( \text{tarbuw} \) \( (\text{tarbutu, turbuw, turbuttu, tur(ubu, turbaru}) \) ‘dust’ (CAD T 485, AHw. 1328) is usually identified with Hbr. \( rōbas \) (HALOT 1181) and, metathetically, with Arb. \( ūbabarat-, ūbār- \) (Lane 2224).\(^{743}\)

6. “bird”: \( \text{yr} \) — Akk. \( \text{ı̊ṣṣurū} \) (CAD I 210, AHw. 390).

⇒ Etymologically unclear, v. SED II Nos. 43 and 212.

11. “breast”: \( \text{irt} \) — Akk. \( \text{ı̊rtu} \) (CAD I 183, AHw. 386).

⇒ Most probably related with metathesis to PS \( *rī̄-\text{at} \) ‘lung’ (cf. SED I No. 10 and 224).

14. “cloud”: \( \text{yrpt} \) — Akk. \( \text{erpetu} \) (CAD E 302, AHw. 243).

⇒ The Ugaritic and Akkadian forms are likely related with metathesis to \( *\text{sapar} \) ‘cloud’ in continental MSA: Mhr. \( \text{wāfūr} \) (ML 15), Jib. \( \text{wāfūr} \) (JL 8).\(^{744}\) Comparison between these forms and Hbr. \( \text{wārāpāl} \) ‘thick darkness’ (HALOT 888), Syr. \( \text{arpellā} \) ‘vapor, nubes’ (LSyr. 549) is marred by the fact that the obviously related Ugr. \( \text{yypt} \) ‘cloud, large storm cloud’ (DUL 326) exhibits \( \text{y} \) rather than \( \text{r} \).

52. “many”: \( \text{mrād, mrod} \) — Akk. \( \text{mādu} \) (CAD M, 20, AHw. 573).

⇒ Clearly related to Hbr. \( \text{mōdō} \), widely attested with the meaning “very” (HALOT 538). Cf. further Arb. \( \text{mrād} \) ‘to become flourishing and fresh’ (Lane 2688) and Min. \( \text{mōd} \) ‘ajouter’ (LM 59).

78. “smoke”: \( \text{kr̄} \) — Akk. \( \text{kutru} \) (CAD Q 326, AHw. 931).

\(^{742}\) One may reasonably wonder whether Gez. \( mî \) ‘what’ (together with its Tigre cognate \( mî \), WTS 105) is at all related to Proto-Canaanite \( \text{miya} \) ‘who’ and not derivable instead from PS \( *\text{mīn} \) ‘what’ with loss of final \( -\text{n} \).

\(^{743}\) Needless to say, one cannot lose sight of Arb. \( \text{turāb} \) ‘dust, earth’ (Lane 301), but comparison between \( \text{tarbutu} \) and \( \text{turāb} \) fails to explain the stable \( \text{r} \) in the Akkadian form. Conversely, this feature is very well compatible with \( \text{\textit{y}} \) in the protoform.

\(^{744}\) For these forms see further below in Chapter 8 (p. 577).
⇒ PS *ḥtr ‘to fumigate’ is well attested,\(^{745}\) but basic terms for “smoke” derived from this root are hardly known anywhere outside Akkadian and Ugaritic.\(^{746}\)

Exclusive isoglosses with other languages are either statistically insignificant (Ugaritic–Aramaic, Ugaritic–MSA) or altogether absent (Ugaritic–Arabic, Ugaritic–Ethiopian).

(4) Ugaritic–Syriac: 2 (1 + 1)

⇒ The etymological background of PCS *ʔūr- ‘mountain’ is extensively discussed above in Chapter 3 (p. 201).

72c. “to see”: ḫdy — Syr. ḫzā (LSyr. 224).
⇒ The reflexes of PWS *ḥdy/*ḥzy ‘to see’ are discussed below in Chapter 6 (p. 384).

(5) Ugaritic–Mehri: 1

31. “foot”: ṃn — Mhr. ṛmn (ML 87).
⇒ The reflexes of PS *paṛm- (SED I No. 207) function as the main terms for “foot” throughout continental MSA. In Hebrew, the meaning “foot” for paṛm is only marginally attested (HALOT 952), but in Phoenician ṅmn was probably the main designation of this basic concept (DNWSI 928).\(^{747}\) Akk. ḫemu displays the non-basic meaning “thigh” (CAD P 231). See further in Chapters 3 (p. 174) and 8 (p. 576).

2.2.3. As the foregoing analysis clearly shows, the basic vocabulary of Ugaritic is highly conservative. With 44 trivial retentions from PS (out of 83 positions, or 53%), the Ugaritic list is superior to the Hebrew one, where 50 trivial retentions (out of 100, or 50%) have been detected (compare 44% in Geez, 38% in Arabic, 30% in Mehri). In practice, it means that at least a half of the lexemes preserved in the Swadesh wordlist of Ugaritic are of no help from the point of view of genealogical classification. The same is true of 12 lexemes labeled above as “less specific”: while not directly traceable to PS, such terms are reliably attested in so many Semitic languages that their relevance for the subgrouping procedure is extremely low.

Potentially relevant positions are only 26 (31% of the list).\(^{748}\) Most of them can be

---

\(^{745}\) Hbr. ḫbr ‘to make a sacrifice, to go up in smoke’ (HALOT 1094), Mnd. ḫtr ‘to fumigate’ (MD 88), Arb. qtr ‘to exhale a scent; to smoke’ (Lane 2486), qur- ‘aloes-wood with which one fumigates’ (ibid. 2543), Sab. mkfr ‘incense-altar’ (SD 109), Gez. ḫatara ‘to fumigate’ (CDG 452).

\(^{746}\) Possible exceptions are JBA ḫtrā (DJB A 990) and Mnd. ḫtrā (MD 83). In both cases, one may legitimately wonder about the possibility of an Akkadian substratum influence.

\(^{747}\) On this remarkable fact see further below in this chapter (pp. 343-344).

\(^{748}\) One has to regret that precisely this segment of the list — the only one truly relevant for genealogical subgrouping — displays the highest concentration of philologically less reliable entries (15
attributed to one of the following three categories: (1) exclusively Ugaritic terms; (2) isoglosses between Ugaritic and Hebrew; (3) isoglosses between Ugaritic and Akkadian. Only the first group is of some importance numerically.

2.3. The Swadesh wordlist: comparison

2.3.1. Ugaritic–Hebrew: 58 (53 + 5)

Trivial retentions: 44 (42 + 2)

1. “all”: kl — kōl (HALOT 474); 7. “to bite”: nṯk — nšk (HALOT 729); 9. “blood”: dm — dām (HALOT 224); 10. “bone”: ṣṭm — ṣāšm (HALOT 869); 17. “to die”: mt — mmut (HALOT 562); 18. “dog”: klb — kālab (HALOT 476); 19. “to drink”: šṭy — šāṭā (HALOT 1667); 21. “ear”: ṣʿudn — ṣʿūzn (HALOT 27); 22. “earth”: ṣʿrṣ — ṣʿārṣ (HALOT 90); 25. “eye”: ṣn — ṣayin (HALOT 817); 28. “fire”: ṣīṭ — ṣĪṣ (HALOT 92); 32. “full”: mlr — ṻḻē (HALOT 584); 36. “hair”: ṣʿr — ʿēṟ (HALOT 1344); 37. “hand”: ṣḍ — ʿēzd (HALOT 386); 38. “head”: ṣʾrīṣ — ṣʾr(ʾ)š (HALOT 1164); 39. “to hear”: ṣrn — ṣnr (HALOT 1570); 40. “heart”: ṣb — ʿēb (HALOT 513); 41. “horn”: ṣrn — ṣkrām (HALOT 1144); 42. “I”: ṣn, ṣank — ṣānī, ṣānīk (HALOT 71–72); 44. “knee”: brk — bārāk (HALOT 160); 45. “to know”: ydv — ydv (HALOT 390); 48. “liver”: ḫbd — ḫbēd (HALOT 456); 54. “moon”: ṣrḥ — ṣārēḥ (HALOT 438); 56. “mouth”: ṣb — ṣḥ (HALOT 914); 57. “name”: ṣm — ʿēm (HALOT 1548); 58. “new”: ḫdt — ḫdēd (HALOT 294); 60. “night”: ṣl — ṣlayl (HALOT 528); 61. “nose”: ṣʿp — ṣʿp (HALOT 76); 62. “not”: l — ṣn (HALOT 511); 63. “one”: ṣʾḥd — ṣʾḥād (HALOT 29); 68. “root”: ṣʿrṣ — ṣʿrāṣ (HALOT 1659); 73. “seed”: ḥr, ḥr — ṣārav (HALOT 282); 80. “star”: ḫbb — ḫḥāb (HALOT 463); 81. “stone”: ṣʿbn — ṣʾbhān (HALOT 7); 82. “sun”: ṣḥ — ṣmāṣ (HALOT 1589); 84. “tail”: ḥbn — ẓānāb (HALOT 274); 86. “this”: ḥnd — ṣā (HALOT 263); 87. “thou”: ṣt — ṣṭṭā (HALOT 102); 88. “tongue”: ʿtšn — ʿāsān (HALOT 556); 89. “tooth”: ṣn — ʿēn (HALOT 1593); 90. “tree”: ṣs — ṣṣ (HALOT 863); 91. “two”: ṣn — ṣnayim (HALOT 1605); 94. “water”: ṣy — ṣmayim (HALOT 576); 99. “woman”: ṣʿṭ — ṣʾīṣā (HALOT 93).

Other: 14 (11 + 3)

a. Less specific: 9 (8 + 1)

12. “to burn”: ṣḥp — ṣḥp (HALOT 1358); 33. “to give”: ṣtn — ṣtn (HALOT 733); 47. “to lie”: ṣkb — ṣkb (HALOT 1486); 49. “long”: ṣrk — ṣrōk (HALOT 88); 53.

out of 26): contrast only 2 less reliable entries among 44 trivial retentions or 3 out of 12 among “less specific” positions. This is by no means unexpected: semantically more primitive concepts tend to be preserved in a greater number of languages and, incidentally, have more chances to be reliably attested within a relatively restricted text corpus.
b. Exclusive: 5 (3 + 2)

29. “fish”: dg — dāg (HALOT 213); 30. “to fly”: ṣp — ṣwp (HALOT 801); 75. “skin”: ṣr — ṣr (HALOT 803); 76. “to sleep”: yšn — yšn (HALOT 447); 98. “who”: my — mî (HALOT 575).

Coincidences between Ugaritic and Hebrew are 58, which yields a very high percentage (70%). No less striking is, however, that in 44 cases (or 76%) of these coincidences we are faced with trivial retentions from PS, whereas only 5 positions are represented by highly specific isoglosses.

2.3.2. Ugaritic–Akkadian: 50 (43 + 7)

Trivial retentions: 37 (35 + 2)

1. “all”: kl — kalû (AHw. 427); 7. “to bite”: nṯk — našāku (AHw. 758); 9. “blood”: dm — damu (AHw. 158); 10. “bone”: ṣm — ešemtu (AHw. 251); 17. “to die”: mt — mātu (AHw. 634); 18. “dog”: klb — kalbu (AHw. 424); 19. “to drink”: šṭy — šatū (AHw. 1202); 21. “ear”: ṣuṭn — ṣuznu (AHw. 1447); 22. “earth”: ṣarṣ — erṣetu (AHw. 245); 25. “eye”: ṣn — ṣnu (AHw. 383); 28. “fire”: ṣš — isšatū (AHw. 392); 32. “full”: mlʾ — malû (AHw. 596); 36. “hair”: šfr — šartu (AHw. 1191); 39. “hear”: šm — šemû (AHw. 1211); 40. “heart”: lb — lībbu (AHw. 549); 41. “horn”: ḫnn — ḫarnu (AHw. 904); 42. “I”: ṣn — anâku (AHw. 49); 44. “knee”: brk — birku (AHw. 129); 45. “to know”: yḥv — idû (AHw. 187); 54. “moon”: ṣrḥ — warḥu (AHw. 1466); 56. “mouth”: ṣp — ṣû (AHw. 872); 57. “name”: šm — šumu (AHw. 1274); 58. “new”: ḫdl — eššu (AHw. 258); 61. “nose”: ṣq — ṣppu (AHw. 60); 62. “not”: l — lâ (AHw. 520); 68. “root”: šrš — šurṣu (AHw. 1286); 73. “seed”: drs, ḫrs — zēru (AHw. 1521); 80. “star”: kkbb — kakhābu (AHw. 421); 81. “stone”: ṣābn — abnu (AHw. 6); 82. “sun”: ṣ̄pš — šamšu (AHw. 1158); 84. “tail”: ḥn — zibbatu (AHW. 1523); 87. “thou”: ṣat — atta (AHw. 87); 88. “tongue”: ṣn — šinnu (AHW. 1243); 90. “tree”: ṣ — ṣṣu (AHW. 390); 91. “two”: ṣn — šinā (AHW. 1241); 94. “water”: my — mû (AHW. 664).

Other: 13 (8 + 5)

a. Less specific: 7 (5 + 2)

749 In remarkable agreement with Tropper 1994:351: “It is an indisputable fact that the great majority of the Ugaritic lexicon (about 70%) and especially the basic vocabulary of Ugaritic is attested in the Canaanite dialects with the same or at least similar meaning.” Tropper does not specify on what kind of statistics his conclusion is based.
5. “big”: rb — rabû (AHw. 936); 12. “to burn”: šrp — šarāpu (AHw. 1185); 33. “to give”: ytn — nadānu (AHw. 701); 49. “long”: ṅrk — arkū (AHw. 69); 75. “to sit”: yṭb — wašābu (AHw. 1480); 92. “to walk”: hlk — alāku (AHw. 31); 100. “yellow”: yrk — warḥu (AHw. 1470).

b. Exclusive: 6 (3 + 3)


The high number of Ugaritic–Akkadian isoglosses (50, or 60%) is surprising. Shared trivial retainments are a bit less prominent here (37, or 74%), whereas the number of less specific and exclusive isoglosses is only slightly inferior to the one observed above for Ugaritic and Hebrew.

2.3.3. Ugaritic–Syriac: 49 (43 + 6)

Trivial retainments: 37 (35 + 2)


Other: 12 (8 + 4)

a. Less specific: 10 (7 + 3)

---

Nöldeke’s observation (“Unusual is … the falling out in ḫnd from ḫḥndā,” 1904:21) remains valid up to this day. As far as the absence of ḫ is concerned, ḫndā is to some extent reminiscent of JBA ḫmnā ‘ear’ (DJBA 91), obviously from *ḥndā. 

---
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5. “big”: *rb — rabbā (LSyr. 706); 33. “to give”: *ytn — nettel (LSyr. 298); 47. “to lie”: *škb — šebeb (LSyr. 775); 49. “long”: *rrk — *arrāk (LSyr. 49); 53. “meat”: *bšr — besrā (LSyr. 82); 65. “rain”: *mtr — metrā (LSyr. 382); 75. “to sit”: *yyb — *yyeb (LSyr. 311); 79. “to stand”: *km — kām (LSyr. 652); 92. “to walk”: *hlk — *hlk (pa.) (LSyr. 177); 100. “yellow”: *yrk — yarḥānā (LSyr. 309).

b. Exclusive: 2 (1 + 1)

55. “mountain”: *yr — ṣurā (LSyr. 272); 72c. “to see”: *ḥdy — ḫā (LSyr. 224).

Ugaritic–Syriac isolglosses (49, or 59%) are approximately the same in number as those between Ugaritic and Akkadian. Given the fact that Syriac and Ugaritic are thought to belong to the same minor genealogical subdivision (North-West Semitic), this amount is surprisingly low. The reduction of shared trivial retentions is identical to that observable in Akkadian, whereas the number of exclusive Ugaritic–Syriac isolglosses is very small with respect to both Hebrew–Ugaritic and Akkadian–Ugaritic ones.

2.4. The Swadesh wordlist: conclusions

70% of coincidences between Ugaritic and Hebrew is statistically remarkable (contrast approximately 60% between Syriac and Hebrew on the one hand and between Syriac and Ugaritic on the other), but the evidence of this percentage for the hypothetic Canaanite affiliation of Ugaritic is seriously undermined by the extraordinary high number of trivial retentions shared by these two languages. If there is something in the Swadesh list on which the Canaanite affiliation of Ugaritic could repose, it is the meager combination of five exclusive Ugaritic–Hebrew lexical coincidences, most of which are, in addition, far from transparent in their origin. Reliable semantic and/or formal innovations are essentially lacking. In other words, the evidence of the Swadesh list yields scarce support for the assumption that Ugaritic is a Canaanite language.

60% of coincidences between Ugaritic and Akkadian is without precedent in WS (contrast some 50% between Akkadian and either Hebrew or Syriac). Even more remarkable are six exclusive isoglosses: note that not a single exclusive Hebrew–Akkadian isogloss is known. These striking facts are unlikely to be accidental, and require an explanation.

The number of Ugaritic–Syriac isoglosses is statistically significant, but this is

751 The origin of *dag – ‘fish’ and *γτρ – ‘skin’ is totally obscure; *wšn – ‘to sleep’ and *wīp – ‘to fly’ are possibly derived from the nominal roots *šin-at – ‘sleep’ and *awp – ‘bird’ respectively, but this is rather hard to prove; *mīya – ‘who’ may be innovative with respect to PS *man(mu), but the exact path of this innovation remains to be elicited.

752 Admittedly, three exclusive isoglosses between Akkadian and Syriac are in evidence: urḫu — urḥā – ‘road,’ nūnu — nūnā – ‘fish’ and mašku — meškā – ‘skin.’ Given the fact that these three concepts belong to the least stable elements of the Swadesh wordlist throughout Semitic, the possibility of an early borrowing from Akkadian to Aramaic is rather appealing.
almost entirely due to a relatively high rate of preservation of trivial and less trivial retentions in both languages. Shared features which could be considered specific or exclusive are almost completely missing, which makes any close genealogical link between Ugaritic and Aramaic quite improbable.

The number of coincidences between Ugaritic and other Semitic languages is well beneath 50 (41 between Ugaritic and Geez, 35 between Ugaritic and Arabic, 28 between Ugaritic and Mehri). Any special genealogical proximity between these languages and Ugaritic is therefore unlikely.

3. Basic vocabulary outside the Swadesh list

As we have seen in the preceding section of this chapter, the analysis of the basic vocabulary of Ugaritic as reflected in the Swadesh wordlist does not yield any unambiguous results. The primary reason for this is the drastically reduced number of diagnostic features: Ugaritic exponents of the basic concepts from the Swadesh wordlist are either too trivial to be useful for genealogical subgrouping, or too uncertain from the philological point of view to be taken as reliable witnesses. In such conditions, the necessity of broadening the scope of lexical evidence is evident. For this purpose, the whole body of the extant Ugaritic vocabulary has been submitted to a systematic diachronic analysis, in an attempt to detect exclusive lexical features shared by Ugaritic with both Canaanite (Hebrew and Phoenician) and non-Canaanite Semitic languages (Akkadian, Aramaic and Arabic).

3.1. Exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite languages

1. *ibr* ‘a stocky male animal (bull, horse)’ (DUL 10).

● The meaning “bull” derives from the parallelism with *y* ‘bull’ (1.12 i 30–32, ii 53-55) and *rum* ‘aurochs’ (1.10 iii 20–21, 35–36). The meaning “horse” is probable for 1.14 iii 16 (_IPV* ibrh* ‘neighing’ of his stallions’), since *alp* ‘oxen’ are mentioned in the following line 18.

▼ Eg.-syl. *híra* ‘stallion’ (Hoch 1994:18), Hbr. *abbîr* ‘bull; stallion’ (HALOT 6).

▼ This animal name probably represents a substantivized adjective *ₐb(₃)bîr* ‘strong, mighty,’ attested in Hebrew as *ábbîr* and *abbîr* (HALOT 6). The adjective, in its turn, may go back to the verbal root *br* ‘to be strong, vigorous’: Akk. *ābāru* ‘strength’ (CAD A 138) and *abr* ‘stark, kräftig’ (AHw. 7), Arb. *br* ‘to be in a good, right, proper

753 In the presentation below, ● will mark the philological section which provides brief remarks on the attestation of the pertinent word in the Ugaritic corpus, ▼ will introduce exclusive cognates from Canaanite (or, in the respective sub-sections, Arabic, Aramaic and Akkadian), ▼ will mark the general discussion section. As elsewhere in this chapter, the only purpose of the philological section is to substantiate the meaning of the Ugaritic lexemes under scrutiny and the reliability of their textual attestation. Completeness of textual and bibliographic references has by no means been intended.

754 But cf. Sanmartín 1978:350 (“Das Ug. gebrauchte *ibr* allerdings spezifisch für die Gattung ‘Rind.’”).

755 Ps 50:13 (*ḥiṣar ṣabbârām* ‘bull meat’), Jer 8.16 (*mišāqāt ṣabbārāw* ‘neighing of his horses’).
state’ (Lane 5), Amh. ṣəbrió ‘conceit, vanity, arrogance; period of wealth; right, rule’ (AED 1195), Cha. Eza aḥār, Enm. Gyt. aḥār, End. awwr ‘young person or animal in its prime’ (EDG 9). See further Proto-EthS *ḥbr ‘to be old’: Gez. ḥber ‘old woman,’ ḥberāwí ‘old man, old woman’ (CDG 5), Tgr. ḥābārā ‘to be old, to grow old’ (WTS 366), Zwy. ibīrī ‘to be old,’ Wol. ḥber, Sel. ḥbēr ‘grandfather, grandmother’ (EDG 9).

2. ḥabyn ‘poor, wretch, insolvent’ (DUL 14).
   • The most reliable attestation of ḥabyn is 1.17 i 16–19: ḥabyn ṭat [d]nīl mt ṭrāḥ ṣānāḥ ẓer ḥrmny d ṭin bn lh km ḥlr ṭw ēšrk km ṭaryh ‘You are poor, oh Dwīl, the man of ṭrēw, (you are) groaning, the valiant ḥrmny, who has no son like his brothers, no descendant like his kinsmen.’ Another possible case is ḥabynm in 4.70:6, tentatively interpreted as “insolvent persons from a particular town” in KTU.
   ▶ Hbr. ṭāḥbān ‘poor’ (HALOT 5).
   ▷ Notwithstanding W. von Soden’s skepticism (1969:324), Proto-Canaanite*[Vby-ān] can be traced back — with a well-known semantic development (Buck 1949:782–784) — to the PWS verbal root *ḥby ‘to want, to desire,’ most clearly represented by Hbr. ḥbā ‘to want, be willing’ (HALOT 3). The supposed Egyptian origin (< bīn ‘bad’) is not to be accepted (von Soden 1969:323, Muchiki 1999:236–237).

3. ṭdm ‘to become red’ (DUL 17).
   • Attested in 1.14 ii 9 (trihš w tradm) and 1.19 iv 42 (vīḏm b ṣḥlp ūm). The meaning “to rouge oneself” is widely accepted (‘Wash and rouge yourself’ and ‘She rouged herself with “husk of the sea”’ in Pardee 1997:334, 355), although the supporting evidence is more etymological than contextual.

---

756 The meaning shift “sturdy, strong” > “old” is probably less unusual than Leslau (CDG 5) believes (cf. Buck 1949:959).


758 In this chapter, Proto-Canaanite (hereafter PC) will be used as a designation of specific lexical isoglosses which Ugaritic shares with Hebrew and/or Phoenician. This purely technical label is not intended to anticipate the final conclusions about Canaanite or non-Canaanite affiliation of Ugaritic.


760 Traditionally connected with Arb. ḥby, Min. ḥby and Gez. ḥbeyā ‘to refuse’ (Lane 12, LM 1, CDG 6). As ingeniously observed by T. Nöldeke (1904:66), the Hebrew verb is almost always coupled with negative particles: lōṣ(r) ṣībā ‘he did not want,’ etc. (for a strikingly similar structural parallel in Old Assyrian la muṣṣṣān ‘not to want’ see Veenhof 1986). Nöldeke surmises that the original meaning of Hbr. ṣībā was “to refuse” (as in Arabic and Geez) and the negative particles were added to emphasize it. This is hard to reconcile with the wide presence of ṣībā ‘to want’ in a variety of Arabic dialects, notably those of Southern Arabia (GD 11–62, Behnstedt 5–6, DRS 3). With Landberg (and contra Nöldeke), such forms can by no means be derived from the Classical Arabic bīy ‘to want.’

761 Note D. Pardee’s reservations as far as the latter passage is concerned (1997:355).
4. **raďm** ‘man; mankind’ (DUL 17).

- This lexeme is comparatively rare, but both individual and collective meanings are reliably attested: for the former v. 1.169:14–15 (*ḻ̱ raďm w d ḫm l ḳrš zm l bn raďm b ḳanšt nīnīl ‘Away from the man, he of the rod, depart to the Netherworld! Away from the human, in weakness be exercised,’ Ford 2002b:155, 191–196), for the latter v. 1.14 i 36-37 (*vīl ... raďm ḳīl ... father of mankind’) and 1.3 ii 7–8 (tmḥṣ ḫrīm ḫp y[l]mn tšmt raďm š’tat špīl ‘She smote the people of the seashore, destroyed the men of the east’).

- Pho. **rdm** ‘man, person, someone’ (DNWSI 13–14), Hbr. **rādām** ‘mankind; individual man’ (HALOT 14).

- The most transparent cognates of PC **raďam**- are known from ESA (Sab. Min. Qat.), where **rdm** has a more specialized meaning “servants, subjects” (SD 2, LM 1, LIQ 5) and functions as a suppletive plural of **bd** ‘servant’ (Stein 2003:66). A more general collective meaning is present in Tgr. **raďdam** ‘men, people’ (WTS 384) and Tna. **raďdam** ‘humanity, mankind, everybody’ (TED 1530), perhaps contaminated with the proper name Adam (cf. Gez. **raďdām**, CDG 7). Note, finally, Arb. **raďam**- ‘skin’ (Lane 36), which makes one think of Arb. **bāšar**- ‘skin; people’ < PS **bāšar**- ‘meat, flesh’ (SED I No. 41). PC **raďam**- can thus be seen as a retention from PWS **raďam**- ‘men, people,’ but still a rather specific one — note in particular the individual meaning “man, person,” unattested anywhere else in Semitic.

---

762 In Bulakh 2005a:258 **rdm** is actually treated as the basic term for “red” in Proto-Semitic alongside **ilm** ‘to be white,’ **flm** ‘to be black’ and *wrk* ‘to be yellow-green.’ The evidence supporting this claim is, in our view, not sufficient.

765 The same applies to the adjective **raďmnūn**, attested syllabically as a field name. Its interpretation as “red,” although widely accepted (Kühne 1974:162–163), is necessarily conjectural.

764 For a semantic parallel cf. Russian سَنَدَثُ ‘people,’ formerly used as a collective designation of household servants (SRJa 8 342).

766 H. Bauer (1914) did not pay enough attention to the fact that, attractive as it is, the comparison between **raďam**- and **bāšar**- does not yield any coherent output from the viewpoint of historical semantics. In the case of **bāšar**-, we are likely faced with two independent semantic developments from an original meaning “flesh, meat” (“flesh” > “skin” and “flesh” > “people”). As for **raďam**-, no meaning “flesh” is available, and the hypothetical shift “people” > “skin” (or vice versa) is rather hard to imagine.

766 The individual meaning is qualified as “late and sporadic” for Hbr. **rādām** in HALOT, but seems to be common (maybe even the only one attested) for Phoenician/Punic **rdm/raďm** (Krahmalkov 2000:32–33).
5. **radn** 'lord, master; noble father’ (DUL 18–19), **radn** ‘(place of) dominion’ (ibid. 20), **radt** ‘lady’ (ibid. 23).
   - The meaning “lord” is widely attested in the poetic corpus (paralleled by bīl ‘lord’ in 1.2 i 17). The meaning “father” is known from 1.24:33 (**radn**h, **riḥḥ**, **raḥṭḥl**),\(^{767}\) as well as from the lexical list (= Akk. **abu**, Huehnergard 1987a:48, 104).
   - Pho. **rdn** ‘lord,’ **rdt** ‘lady’ (DNWSI 15–16), Hbr. **rådôn** ‘lord, master’ (HALOT 13). Almost certainly unrelated is the logogram AD.DA.A.NI in the Amarna letters (Weippert 1974). Nab. **rdwnḥ** and JdArm. **rdwn(h)** (DNWSI 16, DJA 29) are likely borrowed from Canaanite in view of -w-. The same is true of Plm. **-nilh** ‘lady’ (DNWSI 16).\(^{768}\)
   - PC *rådān-*,- competing with PS *bařl-* ‘lord,’\(^{769}\) likely represents an extension of a *Lallwort* for “father,” still preserved in Ugaritic as **råd** (DUL 15).\(^{770}\) In view of the wide presence of similar kinship terms in many languages of the world — but, remarkably, not in Semitic,\(^{771}\) it is hard to decide whether the element *råd-* is an independent Canaanite formation or an early loanword from a non-Semitic source, cf. Hit. *atta-*(Friedrich 38), Hur. *attai* (Laroche 63), Sum. **ad(d)a** (PSD A5 9, with several orthographic variants). At any rate, both the extension in -ān- and the (presumably derived) meaning “lord” must be regarded as PC innovations (Garbini 1984:94).\(^{772}\)

6. **ra-dr** ‘wonderful, magnificent, strong, of good quality,’ **rudr** ‘nobility, the most noble’ (DUL 20–22).
   - Widely attested, the meaning “to be wonderful, magnificent” is clear from the parallelism between **ra-dr** and **mḥmd** ‘choice’ in 1.4 v 16–17.
   - Pho. **dr** ‘to be mighty, powerful,’ **dr** ‘great, mighty, grand, illustrious,

---

\(^{767}\) The special meaning “father” for **radn** is thus justified *(contra* Gzella 2007:531). Note, moreover, that according to Pardee 2002a:95 “In Ug. prose, **radn** normally designates the ‘(biological) father,’ not the ‘(political) father,’” hence his translation “To Yabnū, my father, say’ for ʾybn ʾradry ṛgm in 2.64:1–3 (contrast ‘to my lord’ in DUL 19).


\(^{769}\) Exact details of the functional distribution between *ba-rl-* and *rådān-* in Ugaritic and Canaanite remain to be investigated. The most ancient PS picture was probably identical to what is synchronically observed in Akkadian, where **bēlu** is the only term for both “lord, master” and “owner” (CAD B 191). As we shall try to demonstrate in Chapter 6 below (p. 386), in Aramaic *ba-rl-* was relegated exclusively to the latter meaning since the earliest inscriptions on, whereas the former meaning is expressed by **mʷr**. Is it possible to detect any similar distribution also in Canaanite?


\(^{771}\) Unless one follows W. Leslau, who wonders whether PC *rådān-* is related to Tna. **raḍḍā**, Cha. EZa **ad-at**, Gyt. **adqā**, Enn. End. **adqā**, Sel. Wol. **nadīt** ‘mother’ (TED 1529, EDG 18), Har. **idqē** ‘woman’ (EDH 19) — admitting at the same time that the Ethiopian terms are borrowed from Cushitic.

\(^{772}\) Although one cannot exclude that *-ān-* is an adaptation of the Hurrian determinate form **attūnī** (cf. Sanmartín 1977:271).
splendid’ (DNWSI 17–19), 773 Hbr. *dr ‘to be glorious; raddîr ‘mighty, magnificent,’ rûdâr, raddârat ‘splendor’ (HALOT 13–17).

✓ The origin of PC *dr ‘to be great, strong, magnificent’ is uncertain. JPA *dyr ‘mighty’ (DJPA 35) is marginally attested and (with M. Sokoloff) may be a Hebraism. JBA rûdîrû‘ā ‘glory’ is derived from the root hdr with a weakening of h in DJBA 81. Cf. perhaps Tna. raddârâ ‘to heap up, to amass, to collect’ (TED 1530), which would point to PS *dr ‘to be massive.’ In DRS 10, PC *dr is compared to Arb. rudrat- ‘scrotal hernia’ (Lane 35). 774

7. *rb ‘to love,’ rahbt ‘love’ (DUL 31).

● The meaning of rahbt is reliably derived from the parallelism with dd ‘love’ (1.3 iii 5–8) and yd ‘love’ (1.4 iv 38–39).

✓ Hbr. *rb ‘to like, love,’ rahabā ‘love’ (HALOT 17–18).

✓ The origin of PC *rb ‘to love’ is uncertain. The combination of r and h as root consonants, nearly impossible in Semitic verbal roots (Greenberg 1950:168), makes one think of a secondary origin for one of the gutturals. An extension of the biconsonantal element *rb ‘to wish, to desire,’ represented by Hbr. rby ‘to want’ (HALOT 3), *rb ‘to long for’ (ibid. 381), Syr. *rb (etpa.) ‘desiderio flagravit’ (LSyr. 7), *rb ‘desideravit’ (ibid. 293), Arb. *rb ‘to yearn, long for’ (Lane 3), is thus possible (with DRS 10). Cf., alternatively, Arb. *hbb ‘to groan before copulation (a buck)’ (LA 1 917), 775 tentatively compared to Hbr. *hbb in Zaborski 1971:65. The root *rb does not seem to be attested in Aramaic: the reading *hbbh in Cowl 75:3 is abandoned in favor of *wpsth in Porten–Yardeni 1993:244, 776 whereas JA rahâbā ‘love’ (Jastrow 19) is poorly attested and must be borrowed from Hebrew.

8. rams ‘strong’ (DUL 74).

● Attested in 2.33:5 and 1.82:14. Both contexts are fragmentary, but the meaning ‘(to be) strong’ is very likely mlkn rams ‘Our king (is) strong,’ ydk rams [rammiṣ]

773 The extraordinary wide attestation of the Phoenician adjective makes one suspect that it could be the main exponent of the basic concept “big, large” in this language (cf. *drvm w-rd gwrn ‘From their large one to their small one’ in KAI 85:1, pšt vdrt ‘large pyxis-vessels’ in IEJ 35, 83:4, qpt drmt ‘large crowns’ in KAI 145 i 3) — at least a more suitable candidate than gdl or rb (for which v. Krahmalkov 2000:137 and 440). It is quite likely that *dr enjoyed the basic status also in Ugaritic, especially in view of its wide presence in non-literary texts, notably in opposition to dk (which, then, could be considered as the main exponent of the meaning “small,” with Huehnergard 1987a:39, Tropper 1997a:664–665): yn kndwv rdrm w kndpm dtk ‘Two large kndw-garments and one small kndpm-garment’ (4.4:2–3), yrrt dk[t][] l sav mlw[t] and b w yrst vdrt tvm 774 p. 134 large yrrt-objects and 68 small yrrt-objects’ (4.411:5–8), qvt vdrt ‘a grown-up’ woman passim in 4.102 (cf. Hbr. gdl, gadol about age in BDB 152–153). The literary attestations of rdrv do not provide any positive evidence for this hypothesis, but do not contradict it either. The precise meaning of the lexical entry a-du-râ is hard to establish (Huehnergard 1987a:104), although the newly discovered Hurrian a-mu-mi-ia-aš-še admittedly suggests the translation ‘noble’ (Huehnergard 2008:388).

774 “La rac. exprimerait la notion d’enflure.”

775 habba t-taysu = hâ̇po wa-nabba li-l-fisâdi.

776 Cf. “the only time *rb is found in Ar. ??” (DNWSI 20).
‘Strengthen your hand!’).

- Hbr. יָדִי ‘to be strong’ (HALOT 65), יָאמְנָשׁ ‘strong’ (ibid. 63).
- The origin of PC יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ ‘to be strong’ is unclear. Cf. perhaps (with DRS 23) Arb. יָֽמְֽדַת ‘to be strongly resolved’ (LA 7 128).

It is also tempting to compare Akk. ēmēšu ‘to be hungry’ (CAD E 148, AHw. 214), assuming the meaning shift “strength” > “hardship, hunger” illustrated by Akk. dannatu ‘hunger’ < dannu ‘hard, strong’ (CAD D 87–92).

9. ṭin ‘there is not’ (DUL 77).
- Pho. ṭinu, ennu ‘there is not’ (DNWSI 46), Moab. ṭin id. (ibid.), Hbr. ṭayin, ṭeš id. (BDB 34).
- There is no consensus about the etymology of PC יָֽאֶֽנְעַ ‘there is not.’ Comparison with the fossilized negative element יָֽמְנָ ‘in Geez (Leslau 1958:10, 1969:144, CDG 27) is problematic since יָֽאֶֽנְעַ is not expected to be reduced to י even in a heavily used non-accented proclitic.

The phonologically transparent equation with Arb. יָֽאֶֽנְעַ ‘where’ (HALOT 41) presupposes a semantic shift from rhetorical question to negation. If this etymology is accepted, the innovative nature of PC יָֽאֶֽנְעַ is evident. Still another possibility is to identify יָֽאֶֽנְעַ with the PS negative element יָֽאֶֽנְעַ /יָֽאֶֽנְעַ (v. HALOT 38, CDG 1 for cognates), in which case the innovation (addition of -n) becomes formal rather than semantic (cf. Faber 1991:416). In any case, יָֽאֶֽנְעַ as a predicative element negating presence and existence is a highly specific PC lexical feature.

10. ṭan ‘strength’ (DUL 76).

---

777 For the former passage v. Pardee 2002a:106. The translation ‘(May) your hand (be) strong!’ for the latter passage (del Olmo Lete 2004:376) is problematic because of the feminine gender of יָֽד ‘hand’ (and cf. the imperative יָֽדַֽל above in the same line).

778 יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ ṭ-רָֽאָֽגַתל = יָֽאֶֽמְנַֽשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽמְנָשׁ יָֽאֶֽm

779 The same is true of the hypothetical negative particle יָֽn in Arabic, where י can scarcely go back to יָֽאֶֽנְעַ (cf. Leslau 1969:137–140, with copious references to previous studies). In W. Fischer’s standard reference grammar of Classical Arabic (2002:30) this particle is actually adduced as the only example of the alleged contraction יָֽאֶֽנְעַ > יָֽn.

780 The same semantic development is usually thought to explain the emergence of Akk. יָֽנֵn ‘there is not,’ presumably from יָֽאֶֽנְעַ ‘where?’ (CAD I/J 323, AHw. 411, GAG § 111b). If this derivation is correct, the Akkadian form, superficially similar to PC יָֽאֶֽנְעַ, cannot be its immediate cognate (against most of the standard dictionaries and Faber 1991:414), but, at the very best, a result of a parallel semantic development. Indeed, the negative meaning of יָֽאֶֽנְעַ does not seem to be attested before Middle Babylonian and, consequently, has no chances to be inherited from PS: a supposed archaism of this kind is unlikely to be so completely missing from the extant OB corpus (where this meaning is expressed analytically by מִי הִבָּשָׂ). The emergence of this feature probably correlates with the fact that Canaanite languages do not express the negation of existence by the fusion of יָֽלַ and יָֽיֵה (as against Aramaic, Arabic and Assyrian).

781 Contra Faber (1991:421, 423) who traces what she reconstructs as יָֽאֶֽנְעַ ‘isn’t’ back to PS.
11. **wān** ‘grief, misfortune’ (DUL 78).


- Hbr. rāwān ‘disaster; sin, injustice’ (HALOT 22), ‘trouble, sorrow, wickedness’ (BDB 19).

- As suggested in BDB 19 and DRS 12–13, PC *rāwn- ‘misfortune’ may be related to Arb. ᵨr ‘to be fatigued, tired’ (Lane 138). Cf. perhaps Tna. ᵨnto, ᵨnta ‘curse, punishment; lack, deficiency; fault, error’ (TED 1480).

12. **rāny(t)** ‘ship’ (DUL 85).

- Widely attested in letters and documents.

- Amarna Canaanite a-na-yi (as a gloss to GIŠ.MÁ in EA 245:28), Hbr. ᵨm ‘fleet,’ ᵨniyyā ‘ship’ (HALOT 71).  

- As is widely acknowledged (HALOT 70, CDG 410, Fronzaroli 1966–1967:212, 1972:627), PC *rVny(-at)- ‘ship’ goes back to PS *rVn(V)w- ‘vessel, receptacle,’ represented by Akk. urmatu (AHw. 1422), Proto-Aramaic *mā(r)m- (LSyr. 373) and Arb. ᵨmār- (Lane 119), to which Gez. ᵨwāyy (CDG 410) and Akk. ᵨwāt (AHw. 803, Huehnergard 1991a:692) may be further related. The meaning shift ‘vessel’ > “ship,” abundantly documented elsewhere in the world’s languages, could be considered exclusively Canaanite, but cf. Arb. ᵨmār- ‘port’ (LA 15 486), plausibly derivable from *mi-*rānā-.  

---

783 In this chapter, the definition *hapax legomenon* will be used in a sense broader than the traditional one, subsuming not only true *unica*, but also those Ugaritic words which are attested several times in the corpus, but only in one stereotype (or, more rarely, several quasi-stereotype) context(s).

784 It is uncertain whether i-ni-tum = ḥi-bi-tum in the lexical list An VIII 68 is a WS loanword with the meaning “ship” (as suggested in AHw. 382), cf. CAD I 150 and CAD T 67.

785 There is no convincing explanation for the vocalic discrepancy in the first syllable, where *-a- in Ugaritic and EA is opposed to *-a- in Hebrew.


787 For this interesting comparison, rarely mentioned in Semitological studies, v. Maizel 1983:231.
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13. **rapn** ‘wheel’ (DUL 90).

- Widely attested in economic texts, notably, in connection with **mrkbt** ‘chariot’: REFERRED to **mrkbt dt yr b hml yd **rapn** ‘Eight chariots assigned to the palace, together with their wheels’ (4.145:1–3).
  - Hbr. **rāpān** ‘wheel’ (HALOT 23),788
  - PC *rV**p**n**- ‘wheel’ probably goes back to the verbal root *pny ‘to turn’ (Hbr. pāna, HALOT 937), with a well-attested semantic shift (Buck 1949:724–725) and an (admittedly unusual) rV-prefixation. Syr. rōpne ‘wheels’ (LSyr. 41), hapax legomenon in Ez 10:13, is certainly a Hebraism.

14. **raps** ‘extremity, edge, end’ (DUL 91).

- **Hapax legomenon** in 1.6 i 59–61, the meaning “extremity” is reliably deduced from the context (prov l mwy hdn rīš h l mwy **raps** ‘His feet do not reach the foot-stool, his head — its (upper) extremity’).
  - Amarna Canaanite ḫp-si-ḫi ‘extremity’ (DNWSI 97),789 Pho. ḫs ‘only’ (ibid.),790 Hbr. ḥāpās ‘extremity, end; end, nothing, nothingness; notwithstanding,’ ḫs ‘to be at an end, to be no more’ (HALOT 79), ḥpsayim ‘the two extremities’ (BDB 67).
  - As tentatively suggested in HALOT 79 (and more confidently in DRS 29), PC *rap-s- ‘extremity’ may be borrowed from Akk. apsā ‘cosmic subterranean water’ (CAD A₂ 194), in its turn going back to Sum. **ābzu** (PSD A₂ 184). If this hypothesis is correct, the borrowing is probably to be dated back to the PC period: while the fixed expression ḫapā Ṿārās ‘extremities of the earth’ may be reminiscent of the mythological connotations of the Akkadian term, the more neutral meaning “extremity, end,” attested in both Ugaritic and Hebrew, seems to be missing from Akkadian and must be a Canaanite innovation.

15. **urbt** ‘skylight, window’ (DUL 99).

- The meaning “window” is clear from 1.4 v 61–62, where urbt is paralleled by ḫln ‘window’ (bl rašt urbt b bh[tm] ḫln b ḫrb ḫlm ‘I will surely put a skylight in the house, a window in the palace’) and 1.169:2–3 (w ṭsr ... k ktr urbtm ‘It will go out ... like smoke through a skylight’).
  - Hbr. Ṿārubhā ‘hole in the wall through which the smoke passes’ (HALOT 83).
  - The origin of PC *raubb-at- ‘window’ is obscure. It is tempting to connect it

---

788 The form ḥpsayim (hapax legomenon in Pr 25:11) is probably related to this lexeme: ḥal–ḥpsāw ‘in proper circumstances’ (= “in its turn,” literally “on its wheels”?).

789 In EA 366:34, as a gloss to ZAG.31H1< - ḥs (Rainey 1978:34–35, 98). For a different evaluation of the EA evidence v. van Soldt 1997, who prefers to relate ḫp-si- to Ugr. ḫhs ‘landmark, boundary’ (DUL 174). Van Soldt is right to observe that the u-vocalism of the EA form is not easily compatible with a in Ugr. ḫs and Hbr. ḫpās. The relevance of this argument is, however, to some extent undermined by Hbr. ḥpsayim.

790 **Hapax legomenon** in KAI 26A iv 1–2 (ʾḥps ṭmr ṭm ḫlm ‘Only may the name of ṭmr last for ever,’ Gibson 1982:52–53).

791 **Hapax legomenon** in Ez 47:3, where ḥpsayim ‘ankles’ (= “the extremities of the legs,” cf. Cooke 1936:519) are opposed to ṣirka’yim ‘knees’ and motnayim ‘hips’ in v. 4.
with the verbal root ṣrb ‘to lie in ambush,’ well attested in Hebrew. \(^{792}\) Such a derivation implies an original basic meaning “to spy, to lurk behind” (cf. in this sense Jastrow 113, 116). \(^{793}\)

16. ṣms ‘to load (with); to erect, to build,’ ṣmsn ‘load, cargo’ (DUL 166), mlink ṣms ‘the one loaded with’ (ibid. 521).

- The meaning “to load with” (rather than the more general “to carry”) is likely in 1.6 i 12 (ṃs ṣm by ṣlabiy ṣbl ‘Load on me, please, Bdl, the Victorious One’), followed by ṣbr ṣlabiy ṣbl ṣl ṣlpt ṣmt ṣtš ṣth ‘She takes Bdl, the Victorious One, and puts him on the shoulders of ṣmt.’

- Pho. ṣms ‘to carry’ (DNWSI 872), Hbr. ṣms ‘to load (on to an animal); to carry’ (HALOT 846).

- From PS *ṃs ‘to be massive, compact, heavy’: JA ṣmns ‘to press (the teeth together)’ (Jastrow 1090), Syr. ṣms (etpe.) ‘contractus, condensatus fuit’ (LSyr. 530), perhaps Arb. ṣms ‘to be hard, strong’ (LA 6 177). \(^{794}\) Tgr. ṣmsā ‘to become pregnant’ (WTS 456) may continue the meaning “to be heavy” (Buck 1949:283), but can also be considered a semantic development from “to carry” or “to be loaded with” (Leslau 1958:40, Buck 1949:283–284). In this case, the meaning “to carry” may be not exclusively Canaanite.

17. ʃpp ‘pupil (of eye)’ (DUL 173).

- The most reliable attestation is 1.14 vi 29–30: ṣdh ṣb ṣık ṣw ṣpp ṣh ṣrunl ‘The pupils (of whose eyes) are of pure lapis-lazuli, whose eyes are like alabaster bowls’ (translation from Pardee 1997:335). The meaning “pupil” (or any other part of the eye) can hardly be deduced from this particular context, but cf. ṣnšw ṣb ṣnh ‘I will repose in the gaze of her eyes’ in the immediately following line of the parallel passage in 1.14 iii 43–45. The context of ʃppk in RSOu 14, 53:5’ is broken, but an anatomic meaning is likely in view of ṣnkh ‘your feet’ and ṣdk ‘your hands’ in the next line.

- Hbr. ṣapr ṣppayim ‘eye-lashes; eyes’ (HALOT 861).

- The origin of PC *ʃapr ‘part of the eye’ is uncertain (cf. SED I No. 17), for a possible non-reduplicated cognate cf. Arb. ṣafā ‘a whiteness upon the black of the eye’ (Lane 2094).

18. ʃr ‘city’ (DUL 178).

- The most reliable attestations of ʃr ‘city’ come from the passages where it is paralleled by ṣdr ‘town, settlement,’ such as 1.7 vii 9–10 (ṣl ḫm ṣld ʃr ṣbsm ṣ_bs ṣdr ‘He takes possession of sixty-six cities, seventy-seven towns’). \(^{795}\) Also probable are ʃr d ḫdm

\(^{792}\) With Rainey 1977:60, one hesitates to identify with this root ar-ba-ku in TT 2:6, most probably a suffix conjugation form of Akk. arēbu ‘to enter’ (so most recently Horowitz–Oshima 2006:133).

\(^{793}\) Designations of “window” derived from the verb “to look” (and similar) in Indo-European are discussed in Buck 1949:470.

\(^{794}\) ṣal-ṣamnu = ṣaš-siddata. Not ‘to be heavy’ as in HALOT 846 (contrast BDB 770).

\(^{795}\) See also 1.16 vi 6–7 (ṃs ṣbr ... ṣbr ṣbr ‘She overflew the cities, she overflew the towns’) and

- Pho. ṣr ‘town’ (DNWSI 883), Hbr. ṣir ‘city, town’ (HALOT 821).

- The only possible cognates of PC *ṣr- ‘city, town’ are Sab. ṣr (pl. ṣrr) ‘mountain; citadel, hill-town’ (SD 20), Qat. ṣr ‘hill fortress, citadel’ (LIQ 124). Comparison between Hbr. ṣir and Tgr. ṣerā ‘to come home, to turn in, to come’ suggested in WTS 480 is rather far-fetched. For a critical assessment of the possible relationship between Hbr. ṣir and Sumerian ụru v. Sommerfeld 2006:52–53. As is well known, the reflexes of PC *ṣr- in individual Canaanite languages differ with respect to their functional load (van Soldt 2005:182, Gzella 2007:536–537): while Hbr. ṣir is the basic term for “city,” “town,” the Ugaritic and Phoenician cognates are rather marginal, the corresponding basic terms going back to *ḥar-Ḥar- (DUL 712, 715, DNWSI 1037), for which see further discussion in Chapter 3, p. 212 above.

19. ṣ̄yy ‘to make, to process, to work’ (DUL 190).

- Possible attestations of ṣ̄yy are subdivided into three groups in DUL. The expression ṣd ṣ̄yy, attested thrice in 4.282, is interpreted as ‘worked field.’ The combination ṣ̄n ṣ̄yy, attested in a broken context in 1.17 vi 8, is interpreted as ‘wine that is made, processed, ready.’ Finally, ḡ̄š d ṣ̄yy Ṽuh in 1.17 i 29 is usually thought to mean ‘driving out one who will do him (something bad)’ (Pardee 1997:344).

- Hbr. ṣ̄āsub ‘to do, make’ (HALOT 889), Moab. ṣ̄yy id. (DNWSI 890).

- Outside Ugaritic and Canaanite, comparable terms are attested only in ESA: Sab. Min. Qat. ṣ̄̄y ‘to do’ (SD 20, LM 16, LIQ 125). The highly marginal presence of ṣ̄̄y in Ugaritic contrasts sharply with its basic status in Hebrew (and, presumably, Moabite). The main Ugaritic verb with the meaning “to do, to make” is bı,l, undoubtedly related to Pho. pṭl (DNWSI 924), which also functions as the basic exponent of this meaning. As for *ṣ̄̄y/*ṣ̄yy, it does not seem to be attested in

1.14 iii 6–7 (gr̄n ṣrm ṣr̄m pdr̄m ‘Attack the cities, besiege the towns!’).


797 A similar geminated root presumably underlies the plural form ṣarr̄m in Hebrew (cf. the Samaritan pronunciation ṣarr̄m, Ben-Ḥayyim 2000:248).

798 The term is preserved in post-classical Yemeni Arabic as ṣarr- ‘Berg’ (al-Selwi 1987:150–151), ‘isolated mountain; rock, stone; fortified but not large stronghold’ (Piamenta 320). The morphological shape of these lexemes is quite different from that of Hbr. ṣir.

799 The Hebrew cognates kirāḥ and kārāḥ are, in their turn, comparatively rare poetic synonyms of ṣir (BDB 900).

800 An interesting parallel to this semantic development (“to do” > “to hurt”) is found in Mhr. fāl, Jib. fālāl ‘to hurt someone’ (ML 86, JL 51) < PWS *p̄l ‘to do.’ Cf. also the meaning of the Tigre cognate below.

801 The phonological irregularity (ESA s1 ≠ Hbr. ʃ) is remarkable and still awaits an explanation.

802 Further cognates include Arb. fīl ‘to do’ (Lane 2420), Sab. fīl ‘to make’ (SD 43), Qat. fīl ‘to make, to do’ (LIQ 130), probably Tgr. fīralā ‘to weave; to do mischief, to invent (lies)’ (WTS 671, hardly an Arabism). For the MSA cognates with the meaning “to hurt” v. above. In Aramaic *p̄l is only marginally
Phoenician.  

20. bd ‘into the hands of, (intended) for; from the hands of; at the hands of, for’ (DUL 214).

- Widely attested. Important observations on the available examples from various types of texts can be found in Tropper 2000:774–775, where the non-contracted combination byd is also analyzed.
  - PC *bād- ‘by, at, from’ is a fossilized combination of the preposition *bi- and the substantive *yad- ‘hand.’ While structurally similar formations are well attested elsewhere in Semitic (e.g. Hbr. simm-âd-î ‘with me,’ Arb. sin-da < *rim-da, la-dâ/la-day ‘by,’ cf. Nöldke 1910:116), formal and semantic peculiarities of *bād- do provide a highly specific PC isogloss (cf. Garbini 1984:95).

21. bkšt ‘to search for, to look for; to investigate, to find out’ (DUL 235).

- Reliably attested in 1.6 iv 20 (rubkšt yâlyn brl ‘I will look for Brl the Mighty’), 2.39:34–35 (râṯ ṯî bkt w štn b ‘Look for it wherever it may be and deliver it to me’), 2.42:26 (mlkn ybkšt ṣânyṯ ‘Our king is looking for ships’).
  - Pho. bksš ‘to seek, to look for’ (DNWSI 188), Hbr. bḥš (pi.) ‘to search for, to demand’ (HALOT 152).
  - The etymology of PC *bkšt ‘to look for’ is not quite certain, but comparison with Jib. bōṣṯ ‘to dig away, to dig up, to dig for,’ bštqṭ ‘to throw things around while searching’ (JL 25, Müller 1995:145) and Tna. bāḵšâsā ‘to pull up, to uproot (plants, trees)’ (TED 1147, Brockelmann 1927:31) suggests a plausible semantic derivation from PWS *bkšt ‘to dig (out).’

22. brdl ‘iron’ (DUL 236).

attested, mostly with the meaning “to work” (DJPA 441, LSyr. 585, DJBA 923), see further Chapter 6 below (p. 370).

803 Cf. Vita 2003:404: ‘El verbo “hacer” ugarítico es, de manera consistente, brl ... Considerar la forma brl de Sarepta como un rasgo lingüístico fenicio resulta, por tanto, plausible.” As D. Pardee points out to us in personal communication, one has to be aware of the fact that there is no direct evidence that Ugr. brl was indeed used with the general meaning “to do” (= English to do, French faire): it is only the meaning “to make,” “to produce,” “to manufacture” that is in evidence in all the extant passages. Pardee is probably right, furthermore, that there may be no diagnostic context at all for the general meaning “to do” in the extant Ugaritic corpus.

804 But note Job 17:16: bdy (MT baddē) Šl trânḥ rən yḥd šl-rpr nḥt ‘Will it go down to Sheol with me? Shall we descend to the dust together?’ (Pope 1965:128, with a penetrating comparative analysis on p. 131).

805 For this problematic sentence v. Pardee 2002a:95 (contrast DUL 769 under spr ‘bronze’).

806 Arb. qbd ‘to mix, to mingle’ (LA 2 134) cannot be related for semantic reasons, but cf. perhaps Arb. qbb ‘to pierce, to penetrate; to be penetrating’ (Lane 341), with metathesis.
Hapax legomenon in 4.91:6 (kkrm brql ‘two talents of iron’).

Pho. brzl (DNWSI 196), Hbr. barzål ‘iron’ (HALOT 155).

PC *barr’il ‘iron’ belongs to a wider circle of Near Eastern designations of iron, such as Akk. parzillu ‘iron’ (CAD P 212, AHw. 887),807 Syr. parzlā id. (LSyr. 594), Arb. firzil- ‘shackle, fetter’ (TA 30 155),808 Sab. frzn ‘iron’ (SD 46, Sima 2000:325–328). None of these terms exhibits the same combination of root consonants (notably, the word-initial b-), which looks specifically Canaanite.809

23. dbr ‘to say’ (DUL 264).

**Hapax legomenon in 4.91:6 (kkrm brql ‘two talents of iron’).

- Pho. brzl (DNWSI 196), Hbr. barzål ‘iron’ (HALOT 155).

- PC *barr’il ‘iron’ belongs to a wider circle of Near Eastern designations of iron, such as Akk. parzillu ‘iron’ (CAD P 212, AHw. 887),807 Syr. parzlā id. (LSyr. 594), Arb. firzil- ‘shackle, fetter’ (TA 30 155),808 Sab. frzn ‘iron’ (SD 46, Sima 2000:325–328). None of these terms exhibits the same combination of root consonants (notably, the word-initial b-), which looks specifically Canaanite.809

23. dbr ‘to say’ (DUL 264).

- Attestations of dbr are restricted to the letter 2.72:18–19 (tdbr ṭumy l pn ḫrt ‘My mother will have to talk before the city,’ Bordreuil–Pardee 1991:144) and the incantation 1.82:8 (ydbr ṭrm l ḫt ‘He says: my victuals are two rams’; del Olmo Lete 2004:375). The noun dbr ‘matter, thing’ is probably attested in the letters 2.71:13–15 (ht ṭa dbr ḫmḥkm b l<ḥ>k ṭal ṭst ‘Do not be worried about anything’810 and 2.32:8 (kl dbrm ḫmt ‘all these matters,’ context broken).

- Pho. dbr ‘to speak,’ dbr ‘word’ (DNWSI 238–239), Hbr. dbr ‘to speak,’ dābār ‘word, matter’ (HALOT 210–211).

- Notwithstanding numerous attempts (v. references in BDB 180, HALOT 210, DRS 214–215, Schmidt 1978:94–95), no convincing etymology for PC *dbr ‘to speak’ has been proposed so far. The root dbr with this meaning is not attested in Aramaic outside the preposition šl-dbr, šl-dibrat ‘on account of,’ which, as plausibly suggested in HALOT 1848, must be borrowed “from Canaanite formal language.” For the presence of dbr in the Deir Alla inscription (II:7) and its implications for the genealogical setting of its language v. below in Chapter 6 (p. 410). There is hardly any direct relationship between PC *dbr and Arb. dabbara ‘to consider, forecast the results of the affair; to meditate upon’ and ‘to relate the tradition received from another person’ (Lane 844), as both meanings look like internal Arabic developments from “to follow” (which is the basic meaning of dbr in that language). The functional load of Ugr. dbr is inferior to that of its cognates in Hebrew and Phoenician, where it functions as the main exponent of the meaning “to speak” (expressed by rgm in Ugaritic, see p. 247 above in this chapter).

24. dgn ‘grain, wheat’ (DUL 267).

- Hapax legomenon in 1.16 iii 13–14: nšu rviḥ ḫrpm l ḫrb dgn ‘The ploughmen lifted their heads, on high those who work the grain’ (Pardee 1997:341).

- Pho. dgn ‘grain’ (DNWSI 241), Hbr. dāḡān ‘corn, grain’ (HALOT 214).

---

807 Numerous syllabic spellings with PA can be found in Reiter 1997:361–368. Since BAR is the normal rendering of [par] (= pār) in Old Assyrian (von Soden–Röllig 1991:10), one can only wonder why “the Old Assyrian form of the word for ‘iron’ ... and the local West-Semitic forms ... have an obvious common feature: the initial pronunciation with |b|” (Artzi 1969:270).

808 Also: ‘scissors by which iron is cut by a blacksmith.’

809 It is interesting to observe that other phonetic variants are not attested in the Canaanite milieu: Garbini’s attempt to identify prāżān in Jud 5:7 with Sab. frzn (Garbini 1978) is, contra Sima 2000:327, surely to be rejected (Kogan–Korotaev 2003:110–111).


25. gg ‘roof’ (DUL 296).
   • Reliably attested, the clearest evidence for the meaning “roof” comes from 1.14 ii 26–27 (w yrd krt l ggt ‘Krt will descend from the roof’).
   ▷ Amarna Canaanite ga-ag-gî-m[i] (EA 287:37, as a gloss to ū-ri-e, CAD G 9), Hbr. gâg (pl. gaggâbî) ‘roof’ (HALOT 176).
   ▷ The origin of PC *gagg- ‘roof’ (Greenfield 1969:98, Ginsberg 1970:103) is unclear, etymological comparisons suggested so far carry little conviction.\(^{812}\)

26. gl ‘to rejoice’ (DUL 297).
   • *Hapax legomenon in 1.16 i 14–15, the meaning is clear from the parallelism with šmh ‘to rejoice’ (b ḫykh ṭaḥn n’smh b l mtk ngln ‘We are glad, our father, in your life, in your immortality we rejoice’).
   ▷ Amm. gl ‘to rejoice’ (DNWSI 222),\(^{813}\) Hbr. gyl ‘to shout in exultation, to rejoice’ (HALOT 189).
   ▷ PC *gyl ‘to rejoice’ is probably derived from PS *g-ul/*gyl ‘to move in circle, to turn, to dance’ (cf. Nöldke 1904:43, Leslau 1958:16, DRS 108): pB. Hbr. gyl ‘to form a circle’ (Jastrow 238), Arb. ḥwil ‘to go round’ (Laine 488), Tgr. goyla ‘dance,’ gola ‘to dance (and sing)’ (WTS 591). Tna. g-ayla ‘a traditional dance beginning with the participants forming a circle’ (TED 2352), Jib. egtél ‘to wander, tour around’ (JL 80).

27. grš ‘to eject, to drive out, to evict, to cast out’ (DUL 310).
   • Widely attested in myths, epics and incantations. Remarkable is one non-literary example: km ṣagrškm b ṣty ksp ḫṁšm ṿssr ‘If I expel you from my house, I will pay fifty (shekels of silver)’ (3.9:6–10). For the neutral meaning “to send” see now RS 94.2284:22–23: w grš āvnl w ykh ṭvnk ‘Et (quand) Bana‘ilu est renvoyé, il prendra ta réponse’ (Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:97–98).\(^{814}\)

---


\(^{812}\) Thus, a borrowing from Egyptian ḫ-dis advocated in Koehler 1940:37–38 is only conceivable for a very early, prehistoric period when Proto-Afroasitic *g was not yet (fully) palatalized in Egyptian (cf. Vergote 1945:34–36); the normal Canaanite renderings of Egyptian ḫ are, of course, ẖ or ṭḥ (Muchki 1999:263), as in ẖ ‘ship’ < ḫy, ṭhabbat ‘signet-ring’ < ḫw.t and ḫkb ‘ark’ < ḫbl.t (let alone the fact that the common meaning of Egyptian ḫ-dis is ‘head’ whereas ‘Dach eines Baumwerks’ looks like a late occasionalism, Wb. 5 531). Gez. gqg ‘pillory, shackles, fetter, chain’ (CDG 184) can hardly have anything to do with Hbr. gâg (contra LLA 1206). Comparison with gozjo ‘hut, booth,’ widely attested throughout Modern Ethiopian (EDG 270) would be more attractive, but this word is thought to be borrowed from Cushitic (Brockelmann 1950:19).

\(^{813}\) For the context (ggl w-yṣmḥ bgm b-bṣn ṭḥḥ ‘May he rejoice and be happy for many days and in years far off,’ Tell Siran 6–8) v. Jackson 1982:36.

\(^{814}\) Reference courtesy Dennis Pardee.
Hbr. *grš* (mostly pi.) ‘to drive out’ (HALOT 204), Moab. *grš* ‘to drive away’ (DNWSI 236). The hypothetic Phoenician attestation of this root (*ngrš* in KAI 46:2) is not universally accepted (cf. DNWSI 236, Krahmalkov 2000:144).

H. L. Ginsberg (1970:103) adduces PC *grš* ‘to drive out’ as a root “confined to the Canaanite languages,” which is not quite correct in view of Syr. *gvrš* ‘traxit,’ (pa.) ‘sustulit, abstulit, attulit’ (LSyr. 135). The prominence of *grš* ‘to cast out, to expel’ in Canaanite is, nevertheless, conspicuous (note that the Syriac verb, strangely missing – tras, Jib. – in MSA does not regularly correspond to either Hbr. š or Syr. š or Arb. s. One cannot exclude, finally, that this root was also present in Sargonic Akkadian.819

28. gšm ‘rain, downpour’ (DUL 310).

- Hapax legomenon in 2.38:11–14 (tanyak dt bîkt mṣrm hndt b šr mt by gšm ʔadr). This difficult passage has been repeatedly discussed,820 but the meaning “storm, tempest” for gšm is not in doubt.

- Eg.-syll. gas-mu ‘storm’ (Hoch 1994:354),821 Hbr. gāšām ‘rain’ (HALOT 205).822

815 But note its extraordinary wide presence in Turoyo (Ritter 1990:178–180), which definitely excludes an otherwise feasible possibility of a literary Hebraism in Syriac.

816 The Aramaic semantic equivalent of PC *grš* is *frd* (HALOT 1886).

817 = mā ǰusraqu mina l-γαναμι. Perhaps also ፨ɾs (II) ‘to expose so. to people’s attention (na-tandjdu)’ (ibid. 492), interpreted as “promener dans les rues (p. ex. un criminel avant le supplice)” in BK 1 279. We fail to find the source of maǰras-: ‘pâturage,’ mentioned without reference in DRS 197.

818 Which, of course, depends exclusively on the Masoretic pointing.

819 Thus, M. Bonechi (1997:481) refers to Gelb 1957:120 where [a]-di la tāg-ru-∗ā’am ‘before you come’ from the Sargonic letter Ad 12:14 is discussed. One more Sargonic attestation of this verb comes from an inscription of Narām-Sîn: LUGAL.AN.NÉ [i]g-ru-ṣa-ām ‘PN came’ (RIME 2.1.4.7:7). Given the fact that Hbr. grš is mostly attested in the intensive stem, the non-active meaning of the Akkadian verb (presumably “to go away” and, with the ventive ending, “to come here”) appears unproblematic. Note, finally, the enigmatic expression a-na ga-ra-ši-im iš-kiu, attested in the inscriptions of Rimšu (v. references in Kienast 1994:228) and plausibly interpreted by W. Sommerfeld (2007:374, 2008:230) as ‘he expelled, he drove away’ (by far superior to the traditional ‘ins Lager verlegt hat’).

820 V. references in Watson 2002:795–796 and a balanced rendering ‘Your ships that you dispatched to Egypt were wrecked near Tyre when they found themselves caught in a bad storm’ in Pardee 2002a:94.


822 The Hebrew and Ugaritic terms, though obviously cognates, are not equivalent from the functional point of view. The Ugaritic word was probably rare and did not function as the general designation of rain (“pas seulement une forte pluie ou une ‘pluie torrentielle’ mais plutôt une ‘tornade,’” Bordreuil 1991:29). The main Ugaritic designation of rain was likely mp (see p. 254 above in this chapter). In Hebrew, gāšām has become prominent as the basic exponent of the meaning “rain,” to some extent depriving māṯār of this function. However, this process was by no means completed: māṯār is still so widely used that it is hard to decide which of the two terms synchronically occupies the basic semantic slot for the concept “rain.” H.-J. Zobel (1997:251) believes that “the most general term for rain” is māḏār,
The origin of PC *gVēm- ‘rain’ is uncertain. According to the widely accepted etymology (HALOT 205, DRS 196), it is metaphorically related to Syr. šegme d-meprā ‘magni imbres’ (LSyr. 755) and Arb. ṣāmn ‘to pour water, to rain’ (Lane 1312). Any connection with Tna. ġāssāmā ‘to drink a lot, to quench one’s thirst’ (TED 2280)?

29. gt ‘wine or olive press; farmstead, estate’ (DUL 310).

The presumptively original meaning “olive press” does not seem to be attested in the Ugaritic corpus (Michaut-Colombot 1997:579–580). In 3.5:5–10, gth is usually understood as “farmstead” (yd ... yd gth yd zth yd [k]rmh yd [k]klh ‘The field ... with its farmstead, its olive-groves, its vineyards and everything else’). The same is likely for gtt in RSOu 14, 35 ii 35. Elsewhere, gt is only attested as the first element of toponyms (DUL 311–313). For a comprehensive description of gt as an economic institution v. Heltzer 1982:48–79.

Hbr. gat ‘wine-press’ (HALOT 206).

The etymology of PC *gim-t-224 ‘wine or olive press’ is uncertain. The traditional derivation from a non-attested *gimn is morphologically attractive, but Arb. wēzn ‘to beat (usually about clothes beaten by a fuller)’ (LA 13 548–549) is semantically too remote to be a reliable cognate (cf. BDB 387, HALOT 206, DRS 493–494). Alternative etymologies proposed in Michaux-Colombot 1997 have been critically analyzed in Heltzer 1999:196–197.226

but provides no substantiation for this opinion. Absolute frequency being nearly identical (38 attestations for māṯār vs. 35 for ġūšām, Zobel 1997:250), it would be tempting to suppose that māṯār was more “poetic” and ġūšām more “prosaic,” but at least statistically this is not the case (ca. 13 prosaic attestations for each term). There may be, however, a few more subtle arguments in favor of the basic status of ġūšām. In the prosaic passages, ġūšām is found in a variety of contexts with meteorological connotations: rain and rainbow (Ez 1:28), rain and dark heaven, clouds and wind (1K 18:45), rain and wind (2K 3:17), sound of rushing rain (Ez 34:26), rain and storm-wind (Ez 13:11). In prosaic passages involving māṯār such combinations are less common (cf. rain, hail and thunder in Ez 9:33–34, rain and thunder in Is 12:17–18). Much more frequently, prosaic passages mentioning māṯār deal with presence/absence of rain as the source of fertility. In the poetic corpus, the distribution is slightly less pronounced: contrast ġūšām and wind (Pr 25:14), ġūšām and northern wind (Pr 25:23), ġūšām and clouds (Qoh 11:3, 12:2), ġūšām and autumn (Ct 2:11) with māṯār and lightning (Ps 135:7, Je 10:13), māṯār and clouds (Is 5:6). Can one surmise that in spoken Hebrew ġūšām was the main term for “rain” as a meteorological phenomenon, whereas māṯār was more closely connected with the rain water flowing on the ground, primarily as a source of fertility? The fact that yd ‘to go down (rain from the heaven)’ is more frequent with reference to ġūšām (Ez 34:26, Is 55:10, Jo 2:23) than with reference to māṯār (Ps 72:6) might point in the same direction.


824 This vocalization is suggested by the syllabic spellings of Canaanite toponyms. In Hebrew, the phonetic shift *gin-t > gat is identical to one observed in *bin-t > bat ‘daughter.’

825 waṣana ḥ-paṣāru t-tawba = daqqahu.

826 The very idea (somewhat clumsily expressed throughout Michaux-Colombot’s article) of analyzing *gin-t as a by-form of *ginn-at/*gann-at ‘garden’ is not unattractive: note that *gVmn-at- is otherwise unattested in Ugaritic, whereas in Hebrew *-at-/*-t-doubles like kiḏyāḵārāt ‘town’ are commonplace (for a fresh, penetrating treatment of this question v. Steiner 2012:373–375 and elsewhere in that article). However, the hypothetical semantic narrowing from “garden, agricultural estate” to “vat,
30. hlm ‘to hit’ (DUL 339).
- Reliably attested, e.g. hlmn ūm ḫāldīt lu ṭudn ‘He hit him twice on the crown, thrice on the ear’ (1.18 iv 22–23).
  ▷ Hbr. hlm ‘to strike, to beat’ (HALOT 249), mhlm ‘struck coinage, coin mint’ (Krahmalkov 2000:272, cf. DNWSI 601).
  ▷ There is no reliable cognate for PC *hlm ‘to hit, to strike.’ Cf. perhaps (with Leslau 1958:18 and DRS 417) Tna. ḫalāmā ‘to smack someone in the face, to box his ears’ (TED 4).

31. hmlt ‘multitude’ (DUL 342).
- Reliably attested in parallelism with nšm and ltrim ‘people’ in 1.3 iii 27–28 (ṛgm l ḫš nšm w ṭbn hmlt ṭArs ‘A matter which people do not know, the multitudes of the land do not understand’), 1.6 i 6–7 (bšt mt my ltrim bn ḫtn my hmlt ‘Bšt has died, what (will happen to the) people? Dgn’s son — what (will happen to the) multitude?’), 1.6 ii 17–19 (nṭš ḫšnt bn nšm nḥš hmlt ṭArs ‘My appetite lacked men, my appetite — the multitudes of the earth’). Less decisive is 1.2 i 18 (ṭn ṭlm d ṭkh d ṭkwyn hmlt ‘Give (up), o gods, the one whom you obey, the one whom the hordes (of the earth) fear’).827
  ▷ Hbr. ḫāmūlā ‘crowd’ (HALOT 251).
  ▷ As suggested in DRS 419, PC *hamull-at- ‘crowd’ is probably an extension of the widely attested biconsonantal element *hm to be noisy’ (the semantic shift is well known from Hbr. ḫāmūn ‘turmoil, noise, roar; multitude, crowd,’ HALOT 250). Old Aramaic hml ‘noise’ in KAI 222A:29, often compared to Hbr. ḫāmūlā (DRS 423), is unreliable and eventually rejected in DNWSI 287 (contrast Fitzmyer 1995:87). Arb. hml ‘to overflow and pour forth (water, rain)’ (LA 11 848, Lane 3045) compared in HALOT 251 is semantically remote.828

32. hr ‘mountain’ (HALOT 345).
- Reliable attestations are restricted to the incantation 1.107, where the form hrm occurs in the phrase Ṣpš b hrm ṿrpl ‘Remove, Ṣpš, the clouds from the mountains’ (l. 44 and elsewhere). The meaning “mountains” for hrm in this passage is widely accepted (Pardee 1988:249, del Olmo Lete 2004:372–373).
  ▷ Eg.-syll. ḥsrụ (Hoch 1994:213–215), Amarna Canaanite ḥa-ar-rī (as a gloss to ḪUR.SAG in EA 74:20), Pho. hr (DNWSI 293), Hbr. har (HALOT 254).

---

828 The unprovenienced reference to “a social term like Arabic ḥamūlah (sic!) ‘clan’” in Smith 1994:290 is unclear to us. What is probably meant is ḥamūlat- ‘(a herd) left to graze by itself’ (LA 11 849: ḥalati qad ḥamūlot turā), obviously an internal Arabic derivation from hml ‘to let alone, to disregard.’
829 Clearly enough, hr is not the main designation of “mountain” in Ugaritic and, consequently, not the semantic equivalent of Hbr. har. The basic term for “mountain” in Ugaritic is yr, going back to PCS *ṭur- and etymologically and functionally equivalent to Proto-Aramaic *ṭur- (see above in this chapter as well as p. 201 in Chapter 3 above). The Hebrew reflex of PCS *ṭur- is śr, a frequent but clearly non-basic term (‘rock, boulder,’ HALOT 1016).
The origin of PC *harr- ‘mountain’ is obscure.  

33. ḥdr 'new moon' (DUL 356).
- Widely attested in cultic contexts.
  - PC *ḥudt- ‘new moon, month’ (Pardee 2000:151–152) is derived from PS *ḥdr ‘to be new.’ As rightly observed by Pardee (2000:158), Ugr. ḥḍt has not yet acquired the general meaning “month” at the expense of PS *waṛḥ- ‘moon’ (> Ugr. yrḥ, DUL 979), so characteristic of Hbr. ḥūdāš, which does relegate yārah to a restricted number of passages (cf. BDB 294 and 437 respectively).

34. ḥln ‘window’ (DUL 361).
- The most transparent attestation is 1.4 v 61–62 (bl ḥaš ẓarbt b bh[tm] ḥln b ḥrb ḥkmn ‘I will surely put a skylight in the house, a window in the palace’). In 4.195:15, ḥmn ḥlnm ‘eight windows’ appear among wooden objects.
  - Hbr. ḥallôn ‘window’ (HALOT 320).
  - The origin of PC *ḥallān- ‘window’ (Greenfield 1969:98, Ginsberg 1970:103) is uncertain. The presence of ḥ in the Ugaritic form makes unlikely the traditional identification with *ḥl ‘to bore, to pierce’ (BDB 319, cf. HALOT 320).

35. ḥmt, pl. ḥmyt ‘wall’ (DUL 364–365).
- Well attested, paralleled by mgdl ‘tower’ in 1.14 ii 21–22 (ṭl ẓ yr mgdl rkb ẓkhmn ḥmt ‘Climb on the top of the tower, mount the shoulders of the wall’) and ẓyr ‘gate’ in 1.119:26–27 (k gr ẓ yrkh mrd ḥmytkm ‘When a powerful one attacks your gate, a mighty one your walls …’).
  - Amarna Canaanite ḥw-mi-tu (EA 141:44, a gloss to Akk. diwar), Pho. ḥmyt (pl.), Moab. ḥmt ‘wall, fortress’ (DNWSI 381), Hbr. ḥōmā ‘(city) wall’ (HALOT 298).
  - PC *ḥāmiy-(a)-t- ‘wall’ is probably derived from PS *ḥmy ‘to watch, to protect’ (Blau 1957:98, Marrassini 1971:54–56, Ginsberg 1973:134), otherwise represented by JPA ḥmy ‘to see’ (DJPA 205), Arb. ḥmy ‘to protect, defend’ (Lane 651), Sab. ḥmy ‘to protect’ (SD 69), Qat. ḥmy ‘to protect, defend’ (LIQ 63), Mhr. ḥāmī ‘to defend’ (ML 182), Jib. ḥōmī id. (JL 112). The PC term is to be reconstructed as an active participle *ḥāmiy-(a)-t- on the joint evidence of Hbr. ḥōmā, EA ḥw-ма-tu and the syllabic rendering

830 Quite interesting is Tna. ḫonīt ‘ridge of mountains, mountain chain, high place, elevation, hill’ (TED 16).
831 Cf. also Krahmalkov 2000:178, who observes that “in Phoenician-Punic, ḥḍš is never a synonym of yrḥ ‘month’” — i.e., the Phoenician usage of ḥḍš is close to that of Ugr. ḥḍt and different from the more advanced Hbr. ḥūdāš.
832 A few attestations of the Akkadian adjective eššu ‘new’ applied to moon (CAD E 376, mostly Nuzi) do not undermine the specifically Canaanite nature of this isogloss.
833 Note the translations ‘the new moon of Ḥiyaru’ (del Olmo Lete 2004:530) and ‘Neumondphase (des Monats) Ḥiyaru’ (Tropper 2000:385) for ḥḍt yrḥ in 1.78:1.
of the Ugaritic lexeme, reliably attested as ḫa-miti (Huehnergard 1987a:125). In view of this remarkable formal peculiarity, Qat. ṭhmy (LIQ 63–64) — even if it really designates a concrete object (“wall”) and not a more abstract concept (“defensive works”) — is no obstacle for regarding *ḥāmiy-(a)t- as an exclusive PC isogloss.\(^{834}\)

36. hrš ‘craftsman, manual worker; artisan, builder’ (DUL 370).
   - Abundantly attested in administrative texts (note especially such compound terms as hrš ṣanyt ‘ship-wright,’ hrš btm ‘builder,’ DUL 371). According to Huehnergard 1987a:50 and 126, ḫa-ra-ršu\(^{1}\) in the polyglot vocabulary is probably to be identified with hrš ‘craftsman.’
   - Pho. ḫrš ‘handicraftsman, artisan’ (DNWSI 408), Hbr. ḫārāš, pl. ḫārāšim ‘craftsman’ (HALOT 358).
   - PC *ḥa(r)raš- ‘artisan’ is likely derived from PS *ḥrš ‘to be skillful, intelligent, endowed with magical power,’\(^{835}\): Akk. ēru ‘wise’ (CAD E 314, AHw. 246), Ugr. ḫrš ‘to make spells or incantations,’ ḫrš ‘magic spell’ (DUL 370–371), Hbr. ḫārāšim ‘magic’ (HALOT 358), JPA ḫārāš ‘sorcerer,’ ḫārāšim ‘sorcery,’ Syr. ḫerše ‘ars magica’ (LSyr. 259), Mnd. ḫrš ‘to enchant, bewitch’ (MD 153), Gez. ḫarasa ‘to practice sorcery’ (CDG 243), Muh. araši, Sod. arāši ‘man who has the power of casting the evil eye’ (EDG 92).

37. ḫāw (Ṣt) ‘to prostrate oneself’ (DUL 380).
   - Reliably attested in the prostration formula (1.4 iv 25–26, etc.\(^{836}\)) together with hbr and kl ‘to fall,’ kbd ‘to honor.’
   - Hbr. hištaḥāwā ‘to bow down’ (HALOT 296, 1457).
   - The origin of the PC verb for prostrating is disputed (v. Kreuzer 1985:39–41 and Tropper 1990:73–74 for the history of research). According to a widespread opinion (e.g., HALOT 295), these verbs are to be parsed as ṣt stem forms of the root ḫāw ‘to curl, to coil,’ unattested in Canaanite but present in Arabic (ẖāw (V) ‘to assume a round or circular form, to coil, to gather itself together (a snake),’ Lane 679).\(^{837}\) An alternative derivation from ḫāw ‘to live’ has been proposed in Segert 1984:185 (“to ask life for oneself”) and Kreuzer 1985:54–60 (“hoch leben lassen; huldigen, anbeten”).\(^{838}\)

---

834 One is tempted to connect PC *ḥāmiy-(a)t- with Arb. ḥāmiyat- ‘mass of stones with which a well is cased; all the stones of the casing of a well, matching one another’ (Lane 652). If accepted, this comparison — morphologically attractive and implying a kind of semantic degradation of an original meaning “wall” in Arabic — would push *ḥāmiy-(a)t- ‘wall’ back to PCS. Cf. also Yemenite Arabic ḥāmiyeh ‘Hofraum’ (Behnstedt 288).

835 Etymological relationship between Akk. ērušu, Ugr. ḫrš and Hbr. ḫārāš is widely acknowledged (CAD E 314, AHw. 246, HALOT 358, etc.). In HALOT 358 the Hebrew term is simultaneously equated with the verbal root ḫrš (I) ‘to plow,’ which makes little sense in view of the consistent spelling with š rather than t in Ugaritic (Loewenstamm 1980:78–80).


837 Designations of “snake” in Aramaic, Arabic and Tigre may be further related: JPA ḫiwēl (DJPA 197), Syr. ḫwāw (L.Syr. 220), Mnd. hiuwa (MD 142), Arb. ḫuyat- (Lane 681), Tgr. ḫowaw (WTS 90). See further Chapter 6, p. 384 below (in connection with the Aramaic forms).

838 This interpretation is accepted as the most likely one in Tropper 1990:74–75. Tropper rejects J. Emerton’s (1977) interpretation of hištaḥāwā as hitpāvel from śīḥ ‘to stoop down’ (HALOT 1457), but
Still another possible etymology is Arb. ʾistiḥyā‘ to be ashamed, to be shy of somebody’ (Lane 680), the semantic relationship between “to be ashamed” and “to humiliate oneself” being well conceivable. Independently of its etymological interpretation, this verb represents a highly specific PC isogloss.

38. kbs, kbȅ ‘fuller, launderer’ (DUL 429).

- Widely attested in lists of people by professions, the translation ‘fuller’ is more etymological than contextual. The same is true of the syllabic form ʾštub-bi-s[u] (Huehnergard 1987a:135), although A.MEŠ ku-ub-sà-ti-ša ‘Its water for laundering’ (ibid.) is more suggestive.
  - PC *kbs ‘to full, to wash clothes’ goes back to PS *kbs ‘to tread,’ represented by Akk. kābāšu ‘to step upon; to make compact; to let time pass’ (AHw. 415, CAD K 5), Arb. kbs ‘to full up ditches; to complete years by intercalary periods,’ (II) ‘to squeeze, press together’ (WKAS K 28–29), perhaps Soq. kēbos ‘enfonceur’ (LS 213). According to CAD K 7, the meaning “to full clothes” for Akk. kābāšu is attested in the Sargonic document MAD 1, 258:6 (ana TŬG.ŠÂ.GA.DŬ GA-BA-ZI-im ‘In order to full a garment,’ so already Gelb 1957:141), but this highly isolated example, even if correctly interpreted, does not undermine the high specificity of the PC isogloss.

39. ksm, kôm ‘spelt (grain similar to wheat)’ (DUL 462).

- Widely attested in economic documents and probably equated with Akk. kunâšu ‘spelt’ in the polyglot vocabulary.839
  - Hbr. kussâmāt ‘spelt’ (HALOT 490).
  - PC *kussam-t- ‘spelt’ may be derived from the PS verbal root *ksm ‘to cut, split,’ represented by Akk. kasāmu ‘to cut (down)’ (CAD K 240, AHw. 453), Hbr. ksm ‘to trim’ (HALOT 490), Arb. ksm ‘to crumble in one’s hand’ (LA 12 612), Tna. kēšām ‘rebâlā ‘to dislocate, to break, to pulverize’ (TED 1621). If this derivation is correct, the PC term would either describe spelt as “grain with split awn” (HALOT 490, I. Löw apud Hrozný 1913:41) or allude to special techniques of threshing applied to this cereal (Hrozný 1913:41, 56, Fronzaroli 1969:13).840 Since PC *kussam-t- is to some extent similar to PS *kunâl- ‘spelt, emmer’ — Akk. kunâšu (CAD K 536) and Syr. kunâtā (LSyr. 336) — one wonders whether it might represent a secondary rebuilding of *kunâl- under the influence of *ksm rather than a completely new independent formation.

---

839 Some of Tropper’s arguments apparently miss the point: what Tropper calls hitpalel (presumably for hitpālēl) is no “L Stamm” (which is hitpālēl). Indeed, at least morphologically hištahāswā is the expected hitpālēl (=t-R-stem) form of ʾīb (contra Tropper and Preuss 1980:249).

840 This semantic derivation is paralleled by Latin spelē (> French épeautre, English spelt), borrowed from a non-attested early Germanic source eventually going back to PIE *spel- ‘to cut, to split’ (WH 2 238, 571–572). One wonders, furthermore, whether Sumerian zīz ‘spelt’ could be borrowed from Akk. zīzu with the same meaning, which, in its turn, can be regularly derived from zāzu ‘to divide, to separate’ (contrast AHw. 1534 where Akk. zīzu is thought to be borrowed from Sum. zīz).
40. **ln** ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ (DUL 500).

- **Hapax legomenon** in 1.17 i 14–15, the meaning “to sleep” is reliably deduced from the parallelism with škb ‘to lie down’ (yd šīth yl w yškb [yd] mārizth p ūln ‘He cast down his cloak, went up, and lay down, cast down his girded garment so as to pass the night,’ Pardee 1997:344).

  - Hbr. lyn ‘to spend the night, to stay overnight’ (HALOT 529). It is uncertain whether this root was present in Phoenician: both the reading yltmn and the meaning ‘to spend the night’ suggested in DNWSI 575 (and elsewhere) for KAI 24:10 are problematic (Tropper 1993a:39–41).

  - As suggested already by T. Nöldeke (1904:42), PC *lyn ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ is a denominative verbal root derived from *layl-īyy- ‘night’ with dissimilation of sonorants.\(^{841}\)

41. **msk** ‘to mix,’ mskt(ī) ‘mixture’ (DUL 582).

- Widely attested (v. extensively Loretz 1993): rālp ḫd yḵh b ḫmr rbt ymsk b mskh ‘One thousand jars he takes from the new wine, ten thousands he mixes into his mixture’ (1.3 i 15–17), ḥmn sḏb yyṭ̀ b šr ḥmn ks ymsk ṣhr ‘Are not seven portions in the bowl, and is not a whole river mixed into the cup?’ (1.5 i 20–22), ṭmn ṣfky msk ‘A second time she serves the mixture’ (1.19 iv 61), mskt ḥlḥt ‘thick mixture’ (1.85:3, hippiatric, v. Cohen–Sivan 1983:15).

  - Hbr. msk ‘to mix,’ māsāk ‘spiced drink,’ mimsqūk ‘jug of mixed wine’ (HALOT 605 and 595).

  - PC *msk ‘to mix (wine with spices)’ is clearly related to *mzg with the same meaning, attested in Syr. mzg (LSyr. 378) and elsewhere in Aramaic.\(^{842}\) The ultimate origin of both variants is uncertain. E. Lipiński (1970:84, cf. also Loretz 1993:248, 254) surmises an Indo-European borrowing (Latin misceo, Greek μίσγω < PIE *meik'-, *meig'-, Buck 1949:335), which is not implausible in view of the conspicuous similarity between the corresponding two sets of forms (the opposite direction of borrowing is improbable in view of the semantic narrowness of the Semitic verb).

42. **mṯḥ** ‘bed’ or ‘downwards’ (DUL 604).

- **Hapax legomenon** in 1.14 i 28–30: m[tḥn ru]dwrit ḫm ṭlḥm ṣrš k mẖmlṯ mṯḥ ‘His tears drop like shekels to the earth, to the bed like five-shekel weights.’ The widely accepted translation ‘(his) bed’ for mṯḥ (Pardee 1997:333, Parker 1997:13, Tropper 2000:691) seems to be superior to ‘downwards’ (Loretz 1995:112, with references to earlier studies where this interpretation is endorsed).\(^{843}\)

  - For each of the two possible meanings of mṯḥ, reliable Canaanite cognates are

---

\(^{841}\) See further Fronzaroli 1965a:150. A similar development involving the opposite direction of dissimilation is behind Akk. nīglû ‘to lie down’ (CAD N1 204, AHw. 784), v. Fronzaroli 1984:176, Huehnergard 1991a:692, 2002a:184.

\(^{842}\) Arb. mz$h\$ is certainly an Aramaism (Jeffery 1938:70, 263). The same is true of Hbr. māzāq in Ct 7:3 (Wagner 1966:73–74).

\(^{843}\) Note in particular that neither Hbr. māḥā nor Pho. ṣī display the feminine ending -t- found in the Ugaritic form.
found: for the meaning “downwards” cf. Pho. ṯmt ‘what is below’ (DNWSI 616) and Hbr. māttā ‘beneath, downwards’ (HALOT 573); for the meaning “bed” cf. Hbr. māttā ‘couch, bed’ (HALOT 573).

Both PC *māṭ- ‘down’ and *mVt-at- ‘bed’ are thought to go back to PS *ntw ‘to stretch (down)’: Hbr. ṯty ‘to spread out, to bow down low, to stretch out’ (HALOT 692–693), JPA ṯty ‘to bend over’ (DJPA 348), Arb. ṯtw ‘to stretch out (a rope)’ (LA 15 387).844

43. ṯtr ‘boy; lad, assistant, serving lad,’ ṯtr ‘maidservant’ (DUL 616–617).

- Widely attested (but conspicuously absent from epics and myths). For the meaning “boy, lad” note, in particular, the use of ṯtr together with rāṭṭ ‘wife’ in 2.33:28–29 and in parallelism with ṣyr ‘boy’ in 1.107:8–9.


- The origin of PC *nāvr- ‘boy, lad’ is obscure as none of the two widely attested homonymous verbal roots *nvr (‘to cry, to shout’846 and “to stir, to raise”847) seem to provide a fully suitable source of derivation. Arb. nwr ‘foetus in the womb of female wild ass’ (LA 5 260)848 is semantically more attractive, but too isolated to be taken as a reliable cognate. J. Hoch (1994:182–183) tentatively connects *nāvr- with Akk. ṯnr ‘a word for troops’ (CAD N2 265), emphasizing the military connotations of the PC term.849

44. nbk, npk ‘fountain, spring,’ mbk ‘source, spring’ (DUL 617 and 523).

- Reliably attested in 1.14 v 1–2 (nbk ‘fountain’ || mkr ‘spring’) and 1.4 iv 21–22 (mbk nbhm ‘source of the two rivers’ || ṭpk ṭhmmt ‘streams of the two deeps’). Numerous

---

844 nāṣawtu l-ḥabla = madadtuḥu.
845 As Hoch correctly observes, in view of the complete absence of this root from Aramaic one is compelled to assume that the Egyptian rendering reflects a Canaanite language with nunciation in the plural (such as Moabite).
846 Akk. nārū ‘to roar’ (CAD N, 7, AHw. 694), nārū ‘raging, roaring’ (CAD N, 150, AHw. 709), Syr. nwr ‘clamavit (asinus)’ (LSyr. 435), Arb. ṯr ‘to utter a noise’ (Lane 2815), Amh. anarā ‘to cause to resound’ (AED 1018). Note that according to Kopf 1976:155 “könnte ṭr, das ja auch von einem Kleinkind gebraucht wird ... ursprünglich soviel wie Schreihals bedeuten.”
847 JPA ṯr ‘to shake out’ (DJPA 354), Tgr. nār ‘mischief, quarrel, revolt’ (WTS 335), Tna. täna ‘wūī ‘to be prideful’ (TED 1351), Amh. nār ‘to bounce upward, rise up’ (AED 1018).
848 mā ṭwrannat ḫumruru l-ṣāfšī fi ıtārāmīḥā ṣabla ṭri yadallma ḫalpuḥu.
849 The Akkadian word, attested several times in lexical lists of the first millennium, is not separated from nēr ‘600’ in AHw. 779. Cf. alternatively Akk. nārū as an element of personal names in OA and OB (na-ar-bi-im, na-ar-E.A, ku-bi-na-ri, CAD N, 376) and translated as ‘eine Personenbezeichnung’ in AHw. 749. Could it be tentatively interpreted as a (WS?) lexeme meaning “servant, lad”? In Farber 1989:54–56 a hitherto unrecognized Akkadian lexeme mānu ‘child’ has been identified in the colophon of a 1st millennium Baby-Beschwörung. W. Farber furthermore refers to Roth 1987:739–746 where nārū and nārtu in NB documents, traditionally understood as “male/female singer,” are reinterpreted as WS borrowings denoting “lad” and “lass” respectively. For a possible precedent in OB Mari see Kogan 2012b.
sylabic attestations of nabku and nab(a)kūma are discussed in Huehnergard 1987a:151.

- Hbr. nibkē yām ‘sources of the sea’ (Job 38:16), mibbākī nāhārāt ‘source of the rivers’ (Job 28:11), nbwky mym (1Q Hod 3:15).
- As suggested in HALOT 663, PC *nabk- ‘spring, stream’ is derived from PCS *ngb ‘to spring up’ with word-final devoicing *g > k: JBA nbg ‘to break forth’ (DJBA 725), Syr. nbag ‘scaturivit, prorupit’ (LSyr. 410), Mnd. nbg ‘to (a)rise, spring up’ (MD 287), Arb. nbj ‘to go out (a partridge from its den)’ (TA 6 229).

45. nbt ‘honey’ (DUL 618).
- Widely attested, paralleled by yn ‘wine’ (1.14 iv 1–2) and šmm ‘oil’ (1.6 iii 6–7).
- PC *nub-t- ‘honey’ goes back to PS *nūb(-at)- ‘bee’ (SED II No. 156), represented by Akk. nūbtu (CAD N 2 309, AHw. 800), Aram. nūb- (Lane 2863), Gez. nōhb (CDG 393), Jib. nībīt (JL 198). The Ugaritic form strongly supports this derivation, as it preserves the original *b, devoiced before t in Hebrew and Phoenician (*nub-t- > *nup-t-). The status of *nub-t- in Hebrew in Ugaritic is not identical: in Ugaritic, PS *dibš- ‘honey’ left no trace (a nearly unique case throughout Semitic), whereas Hbr. ḏbaš is clearly the main term for honey, of which nōpāt is a rare poetic synonym.

46. ngh ‘to butt each other’ (DUL 622).
- Ḥāpax legomenon in 1.6 vi 17–18 (ynghon k rūmm ‘They butt each other like wild bulls’).
- Hbr. ngh ‘to gore’ (HALOT 667).
- The origin of PC *ngh is uncertain. If Amh. tānagga ‘to collide, to bump into one another’ (AED 1059), Muh. Msq. Gog. Sod. (tā)nagga, Wol. tānagă ‘to clash (cattle, objects), to collide’ (EDG 453) are related (so tentatively Leslau 1958:33), the meaning “to butt, to gore” in PC could represent a semantic development from “to collide, to clash,” although the reverse is also possible. One wonders whether Aram. nẓḥ ‘to succeed, to attain one’s wish’ (Lane 2766) could be related with an original meaning “to gore,” “to fight.”

The root ngh with the meaning “to gore” is relatively widespread in Jewish Aramaic (both JPA and JBA, v. DJPA 340 and DJBA 729 respectively), but its total absence from the rest of Aramaic makes one suspect that the attestations in the Jewish dialects are due to Hebrew influence.

47. nḥš ‘serpent, snake’ (DUL 628).
- Reliably attested, notably in 1.100 (paralleled by bn bṭn ‘sons of the snake’ in ll. 73–74).
- Hbr. nāḥāš ‘snake’ (HALOT 690).
- As argued in SED II No. 159, PC *naḥaš- ‘snake’ likely goes back to PS *nahaš-

---

850 nabaṣat il-qaḥhatu = ḫarāṣat min ẓuẖriẖā.
with a more general meaning “wild animal,” otherwise represented by Akk. nēšu ‘lion’ (CAD N₂ 193, AHw. 783). Attestations of Ugr. nḫš are much less numerous than those of ḫm (DUL 252), and it was probably the latter term that functioned as the main designation of “snake” in Ugaritic. Conversely, in Hebrew, nāḥāš clearly enjoyed the basic status.

48. nḫš ‘missiles (projectiles, darts)’ (DUL 654).
- Reliably attested in 4.169:3 (list of weapons, together with kšt ‘bow’ and ḫm ‘arrows’). Less transparent is bn ḫš nḫš ḫmrn in 1.4 vii 39, variously translated as ‘Why do you shake with fear, you who take up arms against Dimārānu?’ (Pardee 1997:263) and ‘Why do you fear the darts of the “Powerful One?”’ (DUL 654).
  ▶ Hbr. nāšāk (nāšāk) ‘equipment, weapons; order of battle, battle’ (HALOT 731).
  ▼ Hbr. nāšāk is usually compared with Arb. nsq ‘to put in order’ (LA 10 424).

Gez. nasaḫa ‘to arrange in order, join closely’ (CDG 403), which implies a semantic derivation from “order of battle” to “war,” “warfare,” “weapons” (Kopf 1976:206–208). This comparison is, however, phonologically problematic: on the one hand, reliable examples of PS *š > Ugr. š are few; on the other hand, CDG 403 plausibly relates Arb. nsq and Gez. nasaḫa to Akk. šutassuḫu ‘to put in order, to make ready, to prepare’ (CAD N₂ 22, AHw. 753). If this comparison is correct, it is *s rather than *š that has to be postulated in the proto-form, which is definitely incompatible with either Ugr. š or Hbr. š. According to DUL 654, Ugr. nḫš is probably “an allomorph and secondary lexicalization of nsk,” which does not look very convincing.

49. ṭpamt (pl.) ‘time’ (DUL 659).
- Well attested, the meaning “time” (vicis) is clear in such examples as 1.43:6–8: ṭṭ ṣrīn šmnm šbr ṭpamt l ȗlm ‘Three heads of small cattle as a well-being offering, seven times, for the gods’ (Pardee 2000:214–215, 236).
  ▶ Pho. ṭm (DNWSI 929), Hbr. pa’am ‘time’ (HALOT 952).
  ▼ PC ṭpamt- (pl. ṭpamt-āt-) ‘time’ undoubtedly represents a semantic extension of PS ṭpamt- ‘foot’ (SED I No. 207), although its phonetic split into ṭm ‘foot’ and ṭpamt

---


853 mā kānā ‘volā ṣa’āna nīḥāni nāḥāni wāḥānin.

854 For a recent collection of potentially relevant cases v. Tropper 2000:109–111. Tropper’s generally positive attitude towards these examples is, in our opinion, rarely justified (contrast Blau’s skepticism in 1977a:73–78).

855 To be sure, Akk. nasāku ‘to select’ (AHw. 753, CAD N₂ 21) may also be related, with a plausible meaning shift.

856 For a more detailed exposition of this hypothesis v. Sanmartín 1989:344–345, whose evaluation of the possible relationship between Ugr. nḫš and Hbr. nāšāk is, in our opinion, hypercritical.
‘times’ in Ugaritic remains enigmatic (cf. Tropper 2003:666–670).\(^{857}\)

50. ֶפִּקּ  ‘to obtain, to acquire’ (DUL 677, 974).\(^{858}\)
- Well attested, the most reliable examples include 1.14 i 12–13 (רָגַג יִדְק l יָפָק mtnרַת יָשְׁר ‘He did not obtain his lawful wife, no legitimate spouse’), 1.4 vi 55–56 (שָלֹם יַלְמֶנֶשׁ יָפָק מְרֶגֶל ‘While gods are eating, drinking, consuming sucklings …’), 1.103+:13 (mlkn l יָפָק שֶלֶפֶת ‘The king will not obtain progeny’), 1.4 vi 47 (שֶפֶק שֶלֶפֶת קרו מ ‘He provides the gods withrams and wine’\(^{859}\) and passim in the following lines of this text).
- Pho. ֶפֶקְל  ‘to find, to obtain, to encounter’ (DNWSI 903).\(^{860}\) Hbr. ֶפֶק (hip.) ‘to reach, to obtain, to find; to offer’ (HALOT 920). Amarna Canaanite ʾa-ʾa-ʾa-ʾt (EA 64:23) almost certainly belongs to this root, although the commonly accepted meaning ‘I sent’ (Moran 1992:135) is somewhat unexpected for the basic stem.
- PC *יָפָק/*יָפָק  ‘to obtain, to acquire,’ causative ‘to provide’ (Greenfield 1969:99) is usually compared to Common Aramaic *יָפָק ‘to go out’ and related terms elsewhere in Semitic (v. Chapter 6, pp. 375–376 below). Semantically more suitable can be, however, Arb. ṣfql ‘to be right, agreeable with what was wished,’ (II) ‘to accommodate, to adapt, to dispose’ (Lane 3057), which would imply an original basic meaning “to fit,” “to be suitable,” “to be available.”

51. ֶפֶנֶט  ‘knuckle, joint, vertebra’ (DUL 676).
- Attested in the descriptions of the buckling bodies of the gods ימ (יָשְׁר יִדְק l יָדֵלֶפֶת יָמִנְו ‘His joints did not buckle, his shape did not break up’ in 1.2 iv 17–18) and ṣנ (יוּס פֶּנֶט קלוֹר וָנַשׁ לֶד p ‘The joints of her loins contracted, the muscles of her back’ in 1.3 iii 34–35). Anatomic connotations of ֶפֶנֶט in these passages are not in doubt,\(^{861}\) but there are reasons to suspect a metaphorical application of an originally architectural term (“corner” or the like, cf. ‘corners of the back’ in de Moor 1971:137). Such a possibility is supported by the meaning of the Hebrew cognate (v. below) as well as by the parallelism with ֶפֶנֶט in 1.2 iv 17–18, since the latter lexeme is most probably borrowed from (or at least identical to) Akk. ʾemʾemnemnu ‘foundation’ (CAD T 337).\(^{862}\) Note, finally, that the Hebrew cognate of Ugr. ֶדֵלֶפֶת is used about a house in Qoh 10:18 (de Moor 1971:137, 1980:426).

\(^{857}\) According to Tropper, the unexpected ṣ in pramṭ is due to foreign (more concretely, Phoenician) origin of the Ugaritic word. This is hardly provable in view of the fact that all actually attested Phoenician forms are always spelled with ṣ.

\(^{858}\) DUL splits the available attestations into two variant roots ֶפֶנֶט and יָפָק, but there is no compelling reason to postulate יָפָק for any of the pertinent passages (for יָפָק as a short form of the prefix conjugation from ֶפֶנֶט in 1.14 i 12–13 v. Tropper 2000:700).

\(^{859}\) Possible interpretations of the difficult syntactic arrangement of this passage are extensively dealt with in Pardee 1997:262.

\(^{860}\) The relevant Phoenician forms are commonly interpreted as belonging to the causative stem (Friedrich–Röllig 1999:108).

\(^{861}\) A more specific connection with joints, articulations is supported by the parallelism with וָנַשׁ which, at least on etymological grounds, should be interpreted as ‘(sciatic) tendon’ (SED I No. 201).

\(^{862}\) The parallelism ‘corner’ || ‘foundations’ is attested in the Old Testament: בָּנַנָּא || מַסְגֹּדָת (Jr 51:26, cf. also Is 28:16).
► Hbr. *pinnā* ‘corner, cornerstone’ (HALOT 945).

▼ The origin of PC *pinn-at-* ‘joint, corner’ is uncertain. The evidence for a PS verbal root *pnn* ‘to bend, crook’ from which such a lexeme could be potentially derived is insufficient.

PC *pinn-at-* ‘corner’ has no reliable Aramaic cognate: Syr. *pānyā* ‘angulus’ (LSyr. 578) does render Hbr. *pinnā* in Neh 3:31–32, but it clearly belongs to a different consonantal root (*pny*) and should be considered an occasional and probably artificial phonetic approximation to the Hebrew original. JPA *pynh* ‘cornerstone’ must be a Hebraism (with DJPA 431).

52. *pšr* ‘rebellion, transgression’ (DUL 686).

● Hapax legomenon in 1.17 vi 43–44: *l vākryk b ntb pšr ... b ntb g珊* ‘I will certainly meet you on the path of transgression ... on the path of pride.’

► Hbr. *pāša* ‘crime’ (HALOT 981).

▼ There is no reliable etymology for PC *paš-* ‘crime, transgression.’ Syr. *pša* ‘topruit, perterritus est; insipienter egit,’ *paššiَا* ‘tepidus’ (LSyr. 613) are semantically rather remote. The wide presence of *pš* ‘to be negligent, to harm, to transgress’ in JBA (DJBA 944) is probably due to Hebrew influence. One wonders whether Akk. *pištu* ‘insult’ (CAD P 433), ‘Beschimpfung, Beleidigung’ (AHw. 869) may be related to *paš-* rather than derived from the somewhat ephemeral *wapašu* (AHw. 1459, CAD U/W 402).


● Widely attested in economic documents (Sanmartín 1979:727).


▼ The origin of PC *pVt-* ‘flax’ is obscure.867

54. *rbd* ‘to prepare, get (a bed) ready,’ *mrbd* ‘bedspread, counterpane’ (DUL 731 and 573).

● The specific connection with bed, couch is obvious for both the verb (*trbd rš pdry* ‘The bed of Pdry is prepared’ in 1.132:2–3) and the noun (*mrbd mškbt* ‘a bedspread’ in 4.385:9).

863 Cf. Buck 1949:900: “Words for ‘corner’ are connected with roots for ‘bend’ or with words which ... suggest the notion of a sharp bend or angle, as those for ‘knee,’ ‘elbow,’ ‘wedge,’ ‘hook.’”

864 According to DUL 676, the verb *pnn* ‘to distort, to change’ is in fact attested in Ugaritic, but the only putative example (*tpnn ʼn bty ʼn btt tpnn tpnn* in 1.96:5–6) is more than problematic (cf. del Olmo Lete 2004:381–382). Arb. *fnn* ‘to drive away; to cheat’ (Lane 2446), adduced as a cognate in DUL 676, is semantically rather remote. Cf. perhaps Cha. Enm. Gyt. *fänä*, Eža End. Muh. *fänä* ‘opposite side, reverse side, curved, bent, crooked, not straight’ (EDG 232), borrowed from Cushitic according to Leslau.

865 The normal meaning of the Syriac word is ‘the turn of the day, declining day, early evening’ (PS 3171). The same is true of its cognate in JBA (DJBA 915).

866 For the possible Greek rendering (ζεραφσιστ) with variants v. Löw 1881:406, 411.

867 It is not clear to us what is meant by “numerosi paralleli nelle altre lingue semitiche” in Ribichini–Xella 1985:17.
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Hbr. *rbd* ‘to prepare a couch,’ *marḫaddīm* (pl.) ‘cover’ (HALOT 1176 and 631). Amarna Canaanite *ma-ar-־ba־-d[u]* (EA 120:21) is translated as ‘carpet’ in Rainey 1978:81, but the exact meaning of this form, found in a list of goods in a partly broken context, is hard to establish (cf. ‘blanket’ in Moran 1992:199).

PC *rbd* ‘to prepare, to cover a bed’ likely derives from PCS *rbd* with a more general meaning “to cover,” “to put in layers”: Pho. *rbd* ‘to pave’ (DNWSI 1052), Hbr. pB. *rābūd* ‘mosaic pavement’ (Jastrow 1455), Arb. *rabīd* ‘dates laid one upon another in an earthen pot’ (Lane 1010).

55. *rt* ‘net’ (DUL 750).

- *Hapax legomenon* in 1.4 ii 31–32, the meaning “net” is supported by the context: dgy *rt* *rat[t ym]* ḫḥ *rt bdk* ‘O fisherman of the Great Lady *rat[t ym]*, take the net in your hand.’
- Hbr. *rāsāt* ‘net’ (HALOT 1298).
- The etymology of PC *rVl-t-* ‘net’ is uncertain; derivation from PS *wrē* ‘to inherit, to possess,’ tentatively accepted in both HALOT and DUL, is semantically weak.

56. *sbb* ‘to turn (round)’ (DUL 752).

- Reliably attested: *sbb* *l kšp l ḫrm ḫrṣ *nsb l lbnt* ‘Silver turned into sheets’, gold turned into bricks’ (1.4 vi 34–35), *dvwl ysb prlth bṣḏl yphp b ḫrḥm* ‘Dwil went around his waste land’ and distinguished a green shoot in the untilled land’ (1.19 ii 12–13), *tr ṣārṣ w śmm *sbb* *l kšm ṣārṣ* ‘Go through the earth and the heavens, turn to the end of the earth’ (1.16 iii 2–3).
- Pho. *sb* ‘to turn over,’ *sbb* ‘round about,’ Amm. *sbbt* ‘surrounding’ (DNWSI 772), Hbr. *sbb* ‘to turn oneself around’ (HALOT 738).
- PC *sbb* ‘to turn’ may be related to Arb. *sibb*- ‘turban,’ *sabab*- ‘cord, rope,’ *sabīb*- ‘a lock of hair’ (Lane 1285–1286), Tgr. *sābasābā* ‘to put in folds (garment)’ (WTS 216), Tna. *sābsābā* ‘to tuck up, to roll up’ (TED 704), Amh. *sābāsābā* ‘to wrinkle, to pleat’ (AED 636), although Akk. *šibbu* ‘belt, girdle’ compared in CDG 483 makes this identification problematic (Akk. *š* does not regularly correspond to Hbr. *s*). Sab. *sbb* ‘to surround an enemy’ (Biella 501) would provide a more direct cognate, but the meaning of this military term (*hāpax legomenon* in Ja 631:32–34) is quite obscure (cf. ‘to engage (with an enemy) at close quarters’ in SD 397). Whether Gez. *rāsbāb* ‘guards, sentinels’ goes back to this root is, contra CDG 483 and LLA 359, completely

---

868 The noun is directly connected with bed in Pr 7:16 (*marḫaddīm rābadīt ṣārā* ‘I have decked my bed with covers’).

869 One wonders whether Arb. *tasabbaba* ‘to traffic’ (Lane 1284) could go back to an original meaning “to turn around,” which would offer an excellent parallel to Akk. *sēhiru* ‘peddler’ (CAD S 60–61), Hbr. *sēhēr* ‘trader, dealer’ (HALOT 750), cf. Landsberger 1967:176–190.

870 A. Jamme’s own translation ‘they turned aside’ clearly depends on the Hebrew and Ugaritic etymology (Jamme 1962:134).
The verb *sbb* is attested twice in an Old Aramaic inscription from Sefire (βρθ ḫλ mlkh ʿwsbn<γ> ‘If one of the kings comes and surrounds me,’ KAI 222B:28, kl ṣy ʿsbו ‘Whoever lives around’ ...’ ibid. 34), which prompts one to treat it among common Semitic lexemes still present in Old Aramaic inscriptions, but lost or marginalized in later Aramaic (see extensively below pp. 414-417 in Chapter 6). Its nearly complete absence from Official and Middle Aramaic might suggest that already in Old Aramaic *sbb* was not the basic verb with the meaning “to turn” (in contrast to Hebrew and Ugaritic, where the basic status of *sbb* is not in doubt), presumably being replaced by *spr* (cf. HALOT 739). This assumption cannot be proved, however, since the concept “to turn” does not seem to be attested anywhere else in the Old Aramaic corpus.

57. *spr* ‘to count, to number; to recite’ (DUL 766), *spr* ‘number, inventory’ (ibid. 769), *mspr* ‘recitation, story, talk’ (ibid. 583).

- The meaning “(to) count” is reliably attested in 1.17 vi 28–29 (vašsprk ṣm ḫl šnt ṣm bn wdl ṣpsr ybl ‘I will let you count the years with Bel, with the son of *šl you will count the months’) and 1.14 ii 37–38 (ḥppt d ḫl *spr* ṣmn d ḫl ḫg ‘The irregular troops without number, the archers without count’). The meaning “to recite” is restricted to the prescriptions for cultic recitation (notably in colophons): 1.4 v 42 (w ṭb ḫl *mspr* ‘Recite it again’), 1.23:57 (ṣḥbn yspr l ḫmn ḫl ḫmm ‘He will recite it again five times in front of the statues’), etc.

- Pho. *mspr* ‘number’ (DNWSI 666), Hbr. *spr* (pi.) ‘to count; to report, to tell,’ *msḥpr* ‘number’ (HALOT 766 and 607).

- PC *spr* ‘to count’ is likely related to Gez. *safara* ‘to measure’ (CDG 488) and its cognates throughout EthS (note especially Amh. *sāffārā* ‘to measure, to count,’ AED 595). It is tempting to further compare Sab. *sfṛt* ‘extent, measure, length’ (SD 125, Biella 342), but Sab. *šl* does not regularly correspond to Hbr. *s*. No comparable forms are attested in the rest of WS, notably in Aramaic. Contra HALOT 765–766, PC *spr* ‘to count; to tell’ is to be strictly separated from the widely attested lexemes with the prototypes *sifpr*– ‘writing, inscription, document’ and *sāḥpr*– ‘scribe,’ which are not autochthonous West Semitic, but ultimately go back to Akk. *šipru* and *šāpiru*.

---

871 Gez. *sabba*, *sahaba* ‘to go around, circle,’ added in CDG 483 from a recent work of native lexicography, is not attested in the sources and seems to be an artificial creation with no relevance for the etymology of Hbr. *sbb*.

872 The only possible exception is Mnd. *sub* ‘to surround’ (MD 320), very poorly attested.

873 The precise meaning of the statement “Arm. made more emphatic by *spr*” escapes us.

874 For the semantic shift cf. Lat. *computare* > Fr. *conter* as well as Proto-Germanic *tala* ‘Berechnung, Zahl; Rede’ (Fick 1909:112).


876 JBA *spr* ‘to count’ (DJB 827) is certainly a Hebraism. Sporadic attestations of Syr. *spar* ‘narravit; narravit’ in LSyr. 493 are due to Hebrew influence as well (cf. PS Supplement 239).
58. šm̄k ‘raisin’ (DUL 786).
- *Hapax legomenon* in 4.14:17 ([l]th dblt lth šm̄kš ‘One lth of dry figs, one lth of raisins’) as well as in the combination dblt ŭm̄n w šm̄kš ŭm̄n in hippiatric texts (for which see No. 78 in the present section).
- Pho. šm̄k ‘dried fruit, raisin’ (DNWSI 970, Krahmalkov 2000:418), Hbr. šimmāḵām ‘cake of dried grapes’ (HALOT 1033).
- PC *ṣVmVk- ‘raisin’ goes back to PS *ṣmk ‘to press, to squeeze; to dry, to shrivel up’: Hbr. šm̄k ‘to dry up, wither’ (HALOT 1034), JPA šm̄k ‘to shrink, to dry out’ (DJPA 466), JBA šm̄k ‘to be dry’ (DJBA 967), Mnd. šāmka ‘shriveling’ (MD 387), Tgr. čimkā ‘to pinch, to touch’ (WTS 623), Tna. šāmēkš ‘to wring, to squeeze, to extract’ (TED 2556), Amh. čūmmākā ‘to wring, to squeeze, to compress’ (AED 2206), Har. čimāḵa ‘to squeeze, to wring’ (EDH 51), Zwy. tūmākā, Sel. Wol. ašūmākā, Sod. čūmmākā, Ezh čūmmākā ‘to wring wet clothes, to squeeze water out of clothes or dough’ (EDG 621), perhaps Arb. šāmīq- ‘hungry and thirsty’ (LA 10 248). JPA šimmāḵim ‘raisins’ (DJPA 463) is almost certainly a Hebraism. The similarity between *ṣVmVk- and Akk. muziku ‘raisin’ (CAD Mz 322, AHw. 692) observed in DUL 786 is conspicuous, but probably accidental.

59. šd ‘open field, stretch of cultivated land; field, land, plot, estate, farm’ (DUL 807).
- The meaning “plot of cultivated land,” crucial for the exclusively Canaanite status of this term, is abundantly attested, especially in economic and administrative texts.
- Amarna Canaanite ŠA-TE-e (EA 287:56), Pho. šd ‘field, plain’ (DNWSI 1110), Hbr. šādā ‘pasture, open fields; field, arable land’ (HALOT 1307).
- PC *ṣadaw- ‘(cultivated) field,’ together with Akk. šadū ‘mountain; open country’ (CAD Š 49, AHw. 1124), yields PS *ṣadaw- ‘open country, wild, uncultivated place’ (Fronzaroli 1968:269–270, 287). It is usually assumed that this PS term is not reflected in Aramaic (Blau 1977a:101), but note Mnd. sadia ‘field, open space, plain, desert’ (MD 310). Sab. ṣadw, often compared to Hbr. šādā and Akk. šadū, is an obscure word tentatively rendered as ‘mountain’, ‘cultivated land’ in SD 131 and

---

877 mā šāla fulānnun šāmiqan ụyya ụbṣāna wa-žāḇān.
878 A gloss to Akk. ugāru. The contextual meaning is admittedly “countryside” rather than “cultivated field.”
879 The meaning “cultivated field” is clear in šd ūm krū ‘field or vineyard’ (KA1 287:6).
880 The PS reconstruction with *-w (rather than -y) seems to be assured by well-attested spellings with -u/-w- in Sargonic (ša-dū-e, ša-dū-im) and Old Assyrian (ša-ad-u-im, ša-du-im), v. Kienast 1994:278–280 and CAD Š 51 respectively.
881 For the semantic relationship between “mountain” and “countryside” in Semitic v. CDG 121 in connection with Gez. ḏabḥ ‘mountain’ vs. Hbr. miḥāḇ ‘desert, steppe.’
882 This Mandaic lexeme is so isolated in Aramaic that one is tempted to surmise a Canaanite borrowing (for such a possibility cf. D. Boyarin’s remarks on Mnd. šḥk ‘to laugh’ apud Steiner 1977:118).
60. śmh ‘to be glad, rejoice,’ śmḥt ‘joy’ (DUL 825).
   Widely attested, paralleled by gl ‘to rejoice’ and šhk ‘laughter’ in 1.16 i 14–15 and 1.3 ii 25–26 respectively.
   ▪ Amarna Canaanite šmāḥu ‘to rejoice’ (iš-mu-huš in EA 109:50, Rainey 1978:92), Amm. šmh ‘to be glad’ (DNWSI 1160), Hbr. šmh ‘to rejoice,’ šimḥā ‘joy’ (HALOT 1333).
   ▼ The origin of PC *šmh ‘to rejoice’ (Greenfield 1959:151) is unclear, although one cannot exclude (with Greenfield and Kopf 1976:190) an eventual relationship to PS *šmh ‘to be high, tall,’ represented by Akk. šmāḥu ‘to grow thickly, abundantly’ (CAD Ś, 288, AHw. 1153) and Arb. šmh ‘to be high, lofty’ (Lane 1595). Soq. šāmḥāl ‘long’ belongs to the same root according to LS 418 (“un augmentatif à suffixe l de l’ar. šmh”), but this is unlikely in view of the irregular sibilant correspondence.

61. šns ‘to gird oneself’ (DUL 833).
   ▪ Hapax legomenon in 1.3 ii 11–13: ṭkt rīšt l bmnš šnst kpt b ḫbšš ‘She attached heads to her back, bound hands to her gird.’
   ▪ Hbr. šns ‘to gird’ (HALOT 1607).
   ▼ PC *šns ‘to gird’ has no reliable etymology. Comparison with Arb. šnṣ ‘to be attached to something’ (LA 7 55)887 suggested in Yahuda 1903:711 is semantically attractive, but implies two phonological irregularities.888

62. šph ‘family, offspring, descendants, clan’ (DUL 835).
   ▲ The meaning “son,” “descendant” is clear in 1.14 iii 48–49 (wdl špḥ l krt w ṣlm n l ʾbd n l ‘To bear a descendant to Krt, a boy to vll’s servant’) and 1.16 i 9–11 (krt bnm n il špḥ lʾpn w ḫlš ‘Krt is a son of vll, a descendant of the Benevolent and the Holy One’). The collective interpretation (“family”) is likely in b klln špḥ yʾītbd ‘The family perished in its...

---

883 Cf. perhaps Amh. šād(ī)dā ‘place having no fence, hedge or wall’ (AED 574). The meaning “cultivated field” for *šadaw- is a highly specific PC innovation (Fronzaroli 1969:9) with no precedent in other Semitic languages, where this concept is expressed, inter alia, by the reflexes of PS *ḥaql- (Fronzaroli 1969:8–9, 26): Akk. ḫlu (CAD E 249, AHw. 231), Syr. ḫaklā (LSyr. 252), Arb. ḫaql- (Lane 612). Remarkably, PS *ḥaql- is not attested (presumably, lost) in Canaanite.

884 Amm. šmh ‘to be glad’ (DNWSI 1160), Hbr. šmh ‘to rejoice,’ šimḥā ‘joy’ (HALOT 1333).

885 These translations have been recently challenged in Sima 2000:309 in connection with CIH 660:4 and Robin-Kanit 5:2: “Beides passt im Kontext überhaupt nicht ... šēkl ein Bauwerk, ein Haus, einen Teil eines Hauses o. ä. bezeichnet” (v. already Robin 1982:52).


887 Note especially the derived meanings “to thrive,” “to flourish,” “to attain extraordinary beauty or stature” in Akkadian and “to be proud” in Arabic.

888 For γ note, however, JPA šnṣ ‘strap, lace’ (DJPA 560), JBA šnṣ ‘to tighten a cord,’ šnṣṣā ‘lace’ (DJBA 1166).
entirety’ (1.14 i 24, note a few other collective designations of family in this episode), but the presence of \(y\) \(r\) ‘heir’ in the parallel line 25 suggests that the meaning “descendant,” “offspring” is also prominent in this passage.

- Pho. \(šph\) ‘clan, family’ (DNWSI 1181), Hbr. \(mišpāhā\) ‘extended family’ (HALOT 651).\(^{889}\)

- The origin of PC \(*š\)\(p\)- ‘family’ is uncertain as none of the \(*š\)\(h\) roots extant in other Semitic languages allows for a transparent semantic development into “family,” “progeny.”\(^{890}\)

63. \(št\) ‘to place, set, set up’ (DUL 848).

- \(Passim\) in the Ugaritic corpus.

- Pho. \(št\) ‘to place, to put, to establish’ (DNWSI 1130), Hbr. \(šyt\) ‘to set, stand, place’ (HALOT 1483).

- PC \(*šyt\) ‘to place, to put’ is to be identified with Akk. \(šētu\) ‘to remain, to be left over; to leave’ (CAD \(Š\) 341, AHw. 1221).\(^{891}\) Since the semantic shift “to leave” > “to put, to place” is relatively well attested,\(^{892}\) there are good reasons to attribute the meaning “to leave” to PS \(*šyt\) and to consider “to put” as a PC semantic innovation.\(^{893}\)

---

\(^{889}\) It is hard to say whether Hbr. \(šph\) ‘slave-girl’ is etymologically related to \(mišpāhā\) (cf. HALOT 1620, Reuter 2006:406).

\(^{890}\) HALOT 1620 mentions Arb. \(šfh\) ‘to pour, to shed’ (Lane 1369), with no comments on the hypothetic semantic derivation. BDB 1046 tentatively compares Arb. \(šfh\) (III) ‘to commit fornication’ (Lane 1369), but, it seems, having \(šphā\) rather than \(mišpāhā\) in mind (cf. Zobel 1998:79). For H.-J. Zobel, “OSA \(šfh\) ‘call together’ is closer to the mark,” but the actual meaning of Sab. and Qat. \(šfh\) seems to be ‘to order, to decree, to announce’ (Jamme 1962:443, Ryckmans 1973:383–385, Avanzini 2004:272, 274), which is not very helpful for the semantic derivation advocated by Zobel. The common Eth\(h\) root with the meaning “to be wide, broad” — Gez. \(saffā\) ‘to stretch forth, stretch out, expand, make broad, enlarge’ (CDG 487), Tgr. \(sāffa\) ‘to spread, to stretch’ (WTS 201), Tna. \(sāffē\) ‘to be, to become wide, broad; to grow in extent; to be extensive in length and breadth’ (TED 794), Amh. \(sāffa\) ‘to be or to become broad’ (AED 593), Muh. Sod. \(saffa\), Zwy. \(saffī\) ‘to be broad’ (EDG 537) — could be compared with the meaning shift “to grow, to expand” > “family, clan,” but if Leslau’s comparison between Gez. \(saffa\) and Akk. \(spādu\) ‘to scatter, disperse’ (AHw. 1024, CAD S 151) is correct (Huehnergard 1991a:702), the underlying sibilant must be \(s\) rather than \(š\). Comparison with Mhr. \(šēfh\) ‘to eat food put aside’ (ML 392) tentatively proposed in Diakonoff-Kogan 2001:155 presupposes a rather exotic semantic development and is difficult to prove, that \(š\) in the Mehri verb is more likely to be the causative-reflexive prefix than the first root consonant.

\(^{891}\) Kouwenberg (2010a:556) attributes \(šētu\) to a II\(*\) or II\(*\) root “without etymology” on the basis of the \(c\)-coloring. This feature, unexpected for a II\(*\)\(y\) root, is admittedly worth considering, although it remains to be established how many of the extant early attestations are sufficiently diagnostic in this respect.

\(^{892}\) Cf. Buck 1949:833 for Lettish \(likt\) ‘to put’ < PIE *\(leik\)\(-\) ‘to leave’ and DUL 148 for Ugr. \(vlb\) ‘to put, place, arrange’ < PS \(*vlb\) ‘to leave.’

\(^{893}\) The meaning “to leave” for Ugr. \(št\) is indeed registered in DUL, but the only passage where it is actually present in the translation is w \(št\) \(vik\) \(lk\) ‘I leave the warehouse to you’ (3.9:5). In view of other attestations of \(št\) + direct object + l (2.41:18, 6.29:2), where this construction is rendered as ‘to restore’ and ‘to set up’ in DUL, the translation ‘I leave’ for w \(št\) in 3.9:5 is hardly compelling (cf. ‘Il a réservé son entrepôt pour eux’ in Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:108). As for \(vvt\ \(yś\) \(bl\) in 1.19 iv 5, it can be easily rendered as ‘May Bel make you blind’ (for a similar usage of Hbr. \(šyt\) v. BDB 1011b). Thus, the fundamental semantic difference between the reflexes of PS \(*šyt\) in Akkadian and Canaanite (“to leave”
Ugr. št and Hbr. šyt do not exactly match from the functional point of view. While Ugr. št is clearly the basic exponent of the meaning “to put,” Hbr. šyt appears as a common, but still rather marginal verb if compared to its ubiquitous synonym ūm (85 vs. 582 attestations in the Biblical corpus, Vanoni 2004a:91, 2004b:647). The root *ūm, in its turn, is entirely missing from Ugaritic, which is quite remarkable in view of its broad presence elsewhere in Semitic. Coexistence of šyt and ūm in Hebrew as virtual semantic equivalents (Vanoni 2004b:652) is an extraordinary fact which still awaits a proper diachronic assessment.

64. trr(t) ‘sheath; quiver’ (DUL 857).
- *Hapax legomenon* in 1.19 iv 44–45: št h[...]

65. tk ‘centre, middle; in, in the midst of; to, towards’ (DUL 867).
- Widely attested (Tropper 2000:772, 775–776).
  - Pho. mtk ‘midst’ (Krahmalkov 2000:320),
  - Hbr. tāwāk, tōk ‘midst, in the middle’ (HALOT 1697).

896 The earliest attestation of this lexeme in the Syro-Palestinian area possibly comes from OB Mari: ta-ša-ar-ti (Arkhipov 2012:126).

897 For this interpretation v. most recently Tropper 1993a:35, 273. The translation ‘oppression’ accepted in DNWSI 708 is hardly convincing.

898 As is well known, the functional overlap between Ugr. tk and Hbr. tōk is not complete. In Ugaritic, tk is often used with the terminative force, whereas the locative meaning is typical for the combination b tk (Tropper 2000:772, 775–776). In Hebrew, the combination bō-tōk clearly predominates and its meaning is locative rather than terminative (BDB 1063–1064).

894 There are good reasons to assume that *ūm was the basic verb for “to put” in PS, which, at some early stage of the linguistic history of Canaanite, started to be replaced by the innovative *šyt. As pointed out by G. Vanoni (2004b:647–648), most of the attestations of šyt in Hebrew are early or archaic/archaizing (poetry and pre-exilic prose). It means that early Hebrew was indeed affected by the *ūm > šyt replacement. The subsequent “revitalization” of ūm is, therefore, rather hard to conceive as a purely linear, internal process. Instead, one is tempted to attribute this retrograde development to a foreign influence. (Proto-)Aramaic, where *ūm is the only basic exponent of the meaning “to put” since the earliest inscriptions on, is quite a likely source of such an influence. For possible implications of this and similar isoglosses for the lexical aspect of the Mischsprache theory v. Kogan 2006b:251–252 and the concluding part of this chapter (pp. 342-344).

895 Interestingly, also in Phoenician. The Phoenician picture is hard to evaluate because of the scarcity of data, but from the examples collected by Ch. Krahmalkov (2000:467 and 483–484) one can tentatively conclude that, once again, Phoenician is close to Ugaritic and markedly different from Hebrew: numerous attestations of št contrast sharply with just a handful of examples involving ūm (only one of them pre-Punic).
‘neck’ suggested in Watson 1999:791 is unattractive both formally or semantically. A loanword from Hittite *teukka-* ‘body, self’ has been surmised by Ch. Rabin (1963:136–137).

66. **tmm** ‘frame, form’ (DUL 872).
   - Attested twice in incantations: 1.169:5–6 (*ṭḥpḥ l ḡbk w trṣ l tmmkh ‘That it may harm your body and injure your shape’) and 9.435:14–15 (*l ṣwrtn l ḡbk l tmmth ‘For ṣUrtn, for his body and his shape’).\(^{999}\)
   - Hbr. *ṭmmnaḥ* ‘form, manifestation’ (HALOT 1746).
   - The origin of PC *ṭmmn-at-* ‘shape, body, form’\(^{990}\) is uncertain as no semantically suitable root *mwn/*myn is at hand (Waschke 2006:687).\(^{991}\) The hypothetical relationship with Hbr. *mīn* ‘type, kind’ (HALOT 577, Cazelles 1969), in its turn etymologically obscure, is highly problematic.

67. **ṭṣyt** ‘triumph, success’ (DUL 882).
   - Hapax legomenon in 1.3 iiii 25–27: *ṭydḥ ḡbd ḡ ṣḥk ymlṭv ḡbk b šmhṭ ḡbd ṣnt ṣṭṭ ‘Her liver swells with laughter, her heart fills with joy, ṣnt’s liver with triumph.’\(^{992}\)
   - Hbr. *ṭššyā* ‘success, good result; sound wisdom, prudence’ (HALOT 1713).
   - The origin of PC *ṭššyy-at-* ‘success’ is uncertain.\(^{993}\)

68. **ṭlh** ‘table’ (DUL 905).
   - Widely attested, the meaning “dining table” is clear from 1.4 iv 35–37 (*ḥl[m] b ṭḥnt ḡm ṣṭ b ḡprmn yn ‘Eat bread from the tables, drink wine from the goblets’).
   - Hbr. *šlḥdn* ‘table’ (HALOT 1519).

---

\(^{999}\) For *tmm* in 1.2 iv 17–18 see section 3.2.3 below (pp. 337–338).

\(^{990}\) Diachronic identity between Ugr. *tmm* and Hbr. *ṭmmnaḥ* seems to be accepted by most Ugaritologists, but exact semantic details of this identification did not receive enough attention in recent treatments of both relevant texts (Pardee 2000:884–885, Ford 2002a:147, 2002b:174, contrast Pardee’s and Ford’s extensive treatment of Ugr. *gb* — Hbr. *gab*). As far as we can see, the semantic overlap between Ugr. *tmm* and Hbr. *ṭmmnaḥ* is not exact, since the Hebrew lexeme lacks anatomical connotations.

\(^{991}\) The semantic similarity between *tmm*/*ṭmmnaḥ* and Tgr. *mnād* ‘nature, figure, appearance, shape’ (WTS 129) is striking, but further implications of this comparison are rather uncertain. In WTS, the Tigre noun is analyzed as an (irregular, IIy) derivate of *māna* ‘to create’ (IIy), from which *mān* ‘lie, falsehood’ is also thought to be derived. The latter, however, is clearly identical to Gez. *tamayyana* ‘to deceive’ (CDG 376) and Arb. *myn* = ḡdb (LA 13 525), both IIy as the Hebrew lexeme. One has to emphasize that, *contra* HALOT 577, Fabry 1997:288 and Waschke 2006:687, no other meanings (such as “to create,” “to split” or “to plow”) are attested for the root *myn* in Arabic: the verb *māna* = *ṣaqqa l-ṣāḏa li-z-zawrī* ‘to split the ground for sowing’ (LA 13 525) has no connection with this root, being secondarily derived from the substantive *mān-* ‘höe,’ itself probably not autochthonous. Note, finally, that Tgr. *mn* in *mn ṣadym* ‘men, mankind’ is (*contra* WTS 741) certainly unrelated to Hbr. *mīn*, being rather a deformation of Arb. *bānā ṛādam* with *b* > *m* dissimilation (exactly the same development took place in Mhr. *mānēḏym* ‘person,’ MI. 267).


\(^{993}\) The Ugaritic form with *ḥ* evidently precludes any connection with Hbr. *yēš* ‘there is’ (< *yšu*), still often postulated in Biblical studies (cf. Gertz 2006:647).
The origin of PC *ṭūlḥān- ‘table’ (Greenfield 1969:98, Ginsberg 1970:103) is uncertain. As duly recognized in Blau 1956:243 and HALOT 1519–1520, the Ugaritic form with ṭ and ḫ makes unattractive the traditional identifications of Hbr. šulḥān with either *šlḥ ‘to send, to stretch out’ (Akk. šalḥu, Ugr. šlḥ, Hdr. sīlḥ, CAD Š, 193, DUL 816, Pirenne 1990:107) or *šlḥ ‘to strip off (hide),’ *šVlḥ- ‘hide, skin’ (Syr. šelḥā, Arb. sallḥ-, SED I No. 244).  

69. Ṯṯ ṭv ‘to be frightened, scared’ (DUL 935).
- Reliably attested in 1.6 vi 30 and 1.5 ii 7 (both analyzed under No. 76 in this section).
- Pho. ṭḥ in b-mkmm ṭḥ kn l-pnm nšṭm ṭḥ yšw ṭdm l-lkt drk ‘In the places which used to be fearful, where people were afraid to walk on a road …’ (KAI 26A ii 3–5, DNWSI 1199), Hbr. ṭl tišṭav ‘do not be afraid’ (Is 41:10), nišṭrā ‘let us be afraid’ (Is 41:23).
- The origin of PC *ṯv ‘to be afraid’ (Greenfield 1969:99) is uncertain. Comparison with Arb. ṭḥ ‘to be sad, worried because of hunger or disease’ (LA 8 206), accepted in DUL 935 and elsewhere, is problematic both phonetically and semantically, let alone the exceedingly marginal status of the Arabic verb (cf. HALOT 1671). Since ṭ–ṭ is an unwelcome sequence of root consonants, ṭ- is likely a fossilized reflexive inflex. Are we faced with a ṭ-derivative from *ṭy ‘to gaze, to look at, to seek,’ represented by Akk. šerū (CAD Š, 355) and Hbr. šrū (HALOT 1609)? The underlying semantic shift “to look around” > “to be frightened” is possible, but of course not self-evident; however, the presence of *ṭ behind š in Akkadian is bolstered by the Sargonic orthography. Sab. ṭṛṭ, compared in Tomback 1978:335, is translated as ‘slander, calumny’ in SD 149 and can thus hardly be relevant.

70. ṭṣr ‘to teach, to instruct’ (DUL 943).
- The meaning “to teach” is likely in both contexts where ṭṣr is attested: rḥb ṭl ḫmṭ šbt ᵛḥm l tsrk ‘You are great, oh All, you are wise! Your grey beard surely instructs you!’ (1.4 v 3–4) and ṭl ṭṣb ṭḥl w ṭṣwrn ggnh ‘Also ṭḥ sat in (his) palace and his inwards instructed him’ (1.16 vi 25–26).
- Hbr. ṭsr ‘to instruct’ (HALOT 418).
- The origin of PC *ṭṣr/*ṭṣr ‘to teach, to instruct’ is obscure.

71. ṭyr ‘razor’ (DUL 947).
- Hapax legomenon in 1.5 vi 17–18 (ṛṣr b ṭaḥm ṭdy ṭṣltm b ṭyr). The meaning “razor”

-- In both attestations paralleled by ṭyr ‘to be afraid’ (HALOT 1671, Greenfield 1958:226–228).
-- ṭṣr ṭr ṭs mnr ṭn ṭnr ṭr ṭn ṭnr ṭn ḫjīw.
-- Cf. especially Akk. šerū ‘to look all over, to strive for, to be assiduous, to be solicitous’ (CAD Š, 355).
-- The onlomastic element iš SYS ‘he searched’ (CAD Š, 357). As is well known, IŠSYS can only be used for ṭ.
-- Contrast Tomback’s ‘fear.’
-- A nearly exact parallel is found in Ps 16:7 (yissrāṭān ḫst ībāy ‘My reins instructed me’).
fits the context and is generally accepted (e.g. ‘With a stone he scratches incisions on (his) skin, with a razor he cuts cheeks and chin’ in Pardee 1997:268).

- Hbr. *ta'ar* ‘knife, razor’ (DBB 789, HALOT 1770).
- The origin of PC *ya'r-*/*ta'r-* ‘knife, razor’ remains uncertain, although the traditional derivation from *yrtw* ‘to be naked,’ accepted in DBB 788–789 and Aistleitner 1963:242, but rejected as “clearly not relevant” in HALOT 1770, is still attractive, especially if the term denoted specifically a shaving razor (i.e., “an instrument making the skin bare”\(^911\)).

72. *yn* ‘wine’ (DUL 968).
- *Passim* throughout the Ugaritic corpus.

- PC *ya'n-* ‘wine’ goes back to PWS *wayn-* which, judging by the meaning of the Arabic, ESA and EthS cognates, probably denoted “vine(yard)” (Sab. and Qat. *wy*, SD 166, LIQ 51, Gez. *wayn*, CDG 623, LLA 928–929, Sima 2000:250–257) or “grapes” (Arb. *wayn-*). \(^913\) “wine.” \(^914\) The exclusively Canaanite nature of this lexeme \(^915\) is undermined by the fact that the reflex of PWS *wayn-* as the main designation of “wine” is also attested in Geez. \(^916\)

73. *yš* ‘fowler, bird-catcher’ (DUL 976).
- Attested in lists of people by profession (*yšm* ‘fowlers’ in 4.99:6, 4.126:25), the meaning thus being derived from etymology. The same is true of the syllabic *Lu-ia-šiš* (Huehnergard 1987a:134).

- Hbr. *yš* ‘to catch a bird with a snare,’ *yōš* ‘fowler,’ *mōēš* ‘snare’ (HALOT 432, 430, 561). Also related are *nš* ‘to become ensnared’ (HALOT 723) and *wš* ‘to trap with a snare’ (HALOT 1091).

- The origin of PC *yš* ‘to hunt with a snare’ is uncertain. Comparison with Gez. *waṣṣa* ‘to reprimand, to reproach’ and related EthS forms suggested in CDG 616 is semantically far-fetched. The Ugaritic form with *š* should prevent one from comparing Hbr. *yšš* with Arb. *wtq* ‘to tie’ with metathesis (contra Kopf 1976:150–151). \(^918\)

---

\(^911\) Cf. Ukrainian *голитися* ‘to shave’ < *голий* ‘bare, naked.’

\(^912\) In the trilingual lexical fragment from Tel Aphek (= Sum. *geštin.jmeš,* Akk. *ka-ra-nu*). It is uncertain whether i-nu, equated to Sum. *mu.tin* in CT 19, 1d:10, represents a Canaanite loanword with the meaning “wine” (cf. AHw. 383, CAD I 152 as well as Rubio 1999:8).

\(^913\) *al-inabu l-abya*. \(^914\) This conjecture becomes especially attractive if PWS *wayn-* is considered to be borrowed from an Indo-European source, since the meaning “wine” in PIE can be plausibly derived from the verbal root *wei*- ‘to twist, to wind’ (Buck 1949:390, cf. Franzoroli 1972:613–614, Sima 2000:255–256).

\(^915\) Note in particular the absence of *ya'n-* ‘wine’ from Aramaic, where this meaning is commonly expressed by *amr-* since Official Aramaic onward (cf. HALOT 1877 and below in Chapter 6, p. 408).

\(^916\) For the earliest Geez attestations v. Sima 2000:256.

\(^917\) “The Ethiopic root has a figurative meaning in relation to Semitic ‘lay snares.’” Cf. also DRS 613.

\(^918\) As pointed out above, L. Kopf is admittedly correct to emphasize that the currently accepted meaning of the Ugaritic noun is entirely dependent on the Hebrew etymology.
74. *yph* ‘witness’ (DUL 974).
   - Widely attested in contracts and economic documents and, as rightly acknowledged in Pardee 1978:206, almost certainly the main exponent of the meaning “witness” in Ugaritic.
   - No convincing etymology for PC *yaʃāh*- ‘witness’ has been suggested so far (cf. Pardee 1978:210–212).

75. *yr* ‘early rain’ (DUL 977).
   - Reliably attested in 1.19 i 39–42 (*ysly yrpt b ḫm ṣun yr vrpt tmṭr b ḫl ṭl ṣll l ṣnbn ‘He implores the clouds in the terrible draught, the rain which the clouds pour down in summer, the dew which falls on the grapes’) and 1.14 ii 39–40 (*ḥlk l ṣalpm ḥdd ṭ l ṛbt km yr ‘They went in thousands like a downpour, in myriads like an early rain’).
   - Hbr. *yōrā* ‘early rain’ (HALOT 404).
   - The origin of PC *yāriy-* is uncertain, but it is tempting to surmise (with DRS 621–622) a connection with the widely attested verbal root *rwy* ‘to be saturated with water’ (for which v. HALOT 1194–1195 and CDG 478).

76. *yrr* ‘to be afraid’ (DUL 977).
   - Possible attestations of this root are discussed in Tropper 1996, who deals extensively with both relevant passages: 1.5 ii 6–7 (*yruru*).921 *yārīn bsl ṣṭḥn ṭḥn ṭbb ṛpt ‘The mighty Bd feared him, the Rider of the clouds was frightened of him’) and 1.6 vi 30–32 (*yru bn nīlm <m> ṯṭ ṭbb ṭl ṣṭ ‘Mt, the son of nīl was afraid, frightened was the beloved son of nīl, the warrior’).
   - Hbr. *yrr* ‘to fear’ (HALOT 433).
   - There is no immediate etymological parallel to PC *yrr* ‘to be afraid,’ which, at least in Hebrew, has become the basic verb with this meaning. Hypothetical cognates (DRS 483, 615–616) involve either metathesis (Arb. *wru* ‘to frighten,’ Lane 3048922) or consonantal variation (*wrr* ‘to fear,’ Lane 3051).

77. *yšk* ‘to pour out; to smelt, cast’ (DUL 987).
   - Both the general meaning “to pour” and the more technical “to cast (metals)” are reliably attested: *yšk b gl ḫtīn ṣn ‘He poured wine into a silver cup’ (1.14 iv 1), *yšk kṣp l ṣalpm ḥṣ yšk l ṛbbt ‘He poured silver into thousands (of shekels), gold into myriads’ (1.4 i 26–28).
   - Pho. *yšk* ‘statue’ (Tomback 1978:128, cf. DNWSI 466), ‘to cast a metal object’

---

919  *Hapax legomenon* in Ps 27:12, meaning reliably established from parallelism with *qēdē* ‘witnesses.’
920  Several reliable attestations in Proverbs.
921  Exact morphological interpretation of this difficult form is highly problematic, but its attribution to *yrr* ‘to be afraid’ is beyond doubt.
922  Comparison with Tgr. *wāra* ‘to threaten’ (WTS 435) in HALOT 432 is problematic since *r* is not expected to be lost in Tigre.
(Krahmalkov 2000:214), Hbr. ɣšk ‘to pour out; to cast’ (HALOT 428).

The origin of PC ɣšk ‘to pour; to cast’ is uncertain.

78. ɣtn ‘to be old, become old, wear out,’ ɣtn ‘old, rancid’ (DUL 996).

The meaning “old” is reliably deduced from 4.168:5–8 (mlbš ɣtmmn k ɣtn w b bt mlk mlbš ɣtn lhm ‘Since the garment of ɣtmmn grew old, let one give them one garment from the king’s house’). The expression ḥdbt ɣtn w štnm ɣtnm in the hippiatric prescriptions (1.71:27, also 1.72:37-38 and 1.85:31) is paralleled by Hbr. ḥddāḏāšim ... ḥāḏāšim gam ɣsânām (Ct 7:14), see further Cohen–Sivan 1983:41.

The origin of PC ɣtn ‘to wear out, grow old’ (Ginsberg 1970:103) is uncertain. Comparison with Arb. ɣsn ‘to be altered, long standing, rancid (water)’ (Lane 60) and snn (IV) ‘to be advanced in age’ (Lane 1436) suggested in Tropper 2000:109, albeit semantically attractive, is undermined by the irregular phonological correspondence. DRS 658 compares Arb. wtn (IV) ‘to become wasted and worn out (an old man),’ ḥtn- ‘dry herbage’ (Lane 356). Cf. also Arb. ḥtn (X) ‘to become numerous, abundant’ (LA 13 547).924

3.2. Exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and other Semitic languages

It goes without saying that a correct evaluation of the exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite can only be achieved by comparison with exclusive isoglosses which Ugaritic shares with other Semitic languages. Three groups of such isoglosses have been detected in the course of the present investigation — Ugaritic-Arabic, Ugaritic-Aramaic and Ugaritic-Akkadian.

3.2.1. Ugaritic-Arabic

Exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic occupy a special place in the history of Ugaritic lexicography because of the extraordinary richness of the Arabic vocabulary. Incidentally, these lexical features have often been adduced as a proof of a special genealogical proximity between Ugaritic and Arabic. Much of the relevant material has even been dealt with in a special monograph (Renfroe 1992) — a kind of treatment which exclusive lexical isoglosses uniting Ugaritic with either Hebrew or Akkadian have never received.

F. Renfroe’s study provides a solid background for this segment of our investigation, but numerous points of disagreement in both methodology and concrete etymological decisions have compelled us to undertake an independent scrutiny of the pertinent lexical evidence. In the wake of Renfroe, the results are presented in two separate subsections. Isoglosses which are indeed truly exclusive on the one hand and philologically reliable on the other are listed in the first subsection. The second

---

923 See comments on mlk ‘weapons’ in No. 48 above in this section.
924 ṣistawṣa l-māḫu = ḫatāra.
subsection presents a selection of isoglosses which, for various reasons, have been considered unreliable or not compelling. This second list is intended to demonstrate — once again — how many of the allegedly exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic do not withstand critical scrutiny.\footnote{On this very point, Renfroe’s results are already quite persuasive.}

3.2.1.1. Probable

In Renfroe 1992:11–74, twenty-four exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic are acknowledged as probable. Since many entries from Renfroe’s selection are also reliable in our view, a certain deal of overlap between Renfroe’s list and the evidence collected in this subsection is natural.\footnote{Additions are seven: \textit{phd} ‘heart’, \textit{bgr} ‘to watch’, \textit{msr} ‘to tear’, \textit{rks} ‘to jump’, \textit{lpn} ‘benevolent’, \textit{gngn}/\textit{ggn} ‘interior’ and \textit{slm} ‘to muzzle.’ The former four isoglosses are simply missing from Renfroe’s book. The latter three are rejected by Renfroe as non-exclusive, which is fully or partly unjustified.\footnote{Thus, the well-known \textit{crux} of 1.16 vi 43–44 (\textit{k yz ywm ltr b ywm tswy}) is so ambiguous (cf. Pardee’s recent evaluation in 1997:342) that we prefer to leave out of consideration three otherwise plausible exclusive isoglosses accepted by Renfroe: Ugr. \textit{yz} — Arb. \textit{yze} ‘to invade’ (1992:39–41), Ugr. \textit{yrm} — Arb. \textit{ywr} ‘to plunder’ (1992:37) and Ugr. \textit{tswy} — Arb. \textit{twy} ‘to be idle’ (1992:68–69). The same applies to such highly problematic passages as \textit{k tgd ntr b ymnk} in 1.4 vii 41 (Ugr. \textit{tg} — Arb. \textit{yg} ‘to hasten, to speed,’ Renfroe 1992:31–34, cf. Pardee 1997:263, DUL 317–318), \textit{hkm b gbl stbk h hnnk w ym} in 1.16 vi 57–58 (Ugr. \textit{hpm} — Arb. \textit{hff} ‘to surround, to encompass,’ Renfroe 1992:49–52, cf. Pardee 1997:343, DUL 366), \textit{adv b yl nl knn} in 1.7 vi 23 (Ugr. \textit{yl} — Arb. \textit{yl} ‘thicket,’ Renfroe 1992:34–36, cf. Pardee 1997:347, DUL 318). Sabaic and other ESA languages are often tacitly assumed to be the same as “Arabic” in Renfroe’s study, which is by no means warranted (cf. Renfroe 1992:2). Ugaritic-Arabic isoglosses shared by ESA are, therefore, not to be considered exclusive. This objection applies to the multiplicative enclitic -\textit{id} as well as to \textit{db} ‘to put in order, to prepare,’ \textit{ymn} ‘assistant’ and \textit{hff} ‘fate, lot.’ \footnote{For the presence of \textit{rws} in Hebrew onomastics and its methodological significance v. Kogan 2006b (especially p. 243).}} At the same time, quite a number of isoglosses considered reliable by Renfroe have been presently omitted in view of serious philological and/or etymological difficulties.\footnote{As a result, the number of exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic has decreased from 24 to 18.} As a result, the number of exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic has decreased from 24 to 18.

1. \textit{rušn} ‘present, gift’ (DUL 118).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Hapax legomenon} in 1.14 iii 31–32: \textit{radm ytn} ‘\textit{r} \textit{hil} \textit{w rušn} \textit{rab radm ‘Udm} is a gift of \textit{r} \textit{il} and a present of the father of mankind.’
\item Arb. \textit{ruš} ‘to offer a present,’ \textit{ruws-} ‘gift’ (LA 6 20).\footnote{\textit{\textit{ruš}} ‘to jump,’ \textit{\textit{ruwš}} ‘to offer, to offer a gift’ has no cognates elsewhere in Semitic and may be considered an exclusive isogloss (cf. Renfroe 1992:16).\footnote{\textit{\textit{ruš}} in Hebrew onomastics and its methodological significance v. Kogan 2006b (especially p. 243).}}
\item Ugr.-Arb. \textit{ruš} ‘to grant, to offer a gift’ has no cognates elsewhere in Semitic and may be considered an exclusive isogloss (cf. Renfroe 1992:16).\footnote{\textit{\textit{ruš}} in Hebrew onomastics and its methodological significance v. Kogan 2006b (especially p. 243).}
\end{itemize}

2. \textit{r̄kh} ‘a destructive one’ (DUL 177).

\begin{itemize}
\item Attested twice as a divine epithet, the meaning “ripper” is probable because of the parallelism with \textit{raklm} ‘devourers’: \textit{hl ld raklm tbrkk w ld \textit{r̄kh}n ‘Writhe and bear the devourers, kneel and bear the rippers’ (1.12 ii 25–27), \textit{wn ym\textit{y} raklm w ym\textit{y}a \textit{r̄kh}n ‘That he might reach the devourers and meet the rippers …’ (1.12 i 36–37).}
\end{itemize}
Arb. ṣqq ‘to split, to rip, to cut’ (Lane 2005).

The exclusive nature of the Ugr.-Arb. isogloss (acknowledged in Renfroe 1992:24–26) is to some extent undermined by Tgr. ṣakṣa ‘to cut, to wound, to furrow’ (WTS 467), which, however, may be an Arabic loanword in view of the lack of cognates elsewhere in Ethiopian Semitic.

3. ṣtk ‘to tie, to fasten, to bind’ (DUL 191).
- Attested in stereotypical descriptions of cut off heads fastened to the belt: ṣtkt rīṣt l bmtth šast kpt b ḫṣbh ‘She attached heads to her back, bound hands to her gird’ (1.3 ii 11–13).930
- Arb. ṣtk ‘to stick (intrans.)’ (Lane 1948).
- Ugr.-Arb. *ṭk ‘to stick, to attach’ is an exclusive isogloss (Renfroe 1992:26–29).

4. bṣr ‘to watch’ (DUL 241).
- The most reliable attestation of this verb is 1.18 iv 30–31: ḥn nṣrm ṭḥpn yḥṣr hbl ḏri[y]m] ‘Vultures soar above him, a band of hawks is watching.’931 As persuasively argued by D. Pardee (2000:669), mlkm ṭḥṣn in 1.163:4 is to be understood as ‘Kings will watch one another.’932 Conversely, ḏṣr in 6.24:1 remains highly problematic (v. Singer 1999:703–704; DUL’s translation ‘examination’ is hardly more than a conjecture).
- Arb. bṣr ‘to see’ (Lane 210).
- Ugr.-Arb. *ḥṣr ‘to see’ is an exclusive isogloss.933

5. ggn, ḡg ‘insides’ (DUL 296, 300).
- Attested in 1.16 vi 26 (w ṣwṣmn ḡg ‘And his inner self instructs him’) and 1.4 vii 47–49 (ykr’a mt b ṣṣḥ yṣtrn yḍd b ḡg ‘).934
- Arb. ḫnn ‘interior, heart’ (Lane 403).
- Possible cognates to Ugr.-Arb. *ḡVn-Vn ‘heart, interior’ dealt with in SED I No. 83 are rather unreliable, so it is preferable to treat this isogloss as exclusive. There is hardly any justification for its rejection by F. Renfroe (1992:10), whose comparison between Ugr. g(n)gn and Hbr. gqrg ‘throat’ (let alone Akk. gg Griff, most probably non-existent) is patently wrong (cf. SED I No. 102).

6. ydd ‘to swell’ (DUL 317).
- Hapax legomenon in 1.3 ii 25–27: ṭyḍḍ kbdḥ b ṣḥḥ ṣml ḫ ḥbd ṣḥḥ kbd ṣn tṢṭ ‘Her

---

930 The adjective ṣtk ‘anchored, moored’ postulated in DUL 191 for 4.421:4–5 is unreliable because of the damaged context.
931 Or: ‘is being seen’?
932 Pardee’s Akkadian parallels involving naṭlu can probably be supplemented by those with amāru (N) (e.g. ṣarrānu ina puṭrim innaamarā in YOS 10, 33 ii 30), cf. CAD A 2.
933 Mbr. ḫbṣār ‘to see well’ (ML 55), Jīb. ḫbṣār id. (JL 29) are likely borrowed from Arabic. An etymological relationship between Arb. bṣr ‘to see’ and Hbr. ḫṣr ‘gold ore’ (HALOT 149) advocated in Rundgren 1963 is at best conjectural.
liver swells with laughter, her heart fills with joy, *nt’s liver with triumph.’

▶ Arb. *ydd (IV) ‘to be swollen because of anger,’ *yuddat ‘ganglion, bubo’ (Lane 2231).

▼ Ugr.-Arb. *ydd ‘to swell’ is an exclusive isogloss (Renfroe 1992:30–31), provided that MSA parallels like Mhr. *yydd ‘to be seized by the throat,’ *yaddet ‘influenza’ (ML 132), Jib. *yed ‘to throttle,’ *yaddat ‘choking feeling’ (JL 83) are Arabisms.

7. *hdy ‘to lacerate oneself’ (DUL 336).

● *Hapax legomenon in 1.5 vi 19–20: yhdy lhm w dlk ylt k drh ‘He lacerated his cheeks and beard, he harrowed his upper arms.’

▶ Arb. *hdyw ‘to cut with a sword’ (LA 15 420).

▼ Ugr.-Arb. *hdyw ‘to cut’ as an exclusive isogloss is correctly recognized in Renfroe 1992:45–48.935

8. *lpn ‘benevolent’ (DUL 507).

● Attested as an epithet of *Il, notably in the combination *lpn *Il d prid. The meaning of *lpn can only be ascertained through etymological comparison with Arb. *lf (v. extensively Tropper–Hayajneh 2003).

▶ Arb. *lf ‘to be friendly, kind, considerate, indulgent, merciful’ (WKAS L 698).936

▼ The origin of Ugr.-Arb. *lf is obscure as no further Semitic parallels seem to be attested.937


● *Hapax legomenon in 1.14 ii 27–31, meaning reliably established from context (db rkl l *frt l bt *br *yp lhm d *hm *myd 3 ymn ‘He prepared food from the barns, wheat from the storehouse, he baked bread for five months, provisions for three months’).

▶ Arb. *yd, *dy ‘to feed, to nourish’ (Lane 2236).

▼ There is no cognate for Ugr.-Arb. *yd ‘to feed.’ The exclusive nature of this isogloss is correctly recognized in Renfroe 1992:60–61.

10. *nds ‘to contract, shake; to buckle’ (DUL 625).

● Attested in the descriptions of buckling bodies of gods (v. No. 51 in section 3.1).

935 Comparison between Ugr. *hdy and Gez. tahadya ‘to be burned through heat, to be dissolved by being cooked too much’ mentioned in CDG 215 is semantically unattractive.
937 Contra Renfroe 1992:127, Tgr. *ltf ‘to be mild, gentle’ (WTS 50) has no bearing on the exclusive nature of the Arabic-Ugaritic isogloss since the Tigre verb is obviously borrowed from Arabic. The same is true of similar Arabisms in a variety of other Semitic languages, such as Harari, MSA and modern Hebrew (rightly acknowledged in Tropper–Hayajneh 2003:171).
Arb. *产后* ‘to be in motion, convulsion; to totter’ (Lane 2818).


11. *产后* ‘heart’ (DUL 658).
- Attested exclusively in the combination *产后 d产后* (Tropper–Hayajneh 2003), the meaning “heart” is established on etymological grounds only.
  - Arb. *产后* ‘heart’ (Lane 2323).  
  - Ugr.-Arb. *产后* ‘heart’ has no reliable Semitic cognates (cf. SED I No. 205).

12. *产后* ‘suckling’ (DUL 574).
- *产后* legomenon in 1.4 vi 55–56: *产后 lhm šty rvn *产后 ‘While gods are eating, drinking, consuming sucklings.’
  - Arb. *产后* ‘to suck’ (Lane 1112).
  - Ugr.-Arb. *产后* ‘to suck’ is an exclusive isogloss, as recognized in Renfroe 1992:65–66.

13. *产后* ‘to tear, be torn’ (DUL 607).
- *产后* legomenon in 1.19 i 36: *产后 kst dv*产后 ‘She tore the garment of Dv*产后.’
  - Ugr.-Arb. *产后* ‘to tear’ is an exclusive isogloss.

14. *产后* ‘to jump, to leap’ (DUL 746).
- *产后* legomenon in 1.2 iv 15–16: *产后 sml bd brl km nšr b rv*产后 ‘The club jumped in Br’s hands, like an eagle in his fingers.’
  - Arb. *产后* ‘to jump, to dance’ (Lane 1136).
  - Comparable forms are also attested in MSA, but the possibility of an Arabic loanword is high: Mhr. *产后* ‘to jog up and down’ (ML 325), Jib. *产后* ‘(animals) to trample fodder’ (JL 213), Soq. *产后* ‘danser’ (LS 407). Semantically related but phonetically somewhat different variant roots elsewhere in Semitic are discussed in CDG 464 and EDG 523–524.

15. *产后* ‘to muzzle’ (DUL 805).
- The principal attestation of Ugr. *产后* is the much-discussed passage 1.3 iii 40, read and translated as *产后 rmn *产后 ‘Je me suis permis de museler le dragon, voulant le détruire’ in Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:15. Notwithstanding numerous objections summarized in Barr 1973 and Renfroe 1992:144–145, this interpretation remains the most plausible one (Pardee 1994). Much less certain is *产后 l *产后 tšt in

---

939 *产后-* tamz = *产后-* tarfiqu.
940 As pointed out to us by Dennis Pardee, a new attestation of this root can now be found in RIH 98.02:5: nmrm *产后 trks ‘(As) a mighty panther does she pounce’ according to Pardee 2007:35.
941 According to our informants, rather *产后* (savagelivre).
1.83:8–9 (‘You shall put a muzzle on the Dragon’ according to DUL 805).

- Arb. šbm ‘to put a piece of wood crosswise in the mouth of a kid’ (Lane 1499).
- Ugr.-Arb. *šbm ‘to muzzle’ is an exclusive isogloss with no parallel elsewhere in Semitic.  

16. ṭʾit ‘mud, clay’ (DUL 892).
- *Hapax legomenon in 1.17 ii 6–8: ḫ ḫ g k b y m ṭʾit ṭʾt ṭʾt ṭʾt ṭʾt ‘Who plasters his roof in a dirty day, who washes his garment in the day of mud.’
- Arb. ṭʾrāt ‘black mud’ (LA 7 301).

17. ydy ‘to rip, to scratch’ (DUL 958).
- *Hapax legomenon in 1.5 vi 17–18: yr b ṭʾrbn ydy ṭʾlm b yrr ‘With a stone he scratches incisions on (his) skin, with a razor he cuts cheeks and chin’ (Pardee 1997:268).
- Arb. ṭʾdyat- ‘notch, incision, cut; wounds’ (LA 15 451).
- The exclusive nature of Ugr.-Arb. *y ’to cut, to scratch’ has no cognates elsewhere in Semitic (Renfroe 1992:70–71).

18. yly ‘comrade, companion’ (DUL 963).
- *Hapax legomenon in 1.12 ii 50–51: šʾ ṭʾry mh ṭʾry šʾ ylyh ‘The prince of his brothers met him, the prince of his comrades met him.’
- Arb. ṭʾliyy- ‘friend,’ wly ‘to be close’ (LA 14 480).
- Ugr.-Arb. *wVyVy- ‘companion’ (and the obviously cognate verbal root *wly in Arabic) can be metathetically related to the verbal root *lw ’to accompany, to join oneself to,’ attested in Hebrew and Aramaic (HALOT 522). The formal and semantic proximity between Ugr. yly and Arb. waliyy- is so conspicuous that Renfroe (1992:71–74) may nevertheless be right to consider it an exclusive Ugaritic-Arabic isogloss.

3.2.1.2. Dubious or unreliable

942 Sab. šbm ‘strangling’ (Biella 510) is not recognized in SD.
943 al- ām-.
944 azzat, ud š-.
945 Mhr. awū ’to torment, to pester’ (ML 422), Jib. ṣā’di ‘to pester’ (JL 287) are not only likely Arabisms, but almost certainly go to Arb. ṣā’di (IV) ‘to annoy, to trouble’ (Wehr 12) rather than ṣā’dy.
946 Phonologically identical verbal lexemes with the meaning “to turn, to twist, to surround” are usually thought to be related as well (cf. CDG 322): Akk. lāwû ‘to move in a circle’ (CAD L 69, AHw. 540), Arb. ṭlw ‘to twist’ (Lane 3015), Gez. ṭlāwá ‘to be twisted, wrapped’ (CDG 322), Tgr. ṭlāw ‘to walk on roundabout ways’ (WTS 45), Tna. ṭlāwá ‘to flex’ (TED 120), Mhr. lāwû ‘to bend’ (ML 258), Jib. lē ‘to turn’ (JL 167). Soq. ḫ ’saisir’ compared in LS 230 is more remote semantically. Problematic is Syr. ḡāl ‘decet’ (LSyr. 185) with unexpectedly preserved w- (an early Arabian infiltration?).
947 But note Sab. ṣḥyt ‘protected persons, clients of a clan’ (SD 160), Min. ṣḥy ‘se mêler, s’occuper de’ (LM 104). Jib. ṣā’di ‘to turn towards’ (JL 292) is probably an Arabism.
In this subsection, 21 allegedly exclusive Ugaritic-Arabic lexical features are presented. This selection, quantitatively far inferior to ca. 100 examples dealt with in Renfroe 1992:75–161, is restricted to well-known isoglosses widely recognized in modern Ugaritological scholarship (notably, in DUL). Not unlike the preceding subsection, our evaluation does not always coincide with Renfroe’s: some of our examples (dmt, bdl, dpr, ḫmr, ḫt, ng, ṡght, ṣvar) are missing from his book, whereas a few others (mnl, hbr, ḫpt) are listed by Renfroe as reliable instead of spurious and uncertain, although it is the latter qualification which would be more appropriate from our point of view.

1. dmt ‘desolation’ (DUL 150) — Arb. ʿdm ‘to lack, to miss,’ ʿudm- ‘lack, loss, poverty, destitution’ (Lane 1975–1976).


2. mt ‘to hit’ (DUL 166) — Arb. ṣmt ‘to beat with a stick’ (TA 5 11).948

- Hapax legomenon in the difficult passage 1.16 vi 8–9 (ḥjm ṣmt ṣm ḫm zbn ṣl ṭrīš). G. del Olmo’s interpretation ‘Con una vara golpeó abriendo brecha, y exterminando/desapareció la enfermedad de su cabeza’ (1981:320) is attractive, but hardly compelling (left untranslated in Pardee 1997:342).

3. nn ‘manservant, assistant’ (DUL 170) — Arb. ṣwn (IV) ‘to help’ (Lane 2203).

- The meaning “servant” is suitable in some of the relevant contexts (e.g. 1.4 iv 59–62: p ṣbd ṣwn ṣwn ṣapṭ p ṣbd ṣank ṣal q ḫm ṣamt ṣapṭ lbn lbn ‘Am I a servant, an attendant on ṣʾapt? Am I a servant who holds a trowel? Is ṣʾapt a maidservant who makes bricks?’), but derivation from *ṣwn as envisaged in Renfroe 1992:22–24 is faced with serious morphological difficulties. At any rate (as Renfroe correctly recognizes), this isolgoss is not exclusive since *ṣwn ‘to help’ is well attested also in Sabaic: ḥ-sn ‘to aid, to help, to protect’ (SD 23).

4. bdl, bi-da-lu-ma ‘substitute, reserve personnel’ (DUL 217, Huehnergard 1987a:112) — Arb. bdl ‘to change, to exchange, to replace’ (Lane 167).

- The meaning and the origin of the Ugaritic term are extensively discussed in Schloen 2001:226–230. The Arabic etymology is potentially suitable to explain both the widespread translation ‘substitute’ and the now less popular interpretation ‘merchant.’949 If accepted, Ugr.-Arb. *bdl ‘to exchange’ would represent an exclusive

---

948 ḏarabahu bi-l-ṣaḡā.

949 Contrast Huehnergard 1987a:112 and Huehnergard 2008:390
isogloss.\textsuperscript{950} However, morphological peculiarities made apparent by the syllabic spellings of Ugr. \textit{bdl} — namely, the pattern $^*C_iC\dot{a}C_{\nu}$, highly atypical for a professional designation (cf. Tropper 2000:181), and nunation instead of mimation in the alternative plural form \textit{bi-da-tu-na} (ibid. 294) — cast serious doubts on the validity of this comparison and make one think of a non-Semitic (possibly Hurrian) origin of Ugr. \textit{bdl/bidalu} (Schloen 2001:227, notwithstanding Huehnergard’s objections in 2008:391–392).


- Attested in 1.91:6 and 1.162:1 in the combination \textit{nil bldn}. The translation ‘gods of (our) country’ is widely accepted (Pardee 2000:503, del Olmo Lete 2004:260), but remains conjectural in spite of the hypothetic parallelism with DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR \textit{u-ga-ri-ii} in PRU 3, 18:6–7. As for \textit{bld} in 1.22 i 18, “that \textit{bld γll} might have meant ‘the district of γll’ is possible, but undemonstrable” (Renfroe 1992:90).\textsuperscript{951}

6. \textit{dpr} ‘to exude a strong smell’ (DUL 277) — Arb. \textit{dafr} - ‘to stink,’ \textit{dafir} - ‘stinking’ (Lane 890).

- \textit{Hapax legomenon} in 1.22 i 16 (\textit{dpr ṭhnn b ḫt}). The passage is very obscure and DUL’s translation ‘The table exuded a strong smell’ is merely conjectural. Arb. \textit{dfr} has no reliable cognates elsewhere in Semitic.\textsuperscript{952}

7. \textit{gbl} ‘summit, mount’ (DUL 293) — Arb. \textit{ṣabal} - ‘mountain’ (Lane 376).

- \textit{Hapax legomenon} in 1.3 vi 7–8 (\textit{ḥbr gbl ṣbr ḫt}). The translation ‘mountain’ is possible ‘(Cross the mountain, cross the height’ in Pardee 1997:255), but hardly compelling (v. Renfroe 1992:103–104 and 139–140 for the alternative translation ‘Byblos,’ tentatively accepted in Parker 1997:118, 169).\textsuperscript{953}

8. \textit{γll} ‘thirsty one’ (DUL 319) — Arb. \textit{γll} ‘to be thirsty’ (Lane 2277).

- \textit{Hapax legomenon} in 1.12 ii 34 (context partly broken), supposed to be paralleled by \textit{rakhm ‘the devourers,’ present throughout this text. Identification with Arb. \textit{γll} is possible, but by no means compelling (cf. Renfroe 1992:107).

\textsuperscript{950} Comparable terms in Ethiopian Semitic and MSA — Tna. \textit{bûddûl} ‘to exchange, barter’ (TED 1196), Mhr. \textit{abûdal} ‘to change’ (ML 43), Jib. \textit{ādal} ‘to change’ (JL 22), Soq. \textit{bdl} ‘être changé’ (LS 82) — are likely borrowed from Arabic. The traditional equation between Arb. \textit{bld} ‘to (ex)change’ and Hbr. \textit{bdll} ‘to withdraw, to separate’ (HALOT 110) is hard to justify semantically. In view of the high degree of graphic ambiguity, the widespread identification between BA-DA-LUM in Ebla with either Arb. \textit{bdll} or Ugr. \textit{bdll(m)} (e.g. Fronzaroli 1984:156–157) is at best conjectural.

\textsuperscript{951} Interpreted as \textit{bd ll γll} ‘wine into the goblet’ of intoxication” in DUL 494.

\textsuperscript{952} Tgr. \textit{dāfrāt} ‘breath, smell, scent’ (WTS 544) is clearly an Arabism. Since Arb. \textit{dfr} also means ‘to be base, abject, vile’ (Lane 890), Jib. \textit{dēfr} ‘bad’ (JL 35) can be borrowed from Arabic as well. Note, moreover, that according to a personal communication by Dennis Pardee a recent collation has shown the first sign of the relevant Ugaritic word is \textit{ra} (thus \textit{rapr} rather than \textit{dpr}).

\textsuperscript{953} The same reasoning applies to the parallel \textit{ḥt} (Renfroe 1992:139–140), which can be identified with the Canaanite geographic term (Hbr. \textit{kārāt}, HALOT 1116) instead of the Arabic appellative \textit{qur̄ilat}-(pl. \textit{qur̄il}) = \textit{raq-ūwāl} mina l-ẓibāḥi/rañ-ẓibālu ẓ-ṣyār ‘a tall mountain’ (LA 11 666).
9. **ynū** ‘to gulp down’ (DUL 323) — Arb. **ynṯ** ‘to drink’ (LA 2 196).  
- Hapax legomenon in 1.108:11 in a partly broken context. As pointed out in Renfroe 1992:108, “the proximity of this word to *w yšt ril* ‘God drinks’ in line 10 of this text has prompted some to compare the word with Arb. **yanaṯa** ‘to drink a draught, then take a breath.’ The structure of the text suggests much more that the word be understood as a name or epithet of a deity.”

10. **hbr** ‘to bow’ (DUL 333) — Arb. **habr-**, **habīr-** ‘depressed area surrounded by higher ground’ (LA 5 290).  
- Passim in the prostration formula (e.g. 1.3 iii 9–10: *l ṭn rnt hbr w kḥ* ‘To ṭnt’s feet they bowed down and fell’) as well as in 1.23:49 (*yhr ṣptm yšk* ‘He bowed down and kissed their lips’). The semantic relationship between the Ugaritic verbal root and the topographic terms in Arabic is far from certain (cf. Renfroe 1992:42–45).

11. **hbṯ** ‘to knock down, to hit; to remove, to wipe out’ (DUL 334) — Arb. **hbṯ** ‘to go down, to be lowered, degraded; to beat, to strike; to remove’ (Lane 2876).  
- Reliably attested in letters only (Dijkstra 1975). The best preserved example is 2.61:3–7 (*bn ḥnkk ṭy hḥ ybr ḥh ṭr y ṣḥ l ḥvr*), where both meanings suggested by the Arabic etymology (“to strike” and “to abase”) can fit. More difficult is *ṣpḥ ṭal thḥ* in 2.47:16, translated as ‘Tu ne permettras que le clan soit abaisé’ in Bordreuil–Pardee 2001:382, where this passage is extensively discussed in connection with the double attestation of *hbṯ* (in damaged contexts) in the letter RSOU 14, 51. Very obscure is 2.4:18–20 (*ḥṭ ſm ṭl ṣ yhbṯ ṭn ṭn ṭn ṭn ṭn ṭn*). For the problematic *thḥ* in 1.163:3 see, finally, Pardee 2000:866. Summing up, “le sens précis de HBT nous échappe encore” (Pardee 2000:866), which makes this verb unsuitable as a diachronically meaningful lexical isogloss (Renfroe 1992:114–115).

12. **dg** ‘birth-chair’ (DUL 354) — Arb. **ḥidḵ** ‘a certain thing upon which the women of the Arabs of the desert ride’ (Lane 530).  
- Hapax legomenon in 1.12 i 17–19, where it is listed among objects necessary for the birth process (*ḥḥ ṭsvṃ ḥdg ṭlk* ‘Take your chair, your “saddle,” your swaddling cloth’). This identification is widely accepted, but, as F. Renfroe rightly points out (1992:117–118), the realia behind it are obscure and it is preferable to refrain from treating it as a reliable exclusive isogloss. There is no suitable verbal root elsewhere in

---

954.  šariba ṭumma ṭnaffasa.
955.  mā ṭnwa’nna mīna l-ardh.
957.  Cf. Renfroe 1992:114 (“the usual interpretation of *hbṯ* is out of place here”) and Pardee 2000:866 (“la polarité négative ... est difficile”).
958.  In DUL 334, Sab. *ḥbṯ* is adduced, which would make this isogloss not exclusive. However, as pointed out in Renfroe 1992:115 and Gzella 2007:542, the very existence of the Sabaic verb is doubtful.
Semitic from which either the Arabic or the Ugaritic terms could be convincingly
derived.
13. mr ‘red, reddish’ (DUL 364) — Arb. mr (IX) ‘to be red’ (Lane 640).
● Attested in hippiatric texts (e.g., 1.85:17) as an attribute of ar n/ ir n, which
denotes a materia medica. The translation ‘red’ (Cohen–Sivan 1983:31–32) is arbitrary.
The same is true of the alternative interpretation ‘donkey.’
14. t ‘happy, lucky’ (DUL 383) — Arb. a iya ‘to be happy,’ a - ‘fortune’
(Lane 595–596).
● Hapax legomenon in 1.3 v 30–31: t mk il km kmk m lm yt t t mk ‘Your
decisions, Il, are wise, your wisdom is forever, your decision(s) provide a life of good
fortune’ (Pardee 1997:254). Even if this widely accepted interpretation is correct, the
y ‘favor,’ y t yw ‘to be successful’ (SD 75), Min. y ‘obtenir des auspices favorables,’ y
‘faveur’ (ML 51), Mhr.
‘luck, share’ (ML 167), probably also Gez. a e ‘title of the
emperors of Ethiopia’ (CDG 226, with discussion).960
15.
‘to drag’ (DUL 721) — Arb. q ‘to draw, to drag, to collect’ (Lane 2487).
● Hapax legomenon in 1.2 iv 27: y b l w yšt ym. The commonly accepted
interpretation of this passage — ‘B l grabs Ym and sets about dismembering him’
certain and, at any rate, the translation ‘he grabs’ for y is derived from etymology
rather than from context. The meaning of the reduplicated stem
in 1.114:5–6 (km
k[l]b y
t t l nt) is even more obscure, v. extensively Pardee 1988:42–43.
16. m ‘as one, together’ (DUL 519) — Arb. ma an ‘together’ (LA 8 405).
● Hapax legomenon in 1.14 ii 32–35: dn ngb w y i b u b i ngb w y i dn m b uk ul
m ad. Although there is no unanimously accepted understanding of the syntax of this
passage, comparison with Arb. ma an ‘together’ is certainly not the only way of
interpreting m in this context (‘a throng will indeed961 go forth’ in Pardee 1997:334 and
17. ng ‘to go away, depart’ (DUL 624) — Arb. n w ‘to go out, to escape’ (Lane
3028).
● Hapax legomenon in 1.14 iii 27–29, meaning clear from context (ng mlk l bty
‘Depart, king, from my residence,’ paralleled by r krt l ry ‘Keep far off, Krt, from my
abode’).
► The only cognate for the Ugaritic form adduced in DUL 624 is Arb. n w, but
As is well known, the whole scope of meanings connected with favor, luck etc. eventually goes
back to PS * V - ‘arrow’ (Renfroe 1992:54–55), with a meaning shift also present in Arb. sahm- ‘arrow;
lot, portion’ (Lane 1454).
961
Italics added.
960
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PCS *ngw is also attested in ESA: Sab. ngw ‘to give out,’ mngw ‘event, incident, outcome’ (SD 94), Min. ngw ‘promulger, notifier, proclaimer’ (LM 66), Qat. mngw ‘result, outcome’ (LIQ 102).  

18. nkt ‘to immolate’ (DUL 631), mkt ‘immolation, offering’ (ibid. 545) — Arb. nkt ‘to strike with a stick; to throw upon the ground; to thrust, to pierce’ (Lane 2846).

- The most reliable attestation is 1.40:32–33: *dbh ndb hw fy nty hw nkt nkt ‘Le sacrifice, il est sacrifié, l’offrande, elle est offerte, l’abattage est fait’ (Pardee 2000:97-98). Less transparent are 1.86:4 (*w prt tkt ‘You’ immolate a cow,’ context broken) and 1.48:16 (*nkt l mkt ‘One for the offering of ...,’ context broken963). Notwithstanding F. Renfroe’s objections (1992:134–135), one has to agree with K. Aartun (1968:278) and D. Pardee (2000:127–128) that comparison with Arb. nkt is the best (probably, the only) way of explaining nkt nkt in 1.40:33. The Ugaritic-Arabic isogloss is, nevertheless, not exclusive, since clearly related terms are well attested in Ethiopian Semitic: Tna. näkätä ‘to drive in (a dart); to hit a branch or hedge with a stick,’ mnakat ‘beating’ (TED 1342–1343), Amh. nähkätä ‘to break, to smash’ (AED 1046).

19. nzl ‘offering’ (DUL 655) — Arb. nuz(u)- ‘food prepared for the guest’ (Lane 3031).

- *Hapax legomenon in 1.14 iii 55–59: lkh rrm drb ydh lwa klmtn klt lymh d nzl lk drb nzl ‘He took a sacrificial lamb into his hands, a kid — with both (of his hands), a measure of his bread of offering he took, the entrails of a sacrificial bird.’ As rightly observed in Renfroe 1992:136–137, the meaning of the Arabic noun can only be secondary with respect to the basic meaning of the root nzl in Arabic, viz. “to descend” (> ‘to stop, to sojourn, to abide, to lodge in a place,’ Lane 3001), note in particular nazl- ‘guest’ (ibid.). Arb. nuzul- is therefore unsuitable for direct comparison with phonologically similar terms in other Semitic languages. Since no alternative cognate term is at hand, the expression lymh d nzl must still await a meaningful contextual and etymological interpretation.

20. rgbt ‘respect, fear’ (DUL 732) — Arb. rzb ‘to be frightened, afraid’ (Lane 1033).

- Attested in 1.112:4 (list of sacrifices) in the expression *yrgbt, interpreted as ‘platter of respect’ in DUL. No such meaning can be deduced from the context (cf. Pardee 2000:637–638 for a different, albeit no less arbitrary, interpretation ‘mottes de terre’). Even less certain is 1.133:19 (rgbt zbl ‘the fear of the Prince’ in DUL vs. ‘la motte du Prince’ in Pardee 1988:162). No coherent interpretation has been proposed so far for sm[h] rgbt yw[h]b in 1.92:31–32.

21. tfar ‘avenger (of blood),’ tfr ‘to avenge blood’ (DUL 891–892) — Arb. tfr ‘to revenge one’s blood’ (Lane 327).

962 Tgr. näga ‘to be clean’ (WTS 342), Mhr. ngi ‘to be free’ (ML 288), Jib. ngi ‘to survive’ (JL 184), Soq. ng ‘délivrer’ (LS 256) are Arabisms.

The Arabic root has been widely used to interpret the difficult passage ðar rnm tkn lh (1.14 i 15), but no satisfactory result has been obtained so far.\(^{964}\) The verbal form in 1.2 iii 21 (yvr tr wbl) is also usually interpreted on the basis of the Arabic cognate, but here too the details remain obscure.\(^{965}\) The translation ‘your seven “avengers”’ for šbr ṣrkn in 1.18 i 25 (DUL 892) is necessarily conjectural because of the heavily damaged context. Finally, tgr in 1.3 ii 37 is probably a mistake for Ųr (with DUL 891). At any rate, the Ugr.-Arb. isogloss is not exclusive, since ðr ‘blood revenge’ is also attested in Sabaic (SD 149).

3.2.2. Ugaritic-Aramaic

Since potentially exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Aramaic are extremely few, reliable examples will be listed below alongside more problematic ones.

1. *dhl* ‘to fear’ (DUL 269).
   - Supposed to be attested in 2.16:10–12: w rnm ... w al tdhn ‘And let my mother ... be not afraid.’ The reading with -dl- is suspect,\(^{966}\) whereas tdl̄s seems to be written in a similar context in 2.30:21 (Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:85).
   - Common Aramaic *dhl* id. (HALOT 1850, LSyr. 148).
   - Possible cognates of Ugr.-Arm. *dhl* are discussed below in Chapter 6 (pp. 377-378).

2. *grds* ‘to be undermined, ruined’ (DUL 307).
   - *Hapax legomenon* in 1.14 i 10–11: krt ḥtn rš krt grds mknt ‘Krt — his family was crushed, Krt — his home was destroyed’ (Pardee 1997:337).
   - Syr. gardeš ‘erosit’ (LSyr. 132). The semantic overlap between Ugaritic and Syriac is far from complete. Besides, attestations of the Syriac verb are rare and late, and the root does not seem to be present anywhere else in Aramaic.
   - Ugr.-Syr. *grds* ‘to be ruined’ has no parallels elsewhere in Semitic.\(^{967}\)

\(^{964}\) Cf. Tropper 1995a where KTU’s reading is abandoned in favor of Ųnt rnm. The traditional reading is re-established (even without restoration marks) in Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:20. Comparison with Lev 18:6 in Pardee 1997:333 is, however, hardly attractive, as it implies that Ugr. ðr (‘kin’ in Pardee’s interpretation) is related to Hbr. šwvr ‘flesh,’ whose regular formal and semantic cognate is Ugr. šwr ‘flesh’ (DUL 797, also Pardee 2000:1165), see further SED I No. 238 and Tropper 1995a:530. The same is true of Pardee’s analysis of šbr ṣrkn in 1.18 i 25 (1997:394). Note that according to Pardee (personal communication) the Hebrew word for “kin” in passages like Lev 18:6 (= Ugr. Ųr) is not identical with šwvr ‘flesh’ attested elsewhere (= Ugr. šwr). This proposal is hard to reconcile with the fact that also Hbr. bšwr ‘meat, flesh’ is widely attested with the meaning “kin” (BDB 142), note especially the combination šwvr bšwvr.

\(^{965}\) Cf. twlh in Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:84.

\(^{966}\) Contrast ‘The Bull, his father Ṣlu may take blood vengeance’ (Pardee 1997:248), ‘May Bull El his Father take vengeance’ (Parker 1997:97) and ‘Bull DN stood surety’ (DUL 890).

\(^{967}\) There is, conversely, a remarkable semantic proximity between Ugr. grds and Mhr. āŋgādōs, Jib. āŋgārdēs ‘to fall down’ (ML 124, JL 78). MSA š is compatible with Ugr. š, but not with Syr. š. Cf. also Amh. gārāddāsā ‘to break a stick, to fell a large tree’ (AED 1943).
3. **nḥt** ‘to take down’ (DUL 628).
   - Attested in 1.23:37 (‘il ḫṯt nḥt ṣil ymnṯn mṯ ṣḏh ‘Ilu lowers his staff, Iḷu grasps his rod in his right hand’968) and elsewhere in this text.969
     - Common Aramaic *nḥt* ‘to go down, to descend’ (DNWSI 726, HALOT 1929, LSy. 424).
     - Possible cognates of Ugr.-Arm. *nḥt* ‘to go down’ are discussed below in Chapter 6 (pp. 374-375).

4. **šdy** ‘to pour’ (DUL 811).
   - *Hapax legomenon* in 1.6 iv 18: šd ṣn ṣn b ḫbt ‘Pour sparkling wine into a goblet’ (translation from DUL 692).
     - Common Aramaic *šdy* ‘to throw, to pour’ (LSyr. 757, DJBA 1109, DJPA 538).
     - Ugr.-Arm. *šdy* ‘to pour’ has no direct cognate elsewhere in Semitic.970

5. **šḥḥ** ‘to meet,’ (N) ‘to be met, welcomed’ (DUL 814).
   - Thought to be attested in 2.38:13–15: by ḡšm ṣḥdr nšḥḥ ‘They found themselves in a heavy rain.’ Potentially relevant forms in 2.73:14 (ṭšḥḥ) and 2.73:19 (nsk[h]) are hard to evaluate because of the broken context.
     - Common Aramaic *šḥḥ* ‘to meet, find’ (DNWSI 1132, LSy. 775).
     - The etymological background of Ugr.-Arm. *šḥḥ* ‘to find’ is discussed below in Chapter 6 (p. 419).

### 3.2.3. Ugaritic-Akkadian

1. **rugr** ‘field, soil’ (DUL 27, Watson 2007:76).
   - *Hapax legomenon* in 1.12 i 23–25 (kṛ ṣmḥ ṣp ṣm ṣd ṣḥrm ‘Dig your elbow into the dust, the bone of your hand, into the soil’). Although the precise meaning of this difficult text is uncertain (cf. Stol 2000:121), parallelism with ṣḥr ‘dust’ makes the translation ‘into the soil’ for ruγr-m highly probable.
     - Akk. uγar ‘Feldflur, Ackerland’ (AHw. 1402).
     - The Akkadian lexeme is thought to be borrowed from Sum. a-gār (PSD A1 78, Lieberman 1977:511–512).

2. **ṭmr** ‘to look at’ (DUL 71).
   - The most reliable attestation is 1.3 i 22–24, where the meaning “to look at” seems to be assured by the parallelism with ṣn ‘to see’ (ṭmr ṣb ṣmḥ ṣn ṣḥry ṣt ṣr ṣn ṣm ṣl ṣl)

---

968 Translation from Pardee 1997:280–281 (with commentary). Note that in Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:29 the translation ‘Ilu prépare sa verge’ has been preferred (reference courtesy Dennis Pardee).
969 As Tropper reasonably suggests (1995b:60), yḥḥ in 1.2 iv 11 (kṛ ṣḥdm yḥḥ) may belong to a different PS root *nḥḥ* ‘to cut, to trim.’
970 Arb. ṣdw ‘to stretch one’s legs’ tentatively compared in LSy. 757 is semantically quite remote. More attractive is C. Brockelmann’s alternative comparison, namely ≤tā ‘left, let alone, neglected’ (Lane 1336). Cf. also ṣdw ‘to play with walnuts throwing them into a hole’ (Lane 1336).
bt 'Brīl looks at his daughters, he sees Pdry, daughter of ḫArl, also ḫly, daughter of ḫrb'). Considerably less certain is ṣīṣ ṣīṣm ṣ̄itumr ‘They look like’ one fire, two fires’ (1.2 i 32), whereas the meaning of ṣ̄amr in 1.172:22 cannot be ascertained because of the broken context. In spite of its somewhat sparse attestation, the existence of Ugr. ṣ̄mr ‘to look at’ is widely accepted in Ugaritological literature (see, in particular, Tropper 2000:519–520 for the grammatical problems involved).

- Akk. ḥmâšnu ‘to see’ (AHw. 40, CAD A2 5).
- The extraordinarily complex semantic history of the root *ṣ̄mr cannot be reassessed here, but if one follows S. Moscati (1946:125) and W. F. Albright (1954:229) in regarding the meaning “to see” as the most primitive one, Ugaritic must be the only Semitic language where this archaic meaning is attested virtually side by side with the innovative “to say,” “to command,” normal for the rest of CS.

- Reliably attested in 1.5 i 14–16: ṭp̄s ṭp̄s ḫb̄m ḫw ḫm b̄lt ṛanḥr ṭȳm ‘My appetite is the appetite of the lion in the steppe, indeed the hunger of the whale in the sea.’
- Akk. nāḥīru ‘whale’ (AHw. 714, CAD N 137).
- According to the common opinion (Fronzaroli 1964:53 and elsewhere), the Ugaritic and Akkadian lexemes go back to PS *nḥr ‘to snore,’ in its turn related to PS *nāḥīr- ‘nostril’ (SED I No. 198).

- Reliably attested in 1.3 iii 19–20 (ḥmy ṣ̄n ṭsysn ṣ̄n ṭys ṭȳsdk ‘Let your feet run to me, let your legs hasten to me’), where the meaning “leg” is clear from the parallelism with ṣ̄n, the basic term for “foot” in Ugaritic. See also 1.101:5–6 (ṛiṣḥ t̄l̄y ṭȳ ṭu ṣ̄n [...] ṭw̄r̄t ṭml ṭiṣḥ ḫn [...] b̄t ṭȳm ‘Ṭly lui épouille la tête, [...] entre les yeux, ṭUz̄r̄t lui frotte les pieds, ṭB̄t ṭȳ, les cornes,’ Pardee 1988:125).
- Akk. ṣ̄du ‘base, foundation, bottom, lower extremities’ (AHw. 393, CAD I 235).
- Akk.-Ugr. *ṭ̄ṣd- ‘leg’ may be ultimately related to a variety of anatomical and non-anatomical terms elsewhere in Semitic (v. SED I No. 255), but only Akk. ṣ̄du and Ugr. ṛiṣd match exactly from the phonological point of view.

972 In 1.2 i 31: ṣ̄mr ‘order, demand’ (DUL 72).
973 The specificity of the Ugaritic picture is duly recognized in Haldar 1964:275 and Sanmartín 1973:267–270. Remnants of the original meaning “to see” have been surmised for ṣ̄mr in other CS languages as well (for Hbr. ṣ̄mr ‘to see’ v. Dahood 1963:295–296, for Arb. ṣ̄marrat-, ṣ̄mrar- ‘sign, mark’ in Lane 97–98 v. Moscati 1946:124, Rundgren 1963:182), but they are much less certain. It would be tempting to regard the meaning shift “to see” > “to say” as a shared semantic innovation of CS, but Proto-MSA *ṭ̄mr ‘to say’ (Mhr. ṣ̄marr, ūb. ṣ̄r, Soq. ṣ̄m, ML 25, JL 13, LS 315) is hard to separate from this root in spite of the irregular *твор. (see also below, Chapter 8, p. 534).
974 Needless to say, the semantic difference between Akk. ṣ̄du and Ugr. ṛiṣd cannot be disregarded. Although there are good reasons to suspect that Akk. ṣ̄d-qn was originally an anatomical term, in most of its extant attestations this meaning is not apparent. Curiously enough, by far the most transparent
   - **Hapax legomenon** in a divinatory compendium (1.103+:47). The present interpretation, although fully dependent on the Akkadian etymology, is widely accepted (e.g. Pardee 1997:289).
     - Akk.-Ugr. *šVšr* ‘penis’ has no parallel elsewhere in Semitic. If the Akkadian and Ugaritic terms are related as cognates, the traditional derivation of Akk. *išaru* from *ešēru* ‘to be straight’ (< *yšr*) becomes impossible.

   - **Hapax legomenon** in 1.17 vi 45: *ムmkh nmšm* ‘good and strong among men.’ This almost universally accepted interpretation entirely depends on the Akkadian etymology. It is uncertain whether the syllabic *am₃a* reflects the same basic meaning (‘stronghold,’ Huehnergard 1987a:160) or rather belongs to *ムmkh* ‘to be deep’ (‘plain,’ van Soldt 1991:306).
     - Akk. *em₃ku* ‘strength’ (AHw. 216, CAD E 157).
     - The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ムmkh* ‘to be strong’ is uncertain. Hypothetical WS cognates with the meaning “strength” (notably, Hbr. *-mêmek*) are quite doubtful (with HALOT 849 and contra Greenfield 1967:89). There is no transparent semantic link between Akk.-Ugr. *ムmkh* ‘to be strong’ and *ムmkh* ‘to be deep,’ widely attested throughout WS. According to CAD E 161, Akk. *em₃ku* ‘strength’ is, in its origin, an anatomical term (“arm”), but there is no etymological support for this conjecture.

7. **rb** ‘to enter’ (DUL 179).
   - **Passim** in the Ugaritic corpus.
     - Akk. *er₃bu* ‘to enter’ (AHw. 234, CAD E 259).
     - Ugaritic is the only WS language where *rb* fully preserves its (presumably, original) status of the main exponent of the meaning “to enter.” Elsewhere in WS,
only derived meanings (such as “to set (sun)” or “to stand surety”) are attested (HALOT 876, CDG 69).  

8. **hwt** ‘word, statement’ (DUL 349).
   - **Passim** in the Ugaritic corpus.
     - Akk. *awatu* ‘word, utterance; matter, affair, thing’ (AHw. 89, CAD A2 29).
     - The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *hawat-‘word; matter’ (Haldar 1964:275), ultimately related to the verbal root *hay- ‘to speak’ underlying Akk. *atu (“to discuss, to talk over’ (AHw. 89, CAD A2 29, Goetze 1947:244–245, Kouwenberg 2008), is uncertain (cf. DRS 386).

   - Rather reliably attested in 1.19 ii 19–21 (cf. also ibid. 22–23): *yph šblt b rak* <\textit{l}>t šblt *yph* b **hmdr** ‘He saw an ear of grain in the desolate field, he saw an ear of grain in the parched field.’
     - Akk. *hamadīru* ‘shrivelled or withered’ (CAD Ḣ 57, AHw. 315).
     - The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ḥmdr* ‘to be parched, shrivelled’ is uncertain, although an eventual connection with Gez. ḫamad ‘ashes’ (CDG 231, with cognates in other EthS), Arv. *yawmūn muḥlamūdūn* = *ṣādīdu l-ḥarrī* (LA 3 195), ḫamadat- ‘the sound of the flaming or blazing of fire’ (Lane 639), pB. Hbr. **hmrd** ‘to produce shrivelling by heat’ (Jastrow 475) is not to be ruled out. Akk. ḫ vs. Ugr. ḫ is noteworthy (cf. Huehnergard 2003:105: “The Ugaritic may be a loan from Akkadian”).

    - **Passim** in economic documents.
      - Akk. *ipru* ‘barley ration, food allowance’ (AHw. 385, CAD E 166), *epēru* ‘to provide with food rations’ (AHw. 223, CAD E 190).
      - The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ḥpr* ‘to provide with food’ is uncertain.

    - In 1.40:19–21: *ṭhār[n] ... rulp ḫbtn* ‘Whether you have sinned ... according to the custom of those who pillage you’ (cf. Pardee 2000:97, 119–120 for a different interpretation involving the same lexical comparison: “selon la déclaration des vos

---

981 Both of these derived meanings are attested in Ugaritic as well as in Akkadian: *vb* ‘sunset,’ *vrnu* ‘guarantor, surety’ (DUL 183), *erebu* ‘setting of the sun,’ *eruqatu* ‘pledge’ (CAD E 258, 327).

982 It is still uncertain whether Hbr. *hawwā* and *hōwā* are indeed to be translated as “words” (DCH 2 502–503, cf. HALOT 242) instead of the traditional “desire” and “destruction” in passages like Ps 38:13 (dōrāḏē ṣāvaḏ šabbhā *hawwā*), Ps 52:4 (*hawwā* tāḥšōb ḫāṣāḵūkā), Mc 7:3 (ḥaggūḏāl ḥēḇr ḫawwēt ṣapū), Jb 6:30 (*tim ḫikkī lō<\textit{r}> ṣāḇn *hawwōt*), Ez 7:26 (*hōwā* ṭal ḫōwā tābō<\textit{r}> *wū-šēmātā* ṭil-šēmātā ṭīḥyā). In any case, these marginal examples do not undermine the fundamental agreement between Akkadian and Ugaritic in what concerns the basic status of *awatu/hwt*. Arv. *ḥwt* (II) ‘to call’ compared in DUL 349 is hardly related, being rather a by-form of *ḥyt* (II) ‘to call someone saying *ḥayta* *ḥayta*’ (Lane 2910). More promising could be Arv. *haw- ‘mind, purpose, desire’ (Lane 2904).

983 In Watson 2007:80 and 85 *ipru* = *hpr* is artificially separated from *epēru*, supposedly equivalent to Ugr. *ḥpr*. All this carries little conviction, see below in this chapter (Excursus, p. 356).
oppimēs").

- Akk. ḫabātu ‘to rob, to take away by force’ (CAD 9, AHw. 303).

- Akk.-Ugr. *ḫbt ‘to rob, to plunder’ may be related to Arb. ḫabīt- ‘contemptible, bad, corrupt’ (Lane 693).

12. ḫlb ‘massif, promontory’ (DUL 390, Watson 2007:86)

- The Ugaritic word is rather reliably attested in 1.4 viii 5–6: šā yīr u l dūm ḫlb l ḫr ṭm ‘Lift up the mountain on your hands, the hill on your palms’ (the same parallelism in a more difficult context is found in 1.82:4, v. del Olmo Lete 2004:374). For gd ḫlb in 1.85:20 v. Pardee 1985:64–65.

- Akk. ḫalbu ‘forest’ (CAD 40, AHw. 311).

- The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ḫalb- ‘mountain, hill; forest’ is unknown. According to Hrūša 2010:218 we are probably faced with a WS loanword in Akkadian.


- The most reliable attestation is 1.4 v 29–31: šḥ ḫrn b ḫtb ḫbt b ḫrb ḫlk ‘Call a gang to your house, a squad to your palace.’ The meaning “messenger” (lit. “son of the road”) is usually postulated for bn ḫrnk in 2.61:3, but the exact significance of the relevant lines (bn ḫrnk myy ḫbt hw ḫrd w šl hw ḫrt) remains uncertain (cf. Singer 1999:726).

- Akk. ḫarrānu ‘road; caravan; business venture; service unit’ (AHw. 326, CAD ḫ 106).

- The etymology of Ugr.-Akk. *ḫarrān- ‘road, caravan, gang’ is unknown. J. Huehnergard’s comparison with Arb. ḫrr (II) ‘to set free; to point, to adjust’ (2003:105, 116) is not very appealing from the semantic point of view, the more so since the meaning “to set free” is obviously derived from ḫrr (I) ‘to be free,’ ḫrr- ‘freeborn’ (Lane 538), with transparent cognates throughout CS (HALOT 348 and above in Chapter 3, p. 209). Semantically more suitable could be Gez. ḫarā ‘army, troops’ (CDG 240), usually derived from the same root *ḫrr ‘to be free.’

14. ḥt ‘sceptre, rod, wand, stake’ (DUL 414).

- Widely attested, the most reliable examples include 1.6 vi 28–29 (l ṭhpk ḫs ḫl ḫlk l ṭbr ḥt ṭm ṭpk ‘He will surely overturn the throne of your kingship, will break the sceptre of your rulership’), 1.23:8–9 (ḥdh ḥt ṭhl bdḥ ḥt ṭl mnn ‘The rod of bereavement is in his hand, the rod of widowhood is in his hand’), 1.23:37 (vī ḥḥ ṭḥ vī ṭmn ṭḥ dū ṭll ‘If he lowers his rod, he takes the staff into his right hand’), 1.114:7–8 (w d l ṭΑ mn ṭmn ṭḥ ṭḥ ṭl mn ‘And one who does not know him strikes him with a stick under the table’), 1.169:5 (ḫḥ ṭḥ ṭ mh ṭ ḫr ḥt ‘The rod is ready’, or the rod is near’).

- Akk. ḥattu ‘scepter, staff, stick, branch, twig’ (AHw. 337, CAD ḫ 153).

---

984 Huehnergard does not mention Ugr. ḫrn, but on p. 111 of his study he admits that the apparently unmotivated fluctuation between ḫ and ḫ is attested not only between WS and Akkadian, but also within West Semitic (with several instructive examples).
\textbf{15. kms} ‘to buckle, to bend’ (DUL 446, Watson 2007:88).

- \textit{Hapax legomenon} in 1.12 ii 53–54: \textit{npl brl km ṭr w tkms hd km ṛbr} ‘Brl fell like a bull, kneeled down like a steer.’
  - Akk. \textit{kamāsu} ‘to squat, to kneel’ (AHw. 431, CAD K 117).
  - Akk.-Ugr. \textit{kms} is vaguely reminiscent of Akkadian and WS anatomic terms denoting “articulation,” “joint” (Akk. \textit{kimṣu}, Hbr. \textit{kamāṣım}, SED I No. 172),\(^{986}\) but no phonologically exact cognate has been detected so far.


- \textit{Hapax legomenon} in a rather problematic context: \textit{hm brk}tkšd\textit{vrmm ṣn k dd ṣylt} ‘Does it not crave the pool like wild bulls, the spring — like a herd of deer’ (1.5 i 16–17).\(^{987}\)
  - Akk. \textit{kašādu} ‘to reach, to arrive’ (AHw. 459, CAD K 271).
  - Akk.-Ugr. \textit{kšd} (or \textit{kšd")} ‘to reach’\(^{988}\) has no clear cognates elsewhere in Semitic. Of some interest may be Arb. \textit{kāšid} ‘one who earns, obtains much’ (LA 3 466),\(^{989}\) semantically remarkably similar to some of the prominent meanings of Akk. \textit{kašādu} (“to obtain," “to get hold," “to conquer”).


- Reliably attested in 1.161:9–10: \textit{kriot m ṭr}vaxš \textit{kbron kbs ddn} ‘You have summoned the \textit{Rprim} of the Earth, you have invoked the congregation of \textit{Ddn}.\(^{990}\) Another possible attestation adduced in DUL is \textit{kbrat} in 1.6 vi 40 (context heavily broken).
  - Akk. \textit{ḥabū} ‘to say, to tell, to speak, to decree’ (AHw. 889, CAD Q 22).
  - The origin of Akk.-Ugr. \textit{kbɪ̰} or \textit{kbɔ́}\(^{991}\) is uncertain. Any connection with Hbr. \textit{kbb}

---

\(^{983}\) Arb. \textit{ḥatt}- ‘line, streak, stripe’ adduced in DUL 414 with reference to Lane 759 is not only semantically remote, but in all likelihood represents an internal Arabic derivation from the verbal root \textit{ḥit} ‘to make a mark upon the ground,’ further related to Akk. \textit{ḫatāpu} ‘to make a ditch, to excavate’ (CAD \textit{H} 152), Syr. \textit{ḥat} ‘effodit’ (LSyr. 226), JBA \textit{ḥitt} ‘to dig out’ (DJBA 449) and, possibly, Tna. \textit{ḫatāḥ bālā} ‘to scratch’ (TED 299).

\(^{986}\) As reasonably surmised in HALOT 1109, it is to this root that the Ugaritic verb \textit{kmṣ} ‘to curl up, to bend’ (DUL 703) likely belongs. This comparison invalidates Watson’s conclusion that Ugr. \textit{kmṣ} is borrowed from Akkadian (Watson 2007:101).


\(^{988}\) The semantic overlap between Akkadian and Ugaritic is, of course, far from complete.

\(^{989}\) \textit{ṭl-kašād} = \textit{ṭl-kaṭiirc} l-\textit{kasbi}.


\(^{991}\) The underlying root \*\textit{kbɪ́} for Akk. \textit{ḥabū} has been advocated in recent studies on Sargonic Akkadian because of the orthographic alternation \textit{ik}-BĪ [yikb] ‘he said’ vs. \textit{e}-\textit{kā}-BĪ [yekabbe] ‘he says,’ which makes better sense if these forms are reconstructed as \*\textit{yikbi} vs. \*\textit{yikabbay} (Sommerfeld 1999:20). Hasselbach 2005:41–42 deals specifically with the implications of this orthographic phenomenon for the etymological comparison under review.
‘to curse, enchant’ (HALOT 1060), Tgr. ḫābbā ‘to revile, to ignore’ (WTS 249), Tna. ḫābābā ‘to mock, to deride, to scorn’ (TED 980)?

- Attested as an element of Bēl’s title ṣalāyi ḫrdm ‘The most powerful of the heroes,’ as well as in 1.119:26–29 (k gr ṣ tyrm ḫrd ḫmytnk ...  ḫmytnk ḫmytnk ‘When a mighty one attacks your gates, a valiant one your walls, (you will say:) “If you throw away the mighty one from our gates, the valiant one from our walls ...”).
  - Akk. ḫardu ‘heroic, valiant,’ ḫarrādu ‘hero, warrior,’ ḫurādu id. (AHw. 903, 905, 928, CAD Q 129, 140, 312).
- There is no reliable cognate for Akk.-Ugr. *ḳrd ‘to be heroic.’ Arb. qdr ‘to have power or ability to do something’ (Lane 2495) could perhaps be compared (with metathesis). Also of interest is Tna. ḫarrādā ‘to refuse to agree or listen; to be stubborn, to argue, to persist in wanting to overcome someone; to be rival, to quarrel with each other’ (TED 949).

### 19. ḫtu ‘suckling (lamb or kid)’ (DUL 498, Watson 2007:91).
- Well attested in parallelism with ṣım ‘lamb, ram’: ṣal yrdbk km ṣım b ph k ḫtu b ṣbrn ḫnh ṣṭwṃ ‘May he not put you in his mouth as a ram, may you not be crushed in the breach’ of his throat’ (1.4 viii 17–20) and elsewhere.
  - Akk. ḫalû ‘kid’ (AHw. 592, CAD L 51).
- Contra SED II No. 143, the Akk.-Ugr. isogloss is exclusive: the often quoted Soq. lūloh ‘brébis’ (LS 231) does not seem to exist.\(^{992}\)

- The verb ṣlm and its nominal derivates are known from several reliable attestations: ṣmy ṣḥn ṣlmn ṣmy ṣṭḥ ṣḥdk ‘Let your feet run to me, let your legs hasten to me’ (1.3 iii 19–20), ṣṃṣḥn k ṣlmn ‘They trample’ each other like the swift ones\(^{993}\) (1.6 iv 20–21), ṣmute ṣnt b ṣmlt ‘Those who assist ṣnt with alacrity’ (1.22 i 5–6), ṣmlm ṣrkbṭ (1.162:22).\(^{994}\) Akk. la-sà-mu is equated with Ugr. ṣmá-al-sà-mu in the lexical list (Huehnergard 1987a:143).
  - Akk. la-sà-mu ‘to run fast’ (AHw. 538, CAD L 104).
  - Akk.-Ugr. *ṣlm ‘to be swift’ lacks etymological parallels.

  - Akk. ammakam, maka ‘there’ (AHw. 43, CAD A₂ 66).
  - Akkadian (Assyrian) and Ugaritic seem to be the only Semitic languages that

---

\(^{992}\) The correct designation of female goat kid in Soqotri is ḫŏl, and its similarity to the Akk.-Ugr. ḫărăr- is rather remote.


\(^{994}\) ‘Coureurs de chars’ according to Pardee 2000:895.
use -m- as a deictic element.


- Attested in 1.16 ii 24 (mndr krt my[y] ‘Perhaps Krt has already departed,’ Pardee 1997:340) and 2.34:10–13 (w mndr k rank rahlš myy mndr k ṣigr w mu ṣig[r] rm ʂpš ‘Perhaps I will hurry to come, perhaps I shall lodge here or I shall lodge with the Sun’).

- Akk. minde ‘perhaps’ (CAD M₂ 83, AHw. 655).

- While formally or semantically similar lexemes are attested more or less throughout WS — Hbr. maddāš ‘why?’ (HALOT 548), OffArm. mdrm ‘something’ (DNWSI 598), Gez. ṣndārī ‘perhaps’ (CDG 28), Soq. ṡdav ‘perhaps’ (LS 53) — it is only Ugr. mndr that matches Akk. minde exactly in both form and meaning.995 The most reliable reconstruction of the original shape of this particle is *mīna ṣdav ‘what I know?’ (AHw. 655, Tropper 2000:146, cf. Bulakh 2013b:7–9).

23. n-dd ‘to stand’ (DUL 620).

- Most of the relevant examples are listed under the meaning (3) ‘to prepare, hurry, launch oneself’ (mostly based on Pope 1947 and Tropper–Verreet 1988:346–347). By far the clearest illustrations of the meaning “to stand” come from passages where n-dd is paralleled by (or occurs side by side with) krm, such as 1.3 i 4–8 (krm ṣyf w yšlmn ... ndd ṣyš w ṣyšnh ‘He arises, prepares, and gives him food ... he arises, serves and gives him drink,’ Pardee 1997:250) and 1.4 iii 12–13 (ydd w yšln ṣkm w yṣfrn ‘He stood up and scorned me, he arouse and spat on me”). Also significant is 3.9:12–14: ṣal ydd mt mrz w yṛgm ‘Let no man of the association stand up and say.’

- Akk. izuzzu ‘stehen’ (AHw. 408).

- Parallels to Akk. izuzzu elsewhere in WS are restricted to a few hypothetical remnants in Hebrew. Post-Biblical Hebrew zrv ‘to move, to go away, to depart’ (Jastrow 385) is compatible semantically996 and has indeed been compared with both izuzzu and n-dd ever since Poebel 1939:182–185 (see most recently Huehnergard 2002a:177–178), but it is still a mystery how such a (presumably very archaic) root could survive — and even be commonly used — in the post-Biblical language without leaving a minor trace in its more ancient strata.997 Biblical ṣmržq ‘door-post’ is more feasible as a cognate (Poebel 1939:186–189), but the possibility of an Akkadian loanword (rejected by A. Poebel and, recently, Mankowski 2000:85) cannot be discarded completely. Even if real, these sparse remnants contrast sharply with the

---

995 The difference in meaning between Akkadian and Aramaic has been aptly observed by S. Kaufman (1974:72).
996 The semantic ambiguity of the concept “to stand” — from the most stative “to be still, motionless” to the most dynamic “to arise for action” — is well illustrated by the usage of the Hebrew verbs ṣkwrm and ṣnd (BDB 877 and 763). Cf. also A. Poebel’s penetrating remarks in 1939:184.
997 Poebel’s comparison is emphatically rejected (unfortunately, with no argument whatsoever) in von Soden 1952:169.
basic status of n-dd in Ugaritic.\textsuperscript{998}


\begin{itemize}
\item Attested as a divine epithet: \textit{šn̄w l ngr ŭl ūlũš ngr bt bēl w ŭattθ ngrt ūlht} ‘Listen, o herald of ŭlũš, ŭlũš, ŭlũš, herald of the house of Bēl, and your wife, the herald of the goddesses’ (1.16 iv 8–11). This widely accepted interpretation of \textit{ngr} and \textit{ngrt} (e.g., Pardee 1997:623) seems superior to *\textit{naggār} ‘carpenter’ (Huehnergard 1987a:94).\textsuperscript{999}
\item \textit{Akk. nāgiru} ‘herald,’ nāgirtu id. (AHw. 711, CAD N\textsubscript{1}, 115).
\item The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *\textit{nāgir}– ‘herald’ is uncertain. The Akkadian lexeme is hard to separate from Sum. \textit{nimgr} with the same meaning, and a borrowing from Akkadian to Sumerian appears more likely than vice versa (Edzard 1981:284–285, Steiner 2003:634, Sassmannshausen 1995:91–92, contra Sommerfeld 2006:64). The Akkadian term must then go back to a non-attested *\textit{nagāru} ‘to announce,’\textsuperscript{1000} in its turn likely related to Gez. \textit{nagar} ‘to say’ and its Ethiopian cognates (so AHw. 710, CDG 392, Sanmartín 1991:197). Huehnergard’s assertion ‘the word nāgiru ‘herald’ is not attested in any Semitic language other than Akkadian” (1987a:94) is nevertheless correct (contra J. Sanmartín).
\end{itemize}


\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Hapax legomenon} in 1.108:24–25, in a series of divine attributes (\textit{vzk ḫmrk ṣnnk ḫkk nmrtk} ‘Your strength, your protection, your power, your sovereignty’, your splendour’).
\item \textit{Akk. namurratu} ‘numinous splendour emanating from gods’ (AHw. 730, CAD N\textsubscript{1} 253).
\item An Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic postulated in Pardee 1988:115 is quite likely. M. Bulakh (2005a:196–198) suggests, nevertheless, that the Akkadian and Ugaritic terms are rather related as cognates\textsuperscript{1001} and go back to PS \textit{*nmr} ‘to be brilliant,’ presumably attested also in Arb. \textit{namîr}, \textit{namîr}– ‘pure, clean’ (LA 5 276).\textsuperscript{1002}
\end{itemize}

26. \textit{nš-m} ‘people, men’ (DUL 649).

\begin{itemize}
\item Reliably attested in epics and an incantation: 1.3 iii 27–28 (\textit{rgm l t̄dv nšm w l t̄n hmłat ṣar̄š} ‘A matter which people do not know, the multitudes of the land do not understand’), 1.4 vii 49–52 (\textit{rāldy d ṣmlk šl ṣlm d ṣmr̄u ṣlm w nšm d ỹ̄b[ỵ] hmłat ṣar̄š} ‘I am

\textsuperscript{998} As one can judge from the examples collected in DUL 702, in the extant Ugaritic corpus \textit{km} is probably no more frequent than \textit{n-dd}. Moreover, \textit{n-dd} is attested once in a non-literary text, whereas \textit{km} seems to be restricted to the literary corpus. All this means that our decision to treat \textit{km as the basic term with the meaning “to stand” in Ugaritic above in this chapter (p. 248) may be somewhat premature. The exclusive Ugaritic-Akkadian isoglosses in the Swadesh wordlist ("bird," “breast,” “cloud,” etc.) are thus likely to be supplemented by one more reliable example.

\textsuperscript{999} Huehnergard’s reference to “the context of building a house” is unclear to us.

\textsuperscript{1000} Possibly preserved in \textit{nugγāru} ‘to denounce’ (CAD N\textsubscript{1} 313) as well as in its nominal derivates \textit{mungaḡiru} ‘informant’ (CAD M\textsubscript{1} 198) and \textit{taggirtu} ‘denunciation’ (CAD T 38).

\textsuperscript{1001} Bulakh emphasizes correctly that the Akk. \textit{namurratu} and related lexemes with \textit{m-} cannot be immediately derived from \textit{nawāru} ‘to shine’ (cf. Edzard 1994).

\textsuperscript{1002} \textit{rāld-γ̄iru z-zāk̄i}.
the only one who rules over the gods, who fattens gods and men, who satiates the multitudes of the earth), 1.6 ii 17–19 (npš ḥsrṭ bn nšm npš ḥmḥt ṣrṣ ṣ ‘My appetite lacked men, my appetite — the multitudes of the earth’), 1.17 vi 45 (nšm ṣm nš ‘Good and strong among men’). 9.435:9–10 (ḥwṭ rš ḥwṭ bn nšm ‘The word of a wicked one, the word of (any) man’). The basic status of nš-m is confirmed by the equation of its syllabic equivalent ‘naʔ-[š]u–maʔ’ with [u[n] in the lexical list (Huehnergard 1987a:155).

- Akk. nīš-ū ‘mankind, human beings, people’ (AHw. 796, CAD N₂ 283).
- Throughout WS, Ugaritic nš-m is the closest approximation to Akk. nīš-ū both formally (external masculine plural) and semantically (“men,” “people”). The complex etymological background of these terms cannot be discussed here in its entirety, but if structurally identical CS terms for “women” indeed represent a semantic narrowing of the original meaning “people,” the fact that this isogloss is not shared by Ugaritic becomes all the more significant (see further in Chapter 3, p. 195).

27. ṣḥd ‘a yearling lamb’ (DUL 669, Watson 2007:99)

- *Hapax legomenon in 1.17 v 16–19: ṣdb rımrb b ṣḥd l ṣḥd kṭr w ḥss l bṛlt ḥn ḫ ḥrš ‘She prepared a lamb from the flock, for the throat of Kṭr ḫ ḥss, for the gullet of Ḥyn ḡ ḥrš’ (Pardee 1997:346). This interpretation of ṣḥd remains the most likely one notwithstanding a few obvious difficulties (notably, the absence of collective meaning for Akk. ṣuḥḥād).
- Akk. ṣuḥḥādu ‘lamb, young male sheep’ (AHw. 875, CAD P 476).
- Ugarit. *ṣuḥḥ- ‘lamb; flock’ has no cognates elsewhere in Semitic.


- *Hapax legomenon in 1.6 ii 9–11, meaning reliably established from context: ṣṭḥd ṭt b ṣṭiḥ lṣṭ ṭšk[n] b ḫṣ ṣall ‘She took ṭt by the edge of his garment, she seized him by the hem of his mantle.’
- Akk. sūnu ‘a cloth trimming’ (CDA 328). More traditional interpretations found in CAD S 388 (‘a piece of clothing or part thereof’) and AHw. 1059 (‘ein Tuch oder Binde’) are likely to be rejected (Moran 1983).
- There is no cognate for Akk.-Ugar. *ṣum- ‘hem.’ According to AHw. 1059, the Akkadian term is borrowed from Sum. tūn, but this is difficult to reconcile with the Ugaritic evidence (let alone the internal Akkadian difficulties outlined in Moran 1983).

---

1003 As is widely acknowledged (Bauer–Leander 1927:617, DUL 650, Huehnergard 1987a:77, Krebernik 1985:54). The archaic nature of the a-vocalism in Hebrew (contra Bauer–Leander 1927:617) is reaffirmed not only by Ugr. ‘naʔ-[š]u–maʔ’, but also by the Akkadogram NA–SE₁₁ in Ebla (Krebernik 1985:54). The vocalic difference between Akkadian, Arabic and, probably, Syriac on the one hand and Hebrew, Ugaritic and Eblaite on the other remains enigmatic. Arb. nās- and Arm. nāšā ‘people’ are not to be directly associated with any of the aforementioned forms as they almost certainly go back to prototypes with *V- (nunās-, qūqāš). Also the long ā in Arabic and Aramaic is not compatible with the short a in Hebrew (st. constr. nādā).

1004 Cf. the regular (non-suppletive) plural of ṣāft ‘woman’ in 4.349:2 (ārb ṣāft ‘four women,’ DUL 130).

29. *tbr* ‘to go, leave, depart’ (DUL 857).
   ● *Passim* in the Ugaritic corpus.
   ▷ Akk. *tebû* ‘to get up, to rise; to set out, to depart, to leave’ (AHw. 1342, CAD T 306).
   ▼ Akk.-Ugr. *tbr* ‘to set out, to depart’ is probably related to Arb. *tbr* ‘to follow’ (Lane 293),
   but the semantic gap underlying this comparison contrasts sharply with the virtual semantic identity between Akkadian and Ugaritic.

30. *tmn* ‘foundation, frame’ (DUL 871).
   ● *Hapax legomenon* in 1.2 iv 17–18: *l tnuṣn pnth l ydlp tmnh* ‘His knuckles did not buckle, his frame did not break up.’
   For the reasons expounded in No. 51 of Section 3.1 above, it seems preferable to identify *tmn* in this passage with Akk. *temmennu* ‘foundation’ (CAD T 337)\(^{1007}\) separating it from Hbr. *tûmînâ* ‘form, manifestation’ (HALOT 1746) and its presumable Ugaritic cognate *tmnt* (treated under No. 66 of Section 3.1 above).
   ▷ Akk. *temmennu* ‘foundation’ (AHw. 1346, CAD T 337).

   ● *Hapax legomenon* in 1.14 iii 24–25: *mrkbt b trbš* ‘a chariot from the courtyard.’
   ▷ Akk. *tarbāšu* ‘pen (for cattle, rarely for sheep and goats, horses), enclosure, courtyard’ (AHw. 1327, CAD T 217).
   ▼ Akk.-Ugr. *tarbāš*– ‘enclosure, yard’ goes back to PS *rbš* ‘to lie down, to rest (mostly of animals)’ (HALOT 1181).

   ● Both the verbal root and its nominal derivates are widely attested: 1.14 i 12–14 (*ṣuṭ ṣâkh l ṣṣr k mtrḥt yšrh ṣaṭ trḥ w ṣb ṭ* ‘He did not obtain his lawful wife, no legitimate spouse, he married a wife but she went away’), 1.23:64–65 (*y ṣaṭ ṭḥl ṭ l ṭn ṭaṭh lm nkr mddth* ‘Let the newly married leave his wife to someone else, his beloved one to a stranger’), 1.111:20 (*trḥ ṭvarš* ‘The bride-price that you will request’), and *passim* in 1.24.

\(^{1006}\) Mhr. *ṯabtu, ṯib* ‘to follow’ (ML 399, JL 269) are likely Arabisms. In CDG 569, Gez. *taba* ‘to be brave, to be manly’ and its EthS cognates are tentatively compared to Akk. *tebû* ‘to rise to make war,’ *tebû* ‘insurgent,’ but this is unlikely since Akk. *tebû* (as well as Ugr. *tbr*) is primarily a verb of movement whose military connotations are at best secondary. *Contra* DUL 857 and LSyr. 814, Syr. *t♭* ‘ursit, institit, pressit’ and its Aramaic cognates are not related to Akk. *tebû*, being rather secondarily derived from *ḥy̱* ‘to seek, to request’ (so Hurwitz 1913:98, Zaborski 1971:58).

Akk. *terḥatu ‘bridewealth’ (AHw. 1348, CAD T 350).

The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ṭṛḥ ‘to pay a bride-price, to get married’ is uncertain.\(^{1008}\) Possible WS attestations of *ṭṛḥ outside Ugaritic are problematic: the meaning of the Phoenician priestly title *mtrḥ ‘štrny is disputed (cf. DNWSI 710, Krahmalkov 2000:390), whereas Sab. ṭṛḥ, sometimes understood as ‘redemption-price’ (cf. SD 148, Biella 536) is phonologically unsuitable (Sab. ḥ vs. Akk. and Ugr. ḥ).

4. Conclusions

4.1. Ugaritic as a Canaanite language — the lexical evidence

4.1.1. By its nature, the lexical material treated in Section 3 of this chapter is substantially different from the Swadesh wordlist analyzed in Section 2. Since the impact of this difference is in many senses negative, it seems appropriate to outline the deficiencies of this additional evidence in greater detail before proceeding to its more positive outcome.

1. The Swadesh wordlist is restricted to the most fundamental lexical features whose relevance for genealogical classification is high because of their clear-cut semantic shape and slight probability of borrowing. Additional lexical features analyzed in Section 3 have no such restrictions: some of them belong to less basic, more culture-bound semantic fields, such as social hierarchy and professions (*Vby-ān- ‘poor,’ No. 2\(^{1009}\), *radān- ‘lord,’ No. 5; *ḥa(r)raš ‘artisan,’ No. 36; *kbs ‘to wash clothes,’ No. 38; *yḳš ‘to hunt with a snare,’ No. 73), materials, tools and artifacts (*Vny(at)- ‘ship,’ No. 12; *Vpn- ‘wheel,’ No. 13; *baruṭl- ‘iron,’ No. 22; *nVtk ‘weapon,’ No. 48; *Vt- ‘net,’ No. 55; *tarr- ‘sheath,’ No. 64; *tuḥān- ‘table,’ No. 68; *yarr- ‘knife, razor,’ No. 71), construction and architecture (*ṭrubbat- ‘skylight,’ No. 15; *ṭīr- ‘city,’ No. 18; *gagg ‘roof,’ No. 25; *ḥāmiy(ā)- ‘wall,’ No. 35), agriculture (*dagan ‘grain,’ No. 24; *ginn- ‘wine or olive press,’ No. 28; *kussam- ‘spelt,’ No. 39; *pVt- ‘flax,’ No. 53; *yVmVtk ‘raisin,’ No. 58), abstract concepts, ethics and intellectual activities (*ṣān- ‘vigor, wealth,’ No. 10; *awm- ‘misfortune,’ No. 11; *qps- ‘extremity,’ No. 14; *hamullat- ‘crowd,’ No. 31; *parr- ‘crime,’ No. 52; *tamān-at- ‘frame, form,’ No. 66; *ṭūṣyy- ‘success,’ No. 67; *ṭwṛ/yṣr ‘to teach, to instruct,’ No. 70; *yapīḥ- ‘witness,’ No. 74).

2. In the framework of the Swadesh wordlist, functional equivalence between the terms under comparison is of paramount importance: presence of a root in a given pair of Semitic languages is not relevant unless both lexemes in question can be shown to function as the basic exponents of the respective concept. Conversely, Section 3 above accumulates all exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite independently of their functional status: a given Ugaritic lexeme can be attested as a

\(^{1008}\) As persuasively argued by A. Goetze (1947:242), Akk. *terḥatu cannot be derived from *rēḥū ‘to copulate, to inseminate,’ as it used to be supposed in earlier studies quoted ibid.

\(^{1009}\) Unless explicitly indicated otherwise, the numbers here and below refer to the Ugaritic-Canaanite isoglosses listed in Subsection 3.1.
marginal, non-basic word, whereas its Canaanite cognates clearly enjoyed the basic status, like *db r ‘to say’ (No. 23) or *harr- ‘mountain’ (No. 32).1010 The reverse is also possible, as shown by *yaphīh- ‘witness’ (No. 72).

Significantly, the traditional, “narrow” Canaanite is sometimes divided along the same lines. Thus, a few specific lexical features prominent in Hebrew are marginal in both Ugaritic and Phoenician: *sīr- ‘city’ (No. 18), *sīṣyy/*sīṣy ‘to make’ (No. 19),1011 *hudd- ‘new moon, month’ (No. 33). The reverse situation (a root marginal in Hebrew, but basic in both Ugaritic and Phoenician) can be illustrated by *ḥūd- ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20) and *ṣīt ‘to put’ (No. 63), perhaps also *nub-t- ‘honey’ (No. 45).1012 The only isogloss separating Hebrew and Ugaritic from Phoenician is the broad use of the negative particle *ḥayn- (Ginsberg 1970:109).

3. Lexemes accepted for comparison in the Swadesh wordlist have to be well attested in semantically unambiguous contexts, which assure their basic status independently of etymological considerations.1013 Hapax legomena and other rare words whose exact meaning (let alone functional status) cannot be established contextually are preferably to be left out of consideration. In Section 3, on the contrary, a few hapax legomena have been admitted: *run ‘strength’ (No. 10), *raps- ‘extremity, end’ (No. 14), *dagan- ‘grain’ (No. 24), *gyl ‘to rejoice’ (No. 26), *gVšm- ‘rain’ (No. 28), *lyn ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ (No. 40), *maṭṭ- ‘down’/*mVṭ-at- ‘bed’ (No. 42), *paš- ‘crime, transgression’ (No. 52), *rVṭ-t- ‘net’ (No. 55), *šns ‘to gird’ (No. 61), *tavr- ‘sheath’ (No. 64), *tāṣiyy- ‘success’ (No. 67).

4. Quite often, the diachronic background of a PC lexeme cannot be elicited, which makes impossible to consider it a shared innovation. And conversely, some of the typically Canaanite words do have cognates with more or less the same meaning1014 somewhere else in CS or WS: *dm ‘to be red’ (No. 3), *radam- ‘man; mankind’ (No. 4), *sīr- ‘city’ (No. 18), *sīṣyy/*sīṣy ‘to make’ (No. 19), *sbb ‘to turn’ (No. 56), *spr ‘to count’ (No. 57), *yayn- ‘wine’ (No. 72). Evidently enough, these lexemes, too, cannot be regarded as Canaanite innovations, but only as specific, less trivial retentions from PCS or PWS.

4.1.2. These deficiencies are weighty enough to be taken seriously by everybody willing to assess the lexical proximity between Ugaritic and Canaanite. Nevertheless, they are not sufficient to overshadow the positive aspects of such a comprehensive inquiry.

1010 Presumably also *gVšm- ‘rain’ (No. 28) and *n̄aḥaš- ‘snake’ (No. 47). Since no Phoenician exponents are available for these concepts, one cannot exclude that the functional status of these lexemes in Hebrew and Phoenician was not identical (in which case they would rather belong with the isoglosses discussed in the next paragraph).

1011 H. L. Ginsberg (1970:111) considers this lexeme to be “the simplest mark” by which his “Hebraic group” can be distinguished from other Canaanite languages as well as from the rest of Semitic. The latter is not the case in view of the broad presence of ḫiy in ESA.

1012 Phoenician evidence for *nub-t- is scarce, but *dibš- is not attested at all.

1013 Needless to say, for a dead language with a restricted textual corpus even such contexts have no absolute value.

1014 Some of them even the same basic status.
1. Perhaps the most striking result of our investigation is the extraordinary high number of exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite. There is virtually nothing to compare with 78 exclusive (or, rarely, quasi-exclusive) lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Hebrew and/or Phoenician — contrast 18 exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic or 26 between Ugaritic and Akkadian, let alone the meager five exclusive lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Aramaic. With all possible limitations in mind, this huge amount of exclusive lexical features cannot be dismissed as diachronically meaningless.\(^{1015}\)

2. Many of the relevant lexemes do belong to the most basic semantic strata: *\(^{{}}\)d\(_{m}\) ‘to become red’ (No. 3), *\(^{{}}\)adm- ‘man; mankind’ (No. 4), *\(^{{}}\)h\(_{b}\) ‘to love’ (No. 7), *\(^{{}}\)yn- ‘there is not’ (No. 9), \(^*\)\(^{m}\)yi*\(^{m}\)yi ‘to make’ (No. 19), \(^*\)\(^{b}\)d\(_{d}\) ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20), *\(^{{}}\)d\(_{b}\) ‘to say’ (No. 23), *\(^{{}}\)g\(_{s}\)m- ‘rain’ (No. 28), *\(^{{}}\)lm ‘to strike’ (No. 30), *\(^{{}}\)ar- ‘mountain’ (No. 32), *\(^{{}}\)yn ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ (No. 40), *\(^{{}}\)n\(_{y}\)r- ‘boy, lad’ (No. 43), *\(^{{}}\)h\(_{b}\)u- ‘honey’ (No. 45), *\(^{{}}\)n\(_{h}\)a’s- ‘snake’ (No. 47), *\(^{s}\)yt ‘to put’ (No. 63), *\(^{t}\)awk- ‘midst’ (No. 65), *\(^{y}\)r ‘to be afraid’ (No. 76), *\(^{y}\)\(_{s}\)k ‘to pour’ (No. 77), *\(^{y}\)\(_{l}\)n ‘to become old’ (No. 78). It is thus fair to claim that PC isoglosses are not limited to the superficial layers of the cultural vocabulary.

3. The proportion of hapax legomena among the relevant Ugaritic lexemes is by no means very high (12 out of 78). Our conclusions are thus based on well attested lexemes and not on a few exotic occasionalisms. Comparison with Ugaritic-Arabic isoglosses is instructive in this respect: among 18 exclusive lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Arabic, hapax legomena are no less than 13.

4. For more than 20 PC lexemes, the path of semantic or formal innovation can be plausibly reconstructed: *\(^{a}\)b\(_{b}\)(\(_{b}\))̱r- ‘bull; horse’ (No. 1), *\(^{v}\)by-\(_{m}\)- ‘poor’ (No. 2), *\(^{a}\)yn- ‘there is not’ (No. 9), *\(^{v}\)n\(_{y}\)-\(_{n}\)- ‘ship’ (No. 12), *\(^{v}\)p\(_{n}\)- ‘wheel’ (No. 13), *\(^{b}\)d\(_{d}\)- ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20), *\(^{b}\)ḥ\(_{t}\) ‘to look for’ (No. 21), *\(^{y}\)l\(_{m}\) ‘to rejoice’ (No. 26), *\(^{h}\)ud- ‘new moon, month’ (No. 33), *\(^{h}\)m\(_{i}\)-\(_{m}\)- ‘wall’ (No. 35), *\(^{h}\)a(r)\(_{s}\)- ‘artisan’ (No. 36), *\(^{k}\)s\(_{b}\) ‘to wash clothes’ (No. 38), *\(^{k}\)š\(_{s}\)m-\(_{t}\)- ‘spelt’ (No. 39), *\(^{y}\)l\(_{m}\) ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ (No. 40), *\(^{n}\)ub-\(_{t}\)- ‘honey’ (No. 45), *\(^{n}\)n\(_{h}\)a’s- ‘snake’ (No. 47), *\(^{p}\)rm- ‘time’ (No. 49), *\(^{y}\)\(_{m}\)\(_{v}\)\(_{k}\)- ‘raisin’ (No. 58), *\(^{s}\)d\(_{a}\)- ‘cultivated field’ (No. 59), *\(^{s}\)yt ‘to put’ (No. 63), *\(^{y}\)\(_{a}\)-\(_{s}\)-\(_{t}\)\(_{a}\)- ‘knife, razor’ (No. 71). Given the fact that — at least in Semitic — the origin of “new lexemes” can rarely be established even hypothetically, the significance of this proportion can hardly be overestimated.

4.1.3. In view of the evidence collected and analyzed in Section 3, a close association between Ugaritic and Canaanite, not fully apparent as long as the inquiry has been restricted to the concepts belonging to the Swadesh wordlist, becomes a feasible probability. To put it differently, if there is any subdivision of Semitic with which Ugaritic has ever been specially connected, this subdivision is of necessity the Canaanite group. This conclusion itself is not new. What is innovative is rather the vast body of supporting evidence, which will hopefully make the Canaanite hypothesis

---

1015 In other words, as far as genealogical affiliation of Ugaritic is concerned, it is not possible to find any remotely comparable number of “roots and words in subsets of languages that would indicate other subgroupings” as predicted by J. Huehnergard (2005:190, cf. Hasselbach–Huehnergard 2007:420).
more credible than the somewhat impressionistic statements of our predecessors.\textsuperscript{1016}

4.1.4. As soon as the Canaanite affiliation of the Ugaritic vocabulary is admitted as probable, it quickly prompts a few fundamental questions of genealogical, geographic and historical order.

4.1.4.1. By far the most important problem is how the very designation “Canaanite” should be understood. As we have just seen above, some of the most conspicuous lexical isoglosses labeled by us “Proto-Canaanite” fully affect Ugaritic and Phoenician only, their presence in Hebrew being quite marginal. And vice versa, some of the typically Hebrew lexemes are only sporadically attested in Ugaritic and Phoenician. As long as both Phoenician and Hebrew are thought to be legitimate representatives of the Canaanite Sprachtypus (which is the common opinion), one is forced to conclude that even within this “classical” or “narrow” Canaanite there are two different, only partly overlapping, bundles of specific lexical features — a Southern one and a Northern one. The fact that both types of lexical features are to some extent present over the whole Canaanite area can be explained in two different ways. The relevant isoglosses could have emerged in an incipient form already in Proto-Canaanite, but their subsequent development — from marginal to highly prominent — was different in the North and in the South. Alternatively, two independent focuses of lexical innovations can be postulated, influencing each other via geographic diffusion.

Evidently enough, it is the Northern bundle with which Ugaritic is particularly closely associated. The easiest way to explain this association is, of course, the geographic proximity between Ugarit and Phoenicia as opposed to more southern and more inward areas of Canaan. It is this geographic solution that is usually accepted by those Semitists who do not consider lexical evidence as a reliable tool of genealogical sub-grouping, but are nevertheless reluctant to disregard completely some of the most striking lexical coincidences.\textsuperscript{1017}

However, a genealogical hypothesis envisaging a diachronic unity of Phoenician and Ugaritic within the Canaanite group is also worth considering. The vocabulary of such a “Phoenic group,” postulated without hesitation in H. L. Ginsberg’s brilliant summary description of NWS (1970), can be characterized — both positively and negatively — by several important isoglosses. From among the features collected in the present chapter, note \textsuperscript{+}hdd- ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20), \textsuperscript{+}yty ‘to put’ (No. 63), \textsuperscript{+}nub-t-

---

\textsuperscript{1016} Such as Greenfield 1969:98 (“But the bulk, the great bulk of the vocabulary of Ugaritic, when not gemeinsemitisch ... has its strongest links with Canaanite”) or Tropper 1994:351 (“It is an undisputable fact that the great majority of the Ugaritic lexicon (about 70%) and especially the basic vocabulary of Ugaritic is attested in the Canaanite dialects with the same or at least similar meaning”). Tropper gives no single example of a common Ugaritic-Canaanite lexical feature, nor does he specify the source of his statistics. Greenfield refers to “the common words for table, roof, window, fish” without mentioning any concrete lexical form (at least the first three — overtly cultural — concepts are by no means the best illustrations of what the common words and the bulk of the vocabulary of Ugaritic actually are). One can easily understand why these and similar statements, even if essentially correct, did not produce much confidence in Semitological circles, especially among scholars a priori skeptical about the classificatory value of the basic vocabulary. The same applies to Ginsberg 1970:103, where “roof,” “window” and “table” are supplemented by *gyh ‘to be old (of things),’ *gros ‘to drive out’ and *dlkn ‘to be old (of people).’ That the latter feature is “confined to the Canaanite languages” is, moreover, incorrect (see below in Chapter 6, p. 417).

\textsuperscript{1017} E.g. Tropper 1994:351–353.
‘honey’ (No. 45) and * gerekti- ‘city’ (No. 18), *sîy ‘to make’ (No. 19), *hudil- ‘new moon, month’ (No. 33). An inquiry into the Swadesh wordlist will supplement this list with such terms as *parv- (*rVgl- ‘foot’ (Ginsberg 1970:105), *wrn (*tyh) ‘(to be) good,’ *yt ‘to give’ (Ginsberg 1970:105, Tropper 1994:351), perhaps *dr (*gdil) ‘(to be) big.’ Note, finally, a few other lexemes collected in Harris 1939:52, Ginsberg 1970:105, del Olmo Lete 1986:45–46, Tropper 1994:351 and Rainey 2007:70–74: *kwn (*hwy) ‘to be,’ *harîs- (*dahab-) ‘gold,’ *alp- (*lwâr-, *bâkar-) ‘bull, ox, cattle.’

A comprehensive diachronic assessment of the “Phoenic”/“Hebraic” lexical dichotomy — to one’s utmost regret, drastically hampered by the severe shortage of Phoenician lexical material — is still to be carried out. One possible model of explanation has been briefly outlined above in connection with *šyt ‘to put.’ The readiest interpretation of this peculiar case is that a highly innovative PC feature once affected (proto-)Hebrew, but then gradually receded, perhaps under a foreign influence. The same approach can be applied to several other examples adduced in the preceding paragraph: for 8 out of 13 basic concepts, the Hebrew equivalents are the same as in Aramaic (to some extent, also Arabic) in opposition to Ugaritic/Phoenician. Within such a paradigm, Ugaritic is to be regarded not just as Canaanite, but as Canaanite par excellence, whereas for Hebrew a kind of lexical “de-Canaanization” has to be posited.

To what degree the lexical evidence for the “Phoenic” hypothesis is compatible with a variety of positive and negative morphological isoglosses between Ugaritic, Amarna Canaanite, Phoenician and Hebrew is a debatable issue well beyond the

1018 + means “extensive use, basic status,” − means “marginal use, non-basic status.”
1019 This is of course a formal (yet, lexically determined, or morpho-lexical) peculiarity.
1020 In Ugaritic, aîlpa (pl. aîlpm) was the basic designation of “large cattle” widely attested in a variety of contexts. The usage of tr is, conversely, restricted to the poetic corpus, whereas bkr is attested only once. The Phoenician picture is almost the same (âlp common, bkr rare, *sr unattested), the Hebrew one is exactly the opposite (šôr and bâkîr common, aîlpa deeply marginal).
1021 With del Olmo Lete 1986 and Vita 2003 and, it seems, contra Liverani 1964:191, who believes that only late, non-literary varieties of Ugaritic documentation start to display Canaanite features. As far as we can see, the evidence collected in Liverani’s study hardly ever corroborates this conclusion. Surprisingly enough, lexical evidence is not even mentioned in Liverani 1964.
1022 Cf. in this sense many insightful remarks in Rainey 2007, where Hebrew is qualified as a “Transjordan” (= ‘not-completely-Canaanite’ or “Canaanoid”?) language. We are well aware that this model is not easily compatible with some crucial assumptions about the basic lexicon (such as diachronic stability and resistance to borrowing) on which the present monograph is largely based. However, an instructive example pointing in exactly the same direction can be detected also in the realm of verbal morphology. As is well known, t-prefixation in the 3 m. pl. of the prefix conjugation is one of the most salient peculiarities of both Ugaritic and Amarna Canaanite. This feature — no doubt a highly specific innovation with respect to PS *y — left virtually no trace in either Phoenician or Hebrew, which, for all practical purposes, are usually considered to be linear descendants of the Canaanite linguistic varieties attested in the EA corpus. A non-motivated abandonment of such a marked innovation with a concomitant re-establishment of its diachronic forerunner (which, as common sense plainly suggests, must have been utterly forgotten by the speakers many generations ago) seems an unexplainable mystery unless one suspects some sort of “de-Canaanizing” external influence.
scope of the present investigation.\textsuperscript{1023}

4.1.4.2. Another interesting problem is the chronological stratification of the lexicon within the linguistic history of Ugaritic. It has often been observed (Albright 1958:38, Held 1959:174–175, Haldar 1964:276–277, Liverani 1964) that both the grammar and the vocabulary of Ugaritic prose can be substantially different from the language of myths and epics. Can such differences be detected within the body of the evidence discussed above in this chapter? A positive answer would be of great importance for both genealogical and geographic dimensions of our study. On the one hand, some of the “incipient Canaanisms” could be not ripe enough to penetrate the language of archaic poetry, but nevertheless flourish in everyday prosaic speech. On the other hand, the poetic corpus could be too archaic to be affected by the hypothetical diffusion of the Southern Canaanite, “Hebraic” lexical features. There seems to be, indeed, some evidence in favor of this hypothesis: *\textit{dbr} ‘to say’ (No. 23), *\textit{gVšm}- ‘rain’ (No. 28), *\textit{harr}- ‘mountain’ (No. 32), *\textit{naḥaš}- ‘snake’ (No. 47), *\textit{hudt}- ‘new moon’ (No. 33) are attested in letters, incantations, omens, rituals and other cultic texts, but not in myths and epics.\textsuperscript{1024} In general, however, one has rather to agree with J. Greenfield (1969:98) who believes that the Canaanite nature of the Ugaritic vocabulary is manifest in all of its chronological and stylistic strata.

4.2. Exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic: an evaluation

Eighteen exclusive lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Arabic give a fair account of the lexical proximity between these two languages.\textsuperscript{1025} But the paucity of examples is not the only argument in this case. The immense majority of the relevant Ugaritic lexemes are \textit{hapax legomena} — non-basic, functionally marginal lexemes preserved as rare poetic occasionalisms. That such words have no reliable cognates outside Arabic can be easily explained by the proverbial richness of the Classical Arabic vocabulary as accumulated in traditional lexicographic tools. Moreover, in the whole corpus of exclusive Ugaritic-Arabic lexical features there is not a single reliable semantic innovation. This is a telling witness of the archaic, conservative nature of the Ugaritic-Arabic lexical coincidences. In summary: as long as basic vocabulary is

\textsuperscript{1023} Thus, J. Tropper (1994:352), after a penetrating acknowledgement of the lexical proximity between Ugaritic and Phoenician, emphatically denies the possibility “to subsume Ugaritic and Phoenician in one single subgroup of Canaanite” since “morphological differences between Ugaritic ... and all South Canaanite dialects ... still remain and should not be ignored.” Not a single morphological difference of this kind can, however, be located on the pages of Tropper’s contribution. Moreover, Tropper rejects as irrelevant virtually all such differences suggested in previous studies on the topic (e.g. Blau 1978:38–39, Huehnergard 1991b:286), such as the Canaanite shift *\textit{q} > ẓ, the š-causative and the shift *\textit{a} > i in the first syllable of the suffix conjugation of the intensive and causative stems.

\textsuperscript{1024} Perhaps \textit{ri-i[g]-lu} (rather than \textit{pun}) in the lexical list (Huehnergard 1987a:176 and 72) belongs to the same group of “recent,” “non-Canaanite” lexemes.

\textsuperscript{1025} Contra J. Healey (1995:82–84), a lexical investigation aiming at a meaningful pattern of genealogical subgrouping can by no means ignore such fundamental notions as exclusiveness of lexical isoglosses, functional equivalence between the lexemes under scrutiny, their innovative vs. conservative nature, let alone the frequency of their attestation and their philological reliability. Without a systematic application of these concepts, any \textit{crude statistics} of lexical coincidences between Ugaritic and any other Semitic language is deemed to be useless.
considered to be of some relevance for linguistic subgrouping, the probability of a special genealogical relationship between Ugaritic and Arabic, still advocated in some recent studies on the topic, is close to zero.  

4.3. Ugaritic and Akkadian: shared lexical archaisms or early loanwords?

4.3.1. By their nature, exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Akkadian are fundamentally different from similarly exclusive matches between Ugaritic and West Semitic languages. Lexical features which Ugaritic shares with Hebrew, Aramaic or Arabic are at least potentially indicative of a closer genealogical proximity. For obvious reasons, no special genealogical relationship between Ugaritic and Akkadian is at all conceivable, which means that the lexical features under scrutiny cannot be shared innovations. But where do they come from? Theoretically, two explanations suggest themselves:

1. non-trivial lexical retentions from Proto-Semitic, lost elsewhere in WS but preserved in Ugaritic because of its archaic character and/or early written attestation

or

2. lexical borrowings from Akkadian into Ugaritic which did not penetrate into other WS languages, less affected by the influence of the cuneiform civilization.

In fact, there need not be one single solution for the whole body of examples. While some cases are best explained as shared archaisms, others can be more convincingly interpreted within the borrowing paradigm.

4.3.2. The former solution is to be preferred when we are faced with lexemes belonging to more basic semantic strata and, therefore, unlikely to be borrowed: *mr* ‘to look at’ (No. 2), *rišd* ‘leg’ (No. 4), *ryb* ‘to enter’ (No. 7), *n-dd* ‘to stand’ (No. 23), *nš-m* ‘people, men’ (No. 26), *tbr* ‘to go, to leave’ (No. 29), possibly also *rmk* ‘tough, strong’ (No. 6), *kms* ‘to buckle’ (No. 15), *kšd* ‘to search for, to reach’ (No. 16), *kbr* ‘to summon, to invoke’ (No. 17), *lbru* ‘suckling lamb or kid’ (No. 19), *lsm* ‘to hurry’ (No. 20), *mk* ‘behold’ (No. 21), *mnd*r ‘perhaps’ (No. 22). Together with a few Akkadian-Ugaritic isoglosses from the Swadesh wordlist (*ībr* ‘bird,’ *irt* ‘breast,’ *rpt* ‘cloud’), such lexemes may

---

1026 Such as Kaye 1991a.
1027 The same is obviously true of the Ugaritic-Aramaic genealogical proximity advocated in Segert 1965.
1028 This dichotomy was clear already to A. Haldar (1964:275): “There are a number of pure Akkadian loanwords in Ugaritic, and in other cases common Semitic words have the same meaning in Ugaritic and Akkadian in contradistinction to the other Semitic languages.” This reasonable statement is followed by a very short list of randomly selected examples, none of which is explicitly attributed to any of the two aforementioned categories.
1029 Watson 2007:81 (“A unique isogloss ... but does it mean that it is a loanword?”).
belong to a very ancient stock of Proto-Semitic vocabulary still preserved in Ugaritic, but lost or marginalized in WS languages with more recent textual documentation. Direct borrowing from Akkadian — at least in historical times — seems quite improbable in such cases.

4.3.3. The second alternative brings us to the thorny problem of Akkadian lexical influences on Ugaritic, a problem which received surprisingly little attention from Ugaritological scholarship notwithstanding its obvious relevance. Even W. Watson’s meticulous inquiry into foreign vocabulary of Ugaritic deals only with non-Semitic loanwords and excludes Akkadisms. It becomes less surprising, in such a context, that not a single lexeme from our list has been even tentatively qualified as an Akkadism by the authors of DUL.

As a systematic perusal of Watson’s lists of non-Semitic loanwords in Ugaritic demonstrates, most of them are concentrated in political, administrative, economic, and to some extent, cultic contexts, where they usually designate more or less specific realia. A few Akkadian loanwords are certainly expected to appear in the same groups of texts and can indeed be detected on the pages of DUL, although more or less promising examples are surprisingly few in number: Ṽṭ ‘span, half cubit’ < ʾāṭu (DUL 123, CAD U 358, Watson 2007:79), ʾazml ‘kind of sack’ < ʾazamillu (DUL 137, CAD A 525, Watson 2007:80), Ṽṛk ‘cart, wagon’ < Akk. erekkû (DUL 184, CAD E 296, Watson 2007:81), ḫḥl ‘deposit, guarantee, pledge’ < Akk. ḫubullu (DUL 84, CAD H 216, Watson 2007:84), ḫt ‘pitcher’ < Akk. kāṭu (DUL 467, CAD K 611, Watson 2007:91), ʾmd ‘an official’ < miḏû (DUL 524, CAD M 2167, Watson 2007:92), Ṽmr ‘price’ < mahîru (DUL 539, CAD M 192, Watson 2007:94), Ṽnt ‘recitation of spell, 1030 In Watson 2007:79 this word appears in the “List of [Akkadian] loanwords [in Ugaritic],” with no further explanations whatsoever.

1031 that, because of the archaic nature of Ugaritic myths and epics, many of the pertinent lexemes can be even more ancient than the tablets on which they are inscribed, thus reducing the chronological gap between Ugaritic and Akkadian and emphasizing the difference between Ugaritic and WS languages of the first millennium (such as Hebrew). This hypothesis is plausible, although it fails to account for several common lexemes not restricted to the literary corpus (rḥb ‘to enter,’ n-dd ‘to stand,’ tbr ‘to go, to leave,’ Ṽṭ ‘bird’). Besides, the extant non-literary texts in Ugaritic are by no means representative from the lexical point of view.

1032 The prehistoric situation might have been different, however: an early presence of East Semitic linguistic varieties in Syria might be responsible for a deeper, chronologically and geographically more intensive interaction, which could affect even the most basic lexical strata (see further below at the end of this chapter).

1033 Penetrating remarks on individual lexemes by such leading figures of Ugaritological, Semitological and Assyriological scholarship as A. Goetze, W. Moran, J. Huehnergard and D. Pardee (see references below) are not sufficient to replace a systematic treatment of this fascinating subject.

1034 The references to Watson’s studies are conveniently summarized in Watson 2006:727–728.

1035 This gap has been recently filled by a special detailed study in Watson 2007:63–118. When Watson’s book reached us, the present chapter had fully acquired its present shape, so only occasional references to individual words and forms could have been inserted. It has been deemed necessary, however, to give a detailed account of Watson’s approach to the problem in a special excursion at the end of this chapter.

1036 This is clear from the distribution chart in Watson 1999:793.

1037 Persuasive arguments in favor of this etymology can be found in Huehnergard 1987a:144–145.

Is it possible to subsume under this group some of the terms from our list of exclusive Ugaritic-Akkadian lexical isoglosses? Hardly so. On the one hand, the relevant words are almost never connected with realia: most of the concepts involved, even when not too fundamental, are universally known and could have been easily expressed by native words. On the other hand, the majority of their attestations come from myths and epics, where all types of loanwords (including Akkadianis) are empirically known to be rare.

As common sense nevertheless suggests, the probability of Akkadian origin for some of the lexemes from our list is rather high. Here belong ṣnr ‘field’ (No. 1), ṣnr̡ ‘a marine animal’ (No. 3), ṣnsr ‘penis’ (No. 5), ṣnwt ‘word’ (No. 8), ṣnpr ‘ration’ (No.

---

1039 For the relevant passage (2.41:14–15) and the expression ṣnwt ṣr̡š v. Márquez Rowe 1992:152–153.
1040 Akkadian origin advocated in Tropper 2000:46 seems likely in view of the fact that PS *ṣyr ‘(to be) small’ is well attested in Ugaritic in its original form (DUL 780). But it remains unclear why Akk. ḫ and ṣ should have shifted to γ and s (ṣ) in Ugaritic. The former correspondence could probably be explained by the speaker’s awareness of the etymological relationship between ūṣḥōru and syr (an etymologically motivated contamination, as in Biblical Aramaic ḥālāk ‘tribute, tax’ < Akkadian ḫākkū). The latter can only be accounted for by some sort of phonetic difference between Akkadian ṣ and Ugaritic š (affricate vs. non-affricate or glottalized vs. backed?).
1042 We are convinced that the allegedly broad presence of Hurrian, Hitite and Egyptian loanwords in epics and myths as reflected in the chart in Watson 1999:793 is largely due to uncritical selection. This is not to pretend that Akkadianis are altogether missing from epics and myths, but fully reliable or at least promising examples like šd < šiddu ‘a measure of length’ (DUL 809, CAD Š₂ 403, Watson 2007:107) or tl < tilu ‘a weapon’ (DUL 869, CAD T 411, Watson 2007:110) are extremely few.
1043 Explicitly qualified as a cognate in Pardee 1997:289.
In some cases this attribution may look subjective, but more often the reasons behind it are quite transparent: a highly specific non-basic meaning (“ration,” “a marine animal,” “caravan,” “sceptre,” “hero,” “herald,” “splendor,” “foundation,” perhaps even “word”); a peculiar phonological (ušr, nmrt) or morphological (trb) shape; a more or less feasible possibility of an eventual Sumerian origin (ngr ‘field,’ ngr ‘herald,’ tmn ‘foundation’).

In summary: some Ugariitic lexemes look like Akkadianisms but, by their semantic and/or distributional properties, differ greatly from generally acknowledged, “normal” Akkadian loanwords. In our opinion, a plausible solution to this paradox is to be sought in the chronological dimension of the borrowing process. Within such an approach, those Akkadian loanwords which denote specific realia in economic and administrative contexts are to be treated as recent borrowings roughly contemporary with the documents in which they are attested. This chronological stratum is opposed to another, considerably more ancient layer of Akkadisms to which most of the terms treated in the preceding paragraph can be attributed. An early date of borrowing can convincingly account for the broad attestation of the terms in question (notably, their presence in the most archaic documents of Ugaritic literature) and, importantly, for their archaic phonological shape: evidently enough, such lexemes as hwt ‘word,’ hpr ‘ration’ or sīn ‘hem’ could only be borrowed from very ancient, pre-OB varieties of Akkadian. That such early loanwords are indeed conceivable is clearly shown by hkl ‘palace’ (and its WS cognates), evidently borrowed from a third millennium proto-form *haykal rather than from the standard Akkadian ekallu.

No less interesting is the geographic dimension of the problem. In order to account for such deeply rooted lexical Akkadianisms, a notoriously close interaction between (proto-)Akkadian and (proto-)Ugaritic is to be assumed. Now it may be doubted that “classical,” core Mesopotamian Akkadian — all its cultural prestige notwithstanding — could be responsible for such a marked lexical influence. Could we

---

1044 Apparently treated as a cognate in Goetze 1947:245.
1046 An Akkadamism according to Pardee 1988:115.
1047 According to Moran 1983, “perhaps an old loanword from Akk. before the loss in the latter of the aleph, or perhaps both going back to a common source and the textile vocabulary of the third millennium B.C.?” The possibility of an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic is emphatically rejected in Durand 2009:95.
1048 According to J. Huennergard (1987a:176), “whether Ugar. /tarbaṣu/ is native to the language, or a loan from Akk., cannot be determined” (cf. Kühne 1974:159). Huennergard is right to observe that later tarbaṣu was indeed borrowed into Aramaic (Kaufman 1974:107).
1050 *Inter alia*, explicitly qualified as such by the authors of DUL — an impressionistic but, in practice, very useful criterion.

Excursus: Akkadian loanwords in Ugaritic in Watson 2007:63–118

As mentioned above in the main part of this chapter, the long-awaited special inquiry into the lexical relationship between Ugaritic and Akkadian has been recently carried out by W. Watson. Because of the wealth of lexical material accumulated in it and a fresh and comprehensive bibliographic apparatus, Watson’s study undoubtedly represents an important step in the development of Ugaritic lexicography and is to be welcomed by all interested specialists.

One has to acknowledge, nevertheless, that Watson’s list is — at least for the purpose of a study like the present one — very difficult to handle, first and foremost because a cognate relationship within a given Akkadian-Ugaritic word-pair is seldom explicitly differentiated from a borrowing hypothesis. This rather misleading approach reaches its peak on p. 117 of Watson’s study, where we learn that the total number of Ugaritic words “borrowed from Akkadian (directly or indirectly)” amounts to 175 lexemes, almost exactly a half of what has been listed on pp. 66–114 (25 from hippiatric texts + 330 elsewhere). Now it is virtually impossible to establish which concrete concrete terms have been admitted into the 175 (relatively) reliable loanwords and which ones have been rejected. A scholar aiming at a critical analysis of Watson’s study finds himself in a difficult position: while obviously inclined to follow Watson in rejecting this or that unreliable example, he is rarely capable of sifting out such cases from the huge body of lexical material discussed in the chapter.

In view of the paramount importance of Watson’s collection for the whole issue of the Ugaritic-Akkadian lexical relationship, a sufficiently detailed analysis of its positive and negative achievements becomes unavoidable in the context of the present chapter. In the course of this analysis, we have detected four groups of Ugaritic lexemes which have been explicitly or implicitly ascribed to Akkadian influence by Watson, yet are arguably autochthonous in our opinion.

1. Semantically reliable words with reliable Common Semitic prototypes, borrowing from Akkadian impossible or unlikely.

   1. *r̥ahl ‘tent, mansion’ (DUL 32), an ancient Common Semitic term, borrowing from Akkadian ālu (CAD A1 379) considered in Watson 2007:76 is extremely unlikely.
   2. *r̥al ‘grain, fodder’ (DUL 44), a widely attested Common Semitic root, borrowing from Akk. ukullu ‘food, fodder’ is quite improbable if only for the difference in morphological structure (contra Watson 2007:66).
   3. *r̥ar̥l ‘cow, heifer’ (DUL 102), one of the most ancient and widespread animal names in Semitic (SED II No. 12), borrowing from Akk. arhu ‘cow’ (CAD A2 263) must be emphatically excluded (contra Watson 2007:78).
   4. *rasr ‘prisoner, captive’ (DUL 114, Watson 2007:79). Since *r̥asr- ‘prisoner’ is widely attested in WS, whereas Akk. asīru is probably an early WS loanword (Kogan...
2008b:105 and 110, with references), there is hardly an reason to postulate an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic.

5. *md ‘support or foot of a wall’ (DUL 164, Watson 2007:80), a regular reflex of PS *m₇md, borrowing from Akk. imdu ‘stanchion, support’ (CAD I 109) is quite unlikely (Pardee 2000:882).

6. Neither hlm nor hnm (DUL 344, 337) can be convincingly interpreted as Akkadian loanwords (cf. Watson 2007:84) as both involve well-known deictic elements widely attested throughout West Semitic.

7. hlt ‘desacralization’ (DUL 362, Watson 2007:85) cannot be borrowed from Akk. ellītu ‘purity’ (CAD E 106) if only for the semantic difference.

8. *hlt ‘to perish’ (DUL 86, Watson 2007:86), in view of several related verbs elsewhere in WS (v. CDG 261 under Gez. ḫalḵa), the Ugaritic lexeme is certainly a cognate to Akk. ḫalḵu ‘to disappear, to vanish’ (CAD H 36), not a borrowing from it.

9. *hlm ‘nose’ (DUL 416) goes back to a well attested Common Semitic root (SED I Nos. 137 and 139), borrowing from Akk. ḫaṭṭimmu ‘muzzle, snout’ (CAD H 265) is improbable and unnecessary (contra Watson 2007:87).

10. knyt ‘glorious, of noble ancestry’ (DUL 451) derives from a well attested Common Semitic root (v. HALOT 483 under Hbr. kōnā), borrowing from Akkadian kanātu ‘worshiped, honored’ (CAD K 171), hesitantly considered in Watson 2007:89, is very unlikely.

11. lbn ‘to make bricks’ (DUL 490): with Kaufman 1974:66 (and contra Watson 2007:91) “there is no compelling reason to assume that Akkadian is the origin of the Common Semitic term and its related forms.”

12. Since PS *lβš is virtually ubiquitous, it is hard to see why either lbš ‘clothing’ (DUL 492) or lpš ‘cloak’ (ibid. 500) are to be considered Akkadian loanwords (contra Watson 2007:91).

13. mrad ‘great quantity’ (DUL 513) belongs to a well attested Common Semitic root (HALOT 538 under Hbr. mārd), borrowing from Akk. mādu ‘much’ (CAD M 20) is highly unlikely (contra Watson 2007:92).

14. mrīztr ‘garment, ritual tunic’ (DUL 519) represents a well attested Common Semitic root (HALOT 27 under Hbr. ṣēzōr), borrowing from Akkadian considered in Watson 2007:92 is very unlikely.

15. mḫš ‘weaver’ (DUL 540). Since the meaning “to weave” for the reflexes of PS *mḫš are attested also in JPA mḥy (DJPA 300) and Soq. ṭāḥaz (LS 240), there is hardly any need to postulate a borrowing from Akk. māḥšu ‘weaver’ (CAD M 102), cf. Watson 2007:94.

16. mšḥt (DUL 585) clearly designates a smith’s tongs (Pardee 1997:256) and can be plausibly derived from the widespread Common Semitic root *ṣḥt (v. HALOT 997 under Hbr. šḥt). A borrowing from Akk. nāšbatu (CAD N 2 47) is, contra Watson 2007:95, quite improbable.

17. nblrat ‘flame’ (DUL 618, Watson 2007:97), if indeed related to Akk. nabl ‘flame’ (CAD N 1 25), must be also connected with Gez. nabal ‘flame’ (CDG 383), so the Ugaritic-Akkadian isogloss is not exclusive. The unexpected glottal stop in Ugaritic
remains, as before, enigmatic.

18. *nkr* ‘to be strange, to fall into foreign hands’ (DUL 630) goes back to a very common Semitic root (v. HALOT 699 under Hbr. *nkr* and elsewhere), so it is unclear why any special connection with Akk. *nakaru* ‘to be hostile’ (CAD N1 159) should at all be surmised (*contra* Watson 2007:97).


20. *smkt* ‘height’ (DUL 763, Watson 2007:105) derives from a well-known PS root *sml* ‘to support, to lean upon’ (v. HALOT 759 and CDG 502 for cognates), borrowing from Akk. *samku*, translated as ‘to dam a canal; to reject, to remove’ in CAD S 109, is improbable and unnecessary.

21. *snnt* ‘swallow’ (DUL 764), as long as this translation is maintained, there is hardly any need to treat the Ugaritic word as borrowed from Akk. *simantu* (CAD S 295) since, as Watson himself admits (2007:105), comparable terms are well attested elsewhere in WS (SED II No. 197).


23. The root *gmr* ‘to be complete, to come to an end’ being very well attested outside Akkadian (HALOT 197, CDG 194), there is no need to see in Ugr. *tgmr* ‘totality, total’ (DUL 861) “a Ugaritic adaptation of an Akkadian term” (Watson 2007:110).

24. Since the meaning “to deliver, to pay” is well attested for the reflexes of *šlm* in a variety of WS languages (HALOT 1534 and elsewhere), *ṭšlm* ‘redemption, ransom’ (DUL 882) is not to be considered a borrowing from Akk. *tašlintu* ‘payment’ (CAD T 290), *contra* Watson 2007:111.

25. The root *zbl* ‘to lift, to carry’ is relatively well attested in WS: Hbr. *zbl* ‘to exalt, to honor’ and *zūbūl* ‘elevation, height, lofty abode’ (BDB 259), Arb. *zbl* ‘to bear, to carry, to take up and carry’ (Lane 1212). There is, accordingly, hardly any need (*contra* Watson 2007:114) to consider exclusive the isogloss between Ugr. *zbl* ‘invalid, sick person’ (DUL 998) and Akk. *zabulu* ‘to carry’ (CAD Z 1), even if the latter can occasionally be used with the specific meaning “to carry a sick man on a bed.”

II. Semantically reliable lexemes of uncertain origin (*Wanderwörter*).

1. *ibsn* ‘warehouse’ (DUL 13), an eventual link with Akk. *abūsu* ‘storehouse’ (CAD A1 92) is likely, but a direct borrowing from Akkadian tentatively considered in Watson 2007:75 is difficult in view of the morphological shape of the Ugaritic word (cf. *i* in Hbr. *rēbūs*, HALOT 4).


---

1051 Note that according to Huehnergard 1987a:158 “Akk. *saplu*, attested only beginning with MB and MA ... may itself be a WSem. loan.”

1052 For an internally Ugaritic morphological interpretation *v.* Tropper 2000:270.
and comparable WS lexemes is uncertain, the direction of borrowing cannot be established.

3. *algāti* ‘a mineral or stone’ (DUL 54, Watson 2007:77), related terms are found in numerous ANE languages, borrowing from Akkadian *algamešu* (CAD A₁ 337) into Ugaritic is hard to substantiate.

4. *nuqt* ‘quiver’ (DUL 126, Watson 2007:79) = Akk. *išpatu* (CAD I 257). The origin of this common lexeme, widely attested in a variety of ANE languages, is uncertain, an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic is unprovable.


9. *mrdt* ‘a piece of material or a garment’ (DUL 573) = Akk. *mardatu* ‘fabric woven with several colors in a special technique’ (CAD M₁ 277). The authors of CAD correctly emphasize the prominent Western connections of the Akkadian lexeme, so a WS borrowing in Akkadian is more likely than vice versa (contra Watson 2007:95).


11. *prs* ‘a dry measure’ (DUL 682, Watson 2007:99), the Akkadian measure name *parīsu* is attested as a typically Western word from the earliest times onwards (CAD P 186), so there is hardly any reason to treat the Ugaritic lexeme as an Akkadism.

12. *škw* ‘horse’ (DUL 772), of uncertain origin (cf. SED II No. 199), but, contra Watson 2007:70, certainly not an Akkadism in Ugaritic.

III. Words of uncertain meaning and etymology (often realia), borrowing from Akkadian unlikely or unprovable.

1. *(i)blbl* ‘messenger, bearer’ (DUL 8, Watson 2007:75), very uncertain, Akk. *babhilu* ‘bearer (as agricultural worker), tenant farmer’ (CAD B 8) is, in any case, not a suitable source of borrowing.

2. *adm* ‘obtained, acquired’ (DUL 18, Watson 2007:75), very doubtful, but even if related to Akk. (OA) *adāmu* ‘to own a share in a common fund’ (CAD A₁ 95), hardly a borrowing from it (for other Semitic cognates to this Old Assyrian verb v. Kogan 2006c:187)
3. ʻadr ʻa variety of tree’ (DUL 21, Watson 2007:76), very uncertain, any connection with Akk. aḏəru (CAD A₁ 102) is highly unreliable.

4. ʻayzəd ʻwedding, betrothal’ (DUL 31, Watson 2007:76), very uncertain, any connection with Akk. aḫuṣatu ʻmarriage gift’ (CAD A₁ 217) is doubtful.

5. ʻanḥb ʻsea snail’ (DUL 78, Watson 2007:77), meaning very uncertain, connection with Akk. yānibū ʻa stone’ (CAD I 322) is difficult.

6. ʻannih ʻmint’ (DUL 81, Watson 2007:78), meaning uncertain, identification with Akk. anaḫbu ʻa garden plant’ (CAD A₂ 111) is conjectural, let alone an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic.

7. ʻinšt ʻrelatives’ (DUL 84, Watson 2007:78), meaning highly uncertain, direct connection with Akk. nišṭu ʻfamily, relatives’ (CAD N₂ 297) is quite doubtful.

8. ʻirn ʻa substance used in pharmacopoeia’ (DUL 101, Watson 2007:66-67), meaning and identification fully uncertain, Akk. arḫānu ʻa certain stage of growth of the date palm’ (CAD A₃ 255) and arḫu ʻa kind of milkweed’ (ibid. 267) are among many alternative options for comparison (Pardee 1985:61), but even if accepted, the borrowing hypothesis is far from evident.

9. ʻarkd ʻa projectile’ (DUL 103, Watson 2007:78), meaning highly uncertain, a borrowing from Akk. arīktu ʻspear’ (CAD A₂ 267) is unprovable and, in view of -d, rather unlikely.

10. ʻirn ʻpuppy’ (DUL 104, differently Watson 2007:78), semantically rather uncertain, a connection with either Akk. urnu ʻa snake’ (CAD U 234) or Akk. mērānu ʻyoung dog, puppy’ (CAD M₂ 105) is not to be ruled out (cf. SED II No. 8), but there is no reason to assume an Akkadian loanword in any of the two cases.

11. ʻart ʻshield’ (DUL 109), meaning uncertain, borrowing from Akk. arītu ʻshield’ (CAD A₂ 269) is purely conjectural (contra Watson 2007:78).

12. ʻaškrr ʻa substance used in pharmacopoeia’ (DUL 118), meaning and identification fully uncertain, comparison with Akk. iškurr ᵐ ʻwax’ (CAD I 251) and other Akkadian lexemes mentioned in Watson 2007:67 is highly tentative at best (Pardee 1985:59).

13. ʻuṣḥt ʻincense burner’ (DUL 125, Watson 2007:79). Even if the identification with Akk. sēḥtu (CAD Š₂ 264, Pardee 2000:310) is accepted, it seems wise to follow Pardee’s dictum “l’origine du mot est inconnue.”

14. ʻuṭl ʻsaliva, phlegm, spittle’ (DUL 125, Watson 2007:79). Even if this interpretation is maintained (which is far from obvious), there is hardly any need to postulate an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic, all the more since none of the three uṣultu words listed in CAD U 329 displays a suitable meaning.

15. ʻub ʻa garment’ (DUL 123, Watson 2007:79), meaning uncertain, each of the Akkadian etymologies mentioned by Watson are conjectural, the borrowing hypotheses are unprovable.


17. ʻpr ‘to supply, to provide’ (DUL 174, Watson 2007:80) occurs in a difficult,
largely obscure context (2.71:12, v. Pardee 2002a:111 for a survey of interpretation possibilities). Any connection with Akk. *epēru ‘to provide’ (CAD E 190) is highly doubtful, particularly since the latter is usually thought to be related to Ugr. ḫpr ‘ration’ (for which see above in this chapter, p. 330).


19. *ṛrb ‘an ingredient or medicine in the hippiatric texts’ (DUL 193, Watson 2007:67), hardly any connection with Akk. azupīru ‘a garden plant used as a spice and for medicinal purposes’ (CAD A 530). In view of Arb. ṿṛyrub- (LA 1 676) the Akkadian borrowing in Ugaritic becomes, in any case, superfluous.

20. *bln ‘mixed fodder’ (DUL 223), meaning and interpretation fully uncertain (Pardee 1985:63–64), but if indeed to be derived from *bll ‘to mix,’ there is hardly any need to postulate a borrowing from Akk. bālu (CAD B 63), contra Watson 2007:67.

21. *bnt ‘tamarisk’ (DUL 233, Watson 2007:82), identification far from certain, but even if correct, there is no need to consider the Ugaritic word a borrowing from Akk. bīnu (CAD B 239) rather than a cognate to it (cf. Kogan 2012a:238 on the etymological perspective of these lexemes).

22. *br ‘a type of barge’ (DUL 236), connection with Akk. bēīru ‘fisherman’ (CAD B 31) is, contra Watson 2007:82, very doubtful both formally and semantically.


27. *ght ‘hump’ (DUL 293, Watson 2007:83). As long as the Ugaritic word is thought to mean “hump,” there is no need to consider it a borrowing from Akk. gipšu ‘mass’ (CAD G 85), see SED I No. 82.


29. *grn ‘of average quality’ (DUL 309), supposedly borrowed from Akk. gurnu (CAD G 139). According to Watson 2007:68 “this meaning has been generally accepted,” but D. Pardee (1985:58–59) does not hesitate to connect the Ugaritic word with PS *gurnu- ‘threshing floor,’ which precludes any connection with the Akkadian lexeme.

30. *ḥb ‘sacrificial pit’ (DUL 316, Watson 2007:844), exact interpretation difficult, probably no connection with either Akk. ḫippu ‘hole, depression’ (CAD H 239) or ḥabbu ‘pit’ (ibid. 14).

Watson’s remark “here the form with affirmartive -n seems to be a direct borrowing from Akkadian” is puzzling to us.
31. ḫṭn ‘social group or class’ (DUL 334, Watson 2007:84), semantically uncertain, hardly any connection with Akk. ḫbētu ‘to be tied, girded’ (CAD E 13).

32. ḫḥrt ‘an ingredient in hippiatric pharmacopoea’ (DUL 357), if indeed to be interpreted as “apple” (Watson 2007:68), may be related to Akk. ḫšḥāru (CAD ḫ 139), but the ultimate origin of the whole bunch of terms is far from certain (cf. Pardee 1985:60).

33. ḫbr ‘pot’ (DUL 353, Watson 2007:85), very uncertain, borrowing from Akk. ḫubāru ‘a large vat for beer’ (CAD ḫ 139) is unprovable.

34. ḫkr ‘to knock down’ (DUL 359, Watson 2007:85), totally uncertain, a link with Akk. ḫakāru (CAD ḫ 33) is mere guesswork.

35. ḫr ‘intestines’ (DUL 367, Watson 2007:85), a connection with Akk. ḫrū (CAD ḫ 139) is unprovable.

36. ḫḥrt ‘crimson red’ (DUL 367, Watson 2007:85), totally uncertain, connection with Akk. ḫḥmrātu ‘a red dye’ (CAD 250) is unprovable.

37. ḫrink ‘orchard’ (DUL 368, Watson 2007:85), rather uncertain, borrowing from Akk. ḫrnkku ‘a plant’ (CAD U 235) is unlikely for semantic reasons.

38. ḫsk ‘awarded, assigned’ (DUL 372, Watson 2007:85), rather uncertain, a borrowing from Akk. ḫškku ‘to assign’ (CAD E 327) is hard to substantiate.

39. ḫtg ‘a type of sacrifice’ (DUL 376), if there is a connection between the Ugaritic word and Akk. ḫṭpu ‘a type of sacrifice’ (CAD ḫ 207), it is more likely than the Akkadian lexeme is a West Semitic than the other way round (Pardee 2000:684).


41. ḫḥlg ‘a fruit tree’ (DUL 392, Watson 2007:86), semantic identification tentative at best, a connection with Akk. ḫḥlmku ‘a snake or lizard’ (CAD ḫ 230) is rather uncertain, particularly in view of the phonological difference (cf. Pardee 2000:646 and SED II No. 99).

42. ḫḥdr ‘a fruit tree’ (DUL 398, Watson 2007:68), very uncertain, connection with Akk. ḫḥnzāru (CAD ḫ 170) is doubtful.

43. ḫhr ‘to have spasms of diarrhoea’ (DUL 405), meaning totally uncertain (cf. Pardee 1985:51), but if indeed related to Akk. ḫhrāru ‘to rot, to discharge a putrid liquid’ (CAD Â 237) as tentatively assumed in Watson 2007:69, there is no reason to treat the Ugaritic verb as a borrowing from Akkadian rather than a cognate.

44. The meaning of ḫšt in 1.16 i 3 and 18 is far from clear, and the widely accepted translation ‘sepulchre, mausoleum’ (DUL 412) does not seem to fit the context well enough. Therefore, a connection with Akk. ḫšru ‘hole; grave, pit’ (CAD ḫ 143) assumed in Watson 2007:87 is quite doubtful.

45. ḫṛṣ ‘item, exact portion’ (DUL 369, Watson 2007:85), semantically rather uncertain, a link with Neo-Babylonian ḫrṣu ‘exact’ (CAD ḫ 103) is improbable.

46. ḫb ‘intestine, gut’ (DUL 88, Watson 2007:88), as shown in Pardee 2000:562, connection with Akk. ḫīppu ‘loop’ (CAD K 399) is very unlikely.

47. ḫlm ‘a cult installation’ (DUL 428, Watson 2007:88), connection with Akk.
kābu ‘a chapel’ (CAD K 488) is faced with serious difficulties (cf. Pardee 2000:594).


49. khp ‘to droop, to become depressed’ (DUL 433), meaning totally uncertain, a connection with Akk. kāpu ‘to bend’ (CAD K 192) assumed by Watson (2007:69) is possible, but certainly not in terms of an Akkadian borrowing in Ugaritic.

50. kmī ‘to become angry,’ kmīl ‘anger’ (DUL 445, Watson 2007:88), connection with Akk. kanālu ‘to become angry’ (CAD K 109) is probably to be rejected (Pardee 2000:627).

51. knkt ‘sealed’ (DUL 450, Watson 2007:89), epigraphically uncertain (Pardee 1997:353), connection with Akk. kanāku ‘to seal’ (CAD K 136) is unprovable.

52. ktr ‘a group or profession’ (DUL 469, Watson 2007:91), very uncertain, connection with either Akk. kutturu ‘a profession’ (CAD K 611) or kitru ‘military aid’ (ibid. 467) is unprovable.

53. kū ‘a measure and a container’ (DUL 470, Watson 2007:91), meaning rather uncertain, identification with Akk. kīšu ‘leather bag’ (CAD K 430) is doubtful.

54. lēkā ‘a medicinal plant’ (DUL 701), connection with each of the three Akkadian plant names mentioned by Watson is possible, but comparable terms are attested in so many other Semitic languages1054 that there is hardly any need to postulate an Akkadism in Ugaritic (contra Watson 2007:70: “Evidently an Akk. loanword”).

55. īþ ‘flax seed’ (DUL 719), totally uncertain (cf. Pardee 1985:64), connection with Akk. kitū ‘flax’ (CAD K 473), let alone a borrowing from it, is highly unlikely (contra Watson 2007:70).

56. lbt ‘tyre’ (DUL 493, Watson 2007:91), very uncertain, connection with Akk. libātu ‘rim’ (CAD L 191) is unprovable.

57. ld ‘goblet’ (DUL 493, Watson 2007:91), very uncertain, identification with Akk. ḫūtu ‘a small bowl’ (CAD L 257) is unprovable.

58. lūṯ ‘scorn’ (DUL 508), very uncertain, connection with Akk. lezū (translated ‘to continue, to persist’ in CAD L 163) advocated by Watson (2007:92), let alone a borrowing from it, is highly unlikely (Ford 2002b:189–190).

59. mdīt ‘dispenser, distributor’ (DUL 526, Watson 2007:93), very uncertain, connection with Akk. mādītu ‘official supervising the delivery or distribution of staples’ (CAD M 16) is unprovable.

60. mdīl ‘tower’ (DUL 530, Watson 2007:93). As rightly observed by D. Pardee (2000:675), the meaning of the Ugaritic word is uncertain and its hypothetic relationship to the normal designation of tower (mgdl) remains to be substantiated. A borrowing from Akk. madgaltu (CAD M 16, AHw. 572) is, at any rate, unprovable. 1055

---

1054 To the list of cognates in HALOT 1106 add Jib. ħalkēl (Miller–Morris 1988:344) and Soq. hālkhāl (Miller–Morris 2004:755).

1055 Pardee is right to emphasize that the etymological discussion in this case cannot be limited to this lone Ugaritic form, but should encompass the whole problem of the origin of PWS *magdal- ‘tower’ — attested, as is well known, not only in the NWS area, but also in Min. mgdlhn (LM 36). At the first sight, Akk. madgaltu can be plausibly derived from dagālu ‘to see, to watch,’ which would prompt one to
61. mḏlṯ ‘(DUL 592), totally uncertain, none of the putative Akkadian source-words is in any sense reliable (as admitted by Watson himself, 2007:3).

62. mḏḥtu ‘sandal’ (DUL 529, Watson 2007:93), totally uncertain, borrowing from Akk. mešēnu (CAD M₂ 38) is unprovable and unlikely.

63. mḏmyṯ ‘a medicinal plant’ (DUL 532), identification fully uncertain, a connection with Akk. memētu (CAD M₂ 18) assumed by Watson (2007:69) is possible, but surely not as a borrowing from Akkadian.

64. mḏḥrtr ‘article of clothing’ (DUL 538, Watson 2007:93), very uncertain, derivation from Akk. ḫatartu ‘a quality or color of wool’ (CAD Ḥ 149) is unprovable.


66. mḏšr ‘semolina, forage of partially ground wheat’ (DUL 545), very uncertain, no suitable Akkadian parallel at all is adduced in Watson 2007:69.

67. mḏnd ‘a type of fine flour’ (DUL 561), very uncertain (Pardee 1985:50), comparison with Akk. muntu ‘groats’ (CAD M₂ 201) assumed as certain in Watson 2007:69 remains difficult in view of the final -γ.

68. mšr ‘young of an animal, cub’ (DUL 95, Watson 2007:95), highly uncertain, borrowing from Akk. mškaru ‘foal’ (CAD M₂ 229) is quite improbable (cf. SED II No. 191).

69. mškk ‘harrow’ (Watson 2007:95, cf. DUL 591), totally uncertain, borrowing from Akk. maškakātu (CAD M₁ 368) is unprovable.

70. mškr ‘skin’ (DUL 591, Watson 2007:96), very uncertain, borrowing from Akk. maškara ‘waterskin’ (CAD M₁ 374) is unprovable.


72. mšlt ‘a tool’ (DUL 592), very uncertain, none of the hypothetic Akkadian source-words dealt with in Watson 2007:96 is reliable.

73. The meaning of mḏš (Š) in 1.3 vi 9 is rather uncertain (Pardee 1997:255), the translation ‘to set a vehicle in motion’ (DUL 593, Watson 2007:96) fully depends on the comparison with Akk. mašāru ‘to drag’ (CAD M₁ 359). At any rate, there is hardly any reason to postulate an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic.

74. mnvu ‘a medicinal plant’ (DUL 633), a connection with Akk. nēnū (CAD N₂ 241) is likely, but as Watson himself admits (2007:70), there is no need to postulate an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic (cf. Pardee 1985:60 for related terms in other Semitic languages).

75. ṭhr ‘a type of flour’ (DUL 616, Watson 2007:97), as admitted by Watson himself, any connection with Akk. nḥru ‘dry’ (CAD N₁ 141) is most uncertain.

76. ṭpt ‘sieve, sifter’ (DUL 638), semantically very uncertain, neither Akk. nappūtu ‘sieve’ (CAD N₁ 312) nor Akk. nāptu ‘additional payment’ (CAD N₂ 343) can be interpreted the WS forms as early Akkadian loanwords secondarily distorted under the influence of *gdal ‘to be big.’ However, the fact that the Akkadian word is restricted to Middle Assyrian and Boghasköy makes one think of the opposite course of events: a genuine WS lexeme (perhaps indeed derived from *gdal ‘to be big?’) has been restructured in peripheral Akkadian via popular etymology.
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considered a reliable source of borrowing.

77. **nšlm** ‘guarantee, deposit, pledge’ (DUL 649, Watson 2007:98), highly uncertain, borrowing from Akk. **našlamtu** ‘security for a loan’ (CAD N₂ 65) is unprovable.

78. **prtl** ‘a herb’ (DUL 100, Watson 2007:100), very doubtful, connection with Akk. **pišiduluš** (CAD P 395, presumably a Kassite word) is uncertain.

79. **prz** ‘decision’ (DUL 684, Watson 2007:100), very uncertain (Pardee 2000:624), borrowing from Akk. **purussû** (CAD P 529) is unprovable.

80. **psm** ‘veil, gauze’ (DUL 685, Watson 2007:101–101), very uncertain, borrowing from Akk. **pusmu** ‘a garment’ (CAD P 536) is undemonstrable.\(^{1056}\)

81. **ptr** ‘a container’ (Watson 2007:101, cf. DUL 687), borrowing from Akk. **patiru** ‘a leather bag for holding wool’ (CAD P 277) is unprovable.

82. **pt̂** ‘de luxe box or case for cosmetics’ (DUL 688, Watson 2007:101), rather doubtful, borrowing from Akk. **piššatu** ‘ointment container’ (CAD P 430) is hard to justify.

83. **rš** ‘to toss the head’ (DUL 724), meaning very uncertain (cf. Pardee 1985:62–63), but there is hardly a connection with any of the Akkadian lexemes mentioned in Watson 2007:70. An Akkadian borrowing in Ugaritic is very unlikely.

84. **rîmt** ‘zither’ (DUL 724), an *ad hoc* translation with no etymological support; as long as any connection with *r̂m* ‘to love’ is accepted (so both DUL 724 and Watson 2007:102), the isogloss with Akk. **râmu** is clearly not exclusive, cf. Arb. **r̂m** ‘to love’ (Lane 997), Soq. **r̂m** ‘to be attached to someone, to feel sympathy’ (meaning from our fieldwork notes, ‘désirer’ in LS 391).

85. **rûš** ‘disease of the head’ (DUL 726, Watson 2007:102), highly uncertain, borrowing from Akk. **râšānu** ‘a disease’ (CAD R 191) is unprovable.


87. **slḥ** ‘material for sacrifice’ (DUL 761), semantically highly uncertain (Pardee 2000:273–274), borrowing from any of the Akkadian terms mentioned in Watson 2007:104 is unlikely.

88. **spr** ‘bronze’ (DUL 769), quite uncertain (cf. Pardee 2002a:95), but even if accepted, Akk. **siparru** ‘bronze’ (CAD S 296) is an old *Wanderwort* so that an Akkadism in Ugaritic is hard to prove.

89. **št** ‘baseboard, floor of a chariot’ (DUL 772, Watson 2007:106), very uncertain, borrowing from Akk. **sassu** (CAD S 195) or any of the alternative Akkadian parallels mentioned by Watson is unprovable.


91. **šp** ‘white ewe’ (DUL 787, Watson 2007:107), a rather improbable

\(^{1056}\) The combination **lbš psm** in 4.205:5 can be tentatively interpreted in a variety of ways, and comparison with Hbr. **kātōnāt passû** (HALOT 946) is certainly not the least plausible one.
identification (Pardee 2000:581), borrowing from Akk. šuṣḫu ‘sheep of a special breed’ (CAD § 249) is very doubtful.

92. šīyy ‘raptor’ (Watson 2007:107, cf. DUL 798), quite uncertain (cf. Pardee 1997:350), but even if ša-a-i ‘falcon, hawk’ in the Emar lexical list (Pentiuc 2001:165) is thought to be related, it is by no means certain that the Emar word belongs to the Akkadian rather than local WS lexical stratum.

93. šṭp ‘a commodity’ (DUL 853), highly uncertain, none of the hypothetic Akkadian source-words mentioned in Watson 2007:109 is convincing.

94. tmnl ‘equal amount, equivalent’ (DUL 873), quite uncertain (cf. Pardee 1985:66), as long as the meaning suggested by the authors of DUL is accepted, there is hardly any need to postulate a borrowing from Akk. tamšlu (CAD T 147).

95. šbdl ‘bed’ (DUL 859, Watson 2007:109), borrowing from Akk. tapšaḫu is quite difficult if only for the fact that the Akkadian lexeme, hapax legomenon in a late bilingual text (CAD T 194), does not designate a concrete object (“a bed”), but rather “a resting place” or similar.

96. tvh ‘flask, jar’ (DUL 878), very uncertain (cf. Pardee 1988:178 and the references there), none of the Akkadian etymologies listed in Watson 2007:111 is persuasive.

97. ṭkr ‘to deliver (in payment or tribute)’ (DUL 904, Watson 2007:112), highly uncertain, borrowing from Akk. iskaru (CAD I 244) is unprovable.

98. ṭnṯ ‘a commodity’ (DUL 924), semantically very uncertain, none of the hypothetic Akkadian parallels mentioned in Watson 2007:113 is certain.

99. ṭpt ‘a garment’ (DUL 926), none of the Akkadian parallels listed in Watson 2007:113 is persuasive.

100. ṭrn ‘a vegetable product’ (DUL 933), very uncertain, Akkadian parallels adduced in Watson 2007:113 are all doubtful.

101. ṭṭ ‘a piece of cloth or a garment’ (DUL 936, Watson 2007:113), connection with each of the Akkadian lexemes mentioned by Watson is hard to substantiate.

102. yrṭ ‘coral’ (DUL 983, Watson 2007:114), quite uncertain, borrowing from Akk. ayyartu ‘a shell’ (CAD A1 228) is unprovable.

IV. Others.

1. While an ultimate connection between Ugr. krpn ‘cup, goblet’ (DUL 456) and Akk. karpatu ‘earthen container’ (CAD K 219) is not unlikely, an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic is far from evident in view of the morphological difference (note that in Watson 2007:89 the Ugaritic lexeme is incorrectly adduced as krpt). According to Kaufman 1974:63, this is “an old culture word.”


3. nph ‘personal belongings; clothes’ (DUL 635, Watson 2007:98) does not remotely match any of the meanings of Akk. nipṣu (CAD N2 247) and can scarcely be derived from it.

4. While the meaning of ṣḥbt ‘amphora, jar’ (DUL 737) is relatively clear, there
is, contra Watson 2007:102, hardly any need to postulate a borrowing from Akk. ṣību ‘a vessel’ (CAD R 323).

5. Whatever the meaning of Ugr. ṣīy may be (DUL 750), it is, contra Watson 2007:103, certainly unrelated to Akk. raššū ‘to behave thoughtlessly’ (CAD R 429), which goes back to PS *ṣiš (HALOT 1294, CDG 473).

6. If smd ‘vineyard in blossom’ (DUL 763) is indeed thought to be be related to Akk. samādiru ‘an oliferous aromatic plant’ (CAD S 107), this rare Neo-Assyrian lexeme is unlikely to be considered a source of borrowing in Ugaritic. Rather, together with its Hebrew and Aramaic parallels, it may be of non-Semitic origin (cf. in this sense Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:49).

7. The presence of mlkm ‘kings’ a few lines above makes it virtually certain that srnm in 1.22 i 18 is to be identified with Hbr. sārān ‘governor’ (HALOT 770, DUL 770) rather than with Akk. surru ‘a cup’ (CAD S 413), contra Watson 2007:106.

8. In view of the suitable etymological parallelism with Hbr.  sûb ‘to heap’ and related terms listed in HALOT 999, there is hardly any need to compare sûb in the expression sûb ṭáryh with Akk. šubru ‘slave’ (CAD § 253), contra Watson 2007:106.

9. While the meaning “garment” for Ugr. št is relatively safe because of the parallelism with ṣārīšt (DUL 793, Watson 2007:107), any special connection with the rare Akkadian word āšītu (CAD A, 355) is hard to demonstrate in view of the formal difference.

10. The interpretation of Ugr. šmt ‘fat, grease’ (DUL 830) as a borrowing from Akk. šēmu, pl. šēmētu (CAD Š2 287) is, contra Watson 2007:108, quite improbable in view of the marginal attestation of the Akkadian lexeme.

11. Even if the traditional derivation from šlm is not accepted for ššlmt (‘supplementary delivery or ration according’ to DUL 874), comparison with Akk. sasullu ‘a cloth’ (CAD S, 197) in Watson 2007:109 scarcely provides a better alternative.

12. Any connection between Ugr. tr ‘steering pole of a chariot’ (DUL 876) and the Akkadian verb tāru ‘to turn’ must be considered highly uncertain, and an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic, practically impossible (contra Watson 2007:110).

13. As acknowledged by Watson himself (2007:112, in the wake of several previous researchers), Ugr. š does not regularly correspond to Akk. š, so that the comparison between tkp ‘to be expelled’ (DUL 904) and Akk. sakāpu ‘to push away’ (CAD S 70) remains difficult. In any case, there is hardly any need to postulate an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic.

14. It is hard to see how Ugr. ybl ‘rod’ (DUL 949, Watson 2007:114) can be directly connected with Akk. wābīlu ‘porter’ (CAD A1, 53).

This of necessity selective, yet quite representative inquiry has yielded 153 cases (25 + 12 + 102 + 14) when an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic is, in our view, impossible or highly improbable. Since most of the examples rejected by Watson himself have been omitted and other questionable cases, too, have been rather generously neglected, it turns out that neither 350, nor even 175 Akkadisms in
Ugaritic are in any sense close to the reality. For instance, among the supposed Akkadisms in the Ugaritic hippiatric texts listed in Watson 2007:65–73 there is hardly any single one which can be said to withstand an elementary critical analysis — in glaring contrast with Watson’s “many terms are Akkadian.” Any cultural-historical (or, for that matter, historical-phonological) conclusions made on such a shaky basis are to be treated with utmost skepticism.

Chapter 6.
From Old to Modern Aramaic: the historical unity of Aramaic as reflected in the basic vocabulary

1. Introduction

1.1. What Is Aramaic? The title of John Huehnergard’s groundbreaking article of 1995 anticipates much of its substance. On pp. 266–267 of his study, Huehnergard analyzes a broad scope of phonological and morphological features generally recognized as characteristic of “Classical” Aramaic dialects, such as Biblical and Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac or Mandaic. Huehnergard’s surprising discovery is that few of these features (actually six, some of them with considerable restrictions or reservations) can be detected already in the Old Aramaic (OArm.) inscriptions of 9th–8th centuries B.C. In an attempt to explain this peculiar fact, Huehnergard emphasizes “a certain amount of linguistic diversity” in the Old Aramaic inscriptions, where “clearly a number of distinct early dialects” can be detected. Many of the specific features of “Classical” Aramaic, Huehnergard suggests, arose at some later stage of the development of Aramaic, with all probability in Official Aramaic, which, for Huehnergard, is as a “watershed period in the history of the language” (Huehnergard 1995:272–274).

Huehnergard’s conclusions are based on a penetrating and nearly exhaustive diachronic analysis of Proto-Aramaic (PArm.) phonological and especially morphological features. In this chapter, an attempt will be made to defend the historical unity of the Aramaic language using the evidence of the basic vocabulary. In other words: to what extent does the lexical material preserved in the earliest Aramaic documents correlate with lexical features commonly recognized as specific to Aramaic?

1.2. Two groups of lexical isoglosses uniting Old Aramaic with later Aramaic dialects have been detected. Isoglosses of the first type will be labeled “exclusive,” which means that the root in question is not used as the main term for the respective concept in any other Semitic language. The other group will comprise lexemes which are attested as the basic exponents of the respective concepts in some other Semitic languages, but are

---

1057 A very raw estimate based on our own findings in the main part of this chapter would amount to 45–50 comparatively reliable cases. An overwhelming majority of these lexemes are restricted to material, economic and administrative realia.

1058 With a possible exception of the measure name št (DUL 851, Watson 2007:71).

1059 Let alone statistical speculations similar to those found in Watson 2007:74.

1060 Strong reservations against this general vision of the history of early Aramaic can be found in Loesov 2009 (notably, pp. 430–442).
still far from ubiquitous and, therefore, may become useful for genealogical subgrouping. Such features will be qualified as “non-exclusive.” Finally, some attention will be spent on specifically Aramaic morpholexical features, namely, phonological and morphological phenomena restricted to individual words. These formal peculiarities, too, will be classified into “exclusive” and “non-exclusive.”

These four groups of specific lexical features are analyzed in sections 1–4 of this chapter. Each entry of our inventory will be subdivided into four sections. In the first section, the pertinent lexeme and its basic meaning are adduced, with a reference to DNWSI as a standard tool of Old Aramaic lexicography. The second section (beginning with #) will provide brief textual references, selective for some widely attested words and complete for less common lexical items. Basic lexicographic information about later Aramaic continuants is provided in the third section, marked with ●. The fourth section (beginning with ||) outlines the diachronic background of the lexical feature in question: its origin; presence (and status) vs. absence in other Semitic languages (notably, Canaanite); early Semitic (PS, PWS or PCS) roots probably ousted by the hypothetic innovation.

2. Exclusive pan-Aramaic isoglosses in Old Aramaic inscriptions: lexical items

1. ṣp ‘face’ (DNWSI 83).

# KAI 222A:27–28 ([ys]k tvy vl ṣpy ṣrkh ‘The tvy-insect’ will come up upon the face of its land’), ibid. 42 (w-ymlv vl ṣpyh ‘One strikes her on the face’).

● Continued by JPA ṣappīn, Syr. ṣappyyā, Mal. ffōya (HALOT 1818, DJPA 70, LSyr. 39, GNMD 24).

|| PArm. ṣapp-ay ‘face’ represents a semantic evolution of PS *šanp- ‘nose’ (SED I No. 8), whose incipient stage is also present in Hbr. ṣappayim (HALOT 76–77).

The reflexes of *šanp- replace those of *šan- ‘face’ (SED I No. 215), marginally attested in Official Aramaic only (DNWSI 918). In a concomitant shift, the meaning “nose” came to be expressed by derivatives of PS *nahīr- ‘nostril’ in many Aramaic dialects (SED I No. 198). As one can judge from ṣawh ṣpawh ‘the spirit of his nose’ in KAI 224:2, the first step of this development was a total mixture of these two concepts:

---


1062 Marked with +. In most cases, preference will be given to inscriptions missing from the corpus of DNWSI (such as Tel Dan and Bukān).

1063 In this section, Neo-Aramaic will be usually represented by Turoyo or Mlahşo as reflected in Jastrow 1994 and 2002. It is only when a pertinent root is missing from these sources other modern idioms have been consulted. It must be strongly emphasized that this chapter is not intended to provide an authoritative survey of the distribution of Proto-Aramaic lexical features throughout Middle and Neo-Aramaic. Its only purpose is to show how persistent these features tend to be in both temporal and spatial dimensions.

1064 In Eastern Neo-Aramaic, the meaning “face” is usually expressed by reflexes of PS *piʿ-at- (SED I No. 204); Tur. fogo (Jastrow 2002:162).

1065 The same replacement took place in MSA (see Chapter 8, p. 530 below).
both “face” and “nose” were expressed by the reflexes of *ranap*. In later Aramaic, such a picture seems to be still present in SArm. and JPA (DSA 50, DJPA 69).

2. rzl ‘to go’ (DNWSI 25).

# KAI 222B:39 (w-tlhš nbšk w-trzl ‘You yourself will seek and will go’).1066


|| The origin of PArm. √rzl is uncertain, although an eventual relationship to the biconsonantal element √zl with the meanings “to shake,” “to move,” “to jump” envisaged in DRS 732 cannot be ruled out, cf. Arb. zwl ‘to go to away, to depart, to pass away, to shift’ (Lane 1270), zll ‘to slip, to move away’ (ibid. 1241), zzl ‘to put in the state of agitation’ (ibid. 1242), Gez. zalala ‘to move, to be shaken, to swing, to be agitated’ (CDG 638), Tna. zlalā ‘to spring, to jump’ (TED 1954), Amh. zllalā ‘to jump, to leap’ (AED 1603), Har. zllāla ‘to jump over an obstacle’ (EDH 166), Muh. Msq. Gog. Sod. zllllā, Muh. zllleā, Cha. Enn. Gt. zinnārā, Ezā End. zinnārā ‘to jump, to leap, to start to fly’ (EDG 707). Outside Aramaic, the r-extension is reliably attested only in Hebrew,1067 where this root is, however, only marginally present with the peripheral meanings “to disappear,” “to cease to exist” (vāzial yād ‘The strength failed’ in Deut 32:36, ha-līḥām rāzal mī-kkelēnū ‘There is no bread anymore in our vessels’ in 1S 9:7, rāzālū mayim minnī-yām ‘Water disappeared from the sea’ in Job 14:11).1068

PArm. √rzl probably replaced PS *hlk ‘to go,’ for which see DRS 413, HALOT 246, DUL 337.

3. rbd ‘to make, to do’ (DNWSI 806).

# KAI 309:15 (dmwtr zrt rbd r zy ḫdm hwtr ‘This image he made better than before’), KAI 223B:2 (vdyr w-tbtv z[yy] rbdw ḥln ‘The treaty and the amity which the gods have made’), +.

● Continued by √rbd (HALOT 1941, DJPA 391, LSyrr. 504, Khan 2002:713).

|| As plausibly argued in Huehnergard 1995:276, “this root originally meant ‘to serve’ … and then ‘to work’ and finally ‘to do.’” Only the second stage of this semantic evolution is normal for Hebrew (HALOT 773).1069

PWS *p̪l̪, which became the main verb for “to do,” “to make” in Pho. p̪l and Arb. f̪l̪ (DNWSI 924, Lane 2420), means “to work” in some Aramaic dialects.1070

---

1066 The meaning of this expression is admittedly obscure (v. Fitzmyer 1995:51). The use of rzl in the prefix conjugation (instead of the expected hlk) is noteworthy.

1067 Contrary to the widespread opinion (HALOT 27, Wagner 1966:22), there is hardly any direct semantic proximity between PArm. √rzl ‘to go’ and Arb. rāzal- ‘eternity with respect to past time’ (Lane 54), although an eventual semantic development from “something gone” is, of course, not to be excluded.

1068 It is only in Pr 20:14 that the fundamental meaning “to go away” seems to be attested, and this may well be due to Aramaic influence. This example can reasonably separated from the remaining ones, which may be genuinely Hebrew (cf. Wagner 1966:22 in connection with Dt 32:36).

1069 A few possible (but, at any rate, extremely rare) exceptional examples of Hbr. ṭbd with the meaning “to do,” “to make” are discussed in Wagner 1966:90.

1070 Mostly represented by nominal derivates: JPA p̪r̪l ‘work, wage, possessions;’ p̪̄l ‘day laborer, worker’ (DJPA 441–442), Syr. p̪̄l̪ ‘laboravit,’ p̪̄l̪a ‘opus,’ p̪̄l̪a ‘operarius’ (LSyr. 585–586).
whereas PWS *šy ‘to make,’ ‘to do,’ prominently attested in Sab. Min. Qat. šy (SD 20, LM 16, LIQ 125) and Hbr. ṣāṭa (HALOT 889), is altogether absent from Aramaic.\textsuperscript{1071}

4. ły ‘descendancy’ (DNWSI 883).

# KAI 224:11 (l-hmtt w-l-hmtt bry w-ły ‘To kill myself, or to kill my son and my progeny ...’), +.

- The meaning “progeny” — the only one attested for ły in the OArm. corpus — undoubtedly represents a semantic extension of PArm. *rīkhr- ‘root,’ continued by BA rīkhr (HALOT 1953), JPA ły (DJPA 405), JBA rīkhrā (DJBA 859), Syr. rēkhrā (LSyr. 543).

- PArm. *rīkhr- probably goes back, via metathesis, to PS *sarkh-, *rīk- ‘tendon, vein’ (SED I No. 20).\textsuperscript{1072}

Throughout Aramaic, *rīkhr- is more or less seriously threatening PS *šurš-. In the OArm. corpus, the presence of *šurš- is doubtful.\textsuperscript{1073} A peculiar combination rīkhr šōršōhi is attested in Biblical Aramaic (Da 4:12.20.23), whereas in later dialects the use of *šurš- is rather restricted: it seems to be completely lost in JBA and relatively uncommon in both Syr. (šēršā, LSyr. 810) and JPA (šēš, DJPA 568). At the same time, *šurš- preserves its basic status in Mandaic (šērša, MD 463), where *rīkhr- is probably not reflected at all (cf. MD 356), as well as in Maʿlula (šerša, GNMD 93). In most modern dialects, basic designations of “root” are derived from PS *warād- ‘(jugular) vein’ (SED I No. 287), e.g. Turoyo warīḍa (Tezel 2003:22), Barwar warīḍa (Khan 2008:1072), Betanure warīḍa (Mutzafi 2008:393). However, *rākhr- ‘root’ (presumably identical to *rīkhr- in spite of the structural difference, cf. Mutzafi 2004:215, Sabar 2002:99) is also relatively well attested in Neo-Aramaic, e.g., Hertevin yakra (Jastrow 1988:180).

5. ły ‘to enter’ (DNWSI 855).

# KAI 222B:35 ([w-mlk] ṣy yld w-łykh ‘The king who will enter and take’), KAI 222A:6 (kl ły byt mlk ‘All who enter the palace ...’).


- PArm. *yl ‘to enter’ goes back to PWS *yl ‘to insert,’ ‘to immerse,’ attested in Ugr. yld (DUL 319), Hbr. īl (HALOT 834) and Arb. īl (Lane 2277).\textsuperscript{1074} That *y is

\textsuperscript{1071}As rightly observed in HALOT 890, JBA šy (pa.) ‘to force, compel’ (DJBA 873) is to be connected with Hbr. šy II ‘to press, squeeze’ (HALOT 893) rather than with the present root.

\textsuperscript{1072}Arb. waqqār- ‘what is used medically (plants and their roots)’ (Lane 2110) and Gez. waḵār ‘drug, medicine’ (CDG 68) are borrowed from Aramaic (the Geez term via Arabic). Aramaic origin cannot be excluded also for Hbr. ły ‘to root up’ (Qoh 3:2, Zeph 2:4) and ṣēkhr ‘descendant’ (Lv 25:47), v. HALOT 874.

\textsuperscript{1073}The reconstruction of šēš in KAI 222C:24–25 (w-at yrō šē[s]h šm ‘May his scion inherit no name!’) is widely accepted, but in view of the highly unusual phonological shape of the preceding verbal form (t < *t) the alternative proposals mentioned in Fitzmyer 1995:120 and DNWSI 472 deserve attention. The context of KAI 202B:28 is broken, which makes the reconstruction š[r]š (accepted, e.g., in DNWSI 1195) rather uncertain.

\textsuperscript{1074}Note that the meaning “to enter” is also marginally attested in Arabic.
6. **gbr** ‘man’ (DNWSI 210).

   - KAI 224:1–2 (kl gbr zy ybh rwh ṭpwh ‘Any man who rants . . ’).\(^{1075}\) KAI 222A:39 (w-yh zk yvr gbr šwvr ‘Just as the man of wax is blinded . . ’), KAI 222B:24 (gbr ṭdn hʾ [ṭnh] ‘I am a man of the treaty’).


   - PArm. *gabr- ‘man’ has transparent cognates in Hbr. gābār (HALOT 175)\(^ {1076}\) and Arb. ẓabr- (Lane 374)\(^ {1077}\) and, therefore, must be traced back to PCS *gabr- ‘man’\(^ {1078}\). However, high prominence of *gabr- as the main exponent of the basic meaning “man” with a concomitant gradual extinction of PCS *rinš- ‘man’\(^ {1079}\) is a characteristically Aramaic phenomenon.

7. **gw** ‘interior’ (DNWSI 216).

   - KAI 202B:3 (mlkh b-gwh ‘Its king within it . . ’; context fragmentary).


   - PArm. *gaww- ‘inside, interior’ probably represents a semantic extension of a PS anatomic term, admittedly rather sparsely attested (cf. DRS 106, SED I No. 99). A similar semantic development took place in Arb. ẓaww- ‘inside, interior’ (Lane 478), Min. gw-n ‘partie intérieure d’une construction’ (LM 37) and, probably, Tgr. go ‘to, at, near’ (WTS 558), but in none of these languages we find *gaww- functioning as the

---

\(^{1075}\) Translation from Fitzmyer 1995:141, exact meaning uncertain (for an extensive discussion v. ibid. 143).

\(^{1076}\) Hbr. gābār with the general meaning “man” is relatively common in poetic texts only. Outside the poetic corpus, attestations of gābār are sparse, and in most of them this term is markedly opposed to designations of women and/or children (cf. Dt 22:5, Ex 10:11 and 12:37, Jer 43:6, 44:20). Such a distribution suggests a specialized meaning “adult male” rather than simply “man.”

\(^{1077}\) LA 4 133 adduces one verse in support of this meaning (wā-ṭawm gābān ṭyyuḥā l-ṣabr ‘Good morning, oh man!’), commented upon as ṭyy ṭyyuḥā ṭ-ṣāj̄lu. One may legitimately wonder whether such a usage could be ascribed to the author’s acquaintance with Aramaic (cf. next footnote).

\(^{1078}\) Or even PWS if Gez. gabr ‘slave’ is thought to be related. Interestingly enough, the meaning “slave” for ẓabr- was also known to Arab lexicographers (see a lengthy discussion in LA 4 133), with all probability because of some kind of acquaintance with Gez. gabr.

\(^{1079}\) The details of this process are intricate enough to deserve a special study. While practically no trace of *rinš- seems to be present in such later Aramaic idioms as JPA or Syriac, it is relatively well attested in Official Aramaic (with the remarkable exception of the Biblical Aramaic corpus), where it coexists with *gabr- (cf. Fitzmyer 1995:120). It remains to be investigated whether there is any kind of semantic, syntactic or stylistic distribution between the two terms in various Official Aramaic corpora. As far as the OArm. inscriptions are concerned, ṣ is attested twice in Sefire and once in KAI 202 as opposed to three examples of gbr in Sefire. There is hardly any perceptible difference in the usage of these terms: compare ṭ-ṣ ṭyyuṁh ‘And let no one oppress him’ (KAI 223B:16) with kl gbr zy ybh rwh ṭpwh ‘Any man who rants’ (KAI 224:1–2) or ẓyhkw ṭlmn ṣ[ṭ hʾ w-byṭh ‘May gods overturn that man and his house’ (KAI 222C:21) with w-yh zk yvr gbr šwvr ‘Just as the man of wax is blinded . . ’ (KAI 222A:39).
main term for “inside,” “interior” (= Hbr. הָרָב).\textsuperscript{1080}

8. \textit{ḥsn} 'fortification, stronghold' (DNWSI 393).

\# KAI 202B:8 (ḥšny\* ǧl b-kl gb[ly] 'These strongholds from every side').

- Continued by √ḥsn ‘to be strong’ (HALOT 1878, DJPA 210, LSy. 247, Marrassini 1971:93–94).

[[ The origin of PArm. *ḥsn ‘to be strong’ is uncertain. Hbr. ḥsn is clearly an Aramaic (Wagner 1966:57); the same is almost certainly true of Arb. ḥṣn- ‘fortress’ (Jeffery 1938:110), although ṣ instead of -ṣ is unexpected.\textsuperscript{1081} The well-known Arabic root ḥṣn ‘to be good, beautiful’ (Lane 570) deserves attention as a potential cognate since the semantic shift “good” > “strong” (or vice versa) is not unconceivable.

9. \textit{krk} 'to flee' (DNWSI 1035).

\# KAI 224:4 (w-ḥn ḵrk mnv ḵrk 'If a fugitive flees from me ...'), ibid. 19–20 (w-yḥrk ḵrky ḡl ḫḥlm w-yḥrk ḵrkm w-yṯḥ ḡy 'A fugitive of mine flees to them, or a fugitive of them flees to me').


[[ The origin of this PArm. root is obscure. The correspondence between OArm. ḥ and later Aramaic ṣ unambiguously points to *šrk in the proto-form, but no such root with comparable meaning is attested anywhere else in Semitic. Comparison with Arb. ṣrq 'to go away' (Lane 2017), suggested in HALOT 888, LSy. 550 and elsewhere, further complicates the matter: if accepted, either *ṣ > ṣ in Arabic or *ṣ > ḵ₂ [kx'] in Old Aramaic must be postulated (in both cases, presumably under the influence of ḥ), but such a process has no reliable precedent.\textsuperscript{1082} The very existence of Hbr. ṣrk 'to flee' (Job 30:17) is, as rightly pointed out in HALOT 888, unlikely.

10. \textit{mlh} ‘word,’ \textit{ml} ‘to speak’ (DNWSI 630, 644–645).

\# KAI 222B:8–9 (w- Election ḥdh mn ml ṣprv zn[h] 'Let not one of the words of this

\textsuperscript{1080} The normal equivalent in the Koranic corpus is ḥlāl-: ḥlāl- l-twrqa qwrāran wa-ḥlāla ḥlālahā ḥnhr 'He made the earth firmly established and made rivers within it' (27:61). As for ḥaww- (more precisely, the feminine by-form ḥwaw-at-), only two poetic examples with the meaning “interior” can be found in LA 14 195. Admittedly, ḥwawa/ ḥwawa has become the standard term for “inside,” “interior” in many Arabic dialects, where it is commonly opposed to barra ‘outside’ (v. BH 184 and 64 for guwaba/barra in Egyptian Arabic). It is hard to say to what extent Aramaic influence could be responsible for the emergence of this opposition. As for Pho. gw, it occurs in a problematic passage (KAI 17:1, cf. Gibson 1982:117–118), but even if b-gw in this text is understood as 'in the midst,' this usage is unique in Phoenician, and it is tempting to agree with Friedrich–Röllig–Guzzo 1999:180 who do not hesitate to explain it as an Aramaism.

\textsuperscript{1081} A. Jeffery’s comparison to Arb. ḥṣn ‘to be hard, rough’ would be tenable, but no verb with such meaning is attested in the available dictionaries of Classical Arabic. What is meant is almost certainly Arb. ḥṣn ‘to be rough, harsh, coarse’ (Lane 744), but since Arb. ṣ does not regularly correspond to ṣ in Old Aramaic, this etymology ought to be abandoned.

\textsuperscript{1082} An Aramaism in Arabic is rather hard to imagine in this case, although one may observe that the meaning “to flee” for ṣrq is isolated in Arabic (basic stem only, no nominal derivates). See further Degen 1969:37, Beyer 1994:369.
inscription be silent’), +; KAI 224:2 (w-ymll mlkn lḥyt lḥy ‘And will say bad words against me …’).

- Continued by √mln (pa.) (HALOT 1918, LSyr. 387, DJPA 311).

|| The origin of PArm. *ml∥ ‘to speak,’ *mill-at- ‘word’ is uncertain. Most attestations of Hbr. ml∥ and ml∥ must be due to Aramaic influence, but even if in a few passages it is autochthonous (cf. Wagner 1966:77), the specific status of this root in Aramaic as the basic exponent of the meaning “to speak” is not in doubt. The relationship between PArm. *ml∥ and Arb. ml∥, ml∥ (IV) ‘to dictate’ (LA 11 752) is possible, but far from certain. Note perhaps Gez. tamaḥlala, tamahlala ‘to beseech, supplicate’ (CDG 335), with cognates elsewhere in ES.

11. mšḥ ‘midst, middle’ (DNWSI 677).

# KAI 216:8–10 (w-ršt b-glgl mrry mlk rṣwr b-mšḥ mlkn rbr bn ‘And I ran at the wheel of my lord, the king of Assur, in the midst of great kings’).

- Continued by JPA mlšḥ (DJPA 325), Syr. mešā (LSyr. 399), Mnd. mišia (MD 269), Modern Mnd. mešā (Macuch 1993:415).

|| The origin of PArm. *miš-(at-) ‘midst’ is obscure. It is tempting to compare it with Mhr. ṣmšā, Jib. miš‘downwards’ (ML 272, JL 175), but the semantic development implied by this comparison remains to be elucidated. Borrowing from Greek μέσον supposed by T. Nöldeke (1875:110) can be definitely excluded.

12. nḥt ‘to descend’ (DNWSI 726).

# KAI 309:2 (mḥnḥt ṣr ‘Who rains down abundance …’).


|| The origin of PArm. *nḥt ‘to go down’ is uncertain. As suggested by C. Brockelmann (LSyr. 424), this root may represent an extension of the biconsonantal element *ḥt, attested in Arb. ḥṭ ‘to remove the leaves of a tree,’ (VII) ‘to fell off (the hair from one’s head)’ (Lane 508). An ultimate relationship to PWS *taḥt- ‘under’ (HALOT 1721–1722, CDG 573) cannot be excluded (cf. LSyr. 821).

Marginal presence of nḥt ‘to go down, to descend’ in Ugaritic and Hebrew has no direct relevance for our analysis since yrd clearly remains the basic term for “to go down” in both languages.³⁰⁸⁵

³⁰⁸³ ṣamalahu/samlaḥu = ṣalahu wa-kutiba.

³⁰⁸⁴ Comparison with Soq. Ṽḥt ‘under’ suggested in LS 263 is difficult because the last consonant in this word is Ṵ rather than ṣ, as clearly shown by our fieldwork records. It may be related to Arb. ḥṭ ‘to put down, to make descend; to be low, to abate’ (Lane 592), Mhr. ḫṭ ‘to lay down’ (ML 191), Jib. ḫṭṭ ‘to descend’ (JL 119).

³⁰⁸⁵ Ugr. nḥt is translated as ‘to take down; to reach for; to put at the disposal’ in DUL 628, but, as plausibly suggested in Tropper 1995b:60, the meaning “to cut out” is more suitable for KTU 1.2 iv 11 and 18 (ktv ṣdmn ynh ‘Ktv produced two maces’). Tropper admits the existence of nḥt II ‘senken’ in Ugaritic (ll ḫḥt nḥt ‘II lowered his rod’ in 1:23:37), but this is hardly compelling (“to stretch” or similar would probably be more suitable). As for Hbr. nḥ, those few passages where it clearly means “to go down” (like ḫḥ-rāqō ṣrōl yḥḥātā in Job 21:13) can plausibly be explained by Aramaic influence (Wagner 1966:83). Elsewhere, the interpretation of Hbr. nḥ is rather uncertain and cannot be easily reduced to
PArm. *ṇḥt has completely ousted PS *wṛd ‘to go down’ (DRS 618–619), most probably the basic verb with this meaning in PS.

13. npk ‘to go out’ (DNWSI 741).


- PArm. *npk ‘to go out’ is undoubtedly related to Arb. nfk = ‘to go out from its hole (a jerboa); to die (animals); to be spent (money)’ (LA 10 429–431). Other hypothetical cognates are considerably less reliable:

  - Gez. naafaḥa ‘to tear off, to tear away, to divide, to divide in two, to separate’ (CDG 388, also in the rest of ES)
  - Ugr. ṣ-pk ‘to obtain, to acquire’ (DUL 677), Hbr. ḫē-pīk ‘to reach, to obtain, to find’ (HALOT 920)
  - Sab. Ṣ-pk ‘to demand’ (SD 92), Qat. Ṣ-fwk ‘requirement, obligation’ (LIQ 108).

  All these forms — if indeed related — would point to an original biconsonantal element *pk with various extensions (cf. Zaborski 1971:79–80).

  One could finally compare, as a variant root, Proto-MSA *ŋ:bg, represented by Mhr. naḏūg ‘to come to visit a sick person; to appear from behind’ (ML 283), Jib. nfb ‘to emerge’ (JL 181), Soq. nēfog ‘sortir, paraître’ (LSyr. 370).

  PArm. *npk has replaced PS *wṛd ‘to go out’ (DRS 595–596), with all probability the basic exponent of this meaning in PS. The loss of *wṛd in Aramaic was not complete, however: it is preserved in mwvr ‘sunrise’ in Official Aramaic (DNWSI 604) and, later, as a verbal root with the meanings “to sprout,” “to blossom” (e.g. Syr. yēʿā ‘crevet,’ LSyr. 304). The presence of yyw ‘to go out’ in an Aramaic text in the Demotic script

the common meaning of 牝 in Aramaic. This is, notably, the case of Ps 18:35 = 2S 22:35 (naṣlam ṣadād la-mmilḥāmā ṣ-d-nṣātāt ‘the Temple of Abraham’), which is probably the earliest example of the use of this root in the Biblical corpus.

- Gez. naafaḥa = máṭa; naafaḥa mlḥu = nafaqa, qalla, ḏāḥaba, ḏanīya; nafaqa l-yarbāw min ḥ-php = ḥarāṣa minhu.

- For these forms, together with a possible parallel from Amarna Canaanite, see further Chapter 5 above (pp. 297–298).

- Cf. further Gez. ḥakā ‘to step aside, move over, get out of the way’ (CDG 164), Tgr. ḥak balā ‘s’ecarta un peu,’ ḥakā balā ‘to go away, to give way’ (WTS 663), Amh. ḥak alā ‘to stand aside’ (AED 2297), ḥak ḥa ẓlā ‘to stand or step aside’ (ibid. 2999), Har. ḥak ḥaṣ ‘to move aside’ (EDH 63), Enm. Gyt. Mrp. Sel. Wol. ḥak balā ‘to move aside, away’ (EDG 239, with cognates in other Gurage).

- Although forms with -k (like the Imperfect yəwfrk) are also recorded in LS, parallels in other MSA and our field records make it clear that -g is original. Needless to say, this verb is not the basic term with the meaning “to go out” in Soqotri (which is škāḥ, LS 406). As rightly seen by Leslau (LS 270), nēfog is mostly used about the appearance of heavenly bodies.

- Curiously enough, the same semantic shift is also attested in Soqotri: ƅtu ‘pousser (en parlant des herbes)’ (LS 70). In view of Hbr. ṣwāq ’a ‘offspring, descendant’ (HALOT 993), Arb. ḏwdr ‘origin, root, stock; abundance of offspring’ (Lane 1759) and Gez. ḥq ’shoots’ (CDG 147), it stands to reason that botanical connotations were to some extent inherent in this root as early as in PS.
(DNWSI 1257) must be ascribed to Hebrew influence.

14. rḥm ‘friend’ (DNWSI 1069).
   ☐ KAI 224:8 (kl zy rḥm ḫl ḫl ‘Any one who is a friend of mine’ ...').
   • Continued by JPA rḥm (DJPA 521), JBA rāḥmā (DJBA 1069), Syr. rāḥmā (LSyr. 724), Mnd. rahma (MD 419).
   || PArm. *rāḥim- ‘friend’ is derived from PArm. *rḥm ‘to love,’ unattested in OArm., but widely present in later Aramaic (HALOT 1981, GNMD 75, Macuch 1993:434). This root, in its turn, goes back to PS *rḥm ‘to be compassionate,’ eventually from PS *raḥim- ‘womb’ (SED I No. 231).

15. slk ‘to go up’ (DNWSI 788).
   ☐ KAI 224:14 (w-hn ysl vl lbbk ‘If it comes up to your mind ...’), +.
   || The origin of PArm. *slk ‘to go up’ is obscure. The only immediate parallel is Arb. slk (V) ‘to climb a wall’ (Lane 1410) whose isolated position within Arabic makes one wonder about a possible Aramaic origin (so C. Brockelmann in LSy. 477, contrast Nöldeke 1903:419). Hbr. slk, attested as a hapax legomenon in Ps 139:8 (rāṣṣaḵ), is an obvious Aramaism (Wagner 1966:87). Soq. sšlḵšḏl ‘élevé, haut’ (LS 290) has been compared to this Aramaic root by W. Leslau, which is not impossible.1092

One wonders whether a clue to the etymology of this root can be found in its highly peculiar morphological behavior, viz. the unexpected assimilation *-sl- > -ss- (Beyer 1984:94), probably betraying the secondary origin of -l-. It is, therefore, tempting to follow P. Haupt (1910:712–713) who compared PArm. *slk with Akk. šakū ‘to grow high, to rise, to ascend’ (CAD Š 19, AHw. 1180) and Arb. šq ‘to grow,’ šāqi ‘high, inaccessible’ (LA 14 539). If valid, this comparison would imply that the lateral *š was split into the combination s-l at some early stage of the linguistic history of Aramaic.1093

PArm. *slk has replaced PS *sly/*slw ‘to go up,’ which is only marginally preserved in Aramaic (HALOT 1947).

16. špr ‘beautiful’ (DNWSI 1184).
   ☐ KAI 224:29 ([klmh zy špr w-klmh zy f[h] ‘All that is fine and all that is good ...’).
   || PArm. *špr ‘to be beautiful’ is likely related to Arb. sfr ‘to rise (sun)’ (Lane

---

1091 According to our informants, sšlḵšḏl (du. ššlḵšši, pl. ššlḵššiš) is rather a noun meaning ‘an elevated place.’
1092 In CDG 509, Leslau prefers to relate the Soqotri adjective to Gez. sāqala ‘to hang,’ which is difficult to accept because of the phonological irregularity: the Geez verb goes back to PS *ḫl, whereas Soq. s does not correspond to PS *ḫ.
1093 A fine illustration of such a split is provided by JBA šardā ‘hammock’ (DJBA 165) < PS *srš-, extensively discussed in Steiner 1977:130–136.
for which no further etymology is known. Hbr. >}'spr' (HALOT 1635) is an obvious Aramaism (cf. Wagner 1966:116).

17. ẓḥl ‘to be afraid’ (DNWSI 309).

# KAI 223C:6 (w-ẓḥl hvr mn ld śpr[y] ‘He will be afraid to delete the inscription’), KAI 202A:13 ([w-yrmr ly] bōśmyn ẓl tzhl ‘Bōṣmym said to me: “Do not be afraid!”’).


[[] The only generally recognized cognate of PArm. *ḍḥl (> dḥl) is Ar. ḍahl-‘rancor, malevolence, malice; desire for retaliation of a crime’ (Lane 956). The existence of cognates in Hebrew and Ugaritic has often been admitted (cf. DRS 330), but most of the supposedly pertinent examples are rather problematic. Thus, Hbr. ẓḥl ‘to be afraid’ is thought to be attested in Job 32:6 (val-kēn zāḥaltī wā-ōrā(r) mē-hāwāwāt dén ġāē yātām), but the meaning “to withdraw, to retire” suggested by Ar. ẓḥl (Lane 1220, BDB 267) is no less suitable (cf. Clines 2006:684). For Ugr. dḥl ‘to fear’ (DLU 269) in KTU 2.16:12 v. above in Chapter 5 (p. 325).

3. Exclusive pan-Aramaic isoglosses in Old Aramaic inscriptions: morpholexical features

1. ẓḥrn ‘other’ (DNWSI 41).

# KAI 224:24 (w-k-zy ḍḥbr ḍḥrn byt [yby hvr h]wt l-ẓḥrn ‘When the gods struck my father’s house, it came to belong to another’), KAI 310:11 (context fragmentary).

● Continued by BArm. ẓḥhrān (HALOT 1810), JPA ẓḥhrān (DJPA 38), Syr. (r)ḥrenā (LSyr. 13), Mnd. hurina (MD 137), Tur. ħreno (Jastrow 2002:166).

[[] While adjectives with the meaning “other” derived from PS *ḥfr are widespread throughout Semitic (v. DRS 15, HALOT 35–36), obligatory presence of the suffix *-ān is specifically Aramaic. Whether the vocalic pattern underlying OArm. ẓḥrn was *C₃uC₄C₅ān- (as in later Aramaic) cannot be ascertained.¹⁰⁹⁶

2. ẓḥlm ‘child’ (DNWSI 854).

# KAI 222A:21–22 (w-ṣḥv [mh]ynkn ymḥl[n śdyhn w-]yḥynkn ẓḥlm w-ōl yḥv ‘Seven nurses will anoint their breasts and feed a child, but he will not be sated’), KAI 309:21 (w-mḥ nṣhn lḥynkn ẓḥlm w-ōl yrwy ‘Should one hundred women suckle a child, may it not be sated’).

¹⁰⁹⁴ Other meanings of the Arabic root (such as “to sweep a house,” “to disperse the clouds,” “to make apparent, manifest”) are also noteworthy.
¹⁰⁹⁵ Some of the meanings of Gez. zəḥala (CDG 634) and especially its modern EthS cognates (like Tna. zāḥelā ‘to calm down, to decelerate, to be slow, to dawdle, to tarry,’ TED 1960–1961) might also be compared.
¹⁰⁹⁶ DNWSI 41 lists the preposition ḥr-ru-un-ā ‘after him’ in EA 245:10 together with the Aramaic adjectives, but this is incorrect semantically and, most probably, also formally, as the structure of the Amarna term clearly corresponds to Hbr. nāḏrōn and not to PArm. *nāḥrōn-. Cf. Sivan 1984:133, Rainey 1996 III 122.
- Continued by OffArm. ʾlym (DNWSI 854), JPA ʾwlym (DJPA 399), Syr. ʾlaymā (LSyr. 528).

[1] Together with PArm. *zwyayr- 'small' (see pp. 419-420 below in this chapter), PArm. *yulaym- is an exceptional manifestation of the diminutive pattern *C₁μC₂ηyC₃η, otherwise typical of Arabic only. Contrast Hbr. vālām < *ylaṁ- (HALOT 835). Since the Arabic cognate γυλάμ- (Lane 2286) displays -ā rather than -ay-, the Proto-Aramaic vocalic shape *yulaym- becomes quite unique in Semitic.

The degree of semantic overlap between PArm. *yulaym- and its CS cognates (for which see Chapter 3, pp. 184-185 above) is not easy to ascertain. While Hbr. vālām and vālmā (HALOT 835) are clearly unlike with no basic status, Ugr. γlm (DUL 319), Arb. γulām- (Lane 2286) and Sab. γlm (SD 53) are rather broadly attested and may functionally correspond at least to some meanings of PArm. *yulaym-.

3. by 'house' (DNWSI 156–157).

[2] KAI 216:16 (by ḫyš h-bh ʾy-code 'There was no good house for my fathers').

- Continued by JPA byy, Syr. bay, Jilu biya (DJPA 92, LSyr. 69, Fox 1997:127).

[3] Loss of -t in st. abs. (occasionally also st. constr. and st. emph.) of this lexeme, although not pan-Aramaic, is so widely attested in later dialects — and so conspicuously absent from other Semitic languages — that one can safely list it a specifically Aramaic morphological feature.

4. hwk 'to go' (DNWSI 280).

[4] KAI 224:6 (ʾd ṣhk ʾmn 'Until I come ...'), KAI 224:5 (w-yhkn ḫlb 'They go to Aleppo'), yhk sl [v伯hw] 'He went to his forefathers' (KAI 310:3), w-yhk ḥdd ḡdm 'Ḥdd went before me' (ibid. 5).

- Continued by BArm. ʾphāk (HALOT 1859) and OffArm. yhk (DNWSI 281).

[5] The origin of PArm. *hwk as the prefix-conjugated element of the suppletive paradigm of the verb with the meaning “to go” is debatable, but an ultimate connection with PS *hlk 'to go' appears to be the most likely solution. As rightly emphasized in CDG 220, there is hardly any relationship between these Aramaic forms and Gez. ḥoka 'to stir, to move, to agitate' (contra Nöldeke 1907:142, Garr 1985:145 and others).

5. krs̄r 'throne' (DNWSI 536).

---

1097 See Beyer 1984:437, 570, 659.
1098 Admittedly, the variant *yulām- is also sporadically attested in Aramaic (DJPA 399, DJBA 847).
1099 As opposed to nusāwi/nusārâ (BDB 654–655) and yālādi/yaddâ (BDB 409).
1100 Further elaboration on this topic is beyond the scope of the present survey, but some preliminary observations may be not superfluous in this context. Thus, Ugr. γlm is widely attested, but only in poetry (its non-poetic equivalent was likely n̄r, see further Chapter 5, pp. 294-295 above). As for Sab. γlm, the passages listed in Biella 395–396 suggest that its semantic function was probably to emphasize the sex distinction ("male child").
1101 For a typologically similar phenomenon cf. perhaps Soq. mi 'death' (LS 304).
1102 Also in JPA epigraphy: ṣhk, mhk (DNWSI 282). The form l-mhk in JBA is qualified as “archaic” (DJBA 373). All in all, it is fair that this feature did not survive in later Aramaic.
6. **mrn** 'vessel' (DNWSI 588).

# KAI 309:16–17 (ményr ūy byt ḫdd ṣmr 'The vessels of the temple of Ḫdd my lord').

● Continued by JPA mā(r)n, Syr. mā(r)nā, Barwar mana (HALOT 1910, DJPA 288, LSyR. 373, Khan 2008:1326).

[|] The primary noun **šnūy-** 'vessel' is attested throughout Semitic, but the obligatory prefixation of ma- is specifically Aramaic.

7. **rbbr-n** 'big, large (pl.)' (DNWSI 1058).

# KAI 216:10–11 (mlk n rbbr bnly ksp w-bnly zhb 'Great kings, owners of silver and owners of gold'), ibid. 12–14 (w-hyṯḥn mn byt ḫd mlkn rbbrbn 'I made it better than the house of any powerful king'), KAI 223A:7 (b-kl rbbr 'Among all the nobles of ...').


[|] The reduplicated plural of the adjective *rabb- 'big' is exclusively Aramaic.

8. **štḥ** 'to be silent' (DNWSI 1200).

# KAI 222B:8 (w-dl šṭḥ ḫdḥ mn ṣpr ṣn[h] 'Let not one of the words of this inscription be silent').


---

105 Meaning uncertain (= Akk. ana tirī kussīša 'for the extension of his reign').

106 Since Akk. kussē mentioned in Fitzmyer 1995:155 after Bauer–Leander 1927:233 does not exist, kussū (kussīnu) is not a “second,” but rather the only attested form of this word in Akkadian. As for the unique ksbīy instead of the expected krsy in KAI 224:17, it is of course reminiscent of Hurrian kešī (Laroche 143, CAD K 451), borrowed into Ugaritic as ḫṣ (DUL 434). There are good reasons to suspect that the r-insertion in Aramaic and the guttural insertion in Hurrian/Ugaritic/Amarna are somehow related to each other, but no clear explanation for this similarity is at hand.


108 Arb. mīnu isport (LA 15 486) cannot be separated from Hbr. nūniyyā 'ship' (and, consequently, from PS *YnYy- 'vessel'), but there is, clearly, no direct formal relationship between this term and PArm. *mra- 'vessel. The presence of mra (with r-!) in Tall Fāhariyya makes the interpretation of *mra- as an Iranian loanword highly improbable, although some kind of Iranian influence on later stages of the development of Aramaic cannot be ruled out (cf. Ciancaglini 2008:200–201).
While ultimately related verbs are attested elsewhere in Semitic,\footnote{107} the consonantal composition “sibilant—non-emphatic dental—emphatic velar” expressing the meaning “to be silent” is characteristically Aramaic.

4. Non-exclusive pan-Aramaic isoglosses in Old Aramaic inscriptions: lexical items

1. *nš ‘man’ (DNWSI 84).
   \# KAI 224:16 (w-hm yšk †l [f]bb mlky ẓrpd b-klmh ẓy ymwt br ṭmš ‘And if the idea should come to the mind of the kings of Arpad, in whatever way anyone shall die’).\footnote{1108}
   \[ Application of PCS (or PWS) *Vnāš- to one single individual (“person,” “(some)one”) — to some extent combined with the generic sense “mankind” and the collective meaning “people”\footnote{1110} — is a highly peculiar Aramaic feature with no obvious elsewhere in Semitic.\footnote{1111}

2. *rrh ‘road, way’ (DNWSI 106).
   \# KAI 224:8–9 (ṛṭḥḥ by ṭrḥ ‘The road shall be open for me’).

\footnote{107} Two widespread prototypes are *ṣkt and *ṣkt. The former is represented, inter alia, by Hbr. ṣkt ‘to be at rest’ (HALOT 1641), Syr. ṣkāṭā ‘silentium’ (LSyr. 798), Arb. sqf ‘to fall’ (Lane 1379), Mhr. ḫdāq ‘to be lost’ (ML 155), Jib. ṣkāṭ ‘to be lost, to drop off’ (JL 261), Soq. ḫq̄ ‘être impotent’ (LS 146, not known among our informants). For the latter (with a few so far unexplained sibilant deviations), cf. Akk. saktu ‘to be silent’ (CAD S 74), Hbr. škt ‘to be quiet’ (HALOT 756), Syr. škēt ‘jacuit, quievit’ (LSyr. 778), Arb. škt ‘to be silent’ (Lane 1389), Qat. škēt ‘ceasing, falling into abeyance’ (LIQ 160), Gez. sakata ‘to encamp, to lodge, to rest’ (CDG 497), Tgr. škētā ‘to fall, to tumble; to be absent, to be lost’ (WTS 223).

\footnote{108} ‘A man’ or ‘a human being.’ This inscription attests the early use of this phrase in a generic sense” (Fitzmyer 1995:154).

\footnote{109} For the complex diachronic background of this form v. extensively in Chaper 3, pp. 175-176 above.

\footnote{110} As rightly observed by M. Wagner (Wagner 1966:227), in this sense the Aramaic term rather closely corresponds to Hbr. ṭāḏām (cf., in particular, the combination br ṭš in Sefire and its numerous parallels in later Aramaic on the one hand and bān-ṭāḏām in the Old Testament on the other). At the same time, it should not be forgotten that the individual meaning of Hbr. ṭāḏām is rather marginally attested (as shown in Chapter 5, pp. 273-274 above, the Phoenician and Ugaritic cognates probably had a different functional status). The difference in semantic and functional properties between ṭāḏām and ṭ̀mnš is undoubtedly due to the fact that Hbr. ṭš is commonly used as both vir and homo, whereas Arm. gbrā means vir only, so that a special general word for “human being, person” was always needed.

\footnote{111} The only straightforward exception seems to be Tgr. ṭ̀msh ‘man’ (WTS 371), and it is because of this parallel that one is forced to consider this Proto-Aramaic feature non-exclusive. The Tigre lexeme is completely isolated in Ethiopian Semitic and might theoretically be attributed to Arabic influence, but in view of the lack of reliable semantic precedents in Arabic such a possibility must remain purely hypothetical (Bulakh–Kogan 2011:3–4). Another possible exception is Sab. Min. Qat. ṭns (SD 6, LM 6, LIQ 13), but the vocalic structure of the ESA forms is uncertain (cf. Stein 2003:56). At any rate, both the form and the meaning(s) of PArm. *Vnāš- are atypical for Canaanite: Hbr. ṭ̀mnš is a rare and almost exclusively poetic word (HALOT 70) whose presence in the Biblical corpus may at least partly be conditioned by Aramaic influence (in spite of ḏ < *ā, cf. Wagner 1966:26–27). Arb. (m)nš- is only used with a collective/plural meaning (Lane 114).}
Continued by JPA metōhē, Syr. metōhē, Qaraqosh metōxa (HALOT 1824, DJPA 42, LSyr. 47, Khan 2002:727).

PArm. *metōh- 'road' is obviously identical to Akk. urētu (AHw. 1429, also one of the main terms with this meaning) and Hbr. ṭōrah (HALOT 86), which is, however, a relatively rare and almost exclusively poetic term. In ESA, ṭōh means ‘affair, matter, undertaking’ (SD 7), ‘orders, instructions; affair, matter’ (LIQ 15), ‘affaire, chose’ (LM 7), perhaps a semantic extension of the non-attested meaning “road,” “way.” Soq. ṭōrah ‘venir, arriver’ can also be related to this root (cf. LS 74, where a few other, less convincing comparisons, are proposed).

3. ṣēr ‘place’ (DNWSI 125).

KAI 224:5–7 (šl w ṣērk m ... ṣt ṭpw b-ṣērh ‘Stay quietly in your place ... do not turn to his place’).


PArm. *metār- ‘place’ goes back to a widely attested PS *metār- (DRS 37), but it is only Akk. aṣru (CAD A2 456, AHw. 82) that also functions as the main exponent of this concept. Other cognates denote “footstep,” “trace,” which is probably to be reconstructed as the original meaning of this PS root: Arb. ṭattār- (Lane 18), Sab. Min. ṭār (SD 9, LM 8), Gez. ṭāsar (CDG 45).

4. ṭīy ‘to come’ (DNWSI 133).

KAI 224:11 (ṛt trth w-liḥm dny mnh yd ūny ‘You must come and avenge my blood from the hand of my enemies’), +.

Continued by ṭīy (HALOT 1828, DJPA 80, LSyr. 54, Jastrow 2002:185).

This PArm. root goes back to PWS *ṭīy/*ṭīw, which became (one of) the main verb(s) with the meaning “to come” in several other Semitic languages (such as Ugaritic, Arabic, Sabaic and Geez, v. DUL 123, Lane 14, SD 9, CDG 46). At the same time, Hbr. ṭālā is a rare poetic verb whose presence in some Biblical passages may be due to Aramaic influence (Wagner 1966:31).

5. ṣēr ‘to look for, to require, to wish’ (DNWSI 180).

KAI 224:10–11 (w-ybḥ ṣēy ū-hmṭṭy ‘He will seek my head in order to kill me’),

---

The only exception seems to be the euphemistic expression ṭōrah ka-nnāšīm ‘menstruation’ in Gn 18:11; the normal Hebrew word for “road,” “way” (dārāk) is also attested in similar contexts (Schorck 2000:93–94, 111).

It seems wise to treat separately KAI 222A:5 (w-rm bnwh ṭyn b-ṣē[r]h), similarly KAI 222B:3, as ṣēr in this passage can be alternatively translated as “after him,” “following him.” However, parallelism with Hbr. (bi-)mḵōm (BDB 880) seems to suggest that the literal meaning b-ṣēr in Old Aramaic was “in his place.”

Two examples of ṣēr with the meaning “place” are known from Phoenician and Punic (DNWSI 125), but the main exponent of this concept in Phoenician was obviously mḵōm, attested in a broad variety of contexts (DNWSI 679).
Continued by $\sqrt{bry}$ (HALOT 1836, DJPA 107, LSyrr. 82, GNMD 10, Khan 2002:714).

The reflex of PS *$bgy$ (DRS 75–76) functions as the main verb with the meanings “to look for,” “to search,” “to examine” also in Akkadian (D-stem, AHw. 145, CAD B 360). Both “to wish” and “to search” are well attested as the meanings of Arb. $bgy$ (Lane 231), and it is not unlikely that on some stages of the development of Classical Arabic this verb functioned as one of their main exponents. Hbr. $b\dot{a}\dot{v}\dot{a}$ (HALOT 141) is sparsely attested and may well be borrowed from Aramaic (but cf. HALOT 1836).

6. $huh$ ‘serpent’ (DNWSI 353).

$\#$ KAI 222A:30–31 ([ŷk̂l p̂]m ḥabh w-pm ẓerb w-pm dbhh w-pm nmrh ‘May the mouth of a snake eat, and the mouth of a scorpion, and the mouth of a bear, and the mouth of a leopard’).

Continued by JPA $hîwyâ$ (DJPA 197), Syr. $hewyâ$ (LSyr. 220), Mla $hewyo$ (Jastrow 1994:178).

$\#$ PArm. *$hîwy$- ‘snake’ is undoubtedly related to Arb. $hayyat$- (Lane 681), also functioning as one of the main designations of “snake.” Both terms are ultimately derived from PS *$hw$w ‘to live’ and originally meant “an animal,” “a living being.” For the semantic development “animal” > “snake” v. extensively SED II No. 159 and above in Chapter 5 (p. 296).

7. $hzy$ ‘to see’ (DNWSI 357–359).

$\#$ KAI 222A:13 (pkhw ṭynykm l-hzyh ‘Open your eyes to look at’), KAI 222A:28 (w-l-ydzh yâk ‘No green may be seen’).

Continued by $\sqrt{hzy}$ (HALOT 1872, LSyrr. 224, Jastrow 1994:158).

The PS root *$hdy$/*$hzy$ was generalized as one of the main verbs with the meaning “to see” — most probably, at the expense of PWS *$r\gamma$ — also in Ugaritic.

---

1115. It is not improbable that ybrh in the difficult passage kl gbr zy ybrh rah $\gamma$pah (KAI 224:1–2) also belongs to this root rather than to the alleged homonym br $\gamma$ ‘to rant’ (contra Fitzmyer 1994:221).

1116. Mostly in Babylonian and, remarkably, never in Old Assyrian, where šwârum is normally used instead (Kogan 2006c:195). CAD B 365 is right to point out that the meaning “to wish” for bwrâ, widely attested in some peripheral varieties of Akkadian, is likely due to WS influence, although (contra CAD) Ugr. $b\dot{y}y$ is not a useful illustration: in the only passage where this verb is attested, the most contextually suitable meaning is “to reveal,” “to show”: râm w rânh nbyyh ‘Come and I will reveal it to you’ (KTU 1.3 iii 28–29, DUL 218), whose etymological background remains to be established.

1117. For more certainty, further inquiry into early Arabic text corpora is needed. As far as the Koranic usage is concerned, both $b\dot{y}yâ$ and $\dot{h}b\dot{y}yâ$ are well attested, but $\dot{s}p$ and $\dot{r}w$ for “to wish” are by far more prominent.

1118. Apparently, side by side with $\dot{f}w\dot{b}³n$- (Lane 337). Both terms are present in the Koranic corpus, but the number of attestations is so meager in each case (one vs. two) that no meaningful conclusion about their functional distribution is possible.
and, peculiarly, in Southern Ethiopian (Cha. ažā and related forms listed in EDG 123, see further in Chapter 2, p. 111 above). Hbr. ḥāzā (HALOT 301) is an almost exclusively poetic verb whose presence in the Biblical corpus may be partly due to Aramaic influence (Wagner 1966:54). The situation in Phoenician is more problematic: ḥz is the only verb with the meaning “to see” attested in the corpus, but two out of three extant examples come from KAI 24 where Aramaic influence would be natural (explicitly treated as an Aramaism in Tropper 1993a:278).

8. ḫdm ‘before’ (DNWSI 988).
# KAI 309:1 (dnmts ṣy ḥdssy ṣm ḫdm ḥdd ṣkn ‘The statue of Ḥdssy which he has set up before Ḥdd ṣkn), KAI 310:5 (w-ṣḥk ḥdd ḫdmym ‘Ḥdd went before me’), +.
• Continued by JPA ḫwːm, Syr. ḫdːm, Mal. ḫːdm (HALOT 1967, DJPA 478, LSyR. 647, GNMD 68).

## Prepositions with the meanings “in front of,” “before” derived from PS *ḫdm are attested in a few other Semitic languages:1121 Akk. anu ṭhummi, ṭhum-iš (CAD Q 295, AHw. 926), Ugr. ḫdm (DUL 694), Sab. Ḫdm(y) (SD 104), Qat. b-ḫdmw (LIQ 22), Min. Ḫdm-ṣy, ṣ-ḫdm (LM 70), Gez. ḫḏm (CDG 421). Most of them are functionally marginal, but at least Gez. ḫḏm seems to come close to PArm. *ḫuḏām- in terms of semantic equivalence. From the strictly lexical point of view, this isogloss is, therefore, not exclusive, and it is rather the morphological pattern that makes PArm. *ḫuḏām- so highly specific (admittedly, the vocalic patterns underlying the Ugaritic and ESA forms cannot be elicited).1122

9. Ḫtl ‘to kill’ (DNWSI 1006).
# KAI 224:18 (w-ṭḥmr lh Ḫtl ṣḥk ‘You will say: ‘Kill your brother!’’), KAI 310:6–8 (w-Ḫtl ml[kn] ... Ḫtl ‘I killed kings ... I killed ...’), +.

## The reflexes of PWS *Ḫtl as the main verbs with the meaning “to kill” also in Arabic (qtl), ESA (Sab. Qat. Ḫtl) and EthS (Gez. ḫṭala), v. Lane 2984, SD 109, LIQ 150, CDG 451. Early presence of Ḫtl in the Syrian area is assured by the well-known expression ḫɔyrəm ḥṭalu ‘to kill an ass’ in the Old Babylonian Mari texts (Streck 2000:110). At the same time, there is no reason to doubt that Hbr. Ḫtl is borrowed from Aramaic (with Wagner 1966:100–101). See further Chapter 2, p. 111

1119 Where, however, ṯn (DUL 167–168) and ḥy (DUL 667) are better attested (see Chapter 5, p. 254 above).
1120 For a few highly uncertain attestations of ṭn in the Phoenician corpus v. DNWSI 1041.
1121 Tropper’s assertion “ausschliesslich aram.” (1993a:281) is thus to be corrected.
1122 There are good reasons to suspect that Arb. quddām- ‘in front (of)’ is due to Aramaic influence. While it is true that quddām- as naqiɣa wawār in is mentioned in LA 12 42, one will not lose sight of the fact that both examples of the prepositional use quoted in Fr. III 410 are taken from an Arabic translation of Gospels. One wonders to what extent the broad presence of quddām in (pre-)modern Arabic dialects (Dozy II 324, 689, BH 689, Behnstedt 980) can be accounted for by Aramaic influence.
1125 Forms with emphatic ʿ cease to be attested in post-OArm. dialects. A well-known exception is yḵtlak in KAI 225:11, whose non-emphatic k is highly unusual and remains to be explained.
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above.

10. **mr** 'lord' (DNWSI 682).
   
   # Passim throughout the OArm. corpus.
   
   
   || PArm. *māri-* 'lord' goes back to PS *mar-* 'man, male' (Fronzaroli 1964:28–29, 42). This term has gradually replaced PS *bal-* (HALOT 142, DUL 206), which is mostly relegated to the meaning “husband” in later Aramaic dialects (DJPA 108, LSyrr. 83, MD 60). In the OArm. corpus, **mr** and **bl** seem to occur in complementary distribution: the former is used for “lord” (divine or human, usually a superior king) and the later, for “owner”: contrast KAI 216:9 (*mr̄ y mlk *šwr* ‘My lord, the king of Assur’) and 10–11 (*bl̄ ksp̄ w–bl̄ zhb* ‘Owners of silver and owners of gold’). The semantic development “male” > “lord” took place also in ESA (Sab. Min. Qat. **mr**, SD 87, LM 62, LIQ 98), where **bl** is also in evidence (SD 25, LM 19, LIQ 31).

   The morphological shape of PArm. *māri-* is highly peculiar and may be treated as a remarkable morpholexical isogloss.

11. **šhd** ‘to witness’ (DNWSI 1113).
   
   # KAI 222A:12 (*w-kdm *yw̃ w-lylh *šhdn kl *r̄[l̄y ktk*] ‘And in the presence of Day and Night all the gods of Ktk are witnesses’).
   
   
   || The only cognate of PArm. *š̄d* ‘to witness’ is Arb. *shd* with the same meaning (Lane 1609). Hbr. *šâhêd* in Job 16:19 is an obvious Aramaism (Wagner 1966:109).

12. **šr** ‘wall’ (DNWSI 1190).
   
   # KAI 202A:10 (*w-hrmw šr mn šr ḥzk* ‘They raised a wall higher than the wall of Ḥzk), ibid. 17 (*šwr̄ ḡzn ‘this wall,’ context fragmentary).
   

   || The only immediate cognate of PArm. *š̄r*- ‘wall’ is Arb. *sūr*- with the same meaning (Lane 1464). The Arabic term has often been considered an Aramaism (Fraenkel 1886:237–238), which becomes less evident in view of Sab. *ms̄wr* (pl.) ‘wall,’ *h-s̄r* ‘to build a wall’ (SD 129), Qat. *š̄wr* ‘to build a wall around’ (LIQ 159) and Tgr. *sor* ‘wall, partition wall’ (WTS 193, unless an Arabism). Hbr. *šūr*, although probably autochthonous in such passages as Ps 18:30 = 2S 22:30 and Gn 49:22, is a rare poetic

---

1124 The meaning of **bl** in the expressions *bl̄ ktk*, *bl̄ rpd*, *kpryh w-br̄ yh* is not entirely clear (“citizens,” “aristocracy”).


1126 From a purely morphological point of view, we are faced with the *C₂,C₃,C₄*- pattern of the active participle of the basic stem. Shall one tentatively surmise that the primary noun *mar*- was rebuilt after this pattern because of the “actant” meaning of the concept “lord” (“one who owns, governs”)?

1127 Already in the Koran (57:13).

1128 Cf. also Jib. *essōr* ‘to bring branches to make a fence or house’ (JL 232).
synonym of the standard Hebrew terms for wall, such as ḵīr, ḫōmā and ǧādēr (Wagner 1966:112). No fully persuasive verbal origin for *šūr- is at hand, but an ultimate connection with Gez. sawawara ‘to hide, conceal, shield, screen, protect’ (CDG 520, with cognates in other ES) and Mhr. șr ‘to cover’ (ML 351), Jib. serr id. (JL 231) cannot be excluded (cf. Marrassini 1971:76–79).

13. šr ‘to release’ (DNWSI 1192).

# KAI 224:18 (w-[l] šr yh ‘Do not release him’).


- The meaning “to begin,” typical of this PArm. root in the intensive stem, is shared by Akk. šarrû (CAD Š 3358). Further possible cognates include Ugr. šr ‘to release’ (DUL 846),1129 Arb. šr ‘to throw off, to remove’ (Lane 1353), Gez. saraya ‘to pardon, to absolve, to forgive’ (CDG 515, with cognates in other ES). Hbr. šārā ‘to let loose’ (Job 37:3) is an obvious Aramaism (Wagner 1966:116).

14. tnn ‘smoke.’

# KAI 320:8 (w-ybd mtn mth tnn yh ‘May the smoke of the fire disappear from his country’).

- Continued by JPA tnn (DJPA 587), Syr. tennānā (LSyr. 828), Arbel tinna (Khan 1999:583).


15. yhd ‘to give’ (DNWSI 442).

# KAI 309:10 (kn n yhd lh ‘He set up and gave to him …’), KAI 222B:38 (w-hn l-thb lhmy ‘If you do not give my provisions …’).


- Reflexes of PWS *whb (DRS 508) also function as the main verbs with the meaning “to give” in most of EthS (v. CDG 609 and further remarks in Chapters 2 and 7, pp. 69 and 432 respectively).

16. ykd ‘to burn’ (DNWSI 465).

# KAI 222A:35 (ykh zy tkd šwtz z b-nš kn tkd ypd ‘Just as this wax is burned by fire, so may Arpad be burned’).


- PS *wkd/*kw ‘to burn’ is relatively well attested (DRS 601), but neither Hbr. ykd, nor Akk. ḫād, nor Arb. ḫd can be said to function as the basic verbs with the meaning “to burn” (intransitive) in the respective languages.

---

1129 *Hapax legomenon* in KTU 1.4 v 9 (šr l ʿarṣ bkn ‘To release his lightning to the earth’), subject to alternative interpretations (notably, a Š-stem form from the widely attested PS root *wry/w ‘to throw, shoot,’ DRS 622).

1130 An Aramaism in Geez suggested in Rabin 1975:92 can be safely excluded.
5. Non-exclusive pan-Aramaic isoglosses in Old Aramaic inscriptions: morpholexical features

1. br ‘son’ (DNWSI 188).
   # Passim in the OArm. corpus.
   || As suggested in Testen 1985, PArm. *bir-1131 probably represents a specific phonological evolution of PS *bin- (or bn-?) ‘son.’ As is well known, this PArm. feature is shared by MSA.1132

2. hwy ‘to be’ (DNWSI 271).
   # KAI 224:21–22 (ktlw mnrkm w-hwy hlpbh ‘Kill your lord and be his successor’), KAI 309:12 (hdd gbr hwy kblh ‘May Hdd the hero be his adversary’), KAI 320:3 (zy hwh b-kl ṭlk ‘Which will happen in the land…’), +.
   || As rightly pointed out by J. Tropper (1993a:280), “in dieser Bed. und mit w als zweitem Radikal ausschliesslich aram.” The Hebrew form with y (hāyāh, HALOT 241) is probably an innovation in view of Akk. ewû ‘to turn into’ (CAD E 413, AHw. 266) and Arb. hwy ‘to fall’ (Lane 3046), Mhr. ḥwā’i id. (ML 162), Jib. ḥē id. (JL 100), Tna. hiw bālā id. (TED 38).1133 The presence of hāwā in the Biblical corpus is marginal and may be partly due to Aramaic influence (Wagner 1966:45).

3. ḥd ‘one’ (DNWSI 32).
   # Passim in the OArm. corpus.
   || Outside Aramaic, aphaeresis of ṛa- in PS *ʁaḥad ‘one’ is regular in some varieties of modern EthS (v. EDG 322 under Sel. Zwy. ḥad). J. Huehnergard (1995:275) is almost certainly correct to suppose that rare attestations of ḥdl/ḥad in Phoenician and Hebrew are due to Aramaic influence.

4. lyš ‘there is not’ (DNWSI 576).
   # KAI 216:16 (by ḫ lyš l-rby ‘There was no good house for my forefathers’).
   ● Continued by JPA lēt (DJPA 283), Syr. layt (LSyr. 366), Ṣan āṣa lēt (Jastrow 1980).

1132 Some reservations against Testen’s approach (quite plausible as it is) can be found in Kogan 2003a:127–128. The word for “two,” exhibiting the same phonological evolution both in Aramaic (Syr. tren, LSyrr. 834) and MSA is not attested in the OArm. corpus and, therefore, falls outside the scope of the present chapter. Further details on *bin- and *ṭin-ā in Aramaic in MSA see in Chapter 8, pp. 567 and 571 below.
1133 For the semantic relationship v. DRS 387 and 607–608, in connection with *wār (“to fall” in Arabic vs. “to be” in MSA). On this root see also Chapter 2, p. 86 above.
The fusion of *lā and *yā(y) is also attested in Akk. laššu (CAD L 108)\textsuperscript{1134} and Arb. laysa (Lane 2684).

5. \textit{pm} ‘mouth’ (DNWSI 917).

\# KAI 222A:30–31 ([\textit{ykh p}m] ḫwẖ \textit{w-pm ḫrb \textit{w-pm dbhh \textit{w-pm nmṛh} ‘May the mouth of a snake eat, and the mouth of a scorpion, and the mouth of a bear, and the mouth of a leopard’}), KAI 223A:9 (\textit{pm ṛṛḥ ... \textit{w-pm nmṛ[h]} ‘Mouth of a lion ... mouth of a leopard’), KAI 309:10, 14 (\textit{mṛt pṁḥ ‘The word of his mouth’}).


\# The obligatory \textit{m}-suffixation in the reflexes of PS *\textit{pay}- ‘mouth’ is shared by Arb. \textit{fum}- (Lane 2446).


\# KAI 222A:22–23 ([\textit{šb }] \textit{šwrh ḫyḥn ṛ ḡl \textit{w-\textit{nl ṛḥb ‘Seven cows will feed one calf, but he will not be sated’}), same in KAI 320:5–6.\textsuperscript{1135}


\# No feminine formation from PS *\textit{ṭawr}- ‘bull, ox’ is attested outside PArm. *\textit{ṭawr-at}.\textsuperscript{1136}

6. General evaluation of pan-Aramaic lexical isoglosses

6.1. In the course of the foregoing analysis, 47 lexical features have been detected which are shared by Old Aramaic inscriptions with later Aramaic dialects, but missing from all (or most, or many) other Semitic languages.\textsuperscript{1137} This amount of evidence is impressive for a relatively small corpus of, for most part, seriously damaged inscriptions and strongly suggests that the specific nature of the Aramaic vocabulary was fully developed already in the early centuries of the first millennium B.C. Moreover, such a thick net of peculiar lexical features is unlikely to develop within a relatively short time span. Rather, it must go back to the late second millennium B.C.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Mostly Assyrian (Kogan 2006c:194).
  \item The form without -\textit{h} in KAI 309:20–21 (\textit{swṛ ḫyḥn ṛ ḡl \textit{w-\textit{nl ṛḥw ‘Should one hundred cows suckle a calf, he will not be sated’}) is peculiar and has not yet received any persuasive explanation (v. DNWSI 1118-1119 for a survey of opinions).
  \item The only exception is Arb. \textit{ṭawr-at}-, but this rare word is certainly no basic designation of “cow” in Arabic (in TA 10 338, only one verse by al-Alṭal is adduced as an illustration, which may testify to the restricted use of this lexeme).
  \item Note that only eight lexical features were adduced in a similar list of Ginsberg 1970:119. Six examples from Ginsberg’s list reappear here (*\textit{ḥud}-, *\textit{bir}-, *\textit{mārī}-, *\textit{ṭrī}-, *\textit{kudām}, *\textit{pVm}-). We have omitted *\textit{ḥusī-} ‘truth’ (not in the OArm. corpus) and *\textit{ma:mmāt}- ‘oath’ (only in Samalian in a problematic context, v. Tropper 1993a:87–88).
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1134} Mostly Assyrian (Kogan 2006c:194).

\textsuperscript{1135} The form without -\textit{h} in KAI 309:20–21 (\textit{swṛ ḫyḥn ṛ ḡl \textit{w-\textit{nl ṛḥw ‘Should one hundred cows suckle a calf, he will not be sated’}) is peculiar and has not yet received any persuasive explanation (v. DNWSI 1118-1119 for a survey of opinions).

\textsuperscript{1136} The only exception is Arb. \textit{ṭawr-at}-, but this rare word is certainly no basic designation of “cow” in Arabic (in TA 10 338, only one verse by al-Alṭal is adduced as an illustration, which may testify to the restricted use of this lexeme).

\textsuperscript{1137} Note that only eight lexical features were adduced in a similar list of Ginsberg 1970:119. Six examples from Ginsberg’s list reappear here (*\textit{ḥud}-, *\textit{bir}-, *\textit{mārī}-, *\textit{ṭrī}-, *\textit{kudām}, *\textit{pVm}-). We have omitted *\textit{ḥusī-} ‘truth’ (not in the OArm. corpus) and *\textit{ma:mmāt}- ‘oath’ (only in Samalian in a problematic context, v. Tropper 1993a:87–88).
where the beginnings of Aramaic as an independent language are to be situated. On the opposite extreme, it is worth mentioning that in the great majority of cases (40 out of 47) the pertinent lexical features survived in at least one Neo-Aramaic variety (usually, in most or many of them). This is a powerful demonstration of the extreme conservatism of the basic vocabulary, which has faithfully preserved its key features during three millennia of the turbulent ethnic, political, religious and linguistic history of the area. Given the fact that in many Neo-Aramaic dialects phonological, morphological and syntactical deviations from the classical Aramaic linguistic type are, to say the least, considerable, in this case too, lexical evidence turns out to be considerable help in answering the question *What is Aramaic?*

6.2. Forty-seven specific lexical features in common represent a good piece of comparative evidence. It is now time to submit these isoglosses to a deeper inquiry within the methodological framework implemented in this monograph.

For obvious reasons, trivial retentions were not taken into consideration in our analysis and are, accordingly, absent from the list. Similarly, no common features explainable by borrowing have been discovered. Our examples are thus to be classified either as non-trivial retentions from PS (PWS or PCS), or as semantic innovations, or as etymologically obscure. There remains, finally, a good number of specific morpholexical features which cannot be evaluated within this typological pattern.

6.2.1. Reliable semantic innovations not attested outside Aramaic are observed in four cases: *(n)p ‘face’ (< “nose”), ḏ ‘to make, to do’ (< “to serve,” “to work”), ḳl ‘to enter’ (< “to insert”), ṭ ‘friend’ (< “to love” < “to be compassionate” < “womb”). In two examples (ḥw ‘serpent’ < “animal” and mr ‘lord’ < “male, man”) the semantic shift is shared by one other group of Central Semitic languages. In such cases, one cannot be certain whether the semantic development took place independently in Aramaic and Arabic/ESA, or we are dealing rather with innovations which, in a nuclear form, were already present in PCS. Similar to some extent are gbr ‘man’ (possibly < “to be strong”) and gw ‘inside’ (possibly < “chest,” “belly,” “body”): in both cases the semantic development is earlier than Proto-Aramaic, but, unlike ḥw and mr, it is only in Aramaic that *gabr-* and *gaww-* became the basic exponents of the concepts “man” and “inside.”

6.2.2. By far the clearest examples of non-trivial retentions are Proto-Aramaic roots which are used with the same basic function in several other Semitic languages: *tn* ‘to come,’ *bn* ‘to look for,’ *hz* ‘to see,’ *Islam* ‘before,’ *kl* ‘to kill,’ *yb* ‘to give.’ Obviously, these six lexemes represent the least specific stratum of non-trivial retentions in PArm., but, taken together, even these features are highly suggestive: if a newly discovered North-West Semitic inscription uses *tn* for “to come,” *bn* for “to look

---

1138 As against McCarter 1991:91 (“Many students seem to be becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the usefulness of the Canaanite-Aramaic distinction for categorizing features found in texts from the Persian Period and earlier”) and Kaufman 1988:42 (“Each new epigraphic discovery of the early first millennium seems to contribute further evidence that the division between Canaanite and Aramaic cannot be traced back any distance into the second millennium”). Note that according to Huehnergard 1995:276 the separation of Canaanite and Aramaic is half a millennium earlier than the Deir Allā inscription (that is, third quarter of the second millennium B.C.). For an even earlier date v. Tropper 1993a:310.
for,” ḥzy for “to see,” ḥdm for “before,” ḥtl for “to kill” and ṣḥb for “to give,” its classification as Aramaic\textsuperscript{1139} can be admitted without much hesitation.

Somewhat more specific are ṭnš ‘man, mankind,’ ṣrh ‘road’ and ṣṣr ‘place’: cognate terms are relatively well attested elsewhere in Semitic, but it is only in one non-Aramaic language or subgroup that they display the same basic functional status. To this group one may also attribute ṣḥld ‘to burn,’ ṣṣy ‘to release’ and ṣṣr ‘wall’ (cognates well attested, but with no reliable basic status outside Aramaic) as well as ṣṛn ‘smoke’ and ṣḥd ‘witness’ (basic status in Aramaic and ES/Arabic, but no cognates elsewhere).

The most specific segment of this sub-category is occupied by Proto-Aramaic lexemes with only some sparse cognates (mostly in Arabic) which do not have any basic function: ṣkr ‘root,’ ṣṇk ‘to go out,’ ṣkrk ‘to flee,’ ṣlk ‘to go up,’ ṣḥl ‘to fear.’

6.2.3. Proto-Aramaic lexemes with no reliable cognates include ṣzl ‘to go,’ ṣḥsn ‘to be strong,’ ṣml ‘to speak,’ ṣmṣ ‘middle,’ ṣḥnt ‘to go down’ and ṣṭpr ‘(to be) beautiful.’ In most of these cases, we are probably faced with “hidden” semantic innovations whose diachronic development cannot be convincingly elicited.

6.2.4. Not unexpectedly, the emergence of “new” lexical features in Proto-Aramaic has led to full or partial elimination of their diachronic predecessors. Reliable examples of shared lexical loss in Proto-Aramaic include PS *ṣpan- ‘face,’ PS *ṣwr ‘to descend,’ PS *ṣwš ‘to go out,’ PS *ḥlk ‘to go,’ PWS *ṣrgy ‘to see,’ to some extent also PCS *ṣinš- ‘man,’ PS *ḥvašl- ‘lord,’ PS *ṣṣurš- ‘root’ and PS *ṣly ‘to go up.’ That these roots are already absent (or marginalized) in the earliest Aramaic documents provides another important piece of evidence for the historical unity of Aramaic.

6.2.5. The basic vocabulary of Proto-Aramaic as reflected in the Old Aramaic epigraphic corpus is characterized by an impressive agglomeration of specific morpholexical features. Indeed, with the possible exception of MSA, there is probably no other Semitic subgroup whose linguistic specificity would be so much determined by non-trivial phonological and morphological phenomena bound to individual lexical items.

Clearly enough, the very concept of morpholexical features is nothing but a conventional umbrella label encompassing a variety of inherently divergent phenomena, provisionally classifiable into the following categories.

1. Specific features of derivational morphology: *ṣṭuhrān- ‘other,’ *ṯmān- ‘vessel,’ *ṯawr-at- ‘cow,’ *layt ‘there is not.’


3. Specific features of inflectional morphology: *ḥrabrab- ‘big, large (pl.).’

4. Irregular phonological processes affecting individual nominal and verbal roots: ṣṭk ‘to be silent,’ *ḥḥak- ‘to go,’ *ḥkurṣṣ- ‘throne,’ *ḥbir- ‘son,’ *ḥbav- ‘house,’ *ḥḥad-

\textsuperscript{1139} Or, depending on the presence of conflicting evidence, as “Syrian”/“Aramoid” (i.e., not fully identical to Aramaic, but sharing with it a relatively prolonged period of common history). These designations go back to Huehnergard 1995:281. Huehnergard confesses he is unhappy about “Aramoid” (an imitation of taxonomic terms current in African historical linguistics), but in our view this label is actually quite appropriate and neatly corresponds to the complex, at times contradictory evidence at our disposal.
These features can probably be rearranged in a few other alternative ways, but this fact does not undermine the importance of morpholexical phenomena for our understanding of the linguistic specificity of Aramaic: differently from many "purely lexical" entries treated above in this chapter, shared morpholexical features not only look like innovations, but can be convincingly shown to be innovative since the corresponding morphological and phonological processes are rather transparent.\textsuperscript{1140}

What is more difficult to explain is why some of these features are attested not only in Aramaic, but also in a few other Semitic languages or subgroups.

In some cases, the possibility of parallel development is comparatively high. Thus, aphaeresis of \(*u-\) in the numeral "one" could well occur independently in Proto-Aramaic and in some modern Ethiopian languages. Similarly, the addition of the feminine suffix \(-at\) to PS \(*\textit{tawr}\) ‘bull’ in Proto-Aramaic and, marginally, in Classical Arabic can probably be regarded as due to an unrelated parallel development.

The shift \(*\textit{bin} \rightarrow \*\textit{bir}\) in the term for "son" (and "two") both in Proto-Aramaic and Proto-MSA will have to remain a puzzle in spite of the fact that its phonological background may have found a relatively persuasive explanation in D. Testen’s well-known study of 1985: even if this shift was indeed conditioned by the sonorant nature of the second radical, one still has to show why the hypothetical \(*\textit{bH} \rightarrow \*\textit{H} \) must have become \(*\textit{bir}\) (and \(*\textit{hir}\) precisely in these two West Semitic subdivisions — for all that we know, fairly remote from each other both geographically and genealogically — and not, say, in Canaanite or ESA.

For some examples, finally, a contact-induced spread may be considered a feasible possibility. Thus, it is rather hard to believe that the \(\textit{m}\)-augment in the PS designation of “mouth” was directly inherited from PCS by Aramaic and Arabic, but left no trace in Hebrew, Ugaritic and Sabaic. A secondary diffusion from Aramaic to Arabic (or vice versa) seems to provide a far more appealing alternative. A similar geographic approach is probably to be applied to the fusion of \(*l\) and \(*\textit{ay}\) in Assyrian, Aramaic and Arabic.\textsuperscript{1141}

7. Proto-Aramaic lexical isoglosses in individual Old Aramaic inscriptions

To what extent may Proto-Aramaic lexical features characterize an individual Old Aramaic inscription? To answer this question, an overview of their attestation in the main

\textsuperscript{1140} The only feature attributed to this group in the foregoing analysis, but in fact representing an archaism rather than an innovation, is \textit{hwy} ‘to be.’ When it was listed among non-exclusive morpholexical features, it was evidently because of its specificity with respect to Hebrew \textit{hwy}. In view of the important role which the Aramaic–Canaanite dichotomy plays in our analysis, this seems to be justified.

\textsuperscript{1141} One may legitimately wonder whether this approach could provide an explanation for the otherwise mysterious presence of \(-s\) in the Arabic form.
epigraphic documents of the period is necessary.  

KAI 202A–B

I. ḥsny (B8), ṭzhl (A13)
III. ḥdm (B13), šr, šwr (A10, 17)
IV. br (A4)

KAI 216

I. ṭsšt (9–10)
II. ḫrs (7), by (16), ṭbrbn (10, 13–14)
III. mrr, mrry (3, 5–6, 9)
IV. br (2), ḥd (13), lyšh (16)

KAI 222A

I. ṭpy, ṭpyh (28, 42), ṭkr, ṭkrh (3, 15, 25, 41), gbr (39), ṭl (6), ypḥ (28), ysḥn (5)
II. ṭlym (22), ṭḥkn (24)
III. ḥwḥ (31), ḥżḥ, ḥṯḥḥ (13, 28), ḥdm (8, 9, 10, 11, 12), šḥdn (12), ṭḥd (35, 37)
IV. br, brḥ (1, 3, 14, 25), ṭḥw (25, 32), ṭm (31), šwrḥ (23)

KAI 222B

I. ṭḥl (39), ṭkr, ṭkrḥ (2, 25), yḥl (35), gbr (24), mly (8)
II. ṭṣḥ (8)
III. yḥḥ (28, 31, 32), ṭbrḥ (39), yḥṭḥḥ (27), ṭḥḥ (38)
IV. brk, bry (25, 27, 41, 45), ḥḥd, ḥḥḥ, ḥḥḥm (8, 26, 28, 30, 45)

KAI 222C

I. yḥbd[w] (20–21), mly (17), ysḥn (4)
IV brḥ, bry (3, 8)

---

1142 The Roman numbers from I to IV correspond to four categories of features analyzed above: (I) exclusive lexical; (II) exclusive morpho-lexical; (III) non-exclusive lexical; (IV) non-exclusive morpho-lexical.

1143 We fail to agree with J. Tropper (1993a:299, with references to earlier studies adhering to the same opinion) who believes that the language of this inscription differs from that of other OArm. documents and comes closer to later varieties of Aramaic. At least one of the examples adduced by Tropper in favor of this hypothesis is incorrect: the form ḥrs for “throne” is shared by Tall Faḥariyya and Bukān and has every right to be considered the standard one for both Old and later Aramaic. It is rather the Sefire variant ḥḥs that should be treated as idiosyncratic (for a tentative explanation of this peculiar form see p. 380 above in this chapter). As for by ‘house,’ the absolute state of this lexeme is not attested in the OArm. corpus outside this passage (with DNWSI 156 and contra Tropper 1993a:299), which makes it unsuitable as an argument either in favor or against the OArm. nature of KAI 216.
KAI 223A

II. *rbrby* (7)
IV. *yhw*/*thwy* (4, 6), *pm* (9)

KAI 223B

I. *vbdw* (2), *frh* (6)
III. *ybh*, *tbdh* (8, 17), *yktl* (9)
IV. *bry* (8, 13)

KAI 223C

I. *frh* (15), *yzhl* (6)
IV. *br*, *brh* (14)

KAI 224

II. *frhn* (24), *ykhn*, *frk* (5, 6), *ktl*, *ktlw*, *yktl* (18, 21)
IV. *br*, *brh*, *brk*, *bry* (passim), *hwy*. *[h]wt* (22, 24), *hd*, *hdm* (1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 17, 19, 22)

KAI 309 (Tall Faḥariyya)

I. *vbd* (15), *mhnt* (2)
II. *vym* (21), *krs*h (13), *mrny* (16)
III. *hdm* (1, 15), *mrr* (passim), *mrrty* (18), *yhb* (10)
IV. *br* (6), *lhwy* (12), *pnh* (10, 14)

KAI 310 (Tel Dan)

I. *yl* (3), *ypk* (5), *ys* (2)
II. *frhn* (11), *ykh* (3, 5)
III. *hdm* (5), *flt*, *flt?* (6, 8)
IV. *br* (7, 8)

KAI 320 (Bukān)

II. *krs*h (11)
III. *tnn* (8)
IV. *hwh*, *thwy* (3, 9), *hd* (6, 7), *swrh* (5), *tnn* (8)
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It is not difficult to observe that a certain amount of Proto-Aramaic lexical features are present in every OArm. inscription. Concrete numbers may vary considerably, however, depending on such factors as length, state of preservation and topic. Thus, a relatively long and well preserved inscription like KAI 224 may exhibit as many as 20 pertinent lexemes, but even a short and damaged monument like Tel Dan displays no less than eight examples.

8. Proto-Aramaic lexical features in Samalian and Deir ṭAllā

Elaboration of lexical criteria for genealogical affiliation of KAI 214–215 and the inscription from Deir ṭAllā was not intended as a primary goal of this chapter. However, since these two areas of Semitic linguistics are among those very few where lexical evidence has already played a certain role in the subgrouping discussion, one can hardly avoid spending some attention to the lexical peculiarities of these two idioms.

In both cases, Aramaic(-like) affiliation has become predominant in recent studies. In agreement with this trend, it has been decided to take the Aramaic hypothesis as the basic one and to check its validity against the evidence of the vocabulary.

8.1. Samalian

8.1.1. As we have tried to demonstrate in the preceding section of this chapter, a certain amount of characteristically Aramaic lexical features can be discovered in every Old Aramaic inscription of reasonable length. Both KAI 214 and 215 are seriously damaged, whereas their topics do not always overlap with those dealt with in the “standard” Old Aramaic corpus. Nevertheless, the overall length of these inscriptions is considerable and, taken together, they provide a sufficiently vast body of lexical evidence for a meaningful typological analysis.

There are ten Proto-Aramaic lexical features in the Samalian corpus.

I. mṣḥ ‘middle’ (KAI 214:28: w-yḥm wth b-mṣḥ ‘May he put him in the middle’; KAI 215:10: w-nḥṣḥ ṣby ṭnnw b-mṣḥ mlky kbry ‘My father ṭnnw was esteemed in the midst of mighty kings’)

III.

One peculiar exception seems to be the newly published inscription from Zincirli (Pardee 2009). In this (admittedly rather brief) text, semantic slots potentially indicative from the point of view of genealogical subgrouping are almost entirely lacking (the only exception seems to be w-yḥrg in ll. 10–11, but the meaning “to slaughter” rather than simply “to kill” should prevent one from considering this feature as decidedly “non-Aramaic”). We have, therefore, to content ourselves with a few morpholexical features, some of which are compatible with both Samalian and Old Aramaic (nḥṣ ‘soul’) and a few other, with Samalian only (ṟnk ‘I,’ nota accusativi wthr). D. Pardee’s willingness to attribute this text to a hitherto unknown variety of “narrow” Old Aramaic (rather than Samalian) is primarily conditioned by the presence of nunation in ṭnnw l-ṭnnw ‘year by year’: as is well known, absence of nunation is one of the hallmarks of Samalian.

1144

8.1.2. It may be argued that this number is not particularly impressive, especially since group I (exclusive lexical features) is represented by one example only. This objection is worth considering. It is important to emphasize that the crucial point here is not merely the absence of the remaining features, but rather why they are absent. If the pertinent concepts were present in the Samalian inscriptions, but their exponents would have differed from the characteristically Old Aramaic ones, this fact could indeed be considered a serious argument against the Aramaic affiliation. If, on the contrary, these concepts are absent from the Samalian corpus, their exponents are simply unknown to us and the absence of the corresponding Proto-Aramaic lexical features is only expected.

It turns out that in most cases we are indeed faced with examples belonging of the second category. True and apparent exceptions are few and deserve special discussion.

1145 The distribution between ṻmr and ṣrt in KAI 215 is identical to what has been suggested above for the OAr. corpus: the former is used exclusively about the Assyrian king with respect to the Samalian one, the latter is attested with the meaning “owner” (ṣrt ḷṣp, ṣrt zḥb) and the title ṣrt ṣḥḏ and ṣrt kḥṛṣy.
1146 Always in filiations. Cf. Noorlander 2012:207–209, with the following hesitating conclusion: “Therefore, albeit tentatively, we should at least include /ḥsr/ as a lexical item that Samalian shares with Aramaic.”
1147 For this and other interpretations of this difficult passage v. Tropper 1993a:108.
1148 Rather positively assessed in Noorlander 2012:211–212.
1. It is uncertain whether ūth was the Samalian term for “place,” as in both of its attestations (KAI 214:27: [y]ḥy ṣḥ ṣḥh b-ṣḥ ṣḥh yḥ[y]; KAI 214:31–32: w-h̄w w ṣḥ b-ṣḥ ṣḥh) b-ṣḥ can be translated “with respect to” rather than “in the place”/“in the territory of,” cf. Tropper 1993a:95, Dion 1974:33. It is even less likely, however, that the main term with this meaning was mkm, attested in KAI 214:14 (w-[h]mt nṣb ḥdd zn w-mkm ṭ[nw]). Formally, this is an obvious isogloss with Canaanite (Tropper 1993a:279), namely Pho. mkm (DNWSI 679) and Hbr. māḥôm ‘place’ (HALOT 626–627), but the actual meaning of the Samalian term is “sacred precinct,” “necropolis” rather than simply “place.” Since the religious connotation of Pho. mkm and Hbr. māḥôm are well known, a culturally determined borrowing from the Canaanite area into Samalian is likely. The basic Samalian term with the meaning “place” is thus unknown to us.

2. Neither ṣty ‘to come,’ nor ṣll ‘to enter’ are attested in the Samalian inscriptions. Now, J. Tropper (1993a:126) reads w-h̄rb ṣby ṣn dmlk l-ṣw[r] in KAI 215:18 and translates ‘Und er führte meinen Vater von Damaskus hinein nach Assu[r].’ If this reading is correct, Samalian would possess a verb ṣrb ‘to come in, to enter,’ cognate to Ugr. ṣrb and Akk. erēbu, but not attested in Aramaic. No certainty in this respect is possible, however: apart from the epigraphic difficulties, one may observe that neither Ugr. ṣrb nor Akk. erēbu are normally used with the prepositions meaning “from” (DUL 179–180, CAD E 259–273). Given the fact that Hbr. ṣbr with min is, conversely, well attested (HALOT 780, meaning 8), one may wonder whether the traditional reading ḥ̄br, still accepted in KAI, is worth preserving.

As for m̄erb ‘sunset, West’ in KAI 215:13–14, its significance for our analysis is quite restricted: terms for “sunset” are often diachronically derived from verbs with the meaning “to come in,” “to enter,” but such verbs need not to be synchronically preserved as the basic exponents of these meanings: indeed, m̄arpuhā ‘sunset, West’ is widely attested in later Aramaic (DNWSI 671, LSyr. 547) in spite of the absence of verbal roots with this meaning.

All in all, one is forced to conclude that the exponent of the basic meaning “to come” in Samalian is still unknown to us.

3. ṣbd is attested with the meaning “to till” in KAI 214:7 (ybdw ṣḥ w-krm ‘They cultivated fields and vineyards’) which, as pointed out in Tropper 1993a:279, is not very common in Aramaic. This interesting and, probably, archaic feature ( Huehnergard 1995:276) is, however, practically of no value for the problem under investigation: we simply do not know how “to do” was in Samalian and, vice versa, how

1150 With one single exception on p. 268a.
1151 As duly acknowledged in Tropper 1993a:126, the new reading ḥ̄br does not necessarily exclude an ultimate connection with the root ṣbr (via metathesis or scribal mistake).
1152 Although not totally unknown either, cf. DJBA 837 (meaning 6).
“to till” was in Old Aramaic. In other words, Samalian *bdl could also mean “to do” and, similarly, Old Aramaic *bdl could also mean “to till.”

4. *gbr ‘man’ is not attested in the Samalian corpus, but *š is present in KAI 214:10–11 (ykh * šbyh ‘Each one acquired his herd”) and 34 (*w vb *š zr ‘You incite a stranger’). As pointed out above in this chapter, complete replacement of *š- by *gabr- is a relatively late feature: in Old and Official Aramaic these two terms still coexist with no transparent distribution. The absence of *gabr- in the available Samalian corpus may thus well be accidental and, at any rate, the presence of *š is no argument against an Aramaic affiliation of Samalian.

5. *tl ‘to kill’ is attested only once in Samalian (KAI 215:8) in a derived nominal form *tylt (byt *tylt, presumably ‘Haus der/für die getöteten Frauen,’ Tropper 1993a:115). Incidentally, the basic verb with the meaning “to kill” is *hrg, reliably attested several times (KAI 214:26.33.34; KAI 215:3.5.7). Although *hrg is attested also in the Sefire corpus (v. below in this chapter, p. 414), the distribution of these two roots in Old Aramaic was likely the opposite (*tl basic, *hrg marginal). Since *hrg is the main root with the meaning “to kill” in Hebrew, this is indeed a remarkable non-Aramaic feature of the Samalian lexicon.

6. *npk ‘to go out’ is not attested in Samalian, but two manifestations of its diachronic predecessor *ykh (< PS *wšr) are known. However, both are somewhat problematic from the standpoint of our analysis. Thus, *mwkh in KAI 215:13–14 clearly denotes “sunrise, East” (*mwkh šms). As pointed out above in connection with *mrb ‘sunset, West,’ this fact by no means implies that same root was synchronically the basic one with the meaning “to go out”: *mwkh ‘sunrise’ is well attested in Official Aramaic (Folmer 1995:633–634).1157 where the main verb for “to go out” is of course *npk. As for *ywkh ‘he will bring out’ in KAI 215:21, this reading and interpretation are indeed widely accepted in recent studies on Samalian (Dion 1974:42, Tropper 1993a:70, KAII), but in view of epigraphic and contextual difficulties connected with this passage no certainty about the functional status of the Samalian reflex of *wšr is possible.

7. *yhb ‘to give’ is only sparsely attested in the Samalian corpus: *yhb l-*thy (KAI 214:12; context damaged, morphological interpretation uncertain, v. Tropper 1993a:72). Conversely, *ntn is represented by a broad inventory of forms in both prefix

---

1153 In such a context, J. Huehnergard’s observation “not … in Samalian … where the verb still means ‘to work (land)”’ (italics added) turns out to be somewhat misleading.
1154 For this passage see further Tropper 1993a:70.
1155 On the etymology of this root and its distribution in various CS languages see further Chapter 3 above (pp. 186-187).
1156 Strangely missing from Tropper 1993a:279.
1157 As pointed out by M. Folmer (1995:633), the substantive *mdnh, common with this meaning in later Aramaic dialects, is found in only one Official Aramaic document.

In the Old Aramaic corpus, forms of prefix and suffix conjugations as well as the participle of ntn are attested: *l ytn hdd kḥl b-mth ‘May Hdd not give his voice in his country’ (KAI 320:12–13), ntn ryy ... ntn sīḥ w-tldkwv ‘One who gives pasture ... one who gives rest and vessels of food’ (KAI 309:2–3),1158 zy ntn hdd l-mrḥn ḥzzl ‘Which Hdd gave to our lord Ḥzd’ (Samos). At the same time, both prefix and suffix conjugations forms are known for yhb as well: w-yhb lh ‘He gave to him...’ (KAI 309:10), w-hn l-thb lhmy ‘If you do not give my provisions’ (KAI 222B:38). As is well known, this distribution does not correspond to what we observe in Official Aramaic (notably, in the Biblical Aramaic corpus), where ntn is strictly assigned to the prefix conjugation and the infinitive, whereas yhb is used for the remaining forms.1159

The wide use of ntn in Samalian is, no doubt, a remarkable feature, but to what extent it distinguishes this dialect from Old (and later) Aramaic is hard to assess. As far as the suffix conjugation is considered, one of two extant OArm. examples also uses ntn rather than yhb.1160 As for the prefix conjugation, it is precisely the Samalian picture that best agrees with later Aramaic evidence. Given the fact that yhb ‘to give’ is not entirely missing from Samalian, one is hardly entitled to consider the higher prominence of ntn as anything more than an inner-Aramaic dialectal peculiarity.

8.1.3. On the opposite extreme, the Aramaic connection of the Samalian vocabulary is strengthened by two groups of isoglosses which, for different reasons, have not appeared in the foregoing discussion.

8.1.3.1. On the one hand, several lexemes typical of later Aramaic dialects, but not attested in the OArm. corpus, can be detected.

1. *lb ‘to teach, instruct’ (KAI 214:34: ṣw ṭlb ṣz ḥrg ← ‘Or you incite a stranger to slay him’).

# As pointed out in Tropper 1993a:280, the root *ylp (also *ylp) with the meaning “to teach” is widely attested in later Aramaic (DJPA 60, 241, DJBA 136, 536, LSyP 22, 302, Jastrow 2002:187), but not in Canaanite (Hbr. ṭlp is clearly borrowed from Aramaic, Wagner 1966:25–26). The identity between the Samalian form and Proto-Aramaic *ylp can hardly be put to doubt, although -b instead of *-p is difficult to explain.

Outside Aramaic, the root is reliably attested only in Arabic: ṣlf ‘to be familiar’ (Lane 79).1161

---

1158 That the use of the participle ntn in Tall Faḥarīyya was conditioned by the presence of nādin in the Akkadian version (Folmer 1995:647) is possible, but hardly provable.
1159 Although suffix conjugation forms from ntn and yhb still co-occur in the oldest Official Aramaic documents (Folmer 1995:641–647).
1160 w-yhb in KAI 309:10 is generally understood as a suffix conjugation form, but in view of the wide use of the prefix conjugation for past actions in KAI 202 and 310 one may wonder whether such an interpretation could be suitable for this passage as well.
1161 Much more widely attested is PS *nlp- ‘head of large cattle,’ whose derivation from this verbal root is, however, more than doubtful (SED II No. 4).
2. ḥṭ̄r ‘rod, sceptre’ (KAI 214:3, 9: ḥṭ̄r ḥlbbh ‘scepter of dominion’; KAI 214:20: yḥz ḥṭ̄r w-yṣb ṣl mṣby ‘(One who) seizes the scepter and sits on my throne ...’; KAI 214:25: yḥz ḥṭ̄r b-yd[y] w-yṣb ṣl mṣby ‘(One who) seizes the scepter in Ydy and sits on my throne ...’).

# Not attested in OArm., but widely present in later Aramaic, where it clearly functions as the main term with the meaning "stick, rod" (DJPA 196, DJBA 437, LSyr. 228, MD 135, Tezel 2003:107).

Outside Aramaic, attestations of the reflexes of *ḥṭ̄r- are sporadic: Pho. ḥṭ̄r (DNWSI 364),1162 Hbr. ḫṭ̄r (HALOT 307),1163 Arb. ḫṭ̄r- (Lane 764).1164 Akk. ḫṭ̄rū, ḫṭ̄artu (CAD ḫ 264–265, AHw. 362) is attested in NB/NA and Nuzi, which almost certainly suggests a foreign origin.1165

3. ṛgz ‘anger’ (KAI 214:23: [w-ṣ]l ytn lh l-ḥkl ṛg ṛgz ‘May he not give him to eat because of (his) rage’; KAI 214:26: ṣl yḥṣg ṛ ṛg ṛgz ṛl ... ‘May he not do murder, either out of wrath or because of ...’).

# Later Aramaic examples can be found in HALOT 1978, DJPA 515, LSyr. 711. J. Tropper (1993a:281) is certainly correct to attribute a few attestations of Hbr. ṛgāz ‘wrath’ to Aramaic influence, the normal meaning of the Hebrew word being “nervousness, agitation” (HALOT 1183).1166


# Reflexes of PS *wbl ‘to bring’ (DRS 485) are widely attested in later Aramaic (HALOT 1886–1887, DJPA 234, LSyr. 293, Jastrow 1994:165)1168 and in a few other Semitic languages (notably, Akk. waḥālū and Ugr. ybl, CAD A, 10, DUL 383), but not in Phoenician or Hebrew.1169

---

1162 Hapax legomenon in the archaic Phoenician inscription KAI 1:2.
1163 In two poetic passages (Is 11:1 and Pr 14:3).
1164 Almost certainly related are the peculiar formations with ḫ-extension in MSA: Mḥr. ḫṭ̄rāk ‘cudgel, (walking) stick’ (ML 454), Hrs. ḫṭ̄rāk ‘stick cut from a palm branch’ (HL 144), Jlb. ḫṭ̄rāk ‘stick, walking stick’ (JL 309).
1165 An Aramaism is quite feasible in NB and NA but, of course, not so likely in Nuzi. If this is nevertheless the case, it would be one of the earliest West Semitisms with marked Aramaic traits in Akkadian.
1166 The only additional cognate seems to be Arb. raǯż- ‘convulsive motion in the hind leg or the thighs of a camel’ (Lane 1036). For the complex history of riǯ- and ruǯ- in the Koran see Jeffery 1938:139 (at least the second word is with all probability borrowed from Aramaic).
1167 For the possible meanings of bnt in this passage v. Tropper 1993a:122.
1168 It is uncertain whether ybl is attested in the Old Aramaic corpus, as the interpretation of the only potentially relevant example (w-ṃn ḥy ḥn ybl l-kannḥ ḫds in KAI 309:10–11) is problematic (v. DNWSI 431 for a survey of opinions).
1169 Biblical examples of ybl are rare and almost entirely poetic (HALOT 383).
5. One more possible example is ršy, but the interpretation of the expression yršy šht (KAI 214:27–28) is uncertain. As rightly pointed out in Kaufman 1974:89, the meaning of ršy in this phrase comes closer to Akk. rašu (‘to acquire’ > ‘to incur, to commit, to become liable,’ CAD R 198) than to Old Aramaic and later parallels, themselves rather divergent from the semantic point of view.1170

8.1.3.2. On the other hand, the Samalian corpus exhibits a few lexical features which are characteristically Old Aramaic, but have no steady continuation in later Aramaic dialects.

1. šm ‘name’ (KAI 214:16: w-yzkr šm hdd ‘He invokes the name of Hdd’; KAI 214:21: [w-b yzk]r šm pnmw ‘He does not invoke the name of Pnmw’).

# Prosthetic r in the reflexes of PS *šim- ‘name’ is known from some varieties of Old Aramaic (KAI 222C:25, KAI 223B:7), whereas other documents (KAI 202C:2, KAI 309:11.16) make use of non-prosthetic forms. This feature is lost in the majority of later Aramaic idioms.1171 The form rism- with ʾalif wašlah, standard in Arabic, must be due to a parallel development (Lane 1435). For a negative assessment of this feature v. Noorlander 2012:212–213.

2. kbr ‘to be numerous’ (KAI 215:9: w-kbrt ḥh w-šrh w-šh w-šwrh b-ywrmyh ‘Wheat and barley, ewes and cows were abundant in his days’; KAI 215:4: w-hkbr kyrt ḫrḥtn mn kyrt yšbt ‘He made the ruined cities more numerous than the inhabited ones’).

# As will be shown below in this chapter (p. 419), kbr is not the main verb with the meaning “to be numerous” in later Aramaic. However, the only OArm. passage where this meaning is required by the context does use kbr: w-l-kbr šnwh ‘To make numerous his years...’ (= Ack. ana šumʿud šanāṭša, KAI 309:8). With all probability, the Samalian usage in this case was identical to the Old Aramaic one.

The picture becomes admittedly more complicated in view of the presence of kbr in KAI 215:10 and 214:11. In these passages, the meaning of this root is clearly not “to be numerous,” but rather “to be big, great”: w-nḥšb ṭby pnmw b-mṣṭ mlky kbry ‘My father Pnmw was esteemed among great kings,’ w-kbrw ntnh ly ‘Greatness was given to me.’ This meaning, well attested for the reflexes of PS *kbr in Arabic and ESA (Lane 2585, SD 76), is not typical of either Old or later Aramaic, where the idea of “greatness” is normally expressed by the reflexes of PS *rbb (note especially the phrase mlkn vbrbn

1170 The meaning “to have authority” is the most suitable one for the only OArm. attestation: l-tmšl by b-zr w-l-tršḥ ly ṭḥ[y]. ‘You must not try to dominate me in this or assert your authority over me concerning it’ (KAI 224:9). It is also attested in Official Aramaic (DNWSI 1086) and, sporadically, in later dialects (DJBA 1095). Syr. rṣā, however, means ‘vituperavit, reprehendit’ (LSyr. 744).

1171 It is rather unlikely that similar forms in Mandaic and Neo-Aramaic, found in MD 454, GNDM 90 and Tezel 2003:92, are direct continuants of the Old Aramaic/Samalian picture.
‘great kings’ discussed above in this chapter, pp. 380-381). This semantic nuance may, therefore, be considered a non-Aramaic feature of the Samalian vocabulary.¹¹⁷²


  # The presence of -b- in the reflexes of PS *napš- ‘soul’ is widely attested in the OArm. corpus (see below in this chapter, p. 414) and provides a strong morpholexical isogloss between Samalian and Aramaic (cf. Noorlander 2012:218).

8.1.3.3. Finally, it remains to investigate whether some markedly non-Aramaic (in most cases, practically amounting to “Canaanite”) exponents are attested in the Samalian corpus for concepts not dealt with in the above discussion. A systematic inquiry in this direction will make it clear that promising candidates are rare, and few of them truly compelling.

1. rbrw in w-yyṣd ṭbrw ‘One who maintains power’ (KAI 214:15.21).

  # If J. Tropper’s interpretation ‘Und (seine) Machtposition festigt’ (1993a:76) is accepted, this form may provide an interesting isogloss with Hbr. ṣāḇîr ‘strong’ (HALOT 6) and its Canaanite cognates discussed in Chapter 5, pp. 271-272 above. However, a few alternative interpretations for this difficult phrase have been proposed (DNWSI 7).

2. gbl in kyrt mn gbl grgm ‘Cities from the territory of Grgm’ (KAI 215:15).

  # As will be pointed out below in this chapter (pp. 415-416), loss of gbl ‘border, territory’ is a relatively late feature in Aramaic so that its presence in Samalian cannot be considered an exclusive isogloss with Pho. gbl, Hbr. gōbūl (DNWSI 209, HALOT 171).

3. hnv in w-b-hlbty hnv ... ‘During my reign I allotted a resting place ...’ (KAI 214:19) and w-hnvḥ ṭrvḥ ... ‘l mlky kbr<y> ‘His lord ... positioned him over powerful kings’ (KAI 215:12).

¹¹⁷² J. Tropper (1993a:280) does not hesitate to qualify Hbr. kbr as an Aramaism. Given the fact that the great majority of Biblical attestations of kbr come from Job (notably, from the speeches of Elihu which are well known to be Aramizing, Wagner 1966:145), this attribution is, at first sight, quite reasonable. A closer look at the extant evidence leaves one with some doubts, however. As we have seen, it is only the meaning “to be numerous” that can be reliably considered specifically Aramaic and indeed, both Biblical examples of the verbal usage of kbr display this meaning: millīn yakkbr ‘He multiplies words’ (Job 35:16) and yittēn yōkāl l-ta-makkbr ‘He gives food in abundance’ (Job 36:31). The adjective kabbxr is also well attested with the meanings “many,” “numerous,” as in mṣṣx lō(ɛ) kabbxr ‘Little, few, not much’ (Is 16:14, side by side with another Aramaism mizhr). However, for a few other Biblical attestations of kabbxr (Job 8:2, 34:17.24, 36:5), the meaning “mighty” has been usually postulated. If this interpretation is correct (which seems to be rather difficult to evaluate for at least some of the pertinent passages), an Aramaic borrowing in Hebrew becomes considerably less persuasive. It is probably for that reason that kbr is not qualified as an Aramaism either in the standard Hebrew dictionaries or in Wagner 1966.
The root ḫryn to which the above forms presumably belong (Tropper 1993a:80) is well attested in Hebrew (HALOT 332), but not in later Aramaic dialects. The OArm. picture may well have been different, however, as one can infer from the broad attestation of the derived noun מִלְחָנ 'military camp, army' in KAI 202A.1173

4. ḫṛr in w-hdd ḫṛr lytkh ‘May Hdd pour (his) anger on him’ (KAI 214:23).1174

# As rightly pointed out in Tropper 1993a:82, Samalian ḫṛr is likely identical to Hbr. ḫrī ‘heat (of anger)’ (HALOT 353). Terms for “wrath,” “anger” derived from ḫryn are not typical of later Aramaic, but ḫrn ‘anger’ is attested in KAI 223B:12 (w-b-aym ḫrn ‘In the day of wrath’). In view of this parallel, Samalian ḫṛr can scarcely be considered a Canaanite isogloss.

5. krt in w-wmn hkr by ‘A sure covenant was concluded with me’ (KAI 214:11–12).

# If this reading and interpretation are correct (Tropper 1993a:71), we are faced with the root krt ‘to cut’ > ‘to conclude a treaty,’ practically unattested in Aramaic, but common in Phoenician and Hebrew (DNWSI 538, HALOT 500). In view of the obvious religious connotations of this phrase, a culturally determined borrowing from Canaanite cannot be excluded (with Tropper 1993a:71).

6. za in n šmt ṣmr ṣ b-pm za ‘I have put these words in the mouth of a stranger’ (KAI 214:30), ḫw ṭlb ḫs za l-hṛgh ‘Or you incite a stranger to slay him’ (KAI 214:34).

# As rightly acknowledged by J. Tropper (1993a:91), related terms are well attested in Hebrew and Phoenician (DNWSI 340, HALOT 279),1175 but not in Aramaic.

8.1.4. Lexical evidence for the genealogical affiliation of Samalian is not as impressive as one would wish, but whenever direct comparison between KAI 214–215 and contemporary Old Aramaic inscriptions is possible, serious lexical discrepancies between these two corpora are fairly rare. The only consistent difference is connected with the verb meaning “to kill”: Samalian ḫrg vs. Old Aramaic ḫtl. It is possible (although by no means certain) that PS *wšp ‘to go out’ was not yet replaced by Proto-Aramaic *npk, and certain peculiarities in the use of the roots ntn ‘to give’ and kbr ‘to be big’/‘to be numerous’ have been detected. At the same time, a few other Aramaic-like isolgosses are clearly in evidence, whereas additional non-Aramaic (Canaanite) features (za ‘stranger,’ krt ‘to conclude a treaty’) have proved to be very few. Samalian vocabulary is thus not identical to that of contemporary Aramaic, but the differences hardly exceed the limits of dialectal peculiarities.1176

8.2. Deir ʾAllā

---

1174 For this interpretation v. Tropper 1993a:83–84.
1175 Further possible cognates are discussed in Chapter 8, p. 542 below.
1176 This claim is broadly in agreement with Tropper 1993a:296, where it is rightly emphasized that non-Aramaic elements in Samalian grammar are considerably less impressive than commonly assumed.
8.2.1. A similar analysis applied to the vocabulary of the Deir Allā plaster text quickly reveals several Proto-Aramaic lexical features.

I.  
υll ‘to enter’ (I:4: w-υll ṣnh ḥlwh ‘His kinsfolk entered into his presence’; II:7: byt b-υll ḥlk w-l-υll ḥtn ‘A house where no traveler enters, and the bridegroom does not enter’), 1177 ḫrḫ ‘to flee’ (I:15: ḥnṣṣ ḥশkšt bn[... ] ‘The piglet drove out the young of ...’), ṳpḫ ‘to go out’ (I:6: ṭḥpy skṛy šmyn b-ṭḥky ‘Go out and bolt the heavens with your cloud’). 1178

III.  
ṛṣr ‘place’ (I:9: b-ṛṣr ḥlln yybl ḥṯr ‘Instead of the ewes, it is the staff that is led’), 1179 ṳṭy ‘to come’ (I:1: w-ṭṭw ḥṭw ḥlln b-ṭṭḥ ‘The gods came to him in the night’; II:14: Ṿky Ṿṯḥ ‘For he goes to ...’), ṣḥb ‘to give’ (I:7: ṭḥby, context uncertain). 1180

IV.  
ｂr ‘son’ (I:2.4: bḥm br-ｂr), ḫd (II:10: ṭḥsn lbḥ ḫd ‘You’ will be covered’ with one cloth’).

With all possible reservations due to the poor state of preservation of the text, it may be observed that numerically the Deir Allā picture is only slightly inferior to what we have discovered in Samalian (eight Proto-Aramaic lexical features in the former vs. ten in the latter). As far as the quality of the lexical evidence is concerned, the Deir Allā evidence is even more impressive: three exclusively Aramaic isoglosses have been detected (only one in Samalian).

8.2.2. Furthermore, the Deir Allā text displays a few characteristically Aramaic lexemes for various reasons not included above in our inventory of Proto-Aramaic lexical features.

1. yybl ‘to bring, to lead’ (I:9: b-ṛṣr ḥlln yybl ḥṯr ‘Instead of the ewes the stick is driven along’).

# On this isogloss see above in the Samalian section. If yybl is parsed as passive of the intensive stem (Hackett 1984:49), the Aramaic connection is strengthened as it is precisely in Aramaic that the intensive stem of this root is common (LSyr. 293).

2. ḫmr ‘wine’ (I:10: ṣṭyw ḫmr ‘They drank wine’).

---

1177 Derivation from *wṛḥ*l is quite unlikely: “Hackett’s attempt to take w-ṛḥ*l (I:4) and ṣ-ṛḥ*l (II:7bis) as from ṣ-ṛḥ*l is notoriously ill advised, especially in the latter case” (Kaufman 1988:51, cf. further Tropper 1993a:304).

1178 Reading accepted in KAI5 76 (cf. DNWSI 944). The translation ‘you will go out’ is very suitable if šmš is reconstructed as the subject (which is likely in spite of the obvious difficulties outlined in Hackett 1984:41).

1179 Within such a reading (Hackett 1984:29), the relevance of this feature is slightly reduced as ṛṣr does not mean “place” in the strict sense, but forms part of the prepositional phrase with the meaning “instead.” Note, however, the reading b-ṛṣr ḥlln yybl ḥṯr ṭḥm b-ḥṭw [𝑣]ṭḥb in KAI5 77, which clearly implies the literal meaning “place” (‘In the place to which a rod drove sheep, hares are eating grass’).

1180 One more feature potentially attributable to this group is ṳṃš ‘man’/’men’ in II:10, but the interpretation of ṳṃš as ɣ-ṃš ‘Oh men!’ (DNWSI 84) is quite uncertain (Hackett 1984:65–66).
Not attested in the Old Aramaic inscriptions, but widely present in later Aramaic (DNWSI 383, HALOT 1877, DJPA 207, LSyr. 241, Jastrow 1994:177). Outside Aramaic, it is only Arb. ḫawr- that functions as the main term for “wine” (Lane 808). Attestations of PCS *ḥawr- in the Canaanite area are marginal, the main terms with the meaning “wine” always go back to *wayn. (cf. HALOT 1877). On this root see further Chapter 3, p. 210 above.

3. ḥtr ‘rod, scepter’ (I:9: b-ṣr ṣḥln ṣṭbl ḥtr ‘Instead of the ewes the stick is driven along’).

# On this isogloss see above in the Samalian section (p. 402).

4. ḥwy ‘to tell’ (I:5: ṣḥwkm mh šd[yn…] ‘I will relate to you what the Šdyن …’).

# This specifically Aramaic verb is not attested in the Old Aramaic inscriptions, but widely present in later dialects (DNWSI 353, HALOT 1870, DJPA 190, LSyr. 220, Macuch 1993:385). Hbr. ḥwy (pi.) is likely an Aramaism in most of its attestations (Wagner 1966:53).

5. mlk ‘to advise,’ mlkh ‘advice’ (II:9: w-l-mlkh ṣṭmlk ‘Or for advice, will he not ask advice’).

# Proto-Aramaic .nlmk ‘to advise’ is not attested in the Old Aramaic inscriptions, but common in later dialects (HALOT 1917, DJPA 310, DJBA 680, LSyr. 391).

6. yḥd ‘to gather’ (I:5: ṣḥln ṣṭḥdəw ‘The gods gathered together’).

# The denominative verbal root ʾyḥd is attested in the causative stem in the Old Aramaic inscription KAI 202A:4–5 (w-ḥwḥd ṣḥy brḥdḥ ḥzḥl mlḥ ṣṯ [b] ṣḥr mlḥn ‘Brḥdd son of Ḥzḥl gathered against me seventeen kings’), but not so widespread in later Aramaic dialects. Hbr. yḥd ‘to join, to be united with’ is a rare poetic verb (HALOT 405), but Arb. ṣḥḥd (V, VIII) (Lane 2997) is, admittedly, quite common.

8.2.3. In summary, one may state rather confidently that the amount of lexical evidence supporting the Aramaic affiliation of the Deir ṣAllā inscription is considerable. This fact is duly recognized in several earlier studies on the topic, where most of the pertinent lexical features have been mentioned and more or less extensively discussed:

1181 Contra Fraenkel 1886:161, one hesitates to qualify the Arabic word as an Aramaism.
1182 Ugr. ḫmr is attested twice (1.3 i 16 and 1.23:6), in the latter passage in the peculiar combination ḫmr ṣṭn ‘sparkling wine’ (DUL 396), paralleled by ḫmr ṣṭn in Phoenician (DNWSI 383–383). Hbr. ḫmār is hapax legomenon in Dt 32:14 (HALOT 330). The presence of ṣṭn ‘wine’ in the Aramaic account document RĒS 1791 (Porten–Yardeni 1993:74) is likely due to Hebrew influence.
1183 Possibly related with metathesis to Arb. ḥḥy ‘to reveal, to make known, to suggest’ (Lane 3050).
1184 The meaning “to advise”/“advice” is shared by Akk. malāku, mikk (CAD M1 154, M2 66, AHw. 593, 652) and is so atypical for West Semitic that the possibility of an early Akkadian loanword (or loan translation) is to be seriously considered (one wonders, in particular, whether the frequently attested substantive mikk may have been borrowed first, triggering the subsequent spread of the verbal root). Hbr. mlk (nip.), hapax legomenon in Ne 5:7, is certainly of Aramaic origin (Wagner 1966:77).
1185 Relatively numerous examples come only from JBA (DJBA 532).
8.2.4. As is well known, the complete picture is considerably more ambiguous: unlike Samalian, the Deir ṣAllā text displays several conflicting Canaanite-like lexical isoglosses whose correct evaluation is of key relevance for the problem under discussion.

1. Neither ṣzd, nor ḥwkh for “to go” are present in Deir ṣAllā, but the imperative of ḥlk is attested in I:5 (w-lkw ḫ swelling ḥln ‘Go and see the deeds of the gods’). As for ḥlk in II:7 (presumably ‘traveler’), it is less relevant for the present discussion, as various nominal forms derived from *hlk are attested in many Aramaic dialects (HALOT 1860).

2. Whenever the context is relatively clear, the verb ḥzh is used about prophetic visions. While it is possible that the general meaning “to see” is present in I:14 and II:16, it is ṣrḥ that is indisputably attested as a neutral verb with this meaning in I:5 (w-lkw ḫ swelling ḥln ‘Go and see the deeds of the gods’).

3. The root ṣbd ‘to do’ is missing from the Deir ṣAllā inscription, whereas ṣptl with the same meaning is reliably attested in I:2: kh ṣptl ‘So will he do.’

4. Neither ṣmll ‘to speak,’ nor ṣmlh ‘word’ are attested in Deir ṣAllā, whereas ṣdr is clearly present in II:17 (l-dṣr ṣdb l-emh), differently interpreted as ‘word’ (DNWSI 239) or ‘he spoke’ (Hackett 1984:30). Especially within the latter interpretation, this is a strong Canaanite-linking isogloss, as the verbal root ṣdr ‘to speak’ is standard in

---

1186 D. Pardee’s comment on this term (“may be a semantic innovation, for it does not occur in Ugaritic, and that word is characteristically Aramaic”) is not entirely clear to us: shall one indeed evaluate the archaic vs. innovative nature of a typically Aramaic root on the basis of its presence (or absence) in Ugaritic? Much more important, it seems, is whether we are able to detect the underlying path of semantic development (which, in this particular case, is rather hard to do).

1187 Kaufman 1988:52 considers 21-24 lexemes as “clearly Aramaic,” but not all of his examples are equally convincing. Thus, it is true that, while both ṣgr and ṣkr with the meaning “to close,” “to obstruct” are attested in Aramaic and Canaanite, ṣkr is more widely present in the former than in the latter. However, it is precisely ṣkr that is used in the cosmic context of Gn 8:2 (wa-ṣgrissākārī marā qqāb tḥām wa-ṣhrabāt ha-tšāmāyim ‘The springs of the deep and the sluices of the heaven were stopped up’). Even if ṣNDAR in II:5 is understood as “soil,” Syr. medrā can hardly be considered a characteristically Aramaic lexeme (differently from Gez. ṣNDAR ‘land,’ which is indeed a typically Ethiopian replacement of PS *mqē-, see below in Chapter 7, p. 435). Finally, we fail to recognize anything specifically Aramaic in ḥln ‘gods’ (unless the nunation is meant).

1188 ṣzd ḥzh ḥln ... w-yṣdw ṣzd ‘A divine seer ... he saw a vision’ (1:1).

1189 Both contexts are highly problematic.

1190 It is, therefore, hard to agree with J. Tropper (1993a:304) who adduces ḥzh ‘schauen’ among Aramaic-linking isoglosses.

1191 The nominal formation ṣptl ḥln ‘deeds of the gods’ in I:5 is less relevant.
Phoenician and Hebrew (DNWSI 238–239, HALOT 210), but practically missing from Old and later Aramaic. A few other Canaanite-linking isoglosses can be mentioned, although most of them are not entirely reliable.

1. If š in I:1-2 is understood as a relative pronoun (Hackett 1984:31), this is a strong isogloss with Canaanite (Phoenician and Ammonite). No certainty in this respect is possible, however, since the alternative translation ‘man’ is not unlikely and, indeed, has been widely accepted (DNWSI 115).  

2. šl ‘god’ without -h is unusual for Aramaic, but normal for Canaanite. This understanding of šl in I:2 and II:6 is, however, not unanimously accepted (DNWSI 333, Hackett 1984:59), but even if we are faced with a reflex of PS *ṣil- ‘god,’ it likely functions here as a theonym and not as an appellative.

3. šb ‘cloud’ in I:6 (skry šmyn b-ibky) is clearly identical to Hbr. rāb (HALOT 772) which, together with rānān, is one of the main Hebrew terms with this meaning. Cognate lexemes are uncommon in Aramaic (where reflexes of *ṣanān- clearly predominate), but certainly not absent from it: note especially JBA rēbā ‘dark cloud, cloudiness’ (DJBA 850) and Mnd. aiba ‘cloud, fog, mist, darkness’ (MD 14). The Canaanite-linking value of this isogloss is, therefore, rather restricted.

4. If ylmh in II:4 is understood as ‘his boy’ (or ‘a girl’), lack of y after l does not agree with Proto-Aramaic *šulaym-. This interpretation is, however, very tentative (cf. DNWSI 859).

5. mwdr ‘assembly’ in I:6 is an isogloss with Hbr. mōēd ‘assembly point, meeting, agreed time’ (HALOT 558). No similar nominal formation is common in later Aramaic, but the verbal root wdr (with unexpected w-) is well attested (DJPA 170, LSyr. 185). That Hbr. mōēd is by no means a very specific lexical feature is further suggested by Arb. mawrd- (Lane 2953) and Sab. wmd (SD 155).

6. mswr ‘lesson, exhortation’ in I:10 is an isogloss with Hbr. mūsār ‘discipline, training, warning’ (HALOT 557), derived from the root ysr (ibid. 418), which is shared

---

1192 The incipient presence of dbr in Ugaritic (DUL 263) probably speaks in favor of the Canaanite affiliation of this language (see further above in Chapter 5, p. 284).
1193 The nominal form dbr ‘word, matter’ is attested in Official Aramaic, but its use is restricted to the fixed expression v dbr ‘concerning, with regard to’ (DNWSI 239), clearly reminiscent of Hbr. vāl dšbar (BDB 184).
1194 Within such a reading, it would be identical to n in II:8 (bnym n).
1196 A few attested examples (DJPA 295, DJBA 648, LSyr. 185) are probably due to Hebrew influence.
by Ugaritic ("wr ‘to teach, to instruct,’ DUL 943), but has no reliable attestation in Aramaic (listed as a Canaanite lexical feature above in Chapter 5, p. 309).

7. mšr ‘oracle’ in I:2 is an isogloss with Hbr. maššā(‘) ‘pronouncement,’ probably going back to the verbal expression nāšā(‘) kāl ‘to raise one's voice’ (HALOT 639). Alternative readings for this passage have been proposed (Hackett 1984:33), but even if mšr is accepted (KAI3 312), this relatively uncommon term with obvious cultural-religious connotations is of little value for dialectal subgrouping.

8. mōth ‘rood’ in I:9 is most probably identical to Hbr. māṭā (HALOT 573) and Ugr. mṭ (DUL 602), but with no clear parallel in Aramaic.

9. rkh ‘to mix perfume’ in I:11 goes back to PS *rkh, well attested in Hebrew, Ugaritic and Akkadian (DUL 746, HALOT 1289, CAD R 420), but conspicuously absent from Aramaic. Note that in KAI3 77 the pertinent string of letters is read as wkhk.


8.2.5. The lexical evidence of the Deir ṮAllā plaster text is thus contradictory. Are there any chances for this contradiction to be solved? In our view, the number of specifically Aramaic lexical features and their quality are sufficient to make some kind of special genealogical connection between Deir ṮAllā and Aramaic practically unavoidable. At the same time, it is hardly legitimate to treat a dialect which uses dbr

1197 Thus, ṭḥp is by no means missing from Aramaic, cf. ‘to blaspheme’ in DJPA 215, ‘incitavit’ in LSyR. 258, ‘to grieve; to be grieved, suffer’ in MD 153. The meaning of l-ḥlk in II:11 is uncertain, but if it is understood as “to perish,” this isogloss is neither pro-Aramaic, nor pro-Canaanite (it is only in Ugaritic where — as also in Akkadian and Ethiopian — the reflex of PS *ḥlk ‘to perish’ is common, DUL 393–394). Finally, even if nkr, attested three times in Combination II, is identical to Hbr. nēṣār ‘sprout, offshoot’ (HALOT 718), this rare (four times in the Old Testament) and mostly poetic term can hardly be of much relevance for the purpose of dialectal subgrouping. We tend to agree with S. Kaufman (1988:52) who believes that ṭḥm, ssgr and dvr, designating some concrete bird species in Deir ṮAllā and Biblical Hebrew but having no clear cognates in Aramaic (Hackett 1984:12), are of little relevance for genealogical classification. Conversely, lack of the feminine marker -at- in ywn ‘dove’ is an interesting Proto-Aramaic feature opposing the Deir ṮAllā form to its parallels in Hebrew (yōnā) and Ugaritic (ynt), v. SED II No. 252. Kaufman is right that the meaning “sparrow” (rather than “bird” in general) of sḥr in I:9 is an Aramaic-linking isogloss, although one has to bear in mind that a similarly concrete meaning has been suggested also for Hbr. sippōr in some Biblical passages (HALOT 1047). As for ḫns ‘piglet’ in I:15, treated as an Aramaic-linking isogloss in Hackett 1984:121, Tropper 1993a:304 and Kaufman 1988:52 ("only in Syriac with these root letters"), it is actually attested in both Ugaritic (ḥe-en-ni-ṣu, Huchnergard 1987a:129) and Arabic (ḥmnaṣṣ-, Lane 817), see SED II No. 110. Its absence from the Hebrew Bible, if not merely accidental, may be culturally determined.
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for “to say,” hlk for “to go,” pvl for “to do” and rḥ for “to see” on the same level as roughly contemporary Aramaic dialects, well known to possess different roots for the respective meanings. A common ancestor of Deir ṣAllā and Old Aramaic (“Proto-Syrian” or “Proto-Aramoid” in Huehnergard’s terminology) is thus to be postulated, where lexical features shared by these dialects and opposing them to other NWS languages started to crystallize. As for the Proto-Aramaic lexical isoglosses not shared by Deir ṣAllā, their origin must be attributed to a certain stage of the independent existence of the Aramaic branch.

8.3. Aramaic affiliation of Samalian and Deir ṣAllā as reflected in the lexicon

The sum of the lexical evidence makes one willingly agree with S. Kaufman (1988:52) who believes “Old Aramaic, Samalian and ‘Deir ṣAllān’ shared a period of joint development after the bifurcation of the ancestor of Canaanite-Aramaic into two main branches.” Conversely, this evidence is hard to reconcile with the assumption according to which no special genealogical relationship between Aramaic and either Samalian or Deir ṣAllā has ever existed at all (Huehnergard 1995:282). Whether, as Kaufman asserts, “both Samalian and Deir ṣAllan separated off from the main Aramaic line at about the same time” is more difficult to ascertain. On the one hand, an almost total lack of conflicting lexical evidence makes the Aramaic connection of Samalian rather strong, but the Aramaic-linking isoglosses themselves are somewhat more superficial than one would expect. On the other hand, Proto-Aramaic features preserved in the Deir ṣAllā text are considerably more representative, but their impact is marred to some extent by several undisputable conflicting isoglosses. In such conditions, it would be premature to adhere to any of the Aramaic-like subgrouping models suggested in recent studies on the topic.

The very basic status of the pertinent lexical isoglosses raises some caution against the otherwise plausible suggestion according to which linguistic (notably, lexical) peculiarities of Deir ṣAllā can be explained by the literary (or even poetic) nature of this text. That we are faced with a literary text in the strict sense (thus markedly different from the Old Aramaic royal inscriptions) is a widely acknowledged fact (McCarter 1980:96: “If ‘poetic’ is too precise a term to use at this point in our study of the texts, at least we can speak of a ‘literary’ dialect”; Kaufman 1988:50: “Most of the preserved text is poetry”) and, as pointed out in McCarter 1991:95, “archaism is characteristic of literary language, especially poetry, and the literary quality of our texts may be enough to explain their archaic linguistic features.” To repeat once more, the lexical features in question appear much too essential to be accounted for reasons of style and genre. In some cases, however, these factors may have played a role. Thus, P. K. McCarter is certainly correct to observe that ḥw ḫw ḫl ḫl ḫl in I:5 is a fixed literary formula which finds an exact parallel in the Old Testament (Ps 66:5). As long as one agrees that elements of such formulaic expressions can resist the natural development of the basic vocabulary, no less than a half of Canaanite-like lexical features of the Deir ṣAllā text become at once superfluous or at least suspect. Poetic parallelism may be responsible for a few other lexical oddities, such as the combination of ṭr (“Aramaic”) and ṭḥ (“Canaanite”) for “rod” in I:9.

Such as Tropper 1993a:311 (Samalian separating first, Deir ṣAllā considered merely a branch of Old Aramaic along with Sefire and Tell Fahariyya) and Huehnergard 1995:282 (consecutive separation of Samalian, Deir ṣAllā and Old Aramaic from the common “Proto-Syrian” stock). S. Loesov’s recent
9. Lexical discontinuity between Old Aramaic and later Aramaic dialects

The remarkable consistency with which the Aramaic lexicon preserved for millennia some of its fundamental features did not prevent it from undergoing some substantial diachronic changes.

9.1. On the one hand, a few lexemes which Old Aramaic shares with Canaanite (and other Semitic languages) disappeared from (or are marginally attested in) later dialects, from Official Aramaic onward. A representative selection of such terms includes the following examples.

1. **r̲rbh** ‘locust’ (DNWSI 101): w-šbr šnn ylı̇l r̲rbh ‘For seven years may the locust eat’ (KAI 222A:27).

   # Identical with Hbr. *yaɾbā* (HALOT 83) and related terms throughout Semitic (SED II No. 11). In later Aramaic replaced by the reflexes of PS *ḥ̲a̱m̲s̲: Syr. ḥ̲a̱m̲š̲ā* (SED II No. 131, LSyr. 673).

2. **r̲š** ‘fire’ (DNWSI 121): ṭy ẏl š̱wt ĵ̱t b-řš ‘In the same way as this wax is burned by fire...’ (KAI 222A:35, also 37), w-y̱b̲d mn m̱t tnn r̲š ‘May the smoke of fire disappear from his country’ (KAI 320:8).

   # Identical with Hbr. *r̲š̲* and related terms throughout Semitic (HALOT 92, DUL 119). In later dialects more or less intensively replaced by the reflexes of *n̲ūr-* (HALOT 1928, DJPA 345, LSyr. 421, Jastrow 1994:185), derived from PS *n̲w̲r* ‘to

---

**Note:** Right-to-left script is used for transliteration, standard abbreviations are included.

---

**Footnotes:**

1200 Hypothesis (2009:428–429) postulating the opposite sequence of events (Deir ḏ̱llā — Samalian — Proto-Aramaic) is best compatible with the lexical evidence.

1201 It is uncertain whether ḥ̱rg ‘to kill’ (DNWSI 293) should be attributed to this group since the pertinent passage (KAI 222A:24: w-šbr ḇkṯh y̱ẖkn ḇṯ y̱ẖŋ̱n w-ū y̱ẖkn, context problematic) still defies convincing interpretation (for a survey of opinions v. DNWSI 293, Fitzmyer 1995:81–83). If ḇkṯh is — *faute de mieux* — still understood as ‘hen,’ one wonders whether ḇṯ could be compared with Akk. *būṣ̱ittu* ‘a wood-eating insect, wood fretter, beetle’ (CAD B 352, AHw. 143). The whole passage could then be translated ‘Seven hens will strike a bread-worm, but will not kill’ (y̱ẖkn = Hbr. ẖrkā, for the contraction of *-iy*- cf. i̱ppn ‘let them bake’ in KAI 309:22, v. Huehnergard 1987b:274). In the domain of formal (morpholexical) peculiarities, n̲b̲s̲ ‘soul’ (DNWSI 744) deserves attention. It is widely attested throughout the Old Aramaic corpus (KAI 217:7, 222A:37, 222B:39.40.42, 223B:5, 224:5–7, 309:7), but disappears completely from all later Aramaic sources, where only n̲p̲s̲ is present. Old Aramaic n̲b̲s̲ , together with a few occasional manifestations of the same phenomenon in Phoenician (KAI 24:13, most probably an areal feature of Aramaic/Samalian origin) and Epigraphic Hebrew (more difficult to explain) has attracted much scholarly attention (v. DNWSI 744 for a useful survey of opinions). It has rarely been observed that n̲a̱b̲s̲ ‘soul’ is also widely attested in some Southern Ethiopian languages (SED I No. 46.).

1202 Thus, in Biblical Aramaic n̲n̲r̲ā is attested many times, whereas r̲ʕ̱s̱ā is found only once (Da 7:11; note n̲n̲r̲ā in Da 7:9–10). However, it is the latter term that clearly predominates elsewhere in Official Aramaic (DNWSI 122). In JPA, r̲ʕ̱s̱ā (DJPA 54) is still more common than n̲n̲r̲ā (ibid. 345), but in JBA the former is only scarcely attested (DJBA 126). Both r̲ʕ̱s̱a and n̲n̲r̲a are well represented in Mandaic (MD 357–358 and 294), but a good part of the former’s attestations belong to the fixed expression r̲ʕ̱s̱a ẖaiṯa ‘living fire.’ In Syriac and Neo-Aramaic reflexes of *r̲ʕ̱s̱*- are preserved only with the meaning “fever” (LSyr. 52, Khan 2008:1403), the designations of “fire” invariably going back to *n̲ūr-*.
shine,’ ‘to be bright’ (HALOT 683, DUL 641). A similar, though formally different derivation, took place in Arabic nār- (Lane 2865).

3. ṣzz ‘to be strong’ (DNWSI 835): yʿzz ‘he will strengthen’ (KAI 222B:44, in a difficult context), ẓy ʾyy ʿazz ‘One who is stronger than you’ (KAI 223B:20).

# Identical with Hbr. and Ugr. ṣzz (DUL 197, HALOT 808). The root *ṭzz is to some extent preserved in Official and Middle Aramaic (DNWSI 835, DJPA 401, DJBA 849, LSyrm. 518, MD 12), but in most dialects *ṭḥū has become much more prominent (DJPA 589, 590, DJBA 1227, 1229, LSyrm. 833, MD 481).


# Identical with Hbr. gbāl, Pho. gbāl (HALOT 171, DNWSI 209). In later Aramaic dialects replaced by ṭǎhāmā (DNWSI 1208, DJPA 579, LSyrm. 820, Tezel 2003:191), presumably borrowed from Akk. taḥāmu (CAD T 56, AHw. 1303). JPA gbāl (DJPA 118–119) is almost certainly a Hebraism.

5. ḥry ‘to conceive’ (DNWSI 293): ṣṭ w-ʾl ḥry ‘A ewe, may she not conceive’ (KAI 222A:21, context fragmentary).

# Identical with Hbr. ḥārā and related terms throughout Semitic (SED I No. 20., with an addition in SED II, p. 345). Various replacements in later dialects, such as Syr. bṭu (LSyr. 67) and JPA ṣbr (DJPA 394).

6. ḥpsy ‘affair’ (DNWSI 396): w-ṣlḥ mlhý ṣl[w]lm ṣl-k ḥpsy ‘When I send my ambassador to him for peace’ or for any of my business’ (KAI 224:8).

---

1202 PWS *ṭzz ‘to be strong’ is further represented by Arb. ṣzz ‘to be mighty, powerful, strong’ (Lane 2030), Sab. h-ṭzz ‘to uphold,’ ṣzd ‘strength, vigor’ (SD 24), Qat. ṣzd ‘to work vigorously’ (LIQ 117), Gez. ḥazzza ‘to be strong, steadfast, vigorous’ (CDG 81), Tgr. ḥazzə ‘to be strong, mighty’ (WTS 480). An eventual connection with Akk. ezēzu ‘to be fierce’ (CAD E 427, AHw. 269) is possible, but far from certain because of the semantic difference.

1205 Usually compared to Arb. ṭq ‘to be skilled, active, intelligent; to overcome someone,’ ṭqāq ‘very acidic (vinegar); skilled, active, quick’ (Lane 343). Cf. further Sab. ʾṣlḥ ‘to be appointed, assigned to a post’ (SD 151) and Soq. ʾṭq ‘redresser’ (LSyr. 445).

1204 Note also the reconstruction gbāl[yy] in KAI 202B:8.

1205 No obvious cognates outside Canaanite with a possible exception of Sab. ḡābet ‘cultivated land surrounding village or dwelling’ (SD 48, LIQ 55). Comparison with Arb. ḡābet ‘mountain’ (Lane 376), widely accepted in Semitological literature, must remain hypothetical because of the semantic difference (cf. DRS 96 where “mountain” and “border” are carefully separated). If it is nevertheless accepted, one cannot exclude an eventual connection with PWS *gbāl ‘to be massive, solid,’ represented by Syr. ḡbal ‘coagulavit; finxit, formavit’ (LSyr. 101), Arb. ḡbl ‘to create,’ ḡbl ‘big, thick, coarse,’ ḡbl ‘a great company of men’ (Lane 375–376), Tgr. gábbalā ‘to gather booty’ (WTS 582).

1206 But cf. Kaufman 1974:105–106, where it is rightly emphasized that the Akkadian word is comparatively late and peripheral.

1207 For a few exceptional attestations of ḥry in the DSS Aramaic v. Beyer 1984:564.
7. *lhm* ‘war’: *b-lhm* rw *b-sl* ‘In war or in peace’ (KAI 320:2); *lhm* ‘to fight’: [*b-h*lhm*] ‘When he fought…’ (KAI 310:2, context fragmentary).

# As rightly acknowledged by M. Sokoloff (1999:109), this is “a common West Semitic root, later lost in Aramaic.”

The most prominent replacement in later Aramaic is *kārābā* (HALKOT 1972, DJPA 502, LSyr. 691), presumably derived from PS *ṭrb* ‘to be close.’

8. *lhy* ‘bad’ (DNWSI 571): [yšk h]dd *klm llyh b-yrk w-bšw* ‘May Hdd pour every sort of evil (which exists) on earth and in heaven’ (KAI 222A:25–26), w-yml *mln llyt* ‘He will say bad words’ (KAI 224:2).

# The root *lhy* ‘(to be) bad,’ of uncertain etymology, is still relatively well attested in Official Aramaic (DNWSI 571), but has been gradually replaced by *bš* (HALKOT 1830–1831, DJPA 102, LSyr. 57, Jastrow 1988:183) and ceased to exist in later Aramaic dialects.

---


Represented by Akk. *šbibi* ‘to wish, to desire’ (CAD § 119). Hbr. *šbi* ‘ornament, splendor’ (HALKOT 997), Arb. *šw* ‘to manifest passionate love or desire’ (Lane 1649), perhaps Tna. *tāšabbūyā* ‘to wait; to await, to stand by; to persevere, to expect’ (TED 2580). Akk. *šibītu* ‘need, want, request; purpose; business activity, enterprise’ (CAD § 167) comes so close to Aramaic *šbibi* both formally and semantically that an Akkadism (or at least some kind of Akkadian influence) is to be seriously considered.

Represented elsewhere by Ugr. *lhm* ‘to fight,’ *mlhm* ‘war’ (DUL 496, 548), Hbr. *lhm* ‘to fight,’ *mlhamā* ‘war’ (HALKOT 526, 589), Arb. *lhm* (VI) ‘to come to blows,’ (VIII) ‘to erupt (of war, quarrel)’ (WKAS L 345). HALKOT 526 may be right to surmise an eventual relationship with the meaning “to come in close contact,” represented by Arb. *lhm* ‘to fit, to join together’ (WKAS L 342), Gez. *valhama* ‘to close, to glue’ (CDG 311), Tgr. *lāhamā* ‘to hold together by means of glue’ (WTS 32), Mhr. *lāhmā* ‘to touch’ (ML 253), Jib. *lāhām* ‘to jump up and touch (something high)’ (JL 163), Soq. *lāham* ‘s’habiter’ (LS 232). If this assumption is correct, the old meaning must be preserved in Syr. *lhem* ‘aptus fuit; se applicavit,’ (pa.) ‘conjunxit, adaptavit’ (LSyr. 364).

Close semantic parallels from the same root are attested in Akkadian: *kīrubu* ‘attack, melee,’ *kīrubīš* ‘in a close battle’ (CAD Q 282), *takrubu* ‘battle’ (CAD T 201). Given the fact that most attestations of these terms are late, the possibility of Aramaic influence cannot be excluded (clearly borrowed from Aramaic *kārubu* ‘battle, fight,’ CAD Q 125, Abraham–Sokoloff 2011:46).

In later Aramaic, the root seems to be preserved in Syr. *lḥā* ‘abstersit; perdidit; delevit’ (LSyr. 363), but all further etymological equations are doubtful: (1) Arb. *lhy* ‘to peel bark’ (WKAS L 393), compared by C. Brockelmann in LSyr. 363; (2) Gez. *laḥawya* ‘to be pretty, to be shiny,’ compared in LSyr. 363 and correctly rejected in CDG 312; (3) Gez. *laḥawaa* ‘to mourn, to grieve’ (CDG 312); (4) Arb. *lhy* ‘to abuse, to deride, to jeer’ (WKAS L 393); (5) Gez. *lāḥāla* ‘to be weak, slack, soft’ (CDG 312, with cognates elsewhere in EthS); (6) Akk. *lurū* ‘soiled, dirty, unclean’ (CAD L 258); (7) Jib. *ṣele* ‘der untere’ (Bittner 1917:48), Soq. *lēhe* ‘inférieure’ (LS 232).

One might be tempted to reconstruct PS *bš* with an original meaning “to be putrid,” “to smell bad” on the basis of Akk. *baqṣatu* ‘to smell bad’ (CAD B 4, AHw. 94), Hbr. *bš* ‘to stink’ (HALKOT 107).
9. **zhn** ‘to grow old’ (DNWSI 339): **w-zŷn** ‘he is growing old’ (KAI 223B:8).

# Identities with Hbr. **zākēn** (HALOT 278) and going back to PS *ḏakin- ‘beard’ (SED I No. 63). In later dialects replaced by the reflexes of PS *š̄b ‘to be grey’ (SED I No. 66., DNWSI 1099, HALOT 1986, DJPA 364, LSyR. 469, Jastrow 1994:189) or the specifically Aramaic root *kāšš (LSyr. 702, DJBA 1050–1051, MD 430), of uncertain origin.

9.2. On the other hand, many lexical isoglosses usually perceived as typically Aramaic are not attested before the Official Aramaic period. Theoretically, they could be considered together with the “new roots” dealt with in the preceding section. It turns out, however, that in most such cases the pertinent concepts are simply unattested in Old Aramaic. If they were, their exponents would probably have been the same as in later dialects. The following examples can be adduced as representative of this stratum of Common Aramaic vocabulary.


# Likely related to Akk. **allānu** ‘oak’ (CAD A1 354, AHw. 37), Hbr. **ayīl** ‘mighty tree’ (HALOT 40), **ēlā** ‘massive tree’ (ibid. 51–52), **allōn** ‘oak’ (ibid. 54). PS *nāṣ- ‘tree’ is either relegated to the meaning “wood” (DNWSI 879, HALOT 1811, DJPA 68, DJBA 152) or abandoned completely.

2. **dmk** ‘to sleep’ (DNWSI 252, DJPA 152, LSyR. 157, Jastrow 1994:156)

---

However, one should not lose sight of the fact that many general meanings (including “to be bad”) are attested far beyond Aramaic: Arb. **būṣa** ‘very bad is he!’ (Lane 146), Sab. **bṣš** ‘harm’ (SD 25), Qat. **bṣš** ‘harm, damage, misfortune’ (LIQ 22), Gez. **būṣa** ‘to be bad, to become worse’ (CDG 82, with cognates in other EthS). Nevertheless, the broad spread of the meaning “to be bad” for **būṣša** in later Akkadian is best to be explained by Aramaic influence (contra Streck 2010:655).

---

Cf. further Arb. **μλβλη-, υλλ-, υλλ-** = **sāṣaru ḥasanu l-manṣāri murrī ḫarāmī** (LA 14 53) and Jib. **γλλ** ‘tall grass’ (JL 3). Ugr. **ṭltn** is translated as ‘oak grove’ in DUL 58, but this interpretation is hardly compelling. For an a possible connection with Arb. **μλλλ- = μλ-χαρβατ- l-μλλλματu n-μλλσί** (LA 11 27) v. Fronzaroli 1968:300.

---

As pointed out in HALOT 1811, another later Aramaic replacement of *nāṣ- is *l̄wys- (DJPA 491, LSyR. 665, Jastrow 2002:176). Contra Kaufman 1974:86, this Proto-Aramaic lexeme is hardly a loanword from Akk. *kūṣtu* ‘wood’ (AHw. 923, CAD Q 272), but rather a cognate to it (Fronzaroli 1968:277, 290). Further related are Mhr. **kāṣīt** ‘thicket, forest’ (ML 242) and Soq. **kāṭim** ‘bois’ (LS 388).
# Of unclear origin. Comparison with Soq. démā with the same meaning suggested in LS 129 is tempting, but -k remains unexplained. 1219

3. ðnh 'to rise (sun)' (Beyer 1984:556, DNWSI 256, 597, DJPA 153, LSyr. 159).
# Usually treated as a variant root to Hbr. zrî with the same meaning (HALOT 281), presumably < *ðwrî in view of Arb. ðavârâh- ‘milk mixed with a larger quantity of water,’ rałmârû ðavârîyyun ‘intensively red’ (Lane 960). For its coexistence with *wɔ́ in Official Aramaic v. Folmer 1995:633.

# Proto-Aramaic *kaʔp̯- 'stone,' of unclear origin,1220 replaces PS *ʔabn-.1221

# This etymologically obscure root1222 has replaced PS *ryb 'to be hungry' (SED I No. 59,).

# Clearly related to Arb. sbq 'to precede, to outgo' (Lane 1299), but with no further parallels elsewhere.1223 This root probably replaced PS *qlb 'to leave,' for which see DUL 148, HALOT 806.

# Of uncertain origin.1224 As mentioned above in this chapter, kbr šnwh = Akk. šumūd šanātīšu in KAI 309:8 makes it probable that the concept “to be numerous” was expressed by kbr in Old Aramaic (still attested with this meaning in Syriac, LSyr. 316).

---

1219 If accepted, this comparison would presuppose an eventual connection with PWS *dwm/*dmm ‘to be still, silent, numb,’ for which see DRS 236, 274.
1220 Akk. kāpu ‘cliff, embankment’ (CAD K 191, AHw. 445) is often compared to this Aramaic term, but the Akkadian word is late and may well be borrowed from Aramaic. The matter is further complicated by the fact that kēp̱i/kēp̱a with the characteristically Akkadian meaning ‘shore, bank’ is well attested in JBA and Mandaic (DJBA 578, MD 215). As rightly pointed out in CAD K 192, the meaning of the element ka- pj in OB proper names like a-li-ka-pj is uncertain, which makes rather doubtful its equation with kēp̱a ‘cliff’ proposed in AHw. 445. Of some interest may be Soq. kaf occurring in the expression id kaf sašadî. According to our informants, kaf means ‘side, proximity’ (جَنْب or جَنْب).
1221 In Official Aramaic ʔbn is still clearly predominant (DNWSI 6). For the reflexes of *ʔabn- in later dialects v. DJPA 33 (common), DJBA 75 (rather common), LSyr. 3 (very sparse, possibly a Hebraism), MD 4 (very sparse).
1222 Hardly any connection with Arb. mukfināna = lā mîlḥa šindahum (LA 13 440).
1223 Cf. also Sab. šbḥ ‘success’ (SD 123). Mhr. šbh ‘to come up fast, get in front of so’ (ML 339) and Jib. šbk ‘to get in front’ (JL 222) are borrowed from Arabic.
1224 The only relatively suitable parallel is Arb. saʃawzā, saʃawzār- ‘long in the legs; very tall, with bigness’ (Lane 1510).
The spread of *šg as the principal exponent of the meaning “to be numerous” appears to be a real innovation starting from the Official Aramaic period onward.

8. škh ‘to find’ (DNWSI 1132, HALOT 1993, DJPA 549, LSyr. 775, GNMD 88).
   # Of uncertain origin.1225

9. tly ‘young man’ (DNWSI 423, DJPA 225, LSyr. 276).
   # A semantic evolution of PS *ṭalay- ‘lamb’ (SED II No. 232), whose original meaning almost completely disappeared from Aramaic.

   # The root *žy ‘to be small’ must be explained as a specific phonetic evolution of PS *žy (DRS 772).1226 Hbr. žyēr ‘a little’ and mizār ‘trifling’ (HALOT 276, 566) are certainly borrowed from Aramaic (Wagner 1966:49). The original form of the root is thought to be preserved in JPA ȝyr ‘pain, sorrow, trouble’ (DJPA 468) and Syr. ȝar ‘oppobio affectus est’ (LSyr. 634).

   # As rightly observed by S. Kaufman (1974:112–113), this root is hard to separate from Akk. zibānītu ‘weight’ (CAD Z 99, AHw. 1523), but the exact details of their relationship are still unclear.1227

9.3. The lexical corpus consolidated during the Official Aramaic period was not immune to further changes: several lexemes normal in both Old and Official Aramaic disappeared completely (or almost completely) from later dialects.

Consider, for example, such verbs as *lkh ‘to take’ (DNWSI 582) or *nš ‘to lift up, to carry’ (DNWSI 760), later replaced by *nsb (DJPA 352, DJBA 756, LSyr. 432),1228 *ntl (HALOT 1930, DJPA 348, DJBA 744, LSyr. 425),1229 *sbl (HALOT

---

1225 A connection with Hbr. škh ‘to forget’ (HALOT 1489) is traditionally supposed, but the direction of the semantic shift is not entirely clear: “to forget” > “to look for” > “to find”? The existence of Akk. šekû (Š) ‘beschaffen’ (AHw. 1210) is doubtful (for an alternative interpretation of CH iv 4 see CAD Š 28 under šašû ‘to irrigate’). For Ugr. škh ‘to meet’ (DUL 814) see above in Chapter 5 (p. 326).

1226 That *y is behind ṣ in this Aramaic root is now clear thanks to the Demotic evidence: sḏyρn (Papyrus Amherst 63, 19:11 and 21:2, DNWSI 1256). In view of this, Arb. ṣvr ‘to be scanty and thin (hair, plumage)’ (Lane 1231), compared in Wagner 1966:49, can only be considered a relatively late Aramaic loanword.

1227 See further DRS 675–676, in particular about Arb. zbn ‘to sell fruits upon the tree’ (Lane 1213) and related terms, most probably borrowed from Aramaic.

1228 Of uncertain origin. An etymological relationship with Arb. nšb ‘to stick fast’ (Lane 2791), suggested in Nöldke 1910:188 and accepted in LSyr. 432, is semantically difficult. It is tempting to suppose that *nsb (< *nšb) goes back to a fusion of *nš with the preposition b- (as it happened with ūdah + bi- > ūdah in colloquial Arabic, Zaborski 1991:1681), but the evidence for this prepositional usage of nš in early Aramaic is not much.
1936, DJPA 365, LSyr. 454, MD 316)\textsuperscript{1230} and *škhl (LSyr. 798, DJBA 1174, Jastrow 1994:163).\textsuperscript{1231} Typologically similar are *kkhl ‘to be able’ (DNWSI 489)\textsuperscript{1232} and *ršt ‘to think, to consider’ (DNWSI 895).\textsuperscript{1233}

9.4. When did all these “new Aramaic roots” emerge? This tantalizing question, avoided in our analysis until now, is nevertheless virtually inescapable. Indeed, reliable pan-Aramaic attestation of such lexemes as *nūr- ‘fire,’ *ṭḥp ‘to be strong’ or *ḥrs ‘to be bad’ naturally projects them back to Proto-Aramaic. How then is it possible that they are completely absent from the earliest attested descendants of this proto-language, viz. the idiom(s) of the Old Aramaic inscriptions?

The problem is notoriously complex and in all probability has several partly overlapping solutions, briefly enumerated below.

(1) The features in question were present in the lexical inventory of Old Aramaic, but do not appear in our inscriptions because of their (by that time) marginal functional status in the core vocabulary. In view of the limited size of the extant OArm. text evidence, this is quite a feasible possibility: many of the remarkable lexical features (both “Aramaic-like” and “non-Aramaic-like”) that we do find in the corpus are attested so sparsely that that their very presence in our lexical inventories may well be considered accidental.

(2) Pertinent concepts (sometimes, perhaps, even shades of meanings) are simply missing from the inscriptions, hence the absence of their exponents. As we have repeatedly observed above, this is a powerful factor which cannot be neglected in any further discussion of the history of Aramaic vocabulary.

\textsuperscript{1230} No etymology outside Hbr. nṯl ‘to lift, to bear’ (BDB 642, a rare and mostly poetic verb). Comparison with Akk. napatlu ‘to see’ (CAD N 2 121) suggested in HALOT 694 (presumably < “to lift one’s eyes”) is semantically difficult.

\textsuperscript{1231} No reliable etymology outside Hbr. sbl ‘to carry’ (HALOT 741, a rare poetic verb). Cf. perhaps Tna. sābālā ‘to load lightly’ (TED 700), sābālā ‘to load a saddle bundle on a pack animal’ (ibid. 838), compared in Leslau 1958:39. The relationship between this Aramaic root and Akk. zabalu is uncertain (cf. Kaufman 1974:11 who takes for granted that “the Aramaic cognate of Akk. zabalu ‘to carry’ is sbl”). A fossilized š-causative from *wbl ‘to carry’ is possible, but hard to prove.

\textsuperscript{1232} Perhaps to be compared to Mhr. ḫakla ‘oben, über’ (Jahn 1902:187), Soq. sīkāhāl ‘élevé, haut’ (LS 290). A fossilized š-causative from the biconsonantal element *ṭl (Zaborski 1971:81) is not unlikely. At any rate, Zaborski is certainly right to reject Brockelmann’s comparison with Gez. ṣakla ‘to suspend’ (< PS *ṭl).

\textsuperscript{1233} Attested in KAI 222B:25 (w-l-ykkhl bry [l-šlḥ yd b-bv[k] ‘Nor will my son be able to raise a hand against your son’), KAI 223B:6 (p-l-ḥkhl l-ṣlḥ yd bk ‘I shall not be able to raise a hand against you’) and KAI 222B:33 (w-ḥkhl my, context fragmentary). The verb ḥkhl — shared, inter alia, by Gez. kohla (CDG 277), Mhr. kḥel (ML 205) and Soq. ḫl (LS 214) — is well attested in Official Aramaic (HALOT 1896, DNWSI 489, Folmer 1995:634), but extremely rare in later dialects (on p. 638 of her study Folmer refers to “MD s.v. kahla,” but the only kahla which we were able to locate in MD 195 means ‘kohol, antimony’).

\textsuperscript{1234} Attested in KAI 223B:5 (bn tmr b-nbšk w-ršt b-lbb[k] ‘If you say in your soul and think in your mind…’). The Official Aramaic attestations are well known (HALOT 1954, Beyer 1984:666), but later examples are very rare. No etymological parallels outside Hbr. ršt (HALOT 898), which is almost certainly borrowed from Aramaic (Wagner 1966:93).
(3) Old Aramaic as attested in the extant inscriptions is not the direct precursor of each and every later Aramaic dialect and, therefore, cannot exhaust the lexical (and, more generally, linguistic) specificity of Proto-Aramaic. A few Proto-Aramaic lexical features could have been abandoned (or strongly marginalized) in those early dialects which are reflected in the inscriptions, but simultaneously flourish in other, at that time unwritten, Aramaic varieties, which are only known to us from their later continuants. This solution provides a promising avenue for investigating the well-known Western/Eastern Aramaic dichotomy not only in grammar, but also in vocabulary. However, it is hardly capable of explaining all the relevant examples, as many of them are virtually pan-Aramaic and do not show any marked dialectal specificity.

(4) Some of the relevant lexical features could emerge at a comparatively late date in (an) individual Aramaic (proto-)idioms and subsequently spread to others by oral or literary borrowing.
Chapter 7.
Lexical isoglosses and the historical unity of Ethiopian Semitic

1. Introduction

1.1. Demonstration of the diachronic unity of Ethiopian Semitic could ideally provide a model illustration for one of the principal goals of genealogical subgrouping: a compact, geographically and historically isolated group of languages whose similarity has been intuitively realized by every student of Semitics is naturally expected to provide a significant number of shared isoglosses from which a reliable net of classificatory criteria could be worked out.

But is this indeed the case? Regrettably, the answer seems to be overwhelmingly negative. As rightly observed in Faber 1997:12, “although virtually all discussions of Semitic subgrouping assume a single Ethiopian Semitic branch which later split into North Ethiopic and South Ethiopic, there is virtually no linguistic evidence for such a Common Ethiopian stage.” Indeed, even if Geez alone is confronted with Arabic, Sabaic or Mehri, reliable morphological innovations separating it from these languages are rather difficult to find, even more so if such innovations are expected to be shared by Tigre, Tigrinya or Amharic.

1.2. Faber’s claim is to be viewed as an — undoubtedly justified — reaction against numerous attempts to collect various allegedly specific Ethiopian features, all or most of which either turn out to be absent from several languages of the group (sometimes even from Geez), or are obvious retentions from PS, or can be easily discarded as typologically trivial developments possibly of an areal nature.

A typical example of such a list can be found in Leslau 1975, as duly recognized by E. Ullendorff in his comments on Leslau’s paper: “None of these features, or almost none of them, in isolation can be considered as characterizing Semitic Ethiopic. It is only the sum total of them taken together that can be considered in this light.”

R. Hetzron’s analysis (1972:17–19) is a far more serious attempt, but the final outcome is also rather disappointing. Thus, verbal expressions based on the verb “to say” are only sparsely attested in Geez, but so common in Cushitic that their broad spread in Modern EthS can well be regarded as an areal phenomenon affecting each language independently. The locative verb *hlw, conjugated after the paradigm of the suffix conjugation, but expressing the existence in the present, is at least partly a lexical feature, whereas its peculiar morphosyntactic behavior may also be due to Cushitic influence (as rightly admitted by Hetzron himself). As for some syntactic phenomena discussed by Hetzron, the concluding statement of the

---

1254 Faber’s “linguistic evidence” must be synonymous with “shared morphological innovations.” This implicit equation — independent of its relevance for the subgrouping question — is terminologically inaccurate as it automatically excludes phonology, syntax and lexicon from linguistics.

1255 Such as the word order (SOV, qualifiers preceding qualified elements).
corresponding section of his book is quite telling: “The Cushitic evidence came later and was independent in the different branches of Ethiopian.”

In sum, it is rather hard to agree with D. Appleyard (1996:207–208), who believes that Hetzron’s study “lays to rest the phantom of a dual or even multiple origin of Ethiopian Semitic.” Rather, the contrary is true: it is precisely Hetzron’s attempt to defend the common origin of EthS which is among the weakest points of his otherwise brilliant monograph.

1.3. As a closer examination of the facts reveals, Faber’s claim is to some extent exaggerated (Weninger 2011b:1115–1116): there are, indeed, a few morphological features which might be considered Proto-EthS innovations. Potentially relevant examples, extensively discussed in a recent article by M. Bulakh and the present author, include the following phenomena.

1.3.1. Front vowel after the first radical in the imperfect of the intensive stem: Gez. ya-sebbhr, Tna. ya-sabhbr, Har. yi-siibri. This feature is explicitly preserved also in Argobba, Eastern Gurage and Gunnän-Gurage and has left feasible traces in Amharic (Bulakh–Kogan 2010:281–284). It is, however, completely missing from Tigre, where the imperfect and the jussive of the intensive stem are identical (yasammbr). There is no evidence that Tigre has ever been affected by this isogloss.

The innovative nature of this feature with respect to the more original a-Ablaut (*yuparr) is not in doubt: the *ē-insertion after the second radical in EthS is a direct functional counterpart of the similarly innovative n-extension in MSA (for which see Chapter 8 below, pp. 462-463). However, the origin of the material element of this innovation (in other words, the *ē-vowel as such) remains completely uncertain: it is very hard to say why the front vowel — and precisely in this position — was chosen as the exponent of the present tense (cf. Voigt 1990).

1.3.2. The *katl- base of the converb is most transparently attested in Geez and Tigrinya, but there are good reasons to believe that the *katl- base in Amharic and Argobba is traceable to the same prototype (Bulakh–Kogan 2010:284–286). Furthermore, one cannot exclude that the so-called t-converb in Western Gurage is also somehow related to *katl- (cf. Hetzron 1972:103–105 as opposed to Goldenberg 1977:466–468). Once again, there is virtually no trace of the *katl- converb in Tigre.

The exact origin of this (almost certainly innovative) feature is uncertain. The identity of *katl- to the widely attested adjectival base *katel- has often been assumed (cf. Fox 2003:190–191) and is indeed not unlikely, although no full certainty is possible.

1.3.3. The agent noun *katel-i is by far the most widespread common EthS feature (Weninger 2011b:1115). It is productively preserved in Geez, Tigre and Tigrinya (probably also in Argobba and Selti) and has left more or less prominent traces in many of the remaining Southern EthS languages (Bulakh–Kogan 2010:286–288).

There are good reasons to believe that the introduction of the innovative pattern *katel-i was the primary trigger of the extinction of the PS active participle pattern *katel- — a prominent non-trivial loss which characterizes all EthS languages.

---

with the remarkable exception of Tigre which, once again, shows its profound specificity: in this language, the *ḥāṭil- participle is still in its full blossom.\(^{1237}\)

The diachronic background of the agent noun *ḥāṭāl-iy- is far from certain. In particular, its derivation from the infinitive pattern *ḥāṭāl- (Fox 2003:182–183) is faced with serious difficulties.

1.3.4. The infinitive in -o(t) (Weninger 2011b:1115) is best attested in Geez, Ancient Harari and Eastern Gurage, whereas its less transparent remnants are probably preserved in Tigre and Peripheral Western Gurage (Bulakh–Kogan 2010:292–294). Given the fact that no infinitive suffix can be reliably traced back to PS,\(^{1238}\) this way of forming the infinitive must be innovative, although the origin of the -o(t) morpheme is completely obscure.

1.3.5. A few other morphological features discussed in Bulakh–Kogan 2010 are not sufficiently widespread to be reliably traced back to Proto-EthS. This is the case of the verbal stems in *asta- and *at- (Bulakh–Kogan 2010:275–276, 290–292), the composite verbs based on *bhl ‘to say’ (ibid. 289), the frequentative stem *ḥāṭālala (ibid. 289–290). Most of such features are conspicuously missing from Geez, which makes one think of their comparatively recent emergence probably conditioned by Cushitic influence.

1.4. The foregoing evaluation makes it clear that there is hardly any morphological feature that can be considered to be of crucial value for determining the linguistic specificity of EthS. This conclusion becomes especially evident in view of the fact that most of the potentially relevant phenomena are lacking from two major representatives of this subgroup, viz. Tigre and modern Harari: each of the two languages displays only one diagnostic feature.\(^{1239}\) Yet even when all of these phenomena are found to occur together (as in Geez), such a meager amount of evidence scarcely corresponds to one’s expectations about a group of languages intuitively perceived as so closely related.

Does this mean that the historical unity of Ethiopian Semitic cannot be demonstrated? Should we understand EthS as a geographical and historical-cultural concept only? One important factor should prevent us from such a conclusion, namely the fundamental unity of the basic vocabulary. A systematic demonstration of this unity and its key relevance for the question of the common origin of EthS is the principal goal of the present chapter.

2. The Swadesh wordlist: the evidence

---

1237 For the functional opposition between the reflexes of *ḥāṭil- and *ḥāṭāl-iy- in Tigre (true active participle vs. agent noun) see Bulakh–Kogan 2010:288.

1238 The most prominent means of the infinitive formation in PS were likely internal (*ā or *u before the last radical) and did not involve suffixes.

1239 As far as Tigre is concerned, these observations may have serious genealogical consequences. As tentatively surmised in Bulakh–Kogan 2010:294–298, common EthS features not shared by Tigre may suggest that this language was the first to separate from the Proto-EthS stock, thus representing a kind of “pre-Ethiopian” (or “Ethiopoid”) stage opposed to all the remaining languages of this group.
2.1. As elsewhere in this book, the Swadesh wordlist will be used as a conventional starting point for a more comprehensive diachronic evaluation of the basic vocabulary. Our first step will be to separate the stock of positions which can be more or less safely regarded as reflecting the hypothetic Proto-EthS stage. In this procedure, our choice will be guided by the following criteria.

A root preserved with the same basic meaning in Geez, Tigrinya, Amharic and/or Argobba, Harari and/or Eastern Gurage and one of the Gunnän-Gurage languages/Gafat can be attributed to Proto-EthS without much hesitation. A great majority of our examples (46 positions) clearly belong to this core group.

With a relatively high degree of certainty, these 46 terms can be supplemented by 12 roots which are present in Geez, Tigrinya or/and Tigre and at least in two Southern EthS subdivisions (Amharic/Argobba, Harari/Eastern Gurage, Gunnän-Gurage).

A relatively small residual (10 examples) comprises various less reliable combinations, such as Geez + Tigre/Tigrinya + one Southern EthS subdivision, or all (or most) of Neo-Ethiopian, but not Geez, etc.

All together, no less than 68 positions can be qualified as Proto-EthS, more than 80% of them in a highly reliable way. This proportion means, in particular, that 10 examples qualified as somewhat less reliable can be easily eliminated from the discussion with no damage to its basic conclusions. Vice versa, the same is true of those few common lexemes which, in principle, could be included into the Proto-EthS basic lexical stock, but, for various, reasons have not been.

The diachronic stratification of the Proto-EthS Swadesh wordlist can be outlined as follows.

2.2. Trivial retentions

1. “all” — Gez. kəall-, Tgr. kəl, Tna. kəllu, Amh. hullu, Sod. kull-əm, Har. kullu-(CDG 281, WTS 389, TED 1555, AED 2, EDG 341, EDH 92) < PS *kull-.

7. “to bite” — Gez. nasaka, Tgr. nǎkšä, Tna. nǎkšä, Amh. nǎkkäsä, Sod. nǎkkäsä, Har. nǎxsä (CDG 402, WTS 333, TED 1341, AED 1045, EDG 455, EDH 118) < PS *nətk/nkt.

# Metathetic variation, well attested for this root both within and outside EthS,1241 is intriguing, but can hardly be considered an obstacle for postulating an ultimate etymological identity of both variants.

9. “blood” — Gez. dam, Tgr. däm, Tna. däm, Amh. däm, Har. däm, all Gurage däm (CDG 133, WTS 514, TED 2067, AED 1716, EDG 206, EDH 56) < PS *dam-.

1240 Such as *īs- and *tamm- for “smoke.”

1241 As is well known, *nətk in Akkadian, Ugaritic, Hebrew and Mehri (CAD N 2, 53, DUL 653, HALOT 729, ML 305) is opposed to *nk in Aramaic, Arabic and EthS (LSyr. 430, Lane 2847, SD 96). The EthS picture is peculiar insofar as the variation is attested within one relatively narrow genealogical subdivision.
10. “bone” — Gez. ውስمكان, Tgr. ውስمكان, Tna. ውስRunLoop ወማን, አማ. ውስمكان, ልወ ማ (CDG 58, WTS 491, TED 1942, AED 1339, EDG 108, EDH 36) < PS *рашм-

11. “claw” — Gez. ውስት, Tgr. ውስት, Tna. ውስት, ወማን, አማ. ውስት, ልወ ማ (CDG 549, WTS 650, TED 2627, AED 2195, EDG 614, EDH 152) < PS *ѣVбр-

17. “to die” — Gez. የመታ, Tgr. የመታ, Tna. የመታ, ወማን, አማ. የመታ, ልወ ማ (CDG 375, WTS 134, TED 472, AED 304, EDG 435, EDH 114) < PS *мэнт-


21. “ear” — Gez. ዐን, Tgr. ዐን, Tna. ዐን, ወማን, አማ. ዐን, ልወ ማ (CDG 52, WTS 381, TED 1516, Leslau 1997:194, EDG 121, EDH 39) < PS *овд-

25. “eye” — Gez. ወይን, Tgr. ወይን, Tna. ወይን, ወማን, አማ. ወይን, ልወ ማ (CDG 80, WTS 472, TED 1913, AED 1289, EDG 117, EDH 27) < PS *эйн-

28. “fire” — Gez. ወስታ, Tgr. ወ satin, Tna. ወ sat, ወማን, አማ. ወ sat, ልወ ማ (CDG 44, WTS 363, TED 1450, AED 1171, EDG 98, EDH 34) < PS *эсти(-эт)-

32. “full” — Gez. ሥለት, Tgr. ሥለት, Tna. ሥለት, ወማን, አማ. ሥለት, ልወ ማ (CDG 342, WTS 108, TED 330, AED 141, EDG 401, EDH 107) < PS *мтр-

37. “hand” — Gez. ውድል, Tgr. ውድል, Tna. ውድል, ወማን, አማ. ውድል, ልወ ማ (CDG 7, WTS 383, TED 1526, AED 1313, EDG 28, EDH 22) < PS *лд-

38. “head” — Gez. ውስቅስ, Tgr. ውስቅስ, Tna. ውስቅMultiplicity, ወማን, አማ. ውስቅMultiplicity, ልወ ማ (CDG 458, WTS 155, TED 572, AED 381, EDH 32) < PS *оиш-

39. “to hear” — Gez. ወምላር, Tgr. ወምላር, Tna. ወምላር, ወማን, አማ. ወምላር, ልወ ማ (CDG 501, WTS 174, TED 657, AED 462, EDG 545, EDH 140) < PS *эмв-

40. “heart” — Gez. ይቡቡ, Tgr. ይቡቡ, Tna. ይቡቡ, ወማን, አማ. ይ猢 thụ, ልወ ማ (CDG 305, WTS 39, TED 99, AED 71, EDG 373) < PS *лб-

41. “horn” — Gez. ካርን, Tgr. ካርን, Tna. ካርን, ወማን, አማ. ካርን, ልወ ማ (CDG 442, WTS 242, TED 942, AED 791, EDG 494, EDH 128) < PS *кэн-

42. “I” — Gez. የጾ, Tgr. የጾ, Tna. የጾ, ወማን, አማ. የጾ, ልወ ማ (CDG 26, WTS 371, TED 1473, AED 1211, EDG 54, EDH 27) < PS *ян-
44. “knee” — Gez. ṣark, Tgr. ḏarḵ, Tna. ḏarki, Sel. ḏark (CDG 105, WTS 278, TED 1125, EDG 153) < PS *birk-.

48. “liver” — Gez. kabd, Tgr. kūbd, Tna. kābdī, Cha. xāpt, Har. kūd (CDG 273, WTS 412, TED 1635, EDG 333, EDH 90) < PS *kabd-.

54. “moon” — Gez. wärḥ, Tgr. wārḥ, Tna. wārḥī, Har. wāḥri (CDG 617, WTS 433, TED 1723, EDG 660) < PS *war(i)ḥ-.

56. “mouth” — Gez. ṭaf, Tgr. ṭaf, Tna. ṭaf, Amh. ṭaf, Sod. ṭaf, Har. ṭaf (CDG 8, WTS 388, TED 1546, AED 1346, EDG 19, EDH 19).

57. “name” — Gez. šm, Tgr. šm, Amh. šm, Sod. šm, Har. šm (CDG 504, WTS 175, TED 662, AED 466, EDG 545, EDH 140) < PS *šm-.

59. “new” — Gez. ḥaddis, Tgr. ḥaddis, Tna. ḥaddis, Amh. addis, Sod. adʒis, Har. ḥaʒis (CDG 226, WTS 95, TED 285, AED 1306, EDG 30, EDH 81) < PS *ḥdʒ-.

60. “night” — Gez. lelit, Tgr. lali, Tna. läyti, Amh. let, lelit, Gaf. lijā (CDG 314, WTS 31, TED 133, AED 84 and 41, Leslau 1956:212) < PS *layliy-.

61. “nose” — Gez. ṭanf, Tgr. ṭanf, Tna. ṭanfī, Gaf. āfänd, Sod. afunna, Har. āf (CDG 28, WTS 375, TED 1498, Leslau 1956:172, EDG 21, EDH 19) < PS *ranf-.

63. “one” — Gez. ṭaadu, Tna. ḥadā, Amh. and, Sod. att, Har. ḥad (CDG 12, TED 278, AED 1229, EDG 102, EDH 22) < PS *rəddun-.

68. “root” — Gez. šrv, Tgr. šr, Tna. sur, Amh. šr, Sod. šr, Har. šr (CDG 535, WTS 176, TED 677, AED 482, EDG 558, EDH 142) < PS *švṛṣ-.

73. “seed” — Gez. zar, Tgr. zər, Tna. zarī, Amh. zār, Sod. zār, Har. zār (CDG 642, WTS 496, TED 1975, AED 1622, EDG 713, EDH 167) < PS *gavr-.

---

1242 For the possibility of relating to this root the Gunnān-Gurage forms like Cha. bānā v. EDG 146.

1243 Probably due to the influence of similar Cushitic forms and/or contamination with PS *wamp- ‘nose’ (cf. Dolgopolsky 1973:230–231, Appleyard 1977:11). In any case, the present term can be treated not only as a trivial retention from PS, but also as a rather peculiar morphological innovation of the EthS subgroup.

1244 Perhaps also Har. läyli (EDH 102) whose functional status with respect to the Cushitic loanword artu (ibid. 32) remains to be investigated.
80. “star” — Gez. kokab, Tgr. kokāb, Tna. kokob, Amh. kokāb, Sod. kokāb, Zwy. kokāb (CDG 280, WTS 420, TED 1661, AED 1449, EDG 340) < PS *kabkab-

81. “stone” — Gez. ṣbn, Tgr. ṣbn, Tna. ṣmnī, Sod. ṣmnayā, Har. ān (CDG 4, WTS 367, TED 1434, EDG 54, EDH 27) < PS *vbn-

87. “thou” — Gez. ṭanta, Tgr. ṭanta, Amh. antā, Gaf. ant, Sel. atā (CDG 32, WTS 372, AED 1221, Leslau 1956:181, EDG 102) < PS *anta-

89. “tooth” — Gez. sānn, Tna. sānn, Arg. sān, Gaf. sānā, Sod. sānn, Har. sān (CDG 504, TED 717, Leslau 1997:220, 1956:231, EDG 549, EDH 140) < PS *sinn-

90. “tree” — Gez. ṣṣ, Tgr. ṣṣṣit, Cha. āḏā, Wol. ṣñe (CDG 57, WTS 490, EDG 12) < PS *ṣṣ-

94. “water” — Gez. māy, Tgr. may, Tna. may, Har. māy (CDG 376, WTS 138, TED 498, EDH 116) < PS *māy-

95. “we” — Gez. nēḥna, Tgr. ḫna, Tna. nēḥna, Amh. ēnā, Sod. ēnā, Har. ēnā (CDG 395, WTS 82, TED 1305, AED 1257, EDG 79, EDH 29) < PS *niḥnu-

97. “who” — Gez. mannu, Tgr. mān, Tna. mān, Amh. man, Cha. mān, Har. mān (CDG 348, WTS 126, TED 427, AED 255, EDG 407, EDH 108) < PS *man(n)-

2.3. Non-trivial retentions


# From PWS *rawp- ‘bird’ (SED II No. 48), in its turn related to the verbal root *rawp ‘to fly.’ EthS is the only branch of Semitic where *rawp- became the basic term for “bird,” although this general meaning is also attested for Hbr. ṣāp (HALOT 801), JPA ṣāp (DJPA 399) and Syr. ṣawpā (LSyr. 517). See further Chapter 2, p. 112 above.


# From PS *uḥm, mostly attested with the meaning “(to be) dark” rather than “(to be) black” (Bulakh 2003:5–7, 2006b:738–739). The latter meaning is, however,

---

1245 It remains to be established whether the noun — clearly traceable to PS, at any rate — was derived from the verb or vice versa.

1246 In both Hebrew and Aramaic, the basic designations of “bird” go back to *ṣuppur- (SED II No. 212 and Chapter 4, p. 230 above). In Biblical Hebrew, ṣāp is mostly used as a collective and can be applied to flying beings other than birds (BDB 733).
also typical of Akk. šalmu (CAD § 77). It is uncertain whether the basic meaning “(to be) black” is an independent innovation of Akkadian and EthS or rather a parallel retention of the original PS picture.

16. “to come” — Gez. maš’a, Tgr. māš’a, Tna. māš’e, Amh. māṭ’a, Sod. māṭ’a, Sel. māṭa (CDG 370, WTS 145, TED 531, AED 348, EDG 437).

# From PS *mṭʾ ‘to reach, to arrive’: Akk. mašū ‘to be equal to, to amount to,’ (D) ‘to make reach to’ (CAD M, 344), Ugr. mṭʾ ‘to meet, to run into’ (DUL 608), Hbr. mṣʾ ‘to reach, to meet, to find’ (HALOT 619), Syr. mṭā ‘pervenit, advenit’ (LSyr. 381), Sab. mṭʾ ‘to go, to proceed, to march; to reach a place’ (SD 89), Qat. mṭʾ ‘to enter, to go through’ (LIQ 96), Min. mṭʾ ‘se trouver à un endroit’ (LM 64), Jib. mṭḥi ‘to reach to’ (JL 169), Soq. mṭti ‘venir, arriver, atteindre’ (LS 241). In spite of the broad attestation of this root, EthS seems to be the only Semitic subbranch where it became the basic exponent of the meaning “to come.”


# From *šḥḥ-, reliably attested in MSA where it also became the main term with the meaning “fat” (v. SED I No. 261 and Chapter 8, p. 528 below).

31. “foot” — Gez. ḥgr, Tna. ḥgrī, Amh. ḥgr, Sod. ḥgr, Har. ḥgr (CDG 11, TED 1538, AED 1325, EDG 26, EDH 21, 28).

# The origin of the EthS terms for “foot” and their possible counterparts in a few Arabic dialects remains a matter of controversy: they are either traced back to an independent root (A. Militarev in SED I No. 7) or thought to emerge from PWS *rīgl- ‘foot’ (SED I No. 228) through a highly peculiar phonological evolution (Voigt 1998a). See further Chapter 3, pp. 173-174 above.


# From PWS *whb ‘to give,’ also attested in Hbr. yḥb (HALOT 393), Syr. y(h)ab (LSyr. 298), Arb. whb (Lane 2968), Sab. Min. Qat. whb (SD 158, LM 103, LIQ 49). In Hebrew and Arabic, the status of this root is more or less peripheral. Conversely, in the framework of the Common Aramaic suppletive paradigm of the verb “to give,” *whb became, along with *ntn, one of the two basic roots with this meaning (see further Chapter 6, p. 401 above). The functional status of whb in ESA remains to be established.


---

1247 In Hebrew, only the imperative hab is attested, and even this rather sparsely. In Arabic, whb is primarily used with the non-basic meaning “to give for free, to grant, to bestow.” See further Chapter 2, p. 69 above.
49. “louse” — Gez. ḫw₂mal, Tgr. ḫw₂mlät, Tna. ḫw₂mal, Amh. ḫ̀mal, Sod. ḫ̀mal, Har. ḫw₃māy (CDG 432, WTS 237, TED 912, AED 700, EDG 481, EDH 126).

# From PWS *ḥw₃māl- ‘kind of harmful insect, louse’ (SED II No. 130a), also attested in OArm. ḫml (DNWSI 1013), Arb. ḫaml-, ḫummāl- (Lane 2995), Sab. ḫmlt (SD 105). For a metathetic variant *ḥalm- (SED II No. 130b) v. JBA ḫalmātā (DJBA 1021), Syr. ḫalmā (LSyr. 668), Sab. Qat. ḫlm, ḫlmnt (SD 105, Sima 2000:131). Syr. ḫalmā and Arb. ḫummāl- are also used as the basic designations of “louse.” See further in Chapter 2, p. 112.

52. “many” — Gez. ḫsāw, Tgr. ḫsāw, Tna. ḫsāw, Amh. ḫsu, Gog. ḫzā, Har. ḫsāwḥ (CDG 117, WTS 293, TED 1187, AED 928, EDG 168, EDH 40).

# From PS *ḏVnVn-, possibly one of the most ancient Common Semitic terms for “rain.” The original shape of this root is probably preserved in Akk. ṣanānū ‘to rain,’ ṣannu ‘rain’ (CAD Z 41, 160), whereas the Proto-EthS form *ḏVnām — together with Sab. ḏmn (SD 39) — must be due to dissimilation. Different directions of dissimilation in modern EthS (-n- > -l-, -m > -b) are phonetically unproblematic.


# From PS *ḏVnVn-, possibly one of the most ancient Common Semitic terms for “rain.” The original shape of this root is probably preserved in Akk. ṣanānū ‘to rain,’ ṣannu ‘rain’ (CAD Z 41, 160), whereas the Proto-EthS form *ḏVnām — together with Sab. ḏmn (SD 39) — must be due to dissimilation.

69. “round” — Gez. ḫw₂bub, Tgr. ḫw₂bub, Tna. ḫw₂bub, Amh. ḫ̀bub, Sod. ḫ̀bub, Wol. ḫw₂bub (CDG 273, WTS 410, TED 1631, AED 1420, EDG 333).

# From the PWS biconsonantal element *ḥb, whose meaning can be reconstructed as “to be curved, bent,” “to make a circular movement,” “to encircle”: Arb. ḫbb ‘to overturn, to invert’ (WKAS K 14), ḫbb ‘to turn over’ (Lane 2582), Mhr. ḫbb ‘to stoop’ (ML 201), Jib. ḫbḥ ‘to fold’ (JL 124), possibly P. Hbr. ḫbb (also ḫbb) ‘an arched round vessel’ (Jastrow 608), JPA ḫw ‘pitcher’ (DJPA 252), Akk. ḫw ‘shield’ (CAD K 1).

---

1248 The reverse possibility (an original *ḏmn assimilated to ṣmn in Akkadian) cannot be excluded either (cf. DRS 336).

1249 A partial parallel to the Tigre form is found in Hbr. ṣārām ‘heavy rain’ (HALOT 281).

1250 Likely related to this root is the PS element *ḥp with nearly the same range of meanings: Akk. ḫp ‘to bend, curve,’ ḫp ‘loop, tendril’ (CAD K 175, 397), Hbr. ḫp ‘to bend, to bow down’ (HALOT 493), P. Hbr. ḫp ‘arch, doorway, bow; skull-cap’ (Jastrow 635), JPA ḫp ‘to bend,’ ḫpb ‘dome, vaulted chamber, soft round object’ (DJPA 267, 256), Syr. ḫp ‘flexit’ (LSyr. 323), ḫp ‘inclinavit,
71. “to say” — Gez. bḥla, Tna. bālā, Amh. alā, Sod. balā, Har. bēya (CDG 89, TED 1074, AED 1094, EDH 49, EDG 138).

# From PS *bhl, whose original meaning was probably “to speak with affectation,” “to pray,” “to implore”: Akk. bāālū ‘to pray, to beseech’ (CAD B 2), Arb. bhl ‘to curse,’ (VIII) ‘to address with earnest, energetic supplication’ (Lane 267), Mhr. bḥltīt ‘word’ (ML 45), Jib. behlēt id. (JL 24), Soq. bīlē ‘chose’ (LS 83). Note that the meaning “word” (> “thing”) for *bVhVl-at- in MSA of necessity presupposes that the verbal root *bhl was more or less prominently used with the meaning “to say,” “to speak” at an earlier stage of the history of this subgroup.

72. “to see” — Gez. ṭḥ‘yā, Tgr. ṭārā, Tna. ṭārwāyā, Har. ṭīwā (CDG 459, WTS 156, TED 575, EDH 132).1251

# From PWS *ṛy ‘to see,’ whose attestations outside EthS are mostly restricted to Hbr. ṭy (HALOT 1157), Arb. ṭy (Lane 998) and Sab. ṭy (SD 112). At least in Hebrew and Arabic, the reflexes of this root also function as the basic verbs with the meaning “to see.”


# Proto-EthS *mš/*mnš ‘(to be) small’1252 probably goes back to the PS verbal root *mš with the meaning “(to be) weak, impoverished, shaky” (CAD E 166) and Hbr. mnš ‘to be sickly’ (HALOT 73).


# From PWS *kwem ‘to stand,’ attested in Hbr. kwem (HALOT 1086), Syr. kām (LSyr. 652), Arb. qwm (Lane 2995) and Sab. Min. Qat. kwem (SD 110, LM 73, LIQ 144). The same basic status is observed in Aramaic and Arabic, but not in Hebrew, where *kwem has been partly ousted by md (HALOT 840). See further Chapter 2, pp. 110-111.

96. “what” — Gez. mnmt, Tna. mnmtay, Amh. mn, Sod. mn, Har. mn (CDG 352, TED 434, AED 257, EDG 407, EDH 108) < PS *mēn-

# Proto-EthS *mēn- ‘what’ is a direct counterpart of Akk. mēnu with the same meaning (CAD M 89) and, therefore, probably continues the most ancient
curbavit’ (ibid. 339), Mnd. kwp, kpa, kpp ‘to bow, bend, curve’ (MD 208), Arb. kff ‘to encircle, to surround,’ kīffat- ‘rounding, circle, ring’ (WKAS K 236, 243).
1251 For the presence of re ‘to see’ in some varieties of Argobba v. Leslau 1997:218.
1252 The etymological identity between the two metathetic variants (Northern EthS *mnš vs. Southern EthS *mnš) is evident (cf. Leslau’s remarks in CDG 382).
prototype of this interrogative pronoun (as opposed to the more innovative *maha in Central Semitic), see further Chapters 1 (p. 37) and 3 (p. 176) above.

2.4. Semantic innovations


   # As reasonably argued by Leslau (and Appleyard 1977:41), Proto-EthS *lhš- ‘bark’ is probably derived from the PS verbal root *lḥš/*lḥš ‘to draw off’: Arb. lḥš ‘to pull out the eye together with the fat (of a slaughtered camel)’ (WKAS L 426), Hbr. lḥš ‘to draw off’ (HALOT 321), pB. (nip.) ‘to be peeled off’ (Jastrow 472), Syr. lḥš (pa.) ‘rapuit, spoliavit’ (LSyr. 237), eventually also Akk. ḥalāšu ‘to press, to squeeze out; to clean by combing’ (CAD Ḥ 40, AHw. 311), Arb. lḥš ‘to become clear, ḥulašat- ‘sediment of butter’ (Lane 785–786), Qat. lḥš ‘sincere’ (LIQ 74). For a similar semantic development cf. Latin cortex, according to WH I 279 < *(s)ger-t- ‘schneiden’ (“als abgeschälte, abgeschnittene Rinde”).


   # Proto-EthS *kabd- ‘belly’ emerged via semantic broadening from PS *kabid- ‘liver’ (SED I No. 141). In Geez and Tigrinya, the meanings “belly” and “liver” are not distinguished, whereas in Amharic hod ‘belly’ is opposed to gubbāt ‘liver’ (of uncertain origin).1253 The meaning “interior” for the reflexes of *kabid- is attested also in Arabic (kabid- ‘middle, innermost part,’ WKAS K 20) and Ugaritic (kbd ‘innards, entrails,’ DUL 424), but it is only in EthS that this PS lexeme developed into the main designation of external belly (abdomen).1254


   # Proto-EthS *mVdr- ‘earth’ goes back to PWS *mVd(V)r- ‘soil, clod of earth’: pB. Hbr. mādrũ ‘ordure (material used for vessels)’ (Jastrow 735), Syr. medrũ ‘gleba (terrae), terra, lutum, pulvis’ (LSyr. 375), Arb. madar- ‘lumps, clods of dry clay’ (Lane 2698), Sab. mdr ‘territory, ground’ (SD 83),1255 Mhr. mdër ‘Lehmziegel’ (Jahn 1902:210).

   This term has completely ousted PS *ṭarũ- ‘earth,’ which left virtually no trace in EthS.

1253 Contra Appleyard 1977:13, there is hardly any possibility to derive gubbāt from *kabid- in spite of the superficial phonetic similarity.
1254 The only — puzzling — parallel seems to be provided by the expression ka-ba-tum-ma ‘on the belly’ in Amarna Canaanite (CAD K 14). See further Chapter 5, p. 256.
1255 The semantic shift observed in Sabaic is to some extent similar to the Ethiopian one, but note that ṭũr has clearly remained the basic designation of “earth” throughout ESA (cf. especially the expression mdrũs,ũnũ w-ṛũn ‘lord of heaven and earth’ in the inscriptions from the monotheistic period).

  # Proto-EthS *blv represents a semantic extension of PWS *bl ḫ ‘to swallow,’ attested elsewhere in Hbr. blv (HALOT 134), Syr. blaw (LSyr. 76), Arb. blv (Lane 249), Mhr. bāla (ML 49) and Jib. bēlāv (JL 25).

  PS *okl ‘to eat’ is completely ousted as a verbal root throughout EthS, but an undoubtedly Proto-EthS deverbal derivate *vlkl- ‘corn, cereals’ is preserved in the majority of the languages: Gez. okl, Tgr. okl, Tna. oklī, Amh. okl, Sod. ãkl, Har. axī (CDG 15, WTS 376, TED 1503, AED 1091, EDH 23, EDG 33).

82. “sun” — Gez. šāhāy, Tgr. šāhāy, Tna. šāhay, Amh. ṭay, Eža ḍet (EDG 190, WTS 634, TED 2550, AED 2172, EDG 190).

  # As argued in CDG 149 and Appleyard 1977:39, Proto-EthS *šāhāy- ‘sun’ is likely derived from the verbal root *šlw/*šlw with the meaning “to shine, to be bright.”

  An inherent connection of these roots with sun and sun-heat is suggested by Hbr. ħom șā ‘glowing heat’ (Is 18:4), rūāh șā ‘glowing wind’ (Jer 4:11) and especially Akk. šētu ‘light, shining appearance of the sun, moon and stars, sultry weather, open air, open sun’ (CAD § 150), ‘Glut, heller Schein, Hitze’ (AHw. 1095). A similar semantic derivation from this root is known from Arabic (alḥaṣ ‘period of day after sunrise’ and dīḥh- ‘the sun’, Lane 1773 and 1770), but the functional status of these terms is deeply marginal in comparison with their EthS counterpart.

  PS *šamš ḫ ‘sun’ is completely extinct throughout EthS.


  # Proto-EthS *klp-ay ‘two’ goes back to PS *kil(?)-ā ‘both,’ elsewhere attested in Akk. kilallān (CAD K 353), Hbr. kilbayim (HALOT 475), Arb. kilā (WKAS K 286), Mhr. kalī (ML 207).

  The only remnant of PS *ṭin-ā ‘two’ in EthS is Gez. sānay ‘the next day’ (CDG 509).

2.5. Proto-Ethiopian terms of uncertain origin

2. “ashes” — Gez. ḥamad, Tgr. ḥamād, Amh. amād, Sod. amād, Har. ḥamād (CDG 231, WTS 63, AED 1137, EDG 47, EDH 83).\(^{1257}\)

---

\(^{1256}\) Extensive lists of cognates can be found in CDG 553 and Bulakh 2005a:203. As long as ⱱ in the Geez form šāhāy is taken at face value (which seems reasonable in view of its semantic and, at least partly, formal proximity to Arb. ḏuha-), only cognates from languages which do not distinguish between the reflexes of ⱱ and ⱱ (like Akk. šētu or Hbr. șāh) can be immediately accepted. Comparison with ⱱ-forms like Arb. șh ‘to be cloudless’ (Lane 1656) or Soq. șh ‘luir, éclairer,’ șh ‘matin’ (LS 349–350) can be tentative at best.

\(^{1257}\) It is uncertain whether Tna. ḥamuk- gözü ‘ashes’ (TED 180) is related to this root (but cf. TED 967 for ḥamād ḫ- gözü ‘cinders, ash’). Tna. ḥamād means ‘earth, soil, dirt’ (TED 181).
None of the two alternative etymological approaches to Proto-EthS *ḥamad-'ashes’ proposed by Leslau (and Appleyard 1977:34) is fully convincing:

Arb. ʿaywmun muḥṭamidun = ṣādiqū ʾl-ḥarri (LA 3 195), ḥamadat- ‘the sound of the flaming or blazing of fire’ (Lane 639), further related to pB. Hbr. ḫmd ‘to produce shrivelling by heat’ (Jastrow 475) and, possibly, Ugr. ḫmdrt ‘ parched field’ (DUL 362), Akk. ḥamādiru ‘shrivelled or withered’ (CAD ḳ 57), cf. Chapter 5, p. 330 above;

Arb. ḫmd ‘to subside (fire, its embers remaining unextinguished),’ ḥammād- ‘a place in which fire is buried in order that its flaming may cease’ (Lane 807), Mhr. ṣamād ‘to be extinguished, burnt out’ (ML 443).

46. “leaf” — Gez. kəašl, Tna. kəašli, Amh. koṭāl, Sod. koṭāl, Har. kuṭṭi (CDG 450, TED 1059, AED 829, EDG 508, EDH 131).

Proto-EthS *kVšl- ‘leaf’ may be related to some of the Arabic botanical terms with the root *qšl: qašl- = zuhru s-salamī; qaṣaratun qaṣlatun = riḥawatun (TA 30 255), qašl- ‘corn or barley cut while green for fodder’ (Lane 2989). One cannot exclude that these terms, together with the EthS designations of “leaf,” may go back to the verbal root *kšl with the meaning “to cut,” attested in Arb. qšl = qṣ (LA 11 664) and Soq. kəšil’ ‘couper (les cheveux)’ (LS 381). For possible semantic parallels (“leaf” derived from “to peel, to strip off”) v. Buck 1949:525 (cf. also Appleyard 1977:40).


Proto-EthS *ṣabə- ‘man’ has been included into the present corpus because of its reliable attestation in Tigrinya and a broad presence throughout Southern EthS. It is hard to say whether the collective meaning “people” attested for Gez. səbə (vs. bərəs ‘man,’ CDG 482 and 83) and Tgr. səb (vs. ḥnas, WTS 182 and 371) is archaic or innovative.

The etymology of Proto-EthS *ṣabə is uncertain. One cannot exclude an ultimate connection with Sab. sjbr ‘to carry out an undertaking, a military campaign,’ sjbrt ‘expedition, undertaking, journey’ (SD 122), Qat. sjbr ‘to set out, go’ (LIQ 157). This comparison would imply an original meaning “gang,” “military or working commando.”1258 Generalization of the ethnonym sjbr ‘Saba, Sabaeans’ (cf. LLA 359 and Appleyard 1977:8) is also to be seriously considered. Conversely, comparison with Mhr. ḥabu ‘people’ (accepted in CDG 482) is to be rejected since hā- (ḥā-) in the Mehri form belongs to the definite article and not to the root (cf. ML 2 and below in Chapter 8, p. 536-537).

---

1258 Cf. also Arb. subrat- ‘a long or far journey’ (Lane 1287) and, perhaps, Mhr. ḥabū ‘(poor man) to go to people every day for food,’ ḥābi ‘to struggle back home, make one’s way slowly to people to get help’ (ML 151). That h is from *z in this Mehri verb is suggested by Soq. miṣṭeb ‘pauvre’ (LS 411, unknown to our informants).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *ḵyḥ ‘(to be) red’ is obscure. ESA ḫyḥ, adduced without reference in CDG 456, is hapax legomenon in the Hadramitic inscription RÉS 2693:2, where it is used as an attribute of ḡḥb ‘bronze’ (Sima 2000:320, cf. Pirenne 1990:75). Besides, the following possible cognates (none of them fully convincing) can be mentioned:

- Arb. quḥḥ- ‘pure, sheer, unmixed’ (Lane 2487), quḥ ‘to sweep a house’ (ibid. 2572)
- Sab. h-kwḥ ‘to complete satisfactory, to finish off, to level, to plaster,’ mkḥ ‘success, triumph’ (SD 110), Qat. s₁-kḥ ‘to prepare, to set in order’ (LIQ 143)
- Arb. qayḥ ‘thick purulent matter unmixed with blood’ (Lane 2576), quḥ ‘to suppurate’ (ibid. 2572)
- JA kḥḥ ‘to be dull, faint,’ kḥḥāḥ ‘faint-colored, gray’ (Jastrow 1345)
- Akk. ḫū ‘copper, bronze’ (CAD Q 291).


# The origin of Proto-EthS *mḥ ‘(to be) warm, hot’ is unknown (cf. Appleyard 1977:37).

2.6. Certain or likely Cushitisms


# The Proto-EthS designation of “cloud” is thought to be borrowed from Cushitic by A. Dolgopolsky (1973:51) and D. Appleyard (1977:36). A. Militarev (2004:299–300, 2010:58) prefers to treat the EthS and Cushitic terms as cognates, but his — admittedly, noteworthy — Semitic parallels are probably not sufficient to invalidate the borrowing hypothesis, especially in view of the transparent structural similarity between most of the EthS and Cushitic forms.


---

1259 Some of these comparisons have been kindly suggested to us by M. Bulakh, whose own detailed etymological treatment of this root is now published in Bulakh 2006b:740–741.

1260 Admitting the possibility of mutual influence in “some irrelevant exceptions.”

1261 Arb. dàmm-, dimām- ‘clouds in which is no water’ (Lane 910–911), dīmāt- ‘a lasting and still rain’ (ibid. 937), Syr. dīmātā dī-ṭallā ‘nebula tenuis cineri similis’ (L.Syr. 151).
   # Proto-EthS *qαšα ‘fish’ is clearly borrowed from Cushitic (Dolgopolsky 1973:293, Appleyard 1977:42).

   # Proto-EthS *ýVgr- ‘hair’ has been included into the present lexical corpus because of its broad attestation throughout modern EthS. The main term for “hair” in Geez seems to be ṣḥɔɔrt (LLA 260), although ṣag“r is also well attested (ibid. 1315).
   Borrowed from Cushitic (Appleyard 1977:17).

   # Proto-EthS *šɡα ‘meat’ is clearly borrowed from Cushitic (Dolgopolsky 1973:99).

3. The Swadesh wordlist: analysis and discussion

3.1. As mentioned above, 68 positions in the Swadesh worldlist of Proto-EthS can be filled with a high degree of reliability. From the standpoint of the normal lexicostatistical procedure, this number is very high and unambiguously points to a rather close genealogical relationship: compare, e.g., 48 positions in common between Harari and Geez as opposed to 23 between Harari and Koranic Arabic or 17 between Harari and Mehri. Within our approach, however, bare numbers in themselves are not sufficient. The obviously heterogeneous mass of coincidences is to be carefully analyzed in order to evaluate the classificatory relevance of each of its segments.

3.2. Examples attributed to Group 1 (trivial retentions) represent a clear majority (36 positions out of 68) and, consequently, allow one to consider the Proto-EthS basic vocabulary as a rather conservative one.1262 It is evident, incidentally, that the presence of these terms in Proto-EthS cannot be used as a proof for the common origin of this subgroup since the same roots with the same basic meanings are well preserved in many other Semitic languages. A striking example is Hebrew where all 36 roots are present in the respective positions, and Akkadian with its 31 examples is not far behind. A comparatively massive loss of these roots in certain Semitic languages (cf. 25 positions preserved in Arabic and only 20 in Mehri) might be interpreted as pointing to their relatively prolonged separate status, but certainly does not suggest that the remaining languages (such as Geez, Hebrew and Akkadian) are closely related to each other. In other words, if a text in a previously unknown Semitic language is discovered, presence of these roots in its lexical

1262 Cf. some figures for comparison immediately below and elsewhere in this monograph. Note in particular that there are only 23 trivial retentions in the Proto-MSA list (v. Chapter 8, pp. 522-526 below).
inventory may suggest that this language is neither Arabic nor MSA, yet does not help one to decide whether it is Ethiopian or Canaanite.

3.3. Examples attributed to Group 2 (non-trivial retentions) are 16. Their classificatory value is conditioned by the degree of their specificity, whose evaluation is of necessity subjective. In the framework of such an evaluation, proto-lexemes belonging to this category can be reasonably subdivided into two groups.

The first group comprises terms which have some cognates elsewhere in Semitic, but these are very sparse and functionally marginal. In more formalized terms, it means, in particular, that terms produced from the roots in question are not used as the basic exponents of the respective concepts in any other Semitic language or subgroup. Here belong Proto-EthS *ṣgr- ‘foot,’ *bhql ‘to say,’ *nṣ ‘(to be) small,’ *bzjl ‘(to be) many’ and *kbb ‘(to be) round.’ The relevance of such terms for determining the linguistic specificity of Proto-EthS is very high, in fact approaching that of semantic innovations discussed below in this section.

On the opposite extreme, we find Proto-EthS *ṣlm ‘(to be) black,’ *ṣVbh- ‘fat,’ *ḥVmāl- ‘louse,’ *whb ‘to give,’ *ḥtl ‘to kill,’ *ṣVmān- ‘rain,’ *ṣry ‘to see,’ *ḥwm ‘to stand,’ *mān- ‘what,’ whose counterparts are attested with the same basic status in at least one other Semitic language (and usually several). Mutatis mutandis, *ṣawp- ‘bird’ and *ṣmr ‘to come’ can also be attributed to this subcategory because of their very broad — albeit non-basic — attestation. As long as such terms are taken individually, their relevance for the subgrouping procedure is rather low, as it is difficult to rule out that their functional prominence is more or less directly inherited from PS. It may increase considerably, however, if they are treated as a group: the combination of *ṣlm, *ṣVbh-, *ḥVmāl-, *whb, *ḥtl, *ṣVmān-, *ṣry, *ḥwm and *mān- is highly suggestive of a typically Ethiopian nature of a given Semitic language.

3.4. The 6 examples included in Group 3 (certain or likely innovations) are decisive for qualifying a Semitic language as Ethiopian and provide reliable evidence as to the common origin of EthS. The relevance of individual cases is, admittedly, uneven. As already recognized by J. Cantineau (1932:179), *kVb-ay ‘two’ is probably the most remarkable one: highly specific from the semantic point of view, attested throughout EthS and accompanied by an almost complete elimination of PS *ṭin-ā. The least significant may be *kabdl ‘belly’ (< “liver”): attestation of this feature in Southern EthS is limited to Amharic, whereas a similar (although presumably independent) development can probably be detected in early Canaanite.

The relatively modest number of terms attributable to this category in the Proto-EthS list is in agreement with the general trend observed elsewhere in Semitic: non-trivial and well-defined semantic innovations in the basic vocabulary are, to our regret, not very easy to find.

3.5. The diagnostic relevance of the 5 proto-lexemes of Group 4 is high in spite of their uncertain status: both groups to which they can potentially be attributed (non-trivial retentions or semantic innovations) are relevant for genealogical subgrouping. Indeed, for most of these examples a relatively promising path of semantic derivation can be surmised: completely isolated lexemes like *mawk ‘to be warm’ are rather uncommon.
3.6. Our list of what can be designated as “Common EthS Cushitisms” is essentially in agreement with Ch. Ehret’s “loanwords in core vocabulary of Proto-Ethiopic” (1988:649). Both lists include terms for “cloud,” “fish,” “hair” and “egg.” According to Ehret, the designation of “meat” was borrowed into “Proto-North Ethiopic” and is, accordingly, not included into his Proto-EthS list. Conversely, our list does not include *fib- ‘smoke,’ *brr ‘to fly’ and *swk ‘to know’ because of the non-basic status of most of their reflexes.

The subgrouping relevance of Common EthS Cushitisms crucially depends on whether they are thought to be borrowed independently into various EthS languages or rather — as apparently taken for granted by Ehret — already into the hypothetical Proto-EthS. This dilemma, it seems, has little chance to be solved in a sufficiently persuasive way. The “positive” (Proto-EthS) solution, appealing in some cases, is likely deemed to remain a matter of speculation. Conversely, the “negative” solution (post-Proto-EthS independent borrowings into individual languages) may have some arguments in its favor, at least in some particular cases. Thus, the uniform presence of *basar- ‘meat’ in all Southern EthS languages except Amharic, coupled with its formal and semantic identity with Hebrew bāšār (SED I No. 41, with further cognates elsewhere in West Semitic) rather unambiguously suggests that it was precisely this term — and not the Cushitism *sogā — that functioned as the main designation of “meat” in Proto-EthS (so already Cohen 1970:12). The basic status of the reflexes of sogā in Geez, Tigre, Tigrinya and Amharic is with all probability to be explained as a later replacement conditioned by the Agaw influence independently on each language in question.

3.7. As already mentioned above, the Swasesh wordlist of Proto-EthS is characterized by a number of prominent losses with respect to its PS forerunner. Four lexical features deserve special attention in this connection: *qarṣ- ‘earth,’ *kl ‘to eat,’ *samī- ‘sun’ and *jin-a ‘two.’ Not many Semitic languages have replaced even a single one of these deeply rooted proto-lexemes, which gives quite a special meaning to their simultaneous absence from Proto-EthS. In a sense, these shared losses are even more significant than their shared replacements: while the latter are not always discernible in every EthS language, the former are virtually unexceptional. Thus, Proto-EthS *mVdr- ‘earth’ and *ṣahāy- ‘sun’ are not attested in Harari, where the corresponding concepts are expressed by afār and īr (EDH 20,

---

1265 Ehret admits that sogā is present “also in Amharic,” but leaves this fact without any comment.

1264 Thus, *brr ‘to fly’ achieved the basic status in most of Southern EthS (AED 877, EDG 155, EDH 46), but its presence in Geez (CDG 107, not in LLA), Tigre (WTS 275) and Tigrinya (TED 1115) is rather marginal. The competition between *tann- and *fib- as the main exponents of the meaning “smoke” may well deserve further study, but as far as one can now see, neither of the two terms is to be safely projected onto Proto-EthS within the strict network of criteria used in the present investigation: *fib- occupies the basic slot in Geez (LLA 1245, in contrast to the far less frequent tann ibid. 562) and Amharic (AED 2219), whereas *tann- is prominent in Tigre and the remaining Southern EthS (WTS 314, Leslau 1956:241, EDG 600, EDH 150). Finally, *swk ‘to know’ functions as the basic term only in Amharic and Harari (AED 1269, EDH 30, cf. CDG 78 and LLA 996–998 for its relatively broad presence in Geez).

1265 Further observations on this very important problem can be found in the concluding section of this chapter (p. 455).
30). Still, PS *arıt- ‘earth’ and *şams- ‘sun’ are completely missing from this language exactly in the same way as they do elsewhere in EthS. With all probability, these terms were already lost in Proto-EthS — well before Harari became an independent idiom. Whether *mVdr- ‘earth’ and *şahāy- ‘sun’ once existed in proto-Harari is, strictly speaking, a matter of speculation: at least theoretically, one cannot exclude that some idioms forming the Proto-EthS dialect cluster were not affected by some of its typical lexical replacements. An alternative solution is, however, much more feasible: afiyr and ird simply belong to still another wave of replacement which obliterated the — once innovative — *mVdr- and *şahāy- exactly in the same way as these lexemes did with PS *arıt- and *şams- a few centuries before.

4. Evidence from other lexical fields

4.1. Since lexical innovations are not restricted to any fixed set of basic concepts, it seems convenient to look for further lexical arguments for the historical unity of Ethiopian Semitic also outside the Swadesh wordlist. Such an inquiry has yielded several additional examples of semantic innovations likely going back to Proto-EthS.

1. *fyk ‘to be naked’ — Gez. farḥa, Tgr. farḥa, Tna. farḳā, Amh. arrāḳā (CDG 71, WTS 459, TED 1845, AED 1148).\(^{1266}\)
   
   # As rightly argued by Leslau, Proto-EthS *fyk ‘to be naked’ likely represents a semantic evolution of PWS *fyk ‘to gnaw, to strip away,’ attested in Hbr. irt ‘to gnaw away’ (HALOT 888), Syr. varraḳ ‘rosit, corrosit’ (LSyr. 550), Arb. irt ‘to eat off the flesh from the bone’ (Lane 2017).
   
   Proto-EthS *fyk has completely ousted PS *fyw ‘to be naked’ (HALOT 881, SED I No. 26) which left no trace in EthS. One may wonder whether the phonetic similarity between the two roots could play a role in this replacement.

2. *blḥ ‘to be sharp’ — Gez. balḥa, Tgr. balḥa, Tna. bālḥe, Sod. bulā, Har. bālḥa (CDG 95, WTS 269, TED 1088, EDG 138, EDH 41).
   
   # As argued in Kogan 2005c:204, Proto-EthS *blḥ ‘to be sharp’ is probably related to Arb. bly ‘to reach the utmost point,’ balīy ‘sharp, penetrating in tongue’ (Lane 251–252).
   
   Proto-EthS *blḥ ‘to be sharp’ has completely ousted PS *ḥdd (AHw. 185, HALOT 291, Lane 524),\(^{1267}\) but is competing with PS *šl (AHw. 1211, CDG 493) whose reflexes are well preserved more or less throughout EthS (CDG 493) and function as the main exponents of the meaning “(to be) sharp” in some of the languages (notably, Amh. šl and șl, AED 439, 603).

---

1266 It is probable that Zwy. mdrāḳ ‘nakedness’ is related, in spite of the enigmatic element mdr- (EDG 59). It remains to be established whether the element mīt- ‘naked’ attested throughout Gunnān-Gurage (EDG 56) can also be related (with n < *r and ẓ < *k).

1267 Tgr. ḥaddā ‘to delimit; to cut to pieces’ (WTS 96) is likely borrowed from Arabic.

# The authors of DRS 90 are probably correct to combine Proto-EthS *batr- ‘branch, stick’ with PWS *btr ‘to cut off,’ represented by Hbr. btr ‘to cut in pieces’ (HALOT 167), Arb. btr ‘to cut off’ (Lane 149), Tgr. (iy)bättāra ‘to become unarmed,’ bättray ‘leafless (tree)’ (WTS 287), Jib. åttr ‘to chop’ (JL 30). For an exact semantic parallel v. Buck 1949:523 in connection with Greek κλάδος.

4. *grm ‘to be amazing, awesome’ — Gez. garama, Tgr. gārrāma, Tna. gārāmā, Amh. gārrāmā, Sod. gārrāmā, Sel. gārāmā (CDG 203, WTS 572, TED 2255, AED 1926, EDG 293).

# Proto-EthS *grm ‘to be amazing, awesome’ is probably derived from PWS *gVrm- ‘bone, body’ (SED I No. 94) with a semantic evolution otherwise attested in Semitic and elsewhere (Kogan–Militarev 2003:296–297).

5. *ḥmm ‘to be ill’ — Gez. ḥamama, Tgr. ḥammā, Tna. ḫamāmā, Amh. ammāmā-w, t-ammāmā (CDG 233, WTS 59, TED 170, AED 1120).

# Leslau is right to derive Proto-EthS *ḥmm ‘to be ill’ from PS *ḥmm ‘to be hot’ (AHw. 213, HALOT 328, Lane 635, CDG 233, SED I No. 120).

Proto-EthS *ḥmm completely ousted PS *mrȝ ‘to be ill’ (SED I No. 42.), which left no trace in EthS.


# Leslau is right to connect Proto-EthS *lkḥ ‘to lend’ with PS *lkẖ ‘to take’ (CAD L 131, DUL 501, HALOT 534, SD 82, LM 57) = “to make/to allow one (to) take.” Note that the root is used in the intensive or in the causative stem throughout EthS.


# Contra Leslau (and with LLA 207, Appleyard 1977:28–29), Proto-EthS *mavār- ‘honey’ must be related to Hbr. yawar ‘honeycomb’ (HALOT 423), a meaning still preserved in Geez and undoubtedly underlying the meaning “(ear)wax” for the reflexes of *mavār- in Harari and Gurage: Har. mār (EDH 110), End. mawar (EDG 386).

In view of the fact that PS *dibš- ‘honey’ is still well preserved in EthS,\(^\text{1268}\) it stands to reason that its replacement by *mavār- is a comparatively recent phenomenon originating somewhere in the Northern EthS area and then spreading

\(^{1268}\) Epigraphic Gez. dbs (CDG 122), Arg. dims, dus (Leslau 1997:198-199), Gaf. dəbsā (Leslau 1956:195), Har. dəs (EDH 59).
to the remaining languages (including Amharic). In this sense, *marār- ‘honey’ is probably not to be considered a Proto-EthS semantic innovation. However, even within this approach the obligatory prefixation of *mV- throughout EthS allows one to treat *marār- as a fairly specific morpholexical feature of this subgroup.


# As brilliantly recognized by A. Dillmann (LLA 151,1269 cf. Appleyard 1977:56), Proto-EthS *amlāk- ‘god’ must be analyzed as a broken plural from an unattested *malk- ‘king.’

Given the fact that *amlāk- ‘god’ is not attested in the majority of Southern EthS languages and in view of the high cultural significance of this term, one cannot exclude that this innovation does not go back to Proto-EthS, but was produced in one particular language (with all probability, Geez) and only later penetrated into the remaining idioms by borrowing. From this point of view, more importance should be given to the complete absence of PS *wil- ‘god,’ practically ubiquitous elsewhere in Semitic (HALOT 48–49, DUL 48).


# A. Dillmann (LLA 309) and W. Leslau (CDG 356) are right to connect Proto-EthS *marvāt- ‘bride’ with Gez. ḫarvāt ‘yoke’ (CDG 459), whose cognates — both immediate1270 and more remote1271 — probably suggest the reconstruction of PWS *rāw ‘to join, to put together’ (for the semantic development cf. Latin conjux, Russian купырь, Buck 1949:96–97).

As seen already by J. Cantineau (1932:184), PS *kallat- ‘bride’ (HALOT 477, DUL 441) left no trace in EthS.


# There is no consensus about the etymology of this Proto-EthS element which functions as the suppletive imperative of verbs with the meaning “to come” in the majority of EthS.1272 Leslau (CDG 382) connects it with the emphatic/cohortative enclitic particle -nā in Hebrew (HALOT 656), but this is not very persuasive if only because of the phonological difference. Conversely, M. Bittner’s equation with Soq. nāva ‘now’ (1918a:60) is phonetically appealing, but semantically problematic (LS

---

1269 “Sine dubio a singulare deperditis אָלַח ... [coll. hebr. יי ו arab. مَلِكَ, que et ipsa de Deo usurpantur] derivatum est, et dominos, dominatores significat: deinde in notionem divini numinis (sive in pluribus Deis, sive in unico Deo continentur) abiit, denique apud Abyssinos ad Christianam religionem conversos (pariter atque אָלַח apud Hebraeos) singularis significacionem accepit.”

1270 Arb. ḫarvāt- ‘yoke’ (Lane 1110).

1271 Akk. rasta, Ugr. rr, Hbr. ṣāw ‘friend’ (DUL 726, HALOT 1253, CAD R 439).

1272 For the areal background of this phenomenon v. Tosco 2000:349–350.
269). D. Appleyard (2006:48) tentatively surmises a borrowing from the functionally identical Proto-Agaw *lay-, but the phonological aspects of this comparison remain to be clarified. Perhaps the most plausible solution would be to connect it with Hbr. nwθ 'to tremble, to roam around, to move to and fro' (HALOT 681), Arb. nwθ = tamāyala (LA 8 434). Note that the verbal origin of *nava can be plausibly deduced from its full conjugational paradigm in Geez (nṇr-ū, nṇr-ī, nṇr-ā), Tigre and Amharic.


# Proto-EthS *nVfāṣ- ‘wind’ is derived from the Proto-EthS verbal root *nfs ‘to blow,’ which, in its turn, goes back to PS *nps ‘to breathe’ (SED I No. 46.).

The root *nrḥ, from which designations of “wind” are produced in the majority of WS languages, is only marginally reflected in EthS (cf. Bulakh 2005b:415–420).

12. *ngš ‘to rule, to be king’ — Gez. nagša, Tgr. nāgsā, Tna. nāgāsā, Amh. nāgāsā, Sod. nāggāsā, Har. nāgāsa (CDG 393, WTS 341, TED 1371, AED 1065, EDG 454, EDH 118).

# As rightly acknowledged by W. Leslau and D. Appleyard (1977:51), Proto-EthS *ngš ‘to be king’ goes back to PWS *ngš ‘to push, to press, to drive to work,’ represented by Ugr. ngš ‘to pursue’ (DUL 623), Hbr. ngš ‘to spur on; to collect offerings; to force to work’ (HALOT 670).1273 Arb. nžš ‘to pursue game; to search after a thing; to collect together’ (Lane 2771), Sab. ngs₂ ‘to gain control’ (SD 93), Min. ngs₃ ‘prélever les impôts’ (LM 66), Qat. ngs₂ ‘to demand, to impose tribute’ (LIQ 103).

The only trace of PS *mal(i)k- ‘king’ in EthS is *qamlāk- ‘god,’ analyzed above in this section. Given the highly prominent status of this nominal root in the majority of WS languages, its marginalization in Proto-EthS appears to be quite significant. The verbal root *mlk is relatively well attested in EthS with the meaning “to possess” (CDG 343–344), but is not directly connected with kingship.

13. *rkb ‘to find’ — Gez. rakaba, Tgr. rākbā, Tna. rākbā, Amh. rākkābā, Msq. rākkābā, Sel. rākābā (CDG 469, WTS 156, TED 585, AED 401, EDG 524).

# As already seen by A. Dillmann (LLA 302), Proto-EthS *rkb ‘to meet, to find’ cannot be separated from PS *rkb ‘to ride; to (be) join(ed), connect(ed),’ even though the exact details of the semantic evolution remain somewhat obscure (cf. CDG 469). It is noteworthy that the presumably original meaning “to ride” is not attested in EthS.

1273 One cannot exclude (with W. von Soden) that Akk. nagāšu ‘to leave, to go away’ (CAD N₁ 108, AHw. 710) is related to this root, in which case the intransitive meaning of the Akkadian verb might be regarded as the most ancient one. One wonders, finally, whether there is any connection between PWS *ngš and Mhr. nangš, Jib. ngšt ‘to shake milk for butter’ (ML 288, JL 184).

Leslau convincingly identifies Proto-EthS *rsv ‘to forget’ with PS *rṣə́ ‘to be wicked, ruthless,’ attested in Akk. ruṣṣā ‘to behave thoughtlessly, imperiously, to act in contempt or disrespect of others’ (CAD R 429), Ugr. rṣ ‘bad person’ (DUL 747), Hbr. rṣ ‘to be wicked’ (BDB 957), Syr. rṣ ‘scelestus fuit’ (LSyr. 746), probably Arb. rasā’t = fasādu l-sayn (LA 8 146). This derivation becomes especially convincing in view of the fact that the meanings “to be negligent,” “to act impiously,” “to be wicked” are, at least in Geez, attested side by side with the basic meaning “to forget.”

PWS *nṣy ‘to forget’ (HALOT 728, CDG 403) has been almost completely obliterated in EthS, its only trace being Gez. nāḥṣaya ‘to forget’ (CDG 395), with an unclear -ḥ-.


Proto-EthS *ṭbw ‘to suck’ is derived from PWS *ṭVb- ‘teat, breast,’ widely attested throughout EthS (SED I No. 277).

PS *yṃk, probably the main PS verb with the meaning “to suck” (SED I No. 83c), left virtually no trace in EthS.


The original meaning of Proto-EthS *wald- (and *Vd-) ‘son’ was probably “boy,” as is the case of its immediate parallels in Hebrew (yālād, HALOT 412) and Arabic (walad-), Lane 2966). All these terms are derived from PS *wald ‘to bear,’ widely attested both within and outside EthS (SED I No. 80c). Lack of lexical distinction between the meanings “son” and “boy”/“child” — similar to bēn vs. yālād in Hebrew — observable throughout EthS is atypical for Semitic languages and might be due to the substratum influence.¹²⁷⁴

For the meager preservation of PS *bin- ‘son’ in EthS (Gez. ḫanta rayn, perhaps Amh. yā-yān bərā’ ‘pupil of the eye’) see Kogan 2003a:127–128.


Proto-EthS *zVrb- ‘hyena’ goes back to PS *ḏirb- ‘wolf, jackal’ (SED II No. 72, Appleyard 1977:44).

The PS designation of “hyena” *ḏəb(u)r- (SED II No. 220) is sparsely attested only in Geez (ḏəb’, CDG 147). As for the concept “wolf,” it is mostly expressed by Cushitic loanwords such as Gez. tahlā (CDG 573).

¹²⁷⁴ Admittedly, *walad- seems to have acquired the meaning “son” in some Arabic dialects (DRS 546), but the degree of functional similarity between these terms and the EthS parallels remains to be investigated.
4.2. This list can be supplemented by a — by no means exhaustive —
collection of Proto-EthS lexical features for which no sufficiently reliable etymology
could be discovered. Strictly speaking, such terms cannot be considered semantic
innovations of Proto-EthS, but should rather be attributed to what has been labeled
above as “Proto-Ethiopian terms of uncertain origin.” In view of the fact that the
classificatory relevance of such terms tends to be relatively high, they are worthy of
careful investigation.

1. *etyl*/*məvalt- ‘day’ — Gez. ṣəlat, məvalt, Tgr. məval, məḍal, ṣələt, Tna. məvalt, ṣələt, Sod. may, Har. məvaltu, ṣəlt ‘day = “in daytime,” məy ‘day = “24 hours”
(CDG 603, WTS 443, TED 1829, 476, EDG 441, EDH 102, 116).

# Proto-EthS *etyl*/*məvalt- ‘day’ is derived from the verbal root *wrl ‘to
spend the day,’ for which no persuasive etymology has been suggested so far (cf.
CDG 603).

PS *yəwm- ‘day’ (HALOT 399, DUL 964) is marginally preserved in EthS as
Gez. yəm, Tgr. yəm and Tna. ləmm ‘today’ (CDG 627, WTS 508, TED 74).

2. *bəkər ‘to fit, to be sufficient’ — Gez. bəkəra, Tna. bəkərə, Amh. bəkə, Sod.
bəkə, Har. bəka (CDG 99, TED 1149, AED 903, EDG 146, EDH 43).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *bəkər ‘to be sufficient’ is uncertain, but note Arb.
ɓq= riktaʃa (TA 20 346).

3. *ftn ‘to be fast’ — Gez. fətana, Tna. fətənə, Amh. fətənə, Sod. fətənə, Har.
fətənə (CDG 171, TED 2732, AED 2343, EDH 66, EDG 250).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *ftn ‘to be fast’ is uncertain, but Leslau may be
right to connect it with Arb. ftn ‘to be intelligent, sagacious’ (Lane 2418).1275

4. *gədəl ‘to be missing’ — Gez. gədala, Tna. gədələ, Amh. gəddələ, Sod.
gəddələ (CDG 182, TED 2359, AED 2038, EDG 264).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *gədəl ‘to be missing’ is unknown.

5. *həlw ‘to be’ — Gez. hallawa, Tgr. halla, Tna. rallo, Amh. ałla, End. anə, Har.
ḥal (CDG 218, WTS 5, TED 1410, AED 1098, EDG 37, EDH 82).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *həlw ‘to be’ is uncertain. This verb is likely related
to the predicative element hall- ‘there is,’ widely attested in the Arabic dialects of
Yemen (Behnstedt 1264–1265, Piamenta 510). This element undoubtedly goes back
to a kind of “Proto-Ethiopian” substratum level in the South Arabian linguistic
landscape and, accordingly, cannot be considered a real etymological explanation
for *həlw in Proto-EthS. Further Arabic parallels discussed in CDG 218 are rather
unreliable, the same is true of P. Behnstedt’s tentative comparison with the Arabic

1275 Mhr. fətəm ‘to remember, to recognize’ (ML 108) and Jib. fətəm id. (JL 66) are almost certainly
borrowed from Arabic. Any connection with Sab. fəm ‘to assign’ (SD 47)?
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interrogative particle *hal. Possible non-Semitic Afroasiatic parallels (Berber, Cushitic and Chadic) can be found in DRS 412 and HSED No. 28.

6. *gzʔ ‘to dominate; to own, to possess’ — Gez. gazʔa, Tgr. gázʔa, Tna. gázʔa, Amh. gázza, Sod. gázza, Har. gázaʔa (CDG 210, WTS 595, TED 2346, AED 2024, EDG 304, EDH 77).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *gzʔ ‘to dominate’ is unknown (cf. CDG 201, DRS 109).


# The etymology of Proto-EthS *ḥwṛ ‘to go’ remains uncertain as none of the alternatives mentioned in CDG 249–250 can be considered fully satisfactory.1276

The absence of this root from Tigre, Tigrinya1277 and Amharic is peculiar, but can hardly invalidate its Proto-EthS status.

8. *ḥzl ‘to carry on the back’ — Gez. ḫazala, Tgr. ḫzḻā, Tna. ḫazāḷā, Amh. azzāḷā, Msq. ezzāḷā, Har. ḫazāḷā (CDG 253, WTS 91, TED 269, AED 1276, EDG 120, EDH 89).

# The etymology of Proto-EthS *ḥzl ‘to carry’ is uncertain. Soq. ḫedaf ‘to carry away’ (contrast ‘se détourner’ in LS 165) would provide an ideal match if Soq. d goes to ḫ, which cannot be demonstrated because of the lack of cognates in the continental MSA. Shall one tentatively compare Arb. ḫaqil- = ḫuzātu b-riṣārī wa-l-qqanāsi wa-ṭaraḫfuhu (LA 11 179), from an original meaning “place of carrying”?


# The origin of Proto-EthS *ḥṣb ‘to wash’ is uncertain. Leslau tentatively refers to A. Dillmann’s comparison (LLA 624) with Arb. ḫṣb ‘to color, to tinge, to dye’ (Lane 753).

Proto-EthS *ḥṣb has gradually replaced PS *ṛḥš, probably the main exponent of the meaning “to wash” in PS (HALOT 1220, DUL 738). This verb is still preserved with its original meaning in Gafat (rašā, Leslau 1956:228) and Eastern Gurage (e.g., Sel. tāraṯā, EDG 528). Elsewhere in EthS, the root *ṛḥš is attested with the meaning “to sweat,” “to perspire” (Gez. ṛḥša, Tgr. ṛḥḥašā, Tna. ṛḥḥašā, CDG 466, WTS 147, TED 539), whose eventual connection with “to bathe” is not beyond doubt.

---

1276 (1) Arb. ṛwḥ ‘to go in the evening’ (Lane 1178), with metathesis; (2) Arb. ḫwṛ ‘to return’ (Lane 665; LLA 113, accepted in Nöldeke 1910:48, cf. GD 1506); (3) Sab. ḫwṛ ‘to settle in a town’ (SD 73), according to Leslau, from an original meaning “to go”;(4) Arb. ḫārat- ‘a quarter of a city or town’ (Lane 666). The latter two options presumably represent different manifestations of the same concept.

1277 T. L. Kane is likely correct to consider Tna. ḫorā as “Geez” (TED 259).
   # The origin of Proto-EthS *kɔb 'to double' is uncertain. An ultimate connection with Arb. kərəb- 'joint, juncture of the bones' (Lane 2616) might be considered, implying an underlying meaning “to fold,” “to twist,” “to double.”

11. *kəasl ‘to be wounded’ — Gez. kəaslə, Tna. kəásələ, Amh. kəásələ, Sod. kəásəalə (CDG 446, TED 961, AED 751, EDG 504).
   # The origin of Proto-EthS *kəasl ‘to be wounded’ is uncertain. Leslau tentatively accepts A. Dillmann’s equation with Arb. qəl = qal with dissimilation of emphatics (LLA 431, LA 11 664).

   # The origin of Proto-EthS *kyd ‘to tread,’ ‘to walk’ is uncertain. In the wake of A. Dillmann (LLA 872), Leslau compares it with Arb. kadid- ‘ground trodden with the hoofs of horses; fine dust trodden with the feet’ (Lane 2595). Cf. also Arb. kdkd ‘to run slowly’ (Lane 2595) as well as Mhr. kddu ‘to make (a camel) trot’ (ML 203) and Jib. kedé ‘(camel) to trot’ (JL 126).

   # The origin of Proto-EthS *ləmlm ‘to be green (of plants)’ is unknown.\(^{1278}\)

   # The origin of Proto-EthS *lən ‘to shave’ is uncertain, cf. perhaps Arb. lən = ḥarrakahu ran mawqlithi wa-ərədahu li-yantazivahu (LA 7 99).

15. *məl ‘to swear’ — Gez. məhala, Tgr. məhala, Tna. məhala, Amh. malā, Sod. malā, Zwy. mālā (CDG 335, WTS 110, TED 343, AED 139, WTS 401).
   # The origin of Proto-EthS *məl ‘to swear’ is uncertain (Appleyard 1977:51). Leslau compares it with Sab. məl (GI 1533:6), tentatively interpreted as ‘oath’ in SD 84, as well as with pB. Hbr. məhal ‘to forgive, to pardon’ (Jastrow 761), JPA məl ‘to forgo, to remit a debt’ (DJPA 300). Probably unrelated is Arb. məl (III) = ραλ-καυδω wa-rawnu l-ramri bi-l-ḥiyali (LA 11 736), compared by A. Dillmann in LLA 155.

---

\(^{1278}\) Cf. Appleyard 1977:41 where this root is simultaneously connected with Gez. lamə ‘to be resplendent’ (CDG 315) and Gez. honəla ‘to become verdant’ (CDG 232), both with cognates elsewhere in EthS.

# The origin of Proto-EthS *makkān- ‘childless’ is unknown.
Neither PWS *ṛkr, nor PWS *ḥdl ‘to be childless’ are reliably attested in EthS (cf. SED I No. 1, and 76.).


# The origin of Proto-EthS *mrḥ ‘to lead’ is unknown. One wonders whether Syr. marrāḥa ‘audax’ (LSyr. 404) and Arb. mrḥ ‘to be proud and self-conceit, to walk with an elegant, proud and self-conceit gait’ (Lane 2705) might be related.


# The origin of Proto-EthS *maray-t- ‘earth, soil’ is uncertain. Within Semitic, the only straightforward parallels are Sab. Min. Qat. mrt (SD 87, LM 62, LIQ 99), extensively discussed in Sima 2000:299–301 (‘Ziegel,’ ‘Keramik,’ ‘Terrakotta’). At the same time, the Ethiopian lexemes may find a convincing parallel in Proto-Berber *ta-mur-t- ‘earth’ (Militarev 2004:307, 2010:64).

19. *nbr ‘to sit; to stay, to live’ — Gez. nabara, Tgr. nābrā, Tna. nābārā, Amh. nābbārā, norā, Sod. nābbārā, Har. nābārā (CDG 284, WTS 329, TED 1323, AED 1033, 1047, EDG 448, EDH 117).

# The etymology of Proto-EthS *nbr ‘to sit’ is unknown, cf. perhaps Arb. nabūr- = ṣal-ṣist- (LA 5 222). Of some interest may be Akk. wabru ‘Ortsfremder, Beisasse’ (AHw. 1454), ‘a type of foreigner’ (CAD U/W 388), the semantic shift from “to sit” being illustrated by one of the German translations above as well as by Hbr. tōšāb ‘resident alien, sojourner’ (HALOT 1712). T. Nöldeke’s attempt to compare Gez. nabara with Arb. nbr ‘to be raised, elevated’ (Lane 2757, Nöldeke 1910:49) is semantically rather unattractive.

Proto-EthS *nbr has with all probability ousted PS *wbr ‘to sit’ (DRS 656–657), usually thought to be preserved in Gez. ṭawsaba ‘to take a wife’ (CDG 619).


---

1279 Note that A. Sima identifies the ESA forms with the Yemeni Arabic murr = ṣal-yadāru. If this comparison is correct, the etymological relationship between these terms and Gez. maret becomes problematic from the structural point of view.

1280 For the alternation n-ju- cf. T. Nöldeke’s classic study of 1910 (pp. 179–206) as well as numerous subsequent investigations dealing with the biradical problem.
# The origin of Proto-EthS *ndd 'to burn' is uncertain. Leslau tentatively compares Arb. *nhr 'to cast flesh-meat into the fire, to bury a cake of bread in hot ashes' (Lane 2778).


# The origin of Proto-EthS *ngd 'to travel' is uncertain. A. Dillmann (LLA 693) compared it to Syr. nāɡad 'traxit; se effudit' (LSyr. 413), but a more straightforward cognate can probably be found in Arb. naţd-, traditionally interpreted as 'an elevated way' (Lane 2767), but displaying a rather straightforward meaning "road," "path" in the Koranic passage wa-hadaynāhu n-naţdayni 'We led him by (one of the) two paths' (90:10).

22. *sm 'to kiss' — Gez. sər'ama, Tgr. sārāmā, Tna. sārāmā, Amh. samā, Sod. samā, Sel. sāmā (CDG 481, WTS 194, TED 761, AED 465, EDG 530).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *sm 'to kiss' is unknown. Yemenite Arabic sər'ama (Behnstedt 559), correctly identified with the Ethiopian root by W. Müller (apud Leslau), is to be attributed to the contact with an early forerunner of EthS on the Arabian soil.

23. *šbb 'to be narrow' — Gez. šabba, Tgr. šābbā, Tna. šābbā, Amh. ūbbābā, Sod. ūbbābā, Har. ūbābā (CDG 545, WTS 640, TED 2578, AED 2148, EDG 608, EDH 151).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *šbb 'to be narrow' is uncertain. Rather problematic are Leslau's comparisons with Arb. gettext(66) 'to milk by contracting the hand upon the udder' (Lane 1761), qaff- 'narrow' (Lane 1794), pB. Hbr. špp 'to press' (Jastrow 1297), Syr. šəppūpā 'numella (tormenti genus)' (LSyr. 634).

Proto-EthS *šbb (or *šbb?) has partly ousted PS *šyk 'to be narrow' (with all probability, the basic PS term with this meaning, HALOT 1014, DUL 789), which may still be preserved in Sel. Wol. ţiḥḵaḵi, Msq. ţiḵḵaḵi 'to be narrow' (EDG 628).

24. *wry 'to be hot, to burn' — Gez. wərya, Tna. wārayū, Enm. wiṇi, Har. wory (CDG 603, TED 1773, EDG 639, EDH 162).

# The origin of Proto-EthS *wry 'to be hot, to burn' is unknown (cf. DRS 577).

25. *wtj/*wtj 'to change' — Gez. wallaţa, Tgr. låwāţā, Tna. låwəwəţə, Amh. låwəwəţə, Sod. liwəwəţə (CDG 614, WTS 45, TED 120, AED 101, EDG 384).1281

# The origin of Proto-EthS *wtj/*wtj 'to change' is uncertain, but it might be related to PWS *wtj 'to twist, to turn, to do a second time,' represented by Hbr. ḫaţ

---

1281 Probably also Har. nāwāţə with unexpected n- (EDH 120).

382
5. Conclusions

5.1. By far the most evident conclusion ensuing from the evidence analyzed in this chapter is that A. Faber’s pessimistic claim quoted at the very beginning of our presentation turns out to be incorrect: there is a fairly large amount of linguistic evidence in favor of a “Common Ethiopian stage” and against the polygenetic model of the formation of Ethiopian Semitic. It is quite a different matter, of course, that the bulk of this evidence comes from the basic vocabulary and not from the inflectional morphology, contrary to the prediction of the Hetzronian approach to Semitic classification. Indeed, dozens of deeply rooted pan-Ethioic lexical features contrast strikingly with the rather meager amount of specific morphological traits, very few of which can be shown to be shared innovations of the EthS subgroup.

5.2. Our preliminary conclusions, made on the basis of the restricted evidence of the Swadesh wordlist, have been fully confirmed through a comprehensive perusal of other strata of the basic vocabulary.

Thus, a few semantic innovations discovered in the Swadesh wordlist (*IVḥš- ‘bark,’ *ḥabd- ‘belly,’ *mVdr- ‘earth,’ *ḥb ‘to eat,’ *ṣahāy- ‘sun,’ *kVlr-ay ‘two’) have been supplemented by the exponents of many other fundamental concepts, such as *yḥ ‘to be naked,’ *ḥlḥ ‘to be sharp,’ *ḥmm ‘to be ill,’ *nVfās- ‘wind,’ *mavār- ‘honey,’ *ūmlāk- ‘god,’ *mavā-t ‘bride,’ *ngš ‘to be king,’ *rkb ‘to find,’ *rsv ‘to forget,’ *ṭḥw ‘to suck.’ Besides, a significant number of etymologically opaque, yet highly suggestive common lexical features have been detected both within (*ḥamad- ‘ashes,’ *kVšl- ‘leaf,’ *ḥyl ‘to be red,’ *mswk ‘to be warm’) and outside (*rVl-at-/*mavr-t ‘day,’ *hlw ‘to be,’ *ḥwr ‘to go,’ *ḥsb ‘to wash,’ *kyd ‘to tread, to walk,’ *mavr-t ‘earth, soil,’ *nbr ‘to sit,’ *ṇdd ‘to burn,’ *ṣbb ‘to be narrow,’ *wṛy ‘to be hot, to burn’) the Swadesh wordlist.

The emergence of new lexical features has triggered deep structural changes in the older strata of the basic vocabulary. In this sense, loss or marginalization of such highly prominent pan-Semitic lexemes as *yḥrš- ‘earth,’ *ykl ‘to eat,’ *ṣams- ‘sun,’ *ṭin-ā ‘two,’ *ṣrw ‘to be naked,’ *mrš ‘to be ill,’ *rīl- ‘god,’ *kal-lat- ‘bride,’ *maltik- ‘king,’ *nṣy ‘to forget,’ *ynk ‘to suck,’ *ḥin- ‘son,’ *yam- ‘day,’ *ṣyk ‘to be narrow’ acquires paramount importance for determining the linguistic face of Ethiopian Semitic.

In our view, such an intricate network of innovation, replacement and loss is unlikely to be explained in terms of borrowing and wave spread. Rather, it suggests the existence of one relatively homogeneous Proto-EthS language whose lexical peculiarities have been faithfully inherited by its daughter tongues.

1282 Probably unconnected are Akk. ṣātu ‘to confine, to keep in check’ (CAD L 113), ṣītu ‘hostage, pledge’ (ibid. 223) as well as Arb. ṣuq ‘to cleave, to stick, to adhere’ (Lane 2681).
5.3. There is no need to emphasize, however, that the hypothesis postulating the historical unity of EthS as reflected in its basic vocabulary should not be applied blindly to all of its segments. Thus, in a few — to be sure, not very numerous — cases, a PS root was not obliterated completely throughout EthS, but managed to survive in some of the languages (*baśar- ‘meat,’ *dibš- ‘honey,’ *rẖš ‘to wash,’ *yḵ ‘to be narrow’). As far as such examples are concerned, one is forced to assume that the new lexical features which eventually replaced the old ones in the remaining languages were only incipiently present in the proto-language. Their full generalization must be ascribed to a later stage of the development of EthS, which makes feasible (in a sense, even compelling) the possibility of secondary diffusion by borrowing. In such a framework, the fact that the languages preserving the archaic lexical traits tend to be geographically peripheral (Gafat, Harari and Gurage) becomes all the more significant. A few lexical features whose attestation in Southern EthS is limited to Amharic (*kabd- ‘belly,’ *ḥmm ‘to be ill,’ *mavār- ‘honey,’ *zVib- ‘hyena’ or *maray-t- ‘earth, soil’) likely point to the same direction.
Chapter 8.
Modern South Arabian as a genealogical subgroup: 
the lexical dimension

1. Introduction

Richard Steiner seems to be the only Semitist who has wondered about the reasons behind the common opinion according to which Mehri, Jibbali and Soqotri represent a narrow genealogical unity traditionally designated Modern South Arabian (MSA): “If it is easy to show how the MSA languages differ from Arabic, it is more difficult to name the innovations that justify their being grouped together” (Steiner 1977:12). On p. 22 of his now classic monograph, Steiner correctly emphasizes that the presence of the lateral sibilants in the phonemic inventories of these languages is by no means a subgrouping criterion: since the lateral sibilants *š and *ž go back to Proto-Semitic, their preservation in MSA is a straightforward retention from PS, which says nothing about their hypothetical common origin. Moreover, the specificity of this feature is so salient only in comparison with modern Semitic idioms: as far as the ancient Semitic languages are concerned, there are good reasons to suppose that at least in some of them (notably, in Sabaic and Geez) the lateral sibilants were also preserved intact.

Steiner himself, apparently unable to detect any reliable shared innovation in the phonological domain of MSA, left his query unanswered. Since then — notwithstanding the spectacular progress achieved by the linguistic study of MSA in recent decades — no attempt has been made to define which of the many peculiar features observed in these languages are (1) common to all of them and thus traceable to Proto-MSA and (2) specific enough in comparison with the rest of Semitic languages to be considered shared innovations of this group. In other words, there is, a priori, no obvious reason to exclude the possibility that the diachronic unity of MSA, intuitively perceived by most specialists working in the field of Semitic linguistics and codified throughout Semitological literature, is actually based on historical, geographical and cultural considerations and has no serious linguistic background.

To test the probability of such a negative hypothesis is the primary goal of the present chapter. In section 2, we will look for shared morphological peculiarities of MSA, trying to analyze their origin and to assess their validity for the genealogical subgrouping. In section 3, we will supplement the morphological data with shared lexical isoglosses. In the concluding section of this chapter we will discuss the internal division of MSA using both morphological and lexical evidence.

2. MSA as a genealogical subgroup: morphological features

1283 Contrast W. Leslau's cavalier remark in 1970:525: “The dialectal unity of the various Modern South Arabian languages presents no problem in the present state of our knowledge.”
1284 With a possible exception of de-emphatization of *š (Steiner 1977:13). Steiner admits that even this is not entirely reliable (cf. now Dolgopolovsky 1994:5 and 1999:30–31 on Jibbali and Simeone-Senelle 1996:312–313 on Soqotri).
2.1. Truly specific morphological features reliably traceable to Proto-MSA are not easy to find. A few exciting peculiarities prominent in one or two major languages of the group are often missing from the remaining one(s), which prevents the reconstruction of these features for the proto-language. A few characteristic examples will suffice to illustrate this situation.

2.1.2. A peculiar feature of the verbal morphology of Mehri is the presence of a special set of forms designating actions in the future (“the future participle”): 

\[ \text{wazmōna 'will give}_{\text{masc. sing.}}, \text{wazmūta 'will give}_{\text{fem. sing.}}, \text{wazyēmā 'will give}_{\text{masc. pl.}}, \text{wazmūtām 'will give}_{\text{fem. pl.}} \] (Rubin 2007).

The origin of the base \( C_1aC_2C_3z \) and the corresponding inflectional markers is still uncertain.

The masculine marker \(-ōn-\) clearly goes back to the PS nominal suffix \(*-ān-\). This suffix is well known to be connected with the expression of the masculine gender elsewhere in Semitic (Greenberg 1960, Gelb 1967, 1969:35–36, Wilson-Wright 2014:8-9), and it is tempting to regard the opposition \(-ōn- : -īl-\) in Mehri as one of the most prominent manifestations of this phenomenon (cf. Rubin 2007:386). A. Lonnet (1994:234–235) compares the Mehri form with the Arabic adjectival pattern \( C_1aC_2C_3-ān- \),\(^{1285}\) but this identification does not necessarily contradict the previous one: at least for Gelb, the suffix \(-ān-\) in this Arabic pattern is actually the marker of the masculine gender, opposed to \(*-a-\) in the feminine form \( C_1aC_2C_3-ā \) (< \(*C_1aC_2C_3-a^{2}-u\) ). M. Bittner’s comparison with the \(-ān-\) suffix of nomina agentis of the derived stems in Aramaic (1911:25–26)\(^{1286}\) also deserves attention, especially since \(-ī-\) in the feminine marker \(-ī-\) in Mehri is reminiscent of the feminine ending of nomina agentis in Aramaic (\( māšabbāhī-ān- \) — \( māšabbāhī-īt- \) ‘glorifier’).\(^{1287}\) In the plural, the feminine form \( wāzmūți \) displays the regular feminine plural marker \(-ūtām\), whereas the “broken” pattern of the masculine form \( wāzēm-a \) remains diachronically obscure.\(^{1288}\)

---

1285 As Lonnet admits on p. 237 of his study, “la reconstruction de la première voyelle a n’est permise que par la comparaison avec l’arabe.”

1286 For Bittner, this comparison is compatible with a direct equation of the Mehri form with the Arabic \( C_1aC_2C_3-ān- \) adjectives.

1287 In its turn, almost certainly related to the gender opposition \(-ān- : -ān-\) - in Akkadian (von Soden 1995:86, 91). Lonnet (1994:240, following Rhodokanakis 1910:6) is inclined to derive \( C_1aC_2C_3-āl-\) from \(*C_1aC_2C_3-ay-\) - a, eventually related to the Arabic feminine adjectival form \( C_1aC_2C_3-ā \) (< \( C_1aC_2C_3-ā \)).

1288 For the latter, cf. Lonnet 1994:238–239. Lonnet tends to consider the form with infixed \(-γ\) - (standard in the Najdi dialect of Mehri as described by Johnstone) as diachronically secondary with respect to the form with suffixed \(-γ\) (\( kāb-\) - ‘they will write’), current in the Mehri variety of Qišn. As possible parallels in Arabic, he compares the broken plural patterns \( C_1aC_2C_3-ā \) - and \( C_1aC_2C_3-ā \). Note that on pp. 237–238 of his study Lonnet wonders whether the masculine singular form \( C_1aC_2C_3-ān- \) - which he elsewhere derives from \(*C_1aC_2C_3-ān-\) - could in fact go back to \(*C_1aC_2C_3-ān-\), presupposing an extension in \(-ān\) of the PS pattern of the active participle (1994:238, emphatically rejected in Bittner 1911:25). This reconstruction may provide an interesting clue to the background of the masculine plural form \( C_1aC_3y-\) - a, where \(-γ\) - could be regarded as a remnant of \(*-i-\) of the second syllable, and \(-ē-\), as the reflex of the \(-a\)-infix of the plural: \(*wnziām-a > wazēm-a\) (see further 2.2.5 in this chapter, p. 467 below).

Lonnet (1994:238) is undoubtedly correct to emphasize that the attested pattern of the broken plural with inserted \(-γ\) - in Mehri displays \(-γ\) - rather than \(-ē-\) after the second radical (Bittner 1909:57–58, cf,
The ending -a in wəzm-ən-a, wəzm-ɨl-a and wəzəm-ə is hard to separate from the PS case marker *-a, whose predicative function — quite independently of its eventual interpretation as accusative or absolutive — is well attested (Gelb 1965, Tropper 1999, Streck 2000:288–290, Waltisberg 2002:29–32). A. Lonnet (1994:242–244) does tentatively compare the Mehri ending to -a of the suffix conjugation elsewhere in West Semitic (notably, Arabic katab-a ‘he wrote’), admitting that their direct identification is faced with formidable difficulties (first and foremost, the unexpected preservation of a short -a in a final non-accented syllable in Mehri). 1289

There is no reliable trace of the future participle in either Jibbali or Soqotri, where the future is expressed by other means or has no formal expression at all (Simeone-Senelle 1993, 1997:408–409, Lonnet 1994:227–233, 236). The diachronic status of the Mehri participle within MSA — archaism or innovation? — is therefore uncertain. 1290

2.1.3. The use of *-i- as an apophonic marker of the feminine in adjectives with quadriradical structure has been often qualified as a specific feature of Soqotri (Simeone-Senelle 1997:390, Johnstone 1975:22): šámhal/šámhol ‘long’ (LS 418), hālhal/hālhol ‘gris’ (LS 175) and many further examples. 1291 However, as shown by A. Lonnet (1993:67, 2008:124–125), it is well attested also in Jibbali: šəzən/šəzər ‘yellow’ (JL 265), šəbləl/šəbəl ‘pure’ (JL 243), ferfər/fefer ‘hasty’ (JL 60) — altogether 12 examples in JL. There is, however, no trace of this phenomenon in Mehri, 1292 and indeed, Lonnet (2008:117) does not hesitate to qualify it as a shared innovation of what

1289 Rhodokanakis’ identification of -a (in his transcription, -e) with the nisbah ending *-iyy (1910:3) is improbable.

1290 Cf. Lonnet 1994:234: “Le soqotri n’a pas développé (ou a perdu) cette formation qui est propre au SAM continental.” For Lonnet, the archaical pattern C۱VC۲C۲-ɨn, widely used in Jibbali, is formally identical to the masculine form of the Mehri participle (1993:75, 1994:235). This identification is possible (although hardly provable) from a formal point of view, but the functional differences between these two types of forms are (as duly acknowledged by Lonnet) so deep that it is safe to describe the Mehri future participle as a specific property of this particular language. In Soqotri, the poetic forms di-ningsáne ‘one who plays’ and di-rašmáne ‘one who devours’, recorded in the course of our fieldwork (for the former, cf. already LS 260), are of great interest because of their clearly participial semantics, the transparent reflex of the suffix *-iɨn-, and the final -e, reminiscent of -a in Mehri. Cf. also zatākáne ‘one who shouts’ in LS 155.

More than 120 Soqotri examples have been carefully collected and analyzed by Lonnet (2008:127–131), who rightly acknowledges the merits of D. Müller’s pioneering contribution to the same problem (Müller 1909a).

1292 On p. 123 of his study, Lonnet admits that the gender oppositions in a few numerals of the first decade in Mehri possibly betray the same background: tākiyət ‘one’ (ML 406) and həmənihəyənə ‘five’ (ML 443), cf. the corresponding Jibbali forms padəpit (JL 274) and ḥəsiʃə (JL 302). He does not exclude, accordingly, that the phenomenon under discussion might have been once present in Mehri as well.
he labels *le sudarabique moderne oriental* — a subgroup comprising Jibbali and Soqotri as opposed to Mehri.\footnote{Lonnet (2008:118–121) plausibly connects this feature with other examples of *-ī* as the feminine marker in Semitic (mostly following Gelb 1969:31–47) and non-Semitic Afroasiatic languages. Lonnet’s reconstruction of the Proto-Jibbali-Soqotri picture (2008:124) can be exemplified by *ṣiṣṭār* (masculine)/*ṣiṣṭār-i* > *ṣiṣṭēr-i* > *ṣiṣṭēr* (feminine), i.e. Umlaut rather than Ablaut (so already Müller 1909a:447). Both Müller and Lonnet compare this process to what we observe in the second person singular of the prefix conjugation in the verbal paradigm: Jib. *ṣiṣṭār ‘you are able.*\textsuperscript{1295} If correct, this reconstruction necessarily implies that the MSA picture is completely different from the well-known Ethiopian Semitic facts not only materially, but also structurally: a feminine adjective like *gāllīm* ‘black’ in Geez (CDG 556) is unlikely to be traced to an original *gāllīm-ā*. Rather, we are faced with a true Ablaut replacement of the original thematic vowel *-ā* by the feminine marker *ā*. In principle, a similar explanation in the opposite direction (i-Ablaut) could be applied to MSA as well.\footnote{The only exception would be that in Soqotri (but not in Jibbali) the rule sometimes applies to roots *hāy* (Johnstone 1968:522), where the prefix vowel evidently cannot be reconstructed as *u*. However, Johnstone’s observations to this effect remain to be confirmed. On the one hand, both in the Vienna corpus and in our own field materials there are pertinent forms where *t-* is always preserved, such as *tkon* < *ken* ‘to be’ (Müller 1905:70) or *tērid* < *rēd* ‘to go’ (ibid. 107). On the other hand, most of the verbs explicitly mentioned by Johnstone morphologically belong to the causative stem, where the loss of *t-* is regular for all types of roots. This is the case of *der* ‘to dwell’ (jussive *āder*), *ṭef* ‘to give’ (jussive *lāṭaf*), *ṭer* ‘to hold, to seize’ (jussive *lāṭar*). As far as one can see it now, most of the original hollow verbs in Soqotri have actually adopted the conjunctival pattern of the causative stem, being thus irrelevant for the problem under discussion.}  

\subsection{2.1.4} Another peculiar phenomenon shared by Jibbali and Soqotri is the loss of the prefix *tV*- in the prefix conjugation of some verbal types and stems, namely the passive of the basic stem; the intensive and the causative stems; the basic stem of quadriradical verbs (Johnstone 1968, 1980, 1975:19–20, Lonnet 1993:73–74, 1994:245–246, Simeone-Senelle 1997:403). Thus, compare the Jibbali forms of the imperfect of the basic stem of the verb *kādār* ‘to be able’ (3 sg. m. *ya-kādār*, 3 sg. f. *ta-kādār*, 2 sg. m. *ta-kādār* with the corresponding forms of the intensive stem verb *egōdāl* ‘to chain’ (3 sg. m. *ya-egōdāl*, 3 sg. f. *ēgōdāl*, 2 sg. m. *ēgōdāl*). It was the merit of D. Testen (1992b) to demonstrate that these types of stems fully\footnote{The same conclusion has been made, presumably independently, in Voigt 2004:349–354. For the important consequences of Testen’s discovery for the history of Semitic verb see above in Chapter 3 (p. 163 above).} coincide with those displaying the prefix vowel *-u-* in Classical Arabic (and, *mutatis mutandis*, in Akkadian), even if the exact nature of the impact of this morphophonemic condition is still obscure to us.\footnote{No trace of this phenomenon is observable in Mehri, which allows Lonnet (2008:117) to consider it a genealogically significant feature linking Jibbali and Soqotri as members of the oriental branch of MSA.}  

\subsection{2.1.5} A characteristic feature shared by Jibbali and the Mehri of Najd is the use of negative circumfixes (Simeone-Senelle 1994, 1997:413–414): Mhr. *kō ḥēt ēl nākak b-\textsc{awālīye} lā ‘Why did not you bring my sandals?’ (Johnstone–Stroomer 1999:40, l. 10), Jib. *eskīn al ḥāzēf hēr īḥēz fājr ēr bō ‘The knife is not sharp enough to kill a bull’ (JL 109). This phenomenon is not attested in other Mehri dialects (Rubin 2011:76) nor in Soqotri, where only one negation marker is used (postpositive *lā* and prepositional *rāl
respectively). Elsewhere in Semitic, negative circumfixes are attested only in modern Ethiopian (e.g., Tigrinya የወ...ን).

2.2. These four features are probably sufficient to demonstrate how peculiar the individual MSA languages can be with respect to their Semitic parents — but also with respect to each other! In other words, these phenomena abundantly satisfy the criterion of specificity, but cannot be shown to belong to the Proto-MSA linguistic heritage.\textsuperscript{1296} We need, therefore, to look for other, potentially more illuminating isoglosses in order to prove the diachronic unity of this subgroup.

2.2.1. Perhaps the most salient specific feature in the verbal morphology of MSA is the use of \textit{-n} as the marker of the imperfect of the intensive stem (Mhr. \textit{yərəkkən}, Jib. \textit{yərəkkən} 'he puts on the fire,' Soq. \textit{yəzomī-i}n 'he puts saddle-cloths on') as opposed to the corresponding jussive forms \textit{yərəkəb}, \textit{yərəkkəb} and \textit{лизімь} (Johnstone 1975:14, Simeone-Senelle 1997:398–399).\textsuperscript{1297}

The origin of this clearly innovative feature is rather hard to ascertain.

To begin with, the very \textit{raison d’être} of the \textit{n}-extension is problematic from the diachronic point of view. As is well known, the \textit{a}-apophony as the marker of the imperfect is very well preserved in MSA throughout the derived stems (Kogan 2008a:163), as illustrated by such Mehri examples as \textit{yəhənsəm} — \textit{yəhənsəm} ‘to breathe’ = \textit{yu-}\textit{ha-nsəm} — \textit{yu-}\textit{ha-nsəm} (causative stem), \textit{yəntəfəz} — \textit{yəntəfəz} ‘to break one’s leg’ = \textit{yV-}\textit{n-ta-fəz} — \textit{yV-}\textit{n-ta-fəz} (simple reflexive stem), \textit{yəşəkbər} — \textit{yəşəkbər} ‘to consider big’ = \textit{yV-}\textit{sə-kəbər} — \textit{yV-}\textit{sə-kəbər} (causative-reflexive stem). In principle, nothing should have prevented the existence of such pairs as \textit{**yərəkəb} — \textit{**yərəkəb} < \textit{yu-rəkkəb} — \textit{yu-rəkkəb}, exactly corresponding to \textit{u-parras} — \textit{u-pəriss} in Akkadian.\textsuperscript{1298}

Similarly unclear is the origin of the \textit{-n} morpheme itself.

\textsuperscript{1296}To be sure, at least some of them may well have developed already in Proto-MSA, but this common origin cannot be satisfactorily deduced from the extant evidence.

\textsuperscript{1297}Hasselbach 2006:317 shows a deplorable lack of understanding of the MSA evidence. On the one hand, it is wrong that “the suffix \textit{-m} is not used on all verbal forms of a given paradigm in Mehri, but only on imperfects in the intensive, simple-reflexive and causative stem”: at least in Mehri, the \textit{-m} augment in the imperfect is used exclusively in the intensive stem and the corresponding \textit{t-} and \textit{št-} formations (Rubin 2010:102, 113). Both of the alleged “Gi” and “Ș refl.” verbs adduced by Hasselbach obviously belong to one of these types. On the other hand, this ending has (at least synchronically) virtually nothing to do with the \textit{n}-suffix of the conditional in Mehri and Jibbali, which is not bound to any particular verbal stem. In a broader perspective, it is sad to observe that the hypothetical relationship of any of the two MSA \textit{n}-morphemes to their real or alleged Semitic cognates is nowhere mentioned (let alone discussed) in Hasselbach’s article.

\textsuperscript{1298}Perhaps except for the fact that the hypothetical imperfect \textit{**yərəkəb} would have been too similar to the non-active imperfect/jussive \textit{yəfbər}. E. Wagner (1995:333), otherwise attentive to \textit{a}-Ablaut as a means of formation of the long form of the prefix conjugation, seems to be unaware of its potential for the \textit{D}-stem: “Der Grund für die Anfügung des \textit{-n} gerade in den Doppelungsstämmen dürfte gewesen sein, daß in ihnen sonst Indikativ und Subjunktiv zusammengefallen wären; denn das Bildungselement für Langform (= Indikativ) und Doppelungsstamm ist ja das gleiche, nämlich \textit{a} + Konsonantenlängung.” In fact, the hypothetical pair \textit{**yu-rəkkəb} — \textit{**yu-rəkkəb} is in all respects (notably, the syllabic structure) similar to \textit{yu-ha-nsəm} — \textit{yu-hə-nsəm}, and (except for what has been just mentioned in this footnote) there is no obvious reason why \textit{a}-Ablaut should have been abandoned in the former case but preserved in the latter.
Perhaps the most plausible solution would be to compare it with -nV as the marker of the long form of the prefix conjugation in Central Semitic (Arb. yaq tul-ū-ni, yaq tul-ū-na), in its turn related to the subjunctive markers -ni and -na in Akkadian (v. Chapter 3, p. 157 above). However, in both Akkadian and CS the n-suffixes are primarily associated with forms ending in long vowels, where the basic allomorph of the present (namely, *-u) cannot surface. It would be a mystery why in Proto-MSA the n-allomorph should have become the primary marker of the long form of the prefix conjugation throughout the paradigm of the intensive stem.

Within an alternative explanation, this suffix can be related to the CS energetic marker *-(V)n. At first sight, it is hard to see how the energetic morpheme could be transformed into the marker of the present indicative, but in view of the close connection between the energetic and the present elsewhere in WS, such a shift looks somewhat less unlikely (see further Chapter 3, pp. 134-141 above).\textsuperscript{1299}

2.2.2. The conditional in -n has been often described as a specific feature of Mehri of Najd and Jibbali (Johnstone 1975:18, Lonnet 1994:247–248, Simeone-Senelle 1997:404), but E. Wagner (1953:152, 1993:337) has pointed out its presence in a few Soqotri texts from the Vienna corpus.\textsuperscript{1300} It can, therefore, be safely considered a Proto-MSA feature which has become more marginal in some languages of the group, but has been fully preserved in others. The classical domain of use of the conditional as described by Johnstone is the apodosis of an unreal conditional sentence: lā el-ber lītay erbōt māmīn lā al navel-yan ṭah lā ‘If only he hadn’t killed four of us, we wouldn’t have killed him’ (Johnstone–Stroomer 1999:218–219). Most scholars who have dealt with the MSA conditional have compared it to the energetic jussive in Arabic, which is not unreasonable in view of the fact that the Arabic energetic is well attested in protases of (admittedly, real) conditional sentences (Zewi 1999:38–45). In view of the broader sphere of use of the conditional in Soqotri and some of the Mehri dialects the whole issue seems to be in need of careful reassessment.

2.2.3. Throughout MSA, the causative-reflexive stem is marked by the sibilant prefix, being thus opposed to the simple causative where the guttural prefix is used (Johnstone 1975:13, Simeone-Senelle 1997:400–401): Mhr. ḥa-wgūš ‘to take out the beasts in the late afternoon’ — ṣa-wgūš ‘to go in the early evening’ (ML 424), Jib. e-nzél ‘to bring down’ — ṣa-nzél ‘to be able to be brought down’ (JL 200), Soq. ē-gzam ‘adjurer’

\textsuperscript{1299} This possibility is considered (and rejected) in Wagner 1993:336–337, notably because, in Wagner’s view, the diachronic slot of the CS energetic in MSA is already occupied by the conditional. One cannot exclude, however, that both phenomena are to be explained as residual applications of one and the same ancient morpheme (for a possible parallel cf. the apparent coexistence of “benefactive” and “energetic” *-an in CS, v. Chapter 3, p. 140 above). R. Voigt (1994:300) attributes the n-suffix to dissimilation of the geminated second radical with subsequent metathesis (*yarākkīb > *yarānkīb > *yarākān > *yarākhān), but this ad hoc reconstruction is rather unappealing (it is unclear, in particular, why dissimilation should have affected only the present and not the structurally identical jussive).

\textsuperscript{1300} Many examples of n-augmented forms outside this syntactic position are scattered through the Vienna Soqotri corpus and our own field materials. Consider, for example, lōmriq-ēn-ken ‘Ich lege euch ans Herz’ (Müller 1905:358), or ke-lōmāen ‘Wenn ich gestorben bin ...’ (ibid. 98), or the expression ifūl tanmirin (du. tan mirin, pl. m. tan mirān, pl. f. tan mirēn) ‘What do you say?!,’ ‘Really?!’ in the everyday speech of our Soqotri informants. Some further information on the Soqotri conditional/energetic will be offered in our forthcoming Corpus of Soqotri Oral Literature.
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— śē-gzam 'tomber d’accord' (LS 106). The origin of this phenomenon is obscure (cf. Bittner 1911:51–52, Brockelmann 1908:532, Voigt 1994:305–306),\textsuperscript{1301} but its specificity with respect to other Semitic languages is not in doubt.\textsuperscript{1302}

2.2.4. The MSA languages are characterized by a peculiar system of external plural markers.

2.2.4.1. The masculine suffix appears as -īn in Mehri, -īn in Jibbali and -(V)hōn in Soqotri: Mhr. ȳmnīb — ȳmb-īn, Jib. ȳmūnb — ȳmb-īn, Soq. dēnb — dēnb-hōn ‘tail’ (JL 47, Johnstone 1975:21, Simeone-Senelle 1997:392). This ending does not lend itself to a straightforward diachronic analysis. For Brockelmann (1908:452–453), it is identical to the Arabic external oblique plural marker -ōna, whereas in Johnstone’s view (1975:21) it is rather to be compared to the Geez ending -ān (see also Lonnet 1993:65).

The peculiar nature of the MSA ending is not restricted to its form. Already M. Bittner (1909:46) was aware of the fact that the morphological classes of nouns pluralized with the masculine suffix in Arabic and MSA are not identical.\textsuperscript{1303} Indeed, differing from Arabic -ānā/-īnā (and Geez -ān),\textsuperscript{1304} the MSA ending is not associated with participles and nomina agentis, but can be used freely for morphologically simple nominal structures (notably, for many primary nouns). This picture so overtly contradicts R. Ratcliffe’s reasonable prediction\textsuperscript{1305} that one is forced to wonder whether the MSA suffix is indeed to be understood as an external plural marker. Within an alternative analysis, the MSA structure *C₁VC₂C₃-ān- could be identified with the Arabic broken plural patterns C₁C₂C₃-ān- and C₁C₂C₃-ān-. As pointed out by Ratcliffe (1998a:86), at least the former pattern is primarily associated with nouns having a long ā in the second syllable: γulām- — γilmān- 'boy,' γazāl- — γizlān- 'gazelle.' This distribution is strikingly similar to the Mehri picture as described by Bittner: “Fast regelmäßig wird aber der männliche äußere Plural ... auch gebraucht bei den Nominalformen qatāl, qitāl und qutāl” (1909:47, cf. also 1915b:41).\textsuperscript{1306} The Soqotri evidence obtained in the course of our fieldwork is also very clear in this respect: nouns with o (< *ā) in the second syllable represent the only clear-cut class regularly using the (generally, quite rare) n-extended plural patterns: fōdhun — fōdēnhun ‘mountain,’ ḫfor — ḫfrin ‘burrow, hole,’ sōhūr — sōrūhin ‘kind of tree,’ sērhom — sērhmīn

\textsuperscript{1301} Note that š in Mehri and Soqotri and ȃ in Jibbali suggest the presence of a palatal vowel after or before the original sibilant, thus *si(š)-C₁C₂C₃-.

\textsuperscript{1302} Admittedly, a similar simplification may have independently occurred in the Amharic double causative prefix as- if compared to its Geez parallel ṣasta.

\textsuperscript{1303} “Rücksichtlich der maskulinen Pluralendung ... ist zu konstatieren, daß sie im Mehri ... verhältnismäßig öfter gebraucht wird, als im Arabischen und zwar auch in solchen Fällen, wo das Arabische nie einen äußeren männlichen Plural bildet.” To be sure, on pp. 46–47 of his study Bittner does list many morphological patterns where external masculine plural is used in both Arabic and Mehri, but most of his Mehri examples are rather transparent Arabic loans.

\textsuperscript{1304} \textit{Contra} Bittner 1909:46.

\textsuperscript{1305} “In every language which has an internal plural as a productive process, the internal plural is either the obligatory or at least the only productive plural for underived, unmarked nouns of three or fewer consonants ..., while the external plural is generally obligatory for productively derived nouns such as participles and verbal nouns” (Ratcliffe 1998a:219).

\textsuperscript{1306} Cf. Rhodokanakis 1910:9, where the corresponding Mehri forms have been interpreted as “Doppelplurale (oder mit der Endung des ‘äußeren’ Plur. verscâhene ‘innere’ Plurale).”
‘tree,’ tēḥor — ṭjḥrḥīn ‘wall,’ ḥāḥoḥ — ḥālḥīḥin ‘straps for climbing a palm tree’ (cf. LS 333, 282, 422, 439).\(^ {1307} \)

\[ \text{2.2.4.2.} \] Perhaps no less specific is the external feminine marker -\(ā\)\(ū\)\(m\) in Mehri and Soqotri (Johnstone 1975:20–21, Simeone-Senelle 1997:392): Mhr. kaḥbūt — kaḥbāt\(ā\)\(ū\)\(m\) ‘female wolf’ (ML 208), ḡaggēt — ḡagg-\(ū\)\(ū\)m ‘girl’ (ibid. 147), kafēn — kafān-\(ū\)\(ū\)m ‘shroud’ (ibid. 204); Soq. ṭāzē — ṭeghēt\(ā\)m ‘woman’ (LS 307). While the element -\(ū\)\(t\)- (-\(ū\)\(ū\)-, -\(ē\)t-) is clearly identical to the PS external feminine marker *-\(ū\)\(ū\)-, the diachronic background of the nasal extension is still uncertain. M. Bittner (1909:45–46) has categorically rejected the possibility of connecting -\(ū\)\(m\) with the masculine plural marker (so Brockelmann 1908:442), primarily because the latter always carries the stress in Mehri, so its vowel is not expected to be reduced. Bittner’s alternative proposal is to identify -\(ū\)\(m\) with the Arabic nunation (-\(ū\)\(ū\)-\(u\)-\(n\)), which may be not unreasonable in view of rather transparent traces of nunation also in the singular (Wagner 1953:22–23). \(^ {1308} \)

All these doubts notwithstanding, the rather specific nature of the feminine plural marker in Mehri and Soqotri is evident. Since there is no \(n\)-extension in the corresponding forms in Jibbali (Johnstone 1975:20–21), this isogloss is, strictly speaking, not pan-MSA, but there are good chances that Mehri and Soqotri reflect the original situation in the proto-language whereas the Jibbali picture is due to secondary simplification (Bittner 1915b:42, Lonnet 1993:65).

\[ \text{2.2.5.} \] A characteristic feature of the broken plural system of MSA is the broad application of the operation of \(a\)-replacement (Greenberg 1955). As recognized by J. Greenberg, this operation is relatively uncommon in Semitic, where \(a\)-intercalation between the second and the third radicals is generally preferred (1955:199–201). \(^ {1309} \)

Clear manifestations of \(a\)-replacement in other Semitic languages are confined to a few biconsonantal primary nouns in CS, such as Hbr. bēn — bān-īm (*bin- — *ban-) ‘son,’ šēt — šāt-ōl- (*šīt- — *šāt-) ‘buttocks’ and Arb. ūn-t — ūn-āl- ‘daughter.’ \(^ {1310} \)

In MSA, \(a\)-replacement is used on a much broader scale. Two primary spheres of its application can be detected, namely biconsonantal and quadriconsonantal nouns with a high vowel in the last syllable (Bittner 1909:70–72, Lonnet 1993:66): Mhr. ḥa-dūd — ḥa-dād ‘paternal uncle’ (ML 75), Jib. ḥīj — ḥēl, Soq. ḥīl’ — ḥōl- ‘maternal uncle’ (JL 310, LS 166); Mhr. kābēb — kābēb, Jib. kābekōb — kābekāb, Soq. kābēb — kābekōb ‘star’ (ML 201, JL 125, LS 214). Especially in the latter case, this type of alternation displays a remarkably high degree of regularity: according to R. Ratcliffe (1998a:193), in Harsusi it affects no less than 90% of the relevant forms. The \(a\)-replacement in the broken plural of quadriradical nouns neatly opposes MSA to both Arabic and EthS, where

\(^ {1307} \) The other well-defined group is admittedly of semantic nature, viz. the kinship terms: bēha — bēhējōn ‘father,’ ḥākō — ḥākōjōn ‘brother,’ dēdō — dedējōn ‘uncle,’ mējō — mēmējōn ‘grandfather’ (cf. LS 80, 384, 123, 248).

\(^ {1308} \) Rhodokanakis’ objections to Bittner’s hypothesis (1910:8) do not seem to be sufficiently weighty.

\(^ {1309} \) “As can be seen, only intercalation is at all frequent in Semitic.”

\(^ {1310} \) As already seen by Greenberg, probably also in Arabic adjectives kabār- — kibār- (1955:201; Greenberg explains kibār- from *kabār- via dissimilation). For Ratcliffe (1998a:193), pluralization of the Arabic 
\(C_aC̄_2\)\(C̄_3\) adjectives provides the closest approximation to the MSA picture described in the present section (“the three-consonant type is older and may have been the source of analogy for the quadriconsonantal forms,” cf. Corriente 1971:18, Diem 1979:68).
nouns of this structure are pluralized by a-intercalation after the second radical (Arabic 
mašīs-—mažālis- ‘place of sitting’).\textsuperscript{1311} The high degree of specificity of this feature has
been observed already by T. M. Johnstone,\textsuperscript{1312} whereas R. Ratcliffe (1998a:210)
considers it the only specific element of the MSA system of broken plurals and
explicitely designates it as “innovative” (ibid. 193).\textsuperscript{1313}

2.2.6. Two types of diminutive formations described in Johnstone 1973 are
likely traceable to Proto-MSA.

Johnstone’s type I is represented by Mhr. C\textup{1}\textup{gwēC\textup{2}C\textup{3}}, Jib. C\textup{1}\textup{C\textup{2}C\textup{3}}, Soq.
C\textup{1}\textup{ouC\textup{2}C\textup{3}}: Mhr. g\textup{avēlēd}, Jib. g\textup{elēd}, Soq. g\textup{o}g\textup{eld} ‘little skin.’ Johnstone (1973:106) is
inclined to reconstruct the Proto-MSA background of these forms as *C\textup{1}\textup{IwēC\textup{2}C\textup{3}}
which, in terms of PS vocalic reconstruction, probably amounts to *C\textup{1}\textup{IwēC\textup{2}C\textup{3}}.\textsuperscript{1314} As
Johnstone correctly observes, this pattern may be distantly related to Arabic C\textup{1}uC\textup{2}C\textup{3}-(
and, by implication, to the well-known and productive C\textup{1}uC\textup{2}C\textup{3})
It is, nevertheless, specific enough to be considered a shared peculiarity of MSA.\textsuperscript{1315}

The same conclusion is even more probable in what concerns Johnstone’s type II:
Mhr. C\textup{2}C\textup{3}C\textup{3}C\textup{3} (dāmēbēn ‘little tail’), Jib. C\textup{2}C\textup{3}C\textup{3} (hērīyēn ‘little tree’), Soq.
C\textup{1}ouC\textup{2}C\textup{3} (fīrēbēn ‘little crow’). The Proto-MSA pattern cannot be easily
retrieved,\textsuperscript{1316} but the presence of the suffix *-ān- in the protoform is not in doubt.

\textsuperscript{1311} This strategy of pluralization, too, is not completely missing from MSA (Lonnet 1993:65,
with the feminine marker *-at-: Mhr. maḥīdārūl — maḥīdrūn ‘pen for goats’ (ML 167). A few masculine
nouns with a non-high vowel in the last syllable also use this pattern: Mhr. mānḥāl — mānḥāl ‘sieve’ (ML 308).
Rather numerous examples are attested in Soqotri: əbšī — əbšīb ‘finger’ (LS 70), mašμīd — mašμīd
‘pillow’ (LS 313) and many others.

\textsuperscript{1312} “Another kind of internal plural of frequent occurrence would seem to have been developed
within the MSA languages” (Johnstone 1975:21).

\textsuperscript{1313} It is not impossible that, from the diachronic point of view, the phenomenon under discussion
still can be considered as a-insertion rather than a-replacement. In Johnstone’s ML, a few triconsonantal
substantives with ə-plurals are recorded rather than γ- before the inserted vowel: ḍūlīg — ḍūlāg
‘camel-calf’ (ML 21) or ṣūzīg — ṣūzāg ‘bone’ (ML 39). Now the corresponding Harsusi forms do exhibit
γ- before ə: ṣūlīk — ṣūlāk (HL 8), ṣūzīg — ṣūzāg (HL 14). The same correspondence can be observed in the
plural formation of some quadriradical substantives ending in -in: Mhr. gārdīn — gārdīn ‘rat’ (ML
124) vs. Hrs. gārīn — gārīn (HL 41), Mhr. ṭāhūānīn — ṭāhūān ‘hyena’ (ML 415) vs. Hrs. ṭāhūān — ṭāhūān
(HL 132, cf. Mhr. ṭīrīya in Jahn 1902:229). In at least one case, the opposite picture is observed:
Mhr. ṭāhūān — ṭāhūān ‘horse’ (ML 98, cf. ṭāhūān in Jahn 1902:177) vs. Hrs. ṭāhūān — ṭāhūān
(HL 34). It is hard to say whether the γ-forms are archaic or innovative (cf. Rhodokanakis 1910:18–19,
but if the former is true, they might provide an interesting analogy to the reconstruction of the
masculine broken plural form of the future participle as outlined above in this chapter (*ṭāzī(y)āt-ma >
ṭāzēyān-a).

\textsuperscript{1314} But cf. Rhodokanakis’ *C\textup{1}ū\textup{uC\textup{2}C\textup{3}} (1910:5).

\textsuperscript{1315} So already Bittner 1909:34: “Doch kann das mehrstische qawatēl (wohl für qawatil) mit dem
arabischen qaitul nicht identifiziert werden.”

\textsuperscript{1316} Some of the Soqotri forms produced by our informants (like ṭ\textup{(o)}wēghen ‘boy’) unmistakably
point to *u in the first syllable, which makes these forms quite close to the first type of diminutive
formations discussed above in this section. This is exactly how such forms were understood already by
Rhodokanakis (1910:5–6). A few others, however, certainly do not involve the u-vocalism in the base
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Johnstone (1973:107) identifies this suffix with the diminutive ending *-ān- attested elsewhere in Semitic (Brockelmann 1908:394–395, Bittner 1909:34), but his subsequent remark about the originality of the MSA picture is quite telling: “Comparable diminutives are found in other Semitic languages, but, apart from the ending -ān or its equivalent, there seems to be no distinct pattern associated with them.”

2.2.7. In the Mehri variety of Najd, in Harsusi and in Jibbali, definite nouns are marked with a definite article whose basic allomorph is a/-e- (Johnstone 1970, Sima 2002). In the former two languages, the allomorphs hā-/hā- are also in evidence, mostly used with nouns beginning with an etymological *h-. There is no definite article in Soqotri, but one can reasonably surmise (with Johnstone 1970:302, cf. Sima 2002:663) that the non-etymological prefixed element V- in some primary nouns beginning with *h- (*ḥam ‘hand,’ ẓ-ḥar ‘road’) represents a fossilized definite article. It is thus legitimate to reconstruct the definite article as a Proto-MSA feature. Its diachronic relationship to the definite articles of CS is still poorly understood, whatever concrete reconstructed forms of the latter are thought to be acceptable.1317

2.2.8. The Proto-MSA second and third person dual pronouns can be reliably reconstructed as *(v)Vī and *(tī (see the relevant forms in Johnstone 1975:25, Simeone-Senelle 1997:387). This feature, namely, the direct attachment of the dual marker -i to the “core consonant” of the pronominal morpheme, makes these forms sharply different from āntumā and humā, familiar from Classical Arabic and with good parallels in Sabaic ẓm and ḥm (Stein 2003:131).1318 This interesting Proto-MSA isogloss has good chances of being innovative. The same is true of the first person dual *(v)kī (Wagner 1952), reconstructed o

---

1317 Among numerous studies dealing with this question, Voigt 1998b and Tropper 2001a must be singled out. J. Tropper’s analysis is restricted to the CS evidence and does not address the MSA facts at all. In R. Voigt’s opinion, the MSA article is to be considered “der äußerste und jüngste Vertreter der Welle, die von Palästina ausgehend alle altarabische Dialekte erfaßt hat” (1998b:249), which presumably means that this feature is not autochthonous in MSA but ultimately borrowed from CS. A. Sima (2002:666) also wonders about the possibility of an early North Arabian infiltration. Attractive as they are, these hypotheses can scarcely be verified and are to be taken with much caution. It is especially the variant ḥ- that is quite hard to explain within the borrowing paradigm (Voigt’s “Verstärkung” of an original h- carries little conviction).

1318 For the Akkadian form šunī in EA 366:24 v. Rainey 1996 I 66. It is still a mystery how such forms, “last attested in native Akkadian sources around the middle of the 20th. cent. B.C. were preserved for over six hundred years in W[estern] P[eripheral] A[kkadian]” (Moran 1973:53). J. Tropper (2000:210) postulates ṭam and ḥm for Ugaritic, but there is, of course, no conclusive proof that these consonantal spellings reflect special dual forms rather than the plural ones.


1320 Contrast ḗtī in Harsusi (HL 4) and tī in the Mehri varieties referred to in Simeone-Senelle 1997:387.
corresponding Akkadian and Ugaritic forms are known to us, although they almost certainly existed in these languages.  

3. Lexical evidence for the historical unity of MSA

Eight morphological innovations outlined in the preceding section certainly provide some background for treating MSA as a genealogical subgroup. However, neither the quantity nor the quality of these isoglosses are high enough to meet our expectations. A closer look at the common lexical peculiarities of the MSA languages is thus clearly advisable. As elsewhere in this book, we shall begin our analysis with the most fundamental layers of the vocabulary as conveniently represented by the Swadesh wordlist. As soon as preliminary conclusions are achieved on this basis, other strata of the basic vocabulary will be brought into discussion.

3.1. The Swadesh wordlist: the evidence

3.1.1. The sources

3.1.1.1. Soqotri

The Soqotri evidence has been obtained via direct inquiry of two native speakers from the highland bedouin tribe Da’rHo, once on the island (two weeks in November 2010) and twice outside it (one week in Sanaa in May 2011 and two months in Moscow in Summer 2011). Lack of time constraints and keen understanding from the part of the informants 1322 made possible a highly refined procedure of selecting the pertinent lexical items, so one can be confident that their native dialect is reflected in the list with a great degree of exactitude. These results have been systematically compared with what one can glean from the Vienna Soqotri corpus (Müller 1902, 1905, 1907) as well as with the evidence of more recent studies, among which M.-C. Simeone-Senelle’s remarks on Wellsted’s lexical lists (1991, 1992) are to be singled out because of their usefulness and precision. All Soqotri forms quoted from these “secondary” sources and known to our informants have been normalized according to their pronunciation. Finally, a few valuable remarks (particularly about the Western dialects, little known to us) have been kindly provided by Miranda Morris in personal communication.

1321 For Akkadian, this is implied by the existence of the first person dual forms in the verbal paradigm, brilliantly identified by N. J. C. Kouwenberg (2005:100–101, 2010:51) and strikingly similar to the corresponding MSA forms (*½V-...-ā). The dual suffix -ny in Ugaritic is, of course, well known (Tropper 2000:227). Its “core” element n is materially different from k in Proto-MSA, which bolsters the innovative character of the latter (as seen already by Wagner, 1952:231–232: “Die neusüdärrabische Form unabhängig von der ugaritischen entstanden sein muß und nicht altes semitisches Erbgut sein kann”). It is, admittedly, hard to say whether we are entitled to extrapolate the shape of the suffix to the unattested nominative form.

1322 This was our first working experience with ʾĪsā Gumān al-Da’ārē and ʾĪsā al-Da’ārē who have soon become our permanent co-authors in a variety of projects connected with the Soqotri language and oral literature. The Soqotri wordlist has been prepared in close collaboration with Dmitry Cherkashin whose kind help we gladly acknowledge.
3.1.1.2. Mehri

The Mehri wordlist could not be obtained via personal fieldwork. This obvious drawback is to some extent mitigated by systematic perusal of several extensive text collections produced by outstanding MSA linguists of different generations.

1. T. M. Johnstone’s texts posthumously published by H. Stroomer (1999 = MTO) and reflected in ML represent the bedouin variety of Mehri spoken in the Omani Nagd. At least in the lexical domain, this is by far the most conservative Mehri dialect and, as such, also the most appropriate one for the purpose of the present study. The Mehri column of the chart below exclusively depends on ML (whenever possible, supplemented by text illustrations from MTO). A few Mehri texts recently published by J. Watson (2012) also belong to this group.

2. Alexander Sima’s collection of Mehri texts, posthumously published by J. Watson and W. Arnold (2009 = MTJŠ), represent the dialect spoken in the extreme East of the Mehri-speaking area of Yemen, in the immediate vicinity to the Omani border.

3. Mehri texts collected by the members of the Austrian Südarábische Expedition ("Vienna corpus"). Contrary to a widespread belief, the language of the Mehri texts collected by the Austrian scholars is not homogeneous. The native area of the informant of Müller 1902 (= SAE IV) was al-Ghayda and the costal towns to the west of it (such as Darbut and Nishtawn). The same is true of the main informant of Jahn 1902 (= SAE III). W. Hein, whose text collection was posthumously published by D. H. Müller (1909 = SAE IX), worked in Qišn, and most of his informants seem to represent the Mehri variety of this coastal town in Western Mahra. A few others were inland bedouins, however.

3.1.1.3 Jibbali

The Jibbali evidence available to us is by far the weakest, as it mostly relies on lexicographic sources (JL and Nakano 1986) and not on text collections: while Johnstone’s Jibbali corpus was still unpublished when the bulk of this chapter was completed, the corresponding segment of the Vienna MSA corpus (Müller 1907 = SAE VII) is very limited in size. That this, in many respects crucial, language is so poorly represented in our investigation is, of course, very lamentable and almost certainly detrimental to at least some of its results.

When this chapter was close to completion, many of Johnstone’s Jibbali texts have become known to us through the kind agency of Aaron Rubin, who has made

---

1323 Cf. T. M. Johnstone’s remarks in ML xi. A. Lonnet (2005:200) is also quite explicit in this respect: “Au Yémen, le mehri le plus occidental est affecté assez profondément par le contact avec l’arabe, le mehri du Dhofar l’est nettement moins.”

1324 Cf. Johnstone’s judicious remarks in ML xi as well as the Excursus 1 below in this chapter.

1325 The Mehri texts of Müller 1907 (= SAE VII) are taken from (then unpublished) Hein–Müller 1909.

1326 A penetrating account of the background of Hein’s informants by his widow Maria can be found in the Introduction to SAE IX.
available to us a final draft of his Jibbali grammar (2014 = JLO). These carefully edited materials helped us fill some of the most glaring lacunae. A most valuable contribution to our Jibbali list has been further provided by Miranda Morris, who has generously shared with us the results of her inquiry into the lexical exponents of some of the key positions of the Swadesh wordlist.

3.1.2. The lexical data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Mehri</th>
<th>Jibbali</th>
<th>Soqotri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>“all”</td>
<td>kal</td>
<td>ko(h)l</td>
<td>fahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>“ashes”</td>
<td>rāmēd</td>
<td>rūd</td>
<td>rīmid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>“bark”</td>
<td>kōlēfūt</td>
<td>kiżifūt</td>
<td>kalifū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>“belly”</td>
<td>hōfal</td>
<td>źafal</td>
<td>mēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>“big”</td>
<td>m. šöh</td>
<td>m. raš</td>
<td>dī-vekhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f. ngōb</td>
<td>f. rum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>“bird”</td>
<td>rākṣēt</td>
<td>rešērat</td>
<td>nōybar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>“to bite”</td>
<td>račh</td>
<td>ḏavār</td>
<td>ḏavāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>“black”</td>
<td>ḥōwār</td>
<td>ḥūr</td>
<td>ḥāhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>“blood”</td>
<td>ḏōr</td>
<td>ḏōr</td>
<td>dor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>“bone”</td>
<td>rāżāyē</td>
<td>rāżēz</td>
<td>sōljōh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>“breast”</td>
<td>gawf</td>
<td>gēfer</td>
<td>gēfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 127)</td>
<td>(JL 73)</td>
<td>(LS 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>“to burn”</td>
<td>hō-nēḥā</td>
<td>e-nēḥ</td>
<td>é-nēḥa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 293)</td>
<td>(JL 187)</td>
<td>(LS 264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hērūk</td>
<td>(ML 186)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>“claw”</td>
<td>ḏēfēr</td>
<td>ḏēfēr</td>
<td>Ŧefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>“cloud”</td>
<td>rāfār</td>
<td>rāfār</td>
<td>Ŧilīlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 15)</td>
<td>(JL 8)</td>
<td>(LS 310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>“cold”</td>
<td>ḥāṣom</td>
<td>ḫēṣom</td>
<td>ḫēṣom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 240)</td>
<td>(JL 152)</td>
<td>(LS 382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ḥēbūr</td>
<td>(ML 165)</td>
<td>ḥēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(JL 323)</td>
<td>(LS 421)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>“to come”</td>
<td>nūka</td>
<td>zahām</td>
<td>gēdāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 293)</td>
<td>(JL 318)</td>
<td>(LS 102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>“to die”</td>
<td>mōt</td>
<td>ḥārog</td>
<td>sāmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 275)</td>
<td>(JL 304)</td>
<td>(LS 353)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>“dog”</td>
<td>kawb</td>
<td>kōb</td>
<td>kāf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(mābāyl)</td>
<td>(bēvēl/mahvēl)</td>
<td>(LS 218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 208)</td>
<td>(JL 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>“to drink”</td>
<td>taq</td>
<td>šūsī</td>
<td>rī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 155)</td>
<td>(JL 262)</td>
<td>(LS 395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>“dry”</td>
<td>ḥāṣa</td>
<td>ḵēṣav</td>
<td>ḵēṣav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 242)</td>
<td>(JL 153)</td>
<td>(LS 389)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>“ear”</td>
<td>ḥā-ĩdēn</td>
<td>ṣūdēn</td>
<td>īhēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 3)</td>
<td>(JL 1)</td>
<td>(LS 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>“earth”</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>godrēt</td>
<td>ḥōyhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 246)</td>
<td>(JL 71)</td>
<td>(LS 166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>“to eat”</td>
<td>trwō</td>
<td>té</td>
<td>twi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ML 404)</td>
<td>(JL 273)</td>
<td>(LS 440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>“egg”</td>
<td>káw®øl (ML 227)</td>
<td>ka✓eżín (JL 143)</td>
<td>ka✓il’hin (LS 369)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>“eye”</td>
<td>rāyn (ML 38)</td>
<td>rihm (JL 20)</td>
<td>sän (LS 308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>“feather”</td>
<td>kaf (ML 245)</td>
<td>kaf (JL 155)</td>
<td>málvat (LS 233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>“fire”</td>
<td>š=f (ML 388)</td>
<td>š= (JL 258)</td>
<td>ši√át (LS 426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>“fish”</td>
<td>šayd (ML 369)</td>
<td>šod (JL 243)</td>
<td>šše (LS 349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>“to fly”</td>
<td>før (ML 96)</td>
<td>fér (JL 59)</td>
<td>fer (LS 342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>“foot”</td>
<td>fém (ML 86)</td>
<td>fañm (JL 51)</td>
<td>ḫaf (JL 298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>“full”</td>
<td>málv (ML 265)</td>
<td>mézi (JL 171)</td>
<td>mli (LS 243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>“to give”</td>
<td>wɔzum (ML 434)</td>
<td>ézum (JL 295)</td>
<td>tef (LS 201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>“good”</td>
<td>gid (ML 128)</td>
<td>érhim (JL 210)</td>
<td>di-šker (LS 416)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>“green”</td>
<td>hɔjär (ML 163)</td>
<td>šajo (JL 265)</td>
<td>šajo (LS 420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>“hair”</td>
<td>šat (ML 373)</td>
<td>šet (JL 246)</td>
<td>še (LS 432)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>“hand”</td>
<td>h-ayd (ML 460)</td>
<td>éd (JL 313)</td>
<td>ød (LS 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>“head”</td>
<td>h-o-råh (ML 310)</td>
<td>rëš (JL 201)</td>
<td>ri (LS 390)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>“to hear”</td>
<td>hima (ML 157)</td>
<td>šw (JL 262)</td>
<td>himar (LS 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>“heart”</td>
<td>hɔ-warb (ML 250)</td>
<td>ub (JL 159)</td>
<td>ʃb (LS 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>“horn”</td>
<td>kɔn (ML 236)</td>
<td>kon (JL 149)</td>
<td>kɔn (LS 377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>“I”</td>
<td>hɔ (ML 149)</td>
<td>hé (JL 93)</td>
<td>ho (LS 138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>“to kill”</td>
<td>liñu (ML 256)</td>
<td>lëw (JL 165)</td>
<td>ṭaw (LS 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>“knee”</td>
<td>børk (ML 52)</td>
<td>børk (JL 28)</td>
<td>børk (LS 96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>“to know”</td>
<td>yèv (ML 140)</td>
<td>yàsèh (JL 88)</td>
<td>yè (LS 325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>“leaf”</td>
<td>yΌf (ML 359)</td>
<td>šυp (JL 237)</td>
<td>šat’ (LS 354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>“to lie”</td>
<td>šàwɔf (ML 425)</td>
<td>šèf (JL 267)</td>
<td>šèf (LS 409)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>“liver”</td>
<td>šobdët (ML 392)</td>
<td>šubdët (JL 124)</td>
<td>šbde (LS 410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>“long”</td>
<td>tsàwày (ML 413)</td>
<td>riïm (JL 219)</td>
<td>riïm (LS 399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>“louse”</td>
<td>kɔnnút (ML 212)</td>
<td>šiµ (JL 133)</td>
<td>kòm (LS 221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>“man”</td>
<td>yàv (ML 147)</td>
<td>yèg (JL 91)</td>
<td>yàg (LS 307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>“many”</td>
<td>mèk (ML 264)</td>
<td>mèk (JL 170)</td>
<td>di-dëlæk (LS 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>“meat”</td>
<td>tèẙ (ML 404)</td>
<td>tèr (JL 273)</td>
<td>tè (LS 440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>“moon”</td>
<td>hà-rït (ML 7)</td>
<td>ràrît (JL 4)</td>
<td>ère (LS 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>“mountain”</td>
<td>kɔrmàum (ML 214)</td>
<td>hér (JL 111)</td>
<td>fàdehôn (LS 333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>“mouth”</td>
<td>hà (ML 454)</td>
<td>hàh (JL 310)</td>
<td>hè (LS 158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>“name”</td>
<td>ham (ML 158)</td>
<td>sham (JL 262)</td>
<td>shem (LS 418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“neck”</td>
<td>γοθι (ML 145)</td>
<td>γ’θε (JL 90)</td>
<td>ακρένο (LS 340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>“new”</td>
<td>γοθήν (ML 461)</td>
<td>ὀδίν (JL 287)</td>
<td>γοδίδ (LS 101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>“night”</td>
<td>νασχ (ML 31)</td>
<td>νασχ (JL 17)</td>
<td>ἡτε (LS 194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>“nose”</td>
<td>ηνήρ (ML 308)</td>
<td>ηνήρ (JL 199)</td>
<td>ηνήρ (LS 265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>“not”</td>
<td>λα (ML 249)</td>
<td>λατ (JL 158)</td>
<td>αλ (LS 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>τατ (ML 406)</td>
<td>τατ (JL 274)</td>
<td>τατ (LS 199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>“person”</td>
<td>μολακ (ML 441)</td>
<td>βίδεμ (JL 28)</td>
<td>μολακ (LS 267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>“rain”</td>
<td>μωσκ (ML 256)</td>
<td>μωσκ (JL 165)</td>
<td>μεσε (LS 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>“red”</td>
<td>υφαρ (ML 14)</td>
<td>υφα (JL 8)</td>
<td>υφα (LS 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>“road”</td>
<td>υραμ (ML 7)</td>
<td>υραμ (JL 4)</td>
<td>υραμ (LS 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>“root”</td>
<td>ραρ (ML 28)</td>
<td>ραρ (JL 256)</td>
<td>ραρ (LS 433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>“round”</td>
<td>μοσακ (ML 76)</td>
<td>μοσακ (JL 213)</td>
<td>μοσακ (LS 113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>“sand”</td>
<td>βαθ (ML 57)</td>
<td>βαθ (JL 30)</td>
<td>βαθ (LS 213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rολκε (ML 327)</td>
<td>rολκε (JL 213)</td>
<td>rολκε (LS 315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>“to say”</td>
<td>ραμορ (ML 25)</td>
<td>ραμορ (JL 13)</td>
<td>ραμορ (LS 315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>“to see”</td>
<td>ςίνι (ML 381)</td>
<td>ςίνι (JL 253)</td>
<td>ςίνι (LS 431)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>“seed”</td>
<td>βεδαρ (ML 44)</td>
<td>βεδαρ (JL 23)</td>
<td>βεδαρ (LS 135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>“to sit”</td>
<td>σκο (ML 390)</td>
<td>σκο (JL 227)</td>
<td>σκο (LS 155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>“skin”</td>
<td>γεδ (ML 119)</td>
<td>γεδ (JL 75)</td>
<td>γεδ (LS 101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γόλ (ML 75)</td>
<td>γόλ (JL 75)</td>
<td>γόλ (LS 101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>“to sleep”</td>
<td>σκακ (ML 425)</td>
<td>σκακ (JL 267)</td>
<td>σκακ (LS 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>“small”</td>
<td>κονααν (ML 232)</td>
<td>κονααν (JL 193)</td>
<td>κονααν (LS 374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>“smoke”</td>
<td>νιδα (ML 281)</td>
<td>νιδα (JL 180)</td>
<td>νιδα (LS 332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>“to stand”</td>
<td>σορ (ML 368)</td>
<td>σορ (JL 243)</td>
<td>σορ (LS 382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>“star”</td>
<td>κοκκαβ (ML 201)</td>
<td>κοκκαβ (JL 125)</td>
<td>κοκκαβ (LS 214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>“stone”</td>
<td>σακ (ML 368)</td>
<td>σακ (JL 51)</td>
<td>σακ (LS 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>“sun”</td>
<td>ηραρακ (ML 462)</td>
<td>ηραρακ (JL 314)</td>
<td>ηραρακ (LS 418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>“to swim”</td>
<td>σακ (ML 339)</td>
<td>σακ (JL 202)</td>
<td>σακ (LS 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>“tail”</td>
<td>δομαν (ML 81)</td>
<td>δομαν (JL 47)</td>
<td>δομαν (LS 130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>“that”</td>
<td>δεκ (ML 79)</td>
<td>δεκ (JL 44)</td>
<td>δεκ (LS 120)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.3. Notes to the table

The notes below are not to be taken as a comprehensive commentary on the Swadesh wordlists of each of the three major MSA languages — an ambitious but indispensable undertaking clearly falling beyond the scope of this chapter. What has been intended is rather a brief justification behind our choice whenever such a justification has seemed necessary or desirable. Broadly speaking, this corresponds to two types of situations: either (1) the semantic nature of the relevant concept is such that an unambiguous selection of one definite exponent is problematic, which makes necessary a more or less extensive analysis of the available candidates or (2) the exponents in different sources available to us are not identical, which probably implies some kind of dialectal and/or chronological variation.

3. “bark”

M e h r i

a. MTO does not seem to provide any illustration for koléfít ‘bark.’ An obviously identical lexeme is found in MTjŠ 7:13, but its meaning is “spoon” rather than “bark”: ta-tkoláb l-his héť thôm manh bâh hmâh wa-thalâh bâ-klifót ‘Und tust davon, soviel du willst, in das Wasser und rührst es mit einem Löffel um.’

b. MTjŠ 19:18.21 have żâldôt ‘bark’ in mâyörân yânâkšan bêh w-wädîs żâldôt bêh ‘Dann graviert man hinein, während es noch seine Rinde hat.’ The etymological equivalent in ML 119 is apparently gälôt ‘dry, stoneless soil.’
c. Nakano 1986:112 translates ‘bark’ as ḷaṣīr, for which cf. kasheeroot ‘bark’ in Carter 1847:348. The corresponding term in ML 242 is ḷaṣīr ‘coconut husk, shell; peel, skin.’

Jībbali

The only suitable term found in JL is kiẓīfīt ‘dried bark of a tree’ (JL 145). Nakano 1986:112 opts for ḷiṣōr, but in JL 153 ḷaṣēt is rendered as ‘husk, peel, skin.’

Soqotri

According to our informants, it is only ḷaḷīfo that is strictly applied to the bark of trees, as in ṛaḡ ḷōlof ḷaḷīfo min šēhom ‘A man removed the bark from the tree.’ As for ḷarīšo (LS 388), it is said to have a broader meaning such as “husk,” “shell”: ho ēṟkaḥk ḷarīšo di-tonēže ‘I removed the husk from the bitter orange.’

4. “belly”

Mehrī

The concept “belly” (= “abdomen,” “part of the human body located directly above the pelvis,” Kassian et al. 2010:52) does not seem to be attested in MTO, where ḥāfāl — the main term for “belly” according to both ML 491 and Nakano 1986:7 — is only found with the meaning “stomach”: ḿwkūb 劓yāyl bhrk šī ḏ-aḥīr ṛw-㎜wkūb bhrk ḥāfāls ‘The fox went into the backside of the donkey. He entered her stomach ...’ (MTO 99:32), ḥōbrāy ṣaṭāwt ḥāfāls ‘My son has a pain in his stomach’ (MTO 101:11). The same is true of SAE IX 47:5: ḱrmōl ḏhrēl ḣōfel ḏi-harmēt ‘Er macht den Sohn in den Bauch der Frau.’ More pertinent examples are found in MTjŠ 55:6 ((mbōlab ḳannā ḍrāk ḳmāḏ ... ṛw-ŋalbās ḍ-ḥaflās ‘Wir tun Henna ins Wasser ... und tragen es auf ihren Bauch auf’) and 82:3 (mb ţōḏ ḫōflā ḡ-nāṯfāl ‘Wenn der Bauch von jemandem geschwollen ist ...’), as well as in SAE IV 145:11 (ṣa-ṣûlût ḷālēb ... ḍ-ḥōfel ṛa-fām ‘Sie nahm das Herz ... den Bauch und den Fuss’), 146:12 (ḥen ṣtīḏūt ḫōflū tṣûḏūḏ fām ‘Und wenn der Leib erstarkt, dann erstarkt auch der Fuss’), SAE III 55:17 (ṯāmūs la-haflās ‘Contractavit ventrem virginis’).

Soqotri

The external belly is always designated by ṣer (as in ṣgōr n dīrhe ḍid-mer ‘He struck him on his belly,’ ṛer ḍyār ḳmr ḍ-lo-mer ‘He tightened the belt on his belly’), the use of ūrōs (LS 423) being restricted to “stomach.” The difference has been correctly emphasized in Simeone-Senelle 1992:26 in connection with Wellsted’s translation ‘stomach’ for Ṿr, in spite of ṣṭn as the Arabic equivalent.
5. “big”

**Soqotri**

In the Vienna corpus, the concept “big” is expressed by the suppletive combination of *eb* for the masculine vs. *am* for the feminine (LS 49, 63). Numerous illustrations can be found in D. Müller’s special note on the subject (1909b:347–351), such as *bilād ḍeeb/hadībloh ṣam* ‘die große Stadt.’ According to our informants, in their dialect this usage is now obsolete: the adjectives *am* and *eb* are restricted to the comparative expressions like *ḥyāmmad eb* ṣan *ḥyāmad* ‘Muhammad is bigger than Ahmad’ or *fāmam am* ṣan *sāl’wa* ‘Fatima is bigger than Selwa.’ As in Nakano 1986:124, the basic exponent of the meaning “big” in their speech is *di-rekhar*, as in *šērhom di-rekhar* ‘a big tree’ or *ṣrohom di-rakāro* ‘a big stone.’ In the Vienna corpus this usage is seen rather seldom, cf. *ḥomēh di-rakāroh* ‘ein großes Gefäß’ (Müller 1905:319), *kēse mōkdhīhir di-rekhar* ‘Er ... fand einen großen Topf’ (ibid. 320). According to Simeone-Senelle 1991:116, “*vēb à Qalansiya signifie ‘grand, vieux’,” but this observation is not sufficient to establish the exact semantic slot occupied by this adjective. Mohammed’s Arabic equivalent is, admittedly, *mātīn* ‘strong’.

6. “bird”

**Mehri**

**a.** The only pertinent passage in MTO is *hīs bērī b-hūram šīnak ṭākāb ḍār asārī ḍa-hāyml ṣṭāwāy̆ s̥āy̆ ṭa-ḍār asārī šīymol šīnak ṣawā ṣṭāwāy̆ tāmār* ‘When I was on the road I saw birds on the right eating rice, and on the left side I saw bees eating dates’ (MTO 23:17), which seems to be general enough to suggest that *ṭākābeth* is the main generic designation of “bird” in this corpus (cf. ‘(any) large bird’ in ML 402).

**b.** The same conclusion seems to be valid for SAE III, IV and IX: *ksū aḥabīt* ‘Er ... fand einen Vogel’ (SAE III 84:7, also 15 and 17), *wa-ṭākāb tertitēn men sillēt min ḥerē* ‘Und die Vögel assen aus dem Korbe auf meinem Haupte’ (SAE IV 10:17), *ṣalūgēm aḥabīt bīrēk šījirīt šī ḥubbān bāy̆* ‘Sie sahen auf einem Baume ein Vogelweibchen, das Eier hatte’ (SAE IX 26:1), *ṭḥōm tegṭirēb aḥabīt* ‘Willst du dich in einen Vogel verwandeln’ (SAE IX 42:3). It is, nevertheless, noteworthy that in Hein–Müller 1909:174 a rather detailed description of *aḥabīt* as a concrete bird species can be found.1328

---

1327 According to a personal communication from Miranda Morris, *eb/am* are indeed still current in their original basic function in the Western Soqotri dialects.

1328 But cf. “*ṣh.* *ṣerūr* heißt ‘Vogel’ überhaupt und entspricht also dem allgemeinen Ausdrucke des Mehri für Vogel *aṭaḥābīt*, während *māṭ*r̥r̥*n* eine besondere Art von Vögeln ist” (Bittner 1917:70; see also Bittner 1914:54).


e. In MTjŠ 89:17–18, the general meaning “Vögel” is ascribed to bêgûyôn, which, however, almost certainly designates a concrete bird species (cf. Simeone-Senelle 1997:383, Frolova 2005:440 and ‘Krähen’ in MTjŠ 63:21). The same is likely true of nähmî in MTjŠ 93:3, 14 (Sima’s translation is ‘Vogel,’ but a concrete bird species is likely meant by the narrator, cf. ML 290). A similar picture can be obtained from SAE IX: contrast gâlab nôhôr ‘Verwandele te sich in einen Vogel’ (SAE IX 25:9) with SAE IX 42:1 (‘Zaubervogel’) as well as SAE IX 46 passim (a concrete bird species is clearly meant).

Soqotri

a. In the speech of our informants, nôyhr is clearly the main general term for “bird,” as witnessed by contexts like bîl‘e 'tâhêro mân şerhom wa-raf-térobk iném dîwâ nôyhr vam šfûnis ‘Something moved away from the tree, but I did not know whether this was a bird or an animal,’ dô nôyhr šîy kaxîlôn wa-ka-mûlpok ombhôrê ‘A bird has eggs, whereas a person has (living) children,’ bok nôyhr wa-raf-bêlk iném dîwâ nôyhr ‘There is a bird there, but I cannot distinguish what kind of bird is this.’ As for ašféro, it is said to designate a concrete bird species (“sparrow”). M. Morris’ personal communication yields a different picture: for her, nôyhr and ašféro are generic terms for big and small birds respectively.

b. Judging by the references collected in LS 70, in the Vienna corpus nôyhr is slightly less common than ašféro. The two terms seem to be synonymous in these texts, as shown by passages like wa-kotênh enyhêro wa-kîwê pêy rîsêfôh ‘Und die Vögel kehrten zurück, nur ein Vogel blieb aus’ (Müller 1905:49). A similar lexeme (rîsêfôh) is registered as the main term for “bird” in Nakano 1986:115.

7. “to bite”

Mehri

The meaning “to bite” does not seem to be attested in MTO. The choice of nôfâ is confirmed by Nakano 1986:79 (with some diagnostic examples). A different verb is used in MTjŠ 14:24 (myôrân thôsrâs haydák mân mâlîk aql-dàkm kût ‘Und dann beißt du dir in die Hand wegen des guten Geschmacks jenes Essens’), but this unique example is
probably not sufficient to postulate a real dialectal opposition (cf. \textit{háwža} ‘to bite through (a rope)’ in ML 248).

\textbf{Soqotri}

\textbf{a.} The main verb with the meaning “to bite” is \textit{žárab}, as illustrated by such examples as \textit{žárab\textino kalb} ‘A dog \textit{bit} him’ or \textit{rrouyéghen žárab \textit{tödi} díyhe di-bíyyo} ‘A baby \textit{bit} the breast of his mother.’ The same choice is made in Nakano 1986:79. LS 363 gives three attestations of this verb in the Vienna corpus (translated as ‘manger, mordre, sortir la langue’), but none is indicative of its basic status.

\textbf{b.} As for \textit{káržab} ‘mordre’ (LS 387), it is said to be restricted to chewing food, as in \textit{\textcolor{red}{r}ag káržab \textit{tólfe di-sťaf} ‘A man \textit{bit} the shank of the goat kid (as a cut of meat).’ This usage finds an exact parallel in the only attestation adduced by Leslau: \textit{w-inkař heš éşal il-mişer w-al ōyāmah le-\textit{káržab} sin wa-tiš \textit{káržab} fiř meš ūaūhel ‘Man brachte ihm die Knochen des Bockes und er konnte sie nicht zerbeißen, und als er daran kaute, fiel ihm ein Eckzahn heraus’ (Müller 1905:108).

\textbf{c.} The verb \textit{ kéžaf}, translated as ‘mordre’ in LS 384, means “to break” in the speech of our informants, and indeed, none of its attestations in the Vienna corpus suggests that it could be used as the basic exponent of the meaning “to bite.”

\textbf{11. “breast”}

\textbf{Mehri}

\textit{gawf} is systematically translated as ‘chest’ throughout MTO, but the contextual evidence fits well the definition of “breast” proposed in Kassian et al. 2010:54, viz. “frontal part of the human body, located between the neck and the upper belly (region of the thorax)”: \textit{w-hiś mōḥak ašenbōyyat \textit{man} agáwf \textit{d}a-\textit{ayāyg} māthōk šh akōn w-\textit{anəšəltat} bōkyūl bōrk \textit{agáwf} \textit{d}a-\textit{ayāyg} ‘When he pulled the dagger from the man’s \textit{chest} only the handle came away and the blade stayed in the man’s \textit{chest}’ (MTO 64:19), \textit{hō yaštawt agáwfi ... \textcolor{red}{r}ašāg agáw\textino \textit{bo-sťawyr} ‘I have a pain in my \textit{chest} ... Tie your \textit{chest} up with a cloth’ (MTO 101:9–10), \textit{tōli hō♀ś\textino sī də-yosūyūd dār agáwfi ‘Then I felt something moving on my \textit{chest}’ (MTO 103:4). See also Nakano 1986:6 (\textit{gōf} ‘chest’).

\textbf{Soqotri}

The neutral term for “breast” as the frontal part of upper torso is \textit{gēhe} (\textit{ér}am díyhe \textit{la-gēhe} \textit{še}f \textit{di-dēlāf} “There was much hair on his \textit{breast},” \textit{dā}ṣ \textit{wāže dī-bo\textino dərō} dheb di-\textit{šker dīrše \textit{la-gēhe} “That woman wore a fine necklace on her \textit{breast},’ as opposed to \textit{tōdi}, which is applied to female breasts only (\textit{dā}ṣ \textit{wāže dī-bo\textino ṣəhāro mas tōdi ‘That woman has big \textit{breasts},” \textit{mōhrhe kōyhen ṣərōdəg tōdi díyhe di-bíyyo ‘A little baby sucks from the \textit{breast} of his mother’). For this semantic distribution see also Nakano 1986:6.
12. “to burn”

**Mehrî**

a. The MTO evidence for this concept is not very abundant and to some extent contradictory. The verb ḥānhū is attested twice about burning people and in one and the same text: ṭawmūr ḥāghārūn yahfērōm baṣr wa-yēḵākēm ba naxaṣ borkīh wa-yāhanhām baḥ šīwōt ‘He told the slaves to dig a well and leave Abū Nuwās in it and burn him with fire’ (MTO 20:61), ka-sōbā ḥānhāyw ba-ḥōbūn da-ḥūkom u wəzāyhom ‘In the morning they burned the ruler’s sons and their minister’ (MTO 20:77). However, ḥorūk is also attested once with exactly the same meaning: ṭawtīl ḥaʃāwar ḥah baṣr u ḥarīk baḥ ‘Eventually they dug a well for him and burnt him’ (MTO 20:73). The latter verb is also found in MTO 91:8 (yəṣṣan toh man yohāḥrāk b-ṭamāwlot da-ḥābū ‘We are afraid he will burn people’s farms,’ similarly MTO 91:9.11), where the inchoative nuance “to set on fire” seems to be present (undesirable according to Kassian et al. 2010:55).

b. Both verbs are in evidence in MTjŠ, but the contexts are not sufficiently diagnostic: wat bār awalkan b-ṭirōb lyāmāh tānhā šīwōt b-ṭirōb lyākmāh ‘Wenn wir diese Äste angezündet haben, brennt das Feuer’ (MTjŠ 5:8), l-innā hād mān ḥabū yahhīrōk bēh ... w-tānḥā ... yūsīnāy ḥa-yihinh bēh lā ‘Wenn irgendeiner von den Leuten läßt es anbrennen ... es (das Feuer) verbrennt es ... bis er sieht, daß es weder verbrennt ... ist’ (MTjŠ 12:24).


**Jibbali**

In JL, the neutral translation ‘to burn’ is given to both aḥrēk (JL 115) and enḥē (JL 187). Nakano 1986:28 has only enḥē, and, according to Miranda Morris, “informants say aḥrēk is from Arabic and only accept enḥē.” It is nevertheless noteworthy that both potentially relevant examples from the Vienna corpus display aḥrēk: dhar le-ḥarēχek taḥ ṣat ‘Ich will dich verbrennen’ (SAE VII 7:7), be-ḥarōgiš god ekob żer ḥezānī ‘Du ... darauf die Haut eines Hundes verbrennst’ (SAE VII 13:9, cf. ibid. 18).

14. “cloud”

**Soqotri**

According to our informants, the standard designation of “white cumulus clouds, as distinguished from rain clouds (black)” (Kassian et al. 2010:55) is aTV lō: b-)vītin aTV lō: lābīne ‘There is a white cloud in the sky,’ daš aTV lō: aTV-tošo mas ‘No rain comes from this cloud.” This term is opposed to ḥāḥor ‘black cloud’ (= ‘tempête’ in LS
173: bə-rūtīn ḥāyhor ḥāhor ‘There is a black cloud in the sky.’ Nakano’s choice of ḥīhor as the basic exponent of the meaning “cloud” (1986:104) is thus inexact.

15. “cold”

Mehr i

a. The root ḥbūr is attested six times in MTO, but in all these cases we are faced either with the substantive ḥābūr ‘cold’ or with the verb ḥāyhor ‘to feel cold’: u hūs ba-hollāy nūka ḥābūr ‘At night it became cold’ (MTO 14:A:10), ḏak ṭār ahūkāyṣm ḥābūr ṣbōbōm ʾālem hāgnum aẓāyga ‘It is just that the cold has caught them. I beg you: warm the fold’ (MTO 26:9), nāhā l-myarḥ hūrm lā wā-sūn ḥābūr u maws ‘We do not know the road, it is cold and raining’ (MTO 35:4), šay maws ṭa-ḥābūr ‘It was raining and I was cold’ (MTO 53:6),1329 ṭāl yāmāl ḥānāf ḏa-gēlaḥ wā-da-ḥāyhor ‘One pretending he is fevered and feeling chilled’ (MTO 84:2), ḥām ḥānāf ḥābūr ḏa-yazīyād ‘Keep yourself warm. The cold is increasing’ (MTO 84:4).1330 The root ḥān is attested only once, but here it does seem that we are faced with a truly attributive application: ṭa-hāwr ḥāsām ḥā-hē fulg ‘And the stream was as cold as ice’ (MTO 36:1).

b. There is enough evidence for both ḥālāb and ḥāsam (as well as the corresponding verbal roots) in MTJŠ: yārmlām tōh l-hāl mānāṯiṯ yēḵ ḥālāb ḥālāb ḥālāb ‘Man exportiert das in jene sehr kalten Regionen’ (MTJŠ 2:43), yḵūn ḥālāb ‘It is cold’ (darin) kált (MTJŠ 69:22), wa-ṭṭalābān ṣawīr ‘Und sie kühlten die Steine’ (MTJŠ 15:2), kṣyām ḥērēz ḥālāb ‘Stellten sie fest, daß der Reis kalt war’ (MTJŠ 73:42); nāryāẓa ḏikmāh mšyrfīt b-ṣawār wāḥmāt tkīn ḥāsām kāllās wa-ṭṭalābā b-ḥāmīḥ aẓẓūlāb ṣawīr ṭyākmāh ḥrḳ b-ḥāmīḥ ‘Wir beruhigen jene Kochstelle aus Steinen so mit einem Stein, damit sie ganz kalt wird, du kühlst sie mit Wasser ab, du kühlst jene heißen Steine mit Wasser ab’ (MTJŠ 5:11), ḥīn bār ḥāsam kull nūṭūḇān b-kā ḥansāṣān ‘Wenn sie schon kalt sind, fallen sie alle von selbst ... auf den Boden’ (MTJŠ 57:73), ṭāswālān ḏikm māḥ ḥwāḏ adān kwāḵ wāt̄tārāḥ ṣat̄-tā ṣwāt bār ḥāsam ‘Sie seiht jenes Fett in Flaschen und läßt es (stehen), bis es schon kalt ist’ (MTJŠ 58:26), ḥīn bā-rmūḏ ḥāsam w-li ḏā-rmūḏ ḥrḳ ‘Entweder mit kalter oder mit warmer Asche’ (MTJŠ 83:22), lā从严治党 ḥmūḥ ḥāsam ‘Damit das Wasser kühl bleibt’ (MTJŠ 17:37). Nearly all attestations of ḥāsam refer to substances which become cold after being hot or warm, which correlates nicely with the meaning of the cognate root in Soqotri as described below.1331 The root ḥbūr is also attested in this corpus, with meanings largely comparable with what has been observed in MTO: wi-ykār bēḥ ḏē mān ḥbūr ‘Und er vor der Kālte so warmgehalten wird’ (MTJŠ 17:40), hēt ḥarṭāmk aṣṣāyn sāwīt ḏ-ḥāmāk w-ḥibrāk lā ‘Du hast beim Übernachten das Feuer deiner Mutter gesehen und

1329 Similarly MTO 18:2.
1330 Admittedly, Johnstone’s only illustration in ML 165 seemst to be attributive in meaning: ḥazāyz ḥābūr ‘The wind is cold.’
1331 The only exception seems to be MTJŠ 17:37. It is highly significant that MTJŠ 73:42 uses ḥālāb: the rice in the pot was always cold because there was not fire under it.
(daher) nicht gefroren’ (MTjŠ 73:25, similar in 22, 44). Conversely, the root źbl, so prominent in MTjŠ, is only marginally present in ML, where just two verbal stems are registered: źbūl ‘to cool, to drink something cool’ and źābl ‘to be cool, to get cooled’ (ML 472).

c. Nakano 1986:108 has bōd and kāṣam. The former is missing from MTO (and ML), but the corresponding verbal root is attested in MTjŠ: wa-ṭṭaraṣṣān b-bār at-tā ṭābrūḏān raynāṭ ‘Und du läßt sie draußen, bis sie ein wenig abkühlen ... wenn sie ein wenig abgekühlt sind ...’ (MTjŠ 14:18-19, similar 16:16-17, 57:89). See also Jahn 1902:169.

d. Thomas 1937:290 has kezzam and źel, von Maltzan 1873:260 has kāzem, and Carter 1847:349 has kasim. There is one attestation of kšm in SAE III 2:10-11: ā hātūm ... ba-ḥāzam ā rahmāt ‘Er ... brachte die Nacht zu in Kālte und Regen’ (and cf. Jahn 1902:207 for the corresponding adjective).

**Jibbali**

JL provides several alternative possibilities, namely hōr (JL 101), źel (JL 325), šēk (JL 261), keṣm (JL 152). Only the latter term has parallels in Thomas 1937:290 and SAE VII 47:7 (ʃe tehālōb kism ‘Manche werden kalt gemolken,’ similar ibid. 10). We were unable to identify Nakano’s źab (1986:108) with any suitable parallel in JL. Nakano’s hōr is clearly identical to Johnstone’s hōr, but Nakano’s only illustration refers to whether (‘It is cold today’), in agreement with the general trend observed throughout MSA (see above in the Mehri section). According to Miranda Morris, the normal adjective with the meaning “cold” is źel, whereas keṣm, “as all informants agree, is Mahri.”¹³³² In JLO 35:5-6 źel seems to be attested as a substantive with the meaning “coldness”: hes b-eẓel ṣāmān ṣāmī ... bā-ẓel-žel ayaḏ yēḥant snānī ‘Then he felt cold in his teeth ... The coldness almost took out my teeth!’ Less transparent to us is rāk al-ḥād d-eṯd ši eźel ‘I want to go while I still have the cold (weather)’ (JLO 60:35).

**S o q o t r i**

a. In the speech of our informants, the concept “cold” has two basic exponents: ẓhōk and keṣam. The former adjective, apparently more common, has been explained as designating “strong cold” (as in dā ṭēḥo di-ḥa ẓhōk bēnē ‘This water is very cold’), but has also been spontaneously used in more neutral contexts (such as al-ṣēbōk inēm dā ṣebāw yhiḥo ṣam māhā ‘I do not know whether this stone is cold or hot’). The meaning attributed to the latter adjective is “not warm anymore,” as in dā ṣēbī di-ḥa ḳēṣam ‘This tea (has become) cold,’ in striking agreement with the meaning of its Mehri cognate analyzed above. It is hard to say which of the two terms is a “regular antonym of ‘hot’” (Kassian et al. 2010:55). As for ḥbr (LS 160), it is said to be used exclusively about weather (“to be cold” or “to feel cold”), again in agreement with the Mehri evidence:

¹³³² Which looks somewhat perplexing in view of a very long and detailed entry on ḳšm in JL 152.
bhor nára bhr-āghār ‘It is now \textbf{cold} in Hagher,’ ho nára hēbārk mān mēsē ‘I now feel \textbf{cold} because of the rain.’ A similar usage of hbr has been elicited by A. Nakano (1986:108), for whom the basic adjective with the meaning “cold” in Soqotri is yhōk (no mention of kēsam).

b. Curiously enough, in the Vienna corpus yhōk is hardly attested at all, cf. only škk in wu-ḥēmid saṭēreb wa-riho šēhak ‘Und es war Winterzeit und das Wasser war \textit{kalt}’ (Müller 1905:130)\footnote{Interestingly enough, explained as \textit{khōr} by the narrator.} and šhāhkan di min nkhāšihi ‘Kühles Naß von jener Wasserleitung’ (ibid. 197). In the only attestation of kēsam, its meaning is very close to one mentioned above: diš šiāt kēšēmih ‘Dieses Feuer ist kalt!’ = “not hot anymore” (Müller 1905:57). The root hbr is widespread, but no basic adjective is derived from it,\footnote{Cf., e.g., ōškil hey ... ber hēbārk ‘Bedecke mich ... denn ich friere’ (Müller 1905:167), bóor hēbhor wu-žōde ‘Kälte und Sprühregen kamen des Nachts’ (ibid. 305).} which makes it unsuitable for inclusion into the Swadesh wordlist.

16. “to come”

\textbf{Mehri}

SAE IX (and SAE III, Mundart B) are characterised by a relatively strong presence of ḫhōb (ẖāhēb in ML 226)\footnote{Variously rendered as \textit{khōr} or \textit{ghōr}, cf. T. M. Johnstone’s remarks in ML 226.} to the detriment of ṅkō, which, nevertheless, apparently preserves its basic status in all Mehri corpora (cf. A. Jahn’s explicit remark in 1902:200). T. M. Johnstone ascribes to this verb a more concrete meaning “to come in the middle of the day.” For a similar semantic distribution cf. also Nakano 1986:60 (“to come in general” vs. “to come in the morning”).

\textbf{Jibbali}

While zaḥām is clearly the most common verb with the meaning “to come” in all Jibbali sources available to us, a relatively common use of ṅikār (JL 187) in Johnstone’s Jibbali texts published by A. Rubin is noteworthy\footnote{It seems wise to treat separately a few further examples where “to come with” is used for “to bring” (JLO 51:3, TJ5:84).}: b-ẖl-ŷd ṅikār meš gōb lū ‘And a letter hasn’t \textit{come} from him at all’ (JLO 8:7), ṇhār tēr šēn ‘Come, eat with us!’ (JLO 23:4), ṅhīv al-yōḥ ‘\textit{Come} here!’ (JLO 60:13), ẖl yāḵślār dé ṣāhāsām ‘No one could \textit{come} to them’ (JLO Anon1:3). An unusually high amount of tokens of this verb is found in the texts JLO TJ3 (Segments 5, 6, 10, 16, 25, 26) and JLO TJ4 (Segments 10, 17, 52).
According to our informants, éraḥ (LS 74) is fully synonymous with gédáḥ, but the latter is more common. The same choice is found in Nakano 1986:60. The root nk (LS 267), doubtfully attested with the meaning “to come” in the Vienna corpus (cf. Müller 1902:178–179), is used exclusively in the causative stem with the meaning “to bring” (as already in Wellsted’s list, v. Simeone-Senelle 1992:53). As for mty, translated as ‘venir, arriver, atteindre’ in LS 241, it is used with the meaning “to reach,” “to touch” (as in ho mitàḥ sek di-ḥāvar ‘I reached the roof of the house (with my hand)’), which corresponds admirably to what we can reliably reconstruct for its PS ancestor *mt’ (for this root, v. Chapter 7, p. 431 above).

17. “to die”

Jibbali

In Johnstone’s Jibbali texts published by A. Rubin, a certain amount of attestations of fêt ‘to die’ can be found (translated as ‘to die without being slaughtered’ in JL 67). One’s first impression is that the verb is predominantly used about animals, as in ekēḥar fêt ‘The leopard died’ (JLO 48:22). This is, however, not quite so, as one can infer from al nēḥertem en-nfōt ‘We will not strip them until we die’ (JLO 30:5) or hō-vağaḥ aṣhāvat ānšaf ŋōhum her tafst ‘And he wanted the old woman to jump with them, so she would die’ (JLO AM1:10, cf. ŋargt ‘she died’ in Segment 12 of the same text). In JLO 50–51 both fêt and ŋarōg are each used several times about a baby, with no apparent semantic difference. For ŋarōg about an animal cf. ekērah bēr ŋarōg ‘The donkey had already died’ (JLO TJJ3:11, similar Anon1:1).

22. “earth”

Mehri

The difficulties pertaining to one’s evaluation of the basic exponent of the meaning “earth” in Mehri are partly connected with the semantic ambiguity of the concept. Kassian et al. (2010:57) recommend “earth” as “soil,” but in the geographic conditions of the area it becomes nearly indistinguishable from “sand” (cf. below). Accordingly, a meaning like “earth as dry land opposed to heaven and water,” prototypically illustrated by In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, seems to be much preferable. Such prototypical illustrations are, however, rarely available in the extant text corpora, which compels one to look for a variety of potentially diagnostic contexts from which the most general exponent of the meaning “earth” could be established.

---

1337 As emphasized by the informants, the main difference is in the goverment, viz. direct object with éraḥ vs. di- with gédáḥ: hōhon al-éraḥ fīnduḥ vs. hōhon al-gédáḥ fīnduḥ ‘I did not come to the hotel.’

1338 “D’après notre informateur de Qalansiya ce verbe appartient au dialecte de Hadibo.” Curiously enough, some of our (elder) informants still rather actively use the basic stem of nk, but only in the jussive (baḥ līnkāv ‘before he comes’ and similar expressions).
a. Curiously, the very meaning “earth” seems to be absent from the English translations of MTO and, indeed, from the English-Mehri index of ML. The most frequent and neutral term for “ground,” “land” is evidently bàk, as illustrated by such examples as wa-hōbēr ṭāymol šāḥōf d-yakalāwloh akā ‘The camels had (so much) milk (as) to pour (it) on the ground’ (MTO 10:17) and wa-fār man akā ‘And he jumped up from the ground’ (MTO 42:37). This is also the only choice of Thomas 1937:294.


d. In SAE III, pertinent illustrations for each of the two terms are few, but kā is clearly more prominent: u dōlet kṣiš šīwōt ba-kā ‘Und der Sultan fand das Feuer auf der Erde’ (SAE III 3:5), uль hōṭṭāṭ tōṣṭ ba-kā ‘Auch wenn nur ein Bröselchen auf der Erde liegt’ (SAE III 91:15), u medd-īnī ba-kār ‘Und er streckte mich auf die Erde aus’ (SAE III 112:20), ta-l-e-nṣūl kā ‘Bis die Erde trocken ist’ (SAE III 150:7) vs. u ūḥēm sōyēh berēk arz ‘Dann zog er weiter nomadisierend auf der Erde umher’ (SAE III 29:19, similar 64:6, 89:31). For the semantic difference, cf. A. Jahn’s penetrating remarks in his glossary: arz ‘Erde (terra und mundus)’ (1902:164) vs. kā ‘Erde (terra)’ (ibid. 203).

---

1339 In the remaining, rather numerous attestations (11:26:27; 12:12; 14:21; 20:24; 42:16; 55:12:14) we are faced with the meaning “country,” which is not directly pertinent to our topic.
e. In SAE IV, the two terms are distributed more evenly, but a certain predilection towards ḥā is evident: nisjād ḥāk ha-ḥā ‘Um uns vor dir zur Erde zu bücken’ (SAE IV 2:10, similar 17:6), wa-tēkim wa-hākhfīdīm hel ūd žābereh he ḥā ‘Da liess ein Jeder schnell seinen Sack auf den Boden herab’ (SAE IV 27:11), wa-wuqm fēnuwēh le-ḥā ‘Und sie fielen vor ihm zur Erde’ (SAE IV 27:14), wa-sijādīm heh ḥā ‘Sie ... warf sich zur Erde’ (SAE IV 50:10), ya fāmī skin be-ḥā ‘O mein Fuss, steh fest’ (SAE IV 97:22), wa-sōr bīrēk ḥā ĕvīrī līsen bātāt ek ke-bīrēk ‘Und sie blieben stehen auf dem Boden, so dass die Erde bis zu seinen Knien reichte’ (SAE IV 97:23) vs. wa-sijādīm heh ha āreṣ ‘Sie ... bücken sich vor ihm zur Erde’ (SAE IV 24:26), wa-liyōrīm bīrēk āreṣ ‘Und sie ... gruben in die Erde’ (SAE IV 89:98), wa-eḵōbīm īnḵālī āreṣ ‘Und sie krochen hinein unter die Erde’ (SAE IV 104:47).

f. Only hardz in Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:311), note especially bali essamma wa hardz ‘Lord of the heaven and the earth’ ibid. 314.

### Jibbali

a. In the corpus of SAE VII, ġodrēt ‘ground, the surface of the earth’ is attested several times: īšēnā gidrēt ‘Siehst du die Erde?’ (SAE VII 6:4, also in the same story in JLO TJ1:4–5), bītik īfērīt brī min īḏer ġidrēt ‘Deine Tochter schmähte meinen Sohn ob Nichts (Erde)’ (SAE VII 9:10), ḍad nisgīd ḫek gidrēt ‘Um uns vor dir zur Erde zu bücken’ (SAE VII 12:10), be-żefrīt ṭāk ġidrēt ‘Ihr Zopf war am Boden’ (SAE VII 22:44, cf. ibid. 39), bāḏ er bīyōt ġedrite lo ‘Bevor er zu Boden fiel’ (SAE VII 47:41), be-təhsīs ġidrēt ‘Und sie fallen zur Erde herab’ (SAE VII 54:12). More examples can be found in Johnstone’s Jibbali texts published by A. Rubin: ʾitk b-eḏdarēt ‘I fell onto the ground’ (JLO 51:12). M. Morris’ personal communication also confirms that ġodrēt is the main term for “earth” = “ground” in Jibbali.

b. According to M. Morris, ārēẓ in Jibbali is “land, area,” which is fully confirmed by the evidence from Johnstone’s texts (JLO 15:1, 17:3). Admittedly, in the Vienna corpus both “land, country” and “ground” are attested as the meanings of this lexeme: biš ṭū be-ārēẓ šāger ‘Dort war Wasser und der Boden ist rauh’ (SAE VII 44:23) vs. ṭad bēley ḥayḵ ārēẓ sīltān ‘Bis er und die Küste des Sultanlandes gelangte’ (SAE VII 13:26). In Thomas 1937:294, both aird and agiridit are given. Only arzd in Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:311), cf. errachemū eshutem errachemu ardz ‘Lord of the heaven and the earth’ ibid. 314.

c. The meaning “soil” ascribed to ḥāṣī in JL 118 is confirmed by two attestations from SAE VII: mabnēy bī sidemūn be-ḥāṣī (袤) min ūrīs sēḵef šarōb ūn īḏer šarōb ḥāṣī be-šef ‘gebaut aus Steinen und Erde, darüber ein Holzdach und über dem Holze Erde und Rohrmatten’ (SAE VII 47:4) and naҚfēr be-ḥāṣī ‘Wir ... rieben uns mit Erde ab’ (SAE VII 47:8). Note, however, be-nṣēf Ṿer ḥāṣī ‘Und er breitete es auf dem Boden’ in SAE VII 20:47 and cf. Nakano 1986:108 who opts for ṭarēẓ and ḥāṣī as the equivalents of “earth,” “land,” “ground” and does not mention ġodrēt.

---

1340 For the latter example see also below under “sand.”
In the speech of our informants, the whole array of meanings corresponding to “earth,” “land,” “ground” and “soil” is expressed by ḥoyhi, as illustrated by the following examples: ṣōkāb ālla irāt wa-ḥoyhi ‘God created the heaven and the earth,’ ṭasōr ḥoyhi ḫa-šānkahāl wa-bāvr wa-tārōkāb ḫa-ker rānḥom ḫa-ṣadāk ‘You can travel over the land on a donkey or a camel, and you can travel over the sea in a boat,’ ḥyfor ḥangego wa-kāṭr ḥoyhi di-ṭer ‘He was digging a pit and throwing the earth outside,’ Ḿe zāe ṣa ḥoyhi ‘He took a handful of earth,’ ḥa-ṭérq ḡin ḡd bāy ḥoyhi ‘am ṣākare ‘I do not know what is in that place: earth or sand.’ Evidence from the Vienna corpus generally confirms this choice, although it is interesting to observe that ḥa-ḡhīr ‘champ, terre’ (LS 334) is rather often found in contexts which could be considered diagnostic for the general meaning “earth”: ṭu-?[e]y ḥoyhi ‘Und sie sollen sein Leuchten an der Fläche des Himmels, um die Erde zu beleuchten’ (Müller 1905:3).

24. “egg”

Mehr

a. The concept “egg” is attested in MTO 18:12: ḫąṭuk ṣārāq ḥa-ḥawḥal ḥā-dagh ‘I had a breakfast of chicken’s eggs.’ Elsewhere, the only source for ḥawḥal is Thomas 1937:294 (guwawḥal, side by side with bidait).

b. Only biẓyit in each of the three SAE volumes: γαλύγεμ αγαπη βίρ τά ζύγα ας ḥubın bayz ‘Sie sahen auf einem Baume ein Vogelweibchen, das Eier hatte’ (SAE IX 26:1, cf. ibid. 4), ḥaṣya[s]c ṣ[i]n[et] mērkab bayz ‘af ‘Ihr Brautpreis ist eine Schiffsladung roter Eier’ (SAE IX 41:3 and passim in this text); ḥōba bēẓ ‘sieben Eier’ (SAE IV 27.30.32), yav[e]l ke[bzayt] ‘Er ... sah zwei Eier’ (SAE III 83:9, also ibid. 19). No pertinent information from MTjŠ.

26. “fat”

Mehr

The use of ḥa[b] for “animal fat” is attested several times in MTjŠ 12: wa-ḥsah ṣḥām ‘Während das Fett an einem eigenen Ort ist’ = “separately from meat, bones and viscera’ (MTjŠ 12:13, also 16.18–19.21.30).

---

1341 The evaluation of this concept in Kassian et al. 2010:59 is somewhat contradictory: in the descriptive section, the household function of animal fat is emphasized (“animal fat as a general substance used for eating or various economic needs”), but, as suggested by the first illustration, the concept is also applicable to humans (“the body consists of flesh, fat and bones”).
The basic exponent of the meaning “fat” in Jibbali is šab(a)h (Johnstone’s “fat on meat, which is a delicacy”), as witnessed by ḥol šabah ‘They took the fat (of a slaughtered cow)’ (JLO 12:4), šebh avánti ‘the fat of my eyes’ (JLO 48:21). This is also the only possibility offered by A. Nakano (1986:19).

According to M. Morris, ṣanh ‘fat in an animal; fat put on to melt’ (JL 241) is “the smell of cooking, roasting, melting fat,” whereas ṣə̀ ‘fat’ (JL 21, cf. Thomas 1937:296) is “fat, solid, heavy” (an adjectival lexeme). The exact functional load of šen ‘fat, fatness’ (JL 262, cf. Thomas 1937:296) remains to be established.

In the speech of our informants, the anatomical meaning “fat” is expressed by ṣabḥ, missing from LS, but recorded in Nakano 1986:19: ḥez ḥl’še wa-kōṣaf ḍshal wa-ṣabḥ mon te ‘He slaughtered a cow and separated bones and fat from meat,’ yūnte te wa-ṣabḥ ‘Meat and fat can be eaten,’ bok émtah ṣon ṣabḥ ‘There are pieces of fat there.’

27. “feather”

The choice of our informants is mālyət (pl. mālyət): ḥa-səmyhéro mālyət wa-ḥa-ʃəniš šef ‘There are feathers on birds, but hair on animals,’ ḏıṣef mālyət ṣon néfret di-nóyhər ‘He tore away a feather from the bird’s wing.’ It is in agreement with the only attestation of this concept in the Vienna corpus: milyat di-soyōdoh ... milyat di-zʿərib ‘Geierfedern ... Rabenfedern’ (Müller 1905:85).

29. “fish”

a. There seems to be only one attestation of ᵇayd in MTO: fōṣem ᵇayd ṣa-fōkem ‘We had fish for lunch and left’ (18:7).

b. A. Nakano (1986:18, 115) adduces māṣif side by side with ᵇayd, which is confirmed by the evidence of SAE IX: batatam min gāyre min eğiʃh di maṣšif ‘Schneidet ihn nur auf von seinem Hintern den Fisch’ (SAE IX 39:24). As one can infer from SAE III 113, māṣif can be used as nomen unitatis, as opposed to ᵇayd as nomen collectivum. In the pertinent segment of the story, māṣif is always used when one single fish is explicitly meant: ād ših maṣšif tād ‘Bis er nur noch einen Fisch hatte,’ sallōt maṣšif ‘Sie ... nahm den Fisch,’ meseṭ ba-магаз ‘Ein Kuss um einen Fisch.’ Conversely, each of the

---

1342 But cf. SAE IX 53:2 where a concrete species of fish seems to be intended: yəwādíʃ māṣšif ‘Er ... fing mit dem Netz den Mašōffisch.’
attestations of *sayd* either directly presupposes the collective meaning or is compatible with it: šītem *sayd* min ḥawwūt ā henēhem *sayd* ādīm ‘Er ... kaufte Fische von einem Fischer; und es war gerade Mangel an Fischen bei ihnen,’ ḥōm l-e-stōm *sayd* ‘Ich wünschte Fische zu kaufen,’ men hā *sayd* ‘Woher ist der Fisch?,’ hiṣīlīm *sayd* u fšāwum ‘Sie kochten ihn und aßen zu Mittag.’

c. In MTjŠ 16:12 and 75:11 we find ḥūt translated by Sima as ‘Fisch,’ but since in both cases shark is involved, one cannot exclude that this term specifically applies to big species only (cf. ḥawt ‘any big fish’ in ML 195). According to Geva-Kleinberger 2009:52, the general term for “fish” in the speech of Sima’s informant is *sayd*.

30. “to fly”

**Mehr i**

The root *frr* is attested once in MTjŠ (*färrōt* màl at-tā at-tār ẓidōr ‘Er floh von mir bis auf die Mauer,’ MTjŠ 93:4, also 12), but there is also one attestation of *łyr* in this corpus (*ṭāṭyyūr* ba-ḥallāy ‘Sie fliegt bei Nacht,’ MTjŠ 9:1). It is hard to ascertain to what extent the latter root is widespread in this variety of Mehri (tentatively analyzed as an Arabism in Rubin 2011:79).

31. “foot”

**Mehr i**

**a.** In MTO, the basic term for “foot” is evidently *fām,*1344 as witnessed by numerous examples: tē ḥorū fī mi dāḥ kūmāwn wa-šəbārāt *fāmāh* wa-fiḍal a-mzār̲hhe ‘Then he fell from a small ledge. His leg was broken and he broke (some of) his teeth’ (MTO 17:4), ṣamīqān hēt ʿayrōn ni bā-ḥayān wa-lākān ādūh *frūmāh* wa-wzāmēs *frūmāh* wa-šəmāštāh tē ḥor̲āwum ‘“Tie me up tight later on, but (right now) give me your feet!” He gave her his feet and she tied him firmly’ (MTO 24:28–29), u-wbēh tāt wa-šrūsāwē al-*famāh* ‘One (fellow) shot at him and he got hit in the leg’ (MTO 64:20), fōr Kādēt u ṣawfēh mān *fawm* ‘Kādēt sprang up and got hold of him by the legs’ (MTO 64:23), yorūka ṭawrī ṭroh al *fēmāh* ṭayt mān ʿabdūn dēk ḥa-dēk ‘He has to hop twice on one leg from this marker to that one’ (MTO 71-A:2), hēt tākā d-rwōdbik ūr kā-*fēm* ‘You play someone who has shot somebody in the foot’ (MTO 72:4), rwōdbik ṭawrāyn u ṭawrīk *fēmāh* ‘I shot a hyena and

---

1345 In the latter two examples, the intended meaning is, of course, “fish as food,” “fish meat,” and this is indeed the way A. Jahn renders the contrast between the two terms in his German-Mehri glossary: ‘Fisch’ vs. ‘Fischfleisch.’ The collective meaning advocated here accounts for both semantic aspects of *sayd* (note that Jahn freely uses the plural *Fische* in his translations). At any rate, Jahn’s ‘Fischfleisch’ is totally unsuitable for a few other passages from his corpus, notably 134:18–20: *... yiḏāfelem bis *sayd* ta-nhōr stēlāt lēhem *māsīf* da-ḥaym ‘... mit welchem sie Fische fiengen, bis ihnen einmal ein Haifisch harten Schaden zufügte.’

1344 Often translated as “leg” by Johnstone.
b. A similar picture has been obtained from MTjŠ, where fâm ‘foot’ is attested many times: yēḵaż la-ḵhān sīyārāt tāḵīṭl fasmāh ‘Es kam (vor) das Auto und sein Bein brach’ (MTjŠ 31:25), ḥalbūd yḵnām ṭroḥ lā-ffaṣāmī pṛt ‘Gehören zwei Sandalen zu zwei Füssen’ (MTjŠ 38:10), w-mān ḥlākmāh yārdīdām kīnah lā-framṭ’yhām ‘Und von dort kehrten sie so zu Fuß zurück’ (MTjŠ 39:4), framṭ’yhām rāḏ l-wišal arţ lā ‘Ihre Füße hatten noch nicht die Erde erreicht’ (MTjŠ 39:12, similar 39:11), rāḏ ār at-tābḥōt bā-ffaṣmās ḥlākm ‘(Warum ...) sucht sie dort (etwas) mit ihrem Bein’ (MTjŠ 42:16, similar 42:15).


d. In Nakano 1986:9, “leg, foot” is translated as šrayn (qualified as “Southern Mehri” in ML 382, cf. lasharank ‘leg’ in Carter 1847:354). This term is well attested in SAE IX: beh mangassēt bi-amg di-širāynēh ‘Bei ihm ist eine Schlagwunde in der Mitte seiner Beines’ (SAE IX 55:12), biš ī-hōba ayēnten we-bis hōba šrānten we-bis ē hōba ḫīdūten ‘Die sieben Augen und die sieben Füße und die sieben Hände hatte’ (SAE IX 11:12), yigālbeh hal terāntse ‘Er stellt sie zu ihren Füßen’ (SAE IX 42:7), yāmōl šerānten myōre ḫīdūten ‘Dann macht er Beine, dann Hände’ (SAE IX 47:5). The prominence of šrayn in this variety of Mehri finds a clear confirmation in SAE III 127:10 (Mundart B): ḫabré da-doṿalt tar šərāntīye ‘Der Sohn des Sultans liegt auf meinen Schenkeln’ (also ibid. 17). At first sight, fām is not completely absent from SAE IX, cf. šēlēl fāmeh ‘Heb seinen Fuß!’ (SAE IX 43:19) and ţibṭāṭe we-ṭōt bi-fāmīs ‘Sie nahm es und schmierte es auf ihr Bein’ (SAE IX 51:3, also ibid. 4). However, both stories come from one single informant described by W. Hein as “Beduine aus dem Innern,” whereas none of the texts where šrayn is found come from the same source. It lies at hand to suspect that this usage is alien to the main dialect of this corpus.

e. The only term adduced in Thomas 1937:298 is khuf (cf. ḥaf ‘hoof; sole of the foot’ in ML 438), whereas fem/faim are assigned to “leg” ibid. 306.

Jibbali
a. The meaning “foot” does not seem to be represented in SAE VII. The choice of \textit{farm} is confirmed by several examples from Johnstone’s texts published by A. Rubin: \textit{žōs fayh\textbar m b}\textsubscript{r}-ṣ\textsubscript{mūt} bō-{\textit{ḥus}} ‘He gave her his \textit{feet} and she tied them tightly’ (JLO 18:29, similar ibid. 28), \textit{ṣabbāt al-fām} ‘He hit him in his \textit{leg}’ (JLO 25:14), \textit{bō-sāwār ḍa-yaqūla m\textit{m fārm\textbar s̄}} ‘And the old man was lame in his \textit{foot}’ (JLO 85:2), \textit{ṭər m\textit{ṣ fərm}} ‘(A donkey) broke his \textit{leg}’ (JLO TJ3:25). The same choice has been made in Nakano 1986:9.

b. Thomas 1937:298 displays \textit{fah\textbar r} (= \textit{fæhr} ‘sole’ in JL 54) and \textit{khaf} (= \textit{ḥaf} ‘foot, sole’ in JL 298), whereas \textit{farm} is rendered as ‘leg’ ibid. 306. According to a personal connunciation from Miranda Morris, \textit{ḥaf} is indeed “the most usual for ‘foot’ in Jibbali.” In Johnstone’s texts published by A. Rubin cf. \textit{ayād\textbar k bō-ḥāfī} ‘I went by \textit{foot}’ (JLO 31:1), \textit{kēlar s\textit{nādīk} ḍō yąhē ḍēr ḥaf\textbar š} ‘He let a big box fall on his \textit{foot}’ (JLO 52:2, similar ibid. 3–4).

c. For \textit{gé\textbar dō} (JL 71) cf. \textit{bō-ḥamīt \textit{egdī\textbar lēs}} ‘And they took off its \textit{feet}’ (JLO 12:3, about a slaughtered cow), \textit{bō-dī\textbar lēf} bō-\textit{ṭēr \textit{egdī\textbar lēs}} ‘And the wolf jumped and his \textit{feet} broke’ (JLO 48:17).

33. “to give”

\textit{S\textit{a\textit{q\textit{o\textit{t\textit{r}}}}}}

According to our informants, \textit{ṭef} and \textit{āndāt\textbar k} are fully synonymous and interchangeable, the same is patent from Nakano 1986:73 as well as from the text corpus collected in the course of our field research. Both verbs co-occur in Wellsted’s list as equivalents of Arb. \textit{ṭe\textit{m}} (Simeone-Senelle 1992:44, 52). As for \textit{ez\textit{om}} ‘prē\textit{ter}, donner’ (LS 56), it is strictly limited to the meaning “to lend,” “to give for a while,” as in \textit{hām\textit{ēd} \textit{ez\textit{om}} t\textit{hō d\textit{ī\textbar r\textit{ē\textbar s\textit{i\textbar yā\textbar ra}}} raf l\textit{ā\textbar ḍ\textit{ī\textbar n\textit{a}}} bōs m\textit{m dā\textit{r\textbar h\textbar o}}} ‘Hamed \textit{gave} me his car so that I can return with it from Da\textit{r\textbar h\textbar o}’.

34. “good”

\textit{M\textit{e\textit{h\textit{r}}}}

a. The commonest adjective with the meaning “good” registered in MTO is \textit{gūd}: hē\textit{ṣen nādī\textbar dēr nā\textit{mōl} m\textit{ān yā\textit{μy a\textit{b\textbar r\textbar y\textbar m}}} fōn\textit{ah gūd w\textit{ī\textbar y\textbar m}} w-sī\textsubscript{ū}l ṭē\textsubscript{ēk} u kwāy ‘It used to be very \textit{good} and carry heavy load(s), and it was strong’ (MTO 23:2), \textit{saw\textsubscript{ū}rk gūd} ‘Your advice is \textit{good}!’ (MTO 29:78), am\textsubscript{ā}nd\textsubscript{āwīkī rā\textsubscript{r} gūd\textsubscript{āt} ‘My rifle is a really \textit{good} one’ (MTO 39:4), Kādē\textsubscript{āt} wō-ṭē\textsubscript{ēk} k\textsubscript{w}ā\textsubscript{āth\textsubscript{ām}} gūd\textsubscript{āt} wō-ḥaym dā- Kādē\textsubscript{āt} k\textsubscript{w}ā\textsubscript{āth\textsubscript{ām}} hām\textsubscript{āt} ‘Kādē\textsubscript{āt} and his wife, their story (was) \textit{good}, but Kādē\textsubscript{āt}’s brother-in-law, his story (was) \textit{bad}’ (MTO 64:35), kāl tāt yā\textsubscript{g\textbar ab} yā\textsubscript{r\textbar āb} agūd\textsubscript{ā} m\textit{ān a\textsubscript{ḥ\textbar o\textbar m\textsubscript{āh}}} ‘Everyone wants to distinguish the \textit{good} from the \textit{bad}’ (MTO 73:12). These passages broadly satisfy the criteria laid down in Kassian et al. 2010:62, although all of them refer to objects, concepts and animals rather than people. The use of \textit{ro\textbar hāym} in MTO 18:17 (\textit{y\textbar r\textbar z\textbar b k t\textsubscript{ā\textbar h} dhā\textsubscript{ā} ṭī\textsubscript{ī\textbar kī m\textsubscript{ā\textbar l\textbar ū\textbar s\textsubscript{ā\textbar y}} wā-hū hām}}
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aběli yahöm awkona šah rahāym ‘I knew that he was my sincere friend, and if God will, I shall be good to him’) and 43:4 (bū rihöm ‘nice people’) is, therefore, noteworthy.

b. A similar picture is observed in MTjŠ, where ẓīd is used almost without exceptions: w-kōsām arz ẓīd ‘Sie fanden gutes Land’ (MTjŠ 8:7), dōm nūr mān ḥaym yakūn ṣāylah wī-yakūn ẓīd ‘Das ist eine Art von Hai, der ist fett und gut’ (MTjŠ 16:7), sān ḫbār ẓāyattan aq bādat ‘Das sind gute oder schlechte Kamelkühe’ (MTjŠ 47:6), yākūn ṣāvīd ṣāwīl wa-yakūn ṣāvīd ‘Das sind lange und Gut Stöcke’ (63:34). Of great interest is MTjŠ 11:37, where rīhm and ẓīd have been adduced by the speaker as free variants: ḥattah rīhm [aw ẓīd] ‘Sein Anteil ist schön (oder gut).

c. In Nakano 1986:130, gīd is strictly assigned to inanimate objects. The corresponding term for human beings is mēshr (missing from ML, but the only equivalent of “good” in Carter 1847:353). This is confirmed by yāyy mīshr ‘ein guter Mann’ (and similar) in SAE IX 1:5, 10:3, 11:10 vs. ḫām firhīn dī ẓīt ‘Ich will die Stute, die gut ist’ in SAE IX 11:25. But note wa-sīš yāyy rāhīm ‘Und mit dir ist ein schöner Mann’ in SAE IX 20:14.

d. There are numerous attestations of ẓīd in SAE III and SAE IV, such as kaut ẓīd ‘Die Speise ist gut’ (SAE IV 75:29) or bēyẓ liôm ẓīdēt hāmāsēn ‘Die Mutter jener Eier ist gut’ (SAE III 83:19). As for rīhm, it seems to be mostly attested with the meanings “beautiful,” “handsome,” “nice,” as in wūdās lā yaḥānāt tāt rāhīmet ṣawūt hel šārāh ‘Kennst du vielleicht ein liebliches Mädchen, das zur Unterhaltung gekommen ist?’ (SAE IV 120:19). Apparently there is no trace of mēshr in these corpora, although this adjective does appear in Jahn’s German-Mehri glossary under ‘gut’ (Jahn 1902:252).

e. Note khūdum gīd ‘a good servant’ in Thomas 1937:263, but ghaik arhaim ibid. 266 (but only gīd ‘good’ ibid. 300). Only ḏsheit (presumably = gīd) in Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:312).

Jībbali

In JL 210, erhīm is translated as ‘beautiful,’ but the cumulative evidence available from the extant sources makes it clear that this is the only exponent of the general meaning “good” in Jibbali: tād min nūsīb rehīm wa-tād dīfer ‘Von der einen guten Milch, von der andern schlechte’ (SAE VII 26:17), el-sē rehīm lo šōvel dēnū ‘Es ist nicht schön diese Tat’ (SAE VII 33:7), he tit rehīft ‘Ich bin eine gute Frau’ (SAE VII 1:5), yābgōtt rehīft ‘ein liebliches Mädchen’ (SAE VII 11:19), be-tēbek toš be-kūn rehīm ‘Ich färbte sie und sie wurde schön’ (SAE VII 20:44), rēhīt al-hēs ērēt ‘beautiful like the moon’ (JLO 17:9, similar 46:1), mānṣēl rehīm ‘a beautiful place’ (JLO 28:5), šēbr rehīm ‘good advice’ (JLO 57:6), ḥalāṣ al rēhīt lī ‘His condition was not good’ (JLO 83:1), ḥālūs erhīm ‘your nice letter’ (JLO SB2:6), khūdum rehīm ‘a good servant’ (Thomas 1937:263, the only option for “good” ibid. 300), ardz arhen ‘Das Land ist schön’ in Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:313).

Sọqotri
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a. In the speech of our informants, all aspects of the meaning “good” are covered by dišker, as in sag dišker aš-yarlauta wa-yal-yarhāraḥ ‘A good man does not kill and does not steal,’ ḥāmed mūṣlim dišker yasaḥli‘in ḥimīṣ feraṣṭ fāhre ēnhor ‘Ahmad is a good Muslim, he prays five times every day,’ kāvar diškēro ‘a good house,’ ekhūyaa diškēro ‘a good food,’ da rīho di-ḥa šker wa-dā rīho di-bōḥ diyāv ‘This water is good, and that water is bad,’ rīho da di-bō-ḥadībō šker ṭan rīho da di-bō-ḥilḥem ‘The water in Hadībo is better than the water in the cisterns.’ The same choice is made in Nakano 1986:130. The adverbial meaning “well” is expressed by sūwa (LS 283): hōhon xšmētoj īnglīzī sūwa ‘I (can) speak English well,’ hōhon ekōdof siyāra sūwa ‘I can drive a car well.’ As for diyye, it is used in positive wishes only: diyye l’ou diyho bebe ġēdāh mon imārāt ḥārēre ‘It were nice if my father came from the Emirates tomorrow (and not after two weeks).’

b. In the Vienna corpus, diyye (translated as ‘bonté, salut; bon’ in LS 126) is very rarely attested as an attributive adjective with the meaning “good”: vēghēten ilye ... vēghēten ilyāḥ ‘good women ... bad women’ in Müller 1905:195, fīkēghēten ilye ‘good clothes’ (ibid. 270). For (di-)šker ‘good’ cf. dēmi šker ‘ein guter Schlaf’ (Müller 1905:73, 153), fērehim ṭey diškēroḥ ‘ein liebliches Mädchen’ (Müller 1905:38). In Wellsted’s wordlist, diyah is listed side by side with diyā ‘bad,’ but its exact meaning is hard to determine (equated by Wellsted with dial. Arb. زين ‘good’), cf. Simeone-Senelle 1991:124, 1992:53.

36. “hair”

S o q o t r i

Human hair is designated by šef, whereas šāyhor, translated as ‘cheveux’ in LS 432, can only be applied to animals, as in daš ūwaz di-ḥa bisi has šāyhor ‘This goat has no hair.’ As rightly pointed out in Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1472, the same is true of the only attestation of this lexeme in the Vienna corpus: šārihor il-kalb ‘Haaren eines Hundes’ (Müller 1905:82).

40. “heart”

M e h r i

Apart from the substantival meaning “something good” (as in nefōros bīsen le-mēse wu-le-diyye ‘Wir bitten durch sie um Regen und um Heil,’ nāfāḥ bīsen diyye ‘Ich tat ihnen Gutes,’ Müller 1905:73, 153), most of the attestations of diyye in this corpus are predicative: wa-sīmi állāh gāth ber diyye ‘Und Gott sah, daß das Licht gut sei’ (Müller 1905:1), wu-diyye šī di-hō hēlōḥ wa-d-se raig ‘Und es waren gültig gegen mich meine Tante und ihr Mann’ (ibid. 140).

Admittedly, the adjective sērārīm ‘der Haarige’ is applied to a person in Müller 1905:309, hence it is not entirely clear to us why “le sens en contexte ... est certainement ‘velu’ et non ‘chevelu’” (Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1472).
a. A fine example of a strictly anatomical application of the concept “heart” is found in MTO 99:33: ḏāb Ṣ-ゎ-ursal ʔayawf hark ḥāfsalas Ṣ-ゎ-ursal ʔōbdalas Ṣ-ゎ-ursal ʔaw-ḥawūyahbas Ṣ-ゎ-ursal ʔaw-ḥawūhem ‘He stood there and looked into the donkey’s stomach and snatched her liver, her kidneys, her heart and ate them.’ Also in Thomas 1937:302 ḥawbīb is the only Mehri equivalent of “heart.”

b. In MTjŠ 60:48, ḥalb is found in a similar, strictly anatomical context: ṣhāʕan Ṣ-ゎ-marshān bāt ḥalb Ṣ-ゎ-klī Ṣ-ゎ-ḥāḏ ‘Wir schlachten und nahmen Herz, Nieren, Leber’ (similar in MTjŠ 12:9). In this corpus, ḥalbīb is attested as well, note especially MTjŠ 11:25, where the two terms are adduced as variants by the speaker: ṣawzmām ṭār ḷall ḍā-ṣhāṭ šī mān Ṽwār ḥalb Ṣ-ゎ-ḥalbīb ‘Sie geben all das meistens dem, der schlachtet, manchmal (auch) das Herz.’ In ML 230 ḫāb is translated as ‘mind, intelligence, memory, heart, intention,’ which probably implies a (predominantly or exclusively) non-anatomical, metaphorical use.

c. Strictly anatomical contexts in SAE IV and SAE IX are not many, and ḥalb is used throughout: ḥēḥar di gulāb ḥīroh de dijīṣīt ṣe-gāl̝b ‘Der Alte hatte den Kopf der Henne und das Herz hineingesteckt’ (SAE IX 35:3), ṣa-ṣīlīt ḥāleb ... ṣa-ḥōfel ṣa-ʃām ‘Sie nahm das Herz ... den Bauch und den Fuss’ (SAE IV 145:11). No pertinent passages in SAE III. Only ḥalb in Nakano 1986:7.

45. “to know”

M e h r i

The main verb with the meaning “to know” in MTO is clearly ḡawrāb, attested in a huge number of syntactically varied contexts. The use of ḡawda is restricted to a few particular syntactic environments, by far the most common one being indirect question: ḡ-ʔal ḡawdān lāḥām ḥīlelm aw lā ‘We do not know if they have moved or not’ (MTO 31:3), ḡawšām ḡawdān ṣa-ʃāl Ṣ-ゎ-ʃīyāg ‘But we don’t know when it is coming’ (MTO 45:17), 生产总 ḡawda Ṣ-ゎ-ʃāl Ṣ-ゎ-ʃīyāg lā ‘He no longer knew how to go back’ (MTO 98:1), ḡ-ʔal ḡawdak Ṣ-ゎ-ʃāl Ṣ-ゎ-ʃīyāl lā ‘I don’t know where I should be aiming at’ (MTO 90:2), Ṣ-ゎ-ʃīyād ḡawdā lā Ṽe Ṽadēk Ṣ-ゎ-ʃīdī ‘Nobody knows whether it is true or false’ (MTO 99:1), ḡawdak ḡēʃām l-ʁamāl Ṽhoh ‘Do you know what I should do about it?’ (MTO 101:9). It is also common in the fixed expression ḡ-ʔal-ḡawdān Ṽa ‘I don’t know’ (MTO 42:40, 82:4, 91:24, 98:10). There are just a couple of examples of ḡ-ʔal-ḡawdān lā ‘I don’t know’ (MTO 42:40, 82:4, 91:24, 98:10). A detailed analysis of the distribution of these verbs in Mehri can be found in Bulakh–Kogan 2013. In spite of the substantial differences between various Mehri text corpora, ḡawrāb seems to be firmly established as the basic verb for “to know” in all of them.

J i b b a l i
The Jibbali examples gleaned from SAE VII are broadly compatible with the Mehri evidence described above. While yåršb is a neutral verb found in a variety of contexts, édar is attested only sparsely, mostly in negative sentences with the preposition b-: be-ságk bóhum el yédar bî lô ‘Und ich wünsche, daß keiner von ihnen über mich nicht war erfähre’ (SAE VII 24:2), el-édark bî-lô ‘Ich weiß von ihm nichts’ (SAE VII 24:5), el edvôën bôhum lô ‘Wir wüßten von euch nichts’ (SAE VII 47:26), be-Mehâdêten ledâr bóhum lô hes ertég(e) bîš ‘Meḥâdêten aber wûste davon nicht, als sie über ihn Rat hielten’ (SAE VII 44:22), het ledârke lo be-eršôt iné šérik bî ‘Weißt du es nicht ... was mir die Kinder getan haben?’ (SAE VII 35:5), meledârk še keš šfit mil keš šfit ‘Ich weiß nicht, ob es ein Haar abgeschnitten hat oder nicht’ (SAE VII 43:3).

Johnstone’s Jibbali texts published by A. Rubin provide an even more transparent picture. In this corpus, the use of édar is practically restricted to three special environments: (1) the expression žl édar bô ‘I do not know’ (JLO 10:3, 22:19, 28:4, 38:6); (2) various aspects of propositional knowledge, as in m-mun yądár mun e-latôg ‘He does not know, who killed him’ (JLO 14:6, similar ibid. 7), žl édar iné yågërk bô ‘He did not know what to do’ (JLO 30:1, similar 41:2, TJ5:81, AM1:3–4), žl édar iné kun bô ‘I did not know what had happened’ (JLO 31:4), žl édarš bô-hûn l-ëblê bô ‘I do not know where I should direct myself’ (JLO 57:2), žl-ndo žl édar shûn bô ayağbšt iyënës mûn embëres iyëns ‘And he didn’t know which one (he believed), (if) the girl was telling the truth or the boy was telling the truth’ (JLO TJ5:71); (3) édar bô- ‘to be aware of,’ as in žl édarš bô bô-yağbšt ùt râhît ‘Do you not know a certain pretty girl?’ (JLO 97:19).

Sôqotri

a. In the speech of our informants, the main verb with the meaning “to know” is clearly yérôb. As for édar (LS 52), it is an archaic lexeme used only on a few rare occasions: al-řédark ënhî mîtu yagôdišin ‘I do not know when he comes,’ édar énhî mi álâmëd yôthôr dârrho ‘I know when Ahmed will go to Darhho.’ Already in the Vienna corpus this verb is attested very sparsely (cf. Müller 1905:166). For al-řışyôk wa-âl-řédark ‘I do not know, I do not understand’ v. Morris 2005:356–357, where it is described as “a standard phrase often occurring in poetry.”

b. In the Vienna corpus, the verb ḥûṣé (yâhôṣîllâḫûṣ) is rather often used as the semantic equivalent of the reflexes of *wôr in the continental languages, that is, to render propositional knowledge or, more rarely, to introduce the object of knowledge through the preposition bô:- wâl ḥûṣé dîhê bêbe wa-díhê bîôb ber dé mûn âllâb ‘Sein Vater und seine Mutter aber wußten nicht, daß es von Gott bestimmt war’ (Müller 1905:18), wâl ḥâšân meš id(y)ôwô fînî ‘Wir ... wissen aber nicht wohin er ging’ (ibid. 81), wâl yēhôṣî ifôl šam ṭemôdôh ‘Er ... nicht merkte, daß die Sonne untergegangen war’ (ibid. 279), wa-ḥûṣe biš rëfo ‘Die Leute merkten es’ (ibid. 110). The verb is well known to informants, and their observations about its functional domain correspond exactly to the picture obtained from the Vienna corpus. Yet it is remarkable that its presence in our text corpus is very restricted, the following three examples being the only available ones in
CSOL I: *al-h*sáyk ifúř ṭaṣégw ‘I do not know what shall I do,’ tūro téta děryho rounéghen gámava héřk hiś mën wažife wa-yhe al-h*sé ‘When my son graduated from the university, I started to look for employment for him, and he was not aware (of this),’ h*sáyk bō-nörwem bōr dīyāv ‘I know about this road that it is bad.’

46. “leaf”

Mehri

The only fitting term one could glean from Johnstone’s English-Mehri glossary is *ṣyäfēt*, apparently missing from MTO. There are several competing terms with this meaning in MTjŠ, most of them missing from ML:

– ḥūb dā-ṣṣāyūf ‘Brot in Blättern’ (14:1, also in 6.7.9.14), wā-ṣṣāyūf ḏā-kṣāb rādahīm ykmām ḥāzār šāyūf lōmān ṣaylēf ḏā-kṣāb ḏ-rays ykmūn ḥāzār ‘Und die Blätter der Halme sind noch grün. Diese šāyūf, die Blätter der Halme der Hirse sind (noch) grün’ (MTjŠ 14:3, similar 19)

– dōmāh ḥārī ḷ ykmūn mān saʃ ykmūn mān saʃ d-nāḥal aw mān r.','Die Melkschale ist aus Blättern, aus nāḥal- oder rarf-Palmblättern’ (MTjŠ 69:10)

– wi-ṭawrāh am-ṭirās wrāk ḏa-hǒwar ḥḥǭwar ṣẓārēt ḏi-yəmrūm his ḥǭwar ‘Und lassen darauf Blätter vom Baum, den man ḥǭwar nennt’ (MTjŠ 27:10).

Only wārka in Nakano 1986:112 (according to ML 430, ‘paper, sheet of paper’).

Jibbali

There is one pertinent illustration for *ṣyäfēt* in SAE VII: gerūm ... bīš ṣŷlif ‘Ein ʿIlbaum ... und an ihm Blätter’ (SAE VII 10:7).

47. “to lie”

Mehri

While there are no diagnostic contexts for the meaning “to lie down” in the published Mehri corpora, *ṣṣaḵf* (ML 425, Nakano 1986:29) appears to be the most likely candidate.

Jibbali

In JL 26, *mḥoltāh* is translated as ‘to lie down,’ but, according to Miranda Morris, this is not accepted by the informants, who normally use *ṣef* (thus, with no distinction between “to lie down” and “to sleep”). This is clearly confirmed by the diagnostic examples in Nakano 1986:29, where this verb is used in contexts such as
“Lie down here so that I may examine you.” However, in JL 267 only the meaning “to sleep” is adduced.

In one of Johnstone’s Jibbali texts published by A. Rubin, another verb with the meaning “to lie down” seems to be used, viz. ihé (JLO TJ5:64–65), missing from JL.

S o q o t r i

a. According to our informants, the meaning “to lie down” is reserved to šéřôf, which is normally opposed to démô ‘to sleep’: dîyèho bêbe gógor wa-lat yâsôřôf ba-níñaf šôm wa-hîhe ‘My father is ill and because of this he is lying in bed day and night,’ yâsôřôf móbrhe ba-mayfîno wa-raľ-yogôr kor yâshôbîn ‘The baby lies on the lap (of his mother) and cannot creep (yet).’

b. In the Vienna corpus, šéřôf is often attested with the meaning “to sleep,” as in wa-kołînâh id-îâver wu-šéřôf raf tšábah ‘Und er kehrte ins Haus zurück, schlief bis zum Morgen ...’ (Müller 1905:112) or wa-sâdôkho heş raf išôřôf ‘Und sie (beide) warteten zu (ließen ihn) bis er einschliedf’ (ibid. 133). As far as one can judge from the references collected in LS, the neutral meaning “to lie down” for šéřôf is hardly ever found in this corpus, with a possible exception of remor hês tek lšef de-hêt l-verbêbô wa-sêf mós l-verbêbô wa-ézebeh af ídôm ‘Er sprach zu ihr: “Ich möchte auf deinem Schosse schlafen,” und er legte sich auf ihren Schoß. Und sie liess ihn (liegen), bis er einschliedf’ (Müller 1902:82).†

c. In Nakano 1986:29, the two meanings are mixed together (“to lie down to sleep”): šéřôf and démô are adduced side by side with no explicit distinction.

d. In Wellsted’s list, eidêm and t’shûf are both rendered as ‘to sleep’ (although the the Arabic equivalent د ر rather means ‘to lie down’) and, as far as one can judge from Simeone-Senelle from 1992:58, the two verbs are also synonymous in the speech of her informant from Qalansiya. It may nevertheless be significant that Wellsted lists t’shûf immediately after “sit down” and “stand.”

e. The verb bhî ‘se coucher, s’étendre’ (LS 85), with one attestation in the Vienna corpus,† was not recognized by our informants. However, they do use its metathetic variant tâbah with exactly the same meaning (“to lie on one’s belly”): móbrhe tâbah dîyèhe tóy mer ker hoyhi ‘A child was lying down on his belly on the ground.’

52. “many”

S o q o t r i

In the speech of our informants, the verb dêľôk is the normal expression for “many.” As for kin ‘beaucoup, plus que’ (LS 217), it is a rare word predominantly used in comparative expressions like kin do irhez di-kôri ran di-tôym ‘The rice which is left is

---

† Note also Müller 1902:53 where išôf corresponds to Arb. اضطصح, but idám is adduced in brackets as apparently synonymous.

†† wu-širẖâhån mer-riho id thîr wu-baḏâhån le-nirêhor be-ẖôhi di-ináhå ‘Wir ... gingen aus dem Wasser heraus ans Ufer und legten uns auf den Bauch im Sande, welcher heiß war’ (Müller 1905:144).
55. “mountain”

Mehri

a. The meaning “one isolated mountain” (rather than “plateau” or “mountain range”) for karmāym can be illustrated by examples like hūla wa-rāzīm yāfīk lay sīn karmām aḥūdī jāfīk ‘The shadow has grown and is nearly across to me from the mountains’, each separate from the other’ (MTO 21:1–2), sīnok tāḥ yēmūs sīn aṣmāfī ḏā-karmāym ‘I saw it disapper round the corner of the mountain’ (MTO 26:6), sīnok tūṣ tāḥ dīr karmām ḏāyk ‘I saw them ... on that mountain’ (MTO 28:2).

b. There seems to be no relevant context in MTj̱š, where only ṣhayr with the general/collective meaning “mountain area” is attested (‘mountains’ in ML 377).

c. In the Vienna corpora, the only attested term is ẓibēl (also in Nakano 1986:755), apparently missing from MTO (cf. gābēl ‘mountain(s)’ in ML 113). Cf. ḥerē de ẓebēl ‘Gipfel des Berges’ (SAE IV 40:3); ẓibēl ẓāy hārub ‘Er ... eilte damit den Berg hinan’ (SAE III 26:6), lahāl-ḥamū u ḥarē di-rīš iḥ bi-māḍlāk ba-ẓibēl ‘Zum Wasser ... und zu dem auf dem Berg aufgehängten Schlangenkopfe’ (SAE III 27:15), u dōulet yāher ṭāyrēḥ ba-ẓibēl ‘Und ein anderer, der über ihm auf dem Berge residierte’ (SAE III 29:21), ḥāfēra ṭar ḏžibāl ‘Steig’ hinauf auf den Berg’ (SAE III 111:15); wa-huḥān ẓar te ṭar ḏžibēl ‘Er ... lief mit ihr bis auf den Berg’ (SAE IX 13:2), tē ḥalāhke tāḥūlīl al-ḥibēl ‘Bis sie dort verweilten bei dem Berge’ (SAE IX 47:3), tē ḏžibēl ṭād ḥāmmeh ḏžibēl ṣaṣāud ‘Bis auf einen Berg, sein Name ist Berg Assaud’ (SAE IX 55:7).

d. In Thomas 1937:308, both terms are recorded side by side. Wellstedt 1840:26 has kirmām, von Maltzan 1873:258, 291 has karmām, Carter 1847:356 has ṣibēl.

Jibbali

Johnstone’s Jibbali texts published by A. Rubin provide a substantial amount of evidence for ḥār as the basic designation of “one isolated mountain”: ḥēr šōrak ḥār ḏūkān ‘If you run up that mountain’ (JLO 30:24, similar ibid. 25), ṣar gāṭ ba-ḥār ‘They reached a precipice’ (JLO 48:18), ṣawtēr ḏār ḥār ḏūkān ‘We’ll meet on that mountain’

1549 “Qal. kīn ‘plus, encore plus’; l’informateur précise que ce terme se différencie de ḥāk ‘beaucoup.’“
(JLO 60:43), hes bérd-dā-yrājan hār ‘When they were climbing a mountain’ (JLO AM1:1). This is also confirmed by Miranda Morris, who defines giēl (JL 69) as “the mountains, a mountain range in general.” Note, however, ad dēr gēle ‘Bis auf den Berg’ in SAE VII 8:2 (also ibid. 3). Also Nakano 1986:108 lists only giēl.

There are three alternative terms in Thomas 1937:308: giyār, giyāl and deḥēk. The first one is unclear to us (a distorted rendering of ḫēr?), the second is identical to Johnstone’s giēl, the third one is likely the same as Johnstone’s deḥēk ‘slope, precipice, ledge; rock’ (JL 36).

58. “neck”

Mehrā

a. yōjī with the meaning “neck” is well attested in MTjŠ: gḥēb dōm di-ḥūk b-yōthi ‘Dieser Gold-(schmuck), der am Hals ist’ (MTjŠ 59:9), kālād tād ḥūk yarwath b-yatīyāh ‘Jeder hatte seine Kette um seinen Hals’ (MTjŠ 70:20), šāṭrāyr ... b-yogāiyās ‘Ein Tuch um ihren Hals’ (MTjŠ 81:18). As for čāvrīr, attested once in MTjŠ 53:29 (bāss yānqalān mān būmān mān čāvrīyāh ankārī gākmāh ‘Jener zweite Engländer schwitzte hier an seinem Nacken’), it designates specifically the hind part of the neck, the nape (Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1985–1986:291). There are two attestations of yōjī in SAE IX: hu ber hūllek we-lāzrōme gaṭāb yāṭī ‘Ich habe mich schon (im Schatten) gelagert und jetzt hat sich zusammengezogen mein Hals’ (SAE IX 17:6) and lîgef hibeh bi-yatēyeh ‘Packte er seinen Vater an seinen Halse’ (SAE IX 52:12).

b. Nakano 1986:5 gives only rekēt, also adduced in Jahn 1902:221 and Bittner 1909:41, but, apparently, unattested in any of the three Vienna corpora.

Jībbāli

According to a personal communication by Miranda Morris, yōże is the most general term for “neck” in Jībbali, whereas rekēt specifically designates “the front of the neck where the knife goes when slaughtering.”1350 Only yōže in Nakano 1986:5. In Johnstone’s Jībbali texts published by A. Rubin cf. mēl cid yōṭēk ‘Stretch your neck!’ (JLO 54:30).

Soqotri

The main designation of “neck” is fahrēro (Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1455), described by our informants as a widely used word applied to the external neck only: dā mūgšām di-bok fahrēro bōy di-kātāno ‘That boy has a thin neck’ (so also Nakano 1986:5). As for kār (LS 384, Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1463), it is said to be applied to both “neck” (external, as in dīyhe ko-ṣāže mortārē di-skēro diwē bō-kār ‘There is a fine necklace

1350 For this meaning cf. JLO TJ5:66.
on his wife’s neck’) and “throat” (internal, as in lahâgo fe sîhlo di-zâde ba-kar ‘There is a fish-bone stuck in my throat’). In the Vienna corpus, there are two attestations of each term, all of them referring to the external neck: wa-širâwât d-se be-fišeriâr ‘Und hing es an ihren Hals’ (Müller 1905:189), wu-isâbâk mes be-fišeriâr ‘Und sich heftet an ihren Nacken’ (ibid. 325); wu-tîvan tos id-kar ‘Und er stach sie in den Hals’ (ibid. 137), șeṣye ... di-kar ‘Halsschmuck’ (ibid. 174).

59. “new”

Mehrî

There is one attestation of ḣaḍîn in MTjŠ 20:15 (w-târdûdân hâs-wât alâh ḥaydântân ‘Dann werden sie wieder wie neu’), but in one instance, ḣâdî is used instead (w-tarmîl hē hâbk ṭâd yâḥîr ḣâdî ‘Du ... machst ihr ein anderes, neues Netz,’ MTjŠ 6:33).

60. “night”

Mehrî

a. The main term for “night” in MTO is clearly râṣər, attested more than 30 times in a variety of diagnostic contexts: katâwâ ḥayyâm w-râṣâw ‘They wrote day and night’ (MTO 66:1, also 75:23), ḥa-ŷâwm kâllas u faḵî d-râṣâr ‘The whole day and half the night’ (MTO 36:27), noḥâ šâŷât u kâl ṭât yâzît șâkhî d-râṣâr ‘There are three of us and each one shall take (the watch for) a third of the night’ (MTO 42:24), wa-l-nohâd yâsânûs yânke ḥâlakâmah lâ b-râṣâr râr u hê b-anhâr ‘Nobody dared to go there at night, only during the day’ (MTO 95:1), tê ba-hâllây râbâw wâyîg abkhârhe wa-arâṣâr kêtîw wa-maûsê ‘When the man took his cattle out at night — and that was a night of darkness and rain’ (MTO 15:9), ba-hâllây wâkûb al-têl’ kâtîn wâ-hâtîm tê kâ-sôbah wâ-danyît ștêl’ ma-ârâṣâras ‘Then at night he went into his bride and stayed until morning. The woman became pregnant from her night’ (MTO 9:11, also 85:34). Also in MTjŠ, only râṣar is attested, mostly as part of the nominal phrase râṣar kâllâh ‘the whole night’ (e.g. MTjŠ 41:12).

b. The only term adduced in Nakano 1986:139 is lêylât, whose parallel lîlît (ML 259) seems to be present only once in MTO: wa-sûyâwr tê lîlît tûnîla-sôlît ‘And they went on till the second/third night’ (MTO 48:23–24). Only lêylât (and similar forms) is attested in each of the SAE volumes: lêylât ṭayt ... lêylât hâwliyêt ... lâylet yâyût ‘Eines Nachts ... in der ersten Nacht ... die andere Nacht’ (SAE IX 12:2), wat lêylât taḥôm tibne ḥâzan ‘Sobald es Nacht ist, (und) du willst bauen ein Burg’ (SAE IX 42:5); wa-ḥêlmen ḥâlêm be-lîlît ṭayt ‘Da hatten wir beide in Einer Nacht einen Traum’ (SAE IV 11:11, similar 69:1); siyôrem ta-lîlet tânîyet ‘Sie reisten weiter bis zur zweiten Nacht’ (SAE III 425).

c. Thomas 1937:310 gives only *heli*, cf. *halēl* in Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:311), *halil* in von Maltzan 1873:229. These terms seem to correspond to adverbial expressions like *ba-ḥalāyā* ‘at night’ (ML 179) and *yaḥliḥ* ‘tonight’ (ML 259), very common in MTO and elsewhere (Bittner 1913a:26, 1915a:11).

**Jibbali**

a. There is enough evidence for ṭāṣer ‘night’ in SAE VII: *be-ḥalāk* bis ṭāṣer ḍekū ‘Er schlief mit ihr noch in derselben Nacht’ (SAE VII 22:45), *be-gāḥk* lis ṭāṣer ajejerī el-ṣē ṭāṣer enfi lo ‘Ich kam zu ihr in der zweiten Nacht, nicht in der ersten ...’ (SAE VII 47:33), ṭāṣer vaḵ serīf ṭad be-ṭāṣer vaḵ serīf ṭakāyar ‘In einer Nacht auf der einen Seite und in der anderen Nacht auf der anderen Seite’ (SAE VII 56:2).

b. In Thomas 1937:310 we find gussārī and aser (cf. *oserē* in Krapf’s list, Ewald 1846:311), whereas Nakano 1986:139 gives only yasrē. However, as one learns from Bittner 1917:33 and JL 89, this is rather an adverbial expression with the meaning “at night,” which is also confirmed by its attestations in SAE VII: *ad yasrē škem* bis *In der Nacht war Aufbruch* (SAE VII 9:19), *yosrē* Ḿham ber-ṣīṭān skof talōs ‘Als in der Nacht der Sultansohn zu ihr kam und mit ihr saß ...’ (SAE VII 11:48).

**Saqotri**

In the speech of our informants, the main term for “night” is *ḥte*, whereas *lālhe* (LS 233) is restricted to the expression *ba-lālhe* ‘during the night,’ ‘in the night-time’: *āḥyofk diɣyho ḳālam ba-lālhe* (or: *ba-rankt di-ḥte*) ‘I lost my pen during the night.’ As far as one can judge from the examples collected in LS 233, the same is largely correct about the use of *lālhe* in the Vienna corpus.\(^{1352}\)

64. “person”

**Mehri**

In MTO, the concept “human being,” “person”\(^{1353}\) is variously represented by *mahlīk* (ML 441),\(^{1354}\) *manādām* (ML 267), *yaɣ* (ML 141) and *μνασά* (ML 6): *ḥêt ṣal ḫêt mahlīk lā ‘You are not a human being’ (MTO 4:7), *ḥēšm hēt mān manādām* ‘What kind of person are you?’ (MTO 20:34), *ḥēšm hēt mān yaɣ* ‘What kind of person are you?’

---

\(^{1351}\) Needless to say, it is very unfortunate that all the pertinent attestations in the SAE volumes are adverbial.


\(^{1353}\) For an attempt at semantic definition v. Kassian et al. 2010:68.

\(^{1354}\) Translated as ‘poor fellow’ in ML, but contextually as ‘human being’ in MTO.
In the speech of our informants, the neutral concept “human being,” “person” is alternatively expressed by múḥlōk (not in LS) or ḥōye (LS 171), which have been described as full synonyms (cf. Lonnet 1999:188–190). Thus, in the following contexts the former term can be freely replaced by the latter: ʿākhab ʾalla múḥlōk ʿan ḥōye bi ‘God created the man from the dust,’ ʿākhab di-múḥlōk múḥlāʿif ʿan ʿākhab di-šfāniš ‘Human diseases are different from those of the animals,’ ḥimark ʿ̣ārmale bi-ṣārnihin wa-ri+r-sárobk inám dēnva di-γοχάμος múḥlōk ram Šfāniš ‘I have heard a noise among the trees, but I do not know who produced that noise — a human being or an animal.’ As for ḥōriš (LS 193), it is said to be a rare word, still used by the bedouins but hardly known among coastal people. All neutral designations of human being are strictly opposed to ṣag, which is applied to male individuals only: ʿinō sin érīn̪ di-γοχάμḅōdān kāf ṣag ‘We have goats that can be milked only by a man (and not by a woman),’ ʿyrēːm da ba-ṣārhūla ṣyyūg wa-γογ̪hētōn wa-r̪̄m̪ḅōrē ‘In this village there are men, women and children.’

65. “rain”

Mehrī

a. The main term for ‘rain’ in MTO is clearly mawsē (ML 256), with scores of attestations in a variety of contexts (rare examples of rahmēt v. in MTO 45:3, 47:1). This is also the only choice of Thomas 1937:314.

b. Nakano 1986:104 has only rahmēt (so also Carter 1847:357), whose parallel rahmēt (ML 321) appears just a couple of times in MTO: ʿa+ke rahmēt ʿiš Ṣ̌mān šamēt ʿa+mēh ‘Have they had any rain this year?’ (MTO 45:3), ḥā tāʾ rāmāwār bāʾ rahmēt ‘A place where they said there had been rain’ (MTO 47:1, note mawsē in the following line of this very text).

c. In MTJŠ, mālē is attested more than 20 times, whereas rahmēt is found only four times (8:6.11.15, 50:2). Of special interest is MTJŠ 8:6, where both terms are found simultaneously and, as one can infer from Sima’s translations, designate two different types of rain: w-šā wa+dēr ḍākmāh ši mālē lā ši rahmēt lā ‘Damals gab es weder Nieselregen noch Platzregen.’

d. In both SAE III and SAE IX, only rahmēt (and similar) is attested: ū hātūm ... ba-ṭāzām ū rahmēt ‘Er ... brachte die Nacht zu in Kälte und Regen’ (SAE III 2:10–11), lāḥqaqāṭ-hem rahmēt ‘Da erreichte sie ein Regenguss’ (SAE III 21:15, also 22:11), thūjīs rahmēt talsē yimō ‘Glaubst du dass heute ein Regen kommen wird?’ (SAE III 149:24,

also 25–26), *kall suwanôt yizî índ *rahmát *Jeden Augenblick wächst der Regen* (SAE III 150:3, also 6); té *rihmét enhkàit *Als ein Regen kam* (SAE IX 20:9). Nevertheless, in his German-Mehri glossary Jahn also adduces *mîlesâ*, which he qualifies as “bed[uinisch]” as opposed to *rahmát “städt[lich]”* (Jahn 1902:258).

**Jîbbâlî**

There are a couple of attestations of *mîsê* in Johnstone’s texts published by A. Rubin: *zîhám mîsê *Rain came* (JLO 22:2, similar 31:2). A few examples of *rahmét* (‘rain, vegetation after rain,’ JL 210) are found in the same corpus: *érî ûdd sâr beš *rahmét *A land that they heard had rain* (JLO 15:1, similar ibid. 2), *êkât dênu beš *orhamét* ‘At this time there is rain’ (JLO 38:1).

69. “round”

**Jîbbâlî**

The Jîbbali term for “round,” missing from JL and other extant sources, has been kindly supplied by Miranda Morris (*gâvalól*, f. *gâvalîl*).

**Sôqôtrî**

The Soqotri evidence fits nicely the three-member classification of the concept of “roundness” as predicted in Kassian et al. 2010:74: the adjective *gârjâf* can only be used about spherical objects (*rî gârjâf* ‘a round head,’ *lîm gârjâf* ‘a round lime,’ *wîb gârjâf* ‘a round goat-dropping,’ *ôroên gâralhêl* ‘a round stone’)

70. “sand”

**Mêhîrî**

a. The meaning “sand” for *bâth* seems to be attested in MTO 48:17 (*hîs ðî-yaârdîzor yahâyw dárîr bâth* *wa-sê tmûmâf* *man dárîr abâth* *lûnîn wîka dîr *râdîmâth* ‘While he was digging, sand was falling on him and she was brushing the sand off him that had got on to his back’), although the more general meaning “soil” can hardly be excluded for this passage, cf. MTO 104:19, where Johnstone’s translation is indeed “soil” (*ôw-ôibration *haddôhe barr bâth* *wîs-sîb barr ḥîj(177,907),(366,968)* ‘He put his hands in the soil and threw it into the tamarisk’). Also *bâtâh* in Nakano 1986:111, Carter 1847:358.

b. There are several unmistakable attestations of *bâtâh* ‘sand’ in SAE III and IV: *defîn lêhem ba bâtâh* ‘Er bedeckte sie mit Erde’ (SAE III 22:15), *rôurem dîmê tôub bîh sî là*
ar bátāḥ ‘Das Meer ist ruhig und nur Sand in ihm’ (SAE III 156:12); wa-ţezón Yūsef bar his bátēh de raúrem mekhin wiyye ‘Und Josef hüpfte Getreide auf wie Sand am Meere in grossen Massen’ (SAE IV 16:49).

c. There are many attestations of bátēh in MTjŠ, but there is hardly a single one where the translation ‘sand’ (rather than ‘earth’ or ‘soil’) would be compelling, cf. ykalbām ḫāṣān bátēh mān mšā w-sān ṭkūmān ṣāḳ yūm bátēh al-ṣirān mān ḥāḳdā ‘Bedeckt man sie von unten und von oben mit Erde und sie liegen in der Mitte’ (MTjŠ 70:14, also 82:28), ḥājās ḍāmāh bāʾz mānī ṣālār mān bátēh ... w-bāʾz mānh ... ykūn bāḳ bátēh wi-yāḥfrām lēh mān bátēh ‘Manche von diesen Pilzen wachsen aus dem Erdboden heraus ... und manche ... sind in der Erde, man gräbt sie aus der Erde’ (MTjŠ 70:23, similar 29 and 82:26), ykūn ḫalḵāth wṯāḏ ḫā bátēh ‘Seine Farbe ist wie der Erdboden’ (MTjŠ 70:24), wḏāyām nwrml swīr ṣa-nḥūbās bārkāsān bátēh ‘udimāt-Hütten machen wir (aus) Steinen und schützen darin Erde’ (MTjŠ 72:17, cf. 80:19), lāṯtān ḍāmāh ... ykūn bāḳ bátēh ... w-lī ṣḥūlulk bāḳ bátēh ... ṣḥūrāk ‘Dieser lästigt ... lebt auf dem Erdboden ... wenn du auf dem Erdboden sitzt ... sticht er dich’ (MTjŠ 80:1).

d. Thomas 1937:316 has only raimil, which also appears once in SAE III 85:22 (labdōt r ṭēmēl ‘Da wahr sagte sie aus dem Sande’). This word is recorded also in ML 327 (rmℓēt ‘sand, dust’), but does not seem to be attested in MTO.

e. Krapf’s ḥāṣē is translated as ‘Sand’ (Ewald 1846:312), but what was intended by the informant was rather ḥayk ‘shore, beach’ (ML 197).

Jībbālī

JL displays several terms translated by Johnstone as ‘sand’: bāṭh ‘sand’ (JL 30), ṭeṛrēk ‘soft soil, sand’ (JL 208), ṭarkēk ‘very soft soil, sand’ (JL 213), ṭel ‘dust, sand’ (JL 224). A meaningful selection of one (or several) basic terms is difficult in the present state of our knowledge. Thomas 1937:316 has bāṭāḥ and rāl, which have been accepted here. According to Miranda Morris’ informants, “bāṭh is Mahri,” but cf. the proverb al-hēs ṭ-d-yāḥīl ṭakā ṭēh ‘Like the one who is urinating in the sand’ edited by A. Rubin as JLO Pr188.

In a few examples from Johnstone’s Jībbālī texts published by A. Rubin, ḥāṣē ‘soil, dust’ is clearly tantamount to “sand”: anēs her ḥāṣē ‘Her intention was for the red sand’ (JLO 51:16), mānēbzd ḥa-bōhum ḥāṣē ‘Places that have sand’ (JLO TJ2:102), ymēbātān ṭak dīḥān ērēmē ṭeṛrēk dīḥān ḥāṣē ‘He rolled around in that hot sand, the soft soil’ (JLO TJ4:24).

Sōqörtī

In the speech of our informants, there are three terms which somehow correspond to the meaning “sand”: (1) ṭakh, (2) ṣāḥārē and (3) ūmē. The first lexeme is applied to the red sand (or rather “fine gravel” according to M. Morris) of the wadis: gēdāh ṭakh kā-rihā mān rālē ‘Sand came with water from above.’

The third lexeme is restricted to the white sand of the sea: ḥālās ṣō-gāmē her ūmē ‘A fish
was thrown out to the sand; arkūho rānham šime tēr ‘The sea brought some sand outside.’ As for the second lexeme, it is used for sand raised by the wind as well as the mud on the streets: mūlūrū siyyāra mān tēr šāhare ‘The car is full of sand from outside’ (M. Morris’ “dry, powdery, fine and pale soil”).

Only the third term has been recorded in both LS 418\textsuperscript{1357} and Nakano 1986:111, for the first v. Johnstone 1968:517 (‘gravel’). The second lexeme must be etymologically related to Mhr. šakavāyīt ‘roter Sand’ recorded in Jahn 1902:227, but missing from ML.

72. “to see”

Mehri

It is only in MTO and MTjŠ that šnī ‘to see’ is ubiquitous. In each of the three SAE volumes, this verb is exceedingly rare, as opposed to scores of attestations of γalōk\textsuperscript{1358} translated ‘to look’ in ML 136. This is also the case of Nakano 1986:11 and Krapf’s list, where “sehen” is regularly rendered by γl (Ewald 1846:313). The following sporadic attestations of šni have been located in the SAE volumes: ar šenkh tēš ḥašnet ‘Ich schaue dich nur prahlerisch’ (SAE IX 47:5), he da-šnī emanūt ‘Er sah den Regen’ (SAE IX 22:11); ā šnīk šī là ‘Hast du dich nicht noch sonst etwas gesehen?’ (SAE III 2:19), šnēk mḥammad sājā ‘Hast du M. gesehen?’ (SAE III 35:13), ḥašen šnīš men ajēb ‘Was wunderbares ist dir denn erschien?’ (SAE III 63:12 and passim in similar contexts in this text), u šnēk dihéb ‘Ich sah ihn’ (SAE III 102:4), wiḥta ḫl-e-sēr lahāl ṭībāy yillā d-hū šnēkh là min ṣafāyīt wūrī ‘Ich hätte gestern zu meinem Freunde gehen sollen, welchen ich schon drei Monate nicht gesehen habe’ (SAE III 150:24); amrūt šnēk ṣalāḥ là ‘Ich sehe dabei kein Heil’ (SAE IV 87:85). The reasons behind these peculiar encroachments (especially in SAE III, where they are comparatively numerous) escape us, but it is noteworthy that in his German-Mehri glossary, Jahn explicitly labels γalōk as “städt[lich]” and šnī as “bed[uinisch].”

Sọqọtrị

\textsuperscript{1357} One attestation in Müller 1905:265: w-inēkeren idī šimih w-ināzaf tos be-lāḥad ‘Man bringt Meersand hin und breitet ihn in der Höhlung aus.’ As a possible precedent of ｇāharet one might consider ṣegārhen ‘Sandsteppe’ in Müller 1905:302.

In the speech of our informants, ḍāḥam ‘to see’ is very common, perhaps no less common than ṣinī. The two verbs appear to be used without any perceptible semantic or functional difference.

73. “seed”

Mehri


Soqotri

According to our informants, the main designation of “seed” is déri, as in ḍēnē ṣag déri wa-ṣīkho eknīyo di-skēro ‘A man planted a seed and a good harvest grew (from it),’ ṣākh di-ṣārmhin déri bay ‘Some trees have seeds,’ etsah déri mān bōybay ‘He took a pip from the papaya.’ In the Vienna corpus, cf. ṣīblhot irōkēh déri ‘Kraut, welches Samen bringt’ (Müller 1905:2).

The word šēnī, translated by Leslau as ‘semence, blé qui est sur les tiges’ (LS 145), designates “something sown, standing grain,” as in ke-ṣīkhoḥ ſ/dat ... ṡu-nehe ... be-šānē ‘Wenn Feuer auskommt ... und ... das stehende Korn ... verbrennt’ (Müller 1905:14) or maqreboh telōbed ṡu-temōkēhen be-šānē ‘Der Westwind schlägt um und rüttelt an der Saat’ (ibid. 281).

As for nēbit ‘semence, planté’ (LS 255), its only attestation in the Vienna corpus is applied to the pollen of the male date palm (Müller 1905:238–239), which fits exactly its usage in the present-day language (nēbot).

74. “to sit”

Soqotri

In the speech of our informants, the main verb with the meaning “to sit down” is clearly ḍ żəm. The same is true of Nakano 1986:28 and, it seems, of the Vienna corpus, where this verb is widely attested. According to Simeone-Senelle 1991:113, in the Soqotri variety of Qalansiyya thōl is used side by side with ḍ żəm. In the Vienna corpus this verb is rare and almost always means “to stay,” “to reside” rather than strictly “to sit.”1359

---

1359 The only exception, correctly singled out by M.-C. Simeone-Senelle, seems to be inṣeḥ ḍīhi wa-vēmor ḍīhi stḥalélo wa-thalalélo ‘Er ließ ihnen einen Sitz zurecht legen und sagte: “Setzet euch,” und sie setzten sich’ (Müller 1907:67). The prominence of this verb in the dialect of Abd-el-Kuri has been emphasized in Wagner 1959:483. There are about five attestations of thōl in the only text in this dialect so far available to us (Müller 1902:92–111), where ḍ żəm is never used.
75. “skin”

Soqotri

According to our informants, gad and šörhi are broadly synonymous, although the latter term has been evaluated as slightly more common. This may be at least partly due to the fact that, while both terms can be applied to humans and animals, gad cannot be used about hairy skin (such as that of sheep and goats), only about that of cows and camels: faḫḫ di- rèfəfo màjhan gad/šörhi [ibid. wa-faḫḫ di- rèfəfo màjhan gad/šörhi šörbeh wa-faḫḫ di- rèfəfo màjhan gad/šörhi hāhār ‘Some people have white skin, some people have brown skin and some people have black skin,’ bô-gad/šörhi di- ḫyṛhi šef di- ḫyṛyor wa-bô-šörhi di- rèhôn šef di- délāk ‘On the human skin the hair is few, whereas on the goats’ skin the hair is much.’

Both terms are well represented in the Vienna corpus: vêmor ško di-mîżerid wa- vêmor heš di-ḵârrhen di- gad ‘(Er) machte ein Schwert aus einem Palmebast und machte dazu eine Scheide aus Leder’ (Müller 1905:76), wa- vênkâh ke- nhôbš beţârisk min regêlid ‘Und (er) nahm mit sich Ware [bestehend] aus Fellen’ (ibid. 136), we-verôgîm vêkin be-tê wa- renâţof vêkin be-šörhi ‘Ich überziehe euch mit Fleisch und umschließe euch mit Haut’ (ibid. 22), h(y)vêrâk bevir di- şāţêhân ... wa- vêmor mes šîrhi id- nôgîr ‘(Er) stahl ein Kamel des Sultans ... und tat dessen Fell in die Grube’ (ibid. 87), šîrhi di- kâlb ‘die Haut eines Hundes’ (Müller 1907:61). Only gad in Nakano 1986:9.

77. “small”

Jibbali

Cf. bût kelânn ‘ein kleines Haus’ in SAE VII 47:4 (in JL 144 ḵallân is rendered as ‘baby, infant’). In JLO 60:2 ănšênût is found with the meaning “young,” but cf. ‘a small one’ in JLO TJ3:26 (about a mouse).

Soqotri

In the speech of our informants, the basic adjective with the meaning “small” is kâyhen, as in šêrmom kâyhen ‘a small tree,’ ḫâvar hino ‘a small house,’ ṣag kâyhen ‘a small man.’ The same choice has been made in Nakano 1986:124. According to Simeone-Senelle 1991:116, in some varieties of Soqotri this adjective competes with kâîhôn ‘mince’ (LS 372–373). In the Vienna corpus, kâîhôn is considerably less frequent than kâyhen, and in many of its attestations the meaning does not correspond exactly to the basic concept “small”/“little” (appropriately translated by Müller as ’dünn,’ ‘schmall’ or

One wonders whether it is accidental that all attestations of gad in the Vienna corpus are applied to leather as material.
‘schmächtig’). Admittedly, most of the attestations of kāyhen refer to age rather than size, but note hōri kēynoh ‘ein kleines Boot’ (Müller 1905:96), vērebēh eyōnten trī kāyniūti u trī ēmi ‘Vier Augen, zwei kleinen und zwei grossen’ (Müller 1902:83), vēbehon kēnhīten ‘Steinchen’ (Müller 1905:195).

78. “smoke”

Sōqotri

According to our informants, “smoke” can be alternatively rendered by vēto or ḥilāk, which have been described as full synonyms: sēna ḥilāk/vēto di-siyyāt man di-šārīḥaḵ ‘They saw the smoke of the fire from afar,’ yarōkheb ḥilāk/vēto diyḫo id-sāyyni ‘The smoke enters my eyes.’ Only vēto is adduced in Nakano 1986:27. As for ḥilāk, it is completely missing from LS, but has reliable parallels in the continental MSA: Mhr. ḥālīk ‘soot, smoke marks on walls and ceiling’ (ML 178), Jib. ḥelḵ ‘to give off a smell of burning,’ ḥālīḵ ‘smoke marks on a ceiling’ (JL 110).

80. “star”

Mehrī

a. There is, apparently, no attestation of kābkāb ‘star’ in MTO. Only kubkīb in Thomas 1937:320, kobkob in Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:311).

b. Only nāḡm is attested in MTJŠ, as in täšštād snāt mān nāḡm at-tā nāḡm ‘Sie ist ein Jahr trächtig, von Stern zu Stern’ (MTJŠ 47:22), dōmāb nāḡm yamrām hēh al-ḥūṭ ‘Diesen Stern nennt man al-ḥūṭ.’ The same choice is made in Nakano 1986:105. This word is missing from ML.

c. There are a few attestations of nāḡm in each of the SAE volumes: ho nēṯem ‘Ich bin ein Stern’ (SAE IX 42:9), nēḏimak Ḿḏ ‘Dein Stern ist gut glücklich’ (SAE IV 102:40), u nēṯem yimō bar bēh ʾhelīt ‘Der Stern leuchtet schon drei Tage’ (SAE IV 140:19). However, in SAE IV kābkāb is also attested: yalēṭek ... alḥad ʾasār kibekīb sīḏūdīm li ‘Ich sah ... elf Sterne sich bücken vor mir’ (SAE IV 2:11), see further SAE IV 116:28–30.

83. “to swim”

Sōqotri

The concept of swimming (= “bodily movements intended to cross a watery space,” cf. Kassian et al. 2010:79) is expressed by sābaḥ, as in kaḷ ṭagōsarr tāsbāḥ tatterēkon ‘If you cannot swim, you will drown’ (same in Nakano 1986:120). The verb is well attested in the Vienna corpus, but none of the passages are fully diagnostic for the

1561 Note that the plural nuṯūm (MTJŠ 59:41, 66–67) has been marked as an unadapted Arabism by A. Sima.
basic meaning as described above. This verb is neatly distinguished by the speakers from rábah ‘to bathe’ (aḷ-ṣēgāḥ līrbāḥ ba-rānhom īvēnne ġadāš lēhūm ‘He does not want to bathe in the sea because he is afraid of sharks’) and geb ‘to float’ (yāgbāb rīghem ker rīho ‘There is a cover (of a bottle) floating on the water’).

84. “tail”

Me₇hr₁i

a. The only option provided by ML is ḍənāb (does not seem to be attested in MTO).


c. Both terms are attested in MTjŠ, but the frequency is low in each case, which makes it difficult to decide whether there is any semantic difference between them and which one is more basic: ylōśāṯ bā-ḍōbāb ‘Er schlägt mit seinem Schwanz’ (MTjŠ 2:65), w-ḥaybū thayrōb bā-ḍōbās ... tōsāṯ ḍōbās ‘Du erkennst das am Schwanz der Kamelkuh ... sie ... ihren Schwanz hebt’ (MTjŠ 47:27), ḍnōb d-Ṭāʾayl ‘Fuchsschwanz’ (MTjŠ 82:16, name of a tree) vs. bēh māḏōd ykinām bēh mān arbḵōt w-mān ṭrōh w-mān tāf w-mān arbḵōt ḍ-dāylāḥ ‘Er hat einen Stachel, er hat vier oder zwei oder einen oder vier an seinem Schwanz’ (MTjŠ 2:63).

d. Only ḍenōb in SAE III and IV: yiqatelōb ẓirĕt yihūḵōb ḍanōbēḥ berēk fānḥārōt da-ṭehūḏi ‘Da verwandelte sich der andere in eine Maus und steckte seinen Schwanz in die Nase des Juden’ (SAE III 96:17), wa-aîmel ḍenōb be-ḥenōb ‘Er ... kehrte einen Schwanz gegen den andern’ (SAE IV 38:4).

89. “tooth”

Soqotri

The main term for “tooth” in Soqotri is ṭāle (du. ṭalīti, pl. ṭalēṭom), appearing once in the Vienna corpus1562 and recorded in several modern studies (Nakano 1986:3, Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1452). As for sāral (‘dent, crochet,’ LS 431),1563 it was not even recognized by our informants and seems to be completely unknown to them (note that the only additional reference to this word in Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1471 comes from Johnstone’s unpublished fieldwork notes). It is nevertheless noteworthy

1562 šālḵēf meš ūtalīti dōrīb ‘Gut ist für deine Zähne die Döribwurzel’ (Müller 1905:281).

1563 The word is attested twice in the Vienna corpus. While in the first case the meaning seems to be strictly anatomical (rāmḥōy ke felēsok sāral ‘Wenn Ambhoy die Zähne entblüßet,’ Müller 1905:186), in the second attestation the word describes a part of the device for catching water tortoises (ḥalḵēh di-ḥēṣhin wu-be-ray ḍi-hālḵēh sāral ‘ein Eisenhaken, und an der Spitze desselben ist ein Widerhaken,’ Müller 1905:325). Its etymology is obscure: as pointed out by J. Cantineau (1939:144) and acknowledged by W. Leslau (1945:244), direct derivation from PS *šīm– is scarcely conceivable.
that a clearly related form šārmaš ‘dent’ has been recorded for the Soqotri variety of Abd el-Kuri (Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1992:89).\footnote{Note that -n in šārmaš may presuppose some kind of contamination between ẓār and the (subsequently lost) reflex of PS *sim-.}

90. “tree”

**Mehri**

a. The only term attested in MTO is ḥārmāt. Only ḥmarūm in Thomas 1937:324. This word (peculiarly, again with ḥ-) was known also to A. Jahn, who qualifies it as “dichter[ich]” in his German-Mehri glossary (Jahn 1902:245).

b. The presence of ḥarmāt in MTjŠ is relatively sparse: ḳmudā ḍ-ṭār ḥarmāt ‘Er spannt (einen Strick) von dieser ... an einem Baum’ (MTjŠ 12:13), ḍūm ḥmarūm tārmāl dābh taẓmahv mān ḥarmāt ‘Diese Biene produziert Honig, sie sammelt (ihn) von einem Baum’ (MTjŠ 54:1, also ibid. 2 and 10), wūt ẓī-būn ḫūṣīd ḥabbū ḥarmāt h-hūdā ‘Im Frühjahr schneiden die Leute Bäume für die Zäune’ (MTjŠ 63:4), ḍa-ḥlīyār b-ẓābrē wa-b-harmāt ḥomāy ‘Meistens lebt sie auf dem zābrē-Baum oder auf so einem Baum’ (MTjŠ 80:17), ṣaḵsā ṣavāmāh b-harmāt ‘Wollen wir jetzt von den Bäumen erzählen’ (MTjŠ 82:1). The commonest general designation of “tree” in this corpus is ūṣrēt, as witnessed by numerous examples: ṣīkā b-sāv b-baṣă mān ẓēr ‘Das es auf dem sav-Baum oder auf einigen anderen Bäumen gibt’ (MTjŠ 10:10), ḡūṣmāy ẓēh mān ḥomāy ūṣrēt ‘Man schneidet dafür (einen Ast) von diesem Baum’ (MTjŠ 19:6), wī-ṣaṭrām ẓa-fīras wraḵ ẓa-hūwār ḡūwār ūṣrēt gi-yawāmā hō ḡūwār ‘Und lassen darauf Blätter vom Baum, den man ḡūwār nennt’ (MTjŠ 27:10), ḡasān mān ẓīr aw fār d-kūt ḡūn ẓaḥmāh bā-ṣhāyr tfūrāh ṭī ḡ̄ayb tāhwa ẓīr ‘Welche Bäume oder Nahrungsmittel liebt die Kamelkuh hier bei uns in den Bergen am meisten?’ (MTjŠ 47:82). ūṣrēt bō ḍorūs ṣīkā ḡūn waṭāmāy ‘Ein Baum, der so ein weißes Sekret besitzt’ (MTjŠ 55:2, cf. ibid. 3).

c. ūṣrēt (and similar) is the only term attested in all the remaining sources: Nakano 1986:112, Krapf’s list (Éwald 1846:312), Carter 1847:359, each of the three SAE volumes.\footnote{Select references include: SAE IX 16:8, 35:10–11, 39:14–16, 48:129, 55:17; SAE IV 78:43, 87:88, 96:19–21; SAE III 3:11, 10:16, 15:7, 23:8.}

In ML 374, ūṣgār is ascribed a more general meaning ‘plants and trees.’

92. “to walk”

**Mehri**

a. A peculiary feature of SAE IX is the extreme rarity of siyūr with the meaning “to walk” = “to go.” Instead, there are scores of attestations of ḥokrāwā and ẓīḥmā in nearly every text of this collection (the former verb somewhat more common than the latter one). The exceptional examples of siyūr are: wa-siyūr ṭā-hnā ṣayy ‘Und es ging zu
ihr der Mann’ (39:19), ḥarmátk tibrít tsesyôr là ‘Deine Frau ist verkrüppelt, sie geht nicht’ (30:5), siyûr let-rêgeb ‘Er ging zu der Höhle’ (47:8), siyûrem fâhîr ‘Sie gingen zusammen’ (5:1, 49:4 and several times in this text), siyûr ‘er ging’ (43:12.21, 51:7.9, 57:3). The reasons behind its presence precisely in these particular examples are hard to ascertain. Half of the pertinent compositions belong to a bedouin narrator (texts 5, 43, 51, 57) and, as as already noticed above, there are reasons to believe that his speech may display non-local features (but note that ḥakrâwâr and ḟîzhêm are also very common in nearly each of these texts). The remaining texts (30, 39, 47, 49) appear to be quite ordinary, however.

b. According to ML 117, 233 and Nakano 1986:60, 62, ḟîzhêm is specifically associated with going in the morning and ḥakrâwâr, at midday. This may be true for the SAE IX picture as described above, which would mean that the concept “to go” in this Mehri variety does not exist in its neutral form, being always connected with the part of the day when the movement is carried out. That the neutral (or “basic”) exponent of the meaning “to go” in SAE IX is siyûr is inconceivable because of its very low frequency. A more delicate issue is the possibility of opposing “to go” and “to walk.” As rightly acknowledged in Kassian et al. 2010:62, the meaning “to walk” is less fundamental than “to go.” Since “to walk” is much less common in speech and texts, one could easily surmise that siyûr in the dialect of SAE IX simply means “to walk” rather than “to go,” and there are, indeed, some indirect arguments in favor of this assumption. However, since “to walk” is always understood as “to go” in our book (as recommended in Kassian et al. 2010:62), this issue is broadly irrelevant in the present context and does not undermine the fundamental specificity of the dialect of Qišn in this semantic position.

c. The specific association of ḥakrâwâr with the dialect of Qišn is confirmed by its broad presence in SAE III “Mundart B,” where only minor encroachments of siyûr are in evidence: siyûr yažûn ʿâ yaženôt ‘Der Knabe und das Mädchen zogen weiter’ (SAE III 117:28; cf. also 121:12–13). Also Johnstone explicitly labels ḥakrâwâr as “S[outhern] M[ehri]” (ML 117).

d. In all the remaining Mehri corpora (MTO, MTjŠ, SAE III and IV) siyûr is the only verb widely used with the meaning “to walk” = “to go,” whereas ḥakrâwâr and ḟîzhêm are either altogether absent, or attested rather sparsely. Cf. also ho chomle lesir ‘ich

1366 Note also the transferred meaning “to copulate” in 34:11 (siyûr šîs ‘Er beschlief sie’).
1367 (1) In the whole corpus of SAE IX we do not see any single example where ḟîzhêm or ḥakrâwâr could be appropriately translated as “to walk.” Conversely, there is one such example for siyûr: ḥarmátk tibrít tsesyôr là ‘Deine Frau ist verkrüppelt, sie geht nicht’ (30:5). (2) Thomas 1937:300, 326 opposes gûhmûn for “to go” and siyûr for “to walk.” (3) In Nakano 1986:62, only siyûr is quoted as an equivalent of “to walk” whereas under “to go” this verb is given side by side with ḥakrâwâr and several other verbs depending on the time of day.
1368 This is the case of SE III. A nearly exhaustive list of exceptional examples includes 1:1, 28:5, 29:19, 45:2.23, 46:2, 51:16, 58:3, 64:6, 66:23, 68:4 for ḟîzhêm and 4:5, 129:23, 130:2, 152:1.2.10, 155:17, 156:28–29 for ḥakrâwâr. It is not accidental that many of the attestations of ḥakrâwâr come from the section “Gespräche,” most of which apparently reflect the dialect of Qišn. In MTO ḟîzhêm is not so rare (e.g. 10:3, 12:6, 13:11, 24:33, 34:10, 37:16, 38:1.2.7, 40:11, 44:8.11, 45:11, 46:1, 47:1, 48:18.20.21.33, 54:4, 59:1, 62:13 and a few others), but still much less common than siyûr.
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will gehen,’ sēr ‘go’ in Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:312, 314), yesiur ‘er geht’ in von Maltzan 1873:272, sar al hālōk ‘go there’ in Carter 1847:361 (but ahom alhagar ‘I am about to go’ ibid. 362).

Saqotri

A. Nakano (1986:60–62) seems to be basically correct in assigning the meanings “to go” and “to walk” to tāher and rod respectively, but in view of the semantic uncertainty of the concept we prefer to include both verbs as synonyms (for their presence side by side in Wellsted’s wordlist v. Simeone-Senelle 1991:123–124).

93. “warm”

Mehri

a. The adjective “warm” does not seem to be attested in MTO, but the verbal meaning “to (be) warm” is expressed by gōna qišar alūškāyson ḥabūr ʾabōm ṭstēm ḥāgnam aẓāyga ‘It is just that the cold has caught them. I beg you: warm the fold,’ MTO 26:9; ḥīgūn ḥmāfūk ḥabūr dā-yazydūd ‘Keep yourself warm. The cold is increasing,’ MTO 84:4) or ʾzāb (ḥōmāh ʾal ʾzāb lā ‘The water was not a bit warm,’ MTO 36:23). The latter verb is given a very specific meaning in ML 472 (‘(water) to become a little warm’) and is, therefore, not included in the table.

b. Only ḥark is present in MTjŠ, with numerous attestations such as nāyqān dīkmāh mšārfūt b-sāvar wṭōmāh tkān ḥāṣam kāllās wa-tāblās ba-ḥmāh aẓẓobāl šwīr ḥyākmāh ḥark ba-ḥmāh ‘Wir beruhigen jene Kochstelle aus Steinen so mit einem Stein, damit sie ganz kalt wird, du kühlst sie mit Wasser ab, du kühlst jene heißen Steine mit Wasser ab’ (MTjŠ 5:11) or ḥān bā-rmūd ṭāsam w-lī bā-rmūd ḥark ‘Entweder mit kalter oder mit warmer Asche’ (MTjŠ 83:22). The verbal usage of ḥrīk is also attested in this corpus: aṭṭārah at-tā ḥmāh yahrūk ‘Du läßt ihn stehen, bis das Wasser heiß ist’ (MTjŠ 7:11). This is also the only choice of Thomas 1937:302, but what we find in ML 186 is ḥark ‘heat of the sun; heat.’

c. The meaning “warm” is missing from Nakano 1986, but “hot” is alternatively rendered as ḥark or ḥūb, and it is the latter term that seems to fit better the criteria of Kassian et al. 2010:83 (cf. ḥāmāh ḥark ‘boiling hot water’ vs. ḥāmāh ḥūb ‘hot/warm water’). A similar opposition seems to be hinted at in A. Jahn’s German-Mehri glossary, where “heiß” is rendered as ḥark and “warm” as ḥūb (Jahn 1902:252, 265). For the latter term v. ML 161 (ḥūwāb ‘to get warm’).

d. There is little evidence for the concept “warm”/”hot” in any of the SAE volumes. Cf. perhaps dīnyā ḥark māken ‘Es ist sehr heiß’ (SAE III 149:28).

Jibbali
The readiest candidate for the main exponent of the meaning “warm”/“hot” in Jibbali seems to be ḡeṭ (JL 74), twice attested in the corpus of SAE VII: te ḍeṣott ḡeṭ be-ḥaróg mes ‘Er aß ein Stück heißes Fleisch und starb daran’ (SAE VII 18:10), ḡunu ḍeṣott ḡeṭ ‘Dies ist wenig und heiβ’ (SAE VII 41:8). This is also one of the two alternatives provided by Thomas 1937:302 (the other is ghīqal, which we are unable to identify in JL).

Nakano 1986:107 gives gror and adk, neither of which seems to be attested in JL with the relevant meanings.

99. “woman”

Mehr

While only tēṭ is found in MTO, in the corpus of MTjŠ ḡarmūt and tēṭ are used with more or less equal frequency.¹⁵⁶⁹ It remains to be investigated by which factors the choice of one of the two terms is governed, but at least some speakers apparently use them promiscue, as one can infer from ḥam sēḥ ḡbīṣōt ḡarmūt ... sān tēṭ takkīs màsūr ‘Wenn eine Frau gebissen worden ist ... Es ging um eine Frau, die sich einen Nagel eingetreten hatte’ (MTjŠ 1:49–50) and ḡīlōt lī ḡarmūt tēṭ bārs ẓamrōt hīnī ‘Er sich mir in eine Frau verwandelte. Die Frau sagte zu mir’ (MTjŠ 93:19). The use of ḡajzōn as a suppletive plural of ḡarmūt is very common in MTjŠ but, here again, vacillation between ḡajzōn and ḡaynēt is possible: sān ḡajzōn ḡaynēt ḡajzōn bārs ẓamrōt hīnī ‘Die Frauen waschen sich damit die Köpfe’ (MTjŠ 82:12), mit k-ṣayrāb ḡaynēt at-ḥoṭbān ... ḡamfrān līs ḡajzōn ‘Wenn die Frauen in der Nachmonsunzeit Holz sammeln ... Die Frauen graben danach’ (MTjŠ 82:27). The use of ḡajzūz in the singular is rare: w-ḥārwēt wa-ḡajzūz ẓibōt ‘Und sie gebar, und die Frau verlor dabei der Bewußtsein’ (MTjŠ 3:3), ḡumāh sī ḡīt ḡumāh ḡajzūz ḡlūtī ‘Ich habe hier eine Frau, meine Tante’ (MTjŠ 44:37), ḡīn bārs ḡajzūz ‘Solange sie eine erwachsene Frau ist’ (MTjŠ 108:20).

Only ḡarmūt (with variants) can be found in the majority of the remaining sources: each of the three SAE volumes, Wellstedt 1840:26, Carter 1847:361, von Maltzan 1873:289, Nakano 1986:47.

Only tait in Thomas 1937:326. Krapf’s list (Ewald 1846:311) assigns teit to the singular and ḡariment to the plural, but cf. hermet gedditēla ‘Die Frau ist böse’ ibid. 313 as well as het ḡsīt ṣīl ḡermet el ḡabarri ‘You should not take a wife for my son’ ibid. 314.

100. “yellow”

Jibbali

Since ḡarmūt has no plural form from the same root, the overall figures for tēṭ (pl. ḡaynēt) are even higher. At any rate, one hesitates to agree with A. Rubin’s observation that “in ŠM the usual word [for “woman”] is ḡarmūt” (2011:77).
According to Miranda Morris, the best candidate for this colour designation seems to be ʂərər, as in Nakano 1986:125. This word is missing from JL, but one may suspect that ʂərər ‘yellow’ in JL 236 is actually a misprint for ʂərər.

Excursus 1. Dialectal variety in the Mehri lexicon as reflected in the Swadesh wordlist

The lexical differences between the Mehri corpora analyzed in the preceding section can be summarized in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>MTO/ML</th>
<th>MTjŞ</th>
<th>SAE III</th>
<th>SAE IV</th>
<th>SAE IX</th>
<th>Nakano 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “to burn”</td>
<td>hə-nty</td>
<td>nły</td>
<td>šək</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ʂəwʃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “earth”</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>kā arv</td>
<td>kā arv</td>
<td>kā arv</td>
<td>kā arv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “egg”</td>
<td>kāwɔɬ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>bîzəyt</td>
<td>bîzəyt</td>
<td>bîzəyt</td>
<td>bîzəyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “fish”</td>
<td>ʂəyd</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ʂəyd məʃif</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>məʃif</td>
<td>ʂəyd məʃif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “foot”</td>
<td>fəm</td>
<td>farm</td>
<td>fəm</td>
<td>fəm</td>
<td>śrayn</td>
<td>śrayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “good”</td>
<td>ʂəd rəhəyım</td>
<td>źid rəhım</td>
<td>źid rəhım</td>
<td>źid rəhım</td>
<td>ʂəd méʃəh</td>
<td>ʂəd méʃəh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “heart”</td>
<td>hə-əwbe</td>
<td>ələb həlbəb</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ələb</td>
<td>ələb</td>
<td>ələb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “mountain”</td>
<td>kərməyım</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>źibəl</td>
<td>źibəl</td>
<td>źibəl</td>
<td>źibəl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “night”</td>
<td>rəşər</td>
<td>rəşər</td>
<td>lələt</td>
<td>lələt</td>
<td>lələt</td>
<td>lələt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “rain”</td>
<td>məwsə</td>
<td>məsə rəhmət</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rəhmət</td>
<td>rəhmət</td>
<td>rəhmət</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “to see”</td>
<td>ʂəni</td>
<td>ʂəni</td>
<td>ʂələk</td>
<td>ʂələk</td>
<td>ʂələk</td>
<td>ʂələk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “star”</td>
<td>kəbkəb</td>
<td>nəzəm</td>
<td>nəzəm</td>
<td>nəzəm</td>
<td>nəzəm</td>
<td>nəzəm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “tail”</td>
<td>dəməb</td>
<td>dəməb dəyl</td>
<td>dəməb</td>
<td>dəməb</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>dəl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “tree”</td>
<td>hərməyım</td>
<td>səʃərə ḥərməyım</td>
<td>səʃərə</td>
<td>səʃərə</td>
<td>səʃərə</td>
<td>səʃərə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “to walk”</td>
<td>səyər</td>
<td>sər</td>
<td>sər</td>
<td>sər</td>
<td>ḥəkrəw</td>
<td>səyər ḥəkrəw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “warm”</td>
<td>gəna</td>
<td>hərək</td>
<td>hərək</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>hərək</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1370 A similar comparative lexical chart can already be found in the earliest scientific account of the Mehri language, namely, on pp. 227–230 of H. von Maltzan’s pioneering study of 1873. It is a pity that positions relevant for the present study are not numerous in von Maltzan’s list (the clearest case is, predictably, təq vs. ḥərmət for “woman”).
The first and most striking impression one gets from the chart is how numerous these differences are: at least 15 clear-cut lexical oppositions in the Swadesh wordlist between the Mehri varieties of Qīšn and the Omani Najd are probably without precedent in non-Arabic Semitic dialectology. The circumstances in which this picture was developed make it even more amazing: the geographic area occupied by the Mahra is not very extensive; the essential unity of both the people and the language has always been recognized by the speakers; and the concepts involved tend to be concentrated in the most nuclear areas of the core vocabulary. Last but not least, there are good reasons to believe that the lexical features gleaned from the published text collections do not exhaust the complexity of the real picture: direct inquiry of native speakers would almost certainly reveal more differences in other, less central areas of the list which are just by chance unrepresented in our sources.

The lexical diversity in the basic Mehri vocabulary is impressive and has to be properly assessed. Such an assessment — however preliminary its results may be at the present state of our knowledge — may develop along two different, but to some extent complementary, avenues: a purely synchronic description of the facts, and an attempt at diachronic explanation.

Within the former approach, one has to determine to what extent the evidence of the basic vocabulary can bear on the dialectal division of Mehri and if it can, which pattern of division it favors.

According to Rubin 2010:1, “Mehri can be divided into two basic dialect groups. There is a western group spoken in Yemen, which can be called Yemeni Mehri or Southern Mehri, and there is an eastern group, which can be called Omani Mehri, Dhofari Mehri or Nagd Mehri ... The political boundary between Yemen and Oman probably does not perfectly correspond to the dialect boundary, but the terms Yemeni and Omani Mehri are sufficiently accurate. Within Yemeni Mehri, we can also distinguish western and eastern ... dialects.” An even more clear-cut division into the Yemeni and Omani varieties can be found in Rubin 2011:67.

Does our evidence support such a dichotomy? In a sense, it does: there are many positions in the list whose exponents are prominently attested in all or most of the “Yemeni” varieties, yet never appear in Johnstone’s texts. Belonging to this group are ārẓ for “earth,” bīzāyt for “egg,” māṣif for “fish,” ġalb for “heart,” ġībēl for “mountain,” raḥmēl for “rain,” nāẓm for “star,” ġīzrīt for “tree,” ġārīk for “warm,” and ġarmēl for “woman.” So, our first unmistakable conclusion is that there are indeed many lexical features which oppose all the “Yemeni” varieties to Johnstone’s corpus.

But let us now consider our evidence from the opposite angle: are there any lexical features of Johnstone’s corpus which are not shared by any of the “Yemeni” dialects? There are, but only three: ġāwḥal for “egg,” karmāyīm for “mountain” and ģāna for “warm.” Why is this number so reduced? The answer lies at hand: it is because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.</th>
<th>“woman”</th>
<th>ārẓ</th>
<th>bīzāyt</th>
<th>raḥmēl</th>
<th>hōb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sima’s texts very often display “Yemeni” and “Omani” lexemes side by side\textsuperscript{1372}: nḥy and ḥrḵ for “to burn,” ḵā and LEGROVE{ā} for “earth,” ḫalβ and ḥalnḥ for “heart,” mālsē and raḥmāt for “rain,” sāṣrēt and ḫārmūt for “tree,” ūṭ and ḫārmūt for “woman.”\textsuperscript{1373} This brings us to our second conclusion: in their basic vocabulary, Sima’s texts are much closer to Johnstone’s Mehri than any of the remaining sources. This conclusion is strongly corroborated by those positions of the list where MTO and MTjŠ simply share one single exponent which is normally not used in the remaining corpora, and vice versa: šīnī vs. ḡṣlōk for “to see” and ṭāṣar vs. léylat for “night.” Note, finally, ḡṣūk for “to burn” and māṣīf for “fish,” apparently never attested either in MTO or in MTjŠ.

Our third conclusion is the remarkable specificity of the dialect of Qīšn, reflected in such peculiar features as ṣrayn for “foot,” mēṣreh for “good” and ḥākraversable for “to go.”

Summing up our synchronic observations, we may conclude that the clear-cut dichotomy “Yemeni” : “Omani” is not sufficient to describe the dialectal variety of the basic vocabulary of Mehri. Among the dialects spoken on the Yemenite territory, the available sources allow us to distinguish between three types: the “neutral” or “middle,” connected with al-Ghayda and the adjacent areas to the West,\textsuperscript{1374} the “Eastern,” located in the areas close to the Omani border and with strong links to Johnstone’s Omani variety, and the “Western,” connected with the town of Qīšn.\textsuperscript{1375}

At first sight, the rationale behind this distribution may look purely geographic: the picture described above can be easily visualized as a dialectal continuum stretching from the West (Qīšn) to the East (Dhofar). However, the importance of the geographic factor is not to be overestimated: as pointedly observed by M.-C. Simeone-Senelle (2002:388), “Il est aussi possible de différencier d’une part, à l’intérieur du Mahra, les dialects paysans, parlers des bédouins pasteurs semi-nomades dans la steppe désertique, ou cultivateurs de palmerais dans certains vallées … d’autre part, sur la côte, les dialects villageois ou citadins.” Indeed, as we have repeatedly observed above, lexical oppositions between bedouin and sedentary dialects within the Yemeni territory were clear already to A. Jahn, who aptly opposed mālsē and raḥmāt or šīnī and ḡṣlōk as “bedouin” and “citadine” respectively. And we have also seen that W. Hein’s bedouin informant freely used such words as ṣayyūr or fām, which were normally avoided by other native speakers he worked with. Now shall we suspect that the striking similarities in the basic vocabulary between MTO and MTjŠ are conditioned not only by the geographic proximity of the respective areas, but also by the fact that Sima’s informants are “Halbnomaden, die in den Bergen Landwirtschaft, und an der Küste Fischfang betreiben” (Sima 2009:31)?

\textsuperscript{1372} Of course with different degree of prominence from one case to another (see the notes to individual entries above in this section).

\textsuperscript{1373} Note, furthermore, that the concepts “egg” and “mountain” seem to be absent from Sima’s published corpus.

\textsuperscript{1374} More or less corresponding to A. Jahn’s “Mundart des Landes zwischen Râs Fārtāk and Ġayda.”

\textsuperscript{1375} Thus broadly in agreement with M.-C. Simeone-Senelle’s presentation in 2002:388–389.
Let us now consider the second, diachronic aspect of the problem: what are the reasons that conditioned such a profound dialectal diversity in the basic vocabulary of Mehri?

The first, and only, clear-cut factor immediately coming to one’s mind is the differing degree of Arabic influence. In many cases the “Yemeni” exponents can be reliably evaluated as Arabic loanwords\(^{1376}\); *bįżįt* ‘egg,’ *ḥalb* ‘heart,’ *źįb⎞el* ‘mountain,’ *raḥmεt* ‘rain,’ \(^{1377}\) *nāẓm* ‘star,’ *ḍąyįl* ‘tail,’ *sįżįt* ‘tree,’ *ḥarįk* ‘warm,’ *ḥarmεt* ‘woman.’ While inter-Semitic loanwords are typically rather hard to detect via strictly linguistic criteria (such as irregular phonology or unusual morphological shape), most of the lexemes presently involved are indeed “specifically Arabic,” that is, do not display sufficiently prominent cognates anywhere else in Semitic. Moreover, in a few cases we are faced with internally Arabic secondary derivations (*raḥmεt* ‘rain,’ *ḥarmεt* ‘woman’).

This group can potentially be expanded with *arįz* ‘earth’ and *lįlįt* ‘night,’\(^{1378}\) but in these cases our decisions are deemed to be almost entirely arbitrary,\(^{1379}\) in principle, both lexemes can be directly traced back to the ubiquitous PS prototypes *ʔarį*- and *layliy-at-* rather than borrowed from Arb. *arď-* and *laylat-*\(^{1380}\).

The powerful impact of Arabic on the basic vocabulary of the “Yemeni” varieties of Mehri is not to be denied, yet it would be simplistic to assume that this is the only factor at work. On the one hand, some of the “Yemeni” lexemes are obviously autochthonous (*ḥąwr* ‘to go,’ *šrayn* ‘foot’) or at least have no sufficiently persuasive Arabic etymology (*wį* ‘to burn,’ *mšif* ‘fish,’ *lį* ‘to see’).\(^{1381}\) On the other hand, there remains a possibility — even if a purely theoretical one — that some of the typically “Omani” features are due to substratum and/or adstratum influence of Jibbali.

(End of the excursus)

### 3.2. The Swadesh wordlist: analysis

\(^{1376}\) For a useful list of autochthonous/borrowed exponents of some basic concepts coexisting in Hobyot v. Lonnet 2005:202.

\(^{1377}\) For the origin of this term v. Bittner 1913c, Bittner 1909:39–40.

\(^{1378}\) In both cases, the possibility of borrowing from Arabic has been explicitly (even if tentatively) considered before, v. Bittner 1909:38 and Rubin 2011:79.

\(^{1379}\) To some extent, even circular: we prefer to attribute these terms to the Arabic influence simply because there are many proven Arabisms in the “Yemeni” Mehri. Cf. in this sense already Bittner 1909:5: “Doch ist dabei zu beachten, daß die auch im Arabischen vorhandenen Elemente durchaus nicht alle dem Arabischen entlehnt sein müssen.”

\(^{1380}\) It is interesting to observe that the corresponding “Omani” exponents *kdu* and *tąşor* are also likely borrowed from Arabic. In a broader perspective, an eventual borrowing from Arabic is quite probable for many other lexemes in the Swadesh wordlist, be it Mehri (no matter “Omani,” “Yemeni” or Common), Jibbali or even Common MSA. Among the lexemes treated in this Excursus, we would single out *ḥo* ‘to burn,’ *ṣyrd* ‘fish,’ *gąd* ‘good,’ *raḥyım* id., *ṣyar* ‘to go.’ A few other examples will be analyzed below in Section 5 of this chapter (p. 580). The exact background of these (presumably very old) loanwords is one of the most perplexing issues in the historical lexicography of MSA.

\(^{1381}\) Cf. Bittner 1914:57 for *ylık*; Bittner 1915a:43 and 1911:71 for *šuِk*.
In the table presented above in 3.1.2, we find 57 positions which are shared by each of the three major MSA languages.\footnote{1382} The corresponding terms can thus safely be considered the basic exponents of the respective concepts in Proto-MSA. This body of common basic vocabulary will now be subjected to a detailed diachronic analysis.

3.2.1. Trivial retentions

3.2.1.1. There are 23 trivial retentions in the list.\footnote{1383}

3. “bark”: Mhr. kižfūn, Jib. kižfūt, Soq. kalīfū < PS *qVIPv-at- (LSyr. 670, LS 376)
13. “claw”: Mhr. īfēr, Jib. īfēr, Soq. īfēr < PS *īpr- (SED I No. 285)
18. “dog”: Mhr. kawb (mābāyl), Jib. kāb hārēl/mābēl, Soq. kāb < PS *kalb- (SED II No. 115)\footnote{1384}
21. “ear”: Mhr. ār-yelēn, Jib. ūdēn, Soq. īdhēn < PS *ruḏn- (SED I No. 4)
25. “eye”: Mhr. āyn, Jib. īhn, Soq. āyn < PS *ayn- (SED No. 28)
32. “full”: Mhr. mīlēr, Jib. mižē, Soq. miṣē < PS *mlb (CDG 342)
37. “hand”: Mhr. h-āyēd, Jib. ēd, Soq. ūḏē < PS *yad- (SED I No. 291)
38. “head”: Mhr. ār-rāhū, Jib. ūs, Soq. ri < PS *raš- (SED I No. 225)
39. “to hear”: Mhr. ā褊mā, Jib. šēr, Soq. āṁmav < PS *šmũ (CDG 501)
40. “heart”: Mhr. ār-wēbē, Jib. ūb, Soq. ḍābēb < PS *ibb- (SED I No. 174)
41. “horn”: Mhr. kūn, Jib. kūn, Soq. kūn < PS *kārn- (SED I No. 168)
44. “knee”: Mhr. bārk, Jib. bērk, Soq. bērk < PS *birk- (SED I No. 39)
48. “liver”: Mhr. šōbdēt, Jib. šūbdēt, Soq. šūde < PS *kābdėt- (SED I No. 141)
57. “name”: Mhr. ham, Jib. šūm, Soq. šem < PS *šm- (CDG 504)
80. “star”: Mhr. kābīb, Jib. kābēb, Soq. kābōb < PS *kabkab- (CDG 280)
84. “tail”: Mhr. ḍōmāb, Jib. ḍōmūb, Soq. dēnūb < PS *danāb- (SED No. 64)
85. “that”: Mhr. ādēk, Jib. āḏān, Soq. dā ḍā ḍū < PS *dāv (CDG 629)
86. “this”: Mhr. ḍōmōh, Jib. ḍōnu, Soq. dā ḍā- ḍū < PS *dāv (CDG 629)
87. “thou”: Mhr. hēt, Jib. ḍet, Soq. ṣ < PS *qantā (CDG 32)
88. “tongue”: Mhr. ṣušēn, Jib. āšēn, Soq. šūsīn < PS *šūšān- (SED I No. 181)


\footnote{1383} More information on the comparative evidence behind the PS reconstructions used in the present section can usually be found under the respective headings in Chapter 1 above.

\footnote{1384} In continental MSA, *kalb- has acquired the meaning “wolf,” but continues to mean “dog” both as an independent lexeme and in combination with *ma-br-āl- (originally, “something owned, domestic,” cf. Mhr. mābāyl ‘owned’ in ML 41, Soq. mābāy ‘esclave’ in LS 91). Hrs. mābāyl ‘dog’ (HL 14) can be used independently, presumably as a synonym of kawb ‘wolf; dog’ (ibid. 68). The Soqotri lexeme may well be a comparatively late Arabism as dogs are unknown on the island, yet it is remarkable that our informants are still aware of its pronunciation with the “dark” l (kalb), which is characteristic of the autochthonous Soqotri vocabulary and must point to a rather deep degree of adaptation.
91. “two”: Mhr. ḥwrō, Jib. ḥroh, Soq. ḥrō < PS *t̚in-ā (HALOT 1605)
95. “we”: Mhr. nḥā, Jib. nḥan, Soq. ḥan < PS *niḥnu (CDG 376)
98. “who”: Mhr. mōn, Jib. mun, Soq. mōn < PS *man(nu) (CDG 348).

In comparison with all other Semitic subgroups, this number is very low: contrast, for example, no less than 36 trivial retentions in the Proto-EthS list. It faithfully mirrors the situation in individual MSA languages: 28 trivial retentions in Mehri, 27 in Jibbali and 24 in Soqotri (contrast 50 in Hebrew, 44 in Geez, 40 in Tigre, 35 in the Koranic Arabic). In such conditions, the lexical loss in (Proto-)MSA becomes worthy of a special digression.

**Excursus 2. What is lost in the basic vocabulary of Proto-MSA?**

While discussing the details of the lexical loss in the history of MSA, one should consistently distinguish between two different situations.

I. In some cases, the PS exponent of one or another basic concept is preserved in its basic function *somewhere* in MSA, and it is only because of our strict methodological requirements that such terms have not been directly projected to the proto-language. Indeed, if PS *r̚abn* - ‘stone’ is preserved in Soqotri as ʿohm, there can be little doubt that this preservation reflects the Proto-MSA picture and the loss of this term in Mehri and Jibbali must be treated as a comparatively recent secondary development. 11 positions in the list can be attributed to this category.

1. “all”: PS *kal-, *kull- (CDG 381) is preserved in Mhr. kāl ‘all; whoever, everyone’ (ML 110) and Jib. kɔ(h)l ‘all’ (JL 129). Soq. kal means ‘each, every’ (LS 219), the main term for ‘all’ is fāhr (LS 335), corresponding to Mhr. fāhrəh and Jib. fāhrəh ‘together’ (ML 110, JL 67).

7. “to bite”: PS *n̩k/*nk (CDG 402) is preserved in Mhr. n̩k (ML 305) and Hrs. nepk (HL 99), but lost in Jibbali and Soqotri. Jib. ʿar (JL 322) has no reliable cognates, the same is true of Soq. ʿawab (LS 363).

17. “to die”: PS *mwt (SED I No. 43,) is preserved in Mehri and Harsusi (ML 275, HL 92), whereas in Jibbali and Soqotri only derived stems and nominal derivatives are attested (JL 176, LS 237). The main Jibbali and Soqotri terms are ḫārj (JL 304) and ḥam (LS 353), both without clear etymology.

22. “earth”: PS *r̚arə- is preserved in Jib. ʿarə (JL 4), but is replaced by ḥā in the Mehri of Najd (ML 246) and Harsusi (HL 80) and by ḥyhi in Soqotri (LS 166). For the

---

1385 In the speech of our Soqotri informants, this word has been completely ousted by the Arabic loanword ʿulṭa, but one can still hear it in some of the most archaic poetic compositions.
etymology of the Soqotri term v. 2.4.1 below (p. 548) as well as Chapter 1 above (pp. 30-31).

62. "not": PS *lā is preserved throughout the continental languages (ML 249, JL 158), but lost in Soqotri, where only aļ is used (LS 60).

68. "root": PS *gVrš- seems to be preserved in Jib. širrā (JL 256) and Soq. šāriho (LS 433). Mhr. vark (ML 28, also ‘artery, sinew, nerve’), goes back to a PS term with anatomical meaning (SED I No. 20 and cf. ibid. No. 1.).

73. "seed": PS *darr- is preserved in Soq. dërī (LS 135), but lost in the continental languages, where “seed” is designated as Mhr. bēḏr (ML 44), Hrs. baḍr (HL 15), Jib. bēḍr (JL 23), all likely borrowed from Arb. baḍr-.

81. "stone": PS *rubn- is preserved in Soq. ḍohn (LS 49), but lost in continental MSA,1386 where various replacements are found: Mhr. šāwr (ML 368), Hrs. šēwaer (HL 117), Jib. fidūn (JL 51).

89. "tooth": PS *šinn- is preserved in Jib. šnin (JL 262), but completely disappeared from other languages where various replacements are found: Mhr. māżrāh (ML 478) and Soq. ṛāle (LS 309).

94. "water": PS *māy- is preserved in Mhr. ḥm-māḥ (ML 274) and Jib. mīh (JL 176), but replaced by riḥo in Soqotri (LS 396).

99. "woman": PS *wnt-at- most probably underlies Mhr. tēt (ML 6), Hrs. tēt (HL 3) and Jib. tēt (JL 4) — and clearly the respective plural forms ḡy-ynūt,1388 ḡā-ynūt and ḡinēṭ — although the phonetic development implied by this comparison remains unclear.1389 There is no trace of *wnt-at- in Soqotri, where the main term for woman is ṛāže (LS 307).1390

---


1387  No cognate even in the remaining MSA. As rightly observed in Fronzaroli 1968:298, comparison with Hbr. ġōr ‘rock’ (HALOT 1016) suggested, e.g., in Jahn 1902:228 and Leslau 1958:44 is scarcely possible in view of the fact that it is *ṭ (rather than *ṣ) that underlies Hbr. ṣ in this form (cf. Syr. ṭūn, Ugr. ʃ, Sab. ṣ). 1388  Likely a misprint for ḡy-ynūṯ.

1389  For the presumably archaic Jibbali form *piṯi (شئى) in a 16th century Arabic document see E. Wagner’s remarks in Serjeant–Wagner 1959:130–131 (cf. already Bittner 1915b:21 and Leslau 1947:8: “tēt seems to be instead of ṭet”).

1390  Going back to Proto-MSA *yayg- ‘man,’ for which see below in this chapter (pp. 532-533).
If these 11 positions are added to the 23 discussed previously, the whole number of trivial retentions in Proto-MSA amounts to 34. This figure looks a bit less perplexing, although it should be kept in mind that if a similarly liberal approach were applied to other Semitic subdivisions, an eventual statistical comparison would still remain rather unfavorable for Proto-MSA. In other words, these additional cases do not radically undermine the fundamental claim expressed above: the degree of preservation of the core PS vocabulary in MSA is extraordinary low.

II. The other, much more common, type of erosion of the PS basic vocabulary in MSA is illustrated by 19 semantic positions where the replacement is complete throughout this group and can likely be projected onto the proto-language. Such an early replacement is necessarily hypothetical: independent loss of a lexical feature in each of the relevant languages can never be completely excluded. Nevertheless, at least for those 13 cases where the new exponent is etymologically identical throughout MSA, a momentary loss/replacement already in the proto-language appears far more appealing. The diachronic background of such common replacements, to be systematically analyzed below in this chapter, varies from semantic innovation (“moon,” “mouth,” “nose”) to non-trivial retention (“dry,” “to eat,” “fire,” “hair”) and uncertain origin (“blood,” “green,” “I,” “to know,” “one,” “tree”). In the present excursus, our analysis will be limited to those 6 semantic positions which will not reappear in the discussion below (3.2.2–3.2.4.), as no common exponent reconstructible for Proto-MSA could be discovered for these concepts.

4. “belly” It is unlikely that the reflexes of *kariš- function as (one of) the main term(s) for “belly” in any of MSA (v. above in this chapter, pp. 477-478). The corresponding designations are Mhr. hōfāl, Jib. šifāl and Soq. mer.

10. “bone” In continental MSA, PS *ṣaṭm- is preserved in Mhr. ṣaṭāmēt ‘back’ (ML 14) and Jib. ṣaṭām ‘(skin over wound, badly set bone) to turn into scar tissue’ (JL 8). In these languages, “bone” is derived from *r̥̂ṣā ‘whose possible cognates (rather sparse and doubtful) are discussed in SED I No. 24. The etymology of Soq. ṣoḥlo (LS 347) remains obscure.

15. “cold” PS *krr is likely preserved in MSA with two derived meanings: “tomorrow” (< *“cold of the morning”) and “to go at midday” (< “to go early in the morning”), see 2.4.1 below (p. 551). The meaning “(to be) cold” is expressed by a variety

---

1391 For instance, if trivial retentions from PS preserved in at least one Ethiopian Semitic language were projected to Proto-EthS, the number of trivial retentions attributable to Proto-EthS would rise from 36 to 43.


19. “to drink” PS *šṭy is replaced by the reflexes of PS *šṭy ‘to irrigate, to quench one’s thirst’ in Mhr. ṭḥḥ (ML 155) and Jib. ṣūṣ (JL 262) and by the reflex of PWS *ṛay ‘to be abundant (water); to drink abundantly’ in Soq. ṛ (LS 395).

59. “new” PS *ḥḍḥ left no trace in MSA. In the continental languages, this concept is expressed by reflexes of *ydn1394 of uncertain origin: Mhr. ṣadīn (ML 461), Hrs. ḥe-ydīn (HL 146), Jib. ʾādīn (JL 287). This root is not attested in Soqotri, where “new” is expressed by the Arabic loanword gedīd (LS 101).

60. “night” Reflexes of PS *layliy- are to some extent preserved almost throughout MSA1395 — Mhr. láylāt, līlāt (ML 259), Hrs. lelelt, lēylelt (HL 86), Soq. lālīhe (LS 233) — but none of these lexemes functions as the basic term with the meaning “night” in the text corpora chosen for comparison, being ousted by alternative designations such as Mhr. rāšr (ML 31), Hrs. rāšr (HL 11), Jib. rāšr (JL 17) and Soq. ḥte (LS 194).

(End of the excursus)

3.2.2. Non-trivial retentions

There are 12 Proto-MSA terms which can be qualified as non-trivial retentions from PS. In view of the relative vagueness of this concept, it seems convenient to divide these proto-lexemes into two separate categories. The first subgroup will comprise Proto-MSA lexemes whose cognates display the same basic status in at least one Semitic language outside MSA (marked as 100). The second subgroup will include Proto-MSA terms whose cognates do not function as the basic exponent of the corresponding concepts anywhere else.

3.2.2.1. There are 5 terms which can be attributed to the first subgroup.

2. “ashes”: Mhr. ṭomād (ML 327), Jib. rīd (JL 213), Soq. rīmīd (LS 401).
⇒ No cognates outside Arb. ramād100 (Lane 1154). The MSA terms are likely borrowed from Arabic.

⇒ No cognates outside Gez. ẓabh100 and related terms elsewhere in EthS (CDG 525, SED I No. 261).

1393 For this root see Chapter 2, p. 96 above.
1394 Note perhaps Arb. ṣdn ‘to make soft, tender’ (LA 13 549), Sab. ṣdn ‘to prepare fields for flood-irrigation’ (SD 156).
1395 It is only in Jibbali that the loss seems to be complete.
⇒ No transparent cognates outside Hbr. *kinnām100 (SED II No. 116).

⇒ Identical with Syr. *geldā and Arb. *jild100 (SED I No. 78). Arabic loanwords in MSA are not unlikely.


3.2.2.2. The second subgroup comprises 7 terms.

⇒ Proto-MSA *šis is convincingly compared by M. Bittner (1915a:41) and W. Leslau to Arb. *qaš- ‘dry’ (LA 8 325), but no further parallels have been discovered yet. The root *ybs, widely attested as the main exponent of this concept in CS and EthS (v. Chapter 2, p. 110 above), left no trace in MSA.

⇒ The Proto-MSA verb with the meaning “to eat” likely goes back to the well-known Afroasiatic root *twy, very sparse in Semitic,1396 but widely present in other branches of Afroasiatic, notably in Chadic (HSED No. 2343). PS *kl ‘to eat’ left no trace in MSA.

⇒ Proto-MSA *šawā- ‘fire’ has been correctly identified by Leslau with Arb. *šaw- ‘heat’ (Lane 1619), Syr. *ṣāt ‘combustus est’ (LSyr. 463). There is no trace of PS *ši(-āt)- ‘fire’ in MSA.

⇒ Proto-MSA *prr ‘to fly’ is related to the PS biconsonantal element *pr ‘to run away, to flee’: Syr. *par ‘provenit, abiit, fugit’ (LSyr. 591), Arb. *frr ‘to flee’ (Lane 2355), Tgr. *farra ‘to flee, to fly’ (WTS 655).

⇒ Proto-MSA *šip-at- ‘hair’ goes back to PS *šVp-, whose main representative is Akk. *šipatu ‘wool’ (SED I No. 259). PS *šavr- ‘hair’ is preserved in Hrs. *sōr ‘hair, wool’ (HL 117) and Soq. *sāyhor ‘cheveux’ (LS 432), which do not function as the basic terms with this meaning.

1396 Akk. *wrū ‘to eat, to graze’ SB (CAD T 301, AHw. 1340, very poorly attested), *tūrūm ‘food’ OB, SB (CAD T 398, AHw. 1363), *tīrūtu ‘food, sustenance’ SB (CAD T 439, AHw. 1363).
43. “to kill”: Mhr. lítəɛ (ML 256), Jib. létɛ (JL 165), Soq. látəɛ (LS 236).

⇒ Proto-MSA *ḥly ‘to kill’ is probably related to Arb. ḥly ‘to beat (with one’s hand)’ (LA 8 532, Bittner 1914:57) which, in its turn, has been compared to Akk. letû ‘to split’ (CAD L 148, AHw. 546). Contra Leslau (LS 236), the MSA root is certainly unrelated to PS *ḥlt.


⇒ Derived from the Proto-MSA verb for “to eat” discussed above in this section.

3.2.3. Semantic innovations

There are 6 Proto-MSA terms in the list which can be considered shared semantic innovations going back to Proto-MSA.


⇒ From PS *ṣyd/*swd ‘to hunt, to fish’ (HALOT 1010 and Chapter 3, pp. 216-217), note in particular Arb. ʂayd- ‘what is captured, caught of wild animals, of fowl or of fish’ (Lane 1753). An Arabic loanword in MSA is probable in view of the fact that ʂîd is the normal designation of “fish” throughout the Arabic dialects of Southern Arabia (GD 1980, 2160).

54. “moon”: Mhr. ɬã-rîl (ML 7), Jib. ɭerît (JL 4), Soq. ére (LS 72).

⇒ Proto-MSA *ɬV rude V-(a)-t- ‘moon’ is likely related to Hbr. ṛīr ‘light’ (HALOT 24), Akk. urru ‘(heller) Tag’ (AHw. 1433), ‘day, daylight’ (CAD U 243), Soq. ėrîr ‘allumer’ (LS 75), Ugr. ɨr, ɭr ‘light,’ ɰr ‘warmth, heat’ (DUL 94–95), Arb. ɰrat- ‘fire’ (LA 4 18), ɰwar- ‘heat’ (ibid. 39), Tgr. ɰwâ ‘to flame, to blaze,’ ɰwa ‘flame’ (WTS 359). PS *warî- ‘moon’ is preserved with the meaning “month” in Mhr. warî (ML 430) and Jib. ɭrî (JL 292), but left no trace in Soqotri.

56. “mouth”: Mhr. ɬã (ML 454), Jib. ɭoʔ (LS 310), Soq. ě (LS 158).

⇒ The Proto-MSA term for “mouth” likely represents a semantic evolution from “opening, hole.” The original meaning is preserved in Hbr. ɬoʔ ‘hole, crevice’ (HALOT 296), Arb. ɬawtât- ‘an aperture in a wall, a passage between any two houses’ (Lane 820), Sab. ɬî ‘passageway, corridor’ (SD 65), Min. ɭ ‘portico’ (R 2771:5), Qat. ɭw ‘door, gate’ (LIQ 71), Gez. ɬoʔ ‘door, gate’ (CDG 260). There is no trace of PS *pay- ‘mouth’ in MSA.

61. “nose”: Mhr. naɭrî (ML 308), Jib. naɭrî (JL 199), Soq. nàɭrî (LS 265).

1397 For the complex problem of the etymological background of Gez. ɭr ‘sun, light’ and related EthS forms v. CDG 36, EDG 118.
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Proto-MSA *nahyɾ- ‘nose’ goes back to PS *nahyɾ- ‘nostril’ (v. SED I No. 198), the only reflexes of PS *‘anp- ‘nose’ are Jib. ‘enfī ‘first, ancient,’ ‘enfīt ‘a while ago’ (JL 4, Bittner 1916:51). For a similar replacement in later Aramaic v. Chapter 6, pp. 368-369 above.

66. “red”: Mhr. ɣafār (ML 14), Jib. ɣafār (JL 8), Soq. ɣafār (LS 320).

Proto-MSA *ʔāpVr- ‘red’ derives from PS *’apar- ‘soil,’ represented by Akk. eperu (CAD E 184, AHw. 222), Ugr. ʾpr (DUL 174), Hbr. ʾāpār (HALOT 861), Syr. ʾafprā (LSyr. 539), Arb. ʾafar- (Lan 2090), Tgr. ʾafār (WTS 492), Amh. ʾafār (AED 1353), but unattested in MSA with the possible exceptions of Mhr. ʾatfār ‘to paw the soil’ (ML 14) and Jib. ʾafār ‘to dig’ (JL 8). On this derivation see further Bulakh 2004:274-276 where similar (presumably independent) derivations elsewhere in Semitic are analyzed (such as Arb. ʾafar- ‘dust-colored inclining to white,’ Lan 2090).


Throughout MSA, the main terms for “sun” most probably go back to PS *yāwm- ‘day.’ Soqotri ʾxm is almost certainly no exception, see further below in 3.4.2 (pp. 569-570).

3.2.4. Etymologically uncertain terms

There are 16 positions of the list occupied by lexemes for which no reasonably reliable cognates have been detected outside MSA.

8. “black”: Mhr. ʾḥw-wr (ML 195), Jib. ʾhr (JL 120), Soq. ʾḥwr (LS 168).

The etymology of Proto-MSA *ḥāwVr- ‘black’ is extensively discussed in Bulakh 2004:273-274. According to M. Bulakh, this common term can be related to Arb. ʾawar- ‘intense whiteness of the white of the eye and intense blackness of the black thereof’ (Lan 667), in its turn connected with Common Aramaic *wr ‘to be white’ (HALOT 299, 1871).

9. “blood”: Mhr. ʾdrw (ML 81), Jib. ʾshr (JL 47), Soq. ʾdr (LS 134).

The origin of Proto-MSA *dVr(y)- ‘blood’ is uncertain. Its formal similarity to the widespread PS biconsonantal element *dr ‘to sow, to scatter’ is conspicuous, but there is hardly any persuasive way to reconcile the semantic difference between them. PS *dam- ‘blood’ (SED I No. 50) is relegated to the meaning “pus” throughout MSA: Mhr. ʾdm (ML 71), Jib. dihm (JL 39), Soq. ʾdem (Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1454).


1398 “To scatter” > “to spill blood” (as actually attested in Tgr. tūzārātu ‘to be strewn, to be shed (blood),’ WTS 496)? The presence of ʾd in the continental MSA excludes any relationship between Soq. ʾdr and Arb. ʾdr ‘to flow,’ dirrat- ‘blood’ (contra LS 134 and Kogan 2004b:196).
15. “cold”: Mhr. kāşām (ML 240), Jib. kēşām (JL 152), Soq. kēşam (LS 382).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *kēšm ‘to be cold’ is uncertain. For the MSA reflexes of PWS *kērr v. 2.4.1 below (p. 551).

24. “egg”: Mhr. kāwḥāl (ML 227), Jib. kahēţīn (JL 143), Soq. kōhēţīn (LS 369).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *kēlh- ‘egg’ is uncertain, its hypothetical connection with EthS forms with the same meaning (like Amh. ṭmkal) is far from certain (cf. SED I No. 170 and Chapter 2, p. 114 above).

35. “green”: Mhr. hāţāwr (ML 163), Jib. šdēţr (JL 265), Soq. šdēţar (LS 420).
⇒ Proto-MSA *sēš ‘to be green’ comes close to Arb. ḥādr with the same meaning (Lane 754), but the extremely problematic correspondence *s vs. *h makes a straightforward acceptance of this equation rather unappealing (see further Bittner 1915b:67, Bulakh 2004:276–277). There is no trace of PS *wrk ‘to be green’ in MSA.

42. “I”: Mhr. hā (ML 149), Jib. hé (JL 93), Soq. ho (LS 138).

45. “to know”: Mhr. γarōb (ML 140), Jib. γārō (JL 88), Soq. rérob (LS 325).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *γrb ‘to know’ is uncertain. The only immediate parallel is Sab. γrb ‘to know, to be aware of, recognize’ (SD 54), but one may wonder whether this sparsely attested verb is autochthonous in Sabaic.1400 Comparison with Arb. γrb ‘to know’ accepted in LS and elsewhere implies two phonological irregularities and can hardly be appealing. Shall one tentatively suspect an ultimate connection with PS *γrb/*γrb ‘to come, to enter’ (“to come across” > “to learn”)? For a recent attempt to connect Proto-MSA *γrb ‘to know’ with Arb. γarōb ‘strange, unusual’ and semantically similar lexemes within and outside Arabic v. Bulakh 2013b.

PS *wdē is relatively well preserved throughout MSA (Mhr. wīda, ML 421; Hrs. yōda, HL 146; Jib. édar, JL 286; Soq. édar, LS 52), but does not function as the main verb for “to know” in any of these languages (Bulakh–Kogan 2013).

46. “leaf”: Mhr. γyāfēt (ML 359), Jib. γyīfāt (JL 237), Soq. ṣavīfo (LS 354).

---

1399 Translated as ‘yellow,’ although the verb šēṣr is rendered as ‘to become green.’

1400 The meaning “to know” in Ja 651:54–55 is assured by parallels with dē and sēṣr (Müller 1966:107, Stein 2003:204). For a few additional references from the newly published documents on wood v. Stein 2010:723.
51. “man”: Mhr. ṣayg (ML 147), Jib. ṣég (JL 91), Soq. váyg (LS 307).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣayg- ‘man’ is obscure. This nominal form is undoubtedly connected with the verbal root *ṣayg ‘to give birth’ (ML 146, JL 91, LS 306), but it is hard to say whether the verb — in any case, similarly obscure from the etymological point of view — is denotative or vice versa (cf. Müller 1909b:351–354).

63. “one”: Mhr. ṭāṭ (ML 406), Jib. ṭād (JL 274), Soq. ṭad (LS 199).
⇒ Proto-MSA *ṭad- ‘one’ is obviously identical to Qat. ḫdl ‘one’ (LIQ 77), but one may doubt that this completely isolated term is autochthonous in ESA (rather, an MSA substratum or adstratum influence has to be surmised). There is hardly any trace of PS *raḥad- ‘one’ in MSA.
Further background of *ṭad- is enigmatic. One may be tempted to follow M. Bittner (1913a:82) who analyzes it as an amalgamation of *raḥad- with some other element (but hardly the relative pronoun *ḏV as Bittner assumes), cf. Wilson-Wright 2014:4.

65. “rain”: Mhr. mursē (ML 256), Jib. móṣé (JL 165), Soq. méṣe (LS 234).
⇒ One is tempted to connect Proto-MSA *ma-laṣay- ‘rain’ with Akk. naššu ‘dew’ (CAD N1 202, AHw. 724). The unusual sequence of two sonorants in the Akkadian word makes feasible the secondary origin of n-, whereas the correspondence of Akk. (and PS) š to MSA s has good precedents elsewhere in the MSA vocabulary. This comparison is, however, quite tentative in any case. Contra Leslau, there is hardly

---

1401 Muh. ḫl ḫl ‘branch’ (EDG 179) is too isolated to be worth comparing. According to Leslau, it represents an *e-extension of ḫaf ‘branch,’ widely attested throughout modern EthS (EDG 178, EDH 50).
1402 At least synchronically, only about animals.
1403 As rightly observed by W. Leslau (1947:7), D. Müller’s comparison with Arb. ṭaw ‘to turn, to twist’ (Lane 2187), rather attractive from the semantic point of view, is faced with a serious phonological difficulty: *y in Proto-MSA is not easily compatible with ṭ in the Arabic form.
1404 Cf. Cantineau 1932:201: “Tout ce qu’on peut dire, c’est qu’un nom de nombre ‘un’ non attesté par ailleurs apparaît en qatabanique et en sudarabique moderne.”
1405 Forms like Mhr. ṭaḥad ‘someone, anyone’ (ML 4, Bittner 1913a:72), waḥayd ‘alone, solitary’ (ibid. 425), Jib. ḥyaḥ ‘to unite with’ (JL 289) are certainly borrowed from Arabic.
1406 The by-form naššu, common in OB, is diachronically secondary, being due to the assimilation li > šš well attested for that period (Swiggers 1980, Streck 2006:238).
1407 Cf. Akk. kišādū ‘neck’ — Mhr. kaššid ‘top of shoulder’ (SED I No. 147) as well as the remarks ibid. xci-xciv.
1408 See further Tgr. lāṣa ‘to be moist, smooth,’ lāṣaṣa ‘to be smooth’ (WTS 35), Tna. lāṣāṣa ‘to be soft, tender, fresh’ (TED 84), Amh. lāṣ aṭa ‘to be soft’ (AED 54), lāṣaṣaṣa ‘to be soft, pliant, flexible’ (ibid. 56), Har. lāṣaṣaṣa ‘soft, smooth’ (EDH 101), Muh. Msq. Gog. Sod. ḫṣaṣṣaṣa, Sel. ḫṣaṣṣaṣa, Wol. ḫṣaṣṣaṣa ‘to be soft’ (EDG 383).
any connection with Arb. *ly ‘to be damp, sticky, messy, dirty’ (WKAS L 202) as Arb. *l is not expected to correspond to s in MSA.

67. “road”: Mhr. wūrm (ML 7), Jib. ṛūrm (JL 4), Soq. ʿūrm (LS 75).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ARGV- ‘road’ is uncertain. M. Bittner (1914:55, 1915a:16, 1918b:8) compared it to Arb. ṛīram- ‘a sign or mark set up to show the way; stones set up as a sign or mark to show the way in the desert’ (Lane 51), which is not implausible. Of considerable interest is, furthermore, Akk. arēmmu ‘wharf, embankment (of a canal); ramp, causeway’ (CAD A2 227, AHw. 64).

71. “to say”: Mhr. ṣāmīr (ML 25), Jib. ṣīr (JL 13), Soq. ṭōmor (LS 315).

⇒ Proto-MSA *mr ‘to say’ has been identified by Leslau with Hbr. ṣmr with the same meaning and its CS cognates, but the presence of *r in the proto-form makes this equation rather problematic (note, moreover, that the very meaning “to say” for *mr seems to be a CS innovation with respect to the presumably more archaic “to see” and “to know” in Akkadian and EthS, v. Chapters 4 and 5, pp. 231 and 327 above).

72. “to see”: Mhr. śīnī (ML 381), Jib. śīnī (JL 253), Soq. śīnī (LS 431).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šny ‘to see’ is uncertain as none of the comparisons mentioned by Leslau¹⁴⁰⁹ is convincing semantically and/or phonologically.

90. “tree”: Mhr. ḥrmāyt (ML 160), Jib. ḥérūm (JL 99), Soq. ʾerhom (LS 422).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *hHRĀM- ‘tree’ is uncertain.¹⁴¹⁰ PS *RIṢ- ‘tree’ left no trace in MSA.

3.3. The Swadesh wordlist: conclusions

¹⁴⁰⁹ Such as Gez. ṣannaya ‘to be beautiful, to be good’ (CDG 531), Arb. sny ‘to shine brightly’ (Lane 1448), Hbr. ʾānā ‘crimson’ (HALOT 1603).

¹⁴¹⁰ Note perhaps Arb. ḥarm- ‘kind of saline plant’ (LA 12 722), ḥarmā = ṭal-qadīmu mina l-ḥaṭabi (TA 34 89) as well as Tgr. harāmo ‘straw’ (WTS 9). In Soqotri, ʾerhom is attested side by side with yhēram (LS 146), but the former variant is much more common in the Vienna corpus and normal in the speech of our informants. As rightly observed in DRS 455, Jibbali ḥérūm and Soqotri ʾerhom “ne présentent pas une correspondance normale.” Indeed, the presence of h in Jibbali precludes the possibility of considering š in Soqotri as original and forces one to explain it as a secondary hypercorrection, similar to ṣed ‘tonnerre’ (LS 412) < PS *hadd-. The emergence of such hypercorrect forms in Soqotri is by no means surprising. PS *h, very rare in lexical morphemes throughout Semitic, has practically ceased to exist as an independent phoneme in Soqotri, being almost completely absorbed by the palatal yh. The latter, in its turn, is a regular morphophonemic alternant of š, replacing it whenever a front vowel appears (diachronically) after or before. In such conditions, an etymological *h can secondarily shift into š word-initially in a nominal lexeme where its phonetic environment is stable and no alternation š/yh is possible (unlike verbal roots, where the first consonant can be preceded by the 3 sg. m. prefix *yi-, triggering the shift *š > yh). The Soqotri term for “sun”/“day” (šyn) is also to be accounted for by this phenomenon (see below in this chapter, pp. 569-570).
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3.3.1. As we have seen in the preceding section, the total amount of lexical items shared by Mehri, Jibbali and Soqotri in the Swadesh wordlist is 57. By the standards of classical glottochronological procedure, this rate is comparatively low and suggests a sufficiently deep level of disintegration. From the internal Semitic perspective, however, the Modern South Arabian languages still look as a rather tightly-knit genealogical unit. Comparison with the Ethiopian Semitic picture analyzed above in Chapter 7 is instructive in this sense. With no less than 68 basic lexemes traced back to Proto-EthS, this group may at first sight look much narrower than MSA, but this impression is deceptive: as soon as any concrete trio of individual EthS languages is taken for comparison (Geez–Tigre–Harari, Geez–Amharic–Harari, etc.), the amount of shared basic lexemes hardly ever exceeds 45.\textsuperscript{1411} The Hebrew–Syriac–Arabic picture (43 shared positions in the list) is only slightly inferior. In other words, the genealogical rank of Proto-MSA is substantially lower than that of Proto-EthS and Proto-CS.

3.3.2. As repeatedly observed throughout this monograph, our primary concern is not the statistical evidence in itself, but rather the diachronic rationale behind it. From this point of view, the unusually low amount of trivial retentions in the Proto-MSA list (23) is striking. Indeed, the extraordinarily high degree of erosion of the PS basic vocabulary in Proto-MSA turns out to be one of the principal hallmarks of this subdivision, as witnessed by the (almost) traceless loss of such nearly ubiquitous protolexemes as *ybš ‘tree,’ *∫ahad ‘one,’ *ʾanp ‘nose,’ *pay ‘mouth,’ *rajm ‘bone,’ *ykl ‘to eat,’ *qar ‘fire,’ *anā(ku) ‘I,’ *šdy ‘to drink,’ *ḥdl ‘(to be) new,’ *wrk ‘(to be) green.’

3.3.3. The Proto-MSA lexical features qualified above as non-trivial retentions point in the same direction even more clearly, as one can deduce from their very limited number (12). Furthermore, in almost every case, we are faced with lexemes whose cognates are restricted to just one or two Semitic languages and even there tend to display a fairly marginal functional status. An interesting corollary of this trend is the absence from the Proto-MSA lexical inventory of some basic lexemes which are very common in the rest of West Semitic.\textsuperscript{1412} *ybš ‘to be dry,’ *ḥdl ‘to kill,’ *rny ‘to see,’ *kwum ‘to stand.’ This is one of the chief factors making so loose the genealogical connection between MSA and the remaining WS branches (CS and EthS), for which see Chapter 2 above (pp. 110-114 and 125-126).

3.3.4. The number of proven semantic innovations in the Proto-MSA Swadesh wordlist is not very high (6), but this is basically in agreement with what one can find in the majority of other genealogical subdivisions of Semitic. Given the fact that the path of semantic evolution is relatively clear and persuasive in each of these cases, these

\textsuperscript{1411} The sheer discrepancy between the two figures (68 and 45) is rooted in the different methodologies of counting: the figure 68 has been obtained not for a fixed number of concrete languages, but rather for the main representatives of minor genealogical subdivisions (Tigre or Tigrinya, Amharic or Argobba, Harari or East Gurage, etc.). In itself, this methodology is sound and fits well the main purpose of our inquiry: a PS root preserved in Argobba but lost in Amharic can indeed be traced back to Proto-EthS without much hesitation. Needless to say, it could not be applied to MSA where only three major languages are extant.

\textsuperscript{1412} That is, those non-trivial retentions which, because of their broad attestation and high functional prominence, almost approach the trivial ones in their status.
shared lexical features provide a small but important contribution to our understanding of MSA as a diachronic unity.

3.3.5. A surprisingly high amount of terms without clear etymological connections is another prominent peculiarity of the core vocabulary of MSA: no less than 16 shared lexical isoglosses belonging to this category have been detected in the Proto-MSA Swadesh wordlist. It is this segment of the basic lexicon, supplemented by scores of fundamental lexical features from outside the Swadesh wordlist, that gives the MSA vocabulary its famously peculiar aspect, at times so strikingly “non-Semitic” that some sort of external influence (substratum or adstratum) might legitimately suggest itself as an explanatory model.

3.4. Lexical evidence for the historical unity of MSA outside the Swadesh wordlist

It is now time to check the validity of the results obtained from a relatively restricted segment of the basic vocabulary upon the evidence of a broader lexical corpus. For this purpose, the standard dictionaries of Mehri, Jibbali and Soqotri have been systematically perused in search of shared lexemes which can be considered exclusive (or highly specific) features of this subgroup. As elsewhere in this monograph, full semantic equivalence between the terms under comparison has been considered an important desideratum. A more liberal semantic approach to particular entries will be explicitly acknowledged.

3.4.1. Proto-MSA lexical isoglosses

1. Mhr. ḥā-bū, Jib. ṣʊ (det. ṣ-y), Soq. Ṗefo ‘people’ (ML 2, JL 1, LS 69).
   ⇒ The similarity between Soq. Ṗefo ‘parents, couple, famille, gens’ (LS 69) and Ṗif- ‘père’ (LS 68) makes plausible D. Müller’s derivation of the former from the latter (1909b:350), although the exact phonological and morphological implications of this etymology remain rather uncertain (Lonnet 1999:189). Leslau is undoubtedly correct to dissociate the MSA terms from Gez. sabr ‘people’ (CDG 482), contra Bittner 1908:426, 1915a:10 (also rejected by D. Müller apud Bittner 1909:120).
   
   Proto-MSA *ḥib-V ‘people’ has probably replaced PS *nVS- (v. Chapters 3 and 5 above, pp. 175-176 and 336 respectively), which left no trace in MSA.

2. Mhr. ḥā-rawn, Jib. ṙerūn, Soq. ṕerūn ‘goats’ (ML 7, JL 4, LS 75).

---

1413 For Leslau, “la terminaison -o est la terminaison du collectif.” What is meant is probably the ending -o which replaces -i in the plural of nisbas in Jibbali: ṙũf, pl. ṙũfor ‘first’ (JL 4). ṕagri, pl. ṕagrōn ‘bedouin’ (ibid. 53). In Soqotri, the same pattern is preserved in many tribal designations: ḏārhiḥ ‘the Daarho tribe’, ḏārhi ‘a man from Daarho.’ As far as the phonetic shift *ib > if (Soqotri)/y (Jibbali) is concerned, a clear parallel is Soq. if-ūl, Jib. y-y ‘how’ (LS 69, JL 1) as opposed to Mhr. ḥib-ū (ML 2). Cf. LS 37 where this process is explained (probably incorrectly) by the influence of i that follows the labial. Needless to say, the origin of the i-vowel in Proto-MSA *ʔib- ‘father’ is a mystery of its own.

1414 Curiously enough, the MSA lexeme is the only cognate adduced for the Geez term in CDG 482.
The etymology of Proto-MSA *ūn-* 'goats,' which functions as a suppletive plural of *ūz-* 'goat' throughout MSA, is not quite certain, for some tentative proposals see SED II Nos. 13, 16 and 18.\footnote{Also the singular *ūz- (Mhr. wōz, Jib ẁez, Soq. ẁez) is a highly peculiar formal isogloss of MSA in comparison to PS *̬u̥z-, to which it must be somehow related (SED II No. 35).}

3. Mhr. ṭāy-bal, Jib. ṭayél, Soq. ṭibhal 'flint' (ML 10, JL 6, LS 293).\footnote{The Soqotri term is rendered as 'pierres pointues' and 'broken stones' in LS 293 and JL 6 (v. below in this section, p. 551).}

The etymology of Proto-MSA *ribal- 'flint' is uncertain. Contra Leslau, any connection with PS *ūn-* 'stone' is completely excluded; more appealing is his comparison with Arb. ūrabal- 'a mountain of which the stones are white; rough, rugged thick stone which may be red, black or white' (Lane 1942). One wonders, furthermore, whether the Arabic and MSA terms may be related to one of the general meanings of the root ᶥbl in Arabic, viz. 'to be large, big, thick' (Lane 1941). The Arabic root is, in its turn, likely related to Tgr. ūrabīle 'strong, mightly' (WTS 469), Tna. ūrabīlā to dominate, to overwhelm' (TED 1872).

Proto-MSA *ribal- 'flint' has likely replaced PS *ūn-rr- (v. Chapter 3, p. 201 above), which left no trace in MSA.

4. Mhr. ṭēdāg, Jib. ṭēdāg, Soq. ṭēdōr 'to suck' (ML 11, JL 6, LS 299).\footnote{The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣdg 'to suck' is unclear. Akk. ʾēdīku 'rejeton' compared by Leslau does not exist (cf. CAD E 33).}

The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣdg 'to suck' may have replaced PS *ynk, probably preserved with metathesis in Proto-MSA *yn 'to suckle' (v. below in this section, p. 551).

5. Mhr. ṭadāl, Jib. ṭēdāl, Soq. ṭēdal 'to lift, to raise, to carry' (ML 12, JL 6, LS 299).\footnote{The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣdl 'to lift, to carry' is uncertain. Leslau tentatively compares Arb. ṣdl-, ṭadēl- 'ballot de marchandise,' but the actual meaning of the Arabic words seems to be 'half of a load on either of the two sides of the camel' (Lane 1974), thus clearly derived from the basic meaning of the verbal root ṣdl 'to be equal.'}

The etymology of Proto-MSA *ṣfr 'to grow' is uncertain. Cf. perhaps Arb. ṣfr (V) 'to be accumulated (fat on an animal); to grow well (plants)' (TA 13 114), Tna. ṣakērā 'to save, to put in reserve; to hoard, to amass, to accumulate' (TED 1866), Amh. ʾakfrērā

6. Mhr. ṭāḥāw, Jib. ṭākhār, Soq. ṭēkar 'to grow' (ML 20, JL 11, LS 324).

The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣfr 'to grow' is uncertain. Cf. perhaps Arb. ṣfr (V) 'to be accumulated (fat on an animal); to grow well (plants)' (TA 13 114), Tna. ṣakērā 'to save, to put in reserve; to hoard, to amass, to accumulate' (TED 1866), Amh. ʾakfrērā
‘to collect’ (AED 1185). Comparison with PS *wkr ‘to be heavy’ proposed by M. Bittner (1918a:9) and accepted by W. Leslau is hardly appealing from the phonological point of view.

   ⇒ M. Bittner (1909:14, 1915b:8) and W. Leslau are undoubtedly correct to derive Proto-MSA *jamk- ‘middle’ from PS *mḵ ‘to be deep’ (CDG 63), notwithstanding a somewhat peculiar semantic development.

8. Mhr. ṭāmāl, Jib. ṭāl, Soq. ṭamāl ‘field, farm’ (ML 24, JL 13, LS 314).
   ⇒ As rightly surmised by M. Bittner (1909:18) and W. Leslau, Proto-MSA *amal- ‘field’ must be identical to Arb. ḍamal- ‘work, labor’ (Lane 2158). In Classical Arabic this term does not seem to display any agricultural meaning which is, however, well attested in the Arabic dialects of Southern Arabia (Landberg 1901:663, GD 2330-2331, Behnstedt 867, Piamenta 341, Rhodokanakis 41). In such conditions, it is hard to say whether we are faced with a (relatively early?) Arabic loanword into individual MSA languages or rather with a Proto-MSA term which influenced the local Arabic dialects. Admittedly, the phonetic shape of the Soqotri word (final stress, the “soft” ʕ) rather unambiguously speaks in favor of the the first possibility.

9. Mhr. ṭānēt, Jib. ṭānit, Soq. ṭānī ‘skin (for water, milk etc.)’ (ML 26, JL 14, LS 316).
   ⇒ The etymology of Proto-MSA *an-Vt- ‘skin’ is unknown.

10. Mhr. ḍār, Jib. ṣar, Soq. ḍār ‘but’ (ML 26, JL 14, LS 325).
   ⇒ The etymology of Proto-MSA *ar ‘but’ is uncertain. A cognate relationship with Arb. ḍayr- (Lane 2315) is rather attractive, but ḍ instead of ḍ is hard to explain.

    ⇒ The etymology of Proto-MSA *ardVb- ‘nape’ is unknown.

Note, however, that the meaning “to collect” in EthS is usually derived from the more basic “to wrap up, to make a bundle,” preserved in Gez. ḍakāţārā (CDG 68), Tgr. ḍakrā (WTS 467), Har. ḍakārā (EDH 30).

Forms with ḍ are admittedly known from some Arabic dialects of Southern Arabia (GD 2388, Rhodokanakis 44), but, as rightly acknowledged in Rhodokanakis 76, one cannot exclude that such forms are actually due to the MSA influence.

The Jibbali term is missing from JL. The Soqotri lexeme is translated as ‘tresse qui tombe sur la nuque’ in LS 326, but as rightly observed in Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1991:1452 its actual attestations in the texts of the Vienna expedition (as well as in the present-day usage) are in the genitive combination di-ṣarēdeb, whose original meaning can be easily reconstructed as “that of the neck.” The possibility of independent usage with the meaning “nape of the neck” has been confirmed by our informants.
12. Mhr. ṭāīṭr ‘to back off,’ šārār ‘to have the throat blocked or paralyzed after a snake-bite’ (ML 26), Jib. ṭeṛ ‘to dam, to staunch; to stop from going’ (JL 14), Soq. ṭer ‘enfermer, surveillir, retenir’ (LS 329).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭyr ‘to block, to withhold’ is unknown.

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭṣṣ ‘to rise’ is uncertain. In view of the variant ṭṣy in Soqotri (LS 331), it may be not unreasonable to compare Arb. ṭṣw ‘to repair, to betake oneself by night’ (Lane 2054). Cf. also Tgr. ṭassā ‘to fly; to run quickly’ (WTS 464) as well as Akk. ašāšu ‘to be worried’ (CAD A 422, AHw. 79).

14. Mhr. bār, Jib. baṣār, Soq. bōr ‘to go by night’ (ML 41, JL 22, LS 92).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *br ‘to go by night’ is obscure.

15. Mhr. bādō, Jib. bēdē, Soq. bēd ‘to lie’ (ML 43, JL 23, LS 82).
⇒ Proto-MSA *bdy ‘to lie’ is related to Hbr. bdv ‘to invent, to devise’ (HALOT 109), Syr. bdā ‘finxit, commentus est’ (LSyr. 59), perhaps Zwy. (a)buṣ‘i ‘to cheat, to deceive’ (EDG 134). It is tempting to identify these terms with Arb. bdv ‘to originate, to bring into being, to create’ (Lane 163) and Sab. bdyn ‘first occasion’ (SD 26), with an underlying semantic shift “to lie” > “to create, to invent” > “to make for the first time” > “to begin” (cf. DRS 44). In any case, the high functional prominence of the MSA root in comparison to the rather marginal attestation of *bdv in Hebrew, Syriac and Zway is noteworthy.

⇒ Proto-MSA *bv ‘here’ has often been identified with Hbr. pō with the same meaning (HALOT 916), but the consonantal irregularity remains unexplained. Contra Leslau, there is hardly any connection with Gez. bo ‘there is’ which can be transparently analyzed as the preposition ba- ‘in’ with the 3 sg. masc. pronominal suffix (CDG 82).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *bvr ‘already’ is uncertain, for a survey of very tentative proposals v. Leslau’s remarks in LS 97–98 (notably, about the possibility of identifying it with Common Aramaic *kfbār with the same meaning, presumably analyzable as *k-f-bār, cf. HALOT 459, Wagner 1966:64).

⇒ There are two possible etymological approaches to Proto-MSA *bry ‘to bear.’ On the one hand, it can be considered denominative from Proto-MSA *bvr- ‘son,’ in its

---

1423 The presence of *bdv ‘to begin’ throughout MSA is no obstacle for this comparison as the corresponding terms — Mhr. ṭbōtē (ML 42), Jib. bēdēr (JL 22), Soq. bēd ‘(LS 81) — are likely borrowed from Arabic.
turn representing a peculiar phonological evolution of PS *bin-. On the other hand, it can be identified with the PS verbal root *br̲y/*br̲y ‘to shape, to create,’ attested in Hbr. br̲y ‘to create’ (HALOT 153), Syr. br̲â ‘creavit’ (LSyr. 94), Arb. br̲y ‘to form, to fashion by cutting, to shape out’ (Lane 107), 1424 Sab. Min. Qat. br̲ ‘to build, construct’ (SD 30, ML 23, LIQ 32). The semantic shift “to build” > “to bear” is well documented for Akk. banû (CAD B 83, AHw. 103), cf. GD 143.

Proto-MSA *br̲y ‘to bear’ ousted PS *w̲ld, whose meager traces in Mehri and Jibbali1425 can be plausibly explained as Arabisms.

⇒ The etymology of Proto-MSA *dawn- ‘stone, stony plain’ is unknown.

⇒ Proto-MSA *dVmn- ‘pus’ goes back to PS *dam- ‘blood’ (SED I No. 50), ousted from its original semantic slot by Proto-MSA *dVn- (see above in this chapter, p. 531).

21. Mhr. dâyni, Jib. dîni, Soq. dîni ‘to be pregnant’ (ML 72, JL 40, LS 130).
⇒ Proto-MSA *dny has been compared to Arb. dânw (IV) ‘to be near to bringing forth’ (Lane 921) in LS 131, DRS 281, SED I No. 10, which must imply a contamination of the original meaning “to be pregnant” with the normal meaning of Arb. dânw “to be close, near” (rejected in Bittner 1915a:26, cf. GD 857). Comparison with Cha. dâna, Eža dâanna, End. dâna ‘to be coupled, to conceive’ (EDG 210), proposed in Müller 1975:68 and accepted in SED I No. 10, becomes difficult in view of Leslau’s identification of the Gurage forms with *dry, represented by Muh. Msq. dârra ‘to be covered, to conceive’ (EDG 217) and Amh. dârra ‘to be sexually aroused (cow after becoming dry)’ (AED 1731).

Proto-MSA *dny ‘to be pregnant’ replaced PS *hry (SED I No. 20,).

22. Mhr. madîrêm, Jib. madîrm, Soq. mîdârhem ‘heel’ (ML 74, JL 41, LS 135).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *madîram- ‘heel’ is uncertain. Comparison with Arb. dîrm ‘to be even, to have no protruding parts’ (LA 12 229) is semantically problematic, although it is noteworthy that this root is mostly applied to parts of the body (notably, to šurqūb ‘Achilles’ tendon’). Cf. also Arb. dîrm ‘to move slowly; to move with small steps (like a hedgehog or a hare)’ (LA 12 230). Syr. mîdâram ‘astutus, mîdârmatā ‘astutia, improbitas, machinatio’ (LSyr. 167) may be of some interest in view of Hbr. ḫâkh ‘heel’ — ḫb ‘to betray’ (HALOT 872–873).

Proto-MSA *madîram- ‘heel’ replaced PS *sâkhîb- (SED I No. 14).

---

1424 Koranic br̲ ‘to create’ is usually considered a Hebrew loanword (Jeffery 1938:75–76). The same may be true of the Syriac verb and its Aramaic parallels.
1425 Mhr. wâlûd ‘children’ (ML 428), Jib. el̲d ‘to beget,’ élêd ‘children’ (JL 291).
Leslau compares Proto-MSA *dVr- ‘stranger’ with Hbr. z gör ‘strange, different; stranger’ (HALOT 279), treating *dV- as a reflex of the nisbah suffix. This comparison is not accepted in DRS 340–341, 709–710 where the Hebrew and MSA forms are attributed to phonologically and structurally different types of roots, viz. *zwr/*zyr and *dwr/*dwr/*dvr (cf. already Bittner 1915b:57). The first root is further represented by Akk. zēru ‘to dislike, to hate, to avoid’ (CAD Z 97, AHw. 1522), Sam. zr ‘strange, other’ (DNWSI 340), perhaps Arb. zwr ‘to visit’ (Lane 1268), Qat. s-l-zr ‘to ask to visit’ (LIQ 59), Gez. zwr ‘to go around’ (CDG 646), Tgr. zāwārā ‘to go around, to circulate’ (WTS 502), Tna. zorā ‘to go about, to wander around’ (TED 2009), Amh. zorā ‘to go around, to roam, not to be able to remain in the same place’ (AED 1664), Gog. zorā ‘to go around’ (EDG 714, with cognates in other Gurage), all from “to be an outsider,” “to be strange, foreign.” The second root does not seem to display any transparent representative outside MSA, but cf. perhaps Arb. dvr (IV) ‘to make angry, to incite against’ (Lane 958). Since Proto-MSA *d is not easily compatible with z in Arb. zwr, it seems better to keep the MSA forms apart from PS *zwr in spite of the striking semantic coincidence with some of its reflexes.

The origin of Proto-MSA *dgor ‘to fall’ is unknown.

The origin of Proto-MSA *gedh ‘to come, to drift ashore’ is uncertain. Clearly related is Arb. miţiđâh- ‘seashore’ (TA 6 336), but one may doubt that this extremely rare and isolated word is autochthonous in Arabic.

As duly acknowledged in CDG 208, the etymology of Proto-MSA *ghm ‘to do things in the morning’ is highly debatable. On the one hand, it remains tempting to follow M. Bittner (1914:25, cf. Rundgren 1955:254) who connected this root with Gez. gesam, Tgr. gesäm ‘tomorrow’ (WTS 580). The main obstacle to this comparison, unrecognized by Leslau, is that PS *š does not normally yield h in Jibbali (an ad hoc Mehrizing influence can hardly be considered a satisfactory solution). On the other

---

1426 The specific meaning “to fall ill” in Soqotri must be due to secondary development.

1427 The semantic priority of one of the two meanings is hard to establish. One could easily assume that the meaning “to drift ashore” in the continental languages represents a secondary development of the more basic “to come,” but the reverse development is equally possible, cf. French arriver < ad-ri-pâre (Buck 1949:703). The Arabic parallel seems to corroborate the second possibility.

1428 This is not the only problem with this etymology. As is well known, the verbal root with the meaning “to do things in the morning”/“tomorrow” throughout EthS is *gys rather than *gsm, as in Gez.
hand, the root *ghm with meanings rather close to those postulated for Proto-MSA is also attested in Arabic and ESA: Arb. žahmat-, žahmat- ‘the beginning or the last part of the night’ (Lane 478),\textsuperscript{1429} Sab. ghmy ‘last part of the night just before dawn,’ ghm ‘to go just before dawn’ (SD 49).\textsuperscript{1430} One could ascribe these forms to a substratum/adstratum influence of MSA, but this is hardly more than a purely theoretical possibility.

27. Mhr. gḥāb, Jib. gahāb, Soq. gāḥāb ‘to come ashore’ (ML 117, JL 73, LS 107).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ghb ‘to come ashore’ is unknown. The same meaning for this root is attested in the Arabic dialects of Southern Arabia (Landberg 1901:531, GD 264, Piaminta 61), but it is hard to say whether the MSA terms are borrowed from Arabic or rather the Arabic ones are due to substratum/adstratum influence of MSA.

28. Mhr. gēḥi ‘flat desert, desert plain’ (ML 118), Jib. gōḥi ‘flat desert plain’ (JL 74), Soq. gāḥi ‘vallée, rivière’ (LS 118).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *gāḥi- ‘plain, valley’ is obscure. Of some interest may be Tna. guḥo ‘cave, crevice or hollow in a mountainside’ (TED 2228). For žahī ‘sol’ in Dathina v. GD 266 (due to MSA influence?).

29. Mhr. gēlāw ‘to be ill, fevered’ (ML 119), Jib. gīži id. (JL 75), Soq. gōle ‘maladie’ (LS 109).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *glw ‘to be ill’ is unknown. Assuming that the original meaning of the root is “to be hot,” one might tentatively compare Arb. žlω ‘to be clear, bright’ (Lane 446–447).

This root is competing with the reflexes of PS *mrš with the same meaning (ML 271, JL 174, LS 251).\textsuperscript{1431}

30. Mhr. gamh, Jib. gemš, Soq. gomš ‘skink’ (ML 120, JL 76).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *gams- ‘skink’ is unknown.

31. Mhr. gafūn, Jib. gīfūn, Soq. gafūn ‘stuffed skin given in place of her young one to a bereaved mother-animal’ (ML 115, JL 72, LS 114).

⇒ As rightly acknowledged in EDG 267 and DRS 170, Proto-MSA *gVpan- ‘stuffed skin’ cannot be separated from phonetically similar terms designating the same

gesa ‘to be early’ (CDG 208) or Har. gis ‘tomorrow’ (EDH 76). In such conditions, it seems only reasonable to interpret the element -am in Geez and Tigre as a fossilized adverbial suffix, which would force one to analyze the Proto-MSA root, too, as going back to *gyš-m with loss of *y and secondary incorporation of *m into the consonantal root. That such a peculiar development took place independently in MSA and EthS is hardly conceivable (a non-motivated loss of -m accompanied by the emergence of -y in EthS, tentatively surmised in Bittner 1914:25–26, is of course equally improbable).

\textsuperscript{1429} For this root in Dathina v. GD 304.

\textsuperscript{1430} Of further interest is Tna. gahmi ‘nyctalopia, night blindness’ (TED 2197).

\textsuperscript{1431} In view of the rather marginal presence of mrš in Soqotri, one wonders whether its broad attestation in the continental languages might be due to Arabic influence.
device in Southern EthS: Amh. giatan (AED 2073), Muh. giatan, Msq. gaatila, Cha. Eza Gyt. giatan, Enm. gatifura, End. gofur, Sel. goflala (EDG 266). The ultimate origin of this peculiar areal isogloss is obscure. Any connection with Arb. ẓafn- ‘scabbard, sheath’ (Lane 434)?

32. Mhr. yā, Jib. ayā, Soq. ṣē- ‘brother’ (ML 145, JL 90, LS 56).

33. Mhr. yābār, Jib. yār, Soq. yēbār ‘to meet’ (ML 131, JL 82, LS 295).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ybr ‘to meet’ is obscure. Could it be related to Arb. ybr ‘to remain, to tarry’ (Lane 2223) with a peculiar semantic development?

34. Mhr. yādāw ‘crack, depression on a mountain’ (ML 133), Jib. yādār ‘depression on a mountain’ (JL 83), Soq. yādho ‘défilé’ (LS 299), ‘low mountain, hill, prominence’ (ML 133, JL 83).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *yadVw ‘low mountain, hill’ is unknown.

35. Mhr. yālēt ‘mist’ (ML 136), Jib. yāzzē id. (JL 85), Soq. arlīlo ‘nuage’ (LS 310).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *yill-at- ‘mist’ is uncertain. Comparison with Gez. rawlo ‘tempest, whirlwind, storm’ (CDG 78), Syr. arīlā ‘procella’ (LSyr. 526) seems attractive (Kogan 2005c:197–198), whereas Leslau’s identification with Arb. arīl- ‘clouds disposed one above another’ (Lane 2125) is difficult because of the phonological irregularity. Furthermore, one cannot exclude that the Arabic noun is secondarily derived from the verbal root ʾlll with the general meaning “to repeat, to do a second time.” Also noteworthy are Arb. ʾalal- ‘water having no current, only appearing a little upon the surface of the earth, disappearing at one time and appearing at another’ and ʾayl- ‘water running upon the surface of the earth’ (Lane 2278, 2318).

36. Mhr. yafāẓ ‘to tie’ (ML 135), Jib. yafāz ‘to wrap’ (JL 84), Soq. ʾāfaẓ ‘attacher’ (LS 320).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *yff ‘to tie, to wrap’ is uncertain. Any connection with PS *ṣjp/*ṣp with similar meanings (CDG 74–75)?

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *yarṣVn- ‘wrist’ is unknown.

38. Mhr. yātrī ‘to speak’ (ML 142), Jib. yātrī ‘talk, speech, language’ (JL 89), Soq. ʾotēr ‘parler’ (LS 326).
The origin of Proto-MSA *gry 'to speak' is unknown, as none of the hypothetical cognates tentatively considered by Leslau is even remotely similar to this root.

39. Mhr. yasrawān ‘in the early evening’ (ML 143), Jib. yasré ‘at night’ (JL 89), Soq. yasréhin ‘tard dans l’après-midi’ (LS 318).

⇒ The origin of the Proto-MSA adverb *γς- in the early evening’ is unknown. Contra Leslau, it can hardly be related to Arb. yasr-, which would imply two phonological irregularities.

40. Mhr. yážm, Jib. yéžm, Soq. rēžm ‘to love’ (ML 149, JL 93, LS 322).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *γς- ‘to love’ is unknown. M. Bittner (1915a:40) compares it with Arb. yhn (III) ‘to talk or act with the woman in an amatory and enticing manner, with the contracting of the eyes so as to wrinkle the lids’ (Lane 2268).

41. Mhr. h-, hāl (with 1 sg. suff. háyni), Jib. ḥ-, her (with suff. h-, with 1 sg. suff. hīnī), Soq. ḥ- (with 1 sg. suff. ēnhī, without suff. e-) ‘to, for’ (ML 150, JL 1, 98, LS 137).

⇒ The etymology of the Proto-MSA dative preposition *HV- is debatable. The only direct parallel seems to be h- in Hadramitic, functionally equivalent to l- in Sabaic and Qatabanian and k- in Minaic (Beeston 1962:54–56).1432 In the wake of V. Christian (1924:159, 1944:18), D. Testen (2003) has equated the MSA preposition with Akk. ana (and, further, Tna. no-), but the secondary h- in MSA, although not without precedents, is rather hard to explain.1433 Derivation from *HV- via spirantization proposed in LS 137 and Lipiński 1997:464 (implicit also in Blažek 2007:33) is unappealing.

42. Mhr. hōla‘, Jib. hōla‘, Soq. mil‘āh ‘shadow’ (ML 156, JL 96, LS 143).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *HV/Vr- ‘shadow’ is uncertain. As there is no feasible parallel with *h-,1434 one may be inclined to agree with the authors of DRS 418 who, following Leslau, surmise that the first consonant of the protoform is *š, comparing it to Arb. sīh- ‘a like, a fellow’ (Lane 1407). This etymology is contradicted by the presence of h in Jibbali, but, as rightly acknowledged in DRS, the Jibbali lexeme seems to be specifically poetic and, therefore, probably Mehrizing.1435

Proto-MSA *HV/Vr- ‘shadow’ ousted PS *jill- (HALOT 1024, CDG 555).1436

---

1432 In Huchnergard 2002b:129, this isogloss is actually considered an important link between Hadramitic and MSA, opposing the former language to the rest of ESA. It is somewhat surprising that the Hadramitic preposition is not mentioned at all in D. Testen’s special study on the topic (2003).

1433 The presence of *h- in proto-Akkadian is excluded by the Sargonic spelling a-na (Hasselbach 2005:167).

1434 Hardly any connection with Arb. hhr ‘to be agitated, to lack patience’ (LA 8 445).

1435 The basic term for “shadow” in Jibbali seems to be gūfir (JL 72, Nakano 1986:106), cognate with Soq. žif‘er ‘shadow, shade, unclear contours of an object’ (missing from LS, detected in the course of our fieldwork).

1436 T. M. Johnstone (JL 49) is probably correct to ascribe Jib. ǧilid ‘shade’ to Arabic influence.
43. Mhr. ḥān̄d, Jib. ohúnd, Soq. yhénōd ‘to feel drowsy, sleepy’ (ML 158, JL 97, LS 145).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *hnd ‘to be sleepy’ is uncertain. The authors of DRS 431 are probably correct to identify it with Arb. hnd (II) ‘to be slow in doing, to be reluctant to do something’ (TA 9 351 = qaṣṣara fī:l-ramri), Tgr. ḥan̄d gāva ‘to be lazy, amazed’ (WTS 19). Leslau’s comparison with Arb. nadv ‘to sway, to swing because of drowsiness’ (LA 3 527) is semantically attractive, but there is hardly any evidence for the prefixal nature of h- in MSA. The authors of DRS tentatively surmise that h- in the MSA forms may go back to *š, but no feasible etymology for the hypothetical *šnd is at hand.

44. Mhr. ḥāybar, Jib. hēr, Soq. hébor ‘to be cold’ (ML 164, JL 101, LS 160).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥbr ‘to be cold’ is unknown.

45. Mhr. ḥāgāl, Jib. ḥāgāl, Soq. ḥāgāl ‘eyebrow’ (ML 171, JL 106, LS 162).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥāgāl- ‘eyebrow’ is uncertain. One may be tempted to connect it with the verbal root *ḥgl ‘to encircle, to surround,’ well attested both within and outside MSA (CDG 228). At the same time, the similarity to Arb. ḥāzīb- ‘eyebrow’ (Lane 516) can hardly be accidental.

46. Mhr. ḥīlāk ‘soot, smoke marks on walls and ceiling’ (ML 178), Jib. ḥelk ‘to give off a smell of burning,’ ḥālāk ‘smoke-marks on a ceiling’ (JL 110), Soq. ḥīlāk ‘smoke.’

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥīlāk- ‘smoke, soot’ is unknown.

47. Mhr. ḥañṣābūt, Jib. ḥanžžāt, Soq. ḥanžēbo ‘bead’ (ML 184, JL 113).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥansāb-at- ‘bead’ is unknown. Leslau compares it to Hbr. ḥṣb ‘to cut’ (HALOT 342), but this is hardly feasible in view of *ḥ in the prototype of the Hebrew root (cf. Ugr. ḥṣb ‘to fight,’ DUL 411). Note Tgr. ḥṃdābbūt ‘a sort of earring’ (WTS 85).

1457 For its cognates elsewhere in Semitic v. HALOT 678.
1458 Among the MSA parallels, note Mhr. ḥāgāl ‘naturally enclosed pasture’ (ML 171), Jib. ḥāgāl ‘to be coiled’ (JL 106), Soq. ḥāgol ‘entourer’ (LS 162).
1459 In the Arab lexicographic tradition ḥāzīb- is thought to be derived from the verbal root ḥṣb ‘to protect’ (cf. LA 1 353: summiya bi-dālīka li-rammahu yahṣabu ʿanā l-tayni šūrūta š-šamsī). One wonders whether this interpretation reflects a secondary rearrangement of a more original *ḥāžīl- via popular etymology. The old root may still be preserved in ḥāzīl ‘to sink, to be depressed (about one’s eyes)’ (Lane 520).
1440 The Soqotri term does not appear in the extant published sources, but has been added by our informants as one of the two basic designations of “smoke” (along with ṭētō).
1441 The Soqotri word is rendered as ‘morceau’ in LS 183. The relevant passage describes small pieces of frankincense of different colors (Müller 1905:44) which can well be designated as “beads.”
1442 In a personal communication, I. Arkhipov observes a striking similarity between the MSA lexemes and Akk. anšabtu ‘earring’ (CAD A,144, AHw. 54).
48. Mhr. ḥor ‘small cave used as a pen or fold for goats’ (ML 184), Jib. ḥāhr ‘roofed pen for kids’ (JL 113), Soq. ḥor ‘écure’ (LS 192).

⇒ Proto-MSA *ḥurr- ‘pen’ is likely related to Tgr. ḥarrāt ‘pen, kraal’ (WTS 66), but further etymology of these areal terms is unknown (broad presence of similar lexemes in the Arabic dialects of Yemen as reflected in GD 390–391, Piamonta 87, Behnstedt 244, might in principle be due to MSA influence). Contra Leslau, there can hardly be any connection with Middle Persian ōxārr ‘stable,’ borrowed into Aramaic as JBA ūhwaryārā ‘stable master’ (DJBA 83) and Syr. ʔamīr ʔāk̪orā ‘comes stabulī’ (LSyr. 192). Similarly unrelated must be Arb. ḥara‘ ‘a covert lodging-place of a gazelle’ (Lane 557).

49. Hrs. ḥohi ‘earth, land, soil, dust’ (HL 57), Jib. ḥāši ‘soil’ (JL 118), Soq. ḥöyhī ‘terre’ (LS 166).

⇒ Proto-MSA *ḥašy- ‘earth, soil’ (curiously absent from Mehri, but preserved in Harsusi) is related to Arb. ḥisa‘ accumulated sand beneath which is hard rock; soft or plain ground in which water remains and collects’ (Lane 572–573), Tna. ḥašāwa ‘sand, strand, sandbank’ (TED 212), Ambh. asāwa, asāwa ‘sand’ (AED 1182), Cha. Ĕža Enm. Gyt. Muh. Sol. Wol. asāwa, End. asāwa, Msq. Gog. asāwa ‘sand’ (EDG 102).

It is only in Soqotri that the reflex of *ḥašy- functions as the basic term with the meaning “earth.”

50. Mhr. ʾšṭūlḥ, Jib. ḡālš, Soq. ḡelyho ‘to give birth prematurely’ (ML 440, JL 300, LS 178).

⇒ Proto-MSA *ḥlš ‘to abort’ may go back to PS *ḥlš ‘to tear out,’ represented by Akk. ḥalāšu ‘to scrape off’ (CAD Ḥ 40, AHw. 311), JPA ḥlš ‘to undress, to remove a garment’ (DJPA 204), Arb. ḥlš ‘to seize, to carry off by force, to take hastily, to snatch away’ (Lane 784), perhaps Hbr. ḥlš ‘to defeat’ (HALOT 324). The original meaning is probably preserved in Soq. ḡelōš ‘anéantir, ruiner’ (LS 178). Contra SED I No. 33, there is no connection between this root and PS *ḥyl ‘to be in labor.’


⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥūr-, *ḥarr-Vn- ‘a little’ is uncertain, although A. Jahn’s comparison (1902:199) with Arb. ḥawr ‘to be weak, feeble’ (Lane 820) is not unreasonable, see further Gez. ḥawwr ‘weak, invalid’ (CDG 269), Tgr. ḥawrār ‘perdre la parole (de faiblesse)’ (WTS 89), compared to Mhr. ḥawr in CDG 269. Semantically more attractive is M. Bittner’s equation (1915a:40–41) with Arb. ḥawr ‘to decrease, to be defective or deficient’ (Lane 665), but one is reluctant to accept it because of the phonological difference.1445

---

1445 According to our informants, rather ‘to fight.’

1444 Hbr. ḥwr ‘to diminish’ (HALOT 299), presumably related to the Arabic root, is thought to be attested in Is 24:6, where it indeed seems to fit the context: ʿal-kēn ḥārū yāsḥē rāvaṣ ṣaṣṣir ṣaṣṣir mīzār
The structural similarity between the Jibbali and Soqotri forms (diminutive) is noteworthy.

52. Mhr. \( k(\alpha)\)-, Jib. \( k\-\), Soq. \( k\-\) ‘with’ (ML 200, JL 124, LS 211).

⇒ The meaning “with” for the reflexes of PS \(*k\-V\-\) ‘like, as’ is not attested outside MSA. Leslau’s comparison with Min. and Hdr. \( k\-\) (LM 52) and Amh. \( k\-\) (AED 1361) is at least partly misleading as the meaning of these prepositions is terminative (“to, at, for, until”) rather than comitative (“with”).\(^{1445}\)

The original comparative meaning of \(*k\-V\-\) left no trace in MSA. For the semantic shift from comparative to comitative cf. (with Bittner 1913a:8) Gez. \( m\-s\-l\) ‘with’ < \( m\-s\-l\) (*\( m\-\-l\-\) ‘likeness, similarity’ (CDG 365).

53. Mhr. \( k\-\text{al}\-\) ‘swollen testicle,’ Jib. \( k\-\text{al}\-\) id., Soq. \( k\-\text{er}\-\text{h}\-\) ‘testicule’ (ML 200, JL 124, LS 226).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA \(*k\-\text{aret}-\) ‘(swollen) testicle’ is unknown. Comparable forms are well attested in the Arabic dialects of the area (GD 2577, Piamenta 431, Behnstedt 1076), but it is difficult to say whether they are due to MSA influence or vice versa. It is hard to avoid thinking of Arb. \( k\-\) ‘dry dung which sticks to the testicles of a ram’ (WKAS K 235, LA 11 700) as somehow related to the MSA forms in spite of the fact that “dung” is the general meaning attributed to \( k\-\) in the traditional lexicography. The insertion of \(-r\-\) in Soqotri, in all probability secondary, remains to be explained.

54. Mhr. \( k\-\text{al}\-\) ‘to come; to bring home’ (ML 209), Jib. \( k\-\text{el}\-\) ‘to come home’ (JL 131), Soq. \( k\-\text{ol}\-\) ‘rendre, répondre; détourner, ramener, entourer’ (LS 218).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA \(*k\-\text{aret}-\) ‘to turn back’ is uncertain. In LS 218, Leslau compares it to PS \(*k\-\text{ib}-\) ‘both’ (“faire une chose encore une fois”), which is worth considering (cf. perhaps Arb. \( k\-\) ‘to turn one’s eye repeatedly to a thing, to look at it again and again,’ Lane 2623). At the same time, an ultimate connection with PS \(*k\-\) ‘to hold, to restrain’ (so Leslau in CDG 282) cannot be excluded, cf. the meanings “to keep back,” “to hold back” in Gez. \( k\-\text{ev}\-\) (CDG 281) and Akk. \( k\-\) (CAD K 95). See further Tgr. \( k\-\text{al}k\-\text{al}a\-\) ‘to encircle, to keep back’ (WTS 392), Tna. \( k\-\text{al}k\-\text{al}a\-\) ‘to forbid, to prohibit’ (TED 1567), Amh. \( k\-\text{al}k\-\text{al}a\-\) ‘to prevent, to hinder’ (AED 1372) as well as Tna. \( k\-\) ‘to tour, to go around in a circle’ (TED 1558).

55. Mhr. \( m\-\text{ek}\-\), Jib. \( m\-\text{ek}\-\), Soq. \( k\-\) ‘many’ (ML 264, JL 170, LS 217).

⇒ In the wake of Leslau, it is tempting to identify Proto-MSA \(*k\-\text{non}/*k\-\text{yn} \) ‘to be numerous’ with PS \(*k\-\) ‘to be steadfast, sure, reliable,’ although the underlying

---

*Because of this the inhabitants of the land diminished, just a few people remain.’ This reading seems to be superior to the more traditional identification with \( hurricane\ ‘to be hot, scorched,’ cf. BDB 359 and Blenkinsopp 2000:350.

\(^{1445}\) The semantic development from comitative to terminative is, of course, also conceivable, as witnessed by Ugr. \( m\-\) \( m\-\), for which both meanings are well attested synchronically (DUL 161).
semantic link is not entirely transparent. A. Militarev’s alternative comparison (2012b:608) with Arb. km ‘to be strong’ (Lane 2582) also deserves attention. Hardly any connection with either Amh. màgiin ‘very large’ (AED 343, contra Leslau 1931–1934), nor Akk. magal ‘very (much), greatly’ (CAD M1 28, contra Huehnergard 1998:73), nor Arb. mahanati  qedabbatu = ẓama’ari l-bayda fi ẓawfiḥā (LA 13 508, contra Bittner 1915a:31).

It is not unlikely that this term functioned as the main exponent of the meaning “many” in Proto-MSA, but from the synchronic point of view this is true for Mehri and Jibbali only (or at least not for those Soqotri dialects we are familiar with).

56. Mhr. kēsā ‘boiled beestings’ (ML 204), Jib. kéfe id. (JL 127), Soq. kéfe ‘le lait de la brebis qui vient de mettre bas’ (LS 223).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *kāpv- ‘beestings, colostrum’ is unknown.

57. Mhr. kūss, Jib. ksé, Soq. kēs₂ ‘to find’ (ML 215, JL 135, LS 222).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ks₂ ‘to find’ is uncertain, although an ultimate connection with Arb. ks₂ ‘to pursue, to follow’ (Lane 2608) is not unlikely. In such a case, Tgr. kāssa ‘to drive to pasture’ (WTS 407) must be related as well (unless borrowed from Arabic). M. Höfner (1987:43) identified the MSA root with Qat. ks₂ in Q 243:4–5 (w-kl ś.hmn w-knym b-ykn w-yks₂ ws₂ dtn ʻbytn ‘All servants and property which are present and found in these houses’), which is not improbable.

58. Mhr. kāhēb, Jib. ḫēhēb, Soq. kōhob ‘to be in daytime, to spend the day’ (ML 226, JL 142, LS 369).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḫhb ‘to be in daytime’ is unknown.

59. Mhr. kātn, Jib. ekēnnim id. (JL 147), Soq. kēnom ‘donner à manger’ (LS 378).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *km ‘to feed’ is unknown, although an ultimate connection with the following root is not unlikely.

60. Mhr. kānū, Jib. kēnā, Soq. kānā ‘to feed, to rear’ (ML 233, JL 147, LS 377).

⇒ Leslau is probably correct in his identification of Proto-MSA *kny ‘to rear’ with PS *kny ‘to buy, to acquire, to possess’ (for which see HALOT 1111, CDG 437 and Chapter 2, p. 88 above), but the semantic shift is peculiar and has no immediate precedent elsewhere in Semitic. One wonders whether the meaning “to suckle” for Mhr. kānū and Jib. kēnā may have developed by contamination with PS *ynk, which otherwise left no trace in MSA (cf. SED I No. 83). Tgr. kāna ‘to grow together’ (WTS 253) is too isolated to be taken as a reliable cognate in spite of the remarkable semantic

---

The closest approximation seems to be provided by the meanings “to create,” “to generate,” “to produce” in Ugaritic-Canaanite (HALOT 1111, DNWSI 1015, DUL 706) and Arabic (as rightly acknowledged in Humbert 1958:173, this rather sparsely attested meaning is missing from LA, but note qānuḥu l-lāḥu = ḥaluqahu wa-ḏabalahu, TA 39 535).
proximity.

61. Mhr. hokrāwār ‘to go at midday’ (ML 233), Jib. ƙaréré ‘tomorrow’ (JL 148), Soq. ƙaréré ‘demain’ (LS 388).

⇒ The general concept underlying the attested MSA forms is undoubtedly “(early) morning,” which M. Bittner (1911:60, 1916:43, 56, 1918a:32) and W. Leslau plausibly connect with PS *ƙər ‘to be cold’ (for which see HALOT 1149, CDG 444 and Chapter 1, pp. 38-39 above). Leslau’s comparison with the Arabic expression ṭal-qarratānī ‘the morning and the evening’ as “the two cold times” (Lane 2500) is illuminating, but an even more striking parallel is found in Western Gurage: Cha. Eža Msq. ƙərərə, Gyt. ƙərərə, Enm. ƙərərə, End. ƙərərə ‘early morning’ (EDG 500). One wonders whether the MSA and Gurage forms represent completely independent developments or go back to a single areal source. For a close semantic parallel outside this root cf. Akk. kašitu ‘morning coolness, morning’ (CAD K 263, AHw. 458) < kašū ‘to be cold.’


⇒ Proto-MSA *mi-ƙəraf-at- ‘shoulder blade’ is undoubtedly derived from the verbal root *ƙəp ‘to scratch off,’ preserved in Arb. qəf ‘to peel off the bark of a tree’ (LA 9 334) and Gez. ƙərafa ‘to peel off’ (CDG 441, with cognates in other EthS). Indeed, as pointed out by T. M. Johnstone, the shoulder blade is “used as a broom to clean out a pen-cave” (ML 235). For similar “instrumental” designations of this body part cf. Akk. naglabu (CAD N 1, 119,147 AHw. 711, Streck 2002:231), Latin scapula (WH II 489–490), English shoulder blade, Russian лопатка (diminutive from лопата ‘shovel,’ Vasmer II 519). Leslau’s comparison with Tna. gəɔrbətta ‘rump’ (TED 2262) and Amh. żirba ‘back’ (AED 1859) can hardly be accepted.

63. Mhr. ƙərū, Jib. ƙéré, Soq. ƙərə ‘to hide’ (ML 237, JL 150, LS 386).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ƙəy ‘to hide’ is uncertain. Contra Leslau, there is hardly any connection between this root and Arb. qər ‘to entertain a guest’ (Lane 2988), for which see Chapter 3, p. 212 above.

64. Mhr. hastüm, Jib. hastım, Soq. hastəhim ‘fresh butter’ (ML 245, JL 155, LS 372).

⇒ With Leslau 1947:9, Proto-MSA *hastım- ‘butter’ may be related to Arb. qašmat- = ṭal-labanu l-mutayyiru l-ʃərmî (TA 33 289).

65. Mhr. l(ɔ)-, Jib. l-, Soq. lɔ- ‘against, on’ (ML 249, JL 158, LS 227).

⇒ As duly recognized by both Leslau and Johnstone, the MSA prepositions are

147 “The Akkadian name of this part of the body may have been taken from its similarity of shape with the barber’s knife or razor.”
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semantically equivalent to PS *valay rather than to PS */V-. The etymological *v persists in the Soqotri forms with pronominal suffixes such as ṭay ‘on him.’

66. Mhr. ṭāḇ ‘to suck (mother’s milk)’ (ML 249), Jib. ḫīḇ ‘(flocks) to give milk to their young’ (JL 158), Soq. ḥārab ‘agneau qui reste avec sa mère pendant un mois et demi’ (LS 234), miḏrībo ‘sheep with young’ (JL 158).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḇb ‘to suck’ is unknown. Hardly any connection with either Hbr. ḏb ‘to make sport of’ (HALOT 532), Syr. ḏb ‘delectatus, gavisus est; avidus fuit’ (LSyr. 386), Arb. ḏb ‘to play, to joke (of children)’ (WKAS L 779) or ḥwāb- ‘saliva, spittle’ (ibid. 809).

67. Mhr. ḫāḥī, Jib. ḫāḥē, Soq. ḫēḥ ‘to beat’ (ML 253, JL 162, LS 229).

⇒ The Proto-MSA verbal root *ḥy ‘to beat,’ probably onomatopoetic in its origin, has no direct parallel anywhere else in Semitic.

68. Mhr. ḫāḥām ‘to touch,’ Jib. ḫēḥām ‘to touch,’ ḫāḥām ‘to jump up and touch,’ Soq. ḫēḥam ‘toucher’ (ML 253, JL 162, 163, LS 229).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥm/ḥhm ‘to touch’ is uncertain and it is even hard to say which of the two variants is primary from the etymological point of view. For *ḥhm, cf. perhaps Syr. ḥm ‘aptus fuit; se applicavit; minatus est,’ (pa.) ‘conjunxit’ (LSyr. 364), Arb. ḥm (VI) ‘to be joined, knit together’ (Lane 3008), Gez. ṭahama ‘to close, to glue’ (CDG 311), Tgr. ṭahamā ‘to glue,’ ṭhām belā ‘to stick’ (WTS 32).

69. Mhr. ḫwāķūd ‘to patch something made of leather’ (ML 254), Jib. ḫkād ‘to patch leather’ (JL 163), Soq. ḫkod ‘faire, fabriquer’ (LS 233), ‘to make (a boat, a waterskin)’ (JL 163).

⇒ Leslau is probably correct to connect Proto-MSA *ḥkd ‘to patch leather’\(^{1448}\) with Hbr. ḥd ‘to catch animals by trapping’ (HALOT 530) and Arb. ḥd ‘to cleave, to stick’ (Lane 2671), all going back to the presumably original meanings “to tie,” “to bind,” “to attach.”\(^{1449}\) Sab. mlkd ‘cistern’ (SD 82) likely belongs to the same root (with Biella 259: “something which traps the water brought by the canal”).

70. Mhr. ḫwāḵat, Jib. ḫēḵat, Soq. ḫāḵa ‘water jar, bottle’ (ML 258, JL 166, LS 231).

⇒ Proto-MSA *ḥwak-at- ‘jar, bottle’ cannot be separated from Tgr. ḫokota ‘outre à miel’ (WTS 37), Tna. ḫākwāta, ḫokota ‘pod, skin bag used as a container for grain, flour’ (TED 94), but the ultimate origin of these terms is unclear. Any connection with Arb. ḫaqat- ‘butter’ (LA 10 400)?

\(^{1448}\) The more general meaning of the Soqotri verb is, with all probability, due to secondary widening.

\(^{1449}\) *Contra* HALOT and AHw., Akk. ḫakādu ‘to run’ (CAD L 45, AHw. 529) can scarcely be related in view of the semantic difference. As rightly acknowledged by Leslau, comparison between Hbr. ḫkd and Har. ḫddd ‘to hold, to seize, to catch’ (EDH 99) is hard to accept from the phonological point of view in spite of the remarkable semantic similarity.
71. Mhr. mādēt, Jib. midēt, Soq. mēde ‘South wind’ (ML 261, JL 169, LS 238).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *mīd-at- ‘South wind’ is unknown.

72. Mhr. mārāl, Jib. mirt, Soq. mērāt ‘to be red-hot’ (ML 270, JL 174, LS 251).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *mrt ‘to be red-hot’ is unknown. The presence of mrrat ‘glühen’ in the Arabic of Dhofar (Rhodokanakis 55) may be due to the MSA influence. Contra Rhodokanakis, there is hardly any connection between the present root and Arb. mart- ‘a waterless desert in which there is no herbage’ (Lane 2703).

73. Mhr. mārīq, Jib. mērīq, Soq. mēraq ‘to give instructions’ (ML 268, JL 173, LS 250).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *mrī ‘to give instructions’ is unknown. Any connection with Tna. mārīša, Amh. mārrātā, End. Muh. Sod. mārrātā ‘to choose, to prefer, to elect’ (TED 378, AED 197, EDG 424)?

74. Mhr. nōqār ‘cliff of sand and stone; a sand or dust hill that cannot be rebuilt after collapsing’ (ML 287), Jib. nūqār id. (JL 184), Soq. nūqār ‘fosse’ (LS 257).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *nagr(V)- ‘sand hill’ is uncertain. Leslau compares the Soqotri term with PS *nhr ‘to drill, to make a hole,’ but this meaning is scarcely compatible with that of the remaining MSA parallels (apart from the phonological irregularity).1450 Shall one rather compare Hbr. ngr ‘to be poured, to vanish; to flow, to pour, to run’ (BDB 620)?

75. Mhr. nāhāg, Jib. naḥāg, Soq. nāḥag ‘to dance, to be at leisure, to play’ (ML 291).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *nḥg ‘to play, to dance’ is uncertain. Of some interest may be Akk. negû (negū) ‘to sing joyously’ (CAD N 123, AHw. 712).1452

76. Mhr. šmḥākw, Jib. šmheř, Soq. šēnḥar ‘to complain’ (ML 292, JL 186, LS 265).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA nhr (causative-reflexive stem) ‘to complain’ is unknown. Leslau compares Arb. nhr (VI) ‘to face, to front each other,’ which can also mean ‘to be mutually niggardly, tenacious, avaricious’ (Lane 2774).

77. Mhr. nīka, Jib. nīkar, Soq. nk ‘to come’ (ML 293, JL 187, LS 267).

1450 The semantic discrepancy between Soqotri and the rest of MSA is admittedly a problem of its own (note that the meaning “hole” for the Soqotri word fits well the extant contexts in the Vienna corpus and has been subsequently confirmed by Johnstone’s field notes and our own records).

1451 Note in particular Mi 1:6: wa-lōmar šōmarīn la-wa ha-šālā ... wa-higgartī la-qqay nībānāhā ‘I will make Samaria into a heap of ruins ... and will throw its stones down to the valley.’

1452 From the semantic point of view, this comparison (implying metathesis *nhg/*ngh) is somewhat superior to the widespread equation between Akk. nagû and Hbr. ngh ‘to shine’ (HALOT 667), see further Chapter 2, p. 92 above.
The origin of Proto-MSA *nkr ‘to come’ is uncertain. Comparison with Arb. nkh ‘invit feminam’ (Lane 2847) proposed by M. Bittner (1915a:5) is hard to accept for phonological reasons.

78. Mhr. nakāwī, Jib. nḵjl, Soq. nţĩk ‘to choose’ (ML 297, JL 190, LS 274).

The origin of Proto-MSA *nḵl ‘to choose’ is uncertain. Any connection with Syr. nḵal ‘deject et volvit; sustulit (lapides); ejectit; traduxit’ (LSyr. 446, SD 947), Arb. nql ‘to transfer, to shift’ (Lane 3037), Sab. nḵl ‘to quarry stone’ (SD 97), Min. nḵl ‘transporter, déplacer’ (LM 68), Qat. nḵl ‘to dig out, to excavate’ (LIQ 111), Gez. nakala ‘to uproot, to eradicate, to pull up’ (CDG 400, with cognates throughout EthS)? This comparison would imply a semantic shift from “to take out,” “to pick up” (cf. Bittner 1915a:36).

79. Mhr. mansōb, Jib. mósīt, Soq. męnsob ‘pubic hair’ (ML 299, JL 192, LS 268).

The origin of Proto-MSA *minsab- ‘pubic hair’ is uncertain, for a few tentative comparisons v. SED I No. 239. The similarity between the MSA terms and Sum. munsub ‘hair’ (Civil 2007:29) is striking, but hard to explain.

80. Mhr. nūṣaj, Jib. nīṣaj, Soq. nūṣar ‘to pull out hair’ (ML 299, JL 192).

The origin of Proto-MSA *nṣaj ‘to pull out hair’ is unknown.

81. Mhr. nīṣaj ‘to sip’ (ML 303), Jib. nīṣaj ‘to sip, to drink slowly’ (JL 195), Soq. nēṣaj ‘boire’ (LS 276).

The origin of Proto-MSA *nṣaj ‘to sip’ is unknown. An onomatopoetic imitation of the sound of sipping cannot be excluded.

82. Mhr. nāṣū ‘to transhume, to migrate following pasture’ (ML 303), Jib. nše ‘to move to a place where rain has fallen, to transhume according to plan’ (JL 195), Soq. nēšaj ‘endroit vers lequel on se rend’ (LS 277), nīṣ ‘to be well off’ (JL 195).

Proto-MSA *nṣaj (or *nṣaj) ‘to be far away, to migrate’ can be plausibly derived from PS *nṣaj ‘to raise, to lift’ (HALOT 724, DUL 648). Elsewhere, the intransitive diathesis for this root is best attested in Arb. nṣaj ‘to raise, to become elevated; to grow up, to appear’ (Lane 2790).

83. Mhr. ḫw-wwūf, Jib. enif, Soq. nef ‘to beckon, to make a sign’ (ML 306, JL 198, LS 261).

As rightly acknowledged by W. Leslau and P. Fronzaroli (1972:633), Proto-MSA *nwp ‘to make a sign’ is with all probability related to Hbr. nwp (hip.) ‘to move to

---

1453 The Soqotri verb nāṣar (yaminsar/linsār), missing from the available lexicographic sources, has been recorded in the course of our fieldwork (nāṣar ǧāre di-šajdl mān šef diryihe di-rī ‘He pulled out a handful of hair from his head’).

1454 According to our informants, the word rather means ‘a mountain road difficult to pass.’
and fro, to brandish’ (HALOT 682) and Syr. nāp ‘se inclinavit; pependit’ (LSyr. 421). It is not unlikely that Arb. nwp ‘to overlook, to overtop’ (LA 9 407) is ultimately related to this root (originally “to swing over something”?): The meaning of Akk. nāpu, translated as ‘schwanken’ in AHw. 742, is highly uncertain (cf. CAD N₁ 327) which makes its comparison with PS *nwp rather problematic.

84. Mhr. mtáw, Jib. mtš, Soq. éntah ‘to fight’ (ML 306, JL 198, LS 261).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *nwā (reflexive stem) ‘to fight’ is uncertain. Note Arb. nwā (III, VI) ‘to face each other (mountains, winds)’ (Lane 2863–2864).

85. Mhr. fēhɔl, Jib. fāhɔl, Soq. fāhal ‘penis’ (ML 90, JL 54, LS 335).
⇒ In view of the numerous cognates semantically related to the genital area (SED I No. 210), it is not unlikely that “penis” was actually the principal meaning of *pahl- as early as in PS. In such a case, the MSA isogloss is to be evaluated as an archaism, but it is still significant that this presumably original meaning is not directly preserved anywhere else in Semitic.

86. Mhr. fākh, Jib. fākh, Soq. fākh ‘half’ (ML 91, JL 56, LS 339).
⇒ Leslau connects Proto-MSA *pakh- ‘half’ with the verbal root *phkh, but one has to admit that the meaning “to cut,” “to split” from which “half” could plausibly be derived (Bittner 1913a:97–98) is hardly ever directly attested for the reflexes of this root, cf. only Hbr. phkh ‘to open the eyes’ (HALOT 959), Syr. phkh ‘floruit’ (LSyr. 589), Arb. ḥkh ‘to open the eyes; to blossom,’ perhaps also faḥḥat- ‘anus’ (Lane 2424). Mhr. fākh and Jib. fēkh ‘to cut in half’ (ML 91, JL 56) can hardly be considered the source of *pakh- ‘half,’ being rather secondarily derived from it.

The presence of ḥkh ‘half’ also in Sabaic (SD 45, Stein 2003:123–124) can hardly be accidental and should probably be explained as a contact phenomenon (a substratum/adstratum MSA influence on Sabaic or instead a cultural borrowing from Sabaic into early MSA?). One wonders, finally, whether Tgr. fākh ‘to lease, to practice usury’ (WTS 663) could be related to the meaning “half” with a somewhat peculiar

---

1455 The Soqotri word is unknown to our informants.
1456 In EDG 238 Leslau identifies with it with Amh. ṣāḥka ‘to make a cut or incision in the body’ (AED 2297), Cha. Gyt. ṣāḥā, End. ṣāḥā, Eza Muh. Mṣq. Gog. ṣāḥā, Sel. ṣāḥa, Wol. ṣāḥa ‘to split wood with an ax,’ but one cannot be sure that the underlying guttural in these forms is indeed *ḥ.
1457 With an interesting parallel in Akk. ṣāḵku (ṣāḵu) ‘buttock’ (CAD P 514, AHw. 880).
1458 The same may be true of Soq. ṣāḵah ‘fendre’ in LS 339, attested only once in the corpus of the Vienna expedition (Müller 1905:364) and probably to be rendered as ‘to split in two halves.’ In the speech of our informants, see further the intensive stem ṣāḵā ‘to reach the middle.’
semantic development.

87. Mhr. ḥāṣ ‘to cover’ (ML 92), Jib. ḥē ‘to wear (clothes)’ (JL 56), Soq. ḡē ‘mettre un vêtement’ (LS 340).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *pḥy ‘to cover, to wear clothes’ is unknown. One cannot exclude that this root once replaced PS *lbs ‘to wear,’ which was re-established as lbs in Mehri and Jibbali (ML 251, JL 159) via borrowing from Arabic.

88. Mhr. ḥārd, Jib. ḥērd, Soq. ḡērd ‘to stampede, panic; to make off, to run away’ (ML 97, JL 59, LS 340).

⇒ Leslau plausibly connects Proto-MSA *ḥr ‘to flee in panic’ with PS *ḥr ‘to be separated,’ represented by Hbr. ḥr ‘to separate, to diverge’ (HALOT 962), Arb. ḥrd ‘to become sole, single’ (Lane 2363), Sab. ḥrd-m ‘uniquely, alone’ (SD 46), Tgr. ṭāfārādā ‘to part company as enemies’ (WTS 659). The same shift of meaning took place (presumably independently) in Aramaic (Syr. prd ‘fugit,’ LSyr. 593), as well as in Akkadian, where ṭarādū ‘to be fearful, disturbed’ (CAD P 141, AHw. 827) displays a remarkable semantic similarity to the MSA verbs (as duly observed in Huehnergard 1991a:693).

89. Mhr. ḥūrāw, Jib. ḥūrēr, Soq. ḡūrīr ‘to yawn’ (ML 97, JL 59, LS 342).

⇒ Leslau is likely correct to derive Proto-MSA *prr (reflexive-intensive stem) ‘to yawn’ from an original meaning “to divide,” “to separate,” eventually compatible with PS *prr represented by Akk. parānu (D) ‘to break up, to disperse,’ naqarruru ‘to become crushed, dispersed, separated’ (CAD P 161), Ugr. pr ‘to break’ (DUL 681), Hbr. pr ‘to break, to destroy’ (HALOT 974), Arb. ṭāfarrā rūṣahu bī-s-sayfī = ṣaqqaqahu wa-falaqahu (TA 13 318), Gez. ṭarr ‘to shell, to husk’ (CDG 166), Tna. ṭārā ‘to dissolve flour in water’ (TED 2659). For a closer semantic parallelism cf. Tna. fārār bālā ‘to be opened wide (eyes due to astonishment)” (TED 2659).

90. Mhr. ḥāṣ, Jib. ḥēṣ, Soq. ḡēṣ ‘to lunch’ (ML 105, JL 64, LS 343).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣṣy ‘to have lunch’ is obscure, none of the putative etymological explanations discussed in LS 343 is persuasive. Hardly any connection with Tgr., Tna. and Amh. ḡāṣṣo ‘dried meat’ (WTS 662, TED 2676, AED 2292).

91. Mhr. ḥālā, Jib. ḥēṭēr, Soq. ḡēṭēr ‘to be bare, naked’ (ML 108, JL 66, LS 335).

The meaning “to judge,” typical of the reflexes of *ḥrd in EthS, must be eventually related as well (from “to distinguish between true and false” or similar): Gez. ṭafārādā ‘to be in litigation,’ ḥrd ‘justice, judgment’ (CDG 165, sparsely attested, cf. LLA 1356), Tgr. ṭārā (WTS 659), Tna. ṭārādā (TED 2670), Amh. ṭārādā (AED 2284), Har. ṭārādā (EDH 63), End. ṭārādā, Muh. ṭārādā, Cha. ṭārādā, Cha. ṭārādā, Eẓa ṭāmādā, Sel. Wol. Zwy. ṭārādā (EDG 241). Note that the meaning “to separate” ascribed to Gez. ḥrd by Leslau is only attested in late lexicographic works and is likely due to Arabic influence.

---
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The origin of Proto-MSA *pto ‘to be naked’ (likely replacing PS *rwr/*yw)\textsuperscript{1462} is unknown.

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *rVb-at- ‘foam on milk’ is unknown.

⇒ The etymological background of Proto-MSA *rgm ‘to cover’ is extensively discussed in Chapter 3, p. 215-216 above.

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *rkt ‘to step, to tread’ is uncertain, but it may be related to semantically similar roots displaying the biconsonantal element *rk, for which cf. LS 400 under Soq. *róked ‘trépigner’ and *réka ‘fouler le sol’\textsuperscript{1464}

⇒ While there is no doubt that the MSA designations of “sea” go back to a single prototype, its exact shape is hard to recover because of deep structural changes in individual languages. Nevertheless, it is tempting to suppose that the Proto-MSA form was close to Eastern Jibbali rémrem, with full reduplication of the biconsonantal element *rVm- (cf. already Bittner 1909:128, 1914:55). The origin of this form is with all probability descriptive (onomatopoetic), but no exact parallel seems to be attested in the Semitic-speaking domain (although, as far as verbal roots are concerned, cf. Akk. ramāmu ‘to rumble, to roar, to howl, to bellow,’ CAD R 116, AHw. 949, Tna. ramram balá ‘to be an indistinguishable, incomprehensible noise,’ TED 547).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *slb ‘to wait’ is unknown.

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *sär ‘behind’ is uncertain. Contra W. Leslau and M. Bittner (1914:15), any connection with PS *qatar- ‘trace’ can be safely excluded for phonological reasons. Quite far-fetched is the comparison between the MSA terms and Arb. *sarīr- ‘the part where the head rests upon the neck’ (Lane 1339), sarāt- ‘back’ (ibid).

\textsuperscript{1462} Whose only MSA reflex known to us is perhaps márhe ‘vagina (of an animal),’ recorded from our informants but missing from the extant published sources. For similar semantic derivations from *yw/*wr throughout Semitic see SED I No. 26.

\textsuperscript{1463} According to our informants, the Soqotri word means ‘sole of the foot’ in general.

\textsuperscript{1464} The first verb is unknown to our informants, the second is said to mean ‘to beat, to push’ in general.
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1353), Amh. sārūsār ‘vertebra, spinal cord’ (AED 487) suggested in SED I No. 253. Shall one rather compare Hbr. swr ‘to turn aside’ (HALOT 748), assuming a semantic development from the more original meaning “to turn back”?

98. Mhr. sahār, Jib. sahār, Soq. sóhor ‘to brand’ (ML 361, JL 238, LS 348).

⇒ Leslau is likely correct to relate Proto-MSA *ṣhr ‘to brand’ to Hbr. šāhār ‘reddish-gray’ (HALOT 1019), Syr. ṣḥr ‘erubuit’ (LSyr. 626), Arb. ṣḥr (XI) ‘to dry up, to become yellow,’ ṣḥār- ‘milk into which heated stones are thrown’ (Lane 1654), implying an original meaning “to burn,” “to be burnt” (cf. especially Ugr. ṣḥr ‘to be burnt,’ ‘to roast,’ DUL 782). One might be tempted to relate to this root Tgr. șahrenā ‘to take up and carry away coal and ashes’ (WTS 633), Tna. șāharā ‘to stir a fire’ (TED 2549), but the general meaning of the Tigrinya verb seems rather to be ‘to scoop up, to scrape up with the hands, to shovel.’


⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣVIVl- ‘ravine, wadi’ is uncertain, but cf. perhaps Hbr. șl ‘to sink’ (HALOT 1027) and especially māṣīlā ‘depth, deep’ (ibid. 623).1465

100. Mhr. șālif ‘to be visible from far away’ (ML 362), Jib. šālif ‘to appear quickly and vainsh; to be seen from far away; to dazzle,’ Soq. šelēf ‘light brown mixed with white’ (ML 362, JL 239, LS 352).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šlp ‘to shine, to be bright’ is unknown.


⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣapīr- ‘flower’ is uncertain. Leslau’s comparison with Syr. ṣapā ‘tempus matutinum’ (LSyr. 635), implying an original meaning “s’échapper, éclater” is not easily acceptable from the semantic point of view. Hardly any connection with Arb. taşfar- ‘yellow’ (Lane 1699). Of some interest is Akk. šipru ‘crest, coma (of a comet), summit, excrescence’ (CAD § 204, AHw. 1104).


⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣīt ‘to watch’ is uncertain. The same meaning for šīt is well attested in the Arabic dialects of Dhofar and Oman (Rhodokanakis 32–33, Reinhardt 178), but in view of its isolated status within Arabic one may legitimately wonder about the possibility of MSA substratum/adstratum influence. Of some interest may be Arb. ṣītt- ‘what is opposite’ (TA 4 585).1466 Any connection with JPA šēt ‘to listen, to give heed’ (DJP 462), Syr. șāt ‘audivit’ (LSyr. 625)?


---

1465 Contra HALOT, probably unconnected is Gez. šalala ‘to float’ (CDG 555).
1466 ṣf-ṣītū = ṣf-ṣiddū.
The origin of Proto-MSA *śaṭ(ar)- 'basket' is unknown.

104. Mhr. hēḥar, Jib. sāḥar, Soq. yẖēḥar 'old man' (ML 162, JL 264, LS 210).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *shaḥar- 'old man' is uncertain. Any connection with Akk. ṣaḥarruru 'to become dazed, still, numb with fear' (CAD Ș3 203), Syr. ṣḥar 'timuit' (LSyr. 771)? One wonders whether Arb. șḥr (II) 'to constrain, to compel to what one does not desire, to bring into subjection' (Lane 1324) may also be ultimately related.

105. Mhr. șḵāy, Jib. ẖšnōy, Soq. șko 'sword' (ML 394, JL 314, LS 416).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šVkay- 'sword' is unknown. Contra M. Bittner (1915b:28) and W. Leslau, hardly any connection with Arb. škк 'to pierce with the spear' (Lane 1582), ṛaḫunuš šāki s-sīlāhi 'a man whose weapon is sharp' (Lane 1590), since Arb. š does not regularly correspond to š in MSA. Note Tgr. šakįt 'iron-chips that fall off when a sword is whetted; edge of a sword' (WTS 192).

106. Mhr. māšnūy 'farm near a town' (ML 159), Jib. ẖšēné 'to have a garden, field,’ mašnū 'garden on the mountain' (JL 263), Soq. yẖēnə 'semer,' šēnī 'semence' (LS 145).
⇒ The etymology of Proto-MSA *šny 'to seed, to cultivate' is uncertain. Har. šāni 'seed' (EDH 141), Sel. šāñe, Wol. šāninę and Zwy. šāni 'seed, crop' (EDG 555) are in all probability borrowed from Cushitic (Oromo sañňi, Somali šāni), but the Cushitic terms, in their turn, may be related to the MSA ones as cognates, thus pointing to a fairly archaic Afroasiatic root completely lost elsewhere in Semitic (Militarev 1999:394).

107. Mhr. šāyq̱tım, Jib. šāyq̱ṭım, Soq. ṟīṭin 'heaven' (ML 161, JL 264, LS 78).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šṭiṭim- 'heaven' is enigmatic: an eventual connection with PS *šamąy- is difficult to avoid (Bittner 1909:42), but the underlying phonological and/or structural development has never been convincingly established (none of the hypotheses listed by Leslau in LS 78 is persuasive).

108. Mhr. ẖuʃfē, Jib. ẖuʃfē, Soq. ẖuʃfā 'shallow tray or basked used for fodder' (ML 396, JL 267).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šVf-at- 'tray for fodder' is unknown.

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṣaṭar- 'female calf' is unknown. Cf. perhaps Arb. șaṭr- 'a yearling of goats or of sheep' (Lane 1358).

\[\text{The origin of }  \text{-t} \text{ in the Jibbali form is enigmatic, but its diachronic identity with the Mehri and Soqotri lexemes is not in doubt.}\]
\[\text{Note, however, A. Militarev’s thought-provoking comparison with Akk. } ašnam ‘grain, cereal’ (CAD A2 450, AHw. 82).\]
\[\text{The Soqotri is unknown to our informants.}\]
\[\text{For } ḥ \text{ instead of the expected } h \text{ in Mehri cf. the well-known case of Mhr. } mažěš, Soq. maẓrā (ML 478, JL 327, SED I No. 275).}\]
110. Mhr. šogarāt, Jib. šogarāt, Soq. šāgre ‘ravine, valley’ (ML 374, JL 248, LS 426).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šVgVr-at- ‘ravine’ is unclear. Of some interest may be Gez. šagara ‘to take a step, to amble, to go across’ (CDG 526) and its EthS cognates, note especially Amh. tāšaggārā ‘to cross a river, to cross over’ (AED 660).

111. Mhr. šēızáz, Jib. šāhz, Soq. šāhāz ‘frankincense’ (ML 377, JL 250, LS 427).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šāhz- ‘frankincense’ is unknown.

112. Mhr. šāhaf, Soq. šhafaš ‘milk,’ Jib. šhaf ‘to milk’ (ML 389, JL 258, LS 427).1471
⇒ There is no fully satisfactory cognate for Proto-MSA *šVhāp- ‘milk.’ Ugr. šhp ‘colostrum, first milk’ (DUL 813) would be directly acceptable both formally and semantically, but the hypothetical attestations of this lexeme in KTU 1.10 iii 25–26 are highly doubtful.1472 Syr. šhāpā ‘colostrum’ (LSyr. 770), on which the interpretation of the Ugaritic lexeme obviously depends, is also very sparsely attested and displays š instead of the expected *s, so that its similarity to the MSA forms may be purely accidental. More promising is Arb. šahb- ‘milk coming forth from the udder’ (Lane 1515) in spite of the irregular b. Of further interest can be Amh. šaffata ‘globules of fat on the surface of milk’ (AED 666), End. šīf ‘clumps of butter coming out of the holes in the pot when the milk is being churned’ (EDG 573). Almost certainly unrelated is Akk. šizbu ‘milk’ (AHw. 1253, CAD Š 148), whose etymology is similarly unknown.1473

PWS *hV/Vb- ‘milk’ (for which see Fronzaroli 1969:30, CDG 229, HALOT 315) is preserved in Mhr. ḫšēbak, Jib. ḫšēb, Soq. ḫēlobb ‘to milk’ (ML 177, JL 109, LS 174), Jib. ḫšēb ‘buttermilk,’ Soq. ḫēlob ‘yoghurt’ (JL 109).

113. Mhr. šarū ‘to skin’ (ML 386), Jib. šerē ‘to skin with a knife’ (JL 256), Soq. šārhi ‘peau’ (LS 433).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *šry ‘to skin’ (or *šVry- ‘skin’ if the Soqotri nominal form is primary) is unknown.

⇒ One is tempted to follow W. Müller (apud CDG 149) who tentatively connects Proto-MSA *šgəm- ‘cheek’ with Gez. šagama ‘to be on the left hand; to be twisted, distorted’ (CDG 149), Tna. šągəm ‘left’ (TED 2616), Tgr. šąggāmā ‘to be difficult’ (WTS 648) as well as Arb. ḍəm ‘to be crooked, distorted (mouth),’ ḍāžəm- ‘inclining towards

1471 There is no substantive with the meaning “milk” derived from this root in Jibbali. As one can learn from Nakano 1986:19 (cf. JL 109, 194), “milk” in Jibbali is designated by either ḫšēb or mūšāb.
1473 The Eblaite rendering sa-sa-bu = Sum. ni.ga (VE 82) unambiguously suggests *šlāb or *šlāb as the underlying root (Conti 1990:75), but comparison with Arb. šēb ‘to remove the bark of a tree’ (Lane 1522) discussed in Fronzaroli 1972:613 (“nella industria del latte ‘scremare’”) appears rather far-fetched.
1474 According to our informants, the Soqotri word specifically designates the cheek-bone.
one side of the face’ (Lane 1770).

115. Mhr. ḣayāl ‘to crumple, to squeeze, to take a grip on’ (ML 475), Jib. ḥayāl ‘to grip, to hold, to take a handful; to squeeze, to crumple’ (JL 324), Soq. ḥārot ‘saisir’ (LS 363).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥyāl ‘to hold’ is unknown.

116. Mhr. ḥār ‘thicket, road up a mountain’ (ML 477), Jib. ḥar ‘an area full of bushes and trees, scrub,’ Soq. ḥar ‘foot of the mountains (which is scrubland)’ (ML 477, JL 327).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥar- ‘thicket’ is unknown.

117. Mhr. ẓālāk, Jib. ẓālāk, Soq. ẓālāk ‘to lead an animal by a rope’ (ML 401, JL 271, LS 441).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ḥlk ‘to lead’ is uncertain, but Leslau may be correct to relate it to PS *ḥlk ‘to go.’

118. Mhr. ṭār, Jib. ṭār, Soq. ṭōsor ‘potter’s clay’ (ML 405, JL 273, LS 202).

⇒ Proto-MSA *ṭiyr- ‘clay’ is related to Akk. ṭēru ‘mud, silt’ (CAD T 105, AHw. 1388), but no further cognates elsewhere in Semitic could be detected.

119. Mhr. ṭafh ‘mountain side’ (ML 407), Jib. ṭafh ‘steep mountainside without (many) bushes’ (JL 275), Soq. ṭafha ‘côté’ (LS 207).1475

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭafh- ‘side’ is uncertain. The only parallel adduced by Leslau is ṭofh ‘der Rücken; die stumpfe Seite der einschneidigen Schwert Klinge’ from the Arabic dialect of Dhofar (Rhodokanakis 36), which, in view of its isolated character, may well be due to MSA influence. Any connection with PS *ṭafh- ‘span, palm of the hand,’ tentatively supposed in SED I No. 279, is unlikely.

120. Mhr. ṭeḥem ‘to disappear, to get lost’ (ML 407), Jib. ṭeḥem ‘to disappear, to vanish’ (JL 275), Soq. ṭaham ‘devenir vieux’ (LS 200).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA ṭhm ‘to vanish’ is uncertain. Note perhaps Arb. ṭal-muṭahham- = ṭal-qalīlu laḥmi l-waḥhi (LA 12 432).

121. Mhr. ṭalīfūt ‘skim on boiled milk’ (ML 409), Jib. ṭalīf ‘to skim off’ (JL 277), Soq. ẓalīfo ‘crème’ (LS 205).

⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭlīf ‘to skim off’ is uncertain, although an ultimate connection with Gez. ṭalaṣa ‘to snatch away’ (CDG 590), Tna. ṭalaf ‘to abduct; to seize, to grab’ (TED 2408), Amh. ṭallaf ‘to abduct, to snatch’ (AED 2095), Har. ṭallaf ‘to snatch away, to rob’ (EDH 153), Muh. Msq. Gog. Soq. ṭalaf ‘to rope an

1475 According to our informants, the word means ‘a mountain slope.’
animal to milk or to kill it; to make an opponent fall by intertwining one’s legs with his; to kidnap a girl to marry her; to snatch away’ (EDG 617) is not unlikely.

122. Mhr. ṭmn, Jib. ṭenn, Soq. ṭen ‘to go to sleep’ (ML 411, JL 279, LS 206).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭmn ‘to go to sleep’ is uncertain. Its striking similarity to Cha. Gyt. ṭmn barā, Eza Muḥ. Msq. ṭnn balā ‘to be asleep’ (EDG 622) may be due to chance coincidence. Cf. perhaps Arb. ṭmn ‘to die’ (Lane 1833).

123. Mhr. ṭshēk, Jib. ṭsēk, Soq. ṭhak ‘to be smooth’ (ML 407, JL 280, LS 200).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭšk ‘to be smooth’ is unknown.

124. Mhr. ṭbū, Jib. ṭē, Soq. ṭbā ‘to moo, to low’ (ML 415, JL 283, LS 438).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭby ‘to moo’ is unknown.

125. Mhr. ḥtḥāwr, Jib. ṭḥēr, Soq. ṯḥ ‘to wound’ (ML 416, JL 284, LS 440).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭhr ‘to wound’ is unknown.1476

126. Mhr. ṭfwrū, Jib. ṭfīrēt, Soq. ṭfēr ‘dung pellet’ (ML 416, JL 283).1477
⇒ Proto-MSA *ṭf/ṛ-at- ‘dung pellet’ is likely related to Tgr. ṣfwr ‘manure, dung’ (WTS 230), but further possible cognates are rather uncertain (SED I No. 282).

127. Mhr. ḥdbr ‘to nag, to grumble’ (ML 82), Jib. ḥdē id. (JL 48), Soq. ṭābir ‘blâmer, injurier, outrager’ (LS 199).
⇒ The origin of Proto-MSA *ṭbr ‘to nag, to offend’ is unknown.

128. Mhr. ḥdhām ‘(camel) to urinate’ (ML 83), Jib. ḥḏām ‘(animal) to make water’ (JL 48), Soq. ṭḥem ‘urine.’1478

129. Mhr. ḥār, Jib. ḥer, Soq. ṭḥār ‘on, over’ (ML 86, JL 50, LS 200).
⇒ Proto-MSA *ṭa(h)r ‘on, over’ clearly goes back to PS *ṭa(h)r- ‘back,’ although the original anatomical meaning is completely lost throughout this group. Semantically similar prepositional use of reflexes of *ṭa(h)r- is admittedly attested in a few other Semitic languages (SED I No. 284).

130. Mhr. ḥlrb, Jib. ḥlrb, Soq. ṭhr ‘piece of wood’ (ML 85, JL 50, LS 208).

In a personal communication, M. Krebernik suggests an interesting possibility of comparing proto-MSA *ṭbr ‘to wound’ with Sargonic Akkadian šaṭar (ši1-aru) ‘to conquer, to win, to destroy’ (CAD Š, 2). This etymology provides a far better balance of semantic and phonological/orthographic features than the more traditional comparisons with either PS *ṭyr ‘to break’ or Arabic ṣt ‘to take blood-revenge.’

According to our informants, the Soqotri word rather designates the globular excrements of small cattle.

The Soqotri word, missing from the published sources, goes back to our fieldwork notes.
The origin of Proto-MSA *ṯarb- ‘piece of wood’ is unknown. It would be tempting to identify it with Gez. ṣaraba ‘to hew,’ ṣarb ‘plank,’ ṣarrāb ‘splinter, shaving’ and its cognates throughout EthS (CDG 563), but this comparison is difficult in view of reliable parallels with γ elsewhere in Semitic (notably, in Soq. ṣērob ‘couper,’ LS 357).

Possible cognates of Proto-MSA *ṭey ‘to smell’ are extensively discussed in SED I No. 286. From the semantic point of view, the closest parallels are Ugr. ṭu ‘exhalation, secretion’ (DUL 1007)1479 and Gez. ṣir ‘bad smell.’ Also remarkable are Hbr. ṣērā, ṣērā ‘excrement,’ ṣēr(r) ‘filth’ (HALOT 992) and Gez. ṣivat ‘rot, filth, stench, excrement’ (CDG 567).

Deictic adverbs involving the element *ṯ (DRS 527) have no parallel elsewhere in Semitic.

With Bittner 1916:33, Proto-MSA *wzm ‘to give, to lend’ must be related to Arb. waf ‘to become still, to stop, to stand’ (Lane 3058). See further DRS 609. Any connection with Akk. ḫāpu ‘to buckle, to collapse’ (CAD Q 98) is quite unlikely.

The meaning “smell” seems to fit well the context in the only extant attestation of this term: ṣanhanbim d ṣalp šd ṣṭb b[m] ‘The sea-snails’ whose smell is noticeable at a thousand acres in the sea’ (KTU 1.3 iv 45–46).

The origin of Proto-MSA *ẓhr ‘to go down’ is unknown.

The origin of Proto-MSA *zlk ‘to draw (liquid)’ is unknown.

3.4.2. Proto-MSA morpholexical features

1479 The meaning “smell” seems to fit well the context in the only extant attestation of this term: ṣanhanbim d ṣalp šd ṣṭb b[m] ‘The sea-snails’ whose smell is noticeable at a thousand acres in the sea’ (KTU 1.3 iv 45–46).

1480 ḫal- wazmu = qaqlānu d-dayni; ḫamuru ṣ-sayri l-qalī nišā mišībi.
The basic vocabulary of Proto-MSA displays a high number of non-trivial phonological and morphological features affecting individual lexical items (morpholexical features).

1. “big”: Mhr. šāḥ/nāb (ML 391, 306, Bittner 1909:87), Jib. ṛbih/rum (JL 1, 3), Soq. ʾeb/ʿam (LS 49, 63).\(^{1481}\)

⇒ Throughout MSA, exponents of the concept “big” are characterized by gender suppletivism: the masculine and feminine forms of the adjective “big” are produced from different roots.\(^{1482}\) It is all the more curious that, while the Jibbali and Soqotri forms evidently go back to a single source (for which see above in this chapter), the Mehri adjectives have a completely different origin.\(^{1483}\) The semantic suppletivism is thus undoubtedly traceable to Proto-MSA,\(^{1484}\) but its formal aspects are still unclear to us: either the Jibbali-Soqotri picture is original and was later abandoned by Mehri, or rather we are faced with a shared innovation of Jibbali and Soqotri with respect to the more archaic Mehri forms. Within each alternative, preservation of the suppletive paradigm in spite of the loss of its formal exponents is striking.\(^{1485}\)


⇒ PS *būn- ‘son’ has yielded *bīr- in Proto-MSA, exactly as in Proto-Aramaic (for which see Chapter 6, p. 388 above). In both subgroups, -n- is preserved in the plural

\(^{1481}\) For the (comparatively recent) semantic shift from “big” to “bigger” in some dialects Soqotri v. above in this chapter (pp. 477-478).

\(^{1482}\) As pointed out by A. Rubin (2011:73), this feature is generally lost in the Mehri variety registered in MTy, where šāḥ has a non-suppletive feminine form šāḥt. At least in some other Mehri varieties of Yemen the suppletivism is (or was) normal, however, cf. Jahn 1902:192, 241, Bittner 1915a:13, Nakano 1986:124.

\(^{1483}\) As already seen by D. Müller (1909b:348), the masculine form šāḥ must be traced back to PS *šāb ‘to be high, to grow,’ together with Akk. šāḫu ‘to grow (in size or age)’ (CAD Š 106, AHw. 1224), Arbr. šāḥ ‘to grow old’ (Lane 1628) and, perhaps, modern EthS terms for “thousand” (as “big, high number”?): Tgr. šāḥ (WTS 207), Tna. šāḥ (TED 809), Ambr. šāḥ (AED 601), Eza Muḥ. Mṣq. Gog. Sod. Zwy. Wol. šī, End. šī (EDG 570). The origin of the feminine form nāb is uncertain. It has been attributed to the root nāb by T. M. Johnstone, but the well-known meaning “to replace” in Arabic does not provide any satisfactory semantic link (Müller’s explanation “Wie der älteste Sohn den Vater, vertritt die älteste Tochter die Mutter” is highly artificial). Leslau’s comparison with Arb. nāb- ‘copious’ is at first glance more appealing, but as one learns from Lane 2864, this adjective is part of the expression ḫayyān nābān ‘abundant good,’ traditionally explained as ‘that comes again and again by turns’ (this ultimately identical to the basic meaning “to replace” mentioned above). Quite interesting is N. Rhodokanakis’ (1910:22) identification with Arb. nāb- ‘an aged she-camel; the lord, master, or chief of a people’ (Lane 2870), unless we are faced with metaphoric applications of nāb- ‘canine tooth.’ A. Militarev’s comparison with Eg. nb ‘der Herr’ (Wb. II 228) deserves attention (Militarev 2010:51). M.-C. Simeone-Senelle (1991:115) identifies the Mehri adjective with Soq. ṭnāb ‘big, thick,’ missing from LS, but recorded by Wellsted as an equivalent of Arb. ṭmīn. No further etymology for nāb is at hand.

\(^{1484}\) As D. Müller (1909b:348) pointedly observes, Mehri “stimmt ... mit jenen beiden Dialekten darin uberein, daß für Mask. und Fem. verschiedene Wurzeln in Verwendung kommen.”

\(^{1485}\) As one can see, the two sets of forms tend to be mutually exclusive: there is no trace of *Nbh-/*Vmb(m)- in Mehri and, vice versa, almost no parallels to the Mehri forms in Jibbali and Soqotri.
form (Syr. brā, pl. bnayyā). For an attempt at explaining this peculiar phenomenon v. Testen 1985 and 2003:249.

 ⇒ The presence of h- in the second person pronouns throughout MSA still awaits a convincing explanation. Similarly troubling is the absence of *-n-, which is normally not lost (nor assimilated) in MSA. For a survey of opinions v. Bittner 1913a:9, Zaborski 1994:253–256.

4. “bride”/“groom”: Mhr. kōlān ‘bride; groom’ (ML 209), Jib. kōlān ‘bride; bridegroom’ (JL 130), Soq. kōlān ‘fiancé’ (LS 219).
 ⇒ Proto-MSA *kal(l)-ān-, undoubtedly related to PS *kall-at- (DUL 441, HALOT 478, LSyr. 326), is peculiar both morphologically (the suffix *-ān, perhaps originally the exponent of the masculine) and semantically (the gender syncretism).

 ⇒ The MSA terms with the meaning “self” are hard to separate from PS *napš- (note especially the plural nūfōš in Soqotri), but Jib. nūf makes it clear that the Proto-MSA form should be reconstructed without *š-, which does not shift to h and cannot be dropped in Jibbali (cf. SED I No. 46, and 51.).

6. “bull”: Mhr. fūr (ML 87), Jib. fūr (JL 51), Soq. fūr (LS 338).
 ⇒ Proto-MSA *parr- must be related to PS *parr- ‘young of small or large cattle’ (SED II No. 181), but the origin of the inserted *-r- is unclear.

 ⇒ Throughout MSA, *t- in the reflexes of PS *tīs- ‘nine’ is lost, whereas *š is reflected as *s, which is unusual for lexemes belonging to the most fundamental strata of the basic vocabulary. The implications of this picture for the affricate theory of PS consonantism are discussed in Testen 1998a and SED I p. xci.

8. “thorn”: Mhr. šēkōt (ML 378), Jib. šēkōt (JL 250), Soq. šōko (LS 430).
 ⇒ As seen already by Leslau, Proto-MSA *šVka-ra-at- must be related to *šawk-, *šVkk-, represented, inter alia, by Hbr. šōk and šīkā (HALOT 1312, 1326), Syr. sawkā (LSyr. 463), Arb. sawk- (Lane 1621), Gez. šok (CDG 529). The same r-extension is, somewhat less prominently, also attested in Arb. šukārā = šājaratun šayrātun dātu šawkin (LA 8 220).

\[\text{---}1485\text{---}


\[\text{---}1487\text{---}

Admittedly, forms with t- (and -s-) for Jibbali can be found in the Vienna corpus (Bittner 1916:50).
9. “sun”/“day”: Mhr. ḫa-yāwūm ‘sun,’ nḥôr (sg.)/ḥa-yūm (pl.) ‘day’ (ML 290, 462), Jib. yum ‘sun,’ yum (sg.)/ém (pl.) ‘day’ (JL 314), Soq. šm, yhom ‘soleil; jour’/énhor (pl.) ‘jour’ (LS 210, 260, 418).

⇒ A characteristic feature of MSA is complete or partial overlap between the exponents of the concepts “sun” and “day.” As a result, the corresponding PS terms *šams- and *yawm- appear in a complex interplay whose details are intricate enough to deserve a special treatment.

(1) In Mehri, PS *šams- left no trace at all. “Sun” and “days” are expressed by reflexes of *yawm- (ḫa-yāwūm and ḫa-yūm respectively), whereas for “day” a special form nḥôr is used.

(2) In Johnstone’s Jibbali lexicon, “day” and “sun” are expressed by yum < (*yawm-), whereas šum (presumably related to *šams-) is relegated to the meaning “heat of the sun” (JL 267). A. Nakano (1986:105) adduces both yū and sū for “sun” (the former also “day,” ibid. 143); the same is true of Thomas 1937:322 (sūm/yūhm). It is remarkable that choūm ‘soleil’ is present in the earliest extant account of the Jibbali language by F. Fresnel (Lonnet 1991:67, Yushmanov 1950:389).1488

(3) In Soqotri, šm means both “sun” and “day” (LS 210, 418, Nakano 1986:105, 143), although the latter meaning can be alternatively expressed by yhom in (both cases with the suppletive plural énhor). There is, an addition, a special lexeme šyhom designating the heating effect of the sun rays,1489 with all probability cognate to Jib. šum. The Soqotri picture is further complicated by one more phonetically and semantically similar lexeme, viz. šēhem ‘heat (in general)’ = ‘chaleur’ (LS 413).

While the Proto-MSA reconstruction as a whole is still quite difficult to achieve, generalization of *yawm- as a unified designation of both “day” and “sun” is clearly traceable to the proto-level,1490 with a concomitant marginalization of PS *šams-,1491 apparently preserved in Jibbali and Soqotri with a less fundamental meaning “heat of the sun.”1492 The presence of the reflexes of *nahār- in the suppletive paradigms of

1488 So also in Krapf’s Jibbali wordlist (šum ‘Sonne,’ Ewald 1846:311), but since Krapf’s Mehri equivalent is ḫark, it stands to reason that “heat of the sun” is precisely what was meant by his informant (cf. ḫark ‘heat of the sun,’ explicitly equated with Jib. šum in ML 186).

1489 šimik šm ba-šurîm ‘I saw the sun in the sky’ vs. ḫī ḫa ḫa ḫu ḫu di-šyhom ‘The heat of the sun is hard.’

1490 At first glance, one is tempted to dissociate Soq. šm from the lexical forms in y- and to directly compare it to Hbr. šāmāš. However, the unlikely reconstruction “*šams > *šamh > šam” tentatively outlined in LS (what are Leslau’s “s-” and “s-” and why the former persists and the latter shifts to h?) prompts one to reconsider the issue in favor of the hypercorrect development *y- > *yh > s in Soqotri, previously discussed in fn. 1400. In the speech of our informants, the older form with yh- is regularly used in the expression ḥy yôm’hôm ‘one day, once,’ where the conservation of yh- is triggered by the final -y of ṣay ‘one.’

1491 The opposite development, viz. occassional use of šamšu ‘sun’ with the meaning “day” is known from Old Assyrian (Kogan 2006c:199).

1492 Needless to say, derivation of Jib. šum and Soq. šyhom from the conventional PS reconstruction *šams- is faced with serious difficulties: the MSA sibilant does not correspond to the lateral *š but rather to the “general sibilant” *š (as in Hbr. šāmāš). The problem as a whole is too complex to be discussed in the framework of the present chapter, but an eventual relationship between the two sets of form appears,
“day” in Mehri and Soqotri is intriguing: is this characteristically Arabic lexeme indeed autochthonous in MSA and why are its grammatical functions (singular in Mehri but plural in Soqotri) reversed?

 ⇒ The controversial origin of the Proto-MSA designation of “navel” is extensively discussed in SED I No. 254. If related to PCS *šurr-, the MSA terms display a peculiar r-extension\(^\text{1495}\) with no convincing explanation suggested so far. Alternatively (and more probably), if *krv is postulated as the underlying consonantal root (with no parallels elsewhere in Semitic\(^\text{1494}\)), this proto-lexeme should be attributed to purely lexical features of Proto-MSA dealt with above in 3.4.1.

11. “to wake”: Mhr. tākāl (ML 401), Jib. tākāl (JL 270), Soq. atkāt (LS 444).
 ⇒ Undoubtedly related to PCS *ykīl ‘to wake’\(^\text{1495}\) with t-prefixation, well compatible with the reflexive meaning of the root (Bittner 1918a:36).

 ⇒ The presence of *r- in the Proto-MSA reflex of PS *ṭin-ā ‘two’ is inseparable from \(*n > r\) in the reflexes of PS *bin- ‘son’ discussed above in this section (see further Bittner 1913a:85, Testen 1985 and 2003:249).\(^\text{1496}\)

14. “right”: Mhr. ḥāymōl (ML 461), Jib. ēmēli (JL 314), Soq. ḫmēl (LS 64).
 ⇒ Throughout MSA, PS *yamīn- ‘right’ has attracted *-
 in the reflexes of PS *šīmāl- ‘left’ (Bittner 1909:88, SED I No. 292 and 264). This development cannot, however, be easily extrapolated to Proto-MSA: as rightly observed in Simeone-Senelle–Lonnet 1988–1989:247, the Jibbali picture recorded in the Vienna corpus (Bittner 1915b:57–58) is a witness of the opposite direction of influence (نحن ‘right’ vs. شن ‘left’).\(^\text{1497}\)

4. Modern South Arabian as a genealogical subgroup: the evidence of the basic


\(^{1493}\) Leslau’s ‘élargissement par h de la racine šīr’ (LS 421) is not compatible with r in the plural form širēhēn.

\(^{1494}\) Hardly any relationship with *kurār- ‘shin-bone, leg’ (SED No. 157). Slightly more promising may be Tna. mānkārār ‘armpit’ (TED 1604).

\(^{1495}\) Represented by Ugr. ṣêr (DUL 976), Hbr. šēr (HALOT 431; also šir, ibid. 1098), Arb. yāq (LA 7 527), Sab. mkhēl ‘distress, affliction’ (SD 169). Contra AHw. 28 and HALOT 431, there is probably no relationship between this root and Akk. akšān ‘hartnäckig sein’ (AHw. 28), akšān ‘dangerous, overbearing, terrible’ (CAD A; 282).

\(^{1496}\) It is not without interest that the dual ending in the MSA forms for “two” is the “verbal” *-ā (> -ō), not the nominal *-ay (> i). This feature is reminiscent of the indeclinable šīn-ā in Akkadian and ṣō in Ugaritic (Tropper 2000:345).

\(^{1497}\) Cf. also Thomas 1937:306, 316 (ṣārīl ‘left’ vs. ṣīl ‘right’).
vocabulary

4.1. The profound specificity of the basic vocabulary of Proto-MSA is striking, as aptly observed by Jean Cantineau more than sixty years ago: “Il est frappant de constater que des termes sémitiques très usuels sont souvent remplacés par des mots isolés et difficilement expliquables” (1939:144). Already in our preliminary analysis of the Swadesh list of Proto-MSA, both general trends mentioned by Cantineau have proved to be prominent: the amount of shared losses with respect to the reconstructed PS picture is unusually high, whereas most of the corresponding replacements are “strange words” whose Semitic cognates are either very sparse and marginal or missing altogether.

4.2. A comprehensive analysis of the basic vocabulary outside the Swadesh wordlist can only strengthen this impression. The number of exclusive lexical features of Proto-MSA (more than 130 entries) is impressive. From the point of view of their semantic status, the concepts involved are certainly uneven, but well-defined terms belonging to sufficiently fundamental semantic layers are not lacking: “people” (No. 1), “goats” (No. 2), “flint” (No. 3), “to suck” (No. 4), “here” (No. 16), “to bear” (No. 18), “to be pregnant” (No. 21), “heel” (No. 22), “to speak” (No. 38), “to love” (No. 40), “to, for” (No. 41), “shadow” (No. 42), “to be cold” (No. 44), “eyebrow” (No. 45), “earth, soil” (No. 49), “with” (No. 52), “many, numerous” (No. 55), “to find” (No. 57), “to hide” (No. 63), “to come” (No. 77), “half” (No. 86), “to be naked” (No. 91), “sea” (No. 95), “behind” (No. 97), “flower” (No. 101), “old man” (No. 104), “heaven” (No. 107), “milk” (No. 112), “to smell” (No. 131). Such a high number of basic concepts expressed by shared exclusive isoglosses is unlikely to be explained by borrowing or secondary convergence. Rather, it makes feasible — perhaps even compelling — the hypothesis postulating a common genealogical source for Mehri, Jibbali and Soqotri. Given the fact that pan-MSA exclusive morphological features are not so numerous and their innovative nature can seldom be demonstrated with enough clarity, the relevance of these lexical features for a coherent description of the diachronic specificity of this subgroup is hard to overestimate.

4.3. This conclusion is corroborated by a few prominent shared losses which characterise the Proto-MSA basic vocabulary with respect to its PS ancestor: *nVš- ‘people’ (No. 1), *Vrr- ‘flint’ (No. 3), *ynk ‘to suck’ (No. 4), *wld ‘to bear’ (No. 18), *hry ‘to be pregnant’ (No. 20), *kib- ‘heel’ (No. 21), *šadd- ‘shadow’ (No. 42), *wfr/γwfr ‘to be naked’ (No. 94), *šamāy- ‘heaven’ (No. 107). There are not many Semitic languages from which these very important common lexemes would be missing.

4.4. One has to admit that few of the exclusive lexical features of Proto-MSA can be convincingly explained as shared semantic innovations. Little can be added to such potentially promising examples as “fathers” > “people” (No. 1), “depth” > “middle” (No. 7), “blood” > “pus” (No. 20) or “like” > “with” (No. 52), but even in most of these cases the degree of persuasiveness of the hypothetical path of semantic evolution is

---

This qualification is of necessity relative and subjective: it may well be argued that a concept like “flint” is actually not very fundamental. In our selection, preference has been given to concepts for which deeply rooted pan-Semitic exponents are at hand. And in this sense, “flint,” expressed by regular reflexes of *Vrr- in the majority of Semitic languages, does look sufficiently basic.
below our expectations. This situation is certainly not new: relative rarity of true semantic innovations in the Semitic lexicon has been repeatedly observed elsewhere on the pages of this monograph. But it is certainly in the MSA domain that the tantalizing question “where do the new words come from?” arises most forcefully. And, in this sense, the picture obtained from our broader lexical corpus is not different from what has been observed in the Swadesh wordlist.

Early separation from the common Semitic stock, prolonged geographic isolation, substratum and/or adstratum influence — all these factors might theoretically contribute to such a huge accumulation of strangely “non-Semitic” features in the basic vocabulary of Proto-MSA. Regrettably, none of them is capable of convincingly explaining even a single concrete isogloss, which will likely continue to be a major challenge for many further generations of Semitic etymologists.

5. Lexical evidence and the internal division of MSA

Due to the incipient state of MSA diachronic linguistics, very little has been said in scholarly literature about the internal division of this group. To the best of our knowledge, two relatively elaborate positions on this question have been formulated so far.

On the basis of his (unpublished) glottochronological evidence, J. Rodgers (1991:1326–1327) has separated Soqotri from the continental languages: while Mehri and Jibbali display no less than 88 percent of shared vocabulary in the Swadesh wordlist, there is only about 60 percent in common between each of these languages and Soqotri.

A different pattern of classification has recently been developed by A. Lonnet (2008), for whom Jibbali and Soqotri (sudarabique moderne oriental) are jointly opposed to Mehri. Lonnet’s conclusion is based on two morphological isoglosses discussed in the introductory section of the present chapter: the use of *-i- as an apophonic marker of the feminine in adjectives with quadriradical structure (2.1.3, p. 460) and the loss of tV- in the prefix conjugation of some verbal types and stems (2.1.4, p. 461). Since the foundations of Rodgers’ hypothesis are lexical, it will be extensively analyzed below in this chapter and can be provisionally left out of consideration here. Conversely, it seems appropriate to now revisit the morphological isoglosses put forward by Lonnet.

Although the archaic : innovative dichotomy is rarely considered by Lonnet himself, there can be little doubt that both features under discussion are innovative with respect to PS. More intriguing is the question when (or where) these innovations took place — in the hypothetical ancestor tongue of the Jibbali–Soqotri subgroup or

1499 The quotation marks are appropriate here, as most of the pertinent lexemes show no phonological and/or structural features incompatible with the traditional norms of the Semitic Sprachtypus — what is missing is just the Semitic etymology.

1500 Tentatively accepted in Rubin 2010:6. In a more historically-oriented perspective, this hypothesis is found already in Lonnet 2005:200: “La famille sudarabique moderne a été façonnée par deux faits historiques: la séparation ouest-est — qui répond à l’apparition des royaumes sudarabiques antiques — suivie, quelques siècles plus tard, par la migration vers l’île de Socotra d’un groupe de la branche orientale.” It is a pity that Lonnet does not make more explicit his vision of the ESA/MSA interaction (historical, linguistic or at least geographical) in antiquity.
already in Proto-MSA? As far as the first feature is concerned, the possibility of its Proto-MSA origin is tentatively admitted by Lonnet himself (2008:123) and, indeed, can scarcely be discarded. The second feature is admittedly more difficult to dismiss in such a way, as it would involve a rather complex explanatory model: the PS /V/-prefixation would have to have been lost in Proto-MSA, but then re-established in Mehri. In view of this, it may indeed be preferable to analyze the loss of the /V/-prefixes in Jibbali and Soqotri as a shared innovation, but it is doubtful whether this lone morphological feature is sufficient for such a far-reaching conclusion.

5.1. The Swadesh wordlist

The statistics obtained on the evidence presented in Section 3.1 are broadly compatible with J. Rodgers’ results mentioned above. The number of coincidences between Mehri and Jibbali is 79, as opposed to 60 between Soqotri and Mehri and 64 between Soqotri and Jibbali. In the framework of the standard glottochronological procedure, these figures unambiguously suggest that the continental languages form a clear-cut genealogical unity, from which Soqotri is fairly far removed. It is now time to analyze the factors behind such a marked statistical preponderance.

5.1.1. Mehri—Jibbali


1501 Note, however, that such a peculiar retrograde development would not be without precedents in Semitic: consider the emergence of the /V/-prefix for the third person masculine plural in early Canaanite and the subsequent abandonment of this striking innovation in both Phoenician and Hebrew (v. extensively in Chapter 5, p. 344 above). The re-introduction of the /V/-prefixes in Mehri might have been conditioned by analogy with other, more numerous verbal conjugations not affected by the loss (indeed, our own fieldwork on Soqotri shows that there is a great deal of fluctuation among the speakers as far as the loss of the prefixes is concerned and in many cases forms with and without prefixes can both be approved as grammatical). Finally, the possibility of Arabic influence is not to be underestimated, as Mehri has clearly been more open to contact with Arabic than the remaining two MSA languages.

1502 One has to admit that Lonnet’s two Soqotri-Jibbali isoglosses are probably no last word on this issue, as such an analysis of the verbal morphology as the formation of the imperfect of the “medial” verbs: contrast the monovocalic Mehri base ẓagūm with the bivocalic structures in Jibbali (ʒagūm) and Soqotri (ʒagūm), all from Proto-MSA *ʒgūm ‘to go/come in the morning.’ The same applies to the corresponding formation in the passive voice. Also remarkable are the different imperfect patterns of the imperfect for C1C2C3C2 and C1C2C3C4 quadriradical verbs. In Jibbali and Soqotri, it is only the non-reduplicated quadriradical roots that display the a-Ablaut in the imperfect: Soq. ʒyənəšok ‘(blood) splashes’ vs. ʒyənəmdəm ‘he rocks’ (see Rubin 2014:134 for the corresponding Jibbali forms). No such contrast seems to exist in Mehri (cf. ML lxvi). Note, finally, the plural ending -ə for the nisba adjectives (Ratcliffe 1998a:202 and fn. 1403 above).
riet, 'yellow.'

At first sight, this is quite a substantial body of common lexical features, but a deeper inquiry into their diachronic background quickly reveals that many of them are hardly suitable as evidence of a special genealogical relationship between the two languages.

First of all, clearly irrelevant are 4 lexemes directly inherited from Proto-Semitic: kāl — kj(h)l 'all,' lā — la' 'not,' ḥā-mōh — mih 'water,' tēt — tet 'woman.' Preservation of these almost ubiquitous terms in both Mehri and Jibbali is a prime example of trivial retention, whereas their absence from Soqotri must be ascribed to comparatively recent loss and cannot have any bearing on genealogical classification.

Secondly, one can rather safely discard 5 certain or probable Arabisms (nāsār 'night,' marēsam — birdēm 'person,' ramlēt — rēl 'sand,' bēdar — bēdar 'seed,' šōr — šār 'to stand'): in most of such cases, we are likely faced with comparatively late borrowings which independently affected each individual language (or, perhaps more probably, the Mahra-Dhofar geographic and cultural continuum as a whole). Their absence from Soqotri fits well its general conservatism, at least partly explainable by geographic isolation.1503

As far as the remaining 13 lexemes are concerned, nearly a half of them have transparent (yet non-basic) cognates in Soqotri.

Mhr. hōfjal — Jib. šafjal 'belly.'

⇒ From PS *špl 'to be low.'1504 A clearly related Soqotri lexeme has been recorded as part of the nominal expression di-bašafjal 'ce qui est dans le ventre, entrailles avec les excréments; abats' (Simeone-Senelle-Lonnet 1991:1475).1505

Mhr. nāzayz — Jib. žezēz 'bone.'

⇒ Perhaps related to Arb. naḏḏād- 'cartilage of the nose' (= mā baynu raqītati l-ʾanfi ʿilā ʿašlīhi, LA 7 214, SED I No. 24). In Soqotri, this root is preserved as žezēz 'noyau' (LS 323). Furthermore, Soq. vez 'force' (ibid.) with all probability goes back to the meaning "bone," with a common semantic shift (Kogan–Militarev 2003:296 and p. 527 above in this chapter). All this allows one to trace *nažēz 'bone' to Proto-MSA and to treat Soq. sūhlo 'bone' as a secondary, perhaps rather recent replacement.

Mhr. ṭōk — Jib. ūsūšī 'to drink.'

---

1503 Soq. nāsār 'temps' (LS 321) should prevent one from oversimplification. The etymological identity between this term and the designations of "night" in continental MSA is not in doubt, particularly in view of the fact that so many of the attestations of nāsār in the Vienna corpus are found in the expression nāsār di-lēte 'the night-time.' At the same time, an eventual Arabic origin for the whole bunch of lexemes is, as pointed out above, quite likely. All this must mean that the borrowing from Arabic took place quite early, well before the separation of Soqotri as an independent idiom located on the island of Soqotra.

1504 Alternative etymological comparisons advocated in SED I No. 271 are rather far-fetched.

The Soqotri word is unknown to our informants.
⇒ A reflexive stem of PS *šk̪y ‘to give to drink, to water’ (HALOT 1639). Clearly related is Soq. têki ‘fumer le tabac’ (LS 444).\textsuperscript{1506}

Mhr. fêm — Jib. fam ‘foot.’
⇒ From PS *parm- (SED I No. 207), whose complex semantic history is still poorly understood. On the one hand, the semantic agreement between continental MSA and Ugaritic–Phoenician (see further Chapter 5, p. 266 above) might suggest that *parm- was the main designation of “foot” already in PS. If this assumption is correct, the meaning “hip,” normal for Akk. pēmu (AHw. 854, CAD P 321), must be innovative. On the other hand, the meaning of Soq. fam (‘upper part of the back leg of goats and sheep’)\textsuperscript{1507} comes notoriously close to that of the Akkadian lexeme. The same is true of the verbal root f'm in Arabic (‘to be thick in one’s shanks,’ Lane 2421). In such conditions, one cannot exclude that the meanings “upper leg,” “hip,” “thigh” reflect the most primitive situation, whereas generalization to “foot” took place independently in continental MSA and Canaanite.

Mhr. wzîm — Jib. ezûm ‘to give.’
⇒ For the Soqotri parallel with the meaning “to lend” and a marginally attested Arabic cognate v. 3.4.1, p. 566 above.

Mhr. mîkm — Jib. mîkm ‘many.’
⇒ These forms cannot be separated from Soq. kil ‘beaucoup, plus que’ (LS 217). Admittedly, the Soqotri lexeme lacks the m-prefix which might be considered a shared isogloss of the continental languages.

Mhr. hažâwr — Jib. šožrîr ‘yellow.’
⇒ The adjective šožhar is well attested in Soqotri with the meaning “green,” and its disappearance from the semantic slot “yellow” under the impact of the Arabic loanword kôrhem can scarcely be relevant from the point of view of dialectal subgrouping.

The relevance of these examples for dialectal subgrouping is difficult to assess. We may be dealing with Proto-MSA basic terms which preserved their status in the continental languages but lost it in Soqotri, yet the opposite development (non-basic Proto-MSA lexemes which were promoted to the foreground only in Proto-Mehri-Jibbali) is also quite conceivable. Nevertheless, the nature of the semantic correspondences (“belly” > “non-digested food,” “bone” > “stone in a fruit,” “to drink” > “to smoke,” “to give” > “to lend”) suggests that it was functional marginalization in Soqotri that took place rather than the other way around. Therefore, one should probably not attach too much value to the features belonging to this category.

\textsuperscript{1506} The meaning ‘boir,’ also adduced by Leslau, finds no support in the text passages he refers to.
\textsuperscript{1507} Recorded in our fieldwork and missing from the published lexicographic sources.
It is only in a relatively small, residual number of cases (6) that the Mehri-Jibbali isoglosses do appear truly exclusive: ṭāfūr — ṭāfūr ‘cloud’, 1508 ḥaṭṣaf — ḥaṭ ‘feather’, 1509 ẓwū — ẓwē ‘neck’, ṭadīn — ṭādin ‘new’, bɑth — bɑth ‘sand’, 1151 nūḏh — mɑndžh ‘smoke’. 1511 None of these features can be shown to be a reliable semantic innovation.

5.1.2. Jibbali—Soqotri

The number of exclusive isoglosses between Jibbali and Soqotri does not exceed 7 lexemes — quite an insignificant figure in comparison to 22 common features between Mehri and Jibbali.

In one case we are likely faced with a trivial retention from PS: šārīḥ — šārīho ‘root’ (see further Chapter 1, p. 42 above). That this coincidence is most probably irrelevant from the point of view of genealogical subgrouping is further demonstrated by Mhr. šarḥ ‘wand; lopped, dressed branch’ (ML 385)1512: it shows that not only the meaning, but also the peculiar h-extension was present already in Proto-MSA.

Another example (rīḥm — rīhom ‘long’) should be qualified as a retention from PWS: while no well-defined PS exponent of the meaning “to be long” can be reliably reconstructed, *rāyim may well be one of the candidates, as shown by its broad attestation (admittedly, with rather varied meanings) in most of WS: Ugr. røm ‘to go up, to get up’ (DUL 740), Hbr. røm ‘to be high above’ (HALOT 1202), Syr. rām ‘altus fuit’ (LSyr. 720), Arb. ṭaaym ‘excess, redundance, superiority’ (Lane 1204), Sab. rym ‘height’ (SD 120), Gez. ṭayyām ‘heights’ (CDG 41), Tgr. ṭāyīm ‘long’ (WTS 161), Amh. ṭāžzīm ‘high, tall, long’ (AED 405, from a hypercorrect ṭāzzāmā). A similar evaluation is likely for ṭaɡalol — ṭaɡīhal ‘round’: as shown above in Chapter 2 (pp. 69-70), it is not unlikely that the root *ṛgul/*gul was the main exponent of this meaning in PWS.

Four common lexemes are to be qualified as etymologically unclear: gēḥe — gēhe ‘breast’, 1513 ṣēf — ṣērīf ‘to lie down’, 1514 ṣīyād — ṣīd ‘to walk’ 1515 and ṝīnē — inēm.

---

1508 May be metathetically related to Akk. ṑarpitu (CAD E 302, AHw. 243). See further Chapter 5, p. 265 above.
1509 Any connection with the verbal root *kāṭp ‘to pluck off’; Akk. ḡaṭṭu ‘to pluck, to pick, to cut off’ (CAD Q 164, AHw. 907), Hbr. ḡāṭp ‘to pluck off (twigs, ears of corn)’ (HALOT 1094), Syr. ḡāṭp ‘decerpsit, collegit, messem fecit’ (LSyr. 661), Arb. ḡaf ‘to collect fruits’ (LA 9 340), Gez. ḡaṭsā ‘to pick (flowers), to pluck, to snap’ (CDG 453), Amh. ḡaṭṭa ‘to pick (flowers, leaves, fruit), to pluck (ears of grain)’ (AED 841)?
1510 With Bittner 1915a:40, cf. Ar. bāṭīḥ-, ŭaḥaḥ-, ‘a water-course in which are fine pebbles’ (Lane 216).
1511 In the wake of M. Bittner (1915b:21), it is tempting to connect *ndī in Mehri and Jibbali with Arb. ḏūḥān- ‘smoke’ (Lane 861), all of them eventually traceable to a hypothetical biconsonantal *dīh, perhaps preserved in Arb. ḏūḥār, ḏūḥh- = ḏūḥān- (LA 3 16).
1512 Very interesting in this connection is šarḥ di-gɑwweš ‘die Wurzel der Kraft’ in Hein–Müller 1909:124, in spite of the unexpected ṣ.
1513 Cf. SED I No. 99. An eventual relationship with Arb. ṣawḥ- ‘face’ (Lane 3050) is not to be excluded (Bittner 1915b:25), although it is hard to say whether the verbal root is original or rather vice versa.
Reliable semantic innovations shared by Jibbali and Soqotri are lacking.

5.1.3. Mehri—Soqotri

The number of exclusive isoglosses between Mehri and Soqotri is statistically insignificant (3 lexemes). In two cases, obvious Arabisms are involved: mahliq — mahrlik ‘person’ and sūbah — sābah ‘to swim.’ The only real coincidence (kannawm — kūhen ‘small’) must be attributed to chance, all the more since we are most probably faced with a Proto-MSA archaism.

5.1.4 The Swadesh wordlist: conclusions

As we have seen above in Section 5.1.1 (pp. 575-577), the significance of the obvious statistical preponderance of the Mehri-Jibbali exclusive isoglosses is seriously undermined by several negative factors (retentions from PS, PWS and Proto-MSA, Arabic loanwords). Only 6 features (less than one third of the whole amount) are potentially attributable to the exclusive Proto-Mehri-Jibbali lexical stock. This is still more than the potentially relevant isoglosses between Jibbali and Soqotri (4), but one may legitimately wonder whether such low figures can at all be significant for the purpose of our investigation, especially in view of the fact that the speakers of Mehri and Jibbali live in close contact.

The last circumstance leads one to evaluate Lonnet’s hypothesis from a different angle: to leave aside (at least provisionally) the Mehri-Jibbali cognate pairs and to concentrate on the relationship between each of the two continental languages and Soqotri. Indeed, if Soqotri were genealogically closer to Jibbali than to Mehri, we would expect a higher proportion of Soqotri-Jibbali isoglosses in the Swadesh wordlist

1514 Contra Leslau, there is hardly any possibility to connect these verbs with Mhr. šəkuś ‘to sleep,’ the more so since k as the second radical, recorded for Mehri in Jahn 1902:235–236, does not seem to be confirmed by later observers (cf. Simeone-Senelle 1992:58). Comparison with Hbr. ɡp ‘to gasp, to pant’ (HALOT 1375) suggested by M. Bittner (1916:31) is rather problematic semantically. In principle, the stable (not alternating with yh) š in Soqotri suggests that we are faced with the fossilized causative-reflexive prefix rather than a true root consonant, so the real root to look for must be something like *wp.

1515 Neither *wyl (Jibbali), nor *wol (Soqotri) have cognates elsewhere in Semitic (unless one compares Arb. wyl (III) ‘to imitate someone in going or marching, Lane 2954). Contra LS 301, there is certainly no connection between these verbs and Arb. ṛol ‘to come back.’

1516 The origin of the Jibbali-Soqotri impersonal interrogative is still a mystery, although H. Torczyner’s derivation from *mp‘um (1919:47) is rather appealing (Torczyner’s comparison with Tna. mntay < mntay may look superficial and far-fetched, but note Gez. mdāʾi, with all probability from *mpnādi). Conversely, D. Testen’s derivation from a hypothetical */Vn-ayyi- “for-which” (2003:248) has nothing to recommend it.

quite independently of the mutual relationship of the continental languages — for example, *85 for Jibbali-Mehri, *70 for Jibbali-Soqotri and *60 for Mehri-Soqotri.

As long as bare numbers are taken in consideration, this is not quite the case: the difference between the Mehri-Soqotri and the Jibbali-Soqotri isoglosses (59 vs. 64) is not clear-cut enough to suggest that Soqotri is markedly closer to Jibbali than to Mehri.

A closer look at the exclusive isoglosses yields a different picture. As soon as Arabic loanwords are eliminated from the Mehri-Soqotri list, there remains only 1 exclusive Mehri-Soqotri isogloss as opposed to 7 between Jibbali and Soqotri.

This proportion, of course, does not look very impressive statistically, at least not much more than the 6 (Jibbali-Mehri) : 4 (Jibbali-Soqotri) scoring just analyzed above. But if taken at face value, it can give Lonnet’s theory quite a different meaning: instead of postulating a genealogical unity of Jibbali and Soqotri, one may suppose that these two languages are simply more conservative and have independently preserved some of the archaic Proto-MSA lexical (and morphological) features abandoned by the more innovative Mehri.1518 This suspicion finds a striking corroboration in the fact that, in almost every case where Jibbali and Soqotri display an exclusive coincidence, the corresponding semantic slot in Mehri is occupied by a certain or likely Arabic loanword: gawf ‘breast,’ ḥuwa‘l ‘long,’ madāwawr ‘round,’ wārak ‘root,’ sayū ‘to walk,’ ḥeša‘n ‘what.’1519 It is hard to escape the conclusion that each of the corresponding Jibbali-Soqotri lexemes are old Proto-MSA words which were once current also in Mehri, but were later abandoned under the impact of Arabic influence.

5.2. Other lexical strata

Cf. in this sense A. Lonnet’ reasonable remarks in 2005:200: “Le SAM oriental, i.e. le mehri, est marqué par le contact ininterrompu avec les langues des communautés au pouvoir depuis plus de 3000 ans, langues sudarabiques anciennes, puis langue arabe. Le SAM oriental, continental (jibbali) et insulaire (socotri) s’est développé à l’écart de ces influences, isolé par les conditions géographiques.” Lonnet does not specify the background behind his — undoubtedly, appealing — hypothesis of the ESA/Mehri linguistic interaction in antiquity.

In the former three cases, the borrowing is, to our taste, certain, and in the fourth one, highly probable (for ‘irāq ‘root’ in the Arabic dialects of Yemen v. Behnstedt 821). As for Mhr. ḥeša‘n, its nuclear element ġi ‘thing, something’ is inseparable from Arb. sayr- with the same meaning. Now, in the common perception at least, the Arabic noun is derived from the verbal root šyr ‘to wish’ (“what is willed,” Lane 1626) with a well-known semantic development illustrated by Hbr. ḥāpṣ (HALOT 340) and dialectal Arb. ḥāğa (BH 230). The Arabic noun thus cannot have any independent etymological perspective and its similarity to the Mehri form can only be explained by borrowing, not by a cognate relationship (cf. Lonnet 2005:205 where ḥeša‘n is explicitly qualified as an Arabism). If this analysis is correct, Jib. še ‘thing’ and Soq. ši ‘quelque chose’ (JL 259) must also be treated as Arabisms (so explicitly Bittner 1918b:59), which is, however, not easily acceptable, especially for Soqotri, where this element must be present in the negative pronominal and predicative word biš ‘nobody; nothing; there is not’ (LS 99, Bittner 1918b:37), whose obscure b- is scarcely explainable within a borrowing paradigm. A similar analysis of ḥeša‘n can be found in Rubin 2008:79–80 (Rubin tentatively assumes “a calque or borrowing in Mehri”). The first element hē (sporadically attested as an independent pronoun with the meaning “what” in the Vienna Mehri corpora, Bittner 1913a:71) is thought to be identical to Arabic (and PS) naya ‘which.’ Because of h-, it can hardly be considered a true Arabic loan, although the structural similarity with Arb. nayy nayyin (> colloquial Yemeni ǧi ‘what’) is of course striking (Bittner 1915a:31).
As elsewhere in this monograph, the preliminary conclusions deduced from the Swadesh wordlist will be checked on the basis of a more comprehensive inquiry into the basic vocabulary as a whole. Ideally, three groups of exclusive lexical features should have been collected and analyzed: Mehri-Jibbali, Jibbali-Soqotri and Mehri-Soqotri. However, the first task has quickly proved to be impractical: exclusive lexical isoglosses between Mehri and Jibbali are countless, the degree of semantic equivalence is often difficult to control and the possibility of borrowing can never be discarded with certainty. It has been decided, therefore, to concentrate on two smaller, but suggestive groups of isoglosses: those shared by Soqotri with each of the continental languages.

5.2.1. Jibbali—Soqotri

1. Jib. reh/rum, Soq. eb/am ‘big’ (JL 1, 3, LS 49, 63).

⇒ The Jibbali-Soqotri adjectives with the meaning “big” are undoubtedly identical with PS *raab- ‘father’ and *ruum- ‘mother’ (Müller 1909b:347–351, Bittner 1918a:54). It is noteworthy, however, that the synchronically attested designations of “father” and “mother” (Jib. nì/ñem, Soq. íñef-íñem-) are not identical to the adjectives, and the origin of this discrepancy remains to be determined.

2. Jib. ṛḳūr, Soq. ḫar ‘to come home, to spend the night’ (JL 2, LS 71).

⇒ May be related to Arb. ṭahr ‘to be still, motionless, rested’ (Lane 2960). For a variety of alternative etymological interpretations v. DRS 612.


5. Jib. ṛḳāl ‘to make lie down’ (JL 11), Soq. ṛḳal ‘poser, laisser’ (LS 323).

⇒ Perhaps related to Arb. ṭql ‘to collect the poor-rate’ (Lane 2113), Gez. ṭawᵏala ‘to gather water in a basin’ (CDG 67). Less likely is the relationship with PWS *ṣḥl ‘to twist,’ ‘to turn,’ ‘to bend,’ represented by Ugr. ṭḥtn ‘winding’ (DUL 177), Hbr. ṭɔ̥wkhāl ‘crooked’ (BDB 785), Syr. ṭukālā ‘via tortuosa’ (LSyr. 542), Arb. ṭql ‘to bind a camel’

---

1520 For the sake of completeness, the following six common terms will be adduced as a representative sample of this type of shared isogloss. (1) Mhr. ḥā-gōr, Jib. ṭatūr ‘slave’ (ML 3, JL 2). From PS *gr ‘to hire’ (HALOT 11, DUL 27). The Soqotri designation of “slave” is māḥḡul (LS 91) < PS *hnl, the only trace of *gr is egāreh ‘salaire’ (LS 51). (2) Mhr. ṭekḡal, Jib. ṭekal ‘foot’ (ML 114, JL 71). No fully reliable etymology, cf. SED I No. 73. (3) Mhr. ṭamṯa, Jib. miṣr ‘downwards’ (ML 272, JL 175). Etymologically uncertain, perhaps comparable to Proto-Aramaic *miṯ(-at)- ‘middle’ (v. Chapter 6, p. 374 above). (4) Mhr. ṭimin, Jib. ṭim ‘to be deaf’ (ML 364, JL 240). Etymologically unclear. (5) Mhr. ṭanh, Jib. ṭanh ‘fat in an animal, cooking fat’ (ML 365, JL 241). Etymologically unclear, cf. perhaps ṭanḥ-ṣalḥaššat = ad-darānu wa-ḥ-wasaḥ (LA 3 41). (6) Mhr. ṭib, Jib. ṭawāb ‘to cough’ (ML 414, JL 282). Etymologically unclear.
(Lane 2113), Tgr. ṣablā ‘to bind the folded legs’ (WTS 467), Tna. ṣeṣḥālā ‘to be knock-kneed and walk limpingly’ (TED 1866).


⇒ From PS *ḏakar- ‘male’ (HALOT 270, DUL 269, AHw. 1526). A similar semantic narrowing is prominently attested in Aramaic, where the reflexes of *ḏakar-typically designate a ram (v. HALOT 1853 under Biblical Aramaic ḏakar). However, the peculiar morphological form of the MSA lexemes and their well-defined semantics make their common origin unescapable.


⇒ Dhofari Arabic miḏlib ‘Vormittagsmolke’ (Rhodokanakis 20) is likely due to MSA influence.

9. Jib. ḍerāf, Soq. ḍerāf ‘to itch; to suffer from itching, to scratch’ (JL 47).


⇒ As suggested by Leslau, likely related to Syr. ʾgnā ‘cubuit’ (LSyrr. 123), Arb. ʾṣw ‘to bend down,’ ʾaḏna ru ‘humpbacked’ (Lane 464), Gez. ganaya ‘to bow down’ (CDG 199).


⇒ Directly comparable is Arb. ʾṣr ‘to be daring, courageous, bold’ (Lane 424). With DRS 197, it is tempting to further compare Akk. gašāru ‘to be powerful’ (AHw. 283, CAD G 55), even if the sibilant correspondence is not quite regular.


1521 This background of the Soqotri form, unrecognized by Leslau (but cf. DRS 333), appears rather evident in view of both the plural form and the Jibbali parallel. While palatalization *k > ʰ is well attested in Soqotri, the loss (assimilation) of ḏ is admittedly peculiar, cf. the by-form miṣṣer recorded by Müller.

1522 The Soqotri verb ḍerāf (ʾyāḏerafʾlidrāf), missing from the Vienna corpus, has been recorded in the course of our fieldwork, as in ʾesk maʾn dēm bi-ḥisir di-dāšīm wa-ḏerṭā ḏīḥo ḏin ma bi mānā ḏesor fe ‘I woke up from the sleep because of an ant’s sting and scratched the place where it stung me.’

1523 Neither the Jibbali nor the Soqotri verb are registered in the respective standard dictionaries. Soq. ḡesor (ʾyogēsorʾlīgṣīr), the basic exponent of the meaning “to be able” in the speech of our informants, seems to be completely missing from the Vienna corpus where ʾʃemār (LS 205) is typically used instead. Similarly, there is no obvious trace of ʾṣr in JL, although one may suspect that kṣr ‘to overcome’ (JL 136) actually represents this root with *g- devoiced into k- before s.
For some tentative etymological comparisons v. SED I No. 97. Note that PS *šila*- ‘rib’ is also preserved in Jibbali and Soqotri (SED I No. 272).

⇒ Contra Rhodokanakis 1915:19–20, the diachronic relationship between the Jibbali and Soqotri terms seems highly probable. Hardly any connection with either PS *bibr- ‘well’ (Rhodokanakis 1915:19–20) or Arb. γawr- ‘bottom, lowest part of anything; low or depressed ground’ (Lane 2308, Bittner 1913d:6), but no alternative etymology suggests itself. Note perhaps Arb. γabar- ‘a small water in a place where it collects and stagnates’ (Lane 2223).

⇒ Perhaps related to Arb. ḥadab- ‘high, elevated ground’ (Lane 527). Cf. also Tgr. ḥādbā ‘to be confined to one’s house’ (WTS 96).

⇒ Likely identical with Arb. himārat- ‘mass of stone or rock, any wide stone’ (Lane 641). Cf. also Hbr. ḥōmār ‘heap’ (HALOT 330), which, if related, has to be kept apart from the measure name ḥōmār, almost certainly derived from ḥāmār ‘donkey.’

⇒ According to Leslau, “son rapport avec ke est évident,” but this is scarcely persuasive in view of the semantic difference. Outside Jibbali and Soqotri, the allative meaning of *kV is attested only in Amh. kä ‘from’ (AED 1631).

⇒ Cf. perhaps Tna. kẹ̄rɔbba ‘inflammation or a kind of swelling which develops on the hands’ (TED 940), Amh. kẹ̄rɔbba id. (AED 732).

⇒ The diachronic identity between the Jibbali and Soqotri lexemes is clear in spite of their divergent phonetic shapes. No further etymology confirming the priority of any of the two alternative consonantal roots (*mgt or *mkt) is at hand. Hardly any connection with Arb. mqıt ‘to cover a female (about birds)’ (LA 7 459).

⇒ Leslau’s comparison with Akk. padānu ‘road’ (CAD P 2) is semantically difficult in spite of the cross-linguistic evidence for the semantic relationship between

The word is unknown to our informants.
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the two concepts (Huehnergard 1991a:693). Perhaps more appealing is Arb. fand- ‘a great mountain’ (Lane 2448), with metathesis.

⇒ Cf. perhaps Arb. fażratu l-wādî = muttasawruhu l-laqlî yانfażiru riالîhi l-mānî (LA 5 53).

⇒ Cf. perhaps Akk. rubbâ ‘to submerge, to douse’ (CAD R 394).


⇒ Only Akk. šaḥātu ‘to take off a garment; to pull off the skin; to strip off, to cast off’ (CAD Ši 92, AHw. 1130) appears to be relatively close semantically (the phonological correspondences between Akk. š and MSA s on the one hand and Akk. ḫ and MSA Ũ on the other are not regular, but have many precedents elsewhere and can be accepted as relatively reliable). Hardly any connection with Hbr. šḥt ‘to slaughter,’ Gez. saḥata ‘to wound, to injure’ and other related verbs discussed in HALOT 1458 and CDG 494.


26. Jib. šek, Soq. yheḵ ‘(to be) cold’ (JL 261, LS 421).
⇒ Leslau compares Har. šīkāḵ ‘a cold’ (EDH 146).


⇒ Note Tgr. ğākā ‘to be sharp (eyes), to be quick (ear)’ (WTS 614).


---

\[\text{1525} \]

The Soqotri verb reṛhe (yṛāha:f/inhā) is missing from LS and has been recorded in the course of our fieldwork, as in šīwak šīthare terāha dīše nāhrar ‘I saw a cow licking its nose.’ In fact, the verb is once attested in the Vienna corpus, but the correct meaning was not recognized by Müller (‘beschnuppert,’ 1905:249), nor by Leslau (‘flairer,’ LS 397): wa-reṛhe terāha gadd fi-fōlhi ‘And the cow licks the skin of the calf’ (a dead calf’s stuffed skin by which the cow is cheated and forced to give milk).
LIKELY RELATED TO ARB. ʿJarib- ‘a stone projecting from a mountain or from rugged ground; a small mountain or hill’ (Lane 1909).

5.2.2 Mehri—Soqotri

1. Mhr. ḫāwāl, Soq. ṭalöl ‘to sit down’ (ML 390, LS 176).
⇒ The etymological identity between the Mehri and Soqotri lexemes can hardly be put to doubt, especially in view of the Soqotri forms in -ḥ- discovered by M.-C. Simeone-Senelle in the Western dialect of Qalansiyah (1991:113). Simeone-Senelle is likely correct to analyze the unexpected ū- in Mehri as a secondary development from the causative-reflexive prefix ṣ-. No fully persuasive etymology for ṭull ‘to sit down’ is at hand, but note Arb. ṭull ‘to be lean’ (Lane 777), Gez. taḥalala ‘to become tired’ (CDG 261), Tgr. tūḥallā ‘to be weak, tired’ (WTS 52). Of some interest may also be Akk. ḫalātu ‘to creep’ (CAD ḫ 33).

2. Mhr. ḫīnāḥ ‘(coming) back, returning’ (ML 212), Soq. kānāḥ “placé avant un autre verbe au parf. ou à l’imparf. sert à exprimer l’action répétée” (LS 221).

3. Mhr. ḫāfūd, Soq. ḥāfūd ‘to go down’ (ML 225, LS 380).
⇒ Cf. Sab. mkfūd ‘foundations’ (SD 104).

4. Mhr. ḫāṃūt ‘thicket, forest’ (ML 242), Soq. ḫāśm ‘bois’ (LS 388).
⇒ Related to Akk. ḫīṭu ‘forest’ (AHw. 923, CAD Q 272), Syr. ḫāṣā ‘lignum’ (LSyr. 665).

5. Mhr. ḫāsūr, Soq. ḫāṣūr ‘rock on the shore sometimes covered by the sea’ (ML 242, LS 390).

6. Mhr. ṣbēḥ ‘to have the legs stretched while sleeping’ (ML 392), Soq. ḥībāḥ ‘pied,’ ṣbāḥ ‘étendre les pieds’ (LS 410).

⇒ For the extremely complicated etymological background of these terms v. some tentative remarks in SED I No. 268.


9. Mhr. ṭōbāḥ ‘to have a mark’ (ML 406), Soq. ṭōbēḥ ‘marque au fer rouge’ (LS

1526 The Mehri word, previously unknown, can now be found in Sima 2009:518–520: ṭābāš bō-kāv ‘Du zeigst deinen Rücken,’ b-ṭābī mkāhōf ‘Schürfwunden am Rücken.’
10. Mhr. wakāb, Soq. ēkōb ‘to enter’ (ML 425, LS 58).

⇒ There is no fully convincing etymological approach to this root (cf. DRS 536). One may be inclined to compare it with Arb. wkb ‘to walk along in a leisurely manner’ (Lane 2962), Tgr. wakābā ‘to wish to depart’ (WTS 442), perhaps Amh. wūkkābā ‘to be in a hurry’ (AED 1551). At the same time, one wonders whether it may be related to Sab. wkb ‘to receive, to get’ (SD 159). Finally, M. Bittner’s comparison between Mhr. kābkēb ‘entry’ (ML 201) and Gez. kabkāb ‘wedding’ (CDG 273) is appealing, especially in view of the fact that the Mehri noun is attested as a designation of the wedding night (Bittner 1913b).

11. Mhr. ywē, Soq. ēy ‘to fear’ (ML 462, LS 70).

5.3. Conclusions

Our comprehensive search for specific lexical features outside the Swadesh wordlist has shown that the number of exclusive isoglosses uniting Soqotri with Jibbali is almost three times higher than that between Soqotri and Mehri. It means that the statistically insignificant figures pointing in the same direction within the Swadesh list are with all probability not accidental: the basic vocabulary of Soqotri is substantially closer to that of Jibbali than to the Mehri one.

This conclusion is compatible with both hypotheses outlined above in this chapter: Jibbali and Soqotri may constitute a special genealogical subgroup within MSA (as surmised by A. Lonnet), but one cannot exclude, alternatively, that these two languages simply preserve some inherited Proto-MSA features which have been lost in Mehri (as we are inclined to believe). At present, there is hardly any weighty argument in favor or against either of the two possibilities.

Conclusions

1527 The word is unknown to our informants.
1529 This figure is, moreover, by no means definitive: almost every day of lexicographic fieldwork in Soqotri brings fresh exclusive isoglosses with Jibbali. Conversely, new Soqotri-Mehri isoglosses are a rarity.
1530 Thus, practically none of the exclusive Jibbali-Soqotri isoglosses displays any residual traces in Mehri, nor is there any reason to suspect that the hypothetical Proto-MSA lexemes were replaced by Arabisms in that language (which has proved to be quite a prominent trend within the Swadesh wordlist).
The chart below summarizes our views on the key issues of the Semitic classification debate. This pictorial presentation can be supplemented by the following nine theses dwelling on the most crucial and problematic nodes of our genealogical tree.

1. The historical unity of West Semitic hardly ever finds unambiguous support in the morphological domain, and can only rarely be supported by lexical evidence. Within the Swadesh wordlist, nearly all features opposing Akkadian to the bulk of WS can safely be considered Akkadian innovations, saying nothing of the hypothetical genealogical proximity of the remaining languages. Elsewhere in the basic vocabulary, clear-cut lexical oppositions between Akkadian and West Semitic are not rare, but the diachronic status of the respective WS lexemes — shared innovations of Proto-WS or independently preserved PS archaisms — is usually hard to establish. The ES/WS dichotomy, tentatively preserved in our chart, is difficult to maintain on strictly linguistic grounds.

2. There is little morphological evidence for any of the four possible patterns of the internal division of West Semitic (MSA + EthS; MSA + CS; CS + EthS; three equidistant independent branches). At the same time, lexical evidence from the Swadesh wordlist strongly speaks in favor of Central Semitic having a closer proximity to Ethiopian Semitic as opposed to Modern South Arabian. Other strata of the basic vocabulary broadly confirm this hypothesis. There is virtually no lexical (or, for that matter, morphological) evidence uniting Ethiopian Semitic with Modern South Arabian (as against the modified South Semitic theory of O. Rössler and R. Hetzron).

3. Remarkable lexical proximity is a key argument in favor of the Central Semitic hypothesis, advocating a special genealogical link between Arabic, Epigraphic South Arabian, Aramaic and Canaanite. A few important exclusive isoglosses in the Swadesh wordlist are supplemented by numerous commonalities in other domains of the basic vocabulary. The traditional South Semitic theory, uniting Arabic and ESA with Ethiopian Semitic and Modern South Arabian, cannot be reconciled with the bulk of the lexical evidence and ought to be abandoned. A few morphological features contradicting the Central Semitic affiliation of Arabic and ESA (first and foremost, the broken plural patterns) are to be evaluated as areal phenomena having South Arabia as their original focus of irradiation. The same can be said about a few remarkable (even if not very numerous) lexical isoglosses uniting Arabic with Ethiopian Semitic and, much more rarely, Modern South Arabian. The orbit encompassing the languages affected by these areal “South Semitic” trends is represented by a dashed line oval in our chart.

4. The internal division of Central Semitic remains a poorly understood issue which could not be clarified by either grammatical or lexical arguments. The traditional North West Semitic subdivision, comprising Canaanite and Aramaic and tentatively indicated by another dashed line oval in the chart, is particularly hard to maintain.

5. There is strong lexical evidence in favor of the Canaanite affiliation of Ugaritic. Somewhat ambiguous in the Swadesh wordlist, this conclusion becomes compelling as soon as other segments of the basic vocabulary are taken into consideration. A further, very important, refinement of this thesis is a neat
genealogical link between Ugaritic and Phoenician, opposing both to Hebrew. Whether or not there are grammatical arguments decisively contradicting any of these two assertions is in need of further study.

6. A deeply structured net of shared lexical peculiarities is a highly important element of the historical profile of Aramaic. This is particularly true of Old and Modern Aramaic, where many of the classical Aramaic features of phonological and morphological order are missing or cannot surface. There is, furthermore, enough lexical evidence in favor of some sort of special genealogical proximity between Aramaic proper, Samalian and the language of the Deir Alla inscription, although especially in the latter case a few markedly non-Aramaic lexical elements are also in evidence. A tentative solution offered in our chart is a consecutive separation of Deir Alla, Samalian and Aramaic in the strict sense from a common “Aramoid” stem.

7. The nature of the extant text corpora written in Epigraphic South Arabian does not allow us to meaningfully use the lexical evidence in the hot debate on the eventual diachronic unity of the languages traditionally ascribed to this subgroup. Central Semitic lexical features, relatively well attested in Sabaic, are less common (even if not totally lacking) in the non-Sabaic languages, but this restriction may well be due to a much more fragmentary documentation.

8. The historical unity of Ethiopian Semitic, traditionally based on just a few rather shaky morphological arguments, finds reliable support in the lexical domain both within and outside the Swadesh wordlist. The fascinating problem of the internal division of Ethiopian Semitic is not covered by our monograph, but is scheduled for further research. Our chart provisionally reflects two prominent trends, viz. the profound specificity of Tigre with respect to all the remaining languages of the group, and the well established unity of the Southern languages (which, in any case, does not imply that the remaining tongues must be similarly unified). Much further elaboration on these and other related issues is still necessary.

9. The extraordinary degree of specificity in the Modern South Arabian branch is richly documented in all segments of the basic vocabulary, which provide a welcome addition to several remarkable morphological peculiarities. As far as the internal division of MSA is concerned, a special lexical proximity between Soqotri and Jibbali is beyond doubt, although its nature (archaic or innovative) is practically impossible to detect. Separation of these two languages into a special sub-branch in our chart is, therefore, rather conventional.

* * * *(OR SOME SPACE)

None of our conclusions is particularly innovative or revolutionary. In most cases we have built on comparatively solid foundations laid down by our predecessors. It is our conviction that lexical evidence, playing the key role in our argument but unjustly neglected in the majority of earlier studies on this topic, has proven to be an effective means to refine (and at times perhaps to rectify) these earlier conclusions. If, after the appearance of this book, skeptical minds become less radical in their rejection
of the usefulness of the lexical isoglosses in the Semitic genealogical classification, our main goal may be considered abundantly achieved.

Our own vision of the subgrouping potential of the Semitic basic vocabulary is, nevertheless, quite sober and far from over-optimistic. Lexical isoglosses are not to be regarded as a kind of panacea which will at once solve each and every problem in this exceedingly complex debate. Not unlike the more traditional method of morphological innovations, a systematic diachronic analysis of the basic vocabulary has its merits and drawbacks, and the most acute difficulty is typically the same for both methods, namely, our inability to distinguish shared innovations from common retentions. That the two methods can fruitfully be combined is, in our view, not in doubt, and the paramount importance of such an integral approach to this question is even more obvious in view of the deep crisis in which today’s study of the Semitic genealogical classification finds itself. Whether or not such a combined treatment will finally yield an acceptable consensus on this fascinating issue is, of course, very difficult to predict.
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Abbreviations of lexicographic and grammatical tools

PSD: The Sumerian Dictionary of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, 1984–.
## Abbreviations of language names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akk.</td>
<td>Akkadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amh.</td>
<td>Amharic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amm.</td>
<td>Ammonite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm.</td>
<td>Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArm.</td>
<td>Biblical Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cha.</td>
<td>Chaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Christian Palestinian Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Central Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Deir Alla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Old Canaanite forms in the el-Amarna tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EArm.</td>
<td>Egyptian Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eg.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eg.-syll.</td>
<td>West Semitic words in Egyptian syllabic writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End.</td>
<td>Endegeň</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enm.</td>
<td>Ennemor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>East Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Epigraphic South Arabian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthS.</td>
<td>Ethiopian Semitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaf.</td>
<td>Gafat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gez.</td>
<td>Geez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gog.</td>
<td>Gogot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyt.</td>
<td>Gyeto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had.</td>
<td>Hadramitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har.</td>
<td>Harari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hbr.</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdr.</td>
<td>Hadramitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrs.</td>
<td>Harsusi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Htr.</td>
<td>Hatran Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Jewish Aramaic (unspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBA</td>
<td>Jewish Babylonian Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JdArm.</td>
<td>Judaean Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jib.</td>
<td>Jibbali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNA</td>
<td>Jewish Neo-Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>Jewish Palestinian Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Middle Assyrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td>Maalula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhr.</td>
<td>Mehri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Minaean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Mnd.</td>
<td>Modern Mandaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnd.</td>
<td>Mandaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab.</td>
<td>Moabite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MP – Middle Persian
MSA – Modern South Arabian
Msgq. – Masqan
Muh. – Muher
NA – Neo-Assyrian
NB – Neo-Babylonian
NP – Neo-Persian
NWS – North-West Semitic
OA – Old Assyrian
OArm. – Old Aramaic
OB – Old Babylonian
OffArm. – Official Aramaic
PAA – Proto-Afroasiatic
PArm. – Proto-Aramaic
PC – Proto-Canaanite
PCS – Proto-Central Semitic
Pho. – Phoenician
PIE – Proto-Indo-European
PNWS – Proto-North West Semitic
PS – Proto-Semitic
PWS – Proto-West Semitic
Qat. – Qatabanian
Sab. – Sabaic
Sam. – Samalian
SArm. – Samaritan Aramaic
Sel. – Selti
Sod. – Soddo
Soq. – Soqotri
Sum. – Sumerian
Syr. – Syriac
Tgr. – Tigre
Tna. – Tigrinya
Tur. – Turoyo
Ugr. – Ugaritic
Wol. – Wolane
WS – West Semitic
Zwy. – Zway