"WEAK" PHONETIC CHANGE
AND THE HEBREW *ŚÎN*

By

JOSHUA BLAU

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

0. Introduction

THIS ARTICLE originally arose out of the author's attempt to restate the current, "conservative" view on the existence of a third unvoiced non-emphatic sibilant in Hebrew, and, of course, in Proto-Semitic, viz. the *śîn*, against suggestions raised recently. Yet it soon became clear that the analysis of alleged exceptional sound correspondences of the Hebrew sibilants, claimed by some scholars, has to be based on the examination of the problem of exceptional sound correspondences in the Semitic languages in general, i.e., on what we shall in this paper dub "weak phonetic change." Since, it seems, the notion of "weak phonetic change" and its cautious handling is of great importance not only for the elucidation of the status of the Hebrew *ś* in particular, but for comparative Semitic studies in general, I eventually decided to begin this article with a somewhat long exposition on weak phonetic change, and to deal with the special problem of the Hebrew (and Proto-Semitic) *ś* later.

1. "Weak Phonetic Change"

As is well known, occasional deviations from regular sound cor-respondences are well attested in Semitic languages in general and in

Hebrew in particular. This gives rise to two problems: a theoretical one, concerning the origins of these deviations, and a practical one, concerning how far they authorize scholars to jump to conclusions and apply exceptional sound correspondences for the etymological interpretation of difficult words, thus elucidating abstruse passages.

Malkiel, in a brilliant essay (1962), has focused attention on the cooperation of three forces in the emergence of unexpected sound correspondences, viz. what he dubs *"weak phonetic change," spontaneous sound shift* and *lexical contamination.* Phonetic changes tend to be regular to the extent that they occur in clearly delimited speech communities. Since, however, most communities (including those speaking Semitic languages) tend to be fluid, irregularities occur, considered by Malkiel to be due to weak sound change. In the following, however, we shall prefer to speak of dialect mixture and borrowing, and use the term "weak phonetic change" to designate the result of the cooperation of dialect mixture and borrowing, spontaneous sound shift and lexical contamination. There exists no general agreement on the definition of "spontaneous sound shift," which, at any rate, seems to include dissimilation, assimilation (at least at a distance), metathesis and haplology. Lexical contamination, the third factor contributing to the emergence of weak phonetic change, is, in my opinion, especially important for Semitic languages. Since in Semitic tongues the majority of roots are triliteral, the number of possible combinations is more limited than in other languages and, therefore, the number of roots which by pure chance are similar in sound and form is relatively quite high. These roots tend to attract each other: a "sporadic"[1] sound shift occurs when a word, attracted by another word which belongs to the same semantic field, assimilates itself to it in form as well. Similarly, words similar in sound and related in meaning may assimilate themselves in meaning, so that the meaning of one word is specialized through the influence of the other.[2] It stands to reason that it is, *inter alia,* through this attraction that Semitic tongues exhibit a great number of triliteral roots related in meaning, exhibiting identical first and second radicals and differing in the third only,[3] thus making the impression that the third radical exhibits only phonetic alternation. In other,

---

1. This is the term used by Fraenkel (1898, p. 61), who was the first to pay systematic attention to this phenomenon.

2. See Fraenkel (1898, p. 62).

3. Like Hebrew *prd, prz, prṭ, prk, prm, prs, pr', prṣ, prq, prr, prś, prš.* For this phenomenon cf. recently the judicious remarks of J. Kurylowicz (1973, pp. 6, 12).

though admittedly less conspicuous cases, words of similar (or allegedly similar) meaning, differing either in their first, or sometimes in their second radical,[4] give the impression that the first or second radical, respectively, exhibits a mere phonetic alternation, the basic meaning being expressed by the other radicals. For all these reasons, one must be careful not to jump to conclusions because of the occurrence of what seems to be irregular sound correspondence and disregard the typical features in favor of deviant and random features. One has always to bear in mind that the great majority of words in the various Semitic languages reflect sound correspondences due to regular sound shift, and it would be against any sound method to overlook them because of the existence of exceptional sound correspondences, which are due to weak phonetic change. Not only is the Semitic linguist obliged to assign to regular sound correspondence its proper place and not to exaggerate the importance of irregular sound correspondence, but the Semitic philologist must not light-heartedly apply weak sound change for the elucidation of difficult passages. The prospects that a word whose meaning is not sufficiently clear does indeed exhibit a weak sound change are rather limited and, therefore, one cannot be careful enough. In the following we shall deal with some cases of real and alleged weak sound changes in various Semitic languages.

1.1 Aramaic *ṣ* Corresponding to Proto-Semitic ǯ

The Proto-Semitic (PS) consonant which is continued by Modern Standard Arabic *ḍ*[5] is represented in Early Aramaic by *q* and in later Aramaic by . Yet, alongside this regular correspondence, another, much more restricted one exists, viz. that of the Aramaic *ṣ*, corresponding to PS ǯ. In Blau (1970a, pp. 60–63), I have collected about fourteen cases of such abnormal correspondence. Many of these cases can be interpreted as originating in spontaneous sound shift, i.e., caused by the dissimilating

4. Thus, e.g., Haupt (1906), *inter alia*, connected *wqr, nqr, sqr, q'r*, and *'kr, wkr, nkr, mkr, škr, k'r;* Moscati (1947, p. 135)—*brr, b'r, btr*, further *infra ksl, ksl, ktl* proposed by Vollers (1894). It goes without saying that many of these alleged affinities are rather dubious. Yet cf. also rather established cases like Arabic *'lk, 'lk, lwk*, denoting "to chew, to champ the bit."

5. And which, in all likelihood, in PS was something like ǯ; cf. Steiner's (forthcoming) work on the lateral pronunciation of ʒ and *ś*, to be edited by the American Oriental Society.

effect of *ǵ, ḥ,* and *r*.[6] Other cases may be due to lexical contamination, e.g. *ṣmd—ḍmd.* At least in one case (*npṣ*—"to shake [off]"), it is difficult to find any sound that could have caused dissimiliation or to discover a lexeme with which it could have blended; therefore, one may perhaps attribute its origins to an Aramaic dialect in which *ḍ* had shifted to *ṣ,* rather than to *q/*'. In other cases, the *ṣ* may be due to the joint operation of dissimilation, lexical contamination and dialect mixture.[7]

1.2 Ugaritic *ǵ* Corresponding to PS *θ*

Another famous case of irregular sound correspondence is that of Ugaritic *ǵ* to PS *θ*.[8] Gordon (1965, pp. 27–28) went so far as to posit, on the strength of five such correspondences acknowledged by him, an additional PS consonant. Since, however, weak phonetic change is a quite widespread phenomenon in Semitic languages, we are either obliged to posit additional PS consonants in every case or, what makes much more sense, not to postulate an additional PS sound in the case of Ugaritic *ǵ* corresponding to PS *θ*.[9] In the light of the quite composite character of the dialectal structure of Ugaritic, the weak sound change Ugaritic *ǵ* < PS *θ* can easily be interpreted as due to dialect mixture.[10] On the other hand, I have not found cases which cannot be explained otherwise.[11]

6. As *ḥṣr* ("grass"), occurring in Sefire (whereas Judeo-Aramaic *ḥāṣīrā* may be considered a Hebrew loan as well).

7. Thus *ṣbr* ("to heap up"), attested not only in Judeo-Aramaic but outside it as well (for particulars see Blau, 1970a, pp. 60–63), could have originated in an Aramaic dialect in which *ṣ,* rather than *q/*', was the reflex of PS *ḍ;* the *ṣ* could be due to the dissimilatory effect of *r;* and it could exhibit the lexical contamination of the reflex of PS *θbr* and *ṣbr.*

8. For the whole complex of the problem of Ugaritic *ǵ,* see also Dietrich-Loretz (1967).

9. It has been claimed, to be sure, that for reasons of symmetry, a third lateralized dental existed in PS (see Cantineau, 1960, pp. 16, 55, 287), and it could be reflected by the sound correspondence *θ—ǵ.* Yet symmetry is a rather weak argument (and Cantineau himself was more reserved about it, cf. p. 287, which was written in 1951–52, as against the other passages from 1941) and the fact that it is allegedly reflected by Ugaritic alone makes it even less likely.

10. Cf. Blau (1968, p. 525a, note 18).

11. Rather extreme is Rössler's attitude (1961), who altogether denied the existence of the sound correspondence PS *θ* = Ugaritic *ǵ.* After finding different etymologies for most words allegedly exhibiting this sound correspondence, he accepted only two *prima facie* cases, viz. *ǵm'* and *yqǵ* and attributed them, however, to clerical error. Yet the occurence of such clerical errors in exactly a way that led to the assumption of a nonexisting sound shift, would be quite a coincidence. Cf. also Jirku (1964, pp. 481–482).

Even the clearest case, viz. *ǵm'* ("to be thirsty"), *can* be interpreted as due to a blend of *ẓm'* with *ǵmy*.[12] The other cases are even less certain: Gordon (1965, text 127:42), *ištm'. wtqǵ udn* ("hear and . . . ear") is interpreted (in the wake of Isa 50:4 *yā'îr lî 'ōzen lišmōā'*, "he wakens my ear to hear") as "be alert (of ear)," the Gt imperative of *yqẓ/yqǵ*. This is by no means impossible, yet not certain at all. One must not overlook the differences between the Ugaritic text and the biblical passage: the latter not only uses the root *'wr*, rather than *yqṣ*, but also speaks of God awakening man's ear, rather than of someone being awakened as to his ear. Therefore, one has to take into serious consideration Aistleitner's proposal (1965) to interpret *tqǵ* as "incline";[13] cf. the frequent biblical phrase *hiṭṭā 'ōzen* ("he inclined his ear"), parallel to *šāma'* ("he heard"). As to *nǵr* ("to watch"), Rainey (1970) has adduced strong arguments for its correspondence with PS *nθr*.[14] On the other hand, Loewenstamm (1971) has convincingly shown that *nǵr may* be interpreted as a secondary root, parallel to Ugaritic *ǵyr* ("to watch") = Hebrew *'wr* ("to watch"), which, according to this view, has to be separated from Ugaritic and

12. In Arabic, various extensions of what seems to be the bilateral root *ǵm* are attested: *ǵamy* ("fainting"), *ǵym* ("to be clouded, be affected with burning thirst"); the original meaning was, it seems, "to be covered," which developed to denote both fainting and thirst.

13. His suggestion, however, was not accepted because of the quite impossible etymology proposed by him: he compared the Ugaritic word with Arabic *ṣǵy* ("to incline"), as if Ugaritic *q* could correspond to Arabic *ṣ!* Yet even without a convincing etymology, one must not discard the possibility of *tqǵ* denoting inclination. Tentatively only, I propose to interpret it as G imperative of *tqǵ*. A trace of this *tqǵ* ("to incline") has perhaps been preserved in Biblical Hebrew *tq'*. *tq'*, as a rule, denotes "to thrust, to clap, to blast" and it stands to reason that, in this sense, it is onomatopoetic (cf. Blau, 1955, p. 344). Yet in Exod 10:19 *wayyiśśā 'et hā'arbe wayyitqā'ēhû yammā sûp* ("and it carried the locusts and . . . into the Red Sea") it may denote "it inclined, turned them into the Red Sea," and thus be related to our *tqǵ*. *Prima facie*, the use of *h locativus (yammā)* corroborates this interpretation, since *tq'*, as a rule, governs the preposition *bə-* (the phrase *tāqa' kap lə-* seems to be of different origin, literally meaning "to clap hands *for* someone"). Caquot (1974, pp. 207–208) identified Ugaritic *tqǵ* with Hebrew *tq'* in the Middle Hebrew *tāqa' libbô lə'ābîw šebaššāmayim*, interpreted by him as "he extended his heart to his celestial father." He also compares (Caquot *et al.*, 1974, p. 571, note x) biblical *tāqa' 'ōhel* ("to pitch a tent"). Yet, despite the existence of *nāṭā 'ōhel*, literally "to spread out the tent" (e.g. Gen 31:19), it seems much more likely to interpret *tāqa' 'ōhel* as an abbreviation of *tāqa' yitdôt hā'ōhel* ("to drive the pegs of the tent"). And as to the Middle Hebrew phrase, it must not be separated from Talmud Bab., *Yebamot*, 109b *tôqēā' 'aṣmô lidbar hălākā*, exhibiting an identical construction and perhaps denoting "(forcefully) inserting himself/forcing himself into the decisions of the religious law," but by no means "extending himself . . . ". At any rate, both expressions are vague (cf. also Ben-Yehuda, 1948, s.v.) and cannot be used for the elucidation of the Ugaritic word. For *tāqa' kap* see *supra*.

14. Cf. also Rainey (1971, pp. 157–158).

Hebrew *'wr* ("to arouse").[15] Ultimately, the decision between these two intepretations depends on how one assesses the frequency of the sound shift PS θ > Ugaritic *ġ*, and accordingly, as to the problem we are treating, we move in a vicious circle. *ġr* ("mountain") is generally compared with Aramaic *ṭûr* ("mountain") and Hebrew *ṣûr* ("rock"). Yet Rössler (1961, pp. 165–167) has quite convincingly demonstrated that the affinity of these words is rather doubtful, since the Hebrew word denotes "rock" rather than "mountain," and no common Semitic word for "mountain" exists.[16] As to *mġy* ("to reach, arrive"), its connection with Aramaic *mṭ'* is rather dubious, since one would have expected the Ugaritic word to terminate in '. Moreover, the expected form *mẓ'* is also attested in Ugaritic, and, therefore, it stands to reason that *mġy* is of different origin.[17] *ġlm,* etc. (Gordon, 1965, Krt 19; 125:50; 51:vii:54) has been interpreted by many as denoting "covering, darkness." Yet even if this intepretation proves to be correct, it can easily be derived from Hebrew *'lm* ("to hide"), presumably related to Ugaritic *ġlp* ("to envelop"); see Ginsberg (1946). Since, as we have seen, the correspondence PS θ—Ugaritic *ġ* is so restricted,[18] one will not hasten to elucidate obscure words like *ġlm,* etc. with its help, the more so since in Gordon (1965, text 51:VII:54–55) *ġlmt* is parallel to *ẓlmt,* the real correspondence of PS θ.[19]

---

15. Incidentally, in Middle Hebrew *n'r* in *nip'al* ("to awake") is attested (and perhaps Judg 16:20), thus exhibiting the alteration *'wr:n'r* in the sense of "to awake."

16. Rössler's own etymology (p. 167) for *ġr,* though possible, is unverifiable. He claims that it corresponds to Arabic *ġawr* ("lowland"). This could be buttressed by several words denoting both "lowland, etc." and "mountain, etc.", occurring in Semitic languages (see Nöldeke, 1910, pp. 83–84). Rössler himself compared Hebrew *gib'ā* ("hill") and *gābîā'* ("cup"), which, however, are less convincing; the more so, since *gābîā'* may be an Egyptian loan word (see Koehler-Baumgartner, 1967ff, s.v.). Nöldeke (1910, pp. 83–84) adduces, *inter alia,* Christian Palestinian Aramaic *gəlîmā* ("valley, hill"). As to Arabic *ḥawṣā'u* ("deep well" and "elevation") adduced by Nöldeke, see also Fischer (1965, p. 59, note 1). (I do not understand his exact reasons for his opposition to Nöldeke's etymology; he may perhaps be referring to the second etymology proposed by Nöldeke.)

17. For particulars, see Blau (1972, pp. 67–72).

18. It is perhaps limited to one case, viz. *ġm'* (which may be due either to dialectal borrowing or presumably to lexical contamination).

19. For want of additional material it is impossible to say whether the alternation of *k—zz* in one word in Khurrian (see Soden, 1967, pp. 291–294) has significance for our phenomenon. As to the spelling with *ẓ* for *ṭ,* Dietrich *et al.* (1975) explained it as due to Khurrian influence as well. I have the impression that the seven words spelled in this way (in ten occurrences) have to be divided into two groups. Two words occur in the archaizing text UT 77 in Gordon (1965) (cf. for this Blau, 1970a, p. 43, note 3) and, although according to

1.3 Ugaritic θ Corresponding to PS š

Another weak phonetic change in Ugaritic is the correspondence of Ugaritic θ to what seems to be PS š. The only conspicuous case is Ugaritic ḥθbn ("account"), exhibiting θ as second radical, supported by Egyptian ḥšb ("to reckon up"), since Egyptian š may correspond to Semitic θ, yet not to Semitic š. Aramaic ḥšb ("to reckon up, to consider"), however, points to original š, as does also Arabic ḥsb, whereas Hebrew ḥšb may be derived from both ḥθb and ḥšb. Since in loan words Ugaritic θ may represent š, it may be borrowed in Ugaritic.[20] This, however, does not explain Egyptian š. Degen (1971) therefore suggested to consider this root (which is absent from Akkadian) to be ultimately an Egyptian loan word in all the Semitic languages in which it is attested. This would explain the exceptional sound correspondence Egyptian š—Ugaritic θ—Hebrew š. š in the Aramaic dialects is a Hebrew loan, and Arabic ḥsb an Aramaic loan. This theory, however, despite its ingenuity, is not without problems. Such a long chain of borrowings, though by no means impossible, is *prima facie,* somewhat unlikely. Moreover, ḥšb is attested in quite a considerable number of Aramaic dialects,[21] and this makes the assumption of a Canaanite loan somewhat dubious. Even the assumption of an Aramaic loan in Arabic is less likely than it would seem *prima facie.* Not only is Arabic ḥsb early and amply attested and appears in many derivations (see, e.g., Lane, 1863–93, s.v.), but Goldziher (1889, p. 41) has quite convincingly suggested that Arabic ḥasab ("noble descent") originally denotes the enumeration of the noble deeds of the ancestors. If this etymology proves true, it would show how deeply ḥsb and its derivations are rooted in Arabic. The autochthonous character of Arabic ḥsb becomes even more likely, if one accepts Nöldeke's derivation (1910, p.

---

the lucid exposition of Dietrich *et al.* (1975), the shift ? > ʈ is not attested in Ugaritic texts, I still think that it occurred in Ugaritic, because the simplest explanation of the use of ? instead of ʈ in 77 is still the assumption of pseudo-correction (see Blau, 1970a, p. 43). All the other occurrences of the spelling with ? instead of ʈ occur in one group of texts. I am inclined to interpret it by the assumption that the shift of ? > ʈ underlies this group of texts also. In this group, there was a tendency to mark the sound ʈ more by the letter ? (which was also pronounced ʈ) than by the letter ʈ, and this is the reason for the occurrence of this special spelling in this group of texts. Similarly, the Geʿez letter z, from the point of view of the history of the alphabet, continues South-Arabic δ rather than z, and š in the Canaanite alphabet occupies the place of θ, as exhibited by Ugaritic.

20. See Blau-Greenfield (1970, p. 13).

21. For particulars see Koehler-Baumgartner (1953, Aramaic part, s.v. ḥšb).

59, note 3) of Arabic *ḥizb* ("party, sect"), Ge'ez *ḥezb* ("people, clan, tribe") from *ḥisb* (cf. also Jeffery, 1938, pp. 108–109). Nöldeke calls attention to the alternation of the roots *ḥsb*—*ḥzb* in Ge'ez (cf. also *infra*), and his derivation may be buttressed by the occurrence of *ḥzb* in Epigraphic South-Arabic not only in the sense of "people" (so Conti Rossini, 1931, s.v.) and "fighting band" (so Jamme, 1962, s.v.), but also in that of "quantity, number" (Jeffery, 1938, pp. 108–109). An ingenious solution was proposed by Rainey:[22] he assumed the existence of two originally different, but quite similar roots; viz., *ḥθb* ("to reckon") and *ḥšb* ("to think"), which later have fallen together in the various languages. This suggestion can be buttressed by the likely etymology Egyptian *ḥθb* has on the one hand, and Hebrew *ḥšb* has on the other. (Which, admittedly, can be interpreted not only as exhibiting original *ḥšb* but also *ḥθb*.) Sethe (1916, p. 77; also quoted by Brockelmann, 1928, s.v. *ḥšb*) has quite convincingly derived the Egyptian word "to reckon" from "to break," whereas the original meaning of "to think" might have been "to tie" (cf. Hebrew *ḥēšeḇ*, "girdle"), since the connection between "to tie" and "to think" is well attested.[23] This assumption of the double root *ḥθb* ("to reckon")—*ḥšb* ("to think") can be accomodated to the occurrence of Ge'ez *ḥsb* ("to reckon, to consider") and *ḥzb* ("to consider") by supposing that *ḥsb*, originally denoting "to reckon" only, arose from *ḥθb*, whereas *ḥzb* ("to consider") has to be derived from *ḥšb*.[24] On the other hand, Epigraphic South-Arabic *ḥzb* ("people," or "fighting band," and "number, quantity") is not without difficulties for Rainey's thesis. The meaning "people, fighting band" can, to be sure, be derived (just as Ge'ez *ḥezb*, "people, class, tribe") from the postulated original meaning of *ḥšb* ("to think," viz. "to tie").[25] Yet the derivation of "quantity, number" from the postulated original *ḥθb* denoting reckoning[26] is phonetically ticklish, since it is much more difficult to imagine a phonetic shift *θb* > *zb*

22. First in Rainey (1971, p. 159) somewhat cautiously. In the first (Hebrew) version of this article he had not yet proposed this thesis. Cf. also Rainey (1974, p. 185, note 10).

23. See the literature adduced in Blau (1957, p. 101, and especially note 5). Cf. also Arabic '*aqada* ("to tie"), '*i'taqada* ("to believe"), and further in Gesenius (1835ff, s.v. *ḥšb*).

24. One must not simply assume the shift *ḥšb* > *ḥsb* (according to Ge'ez sound shift *š* > *s*) > *ḥzb*, since *ḥzb* occurs in Epigraphic South-Arabic as well, in which (see the literature adduced in Blau, 1970a, p. 111, note 4) *š* did not shift to *s*. Accordingly, one would rather postulate *šb* > *źb* (since no phoneme *ź* exists in Epigraphic South-Arabic) > *zb*.

25. For the semantic shift cf., e.g., Arabic '*uṣba* ("party") from '*aṣaba* ("to bind").

26. Cf. Nöldeke (1910, p. 59, note 3), who derived also the meaning "party" from "reckoning," assuming, however (see *supra*), original *ḥisb* < *ḥišb*.

(*hiθb > ḥizb) than šb > zb (*ḥišb > ḥizb). If one nevertheless accepts Rainey's thesis (as I am inclined to do), the most satisfactory solution seems to be to assume that ḥizb ("people, fighting band") arose from ḥšb ("to tie") and then attracted *ḥθb ("reckoning").

All the other cases of Ugaritic θ corresponding to PS š are dubious. It stands to reason (see Blau-Greenfield, 1970, p. 12) that Virolleaud was right in connecting the Ugaritic epithet gθr with the Akkadian epithet gašru ("strong, powerful"), since both sense and usage exactly fit. Soden (1965ff, s.v.) has suggested to connect it with Arabic jsr ("to be bold, courageous"), which, however, cannot reflect PS θ, but either š or s. The meaning of the Arabic root, although it does not exactly tally, is close enough. Therefore, one will either accept the equation Akkadian gašru — Arabic jsr and consider Ugaritic gθr an Akkadian loan in which Ugaritic θ transcribes Akkadian š (see Blau-Greenfield, 1970, p. 13), or regard the (partial) similarity of Arabic jsr as being due to chance only. As to Gordon (1965, text 128:1:2) mẓ(?)ma. yd.mθkt, Greenfield (1969, p. 96,) was right in remarking that it occurs in a doubtful context. It is, as a rule, translated "the thirsty she took by the hand." Yet mẓma, if the reading is correct, does not exactly denote "thirsty," but rather "the parched one," as, in fact, Ginsberg (in Pritchard, 1958) translates, being the passive participle of the D form. One would rather expect simple "thirsty"; in Hebrew, at any rate, the parallel *məṣummā' does not exist. Moreover, the attempt to compare Ugaritic yd mθkt with Hos 7:5 māšak yādô 'et lôṣəṣîm is not convincing. The verse is difficult and its meaning dubious. But even if it meant "he stretched out his hand with scorners," i.e. "made common cause with them," it does not mean "he supported the scorners (who needed help)," as the alleged context in Ugaritic requires. Even the sentence structure is different, since the Ugaritic construction would be paralleled by Hebrew *lôṣəṣîm yād māšak. More plausible would be to compare Klmw 13 (cf. Ginsberg, 1946) w'nk.tmkt.mškbm.lyd ("and I supported the mškbm"), tmk denoting not only "to hold (firmly)," as does Hebrew mšk (see Yalon, 1963, p. 80) and Arabic msk, but also "to support." Yet Hebrew mšk (and Arabic msk) do not exhibit the meaning of "support." Accordingly, in light of the dubious text, the lack of any comparable use of mšk, and the necessity of postulating weak sound change, one would rather refrain from comparing mθkt with mšk. Greenfield (1969) has also correctly remarked that for Ugaritic dθ (which has been interpreted as "to tread, trample down") an adequate etymology is provided by Arabic dyθ ("to abase"), so that it

need not be connected with PS *dwš/dyš.* Caquot *et al.* (1974, p. 436, note f), on the other hand, compared it to the rare Arabic *daθθa.* Nothing certain can be stated as to Ugaritic *gbθt.* (For the occurrence of this and other Ugaritic words, see the various Ugaritic glossaries.) It is generally interpreted as "humps" of the *ibrm,* which may denote "bulls," the *gbθt* of the *ibrm* being parallel to the *qrnm* of the *θrm,* i.e., "the horns of the oxen." Yet it is not certain that *gbθt* really denotes "humps," and not another conspicuous part of the body of the *ibrm,* and even if it does, its connection with Middle Hebrew *gbš* ("to heap up") is rather dubious. Moreover, it is difficult to state what kind of *š* is exhibited by *gbš,* since it is attested, in the form of *gbš,* only once in Judeo-Aramaic (see Kutscher, in Koehler-Baumgartner, 1967ff, s.v. *dabbešet* [!]), where, accordingly, it may have been borrowed from Hebrew. Hebrew *šillûḥîm* ("dowry") in 1 Kgs 9:16, *prima facie,* has a clear etymology, viz. from *šlḥ* ("to send"), being the parting gift of the father to his daughter when sending her away. Yet in Ugaritic "to send" is *šlḥ,* while "dowry" (parallel to *mlg,* "dowry") is *θlḥ.* Accordingly, despite the *prima facie* certain etymology, Ugaritic *θlḥ* and Hebrew *šillûḥîm* have to be separated from Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Aramaic *šlḥ.* Were not Ugaritic *šlḥ* attested, one would connect *θlḥ* with "to send," in spite of the existence of Aramaic *šlḥ* (as did, in fact, Driver, 1956, s.v., who, however, misread the word as *θlḥ*), and would assume weak sound change, an additional proof of how careful one has to be not to rush to postulating exceptional sound shifts. Ugaritic *ngθ* and *ngš,* both denoting "to approach, meet,"[27] are, it seems, doublets, either original, inherited ones[28] or originally roots with similar, yet nevertheless different meanings, which were attracted to one another, perhaps also by the interference of other roots.[29] Ugaritic *θθ* ("six"), *θdθ* ("sixth") do not,

27. Ullendorff (1962, p. 340) attributed the meaning of "to press, drive, overwhelm" to *ngš.* Yet in Gordon (1965, text 52:68) only the meaning "to approach, meet" is suitable.

28. Cf., e.g., Mühlau-Volck's rather fanciful assumption (1890, s.v. *ng*') that roots exhibiting *ng* as their first radicals have the basic meaning of "to push, beat," as Hebrew *ngh, ngḥ, ngl, ngn, ngp, ngś, ngš,* also *nhg,* and Arabic *njnj, njl, njh, njš, njr, nj*'. Much more likely is Streck's view (quoted in Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v. *ngš*) that *ngš* and *ngš* are secondary offshoots of one root denoting "to tread."

29. Thus, e.g., Arabic *njθ, inter alia* denoting "to seek, investigate," may be influenced not only by *njš,* which, among other meanings, denotes "to seek" as well, but also by the very frequent *bḥθ,* which governs the preposition of '*an,* as does *njθ.* It is even possible that at first *njθ* was influenced by *bḥθ,* and then *njš* was influenced by *njθ.* At any rate, it seems that Gordon's assumption (1965, s.v. *ngθ*) that Ugaritic *ngθ* denotes "to seek," does not fit text 75:1:40, where Baal has already met the "devourers." One would rather interpret it as "to approach." In Gordon (1965, '*nt:* pl. x: V:4, 17) the text is not clear enough, whereas in

of course, exhibit an exceptional sound shift *š* > *θ*, despite their cor-
respondence to PS *šdθ* (as preserved by Epigraphic South-Arabic), since
the initial *θ* is due to assimilation to the final one. Similar assimilation is
well attested in Ugaritic, where the *š*-prefix of the causative verbal form is
assimilated to *θ* as first radical (see Gordon, 1965, p. 34). Compare also
the assimilation of the *θ* of **šādiθ* to the initial *š* in Arabic *sādis* < **šādiš*
("sixth"). As to Ugaritic *θlθ* ("three") and its correspondence to PS *š*, see
Blau (1972, p. 80); as to Ugaritic *iθ* ("being") as against Arabic *laysa* ("is
not"), see Blau (1972, pp. 58–61). In the wake of al-Yasin (1952, p. 110),
Ugaritic *θrm* ("to eat, dine") is generally connected with Iraqi Arabic
θaram ("to cut food in pieces"). If this connection is correct (pay atten-
tion to the difference in meaning!), it may be buttressed by Classical
Arabic *θarama*, as a rule denoting "to break the teeth," according to
Landberg (1920–42, s.v. *θlm*), yet al-Azharī, quoted by ibn Manẓūr
(1955–56, s.v.), states that it means, like *raθama* and *ratama*, any sort of
breaking. On the other hand, *šrm* ("to break") is attested in Syriac and,
in the form *srm* (marginally, to be sure) in Arabic.[30] One would perhaps
posit a PS doublet *θrm—šrm* ("to break"), which may or may not be con-
nected with Ugaritic *θrm* ("to eat, dine"). Ugaritic *θnn* denotes some kind
of soldier (see Gordon, 1965, s.v.). Aistleitner's interpretation (1965, s.v.)
as "lancer" and its connection with the PS root *šnn*, originally meaning
"tooth," is a mere *etymologicum*. Dahood (1965, p. 332) connected
Ugaritic *yθn* and Hebrew *yāšān* ("old") with Arabic *'asina* ("to be
filthy"), as was usual before the discovery of Ugaritic.[31] Yet the
divergence in form (Ugaritic *θ*, i.e. PS *θ*, as against Arabic *s* representing
PS *š*) and the lack of real identity in meaning (Ugaritic and Hebrew
"old" as against Arabic "stinking water") makes this connection rather
precarious. The meaning of Ugaritic *θ'r* ("to arrange, serve food") is cer-
tain, yet its etymology is completely obscure, and Gordon (1965) is, in
our opinion, right in simply adducing the meaning without any addition.

Gordon (1965, text 49:II:6, 27) would maintain that both "to seek" and "to approach" fit
the context. So "to approach" seems clearly to be attested, whereas "to seek" is dubious. It
may, of course, be parallel to Arabic *njθ*, if in Arabic the meaning "to seek" is not secon-
dary, as suggested. On the other hand, the meaning of "seeking" might have emerged secon-
darily in Ugaritic as well through the interference of *bqθ* ("to seek").

30. Brockelmann (1928, s.v. *šrm*) and Aistleitner, (1965, s.v. *θrm*) cite it in the second
form; I have found it in the fifth form in ibn Manẓūr (1955–56, s.v. *srm*).

31. See especially Nöldeke (1910, p. 203). One would like to add Arabic *wasina* ("to
faint because of the stench of the well"), because it is closer in form to *yšn/yθn*.

For various attempts at etymology, see, e.g., Aistleitner (1965, s.v.), Rin (1968, p. 73), Caquot *et al.* (1974, p. 157, note f; p. 160, note t). Yet any etymological connection is so dubious that one would methodologically refrain from assuming any exceptional sound correspondence. The same applies to the etymologies suggested by Dahood (1965, p. 331, note 60) for *kpθ,* presumably denoting "earth," and by de Moor (1969, p. 107b) for the proper noun *pθpθ.* Etymology is a rather uncertain domain, even if one sticks to the accepted sound shifts.

1.4 Ugaritic *z* Corresponding to PS *ð̣*

Other weak sound changes that have been postulated for Ugaritic are even less attested and therefore, methodologically, one should refrain from using them to explain unclear passages. Thus, in order to explain difficult *zu,* de Moor (1968, p. 213, note 3) claimed that the use of the let-ter *z* in correspondence to PS *ð̣* is not restricted to Gordon (1965), text 75 (where, in my opinion at least [Blau, 1968, p. 525a], it exhibits an archaic trait of marking *ð̣,* which had already disappeared in the contemporary language), but is attested in additional cases as well. He cites three occur-rences, none of which, however, supports his claim. Ugaritic *ḥzr* ("court") corresponds to Arabic *ḥaẓīra,* Judeo-Aramaic *ḥuṭrā* ("sheepfold"), and presumably also to Ge'ez *ḥaṣūr* ("hedge").[32] In the light of Epigraphic South-Arabic *ḥḍr* ("abode") and *mḥḍr* ("vestibule"), Hebrew *ḥāṣēr* ("court") could, to be sure, be derived from *ḥð̣r* as well.[33] Yet the Ugaritic parallel in exactly the same sense and usage, buttressed by Arabic and Aramaic correspondence, conclusively proves its derivation from PS *ḥð̣r.*

---

32. *Pace* Koehler-Baumgartner (1967ff, s.v. III *ḥṣr).* It is more likely that the Ge'ez word exhibits original *ð̣,* rather than *ṣ,* because of the greater frequency of **ḥð̣r* in a local sense. The constant spelling with *ṣ,* rather than with *ḍ,* makes the assumption of the root **ḥð̣r* for Ge'ez somewhat unlikely. This **ḥð̣r,* on the other hand, is well attested in Epigraphic South-Arabic *ḥḍr* ("abode") and *mḥḍr* ("vestibule") (see Conti Rossini, 1931, s.v.), thus showing again that different roots with related meanings may develop in the same direction even without any blend. Accordingly, the occurrence of **ḥð̣r* in this sense in Ge'ez would not be unexpected altogether. Moreover, the derivation of *ḥaḍīra* ("enclosure, vil-lage") and *maḥḍara* ("room") in South Arabic dialects (see Landberg, 1920–42 and 1901, s.v.) from **ḥð̣r* is quite likely. Yet since *ð̣* and *ð̣* have fallen together, these words *may* exhibit the root *ḥð̣r* as well.

33. As, no doubt, Hebrew *ḥāṣēr* ("settlement which has no wall about it") has to be derived from *ḥð̣r.* Cf., e.g., Orlinsky (1939, pp. 24–26), Malamat (1962, p. 147), Rodinson, (1957, p. 116), Loewenstamm and Blau (1957ff, s.v.).

Ugaritic *ẓrw* ("resin") corresponds, to be sure, to Arabic *ḍarw/ḍirw* and Epigraphic South-Arabic *ḍrw* on the one hand, and Syriac *ṣarwâ* on the other. Yet the latter is apparently a loan word (see Kutscher, 1976, p. 25, note 54), and the former are *perhaps* due to blending with *ḍrw* ("to bleed") (see Blau, 1970a, pp. 61–62). And the derivation of *ẓrw* from PS *θrw* is conclusively demonstrated by Galilean Aramaic *ṭrw* (see Kutscher, 1976, p. 25). The third root cited by de Moor, *ġẓy*, which denotes something like "to entreat with gifts," has no clear etymology. Therefore, one would consent to the way adopted by Gordon (1965, s.v.), who elucidated its meaning by *parallelismus membrorum* and refrained from any etymology. Any attempt[34] to connect it with Arabic *ġḍy, ġḍḍ* ("to be dark [night], contract the eyelids, lower [the eyes], blink") not only presupposes a phonetic correspondence *ẓ—ḍ* for which no certain example exists, but also a semantic connection which is more than precarious.[35] Accordingly, one would not accept de Moor's proposal to explain the difficult and unclear *ẓu* by the assumption of a nonexisting sound-correspondence *ẓ—ḍ*.

1.5 Ugaritic *ḏ* Corresponding to PS *š/θ*

One should not also consent to the interpretation of Ugaritic words containing *ḏ* as corresponding, without any constraints, to PS *š* or even to PS *θ*.[36] The only case in which Ugaritic *ḏ* does correspond to PS *š* is when immediately preceding *d*. The phonetic reason for this can be easily understood. After the Ugaritic sound *ḏ* had shifted to *d* and, therefore, the letter *ḏ* had become obsolete (cf. Blau, 1968, pp. 523 ff.), the letter *ḏ* came to be used mostly in Hurrian words, denoting a sound presumably like *ž*.[37] Therefore, since *š* immediately preceding *d* became voiced, it was

---

34. De Moor establishes the connection "to wink at a person," hence "to try to please him with presents"; Aistleitner (1965, s.v.), "to bear patiently," hence "to put in favorable mood"; Caquot *et al.* (1974, p. 194, note o), "to darken, close the eyes," hence "to connive."

35. I have the feeling that, using exceptional sound correspondence and fancy semantic connection, one could establish an etymology for everything.

36. Cf., e.g., Blau (1968, p. 523, note 5), where additional literature is cited (including Cross, 1962, p. 249); further Sauren-Kestemont (1971, p. 205, note 58), who rely on Aistleitner (1965).

37. This pronunciation may be reflected by the Akkadian transliterations of the personal name *ḏmrhd* by *ši-im-rad-du* and *zi-im-rad-du*; cf. also Gröndahl (1967, p. 14).

sometimes spelled with the letter *ð* in such cases. A certain case for all practical purposes, is *kðd,* alongside of *kšd;* it probably arose in immediate contact with the *d* in an infinitive form like **kišdum* > **kiðdum*.[38] Another possible case is *aðddy,* if it corresponds to Hebrew *'ašdôdî* (see Cross-Freedman, 1964, p. 49). In all the other cases the suggestions proposed for *ð* corresponding to PS *š* (or *θ*) are, in my opinion, imaginary. The place name *ðbl* simply does not correspond to PS *θbl;*[39] nor does *ðrt/ðhrt* ("vision") have any connection with Hebrew and Aramaic *šwr/šhr* or Arabic *shr*.[40] *ðd,* exhibiting *ð* not immediately preceding *d,* does not, it seems, denote "mountain," but either "territory, premises" (see Gordon, 1965, s.v.) or "tent" (compare Caquot *et al.,* 1974, p. 121, note d with additional literature), so that its connection with Akkadian *šadû* is precarious even from the semantic point of view.[41] *ðd* ("breast") is a nursery word and, therefore, of exceptional formation: in Ugaritic *ðd, θd,* and *zd* alternate, in Hebrew *šad* < **θad* and *dad* (cf. Nöldeke, 1910, p. 121, note 1).

1.6 Hebrew *d* Corresponding to PS *ð*; Other "Weak" Correspondences of Hebrew *z/d*

As is well known, the regular reflex of PS *ð* is Hebrew *z*. In the following, I shall deal with Hebrew *d* as a reflex of PS *ð*,[42] also mentioning some cases in which it is dubious whether Hebrew *z/d* correspond to PS *z/ð/d*. *d* as reflex of PS *ð* is attested in Hebrew *ndr* ("to vow"), occurring alongside the regular *nzr* ("to consecrate");[43] *qdr* ("to be dark"); *hdl* ("to cease")

38. For such an infinitive cf. *ni-iḫ-rum* in the quadrilingual word list in Nougayrol *et al.* (1968, p. 241). This seems more likely than to assume a clerical error with Caquot *et al.* (1974, p. 242, note r). For a different view, see Held (1962, p. 285, note 4).

39. *Pace* Cross (1962, note 74), Cross-Freedman (1964, note 78).

40. *Pace* Cross (1962, note 74), Aistleitner (1965, s.v.), followed by Sauren-Kestemont (1971, note 74).

41. *Pace* Aistleitner (1965, s.v.), Cross (1962, note 74), Sauren-Kestemont (1971, note 74). By the way, one should by no means compare (*pace* Aistleitner, 1965, Sauren-Kestemont, 1971) Arabic *sadd,* since the meaning "mountain" is secondary only, the primary meaning being "anything that closes and obstructs"; cf. Lane (1863–93, s.v.).

42. For particulars see the biblical dictionaries, especially Gesenius-Buhl (1915), who adduce important additional literature and, further, Brockelmann (1928). See also Gesenius-Buhl (1915, s.v. *d*) and further Bauer (1934), who postulated borrowing from what he termed "Safonic dialects"; see against him Garbini (1960, pp. 194–196).

43. Cf. also Ginsberg (1945, p. 161, note 8), who tentatively suggests a blend of *nðr* with *ndb.*

(cf. Thomas, 1957); *dll* ("to be low, languish"), perhaps alternating with *zll* ("to be worthless");[44] perhaps also *dlq* ("to burn, pursue"), if it really corresponds to Arabic *ðlq*, originally "to sharpen," which, *inter alia*, denotes "to light, do quickly" (see Kopf, 1958, p. 170). The cases enumerated may be due to the dissimilatory effect of *r/l*, shifting *ð* to *d*,[45] yet they may reflect dialect mixture as well, through the influences of dialects in which, as in Aramaic and Ugaritic, *ð* had shifted to *d*. In the case of *dll*, at least,[46] the possibility of lexical contamination must not be overlooked either. For the lack of any dissimilatory factor, one would interpret Hebrew *qippôd* ("owl/hedgehog")[47] in the light of Arabic *qunfuð/qunfað*,[48] either by assuming that it was borrowed from a dialect in

44. Against the historical identification of these two roots see, however, Nöldeke (1900, p. 157), who connects Hebrew *dll* with Syriac *dallîl* ("few"), *dəlîl* ("easy"), positing PS *dll*. In note 157, he calls attention to how secondary semantic developments may mislead: from Arabic *dll*, a separate homonymous root *dalāl* denoting "to direct, indicate" (undoubtedly without any connection whatever with our *dll/ðll/zll*) is derived, originally meaning "indication by gesture," then "boldness, coquetishness." This meaning is quite close to Syriac *zallîl* ("debauched"), although these two words exhibit independent development of two completely unrelated roots. It is quite important to keep the possibility of such developments in mind and not to jump to far-reaching conclusions, involving violation of well-established sound correspondences.

45. This is, it seems, Nöldeke's opinion (1886, p. 729, note 1), if I understand him correctly, where he deals with *qdr, ndr, ḥdl*. Brockelmann (1908–13, I, p. 237) speaks expressly of dissimilation, mentioning *ndr, ḥdl*. Fraenkel (1886, p. xiv) speaks of exceptions from regular sound shifts in general, referring to *ḥdl, qdr, dll*. Cf. also note 61.

46. For the possible existence of PS *dll*, see note 44. This root might have been blended with PS *ðll* which is certainly preserved in Arabic *ðll*.

47. The *ô* of *qippôd* is originally short, see Ben-Ḥayyim (1946, p. 193). The *n* of Arabic *qunfuð* could not have influenced the original *ð* of *qippôd*, since it is secondary only, due to dissimilation; cf. for this feature Blau (1970a, p. 127). The identification of Hebrew *qippôd* with hedgehog is problematic and at least in most of its occurrences in the Bible it denotes some kind of owl; see, e.g., Driver (1921, p. 383); Aharoni (1935), who, however, is in some particulars somewhat inconsistent (cf. Aharoni, 1938, p. 470); Ben-Yehuda (1948ff, s.v.); Aḥiṭuv, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1976, s.v. In Syriac too (cf. also Ben-Yehuda, 1948ff), *qupdâ* may denote not only "hedgehog," but "owl" as well, see Payne Smith (1879–1901, s.v.), who connects these meanings (though not *expressis verbis*), and Brockelmann, (1928, s.v.) who wrongly separates them. For the reason why these words denote both "hedgehog" and "owl," see, e.g., Aharoni (1935, p. 160); Driver (1921, p. 383); Ben-Yehuda (1948ff); Feliks (1955–56, s.v. *qippôd*).

48. As far as I can see, *qunfuð* occurs in the sense of "hedgehog" only. This does not, however, contravene its affinity with biblical *qippôd*, even if the latter denotes "owl" only, since, as demonstrated by Syriac, "hedgehog" and "owl" are related, see the preceding note, *in fine*. In the light of the variation in the vocalization of this word (*qunfU/Að*) and its occurrence with *d* as well (*qunfud*), one could regard it as an Aramaic loan word, as does Jeffery (1938, p. 179); he, however, relies on the secondary *n* only, although it occurs in

which PS *ḏ* has shifted to *d*,[49] or by assuming the existence of a doublet or even a triplet. The latter would consist of (1) *qpd*, from which Hebrew *qippôd* and perhaps Aramaic *qupdâ* are derived; (2) *qpḏ*, the root of Arabic *qunfuḏ*[50] and perhaps of Hebrew *qippôz*, Aramaic *qupdâ* and Geʻez *qʷenfez;* and perhaps (3) *qpz*, if Hebrew *qippôz* is really related and Geʻez *qʷenfez* stems from it. (And perhaps even *qpṣ*.)

Because of the existence of Aramaic and Arabic *zmr* it is generally assumed that Hebrew *zmr* ("to make music, to sing") reflects PS *zmr*. Yet Zimmern (1917, p. 95, cited by Brockelmann, 1928, s.v.) has tentatively suggested that Hebrew and Aramaic *zmr* are borrowed from Akkadian (and Arabic *zmr* was again borrowed from Aramaic).[51] Since Akkadian *z* can reflect both PS *z* and *ḏ*, *zmr* may, if Zimmern's thesis proves true, be derived from both original **zmr* and **ḏmr*. Now Ugaritic *ḏmr* ("to play music")[52] has been discovered (Gordon, 1965, text 602:3). Thus, Loewenstamm (1969)[53] postulated *ḏmr* as the original root, to become *zmr* in Hebrew and Akkadian, whereas in Aramaic and Arabic it exhibits loan words.[54] Another possibility would be to assume that *zmr* ("to sing")

---

original Arabic words as well, as *ḥanẓ*, see Blau (1970a, p. 127). I do not understand why, according to Garbini (1960, p. 196), the alternation of *ḏ* and *d* in *qunfuḏ* suggests original *d*. Does he consider it an Aramaic loan word with original *d*, which had become spirantized after the vowel? Against this interpretation one could adduce Hommel's claim (1879, pp. 401ff), that "hedgehog" is a mammal known in Proto-Semitic (this could also be claimed against the assumption that Hebrew *qippôd* is a loan word; Hebrew *qippôd*, however, may be due to dialect mixture, rather than to borrowing, though the difference is somewhat slight). Moreover, it occurs early in Arabic poetry, see Hommel (1879, p. 339). If, in fact, *qunfuḏ* were an Aramaic loan, one could derive the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic words simply from *qfd*. In this case, however, one should consider Hebrew *qippôz* not related and Geʻez *qʷenfez* an Aramaic loan (with spirantized *d > z*) or an Arabic one, as indeed Geyer (1905, p. 118, note 2), on whom Jeffery relies, seems to assume.

49. Fraenkel (1886, p. XIV) regarded *qippôd* as an Aramaic loan.

50. So far, I have not found the root *qpḏ* attested outside *qunfuḏ* in Arabic, despite Rŭ-zička (1909, p. 133) where read *taqanfaḏa*, a denominative verb derived from *qunfuḏ*, for *ta-qaffaḏa*.

51. If Epigraphic South-Arabic *zmr*, quoted by Koehler-Baumgartner (1967ff, s.v.), really existed (I could not verify it, nor is it mentioned in Müller's additions [1963, p. 308] to Koehler-Baumgartner [1953], where it is lacking)—it would, of course, invalidate Zimmern's suggestion to some extent. That Arabic *zmr* is an Aramaic loan word was already claimed by Schwally (1898, pp. 133–134).

52. *zmr* in this sense is not attested in Ugaritic, *pace* Koehler-Baumgartner (1967, s.v.), since it occurs in a completely obscure context. (In Koehler-Baumgartner, 1953, it was still adduced with a question mark.) Cf. also Loewenstamm (1969).

53. Incidentally, Loewenstamm did not know of Zimmern's proposal and only cited Schwally's view as to Arabic *zmr* being an Aramaic loan word.

54. He went so far as to assume that no homonymous root *ḏmr* (from which, as a rule, Hebrew *zimrâ* in the phrase *ʻozzî wazimrāt YHWH* is derived) exists. He postulated *one*

with *z* in PS, and Ugaritic *ð* is due to the blend of two roots.[55] It is even possible that Ugaritic *ðmr* ("to sing") is a scribal error, since in the same text *ðmr* ("strength, might") occurs twice. At any rate, the case of *zmr* clearly demonstrates how intricate the etymology might be and how imperative it is to collect evidence piecemeal.

Another case of a Hebrew word whose etymology seemed perfectly clear till the discovery of Ugaritic is *ḥzy* ("to see") (cf. Blau, 1970b, pp. 439–440 for particulars), viz. PS *ḥzw*. Yet in Ugaritic *ḥdy* ("to see") is attested, which, it seems, reflects PS *ḥðw* from which, *inter alia*, Arabic *ḥiðā'a* ("opposite") and Hebrew *ḥāze* ("breast") are derived. Since the semantic shift "opposite" > "to see" is well attested,[56] it is easy to derive Hebrew *ḥzy* ("to see") from *ḥðw. This was the reason that Ginsberg (1938, p. 210, note 3) proposed the following ingenious solution: Hebrew *ḥzy* ("to see") stems from PS *ḥðw* ("to be opposite" > "to see"), and no PS *ḥzw* exists at all. Hebrew *ḥzw* (later > *ḥzy*) was borrowed into

root *ðmr* ("to praise in cultic song"), from which *zimrā*, standing parallel to *'oz* ("strength, might"), is derived in the sense of "the glory given to God in cultic song." Loewenstamm's thesis may be buttressed by the fact that in the morning prayer of "*yištabbaḥ*" in the phrase *kī ləkā nā'ē . . . šîr ušbāḥā hallēl wəzimrā 'oz umemšālā . . . bərākôt wəhôdā'ôt* ("because chant and laud, praise and song, strength and power . . . benedictions and thanks befit you"), "song" and "strength" are parallel. Loewenstamm calls attention to Ps 59:18 *'uzzî 'ēleḵā 'ăzammērā* ("my strength I sing to you"), where "strength" and "song" are also connected, and interprets *'ozzî wəzimrāt* accordingly. Yet although this interpretation is, no doubt, possible (cf. the papers pro and con of Good [1970] and Parker [1971]), it is by no means necessary. One may well claim that the phrase *'uzzî 'ēleḵā 'ăzammērā* is not a primary phrase exhibiting both *'oz* and *zimrā*, but rather a secondary one, some sort of play on words, imitating *'ozzî wəzimrāt*, which, though originally exhibiting *zimrā* ("strength, might"), was understood as "praise." Moreover, *ðmr* ("to be strong") does not completely rely on Epigraphic South-Arabic, for which Loewenstamm has convincingly demonstrated that *ðmr* having the sense of "strength" cannot be proved. As to the Samaritan gloss *zimrā* = "strength" (see Ben-Ḥayyim, 1957ff, II, pp. 96–97, 457, quoted also by Greenfield, 1964, p. 265), one may, to be sure, argue that it arose from the interpretation of *'ozzî wəzimrāt*. Yet cf. also Arabic *ðimr, ðamir, ðamir* ("clever and brave") and Ugaritic *ðmr* ("hero") (see, e.g., Caquot *et al.*, 1974, p. 159, note m; p. 217, note n). Moreover, one must not lose sight of the possibility that, as suggested by Montgomery, (1951, p. 289), (*'ozzî wə*)*zimrāt* is etymologically related to Syriac *dmr* ("to awe, wonder"). At any rate, this etymology is not less likely than that propounded by Brockelmann (1928, s.v.). Accordingly, I am inclined to postulate for Biblical Hebrew an additional root *zmr*, originally *ðmr*, in the sense of "to be strong" (or "to be inspired with awe").

55. See Blau-Greenfield (1970, p. 12). One could imagine that it was through the influence of *ðmr* ("to pronounce solemnly"), as preserved in Epigraphic South-Arabic (see Beeston, 1950, p. 265) and Ge'ez, that *zmr*, when used in the sense of "to sing publicly," shifted to *ðmr*.

56. Cf., e.g., the Arabic synonyms *muqābala* and *mu'āyana* (see, e.g., Pollak, 1931, p. 102), and *'iyān* and *muwājaha* (ibn Manẓur, 1955–56, s.v. *'yn*, p. 302b).

Aramaic, from which again Arabic *ḥāzī* ("diviner") was borrowed. Yet
despite its ingenuity, it is not easy to consent to this theory. Aramaic *ḥzw*
(see also Koehler-Baumgartner, 1953, Aramaic part, s.v.) is so well at-
tested that the assumption of a loan word is at least dubious,[57] and even
Arabic *ḥāzī* is not as isolated as it would *prima facie* seem (see, e.g.,
Landberg, 1920–42, s.v.). Therefore, in my opinion, it is much more like-
ly that PS *ḥzw* ("to see") and *ḥδw* ("to be opposite") coexisted in PS, and
at a certain, still undefinable time, the latter developed into "to see."
Hebrew *ḥzy* may, therefore, on principle, be regarded as the continuation
of both roots. (See Gordon, 1965, s.v. For why *ḥzw* is more likely, see
Blau, 1970b, p. 443, note 101.)

Another Hebrew root the etymology of which seemed fairly well es-
tablished till the discovery of Ugaritic is *zr'* ("to sow"). It was generally
derived from PS *zr'*, although Epigraphic South-Arabic *δr'* ("seed") was
already known.[58] As is often the case in Semitic linguistics, it was
Nöldeke (1910, p. 164),[59] exhibiting his usual sober judgment, who deter-
mined (rightly, in my opinion) the relation between the forms with initial
δ and initial *z:* he derives Arabic *δura* ("holcus sorghum") from *δur'a*,
stemming from *δr'* as preserved in Arabic *δara'a* and Ge'ez *zar'a* ("to
scatter, to sow") (and, one may add, Epigraphic South-Arabic *δr'*), which
is related to Hebrew *zārā*, Arabic *δarā*, Aramaic *dərā* and Ge'ez *zarawa*
("to scatter, winnow") and which is to be separated from Arabic *zara'a*,
Aramaic *zəra'* and Hebrew *zāra'*.[60] With the discovery of Ugaritic *δr'*
("to sow"), the vantage point from which Hebrew *zr'* was looked on
changed. Baumgartner (in Koehler-Baumgartner, 1953, Aramaic part,
s.v. *zr'*, following H. Bauer), posited PS *δr'*, and considered, somewhat
hesitantly to be sure, Aramaic *zr'* as a Canaanite loan word, as did also

57. It is interesting to note that Wagner (1966, pp. 53–54), on the contrary, considers
Hebrew *ḥzy* to be an Aramaic loan word. In the light of Ugaritic *ḥdy* and the occurrence of
Hebrew *ḥzy* in pre-exilic writings, one would rather prefer the possibility (also considered
by Wagner) that it is genuine Hebrew, yet its more frequent occurrence is due to Aramaic
influence.
58. See Conti Rossini (1931, s.v.). It is noteworthy to remark that Stehle (1940, p. 513)
and Beeston (1962, p. 13) do not adduce *δr'* among the cases of exceptional sound cor-
respondence of Epigraphic South-Arabic *δ* to PS *z* (in my opinion, rightly so, see *infra*).
59. Yet he adduced only Arabic *δr'* and Ge'ez *zar'a* ("to scatter, sow"), without refer-
ring to Epigraphic South-Arabic.
60. Landberg (1920–42, s.vv. *δry, zr'*, especially p. 940), in accordance with his method
of "great" etymology, which connects roots exhibiting similar radicals (cf. *supra*), expressly
opposed Nöldeke and connected all these roots, as did also, e.g., Mühlau-Volck (1890, s.vv.
zr', I *zrr*).

Aro (1964).[61] This, however, is less likely than Loewenstamm's sugges-
tion (1962) that Ugaritic *ḏr'*, which does not denote "to sow" only, but
also "to winnow, disperse," is due to a blend of PS *zr'* ("to sow") and *ḏrw*
("to winnow, disperse"). One may tentatively add that South Semitic
(Epigraphic South-Arabic, Arabic, Ge'ez) *ḏr'* ("to disperse, sow"), which
is no doubt related to **ḏrw*, has also presumably received the meaning of
"sowing" by semantic attraction to *zr'* ("to sow").

Hebrew *zrq* ("to throw"), no doubt, corresponds to PS *zrq*. It could
however, also reflect **ḏrq*, cf. Arabic *ḏrq*, which, however (*pace* Gesenius-
Buhl, 1915, s.v. *zrq*), does not denote "to throw," but "to dung" (see
Blau, 1970a, p. 49, note 9. Aramaic *drq* is not, it seems, a genuine form,
see note 61.) It is not unlikely that *zrq-ḏrq* constitute a PS doublet. For
Hebrew *zky* ("to be pure"), see the literature cited in Blau (1970a, p. 49,
note 9). Hebrew *giddep* ("to revile, blaspheme") is related not only to
Syriac, Judeo-Aramaic and Christian Aramaic *gaddep* in the same sense,
but, it seems, also to Ge'ez *gdf* ("to throw,[62] repudiate"), on the one
hand, and to Epigraphic South-Arabic, *gḏf* ("to blaspheme") on the
other. (See Stehle, 1940, p. 513, and note 60, without, however, con-
senting to all the correspondences adduced there.) If, in the light of
Epigraphic South-Arabic *gḏf*, one postulated PS *gḏp*, one should regard
Hebrew *giddep* as an Aramaic loan word, since PS *gḏp* should be reflected
by Hebrew **gzp*.[63] Yet Ge'ez *gdf*, in my opinion, proves the *d* to be

61. Aro also, with similar hesitation, suggested that Arabic *zr'* is a Canaanite loan
word. Another possibility, according to this theory, would be to consider the Arabic word
an Aramaic loan word. Both Baumgartner and Aro cited Aramaic *dr'*: Baumgartner as
Judeo-Aramaic, Aro as Aramaic without qualifications. As a matter of fact, *dr'* (just as *drq*)
is restricted to various Targumic texts, and the question arises of how reliable these forms
are, especially since *zr'-dr'* (and *zrq-drq*) alternate. Fraenkel (1905) regarded both verbs as
due to dissimilation of *z > d* in the vicinity of *r* (see *supra*, note 45). Kutscher (1967, p. 173)
and Koehler-Baumgartner (1967ff, s.v. *zrq*) however, regarded *drq* as hyper-Aramaism and
dr' (Koehler-Baumgartner 1967ff, s.v. *zr'*) as a dubious form; I am inclined to accept this
view (*pace* Blau, 1970a, p. 48, note 9) in light of Exod 19:13 Targum Neofiti and Paris 110
yzdrqwn, Kahle (1930, p. 56) *yzdrqn*, as against British Museum add. 27031 *ydryqwn*; Exod
9:8 Neofiti *wyzrwq* as against British Museum *wydrqynyh*.
62. For the semantic shift "to throw" > "to curse" cf. Nöldeke (1910, p. 47, note 3),
Fraenkel (1886, p. 228), Gesenius-Buhl (1915, s.v. *gdp*), Blau-Loewenstamm (1970, p. 9,
note 13). Cf. also Nöldeke (1952, s.v. *'abana*, "to speak evil of"), if I am correct in deriving
it from "to throw stones." In this case, it would exhibit an additional relic of Semitic **'abn*
("stone") in Arabic, besides that cited by Nöldeke (1886, p. 724).
63. So hesitantly Fraenkel (1886, p. 228), who connected the Hebrew word with Arabic
qaḏafa ("to throw"). Yet later (1898, p. 74) he, silently, accepted Barth's etymology (1893,
p. 28), who compared Arabic *jdb* ("to disapprove") and assumed alternation of *p-b* as third
radical, thus postulating original *d* for *giddep*. Nöldeke (1910, p. 62) also changed his mind

original, since the Ge'ez word cannot be considered an Aramaic loan,[64] because Ge'ez has well preserved the presumably original meaning of *gdp*, viz. "to throw" (see note 62), which, as far as I know, is not attested in any Aramaic dialect. Accordingly, one would rather postulate at least two PS related roots, presumably even more, viz. (in the light of Ge'ez) *gdp*[65] and (cf. Epigraphic South-Arabic) *gδp*, with which *qδp*, as occurring in Arabic, is related. Aramaic *gaddep* may reflect both **gdp* and **gδp*.[66]

Hebrew *gzm* ("to cut"; in the Bible, in derivations only) has many correspondences to roots in various Semitic languages which reflect PS *gzm*. Yet in different languages reflections of what seems to be PS *gzm*, *gδm*, and *gdm* with a similar meaning are well attested,[67] exhibiting either genuine variations in PS or later attraction of originally different roots. Hebrew *dlp* ("to drip") corresponds to roots in Semitic tongues reflecting PS *dlp*. Yet in Middle Hebrew and Judeo-Aramaic *zlp* ("to sprinkle, pour") is attested, as well as in Syriac in similar meaning,[68] presumably

---

and hesitantly suggested the possibility of different roots attracting each other for Arabic-Ge'ez-Tigre *qδf, gδf, ġdf, ḥdf, jδf, jdf*. Wagner (1966, p. 39) considered Hebrew *giddep* an Aramaic loan, and consistently assumed the same for Arabic *jaddafa* and Ge'ez *gadafa*. For the latter see *infra*.

64. In Ge'ez, PS *δ* is reflected by *z*, rather than by *d*.

65. Somewhat complicated is the case of Arabic *jaddafa*. In Classical Arabic it denotes "to deny a favor," rather than "to blaspheme." It was Golius who, relying on Hebrew *giddep*, interpreted Arabic *jaddafa* in the sense of blaspheming (see Lane, 1863–93, s.v.), and from here it passed to European works dealing with etymology (as Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v.; Wagner, 1966; Koehler-Baumgartner, 1967ff, s.v.; Barthélemy, 1935ff, s.v.; yet not in Brown *et al.*, 1907, s.v.). In the sense of blasphemy I know it only from dialects—its first attestation, so far as I know, being Bocthor, adduced by Dozy (1881, s.v.); see also Barthélemy (1935ff, s.v.) and Spiro (1895, s.v.). In the dialects it may well be an Aramaic loan; cf. Féghali (1920, p. 257; 1922, pp. 15, 27) for Lebanese *ġaddef* (Féghali, by the way, also postulates for Classical Arabic *jaddafa* the meaning of blaspheming); Frayha (1947, s.v. *ġaddaf*). The original meaning of *jaddafa* ("to deny a favor") may well have been "to cut," a sense preserved by Arabic *jadafa*, and originally it may not be related to Ge'ez *gadafa*, "to throw" > "to blaspheme."

66. *gdp* ("to scrape"), attested in Mandaic (see Drower-Macuch, 1963, s.v.) and in Middle Hebrew (see, e.g., Jastrow, 1903, s.v.) continues, it seems, *gdp* ("to cut"), rather than *gdp* ("to throw").

67. See, e.g., Gesenius-Buhl (1915) and Brown *et al.* (1907), s.v. *gzm*: Stehle (1940, p. 514); Brockelmann (1928, s.vv. *gdm, gzm*); Soden (1965ff, s.v. *gadāmu*); further Landberg (1920–42, s.v. *jdm*). Cf. also the alternation of *gdd, gδδ, gzz* (see Mühlau-Volck, 1890, s.v. *gdd*; Koehler-Baumgartner, 1967ff, s.v. Landberg, 1920–42, s.v.). Cf. also Arabic *jadafa* ("to cut") in note 65 above, and Greenfield (1958, p. 210, note 20), who also mentions *gd'/gz'*.

68. See, e.g., Gesenius-Buhl (1915); Brown *et al.* (1907); Koehler-Baumgartner (1967ff); Brockelmann (1928, s.v. *dlp*); Levy (1867–68 and 1876–89); Jastrow (1903); Payne Smith (1879–1901); Brockelmann (1928, s.v. *zlp*).

not a genuine doublet, but due to attraction of *dlp* by a root like *zlḥ* ("to shed, to sprinkle").[69]

2. Hebrew and PS *ś*

There exists an ever-growing literature dealing with non-voiced, non-emphatic sibilants in Semitic languages in general and in Hebrew in particular. Many of these studies, in one way or another, pivot upon the fact that in the Hebrew alphabet *ś* is the only phoneme[70] marked polyphonically rather than by a special letter.[71] On the other hand, the tradition for the existence of *ś* is well established and the main lines of development, as traditionally explained (see, e.g. Bergsträsser, 1918–29, I, pp. 6, 88) and also accepted by us, are quite clear: the Hebrew alphabet stems from a language in which *š* and *ś* have merged, presumably in *š*. Since the Hebrews did not add new letters to the accepted alphabet, they used *š* (ש) polyphonically, for both *š* and *ś*.[72] And, indeed, comparison with other Semitic languages clearly demonstrates the genuine character of the differentiation between *š* and *ś* in Hebrew, today pronounced *š* and *s*, respectively (except by Samaritans, who pronounce both of them as *š*), and establishes the separate existence of *ś*, different from both PS *š* and *s*. *ś*, i.e. the letter spelled ש and pronounced *s*, exhibits a regular correspondence to many other Semitic languages, different from the sound correspondence of both *š* (i.e. the letter spelled ש and pronounced *š*) and *s* (i.e., the letter *samek*, pronounced *s*). *s* invariably corresponds to *s* in

69. Cf., e.g., Levy (1876–89); Brockelmann (1928, s.v.). Otherwise Greenfield (1958, p. 210).

70. The spirant variants of *b, g, d, k, p, t* are allophones only.

71. Additional letters of the Hebrew alphabet, to be sure, might have been polyphonic. If ʾ and *ḥ*, in fact, marked two different sounds till the end of the second century B.C.E., viz. ʾ/*ġ* and *ḥ*/*ḫ* respectively (see, e.g., Bergsträsser, 1918–29, I, pp. 36–38), they have to be regarded as polyphonic for that period. Yet this fact, if correct, has to be inferred and has not been handed down by living tradition as in the case of *ś*. On the other hand, even *ś* is not pronounced today as a phonetic entity differing from other sounds of the Hebrew alphabet, but as *s* like *samek*.

72. As a rule, it is postulated that the pronunciation of *ś* was closer to *š* than to *s*, and therefore ש, the letter marking *š*, was chosen to represent *ś* (see e.g., Bergsträsser, 1918–29, I, p. 42). Yet it is not impossible that ש was chosen by the impact of the language from which the Hebrew alphabet was borrowed. In this language ש was used for marking not only original *š*, but also *ś*. Therefore, since Hebrew words containing *ś* corresponded to words of that language spelled with ש, ש was used for marking *ś*, even if *ś* happened to be closer to *s* than to *š*. Cf., for the similar choice of Arabic *ṭ*/ʾ for marking *ẓ*/*ġ* respectively through the influence of Nabatean Aramaic, Blau (1970a, pp. 59–60).

other Semitic languages, $\acute{s}$ corresponds to $\check{s}$ in most Semitic languages,
with the exception of Arabic and Ge'ez (and later Assyrian), in which it
appears as s. $\acute{s}$ is exhibited by $\check{s}$ in Akkadian, Ugaritic, Arabic, and
Ethiopic, by a special letter in Epigraphic South-Arabic (and by a special
sound in Modern South-Arabic) and is spelled in early Aramaic with ש,
in later Aramaic with samek. The simplest and most reasonable in-
terpretation of the special correspondence of Hebrew $\acute{s}$ is the assumption
of a separate PS phoneme śin, which continued its existence in South
Arabic, as well as in early Aramaic and (in a changed form) in Arabic and
Ge'ez and, of course, in early Hebrew. Exceptions to regular sound cor-
respondence are, to be sure, attested. They have, however, to be carefully
balanced against regular sound correspondences and reduced, as far as
possible, to their proper dimensions, the more so, since, as we have seen
in Section 1 above, deviations from regular sound correspondence occur
with other Hebrew (and Semitic) sounds as well.

2.1 Critical Analysis of Vollers (1894)

In many ways, one may regard Vollers (1894) as the prototype of
works disregarding typical sound development in favor of deviant and
random features. This article is now, for all practical purposes, forgotten.
Yet it deserves careful consideration, since it demonstrates to what ex-
tremes the negligence of sound philological method may lead, even
though this paper reflects great erudition and acumen, or perhaps
because of these qualities. Its main thesis is the division of the Semitic
languages into two groups, one exhibiting sibilants and their variants
("the S-group"), the other occlusives and their variants ("the T-group"). It
is based on a long series of comparisons of words in which the S-group and
the T-group allegedly interchange, often stemming from a somewhat un-
curbed fantasy. Thus Arabic šariba ("to drink") is related to θirb
("fat") (p. 191); Hebrew šāgag ("to go astray, commit sin") to Arabic θaj-
ja ("to flow strongly") and miθajj ("voluble orator"), allegedly because
the Hebrew word denotes sin committed by quick and negligent speech!
(p. 193); Hebrew sətāw ("winter," i.e. "the period of rain") is connected
with šātā ("to drink") (pp. 201–202; on p. 209 this correspondence is ad-
duced as a certain case); Hebrew kesel ("loins") is, on the one hand,
related to kōtel ("wall," originally "to be compact") (p. 193), and on the

other, to *kāšal* ("to stumble, stagger") (p. 202); Hebrew *šmm* (*inter alia*, "to be appalled") allegedly corresponds to Aramaic (and, one may add, to Hebrew) *tmh* ("to be astounded") and Arabic *whm, thm* ("to imagine"), although the latter is doubtlessly secondary (p. 194). One would not be surprised when, on the strength of such comparisons, Vollers, *inter alia*, arrives at the conclusion (p. 171) that irregular correspondences of sibilants are almost as frequent as the regular ones, and reconstructs a phase in which *s* was the only unvoiced non-emphatic sibilant (p. 210), which only later shifted, under yet unspecified conditions, to *š*. So, in Vollers' opinion (pp. 211–212), the ancient *šb'* ("to be satiated") coexisted in Hebrew with the later, originally southern, *śb'*. Eventually, *šb'* prevailed, and this is the reason for ש in such words being pronounced as *s*. *ś*, in Vollers' opinion, never existed, and one must not (p. 213) infer from Epigraphic South-Arabic *s₃* that PS had three non-emphatic unvoiced sibilants. In Vollers' opinion, it is the result of the collision of two speech communities. We shall, however, see in the following (Section 3 below) that deviations from regular sound shift of sibilants occur in a minority of cases only, and they have to be interpreted as due to special reasons. Accordingly, for PS, as accepted, a series of three unvoiced non-emphatic sibilants has to be postulated, viz. *s, š, ś*.

2.2 Critical Analysis of Gumpertz (1953)

Gumpertz (1953, pp. 33–50; English summary, p. iii) has reconstructed a somewhat similar development of unvoiced non-emphatic sibilants. If I understand him properly,[73] he too postulates one sibilant of this kind, the pronunciation of which, however, was with a bilateral lisp.[74]

---

73. Cf. Ben-Ḥayyim's judicious remarks (1955, pp. 165–166).

74. He even claims that different pronunciations of *š* and *ś* cannot be established until the time of the *naqdānîm*, and that the first authentic testimony for the difference between the pronunciation of ש and *samek* can be traced to Jerome only. Cf. against this view the judicious remarks of Kutscher (1955, p. 361). On the other hand, the core of Gumpertz' paper on the pronunciation of ש is quite important for the history of the pronunciation of this letter, since it demonstrates that all over Europe, with the exception of Arabic-speaking Spain, the pronunciation of ש as *ś* was entirely unknown in the early Middle Ages.

3. Critical Analysis of Magnanini (1974)

In a recent article, Magnanini (1974) also arrives at the conclusion that no PS š existed. In the main part of his paper, Magnanini analyzes 93 Arabic roots containing š, which, according to the current view, should correspond to PS and Hebrew š. He also collected ten cases of Arabic s corresponding to Hebrew š, rather than to Hebrew (and PS) s/š. Taken altogether, he examined 103 cases and found that only 35 exhibit "regular" sound correspondence, as against 68 "irregular" cases. From this extreme irregularity he infers that PS š is a ghost phoneme.

3.1 Attestations of PS š outside Hebrew

Even before we scrutinize the alleged irregular correspondence of Hebrew š and Arabic š, we want to stress that the existence of PS š by no means depends on Hebrew only. It is attested in South Arabic as well, further in Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions, as well as in transcriptions exhibited by Egyptian texts, the al-Amarna letters from Jerusalem (see Diem, 1974, pp. 228ff) and by Old Akkadian (Diem, 1974, p. 248).

3.2 Unvoiced Non-Emphatic Sibilants in Epigraphic South-Arabic

Magnanini was, it seems, aware of this problem. Therefore, in a somewhat summarizing way,[75] he cites eleven cases from Epigraphic South-Arabic and, adding that they could easily be augmented, infers from them that the third unvoiced non-emphatic sibilant exhibits an innovation. Yet, even before analyzing these examples, one must not lose sight of the fact that the texts mentioned above, even without the Hebrew and Epigraphic South-Arabic evidence, postulate the existence of PS š.

From the eleven cases cited by Magnanini from Epigraphic South-Arabic, four contain s_1 (as a rule, and in my opinion correctly, considered to represent PS š). Three of them allegedly correspond to PS s: 's₁r,

---

75. He adduces LaSor (1957–58) and Beeston (1962), yet not Cantineau (1935–45), Stehle (1940), Beeston (1951).

which, however, is due to an error of Conti Rossini, 1931, s.v. (see Stehle, 1940, p. 524, note 185), the correct reading being $'s_3r$ (s_3 is, as a rule, and correctly in my opinion, identified with PS s), which thus reflects regular sound correspondence. hrs_1 is identified by many with Hebrew hrs; yet its correlation with s_1trs_1, i.e., an $'istaf'al$ form, makes one assume that the h of hrs_1 may be the prefix of $hf'l$ (cf. Jamme, 1962, p. 13b, where additional literature is cited). The third, and last, example is the proper noun hs_1n, which allegedly corresponds to Hebrew hsn ("to be strong"). This correspondence, however, is wholly imaginary.[76] The fourth example with s_1, the proper noun (!) dws_1, allegedly corresponds to the Hebrew proper noun $dišôn$, exhibiting the exceptional sound correspondence Epigraphic South-Arabic s_1 = Hebrew (and PS) $š$. Yet the Hebrew proper noun is $dîšôn$,[77] thus exhibiting a completely regular sound correspondence. Moreover, there is no need whatsoever for the Hebrew and Epigraphic South-Arabic proper nouns to be in fact related.[78]

Magnanini cites three cases of s_2 corresponding to Hebrew (and PS) $š$, rather than to the expected $ś$. Yet all of them are dubious. For ws_2': see, e.g., Beeston (1951, p. 16) and Jamme (1962, p. 38a);[79] for $s_2'w$: Beeston (1951, p. 16) and Müller (1963, p. 316); for s_2ft: Müller (1963, p. 316).[80]

From the four cases cited for s_3, which should correspond to PS s, one, allegedly exhibiting the correspondence s_3 = Hebrew $š$ (viz. s_3wd = Hebrew $šēd$), is completely imaginary: see for the various possibilities of the origin of the Hebrew word the biblical dictionaries s.v., especially Brown et al. (1907). Moreover, Hebrew $šēd$ in the sense of "lord," rather than "demon," is a mere *etymologicum*. The other three adduced cases with s_3 allegedly correspond to Hebrew $ś$. The only possible case of exception from regular sound correspondence among them is perhaps Epigraphic South-Arabic hs_3r and Hebrew $*hašrā/*hāšērā$, yet even it is

76. The Epigraphic South-Arabic proper noun could, for instance, correspond to Arabic $hasan$ ("beautiful"), a very frequent proper noun in Arabic, if the latter exhibits PS $hšn$. Incidentally, Conti Rossini (1931, s.v.) connected these two words, yet mixed them up again with Hebrew hsn as well, thus apparently misleading Magnanini.

77. In Conti Rossini (1931, s.v.) $dišôn$ is spelled correctly yet the other Hebrew proper noun, $dišān$, is erroneously spelled $dišān$ with $ś$, and this, perhaps, misled Magnanini.

78. Thus the Hebrew one may reflect original θ (cf., e.g., Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v.).

79. I would like to add that in Middle Hebrew, $siyya'$ (originally $śiyya'$) denotes "to aid."

80. Incidentally, Hebrew $šāpat$ ("to set on the fire, establish"), with which Magnanini compares this word, exhibits, it seems, PS θ, both if it corresponds to Ugaritic θpd ("to put") or—what is, in my opinion, more likely—if it is a denominative verb, derived from a noun from the root θpy, denoting the stone supporting the kettle.

by no means certain.[81] Compare Stehle (1940, p. 536), who adduces Beeston's view, for *'rs₃*; and pp. 536–537, for *'s₃b*.

The inference to be drawn from these cases is quite simple: as Stehle (1940), Cantineau (1935–45), LaSor (1957–58), and Beeston (1951 and 1962) have demonstrated, the Epigraphic South-Arabic sibilants reflect completely regular sound correspondence, as also exhibited by the examples cited by Magnanini.

3.3 Correspondences of Hebrew and Arabic Sibilants

The correspondences Magnanini adduced for Arabic *š* and Hebrew *ś* are not irregular either. The allegedly irregular character of the correspondence of Hebrew *ś* originates in etymologies which are partly based on loan words, on dissimilations, on quite unlikley semantic shifts (disregarding much more likely ones), and even on mere errors. A small number of *possible* (but by no means *necessary*) irregular correspondences remain. But these, however, should be discarded, because they contravene regular sound shift and are not necessary. In one case only, viz. Hebrew *šwq* = Arabic *šwq* ("to desire"), there is, it seems, a genuine deviation from sound shift.[82] I have, in the following, arranged the material according to Hebrew roots, because it is much easier to check the etymology with the help of the biblical, rather than Arabic, dictionaries. I have also divided the material according to the sound correspondences which they exhibit.[83]

81. For the Epigraphic South-Arabic word, cf. Stehle (1940, p. 537). According to Magnanini himself, the Hebrew word corresponds to Arabic *ḥšr* as well, so that one should posit a triple irregular correspondence, viz. Epigraphic South-Arabic *s₃* (as a rule reflecting PS *s*), Hebrew (and PS) *š*, and Arabic *š* (corresponding, as a rule, to PS *š*)! Moreover, the Hebrew word *may* denote the (heavenly) sieve and correspond to Ugaritic *ḫθr*, thus exhibiting original *θ*.

82. One could hardly consent to Brockelmann (1908–13, 1, p. 167), who, in the main, follows Barth (1893, p. 46), that the Arabic *š* is due to assimilation to the following *q*. Fraenkel (1898, p. 80), on the other hand, suggests lexical contamination.

83. As a rule, I am citing roots or, in the case of the clear nominal character of the root, the noun. Magnanini, as a rule (yet see *šemeš, 'eśer, resen, šōrēr, kāsūāḥ*, etc., further *II w/y* roots, as *ṭwś*) adduces roots in the third person sing. masc. of *qal*, even of nominal roots like *šāpan*. As a rule, I do not adduce the meanings, if they can easily be found in the biblical dictionaries for Hebrew and the usual dictionaries for Arabic. Magnanini cites the meaning of the Arabic verb, the Hebrew meaning being quoted after "(ebr)" (see, e.g., *resen, šōrēr, 'eśer*). As a rule, however, "(ebr)" is missing, giving the impression that the Arabic verb

3.3.1

Hebrew *ś* corresponding to Arabic *š*, as stated by Magnanini himself:[84] *'rś; ḫpś*, for which Magnanini cites two Arabic correspondences, viz. *ḫfš*, which seems to be appropriate, and *ḫfś*, the meaning of which does not fit at all;[85] *ṭwś; kārēś; ngś* (cf. also note 28); *nś'; 'eśeb; 'eśer; prś; pśy; pś'*, whose correspondence with Arabic *fšg*, however (cf. Koehler-Baumgartner, 1953, s.v.), is rather dubious; *qaśwā; śb'; śhd; śṭn* (cf. also Blau, 1970a, p. 103); *śyb; śyd; śmḥ; śimlā; śn'; śrg; śrd; śrṭ; śry; śrq; śtr*, altogether 26 cases. Add to them two cases in which Magnanini wrongly connects Hebrew *ś* with Arabic *s*, rather than with Arabic *š*, viz. Hebrew *bśm* as against Arabic *basām* ("spice") (for the problem of Arabic *bšm*, see Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v., who adduced Lagarde's view); and Hebrew *bśr*, which is connected by Magnanini not only correctly with Arabic *bśr*, but also with *bsr*, which, however, has a totally unsuitable meaning ("to frown"). (For its Semitic correspondences see Brockelmann, 1928, s.v. *bsr*.) Magnanini also adduces three cases in which *ś* and *s* alternate in the Hebrew root, corresponding to Arabic *š*. This has to be interpreted as reflecting original Hebrew *ś, s* being due to later orthographic habit: *grś/s, hrś/s*, and *ś/sbk* (see Blau, 1970a, p. 114, and p. 115, respectively). Magnanini connects Hebrew *s'r* with Arabic *šgr*. Yet the Hebrew root alternates with *ś'r*. Moreover, the correspondence with Arabic *šgr* is very dubious and, therefore, it is rather uncertain whether in this case too Hebrew *ś* is matched by Arabic *š* (cf. Blau, 1970a, p. 115, especially note 5). An additional case of Hebrew *ś* corresponding to Arabic *š* is Hebrew *qimmôś* as against Arabic *qummāś;* yet Magnanini adopts the inferior reading *qimmôs*.[86]

---

denotes the meanings of the Hebrew one as well. In most cases I have not called attention to it. Similarly, I have not corrected small deviations. Even if the etymologies of the current biblical dictionaries differ from those proposed by Magnanini, I have not, as a rule, referred to them, contenting myself with stating that Magnanini's etymology is not necessary.

84. As in etymologies in general, not all the cases cited are certain. Yet since Magnanini agreed to these etymologies, I have, as a rule, adduced them without comment. I have, however, omitted Hebrew *qəśîṭā* since the meaning of the proposed Arabic *qśṭ* was too different (the etymology of the Hebrew word being, in fact, unknown), further *śḥṭ*, which does not fit Arabic *šḥṭ* in meaning. For *śyn* read **śyn*, only preserved as *kətîb*, the *ś* being proven by the secondary root *śtn* (cf. also Middle Hebrew *śeten* "urine"), corresponding to *θ, inter alia* in Arabic *maθāna*, which has given rise to the secondary root *mθn* and is felt as derived from it.

85. For particulars see Blau (1955, p. 342 and note 1) and Wagner (1966, pp. 59–60).

86. For *qimmôś* with *ś* see the biblical dictionaries; *ś* is also the reading of the Aleppo Codex and Ms. Leningrad B19a.

3.3.2

Besides *bśm* and *bśr,* treated above, Magnanini claims in nine additional cases that Hebrew *ś* corresponds to Arabic *s.* Yet in three cases only is this correspondence in any way likely, and on the strength of such narrow evidence one will hardly jump to the conclusion that the sound correspondence of Hebrew *ś* is not constant. The three cases are: *ḥśp,* which, however, may reflect a blend of *ḥśp* with *ḥsp,* since it corresponds to Ugaritic *ḥsp* (see also Blau, 1970a, pp. 124, 134); *rpś,* which Magnanini collates with Arabic *rfs* which, however, may itself very well correspond to Hebrew *rms;*[87] and *śbr.*[88] So even in these cases, which are the most likely ones, it is rather dubious that Hebrew *ś,* in fact, is matched by Arabic *s.* Even less certain are the other cases. If *miśpāḥ* ("bloodshed") really corresponds to Arabic *sfḥ* ("to pour out"), the spelling with *ś* should be considered secondary on the strength of *sāpîāḥ ("shower"), spelled with (original) *s* (cf. Blau, 1970a, p. 123). The meaning of Hebrew *śdd* ("to harrow") can hardly be connected with Arabic *sdd* ("to be right"), nor can Hebrew *śāde* ("field") be connected with Arabic *sdw* ("to extend," especially hand). Expressions like *laylun musaddan* ("extended night," see Dozy [1881, s.v.]) are rare and, it seems, secondary. Arabic *sikkīn,* corresponding to Hebrew *śakkîn,* is an Aramaic loan word (see Fraenkel, 1886, p. 84). Hebrew *śkk* alternates with *skk,* Arabic *skk* corresponding to the latter, *śkk* to the former (cf. also Blau, 1970a, p. 116). As to Hebrew *śəmāmît* ("a kind of lizard"), it is dubious whether it can be connected with Arabic *samm* ("poison").[89]

3.3.3

Magnanini also attempts to show the late character of Hebrew *ś* by

87. In Biblical Hebrew *rpś* and *rps* alternate. It stands to reason that the *ś* is original and the *s* due to the impact of *rms;* see Blau (1970a, p. 122), following Barth and Fraenkel (see Blau, 1970a, note 39).

88. For the possibility of Arabic *ś,* rather than *s,* corresponding to the *ś* in this word see e.g., the literature cited in Brockelmann (1928, s.v. *I śbr*), and cf. also. Ginzberg (1934) and Wagner (1966, p. 108). Personally, I would vote for dialectal Arabic *śbr* ("to look") as the most likely correspondence for Hebrew *śbr.* Cf. also Landberg (1920–42, s.v., *śbr*) and further Classical *śbr* ("to measure by span"), admittedly a denominative verb, wrongly connected with Hebrew *śbr* by Magnanini (see *infra* Section 3.3.3, end).

89. And even if so, one must not lose sight of the fact that the latter is an Aramaic loan word, as surmised, because of the inconsistency of its vowel, by Fraenkel (1886, p. 262). For the problem of *samm* cf. also Blau (1970a, pp. 119–120).

the alleged correspondence of Arabic *š* with Hebrew *ś*, rather than with *š*. As mentioned in 3.3 above, however, among Magnanini's examples there is only one really convincing case, viz. Hebrew and Arabic *šwq* ("to desire"). In eleven other cases the correspondence is possible, but by no means necessary. Again, the basis of the deviant correspondence is so narrow that one would not, on the strength of it, jump to the conclusion that the sound correspondence Arabic *š*—Hebrew *ś* is not regular. The cases are: *'šr*, compared by Magnanini with Arabic *'šr*, though it may correspond to Arabic *ysr*,[90] exhibiting regular sound correspondence; **ḥaśrā/ḥāśērā* (see also Kutscher, 1957, p. 252, but cf. note 81 above); *ḥāšaš* ("chaff"), not necessarily corresponding to Arabic *ḥašīš*, but rather to *ḥuθθ* (see Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v.); *nśl* possibly matched by Arabic *nsl*, rather than by *nšl*;[91] Arabic *ntš*, which according to Magnanini corresponds to Hebrew *ntš*,[92] is, in my opinion, best interpreted as reflecting alternation of the third radical of roots beginning with *nt*, as exhibited by Hebrew *ntš*, *nts*, *ntṣ*, *nt'*, ultimately originating in PS *ntś* (cf. also Wagner, 1966, p. 85); similarly Arabic *'qš*, allegedly matched by Hebrew *'qš*, presumably exhibits alternation of the third radical of roots beginning with *'q* (cf. Syriac *'qs*, Arabic *'qṣ*; for *possible* additional cases, see Gesenius, 1835ff, s.v.; Mühlau-Volck, 1890, s.v. *'qb*), ultimately going back to PS *'qś*, which may be reflected by Syriac *'qs* as well (*pace* Brockelmann, 1928, s.v.); *pwš/pyš; qrš; šbb;*[93] *šwt; śôrēr*.

In the following cases, the exceptional sound correspondence Hebrew *ś*—Arabic *š* (which, by the way, is not always certain) is, it seems, due to the dissimilatory effect of an additional sibilant in the Arabic root (for particulars cf. *infra* Section 4.3): *šzr; šḥs; šemeṣ; šemeš; šsp*. In other cases, the assumption of Arabic *s* corresponding to Hebrew *ś* is, in my opinion, much likelier than Arabic *š*: a clear mistake is that Hebrew *ḥbś* is matched by Arabic *ḥbš*, since its Arabic correspondence is, no doubt, *ḥbs;* Hebrew *ḥwš* ("to feel")[94] corresponds to Arabic *ḥss* in the same sense;

90. For the alternation of ' and *y* as first radical see, e.g., Nöldeke's masterly paper (1910, pp. 202–206), where the alternation of initial *w/y* is treated as well.

91. Cf. also Arabic *sll* corresponding to Hebrew *šll* ("to draw out"). Arabic *nšl* was even considered by Fraenkel (1886, p. 88) an Aramaic loan, yet his arguments are not convincing. By no means would one interpret the *š* of *nšl* as being due to an *ad hoc* dissimilation (*pace* Brockelmann, 1908–13, I, p. 167; cf. also Landberg, 1920–42, s.v.).

92. According to Fraenkel (1886, p. 137), Arabic *ntš* is an Aramaic loan, a somewhat unlikely supposition in the light of the existence of Geʿez *nšt* with metathesis.

93. Besides the biblical dictionaries see also Fraenkel (1898, pp. 80–81), Koehler-Baumgartner (1953, Aramaic part, s.v. *šəbīb*), Wagner (1966, pp. 111–112). Cf. also Beeston (1951, p. 11).

94. I assume that Magnanini had this meaning of *ḥwš* in mind, since the meanings ad-

Hebrew *neḥšāl* exhibits formal and semantic similarity not only with Arabic *ḫšl/ḫšl*, as proposed by Magnanini, but also with *ḥsl/ḥsl* (and even with *ḥθl*); Hebrew *r'š* is matched not only by Arabic *r'š*, but also by Arabic *r's* (which is, admittedly, less frequent); Hebrew *šibbōlet* ("ear of grain") must not be derived from Arabic *šbl* ("to grow"), since the latter is clearly a denominative from *šibl* ("whelp"). Although Arabic *sunbula* ("ear of grain") may well be an Aramaic loan (see Jeffery, 1938, pp. 178–179), the Arabic correspondence of Hebrew *šbl* seems to be *sbl* (see the biblical dictionaries); for Hebrew *šeger* ("offspring") cf. the literature adduced by Gesenius-Buhl (1915, s.v.), and especially Fraenkel (1886, p. 114, note 1). Besides, one has to take the possibility into consideration that *šeger* denotes "womb" rather than "offspring" (see Feigin, 1926, p. 44); as to Hebrew *šḥṭ*, according to ibn Sida (cited in Landberg, 1901, p. 388), Arabic *sḥṭ* has to be preferred to Arabic *šḥṭ* (see also Landberg, 1920–42 s.vv. *sḥṭ, šḥṭ*; Beeston, 1951, p. 11); Arabic *štf* is not the genuine correspondence of Hebrew *šṭp*, but rather an Aramaic loan,[95] as also hinted by its restricted dialectal attestation (see Barthélemy, 1935ff, s.v.; further Almkvist, 1925, p. 57, note 1). On the other hand, Arabic *sṭf* (see the literature adduced in Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v. *šṭp*), which *prima facie* may reflect the genuine correspondence of Hebrew *šṭp*, is very restricted as well and may reflect a loan word adapted to Arabic;[96] Hebrew *šrg* simply does not exist.

In other cases it is Arabic *θ*, rather than alleged *š*, that corresponds to Hebrew *š*: Arabic *qašš*, corresponding to Hebrew *qaš* ("chaff"), is an Aramaic loan (see Fraenkel, 1886, p. 137), and if one insists that Hebrew *qšš* ("to gather") is related to an Arabic verb in the sense of collecting, rather than being a denominative verb from *qaš*, meaning "to gather stubble" (*qšš* in Zeph 2:1 is obscure), one would prefer to connect it with Arabic *qθθ*; Hebrew *ḥrš* does not correspond to Arabic *ḥrš* nor to *ḫrš*, but to *ḥrθ*; Hebrew *'šš* ("to be wasted away"), if it is related to an Arabic verb

---

duced "to have fear, be shaken, agitated" (cf. Syriac *ḥss*, "feeling, pain, agitation") fit homonymous *ḥwš* ("to haste") less well. *ḥwš* ("to haste") reflects PS *š* as well, as demonstrated by its Ugaritic parallel. Accordingly, it must not be connected with Arabic *ḥθθ, pace* Barth, cited, e.g., by Gesenius-Buhl (1915, s.v.).

95. For its occurrence in (Jewish and Samaritan) Aramaic see Ben-Ḥayyim (1957ff, II, p. 477a).

96. For such adaptations cf. Blau (1970a, pp. 101–102). I have also played with the idea of regarding *šṭp* as *šaf'ēl* of *ṭpp*, from which also Hebrew *nṭp* ("to drop, drip") is derived; cf. also Ben-Yehuda (1948ff, p. 7056, note 1).

denoting "to be lean," one would rather choose *ġθθ*, and not *'šš*, for it; Hebrew *šāpān* corresponds to PS *θpn*, as proved by the *Sheri*[97] word *θufun*;[98] Hebrew *šql* corresponds to Arabic *θql* since Arabic *šql* is an Aramaic loan (see Fraenkel, 1886, p. 197); for *šyn* cf. above note 84.

In the following cases, although no clear Arabic correspondences to the Hebrew roots can be suggested, it is clear that Magnanini's proposals, exhibiting Arabic *š* as against Hebrew *š*, are not sound: Hebrew *ḥlš* ("to defeat"), presumably originally "to weaken," since it also has the meaning "to be weak," has been connected by Magnanini (so also alternatively by Zorell, 1949ff, s.v.) with Arabic *ḥlš* ("to mow"). Yet the Arabic word is dialectal,[99] and the difference in meaning together with the marginal attestation of the Arabic word (without mentioning the irregular sound corresondence, since this would imply *petitio principii*) makes any connection rather unlikely.[100] Hebrew *ḥšk* ("to be, grow dark") allegedly corresponds to Arabic *ḥšk* ("to be filled"), yet "to be filled" originally refers to the udder, being derived from *ḥišāk* ("a piece of wood preventing a kid from sucking the udder"), related to Hebrew *ḥśk* ("withhold") (see, e.g., Gesenius-Buhl, 1915; Koehler-Baumgartner, 1967ff, s.v. *ḥśk;* Brockelmann, 1928, s.v. *ḥsk*). Hebrew *'nš* ("to punish") must not be connected with Arabic *'nš*, since the latter does not denote "to torture" (*pace* Magnanini), which, incidentally, does not match either, but rather "to seize the neck of the enemy in fighting," which, in my opinion, fits even less. Hebrew *rḥš* is connected with Arabic *rḥš*; yet the Arabic verb, quite a marginal one, is suspect of being an Aramaic loan.[101] Hebrew *ršm* must not be compared with Arabic *ršm*, as proposed

97. Fresnel (1838a, p. 514, note 1) calls this language "Ehhkili," i.e., Eḥkili, which he spells in Arabic with *ḥ*. This language (see Fresnel, 1838b, p. 79, note 2 and Maltzan, 1873, p. 225) was dubbed *Šḥauri* by the Austrian expedition, and is called *Sheri* by Johnstone (1970, p. 296; 1972, p. 1, note 1; 1975, pp. 2–3).

98. See Fresnel (1838a, p. 514, note 1). For Proto-Sinaitic cf. Albright (1948, p. 21, note 71).

99. As expressly noted by Zorell (1949ff). See, e.g., Dozy (1881), Hava (1899), Wahrmund (1876), Barthélemy (1935ff), Denizeau (1960), Landberg (1920–42), s.v.

100. I am playing with the thought of deriving this dialectal *ḥlš* from Aramaic *šlḥ* ("to strip off"). For the metathesis postulated cf. Christian Palestinian Aramaic *ḥlš*. For the semantic shift (Arabic *ḥlš* denotes also "to pull out"): Hebrew *ḥlṣ, qal*—"to draw off (a sandal)"; *pi'el*—"to pull out (stones)"; *nšl*—"to slip off (iron); draw off (sandal)"; *šll*—"to draw out (sheaves); spoil, plunder"; *šlp*—"to draw off (sandal)," related to Arabic *slb* ("to plunder, take off [garment]"). Cf. also Neo-Syriac *šlḥ* ("to be naked, lose hair"). (Arabic *ḥlš* also denotes "to pull out beard," see Dozy, 1881, s.v.).

101. See Brockelmann (1928, s.v. *rḥš*); cf. also Landberg (1920–42, p. 1219, note 1). By the way, Barth (1893, p. 48) connected Aramaic *rḥš* with Arabic *ršḥ*, without knowing that

by Magnanini, not even with *rsm* (though exhibiting regular sound correspondence), since both, in all likelihood, are Aramaic loans (see Fraenkel, 1886, pp. 137, 250), the latter, in all likelihood, due to adaptation to Arabic (see above note 96). Hebrew *š'p* ("to gasp, pant after, be eager for," perhaps also "to persecute") can hardly be compared with Arabic *š'f* ("to be afraid, to hate"), because of the semantic gap separating the latter even from the (uncertain) sense "to persecute," nor can Hebrew *šbḥ* ("to praise") be compared with Arabic *šbḥ* ("to extend [hands]"), which is by no means special to prayer. Hebrew *šābēā'*, compared with Arabic *šabi'a*, is, it seems, due to printer's error. Magnanini compares Arabic *šbr* ("to measure") with Hebrew *šbr*, having possibly "to buy grain" in mind. The gap in meaning, however, makes this assumption quite unlikely; moreover, Arabic *šbr* may perhaps be related to Hebrew *šbr* (see above note 88). Hebrew *šlḥ* ("to send") must not be compared with Arabic *šlḥ* ("to throw off," also "to strip off"), because the Arabic verb is an Aramaic loan.[102] Arabic *šmr* does not exhibit meanings which could possibly be connected with Hebrew *šmr*. Hebrew *šp'* must not be related to Arabic *šf'*, because the latter has the basic meaning "to join," from which all the other meanings are derived. Barth's proposal (1902, p. 51) to connect Hebrew *šp'* with Arabic *sbġ* is very attractive; it is not easy to justify the comparison of Hebrew *'ešnāb* ("window") with Arabic *šnb* ("to be cold"), despite Zorell (1949ff, s.v.).

3.3.4

Magnanini also adduces cases of irregular Arabic correspondence to Hebrew *s*, viz. Arabic *š*. The current, and, in my opinion, correct view is that in these cases the spelling with *s* is late and arose after the original *ś* had merged with *s* (cf. Blau, 1970a, pp. 114ff). We have already mentioned (in 3.3.1) cases of the spelling with the original *ś* still attested alongside the later *s*. We shall now cite three other cases, in which the only attested spelling is with *s*, so that, *prima facie*, one could be more in-

---

ibn Janāḥ (1873–75, s.v., *rḥš*) proposed the same for Hebrew *rḥš*. In my opinion, however, Fraenkel (1898, p. 80) was right in opposing Barth's (and, one may add, ibn Janāḥ's) proposal, since it combines two irregularities, i.e., exceptional sound correspondence and metathesis.

102. Even Firūzabādī in his *Qāmūs* dubs it *sawādī;* cf., e.g., Féghali (1920, pp. 241, 246).

clined to consider an irregular sound correspondence Hebrew *s*—Arabic *š* possible: Magnanini ingeniously connects Hebrew *nissā* ("to try") with Arabic *nšw* ("to smell"); yet despite the ingenuity of this proposal I doubt its validity, even without taking the irregular sound correspondence into account: in Classical Arabic, at least, this meaning developed in a quite different direction, viz. "to get dizzy (from wine), to get wind (of news)," and just as in Hebrew the meaning of "smelling" is totally absent, so too in Classical Arabic is that of "trying" absent. Hebrew *rss* and Arabic *rss*, in fact, match in both form and meaning. Yet the possibility obtains that they are unrelated onomatopoetic words (see Blau, 1970a, p. 115). The third word is *sǝtāw* ("winter"), which, however, is spelled in Old Aramaic with *š* and, therefore, its Hebrew spelling (*hapax legomenon!*) has, by necessity, to be regarded as late (cf. Blau, 1970a, p. 115).

In other cases, the alleged correspondence of Arabic *š* to Hebrew *s* is quite unlikely because of the gap of meaning: Arabic *hšn* ("to be rough, hard, coarse"; so also Brown *et al.*, 1907, s.v.) fits Hebrew *hāsôn* ("strong") much less than Arabic *hsn* ("to be unaccessible", see e.g., Gesenius-Buhl, 1915; Brockelmann, 1928, s.v.). Arabic *kšm* has only the meaning of "to cut off the nose," which matches Hebrew *ksm* ("to shear, clip") fairly well. Nevertheless, in the light of many alternating forms, as Hebrew and Arabic *gzm*, Middle Hebrew and Arabic *gdm*, Arabic *jδm*, Arabic and Hebrew *qsm*, one would rather refrain from positing irregular sound correspondence. Hebrew *shp* denotes "to prostrate, wash away," whereas Arabic *shf* designates "to skin"; a connection between the two is possible, but by no means convincing. Although Arabic *sifl* is an Aramaic loan (see Fraenkel, 1886, pp. 67–68), no Arabic *šafal* exists (*pace* Magnanini) to match Hebrew *sepel*. The alleged connection between Hebrew *sam* ("spice") and Arabic *šamma* ("to smell") is quite intricate (see Blau, 1970a, pp. 119–120), and it becomes even more opaque if one connects it with *sǝmāmît* (see 3.3.2 above and note 89). I have not found any meaning like "to shed, dilate" for Arabic *šrh*, and, therefore, it does not fit Hebrew *srh* ("to overhang, expand"). We have already seen in 3.3.3 above that Arabic *'šš* ("to be lean") does not fit Hebrew *'šš* ("to be wasted away"); by no means does it match Hebrew *'ss* ("to press"), not only because of the difference in meaning, but also since Arabic *'ss* ("to press," *i'tassa*, "to press the udder of a camel," see Fīrū-zabādī's *Qāmūs*, s.v.) is attested, exhibiting the regular sound shift.

In other cases too, one would prefer to postulate regular, rather than irregular, sound correspondence: Arabic *hms* ("to irritate") *may* be com-

pared with Hebrew *ḥms* ("to treat violently"); accordingly, there is no
reason to prefer Arabic *ḥmš* ("to maltreat, offend"), even *ḥmš* ("to slap,
cut off"). Nor would one prefer to compare Arabic *ḥšl*, which is only an
alternative form of *ḥsl*, with Hebrew *ḥsl*, and therefore, one would not
connect the Hebrew word with Arabic *ḥšl* either. Hebrew *ksh* ("to cut
away") fits Arabic *ksḥ* (generally, "to sweep away, remove," also used in
connection with thorns—*kasaḥa šawka-š-šajarati*, "he removed the thorn
of the tree"), but not *kšḥ*, which denotes "to drive away," rather than "to
peel." I would prefer to connect Hebrew *mss* (and also *msy*) with Arabic
tamāsā ("to be melted"; see Saadya's translation of Exod 16:21), rather
than with *mšš*. I do not understand why Magnanini compares Arabic *ršn*
("to put the hand in the vessel") with Hebrew *resen* ("halter"), rather
than Arabic *rasan* ("halter"), for which cf. Fraenkel (1886, pp. 100–101),
Landberg (1920–42, s.v.). No Hebrew *šn'* ("to hate") exists, the regular
correspondence of Arabic *šn'* being always Hebrew *śn'*.

As these examples demonstrate, the sound correspondences of the
Hebrew sibilants are almost always regular, a few only exhibit *possible* ir-
regularity, and in even fewer (perhaps only in *tašūqā*) is irregular sound
correspondence really likely.

4. Critical Analysis of Diem (1974)

In a very closely reasoned article, Diem (1974), following others,[103]
claims that in Biblical Hebrew (i.e., in the dialect of Jerusalem), *ś*, the PS
character of which he admits, had shifted to *š*, to change afterwards to *s*
through the interference of Aramaic. Kutscher's arguments against Gar-
bini's similar views were well known to Diem (1974, p. 246). Kutscher
(1965, pp. 40ff) called attention to the existence of many Hebrew roots
spelled with *š* without parallels in Aramaic. Why, then, he asked, on good
grounds in my opinion, did the Masoretes read ‎ש‎ as *s* in these cases, for
many of which it can be demonstrated by comparison with other Semitic
languages that the ‎ש‎ does not correspond to PS *š*? Against this argument
Diem suggests that it is of little consequence if no Aramaic parallel is
known for this or that Hebrew word, since the vocabulary of Aramaic,
especially of Official Aramaic, is attested to a small extent only. The

103. He quotes (p. 224, especially notes 11 and 13) G. Garbini and K. Beyer. Similar
arguments have already been adduced by Tur-Sinai in his remarks to Ben-Yehuda
(1948ff, p. 6777b).

absence of attestations need not indicate that Aramaic in fact lacked these words. Diem analyzes five words adduced by Kutscher (1965), apparently at random, as words lacking Aramaic parallels and claims that four of them have Aramaic parallels indeed. Diem, however, did not take into account one decisive factor, viz. that of frequency. According to Diem's theory, bilingual Jews, speaking both Hebrew and Aramaic,[104] identified Hebrew words containing original *ś*, already pronounced as *ś*, with the parallel Aramaic ones and started pronouncing them in an Aramaic way, substituting *s* for original *ś*, because of the higher prestige of Aramaic. Yet the influence of an Aramaic word could not make itself felt unless it was frequent enough to influence the parallel Hebrew word. If the Hebrew word was much more frequent, the influence of Aramaic was, for all practical purposes, excluded. Thus for instance, despite the occurrence of an Aramaic parallel to Hebrew *śimlā* ("garment") in the Aramaic Uruk text, it is very difficult to conceive that this rare Aramaic word could have influenced the pronunciation of the frequent Hebrew one. Even less conceivable is Aramaic influence on Hebrew *śmh* ("to rejoice"), even if it is related to Syriac *ṣmh* ("to send out rays"). In this case, a real difference obtains in both meaning ("to rejoice" as against "to send rays") and form (Hebrew *ś*, allegedly pronounced *ś*, as against Aramaic *ṣ*; the latter, at most, should have changed the Hebrew sibilant to *ṣ*, and the existence of Hebrew *ṣmh*, "to grow," should not have prevented this change). Therefore, in this case at least, the assumption of Aramaic influence is altogether impossible. Moreover, as ill luck would have it, in the Hebrew original of Kutscher (1965), viz. *ləšonenu* 29:119 (1964–65), Kutscher cited another example, which, apparently by oversight, has been omitted from the English translation: *śāde* ("field"). This extraordinarily frequent Hebrew word is altogether absent from Aramaic, and even if it should eventually be detected in an Aramaic text, the high frequency of the Hebrew word as against the Aramaic one (which has not yet been detected and perhaps never will!) rules out the possibility of any Aramaic influence on the pronunciation of the Hebrew word. And *śāde* is not the only word of this kind. Even more conspicuous is the case of *'āśā* ("to do, make"), which is so frequent in the Hebraic group of languages and characteristic of them that Ginsberg (1970, p. 111) considered it "the simplest mark by which this group may be distinguished both from other

---

104. For the possibility, tentatively suggested by Diem (1974, p. 245) that the pronunciation of *ś* as *s* came into being after Hebrew had already become a dead language, see *infra* 4.5.

Canaanite ones and from the rest of the Semitic languages." Even if, by
some chance, this verb should be detected in an Aramaic dialect, it is
quite inconceivable that the Aramaic verb with such low frequency
should have influenced such a frequent Hebrew verb. Accordingly,
Diem's hypothesis cannot account for the occurrence of many con-
spicuous Hebrew words containing *ś* (i.e., spelled with ש and pronounced
s). Therefore, by necessity one should concur with the accepted view that
Hebrew *ś*, corresponding to other Semitic languages in a way often dif-
ferent from the reflection of Hebrew *š* and *s*, has to be considered genuine
and that its pronunciation as *s* arose without Aramaic influence.

4.1 Hebrew Words with Sibilants Differing from Aramaic

That the pronunciation of the Hebrew sibilants is not due to the im-
pact of Aramaic is also hinted by *śə'ārûm* ("they were acquainted with
them") in Deut 32:17, the *ś* of which is established by Arabic *ša'ara* ("to
perceive"); if there had been Aramaic influence one would have expected
**šə'ārûm*, in the light of the frequent Aramaic *ša'ēr* ("to estimate") (cf. in
Hebrew, Prov 23:7), which could have been easily adapted to the
Deuteronomic passage (in the sense of "to calculate"). Or why should
obscure *niśqad*, Lam 1:14, be spelled with *ś*, despite the existence of the
frequent Hebrew *šqd* ("to watch")?! By necessity, we have to postulate
the existence of a (genuine) tradition which made the Masoretes establish
ś, rather than *š*, in these cases.

There exist other indications as well which contravene the assumption
of far-reaching Aramaic influence on the pronunciation of Hebrew
sibilants. There exists at least one clear-cut case of Hebrew *s* in a word in-
fluenced by Aramaic corresponding to Aramaic *š*: Nöldeke (1910, p. 37,
note 3) has made a very good case for Hebrew *kns* being a homonymic
verb. Genuine Hebrew *kns*, denoting "to enter," very frequent in Middle
Hebrew in *nif'al*, occurs in Isa 28:20 *wəhammassēkā ṣārā kəhitkannēs*
("and the covering is [too] narrow, when one enters it") and *miknəsê*
("trousers") is derived from it. In late Biblical Hebrew[105] and in Middle
Hebrew, this root was attracted by Aramaic *knš* ("to collect"), and *kns*
acquired the meaning of "to collect." So in this case not only was

---

105. See, e.g, Gesenius-Buhl (1915, s.v. II *kns*); Nöldeke (1910) mentions Middle
Hebrew only.

Aramaic not powerful enough to make Hebrew *kns* be pronounced *knš*, but Hebrew imposed upon "to collect" the pronunciation with *s*, because of the existing Hebrew root, rather than *knš* as in Aramaic.[106]

In this connection, it is worthwhile to call attention to obscure *śtm* (Num 24:3, 15) which, in the light of Diem's thesis, one would have expected to exhibit *ś* through the influence of Aramaic *stm* (see Jastrow, 1903, s.v.), *sṭm* (see Brockelmann, 1928, s.v.), *sdm* (see Drower-Macuch, 1963, s.v.) ("to stop up"), the more so since Hebrew *śtm* is attested (see Blau, 1970a, p. 121, note 35). Accordingly, one would discard the theory of decisive Aramaic influence on the pronunciation of Hebrew sibilants.

4.2

Accordingly, we cannot accept Diem's main thesis that it was through Aramaic influence that, in some cases, *ש* came to be pronounced as *s*. Now we shall proceed to analyze some of his quite impressive collateral proofs in a somewhat different light.

4.3 Irregular Sound Correspondences of Hebrew *š*

Diem (1974, pp. 246–247) calls attention to the existence of Hebrew *š*, where, according to its correspondences with other Semitic languages, one would rather have expected *ś*. These cases, in Diem's opinion, have to be interpreted as exhibiting original *ś*. Yet because of the want of Aramaic parallels, *š*, which in genuine Hebrew, in Diem's opinion, had superseded *ś*, had been left and not changed to *s*. Diem himself (pp. 246–247, note 120) felt the weakness of his position, since in these cases he accepted the *argumentum ex silentio* of the absence of Aramaic parallels, yet not in the case of Hebrew *ś*. More important, however, in our opinion, is the uncertain and marginal character of this *š*. In the wake of Yahuda (1903, especialy pp. 707ff), Diem adduces eight words allegedly exhibiting *š*, where one would have expected *ś*, five of which, however, exhibit another sibilant alongside *š*, so that the deviation from regular

---

106. It is interesting to note that in Codex Kaufmann *niknǝśā* ("she entered") is spelled with *ś* (and final *'alep*), presumably through the influence of Aramaic *knš;* see Blau (1970a, p. 25).

sound correspondence may well be due to dissimilation.[107] As to the
remaining three words, the etymology of Hebrew *nāḥāš* ("snake") is by
no means clear, cf., e.g., Nöldeke (1904, p. 133, note 4) or Fraenkel (1898,
p. 80); Hebrew *šuppû* ("they have become lean") may be connected, to be
sure, with Arabic *šff* ("to be transparent"), yet the meeting of two devia-
tions, viz. Hebrew *š* corresponding to Arabic *š*, and a Hebrew *IIIy* verb to
an Arabic *media geminata*, makes one cautious. One would altogether
discard Yahuda's interpretation of *šəlûḥôt* ("shoots, branches"), Isa 16:8,
since it may easily be derived from *šlḥ* ("to send"), cf. Ps 80:12 *təšallaḥ
qəṣîrêhā 'ad yām* ("she sent her boughs unto the sea"), Jer 17:8 *wə'al
yûḇal yəšallaḥ šorāšāw* ("and it sends out its roots by the river"). (See the
biblical dictionaries s.v., who, justly in our opinion, did not even care to
quote Yahuda on this passage.) It would have been more expedient to
quote a deviant correspondence like Hebrew *təšûqā* ("longing") =
Arabic *šawq*, in exactly the same meaning and usage (see 3.3 above and
note 82). Yet the marginal existence of such deviant correspondence does
not prove anything. One must not forget that exceptional cor-
respondences have been claimed also, e.g., for Aramaic *š*, as for Aramaic
nəšaq = Hebrew *nāšaq*, if it is really related to Arabic *nasaqa* ("to smell")
(see, e.g., Barth, 1893, pp. 46–47; Fraenkel, 1898, pp. 79–80; Barth, 1902,
p. 58); Aramaic *riḥšā* ("reptile"), if it really corresponds to Arabic *rāsiḥ*
(see Barth, 1893, p. 48; Fraenkel, 1898, p. 80; Barth 1902, p. 58); Aramaic
nešḇā ("net"), if related to Arabic *našiba* ("to stick") (see Fraenkel, 1886,
p. 120; Barth, 1893, p. 50). Although this exceptional correspondence
(Aramaic *š*—Arabic *š*) is not less established than Hebrew *š*—Arabic *š*, it
cannot be inferred from it that Aramaic or Arabic *š* have come into being
through foreign influence. Weak phonetic change is well attested in
Semitic languages (cf. Section 1), accordingly, nothing can be inferred
from marginal deviations in sound correspondence for Hebrew *š* either.

107. For such dissimilations cf. the literature adduced by Gesenius-Buhl (1915, s.vv.
šemeš, šrš); Koehler-Baumgartner (1953, Aramaic part, s.v. *šəmaš*). Yahuda (1903, pp.
708–709, note 1) also cites Hebrew *šsp* = Arabic *šsf*. On the other hand, Hebrew *ḥāšaš* =
Arabic *ḥašīš* (p. 708), cf. also *supra* 3.3.3, does not exhibit dissimilation, since in roots *mediae
geminatae* this feature does not occur. Other cases exhibiting dissimilations are: Hebrew *šzr*
= Arabic *šzr* (see the literature adduced in Blau, 1975, p. 28, notes, 8, 9); Hebrew *šhz* =
Arabic *šḥ*. That Diem did not pay attention to the possibility of dissimilation is more sur-
prising, since Yahuda (p. 708) expressly mentioned the occurrence of two sibilants in the
words adduced by him.

4.4 The Shift $\theta > \check{s}$ in the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Lower Ṭiyārî

One of the main reasons for Diem's refusal to accept the shift $\theta > \check{s}$ at
face value while positing rather $\theta > \acute{s} > \check{s}$ (and later, through Aramaic in-
terference, $\check{s} > s$ in some of its occurrences), is his assumption that θ does
not shift to $\check{s}$ if another sibilant without a kettle sound ("Kessel-
geräusch") exists (Diem, 1974, pp. 225–226, p. 247). Yet the shift $\theta > \check{s}$ is
attested under these circumstances in at least one living, though admitted-
ly quite marginal, Semitic tongue, which, however, suffices to prove the
possibility of this shift. In the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Lower Ṭiyārî, for
which, to be sure, no well-established texts exist, what was once the
spirant allophone of t, viz. θ, under conditions which still have to be es-
tablished, has shifted to $\check{s}$. Nöldeke (1896, p. 303) has correctly con-
sidered this to be probably the same sound shift that changed PS θ in
Hebrew and Akkadian into $\check{s}$.[108]

4.4.1

In his endeavor to refute the possibility of the shift $\theta > \check{s}$ (if another
sibilant without kettle sound exists), Diem (1974, pp. 247ff) has collected
important material for the shift $\theta > s$[109] and $\theta > \acute{s}$. Yet one must not lose
sight of the fact that the only shift of θ attested by Diem in living dialects
is to s, whereas its shift to $\acute{s}$ (which is necessary for Diem's theory, see 4.4
above) is based only on Diem's reconstruction of Hebrew, Proto-Sinaitic
and, relying on D. O. Edzard, of Akkadian. Therefore, *prima facie,* one
should not exclude the shift $\theta > \check{s}$ (even if it were not attested, see 4.4
above) more than $\theta > \acute{s}$, the more so, since PS $\acute{s}$ was, it seems, a lateral
sound (Steiner, forthcoming). As to Egyptian transcriptions, despite the
sound proofs adduced by Diem (pp. 230ff) that they distinguish between
$\acute{s}$ and $\acute{s}/\theta$ (by the way, also between $\check{s}$ and the other sibilants) one can only
infer from them that for the Egyptian ear $\acute{s}$ and θ seemed to be close; they
do not, however, prove that θ had, in fact, shifted to $\acute{s}$. Moreover, Aro

108. Cf. also Maclean (1901, p. X), Lidzbarski (1894, pp. 226, 236–237), Nöldeke (1868,
p. 46), further Stoddard (1855, p. 75), Maclean (1895, p. 338).
      109. In passing, I would like to add that in the Arabic dialect of Daragözü as well, θ has
shifted to s, see Jastrow (1973, p. 15).

(1959, p. 323, note 1), despite Diem's qualifications (p. 247, note 122), has made very sound observations on the possible different phonetic character of Semitic s, which, in my opinion, well explain the shift $\theta > \check{s}$. He calls attention to the series of unvoiced non-emphatic sibilants in Semitic consisting of three members (s, $\check{s}$, $\acute{s}$), as against the single voiced z. He surmises therefore, that Semitic s was especially "sharp" and, accordingly, unsuitable for serving as the sibilant counterpart of θ. In Aro's opinion, for languages that had only one unvoiced sibilant, like Hittite and Greek, it was Old Semitic $\check{s}$ that was felt as the closest correspondence to their sibilant(s) and therefore the Hittites spelled their s with Akkadian $\check{s}$ and the Greeks accepted $\check{sin}$ as the sign of their *sigma*.[110] In this connection, it is not without interest to remember[111] that early Arabic transcriptions from Spanish invariably transcribe the Spanish s by Arabic $\check{s}$. It seems that the Spanish s was apico-alveolar. Therefore, the Arabic ear identified it with Arabic $\check{s}$, and Arabic s with Spanish z, ς (a predorsodental affricate). This transcription cautions us not to jump to conclusions on the strength of transcriptions, and this also applies to the transcriptions utilized by Garbini (1971). Thus, in our opinion (*pace* Diem, 1974, pp. 247–248, following Edzard), the use of Old Akkadian $\acute{s}$ to mark PS θ does not prove that θ shifted to $\acute{s}$ in Old Akkadian, since PS $\acute{s}$ is also marked in Old Akkadian by $\acute{s}$ (see Aro, 1959, p. 328). Accordingly, Old Akkadian $\acute{s}$ for PS θ *may* reflect $\theta > \acute{s}$ as well, and, in the light of later Akkadian, this is not unlikely.

4.4.2

In our opinion, Diem has not taken into consideration the admittedly few texts written in an Ugaritic alphabet of approximately 22 letters, which, *inter alia*, reflect the graphemic development $\acute{s}/\theta > \theta$ (see Greenfield, 1969, who adduced additional literature, p. 96, note 20). In all probability, this has to imply that, in the language reflected by these texts, PS $\acute{s}$, $\check{s}$, and θ coincided in $\check{s}$. One could, to be sure, imagine a starting point different from the language reflected by the majority of

110. Yet one must not lose sight of the fact that the situation in Greek was rather complicated (cf. the use of *san* in some Greek dialects); see, e.g., Jeffery (1961, pp. 27ff). Cf. also Nöldeke (1904, pp. 125–126). At any rate one would not consent to Garbini's opinion (1971, p. 37), that Greek *sigma* demonstrates that Northwest-Semitic $\acute{s}$ was pronounced s.

111. See, e.g., Fischer (1917, p. 50), Steiger (1932, pp. 200ff, especially p. 202).

Ugaritic texts (in which š and ś have become one sound) and claim that the development was rather:

Stage I   š, ś, θ
Stage II   š, ś (since θ > š), i.e. different from the majority of Ugaritic texts
Stage III š (since ś > š).

This, however, in light of the majority of Ugaritic texts, is less likely than to assume:

Stage I   š, ś, θ
Stage II   š, θ, (since ś > š) as also reflected by the majority of Ugaritic texts, i.e., at this stage, all the Ugaritic texts still reflected a common lingual type
Stage III š (since θ > š in the minority of texts).

Greenfield (1969, p. 96, note 18), on the strength of the evidence from Hittite and Hurrian (and perhaps also Akkadian) words and names, even suggested that in Ugaritic also, as exhibited by the majority of texts, θ was only a historical spelling, since θ had already phonetically merged with š. At any rate, at least some Ugaritic texts seem to reflect the sound shift θ > š, contrary to Diem's thesis, and the mere fact that in Akkadian transcriptions š marks Ugaritic θ,[112] indicates that š was not phonetically as far from θ as Diem wants us to believe.

4.5 Hebrew š Could Not Shift to s through Aramaic Influence

Diem (1974, p. 245) mentions the possibility that Hebrew š, then still pronounced š, shifted, under Aramaic influence, to s after Hebrew had already become a dead language. In my opinion, however, this assumption is almost inconceivable. It implies that Hebrew, a dead language of great prestige, serving as the sacred tongue of the synagogue, was so much influenced by the spoken vernacular, viz. Aramaic, that in the syn-

---

112. Though one must not overemphasize the importance of these transcriptions either. Rainey (1971, p. 156), at any rate, considers it a mechanical transcription.

agogal reading the letter *w* was overdifferentiated and, in cases in which it corresponded to Aramaic *s*, was no longer pronounced *š*, but rather *s*. No similar cases are known to me from Jews having Arabic as their mother tongue, also a closely related Semitic language (though admittedly, Aramaic is even more closely related), and it is not due to chance that Diem could only adduce one allegedly similar case, in which people with Arabic as their mother tongue learning Syriac, pronounce *dahbā* as *dahabā*, *ₔahabā* and *ₔahbā* thus restoring either an omitted vowel or *ₔ* (or both) in the wake of Arabic *ₔahab*. Yet the resemblance of these cases is deceptive. The introduction of (synchronically) wrong vowels, through the influence of Arabic, into unvocalized Syriac is simply due to lack of knowledge. And as to the pronunciation of *d* as *ₔ*, one must not lose sight of the fact that in Syriac these consonants are allophones. He who learns Syriac is taught, according to certain rules, to pronounce the letter *d* sometimes as *d* and sometimes as *ₔ*. In a case like ours he may, under the impact of his mother tongue, pronounce *ₔ* contrary to the rules. Quite different is the case of Hebrew *w*. Diem claims that the letter *w*, which, in his opinion, should in genuine Hebrew *always* be pronounced *š*, was overdifferentiated under the influence of the Aramaic mother tongue, and, in reading, was sometimes correctly pronounced *š*, yet in other cases *s*. This would exhibit a real overdifferentiation of the reading of a letter in a dead language, whereas in the case of Syriac *d/ₔ*, the double reading is a part of the system of the dead language, yet it was wrongly applied through the influence of the mother tongue.

The assumption that Hebrew was already a dead language when it underwent the alleged (partial) shift *š* > *s* under the influence of Aramaic is impossible to accept for historical reasons as well. Even if one discards the spelling of words containing original *ś* with *s* in the masoretic text as late changes (although this seems quite unlikely), this spelling is attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls from the first century B.C.E., and since the Bar Kosiba letters written in Middle Hebrew prove that Hebrew continued to be a living tongue until the Bar Kosiba revolt (132–35 C.E.) by necessity the alleged shift *š* > *s*, if it occurred at all, took place when Hebrew was still a living tongue.

4.6 "The *šibbōlet* Incident"

Diem (1974, pp. 242–243) accepted Speiser's interpretation (1942) of the *šibbōlet* incident, viz. that in the dialect of Ephraim *θ* had become *s*,

since original *θibbōlet shifted to sibbōlet. This interpretation, however, despite its ingenuity, fails because it is pivoted upon the rare Judeo-Aramaic θublā ("ear of corn"), whereas all the other linguistic evidence indicates that this word begins with PS š, rather than with θ. Yet Fraenkel (1905), in a short notice,[113] correctly in my opinion, regarded this word as a learned Aramaicizing formation,[114] so that there is no way to postulate šibbōlet with initial θ. Therefore, one would have to return to the simple literal interpretation of the šibbōlet incident, viz. that in the language of Ephraim, all the unvoiced non-emphatic sibilants had fallen together in s.[115]

5. Conclusion

We have tried to demonstrate that the Hebrew pronunciation of š is based on living tradition, rather than on Aramaic influence, since it is attested in very frequent words (as 'śy, "to do, make"), which are totally absent from Aramaic (and even if they occurred, would have been too rare to exert any influence). Besides dealing with some marginal issues, we have tried to show that the shift θ > š, even when another unvoiced non-emphatic sibilant exists, is in fact attested in at least one living dialect, and vestiges of it may be reflected in various extinct Semitic tongues. We also dealt in extenso with the problem of "weak phonetic change" due to dialectical mixture (including borrowing), dissimilation and lexical contamination, and attempted to demonstrate how imperative it is for sound linguistic interpretation to keep "weak phonetic change" in its proper limits and not to lose sight of its marginal character as against regular sound shift.

In this paper, I have often opposed views of my colleagues. Yet, paraphrasing Schuchardt's words,[116] one must not forget that it is thanks to their willingness to deal with thorny problems of Semitic sound cor-

113. Kutscher (1967, p. 174), without knowing of Fraenkel's notice, arrived at the same conclusion.

114. One may add, out of over-self-assertion (see Blau, 1970a, p. 48, note 9).

115. According to Brockelmann (1908–13, I, p. 132), who cites Littmann (1902, p. 11) and Bauer (1926, p. 8), this is the case in the Arabic dialect of Nablus as well. Yet one would be prudent to refrain from connecting it with the dialect of Ephraim, the more so since the same phenomenon obtains in Judeo-Arabic Maghrebine dialects (see, e.g., Cohen, 1912, p. 24). The same applies to later Ge'ez (see, e.g., Brockelmann, 1908–13, p. 133) and, according to some scholars (see Soden, 1952, p. 30), to Middle and New Assyrian as well.

116. See Spitzer (1922, p. 338).

respondence in general and of Hebrew sibilants in particular that progress in scholarship is achieved. This paper is founded on the views of its predecessors, both on those to which it assented and those from which it differed, and I am glad to express my indebtedness to them.

Addendum

Sheer oversight on my part is responsible for the omission of due references, when dealing with Hebrew *d* corresponding to Proto-Semitic *ð* (section 1.6), to C. Rabin's important and stimulating paper "La Correspondance *d* Hébreu—*d* Arabe," *Mélanges Marcel Cohen*, The Hague, 1970, pp. 290–297. At this stage, it was not possible to include them in the body of this paper and space prohibits a detailed consideration of all his 32 etymological suggestions. From the cases in which Rabin assumes influence of "liquids and *r*," I have dealt with *dll* (Rabin no. 12), *dlq* (Rabin 13), *ḥdl* (Rabin 18), *ndr* (Rabin 21) and *qdr* (Rabin 27). Since I did not treat Middle Hebrew, Mishnaic (*sukkā*) *maduḇlelet* is outside the scope of our treatise. I have not been convinced by his suggestions as to *dōḥēr* (8, since "horses of noble descent," in my opinion, does not fit Judg 5:22), *dlḥ* (11, since original *d* is firmly established by Akkadian and Sham'ali), *drb* (15; cf. also Gesenius-Buhl, 1915), *ne'dar* (24, since both *ġdr* and *ta'aððara* denote "to remain behind," and the latter must not be preferred to the former), *'ēder* (25, the etymology of which is considered by Rabin himself as doubtful), and *ṣadērā* (29, the original *d* of which is sufficiently established by Akkadian). The other derivations (with the exception of *gdm*, for which cf. Section 1.6) do not convince, since they postulate not only a "weak" sound change, but exceptional semantic correspondence as well (or correspond to a Hebrew root exhibiting *z*; see 9). Therefore, I do not accept Rabin's assumption that *ð* shifts to *d* in the vicinity of labials. In some cases, the accepted correspondence to Arabic *d* is not worse (though also not better) than that proposed by Rabin with *ð* (as 14, Arabic *damdama* as against Rabin's *ðamā*). *pḥd* (26) is, it seems, an Aramaic loan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations:

BASOR = *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
JAOS   = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
VT   = *Vetus Testamentum*
ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

Aharoni, I. 1935. "qippôd." *ləšonenu* 6:137–163.
——. 1938. "On some animals mentioned in the Bible." *Osiris* 5:461–478.
Aistleitner, J. 1965. *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache.* Berlin.
Albright, W. F. 1948. "The early alphabetic inscriptions from Sinai and their decipherment." *BASOR* 110:6–22.
Almkvist, H. 1925. "Kleine Beiträge zur Lexikographie des Vulgärarabischen." *Le Monde Oriental* 19:V–XIV; 1–186.
Al-Yasin, I. 1952. *The Lexical Relation between Ugaritic and Arabic.* (Shelton Semitic Monograph Series I). New York.
Aro, J. 1959. "Die semitischen Zischlaute (*ɬ*), š, ś und s und ihre Vertretung im Akkadischen." *Orientalia* N.S. 28, pp. 321–335.
——. 1964. "Gemeinsemitische Ackerbauterminologie." *ZDMG* 113: 471–480.
Barth, J. 1893. *Etymologische Studien.* Berlin.
——. 1902. *Wurzeluntersuchungen.* Leipzig.
Barthélemy, A. 1935ff. *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, Dialectes de Syrie.* Paris.
Bauer, H. 1934. "Zu den Ras-Schamra Texten 1929." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 37:474–475.
Bauer, L. 1926. *Das palästinische Arabisch*[4]. Leipzig.
Beeston, A. F. L. 1950. "Notes on Old South Arabian lexicography II." *Le Muséon* 63:261–268.
——. 1951. "Phonology of the Epigraphic South Arabian unvoiced sibilants." *Transactions of the Philological Society,* pp. 1–26.
——. 1962. *A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian.* London.
Ben-Ḥayyim, Z. 1946. "ləharḥaḅat hallašon uləṭiqqunah." *ləšonenu* 14:190–197.

————. 1955. Review of Gumpertz *mibṭa'ey səpatenu. Kirjath Sepher* 30:163–172.

————. 1957ff. *'ibrit va'aramit nosaḥ šomron.* Jerusalem.

Ben-Yehuda, E. 1948ff. *millon hallašon ha'ibrit.* Jerusalem.

Bergsträsser, G. 1918–29. *Hebräische Grammatik.* Leipzig.

Blau, J. 1955. "Etymologische Untersuchungen auf Grund des palaestinischen Arabisch." *VT* 5:337–344.

————. 1957. "Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln." *VT* 7: 98–102.

————. 1968. "On problems of polyphony and archaism in Ugaritic spelling." *JAOS* 88:523–526.

————. 1970a. *On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages.* Jerusalem.

————. 1970b. "he'arot lə'ocar hammillim šebbammiqra." *seper Yosef Braslavy,* pp. 439–443. Ed. Israel Ben-Shem. Jerusalem.

————. 1972. "Marginalia Semitica II." *Israel Oriental Studies* 2:57–82.

————. 1975. "Philological notes on the Bible based on medieval Judaeo-Arabic." *Shnaton, An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 1:27–31.

Blau, J. and J. C. Greenfield. 1970. "Ugaritic glosses." *BASOR* 200:11–17.

Blau, J. and S. E. Lowenstamm. 1970. "'ugaritit ṣly 'qillel'." *ləšonenu* 35:7–10.

Brockelmann, C. 1908–13. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen.* Berlin.

————. 1928. *Lexicon Syriacum².* Halle.

Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. 1907. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford.

Cantineau, J. 1935–45. "La 'mutation des sifflantes' en sudarabique." *Mélanges Gaudefroy-Demombynes,* pp. 313–323. Cairo.

————. 1960. *Études de linguistique arabe.* Paris.

Caquot, A. 1974. "Notes de lexicographie ougaritique."*Actes du Ier Congrès International de Linguistique Sémitique et Chamito-Sémitique* (1969, Paris), pp. 203–208. Eds. A. Caquot and D. Cohen. The Hague.

Caquot, A. *et al.* 1974. *Textes ougaritiques, I, Mythes et légendes.* Paris.

Cohen, M. 1912. *Le parler arabe des Juifs d'Alger.* Paris.

Conti Rossini, C. 1931. *Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis epigraphica.* Rome.

Cross, F. M. 1962. "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs." *Harvard Theological Review* 55:225–259.

Cross, F. M. and D. N. Freedman. 1964. "The name of Ashdod." *BASOR* 175:48–50.

Dahood, M. 1965. "Hebrew-Ugaritic lexicography III." *Biblica* 46:311–332.

Degen, R. 1971. Review of Koehler-Baumgartner *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament³*, I, Leiden, 1967. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 66:259–273.

Denizeau, C. 1960. *Dictionnaire des parlers arabes de Syrie, Liban et Palestine.* Paris.

Diem, W. 1974. "Das Problem von שׂ im Althebräischen und die kanaanäische Lautverschiebung." *ZDMG* 124:221–252.

Dietrich, M. and O. Loretz. 1967. "Untersuchungen zur Schrift- und Lautlehre des Ugaritischen (I): Der ugaritische Konsonant ġ." *Welt des Orients* 4:300–315.

Dietrich, M., O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. 1975. "Untersuchungen zur Schrift- und Lautlehre des Ugaritischen (III)." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 7:103–108.

Dozy, R. P. 1881. *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes.* Leyde.

Driver, G. R. 1921. "The meaning of קאת and קפד in Hebrew." *Journal of Theological Studies* 22:382–383.

———. 1956. *Canaanite Myths and Legends.* Edinburgh.

Drower, E. S. and R. Macuch. 1963. *A Mandaic Dictionary.* Oxford.

Encyclopaedia Biblica V. 1976. Jerusalem.

Féghali, M. T. 1920. "Études sur les emprunts syriaques dans les parlers arabes du Liban." *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.* 27:210–248; 257–282.

———. 1922. "Études sur les emprunts syriaques dans les parlers arabes du Liban (suite et fin)." *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.* 28:13–42.

Feigin, S. 1926. "Word Studies." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 43:44–53.

Feliks, Y. 1955–56. *haḥay šel hattanaḵ.* Tel Aviv.

Fischer, A. 1917. *Zur Lautlehre des Marokkanisch-Arabischen.* Leipzig.

Fischer, W. 1965. *Farb- und Formbezeichnungen in der Sprache der altarabischen Dichtung.* Wiesbaden.

Fraenkel, S. 1886. *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen.* Leiden.

———. 1898. "Zum sporadischen Lautwandel in den semitischen

Sprachen." *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* 3:60–86.

———. 1905. "Zu Zeitschrift 58, S. 954 Z.6." *ZDMG* 59, p. 252 (*sic!*).

Frayha, A. 1947. *mu'jam al-'alfaẓ al-'āmmiyya fi-l-lahja-l-lubnāniyya.* Beirut.

Fresnel, F. 1838a. "Quatrième lettre sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme." *Journal Asiatique* (June), pp. 497–544.

———. 1838b. "Note sur la langue hhymiarite (!)." *Journal Asiatique* (July), pp. 79–84.

Garbini, G. 1960. *Il semitico de nord-ovest.* Naples.

———. 1971. "The phonetic shift of sibilants in Northwestern Semitic in the first millennium B.C." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 1:32–38.

Gesenius, W. 1835ff. *Thesaurus philologicus criticus.* Lipsia.

Gesenius, W. and F. Buhl. 1915. *Handwörterbuch.* Leipzig.

Geyer, R. 1905. *Zwei Gedichte von al-'a'šā.* Vienna.

Ginsberg, H. L. 1938. "A Ugaritic parallel to 2 Sam. 1:21." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57:209–213.

———. 1945. "Psalms and inscriptions of petition and acknowledgment." *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume,* pp. 159–171. Eds. A. Marx *et al.* New York.

———. 1946. *The Legend of King Keret.* New Haven.

———. 1970. "The Northwest Semitic languages." *The World History of the Jewish People, II, Patriarchs,* pp. 102–124. Tel Aviv.

Ginzberg, Louis. 1934. "Beiträge zur Lexikographie des Jüdisch-Aramäischen." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 78:23–25.

Goldziher, I. 1889. *Muhammedanische Studien I.* Halle.

Good, E. M. 1970. "Exodus XV:2." *VT* 20:358–359.

Gordon, C. H. 1965. *Ugaritic Textbook.* Rome.

Greenfield, J. C. 1958. "Lexicographical notes I." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29:203–228.

———. 1964. "Samaritan Hebrew and Aramaic in the Work of Prof. Zev Ben-Ḥayyim." *Biblica* 45:261–268.

———. 1969. "Amurrite, Ugaritic and Canaanite." *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies,* pp. 92–101. Jerusalem.

Gröndahl, F. 1967. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit.* Rome.

Gumpertz, Y. F. 1953. *mibṭa'ey səpatenu.* Jerusalem.

Haupt, P. 1906. "Die semitischen Wurzeln QR, KR, XR." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 23:241–252.

Hava, J. G. 1899. *Arabic-English Dictionary.* Beirut.

Held, M. 1962. "The YQTL-QTL (QTL-YQTL) sequence of identical verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic." *Studies and Essays in Honor of A. A. Neuman,* pp. 281–290. Eds. M. Ben-Horin *et al.* Leiden.

Hommel, F. 1879. *Die Namen der Säugetiere bei den südsemitischen Völkern.* Leipzig.

Ibn Janāḥ, M. 1873–75. *The Book of Hebrew Roots.* Ed. A. Neubauer. Oxford.

Ibn Manẓur, M. 1955–56. *lisān al-'arab.* Beirut.

Jamme, A. 1962. *Sabaean Inscriptions from Maḥram Bilqis (Mârib).* Baltimore.

Jastrow, M. 1903. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature.* New York.

Jastrow, O. 1973. *Daragözü (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft 46).* Nürnberg.

Jean, C. F. and J. Hoftijzer. 1965. *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest.* Leiden.

Jeffery, A. 1938. *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ân.* Baroda.

Jeffery, L. H. 1961. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece.* Oxford.

Jirku, A. 1964. "Der Buchstabe Ghain im Ugaritischen." *ZDMG* 113:481–482.

Johnstone, T. M. 1970. "A definite article in the modern South Arabian Languages." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33:295–307.

———. 1972. "The languages of poetry in Dhofar." *Bulletin of the School of African Studies* 35:1–17.

———. 1975. "The modern South Arabian languages." *Afro-Asiatic Linguistics,* Vol. 1, No. 5, pp. 1–29.

Kahle, P. 1930. *Masoreten des Westens* II. Stuttgart.

Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner. 1953. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros.* Leiden.

———. 1967ff. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament³.* Leiden.

Kopf, L. 1958. "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch." *VT* 8:161–215.

Kuryłowicz, J. 1973. *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metres.* London.
Kutscher, Y. 1955. "'al *miḫṭa'ey sˀpatenu* ləGumpertz." *Tarbiz̧* 24:355–368.
———. 1957. "lammillon hammiqra'i." *ləšonenu* 21:251–258.
———. 1965. "Contemporary studies in North-Western Semitic." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 10:21–51.
———. 1967. "Mittelhebräisch und Jüdisch-Aramäisch im neuen Köhler-Baumgartner." *VT Supplement* 16:158–175.
———. 1976. *Studies in Galilean Aramaic.* Ramat Gan.
Landberg, C. 1901. *Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabie méridionale, I. Ḥaḍramoût.* Leide.
———. 1920–42. *Glossaire Daṭînois.* Leide.
Lane, E. W. 1863–93. *An Arabic-English Lexicon.* London.
LaSor, W. S. 1957–58. "The sibilants in Old South Arabic." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* N.S. 48:161–173.
Levy, J. 1867–68. *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim.* Leipzig.
———. 1876–89. *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim.* Leipzig.
Lidzbarski, M. 1894. "Beiträge zur Grammatik der neuaramäischen Dialekte." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 9:224–263.
Littmann, E. 1902. *Neuarabische Volkspoesie.* Berlin.
Loewenstamm, S. E. 1962. "The Ugaritic fertility myth—the result of a mistranslation." *Israel Exploration Journal.* 12:87–88.
———. 1969. "The Lord is my strength and my glory." *VT* 19:464–470.
———. 1971. "mi məpaḥed mippəney haššiṭa habbalšanit?" *ləšonenu* 36:67–70.
Loewenstamm, S. E. and J. Blau. 1957ff. *'ocar ləšon hammiqra.* Jerusalem.
Maclean, A. J. 1895. *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac.* Cambridge.
———. 1901. *A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac.* Oxford.
Magnanini, P. 1974. "Sulla corrispondenza consonantica arabo /š/ ebraico /ś/." *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 34:401–408.
Malamat, A. 1962. "Mari and the Bible: some patterns of tribal organization and institutions." *JAOS* 82:143–150.
Malkiel, Y. 1962. "Weak phonetic change, spontaneous sound shift, lex-

THE HEBREW ŚÎN

ical contamination." *Lingua* 11:263–275. (Reprinted in Malkiel, 1968, *Essays on Linguistic Themes*, pp. 33–45, Berkeley and Los Angeles.)

Maltzan, H. v. 1873. "Dialectische Studien über das Mehri im Vergleich mit verwandten Mundarten." *ZDMG* 27:225–231.

Montgomery, J. A. 1951. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC). Ed. H. S. Gehman. Edinburgh.

Moor, J. C. de. 1968. "Murices in Ugaritic mythology." *Orientalia* 37:212–215.

———. 1969. Review of Franke Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*, 1967. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 26:105a–108a.

Moscati, S. 1947. "Il biconsonantismo nelle lingua semitiche." *Biblica* 28:113–135.

Mühlau, F. and W. Volck. 1890. *Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament.* Leipzig.

Müller, W. W. 1963. "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75:304–316.

Nöldeke, T. 1868. *Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache.* Leipzig.

———. 1886. Review of F. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*, 1886. *ZDMG* 40:718–743.

———. 1896. Review of Lidzbarski's *Die neuaramäischen Handschriften*, 1896; Sachau's *Skizze des Fellichi-Dialekts von Mosul*, 1895; Maclean's *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, 1895. *ZDMG* 50:302–316.

———. 1900. Review of F. Schulthess, *Homonyme Wurzeln im Syrischen.* Berlin. 1900. *ZDMG* 54:152–164.

———. 1904. *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Strassburg.

———. 1910. *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Strassburg.

———. 1952. *Belegwörterbuch zur klassischen arabischen Sprache.* Berlin.

Nougayrol, J., E. Laroche, C. Virrolleaud, and C. Schaffer (eds.). 1968. *Ugaritica V.*

Orlinsky, H. M. 1939. "*ḥāṣēr* in the Old Testament." *JAOS* 59:22–37.

Parker, S. B. 1971. "Exodus XV:2 again." *VT* 21:373–379.

Payne Smith, R. 1879–1901. *Thesaurus Syriacus.* Oxford.

Pollak, F. 1931. "Beiträge zum arabischen Lexikon II." *Wiener*

Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 38:100—124.

Pritchard, J. B. 1958. *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*. Princeton.

Rainey, A. F. 1970. "haššiṭa habbalšanit—ləvay šeyincəruha." *ləšonenu* 35:11—15.

———. 1971. "Observations on Ugaritic grammar." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 3:151—172.

———. 1974. "The Ugaritic texts in *Ugaritica 5*." *JAOS* 94:184—194.

Rin, S. 1968. *'alilot ha'elim*. Jerusalem.

Rodinson, M. 1957. "Ḥṣṣtn, royaume d'Imru-l-qais." *Groupe linguistique d'études chamito-sémitiques* 7:114—116.

Rössler, O. 1961. "Ghain in Ugaritischen." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 54:158—172.

Růžička, R. 1909. "Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen." *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* VI/4:1—268.

Sauren, H. and G. Kestemont. 1971. "Keret, roi de Ḥubur." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 3:181—221.

Schwally, F. 1898. "Lexikalische Studien." *ZDMG* 52:132—148.

Sethe, K. 1916. "Von Zahlen und Zahlwörtern bei den alten Ägyptern und was für andere Völker und Sprachen daraus zu lernen ist." *Schriften der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft Strassburg, 25.*

Soden, W. v. 1952. *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*. Rome.

———. 1965ff. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden.

———. 1967. "Kleine Beiträge zum Ugaritischen und Hebräischen." *VT Supplement* 16:291—300.

Speiser, E. A. 1942. "The Shibboleth incident (Judges 12:6)." *BASOR* 85:10—13.

Spiro, S. 1895. *An Arabic-English Vocabulary of the Colloquial Arabic of Egypt*. Cairo-London.

Spitzer, L. (ed.). 1922. *Hugo Schuchardt-Brevier*. Halle.

Stehle, D. 1940. "Sibilants and emphatics in South Arabic." *JAOS* 60:507—543.

Steiger, A. 1932. *Contribución a la fonética del Hispano-Árabe y de los arabismos en el ibero-romanico y el siciliano*. Madrid.

Steiner, R. Forthcoming. "The case for fricative-laterals in Proto-Semitic." *American Oriental Series* 59.

Stoddard, D. T. 1855. *Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language*. (American Oriental Society's Proceedings V). London.

Thomas, D. W. 1957. "Some observations on the Hebrew root חדל." *VT Supplement* 4:8–16.

Ullendorf, E. 1962. "Ugaritic marginalia II." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 7:339–351.

Vollers, K. 1894. "Arabisch und Semitisch, Gedanken über eine Revision der semitischen Lautgesetze." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 9:165–217.

Wagner, M. 1966. "Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramäismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch." *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 96. Berlin.

Wahrmund, A. 1876. *Handwörterbuch der neu-arabischen und deutschen Sprache, I, Neu-arabisch——deutscher Teil.* Giessen.

Yahuda, A. S. 1903. "Hapax Legomena im Alten Testament." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 15:698–714.

Yalon, H. 1963. "mašak bammiqra." *qunṭrəsim lə'inyəney hallašon ha'ibrit* 2:76–80.

Zimmern, H. 1917. *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss.* Leipzig.

Zorell, F. 1949ff. *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum Veteris Testamenti.* Rome.