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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 ŠIN, 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 Š 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) Š later.

1. "Weak Phonetic Change"

As is well known, occasional deviations from regular sound correspondences 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" 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. 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, 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.
3. Like Hebrew pred, prz, pr/, prk, prm, prs, pr/, prs, prq, prr, prs, prs. For this phenomenon cf. recently the judicious remarks of J. Kuryłowicz (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, 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 $\varsigma$ Corresponding to Proto-Semitic $\delta$

The Proto-Semitic (PS) consonant which is continued by Modern Standard Arabic $\delta$ is represented in Early Aramaic by $\varsigma$ and in later Aramaic by $\varsigma$. Yet, alongside this regular correspondence, another, much more restricted one exists, viz. that of the Aramaic $\varsigma$, corresponding to PS $\delta$. 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 $\text{wqr}$, $\text{nqr}$, $\text{sqr}$, $\text{qr}$, and $\text{kr}$, $\text{wkr}$, $\text{nnkr}$, $\text{mkr}$, $\text{skr}$, $\text{k'r}$; Moscati (1947, p. 135)–$\text{bhr}$, $\text{br}$, $\text{btr}$, further infra $\text{kdl}$, $\text{kdl}$, $\text{kdl}$ 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 $\text{lk}$, $\text{lk}$, $\text{lwk}$, denoting "to chew, to champ the bit."

5. And which, in all likelihood, in PS was something like $\vartheta$; cf. Steiner's (forthcoming) work on the lateral pronunciation of $\delta$ and $\varsigma$, to be edited by the American Oriental Society.
effect of \( g, h, \) and \( r \). Other cases may be due to lexical contamination, e.g. \( smd \rightarrow \text{other} \). At least in one case (\( np\)—"to shake [off]"), it is difficult to find any sound that could have caused dissimilation or to discover a lexeme with which it could have blended; therefore, one may perhaps attribute its origins to an Aramaic dialect in which \( q \) had shifted to \( s \), rather than to \( q' \). In other cases, the \( s \) may be due to the joint operation of dissimilation, lexical contamination and dialect mixture.

### 1.2 Ugaritic \( g \) Corresponding to PS \( \theta \)

Another famous case of irregular sound correspondence is that of Ugaritic \( g \) to PS \( \theta \). 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 \( g \) corresponding to PS \( \theta \). In the light of the quite composite character of the dialectal structure of Ugaritic, the weak sound change Ugaritic \( g \) \(<\) PS \( \theta \) can easily be interpreted as due to dialect mixture. On the other hand, I have not found cases which cannot be explained otherwise.

---

6. As \( hsr \) ("grass"), occurring in Sefir (whereas Judeo-Aramaic \( h\text{š}ir\) \( \dot{a} \) may be considered a Hebrew loan as well).

7. Thus \( sbr \) ("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 \( s \), rather than \( q' \), was the reflex of PS \( \theta \); the \( s \) could be due to the dissimilatory effect of \( r \); and it could exhibit the lexical contamination of the reflex of PS \( \theta \) and \( sbr \).

8. For the whole complex of the problem of Ugaritic \( g \), 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 \( \theta \rightarrow g \). 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.


11. Rather extreme is Rössler's attitude (1961), who altogether denied the existence of the sound correspondence PS \( \theta = \) Ugaritic \( g \). After finding different etymologies for most words allegedly exhibiting this sound correspondence, he accepted only two \textit{prima facie} cases, viz. \( gm' \) and \( yqg \) and attributed them, however, to clerical error. Yet the occurrence 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. ĝm’ (“to be thirsty”), can be interpreted as due to a blend of zm’ with ĝmy. The other cases are even less certain: Gordon (1965, text 127:42), īst’m. ġtg’ udn (“hear and... ear”) is interpreted (in the wake of Isa 50:4 yāʿir lī ‘ōzen lišmōa, “he awakens my ear to hear”) as “be alert (of ear),” the Gt imperative of yqz/yqg. 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 yqs, 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 (1971) has convincingly shown that awakening man’s ear, rather than of someone being awakened as to his ear.

12. In Arabic, various extensions of what seems to be the bilateral root gm are attested: ġamn (“fainting”), ġym (“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 ṣgj (“to incline”), as if Ugaritic q could correspond to Arabic s! Yet even without a convincing etymology, one must not discard the possibility of tqg denoting inclination. Tentatively only, I propose to interpret it as G imperative of tqg. A trace of this tqg (“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 wayīssā’ et hā’arse wayyitqâ ēḥâ yammâ sāp (“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 tq. Prima facie, the use of h locatius (yammâ) corroborates this interpretation, since tq’, as a rule, governs the preposition ba- (the phrase tāqa’ kap ba- seems to be of different origin, literally meaning “to clap hands for someone”). Caquot (1974, pp. 207–208) identified Ugaritic tqg with Hebrew tq’ in the Middle Hebrew tāqa’ liḥbō la’ābīn šeḇašāmāyim, 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 nātā ‘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’ yidōt 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 tōgeq’ ‘asmo līdvar hālākā, 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.

Hebrew 'wr ("to arouse"). Ultimately, the decision between these two interpretations depends on how one assesses the frequency of the sound shift PS θ > Ugaritic ǧ, and accordingly, as to the problem we are treating, we move in a vicious circle. ǧr ("mountain") is generally compared with Aramaic ǧur ("mountain") and Hebrew ǧur ("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. As to mgy ("to reach, arrive"), its connection with Aramaic m( is rather dubious, since one would have expected the Ugaritic word to terminate in 'r. Moreover, the expected form mɣ' is also attested in Ugaritic, and, therefore, it stands to reason that mgy is of different origin. ǧlm, etc. (Gordon, 1965, Krt 19; 125:50; 51:vi:54) has been interpreted by many as denoting "covering, darkness." Yet even if this interpretation proves to be correct, it can easily be derived from Hebrew 'lm ("to hide"), presumably related to Ugaritic ǧlp ("to envelop"); see Ginsberg (1946). Since, as we have seen, the correspondence PS θ—Ugaritic ǧ is so restricted, one will not hasten to elucidate obscure words like ǧlm, etc. with its help, the more so since in Gordon (1965, text 51:VI:54–55) ǧlm is parallel to zlmt, the real correspondence of PS θ.  

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

16. Rössler's own etymology (p. 167) for ǧr, though possible, is unverifiable. He claims that it corresponds to Arabic gawr ("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'a ("hill") and gābi'ā ("cup"), which, however, are less convincing; the more so, since gābi'ā may be an Egyptian loan word (see Koehler-Baumgartner, 1967ff, s.v.). Nöldeke (1910, pp. 83–84) adduces, inter alia, Christian Palestinian Aramaic gāūmā ("valley, hill"). As to Arabic hawsā'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. ǧm' (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 ɣ for ɣ, 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 $\theta$ Corresponding to PS $\check{s}$

Another weak phonetic change in Ugaritic is the correspondence of Ugaritic $\theta$ to what seems to be PS $\check{s}$. The only conspicuous case is Ugaritic $h\theta th\check{b}n$ ("account"), exhibiting $\theta$ as second radical, supported by Egyptian $h\check{s}b$ ("to reckon up"), since Egyptian $\check{s}$ may correspond to Semitic $\check{\theta}$, yet not to Semitic $\check{s}$. Aramaic $h\check{s}b$ ("to reckon up, to consider"), however, points to original $\check{s}$, as does also Arabic $h\check{s}b$, whereas Hebrew $h\check{s}b$ may be derived from both $h\theta b$ and $h\check{s}b$. Since in loan words Ugaritic $\theta$ may represent $\check{s}$, it may be borrowed in Ugaritic.²⁰ This, however, does not explain Egyptian $\check{s}$. 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 $\check{s}$—Ugaritic $\theta$—Hebrew $\check{s}$, $\check{s}$ in the Aramaic dialects is a Hebrew loan, and Arabic $h\check{s}b$ 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, $h\check{s}b$ 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 $h\check{s}b$ 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 $h\check{a}sab$ ("noble descent") originally denotes the enumeration of the noble deeds of the ancestors. If this etymology proves true, it would show how deeply $h\check{s}b$ and its derivations are rooted in Arabic. The autochthonous character of Arabic $h\check{s}b$ becomes even more likely, if one accepts Nöldeke's derivation (1910, p.

²¹ For particulars see Koehler-Baumgartner (1953, Aramaic part, s.v. $h\check{s}b$).
59, note 3) of Arabic *hīz* (*"party, sect"*), Ge'ez *hezb* (*"people, clan, tribe"*) from *ḥisb* (cf. also Jeffery, 1938, pp. 108–109). Nöldeke calls attention to the alternation of the roots *ḥisb*—*ḥizb* in Ge'ez (cf. also infra), and his derivation may be buttressed by the occurrence of *ḥizb* 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: he assumed the existence of two originally different, but quite similar roots; viz., *ḥshb* (*"to reckon"*) and *ḥsib* (*"to think"*), which later have fallen together in the various languages. This suggestion can be buttressed by the likely etymology Egyptian *ḥṣb* has on the one hand, and Hebrew *ḥṣb* has on the other. (Which, admittedly, can be interpreted not only as exhibiting original *ḥṣb* but also *ḥṣḥb.*) Sethe (1916, p. 77; also quoted by Brockelmann, 1928, s.v. *ḥṣb*) 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 *ḥēšeb*, "girdle"), since the connection between "to tie" and "to think" is well attested. This assumption of the double root *ḥṣb* (*"to reckon"*)—*ḥṣib* (*"to think"*) can be accommodated to the occurrence of Ge'ez *ḥṣb* (*"to reckon, to consider"*) and *ḥizb* (*"to consider"*) by supposing that *ḥṣb*, originally denoting "to reckon" only, arose from *ḥṣḥb*, whereas *ḥizb* (*"to consider"*) has to be derived from *ḥṣib*.

On the other hand, Epigraphic South-Arabic *ḥzib* (*"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 *hezb*, "people, class, tribe") from the postulated original meaning of *ḥṣb* (*"to think,"* viz. "to tie"). Yet the derivation of "quantity, number" from the postulated original *ḥṣḥb* denoting reckoning is phonetically ticklish, since it is much more difficult to imagine a phonetic shift *ṭḥ* > *ṭḥb*.

---

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 *ʿaqada* (*"to tie"*), *ʿtaqaqa* (*"to believe"*), and further in Gesenius (1835ff, s.v. *ḥṣb*).

24. One must not simply assume the shift *ḥṣb* > *ḥṣḥb* (according to Ge'ez sound shift *ṣ* > *ṣ* > *ḥz*; since *ḥz* occurs in Epigraphic South-Arabic as well, in which (see the literature adduced in Blau, 1970a, p. 111, note 4) *ṣ* did not shift to *ṣ*). Accordingly, one would rather postulate *ṣb* > *ṣḥ* (since no phoneme *ฑ* exists in Epigraphic South-Arabic) > *ẓb*.

25. For the semantic shift cf., e.g., Arabic *ʿaṣba* (*"party"*) from *ʿaṣaba* (*"to bind"*).

26. Cf. Nöldeke (1910, p. 59, note 3), who derived also the meaning "party" from "reckoning," assuming, however (see supra), original *ḥṣb* < *ḥṣib*. 
(*ḥîḇ > hîzḥ) than šb > zb (*ḥîš > hîzḥ). If one nevertheless accepts Rainey’s thesis (as I am inclined to do), the most satisfactory solution seems to be to assume that hîzḥ (“people, fighting band”) arose from hîš (“to tie”) and then attracted *ḥîḇ (“reckoning”).

All the other cases of Ugaritic ṣ corresponding to PS ʂ are dubious. It stands to reason (see Blau-Greenfield, 1970, p. 12) that Virolleaud was right in connecting the Ugaritic epithet ẓḥr with the Akkadian epithet beschäft (“strong, powerful”), since both sense and usage exactly fit. Soden (1965ff, s.v.) has suggested to connect it with Arabic ḥṣr (“to be bold, courageous”), which, however, cannot reflect PS ṣ, 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 ẓḥr—Arabic ḥṣr and consider Ugaritic ẓḥr an Akkadian loan in which Ugaritic ṣ transcribes Akkadian š (see Blau-Greenfield, 1970, p. 13), or regard the (partial) similarity of Arabic ḥṣr as being due to chance only. As to Gordon (1965, text 128:1:2) mḫ(m)i ṣm[tk, 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 mḥ(m) 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 *mš́m̄́m̄́ does not exist. Moreover, the attempt to compare Ugaritic ṣd mtkt with Hos 7:5 māšak yādō ’et lōṣāśīm 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 *lōṣāśīm yād māšak. More plausible would be to compare Klnw 13 (cf. Ginsberg, 1946) w`hk.tmkt.mskbm.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 mtkt with mšk. Greenfield (1969) has also correctly remarked that for Ugaritic ḏθ (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 1), 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. *dabbefet* [!]), where, accordingly, it may have been borrowed from Hebrew. Hebrew *šillūhim* (“dowry”) in 1 Kgs 9:16, *prima facie*, has a clear etymology, viz. from *šlh* (“to send”), being the parting gift of the father to his daughter when sending her away. Yet in Ugaritic “to send” is *šlh*, while “dowry” (parallel to *mlg*, “dowry”) is *θlh*. Accordingly, despite the *prima facie* certain etymology, Ugaritic *θlh* and Hebrew *šillūhim* have to be separated from Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Aramaic *šlh*. Were not Ugaritic *šlh* attested, one would connect *θlh* with “to send,” in spite of the existence of Aramaic *šlh* (as did, in fact, Driver, 1956, s.v., who, however, misread the word as *θlh*), 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,” are, it seems, doublets, either original, inherited ones or originally roots with similar, yet nevertheless different meanings, which were attracted to one another, perhaps also by the interference of other roots. 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., Mühlaul-Voleck’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 *nych*, *ngθ*, *ngl*, *ngn*, *ngp*, *ngš*, *ngš*, also *nhg*, and Arabic *njŋ*, *njl*, *njh*, *njš*, *njr*, *nj*. Much more likely is Streck’s view (quoted in Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v. *ngs*) 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 *bbθ*, which governs the preposition of ‘an, as does *njθ*. It is even possible that at first *njθ* was influenced by *bbθ*, 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 \( s > \theta \), despite their correspondence to PS \( \theta \delta \theta \) (as preserved by Epigraphic South-Arabic), since the initial \( \theta \) is due to assimilation to the final one. Similar assimilation is well attested in Ugaritic, where the \( \delta \)-prefix of the causative verbal form is assimilated to \( \theta \) as first radical (see Gordon, 1965, p. 34). Compare also the assimilation of the \( \theta \) of \( *\delta \delta \theta \) to the initial \( s \) in Arabic \( \delta \delta \delta \) < \( *\delta \delta \delta \) (“sixth”). As to Ugaritic \( \theta \delta \theta \) (“three”) and its correspondence to PS \( s \), see Blau (1972, p. 80); as to Ugaritic \( \theta \) (“being”) as against Arabic \( \text{lay} \) (“is not”), see Blau (1972, pp. 58–61). In the wake of al-Yasin (1952, p. 110), Ugaritic \( \theta \delta \) (“to eat, dine”) is generally connected with Iraqi Arabic \( \theta \delta \theta \) (“to cut food in pieces”). If this connection is correct (pay attention to the difference in meaning!), it may be buttressed by Classical Arabic \( \theta \delta \) (“to break the teeth,” according to Landberg (1920–42, s.v. \( \theta \delta \delta \delta \)), yet al-Azhari, quoted by ibn Manzūr (1955–56, s.v.), states that it means, like \( \text{ratama} \) and \( \text{ratama} \), any sort of breaking. On the other hand, \( \delta \) (“to break”) is attested in Syrian and, in the form \( s \) marginally, to be sure) in Arabic. 30 One would perhaps posit a PS doublet \( \theta \delta \delta \delta \) (“to break”), which may or may not be connected with Ugaritic \( \theta \delta \delta \delta \) (“to eat, dine”). Ugaritic \( \theta \delta \delta \delta \) 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 \( \delta \delta \delta \), originally meaning “tooth,” is a mere etymologicum. Dahood (1965, p. 332) connected Ugaritic \( \theta \delta \) and Hebrew \( \text{yast} \) (”old”) with Arabic \( \text{'asina} \) (“to be filthy”), as was usual before the discovery of Ugaritic. Yet the divergence in form (Ugaritic \( \theta \), i.e. PS \( \theta \), as against Arabic \( s \) representing PS \( \delta \) 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 \( \theta \delta \delta \delta \) (“to arrange, serve food”) is certain, yet its etymology is completely obscure, and Gordon (1965) is, in our opinion, right in simply aducing the meaning without any addition.

---

Gordon (1965, text 49:11.6, 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 \( \eta \delta \), if in Arabic the meaning “to seek” is not secondary, as suggested. On the other hand, the meaning of “seeking” might have emerged secondarily in Ugaritic as well through the interference of \( \delta \theta \) (“to seek”).

30. Brockelmann (1928, s.v. \( s \)) and Aistleitner, (1965, s.v. \( \delta \delta \delta \)) cite it in the second form; I have found it in the fifth form in ibn Manzūr (1955–56, s.v. \( s \)).

31. See especially Nöldeke (1910, p. 203). One would like to add Arabic \( \text{wasina} \) (“to faint because of the stench of the well”), because it is closer in form to \( \text{yast} \).
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 kph, 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 ṣ Corresponding to PS ḫ

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 ṣu, de Moor (1968, p. 213, note 3) claimed that the use of the letter ṣ in correspondence to PS ḫ 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 ḫ, which had already disappeared in the contemporary language), but is attested in additional cases as well. He cites three occurrences, none of which, however, supports his claim. Ugaritic ḥṣr (“court”) corresponds to Arabic ḥażira, Judeo-Aramaic ḥuṭra (“sheepfold”), and presumably also to Ge’ez ḥaṣăr (“hedge”).32 In the light of Epigraphic South-Arabic ḥdr (“abode”) and mhdr (“vestibule”), Hebrew ḥaṣer (“court”) could, to be sure, be derived from ḥdr 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 ḥṭr.

32. Pace Koehler-Baumgartner (1967ff, s.v. III ḥṭr). It is more likely that the Ge’ez word exhibits original Ḫ, rather than ẖ, because of the greater frequency of *ḥṭr in a local sense. The constant spelling with ẖ, rather than with ḫ, makes the assumption of the root *ḥṭr for Ge’ez somewhat unlikely. This *ḥṭr, on the other hand, is well attested in Epigraphic South-Arabic ḥdr (“abode”) and mhḍr (“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 *ḥṭr in this sense in Ge’ez would not be unexpected altogether. Moreover, the derivation of ḥaṭira (“enclosure, village”) and mahḍara (“room”) in South Arabic dialects (see Landberg, 1920–42 and 1901, s.v.) from *ḥṭr is quite likely. Yet since ḫ and ḥ have fallen together, these words may exhibit the root ḥṭr as well.

33. As no doubt. Hebrew ḥaṣer (“settlement which has no wall about it”) has to be derived from ḥṭr. Cf., e.g., Orlinsky (1939, pp. 24–26), Malamat (1962, p. 147), Rodinson, (1957, p. 116), Loewenstamm and Blau (1957ff, s.v.).
Ugaritic $\text{z}rw$ ("resin") corresponds, to be sure, to Arabic $\text{darw}/\text{dirw}$ and Epigraphic South-Arabic $\text{drw}$ on the one hand, and Syriac $\text{sarw} \text{d}$ 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 $\text{drw}$ ("to bleed") (see Blau, 1970a, pp. 61–62). And the derivation of $\text{z}rw$ from PS $\text{θrw}$ is conclusively demonstrated by Galilean Aramaic $\text{frw}$ (see Kutscher, 1976, p. 25). The third root cited by de Moor, $\text{gzy}$, 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 to connect it with Arabic $\text{Jfrjy}$, $\text{g} \text{r} \text{Jy}$ ("to be dark [night], contract the eyelids, lower [the eyes], blink") not only presupposes a phonetic correspondence $\text{z}--\text{d}$ for which no certain example exists, but also a semantic connection which is more than precarious. Accordingly, one would not accept de Moor's proposal to explain the difficult and unclear $\text{zu}$ by the assumption of a nonexisting sound-correspondence $\text{z}--\text{d}$.

1.5 Ugaritic $\text{δ}$ Corresponding to PS $\text{ζ}/\text{θ}$

One should not also consent to the interpretation of Ugaritic words containing $\text{δ}$ as corresponding, without any constraints, to PS $\text{ζ}$ or even to PS $\text{θ}$. The only case in which Ugaritic $\text{δ}$ does correspond to PS $\text{ζ}$ is when immediately preceding $\text{d}$. The phonetic reason for this can be easily understood. After the Ugaritic sound $\text{δ}$ had shifted to $\text{d}$ and, therefore, the letter $\text{δ}$ had become obsolete (cf. Blau, 1968, pp. 523 ff.), the letter $\text{δ}$ came to be used mostly in Hurrian words, denoting a sound presumably like $\tilde{\varepsilon}$. Therefore, since $\text{ζ}$ immediately preceding $\text{d}$ 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.


37. This pronunciation may be reflected by the Akkadian transliterations of the personal name $\text{bmrhd}$ by $\text{si-im-rad-du}$ and $\text{zi-im-rad-du}$; cf. also Gröndahl (1967, p. 14).
sometimes spelled with the letter $\delta$ in such cases. A certain case for all practical purposes, is $k\delta d$, alongside of $k\delta d$; it probably arose in immediate contact with the $d$ in an infinitive form like *kišdum > *kiḥdum.\footnote{For such an infinitive cf. ni-iḥ-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).}
Another possible case is $a\ddot{o}ddy$, if it corresponds to Hebrew ‘ašdōdi (see Cross-Freedman, 1964, p. 49). In all the other cases the suggestions proposed for $\delta$ corresponding to PS $\delta$ (or $\theta$) are, in my opinion, imaginary. The place name $\delta bl$ simply does not correspond to PS $\theta bl$;\footnote{Pace Cross (1962, note 74), Cross-Freedman (1964, note 78).} nor does $drt$/bhr ("vision") have any connection with Hebrew and Aramaic $\ddot{s}wr$/shr or Arabic shr.\footnote{Pace Cross (1962, note 74), Aistleitner (1965, s.v.), followed by Sauren-Kestemont (1971, note 74).} $\delta d$, exhibiting $\delta$ 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 $\dddot{s}adû$ is precarious even from the semantic point of view.\footnote{By the way, one should by no means compare (pace Aistleitner, 1965, Sauren-Kestemont, 1971) Arabic $\dddot{s}add$, since the meaning "mountain" is secondary only, the primary meaning being "anything that closes and obstructs"; cf. Lane (1863–93, s.v.).} $\delta d$ ("breast") is a nursery word and, therefore, of exceptional formation: in Ugaritic $\ddot{d}d$, $\ddot{d}d$, and $zd$ alternate, in Hebrew $\dddot{s}ad < *\ddot{d}ad$ and $d$ (cf. Nöldeke, 1910, p. 121, note 1).

1.6 Hebrew $d$ Corresponding to PS $\delta$; Other "Weak" Correspondences of Hebrew $z/d$

As is well known, the regular reflex of PS $\delta$ is Hebrew $z$. In the following, I shall deal with Hebrew $d$ as a reflex of PS $\delta$,\footnote{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).} also mentioning some cases in which it is dubious whether Hebrew $z/d$ correspond to PS $z/\theta/d$. $d$ as reflex of PS $\delta$ is attested in Hebrew $n\delta r$ ("to vow"), occurring alongside the regular $n\delta r$ ("to consecrate");\footnote{Cf. also Ginsberg (1945, p. 161, note 8), who tentatively suggests a blend of $n\delta r$ with ndb.} $q\delta r$ ("to be dark"); $hdl$ ("to cease")
THE HEBREW ȘIN

(cf. Thomas, 1957); dl ("to be low, languish"), perhaps alternating with zll ("to be worthless"); perhaps also dlq ("to burn, pursue"), if it really corresponds to Arabic blq, 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 6 to d, yet they may reflect dialect mixture as well, through the influences of dialects in which, as in Aramaic and Ugaritic, 6 had shifted to d. In the case of dl/, at least, the possibility of lexical contamination must not be overlooked either. For the lack of any dissimilatory factor, one would interpret Hebrew qippôd ("owl/hedgehog") in the light of Arabic qunfu6/qunfa', either by assuming that it was borrowed from a dialect in which, as in Aramaic and Ugaritic, 6 had shifted to d.

44. Against the historical identification of these two roots see, however, Nöldeke (1900, p. 157), who connects Hebrew dl with Syriac dalîl ("few"), dalîl ("easy"), positing PS dl. In note 157, he calls attention to how secondary semantic developments may mislead: from Arabic dl, a separate homonymous root dalîl denoting "to direct, indicate" (undoubtedly without any connection whatever with our dl/brl/zll) is derived, originally meaning "indication by gesture," then "boldness, coquetry." This meaning is quite close to Syriac zalîl ("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, bd. Brockelmann (1908–13, I, p. 237) speaks expressly of dissimilation, mentioning ndr, bd. Fraenkel (1886, p. xiv) speaks of exceptions from regular sound shifts in general, referring to bd, qdr, dl. Cf. also note 61.

46. For the possible existence of PS dl, see note 44. This root might have been blended with PS brl which is certainly preserved in Arabic fl/.

47. The 6 of qippôd is originally short, see Ben-Hayyim (1946, p. 193). The n of Arabic qunfa could not have influenced the original 6 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.); Abîtuv, 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, qunfu 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/Ad) and its occurrence with d as well (qunfu6), 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 $\delta$ has shifted to $d$, 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) $qpd$, the root of Arabic qunfu$\delta$ and perhaps of Hebrew qippôz, Aramaic qupdâ and Ge'ez q$\varepsilon enfez$; and perhaps (3) $qsz$, if Hebrew qippôz is really related and Ge'ez q$\varepsilon enfez$ stems from it. (And perhaps even qps.)

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). Since Akkadian $z$ can reflect both PS $z$ and $\delta$, zmr may, if Zimmern’s thesis proves true, be derived from both original *zmr and *$\delta mr$. Now Ugaritic $\delta mr$ (“to play music”) has been discovered (Gordon, 1965, text 602:3). Thus, Loewenstamm (1969) postulated $\delta mr$ as the original root, to become zmr in Hebrew and Akkadian, whereas in Aramaic and Arabic it exhibits loan words. Another possibility would be to assume that zmr (“to sing”)

original Arabic words as well, as hanz, see Blau (1970a, p. 127). I do not understand why, according to Garbini (1960, p. 196), the alternation of $\delta$ and $d$ in qunfu$\delta$ 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, qunfu$\delta$ were an Aramaic loan, one could derive the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic words simply from qjd. In this case, however, one should consider Hebrew qippôz not related and Ge’ez q$\varepsilon enfez$ 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 qpd attested outside qunfu$\delta$ in Arabic, despite Ružička (1909, p. 133) where read taqanfu$\delta$, a denominative verb derived from qunfu$\delta$, for ta-qaqafa.

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 $\delta mr$ (from which, as a rule, Hebrew zimrâ in the phrase ‘ozzi wazimrâ YHWH is derived) exists. He postulated one
with z in PS, and Ugaritic δ is due to the blend of two roots. It is even possible that Ugaritic δmr (“to sing”) is a scribal error, since in the same text δmr (“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 hzy (“to see”) (cf. Blau, 1970b, pp. 439–440 for particulars), viz., PS hzw. Yet in Ugaritic hdy (“to see”) is attested, which, it seems, reflects PS hōw from which, inter alia, Arabic ḥīdāʿa (“opposite”) and Hebrew ḥāze (“breast”) are derived. Since the semantic shift “opposite” > “to see” is well attested, it is easy to derive Hebrew hzy (“to see”) from *hōw. This was the reason that Ginsberg (1938, p. 210, note 3) proposed the following ingenious solution: Hebrew hzy (“to see”) stems from PS hōw (“to be opposite” > “to see”), and no PS hzw exists at all. Hebrew hzw (later > hzy) was borrowed into

root δmr (“to praise in cultic song”), from which zimrā, standing parallel to ṣez (“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 “yaḥabbah” in the phrase ki loḳā nāʾē ... šir wibāḥa ḥallēl wazimrā ṣez umemsālā ... barākōt wāhōdā ʿēt (“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 ʿezī ʾēleḵā ʿazammērā ("my strength I sing to you"), where “strength” and “song” are also connected, and interprets ʿezī wazimrāt 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 ʿezī ʾēleḵā ʿazammērā is not a primary phrase exhibiting both ṣez and zimrā, but rather a secondary one, some sort of play on words, imitating ʿezī wazimrāt, which, though originally exhibiting zimrā (“strength, might”), was understood as “praise.” Moreover, δmr (“to be strong”) does not completely rely on Epigraphic South-Arabic, for which Loewenstamm has convincingly demonstrated that δmr having the sense of “strength” cannot be proved. As to the Samaritan gloss zimrā = “strength” (see Ben-Haṣyim, 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 ʿezī wazimrāt. Yet cf. also Arabic ʿāmr, ʿamir, ʿāmir (“clever and brave”) and Ugaritic ʿāmr (“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), ʿezī wazimrāt is etymologically related to Syriac δmr (“to awe, wonder”). At any rate, this etymology is not less likely than that propounded by Broeckelmann (1928, s.v.). Accordingly, I am inclined to postulate for Biblical Hebrew an additional root zmr, originally δmr, 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 δmr (“to pronounce solemnly”), as preserved in Epigraphic South-Arabic (see Beeston, 1950, p. 265) and Geʿez, that zmr, when used in the sense of “to sing publicly,” shifted to δmr.

56. Cf., e.g., the Arabic synonyms muqābala and muʿāyana (see, e.g., Pollak, 1931, p. 102), and ḳiṣ ʿad ʿawāyahu (ibn Maṇṣur, 1955–56, s.v. ḳiṣ, 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 attested that the assumption of a loan word is at least dubious, 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 likely that PS ḥzw ("to see") and ḫōw ("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 established till the discovery of Ugaritic is zr' ("to sow"). It was generally derived from PS zr', although Epigraphic South-Arabic ḏr' ("seed") was already known. As is often the case in Semitic linguistics, it was Nöldeke (1910, p. 164), exhibiting his usual sober judgment, who determined (rightly, in my opinion) the relation between the forms with initial ḏ and initial z: he derives Arabic ḏura ("holcus sorghum") from ḏur'a, stemming from ḏr' as preserved in Arabic ḏara'a and Ge'ez zar'a ("to scatter, to sow") (and, one may add, Epigraphic South-Arabic ḏr'), which is related to Hebrew zārā, Arabic ẓará, Aramaic ẓarā and Ge'ez zarawa ("to scatter, winnow") and which is to be separated from Arabic zar'a, Aramaic zar'a and Hebrew zāra'. With the discovery of Ugaritic ḏr' ("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 ḏr', 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 ḏr' among the cases of exceptional sound correspondence of Epigraphic South-Arabic ḏ to PS z (in my opinion, rightly so, see infra).

59. Yet he adduced only Arabic ḏr' and Ge'ez zar'a ("to scatter, sow"), without referring to Epigraphic South-Arabic.

60. Landberg (1920–42, s.vv. ḏry, 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). This, however, is less likely than Loewenstamm's suggestion (1962) that Ugaritic dr', which does not denote "to sow" only, but also "to winnow, disperse," is due to a blend of PS zr' ("to sow") and drw ("to winnow, disperse"). One may tentatively add that South Semitic (Epigraphic South-Arabic, Arabic, Ge'ez) dr' ("to disperse, sow"), which is no doubt related to *drw, 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 *drq, cf. Arabic drq, 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-drq 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," repudiate"), on the one hand, and to Epigraphic South-Arabic, gōf ("to blaspheme") on the other. (See Stehle, 1940, p. 513, and note 60, without, however, consenting to all the correspondences adduced there.) If, in the light of Epigraphic South-Arabic gōf, one postulated PS gōp, one should regard Hebrew giddep as an Aramaic loan word, since PS gōp should be reflected by Hebrew *gzp. 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) yzdrqwn, as against British Museum add. 27031 ydyrqwn; Exod 9:8 Neofiti wyzrwq as against British Museum wydrqwnh.

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 qadaja ("to throw"). Yet later (1898, p. 74) he, silently, accepted Barth's etymology (1893, p. 28), who compared Arabic jādab ("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, 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 and (cf. Epigraphic South-Arabic) *gdP, with which *gdP, as occurring in Arabic, is related. Aramaic gaddep may reflect both *gdp and *gdP.

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, *gdM, and *gdM with a similar meaning are well attested, 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, presumably


64. In Ge'ez, PS *d 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.; Barthelemy, 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 Bochtor, adduced by Dozy (1881, s.v.); see also Barthelemy (1935ff, s.v.) and Spiro (1895, s.v.). In the dialects it may well be an Aramaic loan; cf. Feghali (1920, p. 257; 1922, pp. 15, 27) for Lebanese gaddej (Feghali, by the way, also postulates for Classical Arabic jaddafa the meaning of blaspheming); Frayha (1947, s.v. gadaffa). 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.”

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. gadammu); further Landberg (1920–42, s.v. jdm). Cf. also the alternation of gdd, gòo, 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 gid/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 zlh ("to shed, to sprinkle").

2. Hebrew and PS š

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 š is the only phoneme marked polyphonically rather than by a special letter. On the other hand, the tradition for the existence of š 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 š have merged, presumably in š. Since the Hebrews did not add new letters to the accepted alphabet, they used š (ϡ) polyphonically, for both š and š. And, indeed, comparison with other Semitic languages clearly demonstrates the genuine character of the differentiation between š and š in Hebrew, today pronounced š and š, respectively (except by Samaritans, who pronounce both of them as š). š, i.e. the letter spelled ϱ and pronounced š, exhibits a regular correspondence to many other Semitic languages, different from the sound correspondence of both š (i.e. the letter spelled ϱ and pronounced š) and š (i.e., the letter samek, pronounced š). š invariably corresponds to š 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 š and š, in fact, marked two different sounds till the end of the second century B.C.E., viz. š and š/š 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 š. On the other hand, even š is not pronounced today as a phonetic entity differing from other sounds of the Hebrew alphabet, but as š like samek š.

72. As a rule, it is postulated that the pronunciation of š was closer to š than to š, and therefore ϱ, the letter marking š, was chosen to represent š (see e.g., Bergsträsser, 1918–29, I, p. 42). Yet it is not impossible that ϱ was chosen by the impact of the language from which the Hebrew alphabet was borrowed. In this language ϱ was used for marking not only original š, but also š. Therefore, since Hebrew words containing š corresponded to words of that language spelled with ϱ, ϱ was used for marking š, even if š happened to be closer to š than to š. Cf., for the similar choice of Arabic š/š for marking š/š respectively through the influence of Nabatean Aramaic, Blau (1970a, pp. 59–60).
other Semitic languages, \( \check{s} \) corresponds to \( \check{s} \) in most Semitic languages, with the exception of Arabic and Ge'ez (and later Assyrian), in which it appears as \( s \). \( \check{s} \) 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 \( \mathfrak{w} \), in later Aramaic with \( \text{samek} \). The simplest and most reasonable interpretation of the special correspondence of Hebrew \( \check{s} \) is the assumption of a separate PS phoneme \( \check{\text{sin}} \), 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 correspondence 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 extremes 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 uncurbed fantasy. Thus Arabic \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textsc{\textca{a}}}ria\textsc{a}}} \) ("to drink") is related to \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}irb} \) ("fat") (p. 191); Hebrew \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}agag} \) ("to go astray, commit sin") to Arabic \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}aj\textja} \) ("to flow strongly") and \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}i\textdajj} \) ("voluble orator"), allegedly because the Hebrew word denotes sin committed by quick and negligent speech! (p. 193); Hebrew \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}at\textw} \) ("winter," i.e. "the period of rain") is connected with \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}a\textt\textd} \) ("to drink") (pp. 201–202; on p. 209 this correspondence is adduced as a certain case); Hebrew \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}esel} \) ("loins") is, on the one hand, related to \( \text{\textit{\textsc{\textca{a}}}ot\textel} \) ("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) tnh ("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, šb'. Eventually, šb' prevailed, and this is the reason for ϱ in such words being pronounced as s. š, in Vollers' opinion, never existed, and one must not (p. 213) infer from Epigraphic South-Arabic š3 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, š.

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


74. He even claims that different pronunciations of š and š cannot be established until the time of the naqḍānim, and that the first authentic testimony for the difference between the pronunciation of ϱ 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 ϱ 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 ϱ as š was entirely unknown in the early Middle Ages.

In a recent article, Magnanini (1974) also arrives at the conclusion that no PS ś existed. In the main part of his paper, Magnanini analyzes 93 Arabic roots containing ś, which, according to the current view, should correspond to PS and Hebrew ś. He also collected ten cases of Arabic ś 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 ś is a ghost phoneme.

3.1 Attestations of PS ś outside Hebrew

Even before we scrutinize the alleged irregular correspondence of Hebrew ś and Arabic ś, we want to stress that the existence of PS ś 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, 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 ś.

From the eleven cases cited by Magnanini from Epigraphic South-Arabic, four contain s₁ (as a rule, and in my opinion correctly, considered to represent PS ś). Three of them allegedly correspond to PS ś: 's₁r,
THE HEBREW ŠIN

which, however, is due to an error of Conti Rossini, 1931, s.v. (see Stehle, 1940, p. 524, note 185), the correct reading being ‘š3r (š3 is, as a rule, and correctly in my opinion, identified with PS s), which thus reflects regular sound correspondence. hrs1 is identified by many with Hebrew hrs; yet its correlation with s1trrs1, i.e., an ‘ištāf’al form, makes one assume that the h of hrs1 may be the prefix of ḥf’il (cf. Jamme, 1962, p. 13b, where additional literature is cited). The third, and last, example is the proper noun hrs1n, which allegedly corresponds to Hebrew hsn (“to be strong”). This correspondence, however, is wholly imaginary. The fourth example with s1, the proper noun (!) dwrs1, allegedly corresponds to the Hebrew proper noun dīšōn, exhibiting the exceptional sound correspondence Epigraphic South-Arabic s1 = Hebrew (and PS) š. Yet the Hebrew proper noun is dīšōn, 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.

Magnanini cites three cases of s2 corresponding to Hebrew (and PS) š, rather than to the expected š. Yet all of them are dubious. For ws2: see, e.g., Beeston (1951, p. 16) and Jamme (1962, p. 38a); for s2š: Beeston (1951, p. 16) and Müller (1963, p. 316); for s2ši: Müller (1963, p. 316).

From the four cases cited for s1, which should correspond to PS s, one, allegedly exhibiting the correspondence s1 = Hebrew š (viz. s1wd = 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 s1 allegedly correspond to Hebrew š. The only possible case of exception from regular sound correspondence among them is perhaps Epigraphic South-Arabic hšjr 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.) dīšōn is spelled correctly yet the other Hebrew proper noun, dīšān, is erroneously spelled dīšān with š, 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 siyya’) denotes “to aid.”
80. Incidentally, Hebrew šōpat (“to set on the fire, establish”), with which Magnanini compares this word, exhibits, it seems, PS θ, both if it corresponds to Ugaritic ḫpd (“to put”) or—what is, in my opinion, more likely—if it is a denominative verb, derived from a noun from the root ḥpy, denoting the stone supporting the kettle.
by no means certain.\textsuperscript{81} Compare Stehle (1940, p. 536), who adduces Beeston’s view, for ‘rs\textsubscript{3}’; and pp. 536–537, for ‘s\textsubscript{3}b.

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 ₯ and Hebrew ₯ are not irregular either. The allegedly irregular character of the correspondence of Hebrew ₯ originates in etymologies which are partly based on loan words, on dissimilations, on quite unlikely 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 ₢wget = Arabic ₢wget (“to desire”), there is, it seems, a genuine deviation from sound shift.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{81.} For the Epigraphic South-Arabic word, cf. Stehle (1940, p. 537). According to Magnanini himself, the Hebrew word corresponds to Arabic h\textbar as well, so that one should posit a triple irregular correspondence, viz. Epigraphic South-Arabic ₤, Hebrew (and PS) ₤, and Arabic ₤ (corresponding, as a rule, to PS ₤)! Moreover, the Hebrew word may denote the (heavenly) sieve and correspond to Ugaritic h\textbarr, thus exhibiting original ₯.

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

\textsuperscript{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 ṣemes, ’ezer, resen, šōrēr, kāṣūb, etc., further II w/y roots, as ḫwɔ) adduces roots in the third person sing. masc. of qal, even of nominal roots like ḥāpan. 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, ’ezer). As a rule, however, “(ebr)” is missing, giving the impression that the Arabic verb
3.3.1

Hebrew š corresponding to Arabic š, as stated by Magnanini himself,44 'ṛš; ḥpš, for which Magnanini cites two Arabic correspondences, viz. ḥfš, which seems to be appropriate, and ḥfš, the meaning of which does not fit at all;45 ṭwš; kărēš; nğš (cf. also note 28); ns'; 'ešeš; 'ešer; prš; pšy; ps', whose correspondence with Arabic fšg, however (cf. Koehler-Baumgartner, 1953, s.v.), is rather dubious; qašwā; šb'; šhd; šjn (cf. also Blau, 1970a, p. 103); šyb; šyd; šmb; šmlā; šn'; šrg; šrd; šrt; šry; šrq; štr, altogether 26 cases. Add to them two cases in which Magnanini wrongly connects Hebrew š with Arabic s, rather than with Arabic š, viz. Hebrew bšm as against Arabic bašām ("spice") (for the problem of Arabic bšm, see Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v., who added Lagarde's view); and Hebrew bšr, which is connected by Magnanini not only correctly with Arabic bšr, but also with bšr, which, however, has a totally unsuitable meaning ("to frown"). (For its Semitic correspondences see Brockelmann, 1928, s.v. bšr.) Magnanini also adduces three cases in which š and s alternate in the Hebrew root, corresponding to Arabic š. This has to be interpreted as reflecting original Hebrew š, s being due to later orthographic habit: grš/s, hrš/s, and š/sbk (see Blau, 1970a, p. 114, and p. 115, respectively). Magnanini connects Hebrew s'r with Arabic šgr. Yet the Hebrew root alternates with š'r. Moreover, the correspondence with Arabic šgr is very dubious and, therefore, it is rather uncertain whether in this case too Hebrew š is matched by Arabic š (cf. Blau, 1970a, p. 115, especially note 5). An additional case of Hebrew š corresponding to Arabic š is Hebrew qimmāš as against Arabic qummāš; yet Magnanini adopts the inferior reading qimmāš.46

---

44. 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 qašād since the meaning of the proposed Arabic qš was too different (the etymology of the Hebrew word being, in fact, unknown), further šhš, which does not fit Arabic šḥš in meaning. For šyn read *šyn, only preserved as kətš, the š being proven by the secondary root štn (cf. also Middle Hebrew šeten "urine"), corresponding to ṣ, inter alia in Arabic maḏāna, which has given rise to the secondary root mḥn and is felt as derived from it.

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

46. For qimmāš with š see the biblical dictionaries; š is also the reading of the Aleppo Codex and Ms. Leningrad Bl19a.
Besides bšm and bšr, 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: hśp, which, however, may reflect a blend of hśp with ḥsp, since it corresponds to Ugaritic ḥsp (see also Blau, 1970a, pp. 124, 134); rps, which Magnanini collates with Arabic rfs which, however, may itself very well correspond to Hebrew rms; and śbr. 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.

3.3.3

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

87. In Biblical Hebrew rps 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 š, rather than s, corresponding to the ś in this word see e.g., the literature cited in Brockelmann (1928, s.v. l sbr), and cf. also, Ginzberg (1934) and Wagner (1966, p. 108). Personally, I would vote for dialectal Arabic šbr (“to look”) as the most likely correspondence for Hebrew sbr. Cf. also Landberg (1920–42, s.v., šbr) and further Classical šbr (“to measure by span”), admittedly a denominative verb, wrongly connected with Hebrew šbr 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 š, rather than with ʾ.
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 š is not regular. The cases are: ʾšr, compared by Magnanini with Arabic ʾšr, though it may correspond to Arabic ysr, 90 exhibiting regular sound correspondence; ḥašā'/ḥāšā'ā (see also Kutscher, 1957, p. 252, but cf. note 81 above); ḥāšāš (“chaff”), not necessarily corresponding to Arabic ḥašš, but rather to ḥudb (see Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v.); nsā possibly matched by Arabic nsā, rather than by nsā; 91 Arabic nts, which according to Magnanini corresponds to Hebrew nts, 92 is, in my opinion, best interpreted as reflecting alternation of the third radical of roots beginning with nt, as exhibited by Hebrew nts, nts, nts, nt’, ultimately originating in PS nts (cf. also Wagner, 1966, p. 85); similarly Arabic ’qās, allegedly matched by Hebrew ’qāš, presumably exhibits alternation of the third radical of roots beginning with ’q (cf. Syriac ’qs, Arabic ’qs: for possible additional cases, see Gesenius, 1835ff, s.v.; Mühlauf-Volck, 1890, s.v. ’qb), ultimately going back to PS ’qās, which may be reflected by Syriac ’qs as well (pace Brockelmann, 1928, s.v.); pwš/pyš; qrš; šbb; 93 šwš; šōrēr.

In the following cases, the exceptional sound correspondence Hebrew š—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): šsr; šhs; šemes; šemeš; šsp. In other cases, the assumption of Arabic s corresponding to Hebrew š is, in my opinion, much likelier than Arabic š: a clear mistake is that Hebrew hbs is matched by Arabic hbš, since its Arabic correspondence is, no doubt, hbs; Hebrew hwš (“to feel”) 94 corresponds to Arabic hšš in the same sense;

90. For the alternation of ʾ 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 nts is an Aramaic loan, a somewhat unlikely supposition in the light of the existence of Ge’ez n̄št with metathesis.
94. I assume that Magnanini had this meaning of hwš in mind, since the meanings ad
Hebrew *nehšāl* exhibits formal and semantic similarity not only with Arabic *ḥāl/hāl*, as proposed by Magnanini, but also with *ḥāl/hāl* (and even with *ḥāl*); Hebrew *rēš* is matched not only by Arabic *rēš*—but also by Arabic *rēš* (which is, admittedly, less frequent); Hebrew *ṣibbōlet* ("ear of grain") must not be derived from Arabic *ṣbl* ("to grow"), since the latter is clearly a denominative from *ṣbl* ("whelp"). Although Arabic *sunbula* ("ear of grain") may well be an Aramaic loan (see Jeffery, 1938, pp. 178–179), the Arabic correspondence of Hebrew *ṣbl* seems to be *ṣbl* (see the biblical dictionaries); for Hebrew *ṣeger* ("offspring") cf. the literature adduced by Gesenius-Buhl (1915, s.v.), and especially Fraenkel (1886, p. 114, note I). Besides, one has to take the possibility into consideration that *ṣeger* denotes "womb" rather than "offspring" (see Feigin, 1926, p. 44); as to Hebrew *ṣht*, according to ibn Sīda (cited in Landberg, 1901, p. 388), Arabic *ṣht* has to be preferred to Arabic *ṣḥt* (see also Landberg, 1920–42 s.vv. *ṣḥt, ṣḥṭ*; Beeston, 1951, p. 11); Arabic *ṣḥf* is not the genuine correspondence of Hebrew *ṣhp*, 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 *ṣḥf* (see the literature adduced in Gesenius-Buhl, 1915, s.v. *ṣhp*), which *prima facie* may reflect the genuine correspondence of Hebrew *ṣhp*, is very restricted as well and may reflect a loan word adapted to Arabic;96 Hebrew *ṣrg* simply does not exist.

In other cases it is Arabic *ṯ*, rather than alleged *ṣ*, 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 *qašš* ("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" (*qāšš* in Zeph 2:1 is obscure), one would prefer to connect it with Arabic *qūṯ*; Hebrew *ḥrš* does not correspond to Arabic *ḥrš* nor to *ḥrš*, but to *ḥrθ*; Hebrew *ṣš* ("to be wasted away"), if it is related to an Arabic verb...
THE HEBREW ŠIN

97 denoting "to be lean," one would rather choose ġθθ, and not ġšš, for it; Hebrew šápān corresponds to PS θpm, as proved by the Šeri" word ϑυφυν;"8 Hebrew šqāl corresponds to Arabic θqāl since Arabic šqāl 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 šlʾš ("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 ḥlʾš ("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 correspondence, 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 hišāk ("a piece of wood preventing a kid from sucking the udder"), related to Hebrew ḥšk ("withhold") (see, e.g., Gesenius-Buhl, 1915; Koehler-Baumgartner, 1967ff, s.v. ḥšk; Brockelmann, 1928, s.v. ḥšk). Hebrew ṇš ("to punish") must not be connected with Arabic ṇš, 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., Eḥkīlī, which he spells in Arabic with ḫ. This language (see Fresnel, 1838b, p. 79, note 2 and Maltzan, 1873, p. 225) was dubbed Ṣḥaurī by the Austrian expedition, and is called Šeri by Johnstone (1970, p. 296; 1972, p. 1, note 1; 1975, pp. 2–3).


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 ḥš from Aramaic šlḥ ("to strip off"). For the metathesis postulated cf. Christian Palestinian Aramaic šlḥ. For the semantic shift (Aramaic šlḥ denotes also "to pull out"): Hebrew šlʾš, qal—"to draw off (a sandal)"; piʾel—"to pull out (stones)"; nāl—"to slip off (iron); draw off (sandals)"; šl—"to draw out (sheaves); spoil, plunder"; šp—"to draw off (sandals)," related to Arabic slb ("to plunder, take off [garment]"). Cf. also Neo-Syriac šlḥ ("to be naked, lose hair"). (Aramaic šlḥ 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 šʾp ("to gasp, pant after, be eager for," perhaps also "to persecute") can hardly be compared with Arabic šʾf ("to be afraid, to hate"), because of the semantic gap separating the latter even from the (uncertain) sense "to persecute," nor can Hebrew šbh ("to praise") be compared with Arabic šbh ("to extend [hands]"), which is by no means special to prayer. Hebrew šābēʾa, compared with Arabic šabīʿa, 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 šlh ("to send") must not be compared with Arabic šlh ("to throw off," also "to strip off"), because the Arabic verb is an Aramaic loan. Arabišmr does not exhibit meanings which could possibly be connected with Hebrew šmr. Hebrew šʾp 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 šʾp with Arabic sbg is very attractive; it is not easy to justify the comparison of Hebrew *ešnāḥ* ("window") with Arabic šnh ("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 š had merged with *s* (cf. Blau, 1970a, pp. 114ff). We have already mentioned (in 3.3.1) cases of the spelling with the original š 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-

---

102. Even Firuzabadi in his *Qāmūs* dubs it sawāḍī; cf., e.g., Feghali (1920, pp. 241, 246).
declined 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 ršš, 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 sštāw (“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 ḥšn (“to be rough, hard, coarse”; so also Brown et al., 1907, s.v.) fits Hebrew ḥāšōn (“strong”) much less than Arabic ḥšn (“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 kšm (“to shear, clip”) fairly well. Nevertheless, in the light of many alternating forms, as Hebrew and Arabic gzm, Middle Hebrew and Arabic gdm, Arabic jōm, Arabic and Hebrew qsm, one would rather refrain from positing irregular sound correspondence. Hebrew šhp denotes “to prostrate, wash away,” whereas Arabic šhf 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 šamāmūt (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 šš (“to press”), not only because of the difference in meaning, but also since Arabic šš (“to press,” šš, “to press the udder of a camel,” see Fīrūzabādī’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 *hms* ("to treat violently"); accordingly, there is no reason to prefer Arabic *hms* ("to maltreat, offend"), even *hms* ("to slap, cut off"). Nor would one prefer to compare Arabic *hšl*, which is only an alternative form of *hsl*, with Hebrew *hsl*, and therefore, one would not connect the Hebrew word with Arabic *hšl* either. Hebrew *kšh* ("to cut away") fits Arabic *kšh* (generally, "to sweep away, remove," also used in connection with thorns—*kasaha šawka-š-šajarati*, "he removed the thorn of the tree"), but not *kšh*, which denotes "to drive away," rather than "to peel." I would prefer to connect Hebrew *ms* (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 *sn* ("to hate") exists, the regular correspondence of Arabic *šn* being always Hebrew *šn*.

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


In a very closely reasoned article, Diem (1974), following others, claims that in Biblical Hebrew (i.e., in the dialect of Jerusalem), ́s, the PS character of which he admits, had shifted to ̄s, to change afterwards to s through the interference of Aramaic. Kutscher's arguments against Garbini'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 ́s without parallels in Aramaic. Why, then, he asked, on good grounds in my opinion, did the Masoretes read *v* as *s* in these cases, for many of which it can be demonstrated by comparison with other Semitic languages that the *v* does not correspond to PS ́s? 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, identified Hebrew words containing original $\text{s}$, already pronounced as $\check{s}$, with the parallel Aramaic ones and started pronouncing them in an Aramaic way, substituting $s$ for original $\check{s}$, 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 $\text{šiml}â$ ("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 $\text{šmh}$ ("to rejoice"), even if it is related to Syriac $\text{šmh}$ ("to send out rays"). In this case, a real difference obtains in both meaning ("to rejoice" as against "to send rays") and form (Hebrew $\check{s}$, allegedly pronounced $\check{s}$, as against Aramaic $\check{s}$: the latter, at most, should have changed the Hebrew sibilant to $s$, and the existence of Hebrew $\text{šmh}$, "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. $\text{lаšonenu}$ 29:119 (1964–65), Kutscher cited another example, which, apparently by oversight, has been omitted from the English translation: $\text{šāde}$ ("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 $\text{šāde}$ is not the only word of this kind. Even more conspicuous is the case of $\check{\text{āšā}}$ ("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 $\check{s}$ 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 conspicuous Hebrew words containing š (i.e., spelled with ו and pronounced s). Therefore, by necessity one should concur with the accepted view that Hebrew š, corresponding to other Semitic languages in a way often different 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 impact of Aramaic is also hinted by ša’ārūm (“they were acquainted with them”) in Deut 32:17, the š of which is established by Arabic ša’ara (“to perceive”); if there had been Aramaic influence one would have expected *ša’ārūm, in the light of the frequent Aramaic ša’ér (“to estimate”) (cf. in Hebrew, Prov 23:7), which could have been easily adapted to the Deuteronomistic passage (in the sense of “to calculate”). Or why should obscure nisqad, Lam 1:14, be spelled with š, 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 š, rather than s, 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 š in a word influenced 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 wšhammassēḵā šārā kōhitkannēs (“and the covering is [too] narrow, when one enters it”) and miknasē (“trousers”) is derived from it. In late Biblical Hebrew and in Middle Hebrew, this root was attracted by Aramaic knš (“to collect”), and knš 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 \( kn\) be pronounced \( kn\). but Hebrew imposed upon "to collect" the pronunciation with \( s \), because of the existing Hebrew root, rather than \( kn \) as in Aramaic.\(^{106}\)

In this connection, it is worthwhile to call attention to obscure \( stm \) (Num 24:3, 15) which, in the light of Diem's thesis, one would have expected to exhibit \( s \) through the influence of Aramaic \( stm \) (see Jastrow, 1903, s.v.), \( stm \) (see Brockelmann, 1928, s.v.), \( sdm \) (see Drower-Macuch, 1963, s.v.) ("to stop up"), the more so since Hebrew \( stm \) 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, \( v \) 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 \( s \)

Diem (1974, pp. 246–247) calls attention to the existence of Hebrew \( s \), where, according to its correspondences with other Semitic languages, one would rather have expected \( s \). These cases, in Diem's opinion, have to be interpreted as exhibiting original \( s \). Yet because of the want of Aramaic parallels, \( s \), which in genuine Hebrew, in Diem's opinion, had superseded \( s \), 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 \( s \). More important, however, in our opinion, is the uncertain and marginal character of this \( s \). In the wake of Yahuda (1903, especially pp. 707ff), Diem adduces eight words allegedly exhibiting \( s \), where one would have expected \( s \), five of which, however, exhibit another sibilant alongside \( s \), so that the deviation from regular

---

\(^{106}\) It is interesting to note that in Codex Kaufmann \( ni\) ("she entered") is spelled with \( s \) (and final 'alep), presumably through the influence of Aramaic \( kn\); see Blau (1970a, p. 25).
sound correspondence may well be due to dissimilation. 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 šuppū ("they have become lean") may be connected, to be sure, with Arabic šff ("to be transparent"), yet the meeting of two deviations, 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 šalūhōt ("shoots, branches"), Isa 16:8, since it may easily be derived from šlh ("to send"), cf. Ps 80:12 šāšallah qōširēhā 'ad yām ("she sent her boughs unto the sea"). Jer 17:8 waš'al yāšallah 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 šōšūqā ("longing") = Arabic sawq, 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 correspondences have been claimed also, e.g., for Aramaic š, as for Aramaic nāšaq = Hebrew nāšaq, if it is really related to Arabic našqa ("to smell") (see, e.g., Barth, 1893, pp. 46–47; Fraenkel, 1898, pp. 79–80; Barth, 1902, p. 58); Aramaic rišā ("reptile"), if it really corresponds to Arabic rašīh (see Barth, 1893, p. 46; Fraenkel, 1898, p. 80; Barth 1902, p. 58); Aramaic nešbā ("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. šēmēš, šēš); Koehler-Baumgartner (1953, Aramaic part, s.v. šāmar). Yahuda (1903, pp. 708–709, note 1) also cites Hebrew šsp = Arabic šṣ. On the other hand, Hebrew ḥāṣas = Arabic ḥasīṣ (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 šḥā. That Diem did not pay attention to the possibility of dissimilation is more surprising, since Yahuda (p. 708) expressly mentioned the occurrence of two sibilants in the words adduced by him.
4.4 The Shift $\theta > \tilde{s}$ in the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Lower Ṭiyārī

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

4.4.1

In his endeavor to refute the possibility of the shift $\theta > \tilde{s}$ (if another sibilant without kettle sound exists), Diem (1974, pp. 247ff) has collected important material for the shift $\theta > \tilde{s}$ and $\theta > \tilde{s}$. Yet one must not lose sight of the fact that the only shift of $\theta$ attested by Diem in living dialects is to $s$, whereas its shift to $\tilde{s}$ (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 $\theta > \tilde{s}$ (even if it were not attested, see 4.4 above) more than $\theta > \tilde{s}$, the more so, since PS $\tilde{s}$ 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 $\tilde{s}$ and $\tilde{s}/\theta$ (by the way, also between $\tilde{s}$ and the other sibilants) one can only infer from them that for the Egyptian ear $\tilde{s}$ and $\theta$ seemed to be close; they do not, however, prove that $\theta$ had, in fact, shifted to $\tilde{s}$. 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, $\theta$ 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 $\theta > \dot{s}$.

He calls attention to the series of unvoiced non-emphatic sibilants in Semitic consisting of three members ($s, \dot{\theta}, \dot{s}$), 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 $\theta$. In Aro's opinion, for languages that had only one unvoiced sibilant, like Hittite and Greek, it was Old Semitic $\dot{s}$ that was felt as the closest correspondence to their sibilant($s$) and therefore the Hittites spelled their $s$ with Akkadian $\dot{s}$ and the Greeks accepted $\dot{\sin}$ as the sign of their $\text{sigma}$.\footnote{In this connection, it is not without interest to remember\footnote{That early Arabic transcriptions from Spanish invariably transcribe the Spanish $s$ by Arabic $\dot{s}$. It seems that the Spanish $s$ was apico-alveolar. Therefore, the Arabic ear identified it with Arabic $\dot{s}$, and Arabic $s$ with Spanish $z, \varsigma$ (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 $\dot{s}$ to mark PS $\theta$ does not prove that $\theta$ shifted to $\dot{s}$ in Old Akkadian, since PS $\dot{s}$ is also marked in Old Akkadian by $\dot{s}$ (see Aro, 1959, p. 328). Accordingly, Old Akkadian $\dot{s}$ for PS $\theta$ may reflect $\theta > \dot{s}$ as well, and, in the light of later Akkadian, this is not unlikely.}

\textbf{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, \textit{inter alia}, reflect the graphemic development $\dot{s}/\theta > \theta$ (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 $\dot{s}$, $\dot{s}$, and $\theta$ coincided in $\dot{s}$. One could, to be sure, imagine a starting point different from the language reflected by the majority of

\footnote{Yet one must not lose sight of the fact that the situation in Greek was rather complicated (cf. the use of $\varsigma$ in some Greek dialects); see, e.g., Jeffery (1961, pp. 27ff). Cf. also Nöldke (1904, pp. 125-126). At any rate one would not consent to Garbini's opinion (1971, p. 37), that Greek $\text{sigma}$ demonstrates that Northwest-Semitic $\dot{s}$ was pronounced $s$.}
Ugaritic texts (in which \( \check{s} \) and \( s' \) have become one sound) and claim that the development was rather:

- **Stage I** \( \check{s}, s', \theta \)
- **Stage II** \( \check{s}, s' \) (since \( \theta > s' \)), i.e. different from the majority of Ugaritic texts
- **Stage III** \( s' \) (since \( s > \check{s} \)).

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

- **Stage I** \( \check{s}, s', \theta \)
- **Stage II** \( \check{s}, \theta \) (since \( s > \check{s} \)) 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** \( s' \) (since \( \theta > s' \) 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, \( \theta \) was only a historical spelling, since \( \theta \) had already phonetically merged with \( \check{s} \). At any rate, at least some Ugaritic texts seem to reflect the sound shift \( \theta > \check{s} \), contrary to Diem's thesis, and the mere fact that in Akkadian transcriptions \( \check{s} \) marks Ugaritic \( \theta \)^112 indicates that \( \check{s} \) was not phonetically as far from \( \theta \) as Diem wants us to believe.

### 4.5 Hebrew \( \check{s} \) Could Not Shift to \( s \) through Aramaic Influence

Diem (1974, p. 245) mentions the possibility that Hebrew \( \check{s} \), then still pronounced \( \check{s} \), 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 υ 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 dahlba as dahabā, šahabā and šahbā thus restoring either an omitted vowel or š (or both) in the wake of Arabic šahab. 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 š, 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 š. In a case like ours he may, under the impact of his mother tongue, pronounce š contrary to the rules. Quite different is the case of Hebrew υ. Diem claims that the letter υ, 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/š, 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 š 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 ū had become s,
since original *ṭibbōlet shifted to sibbōlet. This interpretation, however, despite its ingenuity, fails because it is pivoted upon the rare Judeo-Aramaic ṣublā (“ear of corn”), whereas all the other linguistic evidence indicates that this word begins with PS ṣ, rather than with θ. Yet Fraenkel (1905), in a short notice, correctly in my opinion, regarded this word as a learned Aramaicizing formation, so that there is no way to postulate sibbōlet with initial θ. Therefore, one would have to return to the simple literal interpretation of the sibbōlet incident, viz. that in the language of Ephraim, all the unvoiced non-emphatic sibilants had fallen together in ṣ.

5. Conclusion

We have tried to demonstrate that the Hebrew pronunciation of ṣ is based on living tradition, rather than on Aramaic influence, since it is attested in very frequent words (as ‘ṣy, “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 > ṣ, 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, 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).
responsiveness 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 $\partial$ (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), $hdl$ (Rabin 18), $n\partial r$ (Rabin 21) and $q\partial r$ (Rabin 27). Since I did not treat Middle Hebrew, Mishnaic (sukkā) mōdulelet is outside the scope of our treatise. I have not been convinced by his suggestions as to $d\partial h\partial r$ (8, since “horses of noble descent,” in my opinion, does not fit Judg 5:22), $dlh$ (11, since original $d$ is firmly established by Akkadian and Sham’ali), $d\partial rb$ (15; cf. also Gesenius-Buhl, 1915), $n\partial e’dar$ (24, since both $\partial dr$ and $t\partial a’t\partial o’ara$ denote “to remain behind,” and the latter must not be preferred to the former), $\partial e’der$ (25, the etymology of which is considered by Rabin himself as doubtful), and $s\partial d\partial r\partial r$ (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 $\partial$ 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 $\partial$ (as 14, Arabic damdama as against Rabin’s $\partial m\partial m$). $phd$ (26) is, it seems, an Aramaic loan.
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