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NOTE

Sheer oversight is responsible for the omission of any reference in the body of this work to the important review-article by M. Dietrich, "Zum mandäischen Wortschatz," Bi.Or. XXV (1967) 290-305. (Thanks are due Dr. M. Sokoloff of Bar Ilan University for bringing it to my attention.) Regrettably, space prohibits a detailed consideration of all the etymological suggestions presented therein. For the present, suffice it to note his independent (and indeed prior) recognition of the Akkadian origin of marula and šara. Of the new Akkadian etymologies offered by Dietrich, the following merit serious consideration:

hipa: "violence" (apparently not actually attested in Mandaic, but found in Syriac ḫ̄p̄a [and in JAr. ḫ̄yp̄, but only in Targum Proverbs, i.e., from Syriac])—Hardly from hîpu, "break," but perhaps from the expression hîp(i) libbi, "panic."

HUŞ, HŞŞ: "to construct with reeds"—hašašu, etc.
kalā, kiliša, "dike"—kālû, kilātu.
riuša, "merciful(?)—rēmeš/ānu.
INTRODUCTION

The Aramaic language is unique among the Semitic languages in that its development as a living language is well documented for a period of almost three thousand years, from the earliest inscriptions in the first centuries of the first millennium B.C. until the present day. Owing to various factors of geography and history, during the course of these three millennia various Aramaic dialects came in contact with other languages of the Near East, leaving a discernible mark on many of them and, in turn, becoming subject to the influence of these languages as well. Thus, the study of Aramaic is an excellent choice for the linguist who seeks to learn about the problems of languages in contact.¹

This fact has by no means escaped the attention of earlier scholars. Comprehensive, though mostly out-of-date studies of borrowing, mostly of loanwords, are available for Greek and Latin in Aramaic,² Old Persian in Aramaic,³

1. The nature and characteristics of languages in contact and bilingualism have received much attention from linguists in recent years, especially after the publication of Uriel Weinreich's important book, Languages in Contact (New York, 1953). See, for example, James E. Alatis, ed., Report of the Twenty-First Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies, Bilingualism and Language Contact (Washington, D.C., 1970) and Els Oksaar, "Bilingualism," in Current Trends in Linguistics IX (The Hague, 1972) 476-511. Nevertheless, little if anything has been presented in the way of general conclusions that might help scholars investigating similar phenomena in ancient and imperfectly known literary languages.

2. S. Krauss, Griechische und lateinische Lehnmörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum (Berlin, 1898-99); A. Schall, Studien über grieschische Fremdwörter im Syrischen (Darmstadt, 1960). The latter is limited to the Greek words in the earliest Syriac texts. For the reverse see H. Lewy, Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen (Berlin, 1895) and the recent work by Émilie Masson, Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en Grec (Paris, 1967).

3. See the bibliography in AF, pp. 119 f. More recent work on Achaemenid and Biblical Aramaic is to be found scattered in many articles and reviews, notable by W. Eilers and E. Benveniste. For Middle Persian in Aramaic see G. Widengren, Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegrenzung in parthischer Zeit (Cologne and Opladen, 1960) pp. 25 ff., 89 ff., and S. Telegdi, "Essai sur la phonétique des emprunts Iraniens en Araméen talmudique," JA CCXXVI (1935) 177-256. A study of the influence of Aramaic on the early Iranian dialects is well-nigh impossible because of the borrowed writing system with all of its logograms.
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Aramaic in Biblical Hebrew,⁴ Aramaic in Mishnaic Hebrew, and Aramaic in Arabic and in Ethiopic.⁵ Notably missing from this list, however, is a study of the Akkadian influences on Aramaic and the reverse, the Aramaic influences on Akkadian (though Akkadian loanwords in general were treated by Zimmern in the work discussed below).⁶ The importance of Akkadian for Aramaic studies stems from its position as the first foreign language to leave its imprint on Aramaic as a whole and from the fact that it was Akkadian that Aramaic replaced both as the native language of Mesopotamia and as the lingua franca of the ancient Near East. Accordingly, the subject under study here will be the Akkadian influences on Aramaic. To be sure, the influences of Aramaic upon the declining Akkadian dialects were quite substantial as well, but it is my belief that the study of this second group of influences, although of great importance, can be undertaken only after the results of the current study are known, though the hoped-for final synthesis must ultimately consider both processes together.

The entire spectrum of Akkadian loanwords in all languages including Aramaic was studied over fifty years ago by Heinrich Zimmern in his important work Akkadische fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss.⁷ Although Zimmern's compendium remains essential for all work in this area (for example, the great majority of words discussed herein are already to be found in it), his work suffers from several major flaws: It was produced at the height of the Pan-Babylonian period of ancient Near Eastern scholarship when Akkadian was assumed to be the origin of almost everything. Furthermore, since, as indicated by its title, the work had other than

⁶ First steps toward a modern compilation of Aramaisms have been taken by W. von Soden, "Aramäische Wörter in neusyrischen und neu- und spätbabylonischen Texten. Ein Vorbericht," Or. n.s. XXXV (1966) 1 ff., XXXVII (1968) 261 ff. See also E. S. Rimalt, "Wechselbeziehungen zwischen dem Aramäischen und dem Neubabylonischen," WZKM XXXIX (1932) 100 ff.
⁷ The first edition was published in Leipzig, 1915. The second edition, with a valuable index, appeared in 1917.
linguistic motivations, it is almost completely lacking in documentation. Nevertheless, as the only work of its kind, it has remained standard, and a great many of Zimmern's overzealously suggested "Fremdwörter" have achieved an almost canonical status among Assyriologists as well as among students of West Semitic, notably Biblical Hebrew.

The other invaluable source for Akkadian etymologies of Aramaic words is to be found in the etymological notes in the second edition of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum (Halle, 1928), the Akkadian material of which was prepared by P. Jensen. Unfortunately, however, many of the new suggestions proposed there by Jensen, as opposed to his earlier suggestions published in various studies (and already included in Zimmern's work), are of very dubious value.

Both of these works suffered from the ultimate and inescapable flaw of being products of their own time. Both men were truly great scholars, but Assyriology was still a new discipline, and Akkadian lexicography was just beginning to establish itself on a firm footing. In the early stages of Assyriology, each new word was more often than not assigned a meaning on the basis of its presumed Semitic cognates rather than on the accumulated evidence of usage, which was often very limited. Thus, many false correspondences were proposed, and, since Akkadian was the older language, it was usually viewed as the origin of the term in question. By Zimmern's time many of the more blatant errors had been eliminated, but many remained; nor are we free of some of them today, as the continuing stream of Akkadian lexicographic studies indicates.

Since the 1920's, a great deal of significant new evidence has come to light which alters the nature of the material that must be considered when making judgments on etymological matters. The discovery and study of Ugaritic have shed important new light on the comparativist's view of the North West Semitic languages while expanding our knowledge of West Semitic lexicography and pushing back its chronology. The archives of Ras Shamra and particularly of Mari have given us a new, if as yet uncertain, picture of the relationship between speakers of Akkadian and West Semitic during the second millennium. Aside from these, new Akkadian texts in great numbers and analyses of them have and are constantly being published. In the field of lexicography, great advances have been made, most notably in the area of material

8. And, as shown by his concluding remarks, other than scholarly motivations as well.
4 / Introduction

culture. Important here have been the works of Benno Landsberger and A. Salonen, and the works of R. Campbell-Thompson are also significant. Certainly most crucial for our immediate purposes are the two modern dictionary projects, the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary and W. von Soden's Akkadisches Handwörterbuch, which already make available an analysis of the majority of the vocabulary of Akkadian. The study of Akkadian grammar was greatly advanced by the publication of von Soden's Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik. Our knowledge of Sumerian, also important for the proper understanding of Akkadian, though still far from perfect, has progressed immensely in the last generation.

Nor have Aramaic studies remained static, though perhaps their progress has not been quantitatively as large as the recent achievements of cuneiform studies. Many important new groups of texts have been published, even new dialects discovered. New lexicographical works have very recently appeared, notably dealing with the older stages of Aramaic9 and with Mandaic.10 Significant new studies of Aramaic dialects have been made, new issues raised and old ones re-examined. Thus, the time now seems ripe for studies of the type undertaken here.

10. MD.
I
PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

GOALS OF THIS STUDY

Any etymological study of Aramaic should have at least three immediate results of interest to the philologist. It should improve his knowledge of the meaning of the Aramaic words studied; it should enable him to choose from a group of variants the form that is most probably correct (a problem especially frequent in Jewish Aramaic texts); and it should permit him to derive some rules to guide further etymological inquiries. Because of the special role that Aramaic played in the ancient Near East, however, a properly oriented study of the Akkadian influences on Aramaic should shed light on some other important issues as well. Accordingly, an attempt has been made here to concentrate on the evidence for Akkadian-Aramaic contact during the major period of that contact, roughly the first half of the first millennium B.C., which witnessed the decline of Akkadian as a spoken language, its replacement by Aramaic as the language of Mesopotamia, and the use of Aramaic as the lingua franca of the entire Near East. As a basic outcome of such a study, we might expect an improvement in our knowledge of the relationships which existed between the two languages and between the groups of people that spoke them.1 More specifically our study should help to illuminate the two languages themselves, or rather the various dialects of the two languages, and their inter-relationships.

Like all long-lived and widespread languages, Akkadian developed many dialects. Modern scholars generally divide them into two major groups—Babylonian and Assyrian—which can be traced as far back as the beginning of the second millennium.2 Unfortunately, because of the important position

1. The historian will note that I have chosen to draw few historical conclusions in this work. Problems of intercultural contact in the ancient Near East are of major importance, to be sure, but also of a nature such that the evidence of language can play only a small part in their elucidation. (For some of the problems involved in such a procedure see T. E. Hope, "Loan-Words as Cultural and Lexical Symbols," Archivum Linguisticum XIV [1962] 111 f., especially p. 115, and XV [1963] 29 ff.) Accordingly I leave the proper use of such evidence as this work may represent to others.

2. This is not to say that Neo-Assyrian is necessarily a direct lineal descendant of Middle Assyrian, though it almost certainly is, or
of writing in Mesopotamian society and its long history, the cuneiform sources do not present a complete picture of these dialects in the period with which we are concerned. For literary purposes, in almost all cases a special dialect was employed, termed by many scholars Standard Babylonian, which functioned similarly to modern Literary Arabic, and only brief glimpses of colloquial forms appear. Even in letters and economic documents, which are generally couched in dialectal Akkadian, conservative orthography is predominant, masking the actual pronunciation. Especially in matters of phonetics and phonology, though significant amounts of evidence can be accumulated from the available texts, scholars have been extremely hesitant to propose analyses that seem to contradict so much of the written evidence. At best they speak only of free variation and, in so doing often ignore some of the evidence as well as the first principle of the historical linguist, the regular nature of phonetic change. Fortunately, the study of the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian dialects themselves has aroused some renewed interest in recent years. It is hoped that this study can provide some further information on the nature of these dialects for the benefit of Assyriologists.

Similarly, one might expect some help on matters of early Aramaic phonology. To be sure, the problems there are rather different, since the alphabetic system of writing was used, and our interest centers on the bivalent nature of some letters used for phonemes which were beginning to merge with others, notably the spirants, and on evidence for the status of vowel reduction in that early period.

that either of them is a direct lineal descendant of Old Assyrian, which may in fact not be the case. But it is beyond doubt that in all these periods there was a group of mutually intelligible dialects spoken in the geographical area of Assyria which differed from that group spoken in southern Mesopotamia. The extent to which members of the two dialect groups were intelligible to each other at any given moment cannot be determined, but intermittent contact between the two groups no doubt kept the two from increasing their differences to an extreme degree.

3. Inasmuch as this dialect functioned as the language of the official cult and was thus well known orally and aurally, it could well have been spoken on a wide scale among certain classes in some periods. Nevertheless, one can be certain that the traditional orthography masks the current pronunciation even in liturgical use. As with Modern Literary Arabic, different readers of the same text might be expected to produce renditions quite mutually distinctive, each tending toward the phonetics of his own native dialect.

4. See notably for Neo-Assyrian the works of K. Deller. Manfried Dietrich has made an auspicious start on the Neo-Babylonian material.
Goals of This Study

Not all of the speakers of early Aramaic were in close contact with speakers of Akkadian. Thus, any Akkadian features found in the descendants of such dialects must have spread to them by various means through Aramaic itself. An analysis of these Akkadian features which takes into account the quantity and nature of their distribution in the various Aramaic dialects might be an important new tool in the study of the development of Aramaic, its spread throughout the Near East, and the classification and analysis of the various Aramaic dialects.

In dealing with the Aramaic dialects, however, one is immediately confronted by the problem of terminology on which, except for the broadest outlines, no great agreement is to be found in the literature. A system of terminology based mostly on chronology is now fashionable, using the terms Old Aramaic, Official or Imperial Aramaic, Middle Aramaic, and Late Aramaic, though here, too, there is disagreement, and classificatory presuppositions must be made, especially for those dialects on the boundaries of the various divisions. Although I accept this terminology as adequate in most cases and support its use as an aid to scholarly communication and mutual understanding, it is clearly inadequate for our purposes here. For our terminology must not presuppose solutions to the problems we are trying to solve, nor should it mask some of the differences we are trying to discover. It should by no means be classificatory, but merely descriptive. Accordingly, the terminology to be used herein is given below together with a summary of some of the problems that each dialect or group presents to scholars.

Old Aramaic.—By Old Aramaic is meant that Aramaic represented by the earliest known Aramaic texts from Syria up until the end of the eighth century B.C. This is a convenient terminal date because there is a gap of perhaps as much as a century before the next Syrian Aramaic inscriptions known to us. One of the important issues of Old Aramaic studies is whether or not to consider the unique dialect represented by the Hadad and Panammuwa inscriptions from


6. For the texts and grammar see Rainer Degen, Altoramäische Grammatik (AbKM, Vol. XXXVIII, 3 [Wiesbaden, 1969]), who omits the Samalian material, however.
Zinjirli as a dialect of Aramaic. In terming this dialect Samalian Aramaic and including it in this study, I concur with the majority of scholars. But what of the origin and nature of the remainder of Old Aramaic which can be called Standard Old Aramaic? There are two basic theories. One views Standard Old Aramaic as originally the dialect of the empire of Damascus, adopted by the Assyrian conquerors as they annexed the areas in the West. The other sees its origins in the Aramaic spoken by the Aramaic tribes of the East and used for administrative purposes in Assyria itself. Both positions take into account the fact that Aramaic inscriptions are found in places where a previous different native language (or dialect) is known or can be supposed to have existed. But there can be no doubt that by the end of the eighth century and probably earlier, Aramaic was in widespread use as the colloquial language of all of Syria.

Was this all one standard dialect or were there old dialect divisions? Is Standard Old Aramaic itself really a literary dialect which masks dialectal differences or are there differences in it which accurately reflect the colloquial speech? Some of these problems have received attention, but much remains unclear.

Mesopotamian Aramaic.—By the term Mesopotamian Aramaic I refer to all of the Aramaic texts known from Mesopotamia

7. KAI, Nos. 214-15. The short inscription of Kilamuwa, KAI, No. 25, is taken by many to be Phoenician like Kilamuwa's long inscription (cf. Benno Landsberger, Sam'al [Ankara, 1948] p. 42, n. 102, and Donner and Röllig in KAI). I include it in Samalian, however (as in DISO and J. J. Koopmans, Aramäische Chrestomathie [Leiden, 1962]). There is no adequate explanation for the forms Ih (cf. W. Röllig, Bi.Or. XXVII [1970] 378, n. 2) and by in Phoenician, whereas they are quite correct in Samalian.

8. Johannes Friedrich is the main proponent of a separate classification for "Yaudic" (Samalian). See most recently "Zur Stellung des Jaudischen in der nordwestsemitischen Sprachgeschichte," AS, No. 16, pp. 425-29. The alternative position has been argued effectively by H. L. Ginsberg, most recently in "The North-West Semitic Languages," in B. Mazar, ed., World History of the Jewish People II (Tel Aviv, 1967) 62 ff. (Heb.).


up until the cuneiform Aramaic incantation from Uruk, probably
of the early Seleucid period. Most scholars class this
group with Imperial Aramaic, and in fact several of the
Imperial Aramaic texts may have their origin in Mesopotamia.
Aside from the important Assur Ostracoon, written from
Babylonia to Assyria, and the Uruk Incantation, most of
these texts are short Aramaic endorsements or docketts on
cuneiform tablets. On some tablets the complete text is in
Aramaic without any cuneiform. It is most unfortunate that
our sources are so limited for this group, for it is precisely
here that the contact we wish to study was taking place.

Though the differences that separated later Eastern
and Western Aramaic had not yet developed, it is extremely
important to realize that there must have been dialectal
differences between the Aramaic of the western Syrian king-
doms, the Aramaic of the upper and middle Euphrates and its
tributaries, and the Aramaic of the Arameans living on the
immediate boundaries of or actually in Assyria and Babylonia
themselves. The Aramaic speakers of the second and third
groups had been in contact with Akkadian-speaking peoples
in Assyria and Babylonia ever since the appearance of the
Arameans on the stage of history, and there was certainly
sufficient separation for many differences with the West to
develop. As we shall see, the difficulties caused by the
uncertain linguistic history of this region will prove to be
most problematic.

Imperial Aramaic.—Imperial Aramaic, which is also known
as Official Aramaic or Reichsaramäisch, was the dialect used
for administrative purposes in ruling the great Near Eastern
empires. The texts from the Neo-Assyrian period are included
in the previous two groups, and thus are not included here.

13. KAI, No. 233.
14. The tablets from Halaf (Gozan), ca. 650 B.C. (J. Friedrich, "Die
aramäischen Tonurkunden," in Die Inschriften von Tell Halaf [AFO Beihf
VI (Berlin, 1940)] pp. 70 ff.) are included in this group.
15. On the area of Aram Naharaim and Assyrian contacts, see primar-
ily A. Malamat, The Arameans in Aram Naharaim and the Rise of Their States
(Jerusalem, 1952; Heb.). For the Babylonian Arameans see J. A. Brinkman,
A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia, An. Or., Vol. XLIII (Rome,
1968)) pp. 267-85, and the more specialized study by M. Dietrich, Die
Aramäer Südbabylonien in der Sargodonzeit (AOAT, Vol. VII (Neukirchen-
16. Classification of the Nerab stelae (KAI, Nos. 225-26) is diffi-
cult. Since they come from an Aramaic-speaking area of Syria during the
last years of the Assyrian period, they will be treated separately from
either Old Aramaic or Imperial Aramaic, but in the final analysis they
10 / Preliminary Considerations

nor are the native Mesopotamian texts from the Neo-Babylonian period. All other texts of the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid empires will be considered under this rubric. So, too, will the various inscriptions from peripheral areas dating well into the Christian era.17

With the publication of every new text, scholars are becoming increasingly aware that there is no uniform dialect of Imperial Aramaic, that at the very least localisms make themselves apparent, and that in different genres of texts different dialects are used. What can be determined about these dialects, and can the features of a general Imperial dialect be isolated? If so, can the origin of Imperial Aramaic be determined? If it is a direct development of the administrative language of the Neo-Assyrian period, as most scholars seem to agree, then Imperial Aramaic should merely be a development of Old Aramaic, if either of the theories about Old Aramaic is correct. But perhaps Old Aramaic is western, while Imperial Aramaic has its origin in the eastern colloquial dialects of Mesopotamia.

In light of these difficulties, forms will be cited as occurring in Imperial Aramaic only when no finer distinction would be productive. Normally citations will be more specific, referring to specific texts or groups of texts. The most important groups of Imperial Aramaic texts are those from Egypt and Biblical Aramaic. In the former, geographical, chronological, and dialectal differences indicate that at least three sub-groups must be distinguished: the main bulk of papyri and ostraca, primarily from Elephantine,18 the personal letters on papyri from Hermopolis West,19 and the official 

will be shown to be Imperial Aramaic. The Nerab tablets (F. Vattioni, "Epigrafia aramaica," Augustinianum X [1970] Nos. 137-41), slightly later—already in the Neo-Babylonian period—must be considered under Imperial Aramaic, though the Aramaic of those tablets, like the cuneiform, is similar to that found on Babylonian tablets. The new inscription from Syria published by Caquot (Caquot, "Inscription") is also to be dated to the Neo-Babylonian period (see Chap. II, s.v. bēl piqitti). In this case its orthography (ḇēḏ, "seize") clearly places it under the broad rubric of Imperial Aramaic.

17. It should be noted that in at least some of the texts of this late group from Iranian areas it is difficult to determine whether the texts are really Aramaic or merely Iranian written with many logograms; cf. W. B. Henning, "Mitteliranisch," in Handbuch der Orientalistik, Vol. IV: Iranistik, Part 1 (Leiden, 1958), pp. 27 ff.

18. Of course here further refinement is necessary as well, most notably between the letters and legal documents. Even the letters must be divided into personal and official correspondence, though the private letters, mostly on ostraca, are usually fragmentary.

letters on leather, probably sent from Babylonia, published by Driver. In Biblical Aramaic, the Aramaic of Ezra and that of Daniel can be separated. The great bulk of the Aramaic in the book of Ezra is probably nearly contemporary with the events it describes and is unquestionably to be considered Imperial Aramaic, though some of the spelling may be modernized. Daniel, which most scholars now date well into the Seleucid period, is the only literary work left to us from that time, but it is still best considered to come under the broad rubric of Imperial Aramaic. Late Biblical Hebrew is also an important secondary source for Imperial Aramaic lexical material.

Monumental Dialects.—The designation Monumental Dialects is merely a convenient way to refer to Palmyran, Nabatean, and the ever increasing corpus of Hatran Aramaic. These are by no means to be considered members of the same dialect, but they are roughly contemporary, and their inscriptions are similar in nature and type. Hatran almost certainly represents a colloquial dialect with strong Eastern Aramaic traits. The nature of Palmyran and Nabatean, their relationship to a spoken Aramaic dialect and to literary Imperial Aramaic have not yet been adequately resolved.

Eastern Aramaic and Western Aramaic.—The main Aramaic dialects of the first millennium of the Christian era are usually divided into Eastern and Western Aramaic—a division which is not to be confused with the earlier but as yet not fully elucidated differences between the Aramaic of Syria and that of Mesopotamia referred to above. While Western Aramaic retains the corresponding features known from Old Aramaic and Imperial Aramaic, Eastern Aramaic is generally distinguished by at least four major characteristic features: \( l^- \) or \( n^- \) as the third person imperfect prefix, \( -ê \) as the ending of the masculine plural determined noun, the loss of the determining force of final \( -ê \), and the loss of the \( n^- \) bearing pronominal suffixes of the imperfect. The dialects of Eastern Aramaic are Syriac, Mandaic, and Babylonian Talmudic. (The latter two may be termed together Babylonian Aramaic.) In Western Aramaic are included Jewish Palestinian Aramaic,

20. G. R. Driver, Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.
22. Rosenthal's term "Jungaramäisch" for Western Aramaic (AF, pp. 104 f.) has not been generally accepted.
Samaritan Aramaic, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic.

Jewish Aramaic.—While there is no single dialect meant by the term Jewish Aramaic, it is often used to refer to all of the Aramaic dialects (except Biblical Aramaic) attested in Jewish literature. One of the great difficulties of Aramaic lexicography is that the existing dictionaries treat all or large portions of the corpus of Jewish Aramaic together, and it is often difficult, and sometimes impossible, to get an accurate lexical picture of any of the individual dialects. It is to be hoped that future lexicographers will see fit to prepare comparative dictionaries of related dialects, such as Babylonian Talmudic and Mandaic or the various Palestinian dialects.

For a long while the influence of Biblical Aramaic (and without a doubt, at least in the early periods, other Imperial Aramaic texts no longer preserved) made itself felt in Jewish circles; and for religious use, perhaps to provide intelligibility to speakers of various dialects, written works were composed in a literary dialect similar to Imperial Aramaic. As usual, however, dialectal traits always make themselves known. In this group we find the Targums and the still limited published material from Qumran. 24

The Targums present us with some of the oldest problems in Aramaic studies, and debate remains lively today, largely propelled by the new impetus of Qumran studies and the discovery of a complete manuscript of a Palestinian Targum, the Codex Neofiti I. 25 The main problem is to determine the date and place of origin of the several Targums now available. Everyone seems agreed that the presently known Targums to the various books of Hagiographa are late and, though probably not all of Babylonian origin, are frequently influenced by Talmudic Aramaic. 26 While early scholars proposed a Babylonian origin

24. Of the published texts, the most important are the so-called Genesis Apocryphon (see Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon) and the Job Targum (J. P. M. van der Ploeg, Le Targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumrân [Leiden, 1971]). Megillat Ta’ânit (H. Lichtenstein, in HUCA VIII [1931-32] 318-51) and the Antiochus Scroll (cf. G. Dalman, Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch [reprint; Darmstadt, 1960] p. 7) are also important representatives of this type of literature, though their dating is still subject to dispute.


for Targum Onkelos and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets and most still agree that at the very least the vocalization of these two Targums is of Babylonian origin, lively discussion still ensues over the place of origin of the consonantal text as we know it, whether Babylonian or Palestinian, and its date. For the Palestinian Targum, the diversity among the four main representatives of this group known today—Pseudo-Jonathan, the Fragment Targum (or Yerushalmi), the Geniza fragments, and the Neofiti—clearly shows that no early standardization of the text took place; but while earlier scholars believed they could prove that all of the Palestinian Targums relied upon Onkelos, this is no longer universally the case, and some now attempt to date the basic, though uncanonized Palestinian text very early while assigning Onkelos a later, Babylonian origin.27

Other important Jewish Aramaic texts are the inscriptions and documents from various Palestinian sites. Significant in the latter group are the Murabba'at documents and the Aramaic Bar Kochba letters.28 Also known from inscriptions but preserved primarily in the Aramaic portions of the Palestinian Talmud (Yerushalmi) and the Palestinian Midrashim is Galilean Aramaic. From Babylonia come the Jewish magic bowl texts.29

at Qumran as well as by the well known passage in the Babylonian Talmud (Sabb. 115a) telling of Gamaliel I's ban on the Targum of Job.

27. On early targumic scholarship see AF, pp. 127 ff. More up-to-date summaries can be found in the works cited in the previous note. The position of the Kahle school is enunciated in Matthew Black, "Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus," In Memoriam Paul Kahle, ed. Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer (BZAW, Vol. CIII [Berlin, 1968]) pp. 17 ff., as well as in the companion articles by M. C. Doubles ("Indications of Antiquity in the Orthography and Morphology of the Fragment Targum," pp. 79-89) and G. J. Kuiper ("A Study of the Relationship between A Genesis Apocryphon and the Pentateuchal Targumim in Genesis 141-12," pp. 149-61); all three show a propensity toward misstating the position of their chief antagonist, E. Y. Kutscher. Cf. also the bibliographies in Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, p. 24, n. 61, and p. 30, n. 71. On Targum Jonathan cf. S. H. Levey, "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets," VT XXI (1971) 186-96. An important article on Onkelos is M. Z. Kaddari, "Studies in the Syntax of Targum Onkelos," Tarbiz XXXII (1963) 232 ff. (Hebrew with English summary), which is significant for its attempt to analyze only those portions without a Biblical Vorlage, thus avoiding one of the most difficult aspects of targumic studies, the translation nature of the targentums.


29. For the Jewish magical texts see most recently Baruch A. Levine, "The Language of the Magical Bowls," in Jacob Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia V (Leiden, 1970) 343 ff., as well as Neusner's chapter (pp. 217 ff.) in that volume.
In light of the substantial dialectal differences among the various Jewish Aramaic texts, whenever possible the specific text or text group to which a Jewish Aramaic reference belongs will be cited. Since the Palestinian Targums and Galilean Aramaic are definitely of Palestinian origin, however, the term Jewish Palestinian Aramaic will be used to refer to them as well as the other Palestinian Jewish texts when speaking of grammatical or lexical characteristics they share. Since the origin of Onkelos and Targum Jonathan is, for the present at least, uncertain, they will always be referred to separately. Only when an item is common to all groups of Jewish Aramaic (including both Targum groups and Babylonian Talmudic), and further subdivision seems fruitless (or impossible with the tools available), will the general term Jewish Aramaic be used.

Post-Biblical Hebrew is also an important source of Aramaic lexical items; it is necessary, however, to distinguish between two basic groups: Mishnaic Hebrew, the last colloquial Hebrew dialect, probably influenced by early Palestinian colloquial Aramaic as well as Imperial Aramaic but still a survival of older Hebrew and whatever Aramaisms and Akkadianisms might have been absorbed at an earlier time; and Rabbinic Hebrew, the Hebrew of the Amoraim, a literary language only, highly influenced by Biblical Hebrew and by the colloquial Aramaic of its users. The latter must accordingly be separated into Palestinian and Babylonian divisions.30

The other Palestinian Aramaic dialects, Samaritan and Christian Palestinian, do not present problems of the type one might hope to solve here.31

Mandaic is unquestionably a dialect of the Eastern Aramaic type, yet a controversy still exists over the


origin of the Mandeans themselves. In the past certain features of Mandaic were used to support the theory of a western origin, while today many see Babylonian origins in some of the same features.32 We might hope to clarify some of these points.

No systematic analysis either of the Aramaic logograms in Iranian texts or of the Neo-Aramaic dialects has been attempted here. The latter, aside from a lack of adequate lexicographical tools, are too encumbered with foreign borrowings of more recent vintage to allow otherwise unknown traces of Akkadian influence to be discovered with any reasonable expense of effort at this time.33 As for the logograms, as far as I have been able to determine, that group actually used by the scribes in literary contexts contains no Akkadianisms other than those common in Imperial Aramaic and common to the various Aramaic dialects. The Aramaic—Middle-Persian dictionary, Frahang-i-Pahlavik, is quite a different matter. Ebeling attempted to show that many of the Aramaic forms in this dictionary can only be explained as Akkadian or even Sumerian words and that this work is thus merely a natural extension of the cuneiform lexicographical tradition.34 Even if one accepts some of his identifications, or even his overall analysis, such items can hardly be considered linguistic borrowings and are thus excluded from consideration here.

THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE CONTACT

The influences of one language upon another can be of many different sorts. The extent and nature of such influences naturally depend upon the nature of the relationship


33. It is to be hoped that among future studies on Eastern Neo-Aramaic will be an attempt to reconstruct its Aramaic ancestors and that the presence or absence of Assyrian traits will then be taken into account; see p. 165.

34. E. Ebeling, Das aramäisch-mittelpersische Glossar Frahang-i-Pahlavik im Lichte der assyriologischen Forschung (MAOG, Vol. XIV 1 [Leipzig, 1941]). Because of the polyvalent nature of the Pehlevi script, the actual reading of the text involves great difficulties; but lacking further studies by competent Iranologists, one can only assume that at least some of Ebeling’s interpretations are correct.
between the dialects or languages involved. Not infrequently, words can be transferred from one language to another without any direct contact at all between the groups speaking those languages. In the ancient Near East such borrowings are to be expected in several spheres. Cultural objects or practices that have their ultimate or immediate origin in one or another of the language groups will often maintain their foreign name as they spread throughout an area. In the ancient Near East during the first millennium B.C. for example, one might expect to find the political terminology of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires widespread throughout the area. Yet while such terminology may give evidence for cultural and political contact which may be quite accurately datable by archeological and historical records, it does not represent evidence for the kind of direct linguistic contact we are seeking here.

It may be assumed with some certainty that during the first half of the first millennium there was large-scale contact between native speakers of various Akkadian and Aramaic dialects. In such a situation different types of linguistic influences may occur, depending on the actual nature of the contact, the degree of native or acquired bilingualism (the ultimate contact situation), and the length of the duration of that contact. Accordingly, one might hope that the material studied herein will provide some of the information needed to derive a general picture of the actual contact relationship.

One of the most perplexing aspects of the study of loanwords is the determination of the cause of the borrowing of a given word. Most commonly, perhaps, as in the cases mentioned above, the new word is borrowed in order to designate something totally new to the borrowing culture, but this is certainly not always the case. Often psycholinguistic factors beyond our powers of analysis may be at work; thus, any argument rejecting the foreign origin of a word solely because there would have been no reason to borrow it must itself be rejected.35

In referring to these psycho-linguistic factors, such terms as "prestige" and "higher" (or "dominant") and "lower" languages are very common in the literature on linguistic borrowing. Bloomfield uses the latter set of terms to refer to his special case of "intimate borrowing which occurs when

35. Reasons which I would classify in this group are the following (discussed by Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact, pp. 56 ff.): the low frequency of the word to be replaced; to resolve the clash of homonyms; the need for synonyms in certain semantic fields to increase the expressive nature of the language.
two languages are spoken in what is topographically and politically a single community."^36 Now, while it is obviously true that prestige can be a strong motive for linguistic change, one must take care not to draw any premature conclusions along that line in the case of Akkadian and Aramaic. For example, in a recent article one finds the a priori statement, "Akkadian had an enormous cultural prestige."^37 In spite of what first thoughts might indicate, why must this statement be correct? There were certainly periods when Akkadian and Aramaic fit Bloomfield's definition of "intimate borrowing"; yet if Akkadian were the more prestigious language, theory would lead us to expect to find "copious borrowings"^38 in the later Aramaic of Mesopotamia, but, as we shall see, they are not to be found. At this stage it seems best to refrain from any prejudgment of the psychology of those whose language habits, and the results of whose habits, we are trying to analyze. Our lexical analysis will allow us to reach some conclusions about the nature of the relationship between the two languages, however, since it can be shown that in different types of relationships, different classes of words are more likely to be borrowed than others.^39

There are many different kinds of lexical interference that may occur between languages. Perhaps the most common but certainly the easiest to recognize is the outright transfer of a word from one language to another—the loanword. Most of the other varieties come under the general rubric of "loan-translation" or "calque."^40 In the lexical portion of this study I shall limit myself almost exclusively to loans of the first type, not because they are more important—they are not—but because in the great majority of cases of suspected calques it is impossible to be at all certain that Akkadian is the origin of a particular usage. Accordingly, I shall omit entirely Aramaic linguistic usages which result

---

40. A good analysis of the various types of loanwords and loan-translations is to be found in Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, p. 47 ff. For a summary of the various theoretical discussions of types of lexical interference see E. Oksaar, "Bilingualism," *Current Trends in Linguistics* IX 494.
41. Probable calques and partial calques which I have included are discussed s.v. ina libbi, ina šilli, bāb ekallī, abbūtu, bēl āšīni, libbatu, šītu, ša ekallī, tajjāru. A particularly difficult type of loan-translation to isolate, found in pairs of closely related languages such as Akkadian and Aramaic, is the use of a term in one language according to the semantics of its cognate in the other; cf. e.g. paqādu, pašāru.
from the borrowing of Akkadian formulae and procedures, such as those of the legal papyri from Elephantine, which are already the subject of an excellent study by Y. Muffs.\textsuperscript{42} As Muffs points out so well, in the great majority of cases the lines of transmission are complicated, involving prolonged and various periods of cultural and political contact and domination. This is something quite different from contact between two language populations. Actual interlinguistic contact is even less likely in the case of similar phraseology in similar genres, such as royal inscriptions or treaties.\textsuperscript{43} Loanwords that occur in such formulae, for example dabâbu, will be treated, however.

Even under the general term "loanword" one must distinguish among several kinds of phenomena. When a speaker of one language first uses a word of another language he usually uses it as a foreign word. As that word spreads throughout the language community and in the course of time, it soon loses its foreign connotations and often becomes totally integrated into the borrowing language.

One might expect to find words of the first type in Aramaic texts contemporaneous with Akkadian, that is Old Aramaic, Mesopotamian Aramaic, and early Imperial Aramaic. If a word is found in later dialects, however, it means that it has been absorbed completely into the fabric of Aramaic.

One might also expect to find different kinds of loanwords in general Aramaic and in those Aramaic-speaking areas that had previously been Akkadian-speaking. For the Aramaic speakers of Mesopotamia were heirs to its material culture along with the terminology associated with that culture.\textsuperscript{44}

A special problem is faced by the etymologist when confronted by the names of natural objects of wide distribution and mobility, such as flora, fauna, and minerals. Frequently these names are not susceptible of etymological analysis. In such cases, not only is the ultimate origin of the name in doubt, but even the direction and process of its spread from one language to another is less than certain. Indeed, the name of an object can be imported together with that object without any significant interlingual contact between the languages involved. Such names are conveniently


\textsuperscript{43} See Chap. IV, n. 73.

The Evidence for Borrowings

...termed "culture words" (German "Kulturwörter"). In this work this term is also used to designate the names of man-made culture objects of similar distribution and unknown etymology. Except for those few names whose Aramaic forms are explicable only on the basis of Akkadian, our study must thus exclude such names of animals, plants, and minerals, even though their earliest occurrence may be in an Akkadian text.

THE EVIDENCE FOR BORROWINGS

Etymological studies in the Semitic languages are often fraught with uncertainties; the greater the scope of the work, the greater the chance for error. Recognizing this in advance, one must be extremely careful in choosing the kind of evidence upon which judgments will be based in attempting to determine whether or not a given word or feature is borrowed from Akkadian.

The strongest proof obtainable for the Akkadian origin of an Aramaic word is in the case of a Semitic word with at least one phoneme that was subject to a different development in Akkadian from that in Aramaic. If the word occurs both in Akkadian and in Aramaic, but the Aramaic has the Akkadian form, then one may be quite certain it is a loan. A difficulty with this approach is that the characteristic Aramaic sound changes were not complete until the Imperial Aramaic period, and some not even then. The following are the relevant consonantal phonemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Semitic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Old Aramaic (spelling)</th>
<th>Later Aramaic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>ɀ</td>
<td>ɀ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t (צ)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ь/0</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ь</td>
<td>ь/0</td>
<td>ь/0</td>
<td>ь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ь/0</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ь</td>
<td>ь/0</td>
<td>ь/0</td>
<td>ь/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although the maintenance of /ḥ/ in Akkadian as opposed to its merger with /h/ in Aramaic is important, when only Akkadian and Aramaic evidence is available the treatment of /ḥ/ is not significant for our inquiry.

t See p. 138.
Akkadian also reduces the diphthongs aw and ay to ā and ī/ī, while they remain unreduced in some positions in Aramaic.

Several problems complicate this analysis, however. On the one hand, in Old Aramaic the spelling may mask actual loans. On the other hand, in a word known only from late Aramaic, subsequent loss of the laryngeals might have occurred, giving the impression that the form comes from Akkadian. In the case of the first four phonemes listed, the Akkadian change was the same as that in Canaanite, and, thus, other considerations are necessary to determine whether a given term is a loan from Canaanite or Akkadian.

Frequently overlooked in etymological discussions are the phonemic changes that may occur in the various Semitic languages because of the incompatibility of certain root consonants in certain positions. Analysis of this phenomenon in the Semitic languages is still in its early stages, but some use can be made of it here.

Other Akkadian sound changes different from those of Aramaic, such as the change of the nominal prefix m- to n- before roots with a labial radical, can also be expected to provide evidence for loanwords. (More of these will be discussed in the analysis of the phonology of loanwords, Chapter IV.)

Words that can be shown to be Sumerian loanwords in Akkadian may generally be assumed to have been borrowed by Aramaic from Akkadian. One must also be on the lookout

45. See Salonen, "Zum Aufbau der Substrate im Sumerschen," St. Or. XXXVII 3 (1968) 1 ff., and Die Fussbekleidung der alten Mesopotamier (Helsinki, 1969) pp. 97-117. For the Sumerian loanwords in Akkadian there is only the long-outdated study of P. Leander, Uber die sumerischen Lehnméter im Assyrischen (Uppsala, 1903). With the increasing realization of the antiquity of Semitic settlement in Mesopotamia (see Robert D. Biggs, "Semitic Names in the Fara Period," Or. n.s. XXXVI [1967] 55-66) not all words common to Sumerian and Akkadian can be assumed to be of Sumerian origin.

46. The ground-breaking study is J. Greenberg, "The Patterning of Root Morphemes in Semitic," Word VI (1950) 162-81. For Biblical Hebrew cf. K. Koskinen, "Kompatibilität in den dreikonsonantigen hebräischen Wurzeln," ZDMG CXIV (1964) 16-58. In Akkadian, "Geers' Law" is an example of this, and a greater awareness is beginning to be shown of the importance of this phenomenon; cf. GAG § 51 (and Ergänz. § 51). An interesting consideration which has not yet been adequately determined is the extent to which each language alters Proto-Semitic words to fit its own sound patterns, as Akkadian appears to do most of the time, as opposed to the cases where words of the offending type are merely discarded entirely from the lexicon.

47. Cf. sungu, sugāqu, and batāgu.

48. This includes those items with a good Sumerian etymology as well as words assigned by some to the Mesopotamian predecessors of Sumerian and Semitic, for which see most recently A. Salonen, "Zum Aufbau der Substrate im Sumerschen," St. Or. XXXVII 3 (1968) 1 ff., and Die Fussbekleidung der alten Mesopotamier (Helsinki, 1969) pp. 97-117. For the Sumerian loanwords in Akkadian there is only the long-outdated study of P. Leander, Über die sumerischen Lehnméter im Assyrischen (Uppsala, 1903). With the increasing realization of the antiquity of Semitic settlement in Mesopotamia (see Robert D. Biggs, "Semitic Names in the Fara Period," Or. n.s. XXXVI [1967] 55-66) not all words common to Sumerian and Akkadian can be assumed to be of Sumerian origin.
for Semitic words that may have undergone expansions or changes of meaning under the influence of Sumerian which one might also be able to trace in Aramaic. When grammatical peculiarities of Akkadian that are attributable to Sumerian influence appear in Aramaic, they may also be assigned an Akkadian origin.

In early studies of loanwords, there was a tendency to presuppose the semantic areas where one would be likely to find loanwords. For example it was assumed that any Arabic word having to do with sedentary or urban life must necessarily be a loan. The potential pitfalls of such assumptions are clear; thus, while it will prove helpful to analyze the loanwords, once determined, on the basis of semantic groups, the occurrence of an uncertain word in a specific group cannot be considered conclusive evidence for its origin. A similar argument, which must also be rejected, is that of antiquity. In the case of nouns without apparent Semitic verbal etymology, it was often assumed in the past that since the earliest occurrence of the word is in Akkadian, its origin is Akkadian, even with widespread Semitic words. But this is no criterion at all, and in such a case only other evidence will allow us to suggest an Akkadian origin.

Another important consideration, but one that can be very misleading, is distribution. If, for example, a word appears in Akkadian and Aramaic but not in Canaanite, then either this word had been known in the immediate ancestor of Canaanite and Aramaic but was lost in the former, or else it was added to Aramaic after the split of the two main North West Semitic language groups, in which case it may be a loan from Akkadian. Unfortunately for our purposes, the probability of the former occurring is by no means small, and there are ways to account for the latter other than as a direct loan in the period with which we are concerned (see below).

If a word occurs only in Eastern Aramaic but not in the other dialects, there is a good chance that it was borrowed by Eastern Aramaic from Akkadian. Yet here, too, aside from possible loss in the western dialects, there are other

49. Fraenkel's Die Aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen (Leiden, 1886; reprint, Hildesheim, 1962) is an excellent philological work but is not free of this flaw.

50. Notable examples are kaspū, "silver," immerū, "sheep," and qanū, "reed." In such cases the borrowing was assumed to have occurred at an early date.

51. Even in the most frequent vocabulary items, Imperial Aramaic and Biblical Hebrew show a lexical difference of more than 20 per cent, and the difference is correspondingly greater with more infrequent words. Another problem is the limited Canaanite vocabulary at our disposal outside Hebrew, and even in Hebrew our knowledge is far from complete. Generally we may suppose that approximately the same percentage of common Akkadian
explanations which must be considered. In the case of grammatical borrowings, distribution is often the only clue.

A final guide in the discovery of loanwords is the study of changes in the native vocabulary, for, except in the case of loanwords with entirely new content, the addition of a foreign word to a vocabulary must somehow affect that vocabulary. It may result in confusion between the semantic content of the new word and its older synonym; the old word could disappear, or both could survive but with specialization in their content. 52 Naturally such changes are often very difficult to detect.

Some of the difficulties encountered in the application of these observations have been discussed above, but there are many more. Perhaps the most important is our limited knowledge of Akkadian. While the corpus of Akkadian provides a wide-ranging scope of lexical material and a broader lexicon than is available from the other early written Semitic languages, one may be certain that there are many Aramaic terms borrowed from Akkadian words that have not yet appeared in the cuneiform texts, or perhaps have not yet been properly recognized. 53

The problem of culture words has been mentioned above. No doubt some of them do indeed derive from Akkadian, yet provide no proof that such is the case. There are many words of a clearly Semitic nature which give every appearance of being cognate in the two languages and grant us no grounds, phonological or otherwise, for establishing their Akkadian origin.

Thus, given the uncertain nature of most of the evidence at our disposal, except when phonological considerations dictate an Akkadian origin, one can be relatively sure of attribution to Akkadian only when several other signs of a loan occur together.

THE PROBLEMS OF AKKADIAN—WEST SEMITIC CONTACTS

The determination of whether or not a given Aramaic lexical or grammatical feature has its ultimate origin in

and North West Semitic vocabulary was lost in Hebrew as in Aramaic and that we might expect to find as many cognate items common to Hebrew and Akkadian but not Aramaic as occur in Akkadian and Aramaic but not in Hebrew. Nevertheless, the reader will find that the number of exclusively Akkadian-Aramaic words whose status as loans is listed as uncertain in Chap. II is far less than the number of exclusively Akkadian-Hebrew cognates which are to be found in the Biblical Hebrew lexicon, a fact which indicates that at least in this regard I have not been over-cautious.

52. Cf. Weinreich, Languages in Contact, p. 54.
53. See, e.g., šē bābi.
Akkadian is hampered by yet another group of problems that also complicate any attempt to confine research to the period of greatest Akkadian-Aramaic contact. These problems may be said to group themselves into the two interrelated subjects of "the Amorite problem" and "the Aramean problem."

It is by now well known that in early Mesopotamia the speakers of Sumerian and Akkadian were in close contact with peoples bearing mostly West Semitic personal names characterized, at least in the Ur III period, by the expression MAR.TU, Akkadian amurrū.54 It is also quite clear that throughout the second millennium semi-nomadic and in some cases sedentary tribes speaking West Semitic dialects or languages were spread from Babylonia to the Levant.55 It is common practice today to use the term "Amorite" to refer to these people and to their languages. While there is general agreement that Amorite is to be considered North West Semitic, there is little agreement over the proper divisions of that language sub-family during the second millennium. Some claim that there are three divisions: Canaanite, Aramaic, and Amorite;56 others that Amorite and Canaanite go together as opposed to Aramaic.57 Some suggest that Aramaic developed from Amorite, which is to be separated from Canaanite.58 The fourth view is that during the greater part of the second millennium North West Semitic was as yet undifferentiated and thus should be referred to under the term Amorite.59

The view that Aramaic developed from Amorite, which is to be separated from Canaanite, is most important for our purposes, for if Aramaic is nothing more than a late Amorite dialect, then it may be said that Aramaic was in contact with

55. There were certainly sedentary Amorites along the Upper Euphrates and its tributaries alongside the semi-nomadic peoples of the desert areas, as typified by the situation at Mari during the OB period (cf. M. B. Rowton, "Urban Autonomy in a Nomadic Environment," JNES XXXII [1973] 201-15). Though that city itself may not always have been in Amorite control, the same cannot be posited a priori for the other urban settlements of the river valleys (contra Buccellati, Amorites, pp. 246 ff.) Even in areas of Hurrian overlordship, such as Alalakh, the basic Semitic population almost certainly preserved its language.
56. This is probably the most common view. Cf. W. F. Albright, CAH, fasc. 51, p. 47.
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Akkadian for a much longer period of time than we have supposed.

As a significant historical group, Arameans first appear in Near Eastern texts in 1112 B.C., and it is usually assumed that they were late invaders from the desert, although recently efforts have been made to find traces of the Arameans as far back as the Ur III period. But, whether or not the name "Aram" occurs prior to 1112 B.C. is really of little consequence for us. Here we must be concerned only with whether or not there can be found among the North West Semitic languages of the second millennium B.C. immediately adjacent to the Akkadian-speaking area a direct lineal linguistic antecedent of the language we call Aramaic.

Unfortunately, our knowledge of Amorite is extremely limited, based almost exclusively on personal names. While it should be clear to most scholars that several different, albeit closely related languages are subsumed under the term Amorite, further analysis and separation of these dialects is extremely difficult. On the evidence available, scholars have been led to different classifications of Amorite exemplified by the names East Canaanites, Canaanites, and Proto-Arameans. It is to be hoped that I. J. Gelb's soon to appear computer-aided analysis of all of the Amorite names, when studied in conjunction with the names from Ugarit and the early Aramaic names attested in both alphabetic and cuneiform texts, will lead to a better understanding of this problem.

63. Some argument continues over whether or not the West Semitic MAR.TU names of Ur III differ from the names of the OB period (cf. Buccellati, Amorites, pp. 10 f.), but other divisions, especially on a synchronic level, are undetermined.
64. The Ugaritic names are collected in Fauke Grondahl, Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit (Rome, 1967). First steps toward a comparison with Aramaic were taken by Liverani, in RSO XXXVII 65-76.

Clearly more work needs to be done, but based on those studies already available, I see no objection to a position which views Aramaic as the descendant of an Amorite dialect. The non-onomastic lexical material discussed by Noth and Edzard (see n. 59) is inconclusive, and there are
In the final analysis, however, even the genetic relationship between Amorite and Aramaic is not crucial, for, in any case, during the first millennium the Aramaic-speaking peoples from Babylonia to northern Syria occupied the very same areas inhabited by the earlier North West Semitic peoples of the second millennium, and there can be little doubt that, even lacking lineal descent, the Aramaic language was strongly influenced by the language of its predecessors. Thus, I shall henceforth use the term "Amorite" or "pre-Aramaic" to refer to the North West Semitic languages which preceded Aramaic and the term "Eastern Amorite" to refer to the Amorite of and immediately adjacent to Mesopotamia.

It should now be clear that some Aramaic words that appear to have been borrowed from Akkadian or words of Sumerian or pre-Sumerian origin that appear to have entered Aramaic through Akkadian may in fact have entered Aramaic through Amorite, which in turn borrowed them from Akkadian, Sumerian, or perhaps even pre-Sumerian. This is especially true of words confined to Eastern Aramaic, which may have had a long history among the Eastern Amorites as well. One must also take into account the special situation of the Amarna period, when Akkadian was in widespread use in the west as well as the east.

Akkadian, too, was greatly affected by Amorite, just as it was later affected by Aramaic during the first millennium. At least from Ur III on, there was a constant movement and assimilation of West Semitic peoples into Mesopotamia. The Amorites were of great importance during the Old Babylonian period, and both the Old Babylonian dynasty of Hammurapi and that of his Assyrian contemporary Šamši-Adad were of self-admitted Amorite origin. The Akkadian of Mari has many Amorite lexical items, and some have been recognized in Old Babylonian. Old Assyrian connections with Amorite have been explored by J. Lewy. In spite of the fact that Akkadian dialectology

no objections on grammatical grounds. Albright, for example (CAH, fasc. 51, p. 47) finds Amorite much closer to Aramaic than to Canaanite but apparently wants to keep it separate from Aramaic on the grounds that the sibilant shifts are different. But this is merely a problem of definition, for at least in some of the Amorite dialects the sibilants had not yet shifted at all.

66. By pre-Sumerian I mean the as yet unknown languages which preceded Sumerian and Akkadian in Mesopotamia whose traces can be found both in the lexicon and in geographical names; see above, n. 48.
is still in its early stages, it is generally assumed that Amorite left no significant lasting imprint on the standard dialects of Akkadian. Different dialects can be detected even in Old Babylonian, however, and some of these, their descendants, and even certain genres of texts probably owe more to Amorite than do others.\textsuperscript{70} Certain distributional clues often prompt the suspicion that a given Akkadian word is Amorite in origin, but even lacking such evidence there is always the possibility that an Aramaic term occurring commonly in Akkadian may have been an Amorite loan in Akkadian.

Another source of West Semitic influence on Babylonian was the Chaldeans, who appeared on the Babylonian scene early in the ninth century and obtained control of Babylonia under Merodach-Baladán in 722.\textsuperscript{71} With the Aramaization of Babylonia, their name became equated with Aramaic, but there is far too little evidence to determine the proper classification of their own language.\textsuperscript{72}

Such significant Aramaic influence on Late Akkadian requires that any word or feature common to Aramaic and Akkadian that is not found in the early stages of Akkadian must be treated with caution. The Akkadian lexical lists

\textsuperscript{70} I have in mind some of the dialects represented in poetic texts and in divination. The latter as we know it is almost certainly of Semitic origin; no Sumerian omen literature is known. The Old Babylonian prayer of the divination priest published by A. Goetze (in \textit{JCS XXII} [1968] 25-29) is strikingly West Semitic in its word order, and there are quite a few Akkadian words apparently cognate to North West Semitic terms which are found only in omen material in Akkadian. The latter, however, might be explained as the result of chance, for a very large proportion of all the extant texts deal with omens. This is not to say that divination was not known to the Sumerians or Akkadians, only that Amorite tradition may have added a strong impetus. (For possible West Semitic mythological motifs in Old Babylonian literature see T. Jacobsen, "The Battle between Marduk and Tiamat," \textit{JAOS LXXVIII} [1968] 108.) Might there also be morphological clues to foreign words in Akkadian, whether Sumerian or Amorite or other, in the not infrequent noun forms with a final double consonant (\textit{CAG} § 55 p, q)? These are much more frequent in Akkadian than in the other Semitic languages and are easily explained as compensatory lengthening resulting from the attempt to preserve the shape of a word which otherwise would have three short syllables and be subject to loss of the middle vowel. Note that several of the words of uncertain origin considered below (e.g. \textit{abullu, itannu, pilaku}, etc.) fall in this category.

\textsuperscript{71} In general see Brinkman, \textit{Political History}, pp. 260 ff.

\textsuperscript{72} According to Dr. Israel Eph'al, who has made extensive study of the Arabs and Arabic names in cuneiform texts, previous hypotheses connecting the Chaldeans with South Arabian tribes (cf., e.g., T. C. Mitchell, "A South Arabian tripod offering Saucer Said to Be from Ur," \textit{Iraq XXXI} [1969] 113 f.) can no longer be maintained. Nevertheless, cultural contact with the South Arabs certainly existed and is an important consideration in dealing with a word such as \textit{apkallu} (see Chap. II s.v.).
warrant equal caution, for in their zeal for completeness the compilers of these materials ranged far and wide for their synonyms and, especially in particular types of lists, made extensive use of Aramaic or other West Semitic words, in most cases without any indication of the foreign origin of Aramaic words.73

In light of the not insubstantial hazards and handicaps discussed in this and the preceding section, one might suppose that an accurate list of all the Akkadianisms in Aramaic can never be produced. True, our results will necessarily be far short of perfect, but careful application of the principles set forth above should result in an accurate and fairly complete sample, and the conclusions drawn from that sample should have a high degree of reliability.

EARLY AKKADIAN LOANS IN WEST SEMITIC

Since the intent of this study is to concentrate on the period of contact between Akkadian and Aramaic, words borrowed by North West Semitic at an earlier period will not be discussed in the main section of this work. As Akkadian loanwords or suggested loanwords in Aramaic, however, they are relevant to the general theme of this study and are therefore listed here.

To my knowledge there is only one Aramaic word74 unquestionably in this category: $h(y)kîl < ekallu, "palace." The occurrence of $kîl in Ugaritic shows that the word was borrowed very early, and the preservation of the $h in all West Semitic forms shows that the borrowed word endured and was not repaid. There is no other example of an Akkadian initial vowel occurring as $h in its borrowed form in West Semitic (see Phonology, in Chapter III).75 There are Aramaic loans from both the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian forms of the very similar word ekurru (see below), and neither has the initial $h. It is not clear whether the $h is due to an early Akkadian dialectal pronunciation of all initial vowels with heavy aspiration rather than a glottal, or, if the loan is very old and $h derives from a Sumerian pronunciation of é-gal, whether the North West Semitic borrowing was directly from Sumerian or, as seems more probable, from an Akkadian which still preserved this possible phonetic trait of Sumerian.76

74. Except for Hama skn; see Chap. II, s.v. šaknu.
75. Except for the possible occurrence of abarakku, "steward," as hbrk in the Azitawadda inscription; see Franz Rosenthal, ANET (2d ed.) p. 499, n. l.
76. A. Falkenstein, Das Sumerische, in Handbuch der Orientalistik,
There are other words whose Akkadian origin is subject to doubt but whose appearance in North West Semitic in any case goes well back into the second millennium.

*kitū,* "flax," "linen," *ktn—*Neither the West Semitic word for linen, flax, *ki*/*attān,* nor the words for tunic, *kittūn,* *kuttūn,* etc., are unquestionably derived from Akkadian. 77 The old Akkadian word for linen is *kitū,* certainly related to but not necessarily a loan from Sumerian *gada.* The difference in the first vowel perhaps points most likely to separate developments of inherited culture words, or the final *-a* of the Sumerian could indicate an early loan from Akkadian. 78 While the form *ktn* occurs in Ugaritic (for both linen and garment?), a form with final *-n* does not occur in Akkadian until the Neo-Babylonian period (*kitīnu,* "linen," "linen cloth"), perhaps as an Aramaic loan. 79 The relationship with the Old Assyrian woolen garment *kutānu* (*AHw.:* *gutānu*) is uncertain. 80

*kussū,* "throne," "chair," *ks², krs²/kwrsy—*The Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Old Aramaic forms of this word all preserve the final *aleph.* Since the Akkadian word has final *aleph* only in Old Akkadian and Old Assyrian, if the North West Semitic form was indeed borrowed from Akkadian, the borrowing must have occurred very early. The only reason to consider the Akkadian form primary here is that it appears to be a loan from Sumerian *gišGU.ZA.* But the Sumerian has no satisfactory etymology, and both the long *ss* and the final *aleph* of the Akkadian are inexplicable on the basis of the Sumerian form. Yet the Sumerian can be interpreted as a loan from Akkadian, 81 and a Semitic etymology is not impossible. 82

---

80. See Oppenheim, in *JCS* XXI 251, n. 82; Landsberger, in *JCS* XXI 158, n. 102. The rare Syr. form *guṭṭaw,* "linen," is difficult to explain but could hardly be from Akk. *kitū.* (Is the Syriac derived from the Armenian form *ktaw?*) On flax in general in the ancient Near East see Oppenheim, in *JCS* XXI 244 ff.
The noun form is unusual for Semitic, however, and so perhaps *kussu² is a foreign or substrate word. 83 The single suggested Akkadian parallel to the Aramaic (➔ Arabic) form with rs for ss has remained unique despite seventy years of scholarship, and there is little reason to regard it as the same word. 84

Šipru, "message," "work"; spr, "document"—It is generally agreed that this North West Semitic term derives from early Akkadian, but Y. Muffs has recently raised a dissenting voice. 85 His argument, while quite correct, does not prove that spr is not a loan, but only that, if a loan, it must have been borrowed even earlier than the period of the Ras Shamra texts. It is quite possible that at the time that cuneiform writing first became known in the Levant the Akkadian word šipru (in Assyrian pronunciation) was associated with that writing. But in light of the Canaanite verb spr, "to count," and the lack of clear etymological connections among the various Semitic roots of the shape spr, Špr and Špr, uncertainty still must prevail. 86

Šiqlu, "shekel," ṭ/š/tql—The root ṭql, "to weigh," is certainly Proto-Semitic, as the noun *tiql, "weight," must be as well. As a specific unit of weight, however, Akkadian may have had some influence at an early date, though, as the preservation of ṭ in Ugaritic and Aramaic shows, it was not a complete borrowing. The frequent Egyptian Aramaic spelling Šql (instead of tql), abbreviated š (also in late Mesopotamian Aramaic) probably represents an historical spelling rather than a borrowing of the Akkadian (or Hebrew) form.

83. Further support for the foreign origin of kussu can be found in the unusual Ugaritic spelling kšu (cf. UT, p. 421b) with the sibilant š reserved usually for foreign words.
86. On spr, "scribe," see Muffs, Studies, p. 207.
II

THE LEXICAL INFLUENCES

In an attempt to produce an accurate list of the Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic, all those Akkadian and Aramaic lexical comparisons whose status as loanwords is relatively certain as well as other suggested comparisons deemed to merit discussion will be studied in this chapter. Only those entries which can with some degree of certainty be shown to be loanwords will be used as the basis for the conclusions in Chapter IV. Such loanwords are marked with an asterisk in the margin next to the entry.

I have not felt it necessary to include for purposes of refutation every comparison that has ever been suggested in print. Many, if not most, of these suggestions were adequate for their day but have been proven false by the evidence accumulated since, and therefore simple reference to the CAD or AHW should settle the matter. In other cases common sense should serve as the final judge, though one notes with some remorse that even long-outdated suggestions are not infrequently resurrected today.1 Words previously considered loanwords but now thought to be Aramaisms in Akkadian, for example, qarābū, "battle," have not been included if they are treated in W. von Soden's study of Aramaisms.2

For obvious reasons it was impossible to read through all of Aramaic literature for the purposes of this study. Only Old Aramaic, Mesopotamian Aramaic, Imperial Aramaic, Hatran, and Qumran texts were thoroughly scrutinized. For the other dialects the standard lexical tools served as a first step, with reference to the texts involved whenever necessary.

As previously mentioned, no extensive effort has been made to include loan-translations, and only those few names of animals, plants, and minerals whose Akkadian origin is almost certain will be discussed. Divine names (and planet names, etc.), borrowed as such, whose borrowing is a result of cultural, not linguistic, influence, will not be included here either. Such names are important, however, inasmuch as they

1. I fail, for example, to understand the reasoning behind the statement that West Semitic ša₄n, "shoe," is manifestly borrowed from Akkadian šēnu" (J. Blau, On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages [Jerusalem, 1970] p. 116).

are part of the corpus of Akkadian appearing in transliterated form in alphabetic texts, and as such they will be of use in matters of phonology.

Because of the great variety of Aramaic forms and spellings in which a given word may appear in the various dialects, the words have been listed alphabetically in order of the Akkadian. An alphabetic listing of the Aramaic forms can be found in the index. In citing Akkadian words that occur in more than one dialect, the reference form of the CAD (Standard Babylonian) is used rather than that of the AHw. (Old Babylonian), since the Standard Babylonian form is likely to be closer to the form actually borrowed.\textsuperscript{3} Aramaic forms are cited in consonantal spelling only, except where the vocalization is certain or crucial to the discussion. While the writer prefers the Drower-Macuch system of transliteration for Mandaic,\textsuperscript{4} to prevent confusion the same system used for the other Aramaic dialects will be used here for Mandaic.\textsuperscript{5} Biblical Hebrew forms are transcribed.\textsuperscript{6} In discussing individual forms and formations, / / is used for phonemic notation, [ ] for rough phonetic approximation, and " " for graphemes. In general discussion, when phonemic and phonetic considerations are not relevant, italic type is used.

Wherever possible, all supplementary material has been collected in a single note at the end of each lexical entry. In each case references to the appropriate pages of Zimmern (Z), Lexicon Syriacum (LS) and Akkadisches Handworterbuch (AHw.) are given first followed by the most recent significant etymological discussion of the word. If it is to be

3. The dialectal divisions of Akkadian and their abbreviations are those used by the CAD. In general see GAG § 2 for the divisions, but the CAD uses Standard Babylonian (SB) instead of von Soden's Jungbabylonische (jb). Von Soden's division between Neo-Babylonian and Late (ca. 625), while perhaps linguistically more accurate than any other, is historically misleading since Late Babylonian would then be the language of the Neo-Babylonian empire. In any case the dialectal development was gradual, and I prefer to use the Late Babylonian to refer only to texts of the Achaemenid and subsequent periods, as the CAD does. In citing Akkadian words, I used "h" for the phoneme usually transcribed "h" for typographic simplicity.

4. See MD, p. vi; HM, pp. 528 ff.

5. Where necessary in reference to specific MD citations the Drower-Macuch system is used. The transliteration system used for the West Semitic languages is fairly standard and should be clear. In transcriptions of Aramaic and Arabic, long vowels are indicated by a circumflex.

6. For Biblical Hebrew the system used is that proposed by W. Weinberg, "Transliteration and Transcription of Hebrew," HUCA XL-XLI (1970) 1-32.

7. Not to be confused with the usage of square brackets in text citations to indicate broken passages.
found in the latter, previous bibliography is not otherwise indicated. If a lexical entry has no note, it indicates that to my knowledge the connection with Akkadian was not previously made. It must be stressed here that this study is not meant to be a dictionary, either of Akkadian or of Aramaic, but on the contrary is intended to be used together with the available lexicographical tools. In Akkadian, for example, not all the meanings of a word will be cited, only those of immediate relevance; nor is any effort made to indicate recent discussions of the word in purely Akkadian contexts which are irrelevant to our study when the word is already treated in the published volumes of CAD or AHw. More complete Assyriological references will be given for those lexical entries not yet the subject of dictionary articles. Accordingly, it has not always seemed necessary to make explicit the reasons why a given word is considered to be loan in the case of words whose Sumerian etymologies are easily found in the dictionaries or wherever phonetic considerations, such as Aramaic /w/ for Akkadian "m" make a loan obvious.

LEXICAL LIST

* abbūtu, "a father's legal status," in the expression abbūtu șabātu, "to intercede"—Syr. ܦܒܘܛ, "patrocinium," used with the verb ܗܕ. The Hebrew reflex of this expression may occur in the Manual of Discipline, col. ii 1. 9, at the conclusion of a curse: ܐܠܝ ܝܗܝ ܠܟܗ ܣܠܘܡ ܒܦܝ ܟܘܠ ܒܝܫܐܢ ܦܒܘܛ. 8

* abullu, "city gate"—Palm. ܒܠܐ; Syr. ܒܘܠܐ; Mand. ܒܘܠܐ; BT ܒܝܢ ܒܘܠܐ; rare elsewhere in JAR.: Targ. Jer. 50:26, Targ. YI Dt. 28:52, and (Hebrew) Tosefta B. Mets. XI, 10. The BH hapax ܕܒܐ (Dan. 8:2 f.) is taken by many ancient and modern scholars to be this word (cf. Greek, Syriac, and Saadiah Gaon). The etymology of abullu is unknown. It was used in Sumerian alongside the more usual kâ-gal in the spelling a-bul₂(ZUR)-la, but this is probably borrowed from Akkadian. That it was almost certainly not a part of the early North West Semitic vocabulary is shown by the Amarna gloss ša-ah-ri (EA 244:16). 9

aburru, "pasture"—Mand. ܒܘܪܢܝ (MD, p. 3); cf. Syr. (lex.) ܒܪܛ, "reed grass"; hardly YT ܒܪܝܛ, "rural places."


9. Z, p. 14; LS, p. 2; AHw., p. 8; KBL, p. 7. A. W. Sjöberg, "K阿拉.GAL(=a) = abulla = abullu," RA LX (1966) 91, suggests that even when spelled K阿拉.GAL the Sumerian is often to be read abulla.
abūtu - akukūtu / 33

abūtu, "a kind of tool" (lex.)—Syr.  депут, "ruler," "scaper."

adē, "treaty"—Sefire ʿdn (pl. tantum). The relationship and etymology of the Akkadian and Aramaic have often been discussed, but no conclusive results have been reached. Nevertheless, the etymological and phonetic evidence, as well as the occurrence of adē in late Akkadian only, almost certainly precludes an Akkadian origin for this political term.

agammu, "marsh"—BH ʾğām, MH, BT, Targ. Prophets, Syr., Mand. ʾgm, "(reed) pool." This word, of unknown etymology, is foreign in Akkadian as well as in the other languages.

agannu, "bowl"—BH, Common Ar. ʾaggān(ā). The origin of this term is unknown, but the West Semitic and Akkadian distribution (peripheral and late Assyrian) indicates a foreign loan from the West.

agāru, "to hire"—There is no reason to suspect that Common Ar. (and Arab.) ʾgr is anything but cognate with the Akkadian verb.

agurru, "kiln-fired brick"—Bab. docket ʾgw(?)rn; Syr.

agwr > Arab., Persian. Though its etymology is unknown, this architectural term was almost certainly borrowed from Akkadian.

akukūtu, "a red glow in the sky"—Syr. kwkyt, "storm," and BT kwkyt, "some sort of heavenly phenomenon," are similar in form. The etymology of the Akkadian is unknown, but the phonetic differences between the Akkadian and Aramaic forms point to an origin in a third language.


11. For phonetic considerations see below, p. 142. One should not rule out a Canaanite origin for the term; cf. E. Y. Kutscher, "Samaritan Aramaic," Tarbiz XXXVII (1968) 410. In CAD, adē A and adē B should be taken as one word, as in AHW.


16. LS, p. 320; Aruch IV 224b, Additamenta, p. 222.
amāru - apkallu

* amāru, "brick pile"—BT 𒀭𒀿.17

ameluttu, "(female) household slave" (CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 61)—The reading =findViewById in the Babylonian docket DEA, No. 91: 1 is doubtful in the light of collation of the tablet.

* amurrijānu, "jaundice"—Syr. mryqtn, "a kind of disease." Although the nature of the rare Syriac disease is uncertain, the word must be a loan from the Akkadian term which is derived from the root wrg, "yellow."18

* amurru, "west"—BT 𒀭𒀽.19

* amuršānu, "a type of pigeon"—BT 𒀭حتياج > Arab. ṣarās.20

ana, "to"—Some scholars have suggested that the common BT preposition 𒀭a, "on," is not, as usually interpreted, derived from the preposition 𒀭al but is to be related to Akkadian ana. There is little to recommend this suggestion, which has been refuted at length by Epstein.21

apkallu, "a priest"—Palm., Nab., Hat. ṣpkl. The term occurs as well in ESA and appears to have been the name of a high religious functionary among various early Arab peoples. If the Sumerian etymology is correct, it might well have been an early loan into the Arabic culture sphere and may represent an Arabic rather than an Aramaic title in the monumental texts.22

22. Z, p. 29; DISO, p. 21; AHw., p. 58; R. Borger, "Assyriologische und altarabische Missellen," Or. n.s. XXVI (1957) 8 ff.; J. Teixidor, "Notes hatréées," Syria XLIII (1966) 91 ff., No. 3; T. C. Mitchell, "A South Arabian Tripod Offering Saucer Said to Be from Ur," Iraq XXXI (1969) 111 f. The apkallu occurs as the name of a profession in Akkadian only in the first millennium, and thus, one might suspect that the loan could only have taken place then; but it is attested as a Sumerian profession
appāru, "reed marsh"—JPA and MH ʿpr, "marshy meadow."
MS Kaufmann, one of the most reliable of Mishnaic manuscripts, gives the vocalization ʾappār for the Hebrew. This term was originally a Sumerian (derived from a substrate?) loanword in Akkadian.23

appittimma, "accordingly(?)", "certainly(?)"—This modal particle occurring only in NB and LB has been compared to two problematic words in Imperial Aramaic: ʾpyty (AP, No. 26:9) and ʾptm (Ezra 4:13). Unfortunately, the meaning of the Akkadian is by no means certain, though the meaning "accordingly" (CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 184) seems to fit the Akkadian contexts better than "sicherlich" (AHw., p. 60). Neither meaning fits nicely into the context of AP, No. 26, however. In any case the first y of the Aramaic form is difficult to explain, and the preservation of the final i is unusual (see Phonology in Chap. III). BA ʾptm has possible Persian etymologies and is probably not connected with the Akkadian word.24

apsû, "deep water"—see below, p. 152.

aptu, "window"—BT ʾptp, "balcony." Cf. as well appāti, the Akkadian translation of "Amorite" bīṭ hilānī, "a type of building with a columned portico and a balcony above."25

arad ekalli, "builder"—Eq., Hat., JAr. (Targ. Prophets, Targ. Hagiographa, BT [Erub. 26a]), Syr., Mand., ʾrad(y)kl(ʾ); RH also ʾdrykl, "architect." Oppenheim's thorough study of this term leaves little doubt that NB arad ekalli was a professional involved with building and that the Aramaic is a loan from Akkadian.26

argamannu, "red purple wool"—Common Ar. ʾargwān > Arab. ʾurğwān, "purple." This culture word of as yet uncertain origin occurs first in the west during the Late Bronze Age and then in Mesopotamia in the first millennium. If Hebrew and

as early as Old Sumerian (see CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 173a). Thus, its development and cultural importance in South Arabian leads us to look for a loan significantly earlier than the NA reference to a South Arabian priestess as apkallatu.


Ar.Or. XVII (1949) 227 ff. Oppenheim himself concluded only that it was probably a loanword in Aramaic. His hesitation and that expressed in the CAD are unwarranted.
Ugaritic forms with m represent the original form, the Aramaic appears explicable only on the basis of a loan from Babylonian, with intervocalic /m/ > [w]. Though purple wool was a precious commodity and was often used for royal tribute, one cannot be certain that Mand. ḫrgb, "money(?)," reflects this word, for it presents a phonetic as well as a semantic problem, especially inasmuch as a correct Mandaic reflex occurs as ḫrw₂n.27

* arhu, "half-brick"—SyR., JAr. ḫṛḥ; MH ḫ(w)ryḥ.28
* arittu, "canal"—BT, Targ. Onk., and Targ. Psalms ḫryt². Although this word occurs only in Neo-Babylonian, both its distribution in Aramaic and its presumed etymology from warittu (< wrd) indicate that it is a loanword.29
* arru, "decoy bird"—Hapax SyR. ḫr, hapax BT ḫr.30
* arsānu, "groats"—SyR. ḫrsn. This is almost certainly the same word as MH ērsn, but it is not clear whether the Hebrew represents the continuation of an old form of this culture.


28. LS., p. 48; AHW., p. 67. Cf. N. H. Tur-Sinai, The Language and the Book I (2d ed.; Jerusalem, 1954) 146 ff. The Hebrew could have been borrowed directly from the Akkadian: arhu [arkh] > ḫrṭṭ or from the Aramaic absolute form before the sound law final eG(truttural) ḫG took effect (or where it did not operate at all). A phonetic change by analogy with ḫrṭṭḥ is also feasible. (Is this the correct etymology as well, < arhu, "moon"?) The forms with "y" in Jewish Aramaic are either incorrect textual variants (cf. the dictionaries) or Hebraisms. (Cf. Additamenta, p. 66.) There may be confusion between two words here, however, for a development into "carrying pole" (Targ. Onk.) is unlikely, though not impossible; half-brick > lath > pole. Cf. G. Hoffmann, "Lexikalisches," ZAW II (1882) 70 ff. For ḫrḥ in Ahiqar (Ed.) see Chap. IV, n. 83.


30. Z., p. 15; LS., p. 45b; AHW., p. 71; and most recently D. Weisberg, "Some Observations on Late Babylonian Texts and Rabbinic Literature," HUCA XXXIX (1968) 76 f., who however, overlooks the Syriac (Ahiqar 69,4) which gives a clear description of the ḫarrā as something which "saves itself not from death, but brings its comrade to the net with its voice." Though the origin of arru is unknown, it is well attested in Akkadian, while its limited Aramaic distribution points strongly to a loan.
word of uncertain etymology, or is an assimilation (orthographic?) to BH ʾārīṣāh. 31

* asītu, "tower (of a city wall)—BH ʾošyāh (said of Babylon); BT, Mand. ʾṣytʾ, "wall"; Syr. ʾṣytʾ, "column" > Arab. ʾāsyah, "column." This word also occurs in Targ. Psalms, but similar-looking words elsewhere in JPA seem all to be from ʾ(w)šʾ, "foundation"; see uššu. Syr. ʾstʾ (pl. ʾstʾ), "wall," is probably cognate; otherwise the Syriac form with s would indicate a loan from Babylonian, while asītu occurs only in Assyrian. 32

* askuppu/atu, "threshold," "doorsill"—Syr., JPA, CPA ʾskwpṭʾ > Arab. ʾuskuffah; Mand. ʾsqwpṭʾ; JPA ʾ(y)sqwpḥ; Mand., Targ. Prophets sqwptʾ > Eastern Neo-Aramaic sqwpt/ta; The Heb. and JAr. forms ʾsqwp and ʾsqʿ may be the result of assimilation to the form of the BH cognates ʾṣeqp and maʾṣqop or may be legitimate Hebrew forms. 33

asmarʾ, "lance"—see below, p. 153.

* asū, "physician"—Common Ar. ʾṣyʾ (ʾ Arab., Ethiopic). Except for the uncertain Imp. Ar. occurrence in AG, No. 67:1, the earliest attestations are in Qumran, Palmyran, and Nabatean (hardly BH ʾāṣān as a euphemism). Note that the derivational verbs are later developments in Aramaic as no verb is known in Akkadian. The traditional Sumerian etymology as "one who knows the water" has recently been challenged, 34 but lacking a good Sumerian etymology, it must be considered to be of pre-Sumerian origin and thus still a Sumerian loanword in Akkadian. 35

32. Z, p. 14; LS, p. 52b; AḤw., p. 74; KBL, p. 91; Wagner, p. 30. The meaning of the Biblical Hebrew term is uncertain. M. Ellenbogen's suggestion (Foreign Words in the Old Testament (London, 1962) p. 41) that it refers to a glacial is highly unlikely, for the passage refers to Iron Age Babylon, not Bronze Age Palestine. The lexical term asītu, "part of a building," is apparently to be differentiated from asītu. With the former compare Syr. ʾṣytʾ (ʾṣytʾ), Targ. Proph. nṣqṭʾ (and BT nṣqyʾ(?), cf. J. Levy, Chaldisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim [Leipzig, 1881] II 122) "projection of a wall."
33. Z, p. 31; LS, p. 35a; AḤw., p. 74; A. Salonen, Die Türken des alten Mesopotamiens (Helsinki, 1961) p. 57. According to I. Löw, "Lexikalische Misszellen," in Festchrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage David Hoffmann's (Berlin, 1914) pp. 119 f., and A. Kohut, Aruch, s.v. ʾsqwp, ʾsqwph is "sill" and ʾsqwp is "lintel," suggesting that the latter is a legitimate Hebrew form. Note that a borrowing from Assyrian is precluded, for the form there is aṣuppu.
35. Z, p. 49; LS, p. 31; AḤw., p. 76; KBL, p. 71; Wagner, p. 27.
asumittu, "stele"—Teima swt. 36

asuppu, "portico"—BH ²asôp; Qumran Ar. (5Q15 I 16-19)
²sp²; BT (and RH) ²sy/wp²; Syr. ²swp². The etymology is unknown. 37

ašītu, hapax in a broken lexical text for "prostitute" and related connotations of the verb ašā, "to go out"—Tarq. Onk., Prophets, Neofiti npqt br (RH yws²t hhw²s); Syr. npqt šwq², "prostitute" (see also Sam. Targum lmtbr²h for BH lsmwt, Lev. 21:9, 14). The noun form cited was certainly not one of the many common Akkadian words for women of this type and may even be a calque from Aramaic. Although the use of the verb with this connotation is very old, it is unlikely that such a connotation would have been borrowed, especially into a non-cognate verb. 38

aššasu, "reed basket(?)", "reed shelter(?)" (lex. only)—Mand. ²š²š², Syr. lex. ²šš², "reed raft." Though the meaning of the Akkadian is uncertain, it clearly is some kind of reed construction, presumably originally made by water fowl. The similar sphere of meaning of the Aramaic term and its limited distribution leaves little doubt that it represents the developed meaning of an inherited culture word.

ašgandu—Occurring in Akkadian only in Neo-Babylonian as a non-Akkadian family name, it may or may not be connected with the Iranian loan in Syr. ²ygy(n)d², Mand. ²šg²nd², "messenger." 39

ašipu, "exorcist"—BA and BH ²šp (noun); Syr. ²šp² and ²šwp² and verb ²šp (p²al); Mand. verb ²šp only. Note that this word does not occur in JAR. As the Akkadian comes from a root with initial waš, there can be no question of a cognate here. It is noteworthy that none of the Aramaic forms reflect the active participle form of the Akkadian but rather other "professional" noun forms. The unusual BA vocalization ²šsap could

36. Z, p. 8; DISO, p. 191; Koopmans, Aramäische Chrestomathie (Leiden, 1962) p. 163. For very uncertain Punic attestations see DISO, s.v. syw²t.
conceivably be a reflex of the original Akkadian form, but there are unfortunately no other loanwords of similar phonetic shape with which to compare it. Since the word does not occur in JAR, however, one might consider assigning the BA vocalization to Masoretic error.40

ašīrtu, "sanctuary"—see below, p. 153.

* aškāpu, "leatherworker"—Hat. No. 212 [؟]škp (Sumar XX (1964) 79); Syr. ʃškp; MH (Tosepta), JPA (ד)škp; BT ֶוškp; Arab. ʃsk(ד)f, sakkāf, "shoemaker."41

* ašlu, "tow rope," "measuring rope"—Eg. ǒšl (see DISO, p. 27), "area measure"; Syr. ʃšl, BT, Targ. Job (canonical), Targ. YI, Mand. ʃšl; Arab. ǒšl, "rope," "tow rope," "measuring rope." Though the word itself may well be cognate in Aramaic and Akkadian (cf. Arab. ˢl, "rush" = Akk. ašlu B [in CAD] and the unexpected form of the Syriac), Akkadian was almost certainly of some influence in its use as a standard measure and perhaps in the meaning "tow rope."42

aššum, "concerning," "because of" (< ana šum)—Kutscher has compared the Akkadian to Eg. őšm (Demotic n-nn), "concerning (the object of a suit)"; MH mšwm, ʾl šwm; Syr. (hapax) ʾl šm, "because." The Egyptian Aramaic form cannot legitimately be compared with the Akkadian, however, for the latter occurs in a similar context only once, in an Old Babylonian Alalakh text; thus, the Demotic should be considered primary here.43

---

40. Z, p. 67; LS, p. 53; KBL, p. 93. Sum. išib is also a loan from āšipu; cf. CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 243a. The suggestion by Ellenbogen (Foreign Words, p. 43) that this word can be found in II Kings 5 ʿšp is not without some merit. On the basis of other uses of this verb in the sense of "remove," we might expect "leprosy" to be the direct object (as it is once in v. 11) and not the man (as in vv. 3, 6, 7). Note as well that the verb is used only to describe the cure as conceived by Naaman (v. 7) and not the actual cure by immersion.


42. Z, p. 35; LS, p. 53; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwoörter, p. 93; DISO, p. 27; AD (2d ed.) p. 68. The phonetic similarity between ašlu and Sum. eše, "rope," is probably coincidental; nevertheless, that similarity may have been at least partially the cause for the development of "rush" into "rope" in Akkadian.


Kutscher ("Two 'Passive' Constructions in Aramaic in the Light of Persian," Proceedings, p. 133) has also pointed out the problem of deter-
The Akkadian may either be a native construction or a loan from Sumerian *mu* . . *gè*; compare Gez *pësma*, "because."44

* atappu, "small canal"—Syr. *tp₃*, "canal."45

* attalū, "eclipse"—Syr. *ṭly₂*, Mand. *ṭly₂*, Medieval Hebrew *ṭly*, "the mythical dragon or constellation which causes eclipses," "eclipse."46

* bābū, "doorway," "gate"—Eg., Ahiqar narrative, Uruk, Palm., Pehlevi logogram, Mand., BT, and Targ. Hagiographa (ゝ Arab.) bābā. The Neo-Babylonian usage in the sense of "account entry," "sector of a field" occurs in AP, No. 81, where the meaning must be "account entry" and in a developed form in BT, Mand., and the Pehlevi logogram (and late Arabic) "sector of a written work," "section."47 The strictly eastern attestation of this word in the late dialects presents an extremely strong case for borrowing, and there is no reason to suggest (cf. *AHw*. p. 95b) that the new NB meanings should be the result of a reborrowing from Aramaic or that the borrowing from Akkadian should have taken place any earlier than the NB period. That it is still a fairly recent borrowing is shown by the confusion prevailing in Eg. and Ahiqar between бб and ṣt. (Note especially the borrowed Akk. phrase bāb ekalli, twice rendered бб hyk₃ [11.

mining the origin of the construction NN *šmḥ*, used in Egyptian, Biblical Aramaic, and Old Persian and in the Akkadian version of the Behistun inscription at the first appearance of proper names. In spite of the somewhat doubtful observation of H. Bauer and P. Leander (Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen [Halle, 1927] p. 358) that this construction seems to have "eine degradierende Bedeutung," this practice can scarcely be connected with the Old Babylonian use of Sum. mu-ni-im after the name of slaves in contracts. Note that precisely this construction (NN *rn-f*) is the regular one in all stages of Egyptian.

44. See F. Rundgren, Über Bildungen mit *š*- und *n*-Demonstrativen im Semitischen (Uppsala, 1955) pp. 19 ff.

45. Z, p. 44; LS, p. 830; *AHw.*, p. 96.


47. Cf. the use of Syr. *pēsav* in the sense of "capitulum (libri)" (LS, p. 616) and of *tarrā* as a literary division.
balaggu - batāqu / 41

17, 23] and once by trc hykl² [l. 44]. This conflict might well account for the retention of bābā only in the East, where the conflict was resolved by limiting the sense of the word trc (cf. daltu). 48

* balaggu, "drum"—Syr. plg jov (plaggā). 49

* bārānū, "rebelle"—BT bryn², "rebelle." One must separate, as Jastrow does, this strictly BT word both semantically and etymologically from the identical Rabbinic Hebrew form, apparently of Latin etymology, meaning "palace guard." On the other hand, relating the talmudic word to its Neo-Assyrian semantic equivalent entails considerable phonetic difficulty. One might suggest that the attested Aramaic form is the result of confusion with and subsequent graphic assimilation to the Hebrew word. Note the unique Akkadian orthography ba-ra-a-nu-ū, suggesting a pronunciation with a y glide. 50

bārū, "diviner"—Mand. brr²y, "exorcizer(?)." Unfortunately, the two Mandaic attestations are in unpublished texts. One would expect the Mandaic form to be bry², however; thus its correct interpretation may well be "foreigner." 51

batāqu, "to cut through"—There is no reason to consider BH bedeq, "fissure," "breach," or JAr., Mand. bdq, "to burst" (let alone the more common Aramaic meaning "to search," "to repair") as "under strong Akkadian influence." 52

48. Z, p. 30; AHW, p. 95; DISO, p. 32; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 14; P. Jouon, "Notes grammaticales, lexicographiques et philologiques sur les papyrus araméennes d'Egypte," Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph XVIII (1934) 17. The Arabic borrowing was probably very early, from a dialect still under the influence of Imperial Aramaic. For the limitation of the meaning of trc, cf. especially Pahlm. bbr² wtrçwh (DISO, p. 32). That bbr² was considered indicative of the Babylonian dialect is demonstrated by the story related in BT Nedarim 66b.

49. LS, p. 571. The late Akk. forms often have "p." For the history and nature of the instrument see CAD, Vol. B, p. 39a.


51. MD, p. 50. The old emendation (cf. Z, p. 67) of BH bdm in Isa. 44:25, Jer. 50:36 "divinners" to "brym" is far superior to Driver's etymology adopted by KBL (3d ed.) p. 105 and M. Wagner, "Beiträge zur Aramaismenfrage im attestamentlichen Hebräisch," Suppl. VT XVI (1967) 358 (= Mari baddum, a military official of some sort, attested nowhere else); but it is by no means certain in view of the uses of the verb bd in Ugaritic, the nouns bd in Phoenician, and bd IV in Hebrew (and Syr. bedyš).

42 / bēl dabābi

*bēl dabābi, "adversary"—Syr., CPA, Mand., BT, Targ. Hagiographa, and RH bēl dbb, "enemy," and derived forms of adjectives, abstracts, and the like in these as well as JPA, Targ. Onk., and Sam., all in the sense of "enmity." This is to be kept separate from the form dwbb occurring in Egyptian Aramaic in the hendiadys dynwdbb, a loan from the NA expression dīnu Udābabu, "suit and process," which is the only place in Aramaic where the juridical meaning of dwbb is preserved. For "adversary in court" the term bēl dyn is the usual expression. This fact militates against the possibility that the highly uncertain Mandaic verb dbb (pael), "to accuse(?)," is correctly interpreted or that the Akkadian semantic development from "adversary" to NB "enemy" could be the result of Aramaic influence.53 More difficult to determine is the relationship between Akk. dippu, "report," "rumor," and BH dibbēr, Syr., JAr., Mand. (conjectured for BH? cf. KBL [3d ed.] p. 352) ḫebbā with the same meaning.54 If, with von Soden (AHw., p. 146), one assumes that Akk. dabābu is cognate with Heb. dibbēr, then a loan relationship must be posited, since Hebrew would then not have had a verb *dbb, "to mutter." There is no reason to accept this suggestion, however, for the Heb. verb dibbēr is certainly a denominative from the word dābēr, as substantiated by its nonexistence in Ugaritic and Aramaic. Thus, there could have been a Hebrew/Aramaic cognate to Akk. dabābu which persisted in a nominal form, leaving only a trace as a verb.55 Several facts support this position: The Hebrew has a feminine form as opposed to the Aramaic and Akkadian masculine forms. A loan correspondence Akk. d Ar. ṭ is otherwise unknown (though such a development within Aramaic is equally difficult to explain). The meanings "report," "gossip," "matter" occur fully developed in NA and NB, but the term is extremely rare in earlier texts and only in the sense "word." One might even suggest possible Aramaic in-

btg) appears at first to be the unexpected form in the group of roots composed of a labial, dental, and velar stop meaning "to split": Arab., Ethiopic btk; Arab., Ar. f/ptq; Ar., Heb. (and Ug. bdqt?) bdq. But batqū is in fact the correct Akkadian reflex of original bdq; cf. GAG Ergänz., p. 8**, § 51d.


54. MHe ṭyb, "nature," "character," is derived from the Aramaic form. Good manuscripts of the Mishna do indicate a doubled b before suffixes, e.g. ṭglob (E. Y. Kutscher, orally).

55. The Rabbinic interpretation of Cant. 7:10 dābēb and their use of the verb dbb with "lips" in the clear meaning "to murmur" may well reflect more than just etymology by exegesis (cf. Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 276, and Targ. Canticles). Such an interpretation of the Biblical passage, to be translated "makes lips of sleepers murmur," is superior to some of the modern attempts to understand the phrase (see KBL [3d ed.] pp. 199 f.). Also see Arab. gbd and ṭbṭb.
fluence on the semantic development in late Akkadian. If it were a loan from Akkadian, the Hebrew form with d (as against Aramaic ṭ) and its frequent occurrence throughout the Old Testament would point to a very early loan indeed, a situation not in agreement with the nature of the word, which was clearly not borrowed in any juridical sense (see Chap. IV, n. 77).

* 

bēl dīni, "adversary in court"—Qumran, Syr., Mand., JAr. b'l dyn; possibly an early calque in Isa. 50:8 bēl mšpṭ. Though presumably bēl dīni was the most common expression for this concept in both NB and NA, the early peripheral attestations of the Akkadian form point to a possible Assyrian origin for the loan at a relatively early date.

* 

bēl piqitti, "commissioner," "overseer"—Imp. Ar.: Caquot, "Inscription" b'l pqt. Although the Aramaic text itself dates from the period of Babylonian control of Syria, this Akkadian term is apparently used here in its Assyrian sense of "royal commissioner" rather than the Babylonian usage as a temple official.

bī'u (bību), "drainage opening" MA, NA, SB—MH, JPA, Syr. bīp, Arab. bīb, "pipe," "gutter." The history of this term of uncertain origin is difficult to trace. The Akkadian orthographies indicate a pronunciation [bīw(u)]. Thus, unless spirantization of b was already operative at the time of borrowing, it could not be a loan into Aramaic. Syriac and BT (Sabb. 29a) also use the form bwby in a similar if not identical meaning as well as a homonym meaning "frying pan." (The Akkadian lexical list entry bubû, "part of an oven," is probably to be connected with the latter.) Note that bīb is found only in Syriac and Western Aramaic and in Assyrian, whereas bwby is only in Syriac and Babylonian Talmudic, suggesting that bwby may originate be a Babylonian form of the Assyrian and Western bīb. Cf. the hapax OB bubû, a toponymographical feature.

56. It must be remembered that ṭebbû and its several related verbal forms (but peal only three times?) are generally connected with Arab. and Ethiopic ṭbb (cf. LS, p. 265). The Ar. root abb could have assimilated to the root ṭbb of similar meaning, thus accounting for the shift d > ṭ.


58. Z, p. 24; AHw., p. 119. Earlier suggestions that the word dīn itself and the corresponding verbal root were borrowed from Akkadian (cf. Z, p. 24, LS, p. 145) have been shown incorrect by its common occurrence in Ugaritic. For bēl dyn in Qumran Aramaic see J. T. Milik, "Turfan et Qumran, Livre des Géants juif et manichéen," in Tradition und Glaube, Festgabe K. G. Kuhn (Göttingen, 1971) p. 124.

59. AHw., p. 134.
biltu - bītu

* biltu, "tribute"—BA bīw. The BA form is probably a corruption from *bīt. Occurring in sequence with hlk and mndh, it can scarcely be anything but a foreign word in Aramaic. It should be noted, however, that the three terms never occur together in Akkadian. Although biltu and maddatu are common together in NA, the BA group seems to be a reflex of the threefold list of Persian taxes represented in LB by the forms ilku, bāru, and nadi/anātu, the middle term being a loanword from Old Persian *bhara. It is thus conceivable that bīw is a corruption of the latter term rather than Akk. biltu. None of the attempts to find biltu in any other Aramaic texts or in Hebrew are convincing. The word bīw does occur in Jewish Aramaic, but only in reference to the Ezra passages.60

* bīrītu, "alley"—Syr. bryt�, Mand. byry郅, Qumran 5Q15 I bryt (const.), BT, and Targ. Proverbs 1:21 bryt郅. Jewish lexicographers have confused this word with others, but its use in Baba Bathra 40b together with ṣwq郅 to describe the types of streets in a city perfectly parallels Mandaic and Akkadian occurrences.61

* bīrtu, "citadel," "fort"—Eq., Persepolis, Behistun, BA, BH, Syr., JAr. byrt郅, "palace," "fortress," "temple." Albright's suggested etymology from a root wbr may be correct, but that does not rule out the possibility that we are dealing here with an Old Amorite word.62 Note the NB plural birānātu, corresponding to BH bīrāniyyāt (and JAr. byrnyt郅), both best explained as borrowed from Aramaic.63

bītu, "an area of land (requiring a given amount of seed)"—There are similar usages in Aramaic and Hebrew, but since the Akkadian is limited to Neo-Assyrian, one cannot determine in which language this method of area measurement originated.64

---


63. Z, p. 14; LS, p. 69; AHw., p. 129; Wagner, pp. 34 f.; KBL (3d ed.) p. 119. The possibility that bīrā is an old word in Aramaic is not ruled out by the form byrt in AP, No. 13:4, as would be the case if the scribe confused the form byrḥ and byrt in the absolute state (cf. egīrtu), for the obvious meaning requires the determined state. Thus, as usually interpreted, the form must be in error. See Persepolis, p. 20 for the same phenomenon in the Persepolis texts.

bubū, see bīšu.

* buḵānu, "pestle"—Syr., BT (JPA rare) bwkū, RH bwknh.
The etymology is uncertain, but the long ṭ in the Aramaic forms
points to a loan (see Phonology, in Chap. IV). 65

* buššītu, "termite"—Syr. bššyt, Targ. Proverbs and Job
b(w)ššyt. The earlier Akkadian form is buššītu. 66

* bašī, "reed mat"—Syr. bwry, pl. bwrt, Mand. (p)bwry, BT bwry, > Persian būryā. Note (CAD, Vol. B, p. 340b) that
the Akkadian reading with b rather than p is based on the Aramaic form, but this evidence is inconclusive, for BT and Mandaic
also have the form pwry. 67

bušinnu, "lamp wick" SB, NA—Syr., JPA, Sam., CPA bwšyn.
In light of the western distribution of the Aramaic and the
-innu ending, indicative of a foreign word in Akkadian, this
may well be a foreign word in both languages in spite of the
Semitic-looking š. 68

* dabābu, see bēl dabābi.

dajjālū, "scout," "inspector," (attendant?)—BT dyšl, 
"constable"; hardly > Ar. šayyel, "to walk about." The CAD
and von Soden differ as to the meaning and origin of the Akkad-
ian, found only in the later dialects. 69

daltu, "door"—Eg. dš, pl. dššyn; BT, Targ. Onk., and
Targ. Hagiographa dš; Sam. dršš; Mand. dyšt, dššt. The ex-
cellent suggestion of Zimmern's relating the Aramaic form dš
to the necessary Assyrian reflex of daltu: dassu, has been
less widely accepted than some of his more unlikely associa-
tions. 70 The phonetic correspondence is perfect, and this
etymology is far superior to a derivation from the root dwš, "to
thresh," "to tread." Interestingly the old Semitic word dalt
occurs in Aramaic only in the Sam. and Y. Targums, as a trans-
lation of BH delet. 71

65. Z, p. 36; LS, p. 73; AHw., p. 136.
66. Z, p. 52; LS, p. 75; AHw., p. 143.
67. Z, p. 35; LS, p. 95; AHw., p. 141.
story related in BT Nedarim 66b indicates that the Rabbis knew that in
the West bwšyn meant "lamp," whereas it was a pumpkin-like vegetable in
the East (cf. Mandaic). The latter may be related to the Akk. bušinnu
plant.
69. Z, p. 7; LS, p. 271; AHw., p. 150; von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXXVII
(1968) 270 (where "nicht echt akkad." must be an error for "eicht akkad.").
70. Not cited in DISO or AHw.
71. Z, p. 30; Additamenta, p. 153; E. Y. Kutscher, Words and Their
History (Jerusalem, 1961) p. 25. The Mandaic forms could represent new
formations after assimilation of the word dššk to the root dwš. Note the
dannatu, "valid tablet"—dnt, passim in Assyrian endorsements. It has been suggested that Nabatean tqp, "valid document," is a calque of the Assyrian form. 72

dannu (AHW. tannu, always spelled DAN-nu), "vat"—Syr., BT dnu, Mand. dnr, Arab. dann, "jar" (cf. also BH dwn and Jar. dny). According to CAD, Vol. D, p. 99a, the word derives from the Akk. adjective dannu, "strong," but this etymology is by no means certain. The term is restricted to NA and NB but may occur in Ugaritic as a container for bread. For the reading tannu compare Mand. tju, "primeval matrix." 73

dappu, "(wooden) board"—Syr., Jar., and MH dp(permissions) > Arab. daff(ah), "board," "tablet," "column," "page." The relationship here is difficult to analyze. The Akkadian, attested only for late NA, NB, and LB, looks very much like a loan from Aramaic. In addition there is the unusual NA by-form adappu. This word is generally treated together with ṭuppu, "tablet" < Sum. DUB (which appears to have been borrowed into ESA ṭp). In OB one finds the form dibbu/dippu for "plank" from Sum. DIB. Thus, it is assumed that dappu, too, is a Sumerian loanword from a form DAB, but all this is extremely uncertain. The form ṭp occurs in Aramaic, in AP, No. 26, but there the context involves wood. Why doesn't Sum. *DAB or Akk. dappu occur earlier if there really is such a Sumerian form? Taken as a whole, the evidence suggests that in the case of dappu we are dealing with a very old loanword (or an old culture word) which, after independent development in Aramaic, was re-borrowed into Akkadian. 74

dibbu, see above, s.v. bēl dabābi.

dīqāru, "bowl"—BT dqwr, "jug." As long recognized, the phonetic similarity between the names of the common household

72. Z, p. 19; AP, p. 32; Muffs, Studies, pp. 187 ff., 208. AP, No. 10:23 dnh, which Muffs (p. 184) terms "the most conclusive proof of the historic link between the docket tradition and the Elephantine papyri," is not unquestionably a form of this word. It may just mean "this"; cf. Palm. šlm dnh dy gynw (CIS II, No. 3922:1). For tqp compare as well BH tqp in Esther 9:29.

73. Z, p. 33; LS, p. 159; CAD, Vol. D, p. 99a; D. Weisberg, in HUCA XXXIX 77; KBL (3d. ed.) p. 218. For the western Jewish Aramaic forms see Aruch III 94. Note that in Akkadian it is a large vat, while in Aramaic and Arabic it is a much smaller vessel.

74. Z, p. 19; LS, p. 102; CAD, Vol. D, p. 106b; C. Conti-Rossini, Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis (Rome, 1931) p. 159. The Mand. hapax dwp (var. dp?) may be correct (with a > u before a labial) or corrupt. That Mand. hapax dwp means "parchment" (MD, p. 100) is very uncertain. On the variability of vowels in CVC signs in Sumerian, see W. W. Hallo, review, Bi.Or. XVIII (1961) 60.
vessels Akk. diqāru and Ar. (and Arab.) gidl, "pot," is almost certainly not coincidental. There is, however (contra Z, p. 33, LS, p. 649), no reason to regard the Aramaic as anything but cognate with Akkadian. The Akkadian word has no other etymology, whereas the metathesis and difference in form indicate a long history of separation. A descendant of the Akkadian form is apparently found in BT dqwṛ, however, a term of uncertain meaning but clearly a vessel of some sort. Is dqwṛ also the same word as BT d(y)gwlr, "basket," "vessel"?75

ebbūbu, "flute"—Syr., JA. ʾbwbr, MH ʾ(y)bwbr, Mand. ʾm/ntbr, all "flute," "tube"; Arab. ʾunbūb, "reed." Possibly cognate; cf. BH nbb, "to be hollow."76

ebbūrū, "harvest," "crop"—This is clearly cognate with and not a loan into Heb., Ar. ʾbwr, etc.77

* ēdīltu, "door" (hapax lex.)—Syr. ṣdl and ṣylt, "door leaves."78

* edū, "high water"—BT ʾ(y)dw(w)t, "foam of the sea."79 BH ṣdq (Gen. 2:6) has frequently been connected with this Akkadian term, itself a loanword from Sumerian. If this identification is correct, it is unusual to find no final vowel preserved in the loan (see Phonology in Chap. IV). One might suggest emendation, perhaps to ṣdw, as in Job 36:27, possibly to be interpreted as an absolute form.80

75. Y. Brand, Klei HaḤeres BeSifrut HaṬalmud (Jerusalem, 1953) p. 109. For the Akkadian and the literature see A. Salonen, Die Hausgeräte der alten Mesopotamier II (Helsinki, 1966) 71.

76. Z, p. 29; LS, p. 1; AḤw., p. 180. A. Ungnad, "Lexikalisches," ZA XXXI (1918) 248 argues on the basis of the OB (hapax) spelling e-bu-bi-im that the doubling and "m" are secondary, but in Old Babylonian we would expect assimilation, and single spellings of doubled consonants are common (CAG, p. 9).

77. Z, p. 41. Still so cited without any foundation by A. Salonen, Agricultura Mesopotamica (Helsinki, 1968) p. 258, and Ellenbogen, Foreign Words, p. 128. The Ugaritic form cited in AḤw. is highly suspect and very probably does not mean "harvest." In its original meaning ʾbwr occurs in a seventh century B.C. Arad ostracon; see Y. Aharoni, "Three Hebrew Ostraca from Arad" (Heb.), Eretz Israel IX (1969) 18.

78. Z, p. 30; LS, p. 5.

79. Perles, in OZL XXI 67. J. N. Epstein, Prolegomena ad litteras amoraticas (Jerusalem, 1962) p. 199, suggests that Mand. ʾdy is the same word as the BT. Though the translation in MD differs, corresponding to other attestations of the word, Epstein's interpretation cannot be ruled out. I am unable to find a meaning "flood" for Syr. ʾdy, as given by Epstein.

80. KBL (3d ed.) p. 11; Ellenbogen, Foreign Words, p. 13. Note (Chap. IV, p. 149) that no final vowel is preserved in two loans from Assyrian. Perhaps the Hebrew word is to be considered a loan from Assyrian as well.
egirtu, "letter" NA—AŠšur Ostracon, DEA, No. 19 (Ass.),
Eg., AD, BA, BH, Palm., Syr., CPA, JAR. ḫ(y)gr/t(3); Mand.
<ngirt>. The origin and direction of borrowing of this word
have been widely debated. A convenient summary of the history
of scholarship can be found in Wagner, p. 19. 81 I find it dif-
ferent to interpret the evidence as pointing to anything but an
Akkadian etymology here. A Persian etymology is ruled out by
the relatively early Akkadian and Aramaic occurrences. Von Soden
considers egirtu Aramaic in origin, saying that it "zu den
den nicht deverbalen Substantiven zu gehören scheint." 82 This is
highly improbable. Not only is the noun form qittal unusual
in Aramaic, 83 but the word itself was still foreign to the
scribes of Elephantine, who were uncertain of the absolute
form of the word, while in the Driver texts only the absolute
form with t, ḫgrt, is found, the same error which occurs in the
certain loanword lbt < libbatu. Nevertheless, a convincing
Akkadian etymology has yet to be proposed.

ekurru, "temple"—Eg. ḫgrw, "temple"; Targ. Proph. ḫgrw,
"pagan altar"; Mand. <kwro, "pagan temple." The two forms with
k and g are loans from Babylonian and Assyrian, respectively
(cf. Phonology in Chap. IV). The JAr. word must be separated
from the similar BA, Targ., and Syr. word ḫgr, "heap," which
has a good Semitic etymology, Ethiopic ḫgr, "mound." 84

*elīltu—This supposed model for Mand. ḫlltl, "purifica-
tion," "rinsing," does not exist. The correct Akkadian form
is tēlīltu. The roots are clearly cognate. 85

elippu, "ship"—Common Ar. ḫlp. Since this word
lacks an obvious Semitic etymology, perhaps it is an old cul-
ture word for "boat" along the upper Euphrates and thus cog-
nate in the two languages. 86

81. Subsequent bibliography: von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXXV 8; KBL (3d
ed.) p. 11; Muffs, Studies, p. 187, n. 4. As pointed out by E. Y. Kutscher
(oral), one must also take into account the similar Greek words ἁγγαρός,
ἀγγαρίων, ἀγγέλων.
82. Von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXXV 8.
83. R. Köbert, "Gedanken zum semitischen Wort- und Satzbau, 1-7,"
Or. n.s. XIV (1945) 278 ff.
84. Z, p. 68; AHw., p. 196; B. Porten, Archives from Elephantine
(Berkeley and Los Angeles) pp. 109, 155. Note that in Egyptian Aramaic
<gywr> serves as the term for the Jewish temple.
85. Cited by Baumgartner, in HUCA XXIII (1950-51) 58. Ar. ẖll cannot
possibly be a denominate from ḫw ḫlp, uhulu, "alkali" (as in KD, p.
148).
86. Z, p. 45; LS, p. 22; AHw., p. 198; A. Salonen, Die Wasserfahr-
zeuge in Babylonien (St.Or., Vol. VIII:4 [Helsinki, 1939]) p. 12. Both
spynh and ḫlp are general terms for "boat" but presumably had varying com-
emēdu—In NB imittu emēdu means to estimate and impose a
tax on a garden or field (cf. CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 123b), deriving
from the old Akkadian usage of emēdu in the sense of "to
impose (taxes)." As Kutscher has shown, MH ṣmd, "to estimate,"
"to evaluate," and its derivatives must be borrowed from this
Neo-Babylonian technical term. The BT forms ṣmd and ṣwmdu
most probably derive from the Hebrew usages, though a separate
development from Akkadian cannot be excluded. 87

In Syriac ṣmd means "to flee," which is clearly derived
from the well known idiomatic usages of Akk. emēdu in the
sense "to take refuge," "to flee to."

ērib bitti, see below, p. 153.

errēšu, "tenant farmer"—JĀr. and RH (Western), Sam.
ṛṣy (D) (rarely ṣryy > Arab. jirrû; Sam. ṣṛṣ, cṛṣ, "to work."
According to the CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 54a the interpretation
"tenant farmer" can no longer be upheld after the Old Babyloni-
ian period on the basis of the Akkadian texts, but this loan
suggests that this meaning was indeed maintained, at least in
Assyrian, for the change ṣ > s shows that this word was borrow-
ed from Assyrian. 88 The spellings with ṣayin are either merely
late orthographic confusions or false etymologies from the
root cṛṣ. The connection between this Akkadian word and the
proposed reading (ṣ)resnu in Caquot, "Inscription," 1. 3 re-

mains uncertain.

ersetu, "earth," used in the sense "underworld"—This has
been suggested as the etymology for Nerab ḫrst, "sarcophagus,"
and, although problematic, is far superior to the usual inter-
pretation of the latter as a development from cṛṣ, "couch."

C. Greenfield, "The Lexical Status of Mishnaic Hebrew" (Ph.D. diss., Yale
University, 1956) p. 275, suggests that ṣmdh in Mic. 1:11 is to be under-
stood as "tax," from imittu, and compares Arab. ṣmt, "to conjecture," "to
determine," as well. Cf. also Soqotri ḫimdēhin, "estimation," "approxima-

88. Z, p. 40; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 128; Additamenta,
p. 68, Jastrow's BT form ṣṛṣ > is incorrect (Dictionary, p. 120); see E.
71) 187 ff. Except for the hapax ḫrisētū, the dictionaries do not list
errēšu in NA. Since the Aramaic and Arabic forms preserve the long vowel
in the second syllable, the borrowed form must have been errēšu and not
*ährēšu as the abstract NA form might suggest. Apparently, in spite of CAD,
Vol. I/J, p. 54b, errēšu, as a borrowed Babylonian term, is to be found
in NA in the spelling LÔ.ENGAR.
50 / esittu - eṭēru

It seems, however, that the correct interpretation of the Aramaic is yet to be found. 89

* esittu, "mortar"—BT ʾsyṯ, ʾsyṯu, Syr. (lex.) ʾstṯ, Eastern Neo-Aramaic sitta. 90

Another word for mortar, the hapax Targ. Y II mzwkt (not in Neofiti!), should be viewed either as a mere orthographic error or as a pseudo-correction of the standard form mdwkt. A derivation from the rare Akk. form mazuktu is almost impossible in light of the common cognate form.

eṭemmu, "ghost"—A reflex of the Akkadian is perhaps to be found in BH ʾṭym but certainly not in MH ʾṭymn, JPA ʾṭmy, "bones" ʾṭm; nor is the Akkadian to be connected with Mand. ʾwdʾmt. 91

eṭēru, "to remove"; in NB "to pay"—BT ʾṣṭḏrṯ, a document indicating complete payment and transfer of ownership.

89. Proposed by G. R. Driver, in An.Or. XII 49 and "Brief Notes," PEQ, 1945, p. 11; E. Y. Kutscher concurred in "Contemporary Studies in North-Western Semitic," JSJS X (1965) 42. Driver's proof in PEQ, 1945, that ērṣetu means "grave" is incorrect, however. The lexical passage cited (incorrectly given as CIWA V 30, which is a broken parallel to the correct CT XVIII, No. 30 rev. 28-30; cf. CAD, Vol. E, pp. 308d, 309a) only shows that Sum. arali (E.KUR.BAD) can mean ērṣetu, "underworld," as well as bīt mūṭi and naqbaru, "grave," and not that those items on the Akkadian side of the list are equivalent.

A cuneiform parallel to Nerab ʾṛṣṭ, whatever its etymology, may actually occur. In a contemporary funerary inscription of an Aramean tribal chief, we find the word e-ṣi-it-ti in a precisely identical context (YOS I, No. 43:5, 13). This has been treated by the modern dictionaries as a form of eṣēmtu, "bone," "body frame" (cf. CAD, Vol. E, p. 342b), but the occurrence would be only the second time that that word is spelled with "tt" for /mt/ or /nt/ (cf. BWL, p. 44, 1. 93), though one might expect the Assyrians always to have pronounced it with [tt]. Albright treated the cuneiform word ("Notes on Assyrian Lexicography and Etymology," RA XVI [1919] 177) but translated "burial cairn," relating it to the Arab. waṣīdah, "stone enclosure." This is unlikely, however, for, just as in Nerab, the eṣītu is something moveable. The dictionaries may be correct, and in fact for Nerab ʾṛṣṭ a meaning "skeleton," or corpse" is not excluded by the context. This could be the NA equivalent of Bab. Šalantu, "corpse," borrowed into Aramaic (and when used in YOS I, No. 43, used as an Aramaic word). The "r" of the Aramaic form is disturbing but not impossible to account for. For a possible parallel see the usage of ʾṭmy, "bones," in the Uzziah inscription (see n. 91).

90. S. A. Kaufman, in Let. XXXVI 30 f.
91. For the BH, see KBL (3d ed.) p. 36. The meaning of the Mandic is uncertain. The famous Uzziah plaque (E. L. Sukenik, "An Epitaph of Uzziah, King of Judah," Tarbiz II [1930-31] 288 ff.) has proven that ʾṭmy is "bones," but for earlier comparisons see J. N. Epstein, "Gloses babyl-on-aramcoenes," REJ LXXIII (1921) 58.
But the verb *ctr, "to remove," does occur elsewhere in JAr., whereas such a noun form is unknown in Akkadian.  

*  
gabbu, "all"—See below, p. 152.  

gagû, "a building or section of the temple district reserved for the women of the nadîtu-class"—Syr. gwâru (lex.), "harlot." Note that this word is attested only in OB texts primarily from Sippar and in SB omen texts, which certainly preserve an old tradition; so although this etymology seems certain, the history of the borrowing remains obscure.  

gallâbu, "barber"—BH, Phoen., and Ar. glîb, "barber"; JPA and Syr., "razor." Evidence to determine whether these terms are borrowed or merely cognate is lacking.  

*  
gâmîrîru, "(door) bolt"—Mand. gîwrâ.  

gammidatu, NA, LB "a kind of garment"—Imp. Ar. (Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum, No. 7:7) gmydîru; MH gwmdîrt. Probably an old Aramaic loanword in Akkadian, but certainly not an Akkadian word.  

*  
gânu:nu, "living quarters," "bedroom"—Genesis Apocryphon, JAr. and RH, Syr., CPA gnûnrâ; Syr. and CPA byt gnûnrâ; Mand. gnûnrâ, BT gnnâ, "bridal chamber." It remains to be seen whether the Aramaic meaning is the result of independent semantic development of this loanword or represents a borrowing of a specific meaning of the Akkadian term not actually attested yet in our texts. If the latter, it could have been taken from a popular term or one used specifically in the cult (see CAD, gannunu hâ, mng. 2 b).  

gašîšu, "stake"—There is no reason to connect this with BT, RH gšswâ, "sounding pole," "sounder" < gšš, "to feel."  

*  
gâšu, NA "to come near"—BT, Mand. gw/ys. The NA form seems to be a development of nagâšu.  

94. Z, p. 28; LS, p. 117; AHW, p. 274.  
95. MD, p. 75.  
97. Z, p. 32; LS, p. 122. In Aramaic the word was probably frequently confused with the root gnâ, "to lie down," "to sleep."  
98. Z, p. 31; Salonen, Wassertfährzeuge, p. 110. The meaning "sounding pole" for the Hebrew is uncertain. The BT references seem to refer to those who make the soundings.  
99. The relation between gw/ys and Syr. gawsâ, "refuge," is uncertain.
gerû - giššu

* gerû, see below, s.v. rašû.

* gînû, "regular offering"—Mand. gyny (pl.), "pagan sacrifices." The form was probably borrowed as a collective.100

* giššu, "bridge"—Syr., JAr. g(y)šr, MH gšr, > Arab. ǧîsr. The term occurs only in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian but has a feasible etymology only in Akkadian. It is to be considered the same word as the one found earlier in the meanings "log" and "barricade" (with Akk. contra CAD) and cannot possibly be separated from the word guššu (q.v.).101

* giššu (gilšu), "hip," "flank"—Syr. gs, BT gys, Targ. Onk. and Targ. Isaiah pl. gyssyn, "hip," "flank," "side"; Mand. gyşn, "cheeks." Note especially its use for translating BH terms for "loins" in Peshitta Jer. 30:6 and Targ. Onk. Lev. 3:4, 15. Except for the Targums, the word is restricted to Eastern Aramaic, developing into one of the common words for "side."102

* giššu (KUD.G1.D.A), "parchment document"—JAr. and MH gêš, ǧîššû, "document," "bill of divorce"; Mand. gyš₃, "document," and in magic bowls, "document of expulsion"; Syr. gîš, "will." The term was borrowed only in its general meaning of a parchment document, so-called because it had only one column, like a cuneiform giššu. It use as the term for "bill of divorce" was a Jewish development, no doubt deriving from its frequent usage in transactions involving women, perhaps as a euphemism. The earliest attestation is Murabba-at (DJD II) 19 I:9, II:21, giš ȝbqyn, already in the context of divorce, but it is still used in contexts other than divorce in BT. Note the independent development in Syriac to another specific type of document. The Mandaic magic bowl usage is definitely a

100. MD, p. 91; if this translation of the form gynû is correct, it represents an assimilation to the verb gnû; cf. gynyngû.


102. This comparison was first suggested by W. F. Albright (RA XVI 180), who correctly termed it a loan from Assyrian. Not yet aware of the construct form giliš, he was led into a false etymology. R. Campbell-Thompson ("Assyrian Prescriptions for Stone in the Kidneys," Afo XI [1937] 339, n. 13) also compared the Aramaic with the Akkadian but gave no other etymology and did not specifically mention borrowing. When the forms with š turned up, F. R. Kraus (Texte zur babylonischen Physiognommatik [Afo Beih. III (Graz, 1939)] p. 27, n. 28) showed that the likelihood of a cognate relationship was slim, though he was not aware of Albright's proposal of a loan relationship. To my knowledge this suggestion has never been reconsidered, yet the relationship is obvious, especially since the Aramaic form is characteristic of Eastern Aramaic. Etymologically, giššu is probably to be connected with Arab. ḥls, "to sit."
gušūru - harišu / 53

borrowing from Jewish Aramaic and not an independent word from
the root gšr ( < ḫšr). 103

* gušūru, "log, "beam"—Eg. gšr, gšwr, Syr. gšwr§ (lex.), kšwr§, JAr. kšwr§, Mand. (modern form?) kyšr§. Probably of
Sumerian etymology (see gišru). The change of g to k before
the unvoiced sibilant is an Aramaic development which occurred
after the reduction of the vowel in the initial syllable.104

habi, "earthenware jug"—MH, BT, Syr. ḫbyt(§); Arab.
ḫabiyyah; Ethiopic ḫabyay. The relationship is unclear, but the
view that the western forms derive from an as yet unattested
Akkadian feminine form *habītu is unfounded. The attested Ak-
kadain form is rare and limited to Standard and Neo-Babylonian.
The Arabic form with "ḥ" also makes a loan through Aramaic un-
likely though not impossible (see below, p. 142). No satis-
factory etymology has been proposed for any of the forms, and
the origin of habī remains obscure.105

halīṣu, "some leather object" rare SB lex. and NE—Syr.
ḥlṣ§, "skin bottle." Cf. also RH ḫlṣ, "loop" or "knot(?)".106

* hámū, "straw"—AP, No. 15, Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum, No.
2 ḫm. The etymology of the Akkadian word is unknown, but as it
occurs nowhere else in Aramaic, one may safely assume that hámū
was borrowed in the process of an Aramaic remodeling of the NA
phrase lū hámū lū ḫusābu, "be it straw or splinter," into nn ḫm
ēd ḫwţ, "from straw to string."107

harišu, "moat"—Old Aramaic (KAI, No. 202 A 10) ḫṛṣ, BH
ḫrwṣ, "moat"; MH ḫrṣ, "trench"; Targ. ḫrṣ§, channel." All

103. Z, p. 19; LS, p. 113; Ahw., p. 294; HM, p. 534. The various
Aramaic meanings are hardly derived from another LB usage of giṭṭu, "quit-

claim" (cf. Ahw., p. 294).

104. Z, p. 31; LS, p. 137; Ahw., p. 300. For the sound change cf.
J. N. Epstein, Grammar of Babylonian Aramaic (Tel Aviv, 1960) p. 18; T.
§ 22. The form gšr in Targ. Ezek. 27:5 may actually be meant for "bridge,"
not out of place in the context of Tyre (see as well Kimchi's commentary
on the verse), but if "ship beam" is meant, it may be a development from
"bridge" (note the English nautical term) rather than a survival of the
old form. For the uncertain Mand. kšwr§ see MD, p. 224.

Fremdwörter, p. 168. D. Weisberg, in HUCA XXXIX 77 f., proposes that the
hapax variant ḫbyḥ cited in the Aruch represents the missing link in the
Akkadian "parental development" *habiatu > *habi. This is incorrect.
The Hebrew variant, at best, is only a back-formation from the plural form
ḥbywt. In addition, a form *habi is impossible in late Akkadian.

106. Ahw., p. 312.

the evidence points toward a native North West Semitic formation for this word.  

harurtu, hapax NA "throat"—Syr. ḫrwš.t. The relationship is very uncertain. The Syriac word would have to have been borrowed from an unattested Babylonian form, while an etymology from ḫrš is not ruled out.  

* hašbu, "clay," sherd," "pot"—BA, Jar., CPA ḫšp, Mand. ḫšp, "sherd," "clay"; MH, BT, Syr. ḫšb, Mand. ḫšby, ḫšwby, "pot"; Syr. ḫšp, "pot," ḫzb, "tub"; Arab. ḫzfr, "pottery." It is difficult to determine the relationships among these many forms. The earliest attested meaning of the Akkadian appears to be "sherd." The best explanation of the various forms appears to be to consider hašbu and ḫšp as parallel developments of an old culture word and take ḫšb and ḫšp as loans from Akkadian perhaps from different periods or dialects.  

haššinnu, "axe"—There is no reason to suppose that this old culture word, Ar. haššīn (Arab., Ethiopic ḫaššīn) necessarily entered Aramaic through Akkadian.  

haššašu, "to need," "to desire"—BA, Syr. ḫš, CPA ʾššwb, ʾšthš, "to be required, needed, useful." The limited distribution of the Aramaic is the only reason to suspect a loan here. The shape of the root ḫšb, with ḫ in first and third positions, is as unusual in Akkadian as it is in Aramaic.  

*haššu, "to pay the ilku"—AD, No. 8:6 ḫšl. Driver's attempt to relate the Aramaic to Akkadian makes faulty use of the Akkadian lexical material. It is true that the logograms used for the verb haššu, "to crush," are also used for verbs  

108. Cf. KBL (3d ed.) p. 338. The corresponding sense of the verb ḫrš is at home in North West Semitic, not in Akkadian, where herd and heritu are the native forms. Note as well the limited distribution of the Akkadian.  

109. W. F. Albright, "Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology II," AJSL XXXIV (1917-18) 240; H. Holma, Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen, eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie (Helsinki, 1911) p. 42; Sh, p. 259; Ahw., p. 329; CAD, Vol. H, p. 121a. Von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXV 10, considers the Akkadian to be a loan from Aramaic and is thus forced to accept a Babylonian origin for the change to št in Syriac.  

110. Z, p. 33; Sh, p. 251; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 169; Salonen, Hausgeräte II 99; E. Y. Kutscher, "kwk (uvne mišpaṭa)," Eretz Israel VIII (1967) 276. The Old Babylonian occurrence in MSL VII 207, l. 32 is uncertain, but the word does occur in an Old Babylonian mathematical text from Susa, MDP XXXIV 27, l. 65, where it probably means sherd, since its coefficient is different from that for clay as given in the similar text MCT Ud.  

111. Z, p. 12; Sh, p. 251; Salonen, Agricultura, p. 150.  

meaning "to give," but whatever other values its logograms may have, when equated with hašālu they only mean "to crush." There is, however, one Neo-Babylonian text in which the verb hašālu might occur in a precisely identical context. In VAS VI, No. 188:13 we read i-ha-pa-la- (<CAD and Ahw., s.v. hapālû, a hapax), but in Neo-Babylonian script PA and ŠA are rather similar signs, so we may have a modern copyist's error here. In any case the origin and etymology remain obscure.

Some Eastern Aramaic noun forms from the root ḫšl may in fact be continuations of similar Akkadian forms. Compare BT ḫšylṭ and Akk. hašlatu, kinds of beer.113

haštu, haltu, "pit," "grave"—Compare the Mandaic hapax h₂jṭš, the location of the throne of the lord of the underworld.

hašû, "lungs," "entrails"—Mand. ḫš₂, ḫš₂ʾš, Arab. hašā, "bowels." These can hardly be cognate since the Akkadian is almost certainly cognate with the word for "chest." Heb. ḥāze, Ar. ḥāḍā, Arab. ḥida. Thus a loan is possible.

ḥātu, "to search carefully," "to pay out"—Possibly in the meaning "to examine" in Ezra 4:12 ḫytw; compare the use of the Akkadian with temennu, "foundation" (<CAD, Vol. H, pp. 160b, 161a). In the meaning "to pay" this verb has been suggested for Sabbath Ostracon, 1. 6, but the reading and the meaning are uncertain.114

* hazannu, "mayor," "chief magistrate"—Aššur tablet, No. 4:2; Caquot, "Inscription," "mayor"; JAr., MH ḥzn(ʾ), "overseer."115

hibišt̄u, "cuttings"—Syr. ḫbš, "wood shavings."116

* himētu, "butter," "ghee"—Syr. ḫwtš, Targ. Proverbs 30:


115. Z, p. 6; Ahw., p. 338; CAD, Vol. H, p. 165; Kutscher, Words, pp. 47 f. The reading ḥzn ḫlgl < hazan ekalli in Aššur Tablet 4:2 was pointed out to me by Prof. E. Lipiński; see below, n. 364. Although the origin of hazannu remains obscure (not from ḫy, cf. CAD, Vol. H, p. 165b; Gelb, MAD, No. 3, p. 136), its limitation outside of Akkadian to the Aššur Tablet, to the Babylonianizing Syrian inscription, and to late Jewish sources makes a loan quite certain.

116. LS, p. 213. The Syriac term is not used at all as the Akkadian is. Cf. Arab. ḫašāb, "wood."
56 / himṣu — hultuppû

33 ḫɔryt (read ḫɔwt, var.: ḫɔ̄mt [Hebraism]). The loan from Babylonian is shown by the w for the original m. It is noteworthy that the expected cognate form with m occurs nowhere in Aramaic.117

* himṣu, "fatty tissue"—Mand., BT (Hull. 49b) hymṣ.118

* hinnu, "ship's cabin" (lex.)—AP, No. 26:11 ḫn, Arab. hin(?)< Persian? This is a culture word of uncertain origin.119

* hirītu, "ditch," "canal"—Syr. ḫɔryt (ḥerītā).120

* hittu, "architrave"—Syr. ḫt (ḥettā), "plank" (supported by columns, cf. I Kings 7:3).121

* hubullu, NB "interest"—Syr. ḫwbl; Mand. ḫbw1, ḫbwly; Targ. Onk. and Targ. Hagig., BT ḫ(y)bwy. This noun is to be separated from the BH verb ḫbl, "to seize a pledge," which is not a loan.122

hultuppû, "whipping rod"—J. N. Epstein, whose reading hulduppû is not inconsistent with the known Akkadian spellings, connected this word to the rare BT hrdwph, traditionally interpreted as a kind of reed cage. The only thing certain about the hrdwph, however, is that it is an instrument or mode of punishment. Since no other satisfactory etymology is known, Epstein's identification may be correct in spite of the imperfect phonetic correspondence.123

118. AHW., p. 346. The BT form with h is the form cited in the Aruch; variants have ḫ (see Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 347).
119. Z, p. 45; AHW., p. 347; Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 82.
120. Z, p. 44; LS, p. 208. See n. 108.
121. Z, p. 31; LS, p. 263; AHW., p. 349. The meaning of hittu as accepted in theCAD, AHW., and Salonen, Türen was challenged by Möllig, in WZKM LXII (1969) 299 f.
122. Z, p. 18; AHW., p. 351; KBL (3d ed.) pp. 274 f. All consider the BH to be a borrowing from Akkadian as well, but this is clearly not the case. Akk. hubullu has two meanings, the older "debt" (maintained in NA habullu) and the MB and NB "interest"; and the related verb habalû B means "to borrow." There is clearly no connection here with the meaning of BH ḫbl, "to seize a pledge," though granted both are aspects of the loan transaction. The fundamental element of ḫbl, as opposed to ḫst, is the seizure, not a voluntary pledge, and it should be considered a cognate of Akk. habalû A, "to ravage (a person)," Ar. (and LB) ḫbl, "to despoil," "to damage." The similarity of the BH nouns (only in Ezekiel ḫbôl and ḫbôlûn to NA habullu may be coincidental or a Masoretic assimilation to the Aramaic word "interest." Note that they are always spelled defectively.
hūgu, "rung of a ladder" (SB, NB, NA)—Syr., BT ḥawqā (JPA also ʿwwq). The origin of the term is uncertain, but in light of the apparent borrowing of the word for ladder, simmilltu, a loan here is not unlikely.124

* hurdi, "reed mat"—Mand. hwrdp; BT hwrdp, hwdrp, "reed mat"; Arab. ḥ/hurdiyy, "reed roof."125

huṭṭīmmu, huṭṭīmmu, "snout," "muzzle"—Syr. ḥrtwm; MB ḥrtwm, ḫtm; Targ. Y ḫtm; Arab. ḫṭḳm, ḡrtūm. The Akkadian occurs only in Neo- and Late Babylonian; its etymology is unknown.126

* igāru, "wall"—Eg. ġgr, "wall"; Uruk ig-ga-ri, "wall" or "roof"; Syr. ʿeggārā, JAr. ʿigār and ʿiggār, Sam., CPA ġgr, Mand. ʾ/āngār> ġgr, ġnār, āngār, all in the meaning "roof." That the Egyptian Aramaic word means "wall" is shown by the phrase ġgr bā, "wall to wall," in describing property lines and even more conclusively in AP, No. 5:5, where an ġgr is described as joining another house "from the ground upwards." Thus, it would seem at first glance that this is a late loanword occurring first in its original sense and then developing a different meaning. The circumstances are not so clear, however. Although the Akkadian is attested only in the meaning "wall," the Sumerian word from which the Akkadian was presumably borrowed is translated in an Old Babylonian lexical text by the word "roof." It is possible, therefore, that we are dealing with a very old culture word taken into Aramaic meaning the entire superstructure of a building, occurring in Egyptian Aramaic with exactly this meaning or more specifically "wall" under the influence of Akkadian. Its use as the only common Aramaic word for "roof" is also suggestive of an ancient borrowing.127

124. Cf. B. Landsberger, "Lexikalogisches Archiv 3. Nachtrag,", ZA XLII (1934) 166, n. 4. The correspondence of Akkadian ū to Aramaic aw would seem to speak against a loanword relationship here. To be sure, Syriac has mawtānā and sawtānā corresponding to Akk. māṭānu and ʿutappu, but the first is not unquestionably a loan and the diphthong of the second can be explained (see p. 150). In any case Jewish Aramaic has ū in these cases, while, it, too, clearly has a diphthong in ḥwwq, as indicated by the spelling with double waw.


126. LS, p. 256.

127. Z., p. 31; LS, p. 5; AHw., p. 366; CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 39; DISO, p. 4. The word is possibly pre-Sumerian. The Old Babylonian text (in two copies), as shown now by ML XII 201, is to be read: lū E.SIGa-dā-šub-ba : mahšām bēl Ħūrim, "one felled by a roof." (For the construction see von Soden, GAG Ergänz., p. 12", citing the old incorrect reading mahšām igārim.) G. R. Driver, "The Aramaic Papyri from Egypt: Notes on
ikkaru, "farmer"—BH ḫikkār, MH, JAr. ḫ(y)kr, Syr. ḫkr (and denom. verb), CPA ḫr (translates BH), Mand. ḫ/xkr, > Arab. ḥa/ikkār.128

Iku, "ditch"—Syr. ḫyg, "stream."129

ilku, "duty (on land or produce)"—Bab. dockets, AD, No. 8, BA ḥlk. Note that in DEA, Nos. 73 and 79 the cuneiform text actually has ilku and the Ar., ḥlk.130

immati (mostly Assyrian and peripheral), "when"—Common Ar., MH ḫ(y)mt(y). (Perhaps in UT 67 I: 18 ḫmt.) This rather unexpected borrowing may result from the common occurrence of immati in Neo-Assyrian legal terminology.131

ina libbi, "within," "there"—In Egyptian Aramaic bgw is used without a suffix in a very similar fashion.132

ina šilli, "under the protection of"—In the Behistun inscription bṭlhl zy is a direct loan-translation from the Akkadian text. Note, however, that zy rather than the construct state is used.

inbu, "fruit"—BA ḫnb, "fruit"; Targ. ḫnb, ḫyb, Syr. ṣb(b), "fruit," "produce." In spite of Heb. ṣḥb, "blossom," ṣḥḥb, "fresh grain," Arab. ṣḥb, "meadow," and Amharic ḫbb, "blossom," there is good reason to assume that the cited forms have been influenced by Akkadian: The dissimilation b > nb is otherwise unknown in Imperial Aramaic, the meaning is al-

Obscure Passages," JRAS, 1932, p. 77, suggested that the feminine gender of the word in Egyptian Aramaic was the result of Akkadian influence.

128. Z., p. 46; LS, p. 20; AHW., p. 368; CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 54. Salonen, Agricultura, p. 343, suggests reading the Akk. form ḫikkaru on the basis of the Aramaic and Biblical Hebrew forms with long ḫ, but the length could be secondary in Aramaic. The word is almost certainly one of the pre-Sumerian group (cf. Salonen, Fussbekleidung, pp. 109, 115) > Sum. engar > Akk. ḫkaru, but could there be any relationship between ḫkaru and MH ḫkw lr, ḫkyr etc., "tenant farmer" (cf. Arab. ḫkr, Fraenkel Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 189)?

129. Z., p. 44; LS, p. 14; AHW., p. 370. This comparison is probably correct. Highly doubtful, however, are the possible connections with MH ḫwgh, BT ḫ(w)gy, and Mand. ḫ(w)g because of the clear MH "c". Perhaps the BT and Mand. forms are to be separated from the Mishnaic word, in which case they might be from an LB form ḫg.

130. Z., p. 10; AHW., p. 371; KBL, p. 1069. The model is clearly the common term which occurs in LB; cf. CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 78.

131. Z., p. 70; LS, p. 27. E. Y. Kutscher’s study of the Aramaic forms of this word ("Leshon Hazal," in Sefer Henech Yalon, ed. S. Lieberman [Jerusalem, 1963] pp. 267 f.) is authoritative and fairly convincing, but many uncertainties still remain. Note, for example, the clear long vowel in the Neo-Syriac form ḫm. There seems to be no reasonable alternative to an Akkadian origin, however.

132. Z., p. 70; AP, p. 6; DISO, p. 48.
ways "fruit" and not "blossom" or "freshness," and Syriac has the cognate to aryawan in the form hbb, hbb, "blossom," along-
side of the word aryawan, "fruit." In Mandaic we have the op-
position aryawan to aryawan, "fruits," and aryawan, "grape," but the for-
mer might possibly belong with Syr. hbb. The Mand. form
aryawan to aryawan could mean either "grape" or "fruit," but the context
favors the latter. 133

aryawan, "festival"—BH?, Targ. Y and CPA aryawan, "season," 
"time." This etymology is hardly convincing, but neither are
the other proposed etymologies for aryawan. 134

* aryawan, "assigned quota, tax, field (on which aryawan work
is to be performed)"—BH aryawan, "tribute"; Persepolis aryawan,
meaning uncertain; Targ. Isaiah 5:10, Syr. aryawan, Iraqi and
Lebanese Arab. aryawan, aryawan, "field." Because of the sibilant
(see Phonology, in Chap. IV) both the Hebrew and Persepolis
forms must derive from Babylonian, that is from the meaning
"quota" and not the specific Neo-Assyrian tax. For the Per-
sepolis formula I would suggest a meaning like "as part of the
(ritual offering) quota of year X." Since the meaning "field"
for the Akkadian is restricted in the texts we know now to
OAKK., OB, and Nuzi, it is not unlikely that the borrowing in
this meaning took place at that early time in the vernacular of
northern Mesopotamia, especially as this meaning is re-
stricted almost entirely to Syriac. 135

* aryawan, "weaver"—BT (Ab.Zar. 20b) aryawan, Syr. (lex.)
aryawan, aryawan. 136

133. Z., p. 55; LS, p. 1; KBL, p. 1017; KBL (3d ed.) p. 2. The view
expressed here follows B. Landsberger, The Date Palm and Its By-products
according to Cuneiform Sources (AFO Beiheft XVII [Graz, 1967]) p. 19, n.
52b. The Akkadian is usually considered cognate with Sem. aryawan, "grape"
(cf. AHw., p. 381), which is reasonable, but there are even difficulties
with this: cf. Ug. aryawan and the unique to Akkadian aryawan, "to sprout lux-
uriously." The nasalization "np" is found in Hat. aryawan < aryawan.

134. Z., p. 63; B. Landsberger, Der kultische-Kalender der Babylonian
pp. 6 ff.; KBL (3d ed.) p. 91. For other etymologies see the older dic-
tionaries. F. Schultess' comparison with aryawan ("Aramäisches IV," ZA
35:16, is phonetically impossible. Neo-Akk. aryawan shows the correct spelling.

135. Z., p. 38; LS, p. 52; AHw., p. 395; KBL (3d ed.) p. 92; A.
Frayha, A Dictionary of the Non-Classical Vocabularies in the Spoken Arabic
of Lebanon Collected and Annotated (Beirut, 1947) p. 97; Persepolis, p.
54. For aryawan in Targ. II Esther 1:3, see Additamenta, p. 70. Persepolis
aryawan is hardly to be related to aryawan, "intoxicating drink"; nor is there
any reason to consider Akk. aryawan, "beer," to be anything but cognate to
Ar. aryawan, Heb. aryawan, etc. (apparently contra Bowman, in Persepolis).

136. Z., p. 27; AHw., p. 397; R. Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus (2
60 / ištānu - iz/ṣqāṭī

* ištānu, "north"—Syr. ʾṣtn, Mand. (c)st²n, BT and Targ. Job 37:22 ʾṣtn, "north wind." 137

* ištaru, ištarutu, "goddess"—Magic bowls ʾ(y)str Mand. cṣṭ(y)r, Syr. ʾstr. 138

išṭēn, "one"—Though this suggestion was long ago shown to be incorrect, the Akkadian form is still often cited as the origin of BH ʾšty in the word for "eleven." The Ugaritic and South Arabian evidence leaves absolutely no doubt that all these terms are merely cognate. The Eg. form ʾṣtr used in measuring terminology, whether or not it indeed has something to do with the meaning "one," has no other connections with Akkadian. 139

* itannu, "interstice (of a net)"—Mand. ʾʾṣṭn, "mesh," "network." 140

ittimāli, "yesterday"—BH ʾṭmml (I Sam. 10:11 ʾittēmml); Common Ar. ʾṭml(y). The initial aleph of the Hebrew-Aramaic forms can hardly be anything but prothetic, for all of the West Semitic forms except for the Hebrew hapax have a single, not a double t. The Akkadian form, traditionally explained as coming from ina timāli, occurs only in Neo-Assyrian. 141

iz/ṣqāṭī, "fetters"—The relationships here are difficult, and several separate words have been confused in the literature. The CAD and AHW. differ on whether the Akkadian is native or a late borrowing folk-etymologized as is qāṭī. In any case there is absolutely no evidence to support the theory

Glossen," OLZ VIII (1905) 385. This word was also previously read in the Babylonian docket DEA, No. 96: zy ʾṣṣpr. Collation of the tablet reveals that the correct reading is zy tāṭr, corresponding to the cuneiform ša ṭēṣṣet-ēṭīr.

137. Z, p. 45; LS, p. 38; AHW., p. 399; CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 270a. Except for peripheral OB, the Akkadian form is always spelled ištānu. This does not rule out a loan, however; see Phonology, Sibilants in Chap. IV.


139. The refutation of the loanword theory was stated most clearly by J. Lewy, "Apropos of the Akkadian Numerals išt-īa-na and išt-ē-na," Ar.Or. XVII (1949) 111, n. 8. Nevertheless, in KBL (2d ed.) and Ellenbogen, Foreign Words, p. 129, there is still agreement voiced with Z, p. 65. For Eg. see DISO, p. 224.


141. Z, p. 70; LS, p. 827; KBL (3d ed.) p. 99. For the Akkadian see GAG § 722b. The Aramaic form with final y is limited to Syriac and Targums Onkelos and Jonathan. Thus, one may assume that the form with -y was the Imperial Aramaic form, showing a remnant of a final long vowel or diphthong (cf. Geʾez tīmalem).
that the Akkadian word is the source of the hapax Targum Jerem­
iah "zqy\textsuperscript{2}, "fetters," let alone the Common Ar. "zgh/t\textsuperscript{2},
"signet ring." The BH hapax "zqym" (for which "zqy\textsuperscript{2} is the
targumic translation) is more difficult to explain, but its
Qr\textsuperscript{2} reading, the common Hebrew and Aramaic zq/egqim/n (Syr.
also zanq\textsuperscript{2}), is hardly a loan from a nonexistent Akk. *"sinqu.
Similarly, there is no reason to regard the Aramaic and Arabic
root znq, "to make tight," as a denominative verb or as any­
thing but cognate to Akk. san\textsuperscript{2}qu.\textsuperscript{142}

\textit{kakku}, "club," "weapon"—Syr., Targ. Yi and BT, Mand.,
Pehlevi logograms kk\textsuperscript{2}, "molar," "tooth." Since the only pos­
sible semantic development would seem to be "molar (tusk?)"
> "club," the Aramaic term would appear to be cognate with Ak­
kadian, not a loan from it.\textsuperscript{143}

\textit{kalapp/bbu}, "pick," "axe"—BH k\textit{elapp\textsuperscript{2}; JPA, Targ. Proph.,
Hagiog., Syr. kwib\textsuperscript{2}, "axe." This is an old culture word of
indeterminate origin; note that in Akkadian it is limited to
Assyrian and that it occurs in Hittite. The differences in
the vowels preclude a loan.\textsuperscript{144}

\* \textit{kalakku}, "raft" NA—Syr. klk\textsuperscript{2}, Iraqi Arabic kalak.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{142} For the Akkadian controversy: CAD, Vol. I/J, p. 205; W. von
Soden, "Izq\textsuperscript{2}tu, i\textsuperscript{2}mq\textsuperscript{2}tu 'Kettenringe,' ein aramäisches Lehnwort," AfO XX
35; LS, pp. 201, 203; KBL (3d ed.) p. 266. Von Soden's interpretation is
highly preferable. As he suggests, the Akkadian and the late Targumic
words for "fetters" could be derived from Ar. \textit{\textipa{hiizq\textsuperscript{2}}}, but there is no way
that the "c" of "\textipa{zq\textsuperscript{2}th}, "signet ring," already attested in Imperial Ara­
maic, could be derived from \textipa{\textit{\hat{a}h}}/\textipa{\textit{\hat{a}}} at such an early period. Further, one
can understand semantic developments from "ring" into "fetters" and "sig­
et ring," but a development from "fetters" into "signet ring" is very dif­
ficult; "\textipa{zq\textsuperscript{2}h}, "signet ring," could be a completely separate word. Compare
Arab. \textipa{\textit{\textipa{\textipad{dq}}}}, "to mark," "to stigmatize," Ar. \textipa{\textipa{\textipad{dq}}\textsuperscript{2}}, "curl" (and BT \textipa{\textipa{\textipad{dq}}} "press
together").

\textsuperscript{143} Z, p. 12; LS, p. 326; AHW., p. 422. See especially Additamenta,
p. 221. While not indicated in AHW., there is some agreement among Sumero­
logists that \textit{kakku} is a loan from Sum. GAG, the famous Mesopotamian cone­
shaped nail or peg. On the one hand there is no textual or lexical sup­
port for this theory, though GAG does mean "arrowhead" (see E. Salonen,
\textit{Die Waffen der alten Mesopotamier} [St. Or., Vol. XXXIII (Helsinki, 1965)]
p. 123), nor do I know of any significant archeological evidence that any
standard macehead was of this shape. On the other hand, the canine teeth
and pre-molars are rather similar in shape to a GAG, and some relationship
here cannot be ruled out; nevertheless, there remains little likelihood
that the Aramaic word was a late borrowing from Akkadian.

\textsuperscript{144} Z, p. 12; LS, p. 328; AHW., p. 424; KBL (2d ed.) p. 433; C.
Rabin, in Or. n.s. XXXII 124.

\textsuperscript{145} Z, p. 45; LS, p. 329; AHW., p. 423; A. Salonen, \textit{Hausgeräte I}
(Helsinki, 1965) 200.
kalāku - kanūnu

* kalāku, "storehouse," "grain silo"—BT ḫlk〈(correct variant of ḫlk)〉. 146

kalūbu, "hook(?)—Mand. kw1b〈(hook)." The Akkadian occurs only in one broken context. 147

* kamāru, "a fish"—BT, Targ. YI, Targ. Hagiog., YT, kwwr〈, Mand. ksr〈2〉, Phrah. iii 2 kwr, "(salt-water?) fish." This is certainly from Akkadian (< Sumerian), but except for rare lexical attestations the Akkadian is known only from Old Babylonian texts. 148

kamāšu, "to bow down"—Greenfield derives BT kwṣ, "to contract," "to shrink," from this. His suggestion must be considered rather unlikely, for kwṣ is clearly just another by-form of the more normal BT form qwṣ, Mand. kbṣ. 149

* kannu, "a large vessel"—Mand. kwn〈, "vessel." This meaning of the word is found only in Akkadian and Mandaic and is thus apparently an inherited word in the latter. In its primary meaning "base," it is to be considered cognate with and not a loan into Heb. kēn, Syr. kannâ, etc. 150

* kanūnu, "brazier"—Palm. knwn〈, Syr. knwn〈, BT knwn〈, Mand. knwn〈 > Arab. kănūn〈. 151

146. J. N. Epstein, in Festschrift, pp. 297 ff. There would not appear to be any connection between this eastern term and MI klyk/bh, "box," "bier."

147. Z. p. 42; A. Salonen, Hippologica Accadica (Helsinki, 1955) p. 158.


149. J. C. Greenfield, "Studies in Aramaic Lexicography I," JAOS LXXII (1962) 296. The original form of the root is qps〈 (Akk. kap/bāsu). We must posit the development qps〈 > Proto-Babylonian Aramaic qbs〈 > kbṣ〈, kwṣ, and qwṣ as dialectal variants. BT k(w)bs〈, "cluster of dates," probably represents a form derived from a related root (compare Syr. qps), and hardly derives from hapax Akk. kibṣu, "pressed," said of dates (for which see Landsberger, Date Palm, p. 54, n. 188).

150. Z. p. 33. The relationship between what appears to be a re-duplicated form of this word, kankānu, and MI qnqīn is uncertain. The Akkadian seems originally to mean "stand" but is also used as a "storehouse for beer." The Hebrew word means a large vessel in the cellar for liquids. Complicating the situation is Ug. kktnt, also a vessel for liquids.

151. Z. p. 32; LS, p. 333; AHw., p. 481; A. Salonen, "Die Ūfen der alten Mesopotamier," Baghdader Mitteilungen III (1964) 108. The Akkadian, whose older (or Babylonian?) form is kinūnu, may be a loanword from Sumerian KI.NE, but its use almost exclusively in the North suggests that it is a northern culture word. Even so, the Aramaic form with a long initial vowel indicates a loan (see p. 146). See s.v. kanūnu, p. 115.
kanzuzu - kilīlu / 63

kanzūzu, "chin(?)"—Mand. kรอบzwɔ, kOntkwɔ; Syr. klzwɔ, "chin." Origin unknown.152

karballatu, "cap"—Eg., BA, JAr., Syr. krblh/tɔ. In Akkadian it is a late word of foreign origin.153

karpatu, "vessel"—This is an old culture word (cf. Ug. krpn), but Syr. krp̣tɔ, "vessels," might be a loan. Cf. also MH q(w)rypjɔwt, "cups" or "bowls," and BT krwpjytɔ.154

karṣillu, "scalpel(?)"—BT kwsyltɔ, Syr. kwsltɔ, "a sharp instrument for blood-letting or operating." The phonetic difficulties almost certainly preclude a loan, but the similarity can hardly be coincidental. Perhaps the Akkadian is to be read karsillu, for the few times that it is spelled syllabically the NUN sign, which has the reading sīl, is used. The word is obviously foreign (compare parzillu); thus the Aramaic form probably derives from an intermediary other than Akkadian.155

karṣu, "slander"; especially in the idiom karṣī akālu, "to slander"—Imp. Ar. (KAI, No. 269) krṣy (pl. const. with ṣmr), BA ṣkl qṛṣyn, JAr. (mostly Targ.) ṣkl q(w)rṣ(yn), Mand. ṣkyl kyṛṣ (participle), Syr. ṣkl qṛṣyn. Note that the Carpentras and Mandaic forms have k, as does the Akkadian, whereas the others have assimilated the expression to the correct Ar. cognate qṛṣ. Although the earliest attestation of this loan occurs with ṣmr and not ṣkl, one may safely assume that the entire idiom was the element borrowed here. Note that Aramaic follows Akkadian using the plural of the noun (except rarely in JAr.).156

kāru, "quay"—Syr. kr d, "(place) where." The Syriac usage may have developed from the numerous Assyrian geographical names beginning with the element kār.157

karū, "grain heap," "storehouse"—MH, Common Ar. kry(ɔ), "heap." This is probably a common Semitic word rather than a loan from Sum. GUR(U)ŋ.158

kilīlu, "wreath," "crown"—Common Ar. klýlɔ > Arab.

152. MD, p. 199; HM, p. 536.
155. Not previously compared. Syr. krzylɔ, "shepherd's crook," and BT (hapax) krzylɔ, "shepherd(?)." are strikingly similar to the Akkadian in form, but the required semantic development is difficult to imagine.
156. Z, p. 25; LS, p. 17; AHw., p. 450.
157. LS, p. 342. This is probably not related to the predominantly late Mand. qɔɔɔ, "chez." (Cf. MD, p. 402, where Nöldeke's interpretation is preferable to that of Drower-Macuch.)
64 / *kimahhu - kisādu

*iklīl. Since the form with I is found only in Old Akkadian and Old Babylonian (cf. kūllum) and the later common form is kululu, the terms would appear to be only cognate. 159

* kimahhu, "grave"—Palm. gmḥḥ, gmḥ, Nab. gwḥ, Syr. byt gmḥ, BT gwḥ, MH, JPA, Targ. Judges, Hagiog. kwk, "grave niche." This has been thoroughly treated by E. Y. Kutscher. 160

kimtu, "family"—Mand. hapax kykm(?) . Since kimtu does not occur in Akkadian in an astronomical use, it appears to be only cognate with Heb., Ar. kīmā, Ethiopic kēma, "Pleiades." 161

* kinattu, "colleague"—Eq., AD, Ahiqar, BA, BH, CPA, Syr. knt, pl. knwt. 162

kippatu, "circle," "circumference"—There is little reason to suspect that any of the Hebrew or Aramaic nouns from the root kpp in the meaning "arch," "dome," "vault (of the heavens)," "cap" were influenced by Akkadian. 163

* kisādu, "neck," "necklace" (see AHw., p. 490a, mngs. 5 ff.)—Mand. kisādā, "a neck ornament." The Mandaic word hardly means "throat," as given in MD. 164


160. Z, p. 68; LS, p. 120; F. Rosenthal, Die Sprache der palmyrenerischen Inschriften und ihre Stellung innerhalb der Aramäischen (MVAG, Vol. XL1 [Leipzig, 1963]) p. 14; E. Y. Kutscher, in Eretz Israel VIII (1967) 273 ff. The rare Syriac form may actually derive from the attested BT kimahl. Kutscher's treatment still leaves several points unclear. What is the origin of the initial k in the Jewish form? He seems to attempt to overcome this difficulty merely by citing the Akkadian as k/gimahhu, yet the other Aramaic forms all have g. I would return to a solution similar to Nödeke's ("Palmyrenerische Inschrift," ZA IX [1894] 266): Ass. [gimaḵ] > Palm. gumaḵ. Bab. kimah [kiwaḵ] > kuwaḵ > kuṭaḥ (emphatic) > kūṭaḥ (absolute). This derivation considers the BT form found by Kutscher uncertain and regards Nab. gwḥ either as a mixed form or, in view of the frequent historical spellings of Nabatean, as a historical spelling for kuṭaḥ/k and the immediate model of Heb. kwk.


162. Z, p. 46; LS, p. 334; AHw., p. 479; KBL, p. 1086. Is this the origin of MH, Jar. kt ( ), kyt, "group"?

163. Cf. LS, p. 339. The etymology for kippatu proposed by M. Bravmann, "Akk. kiprat(m) pl. kipratu(m) and Ethiopic kanfar," JCS XXII (1968-69) 85 ff., is unconvincing.

164. MD, p. 224; cf. M. Lidzbarski, Ginzā, der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer ("Quellen der Religionsgeschichte," Vol. XIII [Göttingen, 1925]) p. 347, n. 1. A translation "Saturn unbinds his loins and frees the k. from his neck" is certainly preferable to "... and cuts his (own!) neck in two." The Akkadian is used for a neck ornament as early as OB.
* **kiššu**, "bundle of reeds"—BT kyš, "bunch."  


**kūru,** "furnace"—This word, which occurs in Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic (all kūr) and Ethiopic (kawr), is almost certainly of Common Semitic origin, yet it is often assumed to be the same word as kūru (Heb. and Arab. kūr), which has a corresponding Sum. form GUR. The latter may be an old culture word and cannot conclusively be proven to be a Sumerian loanword.  

**kusišu** (AHzw., kusīt) lex. only, "turban" or "crown"—This occurs on the left side of the synonym list and represents the foreign (probably Aramaic) word for "full moon," Ug. ksa, BH kese, Syr. k(∅)s.  

**kusītu,** "garment"—Syr. kwsy>>t, "hood." The root is common, but the unusual form of the Syriac suggests a loan.  

* **kuspu**, "residue of ground dates"—BT kwsp.  

* **kutallu**, "back of the neck," "backside"—Syr., Mand. kwτl̂ > Arab. kwṭl; BT kwṭly (dḥzyry), "ba-con." This is to be separated from the word "wall," occurring rarely in Akkadian (kutlu), common in western Aramaic (kōṭl̂), late Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (kōṭel), to be considered a native Aramaic word, lost in eastern Aramaic, where it was replaced by Akkadian words such as asītu and igāru.  

165. AHzw., p. 492.  
166. LS, p. 326; Additamenta, p. 221.  
167. Z, p. 21; AHzw., p. 511; KBL, p. 453. The distribution pattern favors the accepted view that kurru is a loanword from Sum. gur, which became an official Imperial Aramaic measure.  
171. Z, p. 39; Additamenta, p. 229; AHzw., p. 509. The earlier publications recognized the proper Akkadian form.  
172. Z, pp. 32, 45; LS, p. 352; AHzw., p. 516b; W. von Soden, "Der hymnisch-epische Dialetk des Akkadischen," ZA n.f. VII (1933) 171, n. 4; Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 76, n. 2, and Hippologica Accadica, p. 118; Wb.KAS, p. 70. The opinion expressed here follows von Soden and Salonen. With Salonen I also reject a Sumerian etymology for kutallu but for the additional reason that it is probably cognate with the common Aramaic word for "back of the neck," qd̂al > Arab. qd̂al (but previously unrecognized as such). (For Arab. ḍ for Ar. ḍ cf. Fränkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. xix and tilmīg < talmīg.) It is difficult to account for changes in
66 / kutimmu - līlītu

* kutimmu, "gold- and silversmith"—Bab. docket kām.\textsuperscript{173}

labāru, "to be old"—Cf. AP, No. 26:13, 17 lūbr.\textsuperscript{174}

lahannu, "drinking dish"—This may be a Sumerian loanword in Akkadian but could hardly be a loan into Syr. lāqna, which must be from Greek lekānē.\textsuperscript{175}

* lāhhinu, fem. lāhhinatu, "a temple or court official," "steward(?)"—Eg. līn, līnh, "x of the temple"; BA līnh, "x of the court"; Targ. lī(y)nt, "concubine."\textsuperscript{176}

* libbātu, "wrath"; in the idiom libbāti malū, "to be angry with"—Aššur Ostracon, Eg. lkt (absolute) ml\textsuperscript{2}. This idiom is frequently proposed for BH in Ezek. 16:30 but definitely occurs as a loan-translation in Dan. 3:19, Esther 3:5, 5:9 in the form ml\textsuperscript{2} lūnh.\textsuperscript{177}

libittu, "brick"—There is no compelling reason to assume that Akkadian is the origin of the Common Semitic term and its related forms.\textsuperscript{178}

* līlītu, "female demon"—BH, JAR., Syr., Mand. līlīt\textsuperscript{t}, "Lilith."\textsuperscript{179}

both of the stops, but perhaps there was some assimilation to Sumerian. Note that the BT kwt\textsubscript{ly}, "back parts (of pigs)," has the variant qd\textsubscript{ly}. The resulting mixed form qōtel (based on the form found in the Aruch) is used in Modern Hebrew for "bacon."


174. F. Perles, in OLZ XXI 69; AP, p. 95; DISO, p. 136.

175. \textit{Ašw.}, p. 527; Salonen, \textit{Hausgeräte II} 225.

176. DISO, p. 137; KBL, p. 1090; B. Landsberger, "Akkadisch-hebräische Wortgleichungen," Suppl. VT XVI (1967) 204; Porten, \textit{Archives}, pp. 200 f. Attempts to find other than Akkadian etymologies, especially for the Eg., have not been fruitless, but are much less convincing. Note that the NA lāhhinu (lāhhinu in CAD) is something like a temple steward (cf. J. V. Kinnier Wilson, \textit{The Nimrud Wine Lists} [London, 1972] pp. 80 f.), certainly identical in function with the Elephantine līn and his female counterpart (wife?) the līnh, while the lāhhinatu is a woman of the queen's court, just like the līnh of BA. The targumic usage of lūnh\textsuperscript{2} is merely the result of a misinterpretation of the BA term.


178. Z, p. 31; LS, p. 357. It is, in fact, difficult to account for the derivation of the Heb. form lībānātu from any of the Akkadian forms.

* **limmu/limu**, "eponym official"—Assyrian docketts 1%m, lm.180

  *lititu*, "a measuring vessel"—This probably belongs together with Ug. lth, BH and Syr. ltk, "a measure," but as such is probably of foreign origin, to be separated from the root latāku, "to test," cognate with Syr. lātek, "suitable."181

  *lumāšu*, "constellation," "zodiacal position"—Syr. mlwš, Mand. mlwš, "sign of the zodiac." The Aramaic derives from this word, apparently preceded by the pronounced determinative MUL, "star," though in the Akkadian texts lumāšu usually occurs without the determinative, and I know of no spellings mu- or ma-lumāšu that would indicate that it was actually pronounced. The development mul(l)wāš > malwāš is probably due to the absence of a noun preformative mu- in Aramaic.182

  *maddatu*, "tribute"—Eg., AD, BA mndh; BA, BH, Genesis Apocryphon mdh; Syr. mdšt (pl. mddatš and mdštwtš). The only JAr. reference I know of is the Aruch citation of Targum Proverbs 12:24 mdšt (≤ Syriac), while the Rabbinic Hebrew use of mndh is based directly on the Biblical passages.183

  *magannu*, "gift," "gratis"—Ug., Phoen., BH mgm, "to offer," "to present"; Common Ar. (and Arab.) maggn, "gratis." This foreign word has been studied by von Soden. It occurs in early Akkadian in the sense of "gift," but only as a Hurrianism, and in late Akkadian in the meaning "gratis" as an Aramaism. The western forms were probably also borrowed directly from Hurrian.184

  *mahāru*, in mithuru, "to be equal," "to be square"—The connecting link between the many Akkadian uses and Syr.

180. Cf. DISO, p. 134. The aleph of the Aramaic is difficult, but for another possible example of aleph to indicate internal ʾ/ʾ, see n. 136. Since no other etymology is known for the Akkadian, perhaps this is an old North Semitic word for "ruler" (which possibly exists in BH as well; cf. James Barr, Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament [Oxford, 1968] p. 329, s.v. lʾm).


182. To my knowledge this is the first time that the correct model for Ar. malwāš has been found, for the word lumāšu itself is a fairly recent addition to the Akkadian lexicon. Formerly (cf. Z, p. 62; LS, p. 390) Sum. mul-maš was cited, which is only the name of one particular constellation.

183. Z, p. 9; LS, pp. 374-75; Āhw., p. 572; DISO, p. 158; KBL, p. 1091; Wagner, p. 71. For discussion see above s.v. ilku and biltu.

mahāzā, "major town," "city"—Palm., Syr., BT (and possibly Targ. Onk. Num. 22:39) ḫwz, Mand. ḫwz, "walled city." In spite of the many articles and notes devoted to this word, the relationship and development of the various forms and meanings remain obscure. It is clear, however, that in the West Semitic languages there are two separate words. In BA, Targ. Onk., JPA, and Nab. ḥūz means "harbor" and is an ancient word in the West as now attested by a Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurrian, and Ugaritic vocabulary text from Ugarit: KAR : kāru : ma-ḥa-[z]i : ma-ah-ḥa-{...}. Although the evidence of this vocabulary text would suggest that this word is either Hurrian or North West Semitic in origin, it may in fact be an early loan from the Akkadian term in its original meaning (see R. Kutscher; note, however, that the Ugaritic harbor-town name Maḫaddu shows the reflex of the etymologically correct g). The later Ar. ḥūz, "city," must be a development of the late and common Akkadian usage. Nevertheless, the o vowel of the second syllable is inexplicable unless one allows for Canaanite influence, perhaps by formal assimilation to ḥūz, "harbor."186

mahrat elippi, "ship's bow"—Mand. ḫr.187

makkī/ūtu, "a tow barge or cargo ship"—Mand. ḫkt, BT, Syr. (lex) ḫkt, "a kind of boat."188

187. Z, p. 45; Salonen, Wasserverfahrzeuge, p. 76.
188. J. N. Epstein, "Sride Shepelot," Tarbiz VI (1935) 487, n. 36. Some early scholars incorrectly compared the Aramaic with Sum. gis ma-ku-
makkasu, "a kind of date"—Mks appears in an unpublished Babylonian docket in the British Museum.\(^{189}\)

mala, "as much as"—Porten and Greenfield and Kutscher interpret Hermopolis l:7 mlw in this fashion, retaining the reading of the editors but interpreting it differently. Milik's reading, h\(n\)lw, seems preferable, however, on both syntactic and paleographic grounds. The phrase k\(\text{n}(t)\) h\(n\)lw is previously known from Imperial Aramaic.\(^{190}\)

mal\(\text{h}\)u, "sailor"—Common Ar., BH, Arab. m\(\text{all}\)\(\text{h}\).\(^{191}\)

man\(\text{h}\), "mina (weight)"—Assyrian weights (CIS II, Nos. 1-15) mnh; AP, No. 26:17 (pl.) mnh; BA mn; BH m\(\text{a}n\)e > MH; JAr., Syr. m\(\text{ny}\); Mand. m\(\text{ny}\) > perhaps Arab., Greek, etc. Most scholars now consider Sum. MA.NA to be an old loan from Akk. man\(\text{h}\),\(^{192}\) but is the West Semitic word a cognate or a loan? The lack (or at most questionable occurrence) of the term in both alphabetic and syllabic texts at Ugarit is significant evidence that it is a loan, as is the rare and obviously late usage in the Bible (though large numbers of shekels are often listed, as at Ugarit). The irregularities in the plural formations in the various dialects also point toward a loan here.\(^{193}\)

manzaltu, "(star) position"—BH mazzalot (pl.), RH. JAr. mazz\(\text{al}\), "planet," "constellation," "luck"; CPA m\(\text{al}\)y (pl.), "stoixeia"; Syr. mwz\(\text{l}\), mwzl (pl.); "sphere," "heavenly zone";

a (see Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 782, and now Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 61). For makk\(\text{i}\)/\(\text{t}\)-\(\text{u}\) see Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 21. Although the Mandaic term unquestionably means "boat," some of the commentators took the talmudic word to mean "mast," which Salonen (Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 8; Die Landfahrzeuge des alten Mesopotamien [Helsinki, 1951] p. 134; cf. Z, p. 32) thinks is from mak\(\text{k}\)\(\text{u}\), "pole." Zimmern (Z, p. 32) and von Soden (AHw., p. 591) compare this latter word with the rare Syr. m\(k\)\(\text{k}\)/\(\text{h}\)\(\text{w}\)t, "parapet," a connection which is uncertain at best.

189. British Museum No. 82-9-18 403, dated to Darius 19.
190. Porten and Greenfield, in ZAW LXXX 228, and Porten, Archives, p. 270; E. Y. Kutscher, "The Hermopolis Papyri," IOS I (1971) 113; J. T. Milik, in Biblia XLVIII 549. Cf. DISO, p. 65. The letter in question is neither a good "m" nor an "h." Milik suggests that an original "m" was corrected to "h." Considering the varied forms of "h" in this text when compared with the rather uniform shape of "m," the reading h\(l\)w, in my opinion, is much to be preferred. Whatever the correct reading, however, there is probably no connection with Akk. mala, especially in light of CPA l-mlw d-.

70 / maqlūtu - maškanu

Mand. mⁿnzⁿˡˡ, "constellation," "star of destiny" (perhaps the origin of Arab. manzil, "lunar phase").¹⁹⁴

maqlūtu, OB (omens), SB, NA, "burnt offering"—AP, No. 33: 10 mqlw. Although the root is common in Aramaic (see, too, MH mqlḥ), this isolated and unusual Aramaic form would appear to be a borrowing from Akkadian.¹⁹⁵

mār bīti, LB "administrator," "steward"—Eg., AD, JA; br byt; BH and MH bn byt. Both the Akkadian and Aramaic are calques from Iranian.¹⁹⁶

marru, "spade"—Syr., BT mr > Arab. marr, Egyptian mr, late Greek márra, Latin marra, French marre.¹⁹⁷

maruštu, marultu, "sickness," "trouble" (root mrš)—Mand. mʳrwl, "trouble."¹⁹⁸

mašāhu, "to measure"; mšihtu, "measurement"—A careful analysis yields the conclusion that the root mšḥ, "to measure" (Arab. msh) is the native Aramaic word for this activity.¹⁹⁹

maškanu, "pledge"—Nab. mškwn, vb. mškn; JA; and MH mškwnicipant, vb. mškn.²⁰⁰

---


¹⁹⁵. AP, p. 126; DISO, p. 165.


¹⁹⁷. Z, p. 41; LS, p. 400; Ahw., p. 612; Additamenta, p. 266; Salonen, Agricultura, p. 118.

¹⁹⁸. Previously unrecognized. The Mandaic has no other convincing etymology, and the development -uštu > ḫultus > -w Państ is identical to that shown in manazṣatu > manzaltu > mⁿnzⁿˡˡ.

¹⁹⁹. Z, p. 22; E. G. Kraeling, The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papryi (New Haven, 1953) p. 163. In LS, p. 406, we find the suggestion that mšḥ might derive from the Akkadian form of an original "mṭḥ, Ar. mṭṭ, "to stretch," but there is absolutely no evidence for a root other than mṭḥ (as in Arabic and Hebrew, for which see J. C. Greenfield, "The Etymology of "mṭṭt," ZAW LXXVII [1965] 90 ff.) The common Akkadian and Hebrew root for "measure" is mḏḏ, which does not occur in Aramaic, so mšḥ must be the correct original verb for this activity in Aramaic. Further, the Akkadian is attested only from Middle Babylonian on and could be an Aramaic loanword. Whatever the construction of mšḥt in Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum, No. 4:12 and No. 12:28, it definitely is not a singular absolute and hence cannot be used to show treatment as a foreign word here.

²⁰⁰. Z, p. 18; LS, p. 776; H. Petschow, Neubabylonisches Pfandrecht (Berlin, 1956) pp. 52 ff. Although in this meaning the Akkadian term is
mātu - mēdelu / 71

* mātu, "country," "land"—Adon, l. 9 (KAI, No. 266), Ahīqar, l. 36 māṭ, "country," "land"; Syr., BT māṭ, "region," "native land" or "town," pl. "small towns"; Mand. māṭ, "home," "town," pl. "towns"; Neo-Syriac māṭa, "village," "countryside." The etymology of the Akkadian is still uncertain, but we can be quite sure of a loan here on the basis of distribution and meaning. In the Imperial Aramaic texts the correct meaning "country," "land" is still preserved, indicating familiarity with the normal Akkadian use of the term. Later this word is limited to Eastern Aramaic, where it is found in a limited meaning derived perhaps from the rarer Akkadian usage in the sense of "countryside" or "region" (see AHW., p. 634, māṭu(m) I A2) or perhaps even from the use of the Akkadian word in the actual name of regions such as Māṭ-Akkādi, which occurs in Assur Ostracon, l. 2 as māṭday and probably as mtt ṣdāh in Caquot, "Inscription," l. 2. (Cf. mbūbūq in DEA, No. 30:2) 201

mazūru, "fuller's mallet"—Syr. mzwrf. The root is common. Any relationships with the Hebrew and Jar. forms listed by Epstein are extremely doubtful. 202

mēdelu, "bolt"—Syr. (lex.) mdl may be from Greek limited to Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian, it is very unlikely that this word could be anything but an Akkadian development, given the nature of the difference in meaning of the root ṣkn between Akkadian and North West Semitic (cf. AHW., p. 627, "auch Aram. "). The western forms with an "o" vowel in the second syllable presumably derive from the common western pronunciation of /ɔ/ as a middle back, but the /ɔ/ itself is difficult to explain (see Vowels, in Chap. IV).

201. Z, p. 9; LS, p. 408; AHW., p. 633; H. L. Ginsberg, "An Aramaic Contemporary of the Lachish Letters," BASOR, No. 111 (1948) p. 26, n. 10; Kutscher, Words, p. 20. The precise meaning in the broken context of Adon is uncertain, but there can be no doubt about the Ahīqar passage. For Sum. ma-da as a loan from Akkadian, cf. AHW., p. 633, and Gelb, MAD, No. 3, p. 168. Kutscher has another suggestion to explain the semantic developments (or rather limitations) in the Aramaic forms, but I do not agree that BT mṭ means "city" or is used any differently from the Syrian. In fact the example he gives, Mata Meḥasiah, was certainly not a city. Cf. Ketubot 4a, where it is specifically said to be neither a city nor a village. While it might have been a vague suburban area around Sura, more likely it was a small town; see the Syrian source cited in J. Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia V (Leiden, 1970) 21. J. A. Fitzmyer finds mṭ in the difficult Gen. Apoc. 2:23, which he reads ippk mt lprwn (see The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I [2d ed., rev.; Rome, 1971] pp. 94 f.). Aside from being a unique occurrence in Western Aramaic this reading is difficult to support both orthographically and syntactically. One would expect ṣwkr mt lprwn. Though not without difficulties, the reading lh qdm (read lh lhqd? ) is preferable.

202. LS, p. 379; J. N. Epstein, "Biblisich-Talmudisches," OLZ XX (1917) 274 ff.; AHW., p. 637. The meaning "crush," "pound" is more common to North West Semitic, while in Akkadian it is basically "to twist."
mandalos. The Greek word could hardly be derived from Akkad.-

* mesû, "to wash"—Eastern Aramaic mš³, "wash," "rub
  clean."204

* midrû, "watercourse"—BT mdr².205

* miksû, "tax"—BH mekes, miksâh; AP, No. 81; Palm. (also
  as "tax collector"), RH, JPA, BT, CPA, Syr. all mks(²), "tax,
  The form mšksº for "tax collector" in Palmyran and Mandaic may
  possibly be a loan from Akk. mākisū and not a secondary de-
  velopment. The Arabic verb and noun forms appear to be secon-
  dary, but is the Akkadian verb makâsu without cognates?206

mîlu, "flood"—The Akkadian is cognate with, but possibly
  had some influence on Syr. mly³ (same meaning). On the other
  hand, the Akkadian word, normally mîlu, occurs as mîlu in
  Neo-Assyrian, perhaps under Aramaic influence.207

mindēmâ, "perhaps"—Imp. Ar. mnd³m > md³ml, m(y)dm, mydy,
  "something." In light of the semantic difference, a relation-
  ship between the Akkadian and Aramaic forms is highly unlike-
  ly.208

* misrû, "boundary"—Old Ar. mšr, MH myšr, JAR., Mand.
  misrâ (note the JAR. plural in -ân), with verbal meanings of
  mšr "to make a boundary" in JAR. and Mand. and "to stretch" in

203. Z., p. 30; LS, p. 375.

204. The form mš³, in Targ. II Sam. 12:20, is probably a corruption;
  cf. A. Tal, "The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and Its
  Position within the Aramaic Dialects" (Diss.; Hebrew University, 1971) p.
  237.

205. Previously unrecognized, and for good reason. The Akkadian
  has not yet been properly isolated in the dictionaries. The AHW.
  references are cited s.v. mištirū and (incorrectly) bérta (MID = BE).
  For the present see CAD, Vol. B, pp. 206–7, and R. Borger, Die Inschriften
  Assarhadons Königs von Assyrien (AFO Beiheft IX [Graz, 1956]) p. 91, n. 11.

206. Z., p. 10; LS, p. 385; AHW., p. 652; Fraenkel, Aramäischen
  Fremdwörter, p. 283; KBL, p. 522; Wagner, p. 76; A. Malamat, "The Ban in
  Malamat points out that in the Bible the meššes is exclusively devoted to
  the religious authorities, whereas the Akkadian is purely secular in na-
  ture. I fail to see why this reasoning supports his contention that the
  terms are cognate. In any case the Aramaic and Arabic forms are used in
  secular contexts.

207. LS, p. 389.

  Stiehl, Die Araber in der alten Welt II (Berlin, 1965) 85; LS, p. 375.
  The early scholars were apparently unaware of the correct meaning of the
  Akkadian.
Syr., Mand. and JAr. The verbal uses seem more at home in Aramaic than in Akkadian, but, as demonstrated by Tadmor, the use of ṁṣr in the Sefire inscriptions alongside the usual North West Semitic term gb1 suggests that it is indeed a loan from the common Akkadian term. Syr. ṁṣr, "stocks," appears to be a development from the root ṁṣr and should not be connected with Akk. maṣṣaru, "guard."211

mizru, "matted wool(?)" (lex.)—MH myzrn, "bedding material." Except for the rare SB lexical forms mazru and mizru, the root ṁṣr, "to twist wool," is known only in Mishnaic Hebrew.212

mukku, "low quality wool"—The meaning of the Akkadian was established on the basis of MH mwk. Is the Sumerian form original here? Compare as well Mand. m(w) wk, "bedding."213

mulūgu, "dowry"—The form mlwg occurs in Mishnaic and Rabbinic Hebrew although never in Aramaic itself. The aim of Levine's study of this word is to prove contemporary Mesopotamian influence on late first millennium B.C. Palestine, but the history of this word proves no such thing. Its earliest occurrences are at Nuzi, Ugarit, and Amarna, and only later is it found in Mesopotamian Akkadian, indicating that it was of foreign origin, borrowed into Palestinian and Babylonian culture through separate channels. Most significantly, it cannot be shown that the Hebrew use of the word or of the cultural institution which it signifies presupposes the development of the term which took place in the Babylonian area.214

muqaru (not muqāru), "a soft mass"—Syr., Mand., JAr. mwg, "egg yolk," "brain matter." The ultimate origin of this word is unknown. In Akkadian it occurs only in divinatory texts and might therefore derive from Amorite.215

* mušannītu, "irrigation dam or dike"—BT mšwnyṯ, "a pile or bank of earth or stones" > Arab. musannḥ, "irrigation

209. Z., p. 9; AHw., 659. Any relationship with the Semitic name for Egypt remains uncertain. For the Aramaic meaning "rope" compare LB maṣīru, AHw., p. 620, and von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXXV 19, and see J. N. Epstein, "Stricke und Leinen," MGWJ LXV (1921) 357 ff.
211. LS, p. 379.
212. LS, p. 379. D. Weisberg, in HUCA XXXIX 73.
215. See the dictionaries: none suggest a loan.
74 / muṣarû - muterru

dam." The spelling of the talmudic form as well as the single western occurrence in Midrash Genesis Rabbah 10:10 are to be considered contaminations from JPA šwnyt, etc., "cliff," "crag." 216

* muṣarû, "garden bed"—Syr. mšrît, pl. mšryt; BT mšr, "garden bed"; Mand. mšr, "garden," "habitation," "zone," > Arab. māṣārah. The Babylonian Talmudic form is confused in the dictionaries and the editions with mšr, "plain." The common Mandaic meaning, "habitation," probably reflects assimilation to the root šry, which appears correctly in the hapax mšryt, "habitation"; cf. Syr. mašry, mašrīḥ. 217

* muṣkēnu, "a dependent class," NA and SB "destitute"—BH, Common Ar. miskēn, "destitute" > Arab., Ethiopic, Italian, French, Portugese. 218

mutānu, "plague"—Common Ar. mwtn; Arab. mutān. The evidence suggests that this is not a loanword: The form seems to occur in ESA; 219 the Syriac vocalization mawtāna is difficult to account for if it is a loanword (see n. 124); and the Akkadian distribution points to a possible Amorite origin. 220

* muterru, "oven poker"—BT mtr (var. mtwr, mtr), Syr. mtr, mtwr, mtyr. 221

216. A. Salonen, in his excellent study of this word ("Akkad. mušanātu = Arab. musannā," Or. n.s. XXXII [1963] 449 ff., and cf. Agricultura, p. 222), was led astray by his acceptance of the western dictionaries' interpretation of mšn as identical to šn as (based on Rashi); hence, he thought the BT word at best was a related word influenced by Ar. šnn, "rock." Omitting the Akkadian material, a complete study of the Ar. references and their meanings can be found in Aruch V 279 f., where the relationship to the Arabic was already noted. The BT form is to be corrected to mšn.


218. Z, p. 47; LS, p. 474; AHw., p. 684; Wagner, pp. 79 f. Discussion over the etymology and meaning of the OB muškēnum (see the recent bibliography in R. Yaron, The Laws of Eshnunna [Jerusalem, 1969] p. 83, n. 1) continues, but there can be little doubt that the Aramaic was borrowed from NA, where it already meant "poor man," "destitute" (for which see AHw. and G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, The Babylonian Laws I [Oxford, 1952] 90-95). I am unable to isolate or comprehend the linguistic forces which caused this specific value term to become the most widespread and long-lived of the Akkadian loanwords.


221. To my knowledge the connection between the Akkadian and Ara-
nabārtu - namṣaru / 75

* nabārtu, "cage," "trap"—Syr. nmrt³ > Arab. namirah, namūrah. 222

* naggāru, "carpenter"—Bab. docket, Eg., Common Ar. nagğār > MII naggār; Punic; Arab. naγgār. Note Mand. nɔγr² and nɔngγr}. 223

nagů, "region"—Targ. Onk. and Proph. ngwxt³; Mand. ʒ/ʒengɔwy³, "islands," "coastlands"; possibly also in KAI, No. 266:8 ngw³, but the exact meaning is uncertain there; Arab. naγwah, "rising ground." This could be a loanword, but there are indications that it is cognate: the preservation of the "w" in all the western forms (cf. Phonology, in Chap. IV), and the distribution of the Akkadian, especially in Middle and Neo-Assyrian, where it is always used of foreign areas, especially those in the West. On the other hand, the Aramaic distribution points to a loanword. 224

* naktāmu, "cover," "lid"—BT nktm³. 225

nālu, niālu, "to lie down"—Possibly related to Syr., BT, and Mand. nālā, "incubus"; compare the Akkadian causative stem. See as well Mand. nywl³, "torment," and Syr. nawwel, "to afflict." 226

* nāmaru, "mirror"—Syr. (lex.) nwr³ (namwr³), Mand. nɔwr³. 227

namṣaru, "angular stick(?)"—Compare Targ. Isaiah nswr³, "joiner's frame."

maic terms was recognized only by R. Campbell-Thompson, A Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology (Oxford, 1936) p. xxvii. The only possible etymology is Akkadian, a participle of turr, "to turn" (transitive).

222. Z, p. 15; LS, p. 431. The shift b > m is difficult. See Labials in Chap. IV.

223. Z, p. 25; LS, p. 415; AHw., p. 710; DISO, p. 174; A. Salonen, Die Möbel des alten Mesopotamier (Helsinki, 1963) p. 273. The word ngr is found in Ugaritic as the title of the god ilš and his wives in the KRT epic and is generally translated "carpenter" (cf. UT, p. 441; H. L. Ginsberg, in ANET [2d ed.] p. 148), but the context is broken, and the word could as well be nāgiru, "herald," or even an as yet unknown epithet. If it is "carpenter," there is no way to determine whether the word persisted in North West Semitic from that time on or was later reborrowed.

224. Z, p. 43; AHw., p. 712; on Adon: DISO, p. 174. The reading ngr³ should be granted equal probability.

225. Z, p. 34; Additamenta, p. 280. In addition to the fact that the root ktm has quite a different meaning in Aramaic, the preformative n- proves certain Akkadian influence.

226. T. Nöödeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft (Strasbourg, 1910) p. 216, recognized that this type of word should have an Akkadian etymology, though he separated the Syriac verb, comparing it with Arab. nw/yl, "to grasp," "to obtain."

76 / nam/zzītu - nērebu

* nam/zzītu, "mash tub"—BT nzyt>, Syr. (lex.) nzyt>
Arab. nazīyah.²²⁸

* napharu, "total"—Behistun 47 nphr. Although this is the only attested occurrence in Aramaic, its use in this important document of wide circulation suggests that at least for a short time this word was a functioning lexical item in Imp. Ar.²²⁹

  nappāhu, "smith"—MH, Targ. Prophets, BT, Syr. (only in Assyria and Beth Garmai, see LS, p. 436) nph>. Note Mand. nph/nhp, "to fan a flame," as against np>, "to blow." Though the root is common Semitic, the distribution, especially the Syriac, indicates a loan for this derived form.²³⁰

  nappāgu, "beating stick(?)"—BT nph>, "carder," is a gattāl professional formation, while the Akkadian certainly is manpas > nappas.²³¹

  nāqīdu, "shepherd"—Rare Syr. nq̄d² but well known from Ug. nqd and Heb. nōqēd. The origin of this word is still uncertain, but Sumerian nagāda is certainly a loan from Akkadian.²³²

  natbāku, nadabāku, "a course of bricks"—BA nābk; Targ. Prophets nābk; MH nābk (rarely mābk, cf. Jastrow, Dictionary, s.v. mrbk, Dalman mābk), "brick course," "frame" > Arab. midmak.²³³

  nērebu, Ass. nērabu, "defile"—Syr. n̄rb>, "peak," "deep valley"; Mand. nyrb>, "crag." The Akkadian, literally "entrance," refers to a "pass" between high mountains and is commonly used to describe treacherous mountain terrain. In Aramaic, accordingly, it can mean, depending on one's perspective, either a high mountain or a deep valley.²³⁴

²²⁸. LS, p. 422; Additamenta, p. 277; AHW., p. 730; Salonen, Hausgeräte II 189 f.
²²⁹. AP, p. 264; this is restored correctly in the main text from a fragment. The word is used to translate napharu in the Akkadian text.
²³⁰. Z, p. 27; LS, p. 436; AHW., p. 739. The Syriac word is not listed in Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, and the LS references are faulty, so I have been unable to trace the Syriac attestations. Note Ug. m̄phm, "bellows."
²³¹. AHW., p. 739.
²³³. Z, p. 31; AHW., p. 766 (incorrect Arab. form); KBL, p. 1098.
²³⁴. Z, p. 43; LS, p. 449; AHW., p. 780. This word is found as the name of a town near Mosul as well as one near Aleppo (see MG, p. 135, n. 2) and two others in Syria (see C. Clermont-Ganneau, Études d'archéologie
nibzu - nīru / 77

*nibzu*, "document," "receipt" NA, NB—AP, No. 11:6 nbz, "receipt"; Sam., YT, CPA nbz, "lot"; Mand. nybz², "portion." No etymology is known, but it certainly is a loanword in Akkadian. Perhaps this is related in origin to BA nbzḥ, gift."235

* nikassu, "account" > NB/LB "property"—BA nksyn, BH n∔kāšim; Eq., AD, Genesis Apocryphon, Bar Kochba Heb., MA, JAr., CPA, Syr. all pl. nksyn, "property."236

* nindabû, "offering"—Mand. n³ndbyŋ, "offerings."237

niqা, "libation," "sacrifice" (used commonly of sheep, cf. Ahw., p. 793, mbg.4)—Two meanings are connected with this root in Aramaic: Hermopolis nqyḥ, Syr. BT nqyŋ, "sheep," and Syr. nqŋ (pael), "to libate," and AP, No. 72:15, 16 nqyḥ, Mand. n³qwtŋ, nqyŋ, "libation(s)." In addition Biblical Hebrew has m∔naqqît, "sacrificial bowl." The verb is certainly the same one which means "pure" in Hebrew, but this use is rare (possibly foreign?) in Aramaic and does not occur in Syriac at all, where the meaning "libate" is at home. Apparently the root is cognate in Aramaic and Akkadian, but the noun "sheep" may well be a borrowing of the Akkadian term in a very limited usage. The origin of Syr. nqŋ, "eager," "prone," remains uncertain as does the meaning in Ahiqar, l. 92 of wynqynhb.238

nīru, "yoke"—Common Ar. nīrā and MH and Arabic. There is no convincing evidence that this word is of Sumerian origin or other than cognate in Akkadian and Aramaic. Cf. BH mnwr, "part of a loom," and compare the similar Aramaic uses. Con-

orientale II [Paris, 1897] 206 ff.). The name of the Nerab of Aleppo is attested in the seventh-century B.C. Nerab stelae (KAI, Nos. 225-26) but was almost certainly an Assyrian name there, though it is very ancient, probably already mentioned by Thutmose III (see Clermont-Ganneau, op.cit.). The toponymic situation precludes the interpretation "pass" for the name of this town, so it must have its original meaning of "entrance." This presents a very nice parallel to the Biblical name Lebo-Hamath, the first town of the kingdom of Hamath on the road from the south (cf. Y. Aharoni, The Land of the Bible [Philadelphia, 1967] pp. 65 ff.). Modern Nerab is still situated very close to the main road into Aleppo from the east.

235. Muffs, Studies, p. 186; AHW., p. 786; von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXXVII 261; KBL (2d ed.) p. 1097.

236. Z, p. 20; LS, p. 429 (Aramaic not cited in AHW., p. 789). This old Sumerian loanword acquires the meaning "possessions" only in Neo-Babylonian. In all periods it appears both with and without a doubled "k."

237. MD, p. 284; W. Baumgartner, in HUCA XXIII 58.

238. Z, p. 50; AHW., p. 744; KBL (2d ed.) p. 540. Cf. W. F. Albright, "The Babylonian Sage Ut-Napištišmili Rūqu," JAOS XXVIII (1918) 65. If the Ahiqar form is an example of our verb, it lends further support to the cognate theory, for it occurs in the "western" proverbs (see below, p. 157), in a standard wisdom context (the "two-three" progression).
nishu, "extract," "copy"—Nab. nsšt; Arab. nusṣah; Mand. nsš, "to copy," nɔsšəkš; "copyist"; Syr. nwašš; Medieval Hebrew nusṣah. 240

nigirtu, "secret"—One of the problems of Mandaic studies is the origin of the Mandeans' name for their sect, nɔswrɔyɔ, and the abstract nɔsyrɔytɔ, and its possible relationship with the equally enigmatic New Testament term Nazōraios and the Syriac and Jewish word for Christian. It has been suggested that the Mandaic terminology, at least in part, was influenced by this not infrequent NB term. 241

nišu, "oath"—See below, p. 153.

nišu, "people"; in nišš bitti, "household personnel"—AD, No. 8:2 nšy bytn, "our staff" and No. 9:2 nšy byth. This interpretation of the Aramaic was proposed by H. L. Ginsberg. A scribal error for nšy is not totally out of the question, but in view of the common LB idiom is very unlikely. 242 Akk. nišš is certainly not the source of the Mand., BT form of the word for "person," ɛnyšš, ցynšš. 243

nubbû, "to mourn," munambû, "mourning priest"—Mand. nmbɔ, "to mourn." The only participial form attested in Mandaic is the incorrect nɔmbɔyɔtɔ. 244

239. Z, p. 42; AHW, p. 793; Salonen, Hippologica Accadica, p. 99. A. Goetze, "Umma Texts Concerning Reed Mats," JCS II (1948) 179 and n. 30, discussing the Akkadian loanword in Sumerian niyum, thought that it is "not impossible" that this is really a reborrowing of an original Sumerian word, an uncertain suggestion which Salonen cites misleadingly.

240. Z, p. 29; LS, p. 434; AHW, p. 795; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 251; AF, p. 90, n. 7. See Phonology in Chap. IV.


243. It was long ago recognized (cf. MD, pp. 353 f. and MG, p. 151, n. 1) that there was a Proto-North-West-Semitic form  לינש (preserved at least in Arab. линс and the Heb. pl. ליננם, if not actually in the sing. לינש < לינשם < לינש) alongside the form יוינש; thus, its presence in Babylonian Aramaic need not derive from Akkadian influence. The semantic difference between the two terms (the Aramaic is used in the sense of "someone," whereas the Akkadian is the collective "people") is further evidence for independence. It is precisely in this sense of "someone" or "no one" that יונש is frequently found in Imperial Aramaic and in Palmyran texts and as a Middle Persian logogram (cf. AD [abridged] p. 55), hardly a Hebraism. Cf. as well KAI, No. 276:10 יונש.

244. Z, p. 67; MD, p. 301.
* nudunnû, "dowry"—BT ndwny>. In BH (Ezek. 16:33) ndwy,
  "a woman's own capital."245

* nuhatimmu, "baker"—MH, JPA, BT (only B. Bat. 20b?), Syr.
  nhtwm>.246

* pagulu, "a vessel"—BT gwlp>.247

* pagumtu, "bridle"—Syr. pgwd> (pguddû), pgwtd>; Mand.
  pgwtd>, pçg>wdc> (and denom. verbs). The Aramaic can only
  be explained as deriving from an as yet unattested feminine
  form of pagûmu. (For the NB development -mt > -nd > dd, cf.
  šalantu > šladdû.) The existence of such a feminine form is
  confirmed by the NB plural pugudattu.248

* pahâru, "potter"—BA, Jâr., CPA, Syr. pfr>, Mand. pôhr>
  > Arab. faḥhâr. Jâr., CPA and Mandaic have pa/ehrû, "clay,
  "sherd," as well.249

* palgu, "ditch," "canal"—NB brick plg>. Though the root
  plg is very common in Aramaic, the common Semitic noun *palg,
  "ditch" or "river," which occurs in Akk., Ug., BH, Arab.
  and Ethiopic, is not attested elsewhere in Aramaic and must be
  treated as a loan from Akkadian in this text.250

pqâdu—The wide range of meanings of this verb in the
various Semitic languages allows for the possibility of vari-
ous mutual influences. In Akkadian its basic meaning appears
to be "to entrust," which may have been borrowed into Aramaic.
The sense "to command" is probably original in Aramaic, oc-

245. Z, p. 46; AHW., p. 800. This is the BT term for the institution
known in the Mishnah as mlw (see s.v. mulûgû). The terms seem to have
been confused in some Akkadian sources, but in his study of mulûgû, Baruch
Levine (in JAOS LXXVIII 271-85) mentions our term only in passing (p. 278
and n. 37). In the sense of "a woman's private money" it certainly makes
sense in Ezek. 16:33 (cf. KBL, p. 597, which mistranslates the Akkadian).
The medieval Heb. nødûn, "dowry" (whence Yiddish nadan) is apparently based
on the BH passage.

246. Z, p. 39; LS, p. 525; Additamenta, p. 278; AHW., p. 801. This
word is probably of Sumerian origin; cf. Weisberg, Guild Structure, p. 72.
The change of vowels in the Aramaic form can be explained either by assimila-
tion to the qâṭâl participial formation or else by a series of phonetic
changes such as: nuhatimm > hr. nuḥîm > nuḥûm > naḥûm (by dissimila-
tion).


248. Cf. J. C. Greenfield and S. Shaked, "Three Iranian Words in the
Targum of Job from Qumran," ZDMG CXXII (1972) 42, n. 35; von Soden, in Or.
n.s. XXXVII 263.


250. Cf. G. R. Driver, in PEQ, 1945, p. 12; R. Koldewey, Das wieder
erstehende Babylon (Leipzig, 1913) p. 80. For the Ugaritic cf. UT Supple-
ment, p. 555.
currirng as a westernism in Akkadian (so too the noun pagīdu, "official," "appointee"). \(^{251}\)

\* \(p\)baqāru, "to claim"—BT (Aruch) and Gaonic pqr. \(^{252}\)

\* parakku, "dais," "sanctuary"—Hat. prk>, pryk>, Syr. prk>, Mand. pryk>, "altar," "shrine." \(^{253}\)

parsu—In Akkadian parsu means "part." Contrary to the opinions of early scholars and the modern Biblical diction-
aries, there is no cuneiform evidence that parsu was ever na-
tively used in the meaning "half-mina," as is Aramaic prš, al-
most certainly a native Aramaic development. To be sure, al-
phabetic prš does occur in the Assyrian lion weights, corre-
sponding to an Assyrian /pars/; but in light of the lack of
cuneiform evidence, this may well have been a short-lived Ara-
maic loan adaptation in Assyrian. In Aramaic prš is a common
term for half of anything. In fact the famous pršyn of Dan.
5:25 makes more sense as half-shekels than as half-minas. The
homograph prš in Panannuwa, 1. 6 and in Imp. Ar., a grain
measure, is to be connected with the grain measure gīšpa : pa-
ri-si found in Hittite, Alalakh Akkadian, and Ugaritic alpha-
betic and cuneiform texts, which, as the Ugaritic spelling
with "š" indicates, is of foreign, probably Hurrian, origin.
Zimmern's suggested connection between Akkadian uses of parāsu,
"to cut," and West Semitic prš, "to make clear," is extreme-
ly doubtful. \(^{254}\)

251. Z, pp. 10, 18 f.; on the Ugaritic, Hebrew and Aramaic, see H.
L. Ginsberg, The Legend of King Keret (BASOR "Supplementary Studies," Nos.
2-3 [New Haven, 1946]) p. 48. This verb merits a full study. An ostracon
from Arad (ca. 600 B.C.) already has hbgld (< hqyd) in the sense "as-
sign," "entrust"; cf. Y. Aharoni, "Three Hebrew Ostraca from Arad" BASOR,

and Gaonic Literature" (Heb.), Tarbiz XIX (1947-48) 125 f. Kutscher (in
Tarbiz) and E. A. Speiser (Oriental and Biblical Studies, pp. 128 ff.)
have suggested that the standard meaning of MH and JAr. pqr (varying in the
hifhil with hqyr, but hardly because of the Akkadian variation, com-
pare hbgld in the Arad ostracon, n. 251): "to be free of controls or own-
ership" and the related noun pgr are ultimately to be derived from Ak-
kadian as well. This explanation seems somewhat forced in the light of
Syr. and Mand. pgr, "to run wild," obviously the same word.


254. Z, p. 21; KBL (2d ed.) p. 1113. In general cf. O. Eissfeldt,
"Die menetekel-Inschrift und ihre Deutung," ZAW LXIII (1951) 111. The
grain measure is listed as parīsu in AHW., p. 833, where it is considered
to be Akkadian in origin. In spite of the conjectured size given there,
"1/2 kor," no conclusive evidence for its actual size in any period has
turned up, and assumptions that it must be half of something have re-
sulted in contradictory computations (cf. D. Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets
paršigu, "turban"—Although this is generally connected with Syr. barzanqā, "greave(?)," and Mand. bwrzyng3, "turban," all of the phonemes except r represent exceptions to the proper phonetic correspondences. The identical meaning of the Akkadian and Mandaic terms suggests some ultimate connection, but it is best to reject any associations with the Syriac, the uncertain BT bwrzyng3, and Mand. p3rqs3, "chain," possibly the same as BT prsq (var. prstqy), all words of clearly foreign, but hardly Akkadian, etymology. 255

paruššu, "a sharp prick"—BH prš (hiphil), "to sting"; Syr. prš3, "barb," BT and Targ. Proph. prš3, "goad," "plow-share." Paruššu is often assumed to be a Sumerian loanword and hence necessarily a loan into Aramaic, but the Akkadian is so rare as to require commentary in Ludul (BWl, p. 44, 1. 101), which hardly suggests that it could have served as the model for a loanword. 256

paššuru, "to loosen," "to solve"—Several scholars have ascribed various Aramaic uses of the verb pšr to Akkadian influence. Most commonly cited is the sense "to interpret (a dream)," but the meanings "to break the bonds of enchantment" and "to settle an account" have also come into consideration. Little is certain here. 257

paššuru, "table"—Common Ar. ptwr, Arab. fāṭūr. The Akkadian is generally regarded as a loan from Sumerian BAN.ŠUR, an etymology which would require it to be a loanword in Aramaic. This is, however, the only possible Akkadian loanword where Aramaic "š" reflects Akkadian "š," an inconsistency which must be explained. It is now known that in the second millennium Akkadian "š" could represent a pronounced [tʃ], but there is no evidence to suggest that late Akkadian preserved this phone. 258 Nor is there any Akkadian evidence that this

255. Z, p. 36; LS, p. 96; AHW., p. 836; Additamenta, p. 343; G. Widengren, Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in parthischer Zeit (Cologne and Opladen, 1970) pp. 91 ff. The best available explanation appears to be to consider the Mandaic as a word of Persian origin, whose original meaning is found in Syriac, altered in meaning under the influence of the old Akkadian word.

256. LS, p. 607; cf. AHW., p. 837.


258. J. Aro, "Die semitischen Zischlaute (t) š, š und s und ihre Vertretung im Akkadischen," Or. n.s. XXVIII (1959) 333; von Soden and W. Röllig, Das akkadische Syllabar (2d ed.; Rome, 1967) p. xix; and see
pāšu, pāštu - pilakku

particular word was ever pronounced with [t], that Sumerian has such a phoneme, or even that the word BAN.ŠUR is originally Sumerian; it does occur already in Old Akkadian. It could be either a very early loan from Akkadian into pre-Aramaic or an old culture word borrowed separately by Akkadian and Sumerian and pre-Aramaic.259

pāšu, pāštu, "axe"—Syr. pwst². Cf. Arab. faṣs, "axe," and Leviticus Rabbah ps², "spade" or "hoe." These words are undoubtedly all etymologically connected, but the exact relationships are obscure.260

* pattu, "canal"—BT pty².261

* pattû, "water bucket"—BT pty², "bucket"; Mand. pṭty³, "basin(?)."262

* piṭatu, "governor"—Adon, 1. 9, Eg., Behistun, BA ḫḫ, ḫḫt³, pl. ḫḫt³, BH peḫâh.263

pilakku, "spindle"—Plk, "spindle," occurs in Ugaritic (Ugaritica V 243, 1. 22' pi- lak- ku), BH, Phoen., JAr. and

Spirantization in Chap. III. This early preservation of /t/ may be the explanation of the West Semitic spellings of the place name Aššur, spelled with "š" in Hebrew and Old Aramaic but with "t" in later Aramaic. That it was no longer preserved in the late Akkadian dialects themselves is evident from all of the transcriptions as well as all of the other loan-words. Cf. the name of the god Aššur, pronounced with [s] as shown by alphabetic spellings of Assyrian names. See Chap. IV, n. 11.


The word is rare in early Aramaic, occurring once in a late AP text, in Uruk and in Hatran, but the Uruk spelling pa-tu-š-ri proves it was a well established Aramaic word, with the phoneme /t/. The suggestion that Sumerian had the sound [t] is an old one; cf. von Soden, "Zur Laut- und Formenlehre des Neuassyrischen," AFO XVIII (1957-58) 120.

260. Z, p. 12; LS, p. 585. The Arabic and Akkadian are probably cognate, for the Arabic aleph must be original. If so, the sibilant should be /š/. The Assyrian pronunciation of the two Akkadian forms should have been [pāš] and [pašš], neither of which easily yields the Syriac form, though the sibilant of the Syriac could be explained on the basis of Babylonian (see p. 140). The hapax Galilean Aramaic form ps² is suspect by reason of both spelling and syntax.


262. Ibid., pp. 31 ff. For the Akkadian, see Salonen, Hausgeräte I 264.

263. Z, p. 6; AHw., p. 862; KBL, p. 112; see, too, E. Y. Kutscher, "Phw² and Its Cognates," Tarbiz XXX (1961) 112-19 (Heb.), though his reading phw² in the Ramat Rahel seals is no longer to be accepted; cf. J. Naveh, The Development of the Aramaic Script (Jerusalem, 1970) p. 61. The old reading of this word in the Panammuwa inscription 1. 12 ḫḫy was shown to be incorrect by H. L. Ginsberg, "Aramaic Studies Today," JAOS LXII (1942) 236, n. 35. In Akkadian this term is usually spelled logographically: ḫḫy.
Arab., certainly as an old culture word of unknown origin. I know of no Akk. form *pilaqqu meaning "axe," cited by the early scholars as the origin of Syr., Mand. pelqā. The latter has a satisfactory Semitic etymology (plq, "to split") but could be a loan from Greek pelekês.264

* pilku, "region," "sub-province"—BH pelek, Phoen. plq, RH, Targums plk, "district."265

* pīqu, "dumb"—Syr. pɔqɔ, "dumb," Mand. pyqɔ, "dumb," "demon." The Akkadian is an adjective from piāqu, pāqu, "to be narrow, tight," said especially of the mouth.266

pīt pī, "mouth-opening ritual"—A connection with Mand. pyḥtɔ, "sacrificial bread," is highly doubtful.267

* puhrū, "assembly"—The Akkadian is very probably the origin of Syr. pwhrɔ, Mand. pwhrɔ, pwɔ, "banquet" (in Mandaic also "assembly(?)"); for although the noun pfr is not uncommon in Ugaritic (note, too, the alternate form mpɔrt, found also in the Yehimilk inscription from Byblos, KAI, No. 4), the verb paḥrū, "to gather," is known only from Akkadian. The Aramaic distribution is also indicative of a loan.268

* purkullu, "stone or seal cutter"—Syr., Targ. Prophets ḫrgwblɔ, "stone mason." Some of the significant phonetic difference between the two forms can be accounted for by assuming assimilation to the semantically similar ḫardīkā (see s.v. arad ekalli).269


265. Z, p. 9; KAI II 26. The "g" of late Phoen. plq, if correctly interpreted, is to be considered a late phonetic development. The difficult Karatepe II:6 (KAI, No. 26) plkm is still best taken as "spindles." The Mand. hapax ḫtpɔrɔ, "to be divided," used in a geographical text, should probably be connected with the common verb plg, "divide."

266. Z, p. 49; LS, p. 588. Cf. H. Holma, Die assyrisch-babylonischen Personennamen der Form guttulu (Helsinki, 1914) pp. 81 ff. J. Blau, "The Origins of Open and Closed e in Proto-Syriac," BSOGAS XXXII (1969) 4, n. 33, correctly observes that the Syriac cannot be proven to be from Akkadian merely on morphological grounds; but although the cognate roots pqq and ppiq occur in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Arabic, the middle weak form is known only in Akkadian (as opposed to the situation with kēn and kwn) and the Aramaic form is attested only in Eastern Aramaic.


269. Z, p. 26; LS, p. 46. I assume that the b of the second syllable of ḫrgwblɔ results from a transposition of the initial labial; see below, p. 138. Though the purkullu is best known as a "seal cutter," it
84 / purqidam - puṣṣû

* purqidam, "(lying) on the back"—BT prqdn, "one lying on his back," ṣprqd, "on the back," ḫprqd, "to be on the back" (once in Targ. YI Gen. 49:17 but not in Neofiti); Syr. (lex.) prqd, "to fall on the back." In spite of the uncertainties raised by the possible Arab. cognate brqṭ, ṭbrqṭ (as indicated in AḤw., p. 735, s.v. naparrqdu) and the Akkadian distribution (limited almost exclusively to divination, a sphere whose connections with Amorite have already been mentioned), I have taken this to be a loan. The similarity of the forms purqidam and prqdn is highly suggestive of a loan, as is the limitation of the distribution to Eastern Aramaic.²⁷⁰

* pūrû, "lot"—BH pûr, "lot," to explain the name Purim. Since it is glossed in the Hebrew text, pûr was still considered a foreign word. Subsequent RH and JAR. usages are certainly based on the BH usage; Syriac translates Purim by pwrاػ; Mand. pwrاػ, "lot" (uncertain). The Akkadian word is derived from pūrû, "bowl" < Sum. bur. The latter meaning is continued in three Jewish magic bowl texts where pwrاػ means "bowl."²⁷¹

puṣṣû, "to whiten"—Kutscher, in discussing the Eg. pšl, "to clear a claim," correctly connects it with the later Common Ar. (and Arab.) pšy, "to set free." He suggests that the latter is a loan from Akk. puṣṣû, "to make white," "to clean," and that this first loan was then used to translate the Akkadian legal term zukku, "to clear a claim," since its basic meaning is also "to make clean." This is extremely unlikely, for puṣṣû is not used in any similar legal context in Akka-

is clear that not only did he perform all sorts of stone engraving and carving, but he was probably the most important artisan involved with stone in general, as opposed to precious gems and metals (cf. Weisberg, Guild Structure, pp. 58 ff.). A complete analysis and description of the duties of the various artisans who worked in stone has not yet been made, but there appears to be no general Akkadian term that can be translated "stone mason" (cf. CAD, Vol. 1/3, p. 297).

²⁷⁰. The comparison with Aramaic was made as soon as the Akkadian was first isolated; see W. von Soden, "Zum akkadischen Wörterbuch," Or. n.s. XV (1946) 430, for previous literature and most recently E. Y. Kutscher, in LeS. XXXI 114, who points out the limited distribution of the Aramaic (and Babylonian Rabbinic Hebrew) and the similarity of forms, and J. Jacobovitz, "LeInyan 'prqd,'" Les. XXXI (1967) 240. Might the Arabic ultimately derive from Greek prōktos, "posterior," as was long ago suggested for the Aramaic? The phonetics certainly favor that explanation. For the significance of the Targ. YI occurrence see below, p. 163.

²⁷¹. AḤw., p. 881. In general cf. J. Lewy, "Old Assyrian puruethical and pūrûm," RHA XXXVI (1938) 117, n. 2, and 188 f., though, as indicated, his etymology from parûšû, "to cut," cannot be accepted. For the magic bowls cf. Montgomery, Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur, pp. 162, 228, and J. N. Epstein, REJ LXXIV (1922) 46.
pūtu - qātu / 85

dian, nor is it preserved in Aramaic in any non-legal sense. Of greatest significance, however, is the fact that the Akk.
term zukku itself, though frequent in Middle-Assyrian and the
peripheral dialects, was no longer current in Neo-Babylonian
(where the Aramaic loanword murruq was the corresponding term)
and occurred only sporadically in Neo-Assyrian. 272

*  
pūtu, "forehead"—Mand., BT pwt, Syr. (lex.) ṭwMt. 273

gabuttu (LB), "stall"—For semantic reasons, Syr. qbwbt, 
Mand. qa bwbt, qwbyt, "box," "chest," would not appear to be
developments of this late Akkadian term; nor should Syr.
qebyd, "cistern," be connected with qabû, "poultry stall." 274

garbatu, "field"—Early scholars compared the Eastern
Aramaic verb krb (Syr., BT, Mand., and Arab.), "to plow," with
a form *kirubû, which they translated "field," relating it to
garbatu. The former is now properly read kišubû, a Sumerian
loanword meaning "wasteland" (AHw., p. 493). Any connection
between krb and garbatu, whose initial consonant is definitely
/q/, is unlikely. 275

qātu, "hand"—The relations between this common word and
Syr., BT, Mand. qattû, RH qnt, qt, YT qnt, "handle" (verb
qtt in Syriac, "to stick in," in Mandaic, "to be fixed"), are
uncertain at best. The Akkadian form is never used in any
similar way; the correct word for handle is šiku. 276

272. E. Y. Kutscher, in JAOS LXXIV 240; idem, in Tarbiz XIX 53. His
suggestion that psh l → psl is reasonable. Others have suggested a con-
tamination of psh by nsl (cf. DISO, p. 233). It may just be a dialectal
assimilation of the roots psh and psl, both of which mean "to split."

273. The BT form is cited as ṭwMt in the lexicons, although the
variants imply a reading ṭwMt, "on the forehead," for some of the ex-
amples. Nevertheless, the legitimacy of the unusual form ṭwMt is con-
firmed by the Syriac lexicographers.

274. LS, p. 645. The similarity between the Syriac form and Greek
kibôtos can hardly be coincidental.

275. Z, p. 40; LS, p. 342. Suggested similar etymologies for the
land measure gryb (cf. LS, p. 130) are also ruled out. But what is the
etymology of krb? One distant possibility is to consider it somehow cog-
nate to Akk. karâbu, "to bless" (cf. ESA mкрb, "priest"), for connections
between terms of the "cult" and "cultivation" are well-known outside of
this familiar Latin example. Compare Ar. plîb. I would prefer, however,
to relate it to the Akk. term mukarribûu, "gardener," whose supposed ety-
omological connections with Sum. nu-kîrû are tenuous (cf. most recently
D. O. Edzard, "Sumerische Komposita mit dem nominal Präfix nu-," ZA n.f.
[1969] 2). In light of the Aramaic root, it would appear that the Akka-
dian term is, in origin, a D participle of a root *krb : *mukarribu, with
the change of the initial nasal due to dissimilation of labials and/or
assimilation to the Sumerian form.

86 / qinnāzu – quppu

qinnāzu, qi(n)nanzu, "whip"—Syr. (hapax lex.) gnt." 277
The etymology is unknown. 277

qištu, "forest"—Syr., JAr., CPA, Mand. (?) qys", "wood," "tree"; BT (Mand. ?) gyms", "chip." 278

* qudādu (AHzw. k/gudādu), "weak," "crippled(?)"—Not to be read in the Uruk Incantation, l. 11 (cf. DISO, p. 250, s.v. qdd); read [d]i-da-qé-e or [d]a-da-qé-e, the predecessor of the common Mand., BT word for child, drdq. 279

* qudāšu, "earring"—JAr., Syr. qdš. 280

qullū, "food dish," "bowl" only NA, LB—JAr. qwl, "bowl"; JAr., Syr. qwlt, "pitcher." Compare the older Akk. gullu, BH gullāh. 281

* quppu, "collection box"—MH qwph, "money box," "common fund"; Syr. qwpt, "purse"; Mand. qwp, qwpt(?). 282

This is the only meaning of this word where Akkadian influence seems probable. There is little reason to maintain that in their basic meanings quppu, "reed chest," and Ar., Arab. quppu/ff, "large basket," are anything but cognate (or an early loan into Akkadian[?]; note that almost all the early examples are from Mari or Amarna). The profusion of Jewish Aramaic and Hebrew forms supports this (i.e. qwph, qwp, qwpt, qpyph, qwpw, qpyph). The famous Mesopotamian basket boat, Arab. quffah, is possibly attested in Mand. qwpt, but there is no evidence that its precursor was ever called quppu in Akkad.

279. Thus, the interpretation "child" for Ugaritic kdd no longer finds support in Akkadian or Aramaic. Though Landsberger suggested the incorrect identification of the expression in the Uruk incantation, he himself realized that the reading da-da-qé-e was perhaps to be preferred, especially in l. 36; cf. "Zu den aramäischen Beschworungen in Keilschrift," AFO XII (1937-39) 257, n. 48. Another possibility for the origin of the form drdq is to view it as an amalgam of two old Amorite words for child: da/irkū and daggu (for which see CAD, Vol. D, pp. 107, 115, and 160). The scarcity and use of these terms in Akkadian indicates an almost certain West Semitic origin. (Cf. also Gezz dāqlq, "children.")

280. Z, p. 36; LS, p. 649; B. Meissner, "Lexikographische Studien," OLZ XXV (1922) 244 f. A derivation of Syr. qld", "nose ring" (cf. LS, p. 677) from the feminine form of this word is possible but far from certain: qudāštu > qudāl(t) > qullā by metathesis (to avoid homonymy with the word for "neck").

281. AHzw., p. 926.


283. Z, p. 34; Salonen, *Hausgeräte* I 203. The difficult word qwp in
* qurquaru, "a large ship"—Syr. qwrqrw > Arab. qurfar, "long or big ship." 284

rabiku, "flour pulp"—MH, Targ. rbykh/ך. Although the verb rbk does not definitely occur in Aramaic, it is found in BH and in Arabic. 285

* rabû, "great"—The term GAL, usually in the plural GAL. MEŠ, is used in late Akkadian for "officers," "officials" and is generally read rabûti, of which the singular would be rabû. This Akkadian term must be the origin of the strange form rby, "officer," in the Ahiqar narrative. On the other hand, the construct form rab, "chief," in Akkadian is almost certainly of Amorite origin. In OB it occurs only in the expression GAL. MAR.TU, "chief of the Amorites." 286 Later it is common in the western peripheral dialects and in Assyrian. Thus, the Heb. and Ar. term rab is a native West Semitic development. 287

rakûbu, "to ride," "to be on top of"—Although no Akkadian antecedents are actually attested, Syr. rgp, Targ. Proph. rkp, "joined timber" may have an Akkadian etymology. Compare rikbu, "a top part of a plow," but note as well the many uses of the II stem of rkb in Arabic. 288

rakûsu, "to bind"—Any direct connections with BH r enquš, "property," BH and Common Ar. rks, "horse," are unlikely. Note that the verb rks does not otherwise occur in Aramaic, but for some reason became rks. The Akkadian nominal forms cited by Zimmer are now known to be misinterpreted or misread. 289

* rapûqu, "to dig," "to hoe"—BT rpg, "to hoe." 290

Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum, No. 7:17, may be one of the words discussed here, though the long vowel makes that very unlikely. Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, pp. 72 ff., makes an effort to associate this word with pictorial and descriptive evidence of the early basket boat, yet his only adduced lexical connection is the reed quppû (clearly an enclosed box) of the Sargon legend, in which the babe Sargon was sent floating down the river.

284. Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 51, n. 2.
286. Rabû is actually given as the "Amorite" equivalent of Akk. rubû in the lexical list Explicit Malku-Šarru I 35; see A. D. Kilmer, "The First Table of malkû = šarrû Together with Its Explicit Version," JAOS LXXXIII (1963) 433.
290. Z, p. 41. Interestingly, the meaning "hoe" for this root is confined to the Babylonian dialects of both Akkadian and Aramaic.
88 / rapšu - rāšū

* rapšu, "shovel for winnowing grain"—Syr. raḥšā, Arab. rafš.291

raggatu (late SB, LB), "swamp"—MH rqq; JAR., Syr. rqt>; Mand. r²/yq²t³. The limited distribution of the Akkadian suggests that it is a loan from Aramaic.292

* rāšū, NB "creditor"—Targ. Onk., Targ. Prophets, BT ršy², "creditor," ršy (peal), "to lend," ršwt², "loan"; Mand. rš², "to lend." There can be little doubt that this is a loan. This meaning of the Aramaic root is of extremely limited distribution, whereas the Neo-Babylonian meaning derives easily from the known Akkadian usages of the verb rašš, "to have," "to acquire."293 Still not fully determined, however, is the extent of the influence attributable to Assyrian or Babylonian legal formulation on the use of the verb ršy and its virtual synonym gry at Elephantine. The usage of these two terms and their Akkadian cognates rašš and gerš has been carefully analyzed by Muffs adding to the more general, but important observations made by Kutscher.294

Gerš, gry is easier to analyze. Its meaning in BH, RR, JAR., and Syr. (all piel, pael) is "to provoke," obviously the same as Akkadian "to begin hostilities" (and Arab. ʔr², "to dare," though the hamza is unexpected in light of the BH form); no doubt it could be used quite naturally in juridical as well as martial contexts (see Prov. 15:18, 28:25, 29:22). But in view of the long history of the Akkadian formulaic use of the verb in the sense "to initiate a lawsuit" and the virtual identity between the late Akkadian and Egyptian Aramaic phraseology, Akkadian influence here cannot be discounted.295 On the other hand, there is little reason to assume that any of the other Aramaic usages of this verb have been influenced by the Akkadian formulaic expression.

293. Suggested in Z, p. 17, but of course to be separated from BH nšh. For NB rašš, see A. Ungnad, Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungsurkunden, Glossar (Leipzig, 1937) p. 135 (hereafter cited as Ungnad, Glossar); H. Petersow, Neubabylonisches Pfandrecht, p. 19, n. 40. pp. 71 f. Mand. rš²wšt² is from Arab. ršw, "to bribe," not Aramaic. The YT examples of rššw cited by Jastrzbow, Dictionary, are of doubtful legitimacy; I know of no other western occurrences.
295. Muffs, Studies, p. 197, emphasizes the difference between Eg. and NA in the use of the personal object and suggests a late NB component here. I would suggest, rather, that the NB was influenced by Aramaic and that the usage in the papyri merely reflects native Aramaic syntax.
The relationship between rašû and Eq. rṣy is more difficult to analyze. Its basic meaning in Old Aramaic, well attested in later Aramaic and in Hebrew, is "to have control, authority, right," in the derived stems "to grant authority," 296 again clearly cognate to Akkadian, "to have, get possession." The Egyptian Aramaic meaning "to bring suit" to my knowledge is found elsewhere only in Syr. rṣγ, "to accuse," "to find fault." What is the origin of this usage? It almost certainly did not develop from the Neo-Babylonian form "creditor," especially since different verbs are used in the Babylonian equivalents of the Egyptian Aramaic formulae which use rṣy. Rašû does occur in similar contexts in Akkadian, though much earlier and even then only sporadically, 297 but perhaps that is where one must look for the origin of the Egyptian Aramaic usage.

rašu, "watercourse," "pipe"—Targ. Onk. (so in good MSS), Iraqi Arabic raţ; BH, RH, Syr., rḥṭ(ẓ); Mand. r(ẓ)ḫṭ(ẓ). Since the Akkadian form is attested as early as Old Babylonian, this word is apparently not to be connected with the Aramaic root rḥṭ, "run" < rḥ/wẓ. Although the h is preserved in Mandaic, the form raṭû is the expected Babylonian Aramaic reflex of raḥṭû and could be a Babylonian form in Onkelos. Alternatively, the targumic (and Arabic) form could preserve the Akkadian pronunciation. 298

redû, "to follow," "to drive"—Three meanings, possibly derived from different original roots, are associated with the verb rdγ in the Aramaic dialects: "to chastise," "to plow," and "to move," "to journey." The last is found only in Syriac and Mandaic but as a common verb and, though possibly continuing a native Aramaic meaning, may owe some influence to Akkadian. Compare Akk. mardītu, "course," "cult procession," and the common Ar. mardītû, "course," "journey." 299

296. In Old Aramaic the verb occurs in Seferim III 9 and Hadad 11. 27, 28 (and in Phoenician, Karatepe A III 6 rṣγt); cf. Fitzmyer, Seferim, p. 112, and Muffs, Studies, p. 208. The Seferim example might be an apophel: "you shall not control me nor (have to) grant me permission concerning it." Could the "1" of ltršh be asseverative: "rather you shall grant me permission . . ."? The context of Hadad is broken, but it may even be more like Akkadian "to acquire."


299. Z, p. 42; Alw., p. 645. The meaning "to plow" is certainly a native Aramaic development.
90 / riqītu - s/zamītu

* riqītu, "part of the stomach of a ruminant"—Targ. Y Dt. 18:3 riqītu. 300

rubē, NA "interest"—The verb rabû and related noun forms are used in several Akkadian dialects to refer to interest, but there is no reason to regard any of them as other than cognate with similar Aramaic terminology. In Aramaic rby is the only root commonly used here, whereas Akkadian has other words which are much more frequent (ṣiptu, hubullu). Specific formulaic uses of the Aramaic may, however, have Akkadian models. 301

saddinnu, see n. 324.

sāhertu, sahertu—Syr. šhrt, Mand. s'hr, means "walled enclosure" or "palace." Since the verb šhr (common elsewhere in Aramaic as "to go around") is not otherwise used in those dialects except in the meaning "to go around peddling," one suspects a loan here. Possibly related Akkadian forms may be found in the rare sāhertu 4 translated "Ummauerung" by von Soden, and in the lexical equation bād-nigin : sahīrat dūri, whose meaning is uncertain. 302

* sāhiru, "magician"—Mand. s'hr, "demon"; Arab. sāhir, "magician." The Mandaic is not definitely derived from this word, but Arabic h (not ḫ) suggests an Aramaic intermediary. 303

samīdu, "fine flour"—Syr., Targ. Y, BT smyd, Mand. symd, Arab. samīd. Compare Ug. smā, a food of some sort. The evidence for an Akkadian origin is the verb samādū, "to grind fine," found only in Akkadian. If it is a loanword, however, the consonants of the Aramaic form (s with m) indicate a very early date for the borrowing. 304

s/zamītu, "corner"—BH, MH zwyt; Common Ar. zāwītā, ESA zyyym (pl. indefinite); Arab. zāwiyah. The origin of this


301. Z, p. 18; Muffs, Studies, p. 185.


303. Z, p. 67. For the Akkadian see AHw., pp. 1009 and 1008 (s.v. sahertu).

304. LS, p. 479; B. Landsberger, "Zur Mehlsbereitung im Altertum," OLZ XXV (1922) 337 ff. If borrowed from Babylonian one would expect to find w (for m) in Aramaic, whereas the preservation of s indicates that it could not come from Assyrian.
word remains uncertain. The Akkadian term, known only from first-millennium texts, has no Akkadian etymology, nor is there any indication that the second consonant was ever anything but /w/. 305

sîharu (AWH. sahharru), "kind of bowl"—Probably the same as Persepolis šhr, "plate," "shallow bowl." The word is clearly Semitic but not definitely of Akkadian origin. 306

sîkîltu, "hoard"—See s.v. suk/gullu.

* sîkkanu, "rudder"—Syr. swknu, Mand. swknu > Arab. sakkâ, sîkkân. 307


sîkkuru, "bolt," "lock"; sikru, "dam"—Syr., Mand. sukkrâ, "bolt," "bar"; JPA swkrâ, "bolt," "dam." The root skr is common in both Aramaic and Akkadian; thus, the difference in the noun forms suggests that the terms are only cognate. 309

* simân, "set time"—Common Ar. zam (Syr. zbn); late BH, MH zemân; Arab. zaman, zaman; Ethiopic zaman; Pehlevi zamân.

305. Z, p. 31; LS, p. 190; KBG (3d ed.) p. 256; Wagner, p. 48; von Soden, "Zum akkadischen Wörterbuch," Or. n.s. XVI (1947) 448 f. There is no reason to consider this word separate etymologically from zamâ (cf. CAD, Vol. Z, p. 41a), although they are probably not synonymous. An Akkadian pronunciation zam/witu is indicated by spellings with the sign ZA (hardly to be read sâ); cf. CAD, Vol. D, p. 192a, lex. section.

306. Cf. Persepolis, p. 49; Salonen, Hausgeräte II 112 f.; AHW., p. 1008. This connection was not made by Bowman. Note that the Akkadian, found often in NA and lexical lists, does occur once in LB.


308. Z, p. 35; LS, p. 472; AHW., p. 1041; for the meaning "plowshare," see Salonen, Agricultura, p. 92. This is to be separated from Ar. sîkk, derived from sîk, BH šeg, "thorn" (confused in JAR. sources with syrtâ, "thorn," and swkâ, "bush"). In KBG, p. 921, BH šeg is incorrectly compared with the Akkadian, cited as sikkatu. It belongs rather with BH sakkân, Ar. sakkân, "knife," and neither is from Akkadian (cf. Wagner, p. 366, n. 5).

Jastrow's translation of sktâ in Targ. Deut. 23:14 as "spade" is misleading (Dictionary, p. 993). The word merely translates BH ytd, normally "peg," whatever it may actually mean in that context. Arab. sikkah, BT sktâ, Syr. (lex.) sktâ dâbc (see Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, p. 2622), "minting die," represents a development of this word, but the place of origin of this usage is uncertain.

Iranologists are convinced that the word is of Iranian origin, while Assyriologists propose an Akkadian etymology from (w)asāmu, "to be appropriate." The recently discovered occurrences of this otherwise late word in Old Babylonian texts conclusively refute the position of Iranologists. The Aramaic could not have been borrowed from Babylonian, however, where it was pronounced, as shown by the Aramaic month name, [siwān]; but an Assyrian pronunciation [zimān] is quite possible (see Phonology, Sibilants, in Chap. IV).

* simmiltu, "staircase"—Eastern Neo-Ar. semmitla, Syr. sblt>, Mand. swmbylt>, "ladder." See hūgu. 312

sippu, "doorsill"—There is little evidence that would suggest that sippu is anything but cognate to Common Ar. sippa, Heb. sap, and Phoen. sp. 313

sipru, "border," "shore(?)"—MH, Targ. Onk., Syr., CPA spr. In light of the common Arabic forms ūfīr and ūfīr, which show the original sibilant to be ū, the rare late Akkadian term, if correctly interpreted, must be an Aramaism. 314


312. AHW, p. 1045.

313. Z, p. 31; LS, p. 489; Salonen, Türen, p. 62. The only evidence for a non-cognate relationship is the sign ZIG, which also has the value ZIF, translated in one lexical text by Akk. ziggu, which in turn is matched in a synonym list with sippu (cf. CAD, Vol. Z, p. 129a, s.v. ziggu C). On this slim, indirect evidence, Salonen claims that sippu is a Sumerian loanword from ZIF.

suk/gullu, "herd," sikiltu, "hoard," "accumulated property"—Ug. sglt (broken context), BH s<sup>2</sup>gullāh, "accumulated property," "treasure"; Targ. YII sglp<sup>2</sup>, "property" and derived verbs in RH and late JAr. There is little reason to regard the Ugaritic and Hebrew as loans from Akkadian in any period. The JAr. forms are clearly secondary derivations from the Hebrew. 315

* sunqu, "hunger," "need"—Syr. swng<sup>3</sup>, "need" and derived verbs in Syr. and Mand. (cf. Ge<sup>2</sup>ez šng, "provisions(?)"). The limited distribution of the Aramaic indicates a loan here. On the other hand, there is no reason to regard the Common Ar. šng, "to choke," as a loan from Akkadian. The hapax occurrence of tašnigu, "choking," in Akkadian is certainly a loan from Aramaic. 316

supinnu, "trowel(?)," "spindle point(?)"—MH, Targ. Onk. and Proph., BT, Syr. šwpyn<sup>2</sup>, "file"; JAr. šwpyn<sup>2</sup>, "spear butt," "spike." The Akkadian is late, primarily in lexical texts, and the origin of the word (or words) is uncertain. 317

* suqāqu, "alley"—Palm. šqq, Syr. šqq<sup>2</sup>, šqq<sup>2</sup>, "alley";

mena, p. 214, suggest that Ar. spr is derived from Akk. supūru (cited by them as supūrū), previously translated "surrounding wall" but now known to mean "(animal) stall." Although the etymology of the Akkadian term is uncertain, it surely is not the origin of Ar. spr.

315. Thoroughly discussed most recently by M. Held, "A Faithful Lover in an Old Babylonian Dialogue," JCS XV (1961) 11 f.; cf. also M. Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," JAOS XC (1970) 195, n. 103. The following additional observations are relevant: The occurrence of sglt in Ugaritic (UT 2060:7, 12 meaning "treasure"?) and su-gul-la-ti, "accumulation," in a text of Egyptian origin found at Boghazkoy (KUB III, No. 57:4-6) show that the form *sugullat was already current in the West at that time, certainly quite different in form from Akk. sikiltu, and some type of cognate relationship is thus most likely. But there are still difficulties. The Akk. suk/gullu, "herd," "cattle," can hardly be separated from this group of words (Held suggests possible coincidental homonymy), nor can the Ar. form sglw, "cluster of grapes," for the otherwise common West Semitic *ṣīḵāl. In all these words the idea of "collection" is primary.


317. AHw., p. 1060. When spelled with the logogram šīḫBA, supinnu is something which can be part of a spindle (pišakkû, cf. Hh.IV 36, 50); I suggest "point" on the basis of the JAr. word šwpyn<sup>2</sup>. The meaning "file" seems to have a connection with the Aramaic root šwp, "to make smooth," but the ending -yn is problematic on a native Aramaic word (see below, n. 324).
JPA šqq², šwqq², "alley," "street," > Arab. zûqâq. An Akkadian etymology for this word and for its more common relative sūqu (Eqg. and Common Ar., Heb.) šqq > Arab. sūq, "street" > "market," was recently rejected by Landsberger, his sole criterion being the sibilant shift Assyrian š > Aramaic š, which he believed not possible. 318 The evidence fails to support his position, however (see Phonology, in Chap. IV), and his argument must be rejected. But, he quite correctly observed that the sibilant difference does not preclude the possibility of a cognate relationship. 319 Nevertheless, an etymology is available only in Akkadian: Common Semitic ḏq̱, "to be narrow, strait," which correctly becomes šīāqu in Akkadian by Geers' Law. 320 That this is the correct etymology is demonstrated by the place name Suqāqu, whose topographical location correctly fits the meaning "narrow." 321 The word suqāqu is a diminutive whose form has parallels in Akkadian. 322 The early meaning of šqq in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Arabic was "street." Later this developed into "market," at which time š(u)qâq probably assumed part of the former semantic range of šqq in JPA. 323

* sūqu, see s.v. suqāqu.  

* susapinnu, "best man"—MH šwšbēn, JAr., Syr. šwšbēn², Mand. šwšbēn². Although this word may well originally have been of foreign origin, the phonetic correspondences indicate that it was borrowed by Aramaic from the Assyrian dialect. 324

318. B. Landsberger, in Suppl. VT XVI 185, though he does recognize that Assyrian šh/ is rendered by Aramaic "s" (see p. 199).

319. For examples of unusual Akkadian reflexes of Proto-Semitic sibilants see J. Aro, in Or. n.s. XXVIII 330 f.

320. Cf. GAG Ergänz., § 51e; AHw., p. 1039.

321. See W. W. Hallo, "The Road to Emar," JCS XVIII (1964) 70.

322. Cf. GAG Ergänz., p. 9**: buqāqu, "little gnat," and the examples cited by F. R. Kraus, "Ein Sittenkanon in Omenform," ZA XLIII (1936) 112, for purās as a diminutive, though admittedly none of these is precisely our word where the originally single final consonant is reduplicated.

323. Z, p. 43; LS, pp. 766, 796. Sūqu is common in Akkadian. The earliest occurrence I know of suqāqu is in a lexical text from Boghazköy, KBo I 40, but a by-form sūqēnu occurs already in OA (cf. von Soden, GAG Ergänz. § 132g, but read sukinnu in AHw.1). LB forms with šh are clearly reborrowings from Aramaic.

324. Z, p. 46; LS, p. 766; AHw., p. 1063. Cf. most recently C. Wilcke, "ku-li," ZA XXV (1969) 76; S. Greengus, "Old Babylonian Marriage Ceremonies and Rites," JCS XX (1966) 68 ff., and BWL, pp. 339 f. No etymology is yet known. The -innu ending (as opposed to -ennu, -ānu < -ānu on good Semitic words like qutremnu, "incense"; cf. GAG § 56r) points to a northern, possibly Anatolian, origin; cf. GAG § 58b; E. Bilgic, "Die Ortsnamen der 'kappodokischen' Urkunden im Rahmen der alten Sprachen Anatoliens," AFO XV (1945-51) 17, n. 123. A similar history is probable for another -innu culture word, saddinnu (AHw. s/išaddinu), "a piece of
šabātu—The Aramaic root ṣbt, found in the pael in Palmyran and Syriac meaning "to ornament," in the Mand. noun ṣwēt, "ornament," and probably in the BT root ṣbt, meaning "to arrange," "to offer," is connected by Brockelmann (LS, p. 620) with Akk. šibētu, "dyed fabric"; but this Akkadian word is now known to be a rare lexical term, and the meaning "to paint," "to dye" for the verb šabû is not even certain (CAD, Vol. S, p. 46a). Greenfield has suggested that the Aramaic is rather a loan from Akk. šabātu, "to seize," found in the D stative in two Neo-Assyrian texts in the apparent meaning "adorned." A similar semantic development is more commonly found in the D stem of its synonym aḥāzu, "to seize," uhhuzu, "to mount in precious metal." But a direct borrowing of this verb would be unexpected (see below, p. 161), especially in light of the rarity of this meaning. One should not omit from consideration the Akkadian word for "garment," šubātu, common in the older dialects, a noun which probably does not derive from šabātu. In addition, NB has ṣibtu, a garment used primarily for clothing sacred images, identical in shape to the basic noun of the Syriac complex, ṣebtā, "ornament." Definite conclusions cannot be reached, however, for the problems with this root are manifold, and any assumption that only one Proto-Semitic root (ḏbt) is involved and that all variations from the expected reflexes are due to borrowings from Akkadian leads only to further confusion. Much more, including dialect borrowing, assimilation, and root contamination, is clearly involved. In Ugaritic one finds mṣbtm, "tongs," but ṣbt means the same in Mishnaic Hebrew. Ṣbtym, "grain bundles," occurs in Biblical Hebrew, certainly a related form. As a verb, ṣbt occurs in MH and JPA meaning "to join," certainly related to the common Eastern Aramaic šawtā, "group." There is also the common Western Aramaic șmt, "to join," "to press together," "to heap up," which is almost certainly Proto–West-Semitic. As a provisional analysis one might posit that Akk. šubātu and Syr. etc. ṣbt
are related—perhaps the Aramaic is a loan from the Akkadian through Amorite—and that NB šībtu and NA šubbutu are Aramaisms.

The restored word [šb]y(?/t) čzh, "seal-bearer," in Ahiqar is also usually derived from Akk. šabātu, but since no known Akkadian term for seal-bearer involves that verb and only the final consonant of the Aramaic is certain, the equation remains dubious.328

šerru, "door pivot”—BH and MH šîr, Jar. šyr 3 šyr 3, Syr. šyr 3 (gâyartâ!), Arab. šîr. There is no good reason to regard the West Semitic forms as loans. Sum. za-ra is now considered a loan from Akkadian.329

* šîtu, "expenditure" (Bab.)—BA, Eq., Palm., Nab., Syr. npqt 3; BT npqwt 3; > Arab. nafaqah. This is taken to be a loan-translation because of its long Akkadian history dating back to Sumerian economic usage and because this does not seem to be a normal semantic development from the verb "to go out" in Semitic. MH yṣy 3h is probably a calque from Aramaic. On the other hand, the MH form hwṣ 3h from the causative stem could well be an independent development.330

* šumbu, "wagon"—BH šb; Targ. Proph. šyb as a royal conveyance. Though the etymology of the Akkadian is unknown, the scarcity of the Aramaic attestations makes a loan probable.331

Ya—As I have shown elsewhere, the standard interpretation of the first "y" in the Nerab inscriptions as this genitive particle is incorrect.332

šaddaqdim OB, šaddaqad LB, šaddagg/diš NA, "previous year"—Syr. šṭqd(y), BT, YT šṭqd. Since the Akkadian is almost certainly a loan from Amorite and the late Akkadian forms differ considerably from those of Aramaic, the Aramaic and

328. Cf. AP, p. 226, and Greenfield, in JAOS LXXXII 292 ff. The Akkadian term for "seal-bearer" is the Sum. loanword kišibgallu (or perhaps, as a loan-translation, *nâš kunukki); šābit kunukki occurs in YOS I, No. 37:30, but apparently in the meaning "possessor of the document" (cf. CAD, Vol. §, p. 1bb).
330. B. Landsberger, "Bemerkungen zur altbabylonischen Briefliteratur," ZDMG LXIX (1915) 506. Npqt 3 was probably an official term in Imperial Aramaic.
331. Z, p. 42; KBL, p. 790. The BH term (if correctly vocalized) could be cognate, for the Akkadian seems to go back to a similar form (cf. Salonen, Landfahrzeuge, p. 62), but note NB šabbu. The targumic form with "y" probably derives from the Akkadian u.
Akkadian are probably separate developments from Amorite. The initial aleph of the Aramaic form is prothetic, not a development from an Akkadian ina š-. 333

* šadû, "east"—BT šdy², "east wind." 334

* ša ekalli, "queen"—BH šēgāl, BA pl. š-gl-t². In spite of phonetic difficulties, a loan is almost certain here. As demonstrated by Landsberger, the reading ša ekalli for SAL.É.GAL cannot be doubted, and the identity in meaning between the Akkadian and BH and BA could not be coincidental. 335

* šaknu, "prefect"—BH, BA, DEA, No. 70:1, Persepolis, Eg. sgn, "prefect," MH, JAR., "vicerey," "adjutant." The Babylonian docket proves that sgn is šaknu and further shows that the Assyrian pronounation was standard for this word even in Babylonia, as does the LB form sagānu. The Amarna period precursor of the Assyrian form served as the model for the Ug., Phoen. and Heb. title skn, studied most thoroughly by Alt, 336

333. Perles, in OLZ XXI 67 f.; LS, p. 53; D. O. Edzard, "Mari und Aramäer?" ZA XXII (1964) 147. For the Akkadian forms see GAG § 72c. The Amorite origin of šaddaqdim is shown by its frequent occurrences (and the frequent occurrences of qām) at Mari (cf. CAD, Vol. A, Part II, s.v. aqdamatu) and the phonetic difficulties involved were it an original Akkadian word (cf. Edzard).

334. Z, p. 45. J. N. Epstein, "Zum magischen Texte," JAOS XXXIII (1913) 280, n. 1, suggested that Aramaic gbl, "south," may derive from a loan-translation of šadû, but in spite of the interpretation in Aruch of šdy² as south wind (s.v. štn²), there is no indication that šadû was ever anything but east (or northeast)?

335. R. Borger, review of CAD, Vol. E, Wi. Orr. XVIII (1961) 152; B. Landsberger, in Suppl. VT XVI 198 ff. The Akkadian term occurs in at least one Achaemenid text (cf. Landsberger, p. 200), and therefore it is possible that the loan was from the Babylonian pronunciation of the word, borrowed from NA, where a partial Babylonization of the pronunciation has occurred (l̲š) for [s] but maintaining the Assyrian [g] in ekalli; cf. sgn for šaknu in Babylonian Mesopotamian Aramaic). The alternative explanations suggested by A. R. Millard, "Fša Ekalli š-gl D-agale," UF IV (1972) 162, cannot be accepted. The BH verb šgl, with no other known cognates, can hardly be anything but a derivative from šēgāl; but one cannot be forced to regard the loan as early merely because this verb seems attested in otherwise pre-Exilic BH texts. It may even be that the Masoretic substitution of Qre škb for written šgl actually reflects an earlier substitution in reverse, when šgl was felt to be the euphemistic form.

F. Perles, in OLZ XXI 68, suggested that BT dytw, "wife," was formed under the influence of ša ekalli. One might be more correct to say under the influence of noun forms with ša, such as ša ekalli and ša rēši, frequent in the late dialects; but the still unexplained suffixed form dytw, "his wife," adds an element of uncertainty to the origin of the BT term.

found in Aramaic only in one of the early bricks from Hama (KAI, No. 203).\textsuperscript{337}

* Ša lā, "without"—In Eastern Aramaic and, sporadically, in Western Aramaic, d-lā is used to mean "without."\textsuperscript{338} NB Ša lā is similarly used, and even developed into a secondary preposition, šalānu-.\textsuperscript{339} Since, as shown by Rimalt, the Akkadian can be viewed as the result of a long development,\textsuperscript{340} and since the form b-lā appears to be the Common Aramaic expression for "without,"\textsuperscript{341} the likelihood of Akkadian influence here is great.

* Šalamtu, "corpse"—Syr. šlḏ; Mand. šlūnḏ, šliḏ; BT šlḏ, RH (in BT) šlḏ, (in Lam. Rabbah) pl. šldwt.\textsuperscript{342}

Šalātu, "to rule," "to have control over"—The root šlt is much more common in Aramaic than is its cognate in Akka-

\textsuperscript{337} Z, p. 6; KBL, pp. 649, 1103; Persepolis, pp. 25 ff.; von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXXVII 265. For the NA šaknu cf. R. A. Henshaw, "The Office of šaknu in Neo-Assyrian Times," JAOS LXXXVII (1967) 517 ff., LXXXVIII (1968) 461 ff. The Assyrian form of this word was probably always šaknu, but the construct form šakin (māt X) was probably the model for the early Canaanite borrowing, hence Heb. sōqēn. For Bab. šakkanaku as a reborrowing of an early Sumerian loanword from an Akkadian form like šaknu cf. Edzard, in ZA n.f. XXI 94 ff., contra A. Goetze, "Šakkanakku of the Ur III Empire," JCS XVII (1963) 7, n. 90; previously W. W. Hallo, Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles (New Haven, 1957) pp. 106 f.


\textsuperscript{339} Cf. AHw., p. 521a bottom. Lexical entries can be found s.v. balu in CAD, Vol. B.

\textsuperscript{340} Rimalt, in WZKM XXXIX 114 ff. He tried to find its origin in expressions of the negative of the infinitive such as ša lā ragāmim, "of non-claiming," but of course in such constructions lā ragāmim is to be considered a single unit. More recently another frequent usage has come to light, translated "ohne den Willen" by von Soden (AHw., p. 521a). The interpretation "except for," "apart from" also fits many of the cases, and is now attested in the OB Atrahasis story (Lambert and Millard, Atra-ḥasis, III vi 14 [= Gilgamesh XI, 1. 175]). Given this background, there is little reason to regard the common LB preposition as an Aramaism (as in AHw., p. 521a). As Rimalt points out (p. 114), NB did borrow the native Aramaic form for "without" as ina lā.

\textsuperscript{341} This was borrowed into NB and the Akkadian of Mari as ina lā (see n. 340 and I. J. Gelb, Language XXXIII [1957] 203) and into late BH as bopšēn.

\textsuperscript{342} Z, p. 48; LS, p. 779. For the sound change cf. GAG § 31f and below, p. 138. The occurrence of this otherwise eastern word in Lamentations Rabbah, thought to be an early Palestinian Midrash, is worthy of note.
dian. Accordingly, the rare NA and common NB and LB use of this verb in legal formulae is probably modeled after Aramaic usage, not the reverse.343

* Šamāhu, "to sprout"—Syr. Šwh, Targ. Proverbs Šwwh, "to sprout"; MH, BT Šbh, "to increase naturally."344

* Šamallû, "apprentice"—BT Šwly, Mand. (ד)Šwly, 345

* Šambaliltu, "fenugreek"—BT Šblwylt, Šblylt. Syr.

343. Muffs, Studies, p. 178, correctly shows that Šalātu in such formulae is only a late substitution for several earlier verbs. Nevertheless, he insists (pp. 153, n. 4, 177) that the Aramaic is modeled on the Neo- and Late Babylonian form. There is no evidence to support such a position. The Aramaic verb was borrowed into late BH as well (Wagner, p. 114).

344. Z, p. 70; IS, p. 762. The ingenious proposal to connect Šwh with MH, BT Šbh was made by Kutscher (orally); he also pointed out a possible connection with MH bt Šw, a kind of plant. The suggestion is based on the well known alternation between waw and bet rafe in MH. Greenfield, in his excellent study of the verb Šmh and its relatives ("Lexicographical Notes II," HUCA XXX [1959] 141-51), considers the relationship between the Aramaic and Akkadian to be uncertain (p. 142, n. 10). His objection to the pronunciation of Šamāhu as [Kawah] is incorrect, however, for the loan must be from Babylonian, and Babylonian intervocalic /m/ certainly was pronounced [w], no matter what the phonetics underlying Assyrian spellings with (see Nasals in Chap. IV).

345. Z, p. 16; for the OB use of the term Šamallû see W. F. Leemans, The Old-Babylonian Merchant (Leiden, 1950) pp. 22 ff. The meaning "apprentice" in NB is proven conclusively by two apprenticeship contracts: E. and V. Revillout, "A Contract of Apprenticeship from Sippara," Babylonian and Oriental Record II (1898) 119-27, and T. G. Pinches, "Tablet Referring to the Apprenticeship of Slaves at Babylon," Babylonian and Oriental Record I (1887) 81-85, No. 2. In the former (11. 3 ff.) the apprentice-to-be is handed over to a baker anā Šamallūtu nuhattimmūtu, "for the apprenticeship of the baking trade," which is exactly paralleled in the other text by anā lamādu nuhattimmūtu, "to learn the baking trade." Though correctly interpreted by the original editors of the text, this Šamallūtu was misunderstood by M. San Nicolò, Der neubabylonische Lehrvertrag in rechtsvergleichende Betrachtung (Munch, 1950) p. 5, n. 6, who translates uncertainly "Krämerei" on the basis of the OB meaning. He is followed in this interpretation by Weisberg, Gild Structure, pp. 99 f.

N. H. Tur-Sinai, The Language and the Book II (Jerusalem, 1950) 275 ff., attempts to demonstrate that the Akkadian word is native, deriving from an older form *ša mala, equivalent to OA ša kīma, "substitute," which itself, he claims, was borrowed into early Canaanite in the form šml, which he translates "substitute." The latter portion of his suggestion is intriguing, but since *ša mala is hypothetical and the Sum. šaman-lá is attested, its probability is low. (For the Sumerian etymology see W. W. Hallo, "A Mercantile Agreement from the Reign of Gungunum of Larsa," AS, No. 16 [Chicago, 1965] p. 199, n. 5a). In the course of his argument, Tur-Sinai proposes and then rejects (certainly with good reason) the possibility that šml in Ezek. 8:3, 5 is our word in its older sense of "merchant's representative."
plîltâ reflects the original form to which, in Akkadian, the generic term šammu, "plant," has been added.346

šammu, "plant," "herb," "drug"—Common Ar. (MH) sm, pl. sammyn, "drug," "poison," "pigment"; BH sammîm, "fragrant herbs"; Arab. sâmîm, "poison." The Aramaic form is the correct reflex of the Proto-Semitic word *šamm, but it may have been influenced semantically by the Akkadian in medicinal usage. The Biblical Hebrew is probably native, though the spelling with "s" is Aramaized. The Arabic form is certainly an Aramaic loanword.347

* šänû in tēmu šanû, "to lose one's senses"—BH šnh t–m; Syr. šnȳ, "crazy"); Mand. šnyw̄t̄, "madness."348

šañûma, "again"—See below, p. 153.

šaqâlu, "hang," "weigh," "pay" (cf. šiqlu, p. 29)—In Eastern Aramaic šql is the common word for "to lift up," "to take" (also in Genesis Apocryphon and the Palmyran tariff, CIS II 3913). In light of its distribution an Akkadian origin certainly seems probable, but one would have to posit such chains of semantic development as "pay" > "pay for" > "buy" > "take" and "hang" > "lift up." An alternative and reasonable non-Akkadian etymology is offered by Brockelmann, LS, p. 798. As another possibility the writer somewhat hesitantly offers the observation that the common perfect of leqû, "take," in Neo-Assyrian is isseqe [iššeqe]. The latter, with the direct object marker l–, would yield šql. (Compare Syr. ntl, "give" < ntn l–.)

* ša rēšî, "eunuch"—Sefire I B 45, III 5 srs; Imp. Ar. srs, srȳs; BH, MH; Common Ar. šrîsâ > Arab. sarîs; derived verbs in MH, JAR., CPA, Syr., and Mand.349


348. Z, p. 48; for the Akkadian, very frequent in medical and magical texts, see BWL, p. 325. The earliest occurrence I know of is Atrahasis III iii 25. Although Jastrow (Dictionary, p. 1606) cites a meaning "to act strangely" for the verb, the only JAR. references I know that may derive from this meaning are šnȳ and šmâ in Targ. Prophets for BH mhîlîw and štrîwrh.

349. Z, p. 6; LS, p. 500; KBL, p. 668. This is a very old compar-
šāru - šēdu / 101

* šāru, "wind," "direction"—Mand. šór> (also šyr?); "direction," "side." 350

* šatamma, "steward"—Mand. šóttm> (var. šóttm?); "a temple functionary(?);" BT ṣṭm>, "an official"; Syr. ṣṭm>, Arab. ṣṭm>, "ship captain," "supercargo." 351

* šatāru, NB "document"—Babylonian dockets, Narab tablets, AP, No. 81, Nab., Palm., Murabba<at, JAR., MH, Syr. štăr; Mand. šót> r> (?). 352

* šē bābi, "neighbor"—Palm. šbb, Targ. Onk., Proph., YI, BT š(y)bb>, Mand. šyb>b>, Syr. šbb>. The masculine singular form of this compound is not yet attested in our Akkadian sources, but the Aramaic attestations indicate that it was the common word for "neighbor" in late Akkadian. 353

* šēdu, "demon"—BH šēd; Paik. 960; Palm. (?) ; MH and JAR. š(y)d; Syr. š)p>d; Mand. šy)d. The Akk. šēdu is generally a good demon, while in Aramaic it is usually malevolent. 354

ison (cf. BDB, p. 710), but the Akkadian reading itself was not proven correct until recently (see B. Landsberger, in Suppl. VT XVI 199 and n. 1, and an OB example of the plural in YOS X, No. 59 r. 5).

350. Previously unrecognized. Certainly not from mš> r>.

351. Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, pp. 222, 293; LS, p. 812; Additamenta, p. 71; F. Rundgren, "Semitische Wortstudien," Orientalia Suecana X (1961) 100 ff. For the Akkadian see B. Landsberger, Brief des Bischofs von Esgālo an König Asarhaddon (Amsterdam, 1965) pp. 58 ff. The semantic development from steward of a temple or household to supervisor of a ship is not unreasonable, but the explanation of the sound changes proposed by Rundgren is far from convincing; while the form of Mand. šp>cm>, with "a" in the first syllable, is certainly a proper reflex (see Chap. IV, n. 39). The Mand. form ṣṭym>, cited by Fraenkel, is not in MD.

352. Z, p. 92; LS, p. 773; Muffs, Studies, p. 188. Note that although štăr is already common in Babylonian Aramaic texts of the NB period, the only Egyptian example is from the late text AP, No. 81. The entry štăr1 in DISO (p. 295) is incorrect. The verb štrw in AD, No. 7:7, if correctly read, can scarcely be the proper reflex of the Babylonian verb šatāru, for it should have "š" like the noun. Nor is Driver's comparison with Syr. štr satisfactory. The latter is related to seštăr, "side" < štr, and were the derived verb to occur this early it would be spelled with "š". Further speculation on the basis of this uncertain reading is unwarranted. The Punic and JAR. forms cited in DISO are to be connected with BH ṣṭēr, mištēr which is not, as often claimed (cf. KBL, p. 964), a loan from Akkadian. There is no reason to regard the Cannaeanite, Akkadian, and ESA and Arabic štăr as anything but cognates; cf. I. J. Gelb, "Standard Operating Procedure for the Assyrian Dictionary," (mimeograph; Chicago, 1954) pp. 6 and 22 ff.

353. Kaufman, in LeŠ. XXXVII 103 f.

Šemiru, "bracelet"—BH pl. šrwt; MH, Common Ar. šyr, Mand. pl. šəyryā; Arab. siwār. These are all cognate, as shown by the older Akk. form šewiru.355

šiddu, "side"—Targumic šyd̄, used to translate BH šrk, and Mand. šyd̄ (hapax in this sense) do not mean "side" but rather "base," as does Syr. šdt̄, pl. šdd̄, probably related to Akk. išdu, Heb. št, Syr. (ʔ)št, but certainly not a loan from the Akkadian word for "side." The Akkadian feminine form šiddatu seems to mean "chest," "box" in one Neo-Babylonian text, but is probably an Aramaism rather than the source of BH(?), MH šiddā, BT šydt̄, and Mand. šyd̄(?).356

* šiknu, "mud," "slime"—Syr. škn̄, Mand. šykn̄, Gaonic Ar. šwkn̄.357

* šillatu, "vulgarity," "blasphemy"—BA (Dan. 3:29) šlh (Qrē, šālū), "blasphemy."358

šindu (,< šimtu), "mark," "brand," šamātū, "to brand" NB—AD šnt̄, "mark," Eg. šnyt̄, "mark," mānt, "to mark," šnyt, "marked"; MH šntwāt, "marks." Although these Akkadian and Aramaic words are quite obviously related, neither the precise connection between them nor their etymology is clear. The most reasonable explanation seems to be that the Akkadian word is the origin of the rare BH šwmyrû, which he translates "ring." His suggestion must be rejected on phonetic grounds, for Akkadian "m" represents [w] here.

355. Z, p. 38; LS, p. 749. Perles, in OIZ XXI 70, suggests that the Akkadian word is the origin of the rare BH šwmyrû, which he translates "ring." His suggestion must be rejected on phonetic grounds, for Akkadian "m" represents [w] here.


357. LS, p. 776. For the Akkadian see R. Campbell-Thompson, Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology, pp. 20 ff. and A. L. Oppenheim and L. F. Hartman, On Beer and Brewing Techniques in Ancient Mesopotamia (JAOS Suppl. X [New Haven, 1950]) n. 70. The Gaonic example was discovered by J. N. Epstein, "Notes on Post-Talmudic-Aramaic Lexicography," Jewish Quarterly Review XII (1922) 367, n. 70. The "w" in the latter form is probably an error for "y."

358. Perles, in OIZ XXI 71; KBL, p. 1127. It can certainly be no coincidence that precisely where the context demands "insolence" or "blasphemy" and not "negligence" the ktûb has šlh instead of the usual šlw; read šillû. The correct Babylonian form is šillatu, not sillatu, as in KBL (cf. GAG § 30e).

359. Thus, to be separated from wsm, "to be beautiful," Akk. wasāmu, "to be fitting, proper."
bal noun *šimt. The n of Aramaic šnt would thus be due to the NB form śindu, showing the normal NB pattern -mt > -nd, but the preservation of t instead of d in the Aramaic forms remains unexplained (compare šalantu). Talmudic šnt, "to place under the ban," may represent a late survival of this word.360

*  šinēpu, "two-thirds"—Samalian, Nineveh Lion Weight (CIS II 7) snb; Bauer and Meissner 7 Șnb(?).361

*  šūbula, "to send," "to have carry away"—BA mswblyn, "laid" or "raised," said of foundations, is often considered to be a loan from this causative of (w)abālu, but the Akkadian verb never means anything even similar to the Biblical Aramaic usage. Etymologists would do well to look elsewhere for an explanation of the Biblical Aramaic form, perhaps to Aramaic itself.363

*  šukkallu, "vizier"—Aššur tablet, 1. 4 skl.364


362. MD, p. 444.

363. Cf. KBL (2d ed.) pp. 1080, 1102; Rosenthal, Grammar, pp. 49, 58; H. L. Ginsberg, in Franz Rosenthal, ed., An Aramaic Handbook, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 32. In Aramaic the causative forms of ybl and several forms of sbl are much closer in meaning to the BA than is the Akkadian. The initial s is certainly no cause to look outside of North West Semitic (see Shaphel in Chap. III).

364. As indicated by the Aramaic spelling with "s," the correct NA form is šukkallu, as in OB (not sukkalu); cf. AHW, s.v. and GAG Ergänz. § 30e. The sibilant shift $ > s$ in the transliteration is correct; see below, p. 140. Contrary to the view of M. Lidzbarski, Altaramäische Urkunden aus Assur ("Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft," Vol. XXXVIII [Leipzig, 1921]) p. 17, the representation of Akkadian $y$ in Aššur tablet 4 is not inconsistent. The Aramaic text has s for Akkadian $y$ in the following forms: rsl (1. 2), skl (1. 9) srrzd (1. 11) and the second element of šlm²ṣr (1. 8). šmṣḏḥ (1. 14) is obviously an Aramaic name, hence the use of $y$. The other apparent inconsistencies are in šlm²ṣr (1. 8) and šr$n²d$ (1. 1, 4). The first is easily
104 / Šuklulu - Šuṣû

Šuklulu, "to complete"—The Akkadian was possibly of some influence on Common Ar. škil, "to complete," "to perfect," "to decorate," especially when said of buildings, but there is no compelling reason to treat the Aramaic as a loanword. 365

Šuṣû, NA "to bring about"—AD, No. 5:7 šnṣyw, "they succeeded," "they were able," is most probably not to be connected with Aramaic šyṣy< (see s.v. šuṣū) but is rather a form from the root msy, "to be able." Inasmuch as a meaning corresponding to the Aramaic usage does not actually occur in the Akkadian causatives of this verb, the attested Aramaic form is probably the result of a Babylonianized pronunciation (with ms > ns) of a native Ar. form šmṣy. 366

* Šuplu in Šupal šēpē, "footstool"—Syr. (lex.) šwp's. 367

Šusuppû, Šasuppû, "sheet," "tablecloth"—Targums, Leviticus Rabbah šwš(y)p<, "cloak," "sheet"; Syr. šwšp<, "towel," "veil," "robe." This is probably of foreign origin in both languages. Another reflex of this word may occur in Targ. Onk. BT, Mand. ṭwtb<, "sheet," "dress," "shirt." 368

Šuṣû, "to make leave," "to deliver"—BA šṣy<, "to finish," JPA, Sam., CPA šyṣy, "to finish," common in the targums also in the meaning "to be finished," "to be destroyed," "to destroy." This Aramaic verb is usually connected with the Akkadian causative of (w)aṣū, since the original form of the root meaning "to go out" is waṣū, which occurs correctly in Aramaic as y<ṣū. The ū of the first syllable also points to an Akkadian origin, as in šyzb < Šuṣubu. But the situation is far from clear. The Akkadian never means anything at all similar to "to finish," "to complete" or "to destroy." BA (ktṣp) still preserves the final <ṣ, which shows that at most there is only an assimilation of a West Semitic root to the Akkadian form; but why such assimilation to a form so differ-

explained, for we now know that the common form of this root in Akkadian is salāmu, not šalāmu (cf. AHw., s.v.). The second is merely misread. The correct reading is not šrn<ṣd : šar-nsid but šnn<ṣd : sin-naṣid, with Aramaic š corresponding to Akkadian s as in the above example (šlm) and in ṣdṣy (1. 10) (cf. Chap. IV, n. 13). This reading is confirmed by the new reading ūzn in l. 2 (see s.v. hazannu), for in two Harper letters Sin-

naṣid is the hazannu of Aššur (HABL, Nos. 150, 812). The spelling with double ṣ is unusual, however.


366. AD (abridged) p. 54; DISO, p. 314; Rabin, in Eretz Israel IX 150.

367. Z, p. 34; Salonen, Möbel, p. 33.

ent in meaning? Initial $ in the causatives of primae $ (<$ w) verbs is not unknown; see e.g., BA hybl; furthermore, the verb $y$y$y$y is found only in the West, either representing a limited survival of an Imperial Aramaic term or indicating that the verb was always only native to the West. I favor the latter possibility. A loan from some other North West Semitic language where $d > S$ (and which also had shaphel, such as Ugaritic) seems more probable than Akkadian influence here. 369

* $\text{šuššu}$, "one-sixth" or "sixty"—Mand. $\text{šwē}$, a unit of time, probably one-sixth of an hour. 370

* $\text{šutappu}$, "partner" M/NB—Palm. $\text{šwtpwt}$, "partnership," and derived verb; Common Ar. $\text{šwtp}$, "partner" and derived verbs $\text{šwtp}$, "wind." 371

* $\text{šūtu}$, "south"—BT, Syr. (lex.), Mand. $\text{šwē}$, "south wind." 372

* $\text{šušubu}$ (preterite $u$šē$zīb$), "to rescue"—Ahiqar narrative, AP, No. 38 $\text{šzb}$; BA, Nab., JAr. $\text{ṣzb}$; Syr., Sam. JPA, Mand. $\text{šzb}$, 373

  tab/palu, rare SB "tambourine"—Syr., BT, Targ. Hagiographa (once YT), Mand. $\text{ṭablā}$; Arab. $\text{ṭabl}$. Origin unknown. 374

  tahūmu, "boundary"—Common Ar., MH $\text{ṭhm}$; Mand. $\text{ṭwm}$; Arab. $\text{ṭāhm}, \text{ṭāhmah}$. In Akkadian the word is primarily confined to Assyrian, occurring, to my knowledge, no earlier than

369. Z, p. 70; KBL (2d ed.) p. 1129; Rabin, in Eretz Israel IX 150. Mand. $\text{šwē}$, occurring only in the participle and only in one late magical text, is tentatively translated "to drive out," "to consume" in MD. Since two out of its three occurrences are connected with verbs meaning "to excite," "to enrage," I suggest that this verb is not from Western Aramaic $\text{ṣyṣ}$ but rather Arab. $\text{ṣyṣ}$, "to chastise (I and II), $\text{ṣyṣ}$, "temper," "anger." Mand. m$\text{šwē}$, "monsters(?)", may be related; cf. OA and OB $\text{ṣē}$, "to fight with one another."

370. Z, p. 65; MG, p. xxviii and n. 2. According to earlier scholars this word means "1/12 hour," but the reason for such a translation is unclear. Nöldeke's explanation and the passage he cites to prove the point make little sense. I find the Greek word $\text{sōssos}$, cited in Z, MG, and MD, only attested lexically as some kind of measuring device or distance.

371. Z, p. 46; LS, p. 767; Rosenthal, Sprache, p. 90. The Akkadian (for an example see CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 513b, bottom) derives from the verb $\text{ṣuta(p)}$ (for an MB example see PBS, Vol. I, Part 2, No. 61:13) itself a denominative verb from $\text{tappu}$, the original word for "partner," borrowed from Sumerian.


373. Z, pp. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AHW., p. 268; KBL, p. 1129. In light of the common development in all other late dialects to $\text{ṣwb}$, the unvarying JAr. $\text{ṣzw}$ may represent scribal assimilation to the BA form.

106 / tajjāru - talīmu

the Middle Assyrian period. Since no good etymology is known and Arabic has /ḥ/ as Akkadian does (and thus was not borrowed through Aramaic, though see kimahhu), there is little reason to suggest an Akkadian origin. 375

* tajjāru, "merciful"—Palm. tyr>. This and the possible loan translation ṣāmu represent the Palmyran equivalents of the Akkadian divine epithets rēmēnu, tajjāru, "merciful," "forgiving." The Akkadian form itself, however, may be a calque from Aramaic as found in Syr. tyb> and Mand. t>)b> (and Arab. tawwāb). 376

takālu, "to trust in"—Eg., Hermopolis, Syr., Mand., Targ. Hagiographa (once YJ), tkl. In this meaning the t-form of the verb wkl is 'Common Semitic, found also in Arabic and Gez; thus, it is possible that the Aramaic and Akkadian are only cognate. But because the development of primae t verbs from verbs originally primae w is far more common in Akkadian than in Aramaic, and, in addition, the Aramaic is of very limited distribution, Akkadian influence cannot be ruled out. 377

talīmu, "brother" (rare and literary)—Sam. (frequent) tlym, "brother"; Targ. Y (Gen. 49:5) tl(>)myn (Neofiti tlymyn), "twins"; CPA tlym, "own brother(?)." The root may be l>m (Arab. l>m, "equal," "alike"). The forms are probably cognate. 378

375. Z, p. 9; LS, p. 820; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 282. A connection with Heb. yōmāh, "wall," and the root ṣmy, "to defend," has been suggested; if so the Akkadian would almost certainly be a loan from pre-Aramaic (and the Arabic, which has ḥ, a loan from Aramaic). Note C. Bezold, Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar (Heidelberg, 1926) p. 292, "wests. LW."


377. Perles, in OLZ XXI 71. The form wkl is found in Akkadian only in the noun ṣālu. "oversee." In favor of a cognate relationship is the fact that the verbal nouns, Akk. tuktu and Ar. tuqālut, are too different from each other to be a loan but too similar not to be related. For primae w the. cf. GAG § 103d, C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen I (Berlin, 1908) 597, and K. Tsereteli, "Über die Reflexivstämme in den modernen aramäischen Dialekten," RSO XXXIX (1964) 125-32.

378. Z, p. 46; M. Jastrow, "On Assyrian and Samaritan," JAOS XIII (1889) 148. Could the targumic aleph be consonantal? The specific meaning of the Akkadian appears to be "brother of equal status." If talīmu is indeed from l>m, it would be another "Personenbezeichnung" of the tāqṭī formation (cf. talmīdu), which lends support to the possibility of a loan.
talmīdu - targumānu / 107

* talmīdu, "apprentice"—BH, MH, JAr., Syr., CPA talmāḏ, Sam. ṭılmāḏ, "student," "disciple" > Arab. tilmāḏ; Mand. ṯrmāḏ, "priest." Akkadian attestations are surprisingly rare, but talmīdu was apparently the Assyrian word for apprentice, student. As noted long ago, it is only in Akkadian (and only Assyrian(?), see GAG, p. 68) that the noun form taprīs is a "Personenbezeichnung." 12

* tamkaru, "merchant"—Palm., MH, JAr., CPA, Sam., Syr. ṭgr(?) ṭgr(?) > Arab. ṭāḏir. Not unexpectedly the denominative verbs in the various languages were easily confused with forms of ṭgr. There is, however, no reason to suggest that this confusion accounts for the ṭ of the Aramaic form, for original / mk/ was pronounced and often written "ng" in NB (see Phonology, in Chap. IV). 12

* tarbaṣu, "court"—Eq. ṭrbṣ, "courtyard," Imp. Ar. "official residence"; BT, Targ. Chronicles, RH ṭrb(y)iḥ(?) ṭrb(?) > Syr. ṭrbṣ(?) ṭrbṣ(?) > Arab. ṭarrīs, "court," "forecourt," "hall." The Akkadian is attested in this sense only in Assyrian and the peripheral dialects. 12

  turgumānu, "interpreter," "dragoman"—BH mtṛgm, "interpreted"; Common Ar. tāramānu, tūragmanā, etc., Arab. tarḏa/umān, turgumānā > dragoman. This word was recently the object of an extensive study by I. J. Gelb. As he has shown, there is little reason to relate turgumānu to the root ṭgm, "to speak," or to consider it of Akkadian origin. Although it is almost certainly foreign, perhaps Hittite, in origin, the word could have entered Aramaic through Akkadian but may not have. The -ān nominalizing suffix is at home in both Akkadian and West Semitic. 12

379. Z, p. 29; LS, p. 367; Wagner, p. 119. Note that in Zimmern’s time the existence of the Akkadian was still uncertain. The earliest attestation I know of is a broken passage in an OB lexical list: lū KAB(?) zu-zu : ta-a[l-m]i-[du] (MSL XII 195, 1. 14). In Hittite the logogram kab-zu-zu occurs frequently in the meaning "student" or "apprentice."

380. Z, p. 16; LS, p. 876; B. Landsberger, in Suppl. VT XVI (1967) 176 ff. For mk > ng see GAG § 31f and such NB spellings as d/tam-ga-ar (Ungnad, Glossar, p. 162).

381. Z, p. 42; LS, p. 710. In Ugaritic ṭrbṣ is "stable," and Ras Shamra Akkadian gives the equation ʾ-tab-tum : tar-ḥa-ṣi (MRS VI 92, BS 16. 189:17), cf. CAD, Vol. B, p. 283a), that is, "house." Since the correct Aramaic reflex of this root is ṭrb, the Aramaic form must be the result of either Akkadian or Canaanite influence. The evidence of distribution, as well as the lack of a suitable meaning in Canaanite, points clearly to an Akkadian origin.

108 / tarlugallu - tumru

* tarlugallu, "cock"—Phrah. viii l trngwl, MH trnwgl, trngwl, JAr. trngwl, trnwl, Syr. trngl, trnwgl, Mand. t·rn·w·l. 383

* tibûtu, "attack," "invasion"—Mand. tyb, ty·b·w·t(?) , "invasion." 384

tillu, "mound," "ruin heap"—Heb., Ar., Arab. till, tell. Suggested Akkadian etymologies from various weak roots are very uncertain, and the origin of this word remains obscure. Sum. dul is probably an independent development of this ancient culture word. 385

tinûru, "oven"—BH, MH, CPA, Syr., Mand. (in JAr. only in the Targums for BH tnwr), Arab. tannûr. The first Akkadian occurrence of this vocable is in MB Alalakh. Although the word seems Semitic, an Akkadian origin is unlikely. 386

* titurru, "bridge"—BT tytwr, Syr. twr, twtr, Mand. t·twr(qQ). The Akkadian assumes the meaning "bridge" fairly late; in Old Babylonian it is a kind of swampy ground. It is interesting to note that Akkadian has two words for "bridge," and both were borrowed, though the other (gišru) is more widespread in Aramaic. 387

* tubalû, "a device for climbing the palm tree"—BT twbly > Arab. tubalya, tabalya. 388

tumru, "ashes"; in akal tumri, "bread baked in ashes"—Syr. tmîrta (from tmr, "to bury") means the same but, in light of the difference in form and initial consonant, is probably cognate rather than a loan (Akk. temûru means "to bury in ashes"). 389

384. MD, p. 484. The contextual meaning of tyb is quite certain, but that of ty·b·w·t is not clear.
386. Z, p. 32; LS, p. 829; Salonen, in Bagdader Mitteilungen III 101 ff. The rare late Sumerian lexical list forms ti-nu-ur and tu-nu-ur are certainly artificial creations of the scribes, but the legitimate forms durun and dimina (see MSL VII 195) suggest that this is an old culture word.
387. Z, p. 44; LS, p. 839b. The meaning "bridge" first occurs in MB kudurrû's. For OB, see CAD, Vol. E, s.v. eduru end.
388. Z, p. 54; Additamenta, p. 407; B. Landsberger, Date Palm, p. 38 and nn. 132 ff. Landsberger expresses uncertainty about the standard Sumerian etymology gištubâx (TUG)-lā, but no other etymology seems possible.
* **tēmu** , "order," "decree"—Eg., AD, BA, BH tēm, "order," "decree." The word tēm itself, in the meaning "taste" or "reason," is, of course, cognate, but the meaning "order" in Aramaic (and Hebrew) occurs only during the Imperial Aramaic period and must derive from Akkadian where such a meaning is already frequent in Old Babylonian. The use of this word in the sense "matter" (Hermopolis 1:12, AP, No. 41:7) may be either a loan from similar Akkadian usage or an Aramaic development.390

* ummānu, "artisan"—AD, Nab., Palm., Sam. 3mn; BH 3ommān, 3āmōn; MH, JAr., CPA, Syr. 3wmn; Mand. cwmn2p.391

urū, late and rare "stall"—Late BH 3rwt, 3rywt; Syr. 3wry2; BT, Targ. Proph., and Hagiog. 3wry3, 3wryw3; Arab. 3iry, 3āryan; a late culture word of non-Mesopotamian origin.392

* urubātu, (Lex.) "a kind of brick construction"—BT 3wrby.393

* uṣurtu, "figure," "circle"—Mand. šwrt2, "circle," "halo." There is little reason to accept the frequent suggestion that Common Ar. (and BH) šurāštā, "picture," "form," is a loan from Akk. uṣurtu except for their phonetic similarity, but there are several reasons for rejecting this suggestion. Although both Hebrew and Akkadian have the verb yshr, "to form," it is


391. Z, p. 25; LS, p. 25; Wagner, p. 25. The Akkadian form derives from Sum. um-mi-a. J. Barth, Etymologische Studien (Leipzig, 1895) p. 60, suggested that 3wmwtn in MH B.Batra 9:4 npl 3wmwtn3 hmlk, "was summoned to governmental service," is from the Akkadian homonym ummānu, "army." This is uncertain, but the Mishnaic usage is difficult to explain otherwise.

392. Z, p. 42; LS, p. 48; KBL (3d ed.) p. 82; Salonen, Hippologica Accadica, p. 177; C. Rabin, in Sefer Shmuel Yeivin, p. 473. The Sumerian form found in the late lexical lists is certainly artificial. The QA hapax arū is perhaps to be connected (as in CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 313a) with the late synonym list term arū, "granary," but certainly not with urū. For the meaning "granary" see JAr. 3wry3, "storehouse," apparently of Mediterranean origin.

110 / ušallu - wuššuru

does not otherwise exist in Aramaic, and there is every rea-
son to believe that the verb šwr, "to form," occurring in the
peal with a great many associated noun forms, is the Aramaic
reflex of this root. Further, the aphaeresis of the initial
vowel cannot be explained either as an Akkadian or an early
Aramaic development. Nevertheless, the influence of
ušurtu can be found in Aramaic. The most certain example is
Mand. šwrt₃ II, "circle" or "halo around a heavenly body,"
which, though ostensibly connected with the root šrr, "to en-
close," certainly bears the influence of the Akkadian word,
used often in magical and astronomical contexts in precisely
these meanings.

* ušallu, "marsh"—Syr. ʾwšl². 396

* uššu, "foundation"—BA ʾš; CPA, RH, Targ. ʾwš, ʾš; Sam.
ʾrš; > Arab. ʾssš. See asštu. 397

* utūnu, atūnu, "kiln," "furnace"—BA, Targums, BT, Syr.,
Mand. ʾtwš > Arab. ṣattūn, Ethiopic ṣṭṭūn. This is an
old, probably pre-Sumerian, culture word. 398

wuššuru, "to let loose"; in OB, Amarna (and LB?) also
"to send"—Asšur Ostracon and Eg. hwšr, "to send"; cf.
11QtdJb XXXII:3 twšr for BH ʾšallaḥnah. The distribution
of the meaning "send" in Akkadian is strongly suggestive of
a western origin; but in light of the strong semantic con-
nection between "release" and "send" in many languages,
the extent and nature of the possible influences here must re-
main uncertain. 399

394. This is common, especially with initial a- in foreign words in
Akkadian, but almost never occurs in native words (cf. GAG § 14). No
other loanword shows such a loss, nor would we expect to find it as a na-
tive development in the early period attested in BH.

395. For the Mandaic see E. S. Drower, The Book of the Zodiac (Lon-
don, 1949) p. 127, n. 5; Baumgartner, in HUCA XXIII 58. In general, Z,
p. 27; LS, p. 624.

396. Z, p. 43; LS, p. 35. Ušallu is a loan from Sum. ʾuš-sal; cf.

397. Z, p. 31; KBL, p. 1054. The Akkadian is borrowed from Sumerian;
Note the derived verbs in CPA, Arab., and, rarely, Jar. Syr. ʾeštš, a by-
form of ʾešt, has nothing to do with uššu. For the Samaritan see Z. Ben-
Hayaam, The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the

398. Z, p. 32; LS, p. 55; A. Salonen, in Baghdader Mitteilungen III
114 ff., Fussbekleidung, p. 116; KBL, p. 1055. The confusion in the in-
itial vowel goes back to Sumerian.

399. Cf. AD (abridged) p. 45; Koopmans, Aramäische Christostomie, p.
82; Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum, p. 288, KAI II 284. Akk. wuššuru is an
extremely problematic verb. Von Soden, GAG § 103p, claims that in later
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* zabbilu, "bask et"—BT zbyl, Syr. zn/bbyl > Arab. zabîl, zibbîl. W. von Soden and A. Salonen consider the Akkad-
dian to be a loan from Aramaic (see also CAD, s.v.), but the
Aramaic cognate of Akk. zabâlu, "to carry," is sbl, not zbi;
thus, zbyl must be a loan from Akkadian. Moreover, it is
difficult to explain MH sblnt and Syr. sblwn, "betrothal
gifts" (BT sabbel, "to send betrothal gifts"), as calques
from Akk. zobbullû, for the latter term is limited to the OB
and MA periods.

zabbu, "ecstatic"—Mand. z̪b̪a, "a kind of priest." The
meaning of the Mandaic is uncertain, and an alternative ety-

mology from d̪b̪a, "slaughterer," is quite possible. If,
however, the parallel word dydy means "oracle tellers," the
semantic similarity would suggest that z̪b̪a is indeed Akk.

zakāru, "to speak"—Syr. zkwr, JAr. zkwrw, RH zkwr,
"necromantic spirit," "necromancer(?)," and the related verb
zkr in Syr. (and Mand.?). It is by no means certain that
zkwr is related to the root d̪k̪r and hence was necessarily
borrowed from a language where d̪ > z. In addition it must
be noted that the Akkadian verb has no significant magical
connotations.

Babylonian this verb split into two forms: uššuru, "to let loose," and
muššuru, "to send." A confirmation of this position must await the pub-
lication of the "U/W" volumes of the two dictionaries, but the frequent ex-
amples of muššuru meaning "to let loose," "to leave," "to abandon to,"
such as in J. Aro, Glossar zu den mittelbabylonischen Briefen (St.Or.
XXII [Helsinki, 1957]) pp. 64 ff. (MB) and Ungnad, Glossar, pp. 99 f. (NB)
with no examples meaning "to send" and uššuru, "to send," at Amarna, leave
cause for doubt. The etymology of the verb itself is uncertain. It would
seem to be the result of a metathesis of the root šr, "to let loose,"
common in Aramaic, a metathesis perhaps occasioned by the similarity of
the root yār, "straight," used in the causative in the sense "to make go
straight," "to direct." In Akkadian these two roots form a kind of sup-
pletive paradigm. (Note that ešša < yār occurs only in stems I and III
whereas uššuru is found only in II [cf. CAD, Vol. A, Part II, s.v. ašaru
C].) In support of this theory note the synonymous use in the Amarna
documents of (w)uššuru, šutššuru and šuššuru in this meaning.

s. XXXVII 269; Salonen, Hausgeräte I 249.

401. Contra M. Held, "The root ZBL/SBL in Akkadian, Ugazitic and
Biblical Hebrew," J AO S LXXXVIII (1968) 90 f. and n. 19. The difference
in the sibilant, the n affix of the Aramaic and Hebrew forms of the noun,
and the limited use of the Akkadian indicate cognate terminology here,
though a very early calque cannot be ruled out.

402. Baumgartner, in HUCA XXIII 58; MD, p. 156.

403. Z, p. 67; LS, p. 196. Nöldeke's comparison with Arab. zukrah,
"wine skin," resulting in a perfect parallel with Heb. sōp, is worthy of
consideration.
zakû, "to be clear," "to be clean," "to be free of claims"—Common Ar. zky, "to be innocent," "to be victorious," as opposed to dky, "to be pure," the correct reflex of Proto-Semitic dky, is generally thought to be a loan. But there can be little certainty that Akkadian was the donor. In juridical use the Akkadian term means only "to be free of claims" and, in the D stem, "to clear of claims." Although the requisite semantic development is not impossible, it is far from probable. Furthermore, the juridical use of zukkû disappeared in the late Akkadian dialects (see s.v. puṣṣû). Since the sense "to be righteous" for the verb zkh already occurs in BH (Ps. 51:6, Micah 6:11), Canaanite is a much better candidate for the origin of the Aramaic than is Akkadian. 404

Similarly, the Aramaic word for the "clear" substance par excellence, glass, zgwyt-> (BH zkwkyt, BT also zwgut->, zwg> Mand. zggyt->, zggyt->, etc. > Arab. zggy> can hardly be a native Aramaic term; but here, too, a western origin must be given primary consideration, for the rare Akk. zakakatu seems to be an Aramaic loanword, and the more common zukû is only a kind of intermediary in the glassmaking process. 405 The latter could conceivably be the forerunner of the unusual BT variant zwg>, however.

* 

* 
žâzu—The Mandaic magic bowl hapax z̥zy> was connected with an Akk. form žâzu, supposedly meaning "abundance," by earlier scholars. The Akkadian word does not exist. 407

* 
zbânîtu, "scales"—Mand. z(>)bnyt>. Akkadian must also be the ultimate origin of the Arabic star name zubâniyya and

406. Z, p. 13; LS, p. 204; R. Kittel, "z̥zdap = úpsothênai = gekreuzigt werden," ZNW XXXV (1936) 282 ff. This usage is clearly eastern, but šlb is the equivalent in the West.
407. Cf. MD, p. 158. The rejection of this word can be found in CAD, Vol. Z, p. 76. The origin of this understandable error was the mistaken equation of two different eponyms of the NA period, HÈ.NUN-a-a (703 B.C.) and za-za-a-a (692 B.C.), HÈ.NUN meaning "abundance" and so given in the lexical lists.
the Qur’anic zabâniyâh, but the intermediary is unknown. As is frequently remarked, there must be some connection between this word and the common word for "to buy" in Aramaic, zbn. What is almost certainly involved is an old culture word of uncertain origin, zbn (zibana?), meaning "weight," for which there is evidence from Akkadian, Hittite, and Egyptian.


* zîqpu, "zenith," "culminating star or constellation"—Mand. zqpp, "a type of star or constellation."

* zîqtu, "sting," "barb," zaqatu, "to sting"—Targ. Prophets, Hagiographa, BT, zqpt, Syr. zqt, "prick," "goad"; Syr. zqt, "to prick," "to goad." While there is no proof of a loan here, the limited distribution suggests one. 411

zîqtu, zîqu, "torch" NA—The connections, if any, between

408. Z, pp. 16, 62; MD, p. 156. See also Mand. zbb̄n ytl 2, "a horned creature." For zbn cf. CAD, Vol. Z, p. 100, and add the common Egyptian word dhn, "weight," "part of a scale." There may be some ultimate connection with Ug. mwzn, Heb. mdr(?) znaym, Arab. mzwān, etc., but it remains obscure.

409. Z, p. 47; LS, p. 195; KBL, p. 1071. The origin must be Babylonian, for the Akkadian definitely has original /m/. Thus, I find it difficult to see how this late borrowing could be the correct etymology of the BH month name zîw (cf. KBL [3d ed.] p. 255, and Chap. IV, n. 77).

410. Z, p. 27; LS, pp. 194–95; CAD, Vol. Z, p. 87b. The semantic development "(coin) mold" > "false coin" > "false" is perfectly paralleled by the development of the English word "bogus": an apparatus for coining money > counterfeit money > anything not genuine, a development which is said to have taken place in the course of a mere twenty-five hundred years (H. L. Mencken, The American Language [New York, 1965] p. 558; Supplement I [New York, 1966] p. 232). A further parallel is English "fabricate."

To my knowledge no one has previously interpreted zyp in the Targum Onkelos passage as "mold" (but see Aruch III 311). This interpretation is proven correct by the translation of BH ḫrṭ in our passage given in Targ. Y II and Neofiti, ḫwps, and the medieval dictionaries of Ben-Janach, ḫwps, and David ben Abraham al-Fāṣi, "mold" (for which see C. C. Torrey, "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem," JBL LV [1936] 259 f.). Pahrā. XV/2 ḫb, "tablet," is interesting if correctly interpreted, because this meaning is attested in Akkadian only for the OB period, for which see now P. R. Kraus, "Altbabylonisch zeḥum," Bi. Or. XXIV (1967) 12 ff., and J. J. Finkelstein, in YOS XIII 4 ff.

this word and Ar. ziqâ, "shooting star," are unclear. Syriac also has the form zyqt for "shooting star," so perhaps the Aramaic is related to the preceding entry.\footnote{112}

ziqû, "wind," "breath"—Is Common Ar. ziqâ, "storm," cognate or a loan? The verb zâqu, "to blow," is known only in Akkadian.\footnote{113}

zukû, see zakû.

* zuruqû, "irrigation hose"—BT zwrnwq, zwrnwq, Mand. zrw<s>rnwq</s> > Arab. zuruqû.\footnote{114}

* zuqû, "half-shekel," "half-sila"—Eg., Hermopolis, Palm., Murabba'at, MH, Jâr., CPA, Syr., Mand. zwz, "a small coin," "small measure."\footnote{115}

\section*{MONTH NAMES}

The actual pronunciation of the Akkadian month names in the late periods is often difficult to determine because of the almost universal use of logograms. For several of the names one must rely entirely upon the evidence of a few (SB) lexical lists and what can be determined from the shape of the equivalent Aramaic or Hebrew forms. The Imperial Aramaic names are clearly derived from the NB/LB calendar. In the list that follows, the probable NB (NA for kanûnu) forms are given, followed by the Imperial Aramaic consonantal spelling and the Hebrew and Syriac traditional vocalizations.

abû—<b>āb</b>, Heb., Syr. <b>ēb</b>.

addaru—<dr>ādr</dr>, Heb. <b>ēḏâr</b>, <b>ēḏâr</b>, ūaddār, Syr. <b>ēḏâr</b>.\footnote{116}

a/iijjaru—<yr>ēyr</yr>, Heb., Syr. <b>ēyyâr</b>.\footnote{117}

\footnote{112} Z, p. 12. Other related terms are BH ziqqûm, "fire arrows," RH ziqwq, "spark," "dart." These are probably from zqq, "to forge."

\footnote{113} Z, p. 45; LS, p. 195.

\footnote{114} CAD, Vol. Z, p. 167; Salonen, Hausgeräte I 266. The root zrq, "to sprinkle," is common, but this strange Aramaic form must be related to the Akkadian, and if so, zwrnwq (zûrûngû) would appear to be the correct original Aramaic form; see below, Chap. IV, n. 29.


\footnote{116} For the Hebrew (Yemenite) vocalization with a dagesh, see E. Y. Kutscher, in Suppl. Vf XVI 168.

\footnote{117} Ug. <b>îyr</b> is the Hurrian month name hiari. Note the SB spelling IA-e-ru (CAD, Vol. A, Part I, p. 230b).
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arahšamnu (phonetically probably *[mar(a)ḥšawan])—
mrḥšwn, Heb. marḥešwān, Mand. mḥyr(ʾ)wḥn.418

e/i/ilūlu—iilw, Heb. ʾilil, Syr. ʾiliū.l.419

kanūnu—Hatr. knwn, Syr. kānāʾ/unā.
kīslīmu—kślw, Heb. kīsēw.
nīsannu—lnsīn, Heb. and Syr. nīsān.
sīmānu—sīwīn, Heb. sīwān.

šabāṭu—šbṭ, Heb., Syr. šbṭ.

*tammūzu—tmwz, Heb. tammūz, Syr. tāmūz.420

tešrītu—tšry, Heb. tišrî, Syr. tešrî, tešrīn.421

ṭebēṭu—ṭbt, Heb. ṭēbēṭ.

418. For the initial ṣ see Phonology in Chap. III. I transcribe the Akkadian with ṣ rather than traditional s because of the Aramaic form and on the basis of a clear NA vocalization with [s] deriving necessarily from historicsha /ṣ/ (Aššur tablet 5, yrḥ̪ smnh; this tablet has proper Assyrian representation of the sibilants in every other case; note the two separate words, for this is not a normal Assyrian month). Landsberger’s explanation of the Aramaic “ṣ” (in Suppl. VT XVI 185) as the result of syllable-final position is not applicable to early Imperial Aramaic, where there is little reason to assume that it indeed was already syllable-final. Forms with “ṣ” also occur in OA (see GAG, p. 91, and Karl Hecker, Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte [An.Or., Vol. XLIV (Rome, 1968)] § 68b). Note the metathesis in Mandic after the loss of h.

419. Ahw., p. 210. The original initial vowel is /e/. The often cited uilīlu is the Assyrian form resulting from vowel harmony.

420. There is no native evidence for the NB pronunciation (see Ahw., s.v. Duṭūzu), but *tammūṣ is almost certainly the only possible form which could produce the resulting Aramaic; cf. Chap. IV, n. 34.

421. Imp. Ar. ṭšry is the absolute form. The final /t/ of the Akkadian was understood as the feminine ending (correctly, for the root is Šry); contrast the preservation of the t in ṭebēṭu. It is possible that ṭšry is actually an old Aramaic month name adopted by the Babylonians, for the root is a common one in Aramaic but not in Akkadian (cf. S. Langdon, Babylonian Menologies and the Semitic Calendars [London, 1935] p. 29). In fact the rare root may be a loan from Aramaic in Akkadian (cf. s.v. wuṣšuru). The unexpected final "n" of the Syriac (from Arabic?) and Arabic is perhaps to be explained as a plural, since there are two months called tešrīn.
III

THE NON-LEXICAL INFLUENCES

Aside from differences in the lexical stock, many of the non-lexical differences between the older and younger forms of Aramaic and among the contemporary younger dialects have been explained as the result of Akkadian influence. As noted above, the dialects of Eastern Aramaic can be distinguished by several grammatical divergences from Old Aramaic, Imperial Aramaic, and later Western Aramaic; and one might rightfully expect some of these peculiarities to be the result of the Akkadian substratum. These influences, as well as those non-lexical Akkadian influences found in the other dialects, will be studied in this chapter. Discussed here as well are those grammatical characteristics that previous scholars have suggested are due to Akkadian influence but are to be considered uncertain or even improbable. The final two topics k̇ and ṁ in the section on syntax, which might well be considered lexical items, are included here because of their syntactic nature.

PHONOLOGY

Spirantization of Postvocalic Stops

The date and place of origin of this phonetic principle common to the traditional vocalizations of Aramaic and Hebrew have long been in doubt, although there is now some general consensus that in Hebrew it is due to Aramaic influence. The possibility of a similar alternation in the pronunciation of the stops in Akkadian, at least in some dialects, has often

1. See p. 11.
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been proposed. Recently a great deal of attention has been paid to this subject, and the Akkadian evidence has been gathered by von Soden, E. Knudsen, and other scholars.\textsuperscript{3} It has even been suggested that Akkadian might now be considered the origin of this feature of the Aramaic morphophonemic system.\textsuperscript{4}

There can be no objection to this hypothesis on chronological grounds. The internal Aramaic evidence points to the period 700-400 B.C. for the development of this feature into a systematic characteristic of Aramaic. Although sporadic spirantization may well have occurred earlier, as a systematic phenomenon, whatever its ultimate origin, it cannot be separated from the merging of the Proto-Semitic stops \textit{d}, \textit{t}, and \textit{t} with their spirantized counterparts \textit{g}, \textit{z}, and \textit{h} (\textit{gh}),\textsuperscript{5} a merger which is clearly to be dated sometime between the end of Old Aramaic and early Elephantine Aramaic. Spirantization could not have been operative in Old Aramaic,\textsuperscript{6} whereas the appearance of at least traces of it in all of the later Aramaic dialects indicates that it must have been a feature of Imperial Aramaic.

Objections on other than chronological grounds are numerous, however. The only stops that have been subjected to a complete study are the velars \textit{k} and \textit{g}, and with good reason.\textsuperscript{7} Knudsen has shown conclusively that in many words a spelled "\textit{k}" alternates with "\textit{h}." He concludes that, at least in our written sources, the alternation is free, but he claims that the phonetic environment necessary for this alternation is either a preceding vowel (even of a preceding word, as in Masoretic Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic) or the presence of


\textsuperscript{4} Knudsen, in \textit{Lišān miṯฏrti}, p. 155.

\textsuperscript{5} This observation of Schaeder's (\textit{Iranische Beiträge I} [Halle, 1930] 244, and see n. 6 below) has received less recognition than it rightfully due it.

\textsuperscript{6} Once one accepts the inescapable conclusion that Old Aramaic (and old Mesopotamian Aramaic) used the graphemes for the sibilants to represent the Proto-Semitic spirants for which the Canaanite alphabet had no symbols, it is obvious that a spirantized pronunciation of the stops could not have occurred in Old Aramaic, for if spirantization had occurred, \textit{d}, \textit{t}, and \textit{t} would have been confused with the corresponding spirants, still separate graphemes, in the orthography. For bibliography and a list (not without errors) of the early spellings see P. Altheim and R. Stiehl, \textit{Die Araber in der alten Welt I} (Berlin, 1964) 213 ff., though their conclusion that the phonology of Old Aramaic is due to Canaanite influence, cannot be accepted, as has been demonstrated by E. Y. Kutscher, \textit{A History of Aramaic} (Jerusalem, 1972-73) p. 15, among others.

\textsuperscript{7} Knudsen, in \textit{Lišān miṯฏrti}.
another identical velar. Unfortunately, the sound laws he proposes bear little relationship to his examples, and a complete re-analysis of the material is in order. Certainly of greater significance in the Old Babylonian examples of k/h interchange is the presence of an unvoiced sibilant in the vicinity of the velar. There is no significant evidence for the alternation g/h except for the Neo-Babylonian spelling of Aramaic /̥h/ as "g" in a syllable ̥huL (L = labial). Knudsen does note correctly that double /kk/ is never spelled "hh."

There is also evidence for an alternation t/ṣ (only in cases where [t] is meant?), which is of limited occurrence, restricted to certain words and primarily found in Old Babylonian. There is no significant evidence for a spirantized d, and the evidence for the labials is restricted to the use of signs that bear a labial stop to represent the phoneme /w/, foreign to Sumerian.

It is regrettable that von Soden, in his latest statement on the problem, apparently based on Knudsen's conclusions, has given the impression that postvocalic position is a precondi-
tion for spirantization in Akkadian. There is no support for such a statement. His previous position, that whatever general rules there might be remain undiscovered but are clearly different from those of Aramaic, is to be preferred. Thus, for the present at least, there exists no convincing evidence that there was ever any systematic spirantization of any of the stops in any Akkadian dialect.

9. Discussed by von Soden, "Aramäisches h erscheint im Spätbabiloni-
schen vor m auch als g," AFO XIX (1959-60) 149; see also von Soden, "Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbabyloni-
10. See von Soden and Röllig, Syllabar (2d ed.) pp. xix f. There is reason to believe that there is no conditional or free alternation here but merely spelling variations to represent constant [t].
11. GAG Ergänz., p. 4**.
13. All students of the problem claim that cuneiform spelling con-
tentions mask the phonetic realization of the various phonemes, and that spirantization must have been more extensive. This is certainly true. It is also true that our modern multiplication of syllabic values for the cuneiform signs has tended to obscure phonetic realities. Nevertheless, at present there is only a small amount of evidence for a minimal amount of insignificant variation, differing in each of the various dialects. If /d/ were spirantized in Old Babylonian, for example, one would expect to find it varying orthographically with "z," just as both "z" and "d" signs are used for Proto-Semitic /ḏ/ in Amorite (cf. J. C. Greenfield, "Amurrite, Ugaritic, and Canaanite," Proceedings, p. 94, n. 9, p. 95, n. 13).
Surprisingly overlooked by most of these scholars has been the analogous situation of Neo-Babylonian /m/ where the evidence overwhelmingly indicates that every non-lengthened /m/ in intervocalic position was pronounced [w] (see Phonology in Chap. IV). This same evidence, that of Aramaic loanwords and transcriptions, gives no indication of any other spirantization of Akkadian phonemes and in fact proves that Akkadian could not have been the origin of Aramaic spirantization.\(^{14}\)

The theory of an Akkadian origin for spirantization must be rejected.

The Loss of Laryngeals

In the course of their development, many of the Semitic languages lost some of their distinctive laryngeal phonemes. As an element of the general trend toward simplification of the phonemic inventory, most of the losses may be regarded as a natural linguistic development; but in certain cases this weakening or loss must be attributed to foreign influence, almost always in the form of a substratum.

It is generally assumed, no doubt correctly, that the early loss of the laryngeals in Akkadian is due, at least in part, to the Sumerian substratum. It is reasonable to suppose that if in a similar fashion a large enough Akkadian-speaking group formed the basic population of a new Aramaic dialect area, that Aramaic dialect should in time give evidence of a weakening of laryngeals.

Although there is confusion or weakening of some of the laryngeals in most Aramaic dialects, it is precisely in Mandaic and Babylonian Talmudic that this condition is most pronounced, a situation which must result from the earlier Akkadian-speaking substratum in southern Mesopotamia.\(^{15}\) There is, on the other hand, no reason to regard the weakening of the laryngeals in some of the Palestinian dialects as due to Akkadian influence. Greek influence, however, may be partly responsible.\(^{16}\)

14. One must also ask if the Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic give any indications or counterindications of spirantization in Aramaic but not in Akkadian; see Spirantization in Chap. IV. B. Batto, "DINGIR.\(\text{I}S. HI and Spirantization in Hebrew," JSS XVI (1971) 33-34, has shown that the Akkadian transliteration of the theophoric element \(\text{D}I\text{S}.\text{HI} in personal names, long read as \(\text{D}\text{mi}l-hi (i.e., West Semitic milki) and taken to indicate spirantization of the k, is now to be read \(\text{D}I\text{S}-\text{Sr}.

15. Cf. E. Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (Jerusalem, 1959) p. 402. The weakening does not at first sight appear to be as severe in BT as in Mandaic, but this is almost certainly due to the more conservative spellings of the Jewish scribes.

16. All the evidence has been carefully collected by Kutscher, Isaiah Scroll, pp. 42 ff., 57 ff., and especially 402 f., who suggests a
In a limited number of Mandaic words, /a/ before original /c/ or /h/ changes to /e/. Naturally, this cannot be due to the influence of Akkadian, for, although a similar sound shift occurred there, it was millennia earlier than the shift in Mandaic.\textsuperscript{17} Mandaic forms of originally third guttural verbs that have a final ī vowel are formed by analogy to verbs IIIy.

\textbf{Nasalization}

A significant feature of several of the Aramaic dialects is the dissimilation of a geminated consonant by initial nasalization, expressed orthographically by "n." Though occurring elsewhere in the Semitic and Indo-European language families,\textsuperscript{18} it is a salient feature of the Babylonian dialect of Akkadian, found occasionally in Old Babylonian and reaching full development in Middle Babylonian.\textsuperscript{19} The origin of this feature is unknown, however, and it may well be a phonetic feature common to a group of languages around Babylonia including Amorite and the early southeastern dialects of Aramaic.\textsuperscript{20}

The distribution of this feature in Aramaic is distinctive. It is totally absent from Old Aramaic, occurring first in Imperial Aramaic.\textsuperscript{21} Even etymological /n/, which is as-

Greek origin. Since neither Imperial Aramaic nor Syriac shows any significant indication of this phenomenon, it cannot be considered a general Aramaic tendency, and thus, where it occurs outside of BT and Mandaic, cannot be assigned to Akkadian or Persian influence (contra S. Morag, review, \textit{Kiryat Sepher} XXXVI [1951] 27). The limited confusion of lazyngeals in the local Aramaic dialects of Assyria may rightfully be considered the result of Akkadian influence (cf. W. Baumgartner, "Zur Mandäerfrage," \textit{HUCA} XXIII [1950-51] 47.)

\textsuperscript{17} Contra Rimalt, "Wechselbeziehungen zwischen dem Aramäischen und dem Neubabylonischen," \textit{WZKM} XXXIX (1932) 100. See MG, p. 16.


\textsuperscript{19} The best analysis of this feature in Babylonian is J. Aro, \textit{Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik} (St.Or. XX [Helsinki, 1955]) p. 37.

\textsuperscript{20} The Mesopotamian Amorite personal names in cuneiform sources of the second millennium present a picture which can only be described as free variation. Original /n/ is found both assimilated and non-assimilated, and nasalization of a doubled consonant may or may not occur. (Cf. I. J. Gelb, "La lingua degli Amoriti," \textit{AANL, Rendiconti, Classe} ... Morali, Series VIII, Vol. XIII [1958] p. 151, and H. Huffman, \textit{Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study} [Baltimore, 1965] p. 301) Assimilation appears to be more frequent. We also find non-assimilation of original /n/ in verbal forms in the West Semitic names from Palestine in the Amarna period (see W. F. Albright, "An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in an Amarna Letter from Central Palestine," \textit{BASOR}, No. 89 (1943) p. 31, n. 17.

\textsuperscript{21} It must be remembered that a distinctive feature of Imperial
similated in Old Aramaic, appears unassimilated again in Imperial Aramaic. The other dialect where this feature is frequent is Mandaic. Attempts to deduce western origins for the Mandeans on this basis have not been productive. In Mandaic as in Imperial Aramaic it is almost certainly of Babylonian origin (at least in the geographic sense of "Babylonian"). In the other later dialects where less frequent dissimilation occurs (Qumran, Targums, Nabatean, Hatran, Palmyran, Syriac, loans in Armenian), it is certainly only an orthographic remnant of Imperial Aramaic.

Dissimilation of Emphatics

Another characteristic of Mandaic that has been linked to the West by some scholars is the dissimilation of /q/ to /k/ when preceding /s/ or /t/, best known in Mandaic in the important word kušta. The first occurrence of such dissimilation in Aramaic is in the BR-RKB inscription (KAI, No. 216) from Sam'gal, kušra, "summer." It occurs in one of the Nerab inscriptions (the verb qtl > ktl) and is frequent in the proverbs of Ahiqar. Of the later dialects, only Man-

Aramaic dissimilation is that of /cc/ in forms of the root ġll, which could hardly be of Akkadian origin.


23. Most recently discussed by R. Macuch in "Anfänge der Mandäer," in Altheim and Stiehl, Die Araber in der Alten Welt II (Berlin, 1965) 84 ff. The suggestion of Spitaler, decisively refuted there by Macuch, that the "n" is only a spelling convention to indicate consonantal length, no longer needs to be seriously considered. The evidence suggests, however, that precisely the reverse may be true, that nasalization was always present but often, just as in Old Persian cuneiform, not written. Note the Aramaic spelling ḫbš for (Assyrian!) cuneiform ha-am-bu-su (DEA, No. 12).


25. The occurrences and supposed occurrences have been discussed by Kutscher in "The Language of the 'Genesis Apocryphon': A Preliminary Study," Scripta Hierosolimitana IV (1965) 19 f., and JSS X 37 ff. Note his important observation that the rare attestations of this phenomenon in Galilean Aramaic are in non-Galilean Aramaic contexts.

26. For the argument see AF, p. 245, and Macuch, in Altheim and Stiehl, Die Araber in der alten Welt II 103 f. For the phonetic feature see HM, pp. 74 f., and MG § 42.

27. P. Leander, Laut- und Formenlehre des Ägyptisch-Aramäischen (Goteborg, 1928) p. 17.
daic has it as a regular feature of the language. Not surprisingly, Akkadian origins for this morphophonemic feature have been suggested, but there is little to support this position.

According to the well known rule of the incompatibility of root consonants in Akkadian, two different emphatics cannot occur in the same verbal root, the so-called Geers’ Law. But there are several reasons why this Akkadian sound change was probably not the cause of the Aramaic change. In Akkadian it is a law of root formation alone and was probably no longer functioning as part of the language in the first millennium. This is demonstrated by examples of assimilation of non-emphatic consonants to emphatics such as in iqtabi > iqṭabi. Furthermore, there is an order of precedence in Akkadian: /q/ becomes /k/ before /š/ but /t/ becomes /t/ in the presence of /q/ (or /š/), whereas in the Aramaic examples it is only initial /q/ that dissimilates, even before /t/, the reverse of the Akkadian change. Thus, one must discount the possibility of Akkadian origins for this trait in Aramaic in general. The extent of its preservation in Mandaic, however, may be partly due to the Akkadian-speaking substratum.

**MORPHOLOGY**

There is no lack of disagreement among linguists over the processes by which grammatical features may be borrowed by one language from another. In general the evidence suggests that in cases where there is significant bilingualism such transference can occur. Where contact is more limited, morphological and syntactic borrowings are quite rare and almost certainly can occur on the morphological level only when a number of words with the same foreign morpheme are borrowed from which the meaning of the individual morpheme can be abstracted. Similarly on the syntactic level, influence is often assumed to be found only when several similarly constructed two- or three-word semantic units are borrowed, with

28. In the later dialects, aside from the well known occurrence of ḳṭ in Eastern Neo-Aramaic, traces of this dissimilation occur in Galilean Aramaic (cf. E. Y. Kutscher, "Studies in Galilean Aramaic I," Tarbiz XXI [1951] 202) and in BT (see above, s.v. kamāšu).
30. Cf. GAG § 51e, and Chap. II, s.v. suqāšu.
31. GAG §§ 26e, 90g
the obvious exception, of course, of the case of translation language.\(^{33}\)

Shaphel

In spite of the discovery of Ugaritic, a North West Semitic language which uses the shaphel as the common causative conjugation, and the fact that only a small number of the verbs with shaphel forms in Aramaic could possibly be related to Akkadian, claims that the use of the shaphel in Aramaic results from Akkadian influence and even such statements as "Most Aramaic causatives with š-prefix seem to be loan-words from Akkadian..." are still to be found in the literature.\(^{34}\)

A complete study of the shaphel in Aramaic (and Hebrew) was recently published by C. Rabin.\(^{35}\) Unfortunately he chose to omit from his study those few Aramaic verbs with initial š rather than š, but even the most cursory perusal of his contribution should suffice to convince anyone that no Akkadian influence is to be sought after here. In any case, it would seem that there are far too few borrowed Akkadian shaphels in Aramaic to have served as the basis for a morphological borrowing.\(^{36}\)

As pointed out by Rabin, many of the shaphel forms in Aramaic and Hebrew lack a corresponding non-prefixed form of the root;\(^{37}\) that is to say they are not used as functioning causative stems in the language and that accordingly one must not think in terms of two inherited causative formations in Aramaic. He proposed that all shaphel forms not borrowed from Akkadian were borrowed from another North West Semitic language, which he thinks is probably Amorite. The reasoning behind his argument is fundamentally sound; it is, however,


\(^{34}\) K. Deller with M. Dahood, review of Moscati, *Comparative Grammar, Or. n.s. XXXIV* (1965) 41.


\(^{36}\) Rabin (ibid.) considers only Šyżb and Šyšy to be certain Akkadianisms. As discussed above, the loanword status of the latter is subject to doubt as well (see s.v. Šuš).

\(^{37}\) Ibid., p. 157.
very unlikely that Mesopotamian Amorite was the source of these shaphel forms, for the usual causative conjugation there was the haphel, as in Aramaic. But the spread of the shaphel forms into the standard Aramaic dialects and Hebrew from other North West Semitic languages which used the shaphel as the causative (Ugaritic and other as yet unknown early dialects) is quite probable.

The $i/n$ Imperfect Prefix

One of the characteristics of Eastern Aramaic is the use of $i$ or $n$ in the prefix of the third person imperfect verbal forms (instead of $y$), a feature frequently attributed to the influence of Akkadian $iU$, used in asseverative and jussive verbal constructions. In his discussion of this, H. L. Ginsberg concluded that "Akkadian influence was at most only a contributing factor in the evolution of this feature." His main argument is that the prefix $i-$ was already used in the jussive sense in Samalian and in the Assur Ostracon with syncope of the $y-$, and that thus only its use without jussive force is peculiar to Eastern Aramaic, and even in this latter usage the Aramaic and Akkadian forms correspond only roughly.

A restatement of the data seems appropriate here. Akkadian has a jussive verbal construction known as the precative in which the optative particle $iU$ combines with preterite

38. While there are a few Amorite names that seem to yield to interpretation best as shaphels, the common causative is certainly haphel (cf. Huffman, Amorite Personal Names, p. 68; Gelb, in AANL, Rendiconti XIII 159.

39. Two tentative pictures of this process can be imagined. Either all shaphels (and saphels) in Aramaic are the result of outside influence, or among those that had been borrowed (from all sources) there were enough with attested verbal cognates in Aramaic to have allowed the realization that this was indeed a kind of causative conjugation and thus to have served as the model for the formation of a new "causative" form.


42. This construction is now known from Aramaic personal names in cuneiform transliteration as well; cf. W. von Soden, "Das akkadische t-Perfekt und sumerische Verbalformen mit $ba-$, $imma-$, und $u-$," AS, No. 16 (Chicago, 1965) p. 104, n. 2.

43. Ginsberg’s other arguments are not as significant: He admits the uncertain nature of his second point, the use of $i-$ with $hwy$ in BA, to which Kutscher has given a completely different interpretation (see below, n. 46.).
verbs yielding forms like *lirus*, "let him cut," certainly quite similar in shape to the Aramaic jussive construction mentioned above. There is an asseverative particle *lU*, which can be used with any verbal form, but which does not regularly enter into crasis with the initial vowel of the following verb. This asseverative is found commonly only in royal inscriptions.\footnote{GAG § 8lf. Crasis does occur, but apparently only when the initial vowel of the verb is *u*. The optative particle *lU* is also found commonly with stative verbs but also often in nominal sentences (cf. GAG § 12lf).}

In Aramaic, in addition to the examples of the jussive in Samalian and the Aṣšur Ostracon, \(l\)- is used in BA and Qumran Aramaic both in the jussive and in the indicative of the verb *hwy*.\footnote{In Qumran: 4Q Mes.Am., 1Q 21 and 11Q TgJob.} The usual explanation, that this is an intentional scribal change in order to prevent orthographic and/or phonetic similarity to the ineffable divine name, is probably correct. Even so, Kutscher has argued that this practice could only have developed in an area where the use of an \(l\)- imperfect prefix of some sort was known, that is, in Eastern Aramaic, since but for the old Samalian dialect, there is no other evidence of \(l\)-, even with the jussive, in Western Aramaic.\footnote{E. Y. Kutscher, in Leš. XXV 128. The examples adduced from Galilean Aramaic by Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 264, are certainly corruptions from BT. Their limitation primarily to modal usages is not indicative of authenticity, for this is precisely the correct usage of the imperfect in late Aramaic; see n. 51.}

A more precise statement of the distribution of this feature in Eastern Aramaic is also desirable. No relevant forms occur in the Uruk incantation. In Hatran the imperfect prefix is consistently \(l\)-, but in the contemporary Old Syriac texts, which are from farther west, \(y\)- is still used. We first find \(n\)- in the middle of the third century A.D. and then generally in Syriac, where there is no trace of \(l\).\footnote{See Klaus Beyer, "Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der Altesten syrischen Literatur," ZDMG CXVI (1966) 243. Note that \(l\)- is used in the Jewish Aramaic text No. 151 from Dura dating from 200 A.D.; cf. J. T. Milik, "Parchemin judeo-araméen de Doura-Europos, an 200 Ap. J.-C.," *Syria* XLV (1968) 97 ff., 1. 18. As pointed out to me by E. Y. Kutscher, these early texts are of a legal nature and, as in such texts elsewhere, the use of \(y\)- may be a formulaic archaism.}

In Mandaic \(n\)- is also the most usual form, but \(l\)- occurs in the earlier texts, alternating with \(n\)- in both jussive and non-jussive forms.\footnote{MG, pp. 215 ff.; E. Yamauchi, *Mandaic Incantation Texts* (New Haven, 1967) p. 116, suggests that \(l\)- is jussive and \(n\)- indicative, but this is not obviously the case. They occur together only in one text (No. 31), and there they are used interchangeably. The example of a \(y\)- prefix in No. 22:94 is unique in Mandaic. In No. 30:30 read \(d\) *\(l\)Ýṣṭrý\).}
126 / Non-Lexical Influences

In Babylonian Talmudic $l$- is the most common form, though $n$- occurs as well. There is some indication that the dialect of the early Babylonian Amoraim may have $y$-, but the possibilities of western influence exist here. Imperial Aramaic influence or formulaic archaism is possible in the Jewish Aramaic magic bowls, which usually have $y$- and sometimes $n$- but never $l$-. This entire phenomenon cannot be separated from the restructuring of the tense system in the late Aramaic dialects. With the development of a new indicative present-future tense (i.e., the old participle), the old distinctions between jussive and imperfect were lost, and the single resulting form was used in modal, non-indicative functions (jussive, subjunctive). As indicated by the preservation of $l$- as well as by the forms of the pronominal suffixes discussed below, Eastern Aramaic used the old jussive forms to accomplish this function, whereas in Western Aramaic the indicative forms were used. Thus, it would appear that, prior to this restructuring, third person masculine jussives with $l$- or $n$- were the norm, at least in Mesopotamian Aramaic. In spite of the anciently attested, authentic Aramaic jussive prefix $l$-, the replacement of the simple non-$l$- jussive by composite $l$- forms may well have been influenced by the Akkadian prejective construction, which is the only way that the jussive idea can be expressed by prefixed verbal forms in that language.

The Loss of the $n$-Bearing Pronominal Suffixes

In Old Aramaic and Imperial Aramaic the pronominal suffixes of the indicative imperfect (as opposed to the jussive and imperative) are preceded by $-(i)n$-, but in Eastern Aramaic this does not occur, except for the (usually independent) third


50. Epstein (ibid.) claims that the Pehlevi logograms use $n$ as well as $y$ and that once in the Sassanian logograms one finds $l$- with $hwv$, just as in BA, but I have been unable to locate his source.


52. Why did $l$- become $n$- in some dialects? This difficult problem is not solved merely by the observation that initial $l$ and $n$ alternate quite freely in Babylonian Aramaic. Note that BT has $n\mu n$ and $nqt$ corresponding to $l\mu hmp$ and $lqt$ in Mandaic (the $l$ is original; cf. HM, p. 51), but in the verbal prefix $l$- is most frequent in BT and $n$- in Mandaic. Syriac, which otherwise knows only the shift $n > [l]$ (T. Noideke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, J. A. Chrichton, trans. [London, 1904] § 31b) has only the prefix $n$-. In the final analysis it may be that the shift to $n$- was prompted merely by the fact that $n$- was already familiar as the imperfect prefix of the first person plural.
person plural object pronoun. Ginsberg considers this "surely due to the Accadian influence." There is little if any reason to suspect such Akkadian influence here, however, for as described above this merely represents the preference for the old jussive form for the new non-indicative function of the prefixed verb. In Western Aramaic, on the other hand, the forms used for this function are uniformly those of the old indicative.

The Plural Determined Suffix -ē

The ending -ē on the plural determined noun, a third distinguishing characteristic of Eastern Aramaic, is also frequently attributed to the influence of Akkadian, in which, during the first millennium, the common plural ending was -ē in all cases. In contrast to the l/n prefix, this was an early and widespread feature in Aramaic. Its first isolated occurrence is the form ēmmē in Ahigar. It occurs in the Uruk incantation and the early Eastern texts (Hatran and Old Syriac) and even, infrequently, in Palmyran and in targumic texts. The objections raised to the view that this feature must be from Akkadian are that -ē could be a Common Semitic abstract ending, that it might possibly be the result of a natural phonetic development, or, more likely, that it developed on

53. Compare, however, the Mandaic second person plural suffix -nkwn after all verbs, though this is probably modeled after the third person plural suffix. In fifth-century Syriac, traces of -inn- are still to be found; cf. K. Beyer, in ZDMG CXVI 250, where he attributes it to "Reichs- oder westaramaischer Einschlag."


55. There is hardly any uniformity of opinion, however. Cf. Ginsberg, in AJSL LII 101, n. 6, and AF, pp. 173 f.; K. Beyer, in ZDMG CXVI 247, n. 10; J. Blau, "The Origins of Open and Closed e in Proto-Syriac," BSOAS XXXII (1969) 8. Ginsberg's suggestion that the Akkadian morpheme could be from Aramaic is quite improbable, for in the early Assyrian dialects -ē was already the ending of the oblique plural (cf. GAG paradigm 1).

56. Franz Rosenthal, Die Sprache der palmyrenischen Inschriften und ihre Stellung innerhalb des Aramäischen (MVAG, Vol. XLI [Leipzig, 1936]) p. 76. A. Tal, "The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and Its Position within the Aramaic Dialects" (Diss., Hebrew University, 1971) pp. 90 ff., has scrutinized the evidence of the occurrence of -ē in Targum Jonathan and has shown that those occurrences which cannot be explained as either errors in scribal transmission or assimilations to nearby construct forms are limited to specific sets of nouns, primarily the terms zyy, twry and qyy as collectives (as opposed to regular plural forms used when an actual plural is required) and the frequent bīt ʿēṣyr, which he considers an eastern loan. The observation that in these texts the semantic value of the morpheme -ē differs from that of the regular plural affix certainly merits further research.

57. The second possibility seems much more probable than the first, whose difficulties were discussed by Rosenthal, Sprache, p. 76, n. 6.
the analogy of the -ā ending of plural determined gentilic forms. Indeed, I would tend to view the latter as the ultimate origin of the -ā ending, but the preservation of this morpheme as a characteristic only of Eastern Aramaic might be partly due to Akkadian.

The Infinitive of the Derived Conjugations

In Babylonian Talmudic, Mandaic, and Neo-Syriac, the infinitives of the derived conjugations end in -āCā, for example the paael (m)parrāqē. The similarity between this Aramaic form of limited distribution and the Akkadian infinitive purrusu (or even closer, the Assyrian form parrusu) was noted by Barth, though I know of no suggestion that Akkadian influence was responsible here. The final -ā of the Aramaic forms is difficult to explain in any case, as is the long vowel of the second syllable. The Neo-Syriac paael infinitive prāqā, instead of the Common Aramaic mipraq, is likewise similar, in fact identical, to the Akkadian infinitive of the simple stem parāṣu; but this is also the original Hebrew infinitive absolute form and is quite common as an abstract verbal noun in the other Aramaic dialects.

The Plural Ending -ān(ān)

In Old Aramaic, the Aššur Ostracon and doockets, and Imperial Aramaic texts from Egypt, the plural masculine absolute suffix is almost always spelled -n rather than -yn. This fact led Ginsberg to speculate that since the latter two groups of texts almost always expressed internal ū or ū in other cases with a vowel letter, this is not merely an historical spelling for -ān but represents the ending -ān. Rosenthal refuted this position with what Ginsberg himself terms a "devastating

58. The gentilic form -āyə(ā̄yā) is certainly a natural Aramaic development, a simplification of the overly cumbersome "ayayā. From there, the analogy kašdāy : kašdāyā : kašdāy with būn : būnū : X is solved, of course, only by būnū. The Ahiqar form ṭm̄m̄ offers an indirect proof of this explanation. Analogy frequently operates where semantic association is strong, and here we see that it is precisely in the word "peoples" that this ending, developed from the proper names of peoples, first occurs.


60. Discussed by Barth, ibid.

61. Ibid., pp. 59 f., and Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, p. 70. Peal infinitives without initial m- are known from Old Aramaic (cf. lēgb, Sefire IB 32) and Imperial Aramaic (lēmr, frequent in the Aššur Ostracon and in Egyptian Aramaic).

critique."63 Not only is -yn found in Egyptian Aramaic in the
same texts with -n, but in one text even the same word, "fish"
(pl.), is spelled both mwyn and mwnyn.64 Ginsberg still main-
tains, however, that at least in some cases "this view still
deserves the serious consideration of sane men."65

Whether or not the masculine plural ending -ân is conceal-
ed in the spellings discussed above, the ending certainly exis-
ted, found in Aramaic in the double plural -ânân, limited to
certain types of nouns.66 The plural ending -ânu/i (-ânu/û)
is frequent in Akkadian as well, indicating, according to the
generally accepted view, a plural of individual units.67 In
light of the occurrence of -ân as the common plural ending in
Ge²ez and the remnants of -ân in Arabic, Aramaic, and Hebrew,68
any suggestion that this ending might be other than Common
Semitic is very dubious. Nevertheless, since the ending in
question is highly productive in the Neo-Babylonian period69
and is especially frequent in the modern Eastern Aramaic dia-
lects,70 an Akkadian influence affecting the frequency of use
of this plural morpheme cannot be excluded.71

The Imperial Aramaic Passive

Another characteristic of Imperial Aramaic is the preser-
vation of the internal passive verbs, limited almost exclusive-

63. Ginsberg, in JAOS LXII 237. Further (and to my mind, conclusive)
evidence against Ginsberg's position has been collected by Kutscher, A
History of Aramaic, p. 67 n.
64. AP, No. 45.
65. In JAOS LXII 237.
66. See Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, § 74; Brockelmann,
Grundriss I 451. In addition to the lists of such nouns found in the
grammars, see I. Läw, "Lexikalische Misszellen," in Festschrift zum sieb-
zigsten Geburtstage David Hoffman's (Berlin, 1914) pp. 135 ff.
67. First stated by A. Goetze, "The Akkadian Masculine Plural in
-ânu/i and Its Semitic Background," Language XXII (1946) 121-30; cf. GAG
§ 61i; I. M. Diakonoff, Semito-Hamitic Languages (Moscow, 1965) pp. 63 f.;
Sabatino Moscati, et al., An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the
Semitic Languages (Wiesbaden, 1964) par. 12.42.
68. Brockelmann, Grundriss, pp. 450 f.; for Afro-Asiatic cf. I. M.
Diakonoff, Semito-Hamitic Languages, pp. 63 f.
69. Note that it is the accepted plural ending on foreign titles;
cf. W. Eilers, Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilschriftlichen Überlie-
70. The normal plural ending in modern Mandaeic is -âna (HM, p. 225),
while in the Neo-Syriac dialects -ânâ is far more frequent than it is in
the earlier dialects (see the partial list of nouns in A. J. Maclean,
Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac [Cambridge, 1895] p. 46 f.).
71. Cf. Ginsberg, in AJSL LII 101. Ginsberg's alternative sug-
gestion, that the Akkadian ending was borrowed from West Semitic, can no
longer be maintained in light of the occurrence of -ânu in OA and OB (cf.
GAG § 61i).
ly to the perfect and participle.\textsuperscript{72} Ginsberg has also suggested Akkadian influence here. Indeed, the similarity between the Imperial Aramaic internal passive and the Akkadian permissive does seem "too striking to be accidental."\textsuperscript{73} The gradual disappearance of the internal passive in Aramaic and its replacement by the reflexive forms was a general Aramaic development which had already begun prior to the earliest inscriptions, but the pattern of the preservation in Imperial Aramaic, especially the assimilation of the passive perfect of the simple conjugation to the passive participle, could well be due to Akkadian influence.

**SYNTAX**

The Genitive Construction

In all of the Aramaic dialects, except for Old Aramaic,\textsuperscript{74} the relative pronoun $dâ$/$d$- is also used as a genitive particle in place of the construct chain.\textsuperscript{75} Since the first examples of this usage come from Mesopotamian Aramaic, where they are, in fact, nothing more than direct translations of Akkadian ša,\textsuperscript{76} possible Akkadian influence in the development of this feature has been suggested.\textsuperscript{77}

The intimate relationship between relative and genitive constructions in all of the Semitic languages suggests that both of these uses of the so-called determinative pronoun $dâ$/š ū were known in Proto-Semitic; accordingly, the absence of the genitive expansion in Old Aramaic must be taken to indicate only its comparative rarity in that dialect.\textsuperscript{78} Nevertheless, in light of the ubiquitous use of genitive $zy$ in Mesopotamian

\textsuperscript{72} F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Wiesbaden, 1963) p. 44, states that "No passive forms of the imperfect happen to occur in BA," but in view of the fact that in all of Imperial Aramaic only one possible example of an imperfect passive is known (Hermopolis ybl/ywb l) and that in contrast Old Aramaic commonly uses the imperfect passive but not the perfect, the non-occurrence of the imperfect internal passive in BA is certainly more than just coincidental.

\textsuperscript{73} Ginsberg, in *AJSL* LII 99.

\textsuperscript{74} The one exception generally cited is Sefire III 7-8 61 mlk$^2$ zy shryt$^y$, "all the kings of my vicinity." Comparison with the frequent Hebrew construction $n$š$^fr$ $s^y$bd$^4$ strongly suggests, however, that $zy$ functions as a relative in this case as well.


\textsuperscript{76} Passim in Assyrian weights, the $n$š$^fr$ Ostraca, and Assyrian and Babylonian tablets.


\textsuperscript{78} Indeed, genitive $d$- is relatively rare in Ugaritic as well.
texts and in the Behistun inscription,79 the rapid development of this feature in Aramaic must be ascribed to the influence of Akkadian. From there it became a fundamental feature of Imperial Aramaic "high style" (see below, p. 160).80 Its presence in all of the later dialects would thus seem to be the result of a combination of natural development and influence of the literary language.81

A related issue is the common anticipatory genitive construction brh zg/āy X, "the son of X," corresponding to Akkadian māršu ša X. In Akkadian this construction is found not infrequently in OB and rarely in some of the other dialects, but it is most common in western texts (e.g. Ras Shamra) and NB/LB.82 Especially in the latter it is often attributed to Aramaic influence.83 Others consider the Akkadian construction to be an internal Akkadian development and the Aramaic to be under the influence of Akkadian.84

Since, as has been demonstrated, even the simple genitive use of zg was at best extremely rare in Old Aramaic, Aramaic influence on this Akkadian feature would seem to be out of the question. (Note that the anticipatory construction is not yet attested in Mesopotamian Aramaic.) Yet the frequency of the anticipatory suffix in NB/LB may well be the result of immanent development. It is generally recognized that the use of this type of genitive construction indicates a high degree of definiteness of the ruling noun. As in the case of similar constructions in Ethiopic,85 the natural place for such a syntactic development would be in a language such as Akkadian, which lacks a definitizing morpheme.86 Thus, it

79. For references see n. 77.
80. Note especially the difference in the frequency of this usage between the proverbs of Ahigar and the framework story according to Kaddari, in Proceedings, p. 103. See below, p. 157.
81. Kaddari's conclusion (ibid., p. 115)—that only the case where one of the members is determined and/or part of a syntagmatic structure was influenced by Akkadian, whereas "in the undetermined type of B, where an original predication of identity can be re-established (as in the genitivus materiae, or genitivus partitivus relations), an immanent development can be assumed"—is probably on the right track. Further studies as Kaddari's (and that of A. Goetze, review of Ravn, Relative Clauses, JCS I [1947] 75 f.), concentrating on Old Aramaic, Mesopotamian Aramaic, and Neo-Babylonian, should be helpful in shedding further light on this problem.
82. GAG § 138j-l.
83. Ibid. Cf. AF, pp. 38 f.
86. In light of the preponderance of the anticipatory construction
would seem that the development of this feature in Aramaic is to be ascribed at least partially to Babylonian influence. 87

Word Order

In the Old Aramaic of Syria, the word order in the verbal sentence is the expected ancient Semitic type, in most cases verb-subject-object, with the order variable for purposes of emphasis. In Eastern Aramaic, beginning with the earliest Mesopotamian Aramaic texts and including Syriac, Mandaic, and Babylonian Talmudic, word order is much more free. Several scholars have noted that, except for certain important exceptions, Imperial Aramaic texts also have this free word order, whereas Western Aramaic is generally similar to Old Aramaic. 88

Naturally, Akkadian is the most obvious possibility for the origin of this characteristic, 89 for, because of the strong influence of Sumerian, the verb-final position is the normal one in classical Akkadian. 90 Instead of a fixed word order, however, the Akkadian-Aramaic contact seems to have resulted in a rather free word order in both languages. Thus, although the classical Akkadian word order subject-object-verb is, to be sure, a common one in Imperial Aramaic, others, such as subject-verb-object, are equally common, especially in early texts (Nerab, Teima); and although the subject-verb-object order is quite frequent in the late Akkadian dialects as well, 91 Imperial Aramaic also uses word orders rather foreign to Akkadian, such as object-verb-subject. 92

in peripheral Akkadian texts in the second millennium, Barton's suggestion that during this early period foreign, non-Semitic influence is involved may well be correct, at least for those peripheral areas (G. A. Barton, "On the Anticipatory Pronominal Suffix in Aramaic and Akkadian," JAOS XLVII (1927) 260 ff.)

87. Note that, as opposed to the general use of §a as a genitive particle, this is a specifically Babylonian feature, hence its absence in early (Assyrian!) Mesopotamian Aramaic texts.

88. See the bibliography in Yochanan Muffs, Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine (Leiden, 1969) p. 23 n. and J. C. Greenfield, in Lég. XXXII 363 f. The exceptions are the Elephantine legal texts and the Ahigat proverbs. Note that the Hermopolis letters, which Greenfield considers a western dialect, have the free word order.

89. Cf. Ginsberg, in AJSL LII 98.

90. See GAG § 130b.

91. Ibid., c. This change is generally ascribed to Aramaic influence, but it could well be a natural development in Akkadian, which had apparently been forced into an unnatural language pattern by its borrowing of this element of Sumerian syntax; cf. J. H. Greenberg, "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements," Universals of Language (Cambridge, 1966) pp. 76 ff.

Along with this relatively free word order, a distinctive construction of Imperial Aramaic (and to a lesser extent Eastern Aramaic) is the construction object-1+infinitive (e.g. BA byt>dnh lmbnyh, Ezra 5:9). Although Aramaists generally ascribe an Akkadian origin to this feature as well, such would not seem to be the case. The Akkadian infinitive constructions have been studied by Aro, who has concluded that an Akkadian origin for this Aramaic feature is unthinkable; for in the Akkadian of the first millennium, even as early as Middle Assyrian, the old constructions in which the object precedes the infinitive were no longer common. The new forms were ana parāš (infinitive construct form) X and ana parāši/u ša X, corresponding to the older North West Semitic form 1 + infinitive construct-object. Thus, an Akkadian origin for this syntactic feature must be rejected.

The construction object-infinitive is, however, standard in Old Persian, as are verb-final constructions in general. It would seem, therefore, that this element of Imperial Aramaic is due to Persian influence. Similarly, since this feature is clearly non-Akkadian, and in light of the fact that in pre-Achaemenid Imperial Aramaic the normal word order is subject-verb-object whereas subject-object-verb is only found later on, the latter construction, too, is almost certainly the result of Iranian rather than Akkadian influence.

The Eastern Aramaic System of States

The last of the important characteristics of the dialects of Eastern Aramaic that separate them from earlier Aramaic and

93. Found in Qumran Hebrew as well; see n. 94.
95. J. Aro, Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen (St.Or. XXVI [Helsinki, 1961]).
96. Ibid., p. 351. It must be said that there are many NA and NB examples of object-infinitive, many of them actually cited by Aro for other purposes throughout his book, which he apparently has overlooked in his summary of the constructions occurring in each period, but in any case the order infinitive-object is by far the most prevalent.
98. This is hardly unexpected. Compare the clearly Iranian influence on the use of passive verbal constructions in Imperial Aramaic; cf. Kutscher, "Two 'Passive' Constructions in Aramaic in the Light of Persian," Proceedings, pp. 132-51.
Western Aramaic is the loss of the determining force of the definite article. Since, as E. Y. Kutscher has pointed out to me (orally), the natural course of language development is toward the development of determination, not the loss of it, this feature must be the result of external influence.

H. L. Ginsberg correctly showed that what really happens in Eastern Aramaic is that the so-called "determined" or "emphatic" state of the noun, that form with the post-positive article -â, becomes the normal state, while the original absolute state is preserved only in certain usages, resulting in a threefold system of nominal states strikingly similar to the Akkadian pattern of Status rectus, Status constructus, and Status absolutus.99 This situation has recently been discussed at length by Moscati, who has demonstrated that the Aramaic usages of the absolute match the Akkadian usages in almost every case,100 the two most frequent and best known of which are the predicate adjective and the distributive repetition.101

A difficulty with the theory that this characteristic of Eastern Aramaic is due to the influence of Akkadian syntax was also recognized by Ginsberg. He pointed out that in Neo-Babylonian final short vowels had presumably dropped and that the resulting noun forms were identical in all three states for most nouns.102 Thus, he concluded that "We therefore cannot date the East Aramaic reorganization of the statuses too late." But if it was an early influence, why is there no significant indication of this reorganization in earlier Ara-

101. Ginsberg, in JAOS LXII 234, suggests as well that the use of an enclitic pronoun with the predicative participle, so common in Eastern Aramaic, also derives, perhaps as part of the predicate usage of the absolute state, from Akkadian, where the absolute state can be conjugated with the pronominal suffixes of the permansive verb. The Akkadian suffixes involved are those corresponding to the Aramaic perfect, however, and not forms of the independent pronouns. (I have already discussed a possible influence of the Akkadian construction on the Imperial Aramaic passive perfect; see above.) Further, such enclitic pronouns occur with predicate participles or adjectives in Western Aramaic, too, though to a lesser degree (see Dalman, Grammatik, p. 107). It seems to have been a natural development from the common Old Aramaic practice of placing a pronominal subject after its nominal predicate (see Fitzmyer, Sêfre, p. 162, and also the A$ur Ostracon).
maic texts from Mesopotamia, not to mention Imperial Aramaic, where Ginsberg and others find so many eastern traits? In the Aššur ostracon the three states are correctly used. In the Uruk incantation one does find incorrect use of the states, but precisely the reverse of that in later Eastern Aramaic, for the absolute is often used when the determined sense is required. 103

A further difficulty lies in the fact that the characteristic uses of the absolute state (predicate, distributive, and after numerals) are also found in Western Aramaic and thus would seem to have been a systematic feature of general Aramaic prior to its contact with Akkadian.

Thus, at best only the neutralization of the determined—non-determined opposition can be ascribed to the influence of Akkadian. (The Uruk incantation is representative of this first stage.) As a result of the special functions allotted to the absolute state, the emphatic form naturally developed into the unmarked form.

The Use of \(kî\)

Corresponding to Syriac \(kâd\), "when," Mandaic has the written form \(kd\) and Babylonian Talmudic uses \(ky\), both of which are also used for the comparative preposition "like." In Neo-Babylonian, too, \(kî\) and \(kî\ Ša function in both of these ways. 104 Since such a functional similarity could hardly be coincidental, some influence must be present. There is no reason to suspect that \(k + dy\), "when," is other than a native Aramaic development; 105 thus, NB \(kî\ Ša, "when," is almost certainly an Aramaism. Its use as a preposition, however, probably derives from the similar double use of Akkadian \(kî\), which has a long history, although it is most frequently found in NB, after the longer form \(kîma\) drops from common use. 106

The BT form, which has heretofore defied explanation, could easily be regarded as a loan from NB \(kî\). 107 In light of the Mandaic form \(kd\), however, one might venture to posit a development \(kd > kî\), 108 and if so, only the prepositional

105. Cf. BH ka-šēr.
106. See Ahw., pp. 468 ff.
108. For the elision of intervocalic (and postvocalic) \(d\) in BT (under Iranian influence?), see Epstein, Grammar, p. 18.
use of *kēq̱ would have been borrowed, corresponding to the NB use of kī ša as a preposition. Another possibility is to regard the Mandaic written form ḵd (a ligature) as an historical spelling for a phonetic form such as [kī], the same form as in BT, and borrowed from NB.109 Such an interpretation would appear to be supported by Modern Mandaic, where the corresponding form is ke, which, however, could well be a borrowing from Persian.110

The Interrogative Particle m̱

In Babylonian Talmudic and Mandaic, declarative sentences are made interrogative when preceded by the particle m̱ (spelled my in BT; m̱, my and, as a proclitic, my- in Mandaic). This particle may well derive from the identical Akkadian enclitic particle -mî, itself probably a development of the interrogative pronoun mînu, "what."111 The change from an enclitic particle in Akkadian to initial position in Babylonian Aramaic can be explained as a substitution for the earlier Aramaic interrogative h-, or merely as a result of the tendency to avoid enclitic and second position particles in Babylonian Aramaic.112


110. Cf. HM, pp. 234, 452 ff., MD, p. 211. The form kidbirdku cited in MD, p. 211, s.v. ki, as a scripta plena is to be regarded rather as a phonetic writing of what would in normal orthography be ḵdbirdku. Note that d is the enclitic variant of q̱ when used after prepositions (cf. MD, p. 97).

111. Cf. AHw., p. 650, CAG § 123b. Note that von Soden derives the Akkadian from the similar -m̱, suggesting that vowel harmony is the cause of the i vowel. Both forms are found in OB and SB but are apparently unknown in NA or NB texts. Even if -m̱ did not occur in those dialects, however, the Aramaic form may have developed directly from the pronoun mînu. Most scholars try to derive the Aramaic particle in question from Aramaic mî; indeed the BT form of the latter is mʔy, which might easily become my. Schlesinger, Satzlehre, p. 157, n. 2, claims that mh is found as a rhetorical interrogative particle in YT, and my is apparently attested in Palestinian Midrash, but until an investigation based on good manuscripts is available, my must be considered a characteristic of Babylonian Aramaic alone.

112. Cf. MG, p. 429.
IV

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

PHONOLOGY

As discussed in Chapter I, the Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic offer the Assyriologist an approach to the phonemic and phonetic characteristics of the late Akkadian dialects not available through the medium of the cuneiform texts alone. Similarly, one hopes for new light on Aramaic phonology, specifically on the chronology of consonantal merging and vowel reduction. The following is an attempt to assemble the evidence on such matters derivable from a study of the loanwords. In addition to this material, the evidence offered by transliterations of Akkadian names in alphabetic script and of Aramaic and other names in cuneiform as well as that of the Aramaic loans in Akkadian has also been scrutinized. The few tablets with Greek transliterations of Akkadian and Sumerian date from very late times (ca. 100 B.C.) and are of little value for our purposes.\(^1\)

Stops

Labials

The following relevant phonetic changes are apparent from the cuneiform texts themselves (cf. \(GAG\) § 27): \(b > p\) sometimes in the environment of \(s\), \(s\), or \(n\). Initial \(b\) becomes \(p\) in some NA words. NB has "\(b\)" where other dialects have "\(m\)" in forms of \(hab/maššu\), "a rodent."\(^2\)

In alphabetic transcriptions of Neo-Babylonian, Akkadian /\(b/\) and /\(p/\) are kept distinct and represented correctly by Aramaic "\(b\)" and "\(p/\). In Neo-Assyrian intervocalic /\(p/\) was apparently pronounced [b].\(^3\) In other non-word-initial posi-


2. Note (\(GAG\) Ergänz., p. 4\(^*\)) that von Soden suggests that the b/m alternation in the script occurs only when a spirantized pronunciation of "\(b/\)" is intended. This is no doubt true of the Assyrian use of "\(b/\)" for [w], but in hab/maššu the spelling with "\(b/\)" is NB, while the spelling with "\(m/\)" does not occur in NB at all, though "\(m/\)" is the standard NB way of expressing [w] (see below, Nasals). Thus, [w] is certainly not intended in the NB spelling of this word.

3. This shift is attested in alphabetic transliterations in the names \(sb\text{-}sr < ḫēpa-\(AŠšur\) (\(AŠšur\) tablet 3) and \(p(?)/rbhr\) (\(AŠšur\) tablet 6),
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tions in NA, however, /b/ and /p/ are also kept distinct in the transliterations. Deller's suggestion that NA /b/ and /p/ were often confused and were pronounced almost identically must be modified accordingly.4

Of the loanwords, the following exhibit irregularities:

balaggu : plaggā—The form palaggu is well attested in SB, perhaps as an Assyrianism.

hašbu : ?—If any of the Aramaic forms aside from ḫšb are indeed loans, then there are irregularities. Perhaps Syr. ḫṣp is a loan, with b > p because of the g.

purkullu : ṣrgwbl—are This is difficult; perhaps p > b by assimilation to the g and l in the Aramaic form. There is no certainty that the initial phoneme of the Akkadian is /p/ and not /b/, however, for all syllabic spellings are ambiguous. See below, Velars, and Chap. II, n. 268.

nabartu : nmrt > m—Note that the b is intervocalic and in the vicinity of n.5

Dentals

Alternation between d and t is rare but occurs in a few words in NA and SB. D, t, and ū are represented in transcriptions and loanwords by alphabetic d, t, and ū, respectively.6 In NB final mt becomes dd as in šalamtu and *pagumtu. Problematic loanwords are:

kutimmu : kdm—Syllabic spellings of this Sumerian loanword (kù-dīm) are rare. It clearly has /t/ in OB but perhaps was pronounced with [d] in LB. Modern scholars are uncertain whether to transcribe the word with t, ū or d.

where the second element is clearly the Akkadian uparih. Note that in names with the element api (such as Tiglathpileser and *pilār in AMūsr tablet 5) p is always preserved, suggesting that even in the construct form apīl the vowel is easily elided in context and that the shift occurs only in intervocalic, not postvocalic, position. Loanwords displaying this phonetic change are snb < šinipū and šwšbyn < susāpinnu.


5. Since in NB intervocalic /m/ > [w], perhaps intervocalic /b/ was then free to vary in phonetic range toward [m]. This would explain the NB spelling of habaširu discussed above (n. 2) as a reasonable spelling for something like ḫamašir.

6. The problem of d/ū alternation between Sumerian and Akkadian and between Akkadian and West Semitic remains a difficult one. There is no internal Akkadian evidence to prove that Sumerian DUB becomes Akkadian ṣppu, a reading based on West Semitic writings such as BH ṣpsr for Akk. ṣpparru (cf. dibbu, dappu). Still, in light of the consistent renderings of the consonants in transcriptions and in the other loanwords, it is best to assign this change to the earlier Sumerian-Akkadian loan period. The single possible exception in the transcriptions is in O. Krückmann, Neubabylonischen Rechts- und Verwaltungstexte (Leipzig, 1933) No. 20, where *lḥtn may represent a name ending in ah-iddin.
natbaru, nadabako : ndbk—This is the word commonly cited as an example of d/t alternation, but why is the extra vowel inserted in the form with d? The d occurs both in NA and LB examples and is certainly phonetically conditioned, assimilated to the n and b. Syllable-final d cannot be differentiated from t in cuneiform orthography, so perhaps this word always has /d/ and the form "natbaru is only a modern, etymologically influenced but erroneous transcription.

Šimtu, Šindu : šnt—See above, p. 102.

Velars

The Babylonian phonetic change nk (or mk) > ng is well known and is represented in the loanwords by tamkaru > t(n)gr. The only other g/k interchange apparent from the cuneiform sources is in NA, where g is found for k very rarely in initial position, yet the transcriptions consistently have "g" for NA intervocalic /k/. Of the loanwords, the following have /g/ for Akkadian /k/ and may therefore be assigned an Assyrian origin: ekurru : *gwr,* īku : *yg*, šaknu : sgn, ša ekallu : šgl.

Thus, one may posit the phonetic rule that in Neo-Assyrian intervocalic /k/ is pronounced approximately like West Semitic /g/. It is interesting to note that the cuneiform texts give no indication of this allophone; apparently it is only the non-systematic changes which are likely to be expressed in the NA orthography.

Intervocalic doubled kk is preserved as unvoiced, as in Šukkallu : skl. The realization of /k/ in other positions is not so clear:

kimahhu—In discussing this word I suggested an Assyrian pronunciation [qimah]; however, this is one of those words which is occasionally spelled with "g" and thus offers no evidence of the normal realization of initial /k/ in NA. The

8. I have limited this shift to intervocalic rather than postvocalic position solely on the basis of the parallel case of the labial stops. Šaknu : sgn appears to be an exception to this rule, but it may be assumed that with the dropping of final short vowels the absolute form also developed an apthentic vowel as in the construct form šakin.
9. Hurrian etymology may have played some part here, for it is generally agreed that in that language voicing was non-phonemic, stops being voiced in inter- (or post-)vocalic position. Cf. P. M. Purves in I. J. Gelb, P. M. Purves, and A. A. MacRae, Nuzi Personal Names (OIP LI [Chicago, 1943]) p. 184.
10. That intervocalic kk remained [kk] in Assyrian is demonstrated as well by the BH loan nkt < nakkantu, "treasure," which must be from Assyrian with mt > nt > tt rather than Babylonian where mt > nd (> dd).
neighboring liquid might well be the immediate cause of the voicing in this instance.

muškēnu : mskn—This is a loan from Assyrian, as indicated by the altered sibilant. It is possible that /k/ in syllable-initial position always remains [k], but the unvoiced sibilant may have been of some influence here.

purkullu : ֑rgwbl—The original Akkadian consonants are uncertain. The older dictionaries list the word under burgullu, but from Sumerian BUR.GUL one would expect purkullu. Nor can one determine, if indeed ֑rgwbl is derived from this word, whether it was borrowed from NA or NB. The form to which it assimilated, ֑rdykl, was borrowed from NB.

The problematic velars in the Aramaic forms from gušûru and askuppatu have been discussed in Chapter II, where it is suggested that they are the result of later Aramaic developments.

Sibilants

Scholars have long realized that the evidence of alphabetic transcriptions showed that in the Assyrian dialect original /š/ was pronounced [s]. Since most of the time the Assyrians write "š" for this sound, von Soden (GAG § 30d), however, still insists that such a pronunciation is uncertain. But precisely because of the consistent orthography it can be stated with certainty that /š/ > [s] was a systematic phonetic development in the process of which the signs for original /š/ came to be used for [s].

/š/ and /s/ did not merge in Assyrian, however, for Assyrian "s" is used to write West Semitic "š" and vice versa.

11. Cf. DEA, pp. 16 f. The few Biblical exceptions, which are cited by Delaporte, merit investigation. The place name ֑šwr was probably long known in the West and is not merely a transliteration (cf. L. Waterman, Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire IV [Ann Arbor, 1936] 15 ff.). It occurs properly as ֑šwr in Hebrew and Old Aramaic, but in later Aramaic. The š of the name ֑šršs may represent assimilation to the Hebrew cognate. The ֑š of ֑ššmr (Shalmanesar) is no longer to be considered an exception (see Chap. II, n. 364). To be added to the list is Hebrew ֑šq for the Assyrian title ֑šq. Here, too, one suspects assimilation to the Hebrew root ֑שכ or else a Babylonianized formation.

12. When "s" is actually written, as it is frequently in the vicinity of /b/ or /p/, does it indicate a phonetic [s]? Since this, too, is fairly systematic, it probably indicates something other than [s], that is, one of the sounds normally indicated by "s" in Assyrian orthography; see below.

13. This correspondence is generally omitted from the Akkadian grammars altogether. Nevertheless, it is certain. Well known examples are the Assyrian spellings of Jerusalem and Samaria with "s." In DEA we find ֑ס–ו for ֑שכ and ֑אמ–ב–ע for ֑בכ. For the representation of
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There is also a recurrent example of Akkadian $lt \rightarrow ss$, written "$s$" in Aramaic. Since in Old Aramaic /$s$/ and /$š$/ are not graphically differentiated, a normal pronunciation of Assyrian "$s$" like Old Aramaic /$š$/ is not excluded by these mutual transliterations; but if as$\tilde{t}u : ā$ṣyt$\tilde{t}$, daltu : dā$š$t, sūgu : šwq$\tilde{t}$, suqā$\tilde{t}$u : šq$\tilde{t}$q, and mes$\tilde{t}$ : mš$\tilde{t}$ are indeed loans, then the Assyrian pronunciation was clearly closer to [$š$]. Assyrian "$s$" in initial position only corresponds in a few cases to Babylonian "$z$" (GAG § 30c). This seems to be the case as well in the word samītu : zwy$t$, of uncertain origin. In simānu, the Babylonian pronunciation was with [s], as shown by the borrowed month name, but it was apparently pronounced closer to [z] in Assyrian. Perhaps a sound [$\tilde{z}$], the voiced form of [$š$], is involved, and if so, voicing can be ascribed to the subsequent nasal m. In general, however, one can establish the regular development in Assyrian of etymological /$š$/ to [s] and /$s$/ to [$š$]. The following loanwords are thus loans from Assyrian: the Aramaic forms of ērē$š$u, ušallu, giššu, šini$p$u, ša rē$š$i, šaknu, mu$kānu, $gā$šu, and $ suk$allu and, as mentioned above, as$\tilde{t}$u, daltu, su$š$u, suq$\tilde{t}$u, and mes$\tilde{t}$. Conversely, it may be assumed that any Aramaic word which preserves the Akkadian sibilants unchanged was borrowed from Babylonian.

Not all cases of sibilant shift in loanwords may be accounted for by the Assyrian dialect, however. Note the forms ištānu (iltānu) > ėṣtn$\tilde{t}$ and ištartu > ėṣtr$t$2, both of which were almost certainly borrowed from Babylonian. Here the spellings with $lt$ for original $št$ provide the clue. As indicated by the Hebrew rendering of the l of Kaldu, "Chaldea" by $š$, this sound was heard as $šin$ by the West Semites (but as l by the Greeks), and, like etymological $šin$, it was subsequently subject to the Aramaic sound change $š > s$. Note, however, that this consonant is preserved as $l$ in Aramaic when it

Ammari "$s$" by alphabetic "$š$" cf. the names of the priests of Nerab Šnrbn and $š$gbr (see S. Kaufman, "Ši$š$gbar, Priest of Sahr in Nerab,"

14. This is in names with the logographically written divine element previously read as Đ$t\tilde{a}r$, but spelled alphabetically $ṣ$ (DEA, p. 19). This has often been assumed to be an abbreviation. As pointed out first by Stephen J. Lieberman (unpublished paper), however, the only explanation is that the ideogram Đ15, read Đ$t\tilde{a}r$, in fact stands for the other word for "goddess," il$\tilde{t}$u, which in NA would quite normally become "issu" (cf. GAG § 34d) and, as shown by the Aramaic, was pronounced with [$š$].

15. The initial $š$ is in fact preserved in Šamanak, the Armenian descendant of simānu.

16. The first is considered Babylonian because the other wind names are clearly Babylonian loans. As for ištartu, the Assyrian realization should have been $št > ss$ : [$šš$], as in issēn < ištēn.
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precedes final -t of the feminine affix (e.g., manzaltu, marultu) and apparently also before t (e.g., bulbītu).

The phonetic problems involving sibilants in haštū, ša ekallī and paššūru have been discussed under the respective entries.

Glottal Stop and ḫ

Along with the disappearance of most of the laryngeals, /ḥ/ was also lost in many positions in Akkadian; nevertheless, the phoneme /ḥ/ persisted in all of the Akkadian dialects. Words with initial vowels certainly have at least a weak glottal onset, represented by “ḥ” in alphabetic transliteration. In personal names where the second or third element begins with a vowel, “ḥ” is usually expressed in the transliterations.17 In the two compound loanwords whose second element is ekallu (arad ekallī and ša ekallī), no glottal is indicated.

Akkadian words beginning with a vowel have initial /ḥ/ in their Aramaic forms. Exceptions are: the Mandaic forms from attalû and ʾištānu, where the loss of “ḥ” is certainly a late, Mandaic development. In atappu, asumittu and amurrigānu the Aramaic forms without initial “ḥ” may derive from Akkadian forms without the initial syllable a: Though rare among native Akkadian words, the alternation aC-: C- in initial position is not infrequent in late Akkadian (GAG § 14a). Asumittu is certainly of foreign origin. Although atappu may be from Sumerian *a-tab, and hence subject to loss of the initial a, the loss of the initial consonant may well have occurred later, in Aramaic, both in tpḥ and mṛynḥ. See also Chapter II, s.v. uṣurtu. The initial “ḥ” of ḫṭymḥ < ṣatammu is a secondary development in Aramaic.

It should be pointed out here that there is absolutely no evidence for the preservation of ʾayīn in first-millennium Akkadian and no firm evidence that any North West Semitic borrowing from an Akkadian word with an initial vowel has /ḥ/; see the entries adannu, adē, ʾarsānu, ebūru, erēšu, ʾeṭēru, ḫṭēn, izqāṭi.

Akkadian /ḥ/ is borrowed as “ḥ” in Aramaic.18 Problematic words are kimahhu and nishu. In his analysis of kwh : kimahhu, Kutscher proposes that the Eastern Syriac pronunciation of “ḥ” as [ḥ] is the origin of the form kwh.19 I have argued (Chap. II, n. 160) that a Nabatean pronunciation with

17. See S. Kaufman, in JAOS XC 270 f.
18. In Mandaic this became “ḥ,” except in the month name ṯarḥmarwén < arahšamnu. BT “ḥ” corresponds to Akk. “ḥ” in hurdu.
[h], also discussed by Kutscher, is to be considered responsible in the case of kwk. Nabatean can also be used to explain the various forms of nishu. Nabatean nsḥt and Mandaic ns² show that this word was indeed borrowed into early Aramaic. Pronounced with [h], it was borrowed into Arabic as nusḥah from Nabatean or a similar dialect. The later Aramaic (Syriac and Mandaic) forms with /k/ must be borrowings from Arabic. Medieval Hebrew nusḥāh is also from Arabic, but as it is a scholarly loanword, the representation of Arabic /ḥ/ by "ḥ" is explicable.

Nasals

It is well known that in NB/LB intervocalic "m" represents [w], both in the case of original /w/ and original /m/.²⁰ That is to say that [w] is the allophone of /m/ occurring in intervocalic position.²¹ The following words with etymological /m/ appearing as /w/ in Aramaic were thus borrowed from Babylonian: amāru, amurrū, amuršānu, argamānu, himētu, lumāšu, namāru, simānu, šamallū, šamānu, zīmu, and perhaps asumittu. Of those examples where intervocalic /m/ appears in Aramaic as /m/, Palmyran gmḥ < ḫimahhu, Syriac ṣmd < emēdu, and zmī < simānu are certainly from Assyrian.²² West Semitic ṣmd, ẓmd < emēdu, ẓimittu, a Neo-Babylonian technical term, is not to be considered an exception to the rule. The well attested occurrence of ẓayin in the West Semitic forms indicates that this was not a full loanword but rather a loan adaptation of the cognate root to the Babylonian usage.

The only example with etymological /w/ is amurriqānu, which occurs as mryqn²³ in Syriac, almost certainly from Assyrian. Together with the evidence presented in the previous paragraph this suggests that both intervocalic /m/ and /w/ were realized as [m] in Assyrian. In light of attested cuneiform orthography, however, such a development remains uncertain. In the orthography /m/ appears either as "m" or "ū" (or even disappears!) and /w/ either becomes "m" or "ḥ" (although "ḥ" probably signifies [w]).

Doubled /m/ in Babylonian remains /m/ in the loans.²⁴

²⁰ Cf. GAG § 31a.
²¹ See Spirantization in Chap. III.
²² Also see s.v. samīdu. As mentioned above, if it is a loan, it must be very early because the preservation of both /s/ and /m/ rules out both NA and NB.
²³ But in Assyrian we sometimes find "ū" for /mm/; cf. GAG Ergänz. § 31d. The Babylonian examples are etemmu (if BH ṭym is this word), kutimmu, similtu, šataminu, nuhatimmu and umnānu, of which only the first four are necessarily Babylonian, the first two by context and the third and fourth because of the sibilants.
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The phonetic realization of final /m/ in Babylonian is not perfectly clear. L(?)m < līmu is Assyrian and ḫm < hāmu also probably comes from Assyrian. In BT nktm< < nakatum the "m" could result from assimilation to the cognate Aramaic root ktm, though this is semantically unlikely. In at least one personal name, however, final /m/ is preserved. Other etymological /m/ in initial position is maintained in all cases.

The only problem that remains is that of initial etymological /w/. Orthographically, in MB and LB it generally drops completely, but in some cases it becomes "u." In late Assyrian it can disappear or change the following /a/ vowel to "u." In the loanwords, arītu < warītītu appears as ṣryt< in Aramaic, but arahšamnu < warahšamnu becomes mrahšwn. The latter is certainly borrowed from Babylonian. The transliterations offer no relevant information except for the Hatran name wrdnb, which may be Warad-Nabû but might also be of Iranian origin. Thus, at this stage no general rules for initial /w/ can be posited.

Liquids

Although the interchange between n and l is not unknown in Akkadian, the change from /l/ to /n/ in tarlugallu > trngwl probably occurred in Aramaic, where such changes are much more common. Otherwise the liquids undergo no changes in passing from Akkadian to Aramaic.

Though it is not attested in any of the certain loanwords, an important NB/LB phonetic trait is the change of /r/ before /t/ or /k/ to "š," as represented in Aramaic transliteration by the spelling nšt for the Babylonian pronunciation of the divine name I/Enurta (NIN.IB, usually read Ninurta) as op-

24. In DEIA, No. 43, pnbt< : Pan(i)-Nabû-ţemu. Aramaic spellings of Šum as Šw in Babylonian personal names are not decisive, for this is always followed by the vowel of the next name element. Similarly slw< in a new tablet from Nippur is silim-Elil. As for kslw < kislimu, there is no evidence currently available that would demonstrate that /m/ is the original phoneme.

25. GAG § 21c. In musururu is this actual [m] or just conditioned writing from finite forms like umasūr where [w] is certainly intended?


28. See The 1/n Imperfect Prefix in Chap. III.

29. In zurqqu > zrnqg one can posit an intermediate Akkadian form *zurruqu, as indicated by BT zrwq<, rather than a change *zurrqu > zurnuqu. Thus, the /r/ would not be involved in the change. Nevertheless, a dissimilation /rr/ > [rn] is certainly possible; see s.v. aburru.
posed to Assyrian \textsuperscript{30}nrt. This phonetic change, which may occur in the possible loanword harurtu, appears to be regular. In the cuneiform orthography it is attested for /r/ before final feminine t as well as internal t,\textsuperscript{31} yet it does not occur in any of the loanwords with final rt: egirtu, birtu, nabārtu, and ištartu. Although egirtu is certainly Assyrian, nabārtu, and ištartu are probably Babylonian. Compare the similar treatment to final -lt in loanwords (above, p. 141).

Final Feminine -t

There is no evidence, either from cuneiform orthography, alphabetic transliteration, or loanwords, that final feminine -t was ever dropped in Akkadian, as it was in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic.\textsuperscript{32} In the great majority of loanwords, the Akkadian feminine -(a)t is taken over into Aramaic as the feminine ending and is subject to normal Aramaic morphological rules. The -t is neglected completely only in Mandaic mh\textsuperscript{3}rj : mahratu, Mandaic m\textsuperscript{2}rw1\j : marultu, and the common form mzl : mazzaltu. The last example perhaps gives the clue for all, for Syriac also has the form mzl\textsuperscript{3}, and BH has the plural mzlwt. This and the first two words cited might thus be masculine back-formations which developed after the borrowing. Yet final lt seems to present a special case (see above, p. 141), and the latter two loanwords suggest that this cluster may well have been realized as [l].

The confusion in Imperial Aramaic over the correct absolute forms of egirtu and libbatu has already been mentioned. In Syriac, but not in Imperial Aramaic, the -t of md\textsuperscript{3}t (maddattu) is taken as a radical, as shown by the plural forms. The double -tt may be responsible here, for in the similar ending of the form arittu the final -t of the Aramaic is also taken as a radical. This suggests that the model for Aramaic knt\textsuperscript{3}, pl. knwt\textsuperscript{3}, was the by-form kinātu and not kinattu.

A unique case is presented by sikkatu, whose Aramaic forms have -t in the singular but form plurals with the masculine suffix on the base sikk- (and in Arabic, sakk).\textsuperscript{33} This occurs in all of the Aramaic dialects where the word is attested.

It should be mentioned here that except for mušarū : Syriac mšrt\textsuperscript{3} and nishu : Nabatean nsḥt, Arabic nusṣṭah, which are not without other difficulties as well, no Akkadian mascu-


\textsuperscript{31} Cf. amartu/amaštu.

\textsuperscript{32} Also in Egyptian, and probably late Punic, transcriptions show the -t to have dropped.

\textsuperscript{33} Urubātu : \textsuperscript{3}wrby may represent a parallel case.
line form is represented by a feminine -t form in Aramaic.
(Cf. BH dibbāh, s.v. bēl dabābī.)

Vowels and Length

Although vowel length is phonemic in Akkadian, it is not always possible to determine whether a given vowel is long or short, for length is usually not indicated in cuneiform orthography. Nor can one always be certain of vowel quality, though it can often be inferred from alternate spellings that vowel gradations are involved. The late vocalization systems of Aramaic are, at best, just as unreliable. Nevertheless, the majority of the Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic have what must be considered the correct reflex of the posited Akkadian form, both as to vowel quality and quantity.

One type of noun has a systematic inconsistency in this regard, however, the bisyllabic noun with a short first syllable and a long second syllable. Although most of these nouns also have the correct Aramaic reflex, with the first short vowel reduced, such as šatāru : štar, šalantu : šladdā, a significant number of such nouns are subject to a lengthening of the first syllable in Aramaic, either by vowel lengthening, as in kānānu : kānōnā, or consonant lengthening, as in atūnu : atūnānā. Some of these words, to be sure, may have previously unrecognized long first syllables in Akkadian, but the usual explanation for this change is that since pretonic short vowels are reduced in Aramaic, in order to preserve the shape of theloanword yet at the same time to make it conform to Aramaic morphophonemic patterning, it was necessary to lengthen the first syllable. 34

Several objections must be raised to this argument. First is the problem of vowel reduction. Had it already occurred at the time of Akkadian-Aramaic contact? The Uruk incantation, dating from a period well after the period of borrowing, seems to indicate that vowel reduction was not yet complete at the time of its composition. 35 But in Uruk the short vowels are not always retained, and the spelling conventions of the scribe are not yet completely understood, primarily because of inconsistencies. Further, the composition itself might well antedate considerably the date of the tablet from which we know

34. Cf. J. Blau, "Some Difficulties in the Reconstruction of 'Proto-Hebrew' and 'Proto-Canaanite,' " In Memoriam Paul Kahle, ed. Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer (BZAW, Vol. CIII (Berlin, 1968)) p. 31, nn. 9 f. Note that his reconstruction of the Akkadian form corresponding to Syriac Tāmûz is incorrect. Since it was borrowed from Babylonian, the /m/ must have been doubled, as reconstructed in Chap. II s.v.
it. Since reduction of short vowels in open syllables is a feature shared by all of the Aramaic dialects, it must have occurred at a period when all of those dialects were still in close contact, that is, during the time of Imperial Aramaic at the latest.\footnote{K. Beyer, "Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der ältesten syrischen Literatur," ZDMG CXVI (1966) 198, 201, claims that Aramaic vowel reduction only occurred "erst n. Chr.,” although he offers no proof for this assertion. E. Y. Kutscher has demonstrated the presence of vowel reduction in the Genesis Apocryphon and probably in earlier texts as well (review of Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, Or. n.s. XXXIX [1970] 178 f.)} If reduction had occurred prior to the period of Akkadian and Aramaic contact, however, then one would expect to find a much greater percentage of words which have first-syllable lengthening.

Accordingly, it can quite confidently be maintained that at the time and place that a majority of the borrowings took place Aramaic vowel reduction had not yet occurred. Historical considerations lead one to suspect that this period of greatest contact was primarily the Neo-Babylonian period. In fact, of the loanwords of the bisyllabic shape under discussion which are properly transferred and whose original Akkadian dialect can be determined, all except suqāqu and ša rēšī are Babylonian.\footnote{To be sure, BH sāris preserves the qamatz in the plural form sārisim. H. Tadmor (orally) notes the spelling ša-a rēšī in PRU IV 17.25 l. 22 and suggests that Hebrew preserves here an old western pronunciation of this term.} Babylonian words which are subject to the change may thus be assumed to have been borrowed later, after vowel reduction.

Other considerations must be taken into account, however. Of the Babylonian month names, which one can safely assume were all borrowed from Babylonian at the same time, nisannu and simānu show lengthening in the first syllable in Aramaic, while in šabātu the vowel is reduced.\footnote{The situation is unclear with ūbētu, whose vocalization is known only from Hebrew, where pretonic vowels are lengthened, and with elūlu, where Syriac and Hebrew differ in the length of the vowel.} This evidence suggests that at the time of the borrowing of the month names /i/ (and perhaps /u/) were subject to reduction while, as in Gez, /a/ was still preserved.\footnote{Does the pretonic lengthening of /a/ in Hebrew as opposed to the usual reduction of /i/ or /u/ (or lengthening of the following consonant) reflect a similar stage? If this reconstruction of the chronology of Aramaic vowel reduction is correct, then those Babylonian loans which preserve the vowel /a/ in the first syllable can be dated latest of all. This seems to work: The only relevant forms are asūppu, šatammu, and}
original /i/ but does have spirantization after reduced /a/, demonstrating that spirantization was introduced after the reduction of the former but before the reduction of the latter.\textsuperscript{40}

But what of the words borrowed from Assyrian that show first-syllable lengthening? If vowel reduction had not yet taken place in the Neo-Babylonian period, it certainly had not yet occurred during the time of the major Assyrian contact. Since the number of such words is small, one must reckon first of all with simple error in the correct Akkadian form.\textsuperscript{41} Another explanation is that of stress. First-syllable stress has been suggested for the Assyrian dialect.\textsuperscript{42} If this theory is correct, first-syllable lengthening in the Aramaic loans can be explained as the result of an attempt to reproduce the foreign stress pattern of the Assyrian. In such a situation, uniformity in the shapes of the borrowed words is especially unlikely, and thus normal forms like sugāqu are to be expected.\textsuperscript{43} In ša reši, of course, the stress is on the second syllable of the compound, and srīśā is thus the only possible Aramaic form.\textsuperscript{44}

Although when borrowing words from case-inflecting languages Aramaic is likely to take such words over without the case endings,\textsuperscript{45} if the final short-vowel case endings had maruš/ltu, and the latter two are known only from Mandaic. Note especially that the Mandaic form yštēm is thus shown to be a later borrowing than BT and Syriac yšym, where the vowel was reduced and a prothetic ࠝ added. Words such as malāhu and pahāru should not be considered necessarily late on these grounds, for one might expect their assimilation to the gattāl nomen professionis formation, regardless of whether vowel reduction had already occurred or not.


\textsuperscript{41} The Assyrian loans are asītu, egirtu, kanūnu, and ušallu, and probably hi/erītu, iliītu, and māhāzu.


\textsuperscript{43} Assyrian stress might also have had other effects on loanwords. The Aramaic form of simānu, with two short vowels, is quite different from that of the Babylonian month name with two long vowels. Rather than posit the Akkadian form simanu (as in Landsberger, "Jahreszeiten im Sumerisch-akkadischen," JNES VIII [1949] 256, nn. 44 f.) perhaps one should think in terms of an Assyrian form such as "[zimmān], with the initial stress producing in the Aramaic ear the effect of two short vowels. In Aramaic itself, the Syriac form zāmā must be a back-formation from zhan, although the Jar. dialects preserve correctly zimnā.

\textsuperscript{44} See n. 37.

\textsuperscript{45} H. Schaeder, Iranische Beiträge I (Halle, 1930) 261 f.
still been in use in late Akkadian, one might expect at least some clue to their existence in the Aramaic forms of the loanwords; but no Aramaic forms of Akkadian loanwords whose absolute forms end in a consonant give any indication of any case ending (see below for hubullu and amurrnu). Thus, the evidence supports the generally accepted belief that the case endings had disappeared in the colloquial late Akkadian dialects.

Akkadian nouns ending in a final long vowel usually appear in Aramaic with final -â, which becomes -yâ in the emphatic state. Included here are ašû, attâlû, burû, manâ, nudunnû, pattû, rabû, šadû, šamalû, and tubalû. The Aramaic forms clearly derive either from the genitive singular ending in -â, or, more likely, from the construct form ending either in -â or -ê. 46 This fact supports the view that final long (circumflexed) vowels were still pronounced in NB, though short vowels had dropped. 47 Indeed -â may have been the ending for all cases, at least in NB. If the nominative-accusative ending were actually -â (as the grammars claim), one might expect more traces of -w in Aramaic; but -w occurs only in the rare Aramaic forms derived from edû and gâgu (and see nagû). No final vowel at all occurs in the Aramaic forms of šinepû and bârânû. Note that these two are loans from Assyrian, whereas those that have -y, whenever origin can be determined, are from Babylonian. Two words which end in a final -y in Aramaic but appear to derive from Akkadian words without a final vowel are šwry: amurrnu and the JAr. and Mandic šbwly: ḫubullu. 48

Vowel quality is almost always preserved in the Aramaic forms of Akkadian loanwords, with the following exceptions:

Akkadian a becomes Aramaic i in bârânû, digâru, and māḥâzu, all Eastern Aramaic forms and thus difficult to explain, though before n this vowel change is not unknown in Aramaic. 49 As suggested earlier (s.v. māḥâzu), the o in mâḥâz may be due to Canaanite influence. The change in digâru

46. Cf. GAG § 641. By analogy with forms ending in a consonant, the construct or absolute state would certainly have been considered the basic form of the word and would be the one most likely to have been borrowed.


48. The usual explanation of ḫbwly as a qtułyâ abstract form (cf. HM, p. 201, Noldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar § 137) may be correct, but it hardly applies to amurrnu; but see above, s.v., for a possible explanation. An alternative explanation is to regard this y as a development of a schwa vowel after the doubled consonant in the construct state; cf. GAG § 64c, h.

49. Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar § 44.
may be considered an Akkadian development. From *maškanu* Syriac has *meškānā*, while in Nabatean and JAr. the form is *maškān*. In a western form ă > ā is not unusual, but how is one to explain the long vowel? Apparently the Akkadian form is to be transcribed as *maškānu*, as the Syriac forms suggests as well.

In *muškānu* Aramaic has *is* for Assyrian /us/, and the West Semitic form corresponding to Babylonian *nīšu* has *us*. This probably results from an Akkadian tendency to centralize high short vowels before sibilants.

Mandaic has *nāndā* from *nindabū* and *tētwē* from *titurru*. Syriac also has a in the first syllable of the latter, but BT preserves the i. The change u > a occurs in the Aramaic forms of (mul)lamāšu and *nuhatimmu*, and, with a long vowel, in the BT and Mandaic form *gānā* < *ganīnu*. I am unable to explain the third case, but I have suggested explanations for the others in Chapter II. Isolated phonetic difficulties are presented by *sawkānā* < *sikkānu*, the various Aramaic forms of *mutēṛru*, and Hatran, Mandaic *ryē* < *parakku*.

The diphthong of Syriac šawtāpā (Akk. šutappu) is problematic. A possible explanation is to ascribe its origin to analogy with the verbal form šawtep. See also s.v. hūgu.

Akkadian consonantal length is generally preserved in Aramaic, but its preservation apparently depends on the shape of the word. In monosyllabic forms, for example, *dappu*, *giššu*, *gittu*, consonantal length is always preserved. In final position in words of more than one syllable, consonantal length may be preserved, as in *asappu* (BH *āsuppīm*) and *balaggu* > pīlaggā, or the vowel may be lengthened instead, for example, *šuttāpā* < *šutappu*. Whenever the vowel is lengthened, it probably derives from an Akkadian by-form rather than a secondary Aramaic development. In some words, however, no length is preserved at all, and the vowel is subject to reduction: *araḏ ekallī*, *nikassu*, and dialectal forms of *tallugallī*,

50. Cf. GAG and GAG Ergänz. § 9c.
51. For the e vowel see Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, p. 32 and n. 2.
52. Cf. the OA *maškānum* (AHW., p. 627).
54. All JAr. forms of this word, even those spelled *gymnā*, are to be vocalized with mobile schwa in the first syllable and not i followed by doubled n (as in Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 258).
55. For the "free variation" between vowel and consonantal length in Akkadian, cf. Reiner, A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian, pp. 45 ff. Since it seems fairly systematic, at least in the late Akkadian dialects, while "compensatory lengthening" is less frequent in Aramaic (cf. Noldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar § 43 B), the source seems to be Akkadian.
hubullu, kimahhu, and BA šeqlātâ < ša ekalli. The process involved is probably one of back-formation from absolute forms where the doubling is not expressed, e.g. ardēkal : ardēklâ; ḫbul : ḫublā. Thus, this reduction never occurs where the Akkadian has a long vowel in the final syllable which would always be expressed.

The more significant aspects of our phonological findings may be summarized as follows.

In late Akkadian, in both the Babylonian and Assyrian dialects, final case vowels had dropped. Internal short vowels were preserved and were, with some exceptions, pronounced as written. The final feminine -t was preserved in all forms.

In Neo-Babylonian, intervocalic /m/ had become [w]. Accordingly [w] is written "m." Internal št/lt was pronounced št. Otherwise, except for final vowels and regular sound changes expressed in the orthography only some of the time, for example, /rt/ > [št], NB was pronounced as written.

In Neo-Assyrian, the main stress was probably fixed on the first syllable. Intervocalic /k/ became [g], though written "k," and intervocalic /p/ was likewise pronounced [b]. Etymological /š/ became [s], usually written "š," and etymological /s/ became [s], written "s," though in initial position "s" can indicate [z] or [̩] as well.

In Aramaic the reduction of pretonic short vowels appears to have begun in the Imperial Aramaic period, perhaps during the time of the Neo-Babylonian period or slightly later; u and i were reduced prior to the reduction of a.

Spirantization

Although it has not been pointed out in each of the relevant consonant categories, the evidence for spirantization can be reviewed here. On the one hand the Aramaic evidence, of loanwords and transcriptions, proves that it is not the case that Akkadian had spirantization of stops while Aramaic did not (during the period of contact). Nowhere in the transcriptions is Akkadian d represented by alphabetic z, t by š, k by ḥ, or g by c; nor is any systematic problem encountered in the spirantization of any of the stops in theloanwords.56

On the other hand, of the bisyllabic forms mentioned above which have a short first syllable in Akkadian but a long one in Aramaic, instead of vowel lengthening the second consonant is lengthened only in egiru, igaru, šutappu, atunu,

56. The only possible example is /k/ for /ḥ/ in the Syr. form nwšk3 from nishu, but since this is unique, the explanation of the development of this word proposed above (p. 142) seems much more probable than a direct loan.
and titurru. This is some, though admittedly far from strong, evidence that at least as regards t/t and g/ɣ the phonemic merger and subsequent spirantization might already have begun in Aramaic at the time of these loans, since the doubling was then necessary to maintain the non-spirantized pronunciation and preserve the foreign shape of the word. But in many other examples no doubling occurs, so it remains uncertain whether spirantization can be cited as the cause of such doubling. Its limitation to g and t is certainly suggestive, however.

One might argue that if both Akkadian and Aramaic had spirantization, no differences could be expressed or detected through the orthography. Yet it has already been demonstrated that Old Aramaic could not have had spirantization. We must thus conclude on the basis of the evidence above that spirantization was either a native Aramaic development or a borrowing from a language other than Akkadian and that it started to become systematized sometime during the period of Akkadian and Aramaic contact.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARAMAIC DIALECTS

Old Aramaic

The only loanwords occurring in Old Aramaic are snb: šinepû, srs: ša rēši, and mšr: mišru. From a much earlier borrowing are skn: šaknu at Hama and the possible early loan spr at Sefire. No grammatical influences occur. Elsewhere in this study I have shown that the following Aramaic words which occur in Old Aramaic are not to be considered loans from Akkadian: Zakir ḫrš; Samalian prš, ḥgl; Samalian (and Sefire) ṛḥy; BR RKB krs; and the dissimilation in kyṣ5; and Sefire ṣdy and tš.

It remains to discuss some of the more uncertain interpretations of Old Aramaic forms based on Akkadian etymologies:

gb (Zakir B:8, KAI, No. 202)—Hardly Akk. gaddu, "all."
Most scholars interpret it as the common Aramaic word for "side" or read gba[l], "border."

 Propel (Zakir B:11)—Though understood by early scholars to be Akk. apšû, Propel is almost certainly to be taken as the proper name still surviving today in the name of the site where the stele was found.

smr (Kilamuwu II, KAI, No. 25)—A relationship with late

58. Chap. II, s.v. adû, harîšu, parsu, rāšû, tillu; Chap. I, s.v. kussû, ṣiqlu; and see Dissimilation of Emphatics in Chap. III.
60. Cf. KAI II 210.
Akk. asmarû, "lance" (in CAD, s.v. azmarû) is not inconceivable, but the Akkadian itself is a foreign word, and phonetic considerations (sibilant and final vowel) as well as semantic difficulties preclude a loan.

wšım (Hadad, 1. 4, KAI, No. 214)—The context is broken. Perhaps the word is similar to Akk. šaḫuma, "again," but, if so, the similarity is almost certainly coincidental. Adverbs are rarely borrowed; see below, p. 168.

Innsth (Hadad, 11. 28, 29)—Although the context and readings are uncertain, Montgomery's interpretation "oath," from Akk. nišu, makes good sense semantically, but in the light of the sibilant difficulty if the word were borrowed from Assyrian as we would expect, and the infrequent use of nišu in late Akkadian, this must remain highly uncertain.

htnpb (BR KKB, 1. 14, KAI, No. 216)—This is hardly to be considered a "tan" form "unter ostsemit. Einfluss gebil-det." I agree with Cross and Freedman and with Poebel that it is a reflexive of a by-form *n*p of a root which occurs in two other well known by-forms, šbh and y*p.

cīl bt (Sefire I A-6)—The comparison offered by Fitzmyer with ērib bītî is scarcely correct, for the latter is a temple official (CAD, Vol. E, p. 290). A comparison with ērib ekalli, a palace official, would be more reasonable on semantic grounds, but this is a rare compound and is not attested as a NA official term. Thus, Tadmor's interpretation, "legitimate successor," is almost certainly the correct one.

Ăfrţīm (Sefire I B 11)—The reading and context are uncertain. If correctly read, it could be "their Asherahs" but hardly Akk. ašırtu, "sanctuary."

62. It should be noted that in Akkadian one swears a niš išš or niš ilti, the oath of the king or god, whereas in Hadad Inšsh would appear to mean "his oath."
63. KAI II 233.
66. H. Tadmor, "Notes to the Opening Lines of the Aramaic Treaty from Sefire," Sefer Shmuel Yeivin (Jerusalem, 1970) pp. 401 ff. Although Tadmor's conclusion is based on the Akkadian parallel ana bīt abīšu ērub, this expression is found primarily in Mari and Amarna and thus would seem to be a native North West Semitic construction. See n. 73, below.
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*kym* (Sefire III 1)—Dupont-Sommer's interpretation "likewise" is certainly best. None of the scholars go so far as to suggest an actual loan here, rather just a formation similar to Akk. *kīlam* or *kīma*. In fact neither of those Akkadian words provides the exact meaning required here.

šr/gbwh (Sefire III 13-14)—Read "his family," Syr. šarbâ. From the area of flora and fauna come the words šr, "wild cat," and šhlyn, "cress" (Sefire I A 33, 36). There is nothing particularly Akkadian about either word, but both occur in that language. A loanword relationship is prohibited for šhlyn since, as shown by Syr. tahlah, the original initial consonant is /t/. Sumerian ZA(G).HI.LI indicates that this is an old culture word for a very common vegetable.

Thus, Old Aramaic contains only the political-cultural borrowings srs, snb, and mšr, to which one might add at best only ssr. These loans occur only at Samal and Sefire and are expected evidence of the cultural and political contact with and domination by the Neo-Assyrian Empire known from the historical sources. No non-political loanwords occur. On this basis and since Old Aramaic also has none of the non-lexical Akkadian influences characteristic of Mesopotamian Aramaic and Imperial Aramaic one may conclude that the Old Aramaic of Syria gives no indication of any intimate contact with spoken Akkadian. This renders highly improbable that

72. For the problem of genitive zy in Sefire, see above, Chap. III, n. 74.
73. It must be re-emphasized here that similar or even identical phraseology in political documents and commemorative and memorial stelae cannot be considered evidence of interlinguistic contact, nor can the references to or worship of divinities whose origins may be in Mesopotamia. Such problems must always be approached with great hesitancy and care. For example, it is true that there are "Akkadian" parallels to the phrase in Sefire III 11, "seek my head to kill me" (J. C. Greenfield, "Bhinot Leshoniyyot biktovet Sfire," *Leš. XXVII/XXVIII* [1964] 306; cf. Fitzmyer, *Sefire*, p. 113), but these all occur in Hittite treaties. Thus, this phrase is hardly of Akkadian origin but is rather to be assigned to the Hittite political-cultural sphere. Tadmor (see n.66) suggests that the scribes of the Sefire treaty actually knew Akkadian and were translating directly from Akkadian prototypes. I find his position extreme, but even if true it would only confirm my argument about the nature of Old Aramaic, for, as shown above, there are very few actual loanwords. It is clear that the scribes were attempting to compose in pure Aramaic and that this Aramaic was not eastern!
position which considers Old Aramaic to be official, Assyrian Aramaic.

The available material does not allow any significant positive conclusions about the nature of Old Aramaic, however. The corpus of Standard Old Aramaic is too small to present any observable major dialectal differentiations, except for the imperfect consecutive of the Zakir inscription.\(^\text{74}\) Since this is in an isogloss with South Canaanite,\(^\text{75}\) one might expect the Aramaic of Damascus, an intermediate point, to be within the isogloss as well. If this argument is correct, it suggests that the Standard Old Aramaic of Sam'al and Sefire, which are the only two text groups of any length but which do not have the imperfect consecutive, was not Damascus Aramaic either. There are, however, only a few examples of historical narrative in Standard Old Aramaic outside of Zakir (which itself uses the perfect after \(w-\) more often than the prefixed form), and Degen may be correct in suggesting (p. 115 n.) that the construction was more widespread than our limited evidence would indicate. In such a case the possibility of a Damascus origin remains open.\(^\text{76}\) Given the evidence available, however, there is no reason to suppose that Standard Old Aramaic, whether in fact it was "standardized" or not, was anything other than the native Aramaic of northern Syria.\(^\text{77}\)


\(^{75}\) This is the prime example used by many to show that the Syrian Aramaeans borrowed more than just the alphabet from the Phoenicians. But the imperfect consecutive does not conclusively occur in Phoenician, so the language of Zakir could hardly be said to be an artificial Aramaic-Phoenician jargon on the evidence of this verbal construction. Cf. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, p. 114, n. 21.

\(^{76}\) The paleographical evidence would appear to be compatible with this position; cf. B. L. Haines, "A Paleographical Study of Aramaic Inscriptions Antedating 500 B.C.," *Harvard Theological Review* LX (1967) 489.

\(^{77}\) The conclusions of this study can be applied to the problems of Akkadian (and Aramaic) loanwords in Biblical Hebrew as well. Suffice it to point out here that especially in matters of chronology and phonology these conclusions should be quite useful. To give just one example, aside from a few very early loans such as *hykl* and *skn*, one would expect pre-Exilic Biblical Hebrew to have only the same type of loans as are found in Old Aramaic, for if anything the contact between Hebrew and Akkadian during that period must have been less extensive than that between Old Aramaic and Akkadian. Further, such loans must be from Assyrian. Loanwords whose phonology shows them to be from Babylonian, such as *nksym : nikiassu*, must be fairly late.
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Mesopotamian Aramaic

There are differences between the early Aramaic of Mesopotamia and Old Aramaic, but in general these are not the obvious differences which characterize later Eastern Aramaic. As expected, there is a large number of loanwords, especially on the docketts, but one cannot be sure that all of the Aramaic forms represent actual Aramaic words and are not, in some cases, just transliterations of Akkadian forms. Thus, the "loanwords" \( \text{skl, l}^2 \text{m, kdm, and perhaps dnh/t} \) are unique to Mesopotamian Aramaic.

As discussed in Chapter III, Mesopotamian Aramaic makes frequent use of \( \text{zy} \) as a genitive particle, and the word order is characteristically free. None of the other characteristics of Eastern Aramaic occurs except for final \(-\delta\) of the determined plural in the Uruk incantation. As yet there is very little material to analyze, but it is clear that \( \text{y-} \) is the imperfect prefix in early Mesopotamian Aramaic, though \( l- \) is used for the jussive, and that the noun states are properly used. There is no evident weakening of the laryngeals, and, at least in the \( \text{AŠŠur} \) ostracon, nasalization does not occur, as shown by the form \( \text{ষt, "you."} \)

Imperial Aramaic

Although the Akkadian loanwords attested to date in Old Aramaic are limited to the political sphere, there can be little doubt that other loans also occurred in Old Aramaic but are not yet attested in our small corpus of texts; the evidence suggests that the number of other types of loans must have been small. If one makes the almost certain assumption that Akkadian ceased to be a significant spoken language sometime during the Imperial Aramaic period, it may be concluded that, except for political loanwords and those few unknown Old Aramaic loanwords from Akkadian, all the Akkadian loanwords in Western Aramaic must have reached the West through Imperial Aramaic.

We are thus provided with a vocabulary of Imperial Aramaic extending beyond that actually attested in the Aramaic texts from the Imperial Aramaic period, including those few words attested only in late Biblical Hebrew which may be suspected of being of Imperial Aramaic origin.

78. Might the docketts not have functioned as written records to be used by bilinguals who were literate only in the simpler alphabetic writing system? If so, perhaps one should not even grant these words the status of "foreign word" in Aramaic.

79. Excepting those few Hebraisms in JAr. which might have entered Hebrew directly from Akkadian; see n. 80.

80. The great majority of Hebrew words of Akkadian origin reached Hebrew through Aramaic and are actually attested in Aramaic. As such
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In spite of the large Imperial Aramaic vocabulary which can be assembled in this fashion, the lexical borrowings provide very little guidance in the attempt to differentiate among the various dialects of Imperial Aramaic. Aside from one possible exception, no matter how one may wish to group the texts, Akkadian loanwords are found in all groups and all genres, perhaps not equally, but at least in sufficient quantity and variety to prevent the determination of dialectal divisions solely on lexical grounds. One might suggest, of course, that Eq. dbb would not have been used in Babylonian Imperial Aramaic, that AD nṣy byt was not ordinarily understood in Egyptian Aramaic, or that Teima swt would not have been used in Elephantine; but except for these and perhaps a few others, one would not be surprised to find any of the Imperial Aramaic loanwords in a new-found exemplar of a group in which it had not previously been attested. 81

The possible exception is the text of the proverbs of Ahiqar. Greenfield, in discussing Kutscher's valuable observation that the Ahiqar proverbs, as opposed to the narrative framework, are of western origin, claims that the proverbs contain no Akkadian loanwords. 82 Presumably he takes knh, "colleague," "comrade" (ll. 90, 163), to be cognate with and not a loan from kinattu. This seems to be quite unlikely. At the

they have been treated in Chap. II. But because of the historical contact between Hebrew and Babylonian during the exile, it cannot be determined with certainty whether or not any of the few definite Akkadianisms in BH which do not occur in Aramaic were actually found in Imperial Aramaic (and the same for Mishnaic Hebrew). Similarly, a word like BH ṣpsr < Ass. ṣ paṣaru could be borrowed through Old Aramaic, Imperial Aramaic, or even a direct loan from Assyrian, since it is from the political-cultural sphere.

81. Great care must be used here, however. For example, the word ṣṭār < ṣatāru does not occur in Eg. (except for one late administrative text) though it is very common in later Aramaic. For "document" the word spr is used. One might conclude that the word was not yet known in the fifth century at Elephantine and that on these grounds the Elephantine dialect could be separated from that of contemporary Babylonia or even earlier Nerab, where ṣṭr occurs. More likely, however, it was known, but only in the meaning "cuneiform document," and hence the opportunity for its use did not arise in the preserved texts. Later, as the meaning became generalized to "contract," "document," the attestations of ṣṭr become understandably more frequent. The earliest such use apparently is in the papyri from Samaria (see n. 88, below). The use of ḫṣl in the meaning "to save" in Adon 1. 7 probably means that the loanword ḫṣl was not yet widespread. Note that the two words are used together in Dan. 3 and 6, but the latter is much more frequent.

very least, however, loanwords are quite rare in the proverbs.\textsuperscript{83} More important than quantity is the fact that in the proverbs one finds good Aramaic words such as \textit{hns} and \textit{rp} rather than the equivalent Akkadian loans \textit{szb} and \textit{sy}.

The non-lexical characteristics studied in Chapter III are distributed as follows in Imperial Aramaic:

Nasalization occurs in almost all of the Imperial Aramaic texts, including both the narrative and proverbs of Ahiqar. The exceptions are the inscriptions of Nerab, the short Gözne inscription,\textsuperscript{84} and, from Egypt, the Bauer-Meissner papyrus, the Hermopolis letters, the undated, fragmentary \textit{AP}, No. 49 and the very late papyrus \textit{AP}, No. 81. It is important to note that assimilation and non-assimilation or nasalization are not mutually exclusive in a given text. In Bauer-Meissner the form \textit{dtn} (meaning?) occurs once; in the Sabbath Ostracon \textit{dpy} and \textit{bpyky} are found in the same line; and though \textit{mdm} is the normal Hermopolis form, \textit{mndm} does occur once.\textsuperscript{85}

The genitive use of \textit{zy} is frequent in all of Imperial Aramaic except for the Ahiqar proverbs. Kaddari has compiled the ratio of construct state to \textit{zI}-phrases for many of the Imperial Aramaic texts; they rank as follows in order of increasing frequency of \textit{zI}-phrases: Ahiqar’s proverbs (17, 33), (Genesis Apocryphon [12.00]), Elephantine papyri (7.85), Ezra (7.35), Ahiqar’s Tale (5.00), Daniel (4.52), Behistun inscription (0.23).\textsuperscript{86}

Free word order is found in all the Imperial Aramaic texts except for the legal texts from Elephantine and the Ahiqar proverbs.\textsuperscript{87} The order subject-object-verb, however, is a characteristically Achaemenid feature.

The different distribution of each of these features makes analysis difficult. While nasalization, \textit{zy} genitive,\textsuperscript{88}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{83} Other troublesome words in the proverbs are \textit{wynynhy} (1. 92; Chap. II, s. v. \textit{nīqū}) and \textit{wrb}, "fetter" (11. 80, 196). Ginsberg is almost certainly correct in finding the latter word in Second Isaiah (\textit{ANET}, p. 428, n. 2). This could hardly be a loan from Akk. \textit{arhu}, "half-brick" (cf. Chap. II, s. v.), though that loan may develop the meaning "lath" in later JAr. (cf. G. Hoffmann, "Lexikalisches," \textit{ZAW} II [1882] 70 ff.) and even possibly "pole"; but could this development have occurred as early as Second Isaiah? One might suggest a connection with Akk. \textit{wrb}, "copper." Compare Akk. \textit{sīparru}, "bronzes," used in the meaning "fetters" (see \textit{CAD}, Vol. E, p. 323a). Cf. also SB, NB \textit{br}, "headband."
\item \textsuperscript{84} \textit{KAI}, No. 259.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Cf. J. C. Greenfield, in \textit{Leš. XXVII/XXVIII} 366, nn. 41-44.
\item \textsuperscript{86} M. Z. Kaddari, "Construct State and \textit{dī}-Phrases in Imperial Aramaic," \textit{Proceedings}, p. 103.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Of course isolated examples of the order object-verb do occur (e.g., Ahiqar, 1. 91), but as in Old Aramaic, these are infrequent and seem to be used only for emphasis or for poetic reasons.
\end{itemize}
and free word order can be considered new features of Imperial Aramaic as opposed to Old Aramaic, it is clear that each feature has its own history. Free word order and zy genitive are well attested in early Mesopotamian Aramaic, but nasalization does not occur there. Imperial Aramaic before the fifth century presents precisely the same pattern, except that the change from "Semitic" word order is not so severe. Nasalization (and non-assimilation), whose first traces are to be found in Bauer-Meissner and Hermopolis, becomes widespread only during the fifth century, but when it does, since it is purely a phonetic trait, it affects all of the dialects equally for a time. We may be quite confident that if we had a copy of the Ahiqar proverbs dating from the sixth century instead of the fifth, the language of the great majority of the proverbs would be identical except for the nasalization, which is almost certainly a secondarily introduced phenomenon in the text as we know it. Sometime after the period of the bulk of the Elephantine texts nasalization became limited, in Egypt at least, to Imperial Aramaic used for official, literary, or monumental purposes and hence does not appear in AP, Nos. 49 and 81. Unfortunately, there are few texts from the late Achaemenid or early Seleucid periods, so for now this explanation must go untested.  

What then is Imperial Aramaic? Since, as I have shown, the jussive l- was probably commonly used in Mesopotamian Aramaic, it cannot be true that Imperial Aramaic was ever nothing more than contemporary Mesopotamian Aramaic, for l- occurs only in BA and there only in a special case. In the later periods, when Mesopotamian Aramaic had already developed some of the other characteristics of Eastern Aramaic, such as -ê, the difference between it and Imperial Aramaic was even more distinct. Yet, it is also quite obvious that Imperial Aramaic, in all of its forms, is different from Old Aramaic and is different as well from the later Western Aramaic dialects which can be considered, to some degree, to be derived from a language similar to or the same as Old Aramaic. Thus, while the characteristic traits of Imperial Aramaic are eastern, it is not Eastern or Mesopotamian Aramaic; nor is it Western or Syrian Aramaic. It must be something in-between. Nor is it necessarily artificial in origin. That is to say, it is reasonable that this dialect mixture arose in the process of normal intercourse between dialect groups and quite possibly even became a native dialect by the fourth century.

88. It is hoped that the fourth-century texts from Samaria will soon be published and shed further light on these problems; see F. M. Cross, "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dāliyeh," in D. N. Freedman and J. C. Greenfield, eds., New Directions in Biblical Archaeology (Garden City, 1966) pp. 41 ff.
language for some. Certainly at Elephantine it is difficult to imagine that the private letters on ostraca, which have free word order, were written in a dialect whose syntax was significantly different from the writer's native speech. Thus, quite naturally, each of the characteristics of Imperial Aramaic spread differently through the Aramaic speech community. The genitive use of zy/dy/d was most widespread and longest lasting. Free word order was also widespread, affecting local dialects such as that of Hermopolis, but in the West at least, such dialects gradually disappeared. Nasalization and an Iranian word order were the latest and most limited traits. In this picture, the Ahiqar proverbs are to be viewed as survivals from earlier times, orthographically modernized, as is the formulaic legal phraseology of the Elephantine papyri.

Although one can posit the existence of "colloquial" Imperial Aramaic dialects, differing at different times and in different places, it is also evident that at any given time there was a literary standard, a model to be followed in literary composition or inscriptions. Biblical Aramaic, the official letters of the Jews of Elephantine (AP, Nos. 30-34), and the various inscriptions can be viewed as efforts to achieve this standard. The chief lasting characteristics of this dialect appear to be excessive use of the object-verb word order, the use of the zy genitive construction, frequent nasalization, and perhaps the passive perfect construction. Although, as will be shown below, there is reason to suggest that Imperial Aramaic had its origin in the dialects of the Aramaic population centers of the Balīḫ and Ḫabūr valleys during the final stages of the Assyrian Empire99 the major formative period of what may be called Standard Imperial Aramaic, as demonstrated by the Iranian origin of its characteristic word order, must be ascribed to the era of Persian dominance. The Nerab inscriptions may be considered representatives of the first, Assyrian, stage of Imperial Aramaic. With the increasing importance of Babylonia under the Chaldeans and the Persians, first Babylonian features, notably nasalization, and then Iranian word order became fundamental elements of this standard. Characteristically Mesopotamian grammatical features, such as j- jussive and the -̄ determinate plural, which no doubt had already developed in Mesopotamian Aramaic, were not accepted into Imperial Aramaic, perhaps because they were too foreign to non-eastern speakers of Aramaic. But in time the Mesopotamian grammatical traits did manage to make their way into the area of Syriac speech.

99. See the discussion of Syriac, below.
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Monumental Dialects

Our material provides little new information on the monumental dialects. Except for the two new words occurring only in Hatran, *parakk* and *aškāpu*, and the unusual word *plk*, the Akkadian loanwords making their first appearance in these dialects may be assumed to have formed part of the Imperial Aramaic vocabulary.90

Jewish Aramaic

The Targums

In Targums Onkelos and Jonathan (Prophets) the following Akkadian loanwords, which occur otherwise only in Eastern Aramaic, can be found:

- `rgwb` : purkullu, also in Syriac;
- `ryt` : arittu, also BT and Targum Psalms;
- `ṣkr` : iškaru, only in Syriac and Arabic in the meaning "field";
- `gyssyn` : giššu, also Syriac, BT, Mandaic, but only in the Peshitta is it used for "loins," as here;
- `h(y)bwl` : hubullu, also Syriac, BT, Mandaic, Targum Hagiographa;
- `ršy` : rāšā, also BT and Mandaic;
- `šybb` : šē bābi, also Palm., BT, Mandaic, Syriac (and in Pseudo-Jonathan but not Neofiti).

The following vocabulary items are characteristic of these two Targums and Imperial Aramaic as well.

- `dš` : daltu, well known from Imperial Aramaic but not used in JPA at all; occurs in Samaritan and in Eastern Aramaic;
- `zp` : zīpu, "mold"; since the denominative verb "falsify" occurs in MH, it seems safe to say that this was an Imperial Aramaic word, but in this, the original meaning, it occurs nowhere else;
- `gwr` : ekurru, outside of Imperial Aramaic (Eg.) this

90. These words are the Aramaic forms of asū, *kanūnu, kismbh*, māhāzu, nishu, šē bābi, šutappu, and tamkaru. I know of no Imperial Aramaic texts whose content would have required the use of any of these, though asū might occur in a broken text. As has been pointed out above (p. 157), `rp` is used in the Ahiqar proverbs, but these proverbs are not really to be considered Imperial Aramaic. Since Palmyran does have connections with Eastern Aramaic (cf. F. Rosenthal, *Die Sprache der palmyrenischen Inschriften und ihre Stellung innerhalb des Aramäischen* [MVAG, Vol. XLI (Leipzig, 1936)] passim), *mlwhz*, which later is found only in Eastern Aramaic, might have been a borrowing from the East and not an Imperial Aramaic term, but Canaanite influence on the vowel (see Chap. II, s.v.) could only have occurred in Imperial Aramaic.
word occurs only in Targum Jonathan, for Mandaic <kwr> must be a separate borrowing of the Babylonian form. Other specifically eastern (and Imperial Aramaic) words used in Onkelos and Jonathan can be found in Chapter II, s.v. nagû, paruššâ, šušuppu (twtb) and ziqtu. There is no certain loan-word which Onkelos and Jonathan share only with Western Aramaic.

This lexical data, linking the two targums with Imperial Aramaic and Eastern Aramaic, lends itself to two rather different interpretations. At first glance the evidence seems to be indicative of an eastern origin for these targums; and, solely on the basis of the lexical material presented here, such an interpretation cannot be excluded. The preservation of the form <qw̱r> and of the original meanings of gyssyn and zyp, however, points to a very early origin for these targums. Given this early origin, one must consider the possibility that the targums were in fact produced in the West but were written in a literary dialect strongly influenced by Imperial Aramaic and its eastern elements. In light of the ground-breaking studies of Kutscher, Kaddari, and Tal,91 there can no longer be any doubt that this second interpretation is the correct one.92

Although the time of origin of the Palestinian targums to the Pentateuch and the nature of their development remain uncertain,93 it is generally agreed that the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum is the latest of all and is dependent on the other Palestinian targum(s) as well as on Targum Onkelos and, in language, on the Babylonian Talmud.94 Further evidence of this


92. See my discussion of this issue in "The Job Targum from Qumran," JAOS XCIII (1973) 326 f.

93. As I have argued elsewhere (ibid.), the fact that the Palestinian targum tradition does not share in the tradition of what may be called Standard Literary Aramaic would seem to indicate that it dates from a later time, after the demise of that tradition. In light of the undeniably early character of much of the midrashic and halakhic material reflected in that targum, however (see the various introductions to the several volumes of A. Diez Macho's edition of Targum Neofiti I [Neophyti I (3 vols.; Madrid and Barcelona, 1968-71)]), it can be argued that in origin the Palestinian targum was a non-written (i.e., non-"literary"), probably northern work.

94. Cf. Kutscher, in Scripta Hierosolymitana IV 10, n. 45. In a recent monograph, G. J. Kuiper (The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and Its Relationship to Targum Onkelos [Rome, 1972]) has attempted to demonstrate that Pseudo-Jonathan is anterior to Onkelos. His arguments for such a
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is offered by the otherwise solely Babylonian Talmudic words אָבִיל (ašlu), אָבִיל (abullu), prqд (purqidam), and kввр (kamāru)⁹⁵ (see also kkв, s.v. kakku), for in the same passages in the Fragment Targum and Neofiti, representing the legitimate Palestinian tradition, these words are not used. Similarly дл (daltu) and свбв (св bābī) are found only in Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, but not in Neofiti or the Fragment Targum.

Babylonian Talmudic

The language of the Babylonian Talmud is not monolithic. There are a few tractates written in a dialect which in appearance is much closer to Targumic Aramaic: Nedarim, Nazir, Meilah, Kritot, Tamid, and part of Temurah.⁹⁶ All scholars agree that these are the latest tractates of the Talmud, but there is uncertainty about whether the language is archaizing or late, spoken, Gaonic Aramaic.⁹⁷ An analysis of the Akkadian loanwords in BT shows that, except for common Aramaic terms (e.g., свsy), no Akkadian loanwords appear in these tractates, though one might have expected a few if indeed the tractates had their origin in the colloquial Aramaic of Gaonic Babylonia. Thus, archaization should be suspected.

Mandaic

All of the lexical and grammatical traits studied above point only to the East as the home of the Mandaic dialect of Aramaic. There are no words or features of this group which Mandaic has in common only with Western Aramaic, and the Eastern Aramaic features are numerous.

Not surprisingly, the Akkadian loanwords unique to Mandaic are composed of names of objects of the material culture and religious and astrological terminology.⁹⁸ Where it can be de-

⁹⁵. The single occurrence in YT is almost certainly due to contamination as well.
⁹⁷. Ibid., p. 16.
⁹⁸. For the religious terms see ekurru, ginû, ištaru, maruš/ltu, munambû, sāhiru, and šatammu. In astrological terminology, źygп : zigpu and źрп : šēru are unique to Mandaic, but reflexes of attû and lumāšu occur in Syriac as well, and mazzalu is widespread. Many of the planet names, which as divine names have not been studied here, are also from Babylonian.
terminated, all of these unique terms are loans (or better, survivals?) from Babylonian. It must be noted that the two most important of these loanwords in the religious sphere, ṣēkwā and ṣēgny, refer specifically in Mandaic to pagan practices, as does ṣēpryk, which Mandaic shares with Hatran (and Syriac). The disparaging connotations attached to these words suggest that at one time they were part of the vocabulary of a competitive cult but do not necessarily prove that the Mandean religion had its origins elsewhere than in Babylonia.99 Mandaic borrowed freely and apparently without prejudice from the astrological and magical terminology and traditions of the Babylonians.

Syriac

Syriac has many Akkadian loanwords in common with Imperial Aramaic and Western Aramaic, but the great majority of the loans in Syriac are those it shares with the other dialects of Eastern Aramaic.100 The latter are almost all loanwords from Babylonian.101 Fourteen loanwords are exclusive to Syriac, of which nine are probably from Assyrian;102 but six of the nine are architectural or topographical terms.

In light of the special situation of Syriac as a widespread literary and religious language and the extensive lexicon provided by the Syriac texts, these statistics, which demonstrate very little lasting Assyrian influence in the Aramaic-

99. To be sure, the other religious terms do not indicate any strong connections with Babylonian religion either. Ṣēndby is rare and of uncertain usage, as is Ṣēptm̄, though the latter, in the passage cited in MD, is associated with demons and very probably has evil connotations. I suspect that the MD translation "temple functionary" is based solely on the Akkadian meaning for want of anything better (cf. G. Widengren, Iranisch-semitische Kulturbeghungen in parthischer Zeit [Colgne and Opladen, 1970] p. 34, n. 115). Ṣēhiru and marultu are merely lexical items, without religious connotations. The Akkadian divine names in Mandaic would all seem to belong to the realm of astrology.

100. Lexical considerations do not allow a determination of the relationship of the three Eastern dialects. Although Babylonian Talmudic and Mandaic are certainly closer to each other than either is to Syriac, each actually has more loanwords in common with Syriac than they have in common with each other. There are only a few different words involved, however, and the cause is certainly one of chance, due to the different semantic areas treated in the various literatures rather than any genetic relationship.

101. The only certain exception is giššu, which, as shown above, must have been in Imperial Aramaic as well.

102. Cf. amurriḫšu, balaggū, sagurrū, edīltu, atappu, hīrītu, īku, kāru, and nabārtu. Ṣūlī (ṣūlu) and raḫšu (rapšu) are certainly from Babylonian, and the history of ṣēgwy (gagū) is uncertain. Ṣēnd (emēdu) could be from either, but Ṣwē (ṣamāhu) is from Babylonian.
speaking areas previously inhabited or controlled by the Assyrians, are rather unexpected. Syriac, as the language of Edessa, was the heir to a long Aramaic tradition extending, in the area of Harran, back to the beginnings of the history of the Arameans. But no later than the early ninth century the Ballûh region was under Assyrian political control and remained an important Assyrian provincial center. In fact Harran was the final stronghold of the Assyrian Empire. One might have expected a great deal of Assyrian influence during this period, but most of the influences that did occur are already found in Imperial Aramaic and are thus widespread in Aramaic and not limited to Syriac. The only reasonable explanation for this distribution would seem to be that Imperial Aramaic itself had its original home in the Aramaic of the Ballûh and Habbûr valleys and thus shares much in common with Syriac. The great influence of Babylonian Aramaic in grammar and lexicon, which probably began as early as the Neo-Babylonian period, when Harran held such an important position, also may have oblitered earlier Assyrianisms. Farther east, in the region of Assyria itself, however, one might have expected more Assyrian traits to reveal themselves through the veneer of literary Syriac, but it is not impossible that the Assyrian dialect was short-lived after the demise of the Assyrian Empire, and that the shifting of population groups eliminated both Assyrian and strongly Assyrianized Aramaic. Perhaps further study of the Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects can illuminate this issue.

A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LEXICAL DATA

When divided into semantic categories (see Table 1), the Akkadian loanwords group themselves into fairly predictable patterns. In Imperial Aramaic the largest percentage

105. Cf. J. M. Frey, "Assyriens ou Aramiens?" L'Orient Syrien X (1965) 141-60, who treats some of these points in his discussion of the inaccuracy of the term "Assyrian" for the speakers of Eastern Neo-Aramaic.
106. Note, however, that the two preserved loanwords in Eastern Neo-Aramaic, sitta (esittu) and semmîltu (simmiltu) are from Babylonian as well.
107. The semantic categories were chosen rather arbitrarily as suggested by the nature of the lexical material. Excluded from consideration are those loans which already appear in Old Aramaic and forms found exclusively in Mesopotamian Aramaic. The classification used is as follows:

Political-Legal: bêl dabâbî, dabâbu, bêl dînî, bêl piqîtti, biltu,
# TABLE 1

The Types of Loanwords in Aramaic Dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Imperial Aramaic</th>
<th>Western Aramaic</th>
<th>Eastern Aramaic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political-Legal Terminology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of Professions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographical Features</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribal Terminology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools and Utensils</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Items from the Material Culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Vocabulary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of loanwords (25%) are from the realm of politics and law, but since many of these are unique to Imperial Aramaic, they might better be considered foreign words rather than loanwords. Next in frequency are the names of professions (18%). This group of words is fairly stable, occurring in later Eastern and Western Aramaic with only a few additions in Eastern Aramaic. It has long been recognized that architectural terms are frequent among Akkadian loanwords. In Imperial Aramaic they make up about one-sixth of the total loanwords, and these, too, are generally preserved in both Eastern and Western Aramaic, again with a few additions in the East. Imperial Aramaic also has a significant percentage (16%) of loans which may be classed as general vocabulary, words whose borrowing is an indication of strong linguistic, rather than just cultural, contact.

emēdu, ĝerū, hāmū, hubullu, ilkū, iškaru, kurru, maddattu, manū, maškanu, miksū, mišru, nikassu, nudummū, pagāru, pīhatu, pilku, rabū, raḏū, susapīnu, šītu, šēnu, zūzu;

Professions: arad ekalli, asū, ašīpu, aškāpu, errešū, gagū, hazanmu, ikkaru, išparu, lahinnu, malāhu, naggāru, nappāhu, nuhatimmu, pahāru, purkullu, ša ekalli, šamaliu, šattumu, šutappu, talmiду, tamkaru, ummānu;

Architecture: abullu, agurr, amāru, arhu, asītu, askupp, asupp, bēmu, birtu, daltu, ediltu, gāmiru, ganūnu, gišru, guššūru, hittu, igāru, kimahhu, natbāku, tarbašu, titurrū, urubātu, uṣūru;

Religion: ekurru, ginū, ištaru, lišitu, maqlūtu, nindabū, nubbū, parakk, šēdu, sāhiru, marūštu;

Astronomy: attalū, lumāšu, mazzaltu, ziqpu;

Topography: amurrū, appāru, arittu, atappu, birittu, itīku, iškaru, ištānu, kāru, māhāzū, mātu, midru, mušanniitu, mušārū, nērebu, suqāqū, sūgu, šadū, šārū, šūtu, ušallu;

Scribal: asumittu, egiru, gištu, nishu, šatāru, šīptu;

Tools and Utensils: ašlu, bukānu, diqāru, esittu, hašbu, kannu, kanūnu marru, muterru, nabārtu, naktam, nāmaru, nazzītu, pagulu, pattu, rapšu, sikkatu, simmiitu, tubaliu, zabbilu, zibaniitu, zuruqqu;

Others: argammu, arru, arṣānu, aššū, balaggu, burū, hurdu, itannu, kalakk (1), kalakk (2), kiššū, kukku, kuspu, kutallu, mahrāt elippi, makkītu, pagumtu, pūru, gudšītu, gupp, gurqurrū, rapšu, riqītu, sikkatu, sūmu, šuplu, zīpu, zaqīpu, kiššū, amurqānu, bulṭītu, kamāru, šambaliitu, tarlugallu;

General: abbītu, amurqānu, bārānū, edū, ĝāšu, giššu, himētu, himšu, immati, inbu, karšu, kinattu, kutallu, lībbātu, mēšu, mušēnu, napharu, ništī, pīgu, puhru, purqīdam, pūtu, simānu, sunqu, ša lāš, šalantu, šamāhu, šānū, šī bābī, šiknu, šillatu, šūšu, šūsūbu, tībbūtu, uṣurtu, zīmu, tajjaru.

108. As used here Imperial Aramaic includes the vocabulary hypothesized for Imperial Aramaic on the basis of its occurrence in Western Aramaic, Palmyran, and Nabatean.
Except for the political and legal terminology which might be considered foreign in Imperial Aramaic, Western Aramaic preserves approximately the same percentages in the semantic distribution of the loanwords as are found in Imperial Aramaic. This is to be expected if the Western Aramaic loans derive from Imperial Aramaic, since the effects of time and chance should be semantically impartial.

The most important new types of loanwords found in Eastern Aramaic are also predictable: topographic terms and items of the material culture, both of which are semantic areas with their basis in geography. As such, some of these words are better termed "survivals."

About one-fourth (52) of the certain Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic are of Sumerian or pre-Sumerian origin. This is as expected, for those terms foreign to the Semitic-speaking Akkadians and borrowed by them were also foreign to the Arameans. Similarly, many of these old words were further borrowed from Aramaic into Arabic. (The attested percentage is necessarily greater than the actual proportion of Sumerian words. Since Sumerian origin is one of the best clues available for determining a loan and many actual loans may give the impression of being common Semitic, our sample must be biased in favor of Sumerian and substrate words.)

If the loanwords are divided into parts of speech, the following approximate distribution obtains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Imperial Aramaic</th>
<th>Eastern Aramaic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nouns</td>
<td>91 %</td>
<td>90 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb-noun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complexes^109</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interjections</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare this distribution with that of the Aramaic loanwords in Akkadian in the provisional list collected by W. von Soden:110

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nouns</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectives</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbs</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositions</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interjections</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though no modern statistical analyses of such distributions for a large number of languages are available, based on what
is known, the latter distribution approximates rather well the expected pattern from an "upper" language to a "lower" language. Combined with the striking paucity of verbs among the Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic, it seems to indicate quite clearly that though in the areas of politics and culture Akkadian may have been dominant, during the period of closest linguistic contact between Akkadian and Aramaic the latter was the dominant language. One might suggest as well that the period of actual close contact (i.e., bilingualism) was short and that the replacement of Akkadian by Aramaic proceeded at a fairly rapid pace. It is quite probable that in the LB period, and perhaps even earlier, the great majority of those writing Akkadian documents were native Aramaic speakers. The high proportion of Aramaic verbs in their Akkadian would be natural in an imperfectly learned, dying language.

This conclusion, formed solely on the basis of the lexical influences, gives one cause to reconsider the likelihood of finding phonological and grammatical influences of Akkadian in Aramaic. Such influences have been known to occur even without actual dominance, however, especially in phonology. The only non-lexical influence which can without question be ascribed to late Akkadian is the loss of laryngeals. Such Mesopotamian Aramaic traits as nasalization, free word order, and žy genitive might go back to a much earlier period, while the general uncertainty expressed in Chapter III on the other traits studied therein must be reemphasized and given added weight in light of the lexical distribution.

Though the relationship between Akkadian and Aramaic during the first millennium remains somewhat elusive, it should now be fairly clear that the major period of contact

109. I.e., abuṭu șabdītu, karṣu akālu, lībdīti malī, țimu ḫanī.
110. W. von Soden, "aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbabylonischen Texten. Ein Vorbericht," Or. n.s. XXXV (1966) 1 ff., and Or. n.s. XXXVII (1968) 261 ff. I have omitted from the calculations those few words which I have taken as Akkadian loans (e.g., egirtu). Although future work should greatly increase the total number of Aramaisms, his corpus is large enough to insure a fairly accurate sample of the distribution.
112. Even if one were to add all the possible verbs mentioned in Chap. II, the percentage would not increase significantly. Since the two languages involved are very similar and the Aramaisms in Akkadian show that verbs could easily be borrowed in that direction, it cannot be argued that verbs could not be borrowed because of the differences in the verbal systems, as may be the case with Arabic and Spanish, for example (cf. Deroy, L'Emprunt, pp. 70 f.).
starts later, lasts for a shorter period of time, and is of a
different nature from that which scholars have previously sur-
mised. Most of the Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic may be term-
ed "cultural borrowings," for the Aramaeans owed much to
Mesopotamian society in the areas of science, the arts, re-
ligion, and law; but Aramaic was the dominant language, and
the demise of Akkadian followed soon after the loss of native
Mesopotamian rule.
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## INDEX OF NORTH WEST SEMITIC WORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>a-</code></td>
<td>&quot;on,&quot;</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>b</code></td>
<td>&quot;a month,&quot;</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>bh(b)</code></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dh</code></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dbw</code></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dbwl</code></td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dwry</code></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dbwnyt</code></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dbwt</code></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dbwt</code></td>
<td>&quot;scraper,&quot;</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dpl</code></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dpl</code></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dpr</code></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>rgwry</code></td>
<td>&quot;temple, altar,&quot;</td>
<td>48, 139, 161, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>rgwry</code></td>
<td>&quot;brick,&quot;</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wgo</code></td>
<td>58 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wgo</code></td>
<td>58 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>glh</code></td>
<td>55 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>gm</code></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>gm</code></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>gr</code></td>
<td>&quot;hire,&quot;</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>gr</code></td>
<td>&quot;roof, wall,&quot;</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>grh/t</code></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>gd</code></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dw</code></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ydw(w)</code></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ydwy</code></td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dlp</code></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>dr</code></td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wry</code></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wry</code></td>
<td>34 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wwr</code></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wwr</code></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wmn</code></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wmn</code></td>
<td>109 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wsl</code></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wr</code></td>
<td>34 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wrb</code></td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wry</code></td>
<td>&quot;west,&quot;</td>
<td>34, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wry</code></td>
<td>&quot;store-house,&quot;</td>
<td>109 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wry</code></td>
<td>&quot;stall,&quot;</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>wry</code></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>h</code></td>
<td>10 n., 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>w</code></td>
<td>48 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>tym</code></td>
<td>50, 143 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ybr</code></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ybr</code></td>
<td>58, 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ybr</code></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>yn</code></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>yn</code></td>
<td>78 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ypr</code></td>
<td>60 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ypl</code></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>k</code></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>k</code></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>k</code></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>k</code></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lw</code></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>y</code></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>m/nbwb</code></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>m</code></td>
<td>49, 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>m</code></td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>m</code></td>
<td>58 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>m</code></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>m</code></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>78 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ntn</code></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>158, 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>n</code></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>sl</code></td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>sn</code></td>
<td>103 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

187
188 / Index of North West Semitic Words

"s̄ōp, șp̄, sy/wp̄, 38, 150
șp̄, 39
(y)sgwph̄, 37
šgwpc̄, 37
š(y)t̄, šynt̄, 50
št̄, "wall," 37
št̄, "mortar," 50
štn̄̄, 60, 141
štr̄̄, 60
(y)strt̄̄, 60, 141
šw̄t̄, 85
špyky, "your face," 158
špytȳ, 35
špk̄̄, 34, 161
špr̄, 35
šprq̄d̄, 84
šp̄s̄, 152
špt̄, 35
špt̄m̄, 35
šr̄, 36
šrgb̄̄, 36
šrgwb̄l̄̄, 83, 138, 140, 161
šrgn̄, 35
šrgmn̄, 35
şrd(y)k̄l̄̄̄̄, 35, 140, 151
šrw̄t̄, 109
şrh̄, șw(r)(y)h̄, "half-brick," 36
şrys̄, 49
şrysh̄, 49 n.
şrytȳ, 36, 144, 161
şrs̄, 49
şrsn̄, 36
şrr̄t̄, 49 f.
şrr̄, 46 n., 110
ş(w)şsq̄, 37, 110
şšḡnd̄̄, 38
şšw(w)n̄, 59
şšwp̄, 38
şšyāh̄, șytȳ, 37, 141
ş(w)šk̄p̄, 39
şškr̄(?), 59, 161
şšl(?)̄̄̄, şys̄l̄, 39
şśp̄, 38
şšpr̄̄, şşspr̄, 59
şşqq̄, 93
şšē̄š̄er̄, 130 n.
şšr̄thm̄, 153
şš(ş)š̄, 38
şşt̄, 102
şştȳm̄̄, 101, 142, 148 n.
şşτq̄d̄(y)̄, 96
şşτn̄̄, 60
şştn̄̄̄(ş)̄, 110, 146
şştl̄ȳ, 40
şştm̄šl̄, 60
şşt̄m̄̄ȳ, 60
şşt̄̄̄̄pr̄q̄d̄̄̄, 84
b̄es̄en̄, 98 n.
b̄r̄̄̄̄ȳ, 41
bb̄̄, 40 f.
bgw̄, 58
bda, 41 n.
bdȳ, 41 n.
bdym, 41 n.
bdḡ, 41, 42 n.
bwbȳ, "pipe," 43
bwbȳ̄, "frying pan," 43
bwkn̄, bwkn̄n̄, 45
bw̄s̄yn̄, 45
bwr̄, 41 n.
bwrȳ, 45
btl̄lh̄, 58
bbȳ, 43
bȳr̄nyt̄̄, bȳr̄nyw̄t̄̄, 44
bȳrt̄, 44
bȳt̄, 44
bȳt̄ȳ, şsyrȳ, 127 n.
bȳt̄ ȳm̄̄, 64
bȳt̄ gm̄̄n̄, 51
bȳt̄̄, 133
b-l̄, 98
bl̄w̄̄, 44
b(w)ł̄tȳt̄, 45
bn bȳt̄, 70
b̄l̄̄̄̄d̄bb̄̄, 42
b̄l̄ d̄b̄ym̄, 42 n.
b̄l̄ dyn̄, 42 f.
b̄l̄̄ t̄ cm̄, 109 n.
b̄l̄̄̄̄ m̄š̄p̄t̄, 43
b̄l̄̄̄̄ p̄̄t̄, 43
bpȳ, 32
bqr̄, 80 n.
br̄̄̄̄bȳt̄, 70
br̄zs̄n̄q̄, bw̄rz̄yn̄q̄, 81
b̄r̄ȳ, 41 n.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brywn</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bryt, byry</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bšm</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bt šwh</td>
<td>99 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>btq</td>
<td>42 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwr</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gb</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gbl, &quot;south&quot;</td>
<td>97 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gbl, &quot;boundary&quot;</td>
<td>73, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwyr</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwh</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwhr</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwlp</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwys</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gawsâ</td>
<td>51 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g( )</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gnyr</td>
<td>52, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gnymn</td>
<td>52 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyssyn</td>
<td>161, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyty</td>
<td>127 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glb</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g(w)mh</td>
<td>64, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gmydhn, gwmddy, gmd</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gn</td>
<td>51 n., 52 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gwnn</td>
<td>gnn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs (pl. gyssyn)</td>
<td>52, 161, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gry</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gryb</td>
<td>85 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gš(w)r( )</td>
<td>gšš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gš(w)r( )</td>
<td>&quot;beam,&quot; 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gšr( )</td>
<td>&quot;bridge,&quot; 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-</td>
<td>130 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dîb</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dîp</td>
<td>46 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ddb</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dîbbâb</td>
<td>42 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dibbâb</td>
<td>42, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbyt, dbythw</td>
<td>97 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbr</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwn</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwpr</td>
<td>46 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwš</td>
<td>45 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dy</td>
<td>130 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dy-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyn</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dy/št</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dky</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dl</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dîn (dny)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dnh</td>
<td>46 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dnh, &quot;this,&quot; 46 n., 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dnt</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dp( )</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dprw</td>
<td>113 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d(y)qwl</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dqwr</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drdg</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dršh</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dš( ) (pl. dššyn)</td>
<td>45, 141, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h³ltn</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h³lt</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h³š</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hbb</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hbwly</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hbgyd</td>
<td>80 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hbrk</td>
<td>27 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwdr</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwšh</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwzd</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwšr</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hybl</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hynš</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h(y)kl</td>
<td>27, 40 f., 155 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hšw</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hlk</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hmlk</td>
<td>109 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hnšl</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hqgyd</td>
<td>80 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hqgr</td>
<td>80 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrdwp</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>htnbw</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wynyqnhxml, 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wršn</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wšnwm</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z³b³</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z³zy</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zb</td>
<td>113 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z( )b²nyt³</td>
<td>&quot;scales,&quot; 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zb²nyt³</td>
<td>&quot;horned creature,&quot; 113 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zbyl³</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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zbn, "buy," 113
zbn(ơ), "time," 91, 148 n.
zgwyt(ơ), zgwyt(ơ), zgwytt(ơ),
  112
zwg(ơ), 112
zwg(ơ)y, 112
zw, 114
zyt(ơ), 90, 141
zy, 130 ff., 158
zyw, 113 n.
zyw(ơ), 113
zyy, 113
zyq(ơ), zyp(ơ), 113, 161, 162
zyq(ơ), "shooting star," 114
zyq(ơ), "storm," 114
zyqyq, 114 n.
zyqyp(ơ), "pillory," 112
zyqyp(ơ), "a type of star," 113
zyqt(ơ), 114
zhk, 112
zkwyt(ơ), 112
zkwr(ơ), zkwrw, 111
zk(ơ)y, 112
zkr, 111
zmn(ơ), 91 f., 148 n.
znyly, 111
znwt, 38
znq, znq(ơ), 61
zqym, "fire arrows," 114 n.
zqymn, "fetters," 61
zqyp(ơ), 112
zq(ơ)y, 114 n.
zqt, zytq(ơ), 113
zrwq(ơ), 114
zrwq(ơ), 114, 144 n.
zr(ơ), 114 n.

hѡwt(ơ), 55
hѡyt(ơ), 56
hѡryt(ơ), 56
hѡs(ơ)s(ơ), 55
hǹwly(ơ), 56, 149, 161
hǹy, 53 n.
hǹyt(ơ), 53
h直属, 56 n.
hǹs(ơ), 55
hǹbl(ơ), 56, 151
hǹt, 53
hǹwkr, 58 n.

hawqâ, 57
hǹb, 54
hǹh, 55
hǹn(ơ), 55
hǹq(ơ), 61 n.
h(｡)m(｡), 57
hɨ, 8 n.
hɨt, 55
hɨyr, 58 n.
hɨy(ơ)s, hɨy(ơ)s, 53
hɨl, 48 n.
hɨm, 53, 144
hɨm(｡), 56
hɨmɨ, 66
hɨn, 56
hɨsp, 54
hɨ(｡)b, 54, 138
hɨsyn, 54
hɨsp, 54, 138
hɨrwst(ơ), 54
hɨ(｡)t, 113 n.
hɨ(｡)t(｡)m(｡), 57
hɨs, hɨw(｡), hɨy(｡)s(ơ), 53, 152
hɨs, 54
hɨ(｡)s(｡)y(｡)t(｡), 55
hɨ(｡)s, 54 f.
ht(｡), 56

hɨy, 114 n.

tёbbâ, 42
tbb, 42 n.
tb(｡)l(｡), 105
tbb, 115
twps(ơ), 113 n.
ty, 42 n.
ty, 45
tm, 50
(t(｡)y)m(｡)n, 50
tmɨr(｡), 108
t(｡)m, 109
tp, 46
tpsr, 138 n.
trnw(｡)s, 108 n.
ybl, 103 n.
yγ, 48
yhyn, 32
yw(｡)s(｡)t hɨw(｡)s, 38
yḥyṭw, 55
ykt?, 37 n.
ygā, 38 n.
yṣyḥ, 96
yṛḥḥ smḥḥ, 115 n.
ytd, 91 n.

cūnâ, 62
kʿnzwâ, 63
kʿnwâ, 63
kāṣer, 135 n.
kwbsâ, 62 n.
kbṣ, 62
kd, kād, 135
kdd, 86 n.
kdāh, 66, 138
kwk, "grave niche," 64, 142 f.
kwkâ, "cake," 65
kwktyt, 33
kwā, 32
kwâb, 62
kwlbâ, 61
kwān, 63 n.
kwṣyâ, 65
kws(y)ltâ, 63
kwṣpâ, 65
kwṣ, 62
kwhr, kwwr, "fish," 62, 163
kwr, "furnace," 65
kwır, "kör," 65
kwṣâ, 121
kwtlâ, 65
kwty, 65
ktl, 121
ky, 135
kydbyrwkâ, 135 n.
kylpwt, 61
kyrm, 154
kynhm/tâ, 64
kyṣâ, 121, 152
kyr, 65
kyṣâ, 65
kyṣrâ, 53
kkâ, 61
kknt, 62 n.
kl, 130 n.
klzwâ, 63
klybh, 62 n.
klykt, 62 n.
klylâ, 63
klâ, 61
kṣn, kṣnâ, 62
knh, kntâ (pl. knwtâ), 64,
145, 157
kwnâ, 62, 115, 146
kṣâ, "chair," 28
kṣâ, "full moon," 65
kswl, 115, 144 n.
kpyph, 86
kpp, 64
kr, "kor," 65
kr dâ, "(place) where," 63
krîb, 85
krblh/tâ, 63
krzytâ, 63 n.
kryâ, 63
kwreligious sâ, kwrsy, 28, 152
krpn, 63
krptâ, kwpuytâ, 63
krś, krṣyn, 63
krâ, 64
krwâ, 53
krâ, 121
ktâ, kytâ, 64 n.
ktm, 75 n., 144
ktn, 28
lâ, 124 ff.
lâ, 32, 125 n.
lâhmâ, 126
lâm, 67, 106, 144
lâmrâ, 128 n.
lbh, 66 n.
lbn(h), 66
lbâ (mlâ), 48, 66
lh, 8 n., 71 n.
lwbr, 66
lnz, lnzîn, 66
lîlît, 66
lkâ, 32
lm, 67
lmbnyh, 133
lqâ, 126 n.
lqînâ, 66
lqgb, 128 n.
lsw, 39 n.
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1lth, 67
1lk, 67

m²wkn, 73
m²znym, 113
m²y, 136 n.
m²nzn²l, 69, 70 n.
m²rw³, 70, 145
m²ššr(w)no, 115, 142 n.
m²štwsy, 105 n.
mgr, 67
md²t, 67, 145
mdbk, 76
md³, 70 n.
mè³, 67
mdwkt³, 50
md³, 71
m(y)dm, 72
md³m, 72, 158
md³, 72
mn, 136 n.
mn²r, 68, 145
mht³lt³, 100
mwz³l, 69
m³k, 73
m³(w)nl³/t³, m³nzn²l, 69, 145
m³r, "to twist wool," 73
m³r, "stocks," 73
m³hwz(²), 68
m³hw³t, 69 n.
m³hr³, 68
my, my³, 136
my³dy, my³dm, 72
my³zn, 73
m³kw³t³, "parapet," 69 n.
m³(w)kw³t³, "boat," 68
m³ks, "tax," 72
m³ks, "date," 69
m³l³, 66
ml³w, 69
ml³wg, 73, 79 n.
ml³w³, m²l³w³²³, 67
ml³h, 69
m³ly³, 72
m³ly³, 130 n.
m³n, 53
m³nd³h, 67
m³nd³m³, 72, 158
m³nh, m³ny³, 69
m³nrw³, 77
m³ng³yt³, 77
m³sw³b³lyn³, 103
m³s³kn³, 74, 140
m³m³, 136
m³p³hm³, 76 n.
m³s³bt³m³, 95
m³y³, 104
m³³³r³, 72, 152, 154
m³³³l³h³, 70
m³³³lw³, 70
mr³, 70
m³r³dy³t³, 89
m³r³sh³wn³, 115, 144
m³r³y³qn³, 34, 142, 143
m³r³q³q³, 90 n.
m³s³, 72, 141
m³š³r³, m³š³rt³, 74
m³š³w³m³, 39
m³š³wn³yt³, 73
m³š³h³, 70
m³š³ht³, 70 n.
m³š³t³r³, 101 n.
m³š³k³(w)³n³(²), 70, 150
m³š³q³õ³p³, 37
m³š³ry³, 74
m³š³ry³t³, 74
m³š³rt³, 74, 145
mt³, 71
m³³³br³+n³³³h³, 38
m³³³h³, 70 n.
m³³³k³d³y³, 71
m³³³r³, mt³/w³y³, 74
n³¹³, 75
n³²nd³by³, 77, 150
n³²s³³³³k³, 78
n³³³³p³, 153 n.
n³³³sw³r³y³, n³³³š³yr³wt³, 78
n³³³q³wt³, 77
n³³³r³b³, 76
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nbb, 47
nbz, 77
ndzab, 77
ngd?, 75 n.
ngw (pl. ngwawt?), 75
ngw, 75
ndbk, 76, 139
ndwny?, 79
nāḏān, 79 n.
nḏny, 79
nhp, 76
nwl, 75
nwn, 62 n., 129
nws, 78, 151 n.
n(?)wr?, 75
nzy(y)c?, 76
nḥtwm(?)?, 79
nḥm, 126 n.
nḥb?, 77
nḥl, 75
nḥsn, 115
nḥy, 77
nhr(?)?, 77
nhrb?, 76
nḥṣym/n, 77, 155 n.
nkt, 139 n.
nktm, 75
nmb³, 78
nmrt?, 75, 138
nṣ³, 78, 143
nṣḥ, nṣḥ(h), 78, 143, 145
nṣ³, 76
nḥ, 76
nḥ³, 76
nḥhr, 76
nḥl, 109 n.
nḥṣ, 76
nḥy, 37 n.
nḥṣ, "projection," 37 n.
nḥṣ, nḥṣw³, "expense," 96
nḥṣ, br, nḥṣ wq², 38
nḥwr², 75
nṣl, 85 n.
nṣ², 77
nṣd(?)?, 76
nṣṭ, 126 n.
nṣgḥ, 77
nṣ, "oath?", 153 f.
nṣḥ, "lend," 88 n.
nṣy byt, 78, 157
ntl, 100
sḥhr², 90
sḥḥbšt, 130 n.
sbl, 111
sblnt, sblwn², 111
sblt², 92
sgwl, 93
s[r(w)l]h², 93
sglt, 93
sgn, 97, 139
sḏmn², 95 n.
sḏyn, 95 n.
wbl, 103
swk³, 91 n.
wbn², 91
swkr², 91
swmbylt², 92
swng², 93
swpyn², 94
swt, 38, 157
sḥr, "plate," 91
sḥrt², sḥhr², 90
sḥrt²y, 130 n.
sfr, 101 n.
sfrw, 101 n.
sywn, 115
syw²t, 38 n.
syrt³, 91 n.
sk, "thorn," 91 n.
skyn, "knife," 91 n.
skl, 103, 139
skn, 97, 152, 155 n.
skt² (pl. skyn), 91
sm (pl. smnmyn), 100
smd, 90
smw²d², 90
sml, 99
semmīltā, 92
smr, 152
snb, 103, 138 n., 152, 154
snq, 93
sc₃d, 102 n.
s[r²]p, 92
spynh, 48 n.
spr, "scribe," 29 n.
spr, "document," 29, 152
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spr, &quot;border,&quot;</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqwp,</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqwpt,</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqp,</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srs, srsy</td>
<td>100, 147 n., 148, 152, 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitta,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμwr,</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμt,</td>
<td>56 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμ,</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμn, &quot;treaty,&quot;</td>
<td>33, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμq,</td>
<td>61 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμq,</td>
<td>61 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμγh,</td>
<td>58 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμdμλγ,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμw(t)q,</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμzgh/t,</td>
<td>61, 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμzy,</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμγ,</td>
<td>127 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμμ,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμl,</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμ/τd/r,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμkr,</td>
<td>48, 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμl σm, cμl σm,</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμl byt,</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμm/λb,</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμm̄h,</td>
<td>49 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμm̄,</td>
<td>128 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμn,</td>
<td>59 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμγyrt,</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cμγyš,</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)st&gt;n,</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cst(y)r,</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccμτ,</td>
<td>37 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crb,</td>
<td>56 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crγs,</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cárīsh,</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crs,</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crsn,</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crsth,</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr,</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cšty, cšτ,</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cτp,</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμhr,</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμγ,</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμγs,</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pgw,</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμhr, pμhr, pμhr,</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμst,</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμγ, pμγ,</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμγy, &quot;purim,&quot;</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμγy, &quot;mat,&quot;</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pwt,</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμh, pμt, pμh,</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμh,</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμγ,</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pμγt,</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plg, &quot;divide,&quot;</td>
<td>79, 83 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plg, &quot;canal,&quot;</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plg, &quot;drum,&quot;</td>
<td>41, 138, 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plh,</td>
<td>85 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plγlt,</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plk, &quot;spindle,&quot;</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plk, &quot;district,&quot;</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plq,</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps,</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pšy,</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pšl,</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pšd,</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pq,</td>
<td>83 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pq̄q,</td>
<td>83 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pqr, &quot;run wild,&quot;</td>
<td>80 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pqr, &quot;claim,&quot;</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prk, pryk,</td>
<td>80, 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prs (prsyn),</td>
<td>80, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prsq,</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prstqy,</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prq̄q, prq̄q,</td>
<td>84, 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr̃š, &quot;half-mina,&quot;</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr̃š, &quot;to make clear,&quot;</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr̃š, &quot;good, sting,&quot;</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pšr,</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptwr,</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pth,</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pty, &quot;canal,&quot;</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pty, pty, &quot;bucket,&quot;</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pty,</td>
<td>42 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptr,</td>
<td>81 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sμw̄t, &quot;ornament,&quot;</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sμw̄t, &quot;group,&quot;</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s̄b, s̄yb,</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s̄byt, czgh,</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s̄bt,</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s̄bt,</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index of North West Semitic Words / 195

$qbtym$, 95
$swrht^\circ$, 109
$syr(t^\circ)$, 96
$sln^\circ$, 46 n.
$qmt$, 95
$qrr$, 110
$q^\circ bwt^\circ$, 85
$q^n^\circ$, 63 n.
$qby^\circ$, 85
$qbl$, 68
$qbs$, 62 n.
$qdd^*$, 86
$qdly$, 66 n.
$qdmt$, 71 n.
$qdr$, 47
$qdl^\circ$, 86
$qwbyt^\circ$, 85
$qwl^\circ$, $qwl^\circ t^\circ$, 86
$qwp$, 86 n.
$qwph/t^\circ$, 86
$qws$, 62
$qwrqwr^\circ$, 87
$qtw$, 28 n.
$qyns^\circ$, 86
$qys^\circ$, 86
$qld^\circ$, 86 n.
$qnt^\circ$, 86
$qnnn$, 62 n.
$qnt(\circ)$, 85
$qpw/yph$, 86
$qps$, 62 n.
$qps^\circ$, 62 n.
$qrb$, 30
$q^\circ rpy^\circ / w t^\circ$, 63
$qr^\circ ynh$, 63
$qt^\circ(\circ)$, $qtt$, 85
$r^\circ s^\circ y wt^\circ$, 88 n.
$rb$, 87
$rb$ $s^\circ gh$, 140 n.
$rby$, "officer," 87
$rby$, "increase," 90
$rbykh^\circ$, 87
$rbk$, 87
$rb^\circ c$, 107 n.
$rgw^\circ n^\circ$, 36
$rd^\circ$, $rd^\circ y$, 89
$rh^\circ t^\circ(\circ)$, 89
$rhm^\circ n^\circ$, 106
$r^\circ t$, 89
$rks$, 87
$rkpt^\circ$, 87
$rk^\circ s$, $rkw^\circ s$, 87
$rp^\circ$, 158
$rp^\circ q$, 87
$rpq$, 88
$rq^\circ t^\circ$, 88
$rqs$, 87
$rqs^\circ$, 88 f.
$r^\circ st$, 89 n.
$r^\circ swt^\circ$, 88
$r^\circ sy$, 88 f., 152, 161
$s^\circ n$, 30 n.
$s^\circ kyn$, 91 n.
$s^\circ kr$, 33 n.
$s^\circ mh$, 99 n.
$*s^\circ$, 96
$s^\circ pt^\circ$, 103
$s^\circ r^\circ$, 101
$s^\circ t^\circ m^\circ$, 101, 148 n.
$s^\circ (y) b^\circ b^\circ$, 101
$s^\circ bh$, 99
$s^\circ bt$, 115
$s^\circ lw^\circ lt$, $s^\circ lw^\circ lt^\circ$, 99
$s^\circ qyn$, 52
$s^\circ gl$, $s^\circ gl^\circ t^\circ$, 97, 139, 151
$s^\circ (y)d(\circ)$, "demon," 101
$s^\circ dh$, 102
$s^\circ dy^\circ$, 97
$s^\circ dt^\circ$, 102
$s^\circ w z b$, 105
$s^\circ wh$, $s^\circ wh$, 99
$s^\circ h^\circ x^\circ r$, 101 n.
$s^\circ w^\circ ly^\circ$, (\circ)$s\circ w\circ ly^\circ$, 99
$s^\circ w m$, 39
$s^\circ w m y r h$, 102 n.
$s^\circ w n y t$, 74
$s^\circ w p y n (\circ)$, 93
$s^\circ w p^\circ l^\circ$, 104
$s^\circ w q(\circ)$, 44, 94, 141
$s^\circ w s^\circ$, 105 n.
$s^\circ w s^\circ$, 105
$s^\circ w^\circ s^\circ b y n (\circ)$, $s^\circ w^\circ s^\circ b^\circ n^\circ$, 94, 138 n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šwš(y)p</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šwt</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šwtp(wt)</td>
<td>105, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šzb</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šhlyn</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šhswh</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>štr</td>
<td>101, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šybb</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šyd</td>
<td>&quot;base,&quot; 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šyzb</td>
<td>104, 105, 123 n., 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šyṣy(p)</td>
<td>104 bis, 123 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šyr</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>škb</td>
<td>97 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>škl</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>škn</td>
<td>šykn, šwkn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>škp</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>škr</td>
<td>59 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šl(d)</td>
<td>šl&lt;nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šlh</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šlw</td>
<td>102 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šlt</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šlwm</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šmh</td>
<td>40 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnt</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnty</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnh, šny, šnywt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnw</td>
<td>100 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnm</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnn</td>
<td>74 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnpt</td>
<td>103 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnsyw</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šng</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šnt, snyt</td>
<td>102, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>şntw, 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š&lt;rwrh</td>
<td>100 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>špr</td>
<td>&quot;weaver,&quot; 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šqwp</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šql</td>
<td>&quot;shekel,&quot; 29, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šql, &quot;to take,&quot; 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šqp</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šqp</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šqq</td>
<td>šwqq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šrbwh</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šrbt</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šrwt</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šry</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šrn</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>št</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t^n</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t^nmyd</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tgr</td>
<td>t^ngr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twbly</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twkln</td>
<td>106 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twtb</td>
<td>104, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twry</td>
<td>127 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thwm, t^w</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thl</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyb</td>
<td>&quot;merciful,&quot; 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyb</td>
<td>tybwt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyr</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tkl</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tly</td>
<td>t^ly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tl</td>
<td>108, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tlym</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tlmyd, tlmd</td>
<td>65 n., 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tl(2)myn</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tmwz</td>
<td>115, 146 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tnwr</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tp</td>
<td>40, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tq</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tqp</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trbç(2)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trqmn</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trngw</td>
<td>trn(w)gl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trç</td>
<td>40 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trçwh</td>
<td>41 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tštś</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ttwr</td>
<td>tytwr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>