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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, "Zur mundartigen Wortschatz," Bl. 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 *hp*; and in JAr. *hp*, but only in Targum Proverbs, i.e., from Syriac)—Hardly from *hipu*, "break," but perhaps from the expression *hip4* libbi, "panic." *hūš, hūša*: "to construct with reeds"—*ḥaqāšu*, etc. *kallā, kallāta*, "dike"—*kālu, kīltu, cūana*, "merciful(?)-“*cēlu, ḫnū.

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 Comprehensive, though mostly out-of-date studies of borrowing, mostly of loanwords, are available for Greek and Latin in Aramaic,² Old Persian in Aramaic,³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 Elie Oksar, "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 Lehwaörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targue (Berlin, 1898-99); A. Schall, Studien über griechische Fremdwörter in Syrischen (Barmen, 1960). The latter is limited to the Greek words in the earliest Syriac texts. For the reverse see H. Levy, Die semitischen Fremdwörter in Griechischen (Berlin, 1895) and the recent work by Émilie Masson, Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts semitiques 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. Eliens and E. Benveniste. For Middle Persian in Aramaic see G. Widengren, Iranisch-semitische Kulturbezuger in persischer Zeit (Cologne and Opladen, 1960) pp. 15 ff., 99 ff., and S. Telegdi, "Essai sur la phonétique des emprunts Iraniens en Araméen Talmudique," JA CXXVI (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 and all of its ligatures.
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 Zimmerm'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 Zimmerm'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 Zimmerm'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.
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 Handworterbuch, 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 Aramaic and with Mandaic. 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.

---

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. 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. 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. Hodge, "Loan-Words as Cultural and Lexical Symbols," Archivum Linguisticum XIV (1962) 111 ff., especially p. 112, 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 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. 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 marks the 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 Panamnna inscriptions from 5. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I, (2d ed., rev., Rome, 1973) p. 22n. Many scholars would reserve the term Late Aramaic for the modern dialects and use "middle" for Fitzmyer's "late": see Jonas C. Greenfield, "Dialect Traits in Early Aramaic," LeS. XXXIII (1968) 359, n. 1 (Heb.)

6. For the texts and grammar see Rainer Degen, Altoramäische Grammatik (AKM, Vol. XXXVIII, 3 (Miesbaden, 1969)), who omits the Samalian material, however.
Zinjirlî 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, Samai (Ankara, 1948) p. 42, n. 102, and Donner and Röllig in KAI). I include it in Samalian, however (as in DISO and adequate explanation for the forms 1h (cf. W. Röllig, Si. Or. XVII (1970) 378, n. 2) and yh in Phoenician, whereas they are quite correct in Samalian.
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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 Utracca, written from Babylon to Assyria, and the Uruk Incantation, most of these texts are short Aramaic endorsements or documents on cuneiform tablets. On some tablets the complete text is in Aramaic without any cuneiform. It is most unfortunate that our source material is 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 kingdom, 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 Reichsaramaîsch, 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 Halafl (Gosn), ca. 650 B.C. (J. Friedrich, “Die aramäischen Tonurkunden,” in Die Inschriften von Tell Halaf (AOI Beiheft VI (Berlin, 1940) pp. 70 ff.) are included in this group.
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 text different dialects are used. What can be determined about these dialects, and can the features of a general Imperial Aramaic be isolated? If so, can the origin of Imperial Aramaic be determined? Is it a direct development of the administrative language of the Neo-Assyrian period, as some scholars seem to agree, or is it a period belonging to 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 letters on leather, probably sent from Babylon, published by Driver. 20 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 described; it is unquestionably to be considered Imperial Aramaic, though some of the spellings 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 textual 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. 21

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. 22 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: 1) or 2) as the third person imperfect prefix, as the ending of the masculine plural denotative noun, the loss of the n-bearing pronominal suffixes of the imperfect. 23 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 ff.) 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 in Jewish literature. One of the great difficulties of Aramaic lexicography is that the existing dictionaries treat all or it is often difficult, and sometimes impossible, to get an it is to be hoped that future lexicographers will see fit to Babylonian Talmudic and Mandaeic 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 intelligibility to speakers of various dialects, written works. As usual, however, dialectal traits always make themselves 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 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 (Leiden, 1971). Megillat Taeanit (H. Lichtenstein, in HCVA VIII Ḥeβ-dphasis-palsimischen Aramäisch (Frankfurt, 1969) is also important representatives of this type of literature, though their dating is still subject to dispute. 25. A facsimile edition of Neofiti I was published by "Nakor" (Madrid and Barcelona, 1968-71). The text of Genesis, Exodus, and

à la littérature targonique (Rome, 1966) pp. 131-134, M. Machamara, Targum of the Hagiographa existed is shown by the fragmentary Job Targum found

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 Kokhba 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.


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) 341 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 origin of Targums and Galilean Aramaic is definite, however, the term Jewish Palestinian Aramaic will be used to refer to them as well as the other Palestinian Jewish 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 Akkadian-Biblic 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.

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

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. 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. 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, Frieder-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. 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.
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. 33

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 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, whether 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 Mesoopotamia, 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. 41 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 14, 494.
41. Probable calques and partial calques which I have included are discussed e.g. ina libbi, ina šiši, bā ṣekalli, ebbā, bēl dīni, libbata, pētu, ṣa ṣekalli, taḍāru. 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. paššantu, paššaru.
Preliminary Considerations

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. 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.

Loanwords that occur in such formulae, for example dabānu, 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.

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 interlinguistic contact between the languages involved. Such names are conveniently 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 phones:

<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>ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (z)</td>
<td>ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial w</td>
<td>ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial y</td>
<td>ง</td>
<td>ง ง</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the maintenance of /h/ in Akkadian as opposed to its merger with /h/ in Aramaic is important, when only Akkadian and Aramaic evidence is available the treatment of /h/ is not significant for our inquiry. *See p. 138.
Akkradian also reduces the diphthongs as and ay to o and eɪ, 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. 45 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 Akkradian. In the case of the first four phonemes listed, the Akkradian changes are necessary to determine whether a given term is a loan from Canaanite or Akkradian.

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, 46 but some use can be made of it here. 47

Other Akkradian 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 Akkradian may generally be assumed to have been borrowed from Aramaic. 48 One must also be on the lookout 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 Akkradian that are attributable to Sumerian influence appear in Aramaic, they may also be assigned an Akkradian 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. 49 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 Akkradian, its origin is Akkradian, even with widespread Semitic words. 50 But this is no criterion at all, and in such a case only other evidence will allow us to suggest an Akkradian origin.

Another important consideration, but one that can be very misleading, is distribution. If, for example, a word appears in Akkradian 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 Akkradian. Unfortunately for our purposes, the probability of the former occurring is by no means small, 51 and there are some cases in which we cannot 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 from complete to the other dialects, there is a good chance that it was borrowed from Eastern Aramaic from Akkradian. Yet here, too, aside from possible loss in the western dialects, there are other

45. So, too, in most cases of Mesopotamian Aramaic and in later historical spellings. See Spirantization of Postvocalic Stops in Chap. III.

46. The ground-breaking study is J. Greenberg, "The Patterning of cf. K. Koskien, "Kompatibilität in den dreikonsantongigen hebräischen Wurzeln," ZIMC CNIV (1964) 16-58. In Akkradian, "Geer's 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. § 111). An interesting study which is not yet adequately determined is the extent to which each language alters Proto-Semitic words to fit its own sound patterns, as Akkradian appears to do most of the time, as opposed to the cases where the words of the offending type are merely discarded entirely from the lexicon.

47. Cf. sunq, sunq, and baqq.

48. This includes those items with a good Sumerian etymology as well as words assigned by some to the Mesopotamian predecessors of Sumerian. For which see most recently A. Salonen, "Zum Aufbau der Substrate alten Mesopotamier" (Helsinki, 1969) pp. 97-117. For the Sumerian loanwords sumerischen Lehensherrn Assyrerischen (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] 58-86), not all words common to Sumerian and Akkradian can be assumed to be of Sumerian origin.

49. Fransen's Die aramischen Fremdworter im Arabischen (Leiden, 1886; reprint, Heidelberg, 1962) is an excellent philological work but is not free of this flaw.

50. Nocurable examples are kasp, "silver," immeru, "sheep," and gand, "seed." 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 Akkradian
explanations which must be considered. In the case of grammatical borrowings, distribution is often the only clue. A final cause 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. 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.

The problem of cultural 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 sive Akkadian-Aramaic words whose status as loans is listed as under-Aramaic cognates which are to be found in the Biblical Hebrew lexicon, a cautious.

52. Cf. Weinreich, Languages in Contact, p. 54.
53. See, e.g., §5 bbb.
55. There were certainly sedentary Amorites along the Upper Euphrates and its tributaries alongside the other semi-nomadic peoples of the desert.
56. Though that city itself may not always have been in Amorite control, the same cannot be denied for the other important settlements in the river valleys (contra Buccellati, Amorites, pp. 246 ff.).
The Problems of Akkadian-West Semitic Contact

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 a lineal descent, the Aramaic language was strongly influenced by the language of its predecessors. Thus, I shall henceforth use the term "Amarite" 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 Aramaic 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

62. Some argument continues over whether or not the West Semitic, Aramite, names differ from the names of the OB period (cf. Bucellati, Amorite, pp. 10 f.), but other divisions, especially on a synchronic level, are undetermined.
63. The Ugaritic names are collected in Paul Goldschen, Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit (Rome, 1967). First steps toward a comparison with Aramaic were taken by Liverani, in RGA XXXVII, 65-76.
64. Clearly more work needs to be done, but based on those studies alone the descendancy of an Amorite dialect. The non-onomastic lexical material discussed by Noht and Edzard (see n. 59) is inconclusive, and there are no objections on grammatical grounds. Albright, for example (ANB, fasc. 31, 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. 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-Baladan in 722. 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.

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

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 (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," JAOS LXXXIII [1963] 108.) Might there also be morphological or other, in the infrequent noun forms with a final double consonant (e.g., itanna, itanu, plakku, etc.) fall in this category.

71. In general see Brinkman, Political History, pp. 260 ff.

72. According to Dr. Israel Ephraim, who has made extensive study of the history of Semitic names, previous hypotheses concerning the Chaldean names with South Arabian tribes (cf., e.g., T. C. Mitchell, [1969] 113 f.) can no longer be maintained. The most recent and important consideration of dealing with a word such as apkallu (see Chap. II, §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.

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 from 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.

EASY 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 word unambiguously in this category: "eakallu, "palace." The occurrence of hkl 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 reborrowed. 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). 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 e-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.


74. Except for 3MA 461 and 3MA 463, for which see Chap. II, s.v. šakku.

75. Except for the possible occurrence of aburr, "steward," as nhr.1 in the Akitawadda inscription; see Franz Rosenthal, ANET (2d ed.) p. 499, n. 1.

76. A. Falkenstein, Das Syrische, 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.

 kıtuš, "flax," "linen." ktn—Neither the West Semitic word for linen, flax, ki Attān, nor the words for tunic, kikūtu, kuttûn, etc., are unquestionably derived from Akkadian. 77 The old Akkadian word for linen is kıtuš, 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 (ki Attūnu, "linen," "linen cloth"), perhaps as an Aramaic loan. 79 The relationship with the Old Assyrian woolen garment kutānu (AHw. qutānu) is uncertain. 80

kussû, "throne," "chair," ksû, ksr=kurs̄y—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 gusgu₂₄₂. 81 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, and a Semitic etymology is not impossible. 82

The noun form is unusual for Semitic, however, and so perhaps kussû is a foreign or substrate word. 83 The single suggested Akkadian parallel to the Aramaic (or 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

sipru, "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 sipru (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, spr, and spr, uncertainty still remains. 86

āgīlu, "shekel," ˤā/q/l=q/l—The root q/l, "to weigh," is certainly Proto-Semitic, as the noun ˤāq/l, "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 l in Ugaritic and Aramaic shows, it was not a complete borrowing. The frequent Egyptian Aramaic spelling ˤāql (instead of q/l), abbreviated ˤāl (also in late Mesopotamian Aramaic) probably represents an historical spelling rather than a borrowing of the Akkadian (or Hebrew) form.

82. Cf. A. Salonen, Die Měbel des alten Mesopotamien (Helsinki, 1963), p. 94.
83. Further support for the foreign origin of kussû can be found in the unusual Ugaritic spelling kusu (cf. Ut, p. 412b) with the sibilant š reserved usually for foreign words.
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, Ḫarību, "battle," have not been included if they were 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 Qur'ān texts were thoroughly scrutinized. For the other dialects the standard lexical tools served as a first step, with reference to the texts involved when 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 are part of the corpus of Akkadian appearing in transiterated 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.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-Macbuch system of transliteration for Mandaeic,4 to prevent confusion the same system used for the other Aramaic dialects will be used here for Mandaeic.5 Biblical Hebrew forms are transcribed.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 Zimmermann (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

1. The dialectal divisions of Akkadian and their abbreviations are those used by the CAD. In general see CAD § 2 for the divisions, but the CAD uses Standard Babylonian (SB) instead of von Soden's Junghubellinische (J). 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.

2. See MD, pp. vi, 24, pp. 528 ff.

3. Where necessary in reference to specific MD citations the Drower-Macbuch 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.

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

5. 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 previ-
ously made. It must be stressed here that this study is not previ-
ously made, but on the contrary is intended to be used together with the available thesaurus, either of Akkadian or of Aramaic, to which it is meant to be a dictionary. 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 re-
cent discussions of the word in purely Akkadian contexts which are irrelevant to our study when the word is already treated.

More complete Assyrian dictionaries will be given for those lexical entries whose Assyrian etymologies are easily found in the dictionary, or wherever phonetic considerations, such as Aramaic /f/ for Akkadian /m/ make a loan obvious.

**LEXICAL LIST**

abbatu, "a father's legal status," in the expression abbatu šabatu, "to intercede"-Syr. ปา IDC, "pacifism," used with the verb ปา. The Hebrew reflex of this expression may occur in the Manual of Discipline, col. 111, 9, at the conclu-
sion of a curse: נפ הלח בים bN byl wN "the sacred places."

abulû, "city gate"-Palm. ปา; Syr. ปา; Mand. ปา; BT ปา, ปา; rare elsewhere in JAR. Targ. Jer. 50:26, Targ. YH Dt. 28:52, and (Hebrew) Tosefta B. Mets. XI, 10. This, however, is taken by many ancient and modern scholars to be this word (cf. Greek, Syriac, and Saadijah Gaon). The etymology of abulû is unknown. It was used in Semitic alongside the more usual KAAP- and in the spelling a-bul'a (ZUR)-a, and this is probably borrowed from Akkadian. That it was most certainly not a part of the early North West Semitic vocabulary is shown by the Amarna gloss א-א-א (EA 244:16).

abburrû, "pasture"-Mand. بالمengage (MD, p. 3); cf. Syr. ܐܒܘܪܬܐ (exhumeted); Syr. בך, "reedy grass"; hardlylays. The modern "rural places."


**ABBREVIATION**

*abbu, "a kind of tool" (lex.)-Syr. ܒܥܵܪ, "ruler," "scraper."

**ADDNOTES**

adè, "treaty"-Sefire ܕܬ (pl. tantum). The relationship and etymology of the Akkadian and Aramaic have often been dis-
cussed, but no conclusive results have been reached. Nevertheless, the etymological and phonetic evidence, as well as the occurrence of adè in late Akkadian only, almost certainly pre-
cludes an Akkadian origin for this political term.

agammu, "marsh"-BH ܐܪܓܡܐ, BH, BT, Targ. Prophets, Syr., Mand. ܐܘܓܡܐ, "reed pool." This word, of unknown etymology, is foreign in Akkadian as well as in the other languages.

agammu, "bowl"-BH, Common Ar. ܙܓܓܐ (ㅈ). 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.

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

aguru, "kiln-fired brick"-Bab. docket ܓܘܠ(?) in: Syr. ܓܘܠ in: Arab., Persian. Though this etymology is unknown, this architectural term was almost certainly borrowed from Akkadian.

akutû, "a red glow in the sky"-Syr. ܟܟܢܝܬ, "storm," and BT ܟܟܢܝܬ, "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, add a and add b should be taken as one word; as in AHw.


13. Z. p. 33; LS, p. 4; KBL (3d ed.) p. 11.

14. Z. p. 47; AHw, p. 16. Probably ܝܪܐ occurs as "hire" in agra in Ugaritic in E Aqht 213 ("hired woman" [see H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Myths, Epics, and Legends," AMET (2d ed.) p. 155] rather than "employer" (UP, p. 351)). This common Semitic root apparently shifted in meaning in some Hebrew dialects and was replaced by שָׁרָה.

15. Z. p. 31; LS, p. 35; AHw, p. 17; S. Fransen, Die aramischen Fremdwörter im Aramischen (Leiden, 1886; reprint, Hildesheim, 1962) p. 5. The Babylonian docket is in L. Jacob-Rost, Helmut Freydan, "Spätbabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus Babylon mit arabischen Beischriften," Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Forschungen und Berichte, Vol. XIV, Archäologische Bei-

16. LS, p. 320; Aruch IV 224b, Additamenta, p. 222.
amāru, "brick pile"—Bt ʾmar, 17
amēlūtu, "(female) household slave" (CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 61)—The reading ʾmēlē in the Babylonian docket DEA, No. 91: l is doubtful in the light of collation of the tablet.

amurrīgūnu, "jaundice"—Syr. ʾmurqan, "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 ʾwrq, "yellow." 18

amurrīnu, "west"—Bt ʾwrq ḫ 19
Arab. ʾwaršin, "a type of pigeon"—Bt ʾwaršin, Syr. ʾwaršin > ana, "to"—Some scholars have suggested that the common BT preposition ʾa, "on," is not, as usually interpreted, derived from the preposition ʾal 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. ʾpkl. 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

18. Z. p. 49; LS. p. 310.
20. Z. p. 51; LS. p. 186; AW., p. 46.
22. Z. p. 29; DISO, p. 21; AW., p. 58; R. B. Gordon, "Asyriologische und arabische Misskellen," Or. n.s. XXVI (1957) 8 ff.; J. Teixidor, South Arabian Tripod Offering Saucer Said to Be from Uru, Iraq XXXI (1969) 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

appārī, "reed marsh"—JPA and M. pr. "marshy meadow." MS Kaufmann, one of the most reliable of Mishnaic manuscripts, gives the vocalization appārī for the Hebrew. This term was originally a Sumerian (derived from a substratum?) loanword in Akkadian. 23

appittī(mma), "accordingly(?)", "certainly(?)"—This modal particle occurring only in NB and LB has been compared to two problematic words in Imperial Aramaic: ʾapyū (AP, No. 26:9) and Ṿptm (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 context better than "sicherlich" (AW., 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 Ṿptm has possible Persian etymologies and is probably not connected with the Akkadian word. 24

apsu, "deep water"—see below, p. 152.
aptrī, "window"—Bt Ṿpt, "balcony." Cf. as well appārī in bīt appātī, "a type of building with a columned portico and a balcony above." 25

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

argamānu, "red purple wool"—Common Ar. Ṿargwān > Arab. Ṿargwān, "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

25. Z. p. 32; Addicamenta, p. 61.
26. Z. p. 26; A. L. Oppenheim, "Akk. arad ekallī = 'Builder,'" ArOr. 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 a represent the original form 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. ḫrāb, "money(?)", reflects this word, for it presents a phonetic as well as a semantic problem, especially inasmuch as a correct Mandaic reflex occurs as ḫwāb. 27

* arshu, "half-brick"—Syr., Jr., ḫwāb; MH ḫḫwāb. 28

* arittu, "canal"—BT, Targ. Onk., and Targ. Psalms ḫqyw. Although this word occurs only in Neo-Babylonian, both its distribution in Aramaic and its presumed etymology from warittu (k word) indicate that it is a loanword. 29

* ḥru, "decoy bird"—Hapax Syr. ḫqyw, hapax BT ḫqyw. 30

* arasnu, "groats"—Syr. ḫrns. This is almost certainly the same word as MH ḫrns, but it is not clear whether the Hebrew represents the continuation of an old form of this culture 31


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 arsu (arshu) > ḫhr (/T)/ or from the Aramaic absolute form before the sound law final <(con)trual> by analogy with ḫhr ḫhr is also feasible. (Is this the correct etymology as well? < arshu, "moon(?)"> The forms with y' in Jewish Aramaic are either incorrect textual variants (cf. the dictionaries) or Hebrewisms. (Cf. Additamenta, p. 66.) There may be confusion between two words here, however, for a development into "carrying pole" (Targ. Onk.) is unlikely, lexikalisch," ZAW II (1882) 70 ff. For ḫhr in Arqar (Ed.) see Chap. IV, n. 53.

29. J., p. 15; LS, p. 45b; AHw, p. 71; and most recently D. Weissberg, "Some Observations on Late Babylonian Texts and Rabbinic Literature," HUC A (1968) 76 f., who however, overlooks the Syriac (Arqar 69,4) which gives a clear description of the ḫhr as something which "saves itself when the vision of arshu is unknown, it is well attested in Akkadian, while its limited Aramaic distribution strongly to a loan. 32

30. word of uncertain etymology, or is an assimilation (orthographic?) to BH ḫrāb. 31

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

* askupp/atšu, "threshold," "doorsill"—Syr., JPA, CPA ḫqwpt > Arab. ḫkwat; Mand. ḫqwpt; JPA ḫqwp; Mand. Targ. Prophets ḫqwpt > Eastern Neo-Aramaic ḫqwpt/ţu; the Heb. and Jr. forms ḫwp and ḫwp may be the result of assimilation to the form of the BH cognate ḫqwp and ḫwp or may be legitimate Hebrew forms. 33

* asmarū, "lance"—please see below, p. 53.

31. Z., p. 56 and AHw, p. 71 (Heb. only); B. Landesberger and O. R. Gurney, Practical Vocabulary of Assur," ASO XVIII (1957-58) 339; Aruch VI 271.

32. Z., p. 14; LS, p. 52b; AHw, p. 74; KBL, p. 91; Wagner, p. 30. The meaning of the Biblical Hebrew term is uncertain. M. Eilenboim's suggestion (Foreign Words in the Old Testament [London, 1962]) p. 41) that it refers to a glas is highly unlikely, for the passage refers to Iron Age Babylon, not Bronze Age Palestine. The lexical term asšțu, "part of a building," is apparently to be differentiated from asšțu. With the former compare Syr. ḫqwp (asšțu), Targ. Proph. ḫqwp, and Syr. ḫqwp? (asšțu); cf. J. Levy, Chaldaic Wörterbuch über die Targumim (Leipzig, 1918) II 122 "projection of a wall."

33. Z., p. 31; LS, p. 35a; AHw, p. 74; A. Saloner, Die Toren des alten Mesopotamien (Bensis, 1961) p. 57. According to L. B. et al., "Lexikalische Missellen," in Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstag von David Hoffmann's (Berlin, 1914) pp. 119 f., and A. Kuhrt, Aruch, s.v. ḫwp, "asšțu" is "stil" and ḫwp is "linien," suggesting that the latter is a legitimate Hebrew form. Note that a borrowing from Assyrian is precluded, for the form there is askupp. 34


35. Z., p. 49; LS, p. 31; AHw, p. 76; KBL, p. 71; Wagner, p. 27.
ašītu, "sanitary"—see below, p. 153.

aškāpu, "leatherworker"—Hat. No. 212 (?)[8p] (Sumer XX [1964] 79); Syr. 3[8p]; BT 2[8p]; MS (Tosep..h), JPA (8p); BT 2[8p]; Arab. 2[8p], sakāš, "shoemaker." 41

ašīlu, "tow rope," "measuring rope"—Eq. 831 (see DISO, p. 27), "area measure"; Syr. 2[8p], BT, Targ. Job (canonical), Targ. Y1, Mand. 2[8p] > Arab. 2[8p], "tow rope," "measuring rope." Though the word itself may well be cognate in Aramaic and Akkadian (cf. Arab. 831, "rush") = Ašīlu 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 Eq. Šum (Demotic n-rn), "concerning (the object of a suit);" MS šum, 2 šum, Syr. (hapax) 8, 8p, "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


The Akkadian may either be a native construction or a loan from Sumerian mu . . . $s^a$; compare Ge dez $jesma$, “because.”

* atappu, “small canal”—Syr. tp, “canal.”
* attalú, “eclipse”—Syr. t'lý, Mand. t'lyy, Medieval Hebrew tly, “the mythical dragon or constellation which causes eclipses,” “eclipse.”


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) “section of a written ten work,” “section.”

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. NH, p. 95b) that the new BN meanings should be the result of a reborrowing from Arabic or that the borrowing from Akkadian should have taken place any earlier than the BN period. That it is still a fairly recent borrowing is shown by the confusion prevailing in Eq. and Ahigur between bâb and trâ. (Note especially the borrowed Akk. phrase bâb ekallâ, twice rendered bb hûkî[a] [11].

mining the origin of the construction NN $mn$, 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 some- what doubtful observation of H. Bauer and P. Landen (Grammatik des Biblisch-Armenischs [Halle, 1927]) p. 350) that this construction seems to have “einer der bedende Bedeutung,” this practice can scarcely be connected with the Old Babylonian usage of Sumerian $mu$-$ni$-$im$ after the name is the regular one in all stages of Egyptian.

44. See F. Rundgren, Über Bildungen mit $f$- und $nt$- Demonstrativen in Semitischen (Upsala, 1953) pp. 19 ff.
45. Z, p. 44; LS, p. 830; NH, p. 86.
48. Cf. the use of Syr. $f$-bâb in the sense of “capitulum (libri)”.

LS, p. 616) and of cárâ as a literary division.

17, 23) and once by trâ $h$ukî[a] [11, 44]). This conflict might well account for the retention of bâbâ only in the East, where the conflict was resolved by limiting the sense of the word trâ (cf. daltu).

* balaggu, “drum”—Syr. plg, “plaggd.”

bârân, “rebel”—BT bârân, “rebel.” One must separate, as Jastrow does, this strictly BT word both semantically and etymologically from the identical Rabinthic 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- $a-\nu$-$u$, suggesting a pronunciation with a y glide.

bârû, “diviner”—Mand. b’ryy, “exorcizer (?).” Unfortunately, the two Mandic attestations are in unpublished texts. One would expect the Mandic form to be b’ryy, however; thus its correct interpretation may well be “foreigner.”

batqâ, “to cut through”—There is no reason to consider BH bedeq, “fissure,” “breach,” or Jârâ, Mand. bdg, “to burst” (let alone the more common Aramaic meaning “to search,” “to re- pair”) as “under strong Akkadian influence.”

48. Z, p. 30; NH, p. 95; DISO, p. 32; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 14; P. Jouon, “Notes grammaticales, lexicongraphiques et philolinguistiques sur le papirus aramäens de Naplouse,” Mélanges de l’Institut International Saint-Joseph XVIII (1934) 17. The Arabic borrowing was probably early, from a dialect still under the influence of Imperial Aramaic. For the limitation of the meaning of trâ, cf. especially Palm. bâb trâw (DISO, p. 32). That bâb was considered indicative of the Babylonian dialect is demonstrated by the story related in BT Nedarim 66c.
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.
50. This etymology has not been previously suggested. On the Jewish forms, cf. M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmudic Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (reprint; New York, 1950) p. 193; Additaments, p. 106 f. For Akkadian, CAD, Vol. B, p. 103. An etymology from bry, “outside,” “foreign,” and there chance similarity to the Akkadian cannot be ruled out; compare NH bdr.
51. MD, p. 50. The old emendation (cf. Z, p. 67) of BH bdym in Isa. 44:25, Jer. 50:36 “diviners” to “brym” is far superior to Driver’s etymology adopted by KBL (3d ed.) p. 105 and M. W. Wachner, “Beiträge zur Aramäischen enfrage in alttestamentlichen Hebräisch,” Suppl. VT XV (1967) 358 (Mari buddum, a military official of some sort, attested nowhere else), but it is by no means certain in view of the military uses of the verb bd in Ugartic, the nouns bd in Phoenician, and bd IV in Hebrew (and the Syriac).
fluence on the semantic development in late Akkadian. If it was a loan from Akkadian, the Hebrew form with די (as against Aramaic ת) and its frequent occurrence throughout the Old Testament would point to a very early loan indeed, which was not in agreement with the nature of the word, which was clearly not borrowed in any juridical sense (see Chap. IV, n. 77).

bēl dīnī, "adversary in court"—Qumran, Syr., Mand., Ar. bēl dīnī, possibly an early calque in Isa. 50:8 bēl mēpt.

Though presumably bēl dīnī 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. Cuquot, "Inscription" bēl pīt. 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.

bēpu (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 bēpu. 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 bēpu in a similar if not identical meaning as a homonym meaning "frying pan." (The Akkadian lexical list entry būtu, "part of an oven," is probably to be connected with the latter.) Note that bīd is found only in Syriac and Western Aramaic and in Assyrian, whereas bēpu is only in Syriac and Babylonian Talmud, suggesting that bēpu may originally be a Babylonian form of the Assyrian and Western bīb. Cf. the hapax OB būtu, a topographical feature.

56. It must be remembered that bēpu and its several related verbal forms (but not only these three?) are generally connected with Arab and Ethiopic bb (cf. LL, p. 265). The Ar. root bēpu could have assimilated to the root bīb of similar meaning, thus accounting for the shift d > t. 57. 2, p. 24; LS, p. 83; ANWR, p. 146; CAD, Vol. 8, pp. 132 ff.; KKL (3d ed.) p. 200; Muffs, Studies, p. 31 n. and p. 196. 58. 2, p. 24; ANWR, p. 119. Earlier suggestions that the word bētu itself and the corresponding verbal root were borrowed from Akkadian (cf. 2, p. 24; LS, p. 145) have been shown incorrect by its common occurrence in Ugaritic. For bēl dīn in Qumran Aramaic see J. T. Milik, "Turfan et Qumran, Livre des Géants juifs et manichéens," in Tradition und Glaube, Festschrift G. W. Kuhn (Gottingen, 1971) p. 124.

59. ANWR, p. 134.
bilibu, "tribute"—BA blw. The BA form is probably a corruption from *bit. Occurring in sequence with ḫlk and mndh, it should be noted, however, that the three terms never occur together in NA, the BA group seems to be a reflex of the threefold Pers. semites represented in LB by the forms liku, bârâ, bharâ. It is thus conceivable that blw is a corruption of the Old Persian lattice term rather than Akk. biltu. None of the attempts to find biltu in any other Aramaic texts or in Hebrew are convincing. The word blw does occur in Jewish Aramaic, but only in the Ezra passages. 60

birtu, "alley"—Syr. bryt, Mand. byyru, Qumran 5Q15 I bryt (conson.). BT, and Targ. Proverbs 1:21 bryt. Jewish lexiconographers have confused this word with others, but its use in streets in a city perfectly parallels Mandaic and Akkadian occurrence. 61

birtu, "citadel," "fort"—Eg., Persepolis, Behistun, BA, Albright's suggested etymology from a root wbr may be correct, but that does not rule out the possibility that we are dealing corresponding to BH bîrâniyyû or (and Jaz. bryntu), both best explained as borrowed from Aramaic. 62

bîtu, "an area of land (requiring a given amount of seed)"—There are similar usages in Aramaic and Hebrew, at least, the Akkadian is limited to Neo-Assyrian, one cannot determine in which language this method of area measurement originated. 63


bubû, see bâ'û.

buknu, "pestle"—Syr., BT (JPA rare) buknû, BH buchû. The etymology is uncertain, but the long u in the Aramaic forms points to a loan (see Phonology, chap. IV). 65

bulûtu, "termite"—Syr. bulûtu, Targ. Proverbs and Job b(w)lûtu. The earlier Akkadian form is bulûtu. 66

burû, "reed mat"—Syr., burû, pl. burû, Mand. (b)burû, BT burû, > Persian bûrû. 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 Mandae also have the form burû. 67

bûsinu, "lamp wick" SB, NA—Syr., JPA, Sam., CPA bûsûn. 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 g. 68

dâbabû, see bêt dábûbi.

dajjâlu, "scout," "inspector," (attendant?)—BT dyâlu, "constable" hardly > Ar. ṭayyel, "to walk about." The AG and von Soden differ as to the meaning and origin of the Akkadian, found only in the later dialects. 69

daltu, "door"—Eg. dâl, pl. dâlûn; BT, Ḥār. Ónk., and Targ. Hagiographa dâlû, Sam. dâlû; Mand. dâû, dââû. The excellent suggestion of Zimmer's relating the Aramaic form dâlû to the necessary Assyrian reflex of dâlû : dawû has been less widely accepted than some of his more unlikely associations. 70 The phonetic correspondence is perfect, and this etymology is far superior to a derivation from the root duš, "to thresh," "to tread." Interestingly the old Semitic word dâlû occurs in Aramaic only in the Sam. and Y. Targums, as a translation of BH deleq. 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. 68. Z. p. 35; LS, p. 63; AHw., p. 141; CAD, Vol. B, p. 348. 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 "echt akkad."). 70. Not cited in DEDO or AHw. 71. Z. p. 30; Additamenta, p. 151; E. Y. Kutscher, Words and Their History (Jerusalem, 1961) p. 25. The Mandaic forms could represent new formations after assimilation of the word dawu to the root dâlû. Note the
dannatu, "valid tablet"—dnu, passim in Assyrian endorsements. It has been suggested that Nabatean tɔr, "valid document," is a calque of the Assyrian form.

According to CAD, Vol. D, p. 99a, the word derives from the Akk. adjective dannu, "strong," but this etymology is by no means Ugaritic as a container for bread. For the reading dannu compare Mand. ḫn, "primal matrix."

dappu, ("wooden") board—Syr., Jbr., and ḫn ḫp(?) > 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 EBA ṭp). In OB one assumes that dappu, too, is a Semitic 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 Semitic form? Taken as a whole, the evidence suggests that in the case of dappu we are dealing with a very old loanword in Aramaic, which, after independent development in Aramaic, was re-borrowed into Akkadian.

dibbu, see above, s.v. bēl dabāši.

diqrū, "bowl"—BT ḥw(?) > ḥw, "jug." As long recognized, the phonetic similarity between the names of the common household modern Mandaic use of the verb meaning "to enter" (MG, p. 109). For Sum. ḥw > ḥw note MG, p. 107. 72. Z, p. 19; AP, p. 32; Muffs, Studies, pp. 102 ff., 208. AP, No. 10:23 ḫnw, which Muffs (p. 184) terms the "most conclusive proof of the is not unquestionably a form of this word. It may just mean "this"; cf. MG ḫnw in Esther 9:29. 73. Z, p. 33; LS, p. 159; CAD, Vol. D, p. 99a; D. Weisberg, in UGCA 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. 1096; C. Conti-Rossini, Chrestomathia Aramaica Accadialis (Rome, 1931) p. 159. The Mand. hapax ḫnw ḥw>ἐρξν (var. ḥw?) may be correct (with ḥw > ḥw before a labial) or corrupt. On the variability of vowels in CVC signs in Sumerian, see W. W. Hallo, review, BIOr. XVIII (1961) 60.
emêdu—in NB imîti emêdu means to estimate and impose a tax on a garden or field (cf. CAD, Vol. 1/3, p. 1230), deriving from the old Akkadian usage of emêdu in the sense of “to impose (taxes).” As Kutscher has shown, MH Akk. “to estimate,” “to evaluate,” and its derivatives must be borrowed from this Neo-Babylonian technical term. The BT forms 3md and 3mdn7 most probably derive from the Hebrew usages, though a separate development from Akkadian cannot be excluded.87

In Sys. 3md means “to flee,” which is clearly derived from the well known idiomatic usages of Akk. emêdu in the sense “to take refuge,” “to flee to.”

Erib ili, see below, p. 153.

erēš, “tenant farmer”—JAR. and RH (Western), Sam. ārya (rarely ārya) Arab. ārris; Sam. āra, āra, “to work.” According to the CAD, Vol. 1/3, p. 54a the interpretation “tenant farmer” can no longer be upheld after the Old Babylonian 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 $ ś > š shows that this word was borrowed from Assyrian.88 The spellings ārīn are either merely late orthographic confusions or false etymologies from the root āra. The connection between this Akkadian word and the proposed reading /fisra/ in Caqotu, “Inscription,” 1. 3 remains uncertain.

erētu, “earth,” used in the sense “underworld”—This has been suggested as the etymology for Nerab ārra, “sarcophagus” and, although problematic, is far superior to the usual interpretation of the latter as a development from āra, “couch.”

plementary meanings in relation to each other at different periods. For example, see J. T. Milik, “Les papyrus araméens d’Hermopolis et les cultes syro-palmyrénens en Egypte perse,” Bibel XLVII (1967) 355.


80. Z. 40; Franke, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 128; Additamenta, p. 68, Jastrow’s BT form ārra is incorrect (Dictionary, p. 120); see E. S. Rosenthal, “A Contribution to the Talmudic Lexicon,” Tarbiz XI (1970-71) 187 ff. Except for the hapax ērisū, the dictionaries do not list ērisū as a loanword. Since the Aramaic and Arabic forms preserve the long vowel in the second syllable, the borrowed form must have been ērisū and not ērisū as the abstract NA form might suggest. Apparently, in spite of CAD, Vol. 1/3, p. 54b, ērisū, as a borrowed Babylonian term, is to be found in NA in the spelling ērisū.
It seems, however, that the correct interpretation of the Aramaic is yet to be found.\(^9\)

- esitu, "mortal"—BT \(\text{גנבר} \), JPS, Syr. (lex.) \(\text{גנבר} \),
Eastern Neo-Aramaic \(\text{sitz} \).\(^{90}\)

Another word for mortal, the hapax Targ. Y II \(\text{מסי} \) (not in Neofiti!), should be viewed either as a mere orthographic error or as a pseudo-correction of the standard form \(\text{מסי} \). A derivation from the rare Akk. form \(\text{massiku} \) is almost impossible in the absence of the common cognate form.

e\(\text{טמע} \), "ghost"—A reflex of the Akkadian is perhaps to be found in BH \(\text{טמע} \) but certainly not in MH \(\text{טמע} \), JPS \(\text{טמע} \), \(\text{כודטינ} \) 91.

\(\text{טמע} \), "to remove"; in NB "to pay"—BT \(\text{כ hypotheses, a document indicating complete payment and transfer of property.}

89. Proposed by G. R. Driver, in An. Or. VII 49 and "Brief Notes," PEQ, 1945, p. 11; E. Y. Kutscher concurred in "Contemporary Studies in North-Western Semitics," JJS X (1965) 42. Driver’s proof in PEQ, 1945, that \(\text{אֶסֶתְנָה} \) means "grave" is incorrect; however, the lexical passage cited CT X, p. 30 rev. 28-30; cf. CAD, Vol. E, pp. 808b and 809a) only shows that Sur. \(\text{אֶסֶתְנָה} \) can mean \(\text{אֶסֶתְנָה} \), "underworld," as well as \(\text{כֶּסֶתְנָה} \) and \(\text{כֶּסֶתְנָה} \), "grave," and not that the items on the Akkadian side of the list are equivalent.

A cuneiform parallel to Nerab \(\text{טמע} \), whatever its etymology, may actually occur. In a contemporary funerary inscription of an Aramean tribal chief, we find the word \(\text{אֶסֶתְנָה} \) (in a precisely identical context and in a precisely identical cuneiform sign) a meaning "skeleton," or "corpse" is not excluded by the context. This could be the Akkadian equivalent of \(\text{אֶסֶתְנָה} \), "corpse" (a borrowed form), \(\text{אֶסֶתְנָה} \), "skeleton," or "corpse" is not excluded by the context. This could be the Akkadian equivalent of \(\text{אֶסֶתְנָה} \), "corpse," or "skeleton," or "corpse" is not excluded by the context.

- gabbu, "all"—See below, p. 152.

- gam, "a building or section of the temple district reserved for the women of the \(\text{נַדוֹתָא} \)-class"—Syr. \(\text{גמא} \), "harlot." Note that this word is attested only in OB texts primarily from Sippur and in Sb omen texts, which certainly preserve an old tradition; so although this etymology seems certain, the history of the borrowing remains obscure.\(^{93}\)

- gilasu, "barber"—BH, Phoen., and Ar. \(\text{גִּל} \), "barber"; JPS and Syr., "razor." Evidence to determine whether these terms are borrowed or merely cognate is lacking.\(^{94}\)

- gamiru, "(door) bolt"—Mand. \(\text{גמְר} \), "carpenter." Mand. \(\text{גמְר} \), "carpenter." 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 in our texts. If the latter, it could have been taken from a popular term or one used specifically in the context.\(^{95}\)

- ganunu, "living quarters," "bedroom"—Genesis Apocryphon, JAR, and BH, Syr., CPA \(\text{גנֻּנ} \); Syr. and CPA \(\text{גנֻּנ} \), Mand. \(\text{גנֻּנ} \), BT \(\text{גִּנְנ} \), "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 in our texts. If the latter, it could have been taken from a popular term or one used specifically in the context.\(^{96}\)

- gassyu, "stake"—There is no reason to connect this with BT, BH \(\text{גָּסָי} \), "sounding pole," "sounding pole"—JHD, "to feel," "to feel."\(^{98}\)

- \(\text{גָּסָי} \), NA "to come near"—BT, Mand. \(\text{גָּס} \). The NA form seems to be a development of \(\text{גָּסָי} \).\(^{99}\)


95. S. A. Kaufman, in JBL XXXVI 30 f.

96. For the BH, see \(\text{גָּס} \) (3d ed.) p. 36. The meaning of the Mandean is uncertain. The famous Uzasiah plaque (E. L. Sukenik, "An Epigraph of Uzasiah, King of Judah," Tarbiz II [1930-31] 298 ff.) has proven that \(\text{גָּס} \) is "bones," but for earlier comparisons see J. E. Pritchard, "Closest Babylo-aramenian," JBL LXIII (1921) 58.
boring from Jewish Aramaic and not an independent word from the root qtg ($＜qtç). 103

gištu, “log,” “beam”—Eg. ṣfr, ṣwfr, Syr. ṣwr (lex.), kṣwr, Jbr. kṣwr, Mand. (modern form?) kywr. Probably of Sumerian etymology (see gištu). 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

habâl, “earthenware jug”—Mh. BT, Syr. ḫwet (2); Arab. ḥâbiyâh; Ethiopic ḥâbay. The relationship is unclear, but the fact that the Western forms derive from an as yet unattested Akkadian feminine form habatû is unfounded. The attested Akkadian form is rare and limited to Standard and Neo-Babylonian. The Arabic form with “h” also makes a loan through Aramaic unlikely though not impossible (see below, p. 142). No satisfactory etymology has been proposed for any of the forms, and the origin of habâl remains obscure. 105

halfû, “some leather object” rare SB lex. and NB—Syr. ḥwund, “skin bottle.” Cf. also RH ḥwund, “loop” or “knot.” 106

hâmdû, “straw”—AP, No. 15, Kraemig, Brooklyn Museum, No. 2 ḥmû. The etymology of the Akkadian word is unknown, but as it occurs nowhere else in Aramaic, one may safely assume that hâmdû was borrowed in the process of an Aramaic remodelling of the NA phrase ḥmû ḫâlmû hu ḥâlû, “be it straw of splinter,” into ḥmû “ḥd ḫâlû, “from straw to string.” 107


100. MD, p. 91; if this translation of the form qtnp is correct, it represents an assimilation to the verb qtn II; cf. qtnbq. 101. Z. p. 44; LS, p. 137; AHw., p. 293; Fraenkel, Aramäische Fremdwörter, p. 285.

102. This comparison was first suggested by W. F. Albright (BA XVI 180), who incorrectly termed it a loan from Assyrian. Not yet aware of the construct form gištu, he was led into a false etymology. R. Campbell-339, n. 13) also compared the Aramaic with the Akkadian but gave no other I turned up, F. R. Kraus (Terre zur babyloni schen Physiognomik [AFO Bei- nante relationship was slim, though he was not aware of Albright’s proposal. To my knowledge this suggestion has never been re- considered, yet the relationship is obvious, especially since the Ara- maic form is characteristic of Eastern Aramaic. Etymologically, gištu is probably to be connected with Arab. giš, “to sit.”
the evidence points toward a native North West Semitic formation for this word. 108

harurtu, hapax NA "throat"—Syr. ḫṣṣ. The relationship is very uncertain. The Syriac word would have to have been borrowed from an unattested Babylonian form, while an etymology from ḫṣṣ. is not ruled out. 109

* ḫṣṣu, "clay," "sered," "pot"—BA, JAR., CPA ḫṣṣ, Mand. ḫṣṣ. "Clay," "sered," "sered"; MH, BT, Syr. ḫṣṣ, Mand. ḫṣṣ. "Pot," Syr. ḫṣṣ. "Pot," ḫṣṣ, "tub"; Arab. ḫṣṣ, "pottery." It is difficult to determine the relationships among these many forms. The earliest attested meaning of the Akkadian appears to be "sered." The best explanation of the various forms appears to be to consider ḫṣṣu and ḫṣṣ as parallel developments of an old culture word and then ḫṣṣ and ḫṣḥ as loans from Akkadian perhaps from different periods or dialects. 110

baqṣīnu, "axe"—There is no reason to suppose that this old culture word, Ar. baqṣīn (Arab., Ethiopic ḫqṣīn) necessarily entered Aramaic through Akkadian. 111

hassu, "to need," "to desire"—BA, Syr. ḫṣḥ, CPA ḫṣḥ, ḫṣḥ. "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 ḫṣḥ with ḫ in first and third positions, is unusual in Akkadian as it is in Aramaic. 112

* ḫṣḥu, "to pay the ilku"—AD, No. 8:6 ḫṣḥ. 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 ḫṣḥu, "to crush," are also used for verbs meaning "to give," but whatever other values its logograms may have, when equated with ḫṣḥu they only mean "to crush." There is, however, one Neo-Babylonian text in which the verb ḫṣḥu might occur in a precisely identical context. In VAS VI, No. 198:13 we read ḫṣḥu-pa-la-ša (CAD and ANW., s.v. ḫṣḥu, a hapax), but in Neo-Babylonian script PA and ḫṣḥu 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 ḫṣḥ may in fact be continuations of similar Akkadian forms. Compare BT ḫṣḥu and Akk. ḫṣḥu, kinds of beer. 113

hašt, halutu, "pit," "grave"—Compare the Mandala hapax ḫḥlu, the location of the throne of the lord of the underworld.

hašū, "lungs," "entrails"—Mand. ḫšt, ḫšt, ḫšt, Arab. ḫšn, "bowels." These can hardly be cognate since the Akkadian is almost certainly cognate with the word for "chest," Heb. ḫšn, Ar. ḫšn, Arab. ḫšn. Thus a loan is possible.

hāṣu, "to search carefully," "to pay out"—Possibly in the meaning "to examine" in Ezra 4:12 ḫšw; 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 Ostracan, 1. 6, but the reading and the meaning are uncertain. 114

* hazardu, "monetary," "chief magistrate"—AŠšu tablet, No. 4:2; Caquot, "Inscription," "magistrate"; JAR., MH ḫšn, "overseer." 115

hibištu, "cuttings"—Syr. ḫšt, "wood shavings." 116

himētu, "butler," "ghee"—Syr. ḫšt, Targ. Proverbs 30:

113. AD (abridged) pp. 70 f. Cf. also S. Funk, "Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Babyloniens," Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft V (1909) 109, n. 1


115. Z. p. 6; ANW., pp. 138; CAD, Vol. H, p. 165; Kutscher, Words, pp. 47 f. The reading ḫšn < ḫšn < ḫšn < ḫšn < ḫšn is a likely one in the AŠšu tablet 4:2 was pointed out to me by Prof. E. Lipiński; see below, n. 364. Although the origin of ḫšn remains obscure (not from ḫšn, cf. CAD, Vol. H, p. 161b; Geib, MAD, No. 3, p. 136), its limitation outside of Akkadian to the AŠšu Tablet, to the Babyloniizing Syrian inscription, and to late Jewish sources makes a loan quite certain.

116. Cf. p. 213. The Syriac term is not used at all as the Akkadian is. Cf. Arab. ḫšn, "wood."
hīnu, "fatty tissue"—Man., BT (Hull. 49b) hynṯa.118

hīnu, "ship's cabin" (lex.)—AP, No. 26:11 bn, Arab. gīn(?). Persian? This is a culture word of uncertain origin.119

ḥištu, "ditch," "canal"—Syr. ḫirṣu (ḵerṣā), "plank" (supported by columns, cf. I Kings 7:3).121

ḥelahlu, NB "interest"—Syr. ḥwbīl; Mand. ḥwbēl, ḥwbēl; Ṭarg. Onk. and Ṭarg. Hagiōn., BT ḫ(γ)bwbēl. This noun is to be separated from the BH verb ḫbīl, "to seize a pledge," which is not a loan.122

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

117. Z. p. 38; LS, p. 208.
118. Ahw., p. 346. The BT form with ḫ is the form cited in the Aruch; variants have ḫ (see Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 147).
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 ḫṭu as accepted in the CDS, Ahw., and Salonen, Türen was challenged by Röllig, in WZKM LXII (1969) 299 ff.
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. ḫābulī has two meanings, the older "debt" (maintained in means to "borrow.") There is clearly no connection here with the meaning loan transaction. The fundamental element of ḫābulī is, as opposed to Ḫb, is the seizure, not a voluntary pledge, and it should be considered despotic, "to damage." The similarity of the BH noun (only in Ezekiel) to the Akkadian word "interest." Note that they are always spelled defeminately.

ḥīgu, "rung of a ladder" (SB, NB, NA)—Syr., BT ḫwāḏ (JPA also ḫwāḏ). The origin of the term is uncertain, but in light of the apparent borrowing of the word for ladder, similtu, a loan here is not unlikely.124

ḥuru, "reed mat"—Man., BD Ḫwāḏ, BD Ḫwāḏ, BD Ḫwāḏ, BD Ḫwāḏ; Arab. hārdīyā, "reed roof."125

ḥ̃uruṭṭu, hultimmu, "slout," "muzzle"—Syr. ḫwyān, ḫwym, ḫym; Ṭarg. Y ḫwym, ḫwyān. The Akkadian occurs only in Neo- and Late Babylonian; its etymology is unknown.126

igṣu, "wall"—Eq. ṣr, "wall"; Uruk ig-ga-li, "wall" or "roof"; Syr. ḫṣgārār, JAR. ḫṣgār and ḫṣgār, Sam. ḫṣgār, Mand. ḫṣŋ głdr > Arab. ḫṣgār, ḫṣgār, all in the meaning "roof."127 The Egyptian Aramaic word means "wall" is shown by the phrase ḫṣr ḫṣr, "wall to wall," in describing property lines and even more concretely in AP, No. 5:5, where ḫṣr 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—"roof"—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, "Lexikalisches Archiv J. Nachtigals," ZA XLIII (1934) 166 n. 4. The correspondence of Akkadian ḫ to Aramaic ḫ would seem to speak against a loanword relationship here. To be sure, Syrian has hwi, and also ḫwi, corresponding to Akk. ḫwāḏu and ḥwāḏu, but the first is not unquestionably a loan and the dipthong of the second can be explained (see p. 150). In any case Jewish Aramaic has ḫ in these cases, while it, too, clearly has a dipthong in ḫ̃wâḏ, as indicated by the spelling with double wâḏ.
126. LS, p. 256.
127. Z. p. 31; LS, p. 5; Ahw., p. 366; CAD, Vol. 1/2, p. 39: DISO, p. 4. The word is possibly pre-Sumerian. The Old Babylonian text (in two copies), as shown now by MSL XII 201, is to be read: l 6 2 ISI-ia-da-Sub-ba: ḫ̃wāḏ bēl ḫis, "one felled by a roof." (For the constrution see von Soden, GAG Ergänz., p. 12**, citing the old incorrect reading ḫ̃wāḏ ḫṣgār.) G. R. Driver, "The Aramaic Papyri from Egypt: Notes on
ways "fruit" and not "blossom" or "freshness," and Syriac has the cognate to ḫaḥl in the form ḫaḥh₂, ḥaḥh₂, "blossom," alongside of the word ḫaḥd₂, "fruit." In Mandaic we have the opposition ḫuḥ₂, ḥuḥ₂, "fruits," and ḫuḥ₂, ḥuḥ₂, "grape," but the former might possibly belong with Syr. ḫaḥ. The Mandaic form ḫuḥ₂ could mean either "grape" or "fruit," but the context favors the latter. 73

isinnu, "festival"—BHT, Targ. Y and CPA ṣmḥ, "season," "time." This etymology is hardly convincing, but neither are the other proposed etymologies for ṣmḥ. 74

iṣ�u₂, "assumed quota, tax, field (on which iṣ�u work is to be performed)"—BHT ṣippu₂, "tribute"; Persepolis ṣxkr, meaning uncertain; Targ. Isaiah 5:10, Syr. ṣxkr₂, Iraqí and Lebanese Arab ṣkr, ṣḥareh, "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 Persepolis 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 Muzi, 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 restricted almost entirely to Syriac. 75

iṣparu₂, "weaver"—BT (Ab.Zar. 20b) ṣspr, Syr. (lex.) ṣspr₂, ṣspr₂. 76

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 (AÖ 50 Heft XVII [Graz, 1967]) p. 109, n. 52b. The Akkadian is usually considered cognate with Sem. čành, "grape" (cf. Arw., p. 381), which is reasonable, but there are even difficulties with this: cf. Ug. ṣmḥ and the unique to Akkadian hāḥbū, "to sprout luxuriously." The nasalization "nū" is found in Hat. ṣnūm < ṣnūlp. 77


135. Z. p. 38; LS, p. 52; AHW., p. 399; KBL (3d ed.) p. 92; A. Frayha, A Dictionary of the Non-Classical Vocabulary in the Spoken Arabic of Lebanon Collected and Annotated (Beirut, 1947) p. 97; Persepolis, p. 54. For ṣxkr in Targ. II Esther 1:3, see Addicamenta, p. 70. Persepolis ṣxkr is hardly to be related to ṣxkr, "intoxicating drink;" nor is there any reason to consider AKK. ṣḥuru, "beer," to be etymologically cognate to Ar. ṣxar, Heb. ṣḥxr, etc. (apparently contra Bowman, in Persepolis). 79


* ištaru, ištartu, "goddess"—Magic bowls ܡܕܢܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ Mand. ܝܫܬܘ, Syr. ܫܬܐ.138

* ištēn, "one"—Though this suggestion was long ago shown to be incorrect, the Akkadian form is still often cited as the origin of BH ʾṣṭy in the word for "eleven." The Ugaritic and South Arabian evidence leaves absolutely no doubt that all these terms are merely cognate. The Eqg form ʾṣṯy 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. կլեն>, "mesh," "network."

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

* ʾṣṯqti, "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 ig ʾqti. In any case there is absolutely no evidence to support the theory.

* Glossen, "OIZ VIII (1905) 385. This word was also previously read in the Babylonian docket DTA, No. 96: звуч, corresponding to the cuneiform za rāšt-iṣṭar.

* ʾṣṭ, p. 45; LS, p. 38; AHw., p. 399; CAD, Vol. I/3, 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 ʾšt-i-tu-a-na and ʾšt-čt-i-na," ArOr. 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 Eq. see DISO, p. 224.

* 140. Z, p. 15; AHw., p. 403; ND, p. 42; M. Lidszbarski, Das Johannes-Buch der Mandār (Giessen, 1915) p. 155, n. 2.

* 141. Z, p. 70; LS, p. 827; KBL (3d ed.) p. 99. For the Akkadian see GAG § 72b. The Aramaic form with final y is limited to Syriac and Targums Onkelos and Jonathan. Thus, one may assume that the form with ʾ was the Imperial Aramaic form, showing a remnant of a final long vowel or diphthong (cf. GePers timeon).
kalanuku, "storehouse," "grain silo"—BT ḵläḵ2 (correct variant of ḵläḵ). 146

kalašu, "hook?"—Mand. ḵw̱p₂, "hook." The Akkadian occurs only in one broken context. 147

kamara, "a fish"—BT, Targ. 51, Targ. Hagiog., 51, ḵw̱p₂, 51, ḵw̱p₂, ḵw̱p₂, 51, Phraz. 51, 51, 51, "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

kăṉgu, "to bow down"—Greenfield derives BT ḵw̱g̱, "to contract," "to shrink," from this. His suggestion must be considered rather unlikely, for ḵw̱g̱ is clearly just another by-form of the more normal BT form ḵw̱g̱, Mand. ḵšā₂. 149

kannu, "a large vessel"—Mand. ḵnp₂, "vessel." This meaning 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. ḵn₄, Syr. kāṉna₄, etc. 150

kannu, "brazier"—Palm. kānnu, Syr. kānnu₂, BT kānnu₂, Mand. ḵmēn² > Arab. kānān. 151


149. J. C. Greenfield, "Studies in Aramaic Lexicography II," JAOS LXXII (1962) 296. The original form of the root is ḵg̱ (Akk. ḵp̱ḵḇq̱). We must posit the development ḵg̱ > Proto-Babylonian Aramaic q̱g̱ > ḵw̱g̱, ḵw̱q̱, and q̱w̱g̱ as dialectal variants. BT ḵw̱q̱, "cluster of dates," probably represents a form derived from a related root (compare Syr. ḵg̱), and hardly derives from hapax Akk. ḵšā₂, "pressed," said of dates (for which see Landsberger, Dace Pala, p. 54, n. 188).

150. Z. p. 33. The relationship between what appears to be a re-
duplicated form of this word, kānkānu, and Mand q̱ṉq̱ is uncertain. The Ak-
kanaku seems originally to mean "stand" but is also used as a "storehouse
for beer." The Hebrew word means a large vessel in the cellular for liq-
uids. Complicating the situation is Ug. ḵ̄ṉ̄ḵ̄̄, also a vessel for liquids, al-
nten Mesopotamian," Baghdader Mitteilungen II (1964) 108. The Akka-
dian, whose older (or Babylonian?) form is kāṉnu, may be a loanword from
Sumerian KI.RE, 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. kānnu, p. 115.
kiššu, "bundle of reeds"—BT kyš, "bunch."165
kukku, "cake"—Syr., Mand., BT kwk;166
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 kfr (Heb. and Arab. kfr), which has a corresponding Sum. form gur. The latter may be an old culture word and cannot conclusively be proven to be a Sumerian loan-word.168
kusî2u (AHw., kusțu) 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(p)â >169
kusțu, "garment"—Syr. kswyt, "hood." The root is common, but the unusual form of the Syriac suggests a loan.170
kuspu, "residue of ground dates"—BT kwk;171
kutallu, "back of the neck," "backside"—Syr., Mand. kwâp, "ship's stern" > Arab. kwâl; BT kwâly (džûny), "back." This is to be separated from the word "wall," occurring regularly in Akkadian (kutum), common in western Aramaic (koğal), late Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (kôgel), to be considered a native Aramaic word, lost in eastern Aramaic, whereas it was replaced by Akkadian words such as asṭu and igštu.172

160. Z. p. 68; LS, p. 120; F. Rosenthal, Die Sprache der palmyrenischen Inschriften und ihrer Stellung innerhalb der Aramäischen Sprachen (München, 1963) p. 14; E. Y. Kutscher, in Erstes Israel VIII (1967) kimânu. Kutscher's treatment still leaves several points unclear. What to overcome this difficulty merely by citing the Akkadian as ḵigimânu, similar to Ñöideke's ("Palmyreneische Inschriften," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 26 [1927]: Ass. > koğâ (absolute). This derivation considers the BT form found by view of the frequent historical spellings of Nabataean, as an historical form, and the immediate model of Heb. kwk.
162. Z. p. 46; LS, p. 334; AHw., p. 479; KBL, p. 1086. Is this the
163. Cf. LS, p. 339. The etymology for kippatu proposed by M. Braumann, "ADD. Kippatu(m) pl. kippat(m) and Ethiopic Kāfār," JCS XXI (1968-69) 85 ff., is unconvincing.
...
māhāzî, "architect," has not yet been discovered, so one must reserve judgment on the nature of the relationship. The general semantic similarity between Akk. māhāzu and Ar. qbl, both originally meaning "to stand over against," requires further study. Both occur in their original sense in similar juristic usage, and both become the common word for "to receive." 185

māhāzu, "major town," "city"—Palm., Syr., BT (and possibly Targ. Onk. Num. 22:39) mōhrā, Mand. mōhrā, 2, "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 BA, Targ. Onk., JPA, and Nab. māhāz 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 : kā [mā-hā-[zil : ma-aḥ-ḥa-sil]. 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 Maḥādū shows the reflex of the etymologically correct q). The later Ar. māḥāz, "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 māḥāz, "harbor." 186

mahārat elippu, "ship's bow"—Mand. mōhrā, 187

makkasu, "a kind of date"—Nks appears in an unpublished Babylonian docket in the British Museum. 189

malkū, "as much as"—Porten and Greenfield and Kutscher interpret Hermopolis I.7 mlw in this fashion, retaining the reading of the editors but interpreting it differently. Milik's reading, hilw, seems preferable, however, on both syntactic and paleographic grounds. The phrase kṣ̣nt(e) hilw is previously known from Imperial Aramaic. 190

mahātū, "sailor"—Common Ar., BH, Arab. māḥātū. 191

manū, "nina (weight)—Assyrian weights (CIS II, Nos. 1-15) mnh; AP, No. 26:17 (pl.) mnw; BA mnw; BH mnw > MF. Jär., Syr. mny; Mand. mny > perhaps Arab., Greek, etc. Most scholars now consider Sum. MA.NA to be an old loan from Akk. manū, 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 forms in the various dialects also point toward a loan here. 193

manzar, "(star) position"—BH mazzaliot (pl.), RH. Jär. mazzal, "planet," "constellation," "lucky"; CPA mazzal 2 (pl.), "stoixela"; Syr. mazzal 2, mazzal 2, "sphere," "heavenly zone;" a (see Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 782, and now Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 611). For makkassû/UCU see Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 21. Although the Mandaic term unquestionably means "boat," some of the commentators took the tamašû word to mean "mâst," which Salonen (Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 8) Die Landfah- zuke des alten Mesopotamien (Helsinki, 1951) p. 134; cf. 2. p. 32) thinks is from makhût, "pole," Zimmer (Z, p. 32) and von Soden (AWP, p. 591) compare this latter word with the rare Syr. akhûwa, "parapet," a connection which is uncertain at best. 188

British Museum No. 82.9-18.403, dated to Darius 19. 189


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 "m" in this text when compared with the rather uniform shape of "m," the reading hilw, in my opinion, is much to be preferred. Whatever the correct reading, however, there is probably no connection with Akk. malkū, especially in light of CPA l-mlw d-.

191. Z. p. 45; LS, p. 191; AWP, p. 592; Wagener, p. 76.


mand. mnu₂₃₄₅, "constellation," "star of destiny" (perhaps the origin of Arab. manzil, "lunar phase").

mālātu, OB (oomens), SB, NA, "burnt offering"—AP, No. 33; 10 mālū. Although the root is common in Aramaic (see, too, mālūn), this isolated and unusual Aramaic form would appear to be a borrowing from Akkadian.

mār bīlā, LB "administrator," "steward"—Eq., AD, AR bīlā; BT and BM bn bīlā. Both the Akkadian and Aramaic are calques from Iranian.

marru, "spade"—Sy., BT mr > Arab. marr, Egyptian mr, late Greek μάρτα, Latin mappa, French marre.

maršu, maršu, "sickness," "trouble" (root mrp)—mand. māwr, "trouble." 198

māšāhu, "to measure;" māšāhu, "measurement."—A careful analysis yields the conclusion that the root māš, "to measure" (Arab. māsh) is the native Aramaic word for this activity. 199

māškanū, "pledge"—Nab. māškūn, vb. māškūn; AR. and māškūn(2), vb. māškūn; Syr. māškūn, vb. māškūn. 200


195. AP, p. 126; DISO, p. 165.


197. Z, p. 41; LS, p. 400; AHw., p. 612; Adadatmā, p. 266; Salonen, Agricultura, p. 118.

198. Previously unrecognized. The Mandaeic has no other convincing etymology, and the development māš > māšan > māš > māšāhu is identical to that shown in manšalū > manšalut ā > manšalū > māšāhu.

199. Z, p. 22; E. G. Kraelinger, The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri (New Haven, 1953) p. 163. In LS, p. 406, we find the suggestion that māš might derive from the Akkadian form of an original māš. Ar. māš, "to stretch," but there is absolutely no evidence for a root other than māš (as in Arabic and Hebrew, for which see J. C. Greenfield, The Etymology of "Māšāhu," ZAW LXXII (1965) 90 ff.). The common Akkadian and Hebrew root for "measure" is mādā, which does not occur in Aramaic, so māš 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 māšāhu in Kraelinger, Brooklyn Museum, No. 4:12 and No. 13, it is definitely not a singular absolute and hence cannot be used to show treatment as a foreign word.

200. Z, p. 18; LS, p. 776; H. Petschow, Neubabylonisches Pfandrecht (Berlin, 1956) p. 52 ff. Although in this meaning the Akkadian term is mātu, "country," "land"—Adon, 1. 9 (KAI, No. 266). Ahīdū, 1. 36 mē₂. "country," "land"; Syr., BT Mē₃, "region," "native land," or "town," pl. "small towns," Mand. mātu, "home," "town," pl. "towns"; Neo-Syriac māṭ, "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, mā𝑡(m) I A2) or perhaps even from the use of the Akkadian word in the actual name of regions such as Māṭ-Akkadi, which occurs in Assur Ostraca, 1. 2 as mēṭdy and probably as mēṭ ḫd in Caquot, "Inscription," 1. 2. (cf. mēṭdān in DEA, No. 30:2) 201 māṣāru, "fuller’s mallet"—Syr. māwr. The root is common. Any relationships with the Hebrew and AR. forms listed by Epstein are extremely doubtful.

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 Ahīqār passage. For Sum. mā-da as a loan from Akkadian, cf. AHw., p. 633, and Gelb, MAD, No. 3, p. 168. Kutscher has another suggestion to explain the Aramaic developments (or rather limitations) in the Aramaic forms, but I do not agree that BT mēṭ means "city" or is used any differently from the Syriac. In the text the example gives, Mata ḫqassān, was certainly not a city. Cf. Kutscher 4:20, 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 Syriac source cited in J. Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia V (Leiden, 1970) 21. J. A. Fitzmyer finds me in the difficult Gen. Apoc. 2:23, which he reads ḫw mēṭ ḫwmān (see The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I (2d ed., rev.; Rome, 1971) pp. 94 ff.). Aside from being from a unique occurrence in Western Aramaic this reading is difficult to support both orthographically and syntactically. One would expect ḫw mēṭ ḫwmān. Though not without difficulties, the reading ḫw qdmēn (read ḫw ḫdmēn?) is preferable.

202. LS, p. 379; J. N. Epstein, "Biblicist-Talmudischer," OZ XX (1917) 274 ff.; AHw., p. 627. 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 Akkadian. 203
* mesu, "to wash"—Eastern Aramaic mš², "wash," "rub clean." 204
* midnu, "watercourse"—BT md₂. 205
* misku, "tax"—BH mjes, mššahu: AP, No. 81; Palm. (also
as "tax collector") RH, JPA, BT, CPA, Syr. all mks² (?), "tax," "toll"; Mand. mškš, "tax," "tax collector" > Arabic maksi.
The form mššahu for "tax collector" in Pahlavi and Mandarin possibly may be a loan from Akk. mššatu and not a secondary devel-
opment. The Arabic verb and noun forms appear to be second-
dary, but is the Akkadian verb mššatu without cognates? 206
* mšlu, "flood"—The Akkadian is cognate with, but possibly had some influence on Syr. mšlu (same meaning). On the other hand, the Akkadian word, normally mšlu in Neo-Assyrian, perhaps under Aramaic influence. 207
* mindama, "perhaps"—Imp. Ar. mënî > md₃m, m(y)dm, mįdm, "something." In light of the semantic difference, a relationship between the Akkadian and Aramaic forms is highly unlike-
ly. 208
* misru, "boundary"—Old Ar. mgr, Mšm msr, JAR., Mand.
mšru (note the JAR. plural in -šu), with verbal meanings of mšru "to make a boundary" in JAR. and Mand. and "to stretch" in

203. 3, p. 30; LS, p. 375.
204. The form mšlu, 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. mštur and (incorrectly) bētu (MD = BE). For the present see CAD, Vol. B, pp. 206-7, and R. Borger, Die Inschriften Asshurbaschidons Königs von Assyrien (AFO Beiheft IX [Graz, 1956]) p. 91, n. 11.
206. Z., p. 10; LS, p. 385; AHw., p. 652; Fransen, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 283; KBL, p. 522; Wagner, p. 76; A. Malamat, "The Ban in Mari and the Bible," Biblical Essays (Stellenbosch, 1966) p. 48, n. 23. Malamat points out that in the Bible the mšlu is exclusively devoted to the religious authorities, whereas the Akkadian is purely secular in nature.
207. LS, p. 389.

Syr., Mand. and JAR. 209 The verbal uses seem more at home in Aramaic than in Akkadian, but, as demonstrated by Tadmor, the use of mšr in the Sefire inscriptions alongside the usual North West Semitic term gbel suggests that it is indeed a loan from the common Akkadian term. 210 Syr. mšr, "stocks," appears to be a development from the root mšr and should not be connected with Akk. maššatu, "guard." 211
* mšnu, "matted wool?" (lex.)—Mšm msr, "bedding ma-
terial." Except for the rare SB lexical forms mšru and mšru, the root mšr, "to twist wool," is known only in Mishnaic He-
brew. 212
* mukku, "low quality wool?—The meaning of the Akkadian was established on the basis of MI muku. Is the Syriac form original here? Compare as well Mand. m(?)wκ, "bedding." 213
* mušq, "downy?—The form mušq 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 this history of the 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 cul-
tural institution which it signifies presupposes the devel-
opment of the term which took place in the Babylonian area. 214
* mušq (not mušq), "a soft mass"—Syr., Mand., JAR. mšq, "egg yolk," "brain matter." The ultimate origin of this word is unknown. In Akkadian it occurs only in divina-
tory texts and might therefore derive from Amorite. 215
* mušanitu, "irrigation dam or dike?—BT mšwµy>, "a pile or bank of earth or stones" > Arabic mušanah, "irrigation

209. Z., p. 9; AHw., p. 659. Any relationship with the Semitic name for Egypt remains uncertain. For the Aramaic meaning "rope" compare Lš mššaru, AHw., p. 620, and von Soden, in OR. n.s. XXXIV 19, and see J. N. Epstein, "Stricke und Leinen," NOWJ LXXV (1921) 357 ff.
from Sefire," Sefer Shmuel Yeziv, pp. 397 ff. (Heb.)
211. LS, p. 379.
212. LS, p. 379; D. Weisberg, in HUCA XXXIX 1997.
213. AHw., p. 670; Bennon Landsberger and T. Jacobsen, "An Old Bab-
ylonian Charm against Mššaru," JNES XIV (1955) 19.
215. See the dictionaries: none suggest a loan.
dam.” The spelling of the talmudic form as well as the single western occurrence in Midrash Genissim Rabbah 10:10 are to be considered contaminations from JPA šuynt, etc., “cliff,” "crag." 215

* muṣarṭu, "garden bed"—Syr. mṣrṭ, pl. mṣrṭa; BT mṣrṭa₂, "garden bed"; Mand. mṣrṭa₂, "garden bed," "habitation," "zone." > Arabic muṣārath. The Babylonian Talmudic form is confused in the dictionaries and the editions with mṣrṭ, "plain." The common Mandaeic meaning, “habitation,” probably reflects assimilation to the root ṣrṭ, which appears correctly in the hapax mṣrṭa₂, "habitation," cf. Syr. muṣārā, maṣārū. 217

* muṣāmān, "a dependent class." NA and SB “destitute”—BH, Common Ar. miskān, “destitute” > Arabic, Ethiopic, Italian, French, Portuguese. 218

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

* mutetr, "oven poker"—BT mṭr₂ (var. mṭwṛ₂, mṭyr₂), Syr. mṭr₂, mṭwṛ₂, mṭyr₂. 221

216. A. Salonen, in his excellent study of this word (“Akkad. muṣāntt” = Arab. musanth,” Or. n.s. XXXII [1963] 449 ff., and cf. Agricultura, p. 221), was led astray by his acceptance of the western dictionaries’ interpretation of muṣant as identical to šuynt (based on Rashi); hence, he thought the BT word at best was a related word influenced by Ar. šan, “rock.” Omitting the Akkadian material, a complete study of the JAR 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 muṣant. 217. 2. p. 40; LS, p. 408; Additamenta, p. 273; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 129. Note (AWW., p. 681) that the Akkadian occurs with or without final long vowel. The etymology suggested by J. Lewy, “The Old Assyrian Surface Measure Suqtum,” Analecta Biblica XII (1959) 220 ff. (ESA muṣārū, “foundation”) is not convincing.

218. 2. p. 47; LS, p. 474; AWW., p. 684; Wagner, pp. 79 f. Discussion over the etymology and meaning of the OB muṣāmū (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 AWW. 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.


220. 2. p. 49; Fraenkel, Aramäischen Fremdwörter, p. 265.

221. To my knowledge the connection between the Akkadian and Ara-
* nam/zitz - šērebu
  * nam/zitz, "mash tub"—BT nṣyṛ, Syr. (lex.) nṣyṛ.
  * Arab. nazlyih, 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
  * nappšu, "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 npr, "to blow." Though the root is common Semitic, the distribution of the Syriac, especially the Syriac, indicates a loan for this derived form. 230
  * nappṣu, "beating stick (? )"—BT nṣṣ, "carder," is a qattāl professional formation, while the Akkadian certainly is manpa > nappas. 231
  * nāgīdu, "shepherd"—Rare Syr. nqḍ but well known from Ug. nqḍ and Heb. nqgāḏ. The origin of this word is still uncertain, but Sumerian nagaḍa is certainly a loan from Akkadian. 232
  * nāqātu, nadabāku, "a course of bricks"—BA ndbk; Targ. Prophets mdbk; MH ndbk (rarely mdbk, cf. Jastrow, Dictionary, s.v. mbbk, Dalman mdbk), "brick course," "frame" > Arab. midmak. 233
  * šērebu, Ass. nārabu, "defile"—Syr. nṛb, "peak," "deep valley"; Mand. nṛb, "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

nibzu - nišru / 77

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

*nikassu, "account" > NB/LB "property"—BA nṣyṛ, BH ṅṣin; Eq., AD, Genesis Apocryphon, Bar Kochba Heb., WA, Ḫb., CPA, Syr. all pl. nṣyṛ, "property." 236

nindabī, "offering"—Mand. nndbyi, "offerings." 237

*nqḍ, "libation," "sacrifice" (used commonly of sheep, cf. AHW., p. 793, msg. 4)—Two meanings are connected with this root in Aramaic: Hermopolis nṣyṛ, Syr. BT nṣyṛ, "sheep," and Syr. nṛ (pael), "to libate," and AP, No. 72: 15, 16 ṅqḍ, Mand. ṅqḍyt, ṅqḍ, "libation(s)." In addition Biblical Hebrew has mānqgāḏ, "sacrificial bowl." The verb is certainly the same word 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 "liberate" 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. nqḍ, "eager," "provoke," remains uncertain as does the meaning in Ahīqar, l. 92 of wuṣwah. 238

nišru, "yoke"—Common Ar. nifr 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-
nudunnu, "dowry"—BT ndeny². In BH (Ezek. 16:33) ndny, "a woman's own capital." 245

nuhatimmu, "baker"—MH, JPA, BT (only B. Bat. 20b?) Syr. nhtim²(2). 246

pagulu, "a vessel"—BT gwp². 247

pagumu, "bridge"—Syr. pgw² (pγuada), pgw²; Mand. pgw², pγw²/dd² (and denom. verbs). The Aramaic can only be explained as deriving from an as yet unattested feminine form of paguµ. (For the NB development -st > -st > dd, cf. salantu > sładu). The existence of such a feminine form is confirmed by the NB plural pguada. 248

paḥaru, "potter"—BA, JAR., CPA, Syr. pḥr², Mand. pḥr² > Arab. faḥhr. JAR., CPA and Mandai have pa/ehr, "clay," "sherd," as well. 249

palgu, "ditch," "canal"—NB brick plg². Though the root plg is very common in Aramaic, the common Semitic noun palg, "ditch" or "river," which occurs in Akk., Uq., BH, Arab, and Ethiopic, is not attested elsewhere in Aramaic and must be treated as a loan from Akkadian in this text. 250

paguDu—The wide range of meanings of this verb in the various Semitic languages allows for the possibility of various 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, occ-

245. 2, p. 46; AHw., p. 800. This is the BT term for the institution known in the Mishnah as mīlūq (see s.v. mīlūq). The terms seem to have been confused in some Akkadian sources, but in his study of mīlūq Baruch Levine (in JAST XXXVIII 271-85) mentions our term only in passing (p. 276 and n. 37). In the sense of "a woman's private money" it certainly makes sense in Ezek. 16:33 (cf. BBL, p. 597, which transliterates the Akkadian). The medieval Heb. nāḏān, "dowry" (whence Yiddish nadam) is apparently based on the BT passage.

246. 3, p. 39; LS, p. 525; Additamenta, p. 278; AHw., p. 801. This word is probably of Semitic origin: cf. Weisger, Guld Structure, p. 72. The change of vowels in the Aramaic form can be explained either by assimilation to the qetî participial formation or else by a series of phonetic changes such as: nūhatimm > Ar. nūṭun > nūṭun > nūṭun (by dissimilation).


244. 2, p. 67; MD, p. 301.
cyring a as a westernism in Akkadian (so too the noun paqdu, "official," "appointee"). 251

doqarzu, "to claim"—BT (Aruch) and Gaonic prk. 252

paraku, "dais," "sanctuary"—Hat. prk, prk, Syr. prk, Mand. prk, "altar," "shrine." 253

pararzu—in Akkadian pararzu means "part." Contrary to the opinions of early scholars and the modern Biblical dictionaries, there is no cuneiform evidence that pararzu was ever natively used in the meaning "half-mina," as is Aramaic prs, almost certainly a native Aramaic development. To be sure, alphabetic prs does occur in the Assyrian lion weights, corresponding to an Assyrian /para/; but in light of the lack of cuneiform evidence, this may well have been a short-lived Aramaic loan adaptation in Assyrian. In Aramaic prs is a common term for half of anything. In fact the famous prysn of Dan. 5:25 makes more sense as half-shekels than half-minas. The homograph prs in Panammuwa, l. 6 and in Imp. Ar., a grain measure, is to be connected with the grain measure g?upa: parisi found in Hittoite, Alalakh Akkadian, and Ugaritic alphabetic and cuneiform texts, which, as the Ugaritic spelling with "h" indicates, is of foreign, probably Hurrian, origin. Zimmern's suggested connection between Akkadian uses of pararzu, "to cut," and West Semitic prs, "to make clear," is extremely doubtful. 254


252. E. Y. Kutscher, "On the Terminology of Documents in Talmudic and Gaonic Literature" (Heb.), Tarbiz XIX (1947-48) 125 f. Kutscher in Tarbiz (1952) and E. A. Speiser (Oriental and Biblical Studies, pp. 128 f.) have suggested that the standard meaning of Mh and JS prk (varying in the hphil with Bqr, but hardly because of the Akkadian variation, compare hqy in the Adar ostracon, n. 251): "to be free of controls or ownership and the related noun hqyr are ultimately to be derived from Akkad as well. This explanation seems somewhat forced in the light of Syr. and Mand. prk, "to run wild," obviously the same word.


pararzu—"turban"—Although this is generally connected with Syr. barzanq, "greave(?)," and Mand. barzynq, "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 barzynq, and Mand. barq, "chain," possibly the same as BT prq (var. prstq), all words of clearly foreign, but hardly Akkadian, etymology. 255

pararzu, "a sharp prick"—BH pr (hiphil), "to sting," Syr. pr, "barb," BT and Targ. Proph. pr, "goad," "plowshare." Pararzu 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 Ludlul (BM, p. 44, 1. 101), which hardly suggests that it could have served as the model for a loanword. 256

pašaru, "to loosen," "to solve"—Several scholars have ascribed various Aramaic uses of the verb par 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

pašaru, "table"—Common Ar. ptwr, Arab. ëçfer. The Akkadian is generally regarded as a loan from Sumerian BURUR, an etymology which would require it to be a loanword in Aramaic. This is, however, the only possible Akkadian loanword where Aramaic "e" reflects Akkadian "ã," an inconsistency which must be explained. It is now known that in the second millennium Akkadian "ã" could represent a pronounced [j], 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; AW, p. 836; Addittamenta, p. 24; G. Widengren, Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in partischer Zeit (Cologne and Opladen, 1970) pp. 91 f. The best available explanation appears to be to consider the Mandic 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. AW, p. 837.


258. J. Aro, "Die semitischen Zischlaute (q) ñ, ŋ und s und ihre Vertretung im Akkadischen," Or. n.s. XXVII (1959) 333; von Soden and W. Rollig, Die akkadische Syllabar (2d ed.; Rome, 1967) p. xix; and see
particular word was ever pronounced with [ə], that Sumerian
has such a phoneme, or even that the word BAH.SUR is origin-
inally 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 Akka-
dian and Sumerian and pre-Aramaic.259

pāšu, pašu, "axe"—Syr. ṣwst². Cf. Arab. ḫaṣṣ, "axe," and
Leviticus Rabbah ṣs², "spade" or "hoe." These words are un-
doubtedly all etymologically connected, but the exact re-
lationships are obscure.260

paṭtu, "canal"—BH pty²,261

paṭīṭu, "water bucket"—BH pty², "bucket." Mand. pṭy²,
"basin(?)."262

pihatu, "governor"—Adon. 1. 9, Eg. Behistun, BA pḥḥ,
ptḥ², pl. pḥḥ, BH ṣδḥ.263

pilalku, "spindle"—PIk, "spindle," occurs in Ugaritic
(Ugaritic V 243, 1. 22 p-l-ak-ku), BH, Phoen., Jr. and

Spirantization in Chap. III. This early preservation of ḥ may be the ex-
planation of the West Semitic spellings of the place name ṣṣur, spelled
with ṣ in Hebrew and Old Aramaic but with ḫ in later Aramaic. That
it was no longer preserved in the later Aramaic dialects themselves is
evident from all the transcriptions as well as from the loan words.
Cf. the name of the god Asur, pronounced with [s] as shown by
alphabetical spellings of Assyrian names. See Chap. IV, n. 11.

259. Z. p. 33; LS, p. 618; ABW., p. 845; Salonen, MÖbel, p. 176.

The word is rare in early Aramaic, occurring once in a late AP text, in
Uruk and in Hatran, but the Urukan spelling pa-tu-ri proves it was a well
established Aramaic word, with the phoneme /t/. The suggestion that Su-
merian had the sound [s] is an old one; cf. von Boden, "Zur Laut- und
Formenlehre des Neusaarischen." AFO XVIII (1937-38) 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 /f/. The Assyrian pronunciation of the two Akkadian forms should have
been [pæ̇z] and [paf], neither of which easily yields the Syriac form.


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

263. Z. p. 6; ABW., p. 862; KLI, p. 112; see, too, E. Y. Kutscher,
"Phṣ and Its Cognates," Tarbiz XXX (1961) 112-19 (Heb.), though his read-
ing phṣ² in the Ramat Rahel seals is no longer to be accepted; cf. J.
The old reading of this word in the Panammu inscription 1. 12 pty was shown

264. Z. pp. 28, 9; LS, p. 576; MD, p. 371. Salonen, Ústassetikund, p. 116, considers this word to be from the Chalcolithic substratum in Su-
merian. For the Greek see Emilia Masson, Recherches sur les plus anciens

265. Z. p. 9; KAI II 26. The "q" of late Phoen. pḥḏ, if correctly interpreted, is to be considered a late phonetic development. The dif-
ficult Kasidic (II:6 (KAI, No. 26) pḥḏ is still best taken as "spindles." The Mand. ḫapṣ phṣ² is used, used in a geographical text,
though probably should be probably be connected with the common verb pḥḏ, "divide." 266. Z. p. 40; LS, p. 588. Cf. H. Holma, Die asyrisch-babylonischen
correctly observes that the Syriac cannot be proven to be from Akkadian
merely on morphological grounds; but although the cognate roots ṣṣur and
pḥḏ occur in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Arabic, the middle weak form is known
only in Akkadian (as opposed to the situation with ṣṭt and ṣṭl) and the
Aramaic form is attested only in Eastern Aramaic.

267. Z. p. 66; AF, p. 231f. W. Baumgartner, in MuCA XXIII 59, n. 72,
and the references in MD, p. 370, and the references in MD, p. 370.


269. Z. p. 26; LS, p. 46. I assume that the b of the second syllable
of ṣṭwbd results from a transposition of the initial labial; see below, p. 138. Though the purkulu is best known as a "seal cutter," it

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. peiq². The latter
has a satisfactory Semitic etymology (plq, "to split") and could
be a loan from Greek pellekós.264

pilku, "region," "sub-province"—BH pelęk, Phoen. plq, BH,
Τηργυμα plq, "district."265

p ṣ ṣ ṭu, "dumb"—Syr. pḥḏ², "dumb." Mand. pyḏ², "dumb,"
"demon." The Akkadian is an adjective from plq, pḥḏ, "to
be narrow, tight," said especially of the mouth.266

pūṭ pl, "mouth-opening ritual"—A connection with Mand.
pḥḏ², "sacrificial bread," is highly doubtful.267

puruḥ, "assembly"—The Akkadian is very probably the
origin of Syr. ṣṭwḥ², Mand. ṣṭwḥ², ṣṭwḥ², "banquet" (in Mandaic
also "assembly(?)"); for although the noun pḥḏ is not uncommon
in Ugaritic (note, too, the alternate form pḥḏt, found also
in the Yehimak inscription from Byblos, KAI, No. 4), the verb
pḥḏu, "to gather," is known only from Akkadian. The Aramaic
distribution is also indicative of a loan.268

purkulu, "stone or seal cutter"—Syr., Targ. Prophets
ṣṭwbd, "stone mason." Some of the significant phonetic dif-
fERENCE between the two forms can be accounted for by assuming
the semantically similar ṣṭwḥ (see s.v. arad ṣakallī).269
* purqidam, "(lying) on the back"—BT prqdn, "one lying on his back," Frq'd, "on the back," Frq'd, "to be on the back" (once in Targ. Y. 1 Gen. 49:17 but in Neofiti); Syr. (lex.) prq'd, "to fall on the back." In spite of the uncertainties raised by the possible Akk. cognate brqû, brqû (as indicated in NHw., p. 735, s.v. naparqûdu) 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 distribution of the loan to Eastern Aramaic.  

pûru, "lot"—BH pur, "lot," to explain the name Purim. Since it is glossed in the Hebrew text, pur was still considered a foreign word. Subsequent RH and JAR. usages are certainly based on the BH usage; Syriac translates Purim by parçâ; Mand. qârbâ, "lot" (uncertain). The Akkadian word is derived from pûru, "bowl."<sup>270</sup> The latter meaning is continued in three Jewish magic bowl texts where parçâ means "bowl."  

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

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. Welsberg, *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 "stonemason" (cf. CAD, Vol. I/3, p. 297).  

270. The comparison with Aramaic was made in <ref>As the Akkadian was first isolated, see H. von Soden, "Zum assyrischen Wörterbuch," Or. n.s. XV (1946) 430, for previous literature and most recently E. V. Kutscher, in *Lex. XXXI* 114, who points out the limited distribution of the Aramaic (and Babylonian Rabbinitc Hebrew) and the similarity of forms, and J. Jacobovitz, "Le prophète prq'd," *Les. XXXI* (1967) 240. Might the Arabic ultimately derive from Greek próto, "first," as was long ago suggested for the Aramaic? The phonetics certainly favor that explanation. For the significance of the Targ. Y. 1 occurrence see below, p. 163.  


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

* pûru, "forehead"—Mand., BT pâwâ, Syr. (lex.) pâwâ.  

qabctu (LIB.), "stall"—for semantic reasons, Syr. qâbctâ, Mand. qâbctâ, qâbctâ, "box," "chest," would not appear to be developments of this late Akkadian term; nor should Syr. qebbâ, "cistern," be connected with qâbû, "poultry stall."  

qarbudâ, "field"—Early scholars compared the Eastern Aramaic verb kbr (Syr., BT, Mand., and Arab.), "to plow," with a form kîrûdû, which they translated "field," relating it to qarbudâ. The former is now properly read kîrûdû, a Sumerian loan word meaning "wasteland" (NHw., p. 493). Any connection between kbr and kîrûdû, whose initial consonant is definitely /g/, is unlikely.  

qûtu, "hand"—The relations between this common word and Syr., BT, Mand. qattâ, RH qnt, qt, VT qnt, "handle" (verb qnt in Syriac, "to stick in," in Mandaic, "to be fixed"), are unclear. The Akkadian form is never used in any similar way; the correct word for handle is kîrûdû.  

272. Z. V. Kutscher, in *JASS LXXIV* 240; idem, in *Festzehn* 93. His suggestion that psîh la > psîh is reasonable. Others have suggested a contamination of psîh by qgî (cf. *DIZO*, p. 231). It may also be a dualistic assimilation of the roots psîh and zîh, both of which mean "to split."  

273. The BT form is cited as pâwâ in the lexicons, although the variants imply a reading pâwâ, "on the forehead," for numerous examples. Nevertheless, the legitimacy of the unusual form pâwâ is confirmed by the Syriac lexicographers.  

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

275. 2. p. 40; LS, p. 342. Suggested similar etymologies for the land measure prqdr (cf. LS, p. 120) are also ruled out. But what of the etymology of frqdr? One distant possibility is to consider it somehow cognate to Akk. kârûdu, "to bless" (cf. EAA kôbru, "priest"), for connections between terms of the "cult" and "cultivation" are well known outside of this familiar Latin example. Compare Ar. psîh. I would prefer, however, to relate it to the Akk. term nukarribû, "gardener," whose supposed etymological connections with Sum. nu-ki-ri-ku- are tenuous (or, most recently D. O. Edzard, "Sumerische Komposita mit dem nominal Prîfix nu—," ZA N. XII (1963) 92 ff., and C. J. Gadd, "Ebe-êl and his Basket-sear—," RA LXXII (1969) 21). In light of the Aramaic root, it would appear that the Akkadian term is, in origin, a derivative of a root kbr: mumarribû, with the change of the initial nasal due to dissimilation of labials and/or assimilation to the Syriac form.  

276. 2. p. 35; LS, p. 704.
qinnasu - qappu

qinnasu, qin(n)manzu, "whip"—Syr. (hapax lex.) qapt. 2. The etymology is unknown. 277

qištu, "forest"—Syr., Jar., CPA, Mand. (?) qys. 2, "wood," "tree"; BT (Mand. ?) qys. 2, "chip." 278

qaddu (Arw. k/yaddu), "weak," "rippled (?)."—Not to be read in the Uruk Incantation, 1. 11 (ct. DIZU, p. 250, s.v., qadd); read [di]-da-gá-e or [di]-da-da-gá-e, the predecessor of the common Mand., BT word for child, drdqa 2 . 279

qaddu, "earring"—Jar., Syr. qds. 2. 280

qullu, "food dish," "bowl" only NA, LB—Jar. qw1, "bowl", Jar., Syr. qw1, "pitcher." Compare the older Akk. gullu, BH gullah. 281

qappu, "collection box"—MH gwp, "money box," "common fund"; Syr. qwpt 2, "purse"; Mand. qwp. 2, qwpt 2 . 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 qappu, "reed chest," and Ar., Arab. qappu/ff, "large basket," are anything but cognate (or an early loan into Akkadian?)—note that almost all the early examples are from Uruk, or Umma). The profusion of Jewish Aramaic and Hebrew forms supports this (i.e. qwph, qwpt 2, qwph, qwp, qwp, qwp). The famous Mesopotamian boat basket, Arab. quffah, is possibly attested in Mand. qwpt 2, but there is no evidence that its precursor was ever called qappu in Akkadian. 283

278. Z. p. 53; LS, p. 665; on the Syr. see J. Blau, in BAOS XXXIII 3. 393.
279. Thus, the interpretation "child" for Spartac add 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 [a]-da-gá-e was perhaps to be preferred, especially in 1. 36; cf. "zu den aramäischen Beschreibungen in Keilschrift," AFO XII (1937-39) 257, n. 48. Another possibility for the origin of the form drdqa is to view it as an amalgam of two old Amorite words for child: davdu and daburu (for which see JAD, Vol. 0, pp. 107, 115, and 160). The scarcity and use of these terms in Akkadian indicates an almost certain West Semitic origin. (Cf. also Giebel dqvli, "childen." )
280. Z. p. 38; LS, p. 449; B. Weisner, "lexigraphische Studien," OZK XXIV (1922) 244 f. a derivation of Syr. qićiq, "nose ring" (cf. LS, p. 677) from the feminine form of this word is possible but far from certain: qiddatu > qiddl(e) > qidd from metathesis (to avoid homonymy with the word for "neck").
283. Z. p. 34; Salonen, saumaran. 203. The difficult word gwp in-

qurqurra, "a large ship"—Syr. qurqurra > Arab. qurqur, "long or big ship." 284

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

rabū, "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 rađù. This Akkadian term must be the origin of the strange form rby, "officer," in the Abihāq narrative. On the other hand, is 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 raβ is a native West Semitic development. 287

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

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

raṣpu, "to dig," "to hoe."—BH ṛṭ, "to hoe." 290

284. Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 51, n. 2.
285. Z. p. 49. In Aramaic rbk may occur in the broken AO, No. 212.
290. Z. p. 41. Interestingly, the meaning "hoe" for this root is confined to the Babylonian dialects of both Akkadian and Aramaic.
The relationship between rāḏ and Eq. rāḏ 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 stem “to grant authority,” 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. rāḏ, “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 forms which use rāḏ. Rāḏ does occur in similar contexts in Akkadian, though much earlier and even then only sporadically, but perhaps that is where one must look for the origin of the Egyptian Aramaic usage.

rāḏu, “watercourse,” “pipe”—Targ. Onk. (so in good MSS), Iraqi Arabic rāḏ; BH, RH, Syr., rāḏ; Mand. rāḏ. Since the Akkadian form is attested as early as Old Babylonian, this word is apparently not to be connected with the Aramaic root rāḏ, “run.” Although the h is preserved in Mandaic, the form rāḏ is the expected Babylonian Aramaic reflex of rāḏu and could be a Babylonian form in Onkelos. Alternatively, the turgemic (and Arabic) form could preserve the Akkadian pronunciation.

redd, “to follow,” “to drive”—Three meanings, possibly derived from different original roots, are associated with the verb rāḏ 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. ṣariṭu, “course,” “cult procession,” and the common Ar. ṣariṭa, “course,” “journey.”

926. In Old Aramaic the verb occurs in Sefire III 9 and Habad II 17, 26 (and in Phoenician, Karatepe A III 4 rāḏ); cf. Pitman, Sefire, p. 112, and Huffs, Studies, p. 208. The Sefire example might be an aple: “you shall not control me nor (have to) grant me permission concerning it.” Could the “I” of rāḏ be as seer of: “rather you shall grant me permission ...”? The context of Habad is broken, but it may even be more like Akkadian “to acquire.”


riqtu, "part of the stomach of a ruminant"—Targ. Y Dt. 18:3 ryqth. 303

cube, NA "interest"—The verb rabu 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 (qiptu, hubu). Specific formulaic uses of the Aramaic may, however, have Akkadian models. 301

sadīnunu, see n. 324.

sāḥertu, sāḥertu—Syr. sḥrt3, Mand. sḥr3 means "walled enclosure" or "palace." Since the verb sḥr (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 sāḥertu 4 translated "Umwaerung" by von Soden, and in the lexical equation bād-niginn: sāḥāret dūri, whose meaning is uncertain. 302

sāḥiru, "magician"—Mand. sḥr2, "demon"; Arab. sḥir, "magician." The Mandic is not definitely derived from this word, but Arabic š (not š) suggests an Aramaic intermediary. 303

sāmīdu, "fine flour"—Syr., Targ. Y, BT smyd3, Mand. smyd, Arab. samād. Compare Ug. smd, a food of some sort. The evidence for an Akkadian origin is the verb sāmādu, "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/samātu, "corner"—BH, MS swt; Common Ar. ẓwlt3, ESA ẓyym (pl. indefinite); Arab. ẓwiyah. 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. saḥertu).

304. LS, p. 479; R. Landsberger, "Zur Mahlereitung im Altertum," OLZ XXV (1922) 377 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.

siḥharu—siḥmu/ /91

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

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

sikiltu, "board"—See s.v. suk/yullu.

sikkānu, "udder"—Syr. swk3, Mand. swk3; > Arab. sukkān, sikkān. 307


sikkūru, "bolt," "lock"; sikru, "dam"—Syr., Mand. sikkā, "bolt," "bar," JPA swk3, "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

siḥmu, "set time"—Common Ar. zmtn (Syr. zbn); late BH, MH zmmān; Arab. zaman, zamān; Ethiopic zaman; Pehlevi zaman.

305. Z, p. 31; LS, p. 190; KBL (3d ed.) p. 256; Wagner, p. 48; von Soden, "Zum akkadischen Wörterbuch," Or. n.s. XVI (1947) 448 ff. There is no reason to consider this word separate etymologically from zmmān (cf. CAD, Vol. 5, p. 414), although they are probably not synonymous. An Akkadian pronunciation zam/ftu is indicated by spellings with the sign ZA (hard to render sā); cf. CAD, Vol. D, p. 192a, lex. section.

306. Cf. Persepolis, p. 49; Salonen, Haugerödte 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, Agriculture, p. 92. This is to be separated from Ar. sikk, derived from šk, BH šg, "thorn" (confused in Jbr. sources with sgr, "thorn," and swg, "bush"). In KBL, p. 921, BH šg is incorrectly compared with the Akkadian, cited as škātu. It belongs rather with BH šakkānu, Ar. šakkn, "knife," and neither is from Akkadian (cf. Wagner, p. 366, n. 5).

Jastrow's translation of skt3 in Targ. Deut. 21:14 as "spade" is misleading (Dictionary, p. 993). The word merely translates BH ytd, normally "peg," whatever it may actually mean in that context. Arab. sikkā, BT skt3, Syr. (lex.) skt3 dp3 (see Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, p. 2622), "milling die," represents a development of this word, but the place of origin of this usage is uncertain. 309

Iranologists are convinced that the word is of Iranian origin, while Assyriologists propose an Akkadian etymology from (w)asâmû, "to be appropriate." The recently discovered occurrences of this otherwise late word in Old Babylonian texts conclusively refute the position of Iranologists. 110 The Aramaic could not have been borrowed from Babylonian, however, where it was pronounced, as shown by the Aramaic month name, [sîwān], but an Assyrian pronunciation (ṣimân) is quite possible (see Phonology, Sibilants, in Chap. IV). 111

sîmîltu, "staircase"—Eastern Neo-Ar. semîlîlta, Syr. sbîlîlî, Mand. smîblelîlî, "ladder." See hâlû. 112

sîppu, "doorsill"—There is little evidence that would suggest that sîppu is anything but cognate to Common Ar. sîppa, Heb. saûf, and Phoen. sp. 113

sîpru, "border," "shore(?)"—MH, Targ. Onk., Syr., CPA spr. In light of the common Arabic forms sibr and sâfir, which show the original sibilant to be š, the rare late Akkadian term, if correctly interpreted, must be an Aramaism. 114


113. Z. p. 31; LS p. 489; Salonen, Füren, p. 62. The only evidence for a non-cognate relationship is the sign ZIG, which also has the value ZIB, translated in one lexical text by Akk. zīyu, which in turn is matched in a synonym list with sîppu (cf. CAD, Vol. 2, p. 129a, s.v. zīyu). On this slim, indirect evidence, Salonen claims that sîppu is a Sumerian loanword from ZIG. 114. For sîpru see A. Boissier, Documents assyriens relatifs aux pârisages (Paris, 1894-99) pp. 225 ff., No. 35 and especially No. 42 r., sî-pra ša mî: Adad irahhî 4 (note the different interpretation in Hw., p. 1049). L. Ginsberg, "Beiträge zur Lexikographie des Jüdisch-Aramäischen," MKQ LXVIII (1934) 29 r., and J. N. Epstein, Protoge-

suk/gullu, "herd," sikkîlta, "hoard," "accumulated property."—Ug. sîlît (broken context), BM, sîpû Rî, "accumulated property."—Pârs. sîpîr, "property" and derived verbs in Pâ and late JAR. There is little reason to regard the Ugartic and Hebrew as loans from Akkadian in any period. 115

sungu, "hunger," "need"—Syr. svnp, "need" and derived verbs in Syr. and Mand. (cf. Ge'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 tašngu, "chooking," in Akkadian is certainly a loan from Aramaic. 116

supinna, "trowel(?)", "spindle point(?)"—Mi, Targ. Onk. and Proph., BT, Syr. šwpn(2), "file"; JAR. šwpn, "spear butt," "spike." The Akkadian is late, primarily in lexical texts, and the origin of the word (or words) is uncertain. 117

suk/gullu, "alley"—Palm. šqîq, Syr. šqîqâ, šqîq, "alley," mena, p. 214, suggest that Ar. spr is derived from Akk. supnu (cited by them as sāgū). Previous translators translated "surrounding wall" but now known to mean "(an animal) stall." Although the etymology of the Akkadian term is uncertain, it surely is not the origin of Ar. spr. 118

Thoroughly discussed most recently by M. Held, "A Faithful Lover in an Old Babylonian Dialogue," JCS XV (1961) 11 f.; cf. also M. Weinfield, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," JAOAS 100 (1970) 195, n. 103. The following additional observations are relevant: the occurrence of sîlît in Ugartic (UT 2006:7, 12 meaning "treasure") and su-gul-la-zi, "accumulation," in a text of Egyptian origin found at Boghazköy (KIB III, No. 57:4-6) show that the form sîgûlîlî was already current in the West at that time, certainly quite different in form from Akk. sîkîlîlî, and some type of cognate relationship is thus most likely. But there are still difficulties. The Akk. su/kullu, "herd," "cattle," can hardly be separated from this group of words (Held suggests possible coincidental homonomy), nor can the Ar. form sîplî, "cluster of grapes," for the otherwise common West Semitic ignâlîlîlî. In all these words the idea of "collection" is primary.


117. AHw., p. 1060. When spelled with the logogram šgû-šâ, supinna is something which can be part of a spindle (piûku, cf. Hh.IV 36, 50); I suggest "point" on the basis of the JAR. word šwpun. The meaning "file," seems to have a connection with the Aramaic word šng, "to make smooth," but the ending -lîr is problematic on a native Aramaic word (see below, n. 324).
The Akkadian root SUMERIAL, found in the text, is a form of the Akkadian verb meaning "to ornament," and it is used in the text to describe the actions of the individuals involved in the events described. The root is also used to describe the physical appearance of the objects mentioned in the text, such as the garments and jewelry worn by the characters. The text uses the root to create a sense of the beauty and richness of the culture and the characters within it.
are related—perhaps the Aramaic is a loan from the Akkadian through Amorite—and that NB šītu and NA šubūtu are Aramaic.

The restored word [ghl(e)y]t čeq, "seal-bearer," in Ahiqar is also usually derived from Akk. gabcu, 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.

šēru, "door pivot"—BH and MH šīr, JAR. šur 3 šyr 3, Syr. šur 3 (šārṣāl); Arb. šīr. There is no good reason to regard the West Semitic forms as loans. Sum. za-ra is now considered a loan from Akkadian.

šītu, "expedience" (Bab.)—BA, Eq., Pal., Nab., Syr. nprtu; BT nptu; > Arb. naṣaq. 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 šur 3 is probably a calque from Aramaic. On the other hand, the MH form hwṣ 3 from the causative stem could well be an independent development.

šamali, "wagon"—BH ša; Targ. Proph. šab as a royal conveyance. Though the etymology of the Akkadian is unknown, the scarcity of the Aramaic attestations makes a loan probable.

ša—As I have shown elsewhere, the standard interpretation of the first ša in the Nebir inscriptions as this genitive particle is incorrect.

Akkadian akad 3, Akkad LB, akadag/dīš NA, "previous year"—Syr. šrgy(y), BT, VT ṣrgy. Since the Akkadian is almost certainly a loan from Amorite and the late Akkadian forms differ considerably from those of Aramaic, the Aramaic and


329. 2, p. 30; LD, p. 627; Salonen, Turen, p. 66.

330. B. Landsberger, "Bemerkungen zur altbabylonischen Briefliteratur," ZDMG LXIX (1915) 506. Nprtu was probably an official term in Imperial Aramaic.

331. 2, 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, Landfahrerzeug, p. 62), but note NB šabbu. The taryuqic form with ša probably derives from the Akkadian u.


333. Perles, in OIZ XXII 67 f.; LD, p. 53; D. O. Edzard, "Mari und Aramäer" ZA XXII (1964) 147. For the Akkadian forms see CAD C 72c. The Aramaic origin of Saddaqdin is shown by its frequent occurrences (and the frequency of parallels of forms of qdm) in Mari (cf. Edzard, Vol. 3, Part II, s.v. agadmu) and the phonetic difficulties involved were in an original Akkadian word (cf. Edzard).

334. 2, p. 45. J. N. Epstein, "Zum magischen Texte," JAGS XXXIII (1913) 280. n. 1, suggested that Aramaic qulil "south, may derive from a loan-translation of šaddu, but in spite of the interpretation in Aruch of qulil as south wind (s.v. qulil), there is no indication that šaddu was ever anything but east (or northeast?).

335. R. Borger, review of CAD, Vol. 3, §1, OR, XVIII (1961) 152: 9. 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 ([q] for [š]) but maintaining the Assyrian [š] in ekall; cf. sgn for šaknu in Babylonian Mesopotamian Aramaic). The alternative explanations suggested by A. R. Millard, "Ša Ekall—Šgal—Šagale," UF IV (1972) 162, cannot be accepted. The BH verb ṣal, with no other known cognates, can hardly be anything but a denominate from šmg ṣal; but one cannot be forced to regard the loan as purely loaned because this verb seems to occur in other pre-Assyrian BH texts. It may even be that the Masoretic substitution of qeq škb for written šal actually reflects an earlier substitution in reverse, when ṣal was felt to be the euphemistic form.

F. Perles, in OIZ XXI 68, suggested that BT dūab, "wife," was formed under the influence of ša ekall. One might be more correct to say under the influence of new nouns with ša, such as ša ekall and ša reš, frequent in the late dialects; but the still unexplained suffixed form dūab, "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 (KAQ, No. 203). 337

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


Sa'lu, "to rule," "to have control over"—The root Sl is much more common in Aramaic than in its cognate in Akka-

337. Z. p. 6: KBL, pp. 649, 1103: Persepolis, pp. 25 ff.: von Soden, in Or. n.s. XXXVII 265. For the NA šālašu cf. R. A. Henshaw, "The Office of šālašu in Neo-Assyrian Times," JASS XXXVII (1967) 517 ff., XXXVIII (1968) 461 ff. The Assyrian form of this word was probably always šālašu, but the construct form šālāšu (with X) was probably the model for the early Canaanite borrowing, hence Heb. salāš. For šālašu as a borrowing of an early Sumerian loanword from an Akkadian form like šakunu of šakunu a king, see E. A. Speiser, "Sakunanu as a Reborrowing of an Early Sumerian Loanword from an Akkadian Form Like šakunu of šakunu a King," JCL XVIII (1963) 27, n. 78; previously, H. McNeal, Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles (New Haven, 1957) pp. 106 f.


340. Rimalt, in WZKM XXXIX 114 ff. He tried to find its origin in expressions "the negative of the infinitive such as фессиона ̂l, "of non-claiming," but of course in such constructions lesia 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 Atharhaya story (Lambert and Millard. Atra-ḫasāš, III vi 14 (= Gilgamesh XI, 1. 175)), Given this background, there is little reason to regard the common LB preposition as an Aramaic (as in AHw., p. 521a). As Rimalt points out (p. 114). NB did borrow the native Aramaic form for "without" in ISA 12.

341. This was borrowed into NB and the Akkadian of Mari as ina la (see Z. p. 13, and J. J. Gelb, Language XXXIII (1957) 203) and into late BH as bešan.

342. Z. p. 48: LS, p. 779. For the sound change cf. GAG § 11f 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. According to 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

343. Moffs, Studies, p. 178, correctly shows that Sa'lu in such formulae is only a late substitution for several earlier verbs. Nevertheless, he insists (pp. 133, 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: LS, p. 762. The ingenious proposal to connect Slašu with Na BT Slašu was made by Kutscher (orally); he also pointed out a possible connection with NB Bešan, a kind of plant. The suggestion is based on the well-known alternation between wan and beth ram in MT Greenfield, in his excellent study of the verb šašu and its relatives ("Lexicographical Notes II," JCA 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 Slašu as ʾašašu is incorrect, however, for the loan must be from Babylonian, and Babylonian intervocalic /wa/ certainly was pronounced [w], no matter what the phonetics underlying Assyrian spellings with ša (see Nasala in Chap. 1). 345. Z. p. 16: for the OB use of the term Samašu see W. J. 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 Sippar," Babylonian and Oriental Record I (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 (ll. 3 ff.) the apprenticeship is to be handed over to a baker and Samašu the baker, "to learn the trade." Though correctly interpreted by the original editors of the text, this Samašu was misunderstood by M. San Nicolò, Der neubabylonische Lehrvertrag in rachstvereinzelte Betrachtung (Munich, 1950) p. 5, n. 6, who translates uncertainly "Krämser" on the basis of the OB meaning. He is not alone in this interpretation. In Weisberg, Guild Structure, pp. 99 f.

346. N. H. Tur-Sinal, The Language and the Book II (Jerusalem, 1950) 275 ff., attempts to demonstrate that this Akkadian word is passive, deriving from an older form *ša maš, equivalent to OA ša ḫum, "substitute," which itself, he claims, was borrowed into early Canaanite in the form sal, which he translates "substitute." The latter portion of his suggestion is intriguing, but since *ša maš is hypothetical and the base, ša maš, is attested, its probability is low. (For the Sumerian etymology see W. W. Hallo, "A Mercantile Agreement from the Reign of Gunumur of Larsa," AS, Nov. 16 (Chicago, 1965) p. 199, n. 5a.) In the course of his argument, Tur-Sinal proposes and then rejects (certainly with good reason) the possibility that sal in Ezek. 8:13, 5 is our word in its older sense of "merchant's representative."
pliša reflects the original form to which, in Akkadian, the generic term Šamnu, "plant," has been added. 346

Šamnu, "plant," "herb," "drug"—Common Ar. (MI) sw, pl. samnu, "drug," "poison." "pigment"; BH sammil, "fragrant herbs"; Arab. same, "poison." The Akkadian form is the corect 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 "š" is Aramaized. The Arabic form is certainly an Aramaic loanword. 347

šani in šem šani, "to lose one's senses"—BH šnḥ šem; Syr. šny², "crazy"; Mand. šnyywr², "madness." 348

šanūma, "again"—See below, p. 153.

šaqšu, "hang," "weigh," "pay" (cf. šiqšu, p. 29) — In Eastern Aramaic šqš is the common word for "to lift up," "to take" (also in Genesis Apocryphon and the Palmyran tarif, 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 a writer somewhat hesitantly offers the observation that the common perfect of legq, "take," in Neo-Assyrian is iseque (iššeqe). The latter, with the direct object marker l-, would yield šqš. (Compare Syr. ntl, "give" < ntn l-.)

šā rēši, "evenuch"—Sefire I 45, III 5 srs; Imp. Ar. srs, sryš; BH, MI; Common Ar. šršš; Arab. šarš; derived verbs in MI, JAR, CPA, Syr., and Mand. 349

348. Z, p. 48; for the Akkadian, very frequent in medical and magical texts, see BML, p. 315. The earliest occurrence I know of is Aramaisis III ii 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 šny² and štnw in Targ. Prophets for BH mhlwt and əššwr. 349. Z, p. 6; LS, p. 500; KBL, p. 668. This is a very old compar-t...
Sinpeq - Sukkallu / 102

Sinpeq, "two-thirds"—Samanal, Nineveh Lion Weight (CIS II 7) snb; Bauer and Meissner 7 Snb (7) 361

Sinpu, "incantation"—Hand. Sptp, "scroll"—362

Sbulu, "to send," "to have carry away"—BA mswyl, "laid" or "raised," said of foundations, is often considered a loan from this causative of (wa)b螺u, but the Akkadian verb never means anything 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

Sukallu, "vizier"—AMS Ur tablet, 1. 4 skl. 364

360. AD (abridged) p. 66; DISO, p. 314; E. W. Moore, Neo-Babylonian Documents in the University of Michigan Collection (Ann Arbor, 1939) p. 301, for the finite use of samallu see YOS VII, No. 66.3 (cited in CAD, 3. p. 20a).


362. No. p. 444.

363. Cf. KBL (2d ed.) pp. 1080, 1102; Rosenthal, Grammar, pp. 49, 59; H. L. Ginsberg, in Frank Rosenthal, ed., An Aramaic Handbook, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 12. In Aramaic the causative forms of sbl 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 Shefer in Chap. 111).

364. As indicated by the Aramaic spelling with "s," the correct NA form is Sukallu, as in OB (not Sukallu); cf. AWD s.v. and GAG §304. §304. The initial shift s > s in the translation is correct; see below p. 140. Contrary to the view of M. Lidzbarski, Altoramische Urkunden aus Assur ("Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen orient-Gesellschaft," Vol. XXXVIII (Leipzig, 1921)) p. 17, the representation of Akkadian s in AWM tableau 4 is not inconsistent. The Aramaic text has s for Akkadian d in the following forms: rsd (1. 2), sfr (1. 9) srsrd (1. 11) and the second element of Sinpeq (1. 8). Sinpeq (1. 11) is obviously an Aramaic name, hence the use of .s. The other apparent inconsistencies are in Sinpeq (1. 8) and 3npu (1. 4). The first is easily...
ent in meaning? Initial š in the causatives of praeia y (< w) verbs is not unknown; see e.g., BA hpl; furthermore, the verb šgyy 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 šy (and which also had shaphel, such as Ogaritic) seems more probable than Akkadian influence here. 369 Sušu, "one-sixth" or "sixty"—Mand. šw₂, a unit of time, probably one-sixth of an hour. 370 Suṭappu, "partner"—M/NB—Palm. ṣwetp, "partnership," and derived verb: Common Ar. ṣwt, "partner" and derived verbs ṣēthi, Ethioptic. 371 šçu, "south"—BT, Syr. (lex.), Mand. ṣwánt, "south wind." 372 šçušubu (preterite šaščīb), "to rescue"—Ahiqar narrative. AP, No. 38 ššu: BA, Nab., JAr. ššub; Syr.: Sam. JPA, Mand. ššab. 373 tab/palu, rare SB "tambourine"—Syr., BT, Targ. Mago-graha (once Y2), Mand. ṣašša; Arab. ţabš. Origin unknown. 374 tāšamu, "boundary"—Common Ar., Mo ṭanun; Mand. ṭamam; Arab. ṣašma, ṣašmah. In Akkadian the word is primarily confined to Assyrian, occurring, to my knowledge, no earlier than 369. 2, p. 70; KEB (2d ed.) p. 1129; Rabin, in Eretz Israel IX 150. Mand. šew, occurring only in the participle and only in one late magical text, is tentatively translated in the participle to "consume" in MD. Since two of its three occurrences are connected with verbs meaning "to ex- cite," "to enrage," I suggest that this verb is not from Western Aramaic šyy but rather Arab. šu, or chase (cf. and K sentence 277). 375 šal, "monsters" (or MB šašpaš), possibly from šašpaš, or "one with another." 376. 2, p. 65; MG, p. xlviii and n. 2. According to earlier scholars this word means "1/12 hour," but the reason for such a translation is unsa- clear. Wüdeke's explanation and the passage he cites to prove the point make little sense. I find the Greek word ἀδασος, cited in 2, MD, and MG, only attested lexically as some kind of measuring device or distance. 371. 2, p. 46; LS, p. 767; Rosenthal, Sprache, p. 90. The Akkadian šuṭašu (for an example see CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 513b, bottom) derives from the verb šuṭappu (for an MB example see PAS, Vol. I, Part I, p. 61:13) itself a denominative verb from tappa, the original word for "partner," borrowed from Sumerian. 372. 2, p. 45; LS, p. 767. 373. 2, p. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AD, p. 268; KBE, p. 1129. In Light 374. 2, p. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AD, p. 268; KBE, p. 1129. In Light 375. 2, p. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AD, p. 268; KBE, p. 1129. In Light 376. 2, p. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AD, p. 268; KBE, p. 1129. In Light 377. 2, p. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AD, p. 268; KBE, p. 1129. In Light 378. 2, p. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AD, p. 268; KBE, p. 1129. In Light 379. 2, p. 69 f.; LS, p. 762; AD, p. 268; KBE, p. 1129. In Light 371. 2, p. 46; LS, p. 767; Rosenthal, Sprache, p. 90. The Akkadian šuṭašu (for an example see CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 513b, bottom) derives from the verb šuṭappu (for an MB example see PAS, Vol. I, Part I, p. 61:13) itself a denominative verb from tappa, the original word for "partner," borrowed from Sumerian.

šušu, "sixth" or "sixty"—Mand. šw₂, a unit of time, probably one-sixth of an hour. 370 Suṭappu, "partner"—Palm. ṣwetp, "partnership," and derived verb: Common Ar. ṣwt, "partner" and derived verbs ṣēthi, Ethioptic. 371 šçu, "south"—BT, Syr. (lex.), Mand. ṣwánt, "south wind." 372 šçušubu (preterite šaščīb), "to rescue"—Ahiqar narrative. AP, No. 38 ššu: BA, Nab., JAr. ššub; Syr.: Sam. JPA, Mand. ššab. 373 tab/palu, rare SB "tambourine"—Syr., BT, Targ. Mago-graha (once Y2), Mand. ṣašša; Arab. ţabš. Origin unknown. 374 tāšamu, "boundary"—Common Ar., Mo ṭanun; Mand. ṭamam; Arab. ṣašma, ṣašmah. In Akkadian the word is primarily confined to Assyrian, occurring, to my knowledge, no earlier than 369. 2, p. 70; KEB (2d ed.) p. 1129; Rabin, in Eretz Israel IX 150. Mand. šew, occurring only in the participle and only in one late magical text, is tentatively translated in the participle to "consume" in MD. Since two of its three occurrences are connected with verbs meaning "to excite," "to enrage," I suggest that this verb is not from Western Aramaic šyy but rather Arab. šu, or chase (cf. and K sentence 277). 375 šal, "monsters" (or MB šašpaš), possibly from šašpaš, or "one with another." 376. 2, p. 65; MG, p. xlviii and n. 2. According to earlier scholars this word means "1/12 hour," but the reason for such a translation is unclear. Wüdeke's explanation and the passage he cites to prove the point make little sense. I find the Greek word ἀδασος, cited in 2, MD, and MG, only attested lexically as some kind of measuring device or distance. 371. 2, p. 46; LS, p. 767; Rosenthal, Sprache, p. 90. The Akkadian šuṭašu (for an example see CAD, Vol. A, Part II, p. 513b, bottom) derives from the verb šuṭappu (for an MB example see PAS, Vol. I, Part I, p. 61:13) itself a denominative verb from tappa, the original word for "partner," borrowed from Sumerian.
the Middle Assyrian period. Since no good etymology is known and Arabic has /gy/ as Akkadian does (and thus was not borrowed through Aramaic, though see Kimhû), there is little reason to suggest an Akkadian origin. 375

tâjžâru, “merciful”—Palm. târ. This and the possible loan translation rêmânu represent the Palmyran equivalents of the Akkadian divine epithets rêmâmânu, tâjžâru, “merciful,” “forgiving.” The Akkadian form itself, however, may be a calque from Aramaic as found in Syr. târ2 and Mand. târ2b2 (and Arab. taârâb). 376

tâlâmû, “to trust in”—Eq., Hermopolis, Syr., Mand., Targ. Hagiology (once Yt), tâlî. In this meaning the t-form of the verb wâlû is “Common Semitic, found also in Arabic and Ge'ez; thus, it is possible that the Aramaic and Akkadian are only cognate. But because the development of primâ t verbs from verbs originally prime 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


A connection with Heb. 7mûh, “wall,” and the root 7mû, “to defend,” has been suggested, if so the Akkadian would almost certainly be a loan from pre-Aramaic (and the Arabic, which has 7y, a loan from Aramaic). Nohe, [Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar (Heidelberg, 1926) p. 292, “wests. Lm.”]


377. Perles, in DIZ XX 71. The form wâlû is found in Akkadian only in the noun wâlû, “overseer.” In favor of a cognate relationship is the fact that the verbal nouns, Akk. tukûti and Ar. taâlînâ, are too different from each other to be a loan but too similar not to be related. For primes w/ cf. GAG § 103d; S. Brockelmann, Grundiss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen I (Berlin, 1908) 597, and K. Tsereteli, “Über die Reflexivstämme in den modernen aramäischen Dialekten,” RSO XXXIX (1964) 125-12.

378. Z., p. 46; M. Jastrow, “On Assyrian and Samaritan,” JASS XII (1889) 148. Could the târûmûmîk aleph be consonantal? The specific meaning of the Akkadian appears to be “brother of equal status.” If tâlâmû is identical from Arâb, it would be another personenbezeichnung of the tâgîma formation (cf. tâlâmû), which lends support to the possibility of a loan.

tâlâmû, “apprentice”—BH, MH, JAR, Syr., CPA tâlâmû. Sam. timûm, “student,” “disciple” > Arab. timûmî, Mand. tîmûmî, “priest.” Akkadian attestations are surprisingly rare, but tâlâmû 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 tâmpû is a “Personenbezeichnung.” 379

târûšû, “merchant”—Palm., MH, JAR, CPA, Sam., Syr. tâgî (Akk.). Mand. tâmû > Arab. tâgî. Not unexpectedly the denominate verbs in the various languages were easily confused with forms of târ. There, however, no reason to suggest that this confusion accounts for the y of the Aramaic form, for original 7mûk was pronounced and often written “mg” in MB (see Phonology, in Chap. IV).

379. Z., p. 29; LS., p. 367; Wagner, p. 119. Note that in Zimmer’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: 1’d KAB.-zu-û : ta-ì-mûmî (DSL XII 195, 1. 14). In Zittit the logogram ka-òzu-û 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 7mû > ng see GAG § 31f and such NB spellings as d/tam-7ar (Uqnah, Glossar, p. 162).

381. Z., p. 45; LS., p. 710. In Ugaritic târb is “stable,” and Ras Shamra Akkadian gives the equation 6-um : ta-râba (NRS V 92, RG 16 18917), cf. CAU, Vol. 8, p. 281a), that is, “house.” Since the correct Aramaic reflex of this root is zîbû, 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.

382. Z., p. 7; LS., p. 834; Wagner, p. 81. I. J. Gelb, “The Word for Dragoon in the Ancient Near East,” Glossa II (1964) 93-104. Gelb suggests that he expressed his reasons for doing so, that the Aramaic word did come through Akkadian (p. 102).
tālugallu, "cock"—Phrah. vii 1 trnwg, MH trnwg1, trnwg2. JAR trnwg1, trnwg2, Syr. trnw2, trnw2, Mand. c2rmv2. 383

tīštu, "attack," "invasion"—Mand. tyb, tybhw2(?) "invasion." 384

tīlu, "mound," "ruin heap"—Heb., Az., Arab. tīl, têl. 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

tināru, "oven," "BH, MI, CPA, Syr., Mand. (in JAR only in the Targums for BH tnr). Arab. tanūr. The first Akkadian occurrence of this vocable is in MB Alalakh. Although the word seems Semitic, an Akkadian origin is unlikely. 386

titturru, "bridge," "BT tywtr, Syr. twr2, twr2, Mand. c2wr2(q)?" 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 (gāšru) is more widespread in Aramaic. 387

tuβašu, "a device for climbing the palm tree"—BT twbly > Arab. tubaliya, tabilya. 388

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

383. Z. p. 51; LS. p. 836. The Akkadian is from Sum. dar-lugal. For MI trnwg see MS Kaufmann, Ab.Sar. 158. 384. MB, p. 484. The contextual meaning of tyb is quite certain, but that of tywtr is not clear. 385. Z. p. 14; LS. p. 824; KKL (2d ed.) p. 1029; D. G. Edzard, re-
view of MADO, No. 3, ZA LIV (1961) 263. 386. Z. p. 32; LS. p. 829; Solonan, in Baghdader Mitteilungen 111 ff. The rare late Sumerian lexical list forms c̣n-ur or cu-ur are certainly artificial creations of the scribes, but the legitimate forms durun and dilia (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 kudurrus'. For OB, see CAD, Vol. E. s.v. edur end. 388. Z. p. 54; Addittamenta, p. 407; B. Landsberger, Date Palm, p. 38 and nn. 112 ff. Landsberger expresses uncertainty about the standard Sumerian etymology ṣ̌2muša, (TUZ) 14, but no other etymology seems possible. 389. Z. p. 38; LS. p. 280b; F. Hrozný, Das Getreide im alten Babyloni-
nen (Wien, 1913) p. 131. The synonym ša/kumzu (also in Arabic) probably has a different origin. For some Akkadian attestations see CAD, Vol. A, Part I, p. 239a.
does not otherwise exist in Aramaic, and there is every reason to believe that the verb גֵּר, “to form,” occurring in the piel with a great many associated noun forms, is in 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 עֵירַע can be found in Aramaic. The most certain example is Mand. הַנָּר, “circle” or “halo around a heavenly body,” which, though ostensibly connected with the root גֵּר, “to enclose,” certainly bears the influence of the Akkadian word, used often in magical and astronomical contexts in precisely these meanings. 

ušalu, “marsh”—Syr. ʿusla, 396

uššu, “foundation”—BA ʿšš; CPA, RH, Targ. ʿšš, ṣš; Sam. ʿšš; > Arab. ʿusš. See asšalu. 397

uršunu, aršunu, “kiln,” “furnace”—BA, Targums, BT, Syr., Mand. ʿšun > Arab. ʿṣṭn, Ethiopic ʿṣṭn. This is an old, probably pre-Sumerian, culture word. 398

uššaru, “to let loose”; in OB, Amarna (and LB?) also “to send”—Aššu Ostracon and EQ. ʿšš, “to send”; cf. 11Q19Q1 332.13 ʿšš for BH ʾeššaʿāʾn. The distribution of the meaning “send” in Akkadian is strongly suggestive of a western origin; but in light of the strong semantic connection between “release” and “send” in many languages, the extent and nature of the possible influences here must remain uncertain. 399

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


399. Cf. AD (abridged) p. 45; Koopmans, Aramische Chronomastica, p. 82; Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum, p. 288, KAT II 284. Akk. ʿusšaru is an extremely problematic verb. Von soden, CAG § 103p, claims that in later

zaribīl, “basket”—BT ʿzbil, Syr. zn/bbyl > Arab. zribīl, zībbīl. W. von Soden and A. Salonen consider the Akkadian to be a loan from Aramaic (see also CAD, s.v.), but the Aramaic cognate of early ṣāibīl, “soil,” has been borrowed from Akk. zribīl, “soil,” not zībbīl; thus, ṣāibīl must be a loan from Akkadian. Moreover, it is difficult to explain ḫN ʿzbīl and Syr. sbbīl, “betrothal gifts” (BT sabbīl, “to send betrothal gifts”), as calques from Akk. zubbīlīn, for the latter term is limited to the OB and MA periods. 401

zaḫubī, “ecstatic”—Mand. žbā, “a kind of priest.” The meaning of the Mandic is uncertain, and an alternative etymology from ḫbā, “slaughte,” is quite possible. If, however, the parallel word ḫbyldā means “oracle tellers,” the semantic similarity would suggest that žbā is indeed Akk. zaḫubī. 402

zaḫaru, “to speak”—Syr. šmr, Jbr. ʿmr, RH ʿmr, “necromancer(?)” or the related verb žmr in Syr. (and Mand.) 403. It is by no means certain that żmr is related to the root ʾmr and hence was necessarily borrowed from a language where ż > z. In addition it must be noted that the Akkadian verb has no significant magical connotations. 404

Babylonian this verb split into two forms: ūššaru, “to let loose,” and mūššaru, “to send.” A confirmation of this position must await the publication of the “UVR” volumes of the two dictionaries, but the frequent examples of mūššaru meaning “to let loose,” “to leave,” “to abandon to,” such as in J. Aaro, Glossar zu den mittelmittelbabylonischen Grammatik (St. Or. XXII [Helsinki, 1957]) pp. 64 ff. (NB) and Umgäml. Glossar, pp. 99 ff. (NB) with no examples meaning “to send” and ūššaru, “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 ūmr, “to loose,” common in Aramaic, a metathesis perhaps occasioned by the similarity of the root ʾmr, “straight,” used in the causative in the sense “to make straight,” “to direct.” In Akkadian these two roots form a kind of suppletive paradigm. (Note that ūššaru in this sense occurs only in texts I and II; whereas ūššaru is found only in II (cf. CAD, Vol. A, Part II, s.v. ūššaru CI.) In support of this theory note the synonymous use in the Amarna documents of ūššaru, šṭṭṭṭš and ūššaru in this meaning. 400

400. 2, p. 14; 5, p. 187; CAD, Vol. 2, p. 7a; von Soden, in Or. n. s. XXVII 209; Salonen, Hauszeit I 249.


402. Baumberger, in HUCA XXIII 58; 34, p. 156.

403. 2, p. 67; 5, p. 196. Wilcke’s comparison with Arab. zukrah, “wine skin,” resulting in a perfect parallel with Heb. ṣāib, 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 then the sense "to be righteous" for the verb zkb already occurs in Akkadian (Ps. 51:6, 1 Mc 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, žwgyt (BH żikkût, BT also žvyt, žypt, Mand. žypt, žyyt, žyyt, etc., > Arab. zuqš) 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 žypt, however.


Zàzu—The Mandala magic bowl hapax žypt was connected with an Akk. form zàzu, supposedly meaning "abundance," by earlier scholars. The Akkadian word does not exist.407

šibûnu, "scales"—Mand. źyyt, źypt. Akkadian must also be the ultimate origin of the Arabic star name ūshũyāṭ and the Qur'anic zabānîyah, 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, žbn. What is almost certainly involved is an old culture word of uncertain origin, žbn (sibûnu?), meaning "weight," for which there is evidence from Akkadian, Hitittite, and Egyptian.408


žîmu, "mold;" "impression;" "cast coin"—Targ. Onk. EX. 12:4 žyyt, "mold;" Syr. (lex.) žyyt, "envelope;" Syr. and Mand. žyyt, "falsity" and denominative verbs "to falsify" in Syr., MH, and BT; Arab. žîf, "false coin."410

žîpîn, "zenith," "culminating star or constellation"—Mand. žyyt, "a type of star or constellation.

žîtû, "sting," "barb," zaqatu, "to sting"—Targ. Prophets, Haqiqat, BT, žyyt, Syr. ýqût, "prick;" "goad;" Syr. ýqût, "to prick," "to goad." While there is no proof of a loan here, the limited distribution suggests one.411

žîtu, žîfu, "torch"—The connections, if any, between 408. Z, pp. 16, 62; MD, p. 156. See also Mand. žyyt, 2, "horned creature." For žbn cf. CAD, Vol. Z, p. 100, and add the common Egyptian word żbn, "weight," "part of a scale." There may be some ultimate connection with Ug. ūmh, Heb. ăshûn, zâšûn, Arab. ūshûn, 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 ăḫ. Thus, I find it difficult to see how this late borrowing could be the correct etymology of the BH month name žîw (cf. KBL [34 ed.] p. 255, and Chap. IV, n. 77).


To my knowledge no one has previously interpreted źypt in the Targum Onkelos passage as "mold" (but see Aruch 311). This interpretation is proven correct by the translation of B Helena in our passage given in Targ. Y IT and Neofiti, yyypt, and the medieval dictionaries of Ben-Janach, dpvo, and David ben Abraham al-Fasi, "mold" (for which see C. T. Torrey, "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem," JBL LV [1936] 259 f.). Phraeb. XV/2 zd, "tablet," is interesting if correctly interpreted, because this meaning is attested in Akkadian only for the OB period, for which see now F. R. Kraus, "Alphabetisches zeppûn," BJORC XXIV (1967) 12 ff., and J. J. Finkelstein, in YOH XIII 4 ff.

411. Z, p. 42; LS, p. 204; Salonen, Nipponologica Accadica, p. 159.
this word and Ar. zīgā, "shooting star," are unclear. Syriac also has the form zuqr for "shooting star," so perhaps the Aramaic is related to the preceding entry.412

zīgu, "wind," "breath"—Is Common Ar. zīgā, "storm, cog- nate or a loan? The verb zīgu, "to blow," is known only in Akkadian.413

zuṣū, see zakū.

dururgū, "irrigation hose"—BT zrnmq2, zrnmq2, Mand. zrnmq2 > Aruz. zurnū,414


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/LA calendar. In the list that follows, the probable NB (NA for kanūn) forms are given, followed by the Imperial Aramaic consonantal spelling and the Hebrew and Syriac traditional vocalizations.

abu—abd, Heb., Syr. ṣḥb.

addar—Mr, Heb. ḏḏār, ḏḏār, addär, Syr. ḏḏār.416

a/iijazu—Syr., Heb., Syr. ṣyyār.417

412. Z . p. 12. Other related terms are BH ziqqām, "fire arrows," RV zuqr, "sparks," "dart." These are probably from zuqr, "to forge.

413. Z. p. 45; LS. p. 195.

414. CAD, Vol. 2, p. 167; Salonen, Hausgeräte I 266. The root zqr, "to sprinkle," is common, but this strange Aramaic form must be related to the Akkadian, and if so, zrnmq2 (ṣrūngūl) would appear to be the correct original Aramaic form; see below, Chap. IV, n. 29.


416. For the Hebrew (Yemenite) vocalization with a dagesh, see E. Y. Kutscher, in Suppl. VT XVI 168.

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 θ and θ 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 phenomenon 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.

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. It has even been suggested that Akkadian might now be considered the origin of this feature of the Aramaic morphophonemic system. 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 d, t, and θ with their spirantized counterparts θ, θ, and θ (θ), 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, 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 k and g, and with good reason. Knudsen has shown conclusively that in many words a spelled "k" alternates with "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

5. This observation of Schaefer's (Französische Beiträge I Halle, 1930) 244, and see n. 6 below) has received less recognition than it rightfully due it.
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, d, t, and θ 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 R. Altheim and R. Stiehl, 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, A History of Aramaic (Jerusalem, 1972-73) p. 15, among others.
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 $/b/ as "g" in a syllable $ha$ (L = labial). Knudsen does note correctly that double $/kk/ is never spelled "hh."

There is also evidence for an alternation $t/s/ (only in cases where $[l]$ 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 precondition 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.


10. See von Soden and Mollig, 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. 4f.


13. All students of the problem claim that cuneiform spelling conventions 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 $s/ just as both $z/ and $d/ signs are used for Proto-Semitic $/g/ in Amorite (cf. J. C. Greenfield, "Amurrite, Ogirritic, 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 $/w/ where the evidence overwhelmingly indicates that every non-lengthened $/w/ 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. 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. 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.

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. Barto, "DINGIR.BH and Spirantization in Hebrew," JSJ XIX (1971) 13-14, has shown that the Akkadian translocation of the theophoric element $DIS.BH in personal names, long read as $MIL.GH (i.e., West Semitic $MIKH) and taken to indicate spirantization of the $k, is now to be read $DIS.KAR.

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 ff., who suggests a
In a limited number of Mandaic words, /ıa/ before original /ɛ/ or /ʰɛ/ changes to /ɛ/. 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. Mandaic forms of originally third guttural verbs that have a final ı vowel are formed by analogy to verbs IIIY.

Nasalization

A significant feature of several of the Aramaic dialects is the dissimilation of a gminated consonant by initial nasalization, expressed orthographically by "n." Though occurring elsewhere in the Semitic and Indo-European language families, it is a salient feature of the Babylonian dialect of Akkadian, found occasionally in Old Babylonian and reaching full development in Middle Babylonian. 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 southeastem dialects of Aramaic.

The distribution of this feature in Aramaic is distinctive. It is totally absent from Old Aramaic, occurring first in Imperial Aramaic. Even etymological /n/, which is a 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. (Cf. Kutscher, "Das Kauderwelsch" in ZASS 1971: 27.) The limited confusion of laryngeals in the local Aramaic dialects of Assyria may rightfully be considered the result of Akkadian influence (cf. W. Baumgartner, "Zur Mandäerfrage," HUTA XXIII [1950-SI] 47.)

17. Contra Klein, "Wechselseitigkeiten zwischen dem Aramäischen und dem Neubabylonischen," WZKM XXXIX (1932) 100. See MG, p. 16.


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

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. T. J. Gelb, "La lingua degli Amoriti," AANL, Rendiconti, Classe. . . Morali, Series VIII, Vol. XIII [1959] p. 151, and H. Huffman, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Phonological 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," BASOR, No. 89 [1943] p. 11, n. 17.)

21. It must be remembered that a distinctive feature of Imperial Aramaic 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 Mandaic 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 (Quran, Targums, Nabatean, Nazran, Palmyran, Syriac, Aramaic in Armenian), it is certainly only an orthographic survival of Imperial Aramaic.

Dissimilation of Emphatics

Another characteristic of Mandaic that has been linked to the West by some scholars is the dissimilation of /ğ/ to /k/ when preceding /q/ or /t/, best known in Mandaic in the important word kuštatu. The first occurrence of such dissimilation in Aramaic is in the BR-RMS inscription (KAI, No. 216) from Sam'āl, Aqş, "summer." It occurs in one of the Nebān inscriptions (the verb gšt! > kšt!), and is frequent in the proverbs of Ahiqar. Only the later dialects, mainly Mandaic dissimilation is that of /ğ/ in forms of the root /ğJ/, which could hardly be of Akkadian origin.


23. Most recently discussed by R. Machu 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 Machu, 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 ẖab for (Assyrian) ḫunefer ha-am-ba-su (DEA, No. 121).


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

26. For the argument see AF, p. 245, and Machu, in Altheim and Stiehl, Die Araber in der alten Welt II 103 f. For the phonetic feature see AF pp. 245 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.\textsuperscript{28} Not surprisingly, Akkadian origins for this morphophonemic feature have been suggested, but there is little to support this position.\textsuperscript{29}

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 Geer's Law.\textsuperscript{30} 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 īqṭābī > īqṭabī.\textsuperscript{31} Furthermore, there is an order of precedence in Akkadian: /q/ becomes /k/ before /g/ but /k/ becomes /t/ in the presence of /q/ (or /g/), 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.\textsuperscript{32} 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

...
very unlikely that Mesopotamian Amorite was the source of these shaphel forms, for the usual causative conjunction there was the haphec, as in Aramaic.38 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.39

The l/n Imperfect Prefix

One of the characteristics of Eastern Aramaic is the use of l or n in the prefix of the third person imperfect verbal forms (instead of y), a feature frequently attributed to the influence of Akkadían 10, used in asseverative and jussive verbal constructions.40 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."41 His main argument is that the prefix l- was already used in the jussive sense in Samalian and in the ASur Ostracon with syncope of the y-,42 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.43 A restatement of the data seems appropriate here. Akkadían has a jussive verbal construction known as the preterite in which the optative particle 10 combines with preterite

38. While there are a few Amorite names that seem to yield to interpretation best as shaphel, the common causative is certainly haphec (cf. Huffman, Amorite Personal Names, p. 68; Gelb, in ANAU, Rendiconti XII 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 conjunction 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 verbformen mit ba-, imma-, und un-," AS, No. 16 (Chicago, 1963) 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 l- with hwy in 1A, to which Kutscher has given a completely different interpretation (see below, n. 46.).

verbs yielding forms like liprus, "let him cut," certainly quite similar in shape to the Aramaic jussive construction mentioned above. There is an asseverative particle 120, which can be used with any verbal form, but which does not regularly enter into crisis with the initial vowel of the following verb. This asseverative is found commonly only in royal inscriptions.44

In Aramaic, in addition to the examples of the jussive in Samalian and the ASur Ostracon, l- is used in 1A and Qumran Aramaic both in the jussive and in the indicative of the verb hwy.45 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.46

A more precise statement of the distribution of this feature in Eastern Aramaic is also desirable. No relevant forms occur in the Urk 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-47. In Mandæic n- is also the most usual form, but l- occurs in the earlier texts, alternating with n- in both jussive and non-jussive forms.48

44. GAG § 81f. Crisis does occur, but apparently only when the initial vowel of the verb is u. The optative particle 10 is also found commonly with stative verbs but also often in nominal sentences (cf. GAG § 121c).

45. In Qumran: 4Q Mes. Ar., 1Q 21 and 11QqGQjOq.

46. E. Y. Kutscher, in LIT XXI 128. The examples adduced from Galilean Aramaic by Daiman, 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.

47. See Klaus Beyer, "Der reichsaramäische Einschlag in der heutigen syrischen Literatur," ZDMG 69 (1965) 243. Note that l- is used in the Jewish Aramaic text No. 151 from Dura during dating from 200 A.D.; cf. J. T. Milik, "Parchemin jujudo-aramdén 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 cases elsewhere, the use of y- may be a formulaic archais.

48. MG, pp. 215 ff.; E. Yamauchi, Mandæic Incantation Texts (New Haven, 1967) p. 115, suggests that l- is jussive and n- indicative, but this is obviously the case. They occur together only in one text (No. 311), and there they are used interchangeably. The example of a y- prefix in No. 22:94 is unique in Mandæic. In No. 30:10 read 3 (17) 1îṣyt mô. 25
In Babylonian Talmudic 1- 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. 49 Imperial Aramaic influence or formulaic archaism is possible in the Jewish Aramaic maghribi, which usually have y- and sometimes n-. 50

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). 51 As indicated by the preservation of 1- 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 1- or n- were the norm, at least in Mesopotamian Aramaic. 52 In spite of the anciently attested, authentic Aramaic jussive prefix 1-, the replacement of the simple non-1- jussive by composite 1- forms may well have been influenced by the Akkadian precative 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 -(l) 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 haw, just as in BA, but I have been unable to locate his source.
52. Note that the earliest examples of the 1- prefix in Hatran are all with jussive and subjunctive verbs (texts 23, 53, 74, 79, 101).
53. Why did 1- become 1- 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 n̄m̄ and n̄q̄ corresponding to l̄m̄ and l̄q̄ in Mandaic (the i is original; cf. BM, p. 51), but in l̄m̄ and l̄q̄ in Mandaic, the verbal prefix l- is most frequent in BT and n- in Mandaic.
54. Syrian, which otherwise knows only the shift [n] > [1] (T. Noldke, 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 the 1- was already familiar as the imperfect prefix of the first person plural.

53. Ginsberg considers this "surely due to the Accadian influence." 54 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 new 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 -δ

The ending -δ 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 -δ in all cases. 55 In contrast to the l/n prefix, this was an early and widespread feature in Aramaic. Its first isolated occurrence is the form ʾānāmδ in Ahiqar. It occurs in the Uruk incantation and the early eastern texts (Hatran and Old Syriac) and even, infrequently, in Palmyran and in targumic texts. 56

The objections raised to the view that this feature must be from Akkadian are that -δ could be a Common Semitic abstract ending, that it might possibly be the result of a natural phonetic development, 57 or, more likely, that it developed on

53. Compare, however, the Mandaic second person plural suffix -mēn after all verbs, though this is probably modeled after the third person plural suffix. In fifth-century Syriac, traces of -īna are still to be found; cf. K. Beyer, in ZDMG CXXV 250, where he attributes it to "Peichoder westaramaischer Einschlag."
54. JASG LXII, n. 26.
55. There is hardly any uniformity of opinion, however. Cf. Ginsberg, in Assy LII 101, n. 6, and AF, pp. 173 ff.; K. Beyer, in ZDMG CXXIV 247, n. 10; J. Blau, "The Origins of Open and Closed e in Proto-Syriac," NDOG XXXII (1969) 8. Ginsberg's suggestion that the Akkadian morpheme could be from Aramaic is quite improbable, for in the early Assyrian dialects -δ was already the ending of the oblique plural (cf. GAD paradigm 1).
56. Franz Rosenthal, Die Sprache der palmyrenerischen Inschriften und ihre Stellung innerhalb des Aramäischen (MVG, Vol. XIII [Leipzig, 1916]) p. 76, trans. "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 -δ 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 ʾēzy, tawr, and yēt as collectives (as opposed to regular plural forms used when an actual plural is required) and the frequent bēn- ʾēry, which has been considered an eastern loan. The observation that in these texts the semantic value of the morpheme-δ 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 -ē ending of plural determined gentilic forms.58 Indeed, I would tend to view the latter as the ultimate origin of the -ē 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 -ʿaḏā, for example the pael (m) parṣēḏā. The similarity between this Aramaic form of limited distribution and the Akkadian infinitive parṣrūsu (or even closer, the Assyrian form parrrūsu) was noted by Barth,59 though I know of no suggestion that Akkadian infinites was responsible here. The final -ā of the Aramaic forms is difficult to explain in any case,60 as is the long vowel of the second syllable. The Neo-Syriac pael infinitive prāḏā, instead of the common Aramaic miprāq, is likewise similar, in fact identical, to the Akkadian infinitive of the simple stem parṣēsu; but this is also the original Hebrew infinitive absolute form and is quite common as an abstract verbal noun in the other Aramaic dialects.61

The Plural Ending -ān(in)

In Old Aramaic, the Assyur Ostracon and docketts, and Imperial Aramaic texts from Egypt, the plural masculine suffix is almost always spelled -n rather than -un. This fact led Ginsberg to speculate that since the latter two groups of texts almost always expressed internal 1 or 2 in other cases with a vowel letter, this is not merely an historical spelling for -un but represents the ending -ān.62 Rosenthal refuted this position with what Ginsberg himself terms a "devastating"

58. The gentilic form -āḏā(ḥūḵ) is certainly a natural Aramaic development, a simplification of the overly cumbersome *-ā-auyyāḏ. From there, the analogy kāḏāḏ : kāḏāḏā : kāḏyāḏ with bāḏā : bāḏā : x is solved, of course, only by bāḏā. The Ahiqar form ṣmā 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 ff., and Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, p. 70. Pael infinitives without initial -m- are known from Old Aramaic (cf. ʾāḏpēb, Semfire 18 32) and Imperial Aramaic (ʾāḏmr, frequent in the Assyur Ostracon and in Egyptian Aramaic).
63. Not only is -un found in Egyptian Aramaic in the same texts with -n, but in one text even the same word, "fish" (pl.), is spelled both muwun and muwun. Ginsberg still maintains, 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 -ān is concealed in the spellings discussed above, the ending certainly existed, and found in Aramaic in the double plural -ān, limited to certain types of nouns.66 The plural ending -ānu/i (-ānu/t) 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 -ān as the common plural ending in Geʿez and the remnants of -ān in Arabic, Aramaic, and Hebrew,68 any suggestion that this ending might be other than Common Semitic is very dubious. Nevertheless, since the end in question is highly productive in the Neo-Babylonian period69 and is especially frequent in the modern Eastern Aramaic dialects,70 an Akkadian influence affecting the frequency of use of this plural morpheme cannot be excluded.

The Imperial Aramaic Passive

Another characteristic of Imperial Aramaic is the preservation of the internal passive verbs, limited almost exclusively to

64. AP, No. 45.
65. In JPOS LXXII 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. Löw, "Lexikalische Misszellen," in Festschrift zum siebzigsten Buhrstags David Hoffmann's (Berlin, 1914) pp. 135 ff.
70. The normal plural ending in modern Mandaic is -ānā (HM, p. 215), while in the Neo-Syriac dialects -ānā 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 Veramaric Syriac [Cambridge, 1895] p. 46 f.).
71. Cf. Ginsberg, in ASUL LII 101. Ginsberg's alternative suggestion, that the Akkadian ending was borrowed from West Semitic, can no longer be maintained in light of the occurrence of -ānā in OA and OB (cf. CAG § 611).
ly to the perfect and participle. Ginsberg has also suggested Akkadian influence here. Indeed, the similarity between the Aramaic imperfect passive and the Akkadian permissive does seem "too striking to be accidental." 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, the relative pronoun d(st) is also used as a genitive particle in place of the construct chain. Since the first examples of this usage come from Mesopotamian Aramaic, where there are, in fact, nothing more than direct translations of Akkadian ša, possible Akkadian influence in the development of this feature has been suggested.

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 dšt/šš 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. Nevertheless, in light of the ubiquitous use of genitive šy in Mesopotamian texts and in the Behistun inscription, 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). 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.

A related issue is the common anticipatory genitive construction br šy/dy X, "the son of X," corresponding to Akkadian ša 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. Especially in the latter it is often attributed to Aramaic influence. Others consider the Akkadian construction to be an internal Akkadian development and the Aramaic to be under the influence of Akkadian.

Since, as has been demonstrated, even the simple genitive use of šy 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 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, the natural place for such a syntactic development would be in a language such as Akkadian, which lacks a definitizing morpheme. Thus, it

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/wbl) 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.

73. Ginsberg, in AJSL LIV 99.

74. The one exception generally cited is Sefire III 7-8 k šy ṣhrṭ. "all the kings of my vicinity." Comparison with the frequent Hebrew construction šdš šgšš strongly suggests, however, that šy functions as a relative in this case as well.


76. Passim in Assyrian weights, the AŠšur Ostraca, and Assyrian and Babylonian tablets.


78. Indeed, genitive š is relatively rare in Ugaritic as well.

79. For references see n. 77.

80. Note especially the difference in the frequency of this usage between the proverbs of Abîqaar 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 syntactic 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 genitive materiae, or genitive participial relations), an immanent development can be assumed"—is probably on the right track. Further studies such as Kaddari's (and that of A. Goette, 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. GAC § 138-f.

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, Mandäic, 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. 98

Naturally, Akkadian is the most obvious possibility for the origin of this characteristic, 99 for, because of the strong influence of Sumerian, the verb-final position is the normal one in classical Akkadian. 100 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, 51 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," JASS XXII (1927) 260 ff.).

87. Note that, as opposed to the general use of ʾa 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 LeS. XXII 363 f. The exceptions are the Elephantine legal texts and the Ashur proverbs. Note that the Hermopolis letters, which Greenfield considers a western dialect, have the free word order.

89. C. Ginsburg, in AJS 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 the borrowing of this element of Sumerian syntax: C. J. G. 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., ʾa byt-to ʾan lnbnh, Esra 5:9). 93 Although Aramaists generally ascribe an Akkadian origin to this feature as well, 94 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 unthinkible; 95 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 used were ana paraN (infinitive construct form) X and ana-parAsi/išu ʾa X, corresponding to the older North West Semitic form ʾa + infinitive construct-object. 96 Thus, an Akkadian origin for this syntactic feature must be rejected.

The construction object-infinitive is, however, standard in Old Persian, and are verb-final constructions in general. 97 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-verboobject whereas subject-object-verb is only found later, on the latter construction, too, is almost certainly the result of Iranian rather than Akkadian influence. 98

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 PA 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 of 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 -š, 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 this 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 Aramaic?

101. Ginsberg, in JACOS LXIII 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 predicative usage of the absolute state, from Akkadian, where the absolute state can be conjugated with the pronominal suffixes of the permissive 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 predicative 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 Pitzmayr, Seifere, p. 162, and also the Ashur Ostraca).


However, even so, there are other evident influences from Akkadian, for example, in the use of ki as a conjunction. For instance, in the second part of 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 (predicative, 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 ki

Corresponding to Syriac καθ, "when," Mandaic has the written form καθ and Babylonian Talmudic uses καθ, both of which are also used for the comparative preposition "like." In Neo-Babylonian καθ and καθ is a 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 καθ + δή, "when," is other than a native Aramaic development; 105 thus, NB καθ δή, "when," is almost certainly an Aramaism. Its use as a preposition, however, probably derives from the similar double use of Akkadian καθ, which has a long history, although it is most frequently found in NB, after the longer form καθαμα drops from common use. 106

The BT form, which has heretofore defied explanation, could easily be regarded as a loan from NB καθ. 107 In light of the Mandaic form καθ, however, one might venture to posit a development καθ = καθ and if so, only the prepositional

105. Cf. BH καθά;
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 "kaf" would have been borrowed, corresponding to the 
NB use of ki 'as a preposition. Another possibility is to 
regard the Mandaic written form kg as an histori-
ical spelling for a phonetic form such as [kî], the same form 
as in BT, and borrowed from NB.109 Such an interpreta-
tion 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 mû

In Babylonian Talmudic and Mandaic, declarative sentences 
are made interrogative when preceded by the particle mû 
(spelled my in BT; mû, my incorporated, as a prolocit, my in Man-
daic). This particle may well derive from the identical Akka-
dian enclitic particle -mû, itself probably a development of 
the interrogative pronoun minu, "what."111 The change from an 
enclitic particle in Akkadian to initial position in Babylon-
ian Aramaic can be explained as a substitution for the earlier 
Aramaic interrogative b-, or merely as a result of the tend-
cy to avoid enclitic and second position particles in Baby-
lonian Aramaic.112


110. Cf. SN, pp. 234, 452 ff., MD, p. 211. The form kidbirku cited 
in MD, p. 211, s.v. ki, as a scripts plane is to be regarded rather as a 
phonetic writing of what would in normal orthography be kôbirdirku. Note 
that d is the enclitic variant of g when used after prepositions (cf. MD, 
p. 97).

111. Cf. ANW, p. 650, GAG § 123b. Note that von Soden derives the 
Akkadian from the similar -mû, suggesting that vowel harmony is the cause of 
the i vowel. Both forms are found in OA and SB but are apparently un-
known in NA or NB texts. Even if -mû did not occur in those dialects, 
however, the Aramaic form may have developed directly from the pronoun 
minu. Most scholars try to derive the Aramaic particle in question from 
Aramaic mû; indeed the BT form of the latter is mûy, which might easily 
become my. Schlesinger, Satzlehre, p. 157, n. 2, claims that my is found 
as a rhetorical interrogative particle in YT, and my is apparently at-
tested in Palestinian Midrash, but until an investigation based on good 
manuscripts is available, my must be considered a characteristic of Baby-
lonian Aramaic alone.

112. Cf. NG, p. 429.

IV
ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

PHONOLOGY

As discussed in Chapter I, the Akkadian loanwords in Ara-
maic 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, spe-
cifically on the chronology of consonantal merging and vowel 
reduction. The following is an attempt to assemble the evi-
dence on such matters derivable from a study of the loanwords. 
In addition to this material, the evidence offered by trans-
literations of Akkadian names in alphabetic script and of Ara-
maic and other names in cuneiform as well as that of the Ara-
maic loans in Akkadian has also been scrutinized. The few 
tables 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, g, or n. Initial b becomes 
p in some NA words. NB has "b" where other dialects have "m" 
in forms of hab/mag, "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-

See also A. Uegnad, "Zur Aussprache des Spätbabylonischen," Altoriental-

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/mag, the spelling with "b" is NB, while the spelling 
with "w" does not occur in NB at all, though "m" is the standard NB way 
of expressing [w] (see below, Nasalis). Thus, [w] is certainly not in-
tended in the NB spelling of this word.

3. This shift is attested in alphabetic transliterations in the 
names 26-bar < bû-pa-Assur (ASFlur tablet 3) and p(?)chur (ASFlur tablet 6).
tions in NA, however, /b/ and /p/ are also kept distinct in the transliterations. Diller’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:
badagnu : plagag—The form palag is well attested in SB, perhaps as an Assyrianism.

hṣb : ?—If any of the Aramaic forms aside from hṣb are indeed loans, then there are irregularities. Perhaps Syr. ḫṣp is a loan, with b > p because of the ạ.
parkullu : ḫywb exploiting This is difficult; perhaps p > b by assimilation to the ạ and į 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 : mntr > b > 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 ṭ are represented in loanwords by alphabetic d, t, and ṭ, respectively. 6

In NB intervocalic d becomes dd as in ṣalantu and ṣagumdu. Problematic loanwords are:

kutimmu : kd—Syllabic spellings of this Sumerian loanword (kṣ-d-im) 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, ṭ, or d.

where the second element is clearly the Akkadian upahhr. Note that in names with the element apiu (such as Tiglatpilesar and ṣipdr in ASur tablet 5) p is always preserved, suggesting even in the construct form apiu 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 < sinipu and ṣibynu < susapiunu.

4. Cf. GAG Ergänz., p. 4
5. Since in NB intervocalic /m/ > [m], perhaps intervocalic /b/ was then free to vary in phonetic range toward [m]. This would explain the NB spelling of habasitu discussed above (n. 2) as a reasonable spelling for something like (hames)fr.
6. The problem of d/t 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 ṣub becomes Akkadian ṣappu, a reading based on West Semitic writings such as BR ṣpsr for Akk. ṣapparu (cf. dippu, dappu). Still, in light of the consistent renderings of the consonants in transliterations 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 transliterations is in O. Kräckmann, Neubabylonischem Rechts- und Verwaltungsteile (Leipzig, 1931) No. 20, where ṣ/h_m may represent a name ending in ah-tiddin.

nabatku, nadasakku : naddk—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 nathaku is only a modern, etymologically influenced but erroneous transcription.

šītu, šīnu : šnt—See above, p. 102.

Velars

The Babylonian phonetic change ṵ (or mk) > ng is well known and is represented in the loanwords by tamkāru > t(ng)gr. The only other ṣ/mk interchange apparent from the cuneiform sources is in NA, where ṣ is found for k very rarely in initial position; yet the transliterations consistently have "g" for NA intervocalic /k/. 8 Of the loanwords, the following have /q/ for Akkadian /k/ and may therefore be assigned an Assyrian origin:

ekkurru : ṣwqr, šuku : ṣqr, šaku : sn, ša ekalli : šyl

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 ṵk is preserved as unvoiced, as in šukkalu : škl. 10 The realization of /k/ in other positions is not so clear:

kimahlu—In discussing this word I suggested an Assyrian pronunciation (gimah); 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


AO XVIII (1957-58) 121 f., No. 2.

8. I have limited this shift to intervocalic rather than postvocalic position solely on the basis of the parallel case of the labial stops. ṭaknu : ṣgm 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 epenthetic vowel as in the construct form šakin.

9. Hurrian influence 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. Purnes in I. J.

10. That intervocalic ṵk remained (kk) in Assyrian is demonstrated as well by the BN loan ṣakku < ṣakkamu, "treasure," which must be from Assyrian with mk > nk > tt rather than Babylonian where mk > nd (dt).
neighboring liquid might well be the immediate cause of the voicing in this instance.

mulšašu : mska—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 : *purgul—The original Akkadian consonants are uncertain. The older dictionaries list the word under burgul', but from Sumerian BUR.GUL. one would expect purkullu. Nor can one determine, if indeed *purgul is derived from this word, whether it was borrowed from NA or NB. The form to which it assimilated, *podkul', was borrowed from NB.

The problematic velars in the Aramaic forms from guššu and askippatu 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 /s/ 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 /s/ > [s] was a systematic phonetic development in the process of which the signs for original /s/ came to be used for [s] .12 /š/ and /š/ did not merge in Assyrian, however, for Assyrian "š" is used to write West Semitic "š" and vice versa.13

11. Cf. DEA, pp. 16 ff. The few Biblical exceptions, which are cited by Delaporte, merit investigation. The place name *šurar 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, 1946) 15 ff.). It occurs properly as šurar in Hebrew and Old Aramaic, but as šur in later Aramaic. The š of the name šuršar may represent assimilation to the Hebrew cognate. The š of šimšar (Shalmanesar) is no longer to be considered an exception (see Chap. II, n. 364). To be added to the list is Hebrew šb šq for the Assyrian title rab šaq. Here, too, one suspects assimilation to the Hebrew root šq or else a Babylonianized formation.

12. When "š" is actually written, as it is frequently in the vicinity of /h/ 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 "š" 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 "š." In DEA we find š-piššu for š-pizšu and ha-am-bu-ššu for ha-bššu. For the representation of Assyrian "š" by alphabetic "š" cf. the names of the priests of Nebra šnšnu and špššr (see S. Kaufman, "Gigabara, Priest of Sahr in Nebra," JACOS XC (1970) 270 ff.). See, too, Chap. II, n. 364.

14. This is in names with the logographically written divine element previously read as ʾšstar, but spelled alphabetically šš (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 ʾšš, read šštar, in fact stands for the other word for "godness," šštu, 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 Jamaran, the Armenian descendent of šimšu.

16. The first is considered Babylonian because the other wind names are clearly Babylonian loans. As for šštar, the Assyrian realization should have been šš > ššš : ššššš, as in ššššš šššš.
precedes final -t of the feminine affix (e.g., manzaltu, maraltu) and apparently also before τ (e.g., bulṣtu).

The phonetic problems involving sibilants in haṣbu, ša ekallī and paššurum have been discussed under the respective entries.

Glottal Stop and าะ
Along with the disappearance of most of the laryngeals, /ʔ/ was also lost in many positions in Akkadian; nevertheless, the phoneme /ʔ/ persisted in all of the Akkadian dialects. Words with initial vowels certainly have at least a weak glottal onset, represented by "ʔ" in alphabetic transliteration. In personal names where the second or third element begins with a vowel, "ʔ" is usually expressed in the transcriptions. In the two compound loanwords whose second element is ekallī (arad ekalī and ša ekallī), no glottal is indicated.

Akkadian words beginning with a vowel have initial /ʔ/ in their Aramaic forms. Exceptions are: the Mandaeic forms from atuš and ištēnū, where the loss of "ʔ" is certainly a late, Mandaeic development. In atappu, asumittu and amurraqānu the Aramaic forms without initial "ʔ" 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 tpong and mrqyn. See also Chapter II, s.v. uγurru. The initial "ʔ" of štymn < šatuymu is a secondary development in Aramaic.

It should be pointed out here that there is absolutely no evidence for the preservation of ʔayin in first-millennium Akkadian and no firm evidence that any North West Semitic borrowing from an Akkadian word with an initial vowel has /ʔ/: see the entries adannu, ade, arnano, ebūnu, errēšu, eṭērū, ištīn, izqēli. Akkadian /ʔ/ is borrowed as "ʔ" in Aramaic. Problematic words are kimahu and nishu. In his analysis of kwh: kimahu, Kutscher proposes that the Eastern Syriac pronunciation of "ʔ" as [ʔ] is the origin of the form kwh. He have argued (Chap. II, n. 160) that a Nabatean pronunciation with

[h], also discussed by Kutscher, is to be considered responsible in the case of kwh. Nabatean can also be used to explain the various forms of nishu. Nabatean nsḥ and Mandaeic nsḥ show that this word was indeed borrowed into early Aramaic. Pronounced with [ʔ], it was borrowed into Arabic as nūṣbah from Nabatean or a similar dialect. The later Aramaic (Syriac and Mandaeic) forms with /ʔ/ must be borrowings from Arabic. Medieval Hebrew nūṣḥān is also from Arabic, but as it is a scholarly loanword, the representation of Arabic /ʔ/ by "ʔ" is explicable.

Nosals
It is well known that in NB/LB intervocalic "m" represents [w], both in the case of original /w/ and original /m/. That is to say that [w] is the allophone of /m/ occurring in intervocalic position. The following words with etymological /m/ appearing as /w/ in Aramaic were thus borrowed from Babylonian: amāru, amuṣānu, arqamānu, hīṣṭū, lūmašu, namāru, simānu, Šamallū, Šammāšu, Šimšu, and perhaps asumittu. Of those examples where intervocalic /m/ appears in Aramaic as /m/, Palmryan gmm < kimahu, Syriac ṣmd < emēdu, and zm < simānu are certainly from Assyrian. West Semitic ṣmd, ṣmd < emēdu, imittu, a Neo-Babylonian technical term, is not to be considered an exception to the rule. The well attested occurrence of ʔayin 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 mrqyn 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 "w" (or even disappears!) and /w/ either becomes "m" or "b" (although "b" probably signifies [w]).

Doubled /m/ in Babylonian remains /m/ in the loans.

21. See Spiri̇ntization in Chap. III.
22. Also see s.v. šamānu. 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 "ʔ" for /w/: cf. GAG Ergāzū, § 31d. The Babylonian examples are ēṭēmumu (if BH ṣyūm is this word), kutimmu, šimiltu, šamantu, n光环ēmu and wēmu, of which only the first four are necessarily Babylonian, the first two by context and the third and fourth because of the sibilants.
The phonetic realization of final /m/ in Babylonian is not perfectly clear. L(2)m < İlmu is Assyrian and m̄u < hāmu also probably comes from Assyrian. In BT nktm̄ > naṛktam̄u the "m̄" 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. 24 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 "m." In late Assyrian it can disappear or change the following /a/ vowel to "u." 25 In the loanwords, aṣṛtu < waritru appears as arṣrtu in Aramaic, but ar̃hritmu < warar̃hitmu becomes m̄rdšmu. The latter is certainly borrowed from Babylonian. The transliterators offer no relevant information except for the Hatran name wrdnb, which may be Warad-Nabû but might also be of Iranian origin. 26 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, 27 the change from /l/ to /n/ in tarlugušu > ṭmrnl̄ probably occurred in Aramaic, where such changes are much more common. 28 Otherwise the liquids undergo no changes in passing from Akkadian to Aramaic. 29 Although it is not attested in any of the certain loanwords, an important MB/LB phonetic trait is the change of /r/ before /r/ or /lf/ to "k," as represented in Aramaic transliteration by the spelling ṭmr for the Babylonian pronunciation of the divine name 1/ENURTA (NIN.I.B, usually read Ninurta) as op-

24. In DEA, No. 43, pāḏmḵ : ḫn(l)i-habû-ṭ̄mû. Aramaic spellings of ẖm̄ in Babylonian personal names are not decisive, nor is it always followed by the vowel of the next name element. Similarly, alwβl in a new tablet from Nippur is sišm-lil. As for ḫw < kššmu, there is no evidence currently available that would demonstrate that /m/ is the original phoneme.

25. GAG § 21c. In mššfuršu, this is actual (m) or just conditioned writing from finite forms like unwššir where (w) is certainly intended?


28. See The l/n Imperfect Prefix in Chap. III.

29. In zušr̃uq > zruq one can posit an intermediate Akkadian form *zurunqu, as indicated by BT zrvnq, rather than a change *zurququ > zurnuqu. Thus, the /r/ would not be involved in the change. Nevertheless, a dissimilation /tr/ > /m/ is certainly possible; see s.v. asurru.
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, although 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 șašaru : šår, šalandu : š[l]add, a significant number of such nouns are subject to a lengthening of the first syllable in Aramaic, either by vowel lengthening, as in kanunu : kānu, or consonant lengthening, as in atūnu : atūnu. 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 the loanword 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 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.36 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 sugqū and ša rēši are Babylonian.37 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, nisānu and šimānu show lengthening in the first syllable in Aramaic, while in šašaru the vowel is reduced.38 This evidence suggests that at the time of the borrowing of these month names /i/ (and perhaps /u/) were subject to reduction while, as in Gezek, /a/ was still preserved.39 Such an historical reconstruction agrees well with the evidence of Syriac, which generally has no spirantization of bdgkpt following a (reduced)

34. Cf. J. Blau, "Some Difficulties in the Reconstruction of 'Proto-Hebrew' and 'Proto-Canaanite,'" In Memoriam Paul Kahle, ed. Matthew Black and George Fohrer. BEAST, Vol. X XII (Berlin, 1968) 31. nn. 9 f. Note that his reconstruction of the Akkadian form corresponding to Syriac țâmu is incorrect. Since it was borrowed from Babylonian, the /m/ must have been doubled, as reconstructed in Chap. 111.
36. E. Beyer, "Der reichsaramische Einschlag in der keltischen Sprachenstruktur," 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. Kutcher 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.)
37. To be sure, BH sārīš preserves the qamatz in the plural form sārīš. R. Tadmor (orally) notes the spelling ša-rēši in PMV IV 17.25 l. 22 and suggests that Hebrew preserves here an old western pronunciation of this term.
38. The situation is unclear with gedēt[u], whose vocalization is known only from Hebrew, where pretonic vowels are lengthened, and with edlu, where Syriac and Hebrew differ in the length of the vowel.
39. 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 uṣig [q], šarānu, and
still been in use in late Akkadian, one might expect at least some clue to their existence in the Aramaic forms of the loan-words; but no Aramaic forms end in a consonant give any indication of any case ending (see below for hubullu and amurrû). 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 -ê, which becomes -yê in the emphatic state. Included here are assû, attalû, burû, manû, nudûlû, pattiû, radû, sadû, samalî, and cuballû. The Aramaic forms clearly derive either from the genitive singular ending in -ê, or, more likely, from the construct form ending either in -ê or -êê. This fact supports the view that final long (circumflexed) vowels were still pronounced in NB, though short vowels had dropped. Indeed -êê may have been the ending for all cases, at least in NB. If the nominative-accusative ending were actually -ê (as the grammars claim), one might expect more traces of -ê in Aramaic; but -ê occurs only in the rare Aramaic forms derived from edî and gapû (and see nagû). No final vowel at all occurs in the Aramaic forms of šinekû and bârûnu. Note that these two are loans from Assyrian, whose forms that have -û, whenever origin can be determined, are from Babylonian. Two words which end in a final -û in Aramaic but appear to derive from Akkadian words without a final vowel are šwûru: amurrû and the šarû and Man- daic hûwê: hubullû.

Vowel quality is almost always preserved in the Aramaic forms of Akkadian loanwords, with the following exceptions: Akkadian û becomes Aramaic û in bûrûnû, digûru, and mûhûzû, all Eastern Aramaic forms and thus difficult to explain, though before n this vowel change is not unknown in Aramaic. As suggested earlier (s.v. mûhûzû), the û in mûhûzû may be due to Canaanite influence. The change in digûru is problematic.

46. Cf. GAG § 64i. 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 hûwê as a gûlûa astractive form (cf. NN, p. 201, Noldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar § 137) may be correct, but it hardly applies to amurrû; 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. Noldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar § 44.
may be considered an Akkadian development. From maššānu
Syriac has maššānā, while in Nabatean and JAR, the form is
maššān. In a western form šš is not unusual, but how is
one to explain the long vowel? Apparently the Akkadian form
is to be transcribed as maššānu, as the Syriac form suggests
as well.52

In maššānu Aramaic has is for Assyrian /u/ and, the West
Semitic form corresponding to Babylonian nishu has us. This
probably results from an Akkadian tendency to centralize high
short vowels before sibilants.53

Mandaic has nǜndu from nindābū and tçuwā from ticusru.
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)umīnas and nūhatāmi, and, with a long vowel, in
the BT and Mandaic form gnānā < gānnū.54 I am unable to ex-
plain the third case, but I have suggested explanations for
the others in Chapter II. Isolated phonetic difficulties are
presented by sawkānā, the various Aramaic forms of
muterru, and Hatran, Mandaic prykā < parakkū.

The diphthong of Syriac sawtān (Akk. Šutappu) is prob-
lematic. A possible explanation is to ascribe its origin to
analogy with the verbal form sawwa. See also s.v. būqqu.

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, gitšu, consonantal length is always preserved. In
final position in words of more than one syllable, consonantal
length may be preserved, as in asuppā (BH asuppā) and balappu
> plappā, or the vowel may be lengthened instead, for example,
suttān < Šutappu. Whenever the vowel is lengthened, it
probably derives from an Akkadian by-form rather than a secon-
dary Akkadian development.55 In some words, however, no
length is preserved at all, and the vowel is subject to reduction:
arád ekáli, nikkāsu, and dialectal forms of tarlugallu,

50. Cf. GAG and GAG Ergänz., § 90.
51. For the e vowel see NSideke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, p. 32
and n. 2.
52. Cf. the OA maššānum (AW., p. 827).
53. Cf. GAG § 90, and W. von Soden and W. Möllig, Das akkadische
Syllabar (2 ed.) pp. xxiv.
54. All JAR. forms of this word, even those spelled gynn, are to
be vocalized with mobile schwa in the first syllable and not i followed
by doubled a (as in Jastrow, Dictionary, p. 258)
55. For the "free variation" between vowel and consonantal length
Since it seems fairly systematic, at least in the late Akkadian dialects,
while "compensatory lengthening" is less frequent in Aramaic (cf. NSideke,
Compendious Syriac Grammar § 43 B), the source seems to be Akkadian.

hubullu, kimahhu, and BA Sēqīlāt < Sa ekālli. The process in-
volved is probably one of back-formation from absolute forms
where the doubling is not expressed, e.g. ardēgal : arēḏās;
ḥal : ḥulā. Thus, this reduction never occurs where the Akk-
dian has a long vowel in the final syllable which would al-
ways 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 /w/ had become [w]. Ac-
ccordingly [w] is written "m." Internal št/it 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 /s/ became [š], usually written "š," and etymo-
logical /s/ became [s], written "s," though in initial posi-
tion "s" can indicate [z] or [z] as well.

In Aramaic the reduction of pretonic short vowels appears
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 rele-
vant 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 Aramaic had spirantization of stops while Aramaic
did not (during the period of contact). Nowhere in the tra-
scriptions is Akkadian d represented by alphabetic z, t by ū,
k by ū, or g by ĕ; nor is any systematic problem encountered
in the spirantization of any of the stops in the loanwords.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 egirtu, igaru, Šutappu, atiru,

56. The only possible example is /k/ for /g/ in the Syr. form meškā
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/g the phonemic merger occurs. 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.57 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 THEARAMAIC DIALECTS

Old Aramaic

The only loanwords occurring in Old Aramaic are snb: šinepā, srs: ša rāšī, and mpr: miṣarā. From a much earlier borrowing are skn: šakku at Hama and the possible early loan spr at Seftire. 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 hrg, Samalian prs, ūqīl: Samalian (and Seftire) ṣīy; BR RKB 7rī2 and the dissolution in kyṣ2; and Seftire ṣādy and tī.58

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. gubbū, "all." Most scholars interpret it as the common Aramaic word for "side" or read gb̄(l̄)l, "border."

2p̄š (Zakir B:11)—Though understood by early scholars to be Akk. aps̄l,59 2p̄š is almost certainly to be taken as the proper name still surviving today in the name of the site where the stele was found,60 snmr (Kilimannu II, KAI, No. 25)—A relationship with late

58. Chap. II, s.v. ād, ṣaṭṭu, ārāṣ, ṣū, āli; Chap. I, s.v. kussud, ṣūq̄ū; 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.

wēššum (Hadad, I. 4, KAI, No. 214)—The context is broken. Perhaps the word is similar to Akk. šanšum, "again," but, if so, F. M. Cross and his similarity is almost certainly coincidental. Adverbs are rarely borrowed; see below, p. 168.

rīnšīn (Hadad, II. 28, 29)—Although the context and readings are uncertain, Montgomery's interpretation "oath," from Akk. nīšu, makes good sense semantically,61 but in the light of the sibilant difficulty if the word were borrowed from Assyrian as we would expect, and the infrequent use of nūšu in late Akkadian, this must remain highly uncertain.62

hīnpīs (BR RKB, I. 14, KAI, No. 216)—This is hardly to be considered a "tam" form "unter ostsemit." Einfluss gebildet.63 I agree with Cross and Freedman and with Poebel that it is a reflexive of a by-form nīb of a root which occurs in two other well known by-forms, ābāb and yēbāb.64

The comparison offered by Fitzmyer with ḫīrī ḫīṭi is scarcely correct, for the latter is a temple official (CAD, Vol. E, p. 290).65 A comparison with ḫīrī ḫakālī, 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.66

师事务所 (Seftire II A:6)—The reading and context are uncertain. If correctly read, it could be "their Asherahs" but hardly Akk. āširū, "sanctuary."67

62. It should be noted that in Akkadian one swears a nīš āṭar or nīš ūṭī, the oath of the king or god, whereas in Hadad nīsh would appear to mean "his oath."
63. KAI II 233.
66. H. Tadmor, "Notes to the Opening Lines of the Aramaic Treaty from Sīhar," ZSjor Shmuel Peirin (Jerusalem, 1970) pp. 401 ff. Although Tadmor's conclusion is based on the Akkadian parallel and the biblical āḏīḇāḇ āḏūb, 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.
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 imperfective major dialectal differentiations, except for the imperfective major dialectal differentiations, except for the isogloss of the Zakir inscription. Since this is in an isogloss with South Canaanite, 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 imperfective polite, was not Damascusene Aramaic itself. There are, however, only a few examples of historical narrative in Standard Old Aramaic outside of Zakir (which itself uses the perfect after  bào 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 Damascusene origin remains open. 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.


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 imperfective construction does not conclusively exclude a Phoenician influence. The language of Zakir could hardly be said to be an artificial Aramaic-Phoenician jargon on the evidence of this verb construction. Cf. Degen, Altoramäische Grammatik, p. 114, n. 21.


The conclusions of this study can be applied to the problems of Akkadian (and Aramaic) loanwords in Biblical Hebrew as well. Sufficient 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 h#y: and skh, 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 Biblical and Aramaic 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 mlk: nkkts, must be fairly late.


72. For the problem of genitive 2 in Sefire, see above, Chap. III, n. 73.

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 in the phrase in Sefire III 11, “seek my head to kill me” (J. C. Greenfield, “Binit Leshanyou btkvvt Sfdr,” Leš. XXVII/XXVIII [1964] 506; 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. 6) suggests that the scribes of the Sefire treaty actually knew Akkadian and were translating directly from Akkadian prototypes. I find it hard to believe that 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!
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, not equally, that all of the Aramaic forms represent actual Aramaic words and are not, in some cases, just transliterations of Akkadian forms. Thus, the "loanwords" skl, lpm, kdm, and perhaps dhncht are unique to Mesopotamian Aramaic.

As discussed in Chapter III, Mesopotamian Aramaic makes frequent use of zy as a genitive particle, and the word order is characteristically free. None of the other characteristics of Eastern Aramaic occurs except for final -s of the determined plural in the Uruk incantation. As yet there is very little material to analyze, but it is clear that 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 evidence weakening of the laryngeals, and, at least in the Asur ostraca, nasalization does not occur, as shown by the form ḫp, "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.

87. Might the docketts 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.

89. Excepting those few Hebrewisms 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

The Development of the Aramaic Dialects

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 no more equally than in the 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 Ahlqar. Greenfield, in discussing Kutscher's valuable observation that the Ahlqar 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, 161), to be cognate with and not a loan from kinatu. This seems to be quite unlikely. At the
very least, however, loanwords are quite rare in the proverbs.83 More important than quantity is the fact that in the proverbs one finds good Aramaic words such as ṣḥqǝl and ṣr̄f rather than the equivalent Akkadian loans ṣȳz̄b and ṣ̄ȳz̄.

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 Nebâb, the short Gözne inscription, and, from Egypt, the Bauer-Weissner papyrus, the Hermopolis letters, the undated, fragmentary AP, No. 49 and the very late papyrus 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-Weissner the form ḫm̄n̄ (meaning?) occurs once; in the Sabbath Ostraca ṣn̄ṣȳ and ṣ̄p̄ȳṣ̄ȳ are found in the same line; and though ṣ̄m̄m̄ is the normal Hermopolis form, ṣ̄m̄d̄n̄ does occur once.85

The genitive use of ṣz̄ȳ is frequent in all of Imperial Aramaic except for the Ahiqar proverbs. Kaddari has compiled the ratio of construct state to ḫ-phrases for many of the Imperial Aramaic texts; they rank as follows in order of increasing frequency of ḫ-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).86

Free word order is found in all the Imperial Aramaic texts except for the legal texts from Elephantine and the Ahiqar proverbs.87 The order subject-object-verb, however, is a characteristic Aramaeanid feature.

The different distribution of each of these features makes analysis difficult. While nasalization, ṣz̄ȳ genitive, 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 ṣz̄ȳ 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-Weissner 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 ʾl- was probably commonly used in Mesopotamian Aramaic, it cannot be true that Imperial Aramaic was ever nothing more than contemporary Mesopotamian Aramaic, for ʾl- 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 -ŋ, 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

83. Other troublesome words in the proverbs are ṣw̄q̄n̄w̄n̄ȳ (1.92; Chap. II, s.v. niq̄) and ṣw̄m̄ ḫ̄iṭ̄er (11.80, 196). Ginsberg is almost certainly correct in finding the latter word in Second Isaiah (AHAT, p. 428, n. 2). This could hardly be a loan from Akk. arbu, "half-brick" (cf. Chap. II, s.v.). Though that loan may develop the meaning "lath" in later I members (cf. G. Hoffmann, "Lexikalische," 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. wa-rb, "copper," compare Akk. ṣīp̄r̄, "bronze," used in the meaning "fetters" (see CAD, Vol. E, p. 321a). Cf. also SB, NE eru, “headband.”
84. KAII, No. 259.
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.
88. It is hoped that the fourth-century texts from Samaria will soon be published, which will shed further light on these problems. 
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/dyg/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 Akhgar 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-verbal 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 Balâzêz and Usûrâr valleys during the final stages of the Assyrian Empire; 89 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 Nabatean 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 l- jussive and the -ê determined 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 Syrian speech.

89. See the discussion of Syriac, below.

The Development of the Aramaic Dialects / 161

Monumental Dialects

Our material provides little new information on the monumental dialects. Except for the two new words occurring only in Hatran, parakku and ùškùpu, and the unusual word půkîl, 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:

-øwbû : purkûlu, also in Syriac;
-øyû : arîtu, also BT and Targum Psalms;
-økû : ûškarû, only in Syriac and Arabic in the meaning "field";
-gyssûn : gišû, also Syriac, BT, Mandaic, but only in the Peshitta is it used for "loins," as here;
-ø(ø)bû : ûšbulû, also Syriac, BT, Mandaic, Targum Hagioiographa;
-ûûy : rûšûlû, also BT and Mandaic;
-øûbbû : ûš bâbî, also Palm., BT, Mandaic, Syriac (and in Pseudo-Jonathan but not Neocîlit).

The following vocabulary items are characteristic of these two Targums and Imperial Aramaic as well:
-øûtu, well known from Imperial Aramaic but not used in JPA at all; occurs in Samaritan and in Eastern Aramaic;
-zûpû : ûšpû, "mold;" since the denominative verb "falseify" 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.

-øwrû : ekru, outside of Imperial Aramaic (Eq.) this

90. These words are the Aramaic forms of asû, kanûnu, kinânu, mûhûnu, nîshû, ûš bâbî, ûšcappû, and tankûru. I know of no Imperial Aramaic texts whose content would have required the use of any of these, though asû might occur in a broken text. As has been pointed out above (p. 157), rûpû is used in the Akhgar 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 palmäischen Inschriften und ihre Stellung innerhalb des Aramäischen [MaiG, Vol. XLI (Leipzig, 1936) passim], pûwû, 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.
is offered by the otherwise solely Babylonian Talmudic words .TR.l (aššu), .TR.2 (abušu), prq (purqidim), and mvr (kamru), (see also 54.3. 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 dš (daltu) and šyšš (šš bāḥš) 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 tracts written in a dialect which in appearance is much closer to Targumic Aramaic: Nedarim, Nasir, Meilah, Kritot, Tamid, and part of Temurah. All scholars agree that these are the latest tracts of the Talmud, but there is uncertainty about whether the language is archaising or late, spoken, Gaonic Aramaic. An analysis of the Akkadian loanwords in BT shows that, except for common Aramaic terms (e.g., šyšš), no Akkadian loanwords appear in these tracts, though one might have expected a few if indeed the tracts 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. Where it can be demonstrated that Pseudo-Jonathan is anterior to Onkelos, his arguments for such a position are generally fallacious, as demonstrated by the linguistic evidence assembled below. The single occurrence in VT is almost certainly due to contamination as well. For the religious terms see ekurru, ginē, ištaru, marû/īru, manâmû, šâhiru, and šatamû. In astrological terminology, šuğš : šuğš and 56.12 : šuğš are unique to Mandaic, but reflexes of 56.12 and lamû occur in Syriac as well, and mazzalû 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, šēru and gūnuš, refer specifically in Mandaic to pagan practices, as does pruš, 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 Babylonian Mandean religion had its origins elsewhere than in Babylonian. 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. Šēru is rare and of uncertain usage, as is gūnuš, though the latter, in the passage cited in MD, is associated with demons and very probably has evil connotations. Thus, it seems that the Hebrew translation "temple functionary" is based solely on the Akkadian meaning for want of anything better (cf. G. Widengren, "Französisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in parthischer Zeit" [Cologne and Opladen, 1970] p. 14, n. 115). Šēru and masûtu 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 gīšu, which, as shown above, must have been in Imperial Aramaic as well.

A Quantitative Analysis of the Lexical Data

When divided into semantic categories (see Table 1), the Akkadian loanwords group themselves into fairly predictable patterns. 107 In Imperial Aramaic 108 the largest percentage 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 Balši region was under Assyrian political control and remained an important Assyrian provincial center. In fact Harran was the final stronghold of the Assyrian Empire. 103 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 Balši and Gābir 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, 104 also may have obliterated 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. 105 Perhaps further study of the Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects can illuminate this issue. 106
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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.

emdu, gerê, hâmû, hubullu, ilku, iškaru, kerru, maddatu, menû, naškaru, misku, miṣri, nikkatu, muṣum, paṣ̄aru, šāḫatu, šiku, rabû, râšî, susăpiminu, šēlu, šēlu, ūšēlu;

Professions: arad ekašî, adî, atīšu, aškāpu, ārēšu, gašû, hazānu, iškaru, iškuru, lahušu, malâhu, nigašrû, nippaḫu, nunašīmu, pâšêtî, purkallu, ša šēlki, šamâliš, šatammû, šitappu, talîkku, tamkaru, ummušu:

Architecture: aballu, aguru, amûru, ašnu, astcu, akkappa, assappu, bûnu, birtu, daltu, edictu, gašûrû, gannânu, gišîru, gušûru, hittu, igurû, kišinnu, mabûru, tarbâšu, tichuru, urubâšu, wâšu;

Religion: akkurû, ānî, ištaru, ilîšu, maqîšû, nindabû, nûbdû, parâkku, šûdu, šîrû, maašût;

Astronomy: atâšî, lašânu, maaṣaltu, šišîpu;

Topography: amuru, appâru, aripî, atappu, birtî, ārîtu, iku, iškuru, šîctâmû, šûru, mabâšnu, mûtu, mîru, mušannitu, mašâšî, nûbûnu, suqûnu, wâšu, ūndû, šâru, šûtu, ušâlu;

Scribal: asumite, askiru, gišîtu, nishu, šāšû, šišîpu;

Tools and Utensils: ãšî, bukû, diqû, ešitu, harû, kanna, kašûnu, marî, mûraru, nakašû, ninašu, nînu, nikišîtu, pušû, pušû, rašî, rašîku, sînikânu, sîmmihû, sušû, taballû, širimmû, širumû, zuqûq;

Others: argawamnu, aru, aršûnu, ašåmu, bašûru, bûzû, burû, šumma, šannu (1), šulâ (2), kišišû, kušû, kušû, kusumû, mažara, mušû, nakkînu, pušû, quqû, qašû, quqû, rašû, rašû, sîkkanu, suqû, šušu, šûpu, zaqûpu, kišîru, amûrû, bulîtu, kašûnu, šamallitu, šarîqâli;

General: abbûtu, amûrîqînu, bûxânû, edû, gišû, gišû, ānîku, hinêku, hinêku, imûtu, ānu, karšû, kinatku, kutallu, lishantu, màšû, mašûnu, nabûru, nišû, nṣî, pînu, puru, purqîsam, pušû, sušûnu, suqû, ša ša, šašûnu, šannu, šanô, ša šâbû, šikînu, šišînu, šušu, šišênu, tiqû, wâšu, ūšû, tajîšû;

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: toponymic 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 (21%) 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 Aramaeans. 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 because 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>Aramaic</th>
<th>Eastern Aramaic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb-noun</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>66%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nouns</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectives</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbs</td>
<td></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 quite clear 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 18th 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 zy 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...
starts later, lasts for a shorter period of time, and is of a different nature from that which scholars have previously surmised. Most of the Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic may be termed "cultural borrowings," for the Aramaeans owed much to Mesopotamian society in the areas of science, the arts, religion, 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

a-", "on,"
34
b, "a month,"
114
bb/ba, 58
by, 59
bb, 47
bw, 163
by, 45
bwn/t, 32
bwt, 32
bwat, "scraper," 33
b1, ab, abh1, ywhl, 32
bpl, 32
bryt, 32
b, 32
agwr, "temple, altar," 48, 139, 161, 162
agwr, "brick," 33
awg/g, 58 n.
ayg/g, yg/g, 58 n.
sgl, 55 n.
sgn, 33
sgn, 33
gr, "hier,"
33
gr, "roof, wall," 57
sgch/ct, 48
sgd, 47
sdw, 47
sgd/wt, 47
sgdy, 111
slt, 47
sdr, 114
sdrw, 34
sdp, 111 n.
wrs, 34
wzy, 32
wlt, 34
wmdt, 49
wmnwt, 109 n.
wx, 110
wx, 34 n.
wby, 109
wry, "west,"
34, 149
wry, "store-house,"
109 n.
wry, wswy, "stall,"
109
zyn, 61
zy, 10 n., 32
zw, 48 n.
zy, 143 n.
zy, 58, 139
zy, 38
zy, 78
zy, 78 n.
zy, 114
zy, 78 n.
zy, 60 n.
zy, 71
zkl, 63
zik, 62
zik, 62
zk, 58
zlw, 115
zlp, 48
zm/mwbr, 47
mmd, "estimate,"
43
mmd, "flee,"
49, 143
mlm, mwm, mwn, 109
mman, 58 n.
mmt(y), 58
sbg, 58
mng/w, 75
mng, 158
m, 78
msym, 78 n.
smt, 158
s, 37
sasn, 37
s, 158, 163
sp, 37
skwp, 37
s, 163
s, 103 n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Index of North West Semitic Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2s²p, 2s²wp², 38, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2sp, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2y²p, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2ys²p, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ḫtr, “wall,” 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2st²p, “mortar,” 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>2s²n²p, 60, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2str²p, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>2y²str²p, 60, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2str²p, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>ḫpy²p, “your face,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2p²y²p, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>2pkl²p, 34, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2pr²p, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2pr²p, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>2pt²p, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2p²t²p, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2qtm²p, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2qrb²p, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2qtw²p, 140, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2r²p, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>2r²pt²p, 35, 140, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>2rt²p, “half-brick,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2ry²p, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2ry²p, 49 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>2ry²p, 36, 144, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2rs²p, 49 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2rs²p, 46 n., 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2t²p, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>2t²p, 38, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2w²k²p², 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>2w²t²p², 59, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2w²wp², 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2w²y²p², 37, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2w²y²p², 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2š²k²p², 59, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2š²p², 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>2š²p²p², 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>2š²p²r²p², 130 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>2š²t²m²p², 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2š³p², 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>2š³t²p², 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 n.</td>
<td>2š³t²p², 101, 142, 148 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>2š³t²q²p², 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 110, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 n.</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 127 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 n.</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 97 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 n.</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 45 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 n.</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 80 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 n.</td>
<td>2š³t²m²p², 41 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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nbb, 47
nby, 77
nbbh, 77
nqnd?, 75 n.
nby (pl. nbyt?), 75
nqr, 75
ndbb, 76, 139
ndwy?, 79
nqadn, 79 n.
nqny, 79
nnp, 76
nqal, 75
nqal, 62 n., 129
nswk?, 78, 151 n.
n(by?)wr?, 75
nqzy(y)t?, 76
nqzyw(m)?, 79
nqnm, 126 n.
nqbn?, 77
nqwl?, 75
nqyn, 115
nqyg?, 77
nqyr?, 77
nqyrb?, 76
nqsym/w, 77, 155 n.
nqnt, 139 n.
nqntb?, 75
nqntb?, 78
nqntv?, 75, 138
nqntb, 78
nqntb, nqnt(h), 78, 143, 145
nnq, 76
nnq, 76
nnqbr, 76
nnqal, 109 n.
npp, 76
npp?, 37
npp?, 37, "projection," 37 n.
nppq?, nppq(w)t?, "expense," 96
nnqbt br, nppq wt ñwq, 38
nswr?, 75
nswr, 75
nswl, 85 n.
nq, 77
nqdd?, 76
nqft, 126 n.
nqyn, 77
n, "oath?", 153 f.
n, "lend," 88 n.
nbyt, 78, 157
nbl, 100
nhr?, 90
nhr, 90
sblnt, 111
sbnt, sblnt, 111
sbnt, 92
sby, 93
sby(t), 93
sby, 93
sbn, 97, 139
sbn, 95 n.
sdyp, 95 n.
sbwl, 103
swwk?, 91 n.
swn, 91
swn, 91
swwr?, 91
swwybt, 92
swn, 93
sawyn?, 94
swn, 85, 157
syr, "plate," 91
syr, syr?, 90
sht, 130 n.
syr, 101 n.
syw, 115
swwc?, 38 n.
syr?, 91 n.
skw, "thorn," 91 n.
skw, "knife," 91 n.
skw, 103, 139
skn, 97, 152, 155 n.
sk? (pl. skwn), 91
sm (pl. sawyn), 100
smd, 90
smd?, 90
sml, 99
sawmlt, 92
sawr, 152
sawb, 138 n., 152, 154
sawg, 93
sawd, 102 n.
saw(b), 92
sawph, 48 n.
sawt, "scribe," 29 n.
sawt, "document," 29, 152
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spr, "border," 92
sqwp?, 37
sqwp?, 37
sqp, 37
srs, ssys(?), 100, 147 n., 148, 152, 154
sitta, 50

cbwr, 47
cbt, 56 n.
cd, 53
dn, "treaty," 33, 152
cdg, 61 n.
cdg?, 61 n.
cwyh, 58 n.
cwd?sq?, 50

<szgh/t?>, 61, 96
<szqy?, 61
czy, 127 n.
czm, 50
czt, 51
<ct?ld?/t>, 50
<ctw?>, 48, 164
<ctw?, 48, 164
<cl, s?m, cl. šm], 39
<cl, byc, 153
<cm/nb>, 59
<cmdh, 49 n.
<cm>, 128 n.
<cnb, 59 n.
<cn<y+t?>, 48
<cnzy?, 78
<c(st)y?], 60
<ct(y)u?], 60
<ccyt?, 37 n.
<ctb, 56 n.
<ctys, 49
<ctzah, 37
<ctz, 49
<csn, 36
<crzth, 49
<crz, 49
<cty, <ctz?], 60
<ctpt?/k], 83

p²hr², 79
p²g?, 83
p²gq², 81
p²gwd²/t?], 79

p²wbr², p²wbr², p²w², 83
p²wst?], 82
p²wr², p²wr², 84
p²wr², "purim," 84
p²wr², "mat," 45

p²w², 85
p²bh, p²bh, p²h², 82
p²hr², 79
p²y², 83
p²yht², 83
plg, "divide," 79, 83 n.
plg, "canal," 79
plg², "drum," 41, 138, 150
plh, 85 n.
plgy², 100
pilk, "spindle," 82
plik, "district," 83
plq², 83
p²s², 82
p²y², 84
p²q, 84
p²qa, 84
p²qg, 79
pqg², 83 n.
pqg², 83 n.
pqg³, "run wild," 80 n.
pqg, "claim," 80
prk², pryk², 80, 164
prs (prsys), 80, 152
p²rsq, 81
p²rstg, 81
p²rqg, p²rgdn, 84, 163
prs, "half-mana," 80
prs, "to make clear," 80
p²rs³, "good, sting," 81
p²ar, 81
p²twr, 81
p²th³, 40
p²cy², "canal," 82
p²cy², p²cy², "bucket," 82
p²r²q, 42 n.
prt², 81 n.

p²w³t², "ornament," 94
p²w³t², "group," 95
s²bh, s²bh², 96
s²rbt <szgh, 96
s²bt, 95
s²bt², 95

sbtym, 95
sw³h²/t², 109
syet(?), 96
ším?, 46 n.
šm³t, 95
šr³, 110
q²bwn³, 85
q²r³, 63 n.
q²b³y, 85
q²b³, 68
q²s³, 62 n.
q²d³y, 86
q²dt³, 71 n.
q²dr³, 47
q²d³, 86
q²w³bt³, 85
q²w³, q²w³, 86
q²w³, 86 n.
q²w³ph²/t³, 86
q²w³, 62
q²w³rw³, 87
q²tw³, 28 n.
q²yn³, 86
q²y³, 86
q²d³, 86 n.
q²nt³, 86
q²q³n³, 62 n.
q²nt³, 85
q²p³w³g³ph³, 86
q²p³, 62 n.
q²p³, 62 n.
q²rb³, 30
q²(w) p²y³/t³, 63
q²r³sy³, 63
q²t³, q²t³, 85
r²š³w³rc³, 88 n.
r³b³, 87
r³b³ s³gh³, 140 n.
r³b³, "officer," 87
r³b³, "increase," 90
r³b³kh³², 87
r³bh³, 87
r³b³, 107 n.
r³gw³n³, 36
r³d³, r³d³, 89
r³ht³, 89

r³hm³, 106
s³tw³, 89
s³zk³, 87
r²k³p³t³, 87
r³ka³, r³kva³, 87
r³p³, 158
r³q³, 87
r³qa³, 88
r³r³y³, 90
r³z³p³, 87
r³q³, 88
r³zt³, 88
r³z³, 88 f.
r³z³t³, 89 n.
r³z³w³t³, 88
r³z³y³, 88 f., 152, 161
š³n³, 30 n.
š³yn³, 91 n.
š³tr³, 33 n.
š³mh³, 99 n.

š³, 96
š³p³t³, 103
š³r³, 101
š³r³m³, 101, 148 n.
š³y³b³, 101
š³bh³, 99
š³š³, 113
š³bi³ly³t³, š³b³ly³t³, 99
š³by³n³, 52
š³lu³, š³g³t³, 97, 139, 151
š³y³d³(?), "demon," 101
š³dh³, 102
š³dy³, 102
š³dt³, 102
š³w³b³, 105
š³w³h³, š³w³h³, 99
š³t³r³, 101 n.
š³w³ly³, š³w³ly³, 99
š³m³, 39
š³wl³r³, 102 n.
š³w³y³, 74
š³w³yn³²/t³, 93
š³wl³p³, 104
š³w³q³, 44, 94, 141
š³w³s³, 105 n.
š³w³, 105
š³š³b³, 105
š³š³b³yn³²/t³, š³š³w³b³²/n³, 94, 138 n.
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§wâ(y)p, 104
§wât, 105
§swtp(wt), 105, 150
§szb, 105
§shlyn, 154
§shwh, 54
§str, 101, 146
§sybb, 161
§syd, "base," 102
§syzb, 104, 105, 123 n., 158
§sysy(q), 104 bis, 123 n.
§yr, 102
§sdk, 97 n.
§skl, 104
§skn, §ykna, §wkn, 102
§skp, 39
§skr, 59 n.
§slid(q), §ldnd, 98, 146
§šh, 102
§šw, 102 n.
§št, 98
§šwm, 32
§šmh, 40 n.
§šmt, 103
§snby, 103
§šnh, §šny, §šnyt, 100
§šnw, 100 n.
§šnm, 153
§šnn, 74 n.
§šnp, 103 n.
§šnsyw, 104
§šnyq, 93
§šnt, §šnt, 102, 139
§šntwr, 102
§šrwh, 100 n.
§špr, "weaver," 59
§šqwp, 37
§šql, "shekel," 29, 152
§šql, "to take," 100
§šq, 37
§šq, §šqq, §šqq, 93 f., 141
§šrbh, 154
§šrby, 154
§šrw, 102
§šry, 74
§šrn, 154
§št, 102

tân, 46
târmid, 107
tgr(q), tâng, târ, 107, 139
twiby, 108
twkn, 106 n.
twmb, 104, 162
twyr, 127 n.
thwm, tâwm, 105
thl, 154
tyb, "merciful," 106
tyb, tybw, "invasion," 108
tyv, 106
thl, 106
tly, tâly, 40
tl, 108, 152
tlym, 106
tlym, tâlym, 65 n., 107
tl(q)myn, 106
twmb, 115, 146 n.
twbr, 108
tp, 40, 142
tgl, 29
tqg, 46
tbq, 107
tgym, trpm, 107
tgym, trwm, 108
108, 144
trq, 40 f.
trwh, 41 n.
târy, târyn, 115
ttwm, tâtwm, tâtr, 108, 150