Ugaritico-Phoenicia

H. L. GINSBERG
Jewish Theological Seminary

1. The Restoration of *CTA* 6, i:28[1]

The fragment whose obverse constitutes the previously missing top of column one of the tablet to which Virolleaud had assigned the siglum I AB was published either late in 1934 or early in 1935.[2] It may have been on my very first reading of it that it occurred to me that not only the first two words of line 28 were missing but the initial letter of the third as well, that is, that it was to be restored thus: [*tṭbḫ.šb'm.y*] *ḥmrm* "[She slaughters 70 fallo] w deer."[3] My reasoning was as follows. The line names the sixth and (it would seem) last group of seventy victims that Anath immolated in a colossal hecatomb; and since the first five species answer to the description of horned ruminants (in the case of the *aylm* 'antlered' would be more exact), the sixth is more likely to have been *yḥmrm* (cf. Heb.-Arab.-Aram. *yaḥmūr*) 'fallow deer' than *ḥmrm* 'donkeys'; and I added that the survival of the *yaḥmūr* in Syria down to modern times is confirmed by the occurrence on a map of that country of the name Wādi Yaḥmūr.[4] For another weighty consideration we are indebted to Held.[5] It is that the word

---

1 Hereafter, *CTA* = Andrée Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*, vol. 1, *Textes*, vol. 2, *Figures et Planches*, Mission de Ras Shamra 10 (Paris, 1963). *CTA* 6 = Virolleaud I AB = Gordon 49 + 62.

2 C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 15 (1934), 226-43.

3 H. L. Ginsberg, *Orientalia* 5 (1936), 193-98; idem, *Kitve Ugarit* (Jerusalem, 1936), 57-70. The English word I actually used in *Orientalia* is 'roebuck', by which *yaḥmūr* is still conventionally rendered in English Bibles (Deut. 14:5; 1 Kgs. 5:3 [Christian translations 4:23]). However, recent writers doubt if the roe deer was known to ancient Israel. Thus, according to (J. Feliks in) *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 5:1947-48, the fallow deer (*Cervus dama mesopotamica*), a fairly tall species which "was found in the Middle East" until the end of the nineteenth century, is apparently the *yaḥmūr* of the Bible, while *Cervus capreolus*, a goat-sized animal which "survived in Erez Israel until World War I," is to be identified with the biblical *'ayyāl*.

4 An inference confirmed by the above statement of J. Feliks. A further argument was based on the rendering of *rumm*, the first group of animals, by 'buffaloes' and the understanding that the reference was to water buffaloes. Since this species, like the second and third group, is widely domesticated, while the fourth and fifth are not, it would be mildly surprising if the sixth position were again a domestic species like donkeys. This argument was not essential to my case; but its premise, that our *rumm* are water buffalo, may be sound, since the same "Baal cycle" speaks (*CTA* 10 [=Gordon 76], ii:9, 12) of a region *aḫ šmk mlat rumm*, in which *aḫ* is connected by all writers with the Hebrew *'ḥw* 'reeds, reed-marsh'. For whether one accepts or rejects Virolleaud's guess that *šmk* is Semachonitis, as the Huleh was called in antiquity, it is worthwhile to read about the water buffalo that used to graze in the Huleh before it was drained, (J. Feliks) *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 4:1467.

5 M. Held, *JAOS* 79 (1959), 171, n. 49, 174-75; idem, *Studies and Essays in Honor of A. A. Neuman* (Leiden, 1962), 286, n. 4.

ḥmr 'donkey' would be incongruous in any context in the *B'l* epic. Both the latter and *Aqht* are subject to certain conventions which *Krt* cheerfully disregards, and these are not only stylistic[6] but also lexical. Thus *Equus asinus* figures in all three, but under his workaday name *ḥmr* only in the last named (as also, of course, in prose texts); the other two employ instead the cliché *'r//pḥl*, with *CTA* 4, iv:7, 12 managing to add *atnt* 'she-asses' for good measure.

The apparently correct observation of Ms. Herdner that *CTA* 32, embodying a ritual whose exact character eludes us (no doubt partly because a considerable section at the beginning, which would have contributed a good deal to our orientation, is missing) but which was surely an important one—since in the course of its exposition Niqmad who is known to have been a king of Ugarit and Nesht who is known to have been "lady of Ugarit" are mentioned by name in lines 20 and 28 respectively[7]—reads in lines 18, 26 and 35 not, as previously assumed, *ṯr* but *'r*. That the latter means 'ass' serves only to confirm Held's contention that *ḥmr* would be incongruous in our *B'l* passage. That ass-killing rituals were not unknown does not, of course, "show" that our passage must have told of one.[8]

Is all the foregoing outweighted by Herdner's observation, "La restauration [*šb'm.y*] *ḥmrm* . . ., proposée par GINSBERG, est difficile, faute de place"? Hardly. In the first place, "difficult" is not synonymous with "precluded." For there is no more reason for believing that the missing signs of line 28 were written large and/or widely spaced than for believing that their size and spacing approximated rather closely those of the same signs in line 20. Since the distance from the left margin of the tablet to the presumable position of the left edge of the missing left wing of the *ḥ* in line 28 exceeds the span between the two outer word dividers of the group *.tṭbḫ.šb'm.* by a good 3/16 of an inch, there would, in the latter case, have been ample room for a *y* before the *ḥ*. And in the second place, even if it were certain that the scribe never wrote the *y*, it would, in view of the foregoing considerations, be advisable to restore it—at least with a query—between angles, like the *p* of *lṭ* <*p*>*n* at no. 1, iv:13, for example.

2. El's Magic in *CTA* 16, v:25-vi:14,[9] and Its Implications for Ugaritic and Phoenician Morphology

Column v:27-28 was read by Virolleaud *ydm [mr] ṣ gršm/zbln*, and by me,[10] on the basis of Virolleaud's hand copy, *yd* m*[r] ṣ gr*šm *zbln*. Either way, the most sensible interpretation of the four words was, "(I will effectuate[11]) the removal of the sickness, driving out (or,

6 See H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret, BASOR* Supplementary Studies nos. 2-3 (New Haven, 1946), 46, lines 12f.

7 See *CTA* 1:115, n. 2.

8 Though such is the implication of C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1965), 397 on no. 879.

9 Equals Virolleaud IIK; Gordon 126-27.

10 Ginsberg, *Keret*, 30.

11 I now believe that (line 26) *škn* (line 27) *aškn* is more likely the *Š* conjugation of *kwn* (so G. R. Driver) than the *G* conjugation of *škn*, mainly because the latter has elsewhere, as in other West Semitic languages, the intransitive meaning 'to dwell' (and the like).

'the driving out of') the malady"; and it might have seemed equally feasible to have the molding (*yqrṣ*) of a figure refer to the creating of the being Sha'taqat who, in the next column, flies to Keret and heals him, or to a lifeless image which Sha'taqat merely conveys to Keret for the purpose of transferring his illness to it. I favored the first view because of the analogy of what the gods did (and after all, it is a god who is acting here, not a human sorcerer) in order to "cure" Gilgamesh: they had Aruru create Enkidu and be a match for him; and besides, no mention of such an image is preserved anywhere either in column v or in column vi. But my case was summarily dismissed by Gaster,[12] followed by Gray.[13]

However, Herdner's scrutiny of the tablet has led her to the conclusion—and the photograph of the reverse of the tablet[14] bears her out—that both the actual appearance of the extant signs and the actual width of the vertical break (greater than indicated by Virolleaud's autograph) preclude any reading of line 27 but *aškn.ydt.[m] rṣt.gršt*; and when *this* is combined with the first word in line 28 (*zbln*), the sense, it will surely not be denied, can only be, 'I will fashion a *female ejector* of sickness, a *female expeller* of disease.' I submit that the words I have italicized in the translation can only describe the *person* who *performs* the *cure*, that is, the aforementioned Sha'taqat, about whose function and sex there are happily no differences of opinion; whereas the hypothetical figure—whether it is assumed to have represented a male or a female—to which the affliction is assumed to be transferred, could hardly be said even to extract it, let alone eject or expel it, but properly only to receive or absorb it.[15]

If, then, what we have in line 27 are two feminine noun formations *ydt* and *gršt*, it follows that in the question that El has previously addressed seven times to the assembled gods (it is preserved most completely in lines 20-21), *my bilm ydy mrṣ, gršm zbln*, the *m* of *gršm* must be merely the well-known emphatic enclitic and *ydy//grš-m* must be simply the masculine counterparts of the feminine—let me repeat—*nominal* formations *ydt//gršt* in line 27, and El's question is to be translated: "Who among the gods is an ejector of sickness, an expeller of disease?" In other words, so far as our pericope is concerned, the root *ndy* is a will-o'-the-wisp; what we have here is a root *ydy*, presumably a brother of the one that is employed (with the sense of 'to shoot [arrows], throw ([stones]', and the like) in the *qal* and in the *piel* of biblical Hebrew and a cousin of its cousins (see Koehler-Baumgartner on *ydh* I). As for the formation, in the absence of evidence to the contrary it is safest to assume that our *ydt* is of the same formation as *ḥmt* 'city wall' that occurs in the selfsame *Krt* epic, namely in *CTA* 14 (= Gordon

12 T. H. Gaster, *JQR* 37 (1947), 287.

13 J. Gray, *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1964), 74.

14 *CTA* 2, pl. xxvi.

15 I owe to Professor Zvi Abusch, now of Jerusalem, a reference to the case of Ishtar's confinement in the palace of her spiteful sister Ereshkigal, the Mistress of the Nether World (*ANET*[3], 106f.), with "60 miseries" released against her. Since this confinement results in the cessation of all mating among both humans and beasts in the land of the living, Ea—a sort of Mesopotamian El—devises a means of procuring Ishtar's freedom. He *creates* (we are not told of what substance) "Aṣūshunamir, a eunuch" who is somehow able to get Ereshkigal to promise to grant any request he may make (after all, his name means 'His appearance is brilliant'). When he makes it, she curses him a blue streak, but she keeps her word: Ereshkigal has Ishtar sprinkled with water of life at a formal session of the Anunnaki and led out of the nether world by the way she came in. [The nature of the ruse by which Ereshkigal was tricked into releasing her rival seems to have been established by the ingenious detective work of Anne Draffkorn Kilmer in *UF* 3 (1971), 299-309.]

Krt), lines 75, 167. Since the latter is etymologically, as can be seen from the Hebrew *ḥōmǭ*, simply the feminine participle of *ḥmy* 'to protect' (in living use in Arabic), we might have inferred that it was pronounced—in the nominative, that is—*ḥāmītu*, even if we did not have in an Akkadian document of Ugarit itself the native gloss *ḫa-mì-ti* (genitive case).[16] Most probably, therefore, our *ydt* is to be read *yādīta* (accusative); and our *ydy*, *yādiyu* (masc. nominative).

It would seem, however, that the manner of forming the feminine singular participle in the G conjugation of verbs with weak third radical was another regard in which the high epic dialect of Ugaritic differed from the prose and *Krt* dialect. For in the epithet *qnyt ilm* 'Progenitrix of Gods' that the goddess Athirat bears in *B'l*, *qnyt* presumably stands for *qāniyatu*. That is why, in view of the indication we encountered in section one that *CTA* 32 was composed in the "high epic" dialect, we find it hard to decide whether *ḥmyt*, line 28, is a plural like the *bkyt* of *Aqht* or a singular like *qnyt* in *B'l*. [See Addendum.]

Things are simpler in Phoenician, at least so far as our knowledge goes. The word for 'city wall' is here *ḥōmīt*,[17] though it is actually attested only in a Canaanite gloss (*ḫumitu* in an el-Amarna letter) and in Egyptian syllabic orthography; the plural *ḥōmiyōt* is attested as *ḥmyt* 'fortresses' in the Karatepe (Azitawadd) inscriptions.[18] And since, as is well known, just the first two collections of Proverbs (that is, Prov. 1-9 and 10:1-23:16) abound in words and forms which are otherwise unattested or rare in Hebrew but characteristic of Phoenician,[19] the way to the meaning which the context desiderates in Prov. 1:21 (cf. Septuagint) for the received *hmywt* is by restoring not (like *BHK*^{3}) the ordinary Hebrew *ḥmwt*, but the graphically much closer Phoenicizing *ḥmywt* (to be read *ḥōmiyyōt*).

3. Observations on the Phoenician Inscriptions of Karatepe (D.-R. 26)

(a) Surmises Confirmed

My interest in these texts dates from February 1948, when, along with some other students of Phoenician and related languages, I received from the late Professor H. Th. Bossert, of the

---

16 Already cited by W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, 3rd ed., fasc. 1 (Leiden, 1967), s.v. *ḥōmǭ*.

17 In the present article, the closed qualities of *e* and *o* (*ę*, *ǫ*) are indicated only when they are short, the open ones (*ę*, *ǫ*) only when they are long.

18 Baumgartner, ibid.

19 Other examples: *ḥokmōt*, Prov. 1:20; 9:1—probably also 14:1 (with *nšym* to be omitted as a gloss) —with the feminine ending *-at* retained and with its *a* shifted to long (but in Phoenician, open) *o* in the stressed syllable of a noun (presumably also of an adjective) if it ends in a single consonant; *šb'* 'new grain', 3:10 (see below: 3 a iii); *qrt* 'city', 8:3;9:3,14;11:11; *ḥrwṣ* 'gold', 8:10,19; and *p-q* 'to find, enjoy' 3:13;8:35;12:2;18:22. With the exception of *šb'* 'new grain', all these words are also found, *mutatis mutandis*, in Ugaritic. In contrast with the said *šb'*, the verb *lḥm* 'to eat', Prov. 4:17;9:5, and the rare noun *yp(y)ḥ* 'witness', Prov. 6:19;12:17;14:5,25;19:5,9—which are likewise rare in Hebrew outside the above limits—are found in Ugaritic but not in any known Phoenician text. However, they very probably were in use in Phoenician too, although the chances of future confirmation are none too good given the limited scope of Phoenician epigraphy. For it is instructive to recall that the Ugaritic *ṯt'*, whose meaning, 'to fear', I believe I was the first to determine, with the help of the rare Heb. *št'* of Isa. 41:10,23 (*Orientalia* 5 [1936], 170, n. 1), came to light in the early 1930's whereas its Phoenician etymon *št'* did so only in the late 1940's (Karatepe). Now S. H. Horn, *BASOR* 193 (1969), 12 and R. Kutscher, *Qadmoniyot* 5 (1972), 27, have, no

University of Istanbul, a copy of his "Second Preliminary Report" on his explorations at Karatepe,[20] containing a reproduction of his hand copy of the Phoenician statue inscription (hereafter C, the siglum assigned to it in D.-R.) with corrections and restorations in columns II-III and in the first three lines of column I added (by Bossert) in ink on the basis of the—at that time still unpublished—parallel versions on the lower and upper gates (hereafter A and B respectively, again after D.-R.). Professor Bossert held out a prospect of all the treatments by the various scholars consulted being published in a single volume but left us free to publish elsewhere if we preferred. A number of us took advantage of the permission but others, including the late Professor Levi della Vida and myself, sent off our manuscripts to Bossert. Since the Swiss publishing house with which Bossert had made arrangements for the publication of the volume ultimately informed him that it was unable to proceed with the undertaking, our contributions were lost to the world for the time being. However, when Bossert, toward the end of the year 1948, placed at the disposal of the men he had originally consulted a copy of the lower gate inscription (D.-R., B) with permission to publish it after January 1949, Levi della Vida took advantage of this permission and, in the course of his publication on it,[21] referred to two suggestions I had communicated to him orally in New York in March 1948 in connection with C (that was the only version we had at our disposal at that time). These suggestions were:

(i) In the sentence (C III:14-15) . . . *wblkn (15) mtmllbymty ldnnym*—which climaxes Azitawadd's glowing description of the wonderful conditions he created for his country and the happy estate of his people during his reign—the first sixteen letters in line 15 are to be divided not into three but into these four words: *mtm ll bymty ldnnym*; so that the sentence means "and there has never[22] been night for the Danonians[23] during my reign" (cf. Isa. 60:20), and

---

doubt rightly, identified it in line 6 of the inscription in the citadel of Rabbah of the Ammonites. I wonder if the beginning of the line is to be restored *'t] h tšt' bbn 'lm* "you (O great god X) are feared (even) among the divine beings"; cf. especially Ps. 89:7-8f. also Exod. 15:11. For the N conjugation of *št'* with passive meaning, see D.-R. 26A II:4 and parallel versions.

20 H. T. Bossert and U. B. Alkım, *Karatepe* (1947), 2:pl. xxix-xxxi, xl-xliv.

21 G. Levi della Vida, *Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, series 8/iv (1949), 273-90. The version which we, following D.-R., refer to as C is called A by Levi della Vida, and our A is referred to by him as B. For his translation of the latter, see *Atti*, 277; for his references to my communication, see *Atti*, 284.

22 Phoen. *bl . . . mtm* 'not . . . ever'. The second word is identical with Syriac *mtōm*, which as a matter of fact is certainly borrowed from our Phoenician *mtm*, which was evidently pronounced something like *matōm*. The **mataimā* ("anywhen," i.e., "ever") to which the Syriac word is traced in C. Brocklmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, 2nd ed. (1928), 409b (following Jensen), is no doubt its ultimate origin, but it could not have attained its present form inside Syriac. Only a minor difficulty is presented by the fact that Syriac, like other Aramaic dialects, does not know the pure **matai* at all but only the Akkadian loan word *'emmat(i)*; for the Samalian emphatic particle *mt* may represent the former (Charles F. Jean and Jacob Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'Ouest*, s.v.), and conceivably the compound *mt-m* could have arisen in Proto-Aramaic. But inner Aramaic conditions provide no explanation of the modification of *m(a)taim>m(a)tēm* to *m(a)tōm*; whereas there is no difficulty in the way of positing for Phoenician etyma of the Heb. *šilšōm* 'two days ago' and/or adverbs like the Heb. *ywmm* 'by day', *ḥnm* 'for nothing, gratis, gratuitously', and *rqm* 'emptyhanded', whose primitive *-am* would have become *-ōm* in Phoenician a good millennium earlier than in masoretic Hebrew. In Phoenician, therefore, the original

there is no such word as *mtmll* (allegedly akin to the Heb. *'mll* 'wretched'). We shall unfortunately never be able to consult the testimony of one of the two Hieroglyphic Hittite versions on this point, since just this part has not been preserved in either.[24] But confirmation of a different sort is provided by the aforementioned Phoenician version A (in Levi della Vida's terminology, B) in which the sentence in question reads (A II:16-17) *wblknmtmldnny (17) mllbymty.* (This version does not indicate word division any more than the other.) Whereas those writers who did not have the benefit of my oral suggestion on C blithely emended A according to C,[25] Levi della Vida, recalling that I had treated even C's *mtmll* as the two words *mtm ll* (see above), realized that it "sembra confirmata" by the reading of A; and through his paper the truth quickly became known and prevailed.

(ii) In C III:3-4 (which was later found to be identical with A II:4-5) the letters *'šttk (4) lḥdy* are to be grouped as the three words *šī tk lhdy* and mean 'a woman can walk alone' (equating *lḥdy* with, e.g., Syriac [*ba*] *lḥōdēḇ* 'by herself'),[26] and this is confirmed by the Hittite version—at least to the extent that the latter also has the phrase 'women walk' (according to a communication from Bossert which I cited to Professor Levi della Vida). But—*habent sua fata intuitiones.* Levi della Vida accepted this suggestion too, but voiced perplexity about *tk* (which I believe to be contracted from something like the Hebrew *tlk* rather than from something like the Aramaic *thk*) 'walks', about the fact that *lḥdy* 'alone' looks so Aramaic (we shall see that

---

ending of *mtm* can very well have been assimilated to that of any or all of those words by analogy. We shall have occasion to list a few more early borrowings a little farther on.

23 Since our word *dnnym* always corresponds to *Adana-wana*—the name of "the land of the plain of Adana" (in which the city which is still called Adana is located), D.-R. 26A I:4, etc., plus the gentilic ending *-wana* (E. Laroche, *Syria* 35 [1958], 263-75, cited by D.-R., 2:39)—I surmise that the *u* of the cuneiform spelling *KUR. Da-nu-na* represents an *ō* which arose through contraction of the sequence *awa* in the said Hittite form *Adana-wana.* The Phoenician procedure in this case of adding the native gentilic *-iyy* to the borrowed one *-ōn(a)* has many analogues. Thus in the word *šwšnky'* 'the Shushanites', Ezra 4:9, the Aramaic gentilic is added to the Persian one *-ak*, and in the Mishnaic *'yṭlqy* 'Italian', the Hebrew gentilic *-i* is derived not directly from *Italia* but from the Greek gentilic *Italikos.* In the same way, the gentilic corresponding to *America* is not **ameriki* or **amerikati* either in Arabic or in Ivrit, but is *amerikani* in both.

24 The two Hittite texts are reproduced, transcribed, translated, and annotated by P. Meriggi, *Manuele di eteo geroglifico*, 2:69-101. The Hittite text and translation are accompanied by a transliteration and interlinear translation of the corresponding Phoenician text.

25 So, e.g., C. H. Gordon, *JNES* 8 (1949), 108-15 (explicitly on 115a); R. Marcus and I. J. Gelb, ibid., 116-20 (explicitly on 119b).

26 My aforementioned unpublished article cites an Aramaic passage which not only contains this word but also constitutes a substantive parallel to our Phoenician passage. In the Babylonian Talmud, *Ketubbot* 20b, there is an amoraic discussion on the tannaitic ruling that a heap of stones whose nature is unknown in the open field within 50 cubits of a town or highway is presumed to cover human remains, so that objects brought into proximity with it in certain ways become ritually unclean. It is speculated that the reason for the 50 cubit limit is that if a woman wishes to dispose of a stillbirth in the usual manner of depositing it in a hollow in the ground and covering it up with stones she will take somebody along if the spot is more than 50 cubits distant from a town or a highway (and so the nature of the heap will not remain unknown) but that she will feel confident enough to go alone (*'zl' 'yhy lḥwdh*) up to 50 cubits.

that is because Aramaic indubitably borrowed it from Phoenician) and about the word *'nk* by which *'št tk lḥdy* is preceded (he did not realize that its function is to emphasize the pronominal suffix of the word which precedes it: *'wbymty 'nk* means "but in *my* reign" just as *wpgrykm 'tm* [Num. 14:32] means "whereas *your* corpses"). What with the reporter's own hesitations and aberrations and the absence, in this case, of a dramatic confirmation such as assured the early triumph of truth in the other, in this instance it was so persistently ignored[27] that when striking confirmation did turn up the savant into whose hands it fell was pardonably unaware that the truth had been published twenty years earlier and so, in all good faith, he presented it as his own discovery.

The story[28] is as follows. A large block of white marble, identifiable by its shape as a fragment from one of the walls of a sarcophagus and with writing carved on the side that is identifiable as the outer one, was unearthed at Byblos ca. 1959 and deposited in the Lebanese National Museum at Beirut. There, a decade later, J. Starcky studied it. Good Semitist that he is, he could not fail to realize that the words *'nk lḥdy . . . 'nk škb b'rn zn* in line 1 of this inscription serve the same purpose, of persuading would-be violators that the sacrilege is not worth their while, as the words *blt 'nk škb b'rn z* 'only I am lying in this coffin' in line 5 of the Tibnit inscription (D.-R. 13), so that *lḥdy* must mean 'alone', literally, in this case, 'in my oneness' and that consequently 'alone' must also be the meaning of *lḥdy* in the Karatepe inscriptions except that there the literal meaning is 'in her oneness' (the suffix *-y*, like the other pronominal suffixes, will be discussed in section 3). Starcky cites analogous methods of expressing the notion 'alone' from classical Arabic, dialectal Arabic, and Akkadian, but not the closest analogue of all, the Aramic *lḥōd* plus pronominal suffix. This omission, of course, confirms that he did not know that I had interpreted the *lḥdy* of Karatepe correctly (apud Levi della Vida) twenty years before so that the Byblian occurrence did not reveal the true meaning of the Karatepe one but only confirmed it.

But I owe to Professor J. C. Greenfield the observation that the Aramaic *lḥōd* is not only very close to but identical with the Phoenician *lḥd*, which must be vocalized approximately *laḥōd (<la'aḥ̱ōd)*, and not only identical with it but borrowed from it. For the shifting of the second short *a* of *'aḥad* 'one' to long *o* could have originated only in Phoenician, since it is this language which, in nouns and the like, shifts short *a* in a stressed syllable closed by a single consonant to long *o*. In Phoenician the long *o*'s that arose in this way were no doubt open, but not necessarily in other languages which borrowed such words from Phoenician.[29]

---

27 Sad to say, even by Meriggi, who states (p. 69, lines 7-6 from bottom) that in his transliteration and translation of the Phoenician version he followed "sostanzialmente lettura e interpretazione del Della Vida."

28 J. Starcky, "Une inscription phénicienne de Byblos," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 45, fasc. 15 (1969), 259-73.

29 Cf. above, n. 19 beginning. Analogous to Greenfield's proof of the character of Aram. *lḥōd* as a Phoenician loanword from its Phoenician vowel shift, is my proof of the character of Aram. *ḥzw* as a Phoenician loanword from its Phoenician consonant shift (*Hebräische Wortforschung etc.*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 16 [1967], 71). Dr. Zvi Hurwitz points out to me that by the same token Aramaic *ṣrk* must be a Canaanite loanword, since the sound shift Proto-Sem. *ḏ*>*ṣ* is not Aramaic but Canaanite, and

(iii) My third subsequently vindicated surmise,[30] was to the effect that in the phrase *šb' wtrš*, A III:7, 8 (and corresponding passages in other versions), *šb'* means not, as elsewhere, abstract 'plenty' but rather concrete '(new) grain', inasmuch as in Prov. 3:10, where *šb'* and *tyrwš* '(new) wine' stand in parallelism, the former fills the lucky farmer's granaries just as the latter fills his vats, so that in this passage *šb'* is simply a rare synonym of the common word *dgn*. D.-R. failed to profit by that note, while Meriggi (whether he knew of it or not) did not need it. Meriggi translates *šb'* more or less correctly both in line 7 and in line 8, albeit by two different Italian words (*messi . . . grano*), obviously because such is the sense of the corresponding Hittite word (Meriggi renders it by *grano*), which is at any rate written very differently from the one that corresponds to *šb'* where it means 'plenty'.

(b) Further Observations

(i) The grammar of *b'bt p'ln kl mlk*, A I:12. About the meaning there is now agreement. The words mean "every king accepted me as his father." The grammar, however, needs to be elucidated. The current explanation of *'bt* as an abstract formation (*'abūt* 'fatherhood') arouses misgivings on several counts. Akkadian has an idiom similar to the one that is alleged here, but it uses it in connection with espousal as wife, not recognition as father, and it uses the preposition *ana*, corresponding to West Semitic *l* (or *'ęl*), not *b*, so that the Aramaic adaptation of the Akkadian *ana aššūti* which is employed in the Jewish marriage contract and in Jewish targums is not **b'intū* but *l'intū*. Moreover, Syriac does not employ this Akkadianism even in connection with marriage but employs instead *b* (to be identified as *b essentiae*) plus plural, that is, *bneššē*.[31] Does this not suggest that our *b'bt* is likewise an example of "*b essentiae* plus *plural*"? (For why should Phoenician not have formed the plural of *'b* with the ending *-ōt*, just like Hebrew?). Years ago, when I had occasion to discuss Jer. 19-20, I pointed out[32] that *'yk šytk bbnym*, Jer. 3:19, exemplifies the selfsame idiom and means "I will surely adopt you as my child"—and a three-fold cord is not easily broken. Which compels us to consider the possibility that the Syriac *bneššē* construction may be still a fifth example of early Aramaic borrowing from Canaanite.[33]

---

the existence of this root is early Canaanite is attested in the Ugaritic passage *CTA* 19, i:43. (In Hebrew, however, *ṣrk* must, in my opinion, be regarded in light of the available evidence as reborrowed from Aramaic.) On the Phoenician origin of the Syriac *mtōm*, see above n. 22.

30 Published apud F. Rosenthal, *ANET*^{2} (1955), 500; *ANET*^{3} (1969), 654, n. 5.

31 See Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, 450a, lines 19-14 from bottom, and check the cross references. That this, ultimately Aramaic, idiom is behind the impossible *wbt hnšym ytn lw lhšbyth* of Dan. 11:17 was realized by the commentator Behrmann, cited by A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, 7:153. Read *wbth bnšym ytn lw lhšḥytw* "and he (Antiochus III) will give him (Ptolemy V) his daughter (Cleopatra) in marriage in order to destroy him"—a hope which did not materialize, as the verse concludes with a halting retroversion of an Aramaic version of a phrase in Isa. 7:7.

32 *Yehezkel Kaufmann Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1960), 52, n. 4.

33 And there is very likely a sixth. In late biblical passages like Neh. 6:3 and 2 Chr. 32:4, which do not urge a certain course of action upon the listener as being designed to ward off eventualities he must surely wish to avert but rather explain what misfortunes a person who in fact took certain measures hoped to avert thereby, the Hebrew *lmh* corresponds exactly to Aramaic *lmh* 'lest' in Ezra 4:22 and, apparently, already in Ahiqar papyrus line 36 (see my rendering in *ANET* [all editions], 427b), which, reinforced by

di/a- (already Ezra 7:23) is characteristic of Middle Aramaic (see W. Baumgartner in Koehler-Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, 1092b); and this use of the Hebrew *lmh* is surely due to Aramaic influence. This is still more obvious in Cant. 1:7 and Dan. 1:10, where the reinforcing *di* is also imitated. (As I have maintained for a quarter of a century, the latter passage, like all the Hebrew of Daniel except Dan. 9:4-20, is directly translated from an Aramaic original.) Yet the *RSV* has managed to mistranslate even Cant. 1:7, in a context in which "why should I be etc." sounds like a whine. As for Neh. 6:3 and 2 Chr. 32:4, which lack equivalents of the *di/a–* by which *lmh* 'lest' is reinforced in later Aramaic, not only *RSV* but also *NEB*, with its usually fine feeling for English, muffed both of them (with "Why should the work be brought to a standstill while I leave it to come down to you?" [as if the persons named in Neh. 6:1 would have been sorry to see that happen!] at Neh. 6:3, and with "Why . . . should Assyrian kings come here and find plenty of water?" [as if anybody had suggested that that was desirable!] at 2 Chr. 32:4). Even the Jerusalem Bible, which clears the first of these hurdles, crashes over the second. (The true sense is something like, "Otherwise, Assyrian kings may come and find abundant water.") But *lmh* must also be recognized as a synonym of *pen* in a number of indubitably pre-exilic Hebrew passages, where it cannot very well be due to the influence of Aramaic. Here, however, it never occurs in cases like the two foregoing, in which the persons concerned already fear certain eventualities and are already converted to the idea of taking certain measures to avert them, but is limited to cases in which the person concerned has first to be "sold"an idea by means of the argument that otherwise eventualities he would not welcome will ensue. Thus, in the Pentateuch alone, the Jewish Publication Society's translation of *The Torah* (first edition 1962, second edition 1967) rightly follows Saadiah's Arabic translation in recognizing this nuance of *lmh* at Gen. 27:45 (where of course Rebekah is appealing to Jacob's own interests as well as her own); 47:15 (where the implication is "you surely wouldn't want that to happen"); Exod. 32:12 (unfortunately the *JPS* translators also followed Saadiah in verse 11, where he is wrong; see below); Deut. 5:22[25]. Other post-World War II English Bible translations I have consulted muff some or all of these passages, whereas the Septuagint has an even better score than Saadiah; on the one hand, it avoids in Exod. 32:12 the jocular and somewhat patronizing "why hurt your own interests" circumlocution–which is all right (within reason!) between human equals but is always cheap when addressed to the Deity–and, on the other hand, does not blunt in verse 11 the perfectly natural plaintiveness of "why do You?", a variant of "how long?" which is of such frequent occurrence in both Hebrew and Mesopotamian complaints. Indeed, it can be wholesomely sobering for a believer in progress to check, with the help of Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint*, how many of the Septuagint's *mēpote*'s and *mē*'s reflect Hebrew *lmh*'s and then to contrast, for example, the treatment of *lmh* at Ps. 79:10 [LXX 78:10], on the one hand, by the Septuagint (also by Saadiah, ed. Yosef Qâfiḥ [Jerusalem, 1966], though Saadiah wrongly extends such treatment to cases like Ps. 22:2[1], as hinted above), and, on the other hand, by the latest English translation of the Psalms, *The Book of Psalms according to the Traditional Hebrew Text*, Jewish Publication Society of America (Philadelphia, 1972). *In this case*, the latter could have learned from Dahood! Surely, the error will be corrected in the final complete *JPS* translation, and further ones of its kind will be avoided. (E.g., it will hopefully be realized that Prov. 22:27 means, "If you are unable to pay, you may lose the very bedding you lie on." Cf. Exod. 22: 25-26.)

What makes all the foregoing relevant here is the fact that in the Eshmun'azor inscription (D.-R. 14), which can now be dated with virtual certainty ca. 500 B.C.E. (M. Dunand, Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth 18 (1965), 105-9), lines 20b-22 read, "Whatever person (*qnmy=qnm* [Syr. *qnōm*] + *my*) you may be–whatever prince or whatever commoner: Let him not . . . (21) and let him not . . . and let him not . . . and let him not . . . lest (*lm*) (22) those great gods hand them over, so that that prince and those commoners and their posterity are cut off forever." *Lm* is employed here like the argumentative Hebrew *lmh*'s we have just been considering, not like the explanatory ones of Neh. 6:3; 2 Chr. 32:4 cited further back. Whether Phoenician would have used *lm* in the latter case too or would have used another word (either identical or synonymous with the Hebrew *pn*), we do not know. In the former case, Aramaic is indebted to Phoenician for both suasive and explanatory (*di/a*)*lmā* 'lest, perhaps'; in the latter, the suasive one was borrowed from Phoenician but the explanatory one is an inner Aramaic development.

(ii) The last paragraph, A III:12-IV:3.

The Phoenician text

(12) w'm mlk bmlkm wrzn brznm 'm '(13) dm 'š 'dm šm 'š ymḥ[34] šm 'ztw(14)d bš'r z wšt[35] šm 'm 'p yḥmd 'y(15)t hqrt z wys' hš'r z 'š p'l '(16) ztwd wyp'l l[36] š'r zr wšt šm 'ly (17) 'm bḥmdt ys' w'm bšn't wbr' ys' (18) hš'r z wmḥ[37] b'l šmm w'l qn 'rṣ (19) wšmš 'lm wkl dr bn 'lm 'yt hmmlkt h' w'yt hmlk h' w'yt (IV: 1) 'dm h' 'š 'dm šm 'ps (2) šm 'ztwd ykn l'lm km šm šmš wyrḥ

Translation

(12) If any king or ruler,[38] or (13) any commoner,[39] effaces the name of Azitawa (14)dd from this gate and inscribes his own[40] name (on it) or else, desiring th(15)is city, removes this gate which was made by A(16)zitawadd[41] and makes an alien gate for it and inscribes his[42] name on it[43]—(17) whether he removes this gate[44] out of desire or removes (it) out of hatred and

---

34 We have here a conflation of two constructions: *w'm mlk . . . ymḥ* (without *'š*), cf. Num. 15:27, and *wmlk . . . š* (without *'m*), cf. Num. 15:30.

35 Perfect consecutive, so also *wbrk*, a little further back, in line 2. (That *wysgrnm*, D.-R. 14:9 is not, like *ysgrnm*, ibid., line 21, imperfect [=*yasgīrūnōm*] but perfect consecutive [=*wa-yisgīrū-nēm*] was argued by H. L. Ginsberg in *The World History of the Jewish People* [Tel Aviv, 1970], 2:105, lines 20f.; but since it is both preceded and followed by jussives (lines 8 and 11), perhaps it too is a jussive: *wa-yasgīrū-nēm*. The absence of a corresponding imperfect consecutive, such as biblical Hebrew would have employed in place of *wyšb!n*, D.-R. 14:16 *wysbny*, D.-R. 14:17, and *wyspnnm*, D.-R. 14:19 (biblical Hebrew would have used *wannōšīv, wannōšīvēhū*, and *wannōsīfēm* [more accurately, *wannōsīfēn*] respectively) is remarkable.

36 That this *l* is not just the preposition *l* but the preposition *l* plus the pronominal suffix of the third person singular feminine (pronounced approximately *lā*), referring back to *hqrt z* at the beginning of line 15, was clear to me, so far as I can remember, the first time I ever read this passage (see the translation below). That the *l* of D.-R. 18:4 is the preposition *l* plus a suffix of the third person singular—in this case masculine—(approximately *lō/ū*) referring to *hš'r z* in the preceding line—was divined already by D.-R., although they regarded it as "unsicher," apparently because they felt that a pronominal suffix must somehow be expressed graphically. At any rate, we shall see that they missed more than one "invisible" pronominal suffix in our passage.

37 See n. 35.

38 Literally, either "a king among the kings or a ruler among the rulers" or "a king from (i.e., one of) the kings etc." (Cf. Arab. *'abd min al 'abîd* 'a certain slave'.)

39 Lit., "a human being whose name is (merely) human being"; so rightly F. Rosenthal in *ANET*, reading the word *šm* with an "invisible" pronominal suffix. If a Phoenician ever wished to express such a notion as "a person who is a person of name (i.e., renown)"—so still D.-R. and Meriggi—he would have said *'dm 'š* h' *'dm šm*; cf. *bšnt x 1-A 's* hmt *šnt y 1-B* "in the year x of A which is the year y of B," D.-R. 43:4-5.

40 Again the "invisible" pronominal suffix.

41 In genuine Semitic, the passive voice is very rarely used when the doer of the action is named, but it often reads better than the active in an English translation.

42 See n. 40.

43 The same two eventualites—the substitution of another's name for Azitawadd's on an object made by Azitawadd and the replacement of the object itself by an "alien" one with the supplanter's name on it—are contemplated in the statue inscription, D.-R. 26 C.

malice—(18) may Baal-shamēm, El-qōnē-arṣ, (19) Shamsh-'ōlōm, and the entire company of the gods efface[45] that prince, that king, or (IV, 1) that commoner. But (2) may the name of Azitawadd endure forever, like the names of (3) the sun and the moon.

4. On Relative Particles, Demonstratives, and Pronominal Suffixes

(a) Relative Particles

In Byblian, an evolution can be observed. In D.-R. 1, 4, [5], 6, and 7, dating from ca. 1,000 to ca. 900 B.C.E., the relative particle is *z* (for which the analogy of the Hebrew poetical relative particle suggests a pronunication *zū*); in D.-R. 9 (A 3, B 3) to 11, dating from ca. 500 to ca. 350 B.C.E., it is *'š*. In Standard Phoenician, our documentation begins (D.-R. 24) only ca. 825, with *'š* as its relative particle. (This is retained to the end, though it is ultimately reduced to *š* in late Punic.) Whether it used *z* in the tenth century, in agreement with Byblian, we do not know.

(b) On Demonstratives

Apparently only Byblian restricts the pair of singular demonstrative *z* (m.)/*z* (f.). to the sense of 'that . . . there', distinguishing 'this . . . here' by means of *zn* (m.)/*z'* (f.). D.-R. 29, therefore, an engraved ivory box unearthed at Ur, is a problem if the second word is completed to [*z*]*n*, since the third person singular pronominal suffix *-y* (D.-R. 29:2: 'dty.tbrky. *bymy* [the last word perhaps merely contaminated by the two preceding and to be corrected to *bym*]) is not otherwise employed in Byblian (see para. c). Perhaps, therefore, the beginning of this inscription is to be restored rather as *'rn.[š]n* "(this) ivory (Heb. *šen*) box," which would leave us free to seek the object's place of origin in Egypt (cf. the Egyptian proper name *Pṯ-'s*) or somewhere in the East Mediterranean basin outside Byblos; for certainly the space is rather wide for a Phoenician *z*. That the jagged top edge of the abraded area suggests (at least on one of the photos) a *š*, may be accidental, but a scrutiny of the abraded area on the original (at the British Museum) for traces of a *z* or a *š* may yield some positive results.

(c) The Pronominal Suffixes of the Third Person[46]

Here, not only does Byblian diverge from Standard Phoenician (whose basis seems to be Tyro-Sidonian), but within Standard Phoenician there is a special (eastern? purely local?) variant, namely the Phoenician of the Arslan-Tash incantations.

(i) In Byblian.

In the oldest, the Ahiram, inscription (D.-R. 1, ca. 1000 B.C.E.), the suffix *-h* occurs at least three times, and there is a fourth one which is unclear. It always refers to a masculine antecedent; but no doubt the feminine singular was likewise *-h*, and the plural *-hm*. For

44 Brought up from line 18 for English word order.

45 Brought down from line 18 for English word order.

46 In addition to the grammars of Harris, Friedrich-Röllig, and Cross and Freedman's *Early Hebrew Orthography* (New Haven, 1952), see Ginsberg, *The World History of the Jewish People*, 2:108-9.

though the masculine ending *-h* presently (from D.-R. 4—ca. 950—on) evolves into *-w*,[47] the feminine singular suffix and the plural suffix are still *-h* and *-hm* respectively in D.-R. 10 (ca. 400), line 6, and *-h* again in *ysdh*, line 13. If the Ur ivory box inscription of the seventh century referred to above (D.-R. 29) is really of Byblian provenience, it is a maverick, for its third person singular suffixes are *-y* after vocalic themes exactly like those of General Phoenician (see below), but we have seen that the basis on which D.-R. 29 is classified as Byblian, the assumption that the second word is to be completed to [z]*n*, is shaky.

(ii) In Standard Phoenician. Here the *h* of the third person suffixes is never retained as such. After vowels other than *a*—and this includes the *i* of the genitive singular of the noun, which is still alive in Standard Phoenician, at least before pronominal suffixes—the original *-hŭ* of the masculine singular pronominal suffix and the original *-hă* of the feminine singular pronominal suffix become (doubtless unstressed) *-yŭ* and *-yă* respectively, while the original *-him*[48] of the third person masculine plural becomes *nēm*,[49] while I am unable to document the fate of the original feminine plural suffix *-hinnā*.[50] After a consonant or the vowel *a*, on the other hand, the *h* is not shifted to *y* or *n* but entirely eliminated by syncopation. In that case, the only consonant that remains of *-hm* is *-m*,[51] while of *-h* no consonant at all remains but the vowel—pertaining to the *u* class in the masculine and to the *a* class of the feminine—is of course retained though "invisible," as we saw in section 3.

Examples of *yu/ya* after vowels other than *a* (*'d*) *mb'y*. D.-R. 26 A I:5; II:3, i.e., *mabō'i-yu/a* (was *šamš* masculine or feminine in this language and dialect?), the *i* being the sign of the genitive (governed by the preposition *'ad*); *lḥdy*, i.e., *la-ḥōdê-ya* (assuming that the word took the pronominal suffixes of the *plural* masculine noun, as in Aramaic [other than Babylonian Aramaic, in which these have mostly been ousted by the suffixes of the singular noun, so that only the context decides whether, for example, *yômęh* means 'his day' or 'his days']), lit. 'by her oneness (i.e., aloneness),' II:5-6; *'ly*, III:16, i.e., *'alê-yu* (or *'alay-yu?*) 'on it', referring to the 'alien' gate that anyone may presume to substitute for the one that Azitawadd made; *wbny 'nk*, II:11, i.e., *wa-banê/ô-ya*[52] *'anōkī* lit., "and there-built it (namely, this city, 1. 9)

---

47 Note *wšntw*, D.-R. 4:5; 6:3; 7:8; *'dtw*, 5:2; 6:2; 7:4; *'rnw*, 9 B:4 (against D.-R. who divide the words as *'rn w'lt 'rn* after *'rn 'lt 'rn* in A:2); *mstrw . . . wzr'w*, 10:15; *ybrkw yḥww* (so the words are probably to be divided), 12:4.

48 Assuming that the original *u* of the third person plural masculine has been assimilated to the original *i* of the corresponding feminine as in Hebrew.

49 Assuming that this "heavy" suffix was stressed as in Hebrew.

50 Had it been ousted by the corresponding masculine suffix? Otherwise, we should have expected *wyspnnn* rather than *wyspnnm* in D.-R. 14:19.

51 As regards *lm* 'to them', for *a* as the vowel of the preposition *l*, not only see the material in Koehler-Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamentum Libros*, s. v., but also cf. the vocalization of this preposition before suffixes in Arabic as well as in Hebrew.

52 In D.-R. 4:1; 7:1, on the other hand the *y* of *bny* is simply the third radical of the verb *bny*, which is retained in Byblian, at least through the tenth century. With the suffix of the third person singular masculine, this would have yielded **bnyw* in the language of these two inscriptions. When the object of the verb in a relative clause is identical with the antecedent of the clause, it does not need to be expressed; otherwise, *p'lt* in 14:19 would have had to be *p'lty* if *'ṣmt* is singular ('mighty deed') or by *p'ltnm* if *'ṣmt* is plural ('mighty deeds'). (Only rarely is it expressed in such cases in Hebrew.)

I";[53] *wyšbny*, D.-R. 14:17, i.e., (approximately) *wa-yīšibnū-yu* 'and we installed him'; *šty*, D.-R. 24:11 (bis), i.e., *šattī-yu* 'I made him'.

Examples of *-nm* after vowels other than *a*: *štnm*, D.-R. 26 A I:16, i.e., *šattī-nēm* 'I laid them'; *'ntnm*, ibid. line 20, i.e., *'innītī-nēm* 'I subdued them'; *lšbtnm*, ibid. line 17, i.e., *la-šabti-nēm* (*šabti* being genitive after the preposition *la*) 'for their abiding', i.e., 'that they may abide'[54] ; *bnḥt lbnm*, ibid., 'in the ease of their minds' (*libbi-nēm*, *libbi* being genitive singular [used distributively, as frequently] because governed by *nḥt*).

---

53 That in our *w-bn-y* the *y* does not represent the retained third radical but the pronominal suffix *-y* is conveniently proved by the corresponding unsuffixed form *w-bn* both two lines back and six lines ahead. Consequently there can be no doubt but in *yrd-m 'nk, . . . yšb-m 'nk*, 1:20, the *-m* is the pronominal suffix *-m* and not anything else, for the significance of which fact, see n. 56.

54 To be included here are two more forms from D.-R. 14, namely, *bdnm*, line 6, and *lqṣtnm*, lines 9-10; but both of these call for comment.

As regards *bdnm*, all honor to C. C. Torrey, *ZA* 26 (1911), 85, who insisted that it "is not a mistake for *bdbrnm*, as it is generally regarded. The word is written the same way in *both* copies of the inscription . . . ." Where Torrey erred—and in that remote era it was not only pardonable but inevitable—was in including among the biblical words compared the *bdym* of Isa. 44:25 and Jer. 50:36. Both of these are of neo-Babylonian date, and the latter refers specifically (verse 35) to Babylon; and when one looks closely at the context in both of them, and in addition compares the latter with Isa. 19:11-13 (note the noun *'ĕwīlīm*, verse 11, and the verb *nō'ĕlū* 'have proved to be fools', verse 13), there can be no doubt but *bdym* is in both cases miswritten for *brym* and represents a borrowing of the Akkadian *bārû* 'augur', as is now generally recognized. [Some writers have thought to avoid the need for emending the masoretic *baddīm* by connecting it with the word *baddum* which occurs in one of the Mari texts. To this, the gap of eleven centuries between the biblical passages and the cuneiform and the fact that *baddum* does *not* mean "oracle priest" (see *CAD B*, 27) are fatal objections.] But with this insight the entire basis for the assumption of a Hebrew word *bad, baddīm*, 'prating' has vanished. There can be exactly no doubt at all but the words *bdyw*, Isa. 16:6, Jer. 48:30; Job 41:4 and *bdyk*, Job 11:3, are—and it makes no difference whether one accepts the masoretic gemination of the *d* as based on a sound tradition or not—nothing but suffixed forms of the preposition *bdē* 'to, for, with', Jer. 51:58; Nah. 2:13; Hab. 2:13; Job 39:25. (For that matter, anyone with a sense of context will realize that *bdyw* in Jer. 36:18 also means 'for him'; the pointless masoretic 'with ink' will satisfy only the sort of people that can be satisfied by that sort of thing.) The same particle is present in our Phoenician passage D.-R. 14:6, where *'l tšm' bdnm* means neither more nor less than "don't listen *to them*." [See Addendum.]

And as regards *lqṣtnm*, lines 9-10, it represents not the D conjugation but the G conjugation (i.e., *la-qaṣôti-nēm*), and it means not 'to cut them off' but 'that they may perish' and the following expressions, sions, *'yt mmlkt 'm 'dm h'* etc., line 10, and *w'yt zr' mml<k>t h' 'm 'dmm hmt*, line 11, are in apposition not to the suffix of our word *lqṣtnm* which immediately precedes them but to that of *wysgrnm*, line 9. This conclusion follows from two observations: First, in the parallel sentence lines 21-22, *lm ysgrnm (22) 'lnm hqdšm 'l wyqṣn hmmlkt h' wh'dmm hmt wzr'm l'lm*, in which the second verb neither has any pronominal suffix nor is followed by *'yt*, what follows it is evidently not its object but its subject and the sense is, "lest those holy gods render them forfeit, so that the said prince and the said prince and the said commoners, and their descendants, perish forever," [N.B. the indicative plural *yqṣn*, ending in *ūn*, contrasts with the subjunctive plural *yqbr* in line 8, ending in *u*. So, too, the indicative plural *ytlwn* in 24:10 contrasts with the subjunctive plural *ykbd*, 24:14, 15.] Second, it can be seen from D.-R. 26 II:11 that before an objective suffix the infinitive is not treated as a noun that can be inflected for case: for 'to build it' is expressed there not by means of **lbnty* but by means of *lbnt*, i.e., *la-banôt-a* (the vowel which constitutes a pronominal suffix, referring to the feminine noun *qrt*, is surely of the *a* group, but let us be noncommittal about its exact quality or its quantity).

Examples of purely vocalic (hence unwritten) singular suffixes and *-m* plural suffix after *a* or consonant: apart from the examples pointed out above in 3 b ii, note *(w)šṭ 'nk šm (=šima) 'ztwdy*, D.-R. 26 I:9-10m 17-18', lit. "there-set I its (i.e., the city's) name Azitawaddiya," i.e., "I named it A"; *r'š* (=*ra'šu*—or perhaps *rōšu*) 'his head', D.-R. 24:15, 16); *lm*, D.-R. 14:8 (bis), 11 'to them' (to be read *lam* or—cf. poetic Hebrew—*lamu*?); *yrd-m 'nk yšb-m 'nk*, D.-R. 26 I:20, lit. "there-uprooted[55] them I, there-resettled them[56] I . . .," i.e., "I uprooted them, I resettled them . . . "

The special case of the preposition *b*. When only two examples of *b* plus *n* were known, both in a single sentence, namely (D.-R. 14:4-5) *'l yptḥ 'yt mškb z w(5)'l ybqš* bn *mnm k 'y šm* bn *mnm*, it was daring on my part to insist,[57] contrary to the prevailing view, that the *n* did not indicate the first person but that the sense was, "Let them not open up this sleeping-place of mine (*miškabī*) and let them not look for anything *in it* (not 'with me'), for there is not anything deposited *in it*." Of course, once D.-R. 9, in which *bn* (9 A 3) could not possibly be interpreted otherwise than as equivalent to 'in it', was published in 1939, and then D.-R. 26, in which *bn* A II:18; III:8, could not possibly be interpreted otherwise than as 'in it', was published in the years 1947-50, it would require daring, and that not of the constructive sort, to deny it.[58] But that does not explain why the preposition *b* with the pronominal suffix of the third person singular should take the form *bn*. My explanation of 1937[59] is certainly wrong. After years of groping, I have come to the conclusion that the only possible explanation is that in Phoenician the originally distinct prepositions *b* and *min* (of which the *n* was doubtless assimilated to the initial consonant of the following word) have been complete-

---

55 The causative of *yrd* is evidently a technical term for the exiling of populations; cf. Isa. 10:13 end (where, incidentally, it is simplest to regard *k'byr* as a dittogram of *w'wryd* and to vocalize the last word as *yōšvēyęm* = *yōšvēbęm*).

56 D.-R. rightly urge the circumstance that these forms are able to take pronominal suffixes—which the Hebrew infinitive absolute can never do—in favor of Friedrich's interpretation of them as third person singular perfects. In the article referred to above in n. 35, I made both this point and another: these Phoenician forms often dispense with the conjunction *w-* (as in these same two forms, for example), a thing which the Hebrew *narrative* infinitive absolute never does. I am puzzled by the persistence of some writers in citing these forms as infinitives.

57 *JBL* 56 (1937), 140.

58 It therefore seems to me not unreasonable to urge that the demonstrated soundness of my instinct on this point creates a presumption in favor of the other feature of my interpretation (see above in the text) of the phrase in question. It did not ignore the difference between *'y* (obviously equivalent to Heb. *'ēn*) and *bl* and therefore did not take *šm* as a pure verbal form (i.e., as the perfect or imperfect of the root *šym*) but as the *passive participle* of the verb *šym*, equivalent to Hebrew *śīm* (Num. 24:21; Obad. 4—equivalent to the English passive participles *placed, set,* and *lodged*) or *śūm* (so the *qere*, the kethib has *ī* here too) 'a fixed purpose', 2 Sam. 13:32. No less heinous an offense against sound philology than here is, of course ignoring the distinction between *'y* and *bl* in the phrase *'y 'dln*, D.-R. 13:4, in a context identical with ours. Now that no. 26 has dissipated the last remnants of doubt about the existence of a preposition *dl* 'with', D.-R. were of course right in connecting our *'dl* with it. But the particle *'y* shows that *'dln* is not a verb related to but a preposition synonymous with *dl*. *'y 'dln* means neither more nor less than "there is not with me." *'dl* is not the only preposition which takes the first person singular suffix *-n*; so does *tḥt* in *tḥtn*, 24:14; cf. Heb. *taḥtēnī*, 2 Sam. 22:48.

59 See n. 57.

ly merged—apart from a survival of *min* in the combination *lm* (as, e.g., in *lmn'ry* [=*l(i?)minna (a?)'ūrêyu*] 'from his youth', D.-R. 24:120; and by dissimilation before *b* in *mb'l 'gdr* 'of the citizens of Agadir' on coins, cited by Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire*, s.v. *mn*)—in a single word *bin*.[60] With the suffixes of the third person singular, this would naturally yield *bin(n)u* (written *bn*), as in 9 A:3; 14:5 (bis), and *bin(n)a* (written *bn*), as in 26 III:8. With the suffix of the third person plural, it ought, according to the rule for words ending in a consonant, to yield *bin(n)ōm*, but by way of exception it may have yielded *bin(n)ēm*; in either case the spelling ought to be *bnm*, as it in fact is in 14:9.[61]

(iii) In the Phoenician of the Incantations from Arslan-Tash (Khadattu). This special variety of Standard Phoenician seems to dispense with "invisible" suffixes of the third person singular altogether and to employ under all conditions *-y*, the phonetic value of which is a tantalizing

---

60 So clearly in *bmškb z* (=*bimmiškabi zē*) 'from this couch', 14:6, 7-8, 21 and possibly without assimilation of the *n* in *bn*, 43:13. *M* without either dissimilation before *b* or in combination with *l* is supposed to be exemplified by *mnḥšt*, 33:2, which is supposed to mean 'of copper'! But this cannot be correct. One cannot say, "This is the statue (of a female being) *presented and erected* of copper by X."; the other supposed instance or instance of this illogic will be dealt with in a moment. *Mnḥšt* can only be the name of the donor (meaning etymologically 'female diviner'? cf. Heb. *piel* of *nḥš*; or possibly miswritten for *mnḥmt*, cf. A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 22:95), thus: "This is the statue (of a female being) presented by *Mnḥšt* (daughter of) Ya'ush (a *masculine* proper name, Lachish, Elephantine), wife of [Baal] yaton (not Baalatyaton!) serv[ant of the temple of Ashtar] t, [son!] of Shim'a (or however that name was pronounced in Phoenician), so[n] of B[aalyaton], to her lord etc." Mnḥšt's husband was named for his father's father, just like King Eshmunazor (14:1-2) and countless other men through the ages. Of course it is not illogical for the author of 43:7 to say "I *set up* (not presented) . . . the likeness of my father's face *in* bronze." *'z ytn lb'l lbnn 'dny br'št nḥšt*, 31:1, which is supposed to confirm the mistranslation of 33:2 against which I have protested, means: "donated this (or, if *'z* is miswritten for *'s*: which he donated) to his lord Baal Lebandon *as* a (gift from the?) *first yield* of copper." Whether the absolutely first yield of the mine in question is meant or the first yield of the year, we don't know; but that 'as' is the sense of *b* in just such a locution in 181:3-4, "I made this shrine for Chemosh in Qrhh as a . . . of deliverance, inasmuch as he delivered me etc." is well known, and it is hardly necessary to stress how natural is a first yield offering of copper just on Cyprus, the source of this inscription, whose copper was so renowned that the metal was named *cuprum* for it in Late Latin, whence its name in several modern languages: French *cuivre*, English *copper*, German *Kupfer*, etc.

61 Starcky, *Une inscription phénicienne*, 262 bottom, implies that Standard Phoenician has still another pronominal suffix of the third person singular, namely the one which is written *-m* in Punic texts which employ the native alphabet—e.g., in *ql-m*, D.-R. 77:3-4 and in *'m-m*, D.-R. 123:3—and *-im* and *-ym* in Punic written in Latin characters. For that is patently the premise on which he bases his rendering of *wbymty 'nk 'št tk lḥdy dl plkm* (D.-R. 26 A II:5-6 and the parallel versions) by the French "et dans mes jours à moi une femme (peut) marcher toute seule avec *son fuseau*" (my italics). Now, although D.-R. III, p. 95 bottom speaks of this Punic ending only as a possessive suffix of the third person masculine, and I haven't investigated whether it ever functions as a suffix of the third person singular feminine, it can be argued in favor of Starcky's rendering that in the Hittite text, the determinant of the corresponding word consists of only one spindle, and for aught I know the syllabic spelling of the word may preclude taking it as a plural; at any rate, Meriggi's rendering is "col fuso." Moreover, though Ya'el Yisre'elit doubtless found in the bibliography at the end of her section of the relevant article support for her statement (*Enṣiqlopedia Miqra'it*, 4:1,000b top) that "skilled spinners used to spin with two spindles at the same time," it seems doubtful whether they commonly did so *ambulando*. (One would imagine that in that case the wool or flax that had been twisted into rough threads would have had to be wound, for feeding onto the

problem.[62] In no case does it justify Dahood's taking *-y* as a third person masculine singular suffix in Psalms passages like Ps. 2:6; 18:33; 24:4; 25:7; etc., in which Standard Phoenician would require such a suffix to consist only of a vowel of the *u* class. There are no Khadattu psalms or psalms which have undergone a Khadattu recension.

5. The Phoenician of King Kilamu.

That the language of the first Kilamu inscription, D.-R. 24, is Standard Phoenician has been illustrated above with the forms *šty* ending in *-īyu* and *r'š* ending in *-u*.[63] This character of the language of the inscription is not altered by the fact that Kilamu's patronymic appears in it as *br ḥy'* instead of *bn ḥy'*. No doubt this ninth century predecessor on the throne of Y'dy-Sam'al of the two eighth century sovereigns Panamu I and Bir-rakab, who composed D.-R. 214 and 215 respectively in the Samalian language, was like them of Samalian stock, and his Samalian patronymic was regarded as an untranslatable proper name just as Russian patronymics are usually treated as untranslatable even by speakers and writers of impeccable English, who will usually cite the full name of the Russian author Chekhov, even in a purely English context, as Anton Pavlovich Checkhov rather than as Anton, son of Pavel, Chekhov. D.-R., however, imply that on another occasion Kilamu employed a "Phoenician" all his own, when they classify their no. 25 as Phoenician. As we have seen above, the relative particle *z* and the form *lh* meaning 'to him' could, as Phoenician, be only Byblian of ca. 1,000 B.C.E. (*lh* 'to her' could also be later but still, *qua* Phoenician, only Byblian), not Standard Phoenician of the ninth century, while *ḥy* 'life' could not qualify as any sort of Phoenician. On the other hand, in the extreme scriptio defectiva of this document, in which even the proper name which is spelled Ḥy' in 24:2 (and no doubt was also spelled thus at the damaged end of line 1

---

two spindles, around their necks. A photo of a Bedouin woman spinning as she walks along a country "road," reproduced in G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, 5, appendix of illustrations, no. 8, shows her with such raw material wound about her left forearm. From this roll projects a length of finished yarn which is being wound around the spindle whose handle she grasps in her right hand. For an idea of how the loose thread has been twisted tight into real yarn, see ibid., 52-54.) Nevertheless, I hesitate to assume without compelling evidence, in a text which otherwise employs repeatedly the regular Standard Phoenician pronominal suffixes of the third person, one that otherwise only begins to appear five centuries later and that only in Punic texts. After all, the Phoenician version is more pointed than the Hittite one in any case: it tells us that the roads which were once dangerous for all wayfarers have, during Azitawadd's reign, been safe not only for a woman but for an unaccompanied woman, a point which the Hittite text misses. May not, then, the former have gone further than the latter by adding that the woman could walk along safely while attending not to just one but to two spindles? One shouldn't put that past a king who boasts that his subjects have never experienced night during his reign.

62 Cf. the interpretation of the second incantation by T. H. Gaster, *BASOR* 209 (1973), 18-26.

63 I would, however, observe in passing that D.-R.'s view that *'ḫ*, 24:3, can spell either 'my brother' or 'his brother' is incorrect. The latter would have to be written *'ḫy* (perhaps by this time *'aḥiyu* throughout, but originally nom. *-ūyu*, gen. *īyu*, acc. *-āyu*), in accordance with the rule that the kinship terms *'b* 'father', *'ḫ* 'brother', and *ḥm* 'husband's father' (in later dialects and languages also 'wife's father') add a long vowel (originally varying according to case: nom. *ū*, gen. *ī*, acc. *ā*) in the construct state and before all pronominal suffixes except that of the first person singular (in modern Arabic dialects even there, 'my father' being *'būy*).

ibid., as is rightly assumed by D.-R. themselves) dispenses with the latter's final vowel letter, *z* can very well represent the Old Aramaic *zy* and *ḥy* 'life' can very well represent the specifically Samalian word corresponding to Standard Aramaic *ḥayyīn*, namely *ḥayyī* (oblique case because governed by *'rk*; the nominative of the masculine plural ending is of course *-ū*); while *lh* 'to him' is fine in virtually every variety of Aramaic. That the text is Aramaic, and by virtue of *ḥy* = *ḥayyi* specifically Samalian Aramaic, was seen way back in 1947 by Dupont-Sommer.[64]

Addenda

Ad Section 2. Without our detailed analysis—and without pointing out that I have maintained from the start that what El creates here is the being *Š'tqt*—F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Harvard University Press, 1973), 181, n. 155, declares that the forms *ydt* and *gršt* read by Herdner "must be vocalized as feminine participles: *yādītu* and *garištu*, 'exorcist', 'expeller'." Which is of course absolutely right except that *in the context* the forms have to be read with final *a* as accusatives rather than with final *u* as nominatives.

Ad Note 54, second paragraph. I originally excused myself, in my own mind, from listing *bdy*, Job 17:16, which is the same preposition *bdē* with the suffix of the first person singular, because of the complication of having to correct at least the masoretic pointing, but my conscience would not let me shirk the task any longer when I noticed that even the Septuagint realizes from the context that the verse can only mean: "Will they (i.e., the hope and the happiness [for *wtqwty* the LXX's *vorlage* had *wṯ[w]bty*] of verse 15) descend with me to Sheol? Will we go down into the earth (cf. verses 13-14) together?" For since it is obvious from the examples cited that *bdy* can mean 'with me', BHK^3's [*b*] *'mdy* is certainly not the original reading, and is not even probably the Septuagint's reading. What is probable is that the Septuagint read the final *b* of verse 15 at the beginning of verse 16; that the suffix *-n* with which verse 16 then ends can only be that of the third person plural feminine is why they interpreted the (correct) *ṯ[w]bty* which they read in verse 16b as *ta agatha mou* instead of *to agathon mou*. Accordingly, read at the beginning of Job 17:16 either *baddai* or, more probably, *hăvaddai*.

---

64 A. Dupont-Sommer, *RHR* 133 (1947-48). 19-33. For the possible language-political significance of this epigraph, see Ginsberg, *World History of the Jewish People*, 2:118-19. [Dupont-Sommer is followed by J. J. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie* (Leiden, 1962), 1:16-18.]