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The present study discusses ten Ugaritic words whose meanings or general connotations are clear from the context, but for which we lack plausible etymologies. Cognates are proposed from the Modern South Arabian languages of Mehri, Harsusi, Jibbali, and Soqotri. The Ugaritic words treated are the following: b’r, šhr, šrr, hbn, hbrt, šly, nṣt, irn, ḫpn, ḫqm.

There are few examples of two Semitic languages more distantly related than Ugaritic and Modern South Arabian (MSA). Both geographically and temporally there is much that separates them. The former was used near the far northwestern corner of the Semitic speech community in the 2nd Millennium B.C.E; the latter is used in the far southeastern corner of the Near East and is attested only in the last 150 years.¹ These separations of space and time do not a priori preclude a close kinship between languages,² but as any Semitist will readily recognize there is much that distinguishes Ugaritic and MSA.³

Regardless of such differences in space and time, however, all the Semitic languages are closely related to each other. Joshua Blau has correctly referred to “the very close affinity of Semitic tongues, which are not less similar to each other than languages belonging to one branch of Indo-European.”⁴ Accordingly, it is modern language. That is to say, one must first work back from, let us say, Gurage, to proto-Semitic, then back down to, for example, Neo-Aramaic. But such hypothetical machinations do not affect the general point being made here.


² I mention several basic morphological differences: 1) In MSA the 3rd singular pronouns generally begin with a sibilant, while in Ugaritic they begin with h-. 2) In MSA the 1st singular suffix of the perfect verb is -k, while in Ugaritic it is -t. 3) The MSA imperfect and subjunctive verbs have a different syllabification, whereas in Ugaritic these forms are distinguished by modal suffixes. 4) MSA uses internal (broken) plurals extensively, for which there is no evidence in Ugaritic.

fair to comment that a cognate of a particular word or root in any one Semitic language may serve to further our understanding of its relative in any second Semitic language.

In the specific case of Ugaritic studies, this methodology, whereby one searches for cognates in the various dictionaries available, has led to some excesses and abuses. With full cognizance that I am in danger of falling into the same trap, below I propose some etymologies from the MSA languages for Ugaritic words for which no cognates have ever been established. In a few cases there are accepted cognates, but the MSA ones being proposed are in some way (morphologically, semantically, etc.) closer to their Ugaritic counterparts. Furthermore, without exception the meanings or general connotations of the words studied are already well known, having been deduced through the contextual method. What we have lacked to the present are plausible etymologies. In proposing cognates, therefore, I do not intend to reinterpret the Ugaritic texts.

Some work along these lines has already been carried out, mainly by Wolf Leslau and Edward Ullendorff. The former supplemented C. H. Gordon’s UT glossary with a whole series of South Arabian, Ethiopian, and other cognates, although only in a few instances did he adduce cognates for words which lacked etyma altogether according to their entries in UT. Additional material may often be garnered through the intermediate step of Hebrew by consulting Leslau’s two books devoted to this language. Ullendorff’s work, as is well known to Ugaritologists, has also stressed the importance of South Arabian and Ethiopian.

Whereas Leslau and Ullendorff have utilized the entire gamut of South-east Semitic, in the present study I limit myself to the MSA languages. They are specifically 1) Mehri, 2) Jibbali (formerly called Şhauri or Şheri), and 3) Soqotri, as well as 4) Hursusi and 5) Batahari, the latter two being very closely related dialects of Mehri. MSA words are cited according to their entries in the following dictionaries: Johnstone, Hursusi, for Mehri and Hursusi; Johnstone, Jibbali, for Jibbali; and Leslau, Soqotri, for Soqotri.

b’r (S-stem)12

This verb occurs in 51:IV:16–17:

qds.yuldm.sh’r
amrr.kkkkb.lpmn
ayr


5 For this term see W. Leslau, “South-East Semitic (Ethiopic and South-Arabic),” JAOS 62 (1943), 4–14.

6 For simplicity’s sake, henceforth I shall refer to these languages in simplified spelling, i.e., without diacritical marks.

10 Although Johnstone, Hursusi, is devoted to the dialect indicated in the title, it presents Mehri equivalents throughout. Jahn, Mehri, is still important, but Johnstone’s work on MSA has set new standards in the field and thus I use his Hursusi volume as a source for Mehri lexemes as well. An older dictionary of Jibbali is Bittner, Shauri, but this work is often unreliable, so Johnstone, Jibbali, is certainly the preferred text here. Batahari is our least known MSA dialect. An incomplete word-list was published fifty years ago in Thomas, Four, but none of the words discussed in the present paper are to be found in his lexicon. Accordingly, Batahari is not included in the data presented below, though one would assume that cognates are to be found in this dialect as well. Citation forms for the respective languages are taken only from the lexicons mentioned at the end of the previous paragraph. However, for the sake of bibliographic completeness I note all volumes wherein a certain MSA word may be found.

12 Due to the use of different native informants and due to the employment of varying transliteration systems, the lexicons often cite the same word or very similar words in ways differing from each other. I have not attempted to reconcile these differences. Rather, the MSA words are cited exactly as they appear in the sources indicated. The only
The context suggests forward movement of some kind, with the god Qdš-w-Amrr being compared to a star. Representative translations are those of Gordon: “Qadish begins to light the way, Even Amrar forward like a star,”13 and Ginsberg: “Qadesh proceeds to lead, Amrur is like a star in front.”14

Although there are cognates for the root bêt,15 none seems to fit the present context. Thus I would propose the following etyma from the MSA tongues, listed in Johnstone, *Harsusi* 14; Johnstone, *Jibbali* 22; Thomas, *Four* 301; Bittner, *Shauri* 19; and Leslau, *Soqotri* 92:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mehri</th>
<th>bêr</th>
<th>“go at night, late evening”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsusi</td>
<td>bêr</td>
<td>“go at night, late evening”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibbali</td>
<td>ba’êr</td>
<td>“(usually animals) go out at night”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehri</td>
<td>hebâwr</td>
<td>“take out (flocks) at night”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsusi</td>
<td>abôr</td>
<td>“take out (flocks) at night”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibbali</td>
<td>ebêr</td>
<td>“take (animals) out at night”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soqotri</td>
<td>bô’ôr</td>
<td>“voyager la nuit”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that Mehri and Harsusi lack the c phoneme, although it is retained in Jibbali and Soqotri.16

### šhrr

This verb occurs in 49:II:24, 51:VIII:57 with the meaning “to burn/shine (of the sun),” and in 52:41, 45, 48 with the meaning “to roast (of meat).”17 Nominal cognates have been proposed, e.g., Arabic šahrâ, “shadeless desert,”18 Hebrew śhr “yellowish-red,”19; and a pair of denominative verbs has been suggested, Arabic ḥshärâ (XI-stem) “become dust-colored, become brownish-yellow or reddish,” Syriac šēhar “become reddish.”20 An additional cognate, and specifically a verbal one related to the ideas of burning and roasting, is to be found in MSA. See Johnstone, *Harsusi* 115; Johnstone, *Jibbali* 238; Jahn, *Mehri* 227; Bittner, *Shauri* 61, 67; and Leslau, *Soqotri* 348:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mehri</th>
<th>šēhr, zaḥâr</th>
<th>“brand”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsusi</td>
<td>šēhr</td>
<td>“brand”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibbali</td>
<td>šâhr</td>
<td>“cauteriser”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soqotri</td>
<td>šôhor</td>
<td>“cauteriser”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these words—the Ugaritic, Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, and MSA—are cognate, but clearly the Ugaritic verb shares a closer relationship with the MSA verbs than with the other etyma proposed.

### šrr

This word in 126:V:49, 127:7 cannot be translated with any certainty,21 but the context is disease. Nearby occur *mrs* in 126:V:50 and *zhln* in 126:V:51, 127:9, both of which mean “disease, sick, etc.” An appropriate cognate for šrr is listed in Johnstone, *Harsusi* 121; Johnstone, *Jibbali* 253; and Jahn, *Mehri* 241:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mehri</th>
<th>šer</th>
<th>“ill health”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harsusi</td>
<td>šer</td>
<td>“ill health”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehri</td>
<td>eštêrôr</td>
<td>“choke”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsusi</td>
<td>eštêrôr</td>
<td>“choke”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibbali</td>
<td>ešérôr</td>
<td>“choke”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The root šrr also occurs in Arabic with the meaning “bad, evil” and is also to be related. Johnstone notes than in Omani Arabic šrr means “ill health.” Akkadian šerru “klein” is suggested by Aistleitner as a cognate;22 this too is presumably related. But the MSA meanings fit the context of our Ugaritic passages better than the connotations of either the Arabic or the Akkadian cognates.

---

14 H. L. Ginsberg, in *ANET*, p. 133.
18 Ibid.
hbn

This word occurs in 2102:6 in a list of commodities which includes ṭīṣr trees, robes, oxen, barley, and oil. Gordon does not attempt to define this item.23 Dahood translates it as “ebony,” pointing to the Hebrew cognate ḥōbnim in Ezekiel 27:15.24 But since the commodities listed in the text are not precious items, one should be cautious with this identification. MSA provides other possible etyma, listed in Johnstone, Harsusi 50; Johnstone, Jibbali 94; and Bittner, Shauri 33:

Harsusi  hebbān  “sack (of palm-leaf fibres), bag”
Jibbali  hobbān  “finely made man’s leather bag”

The meaning of “sack, bag” would fit the context of 2102:6 as well as if, not better than, ebony. Johnstone notes Omani Arabic ḥibbān “leather bag for rations” as cognate too. This might suggest an ultimate relationship with Arabic ḥb “leather” = Hebrew ʿahābāh in Song of Songs 3:10.25

brl

Of all the words in the Ugaritic lexicon, few have elicited more discussion than brl. This vocable appears consistently as the parallel member of np, so its meaning is well established. But after more than a half-century of studying the Ras Shamra texts, Ugaritologists are still far from a consensus in determining the word’s etymology. M. H. Pope recently reviewed the many suggested cognates for brl as well as presented his own explanation,26 so there is no need to rehearse this material here. In the discussion below, I proceed independently of all previous attempts to etymologize this word.

Within the MSA vocabularies occur the following cognates, listed by Johnstone, Harsusi 5; and Johnstone, Jibbali 6:

As the connection between these entries and Ugaritic brl is not immediately visible, considerable philological discussion is necessary.

The quadrilateral brl is assumed to derive from a root brt expanded by l. This phenomenon is attested elsewhere in Semitic, e.g., compare Tigrigna dlhq with Hebrew dlhq.27 The augmented l is usually in second position,28 but in the case of brl the liquid r may have caused the l to follow r. By analogy, note the location of the l in Aramaic ʿarmēlā “widow” vs. Hebrew ʿalmānāh.

The MSA terms point to a preformative ʾ which is retained in Jibbali. As noted above, this phoneme does not occur in Mehri and Harsusi, so the shift to initial ʾ is easily explained. Preformative ʾ is rare in Semitic, but it does occur. Among the best examples, in fact, are a series of Soqotri words, for which see Leslau, Soqotri 293: ʾabdēher “tachetēc” (cp. Hebrew bārōd), ʾēbhalēten “pièces pointues” (cp. Hebrew ʾeben), ʾēmor “dire” (cp. Hebrew ʾmr), and perhaps ʾāblet “une fois” (cp. Arabic balata, if indeed related). Leslau, Soqotri 18–19, calls attention to this phenomenon, especially before l and r. And although Leslau was discussing only Soqotri, we can notice preformative ʾ in Jibbali as well, e.g., the word under discussion ʿabrēt and also ʾōhr “say.” Further afield we call attention to affirmative ʾ in Hebrew, so ably demonstrated by Stanley Gevitz.29

To sum up, we should posit an original noun brt which has been expanded by augmentative l in Ugaritic and by preformative ʾ (or ʾ[ʾ]) in MSA.

Phonology is not our only obstacle in correlating the aforementioned MSA words and Ugaritic brl. Semantics must also be discussed. The MSA words do not mean simply “desire” but specifically “desire to weep.” Naturally these are not the same, but we do have parallels in other languages where one cognate has a general meaning and another cognate has a very limited semantic range. German Tier and English deer

27 Cf. Leslau, Contributions, p. 17.
28 S. Moscati, An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (Wiesbaden, 1964), p. 131, par. 16.27d.
are cognate, although the former refers to the entire animal kingdom and the latter is a specific species of animal. Similarly, German Hünd and English hound, where the former includes all canines and the latter is limited to only a specific type of dog. Note further that in Jibbali the word also means “lump in the throat”; this might connect with the additional connotation of npš as “appetite.”

In correlating the MSA terms listed above with Ugaritic brlt we have met up with difficulties in the fields of both phonology and semantics. Admittedly, it has taken some phonological gymnastics and some possible stretching of related meanings to overcome these difficulties. But given the intense interest in Ugaritic brlt the presentation of this MSA material was deemed advisable. One can only quote Pope who ended his discussion of brlt thus: “Error is not unprecedented in the evolution of Ugaritology.”

\(\text{gly}\)

From the contexts in such passages as 137:23, 24, 29, and 1 Aqht 31, 160, it is clear that this word means “lower, sink, drop, droop.” The only possible cognate heretofore posited is Arabic ǧalā(w) “das Mass überschreiten,” with the resulting interpretation of our Ugaritic word as “übermässig beugen.” This appears to stretch the meaning of ǧly considerably. A more likely cognate for Ugaritic ǧly is found in Johnstone, Harsusi 44:

Harsusi ǧālō “to throw away”

Semantically “lower” and “throw away” both indicate downward movement. This general notion was specialized in the individual languages of Ugaritic and Harsusi.

The Ugaritic noun ǧlh “inactivity, mischief, error” (?) in 127:32, 44–45 is usually related to the verb ǧly. In light of the foregoing, however, I am inclined to dissociate the two. The form ǧlh presumably is related to Arabic ǧîl “exceed, overdo, exaggerate,” or perhaps even ǧîl “hatred, malice.”

\(\text{nff}\)

All agree that this verb means “wobble, tremble, shake.” The cognate most often cited is Hebrew nwt, a hapax legomenon in Psalms 99:1. Gordon adduced an additional cognate, Arabic nft “jump,” with the following comment: “less close to the Ug. in meaning, though closer in form.”

The ideal etymon would be one which shares the Hebrew meaning and the Arabic form. Such a verb is present in the MSA languages, listed in Johnstone, Harsusi 98; and Johnstone, Jibbali 196; Bittner, Shauri 55; Leslau, Soqotri 265; and Jahn, Mehr 218:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mehri} & \quad \text{net/ynf}\text{ṯ} \text{nṯṯ} \text{ “shake, shiver”} \\
\text{Harsusi} & \quad \text{net/ynf}\text{ṯ} \text{nṯṯ} \text{ “shake, shiver”} \\
\text{Jibbali} & \quad \text{nfṯ} \text{ “shiver, tremble”} \\
\text{Soqotri} & \quad \text{nfṯ} \text{ “trembler”}
\end{align*}
\]

Jahn, Mehr 218, notes that in Egyptian Arabic nft means “shake” as well.

\(\text{irn}\)

This word appears in RS24.247 where it apparently refers to some kind of animal. W. G. E. Watson translated it as “cur” and identified it with Akkadian mūrānu, mārānu “young dog, puppy, cub.” But as Watson himself noted, the Akkadian term is usually associated with Arabic muhr “foal, colt.” A better candidate to be etymologically related to Ugaritic irn is found in Johnstone, Harsusi 3; Johnstone, Jibbali 4; Thomas, Four 300, 318; Bittner, Shauri 13; and Leslau, Soqotri 75:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mehri} & \quad \text{ḥā-rāwn} \text{ “goat”} \\
\text{Harsusi} & \quad \text{he-herin} \text{ “goats” (collective)} \\
\text{Jibbali} & \quad \text{irin, ērin} \text{ “goats” (collective)} \\
\text{Soqotri} & \quad \text{ērehon} \text{ “moutons, chevres” (only plural)}
\end{align*}
\]

---

30 Gordon, UT, p. 496, no. 19.1681; and Aistleitner, WUS, p. 211, no. 1826.
32 Gordon, UT, p. 464, no. 19.1965; Gordon, “Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit,” p. 70; Ginsberg in ANET, pp. 130, 154; and de Moor, Seasonal Pattern, p. 68.
33 Aistleitner, WUS, p. 247, no. 2143; cf. Segert, Basic Grammar, p. 197.
34 Aistleitner, WUS, p. 247, no. 2143.
35 Segert, Basic Grammar, p. 197.
36 Gordon, UT, p. 443; no. 19.1641.
38 Gordon, UT, p. 443, no. 19.1641.
The Mehri and Harsusi forms cited include the definite article ḥā, ḥe. Note the initial vowel in the MSA forms is e/i (except in Mehri where it drops through apharesis) which accords with the Ugaritic spelling with i.

**ḥpn**

From its common use as a parallel member to lbš, the meaning of ḥpn is well established. Gordon translates "garment" and Aistleitner renders "Kleidungsstück." But neither of these dictionaries suggests a cognate. A suitable one may be found in Leslau, *Soqotri* 184:

Soqotri  ḥaf  "vêtement"

Leslau cites Arabic ḥaffa "entourer de quelque chose" and Hebrew ḥff "couvrir" as etyma for his Soqotri entry. Since ḥ and ḥ have merged in Soqotri, the only MSA language where this occurs (see Leslau, *Soqotri* 14, 20–21), cognates for ḥaf may be sought with either ḥ- or ḥ-. In light of Ugaritic ḥpn, which is the semantic equivalent of Soqotri ḥaf, I am inclined to relate the two and to divorce the Arabic and Hebrew cognates forwarded by Leslau. The Ugaritic form, therefore, should be considered a noun with suffixed -n. Other such nouns, formed from biliteral stems, are ḻšn "gift" (medial weak), ǧân "pride" (final weak), and ḥln "window" (geminate).

---

43 Aistleitner, *WUS*, p. 115, no. 1066.

---

**ḥqlm**

This noun occurs parallel to brkm "knees" in Ht:II:14, 28. Interpretations vary from considering ḥqlm to be an item worn on the lower part of the body to identifying the word with a specific part of the body. Among the latter “throat” has been the most popular suggestion, based on Arabic ḥalq, but the suffixed -m then requires explanation. S. Rin’s suggestion that ḥqlm is a dual noun with the singular meaning of “throat” requires special pleading. Gordon’s proposal to interpret the -m as adverbial has been countered by J. C. de Moor: “the D-stem ǧill makes it impossible to take the -m as an adverbial ending.” These difficulties disappear, however, in view of the following MSA cognates noted by Johnstone, Harsusi 59; Johnstone *Jibbali* 110; and Bittner, *Shauri* 37:

Mehri  ḥelqemōt, pl. ḥelqām  “Adam’s apple,”
Harsusi  ḥelqemōt, pl. ḥelqām  “side of the throat”
Jibbali  ḥalqūt, pl. ḥolqūm  “Adam’s apple”

The Jibbali form lacks the m due to the tendency in this language for intervocalic m to be replaced by a lengthened, nasalized vowel. Note that the m appears in the broken plural form.

To sum up, Ugaritic ḥqlm should be rendered "throat, neck," with the -m to be treated as an integral part of the word.

---

45 See the survey of suggestions in de Moor, *Seasonal Pattern*, p. 92.
46 Cf., e.g., Gordon, *UT*, p. 397, no. 19.867.
49 De Moor, *Seasonal Pattern*, p. 92.