

LIPÍŃSKI'S SEMITIC LANGUAGES

EDWARD LIPÍŃSKI, *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar*.

Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 80. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 1997. Pp. 754.

GARY A. RENDSBURG, Cornell University

At first glance, it is not clear to me why this book is subtitled as an *Outline*, for Edward Lipiński has produced nothing short of a fully-researched presentation of comparative Semitic grammar, encyclopedic in scope, with replete examples of every phenomenon discussed. The richness of the information conveyed in its 754 pages justifies more than the subtitle *Outline*. The reader should not expect merely a simple sketch of Semitic grammar, such as Sabatino Moscati's *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (1964), a valuable introductory essay of 185 pages. At second glance, one realizes why the word *Outline* appears in the subtitle. It is the English equivalent of the German *Grundriss*, a word which immediately calls to mind Carl Brockelmann's magnum opus, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (1908–1913). Of course, one could question the use of the word *Grundriss* in that title too, yet the term was common in German reference works of that era. Neither Brockelmann's nor the present work should be considered a mere *Outline* or *Grundriss*, but the association permits one to appreciate that Lipiński will serve scholars in the 21st century in the manner that Brockelmann served them in the 20th.

The volume follows the traditional format of a comparative grammar. Part One introduces the reader to the Afro-Asiatic macrofamily, then presents the individual Semitic languages according to Lipiński's classification scheme. Parts Two, Three, and Four deal with Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax. Part Five, the shortest of the five parts, is nevertheless a bonus. Its 35 pages treat the Lexicon, a subject not typically embraced in works of this nature. The topics covered include etymology, derivatives, languages in contact, internal change, and proper names (with subsections on anthroponymy and toponymy).

The classification of the Semitic languages is still a disputed subject. Apart from labeling Akkadian as East Semitic and the now near-consensus of grouping South Arabian and Ethiopian together as South Semitic, to the exclusion of Arabic, there is little agreement among scholars who have considered the issue. For example, while H. L. Ginsberg argued strongly for including Ugaritic within Canaanite (specifically, with Phoenician as its closest

relative),¹ Albrecht Goetze linked it with Amorite,² and recently Alan Kaye has allied it with Arabic.³ And if such debate swirls around a relatively well-attested language such as Ugaritic, with continuous literary texts yielding most of the necessary grammatical information, all the more is this the situation with Eblaite, a language for which we have a fair amount of lexical information but very little in the way of sustained text.

Lipiński weighs in as follows. He accepts the aforementioned categories of East Semitic and South Semitic; he groups Palaeosyrian (Eblaite, the Tell Beydar tablets, and pre-Sargonic and post-Ur-III texts from Mari), Amorite, and Ugaritic together as North Semitic; and he brackets Canaanite, Aramaic, and Arabic together as West Semitic. I am on record (a) as accepting Ginsberg's view on Ugaritic as Canaanite,⁴ and (b) with a proposal to link Eblaite, Amorite, and Aramaic as a Syrian Semitic *Sprachbund* within West Semitic,⁵ so naturally I disagree with this classification schema. But this is a minor issue. The great strength of this book is not in its argumentation for one particular method of categorizing the Semitic languages, but rather, in the wealth of data conveyed and the clear manner of presentation. This combination is what makes this book work so well and what makes it so indispensable for the scholar of Semitic. I hasten to add, moreover, that even for the scholar with facility in only one or two of the Semitic languages, this book is worth owning. My main field of research is Hebrew, yet there are insights into the language that I have learned from Lipiński's treatment and not from other, more standard grammars of Hebrew (I will note some examples below).⁶

¹ H. L. Ginsberg, "The Northwest Semitic Languages," in *Patriarchs*, ed. B. Mazar, World History of the Jewish People (New Brunswick, NJ, 1970), pp. 102–124, 293, especially pp. 102–106.

² A. Goetze, "Is Ugaritic a Canaanite Dialect?" *Language* 17 (1941) 127–138.

³ A. S. Kaye, "Does Ugaritic Go with Arabic in Semitic Genealogical Sub-Classification?" *Folia Orientalia* 28 (1991) 115–128.

⁴ G. A. Rendsburg, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (Atlanta, 1990), p. 7, and elsewhere.

⁵ G. A. Rendsburg, "Monophthongization of *aw/ay* > *ā* in Eblaite and in Northwest Semitic," in *Eblaitica: Essays on the Ebla Archives and Eblaite Language*, eds. C. H. Gordon and G. A. Rendsburg (Winona Lake, IN, 1990), 2:91–126, especially pp. 113–116.

⁶ The attentive reading will note some inconsistency in the transliterations. For example, Lipiński uses *ī* to represent the long /i:/ vowel throughout Semitic, including Hebrew. Within Hebrew, however, I use the macron for tone-long vowels and the circumflex for pure long vowels. Thus Lipiński uses *-īm* for the plural morpheme, whereas I use *-im*. Moreover, I sometimes use Lipiński's method even when not citing him directly within quotation marks. To further complicate matters, note that Lipiński sometimes follows my method, as in his transliteration of עֲשׂוּם as *ʿāṣūm* (§29.8), using the macron for the tone-long first vowel (and for the pure long second vowel).

Lipiński presents the data from the Semitic languages in their broadest definition. That is, he incorporates material not only from the classical languages, but also from the Semitic languages still spoken today: colloquial Arabic dialects, the Ethiopian and South Arabian languages, and Neo-Aramaic. Modern Hebrew is referred to only several times, for example, the use of the *-îl* suffix to form diminutives like *kadîl* "little pitcher" (§29.49). Though not stated explicitly, most likely Lipiński has limited references to Modern Hebrew because, unlike the other Semitic languages spoken in the present day, there is no continuous development from antiquity to today.

In addition, Lipiński goes beyond Semitic at every turn. Whenever there is something of value in Afro-Asiatic, Lipiński notes the parallel, and if there is something of value in another language family, not related to Semitic, Lipiński incorporates this information as well. A good example is the following, within the context of a brief discussion on the traceable alternation of *t* and *k* (for example, in the second person pronoun markers, with the former attached to verb forms and the latter suffixed to nouns). Lipiński writes, "Instead of being original, this opposition may result from a specialized function obtained by the allophones *t* and *k* of the same phoneme. An example of a phoneme realized as [t] or [k] is encountered nowadays in the Samoan language which is believed to represent the oldest form of Malayo-Polynesian, also known as Austronesian" (§12.4). One can only stand in awe of Lipiński's ability to produce linguistic parallels from such far-flung quarters.

The volume includes a 45-page bibliography listing hundreds of works, organized according to the branches of Semitic, the branches of Afro-Asiatic (though oddly no listing of works relevant to Egyptian), and two other topics (Languages in Contact; Anthroponymy and Toponymy). But within the presentation of the data there is no attempt to associate a particular position with a particular scholar. The author obviously can be excused for this: Such references would have encumbered the volume tremendously and would have interrupted the flow of the discussion. The informed reader will know immediately that a specific scholar's view is represented in a specific instance. Thus, for example, Lipiński states that the shifts of *aw* > *ā* and *ay* > *ā* occur in Eblaite (§22.3), a view proposed by I. J. Gelb in "Ebla and the Kish Civilization,"⁷ an article duly noted in the Bibliography (p. 597), contra the position taken by P. Fronzaroli and others.⁸ But the reader not aware of the scholarly debate will not know the source of Lipiński's view. Similarly, this reviewer recognizes his own work when Lipiński refers to the preservation

⁷ I. J. Gelb, "Ebla and the Kish Civilization," in *La Lingua di Ebla*, ed. L. Cagni (Naples, 1981), pp. 9–73, especially pp. 24–25.

⁸ For a full discussion of the issue, see my article cited above in n. 5.

of the interdental \underline{t} in Transjordan, both in the Hebrew spoken there and in Ammonite (§13.7). In this case, however, the articles that deal with this issue are not cited in the Bibliography, presumably because they are very short and very specific.⁹

In these instances, and in many others, I, as a sample reader, am able to recognize a particular scholarly voice speaking. My question is: What about the numerous cases where I read something that I had not encountered before? For example, in the Phonology section, one reads: "Also t may be palatalized as, for example, the Semitic noun $qāt-$, 'hand', well-known in East Semitic, which corresponds to West Cushitic (Omotic) $kuč-$, $kis-$, 'hand, arm'" (§15.8). I am curious to know: Is this Lipiński's original proposal? Or has someone else already suggested the connection? I have no way of knowing. I would not expect Lipiński to record the source of each of the thousands of opinions voiced in the book. I simply note the experience of reading the book and wishing to know, on occasion, what is Lipiński's and what comes from elsewhere.

I could spend pages praising this work, utilizing the thesaurus to find additional synonyms to "magnificent," "magisterial," and "monumental," but let me simply say to anyone who ever has pondered a particular point in an individual Semitic language or in the family as a whole: Obtain this book! How often do we read in laudable reviews that a certain book deserves to be on the bookshelf of every scholar in the field? In this case, I not only repeat those words, but I offer the following prediction, continuing the comparison noted above. Just as scholars today continue to refer to Brockelmann, notwithstanding how outdated that work is, a century from now scholars will still be utilizing Lipiński as a standard reference work.

The best way to extol this book is to spend the remainder of this review presenting random notes on items raised in this volume, thereby giving the reader of this review a sampling of the vast erudition reflected within its contents. Some of my comments speak to issues on which no *communis opinio* has been reached by Semitists; some are corrections or additions to the material presented; and some are simply findings that I found of interest. My remarks stem mainly from my own interests in the fields of Hebrew in particular and West Semitic in general. My focus is on the first three parts of the book; I have but few comments on the Syntax and Lexicon sections. References are to paragraph numbers.

1.1. I learned that Judah ibn Quraysh from Tiaret in Algeria noted connections between Semitic and Berber already in the 9th century!

1.2. Lipiński agrees that there are points of contact between Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European, though "these are scarcely sufficient to warrant

⁹G. A. Rendsburg, "More on Hebrew *šibbōlet*," *JSS* 33 (1988) 255–258; and G. A. Rendsburg, "The Ammonite Phoneme / \underline{T} /," *BASOR* 269 (1988) 73–79.

assumption of any genetic connection.” On the other hand, he notes some very basic links between Afro-Asiatic and Bantu, e.g., the noun prefix *mu-*, the reciprocal verb morpheme *-án-*, and the causative morpheme *-ís/-iš-*.

2.17. While some scholars have posited that Egyptian is the branch of Afro-Asiatic most closely related to Semitic, perhaps based on geography, or on close cultural and political contacts over millennia, Lipiński deems Berber and Cushitic closest to Semitic, then Egyptian, with Chadic as the most distantly-related group.

3.3 Lipiński considers North Africa to be the original homeland of the Semites. He suggests that they migrated “through the Nile delta from the West to the East, and reached Western Asia, where written documents of the third millennium BC preserve noticeable traces of Pre-Semitic and, in Mesopotamia, also of pre-Sumerian substratum.”

7.46. In classifying the various Arabic colloquials, Lipiński links Maltese with the Maghribi dialects. Others would classify Maltese unto itself within the Arabic realm, or even as a language no longer to be considered Arabic, regardless of its origins.¹⁰

8.18. Lipiński notes that Gafat, now extinct but formerly in use in western Ethiopia, “is the only Semitic language preserving, e.g., the plural noun *kitač* (< **kitāti*), ‘children’, related to Egyptian *ktt*, ‘little one.’” This is an example of what makes this book so remarkably informative. But see also Ugaritic *kdd* “child” in *KTU/CAT* 1.19 IV 12, 16 (= *UT* 1 Aqht 174, 178), as well as Aramaic *[k]i-da-di-e* “children” in the cuneiform incantation text.¹¹ Note that the vowels of the syllabically-written Aramaic form conform exactly to the Gafat form.

9.11. Scholars who study ancient West Semitic inscriptions, where *scriptio continua* is sometimes found, will be interested to learn that there are also “Ethiopian newspapers where words are run together.”

10.9. On the thorny question of how the emphatic consonants were pronounced in antiquity—glottalized as in contemporary Ethiopian and Modern South Arabian, or velarized or pharyngealized as in Arabic—Lipiński opts for the latter. He uses evidence from Ugaritic and Aramaic to support his position, e.g., the shift of *ṣ* > *ḡ* in Ugaritic in such words as *ṣm^ṣ* > *ḡm^ṣ* “be thirsty” or *nṣr* > *nḡr* “guard.”

10.10. On the same topic, we learn that Georgian-speaking Jews articulate the Hebrew emphatics as glottalized consonants, although the cause is due to particular phonological developments in their speech.

11.4. Lipiński notes correctly that “interchanges between *b* and *p* are frequent in Semitic languages,” but I highly doubt that “some of them go

¹⁰ See, e.g., A. Borg, “Maltese Phonology,” in *Phonologies of Asia and Africa*, ed. A. S. Kaye (Winona Lake, IN, 1997), 1:245.

¹¹ C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1967), pp. 417–418.

probably back to the time when *b/p* was one phoneme." On what grounds does Lipiński postulate this single phoneme? As far as I can tell, no-one posits a single phoneme for the two labials, certainly not in the Semitic stage nor in the earlier Afro-Asiatic stage.¹²

11.6; 63.8. In a discussion of the occasional alternation between *b* and *m*, Lipiński suggests that Common Semitic *bn* and Aramaic *bar* "might be related to Babylonian *māru*," all meaning "son."¹³ As the lack of a vowel in such forms as Arabic *ibn*, Hebrew *bənî* (the latter meaning "my son") indicates, we are dealing here with a rare phenomenon in Semitic, either that of a lexeme comprised only of consonants or, more likely, the presence of vocalic *n*.¹⁴ Accordingly, it is most doubtful that Akkadian *māru* "son," with a long vowel between the two consonants, is relevant here. Rather one should look to Arabic *muhr* "foal, colt" as a cognate to the Akkadian term.

11.15. Lipiński cites several examples of the passage of the interdental *t* to the labiodental *f* in Arabic. Note that this shift is more common in colloquial Arabic dialects. Lipiński further states that this shift may explain the Egyptian 3rd person masculine singular pronoun suffix *-f*, though he does not explain further and I do not see how this could be.

12.4. Lipiński refers briefly to "traceable alternations" of *t/k* and *d/r*. I referred to the former above, though here I wish to add the evidence of Hebrew פתח and פקח, both meaning "open" (the latter with specific references to the eyes), and Hebrew שתה "drink" (in the Qal) and קח "give drink" (in the Hiph'il), notwithstanding the fact that here we have an alternation between *t* and *q*, the emphatic form of *k*. On the issue of *d/r*, note also the sporadic use of Egyptian *r* to represent Semitic loanwords with *d*, a finding which points to the Egyptian */r/* as a "'tapped' (or 'flapped') *r*, as opposed to vibrating 'trilled' ('rolled') *r*."¹⁵

16.2. Lipiński writes: "Neither do the Amarna glosses and the Egyptian transcriptions indicate that an autonomous phoneme *š* existed in the Canaanite languages of the II millennium B.C.," and he presents some evidence to bolster this statement. But there are occasional transcriptions in the cunei-

¹² See, e.g., I. M. Diakonoff, *Afrasian Languages* (Moscow, 1988), p. 34.

¹³ Though Lipiński does not note the additional cognate, see also Modern South Arabian *ber* "son."

¹⁴ On vocalic consonants, see C. H. Gordon, "Vocalized Consonants: The Key to *um-ma / en-ma / 𐤎𐤍*," in *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, eds. M. E. Cohen, D. C. Snell, and D. B. Weisberg (Bethesda, MD, 1993), pp. 109–110.

¹⁵ J. E. Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period* (Princeton, 1994), p. 430. See also my review in *JAOS* 116 (1996) 508–511, esp. p. 510 on the *d/r* interchange.

form syllabary and in the hieroglyphic script that indicate the contrary. See, respectively, the standard works of A. F. Rainey and J. E. Hoch.¹⁶

16.5. In a discussion of the phonological realization of Hebrew *ś*, Lipiński notes that the lateral nature of this consonant “is confirmed by the incompatibility of contiguous *ś* and *l* in Hebrew roots . . . since Semitic languages avoid homorganic radicals in contiguous position.” Most likely he relies on the detailed studies of Kalevi Koskinen (cited in the Bibliography),¹⁷ but see the additional statistical analysis put forward by Richard Steiner (also in the Bibliography).¹⁸ None of this, however, denies the basic conclusion, presented in detail by Steiner, that indeed Hebrew (and proto-Semitic) *ś* is/was a lateral consonant.

17.8. Lipiński refers to the fact that “Oriental Jews use a strongly nasalized *‘ain* in Hebrew.” But the most nasalized realization of this consonant is to be found among Italian Jews. See also the outcome of the diminutive of *עקב* among Yiddish-speaking Jews as “Yankel.”

17.8; 23.9. The kind of detail that is furnished in this volume may be illustrated by Lipiński’s citation of both “*r* insertion” and “dissimilation through *r*” in the following examples from Hebrew. For the former he cites שרעפִים “anxieties” (Ps 94:19, 139:23) שרעפִים (cf. Arabic *šagāf* “passion, ardent zeal”); סרעפִה “branches” (Ezek 31:5) סרעפִה (cf. Arabic *sa‘af* “palm leaves”); and Mishnaic Hebrew (MH) חרטום “nose” (alongside חרטם) (cf. Arabic *ḥaṭm*). For the latter he cites יכרסמנה “(the pig) gnaws it” (Ps 80:14), derived from *yakassamennā^h* with dissimilation *ss* > *rs*; and מכרבל “wrapped” (1 Chr 15:27), from the root *kbl* “wrap” attested in MH, with dissimilation *bb* > *rb*. Note also Lipiński’s attention to MH, an oft-neglected subject in comparative Semitic studies.¹⁹

19.8; 45.8. Lipiński believes that Ugaritic *qrat* “she called” represents *qarāt*, and not *qara^ʔat* (and similarly with other forms of III^ʔ verbs). That is to say, the cuneiform signs *a/i/u* (= *ʔa/ʔi/ʔu*) “were employed also as vowels . . . when the etymological *ʔ* was not pronounced in postvocalic or intervocalic position.” He invokes the evidence of proper names written in the cuneiform syllabary to support this claim, but I cannot accept his conclusion

¹⁶ A. F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets* (Leiden, 1996), 1:19 (on the use of the rare sign *śi₂₀*); and Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts*, pp. 409–410.

¹⁷ K. Koskinen, “Kompatibilität in den dreikonsonantigen hebräischen Wurzeln,” *ZDMG* 114 (1964) 16–58.

¹⁸ R. C. Steiner, *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic* (New Haven, 1977), p. 6.

¹⁹ Lipiński errs slightly in implying that the actual form *makubbāl* “wrapped” is attested in MH. According to *Ma‘agarim: The Hebrew Language Historical Dictionary Project*, CD-ROM version of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (Jerusalem, 1998), the root occurs once as a Qal active participle, three times as a Qal passive participle, and three times as a noun meaning “garment,” but it does not occur in the Pu‘al or otherwise.

here. Nor would most Ugaritic specialists, as exemplified by Daniel Sivan in his recent grammar.²⁰

27.9. On the question of the development of the Hebrew segolate nouns, Lipiński accepts the standard explanation of vowel harmony, thus, e.g., **kalb* > **kaleb* > *keleb* “dog” (pausal *kāleb*).

27.11. Students of Hebrew know the familiar rule that the definite article takes the form *he-* before unaccented *hā-* and [◌]*ā-*, and before *hā-* regardless of accent, e.g., *heḥākām* for **haḥākām* “the wise man.” It is to Lipiński’s credit that he places this shift into the greater context of dissimilation of vowels, illustrated by the parallel example of Syriac *šlēmōn* “Solomon” for Hebrew *šālōmō*, Greek *Salōmōn*.

27.12. Lipiński’s range is exemplified when he adduces the following trio of cognates to illustrate metathesis: Phoenician *ḥlṣ*, Early Aramaic *ḥlṣ*, Tigre *laḥaṣa*, all meaning “to save.”

27.20. One of the best examples of Sandhi in Semitic, not noted by Lipiński, is to be found in the Masoretic pronunciation of ליהוה as *ladōnāy*, לאדני as *ladōnī*, etc.

27.26. The cross-reference to §27.29 should read §27.30.

28.13. Lipiński explains the MH forms אבא “father” and אמא “mother” as examples of “the enlargement of certain biconsonantal roots with *ā*,” comparable to Arabic [◌]*abā* “father,” [◌]*aḥā* “brother,” *yadā* “hand,” *damā* “blood,” attested in some ancient dialects (as opposed to standard Arabic [◌]*ab*, [◌]*aḥ*, *yad*, *dam*). That is, the MH forms “are unlikely to have been borrowed from the Aramaic emphatic state.”

28.16. In a discussion of the root morpheme, affixes, and infixes, Lipiński uses the addition of *-īm* to Hebrew *kalb-* to form *kalb-īm* “dogs” as his example. Naturally, he should have sought a different example, since **kal-bīm* is not attested in the language; the plural “dogs” is based on the stem **kilāb-* > *kālāb-*, thus *kālābīm*.

29.11. Hebraists continue to be baffled as to why the shift of *ā* > *ō* does not occur in the *nomen agentis* forms, e.g., *rakkāb* “horseman.” Lipiński notes the problem, but he too offers no solution: “The vowel *ā* should normally have changed into *ō* in Hebrew, but this did not happen for some unknown reason.”

29.16–17. These two sections on noun patterns are introduced as “Preformatives [◌]*-/-*,” but this should be corrected to “[◌]*-/-*.”

29.16. Lipiński notes [◌]*arnab* “hare,” in several Semitic languages, as an example of an animal name with preformative [◌]*-*. He then correctly compares *annabu*, but neglects to note the language of this form. It is Akkadian.

29.28–31. These sections are devoted to nouns with preformative *t-*. Lipiński does not note that in Hebrew such nouns occur more commonly

²⁰ D. Sivan, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 111, 114. I agree that [◌]*aleph* is elided occasionally in Ugaritic (*ibid.*, pp. 32–33), but not that this occurs in III² verbs.

with forms derived from weak roots. Thus, to cite some of his examples: תושב “resident,” תהלה “praise,” תימן “south.” I am not sure that this point has been noted in the scholarly literature.

29.35. In a discussion of the affirmative *-ān*, Lipiński writes, “In Hebrew and Phoenician *-ān* usually changes into *-ōn*, and it develops later to *-ūn* (e.g., ΕΛΙΟΥΝ ‘Most High’).” But this second shift is limited to Phoenician. It occurs in Hebrew in only one instance, in the tribal name *zəbûlûn* “Zebulun,” most likely due to the fact that this tribe dwelled near Phoenicia and presumably shared this isogloss with Phoenicia.²¹

29.49. Correct Modern Hebrew *kasít* “little glass” to *kosít*.

30.5. In a discussion of nouns which may be either masculine or feminine, Lipiński notes Sabaic *nhl* “palmgrove,” a point confirmed by the standard dictionary.²² I would explain this particular example by the unusual botanical phenomenon of palm trees having distinct gender, either male or female.

30.5. In the same discussion, Lipiński notes Hebrew כרם “vineyard” as an example of a noun which occurs in either gender. But then he states, “Animal names can be feminine when they designate a female; e.g. . . . *šōr*, ‘bull’, can designate a ‘cow’ in Hebrew.” But as far as I know, the only possible examples are Lev 22:28 and Num 18:17,²³ both referring to offspring. But in these two passages the word שׁר must refer to the cattle class, not to a specific cow.

30.6. Lipiński continues the discussion on the gender of nouns by noting the well-known rule, “Names of parts of the body, especially paired, are generally feminine.” He then continues, “However, instances occur, even in literary texts, where such nouns are treated as masculine,” with יד in Ex 17:12 and ימן in Prov 27:16 as examples. But neither of these passages demonstrates the point beyond doubt. In the former, כבדים may be a dual participle;²⁴ in the latter, it is not clear that ימן is the subject of this notoriously difficult passage.²⁵

30.10. Another example of Lipiński’s breadth may be seen by his connecting Gafat *anšälä* and Argobba *hansia*, both meaning “donkey,” with

²¹ See G. A. Rendsburg, “Hebrew Philological Notes (I),” *Hebrew Studies* 40 (1999) 28–29.

²² A. F. L. Beeston, M. A. Ghul, W. W. Müller, and J. Ryckmans, *Sabaic Dictionary—Dictionnaire Sabéen* (Louvain, 1982), p. 94.

²³ F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1906), p. 1004.

²⁴ U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem, 1967), p. 205. For general discussion of dual forms, see G. A. Rendsburg, “Dual Personal Pronouns and Dual Verbs in Hebrew,” *JQR* 73 (1982) 38–58. I discussed the question of dual participles on p. 56, but overlooked Ex 17:12 as a potential example.

²⁵ See, e.g., the NJPS rendering: “Or declare one’s right hand to be oil.”

Sumerian *anše* “donkey,” which “therefore seems to indicate that **hanše* was a West Asiatic culture word used around 3000 B.C.”

30.10–11. Lipiński accepts the view of A. van Selms that “the post-positive determinant *-b* qualifies the grammatical gender of wild and dangerous animals.”²⁶ I had not encountered the views concerning two other postpositive determinants presented by Lipiński: *-l/-r* used to qualify the “grammatical gender of domestic or tamed animals” (thus in Hebrew: חמור, בקר, חזיר, כר, רחל, עיר, שור, איל, גמל, עגל, גוזל, and *-n* used to qualify the “grammatical gender comprising names of parts of the body” (thus in Hebrew: שן, (קרן), אذن, בטן, ימין, לשון, עין, (פני)ים).

31.11. Lipiński judges the suffixed *-w* in the Gezer calendar (4x) as the remains of a plural nominative case ending (as opposed to a dual ending), thus ירחו אסף means “months of ingathering” (and not “two months of ingathering”). He compares Samalian *mlkw* “kings” versus *mlky* in the oblique case.

31.13. Lipiński states that שנה “year” “has the plural *šānīm* in the absolute state, but *šānōt* in the construct state.” Actually, the construct plural *šānē* is more frequently attested.

31.26. In a discussion of the internal plural pattern $\text{ʔ}f^cl$ with preformative $\text{ʔ}a-$, well known from Arabic and from South Semitic, Lipiński adduces as an additional example the form *aḥlāmu*, the “probable Old Babylonian designation of the Proto-Arameans and their congeners which must transcribe a native $\text{ʔ}aḡlām$, ‘boys, lads.’”

31.28. Lipiński accepts the view, still debated in some circles, that the plural of Hebrew segolate nouns is an internal or broken plural, with the external plural superimposed on it.

31.1–2. Lipiński believes that Semitic originally had but two cases, “the subject case or ‘ergative’ in *-u* and the non-subject case or ‘predicative’ in *-a*,” in accordance with the evidence from Cushitic and Libyco-Berber.

32.7 He continues the discussion with the following: “As for the ‘new’ genitive marker *-i*, it is likely to have the same origin as the gentilial [*sic*] suffix *-iy-* > *i*, which may derive from a postposition. In Highland East Cushitic, e.g., there is a postposition *-i* which includes the idea ‘out from’ or ‘away from.’” Though Lipiński adds, “Further research work is needed in this field; it should be made on a comparative Afro-Asiatic basis.”

32.17. The following is quite exemplary of Lipiński’s mind and method. He correlates the Akkadian adverbial ending *-iš* with the Palaeosyrian preposition *iš* (Mari), *éš* (Eblaite). “This double use of a particle as a preposition and postposition is not exceptional in Afro-Asiatic and it may be compared

²⁶ A. van Selms, “Some Reflections on the Formation of the Feminine in Semitic,” in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William F. Albright*, ed. H. Goedicke (Baltimore, 1971), pp. 422–423. For doubts regarding this hypothesis, see N. M. Waldman, *The Recent Study of Hebrew* (Cincinnati, 1989), p. 48.

with the parallel existence of the common Semitic conjunction *wa-*, 'and', and of the East Semitic and South Ethiopic enclitic *-ma*, 'and', which may have the same origin, since the alternation *w : m* is well attested."

29.55; 32.18. Lipiński considers שלשום "the day before yesterday" to be a blend of שלש "three" + יום "day." Most Hebraists, I believe, would consider this word to be an example of adverbial *-ōm* (< Proto-Semitic *-um*), as in פתאום "suddenly."

33.8; 33.18. The range of Lipiński's volume, even when he finds weakness in a particular opinion, may be illustrated by the following. The Mehri lexicon includes a number of nouns with prefixed *ha-*, e.g., *hayd* "hand," *hayb* "father." Lipiński records the suggestion that this suffix "may go back to **had*, 'one', serving as an indefinite article." This was the opinion of Brockelmann, which, as far as I can determine, appeared only in an article in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, not in the *Grundriss*.²⁷ Still, Lipiński takes the time and care to note it, if only to add, "This hypothesis is weakened by the fact that the Mehri numeral 'one' is *ṭāṭ*."

33.9. Lipiński states the well-known rule that the Hebrew definite article is elided after the prepositions *b-/k-/l-*, but also notes that "the article is sometimes preserved in Late Biblical Hebrew," e.g., 2 Chr 10:7 להעם "for the people." Note that this feature is attested eight times in Punic (though admittedly not in any standard Phoenician inscriptions),²⁸ and that a significant proportion of the BH examples occur in northern texts. I have concluded that the non-elision of the definite article before the uniconsonantal prepositions should be considered an element of Israelian Hebrew (IH),²⁹ with the concomitant suggestion that the appearance of this usage in exilic and post-exilic Hebrew compositions is due to the reunion of Israelian exiles and Judean exiles in Mesopotamia in the 6th century BCE.³⁰

33.10; 36.32; 49.1. Lipiński accepts the view that "the original articulation of the [Hebrew] article was *han-*," as attested by Lihyanic *hn-*, apparently rejecting the view that the gemination of the first consonant is due to junctural doubling.³¹ On the other hand, he does not accept the "hypothetically reconstructed form **wan-* of the Hebrew conjunction used in the *wayyiqtol*

²⁷ C. Brockelmann, "Mehri," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3:503. For further treatment of the problem, see W. Leslau, "Über das *ha-* Präfix im Arabischen," *WZKM* 44 (1937) 219–220; and W. Leslau, "A Prefix *h* in Egyptian, Modern South Arabian, and Hausa," *Africa* 32 (1962) 65–68.

²⁸ J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik* (Rome, 1970), p. 53.

²⁹ Redsburg, *Northern Origin of Selected Psalms*, p. 40.

³⁰ See further C. H. Gordon, "North Israelite Influence on Postexilic Hebrew," *IEJ* 5 (1955) 85–88.

³¹ See T. O. Lambdin, "The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article," in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William F. Albright*, pp. 315–333.

tense,” preferring instead to consider the doubling of the consonants *y/t/n* which follow *wa-* as a “secondary phenomenon” (see further below §38.11).³²

34.5. In his treatment of the elative, Lipiński presents the three well-known examples from Hebrew: אכזר “cruel,” אכזב “deceitful,” and איתן “lasting.” He then suggests something quite original (as far as I know not found in the standard dictionaries): “A remnant of a larger use of this pattern in Semitic languages may be preserved by Hebrew ^ʿ*almān* and Assyro-Babylonian *almānu*, ‘widower’, a noun probably derived from *lemnu*, ‘bad’, and meaning etymologically ‘worse.’”

35.3. Lipiński’s treatment of ^ʿ*ašt-* “one” leaves the reader with the impression that the form is productive in Hebrew. It is limited, of course, to fossilized usage in the forms for “eleven”: masculine עשתי עשר and feminine עשתי עשרה.

35.4. To be pedantic, Lipiński’s use of *tin-* > *tir-* as Aramaic “two” should have asterisks before the forms, since the attested Aramaic has *t* as the initial consonant.

35.4. In a discussion of the numeral “two” in Semitic, Lipiński notes that “the substantive *śn* means ‘brother’ in Egyptian (*śnt*, ‘sister’), as well as in Cushitic (e.g., Bedja *san*) and in Chadic (e.g., East Chadic *śin*, etc.).” Beyond Afro-Asiatic one should also note Hurrian *šena* “brother.”

35.4. Lipiński states, “In Maghrebine Arabic, the noun *zawġ*, ‘pair’ is used as numeral ‘two’, pronounced *žūz*, *zūz*, or *žuž*.” It should be noted that this word is not native Semitic. It is borrowed from Greek *zeugos* “pair.”³³

35.10. In the discussion of the numeral “five” in Semitic, it might be of interest to note that the Hebrew forms *hāmēš* and *hamiššā^h* run counter to the Semitic norm. Proto-Semitic *hamš-* is continued in Akkadian *hamšat*, Aramaic *hamšā*, Arabic *hams*, *hamsa*, Geez *hams*, etc. The vowel patterns of the Hebrew forms were altered due to attraction to the following forms for “six”: *šēš* and *šiššā^h*.

35.16. Another illustration of Lipiński’s attention to detail is in his presentation of the exceptional Hebrew form for “fifteen” occurring in Ezek 45:12 as עשרה וחמשה. We learn that what is exceptional in Hebrew is standard in other languages, e.g., Phoenician, Nabatean, Modern South Arabian, Geez, Tigre, and Gurage.³⁴ Lipiński’s transliteration, however, should be corrected from ^ʿ*āsrā wa-ḥāmiššā* to ^ʿ*āsārā wa-ḥāmiššā*.

³² In line with Lambdin, “The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article,” p. 324.

³³ Similarly, Mishnaic Hebrew borrowed this word from Greek in the form of ווג. See E. Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem, 1982), p. 138; and A. Saez-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 201.

³⁴ As a tentative explanation for the sole Hebrew example: Did Ezekiel mix with Phoenicians in Mesopotamia and adopt this numeral from their dialect?

35.18. In his discussion of the decade numerals, Lipiński notes the following words for “thirty”: Hebrew *šālōšim*, Aramaic *ṭālātīn*, Classical Arabic *ṭalātūna*, Damascene colloquial *ṭlātīn*. The last entry is of interest, because it exemplifies the shift of *ṭ* > *t* in Damascene Arabic (and generally in Syrian Arabic), a result of the Aramaic substratum. As far as I can tell, this specific issue is not treated in this volume (e.g., at §13.9, in the treatment of the interdentalals in the Phonology section), though Lipiński provides an excellent example of Aramaic substratum in Iraqi Arabic elsewhere (§40.25).

35.22. For “10,000,” Lipiński cites only Hebrew רבוב, רבוב, but the form רבבה is actually more common in the Bible. Lipiński ends his treatment of the cardinals with “10,000,” but notes that Eblaite now provides us with the numeral “100,000” in the form of *ma-i-at*.³⁵ C. H. Gordon pointed to a potential Hebrew parallel, namely, the Ketiv מאית in 2 Kgs 11:4, 11:9, 11:10, 11:15.³⁶ I have proposed that Ugaritic *miyt*, which appears in the Kret epic (UT 126:iii:4 = KTU/CAT 1.16), should be understood as “100,000” as well.³⁷

36.7; 36.22; 40.7–8; etc. Lipiński does not accept the existence of dual pronouns and dual verbs in Hebrew. Either he is unaware of my research into these forms,³⁸ or he opts for Joshua Blau’s alternative interpretation of the data.³⁹

36.28. Once more we may illustrate Lipiński’s vast erudition at work. Specialists in West Semitic are familiar with the reflexive pronoun *qnm* in Phoenician and Punic, *qnūm* in Syriac and Samaritan Aramaic, but have long sought an explanation for this form. First Lipiński notes Christian Palestinian Aramaic *qīqn-*, e.g., *qīqni* “I myself.” He then posits a reduplicated root **qənqən*, “the simple form of which is used in Gurage dialects with the sense of ‘single’, ‘alone’ (*quna* > *qura-*),” and which also appears in Amharic *qəl* “oneself” (e.g., *qəl-u* “himself”) “with the change *n* > *l*.”

36.46; 36.47. Lipiński posits a relationship between the two sets of determinative-relative pronouns in Semitic, those with voiceless interdental *ṭ*- and those with voiced interdental *ḍ*-. The former appears in North and East Semitic, though often with the shift of *ṭ*- > *š*-, e.g., Akkadian *ša*. (As such, there is no connection between this relative marker and the 3msg independent pronoun *šū* and the related demonstrative *šū*). The latter appears in West and South Semitic, e.g., Arabic *ḍū*, Hebrew *ʾū*, though Lipiński notes that the unvoiced form also appears in West Semitic, e.g., Hebrew *-ʾ*.

³⁵ D. O. Edzard, *Verwaltungstexte verschiedenen Inhalts (aus dem Archiv L.2769)*, Archivi reali di Ebla, Testi—II (Rome, 1981), p. 132.

³⁶ C. H. Gordon, “Eblaite and Northwest Semitic,” in *Eblaïtica* 2 (1990) 127, n. 1.

³⁷ “Eblaite and Some Northwest Semitic Lexical Links,” in *Eblaïtica* (Winona Lake, IN, forthcoming), vol. 4.

³⁸ See the article cited in n. 24.

³⁹ J. Blau, “Kelum Nishtamru ‘Iqvotaw shel ha-Zugi bi-Ṭum ha-Kinnuyyim we-ha-Po’al be-‘Ivrit ha-Miqra’,” *Leshonenu* 52 (1988) 165–168.

36.51. Lipiński refers to the archaic Hebrew theonym *zū-Sinay*, but this phrase is not attested. Rather, *ה' סיני* appears in Judg 5:5, Ps 68:9. Accordingly, one should adjust the statement that “the pronoun *zū* is attested as indeclinable relative in poetry” (with the implication that only this form occurs). The facts are as follows: the forms *ה'* and *ה'* both occur, the former as just cited, the latter, for example, in Ex 15:13, 15:16. In so far as they have lost any case significations, it is correct to refer to them as indeclinables.

37.1–8. Lipiński posits both aspect and tense for the Semitic verb, though he places much greater emphasis on the former: “Thus, the so-called present-future (*iparras*) of the grammars of Akkadian, e.g., really is an imperfective aspect, indicating basically that a process has not reached completion at a certain moment of time” (§37.8).

38.6. In addition, contra the opinion of most scholars, Lipiński posits the presence of a *yaqaṭṭul* in Ugaritic, corresponding to Akkadian *iparras*, alongside the widely recognized *yaqtul* (*iprus*) (= G-Stem or Qal) and *yuqaṭṭil* (*uparris*) (= D-Stem or Pi^cel). I do not follow his argumentation here, and it is not clear to me how the attestation of forms such as *yihd*, *yuhd*, and *yahd* relates to his issue. It seems better to explain these forms by lax use of the three ²*aleph* signs to represent vowelless ²*aleph* (expressed normally by *i*, but occasionally by *u* and *a*).

38.11. As alluded to above (re §§33.10; 36.32; 49.1), Lipiński does not consider the doubling of the consonants *y/t/n* which follow *wa-* in the *waw* consecutive form to be original. Thus he writes, “The old preterite preceded by *wa-*, ‘and’, kept on acting as a narrative past tense, at least sporadically, in Hebrew (e.g., *way-yo²mer*, ‘and he said’).” The problem with this approach is that it appears to purport a function to the *wa-* alone, since otherwise the prefix-conjugation would normally be future or modal.⁴⁰ I see no other solution than to assume an assimilated *-n-*, with its closest parallel being the Egyptian *n* marking past tense.⁴¹ Note that the only Semitic languages which utilize the *wayyiqtol* form (Hebrew and Moabite, and probably Phoenician—the evidence from Aramaic is equivocal) are those languages used in areas formerly under Egyptian control during the New Kingdom. I would suggest that we are dealing here with an adstratum feature. I am also somewhat puzzled by Lipiński’s remark “at least sporadically,” since the *wayyiqtol* form is standard in Biblical Hebrew.

38.22. In a nod to the modern Semitic languages, Lipiński discusses the preverb *b(i)-* to express the continuous present in several Arabic dialects of

⁴⁰ Notwithstanding an occasional preterite usage under certain circumstances, e.g., 1 Kgs 21:6, 2 Kgs 8:29, 9:15. Note that all three of these verses are in Israelian contexts. See further G. A. Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew in the Books of Kings* (forthcoming).

⁴¹ See Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, pp. 110–111; G. D. Young, “The Origin of the Waw Conversive,” *JNES* 12 (1953) 248–252; and J. F. X. Sheehan, “Egypto-Semitic Elucidation of the Waw Conversive,” *Biblica* 52 (1971) 39–44.

the Arabian peninsula and in Neo-Aramaic, and to express the general present in Syro-Palestinian and Cairene Arabic. He faults various explanations for this form, and then adds: "An explanation based on the preposition *bi-* cannot be discarded." Lipiński is clearly on the right track, and his approach is supported by the *bet* of predication attested in classical Semitic languages.⁴²

39.2. Lipiński states that the indicative suffix *-u* "seems to appear in Amorite, in the Amarna correspondence, and perhaps in Ugaritic, at least with some prefix-conjugations." Leaving aside the Amorite evidence, which is difficult to assess, I do not understand the qualifications "seems to appear" and "perhaps." In both Amarna and Ugaritic, indicative *-u* is amply attested.⁴³

39.15 There is something amiss in Lipiński's discussion of the apocopated prefix-conjugation forms in Hebrew. He states: "The variations in the spelling, e.g., of the verb *šwy*, 'to order',—*yšw* and *yšwh*, ²*šw*, and ²*šwh*, *šw* and *šwh*,—gave rise to different Masoretic vocalizations,—*yəšaw* and *yəšawwe*, ²*āšaw* and ²*āšawwe*, *šaw* and *šawwē*,—although the differences are purely graphic and dialectal." If I understand him correctly, he claims that the different forms (in those cases where a distinction may be seen, e.g., in IIIy verbs) do not divide along the lines of short form for jussive, long form for indicative; rather that the two forms are simply variants of each other and that the jussive-indicative distinction has been lost. But notwithstanding some exceptions and crossovers, Biblical Hebrew in general retains the distinction between the jussive force of the apocopated prefix-conjugation and the indicative force of the regular prefix-conjugation form.⁴⁴

40.2. The chart of actor affixes (Lipiński's term) for the suffix conjugation shows *-ū* for both 3mpl and 3fpl in Aramaic. But note that there is evidence for distinct forms in some Aramaic dialects. For example, the *qeri* of Dan 7:20 indicates that 3fpl ended in *-ā*; and Jewish Palestinian Aramaic presents 3mpl *-ān*, 3fpl *-ān*.⁴⁵ This evidence brings Aramaic into line with other Semitic languages and with Proto-Semitic, 3mpl *-ū*, 3fpl *-ā*.

40.17. The standard grammars of Ugaritic list *y-/t- . . . (-n)* as the 3mpl prefix conjugation,⁴⁶ and Lipiński repeats that information here. But Deborah Dobrusin has convincingly shown, notwithstanding an occasional possible

⁴² See C. H. Gordon, "In' of Predication or Equivalence," *JBL* 100 (1981) 612–613.

⁴³ Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*, 2:227–234 (for what Rainey terms the "indicative imperfect" *yaqtulu*); Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, pp. 71–72; and Sivan, *Grammar of Ugaritic*, pp. 98, 100–102 (following Rainey's terminology).

⁴⁴ For more detailed treatment, see B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN, 1990), pp. 566–570.

⁴⁵ C. Leviaš, *Diḡduḡ ha-Aramit ha-Gelilit*, ed. M. Sokoloff (New York, 1986), p. 86.

⁴⁶ Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, p. 154; and Sivan, *Grammar of Ugaritic*, pp. 111–112.

counterexample, that the form in Ugaritic was with *t*- only (instances with *y*- are dual forms⁴⁷).⁴⁸

40.17–18. As I stated at the outset, this is not the place to settle the issue of the classification of the Semitic languages. But an important isogloss is forthcoming from Lipiński's presentation of the actor affixes of the prefix conjugation. Note that Eblaite, Ugaritic, and Amarna attest to 3mpl in *t*-.

41.2. It is not clear why Lipiński presents the Hebrew paradigm of the Basic Stem with "Mishnaic Hebrew." The nine forms listed (*kātab*, *kātābā*, etc.) for the suffix conjugation (or perfect) are also the BH forms. He then correctly lists the seven forms (*yiktob*, *tiktob*, etc.) for the prefix conjugation (or imperfect), including the fact that *tiktābū* and *yiktābū* serve as the epicene 2pl and 3pl forms, respectively. But why not present the BH forms, with distinct 2pl and 3pl forms, the above two forms for the masculine, and *tiktobnā* as both 2fpl and 3fpl?

41.7. In a discussion of the causative stem, Lipiński relates the *š*- prefix to the suffixed *-s* or *-š* in Cushitic and Chadic, as well as in Bantu, used to express the causative, e.g., Highland East Cushitic *imm*- "give," *imm-is*- "cause to give." He then states, "The *š*-suffix is attested also in Semitic, but only as a morpheme deriving verbs from nouns," e.g., Hebrew פּוֹשׁ "blow" from פֶּה "mouth," חָלַשׁ "weaken" from חֵלִי "weakness," רָעַשׁ "shake" from רָע "evil," חָרַשׁ "cut in, engrave" from חֹר "hole." This is an extremely imaginative and creative suggestion. But there are problems with some of these, either semantically or etymologically. To note the most serious: חָרַשׁ represents two proto-Semitic roots, *hrš* "artisan, craftsman" and *hrʾ* "plow," and חֹר derives from *hr* (all of these appear in Ugaritic); thus, no matter which of the two roots is the source of חָרַשׁ "cut in, engrave," one still must reckon with חֹר "hole" having a different etymology altogether.⁴⁹

41.13. Most scholars have tacitly assumed that the Phoenician *y*-prefix of the causative stem and the third person masculine singular suffix pronoun *-y* are related, especially since Semitic languages generally correlate the two (with either *š* [as in Akkadian] or *h* [as in Hebrew]). But Lipiński argues for separate origins for these two forms in Phoenician. He suggests one of two origins for the causative *y*-prefix: (a) "the prepalatal *y*- can be an on-glide before the vocalic initial *i*- resulting from the dropping of the laryngeal *h* in the causative *h*-prefix, originally pronounced **hi*- like in Hebrew," or (b)

⁴⁷ Oddly, Lipiński presents only "?" for the Ugaritic 3rd person masculine dual.

⁴⁸ D. L. Dobrusin, "The Third Masculine Plural of the Prefixed Form of the Verb in Ugaritic," *JANES* 13 (1981) 5–14.

⁴⁹ In line with Lipiński's approach to the subject, one might have expected a nod to J. A. Soggin, "Tracce di antichi causativi in *š*- realizzati come radici autonome in ebraico biblico," *Annali, Istituto Universitario Orientali di Napoli* 15 (1965) 17–30. Soggin suggested that a number of Hebrew roots with initial *š* are secondary formations built from other verbal roots, e.g., שָׁגַל from שָׁכַל, שָׁכַן from כָּן, שָׁפַל from פָּל, etc.

viewing *y* as an old causal morpheme used also to form verbs by suffixing it to a monosyllabic nominal base," e.g., *tn-y* "to make another" from *tn* "two," *bn-y* "to make a son" from *bn* "son," etc., with further parallels in Cushitic. Of these two options, I admire the ingenuity of the latter, but find the former more likely. Lipiński continues, "As for the pronominal suffix -*y*, it can best be explained as derived from a masculine suffix *-*hi*, such as occurs in Aramaic. After a vowel the *h* was elided, giving raise [*sic*] to a diphthong," perhaps *-*ay* < *-*ahī*.

41.16. Lipiński states that the N-stem does not occur in Ugaritic. For a contrary view, see the standard grammars of Gordon and Sivan.⁵⁰

41.22. Lipiński lists an array of Semitic languages with the *t*-infix after the first radical of the G-stem, but he does not mention Hebrew in this connection. The verb הִשְׁתִּיחַ "urinate" derives from the root *šyn* (< *ty**n*), though it has been reanalyzed as a Hiph^{il} of *šm*. From the presence of הִתַּל "mock" in the D-stem (occurring only in 1 Kgs 18:27) and תַּלַּל "mock" in the H-stem, we can reconstruct an original G-stem of הִלַּל "be foolish" with *t*-infix. In both cases, the *t*-infix came to be understood as a radical; and in the latter, moreover, the *h* came to be understood as the marker of the H-stem. So while Hebrew does not have pure remnants of the Gt-stem, these examples demonstrate that proto-Hebrew or Early Biblical Hebrew possessed this form.

41.25. In his discussion of the Hitpa^{el} (or Dt-stem), Lipiński presents the standard situation when the first root letter is a sibilant, that is, the *t* preserves its original place following said sibilant. He then notes, "In post-classical Hebrew, however, the *t* can be prefixed to a sibilant, e.g., *htš*^š*w* (1QIs^a) instead of *hišta*^š*aš*^š*ū*, 'enjoy yourselves' (Is. 29,9)."⁵¹ The citation is correct, though the reader would be right to question whether this is not just a scribal error made while copying a biblical manuscript. Indeed, a *taw* is inserted above the line following the first ^š*ayin* as an attempted correction, even though it is wrongly placed since it belongs after the first *šin*.⁵² The general point is correct, but it would have been more appropriate to cite three such forms from 1QH, as this is more likely to represent real Qumran Hebrew.⁵³ Furthermore, note that one such form occurs in the Bible: Jer 49:3

⁵⁰ Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, pp. 81–82; and Sivan, *Grammar of Ugaritic*, pp. 131–132.

⁵¹ Incidentally, most scholars, as reflected in the standard Hebrew dictionaries, distinguish two meanings for the root עִשָּׂה, "besmear" and "enjoy." The usage in Isa 29:9 typically is related to the first of these, not to the latter, with a posited semantic extension from "besmear (one's eyes)" to "blind." Thus, for example, the NJPS renders עִשְׂתִּעְשְׂוּ as "act blind and be blinded."

⁵² E. Y. Kutscher, *Ha-Lashon we-ha-Reqa^š ha-Leshoni shel Megillat Yesha^šyahu ha-Shelema mi-Megillot Yam ha-Mela^š* (Jerusalem, 1959), p. 266.

⁵³ For the references, see E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta, 1986), p. 55.

התשוטטנה “run to and fro.” This form occurs in the prophet’s address to Ammon, and it is most likely an example of addressee-switching, utilizing an Ammonite grammatical form.⁵⁴ Of course, we have no such evidence from our meager corpus of Ammonite inscriptions, but I would speculate thus nonetheless. Support may be forthcoming from another Transjordanian dialect, Nabatean, in which such forms are attested.⁵⁵

41.29 Lipiński correctly presents השתחוה “prostrate oneself” as the Št-stem (= Arabic Stem X) of the root *ḥwy* “strike.” Too many scholars still state that it derives from a root *šḥw*, *šḥy*, *šḥh*, etc.

47.8. I do not quite understand the comment: “The Hebrew spelling *l*^ṣ of the negative goes back to an allophone *lō*^ṣ of *lō* < *lā*, which is attested in Tūrōyo and paralleled by *lā*^ṣ in Modern South Arabian.” Is Lipiński suggesting that the Hebrew negative particle was pronounced with either short /o/ or long /o:/? Why not just assume a single form /lo:/, which in time became a homophone of the word “to him,” that is, after the latter underwent the shift of *lahû* > *lau* (through elision of the *h*) > *law* (with shift of the second vowel *u* to the homorganic consonant *w*) > *lô* (through monophthongization). Once the two exceedingly common words for “no” and “to him” were pronounced the same, Hebrew scribes developed a graphic convention to represent the former with לו and the latter with לו (reserving לו for “to her.”).⁵⁶

48.12–23. With the exception of the primary prepositions (such as *b-* and *l-*), Lipiński posits a nominal origin for a wide series of prepositions. Thus, for example, מן “from” derives from the noun **mini* “measure” (cf. Akkadian *minītu*), related to the verb *mny* “count, measure”; עם “with” derives from the noun *ʿam(m)* “people”; בין “between” is a noun meaning “separation, interval,” derived from the verbal root *byn* “discern, distinguish” (cf. the Hebrew Hiphʿil (הבין); and עמדי “with me” (attested in the first person singular only) derives from the noun *ʿumd-* / *ʿimd-* / *ʿomed* “support.”

48.18. I devote a separate discussion here to Lipiński’s treatment of the preposition *ʿitt, derived “from a noun used in ancient Egyptian *ist*, ‘belongings’ . . . and probably related to Arabic *ʿatta* ‘to be abundant’; *ʿatāt*, ‘furnishings.’” This proto-form yields, among others, Eblaite *āš-tu*, *āš-tā*, *āš-ti* / *ʿatt-* / “from, since, with,” and Hebrew *ʿitt-* “resulting from the assimilation *ʿitt-* > *ʿitt-*.” Once more we marvel at Lipiński’s ability to detect such distant connections.

⁵⁴ On addressee-switching, see G. A. Rendsburg, “Linguistic Variation and the ‘Foreign’ Factor in the Hebrew Bible,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 15 (1996) 184–188.

⁵⁵ J. Cantineau, *Le Nabatéen* (Paris, 1930) 1:73.

⁵⁶ Though they did not carry out this distinction consistently, as indicated by the numerous *ketiv-geri* examples involving these two words. See R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere* (Philadelphia, 1937), pp. 150–156 (about a dozen such examples).

49.1. Lipiński considers enclitic *-ma* to be a “phonetic nasalized variant” of the common conjunction *wa-*. On the prefixing or suffixing of the same morpheme, see above §41.7. Lipiński uses this approach elsewhere as well, e.g., his correlation of the primary preposition *iš* and the postposition *-iš* (§48.10).

49.2. Lipiński associates the conjunction ^ʔ*ap*, attested in Eblaite, Ugaritic, Hebrew, Phoenician, and Aramaic, with the conjunction *pa-/fa-*, attested most notably in Samalian and Arabic, but elsewhere as well (e.g., Ugaritic).

49.4. Lipiński states that Hebrew או , meaning “or,” used especially in questions, e.g., Josh 5:13 (see also Phoenician-Punic ^ʔ*m* and Arabic ^ʔ*am*) “is likely to go back to a phonetic variant of ^ʔ*aw*,” though it developed “by blend” with the conditional particle ^ʔ*im* “if.”

49.23. Lipiński lumps the various particles of existence (and, with prefixed negatives, non-existence) in Semitic (Ugaritic *it*, Hebrew ψ , Aramaic אית , Arabic *laysa*, etc.) into one category (with the note that Arabic *laysa* [and the alternative form *lāta*] “seem to imply borrowing”). But as Joshua Blau has demonstrated, two proto-forms are to be distinguished: **yīš*, yielding Hebrew ψ , Arabic *laysa*; etc.; and *^ʔ*itay*, yielding Ugaritic *it*, Aramaic אית , etc.⁵⁷ Note that Hebrew also has $\psi\text{א}$, attested three times in the Bible, which aligns with the latter group.⁵⁸

50.1. Lipiński introduces the Syntax section by noting that his presentation is based on the evidence of those Semitic languages for which a full picture is available, mainly Arabic, Hebrew, and Akkadian. As for the other languages: “The wide use of logograms in Palaeosyrian, the shortness and the simplicity of the clauses forming Amorite personal names, the lack of vocalization in Ugaritic and in Epigraphic South Arabian inscriptions impose [on] us limits, and only a partial picture of Semitic syntax can therefore be gained.” But he is quick to add, correctly: “On the whole, however, the syntax of the languages just mentioned is very similar to the one of the ‘Classical’ languages.”

62.2. Lipiński’s range and approach are evident again in his claim that “the common Semitic verb *bakaya*, *bakā*, *bakū*, ‘to cry’, ‘to weep’, is formed from the sound of cries, just as the English verb ‘to beg’ or the Polish noun *bek-sa*, ‘weeper.’”

62.3. Correct “homonymous” to “synonymous” in the discussion of Arabic ^ʔ*atā* and $\text{ġā}^{\text{ʔ}}$ *a*, both meaning “he came.”

65.5. Scholars generally have assumed that Hebrew ור “rose” (and its Aramaic and Arabic cognates) is a borrowing from Persian. Lipiński presents a wealth of evidence to suggest otherwise, most importantly “Mycenaean

⁵⁷ J. Blau, “Marginalia Semitica II,” *IOS* 2 (1972) 58–62.

⁵⁸ See further G. A. Rendsburg, “מלת הקיום אֵשׁ,” *Mehqarim ba-Lashon* (forthcoming).

Greek *Fopðo-, a variant of *Fpoðo- that appears as βρόδov in the Aeolian dialect of the 7th century B.C.,” along with the attestation of the element *wd* in Nabatean, Palmyrene, and Safaitic anthroponyms.

65.10. My *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew*⁵⁹ is listed in Lipiński’s Bibliography (p. 604), but the discussion on diglossia is limited to Arabic, admittedly the paradigm example of the phenomenon, not only in Semitic but within all world languages.

67.19. Lipiński points to “Carmel” as an example of a toponym with an unknown etymology. I would point out the obvious: the word is comprised of כרם “vineyard” + ל-, the latter element a shortened form of אל “god,” used here as a superlative, thus “Carmel” = “choicest vineyard.” An analogy within Hebrew is ערפל “thickest cloud” > “darkness, fog.” It is hard to imagine that Lipiński does not know this basic understanding of the word; presumably he rejects it as a folk-etymology, either among the Israelites of old or Hebraists of today.

Finally, it should be noted how wonderfully-produced this book is. The quality of the paper, the plates (of various ancient texts and medieval manuscripts), the page layout, etc., are all first-rate. The number of typographical errors in such a complex work is exceptionally low (rare examples, both dealing with English translations, and not transliterations, are in §41.26 where “he went made” should read “he went mad,” and in §54.6 where “don’t doe!” should read “don’t do!”). I congratulate Uitgeverij Peeters for this achievement.

The volume concludes with an extremely useful 41-page General Index and a very complete 71-page Index of Words and Forms covering 39 different languages or language groups.⁶⁰ In addition, there is a helpful 18-page Glossary of Selected Linguistic Terms.

I am sure that I speak for many in congratulating Lipiński on this outstanding achievement. The book is a masterpiece that will serve scholars well for decades and generations to come.

⁵⁹ G. A. Rendsburg, *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew* (New Haven, 1990).

⁶⁰ However, while trying to locate one of the forms referred to above, namely, Ugaritic *qrar* “she called,” I noticed that it was missing from the Index.