

MODERN SOUTH ARABIAN AS A SOURCE FOR UGARITIC ETYMOLOGIES*

GARY A. RENDSBURG

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

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^cr*, *šhrr*, *šrr*, *hbn*, *brlt*, *gly*, *nṯt*, *irn*, *hpn*, *hḷqm*.

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

* Ugaritic texts are cited according to the numeration of Gordon, *UT*. The following abbreviations should be noted: Gordon, *UT* = C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1967)

Aistleitner, *WUS* = J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (BSAW 106/3; Berlin, 1963)

ANET = J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, 1969)

Johnstone, *Harsusi* = T. M. Johnstone, *Ḥarsūsi Lexicon* (London, 1977)

Johnstone, *Jibbali* = T. M. Johnstone, *Jibbāli Lexicon* (London, 1981)

Leslau, *Soqotri* = W. Leslau, *Lexique Soqotri* (Paris, 1938)

Jahn, *Mehri* = A. Jahn, *Die Mehri-Sprache in Südarabien, Texte und Wörterbuch* (Vienna, 1902)

Bittner, *Shauri* = M. Bittner, *Studien zur Ṣhauri-Sprache in den Bergen von Dofar am persischen Meerbusen* (KAWW 183/5; Vienna, 1917)

Thomas, *Four* = B. Thomas, "Four Strange Tongues from South Arabia—The Hadara Group," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 23 (1938), pp. 231–331.

¹ Based on these criteria, only Akkadian and Eblaite, on the one hand, and modern Ethiopian languages, on the other, are further apart from one another. One could argue, of course, that any two modern languages on different branches are more distantly related than an ancient and a

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 effect the general point being made here.

² As an analogy note the very comparable verbal systems of Berber and Akkadian. See O. Rössler, "Verbalbau und Verbalflexion in den Semito-hamitischen Sprachen," *ZDMG* 100 (1950), 461–514. This classic essay has been slightly updated and translated into English by Y. Arbeitman: O. Rössler, "The Structure and Inflection of the Verb in the Semito-Hamitic Languages," in Y. L. Arbeitman and A. R. Bomhard, eds., *Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns* (Amsterdam 1981), pp. 679–748.

³ 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.

⁴ J. Blau, "Hebrew and North West Semitic: Reflection on the Classification of the Semitic Languages," *HAR* 2 (1978), 22.

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.⁵ 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*.⁶ Additional material may often be garnered through the intermediate step of Hebrew by consulting Leslau's two books devoted to this language.⁷ Ullendorff's work, as is well known to Ugaritologists, has also stressed the importance of South Arabian and Ethiopian.⁸

⁵ See the astute remarks of J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba^clu* (AOAT 16; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971), pp. 44–46.

⁶ W. Leslau, "Observations on Semitic Cognates in Ugaritic," *Orientalia* 37 (1968), 347–66. Of the several hundred words discussed by Leslau, only for nos. 526, 607, 655, 869a, 1215, 1575, 1721, and 1985 does he offer cognates where Gordon omits them altogether. Of these only no. 1985 *gr* III "groan" has solely MSA cognates compared.

⁷ W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (Berkeley, 1958); and W. Leslau, *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic* (Wiesbaden, 1969).

⁸ E. Ullendorff, "Ugaritic Marginalia," *Orientalia* 20 (1951), 270–74; and E. Ullendorff, "Ugaritic Marginalia II," *JSS* 7 (1962), 339–51. See also E. Ullendorff, "The Semitic Languages of Ethiopia and their Contribution to General Semitic

Whereas Leslau and Ullendorff have utilized the entire gamut of South-east Semitic,⁹ in the present study I limit myself to the MSA languages. They are specifically 1) Mehri, 2) Jibbali (formerly called Šhauri or Šheri), and 3) Soqotri, as well as 4) Ḥarsūsi and 5) Baṭahari, the latter two being very closely related dialects of Mehri.¹⁰ MSA words are cited according to their entries in the following dictionaries: Johnstone, *Harsusi*, for Mehri and Harsusi; Johnstone, *Jibbali*, for Jibbali; and Leslau, *Soqotri*, for Soqotri.¹¹

b^cr (Š-stem)¹²

This verb occurs in 51:IV:16–17:

qdš.yuḥdm.šb^cr
amrr.kkbbk.lpnm
atr

Studies," *Africa* 25 (1955), 154–60; and E. Ullendorff, "The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography," *VT* 6 (1956), 190–98. All of these articles are now collected in E. Ullendorff, *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?* (Wiesbaden, 1977).

⁹ For this term see W. Leslau, "South-East Semitic (Ethiopic and South-Arabic)," *JAOS* 62 (1943), 4–14.

¹⁰ For simplicity's sake, henceforth I shall refer to these languages in simplified spelling, i.e., without diacritical marks.

¹¹ Although Johnstone, *Harsusi*, 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 *Harsusi* 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. Baṭahari 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, Baṭahari 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 *b^cr*,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:

Mehri	<i>bār</i>	} “go at night, late evening”
Harsusi	<i>bār</i>	
Jibbali	<i>ba^cār</i>	
Mehri	<i>hebáwr</i>	} “take out (flocks) at night”
Harsusi	<i>abōr</i>	
Jibbali	<i>eb^cēr</i>	
Soqotri	<i>bó^cor</i>	
		“voyager la nuit”

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

šhr

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 *šahrā³* “shadeless desert,”¹⁸ Hebrew *šhr* “yellowish-red”¹⁹; and a pair of denominative verbs has been

exception to this rule is that I have changed Johnstone’s *k* to *q* and his *x* to *b*. For verbs, generally only the 3rd masculine singular perfect is cited. In one instance I have cited the 3rd masculine singular perfect, imperfect, and subjunctive forms, separated by slashes, because the latter forms help identify the root more readily. For nouns, generally only the singular form is cited, though on one occasion I have included a plural form to indicate the root more readily.

¹³ C. H. Gordon, “Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit,” *Berytus* 25 (1977), 93.

¹⁴ H. L. Ginsberg, in *ANET*, p. 133.

¹⁵ See Gordon, *UT*, p. 495, no. 19.375; and Aistleitner, *WUS*, p. 56, no. 559.

¹⁶ T. M. Johnstone, “The Modern South Arabian Languages,” *AAL* 1:5 (1975), 9.

¹⁷ Gordon, *UT*, p. 473, no. 19.2160.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Leslau, “Observations,” p. 362.

suggested, Arabic *išhārra* (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:

Mehri	<i>šehār,</i>	} “brand”
	<i>zahār</i>	
Harsusi	<i>šehār</i>	
Jibbali	<i>šahār</i>	
Soqotri	<i>šohor</i>	“cauteriser”

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 *mrš* in 126:V:50 and *zbln* 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:

Mehri	<i>šer</i>	} “ill health”
Harsusi	<i>šer</i>	
Mehri	<i>ešterōr</i>	} “choke”
Harsusi	<i>ešterōr</i>	
Jibbali	<i>ešér,</i>	
	<i>aštérér</i>	

The root *šrr* also occurs in Arabic with the meaning “bad, evil” and is also to be related. Johnstone notes than in Omani Arabic *šarr* 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.

²⁰ De Moor, *Seasonal Pattern*, p. 114. See also Aistleitner, *WUS*, p. 266, no. 2316; and S. Segert, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Berkeley, 1984), p. 198.

²¹ J. Gray, *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra* (Leiden, 1964), p. 75, states: “*šrr* remains somewhat difficult.”

²² Aistleitner, *WUS*, p. 317, no. 2692.

hbn

This word occurs in 2102:6 in a list of commodities which includes *tišr* 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 *hobnīm* 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	<i>hebbān</i>	“sack (of palm-leaf fibres), bag”
Jibbali	<i>həbbān</i>	“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 *hibbān* “leather bag for rations” as cognate too. This might suggest an ultimate relationship with Arabic ^ʿ*hb* “leather” = Hebrew ^ʿ*ahābāh* in Song of Songs 3:10.²⁵

brlt

Of all the words in the Ugaritic lexicon, few have elicited more discussion than *brlt*. This vocable appears consistently as the parallel member of *npš*, 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 *brlt* 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:

Mehri	^ʿ <i>āberēt</i>	} “desire to weep”
Harsusi	^ʿ <i>āberét</i>	
Jibbali	^ʿ <i>abrét</i>	“lump in the throat, desire to weep”

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

The quadriliteral *brlt* 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 *dhq*.²⁷ The augmented *l* is usually in second position,²⁸ but in the case of *brlt* the liquid *r* may have caused the *l* to follow *r*. By analogy, note the location of the *l* in Aramaic ^ʿ*armēlā* “widow” vs. Hebrew ^ʿ*almānāh*.

The MSA terms point to a preformative ^ʿ which is retained in Jibbali. As noted above, this phoneme does not occur in Mehri and Harsusi, so the shift to initial ^ʿ is easily explained. Preformative ^ʿ 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: ^ʿ*ābdeher* “tachtetée” (cp. Hebrew *bārôd*), ^ʿ*ēbhalēten* “pierres pointues” (cp. Hebrew ^ʿ*eben*), ^ʿ*émor* “dire” (cp. Hebrew ^ʿ*mr*), and perhaps ^ʿ*āblet* “une fois” (cp. Arabic *balāṭa*, 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 ^ʿ in Jibbali as well, e.g., the word under discussion ^ʿ*abrét* and also ^ʿ*oñr* “say.” Further afield we call attention to affirmative ^ʿ in Hebrew, so ably demonstrated by Stanley Gevirtz.²⁹

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

Phonology is not our only obstacle in correlating the aforementioned MSA words and Ugaritic *brlt*. 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*

²³ Gordon, *UT*, p. 389. no. 19.743.

²⁴ M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology* (Rome, 1965), p. 56.

²⁵ See G. R. Driver, “Supposed Arabisms in the Old Testament,” *JBL* 55 (1936), 111; and more recently D. Grossberg, “Canticles 3:10 in the Light of a Homeric Analogue and Biblical Poetics,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 11 (1981), 74–76.

²⁶ M. H. Pope, “An Arabic Cognate for Ugaritic *brlt*?” *UF* 13 (1981), 305–6.

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.

²⁹ S. Gevirtz, “Formative ^ʿ in Biblical Hebrew,” *Eretz-Israel* 16 (1982), 57*–66*.

are cognate, although the former refers to the entire animal kingdom and the latter is a specific species of animal. Similarly, German *Hund* 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.”³⁰

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.”³¹

gly

From the contexts in such passages as 137:23, 24, 29 and I Aqht 31, 160, it is clear that this word means “lower, sink, drop, droop.”³² The only possible cognate heretofore posited is Arabic *galā(w)* “das Mass überschreiten,”³³ with the resulting interpretation of our Ugaritic word as “übermässig beugen.”³⁴ This appears to stretch the meaning of *gly* considerably. A more likely cognate for Ugaritic *gly* is found in Johnstone, *Harsusi* 44:

Harsusi *aḡlō* “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 *ḡlt* “inactivity, mischief, error” (?) in 127:32, 44–45 is usually related to the verb *gly*. In light of the foregoing, however, I am inclined to dissociate the two. The form *ḡlt* presumably is related

to Arabic *ḡlw* “exceed, overdo, exaggerate,” or perhaps even *ḡill* “hatred, malice.”³⁵

ntt

All agree that this verb means “wobble, tremble, shake.”³⁶ The cognate most often cited is Hebrew *nwt*, a hapax legomenon in Psalms 99:1.³⁷ Gordon adduced an additional cognate, Arabic *ntt* “jump,” with the following comment: “less close to the Ug. in meaning, though closer in form.”³⁸

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, *Mehri* 218:

Mehri	<i>neṭ/yeṭāwt/yeṭāṭ</i>	} “shake, shiver”
Harsusi	<i>neṭ/yeṭāwt/yeṭāṭ</i>	
Jibbali	<i>niṭṭ</i>	“shiver, tremble”
Soqotri	<i>neṭṭ</i>	“trembler”

Jahn, *Mehri* 218, notes that in Egyptian Arabic *naṭṭ* means “shake” as well.

irn

This word appears in RS24.247 where it apparently refers to some kind of animal.³⁹ W. G. E. Watson translated it as “cur” and identified it with Akkadian *mīrānu*, *mūrānu* “young dog, puppy, cub.”⁴⁰ 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:

Mehri	<i>hā-rāwn</i>	} “goat”
Harsusi	<i>ḥe-werūn</i>	
Jibbali	<i>irūn</i> , <i>ʿerūn</i>	“goats” (collective)
Soqotri	<i>ʿerehon</i>	“moutons, chevres” (only plural)

³⁰ Gordon, *UT*, p. 496, no. 19.1681; and Aistleitner, *WUS*, p. 211, no. 1826.

³¹ Pope, “Arabic Cognate,” p. 306.

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.

³⁷ Gordon, *UT*, p. 443; no. 19.1641; Aistleitner, *WUS*, p. 205, no. 1777. For the Hebrew term see F. E. Greenspahn, *Hapax Legomena in Biblical Hebrew* (Chico, CA, 1984), p. 135.

³⁸ Gordon, *UT*, p. 443, no. 19.1641.

³⁹ Gordon, *UT*, p. 366, no. 19.366a.

⁴⁰ W. G. E. Watson, “Philological Notes,” *NUS* 21 (1980), 8.

The Mehri and Harsusi forms cited include the definite article *hā*, *he*.⁴¹ Note the initial vowel in the MSA forms is *e/i* (except in Mehri where it drops through aphaeresis) which accords with the Ugaritic spelling with *i*.

hpn

From its common use as a parallel member to *lbš*, the meaning of *hpn* is well established. Gordon translates “garment”⁴² and Aistleitner renders “Kleidungsstück.”⁴³ But neither of these dictionaries suggests a cognate. A suitable one may be found in Leslau, *Soqotri* 184:

Soqotri *haf* “vêtement”

Leslau cites Arabic *haffa* “entourer de quelque chose” and Hebrew *hff* “couvrir” as etyma for his Soqotri entry. Since *h* and *ḥ* have merged in Soqotri, the only MSA language where this occurs (see Leslau, *Soqotri* 14, 20–21), cognates for *haf* may be sought with either *ḥ-* or *h-*. In light of Ugaritic *hpn*, which is the semantic equivalent of Soqotri *haf*, 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 *ušn* “gift” (medial weak), *gan* “pride” (final weak), and *ḥln* “window” (geminate).⁴⁴

⁴¹ On the MSA definite article see further T. M. Johnstone, “A Definite Article in the Modern South Arabian Languages,” *BSOAS* 33 (1970), 295–307.

⁴² Gordon, *UT*, p. 403, no. 19.990.

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

⁴⁴ For Hebrew examples see P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome, 1923), p. 209, par. 88Mb.

hlqm

This noun occurs parallel to *brkm* “knees” in ^cnt:II:14, 28. Interpretations vary from considering *hlqm* to be an item worn on the lower part of the body to identifying the word with a specific part of the body.⁴⁵ Among the latter “throat” has been the most popular suggestion, based on Arabic *ḥalq*,⁴⁶ but the suffixed *-m* then requires explanation. Ş. Rin’s suggestion that *hlqm* is a dual noun with the singular meaning of “throat”⁴⁷ requires special pleading. Gordon’s proposal to interpret the *-m* as adverbial⁴⁸ has been countered by J. C. de Moor: “the D-stem *igll* makes it impossible to take the *-m* as an adverbial ending.”⁴⁹ These difficulties disappear, however, in view of the following MSA cognates noted by Johnstone, *Harsusi* 59; Johnstone *Jibbali* 110; and Bittner, *Shauri* 37:

Mehri	<i>helqemōt</i> , pl. <i>helqām</i>	} “Adam’s apple, side of the throat”
Harsusi	<i>helqemōt</i> , pl. <i>helqām</i>	
Jibbali	<i>ḥalqūt</i> , pl. <i>ḥalóqum</i>	“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.⁵⁰ Note that the *m* appears in the broken plural form.

To sum up, Ugaritic *hlqm* 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.

⁴⁷ Ş. and S. Rin, *Alilot ha-Elim* (Jerusalem, 1968), p. 83.

⁴⁸ Gordon, *UT*, p. 397, no. 19.867.

⁴⁹ De Moor, *Seasonal Pattern*, p. 92.

⁵⁰ Johnstone, “The Modern South Arabian Languages,” p. 9.