

in the realm of vocabulary: not only is one of the two usages adduced by Di Pietro-Selim attested in Western dialects as well,² but lexical similarities with Western dialects are adduced by Di Pietro - Selim themselves (p. 23).

Much more important are *grammatical* phenomena characteristic of Western dialects, which occur in Sicilian documents: they are amply attested in Jewish documents of Sicilian provenance.³ One will not claim that Jews spoke a dialect different from the rest of the population:⁴

² V. M. Beaussier, *Dictionnaire pratique arabe-français . . .*, nouvelle édition . . . par M.M. ben Cheneb, Alger, 1931, s.v. *addâ*.

³ See most recently J. Wansbrough, *BSOAS*, 30 (1967), p. 306.

⁴ As it was perhaps the case in medieval Egypt, see J. Blau, *The Emergence and Linguistic Background of Judaeo-Arabic . . .*, Oxford 1965, p. 56 ff.

even in the Cambridge Chronicle, on which Di Pietro - Salim mainly rely, there is at least one conspicuous Western form (although the monotonous style of this text excludes the occurrence of various dialectal features): in *Bibliotheca Arabo-Sicula* the form *khalât* "she was devastated" occurs (p. 173, note 4),⁵ exhibiting the feminine 3rd person perfect singular ending of *verba tertiae infirmae* -ât, characteristic of Western dialects.⁶ Accordingly, pending new proofs, one will continue to account Sicilian Arabic to belong to the Western dialect group.

JOSHUA BLAU

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY,
JERUSALEM

⁵ This form occurs, of course, together with classical forms, since such texts are invariably written in a mixture of classical and vulgar style.

⁶ See for example Blau, *The Emergence . . .* p., 60.

On Problems of Polyphony and Archaism in Ugaritic Spelling¹

1. As is well known, Proto-Semitic phonemes are, in Ugaritic, sometimes represented by two, or more, letters. Thus Proto-Semitic *ḏ* is, as a rule, represented by Ugaritic *d*.² Sometimes, however,³ especially in texts 75 and 77,⁴ Proto-Semitic *ḏ* is represented by the 16th letter of the Ugaritic alphabet. But this letter occurs mostly in Hurrian words, presumably denoting a sound like *ʒ*.⁵

¹ A lecture delivered at the 27th Congress of Orientalists at Ann Arbor, August, 1967. I had the privilege of discussing these problems with my friends and colleagues, Prof. S. E. Loewenstamm and Prof. J. C. Greenfield, who also furnished me with important material.

² We dispense with the documentation of well-known phenomena, and as a rule refer to C. H. Gordon's *Textbook*.

³ V. *Textbook* §5.3.

⁴ The texts 75 and 77 use the 16th letter even in words in which the other texts employ *d*. Contrariwise, the other texts utilize the 16th letter in special words only. In these texts there are no sure cases of words spelled both with *d* and with the 16th letter.

⁵ The 16th letter also occurs in the Semitic word *k-16-d* "to strive for", alternating with *kšd* (v. M. Held, in *Studies and Essays in Honor of A. A. Neuman*, Leiden

2. The question, whether or not the representation of Proto-Semitic *ḏ* by *d* demonstrates the shift of *ḏ* to *d* in Ugaritic, is one of the most important problems of Ugaritic historical phonetics. Most shifts wherein Canaanite dialects differ from Ugaritic (as that of *á* > *ô*, absent in Ugaritic), may be explained (in spite of chronological difficulties, such as the occurrence of the shift *á* > *ô* in El-Amarna) by the assumption that Ugaritic exhibits

1962, p. 285, note 4), thus exhibiting a similar pronunciation (assimilation of *š* to *d*). Cf. also presumably *šd* "field," also *16-d* [yet one has to take into account the possibility that *16-d* represents Akkad. *šadū*]. Even more complicated is *16-d* "breast," since for this "nursery word" not only *ḏd* but also *zd* and Hebrew *dad* are attested. Cf. also D. N. Freedman, *BASOR* 175 (1964), 49 *a-16-ddy*, if = Hebrew *ašdōdi*. At any rate, *pace* F. M. Cross, *Harvard Theological Review* 55 (1962), 249, cases of sign 16 corresponding to *š* and not preceding *d* (as *16-rt* "vision," allegedly Hebrew *švr*), are completely uncertain. The same pronunciation is reflected by the Akkadian transliterations of the personal name *16-mrhd* by *ši-im-rad-du* and *zi-im-rad-du*, v. *Palais Royal d'Ugarit* IV, p. 250, s.v.

an ancient stage of Canaanite, which has not yet been affected by the changes typical of *late* Canaanite dialects. If, however, as we think, the shift $\delta > d$ turns out to be genuine Ugaritic, corresponding to Aramaic and contrasting with the Canaanite shift $\delta > z$, it will be impossible to class Ugaritic simply as a dialect emerging from an alleged Proto-Canaanite language. This despite its close lexical and grammatical affinities with the Canaanite languages. One will no longer claim that the Canaanite dialects constituted, *at first*, a quite homogeneous body of closely related dialects, which were differentiated only by later divergent development.⁶ On the contrary, one will then concur with J. Friedrich's opinion⁷ that the characteristics of the Canaanite dialects did not emerge in a Proto-Canaanite prehistoric period, but arose in historical times—presumably directly from Northwest Semitic, through parallel development and mutual contact in accordance with the so-called wave theory. Accordingly, the term Canaanite applies to the result of the linguistic development, but not to the development itself. Ugaritic, however, because of its early extinction, was not affected by this later development, and so exhibits features alien to the later Canaanite dialects, e.g. the preservation of long stressed *a* and the shift $\delta > d$.

3. The current view is that Ugaritic *d* is polyphonic:⁸ it designates not only *d*, but also δ , just as Old Aramaic *z* marks not only *z*, but also δ . Nevertheless, this comparison with Old Aramaic is, it seems, fallacious. Aramaic took over the Canaanite alphabet, and was therefore obliged to

designate its sounds with the inventory of the Canaanite alphabet. Ugaritic, however, added new letters at the *end* of its original alphabet. Accordingly, if δ had been preserved in common Ugaritic pronunciation, a corresponding letter would have been added at the end of the alphabet. Moreover, the sixteenth letter, which sometimes designates δ , stands in the middle of the alphabet. Now, if δ were originally represented by polyphonic *d*, the sixteenth letter would have primarily denoted a foreign sound, which occurred mainly in Hurrian words. The only other letter marking an original foreign sound, however, stands at the end of the Ugaritic alphabet, and it seems reasonable that the sixteenth letter, had it originally denoted a foreign sound, would have been placed there as well.

4. Similarly, it seems difficult to assume that the majority of texts exhibit a dialect different from that reflected in those texts which designate δ by the sixteenth letter, as if in the latter δ had survived, while in the former it had shifted to *d*.⁹ This assumption is contradicted by the fact that the sixteenth letter, denoting δ , occurs alongside of *d*, allegedly denoting δ .¹⁰ Accordingly, the only valid explanation seems to be that the sixteenth letter denoting δ is an archaic feature:¹¹ δ shifted to *d* only after the invention of the Ugaritic alphabet.¹² Before this shift, δ was denoted by the sixteenth letter, which, accordingly, stood in the middle of the alphabet. After δ had disappeared, it ceased to be used for this purpose and was employed to mark a similar foreign sound. Nevertheless, the spelling with the sixteenth letter to mark original δ survived as an archaic feature in

⁶ As does e.g. Z. S. Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*, (New Haven 1939), *passim*.

⁷ V. e.g. *Scientia* 84 (1949), 220–23, and his *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*, (Roma 1951), p. 1, and cf. also P. Fronzardi, *La fonetica Ugaritica*, Sussidi eruditi 7, (Roma 1955), pp. 76, 85; further, G. Garbini, e.g. in *Linguistica Semitica: Presente e futuro*, Studi Semitici 4, (Centro di Studi Semitici, Università di Roma, Roma 1961), pp. 55ff., cf. especially p. 61, where additional literature is quoted.

⁸ V. e.g. H. L. Ginsberg, *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 16 (1936), p. 139, as to the polyphony of δ and *d*, further *idem*, *BASOR*, Supplementary Studies, nos. 2–3, 1946, pp. 48–9. So also Gordon, *Manual* pp. 22/3.

⁹ This is *perhaps* C. Brockelmann's view, *Festschrift O. Eissfeldt*, (Halle an der Saale 1947), p. 61.

¹⁰ Even texts 75 and 77 exhibit $d < \delta$: 75 I 3 *darš* (?); 77, 38 *dašr* (v. e.g. *Syria* 23 [1942/3], 283), as against 77, 45 16-*pid*. Gordon, *Textbook*, §5.3, did not succeed in establishing a sound shift responsible for the respective use of *d* and the 16th letter representing proto-Semitic δ .

¹¹ So tentatively already E. Ullendorff, *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 350ff.

¹² Cf. also F. M. Cross, *Harvard Theological Review* 55 (1962), 249, further P. Fronzardi, *op. cit.*, e.g. p. 29, who wonders whether the 16th letter representing δ is a dialectical feature or an archaism.

certain words,¹³ whereas the archaic texts 75 and 77 continued to designate *ḏ* by it in almost every word.¹⁴ In the other texts, however, Proto-Semitic *ḏ* is marked by Ugaritic *d*, thus exhibiting the shift *ḏ* > *d* contrary to the Canaanite dialects, in accordance with Friedrich's theory about the emergence of Canaanite.

5. The archaic character of text 75¹⁵ is also exhibited by its marking of Proto-Semitic *d* by *z*.¹⁶ Again, it seems unlikely that *d*, to which, as a rule, Ugaritic *ṣ* corresponds, persisted in Ugaritic, as if Ugaritic *ṣ* had been polyphonic, marking both *ṣ* and *d*. One would rather assume that *d*, not represented in the Ugaritic alphabet, had already disappeared before its invention. A trace of it, presumably through some sort of tradition,¹⁷ was preserved only in the archaic text 75, where it was represented by the (in all likelihood) phonetically related *z*.

6. Nevertheless, one is inclined to assume that, in process of time, *z* too disappeared in Ugaritic. This happened, however, comparatively late, as may be inferred from the fact that, as a rule, *z* is marked by a special letter. As to the disappearance of *z*, the Ugaritic texts reflect two different dialect groups.¹⁸ In one of them, *z* shifted to *ḡ*: this is reflected by the spelling of *z* with *ḡ* in some words of some texts.¹⁹ The phonetic process was, *mutatis mutandis*, like that by which Proto-Semitic *d* was affected in Old Aramaic, where it is spelled with

q, presumably exhibiting *ḡ*, which afterwards shifted to 'ayn.²⁰ In the other dialect group *z* shifted to *ṭ*. This is exhibited by the single passage RS 24.244, line 67–8 *mḡy. ḥrn. lbth. yštql. lhṭrh* (and not *ḥzrh* "his court," as attested parallel to *hkl* and *bt*) "Hrn reaches his house, he turns to his court." This shift is also corroborated by text 77, which twice uses *z* instead of the original *ṭ*!²¹ The only possible explanation of this strange phenomenon seems to be that it reflects hyper-correction, thus exhibiting the intentional archaic character of text 77 (and the orthographically related text 75): *z* had already shifted to *ṭ*. But text 77, in accordance with its archaic spelling, strove to mark it with a special letter. Nevertheless, its scribe overshot the mark and used the special letter of *z* to denote original *ṭ* as well: since he was used to spelling *z* and pronouncing *ṭ*, he applied *z* even to cases in which even archaic orthography demanded *ṭ*.²²

7. The purpose of this paper is to show that the assumption of archaism explains various strange features in Ugaritic orthography²³ which would otherwise remain unexplained. I propose that,

²⁰ So A. Jirku, *ZDMG* 113 (1963), 481–2.

²¹ *Zhrm* "(pure) gems" (21), *lṭpn* "Lṭpn" (44), v. *Textbook* §5.11. Cf. J. Cantineau, *Syria* 21 (1940), p. 46.

²² Because of RS 24.244, 67–8 and since 77 already exhibits the shift *z* > *ṭ* and it stands to reason that 75 and 77 belong to the same dialect group, one will not derive *mḡy*, occurring also 75 I 36, from *mzy* (contrary to C. Brockelmann *op cit.*, 62–3). For the difficulties of its etymology cf. e.g. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 40 (1886), 736, note 5; Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*², s.vv. *mṣy*, *mṭy*; Koehler-Baumgartner, *Aramaic part*, s.v. *mṭy*.—One may similarly analyze the restricted alphabet, as used e.g. by text 74, exhibiting one sign for *ṣ* and *ḥ* and employing *b* for *ḥ*. Accordingly, one may claim that *ḥ* and *b* disappeared in Ugaritic and their retention in ordinary orthography is due to archaic spelling. On the other hand, this alphabet may well reflect a different dialect.

²³ Cf., *mutatis mutandis*, the spelling of Egyptian Aramaic, v. P. Leander, *Laut- und Formenlehre des Aegyptisch-Aramäischen*, (Göteborg 1928), pp. 8–10, as to the representation of Proto-Semitic *ḏ* and *d* by *z/d* and *q/'* respectively. For hyper-correction in this dialect see E. Kutscher *JAOS* 74 (1954), 235. For the whole scope of hyper-corrections and their occurrence in Semitic languages, cf. my forthcoming extensive paper "Pseudo-corrections in Semitic Languages."

¹³ Such archaic spellings may subsist in certain words. Thus, e.g., in literary Arabic *d* is not marked by *alif* in some words, in accordance with archaic orthography.

¹⁴ For exceptions v. note 10.

¹⁵ In text 77 no letter corresponding to Proto-Semitic *d* occurs. Because of the archaic character of this text, one will not agree with C. Brockelmann's view, *Festschrift Eissfeldt*, pp. 61–3, that the use of *z* for *d* exhibits a different dialect.

¹⁶ As *yḡḡq* (I, 12) and *ḡi* (I, 14), v. *Textbook*, §5.7. *Z* may, of course, denote *z* as well (77, 2 *qz*). In one doubtful case (I, 3 *dars*) Proto-Semitic *d* may be represented by *ṣ*.

¹⁷ It was perhaps due to a similar sort of tradition that the Septuagint to some extent distinguished between *ḥ* and *b*, as well as between ' and *ḡ*.

¹⁸ Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, 61/3, who assumes, however, three dialects—cf. note 15.

¹⁹ In spite of O. Rössler, *ZA* 54 (1961), 158ff.

approximately at the time of the invention of the Ugaritic alphabet, several sound shifts affected Ugaritic: at first, preceding the invention of the alphabet, *d* shifted to *ṣ*, and, accordingly, was not represented in the alphabet (with the exception of archaic 75, where it is indirectly marked by *z*). Immediately after its invention *ṣ* coalesced with *d* and was only in some special words, and in 75/77, marked by its special sign, which had become, as a rule, the sign of a similar foreign sound. Even later was the disappearance of *z*, being, as a rule, represented by a special sign. Some texts, however, exhibit its shift to *ḡ*, one,

its coalescence with *t*. This latter feature is also reflected by text 77, which applies *z* for original *t*, thus clearly attesting its intentional archaic character. At any rate, the shifts *ṣ* to *d*, *z* to *ḡ/t* clearly differ from those attested in the Canaanite dialects (*ṣ* to *z*, *z* to *ṣ*) and corroborate Friedrich's theory that the Canaanite dialects did not constitute a homogeneous body from their very beginnings, but developed in historical times through parallel development and mutual contact.

JOSHUA BLAU

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY,
JERUSALEM

An Aspect of Hittite Use of the Hurrian Suffix -ta

The Hurrian directive ending *-ta* apparently occurs in the nominative-accusative plural of a number of Hittite neuter nouns. Johannes Friedrich has called attention to these forms, remarking that the suffix is used as if it were the case-ending.¹ Recently I cited evidence which seemed to confirm this suggestion.² The facts presented then concerning the suffix may be briefly summarized as follows. With the exception of a single uncertain case among the *u*- stems, *-ta* is confined in Hittite to stems in *-i*.³ The neuter plural of Hittite *i*- stems contained an inherited opposition between nouns in *-i*, identical to the neuter singular ending, and adjectives in *-a* < **-aya*. The contrast has been somewhat obscured through analogy due probably in part to the ambiguity of *-i*, but remains fairly well defined in the texts. It stems from the familiar insertion of *-a* before the stem of *i*- and *u*- stem adjectives and the loss of [y] between like vowels. *-iya*, corresponding to *-uwa* among *u*- stem nouns, is confined among *i*- stems to the dative singular, where the usual Hittite ending *-i* also produced

ambiguity.⁴ The restriction of *-ta* to nouns probably owed its origin to little more than the fact that nouns are in general much more often borrowed than adjectives. Whatever its cause, however, it provided a means of resolving the ambiguity produced by the inherited substantive ending without obliterating the distinction between noun and adjective usually maintained among the other cases. The potential usefulness of the Hurrian suffix appears to have been partially realized, for among a total of fourteen or seventeen *i*- stem neuter nouns for which a nominative-accusative plural is attested, *-ta* occurs with five or seven,⁵ while seven or eight take *-i* and four the inherited

⁴ A single possible exception to this statement, *ḫalwatiya*, of uncertain form and meaning, occurs preceded by *Glossenkeile*.

⁵ These figures, as well as those stated elsewhere, are based on the forms included in Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1952-66). The reason for the present variation is uncertainty as to whether *-ta* occurred in the plural of *kunzi(tta)*- 'holy symbol (?)' and *šuri(ta)*- '?' and whether *GIŠkurtali*^{HLA} is taken as plural of *kurtal* or *kurtali*, both attested in the meaning of 'a receptacle'. Although the conclusions indicated remain the same in every instance, the figures given here are not always precisely the same as in the previous article because of addition of material from Friedrich's third supplement of 1966, not previously available.

¹ Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*² (Heidelberg, 1960) I, 60.

² Brosman, *JAOS* 84 (1964) 344-8.

³ The article mentioned above (fn. 2) dealt only with *i*- and *u*- stems. It is possible, however, to add that neuter plural *-ta* does not occur outside these classes.