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PREFACE

This investigation set out to utilize the Canaanite material for the purpose of general linguistic observations, to see what could be learned about the course of linguistic changes in Canaanite and about the breaking up of the area into dialects. But such general observations could be based only upon a preliminary description of Canaanite (chapters 2, 3) and upon an analysis of the developments which took place in it (chapter 4; linguistically arranged in chapter 5B). This yielded a general picture of the evolution of Canaanite, given in chapter 5A. The linguistic conclusions are given chiefly in chapter 6.

The spelling of words (transliteration of the Phoenician; Latin transcriptions) is given in italics. The actual pronunciation, as nearly as we can make it out, is given in square brackets, except in the tables on p. 3, 92, 93 and in the index. The customary asterisk before reconstructed forms has been omitted throughout, since almost every form is reconstructed in part. > is to read “changes into”; and C in phonetic formulae represents any consonant.

It is a pleasant duty to express here my indebtedness to Professor E. A. Speiser, who has read the manuscript and has made many valuable suggestions. I have talked over with him many of the linguistic changes which are listed here. To Mr. J. Smolens and the Faculty Research Committee of the University of Pennsylvania I am indebted for assistance in preparation of the chart.

This book is dedicated to the memory of Professor Edward Sapir, not only out of a need to give some expression, minute though it be, of what his loss meant to his friends and to scientific work, but also because this book had its origin in his influence. Many specific interpretations of evidence have developed here out of his suggestions, and the whole treatment owes a great deal to countless discussions of linguistic science which I had with him.

ZELIIG S. HARRIS.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. The conditions of investigation. The study of dialect geography has shown how language areas break up in dialectal divisions. The first descriptive results of dialect atlases seem, it is true, to be spatial only: the isoglosses indicate merely what areas are similar in respect to this or that linguistic feature, and what areas differ much or little from one another. But the analysis of these results has made it possible to recover from them certain historical evidence too. The isoglosses are interpreted as the limits of diffusion of the respective linguistic features; from various criteria such as the existence and distribution of relic forms and the movement of certain isoglosses in groups, one may infer the direction and date of the respective linguistic diffusions, and so discover something of the linguistic history of the area.\(^1\) However, such inference, based only upon the current distribution of forms, is methodologically limited. It can not reveal those historical changes and diffusions which were later evened out; in some cases it cannot show the order in which certain changes took place, or whether given current forms are the result of one change or of several successive changes. If we would know, even roughly, the linguistic history of an area, our geographically specified linguistic data must not come from one moment only, but must range over a long period of time. We need evidence from past writings. Such evidence is available for the Canaanite speech of Syria-Palestine between c. 1500 and c. 200 B.C. While the linguistic data from this land are sparse, they have the value of occurring over a long period and a fairly large area; and our knowledge of the related Semitic languages makes it possible for us to understand such material as we have, and to know which of the observed linguistic features are Proto-Semitic and which were developed and diffused within Syria-Palestine.

An investigation of linguistic history is necessarily based on the comparison of a series of static linguistic descriptions taken at various time-levels. The historical analysis is in this case more complete than any one of the static descriptions, since it is based upon scattered evidence for this

\(^1\) L. Bloomfield, Language (1933) chapter 19; A. Brettschneider, Sprachkarte als. Sprachgeschichte, in Indogermanische Forschungen 48 (1930) 181-221; A. Dauzat, La géographie linguistique (1922); E. Gamillscheg, Die Sprachgeographie (Neuphilologische Bibliothek 1928); J. Gilliéron and J. Mongin, Scier dans la Gaule romane (1905); K. Haug, Sprachwandel im Lichte der Mundartgrenzen, in Rheinische Beiträge und Hilfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie 16 (1930); K. Jaberg, Sprachgeographie (1908).
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or that linguistic feature at various moments within the period, rather than upon two complete descriptions of the state of the language at the beginning and end of the period. We can make a large number of single observations, partial descriptions, at various points within this period; but at no point can we obtain a reasonably complete picture of the Semitic speech of Syria-Palestine. Even a descriptive grammar of masoretic Hebrew, the most fully recorded of any of these dialects, is not as linguistically profitable as an historical study. For the masoretic text of the Bible is not direct evidence of some one dialect; it does not represent the speech of just one place and time. A few forms in it are probably artificial; many are confections of the traditions of two different stages of the spoken language; some are dialectal forms which were never used in the speech of Jerusalem. A description of the speech of Jerusalem at any particular time would itself have to be not a mere description of masoretic Hebrew but an historical reconstruction based upon the masoretic and other evidence.

2. What Canaanite includes. During the last two millennia B.C. most of the inhabitants of Syria-Palestine spoke a Semitic language of the Northwest-Semitic type. In the course of time many changes took place in this speech, and differences grew up among various parts of the area. It is these changes that form the basis of the present study.

To the extent that these languages can be shown to be of one Semitic sub-division, they are all called by the general name “Canaanite.” This term is used to distinguish them from the other, Aramaic, sub-division of the Northwest-Semitic group. “Canaan” was the ancient name for a large part of the Palestine-Syria coast and was secondarily used to describe these languages which were spoken there. It receives added color since it appears that most of the linguistic features which distinguish these languages from the Aramaic were not the heritage of some earlier period but had developed here in the area geographically known as Canaan.

One important section of this area is excluded from the present study: north-eastern Syria, bordering on the middle Euphrates. The speech of this area was very probably Canaanite, making a linguistic continuum with that of the Mediterranean Coast and inland Syria-Palestine. It should

*See chapter 2.


*See chapter 2.5.
therefore be included in any complete study of Canaanite. Canaanite material from this area is found in the large number of Amorite names in cuneiform tablets of c. 2000 B.C., and in the thousands of cuneiform tablets from Mari. However, not enough is as yet known of this language to make it clear whether it was merely an outlying section of Canaanite, or whether it had certain early linguistic features which might set it historically apart from the rest of the Canaanite area. At the present writing a large mass of material, afforded by the Mari tablets, has been discovered but not yet published. It seems therefore best to reserve discussion of this area until the new material is available, and to limit this investigation to the Mediterranean coast and its immediate hinterland.

3. The sounds of Canaanite. The transcription used here for the sounds of Canaanite speech covers the phonemes of all the dialects and the chief phonetic features which are here discussed. Although the evidence for their actual pronunciation is slight, and is in most cases not discussed here, the probable nature and point of articulation of each sound may be indicated thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dental-bilabial alveolar &quot;emphatic&quot;</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar laryngeal</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stop (voiceless)</td>
<td>p t t'</td>
<td>k q</td>
<td>(aleph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop (voiced)</td>
<td>b d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirant (voiceless)</td>
<td>t t' (Arab. ٜ)</td>
<td>h (Arab. ُ)</td>
<td>h (Arab. َ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirant (voiced)</td>
<td>d d' (Arab. ٴ)</td>
<td>γ (ghain)</td>
<td>' (ayin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibilant (voiceless)</td>
<td>s s' s''</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibilant (voiced)</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Following all voiced)</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trill</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-vowel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowels (short and long)</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(masor. Heb.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(only long)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The later spirants which developed out of post-vocalic stops are transcribed [p b f d k g]. These were not phonemes, but merely positional variants of their homo-organic stops, and hence do not need to be indicated in a phonemic transcription. They are indicated here, however, because they represent a phonetic change which is here discussed.

In the vowels, the short grade is indicated by the vowel-sign alone. The long grade is indicated by macron - or circumflex ^ over the vowel-sign. While the differentiation of these two types of long vowels would probably not be necessary in a descriptive account, since they did not differ in degree of length, it is convenient to keep them distinct here because they had historically different origins. ( ) is used for Proto-Semitic long vowels, and for long vowels which arose from the assimilation of a consonant to a vowel, or from the contraction of two vowels as a result of the syncope of a consonant between them; some of these changes took place in pre-Canaanite time, many in Canaanite. ( ) is used for Proto-Semitic anceps vowels (long vowels in final position, in which position they seem to have had their short grade as a free variant), and for the stress-lengthening which took place in Canaanite in conditions which included stress and loss of a following final short vowel (see chapter 4, no. 36). The later reduced grade (shwa) of the short vowels is marked by [ə] or, if particular vowel quality is to be represented, [œ o].

Short [i, a, u] and long [ì, à, ù] are Proto-Semitic vowels. Long [ê] arose in Canaanite from the monophthongization of [ay], and later [ë] was the stress-lengthened grade of [i]; short [e] appears in the place of Proto-Semitic short [i] in certain forms. [e] is used only for the segol of the Tiberian masoretic vocalization in Hebrew. [ê, ã] are used for the later back-quality lengthened grade of [a]; it arose only in this circumstance, and had no short grade. This vowel was phonemically distinct from [ë] which had developed earlier from the early cases of long [ã] and from the monophthongization of [aw]; the short [o] occurs in certain forms in place of Proto-Semitic short [u].

1 Proto-Semitic [‘à-] < [‘a’-]; [ê] < [aw], [ë] < [ay], stressed [ê] and unstressed [ã] both < [á] < [a’] in special conditions in early Canaanite; later [À] < [a’], [ë] < [ê]; [ã] < [aya], etc.; probably also [À] < [at].

2 E.g. in [yitten] ‘he will give.’

3 Kahle in BL 97-8, 100; Speiser, JQR 24 (1933) 17.

4 E.g. in [yokolte] ‘ye were able.’
CHAPTER 2

BEFORE THE SYRIA-PALESTINE PERIOD

1. The ancestor of the languages of Syria-Palestine. Any reconstruction of the history of Canaanite out of the several dialects, any putting together of forms from different parts of the Canaanite area, is posited on the assumption that the speech of all parts of that area was once the same, that all the local dialects are developed from one earlier parent language. To determine whether this was indeed the case, we must ask (2.) to what extent they all derive from the same dialectal area of Proto-Semitic, and (3.-5.) if they all went through the same history from the break-up of the Proto-Semitic area up to their entrance into Canaan. To the extent that this is so, we must say that every dialect which we call Canaanite had virtually the same history, namely, that they were all virtually identical up to the time that they came to be spoken in Syria-Palestine. We may then reconstruct out of the later Canaanite dialects a fairly uniform Proto-Canaanite speech, and features which do not appear in the Proto-Canaanite reconstruction will be assumed to have developed during the Canaanite period.

But not all differences among the later Canaanite dialects are necessarily late developments. The single parent of these later languages may itself have contained some dialectal divisions, which should appear as such in the reconstruction of Proto-Canaanite. We should therefore ask further (6.) what dialectal differences there were within this parent of the Canaanite dialects. It is important to distinguish between dialectal divisions before the Canaanite period and those that developed within that period. For the differences that came up in Syria-Palestine arose within the known geographic and social positions of each part of the area, and by studying them in terms of these local conditions we may learn something of the relation between geographic position and the growth of dialect differences; but the differences which developed before that period arose in geographic and social circumstances which we do not know and which were probably unrelated to those established later in Syria-Palestine.

2. The Proto-Semitic dialectal parent of Canaanite. The dialects here studied all derive from a single dialectal parent within Proto-Semitic: in the few features for which a Proto-Semitic dialectal division (“East” and “West”) can be traced, these languages all show the forms which had spread in the Western division. Thus all the languages of
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Syria-Palestine have the \([h\text{-}]\) form of the third person pronouns\(^1\) as is true of almost all the West-Semitic languages, whereas in that part of Proto-Semitic from which the East-Semitic languages developed the \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) forms had been accepted. The fact that the \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) forms occur also in some South Arabic dialects (Minaean, etc., as against \([h\text{-}]\) in Sabaean; in modern South Arabic: Šḥairu and, for the feminine, Mehri and Soqotri) suggests that these \([h\text{-}]\) and \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) forms did not arise later in the separated Eastern and Western groups of Semitic languages, but that both forms existed in Proto-Semitic, preference for \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) forms spreading through the precursors of East-Semitic and of some of the southern West-Semitic languages, while the rest of the Proto-Semitic area used the \([h\text{-}]\) forms.\(^2\)

The causative verb form had an analogous history: all the Canaanite dialects had the form with \([h\text{-}]\) \(([-t], [y])\),\(^3\) as do almost all West-Semitic languages, whereas East-Semitic uses the \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) causative (ṣafel). Ugaritic seems to differ, in that it uses the \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) causative regularly; but petrified formulaic occurrences of the \([-t]\) causative in Ugaritic show that the dialect from which it was derived had once had the \([h\text{-}]\) \(([-t]\) causative.\(^4\) This replacing of the \([h\text{-}]\) causative by the \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) form in the parent of Ugaritic, and the existence of the \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\) causative in some South-Arabic dialects (Minaean), with traces of it elsewhere in West Semitic (e.g. Arabic ista'ala{"i}), all indicate that both existed in Proto-Semitic: parts of the Proto-Semitic area had used the \([h\text{-}]\) causative, parts had used \([\dot{s}\text{-}]\); the Canaanite languages came from the section

---

\(^1\) Hamat suffixes in \([\text{-}h]\) (6, 9); Ugaritic [huwatu, hiyati, himatu] and suffixes in \([\text{-}h]\): Montgomery, JAOS 56 (1936) 440-1; Phoenician, including Ya‘udi h’he, h’mhe, amt ‘they; and suffixes in \([\text{-}h]\) (late [\text{-}w], [\text{-}y]- and contracted vowels) GP 47 f.; South Canaanite suffix [-h] in ab-ru-un-ū, ba-di-ū, ma-ab-zu-ū (Megiddo EA 245. 10, 35, 14), cf. Dhorme RB 11 (1914) 360; Hebrew [hû, hî, hêmâ, hêm] and suffixes in \([\text{-}h]\); Moabite h’ (9) and suffixes in \([\text{-}h]\) (8).

\(^2\) GvG 302-3; G. Bergsträsser, Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen 127; J. Barth, Pronominalbildung 17; D. H. Müller, Südarabische Expedition 6: Die Mehri und Soqotri Sprache 2.373. Soqotri has masc. [h], fem. [s] in the independent and suffixed pronouns, but masc. [s] and fem. [s] in the personal nominal suffixes.

\(^3\) Hamat ṣaqlkhn ‘and he made me king’ (3); Ugaritic [ṣaqrîb] ‘sacrifice,’ etc., cf. J. Friedrich, Ras Shamra 27; Ginsberg, Orientalia 7 (1938) 3-4; Harris JAOS 58 (1938) 103-5; Phoenician [y]-[h] (1); ṣqdt ‘I consecrated,’ Neo-Punic [tr]iqdî ‘he consecrated’ (GP 42-3); South Canaanite bi-bi-bi-e ‘he hid’ (7, EA 250.7) Böhl 84, Dhorme RB 11 (1914) 44; Hebrew hîhîl stem; Moabite hrmt ‘I dedicated it’ (17).

\(^4\) Albright, JPOS 14 (1934). 112-9; Harris, JAOS 58 (1938). 105-11; in opposition to this view Goetz, JAOS 58 (1938) 280 fn. 87.
which had used [h-], except that in Ugaritic (or its parent dialect) the [θ-] form became accepted later on.\footnote{GvG 522-4; Nyberg, Monde Oriental 14 (1920) 197-215; Speiser, JAOS 56 (1936) 23-6.}

3. Common West-Semitic history of Canaanite. In addition to the evidences of dialectal identity in Proto-Semitic, it is clear that all these languages of Syria-Palestine had had a common history with the West-Semitic languages after the East-Semitic group was no longer in contact with them. Thus, probably all Canaanite languages possessed the internal passive verbal construction characterized by the functional vowel sequence [-u-i-] (pf.), [-u-a-] (pret., ipf.)\footnote{Ugaritic [yuḥadu] ‘he became affected’ (IIAB iv.6), etc. Goetz, JAOS 58 (1938) 273, 302; Harris, JAOS 57 (1937) 152; Phoenician, including Yaa‘udi ksy ‘he was covered’ (GP 42), yu-uy-qit ‘it is taken’ (Byblos EA 105, 82) Böhl 60, Ebeling 59; South Canaanite yu-up-pa-šu-mi ‘it will be done’ (Akko EA 232.20) Böhl 62; Hebrew qal passive, pual, and hofal stems. ‘Ugaritic [yiṣṣa‘u] ‘he raised,’ etc. Goetz, JAOS 58 (1938) 290-3, 309; the evidence from the Amarna letters is indecisive, in view of the conditions of cuneiform writing. The form yaqtilu, with [-u], must also be assumed for early Hebrew, to account for the differences in late Hebrew between the reflexes of the indicative and jussive; BL 296-300. For the [-n] that occurred after final long vowels in the indicative but not in the jussive, see chapter 5. A3.} this form seems to have developed in the course of the common history of West-Semitic and is absent in East-Semitic.

Another feature common to all the Canaanite dialects and, as far as is known, to all other West-Semitic languages, was the final [-u] of the preterite (imperfect indicative)\footnote{Ugaritic [yiṣṣa‘a], etc. Goetz, JAOS 58 (1938) 294-6; Harris, JAOS 57 (1937) 152 fn. 11; Phoenician, including Yaa‘udi wycl ‘and if he uncover,’ l ykb ‘may they not honor’ (GP 40, 94), ni-mu-ud ‘then we die’ (Amarna RA 19 (1922) 91.11 Byblos); South Canaanite ya-as-ku-ur ‘may he remember’ (EA 223.19); Hebrew, see BHG II 5c, BL 298-9.}; this [-u] was lost in the various languages when final short vowels dropped, but there is abundant evidence of its earlier existence. In East-Semitic, however, the preterite was without final [-u]; there the vowel was suffixed only in certain syntactic conditions, when the preterite was in a secondary clause.

The yaqtil form without [-u] (= Akkadian preterite) did occur in West-Semitic, but it had a function which was absent from Akkadian (East-Semitic): the jussive function. This West-Semitic jussive, too, existed, as far as the evidence goes, in all the languages of Syria-Palestine.\footnote{Ugaritic [yiṣṣa‘u] ‘he raised,’ etc. Goetz, JAOS 58 (1938) 290-3, 309; the evidence from the Amarna letters is indecisive, in view of the conditions of cuneiform writing. The form yaqtilu, with [-u], must also be assumed for early Hebrew, to account for the differences in late Hebrew between the reflexes of the indicative and jussive; BL 296-300. For the [-n] that occurred after final long vowels in the indicative but not in the jussive, see chapter 5. A3.}
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developed in West-Semitic and was absent from Akkadian; the subjunctive with suffixed [-a]. Evidence for this form, both in the Canaanite languages and in some other West-Semitic dialects is not entirely certain. The Canaanite languages also show the characteristic final [-a] which the nominal ("perfect") verb had developed in West-Semitic: qatila, qatula (and internal passive qitila). The analogous East-Semitic form, the permansive, does not have the final [-a].

Finally, in all the dialects of Syria-Palestine, as in all other West-Semitic languages, the first person suffix of this nominal verb-aspect has [-t-], whereas in the East-Semitic permansive it has [-k-]. The replacing of the [-k-] of this suffix by [-t-], perhaps on the analogy of the [-t-] of the second person suffix, must have taken place during the common history of West-Semitic, since it appears in all West-Semitic languages, and not in Akkadian.

4. Common Northwest-Semitic history of Canaanite. The languages of Syria-Palestine show further certain features which are common only to them and to the Aramaic dialects. Since these features are not present in the other (southern) West-Semitic languages, they are assumed to have developed after the precursor of Canaanite and Aramaic, the Northwest-Semitic speech, was no longer in contact with the parent of South-Semitic.

Thus in all these dialects Proto-Semitic initial [w-] has changed to [y-], a change which did not take place in Akkadian or South Semitic. The special assimilation of [l] to [q] in forms of the root lq̂h 'he took'
is also peculiar to Canaanite (in all those dialects in which the root has been found) 13 and Aramaic.

Another development which seems to have taken place specifically in the Northwest-Semitic area is the extension of the bi-vocalic stems with plural suffixes as the regular plurals of uni-vocalic noun stems: [qatalu/ima] (Aram. [-na]) and [qatalatu] plurals of [qatlu] and [qatlatu], with corresponding analogues [qataluma], etc., for [qitlu], [qataluma], etc., for [qitlu]. Such plurals existed in South-Semitic too, and were undoubtedly a common West-Semitic development; 14 but their extension as the regular plural form for all nouns of the uni-vocalic class must have taken place specifically in the Northwest group. As far as the evidence goes, all the languages of Syria-Palestine had this form. 15

5. Dialectal separateness of Canaanite within Northwest-Semitic.
Even within Northwest-Semitic, the parent of the Canaanite languages seems to have formed a separate sub-division distinct from the Aramaic. Thus the assimilation of [n] to following consonant took place in Aramaic only in certain areas and under certain conditions; but in East-Semitic and in the Canaanite languages which are recorded here it occurred under all conditions. 16

Similarly, of the masculine plural elements with [-m-] and [-n-], the form with [-m-] spread through most of the dialects which later reached Syria-Palestine, while the [-n-] form remained in the parent area of Aramaic, as it had in South-Semitic. In the Canaanite division only the parent of Mosbite accepted the [-n-] forms. 17

13 Ugaritic yqōh 'he received' (III AB 10, K 204, but lq̱ perfect K 159), q̱ (II AB ii 32); Phoenician yq̱h 'he will take' (GP 115); Hebrew [yiqqāḥ]. Cf. Ungnad, Beiträge zur Assyriologie 5 (1907) 278; GvG 176; BHG II 25 ff.; BL 199. 14 GvG 429-30.
15 Ugaritic rkhm for [raʾasq/ima], but rsh for [raʾšu] (cf. Harris, JAOS 57 (1937) 153); Hebrew 'segolate' nouns, originally uni-vocalic (see chapter 4, no. 65d), and their bi-vocalic plural stems BL 565-7, 570; cf. Sapir, Language 13 (1937) 331.
16 In Amorite [n] was apparently not assimilated. There are some unclear forms in early Canaanite: bn̄̂̄nt in the Egyptian transcriptions (Voc. VI B 12), gūn-ti in the Amarna letters from Jerusalem (EA 288. 26, 289. 18, 19). In late Punic, double [t] and [s] seem in some cases to have been dissimilated, yielding a secondary pre-consonantal [n], as in Aramaic and Assyrian: msbāt by the side of msbāt 'monument,' mn̄̂̄nt [nintamā] < [nintamā] 'they were given,' mn̄̂̄nt 'gift' as against Phoenician mtt GP 30; cf. GvG 174-5.
17 Ugaritic l̄m 'goods' (IIAB i 23); Phoenician, including Yaʾudi, l̄m 'god' (GP 60); South Canaanite cf. Dhorme RB 11 (1914) 353; Hebrew [lm] plural form; Mosbite šēn 'thirty' (2); Hamat has [-n] plurals, but these are probably Aramaic forms.
Development of the Canaanite Dialects

Another Proto-Semitic feature in which the Canaanite languages were distinct from the Aramaic was the use of ['anākū] 'I,' as in East-Semitic, whereas Aramaic and South-Semitic had ['anā]. A cognate of the latter form also occurs rarely in Ugaritic and frequently in Hebrew; but these and all other Canaanite languages show that the regular form in their parent speech had been ['anākū].

There were other differences, chiefly lexical, between the Canaanite division and the Aramaic, for example the spread of the form [baru] 'son' in Aramaic, as against the [banu] of Canaanite and South-Semitic.

The vowel [-t] of the first person suffix [-tū] of the nominal ("perfect") aspect is also a Canaanite development, as against the earlier [-tū] which remained in South-Semitic. All Canaanite dialects had it, as far as the evidence goes, but we cannot tell if the development took place before or after the establishment of these languages in Syria-Palestine.

From all these indications, it follows that the languages of Syria-Palestine, before their entrance into that area, had all had the same history, except for a few dialectal differences. They all derived from one sub-division, which may be called the Canaanite, of Northwest-Semitic. This division seems already to have been distinct from the Aramaic, though we cannot tell how much; most of the features which differentiated Canaanite from Aramaic probably developed in the Syria-Palestine area, and are hence included in chapter 4.

The position of Ugaritic can therefore no longer be in doubt. Ugaritic did indeed differ from the other Canaanite languages as we know them. In part these differences are due to dialectal developments

---

18 See chapter 4, no. 56 for ['anî] in Ugaritic and Hebrew. Ugaritic ānk IAB ii 21; Phoenician 'n̂k; Hebrew ['ānōqî]; Moabite 'nk (1).

19 The occurrence of br in the Kilamu inscription from Ya'udi is probably not Canaanite, but an Aramaic form used only in the title of the king. The royal house was not Canaanite and may well have had Aramaic contacts at this time; within the next few generations Aramaic became the official language of Ya'udi.

20 See fn. 11. We cannot tell if this development also occurred in Aramaic, since the vowel was later dropped. Cf. also the final vowels of Canaanite ['ānōqî] and Akkadian ['anāku].

21 Doubts as to the Canaanite position of Ugaritic have been expressed chiefly by: J. Cantineau, Syria 13 (1932) 104-70, 408; H. Bauer, Das Alphabet von Ras Shamra 64; see also Friedrich in ZA 41 (1933) 311, and in Ex Oriente Lux, Jaarbericht 5 (1937-8) 345. 2. On the other hand, Dussaud calls it "early Hebrew" in Découvertes de Ras Shamra 57 and Revue de l'histoire des Religions 105 (1932) 274. Albright calls it North-Canaanite in JPOS 14 (1934) 114, BASOR 70 (April 1938) 20, and this name has been accepted by several American scholars.
peculiar to Ugarit or to that section of pre-Canaanite of which Ugaritic was the continuation; in part they are merely early common Canaanite forms which had been lost by the time of the inscriptions which we have from the other dialects. In any event, Ugaritic clearly shared the general history of the Canaanite division; that is to say, it is a Canaanite language.

Just so, it is impossible to place Proto-Canaanite in the East-Semitic group, or to say that the early "Hebrew" of the Palestinian inhabitants, before the coming of the Aramaean Hebrews (Habiru), was an East-Semitic language, and that biblical Hebrew is a "Mischsprache" of this East-Semitic Canaanite and the West-Semitic Aramaean of the Habiru invaders. All the evidence which we have from the pre-Habiru inhabitants of Palestine and from the early Phoenicians is clearly Northwest-Semitic. It is quite possible that the Habiru and other non-Canaanite speakers had some influence on the development of Hebrew, and it is true that many linguistic changes took place in Hebrew after the coming of the Habiru, as well as before. But what gives Hebrew its Northwest-Semitic character is not the development that took place after the arrival of the Habiru, but the early common West-Semitic and Northwest-Semitic features listed above. And these early features are as apparent in pre-Habiru Canaanite as in the later Hebrew.

6. Dialectal divisions within the parent of Canaanite. The early dialectal differences which existed within pre-Canaanite should be listed together. The preterite and present which are found in Ugaritic are not to be considered in this category; both were common Proto-Semitic aspects which probably existed throughout West-Semitic, including Canaanite, as well as throughout East-Semitic. The use of the

---

22 Cf. for Ugaritic MH 18-25; for Phoenician GP 6-7, 67-9; for the Canaanite of the Amarna letters Dhorme, La langue de Canaan RB 10 (1913) 369, 11 (1914) 37, 344; and the footnotes above.

23 The position that Hebrew is a "Mischsprache," which was put forth by Hans Bauer in Zur Frage der Sprachmischung im Hebräischen (1924) and in BL 19-22, must therefore be discarded. It is attacked by Bergsträsser, OLZ 26 (1923) 293-60, 477-81, and Landsberger, OLZ 29 (1926) 357-76, and recently defended by G. R. Driver, Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System. Many of the individual points Bauer made in support of his thesis are clearly untenable; some cases of dialect-mixture may be true, but they would then represent dialectal developments within Hebrew, and would mean little for the early history of Canaanite. In calling almost every dialectal feature of Hebrew an "Aramaism" there lies a methodological fallacy; for such a method of explanation has no control over it, being entirely ad hoc. Furthermore, it leaves almost nothing to be considered as later dialectal changes, as though Hebrew had no linguistic history except for this one Aramaic intrusion.

24 For traces of the preterite in Canaanite and Arabic, see chapter 4, no. 19,
causative in Ugaritic, superseding the [h-] (['-]) causative which remained in the rest of Canaanite, may have developed in Proto-Semitic times. Similarly, Moabitic differed in that it continued use of the [-n-] plural form, whereas the [-m-] form spread throughout the rest of Canaanite.

More doubtful is the [t-] verb-prefix of the third person masculine plural. This form appears in Ugaritic and in the Amarna letters, but does not occur in later Canaanite, where the 3 m. pl. prefix is [yi-]. It is not clear whether the [t-] form was dialectal in early Canaanite, other dialects having [y-] as elsewhere in Semitic, or whether, less probably, the [t-] form was regular for all early Canaanite and was later replaced by the form with [yi-].

---

20; for traces of the present in Canaanite see chapter 4, no. 22 and cf. the present tense in Ethiopic. The distinctive feature of the present in Canaanite as against Akkadian was the use of the final [-u], as in the case of the preterite.

25 See 2.2 and fn. 4.

26 See 2.5 and fn. 17.

27 First noted by Ginsberg, Orientalia 5 (1936) 188 fn. and Tarbiz 4 (1933) 116; Goetze, JAOS 58 (1938) 290; cf. definitely ḫ-im tērēk tā'imk 'may the gods protect you and keep you whole' (1938b.7-9; Dhorme, Syria 19 (1938) 143).

28 Böhl 52-3; Ebeling 48-50; Dhorme RB 10 (1913) 379.
CHAPTER 3

LINGUISTIC CONDITIONS IN SYRIA-PALESTINE

1. Social and political structure. Close examination of the linguistic remains from the various parts of Syria-Palestine reveals no uniformity, no standard language over the area. If we are to understand why this was so and why certain cities rather than others remained dialectally together, we must know something of the social structure and political divisions in the land. This we may learn in part from the local inscriptions, especially from political correspondence (Akkadian letters in Ugarit c. 1500 and c. 1300 B.C., Amarna correspondence and letters of the same period found in Palestine sites), from royal inscriptions such as those of Kilamu, Zakir, princes of Sidon, and Meshu, and from the historical and political material in the Hebrew bible. The accounts of the Mediterranean campaigns of the Assyrian kings, and the treaties of Assyrian kings with Syrian and Phoenician states, give a fair picture of the political divisions; further light on the early period comes from Egyptian sources dealing with Western Asia (chiefly historical records, Ächtungstexte, lists of conquered cities, and certain popular stories), while Greek writers tell late Phoenician history. About the type of economy and civilization we learn both from these sources and from the material remains found in archaeological excavations.

From the evidence of all these sources, it is clear that the speakers of Proto-Canaanite who settled in this area developed the types of economy which it permitted: agriculture and trade. Agriculture depended upon the regular rainfall. Sea-going commerce grew at various havens along the Mediterranean coast, chiefly to serve the Egyptian ships which came to obtain wood or to replenish their provisions, and the

Cyprian ships which brought copper for transfer to Mesopotamia and elsewhere. Inland trading stations arose at various points along the important caravan routes which ran through Syria-Palestine, connecting Egypt and the sea-coast with Mesopotamia.

The political form which was conditioned by this economy was one of small independent units, city-states, rather than a centralized government; we see this most clearly in the Amarna correspondence, although it is reflected in all the other sources too. This was so because agriculture did not depend upon any single river or irrigation system which would require central control; and trade, passing through successive stations in loose contact, did not at first lead to any inter-city controlling commercial class and centralized power. Later, during the first millennium B.C., the economic development of the area did result in sectional centralizations: an association of the sea-ports of the Phoenician coast (indicated in the Greek histories); the expansion of several of the large inland trade-route stations over the surrounding countryside (Ya‘nûdi, Hamat, etc., are known from Assyrian records; Damascus, etc., from the Bible); and the creation of two small states, Israel and Judah, in inland Palestine (these are known above all from the Bible).

In these conditions, social contact was local rather than far-flung. There was no capital city with which all parts of the area would have been in touch, and which might have set up as standard the character and speech of a central ruling class. There were no central institutions such as a body of officials moving from one place to another and bringing new social and linguistic contacts, or an army which would bring together people from all parts of the area and so tend to level their speech. There must, however, have been considerable intercourse among contiguous agricultural villages. The semi-commercial caravan stations along each trade route must have been in constant contact. And the sea-ports with their commerce and their industries, which had been mostly developed for export and for commercial needs, were rather closely associated: sailors and merchants moved from port to port, and the local population had frequent opportunity to hear the speech of other communities.

2. Degree of communication. But the economy and the way of living was much the same throughout the area; and there was enough intercourse to carry cultural features, including linguistic forms, over most of the country.

The extent of political contact among the various centers of population in Syria-Palestine may be judged from the Amarna letters. And the extent of cultural contact may be judged from the great cultural similarities throughout the whole area, appearing in the pottery remains,
in the rituals (as in types and names of sacrifices) and mythologies, in the very wording of the myth-sagas. These similarities of wording, recurrences of literary pictures and turns of phrase in various parts of the Canaanite area, are particularly relevant here. There can be no question that the literary tradition which we find in the Ugaritic texts was also the literary tradition of the Phoenicians and (Pre-Hebrew) Palestinians, or that the literature of Byblos was also the literature of Sidon, and was well known to the Hebrews in Jerusalem. The Ugaritic expression in [hum tānē dabāḥīma šănī ba’lu, ūlāṯa rāḵibu ’urpāti] (IIAB iii 17-8) ‘Indeed two sacrifices Baal hates, three (hates) the Rider of the Clouds’ is paralleled in the biblical ['al šēlāṯa pišē dam-meseq wa’al-’arbā’ā] (Amos 1.3) ‘For the three sins of Damascus and for the four . . .’ The Ugaritic [yadīnu dīna ’almanati yāпуtu tiptā yatāmî] (D 2v 7-8) ‘He pleads the plea of the widow; he judges the cause of the orphan’ is frequently reflected in the bible, as in [ṣip’tā yāṯom rīḇū ’almānā] (Is. 1.17) ‘Judge the orphans; plead for the widow’; Ugaritic lyhpk kas’ mlk bn lyîbr hī mlḥp (IAB vi 28-9) ‘He will surely overturn your sovereign throne; he will break your royal scepter’ is the same phrase as Byblos Phoenician hts p htr mlḥp ḫl ylpk ‘may his royal scepter be broken; may his sovereign throne be overturned.’ Similar identity of phrase is found among the Phoenician cities: kl mmlkt wkt ‘dm ‘any prince or man,’ in both Byblos and Sidon, etc. We should not overestimate the influence of these political and literary contacts upon the speech of the majority of inhabitants; but they serve as evidence that such communication existed.

3. The analysis of linguistic diffusion. The nature and degree of social intercourse determine the linguistic contact. Forms that were current in one town might be heard and accepted in another; changes that had taken place in one area might thus spread to others. Such linguistic diffusion would usually proceed along the paths of most frequent communication, although in some cases a linguistic feature might not spread even among places which were in close contact. In the history

2 Cp. Ugaritic 1929. 1, 3, etc. with the Phoenician-Punic tariff inscription from Marseille (CIS 165 and Lidz. 63 in GP 157-8) and with the names of sacrifices in the bible.

3 See GP 65; H. L. Ginsberg, A Ugaritic Parallel to 2 Sam. 1. 21, JBL 57 (1938) 209-13; Ginsberg, Orientalia 5 (1936) 172 f.; Ginsberg in Atti del XIX Congr. Internzl. degli Orientalisti (1935). 472-3; Gordon, BASOR 65 (Feb. 1937) 30-1. For the poetic meter of the Ugaritic myths and the bible, see Albright JPOS 12 (1932) 206-8; Ginsberg, Orientalia 5 (1936) 171; MH 29-31; Harris, JAOS 54 (1934) 80-3.
of Canaanite there were many developments that diffused over large parts of the Canaanite area, or over the whole of it.

These considerations of diffusion invalidate the common method of regarding the most wide-spread linguistic features as the earliest, and the most localized as the most recent. According to this method of dating, any feature which is common to all known Canaanite dialects must be Proto-Canaanite. Such criteria would be admissible in the case of languages which had separated and were no longer in contact; even then the similar features might be the result of later independent parallel developments. But the Canaanite languages were in contact throughout their history, and throughout the Syria-Palestine period. Some changes spread over the whole Canaanite area even after local changes had already occurred. Conversely, not all local changes need be late. The Proto-Semitic and Proto-Northwest-Semitic areas were not uniform speech communities. There were dialectal differences among the various parts of these areas, as is indicated by the presence of apparently East-Semitic features in West-Semitic dialects, and the like. A wide-spread Canaanite development may therefore be late and a local peculiarity may be but the reflex of a Proto-Semitic dialectal form.

Each linguistic feature must therefore be studied independently. From the description of each dialect at various time-levels, it is possible to isolate the individual developments which were responsible for changes of form between any two time-levels. The date of each development may be discovered not only from direct inscriptive evidence, but also from the configuration of the whole phonologic system in which it occurs, from the inference of any other known changes which must have been anterior or subsequent to it, and from any information we may gather about the date of the particular conditions which this change presupposes. The area over which a change spread cannot, with our present knowledge, be inferred from the linguistic and social conditions; we must have direct evidence from inscriptions, or indirect evidence, as when we find in the given area a later change which presupposes the one in question.

4. The sources. The evidence upon which the linguistic descriptions must be based is uneven and in certain ways unrepresentative. In the

---

This method, following the old family-tree assumption of the early historical analysis of Indo-European, is used by Bergsträsser; as a result he attributes a number of late changes to pre-Canaanite times, and is necessarily led to misunderstand the character and conditions of these developments (cf. BHG I 30).

In Proto-Semitic: /s/h/ in causative stem and third person pronouns; in Proto-Northwest-Semitic: [m/n] in masculine plural, etc. See chapter 2.2.5.

On the wave-theory of linguistic changes see L. Bloomfield, Language 317 f.
first place, it is not a random selection of the speech of Syria-Palestine, for it is weighted in favor of the larger cities: except for a few names of small towns and geographic places, almost all the extant material represents the speech of the big cities; we do not know if the speech of agricultural areas and small communities differed much or little from the speech of the cities. Furthermore, the inscriptions give us mostly the dialect of the urban upper class, and usually in a rather formal style. Only some graffiti and other informal inscriptions may show the more natural speech of the masses; and with the small amount of evidence which we have, we cannot tell if the difference between the speech of the upper and lower classes was great or negligible. Even for the towns, and for their standard languages, the evidence is sketchy. From most places we have no linguistic remains at all, so that we cannot tell whether certain features spread in their area. And where linguistic material is preserved, it usually covers just a short period, so that we cannot tell, except within wide limits, when the developments in question occurred there.

At present we have linguistic material from the following places: 7 
Ya‘udi—modern Zenjirli, in the farthest north of Syria, in the plain running east of Mt. Amanus. It was an important center of land-commerce in the area which the Assyrians called Hatti, and was active in the political intrigues of the early part of the first millennium B.C. 8 From it we have the Canaanite inscription of Kilamu, c. 800 B.C.; the name of the king shows that the ruling house was not Semitic, 9 and some have considered its language to be Phoenician as written by foreigners. 10 Three later inscriptions, of the 8th century, are already in the intruding Aramaic, but with some admixture of Canaanite in the earlier two. 11 All of these inscriptions were written in the Phoenician alphabet.


7 For the abbreviations used here for each of these sources see p. 29 below.
8 F. von Luschan, Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli; E. Meyer, Geschichte des Altersums II 2.
9 Friedrich, Kleinasiatische Forschungen 1 (1930) 304-5 shows it to be Luwian; he reads it Kilamuwa, but the probability is that it had become Kilamu in Canaanite pronunciation, since final short vowels had been elided (against Friedrich, ZS 1 (1922) 3).
10 Littman in the first publication of the text; the word ‘son’ in the king’s title has the Aramaic form br.
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C. Brockelmann, ibid. 1142-6.
M. Lidzbarski, Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik 3. 218-38.
H. Bauer, ZDMG 67 (1913) 684; 68 (1914) 227.
W. F. Albright, JPOS 6 (1926) 84.
J. A. Montgomery, JBL 47 (1928) 196.

Hamat and La‘aš—The area of modern Hama (and Aleppo), in the heart of North Syria, one of the chief stations on the great road from the Euphrates valley. In the vicinity of Aleppo was found the stele of Zakir, king of Hamat and La‘aš (Nuḥaṣša), c. 800 b. c., written in the Phoenician alphabet, in a mixture of the local Canaanite speech and an attempt at the incoming official Aramaic. Only those features in this inscription which are clearly Canaanite are studied here.

H. Pongon, Inscriptions sémithiques de la Syrie, p. 156-78, no. 86.
T. Nödeke, ZA 21 (1908) 375.
C. C. Torrey, JAOS 35 (1915-1917). 353.
W. F. Albright, JPOS 6 (1926). 85.

Ugarit—modern Ras Shamra, sea port on the north-central Syrian coast, opposite Cyprus; headquarters for Cyprus-Mesopotamia trade, and active in coastwise (and Egyptian) commerce. Here were found many mythological poems and ritual and business texts, of c. 1500 b. c., in the local Canaanite dialect. They are written in a local cuneiform consonantal alphabet.

Hans Bauer, Die alphabetischen Keilschrifttexte von Ras Shamra, 1936 (text).
Zahbūl Yām and Thāpit Nahar in the combat between Baal and the sea, JPOS 16 (1936) 17-20.

12 C. F. A. Schaeffer, annual reports in Syria 1929 and following; J. Friedrich, Ras Shamra, ein Überblick (Der alte Orient 33); R. Dussand, Les découvertes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancien Testament; Z. S. Harris, Ras Shamra: Canaanite Civilization and Language, Smithsonian Report for 1937. 479-502.
13 For the date see Harris, loc. cit. 491; Albright, JPOS 14 (1934) 103; C. F. A. Schaeffer, Syria 14 (1933) 118-4, 16 (1935) 154-9, also 10 (1929) 294-5, 12 (1931) 21-2, 13 (1932) 7-8.
Linguistic Conditions in Syria-Palestine

New Canaanite historical and mythological data, BASOR 63 (Oct. 1936) 23-32.
Recent progress in North-Canaanite research, BASOR 70 (Apr. 1938) 18-23.
Ba‘lu and his brethren, JPOS 16 (1936) 138-49.
The rebellion and death of Ba‘lu, Orientalia 5 (1936) 161-98.
Ba‘l and ‘Anat, Orientalia 7 (1938) 1-11.
Two North-Canaanite letters from Ugarit, BASOR 72 (Dec. 1938) 18 (cf. also p. 13).
A. Goetz, The tenses of Ugaritic, JAOS 58 (1938) 266-309.
C. Gordon, A marriage of the gods in Canaanite mythology, BASOR 65 (Feb. 1937) 29-32.
Z. S. Harris, A conditioned sound change in Ras Shamra, JAOS 57 (1937) 151-7.
Expression of the Causative in Ugaritic, JAOS 58 (1938) 103-11.
B. Maisler, A genealogical list from Ras Shamra, JPOS 16 (1936) 150-7.
J. A. Montgomery, Ras Shamra Notes I-VI, JAOS 1933-6.
F. Thureau-Dangin, Vocabulaire de Ras Shamra, Syria 12 (1931) 225-66.

First editions of all the texts:

(1929) = T
Ch. Virolleaud, Les tablettes de Ras Shamra, Syria 10 (1929) 304-10.
(I AB) = A;
add supplement below
(1931)
(Vocabulaire de Ras Shamra en langue inconnue, ibid. 389-90.
(II AB) = B
Un nouveau chant du poème d’Alein Baal, Syria 13 (1932) 113-63.
(SS) = C
La naissance des dieux gracieux et beaux, Syria 14 (1933) 128-51.
(E. Dhorme, Deux tablettes de la campagne de 1932, ibid. 229-37.
(1934a)
Ch. Virolleaud, Fragments d’un traité phénicien de thérapeutique, hippologique, Syria 15 (1934) 75-83.
(Sur une tablette écrite de droite à gauche, ibid. 103-4.
(1934c)
étiquettes, ibid. 134-5.
(1934d)
Proclamation de Seleg, chef de cinq peuples, ibid. 147-54.
(Nouveau fragment du poème de Mot et d’Aleyan Baal, ibid.
(1934e)
226-43 (with small tablet in p. 243 fn. 1).
Table généalogique, ibid. 244-51.
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(I*AB; = D) La mort de Baal, ibid. 305-36.

(III AB; = E) La révolte de Košer contre Baal, Syria 16 (1935) 29-45.

(1935a) R. Dussaud, Deux stèles portant une dédicace au dieu Dagon, ibid. 177-80.


(BH) Les chasses de Baal, ibid. 247-66.


(V AB) La déesse ‘Anat (1st article), ibid. 335-45.

(V AB) La déesse ‘Anat (2nd article), Syria 18 (1937) 85-102.

(1937) États nominatifs et pièces comptables, ibid. 159-73.

(V AB) La déesse ‘Anat (3rd article), ibid. 256-70.

(1938a) Textes alphabétiques provenant de la IXth campagne, Syria 19 (1938) 127-41.

(1938b) E. Dhorme, Nouvelle lettre d’Ugarit en écriture alphabétique, ibid. 142-6.

(D) Ch. Virolleaud, La légende phénicienne de Danel (Mission de Ras Shamra I 1936).

(K) La légende de Krt (Mission de Ras Shamra II 1936).

Method of citation: myths are indicated by the initials of their chief characters; all other texts are indicated by the year of the journal Syria in which they are published, the articles within each year being marked with consecutive letters of the alphabet. The equated citations are those used in MH.

Byblos—Gubla (probable local form of the name), sea port on the central Syrian coast, trading chiefly with Egypt, from the beginning of dynastic times. From this important center come some names in the Egyptian Åchtungstexte,\(^1\) many letters in the Akkadian Amarna correspondence EA 68-96, 101-40,\(^2\) and some names in Egyptian, Akkadian, and later Greek transcriptions.\(^3\) Here, too, have been found inscriptions in the local Canaanite dialect, written in the Phoenician alphabet, ranging from the 13th to the 1st century B.C.

Ahiram inscription, 13th century.

Yahkimilk inscription, 12-11th century.

Abibaal inscription, 10th century.

---

\(^1\) For the evidence of the Åchtungstexte, and for the bibliography, see p. 27 below.

\(^2\) For the evidence of the Amarna letters, and for the bibliography, see p. 26 below.

\(^3\) For the evidence of the Egyptian lists and Akkadian records, and of the Greek and Latin transcriptions, see p. 27-8 below.
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Elibaal inscription, 10th century.
Yehawmilk inscription, 5th century.
Batna’im inscription, 4th century.
Byblos Roman inscription, 1st century.
Bibliography of these inscriptions, GP 158-9.

Other Phoenician cities—some of the Phoenician words, especially names, in Egyptian, cuneiform (including Amarna), Greek and Latin transcriptions come from cities other than those listed here. Furthermore, there are some inscriptions from unspecified cities; and certain dialectal forms in Punic, which do not seem to be Byblian or Sidonian or Tyrian, probably also come from these other Phoenician cities. Features of colonial Phoenician, including Punic, which developed within the colonies, in Cyprus, North Africa, etc., are not considered in the present study; only those colonial forms are included here which indicate something of the parent speech in Phoenicia.

Sidon—sea port on the south Phoenician (Syrian) coast engaged in coastwise trade, with commercial contacts in the hinterland, including Palestine. In later times it was one of the chief dialectal parents of the colonial Phoenician speech in Athens, North Africa, etc. Its Amarna letters are EA 144-5; names from Sidon are frequent in Egyptian, cuneiform, Greek and Latin transcriptions. Inscriptions from Sidon are in the Phoenician alphabet and range from the 4th century B.C. on.16

Tyre—sea port in south Phoenician, south of Sidon, engaged in coastwise commerce and in various specialized industries for export purposes. It had considerable contacts with Palestine and was probably most active of all Phoenician cities in establishing trading posts and colonies on all the Mediterranean shores. Its speech was probably the chief parent dialect of colonial Phoenician in Cyprus and North Africa (Punic). The Amarna letters from Tyre are EA 146-55; names from it and references to it are frequent in Egyptian, cuneiform and especially Greek and Latin sources.19 Its inscriptions are in the Phoenician alphabet and range from the 3rd century on.20

17 Inscriptions and linguistic forms from other Phoenician cities: Iddo, Ur and other inscriptions, GP 159-60; Punic pronoun at GP 54; Neo-Punic hithpael GP 42.
18 Sidonian inscriptions: CIS 3-4, Lidz. 6-10 in GP 157.
19 See fn. 13-5.
20 Tyrian inscriptions: CIS 7-9, Lidz. 12-6 in GP 157.
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North Palestine—some evidence has come down from the inland trade route stations and from some of the smaller communities of North Palestine. The Amarna letters include a few from Megiddo, an important trade center (EA 242-6, RA 19 (1922) 97), and from a few other places (included in EA 169-284). Some of the place-names in Egyptian and Assyrian records come from North Palestine. From the 9th century we have a number of business inscriptions from Samaria, then capital of the North Palestine kingdom (Israel); these are written on ostraca, in the Phoenician alphabet. Lastly, speech-forms from North Palestine are found in various parts of the biblical text, chiefly in stories dealing with that area; they are recognizable by certain dialectal features which differentiate them from Jerusalem Hebrew. Some evidence on the late pronunciation of Northern Hebrew is probably to be found in the differences between the Babylonian and the common Tiberian masoretic traditions of the Bible.

Samaria Ostraca—
D. Diringer, Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi 21-74, with bibliography.
W. F. Albright, The administrative divisions of Israel and Judah, JPOS 5 (1925) 17-54.
E. Dhorme, L’ancien hébreu dans la vie courante, RB 39 (1930) 63 f.

North Palestinian Material in the Bible—

Babylonian Masora—
P. Kahle, Masoreten des Ostens.

Jerusalem—an inland city in the hills of central Palestine, from which we have several letters in the Amarna correspondence and which became, at the beginning of the first millennium B.C., the capital of the South Palestine kingdom (Judah). The Amarna letters from Jerusalem are EA 285-90; and names from this city appear in the Achtungstexte and in other transcriptions, Egyptian and cuneiform, Greek and Latin. There are a few inscriptions (chiefly Siloam 700 B.C.) and seals from Jerusalem, written in the Phoenician alphabet. Later inscriptions from other Judaean cities were also written in the dialect of Jerusalem as the official language of the state; the largest body of these are the letters found at the Judaean fortress of Lachish, written c. 589 B.C., just before the city fell to the Babylonian army which also took

21 See fn. 13-5.
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Jerusalem. This standard language is also the language of the bible; and the linguistic evidence of the bible, except where it clearly reflects other dialects, must be taken as representing the dialect of Jerusalem of the time when the section in question was written or edited. The masoretic text of the bible represents late and sometimes conflicting traditions of the pronunciation of the language at the time when it was still spoken.

INSCRIPTIONS: SIOAM INSCRIPTION—

D. Diringer, Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi, 81-102, with bibliography.
E. Dhomne, RB 39 (1930), 71 f.
BHГ I p. 10.

OTHERS—

Diringer 74-9, 102-10, and seals and stamps, passim.
W. F. Albright, JPOS 5 (1925) 75-102.

LACHISH LETTERS—

W. F. Albright, BASOR 63 (Oct. 1936) 36-7; 70 (April 1938) 11; 73 (Feb. 1939) 16-21.
C. Gordon, BASOR 67 (Oct. 1937) 30; 70 (April 1938) 17.


H. Bauer and P. Leander, Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache (1922). (BL)

G. Bergsträsser, Hebräische Grammatik (Gesenius' 29th ed., 1918-29). (BHГ)

Since Bergsträsser's is linguistically the soundest and most up-to-date of all these grammars, it is used here as the standard reference. Reference to other grammars will be occasional, as the subject demands; but reference to Bergsträsser will be regular, and the attempt will be made to correct his statements where this is necessitated by the new material on Canaanite which has come to light.
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South Palestine—Some evidence of the speech of South Palestinian towns other than Jerusalem is found in Amarna letters EA 246-329. In Gezer there was found a calendar inscription which clearly represents the local dialect, not that of Jerusalem; it is of the 9th century and is written in the Phoenician alphabet. Early alphabetic inscriptions have been found in various South Palestinian sites but have not as yet been satisfactorily deciphered; they will present additional information in the speech of this area during the middle of the second millennium B.C. But by the middle of the first millennium, the standard language of South Palestine had come to be that of Jerusalem, the capital city, so that inscriptions such as the Lachish letters can not be considered as representing the local speech.

GEZER CALENDAR—

D. Diringer, Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi 1-20, with bibliography.
M. Lidzbarski, Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik 3. 36-43, 189-90.
Lidzbarski, Macalister, Cook and others in Quarterly Statement, Palestine Exploration Fund, 1909.

Moab—the semi-arid plateau east of the Dead Sea (bordering on the Syrian desert; in the 9th century B.C. it was a unified country, with a capital and central government. Its official language is represented in the royal inscription of Mesha, written in the Phoenician alphabet during the middle of the 9th century. Some names from Moab also occur in the Assyrian records.

M. Lidzbarski—Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik 415.
Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik 1. 1-10.

5. The scripts. This variegated linguistic material has come down in several different kinds of writing, each of which must be independently evaluated. The Phoenician alphabet was a cursive linear script of 22

Albright now considers (BASOR 63 (Oct. 1936) 9) that the Gezer calendar should be dated, on paleographical grounds, in the 10th century.

Albright, Early evolution of the Hebrew alphabet, BASOR 63 (Oct. 1936) 8-12; Albright, AJA 41 (1937) 148; Albright, AFO 5 (1928-29) 150; Böhl, Die Sichem-Plakette, ZDPV 61 (1938) 1-25; Horsfield and Vincent, Une stèle égyptomoabite au Balou'a, RB 41 (1932) 417; P. Montet, Byblos et l'Égypte 15-61, fig. 70, pl. xei; Obermann, The archaic inscriptions from Lachish, JAOS 38 (1938) supplement; Obermann, JBL 57 (1938) 239-53; Taylor, JPOS 10 (1930) 17, 79; S. Yeivin, Toldot haKtav haIvri (History of Hebrew script; in modern Hebrew), Jewish Palestine Exploration Society, Jerusalem 1938; Yeivin, BJPES 2 (1935) 6, 7-9.
consonant signs, representing the following sounds in the following order: [b g d h w z h t y k l m n s p s q r s t]. It probably included all the consonantal phonemes of the central and southern Phoenician cities during most of the period studied here. For Ya’udi we cannot tell if there were not other phonemes, for which this alphabet had no representation. And in the case of Hebrew we have evidence that, although it used the Phoenician alphabet without changes, it had, during a large part of this period, the phonemes [t h y š] which were written with the characters for [š h y š] respectively.

Since this alphabet was entirely consonantal, the Phoenician inscriptions are written without any representation for the vowels, except where [y] and [w] (which, as consonants, were always written) became vowels in the course of regular sound change. Hebrew and Moabite, however, extended the use of y and w for original long vowels, first only in word-final, later also medially.

The orthography in the inscriptions seems usually to represent the current local pronunciation. The phonemic character of the alphabet prevented it from developing a complicated and relatively unchanging scribal tradition such as there was in Egyptian and cuneiform writing; among contributing factors, due to the general social structure of this area, we may include the facts that the scribal caste was not as centralized and formalized, and that writing was in general more widespread. As a result of this situation there were several changes of orthography to conform with changes of pronunciation: when the suffix ‘his’ changed from [-aḫa] to [-aw], its spelling in Byblos was changed from -h to -w (see ch. 4, no. 30); when the feminine suffix [-at] was replaced by [-â] Phoenician orthography dropped the -t while Hebrew substituted for it the vowel letter -h (for [-â]; see ch. 4, no. 33, 44). Some changes in the orthography may, however, have been delayed, not taking place till some time after the pronunciation had changed: thus, the writing -y in Byblos for final [-aya] may have continued for a century after [-aya] had changed to [-â]. The writing with -y still occurs in the 10th century, but the syncope of the [-y-] had probably taken place some time before; otherwise nos. 32-7 in ch. 4 must be later than the dates assigned to them, and this would considerably complicate the order of linguistic developments in the 10th century. Such preservation of the old spelling is not surprising in royal inscriptions, where we may expect a degree of archaizing and of imitating the style of past generations and past inscriptions. Some historical spellings, chiefly those that made possible the use of a consonant-sign as a vowel letter, were kept permanently:

\(^{24}\) GP 11-7.
-y remained for the first person suffix even after it had changed from [-iya] to [-i]; similarly -w remained for [-əw], and elsewhere -h for [-ə, -ā] < [-ahū, -ahā]. In the word for 'head' the spelling with ’ remained in Phoenician and Hebrew even after [raśu] changed to [rōšu]; but in Punic the form was written rū, in conformance with the consonantal phonemes of the current pronunciation.

The Ugaritic alphabet was also consonantal; in addition to the phonemes represented in the Phoenician alphabet it had signs for [b, t, ٪], probably [y], a Hurrian affricate [צ], and a special [s²]. It also had three signs for [t], ˀ and ˀ, according to the vowel following the [t], or, if none followed, the vowel preceding. In no case are these three signs, or any others, used merely to represent vowels; their presence is nevertheless of value in determining the vocalization of many forms.\textsuperscript{25}

The Amarna correspondence is written in Babylonian, in the cuneiform syllabary. It includes letters, written mostly in the second quarter of the 14th century B.C., from the princes of Syria and Palestine, and from kings of neighboring states, to the king of Egypt, and from the Egyptian court to them. The letters from Canaanite towns include many Canaanisms in syntax, word-forms, and choice of words, as well as purely Canaanite forms written in cuneiform as glosses to explain Akkadian words. The cuneiform writing is important in that it represents vowels as well as consonants, but there were several consonants and vowel phonemes in the Canaanite dialects which the syllabary could not well represent (e.g. the laryngeals and spirants and the vowels o, a), and the syllabic form of writing is sometimes difficult to interpret.


F. Thureau-Dangin, Nouvelles lettres d'el-Amarna, RA 19 (1922) 91-108.

G. Dossin, Une nouvelle lettre d'el-Amarna, RA 31 (1934) 125-36.

C. Gordon, Eight new cuneiform fragments from Tell el Amarna, JEA 20 (1934) 137-8.

W. F. Albright, The Egyptian correspondence of Abimilki, Prince of Tyre, JEA 23 (1937) 190-203.

F. M. Bühler, Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe, Leipziger semitische Studien 5.2 (1909).

E. Ebeling, Das Verbem der El-Amarna-Briefe, Beiträge zur Assyriologie 8.2 (1910) 39-79.

The Hebrew bible is written in the Phoenician alphabet with certain diacritical marks, chiefly one over the š-sign to indicate [š], and a very

\textsuperscript{25}Friedrich, ZDMG 91 (1937) 321 f. and Ex Oriente Lux, Jaarbericht 5 (1937-8) 346-7; H. Bauer, Der Ursprung des Alphabets 38 f., and Die alphabetischen Keilschrifttexte von Ras Shamra 65-7; Harris, Smithsonian Report for 1937. 490-3.
late system of vowel and stress marks based upon the pronunciations which had been preserved in the reading of the bible. The Tiberian system of vowels had signs for [i, e, e, a, o, u] all long and short, and for [ə] (shwa). The many late features in the bible necessitate considerable caution in dealing with its evidence, but it remains far and away the most important source for our knowledge of Canaanite. The official Jerusalem dialect in which it is written may have differed from the actual current speech of the city, but its use in contemporary Hebrew inscriptions, and its similarity to Moabite and other dialects, show that any such difference must have been small. At all events, it was a standard language, not, as some have supposed, an artificial literary language.

Canaanite place-names, personal names, and loan words appear in transcription in several foreign sources. The earliest of these are the Egyptian Achtungstexte of the latter part of the 11th dynasty, c. 2000 B.C., which give Canaanite names in the consonantal orthography of Egyptian.


W. F. Albright, The Egyptian empire in Asia in the 21st century B.C., JPOS 8 (1928) 223-56.

Many other Canaanite forms appear in the lists of captured towns and in various Egyptian literary sources. The lists range from the time of Thotmes III, shortly after 1500 B.C., and on; the references in literary sources begin several centuries earlier. Most of these transcriptions are in the Egyptian syllabic orthography, used for foreign names, which gives some indication of the vowels. The Egyptian transcriptions are particularly valuable because they can represent accurately almost all the emphatics, spirants, sibilants and laryngeals of the Canaanite dialects.

W. F. Albright, The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography (1934).

M. Burchardt, Die alkanananäischen Fremdworte und Eigennamen in Ägyptischen (1909).

J. Simons, Handbook for the study of Egyptian topographical lists relating to Western Asia (1937), with bibliography. (ETL)

Transcriptions of Canaanite names and other words occur in various cuneiform records, especially in the Assyrian royal annals and in Neo-Babylonian letters. While subject to the corrections noted above for the Amarna material, they are particularly valuable for the representation of vowels.
The most important sources are those noted in GP 4 fn. 18.

The many late transcriptions in Greek and Latin sources are also valuable chiefly in that vowels are indicated. Particularly interesting are the early loan-words, especially the names of the alphabet signs which were probably taken into Greek before the 10th century B.C. (see ch. 4, no. 37 and fn. 59).

The most important sources are those noted in GP 5, fn. 20 and GP 3 fn. 13; also transcriptions in the Septuagint translation of the bible and the transcription of the Hebrew biblical text into Greek by Origen:

E. A. Speiser, The pronunciation of Hebrew based chiefly on the transliterations in the Hexapla, JQR 16 (1926) 343-82, 23 (1933) 233-65, 24 (1933) 9-46.
A. Sperber, Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin transcriptions, Hebrew Union College Annual 1937-8. 163-274.
H. M. Orlinsky, The columnar order of the Hexapla, JQR 27 (1936) 137-49.

The interpretation of these transcriptions is on safer ground than in the other cases, for the contemporary pronunciation of the Greek and Latin, and the phonetic values of the letters of their alphabets, are much better known: cf. E. H. Sturtevant, Pronunciation of Greek and Latin; R. G. Kent, the Sounds of Latin.
CHAPTER 4

LIST OF LINGUISTIC CHANGES

Where Ya’udi is not specifically excepted, “Phoenician” is here understood to include it as certain, if evidence from Ya’udi is given, or as probable, if there is no such evidence. However, in the absence of evidence, the similarity of Ya’udi and Phoenician in any particular feature can not be taken as certain. The same holds for “Hebrew” as probably including North and South Palestine unless these are specifically distinguished.

The dates 1500 and 1365 are used as cliche dates for evidence based upon the Ugaritic and Amarna material respectively.

The inscriptions and other texts from which the evidence is drawn are cited here:

EA — Amarna letters in Knudtzon, see ch. 3.5. (Syria and Palestine, c.1365)
Gezer — Gezer calendar, see ch. 3.4 under South Palestine (South Palestine 9th-10th cent.)
Hamat — Zakir stele, see ch. 3.4. (Hamat-La’aš 9th cent.)
Hebrew words and forms — masoretic text of bible, or GB; see ch. 3.4.
Lachish — Lachish letters, see ch. 3.4 under Jerusalem. (Jerusalem 6th cent.)
Moab — Meša stele, see ch. 3.4. (Moab 9th cent.)
Phoenician and Ya’udi words and forms — as given in the Phoenician Glossary in GP; see ch. 3.4.
Samaria — Samaria ostraca in Diringer, see ch. 3.4 under North Palestine (North Palestine 9th cent.)
Siloa — Siloa inscription, see ch. 3.4 under Jerusalem (Jerusalem 700)
Ugarit — citations of texts as listed in ch. 3.4. (Ugarit 16th-15th cent.)
Ya’udi — Kilamu inscription, see ch. 3.4. (Ya’udi 9th cent.)

For further abbreviations, used for books containing Canaanite linguistic material, see p. 101-2 below.

1. [ay]>[ê]; [aw]>[ô].

PLACE: Ugaritic—qî [qêtu] < [qayṭu] ‘summer’ (D 4 i 5); bt [bētu-] < [baytu-] ‘house (est.)’ (IIÅB v 73; bt abs. IIÅB iv 62); ybn [yubnê] < [yubnay] (juss.) ‘let there be built’ (IIÅB iv 62).
Phoenician—bt [bētu] (Ya’udi 16); gi-e-zî [qēṣî] < [qayṭi] (Byblos EA 131.15); wygl [wa(y)yiglê] (juss.) ‘and if he uncover’ (By-

¹Unless otherwise indicated, all dates given here are B.C.
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blos 13th cent.); 1, b (Byblos 11th cent.); hi-na-ia ['ënayya] < ['aynayya] 'my eyes' (Sidon EA 144.17).

North Palestine—l(i-e)l [lāl] < [layl] 'night' (not est.; Megiddo EA 243.13); bū s'r (est.) 'Beth-shan' (Voc. VI B 7, 17, 18; 15th cent.); yēn [yên] < [yanu] 'wine' (Samaria; although of unknown origin [yanu] is the only form from which both this and Hebrew [yāyin] could develop, if, as is probable, they go back to one form in early Canaanite).

South Palestine—n [tānu] < [yanu] 'well' and bū [bētu] (est.) in Eg. lists (Voc. V B, VI B 6, 8, ETL I 113); qṣ [qēs] (absolute; Gezer 7).

Moabite—iḥh [lēlah] 'at night' (15); mētn [miˈtēn] < [miˈtāˈyna] 'two hundred’ (20); wbbth 'in his house’ (?), but bbyth (25) and s'rēh 'its gate’ (22; y irregular plene spelling for [e]?).

Different conditions in Jerusalem Hebrew—see below.

TIME: Before 1500 B.C. since it appears in the Ugaritic texts, and in early Egyptian transcriptions.

CONDITIONS: In early Semitic, diphthongs were phonologically vowel + syllable-closing [y] or [w]; as such they were always either final or followed by the consonant which began the next syllable: [bāytu]. Since every syllable in early Semitic began with a consonant, intervocalic [y] and [w] must be considered phonologically as hetero-syllabic, not making a diphthong, but rather beginning the next syllable: [bāytiya] ‘of my house.’ In Canaanite, diphthongs were monophthongized in all positions, accented and unaccented, medial and final, except when another [y] or [w] followed; thus [ḥayyīm] ‘life,’ [ḥayyē] ‘life (est.),’ [taw] < [tawwā] ‘mark,’ all remained in Phoenician and Hebrew. The diphthongs [iy], [uw] in medial position had been monophthongized in pre-Canaanite times (BH G I 17 d).

New diphthongs arose later in final position, all of which, with the exception of the last group, were later monophthongized: a) when [h] was elided in the 3rd person suffixes in Hebrew, Byblos, and Moabite: [-ahū] > [-aw], somewhat later > [-ā]; 2 b) when [y] was elided between short unstressed vowels, and the 3rd person m. sg. suffix of Phoenician, excluding Byblos, changed: [-iyā] > [iy] (?), later > [-ā] (?); c) when final short vowels were dropped, and [-iya] and [-uwa], the only cases where [y] and [w] between short vowels had not been elided, became [-iy] and [-uw], later [-ā] and [-ū]; 4 d) when final double

* See no. 30 below.  * See no. 29.  * See no. 35.
consonants were reduced: [taww] > [taw] ‘mark,’ [hayy] > [hay] ‘alive.’ In Jerusalem the new [-ay] was treated like other diphthongs: diphthongal when accented, reduced when unaccented, thus [hay], [he].

The new [-aw], however, seems to have been preserved in all conditions, both in Hebrew and Phoenician, as in [taw], [qaw] ‘line.’

The continued monophthongization of new diphthongs was determined by the phonetic structure of Canaanite: since diphthongs did not exist in these dialects, new ones were reduced as they arose. The preservation of the last-mentioned group of [-aw]-diphthongs seems therefore to involve a change in this feature of the phonetic structure.

DIVERGENT CONDITIONS: In Jerusalem Hebrew, unaccented diphthongs were monophthongized as throughout Canaanite, but accented diphthongs remained: [beytu], but cist. [bethu]; [enayma] < [aynayma] ‘eyes,’ [maletu], but cist. [moteu] ‘death,’ [hoseba] < [hawsiba] ‘he restored’ (when the second vowel was [i] and therefore stressed). When the stress shift took place, diphthongs which lost the stress were monophthongized: [mawtya] > [mitya] > [mif]. In the nifal verb, the monophthongization could not take place until the verb stress shift: [nawda'a] > [nawda'] > [nawda'] > [noda] ‘it became known.’ This was also true of those hifil verb forms which did not have [i] in the second syllable, e.g., the infinitive absolute: the Assyrian transcription a-u-si’ (III Rawlinson 10.2.28) [hawshi], later > [hoshaw], shows the form before the verb stress shift, or in any event before the reduction of the diphthong. This will explain the biblical Hebrew forms, except for the absolute nouns of type [heq] ‘bosom,’ [yom] ‘day,’ which may be due to analogy of the construct forms, or to borrowing from Hebrew dialects where the monophthongization had been complete (cf. the possibly dialectal [lal] in Jes. 21.11, variant to [layl] ‘night.’

Later, after final short vowels were dropped, and the medial diphthongs came to be in doubly closed syllables, they were pronounced as two syllables; [bait] > [bait]; [enayim] > [enayim]; [mawt] > [mawt]. This was part of the late general tendency to break final consonant clusters by anaptyctic (“segolate”) vowels. Final diphthongs remained: [matay] ‘when.’

Bergsträsser’s complicated account of the Jerusalem Hebrew conditions

---

8 See no. 59.
9 To say that [hay] is absolute and [he] construct necessitates the assumption of an analogic extension of [hay] before divine names to account for the alteration in the masoretic biblical text. In any case, [he] arose in unstressed position. Cf. BL 204, GB.
10 See no. 51.
for this change, and his considerable recourse to later analogic forma-
tions, is rendered unnecessary as soon as the change is considered in
terms of the conditions which obtained at the time it occurred, namely
when final short vowels were still pronounced. He lists this change as
taking place after Amarna times, but there is direct evidence that it
was before Amarna, and before 1500.

It has been suggested that this divergence of Jerusalem Hebrew is a
later development, that Jerusalem had originally gone with the rest of
Canaanite, but that later foreign influences caused a restoration of the
diphthongs in some cases. Such new formations, extending from loan-
words which might have come to Jerusalem from a dialect where diph-
thongs had been preserved, would indeed be possible. However, the
fact that the diphthong does not occur in some special group of words
or in some morphologic class, but can be explained as having been pre-
served in one phonetic environment (stress), argues for a regular phonetic
development. The probability is therefore that when this change first
spread in Canaanite there were some areas, specifically Jerusalem, in
which stress was a deciding factor for its occurrence.

Note: In the accompanying chart, 1a refers to the monophthongization
of unstressed diphthongs, 1b to the monophthongization of stressed
diphthongs.

2. Dropping of mimation.

Place: Ugaritic—-m does not appear in indefinite singular nouns; the
occasional non-plural -m which does appear is usually the conjunc-
tion [-ma], which also occurs after verbs and pronouns: ysq-m lrbbt
‘and he cast tens of thousands’ (IIAB i 28-9); dt-m brṣ ‘and that
of gold’ (IIAB vi 37-8; MH 107).

Phoenician—-m in the singular does not appear: ‘rn ‘sarcophagus’;
mīl bmlkm ‘any king, a king among kings’ (both Byblos 13th
cent.).

Palestine—no regular mimation in the Amarna letters, the Egyptian
and Akkadian transcriptions of names, or the biblical text (but see
below).

Moabite—no mimation.

Time: The earliest Egyptian transcriptions show mimation in Canaanite
names: 3wš3mm for Urušalimum, later [y-rušālēm] (Ächtungstexte f 18

* BHG i 17 g, h. His closed syllable is really a doubly closed syllable (cluster
of [y] or [w] + following consonant); but this did not arise till long after
[yral] > [e] had taken place, and is hence irrelevant to that change.

* BL 22-3.
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p. 53; Albright, JPOS 8 (1928) 234, 247; Voc. 7 fn. 13). Hebrew has preserved a few forms with [əm] (BL 529 y, where the suggested connection with the dropping of case endings must be rejected on chronological grounds). It is therefore clear that mimation was dropped within the history of Canaanite, and that the time was after 1800 (Egyptian transcriptions above) and before 1500 (Ugaritic texts).

3. New formation of Iw-like preterite, jussive, and imperative of hlk.

Place: Ugaritic—tlk ‘they flowed’ (IAB iii 7); əlk ‘that I may go’ (D 1.194); ək ‘go’ (D 3 i 17); but hlk ‘they are gone’ (K 94).

Hebrew—[lək] ‘go’; but [hələk] ‘he went.’

Moabite—lk ‘go’ (14).10

Time: Before 1500. This is a common Canaanite change, not found in Aramaic; it may have taken place in these dialects before they came to Syria-Palestine. The new forms without [h] spread through the old verbal classes: preterite, jussive, imperative, and infinitive; but they did not spread to the perfect, which at that time was not closely associated with the tenses, being as yet a nominal conjugation. Later, when a similar new formation spread in Ugaritic and Phoenician through the preformative tenses of the root ntn, the new form spread also to the perfect, which must by that time have been much closer to the tense group.

Conditions: The conditions which led to the new formation of the forms without [h], and to the replacement by them of the old forms, are as yet unknown. The commonly accepted explanation given by Praetorius, ZAW 2 (1881) 310-2, that in the hifil the hlk forms were similar to the Iw verbs ([hɔlîk] < [hâlâka] < [hâhlâka], similar to [hɔsîb] < [hâwšâba]), and that the analogy spread from that point, is now inadmissible; for this new formation antedates [Â] > [ô], and in Ugaritic the causative of hlk could not have had [ô], while the causative of Iw verbs did.

4. Merging of [ʃ] with [ʃ].

Place: Ugaritic—same alphabetic sign for etymological [ʃ] and [ʃ]: yšm ‘he heard’ (IAB iv 8), šmnh ‘heavenward’ (SS 38; etymological [ʃ]); šd ‘field’ (IAB ii 30), š ‘sheep’ (I*AB i 14), šnh ‘he rejoiced’ (IAB iii 14; etymological [ʃ]).

Phoenician and parts of Palestine—same alphabetic sign: šm ‘hear,’ šmn ‘heavens’; šd ‘field,’ š ‘sheep.’ Early Egyptian transcriptions show š for etymological [ʃ]: bšmwt [abî-šîmû] (Byblos c. 1800),11

10 See no. 54.

11 Albright, JPOS 8 (1928) 226.
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and for etymological [ṣ]: *ḥšš [abl-šarru] (if it is Phoenician; 5th dynasty). Later Egyptian transcriptions also have ṣ for etymological [ṣ]: *gΔš [qadišu] (Burchardt 953; ETL 1, c. 1475; XXXVI 14, c. 7th cent.); but a clear case of Ph. etymological [ṣ] is lacking. The Amarna transcriptions too have ṣ for Ph. etymological [ṣ]: ʾš-e-ti ‘hour’ (Byblos EA 138. 76), ša-mi-te ‘I heard’ (Byblos, RA 19 (1922) 91. 5), ša-me-ma ‘heavens’ (S. Pal. EA 264. 16), la-ki-ši ‘Lachish’ (S. Pal. EA 335. 10); but there is no clear case of etymological [ṣ].

Not in Jerusalem—Earliest Egyptian transcriptions are hard to interpret on this score: ʾšwšmm ‘Jerusalem’ (Achtungstexte f 18) where later Jerusalem Hebrew had š; ʾš’nw (ibid., Albricht: ‘Cleaver,’ from later Hebrew root šš). The Amarna letters from Jerusalem have s for etymological [ṣ]: ʾu-ru-sa-lim ‘Jerusalem’ (EA 287. 25, 289. 14), biš-sa-a-mi ‘Beth-shan’ (EA 289. 20), la-ki-si ‘Lachish’ (EA 288. 43); but they have š for etymological [ṣ]: ʾš-š-e-ri ‘field’ (EA 287. 50), perhaps še-e-ri ‘Seir’ (EA 288. 26). Later Egyptian transcriptions have š for etymological [ṣ]: ysrʾr ‘Israel’ (Voc. III B 3), saʾ-ša-ra-ta ‘hair’ (Voc. V A 13). Finally, the masonic distinction of the š-sign as representing variously two late Jerusalem phonemes [š] and [s], and the occasional late confusions of spelling between š (šin) and s (samek), a confusion which never arises in words with [š], shows that [š] (later > [š]) and [š] were distinct in Jerusalem.

TIME: If ḥšš is Phoenician, then the shift is perhaps before the second millennium. In any case, it took place in Ugaritic before 1500, and in

---

12 Mueller, MVAG 1912 no. 3, p. 62; Albricht, JPOS 8 (1928) 255 fn.
13 Note di-ša-š-ga ‘Damascus’ (Byblos EA 107. 28; also EA 53. 63, 197. 21), where biblical Hebrew has usually š((š)), once (Amos 3. 12) š. However, the sign šš also has the value as: F. Thureau-Dangin, Le syllabaire accadien (1926) no. 167.
14 JPOS 8 (1928) 248. Albricht’s suggestion that the name of Jerusalem appears here not in the Jerusalem pronunciation of the sibilant, but in the general Canaanite, is rather difficult to accept. It should further be noted that the etymology of ʾštnw is uncertain. Egyptian š for later Hebrew [š] appears also in ʾšqtnw ‘Ascalon’ (Achtungstexte f 15), but this is not specifically from Jerusalem, and the original sibilant in the name is unknown.
15 See Burchardt §107 for possible additional cases. The variation of ššk (ETL I 67, 13th cent.) and ššk (ETL XXXIV 38, 10th cent.), both probably biblical šššš, cannot be used here because the etymology is unknown, and because of the šš variation.
16 BHG 16 s: BL 114-6. In Phoenician the indications are that the š-sign always represented [š] (GP 22).
Phoenician before the borrowing of the alphabet by the Greeks (at which time it had no ə-sign), and probably before the Amarna period. There is no evidence that the Phoenician or Ugaritic alphabets ever had a sign for [s].

**Conditions:** It is difficult to determine what were the phonetic facts of this change, and the qualities of the two sibilants. But the evidence above suffices to show that the two phonemes coincided throughout most of the Canaanite area, while in Jerusalem (and other parts of the area?) they remained distinct, the [s] eventually coinciding with the [s] (samek). The Amarna evidence shows that this distinction existed in Jerusalem before the coming of the Habiru, and at a time when the rest of Canaanite had already but one phoneme for the two.

5. **Merging of [d̪] with [s].**

**Place:** Ugaritic—ărš ['arš] < ['arq-] ‘earth’ (IAB iii 9); root shq < ḍḥq ‘glad’ (IAB iii 16); y̱š < root wḏ ‘come out’ (so South Arabic, Ethiopic; cf. Aram. mwq’, y”; IIIAB 6, D 1.75). But Ugaritic text BH writes the reflex of [d̪] with the sign for [t̠]: y̱ḥq (BH i 12); ḫl (inv. f. sg. root wḏ; BH i 14, 19); wmt̠t ‘and he found’ (BH i 37, ii 51-2; probably same root as in ymšt IIAB v 5).

Phoenician (including Ḫa’udī)—ṛṣ ['ars-]; ḣṣ.

Hebrew—[ēreš]; [yāšā] (no evidence for distinct [d̪] from Eg. transcriptions).

**Time:** The Phoenician and Hebrew evidence for words with etymological [d̪] is not very early; however, in the absence of indications to the contrary, we may assume that at least in Phoenician the change took place at about the same time as in Ugaritic. The variation in text BH probably indicates that the merging of the two phonemes in Ugaritic was recent; in any case the writer of BH seems to have come from an area of speakers among whom the phoneme [d̪] still existed and was, for lack of a sign, represented by the sign for [t̠].

6. **Merging of [d] with [t].**

**Place:** Ugaritic—d [dā] < [ḏā] ‘the one who, the one of’ in d-mlk (IIAB iii 9), d-tšm’ (1933.2.17; see in Ginsberg, The Ugarit

---

17 The suggestion that the Ugarite sign ʾ represented [s] in the Semitic texts yields no results, see Harris, JAOS 55 (1935) 97. Guerinot in Syria 19 (1938) 39-40 revives this suggestion with practically no admissible etymologies in its support. See also no. 13.

18 The alternative explanation would be that in the dialect of BH too the phoneme [d] no longer existed, but that here it had merged with [t].
Texts; and MH, glossary); ḏḥ < root ḏḥ ‘sacrifice’ (IIAB i 44); ḏḥ < root ḏḥ ‘make’ (IAB ii 22). In Ugaritic text Nk (which uses the [t̂]-sign for [t̂]) the god-name ū ḏplḏ is written ū ḏplḏ (with the Hurrian affricate-sign ū). If, as is probable, this ḏ represents the relative (< [dū]), the Nk writing would indicate that in some part of the Ugaritic area the spirant [d] was still a separate phoneme which was here represented by ū, since standard Ugaritic, not having the phoneme, had no sign for it. The case is similar to that of [t̂].

Not in the rest of known Canaanite—see below.

**TIME:** Before the Ugaritic texts, but perhaps, on the evidence above, very little before that time.

7. **Merging of [d] with [z].**

**PLACE:** Phoenician—z [zū] < [dū] ‘the one who’ (Byblos 13th-11th cent.); ṣḥ < root ḏḥ ‘sacrifice.’

Hebrew—[zū] ‘the one which’; [zēhaḥ] ‘sacrifice’ (no evidence for distinct [d] from the Eg. transcriptions).

Moabite—z’t (6), from a Semitic form with [d].

**TIME:** This change may have taken place at about the same time as Ugaritic [d] > [t], or perhaps, especially in Palestine, somewhat later. There was thus a loss of the [d] phoneme throughout the Canaanite area, but its merging was divergent in Ugaritic as compared with the rest of the area.

8. **-[a]- >-[e]-.**

**PLACE:** Ugaritic—rīš [ rápό] < [rāš] ‘head’ (I* AB vi 15); tīkl [tēkulu] < [tākulu] ‘she ate’ (IAB ii 35); but [yqra"] (ygrrḥ), [ra’āšima] (rašm), [tīššā”u] (tšה) remained unchanged.

Not in Phoenician and Hebrew—[-a"] remained, and later changed to [ā] (> [ā] when stressed; see no. 17).

**TIME:** Before the Ugaritic texts.

**CONDITIONS:** When the [ ] was of the same syllable as the vowel, and in medial position (Harris, A conditioned sound change in Ras Shamra, JAOS 57 (1937) 151-7; Goetze, JAOS 58 (1938) 302-3).

---

*See no. 12.

9. **New formation of ytn forms from ntn ‘give.’**

**Place:** Ugaritic—ṣtn ‘I shall give’ (K 206, Nk 22); yntn ‘I have given’ (IAB vi 15).

Phoenician—preterite and jussive ia-di-nu (EA 105.85), ya-di-en (Byblos EA 113.32), yi-din-ni (Sidon EA 144.26) all for Ph. [yatin-]; ytn ‘he gave’ (Cyprus 9th cent., Sidon 4th); also in Ya’udi ytn, if it is in the perfect (GP 108).

Not in Palestine—yi-id-din (North Palestine EA 248.11); ti-id-di-in-na (Megiddo EA 344.19); but ya-di-(in) (South Palestine EA 337.13); ntn n. pr. in the Samaria ostraca (45), and in Palestine seals (Diringer 191-2); root ntn in biblical Hebrew.

**Time:** The change was completed in Ugarit before 1500, and in Phoenicia before the Amarna period. (Amarna has only the preterite-imperfect; there is no early evidence for the perfect, where ytn forms may not have developed till somewhat later). The fact that the ytn formations developed also in the perfect implies that the perfect had by this time become more closely associated with the verb forms (see no. 3).

**Conditions:** The original form of the root in Phoenician was ntn, as is seen in the noun [mattōn] < [mantānu], cp. Latin transcriptions such as Mutun (GP glossary, under ytn). The Iyw forms are therefore new formations, and probably arose upon the analogy of Iw verbs. This analogy is based upon the similarity of the imperative in In and Iw verbs. For the regular imperative of ntn was [tin], as the imperative of ngs ‘approach’ (ipf. [yiggaš]) was [gaš] (BHG II 25 e). The imperative of Iw verbs with [i]-imperfect was similar: [ṭib] ‘sit’ to ipf. [yaṭibu] and pf. [yaṭaba]. The new ipf. and pf. forms of ntn must have arisen on this analogy [ṭib]: [yaṭibu]: [yaṭaba]: [tin]: [yatinu] (replacing [yattinu] < [yantinu]): [yatana] (replacing [nata]a); the formation of this new preterite-imperfect [yatinu] may have been facilitated by its similarity to the phonetically regular [yattinu] in whose place it arose. These new formations were favored over the old, and finally replaced them, because they fell in with a more regular Canaanite pattern: As a result of the recessive character of the [i]-vowel in preterite-imperfect, ntn had remained the only In verb (or one of very few) with [i] in imperfect and imperative. Thus [yattinu] had come to be, descriptively, an irregular formula in the language, and the relation of an imperative like [tin] with In forms like [nata]a was unique, whereas when related to Iyw forms ([yatana]) it was a member of a type which was regular, since in Iyw verbs the [i]-imperfects had remained (GP 44).

It should be noted that these new forms did not spread to Palestine, although the same conditions prevailed there as well.
10. Fem. sg. ending [-atu] replaced by [-tu].

**Place:** Phoenician—še-ti [šātî] ‘hour’ (Byblos EA 138. 76); kāth [kaštihtu] if ‘for his sleep’ < [šintihu] (Byblos 13th cent.); šī [šat(t)] < [šantu] ‘year’; lmt [almat(t)] < [almantu] ‘widow’ (Sidon); Χωραπῆς [kōsārt], fem. of [kōsūr].

North Palestine—šī [šatt] ‘year’ (Samaria ostraca).

South Palestine dialects—la-bi-tu [labittu] < [labintu] ‘brick’ (EA 296. 17).

Moabite—št [šatt] (8).

Not in Ugaritic of 1500—almant [‘almannatu] (K 97; the [-n-] would have assimilated if the [-t-] had followed directly; cp. mpīm IIAB i 24 from root npī); bšnīth [bišintihtu] ‘in his sleep’ (D 1. 151); mmīt [munallit-] participle ‘filled’ (K 114). But in certain forms the suffix is [-tu]: mlē [mit-] ‘hundred’ (1929. 23. 9; cp. plural māt [mi-] K 89); lbīt [labīti] ‘lions’ (1*AB i 14).


**Time:** Probably before Amarna times, in view of the EA examples. At the time that some Palestinian dialect had [labittu], Jerusalem probably had [labinatu] (the masoretic reflex of which is [lēbenâ]). We cannot tell whether the change took place before 1500 and did not reach Ugarit, or whether it was later and may have reached Ugarit after the time of our texts.

**Conditions:** It seems impossible to explain the alternation of [-atu/-tu] within various languages on phonetic grounds; it is therefore best to assume, not that [-a-] was elided in [-atu] in certain conditions, but that Proto-Semitic had two suffixes [-tu] and [-atu], alternating in different morphologic groups or phonetic environments, and that these were variously extended at each other’s expense in various Semitic dialects. Such levelling, based in each case upon various analogies, may have been much earlier than our existing texts. In masoretic Hebrew, the alternation may be partly the result of dialectal borrowing, especially in the case of certain morphologic groups such as the infinitives [rādā/rēdēt] ‘to descend’ (cp. H. Holzinger, Einleitung 190). The occurrence of [-tu] forms in the construct case in Hebrew, as against [-atu] forms in the absolute is an important variation, but is by no means regular, so that the attempt of Bauer and Leander (BL 507-9) to
explain the Hebrew alternation on this basis can hardly be accepted.
In any event, their suggestion that nouns in the construct always had
the [-at] form, since they never had case-endings, is untenable, because
the Ugaritic evidence shows that early Canaanite had case-endings in
the construct.21


**Place**: Phoenician (including Ya'udi)—kt [kattî] < [kantî] ‘I was’
(Ya'udi); mlt [mattattî] < [mantant-] ‘gift’ (Ur 7th cent.);
gett [yatatti] < [yatanti] ‘I gave’ (Cyprus 3rd cent.).
Not in Hebrew—[yâšântî] ‘I slept,’ etc. [nâtattî] ‘I gave’ is the only
case of such assimilation in Hebrew, but here it must be a special
dissimilation from the 1st-radical [n], independent of the other
IIIn roots. Such a special change would not occur in the ytn root
in Phoenician and Ugaritic, where there is no 1st-radical [n].

**Time**: If it is a restoration of assimilated [n] in Ugaritic and Hebrew,
it must be before 1500. If it is an assimilation in Phoenician of an
originally unassimilated [n], it must have been before the 9th century,
but was perhaps as early as the original assimilation of [n] in Proto-
Canaanite. (In the latter case, if it was a later assimilation, it may
have spread to Ugarit after 1500, and therefore would not appear in
our texts.)

**Conditions**: There are two different chains of linguistic events which
may be assumed, in order to account for this difference in treatment
of 3rd-radical [n] in verbs. The one, which is perhaps simpler, is to
assume that the Proto-Canaanite assimilation of [n] to following conso-
nant 22 occurred wherever that one condition was satisfied, hence also
in 3rd-radical [n]. Later, however, the verbal forms with assimilated
3rd-radical [n] were replaced by new formations with restored [n], on
the analogy of other forms of the root in which the [n] had not assim-
ilated (e.g. [yatattî] replaced by [yatanti] on the analogy of [yatan-]).
Such analogic replacements must have occurred before 1500, since they
appear in Ugarit. They never spread to Phoenician, which on this
explanation would retain the direct reflexes of the proto-Canaanite assim-
ilated forms. The other possible chain involves the assumption that when
in Proto-Canaanite [n] was assimilated to following consonants, that
change did not occur in 3rd-radical position in verbs; it is, however,
hard to say what phonetic peculiarity there was to this stem-final position

21 See no. 14.
22 See chapter 2.5.
which prevented [n] in this one position from assimilating when all other post-consonantal [n] did. At all events, if this was the case, the forms of Ugaritic and Hebrew would go back to this unassimilated [n] in Proto-Canaanite, while in Phoenician the assimilation would have taken place in the 3rd-radical of verbs also, either at the same time as the Proto-Canaanite assimilation (the different treatment of 3rd-radical [n] forming an isogloss then), or else as a special change of 3rd-radical [n] some time later but before the 9th century.

12. Merging of [t] with [s].

PLACE: Phoenician—ḥṣr < ḫtr ‘courtyard’ (for this root as against ḫdr ‘village’ see Orlinsky, JAOS 59 (1939) 22-37); nṣr < mtr ‘guard.’


TIME: Perhaps not long after 1500. While the Phoenician and Hebrew evidence for words with [t] does not happen to be early, it is probable that the loss of phonemic distinction of [t] (by merging with [s]) occurred not very long after the analogous loss of the [q] phoneme. Ugaritic still has a separate sign for this phoneme in 1500: ḫt ‘courtyard’ (IIAB v 63), qṭ ‘summer’ (D 4 i 5, Nk 2, 17); but in one text, Nk, this sign is used both for [t] and [q]: ḥṃ ‘pure’ (Nk 21), elsewhere ḥmr (IIAB v 81). This may be evidence of an incipient or dialectal merging of [t] and [q] (compare Ugaritic merging of [q] with [d]; but [q] with [s] in Ugaritic). If the Phoenician name [ṣr] ‘Tyre’ contained an original [t], that sound may have existed late enough to be reflected in the Greek Ῥῆσος, undoubtedly taken over at a very early time; however, the [t] of the Greek form may be the effect of a non-Semitic language through which the name of Tyre first reached the Greeks (see Friedrich, ZS 1 (1922) 12; GP 20 n. 3).

13. Merging of [t] with [s], [ḥ] with [h], [y] with [ʒ].


Not in Hebrew (Palestine) till much later, see no. 39 below.

Distinct phonemes in Ugaritic of 1500: mtṣṭ ‘rule’ (IAB vi 29), ṣm ‘hear’ (IIAB vi 4); ḥ ‘brother’ (IAB ii 12), ḫṭ ‘court’ (IIAB v 63); γlm ‘youth, servant’ (IAB vi 8), etc., ｒṭ ‘be
hungry’ (Heb. ṛb; IIAB iv 33). Two cases of Ugaritic [t] for Semitic [γ] may be special dissimilations because of [r]: ‘ṛb ‘enter’ (SS 62; 1929. 9. 9; so also South Arabic) < Sem. γṛb, bγr ‘burn’ (IIAB iv 16) < Sem. bγr. The γ-sign also represents the Ugaritic reflex of a Semitic sound which appears in Arabic as [z] (Sem. and Ugar. [t] also appear in Arabic as [z]): nγr ‘guard’ (SS 68, 1938b 8) = Arab. nzd.

**TIME**: After 1500, at least for Ugarit, and before 13th century. In view of the lack of earlier Phoenician evidence, we cannot tell if it may not have occurred in Phoenicia even before 1500, without reaching Ugarit till later. It is also quite possible that the change of [t] may have begun earlier than the others: [t] may have changed to a voiceless sibilant (some sound of [s]-type) not much after [d] changed to the voiceless sibilant [z] (see no. 7 above). However, even if the two changed together, the phonemic effects were not the same, for when [d] > [z] it coincided with the [z] phoneme, whereas the sibilant reflex of [t] remained a separate phoneme (different from Sem. [s]), and only later (after 1500) > [ז] and so coincided with that phoneme.23

14. Dropping of case endings in the construct state.

**PLACE**: Phoenician—Maλξαρθ [malqart] < [malk-qārti] < [malku qārti] ‘King of the city,’ a divine title. Hebrew—[bêt-mêlek] < [bêt-malki] < [baytu malki] ‘king’s house.’

Case endings in the construct state were still pronounced in Ugarit in the 15th century—nominative: ḫsṭ tḥḥ [kussa’u tḥḥ] ‘the throne on which he sits’ (IIAB viii 12), snu ḫd [sani’u håddi] ‘the enemy of Haddu’ (IIAB vii 36); accusative: lyhpk ḫsṭ mlkk [luyâhpiku kussa’a múlkikå] ‘he will surely overturn your royal throne’ (IIAB vi 28); genitive: ḫstlb [likussa’îhsu] ‘from his throne’ (IIAB 12), bnšt ‘nh [binašâ’î ‘ñnhu] ‘at the raising of his eyes’ (IIAB ii 12, D 1. 76, 120); see Friedrich, ZA 41 (1933) 309-10; Ginsberg, Tarbiz 4 (1933) 381.

**TIME**: There is no certain evidence that case endings were dropped in the construct state earlier than in the absolute; the Phoenician and Hebrew evidence merely show that they were lost in both positions. The Amarna letters have case endings in the absolute in Canaanite nouns;24 but there is no certain evidence there for nouns in construct state, so that comparison cannot be made. However, Egyptian transcriptions (of the 19th dynasty) show no indications of final vowel after construct

23 Cp. Friedrich, ZS 2 (1923) 2-5 on t, t, d.
24 Dhorme, RB 11 (1914) 347-8.
nouns whereas they often do after absolute nouns (Burchardt § 173); this may well show that case endings in the construct had already been dropped before this time. Akkadian furnishes a parallel, having lost them in the construct much earlier than in the absolute. Bergsträsser’s explanation of the assimilation of [’] in forms like [ra’su] (see no. 15 below) presupposes the dropping of case endings in the construct earlier than in the absolute and earlier than 1365. However, his attribution of this loss in the construct to the Proto-Northwest Semitic period is wrong, since Ugaritic still had the endings.

CONDITIONS: This change should be understood as the dropping of short vowels in a specific position, namely at the end of the first element of compound (single-stress-unit) words. In this it differs from the conditions of the dropping of final short vowels (including case endings in the absolute), which took place later. The argument of Bauer and Leander (BL 523 c) that there were no case endings in the construct as far back as Proto-Semitic, and that their presence in Arabic is a late extension, is controverted by the existence of these endings in Ugaritic; note also traces of case endings in the construct in Hebrew (GK 251-4; BL 525-6).

15. [Ca'C] > [CâC].

PLACE: Phoenician—[rôš] < [râš] < [ra’s] ‘head,’ early spelling rš, later (Punic) rš.

Hebrew—[rôš], as above, spelled rš; ru-šu-nu [rōšunu] ‘our head’ (EA 264.18); zu-ú-nu [gônu] ‘sheep’ (EA 263.12; both letters from Palestine).

Egyptian transcriptions from Palestine-Syria have rš in the place-name rśqdš (early 15th cent. and early 12th cent.: Voc. X C 9, ETL, I 48, XXVII 108); but also rśqdš, explained by Albright as a Canaanite back-formation [ro’ôš] on the analogy of the plural where the [’] had remained (13th cent.: Voc. III E 6).

TIME: Before 1365, since it underlies the two Amarna forms; before the change of [á] > [â], which is also involved in these two forms; but, if Bergsträsser’s explanation holds (see below), after the dropping of case endings in construct nouns. The Egyptian evidence would indicate that it occurred before 1475, but it may well have taken place at different times, and perhaps independently, in different areas; in Ugarit it probably never occurred, in view of the [a’] > [e’] in these forms.

BH G I 21 e.

See no. 17.

See no. 35.
The late form ba-’li-ra-’si, a Phoenician place-name in Assyrian transcription (9th century), seems to represent a small dialect in which [‘] had not yet assimilated in this position (GP 90, 31).

CONDITIONS: Bergsträsser’s explanation (BHG I 15 b) is that [‘] was assimilated to the preceding vowel in the doubly closed syllables which were formed when these nouns in the construct state lost their case endings; 20 on the analogy of these [‘]-less constructs, e.g., [rōṣ] < [ra’s], new forms arose elsewhere, e.g., absolute [rōṣu] (replacing [rāṣu]). This analogic new formation would account for Amarna [šōnu] and [rōṣunû] above, where there was no doubly closed syllable. Some such complicated reconstruction is necessary, for [‘] was not lost in other positions at this period. 21


PLACE: Jerusalem (and throughout Hebrew?)—[‘et], [‘et] accusative element; [‘ōg] ‘me,’ etc.; ‘t in Lachish letters (2. 2, etc.).
Moabite—‘t (bnh ‘t yhš ‘he built Y.’ 18-9).
Not in Phoenician—‘yt [‘iyāt] < [‘iyāti] (Byblos 5th cent., etc.),
as against ‘t [‘itt] < [‘itti] associative element (Byblos 5th cent., etc.); see GP 63.
Not in Hamat—wbn‘yt ‘yt . . . ‘ and I built . . . ’ (10).

TIME: Perhaps before [á] > [ó]: [‘iyāti-] > [‘āti-] > [‘ōti-]; certainly before the 9th century (Moabite).

CONDITIONS: The history of elision of [y, w] between vowels is not yet entirely clear. It is therefore hard to tell whether or not we have here some special development in the history of this word. In any case, the [y] was preserved in the north; in the south the change in this word may have been part of the early elision of [y, w] after short vowels and before long vowels (BHG I 17 m). This accusative particle was probably stressed before (objective) pronominal suffixes, unstressed before nouns. Later on, the southern [‘āti] was reduced in proclitic (unstressed) position, eventually yielding [‘et].

17. [á] > [ó]. 22

PLACE: Phoenician—bi-‘a-ru-tu, bi-ru-la (early 15th cent. and on: Voc. X C 4, 5), 7be-ru-la (EA 101. 25) [bi’rōt] < [bi’rātu] ‘Beirut (lit. wells)’; lu-mi-tu [hōmitu] < [hāmitu] ‘wall’ (Beirut EA 14 L

20 See no. 14 above.
21 See, for example, no. 53 below.
Development of the Canaanite Dialects

44; cp. Moabite *hmt* 'wall' 21); the Greek alphabetic name ρω [rōs] < [rās] < [raʾs]- 'head,' Punic *rus,* the orthography *rš* reflecting the earlier [-a'-]; *sufet* [šoppet] < šōpiṭu < [šāpiṭu] 'ruler.'

Hebrew—ak-*ru-un-nu* ['ahron-] < ['ahrān-] 'last' (Megiddo EA 245. 10); *ru-šu-nu* and *zu-ū-nu* see under no. 15 above; *zu-ti-ni* [sākini] < [sākini] 'agent' (EA 256. 9); *tu-pi-ir* [sāpir] < [sāpir] 'scribe' (19th dynasty: Voc. VII A 14); participle form [qōṭēl] < [qāṭīl] in biblical Hebrew.

This change had not taken place in Ugarit by the 15th century: e.g. kṣat [kussaʿatu] 'thrones' (IIAB vi 52). However, the following possible evidence may indicate that the change did take place there after the time of these texts: The form *b*r-*u-َا-َا-pu-*-*na* 'Baʾl of Sapon (North)' (in Albright's syllabic orthography reading, Voc. VII B 6) occurs on an Egyptian stele found in Ugarit and dated at the end of the 18th or beginning of the 19th dynasty (14th-13th cent.; Syria 12 (1931) 10-1 and pl. VI); the mountain ba-*-li-sa-َا-*-*pa-*-*na* between Lebanon and Amanus (8th cent., Tlgath Pileser III 3. 27) is probably the Ugaritic mountain *ṣpn* (IIAB v 117, etc., cp. especially the deity *b*l *ṣpn* [baʾlu šaʿapānī] 1929. 9. 13). Both transcriptions indicate a later Ugaritic pronunciation [ṣālun]. Although the etymology of this word is uncertain, its form in early Canaanite and in Ugaritic of the 15th century was probably [ṣapānu], a reconstruction based upon Hebrew [ṣapōn], Phoenician [ṣapōn] (za-*pu-*nu, Σαφών), late Phoenician pronunciation [ṣapūn] (in Αφεσαφών GP 141, 130, 89); Hebrew [ḥō], Phoenician [ḥō], late Ph. pronunciation [ḥō], all developed from early Semitic and Canaanite [ḥā], as in Heb. *ḥālām*, late Ph. pronunciation [ḥalām] (Ολλαμος GP 133), from [ḥalāmu] 'eternity' (so in Arabic).

**Time:** Before 1365 (Amarna; so also BHG I 25 b), probably before the early 15th century, at least in some of the coastal cities (Beirut). Probably after 1500, reaching Ugarit after the time of our texts. After the setting of the Hebrew and Phoenician orthography *rš* which represented [raʾšu] (Sapir, Language 13 (1937) 330).

**Conditions:** This change has been widely regarded as the characteristic phonetic development of Canaanite, having gained this reputation because it is one of the few changes which spread over all (or most) of the Canaanite area without being paralleled elsewhere (except in modern Mehri). It is also regarded as having been among the earliest of Canaanite changes. However, there is nothing which would lead us to place it in a class apart from the many other changes which took
place during this period. There is no evidence that it had begun before the [Ca'C] > [CâC] change, although it may have done so. Praetorius’ widely-accepted stratum explanation for this change (ZDMG 55 (1901) 369) is possible but not necessary; somewhat similar changes took place in later Hebrew and Aramaic dialects of Palestine-Syria (GP 35), but that cannot be directly related to the pre-Canaanite stratum which no longer existed then. The stratum of speakers of Canaanite, who had [i] and [ii] but no [ä], and who changed to Aramaic speech in the early centuries of the first millennium B.C., may have led to the change of [ä] > [i] in Syrian Aramaic. But we cannot give an analogous explanation for the earlier change in Canaanite itself, since we do not know whether or not the language which preceded Canaanite in Syria had [ä].

18. Development of qatala perfect active form.

PLACE: Phoenician—ša-pa-ra (Syria EA 65.7), ša-pa-ar (Beirut EA 141.18) ‘he sent’; la-qa ‘he took’ (Byblos EA 140.13); ka-ša-ad-ti ‘I reached’ (Byblos EA 138.80). Note the formation of a Canaanite perfect active a-pa-š ‘he did’ (Byblos EA 113.10, 122.32) from an Akkadian root.

Hebrew—la-ma-ad ‘he has learned (EA 196.30); ša-ba-ta-ni ‘he took me’ (Jerusalem EA 288.25); ša-al ‘he questioned’ (Jerusalem EA 289.10); [qâtâl] perfect active form in biblical Hebrew. Because of the consonantal orthography, evidence is lacking for the second vowel of this stem in Ya’udi, Hamat, Moabite, etc. However, the wide West-Semitic range of this form, and the fact that these dialects all have an active perfect (instead of preterite) makes it practically certain that they had the qatala form: Ya’udi—pl ‘he did’ (3), yâbt ‘I sat’ (9); Hamat—šm ‘he set up’ (a 1), mh̄w ‘they erected’ (a 16); Moabite—yspt ‘I added’ (29), krt ‘I cut’ (25).

In Ugaritic of the 15th century the perfect is used almost exclusively for stative verbs, in [qatî/u]la form (Goetze, JAOS 58 (1938) 268-89, esp. 285-9); some verbs in the perfect seem to be active transitive, perhaps with the form [qatâla] (see Goetze’s list, ibid. 2b, c, p. 275-8).

TIME: Before 1365, since the form is in full use in the Amarna letters (Ebeling 56-7, Böhl 43-7). After 1500, since it is not yet developed in the Ugaritic texts, although some qatala forms may already have been created by this time.

---

82 No. 15 above.

83 See also no. 37.
Development of the Canaanite Dialects

Conditions: The common Semitic noun form (of stative action) [qaṭil-/qaṭal-], had developed as a nominal sentence form, with the subject expressed in personal suffixes. This is the permissive of Akkadian and, with somewhat different treatment of the personal suffixes, the stative perfect of West-Semitic. In the course of time, all known West-Semitic languages extended this inflection on the base of a noun form (of transitive action) [qaṭal-]; later stages of this extension, and the formation of a [qaṭal-] nominal sentence, were independent in the various languages. The [qaṭi/ul-] form may be seen in na-ṣir-ta 'you are protected, safe' (EA 112.9), la-ki-ta 'it is captured' (root likd, Ebeling 58; EA 274.15), ša-mi-te 'I heard' (Amarna RA 19 (1922) 91.5), ša-du-uq 'it is right' (EA 287.32).

This nominal form with personal suffixes was gradually used more and more in verbal position, finally functioning as a verb in the perfect aspect. The development is reflected in the difference between the extensions of new verbal formations in the roots hilk and ntn: in the earlier case the new verb formations did not extend to the nominal (perfect); in the later case they did.¹⁴ Later the [qaṭal-] form was extended, replacing the [qaṭi/ul-] form in many verbs: e.g. Heb. [ṣādāq] 'he is right.'

Bergsträsser, writing before the discovery of Ugaritic, explained the formation of [qaṭal-] (and subsequent verbal formations) by polarity, inverse analogy to other verbal forms (BHG II 3 f); however, such an arrangement of the related forms does not explain their origin, and does not constitute the best statement of their relation (see Speiser, The Pitfalls of Polarity, Language 14 (1938) 187-202, esp. 196).

19. Disuse of yaqṭulu preterite form.

Place: In Phoenician (including Yaʿudi) and Hebrew, and in Hamat, Moabite, and all other Canaanite material with the exception of Ugaritic, there is no regular preterite form in the verb; its approximate function is filled by the perfect aspect.

Ugaritic in 1500 has a regular preterite: yšm 'he heard' (IIAB iv 8); yš̀ [yəššā'u] 'he raised' (K 99; Goetze, JAOS 58 (1938) 289-94).

Time: After 1500, at least in the area of Ugarit. Before 1365 (over most or all the Canaanite area), as may be judged from the use in the Amarna letters of perfect forms where preterites would have been used before, and especially from the few conflations of Akkadian preterites with Canaanite perfect suffixes, which suggest that the preterite was no longer used in Canaanite: i-ha-ša-li 'I am' (EA 106.24). Forms like yi-mu-ur 'he saw' (EA 137.20) are probably not Canaanite preterites,

¹⁴ See no. 3.
but Akkadian preterites with Canaanite [y-] prefix (on the analogy of the 3rd person [y-] prefix of the Canaanite present). That the perfect had a range of meaning different from the Akkadian forms is clearly shown in *gi-na-aš-ši / na-aš-ši-a* 'he raised,' the second being the Canaanite gloss giving a perfect form to explain the Akkadian present of the same root (Thureau-Dangin, Amarna RA 19 (1922) 99.13).

**CONDITIONS:** The preterite was a common Semitic form which in the course of time fell into disuse in all West-Semitic languages, leaving traces such as the "imperfect with waw consecutive" of Hebrew and "imperfect with lam" of Arabic. Its use began to be infrequent after the active perfect was developed, for the perfect came to be used for actions in past time. See chapter 5. A3.


**PLACE:** Phoenician (including Ya'udi)—no recorded occurrence of a verbal form with personal prefixes in preterite meaning.
Not in Hamat—*wy'ny* 'and he answered me' (11, etc.).
Not in Hebrew—*wyklw* 'and they flowed' (Siloam 4); the use of the "imperfect" form with preterite meaning in many constructions in biblical Hebrew, especially in the "imperfect with waw consecutive," the regular narrative preterite of biblical Hebrew. The Lachish letters (beginning of 6th century) have this form only once: [wayyašlahu] 'and he has brought him up' (4. 7); otherwise the perfect is used. This indicates a later Hebrew decline in frequency of this form, especially outside of formal narrative style; in the last stages of spoken Hebrew (as reflected in the Mishna) it was no longer used.\(^{25}\)
Not in Moabite—*wby* 'and I built' (9); *ky ynp* 'for he was angry' (5).
Not in Ugaritic of 1500—*wy'n [wa(y)yaš] < [wa(y)yašay] 'and he answered' (IA 49); however, the evidence for this short preterite in Ugarit is unclear; there are many occurrences of [wa-] 'and' followed by the full preterite yaqtol, and it is as yet impossible to define the uses of the short preterite.

**TIME:** After 1500; but the Amarna letters provide no evidence. The disuse of this form in Phoenician may have been associated with the disuse of the full preterite and contemporary with it; or it may have taken place somewhat later.

---

25 See no. 20 below.

26 M. H. Segal, A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew 72.
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Conditions: Proto-West-Semitic apparently had, in addition to the pre-terite yaqtilu, a short preterite yaqtil used in narrative sequence after [wa-] ‘and,’ [kt-] ‘when,’ [I(u?)-] ‘indeed’ (Harris JAOS 57 (1937) 152, n. 11). The uses of this form as against the full preterite are as yet not defined, but the evidence from Ugaritic suffices to show its existence. Its later history differs from that of the full preterite, for its loss was confined to Phoenicia alone (of all the areas for which we have evidence of this period), whereas the disuse of the full preterite spread over the whole area. Arabic, which also lost the full preterite, has an analogous preservation of the short preterite yaqtil after [lam] ‘not.’ In those Canaanite areas where the short preterite remained, it was used as the regular narrative tense.


Places Phoenician (including Ya'udi)—wyzq ‘and he will injure’ (root nzq); tpb ‘you (will) open’; yqh ‘he shall take’ (root lqh; the assimilation of [n] and [l] shows that there was no vowel after the first radical, hence this is not the present tense).

Hamat—hšk ‘I shall save you’ (14).

Hebrew—[yiqṭol] and related imperfect forms.

Moabite—nw ‘I will afflict’ (6).

Not in Ugaritic of 1500, where apparently the present (with two stem vowels) is used where the imperfect would later have been used: Goetze, JAOS 58 (1938) 296-309.

Time: After 1500, since Ugaritic does not yet have it. Probably in process of development during the 14th century, for while the Amarna letters do not have a regular imperfect with the functions of the later West-Semitic ipf., they do have a number of yaqtilu forms with meanings which are of the imperfect rather than jussive order: ti-iq-bi ‘you say’ (EA 83.32), ttil-ku ‘they take’ (EA 84.32), ti-du ‘they know’ (EA 105.36), te-ruku-nu ‘you kill us’ (all from Byblos EA 138.40-1), yi-la-ka ‘he goes’ (Megiddo RA 19 (1922) 92.27). Examples of the jussive yaqtil are ya-az-ku-wr ‘may he remember’ (EA 228.19), yi-šal ‘let him ask’ (EA 60.21). However, the difference in form between yaqtilu and yaqtil cannot be adduced from these letters, partly because the syllabic writing of cuneiform often necessitates final vowels even when they do not exist in speech (see Ebeling 46, 66). One form, however, may be ipf. rather than jussive, not only in meaning but also in form: ttil-kun-sē ‘ye will take it’ (Byblos EA 117.64), since the jussive would not have the [-n] suffixed to the [-a] suffix.

Conditions: Proto-West-Semitic had a jussive form yaqtil, which con-
tinues in the various Canaanite dialects, including Ugarit. 37 After the
disuse of the preterite yaqtulu, a new form yaqtulu was developed in the
Canaanite dialects, probably as a modification of the jussive, with more
general imperfect, aspeutal meaning (chiefly future and present time).
The [-u] of the new form may have been on the analogy of the final
vowel of the present; and the development of this form was probably
facilitated by the earlier disuse of the preterite. See chapter 5. A3. 38

22. Disuse of the yaqatalu present form.

Place: In Phoenician (including Ya‘udi) and Hebrew, and in Hamat
and Moabite and all other Canaanite material with the exception of
Ugaritic and the Amarna letters there is no present form of the verb.
In many inscriptions it is impossible to tell whether a verbal form
is in the present or imperfect, because the consonantal orthography
does not show directly the presence or absence of a vowel after the
first radical. The imperfect form is revealed, however, by some cases
of assimilation (see under no. 20 above); and the use of the perfect
aspect rather than the preterite indicates in general a system of
subjective rather than objective aspects, and so points to the
existence of an imperfect rather than a present.

Not in Ugaritic of the 15th century, where the present is apparently in
regular use: Goetze, JAOS 58 (1938) 296-309.

Not in the Amarna letters (early Phoenician and Hebrew) where the
yaqatalu forms represent probably a Canaanite present (rather than
an Akkadian-Canaanite hybrid): yi qa-bu ‘he says’ (Byblos EA
122. 9), see Dhorme, RB 10 (1913) 381, Ebeling 50-1.

Time: After 1365, since it is still in use in the Amarna letters.

Conditions: The present was a Proto-Semitic form which in the course
of time fell into disuse in most West-Semitic languages. When the
imperfect was developed as a extension of the jussive, it was used in some
of the constructions where the present had been used before. Gradually
the imperfect gained in frequency, and the present declined, until the
present was no longer used. This parallels the development of the
perfect active and the disuse of the preterite.

Bergstrâsser (BHG II 3 d) regarded the present and imperfect as
parallel East- and West-Semitic developments from a single Proto-
-Semitic preterite; the new evidence from Ugaritic, however, indicates
that the present too was Proto-Semitic, and the imperfect a special
West-Semitic development. 39

37 See chapter 2.3, 5. A3.
38 For the favoring of this form over the present, see no. 22.
39 See chapter 2. 6, 5. A3.

**Place:** Phoenician—\(\text{lab}^\text{o}n\) \(<\) \([\text{lab}^\text{a}n\text{u}] < [\text{lab}^\text{a}n\text{u}] < [\text{labanu}] ; \text{-ia-tu-ni}\) \([-\text{yat}^\text{a}n]\) \(<\) \([-\text{yat}^\text{a}n\text{u}] < \text{’-yat\text{an}u}\) (verb form as part of a noun complex in proper names), etc. (GP 25-6).

Hebrew—\([\text{dab}^\text{a}r]\) \(<\) \([\text{dab}^\text{a}ru]\) \(<\) \([\text{dabaru}] ; \) place of stress indicated both by stress-lengthening of the second vowel, as in the Phoenician word above,\(^{40}\) and by masoretic marks in the biblical text.

**Time:** After \([\dot{a}] > [\acute{o}]\), since original \([\dot{a}]\) which lost the stress in this shift had already become \([\acute{o}]\); late Ph. sufet \([\acute{s}^\text{opet}^\text{\acute{e}}t}\), Heb. \([\acute{s}^\text{opet}^\text{\acute{e}}t] < [\acute{s}^\text{opit}^\text{\acute{u}}] < [\acute{s}^\text{opitu}] < [\acute{s}^\text{apitu}] \) ‘ruler.’ Before the dropping of final short vowels, at which time the penult vowels, being stressed, became lengthened.

**Conditions:** The stress in Proto-Semitic was apparently on the last long syllable (excluding ances) or, in the absence of long syllables, on the first syllable, of the form. Within Canaanite the stress shifted at this time to the penult in all forms (noun, finite verb forms having consonantal suffixes) except finite verbs without consonantal suffixes and infinitive verbs (with or without such suffixes: see no. 51). The phonetic basis for the exception of these latter forms from this shift is not clear as yet; it was perhaps connected with the position of these forms within the sentence (nouns and suffixed verbs were more frequently at the ends of utterances).

That the penult stress of later Canaanite dialects is not the original stress may be seen, for example, in the fact that later Canaanite had some unaccented \([\acute{o}] < \text{Semitic} [\dot{a}]\) and some unaccented \([\acute{a}] < \text{Semitic} [\dot{a}]\). The difference between these two reflexes of Semitic \([\dot{a}]\) can be explained only by assuming that those which were now \([\acute{o}]\) had once been stressed, and so had participated in \([\dot{a}] > [\acute{o}]\), but had then lost the stress, whereas the others had never been stressed: Heb. participle \([\acute{q}^\text{ot}^\text{\acute{e}l}] < [\acute{q}^\text{atlu}],\) as against \([\acute{s}^\text{ali}^\text{\acute{a}m}] < [\acute{t}^\text{ali}^\text{\acute{e}ma}] \) ‘triptartite musical instrument.’ This evidence accords closely with the statement of the stress shift by Bergsträsser (BHG I 21 f., 25 a, b); cp. the different statement given by Bauer and Leander (BL 176-84) and Brockelmann (GvG 100-1).\(^{41}\)

---

\(^{40}\) See no. 17.

\(^{41}\) Albright (Voc. 20) presents an Egyptian loan-word from Canaanite, the form of which suggests that the Canaanite word was stressed on the ante-penult (‘markábata’ ‘chariot’); this may represent the stress in nouns with fem. [-atu] suffix, or a stage in the shift of the stress to penult position.
24. Reduction of vowels before 2nd person suffixes.

**Place:** Hebrew—[ɪbaʁkɪm] < [libabukumu] ([-kima]) ‘your (m. pl.) heart’; [yɪqtɔlkɪm] < [yaqṭulukumu] ([-kima]) ipf. verb with 2nd person m. pl. suffix; [dɛɾarʁkɑ] < [dabarukɑ] ‘your (m. sg.) word’; [yɪqtɔlkɑ] < [yaqṭulukɑ] ipf. with 2 m. sg. suffix.

Phoenician—no evidence.

**Time:** After the dropping of case endings in the construct and after the stress shift in the noun; before vowel reduction, on the assumption of the conditions stated below.

**Conditions:** In the general stress shift, the stress in forms with possessive and objective suffixes came to be on the vowel preceding the suffix, except in the case of 2nd person pl. suffixes: [bɛṭahʊ] ‘his house (acc.)’ but [bɛṭakʊmu] ‘your (m. pl.) house.’ The unstressed vowel before the [-kumu] was then reduced. This was probably on the analogy of construct nouns, which had lost their case endings; for after the stress shift these forms were similar to construct nouns in form (the noun stem being unstressed and proclitic to the following element) and in grammatical construction (genitive): [libabukumu] > [libabɛkumu]. In the 2 m. sg. this analogy did not hold, for the suffix was not stressed; the vowel preceding it remained: [iʃtʊkɑ] ‘your wife,’ later > [iʃtɛkɑ], [yɑʃmɔrɔkɑ] ‘he will guard you,’ later [yiʃmɛɾɛkɑ]. Later, however, new formations, with stressed suffix, arose here too on the analogy of the forms with pl. suffix: [iʃtɛkɑ], [yiʃmɔrɔkɑ], [dabɑɾɔkɑ], later > [dɛɾarʁkɑ]. For the later regular vowel reduction in these forms, see no. 41.


**Place:** Phoenician—mɛnt [maɾnɛtu] ‘camp’ (root hny Byblos 13th cent.); mɛnt [miɾnɛt] ‘construction’ (root bny).

Hamat—mɛnt.

Not in Ugarit—mks [miʃsɛ] ‘cover’ (root kṣy, IIAB ii 3); mɛnɛ [maɾnɛkɑ] ‘your answer’ (1933. 2. 15; mɛn [miɾnɛ] ‘repetition’ (IIAB ii 20).

*For the later regular vowel reduction in these forms, see no. 41.*
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Not in some Phoenician dialects, or not in some words throughout
Phoenician—\\textit{mks}’ [\\textit{miːkseven}] ‘cover’ (root \textit{ksy}; Punic).
Not in Hebrew—\\textit{mahēne} [\\textit{miːhe̞ne}] ‘camp’ (fem. in some late cases); [\\textit{minē}]
‘construction’; [\\textit{miːksen}] ‘cover’; etc. (masc.).

\textbf{TIME}: Before 13th century since the [-t] form appears in the Ahiram
inscription of Byblos; it may have been considerably earlier.

\textbf{CONDITIONS}: The forms with [-t] may have started on some analogy
with a feminine noun of a IIIy root; they became more frequent than
the older forms (without [-t]) because the syncope of [y] in these forms
had left them shorter than other nouns of that construction, and hence
irregular for the language.

26. \textbf{Lexical specializations in various parts of the Canaanite area.}

‘to be’: [kān]—Phoenician (including Ya’udi); other forms of this
root occur in Hebrew.
\textit{hyy}—Hebrew (\textit{hykh} in Siloam 1).

‘to make’: \textit{pl}—Phoenician (including Ya’udi), more specialized
meaning in Hebrew.
\textit{św}—Hebrew, Moabite (3, 23), perhaps late Ph. (GP
135).

‘gold’: \textit{krs}—Ugarit, Phoenician (including Ya’udi), rarely in Heb.
(poetic, etc.).

\textit{zhb} (< \textit{dhb})—Hebrew.

‘man’: both ‘\textit{dm} and ‘\textit{s occur in all dialects; but in biblical Hebrew
the plural of ‘\textit{dm} does not occur, and ‘\textit{s and its plural are
more common. In Phoenician ‘\textit{s is used chiefly in comp-
ounds; Hamat uses ‘\textit{s.

\textbf{TIME}: Nothing definite can be said of the time of these lexical specializa-
tions, except that they generally antedate the inscriptions of the various
languages which we have.

\textbf{CONDITIONS}: All these roots occur in other Semitic languages as well.
The differences of frequency and occurrence of these roots in the various
dialects is the result of local favoring of one form over another. Of
each of the above pairs of roots, the first one is the more frequent outside
Canaanite. It is significant that Phoenician usage is generally closer to
that of other Semitic languages, whereas Hebrew shows more divergent
local developments in the use of words. These are but a few of the more
obvious dialectal differences; in many cases we cannot tell whether a
word which occurs in an inscription is really common for that meaning
in the speech of that dialect, and whether it has the same range of
meanings which it has in Hebrew.
27. Morphologic extensions in biradical roots.

[‘ilu] ‘god’—regular in Phoenician, Hebrew, etc.
[‘ilôhîma], and its sg. [‘ilôh] ‘god’ secondarily formed—in Hebrew, Hamat (b 9, 25); also in Aramaic, Arabic.

dl ‘door’—Phoenician, rare in Hebrew ([dal špātay] Psalms 141. 3).
dlht—extended plural form in Phoenician.
[dlṭu] (with extension by fem. suffix, ep. no. 25)—some Ph. dialect (alphabetic name ḍal-α), Hebrew [dēlet], pl. [dīlājīt].

TIME: Some of these special formations are pre-Canaanite, the differences between Phoenician and Hebrew dialects being merely in the particular favorings of one form over another in each locality. Other formations may have arisen within the several dialects.

CONDITIONS: Each of these new forms of the short roots must have been formed on the analogy of some existing forms, as was the case with those in no. 25. ‘ḥ was probably an old West-Semitic formation, since it also occurs in Arabic; its regularization in Hebrew but not in Phoenician was probably the result of different favorings of [‘ilu] and [‘ilôh] in the various areas of Canaanite. These are just a few root-extensions of which we happen to have record; how many others there were, and how widely they were spread, we do not know.

28. Favoring of [hûwa], [hîya] over [hûwatu], [hîyati] ‘he, she.’

PLACE: Phoenician—ḥ’ [hu’a] later > [hu’] > [hû] ‘he’ (Byblos 13th cent.); ḥ’ [ḥ] < [hi’] < [hi’a] ‘she’; but hmt [hu’imat(i)] ‘they’ (Ya’udi, Ph.).

Hebrew—hùw [hû] < [hu’a] ‘he’: hy’ [hi] < [hi’a] ‘she’; but [hēmā] < [hima] > [hima] more frequent.

Moabite—ḥ’ (6).

Not in Ugarit of the 15th century—hùwt [huwatu] ‘he’ (D 1.129); hyt [hîyati] ‘she’ (D 1.138); hmt [humati] ‘they’ (D 1.119; all gen.).

TIME: Before 13th century in Byblos, since the short form appears there at that time.

CONDITIONS: There is no proof that Phoenician and Hebrew had originally had the form with deictic [-t], but the fact that these forms were regular in Ugarit, and the existence of the deictic [-t] form in the
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plural pronoun, makes it probable that most of Canaanite had had the
[-tu] form of the singular pronouns. The favoring of the shorter form
can be seen in process in the competition of [hēmā] and [hēm] in
Hebrew.43

29. Assimilation of [-h-] to [-y-] after [i, e] vowels, and the analogic
replacing of [-h-] by [-y-] in other 3rd person sg. suffixes.

Place: Phoenician, except for Byblos (but including Ya’udi)—”[dny
‘for his lord’; lmn[ya] [liminna’uneryi] ‘from his youth on’
(Ya’udi); ’dy ‘her Lady’; wyōny [wayōšabnūyi] ‘and we caused
him to dwell’ (GP 47-9).

Not in Hamat, Byblos, Hebrew, Moabite where these suffixes have
[-h-] (see no. 30).

Time: Probably before syncope of [-h-] in 3rd person suffixes, since
otherwise that syncope, which spread to Byblos, would probably have
extended throughout Phoenician. The assimilation of [-h-] to [-y-]
after [i] and [e] had taken place at the latest before the 9th century,
since it appears in Ya’udi.

Conditions: The first question that arises is: does this y indicate a final
diphthong, or is it intervocalic, like the [-h-] in the earlier form? In
view of the absence of vowel-letters in early Phoenician orthography,
the writing with y indicates that the 3rd person suffixes had a consonantal
[-y-] (and no [-h-]). The orthography in Punic, which contains vowel-
letters, shows that after short vowels the [-y-] had later been elided,
but that after long vowels it had remained: ql’, qlh [qolē] ‘his voice’
< early Canaanite [qollh]; ‘by’ [‘abīyū] (?) ‘his father’ < [‘abīhū],
ply [panēyū] (?) ‘his face’ < [panēhū], bny [banēy] ‘her sons’
< [banēhā] (GP 51-2). It would thus appear that [-y-] in these suffixes
had the same history as it had between vowels in Phoenician,44 and it is
therefore safe to suppose that here too it was intervocalic. In that case
we must reconstruct [‘adoniyyū] ([-yī]) ‘his Lord,’ [‘adatiyya] ‘her
Lady,’ etc.; and we must assume that the [-y-] took the place of the [-h-].
A less plausible alternative view would be that the [-h-] had been elided
in the suffixes as it had elsewhere in Canaanite,45 and that in the resulting
vowel combinations diphthongs with [-y] had been formed. This
development would have yielded final [-y] rather than intervocalic [-y-],
and would not satisfy the Punic spellings.

It is quite possible that before this assimilation [-hu] had changed
to [-hī] after [i, e] vowels (assimilation of the [-ū] to the preceding

43 See no. 48.
44 See no. 32.
45 See no. 30.
vowel; F. Rosenthal, Orientalia 7 (1938) 171-2; and this [-ḥā] form may then have been extended to the other cases of the noun and forms of the verb where the preceding vowel was [-a] or [-u]. A similar development, in part, took place in Arabic. If this was the case, it would have been the chief contributory factor in the assimilation of [-h-] to [-y-] in these suffixes: [-iḥi] > [-iyī], [-ēhī] > [-ēyī], etc.

In any case, assimilation will not account for all the [-y-] forms: when the 3rd person fem. suffix [-hā] was preceded by vowels other than [-i] or [-e] there was no phonetic basis for the assimilation of the [-h-] to [-y-]; and this was true of the masculine too, if the assumption of [-hū] > [-ḥi] is incorrect. In these cases we can only say that new formations have occurred: [-yā] replacing [-hā] on the analogy of those forms of the suffixes where the phonetic assimilation had taken place.

30. Syncope of [-h-] between vowels.

**Place:** Hamat—māṭnh [maḥnētō] < [-aw] < [-ahū] ‘his camp’ (5-7).

For -ḥ as vowel-letter cp. ‘nāḥ [‘anā] ‘I’ (2).

Byblos—šntw [šanōtaw] < [šanōtīhū] ([-ēhū]?) ‘his years’ (11th cent.) cp. mšpīh [mišpātihū] ‘of his rule,’ mlkh [mulkīhū] ‘of his kingship’ (13th cent.).

Hebrew—rw [reō] (or [re'aw]) ‘his comrade’ (Siloam 3); band [‘abḍō] < [‘abdaw] < [‘bdahū] ‘his servant’ (Lachish passim); [-ē] ‘his’ in biblical Hebrew.

Moabite—ršh [‘aršō] ‘his land’ (5-6); the -ḥ is to be taken as a vowel-letter rather than the original consonant of the suffix, in view of its occurrence elsewhere in this text as a final vowel-letter: nḥ [‘nebo’] (14).

**Time:** In Byblos, between the 13th and 11th centuries (or perhaps earlier, with the change in orthography delayed until this period). In parts of Palestine probably somewhat later, for the Bible contains a number of forms with the [-ḥū] suffix, retained in literature from times and places which still had it. Bergsträsser shows that it must have come after [ā] > [ē], since [ā] < [-āhū] (in forms with that stress) did not become [ē] (BHG I 16 e). Consonantal [-h-] still existed in the suffixes at the time of the stress shift (no. 23) for that stress shift, which occurred only in verbal forms having consonantal suffixes, is seen in qaṭalō] < [qṭalāhū] ‘he killed him.’

**Conditions:** It is not quite clear whether [-h-] was lost in all inter-vocalic position, or whether it remained between certain vowels, specifically after long vowels. The first statement, given by Bergsträsser (loc.
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cit.) must have recourse to a large number of later analogic new-formations to account for the many “restorations” of [-h-], e.g. [-āhû], [-ēhû] in the verb, [-ēḥem]. The second leaves a smaller but equally unaccountable residue in syncope of [-h-] after some long vowels: [-āw] < [-ēhû] in nouns in the plural, [-îw] < [-îhû] (with [-îhû] as a free alternate or a dialectal form).

31. [-aw] > [-ō].

Place: Hamat, Hebrew, Moabit—see evidence under no. 30. This monophthongization probably took place wherever the [-aw] suffix developed.

Byblos—no evidence, but probable.

Time: Before the reduction of final double consonants, for the new final [-aw] which were then formed seemed to have remained.

Before the 9th century in Hamat and Moab. In Jerusalem, the writing with -w in the Siloam inscription may represent [-aw]; but, since the change had occurred elsewhere some centuries before, it is more probable that it was already [-ō], the orthography of the earlier form of the suffix being retained, as it is in biblical orthography. The writing -h in Lachish represents merely another orthographic tradition, which retained the writing of the original [-hû] throughout the changes in sound.

Conditions: This change was in keeping with the phonetic structure of Canaanite, which did not have diphthongs, although Jerusalem had them in accented position. The fact that in some places the scribes changed the writing of the suffix from [-h] to [-w] indicates that the new [-aw] < [-ahu] was not pronounced [-ō] automatically, as soon as the diphthong developed, but that for a time the diphthong [-aw] existed in the pronunciation.

32. Syncope of [y, w] between short unstressed vowels.

Place: Ya‘udi—hz [ḥazā] < [ḥāzaya] ‘he saw’ (11).

Phoenician—bn [banō] < [bānaya] ‘he built’ (Sidon 4th cent.), written b‘n in Neo-Punic.

Hebrew—hyh [hayā] ‘he was,’ (Siloam 1); śh [ašā] < [ašawa] ‘he did’ (Lachish 4.3); similar forms of IIIyw verbs in biblical Hebrew (BHG II 30).

Moabit—bnk [banā] ‘he built’ (18).

Time: After 11th century, at least in Byblos, because the Yahimilk inscription has bny [banaya] ‘he built’ and hwj [ḥawwiya] ‘he re-

46 See no. 59.

47 See no. 1, p. 30-1.
stored’; probably after 10th century, in view of the written y in ‘ly
[alaya-] ‘over’ (Elibaal insc. Byblos 10th cent.). All these writings
with y could be historical spellings maintained even after the pronuncia-
tion had changed, but more probably reflect the current speech.48 Ugarit
still had [-y-, -w-] in these positions: yiny [yānānīnu] ‘he repeated’
(IIAB vi 30). This syncope must have occurred after the replacing of
[-b-] by [-y-] in the 3rd person suffixes of Phoenician.49 It must have
taken place before the dropping of final short vowels, for if 3rd radical
[y] and [w] had still been pronounced at that time, they would have
formed diphthongs with the preceding vowel, which would have yielded
entirely different vowels in Hebrew and Punic from those which we find.
The syncope must have spread over most or all of the Canaanite area
before the 9th century, by inscriptionsal evidence of Ya’udi and Moab.

CONDITIONS: Intervocalic [-y-, -w-] had been elided in Proto-Semitic in
certain conditions: š [šē] < [šayu] ‘sheep’ (Ugarit, Ya’udi, Phoenician,
Hebrew [šē]); šd, ša-te-e [šadē] < [šadayu] ‘field’ (Ugarit, Amarna,
Phoenician, Hebrew [šdē]). The evidence from Ugarit and early
Byblos shows, however, that in several positions the syncope of [y, w]
did not take place until considerably later, within the history of Ca-
naanite. The old dating of the syncope of [y, w] (except in [-iya, -awa])
in the Proto-Semitic period (GvG 138, BL 229-30) must now be rejected;
Bergsträsser’s statement (BHG I 17 i), which dates the syncope in
certain positions as pre-Hebrew (because it also appears in Aramaic)
must also be revised.

The Ugaritic material, which has consonantal [y, w] in IIIyw verbs,
but none in IIyw verbs, shows that we must reconstruct these two types
differently, the IIIyw forms being derived from Proto-Semitic forms with
3rd radical [y, w], and the “IIyw” forms being derivable directly only
from Proto-Semitic forms with two radical consonants and a long vowel
between them (so Landsberger, OLZ 29 (1926) 974-5; Bergsträsser,
OLZ 26 (1923) 480-1, BHG II 30 r; as against GvG 605-8; BL 406,
410).

Double [yy, ww] were not elided, hence forms like [hayyu] ‘living,’
tawwu] ‘mark’ remained, later becoming [hayy] > [hay], [taww] >
[taw].50

33. [-at] replaced by [-â] in 3 f. sg. suffix of pf. verb stems.

PLACE: Phoenician—pl [pa*alâ] < [pā’alâ] ‘she made’; but [-at-]
remains when it is not final: plīny [pa*lātn] ‘she made me.’ (both
Byblos 5th century).

48 See chapter 3.5. 49 See no. 29. 50 See no. 35, 59.
Hebrew—[-â] form of the suffix (written h) in biblical Hebrew, [-at-] remaining when non-final.

Time: After 1500 (Ugaritic tmt ‘she is completed’ SS 67, yāt ‘she has come out’ D 3.1.36); and after 1365 (a-ba-da-at Canaanite gloss ‘she is lost’ Jerusalem EA 288.52). After elision of [y, w] between unstressed short vowels, for only so can we explain the special history of this suffix in IIIyw verbs in Hebrew (see no. 34).

In Phoenician this change took place in the suffix of the verb only, and not in the fem. suffix of the noun. It is therefore necessary to assume that the change occurred in the verb suffix at a time when the noun suffix differed from it and so was not affected; i.e., either before the dropping of final short vowels, while the noun suffix was not yet final but was followed by case endings, or before the stress shift in the verb, while the verb suffix was still unstressed and the noun suffix was stressed. In Palestine there were two changes: first, in the verb suffix at the same time as the Phoenician change; and later, in the noun suffix when the dropping of final short vowels yielded a new group of final [-ät] (< [-ätu]). The difference between Hebrew and Phoenician could also be explained on the assumption that the change of [-at] > [-â] did not reach Hebrew until later, after the dropping of final short vowels; it would then have operated in Hebrew not only in the verb suffix, as it did in Phoenician, but also in the noun suffix, which was now also final. This assumption, however, does not explain why the [-at] of [hayât] did not change (see no. 34, 44).

Conditions: It is not known whether this was purely a phonetic change, or whether it involved some analogic extension. In any case it was clearly limited to [-at] in final position, having effect neither in non-final occurrences of the verbal suffix, nor in the noun where case endings followed.

The letter h with which the new [-â] suffix is written in Hebrew is probably merely a spelling for the vowel, -h being used for final [-â] in other cases too (e.g. for [-â] < [-aya], in Siloam, see no. 32). Had there been an [h] in the pronunciation of the suffix we should expect to find it written in Phoenician.

34. [-ät] replaced by [-â] in 3 f. sg. suffix of pf. verb stems.

Place: Phoenician—hw’ [hawâ] < [hawâ] < [hawât] < [hawayat] ‘she lived’ (Neo-Punic; earlier evidence does not occur in known Phoenician texts).

51 See no. 44.
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Not in Hebrew—ḥyt [hayāt] ‘she was’ (Siloam 3); [āsāt] ‘she did,’ [hāyāt], etc., dialectal forms preserved in the bible (Lev. 25.21, 26.34, 2 K 9.37, Jer. 13.19, Eze. 24.12); this must also be assumed as the underlying form of the later [āsāt], [hāyāt], etc., of biblical (Jerusalem) Hebrew (BHG II 30 r).52

TIME: Same time as no. 33, in Phoenician. After syncope of [y, w] in these forms, since it was the long vowel resulting from the syncope that excepted this group from the change to [-ā] in Hebrew.

CONDITIONS: In Phoenician, this change was undoubtedly associated with no. 33; both conditions together make one change, the replacing of [-at/-āt] by [-ā]. In Hebrew, however, shortness of the vowel constituted a significant condition for the change in ḫyw verbs the suffix had a long vowel and was not included in the change.

35. Elision of final short vowels.

PLACE: Phoenician—wēra [yōd] < [yādu] ‘hand’ 52; gubulim [gūbulīm] < [gubūlima] ‘boundaries’ and many other transcriptions showing no final vowels (GP 36).

Hebrew—Masoretic vocalization showing no final vowels and showing phonetic changes which took place only after loss of final vowels: [dāhār] < [dabāru] ‘word;’ [bāyit] < [bāytu] ‘house;’ [bēt] < [bētiy] < [bētiya] ‘of my house.’ For traces of early case-endings, see BL 522-30, GK 251-4.

Moabite—indirect evidence of loss of final short vowels is contained in the use of y as vowel letter for final [-i], as in bnty [banitī] ‘I built’ (22). The letter y came to stand for final [-i] when the 1 sg. possessive suffix [-iya] ‘my’ (after gen. and acc.), written with y, changed to [-iy] (with loss of final short vowels), then > [-i]. The use of y for [-i] which had thus arisen was then extended to other cases of final [-i], which had hitherto not been indicated in the consonantal orthography.

TIME: After 1500, since these vowels are still written in Ugarit: yēt [yiššatu] ‘he raised’ (I*AB vi 22), mrt [marīt] ‘fatling’ (acc. IIAB v 107). After 1365, since they are written in the Canaanite forms and glosses in the Amarna letters, not merely as mechanical features of cuneiform orthography but even where that orthography did not require them: zu-u-nu gloss to šēnu ‘sheep’ (EA 263.12); the various case endings are not confused (Dhorme, RB 11 (1914) 347-8). After the period of the 18th and 19th dynasties in Egypt, since there are indications

52 See no. 58.
53 See no. 36, 37.
of case endings in the Egyptian transcriptions of Canaanite place names (Burchardt p. 56, § 173; Voc. 18-9). After the syncope of [y, w] between unstressed short vowels, since final short vowels were involved in most of those syncopes: [hānaya] > [hanâ] ‘he built.’ Before the stress lengthening of penult vowels which followed immediately upon the dropping of final short vowels. Before the development of the [-ā] form of the feminine suffix in the noun in Hebrew. Before the reduction of double consonants which became final after this change.

Friedrich’s important discussion (Der Schwund kurzer Endvokale im Nordwestsemitischen, ZS 1 (1922) 3-14) assigns the late date of 400 B.C. for this change; but the chain of linguistic events necessitates an earlier date, and the orthographies upon which Friedrich rests should perhaps be understood as historical, i.e., carried over from preceding periods.

Conditions: Evidence from the Egyptian syllabic transcriptions seems to show confusion of final short vowels for some time before they were dropped. It is probable that these vowels were first all reduced to an undifferentiated shwa vowel, during which time case endings were no longer differentiated, and only later completely dropped. Intervocalic [y, w] in final [-iya, -uwa] had not been elided, and now, with the dropping of final short vowels, formed diphthongs which were later monophthongized to [t, ū]: [bétiya] > [bêtīy] > [bēti] ‘my house (gen.).’

36. Stress-lengthening.

Place: Phoenician—wara [yād] < [yād] < [yādu] ‘hand’; sufet [sōpēt] < [sōpiṭu] ‘ruler.’
Hebrew—[yād] < [yādu]; [sōpēt] < [sōpiṭu].

Time: Same time as the dropping of final short vowels; see below. Before [ā] > [ā] in Phoenician; see no. 37.

Conditions: This lengthening did not occur in all stressed short vowels, but only in those which had been in penult open syllables followed by a final open syllable with a short vowel. Stressed vowels which had been in closed syllables were not lengthened: [hāyyu] > [hāyy]; later > [hāy] ‘living’; nor were those lengthened which had been in open but not penult syllables: [qāṭal] > [qāṭal], only later > [qāṭal] in the pf. verb stem. Since this lengthening thus took place only in open syllables which became closed when the final short vowels which followed

---

54 See no. 32.
55 See no. 36.
56 See no. 44.
57 See no. 59.
58 See no. 1.
them were dropped, we are forced to associate the two changes; the lengthening must have developed as the final short vowels were being dropped (cp. BHG I 21 k; GP 34-6 and fn. 38; and, for a different statement, BL 232).

37. [ā] > [ō].

**PLACE:** Phoenician — 心仪的 [yōd] < [yād] < [yādu]; ἀβάνον [labán] < [labán] < [labánu] ‘white.’

Not in Hebrew—Transcriptions in Akkadian, Greek, etc. show that the long [ā] (and [â]) represented by qames in the masoretic vocalization had the [a] quality for perhaps as long as Hebrew was a natively spoken language: see no. 65c.

Not in Moabite — mu*-a-ba (Assurbanipal 7.108), ma*-ab (Esarhaddon ν 56) [mō daemon] < [mōbu].

**TIME:** After the dropping of final short vowels and concomitant lengthening of preceding stressed vowels in open syllables. Before the borrowing by the Greeks of the Phoenician names for the letters of the alphabet, since the change appears in 心仪的. The change may have taken place earlier, in the unstressed [ā] (which had not changed > [ō]) and in [ā] < [-aya] (see no. 38).

**CONDITIONS:** This change was in keeping with the sound pattern of Canaanite in which, since [ā] > [ō], there had been no stressed long [ā], the vowel [ō] configurating as the long counterpart of stressed [ā]. The change probably took place immediately as new long [ā] vowels were created, and continued to apply to all new [ā] vowels, apparently throughout the existence of continental Phoenician: in the later [ā] > [ō] > [ō] of [nasōt], and probably in the much later [ā] > [ō] > [ō] of [bol], the late form of [ba] ‘lord’ which is seen in the borrowed Palmyrene divine name βαλ, bwl (GP 31-2). However, this change in quality did not continue in the Punic dialects of the North African colonies, where this very form developed independently: [bāl] > [bāl] in Hannibal [hannibāl] (GP 34-5). This last fact is particularly interesting in view of the geographic limitation of [ā] > [ō].

It is noteworthy that this change in quality did not take place in

---

59 The date of the Greek borrowing of the alphabet names is very important for Canaanite linguistic reconstruction, since changes such as [ā] > [ō], stress lengthening, and the dropping of the final short vowels may be dated in reference to it. See Ullman, How old is the Greek Alphabet?, AJA 38 (1934) 359-81, who dates it in the 12th-11th century; see also Carpenter, AJA 37 (1933) 8-29; Stillwell, ibid. 605-10; Blegen, AJA 38 (1934) 27-8; Harland, ibid. 89-92.

60 See no. 63.

61 See no. 17.
Hebrew or Moabite, although the sound pattern in this respect had been the same as in Phoenician. Much later there was a Hebrew change of all [ä] > [â] (no. 65c).

This [â] in Phoenician (and the much later [â] in Hebrew) was phonemically distinct from the earlier [ô] < [â] (which had been identical with [ô] < [aw]). Phoenician [ô] was a rounded vowel which developed toward [â] in Late Phoenician and Punic, while the [â] remained a relatively open vowel: Onλαμôs [ôlôm] < [ôlámû] < [âlámû] ‘Eternity’; alonuth [‘alônôth] < [‘alânâtu] ‘goddesses’; rufe [rópê] < [rápî’u] ‘physician’; λασôw [lašôn] < [lašânû] ‘tongue’; rus [róš] < [raš] ‘head’; as against λαβôn [labôn] < [labânû] ‘white.’

38. Disuse of the [t]-reflexive of the simple verbal stem.

Place: Perhaps in Phoenician, where there are two occurrences from 13th century Byblos: thtpk ‘may there be overturned,’ thsp ‘may it be broken’; but none in the known linguistic remains after the 13th century.

Hebrew—where it does not occur in the biblical material except in a few early Palestinian place-names and probably in the root pqd: [‘eštâ’ôl], etc. (BH G II 18 i; BL 281, 285, GK 151).

Not in Moabite—hîlm ‘fight (inv.)’ root lhm (33).

Time: If the absence of this stem in the scanty material we have indicates that it was no longer used in Phoenician, this decline in frequency of use must have taken place, at least in Byblos, after the 13th century, perhaps not till considerably after then. In Ugaritic of the 15th century it is widely used: tôlk ‘I shall go about’ (IAB ii 5), tmthš ‘you will fight’ (IAB vi 24-5). In the Amarna letters it is still used: yi-is-ia-al ‘let him ask’ (EA 280.25; Ebeling 66). In Jerusalem Hebrew it had probably fallen into disuse before the 10th century, before the early literary compositions which we find in the bible.

39. Merging of [t] with [s], [h] with [h], [y] with [’].

Place: Palestine—[t] is still a distinct phoneme in Jerusalem of the Amarna letters, where Jerusalem [s] is written s (la-ki-si EA 288. 43), while Jerusalem [t] and [s] are both written š, although they could not have been the same phoneme in Jerusalem since they had different histories later (ša-ak-mi ‘Sechem’ if it had [t-] EA 88 The phonemic distinction between these two sounds was pointed out to me by Dr. Sapir.

89 This name must be assumed to have had initial [t] (cp. Sabean ikm ‘carry’) since it is written with s in the Egyptian transcriptions (Burchardt
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289. 23; ša-te-e [šādē] ‘field’ EA 287. 56). In the Egyptian transcriptions Palestine (Heb.) [t] and [s] are both written s: ‘strt [šaṭartu] ’Astarte’ (Burchardt 385), ḫdst [ẖadaṭatu] ‘New-(town)’ (Burchardt 707, Voc. XII A 6); but Palestine [s] is written š thus showing that [t] and [s] were different: qdš [qāḍīš(u)] ‘Kadesh’ (Burchardt 953, in many lists, cf. ETL). In the 13th century we find [t] written š: ša-’a-ra ‘gate’ < [tā-yru] (Ramses IX: Burchardt 881, Voc. V A 14). If this is from Phoenicia, it is not surprising; but if it is from Palestine it would indicate [t] > [s], [γ] > [t].

In Hebrew of the time of the written bible, [t] and [s] had merged, both being written š.

[h] is distinct from [h] in the Egyptian transcriptions from Palestine (Burchardt § 102); but in the Shoshenq list (c. 950) [h] seems to have merged with [h]: bt h(w)rm ‘Beth Horon’ (probably with etymological [h]; Burchardt 387). This merging is also seen in biblical Hebrew, [h] representing the reflexes of both sounds.

[γ] is distinct from [t] in the Egyptian transcriptions (Burchardt § 127, Voc. VIII A 8, XVI A 11); but the form ša-’a-ra above would indicate that it had merged with [t] by that time, as it is seen to have done in biblical Hebrew, where ‘ represents the reflexes of both.

TIME: On the very uncertain evidence of the Egyptian transcriptions, the merging of these sets of phonemes may have taken place during the 11th or 10th century. Bergsträsser (BHG I 6 d, f) and others date the merging in the 4th century n. c., on the argument that the velar spirants were still “remembered” in the Septuagint transcriptions. However, phonemes are not remembered once they cease to exist in a dialect; there is no satisfactory evidence that these phonemes existed in Palestine at the time of the Septuagint or for several centuries earlier. The Septuagint transcriptions with χ and γ cannot be used to prove [h] and [γ] phonemes, for they are too frequently used in words which had etymological [h] and [t] (ep., e.g. Růžička, ZA 21 (1908) 294-304). The Septuagint variation of χ, γ with zero probably represent merely the attempted transcriptions of the range of actualizations of the [h] and [t] phonemes.

815, Voc. XIV A15) and with š in the masoretic text; only [t] would have appeared in both these forms.

If biblical [šibboleth] ‘stream’ has etymological [t-] (see no. 40), then we have another example of [t] > [s] in the Egyptian transcription šbrt probably ‘stream’ in Shoshenq’s list, ETL XXXIV 73, 75.

On the reliability of the Shoshenq list, see Albright, JPOS 4 (1924) 145; Simons, ETL 101.
CONDITIONS: These spirants, voiceless dental and voiced and voiceless velar, had merged with the same sibilant and laryngeal phonemes in Phoenicia much earlier. The emphatic spirants and the voiced dental spirants had merged with sibilants both in Phoenician and in Palestine at an even earlier time.

40. Dialectal development of the [s] phoneme (retention of [t] phoneme?).


Not in—Gilead (and Jerusalem?) dialects of Hebrew, by the nature of the story in Ju. 12.6.

TIME: This bit of linguistic information probably goes back to pre-Davidic times in Palestine, and thus reveals a dialectal peculiarity which existed in about the 11th century.

CONDITIONS: There have been varying interpretations of this biblical statement. The form has been explained (Marquart ZAW 8 (1888) 151) as having still contained the [t] phoneme at a time when it had already merged with [s] in the rest of Palestine. The word [sibboleth] ‘stream’ (Jerusalem [sibboleth], as in Ps. 69.16) is given an etymology with initial [t-]; if Ephraim still pronounced [t] at this time the biblical writing with s would serve as an approximate representation, indicating its difference from the [s] which Gilead then pronounced in that word. However, the dialectal difference which this story reveals may have been merely a difference in the pronunciation of the [s] phoneme.

41. Vowel reduction.

PLACE: Phoenician — Before the stress: gubulim [g̱ubulim] < [gabulim] ‘boundaries’; the evidence for Phoenician is highly uncertain because it is mostly from proper names, in which various special analogic changes may have taken place. Some transcriptions and Punic spellings would seem to indicate that short vowels were reduced immediately before the stress, but some other interpretation may be necessary here, since the weight of evidence points rather to reduction in the second pre-stress syllable (GP 36).

After the stress: there is only indirect evidence, in that Punic spellings, which include vowel letters, never show a vowel after the second radical of verb forms with final long vowel (which at this

---

** See no. 13.  
67 See no. 5, 7, 12.
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... time were still stressed on the first syllable): n'dr' [nadərǔ] < [nádrǔ] < [ńádarǔ] 'they vowed.' Hebrew—Before the stress: [yəlāḏîm] < [yalāḏîma] 'children.' After the stress: [qātəlũ] < [qətəlũ] < [qətalũ] 3 pl. pf. verb form. So throughout Hebrew in positions stated below.

TIME: After the stress shift in the noun and verb forms with consonantal suffixes, and before the stress shift in verb forms without consonantal suffixes and in the infinitive verb forms; the unified statement of vowel reduction assumes the stress to have been in the positions in which it was only during this one period. Bergsträsser's late date (BH G I 21 p) must therefore be revised. After the dropping of final short vowels, since forms which had originally had final short vowels developed differently from those which had final long (anceph) vowels: [qətal] < earlier [qətala] remained, but [qətalũ] > [qətəlũ]; we must therefore assume that the final short vowels had already been dropped by this time.

CONDITIONS: A short vowel in open syllable was reduced before the stress when between it and the stressed syllable, or the next reduced vowel, there were one or more syllables of which only the last or none was an open syllable with a short vowel; and after the stress when it followed immediately after the stressed syllable.

It is possible to say that there were two separate processes of reduction, one before the stress, and one after it. Both would have had to take place within this period. Reduction before the stress: after the noun stress shift (but not necessarily after the dropping of final short vowels), and before the verb stress shift (since it was not operative in verb forms without consonantal suffixes); post-stress reduction: after the dropping of final short vowels (as above), and before the verb stress shift.

The results of these conditions may be seen in the masoretic vocalization of Hebrew, and probably also in the Phoenician material, which on this score is rather unclear. In Hebrew the reduced vowel became [ə], the quality of the original short vowel being no longer present except in certain cases, chiefly in the environment of laryngeals. In Phoenician the original quality seems to have been preserved (hence the usual transcriptions of reduced vowels as a, i, u), but these reduced [ə, i, u] could alternate with [ə]. Both in Hebrew and in Phoenician [ə] often received the quality of the following vowel (as in gubulim above).

One analogic reduction of vowels seems to have taken place before this change: the reduction of short vowels preceding the 2nd person plural and sing. possessive and objective suffixes (no. 24). We must assume
that these two formations, [libakêm] and [dabar-kâ] (the latter an
alternant to [dabare-kâ]), existed at the time of the general vowel reduc-
tion stated above, for this reduction operated in these forms as elsewhere.
Bergsträsser's statement (BH G 21 i) omits one type of syllable
before which reduction may occur: open syllable with long vowel, as in
[dabare-šîr] > [dibre-šîr] 'words of song.' A somewhat different state-
ment is given in BL 239-41.

42. Spirantization.

PLACE: Phoenician — rufe [rûfî] < [rápi’u] 'healer'; su fret [šôpêt]
< [šapi’tu] 'ruler'; Safitis [šapôt] < [šapia’tu] 'He has judged'
(nominal form of verb in proper name); Auckusor ['abdkôsôr] (GP
129); Adadôsartos ['abôdôsartô] (GP 130, but cp. Ovôdôsart GP
86); zyôf if [zyôf], identical with the month-name [ziw] 1 Ki. 6. 1.
However, in the large majority of transcriptions there is no indica-
tion of spirantization; Latin p, ph rather than f, is usually written
for Punic [p] even when it was postvocalic and hence spirantized.68
Hebrew—[dabâr] < [dabaru], and so throughout biblical Hebrew.

TIME: Probably after the early [d] > [z] and the later [t] > [z],
[b] > [b], [y] > [i], since there are no traces of confusion between
these spirants and the undoubtedly very similar postvocalic spirantized
pronunciations [d, t, k, g]; [p] had no earlier counterpart, and [b] was
hardly ever confused with the semivowel [w] (BH G 16 m). Before the
syncope of certain reduced vowels (see no. 43); but there is no indication
whether spirantization took place before or after the vowel reduction to
shwa.

The argument that spirantization must be later than the borrowing of
the alphabet names by the Greeks cannot be adduced here; it may or
may not antedate that borrowing, and there is no clear way in which the
Greek forms of the names could have represented the spirants.69

CONDITION: The simple stops [p, b, t, d, k, g], were spirantized after
vowels. This was an assimilation to the open position of the preceding
vowel, and the resulting spirants were merely non-phonemic positional
variants of the stop phonemes.

Some of the short vowels had undoubtedly been reduced to shwa before
this: the vowels before the 2nd person pl. and m. sg. suffix, and probably
those of the general vowel reduction.70 Spirantization occurred after
reduced vowels (shwa) as well as after full vowels. Later on, certain

68 Edward Sapir in Language 15 (1939) 64-5.
69 See Speiser, JQR 16 (1926) 368-70.
70 See no. 29 and 41.
of the reduced vowels were elided, but the spirantized pronunciation remained. If we are to continue even after this to consider the spirants as postvocalic positional variants of the stops, we must then consider these elided vowels as zero variants of the original vowel phonemes which had been there.

This is in essential accord with the position presented by Sievers, and accepted in principle by others (BHG I 21 r, BL 209-10), that spirantization had taken place before the syncope of vowels. The difficulties in dating which accompanied this view are obviated if the syncope of vowels is recognized as being a separate change, necessarily later than the vowel reduction.

43. Syncope of certain reduced vowels.

**Place**: Hebrew — [aḏmaṭi] < [aḏmaṭi] < [aḏamati] ‘my land’; [malḵê-] < [malḵê-] < [malakê-] ‘kings (est.).’

Phoenician—no evidence.

**Time**: After the general vowel reduction. After spirantization, since otherwise the simple stops after elided vowels would not have been spirantized. Before the stress shift in verb forms, for we can explain why reduced vowels were not elided in certain verb forms only by saying that the stress was still on the first syllable of these forms at the time that elision took place: e.g. the reduced vowel in [qātli] remained. Bergsträsser’s late date, after the 4th century B.C. (BHG I 30 k) is therefore impossible.

**Conditions**: Reduced vowels were elided if an unstressed open syllable with short vowel preceded them; the consonant preceding the elided vowel was then syllabified as the final consonant of the preceding syllable, making one closed (unstressed) syllable (with short vowel) in the place of two open syllables. As noted in no. 42, the elided vowel may nevertheless be regarded as a zero variant of the original vowel, and the spirantization which had taken place after the vowel usually remained.

This elided vowel has often been called “shwa medium” (BHG I 10 e, II p. 176); but it occupied no middle position in pronunciation, nor does it present any historical problems when viewed merely as an additional sound change after vowel reduction (BL 209-10).

44. [-át] replaced by [-á].

**Place**: Jerusalem and other Hebrew dialects — hŋqbḥ [hanniqbá] < [hanniqbát] < [hanniqbatu] ‘the tunnel’ (Siloam 1); biblical Hebrew f. sg. suffix [-á], written -h.
Some Phoenician dialects—ṣdyq' [sadiqā] < [sadiqāt] ‘just (f.)’ tm' [tammā] < [tammāt] ‘perfect (f.)’ (both Neo-Punic colonial forms, it is not known from which Phoenician dialect).

Not in most Phoenician dialects—'rpt ['urpat] ‘clerestory’; Phoenician place names in the bible, e. g. [sār'pāt]; possible loan-word through Phoenician in Hebrew: [bār'qāt] 'emerald' (Eze. 28. 13).

Not in some parts of Palestine—in local place names: ['ēlāt], [ba'eiša] [gīyāt] (this perhaps on the analogy of the construct, or from the locative; BL 510); in some personal names: [gīnāt], [šim'āt].

Not in Moabite—ḥmīt zīl ‘this altar’; however, the change may have spread to Moabite after the time of the Meša inscription.

**TIME:** After dropping of final short vowels, since the feminine noun suffix was not final until the case endings were dropped. Before the verb stress shift, since [-āt] in IIIyw verbs did not change. Before 700, since it appears in the Siloam inscription.

**CONDITIONS:** In parts of the Canaanite area this change took place only in the verb fem. suffix, hence before the noun fem. suffix became final. In those parts where both verb and noun suffix changed, it is best to assume two changes: one before the elision of final short vowels, and a second after that elision. See the conditions stated in no. 33.

When non-final, [-at] remained, as in nouns in the construct. Unstressed [-āt] remained, as in the IIIyw verb forms [hāyāt], etc.  

45. **Extension of the article to the demonstrative.**

**PLACE:** Hebrew—ḥ't hzh probably [ha'ēt hazzē] ‘this time’ (Lachish 6. 2); [habbāyīt hazzē] and the like in biblical Hebrew.

Not in Ya‘udi—ḥspr z ‘this inscription.’

Not in Phoenician—ḥrpt z ‘this clerestory’; ḫmm'lkt h 'that prince.’

Not in Moabite—ḥmīt zīl ‘this altar’ (3).

**TIME:** This usage, of the demonstrative with article prefixed, had probably become regular before the establishment of the literary style of the prophetic writings, and before the chief early editings of the biblical stories, for otherwise we should expect to find more traces of the earlier form without the article. It must therefore precede considerably the time of Amos and Hezekiah.

**CONDITIONS:** The regular construction in Canaanite, as also in Aramaic and Akkadian, is: noun + definite article, followed by demonstrative pronoun without article (Ph. ḫspr z ‘this inscription,’ Bib. Aram.

---

71 See no. 33, 34, 58.
[qarnā dā'] 'this horn'). There are traces of a perhaps earlier form, as in Arabic: demonstrative without article, followed by noun + article (Heb. [zē hā'am] 'this people' Is. 23. 13, [zē laḥmēnū] 'this our bread' Jos. 9. 2; Bib. Aram. [dānā binyānā] 'this building' and so especially in Syriac). The common Canaanite construction is found in early Hebrew inscriptions: hāṯm z 'this seal' (Diringer p. 251); in a few rare occurrences in the bible: [ballaylā hā] 'that night' (Gen. 19. 33, 30. 16, 1 S 19. 10 where the text has been doubted), [haqq'dēsā hî] (Gen. 38. 21); and it is the lost prototype for the frequent Hebrew construction with suffixed nouns, which consists, like the common Canaanite construction, of a noun + defining element (in this case possessive suffix, instead of article) followed by demonstrative without defining element: [sēbūṭī fēt] 'this my oath' (Gen. 24. 8), [dēbārēnū zē] 'this our word' (Jos. 2. 20). Later, and only in Hebrew, the demonstrative too came to be prefixed with the article whenever the noun was so prefixed; this was a new syntactic formation, probably on the analogy of the adjectives (nouns in apposition) which followed the noun as did the demonstratives, and which were prefixed with the article whenever the noun was.

46. Relative [zu] (<[dū]) replaced by [('a)š-].

PLACE: Ya'udi—wmy bbn 's yšb 'whoever of my sons shall sit' (13-4). Byblos—wkl 'dm 's ysp 'and any person who continues' (5th cent.). Other Phoenician dialects—'nḥn 's bnn 'it is we who built.'

North Palestine Hebrew—[ša-] ([ša-] Ju. 5. 7, 6. 17, etc.) in North Palestinian sources in Kt., Ju.; later spread over Hebrew area and frequent in later biblical books, where North Hebrew is relatively more prominent (Bergsträsser, ZAW 29 (1909) 40; BL 264; GB).

Not in Jerusalem Hebrew and Moabite, see no. 47.

TIME: After 1500 in Ugarit which has d [dū] 'the one who' (IIAB i 39). After the 10th century, at least in Byblos which has z [zu] in inscriptions of the 13th to 10th centuries (GP 98). By the 9th century, at least in Ya'udi. The new relative ['aš-] may have become regular in some areas earlier than it did in Byblos.

CONDITIONS: The element ['aš-] had undoubtedly existed in these dialects from Proto-Semitic times; it is cognate with the relative [śu] (f. [šāt], pl. [šāt]) of Old Akkadian and the related specialized (acc.) relative [ša] (<Proto-Semitic form with initial [t-]): Thureau-Dangin RA 30 (1933) 93; Poebel, OLZ 31 (1928) 699). Its early function in these Canaanite dialects is not known; it was probably used as a relative in particular constructions. In any case the relative [zu] declined in
frequency of use,²² and [‘aš-] came to be used more and more in its place. Byblos inscriptions show this change of usage locally between the 10th and 5th centuries; it seems to have been connected, at least there, with the change of the forms of the demonstrative from zn to z (GP 54-5, 63-4).

47. Relative [zū] ( [dū]) by [“šer].

PLACE: Jerusalem Hebrew — Ispr śr šlḥ ‘concerning the letter which he sent’ (Lachish 3.5-6); [“šer] in biblical Hebrew.

Moabite — śr yspt ‘which I added’ (29).

Not in Phoenician, North Hebrew; see no. 46.

TIME: The poetic literature of the Bible has many occurrences of the relative [zū] ( [dū]) (see GB), showing it to have been an old form, still remembered from traditional literature and reserved for elevated literary style, but no longer used in the common literary style of the early prophets and editors of the folk traditions. The new relative was therefore in common use probably before the 10th century. Before the 9th century in Moabite.

CONDITIONS: Reflexes of Proto-Semitic [‘atru] ‘place’ and related forms occur in many Semitic languages. In Jerusalem and Moabite, as to a slight extent in Akkadian, the construct of this form, ‘place of, place where,’ came to be used as a relative, probably first of place and then generally. The decline in frequency of the relative [zū] seems to have occurred throughout the Canaanite area at more or less one period; and the difference in its successors cut an isogloss across Canaanite, through the Hebrew area.

48. Disuse of forms with deictic [-t].

PLACE: Hebrew—most common prepositions are forms without the [-t]: [“lē] and [‘al] ‘on,’ [lipnē] ‘before,’ [tk] ‘within’; a few forms have [-t] but have been reinterpreted as feminines: so probably [mibbēnōt] ‘between,’ and the pronoun [zōt] ‘this (f.),’ cp. the probable Phoenician cognate below.

Not in Phoenician—lē [‘alat] (Byblos 5th cent., Sidon 4th cent., Punic) as well as lyy [‘alaya] (Byblos 13th-10th cent.), l [‘al[ē)] (Byblos 13th cent., Ya‘udi, Punic, etc.) ‘on’; pnt (Punic) as well as lpn (Byblos 11th cent., Ya‘udi, Neo-Punic) ‘before’; tkt (Byblos 5th cent., Ya‘udi?) ‘within’; zt, Latin transcription syth [zōt] (?) ‘this’ used in Punic as masculine, hence with deictic [-t], not fem. [-t], and probably cognate with Heb. [zōt].

²² See no. 52.
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TIME: The forms in [-t] had probably ceased to be common in Hebrew before the writing down of the classical texts of the Judaean kingdom, and before the prophetic writings.

CONDITIONS: Cp. the much earlier diphse of pronouns with [-t-] in Phoenician and Hebrew, no. 28. In late biblical Hebrew the pronoun form [hêm] ‘they’ gains in frequency over [hêmâ] < [himâ] which had the reflex of the deictic [-t].

49. New formation of tri-radical ipf. forms of hîk.

PLACE: Moabite—inv. lk ‘go’ (14) but ipf. (‘with waw consecutive,’”
    i.e., short preterite) hîk ‘I went’ (14-5).
    Not in Hebrew—wîlkîw ‘they flowed’ (also short preterite; Siloam
    4); biblical Hebrew [yélêk], etc.

TIME: Before 9th century in Moabite.

CONDITIONS: In view of the wide diffusion of the Iw-like forms of hîk in Canaanite, and since Moabite itself has one of these forms, it is probable that in the ipf. (preterite), too, the short form had been adopted in Moabite, but that later a second new formation, on the analogy of the pf. hîk, restored the ipf. forms with [h-]. This is probably also true of the similar late Hebrew ipf. [wayyahâdîk].

50. [napš] > [nâbš].

PLACE: Ya‘udi — nbš ytm ‘the soul of an orphan’ (13); nbš pmuw
    ‘the soul of Pannamu’ in the 8th century Hadad inscription (line
    32) from Ya‘udi, which is Aramaic but with local Canaanite admixture (see chapter 3. 5, fn. 10).
    Not in Phoenician elsewhere—nps (Cyprus 4th cent.).
    Not in Hebrew—biblical [nêps].

TIME: Before the end of the 9th century in Ya‘udi.

CONDITIONS: This must have been a special change in this word, perhaps assimilation of the [p] to the voicing of the preceding vowel. The assimilation may have occurred more readily if, as is probable, it took place in the final two-consonant cluster, which was created after final short vowels were dropped.

51. Shift of the stress in verb forms without consonantal suffixes.

PLACE: Phoenician—There seems to be no direct evidence.

Hebrew—[‘amar] ‘he said,’ etc., with late Hebrew pre-stress lengthening and masoretic stress-indication in the second syllable.

See no. 3.
**Development of the Canaanite Dialects**

**TIME:** After the dropping of final short vowels, for, had the then penultimate syllable been stressed before that time, its vowel would have been lengthened as in the noun (see below). After the general vowel reduction, for if verb forms had been stressed on the final syllable at that time, no statement could account for the different reductions in noun and verb forms. After the syncope of reduced vowels; syncope did not occur in these verbal forms because they still had initial stress.\(^4\) During or after the 8th century in Palestine, since the transcription a-u-si\(^2\) (728 B.C.) indicates a Canaanite [hâwêi'] which shortly or immediately after the stress shift became [hôši']: however, it may have been [hâwēi'], with the verb stress shift having just taken place and the diphthong remaining for a short time after it lost the stress.\(^2\) Before [-á-] > [-á-], since that change occurred in verbs when they already had final stress.\(^6\)

**CONDITIONS:** In infinitive verb forms, and finite verb forms without consonantal suffixes, all of which had been excluded from the earlier shift of the stress, the stress now shifted to the final syllable (BHGI 1:21). The result was [qatâl] < [qatâl] < earlier [qâțala] (this as compared with the noun [dabâr] (later Heb. [dâbâr]) directly < [dabâru]):\(^7\) [yaqtâl] (later Heb. [yiqtôl]) < [yâqtul] < earlier [yâqṭulu]; [qâṭlû] < [qāṭlû] < [qâṭlû]. In verb forms like [qâṭlī] the stress never shifted, since it had been on the penultimate syllable from Proto-Semitic times, and thus satisfied the conditions of the first stress shift without changing. In verb forms like [qâṭlûmu] the stress had shifted to the penultimate syllable in the first stress shift, that syllable becoming the ultima when final short vowels dropped.

That the second vowel of [qatâl] was short is indicated: in Hebrew by the masoretic vocalization with short [a] (patah); in Phoenician by the fact that it did not become [æ], as long [a] (certainly stressed long [â]) would have done. Cp. for Phoenician ia-ta-na-ē-li [yaṭan-‘âl] ‘El has given’ (JADD 621.2); sa-pa-ti-ba-al [šapāt-ba‘(a)] ‘Baal has judged’; probably ilu-ia-ta-a-nu [‘el-yaṭān] (HABL 1112.8); probably ia-‘a-ta-a-nu [yaṭān] ‘He has given’ (JADD 54.3). The large majority of Phoenician proper names have a long vowel in the final syllable, even if it is in a verb element, but that is because the proper names were in themselves nominal forms and as such shifted their stress in the first stress shift: ia-a-tu-na [yaṭûn] < [yatûnu] ‘He has given’ (so Ginsberg, JBL 56 (1937) 139; Brockelmann OLZ 40 (1937) 528; against GP 26).

\(^4\) See no. 43; see also 44, end.
\(^5\) See no. 1, under Jerusalem conditions, and 31.
\(^6\) See no. 53.
\(^7\) See no. 23.
52. Vowel reduction repeated.

**PLACE:** Hebrew—[y̞uqāt̮l̮ā] < [y̞uqāt̮t̮l̮ā] < [y̞uqāt̮t̮l̮ū] < [y̞uqāt̮t̮l̮ū].
Phoenician—no evidence.

**TIME:** After shift of the verb stress to final position, since this reduction is related to the final stress. Probably immediately after, since this second reduction constituted a conserving of the phonetic structure established by the first reduction.

**CONDITIONS:** This is an application of the reduction described in no. 41 to the new group of finally-stressed forms created by the verb stress shift.

53. [á'(-)] > [-á(-)].

**PLACE:** Phoenician—nasot [našū] < [našātī] (root nš) ‘I bore.’
Hebrew—[māšā] < [māšā'] < [māšā] ‘he found’; [māšā] < [māšā] ‘I found’; but not in [māšākāl] < [māšmāl] ‘food,’ [yeškāl] < [yaškāl] ‘he will eat.’

**TIME:** After the dropping of final short vowels, which yielded the final [-a'] groups. After the verb stress shift, thus accounting for the different histories of first and second stem syllables, the first syllables being now unstressed in both verb and noun.

Bergstrasser dates this change much earlier (BHG I 15 c), but the positions in which it took place require the later dating.

**CONDITIONS:** Syllable-closing ['] assimilated to preceding [a] in stressed syllables, whether final or medial. Since the change of [ā] > [ā] was past,75 — this new [ā] did not become [ā] as the first [ā] < [a'C] had.76 In Phoenician it became [ā], since long [ā (ā)] > [ā (ā)] continued.77

Bergstrasser recognized this as a sound change only in final position, as in [māšā'] < [māšā], explaining forms like [māšātī] by analogy of [māšā]; however if the change took place at this time, it can be understood as a regular sound change in all these forms, and recourse to analogic formations is not necessary.

54. [i''] > [-ê-], [-u''] > [-ô-].

**PLACE:** Phoenician—Bøwød, byt (late orthography) [bēr̪t̪] < [bi'r̪t̪] ‘Beirut, wells.’
Hebrew—nouns of the type of [rēm] < [ri'mu] ‘wild ox,’ and of the secondary type [bēw̪] ‘well’ based on [bi'r̪u].
Moabite—br [bêr] < [bi'r̪u] ‘well’ (or [bôr]? 24).

**TIME:** There is no certain evidence for the date of this change, but it

---

75 See no. 17.  
76 See no. 15.  
77 See no. 37.
probably was later than the change of [a'] > [a], since ['] assimilated more frequently to [a]. Perhaps about the 8th or 7th century: Assyrian transcriptions of that time show forms both with and without the [']: \textit{ab-di-li\textasciitilde{}-ti} (GP 129), \textit{bi\textasciitilde{}-ru-u} (GP 85); \textit{bi\textasciitilde{}-ir-gi\textasciitilde{}} (GP 85). Apparently before the 9th century in Moab.

55. [\textit{yiq\textasciitilde{}t\textacute{}l}] causative stem.

\textbf{Place}: Phoenician (no evidence for Ya\textsc{udi})—\textit{w\textasciitilde{}y\textsc{sh}ny} [wa-y\textasciitilde{}\textsc{sh}abn\textsc{uy\textasciitilde{}}] ‘and we caused him to dwell’ (GP 42).
Not in Hamat—[h-] prefix: \textit{whml\textasciitilde{}k\textsc{ny}} ‘and he caused me to rule’ (3).
Not in Hebrew—[h-] prefix in the [\textit{hiq\textasciitilde{}t\textacute{}l}] causative stem.
Not in Moabite—[h-] prefix: \textit{h\textasciitilde{}ny} ‘he saved me’ (4).

\textbf{Time}: There are no early occurrences of the causative in Phoenician texts, so that it is impossible to tell whether the development of the form with [y-] prefix was early or late. It must have been after the development of the [i] vowel in the prefix, which seems to have already existed in the 14th century, if \textit{hi\textasciitilde{}-i\textasciitilde{}h\textasciitilde{}-bi\textasciitilde{}e} (S. Pal. EA 256.7) is the causative [hi\textasciitilde{}bi\textasciitilde{}] ‘he hid’ (Ebeling 64).

\textbf{Conditions}: The origin of this form is unknown, except that it probably involved assimilation of [h-] to the following [-i-]: [hiq\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}la] > [yiq\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}la]. From these phonetically developed forms, the [y-] causative spread to utterances where that assimilation had not taken place (e.g. the form cited above), and thus replaced the [h-] causative.

56. [\textit{\textasciitilde{}ni}] ‘I’ gains in frequency over [\textit{\textasciitilde{}a\textsc{n}\textasciitilde{}k\textasciitilde{}i}].

\textbf{Place}: Hebrew—[\textit{\textasciitilde{}ni}] in common use (GB).
Not in Phoenician, Moabite—this form is not recorded, only ‘\textsc{n}k ‘I’.

\textbf{Time}: [\textit{\textasciitilde{}a\textsc{n}\textasciitilde{}k\textasciitilde{}i}] is regular in the early written sources (and oral traditions) of the bible (J, E). Sources which probably date just before the period of the prophets use both forms equally (Sam.), while the earliest prophets use [\textit{\textasciitilde{}a\textsc{n}\textasciitilde{}k\textasciitilde{}i}] in formal utterances, but [\textit{\textasciitilde{}ni}] more frequently, especially in ordinary speech. In the literature of the Babylonian exile and post-exilic Palestine [\textit{\textasciitilde{}a\textsc{n}\textasciitilde{}k\textasciitilde{}i}] hardly ever occurs. We must judge, therefore, that [\textit{\textasciitilde{}ni}] became the more frequent word for ‘I’ during the 10th century, and that by the 8th or 7th century [\textit{\textasciitilde{}a\textsc{n}\textasciitilde{}k\textasciitilde{}i}] was rare in the spoken language.

\textbf{Conditions}: Both [\textit{\textasciitilde{}a\textsc{n}\textasciitilde{}k\textasciitilde{}i}] and [\textit{\textasciitilde{}ni}] are reflexes of Proto-Semitic forms, the former having become regular in East-Semitic and Canaanite, the latter in Aramaic and South-Semitic. Early Canaanite also had [\textit{\textasciitilde{}an\textasciitilde{}}], using it infrequently: Ugaritic \textit{\textasciitilde{}an} (IIAB iv 59-60; I*AB ii 12,
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19) in Hebrew its existence is to be assumed from the fact that it later spread and replaced [ʼanōkti]. The position of BL 248-9 that [ʼnt] was an Aramaic form, belonging to the hypothetical younger (Aramaic) stratum in Hebrew, is unnecessary in view of the existence of that word in early Canaanite. The reduction of the first vowel cannot be explained from Aramaic, since that reduction had probably not taken place in Aramaic at the time which Bauer assumes for the coming of the younger stratum, and once the form was taken into Hebrew it must have undergone whatever reductions operated in other similar Hebrew forms, and could no longer be affected by Aramaic developments. The unusual reduction of pre-stress vowel in this form probably arose in its frequent proclitic (unstressed) position in the sentence. From these positions the form with reduced vowel was extended to positions in which it was not unstressed, replacing the regular unreduced form.

57. [-kî] > [-k], [-tî] > [-t].

Place: South Palestine (Jerusalem)—[šāmāʾat] < [šamāt] < [šamātī] ‘you (f. sg.) heard’; [ʼatt] < [ʼattī] ‘you (f. sg.)’; [lāk] < [lākt] ‘to you (f. sg.)’; [dāmēk] < [damā (?)kī] ‘your (f. sg.) blood’; [bānāyik] < [banāyk] < [banāyki] ‘your (f. sg.) sons.’

Not in North Palestine—hilkti [halākti] ‘you (f. sg.) went’ (Jer. 31. 31; and cp. Ru. 3. 4, etc.); ʼty [ʼattī] ‘you (f. sg.)’ (Ju. 17. 2, 1 Ki. 14. 2, 2 Ki. 4. 16, 23, Jer. 4. 36); ᵗky [lākt] ‘to you (f. sg.)’ (2 Ki. 4. 2); bnyky [banāyki] ‘your (f. sg.) sons’ (2 Ki. 4. 8).

Not in Phoenician—ʼbdky [ʼabdā (?)kī] ‘your (f. sg.) servant’ (Punic; perhaps not true for all Ph. dialects).

Time: Before the early editings of the consonantal text of the bible, since otherwise -y would have been written down as in the North Hebrew material. Hence probably well before the Babylonian exile; the writings without -y cannot be attributed to removal of pre-exilic y by post-exilic editings, since the North Hebrew forms with [-y] were left unchanged.

Conditions: The dropping of the aneeps [-t] of the fem. sg. suffix caused changes in the preceding vowel in some cases; see BHG I 27 a. The North Hebrew forms are listed in GK 157, 256, 258; BL 248, 253, 255. When non-final, this [-t] remained: [yaldātni > yliḏtni] ‘you have borne me’ (Jer. 15. 10).

58. New formation of IIIyw pf. verbs with f. suffix.

Place: Hebrew—[hāyā tô] ‘she was,’ [āšē tô] ‘she did’ in biblical

See no. 63 for a similar pre-stress reduction which could hardly have been Aramaic borrowing.
Hebrew, replacing [hayât], [’asât] of the Siloam inscription and earlier Hebrew (see no. 33, 34, and BHG II 30 r).

Not in the other Can. dialects, where the IIlyw verbs in pf. 3 f. sg. did not preserve the [-ât] at the time of the first change (no. 33-4).

**TIME:** After 700, since the Siloam inscription has hyt [hayât]. Before the fixing of the consonantal text of the bible, since the new [-â] is written -h.

**CONDITIONS:** The new formations were on the analogy of the regular 3 f. sg. pf. verb form [qâṭ’lâ]; they replaced the forms in [-ât] which were formulaic in Hebrew, not fitting into the regular pattern, since this [-ât] alone had escaped both Hebrew changes of [-ät/-ât] > [-â].

59. **Reduction of final double consonants.**

**PLACE:** Phoenician — probably: γάνος [gan] < [gann] < [gannu] ‘garden’; κάδος [kad] < [kadd] ‘jar’; final double consonants were still pronounced at an earlier period: the Greek form of the alphabet name καππά [kapp] < [kappu] (final short vowels having already been dropped).

Jerusalem Hebrew (Tiberian masoretic form) — [kol] < [kull] < [kullu] ‘all’; [’am] < [’amm] ‘people’; [hay] < [hayy] ‘living’ (root hyy); [taw] analogically replacing [taw] < [taww] ‘mark’ (root tww/y, as may be seen in the verb form [w’hitwîhâ] ‘and you shall set a mark’).


**TIME:** After dropping of final short vowels, when these originally heterosyllabic double consonants became a final cluster. After the Greek borrowing of the alphabet names. After [-ät] > [-â] (in nouns) since [-ät] < [-att] did not become [-â]: [’ahadtu] > [’ahattu] > [’ahatt] > [’ahat] ‘one.’ There is no lower date before which it must have been completed; the change may be considerably later than here assumed.

**CONDITIONS:** This precedes a later Hebrew (and perhaps wider Canaanite) tendency to reduce final clusters. Medial double consonants remained, divided into two syllables. Bergsträsser notes (BHG I 24 e) that the regular reflex of these forms had a short vowel since vowel lengthening had not occurred in syllables which were closed before the dropping of short final vowels; forms like [gâg] ‘root’ were new formations (replacing [gâg], etc.) on the analogy of the other nouns which had stress-lengthened vowels in their final closed syllables.

---

**See no. 33, 34, 44.**

**See no. 65 d.**
60. **New formation of [ʼilôn] 'god.'**

**Place:** Phoenician—Іт [ʼilôn] (Punic); pl. Імм, алоним [ʼalônîm], f. алонна (Byblos 5th cent., Sidon, Cyprus, Punic).

Not in Hebrew, where it does not occur.

**Time:** Before the 5th century, how much earlier we cannot tell.

**Conditions:** [ʼilu] 'god' is found in early Byblos inscriptions, in later Phoenician it occurs as the name of one god 'El.' The new formation [ʼilôn] was probably on the analogy of [ʼadôn] 'Lord, god' (itself related to a borrowed [ʼaddu] 'father, lord' which was used in Ugarit and probably elsewhere in Canaanite); it may have been formed much earlier, when Canaanite still had [ʼad] by the side of [ʼadôn]. There were several divine names and epithets ending in this suffix, e.g. Sanchuniathon's Элнн [ʼelôn] 'highest.'

61. **Development of the suffix [-nêm] 'them, their.'**

**Place:** Phoenician (Sidon, etc., Punic; no evidence for Byblos)—

ъғърънм [yəgъrъnъm] 'may they deliver them up'; въспънм [wəspъnъm] 'and we added them' (both Sidon 4th cent.); хъбрънм [хъбръnъm] 'their colleagues' (Punic), etc. In other forms, chiefly those ending in consonants (after elision of final short vowels), the suffix was [-êm]: yəbrъm 'may he bless them.'

Not in Hebrew, where the suffix is [-hém], [--ám].

Not in Moabite in the 9th century—въскъ-ъм 'and I dragged them' (18).

**Time:** After syncope of [-h-] after [-n] in this suffix, and after the elision of final short vowels, on the basis of the explanation below. Before the 4th century. Byblos has Імм 'upon them' in the 5th century: the new suffix may not have been extended as yet to that form; or it may have been extended even earlier but may never have reached Byblos.

**Conditions:** In the suffix [-hém] 'their,' [-h-] was elided after consonants, specifically after the [-n] which followed final anepic vowels in ipf. indicative as against jussive; this is seen in [yəgъrъnъm] < [yəgъrъnъhъm] (indicative). The jussive retained the [-h-]: [yəgъrъhъm], since [-h-] was not elided after long vowels. After the dropping of final short vowels the jussive ([ъaъtъlъ]) and indicative ([ъaъtъlъ] < [ъaътъlъ]) came to be identical in most forms and the difference in meaning ceased to be formal; in the forms with final anepic vowel, the [-n], which still remained as a formal distinction between indicative

---

**Note:** See chapters 2, 3, 5, A3.
and jussive, was now no longer recognized in this function, and the forms
with [-n] became free variants of those without [-n]. As a result,
[yasgīrūnm] and [yasgīrūhm] were equivalents, related to [yasgīrū]
‘they will deliver up.’ From such forms [-nēm] was clipped as a suffix
‘them, their’; i.e., other verbs ending in anceps vowels were used with
that suffix, as in the pf. [yasapnū-nēm]. Use of this suffix was extended
to other, non-verbal, forms ending in long vowel, as in [ḥab-rē-nēm];
and apparently also to a few forms which did not end in vowels (GP
49-50). See chapter 5. A3, fn. 11.

62. Lexical specializations: mmlkt ‘prince’; [ʾilīm] ‘godhead.’

PLāCē: Phoenicia—mmlkt (Byblos 5th cent., Sidon 4th cent., Punic);
ʾlm, ʾilīm ‘god (m. and f.).’ (Sidon 4th cent., Tyre 3rd cent., Punic).

Not in Hebrew, where these forms are not recorded in these meanings.

TIME: Before 5th century.

CONDITIONS: These are a few of the specializations in meaning of many
words which apparently occurred independently and with different results
in various parts of the Canaanite area. mmlkt, a derived noun which
in Hebrew came to mean ‘sovereignty,’ was specialized as ‘prince’ in
Phoenician. And [ʾilīm], plural of [ʾil] ‘god’ came to mean ‘godhead, 
divinity’ in Phoenician and became finally the common word for ‘deity,
god (m. or f.).’ in Hebrew this form dropped from use as the regular
plural of [ʾēl] ‘god’ (see GB), but there the form disappeared from
use instead of becoming specialized as in Ph. (GP 59, 60, 77).

63. Formation of [naḥnū] ‘we’ from [“naḥnū].

PLāCē: Hebrew — nḥwn (Lachish 4.10-1), rare variant [naḥnū] in
late biblical sources (Ex. 16. 7, 8, Gen. 42. 11, etc.); but the regular
form in the literary language is [“nāḥnū].

Not in Phoenician—’nḥn (Sidon 4th century).

TIME: By the 6th century it was either the common form in the spoken
language, or at all events a frequent free variant.

CONDITIONS: This form is probably to be explained not as a borrowing
from Aramaic, which has [naḥnā] only in a few late dialects, and in
which case a conflation would have to be assumed with the Hebrew form
ending in [-ū], but rather as a special development in Hebrew. The
syncope of the first syllable, and the earlier reduction of the first vowel,
are both probably due to the frequent occurrence of this word in proclitic
position, without the stress; cp. [“nīf] in no. 56. Cp. the similar syncope
in Phoenician in the name ["shirôm"], and in other names in Punic (GP 31-2). From proclitic positions the form with reduced vowel was extended to positions in which it was stressed, yielding the regular biblical ["nâhnû"]. Then the new form [naḥnû] seems to have originated in unstressed proclitic positions, and it too apparently extended to stressed positions.

64. Formation of root skr from zkr 'remember.'

**Place**: Phoenician (probably most dialects)—lskr ‘for remembrance’ (Tyre 2nd cent.), wyskrn ‘may he remember me’ (Cyprus 3rd cent.), skrb'l, [saƙarba'(a)]l ‘Baal remembers’ (Punic).

Not in some Phoenician dialect—lskr (Punic).

Not in Hebrew—root zkr.

**Time**: Before 3rd century.

**Conditions**: This must first have been an assimilation of [z] to the voiceless [k] following it: [ya (?)skur] < [yazkur]; later, however, new formations were created on the analogy of these forms with skr, so that [s] occurs even when a vowel follows (GP 29).**

(65.) Among the late changes which took place in Hebrew and Phoenician the following may require especial mention:

a. **Merging of [s] with [z] in Hebrew (but not in Phoenician where [s] > [z] long before)** — evidenced by confusion of s and z in writing, and by masoretic tradition: Kahle, Masoreten des Ostens 119, and in BL 114-6; BHG I 6 s.

b. **Weakening of the glottal stop and laryngeals, and later the merging and disappearance of some of them as phonemes, in Hebrew and Phoenician (esp. Punic)—evidenced by such masoretic traditions as the hâqef vowels, and by confusions in spelling. This took place in North Palestine earlier than in South Palestine; and while it probably occurred in Phoenicia, the historical spellings are retained and do not show it. Punic spellings show the loss of most or all of these phonemes: Kahle, Masoreten des Westens; Speiser, JQR 23 (1933) 237; BHG I 6 h, 15 d, 28 r, s; BL 206, 221; GP 27-8.**

c. **[ä] > [ê] in Hebrew (much earlier in Phoenician)** — evidenced

**For skr/zkr cf. B. Meissner, Studien zur assyr. Lexicographie 3 p. 23 (Mitteil. d. alter. Ges. 11. 1)).**

**See no. 4.**

**See no. 37.**
by the masoretic traditions: Kahle in BL 99, 102; GvG 100-1; BHG I 8 n, 10 a, 30 m; Speiser, JQR 24 (1933) 34-5; Sperber, Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin transcriptions, Hebrew Union College Annual 12-3 (1937-8) 103-274.

d. Breaking up of final two-consonant clusters in Hebrew by the intrusion of anaptyctic ("segolate") vowels; in Phoenician this process was limited to clusters whose second consonant had relatively high sonority—evidenced by masoretic anaptyctic vowels and transcriptions of Phoenician forms: Speiser, Secondary developments in Semitic phonology, AJSL 42 (1925-6) 145-69; BHG I 23 f-i; BL 212; GP 33-4.

e. Lengthening of vowels in open syllables immediately before the stress in Hebrew (no trace of it in Phoenician)—BHG I 21 k; BL 234; Speiser, JQR 24 (1933) 37-8.
CHAPTER 5

THE LINGUISTIC EVOLUTION OF CANAANITE

A—Effect upon the Structure of Canaanite

The developments which took place in Syria-Palestine brought about many changes in the total structure of the language. A tabulation of these changes by the effect which they had would thus serve to show the general drift of the whole linguistic area.

1. Phonemic pattern. The emphatic spirants were lost as separate phonemes throughout the whole area: \([\d]\) > \([\t]\) (5), \([\t]\) > \([\t]\) (12), in both cases their pronunciation merged with that of another phoneme, \([\t]\).

The non-emphatic spirants were also lost, \([\d]\] merging with \([\d]\] in Ugaritic (6) and with \([\t]\] elsewhere (7), and \([\t]y\] merging with \([\t]\) respectively (12, 39). The last three continued as distinct phonemes in Palestine much longer than in Phoenician.

\([\t]\) too was eventually lost throughout the Canaanite area. It merged with \([\t]\] at a very early time throughout most of the places for which we have records (4); in Jerusalem it continued to exist, but finally merged with \([\t]\] (65a).\(^2\)

At a very late time, past the scope of this study, the glottal stop, after having assimilated in various positions, seems finally to have been eliminated in most positions and to have been lost as a phoneme. The laryngeals, at the same late period, apparently merged into one laryngeal phoneme, and then that too probably disappeared from speech (65b). These changes took place in some parts of the Canaanite area earlier than in others; there is no proof that they ultimately extended over the whole area.

\(^1\) In chapters 5 and 6 numbers in parentheses indicate the changes listed in chapter 4.

\(^2\) Two other signs in the Ugaritic alphabet, both of which may represent additional sibilants, should be mentioned here. One, \(s^2\), is used in a few foreign words which had come into common use in Canaanite, and in a few uncertain forms; the other, \(z\), is used in Hurrian words, and in several uncertain forms which may be Semitic. Both are used in Semitic texts, but neither in a common Semitic phoneme. \(s^2\) may be merely a traditional writing for \([s]\) in certain borrowed words, or it may represent the foreign sibilant with which these words were for a time pronounced; \(z\) is apparently a Hurrian affricate which was used in Hurrian loan-words into Canaanite and perhaps in some Ugaritic new-formations (cf. chapter 4, fn. 12).
New phonemes [ê, ô] developed by regular sound change from [ay, aw] (1), and later occurrences of long [e] ([ê, ê]) arose from [iː] (54), [iː] (stress lengthening 36), and of long [ô] from [â] (17).  

A new phoneme, long [a] ([ā, ə]) developed in Phoenician (37), and very much later in Hebrew (65c); it arose from [ā-] (stress lengthening) and from later assimilations of [â] (and [a]?) and was phonemically distinct from [ô].

The long grade of the phoneme [a] continued, as far as concerned the sound pattern, in the form of this [ā (ā)], but it no longer had the same phonetic relation to short [a] as it had had before the change.

In terms of the phonemic pattern, Canaanite had thus lost the class of spirants, the dental spirants merging with sibilants (except for Ugaritic, where [d] merged with its stop) and the velar spirants analogously merging with laryngeals. Later Canaanite had lost the class of laryngeals and the glottal stop, their places being taken by zero. In the vowels the pattern development was the addition of intermediate long vowels correspondingly placed among the three Semitic ones, replacing the series [î ˘ ˘] by [î ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘].

2. Phonetic Structure. In types of syllables: Final open syllables with short vowels were eliminated and were replaced by a previously rare category, final closed syllables; this change was the result of the loss of final short vowels (35). And doubly closed syllables, i.e., final consonant clusters, were almost entirely eliminated, at least, in very late Hebrew, by a series of changes including assimilation of [‘] to the preceding vowel when it was the first member of a cluster (15), reduction of final double consonants (59), and development of an anaptyctic vowel between the two consonants of almost all final clusters (65d); the last change seems to have taken place only in Hebrew, and at a very late period.

The incidence of particular phonemes, especially [h w y n], was altered; in certain positions they ceased to occur, either through assimilation or through syncope. In the center and north of the Canaanite area, [n] before consonant was assimilated even in the one position where it had remained, i.e., as third radical (11). Throughout the area syllable-final [y, w] after [a] no longer occurred (monophthongization of the diphthongs 1, 31) and so also syllable-initial [y, w] between short vowels (32); similarly [h] no longer occurred between short vowels and final long ones (aneps; 30). [‘] no longer occurred as the first member

*The phonemic character of short [e] (and [o]) in Phoenician (e.g. σαλλαχ for [šllek] “he set free” GP 150) and Hebrew (short šere as in the piel verb), and of both the long and short [e] (segol) in Hebrew, is still in doubt.
of a consonant cluster (15), nor as syllable-closing in stressed syllables (64; but syllable-final ['] continued, at least for a long time, in unstressed syllables). The combination [-at] at the end of words disappeared entirely or almost entirely in Hebrew (33, 44; the residue in 34 was obviated in 58).

Considerable change took place in the secondary phonemes: The position of the stress changed to the penult syllable (23) which later, after the dropping of final short vowels (35), came most frequently to be final; this new position was extended with the shift of the stress in the unshifted verbal forms to the final syllable (51). Length of vowel took on a new function after stress-lengthening (36). Hitherto length had been almost entirely morphologic, a characteristic of certain stem-types; now it became also a property of stressed vowels in certain conditions. Much later, perhaps only in the artificial tradition of learned Hebrew, there was a similar phonetic lengthening of pre-stress vowels in open syllables (65e).

There also developed new positional variants to the existing phonemes. Vowel reduction set up a shwa variant [ə] to all vowels in certain positions (41, 52), and syncope of some shwas created further a positionally defined zero variant (43). Taken together with stress-lengthening of vowels this resulted in a pattern of four length grades in the place of the Proto-Canaanite short vowels, positionally determined in relation to stress and syllable structure: long, short, reduced, zero. Another set of positional variants was created by the spirantization of simple stops after vowels (42).

3. Morphology. The outstanding change in the morphologic structure of Canaanite was the replacing of the objective aspect system by a subjective aspect system. Proto-Semitic, and Proto-Canaanite, had had the objective aspects which we see in Akkadian: preterite yaqtušul (Akk. yaqtušu) and present yaqatalu (Akk. iqâš(t)aš; the present also had a form with enigmatic [-anna] ([-na]) suffix. However, Proto-Canaanite also had a modal system, which East-Semitic did not have: by the side of the preterite which ended in [-u] it had a jussive yaqṭul without that [-u], and probably a subjunctive yaqṭalu ending in [-a]. It is important to note that, because of the existence of a jussive and subjunctive, the present tense had here a much more restricted function than in Akkadian. It was used, as is seen in Ugaritic, only for present indicative; the conditional, desiderative, etc., which in Akkadian would also have been expressed by the present, were expressed in Canaanite by these.

4 See chapter 2.6, and chapter 4. no. 19, 22.
5 See chapter 2.3.
two modes. In addition, Proto-Canaanite and East-Semitic both had a stative perfect aspect developed out of a pronominally-inflected nominal sentence, the Canaanite suffixes being somewhat different: [kabida] ‘he is heavy,’ [kabidti] ‘I am heavy,’ [qatuna] ‘he is small’; but because of the West-Semitic internal passive formations this "nominal" form functioned as a complete stative perfect, whereas in East-Semitic it functioned just as a passive adjective ("permansive"). It was the elaboration of the morphologic pattern contained in the passive forms and verbal modes that resulted in the aspect-system of Canaanite and of West-Semitic in general. For on the analogy of stative qatila and qatula there was formed qatala (18), for roots referring to more active situations. These three together then formed the perfect verbal aspect, used for completed actions and states; later on, the use of the qatala form was extended to many roots whose perfect had previously been qatila or qatula. This perfect aspect came to be favored over the preterite, in referring to most past actions; and soon the preterite dropped entirely from use (19). In some parts of the Canaanite area, mostly inland, the short preterite, used after [wa-] ‘and’ and other particles, was preserved as the narrative tense; but in Phoenician it too was dropped (20).

At this stage a new aspect was developed, the imperfect, having the same form as the now forgotten preterite (21). The history may have been as follows: As the perfect replaced the preterite in regular speech, the few cases of the preterite which still occurred (in old stereotyped phrases and the like) came to be formulaic, members of an obsolescent form, and were no longer understood as a preterite tense. Now it happened that this petrified verbal form, yaqatula, seemed to have an obvious relation to the other existing forms: as between yaqatala present indicative, and yaqatalu, yaqatula jussive and subjunctive aspects, this yaqatulu had precisely the form which an indicative aspect related to the two modes would have had. It is probable that on this formal analogy the petrified yaqatulu forms came to be interpreted as an imperfect indicative, a category hitherto non-existent. This new imperfect soon became a regular construction, applicable to any root for which there was a jussive or present; the beginnings of its use are seen in the Amarna letters. Fitting as it did into the now largely "subjective" system of the Canaanite verb, it was favored over the present. In time, the present dropped out of use (22) and Canaanite was left with a practically pure

*Since the verb system assumed for Proto-Canaanite, on general comparative grounds, is the same as that which we find in the Ugaritic texts of the 15th century B.C., it can best be seen in the full description presented by A. Goetze, The Tenses of Ugaritic, JAOS 58 (1938) 266-309; see also chapter 2.3.
subjective-aspect verb system, the chief remnant of the old tense system
being the short preterite in the inland dialects.

Later on, the modes were lost as an indirect result of phonetic changes.
With the loss of final short vowels (35) the difference between indicative
imperfect yaqtul and subjunctive yaqta disappeared. The difference
between these and the jussive also disappeared (since all became yaq tul),
except that after long final vowels the first two had [-n] whereas the
jussive did not. However, in time the use of [-n] after long vowels
ceased to be regular, at least in Hebrew; even when it was used, it no
longer marked the indicative as against the jussive.7 The energetic [-na]
([-anna]), which lost its vowel in the dropping of the final short vowels,
also ceased to be used finally, remaining only before objective suffixes.8

Other general morphological changes were the early dropping of mimation
and hence, since the article did not come into wide use till later,
the loss of formal distinction of the indefinite noun (2); and the disuse of
the [t]-reflexive of the simple stem in part of the Canaanite area (38).
There were some amplifications of shortened forms: the new-formation
of feminine nouns with [-t] suffix for IIIy nouns (25), and the new-
formation of verbs with pleonastic feminine suffix [-â] in IIIy pf. 3 f.
sg. (58).

4. Syntax. There is not enough material to speak with certainty on
syntactic changes. One of the clearest changes before late Hebrew times
was the extension of the article to the demonstrative in Hebrew (45),
thus putting the demonstrative into the syntactic position of the adject-
tival (attributive) noun.

5. Lexicon. There were several changes of form in particular roots
or elements. In the personal suffixes, [-h-] of the third person sg. was
replaced by [-y-] in most of Phoenician (29); final [-t] of the second
person feminine suffixes was dropped in southern Hebrew (Jerusalem;
57); a new third person plural suffix [-nêm] arose in South Phoenician,
replacing [-êm] and [-hêm] in many forms (61). In the causative
prefix, too, [h-] was replaced by [y-] in Phoenician (55). Case-endings,
verb-final vowels, and the like, were reduced before stressed second person
suffixes (24). New formations of a group or stems of one root included:
bi-radical lki, ‘go’ (3) and then again tri-radical hlik (49), ytn ‘give’
(9), dlt ‘door’ (24), nôs ‘soul’ (50), skr ‘remember’ (64). New
formations of specific words included [ilôn] ‘god’ (60), [ilîm] ‘god’

7 GP 40-1, and fn. 9; BHG II 5 b; BL 300; see also chapter 4, no. 21, 61.
8 The energetic form is frequent in Ugaritic of the 15th century B. C., cf. Goetze,
JAOS 58 (1938) 292; MH 23; it is found in the Amarna letters, cf. Ebeling 69-73. In Hebrew there are only formulaic traces of it: BL 338 q-s, 340 c'.
Development of the Canaanite Dialects

(62), [ʼnî] ‘I’ (with reduced first vowel, 56), [naḥnû] ‘we’ (with elided first syllable, 63).

There was considerable fluctuation in the frequency of forms, words of one root often being favored over those of another. Such fluctuation is seen in the favoring of third person sg. pronouns without [-tu] (later Hebrew also in plural pronouns, 28), the disuse in Hebrew of particles with deictic [-t] (48), and the various levellings in various dialects of the two feminine suffixes [-atu] and [-tu] (10). Of this order are the favorings of [kûn], p’l, b’rs, ’dm in Phoenician as against ḫyh, ’śh, ḥhb, ’s in Hebrew (26 a, b), of [’nû] in Phoenician and North Hebrew as against [’næsr] in Jerusalem (46-7), of ’lh ‘god’ (27) and [’ani] ‘I’ (56) in Hebrew, and of mmkt ‘prince’ (62) in Phoenician. The paucity of records outside of Hebrew, and the early age of the Ugaritic literature, makes it difficult to discover the favorings of roots and the specializations of meaning in the various Canaanite dialects.

6. Dates of changes in the various linguistic features. In correlating these changes with the dates when they occurred, it is found that changes in all these features occurred at all times. Changes in the phonemic pattern, in the phonetic structure, in the morphology, and in lexical form, all occurred from the earliest to the latest periods. In lexical favoring the sampling was so small, and the dating arbitrary within such wide limits, that no judgment can be made; but the probability is that these changes, too, were scattered over the whole period. It is therefore impossible to say that different features of linguistic development (phonemic, morphologic, etc.) tend to occur early or late, or that they tend to occur in larger or smaller language areas.

B—THE LINGUISTIC PROCESSES INVOLVED

These developments in Canaanite were the result of several different kinds of linguistic processes falling within the general classes of phonetic change, analogic change, and fluctuation of frequency.

1. Phonetic changes. Those for which we can not assign any immediate cause:

the phonemic merging of the spirants, [š], [ʼ], and laryngeals with other

---

* Table 1 on p. 92 (chapter 6.2) can serve for this correlation; it is divided by the features of development in question, and the relative dates may be gauged from the number of each development, the lower numbers representing earlier time.

10 Since, at the end of this period, the Canaanite area was no longer one large area, but a group of smaller ones.
phonemes or with zero (5, 12, 6, 7, 13, 39; 4, 40, 65a, 65b: within each series the later changes may have been partly determined by the situation created by the earlier ones);
the early changes of vowel quality of stressed long [ā] > [ō] (17; which made that phoneme identical with [ō] < [aw]); shift of the stress (33);
dropping of final short vowels (14, 35);
replacing of the suffix [-at] by [-ā] in the verb (33, 34);
reduction of final double consonants (59) and the probably related breaking of final consonant cluster by anaptyctic vowels (65d).

Those which were probably due to the current actualizations of the phonemes (including secondary phonemes):

monophthongization of diphthongs (1) and syncope of intervocalic [y, w] (32), resulting from the semi-vowel pronunciation of [w] and [y];
limited syncope of intervocalic [-h-] (30), resulting from the weak pronunciation of [h] and the probable existence of a zero variant for it (i.e., that a form with intervocalic [-h-] was probably sometimes pronounced without the [-h-]);
stress-lengthening (36), arising partly as length compensation for the dropping of final short vowels;
vowel reduction and syncope (41, 52, 43), including the reduction in ["ni] (56) and ["nahnu] (63), and the syncope in [nahnu] (63), resulting from the strong pronunciation of the stress.

Those changes which may have resulted from configurational pressure, since they had the effect of maintaining the existing phonetic structure: later monophthongization of diphthongs (1, 31) on the pattern established in 1;
change of quality of [ā] > [a] (37, 65c) on the pattern established in 17;
replacing of [-at] by [ā] in the noun (44) on the pattern established in 33;
shift of the stress in verb forms (51) based on the situation resulting from 23;
further reduction of vowels (52), repeating 41.
We may also consider the later loss of phonemes in any given class as being facilitated by the earlier loss of its class-members (see above); and the assimilation of III n (11), if it was an additional change, was undoubtedly due to the incidence of the [n]-phoneme (its non-occurrence before consonants, and the fact that forms having pre-vocalic [-n-] configurated with forms having double consonants where pre-consonantal [-n-] would be expected).
Assimilations of neighboring sounds:
change of quality of [a'] > [e'] (8);
assimilation of [i] to preceding vowel (15, 53, 54);
spirantization of stops after vowels (42);
[h] > [y] in contact with [i]-vowels (in the suffix 29, in the causative 55);
voicing of the stop in assimilation to the vowel (?) in [nabš] < [napš]
'soul' (50);
unvoicing of the sibilant in assimilation to the stop in [yiskur] < [yizkur]
'he will remember' (64).

2. Analogic new-formations. Those for which we cannot assign any immediate analogic model:
loss of mimation (2);
extension of the feminine suffixes [-atu], [-tu] each at the expense of the other (10);
disuse of [t]-reflexive of the simple verb (38);
loss of final [-i] of second person feminine suffixes in Jerusalem (57).

Creation of new grammatical classes on the analogy of the existing morphologic pattern:
qatala, active perfect on the analogy of the stative perfects (18);
yaqatala, imperfect indicative on the analogy of the two modes and the present tense (21).

Creation of new forms on the analogy of functionally comparable grammatical forms of other roots:
IIIy nouns with feminine suffix (25);
IIIy verbs with pleonastic feminine suffix (58);
[daṭu] ‘door’ with feminine suffix (27);
[‘ilôn] ‘god’ with [-ôn] suffix (60);
bi-radical ̀lk ‘go’ (3) and new tri-radical ̀lk (49);
ytn ‘give’ (9).

Extension of existing forms to new positions, on the analogy of comparable forms which occurred in both positions; this is the creation of a new incidence of the form in question:
extension of the construct form without final short vowel to all forms before stressed personal suffixes (24);
extension of the clipped suffix [-nêm] to forms which, not having ended in [-n], had had [-êm] or [-hêm] as suffix (61);11

11 In the history of the formation of this new suffix, such extension is the only process which we can observe. The prior misunderstanding of the [-n-], the
extension of the article to the demonstrative on the analogy of attributive nouns (45);  
new-formation of third person sg. suffixes with [y] instead of [h] on the analogy of those in which [h] had changed phonetically to [y] (29);  
similar extension of [y] in the causative [yiqṭil] to forms where [y] had not phonetically developed (55);  
new formations with the roots nbd, skr in forms where the assimilation had not occurred (50, 64);  
extension of the reduced (unstressed) forms ["nū] ‘I’ (56), ["nāhnu] and later [nāhnu] ‘we’ (63) even to positions in the sentence in which they were stressed.

3. Fluctuation in frequency of forms, dependent upon many un-reconstructable factors of a generally analogic nature: Gain in frequency must have taken place in all the new forms which resulted from analogic change. For in the case of such new forms there was always a choice between the previous way of saying a given utterance and the new way. In many cases there was a competition between the new form and a specific old form in whose place it had originally been created and in whose place alone it could be used: e.g., the competition in the use of [yatana] or [natana] for ‘he gave’ (9), or in the use of [habāyť hazē] or [habāyť zē] for ‘this house’ (45). In other cases the new formation filled an empty space in the morphologic pattern, so that its use competed not with that of some one other form but with the various utterances which had previously been used in comparable situations: e.g., the active perfect qatala (19) and the imperfect yaqṭulu (21). In all cases it was those new formations which rose in frequency that became regular in the current speech.

Decline in frequency occurred in many existing speech-forms, as for example in the competition with new formations which is implied in the acceptance of the new forms above. The disuse of the objective aspects (19, 20, 21) was probably conditioned by the growing aspect pattern; the disuse of pronouns with [-tu] (28) and of forms in deictic [-t] (48) was related to the confusion of this ending with the feminine suffix; and the disfavoring of the relative [zū] (46-7) was probably related to its similarity to the [zē] demonstrative (especially after this form of assumption that the whole of [-nēm] was included in the suffix, is not an event to which we can point. In terms of the configuration of the language, one may say that with the dropping of the functional value of indicative [-n], the form [yasgrūnēm] changed from imperfect indicative verb ([yasgrūn]) + objective suffix ([-ēm]) to imperfect verb ([yasgrūn]) + objective suffix ([nēm]). But this cannot be tested, and the new division does not appear as an event until [nēm] as an objective (and later possessive) suffix is extended to other forms.
the demonstrative had spread at the expense of the [zen] form. In the decline of frequency of various roots in various parts of the area (26ab, 56, 62) there were factors which we cannot now know.

4. Correlation of the processes of change with the features which were changed. From the two lists above it is possible to correlate the features of linguistic development (phonemic, morphologic, etc.) with the types of process which brought them about. It is found that the phonetic changes affected the phonemic pattern, the phonetic structure, and various lexical forms, while the analogic changes affected the morphology, the syntax, and the lexical stock (the existence of certain forms or roots rather than others).

The same arrangement may be stated in terms of the effects: Changes in the phonemic pattern were due mostly to unknown factors, but in some cases to the influence of current pronunciation or the existing phonetic structure. Changes in the phonetic structure were due partly to unknown factors, partly to the influence of the current pronunciation, partly to assimilation. Changes in the morphology were caused in some cases by influence of the existing morphologic structure, in other cases by the automatic result of phonetic changes which merged forms that had previously been morphologically different, and often by extensions and the rise and decline of frequency of words which had special grammatical formations. The one recorded change in syntax was caused by analogic extension. Changes in lexical forms were due to assimilations and the analogic extensions of such changed forms, also to a variety of reasons determining analogic new formations. Changes in acceptance of forms were due to the host of factors which determined the fluctuation in their frequency.

18 GP 53-5.
19 Or from a comparison of the vertical listings in Tables 1 and 2, on p. 92-3.
CHAPTER 6

FORMATION OF DIALECTS

1. The geographic extension of changes: convergence and divergence. The gradual breaking up of the Canaanite linguistic community into large and small dialect areas was the result of the varying geographic extensions of the changes that took place. Some changes occurred over the whole area: in most cases they were the result of diffusion of the new features, from the place where it developed, to all Canaanite communities; in a few cases they may have been the result of independent identical changes in various parts of Syria-Palestine. These changes had the effect of keeping the whole area linguistically similar, and are therefore termed convergent. Other changes, however, spread over only part of the Canaanite area. In some cases, changes which occurred in almost every place failed to spread to outlying regions or to inland hill communities which may have had less contact with the rest of the area, or which for some other reason were less influenced linguistically by it. Such communities may be called islands in the face of the otherwise general change. In other instances, features which began to spread beyond their point of origin stopped at some linguistic or social boundary without covering the whole area; the new form was accepted only in certain parts of the land. Finally, some new forms which developed in one place were never accepted anywhere else, remaining only in one town or small area. All these changes which did not spread over the whole of Syria-Palestine had the effect of breaking it up linguistically, since they created forms in one section which another section did not use; they are therefore termed divergent. Even among those changes which took place over the whole area, many probably occurred in some sections much later than in others. During the time when they had as yet spread to some sections only, they had the effect of being divergent; after they had occurred everywhere, they became convergent.

2. Correlation of linguistic features with their geographic diffusion. In order to see in which features the whole area was convergent and in which it broke up dialectally, it is necessary to correlate the linguistic features of each change with its geographic extent (Table 1).

1 See the extensions and dates of the Canaanite changes as shown in the chart facing the last page; also the notes to the chart.
A. CONVERGENT

a. perhaps partially independent

\( \hat{s} > \hat{s} \ 4 \)
\( \hat{d} > \hat{d} \ 5 \)
\( \hat{g} > \hat{z} \ 7 \)
\( \hat{\imath} > \hat{s} \ 12 \)
laryngeals lost 65b?

later monophthongizations 1, 31
final short vowels 35
verb stress shift 51
2nd vowel reduction 52
a' > A 53
i' > ē, u' > õ 54

mimation lost 2
active perfect 18
disuse of preterite 19
imperfect 21
disuse of present 22

b. delayed

\( \hat{t}b \gamma > \hat{s}h \) 13, 39
\( \hat{a} > \hat{a} 5, 37, 65c \)

\( \hat{a} > \hat{u} 17 \)

construct case-endings 14
Ca'C > CAC 15
stress shift 23
syncope of h 30
syncope of y, w 32
-at > -ā verb 33
stress-lengthening 36
vowel reduction 41
spirantization 42
vowel syncope 43

Lk 3
huwa, hiya 28
disuse of ū 40-7

B. DIVERGENT

b. expected from convergence

\( \hat{a} \) remain (4)

\( \hat{a} y, \hat{a} w \) remain (1b)

\( \hat{a} y > \hat{a} y, \hat{a} w > \hat{a} w \) 1a, (1b)

c. general diffusion

\( \hat{a} y > \hat{a} y, \hat{a} w > \hat{a} w \) 1a, (1b)

Ca'C > CAC 15
stress shift 23
syncope of h 30
syncope of y, w 32
-at > -ā verb 33
stress-lengthening 36
vowel reduction 41
spirantization 42
vowel syncope 43

B. DIVERGENT

d. excepted from convergence

\( \hat{a} \) remain (4)

\( \hat{a} y, \hat{a} w \) remain (1b)

e. partial diffusion

\( \hat{t}b \gamma > \hat{s}h \) 13, 39
\( \hat{a} > \hat{a} 5, 37, 65c \)

assim. III n 11

-āt > -ā 34

-āt > -ā noun 44

final double cons. 59

III'y noun extension 25
disuse of short preterite 20
article in demonstrative 45

ytn 9

dlt 27

h > y 29

yiqtil 55

'sā 40,'āšer 47

'ilūn 60

-nēm 61

'article in declarative 45

-āt-u/tu 10

-atu/tu 10

26a/b

Lk 27

'sā 40,'āšer 47

disuse of delective t 48

'anl 56

'mmlkt 62

f. local changes

\( \hat{d} > \hat{d} 6 \)
\( \hat{s} > \hat{s} 65a \)

'āl > 'ā 8

anapytaxis 65d

pre-stress

lengthening 65e

nkk 49

nū ś 50

2 f. sg. 1 lost 57

nāḥnū 63

skr 64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cause</th>
<th>effect of phonemic actualization</th>
<th>configurational pressure</th>
<th>assimilation</th>
<th>cause</th>
<th>configurational pressure</th>
<th>new formation</th>
<th>extension</th>
<th>gain</th>
<th>loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. CONVERGENT

a. perhaps
   (⁺> 4)
   partially
   (⁺> 5)
   independent
   (⁺> 7)
   final short vowels 35
   laryngeals lost 65b
   later monophthongizations 1, 31
   verb stress shift 51
   2nd vowel reduction 52
   imutation lost 2
   active perfect 18
   imperfect 21
   preterite 19
   present 22

b. delayed
   (⁺> 37, 65c)
   Ca’C > CaC 15
   spirantization 42

B. DIVERGENT

e. partial diffusion
   [⁺> 13, 39]
   ‘ṣml 56
   assim. III n 11
   h > y 29
   t-reflexive 38
   disuse of dlt 27
   pronunciation 39
   III y noun
   article 45
   extension 25
   yiqt 55
   verb
   extension 58
   nám 56
   ‘lón 60
   ‘Iím 62
   ‘aṣ 46/
   ‘tu/-atu 10

f. local changes
   (⁺> 6)
   (⁺> 65a)
   (⁺> 65b)
   pre-stress lengthening 65e
   nálhū nám 63
   nálhū 63
   nbš 50
   skr 64
   ūlt 27
   deitic t 48
   ‘anákū 56
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It appears from this correlation that changes in the phonemic pattern were generally convergent, only a few being local islands. Changes in the phonetic structure were mostly convergent, but some were partial diffusions, and a few were local changes. In morphology there were some convergent changes and some partial diffusions. The one recorded change in syntax was a partial diffusion. The changes in lexical forms included but one convergent diffusion; otherwise, they are partial diffusions and, even more frequently, local changes. Choices of one word rather than another were almost entirely partial diffusions, and a few of them probably local changes.

Taking this correlation from the point of view of geographic extent, we may group the convergent and divergent diffusions. Linguistic features in which the whole area tended to remain the same were: the phonemic pattern, most developments of phonetic structure, and the major morphologic developments; also a very few developments in particular words. Linguistic features in which various parts of the area tended to have different histories were: delays and islands in the face of a few phonemic changes, a few developments of phonetic structure, the less ramified morphologic developments, and almost all changes in lexical form and in choice of words.

It follows that the Canaanite dialects remained generally similar in phonemic and phonetic and morphologic structure, and were differentiated in the less important phonetic, morphological and lexical features.

3. Correlation of linguistic processes with their geographic diffusion; the determining element in diffusion. Table 2 shows the types of linguistic processes in relation to the geographic area which each of them covered.

Of the phonetic changes, all processes are found in all degrees of diffusion. A phonetic change might spread or remain local according to the linguistic feature involved; but the fact that it was a phonetic change, or the particular factors which had brought it about, in no way affected its ability to spread. The analogic changes and the fluctuations in frequency were generally not convergent except in the case of changes involving large morphologic categories. Practically all others, no matter what type of analogy had caused them, or what word or group of words they involved, tend to be merely partial diffusions or local peculiarities.

It appears from this that the cause of a change, or the type of process which constituted it, had little relevance to its geographic extension. Its diffusion or localization was determined chiefly by its structural importance in the language. Changes which affected very many utterances in the language tended to spread over the whole area; those which
affected particular groups of forms or frequently used individual words, diffused over large parts of it; and those which affected one word only usually remained local. The chief modification of this factor seems to have been the growth of dialect boundaries in the course of time, which put obstacles in the way of wide diffusion; for in later times changes diffused less than comparable earlier changes had: compare, e.g., the general diffusion of *lk* (3) and the partial diffusion of *ytn* (9). In any event, this generalization, that the number of forms in which a change occurred determined the extent of its diffusion, holds only for the most part; there were undoubtedly other factors in the case of each development which contributed toward its diffusion or localization.

4. Growth of dialect boundaries. The growth of dialect boundaries may be seen by correlating the dates of linguistic developments with their geographic extension.

Convergent changes are generally absent in later times. Those which may have been independent in various parts of the area occur scattered throughout all periods, but in the later period they are distinctly fewer. And the general diffusions occur up to about 800 B.C. or well before; there were very few, if any, thereafter.

Divergent changes occur throughout the whole time, but they are much more common in the later periods. A few small islands, which did not accept some otherwise general diffusion, appear from earliest times; and small local phonetic and lexical changes probably occurred in the various localities in all periods. Partial diffusions range through the whole time and are particularly frequent in the middle and later periods.

2 The large number of convergent phonetic changes as against the very small number of convergent analogic changes, is thus to be explained on the grounds that an analogic change usually involved a much smaller number of utterances. The few analogic changes which were of wider relevance did indeed spread over the whole area: the loss of the indefinite-noun indication (2) and the formation of the aspects (18-21, except 20).

3 This may be obtained from Table 1 or 2 by disregarding the vertical divisions and arranging all changes in each horizontal division—convergent, partial diffusion, local—by their relative dates, the changes with the lower number being the earlier.

4 The tables would seem to suggest that most of these local changes were late, but this is only an accident arising from the type of evidence upon which they are constructed. Most of the inscriptive material is late. In the case of a general phonetic or morphologic change, there are many individual speech-forms in which we can see its effect, and frequently we can analyze its relation to other changes which must have occurred before it or after it. We have, therefore, better chances of finding evidence of such a change even in the few older inscriptions: either a form which betrays the effect or absence of the change, or one which shows the absence or presence of a change which must have preceded...
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It may be convenient to divide the whole era, from perhaps 1800 B.C. to about 200 B.C., very roughly into three periods: early, to about 1365 B.C.; middle, from then to about 800 B.C.; late, after 800 B.C. In the early period we would then find that for the most part the whole area develops similarly, i.e., most changes are convergent. There are however, a few local islands resisting general changes, a few local changes which do not spread, and, toward the end of this period, a few changes that spread, but only among closely associated towns.

In the middle period, dialect boundaries begin to appear. Additional local changes increased the differences between one place and another; and now many diffusions failed to spread over the whole area, stopping somewhere along lines where social-linguistic communication and influence was at a minimum. However, there were still many changes of broad structural relevance, which spread over the whole area, even across such dialectal divisions as had already developed. The coinciding of the limits of various diffusing features created fairly definite areas, groups of towns which had a certain number of changes in common as against the other towns which did not have them.

In the late period the piling up of these isoglosses continued, and practically no diffusions were able to cross them all and to cover the whole area. There were many local changes, and even those changes that diffused stopped either at the first major isogloss bundle, or, crossing it, at some minor isogloss bundle farther on. By the end of this era, Canaanite had come to be divided into several distinct languages, having various dialectal divisions within them. Or followed it. But the local changes usually involved just one word or a small group of words. We could not discover them unless the particular word happened to occur in a text. And even then, we usually cannot tell how long before the time of the inscription this change occurred, for most of these local changes did not affect the structure of the language and cannot be fitted into some one theoretically necessary point among the other changes in the language. In the tables most of these changes are merely listed at the dates of the inscriptions in which they are found—the terminus ante quem for them. In fact, the tables themselves show that the apparent lateness of local changes is an accident of the evidence, for the only early local changes which they list are from Ugarit, which is the one locality from which we have much early evidence.

The method of naming linguistic periods and changes as “pre-Hebrew,” etc., is therefore difficult in the case of a group of dialects which remained in contact all the time. It is misleading because it says nothing of the geographic extension of the change and because it gives the impression of a sharp division between a pre-Hebrew and a Hebrew stage. Except where definite time-groupings are possible, history should be presented in terms of a continuum of changes through time, rather than a succession of arbitrary periods.
5. **The resultant dialects.** The isoglosses, the limits of linguistic diffusions, did not always stop at exactly the same place, to form dialectal walls. Some changes spread quite differently from others, and several changes which were spreading within a dialect group diffused also into various neighboring dialects, even where these were already separated from the point of origin by several important isoglosses. There was therefore considerable overlapping of dialectal features. We also cannot tell, in view of our small number of geographically differentiated sources, whether the boundaries between languages were definite, so that any given town along the border would be, e.g., Phoenician or Hebrew in its speech, or whether there were border zones, narrow areas which used dialectal features from both languages, or, in special ways, from either.

We may nevertheless distinguish the following languages or dialects:

**Ugaritic**—early divergences, but some, perhaps many, later changes in common with Phoenician.

**Hamat**—little known; few changes, some in common with parts of Phoenician, others in common with Hebrew and Moabite.

**Phoenician**—many changes, most of them common to Ya‘udi, Byblos (Central Phoenicia), and the South Phoenician cities. Its dialects:

- **Ya‘udi**—differed in that it had in addition a few local changes too; in the case of several Phoenician changes we cannot tell if they also spread to Ya‘udi or not.

- **Byblos**—differed in that it did not accept a few changes which spread through South Phoenician and Ya‘udi.⁶

Parts of South Phoenicia differed from the rest of Phoenician, by preserving certain words, and accepting certain changes, in common with other parts of the Canaanite area, which the rest of Phoenician did not.⁷

Several Phoenician changes were also accepted in North Palestine, a few both in North Palestine and Moab.

**Hebrew**—a good number of changes, most of them common to North Palestine and Jerusalem (and early South Palestine).

---

⁶ Albright, BASOR 64 (Dec. 1936) 30 regards these differences between Byblos and South Phoenician as being merely conservative orthography on the part of Byblos. But Byblian writing -w for [-a[h]w] shows a change in orthography from the earlier Byblian -h for [-a]h, and the change [ah] > [-aw] which is thus represented did not occur in South Phoenician or Ya‘udi, where this [-h-] was replaced by [-y-]; the two dialects thus had entirely different forms (see chapter 4, no. 29, 30, 31).

⁷ Cf. chapter 4, no. 27, 44, also certain Punic forms not met with in the known Phoenician dialects, which must have come from other Phoenician towns: GP 42. 5, 54, 70.
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North Palestine—differed in that it accepted certain general Canaanite and Phoenician changes which Jerusalem did not; and several later Jerusalem changes did not spread to it.

Jerusalem—differed from North and South Palestine, and from the rest of Canaanite, as an island resisting a few early general Canaanite changes; later this dialect spread over South Palestine, at least as standard language, and had certain changes which did not spread to North Palestine.

Moabite—close to Hebrew, but not identical with it. It accepted many changes in common with Jerusalem or the whole of Palestine, and some in common with Phoenician or Phoenician and North Palestine; it also had some local changes.

At various times there may have been greater differences between these dialects, due to time-differences in the spread of the general Canaanite diffusions. But they were leveled as these diffusions completed their spread over the whole area.

It is possible to group these dialects into two large categories: Coast Canaanite, including Phoenician and certain inland cities linguistically similar to it (Ya'udi) and Ugaritic; and Inland Canaanite, including Hebrew, Moabite, Hamat and probably other agricultural and inland trade areas. Coast Canaanite was generally the place of origin of changes, some of which spread over the whole area, some of which traveled into neighboring Inland dialects (chiefly North Palestine), but most of which remained within the Coast-dialect sections. Inland Canaanite was more conservative, and though Palestine later developed a number of large changes of its own, this whole dialect area is chiefly to be understood as the sum of regions into which many coastal changes did not spread.

6. Social basis of diffusion. In the whole of linguistic change two types of events are involved: the development of new forms, whether by phonetic or analogic change, and the spread of the new forms over some community of speakers. Changes originate in one place, and may or may not spread out into neighboring places; the diffusion is a new event, over and above the origination of the new feature in one place.

The dialectal division which developed in Syria-Palestine exhibits the

*This arrangement accords with the evidence better than does the division into North and South Canaanite. The latter is arbitrary, and indicates nothing of the difference in linguistic history (in number of changes, etc.) between coast and inland areas.
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partial dependence of perhaps both types of linguistic events upon social conditions.

The origin of changes, especially of phonetic changes, was seen to be mostly in the maritime cities of Phoenicia, much more so than inland. It is possible that this was related to the presence of large numbers of foreigners in these cities; similarly the later loss of the laryngeal phonemes in North Palestine and in North African Punic may be related to the large numbers of foreign speakers of Canaanite in those two areas.

Much clearer, however, is the social basis of the diffusion of these changes. For the diffusion of a change is a social act, brought about by linguistic intercourse between members of contiguous or otherwise associated communities. Among the Phoenician sea-ports, which were in very close economic and social interrelation, almost all changes spread equally. As to Ugarit, which from early times had accepted some changes that did not spread elsewhere, it was also distinct from the other cities in its chief contacts; for the major trade in Ugarit was that between Cyprus (and the Aegean basin) and Mesopotamia, while the chief customer of Byblos and South Phoenicia was at first Egypt, later the Phoenician colonies. Meanwhile inland Palestine, economically and socially somewhat different from Phoenicia, had less social intercourse with it and fewer linguistic diffusions from it; but it is not until the first millennium and the establishment of the Hebrew kingdoms, with their social-political division as against Phoenicia, that the linguistic wall between the two areas seems to have become insurmountable. The lines dividing economically different areas were naturally lines of lesser social contact and served as the first obstacles to diffusions. In the instances where these lines later became political boundaries, social intercourse across them became far less, and most diffusions tended to stop at them. And in addition, each isogloss that stopped at these lines or zones weakened still further the freedom and the amount of social-linguistic communication across it, and so made it all the more sure that later diffusions would also halt there.

7. Independent changes and linguistic drift. But it is possible that some of the changes which occurred over the whole area, or over large parts of it, were not diffusions, but of independent origin in various parts of Syria-Palestine. This much is certain, that some of these changes also occurred independently in Semitic languages which were no longer in contact with Canaanite. The loss of the spirants and of [s] as phonemes, and the later loss of the laryngeals and glottal stop all occurred at various times throughout Akkadian and Aramaic as well as Canaanite;

*In the chart these changes are represented by lines which are broken at the dialect divisions.
some of these developments (e.g., the loss of [ʕ]) also took place in parts of South-Semitic, early or modern. The loss of final short vowels took place early or late in almost all Semitic languages, including modern North Arabic. The development of a subjective aspect system in the verb occurred in all languages of the West-Semitic group. Even the loss of the mimation of the indefinite noun, and the monophthongization of diphthongs were not peculiar to Canaanite.

All these similar developments were not Proto-Semitic or Proto-West-Semitic changes. The occurrence of the original, as yet unchanged forms in Ugaritic and other early Canaanite sources, as well as in early stages of other Semitic languages, shows that they took place in the several languages after they were no longer in contact with each other. These changes must therefore be considered as parallel independent developments in all or some Semitic languages, and at widely varying times. We can understand such events only if we assume that they are all independent results of a situation which had existed in the common parent. The loss of final short vowels may have been the end result of a peculiar weak pronunciation of vowels in that position in Proto-Semitic; the development of subjective verbal aspects may have been the configurational outgrowth of a great and specialized frequency of use of the static perfects and the nominal sentence in Proto-West-Semitic. Taken all together, they represent the “drift”¹⁰ of Semitic.

Within Canaanite, however, it is not clear whether they were diffusions from one center, or of independent origin in various places. In some cases, they may have been independent, e.g., the early loss of the [t b ɣ] phonemes in Phoenician and their later loss in Hebrew; in the case of the laryngeals, their loss in Punic, outside Syria-Palestine, was certainly independent of their loss in North Palestine. To the extent that most of these changes seem to have taken place throughout Canaanite at about the same time, it may be that we should consider them mostly as diffusions within Canaanite, thus accounting for the identity of time. Some of them, however, may well have been separate parallel developments in various localities, similarly determined in each place by the identical phonetic or morphologic structure of the language. In that sense it may be that certain other, purely Canaanite changes too were not diffusions from one center, but had more than one place of origin: these were changes like the continued monophthongization (1, 31), continued vowel reduction (52), shift of the verb stress (51). For these changes too are events which were determined, perhaps independently in different places, by the current structure of Canaanite; they represent perhaps the new features of drift in the Canaanite group.

¹⁰ See E. Sapir, Language, ch. 7, esp. p. 166.
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INDEX

The letters ' and ' are listed at the head of the alphabet.

' 82-3
'm causative 6, 12
'dm 'man' 52
'anā 'I' 10
'anākū 'I' 10
'am 'I' 74-5, 78
'Ānōkū 'I' 74-5
' 8 'man' 52
('a)š relative 69-70
'ser relative 70
'ilām 'godhead' 78
'ilān 'god' 77
'ilu 'god' 53
'iyyāti accusative 43
'aw 'to make' 52
-a fem. sg. suff. 25, 57-9, 67-8, 75-6
-a' > -e' 36
ā > 5 61-2
ā > 6 43-5

'achtungtexte 27
-ānā > -aw 'his' 25
-ānā > 5 'his' 26

Akkadian: see East Semitic
Akkadian transcriptions 26-8
Aleppe 17
alphabet: see Phoenician, Ugaritic
Amarna letters 12-4, 20-4, 26, 84
Amorite 3
analogic formation 88-9
analogy of construct form 31, 43
anaptyctic vowels 31, 80
anceps vowels 4, 77
Arabic 6, 47-8
Aramaic 2, 8-9, 10 fn. 19, 11, 17-8, 45,
68-9, 75
article used with demonstratives 68-9, 85
assimilation 88; of ' to preceding vowel
42-3, 73-4; of n 9; of 3rd radical -n
39-40
-aya > -a 25
banu 'son' 10
baru 'son' 10
biblical evidence: see masoretic evidence
biradical roots, extensions of 53

Byblos 20
"Canaanite" as term 2
Cappadocia 3 fn. 5
case-endings 59-60; in the construct
state 41-2
causative verb form 6, 12, 16 fn. 5, 74
circumflex sign, use of 4
city-states 14
commerce 13-4
Coast-Canaanite 98
configurational analysis 88-9 fn. 11
configurational pressure 87; subjective
aspects 84; new classes 88
consonant clusters 82; final double con-
sonants reduced 76
d 35-6, 81
d 35, 81
dating of linguistic changes 16, 86, 95
fn. 4, 107, 108
deictics -t 70-1
dialects, final divisions within Canaanite
97-8; growth of 96, 107, 108; upper
class 14, 17; urban 17
diffusion 91, 94-5; and historical evi-
dence 1; circumstances of 5; dates of
16; social basis of 13-6, 98-9
diphthongs 30-2; arising of new diph-
thongs 30-1; monophthongization 30-
2, 56
dl door 53
double consonants: see consonant clus-
ters
e 4, 82 fn. 3
e 82
East Semitic 6-11, 16, 68, 70, 83-4
Egyptian transcriptions 27
elision of final short vowels 59-60
energie suffix to present 83, 85
extension of forms to new positions 88-9
family-tree method of historical analysis
16
favoring of new formations 37
fem. sg. suffix -at and -tu 38; extension
in IIIy nouns 51
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fluctuation in frequency 86, 89-90
frequency of utterances affected by a
development 92, 108
Gezer calendar 24
glottal stop and laryngeals, weakening
of 79, 81
Greek alphabet, date of borrowing 61 fn.
59
Greek transcriptions 28
Gubla (= Byblous) 20
h- causative 6, 12; 3rd person pronouns
6
-h > -y after i- vowels 54-5
Habiru 11, 35
Hamat 17
Hebrew 10-1, 25, 29
historical spellings 25
hkk ‘to go’ 33, 71
hyy ‘to be’ 52
hrr ‘gold’ 52
I 1st person suffix 10
imperfect 48-9; indicative 7, 84
independent changes 99-100, 107, 108
Inland Canaanite 98
internal passive 7, 8, 84
isoglosses 1, 96-7, 99, 108
ıstafa 6
ıya > ı ‘my’ 26
Jerusalem Hebrew 22-3, 31-2, 81: see
Hebrew
jussive 7, 77-8, 83, 85
-k- 1st person pronoun 8
-kl > k 2nd fem. sg. suffix 75
Kilamu 10, 13, 17
kdn ‘to be’ 52
La’aš 17
Lachish letters 23-4
Latin transcriptions 28
lexical changes 85-6; specializations 52
literary tradition 15
lq ‘to take’ 8
-m- masc. pl. 9, 12
macron sign, use of 4
Mari 3
masculine plural 9, 12, 16 fn. 5
masoretic evidence 26-7, 34, 79-80;
Hebrew 2; text 22-3; vocalization 65
Mehri 6
Mesha 13
mimation 32-3
Minaean 6
Mischsprache (Hebrew) 11
mhkt ‘prince’ 78
Moab 24; Moabite 9
modes of the verb 7-8
monophthongization: see diphthongs
-n- masc. pl. 9, 12
nakhnu ‘we’ 78
nāp̄ > nābā ‘soul’ 71
-nem suffix ‘their’ 77-8
new phonemes 82
nominal (perfect) 8, 10; active 45-6;
stative 84
‘North Canaanite’ 10 fn. 21, 98 fn. 8
North Palestine 22, 29
Northwest Semitic 2, 8-11, 16, 42
nouns: IIIy 51
nten ‘to give’ 37
Nuṣāšē 17
o 4, 79-80, 82
or 82
orthography and pronunciation 25, 97
fn. 6
p’l ‘to make’ 52
perfect: see nominal
permanse 8, 84
Phoenician 11; alphabet 17-8, 20-2, 24-
6; cities 21
plurals, bi-vocalic, to uni-vocalic stems
9
prefixes, pronominal: see pronoun
‘pre-Hebrew’ 96 fn. 5
present 11, 49, 83
preterite 7, 11, 46-7, 83
pronoun: 3rd person 6; with -tu 53-4;
prefix 3rd masc. pl. 12; 1st person
suffix 8, 10
Proto-Semitic 42, 83, 100; dialect area
5, 16; vowels 4; dialectal features in
6, 8, 10-2; forms 49, 57, 70
Punic 21, 70, 79, 99, 100
qatatal p. act. 43-6
r’s, rē ‘head’ 26, 42
Ras Shamra (= Ugarit) 18
š 26, 33-5, 79, 81
š- causative 11; 3rd person pronouns 6
Saabean 6
šafel 6
Samaria Ostraca 23
Index

Sendachirli (so in Kiepert’s map): see Zenjirli
Septuagint transcriptions 28
Shauri 6
short preterite 47-8, 84
shwa 4; “shwa medium” 67
sibbòlet ‘stream’ 63-4
Sidon 21
skr ‘to remember’ 79
Soqotri 6
South Arabian 6
South Palestine 24, 29
South Semitic 8-10, 100
spirantization 4, 66-7
spirants ʒ h γ 40, 62-4; emphatic 81;
    non-emphatic 81; pattern 82
standard language 13-4, 22, 24, 27
stress lengthening 60-1; shift 50, 83;
    shift in verb forms 71-2
subjunctive with -a 8, 83, 85
substratum explanation of ą > ą 45
suffixes, pronominal: see pronoun
syllables, final closed 82
sycope of -h- between vowels 55-6; of
    y, w between vowels 56-7; of reduced
    vowels 67
t- prefix 3rd masc. pl. 12; reflexive
    stem 82
-t- 1st person pronoun 8
ț h γ 81
-ti > -t 2nd fem. 75
Tyre 21
Ugaritic 6-7, 10-2, 18-20; alphabet 26;
    additional sibilant signs 81 fn. 2; list
    of texts 19-20
verbs: Ilyw and IIIyw 57; IIIyw pt.
    75-6
verbal aspects 83-5; modes 83-5
vowels: elision 59-60; grades—long and
    short 4, 83; grades—reduced 67;
    lengthening 80; letters 25-6, 58;
    pattern 82; reduction 64-6, 73; before
    2nd person suffix 51
w- > y- 8
wave-theory of linguistic change 16
waw consecutive 47
West Semitic 6-9, 16, 48-9, 100
y- causative 6
Ya’udi 17, 25, 29; see also Kilamu
Yaçatalu present 49, 83
yaqul 7; short preterite 47-8
yaqitul preterite 46-7, 83, imperfect
    48-9
yi- prefix 3rd masc. pl. 12
yiqṭl causative 74
ytn ‘to give’ 37
Zakir 13, 18
Zenjirli 17
zhb ‘gold’ 52
NOTES TO CHART

The column on the left gives the names of places in Syria-Palestine, from north to south (see the accompanying map). The numbers are those of the changes listed in chapter 4.

Place of Occurrence—The vertical axis gives a rough approximation of the geographic position of the areas for which we have linguistic evidence. Heavy horizontal lines (= blank intervals on the vertical axis) indicate the existence of large areas for which we have no evidence. The spreading of one dialect over the area of others is indicated in the case of Jerusalem, the only place for which we have such evidence.

Time of Occurrence—is indicated along the horizontal axis. In some cases, the dating is fairly exact, when the known time-limits after and before which a change must have occurred leave but a small margin between them. In other instances, when the margin is very large, the dating is inexact: thus no. 49 is placed just before 850 b.c. for it must have occurred before then, though it may have been centuries before; and no. 58 is placed just after 700 b.c. for it must have occurred after then, though it may have occurred a century or more later.

In several cases the relative order of changes is definite, but the absolute date of each change is not. The most important definite sequences of developments are indicated by connecting arcs at the bottom of the chart.

Unrelated developments which occurred within one general period, but whose relative order is unknown, are grouped under a bracket — at the top of the chart. Such changes may have occurred in entirely different order than that shown on the chart.

Since most of these developments were in process over a long time, the lines in the chart, and the points at which they meet the time-axis, represent only the time at which the development was probably completed. In some cases a phonetic situation which has been changed appears afresh in a group of later new forms and is changed in the new forms too; that constitutes not "continuation" but a repetition of the change in conformance to the current phonetic structure, and is indicated as such either in the text or at the bottom of the chart (no. 1, 31; 17; 38; 33, 44; 41, 53).

Undoubtedly, many of these changes did not occur at the same time in every place. Some changes may have been considerably later in certain areas; so 39 in Palestine as against 13 in Phoenicia; and so perhaps 32-37 in Byblos. Such time-difference in the diffusion of changes in various areas could be indicated by bending the line marking the change along the time axis. However, our evidence for time-differences is so spotty and slight that it seems better not to attempt to indicate it on the chart.

Relation between Developments—In cases where a single development is marked here by two lines, each representing a separate set of conditions in which the change took place, they are connected by horizontal bars (hyphens). In cases where analogous changes of the same linguistic material occurred in different directions in different areas, the lines representing them are connected by a slanting bar.
Notes to Chart

DIFFUSION AND INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT—Lines of change running across the area-divisions mark diffusion of the change over these areas. Developments which also occurred in many other Semitic languages outside this area are here marked by lines cut at every area-boundary, to indicate that in some of these cases the change may have been independent in each area-division, rather than a diffusion from a single center.

TYPES OF LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT—Black lines: phonetic change. Red lines: new formations = analogic change, it being assumed that all new formations are analogic in one way or another. Green lines: favoring of one root over another (not counting the case of new formations).

IMPORTANCE OF EACH DEVELOPMENT—frequency of utterances affected by the change.

Heavy lines: developments determined by conditions which obtain in several or very many roots and forms.

Thin lines: developments relative to one particular root.

TYPE OF EVIDENCE—charts have the advantage of showing not only what we know but also where our information is wanting.

Full lines: Broken lines:

| where the evidence for the occurrence of the change is certain. | uncertain or no evidence, but occurrence of the change probable. | ? no evidence one way or the other (for occurrence or non-occurrence). |

Blank space: evidence that the change did not occur.

INTERPRETATION OF CHART—The vertical lines of change may be regarded as isoglosses connecting areas in respect to like linguistic developments.

The areas horizontally left of each isogloss mark the dialects for which the isogloss is true, i.e. the place and time of the development and the prior condition of the dialect at its occurrence. The linguistic similarity of the total area is marked by the isoglosses that run over the whole or most of the area. Dialect differentiation is marked by the cessation of isoglosses at area-boundaries: the fewer isoglosses cross a horizontal (geographic) line, the more differentiated become the areas on either side of that line.

ON THE DATES OF INDIVIDUAL CHANGES:

5—may be later, except in Ugarit.
7—may be later.
10, 11—may be after 1500, before 1365.
25—may be earlier.
26, 27—may be earlier.
32-37—may be later, 10th cent. or after, in Byblos, and perhaps throughout Canaanitic.
55—may be earlier or somewhat later.