



Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament

Author(s): Thomas O. Lambdin

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 73, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 1953), pp. 145-155

Published by: [American Oriental Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/595204>

Accessed: 28/12/2010 14:50

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

EGYPTIAN LOAN WORDS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

THOMAS O. LAMBDIN
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

THE PRESENCE of Egyptian loan words in Old Testament Hebrew has long been known, but aside from articles on particular problems and individual words, no attempt has been made to gather these words together into a unified study. Such is the purpose of the present paper. A. Erman published, in 1892, an article, "Das Verhältnis des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen," *ZDMG*, 46, 93-129, in which several of the words treated below are mentioned either as loan words in Semitic or as cognates from a common Egypto-Semitic source. The process of distinguishing between these two types of words is still somewhat arbitrary since the comparative phonology of Egypto-Semitic has not yet been completely worked out, but because the nature of the Egyptian consonantal system¹ and the approximate chronology of its major vowel shifts are known,² the direction and the date of borrowing can be fixed in most cases. Most important for our purposes are (1) the voiceless, unaspirated quality of Egyptian *g* and *d* as opposed to the voiceless, aspirated *k* and *t*; (2) the great vowel shift of c. 1200 B. C., in which, generally, *ā* > *ô*, *ā* > *ê*, and

ī > *ā* in closed accented syllables, and *ā* > *ô*, *ī* remained *ī*, and *ū* > *ê* in open accented positions; and (3) the lengthening of short accented vowels in open syllables, the precise date of which change has not yet been determined.

The initial effort of Erman was followed by studies of various scholars mentioned individually in the references below; two persons in particular, however, should be named as having done a large share of the work in identification and discussion, namely W. M. Müller, as contributing editor of Gesenius-Buhl, *Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 17th edition (1915), and B. H. Stricker, whose study "Trois études de phonétique et de morphologie coptique," *AO*, 15 (1937), 1-20, represented to date the most extensive collection and discussion of Egyptian loan words in Hebrew.

No attempt has been made in this short presentation to include all words for which Egyptian prototypes have been suggested;³ several words have been included, however, whose Egyptian origin is very doubtful, but these words offer special problems which cannot be dismissed without special consideration. These include 'abrēk, būš, mēzah, and tahrā'.

References abbreviated in the text:

- Brockelmann: C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, 2nd ed. Halis Saxonum 1928.
Dillmann: C. F. A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae*. Lipsiae 1865.
Crum: W. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford 1939.
GB¹⁷: W. Gesenius-F. Buhl, *Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. 17th ed., reprinted Berlin 1949.
Lane: E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. London 1863-.
WB: A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*. Leipzig 1926-.

¹ See especially J. Vergote, *Phonétique historique de l'Égyptien* (Louvain 1945), and W. H. Worrel, *Coptic Sounds* (Ann Arbor 1934).

² Cf. K. Sethe, "Die Vokalisation des Ägyptischen," *ZDMG*, 77 (1923), 145-207; W. F. Albright, "The Principles of Egyptian Phonology," *Rec. de Trav.*, 40, pp. 64 ff., and *Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography* (New Haven 1934), pp. 15-18.

'Ebyôn, "poor, needy, wretched." As early as 1892 Erman⁴ pointed out the Egyptian origin of this word, which he indicates as a borrowing from Egyptian **ebyēn*, Coptic *ebyēn*, from the root *b'n*, "bad, evil, wretched" (WB I, 442-4). This root is attested in Egyptian from the earliest times and survives in Coptic in two different words, the above mentioned *ebyēn*, "a poor, wretched person," (CD 53a) and *bōōn*: *būūne*, etc., adj.,

³ For recent examples of untenable etymologies not considered in this paper see H. G. Christensen, "Zur Etymologie des Wortes Papier," *OLz*, 1938, 204-5; H. Grimme, "Hebrew *ṭṭṭ* and *ṭṭ*, zwei Lehnwörter aus dem Ägyptischen," *OLz*, 1938, 149-52; N. Herz, "Egyptian Words and Idioms in the Book of Job," *OLz*, 1913, 343-46; and A. S. Yahuda, *The Accuracy of the Bible* (New York 1935), pp. 24, 66, 67, 107.

⁴ A. Erman, "Das Verhältnis des Ägyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen," *ZDMG*, 46 (1892), 109.

"bad," with the feminine form *boone*: *boone*: *boni*: *bani*, noun, "evil, misfortune" (CD 39). W. F. Albright⁵ suggests the following phonetic development: **(ē)b'ūnē(w) > *ēbyūnē (> Heb. 'ebyōn) > ebyēn*. The original Hebrew pronunciation may well have been **ēbyūn*; the pointing with *ō* may represent a hypercorrection (cf. *Zebulūn* and Gr. *Σαβουλων*) with possible analogy of other adjectives ending in *-ōn*. This word provides an excellent example of the vowel shift *ū > ē* in Late Egyptian and further agrees, in reconstruction, with all available evidence. The borrowing could not be later than the 12th century because of the *o*-vowel of the Hebrew. Aside from the evidence adduced by the form itself, the early entrance of the word into Canaanite is confirmed by its occurrence in Ugaritic;⁶ a feminine noun *'abynt* (2 Aqht I: 17), "wretchedness, misery," parallel to *'anḫ*, "sigh," and a problematical *'abynm* (313:6), a masc. pl. noun or adjective describing personnel, are attested. Even though the greater number of loan words are names of objects exchanged through commerce or cultural infusion, it is not unusual for a word of this sort to be borrowed. Such a term as *'ebyōn* may possibly have possessed derogatory significance and have been applied as such by Egyptians to a certain class of Semitic (Canaanite) workers, very possibly in connection with shipping and shipping crews. A good parallel for the borrowing of such a word as this is found in Akk. *muškēnu*, "a poor man," which was taken over by Hebrew, Aramaic, Ethiopic, Arabic, and even French and Italian.

'Abnēt, "a girdle or sash, part of the priestly garments," is possibly to be connected with Eg. *bnd* (WB I, 465). See especially B. H. Stricker, "Trois études de phonétique et de morphologie coptique," *AO*, 15 (1937), 10; Josephus, *Antiquity of the Jews*, III, 155-6; Herodian, *Περὶ καθολικῆς Προσφάσις*, ed. A. Lentz (*Herodiani Technici Reliquiae*, Leipzig, 1867, I, 219).

'Abrēk, Gen. 41:43, an exclamatory word, has excited an immense number of suggestions and explanations, many of which are based on Coptic

and are therefore useless, while others, though more sound historically, present insurmountable linguistic difficulties. If the word is indeed Egyptian, of which fact there is no certain proof, two possible equations have been suggested: (1) Eg. *'b-r.k*, "attention!" by Spiegelberg,⁸ which Breasted approves on phonetic grounds but questions because of the sing. *k* where one would expect pl. *tn*,⁹ and (2) Eg. *brk*, a Semitic loan word in Egyptian, equivalent to Heb. *bērak*, the imperative of which Brugsch would identify with *'abrēk*. Because a prosthetic *aleph* is not characteristic of 3-rad. verbs in Egyptian,¹⁰ Spiegelberg's *'b-r.k* must remain preferred, but by no means certain.

'Aḥ, "a brazier for heating a room"; Eg. *'ḫ* (WB I, 223), "a brazier."¹¹

'Aḫū, "grass, reed, as food for cattle." See especially W. Spiegelberg, "Die Gruppe *'ḫ(j)*," *Rec. de Trav.*, 24 (1902), 180-2. Egyptian *'ḫ(w)* referred originally to the land affected by the annual inundation, but came in later times to mean pasture land in general. The final *ū* of the Hebrew word points to a very early borrowing, possibly in the Old Kingdom, when the final *-w* of the Egyptian word was still pronounced.¹²

⁵ W. Spiegelberg, "Abrēk," *OLz*, 1903, pp. 317-21.

⁶ J. H. Breasted, review of W. Spiegelberg, *Ägyptologische Randglossen zum Alten Testament* (Strassburg 1904), *AJSL*, 21 (1905), 248.

⁷ K. Sethe, *Das ägyptische Verbum* (Leipzig 1899), II, 216.

⁸ W. M. Müller, "Zwei ägyptische Wörter im Hebräischen," *OLz*, 3 (1900), pp. 51-53, in attempting to account for the *aleph* in Hebrew for Egyptian *'ayin*, says that although the Egyptian *'ayin* was preserved in the written language until the beginning of the Roman period, it may have disappeared in daily speech by Jeremiah's time. The very correct use of the *'ayin* in the Aramaic transcriptions of Egyptian proper names in the Persian period contradicts this assumption. If the word came into Canaanite as *'aḥ* before c. 1300 B. C., the change to *'aḥ* was automatic; the dissimilation of *'ayin* to *'aleph* was a natural consequence.

¹² This early borrowing of the word into Canaanite is substantiated in part by a problematical *'aḥ* in Ugaritic. This word occurs in connection with the meeting of Baal and Anath, located in *'aḥ šmk*. Virolleaud, "Anat et la Génisse," *Syria*, 17 (1936), pp. 157-8, prefers to identify *'aḥ* with Akk. *ābu*, "bank, side"; the following *šmk*, as a body of water, he equates with Lake Hule, called *Samachonitis* in antiquity. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore 1946), pp. 197-8, notes this passage in reference to an Egyptian version of the rape of Anath. As can be seen, the Ugaritic word preserves the original *ḫ* of the Egyptian.

⁵ W. F. Albright, *Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography* (New Haven 1934), p. 18.

⁶ Cf. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook* (Rome 1947), p. 206, nos. 16, 17.

⁷ **abyū/ōn(a)tu* (?), pointed out by Virolleaud as perhaps the abstract of *'ebyōn*; *La légende phénicienne de Danel* (Paris 1936), p. 191.

'*Ahlāmāh*, the name of precious stone (Ex. 28: 19; 37:12). Eg. *ḥnm.t* (WB III, 199), a red precious stone from Nubia, used, among other things, as the material for scarabs and amulettes; for the equation of Eg. *n* and Heb. *l*, compare *lešem* below.

'*Ētūn*. This word occurs only in Prov. 7:16b: **ḥātūbôt*¹³ '*ētūn miṣrayim*. Spiegelberg, in his discussion of Egyptian words in Ancient Greek,¹⁴ identifies '*ētūn* with Eg. '*dmj*¹⁵ (WB I, 153), "red linen," also the source of Gr. *δθόνη*, *δθόνιον*.¹⁶ He suggests the vocalization **ādūmēj*, **ādōmēj*, patterned after Copt. *twōt* < **twōtēw* and *amūn* < **ēmōnēw*. A more correct form would be **ēdāmēj*, which after c. 1200 B. C. would have become (')*ēdōm*. It is most likely that the word was taken over into Semitic from this form, becoming in Phoenician (?) **etōm* > **etōn* > **etūn*. From the second stage is derived the Greek *δθόνη*; the last is at the base of Hebrew '*ētūn*. The dissimilation of *m* to *n* is paralleled by such words as *siryam*, *siryōn*; the change of *ō* to *ū* is a coastal phenomenon but has remained intact in Hebrew, unlike '*ebyōn* above.

'*Ī*, "island, coastal lands," Phoen. '*y*.¹⁷ Both are to be traced to Eg. '*w* (WB I, 47), "island," which survives in Coptic only as part of the name *Pilakh*, *Philae*. There is too little evidence to ascertain

the original vocalization with exactitude, but a type **īwē* or **īwē* would perhaps be most satisfactory.¹⁸

'*Ēpāh*, "a certain measure," Eg. '*p.t*, *idem*. See K. Sethe, "Koptische Etymologien," *ZAS*, 41 (1904), 143, and "Zur ägyptischen Herkunft des hebräischen Masses *Epha*," *ZAS*, 62 (1927), 61.

Bahat, "a costly stone," LXX *σμαραγδινος*, Esth. 1:6. W. M. Müller, in *GB*¹⁷ s. v., suggests an equation of this word with Eg. '*bhtj* (WB I, 64), "a type of stone from Nubia." The correspondence *t* = *ṭ* speaks against such an identification, however, as it does with the suggested Arabic cognate *baht*, defined by R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, as "une pierre qu' on trouve dans l'Océan Atlantique . . . Sa couleur ressemble à celle de la marcassite, et les Orientaux lui attribuaient des qualités merveilleuses."¹⁹

Būš, "byssus, linen." This word is found extensively in the Semitic languages: Syr. *būšā*, adj. *būšānā* (Brockelmann 63a), Akk. *būšu*,²⁰ *bušinnu*,²¹ Phoen. *b(w)š*,²² Eth. *bisōs* (Dillmann 510, < Gr. *βύσσος*), Arab. *bazz* (!) and *bisat* (< Gr.);²³ the word found its way into Greek as *βύσσος*,²⁴ and thence into Latin and other Euro-

¹⁸ This is in agreement with the earlier **īw* proposed by Albright, *Vocalization*, p. 23, on the basis of the above mentioned evidence and the use of this word as '*ī* in the syllabic orthography.

¹⁹ Cf. R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, s. v. It seems more probable that '*bhtj* in Egyptian is an adjectival formation from the regional name '*bḥt*, somewhere in Upper Egypt or further south. This is even more convincing in the light of the once attested spelling '*bḥṣwtj* (A. Erman, "Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind," p. 45, Rs. 4, 7). For a more recent evaluation of the material see K. Sethe, "Die Bau- und Denkmalsteine der alten Ägypter und ihre Namen," *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin 1933), p. 911.

²⁰ Only in the late Assyrian and Babylonian periods as far as I can determine; cf. S. Langdon, *Die neubabylonische Königsinschriften* (Leipzig 1912), p. 70 (Nabopolassar), and L. Waterman, *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire* (Ann Arbor 1930), No. 568.

²¹ See H. Holma, "Assyr. *bušinnu* 1. Verbasum, 2. Docht," *OLZ*, 16 (1913), pp. 291-2. Note the expressions *bit bušini eri* and *bit bušini parzilli*, F. Thureau-Dangin, *Une Relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon* (Paris 1912), lines 363 and 365.

²² *Bs* in the *Klmw* inscription (Zenjirli, 9th cent.); *bws*, Late Punic (Carthage), *CIS* I, 166, A. 6.

²³ K. Vollers, "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der lebenden arabischen Sprache in Ägypten," *ZDMG*, 51, p. 295.

²⁴ H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*, p. 125.

¹³ G. Beer (*apud* Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, 4th ed.) suggests, in view of LXX *ἑσπερκα*, *hēptēti*. But note the early occurrence of *ḥṭb* in Elephantine Aramaic.

¹⁴ W. Spiegelberg, "Ägyptische Lehnwörter in der älteren griechischen Sprache," *ZVS*, 41, p. 130.

¹⁵ The root '*dm* in Egyptian, attested only in this word and its feminine form, is apparently an early borrowing from Semitic, where it is of wide-spread occurrence: Heb. '*dm* and derivatives, Ugaritic '*dm* (piel?), "to rouge oneself," Akk. *adamu*, "dark red," *adamtu*, "dark blood," Arab. '*adama*, "to be brown."

¹⁶ For a discussion of this word in Greek see H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen* (Berlin 1895), pp. 124-5.

¹⁷ D. D. Luckenbill, "Jadanan and Javan," *ZA*, 28 (1912), pp. 92-99, would identify with our word the first element of *Jadanan* (spelled *Yadana* in the inscriptions of Sargon II, *Yadanana* in those of Esarhaddon). This identification, however, is open to serious doubt from both linguistic and geographical consideration. As Albright has pointed out ("Some Oriental Glosses on the Homeric Problem," *AJA*, 54 [1950], pp. 171-2), the element *Yā* is the name of Cyprus and forms the basis of Gr. *Iāones* = **Yā* + the gentile pl. *-ōnēs*.

pean languages. The origin of the word has excited a considerable amount of commentary; one faction would consider it Indo-European,²⁵ the other, Egyptian. Müller (*GB*¹⁷ s. v.) would equate *bûš* with Eg. *p-wōš*, by which I assume he means *p³-w³š*, which I have not been able to locate. Spiegelberg²⁶ proposes a straight identification with Eg. *w³š.t* (*WB* I, 268), "a green material for clothing." He considers the representation of initial *w* with *b* as common enough to offer no great difficulty but says that one would expect a feminine form *bûšāh*. Even this is not too difficult with the parallel Heb. *Šō'an*, Eg. **šā'nā(t)*. Spiegelberg, however, suggests the possibility that a masc. collective *w³š* existed side by side with *w³š.t*; he further points out that *bûš* must have been borrowed before the change *š* > *d*, that is, before or during the Middle Kingdom. This observation is justly made in view of the fact that this word is written mostly with the hieroglyph *W³š* (Gardiner No. M. 13), which in New Egyptian is used to write such words as *wđh* and *šwd*, forms known from other spellings to contain *d* and not *š*.²⁷ The use of this sign also indicates that at an early period the *aleph* had quiesced; in fact, there is clear evidence that as early as the Middle Kingdom words written with this sign no longer contained the *aleph*.²⁸ There are two serious objections to the identification of *w³š.t* and *bûš*: the representation of Eg. *w* by Semitic *b* would be unique with this example, though not impossible, and is not ameliorated by the introduction of Egypto-Coptic parallels, where the phonetic situation is somewhat different. Also troublesome is the *u*-vowel found universally in the cognates. If the word were taken into Semitic as **bāš*, we should expect **bōš* in Hebrew, not *bûš* (unless imported from the coastal areas), and *bāšu* in Akkadian. In spite of these objections, the identification is not altogether impossible, but very questionable. Albright's suggestion that this word is Eg. *bš³* (*WB* I, 488),²⁹ a rare word attested

mainly in the Smith Surgical Papyrus and signifying "stiff (linen) rolls," is hard to square with Breasted's detailed note on that word.³⁰

Bōhan, in the phrase 'eben *bōhan*, which is found in Is. 28:16, is usually regarded as a construct element, "stone of testing," i. e., a well-tested stone." K. Sethe, however, has presented³¹ an interesting suggestion on the latter word by identifying it with Eg. *bhn.w* (*WB* I, 471), New Kingdom *bhn*. He has treated the word *bhn.w* in great detail, so I shall note only the following points: Eg. *bhn.w* covers a variety of stones found in the Wadi Hammamāt, varying from black to green in color, but is not basalt, as many have maintained; it is more closely associated with granite and diorite. The original meaning of the root *bhn* in Eg., according to Sethe, is "sichern, spāhen"; the use of *bhn.w* as a touchstone (see Sethe *loc. cit.* for proof) thus allows a connection of its name with that root and somewhat more securely establishes the Egyptian ownership of the word. Sethe's reading of 'eben *bōhan* as "touchstone" in the passage above greatly enhances the translation: "Therefore, thus says the Lord God: 'Behold, I lay in Zion a stone, a touchstone, a precious stone, as the corner-stone of a sure foundation; he who believes shall not be worried'." One must, however, disagree with Sethe's **bāhan*, since such a prototype would have yielded **bōhān* in Hebrew (cf. *hōtām*); we have, on the contrary, a *quill*-form **būhn*. It would seem that the verb in Hebrew must be secondary to this noun, especially since no verb *bhn* is found in Egyptian meaning "to examine, test." The other Semitic attestations of the root are Syriac *bahhen*, "to examine, test," which seems to be denominative, and the noun *būhānā*, "a testing." It is impossible to state definitely that all of these are to be traced to the Egyptian word, but in the light of the present evidence, this seems more than a likelihood.³²

Bahan, "a watch tower," Jer. 32:14, has been identified with Eg. *bhn*, "castle, fortress." No clear idea of its original vocalization is possible because of the apparent variant *bhyn* in Is. 23:13

²⁵ I. Scheftelowitz, *Arisches im Alten Testament* (Berlin 1901), p. 41.

²⁶ W. Spiegelberg, "Ägyptische Lehnwörter in der älteren griechischen Sprache," *ZVS*, 41, pp. 128-9.

²⁷ K. Sethe, *Das ägyptische Verbum* I, p. 97.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

²⁹ C. G. Howie, *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel*, *JBL Monograph Series*, Vol. IV (Philadelphia 1950), p. 51.

³⁰ J. H. Breasted, *The Edwin Smith Surgical Papyrus* (Chicago 1930), pp. 239-40.

³¹ K. Sethe, "Die Bau- und Denkmalsteine der alten Ägypter und ihre Namen," pp. 864-912.

³² For the difficulties in identifying Greek *básanos* with Eg. *bhn.w* see K. Sethe, *op. cit.*, p. 908.

(so the Dead Sea Scrolls), which may or may not be the same word.

Gōme', "reeds"; cf. Eg. Aram. *gm'* (A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford, 1923, No. 15:15) and Eth. *gōmē'*, *papyrus nilotica* (Dillmann 1149). It has been suggested that the Eg. word underlying these is *qm̃* (WB V, 37), "a reed," attested in the New Kingdom and the Greek period. It has survived in Coptic as S. B. *kam*. Stricker³³ proposes the vocalization **gūm'*, which seems improbable in the light of the Coptic derivative. Vycichl,³⁴ on the other hand, suggests an original **qīm̃'w > *qām̃'w > *qām̃'ū* (as the borrowed form) *> *gōmē'*; the ending *-ēw* was lost in Coptic by normal phonetic process and the *i* became *ā* in the closed accented syllable. For another example of tonal lengthening upon borrowing and subsequent change of *ā* to *ō* he compares Heb. *Šō'an* and Eg. *Ĝā'nā(t)*. Two serious objections arise from this identification: (1) the chronology of the changes involved, and (2) the representation of Eg. *q* by Heb. *g*. The change of *i* to *ā* in Egyptian must have been after c. 1200 B. C., to judge from the Amarna and Boghazköi transcriptions; the *ā > ō* shift in Canaanite had been in effect at least before 1400 B. C. and was probably not operative at this late date. Dr. Albright suggests the following solution to the problem of vocalization: the parallel in *Šō'an* must be discarded since the Assyrians also heard simply *Āā'nē*. *Šō'an* is probably due to the analogy of *Šō'ar*, Gr. *Σοαπα*, Arab. *Zughar*, and has nothing to do with the original vocalization. The original form, in view of Copt. *kam*, was apparently **qīm̃ēw*, which came over into Canaanite as **q/gīm'ū > *gūm'ū* (by assimilation of *i* to *m*) *> gōmē'*. As for the interchange of *q* and *g*, our evidence is too poor to preclude the possibility, since our only other example is Heb. *qallahat*, Eg. *qrh.t*. The representation may, however, owe its origin to non-phonetic conditions; the Ethiopic cognate *gōmē'* with *'ayin* is provocative.³⁵

³³ B. H. Stricker, "Trois études de phonétique et de morphologie copte," *AO*, XV (1937), p. 6.

³⁴ W. Vycichl, "Ägyptische Ortsnamen in der Bibel," *ZAS*, 76 (1940), p. 92.

³⁵ In the light of Syriac *gəma'*, *demersus fuit*, Aram. *gəma'*, "to drink," and Eth. *gem(e)'ē*, *vas liquidi*, it seems possible that there existed in Semitic a root *gm'* associated with the idea of soaking up and containing a liquid. In Hebrew, however, we find the two forms

Dayō, "ink," *hapax. leg.*, Jer. 36:18. Müller,³⁶ though he can adduce no etymology, considers this word as unquestionably Egyptian. In the Semitic languages we find as alleged cognates Aram. *dayūtā*, Syr. *idem*, and Arab. *dawāt*, "inkstand." Since the Aramaic and Syriac may be secondary forms based on Hebrew *dayō*, the Hebrew word alone should receive our closest attention. I am far from sure that the Arabic word is even related; it has no apparent etymology in that language. Nor have I been able to find any word in Egyptian which would qualify as the prototype of *dayō*; the greatest difficulty is the initial *d* which would be practically impossible in an Egyptian importation. Since no Semitic etymology presents itself, I would like to suggest the possibility that Heb. *dayō* is a graphic error for *rayō*, which I would equate with Eg. *ry.t* (WB II, 399), "ink," spelled *ry* (without the *t*) in the New Kingdom and vocalized, perhaps, **rēyāt > *rāyā* (cf. *b't*, Copt. *ēbyō*, from **ēbyā(t) < *b'āt*). Another possible form, assuming further error in the Hebrew spelling, i. e., *rōy*, could point to Eg. **rāyāt > *rāyā(t) > *rōy*.

Hobnīm, "ebony," Eg. *hbnj* (WB II, 487). On the basis of the Hebrew form an Egyptian prototype **hūbnēj* may be reconstructed, thus providing another clear example of the *ū > ē* vowel shift; cf. Greek *ἔβενος*.

Hīn, "a liquid measure," Eg. *hn.w* (WB II, 493), "a type of vessel, a measure of about .45 lit. A cuneiform writing is found in el-Amarna Letter No. 14, III, 62, *hi-na*. Note also Coptic *hīn*.

Zeret, "a span (as a measure)"; Targum and Syriac *zartā* (< Hebrew). Eth. *sezr*, usually adduced as a cognate, rests on a somewhat untenable etymology of J. Halévy (*REJ*, XI, pp. 60-77). Bondi³⁷ identifies this word with Eg. *ḡr.t* (WB V, 584), "hand," also (Dyn. XVIII), "a hand-ful," Copt. *tōre: tōri: tōlī; toot-: tot-*. He would

yəgamme' (Job 39:24) and *hagmī'ini* (Gen. 24:17), rendered in the Septuagint by *ἀφανεί* and *ποτισον* respectively; a connection with the root *gm'* above is certainly indicated. It may be that *gōmē'* has been affected in its initial sound by the root *gm'* and the latter has suffered a change from *gm'* to *gm'* because of *gōmē'*. The mixture of these two roots is further attested in Ethiopic where the loan word *gōmē'* seems to be a modification from *gōmē'* on the analogy of Sem. *gm'*.

³⁶ W. M. Müller, "Zwei ägyptische Wörter im Hebräischen," *OLz*, 3 (1900), p. 51, note 2.

³⁷ Bondi, "Die Bezeichnung der ägyptischen Spanne," *ZAS*, 32 (1894), p. 132.

likewise derive Coptic *ertō*, "a span," from the compound *ḡr.t-ʿ3.t* > **tertō*, and by false division, *t.ertō*. Sethe³⁸ opposes this identification on the grounds that the word *ḡr.t* had already become *ḡ3.t* in the Pyramid texts. The existence of Coptic *tōre* etc., however, seems to indicate that this change took place only in the *status constructus* or in other special cases or regions. The borrowing into Semitic must have taken place at an early date, in the Middle Kingdom or before, when a form **ḡart-* was current. The final *t* of the Hebrew form is troublesome, since final *t* in Egyptian was lost quite early. The absolute form must have been **ḡārāt* in Old Kingdom Egyptian; the Semites (Northwestern) apparently borrowed this as **ḡārtū* > *zéret*.

**Hānākim* (only *hānāka[y]w*, Gen. 14:14), "armed retainers."³⁹ Albright⁴⁰ is responsible for having shown correctly, against Yahuda,⁴¹ that this word, found also in cuneiform transcription (Canaanite source) as *ḥa-na-ku-u-ka*,⁴² is probably of Egyptian origin. As he has pointed out, the Egyptian word from which it comes, *ḥnk.w*, is attested from the early period of Egyptian history⁴³ and has in that language a good etymology.⁴⁴

³⁸ K. Sethe, *Das ägyptische Verbum* I, 183, note 1.

³⁹ Generally considered a derivative of *ḥnk*, "einweihen" (GB³⁷). Jensen (ZA, I, 20) and Lewy's (*Fremdwörter*, p. 75) attempt to link this word with Gr. *εὐνοῦχος* is not convincing; the usual Greek etymology (*εὐνή* + *ἐχω*) which Lewy would then label a folk etymology, is nevertheless a perfectly good compound and quite in keeping with the usage of the word in Greek.

⁴⁰ W. F. Albright, "Mitannian *maryannu*, chariot-warrior," *AfO*, 6 (1931), p. 22.

⁴¹ A. S. Yahuda, *Die Sprache des Pentateuchs*, p. 282, erroneously attributes the borrowing to the Egyptians from Canaanite.

⁴² W. F. Albright, "A Prince of Taanach in the Fifteenth Century," *BASOR*, 94 (1944), pp. 12-27, letter No. 6 (p. 24) from Amenophis to Rewašša, lines 6-8: *ša-ni-tam la-a-mi i-na ma-an-ša-ar-ti i-ba-aš[u] ḥa-na-ku-u-ka*.

⁴³ Cf. K. Sethe, "Die Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten," *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1926, No. 5, *passim*; note also p. 15. G. Posener, *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie* (Brussels 1940), pp. 26-8, prefers to read *sqrjw* in place of Sethe's *ḥnk.w* on the basis of evidence presented by the Brussels texts. B. van de Walle, in the appendix of that same work, however, defends Sethe's reading and accounts for the difference between the two spellings as either (1) a graphic (scribal) error (or oversight), or (2) as an organic difference between the texts of the vases and those of the statuettes.

⁴⁴ Cf. *WB* III, 117. The verb *ḥnk*, "to send (a gift),"

Albright further suggests in the light of *ḥa-na-ku-u-ka* that the Hebrew word should be vocalized **hānākim* > Biblical **hānākim*. A further point in favor of its foreign origin is the lack of a convincing Semitic etymology.⁴⁵

**Hartōm*, "a learned magician of the Egyptian court," found only in the plural, *hartummīm* (Gen. 41:8, 24; Ex. 7:11, 22; 8:3, 14, 15; 9:11). This word, which has been variously identified with the root *hrt*,⁴⁶ and with Arab. *ḥaṭm*, *ḥurtūm*, "the nasalizing ones,"⁴⁷ has been treated rather fully by Stricker,⁴⁸ who defends its Egyptian origin. In 1910 H. Ranke⁴⁹ denied the connection between cuneiform *hartibi*, mentioned in an Assyrian list of persons and occupations along with magicians, seers, Egyptian scribes, and the like,⁵⁰ and the above mentioned Hebrew word. Subsequently, however, in 1925, Spiegelberg published⁵¹ a short study of the Demotic word *hr-tp*, *hr-tb*, the title of a priest or magician; he identified the word with the second element of the older title *hry-ḥb hr-tp*, which he prefers to translate as "Vorlesepriester und Oberhaupt" rather than the traditional "oberster Vorlesepriester," taking the second element as coordinate rather than attributive.⁵² Stricker, however, was the first to identify

is as old as the Pyramid texts; the many derivatives of this verb attest its antiquity as well, especially in view of the diversity of meaning. Note also *mḥnk*, *WB* II, 129, also an Old Kingdom word.

⁴⁵ Heb. *ḥnk* (and perhaps Arab. *ḥnk*, "intellexit, firmavit, etc.") could lead to meaningful derivatives in the passage in question, but consideration of the total setting and circumstances of the narrative rather forces one to accept the Egyptian word and its meaning.

⁴⁶ Ewald, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig 1885), p. 368 (No. 163 f.).

⁴⁷ G. Hoffman, "Versuche zu Amos," *ZAW*, 3 (1883), p. 89.

⁴⁸ B. H. Stricker, "Trois études," p. 6. See also the short notice in A. H. Gardiner, "The House of Life," *JEA*, 24 (1938), p. 164.

⁴⁹ H. Ranke, *Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation* (Berlin 1910), p. 37, note 1.

⁵⁰ For the text see C. H. W. Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*, No. 851, IV, 2.

⁵¹ W. Spiegelberg, "Die Lesung des Titels, Vorlesepriester, Zauberer, in den demotischen Texten," *Demotica* I, page 5, in the *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, 1925, 6te Abhandlung (Munich 1925).

⁵² As a result for the loss of the first element he cites the old title 'my-r, which survived in Coptic only as *le*, in *lemēēše* and Gr. *Pelaia*s.

these three words with one another,⁵³ and in confirmation of Spiegelberg's explanation adds an attested *hrj-tp* in the Papyrus Harris, where the *hrj-tp* are mentioned in the role of magicians or learned men. In spite of all this, it still seems impossible to equate all these forms with one another; the chief difficulties, briefly put, are (1) Eg. *t* should be represented both in Hebrew and cuneiform by *t*, not *ṭ*, (2) the *m* of *ḥartum-mim* and the *b* of *ḥartibi* are not the anticipated equivalents of Eg. *p*, (3) the element *hry* of *hry-tp* should be vocalized approximately **ḥr'y*, as is known from cuneiform *ihri-piṭa* (for Eg. *hry-pḡ.t*). If the assumption that *ḥartummim* was Egyptian originally is to be proven, some form such as Eg. **hr-db*(3) must be found having a corresponding meaning. Further, in view of *ḥartibi*, the form should be **ḥēr-dībē* or the like; it is also possible that *-ibi* represents Eg. **-dēbē* < **-dūbē*. We must conclude, then, that (1) Eg. *hry-tp* is not directly related to Heb. *ḥartummim* or to cuneiform *ḥartibi*, and (2) that the Eg. prototype of these two would be approx. **hr-db*(3). Our word is attested several times in Biblical Aramaic (Dan. 2: 10, 27; 4: 4; 5: 11), referring each time to magicians at the court of Nebuchadnezzar. These occurrences probably represent a generalization of the term; the earlier attestations of the Hebrew word make an Egyptian original very likely, but it is not yet demonstrable.

Ḥôtām, "seal, signet ring," *ḥātam*, "to seal," and a secondary *ḥôtémet* (< **ḥātāmtu*). This root and its derivatives are found extensively throughout the Semitic languages; cf. Arab. *ḥātam*, etc., Syr. *ḥātāmā*, etc., Eth. *maḥtam*, etc. Z. Harris⁵⁴ cites a Phoenician *ḥtm* (*CIS* I, 118), which he tentatively translates as "signet officer," following the editors of *CIS* I, p. 145, who equate this *ḥtm* with Lat. "sigellarium vel cancellarium." All of these correspond to Eg. *ḥtm*, "a seal, signet-ring," attested from the earliest stages of the language; Coptic S. B. *šōtm* and S. *štam*, B. *štham*, A². F. *štem*. All the Semitic nominal forms point to a prototype **ḥātam*, and the long *ā* of the Syriac and Arabic forms points to a borrowing before c. 1200 B. C. The widespread use of this word in Semitic indicates an even earlier borrowing.

Ṭabba'at, "a signet-ring, seal," Ar. *ṭāba'* (vocalized on analogy with *ḥātam*?), Syr. *ṭab'ā*; 14th century cuneiform *timbu'u*, *timbu'ēti* (el-Amarna 25: 1, 69?; II, 20; pl. 10: 45; 11: rev. 25). The Egyptian word from which all these are derived is *ḡb'.t* (*WB* V, 566), "a seal," attested in the Old Kingdom and afterward. This has survived in Coptic as S. *tebbe*, with the verb *tōōbe*, "to seal." The unification of all these forms is accomplished only with some difficulty: the Hebrew form appears to be a very early borrowing with the preservation of the final *-t*, whereas the Amarna form shows the loss of the same. From these two words it would appear that the original form was approximately **ḡ'bb't*. If this is so, the system may be presented as **ḡ'ūbb'āt* > **dūbb'āt* (> Heb. **ṭūbb'āt* > ?**ṭābb'āt* > *ṭabb'at*) > **dūbbē* (> cuneiform **ṭūbbū'ū* > **tumbu'u* > *timbu'u*, with dissimilation) > *tebbe*. Its occurrence in the other Semitic languages seems to be secondary to the verbal forms which may be borrowings from Canaanite.

Tene', *ṭan'ākā*, "basket," Eg. *dn'* (*WB* V, 467), "a basket for fruit, corn, etc.," attested from the Middle Kingdom onward: **dān'ā(t)*.

Yā'ôr, originally "the Nile," then "a river" in general. The Egyptian word for the river Nile was **trw* (*WB* I, 146), but during the New Kingdom and later spellings without the *t* are well attested, hence **rw*. For a detailed discussion of the loss of the *t* see W. Vycichl, "Ägyptische Ortsnamen in der Bibel," *ZÄS*, 76 (1940), pp. 81-2, where a development **ātrēw* > **ārrē(w)* > **āṣrē(w)* is indicated. The assumption of an intermediate form **ārrē(w)* is hardly justified from the evidence we possess. If such a phenomenon had occurred one would expect a larger number of 3's in New Egyptian resulting from earlier gemination; such is not the case. Albright⁵⁵ considers the change sporadic and due to careless pronunciation of a very common word. *Yā'ôr* must have been borrowed before the *aleph* in corresponding position quiesced in early Hebrew, i. e., before the Amarna Age. Our word belongs to that particular class of nouns, like *bā'ēr*, *zā'ēb*, whose Masoretic vocalization is a result of hypercorrection based on historical spelling; read *yōr*, *bēr*, *zēb*.

Ketem, a type of gold found in Ophir and

⁵³ *Loc. cit.*

⁵⁴ Z. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, p. 105.

⁵⁵ W. F. Albright, Review of J. Vergote, *Phonétique historique de l'Égyptien, les consonnes*, *JAOS*, 66 (1946), pp. 316-20.

considered very valuable, must be compared with Eg. *ktm.t*, also "gold," attested only in the syllabic orthography. Albright reads the word as *ku-č-m-t*, *ku-ta-m-t*,⁵⁶ and refers it to a Canaanite **kôtemt(a)*, or the like, derived from Akk. *ku-timmu*, "goldsmith," itself a Sumerian loan word. Hence it would appear that the word is foreign to both Hebrew and Egyptian and is ultimately Sumerian.⁵⁷

Lešem, "a precious stone" (Ex. 28:19; 39:12). W. M. Müller (*GB*¹⁷ s. v.) equates this correctly with Eg. *nšm* (*WB* II, 339), more properly *nšm.t*, "a white-blue felspar." For the equivalence of Eg. *n* and Heb. *l* compare 'aḥlāmāh above.

Mēzah, "girdle" (Ps. 109:19), "dam" (Is. 23:10). This word and Assyrian *mezaḥ*, *mezēḥu*, have been identified with Eg. *mǧḥ*, "girdle," used only in the phrase *čs-mǧḥ*, "to bind on the girdle, i. e., to attain puberty"; Copt. *mūḡḥ*: *mūḡḥ*: *maḡḥ*. In Job. 12:21 we have also a construct *māzih*. Of the three occurrences of our word in Hebrew, in only one does the Septuagint rendering correspond to the Hebrew (Ps. 109:19b); the passages in Isaiah and Job are difficult to understand. Equally troublesome are Akk. *mezaḥ*, found only in a syllabary VR 32, 40b, explained as *ša uppiṭi*, and *meziḥu*, which Jastrow identifies with Heb. *māzih* (*AJSL*, 15, p. 75, line 8). The Coptic forms indicate an Eg. *qatl*-form **māḡḥ* which cannot be reconciled with the Semitic words.

**Mārah*. The verb **mārah*, found only in Is. 38:21, "to anoint a wound," is mentioned by Albright as being a loan word in Semitic,⁵⁸ closely related to Egyptian *mrḥ.t*, "ointment." He places the origin of *mrḥ* in Egyptian for the very good reason that it has in that language an etymology: *mrḥ.t* is an *m*-nominal formation, attested as early as the Old Kingdom (*WB* II, 111), from the root *wrḥ*, "to anoint" (*WB* I, 334). The widespread occurrence of the root *mrḥ* in Semitic (Heb., Aram., Arab.) points to a comparatively

early borrowing.⁵⁹ Albright also points out the distinction between the root *mrḥ* and *mrḥ*, the latter being Semitic and different in meaning.⁶⁰

Nōpek, usually translated as a precious stone (Ex. 28:18; 39:11; Ezek. 27:16; 28:13); *pūk*, "stibium, eye-paint" (II Kings 9:30; Jer. 4:30; Is. 54:11; I Chron. 29:2). Dr. Albright has kindly made available to me his notes on these two words, and it is to these that I owe the following observations. Both of the words are Egyptian in origin, the former from O. K. *mḥk3t*, M. K. *mḥk3t*,⁶¹ N. K. *mḥk(t)*, "turquoise, malachite,"⁶² *WB* II, 56, and the latter from a shorter form *fk3t*: *f3kt*: *fk(t)*. The vocalization of *mḥk3t* is ascertained from the Late Assyrian transcription *Pi-ḥa-at-ti-ḥu-ru-un-pi-ki* of the Eg. name *Pr-Ḥṯr-(nb.t)-mḥk3.t*, written both with and without the *nb.t* in the 8th and 7th centuries (Cf. Gauthier II, 188). The cuneiform stands for a contemporary **Pēy-Ḥāthōr-mḥkē*; the phonetic history of the final word is reconstructed by Albright thus: O. K. **mēfūkā3āt* > M. K. **mḥfūkā(3)* > **nḥfūkē* (> Heb. **nūpūk-nūpūk* > *nōpek*) > **nḥfūkē* > **nḥfūkē* (> Assyrian *unpī/ēki*). The short form was obviously *pūk* < **fūk(ē)* < M. K. **fūkā(3)* < O. K. **fūkā3āt*. This word may now be added to the many known examples showing the late Egyptian sound-shift *ū* > *ē*; the Hebrew form was borrowed before the change, the Assyrian transcription is afterward.⁶³

Neter, "niter," probably "natron." This word is not limited only to the Semitic languages, but

⁵⁶ As a point of interest, a denominative verb *mrḥ*, "to anoint," exists also in Egyptian (*WB* II, 111).

⁵⁷ F. Calice (*op. cit.*, note 80) does not consider the two Arabic forms as distinct; he says, "*Marraḥa* verdankt sein *Ḥā* wohl einer Kontamination mit *marḥ*, Holz durch dessen Reibung man Feuer macht."

⁵⁸ Whether actual metathesis of the *ḥ* is represented by this spelling, or whether it is an erroneous historical spelling with misplacement of a now unpronounced *ḥ* is not clear.

⁵⁹ V. Loret, "La turquoise chez les anciens Egyptiens," *Kemé*, I (1928), pp. 99-114.

⁶⁰ The non-existence of Akk. *lupakku*, adduced by Müller, "Der lupakku-nōphek Stein," *OLz*, 1899, pp. 39-41, as a cognate, has been demonstrated by J. Knudtzon, "Der angenommene lupakku-nōphek Stein," *BzA*, 4 (1902), pp. 324-5. Greek *phōkos*, taken by Lewy (*Fremdwörter*, p. 47) and Boisacq (*s. v.*) as a loan word from *pūk*, is doubtful; Albright prefers to consider it unrelated to the Egyptian word on the basis of the early meaning "sea-weed" found in Homer, *Iliad*, 9:7, and of incorrect phonetic correspondence ("should be *phōchos*").

⁵⁶ W. F. Albright, *Vocalization*, p. 61 (XVII, C, 11).

⁵⁷ Cf. H. Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss* (Leipzig 1915), p. 27.

⁵⁸ W. F. Albright, "In Reply to Dr. Gaster's Observation," *BASOR*, 93 (1944), p. 24. This possibility was pointed out earlier, however, by F. Calice, *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortvergleichen* (Wien 1936), No. 566.

has become current in most European tongues through the intermediary of Greek and Latin. The Egyptian original, attested in the Pyramid texts, is *nčrj*, later *ntry*. The early writing of this word with *č* is conclusive evidence that the Egyptian word is the prototype of the many and widespread occurrences. In Semitic we find Heb. *neter*, Aram. *nitrā*, Akk. *nitiru*, *nitru*; ⁶⁴ in early IE languages we have Hittite *nitri* (?) ⁶⁵ and Greek *νίτρον*, *λίτρον*. In consideration of the representation in the various languages, the original vocalization must have been approximately **nitrēj*; the borrowing by Semitic and Hittite must have taken place before the Late Egyptian sound shift (c. 1200 B. C.) but after the change of *č* to *t*. The precise meaning of *ntrj* is discussed by Lucas: ⁶⁶ niter is technically incorrect as a translation. *Ntrj*, now properly natron, is a natural soda consisting essentially of sodium carbonate and sodium bicarbonate, not of potassium nitrate, which today is known as niter.

Sûp, "fresh-water reed, sea-weed." On three occasions (Ex. 2:13, 15; Is. 19:6) *sûp* is used in reference to the reeds (papyrus) of Egypt; a single occurrence is attested (Jonah 2:6) where the generalized meaning "sea-weed" is obviously meant. The most frequent use of the word, however, is in the phrase *yam-sûp*, traditionally translated as the Red Sea, but actually referring to the Great Papyrus Marsh to the North, crossed by Moses and the Israelites in the exodus from Egypt. The Egyptian original of the word is *čwfy*, "papyrus, papyrus thicket" (WB V, 359), attested first in New Egyptian. The spelling, which at first appears to be syllabic, is probably consonantal in view of Coptic S. *ğouf*: B. *čomf*, *čonf*. From the Coptic, one would expect an original **čăwfëy* or the like; the Hebrew form, however, does not coincide perfectly with such a reconstruction, since **sôp*, not *sûp*, would be expected. Certainly not to be separated from this word is Arab. *šuf* in *šufu l-bağri* (Lane I, 85), "sea-weed," probably a borrowing from Coptic.

Pūk. See *Nôpek* above.

Pah, (1) the folding trap of the fowler, (2) a thin sheet (of metal); note also Syr. *pahhā*, "a

snare" (with the denominative verb in the *paēl* and *ethpaēl*), Arab. *faḥḥ* (pl. *fiḥaḥ*, *fuhūḥ*), idem; a denominative verb also occurs in Hebrew, *hāpēaḥ* (Is. 42:22). This word, in both its meanings, is Egyptian in origin. This is born out by the well-known popularity of the fowler's trade in Egypt and by the antiquity of the word and its derivatives in that language. The Egyptian root *ph̄ḥ*, "to split," is the basis of *ph̄ḥ*, "the wooden bird-trap" (New Kingdom) and *ph̄ḥ*, "a plate or sheet, as the deck of a ship, the wooden part of a wagon, also a sheet of stone." An early borrowing in Semitic is indicated by the retention of the original *ḥ* in Arabic; the vocalization of the word c. 1200 B. C. must have been approx. **pāḥ* (*ḥ*), the final *ḥ* having been lost or assimilated to the *ḥ* at an early stage. The word has survived in Coptic as *paš* < **pāḥ* (*ḥ*ē) < **pāḥzē*.

Parōh, "the Pharaoh, king of Egypt." The original form of this *Pr-ḥ*, "great house," Copt. (*p*)*erro*, used as early as the Old Kingdom as a designation of the Egyptian ruler. As Steindorff ⁶⁷ and Ranke ⁶⁸ have already pointed out, the word occurs in cuneiform transcription as *pir'u*, reflecting a contemporary Eg. **pēr'ōḥ*. The date of the borrowing is somewhat difficult to determine since the Egyptian form was doubtlessly approx. **pēr'āḥ* for a considerable period of time before c. 1200 B. C. and *pēr'ō* (*ḥ*) after that date. If the form were borrowed as **pēr'ā* (*ḥ*), one would expect **pēr'ā* (') or the like, unless the quiescence of the final *aleph* took place in some dialects of Canaanite before the *ā* > *ō* shift ceased to be operative (c. 1400 B. C.). Or, the tonal lengthened *ā* may have changed in coastal areas to *ō* and been taken thus into Hebrew: **pēr'ā* (*ḥ*) > **pēr'ā* (') > **pēr'ō* > Heb. *parōh* (sometime between 1200 and 1000 B. C.; cf. Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*, p. 61).

Šî, "a ship," having two plural forms *šîm* and *šîyîm*. Bondi ⁶⁹ has equated this with Eg. *ğ̃j* (WB V, 515), "a type of river ship," attested in New Kingdom Egyptian and later, surviving in Coptic as S. B. *ğoi*: A. *ğai*, pl. *eğew*. The Coptic form

⁶⁴ Cf. R. C. Thompson, *A Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology* (Oxford 1936), p. 11.

⁶⁵ Cf. F. Hrozny, *Boghazköi-Studien*, II (Leipzig 1919), p. 87, note 7.

⁶⁶ A. Lucas, *Egyptian Materials*, p. 303; pp. 317-47.

⁶⁷ G. Steindorff, "Die keilschriftliche Wiedergabe ägyptischer Eigennamen," *BZA*, I, p. 342.

⁶⁸ H. Ranke, *Keilschriftliches Material*, p. 32.

⁶⁹ J. Bondi, *Dem hebräisch-phoenizischen Sprachzweige angehörige Lehnwörter in hieroglyphischen und hieratischen Texten* (Leipzig 1886), pp. 11, 66.

points to an original *ǵāšj > *ǵāy > ǵoi, or the like. In this case we must equate Eg. *ai* with Heb. *i*; this is difficult but also seems necessary in *Sîn* (*Sain*); but compare Heb. *ʿēpāh*, Eg. *ʿāpāt*. As a solution to the problem of vocalization Dr. Albright suggests that *šī* is a back formation from the plural *šiyim*, which has replaced a proper singular *šāy; compare *ʿiyim*, "ruins," sing. *ʿAy*, "The Ruin" (*n. l.*).

Qôp, "an ape, monkey," pl. *qôpîm*, LXX *πιθηκος*, Syr. *qûpā*, Akk. *uqûpu*, Gr. *κῆβος*, *κῆπος*. The Egyptian original⁷⁰ of this word is *gʿf*, "a type of small ape," attested from the Old Kingdom onward (*WB V*, 158); the feminine form *gʿf.t* (*ibid.*) and two other spellings, *gwf* (*WB V*, 160), from the Middle Kingdom, and *gʿf* (*WB V*, 155), Dynasty 19, also occur. The prothetic vowel of the Akkadian form points to a development: Old Kingdom **gʿūfē(y)* > Middle Eg. **ēgʿūfē* or **ēgwūfē* > New Eg. **ēg(ʿ)ūfē* (Acc. *uqûpu*) > *(*ē*)*gūfē* (Heb. **qûp*, *qôp*) > **kēfē* (Gr. *κῆβος*).⁷¹ It is clear that we have here another example of the *ū* > *ē* vowel shift.

Qallahat, "a pot, kettle." The evidence seems to show that the original of this word is Eg. *qrht* (*WB V*, 62), "pottery in general, or a single vessel," attested since the Old Kingdom. The original vocalization is difficult to posit if we do not assume that the middle radical was doubled; it is possible, however, that there may have been influence on the word from the vocalization of *šallahat*, "a bowl." Hence: **qār(rā)hā(t)*. Coptic S. A. *čalaht*, generally considered as a remnant of this word, is clearly a loan word in Egyptian and most likely akin to *ǵlahts*, having ultimate source in the above mentioned *šallahat*, or rather, in its Canaanite prototype.

Qeset, "a scribe's vessel, an ink vessel" (so

⁷⁰ Because of Sanskrit *kapi*, "ape, monkey," found as early as the Rigveda, there have been many attempts to cite this as the original word; Lewy (*Fremdwörter*, p. 6) voices that opinion and is followed by Boisacq (3rd ed., p. 445). In spite of the antiquity of the Sanskrit word, the short *a*-vowel is completely incompatible with any of the forms listed above, including the Greek. Cf. also B. Landsberger, "Die Fauna des alten Mesopotamien," pp. 87-88, for the equation *pagû* = *uqûpu* and a bibliography of the ape in Mesopotamia.

⁷¹ Such is the view of W. F. Albright, *JAOS*, 66 (1946), p. 318, who has rejected his former reconstruction (*Vocalization*, p. 61) as erroneous.

GB¹⁷, Ezek. 9:2, 3, 11. W. M. Müller⁷² has identified this Hebrew word with Eg. *gštj* (*WB V*, 207), "the scribe's palette." The only consonantal difficulty is the representation of Eg. *š* by Heb. *s*, where we quite often have *shin*; this would tend to show a late borrowing. The vocalization of the Egyptian word, then, if after c. 1200 B. C., was either **qāsti* (< **qāstēy* or **qīstēy*) or **qēsti* (< **qūstēy*). The assigning of this word to the root **qsh* is baseless.⁷³

Šûšan, "the name of a flower, a lily (?)" ; Syr. and Aram. *šûšantā*, Arab. *sausan*; Greek *σοῦσον*.⁷⁴ The Egyptian word underlying these forms is *sššn*, in the Old and Middle Kingdoms, and *sšn* from the Middle Kingdom onward, one *š* having been lost by haplology. In Coptic we find B. *šōšen*, "lily," with assimilation of the first *s* to *š*, a process similar to that which must have taken place in the Semitic borrowings of the word. The original vocalization cannot be determined with great accuracy, but a form **sššāšan* for the Middle Kingdom would be approximately correct; by the time of the New Kingdom the word had become **sāšān* or the like.

Šittāh, "the acacia nilotica," pl. *šittîm*. The identity of this with Eg. *šnġ* (*WB IV*, 520), Middle Kingdom *šnġ.t*, written also as *šntj* in the New Kingdom, "the acacia," Copt. *šonte*: *šont*, Arab. *sanġ*, was first established by Erman in 1892.⁷⁵ The word is found also in Akkadian as *samtu*.⁷⁶ The original vocalization must have been approximately **šānġā(t)*.

Šekiyôt. This word, derived by *GB¹⁷* from the root *škh*, "to look at," is translated "an object to be looked at"; it has been shown by Albright,⁷⁷ however, to be a loan word from Eg. *šk.ty* (*WB*

⁷² W. M. Müller, "Zwei ägyptische Wörter im Hebräischen," *OLz*, 3, pp. 49-51.

⁷³ H. Grimme, "Zu hebräischen QST," *OLz*, 3, p. 149.

⁷⁴ Akkadian *šišanu*, *šišnu*, listed by *GB¹⁷* as a cognate, is discussed by C. Thompson, *Dictionary of Assyrian Botany*, p. 11; it appears to be *butomus umbellatus L.*, a flowering rush, and cognate to Syriac *šišnā*. From a phonetic point of view, direct identification is impossible with Eg. **šāšan*.

⁷⁵ A. Erman, "Das Verhältnis," p. 120.

⁷⁶ C. Thompson, *Dictionary of Assyrian Botany*, p. 184, gives only *šamtu* as the *acacia nilotica*; *samētu* is found (*ibid.*, pp. 31, 35, 36) in lists of alkalis and is not yet identified.

⁷⁷ W. F. Albright, "Baal-Zephon," in *Festschrift für A. Bertholet* (Tübingen 1950), p. 4, note 3.

IV, 315), "a ship," and equivalent to Ugaritic *tk̄t*.⁷⁸ Concerning Heb. *ś* (which is found in the standard text) equalling Eg. *ś*, Albright points out that the original text was probably *škyt*, from a singular **šak̄it* or the like. The derivation is excellent, too, as far as the meaning is concerned: in Is. 2:16 (its only occurrence) it is parallel to **ōn̄yôt*, "vessels, ships." The Egyptian prototype would appear to be **šēk̄it̄ēy*.

Šāsāh, "to plunder." Albright has shown that this verb and its secondary formation *šāsas*, is an Egyptian importation into Canaanite.⁷⁹ Since his discussion on the cuneiform *šūzū-me* is complete in itself, I refer the reader to it and cite here only the high points. Cuneiform *šūzū-me* is a Canaanite plural participle, equivalent to Heb. *šōšim*, "plunderers, raiders"; the spelling *z* = *samēkh* (then an affricative) is normal. "It is likely that the (Canaanite) verb itself is ultimately a denominative from Eg. *šāsu*, 'nomads, marauders,' whence Coptic *šōs*, 'shepherd,' itself derived from a very ancient native Egyptian word *šs*, 'to traverse.' Under no circumstances can the Egyptian word be derived from Canaanite, as thought by Max Müller and others."

Ša'atnēz, "a garment woven from two different kinds of material (wool and linen)," Lev. 19:19 and Deut. 22:11. Dr. Albright suggests that this word is Egyptian in origin, from an unattested **š'd-n̄ḡ*, composed of the New Egyptian words *š'd* (WB IV, 422), "to cut," Copt. *šōt*: *šōt*, and *n̄ḡ* (WB II, 376), "thread," possibly the source of Copt. *nat*: *net*: *nēt*, "a loom, spider-web." As the basis of the conjectured word one may cite Eg. *šht-n̄ḡ*, "to weave," composed of *šht*, "to weave" (WB IV, 263), and the latter above. The Hebrew form could indicate an earlier **šā't-n̄iz*, but the possible Coptic cognate suggests that the Egyptian prototype was **šā'd-n̄ḡ* > **šā'd-n̄ḡ*, from which the Hebrew word was borrowed after c. 1200 B. C. The preservation of the final *ḡ*, in view of the Coptic form, may be the result of a dissimilatory

tendency because of the preceding *d*; it may, on the other hand, indicate an earlier borrowing than here suggested.

Šayīš, "white marble"; Syr. *šīšā*, Aram. *šīš*.⁸⁰ The Hebrew form *šayīš* is found only once (I Chron. 29:2); a variant (the primary form?) *šēš* occurs twice (Ct. 5:15; Esther 1:6). With this is to be compared Eg. *šš* (WB IV, 540), "alabaster," attested since the Pyramid texts. I would suspect an original vocalization **šīš* (> Heb. **šīšū* > **šēš* > *šayīš*, as a back-formation). The Syriac and Aramaic forms would then exhibit the original vowel.

Šēš, "byssus, fine linen," Eg. *šš* (WB IV, 539), "linen," attested since the Middle Kingdom; Copt. S. A. B. *šens* is the remnant of the compound *šš-n̄šw*, "the king's linen, royal linen." Stricker⁸¹ says: "L'existence d'un homonyme *šēš*, 'albatre,' prouve que ce n'est pas à *šš-n̄šw* que cet emprunt remonte, mais au simplex **šēš* (fin lin ou albatre), comme l'a déjà vu M. Müller dans le dictionnaire de Gesenius." I cannot see, however, what reason Stricker has for assuming that the two *šš*'s were homonyms in Egyptian, though they may well have been, or why the existence of Eg. *šēš*, "alabaster," proves that Heb. *šēš* is from the simplex *šš* and not from the compound *šš-n̄šw*, the Hebrew prototype being approximately **šinš* from Eg. **šēnš* or the like. There is not yet enough evidence for a confident reconstruction of the original vocalization.

Tahrā, Ex. 28:32; 39:23. It would seem from the two attestations of the word that it refers not to hide or leather, but to a specific type of garment which is put on over the head and has the opening for the head stitched with a hem to prevent tearing. For this reason Müller's (*GB*¹⁷) suggestion that the *tahrā* is a loanword from Eg. *d̄hr* (WB V, 481), "the hide of an animal," must remain open to serious doubt. Phonological considerations add further difficulties: (1) Eg. *d* should appear as Heb. *ṭ*; (2) the *ā* at the end of the Hebrew word is left unexplained.

⁷⁸ The identification of Eg. *sk̄ty* and Ugar. *tk̄t* is made also by A. Alt, "Ägyptisch-ugaritisches," *AfO*, XV (1951), pp. 69-74, and by Driver in the T. H. Robinson volume, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (1950), p. 52 f.

⁷⁹ W. F. Albright, "An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in an Amarna Letter from Central Palestine," *BASOR*, 89, p. 32, note 27.

⁸⁰ Akkadian *šaššu*, listed by *GB*¹⁷ as a cognate, is shown by R. C. Thompson, *Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology*, p. 61, to mean gold, probably a result of **šamšu* > **šanšu* > *šaššu*. See also B. Meissner, *Beiträge zum Assyrischen Wörterbuch II* (Chicago 1932), pp. 67-69.

⁸¹ B. H. Stricker, "Trois études," p. 12.