



PROJECT MUSE®

A Compound Etymology for Biblical Hebrew יָקָלוּ. 'Except'

John Huehnergard, Aren Wilson-Wright

Hebrew Studies, Volume 55, 2014, pp. 7-17 (Article)

Published by National Association of Professors of Hebrew
DOI: 10.1353/hbr.2014.0013



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/hbr/summary/v055/55.huehnergard.html>

A COMPOUND ETYMOLOGY FOR BIBLICAL HEBREW זולתי ‘EXCEPT’*

John Huehnergard and Aren Wilson-Wright

University of Texas at Austin

This paper suggests an alternative derivation for the Biblical Hebrew preposition זולתי ‘except’. It does not derive from an alleged verbal root ZWL, but is rather to be compared with Akkadian *ša lā* and Aramaic *dī lā* with the same meaning and thus originates from the fusing of three elements: the West Semitic relative particle **dū*, the Semitic negative particle **lā*, and the pronominal morpheme **-tī*. This derivation has better comparative Semitic support than the traditional derivation; it also accounts for a large number of instances of the problematic *hireq compaginis*.

The Biblical Hebrew preposition זולתי ‘except’ is usually derived from an alleged root cognate with the Arabic verb *zāla*, plus a *hireq compaginis*. While this etymology is possible, it does not explain the exotic morphology of the form, and it lacks solid comparative evidence. Instead, we argue that זולתי is a compound of three elements: the inherited West Semitic relative particle **dū*, the common Semitic negative particle **lā*, and the oblique pronominal morpheme **-tī*. Thus, זולתי is cognate with Akkadian *ša lā* and Aramaic *dī lā* and is a relic of the Semitic **dū lā su’ātī* construction found in Akkadian. Our derivation has the added benefit of eliminating many examples of the *hireq compaginis* from the biblical corpus.

1. PREVIOUS SUGGESTIONS

Many verbal etymologies have been proposed for זולתי. Gesenius and Buhl, for example, link it with the Arabic verb *zāla* ‘to cease, to remove’ and cite Isa 46:6 as evidence that this verb existed in Biblical Hebrew: הַזְּלִים זָהָב מִכִּיס וְכֶסֶף בְּקֶנֶה יִשְׁקְלוּ ‘The ones who lavish (?) gold from the purse and weigh silver in the scale’.¹ Klein, on the other hand, reconstructs a Proto-

* We wish to thank Ahmad Al-Jallad, Jo Ann Hackett, Saralyn McKinnon-Crowley, Na’ama Pat-El, and Ambjörn Sjörs for helpful discussions on our topic.

¹ F. Buhl, ed., *Wilhelm Gesenius’ hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (17th ed.; Berlin: Springer, 1915; Reprint 1962), p. 195. Similarly BDB, p. 265; F. Zorell, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum veteris testamenti* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1967), p. 206; D. Cohen et al., eds., *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 1970–), 8:703–705; R. Meyer, and H. Donner, eds., *Wilhelm Gesenius’ hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (18th ed.; 6 vols.; Berlin: Springer, 1987–2010), 2:297. The verb in question is a *hapax legomenon*.

Central Semitic root ZWL ‘to waste, lavish’ on the basis of Arabic *zāla* and Jewish Aramaic ZWL ‘to be worthless, cheap’, which he relates to Hebrew זלל ‘to despise’.² In this regard, he seems to subscribe to the “biliteral theory” of Semitic roots, which has fallen into disfavor.³ Finally, in *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Arabic *zāla* is avoided altogether; the entry on זולתי only refers to the two Aramaic roots and the verse from Isaiah.⁴

These verbal derivations of זולתי require too many semantic changes and do not adequately explain the unusual morphology of the form. Indeed, it is doubtful that any subset of Arabic *zāla*, Hebrew זלל, Jewish Aramaic ZWL, and Egyptian Aramaic ZWL are related to each other. Any connection between ‘removing’, ‘lavishing’, ‘being worthless’, and ‘selling’ seems forced: only an unscrupulous vendor would sell worthless merchandise, nor can absent goods be lavished. Even a derivation from an alleged Hebrew root cognate with Arabic *zāla* alone is questionable. While the semantic expansion “cessation, removal” > “except” is not impossible—especially in light of the Akkadian preposition *ezib* / *ezub* ‘apart’, which comes from the masculine singular imperative of *ezēbum* ‘to leave’⁵—a verbal etymology does not explain the final *-î* of זולתי. Instead, proponents of this theory simply label it a *hireq compaginis*, lumping it in with other unexplained phenomena. As will be shown below, a compound derivation has the benefit of more reasonable comparative evidence and can better explain the morphology of this form.

2. A NEW PROPOSAL

With a little squinting, it is not hard to imagine that זולתי contains the relative pronoun ו and the negative particle *lō*([’]) plus an extra element in *-tî*, which looks suspiciously like the oblique *-tî* found elsewhere in Semitic. In this section, we will examine each component in turn and bring the components and development of this form into sharper focus.

² E. Klein, *Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Carta, 1987), p. 196.

³ Proponents of the biliteral theory argue that Proto-Semitic contained a class of biconsonantal verbal roots, which could be semantically modified by the addition of monoconsonantal infixes and affixes. This theory founders on the near absence of biliteral roots in Proto-Semitic—the I-w *a-i* class of verbs is the only exception—and the difficulty of assigning meaning to single consonants.

⁴ L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, et al., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (trans. M. E. J. Richardson; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1:267.

⁵ For a similar construction in English, compare the use of “never mind” in the sentence: “They’ve got popcorn, peanuts—never mind the cotton candy.”

The relative pronoun וְ appears fifteen times in the Hebrew Bible and is a reflex of the Proto-West Semitic relative pronoun **dū*. It is cognate with other West Semitic relatives in *z*, *d*, and *d̲*, such as:

Geʿez: ms *za-*
 Modern South Arabian: ms *d̲ / d*
 Sayhadic: ms *d̲*, fs *dt*
 Classical Arabic: ʾ*alladī*; *dū*, *dī*
 Ugaritic ms *d-* (nom. /*dū*/), fs *dt-*, pl *dt*
 Aramaic: *zy*, *dī*, *d(ə)-*
 early Byblian Phoenician: *z*

The West Semitic relative originally inflected for gender, number, and case, like the Arabic demonstrative pronoun *dū*.⁶ The loss of case distinction in nouns in Pre-Hebrew, however, eliminated the need for case distinction in the relative pronoun. Over time, the nominative masculine singular was generalized in most forms of the language.⁷ A similar process took place in Aramaic and Ethiopic, but there the genitive and accusative forms were generalized, respectively. In Hebrew, the noun *ʾ*atar-* ‘place’ was grammaticalized as a locative relative conjunction and then as a relative pronoun, which eventually displaced וְ and הַ in most environments. In some dialects, grammaticalization was carried one step further: phonological reduction accompanied semantic bleaching, yielding the short form *-w̄*.

Hebrew וְ is also cognate with the Akkadian relative *ša*, which is itself a remnant of a fuller paradigm. In Old Akkadian, the relative pronoun inflected for gender, number, and case, for example, ms nom. *tū*, mp nom. *tūt*, etc.⁸ The mismatch between the initial consonants across the branches is the result of an ad hoc sound change in either East or West Semitic. Either de-

⁶ See J. Huehnergard, “On the Etymology of the Hebrew Relative *šə-*,” in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives* (ed. S. E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006). Traces of case distinction can be found in the oldest strata of the Hebrew Bible. In Psalm 68, dated to perhaps the twelfth century B.C.E., nominative וְ contrasts with genitive הַ:

וְ אֱלֹהִים הוּא פָעַלְתָּ לָנוּ ‘You, O God, who acted for us’ (Ps 68:29);

מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים הוּא סִינַי ‘before the God of Sinai’ (Ps 68:9).

See N. Pat-El and A. Wilson-Wright, “Features of Archaic Biblical Hebrew and the Linguistic Dating Debate” (review of R. C. Vern, *Dating Archaic Biblical Poetry: Critique of the Linguistic Arguments*), *HS* 54 (2013): 401–402.

⁷ The use of the demonstrative הַ as a relative pronoun probably reflects the old genitive form in Exod 13:8; Ps 74:2; 78:54; 104:8, 26; Prov 23:22; Job 15:17; 19:9. It is also used to form nominalizations in the expression הוּא סִינַי ‘the one of Sinai’ (Judg 5:5; Ps 68:9).

⁸ See R. Hasselbach, *Sargonic Akkadian: A Historical and Comparative Study of the Syllabic Texts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), p. 161.

voicing occurred in East Semitic or voicing took place in West Semitic. For the purposes of our argument, which form is original is a moot question; what matters is that the first syllable of זולתי matches the form of the West Semitic relative that survived in Biblical Hebrew.

ל is the standard negative particle in Biblical Hebrew and negates indicative verbs, prepositional phrases, and nouns. It is distinguished from cognate particles by a final aleph. This aleph, however, is probably not etymological, but rather a graphic device used for monosyllabic words that were not cliticized (cf. Hebrew ל and Samalian <W> ‘and’ and <P> ‘then’) or an early vowel letter for /ō/.⁹ Other languages lack an aleph altogether or omit the aleph in certain compounds. In Ugaritic, Old Aramaic, and the Deir ‘Allā inscription, the negative is a clitic and takes the form *l*-. Although all later dialects of Aramaic use *lā*([’]) as the standard negative particle, compound forms in these languages, like Common Aramaic *lyt* < **lā* ([’])*it* and Nabatean <LW> (< **lā hū*[’]), lack an aleph because they formed before the introduction of the regular use of aleph for final *-ā*.¹⁰ In Classical Arabic, the *alif* serves as a vowel letter for /ā/ in *lā* but disappears in composite forms such as *lan* < **lā* [’]*an*. Taken together, the comparative evidence suggests that the Pre-Canaanite ancestor of ל was **lā*.¹¹ Thus, זולתי can contain *lā* as long as it crystallized as a compound before the advent of Hebrew as a written language. As we will argue below, the genesis of זולתי occurred before the Canaanite shift, well before the emergence of written Hebrew.

The Hebrew negative particle ל reflects the Canaanite shift, while זולתי does not. It must come from **dū-la-tī* rather than **dū-lā-tī*; otherwise the Canaanite shift would have produced ***zūlōtī*. For this reason, we suspect that the addition of *-tī* triggered a shortening of **ā* to **a* in זולתי before the operation of the Canaanite shift. There are other examples from Central Semitic where the inherited negative particle *lā* shortens to *la* in compounds, all of which involve the addition of morphological material after the negation.¹² Arabic attests *lammā* ‘not yet’ and *lam* ‘not’ from **lā* + *m(ā)*. Along

⁹The quiescence of aleph in forms like יאמר and ראש, where loss of the glottal stop triggered compensatory lengthening, followed by the Canaanite shift, could give the impression that aleph marked /ō/. W. R. Garr, *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000–586, B.C.E.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), p. 199.

¹⁰ Compare also the counterfactual conditionals—Jewish Palestinian Aramaic [’]*ellulā*, Mandaic [’]*ellā*, and Syriac *law*.

¹¹ An alternative possibility is the existence of biforms, **lā* in context and **la*[’] as an interjection “no!” as, for example, in modern Syro-Lebanese Arabic.

¹² An *ad hoc* shortening of the middle of three long vowels (viz., in **dū-lā-tī*) might also be considered.

similar lines, Pat-El has argued that the Hebrew form לְמָה־disguises two different words—the interrogative **la-mā* and a negative purpose subordinator **lā-mā*—that have fallen together phonologically.¹³ In certain contexts, an interrogative meaning for *lāmā* seems out of place. For example, when Abner is running from Asahel, he states: סוּר לִי מֵאַחֲרַי לְמָה אֶכְפֹּה אֶרְצָה ‘Turn away from following me lest I strike you to the ground’ (2 Sam 2:22). A hardened warrior like Abner would probably not question the necessity of killing his opponent. The negative existential particle *layt* / *lēt* in later Aramaic also attests to a contraction < **lā* *ʾit* (cf. also Arabic *laysa*) as does the Syriac counterfactual conditional *law*, which Nöldeke derives from **lā hū*.¹⁴

The combination of the inherited relative and *lā* appears in Akkadian and Aramaic, both meaning “without, except,” while a similar combination of *dū* and *bal* appears in Ugaritic and Soqotri (Modern South Arabian). This construction is used to negate nouns and infinitives. Both Akkadian dictionaries gloss *ša lā* ‘without’.¹⁵ Note the following example in an early Old Babylonian letter:

ina dabābim ša lā idīm libbum lā uštamraš

the mind should not be troubled by an unfounded report (lit., a report without knowledge).¹⁶

Several centuries later, Rib-Addi, the ruler of Byblos, complains to the Pharaoh Akhenaten:

eqlu-ya aššata ša lā muta mašil

my field is like a wife without a husband.¹⁷

This construction enjoyed an equally long lifespan in Aramaic. An early example appears in the book of Ezra, partly written in Imperial Aramaic:

¹³ N. Pat-El, *Studies in the Historical Syntax of Aramaic* (Perspectives on Linguistics and Ancient Languages 1; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2012), pp. 34–46.

¹⁴ T. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1898), p. 253.

¹⁵ W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965–1981), 1:521a; I. J. Gelb, ed., *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1989), vol. 17.1, p. 1.

¹⁶ Cited in I. J. Gelb, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 10.1, p. 276a.

¹⁷ J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln. Einleitung und Erläuterungen* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907–1915; reprint, Aalen: Zeller, 1964), text 74:17–18; cf. also 75:15–16; 81:37; 90:42–43.

וּמָה חֲשָׁחַן ... מִתְּיָהֵב לָהֶם יוֹם בְּיוֹם דִּי-לֹא שָׁלוּ

whatever is needed...let it be given to them day by day without negligence
(Ezra 6:9)

Later examples crop up in Syriac, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, Palmyrene, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic, where the two individual morphemes have fused into a compound, *dlā*.

The Ugaritic reflex of this construction negates infinitives.¹⁸ In the Kirta Epic, the god El instructs the eponymous hero to marshal, for his campaign to *udm*,

hpt . dbl . spr ‘soldiers without (= beyond) counting’
tnn . dbl . hg ‘archers without (= beyond) reckoning’.¹⁹

A cognate of the Ugaritic construction appears in the Modern South Arabian language Soqotri. Here, *di-ból* ‘without’ negates nouns: *di-ból št wa-di-ból qáyneh* ‘without a thing and without value’ (cf. Exod 21:11).²⁰ Apart from the final *-tî*, Akkadian *ša lā* and Aramaic *dî-lā* can be seen as cognate to זולתי, while the Ugaritic and Soqotri forms are cognate with lexical replacement.

Akkadian also suggests a potential origin for the *-tî* of זולתי. In this language, the combination of the relative pronoun and *lā* can negate the oblique personal pronouns, which end in *-tî*, as in Akkadian *ša lā kâti* ‘without/except for you’.²¹ There is reason to believe that this construction was either Proto-Semitic or easily replicable in individual languages with the operation of identical grammatical rules. As Pat-El argues, the relative pronoun is equivalent to the head noun in a construct chain and thus conditions the genitive.²² The negative particle, in turn, cannot take a pronominal suffix and so must be followed by an oblique pronoun. The end result is a sequence consisting of a relative, negative particle and pronoun: in West Semitic, **dū lā hu’ātî*. Such a construction would have provided the ideal environment for the creation of the form זולתי. The *-tî* of the oblique pronoun was, we suggest, clipped and transferred to the negative particle as well: **dū lā*

¹⁸ J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2nd ed.; AOAT 273; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2012), p. 817.

¹⁹ I. J. Gelb, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 1.14. ii, pp. 37–38.

²⁰ Cited in D. H. Müller, *Die Mehri- und Soqotri-Sprache* (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1905), 2:10; see further W. Leslau, *Lexique Soqotri (sudarabique moderne) avec comparaisons et explications étymologiques* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1938), p. 86.

²¹ See I. J. Gelb, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, 8:306.

²² N. Pat-El, “Tracing the Origin of the Relative Clause: The Case of Semitic,” forthcoming.

hu' ātī > **dū-la-tī hu' ātī*.²³ Then the resulting compound was reanalyzed as a new preposition.

Of course, the oblique pronouns must have survived long enough for this clipping to take place in an ancestor of Hebrew. But the oblique pronouns and, more abstractly, the oblique morpheme *-tī* have a long history in the Semitic family and appear even further afield in Afro-Asiatic.²⁴ Akkadian and Eblaite possess a full set of oblique independent pronouns in *-tī*.²⁵ West Semitic, however, only attests the 3rd person pronouns and a limited number of demonstrative, interrogative, and adverbial elements, which vary by language.²⁶ The distribution of these forms is as follows:

Akkadian and Eblaite: *šuāti*, *šunūti*, etc.²⁷

Ge'ez: 3ms *wə'ətu*, 3fs *yə'əti*, 3mp *'əmntu*; cf. ms *zəntu*, fs *zāti* 'this', etc.

Tigre: 3ms *hətu*, 3fs *həta*, 3mp *hətom*, 3fp *hətän*

Sabaic: 3ms *hwt*, 3fs *hyt*, 3cd *hm(y)t*, 3mp *hmt*, 3fp *hnt*

Ugaritic: 3ms *hwt*, 3fs *hyt*, 3mp *hmt*, 3cd *hmt*

Amarna Canaanite: *miyvti* 'who?'

Phoenician: 3ms *h't* (Byblian), 3m/fp *hmt* (standard)

²³ We prefer clipping over grammaticalization as an explanation for the compounding process because grammaticalization would entail significant phonological reduction: *dū-la-hu' ātī* > *dū-la-tī*.

²⁴ E. Lipiński, *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (2nd ed.; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), p. 305, mentions Old Egyptian 2ms *twt*, 2fs *tmt*, 3ms *swt*, which A. Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 67, vocalizes as /čuwati/, /čimati/, and /suwati/; and Agaw *yət* 'me', *kut* 'you', and *anät* 'us'. The Afro-Asiatic forms are not necessarily cognate with their Semitic counterparts. The Old Egyptian forms mark the nominative case and seem to be derived from the corresponding set of dependent pronouns 2ms *twt*, 2fs *tmt*, and 3ms *sw* rather than the possessive suffixes (see note 26).

²⁵ On pronominal *-tv* in Semitic, see J. Barth, "Zum semitischen Demonstrativ *d...*" *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 59 (1905): 159–162; J. Barth, *Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913), pp. 83–89; R. Hasselbach, "Demonstratives in Semitic," *JAOS* 127 (2007): 2–3. The forms of the Tigre copula—ms *tu*, fs *ta*, mp *tom*, fp *tän*—are grammaticalized versions of the independent third person pronouns *hətu*, *həta*, *hətom*, *hətän*, respectively: W. Leslau, "Grammatical Sketches in Tigré (North Ethiopic), Dialect of Mensa," *JAOS* 65 (1945): 185. An enclitic particle *ta/i* in Amorite was proposed by Krahmalkov, but this has not been accepted by later scholars of Amorite: C. Krahmalkov, "The Amorite Enclitic Particle *ta/i*," *JSS* 14 (1969); see also C. Krahmalkov, "Studies in Amorite Grammar" (Ph. D. thesis, Harvard University, 1965), pp. 139–207.

²⁶ It is unclear whether the 1st and 2nd person forms are an East Semitic innovation or a retention from an earlier, Afro-Asiatic node. Innovation seems more likely. The 1st and 2nd oblique forms could have been derived by analogy to the suffix pronouns in East Semitic (and independently in Egyptian and Agaw?): *-šu* : *šuāti* :: *-ya*, *-ni* : X = *yāti*, *nīāti*. And if they were a retention, the loss of the corresponding forms in West Semitic remains unexplained and unmotivated. See J. Huehnergard, "Proto-Semitic and Proto-Akkadian," in *The Akkadian Language in Its Semitic Context: Studies in the Akkadian of the Third and Second Millennium BC* (ed. G. Deutscher and N. J. C. Kouwenberg; Leiden: NINO, 2006), pp. 10–11.

²⁷ For Eblaite, see R. Hasselbach, *Sargonic Akkadian*, p. 149 n. 10.

Unfortunately, most West Semitic examples of these forms appear in unvocalized texts, which makes it difficult to establish sound correspondences across the different branches. Comparative evidence suggests that the pronouns, at least, end in /ī/, but we could be dealing with several different endings. The lack of vocalization is especially problematic, given that early Akkadian exhibits *-tī* (3ms *šūāti*, 3fs *šīāti*),²⁸ while the Ethio-Semitic languages exhibit a distinction between masculine *-tu* and feminine *-ti*, as in 3ms *wəʾatu*, 3fs *yəʾati*.²⁹ Thus, all unvocalized forms should be treated as only provisionally related to the *-tī* of זולתי.

We have argued that the *-tī* of זולתי was clipped from a following oblique pronoun. The exact mechanism for this transfer is unclear, but it seems that adverbs were more likely to incorporate the oblique morpheme than other parts of speech.³⁰ Apart from pronouns, the morpheme *-tī* appears most frequently on adverbs. Examples of such forms are:³¹

Geʿez: ʾəsfəntu ‘how much?’

Sayhadic: <BLTY> ‘without’³²

Ugaritic: *tmt* ‘there’, *kmt* ‘thus’, *blt* ‘without’³³

Hebrew: זולתי ‘without’

Phoenician: <BLT> ‘without’

²⁸ The 3ms form *šūātu* is probably secondary, by analogy with 3fs *šīāti* (see also the next footnote). For these forms, see W. von Soden and W. R. Mayer, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (3rd ed.; AnOr 33; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1995), p. 51.

²⁹ One wonders whether the Ethiopian distinction between masc. *-tu* and fem. *-ti* is the result of an ancient (Proto-Ethiopic) analogy like that suggested in the preceding note to account for Akkadian *šūātu*, namely, an original ms **huʾātī* is replaced by **huʾātū*, with the same vowels in the first and third syllables, on the analogy with the fs counterpart **hiʾātī*. The new masc. *-tu* and fem. *-ti* would then be extended to other pronominal forms, such as ms *zəntu* versus fs *zāti* ‘this’.

³⁰ Note, however, the transfer of the proto-article **han-* from attribute alone to head-noun and attribute, suggested by N. Pat-El, “The Development of the Semitic Definite Article: A Syntactic Approach,” *JSS* 54 (2009): 38–40.

³¹ Perhaps also to be included here is the Northwest Semitic *nota accusativi* **ʾiyyāt-*; the corresponding Arabic element, *ʾiyyā*, might suggest that the Northwest Semitic form has been extended by an ending **-t(v)*. The etymologies of the various Semitic *notae accusativi* are, however, difficult to establish with any certainty: see C. Correll, “Ein neuer Anlauf zur Erklärung der ‘Notae accusativi’ in den klassischen semitischen Sprachen,” in *Festschrift Ewald Wagner zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. W. Heinrichs and G. Schoeler; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994), pp. 21–43; D. Testen, “Morphological Observations on the Stems of the Semitic ‘Nota accusativi’,” *Archiv für Orientforschung* 44–45 (1997–1998): 215–221; A. Dolgopolsky, “On the Origin of the Hebrew *nota accusativi* ʾet ~ ʾēt and the t-Accusative in Akkadian, Agaw and Saho,” in *Afroasiatica Tergestina: Papers from the 9th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Linguistics, Trieste, April 23–24, 1998* (ed. M. Lamberti and L. Tonelli; Padua: Unipress, 1999), pp. 43–46.

³² Occasionally, <Y> serves as a vowel letter for /ī/ in Sayhadic.

³³ On enclitic *-t* in Ugaritic, see J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, p. 836.

In the case of *dū lā* and *bal*, simple proximity may have been enough since these forms could negate oblique pronouns. But this explanation does not account for adverbs that do not govern pronouns, like Ugaritic *tm*. Perhaps we may posit a link between the oblique pronouns and the adverbial accusative that facilitated the transfer of *-tī* to certain adverbs. After all, the oblique pronouns would have marked the accusative at least as often as the genitive, if not more since oblique pronouns could only mark the genitive after prepositions. On nouns, they would be replaced by the suffix pronouns. In this scenario, the final *-tī* of the oblique pronouns was reanalyzed as an adverbial marker because of its association with the accusative and then transferred to different adverbs individually.

Another possibility is to derive the other adverbs by analogy with *biltī* after the breakup of the Central Semitic languages. In this scenario, **bal hu'ātī* was clipped to *baltī* / *biltī* in Proto-Central Semitic, leaving the following reflexes:³⁴ Sabaic <BLTY>, Ugaritic *blt*, Hebrew *בְּלִתִּי*, and perhaps Phoenician <BLT>.³⁵ In all of these languages, the original form **bal* also survived, setting up an analogy that facilitated the transfer of *-tī* to other adverbs:

$$bal : biltī :: dū lā : X = dū-lā-tī$$

This analogy may have been especially tempting in the case of *dū lā* because the latter construction could negate oblique pronouns. A similar process may account for Ugaritic *kmt* ‘thus’, which may derive ultimately from **kv-mv hu'ātī* ‘like it’ = ‘thus’; note that the Akkadian preposition *kīma* governs independent oblique pronouns rather than pronominal suffixes, as in *kīma šuāti* ‘like him’.³⁶ If this proposal is correct, then various adverbs could have formed at different times, and *זוּלְתִי* in particular could have formed before the Canaanite shift.

Once the transfer of *-tī* took place, *זוּלְתִי* was reanalyzed as a new preposition that could be used independently of the oblique pronouns. The forms with suffixes can be accounted for by assuming that 1cs *dū-la-tī-ya* > *זוּלְתִי*,

³⁴ See N. Pat-El, “On Negation in Phoenician,” in *Linguistic Studies in Phoenician: In Memory of J. Brian Peckham* (ed. R. Holmstedt and A. Schade; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, forthcoming) for a different proposal on the origin of *בְּלִתִּי*.

³⁵ It should be noted, however, that *balum* in Akkadian takes suffixes, as in *balukka* ‘without you’.

³⁶ W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*, p. 205; W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (3 vols.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965–1981), 1:476.

with the remaining forms derived by analogy to feminine singular nouns with suffix:

$$\text{זולְתִי} : \text{X} = \text{זולְתִי} :: \text{מְלַכְתִּי} : \text{מְלַכְתִּי}$$

This process also facilitated the extraction of a *hapax* “nominal” base זולְה, which appears in 2 Kgs 24:14.

3. CONCLUSION

A compound derivation of זולְתִי has several advantages over verbal derivations. It rests on more extensive comparative evidence and can also explain the unusual morphology of the form without invoking the *hireq compaginis*. If correct, our analysis eliminates 117 instances of *hireq compaginis* from the Hebrew Bible (זולְתִי 5 times; בְּלְתִי 112 times).³⁷ In the future, it may turn out that the *hireq compaginis* is actually a composite of several unrelated phenomena that are outwardly identical but historically diffuse.³⁸

Appendix: The Occurrences and Meaning of זולְתִי

The meaning of זולְתִי is fixed by context and its rendering in direct translations of the biblical text. Second Samuel 22, which parallels Psalm 18, substitutes מְבַלְעֵדִי ‘apart from’ for זולְתִי. In the Septuagint, זולְתִי is rendered by *πλην* ‘except for’ nine times, *παρῆξ* ‘besides’ five times, *ἀλλ’ ἢ* ‘except, but’ once, and *ἐκτὸς* ‘out of’ once. In the Targums, *’alāhen* ‘but, except’ is used before nouns and *bār-min* ‘except’ before suffixed personal pronouns. In the Vulgate, Jerome uses four different Latin words to translate זולְתִי: *praeter* ‘besides, except’, *absque* ‘without, apart from’, *extra* ‘outside of, except, without’, and *exceptus* ‘excepted’.

The following chart lists all occurrences of זולְתִי in the biblical text, with its translations in the versions.

³⁷ The examples in Isa 45:5, 21; Hos 13:4; and Ps 18:32 represent זולְתִי plus a following 1cs suffix.

³⁸ There have been several attempts to isolate distinct phenomena subsumed under the *hireq compaginis* label. For example, A. Butts, “A Note on *nedārī* in Ex 15:6,” *VT* 60 (2010): 167–171, has argued that the *hireq compaginis* on נְאֻדְרִי in Exod 15:6 is actually an old feminine morpheme.

Verse	MT	LXX	Targum Jonathan	Vulgate
Deut 1:36	יְהוָה	πλήν	'alāhen ³⁹	<i>praeter</i>
Deut 4:12	יְהוָה	ἀλλ' ἢ	'alāhen ⁴⁰	
Josh 11:13	יְהוָה	πλήν	'alāhen	<i>absque</i>
1Sam 21:10	הַיְהוָה	πάρεξ	<i>bār-minnah</i>	
2 Sam 7:22	יְהוָה	πλήν	<i>bār-minnāk</i>	<i>extra</i>
1 Kgs 3:18	יְהוָה	πάρεξ	'alāhen	<i>exceptus</i>
1 Kgs 12:20	יְהוָה	πάρεξ	'alāhen	<i>praeter</i>
2 Kgs 24:14	תְּהוָה	πλήν	'alāhen	<i>exceptus</i>
Isa 26:13	יְהוָה	ἐκτὸς	<i>bār-minnāk</i>	<i>absque</i>
Isa 45:5	יְהוָה	πλήν	<i>bār-minni</i>	<i>extra</i>
Isa 45:21	יְהוָה	πάρεξ	<i>bār-minni</i>	<i>praeter</i>
Isa 64:3	יְהוָה	πλήν	<i>bār-minnāk</i>	
Hos 13:4	יְהוָה	πλήν	<i>bār-minni</i>	<i>absque</i>
Ps 18:32	יְהוָה	πλήν	<i>bār-minnāk / 'elā'</i>	<i>praeter</i>
Ruth 4:4	יְהוָה	πάρεξ	<i>bār-minnāk</i>	<i>exceptus</i>
1 Chr 17:20	יְהוָה	πλήν	<i>bār-minnāk</i>	<i>absque</i>

³⁹ Also in Targum Neofiti and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan.⁴⁰ Also in Targum Neofiti and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan.