a) General remarks

The present volume, the third of Part One, is meant to furnish general Semito-Hamitic background for it by means of lexical material drawn from other Semitic languages as well as from the other branches of the phylum, and discussion of the Hebrew material presented in the second volume in the light of this comparative material.

It may be unnecessary to state that it was not possible to include all the relevant material available by now. Nor was it deemed necessary, as most of it, at least as far as Semitic languages are concerned, is readily available in standard works, particularly in the new edition of Koehler-Baumgartner’s *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden 1967ff) which indeed proved very helpful in the collection of material for the first nineteen letters of the alphabet of the present work; hopefully, the remaining ones also will be available to the readers by the time this volume will come out or not long afterwards. In any case, I trust that what is presented here will provide an amply representative sample of the material currently available. As K-B^3_3 appears to concentrate on more closely related languages, few of these have been included in the systematically quoted selection, while it is endeavoured to utilize material from the more remote ones more fully. In what follows, the systematically quoted selection is detailed with the principal sources utilized for them; more incidental sources are mentioned only in the body of the work in appropriate connections; and so the sources for material from outside the selection, particularly if this is not a standard work. Needless to say, in the discussion all the known material is attempted to be accounted for, tacitly if not expressly.

The discussion falls naturally into two parts, phonological (including word formation) and semantic. As the former can be done systematically, it is included in the introduction as a subdivision of it, while semantic comments follow the comparative material under each entry word. In addition, as it is not possible to reach definite results in the phonological discussion without determination of the phonological inventory, discussion of this will be included; but as this is properly a matter for Part Two, only pre- and common Semitic material will be considered here, as this will be sufficient for the present purpose. In addition, as the purpose of the determination is a truly etymological one, meant to reflect actual phonological structure of the pre-Semitic parental of Hebrew, criteria for the determination of each pho-
neme are applied more stringently than usual, taking into account only those vocabulary items which with at least some probability can be assumed to have existed in pre-Semitic times and accepting only such minimal pairs as can have truly existed within that vocabulary including consideration of probable elementary syntactic units rather than single words as basis for them, particularly where evidence for pairs based on single words only is scanty and/or doubtful. Sounds constituting phonemes in some historical Semitic languages but not proven as having phonological status on such criteria will be regarded as allophonic only in pre-Semitic times.

b) Systematically quoted languages

The following languages or alternatively, for some more remotely related branches of the phylum, language groups will be quoted regularly, as far as cognates or other items deemed worthy of discussion are known to the author. The order of arrangement is not always according to the closeness of relationship, but takes also account of geographical positions, particularly for the non-Semitic branches of the phylum, semi-accidentally resulting in a closed chain, ending next to the starting point.

Semitic languages

(i) Phoenician (Phoen). The main sources for this were Jean-Hoftijzer's *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'Ouest* and, more recently, R.S. Tomback's *A comparative Semitic lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic languages*; where these offered different interpretations, occasionally also otherwise, texts published in Donner-Röllig's *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* and N. Slouschz's *Thesaurus of Phoenician inscriptions*, sometimes also the grammars of J. Friedrich, Z.S. Harris and S. Segert, and (rarely) CIS vol. I were consulted.

(ii) Ugaritic (Ug). For this, the main source was C.H. Gordon's *Ugaritic textbook*, but Aistleitner's *Wörterbuch der urartischen Sprache* (4th ed.) and Segert's *Basic grammar* were also regularly consulted, apart from occasional references to more recent articles (mainly in *Ugarit-Forschungen*); in addition, D. Pardee kindly commented on a number of uncertain items.

(iii) Aramaic (Aram): This label covers potentially all forms of Aramaic except Syriac; but where a Hebrew item is parallelled by a Jewish Aramaic one, as recorded by Dalman and Jastrow in their respective dictionaries, other forms of Aramaic are recorded only if they offer something of special (phonological) interest; for these, Jean-Hoftijzer and K-B are the usual sources. In cases of uncertainty, original texts were consulted; as critical