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Derivatives of the root lat are latta, lata'a, lataba, lataha, lataxa, latada, lataza, latağa, latama. For the modern latlat - ratrata cf. lakina which means originally to chew the words. In German, Worte or Silben kauen means to utter or pronounce with hesitation or imperfectly, to articulate indistinctly (French mâchonner ses paroles).

The root lat is found in latta, latata, lataha, latasa, lafa'a, latama, laţiza. For laz cf. lazza and lazaha. See my remarks in AJSL 22, 205. 257; 23, 241. 248. 252; GK ${ }^{28}$, p. 107, n. 1.
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Heb. sed, haughty = Assyr. sittu, remnant
 igiduu) to glow; but this etymology (suggested by Jensen, KB 6,390 ) is untenable. It is true, the i instead of $\Psi$ might be due to partial assimilation as in Syr. Pris, righteous - P"IS (JAOS 28,116 ) or $\mathbf{3 T T}$, echo in the Siloam Inscription (ZDMG 65, $565,1)$ = Arab. ${ }_{\text {j }}$; in Assyrian is sittu, remnant.

I pointed out above (p. 56) that Heb. הספית, to induce or seduce is a byform of TOT, from TID, whereas GB ${ }^{16}$ s. v. TTO refers to Delitzsch's theory that men means to induce a person to change his mind, alter his opinion (he altered him $=$ he converted him, persuaded him). According to AL ${ }^{5} 172^{*}$ sîtu (which would be a form like mîtu, dead, or nîcu, quiet $=$ maûitu, nauîxu) means other, plur. situti, the others, and sittu (a feminine form of situ) denotes remnant, remainder; but this explanation is unsatisfactory.

Nor can we assume that sittu stands for sirtu $=s i$ ratu , ساد , although we have for penti (ZDMG 69, 168, 21) the form Piemi; سب, appears in Hebrew as 7אש, consequently we must have a in Assyrian (JAOS 28, 115). For the same reason Schrader's explanation that sittu corresponds to (KAT ${ }^{8}$ 576) is impossible, since ${ }^{\text {است }}$ appears in Hebrew as 皆.

Assyr. sittu, remnant, stands for sîdtu, just as 9\% with me =
 appears, with partial assimilation of the $D$ to the 7 , as just as we have Assyr. zabalu, to carry - Heb. Dב, or Ethiop. zabáta, to strike, instead of sabáta - Assyr. sabâtu (ZDMG 64, 708, 20). Arab. 8.j; means increment, excess, surplus, residue. In legal parlance surplus denotes the residuum of an estate after the debts and legacies are paid. In Assyrian, sîtuu means exclusively residue, remnant, remainder, rest.

On the other hand, Assyr. ataru ( $-u$ utaru) means to increase, to exceed, whereas Heb. C - to be left over, remain; 굴 - abundance, excess and remainder, remnant. Heb. ית and Arab. ${ }^{4}$; have originally the same meaning (overflow, surplus). The caudate lobe of the liver is in Hebrew ת
 terms is excrescence. HK 125 thinks it remarkable that no one has called attention to the Syr. א7ב כ overlooked my note in ZDMG 61, 195. In Hebrew, Ti means to be excessive, i. e. overbearing $=$ overwhelming (cf. Mic. 76,*) or haughty; it means also to overflow, boil over, boil, seethe.

For the plural with preservation of the fem. $\AA$, Assyr. sittuti, sittati or (with $\overline{\text { IV }}$ sittêti) cf. littutu, progeny, from littu -
 fortress (Est. 7) or lîtati, victories, plur. of lîtu, strength, power, fem. of lê $u$, strong (stem 'אל; cf. ZAT 29, 282; JAOS 32, 17). Similar formations in Hebrew are instead of Assyr. qusâti, dalati, ъapâti ( $\mathrm{HK}^{28} \S 87, \mathbf{k} ; \S 95, \mathrm{f}$; $A G^{2} \S 95$, note).
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## Semachonitis - Jungled Region

In my address on Armageddon (JAOS 34, 419; cf. WF 208, n. 60) I have shown that both Meroz and Merom (in the Waters of Merom) are corruptions of Megiddo (cf. GB ${ }^{16}$ xviib,

