Conclusion
Conclusion

The Main Results

The number of Proto-Semitic letters is 28, for each letter 7 words were studied. Therefore, the number of proto-Semitic words which reconstructed is 196 words. More than twenty Semitic languages used in comparison, and in that comparison the number of Semitic words was 1720 words with average 8.77% words for each proto-Semitic word. Most of these words found in Aramaic 9%, Syriac 9%, Akkadian 8%, Ugaritic 7%, Ethiopic 6% ... (See the table in Appendices and its diagram).

The compatibility in meaning between the Proto-Semitic words with Arabic and Hebrew is almost the same, Hebrew has lost some letters by changing to similar letters, but meaning is still the same in most of the words.

By comparing the compatibility in pronunciation between the Proto-Semitic words with Arabic and Hebrew, it found that Arabic is closer to Proto-Semitic language with average 83.67%, and for Hebrew it is 43.36%. And both (Arabic and Hebrew) are incompatible with Proto-Semitic language with average 10.71%. Even I used in comparison Old Hebrew (not Modern Hebrew which becomes far away from Proto-Semitic) the data shows that Hebrew had much changed, and it is not close to Proto-Semitic language, and it had lost 6 letters in its development. In the other hand, Arabic is the very close to Proto-Semitic and it can be the basic for other Semitic languages. So we can say the most change occurred in Semitic languages was a phonetic change rather than semantic change.
Table 28 - Compatibility with Proto-Semitic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Compatibility with Arabic</th>
<th>Compatibility with Hebrew</th>
<th>Incompatibility with Arabic &amp; Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compatibility of Arabic & Hebrew with proto-Semitic letters

In searching for more details between the Hebrew and Arabic to see the likeness and compatibility for each letter, it can say: the words which start with letters (ṯ, ḡ, ḏ, ḍ, Ṣ, ǧ) are lost in Hebrew, so there is no compatibility with Proto-Semitic in pronunciations. Out of 7 words for each letter were analyzed, the study found in Arabic it was compatible with Proto-Semitic for the letter ṣ 3 times, letter ḡ 4 times, letter ḏ 6 times, letter ḍ 6 times, letter Ṣ 7 times, and letter ǧ 6 times. This means these letters are still stable and close to Proto-Semitic.

In Arabic the most words which are close to proto form are the words which start with letters: a h z ḥ y k l n ʕ f Ṣ q ḏ q Ṣ ǧ.

Arabic and Hebrew are close to each other more in the words which start with the letters: a d h ṭ y ʕ Ṣ t.

Most words which are incompatible in Arabic and Hebrew with Proto-Semitic are: ṣ (out of 7 words studied for this letter, 4 words were incompatible). ḡ (out of 7 words studied for this letter, 3 words were incompatible). 1680

1680 See the diagram: (compatibility of Arabic & Hebrew with proto-Semitic letters) in appendixes.
Table 29 - Compatibility of Arabic & Hebrew with proto-Semitic letters
How to reconstruct the Proto-Semitic word?

This is the first question you may ask. It is a difficult task, and it requires many things:

**Researcher’s experience**

Good experience which gives the researcher the ability to expect or guess the words in each language before looking at them in dictionaries, and at the end, each language becomes for him like an individual with special characters for each language. He should also understand the grammar of Semitic languages, and know about the historical background of each language, and should be supported with sufficient dictionaries and references and latest studies and research papers in the world.

**Nature of the data of Semitic languages**

Each Language has its own characters as human beings, and they are also found in Semitic languages.

From the data that collected and studied it found that the north Semitic languages have their own characters which were affected with the Indo-Aryan languages. So most of them have lost 6 letters (ṯ, ḥ, ḍ, ḍ, Ẓ, ġ), the reason for that was using of writing system as found in Sumerian with 22 letters. Also the nature played a good reason in changing the sound of letters, in north Semitic languages which found in great Syria (Syria, Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon) and Iraq the nature is colder than Arabian Peninsula, and the great Syria the nature of cold mountains affected the pronunciation of difficult letters (ṯ, ḥ, ḍ, ḍ, Ẓ, ġ) which at the end were changed to similar letters, to make the language easier. Also, the life there is easier, and the people used to live in urban. The civilizations there is more advanced than Arabian Peninsula, by that they used advanced writing materials which help them to save their books and texts, that is the reason for keeping the oldest Semitic languages texts which were found in the land of north Semitic languages.

On the other hand, the south Semitic language which I consider them the nearest to the Proto-Semitic languages, and many of them are still in use which contain all the proto letters as in Arabic. They were less affected other languages out of Semitic languages, the nature of Arabian Peninsula helped the language to protect and save with less modification, the difficult life, and many people were used to live in mobile tribe or horde. That is the reason for losing inscriptions which used a primary writing material like bones and leathers. From analysing the data it can be said that:
Assyrian and Akkadian languages used to add the suffix -u at the end of the word, as in India with Kannada language: for example the English word car, it becomes in Akkadian or Assyrian caru. Car>caru, bus>busu .... So the suffix –u cannot be considered as a Proto-Semitic suffix.

In Syriac and Aramaic with its dialects (Mandaic, Judaic, Syrian) used to add the suffix -a at the end of the word, for example if we take the English word (car), it becomes in Syriac and Aramaic with its dialects (cara). Car>Cara, bus>busa.... So the suffix –a cannot be considered as a Proto-Semitic suffix.

In Hebrew many words tend to shift their diacritics from a to e or i. As the previous word as an example the word car becomes cer, (car>cer). Another example the Proto-Semitic word *ʼaḥad- (n) which means one became 'efḥad. Or it tends to shift their diacritics from a to o , as in Proto-Semitic word *ra'(i)š-s- (m.n) which means head it in Hebrew became roaš. a>o. But in Arabic it is remain as it is: ra’s. In Hebrew, when the verb ended with the letter ⟩⟩, that means most of the time the proto letter was – y. *-y>-h, for example the Proto-Semitic word *zanā (v) (to commit fornication) form the proto root *znıy in Hebrew it became ננ zānāh (v), But in Arabic it is remain as it is. And when the verb starts in Hebrew with letter y-, in many times the proto letter was *w-. *w->y-, for example the Proto-Semitic word *waṭab- (v) (to sit down) in Hebrew it became יט yāšab (v), But in Arabic it is remain as it is. The Diaspora of Hebrews in their history played a big role in modification and changes in Hebrew language.

Ugaritic and Phoenician and sometimes Canaanite did not use the vowels or diacritics in writing system, so the data of these languages is useful to reconstruct the Proto-Semitic root rather than the Proto-Semitic word. For example if you take the Proto-Semitic word *baḏ- (m.n) which means higher level, one who is master (husband) the proto root is *bḏ, and in Ugaritic, Phoenician and Canaanite the word was written bḏ without the vowel –a-. Maybe the reason for that these languages are following cuneiform writing system which is difficult to write a long text, and by that they can constrict the size of writing, and they can understand the meaning of similar words from the context.

Grammatical categories

Basically the root in Semitic languages consists of three letters in past tense, because as we know from the nature of Semitic languages, in the past
tense the word will be with few affixes. The root is written without formative or diacritics. Most of the Arab grammarians considered the entire root should be thiradical (three letters) not biradical, and for the words which consist of two letters, they considered the third letter as missing, and mostly a missing vowel! For example, the proto word Semitic *yad-, *iyd- (n) which means \textit{hand}, they wrote it in two letters \textit{y+d}, and with diacritic it becomes \textit{yad}, and the root is \textit{ydy} not \textit{yd} (see the discussion in No. 4.10.3). It cannot possible to ignore the theory of biradical root in Semitic languages, and after deep study the results as follows: Semitic languages contain biradical and thiradical roots, and most of them are thiradical, and the roots which have four letters are basically came from 1- two biradical roots. For example, the proto word *ʕaqrab- (m.n) (No. 4.16.7), or 2- from two thiradical roots after deleting two letters from one of them or from both. 3- from one thiradical root, added to it one letter. For example the proto word *τaʕal (No. 4.22.7). Reconstructing the Proto-Semitic root will help a lot in reconstructing the derivations words. The thiradical root is the nearer to the core meaning (Sememe) of the biradical root when the last letter repeated. For example, the root *mr+(r)>*mrr (bitter), *tm+(m)>*tmm (to be completed), *lb+(b)>*lbb core (heart).

In this research, the Proto-Semitic verb was in past tense, and considered past tense only because it is nearer to proto root with little modification and few affixes. For names, nouns, adjectives and propositions are used as they are. In Arabic and Hebrew most of the grammatical categories have been mentioned in detail, and supported by giving sufficient meanings which are found in dictionaries, extra meanings appear to be more than it need, but the aim is to give the reader the ability to guess the proto meaning and to help him to understand the nature of Semitic languages, and in what way the people use those derivations. The extra meanings are given to overcome the doubts about the core meaning in both the languages for each word.

\textbf{Rules for reconstructing the lost letters for many Semitic languages}

Many Semitic languages have lost the proto letters (28 letters). In Hebrew as an example, it used only 22 letters. By comparing 20 Semitic languages the rules for reconstructing the lost letters are as follows:
Rule for reconstructing the letter *ṯ

From previous words for the letter ṭ, it is possible to reconstruct the proto letter ṭ in Semitic languages by comparing them; so if the word starts with letter ṭ in Syriac, or Aramaic; and if starts with letter š in Canaanite, Hebrew, Akkadian, Assyrian or Phoenician, and if starts with letter ṭ in Arabic, Ugaritic or Epigraphic South Arabian, then the proto letter should be ṭ. In Ethiopic it becomes S or š, *ṭ>S. This rule is discovered based on previous comparisons.

Rule for reconstructing the letter *ḫ

From previous words for the letter ḫ, it is possible to reconstruct the proto letter ḫ in Semitic languages by comparing them; so if the word starts with letter ḫ in Syriac, Hebrew, Phoenician, or Aramaic; and if the word starts with letter ḫ in Arabic, Ugaritic, Epigraphic South Arabian, Ethiopic, Assyrian, or Akkadian, then the proto letter should be ḫ. This rule is discovered based on previous comparisons.
Rule for reconstructing the letter *ḫ*

From previous words for the letter ḫ, it is possible to reconstruct the proto letter ḫ in Semitic languages by comparing them; so if the word starts with letter z in Hebrew, Phoenician, Assyrian, Akkadian (most), Ethiopic, or Canaanite; and if the word starts with letter d in Aramaic, Ugaritic, or Syriac; and if the word starts with letter ḫ in Arabic, Epigraphic South Arabian, Eblaite or Akkadian (rare), Ugaritic (occasionally), then the proto letter should be ḫ. This rule is discovered based on previous comparisons.
Rule for reconstructing the letter *ḍ

From previous words for the letter ḍ, it is possible to reconstruct the proto letter ḍ in Semitic languages by comparing them; so if the word starts with letter ʕ in Syriac, Aramaic (Mandaic, Syrian); and if the word starts with letter ḍ in Arabic, Epigraphic South Arabian, Ethiopic, or Geʿez, and if the word starts with letter š in other languages, then the proto letter should be ḍ. This rule is discovered based on previous comparisons.
Rule for reconstructing the letter *ẓ

From previous words for the letter ẓ, it is possible to reconstruct the proto letter Ẓ in Semitic languages by comparing them; so if the word starts with letter š in Assyrian, Akkadian, Hebrew, Geʕez, or Ethiopic; and if the word starts with letter ū in Syriac, Aramaic (Mandaic, Syrian, Judaic, Biblical), Amharic, East Ethiopic; and if the word starts with letter ẓ in Arabic, Epigraphic South Arabian, Eblaite or Ugaritic 1681, then the proto letter should be Ẓ. This rule is discovered based on previous comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>š</th>
<th>ẓ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkadian</td>
<td>Eblaite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Ugaritic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geʕez</td>
<td>Epigraphic South Arabian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian</td>
<td>East Ethiopic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34- Reconstructing the letter *Ẓ

Rule for reconstructing the letter *ḡ

From previous words for the letter ḡ, it is possible to reconstruct the proto letter ḡ in Semitic languages by comparing them; so if the word starts with letter a in Akkadian 1682, or Mandaic Aramaic; and if the word starts with letter ḫ in Akkadian or Eblaite; and if the word starts with letter ʕ in Aramaic (Mandaic, Syrian, Judaic), Hebrew, Geʕez, Ethiopic, Syriac, Ugaritic, Phoenician or Epigraphic South Arabian; and if the word starts with letter ġ in Arabic, Eblaite or Ugaritic, then the proto letter should be *ḡ. This rule is discovered based on previous comparisons.

1681 For Ugaritic mostly it comes with Ẓ, and in rare cases it comes with ū or ḡ.
1682 For Akkadian it sometimes comes with e, a or ḫ.
The nearest language to Proto-Semitic

Based on the comparison, the nearest language to Proto-Semitic is Arabic, then Ugaritic, then Ge’ez and Ethiopian, then Phoenician, then Canaanite, then the other languages including Hebrew, Assyrian, Akkadian...etc.