

Textually Deviant Forms as Evidence for Phonological Analysis: A Service of Philology to Linguistics

JOSEPH L. MALONE

Barnard College and Columbia University

1. Introduction

In recent years, quite apace with the development and refinement of generative-phonological theory, people have been investing great ingenuity in seeking out off-beat kinds of evidence bearing on the correctness of specific linguistic analyses. One such kind of evidence which has been used with some success is that of *speech errors* (*lapsus linguae*, etc.),¹ the general point being that such errors are not totally random phenomena but rather involve deviations with respect to specific aspects of linguistic structure.

In working with ancient languages, we are of course not normally in a position to avail ourselves of the evidence of speech errors in the strict sense. However, we may in fact be sometimes provided with unexpected types of evidence similar in nature to speech errors, and yet quite specific to the philological medium. I am thinking particularly of textual forms deemed by philologists to be linguistically deviant, whether by contamination, scribal error, "Schematisierung,"² or whatever. To be sure, not all such forms will be equally valuable, and it is certainly thinkable that even thorough scrutiny of some collections for some texts will leave us totally uninformed or even puzzled.

Be that as it may, it struck me that it would certainly be a worthwhile experiment to examine collections of Tiberian Hebrew linguistic forms deemed by classical Semitists to be morphophonologically deviant with respect to the normal Biblical language. I would then study these forms in the light of my comprehensive generative-phonological analysis of the Biblical language, *Tiberian Hebrew Phonology* (MS, 1978—hereinafter referred to as "THP"), and let the results lead me where they may.

Time and space have allowed me to complete just a portion of what I had originally planned—I have studied only about 20 pages from Bauer & Leander's³ several sections

1 See, e.g., V. A. Fromkin, ed., *Speech Errors as Linguistic Evidence* (The Hague, 1973).

2 Cf. J. L. Malone, *JAOS* 94 (1974), 395f.

3 H. Bauer & P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Reprint: Hildesheim, 1962 [orig. 1922]).

of *Abweichende Formen* (deviant forms)—and so the results laid out below must be considered altogether incomplete and programmatic. Nevertheless, having piloted this investigation, I am personally sanguine enough about the results, limited though they may be, to recommend the technique to others working in the linguistic analysis of archaic languages, particularly languages conveyed by texts provided with sufficiently rich philological or grammatical apparatus.⁴

In §2 I introduce the procedure with a rather detailed analysis of a long-standing poser for investigators of Tiberian Hebrew: coalesced proclitic-bearing forms of ^ʔēlōah ‘deity’ and ^ʔšōōn ‘lord’ like those presented in (1a-h) and (2a-h).⁵

In §3–4 briefer examples are discussed, illustrating something of the variety of applications that the procedure might be expected to reveal. Cases in general supporting THP are presented in §3, while cases challenging THP are given in §4 (see also note 28).

2. Procliticized forms of ^ʔēlōah ‘deity’ and ^ʔšōōn ‘lord’.

A well known but poorly understood datum of Tiberian Hebrew is the predilection of the nouns ^ʔēlōah ‘deity’ and ^ʔšōōn ‘lord’ to combine with most proclitics into morphologically *coalesced* forms (1a-h, 2a-h), alongside morphologically *discrete* forms (1i-j, 2i-j).⁶ Although the discrete forms must be considered unmarked (normal) from the point of view of the Tiberian morphophonological system at large, the coalesced forms are decidedly more frequent within the paradigms of ^ʔēlōah and ^ʔšōōn *per se*. This fact, in conjunction with the high textual frequency of ^ʔēlōah and ^ʔšōōn in the Bible, makes it unavoidable to recognize the coalesced forms as constituting a genuine

4 This is by no means to say that the expedient of studying textually deviant forms as linguistic evidence originated with me. If there is anything novel in what follows, it may be adaptation of the technique to the specific facets of generative-phonological analysis of an ancient Semitic language (and I am not sure even that is altogether novel). As for the general technique in its application to classical Semitic languages, it has probably been used in one form or another since the development of modern Semitic language study in the mid-19th century. And particularly in the context of this volume, it is very much in order to point out that expert use of this and related techniques pervades the work of that late lamented genius of Semitic linguistics and philology, Meir M. Bravmann. See his *Studies in Semitic Philology* (Leiden, 1977), 8, 69, 158f., and essentially *passim*.

5 The phonetic interpretation of Tiberian Hebrew adopted in THP agrees in substance with Bauer & Leander except for a few points, though the phonetic symbols used vary in several points. The bulk of discrepancies of both types will be indicated here, in the format X = Y where X is THP’s usage and Y Bauer & Leander’s. Of the “begadkefat” fricatives, θ x v γ = p kbz. Of the glides (semivowels and gutturals), w y ʔ ʕ = u i ʔ ʕ. Of the symbols for vowel color, ε ɔ = æ ā. For any reduced vowel (schwa or ĥatuf), $\bar{V}$ = “ and as a special case $\bar{\bar{a}}$ = “ for “schwa na.” In THP itself, however, $\bar{\bar{a}}$ is not *per se* used, being rather replaced by a series of colored schwas [overlapping with the three ĥataf vowels] as per Ben-Asher’s rules. For “pataḥ genuvah,” $\bar{V}a = \bar{V}a$ (for justification of the $\bar{V}$ being short, see my “‘Heavy Segments’ vs. the Paradoxes of Segment Length: The Evidence of Tiberian Hebrew,” *Linguistics*, Special Issue [1978], 119–58). Finally, note that in THP special symbols are used for pausal and contextual accent quite independently of the length of the vowel, which is viewed as a (partially) independent parameter; $\bar{V}$ and $\bar{V}$ respectively. For secondary stress, $\bar{V}$, see notes 6 and 11.

6 Unless an alternative source is mentioned, all Biblical forms are from Rudolf Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica* (Stuttgart, 1937). Though in THP the grapheme *metheg* is (gingerly) interpreted as signaling secondary stress, this latter will be ignored throughout, mainly for simplicity’s sake but also because of various uncertainties in interpretation. See also note 11.

(albeit restricted) *regularity* within the synchronic morphophonological systems of Tiberian Hebrew.

In this regard classical Semitistic scholarship has largely failed, even when it is taken into account that their perspective on linguistic matters was predominantly *historical* rather than *synchronic*. Were it not for space limitations several points in support of this judgment could be developed, but the one point of focal interest here is that several classical investigators—Gesenius-Kautzsch, Bauer & Leander, and Joüon⁷—have detracted from the parallelism between ʔēlōah and ʔōdōn by interpreting the first vowel of their coalesced forms discrepantly with respect to length: long $\bar{e}$ in the case of ʔēlōah (that is, 1 a-d in preference to 1e-h) but short a in the case of ʔōdōn (2e-h rather than 2a-d). And while such discrepancies in phonological patterning are not unprecedented,⁸ they clearly should not be posited in default of cogent evidence. But this latter, I will argue, is lacking in the present case.

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| (1) a. wēlōhē or
'and the God of' (Gen. 31:53) | e. welōhē | i. wēʔēlōah
'and God' (Job 24:12) |
| b. lēlōhō or
'to his god' (Hab. 1:11) | f. lelōhō | j. lēʔēlōah
'to God' (Job 12:4) |
| c. bēlōhēxēm or
'against your God' (Josh. 24:27) | g. belōhēxēm | k. (not attested) |
| d. kēlōhīm or
'like gods' (Gen. 3:5) | h. kelōhīm | l. (not attested) |
| (2) a. wāḏōnī or
'and my lord' (Gen. 18:12) | e. waḏōnī | i. waʔāḏōnēnū
'and our Lord' (1 Kgs. 1:11) |
| b. lāḏōnēxō or
'to thy lord' (1 Kgs. 18:8) | f. laḏōnēxō | j. laʔāḏōnēnū
'to our Lord' (Neh. 8:10) |
| c. bāḏōnī or
'against my Lord' (1 Sam. 24:11) | g. baḏōnī | k. (not attested) |
| d. kāḏōnōw or
'like his Lord' (Isa. 24:2) | h. kaḏōnōw | l. (not attested) |

7 A. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford, 1910), p. 80; Bauer & Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 224; and Paul Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome, 1923), p. 66.

8 In THP, for example, variable rule lengthening is an intrinsic part of the rules *Aleph Coalescence* and *Low Shortening*. The latter case is particularly interesting, in that the vowel lengthening is a variable function of an immediately following low consonant according to the hierarchy $r > ʔ > ʕ > h > ḥ$; e.g. $\text{yāvārrēx} \rightarrow \text{yāvōrēx}$ 'may He bless' (Gen. 28:3) versus $\text{yānahēš} \rightarrow \text{yānahēš}$ 'he divines' (Gen. 44:5). This variable-hierarchical aspect of Low Shortening has, incidentally, been recognized by the classical Semitists. Joüon is particularly insightful; *Grammaire*, p. 60.

It is likely that the pressure for adopting a split analysis in the first place was the *feeling* that adoption of a homogeneous analysis would entail violation of either of two traditionally accepted regularities of Tiberian phonology: postulation of the uniform long vowel analysis, $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{a}$ (1a-d, 2a-d) would conflict with the expected rounding of long $\bar{a}$ to $\bar{o}$, while acceptance of short-vocalic e and a (1e-h, 2e-h) would bring with it an anomalous incidence of short e (rather than ϵ) in atonic position.

I underscore the word *feeling* in the preceding sentence, because I do not think the use of any more precise or less impressionistic term—such as *claim*, perhaps—is justified in view of the classical Semitist's failure to look at a language's facts in terms of an explicit, integral system. And indeed, in default of such a system it is just not possible to assess a hypothesis as being truly in conflict (or consonance) with a language's morphophonology (or any other level). As regards the case before us, in the light of the generative-phonological system of THP the long-vocalic hypothesis ($\bar{e}$ and $\bar{a}$) turns out to be inconsistent with various other facts and relations of the phonology,⁹ whereas the short-vocalic hypothesis fits in quite well, as will now be discussed.

To begin with, in THP the general relation between the coalesced forms (1e-h, 2e-h) and their discrete alternants (1i-j, 2i-j) is given by the rule of *Group Simplification* (GS), whereby a group $V\bar{V}$ ($\bar{V}$ = vocalic schwa or ħataf vowel) may lose its second two segments. GS moreover is formulated as a so-called *minor rule*, applying only to specific lexical items, including $\text{ʔ}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{l}\bar{o}h$ and $\text{ʔ}\bar{o}\bar{d}\bar{o}n$.

If this were all, the forms of $\text{ʔ}\bar{o}\bar{d}\bar{o}n$ (2e-h) would be adequately accounted for, but the corresponding forms of $\text{ʔ}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{l}\bar{o}h$ (1e-h) would be incorrectly given as $\text{ʔ}\bar{w}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{l}\bar{o}h\bar{\epsilon}$, $\text{ʔ}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{l}\bar{o}h\bar{o}$, $\text{ʔ}\bar{b}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{l}\bar{o}h\bar{\epsilon}\bar{x}\bar{m}$, and $\text{ʔ}\bar{k}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{l}\bar{o}h\bar{i}m$.¹⁰ However, this result would be tolerable if there should be a follow-up rule to GS raising the ϵ of such forms to e —as long as such a rule is at least formulable and at best non-adhoc. But in fact such a rule *is* formulable, and moreover it can perhaps escape the charge of adhocity when two distributional facts of Tiberian Hebrew are noted, the forms in question aside: (a) short atonic open-syllabic ϵ only occurs when the next-following vowel is of the same level, that is, *open-mid*, whether full-vocalic (*melex-yisrāʔel* 'the King of Israel' [Isa. 7:1], *beħorim* 'in the mountains' [Exod. 32:12]) or reduced-ħatuf¹¹

9 In THP, the rounding $\bar{a} \rightarrow \bar{o}$ is not taken to be a *rule* in the technical sense, but rather a *redundancy condition*. Among other things, redundancy conditions are defined as applying as many times as their structural conditions are met (details in Chapter 6), so that *if* the long-vocalic hypothesis for $\bar{a}$ were adopted in THP for the case before us, *then* $\bar{a} \rightarrow \bar{o}$ could no longer qualify as a redundancy condition (since ostensibly postulation of phonetic forms like *wāḏōnī* presupposes a phonological level when the formula " $\bar{a} \rightarrow \bar{o}$ " ceases to hold; cf., in the classical-Semitic vein, the hypothesis of G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Reprint: Hildesheim, 1962 [orig. 1918]), 1:91. But in an integral, explicit system like that of THP, this would not necessarily be a justified step, perhaps not even a possible step. Space precludes discussion of this important point here, but the general issue is developed at length in my "Issues in the Morphophonology of Tiberian Hebrew" (MS, 1980).

10. $\text{ʔ}\bar{\epsilon}$ marks non-occurrent forms, whether ungrammatical (*ex hypothesi*) as here, or simply non-attested (e.g., $\text{ʔ}\bar{z}\bar{o}\bar{s}\bar{m}\bar{s}$ in §4.1).

11 The qualification "ħatuf"—referring to ϵ , $\bar{o}$, $\bar{a}$ —may be necessary if, to take one of several examples, the form corresponding to 'and (thou shalt) live!' at Gen. 20:7 is to be interpreted phonetically as *weħiyē*, since ϵ would be occurring when the next-following vowel is *high* ($\bar{i}$), not open-mid. This eventuality is met in THP by a technical adjustment having no substantive bearing on the matter before us, but it should be mentioned that phonetic interpretation of this form as *weħiyē* (and others similarly) is by no means foregone. But while on the subject of this form, it might be wise to anticipate an insightful objection of a different sort.

(*wēʕēlōah* [li], *heḥṣḏṣīm* 'the new moons' [Neh. 10:34]); (b) when the accent moves from a short open-syllabic *e*, the *e* does not lower to *ε* (*wāḥerēe* 'and she shall see' [Mic. 7:10]), even though an otherwise comparable *closed*-syllabic *e* does so lower (*lṣeθ* 'to give' [Gen. 15:7]).

In THP, these observations lead to the hypothesis that short atonic open-syllabic *ε* may not occur when the next-following vowel is other than open-mid, under which conditions rather the *ε* raises to *e*. This hypothesis is captured in terms of the rule of *Vowel Closing* (VC), ordered after GS, as per the illustrative derivations in (3).¹²

(3) (various preceding rules)	<i>wēʕēlōhē</i>	<i>waʕāḏōnī</i>
GS	<i>welōhē</i>	<i>waḏōnī</i>
VC	<i>welōhē</i>	---
	<i>welōhē</i> (= 1a)	<i>waḏōnī</i> (= 2a)

Finally, the main theme of the paper may be applied to the case before us. In default of independent evidence attesting to the unique aspects of the hypothesis developed above, notably VC, one might be rightfully skeptical. But due to both structural and philological accident, it may just not be possible to demonstrate the application of VC independently of GS on the basis of unmistakably clear morphophonological patterns. Consider however a maverick like *heʕāvartṣ* 'thou hast brought over' (Josh. 7:7), listed by Bauer & Leander as a deviant form¹³ (p. 352) in lieu of normally expected *heʕēvartṣ* (compare 1st pers. *heʕēvartī* [Zech. 3:4]). The presence of a *Ṿ* following the *ʕ* is phonologically quite normal in Tiberian,¹⁴ and is formulated in THP as the rule of *Schwa Intrusion*. But while the coloring of the intrusive *Ṿ* is normally dictated by the preceding vowel (*heʕēvartī*, *maʕāvīr* 'making pass' (Deut. 18:10), *mōʕmṣḏ* 'stood up' [1 Kgs. 22:35]), there are also cases—in addition to the one before us—where the intrusive *Ṿ* is colored *ā* independently of context.¹⁵ But then, if in lieu of normal *heʕēvartṣ* Schwa Intrusion gives *heʕāvartṣ*, it will be noted that *ε* now occurs preceding a vowel other than open-mid. So the prediction of THP is that VC will apply to give *heʕāvartṣ*. Since this is in fact so, the maverick form *heʕāvartṣ* can be interpreted as providing some independent support—no matter how fractional—for VC as formulated in THP.¹⁶

The form is attested with the grapheme *metheg*, so as to suggest a pronunciation with secondarily stressed *ē*, like *wēḥiē*, in which case the *ε* would not be atonic to begin with—and the same incidentally might be said of *mēl-x-yiṣṣēl* and *bēḥṣrīm*. But this is all irrelevant to the argument being developed here, since in THP the rule of Secondary Stressing applies *after* the rule (Vowel Closing) to be introduced immediately below.

12 VC is not designated to cover all aspects of the *e* ~ *ε* alternation, most of which in fact is managed by the earlier-ordered rule of *Atonic Opening* which lowers *e* to *ε* (and *o* to *ɔ*), e.g. in *lṣeθ* above. The fact that Atonic Opening and VC can hook up to the telescoping effect of *e* → *ε* → *e* is admittedly tricky to bring into analytic focus and constitutes, I would submit, a major reason that the forms of (1-2) have traditionally proved so elusive of explanation.

13 Bauer & Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 352.

14 Ibid., p. 210.

15 E.g., *ṣihādū* 'ransom (pl.)' (Job 6:22).

16 One possible oversight of the foregoing analysis might prove bothersome unless addressed. It may be well and good to interpret the paradigm of (1) as *eʕē* (→ *ε*) → *e* on the joint basis of *aʕā* → *a* in (2) and maverick forms like *heʕāvartṣ*. But how account for various other cases cited by various classical Semitists which would quite clearly to bespeak *aʕā* (→ *ā*) → *ā*? Two responses are in order. (i) Even if GS must be revised to accommodate *aʕā* → *ā*, that would not change the short-vocalic interpretation either of forms like *waḏōnī* in (2e-h) or of forms

3. THP supported.

Each of the following subsections (§§ 3.1–3.4) provides one or more examples of a way in which examination of deviant forms has supported the analysis of THP. This is as good a spot as any to emphasize that not all points adduced in §3 or subsequently in §4 are claimed to be of equal cogency. On the contrary, some of the individual points are rather weak or inconclusive, but have been purposely included despite that in order to provide at least some illustration of what I judged to be a promising exploitation of the kind of procedure suggested in the paper.¹⁷ This seems proper enough given the programmatic nature of the entire enterprise (compare §1).

3.1. The deviation of some forms may be interpreted as their failure to undergo some standard Tiberian rule or other process. But then the very suppression of that rule or process may lead to the emergence of some aspect of structure predicted by THP.

For a variety of reasons, the *underlying* first schematic (stem vowel) of most simple conjugation (*qal*) imperatives is posited in THP to be /o/, even in the case of forms which due to the agency of other structural factors (such as rules) systematically fail to maintain the labial coloring phonetically. For example, the first schematic of most primae gutturalis verbs surfaces as *i* in conjunction with the stressed subject suffixes *-ī* or *-ū* (ʔimrī ‘say (fem.)!’ [1 Kgs. 14:7], (wā)ʕilzū ‘(and) rejoice (pl.)!’ [Ps. 68:5]); or as *ā* in pausal-type imperatives (ʕāvōdū ‘serve (pl.)!’ [Ezek. 20:39]). In THP, the *i* of the former case is attributed to the rule of *Imperative Raising*, a kind of umlaut whereby a closed-syllabic first schematic raises to *i* when the next-following vowel is high (thus ʕalzū → ʕilzū); and the *ā* of the latter case is attributed to *Schwa Coloring*, one of whose clauses lowers a *Ń* to *ā* following an initial guttural in verbs (thus ʕavōdū → ʕāvōdū).

But now consider the following imperative forms listed by Bauer & Leander¹⁸ as deviant: ʕalzī, ḥōrvū, and ḥōrōvī. Notice in all three cases the labial coloring of the first schematic (ʕ, ḥ): exactly the result predicted in THP on the basis of underlying /o/ if Imperative Raising is suppressed in the case of the first two forms and Schwa Coloring in the case of the third form.¹⁹

3.2 Two or more forms may appear *prima facie* to lack any specific similarity in their deviations. But they may turn out to be specifically or even identically related in terms of THP.

like *heʕāvārtō*. At best, GS might have to be reformulated with a variable vowel lengthening clause like that discussed in note 8. (ii) In fact, however, it is not clear to what extent the presumed cases of *aʔā* → *ō* cited by the Semitists involve GS to begin with. Some cases involve different rules; e.g., *Aleph Coalescence* for the verb *wayyōṣel* cited by Gesenius-Kautzsch, p. 80; or *Preformative Simplification* for a number of forms (for reasons discussed in THP, p. 9.17). Other forms may involve special factors: e.g., the place name in *bōrūmō* (Bauer & Leander, p. 224) may possibly contain the definite article, in which case GS plays no role.

17 On the other hand, the cases presented in §§ 3–4 represent but a sampling of those gathered and processed during development of the paper. Space limitations dictated rather stringent selection.

18 *Grammatik*, pp. 352 f.

19 /o/ would give ʕ by Atonic Opening (note 12), and *ō* by Reduction (cf. §3.2) in association with a redundancy condition (cf. note 9) lowering reduced *o* and *e* to *ō* and *ē*. Incidentally, the analysis of this section (§3.1) is rather similar, in the synchronic vein, to part of that achieved in the historical vein by Richard C. Steiner in “*Yuqattil, yaqattil, or yiqattil*: D-Stem Prefix-Vowels and a Constraint on Reduction in Northwest Semitic,” *JAOS* 100 (1980), 512–17. Since I read Steiner’s paper long before the present one was conceived, I am happy to thank him for what, looking back upon it, may very well have been a subconscious stimulus!

An example of this type was incidentally provided in §2, where the putatively deviant *e* of *he'āvart5* was attributed to the same factor (the rule Vowel Closing) as the *e* of forms like *welohē*.

Another example may perhaps be seen in *bisāvāx-* (a stressless form in proclitic ["muqqaf"] position) and *sivāxē* (Bauer & Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 580). Both are forms of the noun *sāvōx* 'thicket', which might normally be expected to show up respectively as *§bisāvāx-* and *§sivāxē*. Bauer & Leander suggest by their references that different accounts are to be given for either form: weakening to schwa in *bisāvāx-* but epenthesis of schwa in *sivāxē*. In terms of THP, however, both cases fall out as *weakening*, in particular as marked instances of the rule of *Reduction*, which normally (unmarkedly) deletes in cases of this shape. Of equal importance, the theory of generative phonology underpinning THP makes it possible to cross-relate the two cases by the expedient of *lexical marking*. The noun *sāvōx* (underlyingly /sebok/) is simply marked to select the weakening alternative of Reduction in all instances where the structural description of the general rule is met, quite irrespectively of whether the vowel to be reduced is the first schematic /e/ (*bisāvāx-*) or the second schematic /o/ (*sivāxē*).

3.3 A form may at first appear to be deviant, but then turn out in the light of THP to be structurally quite in order, albeit perhaps rare.

Once again, *he'āvart5* of §2 is a case in point, to the extent that insertion of *ā* (in lieu of *ē*) by Schwa Intrusion is regular though relatively infrequent (marked).

Another case is provided by the infinitive *ḥārōṣeθ* 'to craft', which Bauer & Leander deem anomalous because they expect rather *ḥārōṣeθ*, with preservation of the original/underlying labiality of the first schematic.²⁰ But, as was illustrated with *āvōdū* in §3.2, Schwa Coloring lowers *Ṽ* to *ā* following an initial guttural in verbs and, as I have discussed elsewhere,²¹ *Tiberian infinitives systematically react to most phonological rules like verbs*, despite their ostensible morphosyntactic affiliation with nouns in certain other regards.

3.4. The anomaly of a form may at first blush seem haphazard or amorphous, but then be interpretable as a minor deviation from some rule or process of THP.

Bauer & Leander brand several perfective verb forms simply as textual errors (*Textfehler*): *q5ḥ* and *q5ḥ5m* (p. 366), *tātt5* and *tān5* (p. 368), *rād* (p. 383) in lieu of expected *l5qāḥ*, *lāq5ḥ5m*, *n5θātt5*, *n5θān5*, and *y5rād* respectively.

But note that all these verbs regularly evidence imperatives (*qāḥ*, *tēn*, *rēḏ*) and infinitives (*qāḥaθ*, *tēθ*, *rēḏeθ*) missing the first syllable of their respective bases (stems), which is precisely the common theme to the anomalous perfectives listed above. In terms of THP, these perfectives may be accounted for by a simple extension (generalization) of the rule *Imperative-Infinitive Apheresis*.²²

4. THP challenged.

4.1. Some mechanism of THP has been appealed to in interpreting a putatively deviant form

20 Bauer & Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 352.

21 Malone, "Phonological Evidence for Syntactic Bracketing: A Surprise from Tiberian Hebrew," in S. S. Mufwene et al. eds., *Papers from the Twelfth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (Chicago, 1976), 486–94.

22 This rule is discussed in my "Semitic 'Internal Flexion' and Morphophonological Theory," in E. Battistella, ed., *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society Ninth Annual Meeting* 9, Part 2 (1979–80), 88–102.

as actually regular. But then an ostensibly similar form is encountered whose interpretation requires some modification of the same THP mechanism.

Bauer & Leander list the imperative $zo^{\circ}\bar{a}m\acute{s}$ 'defy!' as deviant for expected $\S zo^{\circ}\bar{s}m\acute{s}$.²³ In terms of THP, $zo^{\circ}\bar{a}m\acute{s}$ would fall out in exactly the same way as $he^{\circ}\bar{a}v\acute{a}rt\bar{s}$ (§2) if the rule of Vowel Closing were modified (generalized) to raise $\bar{o}$ to o , along with $\bar{\epsilon}$ to e . This was in fact done in an earlier formulation of VC, but was abandoned for reasons which I shall not rehearse here. Right now I will say that if o -forms (like $zo^{\circ}\bar{a}m\acute{s}$) begin to accrue apace with the e -forms, as I suspect they will, I shall have to bestir myself to reexamine the whole shaky matter of VC as presently formulated.

4.2. A putatively anomalous form deviates in a way which would not constitute a deviation at all if the theoretical framework of THP were modified in some specific manner.

According to the theory of *cyclic rule application* it is claimed that the rules of a phonology, or some subset thereof, apply *first* to the innermost morphosyntactic layer of a form, and then reapply outwardly in as many successive passes (cycles) as correspond to the number of remaining layers in the form. Schematically, if a form XYZ is layered ${}_3[{}_1[X]{}_1Y]{}_2Z]{}_3$, a cyclic rule group will apply first to X, then (again) to XY, and finally (again) to XYZ.

The results of applying the rules of THP to (a surrogate for) the underlying representation²⁴ of the locative noun 'to the tent' are displayed in (4) for cyclic rule application, and in (5) for *non-cyclic* application.²⁵ Bauer & Leander list $h\bar{s}^{\circ}\acute{o}h\bar{e}l\bar{s}$ of (4) as deviant (p. 580).

Two complementary observations are in order. $h\bar{s}^{\circ}\acute{o}h\bar{e}l\bar{s}$ is *not* deviant if processed by THP rules applied cyclically (4),²⁶ but *is* deviant—by virtue of the $\bar{\epsilon}$ —if processed by THP rules applied *non-cyclically* (5).

But since I have explicitly rejected cyclic rule application in THP,²⁷ I am at this moment stuck with (5) and "officially" unable to accept (4) into the fold of nondeviant forms. Reassessment may be in order.

(4)	${}_2[h\bar{s}{}_1[{}^{\circ}\acute{o}hl]{}_1\bar{o}]{}_2$
Red ₁	---
SE ₁	${}^{\circ}\acute{o}h\bar{e}l$
Red ₂	$h\bar{s}^{\circ}\acute{o}h\bar{e}l\bar{s}$
SE ₂	---
	$h\bar{s}^{\circ}\acute{o}h\bar{e}l\bar{s}$

23 Bauer & Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 356.

24 The qualification "a surrogate for" is technically necessary because a complete derivation from a full-fledged underlying representation would require interleaving various additional rules having no direct bearing on the points of immediate interest. To obviate this, portions of the form covered by these extraneous rules are simply presented as given in the representation used as "underlying."

25 Red = *Reduction* (cf. §3.2), SE = *Segolate Epenthesis*.

26 Note however the marked application of Reduction, in the form of weakening. Unmarkedly, Reduction should be expected to delete the $\bar{\epsilon}$ in a form of this structure (cf. §3.2).

27 See the paper cited in note 21.

(5)		$h\bar{s} + \bar{o}hl + \bar{s}$
	Red	---
	SE	---
		$\bar{s}h\bar{s}\bar{o}hl\bar{s}$

4.3. Presumably deviant forms of the same type accrue to the point that it seems likely regularity is involved rather than anomaly. Recognition of the regularity as such may call for modification of some THP mechanism.

The presumably deviant form $h\bar{s}r\bar{s}\bar{v}$ was adduced in §3.1, since its failure to undergo Schwa Coloring revealed the THP-claimed underlying labiality of the first schematic. But even the relatively modest bit of sampling achieved for this paper (§1) has turned up numerous other $\bar{s}$ -containing imperative and imperfective verbs listed by Bauer & Leander as deviant: $yehd\bar{s}fenn\bar{u}$, $yehd\bar{s}fem$ (p. 351); $yird\bar{s}fex\bar{s}$ (p. 353); $tish\bar{s}od\bar{t}$ (p. 357); $\bar{e}f\bar{s}\bar{s}\bar{s}$ (p. 362); $yigg\bar{s}fenn\bar{u}$ (p. 367); $\bar{e}s\bar{s}or\bar{e}nn\bar{u}$, $yiqq\bar{s}v\bar{e}nn\bar{u}$, $\bar{e}s\bar{s}q\bar{s}$ - (p. 368).

It seems most likely that the structural description of Schwa Coloring should be modified to variably (optionally) exempt schematic $\bar{s}$ of the imperative-imperfective conjugation.²⁸

28 In addition to support (§3) and challenge (§4), the study of deviant forms can work back and forth with synchronic phonological analysis in other ways as well. I ran across two which might be mentioned here. (i) *THP was supplemented*. The form $w\bar{a}h\bar{e}h\bar{e}z\bar{a}qt\bar{s}$ (Bauer & Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 351) showed me that the rule of *Stress Adjustment* must precede the rule of *Distant Lowering*, a point which hitherto was quite open. (ii) *THP provides a more adequate solution than that proposed by classical investigators*. This is not so much a new data-plus-interpretation set as it is a distinct angle on other sets used in other ways. Several examples have been incidentally presented throughout, perhaps most notably the issue of §2.