

Another Attestation of Initial $h\bar{w}$ in West Semitic

EDWARD L. GREENSTEIN

Columbia University

The Hebrew Bible contains two suspiciously similar vocables derived from the *pi'el* conjugation both expressing the notion of 'desire, craving', namely, the common verb *'rwṯ* (רָוַח) and its verbal noun *'awwṯ* (אָוֹחַ),¹ and the rare verbal noun *hawwṯ* (חָוֹחַ).² Nineteenth-century Hebrew lexicographers take a schizoid approach to these roots. While on the one hand they explicitly compare the roots, on the other they find a distinct Arabic etymology for each.³ Of the more recent lexica, that of Brown, Driver, and Briggs does not compare the roots, while Koehler at first derived *hawwṯ* from *'awwṯ* and later assigned each an Arabic etymology.⁴ However, we believe that evidence from Ras Shamra lends support to the etymological equation of *hawwṯ* and *'awwṯ*,⁵ and that the order of phonetic development proposed at first by Koehler and others⁶ be reversed.

In biblical Hebrew the root *'awwṯ* both in its verbal form⁷ and nominal form⁸ has as its subject and *nomen rectum*, respectively, the feminine noun *nefēš* 'seat of the appetites'.⁹

1 On the *qattal* formation of a verbal noun derived from a *pi'el* verb, see GKC §84b. In appreciation of the phonemic independence of the Masoretic Hebrew consonants and vowels, please note that spirantized consonants will receive independent transliterations, and note the following transliteration of the vowels *qameš* = *q*, *šere* = *e*, and *seḡol* = *ē*.

2 Mic. 7:3; Prov. 10:3; 11:6. In Ps. 52:9 *b^ehawwṯtō* is generally emended to *b^ebōnō*, parallel to *b^erōv* 'ōšrō'; cf. R. Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1937), ad loc. (hereafter *BH*³); *BDB*, 217; S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae* (Jerusalem-Tel Aviv, 1967), 309.

3 S.v. *'wb* and *hwb*: W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Leipzig, 1828); B. Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (London, 1848[?]); J. Fuerst, *A Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament*, trans. S. Davidson (New York, 1867).

4 L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, eds., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, 1953), 228; *ibid.*, 3rd ed., W. Baumgartner, with B. Hartmann and E. Y. Kutscher, eds. (Leiden, 1967), 232.

5 The possibility of such an equation is raised by J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon* (Leiden, 1959), 23.

6 See the views of others cited in Koehler, *Lexicon*, 3rd ed.

7 E.g., 2 Sam. 3:21; 1 Kgs. 11:37; Isa. 26:9; Mic. 7:1; Job 23:13.

8 E.g., Deut. 12:15, et passim; 1 Sam. 23:20.

9 For examples of Heb. *nefēš* 'seat of the appetites', see *BDB*, 659-61, and U. M. D. Cassuto, *Tarbiz* 12 (1941), 173; cf. R. Saadya Gaon, "Book of Doctrines and Beliefs," in A. Altmann, ed., *Three Jewish Philosophers* (New York, 1969), 147.

Similarly, the noun *hawwō* in Mic. 7:3 is in construct with *nefeš*,¹⁰ and *hawwō* and *nefeš* are parallel in Prov. 10:3. Since *'awwō* and *hawwō* are semantically and syntactically interchangeable in their usages with *nefeš*¹¹ and also phonetically so alike, it would be a strange coincidence indeed if they were not equivalent etymologically, too.

We now bring the Ugaritic evidence to bear on this question. In two slightly divergent statements about Mot's appetite we read:

pnp{.}š. npš. lbim(?) thw. (I*AB I:14-15)¹²
npš npš. lbim thw (Ug. V, 4A:2-4)¹³

Omitting the conjunction *p* in the first text, we may translate this passage: "A lion's appetite craves *live prey*."¹⁴ While there is some reason to suspect this understanding of the syntax of the line,¹⁵ there are more serious reasons to commend it over alternative translations.¹⁶ Rather than invent a causative *pi'el* of **bwy* meaning 'to excite', cognate

10 Heb. *nefeš* 'the seat of the appetites' comes to mean 'desire, appetite' as well; e.g., Isa. 56:11; Ps. 78:18; cf. J. Obermann, "How Daniel was Blessed with a Son," *JAOS* Supplement 6 (1946), 20; M. Pope, *Job*, Anchor Bible 15 (N. Y., 1965), 51. Such a usage is required for Ugar. *npš* in, e.g., IID V: 16:19 (cf. 21-24): *šm' mlt dnty 'd[b] imr bphd lnpš ktr wḥss lbrlt byn dḥrš* "Hearken, Lady Danatiya, Prepare a lamb from the flock For the desire of Ko[th]ar wa-Khassis, For the appetite of Hayyin of the Handicrafts" (trans. Ginsberg, *ANET*³, 151).

11 Cf. A. B. Ehrlich, *Mikrâ ki-Pheschutô* (Berlin, 1901; reprint: Jerusalem, 1969), 3:440.

12 So collated by A. Herdner, *Corpus des Tablettes en Cuneiformes Alphabétiques* (Paris, 1963), 1:33.

13 Ug. V, 559. There is nothing in the cuneiform copy to warrant Virolleaud's reading of our first word *npšk* (?). That *npš* appears twice in this text annuls the rash conclusion of S. E. Loewenstamm (*Leshonenu* 32 [1967-68], 35-36) that the double *npš* in I*AB results from a scribal error; cf. Herdner, loc. cit. Loewenstamm's understanding of *thw* as 'desert', following Ginsberg (*Orientalia* 5 [1936], 186) and Cassuto (*Tarbiz* 12 [1941], 170; cf. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature* [Rome, 1949], 39), must be rejected, since such an interpretation takes no account of the first *npš* and requires a preposition before *thw*.

14 The meaning of the first *npš* has not been established. Ordinarily *npš* can mean 'life' or a 'living thing'; e.g., IAB II: 17-19, *npš ḥsrt bn nšm npš hmlt arš* "Life was absent from mankind, Life among the earth's multitudes." (Cf. Heb. *nefeš* and Akkadian *napištu*.) The context of our passage demands some kind of prey, and *npš* is attested in two sacrificial menus denoting some sort of meat: *alp wš lb'lt bbtm. . . alp wš šrp alp šlmm lb'lt 'šr lšpn npš wš lršp. . .* "A bull and ram for the Mistress of the Temples. . . a bull and ram—a burnt offering, a ram—a peace-offering for Baal, a bird for Šaphon, *npš* and a ram for Resheph. . ." (Ug. V, 588, text 12A: 2, 9-11); *alp wš lb'lt špn. . . wnpš ilib* "A bull and ram for Baal Šaphon. . . and *npš ilib*" (ibid., 592, text 13:9, 12). While L. R. Fisher, *HTR* 63 (1970), 486-87, n. 6, proposes the translation of *npš* in the texts just cited as "a man," acceptance of such a proposal demands corroborating evidence, which he does not provide. Hence, we translate 'live prey'.

15 According to our analysis of the syntax, the word order is object-subject-verb. Although highly poetic, this word order is attested in VAB D:83 *blk aḥth b'ly'n* "His sister's approach Baal sees" (trans. Ginsberg, *ANET*³, 137). The object-subject-verb order is also found in IIAB VI:38-39, VAB B:40, and ID:114 (cf. *passim*), each of which involves a YQTL-QTL/QTL-YQTL sequence of verbs in which the word order is inverted stylistically; and in IVAB II:22, the second line of a "staircase" parallelism. In Hebrew, this word order is attested with *ḥēfēš* (another verb of desiring) as the predicate of *nefeš* in Isa. 66:3.

16 See, e.g., the translation of the Ug. V text by J. C. de Moor, *UF* 1 (1969), 185: "It is a living thing that excites the desire of lions."

with Heb. *hawwō*,¹⁷ it is by far preferable to parse *thw* as a 3rd fem. sing. apocopated imperfect D-stem (*pi'el*) of **hwy*, cognate with Heb. *hawwō*, and used exactly as the Heb. idiom with *'iwwō* and *nefēš*.¹⁸ Since, as we have shown above, Heb. *hawwō* and *'awwō* are semantically and syntactically interchangeable, and since it is virtually certain that Ugar. **hwy* and Heb. *hawwō* are etymologically identical, it is highly reasonable that **hwy* is employed idiomatically exactly as Heb. *'iwwō* with *nefēš*.

Moreover, parsing *thw* as the predicate of *npš lbim* allows the next line of the above Ugaritic passage to appear in a stylistically improved light. The line reads in the divergent versions:

<i>bm. brlt.</i> ¹⁹	<i>anhr. bym.</i>	(I*AB I:15-16)
<i>wnpš anhr. bym</i>		(Ug. V, 4A:4-5)

Setting aside the introductory particles *bm* and *w*, the generally accepted translation is something like: "A sperm-whale's desire (is to be) in the sea." This line lacks its own expressed verb or an elliptical verb that may occur in the preceding hemistich and serve this hemistich as well.²⁰ However, we may now understand *thw* not only as the verb of our first hemistich but as the elliptical verb of our second hemistich. In other words, *thw* is not only the predicate of *npš lbim* but also the unexpressed predicate of *brlt/npš anhr*. Furthermore, other interpretations of this hemistich must insert the verb 'to be' in parentheses in order to account for the preposition *b* preceding the noun *ym*. According to our analysis, however, the preposition serves to indicate the object of the elliptical verb of desiring, as Hebrew verbs with the sense of desiring may take either a direct object or a preposition plus object.²¹ The translation of our second line is now: "A sperm-whale's

17 So W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 83 (1941), 41; Driver, *CML*, 103; M. Dahood, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome, 1963), 18; and J. C. de Moor, *UF* 1, 186, who cites other references in n. 130.

18 See above, n. 7. Somehow the scholars mentioned in the previous note completely overlooked the possibility that Ugar. *npš thw* is semantically and syntactically identical with Heb. *nefēš t'e'awwō*. Apparently only Gaster, *JRAS* 1944, 46-47, and *Thespis* (New York, 1961), 204, recognized the equivalent idioms. It is therefore fitting that this paper be presented in his honor.

19 Since *brlt* is the regular B-word, or poetic synonym, of *npš*, the meaning of both texts is essentially the same; cf. IID V: 15-18 (cf. 21-24); IID I: 37-38; IIID IV: 24-25 (cf. 36-37); and IIK VI: 11-12.

20 Cf. *UT*, §13.105. The main verb always occurs in the first hemistich and is optional in the second. See M. Held, *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969), 72, n. 15.

21 Cf. the examples in the chart below. I am grateful for the suggestions of M. Lichtenstein here and elsewhere in this paper.

Root	Conjugation	With Preposition	With Direct Object
'bh	qal	Prov. 1:30 (l)	Prov. 1:25
'wb	pi'el	Deut. 14:26 (b)	
	bi'pa'el	Ps. 132:13 (l)	Prov. 21:10
hps	qal	Prov. 23:3, 6 (l)	Amos 5:8 (with 'ēθ)
rsh	qal	Isa. 66:3 (b)	Isa. 55:11 (with 'ēθ)
		Ps. 149:4 (b)	Ps. 147:11
			Eccl. 9:7 (with 'ēθ)

appetite (desires) the sea."

Returning to our central problem, the Ugaritic evidence suggests the following conclusions: Ugar. **hwy* and Heb. *hawwā* are etymologically identical;²² Ugar. **hwy* and Heb. *'iwwā* are semantically and syntactically identical. It is highly tempting to deduce that Heb. *'awwā* is a phonological development of Heb. *hawwā*, if such a phonological change of initial *h* to *'* can be justified on linguistic grounds.

A general phonological change in which initial *h* became *'* in all cases did not occur. Moreover, although a *h>* change entails an easing of articulation (nonaspiration of the laryngeal), ease of articulation does not "cause" phonological change; rather it influences the direction of the shift.²³ One must consider why only in certain cases *h* was phonetically simplified to *'*. Therefore, in order to justify a change of *hawwā* to *'awwā* one would have to account for this particular change while other initial *h* words preserved the *h* as a rule.

Comparative Semitists²⁴ had at one time observed a somewhat random interchange of the fricative laryngeal *h* and the glottal stop *'* in West and South Semitic. But it was soon acknowledged that the *h>'* alternation among West Semitic languages and dialects reflected a chronological pattern *h>'*.²⁵ The most telling case is that of the causative conjugation.

22 The proposed Ugar. **hwy* is not related to the Ugar. substantive *hwt* 'word', which is cognate with Akk. *awû/āmû* and the substantive *aw/matu* 'word, matter'. Had a substantive of **hwy* equivalent to Heb. *hawwā* been extant in Ugaritic, it would have been a homograph and probably a homonym of *hwt* 'word', just as Heb. *hawwā* is homonymous, meaning either 'word' or 'desire'. G. R. Driver, *JRAS* 1942, 6f., labors *ad absurdum* to connect all the *hawwā* homonyms etymologically with Arab. *hawâ^{un}* 'wind, air'. He fails to see the semantic and syntactic parallel between *hawwat nefēš* and *'awwat nefēš*. Moreover, his rejection of the etymological equation of Heb. *hawwā* 'word' and Akk. *aw/matu* fails to acknowledge Ugar. *hwt*. In *CML*, 138, n. 1, however, he concedes the possibility of this etymology.

23 Cf. E. Sapir, *Language* (New York, 1921), esp. 183; L. Bloomfield, *Language* (New York, 1933), §21.2; H. M. Hoenigswald, *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction* (Chicago, 1960), §8.3. The phonetic weakening of Canaanite *h* is described by Z. S. Harris, *The Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (New Haven, 1939), 55f., 87.

24 The first explicit treatment of the *h>'* interchange was given by F. R. Blake, "Studies in Semitic Grammar," *JAOS* 35 (1915-1917), 375-77. Blake explained few examples on the basis of phonetic change but appealed to cases of analogical change that can no longer be upheld. Surprisingly, J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien* (Leipzig, 1893), 19f., goes to absurd lengths illustrating interchanges of all guttural combinations except *h>'*. Cf. W. Wright, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (reprint: Amsterdam, 1966), esp. 47. The notion of random interchange was still expressed by A. Haldar, "On the Problem of Akkadian *šumma*," *JCS* 4 (1950), 64.

25 The phenomenon has been outlined with examples and bibliographic citations by G. Garbini, "Sull'alternanza *h>'* in semitico," *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli*, Sezione Linguistica, 1 (1959), 47-52; cf., idem, *Il Semitico di Nord-Ovest* (Naples, 1960), 56-57. While Garbini then attributed the *h>'* shift to phonetic change, he now informs me (by letter of 29 November 1972) that he believes the shift is morphophonemic, involving the substitution of a pronominal *'* morpheme for a *h* morpheme. Such an explanation may account for several *h>'* cases, some of which we shall discuss below. E. A. Speiser has explained the correlation between the Semitic pronouns and the causative conjugation in such a way as to support a morphophonemic change of pronominal *h>'* in some Semitic languages; "Studies in Semitic Formatives," in J. J. Finkelstein and M. Greenberg, eds., *Oriental and Biblical Studies* (Philadelphia, 1967), 403f.; cf. "A Note on the Derivation of *šumma*," in *ibid.*, 455f. But there are cases of *h>'*—includ-

which has preformative *b* in Hebrew, Old Aramaic, early "Imperial" Aramaic, and early Arabic dialects,²⁶ and preformative ' in late "Imperial" Aramaic, later Aramaic dialects, Arabic, and Ethiopic.²⁷

Within our own area of Ugaritic-Hebrew there are also cases of initial *h>*'. The most widely discussed example is the conditional particle, Ugar. *bm*, Aramaic *bn*, South Arabic *bn/bm*, but Heb. *ben/'im* and Arabic *'imma*, *'in*.²⁸ We might seem justified in saying that **bm>* Heb. *'im*.²⁹ However, the matter is complicated by the fact that Heb. *ben/binnē* may

ing, we now believe, *bw/ywy*—that do not admit of this explanation. For the common *h>*' shift in general linguistics, cf. R. D. King, *Historical Linguistics and Generative Grammar* (N. J., 1969), 117.

26 C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik des semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1908), 1:520-22; Speiser, *Studies*, 407; Garbini, *Sull'alternanza*, 50. See M. M. Bravmann, "The Semitic Causative Prefix Š/SA," *Le Muséon* 82 (1969), 517-22, who derives the *b*-causative from the form with preformative *š/s*; cf. the views of F. Rundgren, I. M. Diakonoff, and I. J. Geil, cited in Gelb, *Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian*, AS 18 (Chicago, 1969), 172-73. Gelb, however, argues that the original Proto-Semitic phoneme from which the personal pronouns and the corresponding causative prefix derive is *ž*, which he transcribes as *š₄* in his *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, MAD 2, 2nd ed. (Chicago, 1961), esp. 38. He further believes that the phoneme *ž* in Ugaritic, Old Aramaic, and Arabic, with corresponding *z* in Akkadian and Hebrew and *d* in Aramaic, developed from the same *ž* (oral communication; 22 March 1973). However, serious questions remain unanswered concerning this seminal theory, such as: How did *ž>š* and *z* in Akkadian? How did *ž>š*, *š* and *d* in Ugaritic? For the *s>h* shift in general linguistics, see King, *Historical Linguistics*, 117; P. Kiparsky, "Linguistic Universals and Linguistic Change," in E. Bach and R. T. Harms, eds., *Universals in Linguistic Theory* (New York, 1968), 182-83; cf. J. H. Greenberg, *Language* 42 (1966), 517.

27 Some Ugaritologists have claimed an *'afel* causative conjugation for Ugaritic; see, esp., M. Dahood, "Some Aphel Causatives in Ugaritic," *Biblica* 38 (1957), 62-73. However, each alleged case of *'afel* is fraught with insupportable hypotheses, and the case against the Ugaritic *'afel* need not be repeated here. Recently, C. Rabin, "Semitic Languages," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971), 14:1154, asserts that Proto-Semitic originally had causatives with initial *š* and perhaps also '. We, however, find no justification for the priority of an *-causative* over a *b*-causative but considerable evidence for the reverse.

28 Cf. A. Haldar, *šumma*, 63; Garbini, *Sull'alternanza*, 50.

29 Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret*, BASOR Supplementary Studies 2-3 (1946), 35; M. Held, *Eretz Israel* 9, 72. It has been claimed by some that Ugar. *bm* is the etymological precursor of Heb. *bm(b)* with the sense 'Behold!' For references see W. L. Moran, "The Hebrew Language in Its Northwest Semitic Background," in G. E. Wright, ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (N. Y., 1965), 72 and 81, n. 68; and M. Dahood, *Psalms I*, Anchor Bible 16 (N. Y., 1965), 56. However, in nearly every case Heb. *bmb* is incontestably the (emphatic) 3rd masc. pl. independent pronoun; cf. Ugar. and Phoen. *bmt*. Of the less clear passages, in Ps. 9: 7-8, *bmb* is the indep. pron. serving to emphasize *zixrēm*. The text of Ps. 38:11 is problematic (see BH³, ad loc.), and the interjection *bm* in Ugaritic never occurs mid-clause. Hence, it is difficult to claim *gm-bm* for the particle 'Behold!' The only plausible *bm* 'Behold!' in the Hebrew Bible is that in Deut. 33:17; see F. M. Cross, Jr., and D. N. Freedman, *JBL* 67 (1948), 207, n. 62; but contrast the translations of the Jewish Publication Society, *Torah* (1962), 391, and the *New English Bible* (1970), 238, which take *bm* even here pronominally. In fact, that Ugar. *bm* ever means 'Behold!' has been recently contested by J. C. de Moor, "Ugaritic *bm*—Never 'Behold!'," *UF* 1 (1969), 201-02, who argues that Ugar. *bm* has only the meanings of Heb. *'im*. However, his interpretations of IIAB IV: 59-61; I*AB 1:14-17, 18-20; IAB III: 2-3; and SS: 39-42, 42-46, are plausible but yield a difficult sense. Since Heb. *ben/binnē* 'Behold!' often are used as the conditional particle (see Speiser, "A Note on the Derivation of *šumma*," 460), it appears that both Heb. *ben* and

also be etymologically related to Ugar. *hm/bn*.³⁰ Moreover, a dialectal conditional particle *im* exists in Ugaritic beside the standard *hm*.³¹

Recently an apparent case of *hm>ϕm* has turned up in Ugaritic, resulting from the elision of *h* intervocally.³² While functionally weak particles (such as *hm*) tend to become phonetically simpler in general,³³ it is more than likely that such a phonetic simplification of the intervocalic *h* at least contributed to the dropping of initial *h* in the particle *hm* and the introduction of initial ' in that vocable. Since the ancient Semites did not articulate words beginning with a vowel but rather preceded the vowel with a consonant, usually ' or *y*,³⁴ **ϕm* was expressed in Ugaritic phonetically and graphically as 'm.

This phonological development finds parallels throughout Northwest Semitic. Thus, for

'im may correspond etymologically to Ugar. *hm* and that Ugar. *hm* may subsume both the interjection and the conditional particle; cf. Haldar, *šumma*, 64; M. Held, in M. Ben-Horin et al., eds., *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman* (Leiden, 1962), 285, n. 1.

30 See above, n. 29.

31 *PRU* 2, 20:8. See J. C. de Moor, *JNES* 24 (1965), 360; "Ugaritic *hm*—Never 'Behold!'," 201. De Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu*, *AOAT* 16 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971), 233, has claimed *im* in IAB V: 21 as a dialectal variant of *hm*. While he may be right, one does not expect a late dialectal form in such an early text, and the text there is too defective and obscure to attain certainty. Moreover, his translation of the entire passage is controversial; cf. Ginsberg, *ANET*³, 141. There are other plausible *h*-' interchanges evidenced in Ugaritic. De Moor, *JNES* 24, 364, finds a plausible case of the demonstrative *bnk>ank* in *PRU* 2, 21: 6. B. Margulis, *JBL* 89 (1970), 292f., has assembled persuasive evidence (one might add Gen. 14:5 on the connection of the Rephaim with Ashtaroth) that the biblical transjordanian city Edrei appears in Ugaritic (*Ug.* V, no. 2:3) as *hdr'y*. His suggestion has since been endorsed by M. H. Pope and J. H. Tigay, *UF* 3 (1971), 120.

32 P. D. Miller, in L. R. Fisher, ed., *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets* (Rome, 1971), 40, explains the graph *wm* in a new Ugaritic text as *hm*, the *h* eliding following *wa*-. Elsewhere in Ugaritic a *h* may elide, as in the same text: *bbtw = bi-bētiw < bi-bētihu*; and in the imperfect of the verb *blm* 'smite'. His suggestion, therefore, is quite acceptable. The alternative interpretation proposed by M. Dahood, *ibid.*, 53, is simply outlandish, as *wa*- is not a preposition and as there are no parallel cases anywhere, to my knowledge. Gordon, *UT*, #5.39, and J. Obermann, *How Daniel Was Blessed*, 25, n. 57, suggest that elided *h* may be represented by the variant Ugaritic forms *bšhrth* (IK:36) and *bšrty* (IK:151, 297). However, see Virolleaud, quoted by Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret*, 35.

33 Cf. W. Labov, "The Internal Evolution of Linguistic Rules," in R. P. Stockwell and R. K. S. Macauley, eds., *Linguistic Change and Generative Theory* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1972), 134, 139. (I wish to thank Professor J. L. Malone, whose bibliographic references and comments on an earlier version of this paper stimulated my rethinking of the latter portion of this paper. I, however, bear sole responsibility for the views herein expressed.)

34 H. L. Ginsberg, "The Northwest Semitic Languages," in B. Mazar, ed., *The World History of the Jewish People* (N. J., 1970), 2:109. This phenomenon may be attested at Ugarit in the difficult form *ybnt* (VAB III-IV: 83-84), which Ginsberg (*BASOR* 97 [1945], 9) explains as a probable cognate to Arabic *ibnat* 'daughter'. Instead of articulating **ibnat*, they pronounced *yibnat*. The writer thanks Professor Ginsberg for alerting him to this reference. Some loanwords beginning with a vowel are preceded by a *h* in Northwest Semitic; cf. Akk. *ēkallu*>Ugar. *hkl*/Heb. *hēxāl*; Akk. *abarakku*>Phoen. *hbrk* (Azitawadda, line 1). Apparently the consonant was introduced to preserve the initial vowel. Cf. Blake, "Studies in Semitic Grammar," 377. For the equation of *abarakku* and Phoen. *hbrk*, see the forthcoming study of M. Held on the Azitawadda inscription. Contrast the hasty remarks of S. A. Kaufman,

example, in Hebrew the *b*-prefix of the causative conjugation is elided in the imperfect and participle, where it is intervocalic.³⁵ In Phoenician the same phenomenon led to the phonetic simplification of the causative *b*-prefix in the perfect tense, too, where the *b*-prefix is word initial; that is, **bif'il* > **φif'il*, which produced the attested *yif'il*.³⁶ Similarly, in Aramaic the elision of the causative *b*-prefix in the imperfect and participle was extended to the perfect and infinitive as well; that is, *baf'el* > **φaf'el*, expressed 'af'el.³⁷

We believe that Ugar. **bwy* developed into its Heb. counterpart 'iwwō through a similar process. In other words, the *b* of the imperfect **tabawwē* was elided, and the weakening of *b>* extended to all other forms of the verb, producing the verb 'iwwō. While other initial-*b* verbs do not undergo this development in Hebrew in the *pi'el*, there is at least one contributing factor serving to mark **bwy* > 'iwwō as exceptional.³⁸ Only in this *pi'el* verb is the glide *b* followed by a semi-vowel, *w*.³⁹ Since the vowel between them is unstressed, only a

The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic and the Development of the Aramaic Dialects (University Microfilms: Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1971), 36. For the universal tendency to precede a word-initial vowel with the glottal stop, cf. R. W. Langacker, *Language and Structure*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1973), 255. For Semitic, cf. S. Moscati, ed., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden, 1969), esp. §8.54, §10.2.

35 Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, *JRAS* 1935, 53; T. O. Lambdin, in H. Goedicke, ed., *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 320. Perhaps the theophoric element *yō* developed from *y^hō*, too; for the tenuous identification of this development already in "Amorite," see H. B. Huffmon, in *ibid.*, 283f.; and in Ugaritic, see Gordon, *UT*, §19.1084.

36 Ginsberg, *The Northwest Semitic Languages*, 109. For a linguistic account of the operation of rule simplification (or "analogy") involved, see W. Labov, "On the Mechanism of Linguistic Change," *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics*, 18 (1965), 111.

37 M. M. Bravmann, *The Semitic Causative*, 521-22; Ginsberg, *The Northwest Semitic Languages*, 122. The Old Aramaic *baf'el* imperfect with elided *b* is most likely represented in the Sefire III stela, line 3 *yskr*; so Dupont-Sommer, quoted by J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome, 1967), 106. Fitzmyer himself prefers to parse the form as an early attestation of the 'af'el (loc. cit.). This writer, however, holds such early 'af'el forms as suspect. Note that of the other two 'af'el verbs in Sefire that Fitzmyer lists on page 157, the former is of uncertain meaning and the latter is restored. That so similar a phonological development took place independently in Phoenician, Aramaic, and to a lesser extent in Hebrew, may well illustrate a common "drift" to the phonological trends of Northwest Semitic; cf. E. Sapir, *Language*, 171f.; P. M. Postal, *Aspects of Phonological Theory* (New York, 1968), 257.

38 For convergent theoretical explanations of how a phonological change may only affect specific lexical items with specific attendant features, cf. Y. Malkiel, *Essays on Linguistic Themes* (Oxford, 1968), 23-24, 33f.; King, *Historical Linguistics*, 137; and W. Labov, "The Internal Evolution of Linguistic Rules," 122. Another factor that may have contributed to the change is the tendency in languages to avoid homonymy, i.e., *bwb* 'to become; word; treachery/ruin; desire'.

39 A question arises regarding the tetragrammaton *YHWH*. If it were vocalized as a *pi'el* imperfect, it would contradict this assertion. However, all available evidence indicates that it was pronounced as a *bif'il* imperfect, the preformative *b* eliding as is the rule; for a summary of the prevailing view, see L. F. Hartman, in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 7: col. 680. The *-bw-* cluster was preserved in the tetragrammaton because (1) a preformative *b* had most likely been syncopated already, and (2) the sacred tetragrammaton was preserved religiously in writing, even after its original pronunciation ceased. Cf. now F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973) esp. 60-65.

remarkably conservative phonology could maintain unstressed *-abaw-* intact.⁴⁰ As is well known, Hebrew did not conserve, for example, the 3rd masc. sing. pronominal suffix *-abu*, which > *-aw* > *-ō*.⁴¹ Hence, the development of *hawwē* > *'awwē* is not only reasonable but expected.

The noun *hawwē*, which appears alongside the verb *'iwwē* in Prov. 11,⁴² remained unchanged. It probably owed its survival to the following considerations. It is not developed as a verb but is a rare poetic noun. Moreover, when it appears in parallelism, it appears in the second stich, as is the rule with rare poetic words. Hence, it was apparently preserved as a poetic archaism. Whether the poets were conscious of an etymological connection with *'awwē* cannot, of course, be determined.

40 Cf. the change of initial **bw>w* in Syriac; C. H. Gordon, *Orientalia* 9 (1940), 31; and in English; King, *Historical Linguistics*, 80f.

41 See, e.g., Harris, *Development*, 30, 55-56.

42 The former appears in v. 6, the latter in v. 23.