

SHORT NOTES

USES OF THE SEMITIC DEMONSTRATIVE ELEMENT Z IN HEBREW

The demonstrative particle *d/d/z* is shared by all the Semitic languages of the Northwest and South, and shows an interesting semantic development which can be traced in Hebrew (as in its sister dialects ¹).

The most common use of this particle is, of course, as a simple adjectival demonstrative of the 'this—the man' or 'the man—the this' types, which need no illustration. The next stage in development is to give to the adjectival demonstrative the force of a substantive, 'this man/thing', which again is common enough to need no elaboration. From this, it is but a short step to the use of the demonstrative particle as a relative: 'the man, the one in the house' = 'the man who is in the house', and Aramaic and Arabic and their cognate dialects have this as their usual construction. But here Hebrew turns aside from the main stream, preferring the element *š* in company with East Semitic and the coastal dialects of Phoenicia, at least in its colloquial ²).

¹) The various orthographic forms in which this element appears in the various Semitic languages is an interesting study in itself, but not one with which I am dealing here. The Hebrew forms are: הַ, הַאִי (הַאִי), הַ and הַ, and in the doubly demonstrative forms הַהַ, הַהַ (= هَا هَا; cf. Ibn Barūn in his 'Book of Comparison between the Hebrew and Arabic Languages', I, quoted by P. WECHTER, *JAOS* 61 (1941) p. 176b; G. R. DRIVER, *JTS* xxx (1929) pp. 377f., *VT* i (1951) pp. 244 f.), הַהַ, הַהַ, הַהַ, and possibly also הַהַ (1 Sam. xx 12 for הַהַ) and הַהַ (1 Sam. xx 19, for הַהַ cf. S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Book of Samuel*², 1913, pp. 167 f.). There has certainly been confusion between הַ and הַ in Hebrew (cf. BARTH, *Pronominalbildung*, 1913, p. 153) as between *d*² and *dw* in early Arabic inscriptional material (cf. RABIN, *Ancient West Arabian*, 1951, p. 205). With only our comparatively late MSS to work on, we cannot be certain of such minutiae as the original orthography of particles like these in Hebrew.

²) Allowing SEGAL's theory to be correct, that the northern הַ (הַ) worked its

In poetry, however, it can also use ζ , which would seem to indicate that this usage is a relic of the time when Hebrew stood closer to the Aramaic stream ¹). But we are more concerned at present with its use than its origin, and the next stage of development, although used with increasing frequency in the Aramaic dialects is but rarely represented in Hebrew. This is the idiom whereby the ζ particle, standing alone or in apposition to a previous noun, comes before a noun in the genitive and makes a circumlocutory genitival construction of the type דְּבֵיתִי 'those of my house' = 'my kin', or $\text{רִישָׁא דְּמַלְכָא}$ 'the head, the one of the king' = 'the king's head'. In translating these constructions we usually use the word 'of', but even in the first example above it will be noted that the preposition 'in' might equally well have been used. All that the particle does, in fact, like any other genitival construction, is to bring one noun into close relationship with another, the nature of that relationship depending on the sense of the phrase. Where the genitive expresses a particular quality or abstraction, the genitival relationship can in fact be reversed. For example, $\text{רִישָׁא דְּמַלְכָא}$ must mean 'the king's head', but רוּחַ קְדוֹשׁ means, 'the Spirit, the one possessing Holiness' = 'the Holy Spirit', and in Arabic, of course, the particle ذو comes to bear the meaning 'possessor of' ²) although, in fact, it can be used in phrases where this meaning is quite inapplicable ³). Classical Hebrew expresses the same idea by means of the

'place' in such sentences as $\text{בְּאֵשֶׁר תִּמְצוּת אֲמַצוּת}$ (Ru. i 17), (*AJSL* xxxi (1914-15) pp. 3 ff.), with which one might well compare the local (and sometimes temporal) use of the Accadian *atar* (Cf. VON SODEN, *Grundriss d. Akk. Gr.*, 1952, § 116f). Against this, seeing ו as a shortened or otherwise derived form of וְאֵן , stand OLSHAUSEN, GESENIUS, EWALD, SPERLING, BÖTCHER, KÖNIG (with variations on the origin of the *'aleph* expressed in the two volumes of his *Lehrgebäude*, I, pp. 135 ff. II, 322 f.), BAUMANN, PHILIPPI and EITAN (who is reduced to finding a deictic element *r* in the Semitic languages, cf. *AJSL* xlv (1928) pp. 178 f.). With WRIGHT (*Comparative Grammar*, 1890, p. 118), we must "see the origin of the relative pronoun somewhere in the region of the demonstratives". It is the more surprising, then, that Phoenician and Hebrew should have preferred a particle with the element *f* which does not appear in any of its demonstratives, which include, of course, personal pronouns. We cannot doubt that, at one stage of its history, Hebrew had two dialects which were characterised by differing demonstratives, the one in ζ , the other in *f*, or perhaps one had both, meaning 'nearer' and 'further' respectively. Presumably, the *f* personal pronoun which must have underlain it went the way of the old *šahbšf*

construct state ¹⁾, but since we have noted that the retention of ζ as a relative is continued in the archaic language of the poet, it might be expected that we should find traces of these other developments also. This is, in fact, the case, and once recognised serves to avoid misunderstandings in the text. Many years ago GRIMME suggested ²⁾ that this usage had been preserved in the ancient Canaanitizing war-song of Deborah (Jud. v 5) and the closely related Ps. lxxviii (v. 9), in the phrase יהוה זה סיני (אלהים), 'God of Sinai' to be compared with the Nabatean דושרא, 'The One of Sh.', *Dusares*, the chief god of that people ³⁾. It seems that a striking example may also be found in the messianic prophecy of Mic. v, where in v. 4, מה זה שלום may be rendered 'Possessor of (Lord of) Peace', and compared with the שר שלום of Isa. ix 5. Similarly, in Ps. xxxiv 7, the phrase מה זה עוני ought to be understood as 'the poor man', lit., 'he possessing affliction or poverty' (reading עני for MT עני).

The particle ו, as a relative, usually stands before a verb, as in Ex. xv 13, 16, Isa. xlii 24, xliii 21, etc. ⁴⁾, but in Ps. xii 8: תצרטו מן-הדור וו לעולם we can see a use of ו ל corresponding to אשר ל and, more cogently, to the later של. The basic construction is 'from the generation, the one of everlasting' = 'from the everlasting generation', and is to be compared with the remarkable parallel in Ugaritic:

¹⁾ Cf. GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, *Hebrew Grammar*²⁶, § 128p; e.g.: בגדי קדש; 'the holy garments', (Ex. xxix 29); ארזות עולם 'an everlasting possession' (Gen. xvii 8).

²⁾ ZDMG 50 (1896) p. 571; cf. also W. F. ALBRIGHT, *JBL* 54 (1935) p. 204; *BAJOR* 62 (April 1936) p. 30, *HUCA* 23 (1950-51) I. p. 20 and H. S. NYBERG, *Hebreisk Grammatik*, 1952, § 84 | Anm. 2, who renders it, quite legitimately, 'han på Sinai, Sinais herre'.

³⁾ Cf. G. A. COOKE, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, 1903, pp. 218 f.

⁴⁾ Note the very interesting parallel of Ps. ix, 16: ברשתיו וקטני with ורשתיו of Ps. xxxv 8. This use of ו as an uninflected relative particle has its counterpart, as is well known, in the Tayyi' dialectal و (cf. *Lisānu 'l-'arab*, xx 348, etc. and RABIN, *op. cit.*, p. 205 with references quoted there). RABIN (*ibid.*, p. 205) sees this as another example of the very real connection between the ancient West Arabian dialects of Arabic and Hebrew and in passing we might note the same usage in Safaitic (cf. LITTMAN, *Syria* IV C, 1943, p. XVI). By other routes

'*abdk.an.wd'lmk*, 'thy servant am I and thine eternal slave' (lit.: 'and one-of-thine-eternity')¹).

Bearing in mind this determination of the genitive by a possessive suffix, something of the sort may be meant in the enigmatic Hab. i 11, where *חזקו חזקו* would then mean 'his Strong One' or, 'Possessor (Source) of his s.', perhaps a borrowed phrase with cultic significance²).

Manchester

J. M. ALLEGRO

THE ROOT *MHH* ATTESTED IN UGARITIC

As far as I am aware the root *mhb* has not yet been found in the Ugaritic texts published until now. In three instances a word *mh* occurs, but in two of these (1 Aqht : 201 and 2 Aqht : I : 39) it seems to be quite a different word of which the meaning is not yet clear to me. In the third case, however, where the word *mh* occurs (GORDON, 125 : 27) it had, as far as I know, always been brought into connection with the Accadian word *mubbu* "brain". This vision was favoured by the fact that in the context the word is followed by *riš* "head" and the usual translation "brains of the head" was not too far fetched, but it does not make any sense.

It concerns the following passage in text 125 : 26, 27:

al tkel bn qr 'nk
mh rišk udm't

GORDON translated:

"Do not exhaust, O my son, the well of thine eyes
Nor the brain of thy head with tears!"

and GINSBERG: "Waste not thine eye with flowing,
The brain in thy head with tears."

¹) 67 : II : 12; cf. C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook*, 1947, § 13.65.

²) I note that EITAN has already suggested a similar interpretation in a previous number of this journal (IV (1954), p. 281), only making the phrase refer to the people 'possessed of power'. Perhaps the other possible instances of this use of the *Z* particle noted in this paper may soften BIRKELAND's objection to GRIMME's interpretation of the Sinai phrase in Jud. v 5 (*Studia Theologica* II (1949-50), p. 201-202). Even so, his linguistic objections are difficult to understand, since he admits that the Aramaic *dl* makes as good a starting point as any for the development of the usage later so common in Arabic. Its possible