The Etymology of *hištaḥawāh*

Two explanations of *hištaḥawāh* have been advanced. First, it was once generally agreed that it was the *hithpaʿlel* of *šāḥāh*, from a root ṣḥw. Second, it has more recently been thought that it is the *hishtaphʿal* of a verb *ḥāwāh*, from a root ḥwy. The purpose of the present article is to examine the arguments for and against the two theories.

The more recent explanation of *hištaḥawāh* was first, as far as I know, put forward in 1875 by Martin Hartmann, who suggested that it was a reflexive of the *shaphʿel* of *ḥāwāh*, “sich winden”. The theory seems to have been ignored
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by most scholars until it was advanced again, perhaps independently, after the discovery of the Ugaritic texts, in which the forms yštḥwy and tštḥwy are found in contexts suggesting a meaning identical with that of the Hebrew verb (CTA 1.iii 25; 2.i 15, 31; 3.iii 7, vi 19; 4.iv 26, viii 28; 6.i 38—and in several places where the word is damaged). W.F. Albright claimed in the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 12 (1932), p. 197, note 41, that the “orthography [sc. of the Ugaritic verb] shows” that the Hebrew verb “is derived from a stem” *ḥāwāh*, and he compared Arabic ḥawā(y), of which the V theme means “coil, of a serpent, etc.” His explanation of the Ugaritic evidence has been accepted in such standard works as E. Hammershaimb’s dissertation on the Ugaritic verb, pp. 53, 221–2; G.R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, Edinburgh 1956, p. 139; J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch*, no. 912; and—with a different opinion about the etymology—C.H. Gordon, *Grammar*, § 9.39, and *Glossary*, no. 847. The same explanation of the Hebrew verb is given in a number of recent works, including L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* I, 3rd edn, Leiden 1967, pp. 283–4; and R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik* II, 3rd edn, Berlin 1969, §§ 72.1 (d), and 82.5 (c). In F. Zorell, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti*, fasc. 1–9, reprinted in Rome 1968, pp. 832–3, the Hebrew verb is derived from šāḥāh but the Ugaritic from ḥwy.
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Before the arguments for and against the two theories are examined, the place of the theme of the verb with prefixed Št or St in Semitic languages will be briefly considered. In Accadian, the causative theme begins with š and the element t is used primarily to express the reflexive idea, and the reflexive of the causative is the Št theme. In South Semitic languages, the Arabic X theme, ’istaf’ala, is the reflexive of the causative IV theme, and corresponding themes are found in Ethiopic and Epigraphic South Arabian.³ The t plainly represents the reflexive idea, and the sibilant the causative; and it may be observed that,
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