In the light of this, we cannot rule out as implausible the theory that the Semitic root $hwy$ may have had a partially similar range of meaning. It is not being claimed that the meanings attested for $kanãm(m)$ and those attested or posited for $hwy$ coincide at all points: they clearly do not. But there is a sufficient degree of overlap to show that a quite reasonable semantic development is being envisaged when it is claimed that $hištah câwâb$ and its Ugaritic cognate are related to Arabic $hawâ$. If that is so, then it is at least less clear that the traditional explanation of $hištah câwâb$ is to be preferred.
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1) In *Instruction and Interpretation*, *Oudtestamentische Studien* 20 (Leiden, 1977), pp. 41-55. Page references are to this article where details of earlier discussions of the problem will be found.


It is now clear, as Mr A. R. Millard has kindly pointed out to me, that *kam* $âti$ is the gen. pl. of *kam* $âtu/kawâtu = “outside” and does not mean “distress”, as Campbell Thompson translated it.

7) The text was published by R. Labat, “Une Nouvelle Tablette de Pronostics Médicaux”, *Syria* 33 (1956), pp. 119-30 (cf. p. 124 [Face, l. 21]). Cf. also the note *ša amēti* (= “used of man”) in a lexical text (*CT*. 12. 46 I 1-15).

8) The Chicago Dictionary several times gives “twist, contort” for this group of uses of the verb, but the conjunction of it with $tarâš(m)$ (= “extend”), probably as its opposite, favours von Soden’s view that the meaning is “contract”, which is also a more likely basis for the uses of the $Stn$ and $D$ stems cited above.

**YÂPIÂH IN PSALM XII 6**

In a recent study “ypb ‘witness’ in Hebrew and Ugaritic”, *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 204-13, Dennis Pardee has collected the evidence for the word $yp(y)b = “witness” that appears in both Ugaritic and Hebrew 1). The meaning “witness” for both words has been recognized before by several other scholars, but Pardee’s review and summary of the evidence in light of more recent Ugaritic examples may be regarded as settling the matter and demonstrating one of the clearer cases of the impact of Ugaritic on Hebrew lexicography.

*Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. XXIX, Fasc. 4
The Ugaritic contracts UT 2116 and Claremont 1957-702 give good examples of the Ugaritic word in context. The several cases in Proverbs (vi 19, xii 5, xiv 5, 25, xix 5, 9) where yăpiḥahu appears in parallel or collocation with ‘ēd = “witness” confirm the presence of a noun yăpiḥahu = “witness” in Hebrew also. In addition to the examples from Proverbs, Ps. xxvii 12 is another clear instance of yphb = “witness” and probably also Hab. ii 3, particularly if ‘ēd should be read instead of ‘ēd (though such an emendation is not required.)

Pardee gives a helpful discussion of the possible etymology of yphb. One or two reservations, however, need to be registered. In light of the spelling of ūppm, “bellows”, with b it would seem best not to resort to etymologies on the basis of Arabic roots nfh and nfb, fwb and fwb with related but different meanings, i.e. “pour forth” (nfh and fwb) and “blow” (nfb and fwb). It is better to assume in light of the Ugaritic evidence that yphb and pwb have neither phonetic nor semantic relation to each other. In other words the etymology of yphb is unknown.

As for the type of noun, I would suggest that yphb is a qatil → qatil form similar to such words as ‘āriḥ, “tyrant”, pālīṭ, “fugitive”, pāqīd, “overseer”, nāqīd, “leader, ruler” 

One can hardly be certain of the form, but there are other alternatives to assuming, as does Pardee, that the word was borrowed from a dialect or language without the ā → ō shift but after that shift had taken place in Hebrew. Inasmuch as our examples are from Ugaritic and Hebrew, such an explanation is less likely. As Pardee rightly points out, Ugaritic *yāpiḥhu would have become yōpeah in Hebrew, and the traditional sources for borrowing in the middle of the first millennium do not seem possible in this instance. Both those correct observations cause problems for Pardee’s postulated *yāpiḥhu. He is probably correct in regarding the form as a verbal adjective (active participle), but, if so, the Hebrew vocalization strongly suggests the common nominal pattern Ugaritic *yāpiḥhu — Hebrew yāpīḥyu yāpiḥaḥ.

The basic purpose of this note is to suggest that there is one other passage where the word yāpiḥah may mean “witness” as over against the usual interpretation of it as a Hiphil form of the verb pwb. All the Hiphil forms of pwb listed in the lexicon need to be examined to see if any others of them could in fact be yāpiḥah = “witness”. In addition to the ones discussed by Pardee and others, presumed Hiphil forms of pwb are found in Cant. iv 16; Ezek. xxi 36; Prov. xxix 8; Ps. x 5, xii 6. The first three examples are indeed instances